UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 99—PART 4

MAY 1, 1953, TO MAY 27, 1953
(PAGES 4271 TO 5748)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1953

J11
.R
V.99
PT.A

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2-22-54

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 1, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Theodore T. Dixon, pastor, Congregational Church, Plainville, Conn., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, before whose face the nations rise and pass away, we look to Thee as we undertake the deliberations and decisions of this day. We bless Thee for Thy guidance in the past, and for Thy leading to the opportunities of this hour. Grant now Thy wisdom unto these Thy servants as they fashion the laws of our beloved land. Show them Thy will, and give them courage and confidence to lead our country in Thy way. So may justice prevail, and peace be found, and to Thee shall be our praise forevermore.

We pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 30, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 30, 1953, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1767) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4654. An act to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to appoint a committee to attend the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the first airplane flight at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may have an opportunity to present bills and resolutions and to transact other routine business, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to the passage of H. R. 2137, being a bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States H. R. 2137, entitled 'A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes'; and

"Whereas a proposal of this nature has for its purpose the equitable treatment of all members of the Armed Forces of the United States, including members of the Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, persons who answered the call of the President and were accepted for Federal service, during the period heretofore mentioned, or enlisted men who were accepted for active service in the federalized units of the National Guard pursuant to said call: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island does hereby respectfully request the Congress of the United States to pass the measure above described; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the presiding officers of each honorable body of Congress and to the Senators and Congressmen from Rhode Island duly certified copies of this resolution."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; ordered to lie on the table:

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the tidelands belonged to the United States and that the Federal Government had supervision over the offshore oil; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill directing the Federal Government to continue supervision of offshore oil and that the proceeds therefrom be contributed to education as provided therein: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 65th session assembled:*

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact into law the bill now pending before it giving supervision of offshore oil and that the proceeds therefrom be contributed to education as provided therein.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to a repeal of the 1952 amendment to the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, the Fulbright amendment, so-called

"Whereas United States Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has introduced legislation to repeal the Fulbright amendment, so-called, to the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act which permitted textile mills and other Government contractors to challenge in the courts wage orders issued under that law by the Department of Labor; and

"Whereas in introducing his bill Senator Green asserted that the Fulbright amendment, passed in 1952, did not protect legitimate manufacturers or contractors seeking to do business with the United States; it seriously cripples the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act; it was adopted in a most unusual manner and certainly it was not given sufficient thought and consideration by Congress; and

"Whereas the New England Governors' Textile Industry Committee has also stated:

" 'In the program of reducing the wage differential, we ask for adequate minimum-wage legislation and administration. Not only should the Walsh-Healey Act, setting minimum wages on Government contracts, be maintained without the encumbrances

of the 1952 Fulbright amendment, but adjustments in minimum wages, as a reflection of the general wage scale, should be made much more expeditiously than in the past; and the minimum under the Fair Labor Standards Act should be raised;' and

"Whereas since the Defense Production Act terminates on June 30, 1953, while the Fulbright amendment, so-called, is permanent legislation, this amendment opens the way to confusion, uncertainty, and needless litigation. Controversies regarding governmental policies in respect to minimum wages and working conditions should not be decided by our courts of law. Such policies should be decided by the Congress, and carried out by wise administrative actions of the executive branch of the Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this general assembly from Rhode Island now respectfully memorializes Congress to work for the repeal of said Fulbright amendment to the Defense Production Act; respectfully requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in Congress to use every effort on behalf of the repeal of said Fulbright amendment; authorizing the Secretary of State to transmit to said Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—RESOLUTION OF SUPREME COUNCIL, ORDER OF SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, some time ago, the Supreme Council of the Order of Sons of Italy in America, meeting in plenary session, adopted a resolution in regard to our present immigration and naturalization law. In that resolution, the Sons of Italy, a fine organization of which I have known for many years, expressed its strong opposition to the so-called McCarran-Walter Act and made a number of suggestions for radical revision.

While some of the revisions proposed by that organization are less sweeping in scope than those I would urge, this certainly constitutes further recognition of the widespread base of the opposition to the present act.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, adopted by that great Italian-American organization, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA, IN PLENARY SESSION, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 11, 1953

Whereas it is becoming increasingly evident throughout the entire Nation that the adoption of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 does not adequately solve immigration and naturalization problems, but, on the contrary denies essential principles which have been of the utmost importance in the natural development of our beloved country, the United States of America; and

Whereas the general welfare of the people of our Nation requires that the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 be modified and amended to safeguard the inalienable rights heretofore enjoyed by all citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the problems surrounding immigration and naturalization have become serious problems not only for the people of the United States of America but also for the people of many other nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Supreme Council of the Order Sons of Italy, in plenary session at the Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C., on April 11, 1953, That the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 be amended as follows:

1. The inequalities and injustices which can and do arise under existing immigration-quota system based on national origins should be minimized by the suggestions herein advanced.

2. The annual immigration quota should be 250,000, which number we believe can be conveniently absorbed by this country.

3. The quotas of all nations should be reexamined every 3 years. The number of visas to be allotted to each nation should be based upon the average number used by such nations during the preceding 3 years. All unused quotas should be reallocated. Countries which have used up to 90 percent of their quota should be allowed to participate in the distribution of unused quotas on the same ratio as heretofore established.

4. Adopted children under the age of 14 should be given preference and admitted in the same category as children are generally now admitted.

5. That parents of American citizens should be admitted as nonquota immigrants.

6. Although the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, should be continued as a part of the McCarran-Walter Act in order to make possible the codification of all laws relating to immigration and naturalization, the persons actually admitted as displaced persons should be admitted in addition to established quotas.

7. The judicial powers given to administrative officers, boards, and any other governmental agencies should be eliminated. Any person or persons having powers of prosecution, should not be granted any judicial powers which deprive an individual of his rights to trial by the courts of the United States. Furthermore, the provisions of the Statute of Limitations heretofore existing should be reenacted.

8. Naturalized citizens should enjoy all the rights and privileges of native-born citizens as heretofore established by the Constitution of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and to the chairmen of both Senate and House Committees on Immigration and Naturalization.

In witness whereof, I, the Supreme Venerable of the Order Sons of Italy in America, have hereunto set my hand, the date and year aforesaid.

GEORGE J. SPATUZZA,
Supreme Venerable.

Attest:

A. A. DEMARTINIS,
Supreme Recording Secretary.

DECLINE OF FARM PRICES—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, BARRON COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I have received from the Barron County (Wis.) Board of Supervisors, relating to the very serious decline of farm prices. I know this area of my State exceedingly well, and I can appreciate the tremendously harmful impact of the recent price decline there, as well as elsewhere throughout the dairy heart of our Nation.

I present the resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 2

Whereas we feel that the family-size farm is the backbone of our American democracy; and

Whereas agricultural income has a definite bearing on the Nation's economy, and agricultural trends are closely watched as economic barometers; and

Whereas Barron County is basically an agricultural and dairy county, and naturally feels the effects of up-and-down trends in agricultural income sooner than do industrial sections of the land; and

Whereas farm prices have now dropped 12 percent below the 1952 level, while many things the farmer buys to maintain his farm operations have continued to increase in price: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Barron County Board of Supervisors, duly assembled this 21st day of April 1953, do feel a deep concern over the trend in agricultural prices, and therefore, respectfully petition the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. EZRA T. BENSON, to do everything practical to place agricultural income on an equal basis with the things the farmer has to buy to maintain his farm operations, so that the family-size farm will survive and remain prosperous; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of these United States; Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Hon. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Senators; and Hon. MERLIN HULL, Congressman.

A. V. BODEEN.
EDGAR L. PERRY.
FRED ORGAN.

DECLINE IN FARM PRICES—RESOLUTION OF TWIN LAKES (MINN.) LOCAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Twin Lakes Local, Minnesota Farmers Union, Twin Lakes, Minn., on March 23, 1953, relating to the decline in farm prices.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We take this opportunity to commend you on your efforts to provide an adequate Federal support program on farm products.

We believe that it is necessary and just to legislate a balanced farm-support program, not only to protect the income of agriculture but the economy of the entire Nation as well.

The Twin Lakes Local, Minnesota Farmers Union (consisting of 69 farm families), unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas agriculture constitutes the foundation of the Nation's economy; and

"Whereas the falling farm prices are being directly reflected on the other segments of our economy: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Twin Lakes Local, Minnesota Farmers Union, goes on record requesting Federal legislation supporting all farm products perishable and nonperishable at 90 to 110 percent of the old parity formula, through a program of compensatory payments and Federal purchase of surplus products; further be it

"*Resolved*, That any surplus in excess of adequate reserve, be disposed through assistance to aged, welfare work, school-lunch

program, and to any nations who suffer from famine and catastrophe."

The above resolution was adopted March 23, 1953.

GARWOOD LARSON,
President.
M. S. PERKINS,
Secretary.
ANDREW O. LARSON,
Legislative Director.

FARM PARITY, ETC.—RESOLUTIONS OF CENTRAL COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE, SUPERIOR, WIS.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the Central Cooperative Wholesale, Superior, Wis., at their annual meeting held on April 14 and 15, relating to farm parity, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIDELANDS OIL

Whereas we are much concerned as a group in the extremely rapid rate of dissipation of the irreplaceable natural resources of the Nation, and all too often only a few benefit whereby the whole country should; and

Whereas one of the few remaining great natural resources is the tidelands oil off the United States coastline; we fear that the granting of the national rights to the coastline States would set an example which might result in a very shortsighted policy in the disposition of the remaining Federal natural resources, such as timber, rangelands, water and minerals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting favors control of the so-called tidelands oil by the Federal Government for the benefit of the whole population of this great country.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Whereas the United States is on notice that the Canadian Government is already committed to construction of the St. Lawrence seaway alone if this country does not choose to participate in making it a joint undertaking; and

Whereas the overwhelming facts and arguments in favor of the seaway in the interest of opening up the great central and western areas of the United States and Canada to more advanced agricultural and industrial development, obtaining at the same time great additional resources of badly needed electrical energy especially for the populous eastern sections of the country, strengthening our defenses against any threat of war, and that the project will be self-liquidating, are already established over years of exhaustive surveys and hearings: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we hereby declare ourselves as being most emphatically in favor of an immediate agreement with Canada for the joint construction, utilization and control of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor development of the seaway all the way to Lake Superior, because the currently advocated idea of development of the canals only up to Lake Erie would still leave the North Central States without the benefit of the seaway.

FARM PARITY

Whereas American agriculture, and particularly the small dairy farmers of our area are today caught in the pincers of rising costs and falling prices; and

Whereas the protection of our vital agricultural industry through the parity principle is an accepted and workable formula; and

Whereas we note with alarm that the present administration is acting against its own campaign promises, by administering the farm parity program with obvious antagonism and thus causing fears throughout the agricultural industry; that an effort may be made to kill the parity program at the expiration of the present act in 1954: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this 36th annual meeting of the Central Cooperative Wholesale, acting in behlf of its tens of thousands of farmer members demand vigorous administration of the present 90 percent parity law and for enactment of 100 percent farm parity in 1954: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson.

ON THE THREATS TO REA

The rural-electrification program has in its relatively short existence brought a marvelous change throughout rural America. It has been a change to improved living for millions of farm families, and to assure production of food and fiber in the increasing volume that our Nation needs in peace and war.

The delegates of this 36th annual meeting of the Central Cooperative Wholesale are therefore most seriously concerned at recent moves, in and out of Congress and those identified as counselors to the national administration, to minimize the need for and usefulness of the REA, to curtail its development, and to eliminate it as a safeguard against unbridled power monopoly. The delegates therefore urge every member of the Senate and House of Representatives, most particularly those representing States and districts within the area of the Central Cooperative Wholesale, to be now highly alert against such moves and, instead, promote measures whereby REA projects may be developed with assurance of access to power sources and with no discrimination because of their nonprofit cooperative nature. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to Senators, Congressmen, and three State associations of cooperatives of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—LETTER FROM ANOKA-HENNEPIN (MINN.) PUBLIC SCHOOLS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from Ruth E. Nordlie, corresponding secretary of the Anoka-Hennepin Public Schools Education Association, relating to the so-called Hill amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 13, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOKA-HENNEPIN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Anoka, Minn., April 27, 1953.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Anoka-Hennepin Public Schools Education Association recommends that the Hill amendment to the tidelands' oil bill giving this money to education be approved.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH E. NORDLIE,
Corresponding Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 4664. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 214).

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1376. A bill to amend section 503 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 213).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. CARLSON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1807. A bill for the relief of William Jeffrey Jonas; and

S. 1808. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Monti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1809. A bill for the relief of Evaristo Da Silva Gaspar and Victor Manuel Caetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1810. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code in reference to the survival of things in action; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1811. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of the late John L. LeCours; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1812. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico so as to prevent discrimination under Puerto Rican income-tax laws against citizens of the various States of the United States who are nonresidents of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1813. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, so as to extend the privilege of trial by jury to certain cases arising within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and KERR):

S. 1814. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to construct certain works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention, on the Beaver Creek watershed in Oklahoma; and

S. 1815. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Beaver Creek watershed, in Oklahoma, for purposes of runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF CANAL ZONE CODE, RELATING TO SURVIVAL OF THINGS IN ACTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the request of the Central Labor Union and the Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Canal Zone Code in reference to the survival of things in action.

Several years ago an automobile accident in the Panama Canal Zone which resulted in the death of the careless driver who was the cause of the accident brought out the fact that Canal Zone law did not permit the individuals who were injured in the accident to bring suit against the estate of the wrongdoer.

The bill would remedy this situation. It prevents a cause of action for a tort from being defeated by the death of the person responsible for the tort. The bill also gives the estate of a person who had a right to collect damages on account of a tort to bring suit instead of the deceased.

I am informed that the adoption of these amendments to the Canal Zone Code would simply bring the code into line with the laws of most of our States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1810) to amend the Canal Zone Code in reference to the survival of things in action, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LEHMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to Senate Joint Resolution 13, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GREEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate Joint Resolution 13, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 833) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar as indicated:

H. R. 4654. An act to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to appoint a committee to attend the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the first airplane flight at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C.; placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS (S. DOC. NO. 47)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, President Eisenhower has just issued a historic Executive order setting up a new loyalty-review program for our Government.

Anticipating that important act, I had several months ago requested the Library of Congress to prepare a comprehensive compilation of laws and Executive orders dealing with the history of internal security in the United States.

This compilation has now been completed. It brings up to date a similar study which had been previously prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

As an individual Senator and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I have always believed that America's effectiveness in her foreign policy would depend at least in part upon her own security right here at home. This in turn depends upon the effectiveness of our laws designed to protect and preserve this constitutional Republic from enemies from within.

Let me note that fortunately for our country down through the years, the agency which is the foremost sentinel of America's freedom, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under its great Director, the Honorable John Edgar Hoover, has valiantly and tirelessly fulfilled its investigative responsibilities under our internal security laws.

But often those laws have been sadly lacking in enabling the Bureau to fulfill its great mission. Fortunately, too, the Internal Security Act of 1950 helped to close many gaps in the law and to add much-needed teeth to it.

Today, we of the United States who have emerged as the leading Nation of the earth in the effort to preserve freedom for mankind, can ill afford to ignore or underestimate the cancerous danger of Communist subversion.

Acting on that premise, I had arranged in January for the formation of a Security Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This subcommittee is to deal exclusively with problems of worldwide Communist sabotage, espionage, and sedition.

On Sunday, the subcommittee will release a 28-page committee print entitled "Adequacy of United States Laws With Respect to Offenses Against National Security." This print setting forth loopholes in current laws, has been prepared by Mary Lowe Ramsey of the American Law Division of the Library of Congress at my direction, and with the cooperation of the counsel of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Julius H. Cann.

I believe that the brief committee print will be extremely helpful and will be an interesting adjunct to this much more extensive Senate document whose publication I am now suggesting.

With regard to the latter, I feel that it will be of particular interest and use to all law enforcement agencies of the Government and also, to security officers of Federal agencies.

The voluminous spadework for this particular extensive compilation has been performed by Mrs. Mollie Margolin of the American Law Division of the Library. Review and editing of the manuscript had been assigned to the counsel of my committee, with the assistance of the appropriate Federal authorities.

The resulting document lists all of our laws relating to subversive activities.

It cites all provisions for security applying to Government agencies.

It enumerates the sequence of events in the Federal loyalty program, chronologically listing all of the statutes and Executive order.

Lastly it sets forth the provisions of the Executive order with respect to employment of American nationals on the United Nations Secretariat.

I have prepared an introduction to the report, stressing anew that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. I ask unanimous consent that it, together with this compilation, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I wish to announce that beginning on Tuesday, May 19, and continuing through May 19, 20, 21, and 22, and presumably the first 3 days of the following week, the Subcommittee on Civil Rights of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will hold hearings, in the old Supreme Court Chamber, on Senate bill 692, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

In this connection I urge all civic groups of national importance who are interested in this subject to be represented at the hearings. Most of all I would urge those who are represented to have the heads of their organizations present to testify. I happen to know that many outstanding organizations in the United States favor this type of leg-

islation, but unfortunately too many times the heads of the organizations themselves do not see fit to appear. I believe the time has come when they themselves should be present at the hearings.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF HORACE A. HILDRETH, TO BE AMBASSADOR TO PAKISTAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the White House sent to the Senate today the nomination of Horace A. Hildreth, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan. Notice is hereby given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, under the committee rule.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Government Operations:

Edmund F. Mansure, of Illinois, to be Administrator of General Services.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. NEELY:

Address delivered by Senator KILGORE at a meeting of the Women's Democratic Club of Silver Spring, Md., on April 29, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Peace and Prosperity," published in the Oil City Derrick of April 23, 1953.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

Editorial entitled "Korea: A Test Case," published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, 1953.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Editorial entitled "The Press Shields Itself," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 21, 1953.

Editorial entitled "The Virtues of Unlimited Debate," published in the Arkansas Gazette of April 26, 1953.

Interview with Anna Falconer, teacher from Dundee, Scotland, now teaching in Jacksonville, Ark.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Editorial entitled "Senator HUMPHREY on Immigration Laws," published on April 18, 1953, in the Chicago Pnyx, American-Greek newspaper.

Editorial from America for April 25, 1953, commenting on immigration resolutions adopted at the 33d annual convention of the National Council of Catholic Men, in St. Louis.

Article entitled "Public Policy Toward Communist Unions," written by Father Benjamin L. Masse, and published in America for April 25, 1953.

Memorandum of the United States conference of mayors, called by the White House, Washington, D. C., March 31, 1953, relating to Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

REPATRIATION OF KOREAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter dated April 6, 1953, which I wrote to the Secretary of State relative to prisoners of war who are in our hands in Korea, and also a letter written to me, in reply, by Mr. Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I have been somewhat disturbed in recent days by indications that India might be acceptable as the power to have control over the prisoners of war. From the point of view of the United States, the United Nations, and India herself. I think it would be a great mistake to designate India for that role, because India has a common border with Communist China, and would be subject to pressures from that country.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement made by Prime Minister Nehru on January 17, 1953, at the Conference of the All India Congress Party at Hyderabad, in which Mr. Nehru indicated that the prisoners of war should not have the choice as to whether or not they wished to return to Communist China.

I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement made in the United Nations last December in the closing speech of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, representative of India. I believe this statement is very disturbing not only to the American people, but also to the people of the free world.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 6, 1953.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed is some information relative to the prisoner-of-war situation which was forwarded to me by Mr. Christopher Emmet. I believe that he also sent the same material to you, but knowing how busy you are I am not sure whether you have had a chance to examine the same or not. I believe that it is extremely important in light of the discussions which are now going on and may be contemplated in the future.

I have recently received some figures that disturbed me and for which there appears to be no satisfactory explanation at the present. On May 9, 1952, the following situation prevailed among the prisoners-of-war in Korea relative to their desire to be returned to Communist hands or their determination to resist being returned to Communist hands. Frankly, I have never been satisfied that we had made the fullest use of the opportunity of exploiting the adverse effect upon the Communist world of this situation. I am satisfied from reports reaching me that the questions were all loaded against the person who had the desire to remain outside of the Iron Curtain and in favor of his returning. It was only those who felt so strongly that they said they would resist return by force that were included in the "no" column. The figures are as follows:

	No (would not return)	Yes (would return)	Total
1952, May 9:			
Chinese	15,600	5,100	20,700
North Koreans	42,100	53,900	96,000
South Korean Communists	12,200	3,800	16,000
Total	69,900	62,800	132,700
1953, Feb. 3 (no breakdown by nationality):			
Chinese	----------	----------	21,106
North Koreans	----------	----------	101,620
South Korean Communists	----------	----------	----------
Total	39,726	83,000	122,726

Just what does this mean? Have we permitted further Communist propaganda urging the return of unwilling prisoners of war or has the moral effect of words spreading in the prisoner-of-war camps that while the Communists can return to their homeland, the best that the prisoners who want no part of the Iron Curtain again can look forward to is more or less permanent retention by so-called neutrals who at almost any time may finally agree to surrender them to the tender mercies of the Communists?

With best personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

APRIL 22, 1953.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have received your letter of April 6, 1953, acknowledged by telephone on April 10, concerning prisoners of war held by the U. N. command in Korea, and enclosing a study about the Indian cease-fire plan, which I am returning. Thank you for your courtesy in making this material available to the Department.

The officers concerned with Korean affairs have made a careful study of your letter and have given me the following information: During the course of the hostilities in Korea, the U. N. command, as required by the Geneva Convention, notified the international committee of the Red Cross of the names of some 175,000 captured personnel and the ICRC transmitted this information to the Communists. On December 18, 1951, when the U. N. command and the Communists were first discussing the POW exchange at Panmunjom, the U. N. command gave to the Communists a list of approximately 132,500 POW's, consisting of approximately 21,000 Chinese and more than 111,000 Koreans.

The difference between the figure of 175,000 given to the ICRC and the 132,500 subsequently given to the Communists is accounted for by the fact that the U. N. command had reclassified as civilian internees almost 38,000 persons of South Korean origin who had been swept into U. N. compounds during the rapid northward advance of U. N. forces in the fall of 1950; there were also approximately 5,000 duplicated names. Of the nearly 38,000 civilian internees, approximately 28,000 expressed the desire to remain in South Korea and were subsequently released. The remaining 9,500 indicated their desire to return to North Korea and continue to be in the custody of the U. N. command for ultimate repatriation to Communist areas.

Included in the list of 132,500 were approximately 16,000 former residents of South Korea who were still classified as POW's. Of these, some 11,000 expressed the desire to

remain in South Korea and were later reclassified and released by the U. N. command. The remaining 5,000 expressed the desire to return to North Korea and continue to remain in the custody of the U. N. command for ultimate repatriation to Communist areas.

Of the other 116,500 POW's not included in the foregoing category, approximately 34,000 North Koreans and 14,000 Chinese indicated that they would resist repatriation; more than 62,000 North Koreans and more than 6,500 Chinese were found to be available for repatriation to Communist areas.

Following is a breakdown of persons who are presently remaining in the custody of the U. N. command:

Classification	Approximate number
Available for repatriation:	
Korean POW's	68,000
Korean civilian internees	9,500
Chinese	6,500
Total	84,000
Persons resisting repatriation:	
Koreans	34,000
Chinese	14,500
Total	48,500

There has been no significant change in figures of persons desiring to return to Communist areas in the period from late June 1952, when the screening was completed, to the present time. It should be noted that on May 9, 1952, the date on which your first tabulation is based, the screening had not as yet been completed and the release of persons in the civilian internee and South Korean POW categories had not yet taken place.

The Department is, of course, aware of the effect on prisoners of war inherent in a possible solution which would only provide the alternatives of return to Communist persecution, or more or less indefinite detention by "neutrals." You may be sure that if the armistice negotiations are resumed at Panmunjom, General Clark will have this problem very much in mind.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Prime Minister Nehru said at the conference of the All India Congress Party at Hyderabad, on January 17, 1953:

"It did not recognize voluntary repatriation of prisoners, nor was there any question of prisoners being asked whether they wished to return or decline to do so. It did not recognize the right of asylum for prisoners of war, which applies to political refugees. There was to be no screening of prisoners. It insured that all prisoners would be released from the custody of the detaining side and in neutral territory. The presumption was that they would go back to their country of origin. In fact, repatriation would have begun as soon as these prisoners were released from detention."

From the closing speech of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon in the U. N. last December:

"In the procedure effecting return, there are no further processes of separating the wheat from the chaff, or what is usually called 'screening.' There are no interrogations; there are no questions to be asked. And there will be no restrictions from guards whom in the past the Chinese have called the guards of Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek. * * * 'There will be no offering of temptation to prevent returning. * * * There will equally be no question of groups of people who want to go and groups who do not want to go'—I mean this in quotation marks—who will be kept separate so that they will be marked men. * * * The first act of release by the detaining side is the first act of repatriation."

SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the seventh General Assembly of the United Nations convened in New York City last October 14, where it remained in session until December 21. On February 25 I submitted to the Senate a report of my activities as a delegate to the General Assembly, together with certain speeches I made there.

The second session of the Assembly convened in New York on February 24, and, after completing action on its agenda, recessed on April 23. Because of the pressure of my schedule in the Senate, I was not able to attend the meetings of the second session. At this time, however, I request unanimous consent that a New York Times summary of April 27 of the major resolutions and recommendations adopted by the seventh General Assembly be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S MAJOR STEPS AT SEVENTH SESSION

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., April 26.—Following is a summary of major decisions taken at the seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly, which concluded action on its agenda last Thursday and recessed:

KOREA

On December 3 the General Assembly adopted, 54 to 5, with Nationalist China abstaining, an Indian compromise resolution recognizing the right of Korean prisoners of war to be repatriated but rejecting use of force to compel return of those unwilling to go back. The resolution also provided for creation of a repatriation commission, comprising Czechoslovakia, Poland, Sweden, and Switzerland, with an "umpire" to be named if they were deadlocked. (The plan was later rejected by Communist China and North Korea.) The Assembly approved a resolution backing the United Nations efforts to rebuild the Republic of Korea's shattered economy. A Soviet proposal to kill the United Nations Commission for Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea was defeated. By 45 to 5, with 10 abstentions, the Assembly rejected a Soviet charge that United States military authorities had murdered Korean and Chinese prisoners of war on Pongam Island, and had committed other alleged atrocities in camps on Koje and Cheju, in Pusan and in other places. All 60 member countries voted unanimously in favor of a Brazilian resolution expressing hope for an early settlement of Korean issues, and to recess the present session pending the signing of an armistice agreement. The Assembly appointed a commission to investigate Soviet charges of germ warfare by United Nations forces in Korea and China.

BURMA

By 59 to 0, with Nationalist China abstaining, the Assembly condemned the presence of Nationalist Chinese troops in Burma and called for their immediate withdrawal or internment.

DISARMAMENT

By 50 to 5, with 5 abstentions, the Assembly voted a western-backed resolution calling for continuation of the Disarmament Commission and tying its future work to the majority's concept of stage-by-stage disarmament and atomic control. One Soviet suggestion—striking out any commendation for the past work of the Commission—was accepted by the Assembly.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

The Collective Measures Committee, which for 2 years has been studying ways of preventing or suppressing aggression by such means as imposition of embargoes, was requested to continue its work until 1955. The vote was 50 to 5, with 2 abstentions. A resolution upholding the Committee's past "constructive work" and extending its activities was also approved.

TUNISIA AND MOROCCO

After short but sharp debate, the Assembly adopted a resolution expressing hope that France and Tunisia would "continue negotiations on an urgent basis with a view to bringing about self-governments for Tunisians in the light of relevant provisions of the charter of the United Nations." The vote was 44 to 3, with 8 abstentions. The Assembly also adopted a compromise resolution expressing hope that France and Morocco would continue a conference toward developing free political institutions in the French protectorate. The French delegation boycotted debate on both questions.

AUSTRIA

The Assembly appealed to the Soviet Union, Britain, the United States, and France to make a renewed urgent effort to reach agreement on terms of a treaty for Austria so that the occupation might soon be ended. The vote was 48 to 0, with 2 abstentions.

AFRICA

Assembly named two committees to take up related racial problems in the Union of South Africa. The first will assist in negotiations on the treatment of persons of Indian origin; the other will study the racial situation growing out of the government's policy of apartheid, or racial segregation. Despite the Assembly's decision to postpone the question of southwest Africa's international status until the next session, the issue will continue to be subject for consultations between a special committee and the union government in an effort to reach agreement.

ISREALI COMPLAINT

By 37 to 0, with 11 absentions, the Assembly "took note" of a complaint filed by Israeli charging the Arab States with violating armistice agreements and requiring them "to desist from policies and practices of hostility, and to seek agreement by negotiation for the establishment of peaceful relations with Israel."

GREEK REPATRIATION

With only the Soviet satellites voting in opposition, the Assembly directed an "earnest appeal" to the Soviet bloc to allow the repatriation of 3,000 Greek war prisoners who, according to the Athens government, were captured during the Greek civil war and have been held against their will behind the Iron Curtain. The Assembly also condemned the Soviet bloc states for having refused to repatriate thousands of Greek children removed during the same period.

PALESTINE CONCILIATION

Despite the political and security committee's recommendation that the Assembly urge the Arab States and Israel to open direct discussion of their differences, the Assembly vote was 24 to 21, with 15 abstentions. The motion therefore failed to receive the two-thirds majority required on "important questions."

MEMBERSHIP

The Assembly established a committee to study the admission of new members and report to the Secretary-General 2 months before the next session.

PEACE OBSERVATION COMMISSION

Under the "uniting for peace" resolution of 1950, the Assembly had established a watchdog committee to observe and report on potential danger spots of the world. The Assembly reappointed the group for 2 years more.

STATUS OF WOMEN

The Assembly opened for signature, beginning March 31, the Convention of Political Rights of Women, which provides that women should be entitled to hold public office and to exercise public functions on equal terms with men without discrimination.

NEWS REPORTS

The Assembly requested governments to sign a pact that would oblige them to help correct "false or distorted" news reports for which other foreign governments demanded redress. The decision to open the 6-year-old pact for signature was voted 25 to 22, over the wishes of the United States, Britain, some small powers and the Soviet bloc.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Assembly expressed its conviction that the extension and continued progress of the expanded Technical Assistance Program—operated jointly by the United Nations and specialized agencies since July 1950—could help to improve living standards in backward countries. A target of $25 million was set for the financing program this year, out of vountary contributions by governments.

CHILDREN'S FUND

The Assembly appealed to governments and individuals to contribute generously to the 1953 program of $20 million and also asked information agencies to help in publicizing the fund's long-range child-care programs in 49 countries and aid to children in 72 countries and territories.

PALESTINE REFUGEES

Recognizing that reintegration of Palestine refugees—by repatriation to Palestine or resettlement in countries of refuge—had not been realized, the Assembly made readjustments in financial allocations of its 3-year $250 million program. It authorized the United Nations Relief and Works Agency to raise its current relief budget (for the fiscal year ending June 30) to $23 million and to maintain adequate standards. For the fiscal year 1953–54 the Assembly authorized a relief budget of $18 million, subject to review at the next Assembly session.

ELECTIONS

Three new countries, Colombia, Denmark, and Lebanon, became 2-year members of the Security Council as of January 1, 1953. The Assembly elected them in place of three retiring members—Brazil, Netherlands, and Turkey. Elected to the Economic and Social Council were Australia, India, Turkey, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia, as a result of vacancies left by Canada, Czechoslovakia, Iran, Mexico, and Pakistan. The United States continued as a member.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

By 51 to 0, with one abstention, the Assembly voted for the abolition of all laws and practices of racial discrimination in non-self-governing territories. Administering authorities were asked to examine all such laws, with the aim of abolishing discriminatory practices.

SECRETARY GENERAL

Following the Security Council's nomination of Dag Hammerskjold, of Sweden, as Secretary General to replace Trygve Lie, the Assembly elected Mr. Hammerskjold on April 7 and installed him on April 10 for a 5-year term.

SECRETARIAT

A proposal by the Secretary General envisaged United Nations staff workers under 3 Deputy Secretaries General instead of the present 7 Assistant Secretaries General, and general streamlining of the Organization. The Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution requesting the Secretary General to prepare a full-length report on the problem and to circulate it before the opening of the next session. By 41 to 13, with 4 abstentions, the Assembly expressed confidence that the Secretary General would abide by provisions of the Charter, emphasizing the integrity and international character of the Secretariat.

BUDGET

Appropriations totaling $48,327,700 for the United Nations 1953 budget were approved by the Assembly; this sum slightly exceeds last year's appropriations of $48,096,780. With miscellaneous income at $6,238,200, the estimated net expenditure for 1953 is $42,089,500.

ASSESSMENTS

A further step was taken toward implementation of the principle that no 1 member state should contribute more than one-third of the United Nations expenses in any 1 year. The Assembly approved an assessment for 1953 of 35.12 percent for the United States—the largest contributor. This was a reduction from the United States 1952 assessment of 36.90 percent and 1951 assessment of 38.92 percent. The Soviet Union's assessment was increased from 9.85 percent to 12.28 percent. Others changes were minor.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to Polish Constitution Day, which will occur on May 3.

As is well known, a large percentage of the population of Michigan and of other States of the Union is comprised of Polish Americans. On Sunday I will have an opportunity to be in Detroit with Col. Francis S. Gabreski, a veteran of the Korean war, whom I met in Korea, in order that we may join with Americans of Polish descent in celebrating this day, as it likewise will be celebrated in many other places in our great Nation.

We realize that the people of Poland will not be given an opportunity to commemorate this great day which means so much to them, but let us hope and pray that at an early date the entire Polish nation will become once more free and independent. Let us give them every assistance possible in order that they may be able to achieve their freedom, and that their independence may endure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

On the 3d day of May, Americans of Polish descent will celebrate the 162d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. In Poland itself this event will probably be ignored by the Warsaw regime, for it commemorates, in part, Poland's brave defense against the Russia of the Empress Catherine. But this day will be celebrated by Poles throughout the rest of the world, and particularly by those in the United States.

The constitution of May 3, 1791, is a symbol to all persons of Polish ancestry of the liberalism in the Polish tradition. The 3d of May is for Poles what the Fourth of July is for Americans.

The constitution was drawn up by the so-called Great Parliament which sat from 1788 to 1792. The effective measures it proposed to revivify and strengthen the country undoubtedly moved Poland's neighbors to undertake the second partition of the country in 1793. Two years later, Poland was again partitioned among her neighbors and ceased to exist as an independent state until after the First World War.

The ideals embodied in the May 3d constitution helped the Polish people to maintain a sense of national identity throughout this trying period. Americans can easily understand how this happened because of the noble traditions of our own national life. The Polish Constitution was the first European constitution to equalize the rights of all citizens. Though it did not immediately free the peasant completely, it provided for this freedom and guaranteed it. The constitution also enacted into law the principle of government by the majority. The rights of minorities were safeguarded by the rights invested in a constitutional monarch.

In America, Polish settlers were the first ones to battle for democracy, for the right of all citizens to vote. When the Virginia House of Burgesses attempted to deny the right to vote to anyone but Englishmen in 1619, the Polish settlers in Jamestown were successful in compelling the parent Virginia Company of London to reverse the judgment of the House of Burgesses. From that day on, there has been a strong and natural desire among all Poles and among all persons of Polish ancestry to further and to strengthen democratic ideals which find their finest and earliest expression in our own Constitution and the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

Today, while the Polish nation is subjugated by a tyranny unparalleled in history, this significant historical event symbolizes the common belief in democratic ideals and practices shared by the American and Polish people. This anniversary should serve to renew the faith of Polish citizens in the future of their homeland and reminds us all that tyranny in Poland is the common enemy of freemen everywhere.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan has just stated, next Sunday, May 3, will mark the 162d anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks, the text of a statement I have prepared in recognition of this memorable occasion.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES ON THE OCCASION OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY, MAY 3, 1953

I am once again highly privileged to join my fellow citizens of Polish descent in commemoration of the auspicious anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. On the third day of May, 1791, Poland reasserted her dedication to the principle of liberty and democracy and brought forth one of the noblest documents of freemen.

The brilliant history of Poland's battle against oppression in every form is a living symbol of mankind's determination to resist and conquer the forces of darkness. Americans of every background take pride in their special kinship with the gallant people of Poland. Following by 2 years the adoption of our Constitution, Poland formulated the first written democratic constitution of the Old World.

The traditional Polish heritage of freedom which is embodied in this inspiring document has never weakened in the face of adversity. Despite many years of untold suffering, the brave people of Poland remain firm in their resolve to overcome the ruthless tyranny of Soviet Russia.

On this memorable occasion, we reaffirm our traditional friendship with the Polish people. To do our utmost to speed their liberation remains our sacred obligation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for not more than 2 minutes on the subject of Polish Constitution Day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on the occasion of the celebration of Polish Constitution Day on Sunday, May 3, I certainly want to join my many fellow citizens in Massachusetts in paying tribute to the splendid traditions and the high courage of the Polish people over the centuries.

Poland—by reason of its geographical position and past history—has been subjected to periodic blows which would have shattered the spirit of any people less dedicated to the principles of freedom.

The Polish people have always stood firm in their determination never to surrender to tyranny and to bring to bear against aggression every resource at their individual and collective command.

It has been my privilege during my life to know and to admire many Americans of Polish descent. I have had the opportunity of meeting with them in their homes, of talking with them in the market place and in their offices and places of business. I know their deeply religious heritage and many of their pastors. I have seen them hard at work in our factories and on our farms. I have seen the fine leadership of which they are capable in the halls and the committee rooms of government. Everything I know about them is admirable and we of Massachusetts can feel particularly proud that they represent so large a proportion of our population.

These are dark days indeed for the people of Polish descent. World War II did not bring to them the freedom or the real peace which they and we anticipated. Instead it brought again the heavy hand of a tyrant—this time in the grim form of alien communism. What the Polish people are enduring today in terms of loss of their traditional freedom of speech, of the press, and of worship is tragic and cannot possibly be estimated. We want them to know, however, that we are well aware of the burden which they are carrying on their shoulders and in their hearts.

It would not be right for us to stimulate false hopes in the people of Poland or in their friends and relatives here in the United States. The way to freedom is going to be a hard and difficult one. We do want them to know, however, that our thoughts and our hearts are with them, and that we are resolved to do everything in our power to see that they achieve once again that freedom which is their right and which has been the heart and core of Poland's history through all the years.

I am happy indeed to pay this sincerely felt tribute to the Polish people and to my many friends of Polish extraction in Massachusetts on this anniversary of their constitution day. We want to assure them that our efforts will never be relaxed in striving toward the objective of genuine and enduring independence for the people of Poland and, indeed, for all the world.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes with reference to Polish Constitution Day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, on May 3 of every year Americans pay homage to the memory of a truly great historic document, the Polish Constitution. That we should so commemorate this constitution is readily understandable when one considers that it was the American Constitution and the great ideas contained in it that had inspired the framers of the Polish Constitution of 1791. Examine the constitution devised by these men, and in your reading you will find in one form or another such ideas, extraordinary for the time, as separation of powers, guarantee of man's natural rights, and government by the will of the people. Examine our own American Constitution, and you will find the same eminent republican concepts.

In a constitutional democratic system of government such as our own, there is a quality of self-preservation and self-perpetuation that sets it apart from, and above all other forms of government. The mechanism for orderly change—a mechanism responsive directly to the dictates of the popular will—is the vital center of constitutional government, and it is in this area that the interplay of constitutional processes produces genuine democracy.

How fortunate it was for America to be placed far from the conflicts of Europe during those formative years when this mechanism was being constructed, for within her own protective shores she was able to build slowly and carefully the structure of the Republic. Today, after the labors of generations, this Republic stands, a monument of grace and strength, a majestic edifice of liberty and democracy.

The genius of the men who built the foundation of this structure has long been acclaimed by historians, statesmen, and political scientists throughout the world. But, the greatest tribute to their work was paid by the framers of the Polish Constitution, when only 2 years after the American Government came into operation, they took many of the forms of that government and many of the ideas from its underlying philosophy, and integrated them into the Polish system.

However, unlike America which was situated in another hemisphere and in another world and was practically without a foe to hamper her progress and without an enemy on her borders or on her shores, Poland lay unhappily in the cradle of conflict along the border between Eastern and Western Europe, surrounded by the great powers, Austria, Prussia, and Russia. A frequent victim of these aggressive powers, Poland was in the twilight of her existence as a state when the Constitution was proclaimed in 1791. Alarmed by this manifestation of liberality, internal conspirators contrived with imperial Russia to restore the old order. Russian armies swept into Poland, and before this armed horde the Polish forces were defeated, the constitution destroyed, and Poland partitioned. A futile attempt 2 years later by the Polish-American hero, Kosciusko, to drive out the Russian conqueror and to reestablish Polish independence was ruthlessly suppressed, resulting in the third partition. From then until 1918 when, after the defeat of Germany and the collapse of the Russian Empire, the Polish Republic was established, the Poles were a people without a state.

In spite of the century of oppression that followed the third partition and in spite of the fourth partition after the Nazi-Soviet conquest, the tradition of constitutional government, so boldly created in 1791, lived on in Poland. Although Poland, like many other nations within the Soviet Empire, has suffered the tribulations of aggression, conquest, and oppression, she has always found the strength to make a strike for freedom. Today as we witness a new dark cloud of oppression enveloping Eastern Europe, we can be assured, if history is a reliable teacher, that Poland shall one day throw off the intolerable bonds of her servitude, and, like the proud nation she is, assert her freedom, proclaim her independence, and, finally, take her place among the constitutional democracies throughout the world.

IMPORTANCE OF THE GROUND OBSERVER CORPS—STATEMENT BY GENERAL VANDENBERG

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have placed in the body of the RECORD a statement made on March 20 last by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, on the Columbia Broadcasting System radio program entitled "Target U. S. A." General Vandenberg's statement deals with the important role of the Ground Observer Corps in our defense program. Our Ground Observer Corps certainly deserves great credit for the contribution it is making to our defense today. It should be pointed out of course that it is but one phase of our total defense effort in which civilians participate directly, but I think its value should never be minimized.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GEN. HOYT S. VANDENBERG, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, FOR USE ON CBS TARGET U. S. A. PROGRAM, MARCH 20, 1953

Most of you, I am sure, are thoroughly familiar with the general purposes of the Ground Observer Corps and the reasons why this Corps is so important to the security of the United States. Nevertheless, before commenting upon it further, I should like to restate briefly the basic facts:

First, the Soviet Union possesses a growing stockpile of atomic weapons.

Second, the Soviet Union now has nearly a thousand bombers that on one-way trips can reach all important targets within the United States from bases behind the Iron Curtain. The number of these long-range bombers is steadily rising.

Third, the radar system which the Air Force is now completing in the United States would not always provide all the information the Air Force needs to recognize and meet an air attack. For example, owing to the limitations of present radar equipment,

it is possible that this system might fail to detect low-flying hostile aircraft.

Fourth, trained ground observers can compensate for limitations in our radar system and they can assist in the positive identification of aircraft—functions that cannot yet be performed completely and dependably by mechanical devices.

These are basic facts concerning the air defense of the United States with which we should all be familiar by now. Perhaps I should add that there are Soviet air bases on the Chukotski Peninsula and in the vicinity of Murmansk.

Neither these bases nor the bomber force they are built to support would be required for an attack against any nation other than Canada and the United States. The threat is grave.

The Air Force is fully conscious of the profound importance of its air-defense mission. We have enlisted the aid of groups of eminent scientists to explore all aspects of the air-defense problem. New techniques and new equipment will help to resist the rising power of the enemy that threatens us. Our system of interceptor bases is being extended and I hope our power to strike back will be maintained.

Across the Atlantic and the Pacific, American fighting men are on the job to maintain the outposts necessary to our defense. I urge all citizens who reside beneath our frontiers of the air to help guard the skies above our homes.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes, preliminary to the submitting of a concurrent resolution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I inquire if the transaction of routine business has been concluded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Chair to state the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 13, as amended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The routine business having been concluded, I understand the Senator from Washington is speaking on the question before the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama will state it.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator from Washington have the right to speak on the committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute, without first obtaining unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has that right.

REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS AND EXTENSION OF ECONOMIC AID TO WAR-RAVAGED COUNTRIES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, not every Member of this body will subscribe to every last sentence of the foreign policy address the President of the United States delivered on April 16. But when the President offered the world a plan for the regulation of armaments and the use of the moneys thereby saved for assistance to the economically underdeveloped areas of the world, I believe he spoke for all of us—Republicans and Democrats alike. The President's words were these:

> This Government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of any savings achieved by real disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be: To help other peoples to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world, to stimulate profitable and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom.
>
> The monuments of this new kind of war would be these: Roads and schools, hospitals and homes, food and health.
>
> We are ready, in short, to dedicate our strength to serving the needs, rather than the fears, of the world.

In saying this, the President gave voice to the longings in the heart of every good American. This Nation of ours is determined, grimly determined, to build every single tank and plane and atomic bomb needed to punish aggression and prevent world war III. But we do this because the defense of freedom leaves us no alternative. We are a people of peace. We take no satisfaction in channeling the genius of this Nation into the building of sterile armaments. We would rather, far rather, be participating in great programs for lifting poverty and disease from the shoulders of decent people everywhere.

It is this down-to-earth truth that the President's speech tried to make known to the world.

Mr. President, you will recall that 3 years ago, and again in 1951, our late and beloved colleague, Senator Brien McMahon, sponsored a resolution asking the Senate to go on record as supporting the objectives outlined in the President's speech of April 16—the objectives of rascal-proof regulation of weapons production, and the use of resources thereby saved for constructive tasks on a worldwide basis.

Senators from both sides of the aisle joined with Brien McMahon in sponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 47. Along with Republicans and other Democrats, I submitted an identical resolution in the House of Representatives at the same time. This resolution proposed:

> That the Congress of the United States advocate and recommend an immediate special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations for the single purpose of stopping the armaments race by speeding agreement upon effective and enforceable disarmament and control covering conventional armaments, biological, and chemical agents, and atomic and hydrogen bombs;
>
> That the Congress of the United States, as tangible evidence of its good faith, pledge itself to appropriate and to make available to the United Nations—when an effective and enforceable system of worldwide disarmament and control takes effect—a substantial portion of all money saved for a period of 5 years, such sums to be expended by the United Nations for peaceful development of atomic energy, technical-assistance programs to underdeveloped areas, and general economic aid and assistance to all war-ravaged countries.

It may well be that President Eisenhower's words were inspired by recollection of this resolution. But this is of little import; Brien McMahon took no pride of authorship in his plan for peace with justice.

I need not remind this Chamber that no person of our generation worked harder to enlarge the armed might of the United States than Senator Brien McMahon. It was my privilege to sit on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy while he served as its honored chairman. I observed his total dedication to the twin cause of multiplying our atomic strength and, hand in hand with this, finding some way of abolishing these frightful armaments, and all other weapons as well, from the arsenals of the world.

When he peered into the future, Brien McMahon saw what the President of the United States saw. He saw what all of us must see, unless we close our eyes to the meaning of the onrushing arms competition. If the road before us continues without turning, the future promises at best a world living in fear of annihilation—a world in which our treasures are drained away in the manufacture of weapons which cannot feed a single hungry person or ease the pain of a single man or woman racked by disease. And that is the best we can hope for if armaments continue piling up on both sides of the Iron Curtain at an accelerating rate. If history is to be our guide, we must assume that eventually such an armaments race will spill over to outright global war.

In truth, the future holds only two eventual alternatives: Atomic war, a war made hideous beyond imagination by the new destroyers of men and all their works; or atomic peace, a peace made rich beyond imagination by the power of modern science and technology freed for peaceful tasks.

Mr. President, I shall now resubmit Senate Concurrent Resolution 47. A resolution of identical wording has already been resubmitted in the House. Senators from both parties are joining with me in this resolution. I am particularly proud to have as one of my cosponsors the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

I would not presume for an instant to predict that the Soviet rulers will be willing to join with us and the other nations of the free world in a plan for carrying on a worldwide crusade against hunger and disease and human squalor. I see nothing in the conduct of the new Soviet regime which would make for confidence on this score.

Yet I cannot believe that our Nation must be deterred from subscribing to a noble goal simply because our adversaries may continue to act ignobly. This

country has prospered and grown great in the service of noble causes, and we can forget this only at our peril.

As a minimum, moreover, the concurrent resolution on behalf of which I now speak, will let men everywhere know who bears the responsibility for the fears and tensions that now beset the world. It tells the Kremlin: Put up or shut up. If this concurrent resolution is adopted by the Congress, and if the Soviet rulers refuse to join in a program which will give the world tractors instead of tanks, houses instead of barracks, and medicines in place of explosives—if the Kremlin refuses to become partner to such a program, the Communist slogans of peace and plenty will become a mockery.

I urge with all the power at my command that every Member of the Senate, by supporting this concurrent resolution, now unite behind the President of the United States in our quest for lasting peace.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I desire to congratulate and commend the Senator from Washington on the submission of the concurrent resolution, which originally was submitted by our late colleague, the far-seeing statesman and Senator from Connecticut, Brien McMahon, and which is designed to further the historic program which now is strongly advocated by the President of the United States, President Eisenhower.

I cannot forget that at the same time when the late Senator McMahon submitted the concurrent resolution in the Senate, the present Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], then a Member of the House of Representatives, submitted an identical concurrent resolution in the House.

I think we can look forward with hope to the realization of the promise set forth in the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to submit the concurrent resolution, and request its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) submitted by Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HILL, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the peoples of the earth are plunged, against their will, in an accelerating armaments race that involves atomic bombs, biological and chemical agents, and conventional weapons; and

Whereas the prospect of the hydrogen bomb propels the peoples of the earth into dangers above and beyond anything heretofore conceived by man; and

Whereas in history, armaments races have always led to war; and

Whereas the United States is unshakably determined to keep strong so long as its strivings to halt the armaments race through just and dependable international agreement are thwarted; and

Whereas United States efforts to achieve international control over all weapons do not flow from craven fear or weakness but rather from the strength of democratic institutions, faith in freedom, belief in the value and worth of the human individual everywhere, and from trust in Almighty God and His laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)—

That the Congress of the United States appeal to the peoples of the world to join in a great moral crusade for peace and freedom;

That the Congress of the United States advocate and recommend that the next session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devote itself to the purpose of stopping the armaments race by speeding agreement upon effective and enforceable disarmament and control covering conventional armaments, biological and chemical agents, and atomic and hydrogen bombs;

That the Congress of the United States, as tangible evidence of its good faith, pledge itself to appropriate and to make available to the United Nations—when an effective and enforceable system of world-wide disarmament and control takes effect—a substantial portion of all money saved for a period of 5 years, such sums to be expended by the United Nations for peaceful development of atomic energy, technical-assistance programs to underdeveloped areas, and general economic aid and assistance to all war-ravaged countries.

That the Congress of the United States call upon all other governments to make a like pledge; and, therefore,

That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to each United Nations delegate and also that copies be transmitted to the presiding officer of every national parliament, congress, and deliberative assembly throughout the world.

STRENGTHENING THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently I received from a group of distinguished citizens a statement entitled "Statement on Strengthening NATO." This comes to me from the Honorable Will L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State; former Ambassador Joseph C. Grew; Governor Christian Herter, of Massachusetts; and Mr. Lithgow Osborne, who is handling the matter for this group.

The statement is signed by a number of distinguished citizens from the United States, Great Britain, France, and Canada, and urges certain measures to be taken for the strengthening of NATO. This statement seems to me to be so important, that in order that all our colleagues may have the benefit of the proposals made, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON STRENGTHENING NATO

As citizens of the United States, Great Britain, France and Canada, we are addressing this open letter to our fellow citizens on the eve of the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Paris, and to our representatives at that meeting.

We are convinced that the burdens of taxes and high prices which rest so heavily on all our peoples can be eased only by a better integration of the economic, defense and foreign policies of all our countries through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

We point out that there is authority in the treaty for further development of the North Atlantic Community to: (a) give us better defense at less cost; (b) create a reliable and expanding economy to raise the standard of living for the Altantic Community and the whole free world; (c) multiply the effectiveness of our foreign policies to safeguard individual liberty and to establish peace.

Better defense at lower costs depends as much, if not more, on the integration of our economic policies as it does on the integration of our defense policies. By wise economic coordination, we could so increase the combined national incomes of the 14 NATO members that their combined defense costs would be a much smaller percentage of their incomes than it has been hitherto.

To achieve these goals we respectfully suggest the following steps:

1. A joint declaration by the responsible ministers attending this North Atlantic Council meeting that they will propose immediate steps to lower tariffs, eliminate quotas and other trade restrictions, simplify customs proceedings, and free currencies to the end that the Atlantic nations may eventually become one financial and trading community.

2. Closer cooperation by NATO with all international agencies engaged in economic activity. Absorption by NATO of the separate functions of these agencies wherever such action would make for efficiency and good relations.

3. The creation of a North Atlantic Consultative Assembly, composed of representatives of the peoples of the NATO countries, which would have as its principal objective the implementation of article II of the North Atlantic Treaty which pledges members to bring about "conditions of stability and well-being" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

4. The setting up of a central agency to coordinate Allied policy and planning in all vital areas where imperialist Communist aggression threatens peace, including Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East.

We hope that these proposals will receive consideration at the forthcoming meeting of the North Atlantic Council. We set them forth in the belief that all items on the agenda for this meeting are related to the paramount issue of whether we, the free peoples of the earth, can attain among ourselves a unity adequate to prevent a third world war.

We endorse the statement of our NATO Secretary-General that: "The democracies should form the habit, and have the means, of thinking together and acting together in all matters, be they great or small, in the interests of any of their number that are threatened, and further that the enemy should know without a shadow of doubt that they are so alined."

We also endorse the statement of President Eisenhower, made in his report as NATO Supreme Commander on April 2, 1952, that: "There is power in our union. * * * Visible and within grasp we have the capability of building such military, economic, and moral strength as the Communist world would never dare to challenge."

We are convinced that all the above steps would be taken by the NATO nations in the event of war. We ask that they be taken now in order to prevent war.

SIGNATURES

From the United States (88)

Thomas J. Anderson, publisher, Arkansas Farmer and Mississippi Farmer, Arkansas.

Norman Armour, former Assistant Secretary of State, New Jersey.

Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Raymond E. Baldwin, associate justice, Connecticut Supreme Court, former Senator, Connecticut.

Mrs. Margaret Culkin Banning, author, Minnesota.

Elliot V. Bell, chairman, executive committee, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., New York.

Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, educator, vice president, NAACP, Florida.

Robert Woods Bliss, former Ambassador to Argentina, Washington, D. C.

Hon. James T. Brand, associate justice, Oregon Supreme Court, Oregon.

Sevellon Brown, publisher, Providence Journal and Bulletin, Rhode Island.

P. F. Brundage, senior partner, Price, Waterhouse & Co., New York.

Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Minnesota.

Arthur Bunker, chairman of the board, Climax Molybdenum, New York.

Stephen F. Chadwick, past national commander, American Legion, Washington.

Edwin F. Chinlund, vice president and treasurer, R. H. Macy & Co., New York.

Will L. Clayton, chairman, Anderson, Clayton & Co., former Under Secretary of State, Texas.

Dr. Karl T. Compton, chairman of the corporation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Frank Crosswaith, chairman, Negro Labor Committee, New York.

Hon. Colgate W. Darden, president, University of Virginia, former Governor of Virginia, Virginia.

Chester C. Davis, associate director, Ford Foundation, California.

Dr. J. Frederick Dewhurst, economist, Twentieth Century Fund, New York.

Cleveland E. Dodge, vice president, Phelps-Dodge Corp., New York.

Gen. William J. Donovan, attorney, chairman, American Committee on United Europe, New York.

Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., California.

Thomas K. Finletter, former Secretary of Air, New York.

Henry C. Flower, Jr., vice president, J. Walter Thompson Co., New York.

Henry Ford II, president, Ford Motor Co., Michigan.

Clarence Francis, chairman, General Foods Corp., New York.

Prof. Carl J. Friedrich, professor of government, Harvard University, Massachusetts.

Hon. W. St. John Garwood, associate justice, Texas Supreme Court, Texas.

Robert M. Gaylord, president, Ingersoll Milling Machine Co., Illinois.

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College, New York.

Clinton S. Golden, labor adviser to ECA, Pennsylvania.

Joseph C. Grew, former Under Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

William V. Griffin, president, the English Speaking Union, New York.

Hon. Learned Hand, former judge, United States Circuit Court, New York.

Christian A. Herter, Governor of Massachusetts, Massachusetts.

Prof. Herbert Hill, head of history department, Dartmouth College, New Hampshire.

Rt. Rev. Henry W. Hobson, bishop of southern Ohio.

Dr. Ernest M. Hopkins, former president of Dartmouth College, Vermont.

Palmer Hoyt, publisher, the Denver Post, Colorado.

Dr. Wilbur K. Jordan, president, Radcliffe College, Massachusetts.

Meyer Kestnbaum, chairman, Committee for Economic Development, Illinois.

Fred Lazarus, Jr., president, Federated Department Stores, Ohio.

Edward H. Litchfield, director, American Political Science Association, Washington, D. C.

Paul W. Litchfield, chairman of the board, Goodyear Tire & Rubber, Ohio.

Dr. Clarence C. Little, former president, University of Maine and University of Michigan, Maine.

General of the Army George C. Marshall, Virginia.

Mrs. Dorothy McAllister, chairman of the board, National Consumers League, Michigan.

Frederick C. McKee, industrialist, Pennsylvania.

Hugh Moore, chairman of the board, Dixie Cup Co., Pennsylvania.

Malcolm Muir, publisher, Newsweek, New York.

Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor, University of Kansas, Kansas.

Garrison Norton, former Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

Edmund Orgill, chairman, Orgill Bros., Tennessee.

Lithgow Osborne, president, American-Scandinavian Foundation, former Ambassador to Norway, New York.

Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, New York.

William Phillips, former Under Secretary of State, Massachusetts.

Paul A. Porter, Washington, D. C.

H. W. Prentis, Jr., president, Armstrong Cork Co., Pennsylvania.

Judge Joseph Proskauer, New York.

Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co., New York.

Owen J. Roberts, former Associate Justice, United States Supreme Court, president, Atlantic Union Committee, Pennsylvania.

Thomas L. Robinson, president-publisher, Charlotte News, North Carolina.

Elmo Roper, market analyst, New York.

Beardsley Ruml, treasurer, Democratic National Committee, New York.

Mrs. T. M. Sayman, civic leader, Missouri.

Harry Scherman, president, Book-of-the-Month Club, New York.

George E. Shea, Jr., editorial writer, Wall Street Journal, New York.

Prof. James T. Shotwell, honorary president, A. A. U. N. director emeritus, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York.

Hans Christian Sonne, chairman, National Planning Association, New York.

Charles M. Spofford, former United States Delegate to North Atlantic Council, New York.

Adm. William H. Standley, former Ambassador to Russia, California.

Dr. William E. Stevenson, president, Oberlin College, Ohio.

Robert B. Stewart, dean, Fletcher School of Diplomacy, Massachusetts.

Herbert Bayard Swope, New York.

Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor, attorney, New York.

Wayne Chatfield Taylor, former Under Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

William L. White, journalist, author, Kansas.

Philip H. Willkie, Indiana.

Hon. Harry H. Woodring, former Secretary of War, Kansas.

W. T. Wynn, director, National Cotton Council of America, Mississippi.

Judge Luther W. Youngdahl, former Governor, Minnesota.

Owen D. Young, honorary chairman, General Electric Co., New York.

William Zeckendorf, president, Webb & Knapp, Inc., New York.

From Great Britain (37)

Robert Boothby, Member of Parliament.

Prof. John Bowle.

Sir C. Maurice Bowra, vice chancellor, Oxford University.

Prof. D. W. Brogan.

Alan Bullock, historian, Oxford University.

Prof. George Catlin, political scientist.

Lionel Curtis, C. H., O. M., political scientist.

Admiral of the Fleet Sir John Cunningham.

The Very Reverend E. N. Porter Goff, provost of Portsmouth.

D. A. Grant, D. S. O., barrister.

Wilfred Hill.

Douglas Hyde, editor, the Catholic Herald.

E. S. T. Johnson, Member of Parliament.

Gilbert Longden, Member of Parliament.

E. H. C. Leather, Member of Parliament.

Sir Frederick W. Leith-Ross, director, National Provincial Bank.

B. J. MacKenna, Q. C., constitutional lawyer.

K. W. B. Middleton.

Tracy Philips, Church of England Council on Foreign Relations.

Peter Rowland, barrister.

Earl Bertrand Russell, philosopher.

Dr. Georg Schwarzenberger, vice dean, faculty of laws, University of London.

Alan Thomas, editor, the Listener.

J. D. Tilney, Member of Parliament, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of War.

G. M. Young, fellow of All Souls College, Oxford University.

From France (13)

Jacques Bardoux, member of the Committee for Foreign Affairs of the National Assembly.

Philippe Barres, member of the National Assembly.

Gen. Pierre Billotte, member of the Committee for Foreign Affairs of the National Assembly.

Jacques Chastenet, member of the Institut de France, Conseiller de l'Union Francaise.

Senator Michel Debre.

Comte Robert de Dampierre, former Ambassador to Canada and Sweden.

Edouard Giscard d'Estaing, president of the French Committee of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Edouard Herriot, President of the National Assembly.

Senator Amaury de La Grange, vice president of the French Committee for Atlantic Union.

P. O. Lapie, former Cabinet minister.

Emmanuel Monick, honorary governor of the Bank of France.

Pirmin Roz, president of the French Committee for Atlantic Union, member of the Institut de France.

Gen. Maxim Weygand, former Commander in Chief of the French Army.

From Canada (19)

Mr. L. Rene Beaudoin, M. P., Deputy Speaker, House of Commons.

Father J. M. Belanger, Director, School of Political, Economic, and Social Sciences, University of Ottawa.

•Mr. George Burt, Canadian director, United Automobile Workers, CIO.

Col. Gordon Churchill, M. P.

Mr. Fred Dowling, district director, United Packinghouse Workers of America.

Mr. George Ferguson, editor, Montreal Star.

Mr. George T. Fulford, M. P.

Senator L. M. Gouin, chairman, Senate External Relations Committee.

Right Rev. Msgr. Wasyl Kushner.

Prof. A. R. M. Lower, historian, Queen's University.

Mr. C. H. Millard, national director, United Steelworkers of America.

Mr. A. R. Mosher, president, Canadian Congress of Labour.

Prof. Frank Scott, faculty of law, McGill University.

Dr. Sidney Smith, president, University of Toronto.

Mr. Alistair Stewart, M. P., Winnipeg.

Col. K. R. Swinton, vice president and general manager, Sonograph, Ltd.

Mr. E. P. Taylor, president, Argus Corp.

Mr. Wilson Woodside, foreign editor, Saturday Night.

Mr. Percy Bengough, president, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada.

From Great Britain (supplementary list)

The Right Honorable Lord Beveridge, K. C. B., Economist.[1]

Sir Adrian Boult, conductor.

Frank Byers, executive chairman, Liberal Party.[1]

The Rt. Hon. Clement Davies, QC, M. P., leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party.[1]

Lord Malcolm Douglas-Hamilton, O. B. E., M. P.

Professor Hanburg, political scientist.

Julian Huxley, scientist.[1]

Roger Lewis, University College, South Wales.

Michael Lubbock, Esq., treasurer, United Nations Association.

Maj. Gen. G. O. Lyne.

R. W. G. Mackay, barrister, former M. P.

Prof. Gilbert Murray, O. M., Oxford University.[1]

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF A GROUP OF TURKISH STUDENTS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have the great honor of announcing the presence in the family gallery of 25 young ladies and young gentlemen from Turkey, who are students at the University of Florida, to which they have been sent by the Republic of Turkey. They are accompanied by some of the faculty of the University of Florida.

It occurs to me that there could be no better showing of the great good will toward our Nation by the Republic of Turkey and their high degree of confidence in our Nation and our way of life than the act of that friendly and freedom-loving country in sending 25 of its highly intelligent young people to become students in one of our great institutions of learning.

I ask them to rise at this time, so that the Senate may see them and may extend to them the warm greeting which is their due.

[The students rose from their seats in the gallery, and were greeted with applause by the Senate.]

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the President pro tempore.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a representative of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in the absence of its distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I am glad to add a word to what the Senator from Florida has said in welcoming as guests of the Senate the students from the Republic of Turkey who are now in the gallery. On behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, I should like to add a word of welcome to each of them; to thank them for being here; and on behalf of the Senate to express our gratification that our great colleague and friend, Turkey, has sent to us so distinguished a group.

Let me add that I am somewhat familiar with Turkey, for I have had the pleasure of visiting that splendid land. Certainly it is a pleasure to all Members of the Senate to have this excellent group of students visit the Senate.

---

[1] Should have been included in press release.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF EDMUND F. MANSURE AS ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in executive session, and out of order, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nomination of Edmund F. Mansure, of Illinois, to be Administrator of General Services. Earlier today the nomination was reported unanimously from the Committee on Government Operations, by its chairman, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

It is my information from the committee that, for executive purposes, the administrative department hopes the nomination may be acted upon today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the nomination has been unanimously approved by the members of the committee from both sides of the aisle?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my information.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation.

COMMUNICATIONS IN OPPOSITION TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from Mr. J. E. Chalberg, dean of the Brainerd Public Schools, Brainerd, Minn., be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAINERD PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
BRAINERD JUNIOR COLLEGE,
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 6,
Brainerd, Minn., April 25, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I hope I am not too late in adding my word of encouragement to your fight on the tidelands oil issue.

I am not convinced of the propriety of Federal aid to education in any way. I am convinced, however, that the tidelands oil is the property of the people of the whole country and not merely the States on which it borders.

Sincerely,

J. E. CHALBERG, *Dean.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram which I have received from Ann Isacson, secretary of the Minnesota Federation of Teachers, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 27, 1953.*

Hon. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Minnesota Federation of Teachers in annual convention voted firm support of the Supreme Court position in the title to the offshore oil land decision and urges that the revenues therefrom be dedicated to education. Please continue your support.

ANN ISACSON,
Secretary of MFT.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram which I have received from Lettisha Henderson, chairman of the legislative committee of the St. Paul Federation of Women Teachers be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The St. Paul Federation of Women Teachers congratulates you and appreciates your statesmanlike fight for the preservation of our national resources for the public good. We are proud of your magnificent campaign on offshore oil and of your efforts in behalf of education.

LETTISHA HENDERSON,
Chairman of Legislative Committee.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

COMMITTEE WORK AND REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is Friday. This is the day when the representative of the Independent Party in the Senate makes his committee report to the American people, as a member of the only committee to which he belongs in the Senate, the Committee of the Whole. The opportunity to present his weekly committee report is always appreciated, particularly today, because it is not even 1 o'clock yet, and the representative of the Independent Party actually obtained recognition on the floor of the Senate before late afternoon. He is particularly indebted to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who is now presiding over the Senate, for the great courtesy which has been extended to the representative of the Independent Party.

I imagine that the press is also pleased because, for once, they will not have to excite themselves by the use of uncomplimentary adjectives toward the junior Senator from Oregon in their press gallery conferences, because, for a change, they will not be kept until after 5 o'clock this afternoon. I may say to my friends in the press gallery, at least to those of my friends who are left in that gallery, they could have gotten away much earlier on other Friday afternoons had there been a greater inclination on the part of those in charge of the Senate to permit the representative of the Independent Party to be recognized earlier in the afternoon. So, although I am accustomed to being blamed for things for

which I am not responsible—the discomfiture of the members of the press being an example—I call the attention of the press to the fact that I always try to get the floor early, and am usually honored by getting it late. But today is to be a very pleasant exception, because, Mr. President, I am not going to the Kentucky Derby—which event accounts for so many of the vacant seats in the Senate this afternoon—but, at the conclusion of this speech, and after I finish a little office work, I intend to drive out to a friend's farm, to undertake getting a horse ready for a horse show this weekend.

Mr. President, what makes competition in sports attractive is that there is impartiality in judgments, and a participant's standing is judged by his performance. The rules are not loaded against him. I am always greatly pleased when on weekends I can relax away from the Senate, commune with nature, and recognize that things really are not so bad as one would have a right to consider them to be upon the basis of a week's experience in the Senate. When one can get out of doors, commune with nature, meet the common people of America—who are really the salt of our land—and join with them, as I do so frequently, in competitive sports, he can readily find great hope for the country. Sometimes he becomes a little discouraged that the people do not see more quickly through some of the political mists which frequently befog issues, and which I am satisfied are going to increase in intensity within the next few years.

However, Mr. President, I have not given up hope. The responses to the political reports of the Independent Party to the Senate and to the country have given me renewed hope. I am perfectly satisfied that, given time, the people will come to recognize that what is really happening against their best interests must be corrected; and that is why I, very politely and respectfully, have suggested several times during the debate on the legislative proposal now pending before the Senate that we must give the people of the country every possible opportunity to correct, in the election of 1954, and again in 1956, the great mistake which is being made in connection with that piece of legislation. As I consult the political polls of public opinion, Mr. President, in these days, I am satisfied that that mistake is going to be corrected.

As I said yesterday, if the pending measure should ever be submitted to a referendum vote of the American people, it would be voted down at least 5 to 1. The American people are beginning to see through the giveaway program. They are beginning to recognize what is involved in the pending joint resolution, and they are beginning to recognize its dangerous implications to other forms of the natural-resource wealth of the land. Let us not worry, Mr. President. Give the people time, and we will see at the polls a correction of this great wrong, because the American people believe in conservation, they realize the importance of preserving to future generations of Americans their heritage in the great natural-resource wealth of the country. I am satisfied the people will be heard from, and I am satisfied that some of my colleagues are going to hear from them in a way that they are not going to like, in the 1954 elections. Then, Mr. President, watch 1956; keep your eyes on 1956. There is going to be a political housecleaning in 1956, which will cause a great many people to reflect upon what the Independent Party forewarned in regard to the great mistake which was made in November of 1952.

Take time, Mr. President. Time will pass, and I am perfectly willing to let time and future events be the judges of the course of action the Independent Party has followed during the past several months, which has been consistent with the principles for which the representative of that party has stood in American politics ever since he took the oath of office in this body in January 1945.

Mr. President, I have a great many items to cover this afternoon in my report to the people, but, so that I can have them printed and get my statement about them in the RECORD, I desire first to refer to two amendments to the pending measure which I intend to submit, and which I suggest the Senate vote upon before the pending measure is finally disposed of.

In the course of the debate, on Monday, April 20, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] referred to "section 7 of the bill, which specifically preserves all the reclamation laws of the United States and all the rights of the United States under those laws." The majority report seeks to impart the same assurance. However, the enumeration of laws preserved unimpaired by section 7 is, in my judgment, incomplete. Two significant omissions—the act of 1899 and the Federal Water Power Act of 1920—would be specifically added to this section by the proposed amendment which I shall send to the desk shortly and ask to have printed and await the action of the Senate when I call it up on Monday. I respectfully submit that the enumeration of laws as presently contained in the joint resolution is incomplete, and, as I have indicated, it is also incomplete in the report. In such circumstances I think the good old Latin maxim "e jusdem generis exclusio unius" applies; in other words, any member of a class not included in an enumeration is deemed to be excluded intentionally. That is the essence of my argument, Mr. President. I believe it is a legal principle that courts are most likely to follow. Courts look at the sections of a bill and see what was included, and then they apply the old Latin principle that what was excluded was presumptively excluded intentionally.

Certainly the Senate does not want to enact subconscious legislation. We should not take the chance that Senate Joint Resolution 13 will, without the knowledge of the Congress, undermine existing laws. But, I respectfully submit, without the adoption of my proposed amendment, that result will easily follow.

For example, the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 was largely based on the reclamation laws. However, another extremely important law in the fabric of the Federal waterpower policy established by the Congress during the last 50 years became a vital part of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, under which Boulder Dam, since renamed "Hoover Dam," was constructed.

Section 4 (d) of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 vested in the Federal Power Commission the authority to grant licenses to the various States, municipalities, individuals, and corporations for the construction of dams, powerhouses, transmission lines, and so forth, on any of the navigable waters of the United States. Section 3 of the act defined navigable waters in such a way as to include the uppermost reaches of all the rivers of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the New River case—*U. S.* v. *Appalachian Power Co.* (311 U. S. 377)—upheld this broad definition of navigable waters, thus affirming the authority of the Federal Power Commission to grant or withhold a license to construct a power dam on the uppermost reaches of a navigable river.

It is significant that section 6, paragraph 3, of the Boulder Canyon Project Act provides as follows:

> The Federal Power Commission is hereby directed not to issue or approve any permits or licenses under said Federal Water Power Act upon or affecting the Colorado River or any of its tributaries, except the Gila River, in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, and California until this act shall become effective as provided in section 4 herein.

The Federal Government in this way asserted and exercised its right to control the entire upstream watershed of the Colorado River.

By the omission of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 from section 7, Senate Joint Resolution 13 may be construed to rewrite the current definition of "navigable waters."

I believe there is that danger, Mr. President, and what I am trying to do is to plug the loopholes so as to obviate the danger when the proposed legislation reaches the stage of litigation. Believe me, Mr. President, it is going to be the subject of litigation.

I desire briefly to comment on that point. Eventually, Mr. President, the joint resolution, if it becomes law, is going to go where it ought to go—to the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. President, it may be attempted to reverse the Supreme Court by what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] called legislative packing of the court; but the Supreme Court is still going to sit and function, and I think the legal shortcomings of the joint resolution are so great that when it gets before the Court it will have great difficulty in getting through the Court on constitutional grounds. When it reaches the Court I want to have it in as good shape as is possible in regard to such questions as those which I am raising today. That is why I am going to offer amendments to the pending joint resolution, and I shall ask for a vote on them.

I send forward my first amendment, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. By the omission of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 from section 7, Senate Joint Resolution 13 may be construed to rewrite the current definition of "navigable waters."

This would constitute a grave threat to the further orderly and efficient development of the rivers of the United States, such as the Missouri River, the Connecticut River, and so on, as such development is impossible without complete control of such watersheds, all the way up to their headwaters. The construction of Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government might be blocked by the State of Idaho, if the State through this legislation is given the right to license power sites on the Snake River.

Therefore, section 7 of the pending joint resolution must be amended to include the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, as well as all other laws relating to reclamation, irrigation, and the improvement of rivers and harbors and the other areas over which Federal control is purportedly reserved by section 6 (a).

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk my second proposed amendment and ask to have it printed and lie on the table, to be called up by me on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now wish to invite attention to my second amendment which will be available on Monday. I am making my statement with reference to it today, so that Senators will have available to them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my argument in support of it, as well as of the other amendment, because there is not going to be very much time on Monday and Tuesday for Members of the Senate to inform themselves so far as floor discussion is concerned, with reference to the shortcomings of the proposed legislation. I expect some Senators will be dissociating themselves from the little band of liberals who have been making it known that they are in opposition to the pending joint resolution. We have no closed shop. Entrance into and membership in the little band of liberals is purely voluntary. We do not do any proselyting. We do not use any pressure tactics to induce anyone to take one of our pledge buttons. Come, all ye faithful, who want to join. Leave at your will. Whenever anyone who we thought was a liberal, or who at times has found it convenient to be a liberal, wants to dissociate himself from the little band of liberals, it is all right with us. But let me say, Mr. President, the rock bottom of this little band of liberals is going to keep on fighting against such invasions of what we think is the public interest as are perpetrated by the joint resolution.

Mr. President, if anyone thinks we fought hard this time, let him watch the next fight. I may let my colleagues in on a secret. There are some in our group who do not want to believe that any such attempt as this will be made again by this administration against other natural resource wealth belonging to all the people of the country. So our little band of liberals sit in their conferences. We have quite some arguments. Do not think our caucuses are tea parties. They are not. Discussions sometimes are heated. Variances of points of view are expressed.

I happen to belong to one group which says to the other group in our little band, "What do you mean—you don't think they will try it again? Listen to their speeches. Listen to the talks they are making about turning over the people's legacy in the potential kilowatt power of the streams of America to the private utility monopoly. What do you mean? Do you think this is the end? Why, this is just the beginning. Do you think they do not intend further raids on the Nation's natural resources? What are they proposing in some bills already introduced in regard to the public domain? They are proposing to raid the public domain. That is what they are proposing to do."

From this desk I say to the American people today: Wake up. This administration is being controlled by a political power that is out to take away from the American people their control over the country's natural resources, and they must be stopped.

Our little band of liberals is going to do its part. We are satisfied we are going to receive increasing support from the American people.

Mr. President, if anyone thinks the debate on the pending joint resolution was prolonged, let me forewarn, predict, and announce that the next one will be longer.

I ask the attention now of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I do not think he will rise to dispute with me because he has been one of the two great leaders of this little band of liberals, along with that great statesman, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. These two great statesmen have presided over the meetings of the little band of liberals, as we have met day by day. I should be interested to know if the Senator from Alabama would be willing to deny what I now predict.

Mr. President, if any may think they were subjected to a prolonged debate in opposition to the tidelands joint resolution, then let this administration come forward with another measure which, in the opinion of this little band of liberals, seeks to take away from the American people their heritage in the natural resources of the United States, whether it involve turning the streams of America over to private utilities; or whether it be to carry out the proposal of ex-President Hoover—to sell to private monopoly in America the multiple-purpose dams built by the taxpayers' money of this country; or be it a proposal, for example, to get oil-shale land by the thousands of acres, now in the public domain of this country, into the hands of the oil companies; be it an attempt to bring to an end Federal control over the grazing lands; be it an attempt to invade the people's ownership in the natural resources, and we will give the administration a debate that will take them into the fall. Twenty-two hours and twenty-six minutes will be just the start of a speech if that time comes. We can do it, too. I do not hear the Senator from Alabama denying that statement.

Mr. President, I think all we need is one more example, one more attempt on the part of this administration to give away the natural resources of the United States to selfish economic interests, and the little band of liberals will not be divided on any strategy as to how to handle the problem.

We still will not engage in what I call an ultimate filibuster, either, but we will surely talk, we will surely argue at length, but always we shall be willing, at any time, to lay aside any measure, whatever it may be, and immediately proceed to the adoption—certainly, so far as I am concerned—of the Morse antifilibuster resolution. At any time Senators wish to adopt it, I will give them a chance, even in the midst of a prolonged debate.

Let me tell you, Mr. President, the time has come when the people's interest is not going to be blocked by a filibuster in the United States Senate, and not be protected by the use of filibuster techniques, if necessary, when a raid on the people's interests is about to be consummated. We are going to get rid of the filibuster technique applicable to all issues, or we are going to use it in order to protect the people's interest in cases where it needs to be protected, giving assurance to the American people at all times that we will not use it to such degree that a vote will never occur, but that we will use it to such degree that a vote will not occur until after a reasonable time has elapsed so that the people may arouse themselves, familiarize themselves with the issues, and inform themselves as to the great danger involved in some piece of proposed legislation pending on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I can imagine the comments of my opponents about this speech. I can hear them say:

"Ah, now we have him. He is against filibusters, but he stands on the floor of the Senate and warns that the filibuster technique will be used to protect the public interest against raids on the natural resources."

That is correct. But it is necessary for me to make clear my position by restating and reemphasizing it, because my opponents will not make it clear, since to do so would simply take the wind right out of their lungs. They will not tell the people that Morse stands ready at any time to adopt a workable, effective antifilibuster resolution, either the Morse resolution or the Lehman resolution, or any other resolution that would really make it possible to prevent an ultimate filibuster, but would also guarantee to the minority in the Senate the protection of their right to have full and adequate debate. If the Senate would adopt the Morse resolution, after cloture had been voted there would be guaranteed the right of 96 hours of debate.

That has been my position from the first year I came to the Senate up to this moment; and southern Senators know it, because I have said to them, "I will see to it that you have adequate time to debate on the floor of the Senate so far

as my resolution is concerned. I will give you 96 hours." That is a long time. The American people can be aroused to an understanding of the issue involved in a case in 96 hours, if they do not already understand it. That would be my only purpose in allowing that much time. I think that much time is due the minority, so that they may have an opportunity to inform the American people as to the merits of their position.

I do not agree that we have the right, however, to keep on the books a rule which makes it possible for a determined minority in the Senate to prevent a vote from ever occurring on a measure. I am against that. But when I see a steamroller being fueled up in the Senate, and I can see that there is to be an attempt to force a vote before there has been adequate debate, or before the people have had time to wake up to what is about to happen to them by the passage of proposed legislation, I will not go along with an agreement to fix an early hour for a vote on such a measure.

That is why there is not a Member of the Senate who, on the record during the past 8 years, can chalk up behind his name as many objections to unanimous-consent requests to vote at a specified time on some measure as can the junior Senator from Oregon. There is not a Member of the Senate who has done it half so often as I have done it. I am proud of that record.

Senators will not be able to obtain unanimous-consent agreements to vote on an issue at some specified time before there has been adequate debate, so long as I am in the Senate. I may be caught at lunch occasionally and denied the courtesy of a quorum call, as was done a few days ago. After all, I must eat once in a while. Senators may slip through such an agreement during my absence from the Chamber, but while I am on the floor of the Senate they will never be able to do it. I see by the smile on the face of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] that he knows it, too. He knows that I have always been fair to Senators from the South in insisting that they have adequate time to debate. All I am saying today is that in the application of this principle I shall continue to be fair, but I shall continue to apply the rules of the Senate in a manner which will protect what I consider to be the public interest in connection with natural resources legislation.

I consider legislation affecting natural resources to be one of the greatest threats of the Eisenhower administration. I know what General Eisenhower said at Boise, Idaho, during the campaign. It shocked and frightened me. The Boise statement during the campaign by the now President of the United States was the forerunner of what we are hearing now under this administration as to the attitude of the Republican Party in regard to the Nation's natural resources. All I am saying today is that they will have a fight—a long one and a hard one. They will not get by the little band of liberals next time as easily as they did this time. This time we were motivated by a great deal of Christian charity. We shall continue to practice Christian charity, but we will also remember that it was necessary to drive the moneychangers out of the temple.

We are talking now about the people's temple. We are talking about that great natural temple belonging to all the people of the country, in the form of the natural resources of our land. We are going to keep the moneychangers out of that temple, Mr. President. We are going to protect it for the people of our generation and many generations to come.

I may be mistaken, but I think note is being taken of the fact that the discussion which occurred in connection with the pending measure is but an indication of what is going to happen when some other measures reach the floor of the Senate, measures which, in our opinion, are aimed at destroying the control of the natural resources of our land by the representatives of the people, acting through a friendly government.

As I said the other day, I am still a good Lincoln Republican, though I had to leave the Republican Party in order to remain a Lincoln Republican, because I found myself so alone. But, I propose to follow the independent course of action which characterized the great political philosophy and actions of Lincoln. I have enjoyed refreshing the memory of some of my Republican colleagues as to what Lincoln stood for in the field of natural resources, refreshing their memory as to what a great conservationist he was, and refreshing their memory as to his recognition of a fact which, in my judgment, has been completely forgotten by those behind the joint resolution—the fact that, after all, the sovereignty of a State is not so great as the sovereignty of the Federal Government; and, as Lincoln pointed out, the combined sovereignty of all the States is not so great as the national sovereignty.

That is why I am heard to say that along the coasts of Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California, the sovereignty which controls is the national sovereignty. The national sovereignty is bounded by one boundary, not by variable boundaries.

Texas has no boundary greater than the boundary represented by the national sovereignty. Under the doctrine of national sovereignty, it cannot have a boundary that goes farther out into the high seas than that of Massachusetts, Oregon, or any other coastal State.

Mr. President, I refuse to believe that when the issue of sovereignty involved in this case reaches the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court is going to proclaim any doctrine that splits sovereignty, in the sense that it divides and varies and splits boundaries along the coasts of the Nation. Such a doctrine does not make sense.

One would think, to listen to some persons argue, that Texas received no benefit from coming in the Union, but that she did the Union a favor. Mr. President, when Texas came into the Union, it was the greatest thing that could possibly have happened to Texas. As Lincoln so clearly pointed out, in the quotation which I read from him in the wee hours of the morning the other day, many people outside the State of Texas had a great deal to do with helping to raise the money in connection with the Texas debt.

Oh, we have heard a great deal said in the debate about the Texas debt, but the Texas debt has no relevancy of materiality whatever to the question of sovereignty involved in the pending joint resolution. It does not make any difference who paid the debt. Let us get down to a simple premise. The simple premise is, Of what country did Texas become a member when the Lone Star flag came down and the Stars and Stripes went up in Texas? Every high-school boy and girl knows the answer. It became a State within the United States, subject to the jurisdiction of the sovereignty, the national sovereignty, of the United States, and her State sovereignty became subordinate thereto.

Mr. President, to listen to some of the arguments on sovereignty in the Senate one would think we did not have in this country great national monuments, in the form of national cemeteries, in which lie buried both the Blue and the Gray. The question of national sovereignty was settled by the War Between the States, and the argument of Calhoun was repudiated. I believe the Supreme Court made that point clear in exercising its original jurisdiction in the Texas case.

Of course, the proponents of the joint resolution do not like that decision. Those who favor the giveaway program do not like the decision of the Supreme Court in the Texas case. They do not like to hear what the Court had to say about the subordinate rights of Texas to the national rights. But that is the law. They say it was a 4-to-3 decision, that just one judge decided the case. I respectfully say that that is not my understanding of the judicial process. The members of the Supreme Court who became the majority, after discussion with those who became the minority of the pros and cons of the arguments of counsel, after analysis of counsel's briefs, and after running down of the precedents on the issues, decided against Texas. In a system of government by law we do not talk, and should not talk, about a case being decided by one man. Under this great system of government by law, that case was decided by the United States Supreme Court, and it does not make any difference whether it was a decision of 9 to 0, 5 to 4, or, as in the Texas case, 4 to 3. The decision is the law.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. The count of the vote, 4 to 3, does show that it was a close decision, does it not?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do you see what I mean? The Senator from Texas cannot get away from thinking in terms of men. He must always think in terms of men. It was not a close decision. A decision of the United States Supreme Court is not a close decision. It is the decision. It is the law. It is carrying out under the original jurisdiction

of that Court its great constitutional obligation under the Constitution.

Mr. President, I plead for people to think about a government by law, not by men. The Justices sit over there as a court. They do not sit over there as men. If we ever reach the point of thinking of the Justices in their robes as men rather than as great vehicles of interpretation of the rights of the American people through a system of government by law, then for the first time will we say the courts follow the election returns. God help us if the time ever comes when the courts follow the election returns.

Oh, Mr. President, for years and years in a series of courses, such as legal ethics, in an advanced course on international law, and in procedure courses, I tried to get my students to think of the fact if we are to have a system of government by law we must recognize the fact that when a judge takes the oath of office he must act as a vehicle of interpretation, impersonally and impartially, based on what the record shows the law to be. When there is an attempt made to personalize the Court, then watch out, Mr. President, because we are then getting far away from a system of government by law.

That was one of the reasons why I was so much opposed to the La Follette proposal to overrule the decisions of the Supreme Court by a vote of Congress. Theoretically, although the great Senator from Wisconsin, old Bob La Follette, never would admit it—and everyone in this body knows how much I admire him, and of the influence which he has had upon my political philosophy—I always recognized that in this instance he was personalizing the law; he was thinking of the Justices of the Supreme Court in terms of men, rather than as vehicles of interpretation of the law, in keeping with their solemn judicial office.

Thus we see, Mr. President, that regardless of whether the decision is by a 5 to 4, 4 to 3, or 9 to 0 vote, it is the law once the majority speaks.

Mr. President, where should the decision in a case in which the Court has exercised its original jurisdiction be changed? Over there in the Supreme Court chamber, not here on the floor of the Senate, is where it should be changed. If we think a decision is unsound, let another case be brought before the Court. The Supreme Court reverses itself whenever it can be shown that it has made a mistake in the law.

Mr. President, read the debates of the constitutional convention; read constitutional history. Why do you suppose in some types of disputes the fathers of the Constitution gave the Supreme Court original jurisdiction?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield in a moment. I wish to finish this thought. Why did the Founding Fathers give the Supreme Court in certain types of cases original jurisdiction? They did it because they were well aware of State politics. They were well aware of the dangers of regionalism and sectionalism. They were well aware of the political devices and techniques which can be used in collusion between and among the States. So what did the Founding Fathers say in the Constitution? They said that in respect to such cases, the Court shall have original jurisdiction. That provision is written into the Constitution. I shall read it; but first I yield to my friend, the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Oregon is a recognized student of the law and a teacher of the law, and we respect him for that. The question I should like to ask him is this: Is it not true that, really, the responsibility for making and establishing the law in this country is right here in the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MORSE. Not for changing the Constitution—not at all. I ask my colleague to listen to the Constitution, from which I now read from article III:

> In all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

So in matters of original jurisdiction Congress cannot interfere. That is what the framers of the Constitution said, and for good reason, because in cases such as this one, involving States, are most likely to involve great constitutional questions. In my judgment, the entire question of national sovereignty is involved in the pending legislation. I respectfully submit that is one of the main reasons why the Founding Fathers kept such cases away from the Congress.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. In criticizing us for counting the vote of the Court in the 4-to-3 decision, is not the Senator from Oregon forgetting that the Court itself on many occasions, in referring to previous opinions, has counted the votes and has pointed out the closeness of the division between the members of the Court?

Mr. MORSE. I never said the judges were divine or infallible, or that they did not make mistakes. I did say, and I wish to repeat it with emphasis, that if we are to keep a system of government by law, let us not talk in terms of the men on the bench. Let us talk in terms of the doctrine they lay down and the procedure for reversing them.

The procedure for reversing that Court, I respectfully submit, should not be a political procedure. It should be a judicial one. In my judgment, that is what was intended by the constitutional fathers.

Why do not the Representatives of Texas get another case before the Court, if they think the decision is so wrong?

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from Oregon permit me to answer the question?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment. First, let me say that if the representatives of Texas have had some new ideas since they presented the last case to the Court, let them present them in a new case. I do not know what new ideas they could have, and I respectfully say that I think the brief on the part of Texas was highly fallacious both in law and in fact. In fact, the Court did not "buy" it; the Court rejected it.

Now the representatives of Texas tell me that three judges did think the Texas brief was pretty good. But what does that have to do with the matter? Let those who represent Texas bring another case before the Court, and endeavor to obtain a reversal. That is the only kind of reversal procedure we should sanction. In other words, let them bring before the Court a case which involves the constitutional section regarding original jurisdiction, such as one between States.

I ask my colleagues not to take offense, because I mean no offense. I am entirely impersonal in speaking in regard to what I believe is a great danger to our Government.

In this instance, great danger to our Government arises in connection with a question involving some coastal States such as Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California, and some selfish interests. Then there are in the Senate a number of Members from other States—and I mean no disrespect to them—who, from the very beginning, have most remarkably found themselves in league with the representatives of the coastal States that are making the fight to secure the passage of the joint resolution. I respectfully say that is what the constitutional fathers had in mind when they wrote the section of the Constitution I have just read, namely, the section giving to the Supreme Court original jurisdiction in disputes involving a State, thereby taking such disputes out of the political forum and into the courtroom, where reason is supposed to prevail, and where such natural phenomena of politics as proposing things that will help get votes in the next election, and proposing things that will help work out in the cloakrooms of the Senate some voting arrangements, in return for votes on other measures—which is an historical practice in the Senate, and has gone on as long as there has been a Senate—could not take place, or should not, in a case involving a dispute between the Federal Government and one or more States.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me at this point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Oregon realize that in the Texas case the 4-to-3 decision of the Supreme Court denied the State of Texas the right to introduce the evidence it had accumulated—evidence bearing upon the question of whether the annexation agreement with Texas meant what it said, and that the writers so intended, that Texas was to retain all the lands it owned as a republic?

Mr. MORSE. I know all about that contention by the State of Texas. But what the Senator from Texas should point out, and what I shall now point out for him, is that the Court decided that

it did not need that evidence. The Court decided it did not need it because the legal principle, in the opinion of the majority of the Court, was so clear that the Court was not interested in what, in my judgment, was an entirely irrelevant and immaterial argument on the part of the representatives of the State of Texas. I believe that argument to be entirely irrelevant and immaterial because a great principle of government is involved; namely, the question of national sovereignty.

So why should the Court be interested in a lot of evidence and argument presented by the State of Texas, which, when all of it is added up, in my judgment—and I say this most respectfully—amounted to a statement of, "Mr. Justice, you know it will be very helpful to us in Texas if we could get these billions of dollars of wealth for our people."

Of course, it would be; of course, that would be fine for Texas.

Mr. President, I listened to a great argument made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. That argument should be made again here on the floor of the Senate.

I am a little amused at some of my colleagues from some of the Northern States and from the great industrial New England States, who in recent years have expressed great concern about the loss of industries in New England and in the Northern States because industries have been moving to the South, where low wage rates still prevail. It is a little amusing that they should support the position of some of the coastal States in urging enactment of the joint resolution. I wish to say to my friends, the Senators from the Northern States, "You are being taken. Wait until the people of your States wake up to how you have been taken. Wait until they come to realize that if this joint resolution is passed and if it is sustained, it will result in billions and billions and billions of dollars of advantage for the people of Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California, followed by lower tax rates in those States, thus making it more desirable for northern industries to move into the South. Wait until that caravan of economic movement begins to the South."

So, Mr. President, I warn my colleagues now, wait until this little band of liberals has to say to the people of the Northern States, "You were taken in. Why were not you on guard when the little band of liberals fought so hard in 1953 and warned you that, in economic essence, all the joint resolution amounts to is a lush economic plum for the advantage of the people of the few favored States?" We warned that you were just putting those few States in a nice situation in which the wealth belonging to the people of New England as well as to the people of Oregon, Minnesota, Illinois, and the other Northern States, was given away, by means of the tidelands joint resolution, to the people of a few States. And now you are kicking because you see a lot more New England manufacturing establishments and northern industrial establishments are moving into the South, under the propaganda the southern chambers of commerce will feed out, "Look at our low tax rates." Assuredly the rates were low, because the companies were subsidized by the people of the Northern States through the giveaway program.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment. The proposal now under consideration is not the last one of the kind. It would be fine if one could get by with it. But our little band of liberals say it is not in the national interest. It would not be in the interest of the Northern States. I want the South to have equal treatment, but, to use a colloquialism, I will be jiggered if I am going to sit here and vote to subsidize a few Southern States to the extent of between $50 billion and $300 billion of wealth belonging to all the people of the country. Such a proposition is not going to get my vote. Of course, the Senator from Texas knows he is not going to get my vote for it.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand that.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Texas knows he is not going to get my vote.

Mr. DANIEL. I was about to come to that conclusion. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 1 or 2 questions on the subject to which I referred in the first place, concerning the question of looking at the closeness of divided Court decisions?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. The fact of the matter is, the Supreme Court vote in question—4 to 3—was one by which the Court refused to allow the State of Texas to introduce evidence, and decided the case on the pleadings alone. Does the Senator from Oregon not realize that the 4 Justices who decided against the State of Texas actually comprised a minority of the 9-member Court?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator from Texas, the distinguished former attorney general of the Lone Star State, knows very well that when the Court assumes jurisdiction over a case, it is unnecessary to have nine judges sit in the case. There are a good many reasons why at times all nine Judges do not sit. A judge may be ill, a judge may be disqualified because of a possible past connection with the case. But so long as a constitutional majority of the Court sits in the case, the decision becomes the decision of the whole Court.

If the Senator from Texas thinks that the decision was wrong, why does he not take it back to the Court? Why bring it into a political forum to try to obtain a political reversal of the United States Supreme Court? It is that to which I object; and our difference is a respectful, honest difference of opinion.

Mr. President, I may digress long enough to say, as I said to the Senator from Texas the other day, I have never been more pleased with an opponent on an issue than I have been with the Senator from Texas. He has been courteous, he has been fair, and he has respected my point of view, as I have respected his. We have not minced words toward each other, but our speech has always been professional. I say to the Senator from Texas now, most respectfully, that if he did not like the decision, I think he should have gone back to the judicial forum; I do not think he should have brought the question to the political forum.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Texas, for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. In regard to the count of the vote, I merely wish to point out that Chief Justice Marshall, himself, said, in the case of the *City of New York* v. *Miln* (8 Pet. 120, 122 (1834)), when the Court was composed of only seven members, that a majority of the entire court should concur when constitutional questions are being decided. I read his words:

> The practice of this Court is not (except in cases of absolute necessity) to deliver any judgment in cases where constitutional questions are involved, unless 4 [of 7] judges concur in opinion, thus making the decision that of a majority of the whole Court.

That was when there were only seven members on the Court. It would now take five for a majority of the whole Court.

I merely wanted the Senator from Oregon to realize that at least we have good precedent for counting the number of judges who vote upon decisions, and for feeling a little disappointed that only four members of the Court, less than a majority of the entire Court, decided against Texas without allowing us to introduce evidence.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very happy the Senator from Texas quoted Marshall. I cite Marbury against Madison as my answer to the Senator from Texas on the whole question of the power of the United States Supreme Court in cases involving constitutionality. It was in that connection that Marshall stated that the jurisdiction was in the Court. In my judgment, one cannot apply the philosophy of Marbury against Madison to the course of action which the State of Texas has followed in trying to get a political reversal of the Supreme Court.

Now, Mr. President, let me say a word or two about the direct quotation from Marshall. The brilliant lawyer from Texas, the former attorney general of that State, knows very well that the quotation from Marshall is not the law of the Supreme Court. He knows very well that, even in Marshall's time, the court acted in some instances with less than a majority; and he knows that that has always been the practice of the Court. Consider where that argument would lead, if I may suggest an absurd case. Let us suppose a case arising when four of the judges were sick. Would that mean that all business of the Court must stop? Suppose four of the judges were disqualified because, while practicing law at some time in their lives, they had been involved in the litigation pending before the Court. Would it mean that the Court could not function in the consideration of the case?

Mr. President, that throws a bright light on what Chief Justice Marshall meant. I did not say judges were not human. The suppositions case cited is a perfect example of what Chief Justice Marshall meant, commenting on the statistical fact which existed in the case

cited. But the statement of Chief Justice Marshall is not the law. The Senator from Texas knows that. The Senator knows that the Supreme Court sits in many cases in which one or more of the judges are disqualified. There are certain cases which will be reached in the Supreme Court pretty soon, in which 2 or 3 of the judges will disqualify themselves. Suppose the remaining judges sat for the purpose of hearing the cases. Assuming there would be a constitutional majority of the court sitting in a case, does the Senator from Texas mean that in such case the Court could not decide the case, and that the case could not be decided? Mr. President, I am very fond of the Senator from Texas, and I find him persuasive on certain matters. But in his last argument he does not make an impression, he does not make a dent, because it simply does not stand up in the light of the history of the Court.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Texas, for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Oregon understands, does he not, that the only purpose of the argument was to answer your criticism of those of us who mentioned the closeness of the 4 to 3 division in the Texas case, and to show that able lawyers and able judges, like Mr. Chief Justice Marshall, have counted the vote by which a court makes a decision, and have commented upon the closeness of the vote. Regardless of what the Senator may say about a 4 to 3 decision not being close, I doubt whether he will be able to persuade many persons that it was not a close decision. It is unfortunate when a minority of the full Court renders a decision of great public import, especially when the decision is made without hearing evidence.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, of course, I think the comment by Chief Justice Marshall was quite as irrelevant and immaterial as the evidence the State of Texas tried to introduce in the Texas case, but which was excluded. Let me assure the Senator from Texas that I do not labor under the delusion that a great many people understand the theory of government by law, and the nature of the judicial process, which I have been expounding here and which needs to be expounded, because it is the answer to a proposal for a political reversal of the Supreme Court. No, it will be necessary to come to my door again, and to knock with a better argument than that, in order to be very persuasive; because I repeat, by way of summary, that the Court has spoken. What it decided is the law. The decision is against Texas, and, if Texas does not like it, the State should seek to obtain a reversal of it in the Court. The State should not use political power in a manner which, I say most respectfully, undermines the section of the Constitution which I have read. It represents a manner of circumventing it. It is going around, instead of proceeding directly by constitutional processes to reverse it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a question?

Mr. MORSE. Wait a moment. When the pending measure, if it becomes a law, reaches the Supreme Court, there will be a great deal of trouble. I may then be back in the private practice of the law, and if the Senator needs some help, let me know. As an advocate I shall do my best. But, as a Senator, I am going to stand here and keep faith with what I consider to be the oath of office I took when I became a Member of this body. Under that oath of office I am never going to vote for a piece of legislation which, in my judgment, is in such form as to constitute a political reversal of a decision of the Supreme Court.

I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator agree with me that if the doctrine which the Senator from Texas has followed should be applied to the Congress of the United States, we would find ourselves in a most impossible situation? For example, 25 votes out of 49 is sufficient to pass any bill in the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Let me point out that I have sat in the Senate from 12 o'clock noon until 8:30 o'clock at night and have seen as many as between 200 and 250 bills passed on the Legislative Calendar with less than 10 Members on the floor of the Senate most of that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it the Senator's opinion that despite the fact that there may be only 10 Senators present on the floor, when once the rules are established the bills passed are just as much laws as if there had been 96 Senators on the floor?

Mr. MORSE. Whoever sits in the chair presiding over the Senate says, "Are there any objections? Hearing none, the bill is passed." It is passed, and that is all there is to it. Try to get it back on the calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the argument of the Senator from Texas, namely, that evidence was not permitted to be presented to the Court, is exactly the same argument upon which the Court ruled and upon which it took jurisdiction and upon which it handed down a rule of law? In other words, is it not true that what the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 are attempting to do is to turn the United States Congress into a court of 531 Members to get a legislative decision in lieu of a favorable judicial decision which they were unable to obtain?

Mr. MORSE. That is my judgment. I thank the Senator for bringing it up again, because I think it needs to be stated again and again. I shall be in the State of Minnesota stating that I was a member of the little band of liberals who fought on the floor of the Senate to protect the people's interest in the natural resources of the country which we felt was being given away.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator from Oregon be interested to know that the argument the Senator used a moment ago with reference to vast national resources being made available only to a few coastal States, thereby literally putting other sections of the American economy in an unfavorable economic position, has been sufficiently persuasive in the State of Minnesota so that many chambers of commerce have reversed their resolutions in support of the Holland joint resolution?

Mr. MORSE. I mentioned the fact that the Senator from Minnesota was the first to make that argument, and I think it is an unanswerable argument. I may say that when the businessmen of the country realize what is happening, they are going to say, "Where was you, Charlie?"—I use the word "was" in a colloquial fashion—"Where was you, Charlie? What were you doing? Were you asleep? How did you come to let those fellows get by with it? We do not want to subsidize Southern States with billions of dollars of the wealth belonging to all the people, so they can lower their tax rates and induce industries to move from other sections to the advantage of the Southern States."

Do Senators think they are not going to hear from home? They are going to get blistered, politically.

I understand that some of them do not like the kind of telegrams and letters being received these days, following the efforts of the little band of liberals to call the attention of the American people to the issue involved in Senate Joint Resolution 13. I have had printed in the RECORD a small fraction of the telegrams and letters I have received. I did not go through them all, but my staff went over them very carefully. I gave my staff instructions to keep out any telegram, letter, or editorial reflecting on any Senator. Senators should see what I have in my office. If I knew some of the Senators better I would invite them to come over and read some of the letters and telegrams I have received with reference to this matter.

I keep some cartoons on my office wall. I look up at them and say, "Apparently I have stirred up something." I look at a cartoon published by some reactionary newspaper and say to myself, "I stirred something up by the speech." Believe me, Mr. President, when we stir them up, they try to stick a pen into our blood by drawing a cartoon, and then we know we are making progress in educating the public.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not the Senator from Oregon agree with me that our distinguished colleagues from Louisiana, Texas, and Florida, have been supersalesmen, and because of their tremendous ability and capacity they have done something for their States which no one else could possibly have done?

Mr. MORSE. They are remarkable men.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And they have been able to sell an argument and a program that are almost beyond belief.

Mr. MORSE. I want to make a proposition to my good friend from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. He comes from a great horse State, and he is a very great salesman. I have a mare I want to sell. She is a good, registered, standard-breed brood mare. I do not believe there is any better horse blood in Texas. She is out of Promotor. I won many blue ribbons with her in the West. I will take a thousand dollars for her, and the Senator from Texas can take $250 and give me $750, and with his salesmanship someone in Texas will buy the mare. That would be a good honest $250 very easily made.

That is the best evidence I can give of my confidence in the Senator from Texas. I think he is a supersalesman, and I mean no disrespect to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oregon know that I have found many fine businessmen in the State of Minnesota who have complimented the Senator from Texas and other Senators for their unusual ability to promote and to sell this proposition to the Senate? They have asked me why I could not do as well as these distinguished Senators have done. I stand in amazement and wonder at the remarkable qualities of our colleagues.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question of my great admiration for the Senator from Texas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I am not using any filibuster techniques today. I want to go on with my speech, but I will yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator feel that it is their duty to protect and defend their States, and that it is also the duty of Senators to protect what they believe to be the legitimate interests of the people in the resources of the United States?

Mr. MORSE. That is why I am fighting the proposed legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Including the resources in Washington and Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am not going to eliminate them. It is proper to include them in my answer. I have no doubt about how the people of the State of Washington feel about this measure. I also know the opinion of the people of Oregon. The people of Washington expressed themselves on it in November 1952. The people of my State of Oregon expressed themselves in November 1950.

Mr. President, do you know what I said up and down my State? I mentioned it here the other day, but not many Senators were present, because it was early in the morning. So I will repeat it. I said, "They were going to defeat me in 1950 on the tidelands bill."

The press of my State said that I was against the tidelands bill, and the reactionary Republican machine circulated that statement throughout the State of Oregon. As Senators know, my forums and meetings are always open, so reactionary Republicans were always planted in the audiences. They were told, "First, put him on the spot on the tidelands question. See what he has to say about tidelands. Bring out the fact that he voted against the tidelands bill."

So some fellow would get up and say, "Senator, how did you vote on tidelands?"

My answer was: "Against it. Now let me tell you why. I made a pledge to the people of my State that I would not sit in the United States Senate and vote to give away natural-resource wealth in which the Supreme Court has said all the people have a paramount interest; that I would not vote to take it away from all the people of the country and give any part of it to the State of Oregon. You did not send me to the United States Senate from Oregon for Oregon. If you did, vote against me. Vote for me only if you want to send me to the Senate for the Nation, because that is the meaning of the office of United States Senator."

In about 10 days I did not hear any more about tidelands. No one wanted to ask me any more about tidelands. Do you know, Mr. President, what the reactionary Republicans discovered? They discovered that the people of my State supported my position.

The people of Oregon are not in favor of the tidelands measure. Neither are the people of the Nation as a whole. As I said yesterday in my speech, I wish the proponents of the Holland joint resolution would follow the very democratic process which prevails in the great State of Oregon. That State is the birthplace of the most effective initiative and referendum system in the country. The people of my State hold the reins on the bits in the mouths of the politicians. The people stop the politicians from running away with State legislation detrimental to the people's interests. That happened many times in the history of Oregon, particularly in the early days, in the land-fraud cases, when an attempt was made to exploit the land of Oregon for the benefit of selfish interests. But the people have passed an initiative and referendum law, and when they think the legislature has pulled a "runaway," or has sought to take away from the people interests which they were entitled to have protected, the people simply refer the bill to a referendum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. Not at the moment. This is a good story. It is important. I have a final twist I wish to put in, before I am finished with this one. I would ask the Senator from Minnesota to wait until I get to the end of this story.

Sometimes when the Legislature of Oregon has bent the knee to powerful and selfish interests, and refused to pass legislation the people wanted passed, do you know what the people have done? They have started an initiative petition, and the legislation has been passed by a vote of the people themselves.

There is no State in America—and I say this boastfully and proudly—in which the people have control over the politicians as they do in the State of Oregon. Believe it or not—it is so novel in America—in our State we actually nominate our candidates for office. The people do it. No political machine does it. No fixed party convention does it. No courthouse gang does it. It is not necessary to have the recommendation of any party council. One does not have to pay a price to be nominated. The people do the nominating by a pure, direct primary, in which they pass judgment on the desire of any man or woman who wishes to run for high political office. They will hear him or her. They will look at his program and then decide whether they want that kind of representation.

When I consider the election laws of many States, I realize how fortunate we are in the State of Oregon. When I look at the election laws in some States, I realize how fortunate I am to live in the State of Oregon.

Mr. President, I could not be nominated to be neighborhood precinct committeeman if I lived in most of the States where nominations are controlled by political machines, where it is necessary to get the blessing of some political gang in order to represent a free people in a parliamentary body. Thank God that such an archaic system does not exist in the great State of Oregon. There the people do the nominating.

Their devotion to that system was shown very clearly a few months ago, when the reactionary Republican gang in the State of Oregon, looking ahead to 1956, thought they were going to pull a smart one. But they forgot about the people. A bill was proposed in the Oregon Legislature this year that sought to provide that anyone holding political office who was elected as a member of one party could not run for office again unless he ran as the candidate of that same party. They did not use my name; they did not need to. Everyone knew whom that bill of attainder was aimed at. Everyone knew what that special legislation was about.

Mr. President, the Republican reactionaries thought they were smart. You ought to have seen their press stories. They thought they had pulled a clever one. I am sorry the bill did not pass. I said so at the time. I could have had it thrown out of court with the aid of any Oregon law student, so obviously void was it.

Mr. President, do you know what the people of Oregon did? Within a few short days they made clear to the Republican reactionary machine that they would have none of this undermining of the primary election laws of Oregon. That was the real danger of the bill. It was an attempt to take away from the people of Oregon a completely free choice in nominating whomever they wished to have run for the United States Senate. When they were through hearing from the people of Oregon they were full of alibis. A couple of State senators whose names were on the bill in the first instance had their names removed from it. When the bill finally reached the committee their names could be found nowhere on the bill.

The bill reached the committee, and it was admitted that the reaction against the bill on the part of the people was so negative that it did not have a chance

to pass anyway, although 29 assemblymen and 9 senators had originally placed their names on the bill. We would have liked to see it pass the legislature. It would have helped even further toward separating the sheep from the goats. It would have shown the people very clearly the lurking danger always existing when professional politicians and political machines try to take away from the people control over the election laws.

I wish to get back to one other point, and then I shall move on to the next amendment which I wish to discuss. As I said to the Senator from Minnesota, "Be of strong heart. Do not lose confidence. Do not fear the final judgment of the people." As the Senator from Minnesota has learned during the past few days in speaking before chambers of commerce in Minnesota, once the people of Minnesota come to recognize the dangers of the pending measure they will make clear to the Senator from Minnesota, in the 1954 campaign, that his type of representation, fighting courageously and fearlessly, as he has done on the floor of the Senate on issue after issue, is the type of representation they want to keep in the Senate in behalf of the State of Minnesota and the Nation.

I thank my good friend from Texas and my good friend from Minnesota for helping me to bring out some points which I had not originally intended to develop. I have a long committee report yet to make. I have not yet reached it. There is one further amendment which I wish to cover. I shall send it to the desk in a moment, and I make the following statement in support of it.

As I stated in the course of my remarks on April 25 to April 26, section 6 (a), to which this amendment is addressed, imperils the power of the United States to continue with the construction of multipurpose and other dams on navigable inland waterways.

At that time I pointed out that the presence of the word "constitutional" in section 6 (a) may severely limit the present powers of the United States in the discharge of its duties in control over the fields of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs.

I think we made a good legislative record here yesterday on the Murray-Kefauver-Morse amendment in respect to section 6 (a). We received splendid cooperation from the sponsors of the joint resolution in clarifying for the record the legislative intent, so in our judgment we were quite right in withdrawing our amendment. However, there is one part of section 6 (a) which the debate yesterday did not clarify, and I am submitting an amendment for printing, and shall make this argument in favor of it in the hope that, come Monday, we can either clarify the legislative intent or adopt my amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota, without losing the floor, in order that he may submit several unanimous-consent requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

(At this point Mr. MORSE yielded to Mr. HUMPHREY, who submitted for printing in the RECORD several matters which appear in the Appendix under appropriate hearings.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon, not only for the courtesy he has extended me, but also for his very kind and gracious remarks a few moments ago.

Mr. MORSE. Coming back to the amendment which I am about to submit, during my remarks on April 25–26, I pointed out that the presence of the word "constitutional" in section 6 (a) may severely limit the present powers of the United States in the discharge of its duties in control over the fields of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs.

As a word of limitation, "constitutional" is surplusage. The Constitution already confers all the power that the Federal Government has and the United States is limited to such powers and subject to the express limitations already specified by the Constitution.

When construed with section 7, the reservation in section 6 (a) of the "constitutional" powers of the United States may be construed to modify or repeal by implication the present statutory provisions pertaining to "commerce, navigation, national defense and international affairs."

Various statements made on the floor by proponents have been made to reassure critics that the Federal Government's authority is not impaired and that relevant statutes are specifically declared to be unaffected by Senate Joint Resolution 13. However, in separate amendments proposed to section 7 it will be seen that significant omissions have been made. It is entirely possible that other omissions have also been made. To limit the reservation of power in section 6 (a) to constitutional authority is to place in possible jeopardy carefully considered legislation already adopted by the Congress in the exercise of the constitutional authority over the subjects enumerated in section 6.

As the word "constitutional" adds nothing to section 6 (a) and is potentially dangerous to past congressional enactments, I urge that it be stricken in conformity with the amendment I propose.

I send my amendment to the desk with the request that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

COMMITTEE STATUS OF SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now take up the first of my Committee of the Whole points in my Committee of the Whole report. I wish to say a few words on the committee status of the junior Senator from Oregon. I have the assurance of the majority leader that some time next week, at my convenience, he will bring up the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration on my resolution, which was unanimously adverse. I refer to Senate Resolution 32. I wish to discuss that committee report today. I discussed it a week or two ago. I want my colleagues in the Senate to have full knowledge of the fallacious basis on which much of the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration rests.

It is very interesting to talk with members of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have talked with several of them about this matter. Those with whom I have talked say, "We did not know about the error." I said to each one of them, "You did not ask me anything about it. You never stopped at my desk at any time and asked me about it." I said, "You never extended me the courtesy of calling me before the Committee on Rules and Administration to give my testimony. It would have been very simple to do so if you had any doubt about it."

"On the record," I said, "Senator, you cannot justify your report."

Mr. President, I will prove it. This report of the Committee on Rules and Administration in part—and I will say this is the major argument of the committee—is based upon a typographical error which occurred in an amendment to the resolution I filed, which error was corrected here on the floor of the Senate by a colloquy which took place between the junior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. So the correction is in the RECORD. I spoke to the Parliamentarian and the Parliamentarian advised me that I needed to do no more to correct it. However, I did do more. One thing I did not do, which I wish I had done, was to file a new amendment at the desk. I did not have to do so. It is a matter that should have been handled clerically. However I did advise the staff of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and a member of that staff has advised my legislative assistant that the correction was called to the attention of the committee.

In spite of that fact, the committee submits an adverse report against my resolution, based in large measure upon a typographical error in the amendment, which was corrected.

I pointed all this out 2 weeks ago yesterday. I talked to a member of the committee this morning, and I said, "Have you done anything about it since I pointed it out?" He said, "So far as I know, the committee has not considered it further."

Mr. President, I simply cannot understand it. I should think, if the attention of the committee has been called to the fact that its report in part is based upon an error, it would want to correct it.

I submitted my resolution on January 13. I remember it as though it were last week. The Senate had voted to kick me off the Committee on Armed Services, and I took judicial notice of the fact that it would also vote to kick me off the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I asked the majority leader what he proposed to do by way of nomination of the junior Senator from Oregon for membership on committees. The RECORD will show that he said, in effect, "There are only two committees left, the

Committee on Public Works and the Committee on the District of Columbia."

I said, "Apparently the Senator proposes to assign me on the basis of a garbage-can-disposal principle."

I sent to the desk a resolution and asked to have it read. I also asked for its immediate consideration. Of course, to do so would have required unanimous consent. The record will show that the resolution was read. The resolution reads:

Resolved, That paragraph (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and it is hereby, amended by adding "for the period of the 83d Congress, a member of the majority party to the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare and that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be assigned to service on the same committees."

The purpose of the resolution is perfectly clear, namely, that an additional member be added to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that I be permitted to remain on those two committees, in keeping with my 8 years of seniority in the Senate. That was the purpose of the resolution.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 13 will show that the majority leader said in effect he thought it was a fair resolution and that he was agreeable to it. Democrats do not like to hear me say it. It is true, though. On January 13 no one on the Republican side of the aisle raised any objection to the resolution. I am not saying, if the debate had continued, that there might not have been some objection, but I am saying the RECORD will show that the majority leader was willing to accept the resolution.

The RECORD will also show that it was the minority leader who objected. That is how the resolution got before the Senate in the first instance.

Let us take the next step in the history of the battle of the junior Senator from Oregon to protect his rights in the Senate and to protect the people of his State to their constitutional right of equal representation in this body. I repeat, without arguing at great length, that the course of action which the Senate has taken with respect to the junior Senator from Oregon cannot be reconciled with the equal-representation provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, whenever the Senate makes a certain procedure applicable to one Senator but not to the other Senators it violates the right of equal representation of the State which the Senator represents in the Senate. There can be no escape from that conclusion. Of course, the Senate has the right to write its own rules. It cannot write any rules it wants to write, though. It does not have the right to write a rule which violates the constitutional right of a State to equal representation in the Senate. It has no such right.

The fact is, as I said, before, these are not our rules. In effect the rules belong to the country. They are the people's rules. We are but their vehicles. We cannot adopt rules which violate the constitutional rights of any State.

I say that the Senate of the United States, and every Member who voted to kick me off my committees, violated the equal representation clause of the Constitution of the United States. There is only one way to rectify that action. I say to Senators, "Reverse yourselves." What is wrong with admitting that you made a mistake? We all make mistakes. We make lots of them. If there is anything wrong it is to stick your head in the sand and refuse to admit that you made a mistake, or to stick your head in the sand so that you get your ears all filled up and cannot hear. That is inexcusable."

So, Mr. President, I submitted the resolution, and some debate took place. I talk on this subject every Friday afternoon. Sometimes I talk about it on Thursday afternoon, when the Senate is not going to meet on Friday, as was the case when most of my colleagues went to a baseball game and I received permission to use Thursday afternoon for my report of the committee of the whole of the Independent Party, and therefore I did not speak on Friday. By the way, Mr. President, this is the 15th time that I am making my committee report to the people.

I ask the Senators to get out of their heads any idea that my report is not reaching the people.

Although I do not think many Senators listen to my report when I make it on the floor of the Senate, I am always very much amused when I discover in subsequent conversations that a Senator who was not in the Chamber when I was making my report will nevertheless show by his conversation that he had obviously had time to read it in the intervening time.

Mr. President, I have some suspicions as to why a goodly number of my colleagues have been reading my committee reports, even though they have not been listening to them. It is because they have been hearing from home. That is why I was able to bring to the floor of the Senate a form letter which one of my colleagues who had voted against me on January 13, had sent out to his constituents, because he received so many protests on his vote. He had received so many protests, Mr. President, that he had to send out a form letter in answer to them. It is too bad that he did not tell his constituents what had actually happened, so as to make it unnecessary for me on the floor of the Senate to answer him. I received two letters during last week from constituents of two Senators. The letters were sent by the Senators to their constituents. They are amusing documents. I failed to bring them with me today; but I shall use them next week, because I will certainly mention the subject again, unless my resolution has been acted on in the meantime.

Mr. President, do you know what one of the letters said? I just do not know how a Senator could write it. I should think he would know that his constituents might ask to see the law. I should think he might have known there was a possibility the constituent would send his letter to me, as that constituent did. Do you know what that Senator said in that letter to his constituent, Mr. President? He said, "I had to vote against Senator MORSE under the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1946, because under the terms of that act he was not entitled to be assigned to those committees."

Mr. President, when I looked at the letter, I called my legislative assistant, and said to him, "Do you see what I see? Did that Senator actually write that?"

But, Mr. President, that is what he wrote. However, he did not fool that constituent, for that constituent knows that the Reorganization Act of 1946 provides that the Senate shall by ballot elect the members of committees.

So how could that Senator write to his constituent that under the terms of that act, he had to vote against me?

Mr. President, not a word in the Reorganization Act of 1946 supports what that Senator told his constituent. If Senators think they are going to fool their constituents by that kind of misrepresentation, they are mistaken, for their constituents are seeing through this. They know what this play is. They know it is not right, for I have followed an independent course in American politics, and I have kept faith with the promise I made my voters both in 1944 and 1950, when I said that no one will "call my shots" for me in the Senate. I told my voters that I would vote on the basis of what I thought right, in keeping with the great principle of representation I follow, namely, the principle adhered to by Edmund Burke and by Jefferson and by Lincoln and by Wilson and by Norris and by La Follette and by innumerable others in the history of our Nation, who believed that one's duty as a member of a great legislative body is to function as a free man, on the basis of the merits of the issue presented.

Later, I received the original of a letter which one of the Senators who voted against me on January 13 had sent to one of his constituents. In that letter that Senator was very sweet. He said, "We all appreciate Senator MORSE. We all admire him. But he is not a member of the Democratic Party; and, not being a member of the Democratic Party, our party had no responsibility in connection with assigning him to committees."

Of course, Mr. President, that Senator did not point out that I am not a member of the Republican Party, either, and that I made very clear that I did not want either party, as a party, to assign me to committees, but that I wanted 95 Senators, in keeping with the Reorganization Act of 1946, to assign me to committees by ballot. I told this body that some days before January 13.

However, I thought the real clincher in the letter sent by that Democratic Senator to his constituent was:

However, we have not objected to giving him space on the Democratic side of the aisle for his seat.

Was not that generous, Mr. President? I was deeply moved by it. Such enthusiastic support. They would give me space on the Democratic side.

Of course, I would not particularly object. In fact, I once thought I would go over there. However, two things happened: First, there was some representation in the press about my reasons for going over to the other side of the aisle, so I thought I would stay on this

side a while longer. Second, the Democrats got it into their heads that I had to let the Committee on Rules and Administration decide where I would sit.

Of course, as I pointed out, I am not an employee of the Senate. If I were to make such a request of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I do not know but that the committee might assign me to space in one of the corners of the Chamber or down by the clerks' desk. I simply deny that the Committee on Rules and Administration has any jurisdiction in assigning a Senator a seat in the Senate Chamber. If there is available, architecturally, space which is suitable for a Senator's seat, and if that space is not being used by another Senator, then I take the position that any Senator may have that space for his desk and chair. I believe a Senator does not need to go hat in hand to the Committee on Rules and Administration and say to it, "My dear colleagues, would you be so kind as to assign me that space?" What have we come to in the Senate, Mr. President, if we have to follow such a course of action as that? I will not do it.

I was perfectly willing to select for myself any space not being used by another Senator, and I thought it was very decent of me to point out that that was where I would be willing to sit. But when the Democratic group said, "You have to obtain the consent of the Committee on Rules and Administration," I replied, "Not me, because I deny that the Committee on Rules and Administration has any such jurisdiction."

Mr. President, let me say now, as I have said before, that although my colleagues now chuckle about the spot I am in, they should not forget the old saying, "There, but for the grace of God, go I." Let my colleagues wait until one of them tramples on the political toes of a majority.

Mr. LONG rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield in a moment, Mr. President.

First, I wish to say that I should be glad if this particular matter did not involve me, simply in order that some other Senator might find himself in this predicament, for every Member of this body knows that if some other Senator were involved and an attempt was made to infringe upon his procedural rights, I would not be talking just 1 day a week, but I would be talking about that matter every day. If one of my colleagues in the Senate had been done the procedural injustice I have been done since January 13, I would fight every day in the Senate to protect him, because I well know how important it is that we see to it that the rules are applied uniformly and without discrimination. All my colleagues know that to be true.

However, this is the 15th week we have been waiting to obtain some action on this committee question. Apparently the Democratic Senator who sent to his constituents the letter to which I referred a moment ago does not know that the Reorganization Act provides that Members of the Senate shall be assigned to two committees. I am ready, and always have been since January 13, as I have said, to serve on any committees to which I might be assigned, although I said I would fight an unfair assignment.

Mr. President, at this time I shall yield to one of the greatest Members of the Senate, to one of my dearest friends in the Senate, to a great American. It is true that I disagree with him on a few things. For instance, I do not know how he came to be so wrong regarding the tidelands joint resolution. However, I overlook our disagreements, when we discuss matters such as the one we are about to discuss. A great Senator, about to cross-examine me; and it will be a penetrating cross-examination, too. I traveled with this gentleman some 30,000 miles last fall, investigating military bases, and conducting hearings in various parts of Europe, north Africa, and Turkey, on that subject. I served with him for 2 years on the Subcommittee on Military Installations. I joined with him in the Long-Morse report, and although we could not, for reasons of secrecy, submit our evidence in any great volume, our report pointed out the tremendous wastes of money and wastes of manpower that characterized the Defense Establishment. In due course of time, a fact which is very interesting, many of the recommendations of the Long-Morse report, are now being followed, and many of the criticisms which the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon have made in regard to the Military Establishment are now being heeded. One might think it was the first time such recommendations had ever been made. One might think it was the first time waste, both in manpower and in money, by the Military Establishment was ever discovered by some of the spokesmen for the Eisenhower administration, who are now telling the American people what they are doing, or proposing to do, or will do, about bringing an end to it.

Mr. President, let me say that the Senator about to cross-examine me was the first man in the Senate who, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, under whose great leadership as chairman of the subcommittee it was my privilege to serve, pointed out to the American people the great wastes of manpower and money by the Military Establishment. We saw it with our own eyes as we conducted our 30,000-mile inspection trip.

Not only that, Mr. President, but for months before we went on the trip, in hours of hearings, in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Building, when we brought the brass and the braid to the committee room for cross-examination, we ferreted out millions of dollars in their requests last year for authorization of funds for military installations which were honeycombed with wasteful proposals.

Now, with that little introduction of my good friend from Louisiana, I yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator for his very kind introduction, which is certainly much more flattering than I deserve. I believe the RECORD should indicate that certainly many of us appreciate the fact that the junior Senator from Oregon has been most diligent in protecting the rights of other Senators in the past. The junior Senator from Louisiana well recalls that, on one occasion, when he thought his rights were violated by the Chair, the junior Senator from Oregon was his defender. I completely agree with the Senator's argument that he is entitled to have his chair, or his desk, at any unoccupied place within the Chamber he might desire. However, if the Senator is to be denied the usual, customary seat in the Senate that other Senators have, I suggest that, inasmuch as he was able to stand and talk for 22 hours and 26 minutes the other night, he perhaps is better able to get by without a chair than any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is very kind. I sit down once in a while; but I may tell the Senator where I like to sit the best. Shall I tell the Senator where I like to sit? I like to sit in a saddle, riding in the great State of Maryland, represented in part by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] now presiding over the Senate. I took such a ride last Sunday, and rode 18 miles in the great State of Maryland. That is where I got my sunburn. I needed to relax a little bit after my speech in the Senate last Friday and Saturday. I had gone to a dinner party the night before, Saturday night, and I enjoyed it very much; but a dinner does not provide me with the kind of relaxation I get from sitting in the saddle, riding along the banks of the Potomac River, where I usually ride, in the Poolesville area.

I desire to give a little advice, and I wish the junior Senator from Texas were here, because it might help in connection with the sales offer I made. I made an offer to the Senator from Texas a while ago. He was a very poor salesman. He did not get anywhere in the selling of my horse. But what I am now saying explains how I could stand on the floor of the Senate for 22 hours and 26 minutes. I could have stood here for several hours more. I felt fine. I merely completed all that I had to say on that occasion, and I did not know how long the debate at that time might last. I knew there would be another time, and I wanted to give Senators something to shoot at. I did not want to discourage them completely. I only consumed 22 hours and 26 minutes. I could have continued several hours longer, but I thought it might be too discouraging to some of my colleagues if I should speak longer.

But, Mr. President, to get back to the point I was making, one reason for my being able to stand here for 22 hours and 26 minutes is that I ride 20 or 30 miles every weekend, out into the great State of Maryland. That ought to help someone who is interested in selling my horse, which is a good riding horse.

Mr. LONG. When the junior Senator from Texas heard of the $1,000 price the Senator from Oregon mentioned, he inquired of the Senator from Louisiana

whether the horse could talk. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Let me tell the Senator from Louisiana, the conversation I have with my horse is always pleasant. I always enjoy the conversation I have with my horse. Once in a while horses take advantage of me—as the Senator does, now and then—but they usually give me warning. When I am taken advantage of in the Senate, I am usually in the Senate restaurant eating lunch and am not here to protect myself. My horses treat me better than that. They usually give me a warning, then and there. Sometimes I do not see them coming, as the kick I recently received from one of them certainly proves; but they usually give me a warning.

Mr. President, I have enjoyed this pleasant interlude. Now let me proceed with the discussion of the committee assignment question, to which I was addressing myself. I was about to say that, after having submitted my resolution (S. Res. 32), on January 13, thereafter, on March 6, I submitted a series of amendments. It was in the amendments that the typographical error occurred which has served as the basis for the action of the Committee on Rules and Administration in submitting a report which simply cannot be reconciled with the facts. Let me read the amendments:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "party", insert "be assigned."

On page 1, line 7, strike the period, substitute a semicolon, and add—

"(2) by inserting, in subsection (f) (relating to the Committee on the District of Columbia), after the word 'Senators'; '(but for the period of the Eighty-third Congress to consist of eight Senators)'; and

"(3) by inserting in subsection (n) (relating to the Committee on Public Works), after the word 'Senators': (but for the period of the Eighty-third Congress to consist of eight Senators)'."

Note the word "eight," in subparagraph (3), dealing with the Public Works Committee, upon which the Committee on Rules and Administration has seized as the basis for a large part of its argument adverse to my resolution, Senate Resolution 32. The typographical error is that the word "eight" should have been "ten." The Committee on Public Works is a committee of 11, not of 9. The Committee on the District of Columbia is a committee of nine. In typing the amendment, the typographical error was made of using the word "eight" in connection with both the District of Columbia and the Public Works Committees. It was 8 in connection with the Committee on the District of Columbia, and it should have been 10 in connection with the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. President, that is no "out" for the Committee on Rules and Administration. Listen to the record. I quote from the RECORD of March 6, the same day the amendment containing the typographical error was submitted. Here is what I said about the amendment:

What I propose in my amendment to Senate Resolution 32 is to increase the number of committee posts by 2.

It has been said that I was proposing to decrease a committee by two. I said I was proposing to increase the membership of 2 committees by 2, by adding 1 additional Republican to the Committee on Armed Services and 1 additional Republican to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. What else did I say? I read further:

That would be accomplished by adding 2 members to the Committee on Armed Services and 2 members to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and by reducing the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works by 1 member each.

Listen, Mr. President. I am going to reread that sentence. To show clearly what I was proposing to do at the very time I explained my amendment, I said:

That would be accomplished by adding 2 members to the Committee on Armed Services and 2 members to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and by reducing the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works by 1 member each.

What else did I say on March 6? I said:

The total change in overall committee posts would be from 209 to 211.

How could the Committee on Rules and Administration submit the report it did in the face of those figures?

At the present time the Committee on the District of Columbia is supposed to have 9 members and the Committee on Public Works is supposed to have 11 members. Until now each has operated with one vacancy. It will be recalled that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] explained that it was not found possible to agree upon a plan which would assure a numerical majority of majority-party members on all committees. It was decided that the Republican and Democratic strength on those 2 committees would be equal and that the junior Senator from Oregon should be the 9th member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the 11th member of the Committee on Public Works. They implied that I conceivably held the balance of power on those committees. They were not happy about the prospect, but apparently felt this was the best they could do. Of course, at no time have they ever contemplated what the record will show, namely, that my votes on the Armed Services Committee and my votes on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for years and years have never been based upon any partisan theory of who held the balance of power.

Mr. President, later on the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] pointed out in a colloquy with me on the floor of the Senate that the Public Works Committee was a committee of 11 and not of 9, and therefore, that the reduction should be to 10 rather than to 8. I agreed that that was a mistake in the amendment.

The Committee on Rules and Administration was notified by my office. A staff member of the Committee on Rules and Administration assured my office that the committee was notified.

Now, Mr. President, listen to the committee report:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 32) temporarily increasing the membership of the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare, with proposed amendments, having considered the same, report it unanimously and adversely to the Senate.

This resolution, for the period of the 83d Congress, would assign to service on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare one additional member of the majority together with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

As proposed to be amended, the resolution would also reduce the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works to 8 each, and provide that 16 (rather than 14) majority Senators may have assignments to 3 standing committees and no more.

The typographical error says 8 and the RECORD makes perfectly clear that it should be 10. The staff of the committee was notified it was 10. The staff of the committee notified the committee that it was 10, but in the face of that record, Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration submits to the Senate a report which says that the Senator from Oregon proposed a Public Works Committee of 8 members. Why did they not ask me? Why did they not call me before the committee? Why did not one of them stop at this desk and say, "Wayne, let me get this clear. Are you really proposing a committee of eight? Because, if you are, it does not make sense."

Of course it does not make sense. I do not know why they did not discuss it with me, Mr. President, but I know the suspicion to which they opened themselves, and I told them personally what that suspicion is. They cannot meet my arguments on the merits of the controversy, so they fall back on a typographical error and come forward with this report:

The Committee on Rules and Administration recommends the rejection of these proposals as disruptive of the presently established committee structure of the Senate.

What committee structure of the Senate? Do they mean the committee structure which was approved on January 13, or do they mean to imply that the Reorganization Act of 1946 does not apply? There is nothing disruptive to the Reorganization Act about my resolution. On the contrary, it is consonant with the Reorganization Act. It is in keeping with the provision of the act for election of members of committees by ballot. If they mean by the present committee structure the structure based upon the members of committees assigned on January 13, that brings up the question of ratios, which I shall discuss in a moment.

But let us go on with the committee's report:

Committee assignments arise out of party division in the Senate.

That is not what the Reorganization Act provides, but let us take the committee at its word. Let us take the position that what the committee is trying to tell us is that we have two

political divisions in the Senate. We have more than two. That is what has been the matter with the Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle, I say most respectfully, who voted against me on January 13. They did not want to face the fact that there are 3 divisions, not 2. They want to keep the minority ratio on the basis of 2 divisions in the Senate, when there are 3 divisions in the Senate. When there are three divisions they do not like the idea of a new minority party cutting down the ratio a little bit. Let us be frank about it. The Democrats wanted to keep the same ratio, and they stick their heads in the sand and deny the fact that there are three divisions in the Senate. That is what it adds up to. I know they do not like to hear me say it, but I am pleasant about it.

The strange thing is that with respect to the ratio; the percentage would be changed by this proposal less than a half percent. The lawyers listening to me know that is de minimis. They know that is the kind of change that would not be taken note of by most people. So the ratio argument is not tenable because it is based on an unsound premise.

Quoting further from the committee's report:

> Committee assignments arise out of party division in the Senate.

Let us assign memberships on the basis of party division. If they are assigned on the basis of party division, my resolution should be adopted, without the typographical error.

Let us listen to more of this interesting argument by the committee:

> As nearly as possible, they represent the percentage division between the two major parties on the floor.

Do Senators see what I mean? What the Committee on Rules and Administration is talking about is the two major parties on the floor. But there are three. Do not think the Independent Party is not a major party in the United States. I have more members in my party in the United States than you Democrats and you Republicans have. The trouble with the membership in my party is that many of them are still wearing Republican and Democratic labels. But they are members of my party by their suppressed desires.

What you Republicans and Democrats have not yet awakened to is that you do not begin to have as many real Democrats or as many real Republicans as you have registered as Democrats and Republicans. What you Democrats and Republicans have not yet recognized is that the average Republican and the average Democrat are, first of all, independents. You are going to see that more as the years go by. You are going to see the "label" Republicans and the "label" Democrats voting independently more and more because they are sick and tired of the partisanship argument, "My party, right or wrong." Oh, I know that that is the fear lurking in the heads of many of you. So it is not surprising that the Committee on Rules and Administration, composed of Republicans and Democrats, should have in its report a sentence reading:

> As nearly as possible, they represent the percentage division between the two major parties on the floor. Customarily they also reflect a Senator's preference for committee work.

I expressed that preference long before I resigned from the Republican Party, in a letter to my good friend, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who I hope is speedily recovering in the hospital today. I expressed to him in a note I sent to him yesterday at the Bethesda Naval Hospital my hope that his recovery would be very speedy. I have learned today that he is making nice progress. I wrote a letter to the senior Senator from Nebraska, in reply to a letter he sent me asking me what my committee preferences would be in the new session of Congress.

Mr. President, I am glad to observe that a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], has just come to the floor. I would be highly honored if he would give me his ear and listen to my analysis of his committee's report, because, in my judgment, the report simply cannot stand logical analysis.

But to get back to the exchange of correspondence I had with the senior Senator from Nebraska, who was chairman of the Republican Committee on Committees, he asked me if I would be interested in being assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I was still a Republican then, and I replied to him, as the correspondence will show, that there had been a time when I had wanted to be assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but that with my increased seniority on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I desired to remain on those committees. That is the record. The Senator from Nebraska will so testify, if he is ever asked.

Mr. President, I then resigned from the Republican Party, and I notified the Senate that I did not wish to be assigned to committees by either the Republican or the Democratic caucus, but by the Senate, which was the fair and decent thing for me to have done.

I do not know where you Democrats get the idea that it is the responsibility of the Republicans to assign an Independent to committees. Where did you ever get that idea, trying to "pass the buck" on that basis? When I resigned from the Republican Party, it had no responsibility to assign me to committees.

I wished to be fair. I did not desire to embarrass the Republican Party. It would have been quite improper of me to have resigned from the Republican Party and then to have sat back and expected any favor they might have wanted to extend to me by way of committee assignments.

In a letter from the present Secretary of the Senate, who was then Secretary of the Republican minority, Mr. Mark Trice, in carrying out his official duty, I was invited to attend the Republican caucus at the beginning of this session of Congress. I replied very politely and appreciatively that I would not be there, because I was not a Republican. I wish the RECORD to be perfectly clear. The Republicans extended to me every courtesy at the beginning of this session. I wish to have the RECORD perfectly clear that, before I resigned from the Republican Party, the chairman of the Republican Committee on Committees wrote to me in regard to whether I would be interested in being assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations. No promise or offer was made; it was simply a very proper inquiry. The record is perfectly clear that I notified the chairman of the Committee on Committees that I wished to remain on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor, and Public Welfare.

The record is perfectly clear that I then notified the Republican caucus, through its secretary, that I would not attend the Republican caucus, that I had resigned from the Republican Party, and that I was a member of the Independent Party.

Then I did what I thought was only decent in the circumstances. I came to the floor of the Senate and announced that I desired to be assigned to my committees by the Senate, under the terms of the Reorganization Act. I did not hear any Democrat object. I did not hear any Democrat raise his voice in opposition on the day I made that announcement. I did not hear any Democrat say then, "That is the responsibility of the Republican Party." That became an afterthought with the Democrats. They found that this was a kind of hot potato; they were looking for a rationalization, and the rationalization was: It is the responsibility of the majority party to assign minority party members to committees.

Where did they get that idea? The majority party did not assign Democrats to committees. No, there is no logic in that explanation, Mr. President. That is an excuse. The Democrats refused to face the fact that when I resigned from the Republican Party and became a minority party, their ratio automatically changed. They wanted to keep the old ratio. My membership as an Independent in the Senate changes their ratio by less than one-half of 1 percent.

Let us go on with the next sentence in the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I hope my good friend from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] will listen to this, because it is a report from his committee. I wish he had been present to listen to the complete analysis of it. The committee says:

> Quite often, however, they do not; and, since the adoption of the Case resolution in January, the total of assignments to a committee now represents, in some measure, the Senate's recognition of the workload imposed on it.

That simply is not so, Mr. President. The difference in size of membership as between the District of Columbia Committee and the Public Works Committee does not recognize any difference in workload so far as the individual Sen-

ator is concerned. There is not a committee in the Senate that does not have more work to do than it can do. The Committee on Rules and Administration could have said with accuracy that it took notice of the fact that the Foreign Relations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Appropriations Committee have more work to do, in the sense that the total workload of those committees is greater than that of the Committee on Public Works, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on the District of Columbia. Once a Senator is assigned to a committee, there is no difference in the workload of the individual member of the committee, because there is always more work to do than he can do. It is a selective process. A Senator can do only so much. If he serves on the Public Works Committee, he can devote every hour of time available to the work of that committee. So the argument by the Committee on Rules and Administration is a very catchy argument, but it has no substance.

What else does the Committee on Rules and Administration say in its report?

> Senate Resolution 32, as proposed to be amended, disturbs the existing equitable balance of committee assignments. Membership would be increased on two committees and decreased on two.
>
> Party representation on two committees would be evened and, in the case of each, majority control formally surrendered.

We have had equal party representation of Senate committees for years and years. Several weeks ago I placed in the RECORD all the statistics on that subject. I say to the Committee on Rules and Administration that there is nothing new in the history of the Senate about committees being equally divided. That situation has existed for years. Where does the committee get the idea that it is a sound argument for it to advance against my resolution that, as a result of its membership on the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on the District of Columbia would be evened? Out of one corner of their mouths members of the committee make the argument that I would have the balance of power on those two committees if I were placed on them. Out of the other side of their mouths they say that it would make membership on those two committees even. I do not know what makes members of the Committee on Rules and Administration think that they can violate the old physical law that one cannot have his cake and eat it, too. They cannot have it both ways.

One of the arguments for suggesting that eventually I would probably go on the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works, by way of a garbage-can-disposal principle, was that I would have the balance of power only on those two committees. Apparently the assumption was that they were minor committees, and perhaps that was a risk my former Republican colleagues could dare to run.

For years I sat with the present chairman of the Armed Services Committee, now acting majority leader, on the Committee on Armed Services. He will not rise in the Senate and testify that I cast any partisan votes in the Committee on Armed Services. Neither did he. We functioned as nonpartisans on that committee, as we should. When a Senator walks into the Armed Services Committee he parks partisanship at the door. Every Republican in this body knows that to be true, and so do the Democrats.

That argument was mere political palaver. It was an attempt to rationalize a failure to face the issue. The issue is that on January 13 a State was discriminated against. The fact is that on January 13 the people of the State of Oregon were denied equal representation in the Senate. The fact is that the Committee on Rules and Administration has come forward with a report which does not even mention that fact. The committee did not even consider the argument of the Senator from Oregon. It did not even extend to him the courtesy of calling him before the committee for examination. It never asked him about the typographical error in the amendment, with respect to which the clerk to the committee was advised. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that the error was recognized at the time I submitted the amendment.

Mr. President, it is not pleasant to be in that position. I would that some member of the Committee on Rules and Administration were in that position. He would find the junior Senator from Oregon fighting as hard to protect his procedural rights as I am fighting to protect the procedural rights of myself in this instance, or even harder. I am fighting only because I think it is my duty to do so to protect the people of my State and free them from the discriminatory course of action which has been followed in the Senate.

Let us go on with the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration:

> Party representation on two committees would be evened and, in the case of each majority control formally surrendered. To do otherwise would necessitate more than 16 Members of the majority to serve on 3 committees.

There is no Senator on the majority side who would not jump at the chance to serve on the Committee on Armed Services or on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It would work no hardship on any Senator. At present there is provision in the rule for service on more than two committees. However, the rule names the third committee on which a Senator may serve. That is Senate policy. That is established. What is wrong with my proposal to let some other Senator serve on an additional committee?

Why not ask the Senators concerned? An interesting test would be to say to Senator X, "Senator, if we should adopt the Morse resolution, would you be willing to serve on the Committee on Armed Services?" He would say, "Would I? Just give me the chance." If we were to say to Senator Y, "Senator, if we should adopt the Morse resolution, would you be willing to serve on the Committe on Labor and Public Welfare?" What do Senators suppose he would say? He would say, "Would I? Just give me the chance."

No one is going to "kid" me about this, Mr. President. There is great weeping of crocodile tears in the committee report over the so-called hardship which my resolution would work. More than 16 Members of the Senate would serve on 3 committees. Ask Senators if they object to it.

The Committee on Rules and Administration says further:

> On two committees majority representation would be increased without any gain for the minority.

What minority are the committee talking about? Do they mean the Democratic minority? Certainly. But why should they get a gain? There happens to be another minority, and that minority is entitled to committee representation, and that representation ought to be fair. What makes the Democrats think they are entitled to maintain the same ratio, in view of the reality that there are now two minorities in the Senate.

Let us face the facts. Those happen to be the mathematics. So what the report really means is, "We Democrats and we Republicans league up together and knock down the Independent Party, because we have the votes to do it." That is what it means. It means, "We are not going to give the minority, the Independent Party, any representation."

Mr. President, we are going to make a record on it, believe me. We are going to make a record, so those who read will know. We are going to make a record for a doctor of philosophy thesis on it. There will be one written on it. Mr. President, I have received a great many letters from political scientists in the universities of this country who are incensed over the committee matter, and they want me to send them all the material I can, and all the references to it on the floor of the Senate. There will be a doctor of philosophy thesis on the question. Wait and see. It will be a worthwhile one, too, because the implications of the vote, which will be taken on my resolution, so far as the history of the Senate is concerned, are so important that they will be recorded objectively and in a thorough fashion, not by politicians, but by scholars.

Let us go on with the committee report. The committee says:

> In all, the majority would have a net gain of one committee seat, and the minority a net loss of one.

The minority would not lose any seat, Mr. President. That is where the report is mathematically wrong. The report was made on the basis of a typographical error, which was corrected in the RECORD. The committee never took a note of the correction. They made the report on the false assumption that my resolution proposes a Public Works Committee consisting of 8 members, instead of 10 members.

Mr. President, have we reached the point where we cannot correct a typographical error in the Senate and have

submitted a committee report based on the facts? It just is not so, that the adoption of my resolution would result in a net loss of one seat to the Democrats. I will say to the Democrats, "You do not lose one seat. It is true that the Republicans gain an additional seat on the Committee on Armed Services, and on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They should gain it, in keeping with the ratio policy, in order to protect the interest of the second minority of the Senate. However what you Democrats are objecting to, when we get the facts boiled down, is that the Independent Party would be protected. You base this whole part of the report on the false assumption that you lose one seat. You do not lose a single seat. You do not gain one either, and you should not gain one. You are not entitled to gain a seat."

Mr. President, the Independent Party is entitled to be represented on committees. In line with 8 years of seniority it is entitled to such representation. There is not a single word in the committee's report about the seniority rights of the Senator from Oregon. I say to my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle that they ignore completely the seniority rights of the Senator from Oregon. In my judgment, they ignore them because they cannot answer the facts in the case. They ignore them, although they know the precedents are against them. They ignore them because they know there was only one time in the history of the Senate, and that was in 1871, when a Senator from the State of Massachusetts, the great Sumner, who represented Massachusetts in this body at the beginning of Grant's administration—which is a commentary, I may say, in passing, because we are at the beginning of another military administration—would not go along with Grant's policies, and Republican Party kicked him off his committees in the Senate.

Mr. President, he was even the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He was a powerful figure in the Senate.

To show how we have improved the decorum in the Senate, some years before Sumner was kicked off his committees in the Senate, an incident occurred when, as I understand, Sumner was seated in the front row of the Senate——

Mr. LANGER. He was in the third row from the rear.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from North Dakota says he was in the third row from the rear. At any rate, Mr. President, Sumner was caned on the floor of the Senate. He was knocked unconscious. I believe it happened in 1855. Douglas, of Illinois, stood by and never raised a hand to protect him. That is what history shows. Sumner was caned because he was an Abolitionist, denied the right of the Southern States to secede from the Union, and made the historic arguments on the floor of the Senate which Lincoln followed, to the effect that the sovereignty of the Nation was greater than the summation of the sovereignties of the States, which is the same argument we have made in our fight against the tidelands bill. While Sumner was making his fight against the arguments of the secessionists, the debate became so angry and hostile that a Member of the House knocked him unconscious and gave him a brain concussion. He was for a long time in a serious condition.

Therefore, I say the decorum of the Senate has improved a little since those days. However, that is the same Sumner—and it is a great historic record he made in the annals of this body—who at the beginning of the Grant administration in 1871 refused to follow Grant's policies on foreign relations. The Republicans disciplined him and kicked him off his committees.

Mr. President, you cannot find another precedent in the history of the Senate similar to that, until 1953. At no other time in the history of the Senate, has a Member of this body been denied his committee assignments. It is all very interesting. I have gone into the subject and the arguments, because it is my business to go into them, since I am the victim.

Mr. President, there have been other times when the suggestion has been made that a Senator should be disciplined by kicking him off his committees? Some of the Senators involved were Shipstead, Brookhart, Ladd, the La Follettes, Norris, Couzens, and Burton K. Wheeler.

Mr. President, Burton K. Wheeler has called me three times since the incident of January 13, and each time he has said, "The action taken in your case is beyond my understanding." Burton K. Wheeler has said in these conversations, "I ran for the Vice Presidency of the United States in 1924 with old Bob La Follette, and no action of any disciplinary fashion was taken against me." He said to me, "I not only did not lose any rights on committees, but I was welcomed with open arms."

Then he said to me, "Do any of them ever say anything to you about 1948? Have any of the Democrats who voted against you on January 13 ever said anything to you about the Glenn Taylor incident?"

In 1948 Glenn Taylor ran for the Vice Presidency on the ticket with Henry Wallace. Thereafter the Senate followed its tradition, as it should have, and left Senator Taylor on his committees.

Some Senators have said to me, in the cloakroom—and I love this argument—"There is one difference—Taylor came back into the Democratic Party, but you did not come back into the Republican Party."

You bet I did not, Mr. President, and I am not going to, either. But what does that have to do with my rights under the Reorganization Act? It has absolutely nothing to do with them; that argument is completely irrelevant, because my rights are based on the Reorganization Act, to which the Committee on Rules and Administration, I respectfully say, should have paid more attention.

Let us listen to some more of the committee's report, which is a very interesting one. I repeat a little of the report:

> On two committees majority representation would be increased without any gain for the minority. In all, the majority would have a net gain of 1 committee seat and the minority a net loss of 1.

I have always pointed out that that is not so, so far as the minority is concerned.

I read further:

> Party division would be widened in regard to triple committee assignments with the majority and minority members serving on 3 committees in a 15-to-2 ratio instead of the 14-to-3 spread now in effect.

Is not that terrible, Mr. President—particularly when we keep in mind the fact that that is not necessary in order to take care of the second minority party which they would like to ignore. However, they will not be allowed to ignore it. No matter what they do with me, in the case of committee assignments, they will not be allowed to ignore that party.

I read further from the report:

> The Committee on Rules and Administration is convinced that such changes would operate to the disadvantage of the Senate and to the majority and minority parties.

Is not that thoughtful, Mr. President? These gentlemen decide it would be to the disadvantage of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party to recognize the seniority rights of the new minority party. So what? I imagine that a number of witnesses would testify that it has not been to the advantage of the Republican Party for me to follow the course of action I have followed in American politics, and a number of witnesses could testify that it has not been to the advantage of the Democratic Party for me to follow the course of action I have followed in American politics. So what, Mr. President? That comes rather close to showing the subconscious motivation involved in this entire fight. It is a rather clear case, I think, of showing that the Democrats and the Republicans do not like the results and do not like the prospect of having a third party. But let me say most respectfully, that gives the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration no right to set themselves up as judges of whether a member of the minority party should follow the political course of action he has followed. That happens to be his prerogative and his right; and, I say most respectfully, it happens to be the duty and the obligation of the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration to respect and protect the rights of the minority party to committee assignments, under the Reorganization Act of 1946.

Let us listen to some more of the committee report. The Committee on Rules and Administration further says:

> The workload of the Senate has been equitably distributed within the present committee structure, and no valid purpose could be served by changing it.

Mr. President, who says so? Where is the proof? Is it valid to protect the rights of the Independent Party under the Reorganization Act? My answer is "Yes"; and it is not changed by saying that no valid purpose would be served. Is it valid to deny the State of Oregon equal representation in the Senate by means of equal treatment in regard to committee assignments? I say it is not, and I say that fact is not changed by a statement to the effect that no valid purpose would be served.

Mr. President, in the report a great many glittering generalities are laid down and are called arguments; but they have no reference to the arguments made by me.

I read further from the report:

The majority and minority parties would sustain inequities that are objectionable and contrary to long-established custom.

Mr. President, they should have swallowed their tongues on that one—when the long-established custom of the Senate is contrary, just the opposite, to what the Committee on Rules and Administration said.

For 15 weeks I have challenged and challenged and challenged them to produce a precedent, other than the Sumner case of 1871. Does the Committee on Rules and Administration say, in its report, anything by way of proof to back up its assertion that such action would be contrary to the customs of the Senate? There is not a word of proof of that assertion. The committee could not prove it, because the customs of the Senate, except in the 1871 case, are entirely the other way.

I repeat that the report is a very interesting one.

I do not wish to get on thin ice; when I make a prediction, I always like to be standing on rather substantial footing. However, I know the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I know how committee reports sometimes are written. I know that sometimes Senators—busy as they are—go along with a committee report, when they do not have the slightest idea of the contents of the report. Until each member of the committee says to me, "I knew what was in it, and I approved what was in it, and I stand by what is in it," I am going to continue to assume that most of the members of the committee did not have the slightest idea what was in the report when it was filed at the desk. I simply cannot believe that some of them would endorse a report which says my proposal would be contrary to the customs of the Senate, when they know that all the precedents, except one, are to the contrary.

No, Mr. President; I prefer to believe that the committee report was written by a staff member, under some instruction, and following the sort of poll that sometimes is taken in committees, to the effect, "Well, we have the report on such-and-such an issue; it is prepared. It is along the lines of the discussion in the committee. It is favorable"—or perhaps they might say, "It is adverse, and I do not think it is a matter of any great import."

I have been in attendance at committee sessions when similar statements have been made; and I recall that at times I have replied, "It carries out what we have agreed to in the committee, does it?"

Often the reply is, "Yes."

In such instances I have often replied, "Very well; I will go along."

Sometimes that happens to all Senators, and sometimes Senators find that it would have been better to read the committee report.

So I have a suspicion—and I hope it is well founded, because in that case I can better understand how the report was filed—that most of my colleagues on the Committee on Rules and Administration do not know what is in the report.

However, be that as it may, they have to assume responsibility for the report until they do something to the contrary. Now that the report is filed as the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration—for the report bears the statement, near the top of the page, "from the Committee on Rules and Administration, submitted the following"—the members of the committee have to assume responsibility for the report, until they have it corrected.

The reason for this long statement—and it is not pleasant for me to make it—and this long analysis of the committee report is that I believe, down in my heart, that once the members of the committee come to see how fallacious the report is, they will wish to take it back and correct it. I am taking the time to discuss it today because the majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], has assured me that he will bring up the report for action in the Senate sometime next week; and I think it is only fair to try at least to give full notice as to my position on the report, so that the Committee on Rules and Administration will have ample time to file a corrected report, or at least one that is mathematically correct.

So I continue with the next sentence:

There are additional reasons for failure to accommodate the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, it is no accommodation to me. Let members of the committee get that idea out of their heads. I say to members of the Committee on Rules and Administration that a recognition of my rights is not an accommodation to the junior Senator from Oregon. I ask for no accommodation. I ask for no favor; I want none. I am asking only for a fair application of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to my seniority rights, which the Committee on Rules and Administration does not even mention. Does someone talk to me about accommodation? I happen to be one politician who does not deal in terms of accommodation. I ask myself the question, "What are the rights in the premises?" and whatever the rights are determines my vote.

Mr. President, listen to this:

Other Senators, originally dissatisfied with one or both their committee assignments, but now more or less reconciled to them, could quite properly expect the same preferment.

What a fallacious argument. Name me a Senator who on January 13, was kicked off any committee on which he had a right to remain. Name me one, because he is the one who must be named if this sentence in the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration is to apply.

What the committee means is that some of the new Senators, some of the freshmen Senators, without any seniority rights at all, might have liked some assignments other than the assignments they were given. That is always true in the Senate. But Senators who voted against me on January 13, and kicked me off my committees, had no right to take the position that a freshman Senator, with no seniority at all, should be placed on a committee in preference to the junior Senator from Oregon, who had 8 years of seniority in this body. To Senators I say, down in your hearts, most of you know that what I say is accurate. I may add, Mr. President, that many Senators have said so to me privately. But apparently partisan politics cause some people to do very strange things. A man was in my office this morning who was in an open forum, at which one of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle spoke recently. The time came for the question period. I had never met this man before today. He was a perfect stranger to me, but he came in because he wanted to tell me what had happened. He said, "Senator, I got up and asked the Senator who was speaking in the open forum period, 'What have you got to say about your vote against Senator MORSE, on January 13? How do you justify it?' " He said, "You ought to have listened to the blarney we got. The Senator said, 'You know, after all, I belong to a party, and the Senator from Oregon does not belong to my party; and sometimes, you know, politics makes you do very partisan things. I wish I could have voted for Senator MORSE, because I have a high regard for him. But I just did not feel that I could vote against a Democrat.' " Then the gentleman who called at my office this morning said, "My next question was, 'Do you mean that you thought a freshman Democrat should be placed ahead of Senator MORSE, with his service in the Senate?' " He said the audience applauded, because the Senator did not get by with his partisanship. The audience saw through it. Mr. President, the people of America believe in the rules of the playground, the rules of fair play; and the Senator, in that situation, was confessing that he did not follow the rules of fair play, he substituted partisanship for the rules of fair play. That is what he did, and the people there realized it.

Mr. President, let us proceed with the committee report. The Committee on Rules and Administration says:

To adopt Senate Resolution 32, as proposed to be amended, would also reopen the whole question of committee structure, now fitted to the close political division existing in the Senate.

Not at all. To the contrary, the adoption of my resolution would protect the ratio rights of the three parties in the Senate. What the Democrats are after is more than their rights. Democrats want a higher ratio than the mathematical division of the Senate entitles them to have. That is what they want, that is what they are after. But that fact is not faced at all by the Committee on Rules and Administration in its report. I read further from the report:

Action taken by the Senate on committees in January guaranteed to each Senator the right to two committee assignments as provided in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

That statement cannot be squared with the facts until and unless a course of action is followed which protects the

seniority rights of the junior Senator from Oregon. When that shall have been done, that sentence will be accurate, not before. The next sentence reads:

To overturn that action, to reopen debate on the whole field of committee preferences, will accomplish little for the Senate, and its legislative program, at this date.

Mr. President, is not that a nice sentence? Is it not an interesting sentence? To come to grips with the problem, to rectify a wrong, would not interfere with the legislative program of the Senate; it would merely put the Senate in a position where it could do what it should have done on January 13. I know it is difficult for some people to admit they made a mistake. They ought to do it, because their action against me on January 13 was action against themselves. This precedent is going to live on, if not erased. It is a bad precedent, and it ought to be corrected. The Committee on Rules and Administration should have submitted a report recommending its correction. It is a sad thing, I think, that it did not.

To continue, the committee said:

Further, the minority objects to the loss of its triple committee assignments now granted to it by the Senate.

That means that the minority does not like it, because the ratio, affecting less than one-half percent of the total, is going to result in 1 more Republican being placed on the Armed Services Committee, and 1 more Republican being placed on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Independent Member of the Senate being placed on those 2 committees. No Democrat is taken off them. All the Democrats on those committees continue on them. No Democrat is taken off the Committee on Public Works, the Committee on Rules and Administration to the contrary notwithstanding. Every Democrat remains on that committee, and my seniority rights of 8 years' standing, in keeping with the precedents of the Senate, are protected.

We sometimes hear lawyers talk about an open-and-shut case. If this is not one, I never saw one. The precedents are with me. The language of the Reorganization Act is with me, and the private conversations of a great many of the Senators who voted against me are with me. I am just asking them to vote as they talk in private—to vote in public as they talk in private. When the politicians of America start voting in public as they talk in private, the Government will be closer to the people than it is at this time.

Here is an example. Here is an opportunity for each colleague on the floor of the Senate who has come to me privately and said, "Wayne, I wish I had January 13 to do over, and I would vote with you," to do it in an orderly fashion.

Mr. President, I am almost through with the committee report. The next sentence is as follows:

It is not known which Senator of the 3 would surrender 1 of his posts in order that, under this resolution, the minority member leaving the Committee on Public Works might then have 2 committee places accorded to him by law.

No minority member is going to be taken off unless he wants to get off.

That accommodation would have to be made, however. The minority members of this committee refuse to support a condition where one of their colleagues will be compelled to give up something already acquired, and something that has gone to him as a right given by the Senate.

There is nothing in my proposal, Mr. President, that requires any Democrat to get off a committee. The members of the Committee on Rules and Administration did not pay any attention to the correction, and they apparently did not give heed to advice. They just proceeded on the assumption that the typographical error in my amendment had not been corrected. That is the danger they ran when they did not consult me or did not ask me to come before the committee and discuss the resolution. I was not entitled as a matter of right, of course, to be queried about it. I was not entitled, as a matter of right, to appear before the Committee on Rules and Administration, but I leave it to the sense of fairness of the Senate whether the opportunity should have been afforded me. They would then have soon discovered that they were wrong on the arithmetic of the matter.

I read the last paragraph of the report:

The precedents of the Senate, by which the two political parties have, for long years, harmoniously collaborated to establish committees, should be followed, and Senate Resolution 32, as proposed to be amended, should not be adopted.

Mr. President, it would be thought that the members of the committee never knew that the Reorganization Act of 1946 had been passed. That is not what the Reorganization Act requires. I said I was standing on the provisions of the Reorganization Act, as I have a legal right to do. In my judgment, Senators are not going to get by with public opinion on any such representation. The people will not buy any such proposal as that. All the precedents of the Senate, contrary to what the committee says, except the sad one of 1871, show that the rights of minorities, of rebels, of non-Conformists, of Progressives, of free-soilers, and of Laborites, all the different third party representatives who have sat from time to time in the Senate throughout the history of this country, have been protected so far as their committee assignments were concerned. They have been allowed to remain on their committees. The great Norris was allowed to remain on his committee. He retained the chairmanship of the Committee on the Judiciary. Obviously, when he became an Independent, he should not have been removed. Do not forget that he first became an Independent in the course of a campaign. He did exactly what I have done, so far as bolting his party was concerned, and he ran as an Independent later, after he had declared his independence, and the Senate never disturbed his committee assignments.

There has not been a word from the Committee on Rules and Administration with regard to such precedents as that. Consider the case of old Bob La Follette. He did not sit here as a Republican. He called himself a Progressive Republican, but he was an Independent. Young Bob for years did not go to Republican conferences. He sat here as a Progressive and he was not kicked off his committees. Why does not the Committee on Rules and Administration talk about those instances? It is because they could not discuss them and say in their committee report what was said about the customs and the precedents because those cases cannot be squared with what is said in the committee report.

Mr. President, I have made the record on this item of business because I wanted to have my statement in the RECORD so that when the majority leader brings up my resolution next week he will know what I think. He will know what my position is on the committee report and I shall await with interest his reply. It better be good, Mr. President, because there is not anything on the record in this case which supports the Committee on Rules and Administration in the report which it has filed.

Mr. President, I have a few more items to discuss. I understand the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] wishes to submit an amendment and make some comments. I am willing to yield to him with the understanding that I have unanimous consent to do so, and that by yielding I shall not lose my right to the floor. The Senator says he wants to speak for approximately 10 minutes. While I can stand for 10 minutes, in view of the fact that there is no filibuster going on in the Senate and there is, therefore, no reason for the strict application of the rules such as that which occurred to me a few days ago when consent was given to the Senator from Nevada to make a 2-minute statement and I was required to stand and listen to him, and was perfectly willing to do so, in view of the fact that the situation is different at this time, I will sit down. I shall stand if that is necessary, but I want it clearly understood that in yielding to the Senator from Rhode Island, either standing or sitting, I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. President, does the Senator from Rhode Island desire that I yield to him at this time?

Mr. GREEN. I should be very grateful to have the Senator do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I request that I be permitted to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island for the purpose of allowing him to offer an amendment and, as I understand, to make a speech in support of his amendment, which the Senator says will take him in the neighborhood of 10 minutes. However, I do not wish to limit him to 10 minutes, but that will be up to him.

I have also said that, unless there is objection, while the Senator is making his 10-minute speech, I might go out to get a drink of water, rather than sit down.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the Senator from Oregon would be willing to desist long enough, under the same conditions, to allow me to call up

an amendment to the pending joint resolution and to discuss it. I think my whole discussion would not take more than 40 or 45 minutes, and I would ask that it be printed at the end of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, so as not to interrupt the continuity of his speech.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, ordinarily I should be happy to do that for my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee. But I wish to finish my committee report. I have two more items to take up. I am very anxious to conclude, so that I may get on with the weekend work I announced earlier in the afternoon.

I am sorry. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not think me impolite or discourteous, but I would not yield for that purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Very well.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon, how long he expects to speak?

Mr. MORSE. I think I have about 30 minutes more of committee work.

Mr. LANGER. I have been waiting since the Senate convened this noon to speak on an amendment I have lying on the table. But I shall not object. My distinguished friend has asked me not to, so I shall not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that he may yield to the Senator from Rhode Island without losing his right to the floor? The chair hears none, and the Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me a few minutes, especially in view of what has occurred this afternoon. I have sat here and listened to criticisms of the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I am a humble member, a minority member, not even a majority member. I think it shows a degree of objectivity which is admirable, that at the end of those remarks the Senator has yielded to me for another purpose, which I hope he regards as a worthy purpose, that of offering another amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. President, the discussion which we have been hearing on the floor of the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 13 has served to emphasize the fact that there is no valid reason why the Congress should attempt to deprive the United States of its oil, gas, sulfur, and other mineral resources in the submerged lands of the sea, and to give those resources to 3 States—California, Louisiana, and Texas—at the expense of the other 45.

My State of Rhode Island stands to lose great sums of money if the proposed legislation goes into effect. In his admirable analysis of the issues involved, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has pointed out that if revenues from the mineral resources were distributed to the States for school purposes, Rhode Island, on the basis of its children between the ages of 5 and 17 years, would eventually benefit by the sum of $27 million, assuming the royalties were 12½ percent, and $43,200,000 if the royalties were 20 percent. This is on the assumption that the estimated capital value of the natural resources is $50 billion. If, however, as some authorities believe, the value of such resources should reach $300 billion, then Rhode Island would receive $162 million if the royalties were 12½ percent, and $259,200,000 if the royalties were 20 percent. It is fair to estimate on the 20-percent basis, because the royalties do not include the substantial bonus payments to be expected from leases in new areas; nor do they include the annual rentals paid under all such leases. This means that eventually every man, woman, and child of the 800,000 population of Rhode Island would lose, on the basis used by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], at least $324 each, for the benefit of the people of California, Louisiana, and Texas. There is no good reason given why the people of Rhode Island should be discriminated against in this way.

If Rhode Island's share in the Nation's natural resources in the submerged lands of the sea were given to it for school purposes, Rhode Island's taxes on its citizens for school purposes could be reduced. If, on the other hand, some other use of the revenues from oil and other minerals in the submerged lands of the sea is authorized by Congress, Rhode Island will receive its proportionate share of the benefits. The only way Rhode Island can lose is by such legislation as is contained in Senate Joint Resolution 13.

I have spoken of Rhode Island not only because it is my own State, but because it is a typical example of the other 44 States adversely affected by the pending measure, the purpose of which is to give to 3 States the resources belonging to the other 45. That is the whole controversy in a nutshell. Supporters of this legislation have attempted on this floor to reargue three cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. California, Louisiana, and Texas lost those cases. The Court held that those States, and, in fact, all of the coastal States, had no right or property interest in the submerged lands of the marginal sea. That is the law.

Senate Joint Resolution 13 not only purports to give coastal States all of the territory claimed in the sea by the United States, but it also purports to grant rights beyond the boundaries of the United States. Nobody can say with any degree of certainty just what or how much territory is being given away under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 13. The arguments in favor of this proposed legislation have already been answered by the Supreme Court of the United States. The property belongs to the United States. Our country needs it, and should keep it, especially for national defense; but if it is to be given away, I want Rhode Island to get its fair share of the assets belonging to the Nation. There is no excuse for any other distribution.

For this reason, I offer for the benefit of Rhode Island and of her 44 sister States an amendment to place all the 48 States on an even pecuniary basis if this proposed legislation should be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island desire to have his amendment stated at this time?

Mr. GREEN. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. Each coastal State receiving any income from oil, gas, or other minerals in submerged lands, which are covered by tidal waters and are outside of inland waters and the ordinary low-water line of such tidal waters, shall report at the end of each 6-month period in each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1953, the gross amount of such income received (including amounts previously received and not reported) to the Secretary of the Treasury who shall determine the total such income received by all coastal States in such period. Within 60 days after the end of each such 6-month period the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to each of the several States an amount of money which shall be equal in the case of each such State to the percentage, listed in the following table, of such total, except that amounts reported by each coastal State as required in this section shall be debited against amounts to be paid such coastal State under this section. Amounts paid to each State under this section shall be used primarily for public education to the extent deemed necessary by such State. Such table is as follows:

State:	*Percentage*
Alabama	2.52
Arizona	.56
Arkansas	1.54
California	6.33
Colorado	.88
Connecticut	1.17
Delaware	.20
District of Columbia	.37
Florida	1.77
Georgia	2.66
Idaho	.47
Illinois	5.24
Indiana	2.61
Iowa	1.80
Kansas	1.26
Kentucky	2.13
Louisiana	2.05
Maine	.64
Maryland	1.47
Massachusetts	2.79
Michigan	4.36
Minnesota	2.05
Mississippi	1.80
Missouri	2.48
Montana	.42
Nebraska	.89
Nevada	.10
New Hampshire	.35
New Jersey	2.77
New Mexico	.55
New York	8.43
North Carolina	3.22
North Dakota	.48
Ohio	5.04
Oklahoma	1.68
Oregon	1.00
Pennsylvania	6.79
Rhode Island	.45
South Carolina	1.77
South Dakota	.47
Tennessee	2.44
Texas	5.20
Utah	.57
Vermont	.27
Virginia	2.30
Washington	1.49
West Virginia	1.60
Wisconsin	2.33
Wyoming	.24

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for the purpose of submitting a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield with the understanding that I am protected in my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier today I had an interesting discussion with the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] with regard to the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. I had an equally interesting discussion with my good friend from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] on April 27. I wish to make a brief statement of my position. If the Senator from Maryland can remain for a few moments I think he will be interested in the contents of my statement.

On Monday evening, April 27, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], in the course of the submerged-lands debate, propounded the following question:

> Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Oregon seems to lay much stress on the separation of powers, and the fact that the Congress, in a case involving the Constitution, should not by legislation overrule the Supreme Court. Is it not true that, under the Constitution of the United States, the Congress may withdraw from the Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction in cases arising under the Constitution?

He had reference to article III, section 2, of the Constitution, which reads:

> In all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

The discussion that followed was in general terms and general principles. In fact, as Senators who are present may recall, the discussion which followed, took place in a very interesting parliamentary situation, in which the Senator from Oregon was granted unanimous consent to reply to the Senator from Maryland, and the Senator from Maryland, in turn, was limited—which I thought was unfair—to 2 minutes, as I recall, to make further reply. I think we got about as near to the subject matter that each of us had in his own mind as the door on one side of the Chamber is to the door on the other side of the Chamber. I think we were both talking about different things. Each one of us has enough concern over his own reputation as a lawyer to wish to keep the record straight. The next day the Senator from Maryland and I sat down and for the first time discovered what each was talking about the night before. So I am making this statement to clarify the record.

In the context of this debate, the answer is a simple one. In all three submerged lands cases, the jurisdiction exercised by the Supreme Court was its original jurisdiction under the first sentence of the quoted provision of the Constitution, as they were cases in which a State was a party. That is the same section which the junior Senator from Texas and the junior Senator from Oregon discussed earlier this afternoon.

In *U. S.* v. *California* ((1947) 322 U. S. 19) the Supreme Court at the outset of its opinion stated:

> The United States by its Attorney General and Solicitor General brought this suit against the State of California invoking our original jurisdiction under article III, section 2, of the Constitution which provides that "In all cases * * * in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction."

Similarly in *U. S.* v. *Louisiana* ((1950) 339 U. S. 699) the Court said:

> The United States by its Attorney General and its Solicitor General brought this suit against the State of Louisiana, invoking our jurisdiction under article III, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution which provides "In all cases * * * in which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction."

In *U. S.* v. *Texas* ((1950) 339 U. S. 707), the Court said:

> This suit, like its companion, *United States* v. *Louisiana*, *ante*, page 699, decided this day, invokes our original jurisdiction under article III, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution.

It follows that the argument based upon the power of Congress to exclude certain subjects from the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is not pertinent to this debate so far as the original jurisdiction of the Court is concerned.

On Monday, I made reference to *Marbury* v. *Madison* ((1803) 1 Cranch. 137). Let me expand that portion of my remarks. The basic principles of the case are known, but I wish to point out certain details.

The case involved a petition for mandamus to the Secretary of State to issue a commission to certain justices of the peace for the District of Columbia. The petition to show cause why the mandamus should not issue was filed in the first instance with the Supreme Court pursuant to an act of Congress which sought to confer the mandamus power upon the Supreme Court. Chief Justice Marshall held that the facts would warrant mandamus if the statute were proper.

He also held that as the original jurisdiction of the Court was involved, the remedy of mandamus was not available because the statute attempted to enlarge the original jurisdiction of the Court by conferring a power which was an appellate power.

I agree that the Constitution confers upon Congress the authority to create exceptions to the Supreme Court's appellate power. This is not to say that the Congress can arrogate to itself the final determination of constitutional questions—it merely means that the Supreme Court may not pass upon lower court decisions when Congress so decides.

As the Senator from Maryland and I agreed in our personal conversation later, Congress could have taken appellate jurisdiction away from the Court in the steel case, and that would have left the decision of Judge Pine standing. But my point is that the power to decide the question of constitutionality cannot be taken away from the judicial branch of the Government. It cannot be taken away from the courts. The courts would still decide it. It is not a matter for Congress to decide. The only way to place the Congress in a position to decide on constitutionality would be to adopt some proposal such as the La Follette proposal, which I discussed in my colloquy with the Senator from Maryland the other day. That would have to be by way of constitutional amendment. The La Follette proposal was a proposal for a constitutional amendment.

What the Senator from Maryland and I did not get together on—because, as I say, we were in the heat of debate, in the parliamentary situation of a filibuster which was going on at the time, with Senators trying to apply the rules very technically against one another—related to the application of the separation-of-powers doctrine which I was trying to make, and upon which I still stand in my argument on the pending measure, namely, that under the separation-of-powers doctrine it is the judicial branch of Government, and not the Congress, which has jurisdiction to pass upon great constitutional questions. We should not try to reverse the Court, the judicial branch of Government, in this manner, through legislation. That is my thesis. Senators may disagree with me.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Let me finish the argument, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Charles Warren in Congress, the Constitution, and the Supreme Court—1935, Boston—points out:

> For if the United States Supreme Court lost its power to pass on the validity of Federal statutes, the power to do so would still remain in the State supreme courts, in any case involving a Federal statute coming before them.

Also, I digress to say, for example, in the case which the Senator from Maryland cited, in the lower Federal court, in the Steel case, if Congress, in turn, did not do anything about its appeal power.

I continue to quote from Warren:

> There have been many decisions by State supreme courts, in our history, holding acts of Congress unconstitutional.

And, the lower Federal courts would retain the power to pass on constitutional questions as article III, section 1, provides:

> The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

And section 2 defines the area of Federal judicial power as follows, in part:

> The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority.

It is true that in *Ex parte McCardle* ((1869) 7 Wall. 506) the Supreme Court held that it was without power to pass upon an appeal in a habeas corpus case arising under an 1867 statute, because of its repeal in 1868. This, the Court held, was an exception within the meaning of the constitutional provision.

I should say that the McCardle case deals with the exception to the constitutional provision on which I base my argument in respect of Marbury versus Madison.

It is legally possible to create many exceptions—but exceptions do not mean obliteration.

The arguments already made urging noninterference with the coequal status of the Supreme Court are sound. Congress may defeat the future appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. It may do so for the purpose of relieving the Court of burdensome and trivial cases. It should never do so where the principle of checks and balances which guarantees freedom will be undermined.

Congress has no power, Mr. President, to take away from the judicial branch of the Government any and all power to pass on the constitutionality of acts of Congress. Marbury against Madison is the answer to that. I believe, however, that Congress could, if it had wanted to and if it had been afraid that the Pine decision might not have been sustained by the Supreme Court, taken the case from the Supreme Court. However, I repeat, Mr. President, under the language I have just stated it would have been an exception, and it would not have obliterated the power of the judicial branch of the Government under the separation-of-powers doctrine to pass on great constitutional questions. It would simply put the Congress in a position where it could say, by way of exception, "This particular court is not going to be able to act in this particular case."

I now yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I once more find myself in the embarrassing position of being somewhat limited as to time, because in accordance with the rule under which we are operating I feel I should not take this time.

However, let me say to my friend from Oregon that he has made a very excellent statement and a very clear statement. I think it is completely true that because of the time allowed, the hurly-burly of debate, and the questions which were being hurled at both of us and at the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who at the time had the floor and was asked to yield so that we could debate this question, the real meaning and effect of what we were trying to say was lost.

I agree it is beyond the powers of Congress to deprive the judiciary of the right to pass on constitutional questions. I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Oregon, however, that it is competent for Congress to say, for instance, that State supreme courts shall have the right to pass upon constitutional questions without the right of appeal.

I think also that Congress would have the right, as it did in OPA days, to say that the special court of appeals created by the Congress to hear appeals on OPA questions in those days, should be the court of last resort. In many cases those decisions involved very weighty constitutional questions.

Mr. MORSE. If I may interrupt my friend from Maryland, I would say that we do very frequently, in passing legislation which is to be administered by an administrative law tribunal, enact provisions to the effect that the decisions of such tribunal shall be final. I do not question that at all.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I find myself in complete agreement with the Senator from Oregon. The reason I made the statement was because I got the impression that the Senator from Oregon was stressing the doctrine of the separation of powers to a point that was not justified.

When we come right down to it, while the Supreme Court is certainly an arm, and a very vital arm, of our triune system of government, we, in Congress, do have the power to check it.

I thought it would be a helpful suggestion to make by way of analogy.

Today there occurred on the floor of the Senate a colloquy between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] in connection with the numerical vote of the Supreme Court in the Texas case. The Senator from Texas said that the decision was not made by a majority of the Court, because the decision was a 4-to-3 decision.

The Senator from Minnesota arose and pointed out—and the Senator from Oregon agreed with him—that frequently, bills on the Consent Calendar are passed by the Senate with less than a handful of Senators present.

It is unfortunate, I believe, that the previous colloquy got into the same shape it did, and, although the two colloquys on the subject are far apart, they may be constructive, when considered in the light of the general pattern of the debate. Had the colloquy between the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Oregon been permitted to flow along easy and gentle lines, I am certain it would have resolved itself into the agreement in which we find ourselves.

Mr. MORSE. At least in the same argumentative room.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes. I certainly appreciate the statement of the Senator from Oregon. I think it was, as I said, a very fair statement, and I concur in it to a point. I would be the last one to say that judicial questions should be decided by anyone other than the courts. But I do say that under our check-and-balance system, the Congress of the United States can, as it has done repeatedly, legislatively reverse the Supreme Court. It may also, as has been pointed out, withdraw its appellate jurisdiction in cases arising under the Constitution. I know the Senator from Oregon does not feel that way.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator will agree, save and except on a matter of original jurisdiction.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Certainly there is nothing in the Constitution which expressly forbids it. It has been done before, and I believe it will be done again.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to read—and this may well be the only difference of opinion we have on these points—the section of the Constitution which applies. I read:

> In all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases beforementioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If I may briefly answer the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Maryland believes wholeheartedly that the residue of power under our system of government is in the people of the United States and they through their Congress may correct a mistake or what they consider a mistake of the Court.

Mr. MORSE. It seems to me that, under the decision in the case of Marbury versus Madison, the Congress cannot expand the jurisdiction, but will have to stand on the constitutional grants already made. It is on that basis that I predicate my argument.

But, at least, we now have the points of agreement and such points of disagreement as may exist, set forth in the RECORD in understandable form, whereas they certainly were not in the RECORD in understandable form on the basis of the debate of the other evening. That was not the fault of either the Senator from Maryland or myself, but it was due to the parliamentary situation which existed at the time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have two other matters, which I shall take up next Friday. One of them is a very interesting analysis of the course of action followed by Mr. Churchill. My argument will be simply one by analogy, and then only as to the principle of representation involved, and not a comparison of individuals, for let me make clear that I could not even walk in the shadow of that great world statesman. However, he set an example for many of us in connection with the matter of independence of thought in the political arena. Next Friday I shall give what I

am sure will be found to be a very interesting survey or account of the political course of action Mr. Churchill has followed. In his political career he did not hesitate to leave his party in the House of Commons and walk from his bench to the other side of the House, and announce that that was where he was staying thereafter.

I have studied Churchill with great interest and profit, and I believe it would be helpful to my colleagues in the Senate, in connection with the question of respecting and protecting minority rights, to take note of the fact that the exercise of independence of judgment in American politics should not be discouraged, but should be encouraged. However, I shall postpone that speech until next Friday.

THE ASTIN CASE

Mr. President, the last item I wish to take up today in behalf of the Independent Party is a matter of encouragement to the scientists of the country. I wish to speak briefly on this subject.

The scientists of the Nation continue to make clear to the Eisenhower administration that no reputable man of science can serve in a Government administration that does not make perfectly clear that the scientific work of the scientists will be free from political pressure.

[Manifestations of applause by occupants of the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, to the men of science in America, I say from this floor today, "You have a job of citizenship responsibility to perform, too. You have a duty to perform, because if you are going to be true to the ethics of science and the scientific professions which you are following, you must serve notice on the politicians that you are not going to serve in an administration that does not make perfectly clear to you that you can follow the scientific truth, no matter where it leads, without being subjected to political pressure."

That is the Astin case, and I have no intention to let Eisenhower and Weeks out of the "bite." Weeks does not settle the Astin case by saying, "I am going to let this go for a few weeks, and next fall, remove him to another job, although a good one; but I am going to have a man of my own choice in the Bureau of Standards."

That does not settle the matter, Mr. President, because now the Astin case has become a cause célèbre in American science. If Astin deserves to be removed on the merits, I want him removed. But if Astin is a competent scientist, and if he has conducted himself with merit, efficiency, and competency as the head of the Bureau of Standards, let me say the American people must not let a political administration adopt a spoils system in connection with the great positions in Government departments which should be 'way above politics.

We cannot afford to have the administration take steps in connection with, for example, the administration of the pure-food and drug law, to make the administration of the law subject to pressure by any member of the Cabinet; and we cannot run the risk of having the head of the Bureau of Standards made subject to any pressure by Sinclair Weeks or the head of the Sheaffer Fountain Pen Co., or anyone else.

So the issue is very simple.

Over the years we have been trying to build up a system of career service in the Government. But now that the Republicans are in office, and because they have not been in office for 20 years, they seem to think they should be able to put persons of their choice in all career jobs. However, in that case there would be no career service.

After all, why did we adopt the career-service system. The purpose was not to scuttle it when the Republicans came in.

There are millions of Republicans who agree with me on this principle. Mr. President, just go out and talk to them. They are shocked.

On the other hand, listen to what is said by the Cabinet officers under Eisenhower. They say, "Well, I want men of my own choice." Regardless of the words that are used, that means the spoils system. Competent scientists will not enter the Government service, highly skilled men will not enter the Government service, great doctors will not enter the Government service, if the Eisenhower administration sets an example which indicates that such men will be subject to political control. In that event, such men would not be able to search for the truth.

The fuzzily-worded statement made the other day by the President at his conference does not settle the problem. He cannot pass the buck to his Cabinet by saying that he expects them to appoint good men. Of course, I do not quote the President exactly, but that was the meaning of what he said.

The American people are entitled to know the meaning of this cause célèbre. All over the Nation scientists are meeting. They wish to know the facts about the Astin case. I do not know the facts of that case, but we should ascertain them. An investigation should be conducted by the Congress, with witnesses under oath, beginning with Astin, Weeks, and Shaeffer, and we should get the documents and the facts. So far as the particular battery matter is concerned, it should be made the subject of a controlled experiment. The Bureau of Standards is on trial, so far as I am concerned, in the battery matter. So is the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

So let us have another scientific group conduct a controlled experiment, in order to ascertain whether the Bureau of Standards was right or wrong. Speaking hypothetically, let us suppose the Bureau of Standards is found to have been wrong. Does that mean that the head of the Bureau should be fired? Not at all, unless facts can be produced to show that in that matter the Bureau proceeded in such a manner as to show that the scientist at the head of the Bureau did not live up to the ethical standards of the profession to which he belongs. That is the test we must make.

The postponement of the decision, in the hope that the people will forget about it, is not sufficient for great principles are involved. I believe the Astin case involves a principle which will have a far-reaching effect on the morale of public service on the part of thousands of Government employees for a long time in the future, if it is not settled properly.

Here again I say, as I said earlier this afternoon, if a mistake has been made, for goodness' sake admit. What is wrong with that? The American people appreciate honest confessions of mistakes. The American people know we cannot run a Government such as ours, we cannot run the Bureau of Standards, we cannot run the Department of Commerce, we cannot run the White House, we cannot run any great government, without making a great many mistakes. When a mistake is made, tell the people it was a mistake, and then go ahead to right the wrong. That is all I am asking.

So I close my committee report this afternoon, not only in the defense of the scientists of America, but challenging the scientists of America, and saying to them, "You have a responsibility. You may never have any intention of working for the Government. You may intend to remain the rest of your life in the physics laboratory at the University of California, of Oregon, of Chicago, or Harvard; you may intend to continue in the industrial laboratory of United States Rubber, General Electric, the Southern Pacific Railroad, an aircraft plant, or in any other industrial plant in the country. That makes no difference. You are men of science, and you know very well that if politics ever is allowed to interfere with and direct the course of scientific investigation away from the truth, then people will have suffered an irrevocable loss; and you have no right to let the people lose confidence in either the ethics of scientists or the reliability of scientific research. Let us never come to the time when the American people will have cause to fear that scientific findings are twisted and distorted and slanted by political pressure."

So I repeat what I have requested—I think this is the fourth time—in my committee reports. I ask again for action, not postponement, on the Astin case; for hearings, under oath, not for passing the buck or playing and stalling for delay. "Come on," say I to the Eisenhower administration, "give the American people the facts. If you have made a mistake, admit it, and announce to the people that a career position is going to be maintained and protected in the directorship of the Bureau of Standards."

Mr. President, I have reported a little longer this afternoon than I had intended, but I had so many delightful interruptions, I was so dumfounded and so surprisingly shocked to find that, during most of the afternoon, I had a remarkable attendance on the part of my colleagues, that I simply could not miss the opportunity to do the best I could to report to them on the various views I thought ought to be presented.

Then, Mr. President, when a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration came to the floor—ah—that was an opportunity made to order. I got a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration here, who asked me to yield to him that he might offer an amendment, and also make a statement. I knew he would be willing to wait until I concluded my report. He said he would. I could not pass up that opportunity.

So, in conclusion, I desire to thank my colleagues for remaining. I am always delighted when the distinguished Senator now in the chair, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], presides over any session I address. He is always fair and courteous, and I express the hope that, next Friday, he once again will be presiding when I make my report; because I can assure him, God willing, he will get another report, next Friday.

I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understood that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and also the distinguished Senator from Tennessee were awaiting an opportunity to take the floor.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished acting minority leader yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield, of course, to the distinguished acting majority leader. He may have other plans, of which I do not know.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say that the Senator from North Dakota had indicated to the acting majority leader that he was not going to wait, but that he would hope to take the floor on Monday next to discuss the amendment which he has submitted, which was printed and ordered to lie on the table. I want the RECORD to show that, since he could not remain tonight, I think it proper that he should be protected to the extent of having an opportunity, on Monday, to speak on his amendment, which I am sure he will desire to do. As to the position of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and what he may have requested, I am at this time unable to state to the acting minority leader.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my information from the distinguished Senator from Tennessee was that he wanted to speak on another amendment, an amendment different from the one on which he spoke a day or two ago, and on which the vote has not yet been had. I am sorry the Senator from Tennessee is not now available.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to accommodate. I have another matter I could take up, if the Senator would like to have me take it up until he can find the Senator from Tennessee, or at least until he can ascertain whether the Senator from Tennessee will return to the Senate today. I shall be glad to take up the other matter, simply to accommodate the Senator, it will be understood.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator is most accommodating, but I do not like to ask him to make the sacrifice.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, I can assure the Senator it would be no sacrifice. But, in fairness—and I am speaking seriously now, though I was facetious in my first remark—I do not think we should have any misunderstanding with the Senator from Tennessee, and I think we ought to extend him every courtesy.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, could the clerk very quickly call the Senator from Tennessee? If so, I can proceed, or one of us can proceed with the discussion of another matter until the clerk can get a telephone message to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am agreeable to any course that may be suggested. I, too, want to protect the Senator from Tennessee, as well as the Senator from North Dakota, who has also been mentioned. I do not know what has occurred to take them away from the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What are the wishes of the acting majority leader?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the acting minority leader yield for a question and an observation with reference to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I understood the Senator from North Dakota had intended to proceed to the discussion of the amendment he has on the table, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I feel quite sure that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota was not discouraged by the Senator's speech. He probably was discouraged as to when he might have an opportunity to discuss his amendment, and probably, keeping in mind the marathon the Senator from Oregon demonstrated could be completed within 22 hours and 26 minutes, he may have been a little weakened in his determination to remain for the delivery of his speech tonight.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I beg to advise the acting majority leader that I understand the Senator from Tennessee is in the Capitol, is now on his way to the Senate Chamber, and will be here within 2 or 3 minutes. It would be quite agreeable to me to recess informally until the Senator arrives, or to yield to my friend from Oregon, in the event he has something that could be said that speedily.

Mr. MORSE. I would be happy to join in the suggestion of the Senator from Florida regarding a temporary recess.

TEMPORARY RECESS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess temporarily, subject to the call of the Chair, in order to permit the Senator from Tennessee to reach the floor.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 4:55 o'clock p. m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair).

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "4-28-53—C" and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have his amendment read by the clerk or printed in the RECORD?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD without its being read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER'S amendment proposes to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That for the purpose of assisting in making a proper and equitable settlement of problems and claims arising out of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court to the effect that the paramount right to the submerged lands (including the resources therein) off the coasts of the United States is in the Federal Government as against the coastal States (outside of the inland waters and harbors, the jurisdiction over which is recognized to be in the States) there is hereby established a temporary commission to be known as the Commission on Submerged Lands (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of 9 members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 3 to be appointed to represent the general public, 3 to be appointed to represent the Federal Government, and 3 to be appointed to represent the coastal States and their interests. Of the 3 members appointed to represent the coastal States, 1 shall be a resident of the State of California, 1 a resident of the State of Louisiana, and 1 a resident of the State of Texas. Any vacancy in the Commission occurring after all the original appointments are made shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The Commission shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining (1) an economically sound and equitable program for the management by the United States of the resources in the submerged lands off the coasts of the United States and outside of the inland waters, and for the disposition of revenues from such sources, including a study of the feasibility of utilizing such revenues for improvement of the educational system and/or for a reduction of the national debt; (2) the amount of losses to private citizens, States, and communities resulting from a dependence on the belief that the coastal States have the paramount rights to such lands and the resources therein; (3) which of such losses should be compensated by the United States; (4) for the purpose of establishing boundaries and

lines of jurisdiction between the States and Federal Government; (5) the effect of this legislation upon experimentation now being conducted under congressional act to make potable water out of sea water; (6) the international effects of the extension of our boundaries and its effect upon treaties; (7) the effect on public power developments and flood control of the language in section 6 of Senate Joint Resolution 13, granting the States "proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, leasing, use, and development of the lands" under navigable waters; (8) the relationship of the proposed policy toward the seaward submerged lands and the policy toward public lands within the United States and possessions; (9) such other related matters as the Commission deems wise to report upon. The Commission shall complete its investigation and study and make a report of its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress not later than 6 months after the date on which the last of the original appointments to the Commission is confirmed by the Senate.

SEC. 3. Members of the Commission who are appointed from private life shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. Officers or employees of the Government who are appointed to the Commission shall not receive additional compensation for their work on the Commission; but all members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as such members. The Commission may appoint in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949 such personnel as it deems necessary to carry out its duties.

SEC. 4. The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality any information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics which the Commission shall deem necessary for the purposes of this joint resolution; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman. The Commission is also authorized to secure from any special master appointed by the Supreme Court, with the consent of the Court, any such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum, not exceeding $100,000, to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest that since only 10 minutes' time is left for the discussion of the Senator's other amendment, it may be made clear that the amendment on which he is about to speak may be made the order of business on Monday when it is called up.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be made the order of business when the Senate meets on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, my amendment is in the nature of a substitute. I shall not talk at great length on my proposal to establish a Commission to study and to report to Congress and to the President on the submerged lands question.

My position on the Holland joint resolution is well known. The Senate has clearly indicated that it is in a mood to adopt the Holland joint resolution without any effective amendment. I can only plead that Senators stop and think before giving away the vast treasure of the United States which is involved in the submerged lands.

I believe my proposal to be a fair one, but I am willing to listen to any suggestions or amendments or changes which do not affect the basic proposition. The basic purpose of the amendment is to provide an opportunity for getting more accurate information free from any consideration of politics. I think it is no more than fair for the sponsors of the give-away proposal to join in asking for the establishment of a Commission as suggested in my amendment. The personnel of the Commission would be appointed by the President, who has already said that he favors giving the submerged lands to the three States of California, Texas, and Louisiana. Therefore, the sponsors of the pending joint resolution need not feel that the Commission would be "stacked" against them. No undue delay would be involved in having a report from the Commission. My amendment provides that the Commission shall report to the President and to the Congress not later than 6 months after the nominations of the Commission members have been confirmed. Surely, Mr. President, we can afford to take 6 months to find out what we are doing.

As I have stated before, and now repeat, we cannot realize the full purport of what we are doing if we agree to Senate Joint Resolution 13. We have various estimates of the treasure involved in oil, alone, running from $50 billion upward.

We can have only opinions of how the passage of the joint resolution will affect the other resources of the marginal seas, the fish, the minerals, the salt, and other treasures of the sea.

I should like to have from such a Commission as I propose the benefit of a scholarly research and analysis of the whole situation.

My amendment provides in section 1 that the Commission "shall be composed of 9 members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 3 to be appointed to represent the general public, 3 to be appointed to represent the Federal Government" or the viewpoint of the Federal Government—and 3 to be appointed to represent the coastal States and their interests. Of the 3 members to be appointed to represent the coastal States, 1 shall be a resident of the State of California, 1 a resident of the State of Louisiana, and 1 a resident of the State of Texas.

Section 2 of my amendment provides:

It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining (1) an economically sound and equitable program for the management by the United States of the resources in the submerged lands off the coasts of the United States and outside of the inland waters.

Mr. President, the first paragraph of the first section of the amendment recognizes, as we have always known, and as the Supreme Court has always held, that, insofar as inland waters, harbors, and river bottoms are concerned, the jurisdiction is recognized to be in the States.

Section 2 of my amendment asks for this study, in the following language:

Including a study of the feasibility of utilizing such revenues for improvement of the educational system and/or for a reduction of the national debt.

A few days ago I discussed to some extent the importance of using the revenue from these resources for the reduction of the national debt. The discussion the other day was in connection with an amendment to apply at least the $65 million or $70 million which has accumulated in royalties between the time this controversy arose and the present time to a reduction of the national debt.

I reiterate that at a time when the Federal Government owes $267 billion, when we do not know how we are going to pay it, when our people are concerned about the heavy carrying charges of the debt, and when we consider the fact that a tremendous debt load will be passed on to generations to come, it is certainly not proper to be giving away the greatest treasure the United States has, land beneath the marginal sea, containing the great oil and gas wealth which is the subject of the Holland joint resolution. That money ought to be used for educational purposes. By so doing, the burden of the taxpayers of the United States would be reduced. Othewise, we ought to use the money for the reduction of the national debt.

These are matters which the commission I propose in my amendment ought to study and report on. The commission would determine how much the national debt could be reduced, or how much should be applied to the national debt, and what part of this vast fund might properly be applied to education.

I think history would be made if this administration, instead of entering upon a policy of giving away, instead of trying to dispose of or divesting the Federal Government of priceless assets, were to inaugurate a program of applying the revenue derived therefrom to the educational system of the Nation and to a reduction of the national debt. Those are questions which would be studied by the proposed commission. I am certain the American people would be highly interested in an investigation and study of this particular subject by a thoughtful group of persons.

The second point to be investigated and reported upon by the proposed commission is:

The amount of losses to private citizens, States, and communities resulting from a dependence on the belief that the coastal States have the paramount rights to such lands and the resources therein.

I have said very frequently that there are legal situations in some communi-

ties, such as Long Beach, Calif., which should be taken into consideration. I have been advised that the city of Long Beach uses a part of the revenue it derives from oil for the operation of its school system and also of its excellent harbor.

Certainly this is the type of problem which should be considered on a quantum meruit basis. There is no intention on the part of the sponsors of the joint resolution, nor on the part of those who are opposing this all-out giveaway measure, not to deal fairly and equitably with States and local communities.

Under the Anderson bill and the Hill amendment, the coastal States, from whose ocean waters the revenue would be derived, would receive, to begin with, 37½ percent of such revenue. Then, after getting 37½ percent of the revenue, they would, under the Anderson and Hill proposals, share in the remaining 62½ percent, together with all the other States, such amount to be used for their educational systems. That seems to be fair, and it follows substantially the division between the States and the Federal Government where minerals are mined under the Mineral Leasing Act, and between the States and the Federal Government in reclamation States.

If that is not fair or equitable, it would be up to the Commission to suggest a formula which would treat the coastal States fairly and equitably. That is the purpose of all of us.

The third provision of section 2 reads "which of such losses should be compensated by the United States.

I think this is a question which would have to be studied by the Commission, and it is one in which Congress would be interested. Congress certainly would wish to compensate any local communities or States which were entitled to compensation.

The fourth provision of section 2 reads "for the purpose of establishing boundaries and lines of jurisdiction between the States and Federal Government."

I should think that a commission would desire, first, to work in consultation with the special master of the Supreme Court who has been given the undertaking of establishing the coastal boundaries of the States, under the decrees in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases. Many interesting controversies have arisen in that connection. I understand that California contends that its boundary, under the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case, is a line drawn between two islands 30 or 35 miles out in the ocean.

I was interested in the testimony of Mr. LeBlanc, attorney general of Louisiana, and of Mr. Madden, assistant attorney general of Louisiana. There are numerous places in the hearings where those gentlemen were asked where the line would be. They said they could not tell where the line would be; they did not know; it was a question which the Supreme Court would have to determine. Surely, under these conditions a special commission should be created to determine just where the boundary between the property of the Federal Government and that of the States will be.

The commission would investigate and report upon "(5) the effect of this legislation upon experimentation now being conducted under congressional act to make potable water out of sea water."

I discussed that subject at considerable length in my first speech, but I think I should mention again that under an act passed by the Congress, an act which was sponsored by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, an experiment is now being carried on in which all the research facilities of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Department of the Interior, and many colleges which have been interested in this problem have brought together for the purpose of making potable water, at a reasonable price, from sea water; also water for irrigation and other purposes. Great progress has been made. We know that during the last war drinking water for the inhabitants of many small islands and for our troops on many islands of the Pacific was taken from the sea by a distillation process. There is also a chemical process, which may be less expensive. In any event, great hope is held out for getting water to the desert and arid sections of many of our Western States. If this experiment should prove successful, it would be the greatest boon to peace that we have known about for a long time.

One of the difficulties of many of the nations of the Middle East, of Africa, and even of Europe and Asia, is the lack of water for their land, so that they may grow enough food to sustain them. The problem may be a little technical. Perhaps many Members of the Senate do not think it would happen, but this measure giving away title to the use of natural resources, which include the waters of the sea, except when such natural resources are used for purposes of producing power, under section 2 (e), raises a very serious question as to whether the Federal Government would have the power to take water from the ocean, for the purpose of making water for irrigation or drinking purposes without condemning it and paying a severance tax to the States. Surely this great country of ours, in its efforts to help the people of the States of Arizona, Nevada, California, New Mexico, and many other States where water is such a problem, does not want to place itself at the mercy of any State in obtaining water which can be used for irrigation.

It was stated by the senior Senator from the State of California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that we need not worry about this, because California would be very generous in permitting water to be taken for irrigation purposes in other States. It may be a long time before there is enough water of this kind to satisfy the State of California, let alone Arizona and other States. Furthermore, the dispute between California and other Western States over the little water in the Colorado River does not lead one to believe that there would be so much harmony in the disposition of water which might be taken from the sea for irrigation purposes.

I greatly fear that if we enter upon this program and pass the pending measure without some clarifying amendment, the result might be what I have described. Certainly such a result would nip in the bud one of the most hopeful experiments now being carried on.

In that connection it is also of great value to the United States that magnesium and other minerals are being taken from sea water. I am convinced that it would be impossible for the Government or for private industry, without the permission of the States, to extract magnesium and other minerals which are found in the waters of the sea in such large quantities. We do not want to have to place ourselves in that position. Magnesium is vital for the production of aircraft. It will stand great heat. Every one of our military planes contains a substantial amount of magnesium. According to Miss Carson, in The Sea Around Us, 98 percent of the magnesium which is domestically produced is being taken from the waters of the sea. We do not want to have to place ourselves in a position where a severance tax would be charged to the United States Government or to private industry for taking water off the coasts of the coastal States. In particular, it is not fair, because under the decisions of the Supreme Court that water belongs to all the people of the United States.

That is another subject which should be investigated, and some provision should be made, before we enter into this all-out giveaway program, to protect the legitimate interests of our Nation and of our industries in extracting these valuable minerals.

The sixth matter to be investigated and reported upon by the proposed Commission is "6. The international effects of the extension of our boundaries and its effect upon treaties."

A great many treaties have been entered into with Russia, Canada, Britain, and other nations, in which fishing rights are based upon the principle that waters beyond the 3-mile limit are international waters.

We have always defended the 3-mile limit. Since the beginning of our Nation; since the principle was proclaimed by Thomas Jefferson, we have always protested when anyone interfered with American commerce anywhere outside the 3-mile limit.

What effect would this measure have upon such treaties? What retaliatory effect would follow upon the part of other nations if we were to start giving States boundaries out 10½ miles? What would the British, the Canadians, and the Russians say in connection with treaties which they have entered into in good faith with us, on the theory that we would always maintain the 3-mile limit, and that waters beyond that distance are international waters?

What is to be the answer of the fishermen from the States of Louisiana, Texas, and Florida, whose ships have been seized by the Mexican Government when they were 5 or 6 miles from the Mexican coast? They were seized upon the theory that they were within the boundary of Mexico, that they were in Mexican waters. We have protested. Five representatives from the State of

Texas protested and asked the State Department to do something about it, in resolutions which were introduced in the House of Representatives.

How are we going to protest the seizure of ships 5, 6, or 7 miles out from the coast of Mexico when, by this act, we tell the world that we no longer have respect for the 3-mile limit, and that in the case of Texas and west Florida, we are extending the boundary out to 10½ miles? The complications and the implications involved in the international field certainly deserve more thorough and thoughtful consideration than they have received either in committee or on the floor of the Senate.

This is an important step we are asked to take, and we ought to stop, look, and listen, and we ought to protect, first of all, the interests of the United States.

The seventh determination which my amendment would bring about would be the effect on public-power developments and flood control of the language in section 6 of Senate Joint Resolution 13, granting the States "proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, leasing, use, and development of the lands" under navigable waters.

I argued at considerable length the other day as to the effect the joint resolution would have on our multiple-purpose-dam program and upon our dams for flood control, power, and even navigation. It was insisted by the Senator from Florida that reclamation, at least, was excluded under section 7 of Senate Joint Resolution 13. However, I could find nothing in section 7 which did not still leave the multipurpose projects in great danger. The acts referred to have more to do with the operation of reclamation than with the matter of who has use and ownership and what the Federal Government can do in connection with the land on which it might want to build dams for the purpose of carrying out reclamation.

I pointed out, Mr. President, that the section, dealing with the rights of the States and the Federal Government in connection with the power retained by the United States, provides:

> The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution.

Mr. President, my argument is that the first part of section 6 is a general definition of what is retained by the Federal Government. It has paramount rights over commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs. It does not include dams for reclamation, and it might not include dams built for navigation. At least, the multi-purpose-dam program would be in great danger, particularly so when we find in the second part of section 6 (a) the provision: "administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution."

So it would seem, in my opinion, to seriously impede the right of the Federal Government to carry on these worthwhile projects.

I know the sponsors of the joint resolution will say, by referring back to section 3 of the joint resolution, that the right, title, and interest there granted would be granted, with the limitation of subsection (d). However, it seems to me that what is referred to by the last part of section 6 is the granting provision of section 3.

Furthermore, section 6, coming later, might be interpreted by the Supreme Court as prevailing.

At least that is the opinion of the three distinguished members of the committee, who in their minority views express alarm over the fact that it might happen. It is the opinion of others also who are interested in the multiple-purpose-dam program, with whom I have talked. We remember that Judson King, who has studied the power program of this Nation for many years, and who is familiar with the legal interpretations in connection with these matters, issued a special bulletin, in which he said he thought that would be the result of Senate Joint Resolution 13.

In any event, it is a program which ought to be considered by a commission. It ought to be studied fully. We ought to know what it is going to do to our great program of resource development in the building of multipurpose dams before we pass a joint resolution of this kind.

Mr. President, many of us have been fearful that this is only the beginning of a great giveaway program. Certainly it is a substantial beginning. Many of us have been fearful that this is going to lead to the giving away of the public domain and the mineral rights under it, and to a giving away of our national parks and national forests, or to granting substantial rights to certain interests for the lumbering of timber in the national parks and national forests.

Many of us have been fearful it is only the beginning of a program of giving away or selling our great power development facilities.

Mr. President, before we enter into such a program we ought at least to establish a policy regarding it. It should not be a haphazard giveaway program such as is presented in Senate Joint Resolution 13. Certainly a great program of national importance in which the people are interested should be thoroughly studied.

The eighth determination which the Commission would make would be with respect to the relationship of the proposed policy toward the seaward submerged lands and the policy toward public lands within the United States and possessions.

I have discussed that provision in my previous statement.

Mr. President, this is not something that has just been imagined. Some people might argue that it is fantastic to say this great giveaway program of the most priceless resources we have to a few States is not going to lead to similar demands by Senators and Representatives and special interests from other States for giving away other assets.

Those who argue that way have had their answer in the amendment presented by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], in which he asks the Federal Government to quitclaim its mineral rights to the States in the public lands of the public domain. They have had that answer in a bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], in which he asks that the mineral rights under public lands be deeded to the States. It is shown that this is a real threat by the words of the chairman of the committee which reported the joint resolution, the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. When Mr. McKay, the nominee for the office of Secretary of Commerce, was before that committee, the Senator from Nebraska gave him notice that immediately after the passage of this giveaway legislation he could look for the introduction of a bill giving the public lands back to the States.

Mr. President, we ought to stop and think before we upset our great conservation program, which has been carried on over so many years by Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents, and which has been supported by Democratic Congresses and Republican Congresses.

Ninth. The Commission will investigate and report on such other related matters as the Commission deems wise to report upon.

Mr. President, I have great regard for the committee which sat so long in hearing the testimony on the pending joint resolution. We have before us a large volume of the testimony that has been taken. The committee heard every witness who wished to testify.

However, I am advocating a scientific investigation of the questions which have come up and are unanswered. Furthermore, many questions have arisen during the debate on the floor of the Senate, but have not been gone into fully, and the answers to them have not been secured. Yet the public welfare depends upon a proper understanding of these questions. I think the Senate, before legislating somewhat blindly on these questions, would welcome a study of them by a commission to be appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.

The appointment of a commission is the traditional and best way the executive and legislative bodies have of obtaining the facts concerning technical questions, so that they may take informed action. This is particularly true of questions which have become involved in politics, and in respect to which slogans, catch phrases, and exaggerations are likely to be used by both sides.

If there ever was a measure in connection with which catch phrases and misleading propaganda have been sold to a great many people of the United States, it is this measure. Even the name used in stating what is involved in the joint resolution is misleading in the

first place, for the joint resolution is generally referred to, in common parlance, as the tidelands bill; and on the basis of the use of the word "tidelands," in connection with the measure, the coastal States have been frightened into believing that the actual coast where the tide ebbs and flows is under dispute, and that the Federal Government is about to lay claim to it. Of course, that is entirely misleading, for this issue does not involve the tidelands.

I looked in the two dictionaries which are placed in the lobby adjoining this Chamber, and there I found that Webster's New International Dictionary, the second edition, defines "tideland" as follows: "Land overflowed during flood tide."

I also found that Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary defines "tidelands" as follows: "Lands alternately covered and uncovered by the tide."

However, Mr. President, the matter now before us does not involve tidelands at all. It involves the submerged lands, covered by the sea, way beyond the low-water mark on the coast.

The people of the country have had a misconception of what is involved in this measure. We find it referred to in the newspapers as "the tidelands bill," and in the newspaper accounts we find statements to the effect that "the amendment to the tidelands bill was rejected."

So the people have gotten a misunderstanding of what is involved; and because of that misunderstanding, the way has been easier for the biggest grab that has ever been known in the history of our Nation, and one that I am afraid will cause the Members of this body a great deal of concern when the public really becomes aware of what has happened and when the members of the public express concern about it.

Mr. President, I have before me a little book called Presidential Commissions. The book was written by Carl Marcy, and it shows how important commissions have been in the history of our Nation. It refers to the many commissions which have been appointed by the President or have been provided for by acts of Congress.

For instance, let me read one paragraph from the book:

> Democracy assumes the electorate is able to dispose of controversial issues in the light of rational appraisal of relevant data. Such an assumption presupposes not only judgment but also adequate information. But at a time when the responsibilities of democratic government are becoming increasingly acute, new economic complexities make it increasingly difficult to provide the public with the mass of information which is necessary for a democracy to discharge its obligations. The totalitarian states substitute the judgment of one or a few for mass judgment. They substituted state-controlled facts for mass information. The governments which resulted were totalitarian regimes capable of swift and violent dealing with the new complexities.

Then the book shows how many problems which seemed difficult of solution were brought to fairly easy conclusion after commissions had been established to delve into the facts and to consider the technical matters involved or to have them considered by experts, and then to make reports to Congress.

As I remember, even in the Tilden-Hayes controversy, back in the 1870's, it was so difficult to secure a settlement, that finally a commission was appointed, when the House of Representatives agreed to abide by the result of the commission's work; and in that way one of the grave political issues in our history was settled.

Furthermore, the President of the United States has shown that he believes in commissions. The other day I saw in one newspaper a list of some of the commissions that have been appointed by President Eisenhower. The list is a long and substantial one. It has even been contended that our Government is now a commission government, that the executive branch of the Government is substantially being operated by commissions and that ours is now a commission form of government, so far as the executive branch is concerned.

I dare say that no problem the President has appointed a commission to consider is so grave or complicated or so far reaching in effect as the problem presented by Senate Joint Resolution 13, which the Senate is about to pass without having full information and without realizing fully the vital consequences of the measure.

Mr. President, many Members of the Senate have not actively participated on either side of this controversy, with the exception of expressing their preference by their votes. On the other hand, many Senators have taken very aggressive and active parts, some on one side, and some on the other. However, I think every one of us, no matter what may have been our previous participation in this debate, can afford to vote for my amendment.

I would particularly hope that the distinguished Senators from Louisiana, Texas, and California, the States which alone will benefit from this $50 billion treasure, would welcome the opportunity to receive the unbiased results of such study and research. I do not believe the people those Senators represent want anything that does not rightfully belong to them.

Certainly the rest of us need to stop and consider what we are doing, or else we shall live to regret this day, for I believe that the people of the Nation have been aroused by the debate which has occurred in the Senate, and are now so much aroused that when in the future they go to the ballot boxes—even if they find no other way of expressing their opinion—they will let us know in unmistakable terms that we should regret the action that some of us now expect to take. I do not think the people will willingly and supinely approve actions which result in taking away their treasure, particularly if the Members of Congress who act on that matter do not have the benefit of a dispassionate report and survey regarding the subject at issue.

It would be very difficult for me to tell my constituents that I voted for a measure which vested title in just a few States, although the Supreme Court of the United States had unequivocally and plainly said the property belonged to the people of the entire Nation.

I know that some of my colleagues may say that a number of hearings have been held on this subject. Of course, there have been a number of hearings and a number of debates on it. However, the more this matter has been debated, the clearer it has become that we need to have the benefit of an unbiased expert commission which will study and report on this problem, before we vote to have this joint resolution become law.

I think there have been some very good hearings, though not one of them has afforded the type of dispassionate, scientific study which a very technical and involved matter such as the one now before the Senate deserves.

Mr. President, I should think the administration would welcome an investigation by a properly constituted commission, because the administration itself is not united on the question of what kind of give-away measure ought to be passed. Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General, having consideration for constitutional problems, was in favor of a measure of one kind, but Mr. McKay, Secretary of the Interior, having consideration for the development of resources lying seaward of the area it is proposed to give away, favored another kind of measure. Apparently the State Department thinks that any measure, particularly one proposing to deal with rights outside the 3-mile limit, would be very dangerous to the foreign policy of the Nation and the position we have always maintained heretofore. I am sure that is true. If it were not true, Secretary Dulles would certainly have been called upon to testify.

Mr. President, how can we pass the pending measure, in view of all the problems which might arise under treaties if we extended our seaward boundary beyond the 3-mile limit, and the possibility of retaliatory action by other nations? How can we proceed in opposition to our foreign policy, which has been maintained since our Nation was founded, with reference to rights in international waters? How can we take such drastic action without having the testimony of the chief official of the Nation in matters affecting our international affairs? How that can be done is beyond my comprehension.

The sponsors of the pending measure called hundreds and hundreds of witnesses, and took testimony filling a volume of 1,300 pages. I can only assume that the reason for not having called Mr. Dulles is that it was understood that Mr. Dulles would certainly disapprove of what is sought to be accomplished, and that proponents of the pending measure would be alarmed by what Mr. Dulles would say. But are we not in a time in the history of the Nation when we ought to pay attention to what our Secretary of State says? Should we not want to know what complications might arise in the international field before passing such drastic legislation as the pending measure? Should we not have the benefit of his counsel?

Mr. President, I am sure Mr. Dulles would have been a strong witness in opposition to the pending measure, in view of the letter written by the Assistant Secretary of State to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I also think there is a similar

letter which was adressed to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], in response to a letter by him, which appears at some place in the hearings.

In order that the people may have their minds refreshed on this subject, we should leave no stone unturned, and we should give notice to the people of the Nation that they can expect very bad results with respect to our international relations if the pending measure shall be passed. We ought to let the people know that it is proposed to pass it without even the benefit of a word from the Secretary of State, himself. The Secretary of State was not called as a witness, though there is no showing that he would have manifested any reluctance, had he been requested to testify. He has appeared before other committees of the Congress on numerous occasions since the hearings on the pending measure began, but he has never been called as a witness to testify regarding Senate Joint Resolution 13.

But we have a letter—unfortunately, in fine print—from Mr. Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary, written on behalf of the Secretary of State, in which he gives a little inkling of the apparently bitter opposition Secretary Dulles would make to the pending measure. Let us consult the letter, to gather a little of that inkling on the part of Mr. Morton, who, incidentally, is a former Representative from Kentucky, and a very capable, thoughtful man. In his letter, found at page 27 of the hearings on the subject of the submerged lands, before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. Morton, in part, said:

> Pursuant to its policy of freedom of the seas, this Government has always supported the concept that the sovereignty of coastal States in seas adjacent to their coast (as well as the lands beneath such waters and the airspace above them) was limited to a belt of waters of 3 miles width, and has vigorously objected to claims of other States to broader limits. Such an extension of boundaries would compel this Government, now committed to the defense of the 3-mile limit in the interest of the Nation as a whole, to modify this national policy in order to support the special claims of certain States of the Union, for obviously, the territorial claims of the States cannot exceed those of the Nation. Likewise, if this Government were to abandon its position on the 3-mile limit it would perforce abandon any ground for protest against claims of foreign states to greater breadths of territorial waters. Such a result would be unfortunate at a time when a substantial number of foreign states exhibit a clear propensity to break down the restraints imposed by the principle of freedom of the seas by seeking extensions of their sovereignty over considerable areas of their adjacent seas. A change of position regarding the 3-mile limit on the part of this Government is very likely, as past experience in related fields establishes, to be seized upon by other States as justification or excuse for broader and even extravagant claims over their adjacent seas. Hence a realistic appraisal of the situation would seem to indicate that this Government should adhere to the 3-mile limit until such time as it is determined that the interests of the Nation as a whole would be better served by a change or modification of policy.

In his reference to "other States" Mr. Morton refers to other nations. In another paragraph he talks about ships which have been seized, and so forth, and he then states:

> It is the view of the Department, therefore, that the proposed legislation should not support claims of the States to seaward boundaries in excess of those traditionally claimed by the Nation, i. e., 3 miles from the low-water mark on the coast.

Mr. President, the contents of this letter ought to lead us to stop, look, and listen. Is the desire for oil and money so great on the part of the interested coastal States—is their desire for something that does not belong to them under the decision of the Supreme Court so great—that they are willing to jeopardize the position of the Nation in the field of foreign affairs? Mr. President, the Assistant Secretary of State says it would be permissible to give the coastal States the area within the 3-mile limit; but is their desire for this little additional area, extending seaward 10½ miles, so great that they are willing to risk the grave consequences of which Mr. Morton, in his letter, warns?

If the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will not call Secretary Dulles, there ought to be some other way of letting the Nation have the benefit of his testimony. We ought to have a detailed statement by Mr. Dulles of what, in his opinion, is going to happen; and it would, of course, be the function of the proposed commission to obtain that information without delay.

Mr. President, I should like again to call attention to what we are actually considering. It is an oil-leasing measure. However, in the oil-leasing measure, we are proposing to legislate regarding matters which lie in the field of foreign affairs. We are doing so on the basis of hearings conducted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Foreign Relations Committee has never had an opportunity to study the pending measure. Should not the Foreign Relations Committee have an opportunity of at least considering the probable effect of such legislation, and the possibility of its disrupting the orderly administration of the foreign policy of the Nation? I think the Foreign Relations Committee should have that opportunity. When the people of the Nation understand that the pending measure is designed to meet the demands of only a few for money, money, money, without regard to the disastrous effect it might have upon our foreign relations, and without regard to the disastrous effect it might have upon treaties which have been negotiated over a long period of time, I believe they are going to be very much concerned.

We are considering legislation in the field of sovereignty, not merely in the field of domestic law; yet the Judiciary Committee has never had an opportunity to act upon the pending measure. The Judiciary Committee is the committee which has jurisdiction of questions which relate to the sovereignty of the United States. Under the decisions in the Texas case and other cases the Supreme Court of the United States has held that a question of sovereignty is involved and that it is necessary for the orderly conduct of the affairs of the Nation that the Government of the United States have sovereign powers over the seas from the low-water mark on the coast. Yet we are undertaking to divest the United States of this sovereignty. Where it will go, I do not know. We are undertaking to transfer the jurisdiction of the land under the sea to certain States. The Judiciary Committee, which deals with problems of that kind, Mr. President, ought to have a chance of at least studying the measure. It should be referred to that committee before we take any action on it, and in the absence of referring it to that committee, I think the Commission I propose to create ought to summon international lawyers of repute. I think it should have before it men who have made a particular study of the freedom of the seas, what it means, what is involved, and how important it is for the United States to have sovereignty over the coastal seas. Such questions should be thoroughly explored before we pass the pending measure. Anyone who will read the works of Mr. John Bassett Moore, that great international law scholar, who spent his life trying to build up a substantial body of international law for the regulation of conduct between nations, cannot fail to realize that we are too hastily taking action.

This is a question which should be studied and considered. We are legislating in a field involving billions of dollars of the people's money. The Finance Committee has not had the measure before it. Neither the Finance Committee of the United States Senate nor the Ways and Means Committee of the House has had before it the pending joint resolution. What effect will it have upon treasure which belongs to the United States and which could be used to some extent to meet its obligations by applying it to the national debt? It was stated a few days ago that the $65 million or $70 million which has been collected in royalties would pay the interest on the national debt only for a few days. That illustrates how serious is the burden resting upon the Finance Committee.

I do not think the proponents of the measure intended it, but I suspect that the measure will go down in history as being a reversal of the philosophy of Robin Hood, who took from the rich to give to the poor. This measure would take from the poor to give to the rich.

Mr. President, if my amendment should be adopted, it would not mean that anyone who is for the pending joint resolution would have to change his position; it would not mean that anyone who is opposed to it would have to change his position; it would mean only that the Members of the Senate would have more light upon the question before they took legislative action. There is much confusion about it. The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said the confusion and the chaos are unbearable. But if the proponents of the measure had obeyed the decision of the Supreme Court, as all other liti-

gants do, there would not have been any chaos and confusion. Since the chaos and confusion have been brought about by the proponents of the grab measure, I think that before we settle the question in favor of the chaos and confusion which have been generated, we should certainly have a disinterested fact-finding commission study and report so that the people of the Nation and the Members of Congress can understand just what is involved.

Mr. President, the commission would make its study and report its findings to the President and the Congress not later than 6 months from the time the commission is established. Certainly, 6 months is not too long a time to wait. Surely, Mr. President, with all the grave problems involved, the proponents of the measure would not mind waiting 6 months. They have been stirring up chaos and confusion since 1947 when they refused to abide by the decree of the highest Court of the land. Certainly they could wait 6 months in having the question settled by a thoughtful fact-finding body.

So, Mr. President, I plead with the proponents of the pending measure to give the American people a break, to give enlightened public opinion an opportunity to be informed and to be heard. Let the commission study the problem and let the people know the facts. After that, if the Congress of the United States wants to give away this vast treasure, they can do so with knowledge, at least, that the people know what it is all about and that they want to embark upon a great giveaway program at a time when the Nation is in debt. In that event those who are opposing the pending proposal would not feel so badly about it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee would be agreeable to taking the same course with reference to his amendment as he took a day or two ago with reference to his other amendment, in which case the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator controlling time on the other side agreed to relinquish all their time except 10 minutes on each side, so that the amendment could be expeditiously disposed of on Monday or Tuesday. There would have to be a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the colloquy and discussion this afternoon I may be permitted to yield back the remainder of my time, with the exception of 10 minutes, and that the vote on the amendment be postponed until Monday or Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator include in his request that the opposition be given the same length of time?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Tennessee in his request and tender the relinquishment of all time in opposition to the amendment, except 10 minutes, under the same conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon on next Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 4, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 1 (legislative day of April 6), 1953:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Horace A. Hildreth, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Dallas S. Townsend, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Harold I. Baynton, resigned.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Joseph Holmes Lesh, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana, vice Gilmore S. Haynie, resigned.

Francis Everett Van Alstine, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Iowa, vice Tobias E. Diamond, resigned.

Roy L. Stephenson, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa, vice William R. Hart, term expired.

Frederick W. Kaess, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Philip Allen Hart, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Saul Hale Clark, of Idaho, to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho, vice Everett M. Evans, resigning.

Clement W. Crahan, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa, vice Frederick Elliott Biermann, term expired.

Roland A. Walter, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa, vice Daniel N. McEniry, resigning.

William E. Smith, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York, vice Eugene J. Smith, resigning.

William B. Somers, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina, vice William D. Kizziah, term expired.

Albert W. Saegert, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas, vice Kehoe C. Shannon, term expired.

Howard Call, of Utah, to be United States marshal for the district of Utah, vice William Q. Treseder, resigning.

Darrell O. Holmes, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington, vice Wayne Bezona, resigning.

William Budd Parsons, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the western district of Washington, vice John S. Denise, Sr., resigning.

Noah W. Riley, of Wyoming, to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming, vice Earl R. Burns, resigning.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 1 (legislative day of April 6), 1953:

GENERAL SERVICES

Edmund F. Mansure, of Illinois, to be Administrator of General Services.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 4, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted, from the flickering torches of our own understanding we would lift the difficult decisions of the public weal unto Thy holy light. Lead, kindly light, amid the encircling gloom; for in these anxious days when the destinies of nations hang in the balance, the tensions of human relationships are like waters tossed and troubled. O God, the answers for which we gropingly seek in the darkness of our own devices are hidden in Thy heart. Make us such men that Thou mayest speak to us and that to this bewildered generation we may be the broadcasters of Thy voice and will. So shall the world that ever surely climbs to Thy desire mount swifter toward Thy purpose and intent for mankind. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1953.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 1, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KNOWLAND was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today, because of a death in his family.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

COMMISSION ON REEXAMINATION OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

A communication from the President of the United States, relating to the establishment of a commission to reexamine the foreign economic policy of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

NEWPORT ELECTRIC CORPORATION *v.* UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on the settlement, in the amount of $4,449.21, of the claim of the Newport Electric Corp., Newport, R. I. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON OVEREXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATION ALLOTMENT

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, that the allotment of appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals, Justice, 1953" had been exceeded in obligations through March 31, 1953; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION REPORT

A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Air Force entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

APPARATUS AND OPERATORS FOR RADIO COMMUNICATION ON CERTAIN OCEAN STEAMERS

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, recommending the enactment of legislation to repeal the act of June 24, 1910, as amended, entitled "An act to require apparatus and operators for radio communication on certain ocean steamers;" to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN RECORDS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the disposal of certain records under the provisions of sections 7, 10, and 11 of the act approved July 7, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 382; 59 Stat. 434), during the calendar year 1952 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

• By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 16

"Whereas the Federal Government has taken over extensive tracts of land in Illinois for atomic energy and other plants; and

"Whereas the loss of tax revenues on the part of school districts in areas in which Government plants are located has resulted in a severe financial hardship to these districts: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the house of representatives concurring herein)*, That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to make provision for reimbursing school districts for the loss of tax revenues resulting when land is taken or used by the Federal Government for a Government plant; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Congressman from the State of Illinois, by the secretary of state."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact an accelerated amortization law

"Whereas in order for certain industries to reduce or eliminate the contamination of surface waters or air it is necessary for them to make heavy expenditures in plant and equipment which produce no net income in the immediate future; and

"Whereas this problem affects industries of Wisconsin employing nearly 50,000 persons with a total annual payroll of over $150 million and producing products valued at more than $1¼ billion; and

"Whereas proposals have been made to recognize these facts on the State level by enactment of an accelerated amortization law; and

"Whereas it is equally important that the Federal Government recognize the problem: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorialize Congress to enact an accelerated amortization law permitting industries which make antipollution installations to amortize them at an accelerated rate; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and each of the Members of Congress from Wisconsin."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 28

"Joint resolution relative to the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of California

"Whereas there are within the State of California more than 611,000 acres of restricted lands known as Indian reservations, rancherias, and allotments, located in many parts of the State which are controlled and managed by the Federal Government, and a portion of such land could and would be greatly increased in value to the Indian possessors by an act of Congress to authorize leasing such lands for a period of more than 5 years; and

"Whereas persons who are financially able to pay Indians a substantial annual rental, to plant and care for and harvest highly specialized crops, such as grapes, requiring 4 years to produce, and dates, which require 8 years of laborious, painstaking care to bring them to the stage of production, to erect buildings and to make other improvements, will not invest their capital with a lease limited to 5 years; and

"Whereas in many instances valuable restricted Indian lands produce but little or nothing and the Indian possessors continue to be handicapped and poverty stricken, and an example of the inequity and handicap resulting from the existing Federal law is evidenced at Palm Springs where Indian Avenue, a paved street, separates the restricted land of the Indians from the lands of the city of Palm Springs. On the city side of the avenue, under the laws of the State of California, the lands may be leased for as long as 99 years, while on the reservation side of this same avenue the Indians are limited to leases not to exceed 5 years for lands equally valuable; and

"Whereas Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS has pending in Congress remedial legislation, H. R. 2976 'To authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of California for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes Congress to enact H. R. 2976; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 29

"Joint resolution relating to the welfare of the Indians of California

"Whereas remedial congressional legislation is urgently needed for benefit of the Indians of California on several subjects, some of which are now before Congress represented by bills and other bills are being drafted which deal with the following subjects:

"A bill, H. R. 1063, by Congressman POULSON, 'To amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of California civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State.'

"A bill, H. R. 2974, by Congressman PHILLIPS, 'To add to the revised roll of Indians of California certain Indians who made application for enrollment within the time fixed by law, and for other purposes.'

"A bill, H. R. 2976, by Congressman PHILLIPS, 'To authorize leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of California for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and for other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases.'

"A bill, 'To facilitate termination of Federal supervision over Indians affairs in California.'

"A bill, 'To authorize traveling expenses and pay to delegates representing Indians of California from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact remedial legislation for the purposes herein enumerated; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Resolution requesting that for purposes of the State of Maryland; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"Senate Resolution 41

"Resolution requesting that for purposes of taxation, the activities of a private contractor performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission be treated as activities of the Commission itself

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the activities of a private contractor performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission are to be treated as activities of the Atomic Energy Commission itself for the purpose of securing immunity from State and local taxes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland*, That the Legislature of the State of Maryland respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Atomic Energy Act so as to eliminate therefrom any language which may be interpreted as providing for the extension of tax exemption to private contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission or to the vendors of such contractors, contrary to the well-established principles of intergovernmental relations which have assured to the States and their political subdivisions full power to impose nondiscriminatory taxation upon private persons who deal with the Government; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Maryland in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint resolution rescinding the vote taken by the 90th legislature on the resolution (H. P. 466) (L. D. 202) passed and adopted by the senate on April 15, 1941, and passed in concurrence by the house of representatives on April 17, 1941, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 96th legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body, as follows:

"Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 1941 regular session of the legislature submitted a resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; and

"Whereas the resolution provided among other things for the repeal of the 16th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas this resolution provided for a 25-percent limitation on incomes, inheritances, and gifts: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, your memorialists, do hereby rescind, withdraw, and repeal the said resolve of 1941 and respectfully urge that the same be disregarded; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state, by registered mail, to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress, to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State, and to the presiding officers for each of the legislatures in the several States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Whereas in the year 1946 there were 14 positions created here in the Territory of Hawaii from funds allocated therefor by the United States Public Health Service to combat plague-infected rodents in a systematic, overall rodent control and eradication program; and

"Whereas during the course of 7 years last past the number of positions has been drastically reduced, so that as of the fiscal year 1953 only four of these positions remained and they likewise will be completely discontinued at the end of June of this year, not that there is no further need for such rodent-control program, but because of reduced funds; and

"Whereas although much has been accomplished toward the control of rodent-plague infections, such infections are ever present in the Territory of Hawaii and are always a menace, and it is of vital importance that there be a continuous maintenance of rodent-plague suppressive program in order to safeguard the safety of the people of Hawaii, and a complete cessation of rodent-control program will leave Hawaii open and susceptible to any outbreak of plague: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to appropriate additional funds for rodent control so that the United States Public Health Service will be in a position to make adequate allocations for the continuation of rodent control in the Territory of Hawaii which is so vital to the health and safety of its people; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Trenton, N. J., relating to the appropriations for public housing and slum clearance for the fiscal year 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Twenty-nine Palms (Calif.) Realty Board, favoring the land acquisition and water investigation procedures of the Navy and Marine Corps in the Greater Morongo Basin; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Central Valley Wine Growers Association, at Lodi, Calif., favoring the enactment of House bill 4294, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the United Veterans Legislative Committee, assembled in Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Birmingham, Ala., Industrial Union Council, favoring the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Two resolutions adopted by the Alabama State Industrial Union Council, Birmingham, Ala., relating to the Federal Income tax and increase in social-security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

Three resolutions adopted by the Alabama State Industrial Union Council, Birmingham, Ala., relating to the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley law, Federal supplement to State unemployment compensation, and Federal workmen's compensation law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS TO MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WHO SERVED IN MEXICO—RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and myself, I present a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, which memorializes Congress with respect to the passage of House Resolution 2137, to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on May 1, 1953, p. 4271, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

COLUMBUS CELEBRATION COMMITTEE—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], I present for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island in commendation of the Columbus celebration committee, representing the residents of Italian heritage in Newport County, for its endeavor to add to monuments, commemorating the lives of great men, a statue of Christopher Columbus, to be unveiled in Newport on Monday, October 13, 1953.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and, under

the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution in commendation of the Columbus celebration committee, representing the residents of Italian heritage in Newport County, for its endeavor to add to monuments, commemorating the lives of great men, a statue of Christopher Columbus, to be unveiled in Newport, Monday, October 13, 1953

Whereas a statue of Christopher Columbus is to be erected in Newport and unveiled on Monday, October 13, 1953, as a gift to the people of this State by the residents of Newport County of Italian heritage, in a 3-day special celebration from October 11 to 13, 1953, inclusive; and

Whereas membership upon the Columbus celebration committee is representative of Lodge Progresso e Civilta, Order Sons of Italy, St. Catherine of Sienna Lodge, Order Sons of Italy, Italian Brotherhood Society, and the community-at-large of Italian heritage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this general assembly now extends to the residents of Newport County of Italian heritage its gratitude and good wishes upon the occasion of the presentation of the statue of Christopher Columbus, who was one of the greatest seamen and navigators of all time and who opened the New World to the use and knowledge of Europeans as the discoverer of America; thanking the Columbus celebration committee and all concerned for the motivation and the generosity which have brought this gift to the people of this State; directing the Secretary of State to transmitt duly certified copies of this resolution to United States Senator John O. Pastore; His Honor Dean J. Lewis, mayor of the city of Newport; and to Gabriel D. Russo, chairman of the Columbus celebration committee.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES IN NATIONAL FORESTS—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN CAMPING ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted April 27, 1953, by the American Camping Association, Chicago, Ill., relating to recreational facilities in the national forests.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is a greatly increased public demand for family and group camping, picnicking, boating, swimming, hiking, winter sports, and other forms of outdoor recreation; and

Whereas the Forest Service is greatly handicapped by lack of funds to properly administer the recreational resources and opportunities of these lands, or to plan, develop, operate, and maintain recreational areas and facilities for public use to meet the present demand by individuals, families, private and public agencies, State and national educational and recreational groups: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Camping Association, a national voluntary and professional organization made up of over 5,000 members, representatives of public and private agencies and institutions interested in the welfare of children and adults through camping as an educative and recreative experience, urgently requests that greater financial support be given the Forest Service for the development, maintenance, and operation of national forest recreational resources and areas, including wildlife resources, by the passage of the Baker bill, H. R. 1972, and the Watkins bill, S. 1173, and further

Resolved, That this resolution be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS—RESOLUTION OF FARMERS UNION MEETING, NEW ROCKFORD, N. DAK.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted at a Farmers Union meeting held at Tiffany Hall, New Rockford, N. Dak., relating to price supports on basic agricultural commodities. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED AT A FARMERS' UNION MEETING AT TIFFANY HALL, APRIL 24, 1953

Here and now, without any ifs or buts, I say to you that I stand behind, and the Republican Party stands behind, the amendment to the basic farm act to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income.

A fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity, but full parity.

We firmly believe we have not only a right but a duty to demand a fulfillment of the above promise made by our President at Kasson, Minn.

As the economy of the Nation revolves around a prosperous agriculture, we demand the resignation of Secretary Benson so that the promise of President Eisenhower can be fulfilled.

We firmly believe in price supports of 100 percent of parity, and if a burdensome surplus is on hand that acreage control be invoked, handled by democratically elected farmer committees.

We resent the statement that this is regimentation or interference with our freedom. We well remember when wheat sold for 25 cents per bushel and cattle for $20 per head. We don't want that kind of freedom with farm failures, business bankruptcy, and thousands of closed banks.

Whereas the price of cattle has gone down 50 percent mostly during the last 6 months, and whereas the income of beef is second only to grain, we, therefore, petition the Secretary of Agriculture to use the authority he now has to bring the price of beef to 90 percent of parity.

We are opposed to giving away our offshore oil and other deposits and believe the tidelands should belong to all the Nation. Therefore we urge strong opposition to the tidelands bill now before the Senate.

AMENDMENTS TO SO-CALLED ROBINSON ACT AFFECTING FOOD RETAILERS—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA FOOD RETAILERS' ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Food Retailers' Association, during their convention on April 19 and 20, at St. Paul, Minn., relating to amendments to the so-called Robinson-Patman Act, as they relate to food retailers.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas Congress, at this session, will be considering amendments to the Robinson-Patman Act; and

Whereas many of these amendments are of such a nature that food retailers will suffer serious economic difficulties if these are passed; and

Whereas these proposed amendments would in actuality nullify and destroy the effectiveness of this act; and

Whereas the Robinson-Patman and the Sherman Acts have operated in a manner which has enabled the food industry to operate under the free-enterprise system: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Food Retailers' Association in convention assembled in the city of St. Paul, April 19 and 20, oppose all amendments to the Robinson-Patman Act which in any way remove or weaken provisions of this act; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention urge the Senators and Representatives of this State to oppose such amendments and that a copy of this resolution be directed to each of these Senators and Representatives for their guidance.

OIL FOR EDUCATION — LETTER FROM PRINCIPAL OF MOORHEAD (MINN.) PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have received from Roger L. Lundquist, principal of the Moorhead public schools, Moorhead, Minn., in support of the so-called Hill oil-for-education amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 13, relating to title to certain submerged lands.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOORHEAD PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Moorhead, Minn., April 27, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I strongly urge your continued support of the Hill oil-for-education amendment.

Right here in Moorhead we have built three new elementary schools within the past 5 years and the contracts have been let for a fourth, so additional sources of revenue for school support, especially buildings, is sorely needed.

Thank you for your work on this amendment.

Sincerely,

ROGER L. LUNDQUIST.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 106. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Execu-

tive Branch of the Government; with amendments (Rept. No. 216); and

S. 1514. A bill to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources; with amendments (Rept. No. 215).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1334. A bill for the relief of the Reverend A. E. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 217);

H. R. 662. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 218);

H. R. 720. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery; without amendment (Rept. No. 219);

H. R. 739. A bill for the relief of Alexander A. Senibaldi; without amendment (Rept. No. 220); and

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; without amendment (Rept. No. 221).

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 93. Resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week May 3 to May 9, 1953, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week; without amendment (Rept. No. 222).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 3. A bill to prevent citizens of the United States of questionable loyalty to the United States Government from accepting any office or employment in or under the United Nations, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 223);

S. 15. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 224); and

S. 1608. A bill to prevent the indefinite continuation of service of a United States marshal following the expiration of his term; without amendment (Rept. No. 225).

SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES ON "FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND UNEXPENDED BALANCES"

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures as of April 28, 1953, has compiled a completely factual report on unexpended balances of appropriations and authorizations previously made which are still available for expenditure. It should be understood that appropriations enacted in the current session of Congress will be in addition to balances in these prior appropriations as of the end of the fiscal year on June 30, 1953.

The balances shown in this report were taken from United States Treasury accounts as of January 31, 1953. The report was published in Committee Print form, and it is too voluminous to reprint in the RECORD at this time. For that reason I request permission to have printed in the body of the RECORD a summary of the Additional Report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, on "Federal Appropriations and Authorizations, Expenditures, and Unexpended Balances (through January 31, 1953)."

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY

Agencies of the Federal Government on February 1 entered the eighth month of the current fiscal year, which ends June 30, with $135.3 billion of unexpended balances in appropriations and other authorizations already made.

Of this total remaining spending authority nearly $57.4 billion was in appropriations and other authorizations made during calendar year 1952, and more than $77.9 billion was in appropriations and other authorizations made in some previous year.

As of January 31 the military services, exclusive of civil functions, had unexpended balances in appropriations already made totaling $82.4 billion, and $13.3 billion was still available for Mutual Security expenditure in appropriations to the President and other Mutual Security Agency accounts.

Within the military services the Air Force entered February with unexpended balances totaling $35.2 billion; the Army, exclusive of civil functions, with balances of $24.4 billion; and the Navy with balances totaling $22.3 billion; and Office of the Secretary of Defense with balance totaling $0.5 billion.

Among the Mutual Security programs balances in appropriations and other authorizations for economic and technical assistance as of January 31 totaled $0.6 billion, and at the beginning of February balances in military assistance programs totaled $10.9 billion. The remaining balances of more than a billion dollars were scattered through other foreign assistance programs.

There was $15.1 billion of balances in appropriations and other authorizations to independent offices, including $4.5 billion for the Atomic Energy Commission; there was $6.7 billion in balances in appropriations and other authorizations to the Department of Agriculture, including $4.3 billion of authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation to expend from public debt receipts; and there was $5.2 billion in remaining expenditure authority for agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

These figures were shown today in the fourth of a series of reports on unexpended balances available to Federal agencies, compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

This report showed that in the first 7 months of the current fiscal year Federal expenditures totaled $41.2 billion. Of this total $22.3 billion was from appropriations enacted last year by the previous session of Congress, and $18.8 billion was spent from appropriations enacted in previous years.

The first of this series of reports estimated that, as of the end of the fiscal year next June 30, Federal agencies would carry over into fiscal year 1954, beginning July 1, a total of $102 billion, in addition to new appropriations which are to be enacted in the current session. If this estimate proves to be accurate, expenditures in the second half of the fiscal year would total more than $33 billion, as compared with $41.2 billion in the first 7 months of the year.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of March 1953, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FEBRUARY-MARCH 1953, AND PAY, JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1953

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for March 1953 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In March numbered—	In February numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In February was—	In January was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,526,819	2,546,954	−20,135	$836,739	$893,513	−$56,774
1. Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,223,285	1,225,561	−2,276	459,022	479,630	−20,608
2. Department of Defense	1,303,534	1,321,393	−17,859	377,717	413,883	−36,166
Within the Department of Defense:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,267	2,290	−23	1,022	1,126	−104
Department of the Army	523,836	533,490	−9,654	138,456	151,624	−13,168
Department of the Air Force	310,449	313,694	−3,245	90,127	99,673	−9,546
Department of the Navy	466,982	471,919	−4,937	148,112	161,460	−13,348

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States, outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further breakdown in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because payroll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1953, and comparison with February 1953, and pay for February 1953, and comparison with January 1953*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	January	February	Increase	Decrease	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	22,392	20,632		1,760	70,169	71,266	1,097	
Commerce [12]	20,178	18,764		1,414	50,608	50,117		491
Interior	20,266	18,807		1,459	56,366	56,204		162
Justice	13,020	11,483		1,537	30,231	30,231		
Labor	2,655	2,312		343	6,075	6,020		55
Post Office [3]	231,470	231,470			520,803	520,803		
State	10,754	10,493		261	32,156	32,329	173	
Treasury	32,685	29,904		2,781	67,008	88,147	539	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	180	134		46	247	244		3
Bureau of the Budget	274	250		24	470	470		
Council of Economic Advisers	26	19		7	26	7		19
Executive Mansion and Grounds	27	22		5	91	91		
National Security Council [4]	12	12			22	22		
National Security Resources Board [5]	49	50	1		76	38		38
Office of Defense Mobilization [5 6]	92	221	129		522	516		6
Office of the Director for Mutual Security	82	60		22	181	174		7
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization		1	1		5	7	2	
President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization [7]	24			24				
Emergency agencies:								
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	90	79		11	153	133		20
Defense Production Administration [8]	191	17		174	10			10
Defense Transport Administration	75	67		8	157	120		37
Economic Stabilization Agency	4,279	3,631		648	8,247	5,046		3,201
Federal Civil Defense Administration	416	387		29	767	769	2	
Mutual Security Agency	1,983	1,885		98	4,988	4,888		100
National Security Training Commission	3	3			4	1		3
Renegotiation Board	377	347		30	680	726	46	
Small Defense Plants Administration	242	222		20	442	448	6	
Subversive Activities Control Board	14	14			26	26		
Postwar agencies: War Claims Commission	76	69		7	222	219		3
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	85	81		4	459	468	9	
Atomic Energy Commission	3,044	2,813		231	6,825	6,843	18	
Civil Aeronautics Board	273	251		22	555	552		3
Civil Service Commission	1,891	1,711		180	5,148	5,082		66
Export-Import Bank of Washington	82	69		13	138	138		
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	4	3		1	7	8	1	
Federal Communications Commission	53 [1]	470		61	1,090	1,084		6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	438	401		37	1,042	1,039		3
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	236	216		20	396	395		1
Federal Power Commission	317	292		25	645	647	82	
Federal Security Agency [9 9]	13,356	12,259		1,097	37,973	37,726		247
Federal Trade Commission	326	303		23	653	645		8
General Accounting Office	2,482	2,270		212	6,236	6,247	11	
General Services Administration	8,954	8,443		511	29,206	29,166		40
Government Printing Office	2,900	2,583		317	7,696	7,638		58
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,181	4,655		526	12,371	12,270		101
Indian Claims Commission	7	7			11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	916	837		79	1,995	1,969		26
Missouri Basin Survey Commission	12			12				
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,936	2,661		275	7,265	7,201		64
National Capital Housing Authority	116	104		12	357	359	2	
National Capital Planning Commission	3	2		1	6	6		
National Gallery of Art	93	88		5	308	306		
National Labor Relations Board	637	577		60	1,341	1,361	20	
National Mediation Board	71	66		5	118	107		11
National Science Foundation	55	57	2		157	169	12	
Panama Canal	4,670	3,624		1,046	19,421	19,402		19
Railroad Retirement Board	800	710		90	2,226	2,227	1	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,082	993		89	2,223	2,207		16
Securities and Exchange Commission	412	370		42	784	779		5
Selective Service System	1,832	1,646		186	7,972	7,931		41
Smithsonian Institution	185	167		18	515	521	6	
Soldiers' Home	145	132		13	737	748	11	
Tariff Commission	102	93		9	194	193		1
Tax Court of the United States	63	63			132	132		
Tennessee Valley Authority	8,246	[10] 7,915		331	21,087	21,311	224	
Veterans' Administration	55,215	50,735		4,480	176,920	177,335	415	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	479,630	459,022	133	20,741	1,225,561	1,223,285	2,897	4,873
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			20,608				2,276	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [11]	1,126	1,022		104	2,290	2,267		23
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	138,403	125,870		12,533	480,921	471,787		9,134
Outside continental United States	13,221	12,586		635	52,569	52,049		520
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	91,047	82,356		8,691	276,568	273,745		2,823
Outside continental United States	8,626	7,771		855	37,126	36,704		422
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	151,806	139,164		12,642	438,061	433,394		4,667
Outside continental United States	9,654	8,948		706	33,858	33,588		270
Total, Department of Defense	413,883	377,717		36,166	1,321,393	1,303,534		17,859
Net decrease, Department of Defense			36,166				17,859	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	893,513	836,739	133	56,907	2,546,954	2,526,819	2,897	22,732
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			56,774				20,135	

[1] March figure includes 2,482 employees of the National Production Authority, a decrease of 108 from the February figure of 2,590.

[2] March figure is exclusive of 5,226 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[3] February and March report figures not available. See letter from Postmaster General, p. 11, January report figures used for comparison.

[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[5] Under authority of Executive Order 10438, dated Mar. 13, 1953, certain functions of the National Security Resources Board and the Chairman thereof were transferred to the Office of Defense Mobilization.

[6] Under Executive Order 10433, dated Feb. 4, 1953, the Defense Production Administration was transferred to the Office of Defense Mobilization.

[7] Ceased to exist Jan. 31, 1953.

[8] Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

[9] March figure includes 2,590 commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, a decrease of 9 from the February figure of 2,599.

[10] Includes retroactive pay increases.

[11] Includes 266 employees assigned to Defense Supply Management Agency and 45 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1953, and comparison with February 1953*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	68,617	69,745	1,128	
Commerce [1] [2]	47,424	46,943		481
Interior	49,806	49,619		187
Justice	29,682	29,691	9	
Labor	5,959	5,895		64
Post Office [3]	518,520	518,520		
State	10,949	10,888		61
Treasury	86,579	87,118	539	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	247	244		3
Bureau of the Budget	470	470		
Council of Economic Advisors	26	7		19
Executive Mansion and Grounds	91	91		
National Security Council [4]	22	22		
National Security Resources Board [5]	76	38		38
Office of Defense Mobilization [5] [6]	522	516		6
Office of the Director for Mutual Security	181	174		7
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	7	2	
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	146	129		17
Defense Production Administration	10			10
Defense Transport Administration	157	120		37
Economic Stabilization Agency	8,133	4,989		3,144
Federal Civil Defense Administration	767	769	2	
Mutual Security Agency	1,070	1,073	3	
National Security Training Commission	4	1		3
Renegotiation Board	680	726	46	
Small Defense Plants Administration	442	448	6	
Subversive	26	26		
Postwar agencies:				
War Claims Commission	183	181		2
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	15	16	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,814	6,832	18	
Civil Aeronautics Board	546	543		3
Civil Service Commission	5,133	5,075		58
Export-Import Bank of Washington	138	138		
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	8	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,064	1,058		6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,042	1,039		3
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	396	395		1
Federal Power Commission	645	647	2	
Federal Security Agency [7] [8]	37,395	37,147		248
Federal Trade Commission	653	645		8
General Accounting Office	6,208	6,218	10	
General Services Administration	29,097	29,059		38
Government Printing Office	7,696	7,638		58
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,219	12,116		103
Indian Claims Commission	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,995	1,969		26
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,265	7,201		64
National Capital Housing Authority	357	359	2	
National Capital Planning Commission	6	6		
National Gallery of Art	308	306		2
National Labor Relations Board	1,317	1,333	16	
National Mediation Board	118	107		11
National Science Foundation	157	169	12	
Panama Canal	537	529		8
Railroad Retirement Board	2,226	2,227	1	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,216	2,200		16
Securities and Exchange Commission	784	779		5
Selective Service System	7,753	7,713		40
Smithsonian Institution	513	519	6	
Soldiers' Home	737	748	11	
Tariff Commission	194	193		1
Tax Court of the United States	132	132		
Tennessee Valley Authority	21,087	21,311	224	
Veterans' Administration	175,668	176,091	423	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,163,243	1,160,927	2,462	4,778
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			2,316	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,235	2,215		20
Department of the Army	480,921	471,787		9,134
Department of the Air Force	276,568	273,745		2,823
Department of the Navy	438,061	433,394		4,667
Total, Department of Defense	1,197,785	1,181,141		16,644
Net decrease, Department of Defense			16,644	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,361,028	2,342,068	2,462	21,422
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			18,960	

[1] March figure includes 2,482 employees of the National Production Authority, a decrease of 108 from the February figure of 2,590.
[2] March figure is exclusive of 5,226 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[3] February and March report figures not available. See letter from Postmaster General, p. 11. January report figures used for comparison.
[4] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[5] Under authority of Executive Order 10438, dated Mar. 13, 1953, certain functions of the National Security Resources Board and the Chairman thereof were transferred to the Office of Defense Mobilization.
[6] Under Executive Order 10433, dated Feb. 4, 1953, the Defense Production Administration was transferred to the Office of Defense Mobilization.
[7] Includes personnel of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[8] March figure includes 2,361 commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, a decrease of 7 from the February figure of 2,368.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1953, and comparison with February 1953*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,552	1,521		31
Commerce	3,184	3,174		10
Interior	6,560	6,585	25	
Justice	549	540		9
Labor	116	125	9	
Post Office [1]	2,283	2,283		
State	21,207	21,441	234	
Treasury	1,029	1,029		
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	7	4		3
Economic Stabilization Agency	114	57		57
Mutual Security Agency	3,918	3,815		103
Postwar agencies:				
War Claims Commission	39	38		1
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	444	452	8	
Atomic Energy Commission	11	11		
Civil Aeronautics Board	9	9		
Civil Service Commission	15	7		8
Federal Communications Commission	26	26		
Federal Security Agency	578	579	1	
General Accounting Office	28	29	1	
General Services Administration	109	107		2
Housing and Home Finance Agency	152	154	2	
National Labor Relations Board	24	28	4	
Panama Canal	18,884	18,873		11
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7	7		
Selective Service System	219	218		1
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
Veterans' Administration	1,252	1,244		8
Total, excluding Department of Defense	62,318	62,358	284	244
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			40	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	55	52		3
Department of the Army	52,569	52,049		520
Department of the Air Force	37,126	36,704		422
Department of the Navy	33,858	33,588		270
Total, Department of Defense	123,608	122,393		1,215
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,215	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	185,926	184,751	284	1,459
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			1,175	

[1] February and March report figures not available. See letter from Postmaster General, p. 11. January report figures used.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1953, and comparison with February 1953*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Commerce	394	435	41	
Interior	2,463	2,515	52	
State	179	168		11
Treasury	9,249	9,101		148
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	96	97	1	
General Services Administration	162	168	6	
Panama Canal	1,504	1,485		19
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,087	12,805	718	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	26,134	26,774	818	178
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			640	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	247,884	241,659		6,225
Outside continental United States	32,675	32,274		401
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	161,675	159,384		2,291
Outside continental United States	21,485	21,194		291
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	292,056	288,472		3,584
Outside continental United States	25,463	25,197		266
Total, Department of Defense	781,238	768,180		13,058
Net decrease, Department of Defense			13,058	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	807,372	794,954	818	13,236
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			12,418	

TABLE V.—*Federal employees assigned to Mutual Defense Assistance Program*

Department or agency	Payroll (in thousands)			Civilian personnel		
	In January was—	In February was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In February numbered—	In March numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	$9,947	$9,711	−$236	31,312	34,077	+2,765
State Department	126	115	−11	90	88	−2
Office of the Director for Mutual Security		12	+12	18	21	+3
Mutual Security Agency	9	9		15	17	+2
Office of the Secretary of Defense	90	76	−14	172	170	−2
Department of the Army	7,122	6,681	−441	21,885	24,881	+2,996
Department of the Air Force	1,472	1,406	−66	5,748	4,857	−891
Department of the Navy	1,128	1,412	+284	3,384	4,043	+659

LETTER FROM THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, RELATIVE TO EMPLOYMENT IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1953.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to my letter of April 3, 1953, concerning the personnel report covering departmental and field employees which the Post Office Department has been submitting to your committee each month.

It now appears that the Department will be unable to submit a factual report for the month of March 1953 and we request that you use for the March report the same number of employees as were listed on the January 1953 report.

Please be assured that a concerted effort is being made to develop factual data for these reports and that your committee will be furnished the information as soon as it has been compiled.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. HOOK, Jr.,
Deputy Postmaster General.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Reports to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, compiled today, indicate the largest reduction in civilian employment by executive agencies of the Government during March since the Korean War began.

Reports submitted to the committee showed a reduction during the month of 20,135, bringing the total down from 2,546,954 in February to 2,526,819 in March. Of the net reduction 17,859 was in civilian employment by the Department of Defense, and 2,276 was in employment by civilian agencies.

These figures are subject to revision upon receipt of actual figures by the Post Office Department, which has not submitted a personnel report since January pending development of more accurate reporting. During reorganization of its personnel reporting procedures, the Post Office Department is reporting January employment figures.

Civilian employment by the Department of Defense in March was reported at 1,303,534, as compared with 1,321,393 in February; and employment by civilian agencies during March was reported at 1,223,285 as compared with 1,225,561 in February.

As of March civilian employment inside continental United States, subject to Post Office Department revisions, was reported at 2,342,068. This was a decrease of 18,960 under employment inside the country reported for February.

Regular civilian employment outside continental United States in March, subject to Post Office revisions, was reported at 184,751, a reduction of 1,175 under the February figure. Foreign nationals of the Departments of Defense and State paid from foreign currencies and other funds not specifically appropriated for personal service are in addition to these figures.

The last monthly reduction exceeding 20,000 was reported in June 1950, and in that month the separations were mostly of employees engaged temporarily for the decennial census.

QUARTERLY REDUCTIONS

As of the end of March, civilian employment in the executive agencies, exclusive of the Post Office Department, had declined 29,246 in the third quarter of the fiscal year which began in January 1953. Of this total reduction for the quarter, 26,739 was in civilian employment by the Department of Defense. Employment by the civilian agencies, exclusive of the Post Office Department, during the quarter declined 2,507.

The reduction in employment inside continental United States, exclusive of Post Office Department, during the quarter was 29,039. Regular employment, exclusive of Post Office Department, outside the country during the quarter was reduced by only 207.

In addition to the reduction in civilian employment by the Military Establishment, sharp reductions during the quarter were reported by the Economic Stabilization Agency, whose activities have been curtailed, and the Commerce Department, where the National Production Authority programs have been curtailed. Lesser reductions during the quarter have occurred in the Labor and Justice Departments, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and Civil Service Commission.

Meanwhile, the Treasury Department and Veterans' Administration have reported sharp increases. Lesser increases during the quarter have been reported by the Departments of Agriculture, Interior and State, the Panama Canal, Tennessee Valley Authority, General Services Administration, Federal Security Agency, and General Accounting Office.

These figures are based on monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by each of the executive agencies over the signature of a responsible officer.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1816. A bill for the relief of Constantios Georgios Samonas; and

S. 1817. A bill for the relief of Markos M. Pericolaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1818. A bill for the relief of Vito Martell; and

S. 1819. A bill for the relief of Carmela Daino Davenia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1820. A bill for the relief of Cpl. Clifford T. Reynolds; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1821. A bill for the relief of Lyguim Sowinski (Sigmund Sova) and Irene Sowinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 1822. A bill to provide for determination of the period of tribal ownership of mineral and like resources on reserve or allotted Indian lands within the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1823. A bill to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. DWORSHAK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1824. A bill to prohibit the transmittal of communistic propaganda matter in the United States mails or in interstate commerce for circulation or use in public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 1825. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1826. A bill to clarify certain provisions of law pertaining to the retirement of warrant officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1827. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request) (for himself and Mr. POTTER):

S. 1828. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American Merchant Marine, and for other purposes; and

S. 1829. A bill to encourage the development and expansion of privately owned tramp shipping operations under the United States flag, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1830. A bill to define the surface rights vested in the locator of a mining claim hereafter made under the mining laws of the United States, prior to issuance of patent therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. DWORSHAK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to name the Equalizing Reservoir back of Dry Falls Dam "Steamboat Lake"; to the Committee on Public Works.

CREDIT ALLOWANCE TO VETERANS IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRIES

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to extend to veterans of the Korean conflict the same veterans' preference afforded to World War II veterans in connection with homestead entries of public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation.

At present veterans who have served beyond July 3, 1952, are not eligible for veterans' preference. The result is that many veterans who have served in the Korean campaign after July 3, 1952, are not afforded the same preference as those who have served before that date. My bill is intended to correct this situation and to place other veterans on an equal footing with those who saw service previously.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1823) to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during the Korean conflict, introduced by Mr. DWORSHAK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of the first section of the act of September 27, 1944, as amended (43 U. S. C. 279–284), is amended to read as follows: "That any person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least 90 days at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the Korean conflict as determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and is honorably discharged from the military or naval forces and who makes homestead entry subsequent to such discharge shall have the period of such service, not exceeding 2 years, construed to be equivalent to residence and cultivation upon the land for the same length of time."

(b) The proviso at the end of the first section of such act is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That no person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least 90 days at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the Korean conflict as determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and is honorably discharged shall be disqualified from making homestead entry or from any other benefits of this act merely by reason of not having reached the age of 21 years."

(c) Section 4 of such act is amended by striking out "10 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 years."

DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION OF PRIVATELY OWNED TRAMP SHIPPING OPERATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], I introduce for appropriate reference two bills to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, and to encourage the development and expansion of privately owned tramp shipping operations under the United States flag, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the two bills, together with a statement by me in explanation of the bills be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1828) to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON by request (for himself and Mr. POTTER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"The term 'contract carrier by water' means any carrier engaged in tramp shipping services in foreign commerce, and it shall be deemed to include all operations of dry-cargo vessels on irregular or unscheduled sailings, lifting on any one sailing not more than one type of cargo in bulk consigned to not more than one consignee."

SEC. 2. Section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, is amended by inserting the words "or contract" prior to the term "carrier by water" in the first sentence thereof.

The bill (S. 1829) to encourage the development and expansion of privately owned tramp shipping operations under the United States flag, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request (for himself and Mr. POTTER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 501, 601 (A), 603 (A), 605 (C), 606, 607 (B), and 608, of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 1101 and the following), are amended by inserting after the words "service" wherever it appears therein the words "including tramp shipping service."

SEC. 2. Section 603 (B) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In computing such operating-differential subsidy for vessels engaged in tramp shipping service the Commission shall use the weighted average costs of all such items of expense for similar type vessels operated under the flags of major competing maritime nations. The operating-differential subsidy shall be paid to all vessels covered by the contracts therefore, provided such vessels operate primarily in the foreign trade and commerce of the United States, except that the Federal Maritime Board may authorize such vessels to operate between foreign ports in the course of a voyage beginning and terminating at a United States port and not longer than 90 days in duration unless the Federal Maritime Board shall consent to an extension of the period of such voyage."

SEC. 3. Section 604 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended by striking at the beginning thereof the words "If in the case of any particular foreign trade route" and insert in lieu thereof the word "whenever."

SEC. 4. Section 605 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraphs:

"(D) The Federal Maritime Board shall contract to grant operating-differential subsidies pursuant to this title to not over 200 vessels engaged in tramp shipping services. The Federal Maritime Board shall specify the minimum and maximum number of vessels to be covered under subsidy contracts with any single operator for the operation of vessels in tramp shipping service, with the minimum limitation to be such as to insure reasonably adequate tramp service by such operator, and the maximum to be established to prevent overexpansion of operations by any single applicant in such manner as would preclude reasonable equality of treatment as between applicants having similar qualification as operators. In determining the number of vessels to be covered by contracts for operating-differential subsidies for tramp shipping service, the Federal Maritime Board shall consider the competitive effects thereof on other American vessels engaged in liner and tramp services.

"(E) The Federal Maritime Board is directed and authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to require that vessels engaged in tramp shipping service shall not operate to the detriment of other American vessels engaged in liner services."

SEC. 5. Section 607 (B) is amended by striking out the word "Line of" after the words "The annual depreciation charges on the contractor's."

SEC. 6. Title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 613. Whenever the term 'tramp shipping service' is used in this title, it shall be deemed to include all operations of dry-cargo vessels on irregular or unscheduled sailings, lifting on any one sailing not more than one type of cargo in bulk consigned to not more than one consignee."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

At the present time our tramp fleet consists of some 160 vessels of 10,000 tons and over. This tonnage represents an important segment of our merchant fleet. If our bill is enacted, the Maritime Administration will be given authority to extend operating differential subsidies to these operators. Not more than 200 vessels, however, would be eligible for such assistance.

The question involved in this proposal is much broader than mere assistance to 160 operators of tramp vessels. My colleague and I are hopeful this bill will serve to focus committee and Senate attention on the broad question of national policy; namely how big a merchant fleet does this country need? What types of tonnage should it include? How much assistance, in terms of taxpayer dollars, will an adequate merchant fleet require? Does the national interest justify such an expenditure?

In my judgment national defense requirements provide a clear justification for maintaining a United States flag merchant marine. We should have a sufficient active fleet, in operation at all times, to provide a nucleus around which may be expanded the shipping operations needed in the event of full mobilization. This nucleus includes trained maritime labor and management.

This active operating nucleus should be supplemented by a reserve fleet capable of being readily activated. Our problem is to reach a considered judgment on the size of the peacetime nucleus that is required for national security. To reach such a judgment requires the full cooperation of the Congress and the executive branch of this Government. Congress must have access to plans formulated by the military and data to support those plans. Without such information the Congress will never be in position to take an overall, comprehensive, and intelligent look at the shipping needs of this country and what it will cost us to achieve and maintain these objectives.

The active fleet I envision should be a balanced fleet and, as I have said before, it should have behind it an adequate and balanced reserve fleet. It should be capable of carrying a fair share of this Nation's foreign commerce. It should be capable of providing peacetime support for our allies in connection with economic or other emergencies. Assuming that these criteria are met our studies may still show—and I believe they will—that a still larger fleet is justified to meet the requirements of national defense.

I firmly believe that for the foreseeable future the United States flag merchant marine, required in the national interest, cannot be maintained without Federal aid. Some operating and construction subsidies will be required.

I have said many times on this floor that our privately owned fleet, as well as our reserve fleet, was built predominantly during the war. These ships will reach obsolescence at about the same time—probably in the period 1962 to 1966. This fact presents a serious problem both to the owners of these vessels and to the ship construction industry. If all vessels were to be replaced, or even modernized during the period I have mentioned, ship construction would experience a temporary boom followed by a complete bust. It is important to the Nation that an adequate nucleus of ship-building skills be available on a continuing basis. This Government has a real interest in helping the industry to shift to a more orderly schedule of ship replacement. In my judgment it will be necessary for this Congress to take cognizance of, and action on, this vital question.

I mention these basic questions, because the bill Senator POTTER and I are introducing today is directly related to them. It is against this backdrop that the merits of our proposal must be judged.

Senator POTTER and I are also introducing a bill which would extend to tramp and contract carriers the same privilege to enter into conferences that operators of liner-type ships now enjoy under the Shipping Act of 1916. The purpose of this legislation is to minimize the effects of low-cost foreign competition on this additional segment of the American merchant marine.

The conference system has proven very valuable to American liner operators. This is justification for extending the procedure to tramp operators. Moreover, the benefits extended by the conference system to these operators involves no cost to the Government.

ENTRY OF CERTAIN CHILDREN AS NONQUOTA IMMIGRANTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 600) to permit in certain cases children under 18 years of age who are to be adopted in the United States to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS AND FISCAL RESOURCES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1514) to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources, which was just reported by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], from the Committee on Government Operations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am the sponsor of the bill (S. 106) for the establishment of the Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], introduced the bill (S. 1514) to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources, which was reported this morning from the Committee on Government Operations by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. S. 1514 covers a part of the jurisdiction which is provided in S. 106. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the separate commission provided for in S. 1514, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that my name be added as an additional cosponsor of S. 1514.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICES OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOSEPH HOLMES LESH TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Joseph Holmes Lesh, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana, vice Gilmore S. Haynie, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROY L. STEPHENSON TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Roy L. Stephenson, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa, vice William R. Hart, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANCIS EVERETT VAN ALSTINE TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Francis Everett Van Alstine, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Iowa, vice Tobias E. Diamond, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FREDERICK W. KAESS TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Frederick W. Kaess, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Philip Allen Hart, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF SAUL HALE CLARK TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Saul Hale Clark, of Idaho, to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho, vice Everett M. Evans, resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CLEMENT W. CRAHAN TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Clement W. Crahan, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa, vice Frederick Elliott Biermann, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROLAND A. WALTER TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Roland A. Walter, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa, vice Daniel N. McEniry, resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM E. SMITH TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William E. Smith, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York, vice Eugene J. Smith, resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM B. SOMERS TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William B. Somers, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina, vice William D. Kizziah, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ALBERT W. SAEGERT TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Albert W. Saegert, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas, vice Kehoe C. Shannon, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HOWARD CALL TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, DISTRICT OF UTAH

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Howard Call, of Utah, to be United States marshal for the district of Utah, vice William Q. Treseder, resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DARRELL O. HOLMES TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Darrell O. Holmes, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington, vice Wayne Bezona, resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE ON HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BUDD PARSONS TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424,

Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William Budd Parsons, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the western district of Washington, vice John S. Denise, Sr., resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE ON HEARING ON NOMINATION OF NOAH W. RILEY TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, DISTRICT OF WYOMING

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Noah W. Riley, of Wyoming, to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming, vice Earl R. Burns, resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Walter Bruchhausen, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, vice Harold M. Kennedy, resigned;

John O. Henderson, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York, vice George L. Grobe; and

George W. Beach, of New Mexico, to be United States marshal from the district of New Mexico, vice Martin Lopez.

By Mr. WELKER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Sherman F. Furey, Jr., of Idaho, to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho, vice John A. Carver, resigning.

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

A. Pratt Kesler, of Utah, to be United States attorney for the district of Utah, vice Scott M. Matheson, resigning.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN PARTIES TO NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY REGARDING STATUS OF FORCES—RESERVATION

Mr. BRICKER, as in executive session, submitted a reservation, intended to be proposed by him to Executive T, 82d Congress, 2d session, an agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces, signed at London on June 19, 1951, which was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of Executive T, 82d Congress, 2d session, regarding status of forces of parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at London on June 19, 1951, subject to the reservation, which is hereby made a part and condition of the resolution of ratification, that the military authorities of the United States as a sending state shall have exclusive jurisdiction over the members of its forces or civilian component and their dependents with respect to all offenses committed within the territory of the receiving state, and the United States as a receiving state shall, at the request of a sending state, waive any jurisdiction which it might possess over the members of a force or civilian component of a sending state and their dependents with respect to all offenses committed within the territory of the United States.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address entitled "The Retailers' Responsibility to Government," delivered by Senator GOLDWATER before the Illinois Retail Federation, in Springfield, Ill., on April 15, 1953.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Statement prepared by him relative to the anniversary of the death of Gen. Milan Rastislav Stefanik.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Series of addresses by Senator HUMPHREY, broadcast by a network of radio stations in Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana under sponsorship of the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Statement prepared by him regarding Polish Constitution Day.

Clippings from various newspapers regarding defalcation in Federal Credit Union of the Social Security Administration in Baltimore.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Address entitled "Industry's Stake in Civil Defense," delivered by Val Peterson, Civil Defense Administrator, before the Economic Club of New York, at the Hotel Astor, New York City, April 28, 1953.

By Mr. BYRD:

Address delivered by Hon. Landon Wyatt at the congressional meeting of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, in Washington, D. C., on April 28, 1953.

Sermon delivered by Dr. J. Blaton Belk, minister of St. Giles Presbyterian Church at Richmond, Va., on January 25, 1953.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "Squander Won't Buy National Security," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 3, 1953.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Series of articles commenting on the activities and policies of Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, written by Holmes Alexander, and published by the McNaught Syndicate, Inc.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

Article entitled "Dulles Plays Ball With Congress," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 2, 1953.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Article entitled "Changes Due in United States Power Program," written by Reiman Morin, and published in the Portland Oregonian of April 19, 1952.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Minnesota Needs Many New Schools," published in St. Paul Pioneer Press of April 27, 1953.

By Mr. MORSE:

Remarks on the subject of Free Speech, Free Press, and Freedom from Censorship in America, delivered by the Honorable Maury Maverick, Jr., in the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Texas, on April 27, 1953.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on May 3 citizens of Polish origin in the United States and many other countries celebrated a Polish national holiday—the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

In our own country, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May in order to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, that Poland succeeded in bringing into being a constitution which reformed her political institutions and halted an internal decline. Unfortunately this great rebirth and assertion came too late and did not forstall the third partition of Poland by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

I do not believe that the people of Poland will ever lose their basic devotion to the principles of liberal democracy which took form in the Constitution of 1791. I congratulate those persons of Polish descent who, by celebrating this anniversary and their other activities are helping to keep alive in the hearts of the people of Poland the spirit of freedom and democracy.

American foreign policy, I feel sure, will also be directed toward maintaining the hope and faith of these people now under the heel of Soviet tyranny. Our goal must be the eventual achievement of freedom and independence of all peoples. This anniversary is an appropriate time for reaffirming our determination to achieve that goal.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement with regard to the 162d anniversary of the May Constitution of Poland. We pay homage to the courage and moral strength of the Polish people. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement which I have prepared printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

As we celebrate the 162d anniversary of the May Constitution of Poland we pay homage to the courage and moral strength of the Polish people. The May constitution was passed by the Polish Diet just 19 years after the first partition of Poland by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The tyrannical pressure, threats and rigid laws imposed of the Polish nation by these aggressors did not deter nor discourage the Poles. Instead they fought with more vigor for those principles and ideals that were engraved in their hearts. And out of this struggle came a constitution which proclaimed that all men are free and equal.

Standing on the brink of a national catastrophe, at a moment when many men would

advocate meekness as the only guaranty of survival, Poland instituted the most drastic internal reforms in her history: Freedom of religion was guaranteed to all men, a democratic legislature was established, the rights of the King were restricted, commoners were granted full political rights and protection of the laws was given to the peasants. Leaders the world over hailed the constitution as one of the most important documents in the development of liberalism. In 1793 the armies of Poland's neighbors overran that country. For over a century the Polish people lived under foreign occupation, yet the memory and spirit of the May constitution gave that nation such spiritual strength that they could not be defeated. When in 1918 Poland regained her independence it was just as though she had been free all along. In spite of the strictest of censorship and control, Polish national life and culture had flourished right under the eyes of the invaders. Precisely because they had not cowered in the face of danger, because they had dared to speak out for what they believed, the Polish people attained a strength that could not be broken.

Since 1791, the Polish people have demonstrated their greatness in times of crisis over and over again. Warsaw, the hell peninsula—Monte Cassino—these are just a few of the places that recall the unbelievable feats of courage performed by Poles faced with the gravest dangers. It is a sad fact that the men who participated in those battles are today prevented from entering the United States. We have repaid their bravery by unconscionable restrictions on their immigration. Let us go beyond words when we pay tribute to the people who have set an example before the world of how to defend liberty. Only after we have proven our faith in these people by opening our doors to them can we say without shame, we are with you and we shall not fail you in the struggle for a free Poland.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have prepared regarding the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On May 3, 1791, when the Patriot group of the Polish Diet adopted the constitution we commemorate today, they transformed their Government from a medieval type into one which embodied progressive, modern concepts. The constitution of 1791 was a democratic and liberal document, whereby a check was placed upon the powers of the King, ministerial responsibility was introduced, many abhorent class distinctions were eliminated, towns were granted autonomy, the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law, and absolute religious toleration was established. For its time, it was a model constitution, which excited the admiration of many Western democratic statesmen. Today we heartily join in the celebration of the 162d anniversary of that constitution, and hope that soon its fine ideas and principles will again be adopted in a reconstructed and truly independent Poland.

THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in view of the public interest in the President's letter to me under date of April 6, 1953, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my letter of March 20, 1953, and the President's reply of April 6, 1953, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The President's letter was delivered to me in person by the President at the White House on April 22, 1953. I have forwarded copies to the members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and to the members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, of which I am chairman. By placing the full text of both letters in the RECORD, they will be available to the public in general.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 20, 1953.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your state of the Union message to the Congress occurred the following statement:

"There is one sphere in which civil rights are inevitably involved in Federal legislation. This is the sphere of immigration.

"It is a manifest right of our Government to limit the number of immigrants our Nation can absorb. It is also a manifest right of our Government to set reasonable requirements on the character and the numbers of the people who come to share our land and our freedom.

"It is well for us, however, to remind ourselves occasionally of an equally manifest fact: we are—one and all—immigrants or sons and daughters of immigrants.

"Existing legislation contains injustices. It does, in fact, discriminate. I am informed by Members of the Congress that it was realized, at the time of its enactment, that future study of the basis of determining quotas would be necessary."

In this statement you direct attention to the Immigration Act of 1952. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration which will hold hearings on several immigration bills which have already been introduced by various Members of the Congress, and in behalf of the committee, I am calling your attention to the fact that it would be very helpful if we could have before us when these hearings begin your suggested program with respect to our immigration laws. As a part of the "team" I should like to help implement your program insofar as I can consistently do so.

If you are intending offering any immigration legislation during the present session of the Congress, we would appreciate having your program as early as possible so that we might have it in mind in considering other legislation which has been offered by Members of the Congress.

Since the present immigration act was passed by more than a two-thirds majority of both houses of Congress, it seems to me that the burden of establishing wherein the law should be amended or changed would be on the proponents. The law, as you know, has been in effect only since December 24, 1952.

May I point out, also, that the Congress set up a Joint Committee on Immigration and Naturalization which has as its specific purpose a study of the operation and effect of the act of 1952. I happen to be the Chairman of that Joint Committee and we are undertaking a study of the operations of the present statute with the objective in view of proposing changes that may seem desirable.

Again may I say both these committees want to be as helpful as possible.

Yours very respectfully,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 6, 1953.

The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Thank you for your letter of March 20 informing me of the plan of your subcommittee to hold hearings on several immigration bills now pending before it. I am particularly grateful to have your assurance that you are prepared to cooperate in the formulation and implementation of an improved immigration program, insofar as you can consistently do so.

It is only proper to point out to you that I have received a great many complaints that the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 does embody many serious and inequitable restrictions. While I recognize that the act contains some provisions which represent a liberalizing influence in the field of immigration law and that a fundamental revision of a statute cannot be approached without searching analysis, I suggest that a study of the operation of many of the administrative provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 should be immediately undertaken, with an invitation to all concerned to testify regarding the provisions of which they complain.

In the state of the Union message I pointed out that "existing legislation contains injustices." Among the administrative provisions of the law which it is claimed may operate with unwarranted harshness are the following:

1. The provisions which make inadmissible any alien who, in the opinion of the consul, is likely to become a public charge at any time in the future. This places upon the consul the burden of forecasting events which cannot be predicted and, it is claimed, would permit abuse of discretionary judgment.

2. The provisions which make ineligible for a visa any alien with respect to whom the consular officer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe probably would, after entry, engage in espionage, sabotage, or subversive activities. It is asserted that this provision vests in the consul the authority, without restraint, to determine by his own mental processes the probability of future proscribed conduct, thus permitting a possible abuse of discretionary judgment.

3. The provision which permits an immigration official to interrogate without warrant "any alien or person believed to be an alien as to his right to be or to remain in the United States." It is said that unless the word "believed" is clarified so as specifically to require "probable cause", an abuse of this authority could possibly subject any citizens to improper interrogation.

4. The provisions under which, it is asserted, naturalized citizens have only second-class citizenship because they, as distinguished from native-born citizens, can be expatriated because of residence abroad for certain periods of time, without reference to any other conduct on their part.

5. New restriction upon granting leave to seamen while ships are in United States ports.

6. The provision which exempts from the criminal grounds of exclusion those aliens who have been convicted abroad of purely political offenses, fails to define the term "political." It is asserted that it is therefore difficult for administrative officers to determine whether the criminal offenses for which individuals have been convicted are indeed of a criminal, as distinguished from a political, nature.

7. The provisions permitting aliens who were and are believers in nazism and fascism to enter the United States unless it can be affirmatively shown that they advocated the establishment of those ideologies in the United States.

8. Deportation provisions that permit an alien to be deported at any time after entry, irrespective of how long ago he was involved, after entry, in an active or affiliation designated as "subversive." Such alien is now subject to deportation even if his prior affiliation was terminated many years ago and he has since conducted himself as a model American.

9. The provision which authorizes the Attorney General to suspend deportation of certain deportable aliens if "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" is demonstrated. It is asserted, however, that these restrictive terms are not explained in the law, thus leaving the interpretation of the phrase open to administrative determination, subject to congressional approval or "veto." It is argued that the law should more clearly state the standards upon which this discretionary relief may be granted by the Attorney General.

10. The provisions which permit the continuation of up to a 50-percent mortgage extending far into the future on the quotas of many countries. Under these provisions, it is charged that Estonia has its quotas partially mortgaged until the year 2146; 2014 for Greece; Poland, the year 2000; and Turkey, 1964.

It would seem desirable for the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate these complaints and the other critical comments which have developed as a result of the operation of the immigration and naturalization law of 1952 with a view to achieving legislation which would be fair and just to all. I shall appreciate it if you will present these comments to the members of the committee and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PROPOSAL TO END RECOGNITION OF ENLISTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD PRIOR TO THE AGE OF 18½ YEARS AS GROUND FOR DEFERMENT UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement prepared by me on a subject which I believe to be of very great importance to the National Guard of the United States. I hope all Senators will give the statement careful reading.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

There is now circulating in the Pentagon a proposal which if adopted, will mean the end of the National Guard's historic part in the defense of our country.

It is a proposal which could destroy the National Guard as an effective reserve of trained citizen soldiers.

This proposal has come to my attention in the form of a memorandum prepared by Dr. John A. Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower. It recommends to the Secretary of Defense that enlistment in a National Guard unit, prior to the age of 18½ years, be no longer recognized as ground for deferment under Selective Service.

Thus, it would take from the National Guard, both Army and Air, its only source of recruitment for original enlistment.

The Congress very wisely took great pains to provide in the Selective Service Act of 1948 and its successor, the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, to provide a means whereby the National Guard could maintain the approximate strengths authorized by appropriations.

Both of these acts provided that those who were members of the National Guard on specified dates were deferred from induction so long as they trained regularly and performed their military duties. Both acts further provided that those enlisting in the National Guard prior to reaching the age of 18½ years, the minimum age for induction, would also be deferred under the same conditions.

In anticipation of the early implementation of Universal Military Training as outlined in the 1951 act, a provision was included authorizing the Secretary of Defense to void the deferment for those enlisting in the National Guard prior to reaching the age of 18½ years, when sufficient trained personnel is available to the National Guard to maintain the strength authorized by Congress.

Dr. Hannah now concludes that there is sufficient trained personnel available to the National Guard on the basis that since the outbreak of Korea approximately 2 million individuals have been released from all the Armed Forces after serving their required term of service of 2 or more years. It was certainly not the intent of Congress when this law was passed to force those individuals who had fulfilled their active duty obligation into the National Guard where they would again be subject to call.

It is my recollection and I am sure the members of the Armed Services Committee will bear me out, that the trained personnel referred to were to be the product of UMT. It was these individuals who were to be used to fill all our Reserve forces—rather than the veterans who had gained their training in combat.

I would call Dr. Hannah's attention to the statement of congressional intent in section 1 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which reads as follows:

"It is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the Ground Forces and the Air Forces, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists."

Eight National Guard divisions and many more separate units of the Army National Guard as well as 80 percent of the Air National Guard have been ordered to Federal service since the outbreak of Korea. While many of the individual members of these units have been released after their required 2 years' active service, the 8 Army divisions are still remembered among the 20 Army divisions now in existence.

Many of these that have returned from active duty are regrouping to reactivate these divisions, but like any organization, there must be a source of new strength to survive. These young men who enlist in the National Guard are not exempted from military service. Many have already gone to active duty with their units, and those now in the units are available at any time when the President sees fit to order their units to active duty.

If it is Dr. Hannah's purpose to strangle the National Guard to the point where it will no longer be an effective reserve, he is taking the proper approach. I hope this matter will receive the attention of the Armed Services Committees and the Governors of the several States while they are here in Washington.

ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD E. STASSEN BEFORE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on April 30 Hon. Harold E. Stassen, Director for Mutual Security, delivered an address at the national commander's dinner of the American Legion, at Indianapolis, Ind. This address was in the form of a brief report of his recent trip with the Secretary of State to Paris to consider the problems of NATO. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this address be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF HAROLD E. STASSEN, DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY, TO THE NATIONAL COMMANDER'S DINNER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT INDIANAPOLIS, IND., APRIL 30, 1953

National Commander, members and guests of the American Legion, may I join with you tonight in a salute to your able national commander, Lewis K. Gough. Under his leadership the American Legion is carrying on its alert interest in the future security and progress of America.

We meet at an unusually significant moment in history.

Stalin is gone from the Kremlin. The dominant central figure in the center of the Communist complex for a quarter of a century has departed.

Eisenhower is in the White House. The victorious general, the successful leader of the free peoples in the recent decade, has been placed by our fellow citizens in the Presidency of our country.

No one can now foretell the complete significance and future results of these facts, but we all sense their far-reaching impact.

Throughout his life, our new Commander in Chief has been a man who attains spectacular results by unspectacular methods. He has never made grandiose claims, and has never jumped to ill-considered conclusions. Careful consideration of plans and courageous conduct of programs have characterized his approach.

His new policies for the future security of America and the free nations of the world are now unfolding. They are the result of an intensive 3 months study of the entire world situation through the National Security Council, and upon a background of his unequalled experience in these matters.

At the meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Paris last week, steps were taken to place these new policies in effect. It is my view that the session was a solid success. Much more remains to be done. But real progress has been made and the foundation has been laid for steady building.

On next Tuesday, May 5, hearings will start in the Congress on President Eisenhower's request for funds to carry on the mutual-security program during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. The President's request is based upon a careful assessment of the economic position of the United States and the rest of the free world, changes in the military situation which confront us, and the opportunities for positive action which lie before us. The President will request funds to aid our allies and partners in the military buildup, and to maintain and increase the economic strength of a number of countries in order to make a greater future contribution to the defensive strength of the free world.

The problems of building up military strength—without weakening the underlying economies and depriving the citizens of the free world of hope for the gradual rise in living standards—are not easy to solve. They cannot be solved by pretending they do not exist; nor can they be solved overnight by using some trick formula. This administration, under the inspiring leadership of President Eisenhower, is patiently working out new policies to guide this Nation as we settle down to win the peace. No one knows better than the President that military strength cannot be built from economic weakness. If the free world—and that includes our partners as well as ourselves—is to have increasingly strong mili-

tary defenses, each nation must have a sound and growing economy.

In the new administration we combined this knowledge with another bit of knowledge, namely, that it is not possible to say that any given year in the future will be the year of greatest danger. The facts are that no one can tell precisely when an aggressor will attack. For those who are in danger of attack, the day after tomorrow is just as perilous as 2 years from tomorrow. By combining these two bits of knowledge, the top policymakers of this administration arrived at two conclusions which seem, on the surface, to contradict each other: First is the need to work toward a maximum amount of military strength with a minimum amount of delay; second is a realization that we are not engaged in a 100-yard dash, so to speak, where the objective is to reach a set goal, but are engaged in a cross-country marathon where the goal cannot yet be seen. This means we are in a contest which may last for years and we must set a pace which can be held; neither we nor our partners can afford to burn ourselves out trying to sprint for miles.

With these two policies in mind, namely, the need to achieve immediately more effective strength for defense forces already in existence and the need to sustain and expand the civilian economies for the long pull ahead, Secretaries Dulles, Wilson, Humphrey, and I attended last week, in Paris, a meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The Secretary of State represented this Government and its new policies in a most brilliant fashion. He reported to the country last night some of the general results of the Paris meeting. He introduced a resolution calling for prompt ratification of the treaty to create a European defense community which would allow German armed forces to come into being and participate in the integrated defense of Western Europe with other NATO nations under the SHAPE command. This resolution was adopted unanimously. The Secretary of Defense was able to report what the United States was doing to increase the effective readiness of the NATO forces, some of which were in being but not adequately equipped or supplied.

As background for this, when I accompanied the Secretary of State to Europe in the first week of February, I asked Generals Ridgway, Gruenther, Norstad, and Handy: "What critical items are lagging in deliveries and adversely affect the effectiveness of the forces under your command?" At that time I was given specific information about a number of items that were critically short because of delays in shipments and deliveries from the United States. Through the leadership of the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense, these deficiencies are being made up as rapidly as possible. Secretary Wilson was able to report to the NATO Council that deliveries in 1953 of the critically short items will be, in most instances, at least 50 percent—and, in some instances, twofold, threefold, or fourfold—above the forecast of December 1952.

In connection with the specific operations of the Mutual Security Program in relation to the NATO meeting, four specific results were obtained:

1. Contracts were signed for the production and delivery, over a period of years, of the very best types of modern jet aircraft—the British Hunter Hawker and the French Mystere-IV. A number of NATO members are participants both in the production of these planes and paying the bills. The United States commitment is entirely within appropriations already granted by the Congress and within previously approved programs for military assistance.

2. Agreements were reached, subject to the approval of the Congress and other parliaments, for the construction, over a 3-year period, of airfields, communications and radar warning networks, and related facilities—with every one of the 14 members of NATO sharing in the cost.

3. Within the context of the two policies I referred to earlier, the NATO Council adopted realistic goals for increasing the effectiveness and strength of armed forces during the calendar year 1953. These goals are within the capabilities of the NATO members; they are within the ability of the United States to make deliveries of arms and equipment; they will make up for deficiencies existing last December; and they will add substantial strength above and beyond that which was forecast at the end of 1952.

4. Some initial decisions were made concerning the use of new tactical weapons and what these new weapons could add to the effectiveness of forces already in being.

Senior military advisers estimated that all these actions will mean a 30-percent increase in effectiveness of NATO forces by the end of this calendar year.

In addition, the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Defense were instrumental in developing among our NATO partners a new understanding concerning the general nature of the future of the mutual-security program and the limitations of future United States plans. I refer especially to economic aid. As the Secretary of State said last night: "Americans have always generously responded to emergency needs. But outright grants ought to be reserved only for real emergencies. They are a kind of crutch which may be needed from time to time. But as soon as there is economic health and the opportunity for a people to earn their way by their own efforts, then the crutch ought to be thrown away. We believe that this is becoming increasingly possible."

There are, of course, many activities other than economic-aid programs which can be undertaken by the United States to assist the other nations of the free world to earn their own way. President Eisenhower has requested an extension as is of the Reciprocal Trade Act for 1 year, during which time a study will be made to determine the best international-trade policies which could be adopted for the benefit of the United States and other nations. Here, as elsewhere, a balance must be found which will take account of many complex factors which lie between the relatively simple extremes of high protective tariffs, on the one hand, and free trade, on the other. Much can and should be done to stimulate investment abroad of private American capital and to create conditions (businessmen call it "climate") which attract capital and make foreign investment rewarding to those who participate in it.

Under the leadership of President Eisenhower, we, in the mutual-security program, and every American citizen whose taxes support this program, are taking part in a great effort to bring strength and confidence and hope among all the people in the non-Communist world. All of us would welcome the day when—following the President's bold vision of a world at peace—we could invest for economic and social betterment part of the money, energy, and skills which now necessarily are going into building armed strength.

But until we have real proof that the leaders of the Soviet Union have changed their belief in the Marxist doctrine that international communism will take over the world and the related doctrine concerning the inevitability of war, neither we nor our partners can neglect our defenses. In this process we cannot afford, as I said earlier, to burn ourselves out trying to do too much too fast—on the one hand; nor can we afford to drift toward the other equally dangerous extreme where we seek to conserve our energy by relaxing in a rocking chair.

In the year ahead, as we support the President's program for mutual security, we know that we are helping create conditions which will enable all the nations outside the Soviet bloc to share with us the opportunities and responsibilities of freedom.

THE LATE SENATOR WESLEY L. JONES, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished Senators ever to serve in this body or in the House of Representatives from the Pacific Northwest was the Honorable Wesley L. Jones, of Washington.

Recently an excellent article on the life and accomplishments of this great Senator, written by Mr. C. T. Conover, of Seattle, was published in the Seattle Sunday Times.

I do not suppose there are many Senators left who served with him. I see my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who was a Member of the Senate at the same time.

Wesley L. Jones had a very distinguished and honorable career in the Congress. He served a total of 34 years, all told, in both bodies, the longest tenure of anyone from the State of Washington.

I commend to my colleagues the reading of the article to which I have referred—both those who served with this great Northwest statesman and those who have entered the Congress since his decease.

This article is not a complete record of the distinguished service rendered by Hon. Wesley L. Jones, but it is reminiscent of the Senate and the House as of that time; it also points up what he did toward the development of the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DEBT TO UNITED STATES SENATOR WESLEY L. JONES

(By C. T. Conover)

Wesley L. Jones served in Congress from March 1899, until his death in November 1932, virtually 34 years and the longest tenure in Congress of any representative from this State.

He served in the House of Representatives five consecutive terms, much of the time as Representative at Large and handling the affairs of the entire State rather than simply those of a district. During this period he devoted much of his time to irrigation and reclamation matters. Much of the present development, not only in Washington but throughout the West, stems from his efforts.

In 1908 Jones ran against Senator Levi Ankeny for a seat in the Senate, in the first election under the direct-primary system, and was elected and later reelected for three successive terms. He served in Congress under seven Presidents, from William McKinley to and including Herbert Hoover. His long years in office gave him an important place in the administration of national affairs. He was the Republican Party whip in 1924 and was proposed as majority floor leader in the Senate, but declined the post.

Jones was a member of the Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation and was chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee when Herbert Hoover was Secretary of Commerce. Under his chairmanship the Northwest Marine Act and what is known as the Jones Act, liberalizing the rights of seamen in personal-injury cases, were sponsored. He later was chairman of the Senate's important Committee on Appropriations, serving until his death. He was active especially

in all problems affecting the development of Alaska.

The Senator served on the Committee on the District of Columbia so long and effectively that he was regarded by the citizens of the District as their personal representative in Congress. He was in fact a broadgage statesman, acting always for the national interest rather than for that of his own bailiwick alone.

Jones was born in Illinois in 1863 and grew up in the atmosphere and traditions of the Lincoln era. His father, a farm laborer, was killed in the Civil War a few days before Wesley's birth. This put the son on his own resources throughout his life. He did farm work to pay for schooling and ultimately succeeded in being graduated from the College of Southern Illinois, where he was a classmate of William E. Borah, of Idaho. Later they served together in the Senate. After a 4-month course at the Northwestern University Law School, he was admitted to the bar.

He began practice in Illinois in 1886 and in that year married Minda Nelson. With the coming of a son, Harry B. Jones, and increased responsibilities, he decided that he needed a larger field. He came out West scouting for a location and finally decided on Yakima, a typical western town of 2,000 people, with a full quota of saloons, gambling joints and Indians in a land of dust and sagebrush. But he believed it a place with a future. He sent for his family and worked for an abstract company until he was able to engage in law practice. For years, with various business partners, his was one of the principal law offices in central Washington.

Jones always had taken a keen interest in politics and was active in the Blaine campaign in 1884 and the Harrison campaign in 1888. In 1898 he ran for a seat in Congress then held by James Hamilton Lewis and was successful. He immediately disposed of his law business to be able to devote all of his time and efforts to his new career.

He was regarded as a commonsense liberal, with a keen interest in progress, not unmixed with a spirit of adventure. He loved to hunt and fish and take hiking trips into the mountains. During the First World War he made frequent flights with Army pilots in the old single-engine cockpit planes and once announced that he had made a round-trip flight from the Atlantic to the Pacific in less than a day. He had flown over the Isthmus of Panama.

Late in life Jones was attacked by the golf "bug" and never missed an opportunity for an early-morning game. As he usually was at his office by 8 o'clock, that really meant early. One morning he went out into the driveway of his hotel in Washington to wait for a friend to pick him up for a game. After waiting a long time he looked at his watch and found that it was 2:30 a. m., so he went back to bed until the usual time of 5:30.

In his last years he was weakened by a serious operation and did not give himself adequate time to regain his strength. His death occurred shortly after the Democratic landslide in 1933 and some attributed it to his disappointment. Nothing was further from the fact. He simply had drawn too heavily upon his physical resources in trying to stem the political tide and in his tireless work in the Senate.

Surviving him are a son, Harry B. Jones, the senior head of a well-known Seattle law firm, and a daughter, Mrs. Hazel E. Coffin, of Yakima.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. GARRETT L. WITHERS, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me in order that I may make a request for printing in the RECORD certain communications pertaining to the pending business?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a telegram dated March 13, 1953, relative to the pending joint resolution, which I sent to the distinguished Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable William C. Marland, and also the response of Governor Marland, dated March 14, 1953, to my telegram.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 13, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM C. MARLAND,
Charleston, W. Va.

DEAR GOVERNOR: A number of bills are pending in Congress which are designed to give to California, Louisiana, and Texas vast oil, gas, and other mineral resources in the submerged lands off their shores. As held by the highest Court in the land, these resources belong to the people of all the States, including, of course, the people of West Virginia.

The exact value of the subject matter has not been determined but it is estimated that under the 16 million acres or more of undersea lands which are involved, there are at least 15 billion barrels of oil worth more than $40 billion and gas worth more than $10 billion.

If one of these bills should be enacted and later held to be constitutional, under its operation every man, woman, and child in our State would utterly lose his or her share of much more than half a billion dollars.

Propaganda to the effect that any of the proposed bills would benefit inland States by confirming titles to inland waters is meaningless, for the reason that such titles are not endangered and are, in no manner, connected with the question of depriving the people of the inland States of their rights to the lands under ocean, sea, or gulf. Despite the terrific pressure being exerted by the great interests backing this legislation, the States cannot be deprived of their right to litigate the validity of any of these bills that may be passed. Only the Supreme Court of the United States can finally determine whether the Congress has the power to deprive the people of 45 States of the Union of their rights and bestow those rights upon the people of the 3 States mentioned.

In my opinion, it will probably prove impossible for the liberals to defeat the administration's efforts to pass one of the pending bills. In the circumstances, please let me entreat you to request the legislature to authorize and instruct or you, on your own responsibility as Governor, to authorize and instruct our distinguished attorney general to prepare to litigate this most important matter and to institute a suit by and in behalf of the State of West Virginia to have any one of the indicated bills that may become a law declared null and void, to the end that the people of West Virginia may be protected against the exploiters who are seeking to rob them of their heritage.

MATTHEW M. NEELY.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, March 14, 1953.

Hon. M. M. NEELY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEELY: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram concerning a question vital to all of the people of West Virginia in the matter of natural resources now held by the Federal Government, commonly referred to as the tidelands oil question.

I want to assure you and every member of our senatorial and congressional delegation to the United States Congress that I, as Governor of West Virginia, consider it of the most paramount importance that we do everything possible to preserve those mineral resources for all of our citizens, rather than to let them be given to a few States.

I am most appreciative of your interest in the matter, and in line with your suggestion, I am requesting the Attorney General to follow closely the progress of this legislation, and in the event that Congress is so misguided as to pass same, to take whatever action is necessary, either by way of a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States, or any other tribunal that may have jurisdiction in this matter, to see to it that the interests of the State of West Virginia are protected to the utmost of our ability as officers of the government of the people of West Virginia.

You are exactly right in your thinking concerning the fallacies of the argument advanced to the effect that any of the proposed bills would benefit inland States by confirming title to inland waters. A prime example of the falseness of such propaganda is our own situation concerning the Ohio River. West Virginia owns the natural resources under the Ohio River and has been using them as an owner for many many years in selling, leasing, and otherwise disposing of the resources in a manner that will best benefit our citizens. We need no legislation to confirm our title to these resources. In my opinion, the entire move is one to deprive the people of the United States of that which is rightfully theirs; namely, the natural resources closely adjoining their country in the oceans and gulfs that surround us.

I am sending a copy of this letter to each of our Congressmen and Senators so that they may know beyond any question of a doubt where the government of the State of West Virginia stands on this question. Since this is in no way a party matter, and since the people of West Virginia who will be robbed if this legislation is successfully enacted are of both political faiths, I am sending a message to the West Virginia Republican national committeeman, the Honorable Walter Hallanan, asking him to exert whatever influence he may have with the Republican National Government toward the end that this pillage of our natural resources will be stopped.

If there is anything that you or any other member of our delegation feels that I can do as Governor of West Virginia to aid in this fight for the people of West Virginia, please feel free to call upon me.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. MARLAND,
Governor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this is the last day on which there will be an opportunity to debate the pending joint

resolution and to permit Senators to offer amendments to the measure.

Since I have consumed considerable time during the debate on the joint resolution, and because a number of other Senators wish to offer amendments and to speak on them, I feel constrained, in fairness to them, to proceed with my remarks today without yielding. I always like to yield and to show every courtesy I can to my fellow Senators, but I find myself under a limitation of time when so many other Senators wish to be heard on the measure and desire to offer their amendments.

Sections 3 and 6 of this measure introduce an altogether new concept never before mentioned in any previous discussion of the problem of the lands submerged beneath the ocean. The language is an attempt to compromise in one statement the conflicting theories of those who contend that the submerged lands belong to the States and that the Federal Government has been trying to "grab" them, and on the other hand, the theories of those who have contended that as a matter of constitutional and international law the Federal Government has paramount power over the land submerged thereby. The attempt to combine these two conflicting theories in one law raises a constitutional question which can be settled only by the Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, if this bill should be passed with this language in it neither the States nor the oil companies which have sought to obtain control over the natural resources beneath the sea will obtain their objective.

Clauses 1 and 2, page 13, lines 6 and 9, are contradictory. Clause 1 deals with title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters. Clause 2 deals with "the right and power to manage, administer, lease, develop, and use the said lands in accordance with applicable State law."

Obviously this clause was written upon the theory that the right and power to manage, and so forth, the lands under State law does not now exist because otherwise it would not be necessary to use the word "assigned" in line 13.

It will be seen from lines 11, 12, and 13 that the attempt is made to recognize, confirm, establish, and vest the title and ownership in the States and to assign to them the rights mentioned in clause 2.

It is clear that what the committee has sought to do in this provision is first to confirm what it deems to be an existing title and ownership, and, second, to assign a right of management, use, and development which does not now exist in the States.

The Constitution of the United States gives to the Federal Government unquestioned jurisdiction over commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs. To use the words of section 6, the Federal power extends to all matters affecting national jurisdiction and sovereignty. No State can constitutionally invade the sovereign powers of the National Government and any attempt to split its powers or cast a cloud upon those powers by purporting to extend to the States power and authority to interfere with commerce, navigation, national defense, international affairs, and national sovereignty can only result in creating legalistic questions of the utmost complexity.

If Congress is to undertake now, as it does by section 3, to confirm in the States title and ownership to lands within the historical boundaries of the States, though beneath the ocean, Congress sets up the basis by which the States can set up a sort of riparian claim to ownership of the Continental Shelf. Thus, this bill is an invitation to the coastal States to seek to establish a claim to the Continental Shelf, a purpose which most of the sponsors of the bill expressly disavow.

More important, however, when Congress, by this measure, assigns the power to manage, administer, lease, develop, and use the lands beneath the ocean it may give away at the same time the power to authorize the construction of drilling platforms, the laying of pipelines and the construction of other obstructions to commerce and navigation.

True, it is stated in section 6 that "the United States retains all its navigable servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs." It is true that section 6 declares that all of these shall be paramount, but, How is it possible that the title and ownership by the State to submerged lands can be recognized, confirmed, and established in the States, as set forth in section 3, when in section 6 it is declared that the Federal Government has constitutional rights in the lands as well as in the waters?

What Congress is saying by this language is merely that the sovereign Government of the United States has constitutional rights over both land and water but that it may have to establish those rights as against the States by insisting that all of these lands and waters are impressed with a servitude. To establish the servitude, if any oil company resists or if any State resists, it would be necessary for the Federal Government to go into court and to say, "this drilling platform, this pipeline, this pier, this boat line, interferes with national defense, with navigation, with commerce, with international affairs and must be taken down," particularly when it is recalled that section 3 assigns to the States the Federal Government's power of management.

When this bill is passed and is signed by a President whose duty it is to protect the national security of the United States, a situation may be created in which the initiative for the exercising of national power has been taken away from the Federal Government and given to the lessees of a State or municipality along the coast compelling the Federal Government to bring suit against the State, community, or oil and gas company which is seeking to withdraw the oil from beneath nature's ocean and sell it perchance to the national sovereign, the Federal Government.

INTERNATIONAL DANGERS AND TREATY VIOLATIONS

An additional objection to the joint resolution is that by attempting to extend the territorial boundaries of the United States beyond the 3-mile limit, it constitutes a clear violation of international law. It constitutes an abandonment of the traditional position of the United States in international law in support of the 3-mile limit, a position which has had the support of every Secretary of State from Thomas Jefferson on, every President from George Washington on, and which is soundly based on the military and political interests of the United States.

It is not necessary to labor the point as to how the joint resolution seeks to extend the territorial boundaries of the United States for the benefit of two States, and two States alone. I am sure that my distinguished colleagues from Florida and Texas would not disclaim that they would like to establish the territorial boundaries of Florida and Texas along the Gulf of Mexico as extending 3 leagues or 10½ miles from the coast line. Whether by the joint resolution, if enacted, they will be enabled to succeed in their attempt will be a matter which the courts should adjudicate, as I will point out later, but it is clear that is what they would like to do. Now Florida and Texas are sovereign States; they are fine States but they are still part of the United States just like Alabama. If the territorial boundaries of Texas and Florida are approved as going 10½ miles into the Gulf of Mexico, so are those of the United States in those areas. So it is unquestioned that this measure represents the first time in which the Government of the United States has abandoned its position that the proper width of territorial waters is 3 miles. Now, for the benefit of Florida and Texas, we are asked to provide that off those States, the proper boundary of territorial waters is 10½ miles.

As I said earlier, the position of the United States that the proper limit of territorial waters should not extend more than 3 miles beyond the shores goes back to the earliest days of the Republic. In 1793 Thomas Jefferson, then Secretary of State, told both the Governments of France and England that the United States should consider territorial waters as restrained "to a distance of 1 sea league or 3 geographical miles from the seashore." Thomas Jefferson, acting as Secretary of State for our first President, George Washington, was just the first Secretary of State to assert this fundamental principle of international law: That the width of territorial waters should not extend more than 3 miles from the shore. Secretaries of State, both Democratic and Republican, have been fighting to sustain this principle ever since.

This fight has not always been an easy one. Many other countries have tried to make claims to the waters adjacent to them which were greatly in excess of the 3 miles permitted them by international law, but the United States has always been in the forefront of those countries which have insisted that 3 miles is as far as a nation can go. In 1821 Russia announced a ukase which prohibited foreign vessels from approaching within 100 miles of certain Russian possessions in the Pacific Ocean. John Quincy Adams was our Secretary of State then, and he opposed this illegal

Russian claim just as his successors are opposing similar illegal actions of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics now. In 1822 our Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, sent the Russians a stiff note saying that their ukase was illegal and that the United States would not be bound by it.

In 1862 we had a similar dispute with Spain. Spain asserted the right to regard as territorial waters of Cuba the waters surrounding Cuba to a distance of 6 marine miles. In 1862 this Nation was engaged in a great civil conflict and it might have appeared to some that the best thing to do was not to interpose any interjection to the Spanish claim. But the principle that the limit of territorial waters should not exceed 3 miles was so important to the United States that President Lincoln instructed his Secretary of State, Secretary Seward, to protest this illegal action. Secretary Seward did protest. He declared that the extent of territorial waters of a state was not derived from its own decrees or legislative enactments, but from the law of nations and, that according to that law, the limit was fixed at 3 marine miles from the coast. The language of his protest to the Spanish Foreign Minister is just as true today as it was when it was delivered, and I should like to read it:

> Nevertheless it cannot be admitted, nor indeed is Mr. Tassara understood to claim, that the mere assertion of a sovereign, by an act of legislation, however solemn, can have the effect to establish and fix its external maritime jurisdiction. His right to a jurisdiction of 3 miles is derived not from his own decree but from the law of nations, and exists even though he may never have proclaimed or asserted it by any decree or declaration whatsoever. He cannot, by a mere decree, extend the limit and fix it at 6 miles, because, if he could, he could in the same manner, and upon motives of interest, ambition, or even upon caprice, fix it at 10, or 20, or 50 miles, without the consent or acquiescence of other powers which have a common right with himself in the freedom of all the oceans. Such a pretension could never be successfully or rightfully maintained (1 Moore's Digest 710).

The United States took the same position in 1908 when Mr. Adee, Acting Secretary of State, informed the military governor of Cuba that—

> The rule which is reported to have been announced by the Cuban Government in this case—namely, that the territorial waters of Cuba extend 4 leagues from the coast of the island and of the cays belonging to it—not only fails to accord with the views now expressed by the British Government, but is out of harmony with the principles held by this Government as declared by Secretaries Seward and Olney, as well as with the generally accepted rules of international law (1 Hyde 456).

The United States has taken the same position in disputes with Mexico. I shall deal with the problem of the dispute with Mexico in more detail later, because it is an issue which is still pending, but I believe that you should know that ever since 1906 our Department of State has been protesting, and in the great majority of cases successfully, the attempts of the Government of Mexico to seize American fishing vessels which are fishing off the coast of Mexico between the 3- and the 9-mile limit. The American Government also had to object to the attempts of the Italian Government to establish a band of territorial waters in excess of 3 miles. On August 6, 1914, the Italian Government promulgated a decree which attempted to establish the limit of its territorial waters 6 miles from its shores. The United States promptly objected. Our Secretary of State again reiterated the historic position of the United States in opposition to any attempt to extend territorial waters beyond 3 miles from the shore. The Italian Ambassador was informed as follows:

> I am compelled to inform Your Excellency of my inability to accept the principle of the royal decree, insofar as it may undertake to extend the limits of the territorial waters beyond three nautical miles from the main shoreline and to extend thereover the jurisdiction of the Italian Government (1 Hackworth 637).

The United States has not only supported the 3-mile limit because it believes this to be the proper rule of international law on the subject, it has done so because we are bound by treaty to do so. In 1924, the United States and Great Britain entered into a treaty with respect to the smuggling of intoxicating liquors. I would like to read you article I of this treaty. It reads as follows:

> The high contracting parties declare that it is their firm intention to uphold the principle that three marine miles extending from the coastline outward and measured from low-water mark constitute the proper limits of territorial waters (43 Stat. 1761).

We have similar provisions in treaties with Germany, with Panama, with the Netherlands, with Cuba, and with Japan.

Now I know that we will hear a great deal of talk that the 3-mile rule is an old and obsolete one and should be changed. The proponents of this bill must be making that argument, because they do propose to change the 3-mile rule, if only on behalf of Florida and Texas. The argument that the 3-mile limit is obsolete has been going on for some time. One of the first cases that I can find when it was made was in a controversy between Mr. Bayard, the Secretary of State under President Cleveland, and Mr. Manning, Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Manning was adopting a position very similar to that of the proponents of this bill. He wanted to extend the 3-mile limit to take in some fisheries, although in this case, he was attempting to extend it on the northwest coast rather than in the Gulf of Mexico. Mr. Bayard, who had the support of the President, told him the reasons why this should not be done:

> In a letter by Mr. Jefferson, when Secretary of State on November 8, 1793, to the minister of Great Britain, and in a circular of November 10, 1793, to the United States district attorneys, the limit of one sea-league from shore was provisionally adopted by him as that of the territorial seas of the United States. The same position was taken by Mr. Madison, Secretary of State, February 3, 1807; by Mr. Webster, Secretary of State, August 1, 1842; by Mr. Seward, Secretary of State, December 16, 1862, August 10, 1863, and September 16, 1864; and by Mr. Fish, Secretary of State, December 1, 1875.
>
> In a note from Mr. Fish to Sir Edward Thornton, dated January 22, 1875, it is expressly stated in reply to inquiries from the British Foreign Office "that this Government has uniformly, under every administration, objected to the pretension of Spain" to a 6-mile limit. Mr. Fish proceeds to show that the United States statute, giving the right to board vessels within 4 leagues of the coast, is applied only to vessels coming to United States ports, and that the extension of the boundary line, between the United States and Mexico, to 3 leagues from land, by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, applies only to Mexico and the United States.
>
> Mr. Evarts, writing to Mr. Fairchild, then our representative in Spain on March 3, 1881 (Foreign Relations, 1881), said: "This Government must adhere to the 3-mile rule as the jurisdictional limit, and the cases of visitation without that line seem not to be excused or excusable under that rule."
>
> • • • • •
>
> The position I here state, you must remember, was not taken by this Department speculatively. It was advanced in periods when the question of peace or war hung on the decision. When, during the three earlier administrations, we were threatened on our coast by Great Britain and France, war being imminent with Great Britain, and for a time actually though not formally engaged in with France, we asserted this line as determining the extent of our territorial waters. When we were involved in the earlier part of Mr. Jefferson's administration in difficulties with Spain, we then told Spain that we conceded to her, so far as concerned Cuba, the same limit of territorial waters as we claimed for ourselves, granting nothing more; and this limit was afterward reasserted by Mr. Seward during the late Civil War, when there was every inducement on our part not only to oblige Spain, but to extend, for our own use as a belligerent, territorial privilege. When, in 1807, after the outrage on the *Chesapeake* by the *Leopard*, Mr. Jefferson issued a proclamation excluding British men-of-war from our territorial waters, there was the same rigor in limiting these waters to 3 miles from shore. And during our various fishery negotiations with Great Britain we have insisted that beyond the 3-mile line British territorial waters on the northeastern coast do not extend. Such was our position in 1783, in 1794, in 1815, in 1818. Such is our position now in our pending controversy with Great Britain on this important issue (1 Hyde 718–20).

These reasons were restated just a few weeks ago by a representative of President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, who appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and urged that committee to continue this policy as an essential element in the security of the United States. Speaking before the committee, a senior representative of the State Department spoke as follows:

> I now turn to the reasons for the adoption and maintenance of this position. The purpose of this Government has been, and still is to give effect to its traditional policy of freedom of the seas. Such freedom is essential to its national interests. It is a time-honored concept of defense that the greater the freedom and range of its warships and aircraft, the better protected are its security interests. Likewise, the maintenance of free lanes and air routes is vital to the success of its shipping and air transport. And it is becoming increasingly evident that its fishing interest depends in large part upon fishing resources in seas adjacent to foreign states (1953).

I shall deal in more detail later with the arguments based on national security, but I should like to point out, at this time, that the proponents of this bill have not produced a single responsible

officer of the Navy or of the Air Force who has urged that we abandon the concept of the 3-mile limit. The reason is the officers of our Navy and Air Force, indeed of our entire Military Establishment, are convinced that it is in the interests of our national security to solidify and support the 3-mile rule not to chip away at it. The United States has a great Navy and it contributes to our national security by having command of the seas. It does not contribute to our national security by hovering under the cover of Coast Artillery. As the State Department has pointed out, under the concept of defense which has long been held by the United States, the greater the freedom and range of its warships the better protected are its security interests. The United States has a great Air Force. Its contribution to our national security however is not merely by flying coastal patrol. It is by obtaining command of the skies. As the State Department has pointed out, the greater the freedom and range of our aircraft, the better protected are our security interests.

I would like to make it clear that the United States has supported the 3-mile rule because it is in the best interests of the United States, from the point of view of economic strength, foreign relations, and national security, to do so. I would like to make it clear that this is not just a unilateral decision of the United States. It is a decision which we have made in solemn convenant with other countries, including our major ally, Great Britain.

I would like to read again the relevant clause of our treaty with Great Britain. It provides:

> The high contracting parties declare that it is their firm intention to uphold the principle that 3 marine miles extending from the coastline outward and measured from low-water mark constitute the proper limits of territorial waters.

The United States has made similar pledges to five other countries.

Let us suppose that this bill, which we are now considering, should become law. What would the result be? In the first place, we would have committed a clear violation of our treaties with England and the five other countries to which I have just referred. In those treaties, the United States pledged its solemn word that it would support the principle that 3 miles is the maximum extent to which territorial waters may be extended under international law. The United States can claim that we are keeping our word to our gallant ally Great Britain and the other countries to which we have pledged our word if, at the very time that we are promising to support the principle of the 3-mile limit, we are claiming 10½ miles off the coasts of Texas and of Florida.

It is entirely immaterial that what is being done is to confirm a claim of 10½ miles as the territorial boundaries of two States, rather than expressly doing it on behalf of the Federal Government.

It was made perfectly clear by the representatives of the Department of State that from the point of view of international relations, it is immaterial whether the boundary claim is being asserted on behalf of the State of Texas or on behalf of the Federal Government. The representatives of the Department of State said as follows:

> In international relations, the territorial claims of the States and of the Nation are indivisible. The claims of the States cannot exceed those of the Nation (1053).

It is, therefore, perfectly clear that the passage of this bill would commit this country to the principle that in certain areas, at least, its territorial waters extend 10½ miles from the coast. It is also perfectly clear that the passage of this bill would be a flagrant violation of our treaty obligation to support the principle that 3 miles from the low-water mark constitutes the proper limit of territorial waters.

Now I know that I do not have to explain to this great body that the principle of the sanctity of treaty obligations has been a cornerstone of the foreign policy of the United States, whether the administration in power is Democratic or Republican. But I do not feel that in good conscience I could watch this great body deliberate an action which would be a flagrant violation of our treaty obligations without calling to your attention the statements of two great Americans on the significance of this fundamental principle. The first is a statement of President Wilson. It was made in an address to Congress in which he requested Congress to repeal certain provisions of the Panama Canal Act of 1912, which were considered to be in violation of our treaty of November 18, 1901, with Great Britain. This is what he said:

> We consented to the treaty; its language we accepted, if we did not originate it; and we are too big, too powerful, too self-respecting a nation to interpret with too strained or refined a reading the words of our own promises just because we have power enough to give us leave to read them as we please. The large thing to do is the only thing we can afford to do, a voluntary withdrawal from a position everywhere questioned and misunderstood. We ought to reverse our action without raising the question whether we were right or wrong, and so once more deserve our reputation for generosity and for the redemption of every obligation without quibble or hesitation (V Hackworth 164).

The other great American was Cordell Hull. He made a statement on international affairs and American foreign policy on July 16, 1937, and this is what he said:

> We advocate faithful observance of international agreements. Upholding the principle of the sanctity of treaties, we believe in modification of provisions of treaties, when need therefor arises, by orderly processes carried out in a spirit of mutual helpfulness and accommodation. We believe in respect by all nations for the rights of others and performance by all nations of established obligations (V Hackworth 164).

Today the United States has a position of world leadership which is unparalleled in its history. Today it is of the utmost importance for the survival of civilization that this leadership be exercised wisely and well. Today it is of greater importance than ever before, that the pledged word of the United States be entitled to respect; that the other countries know that when the United States has given its word, it will keep it. I am grieved to see this great body seriously deliberate a measure which, if it became law, would be a clear violation of our pledged word, would restroy our reputation for keeping our word which has been established by a record of honorable conduct scrupulously carried out since the formation of the Republic; and which would therefore cast doubt upon the integrity of any treaty obligation which we now have, many of which are obligations essential to the unity and strength of the free world.

There is, of course, a great temptation for the distinguished proponents of this bill to try to eat their cake and have it, too. In other words, there may be some wishful thinkers who feel that it is possible for the United States to assert a 10½-mile limit off the coast of Texas and Florida, but to continue to object to anything more than a 3-mile limit when applied against American ships and aircraft by foreign countries. These wishful thinkers should pay heed to the warnings of our Department of State. Before the committee the representatives of the Department said:

> If the Nation should recognize the extension of the boundaries of any State beyond the 3-mile limit, its identification with the broader claim would force abandonment of its traditional position. At the same time it would renounce protests against claims of foreign states to greater breadths of territorial waters (1053).

The representatives of the Department of State have pointed out that the passage of this bill would not merely force the United States to withdraw its protests against claims of territorial waters under 10½ miles. Its practical effect would be far more serious. They pointed out that the United States has long stood as the champion of the principle that 3 miles was the maximum permissible limit. If the United States were to abandon this position and start making broader claims, it would have opened Pandora's box. If the United States were to raise its claims from 3 miles to 10½, the other countries would not necessarily stop at a 10½ which matched us. Past experience has shown that the claims would be bigger and bigger, more and more extravagant, that a veritable Oklahoma land rush of claims would ensue which the United States, having started, would be powerless to stop, and that the avalanche which our ill-considered action had started might very well sweep away or destroy the concept of freedom of the seas which Americans have been working and fighting to build up since the time of Thomas Jefferson. The representatives of President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, made this clear when they warned the committee as follows:

> The maintenance of the traditional position of the United States is vital at a time when a number of foreign states show a tendency unilaterally to break down the principle of freedom of the seas by attempted extensions of sovereignty on the high seas. A change of the traditional position of this Government would be seized upon by other states as justification for broad and extravagant claims over adjacent seas (1053).

I would like to turn now to disputes which this Government has had with Mexico concerning the width of the band

of territorial waters which Mexico can properly claim under international law, I think that an analysis of this dispute will be interesting to this body because it will cast a new light on some of the arguments which have been raised by my distinguished colleagues. On April 23, 1950, the Mexican Coast Guard seized five United States fishing vessels which were fishing outside of the 3-mile limit off the coast of Mexico. They justified this seizure on the grounds that the territorial waters of Mexico extended 9 miles seaward. This claim was rejected by the United States Ambassador, Mr. Thurston, and the ships were released on May 3. This incident has been repeated on March 3 of this year. Mexico has made the same claim again, and the matter is now under active consideration between the Mexican Government and the Department of State. Let us take a look at the arguments which the Mexican Government is making in this attempt to stifle the American claims of American fishermen. I do this with particular interest because some of these boats sailed from Mobile. I am sure that some of them also sailed from Gulfport, Pascagoula, and Biloxi, so that my distinguished colleagues from Mississippi have an interest in the outcome of this matter. The Mexican Government is making an argument almost identical with that made by my distinguished colleague from Texas. Their argument is based solely on the fact that article V of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo between the United States and Mexico, which was signed on February 2, 1848, provides:

> The boundary line between the two Republics shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico, 3 leagues from land, opposite the mouth of the Rio Grande (9 Stat. 922, 926).

Now, since this treaty was signed, other countries became worried that it would have the effect which my distinguished colleague from Texas claims that it has; namely, that it was an attempt to extend the territorial waters of the United States out 3 leagues or 10½ miles off the coast of Texas. The British Minister sent the United States Government a note on April 30, 1848, objecting to this provision on the grounds that it was an attempt to extend the territorial waters of the United States 3 leagues instead of the 3 miles which was acknowledged by international law and practice as the extent of territorial jurisdiction over the sea that washes the coasts of States. The Secretary of State then was James Buchanan, and on August 19, 1848, he replied that this provision was merely for the convenience of Mexico and the United States in identifying the dividing line between their two countries, and that it was not intended and did not have the effect of extending the territorial waters of the United States. The United States Government was questioned on this point again in 1875 by the British Minister. Mr. Hamilton Fish was the Secretary of State then, and on January 2, 1875, he sent a note to the British Minister in which he flatly denied that the purpose of this treaty or its effect was to extend the territorial waters of the United States. He went on to say:

> We have always understood and asserted that, pursuant to public law, no nation can rightfully claim jurisdiction at sea beyond a marine league from its coast (1 Moore 731).

The question came up again in the fall of 1906 when a number of protests were received by the Department of State, alleging that the Government of Mexico was seizing American fishing vessels beyond the 3-mile limit and that proceedings were being instituted for the confiscation of such vessels. The Solicitor of the Department of State wrote an opinion, dated October 2, 1906, and this was forwarded to the American Embassy in Mexico City with instructions to take the problem up with the Mexican Government on the basis of the principles of law which were set forth in this opinion. I would like to read you portions of this opinion:

> The case is different with vessels found beyond the 3-mile limit. International law limits the sovereignty of a country to 3 miles from low-water mark, and although Mexican sovereignty follows Mexican vessels upon the high seas until they put into a foreign port, international law does not recognize Mexican sovereignty over a foreign vessel, or any right on the part of Mexico to assume the incidents of sovereignty upon a foreign vessel, beyond the 3-mile limit.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The claim to exercise the right of visit and search beyond the 3-mile limit is based upon paragraph 2, article 5, of a Mexican law issued December 18, 1902, which reads as follows:
>
> "The inspection and jurisdiction of the Federal authority may extend into the sea for fiscal purposes up to a distance of 20 kilometers measured from the line marked by low tide on the coasts of the Republic."
>
> Expressed in English terms, it appears that Mexico claims the right to extend its laws for fiscal purposes to a distance of 12½ statute miles * * * ["a little over 10 nautical miles"] from low-water mark. In the light of the previous statement it is at once evident that this law can only bind Mexican subjects to submit to visit and search and such foreign vessels as consent to the exercise of the right. In the absence of such consent, resistance to the exercise of the alleged right is clearly justifiable.
>
> While it is clearly settled that territorial jurisdiction does not extend beyond the 3-mile limit, still there is a tendency to permit the regulated exercise of the right of inspection beyond this limit. A distinction is taken between the general application of municipal laws beyond the limit and the extension of the revenue or customs laws for the purpose of facilitating importation. For example an unrepealed statute of the United States permits officers of revenue cutters "to board all vessels which arrive within 4 leagues of the coast thereof, if bound for the United States, and search and examine the same, and every part thereof, and shall demand, receive, and certify the manifest required to be on board certain vessels, shall affix and put proper fastenings on the hatches and other communications with the hold of any vessel, and shall remain on board such vessels until they arrive at the port or place of their destination" (R. S. 2760).
>
> It cannot be claimed that the jurisdiction of the United States rightfully extends beyond the 3-mile limit, except to its citizens. It would seem, however, that where foreign vessels are bound to the United States, the visitation and examination of cargo as provided for in this article may be convenient. Convenience, therefore, to both parties—to the incoming vessel as well as to the customs officers—would seem to dictate the act and justify the policy. Such seems to be the general view, for in the statement to the British Minister Mr. Secretary Fish was able to say: "It is believed, however, that in carrying into effect the authority conferred by the act of Congress referred to, no vessel is boarded, if boarded at all, except such a one as, upon being hailed, may have answered that she was bound to a port of the United States" (Moore's International Law Digest, vol. I, p. 731).
>
> It is to be noted, however, that only those vessels are inspected which are bound or destined to the United States; that a foreign merchant vessel outside of the 3-mile limit would not be inspected even although such vessel should proceed along the entire extent of the Atlantic coast.
>
> To this extent, therefore, the United States has extended its revenue laws. It cannot object that Mexico should claim and exercise the same right under similar circumstances. It is, however, recognized by Mexico and the United States that revenue laws can solely be applied to the purpose for which they are passed and that they cannot be extended as a cover to other and different circumstances. * * *
>
> It would appear, therefore, in the light of authority that local jurisdiction without the consent of the party to be affected does not extend beyond the 3-mile limit; that this Government has, as previously stated, extended its jurisdiction 4 marine leagues solely for the purpose of examining foreign vessels bound to an American port; that this extension of local law is for the purpose of convenience; that it has always been consented to and that when convenience and consent should cease the law itself would be inoperative as regards foreign vessels. The attempt to use a customs or revenue law to confer jurisdiction for other purposes and for all purposes is not and cannot be justified.
>
> It would appear, therefore, that the statute of Mexico extending its jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit should not affect American vessels unless such vessels are bound for a Mexican port, and that inasmuch as the statute is general in its nature and subjects all foreign vessels to examination whether such vessels be bound for a Mexican port or merely be temporarily within the limits covered by the statute, this Government should refuse to recognize the effect of the statute so far as American interests are concerned (1 Hackworth 658).

The most recent dispute grows out of a Mexican decree, dated August 30, 1935, which provided for the extension of the territorial waters of Mexico from 3 miles to 10½ miles. On January 11, 1936, Secretary of State Cordell Hull instructed our Embassy in Mexico as follows:

> It is desired that you advise the Mexican Foreign Office in writing that your Government reserves all rights of whatever nature so far as concerns any effect upon American commerce from enforcement of this legislation purporting to amend existing law so as to extend the territorial waters of Mexico from 3 miles in breadth to 9 miles (1 Hackworth 639).

The Mexican Foreign Office replied with argument identical to that which is now being made by my distinguished colleague from Texas. The Foreign Office argued that article V of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo set the territorial waters off the coast of Mexico at 10½ miles. The Department of State promptly rejected this argument and I would like to read you what they said, because I believe it contains a definitive

answer to the arguments made by my distinguished colleague. The reply was as follows:

The treaty provisions [art. V of the treaty of 1848] in question reads as follows:

"The dividing line between the 2 republics shall begin in the Gulf of Mexico, 3 leagues from land at the mouth of the Rio Grande."

The Foreign Office has not taken into account the remaining words of the paragraph from which the quotation is taken, which words delimit the boundary line between its eastern end in the Gulf of Mexico and its western end which is said to be the Pacific Ocean. It will be observed that the eastern limit of the boundary line is not stated to be 3 leagues from land. Moreover the second paragraph of article V of the treaty of 1848 contains the following provision as to the western limit of the boundary line between the two countries: "and, in order to preclude all difficulty in tracing upon the ground the limits separating upper from Lower California, it is agreed that the said limit shall consist of a straight line drawn from the middle of the Rio Gila, where it unites with the Colorado, to a point on the coast of the Pacific Ocean, distant 1 marine league due south of the southernmost point of the port of San Diego."

It will be further observed that in the last quoted provisions of the article upon which the Mexican Foreign Office relies, the westernmost point of the boundary line between the two countries is stated as being on the coast of the Pacific Ocean.

That portion of article V of the treaty of 1848 which the Mexican Foreign Office quotes relates only to the boundary line at a given point and furnishes no authority for Mexico to claim generally that its territorial waters extend 9 miles from the coast. The British note of June 9, 1848, which is quoted by the Mexican Foreign Office recognizes the merely local applicability of the agreement between the United States and Mexico as to the easternmost part of the boundary line, when it states in giving notice that the British Government could not "acquiesce in the extent of maritime jurisdiction assumed by the United States and Maxico," that the giving of such notice is "the more necessary because the Gulf of Mexico is a great thoroughfare of maritime commerce."

Furthermore, this view of the restricted nature of the agreement is strengthened by the statements in this Department's note to the British Minister of August 19, 1848, which is also quoted by the Mexican Foreign Office, and wherein it was said that if for the mutual convenience of the United States and Mexico it had been proper to enter into such an arrangement, third parties had no just cause of complaint and that the Government of the United States never intended by this stipulation to question the rights which Great Britain or any other power may possess under the law of nations.

Presumably it is true as indicated by a note sent by this Department to the British Minister on January 22, 1875, that the arrangement thus made between the United States and Mexico with respect to the Gulf of Mexico was designed to prevent smuggling in the particular area covered by the arrangement.

Wholly aside from the question of the boundary line between the two countries, there remains to be considered the total great extent of the Mexican coast and the bordering territorial waters. To say that because the United States agreed that in one area, so far as the United States was concerned, Mexican territorial waters extended 3 leagues from land, therefore Mexico was entitled to claim such an extent of territorial waters adjacent to her entire coastline is an unwarranted deduction from the terms of article V of the treaty of 1848 (1 Hackworth 641).

The question has come up again on January 14, 1948, after the detention by Mexican authorities of American fishing vessels, and that day our Embassy at Mexico City delivered the Mexican Foreign Office a note, the relevant paragraphs of which read as follows:

I have the honor to refer to Your Excellency's note No. 52602 of February 18, 1947, concerning the interception and detention, in September 1946, of four United States fishing vessels which had been operating off the coasts of the State of Campeche.

In the note under reference the statement is made that the territorial waters of Mexico, in the relations between the United States and Mexico, have an extension of 9 miles, which extension, it is stated, is derived from interpretations of article V of the treaty of 1848 and of article I of the treaty of 1853 between the United States and Mexico. The Government of the United States maintains, and has consistently maintained, that the general territorial jurisdiction of Mexico, so far as United States nationals are concerned, extends 3 miles seaward from the coast measured from the low-water mark. In this regard Your Excellency's attention is invited to this Embassy's note of June 3, 1936, addressed to Your Excellency's Government, which, after discussing at length the treaty of 1848, pointed out that it furnished no authority for the Government of Mexico to claim generally that the territorial waters of Mexico extend 9 miles from the coast. The same conclusion necessarily applies to the treaty of 1853 which, in regard to the question of territorial waters, introduced no change in the terms or meaning of the treaty of 1848.

With reference to article 17, section II, of the General Law of National Wealth referred to in Your Excellency's note and stated to be the justification of the seizures, the United States cannot, so far as that law purports to define the territorial waters of Mexico as coastal waters to the distance of 9 nautical miles from land, accept its application to United States fishing vessels operating between 3 and 9 miles off the coast. Further, the Government of the United States continues, as in 1936, to reserve all rights of whatever nature so far as concerns any effects upon American commerce from enforcement of this legislation, or of similar legislation which purports to extend the limit of general jurisdiction beyond 3 nautical miles (Mr. Thurston, Ambassador to Mexico to Senor Torres Bodet, Mexican Secretary for Foreign Relations, January 14, 1948). (See hearings, 322.)

The position of this Government was summed up by Under Secretary Jim Webb in a letter to our former colleague, Tom Connally, in which he said:

This Government has therefore consistently denied that the Government of Mexico has an extent of territorial waters of 3 leagues in the Gulf of Mexico, whether based upon treaty or upon international law. This Government would find it difficult now to assert or support a claim over Mexican nationals in the high seas of the Gulf of Mexico off its coasts which it denies to the Mexican Government with respect to American nationals. (See hearings, 323.)

The position taken by Jim Webb was reaffirmed by the representatives of President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

It can be seen, therefore, that the interpretation which my colleague from Texas places on the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo has been rejected by every Secretary of State from James Buchanan to John Foster Dulles. Every Secretary of State from James Buchanan to John Foster Dulles has consistently asserted that American fishing boats have the right to fish up to 3 miles off the coast of Mexico. If the measure we are now considering should become law, this assertion will have to be dropped. If the measure we are now considering should become law, our Government will have to say to Mexico: "We take back what we have been saying for over 100 years. We have been wrong all that time. You, Mexico, have been right, and have the exclusive right to control fisheries up to 10½ miles off your coasts."

As has been pointed out earlier, no man can foresee or safely predict that the effect of this sudden switch in the position of the United States would be limited to claims by other countries only after 10½ miles. The United States has been the strongest advocate of the 3-mile limit. If our support is suddenly withdrawn, no Member of the Senate can guarantee that other countries having succeeded in their claims to extend the 3-mile limit will stop at 10½ miles. It is a reasonable assumption that they will go on and on, at least out to the end of the Continental Shelf; and that the United States, having started this avalanche, will be unable to stop it; and that our fishing men will be deprived of valuable rights which their government has been fighting to obtain for them since the early days of the republic.

Some of these fishermen come from Texas. Some undoubtedly come from Florida, and it is up to their representatives to answer to them. But I feel that this is a matter which should not be determined on the basis of the interests of two States, however fine and important States they may be. This decision will adversely affect the interests of every maritime State. It will adversely affect the interests of every State from which fishermen set forth. The decision will adversely affect everyone who believes in the traditional American principle of freedom of the seas.

I know there may be those who will say we have not been aggressive enough in asserting our rights and that since on occasions other countries have seized our boats outside the 3-mile limit, we should imitate them. One answer to this argument is that the organized fishermen of this country do not seem to agree. Mr. John J. Real, representative of the Fishermen's Cooperative Association, speaking for his association and the other organizations of fishermen in this country, made it clear that they opposed this provision of the joint resolution. I share the views of some who think that this Government may not have been forceful enough in insisting on the observation of its legal rights. If fishermen from Alabama are arrested for fishing more than 3 miles off the coast, where they have a right to fish, I want something done about it. I do not think they have done too badly. It is only the flare-ups that get in the newspapers. The great majority of times when the fishermen are not interfered with do not make

news. If the State Department cannot obtain recognition of our rights by diplomatic negotiation, it should insist on arbitration, or perhaps should take the matter to the International Court of Justice. But the way to handle this problem is to insist on our rights. It is not to take a step which will make their enforcement impossible. It is not to turn back the clock on 150 years of progress in obtaining recognition of the principle of freedom of the seas.

Before passing to an even more serious effect of the joint resolution on our national security, I should like to deal with one additional aspect of the fisheries problem, as a Senator from a seaboard State. The Supreme Court held in 1941, in *Skiriotes* v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 69), that Florida had competence to make reasonable regulations concerning the conduct of its own citizens in fishing for sponges outside the territorial waters off the coast of Florida; but its opinion made it clear that as to the citizens of other States, the competence of Florida was limited to its territorial waters. As a result, in the past, fishing boats from my State have been able to fish outside the 3-mile limit off the boundaries of any State that they pleased. They have, of course, been subject to Federal regulation and to the regulation of any applicable treaties. But they have not had to get the permission of Texas, for example, to fish between the 3- and the 10½-mile limit off the coast of Texas. Neither have fishermen from the State of Texas had to get the permission of any of the other States, as long as they were fishing outside the 3-mile lim

This has seemed to me to be a fai rrangement between States all of w ich are members of the United States on an equal basis. But this joint resolution, if it becomes law, will change all of that. Under it, Texas and Florida are trying to get exclusive control of the fisheries 10½ miles out from their coasts. This strikes a blow at every other maritime State in the Union. This strikes a blow at the mutual freedom of fishing in the high seas which all States have enjoyed in the past. It destroys the equality which has existed in the past between all States in the Union. It places a great handicap on the fishermen of my State and others who are not in this small circle of the favored few. This is another reason why I believe this measure should be defeated.

The issue which the Senate is about to decide involves a matter which is much more important than oil, is much more important than fisheries. It involves a matter essential to our national security, namely, the freedom of the skies over the high seas and the lives and safety of the American boys flying the planes in which we protected this freedom of the skies over the high seas.

I pointed out earlier that the proponents of this joint resolution have not produced a single responsible officer of the Navy or of the Air Force who has urged that we abandon the concept of the 3-mile limit. I pointed out that the reason for this was that the officers of our Navy and of our Air Force are convinced that it is in the interest of our national security to strengthen and support the 3-mile rule, and that it is harmful to our national security to abandon it.

I should like to recount to the Senate four instances in which the crews of American aircraft have been attacked while they were asserting the right of freedom of the air over the high seas. In three of these instances, the crews of the American aircraft paid with their lives. I should like to ask the Senate whether we want now to cast doubt upon the principle of freedom of the air over the high seas that cost these men their lives.

The first incident that I should like to recall is that of the Navy Privateer which was ruthlessly shot down by Soviet aircraft over the Baltic Sea on April 8, 1950. Ten naval aviators lost their lives. I think the best account of this shocking episode is found in the note which our Ambassador delivered to the Soviet Union. I should like to read it:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *April 18, 1950.*

TEXT OF NOTE FROM AMBASSADOR ALAN G. KIRK TO THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, MOSCOW, APRIL 18, 1950

The Ambassador of the United States of America presents his compliments to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of April 11, 1950, has the honor to state that the only American military aircraft which was in the air in the Baltic area on April 8, 1950, was a United States Navy Privateer airplane which disappeared on that date and no trace of its crew has since been found.

The United States Navy airplane carried 10 persons. It was wholly unarmed. It left Wiesbaden at 10:31 a. m., Greenwich time for a flight over the Baltic Sea and 2½ hours later reported by radio crossing the coastline of the British Zone of Germany. All American military aircraft operate under strict instructions to avoid flying over any foreign territory in the absence of express permission for such a flight from the appropriate foreign government. The investigation conducted by the United States Government has convinced it that the United States Navy airplane in question complied strictly with these instructions and did not fly over any Soviet or Soviet-occupied territory or territorial waters adjacent thereto.

In the ministry's communication under reference the Soviet Government acknowledges that one of its fighter aircraft fired upon an American plane on April 8, 1950, at 5:30 p. m Moscow time. In view of the fact that the only American military airplane which was in the air in the Baltic area on that date was the unarmed United States Navy airplane mentioned above and that this airplane was at no time after it crossed the coastline of Germany over any foreign territory or territorial waters, it must be concluded that Soviet military aircraft fired upon an unarmed American plane over the open sea, following which the American airplane was lost.

The Ambassador of the United States has been instructed to protest in the most solemn manner agafnst this violation of international law and of the most elementary rules of peaceful conduct between nations. The United States Government demands that the Soviet Government institute a prompt and thorough investigation of this matter in order that the facts set forth above may be confirmed to its satisfaction. The United States Government further demands that the most strict and categorical instructions be issued to the Soviet Air Force that there be no repetition, under whatever pretext, of incidents of this kind which are so clearly calculated to magnify the difficulties of maintaining peaceful and correct international relationships.

The United States Government confidently expects that, when its investigation is completed, the Soviet Government will express its regret for the unlawful and provocative behavior of its aviators, will see to it that those responsible for this action are promptly and severely punished and will, in accordance with established custom among peace-loving nations, pay appropriate indemnity for the unprovoked destruction of American lives and property.

The Soviets, however, merely adhered to their contention that the plane was over Soviet territory. They repeated the falsehood that Soviet interceptors had fired in self-defense.

The relevance of this incident to this controversy is clear. The United States has always contended that the Baltic Sea is part of the high seas and that, as a result, all nations are free to sail on it and to fly over it, so long as they do not encroach on or over the territorial waters of the nations whose shores adjoin the Baltic Sea. The Soviet Union, however, have recently given indications that they regard the Baltic Sea as inland waters, and that the various countries which adjoin it are entitled to claim up to the centerline as part of their territory.

It is often difficult to determine whether an indentation like the Baltic Sea is part of the high seas or is inland waters. One test is whether the indentation has been traditionally considered to be inland waters or an historic bay, such as Chesapeake Bay, Delaware Bay, and Alabama's own Mobile Bay. The Baltic Sea is not an historic bay, so its status must be determined by its width at its mouth. The countries who claim 3 miles as the maximum extent of territorial waters have generally agreed that the maximum width must be from 6 to 10 miles, depending on whether the mouth is all in one country. The countries who have attempted to claim that territorial waters can extend farther have made the distance proportionately greater.

The geography of the Baltic Sea is such that so long as the United States supports the principle that 3 miles is the maximum extent of territorial waters, we are on sound ground in claiming that the Baltic Sea is an open sea. But the geography is also such that if we were to extend our claim to 10½ miles, we would be forced to admit that the Baltic was an inland sea. We could no longer claim that we are free to sail on it and fly over it, so long as we do not encroach on the proper claim of territorial waters of other countries. I do not think we should abandon that claim. I do not think we should admit a theory which will permit the Soviets to turn the Baltic into a Russian bay. I think we should stand by our guns and should prove that our plane was flying where it had a right to fly when it was shot down by these Russian assassins. I do not think we should take any step which would permit the Russians to claim that we now must admit that our plane was invading the territory of the Soviet Union.

I should like to recall the attention of the Senate to three more incidents in which American planes were unlawfully attacked by the Soviets. The first

of these was a Navy Neptune bomber which was unlawfully shot down on November 6, 1951. All of its crew were lost. I should like to read the communication on the plane which was made by Ambassador Warren G. Austin to the Secretary-General of the United Nations:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
November 24, 1951.

Following is the text of a communication from Ambassador Warren R. Austin to the Secretary General of the United Nations:

"The United States Representative to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary General of the United Nations and has the honor to report the following from the unified command under the United States for submission to the Security Council:

"A United Nations plane, a two-motored P2V bomber, operating under General Ridgway's command in connection with the U. N. operations in Korea failed to return from a weather reconnaissance over the Sea of Japan on November 6, 1951. An intensive search for survivors proved fruitless.

"From the last reported position of this plane at 0850 (−9 time zone) on November 6, it is undoubtedly this plane that was the subject of a Soviet statement to the United States Charge d'Affaires in Moscow on November 7, admitting that two Soviet fighter planes fired on a two-engine bomber at 1010 November 6 in the vicinity of Cape Ostrovnaya.

"The route this plane was following did not approach closer than 40 miles to U. S. S. R. territory, and the plane crew had been thoroughly briefed not to approach closer than 20 miles to U. S. S. R. territory under any circumstances.

"It can only be concluded that an intentional or unplanned approach to the Russian coast was not made, and the plane was intercepted and attacked without warning while over international waters, and furthermore, while well outside of 20 miles from the Russian coastline."

The Soviet answer was a monotonous repetition of the old lie that Soviet planes had shot in self defense when Soviet territory had been violated.

The next incident involved a B–29, which was shot down off Hokkaido on October 7, 1952. All the members of the crew were lost. I should like to read you a description of the incident from the note which our Ambassador in Moscow delivered to the Soviet Government:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
December 16, 1952.

The Embassy of the United States of America refers to the Ministry's note of November 24, 1952, concerning the United States Air Force plane shot down near the Japanese island of Hokkaido on October 7, 1952.

The United States Government notes that the Soviet Government has repeated its allegation that the United States Air Force plane violated the state frontier of the Soviet Union and that it opened fire on the Soviet aircraft. This allegation is in complete contradiction with the facts of the case. As the Soviet Government is aware, the radar plot of the tracks of the United States and Soviet aircraft showed conclusively that the United States plane was intercepted 32 miles from Yuri Island and approximately 6 miles from the island of Hokkaido by Soviet fighter aircraft which illegally entered Japanese territory in the course of making this interception. The United States plane was entirely undefended; in keeping with the routine character of its mission, it carried no bombs and its guns were inoperative.

The United States Government therefore must reiterate its protest against this unprovoked and unjustifiable attack on the United States aircraft, and must request again that the Soviet Government make payment of appropriate compensation for the loss of this aircraft and the lives of the crew members who have perished.

The United States Government also cannot accept the Soviet Government's declaration that it does not consider it necessary to enter into discussion of the statement of the United States Government that Yuri Island is not Soviet territory. In the view of the United States Government, Yuri Island, together with the other islands of the Habomai group, is Japanese territory under Japanese sovereignty and the status of these islands as Japanese territory has not been changed by the fact of their occupation by the Soviet Union.

The Soviets again repeated their shopworn lie: that American planes had violated Soviet territory, and that Soviet interceptors had fired in self-defense.

We have still another incident. It occurred just a little over 2 weeks ago, but it had a happier ending. Russian MIG fighters attacked a United States Air Force RB–50 over the North Pacific. The alert gunners in our plane drove the marauders away. I have not obtained access to the notes which have been exchanged in this incident, but I should like to read two press releases issued by the Department of State describing what took place:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
March 18, 1953.

The American Embassy at Moscow this morning, on instructions from the Department of State, lodged a vigorous protest with the Soviet Foreign Office against the attack by MIG fighters upon a United States Air Force RB–50 in the North Pacific Ocean on March 15.

The note sets forth the position of the United States plane when attacked (about 100 miles northeast of Petropaviosk and at least 25 miles from the nearest Soviet territory), vigorously protests the action of the Soviet aircraft, states that the Government of the United States expects to be informed at an early date of the disciplinary action taken with regard to the Soviet personnel responsible for the attack, and asks for information concerning measures adopted by Soviet authorities to prevent a recurrence of incidents of this kind.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
March 24, 1953.

The Department has studied the text of a note received from the Soviet Government on March 22 in response to our note of March 18 protesting the action of a Soviet plane in firing upon an American plane over the North Pacific. We find the allegations made by the Soviets completely at variance with the facts as established by a careful investigation.

As we pointed out in our note, the United States RB–50 aircraft involved was at all times over international waters, and at the time of the incident was at least 25 miles from the nearest Soviet territory. Without any reason whatever the Soviet aircraft opened fire on our plane, which was obliged to return the fire in self-defense.

The present Soviet note is a typical attempt by the Soviet Government to avoid responsibility for an unwarranted action of its military personnel through the device of fabricating an unfounded version of the affair. We stand on our note of March 18, and continue to expect that the Soviet Government will take measures to discipline the Soviet personnel responsible and to prevent recurrence of such incidents.

You can see from these releases that the Soviets have once more repeated their shopworn lie. They have said that the American plane had violated Soviet territory. They may well have thrown in their standard claim that this was in gross violation of international law. They ended by crying, through crocodile tears, that the Soviet planes had been forced to fire in self-defense.

Let us look at what is happening. One plane between 20 and 40 miles off the coast; another 32 miles off the coast; a third at least 25 miles off the coast. Each time there is a Soviet claim that their territory had been violated. How many more American boys will have to die before we see what the Russian are trying to do? How many more men have to die before we see that what the Russian are trying to do is to establish that there is no such thing as freedom of the seas or freedom of the air above the high seas? Do Senators believe that the United States should back down before these unlawful attacks? Do Senators believe that if we pass this joint resolution and establish a 10½-mile limit off of part of our coast, because of our own internal political considerations, we shall be able to tell the Russians that they can have territorial limits of 10½ also, but no more? Once we abandon the position, which is well established in international law, that 3 miles is the maximum permissible extension of territorial waters, who is to say whether the limit should be set at 10½ at 12, or at 20, 25, or 32 miles? Perhaps the Russians would even seek to extend their claims for a distance of 100 miles, as they attempted to do when John Quincy Adams was our Secretary of State. Earlier I referred to that situation. For my part, I do not propose to help the Soviets make a truth out of their damnable lies that these planes were shot down or shot at while violating Soviet territory.

Despite this outrageous Soviet attempt to stamp out freedom of the seas and freedom of the air above the high seas, the formal Soviet claim only goes to 12 miles. What the formal claims will be if the United States extends its claims to 10½ miles is another matter. But at the moment, all the Russians say they are claiming is 12 miles. I should like to read to the Senate a note in which our Government deals with this illegal pretense and sharply rejects it. It was delivered on November 24, 1952, and it reads as follows:

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that the Government of the United States of America has noted with increasing concern the policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of asserting territorial jurisdiction over a belt of waters 12 nautical miles in breadth along its coasts and coasts under its control. My government has also noted that in pursuing this policy the Soviet Union is permitting its authorities to violate the rights of nationals of other states in what are generally recognized as international waters by ordering the seizure and detention of foreign-flag vessels between 3 and 12 nautical miles off the coasts and otherwise denying them access to that area.

It is the view of my Government that the Soviet Union, in thus attempting to appropriate to its exclusive use and control a portion of the high seas, has manifested a willingness to deprive other states, without

their consent, of rights under international law. Such conclusion is inescapable in the face of a territorial waters policy whereunder the Soviet Union would supplant free and untrammeled navigation by all vessels and aircraft over water areas comprising a part of the high seas with such controls as that Government might apply. The Government of the United States of America is not aware of any principle of international law which would support and justify such a policy. In the circumstances, my Government finds it necessary to reiterate that it cannot recognize the action of any government which is calculated to assimilate adjacent high seas to its territory.

The Government of the United States of America therefore protests the Soviet Union's closure of a 12-mile belt of waters contiguous out to its coasts and to the coasts under its control, and reserves all its rights and interest of whatever nature in the high seas outside 3 nautical miles from those coasts.

This is what we told Jacob Malik on November 24, 1952, and I think we should adhere to it.

This protest presents the Senate with a simple question. Do we want to back it up, or do we want to back down, in the face of Soviet threats? There is no question but that this is our choice. Representatives of President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, have made it perfectly clear that if the United States should recognize the extension of the boundaries of any State beyond the 3-mile limit, we would renounce the grounds on which we have been opposing the illegal attempts of other states to extend their boundaries beyond the 3-mile limit.

If the pending measure is passed, the United States will have to back down on this protest. There is no question about that. I, for one, will never agree that we should do so. I believe that this country should stay in the paths first set for it by Thomas Jefferson, and should continue to support the principle of freedom of the seas, and freedom of the air above the high seas.

I would like the Senate to consider for a moment what the United States is to get in return for giving up this precious birthright. I would like the Senate to consider whether the proposal contained in the pending measure is for the best interest of all of the 48 States. With reference to our fishing interests, we are giving up the right to fish within 10½ miles of any foreign shores. We are encouraging a stampede of claims, which may result in our being forced off the Continental Shelf, so far as fishing is concerned, except where it is adjacent to our own shores. These rights are being given up by fishermen of every State, not merely by the fishermen of Texas and Florida. But only Texas and Florida are getting any benefits from the proposed extension. The fishermen of other States are not benefiting. They may be losing even the right to fish off the coasts of Texas and Florida, between 3 and 10½ miles, which they have previously had.

Insofar as Senate Joint Resolution 13 would impair the national security by cutting the ground out from under our protests against the illegal Soviet attempts to extend their territorial water to 12 miles, and, undoubtedly beyond, it would injure every State in the Union. Yet what would 46 of the 48 States receive in return? They would not get even the cold comfort of an extension of the territorial waters of the United States in those areas where it at least could be argued—although I believe incorrectly—that this would promote national security. No one has argued that it is in the interests of our national security that the United States extend its territorial waters along the Texas or Florida coasts of the Gulf of Mexico. When the Members of the Senate consider the extensive bases which we have in the Caribbean I am sure they will agree that such an argument could not be seriously made. Yet it is for this mess of pottage that we are now considering taking a step which would involve surendering our sacred birthrights, freedom of the seas and freedom of the air over the seas. It is for this reason that I shall vote against Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, immediately following the remarks which I delivered earlier today, there may be printed in the RECORD editorials on the pending joint resolution published in the Milwaukee Journal, the Nashville Tennessean, the Atlanta Constitution, the Miami Herald, and the Daytona Beach Evening News.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 25, 1953]

WHO'LL GUARD THE TIDELANDS?

The ironic aspect of the quitclaim plan is that, if any of the involved States run into international disputes in extracting oil from the Continental Shelf, it will be the Government of the 48 States that will have to come to their aid. Texas and Florida, for example, claim land out to 10½ miles—7½ miles beyond the line to which the United States asserts jurisdiction. If Texas oil drillers in international waters get into trouble, as Texas shrimpers have in the past, the State Department or the Navy will be expected to guard their rights.

Since the Federal Government is expected to protect American interests in such areas, it should be entrusted with administering the offshore oil lands and proceeds from them should go to all the States.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of April 23, 1953]

WHAT SAYS THE GOP LEADER?

Republican leadership now realizes its serious miscalculation in deciding to give offshore oil lands quitclaim legislation priority in the Senate.

Confident of enough votes to approve this colossal grab of natural resources in the final test, majority party strategists seemed to take it for granted that all opposition would fold up in unconditional surrender. It expected no extended debate on a subject of such vital importance, and now emits anguished cries because the people are being fully advised of what the oil deal really means.

If it pleases Senator ROBERT TAFT and others to berate the able Democrats, in company with a few liberal Republicans, who are making a last-ditch fight to preserve the multibillion dollar oil resources for all of the States rather than bestow them upon a very few, they are welcome to do so.

The fact remains, however, that two dozen or more Senators who oppose depriving the Government of the oil deposits in which it has a paramount interest, according to a Supreme Court ruling, are performing a distinguished public service. It is gratifying to note that Senators KEFAUVER and GORE, of Tennessee, are leaders in this fight.

Presumably, the Republicans eventually will carry their point unless an enlightened national citizenship intervenes. But it is fitting that this anticipated victory should not occur until the fullest light has been shed on every aspect of the issue through unhurried discussion and debate.

From the Republican standpoint, the offshore oil giveaway is being retarded by a filibuster participated in by some Members who are on record as opposed to such tactics.

From the standpoint of the opposition, however, no final action must be taken without public understanding of a complicated question which was subjected to all sorts of interpretations during the election campaign, and so obviously was never well understood by the Republican candidate for President.

Even now the majority party's congressional leadership is pressing for passage of the Holland State-ownership bill although spokesmen for the Eisenhower administration have advised against giving States ownership of offshore lands to the extent of their historic boundaries. Both the State Department and the Attorney General have noted the international complications that would result from permitting States to extend their authority beyond the traditional 3-mile limit. There is also involved the question of discrimination between States admitted to the Union on equal footing.

Even though President Eisenhower was confused on offshore oil before election, he has had plenty of time to study the subject and reach a definite decision. And as the leader of his party, who has said he would sign the Holland bill, he has a duty to clarify his position.

Twenty-five Senators have taken steps to rescue the President from his untenable position, and they are to be commended for doing so. Specifically, they have asked whether he supports the State claims to boundaries before the 3-mile limit and what his attitude will be on future efforts by other than the tideland States to extend their boundary lines.

In matters of this kind, President Eisenhower usually prefers to take the stand that he does not want to interfere with the Congress. But the issue in question is too important to be thus ignored, especially so in view of the part it played in the election.

In a sense the President has become a symbol of the come-and-get-it attitude as regards the public domain, but if this does him an injustice, he can absolve himself with no more than a few clear and definite words.

With his election, there was much talk of brave and forthright leadership in the White House, but we have not yet had it in regard to offshore oil nor the other resources of the Nation which are being covetously eyed by private interests.

The Nation is entitled to the answers sought by the group of Senators who stand against a legalized Teapot Dome transaction, and it will not redound to the President's credit if he fails to give them in terms beyond misunderstanding.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of April 24, 1953]

TIDELANDS FACTS ARE EYE OPENING

"No, it's not a filibuster, it's an educational campaign. The people are not aware of what is at stake in the tidelands-oil fight and must be informed, with the floor of the Senate as the forum."

It seems to us we've heard that argument before and that some of the loudest opposition to southerners' use of the device in the

arguments over civil-rights legislation are now leading the parade in harassment of TAFT in the big oil giveaway.

Regardless of what it's called, the old Shakespearean adage would apply: "A rose by any other name smells as sweet." And sweet-smelling, indeed, to southern Senators has been their old ace in the hole, the filibuster, until now some of them find it turned upon themselves.

Perhaps it was never invoked for a better purpose than in the present instance, an attempt to awaken the public to what could well become known in the future as the great tidelands robbery.

There are a few States, notably Texas, Florida, and California, that will profit from this bill. All others are in the ludicrous position of robbing themselves. Billions of dollars in natural resources would be given up to these 3 States at the expense of the other 45.

Wednesday 25 Senators called on the President to clarify what the administration considers the boundaries of States in connection with offshore lands. Since the United States Government was established, the accepted boundaries have been 3 miles to seaward of the low-water mark. Texas and Florida claim 10½ miles and the bill in question leaves the door wide open for even further extension by providing for recognition of any State boundaries heretofore and hereafter approved by Congress.

Total oil resources on the Continental Shelf are estimated to have a total value of almost $300 billion. The Holland bill would turn over a great percentage of these assets to three, perhaps four, States, leaving the way open for their eventual acquisition of it all.

In a few words, the issue is summed up well by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, as follows:

"These huge treasures of offshore oil and gas which are the property of the Nation should not be given to the comparative few. They should be used to help meet the costs of national defense, to reduce the public debt, to wipe out illiteracy and to develop through education the human resources of the country. These are the great purposes for which these natural resources are to be used.

"If we alienate the offshore oil and gas, then the Mountain States will demand the mineral rights on Government land within their boundaries; there will be a drive to turn over the forests and uplands now owned by the Federal Government to the States which will mean that they will be overcut and overgrazed. The results will be greater floods and soil erosion."

We agree. We also agree that there is a need for a prolonged educational campaign on the subject. The Supreme Court has spoken already. It's now up to the people.

[From the Miami Herald of April 25, 1953]

STATE SENATE ASKED TO ACT ON SHRIMPERS

TALLAHASSEE.—The Florida Senate was asked Friday to request Congress to make a treaty with Mexico so Florida shrimp boats may be safeguarded while fishing in Gulf of Mexico waters.

Senator Wayne Ripley, Jacksonville, said in a resolution the "right of citizens of the State of Florida have been improperly and unlawfully interfered with by the Government of Mexico while they were on the high seas and engaged in a peaceful pursuit of their lawful occupation.

He asked that Florida shrimpers be protected while plying their trade on the high seas of the Gulf.

The resolution came while the United States Government and Mexico discussed rights of Florida and Texas shrimpers in waters near Mexico.

The Mexican Government contends shrimping from this country are violating its territorial waters. The shrimpers argue Mexican gunboats have run them in illegally from waters far off Mexico.

Thirty-three shrimpers and their boats were seized in March by the Mexican gunboats.

Most of the Florida shrimp boats fishing in Gulf waters are based at Tampa and Fort Myers.

Ripley's resolution was referred to the game and fish committee.

[From the Daytona Beach Evening News of April 27, 1953]

OIL FOR THE NATION

This week the prolonged fight continues in the United States Senate over whether a few coastal States or all of the 48 which make up the strength of our Nation shall hold title to the submerged oil and mineral resources lying along parts of the seacoast.

At the weekend President Eisenhower took a hand in the dispute by pleading publicity for passage of the measure which some few of the coastal States and private oil interests have been so fervently pushing for enactment.

Against these advocates of one of the biggest grabs in the Nation's history are arrayed a group of determined Senators who have been urging the passage of legislation which would continue the Federal ownership of the offshore wealth, pay the coastal States a handsome royalty when the oil and other minerals are marketed, and pool the remainder in a fund to aid primary, secondary, and higher education.

How the issue finally is decided will have a profound and far-reaching effect on future national policy in the ownership and management of natural resources which tradition has held generally to be Federal property.

Backing the pressure for passage of the coastal State grab bill has been a great deal of propaganda asking us to believe that for some mysterious reason the Federal Government is something to be distrusted and feared, and that only separate States and certain private interests are to be trusted in the disposition of natural resources. Many Federal officials in high places are nurturing this amazing doctrine.

The conservative New York Times, which supported Eisenhower in the presidential campaign, parts company with him on the vital issue of what should be done with the offshore wealth. Says the Times in an editorial entitled "Oil for the Nation":

"One of the greatest and surely the must unjustified giveaway programs in the history of the United States is taking place before our eyes. The administration has endorsed in principle, the House has already approved and the Senate within a few days apparently will approve this plan to give to the people of a handful of States billions upon billions of dollars worth of undersea oil that rightly belongs—and always has belonged—to the people of the entire Nation."

The giveaway legislation, the Times point out, "is cast in such form as to lead to endless legal complications, international as well as domestic. For instance, it would recognize historic boundaries in some cases far beyond the 3 mile limit on which the United States has always insisted in its relations with other countries. Since nobody, including the proponents of the bill, knows just where the historic boundaries lie anyway, the confusion will be indescribable. Furthermore, the bill would lead the way for State claims to other federally held resources within the States, including public lands and forests. It would deprive the Federal Government of direct control over a vital reserve for the national defense."

The Times supports the position of such outstanding Senators as DOUGLAS, of Illinois, LEHMAN, of New York, HILL, of Alabama, and ANDERSON, of New Mexico, who, its editorial says, "offer a sound alternative in the Anderson bill, which would confirm Federal jurisdiction over the offshore resources and State jurisdiction over lands beneath tidal and inland waters, and would give the coastal States a percentage royalty on oil taken from within the 3 mile limit."

Under this bill all money received by the Federal Government from leases for oil development would be used exclusively to aid education throughout the Nation.

"What sums of this order would mean to education in all 48 States is self-evident," says the Times. "Again we urge the Senate leadership and the administraion to think through the offshore oil question and to look at it in terms of benefit to the Nation."

Unfortunately, that phrase, "benefit to the Nation," is about the same thing to some very selfish people as a red rag to a bull. These days the pressure for local and special interests rides high over those great traditions whose prophets had respect for the general welfare.

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum with the understanding that it will not infringe the Senator's rights to the floor?

Mr. MALONE. I yield with that understanding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Nevada yields to the Senator from Ohio for the purpose and upon the condition stated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McClellan
Anderson	Griswold	Millikin
Barrett	Hayden	Monroney
Beall	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Robertson
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N.J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Lehman	Symington
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	Magnuson	Thye
Frear	Malone	Tobey
Fulbright	Mansfield	Watkins
George	Martin	Welker
Gillette	Maybank	Williams
Goldwater	McCarran	Young
Gore	McCarthy	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr.

HOEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has the floor.

AMENDMENT TO UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield in order that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MALONE. If I may do so without losing the floor and without the time being counted against me.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada may yield under the conditions which he has named.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there are a number of amendments. If we dispose of them in accordance with the schedule, we are going to run very far into the evening. I have talked with, I think, all the proposers of the amendments, and I should like to amend the present unanimous-consent agreement by providing that the debate upon any amendment, motion, or appeal which may be pending or which may be made or proposed be limited to 2 hours instead of 4 hours. I think that would be agreeable except, perhaps, to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I ask that his amendment be excepted from that proposal.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am not sure that I will take that length of time, but I should like to have my remarks complete. I am offering an amendment to my substitute.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I make that unanimous-consent request as an amendment to the unanimous-consent agreement dated April 28, 1953, except as to the amendment in the nature of the substitute for the committee amendment, offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROTECT THE RECLAMATION FUND—TREAT THE PUBLIC-LAND STATES ALIKE

The Chair wishes to inquire whether the Senator from Nevada proposes to offer an amendment.

Mr. MALONE. I intend to offer an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada desire to waive the reading of the amendment at this time, but to have the amendment printed in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada should like to have his amendment read later during his discussion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

OUTMODED FEDERAL LAND LEGISLATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, for 50 years the public-land States have been plagued and harassed with the problems presented in connection with the public lands within their borders, and with the outmoded Federal land legislation.

I assure my colleagues that the problem is not new.

Senate Joint Resolution 13 represents a glancing blow at the problem, and is designated to wet down rising sentiment in the three powerful States of California, Louisiana, and Texas, without the necessary consideration which a subject of this magnitude requires and deserves.

DANGEROUS PRECEDENTS

There has been little consideration of the precedents which would be established by the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13 and the ultimate effect they would have upon the public-land States as such the 8 States embraced in the Intermountain Area.

The Coast States, while within the public-land category, have so many diversified industries and investments that the public lands are not their chief interest.

THE 1841 PREEMPTION ACT

A general overhaul of Federal public land legislation, beginning with the Preemption Act of 1841, is long overdue. Starting with that act, the congressional policy was clearly that of holding the public lands in trust for the States, until such time as a Federal law could be enacted whereby such lands could become subject to private ownership and therefore be a part of the taxable property of the States.

WITHHOLDING KNOWN MINERAL RIGHTS

The Federal Government has consistently followed the policy of withholding known mineral rights when deeding such lands to the States or to individuals under the Federal land laws. That is a century-old policy. However, if that century-old policy is to be changed, then I wish to offer an amendment that would, if accepted, result in all the public-land States being treated alike.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

MINERAL RIGHTS TO STATES—TREAT PUBLIC-LAND STATES ALIKE

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 7, it is proposed to insert before "this joint resolution" the following: "Titles I and II of."

On page 19, line 14, it is proposed to insert before "this joint resolution" the following: "Titles I and II of."

At the end of such joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following:

TITLE III—MINERAL RIGHTS IN PUBLIC LANDS GRANTED TO STATES

SEC. 12. Subject to the provisions of section 13 of this joint resolution all minerals and mineral rights in deposits in the public lands belonging to the United States, including (1) lands temporarily withdrawn or reserved for classification purposes, and (2) lands within grazing districts established pursuant to Public Law 482, 73d Congress, approved June 28, 1934, as amended (commonly known as the Taylor Grazing Act, except any such lands forming a part of a national forest, are hereby granted to the several States within the territorial boundaries of which such lands are situated. Such minerals and mineral rights and the proceeds derived from the sale, lease, or other disposition thereof shall be used for such purposes as the respective legislatures of such States shall determine.

SEC. 13. (a) The provisions of section 12 of this joint resolution shall not apply (1) to any public lands with respect to which any entry has been made, or any right or claim has been initiated, under the provisions of law in force on the date of acceptance by the State of the grant made by such section except that upon the relinquishment or cancellation of such entry, application, right, or claim such lands shall become immediately subject to the provisions of this section, or (2) with respect to deposits of materials essential to the production of fissionable materials reserved for the use of the United States under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

(b) The grant made by section 12 of this joint resolution shall take effect with respect to the lands within a particular State whenever the legislature of such State (1) enacts legislation providing for the location and development of mineral deposits in the public lands of such State, corresponding to the laws then in effect relating to the location and development of mineral deposits in the public lands of the United States, (2) assumes in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior all obligations of the United States with respect to any valid claims, rights, or privileges existing upon the date of acceptance by the State of the grant, and (3) by resolution, accepts the grants and deposits a certified copy of such resolution with the Secretary of the Interior. Upon receipt of a certified copy of a resolution of acceptance from any State and an instrument evidencing the assumption of such obligations, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be delivered to the proper officials of such State such maps, records, books, and documents as may be necessary for the enjoyment, control, use, administration, and disposition of such lands.

(c) Upon the acceptance by any State of such grants as provided in subsection (b) all laws and regulations relating to mineral rights and deposits in the public lands shall cease to be applicable to the public lands within such State, but such laws shall continue in force with respect to the lands and deposits excepted under this title.

SEC. 14. As used in this title—

(a) Subject to the provisions of section 12 of this joint resolution, the term "public lands" means the public domain, surveyed or unsurveyed, unappropriated lands, and lands not held back or reserved for any special governmental or other public purpose.

(b) The term "State" means any State of the Union.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters; to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries; and for other purposes."

TOTAL PUBLIC LAND IN THE UNITED STATES, 455,632,000 ACRES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in order that distinguished Members of this body may obtain an idea of the amount of land included in the public lands of the United States, I ask unanimous con-

sent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table containing a list of the several States, showing rural land holdings in Federal ownership. Each of the 48 States has public lands and the table shows the amount of public lands in Federal ownership.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rural landholdings in Federal ownership, 455,632,000 acres

	Acres
Alabama	966,000
Arizona	50,749,000
Arkansas	3,049,000
California	45,993,000
Colorado	25,094,000
Connecticut	14,000
Delaware	40,000
Florida	2,829,000
Georgia	1,841,000
Idaho	34,444,000
Illinois	450,000
Indiana	341,000
Iowa	107,000
Kansas	322,000
Kentucky	989,000
Louisiana	1,064,000
Maine	134,000
Maryland	216,000
Massachusetts	62,000
Michigan	2,801,000
Minnesota	3,829,000
Mississippi	1,480,000
Missouri	1,646,000
Montana	34,307,000
Nebraska	740,000
Nevada	59,008,000
New Hampshire	683,000
New Jersey	96,000
New Mexico	34,793,000
New York	354,000
North Carolina	1,931,000
North Dakota	2,681,000
Ohio	251,000
Oklahoma	3,769,000
Oregon	32,772,000
Pennsylvania	584,000
Rhode Island	19,000
South Carolina	952,000
South Dakota	8,644,000
Tennessee	1,347,000
Texas	2,723,000
Utah	37,919,000
Vermont	226,000
Virginia	2,074,000
Washington	15,381,000
West Virginia	947,000
Wisconsin	2,242,000
Wyoming	32,723,000
Total	455,632,000

PUBLIC LANDS—SINCE PUBLIC LAND LAWS OBSOLETE

Mr. MALONE. In the State of Arizona 50,749,000 acres are public lands. In the State of Nevada 59,008,000 acres are public lands, out of Nevada's total of 70,600,000 acres in the entire State.

At this point I wish to read a portion of a letter which I addressed to the Secretary of the Interior on December 28, 1950, relative to some of the public lands in the State of Nevada which constitute a part of the great area included within the boundaries of my State.

I have heretofore said on the floor of the Senate that perhaps Members of the Senate did not understand the value of the remaining public lands, and why they are still public lands. The 11 Western States are the principal public-land States. The two Dakotas are next in importance in this category.

The reason why most of such lands are still public lands, excluding those held in Federal and State reservations and by departments of Government for governmental uses—is that they are such poor lands, and their productive capacity is so small that the public land laws are inapplicable to them for the most part.

THE 1872 MINING STATUTE

The only exception is the 1872 mining statute, which permits the location of a mining claim 600 by 1,500 feet on any of the unappropriated public lands by anyone who discovers a vein or a mineral showing by visably staking such claim on the ground and doing the required assessment work.

On December 28, 1950, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, from which I read:

Hon. OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In accordance with our conversation dealing with the remaining lean desert-range areas located in the three counties of Landor, Eureka, and Nye in my State of Nevada, I am attaching an outline of suggested legislation that could furnish a feasible approach to the problem [public land].

GRAZING BILL—CUSTOMARY USE

I enclosed a copy of a bill which would recognize, in those three counties, known then as district No. 6, the use of the lands in accordance with customary use under the Taylor Grazing Act.

Under the 1934 Taylor Grazing Act the Government of the United States sought to organize a district in each of the areas in Nevada, as well as other public-land States, and to charge for the use of grazing areas, as well as to regulate the number of cattle and sheep that could be grazed on such areas.

This could be done independent of the customary users of such public range—public lands. My bill provides that the use of the lands be recognized in accordance with customary use in connection with the feed-producing ranches and water rights, just as is the case in the use of water. You do not own the water, you own the use of it and can lose it by nonuse. For the past 60 or 70 years users of the land in the West have appropriated water for beneficial use. The first in time was the first in right. The right could be lost by nonuse. I suggested that the same rule apply to the range.

Over a period of 50, 60, or 70 years, depending upon the time the lands were settled, the livestock users blocked out the use of the range lands themselves.

That is to say, the size of the feed-producing ranches was governed by the amount of water available for irrigation. The amount of range needed in connection with the feed-producing ranches was governed by the amount of feed produced. Anyone familiar with the desert areas knows how that is done. Then certain water from springs in the mountains was blocked out by those who used the range for stock watering on the range.

METHOD DOES NOT RECOGNIZE CONDITIONS

Then along came Uncle Sam's agents. Some of them were fairly familiar with the customs in the desert areas, but others were graduates of eastern agricultural schools, coming into the desert for the first time.

They could see no grass at all on some of the lands, and they started cutting down the herds. Of course, such random cutting is what was ruining, and still is ruining, the livestock growers of the West and of the public-land States in general.

Continuing to read from my letter to the Secretary of the Interior:

I am advised that there are 7,367,000 acres included in the area divided between the 3 counties, as follows:

Lander County	2,445,502
Eureka County	1,357,806
Nye County	3,563,692
Total	7,367,000

This is where the truth shines through:

The approximately 200 acres to the cow unit annually, that your people estimate is necessary on the average—some areas will require much more and some less—just about approaches the roller skate requirement for the cow to cover that much area in time to get enough to eat.

The new approach for this thin production area is not proposed as a cure-all but simply as a method for your department to bridge an impossible situation where you cannot possibly charge enough rental for the use of such lands, to return the cost of supervision to the Government.

This approach will provide a method for the Government to become entirely familiar with the actual conditions—to advise in the matter of mining development, fish and game conservation, and the development of the recreation facilities, without injuring the established livestock units, which I am sure is your real objective—

To give him the benefit of the doubt—

If you agree with me that the new approach should be tried out and in the event it does not merit continuation after a reasonable time, I will personally advocate the repeal of the legislation and in no event is any other area affected by the special act.

I will await your call to further discuss the details and will introduce the proper legislation when we are agreed upon procedure.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

RAINFALL ON THE DESERT 6 TO 12 INCHES—MOSTLY SNOW

Mr. President, I have before me a memorandum written by Mr. William Zimmerman, Jr., Assistant Director, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, under date of December 26, 1950. It is a memorandum to the Secretary of the Interior. It reads:

Subject: Nevada Grazing District No. 6.

Tabulated below is the information requested by telephone covering precipitation and average grazing capacity in Esmeralda, Eureka, Lander, and Nye Counties, Nev.

Mr. President, Eureka County has an annual rainfall of 6.26 to 12.17 inches. That is the annual rainfall. Varies according to elevation.

Lander County has rainfall of 6.17 to 12.22 inches.

Nye County has rainfall each year of 3.07 to 12.29 inches.

The desert accounts for from 3 to 6 inches—mostly winter snow.

A considerable amount of the desert can only be pastured by livestock during the winter months, when snow is available.

In the city of Washington, where the temperature in summer often exceeds 90 degrees, and there is high humidity, there are times when as much water accumulates on the grass at night, in the form of dew, as we in Nevada get in many weeks through rainfall or snowfall in the desert areas. Most of the moisture in Nevada is in the form of snow in the winter.

Mr. Zimmerman continues:

Carrying capacity: Estimated average, 12 acres per animal-unit month.

That, Mr. President, is equal to 144 acres a year. That is the average. It probably runs from 30 to 40 acres per cow unit a year up to 250 acres. In other words, in some of those desert areas it reaches a point where a cow cannot walk far enough in a day to get enough to eat; so she turns around and goes back toward the mountains or to the ranch. The description is of much of the land under discussion, and is the kind of land concerning which we are asked to establish a precedent without adequate examination and debate.

The memorandum is signed by William Zimmerman, Jr. Mr. Zimmerman never did have a very favorable reputation for favoring the stockman, so it may be assumed he is conservative in his figures.

1930–32 REPORT—STATE ENGINEER OF NEVADA—GEORGE W. MALONE

Mr. President, I wish to read from page 87 of the report of the State engineer of Nevada for the period January 1, 1931, to June 30, 1932, inclusive. I may say that it is my own report, as I was State engineer from 1927 to 1935. I read as follows:

It is not generally realized by people of the Midwest and Eastern States just how small our western development really is in comparison to the total development of the United States, or the obstacles that must be surmounted for further development.

Nevada, for example, has a total area of 70,285,440 acres, of which less than 500,000 acres are actually under intensive cultivation, or approximately three-quarters of 1 percent (0.75 percent). The total irrigated acreage in the 17 Western States is approximately 18,500,000 acres, which is, in itself, insignificant compared to the estimated total of 400 million cultivated acres in the United States. Approximately 1,500,000 acres of the 18,500,000 have been brought under cultivation on the Government reclamation projects.

Mr. President, the report is dated 1933. It will be understood, therefore, that there has been some increase in acreage since the time the report was written. I read further:

Our policy with respect to utilization is outlined in detail under "The State Range Commission," on page 71, but in general our policy with respect to national legislation has been to have it so drawn that our State laws in this connection would be recognized when they were not discriminatory between the States, and that such legislation would not be operative exception by the request of the State involved or the actual users of such range, feeling that we would be amply protected in that event, and at the same time would not be preventing other States from securing such supervision as they might desire.

This was the policy of the State Range Commission.

SUCCESSION OF FEDERAL LAWS—INDIVIDUAL OWNERSHIP

Mr. President, since the Preemption Act of 1841, followed by the Homestead Act in 1862, then by the Mining Act of 1872, and later by a number of acts designed to make public land available for individuals in family-sized units, the policy of Congress has been clear.

It has been the policy to hold public lands in trust for the States until such time as there could be provided a Federal law under which the public lands would go on the tax rolls of the States through individual ownership. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a marked excerpt from a memorandum entitled "Vacant Public Lands, Areas by States, and Other Information," issued by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

The excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC-LAND LAWS

The principal public-land laws governing the acquisition of title to vacant public lands are as follows:

1. The homestead laws permit acquisition of agricultural lands through settlement, cultivation, and improvement. For further information, request Information Bulletin No. 3 and Circular No. 1728.

2. The desert-land laws permit acquisition of arid, irrigable lands through cultivation, improvement, and payment of $1.25 per acre. For further information, request Circular No. 1731.

3. The public-sale laws permit acquisition at public auction of isolated tracts and rough and mountainous tracts at not less than their appraised value. For further information, request Circular No. 1732.

4. The mining laws permit acquisition of mineral lands after valid discovery and development of specified minerals. For further information, request Circular No. 1278.

5. For general information on acquisition of vacant public lands in Alaska, request Information Bulletin 2.

6. For veterans' rights and privileges, request Circular No. 1720.

The principal public-land laws governing the leasing of vacant public lands are as follows:

1. The Taylor Grazing Act permits use of forage lands outside of grazing districts under lease. For further information, request Circular No. 1705.

2. The Small-Tract Act permits use under lease of not more than 5 acres of lands chiefly suitable for home, health, recreational, convalescent, cabin, camp, and business sites. The leases often contain an option to purchase at appraised value at the expiration of 1 year. For further information, request Circular No. 1724.

3. The mineral-leasing laws permit exploitation of specified minerals upon payment of rentals and royalties. For further information, request circulars governing the mineral in which you are interested.

The regulations covering the acquisition of title to, or rights in, the vacant public lands under the above acts and other laws are published in title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations of the United States of America, copies of which can be found in many local libraries.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the provisions of the 160-acre Homestead Act was designed to fit Ohio, Iowa, eastern Kansas, Missouri, and other fertile areas of public lands. Those lands were taken up by individuals for a $16 filing fee, and they comprise the most valuable corn and wheat land in the world.

HOMESTEAD ACT—ADDITIONAL HOMESTEADS

However, in the case of the desert areas, the formula does not fit such land. That is why the additional Homestead Act was enacted, after it was found that the 160-acre provision did not work on the semiarid areas of western Kansas. Then it was found that such a provision did not fit the mesa land and the plateaus in Colorado. Therefore, it was found necessary to provide the additional 640-acre homestead provision.

Finally, when the country expanded and reached into the great American desert, it was found that none of the acts fitted the situation there.

That is the reason we still have public lands—no Federal act has to date been enacted to allow them to be taken up by individuals in such amounts to support a family.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP—FAMILY-SIZE UNITS

Of course, Mr. President, this policy has never affected the reserves, the parks, monuments, forest reserves, and fish and game preserves. Such lands have never been and will not be disturbed. We are talking only about the lands which are left to the people of the United States to which for 140 years Congress has continually tried to adopt public land laws so they may be taken up by individuals in family-size units and placed on the tax rolls of the States.

CENTURY AND A QUARTER—PIECEMEAL LEGISLATION

It is also clear that the public-land acts were developed and were enacted on a piecemeal basis over almost a century and a quarter.

The time has long since arrived when public lands legislation should be reviewed and a method arrived at by which the lands I have described could be placed in private ownership, on the tax rolls of the States.

PUBLIC-LAND QUESTION—ACADEMIC WITH EASTERN-MIDWESTERN STATES

Mr. President, it is very easy for people living in Ohio, Iowa, or Georgia, and even in New York State, where almost every foot of land is under cultivation, to talk at random and to vote at random on the subject of public lands. If the Representatives of those States will visit the junior Senator from Nevada in his State he will make sure that they understand what the term "public lands" to the "public-land" States means before they return to the next session of Congress—more especially to a State more than 80 percent owned by the Federal Government.

MINING ACT PRACTICAL AND USEFUL

The Mining Act of 1872 is practical and useful in encouraging mining and production of minerals on public lands. It is about the only act left on the books which fits the situation. For 20 years the administration has tried to substitute a leasing act for the location method under the 1872 mining statute, so the last vestige of any kind of land which a man

without money may take up, and not be subservient to a bureau official, would be gone.

The mining statute of 1872 is the last act on the books under which a man without money may locate a mineral claim by putting a stake in the ground, with a note in a tobacco can attached to it, and provided he can beat anyone else to the recorder of his county and register it.

If he does that, the claim is his. He has 30 days in which to put up his corners, and then if he does a certain amount of work each year it is his, just the same as a home which is purchased and paid for. Then, after he has done as much as $500 work on the property, he can get a mineral surveyor to survey his claim—and then for a fee of $5 an acre he can purchase it from the Government—it makes no difference whether the land is producing nothing or a million dollars a year the land belongs to the man who first filed on it.

However, most of the remaining land acts are not practicable at all except under certain conditions.

However, the Homestead Act, the Additional Homestead Act, and the Stock Homestead Grazing Act are practically valueless unless underground water can be located and the right to its use secured.

NO EFFECT ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. President, much has been said about what the effect the production of petroleum for national defense would be if the public lands were deeded to the States, or if they were not deeded to the States.

I will say to you, Mr. President, without fear of contradiction, that the passage or the defeat of Senate Joint Resolution 13 will have absolutely no effect or influence on the availability of the petroleum under the controversial sea bottom lands for national defense. I would be very glad to debate that point with anyone, either now or at any future time.

If the joint resolution does not pass, such lands will be leased by the Federal Government under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the so-called National Oil and Gas Leasing Act.

If the joint resolution does pass, the lands will be leased by the States in question—namely, California, Texas, and Louisiana—and by any other coastal State, wherever oil is discovered, according to the joint resolution as written.

THE RECLAMATION FUND

The difference is that if the lands remain in Government ownership, the royalty received will be divided, with 37½ percent going to the States wherein the oil and gas is located, 52½ percent to the reclamation fund, which is the chief source of new funds for the arid and semiarid States to develop desert lands into productive agricultural homes, and 10 percent to the Federal Government, presumably for supervision.

The National Oil and Gas Leasing Act was passed in 1920, and since that time it has operated successfully.

GOVERNMENT WOULD ASK FOR BIDS

The chief difference is disclosed in that under the Government system of leasing, as specified in the Mineral Leasing Act, the applications for a permit to prospect for oil and gas provide for a 12½-percent royalty in the first instance; but when further leases are issued on known or proven fields, bids must be asked for, and the royalty might be any amount. For example, it is known that the city of Long Beach, Calif., receives as much as 68 percent net from such procedure, or about 94 percent gross, because of negotiated bids or bids upon nonproducing oil lands.

However, the State of California adheres to the 12½ percent royalty even in known fields, which is important to the lessee.

REGULAR APPLICANTS FORGOTTEN

Another important fact, little discussed during the hearings in either the Senate or the House committee, is that the applicants to the Federal Government for permits to prospect for oil and gas under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 were disregarded in connection with the sea-bottom lands. If Senate Joint Resolution 13, the so-called Holland joint resolution, is enacted, the lands will go to the States; and these applicants to the Government for permits to prospect for oil and gas, some of whom made application to the Federal Government, under the Mineral Leasing Act, in the late 1920's, and at least 11 applications, in which approximately 400 or 500 individuals are interested, would be disregarded, although the latest application was filed on March 6, 1934.

LIST OF 11 APPLICATIONS—SEVERAL HUNDRED INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED

Madam President (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair), I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the table appearing on page 241 of the hearings held before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 13, from February 6 to March 4, 1953.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Serial No.—	Date of filing	Applicant	Acreage
LA-051847	Mar. 5, 1934	Deryl L. Mayhew	1,600
LA-051805	Feb. 6, 1934	J. Cunningham	1,600
LA-052140	Sept. 6, 1934	Arthur M. Weirick	640
LA-052146	Sept. 11, 1934	Charles W. List	1,600
LA-052149	Sept. 13, 1934	Patrick George Quinn	960
LA-052150	do	Clifford Finley	1,280
LA-052165	Sept. 22, 1934	W. W. Duncan	960
LA-052331	Feb. 16, 1935	Ronald W. Jensen	1,600
LA-052406	Mar. 8, 1935	J. B. Primm	1,600
LA-051843	Mar. 3, 1934	Hubert L. Rose, Jr.	300
LA-051848	Mar. 6, 1934	Fred Vermilyea	36

Mr. MALONE. Madam President, it may be that these persons, most of whom have meager financial resources, mean nothing to the Senate. Yet, in 1920, provision was made whereby such applications could be made, and the applications were made. If the pending joint resolution is enacted, those applications will be utterly disregarded.

The 1920 Oil and Gas Leasing Act provides for the disposition of the royalties on the funds received from leases for the production of oil and gas from the public lands of the United States.

The Supreme Court of the United States ruled in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases that the sea-bottom lands seaward from the low-water mark to the State boundary, wherever it is finally fixed, belong to the United States Government.

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT—HIGHEST TITLE

The Supreme Court said the lands do not belong to the State of California or the State of Texas or the State of Louisiana, but that the United States has paramount rights, which Webster's Dictionary defines as meaning the highest title.

The lands in question are public lands or public domain, just the same as Mount Peavine near Reno, Nev., is owned by the public, or, in other words, by the United States Government.

There is no reason why the junior Senator from Nevada could not introduce a bill to transfer the public lands, including Mount Peavine, to the State of Nevada. However, could we claim that as a right? We could not. Neither can the coastal States in the case of the sea-bottom lands, which have been ruled to be public domain.

During the last 30 days a great many words have been hashed and rehashed in committee and on the floor of the Senate. I have either listened to all of them or have read all of them in the RECORD. However, I find that there is a general tendency to shy away from any statement to the effect that the Court said the Federal Government owns these lands. If the Supreme Court did not say the Federal Government owns these lands, when the Court said the Federal Government has paramount rights to them, then I cannot read the dictionary.

Of course, the Supreme Court has said the Federal Government owns these lands; and if the Federal Government owns them and if the lands are not taken up under a Federal act, they are public lands. There can be no question about that.

PUBLIC LANDS REPORT OF 1832

Mr. BARRETT. Madam President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to a report made by the Senate Public Lands Committee in 1832, which is now about 120 years ago. At that time this very question was being debated. The Middle Western States at that time were petitioning the Congress for some liberal action with respect to the public lands. The committee made a report which, in part, reads as follows:

Our pledge would not be redeemed by merely dividing the surface into States and giving them names. The public debt being now paid, the public lands are entirely released from the pledge they were under to that object and are free to receive a new and liberal destination for the release of the States in which they lie. The speedy extinction of the Federal title within their

limits is necessary to the independence of the new States, to their equality with elder States, to the development of their resources, to the subjection of their soil to taxation, cultivation, and settlement, and to the proper enjoyment of their jurisdiction and sovereignty.

It is very clear to me that the Congress followed such a policy down through the years until approximately 20 years ago. In 1934 all settlement and homesteading was suspended on all the public domain in the West, and the public lands other than national parks and forest reserves were administered by the Department of the Interior.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that the original States kept all of the public lands within their borders and that the public lands in the Northwest Territory were turned over to the Federal Government shortly after the Revolutionary War, solely for the purpose of extinguishing the war debt of this country at that time. The Federal Government then had no means of levying taxes of any kind or character, and had no income. Consequently, the public lands were sold, and the proceeds were used to pay off the Revolutionary War debt.

It seems clear to me, Madam President that the Congress in those early days intended that the public lands belonged to the various States of the Union, and not to the Federal Government by the fact that after the debt of the Revolutionary War was paid off, $25 million was left in the Treasury and that money was not kept in the Treasury of the United States for the benefit of the Federal Government, although the Federal Government needed money in order to carry on its operations. Rather, that money was paid to every State then admitted to the Union. It was turned over to the various States as a loan from the Federal Government. Each of the States signed notes and the Treasury still holds those obligations in its files.

Twenty-six States participated in that public-land melon. Of the funds in question, the State of New York received $4,014,520. As the junior Senator from Nevada also knows, the State of New York retained for its own use and benefit all the public domain within its borders. In addition to that, in 1836 the State of New York received $4 million realized from the sale of the public domain. Furthermore, the State of New York received nearly 1 million acres of the public domain in the territory of Wisconsin, the proceeds of which were used to establish the State University at Cornell. Thus the public lands in Wisconsin served as the source of the money that laid the foundation of the endowment of that university originally.

It is therefore perfectly clear, that the Congress intended from the early days of the Republic that the public lands would be held in trust for the use and benefit of the repective States of the Union. That was the policy up to the time of the passage of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934.

In view of this situation, I should like to ask the junior Senator from Nevada, who is well informed on the subject, how can it properly be said that the Mountain States were admitted into the Union on an equal footing with all other States, in light of the fact that the Federal Government retained title to more than half the area of those States?

UNITED STATES POLICY—HOLD LAND IN TRUST FOR THE STATES

Mr. MALONE. Madam President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming whether he does not agree with the junior Senator from Nevada that the history of Federal legislation, until 1934, indicates that it was the desire of the Congress to hold such lands in trust for the States until it could be transferred into individual ownership in family-size units, the Federal lands within State boundaries, in order that the lands might be placed upon the tax rolls?

Mr. BARRETT. That, of course, has been the historic policy of the country. In the beginning, the public lands were first disposed of through sales for small amounts. Later, grants were made to the railroads in order that the transcontinental lines might be built. Grants were also made for the purpose of having toll roads and canals constructed. Later on, as everyone knows, grants were made to the States for the common schools of the country and, later on, under the Morrill Act for the establishment of agricultural colleges in all the States of the Union.

Mr. MALONE. Grants were also made for the purpose of aid for schools within the respective States.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct. Later came the Homestead Act of 1862, which provided for minimum grants of 160 acres which made possible the settlement of the Missouri Valley and of the great Mississippi Valley. Through a subsequent amendment of the act, grants of 320 acres were made available for homestead purposes. To meet the needs of the mountain regions, the Stock Grazing Act was passed, providing for homesteads of a full section with mineral rights being reserved to the Government.

Mr. MALONE. That applied to known minerals.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct. The Eastern States received exclusive dominion of all public lands within their respective borders, and, further than that, they participated in the benefits of public lands lying beyond the boundaries of their respective States, receiving bounties in connection therewith. However, when it comes to legislation concerning the Mountain States, some are unwilling to treat the Western States in the same liberal manner that they have been treated. So it seems to me that some of the representatives from the older and more populous States are assuming a rather ungenerous attitude toward the newer States, and toward the people of those States.

I agree with the Senator from Nevada that title to the lands in question is vested in the Federal Government; nevertheless, it seems to me that that title or ownership is charged with a trust to administer the lands in accordance with our historic policy, and in such manner as to make it possible for the newer States of the West to enjoy the same right and privilege of developing their respective areas as was enjoyed by the older States of the Union, and to be, in every respect, on a basis of equality with them. Consequently, I think that ownership by the Federal Government is charged with the trust and responsibility which I have indicated.

IDENTICAL TREATMENT—PUBLIC-LAND STATES

Mr. MALONE. I may say that is why the junior Senator from Nevada is taking part in this debate today. I have an amendment providing for identical treatment of all public-land States. Approximately 60 million acres of public land, of a total of more than 70 million acres, lies within the State of Nevada, representing more than 80 percent of the total acreage of the State.

How is it possible for a State to operate without grants and without emoluments of any kind in view of the fact that the Federal Government owns 80 percent of the public lands in the State?

I agree heartily with the junior Senator from Wyoming; it was not so intended at the beginning. The Western States have reached a point in their development when the public lands are needed by them. All the older States of the Union have either been granted their land outright, or have taken up the land under Federal land laws. In that situation almost every acre of their public land has been taken up by individual citizens. They took up practically all the land under the existing Federal land laws upon payment of a filing fee of $16 for 160 acres.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WINNING ALL OF THE BETS

As I have heretofore stated on the floor of the Senate, it was ascertained when they reached western Kansas that 160 acres would not afford a living for a family. Under a subsequent homestead act, provision was made for another 160 acres. In that area it became a byword that the Federal Government was betting 160 acres against $16 that the homesteader could not make it—that he would not succeed—and the Federal Government was winning all the bets.

Then the Congress passed the Stock-Grazing and Homestead Act—640 acres. Then when the great American desert was reached the Government began to win all the bets again. The result is that public lands in the desert areas as we know them continue to exist as public land simply because there is no known method by which homesteaders or individuals may take up and patent the land in family-sized units.

Mr. BARRETT. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I regret that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is not presently on the Senate floor. I should like to refer to a statement he has repeatedly made in the Senate to the effect that the public domain in the Western States belongs to all the people of the country. The Senator from Tennessee desires to protect that great resource for the people of Tennessee and for the people of all the other States.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when Tennessee was admitted to the Union, in 1796, no mention

was made about reserving to the Federal Government the public lands within that State. Thereafter, for a number of years, the State of Tennessee contended that it was sole owner of all public lands within her borders—and most of the area of the State consisted of public lands at that time. A settlement was made, whereby Tennessee acquired practically all the public lands within her borders. Furthermore, when the State of Tennessee returned a small portion of the public lands to the Federal Government, it received from the Federal Government in return a considerable portion of land for use in connection with the school system.

Mr. President, I maintain that all the States of the Union ought to be treated on an equal basis. It does not seem right to me for one State to demand and to receive all the public lands lying within its borders, and then, at a later date, have its representatives say, in effect, "We were treated in that manner, but we do not want other States to be treated in the same fair and equal way in which we were treated."

SENATOR BARRETT FORMER GOVERNOR

Mr. MALONE. Madam President, I thank the junior Senator from Wyoming for his contribution. The Senator from Wyoming does understand the public-land questions.

He was Governor of the State of Wyoming, which is a very important State in the public-land picture. I should like to say for the benefit of the Senator from Wyoming that we have heard much talk on this subject in the past month on the Senate floor, and for 2 or 3 weeks prior to that, in committee, and I know the junior Senator from Wyoming has paid the same close attention to the hearings which he has paid to the debate.

PROSPECTIVE EDUCATIONAL FUND, 48 STATES, VERSUS ESTABLISHED RECLAMATION FUND FOR 17 WESTERN ARID AND SEMIARID STATES

We have heard debate with reference to a prospective educational fund. The junior Senator from Wyoming and the junior Senator from Nevada favor education. In the State of Nevada we struggle to collect taxes to educate our children, to pay our teachers, and to keep up with the inflation because of the depreciation of the dollar. That depreciation was not accidental. It is not accidental that the dollar is worth 40 cents or less after 20 years of rule and random printing of money.

The salaries which our teachers receive are inadequate.

SALARIES AND INFLATION

They were adequate at one time, but the salaries remained fixed while the dollar depreciated in value. A teacher who was receiving from $150 to $200 a month in 1924 is now receiving the equivalent of from $70 to $90. There are several ways of lowering salaries. One way is to make money worth less. Salaries should be adjusted.

The Legislature of the State of Nevada this year appropriated more money for schools. It will be a little tougher on us in connection with the tax structure, but we do not ask and beg for a piece of New York in order to do our job.

I want to say to the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming that under the Mineral Leasing Act, commonly known as the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act, the State of Wyoming has received only 37½ percent of the royalties from its oil and gas leases, 52½ percent of the revenue has gone into the reclamation fund, and 10 percent has gone to the Government for supervision.

SECRETARY OF INTERIOR—WEIRD DECISION

With the division of the revenue established for 34 years, the Secretary of the Interior, by one of those weird decisions which are so well known in the Department of the Interior, ruled that when the Supreme Court said the lands were public lands—and that is what the Court said—that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act was not applicable to the sea-bottom lands.

Why did he say that? He said that because prior to the Supreme Court decision, the States had claimed the land, and because the Federal Government had not claimed the land up to that time, therefore, the act was not applicable.

Mr. BARRETT. Madam President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a further question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. As the Senator from Nevada well knows, I do not take the same position as he does on the Holland bill. I favor that legislation. I think that as a matter of right and solely for the purpose of doing equity in the premises, the proposed legislation should pass.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator agree with me that all the States should be treated alike?

Mr. BARRETT. I agree that all the States should be treated alike. That, however, is a matter which should be considered at some future date. The natural resources in the State of Wyoming have produced revenues paid into the Federal Treasury amounting to a total of $146 million. Wyoming is one of the poorer States in the Union. At the present moment the Federal Government is receiving $18 million a year from the oil and gas produced within our borders. We are having a pretty tough time to educate our children and to maintain our State university.

At the same time, the older, richer, and more populous States of the Union are coming forward with very poor grace at this late date and saying that Wyoming is not entitled to develop as all other States.

How can the State of New York in this august body say: "We retained all of the public lands in our State; we used those lands to develop our State and to maintain it. We received $4 million from the public lands sold after the Revolutionary War. We received a million acres of public lands in the Middle West, which we used to establish our great Cornell University. The rules are different now. We have just as much interest in the public lands in Wyoming as the people of Wyoming have. You are not going to develop your State and build a university in order to give your children the education to which they are entitled. You are not going to be able to provide a public school system which will give the little children of Wyoming the benefit accorded to the children of New York."

So, it seems to me, Madam President, that the other States are acting in very poor grace when they say to the western States, "You cannot use for your own development the resources which God gave the people of the West. You have got to divide them up with us."

That, in effect, is the position of some people on this floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I shall yield only for a question. If the Senator from New York would like to ask a question, I shall be very happy to try to answer it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Montana——

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Wyoming was speaking, and I am from Nevada. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEHMAN. I am asking the distinguished Senator from Nevada to take note, if he will, that I should like to answer the statement of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MALONE. May I ask the Senator from New York a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am asking the Senator from Nevada a question.

Mr. MALONE. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has refused to yield in order that I may answer the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MALONE. Ask the question, and I shall try to answer it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well; I will.

Does the Senator from Nevada understand that the State of New York has for many years voted for appropriations to build up the great reclamation and irrigation projects of the West and for the great power projects of the West, Northwest, the Southeast, and the Southwest, even though the State of New York had no direct interest in or benefit from those projects? Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. MALONE. Of course, and I remember, also, that the Senator from New York is interested in a St. Lawrence seaway for New York, costing more than $100 million of public money.

I also remember of approving—as chairman and member of the Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee—more than $65 million of taxpayers money for the State of New York for river and harbors improvement during the last 4 years—1949 to and including 1952—for which no repayment is asked or expected.

I should also like to ask the distinguished Senator from New York if he knows that the projects in my own State are paying back every dime of public money—with the Hoover Dam project paying 3 percent interest.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator realize——

Mr. MALONE. I have listened to practically all the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York, and

I have heard him raise the question of public ownership, but I want the Senator to understand that we in the West repay the Federal Government the money expended on reclamation projects and we pay interest on power-producing projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I yield an additional 10 minutes of my time to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BARRETT. Madam President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am still yielding to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada if it is not a fact that New York State has received no direct interest or benefit from the building of Grand Coulee, Boulder Dam, or the TVA. Yet I, representing what I believe to be the will and approval of the people of New York, have voted for every one of those projects, simply because I believed each one of them was for the benefit of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. I thank you for your attitude in connection with western reclamation projects—you know, of course, that we repay the money expended upon such projects—also that we pay 3 percent interest on the Hoover Dam expenditure in addition to adhering to a definite amortization program.

I hope the distinguished junior Senator from New York also knows that New York does not repay to the Federal Government any of the many millions of dollars expended in his State on flood-control and rivers and harbors improvements.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from Nevada know that the State of New York and other States in the East have paid their share, and more than their share, of all those improvements?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from New York should inform himself so he would know that New York does not repay the millions expended in that State on flood control and rivers and harbors improvements.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to do so.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator from Nevada mention any great or substantial flood-control project that was begun in the State of New York through Federal funds?

Mr. MALONE. I am mentioning rivers and harbors. There have been millions and millions of dollars expended; for the purpose of this argument, I shall say that the Federal Government expended in New York State for rivers and harbors and flood control—1949, $19 million; 1950, $16,800,000; 1951, $18 million, and 1952 $11,600,000. The figures are round numbers.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to see them.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that many billions of dollars have been spent on flood control, for which there has been no return to the Treasury from the individuals or organizations which received direct benefit from flood control in the United States, but that under the reclamation program there is a requirement that every dollar be paid back?

WESTERN PROJECTS REPAID

Mr. MALONE. It is required that money spent for reclamation be returned to the Treasury and for Federal power development to be paid back with interest, while New York, Texas, Louisiana, and California are among the chief beneficiaries under the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act where no money is returned. We do not begrudge those developments. They are made in pursuance of a policy of Congress.

PUBLIC LAND OIL LEASES VERSUS EASTERN OIL LEASES

However, in passing I should like to say that whenever an oil lease is made in New York or in Ohio, the lease is made with the individual owner of such lands who is the only beneficiary.

This is because the individual owner of land owns the mineral rights and no one would will it otherwise.

WEIRD DECISION BY SECRETARY OF INTERIOR

Almost immediately following the Supreme Court decision of June 23, 1947, holding that the Federal Government had paramount rights, the Secretary of the Interior ruled in a weird, labored decision that, whereas the Government owned the sea-bottom lands in question, such lands were not subject to lease under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920.

The Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, Mastin G. White, said in his opinion, which is a masterpiece of open-field running, to support a decision already reached by a Secretary of the Interior:

> Land situated below high-water mark has not been regarded heretofore as included in the term "public lands." For this reason alone, it may be concluded that the Mineral Leasing Act does not apply to the submerged lands, as they are, of course, below low tide.

NO QUESTION OF TIDELANDS OWNERSHIP BY STATES

I call attention to the fact that there has never been any question but that the tidelands belong to the States.

Thirty or forty decisions have given the tidelands to the States. So it was that Mr. White rendered the opinion from which I have just quoted. It required imagination to reach this conclusion for the reason given.

No one has ever asserted that the submerged lands or the sea-bottom lands were not below low tide.

There are no States' rights involved in this controversy, because the Supreme Court said that the sea-bottom lands have always belonged to the United States, in spite of the claim to ownership by several States—that the principal of laches, or estoppel, or adverse possession does not run against the Federal Government.

The decision by the Solicitor General would appear to be a masterpiece of reasoning, since the Court in ruling that the sea-bottom lands were public lands said specifically that the Federal paramount rights in the 3-mile belt have not been lost by reason of the conduct of its agents, nor by this conduct is the Government barred from enforcing its rights by reason of principles similar to laches, estoppel, or adverse possession.

FEDERAL PUBLIC LAND LAWS NEED OVERHAULING

Madam President, since that decision was rendered, there never has been any question that the lands do belong to the United States Government. The question before the Senate is whether we are going to start, piecemeal, deeding them to the States. The whole subject of the Federal public land law needs overhauling.

However, I do not believe that such action can be effective by striking a glancing blow by legislating with respect to the lands of three States, while leaving the land of the remainder of the States in its present status.

OIL DISCOVERED IN NEVADA

Oil has just been discovered in Nevada. Therefore, it becomes important to us in Nevada as to who owns the oil lands. In Wyoming, millions of dollars of Federal funds have been spent for reclamation purposes, as is true of all 17 Western States, including California and Texas. Still other States want to take their lands out of Federal control after they have profited from Wyoming and Nevada. Wyoming already has oil wells; Nevada may have them soon. Yet other States want to keep their own lands but profit by the production of petroleum in our States. Madam President, a principal is needed—and the whole problem should be considered.

My fourth point is that the sea-bottom lands are public lands in the light of Supreme Court decisions, and have always been public lands, since the Federal Government's title could not have been clouded by any prior action of its agents nor by any prior claims by individuals or States.

Fifth, the joint resolution which we are considering proposes a complete departure from the century-old policy of Congress to withhold known mineral rights whenever the public lands were conveyed to States or to individuals, and it thereby discriminates against the public land States.

Whenever power is involved, such as in the construction of a dam, we are paying 3 percent—it was 4 percent for a while, but it is always more than it costs the Government.

Sixth, under the present law, 52½ percent of all moneys received from oil and gas leases goes to the reclamation fund and is used to develop the great reclamation projects of this Nation. This joint resolution is designed to deprive the reclamation fund of money it should have.

Seventh, whether the States or the Federal Government owns the sea-bottom land, there is no reason to worry about the production of oil, if private industry is given a chance to realize a reasonable profit on the oil produced. The only force that will keep those oil deposits from being developed is a free-trade policy that would wreck the domestic petroleum industry.

I was present on the Senate floor about 2 weeks ago and heard the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in-

troduce a bill to limit oil imports to 10 percent. I understand that all of the oil States are in favor of that particular limitation, although they are also for an extension of free trade, but they do not wish to be affected themselves.

Madam President, I am skipping through on my prepared address. I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the RECORD as though I had delivered it in complete detail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. MALONE. Time is running out. I had better continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a provision in the Senate rules which precludes the Chair from entertaining the request of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I shall continue.

FIRST DECISION ON SEA-BOTTOM LANDS

Statements have been made to the effect that many previous decisions rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States have laid down a principle of State ownership broad enough to include the sea-bottom lands within their historic boundaries. However, when the case of the United States against California came before the United States Supreme Court in June 1947, the Supreme Court said, quoting its own language:

It [the question of ownership of sea-bottom lands] is before this Court for the first time.

This statement by the Court would clearly indicate that any reference to submerged lands in previous decisions concerning tidelands or navigable waters were not directly in point and did not decide ownership of the sea-bottom lands.

SEA-BOTTOM LANDS ARE PUBLIC LANDS

Madam President, the chief purpose of this joint resolution is to deed federally owned public lands with known mineral deposits to certain States. The confirmation of State ownership to the lands under inland waters is only incidental, because the States' titles to those lands have been repeatedly confirmed by Court decision and are not in jeopardy.

There have been statements made to the effect that although the Federal Government may now have a property interest in the sea-bottom lands that they are not public lands.

In the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, no such narrow distinction can be drawn.

The former Solicitor for the Department of the Interior took the position that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920 applies to public lands, but that it does not apply to the federally owned sea-bottom lands because those lands do not qualify as public lands.

On that basis the Department of the Interior has refused to grant leasing permits to applicants under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. These lands could at the present time be leased under that act if it is were not for what I consider erroneous opinions given by members of the previous administration.

This question has been argued before the Federal courts, and its judicial determination can be expected in the near future.

The case of *Hynes* v. *Grimes Packing Co.* (337 U. S. 86), decided by the Supreme Court of the United States on May 31, 1949, has come to my attention, and I believe that the decision definitely and finally determines that the land under the marginal sea is public land.

The issue in that case was whether certain Indians in Alaska had the right to fish for salmon in the marginal sea off the Alaska coast. The existence of this right depended upon whether the marginal-sea lands were covered by a statute, the body of which specifically declared that it should apply to the public lands of the United States in accordance with the explicit requirements of the statute under which the rights of the Indians were claimed.

Here there was a measure which by its own plain and explicit terms was stated by the Congress to be applicable to "public lands" of the United States. The Supreme Court reversed a decision of the circuit court of appeals which had held that the statute did not apply to the marginal-sea lands by reason of the "public-lands" limitation in the text of the act.

In reversing the court of appeals the Supreme Court held exactly to the contrary—that this statute applicable to "public lands" does apply to the sea-bottom lands of the marginal sea. Unless it is to be argued that the two situations are different because one involves oil and the other involved fish, I see no escape from the conclusion that the sea-bottom lands of the marginal sea, wherever situated, are "public lands" under the authority of the Supreme Court's decision in this case of Hynes versus Grimes Packing Co.

Madam President, my chief objection to this joint resolution is the fact that it is a complete departure from the century-old policy of Congress under which the Federal Government withholds title to known minerals whenever it conveyed lands either to individuals or to States.

With the passage of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 proceeds from leasing are distributed in the following manner: 37½ percent to the State in which the leased land is situated, 52½ percent to the reclamation fund, and 10 percent to the general fund for purposes of administration.

Under this act, the public-land States have contributed millions of dollars to the reclamation fund which has helped to finance the building of the great reclamation projects of this Nation.

A source of great wealth lies beneath the sea-bottom lands off the shore of this Nation. If we are to depart from the century-old policy of withholding known mineral rights—the Mineral Leasing Act provides for the distribution of the revenues—I do not believe that the public land within any State should be released from this responsibility without a complete study of the public-land problem.

Madam President, because I am convinced that this departure from a well-established policy is about to be accomplished, and the junior Senator from Nevada does not intend to stand idly by and see his State or any of the other public-land States discriminated against, therefore I have introduced an amendment to this joint resolution which would treat all public-land States alike and deed to them the mineral rights in the public lands within their boundaries.

Madam President, if private capital is given a chance to make a fair and reasonable profit on the investment the oil will be produced from the sea-bottom lands whether they are owned by the Federal Government or by the States.

There is only one barrier to the development of the vast oil deposits in the submerged lands and that is the continuation and extension of the free-trade policy. Right now the domestic petroleum industry is suffering from the effect which imported oil, produced at only a fraction of the cost of producing a similar amount of oil here in the United States, has had on the domestic market.

The petroleum industry must continue to explore and drill and bring in new oil wells. It must always remain a going-concern industry for we never know at what moment the entangling alliances and commitments which I have recently brought to the attention of this body may plunge us into a full-scale war at which time the improved submarines of the enemy might completely stop imports. Without a petroleum industry which could immediately go into full production we would be facing disaster.

A producing oil well cannot be discovered and brought in overnight. Extracting oil is just another phase of the mining industry and there are many dry holes drilled for each good producer which is brought in.

Madam President, the question of State or Federal ownership has no material effect on the production of oil from the sea-bottom lands. If we are to be concerned at all with the question of whether or not these deposits will be developed we must legislate so the private investor will have an incentive to finance such development and this can be done by fixing a flexible import fee based on fair and reasonable competition. This policy should not be confined merely to petroleum or minerals, but should be extended to all imports.

Such a policy would not only protect our own standard of living, but it would have a strong tendency to raise the wages in countries wishing to export products to this country, because it is chiefly in the exploitation of labor that the true cost of production of any similar article differs.

Madam President, in conclusion I wish to say that the chief purpose of the joint resolution which we are now considering is to depart from a century-old policy of withholding the mineral rights whenever public lands are deeded to States or individuals.

This departure will deprive the reclamation fund of money to which it is entitled.

The public-land States who have contributed their share to the reclamation fund are being discriminated against unless they receive similar treatment. To correct this wrong I urge that my amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 13 be adopted conveying to the public-land States title to the mineral deposits within their boundaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MALONE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, certain marked excepts from the hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approximate acres of submerged lands within State boundaries

State:	*Marginal sea* [1]
Alabama	101,760
California	2,540,800
Connecticut	384,000
Delaware	53,760
Florida	4,697,600
Georgia	192,000
Louisiana	2,668,160
Maine	759,680
Maryland	59,520
Massachusetts	368,640
Mississippi	136,320
New Hampshire	8,960
New Jersey	249,600
New York	243,840
North Carolina	577,920
Oregon	568,320
Rhode Island	76,800
South Carolina	359,040
Texas	2,466,560
Virginia	215,040
Washington	300,800
Total	17,029,120

[1] World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1947, published by the New York World-Telegram (1947), p. 138; Serial No. 22, Department of Commerce, U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, November 1915. In figuring the marginal sea area, only original State boundaries have been used. These coincide with the 3-mile limit for all States except Texas, Louisiana, and Florida Gulf coast. In the latter cases, the 3-league limit as established before or at the time of entry into the Union has been used.

Approximate acres of submerged lands of chief proponents of S. J. Res. 13

State:	*Marginal sea*
California	2,540,800
Florida	4,694
Louisiana	2,668,600
Texas	2,466,560
Total	12,370,120

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE W. MALONE, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I am a good deal in the position of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I have no written statement; merely notes.

NO TIDELANDS OR STATES RIGHTS IN SUPREME COURT DECISION

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I may be somewhat repetitious here in the interest of a complete statement on my own account. I believe that all the testimony referred to tidelands, inland waterways, and all that. We have cleared up two points in the testimony, and that is that there are no tidelands or States rights involved in the Supreme Court decision. That is the propaganda that was spread a foot thick in my State, even during the campaign.

Mr. Chairman, I have an inclusion in the record that I would like to make, which I will not read, but it will be in the copy that I submit for the record here today. It is an excerpt from the Christian Science Monitor, October 2, 1951.

Senator BARRETT. It may be received.

(The excerpt referred to follows:)

"We believe all the answers to Mr. Daniel's arguments are very simple and complete:

"1. The most fundamental misrepresentation regarding this problem is the statement that the disputed area is tidelands. There is not 1 foot of tidelands involved—never has the National Government claimed any part of State-owned tidelands or State-owned inland waters. The three Supreme Court decisions described the area in dispute as commencing where the tidelands end and extending oceanward. The complaints and decisions in all three cases specifically exclude tidelands from the controversy.

"The use of the word 'tidelands' has been retained by the oil lobby to becloud and misrepresent the real issue to Congress and the American people. There are 54 Supreme Court decisions which hold that tidelands actually belong to the States. The oil-lobby group want to make it appear as if the Supreme Court had overruled all these prior decisions—taken the tidelands from the States and given them to the National Government under this new doctrine of necessity. Never has a Supreme Court decision been so completely misrepresented.

"The only area in dispute is the offshore marginal sea, commencing where the tidelands end and extending oceanward. In regard to this area the Supreme Court said: '(a) The case of United States against California was the first time a question of ownership of this offshore belt had ever come before the Supreme Court; (b) neither the Original Thirteen States, nor any new State after being admitted into the Union, have ever owned or controlled this submerged offshore belt.

" 'California, like the Thirteen Original Colonies, never acquired ownership in the marginal sea. The claim to our 3-mile belt was first asserted by the National Government. Protection and control of the area are indeed functions of national external sovereignty (332 U. S., pp. 31–34). The marginal sea is a national, not a State concern. National interests, national responsibilities, national defense, relations with other powers, war, and peace focus there. National rights must therefore be paramount in that area' (339 U. S. 704).

"If the statements (a) and (b) are true (and a rereading will convince anyone that that is exactly what the Supreme Court decided) then the States have never owned the disputed area—the Supreme Court did not take this disputed area from the States and give it to the National Government—there is no new theory or doctrine of law which the Supreme Court announced, that the National Government can take property from the States without just compensation contrary to fundamental constitutional law."

STATES DO NOT OWN SEA BOTTOM

Senator MALONE. Of course, it has been made abundantly clear in this testimony that in 1947 the question, "Is the State of California the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along the coast?" came squarely before the Supreme Court of the United States, and that Court held that California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along its coast, and that the Federal Government rather than the State has paramount rights, a title superior to all others, in and power over that belt. In the States of Louisiana and Texas, the Supreme Court made similar rulings.

FIRST DECISION ON SEA BOTTOM

Mr. Chairman, up to this time there had not been a clear-cut decision on the sea-bottom lands adjacent to the coast as to whether they were federally owned or public lands or belonged to the States. The question had not been directly raised. The Supreme Court was asked to pass on this question at that time.

(Insertion for the record submitted by Senator MALONE, from his remarks in the Senate of the United States July 4 and 5, 1952, follows:)

"NO PRIOR DECISION AFFECTING SEA-BOTTOM LANDS

"Mr. President, in this connection there never has been a direct decision on sea-bottom or submerged lands with reference to ownership until the 1947 Supreme Court decision.

"The question was never raised directly before the Supreme Court until that time."

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, at the risk of repetitious statement, it is well known that no tidelands, inland waterways, or navigable rivers are included in the Supreme Court decisions and that they are in no way affected by the Supreme Court decisions. Nor are there any States rights violated in any way. The States have exactly the same police power or general jurisdiction over such public domain, known as the sea-bottom or submerged lands, as they have over any other public lands located within the respective States.

POLICE POWER OVER MARGINAL SEA

Mr. Chairman, as a fuller explanation, I would like to insert in the record at this point, a short statement entitled "Exercise by Coastal States of Police Power in the Marginal Sea," by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

Senator BARRETT. It may be received.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"EXERCISE BY COASTAL STATES OF POLICE POWER IN THE MARGINAL SEA

"That the police power of a coastal State extends over the marginal (or territorial) sea contiguous to its coast was clearly established by the Supreme Court in the case of *Skiriotes* v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 69 (1941)). That case involved the power of the State of Florida to regulate the sponge fishery off its coast. The Supreme Court held, among other things, '* * * that Florida has an interest in the proper maintenance of the sponge fishery and that the (Florida) statute so far as applied to conduct within the territorial waters of Florida, in the absence of conflicting Federal legislation, is within the police power of the State' (p. 75).

"The Supreme Court, in the case of *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U. S. 385 (1948)), again upheld the authority of a coastal State to exercise its police power in the marginal sea contiguous to its coast. That case involved the authority of the State of South Carolina to regulate commercial shrimp fishing in the marginal sea.

"The Toomer case was decided after the Supreme Court had rendered its decision in the case of United States against California, holding that the lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea are Federal rather than State-owned lands. Thus, it is clear from the decision in the Toomer case that the fact that the lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea are Federal lands does not affect the authority of a coastal State to exercise its police power with respect to activities conducted in such lands or in the waters above them. A State's police power over activities conducted in the marginal sea is comparable to a State's police power over activities conducted on public-domain lands situated within the boundaries of the State."

SEA BOTTOM IS PUBLIC LAND

Senator MALONE. The effect of the United States Supreme Court decisions makes these submerged lands public lands within the State boundaries just the same as approximately 65,000,000 acres of public lands located in my State of Nevada. It is only in the minds and opinions of certain public officials that these submerged lands are not public lands within the meaning of the Federal Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920 and the final decision is with the courts.

Mr. Chairman, as testified to yesterday by one of the principal attorneys in this case,

the applicants sued the Secretary of the Interior to reverse the decision that he made immediately following the Supreme Court decision that they were Federal lands when he said that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act was not applicable to the submerged or sea-bottom lands. This court decision is ready to be rendered, according to one of the principal attorneys, Mr. Wheeler, former United States Senator, as soon as the Supreme Court passes on the master's recommendation as to the limit or the boundary of the inland waters.

There are approximately 750 million acres of public lands. My own State of Nevada contains approximately 65 million acres of public land.

It is made absolutely clear that the Federal Government does have paramount rights, a title superior to all others, in and power over the sea-bottom lands seaward of mean low tide, and that the Congress of the United States has the power to grant to the States title to the submerged lands in question. However, in the past the Federal Government has followed the policy of withholding the subsurface rights to known minerals in granting title to Federal lands. If this policy is to be changed, if it is to be reversed, then, Mr. Chairman, there should be a general public lands act which would deal equitably with all of the public lands, and not only the public lands under the marginal sea or the sea-bottom lands. Most of the public lands are located principally in the 11 Western States—your own State, Wyoming; my own State of Nevada, beginning on the eastern boundary of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico, and everything west. Only a relatively small acreage is in the other States.

CONGRESS CAN CEDE SEA BOTTOMS TO STATES

There is no question as to the authority of Congress to deed to the States wherein they are located in fee simple all or any part of such lands, for example, the minerals, but no State has ever claimed such lands as a right.

Mr. Chairman, no one in Nevada, and I am sure in Wyoming, according to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, acting as chairman of these proceedings, has ever claimed any forest reserves or any parks. In fact, they have never claimed any Federal lands. For 30 years while I have been in the engineering business in the 11 Western States they have argued as to whether or not they should own them.

Senator BARRETT. Senator, there is one question I would like to ask you. I assure you that I am not trying to be facetious. If these submerged lands are properly classified as public lands, then of course they have been public lands all the time.

The point I am trying to make is that the public lands were open to homestead settlement after 1862, and of course a good many people moved onto these public lands in your State and mine before they were surveyed, and the Congress recognized those people who squatted on the lands and established a home on the lands.

By the same line of reasoning, could not a fellow have filed a homestead on those lands out there in the submerged areas?

HOMESTEADS

Senator MALONE. Just as ridiculous homesteads were filed. The junior Senator from Nevada started on the public lands in 1914 as surveyor and engineer for cattle and sheep companies and individuals, and those were the times of the range fights. Many times a homestead would be filed to get a water right, where there was no possible chance of irrigating any land in accordance with the homestead law. But it took time to prove that. Therefore, during the time that the filing was running for the first year, before it could be proved that a certain number of acres could not be put into cultivation or before an inspector got out there, they had the use of that spring.

I might say that looking back on it after a few years—the junior Senator was 24 years old then—he had a transit on his shoulder and a couple of chainmen and rodmen, a checkbook in his hip pocket, and would buy lands for companies or individuals if they thought it was worth the money. He also had a .45 automatic in a shoulder holster, and did not button his flannel shirt for a good many years. That is what they called range fights.

NEVADA'S RANGE LAW

Our own State public laws took care of that. I was the State engineer for 8½ years, from 1927 to 1935, in the State of Nevada. We passed what was called a stock-water right, where the State engineer could turn down, even though there was plenty of water for an additional herd of stock, if he found that the range was already substantially utilized in that area he could turn it down, and it was his duty to do that.

We had the range in pretty good shape before we ever heard of the Taylor Grazing Act, which has raised Old Ned with the livestock people practically all over the West. The administrators of that act took it upon themselves right away to make the rules and regulations, and to divide the range, when someone was already established and a new raiser came in, or when they transferred the range, they cut it 10 or 20 percent, and they could raise the fees any time they wanted to. So they controlled one of the parts of a livestock unit. The three parts are: Water rights, the ranch where the feed is raised for the winter, and then the public range. Anyone who controls one part of this unit, of course, controls all the unit. So they were just running them off the range.

That is something that can be taken up under another head, but it also vitally touches this problem of the control of the public lands that we are now dealing with for another purpose.

FOREST LANDS

The forest lands would be excepted. In my own State we have 5 million acres of forest lands, that is, theoretically. The stockmen are partly responsible for the withdrawal for forest reserves, because they had no other way of controlling summer range, and the forest reserves are mostly summer range, in mountainous and desert areas, as all the Senators realize who are in the public-lands States.

Out of this 5 million acres, I would say without fear of contradiction there are not over a half million acres of forests in the State of Nevada that could ever be called forests. It is impossible to reforest or to set out trees where it never was forested because of insufficient rainfall. Sometimes the rainfall is as low as 2½ to 3 inches, in certain parts of Nevada.

I should say that in the long run, if you are going to reserve the forests to the Government, even if you deeded the lands to the States, that these forest areas should be reclassified. That, of course, will all come when we have any general public-land bill, that I certainly would recommend if we are going to change the present policy by deeding to the States mineral rights under Federal lands. Certainly we are doing it with this bill before us.

Senator BARRETT. Will the Senator yield to me?

Senator MALONE. I would be happy to.

Senator BARRETT. I think the Senator is correct in his assumption there. By the same token, I believe that there are certain areas of timberlands under the administration of the Taylor Grazing Act, and if and when we find any lands that are in fact timberlands, they ought to be transferred over to the forest reserves, in my judgment.

Senator MALONE. They should be in the forest reserve, controlled either by the State or the Federal Government. It really does not make much difference, in my opinion.

SQUATTERS' RIGHTS

I was going to touch on this matter of squatters' rights. The junior Senator from Nevada, as he mentioned the other day, held a commission as mineral surveyor under the Government for 25 years. Under $5,000 bond, you could go out into your surveyed or unsurveyed country and survey a mining claim or patent and put up your own monuments. It was never questioned. You simply filed with the Federal Government your notes, and your bond took care of the rest of it.

Squatters' right referred to unsurveyed land for mineral claims. A squatter was known as a man who would go out into an area that was unsurveyed and take up what he would call a homestead. You could not take up a homestead on unsurveyed ground, but if he stayed right there he could hold what is known as squatter's right. If the first squatter left and someone else came to the location, the newcomer had the squatter's right. This is well known to the courts. You could not hold any unsurveyed land if you did not stay right on it. If you did stay right there on the land then when it was surveyed you could file on it.

Senator BARRETT. That is right. I think that when most of the States were admitted to the Union, two sections, 16 and 36, were granted to the State. I think you will find a provision of law in all the enabling acts to the effect that where certain people have acquired rights by reason of being squatters on the land, then the States would get in-lieu lands in place of the lands that were preempted by the squatters. The Federal Government recognized squatters' rights.

Senator MALONE. I doubt if the States got the lands, but the squatters' rights were recognized to the squatter himself as soon as it was surveyed, if he had not left the land and someone else moved in in his absence.

Senator BARRETT. That is true. If, when it came out, it happened to be all or part of section 16, let us say, or section 36, then the States did not get that land and they got land in lieu of the land taken by the squatter.

Senator MALONE. That is true. I misunderstood the distinguished Senator from Wyoming in his reference to sections 16 and 36. It was the other sections that I had reference to.

ROYALTY FROM RESOURCES FOR RECLAMATION FUND

In the proposed bills, Senate Joint Resolution 13 and Senate bill 294, all the now public lands under the marginal sea or sea-bottom lands would be granted to the coastal States, and all the revenues from the royalties resulting from the leasing of such lands would go to the States wherein such lands were located. These bills would repudiate the present division of royalties received by the Federal Government from the public lands under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act, under which the Government receives 10 percent for supervision, 37½ percent goes to the State wherein such oil and gas may be located, and 57½ percent goes to the reclamation fund to be expended for reclamation within the reclamation States, which now include 17 Western States. It did only include the 11 Western States for a considerable time, and I think the junior Senator from Nevada had something to do with the expansion, because it was realized that the western half of that tier of States—Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and the two Dakotas—were semiarid, at least. Some of them are really arid west of the 97th meridian. West of that line it is considered semiarid, and then, of course, when you travel west of those States the land is really arid. Those States which I have mentioned wanted to come in under the Reclamation

Act, and they are under the Reclamation Act.

I want to say for the benefit of the Senators who may not have had experience in that line, that there are several other States that have wanted to come under the Reclamation Act because of the drought periods in those States where it is possible to store water and carry over during the drought period. I think it is clear why the 11 Western States were included as recipients through the reclamation fund created in part from the royalty received under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920, because it was in those States where the principal revenues accrued. Oil had not been discovered, and there had been no Supreme Court decision, so there was not supposed to be any public lands in Louisiana or Texas or any of the Eastern States.

So it took a Supreme Court decision to determine that they are public-lands States, and at the moment they are, in the absence of any special legislation.

The reclamation fund has been described several times, and I would ask that a statement contained in my debate last year be included in the record at this time, clarifying it.

Senator BARRETT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The material referred to follows:)

"THE RECLAMATION FUND

"In 1920 the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act decreed that 52½ percent of the royalties from the leases on such public domain shall go to the reclamation fund, 37½ percent to the States wherein such leases are located, and 10 percent to the Federal Government for supervision.

"Distribution of revenues derived under the Mineral Leasing Act

"The revenues derived by the United States from mineral operations on public lands under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 are distributed as follows: 37½ percent is paid to the respective States within whose boundaries the lands comprising the source of the income are situated; 52½ percent goes into the reclamation fund; and 10 percent is deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts (sec. 35, Mineral Leasing Act of 1920; 30 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 191).

"There are pending at the present time in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia several cases involving the question whether the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 applies to lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea. If it should be judicially determined as a result of the pending litigation that the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 is applicable to such lands, the income derived from the development of the oil and gas deposits in these lands would, of course, be distributed in the manner outlined above—i. e., the several coastal States would get 37½ percent of the money derived from operations in the portions of the marginal seabed contiguous to their respective coasts; 57½ percent of the money would go into the reclamation fund and would be used for the reclamation of arid lands in the 17 Western States; and 10 percent would be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

"* * * The proponents of State ownership seeks to transfer that part of the public domain known as the sea bottom or submerged lands between low tide and the State line, to the States wherein they are located.

"The transfer would mean, of course, that all the royalties or revenues from such leases would accrue to the individual States to the exclusion of the reclamation fund, and thereby nullify the 32-year-old Government policy initiated by the Congress in 1920.

"One hundred billion dollars' worth of petroleum

"It is estimated that from $40 billion to $100 billion of petroleum will be produced within the sea-bottom lands area affected by the Supreme Court decisions affecting the sea-bottom lands. Twelve and one-half percent has been the customary royalty to be received from these areas. Fifty-two and one-half percent of that amount would go to the reclamation fund, amounting to between $2½ billion and $6 billion to such reclamation fund, with which to construct reclamation projects in the 17 Western States.

"Nevada is vitally concerned in the disposition of the royalty payments from oil and gas production in the public domain, since Congress stipulated in the 1920 National Oil and Gas Leasing Act that 52½ percent of such royalties should accrue to the reclamation fund, to be expended in the 17 reclamation States.

"The public-land States should be treated alike

"I may say that this act has been amended from time to time, but as it stands now, that is the situation. If the oil- and gas-bearing public lands are to be transferred to the States it should be done through a bill introduced in the 83d Congress in 1953, simply stipulating that when oil or gas is discovered on the publicly owned lands, immediately such lands are to be transferred to the States.

"That would then equalize the situation. Many companies are drilling for oil and gas now in my State of Nevada under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act.

"We have high hopes that they will discover oil. Under a bill then of that nature, when such oil was discovered such lands would be automatically transferred to the State of Nevada in the same manner as it is proposed to transfer to the States in this case the publicly owned lands including the submerged or sea-bottom lands seaward from low tide to the State boundaries."

EQUAL TREATMENT FOR PUBLIC-LAND STATES

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the theory of extending jurisdiction of the coastal States out to their historical boundaries, just as the jurisdiction of the State of Nevada is extended to its boundaries, but I do contend that the policy of Congress to withhold to the Federal Government the rights in the subsoil of the public lands where mineral deposits are known to exist either should not be changed or, if it is changed, should apply to all of the public-lands States. In other words, it should not be done by special legislation and sharpshooting at Nevada and Wyoming, California, Louisiana, or Texas. It should treat them all alike. I see no reason why this policy should not be extended to the public lands under the marginal sea within the historical boundaries of the coastal States. In other words, there seems to have arisen in the public mind—through publicity which I want to say here and now had nothing to do with the newspaper people, because the statement was made so many times that they could not have understood it otherwise—that these were tidelands. If the State boundaries went out beyond the tidelands, which is between mean low tide and mean high tide, then, of course, if the State boundaries extended out there, then they owned the land, which is not true at all. Ownership of the land has nothing to do with the State boundaries.

PREVIOUS CONDUCT OF AGENTS DID NOT CLOUD FEDERAL TITLE

Through the Supreme Court decision that has now been made and is the law of the land until such time, if and when, Congress takes action to change the situation, they are public lands within the boundaries of the State just exactly the same as the 65 million acres in the State of Nevada. We have made that clear enough, I think. The Supreme Court covered that point specifically, that the mistakes or the conduct of its agents had nothing at all to do with the Federal Government's ownership of the sea-bottom land seaward of low mean tide. Public officials are transient, Mr. Chairman, just as Senators and Congressmen are transient. They may vote something in this session of Congress, and in some other session may change it. They can make or unmake the laws of the land.

So just because we decide something here, just because some public official decides something, does not mean it will not change. As the fellow said one time, "There is nothing permanent but change."

The Supreme Court specifically cleared up that point. Whether it was Mr. Ickes, who is now dead, whether it was the last Secretary of the Interior, or whether it was the present one, he has nothing to do with making the law, and anything he says is his interpretation, which in the final analysis, when passed upon by the Supreme Court, may or may not be correct.

PRODUCTION IS NOT RETARDED

Mr. Chairman, there is no foundation for the argument that the exploration and production of oil and gas would be retarded if the proposed legislation is not passed by Congress. I have heard this assertion many times, and it is a good argument if it is not explained. But as has been explained here, the Federal Government can proceed to lease such lands in the same manner as has been done for the past 30 years under the Federal Oil and Gas Leasing Act, and the revenues will continue to be divided as provided by law or as may be hereafter provided.

There is nothing permanent about the 52½ percent to the Bureau of Reclamation, 10 percent to the Federal Government, and 37½ percent to the States. If any Congress wanted to change it and the President signed the bill, it would be changed as of that date.

SEA-BOTTOM LANDS COULD NOW BE LEASED

If, as explained here, these filings—that I will come to pretty soon—are not bona fide due to the fact that they may be filed on existing or known structures, and the Secretary so rules—and he is the one to do the ruling, in the absence of special legislation by Congress—then and in that event, if it is known oil land, the Federal Government, under the Secretary of the Interior, could proceed to lease these lands on the basis of competitive bids or otherwise, as provided by law, and no delay would ensue whatever unless deliberately designed by the Secretary of the Interior. And we think the previous Secretaries of Interior did deliberately delay it by their two rulings. It appears a little too much as if they had an objective, first, when Mr. Ickes said that he could not grant these applicants permits because the States owned the land; and then after the Supreme Court said the States did not own the land in the case of United States against California, Mr. Chapman suddenly said that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act was not applicable.

Mr. Chairman, the applicants then promptly sued, which it was their right to do, to reverse that decision. Arguments have been made, as we heard in the testimony here yesterday, and they are awaiting decision on the Supreme Court's action on the special master's recommendation as to the boundaries of the inland waterways.

I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, there has been no delay, anyway. The States have continued to grant leases, even after it was under consideration by the Supreme Court, and they continued to drill new wells. There was no delay. They are getting out a lot of oil. If you think there is any delay, go down and take a look at it. I did. There is no delay. There need not be any delay. That is my point.

POTENTIAL OIL IN THE SEA BOTTOMS

It is variously estimated, Mr. Chairman, by people who have knowledge of this situation and have a foundation for their estimate, that the lands in question seaward

from their boundaries contain from 40 to 100 billion barrels of oil.

Senator DANIEL. Will you give me the name of anybody making such an estimate?

Senator MALONE. I will finish it for the record. (The estimate did include the Continental Shelf.)

Senator DANIEL. This is in the friendliest of spirit. I think this whole controversy maybe gets a little bit too big if we use those estimates, unless they are pretty true.

You heard the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey estimates, did you not?

Senator MALONE. Their record is not very good. They claimed we had 5 billion barrels of oil, if you remember, in 1935; and Mr. Ickes said, in the early thirties that we would be out of oil very soon. He was running out of oil every year, because he figured that we knew where all the oil is located.

People who are experienced in the drilling for oil—and I will furnish the references for the record—believe that this amount of oil is very likely to be found within this area.

Senator DANIEL. Is that just within the historic boundaries?

Senator MALONE. Within the claimed boundaries of the States on this public land.

Senator DANIEL. You will give us the names of those who made the estimates you have mentioned?

Senator MALONE. I will give you the references.

(NOTE.—Senator MALONE subsequently submitted the following explanatory statement:)

"I find upon investigation that my reference to the estimated amount of oil in the submerged lands included the entire Continental Shelf. However, since only an infinitesimal area of the sea bottom lands under the 3-mile belt of the marginal sea has been actually subjected to drilling exploration, it can well be expected the total amount of oil discovered there over the years ahead will probably be many time the present estimates. Past experience has shown that the estimates have usually been much too conservative in other areas which have now been developed."

Senator MALONE. I made speeches about it and debated it, and through engineering experience for 30 years, and having fought Secretary Ickes for 20 years on it, I finally got him to the point where he did not make such assertions.

I made the statement in San Antonio, Tex., before the Independent Oil Operators in 1948, that you could not possibly run out of petroleum fuels in the United States of America except by desire, and proved it.

He never since that time has made any such statement.

Senator DANIEL. The only reason I question you here is that you have just given the highest figures of anybody I have ever heard, as to the possibilities within original State boundaries.

Senator MALONE. Not the original State boundaries. I am talking now about the claimed boundaries. The Continental Shelf is included.

Senator DANIEL. Are you talking about the entire Continental Shelf?

Senator MALONE. No. I am talking about the claimed boundaries of the States. The Continental Shelf is included in such estimates.

Senator DANIEL. You mean the 3-mile and 3-league boundaries?

Senator MALONE. That is right. The Continental Shelf is included.

Senator LONG. My understanding was that the 40-billion-barrel estimate which I heard, which at that time sounded enormous to me, was based on the theory that if you went into the Gulf of Mexico south from the shoreline to the edge of the Continental Shelf, and then you estimated the amount of oil that could be produced based on experience going north on dry land an equal distance, you could estimate that if it was just as good, acre for acre, south of the shoreline, as it was north of the shoreline, you might arrive at your 40 billion barrels. But this is the first time I have heard it urged that even the 40-billion figure, which I regarded as being very large at the time and far more than you would ever recover, was to be multiplied within the 3-mile limit or the 10-mile limit. The 40-billion figure, as I recall, related to the entire Continental Shelf, which is out as far as 125 miles.

RESERVE OF NATURAL RESOURCES UNDERESTIMATED

Senator MALONE. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that there never has been yet an estimate by the USGS that was not an underestimate. In other words, since we are in this quarrel with the Department of the Interior—you might call it so—I was so irritated that it adds up to one of the reasons I ran for the Senate to start with. There was so much misinformation on minerals and oil and everything else, put out by the Department of the Interior at that time, to the effect that we were out of all kinds of minerals. I would not go into this business if it was not necessary.

All of the information proved, if exploration were allowed to continue—which it was not under that regime—that there would be plenty of oil and a much larger supply of the so-called strategic and critical minerals, and materials if the miners and prospectors were allowed to continue their work without a Government bureau breathing down their necks.

I could go into that. In the matter of tungsten, we were out of tungsten, according to Mr. Ickes, when he came into office. When I went into World War I, we were out of tungsten. We finally, through World Wars I and II, became self-sufficient in the production of tungsten when it was necessary. I know about the matter because I was special consultant to the Senate Military Affairs Committee and reported to them.

So we used tremendous amounts of tungsten for 35 years, and we have more domestic tungsten in sight now that we have ever had. If the SEC would get off the necks of the miners and if we had a floor under wages and investments in the form of a duty, tariff, or import fee, there would be a much greater domestic supply of such strategic minerals. The Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall regulate foreign commerce and impose tariffs, imposts, and excises.

I visited Burma to inspect one source of our competition and saw these tungsten deposits. They are at war now, but when it is stopped, the flow of tungsten from there will cause domestic production to practically cease, unless there is a floor in the form of a tariff under these investments.

The main thing that has kept you in the oil business and the mining business is the depletion allowance.

We have had to fight the administration and Congress every year to retain the depletion allowance. I have appeared so regularly before the committee of the House that some of them think I am a Member of the House of Representatives.

This 27½ percent depletion allowance on oil and 15 percent depletion allowance on minerals, is the only thing that has kept us in the mineral or oil business.

I think if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana goes into this question he will find that out.

SEC RETARDS RESOURCES EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT

But the SEC, with its small-caliber engineers—and they cannot hire any other kind because a man who can do anything about it is out there doing it—try to determine the feasibility of a mine, an oil well, or anything, before they will allow any stock to be sold. After the stock is starting on the market, they get a crackpot letter or some similar misinformation, as I suppose General Motors gets sometimes, and then they announce in a loud tone of voice that they are going to investigate this matter. No matter what they find, the boy is through selling stock. So with the SEC, with the restrictions that the Department of the Interior put on for 20 years, we were just about out of business. Just as the cowmen are getting hurt now, minerals have been hurt all the time.

LOW WAGES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

I will not go into these matters because in my opinion they have no place here, but I can. I have studied them for 30 years. I visited Japan to find out from where the crockery which I find all over town in the medium-priced and cheaper market was coming and I found it processed in factories paying 7 to 12 cents an hour for a Japanese skilled worker, as against $1.80 over here.

That is the reason these pottery manufacturers are going out of business in Ohio and other places. You will hear more about it on the Senate floor.

So with all of the restrictions around it, the USGS were almost able to make their predictions come true, but not quite.

Senator LONG. I believe you used the figure 100 billion barrels of oil. If there are 100 billion barrels of oil within the 3-mile limit——

Senator DANIEL. Forty.

Senator LONG. I believe you estimated 40 to 100 billion.

Senator MALONE. Yes, I did.

Senator LONG. If there are 40 to 100 billion barrels of oil within the 3-mile limit, if you use the same yardstick that was used in some of the prior estimates in estimating that it would be just as good, acre per acre, the further you went out on the Continental Shelf, would that not indicate that there are perhaps several trillion barrels of oil on the Continental Shelf beyond the original boundaries?

ENGINEERING PROGRESS WILL PRODUCE ADEQUATE OIL SUPPLY

Senator MALONE. I am entirely impatient with anybody who thinks we can possibly run out of oil if you turn the oil companies loose and let them go. That is all you have to do, either way, whether it is under the supervision of the Government or under the States. Let them alone. They know how to drill for oil. Do not try to break them.

An engineer told me on my visit to the coast when this was under consideration before, that while they could not at this moment drill in the deep water, they were perfecting methods and they thought within a very reasonable time they would be able to drill wells in the deep water on the Continental Shelf. Engineers will whip anything if there is enough money in it to let them experiment and go through with it.

Senator BARRETT. How deep did they say they could go?

Senator MALONE. They did not say there was a limit. They just said they thought they could go wherever there was oil, given time, and the incentive.

Senator BARRETT. Even under 600 feet of water?

Senator MALONE. I would say so; yes.

Senator BARRETT. I do not know a thing about it.

Senator MALONE. Neither did I at that moment, but that is what the technical men told me.

MUST BE AN INCENTIVE FOR INVESTMENT

Of course, the incentive must be there so they can profit from it. We went through 20 years of trying to take the profit or the incentive out of wildcatting and prospecting, that is, drilling for oil, or prospecting for new mines. We did almost run out of minerals, and might have, except for the fact that the people concerned flocked into Washington, D. C. They are pretty smart,

after you break them once. They got loans from the General Services and the RFC, and the guaranteed unit price, and a short amortization period, and put every taxpayer in America in business with them.

Of course, they are not going to lose the money. They will not lose Government money. These people do it on the theory that if Uncle Sam is a partner, then the Congress will be more lenient with them and probably will not try to break them.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO REGULATE FOREIGN COMMERCE

However, if the Federal Government will establish a long-range policy, through a flexible tariff to provide a floor under wages and investments, then private capital will go into the mining business.

The Constitution empowers Congress to fix tariffs and imposts and to regulate foreign commerce, but it does not say that such powers can be transferred to the Secretary of State, yet the Congress in 1934 transferred its constitutional responsibility to the executive branch.

If I were adviser to a President, I would advise him to refuse to accept this responsibility. The previous Presidents have accepted this tremendous responsibility for the last 18 years, and our present President is now in the throes of making a decision whether or not he is going to accept it. I doubt if he does, when he realizes its implications.

LARGE REVENUE FROM SEA-BOTTOM RESOURCES

Oil is selling—I have not looked up the market recently—at somewhere around $2.50 a barrel. That means, Mr. Chairman, $100 to $250 billion involved in this transfer in the event this estimate is anywhere near correct.

(See explanatory statement above.)

The law provides that in granting leases within proven territory, the Federal Government may ask for bids on the amount of royalty to be paid. Much of this area is within proven fields. That has all been reviewed, and I guess there is no question about that.

The city of Long Beach has let leases—I get this from the testimony of the engineer of the city of Long Beach and other sources—has let leases giving it a gross of as high as 94 percent, instead of the customary 12½ percent or one-eighth of the production that is generally collected by the Government and by the States. The net to the city in some cases, after the expense of drilling and marketing, is said to be as high as 68 percent.

There is no reason why the Federal leases could not be on a similar basis to that of the city of Long Beach, and then the Federal Government could ask for bids and, if arranged on a similar basis, it could mean a return to the Government of $60 to $170 billion. It would be quite a nick in the national debt, even if they took it away from the reclamation fund, which we would hate to see; but it would, after all, belong to the Federal Government, and Congress could do with it as they saw fit.

Assuming an average of the 2 figures, of $119 billion, which is equal to more than 45 percent of the national debt, it would be quite a boon to the taxpayers of this Nation; or, divided in the usual manner, would mean $44 billion to the States wherein such oil is located, $11.9 billion to the Federal Government, and $62.475 billion to the Bureau of Reclamation. This $62.475 billion might be divided between reclamation, Federal roads, and flood-control projects, which would help to develop and build up our Nation.

I think we went into that very thoroughly. Some of the States may not want reclamation, but they certainly want appropriations for flood control, and get hundreds of millions of dollars for flood control for which there is no return to the Federal Government; and, Mr. Chairman, I am for that. It is a settled policy of the Government, and until we see fit to study the question and change the policy, I am for their getting this money.

EQUAL TREATMENT FOR ALL STATES

Mr. Chairman, if the Congress of the United States is determined to grant—and I use the term "grant," not "restore," advisedly—to the States the title to the submerged lands and all of the resources in the soil therein, I feel that all States should be treated equally. Therefore, I wish to submit an amendment to be inserted at the end of Senate Joint Resolution 13, and to S. 294, respectively, granting to all States wherein there is located any public lands, the title to the minerals, including oil and gas, in the subsurface soil.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that a statement that I previously made before this committee be included at this point.

Senator BARRETT. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"NOT RETURNING LANDS TO THE STATES

"I point out that the Government is not, as is often said, returning anything to the States through the legislation. The States never have had these lands. There has been only one previous decision touching the submerged or sea-bottom lands. That was an Alaskan decision (*Hynes* v. *Grimes Packing Co.* (337 U. S. 86, decided May 31, 1949)), in regard to fisheries, in which it was held that the Government controlled the lands and had the right to reserve such lands for the Indian fisheries.

"There were many decisions by the Supreme Court, however, involving inland waterways, tidelands, navigable rivers, and lakes. Mr. President, those decisions always held that the States owned and controlled such lands.

"The Supreme Court decision to which I have referred did not in any way affect these lands or these decisions.

"We in Nevada have never desired to own such public lands. However, if oil were to be discovered upon such public lands within our State, there might be a change with respect to the desire to own and control such areas."

FIRST OIL WELL IN NEVADA

Senator MALONE. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that while the question of oil and gas has been academic up to now in the State of Nevada, I was just informed by telephone a while ago that they had discovered an oil well, producing 25 barrels a day, out in east-central Nevada, which is greater than the average production of oil wells within the United States of America; that is to say, the average production of all the wells is about one-half as much.

Senator ANDERSON. How deep was it?

Senator MALONE. A very shallow well. I do not know the depth, but they expect to get more oil at a greater depth.

A geologist is a fellow who goes on present information, and they are the best we have. I am not a geologist, myself, but I have a high respect for them. They said that in this volcanic area the oil, if any, had been burned, and there could not possibly be any oil. They said that until 10 years ago, I believe. Then they struck oil in Utah, in the same kind of structure, the same kind of area. So they began drilling in Nevada. They have not gone as deep yet as they have in other areas, but we have high hopes that we will develop a producing commercial area.

They have brought in one 25-barrel well in eastern Nevada. One well in the center of a large area would not be a commercial well, except to furnish oil to local communities. This is the first oil, and it is very significant, I think.

KNOWN MINERAL RESOURCES RESERVED TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Chairman, it was brought out before in the testimony that prior to 1914 it was the general policy laid down by Congress to reserve all public land wherever there was a known deposit mineral in character. In 1914, an act was passed which in effect separated the surface and the subsoil, and wherever there was subsoil mineral in character, that part was reserved by the Federal Government, and the surface was conveyed to private ownership; that is, whenever it could be conveyed under some existing Federal law. This reference is 30 United States Code, sections 121–124.

Under the present policy, it is impossible for the States to acquire title to land which is mineral in character unless through an act of Congress. However, Congress could convey to the States both the surface and the subsoil, even though it was mineral in character.

As I have previously stated, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to set that precedent, I believe the amendment I am about to offer should be included in this act.

VESTED RIGHTS MUST BE PROTECTED

It has long been the practice of Congress to protect prior rights and claims whenever it made a disposition of lands or mineral rights belonging to the United States. In many acts of Congress such prior rights have been protected.

In order to protect many small investors who have made application under the Federal Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920 for leases in the submerged lands beneath the sea-bottom lands or the submerged lands in the marginal sea, and whose cases are pending before the courts where their rights will be eventually determined, I wish to protect them by inserting at the end of section 5 in both Senate Joint Resolutions 13 and S. 294, the following amendment—I have heretofore read this amendment, Mr. Chairman, and if I may, include it in the record at this time.

Senator BARRETT. It may be received.

(The amendment referred to follows:)

"Nothing herein contained shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person on lands subject to this act and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this act or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights of such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything herein contained."

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize again that there has been a great effort here to minimize the importance of persons who file on public lands due to the fact that some may be small, and their opponents may be worth a billion dollars. They may be worth only $2, and maybe they are in debt.

I want to describe one person, a lady who worked for the county government in Lincoln County, Nev. Her husband had spent about all their money in this particular matter, and died practically broke. She got herself a job to support herself and her family. Under her name the suit was filed that is about to be decided in the court in Washington, D. C. I have quite a responsibility, in my opinion, as Senator from the State of Nevada, to see that these small investors are protected if they have any rights. That is the way this amendment will work.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that a relatively small amount of money was put down on these lands is because that is what the law called for. They simply conformed to the law, whatever it was.

As a matter of fact, as the Senator from Wyoming knows, some of the greatest mines in the country have been located for a filing

fee with the county recorder. That is provided under our Federal law.

Then after they have $500 worth of work done, they get a mineral surveyor and they can survey that claim and patent it and pay $5 an acre.

Senator BARRETT. I do not think anybody is disposed to dispute the statement made by the Senator.

Senator MALONE. They do not dispute it, but they keep mentioning it every other breath.

Senator BARRETT. I do not think they can consistently do so, in my judgment.

Senator MALONE. They complain that the reporters get the wrong idea. I think the reporters are given the wrong idea. That is the reason they have it in their stories. As far as I know, they are very fair reporters. As far as I am concerned, they are.

I ask permission to put into the record here two amendments I am submitting. There are two amendments necessary, because one is Senate Joint Resolution 13 and the other is Senate bill 294. So I will ask permission to have them included at this point.

Senator BARRETT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendments referred to follow:)

"PROPOSED AMENTMENTS TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

"On page 2, line 3, insert before 'this act' the following: "Titles I and II of.'

"On page 9, line 12, insert before 'this act' the following: 'Titles I and II of.'

"At the end of such joint resolution insert the following:

" 'TITLE III—MINERAL RIGHTS IN PUBLIC LANDS GRANTED TO STATES

" 'SEC. 10. Subject to the provisions of section 11 of this act all minerals and mineral rights in deposits in the public lands belonging to the United States, including (1) lands temporarily withdrawn or reserved for classification purposes, and (2) lands within grazing districts established pursuant to Public Law No. 482, 73d Congress, approved June 28, 1934, as amended (commonly known as the Taylor Grazing Act), except any such lands forming a part of a national forest, are hereby granted to the several States within the territorial boundaries of which such lands are situated. Such minerals and mineral rights and the proceeds derived from the sale, lease, or other disposition thereof shall be used for such purposes as the respective legislatures of such States shall determine.

" 'SEC. 11. (a) The provisions of section 10 of this act shall not apply (1) to any public lands with respect to which any entry has been made, or any right or claim has been initiated, under the provisions of law in force on the date of acceptance by the State of the grant made by such section except that upon the relinquishment or cancellation of such entry, application, right, or claim such lands shall become immediately subject to the provisions of this section, or (2) with respect to deposits of materials essential to the production of fissionable materials reserved for the use of the United States under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

" '(b) The grant made by section 10 of this act shall take effect with respect to the lands within a particular State whenever the legislature of such State (1) enacts legislation providing for the location and development of mineral deposits in the public lands of such States, corresponding to the laws then in effect relating to the location and development of mineral deposits in the public lands of the United States; (2) assumes in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior all obligations of the United States with respect to any valid claims, rights, or privileges existing upon the date of acceptance by the State of the grant; and (3) by resolution, accepts the grant and deposits a certified copy of such resolution with the Secretary of the Interior. Upon receipt of a certified copy of a resolution of acceptance from any State and an instrument evidencing the assumption of such obligations, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be delivered to the proper officials of such State such maps, records, books, and documents as may be necessary for the enjoyment, control, use, administration, and disposition of such lands.

" '(c) Upon the acceptance by any State of such grant as provided in subsection (b), all laws and regulations relating to mineral rights and deposits in the public lands shall cease to be applicable to the public lands within such State, but such laws shall continue in force with respect to the lands and deposits excepted under this titite.

" 'SEC. 12. As used in this title—

" '(a) Subject to the provisions of section 10 of this act, the term "public lands" means the public domain, surveyed or unsurveyed, unappropriated lands, and lands not held back or reserved for any special governmental or public purpose.

" '(b) The term "State" means any State of the Union.'

"PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO S. 294

"On the first page, line 5, before 'this act', insert 'titles I, II, and III of.'

"On page 10, line 5, before 'this act', insert 'titles I, II, and III of.'

"At the end of the bill insert the following:

" 'TITLE IV—MINERAL RIGHTS IN PUBLIC LANDS GRANTED TO STATES

" 'SEC. 20. Subject to the provisions of section 21 of this act, all minerals and mineral rights in deposits in the public lands belonging to the United States, including (1) lands temporarily withdrawn or reserved for classification purposes, and (2) lands within grazing districts established pursuant to Public Law No. 482, 73d Congress, approved June 28, 1934, as amended (commonly known as the Taylor Grazing Act), except any such lands forming a part of a national forest, are hereby granted to the several States within the territorial boundaries of which such lands are situated. Such minerals and mineral rights and the proceeds derived from the sale, lease, or other disposition thereof shall be used for such purposes as the respective legislatures of such States shall determine.

" 'SEC. 21. (a) The provisions of section 20 of this act shall not apply (1) to any public lands with respect to which any entry has been made, or any right or claim has been initiated, under the provisions of law in force on the date of acceptance by the State of the grant made by such section except that upon the relinquishment or cancellation of such entry, application, right, or claim such lands shall become immediately subject to the provisions of this section, or (2) with respect to deposits of materials essential to the production of fissionable materials reserved for the use of the United States under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

" '(b) The grant made by section 20 of this act shall take effect with respect to the lands within a particular State whenever the legislature of such State (1) enacts legislation providing for the location and development of mineral deposits in the public lands of such State, corresponding to the laws then in effect relating to the location and development of mineral deposits in the public lands of the United States, (2) assumes in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior all obligations of the United States with respect to any valid claims, rights, or privileges existing upon the date of acceptance by the State of the grant, and (3) by resolution, accepts the grant and deposits a certified copy of such resolution with the Secretary of the Interior. Upon receipt of a certified copy of a resolution of acceptance from any State and an instrument evidencing the assumption of such obligations, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be delivered to the proper officials of such State such maps, records, books, and documents as may be necessary for the enjoyment, control, use, administration, and disposition of such lands.

" '(c) Upon the acceptance of any State of such grant as provided in subsection (b) all laws and regulations relating to mineral rights and deposits in the public lands shall cease to be applicable to the public lands within such State, but such laws shall continue in force with respect to the lands and deposits excepted under this title.

" 'SEC. 22. As used in this title—

" '(a) Subject to the provisions of section 20 of this act, the term "public lands" means the public domain, surveyed or unsurveyed, unappropriated lands, and lands not held back or reserved for any special governmental or public purpose.

" '(b) The term "State" means any State of the Union.' "

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I asked permission in the beginning to round out or supplement my testimony because I had not had an opportunity to have a written statement. I simply made an extemperaneous statement.

Senator BARRETT. Senator Daniel, do you have any questions?

Senator DANIEL. I do not believe I have, sir.

Senator BARRETT. We thank you very much, Senator.

"SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF GEORGE W. MALONE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

"The sea-bottom lands

"The proposal to cede or deed the sea-bottom lands with all the mineral rights therein to the States of California, Louisiana, and Texas completely reverses a century-old policy of the Congress of the United States reserving to the Federal Government known mineral rights underlying areas deeded to States or individuals.

"If the 83d Congress desires to chang this long-established policy then the change should be made to apply equally to all the States. My State of Nevada is 87 percent federally owned and the mineral rights are vital to us. All the public-land States are vitally affected and they should have the same privilege of receiving the mineral rights as the coastal States.

"For 50 years the Congress of the United States has followed a policy of advancing the cost of irrigation and reclamation projects. This policy provided for the Federal Government to advance the cost whenever a project was found feasible by the engineers of the Department of the Interior. Water users in these irrigation projects repay, without interest, the funds advanced by the Federal Government.

"At first only the 11 Western States were included in the area benefited by the reclamation fund, now 17 western arid and semi-arid States receive its benefits.

"In 1920 the Oil and Gas Leasing Act was passed and for 33 years it has had the effect of supplementing the reclamation fund with 52½ percent of the royalty obtained from oil, gas, and mineral products produced on the public lands.

"These funds have been expended for irrigation and reclamation developments on the condition that the money be returned to the United States Treasury through repayments extending over a definite period of years.

"The Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920 provided that 10 percent of the royalty collectible under these leases would go to the Federal Government for administration purposes; that 37½ percent of such royalty would be paid to the States wherein the oil, gas, or minerals are produced; and that 52½ percent of such royalty is allotted to the reclamation fund for reclamation projects.

"Long before the Supreme Court of the United States rendered those decisions in the submerged lands cases, which decisions held that the sea-bottom land was not owned by the coastal States but was federally owned

lands, many citizens of the United States filed, under the Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920, on certain areas of these sea-bottom lands seaward from mean low tide.

"Those people made application under the Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920 to the Secretary of the Interior for leases to enable them to prospect for oil and gas in the sea-bottom lands of the marginal sea.

"In the first instances these applications were denied by the Secretary of the Interior on the ground that the Federal Government did not own such lands. Then almost immediately following the rendering of the decision by the Supreme Court in the case of the *United States* v. *California*, which decision denied State ownership and affirmed Federal ownership of the sea-bottom lands; the Secretary of the Interior again refused to consider the applications for leases, this time on the ground that the Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920 did not apply to the sea-bottom lands.

"Almost immediately these applicants, whose interests are evidenced in 11 applications, sued the Secretary of the Interior and petitioned the courts to reverse his opinion and for an order directing him to issue such leases. These 11 applications include the interests of several hundred persons, approximately 400 of whom are residing in my State of Nevada.

"To the pending bills which would cede or deed the sea-bottom lands to the coastal States, I have offered two amendments: First to provide that all public-land States shall be treated equally, if the century-old policy of reserving known mineral rights to the Federal Government, when public land is conveyed to States or individuals, is to be changed; and second, to protect any right that may have been acquired by citizens of the United States, by virtue of applications, under existing statutes of the United States, such as the Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920. Such rights should be completely safeguarded by this or and other Congress affecting them.

"Mr. Chairman, in my statement before the committee I intend to show:

"1. That there are no tidelands, inland waterways, river beds or lake bottoms involved in the Supreme Court decisions which decided that the States did not own sea-bottom lands; that the proposed legislation before this committee would reverse that decision by ceding the sea-bottom lands to the coastal States.

"2. That the statute of limitations or principle of laches or estoppel does not run against the Government; that the Government has not lost any rights by the prior actions of its officials or agents, and that the title to Federal lands or property could not be "clouded" by claims of ownership either by States or individuals.

"3. That there are no States rights involved, since the States have no legal interest in the sea-bottom lands beneath the marginal sea, and while the Congress has the unquestioned power to deed or cede any public property to a State or States—they cannot claim such action as a right.

"4. That the question of ownership of the sea-bottom lands came before the Supreme Court of the United States for the first time in the case of the *United States* v. *California*, decided June 23, 1947. The Supreme Court in its own words said '• • • it (the question of ownership of the submerged lands) is squarely presented for the first time.'

"5. That the Supreme Court, by its action, has not reversed any of its previous decisions in regard to States' ownership of the tidelands and inland waterways, but on the contrary has restated the rule of ownership by the States of their tidelands, inland waters, and lands under navigable lakes and streams.

"6. That the Supreme Court has squarely decided that the same rule of law—namely State ownership—applies to the lake-bottom lands of the Great Lakes as to the tidelands, inland waters and the bottoms of navigable rivers.

"7. That the 10th amendment of the Constitution (States rights) has not been violated by the Supreme Court decisions in the sea-bottom land cases, but on the other hand that amendment has been strengthened through clarification of ownership of the sea-bottom lands for the first time.

"8. That the sea-bottom lands are public lands in the light of Supreme Court decisions, and have always been public lands since the title could not have been clouded by any prior action by its agents, or any prior claim by any individual or State.

"9. That as public lands the sea-bottom lands should now be subject to leasing under the Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920 the same as any other public lands in spite of the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior to the contrary. Applicants for permits under the Oil and Gas Leasing Act have sued the Secretary of the Interior to reverse his decision.

"10. That any vested right, which may have accrued under any existing Federal statute prior to the effective date of quitclaim legislation ceding to the coastal States the sea-bottom lands, must be completely protected; and second, that all the public-land States should be treated equally and have conveyed to them the title to the mineral and mineral rights in the public lands within their boundaries, if the century-old congressional policy of reserving to the Federal Government known mineral rights when land was conveyed to individuals or States, is to be changed by quitclaim legislation.

"No property rights taken from the States

"The Supreme Court said in the California decision (*U. S.* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 39–40)) that 'the Federal Government's paramount rights in the 3-mile belt have not been lost by the conduct of its agents, nor by this conduct is the Government barred from enforcing its rights by reason of principles similar to laches, estoppel, or adverse possession.'

"NOTE.—'Paramount rights' means the supreme title to property. Paramount—supreme. Right—a claim or title to property. (Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language, 2d ed., 1949.)

"(By the term 'paramount' is meant superior, preeminent, or the highest rank (*Big Horn County* v. *Bench Canal Drainage District*, Wyo. (108 P. 2d 590, 594)).

"('Right,' as defined in law, is an enforceable claim or title to any subject matter whatever. Webster defines it as a legal claim, ownership, property (*Hathorn* v. *Robinson* (56 A. 1057, 1959))).

"The Court also said in that decision (332 U. S. 19, 29–39), that: 'California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along its coast.' One of the basic fallacies which constantly crops up in the contentions of the quitclaim advocates is that the Supreme Court by its decisions in the submerged-lands cases took away something from the States which had previously belonged to them.

"Thus there are statements (e. g., p. 238, supra) to the effect that the Federal Government, through the decisions of the Supreme Court in these submerged-lands cases, took away from 21 coastal States 17 million acres of land that they have claimed for over 100 years.

"This assumption involves two fallacies which I believe are obvious upon the slightest examination of such a statement. It assumes, first, that there is some statute of limitations or principle of laches which runs against the Federal Government, which, of course, has never been the law; and that principle is, in fact, reasserted in the California decision (321 U. S. 19, 39–40).

"Second, such a statement assumes that the Supreme Court in its submerged-lands decisions conveyed title to these submerged lands from the States to the Federal Government. But this completely overlooks not only the essential character of the judicial function, merely to declare the preexisting status of disputed property interests, but also the express determinations of the Supreme Court in those submerged-lands decisions that the States involved never, while they were States of the Union, had any title or property interests whatsoever in this area. As States, therefore, they were utterly destitute of any property interests in this area which the Supreme Court or anyone else could take away from them.

"These points appear to me, at least, to be undeniable from the barest statement of them, but I feel that they should be stated to combat and clear up the erroneous impressions and the confusion that they have undoubtedly caused in the minds of a number of people who are sincerely seeking to understand this controversy but who have been led heretofore to regard such fallacies as valid arguments.

"It is therefore established that the State does not own such sea-bottom lands within its borders, and that the Government does own such lands.

"Legal rules and precedents followed in deciding marginal sea cases

"Some of the testimony indicates that the Supreme Court on numerous occasions heretofore, has decided that the marginal sea lands belong to the States, and that in its recent decisions it has overturned and reversed that long line of decisions.

"I specifically refer, as an example, to the statement of my distinguished colleague, Senator DANIEL, at page 235, that 'there are about 43 Supreme Court cases that write the rule of State ownership broad enough to cover all submerged lands, both inland and coastal.'

"While I, of course, know that Senator DANIEL made that statement in good faith, I must point out that it is misleading on the basis of the decision of the Supreme Court, as specifically set out in the California case. The statement I refer to is based upon an incomplete version of the Supreme Court's language in that case, which language has often been advanced for the proposition which I am now considering. I am referring to the following portion of the Supreme Court's statement appearing at pages 36–37 (332 U. S. 19):

"'As previously stated this Court has followed and reasserted the doctrine of the Pollard case many times. And in doing so it has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not.'

"But the people who rely on that statement, it is to be noted, always refrain from continuing to quote the next statement immediately thereafter, which is as follows:

"'All of these statements were, however, merely paraphrases or offshoots of the Pollard inland water rule, and were used, not as enunciation of a new ocean rule, but in explanation of the old inland-water principle. Notwithstanding the fact that none of these cases either involved or decided the State-Federal conflict presented here, we are urged to say that the language used and repeated in those cases forecloses the Government from the right to have this Court decide that question now that it is squarely presented for the first time.'

"What I want to emphasize is the Supreme Court's express determination that none of these 40-odd cases involved or decided any question of ownership of the sea-bottom lands in the marginal sea.

"All the lawyers with whom I have conferred assure me that it follows inescapably, that all of the intimations regarding the status of the marginal sea, which may appear in some of these earlier decisions, and

which the quitclaim advocates contend should have controlled the Supreme Court's determination in the marginal sea cases, were purely obiter dictum. That being the case, the Supreme Court was acting with complete propriety and in the performance of its proper functions as a judicial body, when it ignored and disregarded such intimations by way of dicta in its earlier decisions.

"This point again is elementary, and typical statements of it can be found in any hornbook legal treatise. For example, a typical statement of this fundamental principle appears in 14th American Jurisprudence, pages 295–296, 'Courts,' section 83, as follows:

" 'Obiter dicta. The doctrine of stare decisis contemplates only such points as are actually involved and determined in a case, and not what is said by the court or judge outside the record or on points not necessarily involved therein. Such expressions, being obiter dicta, do not become precedents.'

"I have gone into this question to set at rest the baseless criticisms which the quitclaim advocates have continuously made of the propriety of the Supreme Court's determination in the marginal sea cases, in the light of the obiter dicta in its previous decisions which, as the Court itself admits, in the California case, might be construed as pointing the other way.

"But the refusal of the Court to follow these dicta, under settled principles, was entirely proper; and the contentions of the quitclaim advocates to the contrary are simply in conflict with the elementary and universally accepted principles to which I have referred.

"State ownership of lands under inland waters affirmed in marginal sea decisions

"It is fundamental that no 'tidelands, inland waterways, navigable streams, or States rights,' are included in the Supreme Court decision. Time and again the advocates of the quitclaim legislation have raised the specter of a vast scheme on the part of the Federal Government, proceeding under the authority of the marginal sea cases, to seize without compensation anything within the boundaries of any State that the Federal Government wanted, and that the Supreme Court might say that the national interest required.

"I have always been inclined to believe that these arguments were raised in order to disguise the purpose of 3 States which will benefit greatly by State ownership, to frighten the other 45 States into making them a present of these immensely valuable resources that belong to all the people of the United States.

"Certainly, it does not follow from the fact that the Supreme Court in the California cases refused to extend out into the ocean rule of State ownership of inland waters, exemplified in *Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan* (44 U. S. 212), that the inland-water rule has been impaired or discredited in the slightest degree.

"Quite on the contrary, the Court recognized the continued force and existence of the inland-water rule as applied within the boundaries of the respective States.

"Thus the Supreme Court in the California decision expresses its conception of the doctrine of the *Pollard* case (332 U. S. 19, 30), as follows:

" 'In the Pollard case it was held, in effect, that the original States owned in trust for their people the navigable tidewaters between high- and low-water mark within each State's boundaries, and the soil under them, as an inseparable attribute of State sovereignty.'

"The question before the Supreme Court in the California case was not whether the rule of the Pollard case should be abandoned, or impaired, or even qualified. The question was, as the Supreme Court itself said, whether the rule of the Pollard case—this rule of State ownership of tidelands and inland waters—should be extended beyond tidelands and out into the open sea.

"The Court on page 36 of the *California* case (332 U. S. 19, 36), while recognizing the continuing force of the Pollard rule, refused so to extend it in the following statement:

" 'Consequently, we are not persuaded to transplant the Pollard rule of ownership as an incident of State sovereignty in relation to inland waters out into the soil beneath the ocean, so much more a matter of national concern.'

"So to me it is perfectly plain that the Supreme Court in the California case, far from impairing or overruling the Pollard rule of State ownership of inland waters, recognized and reaffirmed the doctrine of that case; but refused to extend it to an area to which it had never—in spite of the dicta upon which California relied—been applied in any case involving the question of the ownership of the marginal sea.

"The quitclaim advocates have repeatedly stated their unalterable opposition to any proposed legislation which would merely confirm the rule of the Pollard case, and vest in the States title to all State lands which would have qualified as such under the principle of the Pollard case, at the time of the Supreme Court's decision in United States against California.

"Why are they so strongly opposed to legislation that would completely and for all time remove the very apprehension upon the basis of which they urge the necessity for quitclaiming not merely the inland waters, but also the marginal sea oil to the three States of California, Texas, and Louisiana?

"By a quitclaim measure merely confirming State ownership under the principles of the Pollard case, they would be afforded a complete and final protection against the very thing they claim most to fear, and yet they have consistently and even violently rejected it. It is to be noted above all else that such a measure would not operate as a protection and a benefit to 3 States merely, but it would operate to the benefit, actual or supposed, of all 48 States.

"Yet they reject it and insist, upon some line of reasoning that I cannot follow, and that I challenge anyone to follow, that the way to remove this supposed threat to the property of all the States, is not merely to remove it specifically by legislation, but in addition for 45 States to deed away their oil property in the ocean solely to the enrichment of the 3 coastal States which lie adjacent thereto. To me this situation speaks so strongly for itself that I cannot see that further comment is called for.

"There is, of course, no question that the Congress can deed or transfer the publicly owned sea bottom lands, seaward from the mean low tide, to the contiguous States as well as any of the publicly owned land within the public land States—but certainly no State can claim a right to such transfer.

"State ownership of the lands under the Great Lakes is confirmed

"There is no basis for the claims that the Supreme Court decision affects any inland waters including the Great Lakes—in fact the reverse is true—because the decisions in the sea bottom lands cases establish even more firmly that the States own the land under their inland navigable waters.

"The proponents of the quitclaim legislation claim that the United States under the Supreme Court sea bottom lands decisions now have the authority to go out and seize the lands underlying the Great Lakes. For this proposition there has been cited the case of *Illinois Central Railroad Co.* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387). It is said that this case holds that the Great Lakes are like the open seas and not like inland waters.

"From this, as I gather, it is to be inferred that the Supreme Court will next say that the Great Lakes are not like the State-owned tidelands whose status is governed by the Pollard rule which the Supreme Court expressly recognized and reaffirmed in the California case, but, on the contrary, are like the sea bottom lands under the marginal sea, which the Court in the same decision said is subject to the paramount rights of the United States.

"But on its face, as clearly as language could possibly express it, the Illinois decision states just the opposite position, namely, that the Great Lakes are governed by the Pollard rule, and are owned by the States just as fully as any State owns its tidelands.

"I am in fact greatly surprised that such a contention should have been advanced before the committee. I have carefully considered the language of the Supreme Court in this Illinois decision, and I have obtained the views of several able lawyers as to the Supreme Courts holdings in that case.

"Without exception their views have concurred with my own, and I have concluded not only that the Illinois decision squarely decides that it is the States, and not the Federal Government, that own the bottom of the Great Lakes, but also that this ownership arises by virtue of the force and application of the rule of the Pollard case.

"In my opinion, the contention I am considering is refuted and entirely disposed of by the following statement of the Supreme Court appearing at pages 434–435 of the Illinois decision:

" 'The State of Illinois was admitted into the Union in 1818 on an equal footing with the original States in all respects. * * * The boundaries of the States were prescribed by Congress and accepted by the State in its original constitution. They are given in the bill. It is sufficient for our purpose to observe that they include within their eastern line all that portion of Lake Michigan lying east of the main land of the State and the middle of the lake * * *.

" 'It is the settled law of this country that the ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by tidewaters, within the limits of the several States belong to the respective States within which they are found. * * * This doctrine has been often announced by this Court, and is not questioned by counsel of any of the parties. *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (44 U. S. 212, 3 How. 212). * * *

" 'This same doctrine is in this country held to be applicable to lands covered by fresh water in the Great Lakes over which conducted an extended commerce with different States and foreign nations. These lakes possess all the general characteristics of open seas, except in the freshness of their waters, and in the absence of the ebb and flow of the tide. In other respects they are inland seas, and there is no reason or principle for the assertion of dominion and sovereignty over and ownership by the State of lands covered by tidewaters that is not equally applicable to its ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by the fresh waters of these lakes.'

"No States rights involved

"There are no States rights involved in this controversy concerning the sea-bottom lands of the marginal sea.

"In the course of the hearings and of previous debates, both this year and in past years, I have heard bandied about a great many references to States' rights and many implications and assertions that the Supreme Court's decisions in the submerged lands cases stood in violation of the provisions of the 10th amendment of the Constitution. The 10th amendment, of course, provides—

" 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by

it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'

"While I do not profess to be an authority on constitutional law, this argument which, as I understand it, is apparently to the effect that the Supreme Court by its decisions in the submerged lands cases unlawfully invaded States' rights in violation of the 10th amendment, and in my judgment these statements are without foundation.

"The Supreme Court in the *California* decision (332 U. S. 19, 37) said that '• • • It [the question of ownership of the sea bottom land] is squarely presented for the first time.'

"It is also established that the statute of limitations does not run against the Government—therefore when the Court said that 'California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along its coast' (*U. S.* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 29–39)) it declared that California had no interest in the sea bottom lands and no right could be established by virtue of prior claims.

"Chief Justice Hughes, I am told, once said that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is, and certainly no truer words have ever been spoken.

"The Supreme Court in the California case said that since the States had by the Federal Constitution delegated to the National Government exclusive powers in the fields of war, commerce, and international affairs, the proper exercise of those exclusive functions, under the Constitution, required that the Federal Government, and not the States, have paramount rights in the marginal sea. And inasmuch as these constitutional powers have been delegated by the States to the National Government with respect to these marginal sea lands, these powers are expressly excepted by the terms of the 10th amendment itself from the reservations of power which are preserved to the States thereby.

"In the light of these undeniable considerations, I must confess that I am unable to follow their reasoning when they say that the Supreme Court went counter to the 10th amendment.

"Sea-bottom lands are 'public lands'

"Many of the proponents of quitclaim legislation and former members of the Departments of Justice and Interior claim that the sea bottom lands under the marginal sea are federally owned but are not 'public lands.'

"The former Solicitor for the Department of the Interior took the position that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920 applies to 'public lands,' but that it does not apply to the federally owned sea bottom lands because those lands do not qualify as 'public lands.'

"On that basis the Department of the Interior has refused to grant permits to applicants under the Oil and Gas Leasing Act, and has denied the application of those who have filed for prospecting permits and leases under that act. These lands could be leased under the Oil and Gas Leasing Act now if it were not for what I consider erroneous opinions given by members of the previous administration.

"The case of *Hynes* v. *Grimes Packing Co.* (337 U. S. 86) decided by the Supreme Court of the United States on May 31, 1949, has come to my attention, and I believe that the decision definitely and finally determines that the land under the marginal sea is 'public land.'

"The issue in that case was whether certain Indians in Alaska had the right to fish for salmon in the marginal sea off the Alaska coast. The existence of this right depended upon whether the marginal sea lands were covered by a statute, the body of which specifically declared that it should apply to the 'public lands' of the United States in accordance with the explicit requirements of the statute under which the rights of the Indians were claimed. The material part of the statute in question (S. 2 of the act of May 1, 1936, 49 Stat. 1250, sec. 337 U. S. 86, 91) provided:

" 'SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to designate as an Indian reservation any area of land which has been reserved for the use and occupance of Indians or Eskimos • • • together with additional public lands adjacent thereto, within the Territory of Alaska, or any other public lands which are actually occupied by Indians or Eskimos within said Territory. • • •'

"Here, then, was a measure which by its own plain and explicit terms was stated by the Congress to be applicable to 'public lands' of the United States. The Supreme Court reversed a decision of the circuit court of appeals which had held that the statute did not apply to the marginal sea lands by reason of the 'public lands' limitation in the text of the act.

"In reversing the court of appeals, the Supreme Court held, exactly to the contrary, that this statute, applicable to 'public lands' does apply to the marginal sea. Unless it is to be argued that the 2 situations are different because 1 involves oil, and the other involved fish, I see no escape from the conclusion that the marginal-sea lands, wherever situated, are 'public lands' under the authority of the Supreme Court's decision in this case of *Hynes* v. *Grimes Packing Co.*

"Vested rights must be protected

"The point has been raised and statements made to the effect that there is no need for an amendment to the proposed legislation before this committee, because vested rights could not be destroyed by legislation. The former Senator Burton K. Wheeler's testimony before this committee very ably explained why a saving clause is necessary.

"I join with Senator Wheeler in his statement that such a provision is necessary and that the congressional precedent in safeguarding such rights is both necessary and customary—when he said:

" 'At previous hearings I have been asked, since vested rights cannot in any event be destroyed by legislation, why I nevertheless am asking for a specific saving clause in the bill to protect those rights. While from the academic standpoint of abstract theory that might be a good question, yet anyone who has had practical experience as a lawyer must know that where a piece of legislation sets about to destroy vested rights, the chances of the people affected to have their rights vindicated in judicial proceedings are often jeopardized and very unfairly prejudiced. As a practical matter, these people will have to overcome both the presumption which the courts say exists in favor of the constitutionality of all acts of Congress, and the reluctance of the courts to apply this drastic remedy which would nullify a congressional enactment in order to save private rights which enjoy the higher protection of the Constitution. Now I have no doubt that these applicants would ultimately succeed in having this legislation stricken down on that basis; but I only say that failure to include a saving clause protecting their rights will impose upon them an unfair and entirely unnecessary burden in the courts.'

"As a practical matter I believe this committee, which has spent so much time and effort to hear all sides of this controversy, should take every precaution to protect its own legislation from attack on the grounds of constitutionality.

"Historically it has been the policy of Congress to protect prior rights and claims whenever disposition was made of lands and mineral deposits belonging to the United States.

"In at least 19 acts of Congress, vested rights were specifically protected. In the Mineral Leasing Act itself prior claims were protected in section 37 of that act. As another example when the Congress passed the Acquired Lands Act of August 7, 1947, it inserted a savings clause which not only protects all prior rights but even went so far as to reinstate any valid applications filed on such lands under the Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920.

"Inasmuch as the policy of Congress has been to include a savings clause in its acts in making disposition of lands with mineral deposits, I see no reason why that policy should now be changed.

"Grant ownership of minerals to all the States

"Mr. Chairman, it has long been the policy of the Federal Government in its disposition of public lands to withhold rights in the subsoil containing known mineral deposits. For the benefit of the record I wish to include as part of this statement a letter from Mr. William Pincus, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of Interior, setting forth this well-established policy.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
"Washington 25, D. C., March 2, 1953.

"Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
"United States Senate,
"Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR SENATOR MALONE: You have asked for a brief statement outlining the conditions under which minerals are reserved by the United States in grants of land made under acts of Congress.

"Prior to the act of March 3, 1853 (10 Stat. 244), which granted inter alia certain lands to the State of California for school purposes, it had been the general policy of Congress to grant lands, whether to individuals or to States, without regard to whether or not they contained minerals. That act marked a change in this policy. It provided in express terms that the mineral lands were excepted from preemption and from public sale. And, as held by the United States Supreme Court in *Mining Company* v. *Consolidated Mining Company* (102 U. S. 167), this exception went to land grants generally thereafter made by Congress.

"The general policy of reserving mineral lands from disposal under all grants except for locations under the mining laws, act of May 10, 1872 (17 Stat. 91, 30 U. S. C., sec. 22, et seq.), and the sale of coal lands under the act of March 3, 1873 (17 Stat. 607, 30 U. S. C., sec. 71), was continued without change until 1909. The act of March 3 of that year (35 Stat. 844, 30 U. S. C., sec 81), provided for the patenting of entries theretofore made under the non-mineral-land laws of lands classified, claimed, or reported as being valuable for coal with a reservation of the coal deposits to the United States. The act of June 22, 1910 (36 Stat. 583, 30 U. S. C., sec. 83), extended this principle to all nonmineral, homestead, and desert land entries and to all selections of coal land thereafter made. The act of July 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 509, 30 U. S. C., sec. 121), permitted the entry and patenting of lands withdrawn or classified, or which are valuable for phosphate, nitrate, potash, oil, gas, or asphaltic minerals with a reservation to the United States of the particular mineral for which the land was withdrawn, etc. Sodium and sulfur were added by the act of March 4, 1933 (47 Stat. 1570, 30 U. S. C., sec. 124).

"The act of December 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 862, 43 U. S. C., sec. 291), provided for stock-raising entries of 640 acres with a reservation to the United States of all minerals. This act differed from the three preceding acts in that all minerals were required to be reserved as a matter of course without regard to the known mineral character of the land whereas the prior acts, applicable, as to private entries to a maximum of 320 acres under the enlarged homestead and desert land laws, provided for a reservation only of known minerals of the kinds specified in the acts.

"The act of March 20, 1922, as amended February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1090, 16 U. S. C., sec. 486), provided for the exchange of national forest land or timber for privately owned lands and that either party to such an exchange might make reservations of minerals, etc., in the lands exchanged. Similar authority is contained in section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1272, 43 U. S. C. sec. 315g).

"The Taylor Grazing Act, supra, in section 7, as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976, 43 U. S. C., sec. 315f), also provided that before disposing of any public land the Secretary of the Interior should classify it as more valuable or suitable for the purpose contemplated by the proposed disposal than for the production of native grasses and forage, but did not effect any change in the policy of reserving minerals, except that by implication it repealed the Stock Raising Homestead Act of December 29, 1916, supra. Thus, under present law and with the exception of the forest and Taylor Grazing Act exchange provisions (and perhaps other laws of limited scope) under which all minerals may be reserved whether known to exist or not, the policy of reserving minerals in lands disposed of under nonmineral-land laws applies to minerals known or believed to exist in the lands on the date of entry and/or patent. Those minerals, except asphalt, are all subject to leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 30 U. S. C., sec. 181, et seq.), as amended. Under that act all proceeds from leasing are distributed 37½ percent to the State in which the leased land is situated, 52½ percent to the reclamation fund, and 10 percent to the general fund.

"As of June 30, 1950, all minerals had been reserved in 36,611,032 acres of patented lands; coal had been reserved in 10,947,032 acres and either oil, gas, phosphate, potash, sodium, sulfur, or asphalt or combinations of those minerals, but principally oil and gas, had been reserved in 2,135,131 acres of patented public lands.

"I trust that this is the information you desire.

"Sincerely yours,

"WILLIAM PINCUS,
"*Assistant Director.*

"As I have previously stated, the coastal States certainly have no valid claim to the sea-bottom lands of the marginal sea since the Supreme Court decisions in *U. S.* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19). However, if the Congress is going to change its long-established policy of reserving the mineral rights, and is instead going to grant to the coastal States fee simple title or title to the mineral rights or title to the subsurface values found under the sea-bottom lands as the present Attorney General suggested in the committee hearings, then I say all of the States must be treated equally.

"I have proposed in my previous statement before this committee an amendment to grant to such States title to all minerals and mineral rights within their boundaries.

"At this point I wish to include as a part of this statement a portion of a telegram addressed to me from Mr. Louis D. Gordon, executive secretary of Nevada Mining Association, recommending that the mineral rights be granted to the States:

"'In re your telephone conversation with Hardy, we advocate transferring all mineral rights—metallic, nonmetallic, and oil—to States.'

"Mr. Chairman, I again want to call to the attention of this committee the century-old policy of reserving to the Federal Government known mineral rights whenever federally owned public lands are conveyed to States or to individuals.

"I want also to emphasize the benefits derived under this long-established policy. As a consequence, the mineral rights are leased under the provisions of the Natural Oil and Gas Leasing Act of 1920 and from the royalties 52½ percent is allocated to the reclamation fund and is expended for irrigation and reclamation projects in the 17 Western States.

"These benefits will be nullified if this quitclaim legislation is passed and the mineral rights in the submerged lands are conveyed to the States.

"Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to again point out that many citizens of the State of Nevada and of other States have made application under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act for permits and leases to prospect for oil and gas in the sea-bottom lands.

"These applicants which I have mentioned have an interest in 11 applications filed at least 90 days prior to an amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, dated August 21, 1935, which directed the Secretary of the Interior to grant leases for all valid applications.

"Through certain pretexts, which have heretofore been set forth and explained, these applicants have not been granted leases to certain areas of the sea-bottom lands.

"If the Federal Government is going to cede or deed the sea-bottom lands to the coastal States, these applicants with vested rights under the existing Federal laws must be protected. I have proposed an amendment to protect these rights, and I intend to work for its adoption."

Mr. MALONE. Madam President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD certain excerpts from the biennial report of the State engineer of Nevada for 1929–30, GEORGE W. MALONE, then State engineer of Nevada.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAU OF INDUSTRY, AGRICULTURE, AND IRRIGATION

The State engineer, by virtue of his position, is a member of the commission of bureau of industry, agriculture, and irrigation.

This commission has not been active, due to lack of appropriations to support investigations and operations necessary to the proper functioning of this body.

RANGE CONTROL

The problem of proper utilization of the public range in our State is difficult of solution due to the extremely low grazing value. According to Government reports covering the approximately 55 million acres of unappropriated and unreserved public domain, it requires an average of 140 acres to graze a cow unit and 40 acres to graze a sheep unit for 1 year. It is obvious then that any solution of our range problems must be such that a very small expenditure for supervision will be required.

RANGE ALL UTILIZED

It is well known to the stockmen and those familiar with range conditions that all of the public range in Nevada has been utilized for 25 or 30 years, and during that period any new user who has placed additional livestock upon the range has only displaced stock that were already there or caused the range to be overgrazed. No new wealth has been created—rather, it has tended to decrease the resources of the State on account of the deterioration of the range due to overgrazing.

RANCHES DEPENDENT UPON RANGELAND

The value of the ranches scattered widely throughout the public lands of our State is for the most part directly dependent upon the surrounding range. To preserve such value enough of the adjacent range must be retained to graze the number of livestock during the spring, summer, and early fall that the ranch will provide feed for in the winter.

The assessed valuation of such ranch property is based upon a complete unit in nearly every case, and if the range is to be considered separately or taken from the control of the ranches, then the assessed value of the ranch must be reduced accordingly.

If each individual were to be given the range unit used by him, no new values would be found or created, but the present assessed value would merely be redistributed. The only new value created would be whatever development of the range could be brought about by virtue of more perfect control of the range unit and it would require considerable time to become noticeable.

FOREST RESERVE VERSUS STATE METHODS

The Forest Service has done and is doing a splendid work in conservation of the forests; however, when any branch of the Government created for a special service enlarges its field of activity and enters into an entirely new work, its methods should be scrutinized carefully and the personnel of such branch of the Government should study local conditions carefully and consult men familiar with the particular territory before establishing principles and policies affecting an important industry.

The Forest Service follows the policy of redistribution of range and of charging the stockmen the full value of the feed. Redistribution in some instances means taking part of the range from one user and giving it to another under certain conditions and at certain periods.

The State's method is to protect the range units, insofar as possible, as established by long use, allowing the natural economic situation to take care of any redistribution and appropriating sufficient funds for the actual expense of supervision.

It would seem that when a complete livestock unit has been built up over a period of years, such unit consisting of a summer, winter, spring, and fall range, with a ranch of sufficient size to balance same, one part of the unit as the summer range—which is largely controlled by the Forest Service—should not be arbitrarily decreased, leaving the owner of such unit with a reduced carrying capacity and with the same investment in his plant.

In the matter of the charges for the use of such range, where the land is of such small grazing value, it is concluded that any system of charges must be subject to close scrutiny or a real injustice may be done.

STOCK WATER LAW

The Stock Watering Act of Nevada became a law on April 1, 1925. This act is predicated upon the principle that the value of a right to the use of water for stock watering at a particular source upon the public domain is directly dependent, not upon the number of stock that can water at said watering place, but upon the number of stock that can graze and feed upon the available range readily accessible to livestock watering at such place. In other words, there has been a definite relationship established between the water and range value. Thus, it would seem that the Nevada Stock Watering Act accomplished indirectly that which is intended by the Colorado regulation. The constitutionality of the Nevada Act has been upheld by the Nevada Supreme Court in the Calvo case, decision No. 2747, February 21, 1927. The validity of this act therefore seems to be unquestioned, while the Colorado law remains to be tested in a higher court.

Contrary to the opinion held by many, the Nevada Stock Watering Act did not change the manner of procedure in which a valid stock watering right could be acquired. It has, however, fixed a method for the more exclusive control of range by virtue of valid stock watering rights and protects prior or vested users against subsequent appropriation. Neither has the act, as asserted by some of its opponents, granted any additional rights not previously enjoyed by stockmen, such as a right to 1 day's watering without

penalty, as prior to the enactment of this legislation there was no limit to the number of times stock could be watered at a particular place.

RANGE MAPS

In order that the State engineer, who is charged with the administration of the Stock Watering Act, could intelligently formulate departmental policies governing the administration of this act, it has been necessary to make a comprehensive study of the whole stock watering and range problem during the past 4 years. As an aid in making this study and formulating policies, numerous stockmen throughout the State have, upon request, submitted maps showing boundaries of the range claimed by them. With these maps as a working basis a State range map has been compiled, showing the relative locations of ranges claimed by various stockmen throughout the State of Nevada. Up to the present time 224 range claimants have submitted maps, which have proved an invaluable source of range and stock watering information, and which will undoubtedly form the basis for the ultimate determination of range rights and the settling of range disputes.

VESTED RIGHTS IN RANGE

There has been considerable discussion as to whether or not a vested right should be gained by long use of the range on the same principle as laid down in our water law. Whether rights are vested or not, it is generally conceded that any division of the range or the fixing of range boundaries should be based on "use of range." The State's method of control of range units built up over a long period of years must be recognized as economically sound and protected as far as possible under the police power of the State, provided Federal recognition can be secured of the State's method of control.

FURTHER RANGE LEGISLATION

It is proper at this time to proceed with further legislation under the police power of the State to protect established range limits from further encroachment in order to prevent range conflicts, with the consequent overgrazing and abuse of the range.

Mr. MALONE. Madam President, I offer my amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 13 for the purpose of treating all of the public-land States alike, if we are to break the precedent of withholding known minerals when land is deeded to the States.

I offer the amendment for the further purpose that if the Congress determines to split away from the reclamation fund the production of petroleum and gas from certain public lands in certain States, then allow the remaining States to utilize their own resources for their own development.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks certain excerpts from the hearings in executive sessions before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OWNERSHIP OF THE PUBLIC LANDS IN CALIFORNIA

Senator CORDON. With respect to California, and a portion of California coast; yes.

The next change, and I am not referring now to the changes in the letters identifying the paragraphs, in line 16, we have subparagraph (d), in line 19, the word "from" has been inserted. In line 20, the phrase "if legally validated" has been inserted. The reason for that phrase being inserted is that with respect to the Louisiana Purchase and possibly some of the Mexican grants, there were ancient grants by the former sovereign. Those grants have either been validated or are no longer deemed to be instruments of title.

Senator MALONE. Who was the original sovereign off the coast of California?

Senator CORDON. Spain.

Senator ANDERSON. And Russia after that.

Senator CORDON. Yes; I believe Russia then.

Senator MALONE. It is included in the land grants from Spain?

Senator CORDON. The grants in California were from Spain.

Senator MALONE. And they were granted to whom?

Senator CORDON. Various Spaniards.

Senator MALONE. To individuals.

Senator CORDON. That is correct.

Senator DANIEL. And Mexico.

Senator CORDON. That is right, Mexico. I forgot about that.

Senator MALONE. The grants were to individuals, were they not?

Senator CORDON. That is right, grants to persons. And there were vast grants in Arizona, what is now Arizona, and New Mexico.

Senator MALONE. What happened to the land where there were no grants to individuals? The remainder of such land was granted to or ownership assumed by the Federal Government of the United States, was it not?

Senator CORDON. When the areas came under the jurisdiction of the United States, the land became owned by the United States, and the grants in part, where they hadn't been secured by fraud, or there wasn't some other reason for failure to validate, were validated.

Senator MALONE. The Government of the United States did there and then own the lands that were not specifically granted to individuals, and then the United States Government recognized such legitimate grants to individuals; our Government then recognized such grants as they considered were obtained from Spain or Mexico in a proper manner.

Senator CORDON. That is right.

Senator MALONE. Then the State of California never did at any time own such land?

Senator CORDON. No.

* * * * *

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer two amendments to each of the bills. Now, as I understand it, there is only one bill before the committee. Everything else has been discarded. That is, the rewritten bill presented by the chairman today nullifies all other offered legislation.

Senator CORDON. I do not want to say everything has been discarded. This is the one bill that has been gone through with regard to perfecting its amendments, as far as its major provisions are concerned, and the Chair has submitted it to the committee.

Senator ANDERSON. Permit me just a second. There are some bills that naturally would fall by the wayside. For example, I have a bill for interim operation of this area. If you are going to give title, definitely, to the States, there is no need for interim operation in that area. Secondly, I have a bill to try to make sure that title to these inland waters and lands underneath navigable streams, and filled-in lands, return to the States. Now, on the basis of the explanation that the chairman just made, if this bill were to be passed, I would not be interested in pushing that legislation because if the grants to the States should be held unconstitutional, the other act still applies.

I have no assurance that this act would be held unconstitutional, but if it should then the grants to the States on the inland waters still apply.

PERMIT APPLICANTS—NATIONAL OIL AND GAS LEASING ACT

Senator MALONE. I will amend my statement, Mr. Chairman, that the junior Senator from Nevada did not recognize the bill after the chairman brought it in, and could not find any suitable place to immediately offer the amendments. But, given time to read it, I think it can be arranged.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, there may be others in the same predicament, and I think that all that is necessary is for Senator MALONE to offer his amendment to be placed at the proper place in the bill, and it will be done.

Senator MALONE. As I understand the proposition it is that we will read them into the record now, if we wish to, but nothing will be done about it until tomorrow.

Senator CORDON. That is the chairman's thought about it.

Senator MALONE. I intend to offer two amendments, Mr. Chairman. In view of all the debate and the hearings that were held, it was made very clear that there had been certain applications for permits to prospect for oil and gas under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act. These filings were made prior to the amendment to the National Gas and Oil Leasing Act, in 1935. That is, August 21, 1935, is the date of the amendment.

The applications were made one certain specified time before this amendment which would bring them within the purview of the act itself. The only reason is that they were not granted, and there were two reasons given as time went on, as follows: The first and earlier reason was that the Secretary of the Interior thought they belonged to the States and therefore he could not grant the permit through the applications, and then as soon as he found that they were publicly owned Government lands, he immediately, and without delay, ruled that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act was not applicable to the sea-bottom lands, thus giving the appearance of reading the menu backward in both cases to prevent permits being granted under the applications. Under these rulings the Secretary of the Interior would not be under obligation to issue the permits.

As has been brought out in the argument and testimony before the committee, there were 11 applications, and approximately 400 people in my State and perhaps others in other States are interested in these 11 applications. Immediately after the Secretary's decision, there was a suit directed against the Secretary of the Interior through the Federal court here to reverse his decision. That case has been argued, I understand, in the Federal court here in Washington, D. C. It has been tried and argued and is ready for decision.

That decision, and the fact seems to be well known, has been held up until the Supreme Court has either adopted the master's report as to where the boundary between the inland waterways and the open sea is located, or has been amended or settled that issue in any case, and then this decision will be rendered either for or against the Secretary.

If it is rendered against the Secretary, then these applications would be immediately ready to be acted upon by the Secretary under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act in the absence of legislation by the Congress transferring these lands to the States or making disposition of them in some other way.

PROTECT RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS, IF ANY

I will offer an amendment that will protect any rights that may have been acquired by these individuals through the 11 applications for permits to develop these sea-bottom lands, by virtue of the fact that they were in good standing before the Secretary of the Interior.

I will read this amendment that was prepared for the bill as it stood before committee print No. 4 came before us today. It reads:

"At the appropriate place in Senate Joint Resolution 13, as amended, insert the following:

"'(b) Nothing contained in this act shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been

acquired under any law of the United States by any person in lands subject to this act and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this act or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights in such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything contained in this act.'"

Senator MALONE. That completes the first amendment. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it be discussed at the proper time and that it be inserted in the proper place.

Senator CORDON. May I interrupt you to ask if you, after reading them into the record, would permit the committee to have them. Tonight we could have a print made of them so that every member may have your amendments tomorrow morning.

Senator MALONE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer another amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 13, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is presented for the record for the reason that is known to most persons who are familiar with the Federal action on public lands over the last few years, and brought out very clearly in the hearings, that for approximately a century the Federal Government had withheld known mineral rights when they were deeding lands to the States or persons.

The public-land States, of course, are the 11 Western States, although the 2 Dakotas have a certain amount of public land. But that is about all the public land that is left as such.

Mr. Chairman, if that precedent is to be broken, the precedent as it has been established of withholding mineral rights, then treat all public-land States alike. The Supreme Court did rule that the States did not own the sea-bottom lands, that the Federal Government had paramount rights in and dominion over these lands, and all of these words and phrases are foreign to engineer language. But upon looking them up in the dictionary, and consulting eminent attorneys, they are defined as the highest possible title. The Federal Government owns these lands so the Supreme Court says. There is no question about their being public lands. Now if we are about to break that century-old precedent and deed the mineral rights on Federal land containing known minerals to the States, then my amendment would treat all public-land States alike.

Therefore, I offer this amendment to be inserted in the proper place in the resolution.

In many States the question of public lands may be a small matter, but when you get out to Colorado, New Mexico, and Nevada, it becomes a major issue and is nothing to be trifled with, or just laughed off, that you can do something with public lands in some States and you can do something else with other public lands in other States, because you cannot do it and still keep faith with the public-land States.

PUBLIC LANDS IN TRUST FOR THE STATES

It has been established in the testimony before this committee many times that the whole public-land policy of Congress for nearly a century pointed to the fact that they were holding the lands in trust for the States until they could find some method of transferring them to private ownership under Federal law and putting them on the tax rolls. They did that through homesteads, through mining claims, and other Federal legislation for a nominal filing fee. The objective was to arrange it so that an individual secures enough land to make a living. If it is mining, it is the amount of land that he can work handily, because in the Mining Act it is set down that he must do $100 worth of work a year to hold his mining claim. If it is agricultural land, 160 acres was estimated about right for a family—all for a nominal filing fee.

This is a definite change in public-land policy. We are about to deed this land with the known mineral rights to the United States.

I therefore offer the following amendment to be placed at the end of Senate Joint Resolution 13:

"TITLE III—MINERAL RIGHTS IN PUBLIC LANDS GRANTED TO STATES

"SEC. 10. Subject to the provisions of section 11 of this act all minerals and mineral rights in deposits in the public lands belonging to the United States, including (1) lands temporarily withdrawn or reserved for classification purposes, and (2) lands within grazing districts established pursuant to Public Law No. 482, 73d Congress, approved June 28, 1934, as amended (commonly known as the Taylor Grazing Act), except any such lands forming a part of a national forest, are hereby granted to the several States within the territorial boundaries of which such lands are situated. Such minerals and mineral rights and the proceeds derived from the sale, lease, or other disposition thereof shall be used for such purposes as the respective legislatures of such States shall determine.

"SEC. 11. (a) The provisions of section 10 of this act shall not apply (1) to any public lands with respect to which any entry has been made, or any right or claim has been initiated, under the provisions of law in force on the date of acceptance by the State of the grant made by such section except that upon the relinquishment or cancellation of such entry, application, right, or claim such lands shall become immediately subject to the provisions of this section, or (2) with respect to deposits of materials essential to the production of fissionable materials reserved for the use of the United States under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

"(b) The grant made by section 10 of this act shall take effect with respect to the lands within a particular State whenever the legislature of such State (1) enacts legislation providing for the location and development of mineral deposits in the public lands of such State, corresponding to the laws then in effect relating to the location and development of mineral deposits in the public lands of the United States, (2) assumes in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior all obligations of the United States with respect to any valid claims, rights, or privileges existing upon the date of acceptance by the State of the grant, and (3) by resolution, accepts the grant and deposits a certified copy of such resolution with the Secretary of the Interior. Upon receipt of a certified copy of a resolution of acceptance from any State and an instrument evidencing the assumption of such obligations, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be delivered to the proper officials of such State such maps, records, books, and documents as may be necessary for the enjoyment, control, use, administration, and disposition of such lands.

"(c) Upon the acceptance by any State of such grant as provided in subsection (b) all laws and regulations relating to mineral rights and deposits in the public lands, shall cease to be applicable to the public lands within such State, but such laws shall continue in force with respect to the lands and deposits excepted under this title.

"SEC. 12. As used in this title—

"(a) Subject to the provisions of section 10 of this act the term 'public lands' means the public domain, surveyed or unsurveyed, unappropriated lands, and lands not held back or reserved for any special Government or public purpose.

"(b) The term 'State' means any State of the Union."

Mr. Chairman, that concludes the amendments that I intend to offer at the proper time, to conform to the policy being adopted by this act.

Senator ANDERSON. May I ask the Senator from Nevada if this is a grant to the public land States of the minerals lying beneath their public lands?

Senator MALONE. That is true in the same manner as the mineral rights are going to the States under the sea-bottom lands.

Senator ANDERSON. The forests are exempted here. There are mineral values in the forests. While I would not interfere with the national forests, does he intend to include mineral rights beneath the national forests?

I ask that question, Mr. Chairman, because while I was Secretary of Agriculture I attempted to transfer—and I believe I did transfer—to the Department of the Interior the responsibility for leasing forests for mineral development on the theory that they were equipped to handle mineral development and the Department of Agriculture was not.

Senator MALONE. It would be subject to discussion. Perhaps they should be included with proper safeguards. My idea, principally, was to transfer the mineral rights to all lands not specifically withdrawn for a specific Federal purpose. That does not, of course, really prevent the United States Government from proceeding in the usual manner from releasing the minerals upon the lands at their discretion. But perhaps they should be included in this amendment.

Senator ANDERSON. Furthermore, I happen to know in my State, and I assume in a good many other States, there was a good deal of land to be selected by the State for various purposes, grants to schools and otherwise.

The Federal Government never allowed the States to select any section known to be mineral in character or where the geological report at any time had indicated the presence of mineral deposits.

Now, since a great section of the State is known to have coal underlying it, all those areas where coal underlies it, which means any area a few miles north of Albuquerque up to the corner of the State where it borders Utah, Colorado, and Arizona, that entire section is underlain with coal. Therefore, all that land has been retained by the Federal Government since the mineral is there.

It does seem to me that if that mineral was held by the Federal Government all these years, the situation is quite comparable to what is taking place here, and perhaps that mineral does belong to the State that has it within its borders. I am just trying to find out if he intends to include all that type of mineral within his amendment so that the State will get it as a direct benefit from it.

Senator MALONE. Not including the land directly withdrawn for a specific Federal purpose on a permanent basis. I will say further to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, there has been a good deal of doubletalk and mixed metaphors and a lot of things in the discussion of this problem.

First, of course, it started out widely advertised as tidelands and States rights, neither of which are in any remote way affected or included. The Supreme Court said specifically that there never had been any decision directly affecting the sea-bottom lands. Of course, there has not been any such Supreme Court decision. The public

can be deluded by discussing the fringe of several decisions and by stretching the imagination, allege that these sea-bottom lands were included in prior decisions—but it is not seriously contended. There has never been any question, I will say further, Mr. Chairman, about the States having full police power over all the lands within its boundaries, either public or otherwise; that is, public, State-owned, or privately owned.

POLICE POWER OF THE STATE

We tried that out in our State, I have already outlined to the committee. In my State of Nevada, 87 percent of our land is public land, and we have about 60 million acres of rangelands without forests. Now, as a matter of fact, we passed a stock-raising act to regulate grazing long before the Taylor Grazing Act came along. It worked very well, since it allowed the State engineer to refuse an application for a permit to water cattle or sheep or livestock of any kind at a certain spring or waterhole, to deny that application, even though there were plenty of water for an additional permit, if he found, upon examination, that all the range was being substantially utilized from a subsisting right; meaning that if you threw another band of sheep or herd of cattle or herd of horses in there, it meant trouble. You could curtail the permits under the police power of the State.

Some people said that you could not keep them off the public land, that they had a perfect right to go any place on a public land. But our supreme court held it constitutional under the police power of the State. To keep the peace, the State legislature had the right to prevent you or me, or anyone else, from going on that land under certain circumstances that might cause trouble. So we regulated the use of the land under the police powers of the State and did a very good job of it. It was taken away from us under the so-called Taylor Grazing Act, which is not working satisfactorily in our State.

We will have either general legislation or special legislation, and maybe both, to deal with this problem at the proper time. It will be a matter for separate discussion.

APPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL OIL AND GAS LEASING ACT

There has never been any reason why, since the sea-bottom lands were ruled to be public lands within State boundaries, just exactly the same as the 87 percent of our land in the State of Nevada, they should not be treated like other public lands. If there was a technicality, which I doubt, and the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act was not applicable to these lands after they were declared public lands, it would require only a very simple congressional amendment to the act to make them applicable.

Therefore, there is no legitimate excuse for saying that in order to develop these lands they must be owned by the State any more than the lands in eastern or central Nevada, where we brought in an oil well a few days ago.

There is no more reason to say that these lands must be under State ownership to be developed, than there is to say that the public lands of Nevada must be under State ownership to be developed. It is simply a matter of what Congress wants to do.

Senator JACKSON. How long has the Federal Government been reserving mineral rights?

Senator MALONE. About a century. That is, not always, but off and on.

Senator JACKSON. Sometimes they would grant a fee simple of everything?

Senator MALONE. I do not know of any specific cases. When it was known that it was a known proven mineral area, they generally did not grant mineral rights.

Senator ANDERSON. I will say that in about 1878 or so a party of surveyors crossed a section of New Mexico and found outcroppings of coal, and traced the general geology of the area, and determined that hundreds of square miles were mineral in character, and therefore, could not be selected by the State as lieu lands because there was known mineral there.

My question to him has been this: If a strip along the open ocean developed mineral and that mineral is now going to belong to the State, does he see any reason why that coal that underlies the area in my State should not belong to the State?

Senator MALONE. None whatever. No, Senator, and further along this line, I will come back to the matter of the Federal lease in a moment.

To show or to illustrate the utter idiocy of some of the rulings made out of the Department of the Interior in recent years, suddenly nuclear energy becomes the order of the day and atomic ores become very valuable and become very necessary. So the Secretary of the Interior Ickes, in his wisdom, the same kind he has used in nearly all of his career, immediately withdrew all Federal lands whenever a discovery of uranium ore was discovered. In other words, whenever it became known that it contained any of this mineral, fissionable mineral, that acreage was immediately withdrawn. That, of course, fixed it so that no one would tell him when they discovered uranium, so he delayed the mining of the metal indefinitely.

This was in line with his general policy, practically 100 percent, he fixed it so that the Government would never find out where these discoveries were made because a prospector may only know one thing but he knows that very well, and that is that he is not going to tell you or me or the Government where he discovered the minerals until he has it located and it belongs to him. So when he has it known that it would immediately belong to Uncle Sam and there was no set price to be paid for it, Uncle Sam received no more information. Mr. Ickes set us back at least 20 years in mining. Today there were people in my office on this very problem.

GRAZING LAND

I was just illustrating some of the utter idiocy displayed through ruling by an ignorant Government official. As a matter of fact, up until 1934, when the Taylor Grazing Act was passed, when Mr. Ickes came into office and discovered suddenly thousands of acres where it took from 20 to 150 acres to run a cow unit a year—and in some areas a cow could not travel far enough in a day to get enough to eat so there was no value in the land—he was going to save the poorest grazing land in the United States and make a large amount of money for all the people in the Nation by leasing it.

Of course he could not possibly get enough out of this land as rental to repay the cost of administering it. That, however, he did not tell the people of the United States.

A CENTURY OF LAND LAWS

Up to that time, of course, Congress had used very good judgment. You can trace the whole period, their whole list of land laws starting a century ago, and they all point to one thing.

They pointed to putting the public land into private ownership with enough land for a man to make a living, charging only a nominal fee, with no charge for the land. The policy was private ownership. It was not until Mr. Ickes came along with his bright ideas that all of that changed and the policy was completely reversed so that these poorest lands in the Nation would remain forever in the hands of the Government to be kicked around by Federal officials.

Now to come back to the Federal lease. There is no reason why this land could not be put under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act. A very simple amendment, if the decision of the Federal court when finally it is made, upholds the Secretary of the Interior. No amendment is necessary if the court reverses the Secretary.

Senator ANDERSON. Would you yield a moment?

Senator MALONE. I will yield.

Senator ANDERSON. Of course, you are familiar with the fact that when helium was discovered in my State, and people thought it was going to be needed for the purpose of supplying dirigibles to fly across the ocean, immediately the Secretary of the Interior removed that from the field where a man could prospect.

I was just going to say, would it be difficult, where these Federal leases are in existence in our area, to validate all of the leases where there is production of oil, but it would be easy to change the place where the proceeds are paid on the royalties? The Federal Government is familiar with handling these royalty payments and the $5 million being taken out of my State by the Federal Government each year, and more than that in the State of Wyoming, could be paid directly to the State under the amendment that the Senator has introduced. Is that not correct?

Senator MALONE. That is correct. And it would be very easy.

Now to get back to the original disposition of the fund. Congress has used very good judgment over the years. Like I have said, they might vary a little here and there, but they always righted themselves. The long-established policy is to develop the fuels and the minerals under the act (National Oil and Gas Leasing Act), and to pass the agricultural lands into the hands of the man who would work it, into the hands of the people in amounts so that the family could make a living and the transfer would be made at a nominal filing fee and the individual would not pay anything for the land.

Even a mining claim, when you patent it, after doing $500 worth of work—and I have patented hundreds of claims in the Western States over 20 or 25 years' time—there are certain Federal fees and State fees which must be paid. But when you pay those and finally get the patent survey made, then they charge you $5 an acre for the land, no matter if it may be worth a million dollars or $2, but you still pay $5 per acre.

The theory is that you are going to work this land, and then pay the State taxes and the income tax. It just gets lost in the general property taxes of the country around which the entire Government is built.

RECLAMATION FUND

In 1920, in the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act, the Government set down a very definite disposition of the moneys from these leases. The 11 western land States were the arid States. They all needed agricultural development. It was not determined at the moment where the development would be, but it was thought that it would average among the States in the long run. They did not know where the oil would be discovered and do not know yet, as a matter of fact, where more of it will be found. We are discovering oil on land on which geologists, for 50 years, said there would be no oil discovered, for example, the volcanic areas. So they said in their wisdom that 10 percent would go to the Government for supervision, presumably, 37.5 percent would go to the State wherein such oil and gas was located—that is, of the royalty, whether it was 12.5 percent or more—and 52.5 percent would go to the reclamation fund which originally was distributed in 11 western public land States in accordance with the direction of the Congress of the United States for the construction of irrigation projects.

This committee, the Public Lands Committee before the name was changed, has been passing on those projects. As a matter of fact, the Senator from my State, Senator Newlands, was the author of the Bureau of Reclamation bill in 1902. The first project ever built under it was in Fallon, Nev.

If we should suddenly wake up, and suddenly say, through the Congress, that since these are very rich lands and since these States have claimed these lands, then we are going to deed such lands to them. Concerning the reclamation fund there is no question in my mind but that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act is applicable and, naturally, the 52.5 percent will go into the fund and will not need any further legislation except a simple amendment providing the Federal court says that under the present provisions the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act is not applicable. That is the worst that could happen. If they said it is applicable, no legislation is necessary.

So when you are taking the land, you are taking 52.5 percent of the royalties, whether it is 12½ or 20 percent, and you are forever keeping the funds from the reclamation fund.

If you are going to separate these lands from the fund, then why not complete the job and let the mineral deposits of the States go to the States wherein they are located? That, then, would supplement and replace, to a certain extent for each State the loss of revenue that you are beginning to chisel off here.

Senator BUTLER. Will you yield?

Senator MALONE. Yes, I will yield.

Senator BUTLER. I think I gather the general tenor of what the Senator desires to do, and I think I am in sympathy with his objective because certainly I believe that the whole country will be better off if every acre of land that has not been reserved for public parks and things like that was in private ownership and was on the tax rolls. But I wanted to ask this question:

You have proposed a couple of amendments to the bill we propose reporting for one objective. That is to take care of the lands, submerged lands, sir. Would it not be wiser to let that bill go through as it is planned without trying to swallow the whole elephant in one gulp, to let that become a law and then you have established the precedent for the passage of a bill similar to what you have in mind, and I think I would support it?

Senator MALONE. Well, as I would say to the distinguished chairman of this committee, and for whom I have the highest regard, I am a little like the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Probably that is the last you will hear of it if this bill is passed without such a provision.

There is so much money in this picture, apparently around thirty to one hundred billion dollars.

Senator DWORSHAK. Will you yield?

Senator MALONE. Yes.

Senator DWORSHAK. You are merely transferring the mineral rights below the surface?

Senator MALONE. And the States would have to accept them in the regular manner before it would become effective.

Senator DWORSHAK. If you carry that proposal a little further, in Idaho we have extensive and valuable Federal forests on federally owned land. Why would we not be entitled to have a transfer of the surface rights? We do not have oil in Idaho, but we have virgin stands of white pine and other valuable timber. I think we might justify that approach in our State. But we would not want to confine the transfer to subsurface minerals.

Senator MALONE. I have no objection whatsoever. I am trying to emphasize that you are cutting a piece of the pie and then backing away from the rest of it. You are not really facing the issue. You are just going in and cutting the best looking piece of pie. This is my 7th year here and I think I have been very patient about the way the public lands are kicked around, or the people that are using the public lands in my State are being ruined.

I do intend to bring a bill before this committee that would deal with a small section of my State as an experiment.

What you have done, what this Congress did do, when they jammed through the Taylor Grazing Act in 1934 was to mess up the entire grazing question in the public-land States.

I was not in the Congress, but I was right outside the door. I wrote the amendment to the bill, and Senator MCCARRAN forced them to take what became known as the McCarran amendment. It was the only good thing about the bill, and they defeated that by not granting permits.

The amendment read that whenever a permit was granted to a customary user of the range in connection with his own land, that you could not cancel it as long as there was an obligation on the livestock unit.

The livestock unit was made up of three parts. The owned land, the water rights, filed on water for irrigation, and the water rights to the spring where the cattle and sheep water, and the feed-producing ranch.

Any organization that controls one of those parts of that livestock unit controls the whole business. So, Mr. Ickes got the idea suddenly that he must make a lot of money for all of the people of the United States. I will say this for Senator MCCARRAN: He stood up on the Senate floor and would not let them adjourn until they took that amendment. That was in 1934.

Now what they have done for 20 long years, the boys from nice agricultural schools, start to regulate the men who have been running a certain number of cattle 30 to 60 years, and tell them they must cut the carrying capacity 20 percent or 30 percent. The rancher has his investment for the certain number of livestock, whatever it is. The Federal range supervisor cut the carrying capacity without cutting investment and ruins the livestock man.

This has been a very interesting problem to me all the way through, to see what can be done with public lands if you can hit the public hard enough and with the right kind of propaganda.

I would like to see this committee tackle this public lands problem. Take my bill that merely would make an adjudicating bureau out of the Bureau of Land Management.

As far as district 6, to which my range bill would apply, it is in a small part of Nevada, let them adjudicate it and see how it works on the basis of customary use.

Senator CORDON. I do not recall that there is an amendment of that character before us.

Senator MALONE. The amendment I have offered is to correct a situation caused by your Senate Joint Resolution 13. The problem I was discussing was caused by a similar Congress 20 years ago.

Senator CORDON. You are entitled to get anything you want before this committee. The ordinary method is by introducing bills.

Senator MALONE. I introduced an amendment here for the purpose of correcting an injustice about to be executed by this legislation.

Senator CORDON. You were discussing, I thought, another matter which was extraneous.

Senator MALONE. It is not extraneous; it is the same principle. If you are going to take a piece of the pie, let us cut the entire pie.

I have yielded to the chairman.

Senator BUTLER. The senior Senator from Wyoming appeared before the committee in connection with S. 807 which he filed on February 6. He did not propose that it be handled as an amendment to this bill, but it is still before the committee and I think in due time will be given attention by the proper subcommittee here. It is introduced by Mr. HUNT and entitled "To provide for granting to the several States the mineral rights in public lands belonging to the United States."

Senator ANDERSON. He appeared before this committee on this bill.

Senator BUTLER. But he did not introduce it as an amendment.

Senator MALONE. Now I would like to finish this one thought. You would then be holding the public lands status quo if you adjudicated the use and allowed this use. You would not own the land, you would own the use of it like you do water, and transfer it like you do water. You would then hold the status quo until you could locate it for a higher use, for mineral claims or for oil. You would not then, under that kind of a setup, deed the land to the State every time you found an isolated place, every time it was valuable enough to cause a furore in the United States so you could do it. That was my point.

I just want to say that we will discuss the amendments tomorrow, or whenever you care to bring this committee together again. I think this is a good bill of Senator HUNT, and I think it is the last you will hear of it if it is not hooked onto this bill.

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I yield 1 minute out of my time to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Madam President, I am supporting the Malone amendment, but if the Malone amendment is adopted, I still will not be able to support Senate Joint Resolution 13.

The reason I am supporting the Malone amendment is that if these valuable deposits on Federal lands are to be transferred to any State, I think they ought to be transferred to all States. What is good for the goose ought to be good for the gander. However, I do not think the petroleum deposits under Federal lands ought to be transferred to any State. That explains, perhaps, the erroneous charge of inconsistency of my position. I wanted to make it clear in the RECORD as to just what my position is with respect to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. I am supporting it, but even if it is adopted I shall still vote against Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Colorado one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield time for the question to be asked and answered.

Mr. MALONE. I ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who was Governor of his State at the time when I was State engineer of my own State, and who thoroughly understands the public lands problem, if he does not believe, with the junior Senator from Nevada, that a thorough and studied overhauling of public lands legislation is long overdue?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Indeed I agree with the Senator on that proposition.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall first address myself briefly to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. I think that without any study whatsoever at this point the Senator from Florida could not be expected to express any judgment upon the merits or demerits of that amendment, whatever they might prove to be.

I feel very deeply that for an amendment of this sweeping nature to be attached to the joint resolution would be entirely improper and improvident, and for that reason I oppose the adoption of the amendment.

This amendment relates to all the States but, of course, particularly and peculiarly to the public-land States. It provides, in effect, that the minerals and mineral rights and deposits in public lands belonging to the United States, including both lands which are temporarily withdrawn or reserved for classification purposes and lands within grazing districts except lands forming a part of a national forest, shall be granted, if the amendment is adopted, to the several States within the territorial boundaries of which such lands are situated.

There is no showing whatsoever as to the areas which are covered. The Senator from Florida understands that they probably amount to about 200 million acres.

There is no showing as to the values which are involved. The Senator from Florida understands that the values which would be affected by the amendment would amount to many hundreds of billions of dollars.

There is no showing whatever as to how the situation would be changed with respect to the reclamation program.

As the Senator from Florida understands, under the present law 52½ percent of the receipts from such lands form the bedrock of the financing of the important reclamation projects of the Nation.

There is no showing as to how numerous other important programs would be affected by this amendment.

Furthermore, the Senator from Florida believes that when the reclamation States have been treated as generously as they have been treated by the Federal Government, that is, by granting them 37½ percent outright as a grant from the revenue from this type of public lands, and by granting them, in addition, 52½ percent to go into the reclamation fund, at least there should be ample time allowed to subject this matter to careful hearings, to ascertain where the equities are, and to see how seriously the Western States are being held back, if at all, by the present situation. The Senator from Florida is perfectly willing to keep a completely open mind on the subject as it relates to the legitimate rights and interests of the Western States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida does not feel that he should be hurried into an expression on a subject of such vast importance, affecting such complicated and difficult problems as it does, without having available the necessary facts in order to express a wise and deliberate judgment.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida whether he understands that only 37½ percent of the revenue derived from the oil and gas resources within its borders accrues to the particular State. The State is given only 37½ percent of that which comes out of its own soil. Does the Senator from Florida understand that to be the fact?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida understands that to be the fact; and he also understands it to be the fact that 52½ percent of the total revenue, which, with the 37½ percent, adds up to 90 percent, goes into the reclamation fund, the expenditure of which fund is confined to the very public-lands States which are most concerned.

The Senator from Florida finds no fault with that program, because he thinks that the program has helped in producing values which not only are most desirable for the States which are affected but are also important for the American people as a whole, as well as for their Government.

The Senator from Florida is not asking that the law be changed. He might be willing to amplify it after the facts pertaining to it are made available to him. However, with the scant knowledge which he has—and he has attended all the hearings on the joint resolution and he realizes that very little in the way of detail was produced in this field—he feels that it would be unwise and very wrong for Congress to express a final judgment upon a matter of such great importance without careful and deliberate hearings to produce all the facts.

The Senator from Florida is perfectly willing—and he so states now to his friend from Nevada—to hold his mind open and look at the facts when they are produced, and to look at them against the background of the development which has been attained and is still going on in the public land States, and to do for them as generously as he feels the Nation should do for any State. Further than that he could not go at the present time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

RECLAMATION STATES PRODUCE THEIR OWN FUNDS

Mr. MALONE. I should like to draw the Senator's attention to the fact that 17 Western States, the beneficiaries of the reclamation fund produced by the oil and gas found within their borders, repay over a definite amortization period all of the money expended for reclamation projects within their borders.

Does the Senator from Florida further understand that the money which goes into the fund is made up almost entirely of gas and oil revenues from the States wherein it is later expended for reclamation purposes? The only other source of funds is by way of repayment of funds expended through the projects constructed.

THE CENTRAL FLORIDA PROJECT

The Senator from Nevada recalls that, as chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, he was instrumental in allocating $112 million to Florida, with no repayment provision whatever. That was only one project. Does the Senator recall the project?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the first place the Senator from Nevada is wrong about his figures. However, as to that, the Senator from Florida wants to say that the Senator from Nevada was wholesome, generous, and fully American in his approach to the subject, and the Senator from Florida appreciates that fact. The figures which he has in mind, however, are greatly in excess of the actual figures.

In the second place, the Senator from Nevada probably remembers that under the Florida flood control program which was approved by Congress, under the able direction of the Senator from Nevada, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, the State of Florida is required to pay approximately 38 or 39 percent of the funds to be used in the development of that completed project and in its maintenance.

So I suspect, if the Senator from Nevada will compare our situation against that which prevails in the reclamation States, he will find that any difference which exists is in favor of the Western States.

The Senator from Florida does not complain of that fact, because he believes the program is wise, and is just, and he approved of it himself. He is grateful to the Senator from Nevada for his willingness to go into it on its merits. The Senator from Florida has exactly the same attitude with reference to the situation in the public land States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield one more time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that if the Senator from Florida will examine the figures he will find that more than $100,000,000 was authorized for the project referred to. However, be that as it may, it is in accordance with a 75-year national policy and I approve of it.

However, the reclamation money we are talking about comes from the resources found in the States in which the funds are expended. That is what we are talking about. On the other hand, all the eastern and central States keep their resources and the funds appropriated for their flood control and rivers and harbors projects come from taxpayers of all of the States. The resources are owned by individuals in the Eastern and Middle Western States, and they are on the tax rolls of the States.

In the case of the State of the junior Senator from Nevada such resources are in lands which are in public ownership.

I will say now that a bill should be introduced in Congress for the Federal Government to pay taxes just the same as any other owner of lands. The principle might change the minds of some of the bureaucrats who want the residents of the public-land States to be permanent tenants.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida appreciates the comment of the Senator from Nevada. As Governor of the State of Florida, and since he has been a Member of the Sen-

ate, the Senator from Florida has consistently taken the position that the Federal Government should pay in lieu of taxes a reasonable amount to the States and to local units of government who find themselves short of funds because of ownership by the Federal Government of large bodies of public lands within their limits.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida will not deal longer with this particular amendment. However, he does have two matters relating to the joint resolution which he thinks should be mentioned some time during the debate, and he will do so at this time.

The Senator from Florida recalls that several Senators who are opposing Senate Joint Resolution 13 evidently have been under a misapprehension of the facts, since from time to time they have said that the State of Rhode Island was prepared and had already passed legislation empowering its attorney general to go immediately into court and test the validity of Senate Joint Resolution 13 as soon as it becomes law.

I can well understand how that mistake of fact could have occurred, because the newspapers carried the news that the lower house of the Rhode Island legislature had adopted 2 resolutions, 1 of which was in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 13 and the other of which was to empower the Attorney General to bring the suit of the type mentioned.

However, Senators evidently let their wishful thinking precede the actual event, because last Thursday the upper house of the Rhode Island legislature took exactly the opposite position.

In order that the RECORD may be kept entirely clear, the Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent at this time, that the news item reporting the action taken on the two joint resolutions of the Rhode Island House of Representatives may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of his remarks. The two resolutions were killed by the Senate of Rhode Island last Thursday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RHODE ISLAND SENATE KILLS TIDELANDS SUIT—DEFEATS BY 26–17 VOTE LEGAL ACTION BASED ON DECISION IN CONGRESS

The Republican majority yesterday killed on the floor of the Senate the administration's resolution directing Rhode Island's attorney general to institute court action if Congress votes to turn over control of tidelands to California, Louisiana and Texas. The rollcall vote, strictly along party lines, was 26 to 17.

Lengthy debate preceded action on the measure which the GOP-controlled judiciary committee had reported out with recommendation that it be defeated.

After citing tidelands legislation pending in Congress, Senator Donald A. Kingsley of Barrington, Republican floor leader, declared that the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt had been of the opinion that the Federal Government "should be a wet nurse to everyone in the country."

CITES SUPREME COURT DECISION

Some who shared his philosophy were appointed to the Supreme Court, Kingsley said. He mentioned the Court's tidelands decision in the California case, which held that the Federal Government had the paramount right in tidelands property.

Kingsley said that was contrary to previous legal opinions and to the previous opinion of two Democratic officials in Rhode Island, including the late Attorney General John H. Nolan.

He said he saw no heresy in Congress attempting to put title in the tidelands into the States where up to 2 years ago it was felt it belonged. Political expediency was not the question, the senator contended.

Senator Raymond A. McCabe, of Providence, Democratic floor leader, argued that the Court's decision made clear that title to the tidelands rested in all the people of the United States.

"ONE OF THE GREATEST GRABS"

Senator Frank Licht, Democrat, of Providence, held that Congress was dealing with "one of the greatest grabs in the history of the country," and reiterated that the Court has said the property belongs to the people everywhere.

The Court's decision, said Senator Joseph R. Weisberger, Republican, of East Providence, threatens title to all submerged lands under any navigable stream.

Senator John G. Murphy, Republican, of Cranston, contended that Congress is doing just what the decision said it has the right to do. The question involved was not political but legal, Murphy said. Of the 48 States involved, Murphy said, the attorneys general of 47 take a position very different from that of this State.

Senator Hoyt W. Lark, Republican, of Cranston, said he was not in favor of a little State like Rhode Island spending its hard-earned money to try to "steal" something from Texas, Louisiana, and California.

Defeated without debate on a division vote 26 to 13 was a resolution asking Congress to confirm title of the people of the United States in offshore resources.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in order that Senators may be under no misapprehension at all as to what is contained in the article, I will say that the committee of the Senate of the Rhode Island Legislature conducted hearings on the subject. No hearings had been held by the house committee of the Rhode Island Legislature. After hearings had been concluded the senate committee reported by a vote of 7 to 2 that neither of these measures should pass. It recommended against the passage of both of these joint resolutions.

Then when the measures came to the floor the Senate of Rhode Island, by a recorded vote of 26 to 17, killed the house joint resolution, which would have empowered the attorney general of Rhode Island to bring suit in the event Senate Joint Resolution 13 were passed and became law.

By a vote of 26 to 13 the Senate of Rhode Island killed the resolution asking Congress to confirm the title of the people of the United States in offshore resources.

I think it would be interesting to read from the article 2 or 3 quotations showing how the majority of the Senate felt on the issue. The first quotation which I wish to read is as follows:

The Court's decision, said Senator Joseph H. Weisburger, threatens title to all submerged lands under any navigable stream.

The second quotation I wish to read, reads as follows:

Senator John G. Murphy contended that Congress is doing just what the decision says it has the right to do. The question involved was not political but legal, Murphy said. Of the 48 States involved, Murphy said, the attorneys general of 47 take a position very different from that of this State.

I think this quotation is peculiarly appropriate:

Senator Hoyt W. Lark said he was not in favor of a little State like Rhode Island spending its hard-earned money to try to "steal" something from Texas, Louisiana, and California.

Therefore, Mr. President, instead of empowering its attorney general to bring suit, the Legislature of Rhode Island decided not so to do. Instead of memorializing Congress to defeat Senate Joint Resolution 13 and pass some other legislation, the Legislature of Rhode Island decided not to take any such course.

So the statements made in the best of faith by Senators who are in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 13 prove to be not in accord with the final word spoken by the Legislature of the sovereign State of Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I go next to another matter, namely, the fantastic, extravagant, and vastly differing figures which have been used. I have been amazed at the very conflicting results which some of the mathematicians who oppose Senate Joint Resolution 13 have reached. When contending with the same figures, which are basic, they arrive at such tremendously different results that it is apparent that they did not attend the same schools, at least insofar as their arithmetic textbooks were concerned.

I wish to present what I believe to be a completely accurate picture on this subject, and I ask my colleagues to follow it as closely as possible.

THE TRUTH ABOUT SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13—A REPLY TO THE CIO PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN AGAINST STATE OWNERSHIP OF SUBMERGED LANDS WITHIN THEIR BOUNDARIES

The Congress of Industrial Organization—CIO—used the time consumed by the ultra-liberal filibuster against Senate Joint Resolution 13 in the effort to spread a vast amount of false and misleading propaganda to exert pressure on Members of the United States Senate against this proposed legislation. This propoganda was handed out principally to newspapers, public-school officials, and local unions.

An example was the full-page ad run by the CIO on page 25 of the Washington Post on April 17, in opposing Senate Joint Resolution 13, and in supporting the Hill amendment to the Anderson substitute. This advertisement, directed to Members of the United States Senate, and later mailed to them by the CIO, contains gross exaggerations of the values involved, and completely misrepresents the terms of the Holland bill (S. J. Res. 13) and the Hill amendment.

This deceptive propaganda of the CIO would not justify a reply except that some of the figures and arguments used have been included in the speeches of certain Members of the Senate who oppose State ownership. The true facts clearly refute the CIO and those who have adopted their arguments.

FIGURES AND VALUES GROSSLY EXAGGERATED—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION DOES NOT COVER PUBLIC LANDS OR THE OUTER NINE-TENTHS OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

All the figures in the CIO ad and the multi-billion-dollar figures used by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and other opponents of this measure, are grossly exaggerated, in that—

First. They are based upon the erroneous claim that Senate Joint Resolution 13 includes that vast portion of the Continental Shelf—nine-tenths of the entire area—which lies outside of the historic 3-mile and 3-league limits. Actually, the proposed legislation covers only the one-tenth of the Continental Shelf which lies within State boundaries.

Second. The CIO figures are based not only upon the above blatant error, but upon the additional assumption that Senate Joint Resolution 13 will result in the conveyance to the States of all federally owned land. The CIO says that the Holland bill—Senate Joint Resolution 13—is step one of a proposed two-step giveaway of the entire public domain. This, of course, is wholly untrue.

Third. The exaggerated values must be further reduced in many cases by seven-eighths thereof, because the customary royalty paid under either State or Federal leases is one-eighth of the full value.

The truth is that Senate Joint Resolution 13 covers only the lands beneath navigable waters within the historic boundaries of the 48 States—lands which the States have possessed, used and developed for more than 100 years. As to the 21 coastal States, this measure does not extend to any property beyond their recognized seaward boundaries 3 miles from shore, except in the cases of Texas and the West Coast of Florida, where 9 marine miles—nearly 10½ land miles—was long ago recognized by Congress as the seaward boundary in the Gulf of Mexico.

Senate Joint Resolution 13 releases to the States no part of the Continental Shelf seaward of the 3-mile or 3-league limit, an area valued in the CIO ad at from $62½ billion to $300 billion.

Senate Joint Resolution 13 covers no part of the Federal public lands in the 11 Western States, listed in the CIO ad at a value of well over a trillion dollars.

Senate Joint Resolution 13, releasing to the States only one-tenth of the total area of the Continental Shelf, specifically asserts that the natural resources of all the remaining nine-tenths of the Continental Shelf are confirmed to be subject to the jurisdiction and control of the United States—section 9, Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to observe the next statement very carefully, because it is the truth as regards Senate Joint Resolution 13, in connection with the matter of its effect upon the Continental Shelf: Senators who vote for this joint resolution will be joining in the first congressional assertion of Federal rights to this vast area of land. They will be helping to safeguard Federal rights to this area, rather than giving them away.

TRUE VALUES AMOUNT TO 41 CENTS PER SCHOOL-CHILD PER YEAR

The Hill amendment would not have given any money to the States or to the public schools at the present time; and even if it had, the revenues derived from lands covered by Senate Joint Resolution 13 would amount, at most, to about 41 cents per student per year, during a 50-year period.

These figures are based upon the only reliable estimate of oil and gas resources within the historic marginal-sea boundaries of the coastal States, as given to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee by the United States Geological Survey. See hearings, pages 567–586. They show the undiscovered but potential existence of 15 billion barrels of oil and 68.5 trillion cubic feet of gas in the entire Continental Shelf. These are the identical estimates for oil that were stated by President Truman in his veto message of 1952, and used in the debate last year by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 3, page 2892 and page 3341.

This official agency of the United States Government, the Geological Survey, states that only one-sixth of the estimated oil—2½ billion barrels—and only one-seventh of the estimated gas—9¼ trillion cubic feet—existing in the entire Continental Shelf are located within the historic 3-mile and 3-league State boundaries.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, table I, taken from the hearings at page 584, and covering the official estimate made by the United States Geological Survey to the Congress of the United States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Estimated potential oil and gas reserves of Continental Shelf landward of traditional State boundaries and for entire Continental Shelf*

[All miles indicated are statute miles]

	Oil (in billions of barrels)	Gas (in trillions of cubic feet)
Texas:		
Within 10½ miles of the coast	1.2	6.0
Total Continental Shelf	9.0	45.0
Louisiana:		
Within 3½ miles of the coast	.25	1.25
Total Continental Shelf	4.0	20.0
California:		
Within 3½ miles of the coast, bordering 3 productive basins	1.1	2.0
Total Continental Shelf bordering 3 productive basins	2.0	3.5

Source: Statement of Ralph L. Miller, Chief, Fuels Branch, Geologic Division, U. S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior (p. 384).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, table V, from the testimony of Mr. H. G. Barton, chief of the Oil and Gas Leasing Branch, Conservation Division, United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE V.—*Estimated proved reserves*

FIELDS WITHIN THE AREA CLAIMED BY UNITED STATES BUT LANDWARD OF TRADITIONAL STATE BOUNDARIES

State and product	Number of proved fields	Estimated proved reserves
Louisiana: Oil or oil and gas.	5	84,000,000 barrels.
Texas:		
Oil	2	15,000,000 barrels.[1]
Gas	1	75,000,000 thousand cubic feet.[1]
California: Oil	5	160,000,000 barrels.

FIELDS SEAWARD OF TRADITIONAL STATE BOUNDARIES

Louisiana:		
Oil or oil and gas	17	335,000,000 barrels.
Gas[2]	[2]14	2,100,000,000 thousand cubic feet.
Texas	None	None.
California	None	Do.

[1] Estimates based on incomplete data.
[2] Includes 2 gas and 12 oil and gas fields.

Source: Statement of H. G. Barton, Chief, Oil and Gas Leasing Branch, Conservation Division, U. S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior (p. 577).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in order that there may be no question at all about the facts previously stated in my remarks, namely, that the estimates contained in these two tables were recognized last year by the President of the United States in his veto message and by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, first, an excerpt from the veto message of the President.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the veto message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

About 235 million barrels of oil have already been recovered from the submerged lands affected by this joint resolution—nearly all of it from lands off the coasts of California and Louisiana. The oilfields already discovered in these lands are estimated to hold at least 278 million more barrels of oil. Moreover, it is estimated that more than 2½ billion additional barrels of oil may be discovered in the submerged lands that would be given away off the coasts of California, Texas, and Louisiana alone. (From veto message on title to certain submerged lands bill dated May 29, 1952, p. 3.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Next, Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD an excerpt from the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as it appears at page 3341 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 3:

TREMENDOUS RESOURCES UNDER THE MARGINAL SEA

The oil resources of the submerged lands are presently estimated as 15 billion barrels which, as present prices, would be worth $40 billion.

The Senator from Illinois was talking about the entire Continental Shelf, that is, the nine-tenths outside the State

boundaries, and also the one-tenth within the State boundaries.

Here is the statement made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] as it appears at page 2892 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 3:

In an earlier speech in the Senate I pointed out that the ablest petroleum geologists in the oil industry estimate the offshore oil reserves of the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf at 15 billion barrels More than a year ago Dr. E. O. DeGolyer, of Dallas, Tex., who has an international reputation as one of the most outstanding petroleum geologists in the world—if not the outstanding one—stated in an article in Life Magazine that there may be 10,500,000,000 barrels of oil along the coasts of Texas and Louisiana alone. The Geological Survey of the United States Department of the Interior confirms these estimates. At present prices, these 15 billion barrels are worth over $40 billion (p. 2892, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, part 3).

Again, Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama was speaking about the entire Continental Shelf, the nine-tenths that is outside the State boundaries, plus the one-tenth that is within the State boundaries.

The customary one-eighth royalty on this entire production at present average prices—which have been furnished to us by the Petroleum Administration for Defense, and are stated to us as $2.56 a barrel for oil and 9 cents a thousand cubic feet for gas—would amount to a total of $920 million if the whole estimated amount of oil and gas could be actually produced, which is clearly impossible in view of the authoritative statement of the Geological Survey that "the estimate includes, of course, much oil that is not now economically recoverable by processes of exploration and production that are now known to be practicable."

Mr. President, from the figure last stated must be subtracted three-eighths thereof, inasmuch as even the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 concede that the coastal States should receive 37½ percent of the royalties on production within their State borders. This would leave a total $575 million to be distributed among the 48 States throughout the years, if the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 should prevail and if the Hill amendment were adopted. Distributing the entire amount over a period of 50 years, which is estimated by many as the full period of production, the average annual royalty would be $11,500,000 per annum. Dividing this annual income among the 28,196,000 public-school students, annual estimates, 1952–53 school year, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the Nation at this time would provide about 41 cents per student per year as contrasted with the extravagantly astronomical figures of the CIO and other opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13.

These prospective receipts would be of great assistance to the public schools within the States which discovered and developed the natural resources in these lands, but they would amount to very little, to a negligible amount, to any State if spread throughout the entire Nation.

Mr. President, if I may do so, I should like to present what is indeed a contrast. The total amount of $575 million is available from royalties, over the full time of production, from everything that could be produced from lands lying within the State boundaries. I should like to contrast that with some of the extravagant figures set forth in the page-wide CIO advertisement, which, incidentally, appeared on the same day the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] stated on the floor of the Senate that it was unfortunate that all the people who had money and who were able to command publicity were on the other side, and that therefore, those who were opposing the pending measure had not been able to take their case to the public. That very morning, a page-long advertisement was published in the Washington Post by the CIO.

Senators will remember how the amount imagined to exist as royalties was applied and apportioned among the several States, and then, within the States, brought down to the county level, and in some instances, down to the town level within the counties, in an effort to show, through the production of extravagant and completely untrue figures, that the schools and the public were being despoiled by Senate Joint Resolution 13.

By way of contrast, for example, the amount the CIO said should go to Connecticut, but was being taken away by Senate Joint Resolution 13, was $676,635,000; which, by the way, exceeds by more than $100 million the total amount available to the whole Nation out of the royalties in all the areas within State boundaries, throughout the whole period of production. In the case of Georgia, the CIO is very modest. It makes the amount going to Georgia only about 6 times the amount that the whole Nation would get under the correct figures, because it says Georgia would get $3,125,000,000 plus, or almost 6 times the amount the whole Nation would actually receive if all the potential oil in the reserves could be produced—and the CIO knows that this, itself, is impossible.

In the case of the State of Illinois, the statement is made by the CIO that Illinois is giving away $2,946,000,000, which is about 5½ times the full amount the whole Nation would get if the correct figures were used. In the case of Massachusetts, the amount is more than 3 times as great as that which the whole Nation would receive; and in the case of New York, more than 7 times as great.

Mr. President, one would think that, with those ridiculous figures, opponents of the pending measure would have been content—and many of them quoted those figures in the course of their arguments. But they were not content with relying upon that extravaganza; instead, they developed some fantastic figures of their own. For instance, if Senators will turn to page 3771 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under date of April 24, 1953, they will see the premise from which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] took off. I shall quote from a question he was asking of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]:

Does the Senator from Oregon know that if the $175 billion is divided by the population of the United States, as shown in the World Almanac for 1953—the population being 150,697,361—the amount proposed to be given away, as a result of enactment of the pending joint resolution, would equal $1,161.26 per person?

Mr. President, of course, the distinguished Senator from Oregon expressed approval of that computation.

Next we come down to Connecticut. Let us recall that the CIO very modestly stated that Connecticut was being deprived of a mere $676 million, or only $100 million more than the whole Nation would actually receive. But our distinguished friend from North Dakota was not content with having the State of Connecticut so deprived of its rights.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield in a moment, I may say to my friend from Colorado. The questioning by the Senator from North Dakota related to Connecticut—and the question, by the way, was entirely approved by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I read the question and answer, found on page 3771 of the RECORD:

Mr. LANGER. * * * Does the Senator from Oregon realize that even if we accept the $175 billion figure as the correct amount for the value of the natural resources which are proposed to be given away under the provisions of the pending joint resolution—although that figure is only one-half the amount which it is estimated will be given away as a result of the enactment of the joint resolution—then the people of Connecticut and the school children of Connecticut would lose the sum of $2,330,973,972.80?

The Senator from Oregon, replying in like extravagance comments:

I hope the distinguished Senator who now is presiding over the Senate, the very great Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], heard those figures for Connecticut. I believe the amount stated by the Senator from North Dakota is the amount that the people of Connecticut would lose.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that it is just a little more than four times the full amount the royalties from all the submerged areas within the State boundaries would produce to the whole Nation, or to whomever they should belong, over a period of 50 years, or over the full period of production. So that it is quite evident that extravagance became ever more extravagant, when interpreted by our distinguished friends, the senior Senator from North Dakota and the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I promised to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BUSH. I merely wanted to obtain the page number.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is page 3771 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1953. I may say the Senator will find it a very valuable archive, because it indicates that his State would receive more than four times the total

amount which the real owners, whoever they may be, of the lands within the submerged belts of the States, and extending out to State boundaries, could get by way of royalties. I congratulate the Senator from Connecticut, both upon the established importance of his State, and upon the fact that, apparently, according to the estimate of our distinguished friend from North Dakota, which I have just quoted, the enactment of the legislation would give the people of his State four times as much as the whole Nation, including all the operators, would get from the entire area.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I promised to yield to the Senator from Colorado, after which I shall yield to the Senator from North Dakota. I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I shall vote against the Malone amendment, because I think it a mistake to raise and submit to decision the matters involved in that amendment, while deciding the matters involved in the Holland joint resolution. The questions involved in the Holland resolution will turn, in my mind, on claims of right. The matters covered by the Malone amendment will turn on questions of policy. The decision on one does not compel the same decision on the other. I fear that premature consideration of the matters covered by the Malone amendment will prejudice their consideration when they are brought before the Senate on their own separate merits.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. May I say to my distinguished friend and colleague that at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] I intend to speak for an hour on the pending legislation, and I intend to reiterate the very figures which the distinguished Senator from Florida has just criticized?

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I think he will again go into a field of extravagance where I shall not be able to follow him.

Mr. President, let us follow the distinguished Senator from North Dakota in his peregrinations among the great States of the Union. I find on page 3773 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that when the distinguished Senator came to the State of Illinois he asked this question of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]:

> And does the Senator realize that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois is advised that the schoolchildren and the other people of the State of Illinois, even on the assumption of the accuracy of the estimate of $175 billion of total revenues to be derived under the pending joint resolution, will lose the staggering sum of $10,117,101,501.76?

Of course, Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon was properly shocked at that revelation, and I think we should all be shocked at it, because it is so completely out of proportion to anything like the full amount which, at most, will be derived. According to these figures, as stated by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, he increased the CIO estimate, which was more modest—it was only 5 times as great as the total revenue—the Senator from North Dakota increased that figure for Illinois to more than 18 times as much as the entire revenue from royalties in all the States put together if they produced every drop of oil and every foot of gas estimated by the United States Geological Survey. Let us remember always that when oil is being taken from great depths of water, it cannot be hoped that all of it will be produced.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder whether the Senator knows that the CIO figures were unreasonably low.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator that possibly that is the explanation as to why the Senator from North Dakota proceeded to outextravagandize even the CIO figures. I, therefore, compliment my distinguished friend that when he got through exaggerating there was nothing else left to exaggerate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder whether the Senator from Florida realizes that the source from which the late Secretary Ickes secured his figures was the same basic information which the Senator from Florida is now using, namely, the estimate of the United States Geological Survey, but he failed to take into consideration the fact that there is only a one-eighth or a one-sixth royalty, at the most, and, further, that 90 percent of the resources involved are beyond the States' historic boundaries and, therefore, not covered by the Holland joint resolution?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct, and I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his observation.

Mr. LONG. Nor did Mr. Ickes take into consideration the calculation that the figures involve a period of approximately 50 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, correct.

Mr. President, I shall not quote further from these extravagant figures except to say that in the case of the State of New York the maximum of extravagance was attained when my distinguished friend from North Dakota, evidently getting his second wind, and since no one had questioned him, thinking that he would go the whole limit, used as big figures as he could state. I am not sure that I can properly state them——

Mr. LANGER. The figure was over $17 billion.

Mr. HOLLAND. I congratulate the Senator upon the excellence of his memory, if not upon the accuracy of his figures.

On page 3782 our distinguished friend from North Dakota, who is loved by every one of us, apparently attempted to completely and irrevocably outestimate the figures of the CIO, and he did a good job of it. I read from page 3782 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator aware of the fact that if the pending measure is passed, there will be taken from the pockets of the people of New York, $17,221,708,761.92, this being based only on the estimated $175 billion worth of oil?

The Senator from Oregon, strange to say, did not faint and was not shocked, but he came right back with imperturbability as great as any I have ever seen, and admitted that the Senator from North Dakota had accurately stated the situation, and it was just that way.

I shall not dwell further on this phase of the matter, but, once having been encouraged by the CIO to take off in flights of fancy into the wild-blue yonder, the Senator from North Dakota has certainly attained ethereal heights.

Mr. President, it is evident that each individual State stands to profit far more from the ownership of its own submerged lands than from a small share of the revenues now being received by the coastal States.

I see my time is about to run out. It will take me about 10 minutes to complete my statement. I wonder if Senators would be agreeable to charging my next time allowance with sufficient time to complete these remarks, because I shall be entitled to speak further at a later time on the next amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, every State has submerged lands, and their titles will be confirmed by Senate Joint Resolution 13. There is a table at page 35 of the printed hearings showing the acreage covered by this resolution in each State.

The total area of submerged lands under inland waters within all 48 States is 28,960,640 acres; the similar total beneath the Great Lakes in the 8 Great Lakes States is 38,595,840 acres; the similar total beneath the marginal sea within the boundaries of the 21 coastal States is 17,029,120 acres.

It is believed that the representatives of each State will serve their own people better by securing safe and secure title to these lands within their own boundaries than by setting a precedent for their surrender or loss to the Federal Government.

Some of the Senators from coastal States who are willing to give up their claims to their marginal belts in order to share in the future revenues of Texas, California, and Louisiana, may live to see this a bad bargain. In their own lands, uranium, iron ore, gold, or other valuable resources may be discovered in the future. They may find themselves like the landowner in the story, Acres of Diamonds, who sold his land and all of his possessions in order to go out and search the world for diamonds. After many years had passed, he ended up with nothing, but on the land which he had disposed of, in his own backyard, was found the greatest diamond mine in the world.

THE HILL AMENDMENT WOULD NOT HAVE GIVEN ANYTHING TO THE STATES OR TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The CIO ad, and most of the speeches by those opposing Senate Joint Resolu-

tion 13, argue that the Federal Government should keep the submerged lands formerly held and developed by the 21 coastal States in order that future revenues may go to the schools of all the States under the Hill amendment.

The truth is that the Hill amendment, already defeated by the Senate, would not have appropriated any of these revenues to the States or to public education. It would have appropriated all of the revenues to national defense and national security for the duration of the present national emergency and, until Congress shall otherwise provide. Only after the present national emergency is over, and only if a future Congress so decides, would any of these funds be available for Federal aid to education. Here are the exact words of the Hill amendment:

> All other moneys received under the provisions of this act shall be held in a special account in the Treasury during the present national emergency and, until the Congress shall otherwise provide, the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine and thereafter shall be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

There are two jokers in this proposal: First, the national emergency may outlast the production of oil and gas from the marginal sea within historic State boundaries; second, even if the emergency ends before these natural resources have been exhausted, a future Congress may decline to appropriate the remaining revenues for Federal aid to education, since similar measures have always been defeated in the past by those who fear that they would result in Federal control of our public schools, or who contend that children who attend private and religious schools should or should not share in the public grant.

The truth is that the total effect of the Hill amendment on public education would be to take away funds now dedicated to public schools in the coastal States and transfer them to the Federal Treasury for national defense purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13 IS NOT A GIVE-AWAY BILL

In boldface headline type the CIO ad calls Senate Joint Resolution 13 a give-away bill. This CIO line of attack is the same that Senate opponents have followed continuously for the past month.

The truth is that Senate Joint Resolution 13 simply restores or gives back to the States the submerged lands within their historic boundaries which they have possessed, used and developed in good faith for over 100 years. It confirms the property to the same people who have always owned and used it.

The Federal Government recognized State ownership of these lands in accordance with a long line of Supreme Court opinions preceding the rulings of the present Supreme Court in 1947 and 1950. Even the more recent Court decisions recognize that Congress may restore the property to the States, or establish title in the States as it was previously thought to exist.

Throughout all these years of possession in good faith the States and their lessees have expended millions of dollars in developing the property. Oil was discovered in the coastal belt by 3 States under State management and development, and it was not until long after oil was being produced—more than 20 years after the original production—that Federal officials first asserted claims against the States. This was due to the insistence of Federal lease applicants and was contrary to the expressed will of the Congress.

If this had been a land suit between individuals, the family in possession in good faith for over 100 years would have received judgment against even the legal claims of a family which sat idly by until after the land had been highly developed by the family in possession. Such judgments, based upon long possession and improvements made in good faith by one party and acquiescence or laches by the other party, are based upon general principles of equity and justice.

In the Supreme Court cases against California, Texas, and Louisiana the Court said it could not apply such equitable rules as adverse possession, prescription, acquiescence, laches, or estoppel against the Federal Government, but it said clearly that the Congress could do so. After overruling the equitable defenses of the States, the Supreme Court said that it would not be assumed that:

> Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, would execute its power in such a way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

The Attorney General of the United States acknowledged the equities and told the Supreme Court in his oral argument and supplemental brief in the California case:

> The President recognizes that in the event the decision of this Court is favorable to the United States, it will be necessary to have congressional action looking toward the future management of the resources of this area. And he also intends to recommend to the Congress that legislation be enacted recognizing both prospectively and retrospectively, any equities of the State and those who have operated under it, to the fullest extent consistent with the national interest.

While we believe that the present Supreme Court was wrong in writing the law differently from what it was believed to be by all previous Supreme Courts, Senate Joint Resolution 13 does not overrule the recent decisions. It merely applies the equities which both the Court and the Executive recognized that Congress must consider. It would write the law for the future as it was believed to exist in the past by restoring to the States all lands beneath navigable waters within their historic boundaries. The application of such principles of equity and justice have never been considered to be a gift. One does not give away, in the true sense of the term, land which has been possessed and developed in good faith for over 100 years by another party. Then, too, that part of the recent Supreme Court decisions which dealt with the outside Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries—nine-tenths of the whole shelf—is confirmed and supported by Senate Joint Resolution 13.

THE REAL ISSUE

Obviously, the real issue is whether the United States Congress should approve and adopt a Federal policy for the taking of lands heretofore held in good faith for over 100 years by the coastal States and already developed in many respects by them and their grantees. This is part of the broad issue of whether we shall continue to build a bigger and more centralized Federal Government at the expense of the States, their local units of government, and thousands of individual developers.

Naturally, those who favor more and more centralization of power in Washington are opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 13. On the other hand, with few exceptions, those who think that our National Government is already too big, too wasteful, and too far away from the people, warmly support Senate Joint Resolution 13 as a matter of equity and justice to the States and their grantees and as a means of preventing further encroachment on State rights and property under the new applications of the doctrines of "inherent powers," "external sovereignty," and "paramount rights."

NOT A PARTISAN ISSUE

State ownership of submerged lands is not a partisan issue. A majority of both the Democrats and the Republicans have supported this legislation in the House both last year and this. Democrats last year were almost evenly divided in the Senate, while the legislation has always been supported by a majority of the Republican Senators. The Republican platforms of 1948 and 1952 call for State ownership legislation, and this course is strongly favored by President Eisenhower. The only attempt to write a contrary plank in the Democratic platform was at Philadelphia in 1948, and that was defeated. Only the Progressive Party of Mr. Henry Wallace has ever called, by a platform plank, for Federal ownership of this property.

While State ownership and control is frantically opposed by such ultra liberal national organizations as the CIO and Americans for Democratic Action, who do not want to see a reversal of the trend toward nationalization of natural resources and regimentation of private industry, it has the support of many substantial national organizations, including the following: Conference of Governors, National Association of Attorneys General, Council of State Governments, National Association of State Land Officials, American Association of Port Authorities, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, Conference of Mayors, National Association of Secretaries of State, National Association of County Officials, American Municipal Association, Great Lakes Harbor Association, The American Bar Association, American Title Association, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, National Water Conservation Conference, National Reclamation Association, National Sand and Gravel Association, National Association of Real Estate Boards, National Ready Mix Concrete

Association, Western States Land Commissioners Association—12 States, Western States Council—representing chambers of commerce in the 11 Western States.

I hope that this statement will so clarify the issues that no one will be misled by the exaggerated figures and deceptive propaganda which have been distributed at great expense by the CIO in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Florida read hastily, and I was not able to identify the names of all the organizations. Did I understand him to say that one of them was the "Ready Mix Concrete Association" or the "Ready Fixed Concrete Association"? [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his contribution, which illustrates how desperately our opponents are gasping for breath.

Almost every substantial business and civic organization in the Nation is with us in urging the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 13, which has for its purpose the preservation of long-established States rights, and keeping away from bureaucratic control in Washington matters that reach down into the intimate details of property enjoyment along 5,000 miles of shoreline. They are opposing the grab which is taking place, the unwarranted and dangerous extension of the rules as to paramount rights external sovereignty and inherent powers.

I feel, and I think the great majority of the Members of the Senate feel, that it is in the interest of sound democratic principles, of preservation—resurrection, almost—of sound democratic government, and the protection of both States and people, to pass Senate Joint Resolution 13 and get on to other important business of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not like to insist upon the carrying out of the agreement, but I suggest that we have gone long over the time permitted on this particular amendment. If the Senator from Florida is willing to cease and charge his time against the next amendment, perhaps we can reach a vote on the pending amendment. I would have objected at the time if I had understood the request. I think we must adhere to the rules.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Florida had yielded out of his time to the Senator from Nevada in order to allow him time to conclude his argument. It was only by reason of that fact that the Senator from Florida asked for 10 minutes additional, to be charged against the time on the next amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I think we should proceed to a vote on the pending amendment. Is the Senator from Nevada prepared to vote on the pending amendment, or would he prefer to have the vote put off until tomorrow?

Mr. MALONE. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Florida yielded a part of his time to me. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that the vote be put over until tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending amendment may be taken tomorrow at 2 o'clock, when other amendments and the joint resolution itself are to be voted upon; also that it be in order to offer additional amendments at this time and discuss such amendments under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement which is now in effect, is it necessary for a Senator who wishes to speak on the joint resolution, and not on an amendment, to have time yielded to him by one of the Senators in control of the time on the amendments?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the Presiding Officer that the Senator from Florida had agreed to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas time from the first time available following the discussion which the Senator from Florida has just completed. It appears that it must be upon the next amendment, because, as the Senator from Florida understands, the time to vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Nevada has now arrived, and the Senator from Florida assumes that a vote will take place immediately.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, by unanimous consent the vote on the Malone amendment has been postponed until tomorrow. The Senate is now about to consider the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], for which 4 hours are available. When the Senator from New York completes the presentation of his affirmative case, the Senator from Florida will be able to yield ample time to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wished only to get the parliamentary situation clearly in mind. The distinguished Senator from Florida had agreed to yield to me out of his time. However, his time on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that since the Senator from New York is about to offer his amendment, there will be opposition time out of which time can be yielded to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How much time is allowed on each amendment?

Mr. TAFT. According to the modification made today, amendments generally are limited to 1 hour to a side. With respect to the amendment of the Senator from New York, however, 2 hours to a side will be available.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I shall call up a couple of brief amendments, upon which I shall not require more than 10 minutes for explanation, because I discussed them at length last Friday. I shall be happy to yield time to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the offer of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Florida will have plenty of time available to him on the amendment which the Senator from New York is about to offer. I shall require only a few moments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from New York may yield under the conditions stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement on the joint resolution under discussion, as well as certain editorials from various newspapers relative to the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

On the basis of decisions already made by the Supreme Court, I believe that title in the submerged lands has been vested in the United States and, unless legislation such as the Holland bill is enacted, will remain so.

The Supreme Court of the United States on June 23, 1947, rendered an opinion in the case of United States against California and on June 5, 1950, rendered opinion in the cases of United States against Texas, holding that the United States has paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of California, Louisiana, and Texas, and stated that the respective States do not own the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf within their boundaries.

At the present time the American system of primary, secondary, and higher education faces a financial crisis of severe magnitude because of the unusually large growth in the school-age population, because of the inadequate supply of teachers, and because of the deteriorating and infirm physical plant of the American educational system.

In my opinion the children of the United States—not oil—are this Nation's most precious natural resource and their education has from the beginnings of this Republic been traditionally held most dear by all Americans.

It is not my purpose to join in the complicated and technical controversy revolving around the ownership of these offshore lands. The Supreme Court of the United States has twice determined the question in unmistakable language. The high Court has ruled that this oil, which the Geological Survey has estimated to be worth at least $40 billion—others up to $300 billion at present prices—belongs to all the people of all the States. In my view the issue of ownership has been settled.

It is, however, my desire to emphasize once more to the Members of the Senate the crucial financial crisis which our American educational system faces. I know that it is not precisely a secret to any of my colleagues. I do, however, believe the actual bare figures will bring a new sense of shock to them as they did to me despite our mutual awareness of the crisis.

Our children, yours and mine, and those of our constituents, are the most precious asset this Nation has. They are America's greatest single natural resource. Their independence of mind, their individuality, their ability to think for themselves and to speak and act for themselves are what we hold most dear. It is their heritage as it was ours. As often as we are confronted with today's specter of Communist totalitarianism just as often do we take comfort in the ability of our young Americans to take care of themselves. They have always had this ability in the past. It is in the American tradition. But they have had it mainly because of our great system of education, a system which today is deteriorating and is in serious danger of breaking down. We have been blessed in times of international danger with the engineers, the chemists, the inventors, the technicians, the mechanics, the scientists, the military leaders who have always been imaginative and ingenious enough to protect our people.

Are we today so sure that this supply of American talent will always be available to us in the future? Ten years, twenty years from now, what kind of education can our children thank us for? Let us take a look at the record.

In 1947 the elementary-school enrollment in public and private schools was 20,300,000 children. By 1957 it is estimated that this enrollment will be 29,500,000. In this 10-year period our school-age children will have increased 50 percent.

Although there has been considerable school construction in the years since the war, the school buildings going up are merely replacing obsolete and unsafe school plants. They do not even begin to touch the problem created by the increased enrollments. It has been authoritatively estimated that it would cost around $11 billion over the next 10 years to construct the classrooms to meet the needs of our growing school population.

This neglect now puts us in a serious dilemma. First the depression and then World War II brought school construction to a standstill. At the same time building costs have doubled over the past 25 years. The longer we have waited the more we must pay.

Also, just as more and more of our children reach school age, so are more and more of our teachers leaving the schools. This is just as true today as it was during World War II. The labor supply is tightening and the teachers are leaving their low-paid jobs to go into defense work. During World War II 350,000 teachers left the profession. Most of them did not return. Why? The answer was given in one paragraph from the lead editorial in Collier's for July 28, 1951:

> The average pay for elementary teachers during the past school year was less than $40 a week in 10 States, according to NEA figures. Twenty-one States paid less than $50 a week, and 37 States less than $60 a week. There are not enough replacements coming up. The 1951 National Teachers Supply and Demand Study reveals that this year only 32,000 qualified elementary-school teachers will graduate. That is the national supply. What is the demand? In 1953, this year, we will need 60,000 teachers merely to replace those who retire; we will need 10,000 teachers to meet the demands of increased enrollments; we will need another 10,000 teachers merely to relieve overcrowding; and we need thousands more to replace unqualified temporary teachers.

In the postwar years very little, not much, has been done to raise teachers' salaries. But the few raises have long ago been wiped out by our spiraling inflation. Teachers' pay has not kept pace with our people's pay. In 1949 they earned 99 percent more than in 1940, yet the average employed person earned 120 percent more.

School financing is a serious local problem. As the Federal Government takes more in taxes for purposes of defense, there is less for our local tax systems, which have in the past taken care of our school problems, and that is one great additional virtue of the oil-for-education amendment. It puts no additional burden whatsoever on the back of the taxpayer, since whatever grants-in-aid are made to the 48 States will not come out of his pocket but out of oil royalties.

I have summarized as briefly as I can the financial crisis in the education of America's children. We must supplement the funds for education or in a few short years our own children will be inadequately educated. Our illiteracy rates will start rising again.

In 1949 we spent approximately $5 billion for the cost of public schools, private schools, parochial schools, colleges, and universities. In that same year we spent more than $7 billion for foreign aid and $12 billion for defense. In my opinion, the dollars for foreign aid and national defense were money wisely spent. But we did not spend enough to educate our children at home. This amendment is a method for increasing our educational facilities without spending more tax money.

Tidelands oil has been a controversial issue for the past 12 years. It has been fought out on the political platforms, in the courts, and in the Congress. I suggest to all of you that here in this oil-for-education amendment you will find a reasonable—in fact, an idealistic—compromise for both sides. In accepting this compromise we will be contributing in the most direct way possible to the future of America.

Amendments have been offered to allocate royalties from submerged lands to reduce expenditures and curtail taxation. Unfortunately, these amendments, like the oil-for-education amendment, have been defeated.

The danger, once this bill passes and becomes law, lies in the possibility that, in addition to this giveaway, there will be additional takeaways. Bills have already been introduced in both Houses to take away from the Federal Government the mineral rights it possesses in the States and also to reduce the grazing authority of the United States Government on the public domain in the West. These are only indications of what may happen and I sincerely hope that what I anticipate may not come to pass.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of April 23, 1953]

MONTANA HAS STAKE IN TIDELANDS

Featured this week along with congressional debate on the controversial tidelands legislation is a letter to President Eisenhower from 25 Senators, including MURRAY and MANSFIELD, of Montana, asking him whether he supports State claims to boundaries beyond the 3-mile limit.

Claims, contentions, and technicalities in this prolonged controversy over offshore oil lands are numerous and complicated, but the main issue seems simple.

In two separate decisions, the United States Supreme Court has ruled that the ownership and control of the lands and assets beyond the low-tide mark rests with the United States. The purpose of the pending legislation is to transfer that ownership and control from the United States to the States from the borders of which the rich oil lands extend.

On a number of occasions in the past the Tribune has expressed opposition to the so-called tidelands legislation. We are not willing to accept contentions of those who favor giving Montana's traditional share of income from these assets to a few States or the cry of "State rights" as just reason for overriding the decisions of the highest court in the land. Those decisions established the Montana rights, and those of other noncoastal States, to a share in the assets that backers of the tidelands legislation are now seeking to present as a gift to the coastal States.

Further than that, there have recently sprung up in Congress various moves, closely akin to the tidelands affair, to seek other areas where public domain might be divided or served up to States or private interests. This is a trend against which the entire West, with its vast public domain, should be alert.

[From the New York Times of April 20, 1953]

OIL FOR THE NATION

One of the greatest, and surely the most unjustified, giveaway programs in the history of the United States is legally taking shape before our eyes. The administration has endorsed in principle, the House has already approved, and the Senate within a few days apparently will approve this plan to give to the people of a handful of States billions upon billions of dollars' worth of undersea oil that rightly belongs—and always has belonged—to the people of the entire Nation.

Although the fight over ownership of America's offshore oil resources involves many legal complications, the basic question is not hard to grasp. It is simply this: Will the Nation retain that control over the vast undersea resources beyond the low-water mark which the Supreme Court has repeatedly said belongs to the Nation, or will these resources be handed over to the coastal States? While direct self-interest accounts for the furious fight for the oil waged by Texas, Louisiana, California, and Florida, it is difficult to understand why the representatives of so many other States have joined in to deprive their constituencies—and the Nation as a whole—of an immensely valuable possession that rightly belongs to all of us. One explanation may be that a smokescreen of false issues has tended to obscure the real issue.

The argument is not and never has been over lands covered and uncovered by the tides. These unquestionably belong to the States. The argument is not and never has been over the bottom of rivers and lakes. These, too, belong to the States, and the opponents of the present bill have repeatedly offered legislation to make that fact perfectly clear. The argument is not over filled-in land along the ocean shore. This, too, belongs to the States; and whatever reasonable legal doubts may have been raised about that can easily be taken care of through appropriate legislation. The argument is not over socialism against private enterprise, because whether the States or the National Government controls the oil, it will be developed by private companies as at present.

The purpose of the pending legislation is to give to certain States what properly belongs to all the people. It is cast in such a form as to lead to endless legal complications, international as well as domestic. For instance, it would recognize historic boundaries in some cases far beyond the 3-mile limit on which the United States has always insisted in its relations with other countries. Since nobody, including the proponents of the bill, knows just where the historic boundaries lie, anyway, the confusion will be indescribable. Furthermore, the bill would pave the way for State claims to other federally held resources within the States, including public lands and forests. It would deprive the Federal Government of direct control over a vital reserve for the national defense.

The opponents of the bill, led by such careful thinkers as Senators DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and LEHMAN, of New York, offer a sound alternative in the Anderson bill, which would confirm Federal jurisdiction over the offshore oil resources and State jurisdiction over lands beneath tidal and inland waters, and would give the coastal States a percentage royalty on oil taken from within the 3-mile limit. Under the Hill amendment all money received by the Federal Government from leases for oil development would eventually be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education. According to this provision, Senator DOUGLAS estimates that New York, for example, would receive in royalties anywhere from $500 million to nearly $5 billion, depending on the actual worth of the reserves and the royalty percentage eventually agreed upon. What sums of this order would mean to education in all 48 States is self-evident. Again we urge the Senate leadership and the administration to think through the offshore oil question and to look at it in terms of benefit to the Nation.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of April 9, 1953]

SHALL FORESTS BE PRIVATE PRESERVES?

A dangerous storm is brewing, imperiling national forests of Montana and throughout the mountain West. It is embodied in identical bills now pending in both branches of Congress. If enacted into law these measures could turn grazing permits on our national forests into legal property rights for the benefit of a comparatively few large livestock operators.

In the House this bill (H. R. 4023) has been introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana. Notation that it was introduced "by request" may indicate that Mr. D'EWART has some reservations regarding it but we believe his sponsorship of it, limited or otherwise, is a serious mistake. In the upper branch a companion bill, is sponsored by Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming, and BUTLER of Nebraska.

The bills would reverse the established policy of administering our national forests for the greatest good to the greatest number. That policy recognizes Government control as necessary to safeguard vital resources for the benefit of all the people. Timber and watersheds are given first priority. Other uses are secondary. This overall policy has proved wise and farseeing.

The Forest Service now affords the stockmen considerable protection in the exercise of grazing privileges. Having once granted a rancher a permit to graze a specific number on the national forest, he is accorded preference rights for a similar number as long as he retains the ranch holdings. But limits are established as to how many one owner may graze on the forests and these limits vary in accordance with the economy of the area which surrounds the forests.

The pending legislation could, in effect, establish property rights to the grazing permits which could be bought and sold and which could lead to all of the rights eventually going to a few large operators. It would also transfer a major portion of the control and administration of forest grazing lands to advisory boards elected by the permit holders.

There are bountiful assets in our public forest lands and a multiplicity of interests—some of them conflicting. The grazing privilege is important to the livestock industry. It deserves both fair and practical administration but it does not deserve special advantages that would jeopardize the best long-term interests of the region and the country.

We are told that the impetus for this legislation came from the Southwest. There is no conflict in Montana, but there could be in years to come, under such a law. Hence we think it is a bad piece of legislation for Montana as well as for the entire mountain area of public domain.

[From the Washington Post of April 17, 1953]

HOME ON THE RANGE

Now that the bills to give away offshore oil are well advanced, a new sort of land grab has been proposed to Congress. This is the D'Ewart bill in the House and the companion piece sponsored by Senators BARRETT and BUTLER of Nebraska in the Senate—bills which purport to set uniform standards for tenancy of federally owned grazing lands in the national forests. Couched in appealing and deceptive language, the bills actually would turn over much of the control of grazing lands in 14 Western States to the grazers. The result would be like depriving a landlord of any say as to who should sublet his property and as to what uses should be made of the premises.

It is important to bear in mind that grazing is a decidely subsidiary use of the national forests. These lands have been set aside by law primarily to protect watersheds—vital in the arid West—and to provide stabilized sources of timber. Recreation, the protection of wildlife, and the provision of forage for livestock are incidental uses. The Secretary of Agriculture, through the Forest Service, is charged with administering the national forests in the broad public interest. To accommodate stock raisers, a system of permits or "preferences" has been developed, authorizing them to graze specified numbers of livestock in accordance with the carrying capacity of the range. Grazing fees are, in general, far lower than those charged for private forage.

What the new bills would do is give grazers property rights in the permits, thus enabling the holders to sell or deed their permits. The determination of standards would be under the joint control of the Secretary and local advisory boards made up of permit holders, and decisions of the Secretary could be contested in court. Perhaps the most mischievous section is the one which eliminates the authority of the Secretary and the Forest Service to reduce the number of head that could be grazed when permits were transferred. This power is essential to protect sections that have been overgrazed.

The Forest Service has resorted to a minimum of bureaucracy in accommodating the legitimate desires of the stockmen, and the system has worked reasonably well. But the sponsors of the new bills would place the grazing interests above the larger public interest. We cannot think that the people of the West, of whatever party, will sanction a move which would jeopardize the protection of the national forests.

[From the Denver Post]

ANOTHER LAND GRAB ATTEMPT IN THE OFFING

Western livestock ranchers are out in the open at last with their latest attempt to grab control of the national forests of Colorado and 13 other States for their own benefit.

Congressman D'EWART, Republican, of Montana, has introduced, "by request," H. R. 4023 which would give firm, legal property rights in the national forests—rights which would be worth many millions of dollars—to those ranchers who now happen to hold permits to graze cattle, sheep and horses on the forests.

Passage of the bill would be complete reversal of our whole policy of administering national forests in the public interest.

The law creating our national forests recognized that Government administration of the lands was necessary to protect timber resources and watersheds, upon which western irrigation and western cities depend for their lifeblood.

In administering the law the Department of Agriculture has issued grazing permits whenever it has believed that the running of livestock would not damage watersheds. The Department also has encouraged the use of the forests for recreational purposes.

The first aim of H. R. 4023 is to put into law the idea that one of the main purposes for having national forests is to provide pasturage (for a fee) for stockmen who are fortunate enough to have grazing permits.

An entirely new vested right would be established. When a grazing permit expired, the present holder would have a legal right to first preference for renewal. The grazing right would belong to him so completely that he could bequeath it to his heirs or deed it when he sold his ranch.

He could even rent his right at a profit to another livestockman if he didn't want to use it himself.

We now have a single custodian for our forests, the Secretary of Agriculture. Unified administration is necessary if a consistent conservation policy is to be followed.

Under H. R. 4023, part of the Secretary's authority would be delegated to advisory boards of stockmen and to the courts. Judicial review of decisions by the Secretary is not now possible because there are no special rights in the forest except those granted by the Secretary.

If the law itself grants special rights to stockmen, the courts necessarily will become involved in protecting those rights under the law and unified administration will be further diluted.

H. R. 4023 is a slick rights-grabbing scheme on behalf of special interests. In promoting it, stockmen have overplayed their hand. It deserves quick death.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of April 17, 1953]

BILL FOR NEW FOREST GRAZING CONTROL CALLED "LAND GRAB" BY WILDLIFE LEADER

A congressional bill relating to Federal grazing land, introduced by Representative WESLEY A. D'EWART, Republican, Montana, was described here Thursday as the greatest land grab in history.

The bill, H. R. 4023, was given that label by Tom Messelt, Great Falls businessman and secretary of the Montana Wildlife Federation, in a talk before the Civitan Club.

Messelt said the measure is "promoted by big livestock corporations in the Southwest which for years have fought restrictions of forest service" and he urged Montana voters to write to their Congressmen expressing opposition to the bill.

Section 5 of the bill, Messelt said, would place control of national forest-grazing privileges under local advisory boards, and he declared such boards are controlled by livestock interests.

Sections 6 and 7 give holders of established grazing privileges first preference for continued use and entitle them to transfer their grazing privileges to successors, Messelt said.

This is the vested right in national forest-grazing lands which the stockmen have long sought, and is one of the real purposes of the bill, Messelt declared.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment E, as modified by my amendment C. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment, as modified, be dispensed with and that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. LEHMAN, is as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

"That (a) the provisions of this section shall apply to all mineral leases covering

submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof (including any extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to such lease or under the laws of such State): *Provided*—

"(1) That such lease, or a true copy thereof, shall have been filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this act, or within such further period or periods as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary;

"(2) That such lease was issued (i) prior to December 21, 1948, and was on June 5, 1950, in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it, or (ii) with the approval of the Secretary and was on the effective date of this act in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it;

"(3) That within the time specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, there shall have been filed with the Secretary (i) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction and stating that the lease was in force and effect as required by the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection or (ii) in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents, and the Secretary shall determine whether such lease was so in force and effect;

"(4) That except as otherwise provided in section 3 hereof, all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this act, which have not been paid in accordance with the provisions thereof, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease after the effective date of this act shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided;

"(5) That the holder of such lease certifies that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this act;

"(6) That such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

"(7) That such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

"(8) That such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the lease: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

"(9) That such lease will terminate within a period of not more than 5 years from the effective date of this act in the absence of production or operations for drilling: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the reduction of such period, so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

"(10) That the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may deem to be reasonable and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"(b) Any person holding a mineral lease which comes within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, as determined by the Secretary, may continue to maintain such lease, and may conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions for the full term thereof and of any extension, renewal, or replacement authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the law of the State issuing such lease: *Provided, however,* That if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on or before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease. A negative determination under this subsection may be made by the Secretary only after giving to the holder of the lease notice and an opportunity to be heard.

"(c) With respect to any mineral lease that is within the scope of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall exercise such powers of supervision and control as may be vested in the lessor by law or the terms and provisions of the lease.

"(d) The permission granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to be a waiver of such claims, if any, as the United States may have against the lessor or the lessee or any other person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this act.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any lessor or lessee of a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, its political subdivision or grantee, on tidelands or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of such State, to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in such lands or in the mineral deposits within them. The authority granted in this section shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (a) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (b) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (c) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (d) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

"SEC. 3. In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, the Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 1 of this act, and with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States, to negotiate and enter into agreements with the State, its political subdivision or grantee or a lessee thereof, respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or with the State, its political subdivision or grantee, respecting the issuance of nonissuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy: *Provided, however,* That the authorization contained in this section shall not be construed to be a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this act. Payments made pursuant to such agreement, or pursuant to any stipulation between the United States and a State, shall be considered as compliance with section 1 (a) (4) hereof. Upon the termination of such agreement or stipulation by reason of the final settlement or adjudication of such controversy, if the lands subject to any mineral lease are determined to be in whole or in part submerged land of the Continental Shelf, the lessee, if he has not already done so, shall comply with the requirements of section 1 (a), and thereupon the provisions of section 1 (b) shall govern such lease. The following stipulations and authorizations are hereby approved and confirmed: (i) The stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to certain bays and harbors in the State of California; (ii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to the continuance of oil and gas operations in the submerged lands within the boundaries of the State of California and herein referred to as the operating stipulation; (iii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated July 28, 1948, extending the term of said operating stipulation; (iv) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated August 2, 1949, further extending the term of said operating stipulation; (v) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated August 21, 1950, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vi) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated September 4, 1951, further extending and revising and operating stipulation; (vii) the notice concerning "Oil and Gas Operations in the Submerged Coastal Lands of the Gulf of Mexico" issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 11, 1950 (15 F. R. 8835), as amended by the notice dated January 26, 1951 (16 F. R. 953), and as supplemented by the notices dated February 2, 1951 (16 F. R. 1203), March 5, 1951 (16 F. R. 2195), April 23, 1951 (16 F. R. 3623), June 25, 1951 (16 F. R. 6404), August 22, 1951 (16 F. R. 8720), October 24, 1951 (16 F. R. 10998), and December 21, 1951 (17 F. R. 43), respectively.

"SEC. 4. (a) In order to meet the urgent need during the present emergency for further exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized, pending the enactment of further legislation on the subject, to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of section 1 of this act.

"(b) A lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover an area of such size and dimensions as the Secretary may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon, shall require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent, and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

"(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided.

"(d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this section 4 of this act, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any submerged lands pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is submerged land beneath navigable inland waters.

"SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section—

"(1) all moneys received under the provisions of this act shall be held in a special account in the Treasury and shall be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education as Congress may determine; and

"(2) it shall be the duty of every State or political subdivision or grantee thereof having issued any mineral lease or grant, or leases or grants, covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf to file with the Attorney General of the United States on or before December 31, 1953, a statement of the moneys or other things of value received by such State or political subdivision or grantee from or on account of such lease or grant, or leases or grants, since January 1, 1940, and the Attorney General shall submit the statements so received to the Congress not later than February 1, 1954.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to moneys received and held pursuant to any stipulation or agreement referred to in section 3 of this act pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy.

"SEC. 6. (a) The President may, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security.

"(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands covered by this act.

"(c) All leases issued under this act, and leases, the maintenance and operation of which are authorized under this act, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary, upon a recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of this act, to suspend operations under, or to terminate any lease; and all such leases shall contain or be construed to contain provisions for the payment of just compensation to the lessee whose operations are thus suspended or whose lease is thus terminated.

"SEC. 7. Nothing herein contained shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person on lands subject to this act and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this act or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights of such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything herein contained.

"SEC. 8. The United States consents that the respective States may regulate, manage, and administer the taking, conservation, and development of all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life within the area of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, in accordance with applicable State law.

"SEC. 9. The United States hereby asserts that it has no right, title, or interest in or to the lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States, but that all such right, title, and interest are vested in the several States or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the laws of such States, or the respective lawful grantees, lessees, or possessors in interest thereof under State authority.

"SEC. 10. Section 9 of this act shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (1) which have been lawfully accrued by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (2) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (3) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (4) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians. This act shall not apply to water power, or to the use of water for the production of power, or to any right to develop water power which has been or may be expressly reserved by the United States for its own benefit or for the benefit of its licensees or permittees under any law of the United States.

"SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this act by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act.

"(b) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, public agency, or person, holding thereunder to the surface of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands as a result of authorized action taken by any such State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, public agency, or person, holding thereunder for public or private purpose is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

"SEC. 12. Nothing in section 11 of this act shall be construed as confirming or recognizing any right with respect to oil, gas, or other minerals in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf; or as confirming or recognizing any interest in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf other than that essential to the right to construct, maintain, use, and occupy the structures enumerated in that section, or to the use and occupancy of the surface of filled-in or reclaimed land.

"SEC. 13. The structures enumerated in section 11, above, shall not be construed as including derricks, wells, or other installations in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf employed in the exploration, development, extraction, and production of oil and gas or other minerals, or as including necessary structures for the development of waterpower.

"SEC. 14. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal, limit, or affect in any way any provision of law relating to the national defense, the control of navigation, or the improvement, protection, and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States; or to repeal, limit, or affect any provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted pursuant to the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

"SEC. 15. Any person seeking the authorization of the United States to use or occupy any submerged lands of the Continental Shelf for the construction of, or additions to, installations of the type enumerated in section 11 of this act, shall apply therefor to the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, who shall have authority to issue such authorization, upon such terms and conditions as in his discretion may seem appropriate.

"SEC. 16. Within 2 years of the date of the enactment of this act, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the use and occupancy of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf for installations of the type enumerated in section 11 of this act.

"SEC. 17. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this act.

"SEC. 18. When used in this act, (a) the term 'tidelands' means lands situated between the lines of mean high tide and mean low tide; (b) the term 'navigable' means navigable at the time of the admission of a State into the Union under the laws of the United States; (c) the term 'inland waters' includes the waters of lakes (including Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario to the extent that they are within the boundaries of a State of the United States), bays, rivers, ports, and harbors which are landward of the ocean; and lands beneath navigable inland waters include filled-in or reclaimed lands which formerly were within that category; (d) the term 'submerged lands of the Continental Shelf' means the lands (including the oil, gas, and other minerals therein) underlying the open ocean, situated seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside the inland waters, and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf; (e) the term 'seaward boundary of a State' means a line 3 nautical miles seaward from the points on the coast of a State at which the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf begin; (f) the term 'mineral lease' means any form of authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; and (g) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I address myself to the amendment I have introduced. I think it is a fair and proper substitute for the Holland joint resolution, proposing, as my amendment does, that all the revenues from the oil resources in the submerged tidelands be made available to the Nation, for distribution to the States for the support of education.

The Anderson bill, of course, provided that 37½ percent of the revenues from oil resources within the 3-mile zone be allocated to those coastal States off whose shores the oil deposits are found. Constitutional experts with whom I have discussed the matter suggest that there is considerable doubt as to whether such a prior allocation is legally permissible since, under the law, all the resources in question belong exclusively to the Nation. It might be that some Members of the Senate who voted to table the Anderson bill were troubled by this doubt. If so, I offer my amendment which eliminates this legal question by making it clear that all the revenues from the governmental regulation of the development of the oil and other mineral resources in the submerged lands—all the royalties—will accrue to the Nation as a whole.

Of course, Congress has the power to distribute these revenues among the States for a uniform purpose advancing

the general welfare, namely, the promotion of education.

But before I get into the subject matter of my discussion today, I am going to make some general remarks about this entire debate, and about my part in it.

Mr. President, I have taken a very active part in the debate on the great issue which has now been before us, and before the country, for some weeks.

I have spent, as have my colleagues, long hours in this Chamber, day after day and week after week. It has been a heavy physical burden, in which we have all been sustained by the knowledge that we were and are fighting in behalf of a high principle, the most important to come before the Senate this year, and as important as any to be decided in many years.

We have been fighting because we have felt that we stood at the dike against a flood of error which could—which very well might—cause as great damage to our country as any legislative proposal within memory.

We have been further supported in our efforts by the aroused sentiments of hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, of our fellow citizens. We have thus exerted ourselves in behalf of all the people, against the interests of a relatively few.

I believe that the country will regret the passage of the Holland bill. I believe the country will, in the end, rebuke those who acquiesced in its passage. I believe that those of us who have been convinced in this matter have been duty-bound to oppose this legislation with all our strength and skill in the hope that the majority of the Senate would yet be convinced, as we have been, and would come to prefer a formula like that contained in the Anderson bill, with the further proviso contained in the Hill amendment, or the combination of the Anderson and Hill bills as contained in the pending amendment—my amendment.

I can readily understand, Mr. President, how the Senators from Florida, and Texas, and Louisiana, and California feel in this matter. They seek special advantage for their States. They strive to obtain that advantage.

I do not deny them the sincerity of their motives, nor of their belief that they serve their constituencies well in seeking to override the decisions of the Supreme Court to the effect that the resources in the submerged lands off the coasts of their States belong to the Nation, and to all the people of all the States equally. Obviously, such a finding is distasteful to them and they are trying to reverse that finding by every means open to them.

What I cannot understand, Mr. President, is how the Senators from other States, who would, in fact, be deprived of a rightful share of what belongs to all the people equally, can support the proposition to give away to these three or four States that which belongs to the whole Nation.

I represent the State of New York. I would be remiss in my duty, in my judgment, if I did not use every proper resource to defend the interests of my State in this national resource. I am doing just that. In my remarks today, Mr. President, I propose to show what New York would lose, what the people of my State would lose, through the Holland joint resolution, and what they would gain through the Anderson-Hill formula; which, while tabled in the Senate, still remains before the country.

But, Mr. President, we, as Senators, represent more than merely our individual States. We represent the Nation.

It has been shown in this debate already what the Holland joint resolution would mean to the Nation, how it would violate the national and international interests of our country. It has already been indicated, I say, Mr. President, what mischief the Holland bill would work, what a precedent it would establish. I propose to go into that further, Mr. President, and I propose to show what it would mean to the Nation if the formula laid down in the Holland bill were to serve as a pattern for analogous demands by the State of New York. I propose to show, in short, some of the implications of the Holland bill for the national welfare, for the Federal system of Government which the Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, created—and which, in my opinion, we gravely endanger by the precedent which would be established by the Holland joint resolution.

I seriously doubt, Mr. President, whether what the Congress proposes to do is constitutionally possible. But I am not a constitutional lawyer, nor a lawyer at all. The Supreme Court will have to decide the legality of what is here proposed. But I am going to discuss the significance of the Holland joint resolution for the future, as well as for the present.

The supporters of this giveaway bill, in an excess of zeal to count the votes on the Holland bill—they have been so sure of its passage—charged last week that those who opposed the Holland joint resolution were engaging in a filibuster in order to prevent a vote on the bill. That charge has now been tabled along with the Anderson bill and the Hill amendment. In good time we did, indeed, agree to a limitation of debate. We agreed to set a date certain for a vote on the Holland joint resolution.

We were not filibustering. We were engaged, with all our strength and resolution, in debating the proposed giveaway, for the enlightenment of the Senate and of the country.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] so brilliantly pointed out last week, not we, but the proponents of the Holland joint resolution are the ones who were actually engaging in a filibuster, for it was brought out by the Senator from Arkansas that the original meaning of the word "filibuster" is "piracy on the high seas," and if the Holland joint resolution is not piracy of the Nation's rights on the high seas, it is the closest thing to it I have ever seen in the Congress.

But even so, Mr. President, the majority of those engaged in all-out opposition to the Holland giveaway joint resolution, the filibuster joint resolution—in the original meaning of that word—could not be successfully accused of engaging in a filibuster, in the current, parliamentary meaning of the word. We have always been opposed to the parliamentary filibuster—to endless debate for the purpose of blocking a vote and thus defeating the will of the majority. We continue to be so opposed.

In fact, as the record shows, I and many of my colleagues repeatedly urged the majority leader to make a motion which we promised to support, to set aside the pending giveaway joint resolution, and to proceed immediately to a vote on a motion to amend the rules, so as to provide for effective limitation on debate and to provide an effective cloture rule, so that debate could be shut off and a vote taken, after fair and reasonable debate.

The majority leader did not take us up on our offer. He brushed it aside. Apparently he did not want to consider a cloture rule. We were, instead, threatened with an invocation of cloture under the present rules, but this was only a gesture, for the present rule cannot practically be invoked, and the majority leader knows it.

Indeed, the distinguished majority leader is clearly on record against an effective cloture rule. As recently as January 6 of this year, in the course of the debate on our proposal to adopt new rules for the Senate, including an effective cloture rule, the majority leader said—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 114:

> Even then, it seems to me that unlimited debate is no abuse, because it has been the practice of parliament and it has been the practice of the Senate for 165 years, and I do not think such debate could be considered an abuse sufficient to justify setting aside the precedents of the Senate.

So the distinguished majority leader cannot, I may say, have his cake and eat it, too. He could not properly lay against us a charge of filibustering, and at the same time be on record as saying that unlimited debate is not an abuse and does not justify changing the rules of the Senate.

No, Mr. President. We have not filibustered. Most of us on this side of the question are and always have been against the filibuster; and we have been and are ready at any time to support a motion to change the present rules to prevent filibusters—although, I for one, will always maintain the right to have fair and reasonable debate. Just as I oppose the filibuster, I would oppose with all my strength a "gag rule." The rule recently reported by the Rules and Administration Committee shows, I think, the paradox of the position of the majority party in the Senate.

On the one hand, the majority leadership refuses to support a truly effective cloture rule—a rule that would limit debate on a change in the rules; and, on the other hand, the majority propose that when cloture is invoked, it should arbitrarily and inflexibly shut off debate after 5 days—an unreasonably short period for a minority, if it is a sizable minority, to have in which to present its viewpoint. So much for that, Mr. President.

Now I return to the pending question, namely the resources giveaway proposed in the Holland joint resolution, and of the constructive alternatives which we who oppose that measure propose instead.

I do not think it is yet clear to all the Members of the Senate, and certainly not

to the public at large, what the Holland joint resolution does, and what it leaves undone in regard to the mineral resources in the submerged lands in the open sea.

Let me say, first of all, that the basic purpose of my amendment—as was that of the Anderson amendment—is to get the oil out of the ground, to develop the resources in the submerged lands, for the sake of our national economy and of our national security.

My amendment does not disturb or affect present rights in the offshore oil lands, in the submerged lands. That question is not dealt with because it is no longer a question, as far as the law is concerned. The Supreme Court has ruled, three times, that these rights belong to the entire Nation.

My amendment—as did the Anderson amendment—gives authority to the Federal Government to lease these lands to private oil companies, for the orderly development of the vital resources. That authority is needed. Without it, the Federal Government cannot proceed to issue leases. Without it, these oil lands in the ocean will remain undeveloped, while our inland resources are being swiftly drained.

The basic formula for this development, as contained in my amendment, and as it was contained in the Anderson amendment, was carefully worked out after years of study and discussion. It was worked out by the best experts who could be assembled under the direction of former Senator O'Mahoney, who formerly was chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

It is not a hastily improvised formula. It should not be rejected merely upon the promise of the majority leader to bring up for consideration another formula, which might be concocted in a hurry, for the purpose of meeting the obvious objection that the Holland joint resolution does nothing to resolve this fundamental problem, namely, the development of the oil resources in the lands under Federal jurisdiction.

I wish to emphasize that point. The Anderson formula, as contained in my amendment, is absolutely essential for any Federal leasing of oil lands anywhere in the submerged land where the Federal Government has paramount rights and jurisdiction. In other words, without the Anderson formula, the Federal Government cannot issue a single lease for any oil development anywhere on the Continental Shelf, whether it be 1 mile out or 50 miles out.

The Holland joint resolution is a pure and simple quitclaim measure, giving away to the coastal States a certain portion of the resources in the submerged lands which the Supreme Court has ruled belong to the Nation as a whole, but the Holland joint resolution leaves completely unresolved the disposition of these resources which even that measure leaves within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

In other words, the Holland joint resolution cuts out a chunk of the Nation's offshore oil resources pie and hands it to Texas, California, and Louisiana, but leaves the rest of the pie out of reach as far as the other 45 States are concerned.

Now, let us get a closer look at what the Holland joint resolution really does, since I have already pointed out what it does not do.

It proposes to give away to Texas, California, and Louisiana the vast oil resources in the open sea off the coasts of the States I have just mentioned up to the so-called seaward boundaries of these States.

Until a few days ago, before certain restricting amendments to the Holland joint resolution were adopted, the extent of the seaward boundaries of the States in question was described as those which had "heretofore" or might "hereafter" be approved by Congress. But there was no definition of what "approval" really meant. It might have been some obscure statute in which reference to a seaward boundary was included, but without consideration of its significance. Indeed, this was clearly the case in the claim which Florida now maintains for a western seaward boundary of 10½ miles. An obscure provision of the constitution of the State of Florida, approved on its readmission to the Union in 1868, after the Civil War, is now cited as justifying this giveaway of submerged lands within 10½ miles of the western shoreline of Florida. There was no congressional discussion of this provision and no establishment of congressional intent. But the enabling act which readmitted Florida into the Union is now cited as "approval" by Congress of a boundary 10½ miles in the Gulf of Mexico, a boundary 7½ miles further into the Gulf than the United States has ever claimed for itself as a Nation.

But no matter, Mr. President. We are in the giveaway business, and the Senate appears intent on giving away to Florida, Louisiana, and Texas the resources in the Gulf which belong to the Nation.

I suppose the rest of us should be grateful that the Senate has voted to close, at least temporarily, the completely open end of the Holland proposal and to fix the extent of the giveaway to those resources within 10½ miles of the Florida coastline, 3 miles of the Louisiana coastline, 3 miles of the California coastline, and 10½ miles of the Texas coastline.

I must say that I, for one, do not believe that this will be the end of this story. I predict that these States will be back for more.

But for the moment, at least, all the Continental Shelf beyond these newly established seaward boundaries is left by the Holland joint resolution, in the hands of the Federal Government. But the Holland measure does not permit the Federal Government to do anything with these submerged lands and their resources. So this area will continue to be undeveloped and its oil resources untapped until we receive and consider the further legislation on this subject promised by the majority leader.

Mr. President, such a course of action makes a mockery of our national responsibilities. Our first need, as a Nation, is to develop these offshore oil resources. That is vital to our national security. To fail to make provision for that is to neglect the most urgent requirements of our national security, and to leave us vulnerable to a crippling oil shortage, if our supply lines to the Middle East and to South America should be interfered with. Should this not be our first consideration?

I should like to make one other thing clear, Mr. President. Under the terms of my bill, as of the Anderson bill, the development of these oil resources would be actually undertaken by private oil companies. There is no thought of governmental operation or development of these resources. We contemplate private development of these resources, even of those areas which might be reserved for national security purposes.

Of course, if the Federal Government issues the leases, the royalties would accrue to the whole Nation. Another point to be made is that under Federal jurisdiction, there would be a uniform and integrated program of development, of these resources, with due regard for conservation, and above all, of the needs of national security.

Mr. President, I hasten to say that I am not criticizing the oil conservation policies of any particular State. That is not the point. The point is that the resources in question belong to the Federal Government; even if the Holland joint resolution is passed, some of these resources will, at least temporarily, continue to belong to the Federal Government. It would certainly seem highly desirable that there be a uniform oil development program and policy for all this area. That can best be accomplished under the terms of the Anderson formula, as contained in my bill, and by the defeat of the Holland measure.

Of course the Holland joint resolution does not confine its effects to Louisiana, Texas, California, and Florida. It proposes to give analogous rights in the open sea to all coastal States. But its practical effect is to give these billions of dollars' worth of oil resources to Louisiana, Texas, and California, because the great bulk of the oil deposits are in the open ocean opposite these three States.

The Holland resolution purports to give the same kind of undefined proprietary rights in the ocean bottom to other coastal States. But as far as the other coastal States are concerned, the gift is a chimera, unless oil or other valuable minerals are discovered in the submerged land off their shores.

Moreover, it should be pointed out that even this grant is highly discriminatory, as between the coastal States. The fact is that, even without regard to the value of the oil and other mineral deposits, the practical effect of the Holland bill is to give a bonanza to a few of the coastal States and to make a meaningless grant to most of the other States.

For there is little meaning to the grant for those States with abbreviated coastlines. It is interesting to note that the 4 States most vitally interested in the Holland bill—Florida, Texas, California, and Louisiana—together have 56 percent of the entire coastline of the United States. Florida alone has 24.5 percent of the entire United States coastline; California, 17 percent; Louisiana, 8.2 percent; and Texas, 7.16 percent.

In addition to these 4, there are 17 other coastal States, all these States combined have only 43.4 percent of the coastline of the United States.

Thus, it can be seen that, speaking solely in terms of Continental Shelf area, aside from the question of the concentration of mineral resources, the Holland joint resolution is a bonanza for the four States in question, and a highly dubious grant for the other coastal States.

Of course, it is highly academic to speak of the submerged lands without reference to the mineral wealth concentrated in some parts of them. The mineral riches are in the Gulf and in the Pacific immediately off the California coast. In these areas there is little value. In the other offshore areas, there is only space and relatively little of that.

I hesitate to speak for States other than my own—and I shall shortly speak for my own and at some length—but I would think that the old Yankee traders of New England, for instance, would turn over in their graves at the idea of swapping their shares in the billions of dollars worth of oil-rich land off the coasts of Texas, Louisiana, and California, in return for an acreage of ocean ooze off the coast of New England.

Yet this is exactly the kind of bargain the Holland joint resolution is offering to the coastal States. As for the inland States, they are being completely shortchanged. Our southern friends and colleagues, along with those from California, with honeyed words and high-powered propaganda, have sold a bill of goods. They have reversed the fable and are selling us the Brooklyn Bridge.

As for myself, Mr. President, I cannot accept such a transaction without emphatic protest. Failing such a protest, I would be false to my conscience, my country, and my State.

As I have already said, I can understand the attitude of the Senators from California, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida. They are fighting for the special interests of their States and their constituencies. But the rest of us, too, must think of our respective States, and of the Nation.

What of my State, Mr. President? What of the interests of New York? My State was one of the original 13 which formed this Union, which participated in the great rebellion which led to the establishment of a new Nation on these shores. New York blood flowed in that revolution, and New York genius contributed to the fundamental charter of our Union.

The Thirteen Colonies did not form a loose association of competing sovereignties, each seeking special advantage at the expense of the others. The Preamble to the Constitution says that "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union—to provide for the common defense—and promote the general welfare."

And these key words—"To provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare"—are repeated, with emphasis, in the enumeration of the powers of the Congress.

The people of New York, in order to forge that Union, to create that Nation, to provide for the common defense, and to promote the general welfare, invested in the Union and in the Nation, the qualities, the rights, and responsibilities of sovereignty.

The people of New York vested in the Nation the responsibility to provide for the common defense, to guard the land borders and the sea approaches to the United States. New York and Massachusetts, and Connecticut, and Delaware, and Georgia, and Pennsylvania and Maryland, and the others of the Thirteen Original Colonies, gave the Nation the duty of maintaining the guard on the sea approaches to our shores, and of manning our borders.

Remember, Mr. President, that all 13 of the original States were coastal States. There were no inland States when our Nation was formed. Yet there was no doubt, at that time, that the United States, and not the individual States, was given all rights and responsibilities in the marginal sea.

New York was one of these States, Mr. President. New York, insofar as it was a sovereign entity, surrendered to the Union whatever sovereignty New York had in the marginal seas.

The seaward boundary of the Province of New York might have been claimed to be—although it was not—5 or 10 miles or 20 out in the open sea. But when New York became part of the Union, all of New York's claim to the open sea was vested in the United States. And the United States made at no time a greater claim of title and sovereignty than 3 miles into the open sea.

Prior to the Revolution, the British Crown was sovereign in these waters. Following the Revolution and the creation of the Union, the Union became sovereign.

At one time, Mr. President, the Province of New York included all of New England. As recently as 1792, New York State ceded to Vermont a major part of the territory which is now Vermont. Perhaps New York State should now assert a claim to jurisdiction over these lands. The claims of Texas and Florida to the submerged lands in the Gulf of Mexico have no greater, if as much, validity.

At one time, Mr. President, the State of New York—and this was after the establishment of the Union—held territories which extended far to the west, including lands which now constitute, in part or in whole, the States of Ohio and Michigan. But do you know, Mr. President, what New York State did in 1781? New York State gave all the western lands beyond her present borders to the Nation, to the United States, to be held as a National Territory, for the good of the Nation, and all its people, those of that day, and of the generations still to come.

New York divested herself of her sovereignty over those lands and gave them to the Nation, so that new States might be carved out of those territories, and so that the Nation might benefit from the public lands thereby acquired from New York by the United States.

In 1780 the New York State Legislature passed an act of cession, granting those lands to the United States Government. That act contained these words:

> The people of the State of New York were on all occasions disposed to manifest their regard for their sister States, and their earnest desire to promote the general interest and security.

In fact, New York State was the first State to turn over its western lands to the United States. Other States, including Virginia and Massachusetts, subsequently followed suit.

And this was very significant. As I have said, New York's grant of western lands to the National Government was followed by similar grants from other States. These grants resulted in the early creation of a sizable national domain. The creation of that national domain led, in turn, to the acceptance by the States of the idea of an overriding national sovereignty. Hence this grant of land by New York State in 1781, as much as any other single factor, prepared the way for the Constitution.

New York thus has a great historical, as well as a practical, interest in the maintenance of the national domain.

In the past our concern was to build up the country as a whole and to support the National Government.

What a contrast to the present trend, as reflected in the pending proposal. Instead of contributing to the resources of the National Government in these days of towering national responsibility, of astronomic public debt, and of unbalanced budgets, in these days when the National Government needs, as it did in 1781, fiscal resources to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare, it is now proposed that the Nation be stripped of its resources, that sovereign rights in the Continental Shelf be turned over to a few States, at the expense of all the other States, including my State of New York.

Thus, history is being turned upside down. The trend which made this Nation great is being reversed.

One of New York's great contributions to the Nation of that period was a citizen, an alien-born citizen, who was one of the architects of the Republic and who became one of the patron saints of the Republican Party. I refer to Alexander Hamilton, the chief advocate of federalism and of a strong Central Government. I wonder what Alexander Hamilton would have thought about this proposal to deprive the United States of its legitimate resources, of its proper sources of future revenues. It is strange that so few of the Senators who, at political gatherings, pay tribute to the memory of Alexander Hamilton are to be found in the forefront of this fight against tearing down what Alexander Hamilton struggled so hard to build up. This greatest of all Secretaries of the Treasury—at least, so proclaimed in Republican Party speeches—did what he could to build up the Federal credit to create new sources of Federal revenue so that the United States Government could discharge the responsibilities set forth in the Constitution.

But now it is proposed to give away those resources, to hand them over to a few States, at exactly the time when the National Government stands in the most critical need of finding additional sources of revenue to meet the crushing obligations and burdens it must now bear.

I shall not dwell at much greater length on history, but I should like to

make one further reference to the Constitution. Let us look at the enumeration of powers given to Congress, in section 8 of article I. Included in the many powers expressly granted Congress and the United States Government, is the following responsibility:

To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations.

Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that the Holland joint resolution is a violation of this provision of the Constitution, and that Congress should be considering, not this giveaway legislation, but legislation carrying out this constitutional injunction contained in section 8 of article I.

If what the Holland joint resolution proposes is not actually piracy on the high seas, it is surely a violation of international law. It is an attempt to obtain title to an area which, according to international law, is international territory. At least, we should give this point due consideration, along with the other constitutional points which have been raised in the course of this debate.

Mr. President, I return again to the viewpoint that New York State, my State, having contributed so much to the formation of this Union, and to the upbuilding of the Nation, has a great interest in seeing that the Nation is not torn down, bit by bit, piece by piece, and that this Nation is rendered capable of meeting its obligations, under the Constitution, and satisfying the urgent needs of the general welfare.

The people of New York, 15,000,000 of them—one-tenth of the population of the Nation—have a proportionate right in the mineral resources in the Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of California. The people of New York have as much right in those resources as do the people of Texas, Louisiana, Florida, and California. It is our coast, the coast of the Nation. It is our marginal sea, the marginal sea of the United States of America.

It is not I who says so. Do not take my word for it. Take the word of the Supreme Court of the United States. That word was given three separate times, in three separate decisions.

The United States is sovereign in those waters. The United States has paramount rights and dominion in those waters, and over the land beds underlying those waters. The people of New York State, as citizens of the Nation, have a right in those waters, in those land beds off the coasts of Texas, California, Florida, and Louisiana, just as the citizens of those States have a right in the waters and land beds off New York State. Why should Congress give away those rights, worth billions of dollars—the amount does not really matter—to the 4 States I have mentioned? I repeat: Why? That question has been asked again and again in the course of this debate. It has not been answered. It cannot be answered. There is no good reason.

Oh, Mr. President, what a tangled web we weave, when first we undertake to rationalize error.

If Texas, Louisiana, California, and Florida are to be given title to the lands underneath the marginal seas—and, in the cases of Florida and Texas, 10 miles out into the open sea—if these States are to be given all title and rights and regulatory powers in these seas, in these land beds, where do we stop?

What comparable title and rights shall New York claim? True, we get 3 miles of ocean ooze off our shores. It is a joke, but not one at which to laugh. We yield our rights in billions of dollars' worth of oil resources to these few States and they yield to us their rights in some hundreds of square miles of mud.

Why, Mr. President? I ask again: Why?

It is true that this question would not have arisen, if oil had not been discovered in these ocean beds, in these submerged lands. But, by the same logic, the question of Federal jurisdiction over navigable waters would never have arisen if ships had not been invented, if there were no such thing as commerce. The fact of recent discovery of value in these ocean beds, the discovery of oil in the Continental Shelf, does not diminish the national rights in those resources, once the claim to those rights has been made. The Nation has those rights, not the States. Who said so? The Supreme Court, three times. Why should those rights be given to three or four States?

Mr. President, let us take a look at my State. Again, I wish to say that when I talk about my State, I am talking not only about the interests of New York, but of the interests of the Nation, as well, because I feel, as do many other Senators, that I represent not only my own constituency, but also the entire Nation. I am talking now about the direct interests of 15 million people in my own State. We do not at the moment have oil off our coast. At least, none has been discovered. But we do have great resources in New York, resources which are regulated by, and on which taxes are collected by the Nation.

We have commerce and industry. We have the greatest port in the world, and into that port flows a great share of the Nation's commerce, by ship, and by air.

The Federal Government has the right to collect customs duties on certain foreign products and commodities landed at the port of New York—products and commodities destined for the people of New York and the people of the Nation.

In 1950 New York harbor handled over 186 million tons of commerce, by far the greatest tonnage of any of the other great ports in our country. Private, State, and local public expenditures on the facilities at the ports in New York harbor have amounted to billions of dollars. But the State of New York did not carve this great harbor out of its coastline. This harbor is a phemomenon of nature, a gift of providence. It is one of our great natural resources, just as the Tennessee River is a great natural resource of the States of Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky.

The people of the State of New York could take the attitude that all the revenues which accrue from this great natural resource which lies mostly within New York State should go into the treasury of the State of New York.

Let us see how the people of the United States now profit from the port of New York. First I should explain that the figures I am about to use cover Federal revenues from only that part of New York harbor lying within New York State, commonly called the port of New York. These figures also include receipts from Idlewild airport.

For the fiscal year 1952 alone, the Federal Government collected at the port of New York over $209 million in duties, over $2 million in miscellaneous receipts, and over $64 million in internal revenue taxes on imports such as liquor. The total collections came to $276,687,550.26.

I am not talking about personal income taxes or corporation taxes. I will take them up in a moment. I am speaking only of those revenues which accrued to the Federal Government as a result of the commerce flowing into the great port of New York during the year 1952. As a result of our great natural resource, the harbor of New York, the Federal Government collected over $276 million. Now let us do a little comparing. This is more than the Federal Government collected in personal income taxes from all the people living in the State of Louisiana. It represents more than was collected in combined corporation income and excess profit taxes from both the States of Florida and Louisiana.

We in New York are glad that we have a great natural harbor which permits the development of commerce on such a great scale, and which is used by all the people of the United States. We do not ask of the Federal Government that the revenues which accrue from this great port remain in New York State. We have not come to Congress to ask that these funds be returned to New York, because the port of New York is in New York State.

Of course we do not. The Constitution says that the Federal Government shall have the right to impose customs duties, and to collect excise taxes. So the Federal Government exercises that right on commerce entering the port of New York.

That is the Federal Government's right, the Nation's right, in regard to foreign products entering the United States. Nor is there any reason to stop at that point.

I wish to emphasize certain figures which are of particular importance. New York pays almost $8 billion annually in Federal income taxes, at current rates—personal, corporation, and excess profits—roughly one-fifth of the total collected in the entire Nation. That is 20 times as much as Florida pays, and almost 30 times as much as Louisiana pays.

Why should not New York ask that this money, collected from our great resource, our commerce and industry, be retained in New York? If this were done, New York, like Texas, could do without a State income tax. We could have the finest school system in the world. We could have an old-age pension system that would be the envy of all other sections of the Nation, and of the world. As for the subways, we could run them without any fare at all.

I wish to give a comparison between the income taxes collected in New York, Florida, and Louisiana, broken down as between corporation income and excess

profits tax receipts, and personal income tax receipts.

Comparison of corporation income and excess profits tax receipts, fiscal year 1951

Florida	$81,694,752
Louisiana	102,686,324
New York	3,243,085,654

Comparison of personal income tax receipts, fiscal year 1951

Florida	$319,601,286
Louisiana	237,580,740
New York	4,720,430,636

We, too, could claim particular favors, because we pay so much to the Federal Government. But we do not. We believe—and I possibly more than anyone else in the State of New York—that every citizen of the State of New York should pay his full share of taxes accruing to the Federal Government, without any excuses whatsoever. By the same token I, like many of my fellow citizens in New York, feel that the resources of the country should not be applied exclusively to three or four States of the Union.

Oh, Mr. President, I am not indulging in pure sport. I am aware that such proposals as I am suggesting would never seriously be made or seriously considered. Yet, these proposals are just as logical as the Holland proposal. The resources to which I have referred—The New York port, the commerce and industry of New York—are major resources within the boundaries of New York State. There is just as much reason to give the income from those resources to New York State, as to give the income from the offshore oil deposits to Florida, and Texas, and California, and Lousiana.

But obviously there is no sense to such proposals. The Federal Government has a right, under law, to tax these activities and to obtain the equivalent of royalties from them. They are within the Federal domain, as defined by law. The Federal Government needs the income from these sources to meet its obligations. It needs even more—much more.

The same is true of the offshore oil deposits. These deposits are within the Federal domain. The Federal Government has a right to obtain royalties from the development of these mineral deposits. Why should the Nation deny itself these sources of revenue? Why should the Congress seek to give them away to the 3 or 4 States at the expense of all the others?

At the same time we are considering the Holland proposal, there is a great clamor to cut taxes and to balance the budget. However much appropriations may be slashed—and I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. President, that I am strongly opposed to cuts in appropriations which sacrifice the national security or welfare—the national budget will still be unbalanced and taxes will still remain very high.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield when I have concluded with this part of the statement.

We must seek new sources of revenue or go deeper into debt.

Mr. President, what will be the situation if the Holland proposal is adopted? I am realistic, Mr. President. I know that it will be adopted. What will be the situation as between the States? The four States involved will obtain great revenues, if the estimates are even partially confirmed, and such estimates have been made by many experts in various States. It is quite conceivable that the States of Texas, Louisiana, Florida, and California will be able to reduce their State taxes in great part, possibly even eliminate them.

All the other States of the Union will be burdened by their State taxes. State taxes are almost as burdensome as those which must be imposed by the Federal Government because of existing conditions.

New York State turns over to its communities, in the form of State aid for local education, nearly $300 million a year, and the communities themselves provide many times that amount. The citizens of New York must continue to pay these heavy State taxes, and possibly increase them. I am sure every Member of the Senate will agree with me that the education of the youth of the country is far below the standard it should be.

Yet, because of these resources, the income from which will accrue to the four coastal States—the States which are the main proponents of the legislation—those States will be able to reduce their taxes by a great amount.

I know, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Florida, for whom I have a very high regard, has given figures purporting to show how little money the four States would realize from the development of the offshore oil resources. However, those figures do not agree with figures I have seen, which have been prepared by able experts representing the States which would benefit by this legislation.

I recall a report made by a great number of experts—forty, fifty, or sixty engineers and leading citizens of Texas—which show that in the Gulf off Texas alone there are oil resources worth from forty to one hundred billion dollars. So I am not impressed by the figures given by the Senator from Florida. If he does not think the amount of money involved is a large one, why does he fight for the proposal? Certainly he does not fight for it as a matter of principle. He cannot contend, as a matter of principle alone that the offshore waters belong to the States, when it has been clearly established from the time of Thomas Jefferson that the United States Government is sovereign in those waters.

It does not make sense to me that the Congress should be willing to give up these valuable oil resources to three or four States, and thus deprive the other States of their ownership of and title to the property.

How absurd, then, to give away the national rights in these rich oil resources? It is not only absurd, but it is unfair to New York, and to the other States, which pay the lion's share of the taxes collected by the Federal Government.

The Holland proposal is the road to national ruin. It establishes a precedent which must surely end in stripping away our Nation's resources, natural and otherwise, and giving them away to the States, so that the Nation will be left without domain, without resources, helpless, and impotent.

I am not drawing a long bow, Mr. President. This is the logical end of what is proposed to be done under the terms of the Holland joint resolution.

If we have any doubt about what is being attempted to be done, I should think the remarks of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT]—and these remarks were not in any way contradicted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]—would prove the danger of what is being attempted to be done.

The Senator from Nevada has urged, as has the senior Senator from Wyoming—and I believe the junior Senator from Wyoming also—that all natural resources now owned by the National Government be turned over to the States.

Mr. President, I thought we were a Nation. I have always thought so. I still believe the United States is a Nation, and I shall fight for that idea as long as I have breath in my body. It is proposed by the Holland resolution to turn over the offshore oil lands to the States, and it is proposed now by other amendments to turn over all the lands—the grazing lands, mineral lands, and timber lands, and the power facilities—to the States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, Mr. President; I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to point out that the Senator from New York has just now made a misstatement.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have only a limited amount of time, and I prefer to continue.

Mr. MALONE. However, Mr. President, the Senator from New York has just made a misstatement.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there will be 2 hours in which the Senator from Nevada can answer my argument.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege, for the Senator from New York has just made a misstatement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LEHMAN. For what purpose does the Senator from Nevada wish me to yield, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For a matter of personal privilege.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from New York would not yield for a question, so now I ask him to yield for a question of personal privilege.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I am very glad to yield for a matter of personal privilege.

I yield for a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MALONE. I do not ask the Senator from New York to yield for a question of personal privilege, but as a matter of personal privilege, so that I may make a statement.

Mr. LEHMAN. Oh, no. The Senator from Nevada has 2 hours in which to answer my argument.

Mr. MALONE. However, the Senator from New York has just made a false statement.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to yield on a question of personal privilege, as I always have been and always will be. However, I have only a limited time, and I wish to continue.

Mr. MALONE. Then I shall simply say that there is nothing in my amendment that would turn over the grazing lands or, in fact, any land surface to the States.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Nevada can make that very clear in the course of his statement.

Mr. MALONE. I have made it very clear in my statement just made.

Mr. LEHMAN. Good.

Mr. President, the Holland joint resolution moves in exactly the opposite direction from that of the great current in our history which has made us the mighty nation we are. That current is the building up of our Nation, as a whole, in all its parts, through the judicious use of the Federal authority and the Federal taxing power to promote the general welfare of all the States of the Union.

The building of the post roads and the river improvements which opened up the West more than a century ago were part of this current of our history. The great conservation measures so strenuously advocated by the great Republican President from my own State of New York, Theodore Roosevelt, was another, along with the building of such great projects as the Panama Canal. This current went on through the administration of Woodrow Wilson, when a Federal income tax was approved, making possible new measures to help develop the national domain and the national resources and to promote the general welfare.

During the more recent era of Franklin D. Roosevelt, this current broadened into a great stream of national improvement and expansion which included great power and reclamation dams in the West, the South, and the Southwest, epitomized in the TVA and the Grand Coulee Dam, and great highways and airports and ship canals and various irrigation and reclamation projects, wherever they were needed throughout this great country of ours.

In all those vast expenditures, New York State has always borne far more than its share. These great improvements were made possible through the recognition that what was good for one section of the Nation was good for all sections; that ours is one union, one nation; and that what promotes the general welfare of one region promotes the general welfare of all. That was made possible through the use by the Federal Government of the sovereign power the people had vested in it.

Mr. President, let me say to my colleagues—and I say it in all seriousness—that this is my fifth year in the Senate, and I think I am safe in saying that I have never voted against an appropriation for the development of any of the natural resources of the Nation, whether they existed in California or in Arizona or in New Mexico or in Tennessee or in Alabama or in Florida or in any of the other States of the Union. In those developments New York State had very little direct interest, and on many occasions I have been very much criticized by my constituents in New York for having voted for large appropriations for projects that made no direct contribution to the welfare of my own State.

However, I have taken the position with my constituents—and I believe their action at the polls has indicated that they agree with my position—that I would continue to vote for sound and practical projects for the development of particular regions of our country because I have felt, and I still feel very strongly with the utmost fervor, that what benefits one great area of the Nation benefits all the areas of the Nation.

However, I wish to say that I am not sure that the people of my State are going to continue to back me in that position.

Last year I appealed to the Congress to appropriate $1 million for plans for the development of the Niagara River. The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] will remember that, and he backed me in my efforts to have that appropriation made. However, the appropriation was not made. We were not successful in that effort.

I have not fought for many such undertakings. New York has not asked for many appropriations of this kind. But we have been denied even those we have asked. Many of my constituents feel that I should be working more for the direct and immediate interests of New York and think less for the interests of other regions and of the Nation as a whole. Whether I shall continue to be able to convince them, as I have before, that when I vote for something which will benefit Florida or Arkansas or Oklahoma or California, something which will increase the prosperity and the welfare of the Nation, I am also helping the people of my own State, I do not know. I simply wish to mention this point, which I am sure my colleagues do not sufficiently realize. They do not realize the feeling which exists today, and how anxious I have been, and am, to preserve the interests of the entire country, not those of one section only. However, my colleagues are making it very difficult for me.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas. Let me say this is the only time I shall yield, because I have only a limited amount of time in which to speak.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I may have misunderstood the remarks of the Senator from New York and the implications regarding the Senator from Arkansas. As I recall, I was chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works which held hearings upon three bills providing for the development of the Niagara River. I do not recall the bill of the Senator from New York. However, one of those bills would have given all that resource to the State of New York, as I recall. I do not know whether the Senator from New York was saying that I backed him in that endeavor or not.

Mr. LEHMAN. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I backed no one, because we simply held hearings. The committee took no action.

I may say I did undertake to develop, at those hearings, all facts pertinent or relevant to the entire subject of the development of the Niagara River.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I may say to my distinguished colleague from Arkansas, for whom I have great affection and regard, there were actually two Niagara bills in which I was interested. One was an appropriation for the making of plans. Another was an authorization bill for the whole project. He is thinking of the latter bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] introduced a bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. No, it was another bill—my bill—to permit New York State to develop the power resources of the Niagara. That came before the Senator's committee. I have the impression that the Senator from Arkansas was personally sympathetic, though the committee took no action. There was, in addition, a request for $1 million, which was made to the Appropriations Committee, to provide for the drawing of plans under the guidance of the United States Army engineers. As I remember the Senator from Arkansas was sympathetic to both proposals. I know the Senator was not unsympathetic, at any rate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am quite sure I supported the $1 million appropriation to make possible the drawing of the plans, because I believed in the development of the resources. However, I do not think I took a position on either bill. We endeavored to develop fully all the information necessary to enable the committee and the Congress to make a decision later regarding the project.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas for his correction, as I am always grateful to him for his sympathetic consideration.

In the Holland proposal, we are urged to turn backward, to reverse this mighty current in our history, and to turn over to some of the States the national resources located in the open sea, in the national domain, within the purview of the national sovereignty.

The resources of the Nation are no longer to be governed by the Nation for the benefit of all the people, for the promotion of the general welfare, but to be given away to a few States, not on the basis of special need, but on the basis of geographical proximity to the resources in question.

I really do not think that either California, Louisiana, Texas, or Florida could make a very good case on the ground of special need, but those States are basing their proposal on geographical proximity to the resources in question.

This is not like a power dam whose benefits must necessarily flow to the peo-

ple in the immediate vicinity. This is oil, and gas, and sulfur to be brought out of the submerged lands, and sold in the open market.

New York State can and should benefit from these oil deposits, on a proportionate basis, just as much as Texas, and California and Louisiana and Florida. New York State has that right under law, as one of the 48 States. The Supreme Court has said so. And the people of New York, one-tenth of the people of the entire Nation, have a right to insist that this proposal to give away their resources be defeated and set aside, in favor of my proposal which would provide for the development of these resources in the interest of all the people of this country, and in the interest of our national security.

I know, Mr. President, that it will be said that some of the officials of the State of New York support this proposal. Mr. Robert Moses, the commissioner of parks of New York State, has endorsed this legislation, and the senior Senator from Florida has made much of this circumstance.

Mr. Moses has lent his support to this giveaway on what I must call spurious and specious grounds. Anyone in New York State who supports the Holland bill is laboring, in my judgment, under the most serious misapprehensions, and is either inadequately informed or is tragically neglectful of the interests of the State and of its people, as well as of the interests of the Nation.

I turn now to the argument that the Holland bill is necessary for New York, in order to assure State title to the filled-in lands on the ocean front.

I say that the entire excitement about filled-in lands, along with the associated fable that the Holland bill is essential to assure State title to the land beds beneath inland waters, rivers, lakes, and harbors, is pure hoax.

After carefully surveying all the facts, it is difficult for me to refrain from arriving at the conclusion that these arguments have been made with the intention to deceive. But I do not make that charge. I simply submit the facts. And the facts, in my opinion, are rather convincing.

Mr. President, the filled-in lands, piers, jetties, wharves, and other structures built in New York harbor and facing Long Island sound have been constructed on submerged bottoms under inland waters. There never has been a question, nor is there now a question, concerning the full title and rights of State, municipal, or private interests in these bottom lands or the structures built on them. Under every official interpretation I have been able to find, the waters of New York Harbor and Long Island Sound have always been considered inland waters. I am sure that the present administration and the past administration have considered Long Island Sound an inland waterway. I know that the Supreme Court of the United States considers New York Harbor and Long Island Sound as inland waters.

There never was and could not be any question with regard to New York's full title and rights in these particular bottom lands.

Now, Mr. President, the situation on the eastern coast of Long Island, facing the open sea, may be somewhat different. There may be some doubt in the minds of New York State officials and private property owners concerning present or future title to filled-in lands or structures built on that coast. This doubt arose following the decisions by the Supreme Court in the three historic offshore oil cases. These cases dealt with the ownership of the bed of the ocean and the mineral rights in the Continental Shelf beginning at low water mark opposite coastlines facing the open sea.

I would like to recall, Mr. President, that because of the doubts I have just referred to, the senior Senator from New York and I, during the last session of Congress, jointly offered an amendment to the then pending O'Mahoney resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 20. We offered this amendment to quiet any fears with regard to filled-in lands along the east coast of Long Island. We wanted to assure the officials of New York City who brought this problem to my attention that fills could continue to be made along the coastline to expand the great public recreational developments in that area, without raising a question of title.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the wording of the amendment incorporated in the O'Mahoney resolution last year, bearing on this point:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the wording of the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 10. (a) The United States hereby quitclaims all right, title, and interest in any filled-in, made, or reclaimed land which formerly was land underlying the sea and situated outside the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside the inland waters to the State, subdivision thereof, or person who was on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the property law of the State in which such land is located.

(b) The United States hereby quitclaims all right, title, and interest in any land which is underlying the sea and situated outside the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside the inland waters and in the future becomes filled in, made, or reclaimed land as the result of action taken by any State or subdivision thereof for recreation or any other public purpose, to such State or subdivision effective as of the date determined by the Secretary on which such land becomes filled in, made, or reclaimed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it should be noted that in this amendment last year we used the words "quitclaim all right, title, and interest." Since that time many students of this problem have raised serious constitutional questions concerning this language, leading to the conclusion that the Federal Government cannot "quitclaim" its total rights and title in these lands. I emphasize the words "its total rights and title in these lands."

Hence this year, when last year's amendment was incorporated in the Anderson bill, S. 107, the wording was changed slightly to eliminate the possibility that quitclaiming title to areas on the coast where there was filled land or structures might be unconstitutional. The wording we used this year confirmed and recognized any right, title, and interest the State had or might need in the future to assure its full control over the surface rights of filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point the revised wording concerning filled lands as those words appeared in the Anderson bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the revised wording was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this act by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act.

(b) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder to the surface of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands as a result of authorized action taken by any such State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder for recreation or other public purpose is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. It has been pointed out, Mr. President, that this wording, although it clearly covers all fills made in the past, both public and private, it would not cover new fills and structures, made in the future, if such fills were made by private persons rather than public agencies or instrumentalities.

That is true, Mr. President. However, despite the excitement shown by the senior Senator from Florida in regard to this point, there is no significance in it. No provision was included in the Anderson bill with regard to future fills by private persons because we had received no indication that private individuals had any concern with this problem. However, Mr. President, I see no reason to discriminate against privately made fills in this matter, and have therefore written further language which I have introduced as an amendment to my amendment, and which is, of course, included in the total substitute now pending before the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that this wording, as revised by me, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this act by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act,

(b) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, public agency, or person, holding thereunder to the surface of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands as a result of authorized action taken by any such State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, public agency, or person, holding thereunder for public or private purposes is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I want to point out for the record that I and my colleagues who have been opposed to the giveaway have tried our level best to separate the question of coastal fills from the completely different question of offshore oil.

But there has been a studied effort on the part of the supporters of the giveaway to confuse the two questions and to throw into the confusion the further question about inland waters and actual tidelands.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. After hurriedly comparing the amendment presented by the distinguished Senator from New York with the earlier amendment presented by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I find very little difference between them. Is it true that the only substantial departure is that whereas the Senator from New Mexico proposed to give to the States 37½ percent of the royalties derived from properties within State boundaries, the Senator from New York does not have that provision in his amendment, but proposes to divert to the United States all the royalty revenues, both within State boundaries and in the Continental Shelf?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite correct. It is a clear-cut amendment to the proposed joint resolution. The joint resolution provides that 37½ percent of the revenues from the 3-mile strip shall be given to the States and that all the balance shall be given for defense or for other national purposes. My amendment is clear-cut, so that there will be no doubt whatsoever with regard to it. I am 100 percent in favor of the purpose of the Hill amendment. I think it is a good amendment. I want the oil revenue to go to all the States for education. I believe there is nothing more important than the education of our young people. So that, to prevent any misunderstanding, my amendment is a perfectly clear-cut declaration of what I have in mind and what I hope my colleagues may have in mind, that all the revenues from the offshore lands shall go to the Federal Government to be used by the Federal Government for the development and maintenance of education. There is no doubt whatsoever in my amendment. I am not "pussy-footing" on this matter. I am not saying that the States of Texas, California, Louisiana, or any other State should get 37½ percent of the revenues from lands even within the 3-mile limit. I am saying that the lands underlying the waters in the 3-mile limit belong to the Federal Government, and, therefore, I think the Federal Government can dispose of the revenues from those lands in any way it may see fit. My amendment provides that the revenues be used for the education of all of the young people of all of the States of the Nation.

I may say to the Senator from Florida that I do not want to set myself up as being more concerned with the welfare of my country than is any other Senator. I know we are all well-meaning and patriotic men. But there is a difference of opinion as between what will develop progress, prosperity, and constructive effort toward the defense and protection of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a further question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I shall be very glad indeed to yield to the Senator from Florida when I am through saying what I want to say.

I think we must do everything we possibly can to strengthen ourselves and our allies, and I want to see that objective accomplished. I am in hope that this country is going to survive and prosper, and I am convinced that there is nothing—and I emphasize the word "nothing," if I may—that is of such great importance and such great value to our progress and our prosperity as is the education of our young people. I know that even in the great State which I have the honor in part to represent, the salaries, at the highest, are quite inadequate to attract good teachers who have given years and years to their training. I know we have insufficient and overcrowded schools, with classes which are twice as large as they should be, and that we have a very inadequate and ineffective educational system in many localities.

I am quite certain—I am saying this without criticism of any State—that the same situation exists in many other States, not because their citizens are less interested in education, but because they have smaller resources. I know that many of the States are paying as little as $1,700, $1,800, or $1,900 a year for a teacher, which is much less than a dogcatcher would get, much less than a garbage collector would get, much less than a domestic servant would get. Yet, Mr. President, for the schools we need people who have had years and years of professional training.

I say to the Senator from Florida that I do not want a single thing in the world for my State alone; I do not want New York to get the slightest advantage over any other State. I want to see, however, the natural resources of the country safeguarded for the Nation. This is a great Nation; it is not merely a loose federation of States in which each State looks for advantage for itself. We have lived, survived, grown, and prospered, and we have received the respect of the world in the past 160 years. I want this Nation to be a Nation, composed not just of Florida, not just of New York, not just of Texas or California or Arizona, but of 48 States. We have certain natural resources which the good Lord has given us. Those are the things I am trying to protect for the benefit of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. In order to make the RECORD perfectly clear, am I correct in my understanding that the distinguished Senator from New York believes that all the natural resources in the seabed between low-water mark of the several States and the State boundaries offshore should be federalized 100 percent and should wholly belong to the Federal Government?

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe the mineral rights in the entire offshore submerged lands should belong to the Federal Government. Of course, exceptions have been made regarding filled-in land, buildings, piers, docks, and recreation facilities. But that is a different proposition. I would give to the States only the surface rights; I would not give them mineral rights, whether the lands be in New York or in Florida. Certainly I would protect the rights of the States to the surface rights.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, this confusion was desired by the giveaway advocates. They have thus succeeded in convincing a sufficient number of people that the only way to clear State and private title to tidelands, to coastal fills, and to inland waterbeds is to give away the submerged lands in the open sea as well.

This is nonsense. There has been a bill before the Interior Committee for several years. It was reintroduced this year as S. 1252, is confined solely and entirely to clearing title to the coastal fills, and, for the record, gives new assurance on title to the beds of inland waters, lakes, harbors, and bays.

But that bill, S. 1252, was never moved out of committee. The proponents of giveaway would not separate the two different questions. So appropriate language covering the substance contained in S. 1252 was included in the O'Mahoney bill last year, in the Anderson bill this year, and in my amendment now pending before the Senate.

Mr. President, the whole question of filled lands is a red herring, as is the question of State title to the landbeds underneath the inland waters, lakes, harbors, and bays. It is meant to divert attention from the naked giveaway of our oil resources.

I want to discuss this latter point for a moment. It has been stated in broadsides of propaganda that unless the Holland joint resolution or its equivalent is passed, the States will lose title to the beds of their rivers, lakes, and harbors. Much has been made of this point, as much has been made of the question of filled-in and reclaimed lands already referred to. We in New York have been told that unless the Holland joint resolution was passed, we would lose title to the bed of Lake Ontario. Indeed, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] has stated that the Holland joint resolution will give us title to the bed of Lake Ontario. Again they are trying to sell us the Brooklyn Bridge. What are the facts?

I have read some of the hearings of past years on this subject. Recently I ran across what I believe is an important revelation. In 1948 Senator Donnell, of Missouri, attempted to ascertain who was really behind the clamor for quitclaiming the offshore oil. Mr. Edward A. Harris, Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, was on the witness stand.

Mr. Harris had uncovered many interesting facts concerning the forces behind the offshore-oil legislation, and one of the statements he made before the committee dealt with an interview he had with the attorney general of the States of Missouri in 1945. Mr. Harris, in a statement to be found on page 1539 of the 1948 Joint Committee Hearings on Title to Submerged Tidal Lands, said:

> In any case, the attorney general of Missouri stated that he didn't know what it was all about, but he got many letters from Clary and Kenny and forms all ready to be signed by him, and was told that it was a matter of Federal seizure of inland rights. And so he signed it. And later, when he went into it, he withdrew it.

The Mr. Clary referred to was a member of a law firm representing a large number of oil companies, and Mr. Kenny was then the attorney general of California.

I cite this excerpt from the hearings, Mr. President, because I believe that many State officials, like the attorney general of Missouri, back in 1945, have been drawn into this fight because they were told that the Federal Government was claiming the beds of all lakes, rivers, and harbors.

For this reason, I was especially encouraged recently to read in the Legislative Bulletin of the Council of State Governments of April 1953 what I feel is a fair description of all the measures before the Congress on this subject. The Council of State Governments, as I am sure all Senators know, is a sort of holding corporation for organizations such as the Association of State Attorneys General, the Governors Conference, and many other associations of various State officials, as well.

This bulletin has analyzed all the measures before the Senate including the Holland joint resolution, the Anderson bill, the Daniel bill, and the special bill placed before the Senate by Senator ANDERSON and 17 other Senators, S. 1252.

It is interesting to note that the official bulletin of the organizations which have been supporting quitclaim legislation states that all the bills before the Senate adequately dispose of any doubts which might have been raised concerning the lands beneath inland navigable waters.

I say this because the impression has been given that this organization has supported only one measure. As a matter of fact, it now says that the intent of what is contained in all the measures would be effective. I quote from the bulletin:

> Like Senate Joint Resolution 13, and S. 294, S. 107 affirms State title to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands beneath navigable inland waters (including the Great Lakes to the extent that they are within the boundaries of a State of the United States).

Mr. President, the bulletin of the Council of State Governments thus makes clear what should be crystal clear—that no controversy or difference of opinion exists in the Senate or in the country regarding title to filled lands, to actual tidelands, or to the beds underneath inland waters, lakes, bays, or harbors.

Whatever doubt there is in regard to title to filled lands along the coast facing the open sea would be resolved by any one of the bills which have been introduced. It is not necessary to pass the Holland resolution to accomplish that purpose.

As for the inland water-beds and the beds of the Great Lakes, the courts have twice ruled, in the *Illinois Central* case (146 U. S. 387 (1892)) and in the *Massachusetts* case, (271 U. S. 65 (1926)), that the beds of the Great Lakes belong to the States bordering those lakes, up to the international boundry. The court has ruled on 10 separate occasions that the true tidelands belong to the States.

In the case of Massachusetts against New York, which involved Lake Ontario, the court ruled that the bed of this lake, up to the international boundary, was owned, in fee simple, by the State of New York. Then why this misleading talk about the Holland joint resolution giving us title to the bed of Lake Ontario?

Oh, Mr. President, this is all cloud and confusion, raised to divert our attention from the question of oil, of these rich oil resources in the submerged lands, which belong to all the Nation, and are proposed under the terms of the Holland bill to be given to 3 or 4 States only.

Yet this cause cannot be lost. It dare not be lost. I believe the courts will sustain us. In any event, I am convinced the people sustain us and will continue to do so. The issue has been carried home to the people. The facts have even been made known, and will continue to be made known.

There will be a reckoning. The people of this country are not going to divest themselves of their rights in these resources. They are not going to stand idly by and let the Nation be deprived of what is an inalienable possession of all the people.

Mr. President, a number of very fine editorials and articles have appeared recently in newspapers and periodicals on this subject. I shall ask to have them printed in the body of the RECORD.

A very fine editorial appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times. It is entitled "Oil Giveaway," and was published in the New York Times of May 1, 1953. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL GIVEAWAY

The test votes in the Senate this week on the offshore oil bill make it clear that—barring a miracle—one of the greatest giveaway programs in all our history will soon receive legal sanction. The final vote is now scheduled for Tuesday; and the measure that is then to be passed will, after its differences with the House-approved bill have been ironed out, doubtless receive the President's signature in fulfillment of ill-advised promises made during the campaign.

The Senators fighting to preserve the rights of all the people of the United States in this valuable natural resource have been able to muster a maximum of only 33 votes. They achieved this total in defense of the Anderson-Hill amendments, which would provide for Federal control over all offshore oil beyond the low-water mark (in accordance with previous decisions of the Supreme Court) and would set aside royalties to be received by the Federal Government from private exploitation of that oil for eventual distribution among the States for educational purposes.

Only 33 Senators thus were recorded in favor of a measure that would have prevented 3 or 4 coastal States from gaining control over billions of dollars worth of oil that actually belongs to the people of all the States. Seven Republicans, 25 Democrats, and 1 Independent. Of the 6 Senators from New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut—States that will lose by the oil giveaway—Senator LEHMAN was the only one to stand up against the tide. Senator IVES joined him on a subsequent vote to confirm Federal authority over the oil lands seaward of the traditional 3-mile limit. But this proposal, which would have at least barred Florida, Louisiana, and Texas from their claims running an unknown number of miles out to sea, was also defeated, and by an even more decisive majority.

It is clear that most Members of Congress are willing to deprive the United States of property that is of enormous commercial value. If the Federal Government were allowed to hold on to the oil lands, they still would be developed by private companies. And they might well be developed much more expeditiously, because in no matter what form the pending legislation is passed it will probably lead to further prolonged litigation. The question of just where so-called historic State boundaries lie has not been settled to anyone's satisfaction and contains the seeds of endless disputes. But still the Congress is obviously unwilling to accept Senator LEHMAN's observation: "Beyond the water's edge there is no Texas, no California, no Louisiana, no New York. There is only the United States of America." The present bill giving the States title to oil that belongs to the Nation is wrong in principle and dangerous in practice, and it should be defeated.

Mr. LEHMAN. On Saturday, May 2, a very excellent editorial entitled "Going, Going" was published in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOING, GOING

Time is running out on the tidelands. It appears that the gallant stand made by the Senate minority seeking to save this rich natural inheritance for the people of the United States will prove of no avail when the votes are counted in the Senate on Tuesday. But the opponents of the oil giveaway need not feel that their effort has been an altogether futile one. It has dramatized the difficult issue sufficiently to start a dawning recognition among the people of the country generally that they are being made the victims of a gigantic hornswoggle.

More and more as the debate drones on, it is becoming plain that the spokesmen for California, Texas, Florida, and Louisiana want nothing less than the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. They, and the representatives of the inland States whom they have cajoled into supporting them, beat down overwhelmingly an amendment

by Senator MONRONEY to set the limit of State ownership 3 miles out to sea and to provide for Federal management of the Continental Shelf beyond this limit. Their rapacity is not confined even to the marginal sea—let alone to the tidelands and the inland waters over which the Federal Government has never asserted any claim.

More and more it is becoming clear also that the inland States were gulled into believing that their own lakes, rivers, and harbors were somehow threatened by the Supreme Court decision recognizing the paramount rights of the Federal Government in the submerged lands under the open ocean. They were induced to support the grab of the coastal States in much the same way that panicked householders might be tricked into helping some vandal escape justice because he pointed a finger at a policeman and shouted, "Stop thief!" The inland States are giving away to the 3 or 4 interested coastal States an incalculable treasure which belongs by right to the whole of the United States. We still nurture a faint hope that they will wake up from their befuddlement before it is too late.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a most interesting analysis of the tidelands-oil question, entitled "Offshore Oil—A Precedent?" from the April 11, 1953, issue of the Economist. The writer for this British journal is keenly aware that the precedent being attempted by the present administration with regard to offshore oil may very well lead to the loss of our great public lands, parks, and water-resource projects.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFSHORE OIL—A PRECEDENT?

WASHINGTON, D. C.—It is very probable that the first Republican law for 20 years to reach the statute book after being passed by a Republican Congress and signed by a Republican President will be one that repudiates many of the best traditions of the Republican Party. Last week the House of Representatives approved, by 285 to 108 votes, a bill to give control of petroleum and other minerals which may be found under the sea to the adjoining States. The Senate has already held its committee hearings on the subject and began its debate on the measure this week; although there will be vigorous opposition, it is virtually certain that the Republicans will have enough support from southern Democratic Senators to enable them to carry the measure. When twice before, in 1946 and 1952, Congress passed a similar bill, Mr. Truman had no hesitation in exercising his veto. This time the new President is the proposal's avowed and enthusiastic supporter.

In the Gulf of Mexico the American Continent dives only gradually below the waves, and in places the Continental Shelf extends outward for 100 miles or more at depths at which modern ingenuity can develop its resources. Ever since oil became worth exploiting, three States with known oil deposits off their shores, Texas, Louisiana, and California, have persistently claimed that this underwater ground was within their own borders, and therefore within their own power to lease or develop. Successive Democratic administrations, upheld by two Supreme Court decisions, maintained that the Federal Government—that is the United States itself—had paramount power over the offshore lands.

Whether General Eisenhower had ever considered the problem before he gave his support so decisively to the position of the States may be doubted, but by so doing he enhanced his popularity enormously in the Southwest, and especially in Texas; this was the nearest that he permitted his advisers to bring him to a direct purchase of votes, and in view of his overwhelming victory even this was unnecessary. Now the promise is being redeemed, but not quite in the coin the coastal States had been led to expect. The Attorney General has concluded that they can only claim title to resources within their historic boundaries. These are the offshore boundaries the States possessed before they joined the United States; for Texas and Florida they mean 3 leagues, or 10½ miles, out to sea, and, in the case of the others, 3 miles. Even the concession to the vagaries of Spanish measurement in Texas and Florida has been opposed by the State Department, which rightly fears that it will be hampered in its battles to persuade other nations, especially Mexico, to restrict their definition of their seaward boundaries to the 3-mile limit. With wry faces the representatives of the Gulf and Pacific Coast States have accepted the Attorney General's ruling and the House bill gives the States quitclaim rights to the submerged lands within their historic boundaries but reserves control over the rest of the Continental Shelf to the Federal Government. The Senate bill is somewhat weaker since it does not specifically provide for Federal control over the area beyond historic boundaries. The measure has not gone unchallenged, for there was nothing during the election on which Republicans and northern Democrats were more flatly opposed, but there is as yet no aroused public opinion on the subject.

What is disturbing is not the offshore oil bill itself so much as its demonstration of the apparently weak resistance of the Republicans to raids on the national assets still held by the Federal Government on behalf of the people as a whole. The Government still owns one-quarter of the land in the United States, 455 million acres in the country itself and 365 million acres in Alaska; a century ago before the Western States were carved out and the railway companies lavishly endowed, the Government owned three-quarters of the land. It ranges from grazing land, which is let usually to small farmers and ranchers, timberland which has been cautiously forested and conserved, and national parks to mineral resources, estimated at 4 billion barrels of oil and 325 billion tons of coal. It brings in a revenue of well over $300 million a year, of which two-thirds comes from the sale of electric power.

For many years the attack on the Federal domain has been growing in intensity, from the big ranching concerns, from the oil interests, represented in equal strength in both political parties, and most particularly from the private power and utility companies. It takes various forms; in the case of power and lumber projects, the demand is that Federal assets should be sold to the public. With careful disingenuousness Mr. Charles E. Wilson, of the electric, not the motor, company, asked last September:

"What is wrong with selling our national dams, generating equipment and distribution facilities to the people? The potential buyers are all around us. They are the people who own Government bonds. Bonds could be exchanged for shares of stock in the new companies to spring from the presently Government-owned plants."

The national debt would be reduced and millions of citizens would own a tangible part of American business, added Mr. Wilson. Soon after the election Mr. Laurence Lee, the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, inaugurated a crusade for "land freedom," the gradual transfer of all Federal lands to private owners. More often, however, covetousness for Federal lands appears decently clothed as a desire to see them "returned" to the States; the hidden assumption is that a State government would be more amenable to giving permission for the quick exploitation of land or resources than the remote, upright and powerful Federal Government.

Apart from the legal impossibility of "returning" property which historically belonged to the Nation before any of the Western States existed, the general Republican dislike of big government, or any Federal initiative even faintly reminiscent of the New Deal has led to an attitude of mind which, by permitting ruthless exploitation of natural resources, could weaken irreparably both the Western States themselves and the rest of the country. Furthermore, the typical cry that the West is underprivileged in relation to the rest of the country, because almost all the Federal land is situated there and State governments cannot levy taxes on Federal property, is hardly justified. For like other poorer areas, such Western States as Montana and Wyoming are indirectly subsidized by the richer States through the Federal grants-in-aid which they receive for roadbuilding and other development projects.

It would seem that ingrained dislike of the New Deal has perverted one of the strongest and finest Republican traditions. With the exception of Franklin Roosevelt, the pioneering work in conserving the Federal lands has been done by Republicans. The word "conservation" was invented by a Republican and the two men who arrested the frittering away of public lands and made them an example of careful development were Theodore Roosevelt and the intensely Republican head of his Conservation Service, Gifford Pinchot. Indeed, much of the political support which the Republicans gained in the West in the early part of the century rested on admiration and gratitude for Federal safeguarding of natural resources. But now the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, Mr. HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, has hinted darkly at a bill which would make the theory behind the offshore oil bill "applicable to public lands." And he is likely to get the fullest support from Mr. McKay, the Secretary of the Interior, and his new assistants, most of whom have been connected with private utility companies.

Offshore oil is clearly the opening shot of an attack that will be hotly pressed. It is, unfortunately, no adequate answer to say, as many Democrats are saying, that the Republicans are digging their political grave and making themselves very vulnerable to a rousing radical campaign next year. The public lands exist as such only as a result of the special historical development of the United States. As Mr. Bernard De Voto points out in a recent issue of Harpers magazine: "If the public lands are once relinquished, or even if any fundamental change is made in the present system, they will be gone for good."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, although it has been said that some officials of New York State are in favor of the Holland bill, there are other officials who feel quite differently.

Mr. Robert F. Wagner, Jr., president of the Borough of Manhattan, recently made public a letter which he had addressed to my colleague [Mr. IVES], which was very similar to a letter he had sent to me. Mr. Wagner indicates that so far as he is concerned the interests of

New York would be served by the defeat of the Holland bill. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter which I have be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York N. Y., April 13, 1953.

Hon. IRVING M. IVES,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As president of the Borough of Manhattan, I am deeply concerned over congressional action on the tidelands oil bill introduced by Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, now before the Senate, and want to urge you most vigorously to oppose and vote against that proposal.

The Supreme Court has ruled that the tidelands oils are the property of the people of the United States and there is no justification for turning over those national properties to the States of California, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas. On the contrary, that vast natural resource should be preserved and developed for the benefit of all the people of our Nation.

Moreover, it is equally clear that, in light of testimony offered by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, that enactment of Senator Holland's bill will result in prolonged litigation involving, not only the scope of the grant to these four States, but also the constitutional power of Congress to dispose of Federal properties in a way that will benefit only a small percentage of our people.

We think entirely specious the argument of the proponents of Senator HOLLAND'S bill to the effect that such legislation is necessary to protect Jones Beach, Idlewild Airport, municipal piers and other waterfront facilities from encroachment by Federal authority. That entire problem can be resolved if the proponents of the Holland bill would support Senate bill 1017 introduced by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Senator HERBERT LEHMAN and 16 additional Senators.

As a representative of the people of the State of New York in the United States Senate, you no doubt realize that enactment of the Holland bill will in no way benefit the people of our State, but will, on the contrary, be harmful to our people by depriving them of revenues from resources in which, under the ruling of the Supreme Court, we have a clear interest.

We think that the national interest, as well as the welfare of the people of this State, will best be served by enactment of the bill introduced by Senators LISTER HILL and HERBERT LEHMAN, which will make royalties from this resource available for education purposes. Such legislation will enable our cities and local governments to make real progress toward providing our children with modern educational facilities. Such legislation is within the best traditions of our national development and finds its roots in the historic ordinance of 1787.

I know of your deep interest in this matter and trust that you will recognize the paramount interest of the people of the State of New York in the tidelands oil resources and that you will do all you can to preserve those resources for the people of all the States.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT F. WAGNER, Jr.,
President, Borough of Manhattan.

Mr. LEHMAN. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD three messages I have received from organizations in New York State who wish to see the revenues from the offshore oil go for the benefit of all the children of the United States.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 31, 1953.*
Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building:

The United Parents Association of New York City, representing over a quarter million parents of school children, strongly urges and expects that you will do everything in your power to support congressional action for using proceeds of tideland oil for educational purposes, in accordance with Hill amendment. Application of these funds from proceeds of oil resources to our greatest natural resource, the children, is sound national policy, and will pay the maximum dividend. Such Federal aid to education is a crying need for almost every community in the country.

LILLIAN H. SHE,
President.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 6, 1953.*
Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building:

As you know, New York State CIO Council and affiliates representing more than million workers in State vigorously opposes surrender of Federal ownership offshore oil deposits to States. These billions of dollars in vital natural resources belong to people of Nation. Under Federal ownership, necessary security reserves will be assured, and income can be dedicated to meeting nationwide school crisis. Proposals now under consideration would deprive people of New York and 44 other States of rightful share of these benefits to enrich 3 States and more particularly the private interests, which will be prime beneficiaries of State ownership. This would represent most arrogant plunder of Nation's natural resources in history. Ask not only your vote against measure but every possible effort to prevent this raid on public wealth.

NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL, CIO.
LOUIS HOLLANDER,
HAROLD J. GARNO.

THE NEW YORK TEACHERS GUILD,
NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 13, 1953.*
Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: The New York Teachers Guild, representing several thousand organized public-school teachers in this city, wishes to record its deep anxiety over the dangerous precedent which will be established by passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13 and to urge your vote against this resolution.

Since its passage appears assured, however, we further request that you do everything possible to support favorable action on Senator HILL'S amendment which would guarantee that Federal income from the exploitation of the undersea-water resources would be used in the form of Federal aid to benefit education.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES COGEN,
President.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I ask how much time I have remaining under the agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The Senator from New York still has about 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield first to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] as much time as he may require.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield to me 5 minutes in order that I may make a few brief remarks.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan first for 5 minutes, if I may then have 15 or 20 minutes. I think that will be all I shall require.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Arkansas, I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Michigan, with the understanding that the Senator from Arkansas is to have not to exceed 20 minutes; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] possibly 10 minutes following; the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] 20 minutes; and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] not to exceed 10 minutes. That was the order in which those Senators came to me, and that is the order in which I shall yield to them, unless otherwise agreed.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am glad to defer to the wishes of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], because I understand he is is anxious to leave the Chamber as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, some debate in the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 13, in connection with former President Hoover's address on Federal Socialism in Electric Power indicated that the speakers had not read or misunderstood Mr. Hoover's speech, which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] stated:

> A former President of the United States says, "Let us get rid of the power dams and all the great public resources."

An examination indicates that Mr. Hoover made no such statement. For 30 years he has advocated the construction of multiple-purpose dams to conserve water for navigation, flood control, irrigation, and electric power. What Mr. Hoover said was that the Federal Government should get out of the operation of power plants and the distribution of power by leasing the energy of the Government plants at the bus bar.

Several Senators implied that Mr. Hoover proposed to turn over all these dams to private enterprise. Quite to the contrary, he set up the alternatives proposing that the lease of the energy—not sale of dams—should be made to either (a) private enterprise, (b) or municipalities, (c) or the State governments, (d) or districts, (e) or authorities set up by the States and managed by them.

He proposed that these leases should be based upon standard terms the minimum of which would return interest on the Government investment in the electrical side and its amortization over 50 years. He stated that the rates to consumers should be regulated by State or Federal commissions as the case might be.

Some reference was made to the policies of Theodore Roosevelt in these respects. At every dam built under his

administration, the electric energy was leased at the bus bar to private enterprise, to municipalities or irrigation districts. This is exactly the policy advocated by Mr. Hoover and followed during his administration. Theodore Roosevelt, like Mr. Hoover, was opposed to socialism.

Some discussion took place as to the Hoover Dam on the Colorado. Some of the speakers seemed unaware that the operation of the powerhouse and the energy from this dam, under a requirement by the Congress, were leased for 50 years to the private utilities and the municipalities at a rate that would return interest on the Federal investment, and its amortization, over 50 years. That lease is under operation today and is giving satisfaction to the people in that region. Mr. Hoover suggested that this precedent be followed so as to eliminate the advance of socialism by the Federal Government in these enterprises.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] said:

> Former President Hoover has announced that he would like to see the Federal power projects sold * * * maybe he wants to sell the best part of the dams.

Mr. Hoover made no proposal whatever for the sale of Federal power dams.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] seemed to be under the impression that Mr. Hoover only wished to sell dams built for electric energy alone. Again, if the Senator will read Mr. Hoover's address, he will find he made no proposal to sell any dams.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

What Mr. Hoover said was that "Congress should cease to make appropriations for more steam plants or hydroelectric plants solely for power. If they are justified, private enterprise will build them and pay taxes upon them."

Great steamplants have been built with no constitutional authority, as I have repeatedly stated on the floor of the Senate, and dams for hydro-power alone also have been built and more are proposed.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suggest to the able Senator from Michigan that it was the distinguished majority leader [Mr. TAFT] who made the suggestion that former President Hoover favored selling only single-purpose dams. If the Senator will review the RECORD he will find that my statement was that so far as I knew, not a single dam that had been built was solely for the purpose of producing power.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood the Senator from Alabama had made the statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I did not make it. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made the statement to which the Senator from Michigan referred.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have the explanation of the distinguished Senator from Alabama that he did not make such a statement and did not try to convey the idea that former President Hoover had said so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, when the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) was made the unfinished business of the Senate some 5 weeks ago, I began a reexamination of my position on this issue, as expressed by my votes on two similar measures heretofore passed by both Houses of the Congress.

I have reviewed many of the decisions of the Supreme Court, including those most recent in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, together with the minority opinions. I have also listened to some very able and to many long speeches here in the Senate of both the proponents and opponents of this measure; I have read others that I did not listen to; and I have read and considered many published articles, editorials, and other expressed views and arguments both pro and con. I have sincerely undertaken to weigh and consider all facts, legal opinions, court decisions, and all other information available to me. I have carefully considered the specious charge, with all of its implications, that this measure is a giveaway of a great wealth of natural resources of the Federal Government that belongs to all of the people and is not the property of the several States within whose historic boundaries it is located.

If that charge were true, I would not vote for the joint resolution If that charge were true, a great majority of both Houses of Congress would not have twice previously voted for a similar bill. If that charge were true, 285 Members of the House of Representatives would not have during this session voted for the enactment of a similar bill, as against 108 Members of the House opposing it. If that charge were true, the great majority of this Senate would not favor the enactment of this joint resolution.

Majorities within or without the Congress are not always right, nor are minorities always wrong. But, Mr. President, the charge or any implication thereof that these great majorities in the Congress on three different and separate occasions in voting for this legislation were or that they are prompted in doing so by any ulterior motive or in disregard of the national interest, it seems to me, challenges the very integrity of the legislative branch of our Government.

I believe, Mr. President, there are honest differences of opinion between the proponents and opponents of this measure. I prefer to think that each and every Member of the Congress in his decision and vote on this issue is motivated only by what he conceives to be his duty and by his earnest and conscientious evaluation of merit and of the justice and equities that are involved.

And, Mr. President, there is more involved in this controversy than merely rigidly upholding or adhering to some recent harsh legal concept or decree that, if permitted to remain the law unchanged and unmodified, would destroy the traditional concept of interest, ownership, equity, and justice that has prevailed from the time of the founding of this Republic and which was recognized and accepted by the States, by the Federal Government, by all agencies of the Federal Government, and by the highest Court of this land for more than 100 years of our national existence.

When this Republic was formed, and subsequently as States were admitted to the Union, they came into the Union on the basis of their then recognized colonial or territorial boundaries. Their State sovereignty over their territorial and historical boundaries and their ownership of the lands and resources beneath the navigable waters therein remained inviolable and were never successfully challenged until the recent revolutionary decision of the Supreme Court in the California case which was followed by the Louisiana and Texas cases. Each of those decisions was by a divided Court. In the Texas case the division was 4 to 3.

Mr. President, Mr. Justice Black in writing the majority opinion of the Court in the California case referred to the rule of law laid down in the Pollard case, decided by the Supreme Court 109 years ago, in 1844, which rule has been subsequently followed in deciding some 50 or more cases involving similar issues. Mr. Justice Black stated:

> As prevously stated, this Court has followed and reasserted the basic doctrine of the Pollard case many times. And in doing so it has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not.

What the Supreme Court believed, and the language it wrote into many decisions strong enough to convey that belief for more than 100 years, did not give rise to the claim of State ownership of submerged lands under navigable waters within the States' territorial and historical boundaries. What the Supreme Court did by the use of such language was to confirm over and over again the known and accepted ownership of the several States in and to these properties. That very language and the majority opinion of the Court does give rise to the necessity for this legislation in order to do equity and justice and preserve national integrity.

It is undisputed that hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended by the State governments and peoples of the several States in the development of these natural resources and in the construction of improvements, of docks, of wharves, and of other facilities on the lands involved in this controversy. In all instances the Federal Government has recognized this ownership and the right of the States and the people thereof to make these improvements. So emphatic has been that recognition of State ownership throughout all the history of this Nation that the Federal

Government has repeatedly, continuously, and consistently purchased from the various States lands in these areas upon which to construct wharves, docks, and other facilities for its own use.

Notwithstanding the strained reasoning by which the Supreme Court reached its harsh decision in the California case, it obviously recognized the equities of the several States, and strongly implied that a proper sense of justice should impel the Congress to act to make restoration—not to "give away," but to restore to the States—of the equitable interests which the Court's decision, if left unmodified, would take away from them. The majority of the Court in effect stated in the California case that notwithstanding its decision, the Congress could by proper legislation do justice and equity between both the Federal Government and the States. It said:

> For article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution vests in Congress "power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States." We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation.

The majority of the Court further indicated that it expected the Congress to take just that action, for in the opinion of the majority it is stated:

> But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

Mr. President, other Members of the Senate have read to us what the Court said in its decisions in previous years. However, I think the majority of the Court indicated in the decision from which I have just quoted that it was the responsibility and duty of the Congress to do equity as between the States and the Federal Government in this circumstance.

Surely the Court meant what it said, and I am certain that no opponent of the joint resolution will challenge the Court's sincerity in that emphatic declaration of the powers which it recognizes and declares to be reposed in the Congress. Thus it cannot be contended that this joint resolution is unconstitutional. In view of that statement by the Court, I do not believe the present Court or any future Court will assert that the Constitution does not confer upon Congress such powers as the Congress proposes to exercise in connection with the enactment of this joint resolution.

Mr. President, earlier I referred to some specious charges and arguments that are made in an effort to sustain the position of the opposition. The decision of the Supreme Court in the California case implied the necessity for its ruling as it did because these resources at some future time might be needed for national defense, and since national defense is the primary responsibility of the Federal Government, it should take these resources away from the States. That argument, Mr. President, has been repeated on the floor of the Senate. But Mr. Justice Reed, in his dissenting opinion, made the unchallengcd and unchallengeable statement, to refute the soundness of that doctrine and philosophy, that—

> This ownership in California would not interfere in any way with the needs or rights of the United States in war or peace. The power of the United States is plenary over these undersea lands precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation.

Mr. President, that plenary power of the Federal Government goes even beyond property rights and property ownership of either State or individual citizens. That plenary power permits the Federal Government to draft the youth of our country and send them into foreign lands, as they are today on the battlefields of Korea fighting and dying to preserve our national sovereignty, our way of life, and the rights and heritages that we cherish as free men of an independent nation. Those plenary powers have been repeatedly exercised in time of war over property of States and of the individuals. No one contends they cannot be and that they will not be exercised again and again if and when the natural resources involved in this joint resolution or any other resource of minerals, of other material wealth, and of human life are needed and required to meet any great crisis that may arise.

The restoration to the respective States of such natural resources as are involved in this measure is not a give-away. There is and will be no loss of national wealth or assets. We are giving nothing away to any other country, either friend or foe. The undisputed plenary powers of the Federal Government, to which I have referred, and which are universally recognized, can be invoked and exercised at any time in a national crisis to take these resources and every other material resource of every State, including the lives of our citizens, if and when such taking becomes necessary in the defense of our country.

Mr. President, it is preposterous to say that the enactment of this measure would result in crippling the Nation, when all this measure will do is simply restore title or ownership in this property to the States.

What is the Nation composed of? It is composed of States. Every ounce of economic strength, of physical strength, and of natural resources of every State of the Union is an asset of the National Government. So, Mr. President, by the enactment of this measure, nothing will be lost to the Federal Government. The result of the enactment of this measure will not be to give anything away. It will still be available.

Another thing generally lost sight of in this controversy is that of all of the presently known oil reserves on the Continental Shelf, something less than one-sixth will be restored to State ownership by this measure. More than five-sixths will remain in the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], as he spoke today and as he pointed out and cited the documentary evidence from the best sources available, namely, the United States Geological Survey. The best information available today is that only one-tenth of these resources is within the area of the 3 miles and the other limitations provided by the joint resolution, which would revert to the States.

The chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]—and I believe he has been joined in that position by the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]—has repeatedly, during the course of the debate, assured the Senate that his committee will report within the next few weeks—and as I recall, he said it would be within 2 weeks—a well-considered measure providing for the management, development, and control of the reserves in the Continental Shelf by the Federal Government. It has been thoroughly demonstrated in the discussion of amendments that have been proposed to this joint resolution that such proposed legislation is highly technical, and that in order to be sound and workable, it is necessary to give it more than casual thought and consideration.

When that measure comes before the Senate, Mr. President, if the Committee has not already incorporated those provisions in it, then the so-called Hill amendment, setting aside all revenues from these reserves for national defense and education, will merit the earnest study and judgment of the Congress. It may be a wise policy and most appropriate that such revenues be so earmarked and expended.

Mr. President, I would add that if those revenues are to be earmarked at this time by the Congress, one other factor should be taken into consideration, I believe, and that is the national debt. If we are going to begin earmarking funds, I believe we should begin to take the national debt into account, for there is not much prospect of our ever reducing the tax burden which rests on our people today unless we can find some way to stop going further into debt. In order to bring that about we should reduce the expenditures of the National Government and make some provision for the retirement of the astronomical national debt which now weighs so heavily upon us.

Mr. President, the enactment of the pending joint resolution into law and the following of that action by the enactment of an appropriate measure to deal with the other five-sixths or more of these natural resources for the full protection and advantage of the Federal Government and all the people of the Nation will, in my opinion, have done full justice and equity in resolving all phases of this issue.

Mr. President, I still stand on the figure of five-sixths, because there has been so much exaggeration, even to the point, it seems to me, of distortion of the facts in connection with this issue, that I prefer to remain ultraconservative in respect to the figures. So for

my purposes I shall stand on the ratio of one-sixth to five-sixths.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield briefly for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator not agree with me that 100 percent of all the California off-shore production is within the 3-mile limit?

Mr. McCLELLAN. As of the moment, it may be. We are talking about all the reserves.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say, would the Senator not agree with me that 100 percent of all the California off-shore production is within the 3-mile limit?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; I do not agree that it is. I do not agree that all the reserves of California are within the 3-mile limit. But we are talking about the entire area. Does the Senator from New Mexico disagree with the statement that five-sixths of all the reserves of California are beyond the limits prescribed by the pending measure? Does the Senator agree with that, first?

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator define whether he is talking about crude reserves or known reserves?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am talking about known reserves, as of now.

Mr. ANDERSON. I contend that is not the situation at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I state that as the best estimate before us—the one made by the United States Geological Survey.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator would give a reference to his evidence, I should be glad to see it. He is talking about the possibility, someday, away down the road, of these productions being achieved. They do not now exist.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is the Senator talking about? Is this something like the talk about a $300 billion production, someday, somewhere away down the road, something it is hoped to get some day?

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator agree that 100 percent of all the production that we now know anything about outside California is within the 3 mile limit?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am certain that 100 percent of the production today is not within the area defined by the pending measure.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Ninety-four percent of it is.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the Senator knows where the reserves are, and as the development proceeds, it is expected that far greater production of oil will be obtained beyond the area defined in the pending measure than will be obtained within it.

Mr. President, I have but 20 minutes. As soon as I conclude, I shall be glad to answer further questions.

We can reasonably anticipate that before this session of the Congress is concluded all necessary and proper legislation covering the whole aspect of this problem will have been enacted into law. I am confident, Mr. President, that as soon as the other bill is reported by the committee its passage will be expedited, and the whole problem will be solved, so far as congressional action is concerned, before this session of the Congress shall have adjourned.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, and for the reasons I have outlined, I shall vote for final passage of the pending measure. I shall do so because I believe the enactment of this law is necessary to do equity and justice and to maintain the highest order of national integrity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. The time in opposition is under the control of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I was indeed very much impressed by the able remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. He stated the matter clearly, specifically, and in an understandable manner. He cleared up much of the confusion which has surrounded the entire issue.

Mr. President, for several weeks the Senate has been engaged in lengthy and comprehensive debate on the so-called tidelands question. Profound arguments have been made on both sides of the question.

It is not my intention to undertake at this time any detailed discussion of the issues which have been before the Senate. They have been fully covered during the course of the debate. However, I should like to make a few brief remarks with regard to the conclusions I have reached after considering the question in its entirety.

First, I believe it is unfortunate so many unrelated issues and extravagent claims were injected into the question of ownership of the submerged lands. I believe that the question should have been debated solely on the merits of the committee-approved resolution which is before the Senate, without recourse to the use of catchwords, such as "grab," "steal," and "giveaway," and to the repetition of doubtful facts to lend substance to one side of the argument. Such words as "grab," "steal," and "giveaway" are used for the purpose of creating fear in the public mind that within this legislative body there are those who might be willing to give away something that had a great value to the Nation, or something rightfully belonging to the Government. That was the reason for the use of such words, and the repetition of doubtful facts to lend substance to one side of the argument.

For instance, I have in mind the proposal to utilize for educational purposes the oil royalties derived from the submerged lands. Reports have been publicized which estimated these royalties up to astronomical amounts. There can be, of course, no accurate estimate made of the oil and gas reserves under the submerged lands in question. However, I would prefer to rely upon the estimates of the United States Geological Survey as presented in testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. These estimates indicated that there may be around 2,550,000,000 barrels of oil and 9,250,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas contained in the area of the Continental Shelf landward of traditional State boundaries.

If we are to estimate the revenue to be derived from these reserves and to base it on current prices for oil and gas, the total funds available for distribution would approximate $7.3 billion over a 50-year period of production. That would be 50 years, the full-life production of all the oil reserves, in the amount of $7.3 billion, the annual average, consequently, would be somewhat over $147 million. Under the amendment proposed in the Senate, whereby the States would be allocated the one-eighth royalty of the total revenue for educational purposes and granted 37½ percent of the royalties which even the proponents of Federal ownership concede to the States, the average annual royalty for school assistance would be approximately $11.5 million.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. I have only a limited number of minutes. When I have finished, if I have any time remaining, I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. President, dividing this annual royalty among the student population, we arrive at the interesting figure of between 40 and 41 cents for each of the students in attendance at public schools within the State. Therefore, based on the most accurate information that can be supplied by the United States Geologic Survey, royalties to be derived from the oil and gas deposits under the submerged lands in question might provide each State with approximately 41 cents annual assistance for each student attending public school. If we take into consideration the costs involved in allocating these royalties to the States, I would say that the administrative expenditures to carry out such a program would so substantially reduce the amount of funds available for educational assistance that in the long run the meritorious objective of aiding and improving our school system would be defeated.

I am deeply interested in our educational system. I voted for a bill in a previous session of Congress to provide funds for Federal aid to education. It is not my view, however, that the proposal making the income from oil royalties available to the schools is a good one. In addition to the question of administrative costs in relation to estimated royalties which I have discussed, there is also the question of having extensive dedicated funds of this character for any purpose. In my opinion, such earmarked funds are highly undesirable. It seems to me a far wiser plan that funds go into the general treasury for appropriation by the legislative authority after full examination of the needs at the time the appropriations are made.

The issue of the Federal Government's utilization of royalties has, of course, little to do with the basic question of ownership. Up until the late 1930's, it

was generally accepted that the States held title to the submerged lands within their historic boundaries. This view was reiterated on many instances by the Supreme Court up until the 1947 decision which determined that the State of California did not hold title to the lands lying seaward of the low-water mark and extending to the 3-mile limit and that the Federal Government retained paramount rights in this area. The Supreme Court did not decide the question of ownership. The Court merely asserted the paramount rights of the Federal Government, and extended these rights to all natural resources within the area. Of the three recent Supreme Court decisions, none was unanimous. Twice, the United States Congress has voted for State ownership.

Therefore, the question before the Senate is one of determining the ownership of the submerged lands within the historic boundaries of the States. This provision of the pending proposed legislation, giving title to the States within the limits specified, deals only with one-sixth of the estimated natural resources involved. The other five-sixths are part of the Continental Shelf, extending beyond the historic boundaries of the States, and the resolution before the Senate affirms, for the first time by congressional action, the jurisdiction and control by the Federal Government of the submerged area containing these resources.

Personally, I am of the opinion that the title to the submerged lands within State boundaries, as provided for in the Senate joint resolution, should rest in the States. I have never doubted that my State held title to the submerged lands within the boundaries of Minnesota. Nevertheless, under the claims of the proponents of Federal ownership, Minnesota could lose title to these lands as well as the revenues from valuable mineral deposits. I do not think this should happen in the case of Minnesota, and I believe it is simple justice to extend the same right to other States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. If I have any time remaining, I shall be very happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 1 more minute remaining.

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the negative characteristics which the Senator has attributed to the figures used by his opponents in this debate, I should like to ask him if he would be perfectly willing to let the readers of the RECORD be the judges as to who has used the loose figures.

Mr. THYE. It will take the general public a very long time to read the RECORD and determine whose figures have any particular meaning, after the filibuster which has taken place on the very important question which is involved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

To whom does the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield, next, to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], 6 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the debate on Senate Joint Resolution 13 has consumed so much time that I hesitate to prolong the discussion.

Nevertheless, I ask my colleagues to bear with me for a few minutes in order that I may make my position clear.

Mr. President, I contend that no matter how completely we examine the record we cannot escape certain fundamentals which, in my opinion, have a most important bearing upon our decision in the vital question at issue.

From the beginning of our existence as a Nation no one questioned that the lands beneath the navigable waters within the boundaries of the various States were owned by the respective States.

That was considered a fundamental proposition of the American system of Government.

It was regarded as coming within the scope of the constitutional provision reserving to the States or to the people all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution.

It was supported by the universally accepted concept of the sovereign rights of the States.

It was given further support by the great legal minds of our country in Supreme Court decisions handed down over a period of nearly 100 years.

During all that time State ownership of submerged lands within State boundaries was honored, accepted, and relied upon.

When the Supreme Court in three recent decisions proclaimed the doctrine of paramount rights possessed by the Federal Government it gave expression to a philosophy first advanced in the Truman administration.

These so-called paramount rights were invoked to deprive the States of the ownership of the submerged lands within their territorial boundaries. They handed over to the Federal Government, without compensation, all right, title, and interest in these lands and all their natural resources.

I believe this to be a dangerous un-American doctrine.

I believe it to be contrary to the limitations placed upon the power of the Central Government by the Constitution.

I believe it to be in violation of the fifth amendment to the Constitution which protects private property against seizure by the Federal Government without just compensation.

I believe it to be an unwarranted invasion upon the sovereignty of the States and an improper encroachment upon their jurisdiction.

It strikes me as most unfortunate that the issue before us has become clouded with irrelevant arguments which have created confusion in the public mind.

Many educators and other sincere friends of the public schools have been led to believe that the revenues from oil deposits under tidal waters can be converted into a rich source of funds for educational purposes—provided they are controlled at Washington.

In other words, they believe that the Federal Government alone is concerned with education and is best qualified to direct the expansion of educational facilities.

I recognize the urgent need for additional revenues to meet the growing cost of education. But I see no advantage, but real danger, in making the education of our children dependent upon the exercise by the Federal Government of a method that is wrong in principle.

Let us keep our schools where they belong—under the direction of local authority and not subject to remote control by Washington.

Turning again to the doctrine of paramount rights, I should like to mention one danger that is of importance to Pennsylvania.

We have under some of our rivers vast deposits of coal. This coal is of great value as the last reserve to be held in trust for needs that may arise far in the future.

Now the question is: Does that rich resource belong to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and its people, or does the Federal Government have a paramount right to its ownership?

That question should be settled so that there will be no doubt about Pennsylvania's sovereign right to the mineral resources beneath its soil or its waters.

I ask my colleagues to vote for Senate Joint Resolution 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is in control of the time of the opposition.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield in order that I may propose a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. At the request of many Senators, I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request, which is that the Senate shall not vote on any amendments tonight, but that all amendments shall be voted on tomorrow, and that after the discussion of one amendment has been completed today, the offering of another amendment shall be in order, the vote on such amendment to be postponed until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the unanimous-consent request, as stated by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], to be that no votes on amendments shall be taken tonight; and that when the time for discussion of an amendment expires, the next amendment shall be called up and discussion continue for the length of time allocated.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon, who first addressed the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not expect to object, I wish to ask the majority leader a question.

Is it to be the understanding that when amendments are called up tomorrow, time will be allowed for explanation, such as 5 minutes for an amendment and 5 minutes against an amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I would add to the request that if the proposer of an amendment desires to have a last-minute voice, so to speak, before the vote on the amendment, the proponent of the amendment shall be allowed 5 minutes, and the opponents 5 minutes, so that there may be an opportunity to sum up or explain to the Senate the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I think that would be only fair. I have 2 amendments to offer, and it will take only 3 or 4 minutes to explain them. However, I think time ought to be allotted in which to explain them before a vote is taken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, am I to understand the proposal of the Senator from Ohio involves the previous unanimous-consent agreement, namely, that amendments which have not been acted upon by 3 o'clock will die?

Mr. TAFT. No. All amendments will be voted on tomorrow, whether they have been acted upon by 2 o'clock or not. After 2 o'clock it will be in order for Senators to offer any amendments they wish to offer and have them voted on until, of course, the vote on the joint resolution itself is reached. But amendments will be in order, whether or not they have been discussed or whether or not they have been before the Senate today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So if a vote on the joint resolution itself is not reached by 3 o'clock, discussion will continue?

Mr. TAFT. Discussion will continue. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, at 2 o'clock we shall begin to vote on amendments, and we shall vote on all amendments, including those which have been discussed and those which have not, until no more amendments shall have been offered; then we shall vote on the joint resolution itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] have said that they desired to offer amendments to be voted upon, but not by a record vote this afternoon.

Mr. TAFT. I understand they would be willing to postpone a vote. Since that is a general feeling, I think it would be better to postpone the voting until tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. If that is agreeable to the Senator from New York and the Senator from Rhode Island, certainly I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I think that Senators ought to understand that until 2 o'clock, if a Senator called up an amendment, he would be allowed 5 minutes, if the request of the distinguished Senator from Ohio were agreed to, in order to discuss his amendment, and the opposition would have 5 minutes in which to present their views.

Mr. TAFT. No. The time between 12 o'clock noon and 2 o'clock will be for debate on the joint resolution. A Senator who is in favor of the joint resolution may assign time to opponents of an amendment, or a Senator who is against the joint resolution may assign time to the proposer of an amendment, as he may see fit. But the 5-minute rule I have discussed would take effect at 2 o'clock. After 2 o'clock, when votes are to be taken, instead of being taken one after another, 5 minutes would be allowed to each side simply for explanation of the amendment.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio for making clear his proposal. That is exactly what I had in mind, and certainly I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there are two unanimous-consent requests. One is for a modification of the agreement already made, and the other is a new proposal. The Chair will state the modification first.

The Chair understands that the Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement already entered into be modified to the extent that after 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, when the voting is to begin, the proponents of and the opposition to each amendment will each have 5 minutes to debate the amendment before a vote is taken.

Is there objection to the modification? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Second, the Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent that no votes be taken the remainder of this evening, but that amendments be taken up one after another; that when the time for debate on an amendment expires, the next amendment be called up, and that when the Senate concludes its business tonight, it recess until tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. I might as well include in my proposal that when the Senate recesses tonight, it recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN. I should like to ask a question for information. In what order are the amendments to be taken up?

Mr. TAFT. First, amendments which have not been acted on will be taken up in the order in which they are called up, and after the Senate has disposed of amendments which have been discussed but not voted upon, we shall then take up amendments in the order in which they are offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida is entitled to the time remaining for the proponents of the joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], chairman of the subcommittee, as much time as he may require.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in the course of this debate the impelling arguments in support of the policy which would be established by Senate Joint Resolution 13 have been fully presented.

In my opinion, these arguments clearly show that justice, equity, and the best interests of the Nation will be served by the enactment of this legislation.

In the closing hours of this debate, nothing can be added, in my opinion, except by way of reply to the constitutional questions which have been raised by some of the Senators who have spoken against Senate Joint Resolution 13.

In collaboration with other coauthors of the resolution and with members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have prepared a detailed statement showing that the true intent and effect of Senate Joint Resolution 13 are to establish a policy which is clearly within the authority of the Congress of the United States. In order that every Member of the Senate may have an opportunity to consider this statement prior to a final vote on the passage of the resolution, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPLY TO CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS RAISED ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Although no serious arguments were advanced against the constitutionality of Senate Joint Resolution 13, the question of authority of Congress to enact the legislation was thoroughly considered by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs just as it was considered by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate in 1948 and by the House Judiciary Committee in 1948, 1950, 1952, and 1953. On each occasion the committees have concluded that Congress has the authority to enact this type of legislation.

As acting chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during its consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 13, I want to emphasize that the majority of the committee had no doubt whatever as to the authority of Congress to enact this legislation.

Our conclusion was supported by the testimony of attorneys representing the Federal Government who have appeared before the committees throughout the many years that this legislation has been under consideration. For instance, Mr. Justice Tom Clark, then serving as Attorney General, testified before joint hearings of the Judiciary Committees (See Joint hearings on S. 1988, 80th Cong., 2d sess, 1948) with reference to a bill which was substantially the same as Senate Joint Resolution 13, as follows:

"Senator MCCARRAN. You do not deny the right of the Congress to enact this law S. 1988.

Mr. CLARK. No; I think the Congress has the power under the Constitution. Well, I think they could even give away the property" (p. 638).

"If the Congress wants to give this property away, if the Congress wants to, it has the power to dispose of this property" (p. 646).

Hon. Philip Perlman, while Solicitor General, testified with reference to similar legislation before the House Judiciary Committee (See hearings on H. R. 5991, etc., 81st Cong., 1st sess, 1949, p. 196) as follows:

"Of course, the Congress may undo anything that the Supreme Court has done and, under the Constitution, it may give away that which the Supreme Court has held to belong to the United States."

Solicitor General Perlman, while arguing in the Supreme Court in support of the

Federal Government's Motion for Leave to File Complaint in *United States* v. *Texas*, was asked the direct question by Mr. Justice Reed whether, if the United States owns the submerged lands of the marginal belt, could it convey the property to the States? Mr. Perlman's reply was:

"Oh, yes; Congress could give whatever title it has, whatever rights it has, to the States." (See reporter's transcript of the argument, p. 6.)

It is true that Mr. Perlman expressed doubts before our committee this year as to the form in which this proposed gift may constitutionally be made. (Senate hearings on S. J. Res. 13, 1953, p. 684.) However, he further testified, "I said there does not seem to be any doubt in my mind that Congress can dispose of the Government's property as property" and explained that the question in his mind related to whether the Government could convey "all of its right, title, and interest" (id., p. 686). When told that the intention of the bill was to convey only the proprietary interest and not any constitutional Federal powers, jurisdiction, or regulation in matters of national sovereignty, and asked, "Is that not perfectly constitutional?" Mr. Perlman said:

"I have said before—I will repeat it—that in my opinion, Congress has the right to dispose of the property of the United States, and it has the right to take these mineral resources from the bed of the sea. I think it can delegate others to take them and to enjoy them. I do think that" (id., p. 705).

Attorney General Brownell testified that in his opinion the restoration or establishment of title in the States under the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 13 would be constitutional. Much has been said concerning his recommendation that, in order to minimize or completely avoid litigation on the question of constitutionality, the State be delegated the power to manage the property and use the revenues collected therefrom. However, it is important to note that Mr. Brownell immediately added these words: "I do not thereby intend to cast any doubt upon the constitutionality of a so-called quitclaim statute * * *" (id., p. 926). Later Attorney General Brownell said:

"There seems to be an argument made by certain persons that if the Federal Government cedes the so-called title to this area that that might raise a serious constitutional question. We do not believe that it does" (id., p. 927).

It is also worthy of note that attorneys for the Federal Government did not raise the question of constitutionality of State ownership of lands beneath the territorial waters of the marginal belt in lawsuits filed against California, Texas, and Louisiana. If ownership of these lands is an inseparable incident of national sovereignty and absolutely essential to the exercise of Federal governmental powers in the area, that point alone would have been enough to conclude these cases in favor of the Federal Government. The argument was never made. On the contrary, Federal attorneys assumed that under certain circumstances these lands could be owned by the States without interfering with the governmental powers of the national sovereign. The Attorney General said at page 89 in his brief in the case of United States against California:

"We do not argue that the effective exercise of the foregoing powers (commerce, national defense, and international relations) granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution would be impossible without ownership of the bed of the marginal sea."

In their brief in the Texas case, Federal attorneys made no contention that it would have been unconstitutional for the Congress to have agreed that Texas was to retain its marginal sea lands upon annexation to the Union, and the four-member majority opinion made no such conclusion or inference. Both the Federal attorneys and the Court went to great lengths to explain that the proprietary rights of Texas were acquired under the "equal footing" clause rather than under the theory lately advanced by certain Senators that the Constitution prohibits State ownership of subordinate proprietary rights in the area.

The Supreme Court itself has given every indication that Congress has the constitutional authority to separate proprietary rights from paramount political powers in the marginal belt by vesting or establishing the proprietary rights in the States. In fact, the Court said in the California case that future decisions as to such property rights are within the "congressional area of national power." The Court said:

"For article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution vests in Congress 'power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. * * *' We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. *United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16, 29–30). Thus neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power."

The Court thereafter made specific reference to a quitclaim resolution theretofore passed by Congress as not effecting "an exercise of the constitutional power of Congress to dispose of public property under article IV, section 3, clause 2," because it was vetoed by the President. Later in the opinion, the Supreme Court again mentioned "a congressional surrender of title" as though the authority of Congress in this respect was unquestioned. Again, in the California opinion, the Court referred to the authority of Congress to care for the many equities which were recognized to exist on the part of those who had filled in or developed the lands under State authority when it said: "But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such a way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission."

It would appear from the above quotation from the Supreme Court's opinion in the California case that the Court not only recognized the authority of Congress to act as contemplated in Senate Joint Resolution 13, but that the Court was inviting congressional consideration of the equities and the future policy to be followed with reference to ownership of these lands. The decision itself seems to contain a complete answer to those who contend that the authors of Senate Joint Resolution 13 propose to disregard the Supreme Court and overrule its decisions in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases.

It is true that many of the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 13 and some of the members of our committee disagree with the Court's interpretation of the law with reference to the present status of proprietary rights under the marginal belt covered by territorial waters within State boundaries. Many believe that the Court interpreted the law not only differently from what eminent jurists, lawyers, and public officials for more than a century had believed it to be, but also differently from what the Supreme Court apparently had believed it to be. This reaction is somewhat justified by the Court's own statement in the California case that the Supreme Court "many times * * * used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

In spite of any dissatisfaction or disagreement which we might have with the Court's interpretation of the law, the majority of our committee recognized that it is within the province of the Supreme Court to define the law as the Court believes it to be at the time of its opinion. We accept the Court's opinion as binding and as the law of the land at the present time. However, the Supreme Court does not pass upon the wisdom of the law as they have found it to exist. That is exclusively within the congressional area of national power. Congress has the power to change the law for the future by establishing it as it was formerly believed to be. Therefore, in full acceptance of what the Supreme Court has now found the law to be, the authors of Senate Joint Resolution 13 and the majority of our committee recommend the enactment of this legislation as the policy for the future which will do equity and justice to the States that have used and developed the lands in good faith for over 100 years, and which will best serve the future interests of the Nation.

It is apparent that the few distinguished members of the Senate who have raised constitutional questions with respect to this legislation are laboring under misapprehension or misinterpretation of the intention and effect of the legislation. Their basic errors are shown in their assumptions (1) that the resolution attempts to transfer to the States paramount political rights or part of the national sovereignty of the United States, and (2) that lands seaward of low tide are so much a part of the international domain that property rights cannot exist therein separately from paramount political rights connected with external sovereignty. As shown by the terms of the resolution and the evidence adduced in the hearings, both of these assumptions are incorrect.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13 DOES NOT TRANSFER ANY PARAMOUNT CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS OF THE NATIONAL SOVEREIGN

The concept of State ownership of these lands, and the implementation of such concept by the States for more than 100 years, has been subordinate to all powers delegated to the national sovereign by the Constitution of the United States. Your committee was particularly careful to see that the wording of the resolution covers only proprietary rights, uses, and management and in such a way that the States and their grantees or lessees cannot interfere in any manner with the constitutional powers of the United States with respect to the lands or the overlying waters. Although probably unnecessary, the authors of Senate Joint Resolution 13 included section 6 for the specific purpose of making it clear that the rights confirmed, established, and vested in the States are subordinate to and must not interfere with the paramount constitutional powers of the Federal Government. Our committee added words which would strengthen and clarify this interpretation so that section 6 now reads:

"SEC. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution."

Clearly, the above section expresses the purpose and intention to separate proprietary rights (dominium) from paramount governmental powers (imperium) with respect to lands beneath all navigable waters, both inland and coastal, within the historic

boundaries of the States, with the proprietary rights vested or established in the States being subordinate to the constitutional political powers of the United States.

All rights vested in the States in section 3 are "subject to the provisions hereof," or "except as otherwise reserved herein," making them clearly subordinate to the rights reserved to the national sovereign in section 6. In discussing this matter in the executive sessions of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I explained that in section 6 "this language 'all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include' was inserted to clearly indicate that these (constitutional Federal powers) are paramount rights but that they do not include the proprietary rights that could be exercised subordinate to the paramount rights." Thereupon, another coauthor of the resolution and member of the committee further amplified the intention and effect of this part of the resolution as follows:

"Subordinate to and without interfering with that paramount right. Mr. Chairman, right at this point I would like to say, in further clarification of what I understand the intention of this paragraph to be, that these constitutional powers of the Federal Government are all, of course, retained by the Federal Government; they are retained without us saying so here. But in this paragraph we are making it plain that these constitutional governmental powers are paramount to the proprietary rights and the proprietary uses of the States or their grantees. And I might add further that, the governmental powers of the Federal Government being paramount, of course, it makes the proprietary rights of the States and their grantees subordinate, and they cannot use the property in any way to interfere with the exercise of the paramount governmental powers. In other words, they cannot put an oil derrick out in any navigable stream or any navigable water if it is going to interfere with navigation. They cannot cultivate an oyster bed out in the middle of a channel that has to be dug and, therefore, stop the Government from digging that channel. (Hearings, executive session, on S. J. Res. 13, etc., p. 1324.)

The committee accepted this as a correct interpretation of the intention and effect of the resolution. Therefore, it is apparent that none of the paramount constitutional powers of the national sovereign would be transferred to the States by Senate Joint Resolution 13. The proprietary rights and uses can take no national sovereignty or paramount political powers with them, because the proprietary rights and uses are subordinate and subject to the constitutional powers of the Federal Government and can never be legally used or employed in such a manner as to interfere with the public interest in the waters or with national defense, commerce, navigation, innocent passage, or international agreements heretofore or hereafter made with respect thereto.

We have carefully examined every national governmental power and responsibility that the Supreme Court mentioned in referring to national interests and national sovereignty in these lands and waters, and have concluded that all rights vested or established in the States under Senate Joint Resolution 13 are subordinate and subject thereto, and that the States will have no authority to use the lands or the waters or convey or lease rights therein which would interfere in any manner with the paramount constitutional powers of the national sovereign. Those who argue to the contrary are ignoring the qualifications and limitations which surround the proprietary rights vested or established in the States.

That every constitutional governmental power of the national sovereign can be exercised without interference arising from the subordinate proprietary rights of the States is best evidenced by the fact that such governmental powers have been so exercised without such interference for more than 100 years when this concept of State ownership actually existed in theory and practice. As said at paragraph 6 of our committee report on Senate Joint Resolution 13:

"It is highly significant that in all 16 hearings on this subject, comprising over 8,000 printed pages of evidence, no single instance has been mentioned where any of the thousands of developments accomplished under the authority and direction of the States and their grantees has interfered in the slightest degree with the exercise by the United States of its paramount constitutional powers or its governmental functions. Senate Joint Resolution 13 makes certain that there shall be no such interference or impairment in the future."

Those who argue that rights of national sovereignty would be transferred by Senate Joint Resolution 13 are confusing political powers with proprietary rights. It is true that the Supreme Court has held that proprietary rights in the marginal belt of the Original States were acquired by the United States in its exercise of national sovereignty and that they are, therefore, incidental to the paramount powers of the United States in that area; and in the Texas case it was held that under the equal-footing clause these proprietary rights "must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign." But the Court did not say in any of its opinions that proprietary rights in these lands were inseparable incidents of national sovereignty. To the contrary, the California decision clearly indicates that Congress has the power to say in the first instance who shall have and develop the proprietary rights. As further indicated in that opinion, this land is within the territorial limits of the United States; the Constitution and domestic law apply; and Congress has the power to separate the proprietary rights and vest them in the States so long as this is accomplished in a manner which will leave them subordinate to all present and future obligations, responsibilities, and actions of the Federal Government in the exercise of its constitutional powers. That is the intent and will be the effect of this legislation. It would so separate or "uncoalesce" the proprietary rights from the paramount governmental powers, leaving the former always subject and subordinate to the latter.

LANDS BENEATH NAVIGABLE WATERS AS DEFINED IN SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13 ARE WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES; DOMESTIC LAW APPLIES; AND SUBORDINATE PROPRIETARY RIGHTS CAN EXIST THEREIN

Senate Joint Resolution 13 treats all lands beneath navigable waters within the United States on the same basis and in the same manner, whether the overlying waters happen to be the Great Lakes, inland rivers or lakes, or the territorial waters of the marginal sea. The States would henceforth hold the subordinate proprietary rights subject to every type of paramount governmental power which the national sovereign must exercise. These governmental powers and the extent of their exercise will vary with the different types of overlying waters. For instance, on the Great Lakes, on rivers which form international boundaries, and in the marginal sea, there will be present and future treaties, international agreements, and rules of international law such as the right of innocent passage in the marginal sea, which may limit and restrict the proprietary uses of these lands more than in the case of inland navigable waters which form no part of international boundaries. Regardless of this variation in the type and extent of the paramount governmental powers over the waters, Senate Joint Resolution 13 would leave the proprietary rights within and beneath all navigable waters, both inland and coastal, subordinate to the governmental powers, whatever they may be, and would recognize, vest, or establish them in the State with such qualifications and limitations.

The opponents do not question the constitutionality of this legislation insofar as it relates to lands beneath the Great Lakes and the inland waters of the country, or insofar as it delegates or assigns to the coastal States management of the lands and resources and enjoyment of the revenues from the marginal belt [Sec. 3 (a) (2)]. They question only the authority of Congress to vest or establish in the States proprietary rights in the lands and resources of the marginal belt. As heretofore said, they base their arguments upon the erroneous assumption that this particular area is so much within the international domain that proprietary rights do not exist and that Congress cannot establish them.

Those who make this argument cite as their authority the Court's language in *U. S. v. Texas*: "Once low-water mark is passed the international domain is reached." Taken alone, these words might indicate that the Court believed the area within the marginal belt to be outside the United States and subject only to Federal powers derived from external sovereignty as a member of the family of nations—wholly beyond the legislative jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. However, a study of the full opinions in both the Texas and California cases reveals clearly that the Court meant no such strained interpretation.

From the Court opinions it is apparent that the marginal belt and its lands and resources are treated as being within the boundaries and jurisdiction of the States and the United States. That was the position of the Federal attorneys, because they made specific reference to the seaward boundaries of the States in describing the land in controversy. In their California brief, Federal attorneys said:

"There is no doubt that the area involved is within the boundaries of both California and the United States." (Brief for the United States in support of motion for judgment, *U. S. v. California*, p. 217.)

In the decrees in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases the Court used the seaward boundaries of the States in describing the area in which paramount rights and powers were awarded to the United States. In the California opinion the Court spoke of the disposition of these lands as being withing the "congressional area of national power." Therefore, regardless of how the marginal belt and its lands and resources were acquired in the first instance, they are now a part of the territory of the United States the same as its land territory, and the Constitution and domestic laws are applicable as between the Federal Government and the States or individual citizens.

It is believed that the Court, in the Texas case, referred to the "international domain" beginning at low-water mark merely to emphasize that rights of innocent passage over the waters exist in other nations and that these and other international obligations of the present and future must be protected by the United States along with other national interests and responsibilities, and that proprietary rights in the lands and resources must be subordinate to these national interests, responsibilities, and obligations. With this there is no argument and no conflict in Senate Joint Resolution 13, because it clearly states that the proprietary rights of the States shall be subordinate to these paramount Federal powers of internal and external sovereignty.

With reference to "international domain" the Court could have used the same words in referring to the lands and waters of the Great Lakes or of the Rio Grande River, because treaties and other international agreements have been made with respect to those waters. They are subject to future international agreements and obligations the same as the waters of the marginal belt, and under Senate Joint Resolution 13 the proprietary

rights in the lands and resources of all these areas will be subject to the same qualifications and limitations in the future as in the past. See *Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387 (1892)).

The official position of the United States, as expressed by the State Department, is that the marginal belt covered by territorial waters is within the territory and jurisdiction of the United States. This was verified by the testimony of the representatives of the State Department who appeared before our committee. Mr. Jack B. Tate, Deputy Legal Adviser of the Department of State, testified as follows:

"Senator DANIEL. Mr. Tate, * * * as to the lands within our territorial waters, using your theory of the 3-mile limit for the purpose of this question, as I understand it, this country recognizes that that area is part of the United States.

"Mr. TATE. That is correct.

"Senator DANIEL. The same as its land territory.

"Mr. TATE. That is correct.

"Senator DANIEL. And domestic law applies.

"Mr. TATE. That is correct.

"Senator DANIEL. As Wheaton said in his book on Elements of International Law in 1836, 'within these limits,' that is, out to the limit of the territorial waters, 'a country's rights of property and territorial jurisdiction are absolute and exclude those of other nations.' Is that correct?

"Mr. TATE. That is correct.

"Senator DANIEL. That is the view of this Nation?

"Mr. TATE. That is correct.

* * * * *

"Senator DANIEL. As a matter of fact, in the United States reply to the proposed codification in 1930 of the law as to territorial waters and the high seas [Hague Conference], I believe the position of this Nation was very clearly stated in accordance with what you have interpreted it to be, and I would like to read from the reply the following quotation: 'The sea bottom and subsoil covered by the territorial waters, including fish and minerals, are the property of the United States or of the individual States where they border.' Is that correct?

"Mr. TATE. That is correct.

"Senator DANIEL. That is still the position of the United States Government?

"Mr. TATE. That is right."

As shown by the above testimony, and especially the quotation of the State Department's position at the Hague Conference in 1930, it is the official position of the United States that proprietary rights do exist and can exist in the lands and resources beneath the territorial waters of the marginal belt, and that they can exist in the individuual States of our own Nation. Furthermore, the jurisdiction of the United States over the subsoil and sea bed of that part of the Continental Shelf beyond territorial waters has been proclaimed by the United States (Proclamation No. 2667, September 28, 1945) and would be confirmed by section 9 of Senate Joint Resolution 13. On the date of the Presidential proclamation, the President issued his Executive Order 9633 which clearly recognizes the possibility of proprietary rights existing in the United States or the individual States, for the Executive order provides:

"Neither this order nor the aforesaid proclamation shall be deemed to affect the determination by legislation or judicial decree of any issues between the United States and the several States, relating to the ownership or control of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf within or outside of the 3-mile limit."

Obviously, this order recognizes that Congress by legislation may determine future questions of ownership so long as its determination does not interfere with the constitutional Federal powers and responsibilities or with the public and international interests in the overlying waters.

The Deputy Legal Adviser for the State Department, Mr. Tate, further testified that the division of rights between the United States and the individual States within territorial waters and in the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf "is not a matter that is of international concern" (Senate Hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 13, p. 1067) and that the domestic law of our Nation would apply thereto (Id., p. 1080).

If any doubt remains on this question of whether that part of the marginal belt included within the definition of "lands beneath navigable waters" in Senate Joint Resolution 13 is a part of the territory of the United States and subject to the authority of Congress, the doubt will be removed by the terms of this joint resolution. No one will question the right of the Congress to declare the territorial extent of the jurisdiction of our Nation. By its definition of "lands beneath navigable waters" Senate Joint Resolution 13 recognizes that the area within the 3-mile limit or within such greater distance as a State's seaward boundary existed "in the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore approved by the Congress" is within the territory of the States and the United States. This assertion of congressional policy will confirm the fact that such area is within the jurisdiction of the United States, and therefore it is subject to legislation by the Congress. The future existence and control of proprietary rights and uses of the lands and resources within this area are matters which Congress may determine. If the effect of the Court decisions is to say that proprietary rights now exist in the national sovereign, they may be transferred to the States subject to the reservations of constitutional political powers in the Federal Government. If the effect of the Court decisions is to say that proprietary rights do not now exist in the area, there can be no doubt but that Congress may by this legislation establish such rights. That is why both of the terms "established" and "vested" are used in Senate Joint Resolution 13.

As shown by the evidence furnished by the State Department and by the Presidential proclamation and Executive order of September 28, 1945, the vesting or establishment of these proprietary rights in the States is a matter of domestic concern and will not interfere with international law or present and future international agreements and obligations, so long as they are vested or established subordinate and subject to the constitutional governmental powers of the national sovereign. That is exactly what is intended to be accomplished by the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 13, and under such circumstances there should be doubt concerning the constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Illinois desires to request permission to make an insertion in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to him for that purpose, without the time used by him being charged to my side.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that an implication has been left that the only organizations opposed to the offshore oil joint resolution are, first, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and, second, the Americans for Democratic Action, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a resolution of the Nebraska Legislature, opposing the measure, as printed in the Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal, and also editorials and articles from sundry newspapers, including the Daytona Beach (Fla.) Evening News; the Madison (Wis.) Capital-Times, edited and published by the courageous William Eujue; the Louisville Courier-Journal; the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution; the Commonweal, a distinguished Catholic journal; the Christian Century, a distinguished Protestant journal; the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, a leading newspaper published by that outstanding citizen, Paul Block, Jr., another article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette; an editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin, owned and edited by the distinguished McLean family, no member of which I think is a member of either the Americans for Democratic Action or the CIO; an editorial from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer, edited by Jonathan Daniels, son of one of the greatest editors of all times, Josephus Daniels; an editorial entitled "At Last a Kind Word for Filibusters," published in the Detroit News, founded by James E. Scripps, of April 22, 1953; also an article entitled "Senatorial Oil Oratory," from the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 22, 1953. This article is written by Ralph W. Page.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks some representative statements of executive and legal officers of the United States to congressional committees, recognizing State ownership of tidelands, filled lands, and submerged lands under ports, harbors, and all navigable inland waters.

There being no objection the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal of April 29, 1953]

LEGISLATURE VOTES FOR UNITED STATES TIDELANDS CONTROL

The Nebraska Legislature by a vote of 27 to 11 Wednesday passed a resolution urging the jurisdiction of tidelands oil lands remain with the Federal Government.

The United States Senate is scheduled to take a vote next Tuesday turning the tidelands over to the coastal States.

The Nebraska legislative resolution was offered by Senator John Larkin, Jr., of Omaha, who argued that Nebraska needed and wants the school money that would come through jurisdiction staying with the Federal Government.

Senator Terry Carpenter, of Scottsbluff, a former Congressman who was a Democrat when he served in Washington and now is a Republican Party member, argued for the resolution.

Senator Carpenter said no one can say that the schools of Nebraska couldn't use the money the State would get with continued Federal jurisdiction. But, he added, he would admit the resolution probably would have no force or effect on Congress.

Senator Arthur Carmody, of Trenton, moved the resolution be held over 1 day. The Carmody lay-over motion lost and then the resolution passed. The vote:

For: Adams, Anderson, Aufenkamp, Bixler, Britt, Carpenter, Coffey, Cole, Diers, Dooley, Duis, Fenske, Hill, Hubka, Kotouc, Larkin, Liebers, Lillibridge, Brower, McHenry, Martin, Marvel, Person, Pizer, Tvrdik, Williams, Wilson.

Against: Beaver, Bridenbaugh, Brown, Burney, Carmody, Carson, Cramer, Klaver, McNutt, Peterson, Shultz.

[From the Daytona Beach (Fla.) Evening News of April 27, 1953]

OIL FOR THE NATION

This week the prolonged fight continues in the United States Senate over whether a few coastal States or all of the 48 which make up the strength of our Nation shall hold title to the submerged oil and mineral resources lying along parts of the seacoast.

At the weekend President Eisenhower took a hand in the dispute by pleading publicly for passage of the measure which some few of the coastal States and private oil interests have been so fervently pushing for enactment.

Against these advocates of one of the biggest grabs in the Nation's history are arrayed a group of determined Senators who have been urging the passage of legislation which would continue Federal ownership of the offshore wealth, pay the coastal States a handsome royalty when the oil and other minerals are marketed, and pool the remainder in a fund to aid primary, secondary and higher education.

How the issue finally is decided will have a profound and far reaching effect on future national policy in the ownership and management of natural resources which tradition has held generally to be Federal property.

Backing the pressure for passage of the coastal State grab bill has been a great deal of propaganda asking us to believe that for some mysterious reason the Federal Government is something to be distrusted and feared, and that only separate States and certain private interests are to be trusted in the disposition of natural resources. Many Federal officials in high places are nurturing this amazing doctrine.

The conservative New York Times, which supported Eisenhower in the presidential campaign, parts company with him on the vital issue of what should be done with the offshore wealth. Says the Times in an editorial entitled "Oil For the Nation:"

"One of the greatest and surely the most unjustified giveaway programs in the history of the United States is taking place before our eyes. The administration has endorsed in principle, the House has already approved and the Senate within a few days apparently will approve this plan to give to the people of a handful of States billions upon billions of dollars worth of undersea oil that rightly belongs—and always has belonged—to the people of the entire Nation * * *"

The giveaway legislation, the Times points out, "is cast in such form as to lead to endless legal complications, international as well as domestic. For instance, it would recognise 'historic' boundaries in some cases far beyond the 3-mile limit on which the United States has always insisted in its relations with other countries. Since nobody, including the proponents of the bill, knows just where the 'historic' boundaries lie anyway, the confusion will be indescribable. Furthermore, the bill would lead the way for State claims to other federally held resources within the States, including public lands and forests. It would deprive the Federal Government of direct control over a vital reserve for the national defense."

The Times supports the position of such outstanding Senators as DOUGLAS of Illinois, LEHMAN of New York, HILL of Alabama, and ANDERSON of New Mexico who, its editorial says, "offer a sound alternative in the Anderson bill, which would confirm Federal jurisdiction over the offshore resources and State jurisdiction over lands beneath tidal and inland waters, and would give the coastal States a percentage royalty on oil taken from within the 3-mile limit."

Under this bill all money received by the Federal Government from leases for oil development would be used exclusively to aid education throughout the Nation.

"What sums of this order would mean to education in all 48 States is self-evident," says the Times. "Again we urge the Senate leadership and the administration to think through the offshore oil question and to look at it in terms of benefit to the Nation."

Unfortunately that phrase, "benefit to the Nation" is about the same thing to some very selfish people as a red rag to a bull. These days the pressure for local and special interests rides high over those great traditions whose prophets had respect for the general welfare—F. B.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of April 29, 1953]

THE REPUBLICANS KEEP ONE CAMPAIGN PROMISE—TIDELANDS GIVEAWAY

The first test vote in the Senate on the tidelands oil steal has turned out to be bad news for the people of the United States. The Anderson substitute amendment, which would have retained title to the oil-rich submerged lands in the hands of the Federal Government, was tabled by a vote of 56 to 33. The vote was so decisive and Republican Majority Leader TAFT is so determined to pass the bill that the tired minority, which has been fighting the bill for almost a month, has agreed to take a vote on passage of the giveaway bill on May 5.

The most notable thing about this outrageous giveaway, of course, is that it is the first major piece of legislation to be put through Congress by the new Republican administration. It is the only campaign promise on which the Eisenhower administration has delivered in the first 100 days of its rule. The other promises of tax cuts, budget balancing, extension of old-age security, modification of the Taft-Hartley law and others have been forgotten. But the giveaway of submerged oil lands is all but accomplished.

The promise to the oil interests who swung behind Eisenhower at Chicago and who delivered Texas and the other oil States to him in the election, is being kept. It is the first campaign promise to be kept and is perhaps the only one that will be kept.

It is significant to note how carefully the one-party press has refrained from telling the people of the United States the facts about this giveaway of enormously rich natural resources. For weeks there was a blackout on the news concerning the momentous fight that a group of liberal Senators were making against the passage of the tidelands bill. It was only after the debate had carried to the point that Senator TAFT was making threatening gestures of cloture and the President intervened to demand action on the bill that the debate was reported on the front pages of the one-party press.

These newspapers, which like to preen themselves about their devotion to the slogan "your right to know," carried this conspiracy of silence with them when they reported the vote in the Senate on the Anderson amendment. Here was a significant vote, showing the line-up in the Senate on one of the most important issues to come before the Congress in this session or in any recent session. It is more important in this session than in previous sessions because for the first time since the bill has been offered, we have a President who is pledged to sign it.

But most of the newspapers which reported the Senate's action in voting to table the Anderson amendment neglected to inform their readers how the Senators voted. The Wisconsin State Journal, here in Madison, the Milwaukee Sentinel, and the Chicago Tribune carried no roll calls in the morning papers on Tuesday, the day after the vote was taken. These papers are for the tidelands bill. The Chicago Sun-Times, which opposes the bill, carried a rollcall supplied by the United Press.

The Capital Times received no roll call from either the United Press or the Associated Press.

This is typical of the way the newspapers and the news services honor the slogan they preach about so much—"your right to know."

The line-up in the Senate on the vote was what could be expected. The Dixiecrats and the Republicans joined forces to kill the Anderson amendment. Seven Republicans and 25 Democrats voted for it. Thirty-eight Republicans and 18 Democrats voted to kill it.

Here is the rollcall:

For the substitute:

Republicans (7)—Aiken, Case, Cooper, Griswold, Langer, Tobey, and Young.

Democrats (25)—Anderson, Douglas, Frear, Fulbright, Gillette, Gore, Hayden, Hennings, Hill, Humphrey, Jackson, Johnson of Colorado, Kefauver, Kennedy, Kilgore, Lehman, Magnuson, Mansfield, Neely, Pastore, Sparkman and Symington.

Independents (1)—Morse.

Against the substitute:

Republicans (38)—Barrett, Beall, Bennett, Bricker, Bridges, Bush, Butler of Maryland, Butler of Nebraska, Capehart, Carlson, Cordon, Dirksen, Duff, Dworshak, Ferguson, Flanders, Goldwater, Hendrickson, Hickenlooper, Ives, Jenner, Knowland, Kuchel, Martin, McCarthy, Millikin, Mundt, Payne, Potter, Purtell, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Smith of Maine, Smith of New Jersey, Taft, Watkins, Welker, and Williams.

Democrats (18)—Byrd, Clements, Daniel, Ellender, George, Hoey, Holland, Hunt, Johnson of Texas, Johnston of South Carolina, Long, Maybank, McCarran, Robertson, Russell, Smathers, Smith of North Carolina, and Stennis.

Paired for the substitute—Chavez (Democrat) and Green (Democrat).

Paired against—Eastland (Democrat) and Thye (Republican).

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of April 23, 1953]

WHOSE ADMINISTRATION IS IT, AFTER ALL?

A curious turn of affairs shows up in Washington. Democrats in both the Senate and the House, in a move which may be strategic but which certainly seems devoid of malice, are asking President Eisenhower to accept his natural and proper role. That is, they ask him to assert his leadership in matters involving national policy.

It is not a hostile request. It is rather a reminder of executive responsibility. As we see the action, it suggests that by silence on certain legislation, the President may appear to be abdicating that responsibility. He may be letting Congress write the record of his administration.

In the Senate, the move is formal. It takes shape in a letter signed by 25 Senators, asking whether he supports the claims of coastal States to submerged lands beyond their 3-mile limit. If he answers, the whole issue of rights to oil deposits in land beneath the offshore waters would be illuminated. There might even be a settlement of the issue which has tied up all business in the Senate for 3 weeks.

The question needs answering. The bill which is under debate, if you want to call it debate, is claimed by its supporters, undoubtedly a majority of the Senate, to be a fulfillment of campaign promises. But is it? Was ever a campaign promise as vague and unlimited?

Nobody doubts that in Mr. Eisenhower's wooing particularly the votes of Texas he spoke impulsively and without knowledge of all the facts when he came out for State claims to the oil of the tidelands. And we have an idea that he would have had serious reservations if he had known the indefinability of those claims; if he had foreseen that by promising the politician's inch

he would encourage an extravagant demand for an oil.

What he encouraged, in fact, was a bill which already had passed the House and which would go beyond the tidelands, beyond even the 3-mile limit, and give away to the States all offshore land within their historic boundaries.

This is practically special legislation in favor of Texas. The Texas argument is that the Lone Star State came into the Union not as a mere territory but as a sovereign nation, and gave up nothing in the process. The argument goes on to say that the national boundaries of Texas, fixed by its treaty of independence with Mexico, extended 3 leagues out into the waters.

What do they mean, three leagues? There are leagues and leagues—nautical leagues, statute leagues, leagues whose length varies with the nation that measures them. Texas disregarding the likelihood that its treaty with Mexico implies the Spanish league (the shortest measurement), is pressing rather for leagues in the fullest measure, or about 3.5 miles each, 10.5 miles in all.

Is this what the President had in mind in his blithe campaigning days? Did he think that tidelands, the old misapplied name for the disputed land, really meant tidelands, which is land between high and low water marks? The Senators have a right to ask. The country has a right to know. There is much at stake for the whole country.

In a similar demand for a statement of policy, Democrats in the lower Chamber of Congress want Mr. Eisenhower to declare his views on the public low-rent housing program. There is a drive in conservative Republican quarters to put an end to it, with strong prospects of success. Is this the President's idea? He never mentioned it before. As House Democratic Leader McCORMACK points out, if he doesn't speak out quickly, he must share responsibility for defeat of the program. Prodding like this is in order, but it is interesting to see it come from the opposition party.

[From the Commonweal of May 1, 1953]

RAIDS ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

In the early days of the New Deal such Rooseveltian phrases as "vested interests" and "special privilege" imparted vigor to addresses on domestic problems. When monopoly and unchecked private enterprise then gave way to Government regulation and control, such terms lost much of their political sting. It now looks as if they will soon be back in the political picture.

This swing of the pendulum is comparable to what has followed defeats of Labor governments in Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain. Yet in those Commonwealth nations retracing of steps has been very limited indeed. The changes which our new administration bids fair to put over in its first few months are big strides in comparison.

Transfer to California, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas of title to offshore oil lands is first on the whole Eisenhower legislative list. Properties worth some $40 billions are to be exploited by private companies with royalties going only to those four coastal States. Yet three times in recent years the United States Supreme Court has declared that these vital resources belong to the Nation as a whole. Not only the extent and importance of these untapped sources of underseas wealth make the battle in the Senate against transfer so deserving of public support. The shift of offshore oil to the States leads to other attacks on the Federal domain.

National parks and other public lands are already in grave danger. Lumber interests in the Far West have their eyes on big tracts of Olympia National Park. Both House and Senate are considering bills that would give private interests grazing and other privileges on our public lands, which are also threatened by attempts to bring outdated mining laws to bear on behalf of private claimants.

Private utilities are making their influence felt against regional river valley development and public power generally. What is not attainable through straight legislation, these companies may well be able to procure through friendly administering, such as purchase of the electricity generated by Government dams.

That legislation is not always required is indicated by the dismissal of Albert M. Day, director of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Day declares that Secretary McKay took this step under pressure from California duck hunters and Alaska salmon packers opposed to conservation.

The offshore oil battle therefore is of the widest public concern. It must be followed up by stands against similar legislative and administrative raids on vital national resources—there would be reason enough to resist them solely in the interests of national defense. And if the administration succeeds in transferring to private enterprise much of the natural resources now held as a public trust—so that profit becomes the criterion for their preservation and development—it will present the voters with a tremendous issue in 1954 and 1956.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 18, 1953]

OUR GIFT TO TEXAS

Now that Republican Majority Leader TAFT has announced his intention to press for a showndown on the offshore oil bill, the Senate may soon vote on that vital legislation. Opponents of the administration measure to establish State ownership of submerged coastal oil lands have marshaled an impressive array of facts against the bill. But there has been no sign that their efforts are likely to prevent Congress from going through with the plan to quitclaim Federal title in the undersea lands.

A favorable Senate vote will complete legislative action on the bill to give a few coastal States valuable resources which the Supreme Court has held belong to the Federal Government and therefore to all the States. One way to look at the treasure involved is to measure it in terms of a proposal by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, one of the quitclaim opponents. Senator HILL has suggested that, instead of granting the offshore oil to California, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida, the Federal Government be authorized to distribute the royalties from it to all the States for the support of education (with the coastal States getting a larger share).

The probable amounts that the States would get under this plan vary, depending on the estimated value of the oil under the submerged areas and on the percentage of the royalties. But even under the most conservative estimates, Pennsylvania would get $424 million. Under liberal estimates, this State would get nearly $4 billion.

The ironic aspect of the quitclaim plan is that, if any of the involved States run into international disputes in extracting oil from the Continental Shelf, it will be the Government of the 48 States that will have to come to their aid. Texas and Florida, for example, claim land out to 10½ miles—7½ miles beyond the line to which the United States asserts jurisdiction. If Texas oil drillers in international waters get into trouble, as Texas shrimpers have in the past, the State Department or the Navy will be expected to guard their rights.

Since the Federal Government is expected to protect American interests in such areas, it should be entrusted with administering the offshore oil lands and proceeds from them should go to all the States.

[From the Christian Century of April 22, 1953]

OFFSHORE OIL AND THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Control of offshore oil was the principal bill General Eisenhower made for the electoral votes of Texas, Florida, and California. The Supreme Court has three times held that the underwater areas at stake belong to the whole Nation and not to the States on which they border. But General Eisenhower supported the contentions of the four States named, and he is committeed to sign any law Congress may pass giving them this potential bonanza. Estimates set the amount of revenue to be derived from offshore oil deposits at from forty to two hundred and fifty billion dollars. There are indications that the State Department is unhappy about turning over these offshore lands to the States, for questions of national sovereignty—such as came up a few years ago when rumrunners tried to operate inside the 3-mile limit—could be extremely embarrassing to our international relations. The Attorney General, likewise, has apparently been trying to tone down some of the demands of the four States. But the House has now passed a bill giving these States the oil lands out to their historic limits, which is said to mean from 3 miles out in the case of California to 10½ for the others. Even this, it can be predicted, will not satisfy the Texans, for the most promising submarine oil deposits off their coast are far out in the shelving Gulf of Mexico.

If this is the best Texas can get from Congress this time, and this limited gift stands its court tests, then the Texas oil interests will come back to ask a subsequent Congress for the lands as far out as 150 or 200 miles. A little group of Senators is fighting to block passage of the bill giving away these oil lands, but so far little public interest has been shown. Yet if this bill passes, it will do two things. It will cut off the other 44 States from any share in this vast potential income, and thus will make impossible any such project as that proposed by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, to use offshore oil royalties to help defray public school costs all over the Nation. (Or why not, asks Senator DOUGLAS, if there is $250 billion involved, use it to pay off the national debt and thus to cut taxes?) And in the second place, it will start a rush in Congress to pass out other portions of the Federal public domain. Wyoming is already after the federally owned oil lands in that State, and Senator BUTLER, chairman of the interior committee, says that sentiment is growing in the upper chamber to turn all Federal lands, including those with rich mineral deposits, over to the States. Republican leaders might wisely recall that the last time they took office there followed an episode known to history as Teapot Dome.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of April 24, 1953]

TIDELANDS FACTS ARE EYE OPENING

"No; it's not a filibuster, it's an educational campaign. The people are not aware of what is at stake in the tidelands oil fight and must be informed, with the floor of the Senate as the forum."

It seems to us we've heard that argument before and that some of the loudest opposition to southerners' use of the device in the arguments over civil-rights legislation are now leading the parade in harassment of TAFT in the big oil giveaway.

Regardless of what it's called, the old Shakespearean adage would apply: "A rose by any other name smells as sweet." And sweet smelling indeed to southern Senators has been their old ace in the hole, the filibuster, until now some of them find it turned upon themselves.

Perhaps it was never invoked for a better purpose than in the present instance, an attempt to awaken the public to what could well become known in the future as the great tidelands robbery.

There are a few States, notably Texas, Florida and California, that will profit from this bill. All others are in the ludicrous position of robbing themselves. Billions of dollars in natural resources would be given up to these 3 States at the expense of the other 45.

Wednesday 25 Senators called on the President to clarify what the administration considers the boundaries of States in connection with offshore lands. Since the United States Government was established, the accepted boundaries have been 3 miles to seaward of the low water mark. Texas and Florida claim 10½ miles and the bill in question leaves the door wide open for even further extension by providing for recognition of any State boundaries "heretofore and hereafter" approved by Congress.

Total oil resources on the continental shelf are estimated to have a total value of almost $300,000,000,000. The Holland bill would turn over a great percentage of these assets to 3, perhaps 4, States, leaving the way open for their eventual acquisition of it all.

In a few words, the issue is summed up well by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, as follows:

"These huge treasures of offshore oil and gas which are the property of the Nation should not be given to the comparative few. They should be used to help meet the costs of national defense, to reduce the public debt, to wipe out illiteracy, and to develop through education the human resources of the country. These are the great purposes for which these natural resources are to be used.

"If we alienate the offshore oil and gas, then the Mountain States will demand the mineral rights on Government land within their boundaries; there will be a drive to turn over the forests and uplands now owned by the Federal Government to the States which will mean that they will be overcut and overgrazed. The results will be greater floods and soil erosion."

We agree. We also agree that there is a need for a prolonged educational campaign on the subject. The Supreme Court has spoken already. It's now up to the people.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 23, 1953]

A READER'S VIEWPOINT: STATES' CLAIM TO OFFSHORE OIL DEFENDED

EDITOR, THE POST-GAZETTE:

Your position on the tidelands oil question is very disappointing in "Our Gift to Texas," April 18, 1953. But even more disappointing are your reasons. Aside from the Supreme Court decisions, you appear to favor Federal control and ownership for the benefit of all the States because (1) the profits will be huge (you assume that Pennsylvania will receive $400 million at the least) and (2) the Federal Government will have to protect American interests in the area from the 3-mile limit to the 10½-mile limit, which is claimed by Texas and Florida and which the Republicans in Congress now propose to quitclaim to those States (this is labeled the ironic aspect of the problem).

As to the first point—assuming your figures to be correct, over how many years will Pennsylvania receive funds which will eventually amount to $400 million? Whatever the answer I suggest that Federal grants to the States from tax revenues can accomplish a more equitable result. It is clear that Congress has the power to levy excise and income taxes on oil operations, and State-owned operations are not immune in this respect (*New York* v. *United States*, (326 U. S. 572, 1946)). But in any event I dispute your figures. Oil operations are very speculative. As of February 1951, over $250 million has been spent in search of oil in the Gulf of Mexico and only $20 million had been grossed. (See testimony of Walter Hallanan, hearings on S. J. Res. 20, 82d Cong., 1st sess. 1952).

As to the second point—this was a real shocker. United States embassies and consulates are located all over the world for the express purpose of protecting American interests, private and public, and thank goodness. There would have been quite a howl if the State Department had said, "O well, William Oatis is a citizen of New York State (or wherever), so let their officials argue with the Czechs." United States Marines fought "to the shores of Tripoli" to protect private American shipping (those shippers were mostly Massachusetts boys) and today they are fighting in Korea for the ultimate benefit of everyone in the world. For this protection of interests we gladly pay taxes and it does not follow that the Federal Government does or should own those interests.

On the basis of your second point, the Supreme Court decided against the States in the tidelands cases. The Court held that because the Government had sovereignty (or political control) over the tidelands, the Government had ownership. Mr. Justice Frankfurter (not known as being "conservative") dissented and his opinions should be read by everyone. An overwhelming number of authorities agree with him that, in this country, ownership does not arise from sovereignty. The Constitution prescribes only two general purposes for which the Federal Government can own land, viz., for military bases, post offices, and so forth, and for the erection of future States (as in the case of Hawaii and Alaska this is a mere trusteeship), and for no other purpose.

By using its commerce, taxing, and spending powers, Congress could have controlled (but not have owned) the tidelands and, also, could have seized the steel industry. These were President Truman's aims and, finding Congress uncooperative, he sought to accomplish them by Executive fiat. Many are thankful that the Supreme Court would only cooperate with the first aim.

"Gift" is the wrong word. Congress is merely attempting to restore to the particular States the ownership of land which was taken from them in a very questionable manner.

JAMES B. HECHT.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

EDITOR'S REPLY: CASE FOR FEDERAL CONTROL

Mr. Hecht begins his comment with a misnomer. The States' rights to "tidelands" oil (oil underneath lands covered and uncovered by tides) is not now and never has been in question. The only oil in question is that beyond the low-water mark, a point which the Post-Gazette has made clear in designating it "offshore oil."

The editorial of April 18 did not contemplate (as Mr. Hecht seems to think) that the Federal Government's jurisdiction should be limited to that area from the 3-mile limit to the 10½-mile limit. This area was simply suggested as the area where difficulties might be more likely to arise and where Federal intercession might be necessary. The editorial said the Federal Government "should be entrusted with administering the offshore oil lands"—meaning all submerged lands from the low-water mark outward.

Mr. Hecht suggests that, as of February 1951, only $20 million had been grossed on oil from the Gulf of Mexico. Yet former Solicitor General Philip Perlman reported recently that between 1950 and the present the Federal Government had collected between $10 million and $25 million in rents and royalties alone from Louisiana and Texas offshore oil. But in any event, figures on the value of oil so far extracted are beside the point. The Post-Gazette's observation that Pennsylvania would receive minimum royalties of $424,000,000 under the Hill amendment was based on the total value of offshore oil and not on oil pumped to date. Estimates of total value range from a low of $50 billion (United States Geological Survey) to a high of $300 billion (Wallace Pratt, former vice president of Standard Oil of New Jersey).

Mr. Hecht cites the Oatis case and the case of American shippers in an attempt to refute the editorial's claim that the Federal Government should exercise jurisdiction over offshore oil drillers because it will have to defend them in the event of international complications. In actuality the Oatis case supports the editorial's position. In that case the Federal Government (not Oatis' home State of Indiana) exercised control over Oatis' movements abroad—i. e., issued him a passport valid for travel in Czechoslovakia. Subsequently the Federal Government intervened in Oatis' behalf when he was arrested by Czechoslovakia. In the case of American shippers, it is the Federal Government (not their home States of Massachusetts or Texas) which licenses their vessels and their captains.

But in the case of the offshore oil drillers, the quitclaim bill supporters want the States to have control over the movements of Texans or Louisianans in a controversial area, with the Federal Government presumably stepping in only after they have become involved in circumstances over which it has no control.

The overall case for the Federal Government's need to exercise control was succinctly put by the United States Supreme Court in the Louisiana action (339 United States Reports 704):

"The marginal sea is a national, not a State concern. National interests, national responsibilities, national concerns are involved. The problems of commerce, national defense, relations with other powers, war, and peace, focus here. National rights must therefore be paramount in that area, that area in contradistinction to the internal area."

Mr. Hecht declares that "an overwhelming number of authorities agree * * * that, in this country, ownership does not arise from sovereignty." But the Supreme Court made clear in the Texas case (339 United States Reports 707) why there is a distinction as to undersea lands:

"And so although dominion and imperium are normally separable and and separate, this is an instance where property interests are so subordinated to the rights of sovereignty as to follow sovereignty."

Mr. Hecht's assertion that "Congress is merely attempting to restore to the particular States the ownership of land which was taken from them" is refuted by the historically documented opinions of the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases.

In the California case the Court said: "The United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark."

The Court used almost the same language in the Louisiana case. And in the Texas case it said: "We hold that as an incident of the transfer of that sovereignty (Texas sovereignty) any claim that Texas may have had to the marginal sea was relinquished to the United States."

[From the Raleigh News and Observer of April 27, 1953]

HAS BEEN EFFECTIVE

There is only the most remote possibility that the prolonged debate in the Senate will result in the defeat of the bill to give to contiguous States to the offshore oil lands which the United States Supreme Court has three times held belong to all the people of the United States.

The debate, however, has unquestionably been effective. Opposition to the bill has been strengthened, and there has been little enthusiasm for it except on the part of Senators from the 4 States affected directly, California, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas.

The bill seems destined to pass for two reasons only: the support of President Eisenhower and individual commitments of Senators, many of them made a long time ago. Against those two conditions, the fact that the opponents have had all the best of the debate, is not expeced to weigh very heavily.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 28, 1953]

SLOW GRINDING LAW MILL

Senator ANDERSON, one of the leaders of the opposition to the administration's offshore oil lands bill, denies that the near filibuster has delayed any important legislation in the Senate. He says the leaders have none ready for action.

And that would appear to be exactly right. Congress has extended rent control, created a new Cabinet position, and extended executive power to reorganize Government agencies. Otherwise the record is bare as far as important legislation is concerned.

On February 9 Congress leaders and the President agreed on an 11-point minimum program for legislation. It provided that all appropriation bills should clear the House by May 15. So far only one such measure—the appropriation for independent Federal agencies—has passed the House. Statehood for Hawaii was on the list. The House has passed the bill but approval by the Senate seems doubtful.

No action has been taken on Taft-Hartley law amendments, extension of reciprocity legislation, or the bill to simplify United States customs procedures, all highly controversial measures.

Revenue legislation was not on the list, but if not renewed, the excess-profits tax and the last increase in personal income taxes, are due to expire this year.

The legislative jam over the annual supply bills and various controversial measures is an old story in Congress. Adjournment is delayed, filibusters encouraged, and log-rolling promoted by such slack legislative practices. But the situation this year is worse than usual since 4 months have passed with practically no major legislation recorded.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 22, 1953]

SENATORIAL OIL ORATORY—FILIBUSTER OR NOT, DEBATE ON TIDELANDS HAS EDUCATIONAL ASPECT

(By Ralph W. Page)

The talking marathon over the disposition of the offshore oil shows no sign of abating at this juncture.

The immediate question seems to be whether this is a filibuster or a seminar constituting a liberal education in the legal history of State boundaries and Federal jurisdictions.

The attempted distinction seems to be that—in conducting a filibuster the orators attempt to prolong the debate and wear out the Senate by endless irrelevant discourses and reading from material that has no relation to the subject at hand. In this case the protagonists stick to their contention and reiterate all the arguments on their side ad infinitum. This, they say, is education.

It would certainly be education if everyone—or anyone—listened to it. As a matter of fact, if the public read these closely knit and exhaustive briefs presented by Senators DOUGLAS, HUMPHREY, and LEHMAN it might very possibly be convinced.

They certainly make hash out of the main contention which seems to have influenced the majority of our States to join with California, Texas and Louisiana in trying to get Congress to give them the offshore oil.

This contention is that the Supreme Court decisions determining that the Federal Government has a paramount interest in the ocean beyond low-water mark jeopardize all State jurisdiction over inland waters and bays and such things as jetties and docks, filled in land, and over clams and shrimps and lobsters and such marine foodstuffs.

It has been pointed out that there are over 50 Supreme Court decisions upholding the jurisdiction of States over these waters, installations and denizens. Also that these California, Texas and Louisiana decisions are the first that dealt with the ocean, and in nowise repealed or modified any of the previous decrees.

This makes sense to everyone but hair-splitting lawyers. The average mentality easily grasps the difference between Federal control of the ocean and Federal control of filled-in land.

But anyway, it is argued that if anyone is honestly afraid that the Court would in fact at some time assert that there is no difference between the ocean and Muddy Creek, and that a decision that the Government of the United States controls the seas also indicates that it controls new land made on Lake Michigan, the remedy is easy. All Congress needs do in this circumstance is to pass the Anderson bill, which specifically relinquishes all these properties to the States for all time. Such an act does not attempt to overrule the Supreme Court. It merely reaffirms the law as laid down by the Court for 150 years.

So manifestly these arguments are a subterfuge, or pretense for giving away the oil.

Still this doesn't settle the question of filibuster.

It would seem to the ordinary citizen that the opposition is certainly carrying on a filibuster. As he understands it, the essence of a filibuster is the attempt to kill a bill by unlimited talk. Whether this purpose is maintained by inteligent remarks or by simply reading the dictionary would seem to be irrelevant to the object.

If it is a filibuster, the Senate has nothing to complain about. It loves the filibuster principle. It maintains it as a holy prerogative in spite of popular disapproval. In such case it surely cannot be reserved simply for the use of southern solons to defeat civil rights. In this case Texas and Louisiana are bit by their own watchdog.

In other words, if the talkathon is a matter of principle with the Senate, and is justified in its mind for the protection of a southern minority, it is equally justified for any minority that feels sufficiently wrought up to go through the ordeal.

The way to stop filibusters is not to curse them when you disagree and support them when you like the cause. It is to abolish the rules that permit them. As long as they are specifically protected by the archaic procedures and prerogatives of our prima donna Senators, it is quite reasonable for them to be used. Calling them another name doesn't change the fact.

[From the Detroit News of April 22, 1953]

AT LAST A KIND WORD FOR FILIBUSTERS

The long Senate debate over the offshore oil bill has afforded a demonstration of one justifiable use of the filibuster.

As more often employed, the time-killing oratory and other delaying tactics known by that name have the object of defeating the majority will. Physical endurance rather than persuasion is relied on in such cases to prevent a vote that, if taken, would go against the wishes of the filibusterers.

In the present case, the group opposing the offshore oil bill denies that the debate, now 2 weeks old, is a filibuster at all. The aim, they say, is not to keep the bill from an eventual vote but to prolong its consideration in order to arouse public concern about it.

Whether that is to be termed a filibuster is a question of definition. The good faith of the opponents' statement of purpose at any rate may be accepted, for the bill plainly might be defeated by bringing home to the people of 45 States its meaning to themselves.

In essence it proposes to donate to 3 coastal States oil deposits worth many billions, which, by 3 Supreme Court decisions, rightfully belong to the people of all the States. The Senators opposing the bill therefore believe popular apathy toward the giveaway must be due to lack of understanding. They believe that, if the people can be made aware of it as a despoiling of the common pocketbook for the benefit of a few, the reaction may force a Senate majority to join the opposition.

If the Senate's tolerance of practically unlimited debate ever is justified, it is in an effort of this kind to delay action while the public informs itself.

It should be noted, however, that this use of debate would seldom be restricted by a practicable rule aimed at filibusters in the ordinary sense. Under any kind of cloture rule, the Senate always will be slow to limit debate, especially in a case like the present, where an effort to do so could be fairly denounced as intended to keep the people in ignorance of their interests.

SOME REPRESENTATIVE STATEMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AND LEGAL OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES RECOGNIZING STATE OWNERSHIP OF TIDELANDS, FILLED LANDS, AND SUBMERGED LANDS UNDER PORTS, HARBORS, AND ALL NAVIGABLE INLAND WATERS

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF HON. HAROLD L. ICKES, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 225, 79TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, FEBRUARY 5, 1946 (P. 7)

Mr. ICKES. The advocates of House Joint Resolution 225 have insisted that many decisions of the Supreme Court have laid the question at rest. This is simply not the case. These decisions have dealt with the lands under inland lakes and rivers, and with bays and harbors. No one is claiming these lands on behalf of the United States, and no one doubts that the courts have held that they are owned by the States.

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL TOM C. CLARK BEFORE THE COMMITTEES ON THE JUDICIARY, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, 80TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, ON S. 1988 AND SIMILAR HOUSE BILLS MARCH 2, 1948 (PP. 610 AND 611)

Mr. CLARK. The second thing that is not involved here: inland waters, including their filled or reclaimed land. We have heard much about that. The Federal Government does not now assert and has no intention of asserting any claim to inland navigable waters and the beds thereof.

I have said that a hundred times. • • •

Likewise, the Federal Government does not claim any filled-in or reclaimed lands in such waters. There should be no apprehension whatever regarding the title to these filled-in or reclaimed lands. The title is not in the Federal Government. Whether such lands be in Boston, as I understand one witness testified, perhaps the Federal Government might claim the Hotel Pennsylvania, I believe it was, or some hotel up there.

Whether the land be in Boston or elsewhere, the Federal Government has no title to it. We have denied again and again this misrepresentation of some of the proponents of these measures.

Let me repeat it: The Federal Government has no property rights in any such lands, except where it may have acquired rights by purchase, by condemnation, by a specific grant, or by cession.

Now, third, the next thing that is not involved here is fish and other marine life.

We have read much about that. The attorney general of Ohio, I believe, said that Ohio got $10,000 out of its fish in taxes or something like that. There is nothing in the California case that tended to disturb the control exercised by the States over the taking of fish and other forms of marine life in the marginal sea.

We stated that in the argument in the Supreme Court again and again. The Government disclaims any intention to disturb such control by the several States. There is no basis in my opinion for assertions that the Supreme Court's decision interferes with or withdraws any powers heretofore exercised by the States in this regard.

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JULIUS A. KRUG BEFORE THE COMMITTEES ON THE JUDICIARY, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, 80TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, ON S. 1988 AND SIMILIAR HOUSE BILLS, MARCH 3, 1948 (P. 739)

Mr. KRUG. An incidental purpose of S. 1988 (which he supported) and similar measures is to quiet the titles of the States to the lands which lie between high and low tide and to the lands which form the beds of bays, harbors, and other navigable inland waters. This is to be accomplished by quitclaiming to the respective States, and to the persons who have acquired rights under State authority, whatever interest and title the United States may have in and to such lands.

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES PHILIP B. PERLMAN BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 81ST CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ON H. R. 5991 AND H. R. 5992, AUGUST 29, 1949

Mr. PERLMAN. The widespread dissemination of that false assumption has been facilitated by the use of the word "tidelands." That term is a verbal trap. Strictly speaking, tidelands constitute the area that is alternately covered and uncovered by the tides—the lands between the high-water mark and the low-water mark. The Supreme Court has often indicated that the individual States own the beds of their inland navigable waters as well as the tidelands. The United States has never challenged that finding. The decision of the Supreme Court in the California case does not cast any doubt upon it. The facts and the law have been misrepresented, and grossly misrepresented.

EXCERPTS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR J. A. KRUG BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 81ST CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ON H. R. 5991 AND H. R. 5992, AUGUST 29, 1949 (PP. 165, 166, 171, 172)

Mr. KRUG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I greatly appreciate the opportunity of discussing with you the subject of proposed legislation relating to submerged lands.

It is my purpose, in appearing before you, to state my conviction that legislation on the subject should be enacted promptly by the Congress, and that such legislation should be based upon the following proposed measures: First, H. R. 5280, a bill to quiet the titles of the several States to the tidelands—that is, the lands that are regularly covered and uncovered by the flow of the ebb of the tide—and to the lands beneath navigable inland waters, situated within the exterior boundaries of the States * * * (p. 165).

As I have previously indicated, we in the executive branch of the Government are not concerned with the tidelands situated within the boundaries of the coastal States * * * (p. 166).

The Department of the Interior and the other administrative departments involved are in favor of two proposals. The first is H. R. 5280, a bill to quiet the titles of the several States to the tidelands—that is, the lands that are regularly covered and uncovered by the flow and ebb of the tide—and to the lands beneath navigable inland waters situated within the exterior boundaries of the States.

The tidelands are not the matters really under controversy here. It is the submerged lands seaward from the tidelands. Properly speaking, the tidelands are merely the strip along the shore that is uncovered and covered by the ebb and flow of the tide.

Mr. GOSSETT. "Tidelands" is a misnomer we have applied to this whole thing?

Secretary KRUG. Tidelands oil is not in controversy at all. Our proposal is to quiet the States' claim for that, because we have never argued that the Federal Government has any claim for that oil. The pertinent area under consideration here is the area seaward from that area which is covered and uncovered by the tide (p. 171, 172).

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR J. A. KRUG BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, 81ST CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ON S. 155, OCTOBER 4, 1949

Mr. KRUG. I was pleased to hear the committee clear up the question of tidelands. We are really talking about the submerged lands and not the tidelands.

I desire to emphasize that S. 923 does not provide for the issuance by the Federal Government of oil and gas leases on the tidelands—that is, the lands that are regularly covered and uncovered by the flow and the ebb of the tide—within the coastal States. The Government has never made, and does not now make, any claim of right or title respecting these tidelands. In fact, S. 2153, whose enactment we favor, is designed forever to quiet the titles of the several States to these tidelands and to the lands beneath navigable inland waters, situated within the exterior boundaries of the States (p. 65).

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES PHILIP B. PERLMAN BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, 81ST CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ON S. 155, OCTOBER 4, 1949

Mr. PERLMAN. The purpose of S. 2153 is twofold. In the first place, it would enact the frequently repeated assertions by the executive branch that the United States is making no claim to lands which may consist of tidelands, that is, the area regularly covered and uncovered by the ebb and flow of the tide, or to lands underlying inland navigable waters. The California case did not involve such lands, nor do the pending cases against the States of Louisiana and Texas. Representatives of the Department of Justice have at all times adhered to the position that the United States makes no claim to lands underlying inland navigable waters. Indeed, within the past few months the fifth circuit court of appeals has had before it a case involving the ownership of an area which was formerly submerged land underlying Mobile River and Mobile Bay, and in this proceeding the United States took the position that the ownership of that land, lying beneath inland navigable waters, was vested in the State of Alabama at the time of its admission to the Union. The court of appeals agreed with that position. For example, all of the filled areas in such cities as Boston, Mobile, San Francisco, and Seattle are clearly within what are admittedly inland navigable waters, an area which has been held to belong to the several States. However, some apprehension has been voiced by representatives of various municipalities; and, notwithstanding repeated assurances by representatives of the United States, these municipalities and others holding grants of lands near inland navigable waters from various States seem to fear that a cloud has been placed upon their rights to such lands and upon investments made there. For the purpose of allaying such apprehensions, title I of S. 2153 has been drafted, although we think it is wholly unnecessary. The enactment of title I is urged in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the basic ownership by the several States of lands underlying their inland navigable waters (pp. 24, 25).

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF MR. MASTIN G. WHITE, SOLICITOR, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, 81ST CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 195, AUGUST 14, 1950 (PP. 27–28, 29)

Mr. WILLIS * * * For instance, in section 3, Mr. White, it is proposed that in the event of a controversy between the Federal Government and a particular State with regard to whether these submerged lands are under inland waters or outside the waters the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to negotiate with the States. What does that mean? Doesn't that throw it into a stalemate? Is it not the same as saying that we shall have no exploration even under inland waters?

Mr. WHITE. Congressman, as to that, there has never been the slightest doubt as to the position of the executive branch of the Government. The executive branch has never claimed, it does not now claim, and it does not expect to claim any rights in submerged lands beneath navigable waters or any rights in the tidelands. It is conceded, and it has to be conceded because many decisions of the Supreme Court have stated it to be a fact, that the States within whose boundaries tidelands and lands beneath navigable inland waters are situated own those lands.

Mr. WILLIS. If it is so simple as that, shouldn't we have language in this bill indicating as a matter of law that the Federal Government does not have title to and does not claim title to inland waters and puts the burden of proof upon the Federal Government and thereby up to them to come forward?

The CHAIRMAN. There is already pending before this committee a bill of that kind. It was submitted by the executive branch and introduced by the chairman as an administration bill.

Mr. WHITE. It was drafted jointly by the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Defense in order to put to rest the fears of people who believe, or say they believe, that the Federal Government is about to pounce on tidelands and submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters.

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES PHILIP B. PERLMAN BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, 82D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20, MARCH 28, 1951

Mr. PERLMAN. In this connection it seems appropriate to emphasize an aspect of this problem which should always be kept in mind. This is the fact that the ownership of lands beneath ocean waters, beyond the shores of this country and outside of inland waters, is an entirely different matter, insofar as legal principle is concerned, from the ownership of tidelands between high- and low-water mark or lands under bays, rivers, and other inland waters. The Supreme Court has on numerous occasions held that the States own their tidelands and the lands under inland navigable waters. The United States does not and never has challenged the ruling in those decisions. But the ownership of lands under the ocean, the principles governing which are derived not from the common law, but from developments in the law of nations, is something totally different. Beyond low-water mark and beyond the seaward limit of inland waters, the domain of international affairs is reached, and different rights and different problems are encountered. It is for this reason that State ownership of tidelands and lands under inland navigable waters is not in

way threatened by the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases.

Senator WATKINS. May I ask a question at this point? Would the Government be willing to stipulate that they are not in any way involved or in any way endangered by these decisions?

Mr. PERLMAN. Yes, sir; not only would stipulate, but, as the chairman has stated, the Government prepared a bill and asked that it be introduced, and it was introduced, expressly waiving forever any claim to any inland waters.

Senator WATKINS. And the navigable streams?

Mr. PERLMAN. Under all rivers.

Senator WATKINS. Lakes?

Mr. PERLMAN. That is right (pp. 351, 352).

* * * * *

Senator LONG. You do not think the States would have had any difficulty in getting the United States to surrender its claim so long as we only had soil and shells off our coast, but once we discovered oil, it was a horse of a different color.

How could we ever know, if we ever discover anything of great value underlying inland waters, that a future Solicitor General would not take the same attitude you took with regard to marginal waters?

Mr. PERLMAN. The answer to that, Senator, is found in the circumstances, the facts, that surround this very situation. We are interested at the moment in minerals and in oil. There are great pools of oil that are within inland waters, and under inland waters. The United States is not asserting, and has not asserted, any claim to them; and in your own State there is a great production at the moment in what we know, and what we admit and concede to be, inland waters, and we do not want to make any claim. We do not want to be understood as making any claim. We do not think we have any right to it (pp. 352, 353).

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR OSCAR L. CHAPMAN BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 82D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 131, JUNE 6, 1951

Mr. CHAPMAN. As Attorney General and Secretaries of the Interior have said many times, the executive branch of the Government has never made any claim to the tidelands situated between the low-water mark and the high watermark, or to the submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters (p. 22).

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL J. HOWARD M'GRATH, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 82D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 131, JUNE 6, 1951

Mr. MCGRATH. Throughout this controversy, representatives of the Department of Justice and of other branches of the Federal Government have repeatedly declared that the United States makes no claim whatsoever to the ownership of lands underlying inland navigable waters and such lands were specifically excluded when the complaints were filed in the Supreme Court cases (p. 13).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during the past month I doubt that any phase of the issues involved in Senate Joint Resolution 13 has not been touched upon. Many of the issues have been debated over and over, and it is not my purpose to engage in an extended debate. My remarks may be considered more or less as a warning of what the future holds should the Congress not take affirmative action on the pending resolution.

I wish to pay tribute to my colleagues who have ably presented the proponents' views on the issues involved, particularly to the distinguished Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

The principle the Senate is considering today goes much deeper than the mere question of who shall have the ownership of the oil lying beneath the submerged coastal lands, important as this in itself is. Of much greater import and transcending all other considerations is the so-called paramount-rights doctrine which our Supreme Court announced in support of its rulings against the States of California, Louisiana, and Texas in the tidelands cases.

I, among many others, believe that the oil and gas beneath the submerged lands in question are rightfully the property of the coastal States. But my belief stems not from the mere existence of these petroleum resources, nor from their value. It goes much deeper, Mr. President, than that alone.

If the Senate now should deny the coastal States these resources, which are rightfully and legally theirs, then by this very act of denial, the Senate will give final substance to a legal principle which is capable of nullifying for all time our Constitution, our union of sovereign States, and our cherished freedom.

To understand the basic question lying at the heart of this problem, it is necessary for Senators to look back not to 1947, when the California decision was handed down, but to 1776, when the Declaration of Independence was signed and adopted.

At that time, Mr. President, the United States of America came into being as 13 separate and sovereign States joined only by their common belief in freedom—with each State empowered to coin money, incur debts, regulate its individual trade, and provide for its own defense. As their struggle with Great Britain became more and more involved, it was necessary for a stronger union of these States to be formed. To achieve that end, the Articles of Confederation were promulgated. These, however, proved unworkable and insufficient, and in order to obtain a stronger, more permanent union, the Thirteen Original Colonies entered into a more comprehensive contract—the Constitution of the United States. The original States, later joined by the other 35, surrendered certain specified rights—and these rights alone—to the Federal Government. The Federal powers are specifically enumerated in our Constitution, and, in order to prevent abuses of them, or excesses of Federal prerogatives, our Founding Fathers wrote into our organic and basic law the restriction that all powers not enumerated in the Constitution shall be reserved to the States, or to the people.

Accepting this as a basic premise, we reach the obvious conclusion that first, our Federal Government is a creature of the sovereign States—a creature of limited powers, limited jurisdiction, and limited prerogatives. We arrive at the second conclusion that since this Federal Government is a creature of the States, its powers do not exceed those of the States except where expressly so provided in our Constitution. The Federal powers which are supreme to those of the individual States are enumerated in the Constitution—the coining of money, the burden of national defense, the regulation of foreign trade, etc. All others are reserved to the States, or to the people.

It is true, Mr. President, that the Federal Government is empowered to provide for the common defense. This authority and duty extends not only to the territorial waters surrounding our Nation, but to the inland areas as well. The responsibility for defense is just as binding upon the Federal Government with respect to the wheatfields of Kansas and the cornfields of Iowa, as it is with respect to the marginal sea off the coast of Louisiana, or Texas, or California.

How, then, is it possible for the Federal Government to set up a claim to the submerged coastal lands, and maintain that claim under any color whatsoever, other than in the name of the respective coastal States? Certainly, the Federal Government has no power or authority supreme to that of the component States except in specified instances. And if, as some proponents claim, our sprawling Federal bureaucracy can assert title to the mineral resources under these submerged lands—a title founded upon its duty to defend the coastal waters—where is the ultimate line of demarcation to be drawn? What will prevent the all-powerful Federal Government, operating under the paramount rights doctrine, from claiming not only the minerals lying beneath the submerged lands, but the coal deposits of Pennsylvania and the iron ore of the Great Lakes region under its authority as the defender of our Nation's soil?

I say none, Mr. President. I repeat and I warn again that if the Congress does not repudiate this doctrine of paramount rights—a doctrine which creates a qualified legal title supreme to any known under our law and which authorizes a Federal power subject to no limitation—the way will be open for a Federal dictatorship to arise, and for statism to replace our federation of sovereign States. I will certainly agree, Mr. President, that there are Federal rights which are paramount to those of the States. Those rights are obvious; they are enumerated in the Constitution of the United States. They are specific rights, but they are limited to certain designated areas of control by virtue of the 10th amendment which declares that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." There is no authority in our Constitution or in any other portion of our organic law which asserts that ownership of the marginal sea, or the resources lying beneath them, shall be vested in the Federal Government. On the contrary, both by precedent and practice, the boundaries of our coastal States and the boundaries of our Federal land mass have been coincident, and the Federal Government has been granted paramount rights with reference to defense, to the regulation of

commerce, and to the conduct of our international affairs in these areas only because such powers were made paramount by the Constitution. The supremacy of the Federal Government in these fields of endeavor, and in these areas of jurisdiction, has been the same as to the Mohave Desert or the cottonfields of Mississippi only because our Constitution so provides. Basically, there is no difference between submerged lands or uplands as far as Federal powers are concerned, since there is no such distinction made in our Constitution.

Where, and from what precedent, Mr. President, did our Supreme Court deduce the line of reasoning resulting in the California, Texas and Louisiana submerged lands decisions? From whence did this obnoxious and devouring theory of Federal paramount rights arise? I frankly do not know, Mr. President. I do not believe anyone knows, for that matter. I have studied this problem carefully for quite a long time. I have searched the records of judicial precedent for a groundstone upon which the Supreme Court might have anchored its decision. I have found none, and while I have found none that will bolster these decisions, I have found many which contradict them. It is true that, in legal terminology, many early decisions affecting submerged lands enumerate only dicta; nevertheless, dicta is ample evidence of the manner in which our jurists were thinking and the path of reasoning they were following during the fruitful years prior to 1947.

Certainly, in the lack of specific judicial rulings on either hand, the overwhelming weight of court dicta should point the way. And it does point the way, Mr. President; in more than 30 Supreme Court decisions and some 200 lower court opinions, the same principles of State ownership and sovereignty over submerged lands have been enumerated and reenumerated. Only in the Texas, California and Louisiana decisions has the Supreme Court departed from the traditional path—the road of judicial precedent—and in the process, has enunciated a theory of Federal ownership founded upon the tenuous theory of paramount rights flowing from the National Government's duty to defend.

There is one case, one Supreme Court opinion, which is particularly enlightening. I refer, Mr. President, to the case of *Knight* v. *U. S. Land Association* (142 U. S. 161) in which the Court, speaking through Justice Lamar, restated the proposition found in five other decisions; namely, "that absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, the soils under the tidewaters in the original States were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders."

And again, Mr. President, the Court further stated that—

> Upon the acquisition of the territory of Mexico the United States acquired the title to tidelands equally with the title to upland; but with respect to the former, they held it only in trust for the future States that might be created out of such territory (*Knight* v. *U. S. Land Association, supra*).

Thus, the Court again enumerates two principles. First, that States entering our Federal Union subsequent to the formation of that political brotherhood by the Thirteen Original Colonies are possessed of the same rights with respect to lands within their borders, including submerged lands, as the Thirteen Original States. Second, the Court emphasizes the proposition that, with reference to lands beneath navigable waters acquired in the name of the United States by purchase, gift or conquest, the title to those lands were held by the United States as trustee for the future States which were to be created out of that territory.

The Courts have denied the Federal Government the right to convey by patent those lands lying beneath navigable waters. Thus, the Supreme Court, recognizing that the submerged lands of Federal territories cannot be granted away by the Federal Government, or by the Congress, because they are held in trust for future States, ruled in 1894:

> Grants by Congress of portions of the public lands within a territory to settlers thereon, though bordering on or bounded by navigable waters, convey, of their own force, no right or title below high-water mark (*Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1)).

These lands are held for the States.

This, in the absence of statutes to the contrary or opposing constitutional provisions, is the law. There is nothing in the Constitution that contradicts this ruling. There is, however, an affirmative statute which I shall discuss in a moment.

It is sufficient now for the Senate to understand that both the courts and the Congress have spoken, and have vested the United States with the powers and obligations of a trustee as to lands from which new States have been or are to be established, and to sovereignty over these lands. The purpose of the trust, as stated by the highest tribunal our land knows, is to administer these lands until new States are created out of them, whereupon title to the lands within the new State's boundaries and sovereignty over them shall pass from the trustee—from the Federal Government—to the new State at the time the privilege of statehood is granted. It is true that the Federal Government may, acting in the public interest, reserve to itself certain areas to be known as public lands. Unless, however, the reservation of title to lands is made at the time the State enters the Union, permission of the State, either by conveyance or grant, must be obtained to acquire further State-owned lands. With particular reference to submerged lands within State boundaries, no such reservation by the Federal Government was made in any instance. Sovereignty over, and title to, the submerged lands within State boundaries passed to the States as of the time they were created. Only in certain instances did Federal sovereignty remain paramount to State sovereignty, and these instances are the enumerated powers of the Federal Government as found in the United States Constitution. That Federal powers are not extended under any guise with reference to new States is insured under the equal-footing doctrine.

In addition to this judicial dictum I have just mentioned, the Congress of the United States has spoken, also.

The act of May 14, 1898—30 Statutes 409 (48 U. S. C. 411)—entitled "Extending the homestead laws and providing for right-of-way for railroads in the District of Alaska and for other purposes," is cited approvingly by the Supreme Court in *Hynes* v. *Grimes Packing Co.* (337 U. S. 86). This is a decision rendered by the Supreme Court in 1948, 1 year after the California submerged lands decision.

The statute I have mentioned states, in part, as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as impairing in any degree the title of any State that may hereafter be erected out of the Territory of Alaska, or any part thereof, to tidelands and beds of any of its navigable waters, or the right of such State to regulate the use thereof, it being declared that all such rights shall continue to be held by the United States in trust for the people of any State or States which may hereafter be erected out of said Territory.

Thus, the Congress of the United States has, by specific statute, embraced the trustee relationship our Federal government is charged with under various Supreme Court decisions. In addition, it has defined—in the same act—navigable waters as "to include all tidal waters up to the line of ordinary high tide and all nontidal waters navigable in fact up to the line of ordinary high-water mark"—Hynes against Grimes Packing Co., supra.

In the face of this overwhelming judicial precedent and evidence of Congressional intent, Mr. President, I can see no reason for the Senate to any longer withhold its repudiation of the doctrine of paramount rights as embodied in the California, Louisana and Texas decisions. To do so would be to invite disaster; to do so would deprive our coastal States of resources legally theirs, rightfully theirs, and morally theirs.

Mr. President, the charge has been made that these submerged lands are, in reality, public lands, and as such, appertain to the Federal Government. In order to clarify the true status of these submerged areas, it might be well for Senators to realize that in no way do these offshore areas conform to the legal concept of public lands.

The origin of our public domain was this: Following the Revolutionary War, when the Thirteen Original Colonies became free and sovereign political entities, they succeeded to all rights which previously had appertained to the King of England. This included title to all lands which the King had claimed by right of conquest or discovery, and sovereignty over all lands included in the Colonies. Since several of the Original Colonies were possessed of no fixed western boundaries, the question soon arose as to their western boundary line. In order to settle this question, these several States, by acts of their respective legislatures, ceded to the Federal Government all lands beyond a western boundary, fixed in these legislative acts. From these grants by the States to the

new Federal Government, created under the authority of the Articles of Confederation, was created the Northwest Territory, which later was subdivided into States and these States admitted to the Union. Lands other than those organized into the Northwest Territory were ceded to the Federal Government by the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. These, plus some lands previously ceded by the State of Virginia, became the States of Tennessee and portions of Alabama and Mississippi.

Thus, Mr. President, was established first, the theory underlying the public-land concept in the United States, and, second, the initial method by which the United States acquired public lands—namely, cession.

Other public lands came into the hands of our Federal Government by virtue of its acquiring sovereignty over territories previously owned by foreign nations. The case of the Louisiana Purchase is pertinent. In this instance, the United States purchased the territory of Louisiana from France. Thus, title, as well as sovereignty, was transferred from the government of France to the Government of the United States, and the entire area thus purchased became public land—except, of course, those areas under private ownership by virtue of previous grant and/or conveyances.

When the State of Louisiana was admitted to the Union, the Federal Government relinquished title to all lands in private ownership and all lands which by express provision of the enabling act the United States did not retain. The pertinent portion of the Louisiana enabling act reads as follows:

> *And provided also*, That the said convention (constitutional convention) shall provide by an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that the people inhabiting the said territory do agree and declare, that they forever disclaim all right or title to the waste or unappropriated lands lying within the said territory; and that the same shall be and remain at the sole and entire disposition of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). The Chair regrets to advise the Senator from Louisiana that the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana whatever further time he may require.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana may proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have read from section 3, of the act of February 20, 1811 entitled "An act to enable the people of the Territory of Orleans to form a constitution and State government," and so forth—Second Statutes, page 641.

Thus, the Federal Government came into possession of additional public lands by reserving them for its use within States erected out of territories acquired by the Federal sovereign.

Louisiana was no exception. Other enabling acts were similar. For example, in the case of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana and Washington—which were included together in the enabling act of February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676)—the following reservation of public lands is made:

> Section 4. * * * Second, that the people inhabiting said proposed States do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within the boundaries thereof.

Thus, Mr. President, we have the background of the creation of our public domain. Lands became a part of the public domain either by cession, as in the case of the Thirteen Original Colonies; or by acquisition of territory by the United States, as in the case of the Louisiana Purchase—following which portions of lands embraced within new States were reserved to the Federal Government.

A third method of acquisition exists, whereby the Federal Government acquires title to lands by conveyance either from a State or a person.

Nevertheless, once the Federal Government has passed title to lands included in the boundaries of a new State to that State, it is not possible for the United States, at a later date, to claim these lands as part of the public domain except by valid conveyance either from the State, or a private owner.

The Supreme Court so ruled when it stated in 1886 that—

> Unless otherwise declared by Congress, the title to every species of property owned by a Territory passes to the State upon admission (*Brown* v. *Grant* (116 U. S. 207, 212)).

Thus the submerged lands, which are within State borders and which were admittedly not reserved to the Federal Government at the time when such State was erected from a new Territory, cannot appertain to the Federal Government as part of the public domain.

Mr. President, the submerged lands cannot be considered as waste or unappropriated lands, and thus subject to being withheld by the Federal Government as a part of the Federal domain. The Supreme Court has held, as I quoted above, that the lands lying beneath navigable waters of territories appertaining to the United States are merely held in trust by the United States for the States to be erected out of those territories.

I should like to point out, also, that in many instances the Federal Government has ceded portions of the public domain to the respective States under acts of Congress. Thus, we have examples of these cessions under the school-land grants, swampland grants, internal-improvement grants, railroad grants, and so forth.

There has been much talk of theft, of the coastal States attempting to grab what is not theirs. That is not so, Mr. President. That there is a theft involved in this discussion is perfectly true. But it lies not in the coastal States, who are attempting to invoke the equitable sense of the Congress. It lies, rather, in the theft of our freedom which the loosing of this paramount-rights doctrine makes possible and perhaps inevitable.

Our people, Mr. President, ask only for justice; and my hope is that it will soon be accorded.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a syndicated article by the King Features Syndicate, which appeared in over 500 United States newspapers and in several foreign newspapers. This article is based on an interview which I gave on this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR ELLENDER SAYS STATES HAVE MORAL RIGHT TO TIDELANDS

(By ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senator from Louisiana)

WASHINGTON.—For the better part of the last decade the air has been thick with charges and countercharges by advocates of both sides of the tidelands oil controversy. Seldom has the debate on any subject produced so much heat.

It is risky to venture into the field of prediction, and I usually decline to do so, but I should like to make a prediction with regard to the tidelands problem. It is this: Congress will soon put the matter to rest by passing a bill which will vest title to the area in the States—as it should be. And I further predict President Eisenhower will approve the bill, making it a law.

Why am I so confident?

Because it is a matter of simple justice. The States have always assumed jurisdiction of the area from the earliest days of our Nation's history. If the States don't own the tidelands, neither does the United States. Nobody even suggested that the National Government might have any oil rights in the tidelands until recent legal action was undertaken to cast a cloud on the title of the States to the area.

There is a second and more compelling reason why the title of the States to the tidelands should be confirmed. The ever-encroaching hand of the Federal Government must be stayed at some point and if it cannot be stayed here, it cannot be stayed anywhere.

If the Government can seize the tidelands oil of Louisiana, Texas, and California, it can, under the same concepts, seize the iron mines of Minnesota, the coal of Pennsylvania or the steel mills of Chicago. Or just about anything else it makes up its mind to take, for that matter.

That this danger is appreciated by many thoughtful State officials is indicated by the fact that many of them in areas far from the tidelands, have pledged their support to the cause of State control of the area.

Let us take a look at the history of the dispute. Until 1937, the right of the States to the ownership and control of the tidelands was unquestioned. Only navigation, a recognized power of the National Government, was regulated from Washington.

Then, in 1937, the late Harold L. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, reversed himself and became the champion of the theory of Federal ownership of the tidelands. Previously, Mr. Ickes had recognized the rights of the States in the matter. Between 1933 and 1937, he stated on 33 separate occasions that the States owned the tidelands.

Later, in various cases before the Supreme Court, that tribunal reversed many previous decisions to the effect that the States owned their offshore lands and ruled that the Federal Government has a paramount right to them.

The reasoning on which the Court based its decisions is nothing short of amazing. Because the Federal Government has the obligation to protect the area, the Court said, it has the paramount power and dominion over them.

Now what do these decisions prove? Very little, I think.

In the first place, even the Supreme Court expressly recognizes the right of Congress

to deal with the tidelands, to restore full title to them to the States if it chooses. (Which I predict Congress will do.)

Second, isn't it an incredible legal doctrine that holds that because the Federal Government has the duty to protect something, it also has the right to grab it? Carry this idea far enough and nothing is safe from appropriation by the long arm of the Federal Government.

This is bad law in my opinion. Under our Constitution, the Federal Government has only the powers expressly given it by that document. Not even 1 inch of land in the States is granted by the Constitution unless the Federal Government acquired it by deed or purchase.

One incidental bad effect of the Supreme Court's decision is to confuse the international boundaries of the United States. For example, pursuant to long-standing law and tradition, the State of Louisiana set its boundary 27 miles out at sea, toward the edge of the Continental Shelf. If Louisiana doesn't own this land, who does? Where is the international boundary?

There has been much talk about the National Government losing a lot of revenue if the States are granted their rights of ownership in the tidelands. There is an easy answer to this objection. Under our present sky-high system of income taxes, the Federal Government will end up with the lion's share of the money no matter who is finally awarded the tidelands.

I think the whole matter boils down to a moral question of right and wrong. For many decades the States have been unchallenged in their rights of ownership. The Federal Government only became interested when it was learned that the tidelands are immensely valuable. In this matter, the moral right lies entirely on the side of the States, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield the remaining portion of my time to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

DEFINITION OF SURFACE RIGHTS IN CONNECTION WITH MINING CLAIMS—BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on a measure which I am introducing today which would explicitly express the will of Congress as to mining claims on the public domain.

The mining laws of the United States have been the unending target of bureaucratic officials of the Interior Department during the past 20 years. These officials sought with every propaganda device to do away with mineral property law based upon location, discovery, and patent, and to substitute a Federal system of leasing. Their real objective was to gain bureaucratic control over every move made by industry, the small prospector, and the small miner upon the public domain. While engaging in this propaganda drive, the bureaucrats failed to carry out the administrative responsibilities charged to them by law. They failed miserably in enforcing the mining laws, and to this failure we may rightfully attribute many of the claims of abuses of the mining laws that have appeared in the press and nationally known magazines in the past few months. I am hopeful that the Department of Interior will clean its house of these administrators, and will turn to the task of enforcing our present mining laws to the utmost degree. I feel sure that this action alone will remove many of the controversies over use of the public lands, and will not interfere with legitimate mining enterprises.

It has been my experience as a member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that no member of this body nor any person making legitimate use of the public lands condones in any way fraudulent locations upon the public domain. I am thoroughly convinced that the legitimate mining industry of this country, in particular, abhors fraudulent mine locations. Further, I am convinced that the abuses of the mining laws that we hear so much about lately stem without the mining industry.

It was never intended that the mining laws be used for the purpose of obtaining valuable timber rights, cabin sites, filling-station locations, recreational areas, or hotdog stands. The mining laws were created to encourage exploration, development, and mining of the minerals and metals lying hidden in the earth and to make them available to our economy for the benefit of the entire Nation. They were enacted so that there would be incentive for the prospector to go into the hills and search out the minerals so essential to our security. They were enacted so that private individuals could exercise initiative. That is the American way. There is no need to change those fundamental objectives merely because a few unscrupulous individuals seek to abuse the law for personal pleasure or for gain from other than mining activities. But it may be well to make it crystal clear that the United States will not continue to condone such activities, and that it will provide in the law the teeth to prevent the abuses cited.

The bill I am introducing today will accomplish these goals and at the same time will not hinder the efficient and proper development of the mineral resources on our public lands. In preparing this measure, I have consulted with representatives of responsible mining companies and organizations in the affected areas, and in my judgment they are thoroughly in accord with its aims.

This measure, which would apply to mining claims hereafter made, would prevent, prior to patenting, the use of any such claim for any purpose other than prospecting, mining, or processing operations and uses reasonably incident thereto. It would permit the use of the surface of the claim, by the United States or its licensees for forage control; reforestation, fire prevention, or other forest protection; or for access to adjacent lands for removal of timber; and for the United States or its licensees to remove dead, diseased, or overmature timber, so long as such use does not materially interfere with the prospecting, mining, or processing operations or related activities of the claimant. It would protect the rights of the mining claimant to cut timber for his operations, and would prevent him from cutting timber not needed in his operations. It would not disturb the established rights of existing claim holders.

Mr. President, I am convinced that if we enact this measure into law, we shall eliminate a major cause of controversy over proper use of the public domain. I believe that the difficult situations which have arisen in the Northwest will be settled, and I believe that the many legitimate users of the public domain will thank Congress for its efforts.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill, and I request that it be printed in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1830) to define the surface rights vested in the locator of a mining claim hereafter made under the mining laws of the United States, prior to issuance of patent therefor, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DWORSHAK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That mining claims hereafter located under the mining laws of the United States shall not, prior to issuance of patent therefor, be used for any purposes other than prospecting, mining, or processing operations and uses reasonably incidental thereto.

SEC. 2. (a) Any mining claim hereafter located, prior to the issuance of patent therefor, shall be subject to the right of the United States, its permittees and licensees, under the limitations of subsection (c) hereof, to use so much of the surface thereof as may be necessary or appropriate for forage control or usage, or reforestation, fire prevention, or other forest protection, upon such claim or for access to adjacent land for said purposes or to cut and remove timber on the adjacent land, and to the right of the United States, its permittees and licensees, under the limitations of subsection (c) hereof, to cut and remove dead, fallen, diseased, insect-infested, or overmature timber.

(b) Except to the extent required to provide timber for the mining claimant's prospecting, mining, or processing operations and uses reasonably incidental thereto, or to provide clearance for such operations or uses, or for buildings or structures in connection therewith, no claimant of an unpatented mining claim hereafter located shall cut and remove any timber growing thereon without authorization from the United States. Any cutting and removal of timber for such prospecting, mining, or processing operations and uses reasonably incidental thereto (but not cutting required to provide clearance as aforesaid) shall be conducted in accordance with sound principles of forest management.

(c) Any use of the surface of an unpatented mining claim authorized to be made under this section by the United States, or its permittees or licensees, shall be such as to not interfere materially with the prospecting, mining, or processing operations or reasonably incidental uses of the mining claimant.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed in any manner to limit or restrict or to authorize the limitation or restriction of any existing rights of any claimant under any valid mining claim heretofore located or to authorize inclusion in any patent hereafter issued under the mining laws of the United States for any mining claim heretofore or hereafter located, of any limitation or restriction not otherwise authorized by law.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida having yielded the remainder of his time to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from Idaho having completed his statement, the time available for debate on the amendment has expired.

Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to speak on my amendment.

Mr. President, every Senator on this floor is entirely familiar with the attitude of the senior Senator from North Dakota regarding the so-called tidelands legislation. On every occasion that it has been possible to do so, I have spoken against such legislation on this floor. I voted to sustain the President of the United States in his veto. The pending measure is the same kind of legislative proposal as that which was placed before us at the time it was referred to the Judiciary Committee originally. The next time such a legislative proposal came before the Senate, it was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This time it was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. But all the time, it has been the same old legislative proposal. The Congress wants to make certain States and individuals in this country the object of its beneficence. And the gift to be conferred is larger and more grandiose than ever. The Congress wants to give away billions of dollars in anticipated revenue and perhaps even a chunk of its sovereignty.

Mr. President, I have opposed other give-away programs; I have opposed other legislation divesting this country of its sovereignty; and, Mr. President, I am opposed to this legislation.

Right now, Mr. President, let us examine the present state of the Treasury and the manner in which this resolution could affect it.

In the past 37 years, Federal taxes have gone up 5,439 percent.

Today, our national debt is over $263 billion. No matter how great the economies effected by this and succeeding administrations may be, the American people are faced with this staggering debt. If it never increases 1 cent beyond the present figure, still—millions of dollars must be taken out of the pockets of the American taxpayers each year—even as this is now being done—in order to pay this huge obligation, along with the millions of additional dollars which must be raised each year to pay the interest on this enormous principal sum.

Specifically, let us see how this process affects the average taxpayer in this country.

If Mr. Average Taxpayer is a wage earner in North Dakota, or any of the other States of our Union, he was forced to work last year until May 19 before he could put the first earned dollar in his pocket—and call it his own.

Why?

Because he had to use all the money he earned until May 19 to pay his taxes for 1952.

If this same Mr. Average Taxpayer is a North Dakota farmer, he is saddled with a per capita debt of over $1,800 in taxes—and the same goes for the average taxpaying farmer throughout the United States.

When taxes take this much money out of the pockets of our farmers, our wage earners, there is little left after taxes with which to buy food, clothing, and the other necessities of life. Thus, these wage earners and farmers have no choice except to raise the price they ask for their labor and the products they sell. The same rule applies to the merchant, the manufacturer, and every individual, partnership, and corporation in our land—because none can escape from the tax levy.

So what happens?

Prices go up on every product offered for sale—and we have inflation.

Thus, a double-bladed ax falls upon the neck of every American citizen—high taxes and high prices.

With such a state of affairs, the young married man with a wife and 2 children can provide no better standard of living for his family on $3,600 a year than he could have supplied on an income of $1,800 a year some 12 years ago.

Or again, if we turn to the individual approaching retirement, who has led a life of thrift, let us assume he has saved with regularity and carefully invested his savings in bonds.

In recent years—due to this high tax-high price era—a bond investment of $58,680 will be required for a widow to live as well as she lived on $40,000 invested in bonds 9 years ago. But with her husband gone, with age making work difficult, if not impossible, she must be satisfied with a lower standard of living.

Likewise, elderly people who, year after year, have paid premiums on life insurance to secure a nest egg for old age, face a similar plight. High taxes, and resulting high prices, have cost life-insurance policyholders an estimated $100 billion since World War II.

As if this situation were not bad enough, what about the elderly people who have no bond investment—no life insurance? This group must live on the meager funds of a savings account, a small pension from industry or Government, social security or welfare assistance.

Today, we find a pension, annuity, or other fixed income as low as $100 a month back in April 1945, would have bought as much as $151 in July of last year. Besides, where the sole source of income of these aged people lies in public welfare, it is more likely to run between $50 and $60 a month instead of 100.

But high taxes and high prices are no respecter of the aged and the people of meager income.

The $4 market basket of 12 years ago has more than doubled in price. How many baskets of groceries do you think these old folks can buy for fifty or sixty dollars a month? And how much will they have left for fuel, rent, clothing after they purchase the food for their table?

Still this is not the end of their plight.

So far we have been talking about direct taxes.

If we must pay this national debt by taxation, direct taxes are not enough. We must have hidden taxes. And we do have hidden taxes.

Hidden taxes take their toll upon the aged, in the form of 78 hidden taxes upon every quart of milk they purchase—in 151 hidden taxes upon every loaf of bread they buy. The same applies to the young man with a family, trying to get a start in life—and to every age group. These are the real problems which face millions of our people from North Dakota to Florida; from Maine to southern California.

What does all of this have to do with submerged lands and this tidelands bill?

Mr. President, I want to point out to the members of the Senate that a substantial portion of this principal indebtedness can be discharged by the development of the natural resources of the submerged lands off our coastal water.

Every dollar that can be used from these natural resources to pay the national debt means one less dollar taken out of the pockets of the wage earners, the farmers, the businessmen of North Dakota and her sister States in the form of taxes.

The revenues to be derived from these vast submerged lands will pay much of the interest on our national debt, and it may even materially reduce the principal obligation. Despite this, however, the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 propose to take these lands from the Federal Government and given them to a small group of States.

As stated so many times before this body, we are to decide here whether to give vast natural resources to a few States, to the exclusion of North Dakota and the remaining States of the Union, or whether we are to permit these resources to inure to the benefit of every State and to the Nation as a whole.

If I were to join in such a give-away program by supporting Senate Joint Resolution 13, I would, by my act, deprive the people of the great State of North Dakota of assets in which their just share eventually may be worth over $700 million.

Let me show why the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 13 would mean just that.

If we assume the natural resources in the areas in question to be eventually worth $175 billion, and that is a reasonable assumption, and that sum is divided by 150,697,361—the population of the entire United States under the 1950 census—we find that each citizen of the United States has an interest in this $175 billion worth of natural resources amounting to $1,161.26. That is why North Dakota, with a population in 1950 of 619,636 has an interest in these submerged areas worth $719,558,501.36.

Now suppose Senate Joint Resolution 13 is defeated, and these assets are declared the property of all the States instead of the property of 3 or 4.

How much would Florida receive?

Answer: $3,218,205,644.30.

How much would Louisiana receive?

Answer: $3,116,239,770.16.

How much would Texas receive?

Answer: $8,954,701,144.44.

How much would California receive?

Answer: $12,293,357,300.98.

No matter how soundly we, who oppose Senate Joint Resolution 13, defeat the bill—these four States of Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California still stand to receive an aggregate of $27,582,503,859.88—as against some $719 million which would represent the per capita interest of my people of North Dakota.

What impoverishment of Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California if Senate Joint Resolution 13 is not enacted into law.

Still these States are not satisfied. They want me to hand them over another seven hundred million which rightfully belongs to the people of my State, and join in turning to them the entire one hundred seventy-five billion of assets which belong to every citizen of the United States.

I do not know what the other Members of this distinguished body conceive to be the reason why the people of their respective States elected them to the United States Senate—but I feel that the people of North Dakota elected me to protect their interests. I cannot do it by voting for Senate Joint Resolution 13. I cannot do it by giving away $700 million in potential assets which rightfully belong to them.

Someone recently stated:

Everything that can be said about this bill has been said.

Is there no news in Senate Joint Resolution 13, for the reporters to put in the newspapers back in their respective home States?

"Alabama Senators give $3½ billion of their people's property to Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California." There's a headline for you, Mr. Alabama reporter. Because my good friend, Senator HILL, from the great State of Alabama, knows that is exactly what would happen if his vote for Senate Joint Resolution 13 brought about its enactment, is no doubt the very cogent reason why he has spoken for hours on the floor of this Senate against Senate Joint Resolution 13, in the face of accusations of filibustering.

I think it is high time every Member of the United States Senate should know how much he is giving away of the property of every citizen of his State, and I think it is high time every citizen of the respective States should know this. Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to read the total gift, figured at $1,161.26 per capita which each State, and the District of Columbia, upon the basis of its 1950 census of population intends to give to Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California, if its Senators, by voting for Senate Joint Resolution 13, succeed in enacting this bill into law.

MATHEMATICAL COMPUTATIONS

Three hundred and fifty billion dollars divided by 2 equals $175 billion. Total population of United States, 1950, 150,697,361—World Almanac, 1953, United States Census, page 389. One hundred and seventy-five billion dollars divided by 150,697,361 equals $1,161.26 per capita.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Population per 1950 census (World Almanac)	Total gift to each State at $1,161.26 per capita population
Alabama	3,061,747	$3,555,479,676.18
Arizona	749,587	870,465,399.62
Arkansas	1,909,511	2,217,438,743.86
California	10,586,223	12,293,357,300.98
Colorado	1,325,089	1,538,772,852.14
Connecticut	2,007,280	2,330,973,972.80
Delaware	318,085	369,379,387.10
District of Columbia	802,178	931,537,722.28
Florida	2,771,305	3,218,205,644.30
Georgia	3,444,587	4,000,050,648.28
Idaho	588,637	683,590,602.62
Illinois	8,712,176	10,117,101,501.76
Indiana	3,934,224	4,568,656,902.24
Iowa	2,621,073	3,043,747,231.98
Kansas	1,905,299	2,212,547,516.74
Kentucky	2,944,806	3,419,685,415.56
Louisiana	2,683,516	3,116,239,770.16
Maine	313,774	365,244,095.24
Maryland	2,343,001	2,720,833,341.26
Massachusetts	4,690,514	5,446,906,287.64
Michigan	6,371,766	7,399,276,985.16
Minnesota	2,982,483	4,563,438,208.58
Mississippi	2,178,914	2,410,165,671.64
Missouri	3,954,653	4,592,380,342.78
Montana	591,024	686,332,530.23
Nebraska	1,325,510	1,539,261,742.60
Nevada	160,083	185,897,984.58
New Hampshire	533,242	619,232,604.92
New Jersey	4,835,329	5,615,074,154.54
New Mexico	681,187	791,075,255.62
New York	14,830,192	17,221,708,761.92
North Carolina	4,061,929	4,716,955,670.54
North Dakota	619,636	719,558,501.36
Ohio	7,946,627	9,228,100,070.02
Oklahoma	2,233,351	2,593,501,182.26
Oregon	1,521,341	1,886,792,449.66
Pennsylvania	10,498,012	12,190,821,415.12
Rhode Island	791,896	$919,597,148.96
South Carolina	2,117,027	2,458,418,774.02
South Dakota	652,740	756,000,852.40
Tennessee	3,291,718	3,822,540,444.68
Texas	7,711,194	8,954,701,114.44
Utah	688,862	799,947,886.12
Vermont	377,747	438,662,481.22
Virginia	3,318,680	3,857,854,336.80
Washington	3,378,963	2,762,624,573.38
West Virginia	2,005,552	2,328,967,315.52
Wisconsin	3,434,575	3,998,434,564.50
Wyoming	290,529	337,379,706.54

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as I stated earlier, the revenues to be derived from these vast areas will pay much of the interest on our national debt, and it may even materially reduce the principal obligation. To prove my point, let me direct your attention to the value of the natural resources which underlie these coastal waters as pointed out in the minority report on Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Senator MURRAY said on the Senate floor the other day that the submerged lands are capable of producing an estimated 15 billion barrels of oil, which, at the current price of $2.65 per barrel, represents about $40 billion.

The minority views state that—

This $40 billion figure is equivalent to the total Federal revenues from individuals and corporation taxes in fiscal 1951. It is greater than the total budget expenditures for military services in fiscal 1952. It is almost one-fourth of the total current assets of American corporations, as reported by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Moreover, as further pointed out in the report, it is possible that this estimate is much too conservative; that this 15 billion barrels of oil might well be worth $76.5 billion instead of $40 billion. Furthermore, these estimates do not include the 23.5 billion barrels of oil which are estimated to lie in the Continental Shelf off the coast of Alaska. When the Alaskan reserves are included, as the minority report so strikingly shows at page 7, the potential reserves might be well worth from $102 billion to more than $173 billion.

Is this a preposterous assumption?

Certainly, if the testimony of Secretary of the Interior Krug, in the joint hearings before the Committees on the Judiciary is to be believed—it is not.

As Secretary Krug so ably pointed out, estimates of Wallace E. Pratt, one of the leading petroleum geologists of the United States, indicate that the continental shelves of the earth should contain more than 1,000 billion barrels of oil.

Furthermore, Mr. Pratt estimates that since the Continental Shelves of the United States and Alaska include nearly one-tenth of the area of all the continental shelves of the earth, one could infer on the basis of Mr. Pratt's estimate that the Continental Shelves contiguous to the United States and Alaska may contain nearly 100 billion barrels of oil. This figure may be compared with the proved reserves of approximately 21 billion barrels of oil in the continental United States. See pages 735 and 736, committee hearings.

As Secretary Krug pointed out, the Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico is fairly uniform in width, the average width being about 59 miles. The Continental Shelf beneath the waters of the Atlantic Ocean and contiguous to the east coast of the United States varies in width from a few miles in the Florida Straits to several hundred miles off New Jersey and New England. The average width of this shelf between Florida and Maine is about 73 miles. The Continental Shelf contiguous to the Pacific Coast States is comparatively narrow, having an average width of only about 18 miles. It is estimated that the total area of the Continental Shelf contiguous to the Gulf Coast States comprises approximately 111,000 square miles; that the Continental Shelf contiguous to the States on the east coast embraces a total area of approximately 128,600 square miles; and that the total area of the Continental Shelf contiguous to the States on the Pacific coast amounts to approximately 22,900 square miles. Hence, the aggregate area of the shelves contiguous to the coasts of the continental United States is estimated to be about 262,500 square miles—see page 734, committee hearings.

According to Secretary Krug, it appears that the oil reserves in the Continental Shelves contiguous to the coasts of the United States are vital to the economy and defense of the United States as a whole:

The United States military and civilian needs for a major war effort would exceed by at least 2 million barrels a day the foreseeable production from the continental

United States. The basic fact that oil is an absolutely essential commodity for the fulfillment of the mission of the national military establishment is incontrovertible. * * * Therefore, the oil reserves in the Continental Shelves are vital to the economy and defense of the United States as a whole. The people of the United States cannot afford to make a gift of these tremendously valuable resources to a few coastal States. Instead, the people of the United States, acting through their Government, ought to manage and conserve these oil reserves for the economic benefit and common defense of the Nation as a whole.

With this statement of our former Secretary of the Interior, I wholeheartedly agree.

How much are the natural resources in this Continental Shelf worth?

A story appearing in the Houston Post of October 26, 1952, said that the ultimate worth of the resources off the coast of Texas is over $80 billion. I think, Mr. President, that that article is of sufficient importance that it should be in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post of October 26, 1952]

RICH TIDELAND POTENTIAL CITED—ENGINEERS SAY ULTIMATE WORTH IS OVER $80 BILLION

Far from being of no economic importance, the submerged lands off the shore of Texas are reported to hold gas, oil, and sulfur worth an estimated $80 billion.

This realistic forecast of the possible gross ultimate income from the recovery of minerals under the offshore lands was made in a report issued Saturday by 18 Texas geologists and registered engineers.

The report said the evaluation was made because a confusion has been established in the minds of people not only by the erroneous use of the term "tidelands" but also by an attempt to establish these offshore submerged lands to be of no economic importance to the State of Texas.

The engineers' report, however, did not go into a legal definition of what constitutes the tidelands.

The original boundaries established by the Republic of Texas included a submerged strip offshore, 3 leagues or 10½ miles wide, running from the mouth of the Sabine River to the mouth of the Rio Grande.

In recent years the Texas Legislature first claimed possession for 27 miles offshore, then possession out to the edge of the Continental Shelf. The United States Supreme Court denied all three claims, holding that the Federal Government had a paramount right to all submerged lands lying seaward of mean low tide. In general, the Gulf States claim submerged lands for 3 leagues offshore, the Atlantic and Pacific States for 3 miles.

The Texas claim to the 3-league strip included in the original boundary of the Texas Republic has become a hot issue in the presidential campaign. Gov. Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic candidate, has said he agrees with Mr. Truman, who twice has vetoed congressional action which would have restored the strip to Texas.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Republican candidate, has said he favors State ownership of the tidelands.

The engineers' report, pointing out that loss of the tidelands means a real loss of large sums of money to Texas and Texans, concludes with these words:

"If the ownership to these potential oil, gas, and sulfur reserves is seized and nationalized by the Government in Washington, it not only means the loss of this future income to the State school fund that will have to be replaced by taxes, but will also remove these taxable values as a source of future ad valorem income required to offset the declining oil and gas values of the existing fields located on the adjacent onshore unsubmerged land areas."

The income to the Texas public-school fund would be a royalty of one-eighth of the income from mineral recovered from State-owned lands.

The $80 billion estimate made by the engineers refers, however, to the income from those Texas submerged-land areas, immediately adjacent to the Gulf coastal belt of railroad commission districts 2, 3, and 4, extending for over 400 miles along the coastline having the same geological and structural features as the unsubmerged lands lying inward from the coast.

This belt would extend 60 to 80 miles into the Gulf of Mexico.

The vastness of the oil, gas, condensate, and sulfur potentialities in this submerged-land area is indicated by the discoveries made on the landward portion of this basin, the report states.

As of January 1, 1952, there were 1,085 oil and gas fields producing within a 100-mile belt along the Texas gulf coast, it says.

Production from these fields on that date had totaled 11.9 trillion cubic feet of gas, 5,046 billion barrels of oil and condensate, and 70.9 million long tons of sulfur.

Reserves estimated to exist in those fields total 50 trillion cubic feet of gas, 5,965 billion barrels of oil and condensate, and 50 million long tons of sulfur.

Adding these two sets of figures would give total discoveries of 61.94 trillion cubic feet of gas, 11.011 billion barrels of oil and condensate, and 120.9 million long tons of sulfur.

The estimate of future reserves is conservative, the report points out, because it does not include 70 new fields already discovered since the first of this year.

Assuming that the submerged lands have potentialities at least equivalent to the discoveries already made on unsubmerged lands, the engineers estimate the gross ultimate income from offshore lands in this wise:

From the gas, at 15 cents per 1,000 cubic feet, $9.291 billion.

From the oil and condensate, at $2.65 per barrel, $29,179,150,000.

From the sulfur, at $25 per long ton, $3,022,500,000.

This gives a total of $41,492,650,000.

But, the engineers say, potential production from the offshore lands is much greater because of its greater area, better reservoir conditions, and the full use of modern methods of recovery.

Hence, the more realistic forecast is $80 billion.

The engineers' report says the offshore lands have been built up thousands of feet by sediment deposited by rivers for millions of years.

Folding, faulting, and uplifting through earth structural changes and piercement by salt masses, it said, have resulted in the formation of reservoirs favorable for the accumulation of gas, oil, and sulfur.

Sea level has nothing to do with the occurrence of these traps and salt domes, it said.

It simply has been cheaper and easier heretofore to drill on dry land. But with increased demand for the minerals, methods were devised for drilling under water.

These underwater operations were conducted successfully off the coasts of Louisiana and Texas until the title to the lands was questioned by the Federal Government, after which all drilling was terminated on Texas submerged lands.

These Texas offshore lands, the report says, occur along the same structural trends and at similar depths to the large number of oil and gas fields and sulfur domes now being produced in southern Louisiana on submerged areas raised above sea level by the great delta of the Mississippi River and its distributaries.

The 18 engineers who signed the report said they functioned as Texas citizens in making the study as a public service.

Houstonians who helped in the study include Alexander Duessen, Walter L. Goldston, Michael T. Halbouty, John S. Ivy, and Perry Olcott.

Others include David Donoghue and H. B. Fuquo, of Forth Worth; L. A. Douglas and William H. Spice, Jr., of San Antonio; George R. Gibson and Oliver C. Harper, of Midland; Dilworth S. Hager, of Dallas; James S. Hudnall, of Tyler; Charles P. McGaha, of Wichita Falls; Vincent C. Perini, of Abilene; Harry H. Power, of Austin; W. Armstrong Price, of Corpus Christi; and James D. Thompson, Jr., of Amarillo.

Mr. LANGER. But oil is not the only natural resource to be found in these tideland areas.

Added to the above oil estimates are potential gas reserves worth approximately $10 billion.

Finally, as further pointed out on pages 8 and 9 of the minority views:

> The sulfur reserves alone would be worth more than $3 billion. * * * To recapitulate, with Alaskan reserves included, with price increases assumed, and with a $3 billion estimated for sulfur included, the total value would be $186 billion. At the rate of 12½ percent, royalties on this amount would be more than $23 billion.

To the above figure must be added revenues already accrued since the Supreme Court upheld the rights of the Federal Government.

A grant total of approximately $62.8 million derived from the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf is awaiting disposition either to the Federal Government or to the coastal States at the present time. A little more than $27 million of this amount has been impounded by the State of California. An additional $35 million is held in escrow by the United States.

Mr. President, I fail to see how those who consistently preach economy in Government can support a measure like this which would divest the United States of millions of dollars in revenue which it now holds in escrow, and billions more that it might reasonably anticipate if the resources of these lands remain in the hands of the Federal Government.

Think what a tremendous potential these reserves of oil, gas, sulfur, and other minerals alone offer as an instrument whereby the interest may be paid upon our national debt.

Shall we leave the people of North Dakota and the other 44 States saddled with these tax obligations while we give these resources to California, Texas, and Louisiana?—or shall we make this available for the benefit of all the people of the whole United States?

Surely if we follow the latter course, neither California, Texas, nor Louisiana will be treated inequitably. They will participate in these revenues alike with North Dakota and every other State of the Union.

I want it known that I agree with what President Truman said in his veto message on Senate Joint Resolution 20

of the 82d Congress at page 3 of that veto message:

I see no good reason for the Federal Government to make an outright gift, for the benefit of a few coastal States, of property interests worth billions of dollars—property interests which belong to 155 million people. The vast quantities of oil and gas in the submerged ocean lands belong to the people of all the States. They represent part of a priceless national heritage. This national wealth, like other lands owned by the United States, is held in trust for every citizen of the United States. It should be used for the welfare and security of the Nation as a whole. Its future revenues should be applied to relieve the tax burdens of the people of all the States and not of just a few States.

For these reasons, I cannot concur in donating lands under the open sea to the coastal States, as this resolution would do.

Such a policy will not leave either California, Texas, or Louisiana in a state of destitution.

Much has been said in these debates about the inland waters of States such as my own, which are strictly inland States. Do you know how the acreage of California, Texas, and Louisiana covered by strictly inland waters compares with the State of North Dakota?

The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] introduced into the RECORD a table which shows the extent of these inland areas—see page 2746, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 7, 1953. According to his own evidence—and the Senator from Florida is a proponent of this bill—his State, Florida, has 2,750,720 acres covered by inland waters; Texas has an acreage of 2,364,800 covered by inland waters; Louisiana has another 2,141,440 acres covered by inland waters; while California encompasses another 1,209,600 acres of inland waters. In comparison, my State of North Dakota has an acreage of inland waters of less than one-half million—391,040 acres, to be exact.

In fact, with the exception of Minnesota, the only States whose boundaries embrace more than 2 million acres of inland waters are the very States of Florida, Louisiana, and Texas which are now asking Congress to give them the rich resources of the tidelands areas to the exclusion of the other 44 States. Certainly they cannot justify their stand on the ground either of impoverishment or an inequitable distribution of the inland-water areas to the benefit of their sister States.

I could never go back and face the people of North Dakota, who have elected me to represent them in this distinguished body if I were to be a party to their exclusion from these benefits to the enhancement of a small group of their sister States. Furthermore my position is thoroughly justified in law.

I think my distinguished colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spoke wisely when he said before this body:

The issue is as to the ownership and control of the submerged lands which lie under the oceans seaward from the low-water mark.

This issue should be carefully distinguished from ownership and control of the tidelands proper or ownership and control of the submerged lands under inland waters.

Much has been said concerning the legal aspects of this phase of the controversy, and I shall try to reemphasize rather than to restate much of this discussion.

One of the great illusions that has been created by the promoters of this legislation is that the opponents of this measure are really seeking to take over the submerged lands beneath the rivers, harbors, and lakes of this country. Hundreds of dollars were spent on an elaborate brochure which was circulated throughout the United States in an effort to persuade the people that they should help the citizens of California, Texas, and Louisiana in order to protect their own river and lake beds from seizure by a grasping Federal Government.

This ghost was laid to rest as long ago as 1842 when the Supreme Court held in the case of *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Peters 366) that certain oyster beds lying beneath the waters of the Raritan River in New Jersey, where the tide ebbs and flows, belonged to the State of New Jersey. A number of cases decided since may be cited wherein the Supreme Court has held that control over the lands under navigable rivers is vested in the States. Moreover, a similar series of decisions have firmly implanted the doctrine that lands under lakes and under all navigable inland waterways belong to the States.

So far as the States bordering on the Great Lakes are concerned, there is no question but that they own the submerged lands out to the half-way mark, or the international boundary, as was decided by the Supreme Court in 1892 in the celebrated case of *Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387, 433). In that momentous decision the Court said:

The State can no more abdicate its trust over property in which the whole people are interested like navigable waters and soils under them * * * than it can abdicate its police powers in the administration of government and the preservation of the peace.

When he was President of the United States, Harry Truman adopted the viewpoint that the beds underlying the inland waters belonged to the States. He said, for example, in his veto message on Senate Joint Resolution 20 of the 82d Congress:

I should like to dispose of some of the arguments which have been made in support of this resolution—arguments which seem to me to be wholly fallacious.

It has been claimed that such legislation as this is necessary to protect the rights of all the States in the lands beneath their navigable inland waters. It has been argued that the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases have somehow cast doubt on the status of lands under these inland waters. There is no truth in this at all. Nothing in these cases raises the slightest question about the ownership of lands beneath inland waters. A long and unbroken line of Supreme Court decisions, extending back for more than 100 years, holds unequivocally that the States or their grantees own the lands beneath the navigable inland waters within the State boundaries.

Long Island Sound, for example, was determined by the courts to be an inland water many years ago. So were Mobile Bay, and Mississippi Sound, and San Francisco Bay, and Puget Sound. Chesapeake and Delaware Bays, and New York and Boston Harbors are inland waters. The Federal Government neither has nor asserts any right or interest in the lands and resources underlying these or other navigable inland waters within State boundaries. Neither does it have or assert any right or interest in the tidelands, the lands lying between the high and low watermarks of the tides. All this has been settled conclusively by the courts.

If the Congress wishes to enact legislation confirming the States in the ownership of what is already theirs—that is, the lands and resources under navigable inland waters and the tidelands—I shall, of course, be glad to approve it. But such legislation is completely unnecessary, and bears no relation whatever to the question of what should be done with lands which the States do not now own—that is, the lands under the open sea.

Not only did the President disclaim any thought that these decisions affected any change in the title of the States to the beds underlying inland waters, but Attorney General Clark also disclaimed any such intention in the joint hearings before the Committees on the Judiciary of both Houses of Congress in 1948. He said, and this part of his testimony appears at pages 610 and 611 of the printed record of that hearing:

The second thing that is not involved here: Inland waters, including their filled or reclaimed land. We have heard much about that. The Federal Government does not now assert and has no intention of asserting any claim to inland navigable waters and the beds thereof.

I have said that a hundred times. * * *

Likewise, the Federal Government does not claim any filled-in or reclaimed lands in such waters. There should be no apprehension whatever regarding the title to these filled-in or reclaimed lands. The title is not in the Federal Government. Whether such lands be in Boston, as I understand one witness testified, perhaps the Federal Government might claim the Hotel Pennsylvania, I believe it was, or some hotel up there.

Whether the land be in Boston or elsewhere, the Federal Government has no title to it. We have denied again and again this misrepresentation of some of the proponents of these measures.

Let me repeat it: The Federal Government has no property rights in any such lands, except where it may have acquired rights by purchase, by condemnation, by a specific grant, or by cession.

Now, third, the next thing that is not involved here is fish and other marine life. We have read much about that. The Attorney General of Ohio, I believe, said that Ohio got $10,000 out of its fish in taxes, or something like that. There is nothing in the California case that tended to disturb the control exercised by the States over the taking of fish and other forms of marine life in the marginal sea.

We stated that in the argument in the Supreme Court again and again. The Government disclaims any intention to disturb such control by the several States. There is no basis in my opinion for assertions that the Supreme Court's decision interferes with or withdraws any powers heretofore exercised by the States in this regard.

For the sake of the selfish desires of a few greedy individuals and an even lesser number of gigantic corporations, the school children, the needy, the ill, the sick and suffering, and the aged are going to be denied sorely needed aid in order to satisfy a select group of super Americans.

The only greater outrage within the memory of man was the recent transfer of the bones of Sitting Bull from the

comforting bosom of the soil of North Dakota to a harsh cement cistern in the sands of South Dakota.

Now, Mr. President, let us examine the scope and terms of the resolution itself.

Section 3 (a) of Senate Joint Resolution 13 gives title and ownership of the submerged lands to the coastal States. However, section 3 (b) of the resolution casts doubt on the present right, title, and interest of the United States and necessarily on the authority of the United States to grant what it purports to convey. The resolution in one provision vests title and ownership to the submerged lands. In the next provision it releases and relinquishes the right, title, and interest of the United States "if any it has." But this is characteristic of the resolution, for it consistently attempts to ignore three determinations of the Supreme Court and, at the same time, overcome their effect.

Mr. President, because of the pertinency of his remarks, I wish to quote extensively at this point from a speech made on the Senate floor in the 79th Congress by former Senator Donnell, whom I have always looked upon as one of our truly great constitutional lawyers. Senator Donnell dwelt at great length on the question of whether the rule which has been laid down by the courts, and which is stated to have been supported by 54 United States Supreme Court decisions, applies to land under waters in the ocean adjacent to the States.

Senator Donnell stated:

I recur to the question whether or not the rule which has been laid down by the courts, and which is stated in the report to have been supported by 54 United States Supreme Court decisions, applies to land under waters in the ocean adjacent to the States.

Mr. President, I said there was another sentence in the report referring to this subject. That sentence is on page 3 of the report, and I shall read it. It appears, I may say, after the discussion in which it is stated:

"In 54 decisions, over a period of 100 years, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the ownership of lands beneath navigable waters lies in the States and in those to whom the States granted them."

Then a little further down the page occurs this sentence:

"And, likewise, it has been decided that lands underlying the bordering oceans within the 3-mile limit belong to the States within their respective boundaries."

The case that is cited in support of that proposition on page 3 of the report is the case of *Martin* v. *Waddell* (41 U. S. 366–410).

I indicated yesterday that I was unable to tell, and I do not think anyone can tell, from the portions of the decision I have read, unless far better acquainted with the geography of this particular neighborhood than am I, whether the waters in question were out in the ocean proper, or whether they were back in some bay or inlet of the ocean. As a matter of fact, the decision itself refers to the fact that the property included in the litigation was that in the Raritan Bay and River, and which, in itself, as I noted this morning from an inspection of the map of New Jersey, would appear to be not out in the open sea, but back in the recess of a bay or portion of the water which is not out in the open sea.

Mr. President, that is the only specific citation of authority contained in the committee's report in support of the very vital and tremendously important proposition that lands "underlying the bordering oceans within the 3-mile limit belong to the States within their respective boundaries.

Senator Donnell continued:

Yesterday afternoon the distinguished Senator from Nevada was very courteous and kind in giving me information and statements with respect to these matters, and he said then, very appropriately, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 8, page 9437:

"If the Senator will read the report of the judiciary committee he will find there cited a number of cases which will throw much light on the question in the Senator's mind."

I propose in a few minutes to examine those cases. I may say that the only cases I have found—and if I am in error, I am sure the Senator from Nevada will correct me—the only cases I have found in the report which purported to bear upon the question of coastal waters, and the lands underneath coastal waters, are those authorities set forth on page 8 of the report, beginning with the case of *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* and ending with *Mobile Transportation Co.* v. *Mobile*. Added to that may be the fact that the writer of the report, or of the appendix—for, after all, it is an appendix—and not the report proper—intended to report, and doubtless did, the case of *Smith* v. *Maryland* (18 Howard 71) from which I have quoted, and in the decision is the language, "within whose territory it lies."

I address myself this afternoon to the question as to whether or not it is an open and shut question, one that is settled by 54 or any other number of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, that lands underlying the bordering oceans within the 3-mile limit belong to the States within their respective boundaries.

My point is that, as I understand, there is no rule of law declaring that ipso facto the boundary of a State extends any distance out into the ocean. There is no such rule. The language as stated in corpus juris, from which I have read, with respect to offense, it will be recalled said:

It is doubtful whether there is any jurisdiction to punish for offenses committed within this marine-league limit, if the place of the offense is not an arm of the sea and within the body of a country, unless the jurisdiction is expressly conferred by statute.

Senator Donnell continued:

Furthermore, Mr. President, I submit that the question by what jurisdiction the statute must be enacted, to my mind, is a very grave question, and, as I indicated in my response to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], notwithstanding the action of the Supreme Court in New York, an inferior court, the issue so far as I know not having been passed upon by an appellate court, to my mind, the question is of great difficulty and of great doubt as to the right of the State itself to bring to itself property which did not otherwise belong to it.

I want in frankness to state that I have this morning located one further decision, namely, that in the case of *People* v. *Stralla* (96 Pac. 2541), decided by the Supreme Court of California, which set out a portion of the constitution of the State of California, in which the ocean boundary of the State is fixed as running west to the Pacific Ocean and "extending therein 3 English miles." I have not had the time carefully to study this decision, but from the fact that a conviction, apparently for an offense committed in this particular area, in a State court in California, was sustained by its supreme court. I judge that the court understood, and at least tacitly agreed, that the State of California had the right by its constitution to establish its own boundaries.

Continuing, Senator Donnell said:

But may I say to the Senator from Oregon and to the Senator from Michigan that this, as I have indicated, is not a decision of a Federal court, not a decision even of a lower Federal court, and certainly not in the Supreme Court. It is a decision of the Supreme Court of California, and to my mind, until there is secured an adjudication by the Supreme Court of the United States upon the question as to whether or not, if the property out in the ocean belongs to the Federal Government, it can be taken by the State, either by constitution or statute, we are unable to say with certainty or definiteness what is the status of the respective property rights of the State and the Federal Government.

I was discussing the question as to whether or not this rule with respect to coastwise property has been laid to rest by the 54 decisions of the United States Supreme Court. There is one man in the United States, at any rate, who does not think it has been laid at rest. He was referred to in the statement made in the opening of this debate. The letter written by Mr. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, under date of December 22, 1933, was cited, and later on certain testimony given by him before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on February 5, 1946, was mentioned. I should like to refer briefly to the contents, both of the original opinion of Mr. Ickes in 1933 and the testimony which he gave before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] presiding, on February 5, 1946. The letter, which is set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 8, page 9430, from Mr. Ickes to Mr. Olin S. Proctor, Long Beach, Calif., contains, among other things, the following:

"As to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over lands, bordering on tidewater the Supreme Court of the United States has held in the case of *Hardin* v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371) as follows:

" 'With regard to grants of the Government for lands bordering on tidewater, it has been distinctly settled that they only extend to high-water mark, and that the title to the shore and lands under water in front of lands so granted inures to the State within which they are situated, if a State has been organized and established there. Such title to the shore and lands under water is regarded as incidental to the soverignty of the State—a portion of the royalties belonging thereto and held in trust for the public purposes of navigation and fishery—and cannot be retained or granted out to individuals by the United States.' "

Senator Donnell continued:

Mr. President, in connection with the decision, in the case of Hardin against Jordan, I undertake to say that it does not remotely decide the question as to the title to lands along the seacoast of a nation.

As a matter of fact, as will be observed from the map at page 373 of the volume in which appears this decision, and as is stated specifically in the body of the decision, which was delivered by Mr. Justice Bradley, the proceeding was an action in ejectment to recover possession of certain fractional sections of land lying on the west and south sides of a small lake in Cook County, Ill., situated about a dozen miles south of Chicago. I call attention to this language, "and 2 or 3 miles from Lake Michigan." So obviously, the case of Hardin against Jordan, which was cited by Mr. Ickes and which is cited in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD could not, no matter what its dicta may have been—and there are dicta in it—have been decisive of the question of the ownership of lands or waters along the seacoast, because it related to inland water in Cook County, Ill., which, as nearly everyone will recall, is

the county in which Chicago is located, which water was not even connected with Lake Michigan.

That was the case on which Mr. Ickes based his statement. He further stated in the letter set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 8, page 9430:

"The foregoing is a statement of the settled law, and therefore no rights can be granted to you (to Mr. Proctor) either under the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920)41 Stat. 437), or under any other public-land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean either within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State. A permit would be necessary to be obtained from the War Department as a prerequisite to the maintenance of structures in navigable waters of the United States, but such a permit would not confer any rights to the ocean bed. I find no authority of law under which any right can be granted to you to establish your proposed structures in the ocean outside the 3-mile limit of the jurisdiction of the State of California, nor am I advised that any other branch of the Federal Government has such authority."

That letter was signed—and I assume delivered or caused to be delivered—by Mr. Ickes under date of December 22, 1933, that being the date of the actual execution of the letter.

That was the opinion of Mr. Ickes back in 1933. He based it upon the decision in the case of *Hardin* v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371). As I have indicated, that case could not have decided what the law is with respect to coastal properties along the seacoast, because it related to inland waters in Cook County, Ill.

Further, Senator Donnell stated:

Mr. Ickes, like most Senators—I hope all of us—discovered in time that humanity is fallible, and that he had erred in his conclusion, or, to put it perhaps more accurately, that there was a substantial doubt as to the correctness of the ruling which he had made. So a day or so ago the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] quoted this from the testimony of Mr. Ickes on February 5, 1946:

"Until 1937 these applications were denied"—

I take it he was referring to applications similar to those made by Mr. Proctor dealing with rights out in the ocean.

"Until 1937 these applications were denied by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and in those cases where appeals were taken to the Department his decisions were affirmed. But applicants and their lawyers continued to insist that the United States does own the land and the oil, and that the Department does have the power to grant them oil and gas leases. So we began to have doubts. Consequently since 1937 action on all those applications, of which there are about 200, has been suspended pending a judicial determination."

Senator Donnell continued:

So, I say, Mr. President, that although the Committee on the Judiciary lays down categorically the proposition that 54 United States Supreme Court decisions support the resolution, and lays down categorically the proposition that the same rule that applies to navigable waters within a State applies to lands underlying the bordering oceans within the 3-mile limit, nevertheless, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States at least determined that there was such grave doubt as to the proposition and as to the correctness of his previous ruling that in the case of about 200 applications he subsequently declined to issue permits. I believe the very fact that Mr. Ickes had held to one opinion in 1933 and thereafter changed his ruling is significant, because every motive of the pride of opinion would have led him to sustain his own previous ruling, and would have caused him to grant the permits rather than to overturn an official ruling which had been issued under his own hand on December 22, 1933. But Mr. Ickes came to the contrary conclusion. I shall read somewhat more in detail than is set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 19, from what Mr. Ickes had to say on this subject. I shall omit the portions set out in the RECORD, which I have read.

Senator Donnell then stated:

I invite the attention of the Senate to this language, after that which says the applicants and their lawyers continued to insist that the United States does own the land and the oil. Mr. Ickes said this:

"So we began to have doubts. At the same time Congress had before it proposed legislation which would in one way or another have resulted in judicial proceedings to decide the issue. Consequently, since 1937 action on all these applications, of which there are about 200, has been suspended pending a judicial determination. It is true that I have on occasions considered the issuance of a single oil lease on submerged coastal lands as a possible way of precipitating a test suit to settle the issue, but the pending Government suit has made any such device unnecessary."

Continuing from Senator Donnell's remarks:

I should like to have this language noted with care:

"So, as soon as I realized that there were substantial doubts as to the validity of the States' claim to submerged coastal lands below low-water mark, I stopped all action in the Department which was based on the assumption that the States owned these submerged lands, and began to press for a judicial solution of the debated issue of law. This I most readily concede was a change from the earlier action of myself and of the Department."

Then Senator Donnell remarked:

I digress to note the fact that he stated that he realized that there were substantial doubts. In the earlier portion of his testimony he had referred to applicants and their lawyers continuing to insist that the United States does own the land. He mentioned the fact that "We began to have doubts." Then he made the further, stronger statement:

"As soon as I realized that there were substantial doubts as to the validity of the States' claim to submerged coastal lands below low-water mark, I stopped all action in the Department which was based on the assumption that the States owned the submerged lands and began to press for a judicial solution of the debated issue of law."

Continuing Senator Donnell's statement:

Mr. President, referring again to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Revercomb, let me point out that he referred to the 54 decisions which, as it would appear from the comments which previously have been made in this body, prior to this afternoon, have set this question at rest. Again I wish to say that, to my mind, none of the 54 decisions which I have seen do set this question at rest. They do not pertain to this question. They may contain dicta, but of the ones which are specifically cited in the committee report, which are the only ones I have taken time, thus far, to read—and I refer to the cases mentioned on page 8 of the report, and also the case of Martin against Waddell, mentioned on page 3—none of them relates to the ownership of coast land, as I see it.

The Senator suggested that each case will come up upon its own set of facts. I realize that is true. It is true in the event of any litigation. We might very well say that in connection with any matter which might ultimately result in a declaration of policy, the Congress of the United States should first express its policy before the Supreme Court of the United States should indicate in whom reside the respective rights which are involved in such policy. To my mind, the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Michigan have clearly indicated what, to my point of view, is the sounder view, namely—and I think I am correctly quoting the Senator from Michigan, and I am quite sure I am correctly quoting the Senator from Oregon—that we should have the benefit of the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States in respect to the rights of the parties.

I wish to say that I believe that a case can be presented to the Supreme Court of the United States which will enable that body to lay down the law and will enable us to read it, in the same way that the members of the Judiciary Committee in the report claim that the 54 decisions they mention have established the law. I undertake to say that the Supreme Court can lay down a decision which will be understandable and will declare the law, and that everyone in the United States will understand it from beginning to end as declaring the law; and I see no indication that the Supreme Court has attempted to avoid making a decision of a case along that line, or along any other line, for that matter, which would at least be intelligible and would answer the questions which may be presented.

Continuing, Senator Donnell stated:

I think I should add that with respect to the Supreme Court decisions, criticisms have been made of the Supreme Court. Perhaps some of them have been just, because the Supreme Court of the United States, like the Senate of the United States, is composed of human beings, and it may be that some of the decisions of the Court have been unsound. I say that the Supreme Court itself has frankly and honestly recognized the fact that it has made errors, in that without manifesting any pride of opinion, it has overruled some previous decisions, and has given us its best opinion.

While this is a digression from the points strictly at issue, I wish to stand here today and announce my confidence in the Supreme Court of the United States. Let me say that, if I am not mistaken, the distinguished Senator from Oregon enunciated—not on the floor of the Senate but elsewhere—something of confidence in the Supreme Court.

I wish to say that regardless of the frictions or difficulties which may have developed, after all the people of the United States should and can and do look to the Supreme Court as the final arbiter of the questions which under the Constitution are eligible to be submitted to it. I express the hope that there may be no consideration in the Senate of the United States which undertakes in any way to lower the estimation of the Supreme Court of the United States in the minds of the people of the Nation. I rejoice that we have a Supreme Court of the United States. I rejoice in its history. I rejoice at the list of great men who have served upon it. I think great men will serve on it in the future, and I think great men are now serving on it, among them being a former distinguished Member of this body, former Senator Burton, of Ohio, who went to the Court just a few months ago.

I am not arguing this afternoon whether the ownership is in the States or is in the Federal Government. My point is that until the Supreme Court of the United States has passed upon the question under a set of facts which will make its observations more than mere dicta, we are not able to say with

finality in whom the title rests or whether, as the Senator from Oregon has said, the title to oil in those lands rests in no one, or as I expressed it, using the Latin term, whether the matter is in nubibus.

Mr. President, I now quote from Mr. Ickes' statement:

"The advocates of House Joint Resolution 225 have insisted that many decisions of the Supreme Court have laid the question at rest. This is simply not the case. These decisions have dealt with the lands under inland lakes and rivers, and with bays and harbors. No one is claiming these lands on behalf of the United States, and no one doubts that the courts have held that they are owned by the States. California and the oil companies insist that these decisions with reference to the lands beneath inland waters apply to the submerged lands off the coast; the Attorney General says that they do not. This question is the heart of the pending lawsuit and the advocates of this resolution have not and cannot produce a single decision by the Supreme Court which has settled this question."

Mr. President, perhaps Mr. Ickes is wrong. I do not know whether he is a lawyer. He may be entirely wrong in the matter. But the fact that the Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General of the United States, according to the Secretary of the Interior—and the Attorney General of the United States is a lawyer—have said that these decisions with reference to the lands beneath inland waters do not apply to the submerged lands off the coast, to my mind indicates very persuasively that it will be necessary to have a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States before that question can be answered.

Then Senator Donnell said:

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nevada referred to the change of heart or change of opinion of Mr. Ickes. I do not recall that there was the slightest intimation that the change of heart was captious or capricious: but not very much was said in the discussion the other day, as I recall, about the reason for it. At page 9430 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 8, we find the following statement by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]:

"Applicants for oil leases 'and their lawyers' caused Mr. Ickes to decide that the 'settled law' of 1933 had changed by 1937."

Mr. President, I have no doubt that the opinion of lawyers presented to Mr. Ickes had some weight. I have no doubt also that the opinion of the Attorney General, the lawyer for the United States of America, had some weight: and I doubt exceedingly, although I do not know the facts, whether the Secretary of the Interior was moved solely by the counsel for the contending parties who desired to obtain grants from the Federal Government.

Be that as it may, however, I think it is of importance to present to the Senate not merely the statement that—"Applicants for oil leases" and "their lawyers" caused Mr. Ickes to decide that the "'settled law" of 1933 had changed by 1937. But I think it well to read at this point in the RECORD what Mr. Ickes said with reference to his own mental attitude. He said this to the Judiciary Committee:

"I did not, when I assumed office a good many years ago, take an oath that I would always be right, nor even that I would never change my mind. I did take an oath to do my duty, and I viewed my duty in this matter as plain, once I realized that the ownership of submerged coastal lands had not in fact been settled by the courts. Show me a man who takes stubborn pride in the fact that his mind, once made up, is unchangeable, and I will show you a man who is not fit to be a public servant. I should point out, however, that I have never attempted, myself, to resolve this difficult question of law, but have simply refused to renounce any claims which the United States might have to these lands. It has always seemed to me to be a legal question, not appropriate for either legislative or executive decision, but exactly the sort of question which the Federal courts were created by the Constitution to decide."

Senator Donnell then said:

I continue reading what Mr. Ickes said:

"I have, indeed, been attacked not only by the officials of California but also by those who disagreed with California, because of my insistence that we had created courts to decide questions of law. Two applicants for leases off the California coast, whose applications have been among those held in suspense pending a judicial determination of the issue, commenced proceedings in the courts to compel me to issue leases to them.

"I defended those two suits, because until the title issue was decided in an appropriate judicial proceeding, neither I nor anyone else could say whether the Federal Government or California owned the lands or the oil in them. The courts refused to interfere with my decision to suspend the applications. *Dunn* v. *Ickes* (115 F. (2d) 36), (certiorari denied 311 U. S. 698), and *Jordan* v. *Ickes* (143 F. (2d) 152), (certiorari denied 320 U. S. 801, 323 U. S. 759)."

Mr. Ickes continued:

"In 1937, the Senate Committee on Public Lands favorably reported and the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 208. It provided that the Attorney General by appropriate proceedings was to establish the title of the United States to the submerged lands along the coast below low-water mark and up to the 3-mile limit."

Senator Donnell continued:

Mr. President, Mr. Ickes proceeded to refer to the resolution by which the Senate was asked by the Judiciary Committee to quitclaim to the States all those lands on the ground that 54 decisions of the Supreme Court had set at rest the question, showing that the Federal Government had no title. Nine years ago the Senate Committee on Public Lands reported a resolution providing that the Attorney General was to establish the title to submerged lands along the coast and below the low-water mark, up to the 3-mile limit, not in the States—the Judiciary Committee now tells us that, by an unbroken line of 54 decisions, the title is in the States—but in the United States.

Mr. Ickes proceeded as follows:

"While the resolution was being considered by the House Judiciary Committee, the Navy Department and the Departments of Justice and Interior drafted and supported an amended version of it. This version would have authorized the President to establish naval petroleum reserves in these territorial-water areas and it made similar provision for judicial proceedings to be brought by the Attorney General."

Senator Donnell then stated:

In other words, Mr. President, it is quite obvious, as I infer from this testimony, that the Committee on Public Lands, together with the Navy Department, the Department of Justice, the House Judiciary Committee, and Department of the Interior drafted a document which would have authorized not the States, which we are told own these lands, but the President of the United States to establish naval petroleum reserves in those territorial-water areas, and have judicial proceedings brought by the Attorney General.

I wish to read further from Mr. Ickes. I want it to be in the RECORD because I think it is only fair to Mr. Ickes that the position be known. But, far beyond that, Mr. President, I think that as Senators are about to vote on the matter of quitclaiming title, if any the Government has, and without knowing whether it has them, they should know whether or not this public official acted with reasonable discretion, or acted arbitrarily and captiously in refusing those applications.

Mr. Ickes proceeds as follows:

"In 1938 the House Judiciary Committee by a divided vote favorably reported Senate Joint Resolution 208—with certain amendments not now important (H. Rept. No. 2378, 75th Cong., 3d sess.). The committee said:

" 'The Departments of the Navy, the Interior, and Justice are one in requesting that this resolution be passed, so that the courts may determine the question involved while fully protecting by their decrees all lawfully vested rights. There seems to be no good reason to deny their reasonable request that they be permitted to have the courts decide whether or not the Nation has a permanent right to take and use the oil in question.' The House, however, never acted on this resolution."

I continue with Senator Donnell's remarks:

In 1939 Senate Joint Resolution 92, containing substantially the same provisions recommended by the House Judiciary Committee, was introduced in the Senate. After extended hearings the Senate Public Lands Committee in 1940 reported a committee version, which in effect merely requested the Attorney General to seek a judicial determination of the rights of the United States in the submerged lands under the territorial waters.

Mr. Ickes then said:

"I think that you will find its report a valuable guide to your action now. The committee said: 'The property involved in this conflict of opinion is of very great value. The controversy, in the opinion of the committee, is purely a legal one and its decision of much importance."

Senator Donnell continued:

Mr. President, I pause in my reading to say that if the matter has already been decided by fifty-odd decisions I cannot see why any other decision would be greatly important. However, this committee said that the decision of the controversy was of much importance. I proceed with its observation:

"The committee concluded as a legislative committee that it would not attempt to pass judgment on the legal question involved, and was of the opinion"—

By the way, Mr. President, it should be remembered that this was the House Judiciary Committee passing upon a legal question.

I repeat:

"The committee concluded as a legislative committee that it would not attempt to pass judgment on the legal question involved and was of the opinion that the matter should be referred to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he might take such action as he thought proper to protect the interests of the United States."

Not of the separate States of the United States.

Mr. Ickes continued as follows:

"It is true that no action has ever been taken by both Houses of the Congress on any of these resolutions, yet the Senate and its Public Lands Committee are on record as favoring a judicial determination of this issue with respect to the submerged lands in coastal waters below low tide."

Mr. President, I invite attention to this language of Mr. Ickes: "Obviously they were not at all certain of the law. But they did recognize that contest over the ownership of property are matters for the courts and not for Congress."

Mr. Ickes said:

"I am not here to argue the law with California or the oil companies; indeed, I could not do so with propriety while the case is pending in the Supreme Court and under the control of the Attorney General. But I

do insist that the ownership of the submerged coastal lands below the low-water mark has never been settled and that it is a very difficult question. Two Attorneys General of the United States have taken the position that these submerged lands belong to the United States and not to the States."

I wish to read one further sentence from the statement of Mr. Ickes. On page 7 of the hearings, on February 5 of this year, Mr. Ickes said:

"The House"—meaning the House of Representatives—"passed House Joint Resolution 225. That is the joint resolution which is now before the Senate—under the mistaken belief that the law was settled beyond any doubt. It also acted after a series of misrepresentations as to what the Federal Government claimed and as to what I proposed to do."

Then Senator Donnell said:

Mr. President, I was in process of reading certain quotations from the testimony of Mr. Ickes. There are a few further observations made by him in the course of his testimony, to which I should like to address myself. In the first place I made the statement a little while ago that I did not know whether Mr. Ickes is a lawyer. I doubtless should know that, and I find that at page 7 of his testimony he said:

"I have no doubt that most of the State attorneys general are thoroughly learned men, but when I was a practicing lawyer I signed briefs only when I had thoroughly studied the problem and never in response to telegraphic solicitation."

I call attention to this statement first, because of the fact that to my mind Mr. Ickes' membership in the legal profession entitles his statements with respect to the law to even greater weight than if he were giving those expressions as a layman who had never studied or practiced law.

In the second place, I cite this observation because of its mention of a very wholesome rule, it appears to me, of thorough study of the problem. He states that he signed briefs only when he had thoroughly studied the problem and never in response to telegraphic solicitation, and I judge from his testimony that he thinks at any rate that he had given thorough study to this problem before he reversed the decision which he had given in writing over his own signature in 1933.

Mr. President, some reference has been made here to the States. I do not see upon the floor the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Revercomb, but I am confident he would have no objection to my reading this with reference to his remarks. Mr. Ickes said:

"In the process of building up support based on emotion, rather than upon fact, I am thus accused of wanting to seize these lands and ultimately to complete the conquest in all of the States."

Senator Donnell continued:

Mr. President, I digress to say that by reading this I do not in any sense mean to imply that the Senator from West Virginia was attempting to play upon emotion or was actuated by anything other than the highest of motives, but I wanted to read this because of the observation Mr. Ickes makes with respect to the respective rights of the States and the Federal Government. He says further:

"To the supporters of this resolution, my insistence for 8 years that this troublesome problem should be settled by the courts is the equivalent of a seizure vi et armis, and our doubts about the true ownership of these submerged lands amount to an assault on States' rights. I have been an advocate of legitimate States' rights for well over half a century, but it has never occurred to me that one of the inalienable rights of a State is to escape litigation when it claims land to which the National Government also asserts title."

Then he proceeds:

"The committee will note that I persist in viewing this contest as one over oil, and one between the United States and California. This does not mean that I have not heard that the attorneys general of 46 States, to say nothing of the American Association of Port Authorities, and the oil company lessees of California, have joined in supporting this legislation. I have certainly heard of this vocal group, every member of which is opposed to an invasion of States' rights and to overrule settled law, although apparently none of them has troubled to investigate whether either issue is in truth involved."

Then Mr. Ickes a little further on states:

"Once California embarked on the united-front tactic"—

I want to say to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], whose colleague does not appear to be present, that I mean no disrespect to California in reading this testimony, not in the slightest; but I think it is well for us to understand the views of Mr. Ickes and his comments as to the support which the joint resolution has received. He said:

"Once California embarked on the united-front tactic it forced into prominence, not the merits of its case, but the fact that some have refused to go along. The attorneys general of Washington and Arizona never did join up. The attorneys general of Missouri and Georgia, I am informed by the press, took another look and withdrew from the attempt to high-pressure the Congress into deciding a law case in favor of California and the oil companies."

Senator Donnell said:

I digress, Mr. President, by reason of the fact that I come from the State of Missouri, to say that until I read this testimony I did not know the attitude of the attorney general of Missouri, and I do not know whether this is a correct statement or not, though I have no doubt of Mr. Ickes' sincerity in stating it. He says this:

"If the law is in truth so well settled against the United States why not permit the Court to speak? Is California, or are the oil companies apprehensive that the Supreme Court cannot find or will fail to apply a rule so thoroughly settled as they claim this to be? Or do they prefer to make their statements about settled law to a legislative body, composed of busy men who have not had both sides of the legal question extensively argued before them and who lack the time to study the case thoroughly themselves? Finally, if the law is so well settled, why did California ask for a delay of 1 month, in addition to the 2 first allowed by the Supreme Court, in order to file an answer to the complaint? One would have imagined that the brief printed in Los Angeles, and signed in the spaces indicated for their signature by accommodating State attorneys general, would have already proved beyond the peradventure of a doubt what the law is, if it is in fact as well settled as that brief so vigorously and repetitiously asserts."

I call further attention to this language from Mr. Ickes:

"Whatever the motives of those who advocate the passage of House Joint Resolution 225, without waiting for orderly judicial procedures, and whatever the strength or weakness of their case before the courts, there is a compelling reason why the Congress should not enact this legislation at this time. Its sole effect would be to give away a claim of the United States which is now pending before the Supreme Court for decision.

"The Congress has deprived the Supreme Court of its jurisdiction of a pending case only once in our history. That episode occurred in the heat of the reconstruction passions after the Civil War. Then a Mississippi editor, held for trial by the military authorities, had a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pending in the Supreme Court.

"The Congress, fearful of the possible decision, took away the Court's jurisdiction (Ex parte McCardle (6 Wall. 318, 7 Wall. 506; 1869). Despite the veto of President Johnson, the bill was passed. Later generations have considered this to be a shameful abuse of the powers of Congress (Charles Warren, History of the Supreme Court, II p. 480, quoting John W. Burgess)."

Senator Donnell continued:

Mr. President, I pass to several pages later in Mr. Ickes' testimony, where he said this:

"The United States and California are now litigating in the Supreme Court their opposing claims to ownership. The question has never before been decided, and no one knows the outcome. It would be an almost unprecedented abuse of legislative power if Congress were to take the issue away from the Supreme Court by presenting to the defendant State the Government's claims. The result would be bad government, not only because it would be an invasion by the legislative branch of the judicial function, but because it would constitute the waste of a national asset which might some day be crucial to our survival."

Thus it is that the Department of the Interior has reversed the decision of 1933. As indicated earlier this afternoon, it seems to me that the very fact that it had made a ruling in writing over the signature of the Secretary of the Interior, and the very fact that thereafter there was an overruling of that decision by the refusal on the part of the Department to grant some 200 applications are themselves indicative of the sincerity of the Department in taking the action by which it overruled the former decision. The case is now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Yesterday in the course of the discussion the Senator from Nevada stated:

"If the Senator will read the report of the Judiciary Committee he will find there cited a number of cases which will throw much light on the question in the Senator's mind."

He was referring to the question which I had presented, as to whether or not the same rule which has been supported by these various decisions of the United States Supreme Court with respect to title to lands under navigable rivers within the borders of a State applies likewise to coastal lands. I, therefore, searched the report of the committee to ascertain what decisions were therein cited as bearing on this particular problem.

As I indicated a while ago, I found that in the body of the report of the committee the only cases cited to the effect that land underlying the bordering ocean within the 3-mile limit belonged to the States within their respective boundaries was that of *Martin* v. *Waddell* (41 U. S. 366, 410). Inasmuch as that case was discussed yesterday to some extent, I shall only say with respect to it that, as indicated twice today, that case referred to lands in the Raritan Bay and River, and, therefore, to my mind, may be very properly distinguished on the ground that it did not involve necessarily, nor in its terms, the title to lands along the coastal region not embraced within bays or rivers. The first case to which I shall pay attention among those which are cited in the appendix is that of *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. 57, 65–66). I point out that at page 65 the Court said:

"The complainant is not the proprietor of any land bordering on the shore"—

The word "shore" is italicized—"of the sea in any proper sense of that term. His land is situated nearly half a mile from what was the shore of the bay of San Francisco at the time California was admitted into the Union, and over it the water at the lowest

tide then flowed at a depth sufficient to float vessels of ordinary size."

Senator Donnell continued:

So I submit that that case is one in which the Court itself distinctly shows by the statement which I have just read, that the land involved is not the coastal area to which I have referred in my argument.

The next case to which reference is made in the appendix to the report is that of *St. Clair* v. *Lovingston* (23 Wall. 46, 68). This case almost makes me homesick, because it goes back to Illinois, our neighbor to the east of Missouri. It refers to a piece of land in the county of St. Clair, Ill., which I take it, obviously, notwithstanding the patriotic claims of our Illinois brethren with respect to their State, cannot be claimed to be upon an ocean bank.

I do not know what were the conferences between the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior. I do not know whether the Secretary of the Interior was advised by Attorney General Biddle before the reversal of the position taken in 1933 occurred. I have no means of knowing that. So far as I have been able to observe, that point is not brought out in the testimony given by Mr. Ickes before the committee.

The next case referred to in the appendix to the report of the Committee on the Judiciary is the case of *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391); at page 394 I find the following sentence:

"The precise question to be determined in this case is, whether the State of Virginia can prohibit the citizens of other States from planting oysters in the Ware River, a stream in the State, where the tide ebbs and flows, when its own citizens have that privilege."

Senator Donnell continues:

Obviously, Mr. President, that case did not involve the question of coastwise lands.

I now pass to the next case cited in the appendix, namely, *Hoboken* v. *Pennsylvania Railroad Company* (124 U. S. 656), and I invite attention to the fact that, as I read this case, it involves six actions in ejectment with respect to certain lands on the western shore of the Hudson River where the city of Hoboken—quoting from the decision—"now stands." If my understanding of the decision is correct, it does not pertain to coastwise marginal real estate.

I now pass to the next case cited in the appendix to the report, namely, *Knight* v. *U. S. Land Association* (142 U. S. 161, loc. cit. 193). I find, Mr. President, from the opinion of Mr. Justice Lamar, that it is strenuously insisted that the patent for the San Francisco Pueblo is void to the extent it embraces lands below the ordinary high-water mark of Mission Creek as that line existed at the time of the conquest from Mexico in 1846.

Senator Donnell continued:

I note also on page 182 of the decision the following language:

"The only remaining question in the case, as we understand it, and as we desire to consider it, may be thus stated: Admitting that the Von Leicht survey is correct and follows the decree of confirmation: Admitting also that the patent followed the survey and the decree, and the premises in dispute are embraced in the patent: Was parol evidence admissible to show that these premises were below the ordinary high-water mark—not of the bay of San Francisco, but of Mission Creek, a navigable arm of the bay, as that line existed at the date of the conquest from Mexico in 1846?"

Continuing quoting from Senator Donnell:

So, Mr. President, it would appear that this case is likewise one in which the question of coastal waters, the so-called marginal area, is not involved. I now pass to the case of *Mann* v. *Tacoma Land Co.* (153 U. S. 273, loc. cit. 283). I find that this case, as I understand it, relates to property in what is called Commencement Bay, at the head of Puget Sound, in Pierce County, State of Washington, and that it is near the city of Tacoma. I recall the old admonition "Watch Tacoma grow." However, I do not believe that Tacoma ever grew clear out to the marginal area which is involved here.

The final case cited in the appendix is *Mobile Transportation Co.* v. *Mobile* (187 U. S. 479 at p. 482). I observe from a reading of that case that it relates to a portion of the shore and bed of the Mobile River in the city of Mobile. As I understand, the river empties into a bay between Mobile and the ocean.

Mr. President, earlier in the day I referred to a case on which I could not place my hands at the time, but which I now have before me. It is the case of *Smith* v. *Maryland*, which is the case from which the quotation appears on page 8 of the appendix. The quotation reads:

"Whatever soil below low-water mark is the subject of exclusive property and ownership belongs to the State on whose maritime border and within whose territory it lies, subject to any lawful grants of that soil by the State or the sovereign power which governed its territory before the Declaration of Independence."

Mr. President, I may say that this case comes about as close to the question as does any other. It relates to the questions of the power of the State of Maryland with respect to the owner of a schooner which had been dredging for oysters in the Chesapeake Bay. Because of some violation of a statute of Maryland the owner of the schooner was punished by being required to forfeit his schooner. Yet, Mr. President, in this case it will be observed—quoting from the decision:

"The purpose of the law is to protect the growth of oysters in the waters of the State by prohibiting the use of particular instruments in dredging for them. No question was made in the court below whether the place in question be within the territory of the State."

I wish to repeat that sentence:

"No question was made in the court below whether the place in question be within the territory of the State."

Senator Donnell then stated:

I disgress to say that the very fact that the Court emphasized that no question was raised in the court below as to whether the place in question was within the territory of the State, to my mind is very significant as indicating that the Court itself thought that the proposition might be of some importance. Indeed, Mr. President, counsel obviously thought so as it will be observed later. The Court continued as follows:

"No question was made in the court below whether the place in question be within the territory of the State. The law is, in terms, limited to the waters of the State. If the county court extended the operation of the law beyond those waters, that was a distinct and substantive ground of exception, to be specifically taken and presented on the record, accompanied by all the necessary facts to enable the Court to determine whether a voyage of a vessel, licensed and enrolled for the coasting trade, had been interrupted by force of a law of a State while on the high seas, and out of the territorial jurisdiction of the State.

"To present to this Court"—that is the Supreme Court of the United States—"such a question upon a writ of error to a State court, it is not enough that it might have been made in the court below; it must appear by the record that it was made, and decided against the plaintiff in error.

"As we do not find from the record that any question of this kind was raised, we must consider that the acts in question were done, and the seizure made, within the waters of the State; and that the law, if valid, was not misapplied by the county court by extending its operation, contrary to its terms, to waters within the limits of the State. What we have to consider under the writ of error is, whether the law itself, as above recited, be repugnant to the Constitution or laws of the United States."

Senator Donnell continued:

Mr. President, my recollection is that there are certain dicta in this case which I presume are the reasons for the citation of the case in the appendix of the report of the committee. But the observations of the Court show that the Court itself did not go into the question of whether or not the action of the defendant took place within the territory of the State, a decided question, as is obvious in the language of the decision which reads, in part:

"What we have to consider under this writ of error is, whether the law itself, as above recited, be repugnant to the Constitution or laws of the United States."

So, Mr. President, these are all the cases that are cited on the proposition of coastal waters in the appendix, and the only other case cited in the report itself on the question of coastal waters is the case of Martin against Waddell which was mentioned previously.

Continuing quoting from Senator Donnell's remarks:

Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words in conclusion. I appreciate the points made today by the distinguished Senators. It may well be that the Supreme Court of the United States will follow their theory. But in light of the contrary view taken by distinguished counsel such as the Attorney General of the United States, and the distinguished Secretary of the Department of the Interior who himself has been a practicing lawyer, I submit that there is at least room for doubt with reference to the proposition.

The Newark case referred to yesterday pointed out that the State of New Jersey had passed a law extending its boundaries into the ocean. Mr. President, we do not know whether—at least I do not know from the evidence which I have read; it may be present somewhere, but I did not read the report until it came into my possession this afternoon—there is anything in the report of the committee as to any other State extending its boundaries into the ocean. I know that the State of California, according to the decision to which reference was made, and which I believe I mentioned earlier in 96 Pennsylvania 2d, at page 941, has a constitutional provision by which its boundary goes 3 English miles into the Pacific Ocean. It may well be that all the Pacific Coast States may have been the recipients of enabling acts similar to that to which the senior Senator from Oregon referred. There is no evidence in the report of the committee before the Senate as to whether that is true with respect to all the coastwise States of the Union. There are a great many of them on the Atlantic Ocean, on the Gulf of Mexico, and on the Pacific Ocean. In order for us to know whether in any given case the lands which are sought to be quitclaimed away, given away, by House Joint Resolution 225, are within the boundaries of the States, we must know, first, whether or not any attempt has been made, either by the States themselves or by the Federal Government, respectively, to extend the boundaries of the States out into the ocean adjacent to those several States, each one by itself. We would have to know that.

We would have to know, further, whether or not the States, either by their constitutions or by their statutes, undertook to extend their boundaries.

Senator Donnell concluded with this remark:

We would have to know whether they could do it along the line of the inquiry of the Senator from Michigan this afternoon. Whether or not a State can lift itself by its own bootstraps, whether by its own declaration it can vest title in itself to lands is a question which would have to be determined.

Now, Mr. President, there is another part of this resolution that I find objectionable. That is subsection (b) of section 6. That subsection generously saves for the United States the right of first refusal to purchase any of the natural resources accruing from these submerged lands, not at a bargain price, Mr. President, but at the prevailing price or by condemnation of the property and payment of just compensation. What shoddy treatment is this for a donor who is about to give away lands whose natural resources may produce revenue measured in billions? And I might point out, Mr. President, in time of peace, or in a time when no national emergency exists, the United States is not even granted the right of first refusal to purchase. Maybe that does not offend the sense of fair dealing of some of the Members of the Senate but I assure you it offends mine. It ought to be, in my mind, especially offensive to all the inland States who gain little or nothing from this resolution.

I notice that section 9 of the resolution preserves to the United States the right to the natural resources lying outside the boundaries of the coastal States. At least, that is the interpretation placed on section 9 by the majority report, though it is by no means clear from reading the section. Now, I wonder, as did the minority report, why the resolution provides no authority for the Federal Government to develop the resources that are not taken away? The majority report seeks to answer this by saying that many questions would be raised by such an undertaking and therefore the matter should be left for early consideration in separate legislation. Mr. President, many questions are raised by the undertaking proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 13, but the existence of such questions has not deterred the proponents of this measure from urging immediate consideration of it.

One of the questions not mentioned is, how far seaward do the boundaries claimed by the coastal States extend? The bill does not prejudice State claims extending beyond the traditional 3-mile limit and I think it is acknowledged that some of the coastal States may claim boundaries extending at least 10½ land miles seaward of the coast line. But the important point is that, in the case of at least one of the coastal States, Louisiana, the attorney general of the State testified that he does not know what the historic boundaries of the State are. If he does not know, who does? And if he does not know the boundary of the State of Louisiana, how can the interest of the United States beyond that boundary be determined? Are we headed for another series of lengthy and costly suits in the Federal courts to determine the rights of the United States to be followed by more giveaway legislation like this? The Attorney General of the United States, in his testimony before the committee, urged that a line be drawn on a map so that the State boundaries could be fixed and the interests of the United States determined, but this suggestion has not been adopted. Failure to do this seems to me to represent but the prelude to another long overture of discordant litigation.

In the veto message President Truman saw this problem clearly. He remarked, at page 3 of that message:

The figures I have cited relate only to the submerged lands which are claimed to be covered by this resolution—that is, the marginal belt of land which the sponsors of the resolution say extends seaward 3 marine leagues (10½ land miles) from the low-tide mark off the coast of Texas and the west coast of Florida, and 3 nautical miles (3½ land miles) off all other coastal areas.

The Continental Shelf, which extends in some areas 150 miles or more off the coast of our country, contains additional amounts of oil and other minerals of huge value. One oil well, for example, has already been drilled and is producing about 22 miles off the coast of Louisiana.

While this resolution does not specifically purport to convey lands and resources of the Continental Shelf beyond a marginal belt, the resolution does open the door for the coastal States to come back and assert claims for the mineral resources of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of this area. The intent of the coastal States in this regard has been made clear by actions of the State Legislature of Louisiana, which has enacted legislation claiming to extend the State's boundary 27 miles into the Gulf of Mexico, and of the State Legislature of Texas, which has enacted legislation claiming to extend that State's boundaries to the outer limit of the Continental Shelf. Such an action would extend Texas' boundary as much as 130 miles into the Gulf of Mexico.

Former Attorney General Clark also realized the difficulties involved in the present approach to the problem. At the joint hearings before the Committees on the Judiciary in the 80th Congress, 2d session, he appeared and I ask unanimous consent that his statement, which appears at page 617 of the printed record of those hearings, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The measures now before you are designed to accomplish a single objective, although they differ in certain respects as to form and language. The purpose is to release and relinquish to the several coastal States of the Union all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands and resources underlying the open ocean adjacent to the shores of this country, beyond low-water mark along the open coast and outside of the inland waters. To be sure, the language of these proposals refers to all lands beneath navigable waters within the respective boundaries of the several States, and this is defined as extending seaward to the 3-mile limit, or, where a State has extended its boundary beyond 3 miles, to the exterior limits of that State.

I would like to violate, as you call it, my rule; I would like to call the attention of the committee to this strange anomaly that I will point out later in the statement but I want to call attenion to it here to the committee now—every State under this bill would have a different territorial limit. It could have a territorial limit beyond the territorial limits that the United States Government itself claims.

For example, in the California case, the territorial limit there was 3 miles. However, the Court held that the United States had, we claim, ownership in that property.

Take Texas, for example. It had, I think, 9 miles back in 1936. Then in 1941 they extended it, I think, to 27 miles, and in May last year they extended it out to the farthest boundary of the Continental Shelf. I understand that is some 59 miles.

You take Louisiana, for example. They had, I think, the same as Texas originally, and then in 1938 they extended theirs to 27 miles.

So that the boundary of the United States would start down in Texas at 59 miles outside, and then it jumped over to Louisiana, and come over 27, and if Florida got an idea they wanted 1,000 miles, they could extend theirs out halfway to Europe.

Senator MOORE. That would be beyond the Continental Shelf?

Mr. CLARK. The Continental Shelf is right at the United States. We do not even claim that.

Senator MOORE. I mean the Continental Shelf varies.

Mr. CLARK. Yes. There in Texas it is supposed to be 59 miles.

Senator MOORE. Depending upon the depth of the water.

Mr. CLARK. The United States does not claim any title beyond the 3-mile limit, never has. There has not been any legislation of any type——

Senator MOORE. There are some who think it has not any title at all.

Mr. CLARK. What I am saying, this is a very strange thing, and something that the committee should study very seriously, because here you are validating a State's action in extending the territorial limits away out into the sea beyond the limit that the United States ever claimed. There would be very much complication, as I see it, from the standpoint of international relations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, just to elaborate on how confused this matter of the State boundaries is, let me draw your attention to the statement of the chairman of the State Mineral Board of the State of Louisiana at the joint hearings before the Committees on the Judiciary in the 80th Congress. This is what was said at that time, which will be found at pages 105 and 106 of the printed record of those hearings:

Senator DONNELL. Mr. Hardey, are you able to tell us approximately the total annual revenue which the State of Louisiana derives from the 524 leases covering lands in Louisiana's marginal waters off coast?

Mr. HARDEY. Senator, that is a very new development, started about a year and a half ago. Since the war, we have encouraged a new frontier of exploration extending out into the gulf. Realizing that we were short of reserves, that development started about a year and a half ago. To date, only 6 wildcat wells have been drilled out in the gulf. Out of the 6 wells, one new field has been developed during the past summer, brought in by an oil company from Oklahoma City and its associates. It looks like a very fine oil field. So far, no revenue has been derived.

Senator MCCARRAN. How far offshore is it?

Mr. HARDEY. We got out 27 nautical miles, Senator. Our jurisdiction was established by a special act of the legislature in 1938, establishing a State jurisdiction out 27 nautical miles. We have leased out that far.

Senator DONNELL. Do you know how many of these 524 leases comprising the 1,885,689 acres, are with respect to lands within the 3-mile limit seaward from the low-water mark?

Mr. HARDEY. I don't have the figures, Senator. The spread is pretty even, though, from shoreward out to 27 miles, so I would say approximately one-ninth.

Senator MOORE. You mean these 524 leases are on coast lands?

Mr. HARDEY. They are on submerged lands off coast, beginning at the coastline and extending out 27 nautical miles.

Senator MOORE. But not including the inland?

Mr. HARDEY. Not the inland bays or rivers at all.

Senator DONNELL. The State of Louisiana, then, asserts ownership at least 27 miles off its coast, is that correct?

Mr. HARDEY. 27 nautical miles, Senator.

Senator DONNELL. Do you know, Mr. Hardey, what the legal basis is on which the State of Louisiana asserts ownership 27 nautical miles off coast?

Mr. HARDEY. I do not, Senator. I think you probably will have a treatise on that from our attorney general when he makes his appearance here.

Senator MOORE. That is based on acts of legislature?

Mr. HARDEY. It is by special act of legislature in 1938.

Senator DONNELL. The Federal Government has not passed any legislation recognizing any such rights so far as you know, has it?

Mr. HARDEY. No, sir.

Senator DONNELL. The nautical mile is even greater in length than the ordinary English mile?

Mr. HARDEY. That is right. It is almost equivalent to 39 miles.

Senator DONNELL. The United States nautical mile, as I understand it, is 6,080.20 feet. Is that correct?

Mr. HARDEY. I assume it is. I don't know.

I wish my colleagues would give heed to what the present Attorney General of the United States said concerning this phase of the problem. His statement, appearing at page 926 of the printed record of the hearings held this year, reads:

Second. An actual line on a map dividing the two areas of submerged lands should be drawn by Congress in the bill to eliminate much expensive and unnecessary litigation. If the statute merely refers in words to "historic boundaries" or in words describes a line beginning at the edge of the States' inland waters or tries to describe in words bays or other characteristics of the coast, unnecessary litigation will almost surely result. Therefore, we make this suggestion of an actual line on a map drawn as part of the bill, which would eliminate also, we think, certain international problems that might otherwise arise if territorial-ownership claims are asserted in the States or Federal Government, beyond their historic 3-mile limit.

Now, all of these gimmicks are in the gift bag, Mr. President, but I think we ought to give attention, too, to the constitutional arguments involved in this proposal.

The title of the resolution reads "To confirm and establish the titles of the States" to the submerged lands. This is an unconcealed attempt to ignore the plain and unequivocal declarations of the Supreme Court in the submerged lands cases that the States did not have title or interest in the submerged lands. This is nothing more than a masquerade. It is an attempt to conceal the true nature of this measure which is in reality another giveaway.

Attorney General Clark, it seems to me, hit the nail on the head when he stated at the joint hearings before the Committees on the Judiciary in the 80th Congress, at page 619 of the printed record:

As a result of the decision in the case of *United States* v. *California*, the situation is now different from that existing at the time a similar proposal was before the 79th Congress. At that time the question as to the respective rights and interests of the Federal Government and the several coastal States in the lands underlying the marginal sea adjacent to the shores of the United States was in doubt. This doubt has been resolved—people seem to forget—by the Supreme Court in the California case. We now know that California, for example, does not have and never did have any title to the lands underlying the ocean seaward of low-water mark; and that the United States, rather than the coastal State, is vested with the right and power to control the disposal of the resources situated in those lands. There is no State title or interest which can be subject to the so-called cloud which a quitclaim would remove.

Consequently, the proposed legislation would, as I have said, operate as an outright gift of the rights and interests of the United States in the subsoil of the adjacent oceans, and the beneficiaries of this gift would not be all the States of the Union but only the States and their lessees, the oil operators, which by accident happen to be those coastal States off the shores of which valuable and essential mineral deposits are located.

Right now, Mr. President, a grand total of approximately $63 million is awaiting disposition either to the Federal Government or to the States of Texas, California, or Louisiana, according to the minority report filed by the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. According to this same report, royalties from the oil and gas resources in the offshore areas may bring as much as $23 billion to those who own and control this property.

What a colossal giveaway this would be if this resolution should be adopted. And who would benefit from it? Primarily, the States of Texas, California, and Louisiana. How would the great State of North Dakota recover the loss of its share of the national resource—how could it benefit? Maybe the sponsors of this resolution could answer that question. I cannot.

Now, Mr. President, during the hearings on this resolution, it became apparent that a close constitutional question was involved in this giveaway. It was so apparent, as a matter of fact, that the Attorney General of the United States suggested a six-point program to avoid the issue being presented to the courts. One of the points of the program involved the abandonment of the conveyance of full title of the submerged lands to the coastal States and the grant of authority only to develop and use the natural resources from the submerged lands.

The proponent of this resolution tacitly, at least, recognized the serious constitutional question involved here, for the separability section of the resolution is unusually specific in stating that if the sections of the resolution which vest title in the States are held invalid, other sections, such as that establishing the seaward boundaries of the States, will be unaffected. Normally a general separability clause would be sufficient, but not in this resolution. The proponents know that these submerged lands are under the full dominion and control of the United States because the United States is a sovereign with the sovereign obligation to defend its people and the States which compose it. They know that the submerged lands are under the full dominion and control of the United States because the United States is a sovereign with a constitutional directive from the people to conduct the foreign relations of this country. They know all this because the Supreme Court has told them so. And, Mr. President, the proponents of this legislation know that the grant authorized by this resolution may result in an impairment of national sovereignty. They know because a former Solicitor General of the United States warned them and the present Attorney General suggested that the objection be avoided by several amendments to the resolution. The proponents of this resolution also know that this resolution may embarrass the United States in its relations with foreign nations who make extravagant seaward boundary claims for themselves. They know this because of what they were advised by Assistant Secretary of State Thruston Morton in a letter to the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 4, 1953.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: Reference is made to your letter of January 28, 1953, receipt of which was acknowledged January 30, 1953, transmitting for the comment of the Department of State Senate Joint Resolution 13, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said land and resources.

The interest of the Department in the proposed legislation is limited to the bearing which it may have upon the international relations of the United States.

With respect to claims of States in the seas adjacent to their coasts, the general policy of the United States is to support the principle of freedom of the seas. Such freedom is essential to its national interests. It is a time-honored principle of its concept of defense that the greater the freedom and range of its warships and aircraft, the better protected are its security interests. It is axiomatic of its commercial interests that the maintenance of free lanes and air routes is vital to the preeminence of its shipping tonnage and air transport. And it is becoming evident that its fishing interests depend in part, and may come more so to depend in the future, upon fishing resources in seas adjacent to the coasts of foreign states.

Pursuant to its policy of freedom of the seas, this Government has always supported the concept that the sovereignty of coastal States in seas adjacent to their coasts (as well as the lands beneath such waters and the air space above them) was limited to a belt of waters of 3 miles' width, and has vigorously objected to claims of other States to broader limits. In the circumstances, the Department is much concerned with the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 13 which would permit the extension of the seaward

boundaries of certain States of the United States beyond the 3-mile limit traditionally asserted by the United States in its international relations. Such an extension of boundaries would compel this Government, now committed to the defense of the 3-mile limit in the interest of the Nation as a whole, to modify this national policy in order to support the special claims of certain States of the Union, for obviously, the territorial claims of the States cannot exceed those of the Nation. Likewise, if this Government were to abandon its position on the 3-mile limit it would perforce abandon any ground for protest against claims of foreign states to greater breadths of territorial waters. Such a result would be unfortunate at a time when a substantial number of foreign states exhibit a clear propensity to break down the restraints imposed by the principle of freedom of the seas by seeking extensions of their sovereignty over considerable areas of their adjacent seas. A change of position regarding the 3-mile limit on the part of this Government is very likely, as past experience in related fields establishes, to be seized upon by other States as justification or excuse for broader and even extravagant claims over their adjacent seas. Hence a realistic appraisal of the situation would seem to indicate that the Government should adhere to the 3-mile limit until such time as it is determined that the interests of the Nation as a whole would be better served by a change or modification of policy.

It should be noted, moreover, that the interest of the United States in resources in the high seas has in no wise been affected by its adherence to the 3-mile limit of territorial waters. The claim of the United States in the President's proclamation of September 28, 1945, to jurisdiction and control of the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf beyond the limit of its territorial waters has not been questioned. These resources were thus secured without recourse to an extension of its territorial waters and as a result, navigation on the high seas off its coasts remains free and unimpeded as befits this country's dedication to the principle of freedom of the seas and in sharp contrast to the actions of some foreign states which sought the same result by assertions of sovereignty over immense areas of the high seas.

It is the view of the Department, therefore, that the proposed legislation should not support claims of the States to seaward boundaries in excess of those traditionally claimed by the Nation; i. e., 3 miles from the low-water mark on the coast. This is without reference to the question whether coastal States have, or should have, rights in the subsoil and seabed beyond the limits of territorial waters.

In section 2 of the Senate Joint Resolution 13, page 3, lines 3 to 5, inland waters are defined as including "all estuaries, ports, harbors, bays, channels, straits, historic bays, and sounds, and all other bodies of water which join the open sea." This definition appears to be too broad. With respect to bays and estuaries, the United States has traditionally taken the position that the waters of estuaries and bays are inland waters only if their opening is no more than 10 miles wide, or, where such opening exceeds 10 miles, at the first point where it does not exceed 10 miles. With respect to a strait which is only a channel of communication to an inland body of water, the United States has taken the position that the rules governing bays should apply. So far as concerns a strait connecting two seas having the character of high seas, whether the coasts of the strait belong to a single State or to two or more States, the United States has always adhered to the well-established principle of international law that passage should be free in such a strait and hence has maintained that its waters, even thought to be 6 miles wide or less, cannot be inland waters. With respect to both bays and straits, of course, the United States has excepted the cases where, by historical usage, such waters are shown to have been traditionally subjected to the exclusive authority of the coastal State.

The purpose of this Government in adopting such a definition of inland waters was to give effectiveness to its policy of freedom of the seas. The broader the definition of inland waters, the more the seaward limit of inland waters is brought forward from the coast. And since the seaward limit of inland waters is the baseline whence the belt of territorial waters is measured, this by cumulative effect brings forward the outer limits of territorial waters. Of late, efforts have been made by some foreign States to broaden the definition of their inland waters and to gain control thereby of large areas of the seas adjacent to their coasts. This Government has opposed and continues to oppose such developments, but any indication on its part of a change of position, such as may be suggested by the broad definition of inland waters now present in the proposed legislation, may well encourage the growth of a dangerous trend. Hence, in the view of the Department it would be advisable to amend section 2 of the proposed legislation, page 3, lines 3 to 5, as follows:

"Limit of inland waters in estuaries, ports, harbors, bays, channels, straits, sounds, and all other bodies of water which join the open sea."

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, they know, too, that the boundary claims of some of these States which are preserved under section 4 of this resolution may result in the harassment of our fishing industry. Mexico has just recently seized several American shrimp boats whose owners claim they were not violating international law. But Mexico, Mr. President, claims territorial waters to a distance of 9 miles.

An excellent discussion of this phase of the controversy appears on page 31 of the minority report, and I recommend to those of my colleagues who may not have read it that they study that portion of the report carefully.

Mr. President, this whole issue is of momentous consequence. Shall the Congress abdicate the national interest in billions of dollars of national resources to benefit a few States? I believe that the national interest, as well as the interest of the people of North Dakota, require that these valuable rights be reserved to all the people.

Mr. President, I believe it is pertinent at this stage of the discussion of Senate Joint Resolution 13, to consider an aspect of this proposed legislation which may give rise to troublesome questions at a later day.

One of the primary issues before us is the constitutionality of the proposed transfer of ownership of the submerged lands which lie under the oceans seaward from the low-water mark.

The decision of the Supreme Court in the California case—332d United States Reports at page 19, 1947—clearly stated that California had no title to these lands. Whatever, then, may be the basis under which the United States holds this property, it is entirely clear that this legislation is conferring upon these coastal States an attribute of ownership which they do not now possess.

The legal effect of Senate Joint Resolution 13 would grant to coastal States by section 2 (a) (2), 2 (b), 2 (e), 3 (a), 3 (b), and section 4, title and ownership in the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark at least out to a line "3 geographical miles" distant from its coast line. This is explicitly confirmed by the bill for the Thirteen Original States. Other States which have asserted their claim by statute or constitutional provision or otherwise for such boundaries receive ownership and title in the submerged lands out to the 3-geographical-mile limit.

AUTHORITY OF CONGRESS TO DISPOSE OF PROPERTY

The constitutional grant to Congress of the "power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States" is contained in article IV, section 3, clause 2. The word "territory" as there used, has been construed to mean property—*O'Donoghue* v. *United States* (289 U. S. 516, 537 (1933))—and the authority conferred upon Congress to dispose of this property was not abridged or withdrawn by the 9th and 10th amendments to this Constitution. *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288, 330 (1936)). The nature of the disposal is left to the discretion of the Congress—*U. S.* v. *Gratiot* (14 Pet. 526, 538 (1840)).

While Congress may constitutionally limit the disposition of the public domain to a manner consistent with its views of public policy—*U. S.* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 31)—this broad grant of authority in the Congress is not unlimited. Certain of the lands obtained by the United States, no matter how acquired, are held with the object, as soon as their population and condition justify it, of being admitted into the Union as States, upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects; and the title and dominion of the tide waters and the land under them are held by the United States for the benefit of the whole people, and in trust for future States—*Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1).

Historically, Congress, in disposing of the public lands under authority of article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the Constitution, has constantly acted upon the theory, that those lands, whether in the interior, or upon the coast, above high-water mark, may be taken up by actual occupants, in order to encourage the actual settlement of the country; but that the navigable waters and the soils under them, whether within or above the ebb and flow of the tide, shall be and remain public highways; and being chiefly valuable for the public purposes of commerce, navigation and fishing, and for the improvements necessary to secure and promote those purposes, shall not be granted away during the period of territorial government; but, unless in the case of some international duty or public exigency, shall be held by the United States in trust for the future States.

In this connection the Supreme Court in *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, at p. 57) said:

> Upon the acquisition of a territory by the United States, whether by cession from one of the States, or by treaty with a foreign country, or by discovery and settlement, the same title and dominion passed to the United States, for the benefit of the whole people, and in trust for the several States to be ultimately created out of the territory.

From these expressions of the Court in Shively against Bowlby, supra, under article IV, section 3, congressional power over the territories and other properties could be viewed as relating to such territory or property which could be carved into later States, and inferentially land claims. But here under Senate Joint Resolution 13, we are dealing with property under the marginal sea, incapable of being erected into States. Here we have an instance of the United States coming into dominion over tremendous area of the sea bed by reason of its existence as a Nation and its obligations with reference to foreign affairs and national defense.

These areas under the marginal seas are incapable of formation into States, and as the Court stated in Shively against Bowlby, supra, title and dominion rests in the United States for the benefit of the whole people. It thus can be argued that if these marginal areas, seaward, are incapable of being formed into States, Federal ownership and control should be maintained over these lands. As was stated by the Court in the *California* case (332 U. S. 19, at p. 37)—

> We are not persuaded to transplant the Pollard rule of ownership as an incident of State sovereignty in relation to inland waters out into the soil beneath the ocean, so much more a matter of national concern. If this rationale of the Pollard case is a valid basis for a conclusion that paramount rights run to the States in inland waters to the shoreward of the low-water mark, the same rationale leads to the conclusion that national interests, responsibilities, and therefore natural rights are paramount in waters lying to the seaward in the 3-mile belt. Cf. *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corp.*, 229 U. S. 304, 316; *United States* v. *Cousby*, 328 U. S. 256.

Thus, while the general authority of the Congress to dispose of property belonging to the United States is not questioned, its authority to dispose of the title to the beds lying seaward of the low-water mark is open to serious question. This is due chiefly to the character or nature of the property involved. The role of the Federal Government with respect to these lands is similar to the role of the State of Illinois with respect to the property involved in the case of *Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387). The Court said in that case:

> The State holds the title to the lands under the navigable waters of Lake Michigan within its limits in the same manner that the State holds title to soils under tidewater, by the common law, we have already shown and that title necessarily carries with it control over the waters above them whenever the lands are subjected to use. But it is a title different in character from that which the State holds in lands intended for sale. It is different from the title which the United States holds in the public lands which are open to preemption and sale.

THE CHARACTER OF THE PROPERTY INVOLVED

In the first case to be presented to the Supreme Court on the issue of the paramount right to the submerged lands—*U. S.* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19 (1947))—the Supreme Court noted the unusual character of the property here involved. Indeed, the Supreme Court's decision in the California case can be said to rest primarily on the unusual nature of this property and the subsequent decisions involving the State of Louisiana and Texas—*U. S.* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699 (1950)); *U. S.* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707 (1950))—reaffirmed the Court's position in that regard. The Court in the California case stated at page 34:

> Not only has acquisition, as it were, of the 3-mile belt been accomplished by the National Government but protection and control of it has been and is a function of national external sovereignty.

The Court explained what it meant by "national external sovereignty" by saying that a government next to the sea must be able to protect itself from dangers incident to its location. It must have powers of dominion and regulation in the interest of its revenues, its health, and the security of its people from wars waged on or to near its coast—*U. S.* v. *California* (332 U. S. 1935).

The statement of the Court reveals a character inherent in the property under discussion which is not common to other property which the United States Government may hold. Here the Court affirms the intangible nature of this property which represents a portion of the security of the people from wars to be waged from outside sources. Unlike any other property, the 3-mile belt becomes a barrier erected for the purpose of national security, and for the benefit of all of the people of the United States. It is most important that we recognize this intangible feature attendant to this property as distinguished from other public lands and property owned by the United States which may be sold at the dictates of Congress.

The ocean, even its 3-mile belt, is thus of vital consequence to the Nation in its desire to engage in commerce and to live in peace with the world; it also becomes of crucial importance should it ever again become impossible to preserve that peace. And as peace and world commerce are the paramount responsibilities of the Nation, rather than an individual State, so, if wars come, they must be fought by the Nation—(*U. S.* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 35)).

Thus, even in its first decision on the issue of paramount rights to the submerged lands, the Supreme Court recognized the inescapable fact that these lands beneath the sea are closely related to the national external sovereignty, and by that very characteristic, are to be distinguished from other property belonging to the United States.

This proposition was reiterated by the Court in the Louisiana case cited earlier. Mr. Justice Douglas, in the majority opinion, wrote:

> The claim to our 3-mile belt was first asserted by the National Government. Protection and control of the area are indeed functions of national external sovereignty, (332 U. S. pp. 31–34). The marginal sea is a national, not a State concern. National interests, national responsibilities, national concerns are involved. The problems of commerce, national defense, relations with other powers, war and peace focus there. National rights must therefore be paramount in that area (*U. S.* v. *Louisiana*, at p. 704).

Mr. President, I might add that I thoroughly examined the proposed measure. I did so, Mr. President, because I noticed in the Evening Star of April 27, 1953, a headline reading as follows: "Net Farm Income Expected To Be Lowest Since 1941—Agriculture Department Sees Prices for Products Falling Faster Than Costs."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, which is a short one, appearing on the front page of the Washington Star, may be printed in the RECORD at this point, in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NET FARM INCOMES EXPECTED TO BE AT LOWEST SINCE 1941—AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT SEES PRICES FOR PRODUCTS FALLING FASTER THAN COSTS

(By James E. Roper)

The Agriculture Department predicted today that farmers will be worse off this year than at any time since 1941—even though most of the Nation's economy is booming.

The Department said farmers will net about $14.3 billion this year. This is $1 billion less than in 1952.

"The purchasing power of this income would be the lowest since 1941," the Agriculture Department said.

The farm net is dropping because prices farmers receive are falling faster than the prices they pay.

STIFFENING PRICES SEEN

The Agriculture Department, however, sees stiffening prices because of the Nation's general prosperity.

"Economic activity is at record rates with output of factories and mines at postwar highs," the Department said in a regular survey of the demand and price situation.

"Employment, incomes and retail sales are at record levels. Moreover, reports by both consumers and businessmen are generally optimistic regarding investment and spending plans for 1953 and total Government outlays probably will not change much from current levels.

"These prospects suggest that economic activity, employment and income will continue high in 1953."

QUANTITY TO STAY SAME

The Department expects demand from American consumers of farm products probably to continue high, demand from foreign countries to stay about as it is now, and farmers to market about the same quantity of products this year as last year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot yield. I have only an hour.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask whether the Senator contends that where a boundary is defined in the Great Lakes, the land inside that line belongs to the State.

Mr. LANGER. It belongs to the State.

I thank the distinguished Senator for asking that question. The Senator from Michigan is a very distinguished constitutional lawyer. For many years we have been seat mates on the Judiciary Committee. The Senator did a very fine job on that committee. I enjoyed very much working with him on the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it remained for the Court in the decision of United States against Texas, cited above, to establish the inextricable adhesion of the submerged lands to the national sovereignty. In that decision the Court states—339 United States Reports 719:

> And so although dominium and imperium are normally separable and separate, this is an instance where property interests are so subordinated to the rights of sovereignty as to follow sovereignty.

And later on the same page:

> Property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign.

And further:

> Unless any claim or title which the Republic of Texas had to the marginal sea is subordinated to this full paramount power of the United States on admission, there is or may be in practical effect a subtraction in favor of Texas from the national sovereignty of the United States.

From these decisions of the United States Supreme Court, two considerations clearly emerge. One is that the conveyance of the title and ownership of the submerged lands would involve the transfer of a portion of the national sovereignty to a few coastal States. The other consideration which is readily apparent from these decisions is that such a transfer of sovereignty would upset the equality of political rights and sovereignty of the several States obtained upon their admission by virtue of the "equal footing" clause in the enabling act authorizing the formation of State governments.

One writer, whose summation appears in the Temple Law Quarterly, volume 24, page 378, 1950–51, viewed the decision similarly, for he wrote:

> The Court rejected the contention that dominium and imperium were separable, on the grounds the property interests involved were so subordinate to natural political rights as to coalesce and be united in national sovereignty. This conclusion also was reached by applying the equal-footing principle. The alternative to the equal-footing concept would result in contracting national sovereignty in favor of Texas and granting superiority over other States.

This view is clearly supported by the statement in the majority opinion in the Texas case—supra, page 719—that—

> The equal-footing clause prevents extension of the sovereignty of a State into a domain of political and sovereign power of the United States from which the other States have been excluded. Just as it prevents a contraction of sovereignty (*Pollard's Lease* v. *Hagan*, supra) which would produce inequality among the States.

An "equal footing" clause was incorporated in the enabling act admitting Tennessee to the Union—2 statutes 847—and similar phraseology has been inserted in all the admission acts since that date. See, for example, Missouri, 3 statutes 645; Mississippi, 3 statutes 472; Indiana, 3 statutes 399; Illinois, 3 statutes 536.

This guarantee of equal footing is not a guarantee of economic quality, but it has long been held to have a direct effect on property rights—United States against Texas, cited above. For example, it has long been the rule that the States have "absolute property in and dominion and sovereignty over the soils under the tide waters" since the original States possessed such rights after the formation of the Union and States which have been admitted subsequently acquired the same rights, sovereignty and jurisdiction as the original States possessed by virtue of the equal footing clause—see *Knight* v. *United States Land Association* (142 U. S. 161 (1891)).

The equal-footing clause was, however, designed to create a parity as respects political standing and sovereignty—U. S. against Texas, at page 716—and the provisions of the enabling acts and State constitutions on this issue form a compact between the States and the United States—*Stearns* v. *Minnesota* (179 U. S. 223 (1900)).

Equal footing among the States cannot be maintained under these statements of the Court, if title to the submerged lands is to be transferred to a few coastal States.

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AS TRUSTEE

The character of this property leads logically to the question of the manner in which this property is held by the United States and the relation which the possessor bears to the States collectively and the people for whose benefit it is held.

As hereinbefore stated in the California case, not only has acquisition of the 3-mile belt been accomplished by the National Government, but protection and control of it is a function of national external sovereignty.

Sovereign right, as defined in Black's Law Dictionary, third edition, is as follows:

> A right which the State alone, or some of its governmental agencies, can possess, and which it possesses in the character of a sovereign, for the common benefit and to enable it to carry out its proper functions.

It, therefore, appears that where the protection and control is a function of national external sovereignty, it is a function and control for the benefit of all. In other words, a trust relationship arises wherein the United States holds the 3-mile belt by its sovereign right and for the benefit of all of the people.

The nature of the property, which distinguishes it from property owned in fee, is discussed in *Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387). The Court stated that—

> The title to the land under the navigable waters of Lake Michigan is a title held in trust for the people of the State that they may enjoy the navigation of the waters, carry on commerce over them, and have liberty of fishing therein freed from the obstruction or interference of private parties. The interest of the people in the navigation of the waters and in commerce over them may be improved in many instances by the erection of wharves, docks, and piers therein, for which purpose the State may grant parcels of the submerged lands. And, so long as their disposition is made for such purpose, no valid objections can be made to the grants. * * * But that is a very different doctrine from the one which would sanction the abdication of the general control of the State over lands under the navigable waters of an entire harbor or bay, or of a sea or lake.
>
> Such abdication is not consistent with the exercise of that trust which requires the Government of the State to preserve such waters for the use of the public. The trust devolving upon the State for the public, and which can only be discharged by the management and control of property in which the public has an interest, cannot be relinquished by a transfer of the property. The control of the State for the purposes of the trust can never be lost, except as to such parcels as are used in promoting the interests of the public therein, or can be disposed of without any substantial impairment of the public interest in the lands and waters remaining. It is only by observing the distinction between a grant of such parcels for the improvement of the public interest, or which when occupied do not substantially impair the public interest in the lands and waters remaining, and a grant of the whole property in which the public is interested, that the language of the adjudged cases can be reconciled. * * * A grant of all the lands under the navigable waters of a State has never been adjudged to be within the legislative power: And any attempted grant of the kind would be held, if not absolutely void on its face, as subject to revocation.

The above case, which is quoted somewhat at length, shows clearly the trust relationship that exists between a State and the people. It is established that the Government of the United States exercises possession and control over the 3-mile belt for the benefit of the United States as a whole, so that the distinction between its position over such property is not different from the relationship which existed between the State of Illinois and the people of that State in the Illinois Central case.

The Court, in the Illinois Central case, went on to point out that—

> The decisions are numerous which declare that such property is held by the State, by virtue of its sovereignty, in trust for the public. The ownership of the navigable waters of the harbor and of the lands under them is a subject of public concern to the whole people of the State. The trust with which they are held, therefore, is governmental and cannot be alienated, except in those instances mentioned of parcels used in the improvement of the interest thus held, or when parcels can be disposed of without detriment to the public interest in the lands and waters remaining.

It will be noted that such property is held by the State by virtue of its sovereignty in trust for the public so that the character of the property, together with the use for which it is held, establishes the trust relationship. The 3-mile belt, as has been decided in previous cases, is held by the Government for the revenue, the health, and the security of its people from wars waged on or too near its coast.

There is a definite obligation of the United States Government to hold that property for those purposes. Any measure which would, in any way, interfere with such obligation would be a relinquishment or abandonment of the trust.

> The State can no more abdicate its trust over property in which the whole people are interested, like navigable waters and soils

under them, so as to leave them entirely under the use and control of private parties, except in the instances of parcels, et cetera, * * * than it can abdicate its police powers in the administration of Government and the preservation of peace (*Illinois Central R. R.* v. *Illinois*, cited *supra*).

And likewise in *People* v. *Kirk* (45 N. E. 830), it is stated:

Title to and dominion over lands beneath the navigable waters of the Great Lakes are in the States respectively, within whose boundaries such lands are located, each State holding the fee thereof in trust for the people for the purpose of navigation and fishing. * * * It is true that the State, holding the title to the lands covered by the waters of Lake Michigan does not hold such title subject to barter and sale, as does the United States its public lands: But the State holds the title in trust in its sovereign capacity for the people of the entire State, for the purposes of navigation and fishing. The governmental powers of the State over these lands cannot be relinquished or given away. The trust imposed upon the State must be kept and faithfully observed.

The United States of America holds no different position as to the 3-mile belt of coastline of the United States than does the State heretofore discussed in its ownership of the beds of Lake Michigan. The property herein dealt with must be considered to be held by the United States Government in trust for the benefit of all its people and, to relinquish to any particular State or States its sovereignty, would be to violate the trust heretofore imposed.

CONCLUSION

From an analysis of these cases, it must be clear that any legislation by the Congress which would diminish the collective sovereignty of the United States would violate the Constitution. It must also be clear that legislation which would increase the political rights and sovereignty of a few States at the expense of the others would be a violation of the equal-footing compact between the Nation and the States which it admitted to the Union. Senate Joint Resolution 13 would also violate the trust relationship existing between the United States as a governmental unit and the people of the Nation who constitute the true beneficiaries of the trust, for the trust contemplates this 3-mile belt as a unit of protection for all the people of the United States, for which the Government is always responsible to the people and which it may not relinquish.

The property involved in Senate Joint Resolution 13 is so intrinsically different from that ordinarily transferred by the Federal Government that it cannot be constitutionally transferred by virtue of the delegated authority of article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution.

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH AND COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED BY SENATOR MORSE IN OPPOSITION TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mr. Irving Dillard, whom I regard as one of the greatest newspapermen in America, and who is the editor of what I consider to be the greatest newspaper in America, insofar as objectivity both of news reporting and inspiration of editorial content is concerned, sent to me the galley proof of the lead editorial which was published in yesterday's—Sunday's—edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. It is my pleasure, Mr. President, to ask that the editorial be printed as a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD. It deals with the fight the little band of liberals have put up in opposition to the pending measure. The title of the editorial is "A Lot Has Been Gained." In behalf of the opponents of the pending measure, I wish to express our deep appreciation to Mr. Irving Dillard for the analysis both of the pending measure and of the position of opponents of the measure, as set forth in the editorial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LOT HAS BEEN GAINED

As agreed last week, the Senate will vote Tuesday afternoon on the Holland bill to establish title to offshore oil lands in the States. There is little, if any, question as to the outcome. Judging by the tests on amendments, the vote will be overwhelmingly for handing over this great natural resource to Texas, Louisiana, and California—at the expense of the taxpayers in the 45 other States.

What, then, was the good of the month-long fight of some 25 Senators—approximately one-fourth of the membership—against the giveaway bill? What has been achieved?

The answer is that a lot has been gained. As Senators HUMPHREY and DOUGLAS and HILL and ANDERSON have spoken and been succeeded on the floor by Senators LEHMAN, FULBRIGHT, MORSE, KEFAUVER, and others, countless citizens have come to know for the first time what is involved. From all parts of the country they have sent their protests to Washington. These citizens know now who is for giving away their heritage and who is fighting to save that heritage from exploitation.

The record has been made and it will be referred to time and again. This record will be an issue in the midterm election next year. It will be a factor in the court tests that will follow congressional action. Let those who will dismiss the heroic effort in the Senate as a "talkathon" or even as a "filibuster." The fact is that this has been one of the most important debates in the history of the Nation, conducted on a high plane and without delay to the work of Congress.

This last statement is at variance with comments by newspaper writers and radio commentators. It is at variance with President Eisenhower's letter to Senator ANDERSON. It is at variance with remarks such as that of David Lawrence, editor of U. S. News & World Report, namely: "Congress has been delayed in getting started on important legislation at this session because a minority in the Senate have carried on a filibuster."

What the facts are can be judged from an exchange between the Post-Dispatch and the New York headquarters of the Associated Press. Last Wednesday a news summary of the Associated Press said the offshore oil debate "has been blocking consideration of other important legislation."

Whereupon the Post-Dispatch asked the Associated Press for a list of bills ready for Senate action and being delayed by presentation of the case against the oil bill. Several messages were exchanged in the course of 3 days. Finally the Associated Press reported that "Hawaiian statehood, reciprocal trade and supplemental appropriation bills" were "expected to clear committees momentarily," but conceded that there was no log-jam.

We are pleased to report this correction by the Associated Press. For it is bad enough to have Majority Leader TAFT and others who know better talking about a log-jam that does not exist. But is infinitely worse when news facilities—on which the people must depend for accurate information—fall for such patent propaganda.

If any further evidence is needed that a lot of hokum has been pumped out to the country about delay to the Eisenhower program, it can be found in the leading item in the current Newsweek's Periscope. Newsweeks say that GOP leaders are worrying because they have done so little to advance administration bills and that Hawaiian statehood is being moved up on the agenda, in effect, to make this situation look better.

Since the GOP-controlled Senate committees have no bills of consequence ready to pass, the majority leadership actually owes the opponents of offshore oil giveaway a vote of appreciation for using time that otherwise would have been almost entirely wasted. But the greatest debt of all to the 25 Senators is the one owed by the American people.

This fight already has a sure place in history. And what is lost now can be won back in the future.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain other letters, telegrams, and editorials in support of the position which I have taken in opposition to the pending measure.

There being no objection, the letters, telegrams, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALM BEACH, FLA., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: I cannot resist the impulse to write you a note of congratulation upon the fine public service you rendered in the tidelands matter.

Of course you were eternally right and the manner in which you handled your part in the debate, including your last great speech, is quite beyond praise.

The whole episode will live in history. Your wisdom, foresight, and statesmanship will not be forgotten. I hope the vindication will come before it is too late. In any event you have spoken—and spoken greatly—in behalf of millions of your countrymen.

With high regards,

Sincerely,

HOMER CUMMINGS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We want you to know that we are with you 100 percent on your stand on the tidelands oil debate. We believe this revenue could be very well used for the schools or on the national debt. We have always approved of your stand on controversial legislation and wish that we could say as much for the senior Senator of Oregon. Hope to vote for you again in 1956.

Yours truly,

ALBERT F. KITTRELL.
NANCY C. KITTRELL.

SALEM, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I would like to let you know that we certainly appreciate your efforts on account of

the tidelands oil bill. We do hope your fight against State ownership will be successful and we can assure you that there are lots of strong backers of your endeavor to fight this devastating bill.

Thank you for your tremendous effort.

Yours very truly,

ALICE H. BERGMAN.

DEXTER, OREG.

DEAR SIR: We are very much pleased and appreciative of your great efforts to gain a strong opposition to tidelands oil going to the States. We feel you have proved to be one man we can depend on to vote right and fight for the right consistently.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. FRED HAYES.

SALEM, OREG., *April 28, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator From Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is conceivable that the snide editorial comment concerning your tactics in attempting to let the people know about the oil potential giveaway does not represent the thinking of the people. In the nature of things I do not have many contacts, but from those who have not been bored by my opinion in the matter, I have had considerable favorable comment and agreement that your efforts are not and will not be entirely in vain, and as futile as some of the newspaper editors would like to make it appear.

In fact I have listened to comment about you which refutes much of the earlier criticism of your repudiation of the Eisenhower group and its works. I believe people are waking up to the fact that we didn't do so good in putting the reactionaries, tories, and downright fascists in power.

You have a thankless task, as of now, but your reward will come when we are fully awake to what is being put over and what they intend to put over, this giveaway oil deal being only the beginning.

Very sincerely yours,

C. B. WALKER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 29, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for the recent effort you made to save the tidelands oil for the benefit of all the people of the United States. At least we can be sure of one Senator who is not afraid to take a stand for the right.

C. J. and MARTHA GATES.

MONROE, OREG., *May 1, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: I am opposed to State ownership of tidelands.

Yours truly,

F. S. CRAMER.

REEDSPORT, OREG., *May 2, 1953.*

WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon:

Please accept our heartfelt if late congratulations for the real effort you are making in behalf of the interests of the huge majority of citizens. The so-called tidelands oil question is only the beginning for those who have no regard for conserving our natural resources. We in the lumbering industry can see clearly the pattern which a few zealous profiteers are foisting off onto the general public and we are fearful that the next step will swallow the fast diminishing timber resources which provides the bulk of the west coast with its livelihood. There is no question of government which in its rendering would revert to the extortionate advantage of the few at the direct or indirect expense of the many.

W. I. HARRIS,
Business Agent, IWA Local 140, CIO.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 27, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I congratulate you on the hard courageous battle you are fighting for so many people.

I feel it is an honor and a great privilege to be able to send you my very sincere thanks for all you are doing.

I will not bother you with a long letter. But I want you to know that you are one of the very few great men that I admire.

I am a very poor letter writer but a good listener.

Respectfully yours,

E. L. SUMMERS.

SALEM, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to congratulate you for your stand on the offshore oil bill. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. R. T. RUSSELL.

ALBANY, OREG., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SIR: I think most people like what you are doing, because they believe you are really trying for the best.

Yours truly,

MRS. ELEANOR MCCARTHY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE. I want you to know that my wife and I appreciate the stand which you have taken in regard to the tidelands oil giveaway. We wish you every success in defeating the attempts of the administration to give away not only the tidelands oil but also other natural resources of the Nation which are the birthright of all the American people.

Sincerely,

ERVIN F. SAUER.

SALEM, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have more friends today than yesterday. The folks of your State are learning to admire your courage, stamina, and vision.

I have talked with many and they are beginning to ask what they can do to help. They are certain that they do not want their children's inheritance in submerged oil resources given away.

With the highest personal regards.

Your friend,

ROY R. HEWITT.

EUGENE, OREG., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A number of us in this neck of the woods have been discussing the offshore oil reserves and are happy to learn that you are right on your toes, and right in there fighting the giveaway Holland bill.

I would like to take this opportunity to assure you that you have our approval and best wishes for success in that battle.

Very truly yours,

E. F. KELLER
(Not the insurance E. F. Keller.)

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 2, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I are very pleased with the strong stand you have taken against the tidelands or more properly offshore oil bill. It is indeed unfortunate that it takes a marathon speech such as yours to put this vital issue on page 1 of our newspapers.

Sincerely,

FRANK A. BAUMAN.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF PAPER MAKERS,
OREGON CITY LOCAL NO. 166,
Oregon City, Oreg., May 2, 1953.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Local No. 166 of the Internations. Brotherhood of Paper Makers at Oregon City, Oreg., wishes to congratulate you on your efforts to defeat the tidelands oil bill which is being debated in the United States Senate. We think you have the interests of the State of Oregon, and the people of the Nation, in your heart in this issue.

With best wishes and good will,

Sincerely yours,

PAUL D. BURNUM,
Recording Secretary, Local No. 166.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your courageous fight against the tidelands oil bill is to be highly commended.

We are certainly glad that there are at least a few men in Washington who represent the public instead of the special interests.

Keep up the good work.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. A. H. KERR.

MEDFORD, OREG., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your vigorous stand on the tidelands issue, and your part in opposing the Holland giveaway bill. Your stand certainly meets with our approval.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. J. BOYCE KELLOGG.

CORVALLIS, OREG., *May 1, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You certainly have my good wishes in your work for saving underwater lands and also for the Hells Canyon Dam.

It truly seems to me your ideas in regard to them are right. I wish you success.

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE L. BERKELEY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily approve your stand on Hill-Anderson bill.

Mr. and Mrs. EDWARD HANEY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: More power to you for your gallant stand on the tidelands oil issue. It is, indeed, a national resource.

We are ashamed of our Portland Chamber of Commerce for their treatment of you.

B. W. BORDEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your presence in the United States Senate makes me proud to be an Oregonian. You are setting a high standard for future servants of the State.

May I commend you on your tidelands stand? Because of such as you, in the end the people will win.

I extend to you genuine admiration and remain

Very truly yours,

MRS. HELEN OLDHAM CAMPBELL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my appreciation for the courageous fight you are making against the tidelands-oil bill. Your action is a bright spot in a black political picture. This plundering of our national resources must be stopped. You are fighting our battle and we shall remember it at election time. Keep up the good work, we are with you.

Respectfully,

H. A. RUSSELL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 26, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Heartiest congratulations on your excellent speech in defense of the tidelands oil. The present administration is striving to undo the conservation policies of Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt and hand over the Nation's vital resources for exploitation by greedy corporations.

I sincerely hope that Americans all over the country will write to their Representatives in Congress endorsing the stand you have taken.

Take good care of your health, Senator, your country needs you now more than ever.

With very best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

GEORGE H. HORNE.

BEAVERCREEK, OREG., *April 28, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just completed letters to Senators CORDON and TAFT voicing disapproval of their stand on the giveaway oil bill. Now I want to thank you for your work in the interest of the State of Oregon as well as the entire Nation. Your marathon speech was drastic action, but entirely justified. I doubt whether it will stop the giveaway, but at least you will have done your best, and the voters will do the rest in 1954. It is like I wrote Senator TAFT, "Pass that bill and you will be minority leader in 1954."

Now I want to voice my general approval of your policies during and since the last election campaign. I know that you must have taken terrific abuse both from your constituents, and from your fellow legislators, but your voting record in my opinion speaks for itself, and therefore should be of great satisfaction to you. I understand that your mail has been more approvals than disapprovals, but thousands of your supporters like myself have been too lazy to write. We will be around to mark an "X" by WAYNE MORSE on election day in 1956.

By the way, is there any way that we can have a "Wayne Morse Independent" on the ticket in 1954? I would like to see a solid bloc in the Senate from Oregon, not so much in political party as in voting record. Think it over; perhaps we can get you some help in 1954.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL C. SCHMIDT.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have tried to write this letter for several days. I have to keep such long hours trying to make my small business pay that it doesn't leave me much time to write letters.

On behalf of our four children Jimmy, Johnny (twins age 5½ years), Judy (age 2), and Jeff (aged 3 months), my wife and myself, in particular, wish to thank you from the bottom of our hearts for the courageous and record-breaking stand you took on the Hill-Anderson bill.

The very partisan papers out here didn't give it the space they should have, but we know and have made it a point to point it out to our neighbors.

We have also noticed your omission from several dinners and parties lately. We have also read that you are the loneliest man in Washington. We doubt this.

We are with you in spirit if not able to be there personally.

We would consider it an honor if you would have dinner with us in our home the next time you are in Portland. We have a new home, and we'll give you the best turkey dinner you've ever had. We appreciate what you are doing.

Truly yours,

C. S. JOHNNY JOHNSTON.

P. S.—Is it possible to subscribe to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? Have you been appointed to a committee yet, or is it still the "committee of the whole"? Doesn't the "Big Deal" think we're entitled to representation?

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on the stand you have taken on the tidelands bill. You are doing a splendid job. Keep the good work up. We are cheering for you.

We think the Republicans were very poor sports to pull you off your two committees. But we think they have won you many votes.

You can count on two votes here in 1956.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. RALPH L. CARSON.
RALPH L. CARSON.

PORTLAND OREG., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SENATOR: Have been noticing your most courageous battle to date, your most recent personal marathon of 23 hours on the Senate floor against the Holland bill, and the very least I can say is that you should have every citizen in this United States on your side. As far as I am concerned, mostly President Eisenhower's official acts have been far too full of big business bonanzas.

Have already written President D. David Eisenhower to veto that Holland bill and anything else that faintly resembles it.

Yours for real courageous leadership for all the people all over the world.

Mr. C. M. BROUGHT.

PORTLAND, OREG.

SENATOR MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

We want the tidelands oil saved for our schools and know that you will vote to help them rather than the big oil interests.

MARY E. MASON.
A. H. MASON.

EUGENE, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR: I hope you vote in favor of the Government to retain control of submerged oil tidelands.

Yours truly,

PAUL NUSS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily approve your stand on Hill-Anderson bill.

Mr. and Mrs. HENRY KUTTER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 26, 1953.*

DEAR SIR: Courage, intelligence, integrity. From the bottom of my heart, I admire you as one of the few "men," one of the great leaders of our country.

Sincerely,

BEN T. GRAY.
ANNE GRAY.

MEDFORD, OREG., *April 27, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: Just a word of thanks to you for your sincere efforts to save the submerged oil lands for all the people of this United States of America.

Yours truly,

O. M. OSTLUND.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for the wonderful job you did in bringing to the people the true facts about the tidelands-oil controvery.

I have been with you all along and admire you as a truly courageous man.

Most sincerely,

BETTY METZ.

REEDSPORT, OREG., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing to congratulate you on your stand on the Holland giveaway oil bill, as well as to say we admire and appreciate your efforts to serve the Nation, as well as the people of Oregon. We are sure the time is fast approaching when your critics, both here and in Washington, D. C., will realize that Senator MORSE, of Oregon, is an American first and a politician second.

The best of luck to you.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. T. W. MCMAHON.

TURNER, OREG.

Congratulations.

W. J. REASONER.

WALDPORT, OREG., *April 26, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my approval of your stand on and continued opposition to the turning over to a few States our great God-given resource lying under the ocean. I have followed the so-called tidelands-oil question very closely and carefully considered it both pro and con as presented on radio and in publications and fail to see any justice in doing what the present administration, backed by a large portion of the Congress, proposes.

How can our elected representatives justify their action when these wealthy resources used for the benefit of all the people, for defense, and for education as the Hill bill proposes, could be of so much benefit to the whole Nation in raising the educational level of our citizenry, for no nation can be greater than its people.

Our own State needs so much in the way of more schools, more educational facilities, and our property is taxed as much as it can stand.

While I do not believe in the filibuster, I heartily approve of your using it since it is the rule of the Senate, and I do not see why it should not be used, thus calling attention of the people to the facts about this great God-given resource, and I sincerely hope Congress will be bombarded with protests.

I have sent one to Senator CORDON.

Best wishes for your continued fight for the rights of the people.

Sincerely yours,

MINNIE MCFARLAND.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 27, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your valiant fight for oil for all the people.

The "big deal" is wanting to sell all of us down the river.

Hastily,

H. D. WILLITS.

MEDFORD, OREG., *April 28, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are happy to read of your recent talkathon regarding the offshore oil. May you keep up the good work.

We have written a letter of protest to the Hon. GUY CORDON, as our little part in this battle.

We think that a dangerous precedent is in the making, it could well be the national forests in the next banknight.

Once again we urge you to keep up the good work.

Yours very truly,

C. A. LUSK.
MARION C. LUSK.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 24, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations to you for your stand on the "big boys" oil grab, if we lose this one we stand to lose for years to come.

Mr. Frank Edwards keeps us posted here and we are following this bill with great interest.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM A. TURNSTALL.

PORTLAND OREG., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my gratitude for your magnificent defense of the property of the American people in the offshore oil deal.

It is hard to understand why the heirs to the party of Abraham Lincoln could be so hell bent on looting the public domain, emasculating all the Government regulatory bodies set up in the public interest, and in general ignoring the common people whom he loved and respected.

We are proud that the strongest voice condemning this trend come from you and that you come from Oregon.

Respectfully yours,

R. S. PICKETT.

PROSPECT, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

Attention WAYNE MORSE:

Our support on the tidelands bill. Please keep fighting.

HELEN HUFFMAN,
Republican.
WILLARD HUFFMAN,
Democrat.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 25, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Report of one constituent who still approves of what you are doing and especially to commend your effort to save the offshore oil for all the people.

Sincerely,

EDWARD G. PORTS.

FLOSSMOOR, ILL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have done an excellent job in fighting the tidelands-oil bill. You are to be praised, along with the other Senators who have fought this give away.

You may lose on this issue, but your fight will make it harder to give away any of our other natural resources.

A. F. SCHWARZ.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily approve your stand on Hill-Anderson bill.

MRS. H. A. MCINTYRE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept our best wishes and support of your fight against the Holland bill and for the Hill-Anderson bill.

We believe you are doing a great service, not only to Oregon, but to our whole Nation.

We are registered Democrats, but you can count on our vote in 1956.

Sincerely,

LAURENCE L. MOORE.
DONALD J. MOORE.
GOLDIE L. MOORE.

ALBANY, N. Y., *May 2, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

With many Republicans I agree with the New York Times that proposed oil giveaway is wrong in principle and dangerous in practice and should be defeated.

LAWRENCE MCKINNEY.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May 2, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Thanks for your courageous effort to educate the public on tidelands issue.

T. B. BENNETT.

KALISPELL, MONT., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read your great speech in defense of our national resources and I wish to express my heartfelt thanks that there are such men as yourself, however pitifully few, in the Senate of the United States.

If the spoilers are successful in this monumental steal of our national resources, it will indeed be a black day for our people.

Keep up your good work. We are behind you, and we shall forever be grateful that you recognize the true meaning of these attempts to rob the people of that which is rightfully theirs.

Sincerely yours,

CARL RYDBERG.

VAN NUYS, CALIF., *April 26 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My congratulations on your splendid fight against the pending tidelands oil bill. I think your position the correct one, that offshore oil does, and should belong to all our people, and that the Federal Government is the logical guardian and administrator of this trust.

Sincerely,

HARRY H. GIDEL.

BIRMINGHAM, MICH., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your stand on the Holland bill and for your efforts in behalf of the people on the tidelands oil giveaway.

Sincerely yours,

CLEVELAND WALCUTT.
LUCILE WALCUTT.

DECATUR, ILL., *April 29, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are students in the eighth grade who wish to thank you for the splendid speech you made about the offshore oil bill.

Thank you.

Doris Waller, Terry Wright, Eugene Dale Snyder, Dean Roberts, Donald Butler, Charles Maple, Ray Kendall, Carol Kite, Sheila Suhl, Sharon Boyd, Judson McClellan, John Nugent, Donna Montague, Doris Leinard, Shirley Carter, Tom Flanders, Karan Kunzman, Judy Priser, Ted Marshall, Enoch Johnson, J. D. Giles, Iris Patrick, Sharon Roarick.

PRINCETON, N. J., *April 29, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your great effort on the tidelands oil bill. And thank you for being the real independent you are. I thought your campaign speeches very important and enlightening, and I follow news of you from day to day with great interest.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR C. HOLMES
Mrs. D. W.

EAST ORANGE, N. J.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations for your magnificent filibuster. I regret that State lines prevent me from voting for you. Thank you for your effort.

HARRY W. ZUTZ, M. D.

APRIL 26, 1953.

DEAR SIR: May I humbly thank you for all you are trying to do on behalf of the people of this country in your present fight on the oil grab.

Your 22-hour talk was a great service to all the little people of the United States.

Sincerely,

FRED J. LINNETZ.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 29, 1953.*

HON. Senator MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our country is most fortunate in having a man like you in the Senate. Please accept my deepest appreciation for your ceaseless efforts in trying to do what is right.

Sincerely,

PAUL T. VOEGELI.

WAYNE, NEBR., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for your ardent efforts to defeat the tidelands oil bill and your other liberal and constructive efforts. Unfortunately the people do not get good news coverage on issues.

Sincerely,

VERNA ELEFSON.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Not only the good citizens of the State of Oregon but all of us who believe in government in the general interest are fortunate to have such an able representative as yourself in the United States Senate.

Your 22½-hour talk against the administration's offshore oil giveaway was a magnificent effort. Even the San Francisco Chronicle carried 17 lines devoted to the gist of your argument (on p. 31 of the second news section in their Sunday edition). I have just written them my congratulations in performing such a service for their readers.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD MUFFLEY.

JAMAICA, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am in favor of your rejection of the tidelands oil for the States. Please continue your fight. Thank you.

Respectfully,

MRS. HERMAN HALBERT.

SEATTLE, WASH.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to thank you as far as words can for the valiant fight you put up against the tidelands oil bill.

Mr. and Mrs. HERMAN BOHN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR: Please continue your fight against the tidelands oil bill.

ROGER KRESS.

TACOMA, WASH., *April 27, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Allow me to offer you my congratulations on your record marathon talk in the Senate on the question of the offshore oil rights giveaway. It was a magnificent job and done in a most worthy cause.

I am a linotype operator employed on the local monopoly press. Before your talk the offshore-oil debate got only the most meager mention on the inside pages. But your effort compelled them to give it a front-page coverage, complete with your picture and all. However, still not much of the real arguments or issues were given. This, of course, has become standard practice in the one-party press over the last decade. But your effort did show the people that something big was going on and will make them curious to find out more of what it is all about. Perhaps a few letters to the editors will force the presentation of some of the real facts on the issue.

Your courageous step in renouncing the ultrareactionary Republican national ticket last year is another point on which I want to commend you. From a practical political standpoint I can understand what you are up against. However, it must be a considerable compensation to realize you are the most free of any Senator in Washington to follow the dictates of your own conscience. And I am optimist enough to believe that such a unique position may yet prove to pay off in the long run at the polls. A lot of disillusioned voters can be created in the next 4 years.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. COLEMAN.

SAN MATEO, CALIF., *April 26, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Out here in California there is only the barest trickle of news of what you and your liberal associates are doing to block the giveaway of the people's offshore oil rights. But I for one know full well the kind of fight it is, and words cannot express my admiration for your courage and tenacity.

You have right and justice on your side, and I hope you will hold out as long as possible, because as soon as the facts are made known there can be no doubt as to which way the American people as a whole would choose.

As a Californian, and a resident of one of the have rather than have-not States, my view is simply expressed: No matter who drills or who owns, I would rather have the rules made in Washington rather than in Sacramento.

Sincerely,

LOUIS W. JONES.

IOWA CITY, IOWA, *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish at this time to take formal membership in that growing group of American citizens who consider you their Senator because you so often represent their wishes better than the Senators from their own States may be doing.

Specifically, I would like to commend both the courage and glowing good health which made it possible for you to deliver your speech of considerable length against the tidelands oil robbery. I have written urgent letters to our Iowa Senators in the hope that they may support your stand when the final vote comes.

Very sincerely yours,

MARY D. SPRINGER
Mrs. Norman Springer.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I regard the great and gallant fight you are making as a just and noble cause. It is my opinion that the noble effort exerted by you and the band of liberals should be prolonged and continued as long as possible. Once the people understand the facts, action on behalf of your stand is inevitable.

I was not acquainted with the true issue involved until reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is impossible to gain an insight into the truth of the situation by reading our daily newspapers. Too few people, as you know, have any conception of the importance of this battle in Congress.

The American people certainly should be grateful to you. Your words have been spoken in the defense of all Americans and even on behalf of generations yet unborn. Time and history will bring vindication and credit to your stand.

Very truly yours,

WILEY THORNTON.

KEW GARDENS, N. Y., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Congratulations on your courageous stand against the offshore oil bill on behalf of all the American people.

May you be the happiest of men and prosper forever.

Sincerely,

WM. FREDERICKSEN.
Mr. and Mrs. WM. FREDERICKSEN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 28, 1953.*

SENATOR MORSE: We need more like you, but there may come a day when the Senate will have to represent a public who are more mature politically than they are now.

Keep up the good work.

As ever,

CARL W. ANDERSON.

BOZEMAN, MONT.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I thank you most sincerely for the excellent fight you have waged against the oil grab. It may seem futile, but surely the people will come gradually to realize the value of this wealth and make some effort to assert their rights.

As a school teacher, I am daily appalled at the lethargy of many of our people. However, we have had liberal moments; maybe we will again.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) FLORENCE B. HESS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to thank you for your great effort to keep tidelands oil in the hands of the Federal Government. I consider this the most important piece of domestic legislation since public lands were given to the railroads and am running a campaign to inform our own renegade Senator, IVES, how the people of New York feel about this.

Sincere good wishes.

Respectfully,

(Mrs.) LOUISE O. KARMAN.

PARK FOREST, ILL., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your inspiring efforts on behalf of Federal control of the tidelands oil.

Cheers for you and our Senator DOUGLAS. Wish we had about 30 more real statesmen like you in the Senate and this would really be a country to be more proud of.

Mrs. A. C. SWIFT.

BERRY ALA., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I want to let you know that our educational workers are deeply grateful for your noble efforts to defeat the administration's tidelands oil measure. God bless and guide you as you strive to equalize educational opportunities for our boys and girls.

Sincerely yours,

JESSIE D. STUDDARD.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: My deepest thanks and gratitude to you and the group of Senators who have so valiantly fought for all the 48 States in the tidal bill case.

There must be millions of other citizens who feel the same as I do.

I hope they write and let themselves be heard.

Gratefully yours,

MAX SCHWARTZ.

PLYMOUTH, MASS., *April 29, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I congratulate you on your wonderful attempt to awaken America to the peril of our losing our public land reserves to the States and probably to the various industries.

I have written my Senators to vote against the tidelands bill when it comes up for a vote.

I wish you much success in your present term in Congress and hope you will be returned to the Senate when your present term expires.

Sincerely yours,

RENATO P. PEDRINI.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just a fan letter to tell you how wonderful it makes me feel to know that there are people like you around. I shall not say "keep up the good work," because I know that you always will.

Sincerely,

ALIDA GREENBERG.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 29, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: The people of America owe you a debt of gratitude for your wonderful defense of their interests.

You are a credit to your constituents, the people of America and the United States Senate.

Congratulations, keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. R. SCHNEER.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 28, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: To know that our country still has among its lawmakers those who stand for righteousness and who

are unafraid to fight the vested interests, gives us great encouragement in these times of uncertainty and strife.

Please know that you have the prayers and thanks of us freedom loving people for your valiant and untiring efforts in this tidelands oil debate.

JAMES G. STALEY.
MARCIA L. STALEY.
DALE W. HUFF.
LILY A. HUFF.
AUDREY A. TAYLOR.
JEANNETTE M. TAYLOR.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 27, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The debate which is now in progress to defeat the proposed transfer of the tidelands-oil lands to the States has our wholehearted approval. We feel that State ownership of their valuable lands would be extremely harmful to the country and the hope that you will continue your fine fight in order to insure continued Federal control.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. ARNOLD LEVIN.

APRIL 29, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to express my sincere appreciation of your efforts, and of those of Senator DOUGLAS, in attempting to defeat the proposed giving of our national tidelands resources to the States. Win or lose, you have waged a most gallant fight for all the people. I salute you, sir.

Very respectfully yours,
JOHN T. R. ANDREWS.

OAK HARBOR, WASH.

DEAR SENATOR: I am behind you 100 percent. This country is terribly lacking in your type of fearless uncompromising spirit.

Thank you for your action on the submerged oil steal.

Yours,
ARCHIE ANDERSON.

MOSES LAKE, WASH., *April 26, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE.

MY DEAR SENATOR. Thanks a million for your long debate on the tideland oil issue. As usual you are voting and fighting right where I think you should and I appreciate your efforts.

I hope you duplicate the late Senator Norris in finally being able to come into your own in a big way.

More power to you and your tribe.

Very truly yours,
HERBERT M. ADAMS.

P. S.—We lived in Portland until recently.

DETROIT, MICH., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Just want to say "Hurrah for you," and I pray to God to send more men like you into our Government. Men that speak for all of the people, and have the courage of their conviction.

God bless you, and do carry on.

Respectfully yours,
CLARA PEIG.

WILMINGTON, N. C., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for the magnificent way in which you carried on the filibuster for the off-shore oil.

You have many admirers in our part of the country.

Very truly yours,
(Miss) REBECCA PLOWDEN.

WATERVILLE, MAINE, *April 28, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I am opposed to the filibuster in principle, I cannot help congratulating you on yours against the submerged lands bill. As long as the filibuster is with us, it might as well be used for good purposes and yours is a good one.

I have written my Senators urging them to vote against the bill.

Sincerely,
JANE S. BIRGE.

BELLROSE, N. Y., *April 26, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My wife and I warmly applaud your courageous effort to prevent a monstrous felony against the interests of the American people.

If you succeed, generations of school children, and the country in general, will be in your debt for the great good revenues from offshore oil can do if applied to public education.

Terrible that our Congress should so flagrantly attempt to supervene not only the repeated ruling of the Supreme Court, but the best interests of the overwhelming majority.

Good luck.

RICHARD MAGAT.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR: Delighted to note in the New York Times that your 22-hour marathon against this tidelands oil grab got headlines on the front page.

I am sorry not to be a citizen of your State so that I could have the privilege of voting for you.

O. DAHLGREN.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Heartiest congratulations on your recent "talkathon" on offshore oil. Countless Americans applaud your courageous stand on this and other vital issues of our day.

All good wishes to the independent Senator from Oregon from an anti-Tammany Democrat.

SUE LISS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have the thanks of the country for your splendid and intelligent battle against giving away the national trusts. You, I believe, arouse millions to a consciousness of what this steal means. A great public service. Keep it up. Remember Senator Norris. For awhile he fought alone, but he prevailed and preserved public power for the Nation.

Sincerely,
THOMAS M. WOODWARD.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

DEAR SENATOR: Wish you every success in your fight against the tidelands steal.

Yours truly,
E. J. FLANAGAN.

AKRON, OHIO.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your heroic stand against the selfish Senators who would take away from the people what is legally theirs. You deserve the gratitude of millions of Americans. I, for one, am your sincere admirer for standing up for what is right.

Yours truly,
JOSEPHINE HINSDALE.

HOBOKEN, N. J., *May 1, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have sent the following to Senators SMITH and HENDRICKSON: "Urge you vote against Holland bill to give away United States offshore oil rights to States. For Hill amendment to retain Federal rights and provide aid to education. For Taft amendment to keep Federal Government title to Continental Shelf outside 3-mile limit.

LOCAL 480, IUE, CIO.
LEO SMITH, *President.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF, *May 1, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your courageous stand as the people's national champion inspires us to send you our protest against tidelands release and dissipation. We urge you back Langer amendment or other means your judgment indicates to preserve Federal rights. You have been a grateful supporter out here. We wish you well.

MRS. LEO B. HEDGES,
PEARL EDDY.

HAMILTON, OHIO, *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to congratulate you on your great stand in the interests of public control of the offshore oil reserves. I hope you and other public-spirited Senators can pull a trick out of the hat to defeat the measure to turn offshore oil lands over to the States. I feel the amendment to use revenue to pay off public debt or support education should have passed. I have written to both Ohio Senators sometime back but they seem to be on the other side.

Sincerely yours,
H. BRUCE HILL.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please allow an old (76 years) Democrat to thank you sincerely, for the honesty, ability, and courage you have manifested in your "lone wolf" fight against your own party and I regret to say entirely too many of my party.

I would like very much to follow your leadership of a third party, but of course we all realize how very difficult and costly a task that would be. While I vote Democratic, I have always admired men such as Teddy Roosevelt, Geo. W. Norris, Harold Ickes, and many other liberal Republicans, even more than most of the leaders of my party.

Don't give up the fight—they will try to crucify you, of course, but here's hoping they fail.

JOHN C. MCWILLIAMS.

DETROIT, MICH., *April 25, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: May I say that I heartily endorse your efforts against the so-called tideland oil bill.

My only regret is that I do not live in Oregon where I could do you some good when you come up for reelection.

Your friend,
HARRY H. ZEITS.

EVANSTON, ILL., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm sure that many, many people in this country feel as I do, namely, a sense of appreciation to you for all you've been doing to try to make the Nation aware of the tidelands oil situation.

I sincerely hope that these resources will be kept available for all the Nation.

If the administration is successful in passing a law that overrides the judgment of the Supreme Court, I hope this will not open the way for individual States or private business to grab other natural resources which belong to the Nation and ought to be kept as natural resources for all people.

More power to you.

Cordially yours,

G. EUGENE DURHAM.

SILVER SPRING, MD., *April 30, 1953.*

Re your stand and action on Federal tidelands giveaway bill: Bravo.

Mrs. L. COSBALL.

FRAMINGHAM, MASS., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: This is to express our thanks for the superb fight you and the other Senators in your group have put up against tidelands oil bill. It is an outrageous thing to give away any of the domain still left to the public. Please express our appreciation to Senator HUMPHREY, Senator HILL, etc., as we cannot write to each one. You are courageous and we are grateful.

B. K. and A. W. FISK.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 28, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to express my emphatic approval of your heroic efforts to prevent the passage of the tidelands oil bill.

Everyone admires a man who has the courage of his convictions and especially one who has the physical strength to fight for them.

It is to be regretted we do not have more men like you in Congress—who have a sincere interest in the public welfare and place it above party and sectional considerations.

It is to be regretted also that our press does not recognize and applaud the spiritual and moral qualities your actions have exemplified.

May you have the opportunity and strength to keep up the good fight for many, many years.

Sincerely yours,

H. G. GOLDFUS.

CARMEL, CALIF., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have been following your long hard fight to defeat the tidelands oil bill, now before the Senate and have only gratitude and respect for your efforts.

However, the vote finally goes, we shall keep up our fight against the selfish interests and back you 100 percent.

Most gratefully yours,

Mrs. E. DE K. LEFFINGWELL.
ANNA M. LEFFINGWELL.

HENDERSON, KY., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please permit me to express my appreciation of your untiring efforts to defeat the offshore oil grab. Several Senators have fought valiantly, and are due the thanks of the general public, but you are especially deserving because your long speech served not only to educate the public, but also to delay matters while sentiment crystallized.

It was gratifying to read that you did not feel unduly tired by your long effort, but, as the public needs men like you worse than it ever did, I take the liberty of suggesting that you have an early medical examination to make sure that your physical condition was not impaired by the long strain.

It looks as if you and the others who fought on the same side are licked for the time being, but it may not be impossible to get the bill ruled as unconstitutional, which it pretty certainly is.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE H. LYNE.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to commend and thank you for the brave stand that you have taken on the tidelands oil issue.

I am as outraged as you at this attempted "grab" by oil interests at the national domain. So is everyone I talk to about it.

Keep up the good work.

Yours,

HARLEY FLANDERS.

CHICOPEE, MASS., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I can well imagine that much of the correspondence you must be receiving is in the nature of a condemnation for your many stands and speeches. I trust you will appreciate the fact that someone writes to you to commend you for a forthright demonstration of standing by the principles on which you were elected a Senator as a representative of all the people.

I hope that your efforts particularly on educating the American people on the issue of the tidelands oil bill will bear fruit; but in any case it is wonderful to know that at least one Senator speaks his mind openly and to the point.

Please accept my good wishes for many years of useful effort in the Nation's behalf.

Respectfully yours,

LAWRENCE WOLFSON.

TACOMA, WASH., *April 30, 1953.*

Thank you for your great effort.

J. D. ELLIOTT.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Permit me to congratulate you at this time for your spectacular speech and exposé of the proposed oil grab. I and the membership within my union, the Transport Workers Union, congratulate you to the fullest.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. LAFFIN, *Chairman.*

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: That was a great job you did on the offshore oil lands debate. It even got a lazy cuss like me to write to both my Senators.

Sincerely,

STANLEY MAZUR.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *April 27, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D. C.

SENATOR: I want to tell you that I heartily approve of your courageous stand against the Holland giveaway bill. You have said all there is to say about it and I hope you all the success in your fight against it.

The present administration is justly being tagged the giveaway administration.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. BUCHANAN.

AKRON, OHIO, *April 30, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bless you, sir, for your courage and stamina in fighting the huge oil interests. The whole country is back of you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. L. O. WEISS.

BIRMINGHAM, MICH, *April 30, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My heartiest congratulations and thanks for the magnificent stand you took on the matter of submergedlands oil. It was indeed a liberal education for the American people and I only wish it would stop passage of the bill. At least we can be grateful that we have such a fine spokesman in the public interest.

My sincere good wishes to you.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY K. ROOSEVELT.

FOREST PARK, ILL., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have been watching your valiant efforts to prevent the so-called tidelands oil bill from passing and, though it will probably be passed, we appreciate and feel fortunate in having a few Senators who have principles and can fight for them. You have made people more conscious of what is going on and efforts such as yours are never wholly lost.

Respectfully and sincerely,

ELMER R. UNDERWOOD.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: Thank you for your stand on the offshore oil grab—$100 billion steal. You are the best friend of labor in Washington, D. C.

Yours truly,

P. G. NOLAN.

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (UAW–CIO), LOCAL 128,
Troy, Ohio, April 29, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Would you please accept my congratulations on your effort to save the tideland oils?

Having had the pleasure of hearing you address our educational conference in Cleveland early last year, I am sure your record-breaking speech could only have been possible by your deep sincerity for a cause you feel that is right from the bottom of your heart.

May our good Lord continue to give you strength to fight, not only on this issue but any issue that is best for all the American people.

May God bless you and all the other officials in our Government that are willing to put right before petty party politics.

Very sincerely yours,

ARTHUR K. FAGAN,
President.

WHITTIER, CALIF., *April 30, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your magnificent stand on behalf of the American people and for being a Senator for all the people of the United States. We are deeply grateful, and you are in our thoughts and prayers. All the liberal Whittier Democrats join me.

Most sincerely,

NOLLIE HUDSON.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to express the deep gratitude of my husband and myself to you and Senator DOUGLAS, as well as those other Senators who are striving so greatly to forestall the giving away of one of our very important natural resources.

We agree completely that these offshore oil lands rightly belong to all the people, and

consider that you gentlemen are performing a great service for all of the American people. So we thank you all again.

Sincerely,

WILHELMINA M. INGOLD.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator of Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my deep gratitude for your untiring efforts toward the defeat of the tidelands oil bill.

You deserve the respect and admiration of all of the people of the country.

Sincerely,

RUTH SUSSMAN.

NORTH BROOKFIELD, MASS., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your brave fight and also to your fellow Senators who have taken part in the tidelands question. It seems likely that it is only the beginning of such steals from the people—Federal lands may be next. The States righters have been waiting for this moment.

I felt that I should at least protest in my small way, not only this bill but what is happening to our other freedoms.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH DONOVAN.

EAST ORANGE, N. J., *April 27, 1953.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations to you and to your distinguished colleagues on your courageous struggle against the tidelands oil bill. The issue is clear; the bill deprives millions of Americans of their birthright, and we can only hope that, like similar attempts in the past, it will ultimately fail. Your recent speech against this bill makes me proud to be counted among the members of the Independent Party.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. SMITH.

ABILENE, TEX., *April 7, 1953.*

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have always been interested in history and government and received a degree in this work from college. Therefore, I am very happy to tell you how much I think of your stand in the present Congress. Your speeches in the RECORD have been a source of information and fun to me.

However, I am writing this letter to tell you to keep up the good work concerning the so-called tidelands issue. Although I am a public-school teacher, and therefore my position is not too well thought of here, I am against the Government giving land, power, or anything away that belongs to all the people. In our State the Governor says they will use the money for the schools. Texas has had oil a long time, as well as natural gas, and the schools have not been blessed with this money. Therefore, it seems rather silly to say now we will help the schools. It is well known that Louisiana and other States realize money from taxes on Texas oil for their schools. At the present time a bill is in the State legislature to raise teachers' salaries to $3,000—but it is being opposed by the oil and gas companies. The South has been screaming about this—it would be really funny to see some public-minded Senators filibuster this issue in the old southern tradition. I faintly remember something like the land ordinance of 1787, and buying Louisiana from France and getting California; therefore I do not see how the States can claim the land.

I only wish you were from Texas so I would have a chance to vote for you. Would very much like to see the other Senators that support your position in most cases and others form a party or cause a change in the two parties to liberal and conservative.

Sincerely,

(Name deleted.)

SUMMIT, N. J.

DEAR SENATOR: We applaud you in Summit, N. J. Keep up the good work. By no means shall our children be deprived of their schools. Keep fighting, Senator. We depend on you.

Mrs. L. MENDELSOHN.

GLENS FALLS, N. Y., *April 25, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have your favor of the 20th instant enclosing your speech made in the Senate on April 2. The chief reason I wrote you was the inadequate coverage given the tideland oils controversy in the press and because the newspapers, wittingly or unwittingly, had given the writer, at least, the impression you were just about the only Member of the Senate who was against the giveaway bill.

Shortly after I wrote you, my curiosity became further aroused with the result that I obtained the current issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There I read with deep interest your speech in full, as well as the discourse of Senator DANIEL, and the masterly coverage of the subject by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. After spending practically an entire weekend and now part of another in perusing these brilliant and profound discussions of a subject of such vital national interest, I almost feel I am an expert on the subject of tideland oils.

It is a distressing commentary on our newspapers' lack of comprehension of their social obligations, when we note such a failure to give the public the complete facts on a subject of such importance.

You, Senator DOUGLAS, Senator LEHMAN, Senator HILL, and a number of other conscientious Members of the Senate are performing a herculean task, which would, no doubt, be rewarded with victory were it not for the fact the press has erected a wall of silence against the interests of the people of the United States.

There will, of course, be a day of reckoning and I am just wondering what some of our present Congressmen and Senators who vote for this giveaway bill will say when they come before the voters for reelection. I await with much curiosity their replies to their opponents charges: "You voted to give to California, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida more than $80 billion, which belonged legally and morally to the people of your own district and State, money which if retained by the Federal Government would have materially eased the tax burden of every citizen in your State and district."

I have inspired 1 or 2 letters in our local paper against this giveaway but am afraid it is all too little and too late. Nonetheless, eventually the people will awaken to the fact they have been robbed with the connivance of their own representatives. Then the legislative heads will begin to roll.

Thank you ever so much for the information you have given me and I rejoice to read today that you survived with health unimpaired the record speech marathon of 22 hours.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD V. BAKER.

LARAMIE, WYO., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: From this week's issue of Labor I learn that you are one of those making so courageous a fight to retain our natural resources for all of us. For this I wish to say a sincere thank you. And to wish you success.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MERLE I. WEIBEL.
D. G. WEIBEL.
H. WEIBEL.

THE NETHERLANDS, *April 28, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The filibuster is not a technique which I generally approve of; however, your recent speech on the tidelands oil bill I feel was delivered in the interest of the people of the United States. There is no measure, in my recollection, which is so purely political in its aim and scope since the impeachment proceedings against President Johnson. Therefore, I greatly appreciate your independent and forthright stand on this bill.

While I regard the American two-party system as an important part of our political life, still I think you have rendered great service during your independence in promoting objective thought about nature of the American political party. I only hope that it will not be the cause of your loss to the political life of our country.

At the present time, I am an American Fulbright exchange teacher in the Netherlands. Not only has this been a great personal experience, but I honestly feel that the program accomplishes its purpose exceedingly well. It has also been my observation that the United States Information Service in the Netherlands is performing an indispensable service.

As a resident of the State of Washington, I would like to express my appreciation to you for your service to and representation of the Northwest.

Very truly yours,

FRANK E. SEELEY.

ROCKFORD, ILL., *April 28, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE:

Heartiest congratulations on your attempt to preserve the dignity of Supreme Court decisions and your desire to see our Federal Government owner of submerged lands which our President so glibly promised to three States.

More power to you and all those who are trying to make the people aware of what is being planned.

Yours for more of the courage it takes.

GRACE E. (Mrs. B. J.) KNIGHT.

INKSTER, MICH., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I commend your stand on the tidelands oil measure and had hoped that your filibustering could be as successful as filibustering on civil rights has been. It would be gratifying if our Michigan Senators could take the same stand.

Respectfully,

Mrs. M. ROBINSON.

NORTH HIGHLANDS, CALIF., *April 27, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: Bravo.

WILLIAM POWELL.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *April 26, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We applaud you for your tireless stand against the tidelands oil bill which would allot to a few States the property of all. But, please Senator MORSE, don't risk your strength too far, as we need you so badly during the occupation in Washington for many, many, other vital discriminatory measures rapidly being concocted to advantage the few versus the many. Although we are residents in one of the favored States, we don't want so unfair an advantage.

Yours very truly,

MABEL and MARY BORDEN.

WHITE SALMON, WASH.

DEAR SENATOR: Bully for you. We have even considered moving to Oregon so we could vote for you. However, we have many friends there whom we help to see the light.

Men like you, with the courage of their convictions, are the hope of the world.

Wishing you success and with you in spirit.

Sincerely,

LORINE SIPE.

MOON RUN, PA., *April 29, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks a million times for your courageous stand on tidelands oil. No one will ever accuse you of selling your honor for a few pieces of silver.

The writer thinks you are 100 percent right; but, right or wrong, it is indeed inspiring to know that we have patriots of your type in Washington. More power to you.

Yours very truly,

G. J. SECORD.

EARLHAM COLLEGE,
Richmond, Ind., April 29, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Congratulations for keeping up the good fight against turning tidelands oil over to the States. God-given natural resources should be for the benefit of all.

Cordially,

ED NICHOLSON,
Instructor in Economics.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *April 28, 1953.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note of encouragement and thanks for the good fight on tidelands oil. We have admired you passionately since your action in the recent election campaign, and as we watch your work in the Senate that admiration continues to grow. I hope that in meeting the inevitable defeats of the next few years you will be able to remember that you are lovingly thought of by many like myself. Your presence in the Senate is a fine thing for all our country even if you don't always win.

Good luck.

Sincerely yours,

(MRS.) MARIANNE F. SMITH.

NEWPORT, R. I., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Lodge No. 119, International Association of Machinists, A. F. of L., wish to inform you that the people in Rhode Island are behind you on your stand concerning the States Rights bill.

CHARLES F. RIGEL,
Recording Secretary.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: No Government, State, municipal, or person whose laws do not conform with the laws of God and justice for all has not, cannot, and will not survive for long. Thanks for your great fight.

FRANK C. ALUMBAUGH.

SAN BRUNO, CALIF., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your efforts against tideland oil grab highly commendable. Keep up the good work.

S. J. ACKERMANN,
President Local 505 TWU–CIO.

NUTLEY, N. J., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have sent the following to Senators SMITH and HENDRICKSON, "Urge you vote against Holland bill to give away United States offshore oil rights to State for Hill amendment to retain Federal rights and provide aid to education for Taft amendment to keep Federal Government title to Continental Shelf outside 3-mile limit."

LOCAL 447, IUE.

ABERDEEN, MD., *April 29, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Give 'em hell but not the tidelands. Bless you.

Sincerely,

M. GOLDMAN.

NEWARK, N. J., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

We have sent the following to Senators SMITH and HENDRICKSON: "Urge you vote against Holland bill United States offshore oil rights to State, for Hill amendment to retain Federal rights and provide aid to education. For Taft amendment to keep Federal Government title to Continental Shelf outside 3-mile limit."

VINCENT SMITH,
President, Local 436, IUE–CIO.

NUTLEY, N. J., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

We have sent the following to Senators SMITH and HENDRICKSON: "Urge you to vote against Holland bill to give away United States offshore oil rights and provide aid to education. For Taft amendment to keep Federal Government title to Continental Shelf outside 3-mile limit."

JULIAN GULACK,
President, Local 400, IUE–CIO.

ELIZABETH, N. J., *May 1, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

We have sent the following to Senators SMITH and HENDRICKSON: "Local 461, IUE–CIO, representing 6,000 Singer employees, urges you vote against Holland bill to give away United States offshore oil rights to States. For Hill amendment to retain Federal rights and provide aid to education. For Taft amendment to keep Federal title to Continental Shelf outside 3-mile limit."

SAMUEL D. TRUEBA, *President.*

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *April 28, 1953.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have just completed reading your magnificent 22-hour speech of last Friday and Saturday in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

While I'm a long way from Oregon, I'm still in the United States and this oil giveaway by the Republicans will affect me directly. I've wanted to write you for some time—in fact, since you took your walk from those bums—and tell you to keep up the good work. If only the people of your home State have the brains and courage to keep you in the Senate for many years. We need lots more exactly like you.

Thanks again for looking out for my interest.

Sincerely,

W. P. WOOLLEY, Jr.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator from Oregon,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are to be congratulated for your unselfish interest in the welfare of our country through your efforts to prevent passage of the pending tidelands measure.

Your good work is deeply appreciate.

Best wishes for good health.

Respectfully yours,

MINNIE SUSSMAN.

OROVILLE, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR: We admire your stand on the tideland and other issues. We are in favor of letting the Government control these tidelands. Our votes would be for you and others like you if we could.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. SAM LONIDIES.

CHARLESTON, W. VA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have our admiration for your determined stand against the individual State's ownership of tidelands oil. We are vitally concerned about this problem, knowing it is but a first step in the attack on the public domain. Living in an area where the schools are very poor, I certainly favor using the funds from tidelands oil for the schools of the Nation.

Mr. and Mrs. J. A. PIANFETTI.

DECATUR, ILL., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you very much for trying to show the Senators of the United States how much the schools really need the offshore oil. I hope that you will keep trying to make them look at it the way some people do. Again I thank you very much. Good luck.

Yours truly,

NOLA SIMMONS.

TACOMA, WASH., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, and millions of others fully appreciate what you are doing to save the oil lands for present and future generations.

Very sincerely yours,

MILDRED and W. L. LUNDIN.

FLUSHING, N. Y., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am following with utmost interest your fight for the principles of the Constitution and wish you all the best in the interest of ourselves and country.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL F. HOELLERING.

KENSINGTON, MD., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I congratulate you on your gallant fight in opposing the offshore oil bill.

Yours respectfully,

MANUEL CALVO.

MONTROSE, CALIF., *April 24, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am not adept at this type of correspondence, but I feel in my heart that I owe it not only to you but to myself to write and thank you for your recent oratory in regard to the tidelands bill.

It is not only the fact that you have set a Senate speaking record, but the fact that you are a man true to yourself and to those who have placed a public trust in you. Oregon should be proud of you, sir; and the fact that we still have men of your caliber serving our country is appreciated by many, more than you will ever know.

Again my thanks to you and from many more like myself who will probably not take the time to sit down and write.

Sincerely,

MRS. R. I. BARLOW.

BURLINGTON, VT., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I congratulate you on your courageous battle against those who would deprive the people of their rights to oil reserves outside of the low-tide mark.

I follow with interest and admiration the committee reports of the Independent Party as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and hope that they may continue through many years to come.

Very truly yours.

C. M. PRESSEY.

LOCAL 4,
UTILITY WORKERS UNION
OF AMERICA, CIO,
New York, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Local 4, Utility Workers Union of America, CIO, wishes to express its sincere and unanimous admiration for your strong and continued efforts to prevent the colossal and callous tidelands oil steal.

We salute your courage and perserverance.

Sincerely yours,

R. P. HUGHES,
Business Manager.

LINCOLN, NEBR., *April 27, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Just a line to express my deep and sincere appreciation for your splendid and courageous efforts in defense of the public decency and public interest in tidelands oil case.

The archaic World-Herald of Omaha has called your noble efforts a hilarious comedy. Please do not think the people of Nebraska who heard your magnificent address in Lincoln last spring and, by the way, it is still widely talked about and complimented, are swallowing the reactionary trash so impudently thrown out by the Omaha paper or that the impression you left will be soon forgotten.

I am hoping that your brave and unwavering stand for a progressive America will receive the attention of, and arouse all thinking Americans to follow the course you are leading. I am eagerly awaiting the inspiring words which you can be counted on to deliver at the coming Norris day dinner in Omaha.

Truly yours,

RONALD RAY RADER.

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y., *April 28, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: May I extend to you my sincerest thanks for your very brave and courageous stand in not only the present tideland discussion, but all other matters coming up before the Senate.

If all our Senators were gentlemen of your high caliber, it would make this Senate group the best our country has ever had.

While you are not my Senator, I could not refrain from sending along to you a few words of thanks and praise for the wonderful job you are doing.

Keep up the good work, and may God bless you.

Very sincerely yours,

BERTHA R. SCHWARTZ
Mrs. I. J. Schwartz.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE B. MORSE,
United State Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am heartily in favor of your attitude toward the proposed move to give away the submerged coastlands. I have written to Senators ROBERT A. TAFT and JOHN W. BRICKER my protest against the proposal to give these lands away.

I hope for the sake of our Nation as a whole that this cause for which you and other liberal-minded Senators are fighting will win the day.

Very truly yours,

GILBERT LOVELL.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 26, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You're to be congratulated on your courageous, dramatic fight against passage of the tidelands oil bill. As rather ordinary citizens, we very much appreciate the fact that you have at heart the best interests of all the people.

We trust that you will continue to lead the attack against this dangerous bill. May you win this fight.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN and CLAIRE WILSON.

STEVENS POINT, WIS., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My hat is off to you for your courageous stand against the oil lobby and their representatives in Congress in your long talk a few days ago.

It seems I can't do anything with the recalcitrant fellow I have representing us in Wisconsin in the Senate, and we can only hope and pray that enough Senators will see the light and change their mind soon.

If they want to call it filibustering, let them go ahead, but carry on—the good people of America are behind you. We need schools for the thousands of children who are now being deprived of the proper training simply because we have in the past had "articles" in Washington who forgot the voter and have become yes-men for the various lobbies.

Giving these offshore oil lands to States will set a terrible precedent for other actions in the interest of the few. I hope and pray to God that the Senate will protect the majority interests and make oil pay the way and pave the way toward a better America through education.

If I can help you or Senator HUMPHREY, Senator HILL or DOUGLAS, it will certainly be a pleasure to do anything and everything possible to achieve victory for our American citizens and taxpayers.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK J. LUCAS.

DULUTH, MINN.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations to you and your colleagues on your excellent fight against State ownership on tidelands oil.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. C. W. LINDBERG.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been reading about your efforts to stop the proposed legislation to make the tidelands State property. Keep it up; you are doing fine. If there were more Senators and Representatives like you who are not engaged primarily in playing power politics perhaps many more constructive things could be done toward improving both domestic and foreign conditions.

I am a student at the university at Chicago. I heard the address which you gave before a large group of the student body several weeks ago in Mandel Hall. I went to that meeting ready to disagree with everything you said. I thought that you would be defending these pseudo-intellectuals which we have a large number of here. However, I came away feeling that I agreed completely with you, much to my surprise. Since then I have tried to follow what you have been doing. I find myself in remarkable agreement with what you have said in Congress, especially on the subject of the tidelands. Probably many others feel as I do. I hope so. If they just write their Congressmen, as I have done, all may yet be well.

Meanwhile, keep up the fight, for what you think is best for the country. And, may God be with you.

Sincerely yours,

JACK MEYER.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 28, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my thanks to you for the sustained fight you are making against the administration's offshore oil bill.

This giveaway program cannot possibly serve the public's interest. Your effort, in addition to the help of other Senators, may be able to swing the tide against the administration.

The public owes you a vote of thanks for forcing the administration to put its views on record.

I hope you are successful in the fight on this issue.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. SELMA GROSSMAN.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write to you as a United States Senator although you were elected by the people of a State far from the one in which I live. I feel in you the spirit of the United States. You are truly independent.

I have written to both Senators from New York State urging them to oppose the tidelands bill.

Thank you for giving so much of yourself to your country.

It took character as well as a rugged constitution to speak those 22 plus hours you accomplished.

Thank you again and God bless you,

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HELEN M. NORWOOD.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you on your great fight against the tidelands oil bill, and encourage you to carry on the battle against private exploitation of resources that belong to the Nation as a whole. This flagrant attempt to override a decision of the Supreme Court by Congressional legislation presents a definite threat to our Constitution.

Good luck and keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD GRAY.

RICHLAND CENTER, WIS., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After all the time you spent trying to save a few barrels of oil for all of us the least we can do is to take a few minutes to let you know we appreciate your efforts. Usually we don't care for filibuster methods but in this case it did dramatize the situation and bring it to the attention of more people. Thanks again for trying to keep for all of us what should be ours.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. HARRY J. NEE.

LINCOLN, NEBR., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your lengthy speech in the Senate last week. I am glad to see that a determined group of Senators are fighting tirelessly for a very fine cause. I believe that more and more Americans are being awakened to the fact that three States are boldly attempting to grab what rightfully belongs to all of the States. It is a

shame that many legislators are deserting the best interests of the States they represent in order to participate in this giveaway.

Sincerely yours,

LOREN BRAUN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 27, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your good work in opposition to the so-called tidelands giveaway.

I admire your integrity and courage.

Very truly yours,

MARGET L. MCPHERRON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: My wife and I heartily endorse your patriotic stand on the tidelands oil bill.

We feel as you do that these resources belong to the American people. Thanks for fighting for our America.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JOEL S. GOLOMB.

DETROIT, MICH., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You did wonderfully talking for 22 hours and 26 minutes, so on behalf of my wife and daughter we join in congratulating you on the wonderful work you do; if only we had more men to fight for the workingman that are sent to Washington,

You will be among the great men in history; long may you be able to continue the good work.

Sincerely yours,

WM. J. LOCHRIE.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our committee of a sisterhood, comprising some 600 women, wishes to commend you for the courageous stand you have taken regarding the Federal control of the offshore oil resources of Texas, Louisiana, and California. We agree with you that these resources should be used for the benefits of the country as a whole.

Your educational campaign on the floor of the Senate will be long remembered by all liberal Americans. We urge you to continue your courageous stand on this issue and the many others which will need your liberal backing in the future.

Sincerely yours,

COMMUNITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
K. A. M. TEMPLE SISTERHOOD,
THELMA ROSENTHAL.
Mrs. Sidney Rosenthal,
Executive Chairman.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

We love you.

Keep fighting tidelands.

CITIZENS TONI, JONATHAN, MARVIN and DOROTHY WALKER,
Four votes.

RIVERVIEW, NEBR., *April 27, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to compliment you very much on the heroic fight you are making to preserve the tidelands oil for all the people instead of giving it to the few.

I wish that you had the support of that great Senator who did so much for all the people and who has passed on, Senator George Norris. I sincere hope that our Senators and Representatives will pitch in and help.

With best wishes, I am

Yours very truly,

JOE KOENIG.

SCRANTON, PA., *May 2, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for fighting the steal of United States oil.

ROY SCHWEITZER.

PASADENA, CALIF., *April 30, 1953.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the fine job you are doing in Washington. We can't think of another time when we have favored lengthy debate in the Senate, but we feel that you and your colleagues have done right in fighting this tidelands issue the way you have.

We are notifying both our Senators by airmail how we stand—not that it will change their vote, but it is all we can do.

We hope the good people of Oregon will keep you in the Senate as long as you care to stay. We admire your courage tremendously.

JAMES and ETHEL BECKER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 3, 1953.*

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We of the Bakery and Confectionery Workers, Local No. 492, AFL, wish to commend you on your untiring efforts which you have so devotedly given to the tidelands oil bill; not only do we express our gratitude to you from a labor union but likewise as citizens interested in sound government for all the people of the country rather than for the privileged few. We know that men with such sincere interest and honest efforts as you place in your endeavors should perpetrate a spark and bring only success to the enactment of the tidelands oil bill. It is with thanks for men of your interest for all the people's welfare that we owe allegiance and hope that your beliefs may be passed on to your colleagues.

JOHN D. NICOLA,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 3, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Admire and appreciate your stand on tidelands oil issue.

ALTON SCHMIEGELOW,
Chairman, Sunbright Laundry.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 3, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Wishing you success on your undertaking of the tidelands oil bill. The 150 employees of the Hudson Laundry of New York are behind you.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY RACHLIN, *Chairman.*

DULUTH, MINN., *May 2, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our union wishes to commend you on your dramatic and educational fight for the people in opposition to the special interests as exemplified in the tidelands oil situation.

JOSEPH REYNOLDS,
Secretary, Federal Labor Union 8650.

GLEN RIDGE, N. J., *May 2, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I appreciate so much the wonderful 22-hour speech you made against the Holland bill and for the people of the whole United States. All the more are you to be congratulated when you knew the outcome of the vote is conceded to go against your principles. However you have awakened many I feel sure to the inherent dangers of this bill and what may follow in the way of giving away our national resources to the big interests, under the guise of giving them to the individual States.

Our best wishes to you.

Most sincerely,

ELLEN SANBORN.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y., *May 2, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your fight to preserve the title to offshore lands for the Federal Government is one of the most brilliant chapters in the long annals of the United States Senate.

I hope that when the vote takes place the patriotic principles for which you and your associates have fought will be upheld.

You have my sincere admiration for the principles and causes which you champion.

Sincerely yours,

EVELYN HAMBURGER.
Mrs. Edward.

STAMFORD, CONN., *May 2, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Am truly in your corner in many of your fights—especially in this tidelands stealaway fracas.

Have greatest admiration for your political viewpoints and hope they come to blossom.

Sincerely,

IRVING RABINOVITZ.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 2, 1953.*

Hon WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I find myself delighted to write you and express my deep appreciation as a good American for your fine courage, and masterful conception of the highest ideals in government. I have followed your course for a long time and admire it. You are the type of man that the country needs in the White House. Keep it up, Senator, and stand firm.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT E. GREEN.

WOODSIDE, N. Y., *May 1, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I join the millions of people who wish to express their appreciation of your tremendous efforts to retain for all the people what seems so obviously theirs.

After tidelands oil has been given away, it seems we are to present hydroelectric developments to private industry, all in the crusade for "free enterprise."

But we must applaud you and all the Senators who tried to stop the grab.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) HELEN A. SCHLOSSER.

PRINCETON, N. J., *May 4, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:

Congratulations on your valiant fight to conserve our natural resources.

HARRY KIHN.

ASTORIA, N. Y., *May 2, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to let you know I appreciate your heroic stand in opposition to the oil grab. I wish you every blessing.

Gratefully,

(Mrs.) KATHRYN HANSCOM.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I want you to know that we believe that you

are right in this tidelands oil controversy and thank you for the efforts you have made to bring the issue to the people.

We believe that even in the States of California, Texas, and Florida the best interests of the citizens are served when the best interests of the whole country are used as the measuring stick for national legislation.

Thank you again for your efforts.

Sincerely,

MARGARET C. HAYES.
Mrs. Kenneth A.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *April 28, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Mrs. Ternus and I have never written our Congressmen about anything before, but tonight we have addressed letters to both Senator KNOWLAND and Senator KUCHEL, urging that they vote "No" on the tidelands oil bill, against which you have waged such a magnificent fight.

We wish to express our deep thanks to you and to convey our admiration of your courage. We are cognizant of the physical and mental suffering you have undergone. You have our profound sympathy and respect. If there is anything we can do in our capacity as private citizens please feel free to call upon us.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN W. TERNUS.

URBANA, ILL., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate you on your recent speech against the tidelands oil grab. Even though most of the daily press only reported that you spoke without reporting what you said, I believe you have done much to publicize some of the little known facts in the case.

I hope that you keep up the good work that you have been doing in the 83d Congress. I especially enjoy the Friday afternoon committee reports of the Independent Party. We need more men to continue the traditions of Robert La Follette and George Norris in the United States Senate.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS LEWENSTEIN.

POTTSTOWN, PA., *May 2, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I commend you for the hard fight you are putting up in defense of Federal control of tidelands oil. I can't find any good reason why those offshore oil reserves should be given to a selfish few. It seems unthinkable that a Supreme Court decision made three times in favor of Federal control should be set aside.

Thank you for your progressive work in the Senate.

Sincerely,

Mrs. DOROTHY D. PICKAR.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 2, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Please keep up the fight against the tidelands bill they are trying to railroad through. You've put up a wonderful battle and I only wish I could have the opportunity of voting for you some day.

Sincerely,

EDWIN L. ROSE.

RAVENA, N. Y., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I think you are fighting for an important principle in your opposition to the Holland bill. Americans have not yet come to appreciate that our resources are no longer so lush that we can afford to exploit them wantonly; certainly, the States have not been very vigilant guardians of our natural riches. You have smoked out some questionable motives.

Congratulations.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT RIENOW,
Professor of Political Science.

NEW CANAAN, CONN., *May 1, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your splendid effort on behalf of Federal control of our marginal oil lands.

It seems like a hopeless cause, yet I cannot help feeling that the effort will count, that it is very important to have it on the record.

And so I'm most appreciative of your marathon speech. Good for your.

Very truly yours,

ISABEL D. LEE.

WEST SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *May 2, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We the undersigned wish to protest against the ownership of the tidelands by a few States.

We believe the tidelands should be kept for the entire United States as a Nation and would request that you vote accordingly.

The money derived from the tidelands should be used for educational purposes for all States.

Very sincerely yours,

(Miss) MARY VEZINA,
(Miss) MELANIE M. VEZINA,
(Miss) NELLIE H. VEZINA.

MELROSE, MASS., *May 2, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This note is sent to express my appreciation for your efforts to show up the dangers of the Holland bill. I hope that the Holland bill can be defeated, or amended in such a way as to give the income from the valuable tidelands oil to all the United States.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORA DENNISON.

HUNTINGTON WOODS, MICH., *April 29, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you and the others who spoke in opposition to the tideland oil bill. We appreciate it and we are glad someone represented us and our opinions on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET A. SHEPPARD.

CANTON, N. Y., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let me express my great admiration of your fine courage and excellent judgment in all your recent stands in the national interest and for the general popular welfare, especially in opposing this tidelands oil fraud and giveaway.

I approve and applaud the grand work you are doing.

Oregon and America ought to be proud of you. History will, I predict, honor you more than some of your contemporaries who are deaf to eloquence, blind to genuine merit, and often, alas, just plain dumb.

Cordially yours,

R. E. DELMAGE.

CHEVY CHASE, MD., *May 3, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for the many strenuous hours you have spent fighting the giveaway of submerged lands. I am afraid this gallant fight is lost, but I hope you will continue to oppose other raids on the public domain which seem imminent. These are hard days for Democrats and Independents.

Sincerely,

REBECCA FAESCH
Mrs. Ernest Faesch.

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y., *May 1, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I thought you might be interested in the attached clipping from today's New York Times.

Your long talk on the great oil grab was pretty wonderful.

According to the recent article on you in Collier's you are the only member of the Independent Party in the United States. I must beg to differ with that statement, Senator, suh. There are now at least two of us.

With all good wishes and rooting my hardest for you.

Sincerely,

ALLEN KLEIN.

(Enclosure)

DEBATE ON OFFSHORE OIL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial on Senator WAYNE MORSE's marathon talk is not quite fair. As I recall, the minority group fighting the oil giveaway offered to halt the debate about 2 weeks ago to permit the Senate to pass legislation against filibustering. This Senator TAFT refused to do.

While it is true that everything has been said about the matter that can be said, not everybody has heard or understood everything, or even part of everything, and such discussion and education must necessarily take time.

It is debatable that the majority of citizens, just because they elected Eisenhower, also elected to give to 3 States national resources that belong to all 48 States. What's more, this will teach the southern Democrats who favor the tidelands giveaway that they can't have their cake and eat it too.

In a statement remarkable for its candor, Senator TAFT says let them keep talking, "We really haven't got anything very serious on the calendar." If this is true and, considering that the Senate has accomplished nothing very much to date during this session, this will be the most do-nothing Congress in history.

ALLEN KLEIN.

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y., *April 27, 1953.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 30, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: We were in Washington, D. C., April 23, 24, 25, and had the good fortune to hear you speak in the Senate. It was not only enjoyable, but you gained our admiration and respect. We certainly hope you will be successful in your attempt to prevent this steal from the American people.

Yours sincerely,

SOPHIE YAHAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 23, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We want to express our appreciation and admiration for your dramatization of the big giveaway. As ordinary people your courage makes us more courageous and confident that principles are still important in these days.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. D. FRIEDLAND.
Mr. and Mrs. DENNIS FRIEDLAND.

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (UAW–CIO),
AMALGAMATED LOCAL 669,
PATERSON, N. J., *May 1, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed please find copies of the latest telegrams sent to

New Jersey Senators SMITH and HENDRICKSON. This is the latest of similar telegrams which our people have sent to these gentlemen.

Words cannot convey the admiration that the officers and members of Local 669, UAW-CIO, feel for the efforts of you and your colleagues on behalf of the people. We know that if this oil steal goes through, it will not be because of lack of effort on your part.

Many, many thanks for the wonderful fight that you have put up for the people of the United States.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

ROBERT ORMSBY,
President, Local 669, UAW-CIO.

APRIL 30, 1953.

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge you to vote against Holland giveaway oil bill. Members of UAW-CIO Local 669 feel that people of New Jersey did not elect you to give away natural resources part of which belong to them. We would also urge you to vote for the Hill amendment to retain Federal title to oil resources in order to provide aid to education so badly needed by the children of our State and also to vote in favor of the Taft amendment to keep Federal title to the Continental Shelf outside the 3-mile limit.

ROBERT ORMSBY,
President, Local 669, UAW-CIO.

APRIL 30, 1953.

Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge you to vote against Holland giveaway oil bill. Members of UAW-CIO Local 669 feel that people of New Jersey did not elect you to give away natural resources part of which belong to them. We would also urge you to vote for the Hill amendment to retain Federal title to oil resources in order to provide aid to education so badly needed by the children of our State, and also to vote in favor of the Taft amendment to keep Federal title to the Continental Shelf outside the 3-mile limit.

ROBERT ORMSBY,
President, Local 669, UAW-CIO.

PEORIA, ILL., *May 1, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish I could tell you how inspiring your courage and integrity have been to me. I am even more grateful for the example to young people. It will do much to destroy the too-common cynicism about politics.

I was happy to hear of the presence and support of Mrs. Morse and your daughter during your recent long and useful speech. Affection and help at home largely offset misunderstanding and injustice and slander from outside.

I have wanted to write to you for a long time, but couldn't produce anything that seemed good enough. But I am sure I can convey my respect and gratitude. God does sustain His servants, and you have been a faithful one though you may not have thought of it so.

Very gratefully,

MARY M. PITCH.

P. S.—I have voted Republican since women were first allowed to vote till 1952.

GUADALAJARA, JAL., MEXICO, *May 1. 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORRIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Have been following your fight against tidelands bill, which is before the Senate, and I heartily approve of what you are doing. It is only way to get the facts before our people.

I believe there is no difference in a President packing a Supreme Court to make it subservient to him, and a Congress that makes the Supreme Court impotent through legislation overriding same. Keep up the good work.

Respectfully yours,

H. R. CONNOR.

LANCASTER, N. Y., *April 27, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you for your filibuster on the issue of tidelands oil.

Sincerely,

DONN F. ALKATE.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for the brave and, I am afraid, futile fight. Thank God we do have men (so few) of your integrity. Your principles and the sacrifice you make for them are such that they are an inspiration and a light to those of us forlorn and hopeless in the dim vistas of the future. Is there any way we individuals who feel so strongly about the tidelands and the conservation question in general can do anything? Is there any way (short of money, which we don't have) to make our voices heard?

I hope to God Oregon has enough sense to see that you are among the best in the Government and sends you back—woeful Independent or not.

Be of good heart. There are we who love you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. L. D. LANG.

MAY 1, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: I'd like to thank you for your wonderful action in the tidelands oil matter. In fact, ever since you have become an independent you are strictly for the public interest.

Hoping you continue successfully, I remain,

Yours truly,

LOUIS ZALKIN.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y., *May 2, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate your noble work to maintain Federal rights and control of the coastal submerged oil lands.

Keep up the fight against the big drive to plunder our national resources.

M. E. BIVENS.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

We respect your courage and admire your farsightedness in striving to maintain Federal rights and control of the coastal submerged oil lands. If the bill goes through, let those men holding public office who vote for it beware, because they will have incurred the enmity of the people they betray.

LUCIENNE BIVENS.

NORTH CHICAGO, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR: Although a voter of Missouri, may I say that your stand on recent vital problems have struck within me a deep chord of admiration for the things we, millions of us, believe in. In all sincerity, I cannot see the logic or justice in giving title of offshore oil to a handful of these great United States, and I believe we'll regret the day that brings about the proposed transfer should it happen. Incidentally, should you wonder about the postmark, I am serving in the Armed Forces.

W. B. KIRCHNER.

TAMA, IOWA, *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Although I am against the use of filibustering, not in principle, but in the sense of time lost in the delay, I would like to commend your speech of last Friday and Saturday against the tidelands bill.

I am confident, that with time, these tideland resources will boom far beyond even their present wealth. I would like to see the wealth of these resources turned over to the Government and then redistributed, on a proportional basis, to all the States in the form of financial aid to education.

I feel that the American people should take a more active attitude toward their Government. Your speech has not only stated your position on this bill, but it has achieved in arousing an interest in the bill by bringing it to the attention of the public.

Sincerely,

ROGER COE.

ROGERS CITY, MICH., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you for your heroic action on the tidelands debate. It was a good fight on behalf of the people of the United States, who have so few representatives in the present Congress. To know that the people of this country have a few friends in Congress is reassuring. More power to you.

Yours truly,

LEE H. GREGORY.

NEW YORK, *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: The oil grab will top any and all scandals of the past.

Your herculean efforts in our behalf is not escaping the American people, despite the unwillingness of most of the press to acquaint them with the facts. When the debate first began, people just whispered and hopelessly shook their heads. It is now beginning to roar. I hear discussions on tidelands oil in the most unexpected places.

May God give you strength, you are indeed a champion of the people.

Sincerely,

Mrs. A. NIMKOFF.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are to be commended for your efforts to defeat the tidelands bill. I am with you 100 percent.

Sincerely,

(Miss) EVA BAUK.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a line, even though I am not one of your constituents, to convey to you the deep appreciation of my husband and myself for the heroic and magnificent fight you put up to save the fabulous offshore-oil resources for all the people of all the States. You have, indeed, proved yourself once again to be a patriot and statesman of high and honorable stature, and lived up to that worthy designation of an independent, which you so proudly bear. If we could only boast of many more Wayne Morses in the Congress, we would have far brighter prospects for the future of our beloved country and the world.

Respectfully and admiringly yours,

EVA INGERSOLL WAKEFIELD
(Mrs. Sherman D. Wakefield).

PORTSMOUTH, VA., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I congratulate you on your courageous stand with regard to

the submerged lands. Would that we had a goodly number of noble men in our Congress today—statesmen such as you, who put principle above everything. I have always contended that the natural resources of any country belong to all its people and not to just a few. Having come from a long line of educators, I am the greatest believer in education. I believe by education they shall know the truth, and the truth shall make them free. No man can be a freeman if he is ignorant. That has been demonstrated all too plainly.

May I ask that you keep fighting to keep America free, and in all reverence—with God's help keep America for the Americans. Too many persons are being carried away with the plight of the displaced persons in other lands—you are a representative of the American people—every displaced person you allow to come into this country displaces an American.

Sincerely,

RUTH W. PLUMMER
(Mrs. Kemp Plummer).

Congratulations on your stand re tidelands-oil property belonging rightfully to all of the United States.

Keep up the fight to inform the public.

Sincerely,

AN EX-TEXAN.

LEWISBURG, W. Va.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 1, 1953.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please be assured of the gratitude of so many of us for your courageous and persistent effort to prevent the handing over of the tideland oil to States. Thank you, too, for bespeaking decent and orderly conduct in congressional procedure.

The enclosed clipping from the Boston Globe is from a Californian, and says what we, many of us, would like to have said where it would do the most good.

Respectfully,

ROBERT BELUE.

(Enclosure)

ISSUE IS BETWEEN OIL INTERESTS, PUBLIC

TO THE EDITOR:

A few weeks ago, Uncle Dudley discussed the tidelands oil dispute which is again current. I was surprised that even he fell into the error of treating this as an issue betweeen Federal versus State control; whereas, in fact, it is an issue between the oil interests and the public.

In the three States most concerned—Louisiana, Texas, and California (the last being my own State)—the oil interests can and do write their own legislation, which is then meekly passed.

Federal legislation is not quite so automatic, which is why they prefer the States to get control. It is a dollar and cents proposition for them. (Incidentally, the same reasoning lies behind the mineral, sheep, cattle, and timber interests putting on pressure to get our national land reserves turned back to the States. They can then raid them with no fear from the sleeping public.)

If this transfer to the States takes place, it will cost eventually every man, woman, and child in Massachusetts from $30 to $50 in taxes or otherwise to make up for the revenues the Federal Government won't be getting.

This kind of legal raid on the United States Treasury makes mink coats seem pretty small-time stuff. Yet it is one of the first things the great, "clean" Republican Party has sponsored. Incidentally, it was the only issue that Ike came out for before convention time. That Texas-et-al. oil money wields a powerful stick.

So, if any reader wants to save himself an eventual $30–$50, now is his chance to write or telegraph any of the small band of Senators who are right now fighting for the rights of all of us, fighting the public's battle, trying to awaken us in order to stop another theft such as the Teapot Dome scandals under Harding.

WOODROW W. SAYRE.

BELMONT.

AKRON 5, OHIO, *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SENATOR: More power to you, we admire your work against the big oil steal. Wish there were more like you.

Very sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. C. PERRY SMALLRIDGE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very much in favor of your courageous stand on the tidelands oil bill.

More power to you.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. MAY R. GIBSON.

BALTIMORE, MD., *May 2, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am thrilled by your courageous fight to keep the tidelands oil in the possession of its rightful owners, the people of the United States of America. Between you and Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN (Democrat, New York) we have in Congress two "fighting liberals." If it weren't for liberals like Jefferson, both Roosevelts, Brandeis, LaGuardia, Lehman, and yourself, this great land of ours would have literally "gone to the dogs" long ago. All liberal Americans are behind you.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL SICULAR.

P. S.—Why don't you start an American Liberal Party?

APRIL 28, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God we have a Senator like you fighting for the good of the majority of the people of our United States. Keep up the fight against tidelands oil grab and other Senators will awaken to help you. I wish I could give you my own physical help for endurance. We're with you all the way.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN S. GLASCOCK.

QUINCY, ILL., *May 1, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to add my voice of thanks to you to that, no doubt, of thousands of others for your stand you are making for justice and righteousness against greed, privilege, and the special interests.

The record of every one of us will stand for all eternity. God will be the final judge and His will be the reward.

Would to God all the other Senators and President Eisenhower would think about that and realize its full significance.

For your cause in the common good may God bless and strengthen and keep you.

Sincerely,

JOHN SUHREN.

WEST HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *May 4, 1953.*

Senator MORSE,
Washington D. C.:

Thanks to you and other Senators who made heroic stand on oil issue. Consider it big steal and only first step in taking over all public lands and resources owned by all the people. Election was not a mandate for that.

ROGER VIVIAN.
ADAM VRAY.

LAGUNA BEACH, CALIF., *May 1, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: A word of appreciation for your magnificent stand on the tidelands oil and related issues.

Your clear-sighted courage, independence, and integrity in the service of our country is as a beacon in this dark day of low politics.

Respectfully,

EDWARD J. SCHINDELER.
ANN SCHINDELER.

BALTIMORE, MD., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for your magnificent effort against the offshore oil bill.

I only wish there was more that I could do to help you and your associates in this fight. My husband and I wrote our two Senators but of course they do not represent our feelings and are in favor of the bill.

I realize the seriousness of this move on the part of the majority in the Congress, and I can only hope that the judiciary will declare that some parts of it are illegal.

Yours sincerely,

BETTY COCHRAN.

FALLS CITY, NEBR., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Member of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This note is to commend you on the valiant effort which you have made in opposition to the pending offshore-oil bill. Your position is absolutely correct in this matter.

I look forward to hearing you later this month when you address the George W. Norris memorial dinner in Omaha.

Very sincerely yours,

HAROLD C. PRICHARD.

WILLOW RUN, MICH., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to express my personal thanks to you for your fight to keep tidelands oil under Federal jurisdiction and public ownership.

Yours truly,

EVA FILLION.

RICHLAND, WASH., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator MORSE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: As a citizen of the United States allow me to congratulate you on your splendid effort to save the tidelands for the people of the United States. I wish there were more men like you in the United States Senate.

Thank you.

LAWRENCE E. RYAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 1, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue your heroic effort to halt the confiscation of undersea oil lands by selfish interests. Every thinking Senator will have to weigh the costs to his country if he votes for the Holland measure. If he believes in America, all of its 159 million people, and in its future generations, then he just cannot conscientiously vote for this steal.

Your efforts to bring justice to the American people are appreciated by our nearly 2-million-family membership. We know there are countless other millions who feel the same way.

Sincerely,

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE,
WALLACE J. CAMPBELL,
Director.

APRIL 29, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are just two of the many people we know of who think that the efforts you have made, since you became an Independent, to see justice established in our present-day "somewhat confused"

Government policies are among the greatest attempts that have been made by any one man in a long while.

You have probably received many similar letters, all praising you and encouraging you on in your crusade.

Your 23-hour speech in Congress last week should be recorded as one of the greatest historical documents of our country's history, as should you deservedly take your place, also, along with Thomas Jefferson and men of his character and convictions.

You're a great man, in every sense of the word, and your every effort to see righteousness maintained in our country is cheered on by everyone who feels as we do. We all know that our kind of government is the greatest on earth, but, like anything else that is worth preserving, it constantly needs repairs and amends.

We're all behind you, Senator Morse. We're with you all the way—every sentence—every word. God bless you and aid you in the stand you have so unselfishly taken upon yourself.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY and ELAINE MARFOGLIA.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to express our deep gratitude for having in the Senate of the United States a man of your honesty, integrity, and courage, as exemplified in your stand on the tidelands oil issue and your many other contributions to good government. We do hope that you will represent the people of this country for many and many a year.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH KRIM.
FRANCES KRIM.

LAS ANIMAS, COLO., *May 1, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your "talkathon" record. I hope it will result in focusing the attention of the public to the courageous job you and the band of liberals are doing.

I'm afraid most of the public is too preoccupied with their own petty affairs to let you know how they feel. However, it is my feeling that last November's mandate to the Republican Party did not include the proposal to give away our heritage. But if your "roadblock" is overrun I have no doubt that public power projects, national forests, public grazing lands, and maybe even the postoffice will be divided up as part of the spoils.

Keep up the good fight. Whether they know it or not our children and our children's children will be forever in your debt.

Yours truly,

ROBERT S. CRITES.

IOWA CITY, IOWA, *May 1, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous and untiring effort to defeat the offshore oil bill, which seems to me an unfair, dangerous, and unconstitutional piece of legislation. I most devoutly hope it will be defeated.

Very truly yours,

ANN H. EDELMAN
Mrs. Richard Edelman.

ELSIE, NEBR., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I feel that the least that I and millions of other Americans can do is to write and thank you for your efforts in our behalf on the tidelands-oil controversy. I believe most people will do as I have often done, say they are going to write, then neglect to do so. I heard you and Senator HUMPHREY on the radio a short time ago and was going to write to both of you expressing my approval but neglected to do so.

It is a great comfort to little fellows like myself—I am a small farmer and stockman—to know that we still have men in the Senate who are not afraid to fight the forces of reaction and monopoly. We admire men who, like our own Senator Norris, put principle above party. I hope you will be in the Senate a long time, and wish I could vote to keep you there. Thanking you again, I have the honor to remain,

Yours very truly,

V. E. LINGBLOOM.

BALTIMORE, MD., *May 1, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Congratulations on your honorable, courageous, and militant stand against the tidelands-oil bill.

I and my wife only wish that we could vote for you, but, of course, you don't represent our State. Nevertheless, we heartily endorse your views and stand in the Senate.

Respectfully,

SAMUEL PRINCE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your many friends in California appreciate your strong stand and the long hours you have put in against the tideland-oil bill.

I have written to both our Senators but as yet have received no reply. If it passes, you will at least have the satisfaction of knowing you did your best to prevent it.

Very truly yours,

E. GRACE BUTLER.

LAURELTON, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your fight on the tidelands oil bill. Your long speech has brought this issue to the people's attention. Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

MRS. DANIEL FORGER.

DETROIT, MICH., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations for your great effort to dramatize to the American people, their stake and probable loss in the present, tidelands oil bill.

We expect the worst but hope for the best in the final vote.

Sincerely,

ROBERT BAETENS.
FRANK SAYER.
RAY DIETZ.

DETROIT, MICH., *May 1, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to take this opportunity of congratulating you and expressing my appreciation of your valiant effort in keeping our resources, as well as the tideland oils, for all of our people.

It is good to find a Senator following the footsteps of men like the late Robert La Follette, and Senator George Norris and also in the footsteps of the fine Secretary of the Interior like the late Harold Ickes, Mr. Krug and Mr. Chapman.

We are all very proud of you and we hope that you will continue in your fine efforts to serve all of the people of our Nation.

With kindest regards to you, I remain,

Cordially yours,

HARRY PERLIS.

RED BANK, N. J., *May 4, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

We have sent the following to Senators SMITH and HENDRICKSON: "This union, representing 1,400 employees of Bendix Aviation Corp., urge you vote against Holland bill to give away United States offshore oil rights to States. For Hill amendment to retain Federal rights and provide aid to education. For Taft amendment to keep Federal Government title to Continental Shelf outside 3-mile limit."

OTTO VAN HOWE,
President, Local 417, IUE–CIO.

LA JOLLA, CALIF., *April 27, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I want to congratulate you on your outstanding work in trying to save the tidelands for all of the States. I was also especially gratified by your stand for the right at election time. Truly we need more such statesmen as you who put principle above party.

With sincere best wishes,

Respectfully yours,

FRANCES MITCHELL LEE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 27, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your fine efforts in support of Federal ownership of tidelands. As a resident of California, I am one of many in this State who believe that ownership of these tidelands should remain with the Federal Government.

It is heartwarming to know that we have a spokesman to defend the interests of the people of the Nation.

Very truly yours,

MRS. MURRAY LESSER.

ARLINGTON, VA., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The people of this Nation should be eternally grateful to you for the valiant fight you have waged to defeat Senate Joint Resolution 13.

If we had more Members of the Senate who displayed your type of moral stamina, political integrity, and intellectual honesty, this democracy of ours would never be jeopardized.

The people of the United States are deeply indebted to you for your untiring efforts to preserve the natural resources of this Nation for all the citizens of the Republic.

Respectfully,

A. RAY NOLAN.

BRECKSVILLE, OHIO, *April 30, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to say "Thank you" for your courageous and untiring stand in the public interest on the tidelands oil controversy.

Those lands and the revenues therefrom should be federally administered as the Supreme Court has made abundantly clear.

I appreciate your tenacity.

GERALDINE MCNABB
Mrs. F. L. McNabb.

ELGIN, ILL., *April 29, 1953.*

DEAR MR. MORSE: I have been gathering information on the offshore oil bill and have come to the point where I think the National Government should have full control over all of the oil on the borders of Texas, California, Florida, and Louisiana. I am fully with you on this subject. I wish you would keep arguing on what you think is right for the whole United States.

Sincerely yours,

D. L. JOHNSTON.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., *April 30, 1953.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are to be heartily commended for the fight you are carrying on in the Senate. It is good to know there are still some men who are sincere enough, clear-sighted enough, to see the

danger in the philosophy of the Republican Party and its representatives in our Congress who are trying to foster it on the people. I am entirely in sympathy with your viewpoints on the many issues you have so energetically attempted to bring to the attention of the American people. Won't you please keep on fighting and speaking for those of us whose voice is beginning to be just a cry in the wilderness.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Eva D. Frank.

Oakland, Calif., *April 28, 1953.*

Honorable Senator Wayne Morse: I wish to express my appreciation to you for your strenuous efforts to save the tidelands oil for all the people.

It is harder and harder for those of us who are growing old. In my case I'm trying desperately to make ends meet on my small independent income. It isn't difficult to see what would happen in this controversy should the opposition be successful, thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. Thompson.

Yakima, Wash., *April 28, 1953.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Permit me to compliment you for your fight on the oil tidelands.

I hope you will succeed in saving this oil property for the people at large rather than for someone to exploit.

Yours very truly,

Ira D. Cardiff.

Albuquerque, N. Mex., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I just wrote Senator Anderson a note of thanks for his stand on the so-called tidelands oil bill and thought I really ought to say thank you to you, too, for your heroic efforts on behalf of the people.

Carolyn Weihafen and I were saying today that we certainly wished we could thank you with votes as well as words.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Gene Yell.

My Dear Senator Morse: A bouquet for you. You probably receive too few anyway.

Many of us appreciate your valiant efforts to defeat this very bad tidelands bill. I hope your efforts have an effect.

Best wishes and more power to you in all your endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs. T. G.) Anna J. Emmons.

Resident of California (Salinas). Visiting in Tucson.

Kalispell, Mont., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

I am herewith submitting my congratulations on the stand you have taken on the tidelands oil controversy. I am not a writer of note and below is a quote expressing my sentiments:

"I love the man that can smile in trouble, that can gather strength from distress, and grow brave by reflection, t'is the business of little minds to shrink, but he whose heart is firm, and whose conscience approves his conduct, will pursue his principles unto death."

Yours respectfully,

George Burns.

Madison, Wis., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: You have made a wonderful fight on the tidelands oil.

Thanks for your work, even though the people may lose at this time.

Very truly,

Catherine Byrne.

Oriskany Falls, N. Y., *April 30, 1953.*

Dear Sir: A little long-distance applause from a friend. The lot of an independent obviously is not an easy one—heavy crossfire.

You fought the good fight on this tidelands issue. I'm glad your stamina is equal to your personal courage.

Also saw and heard you on Ted Collins' "Cracker Barrel." Was particularly gratified at your remarks on political ethics. Too bad there aren't more people with those high standards and the courage of their own convictions.

Best wishes for your continued success. No need to add "Don't let 'em throw you." I'm sure you won't.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Eleanor Furness.

Kalamazoo, Mich.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I agree with your stand in the tidelands question and want to thank you for your fight in behalf of our rights.

Very truly yours,

Hermann E. Rothfuss.

Los Angeles, Calif., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to express my admiration to you for your courageous opposition to the oil grab; also for your statesmen's vision of the Nation owning our national resources and administering them for all the people's benefit.

You and Senator Douglas and others, who have awakened the public to this sacrifice of the heritage of all our Nation, to enrich a few greedy corruptors of Congress deserve the gratitude of all United States citizens.

I most heartily agree with you—that Congress especially needs to be investigated and cleansed of its corruption.

I hope yet for Lister Hill's bill to use the tidal oil for the education of our youth; who are growing up illiterate and neglected.

I have watched your record in Congress for some years, with admiration; though I am a Democrat.

Very sincerely,

Minnie Reed.

Retired teacher, 86 years old.

Inverness, Mont., *April 29, 1953.*

Dear Mr. Morse: Just a line to let you know how much I've admired the course you've followed, especially since your break with the party and Eisenhower. I believe you're absolutely right, but that there are very few with guts enough to do as you've done.

Congratulations, also, on your stand on the tidelands oil steal. Keep up the good work. I know there are millions more like me who wish you all the luck in the world.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Bangs.

New York, N. Y., *May 1, 1953.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

May I express to you my humble gratitude for the fight you are waging in behalf of all the people of our country.

It's slightly silly to see headlines of a saving of $8 billions and no plan in the headlines of the giving away of thousands of billions.

Perhaps because my work (in the form of a doctoral thesis) is concerned with the creative artistry innate in all peoples, that I had hoped that the money from the tidelands would make it possible for teachers to show the men, women, and children of our land and all lands the manner in which they can put into vibrant form and rhythms, without frustration, their inmost dreams and ideas.

A pity, too, that 27 million of us have no say. How many firms will receive that wealth? Could that be told?

Again my deep respect for the honesty, integrity, and great courage that has inspired you.

Respectfully,

Toska Tolces.

Richmond, Ky., *May 1, 1953.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Morse: Thank you for your honorable stand on public issues. We know that you act with the public good in mind, and we are grateful to you for that.

We shudder to think what would happen to the country if there were not men like you to combat the evil forces which are afoot. Your glorious fight to inform the public on the offshore oil issue is a feat worthy of the noblest knight of old. You are the hero of all liberal public-spirited citizens in this country. Thank you again.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. Janet Murbach.

Sunnyville, Calif., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: My congratulations on your forthright, vigorous, and also exhausting stand on the offshore-lands issue.

Your efforts in all things in Congress make us citizens feel more secure and restores some faith in this form of government.

I suppose the tidelands bill will pass, but your efforts will be long remembered.

Sincerely and respectfully,

A. A. Goetz.

Newark, N. J., *May 1, 1953.*

Hon Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: I wish to thank you for the splendid efforts you made against the tidelands oil bill.

It is in keeping with your record as a defender of the rights of the ordinary citizen.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. Constance Davis.

Philadelphia, Pa., *May 4, 1953.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations. Keep up the good work. Hope we can lick the tidelands oil bill.

Lionel Friedmann.

Menomonie, Wis., *April 30, 1953.*

Dear Senator Morse: My hat is off to you and your fellow Senators in your fight to stop the steal of billions of dollars in tidelands oil.

Your speech last weekend was magnificent and forced the papers to present the people's side of this question.

I support the Hill amendment and the use of this oil money for our schools. The schools in our own State need it.

The people are behind you in your fight to protect our interests against the big-oil men. Keep talking and fighting. Our schoolchildren need that money.

Sincerely,

John Geist.

Jackson, Miss., *May 2, 1953.*

Dear Senator Morse: Want to congratulate and commend you for your stand on tidelands. Know most of your people are proud of you.

Sincerely,

D. C. Hester.

BRONX, N. Y., *May 2, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for the vigorous fight and really long speech that you made against the offshore oil bill recently. This was truly an outstanding fight and a real education to the people. I do not believe that most people knew what the real meaning of this bill was.

In any case, the people should know now and I do hope that they make themselves heard. That is about the only thing left that might stop this bill from passing.

Thanks a million for the wonderful job that you did with your speech against it.

Most sincerely,

J. S. VOLKERT.

NESHANIC STATION, N. J.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for the apparently thankless job you have been doing in opposing the Holland bill. This bill seems so utterly unjustified and outrageous, I cannot understand the support it is getting in the Senate. I have written my own Senators and Senator TAFT my feelings. I am sure this matter has not gotten the understanding of the people, but your untiring efforts and those of your colleagues have certainly emphasized it more than it otherwise would have been. Please extend my thanks to Senator ANDERSON, Senator DOUGLAS, and all the others who have stood with you. I suppose it will be up to the Supreme Court and I still have confidence in them, but many thanks to you for supporting the cause of the people of the United States against the selfish interests of a few.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH BORTON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 1, 1953.*

DEAR SIR: As an ordinary American of liberal opinions, I wish to take this chance to express my appreciation and admiration for your heroic efforts against passage of the Holland bill re tideland oil. The efforts made by yourself and your Senate colleagues of like mind will not soon be forgotten by liberals. Be assured that you have the support and affection of many of us, who, though inarticulate, are not unappreciative.

Sincerely,

JEROME I. GREENSTEIN.

ALEXANDRIA, VA., *May 1, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express to you my very great appreciation of your strong efforts to prevent the return to State ownership of the tidelands oil areas.

I also admired your decision to become an Independent, so that you could be free to act according to your conscience.

I believe that true progress is made by persons who, like yourself, have ideals, and the courage to support them.

Very sincerely,

MRS. EDWARD S. RENDALL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend your stand on the issue of offshore oil rights. The people need more courageous men like you.

DAVID SEIDMAN.

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF., *April 25, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations. You are the finest man in the United States Senate. I think your talkathon was a great and wonderful effort.

Sincerely,

HAROLD L. CONNOR.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 30, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We thank you for your untiring efforts on the Hill amendment. Now it would seem that the matter at hand is for you to vote for the Langer amendment. We do appreciate your sincere efforts.

Sincerely yours,

ROY A. GAGE.

LAKE GROVE, OREG., *April 28, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations and my most sincere appreciation for your efforts on the offshore oil issue. While you no doubt are receiving a great deal of unfavorable criticism, there are many, many of us who regard you as a champion.

Perhaps those who do not realize it now will come to see just how they are being hoodwinked and deprived of the great national resources to which we are all entitled. When they do wake up, I hope they'll have the grace to thank you and the others who have tried so hard.

However this battle comes out, it is obviously only the beginning, so may I add, please don't let them take Bonneville. The Northwest power interests are already licking their chops.

Yours very truly,

JANE VENN
Mrs. Howard Venn.

DAYTON, OHIO, *May 2, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to express my deep appreciation for the dramatic fight you made last weekend. I feel sure that when all the American people have the facts on the offshore issue, they will feel as strongly as you do about it.

It is a great pity that the press by and large treated your marathon speech as just so much showmanship—but enough of the substance of your fight seeped through so that your points were not entirely lost.

I understand that there is some hope of a Presidential veto and that a fight will be made until that hope is lost. Please be assured that your efforts to wake up the American people have aroused at least my sentiments, and that I am doing all I can to see that these public resources are used for the children of America and are not lost to selfish interests.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN WALLICK.

HAZLETON, PA., *April 30, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Many, many thanks to you, Senator MORSE, and to your colleagues who have fought so heroically to prevent our tidelands oil resources going the way of the bulk of the timber on our public lands along with other resources. Our grandchildren and theirs in their hour of need should recall or have recalled to them that there were a few of you with the wisdom of our forefathers.

Some of my Republican acquaintances have been a bit shocked at the vehemence with which I have endeavored to change their attitudes on this issue—one complains he can't buy a decent piece of lumber.

Do not take time to reply to this letter, but conserve your time and energy for opposing the other raids which will undoubtedly soon be attempted on our power resources and other of the public domain.

Sincerely yours,

WM. A. HERR.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 28, 1953.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We, among thousands of other Americans, are watching your courageous battle for principle, and just wanted you to know, though we can't express it by voting for you, how we feel.

Never having written a "fan" letter in my life, I'm not sure that this is even the correct approach, but as a former student in your speech department at Minnesota, I'm proud of the professor's practice of what he taught. May you continue to uphold the right, and may your own constituency uphold your hands.

With kindest personal regards to both you and Mrs. Morse,

I am sincerely yours,

GUITA BEARMAN GORDON.

HAMMOND, IND., *April 30, 1593.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I do not know exactly how I should begin to relay our thoughts on a speech the likes of which we saw you give at Gary last night. If you were great at the University of Chicago, you were immortal Wednesday. We were virtually struck with awe after the speech was over, when we recalled the force, vigor, clarity, and drama with which you are able to relate your interpretation of American ideals to specific issues we face today. If Stevenson's speeches (which I just today was able to purchase in Hammond) could be used as a text in a graduate course, so could your ideas on the problems we face today. Congratulations on a fine piece of work. You are rapidly becoming political idealism personified to us.

I would like to thank you very much for the useful and informative materials you sent me; my friends and I are using and enjoying them very much. We would also be very much interested in any materials you might send us on these or other topics deemed pertinent by you at this time. We would especially be interested in something on the recent statement recently issued by you and the other Senate liberals concerning the recent raising of the interest rate on the national debt by Secretary Humphrey.

Your points concerning the necessity of maintaining and increasing the buying power of the American worker, as well as your espousal of a liberal capitalism were especially well taken; I know that many of my associates genuinely wish to avoid a socialist government in the United States; but the reactionaries in our midst seem to offer little alternative to socialism; your type of enlightened leadership definitely does, and through it, we shall keep and improve on the best features of capitalism, thus avoiding the evils in a totally socialist government and economy.

Your reference to Edmund Burke and your statements concerning his place in the philosophies of your and Adlai E. Stevenson's have prompted me to delve into him immediately. Believe me, the opportunities of one like yourself, in whom one can believe, for forwarding the political education of those who listen to you, are limitless.

* * * * *

With the best of luck and all possible success on all fronts,

I remain, sincerely,

TOM KAFANTAIS.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 3, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It has been several months since we have heard from each other. However, I have been following your activities in the United States Senate from the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the newspapers. Having known you personally since 1948 it did not surprise me to find you in the ranks of the Members of the United States Senate who are interested in the welfare of the majority of the people of our country and in the future of the United States.

Permit me to congratulate you in your stand on Joint Resolution 13, "title to certain submerged lands," and bringing to the attention of the voters of the attempted steal of submerged oil lands for the benefit of three States supposedly but actually in and for the benefit of the private oil interests. If such legislation is enacted it will be the start of the giving up by the Federal Government of water rights, timberland, millions of acres of grazing land, irrigation projects, and hydroelectric power sites and powerplants to private groups for exploitation and private profits. Such efforts have been made in the past. Our natural resources belong to all the people and not to just a few.

If the voters only knew what was back of the joint resolutions they would insist that their Representatives in the Congress vote against this legislation. I have noticed from the letters and telegrams that you have received that many are from Massachusetts. Permit me to inform you that in the Massachusetts Legislature on last week the matter was debated in the house by way of resolutions to be sent to the Congress.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR J. GROSS.

FAIRFIELD, CONN.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate.

SIR: I want to express my appreciation and admiration, in my humble way, of a great barrister and statesman, in your recent address to the United States Senate in regard to the Continental Shelf offshore oil bill.

It brings to the point your manifest interest in the welfare of the commonwealth of this great Nation.

I was reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about the oil bill. Some Senator called it a giveaway bill. He was mild with the slogan; I would say it looks like legal larceny if they get away with it.

• • • • •

I like a man who has intestinal fortitude to express his constituted feeling, and not be a "yes man" when you feel you're doing what is right.

Like a great statesman years ago, Henry Clay (quote:) I would rather be right than be President.

Well Senator, here is one citizen who is pulling for you.

• • • • •

However, Senator, wishing you good health and good luck for you and your family.

I remain a constituent of this commonwealth, and

Very respectfully yours,

FRANK J. FARRELL.

KALAMAZOO, MICH., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE:

DEAR SIR: This is to let you know that there are a few of us who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are not a bit fooled by what we read in the newspapers about the junior Senator from Oregon. We note that you, LANGER, and MURRAY opposed the nomination of the unspeakable Winthrop Aldrich to Ambassador to England, and you are doing all you can to impede piracy by the big money power. We would like to see a bigger and better fight against deficit financing of government, and against the payment of interest to people who create the money they lend, and perhaps a rebirth of the old Greenback Party and constitutional money as required by article 1, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

John O. Davis, Richard H. Forster, Wesley D. Merriman, Jr., Harry H. White, H. M. Gall, Keith Billings, Franklin W. Sebastian, Wilbur C. Ganger, Henry Cunningham, Richard A. Tarkin, Elmer B. Donovan.

ORINDA, CALIF., *May 1, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I haven't time to write you a personal letter so am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have just sent to Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL of California.

We think that you are just wonderful and hope that you will keep up the good work but do take care of yourself. We can't afford to be without you.

Greetings and best wishes to you and all who fight the good fight.

Sincerely,

HELEN M. BOLE.

NORWOOD, PA., *April 15, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Americans in generations to come will acclaim the great stand that you and the other Senators opposing the tidelands bill are making.

It is a monumental period in your lives and I am confident that generations of future Americans will be thankful for the untiring effort you are spending on behalf of the American public. Do not lose heart, as I am confident that the public will respond with deeper conviction as the import of this outrageous bill reaches them. The press, or I should say the "silent press" have done their best to ignore the implications but the dramatic stand you are making forces recognition.

It took courage and conviction to stand the tortured hours in your marathon speech and as one American I wish to express my gratitude. Do not give in because when the dam breaks the public domain will end in the "way of all flesh." On behalf of myself and family, please accept my thanks.

Cordially,

JOHN W. BOSWELL.

BAKER, OREG., *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE:

DEAR WAYNE: The main thing that tees me off is the fact that the papers just played up the fact that you had the stamina to talk for 22 hours against the theft of the oil lands from all the people—they neglected to mention what you said. That is the part I would like to know. I have heard you a great many times and I am sure you don't talk without saying something worth listening to.

Anyhow, more power to you. May you continue to be the voice of the common people in a place where for the past few years and particularly now, so little real concern is being shown for the greatest good for the greatest number.

I am proud of our junior Senator and of my acquaintance with him. I also am proud of your work for Hells Canyon big dam bill and I trust that when the Idaho Power Co. hearings come up you will be in there pitching with GRACIE PFOST for the good of folks like Mrs. Reed and me.

My kindest personal regards and wholehearted thanks. May God give you strength to continue your Robin Hood role and give you the instinct to know what fat seat to jab with a specially fashioned Wayne Morse arrow to get them off of the reactionary bench and over on to the liberal one.

Very sincerely yours,

DON REED.

OAK RIDGE, OREG., *May 2, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C:

Congratulations on your fight for Hells Canyon Dam. Will back you 100 percent. Do all you can. We are behind you.

ROLAND CLARK,
Member of Board of Directors, Lane County Electric Co-op of Eugene, Oreg.

VALE, OREG., *April 25, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: I have been watching with interest your activities in the United States Senate. Your 11-hour debate on offshore oils—spoke too soon, now 22.18 hours. Thank God that we have a few like yourself that will talk until you drop to try to preserve some of our God-given natural resources to maintain them and not let the wolves take them all.

• • • • •

Public thinking locally has done to a large extent a right about face in the past couple of months. Those who expressed bitterness, or some of those, are now in a quandary. They had to admit their wrong past thinking, but can't accept what the big boys are passing to them and are not mealy mouthed in expressing their feelings. Three and one-half more years may change things considerably.

As I stated to you in Baker, God bless you; still with you and I assure you I will remain. I don't believe the boys can continue to crucify you very much longer. All I can say is stay with them as basic facts in the long run always pay dividends where half truths and untruths fail.

Your very truly,

S. STANTON,
County Judge.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., April 30, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just a note to say how much many of us here appreciate the fine work you have done to oppose the so-called tidelands bill. It is a thoroughly vicious measure, not far removed from using Public Treasury to buy votes.

Enclosed is a photostat of a clipping from the New York Times for February 23, 1953, which states my views more fully.

Sincerely,

ROSCOE T. STEFFEN.

(Enclosure)

TRANSFERRING OFFSHORE LANDS—AUTHORITY OF CONGRESS TO DISPOSE OF PUBLIC LANDS IS QUESTIONED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It seems to be generally assumed that Congress may dispose of the vast offshore oil reserves belonging to the United States in any way that it sees fit. But, in spite of the broad wording of article IV, section 2, of the Constitution, by which Congress is given power "to dispose of the territory or other property belonging to the United States," it is believed that this is not necessarily true. There are definite limitations on what Congress may properly do.

Perhaps a business analogy will make the point clear. It is usual in corporation charters or by-laws to give the board of directors broad powers "to manage" the affairs of the business, including, of course, the power to buy and dispose of property. But nothing is better settled, in spite of the generality of these charter provisions, than the point that directors have no power to cede or hand over corporation property to a particular share-

holder without compensation, though it has often been tried under one disguise or another. Corporation assets are said by the courts to be held in trust for all of the shareholders.

So too, the courts have said, over and over again, that United States property is held in trust for all the people. In Light against United States, for example, Mr. Justice Lamar quoted the accepted text: "All the public lands of the Nation are held in trust for the people of the whole country." He then went on to say: "And it is not for the courts to say how that trust shall be administered. That is for Congress to determine."

POWERS OF CONGRESS

In other words, Congress is given the widest discretion as to how it shall administer its trust on behalf of all the people, but it is given no warrant whatever, quite apart from any question of possible judicial review, to abandon or disregard its trust in order to prefer some particular State or States, or cetain private interests, when there is no national interest to be served.

The much relied upon statement of Mr. Justice Black in the California oil lands case, that the power of Congress under article IV, section 2, is "without limitation," does not, when fairly examined, state anything to the contrary. That language was used merely in support of the Court's incidental holding that the Attorney General had appropriate Congressional authority to bring the suit then before the Court.

In that respect, that is, to further the public welfare, Congress was said to have complete power. The Justice did not say that Congress could give away land contrary to the national interest, or anything of the sort.

Strangely enough, no one seriously pretends that it would be in the national interest today for Congress to hand over the offshore oil lands, worth unknown billions of dollars, for exploitation by particular States or private interests. Oil-rich Texas, least of all, can ask for such bounty at the national expense. Congress, of course, may properly lease or sell its oil rights at a fair consideration, since in that case the money received could in turn be used for the benefit of all the people, i. e., for education or to apply on the national debt. But a simple gift, as has been proposed, would be a plain breach of trust.

COURT RULING ON OIL

In fairness to Texas it does not ask for a gift. Its position, and that of certain Senators, is that the Supreme Court was simply wrong in ruling, as it now has done on three occasions, that the offshore oil lands do not belong to the coastal States.

Unfortunately for that contention, we have a Government of coordinate powers, and it would be improper, if not indecent, for the Congress now to try to overrule the Court on a question of this sort. The offshore oil lands, to the edge of the Continental Shelf, therefore must be understood to belong to the United States, insofar as title may be asserted to such property under international law.

But what this contention does make wholly clear is that the drive to give away these lands, falsely represented to the people as "tidelands," does not stem from any purpose to further the national interest. The record is clear on that. It is a bare assertion of power to subvert the national interest, in disregard of the fact that Congress is given no authority under article IV, section 2, of the Constitution to play Santa Claus with the public lands.

The new administration must not forget that public property, no less than public office, is a public trust.

ROSCOE T. STEFFEN.

CHICAGO, *February 19, 1953.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 1, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: Congratulations on the new record you established. I hope in addition that your tremendous effort will help to get across to the public the significance of the tidelands oil case.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

TED.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *April 27, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I'm sincerely proud of you in your efforts against the tidelands oil bill. I admire your courage in fighting against something you believe is wrong even though your long 22-hour talk may have cost you some personal prestige. Congratulations from one of your ex-constituents.

I'm grateful too that you're on my side in the Hells Canyon Dam controversy, and I want you to know that there are plenty of folks here in Idaho who are behind you in that fight too.

Thank you for your pre-release speech you made before the Senate. It was a dandy, and I'm giving you a lot of publicity on KRLC on that talk. Also, Hells Canyon Dam Association, of which I am a member, is canvassing Oregon, Idaho, and Washington for signatures refuting McKay's contention that few Northwest people are interested in multiple-purpose dams. In my canvassing through town, I find that about 20 people are for Hells Canyon, to 1 against, and I believe other members have found that percentage consistent.

If there is anything I can do here in Lewiston to help you, Senator MORSE, be sure to let me know. I want to do more than I'm doing.

Again, thank you for your responses to my previous letters.

Sincerely,

A. THOMAS DECKER.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *April 29, 1953.*

DEAR WAYNE: I certainly admire your courage in standing up and battling the powerful oil trust in their grab for the tidelands.

* * * * *

Many Republican friends are not too happy with them up to this date. It looks like the same Republican deal after World War I with Hoover asking that the Government power projects be turned over to the power trust.

Enclosed are a few clippings and more power to you, fellow. You have what it takes to tell them off and letting them know you are not a rubber stamp to any outfit. I would give my right arm to be with you in taking them on and I would be pretty rough with no holds barred.

Yours,

AL.

P. S.—Amend the bill guaranteeing all prior filing rights to individuals who filed on leases under the Government act. This will upset them as this is what the whole fight is about. If it takes an act of Congress to give these lands away, it is an admission that the Government owns them. You can still file on leases owned by the Government within the boundaries of States. In the event you fellows lose, it will be submitted to the Supreme Court that Congress cannot give away any of the sovereign domain to individual entities.

(Enclosure)

TIDELANDS OIL ISSUE

There has been a consistent effort by the big oil lobby to set aside three Supreme Court decisions that have ruled that the Federal Government owns the oil-rich tidelands that extend beyond the shores and into the oceans.

The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (Stat. 437 as amended, 49 Stat. 674), provided that any qualified applicant could obtain a permit to prospect for oil and gas upon land "wherein such deposits belong to the United States." In numerous incidents where citizens filed on these tidelands, their permits were denied by the Secretary of the Interior.

At the time of the original application, section 13, supra, vested discretionary power in the Secretary with regard to such application in that it merely "authorized" him to grant permits. In 1935 the statute was amended so as to change the discretionary power of the Secretary and thus not only was he to be "authorized" but also he was "directed" to grant permits when such permits had been on file for 90 days prior to the effective date of the act.

Setting aside the three decisions rendered by the Supreme Court in its rulings that the United States Government has paramount rights to these lands will automatically cancel the rights of individual citizens to file on lands in these territorial waters and will place these lands under the States and their politicians and will make a better bonanza for the oil interests who have in many instances drilled in the tidelands without permits from the Government. Under such a scheme, 155 million American citizens will lose a right to file the same as they had under Government homestead laws that created many of the fine farms of today.

This writer has never seen any State boundaries on any map of the United States extending into the oceans claiming jurisdiction over these offshore lands. Then why have the oil interests all of a sudden tried to get these lands wrested from the Government and turned over to the States? The only reason is, oil was discovered in the ocean lands and they would have a better chance to acquire them. Therefore, they have supported a powerful lobby to get the job done.

In a bulletin entitled, "Summary of Operations, California Oil Fields, 33d Annual Report of the State oil and gas supervisor," issued by department of natural resources, division of oil and gas, volume 33, San Francisco, Calif., January-June 1947, No. 1, contains a map on tideland pools, Huntington Beach Oil Field, Orange County, Calif., and shows courses of wells producing in the main zone. In showing the courses of the wells on this map, it can be seen where the wells were drilled back on the land and out of the water and then slanted out under the ocean floor.

If the United States Government has not owned the tidelands, does the Government own the range lands and the timber lands that come within the boundaries of States? If the oil lobby is successful in getting the President's veto overridden, isn't it logical for the big cattle interests and timber interests to ask for the same favors in regard to the range lands and timber lands?

Will the Members of Congress that went all out for the oil boys as they did in the tidelands deal favor one like it for the cattle interests and the timber interests, if they asked for it?

Drew Pearson's syndicated article of May 27, 1952, in the Oakland Tribune, lists the lobbyists who are the chief wire pullers in the tidelands oil battle. The salaries are impressive, so there must be money in oil.

In magazine U. S. Crime, volume 1, No. 2, is an article by Robert S. Allen entitled, "The Biggest Steal in U. S. History." It covers the tideland history in considerable detail and who is back of trying to wrest these lands from the Government—and the people.

The majority of American citizens have never known the true issue back of the tidelands oil controversy and the effect on their rights in connection with it. They should rise in indignation and combat the biggest steal in the history of the country.

W. A. BLACKFORD.

OAKLAND, CALIF.

THE CITIZEN-ADVERTISER,
Auburn, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You made a wonderful, wonderful try at waking up the people, and we at the Citizen were rooting for you all the way. I'm afraid that if you don't watch out you are going to go down in history as a stateman, and there are darned few of those I can think of. The late Senator from Michigan was one.

Yours,

WELLINGTON WALES,
Editor.

(Enclosure)

[From the Citizen-Advertiser, Auburn, N. Y., of April 25, 1953]

HE TRIED

Filibustering is speaking just to consume time. It consists generally of reading the Almanac, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or anything handy, even though the material may be completely extraneous to the subject at hand. It is a delaying tactic, used to block legislation.

Senator MORSE has just finished what most people will call the longest filibuster on record. In opposition to the tidelands oil bill he steadily and solely held the Senate floor for 22 hours, 26 minutes. He sat down not once during the period.

But his long speech was different from a filibuster in intent and content. The intent was not to delay, but to dramatize—dramatize one of the most colossal frauds ever imposed on the American public.

And the content was not just other people's words, but Senator MORSE's own, and they added up to an impassioned plea to the American people to recognize what they were doing before it was too late.

He spoke of how giving control of the undersea oil property to the States would deprive schools, colleges, and universities of drastically needed funds for education. He argued for the human wealth of the Nation, human wealth through knowledge that could be provided with the $50 billion that under the tidelands bill will go to three States.

He did his best, but his best—sad to say—will probably not be enough. The temper of America is so fanatically Republican at the moment that we are determined to give away anything, even our children's educations, in return for the victory the party has just won.

LINCOLN, NEBR., *April 30, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am attaching a copy of the news report of the action of the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature on a resolution favoring Federal ownership of tidelands oil.

Perhaps I should introduce myself. You will recall possibly that, as chairman of the Missouri Basin Survey Commission, I telephoned your office while in Washington last October, and that when you were here in Lincoln delivering an address at the University of Nebraska, you were kind enough to call me for a brief telephone conversation. I handled the late Senator George W. Norris' last two senatorial campaigns as an independent candidate for the Senate.

The significance of the action of the Nebraska Legislature rests in the fact that this State is overwhelmingly Republican at this time—the legislature consists of 40 Republicans and only 3 Democrats—and all the members of the Nebraska delegation in Congress, with the single exception of Senator GRISWOLD, have followed President Eisenhower in this fight.

You and your associates have fought a magnificent battle. You have won your fight. The people of this State are against this tidelands bill, irrespective of political affiliation. Not only are they disillusioned by President Eisenhower's position in this matter but each day sees the people of Nebraska turning against the President, with the farm program, the administration's attitude on public power, and its views on reclamation the chief contributing causes for a changing public sentiment.

There is a possibility that later in the spring or in the early summer I may get back to Washington. I realize fully how busy you are, but if events so shape themselves as to permit me to come east, I would deem it a great favor if I might visit with you for a short time with reference to the study that we made on Missouri Basin development.

You have made so many splendid fights that I have felt I was negligent in not sending you word of encouragement.

Very cordially yours,

J. E. LAWRENCE,
Editor, the Lincoln Star.

(Enclosure)

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star of Thursday, April 30, 1953]

UNICAM URGES FEDERAL TIDELANDS CONTROL—RESOLUTION IS PASSED, 27 TO 11

The Nebraska Legislature, by a vote of 27 to 11, Wednesday passed a resolution urging the jurisdiction of tidelands oil lands remain with the Federal Government.

The United States Senate is scheduled to take a vote next Tuesday turning the tidelands over to the coastal States. The House of Representatives already has passed the Federal bill.

All four of Nebraska's Congressmen voted for the bill and Senator BUTLER, of Omaha, has said he will vote for it in the Senate. Senator GRISWOLD recently voted against tabling an amendment affirming Federal tidelands ownership.

The Nebraska Legislative resolution was offered by Senator John Larkin, Jr., of Omaha, who argued that Nebraska needed and wants the school money that would come through jurisdiction staying with the Federal Government.

Senator Terry Carpenter, of Scottsbluff, a former Congressman who was a Democrat when he served in Washington and now is a Republican Party member, argued for the resolution.

Senator Carpenter said "no one can say" that the schools of Nebraska couldn't use the money the State would get with continued Federal jurisdiction, and set this amount at around $500 million "in a period of time."

But, he added, he would admit the resolution probably "would have no force or effect" on Congress.

Senator Arthur Carmody, of Trenton, who had brought up the question of whether the resolution would have any effect, finally asked "who knows here" of all the problems in the tidelands case and moved the resolution be held over 1 day. He asked that Senator Carpenter gather information on all phases of the case, but Carpenter moved for immediate action.

Replying to Carmody's request that he gather more information, Carpenter laughed and said, "Congress has been arguing this for 20 days and can't agree on all the problems. I won't get any more information because first, I have neither the time; second, I have neither the ability; and third, I have neither the inclination to do it."

The Carmody "lay-over motion" lost and then the resolution passed.

Voting for the resolution: Adams, Anderson, Aufenkamp, Bixler, Britt, Carpenter, Coffey, Cole, Diers, Dooley, Duis, Fenske, Hill, Hubka, Kotouc, Larkin, Liebers, Lillibridge, Brower, McHenry, Martin, Marvel, Person, Pizer, Tvrdik, Williams, Wilson.

Voting "no": Beaver, Bridenbaugh, Brown, Burney, Carmody, Carson, Cramer, Klaver, McNutt, Peterson, Shultz.

The Nebraska Legislature is elected on a nonpartisan basis, but most of its members this session are Republicans.

ALEXANDRIA, VA., *April 29, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Thank God for thought.

JOHN BENNETT.

BOISE, IDAHO, *April 28, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just finished reading a copy of your Hells Canyon speech which was sent to me by Al Ullman; and I want to let you know how stimulating I found it. It's truly the definitive work on the Hells Canyon fight.

You may not be aware of the inspiration you have given to scores of people in this area. Like you, they have a deep feeling for our heritage of natural resources and the need for proper conservation and development. I am sure they get as much gratification as I do from your efforts to articulate what may well be the greatest need of our generation—the saving of our land and its resources from those who lust for its wealth.

As far as Hells Canyon is concerned, the job is far from finished. However, for the first time, and despite the many immediate obstacles, I feel that we are on the road to victory. It may take many years, but this is one we'll win in the end.

There's an old saying that you can't lick a good man who knows he's right and keeps on swinging.

Cordially,

LLOYD TUPLING.

NEW PLYMOUTH, IDAHO, *April 26, 1953.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: Just a letter of congratulation on your efforts to support legislation that benefit all the people instead of the vested few. You will win with the truth and the people will support you in the end for your honest and diligent efforts to stand up in the face of the present giveaway regime and fight for what is right. I only wish we had more of your kind to represent us, and if you can just hold out we will give you more help in 1954. We may be able to save some of it if they haven't given it all away by then.

Yours respectfully,

C. H. GALVIN.

RETAIL CLERKS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
April 28, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It was a distinct pleasure and personal privilege for me to hear and witness, as a gallery spectator, your history-making speech on the Senate floor, last Friday evening. Your reference to certain actions of a congressional group as being "just good Lincoln Republicanism" and your remarks on the movement of the lumber

industry of the West coast, with special reference to your own home town, Eugene, Oreg., brought to mind the March 1953 issue of our monthly publication—Retail Clerks Advocate.

Containing, as it does, a quotation from a speech by Abraham Lincoln on the cover and a sketch-pad article about Eugene within its pages, it seems to be appropriate that I send you the enclosed copy of that issue.

While doing so, permit me to express to you my personal appreciation and high esteem of your magnificent courage and integrity. Your firm devotion to the cause of liberal government for the people of America, and your unceasing and alert attention to the welfare and interests of all the little people of these United States, will surely be long remembered by your countrymen as a true example of man's responsibility to man.

Most sincerely yours,

JOHN L. PHILPOTT,
Washington Representative.

TOPEKA, KANS., *April 28, 1953.*

DEAR WAYNE: I am a Morse telegrapher and I think we need more Morse men like you in the Senate.

GLENN D. BAKER.

MONROE, N. Y., *April 27, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: An old saying that I first heard many years ago is along the lines that, "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones" (I have windows in my house) because someone might throw the stone back. (I had that happen last Halloween night when the plate glass in my front door was broken.)

In reading yesterday's New York Times, it states that the Senate crowned you as their new speaking champion because of your talk on the offshore oil bill. This letter is not intended as a criticism or to find fault in any way, shape or manner, but I remember the time when J. P. Morgan was attending a railroad meeting and the president of the railroad suggested that one of the very little stations have its name changed. Morgan replied, "To what?" The president answered that no name had been picked out, whereby Morgan moved that the meeting be adjourned until the president knew what he wanted.

This may seem far-fetched, but to the ordinary run of Americans, and I believe to people in other countries, some of the business methods in Washington are beyond understanding. A rule for writing a letter is that to have it given attention, it should not be more than a page in length and the pertinent part should be in the first sentence. If a member of a board of directors of any of the big companies should attempt to give a talk lasting many hours, it is doubtful if he would be a member for very long.

I have personally sat in the gallery of the Senate Chamber and also the House of Representatives and I have seen so few Senators present while a speech was being made that it seemed amazing. As to the House of Representatives, I have seen so much confusion and talk that hardly anyone could hear what was being said and for the calling a vote for something before the House, the length of time wasted through not using an electrical recording device is also not understood by many visitors to the gallery. I have watched little board meetings that conducted the business of the village so orderly and so promptly that there is no comparison between Washington and Pochunk.

Yours very truly,

R. W. SMITH.

O TIDELANDS, MY TIDELANDS
(By Abram Eisenman)

Bubble, bubble, trouble and toil,
Who owns our water, soil, and oil?
The 48 States in sovereign isolation,
Or the 150 million people of this great Nation?

What is this local-yokel's appeal?—
Cogs to be bigger than the wheel?

What is this new States rights law of geography,
That extends Florida and Texas 10 miles out to sea?

O take our great Federal power,
O Dwight David Eisenhower,
And on every ballot's tide,
Divide, divide, divide!

Split this great Nation into the fragmentation
Of 48 units in supreme isolation,
Turn back progress without commotion,
Make Florida and Texas part of the ocean!

Sail on, O Union, strong and great,
In spite of selfish men in every state,
Sail on, O Captain, in thy raft,
Powered by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT,
And when you've stripped the Federal Government of power,
What will be history's verdict of President Eisenhower?

"A nice guy who fronts for Mr. TAFT,
Plays golf with shiny sticks,
But, in the world of politics,
Can't tell his fore from aft."

LANSING, MICH., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand against giving away our offshore oil lands is encouraging to those of us who are concerned about the trend of our present Government.

From May 9 through May 12 I am going to be in Washington on a vacation and would like the opportunity to meet you if possible. Naturally I realize that you are very busy and if it is not possible to meet you I will understand. At any rate, it is pleasant to know that there are still a few men in public office who really believe in democracy and who are not afraid to fight for it.

Wishing you good health and success in your political undertakings, I am

Very truly yours,

BETH LANGWORTHY
Mrs. Beth Langworthy.

AUSTIN, TEX., *April 25, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We cannot help trying to express directly our admiration, not only for your recent stand against tideland oil giveaways but also for your courageous, independent stand since the beginning of the Taft-Eisenhower coalition.

When you run for reelection I am sure we shall be able to take up a small collection of contributions to your campaign fund from Texans who realize where our national resources are really going. Meanwhile, personal thanks for representing our point of view, which our own party's Senators have often failed to do.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. DON BARTLETT.

THE BRYAN TIMES,
Bryan, Ohio, April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I certainly appreciate your effort to prevent Congress from giving away the greatest gift in all of history. With 40 more Morses, Humphreys, and Douglases, and some others, this would be a better country.

Yours,

CASS CULLIS.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: Enclosed is a copy of a telegram which was sent yesterday to sixty NAACP branches urging them to wire their Senators regarding the bill on tidelands oil.

Ever sincerely,

WALTER,
Executive Secretary.

(Enclosure)

APRIL 28, 1953.

Senate voted unanimous consent today to vote Friday on bill giving tidelands oil to Texas, Louisiana, Florida and California which our Senate friends like LEHMAN, HUMPHREY, MORSE, and DOUGLAS characterize as greatest giveaway in human history. They propose using money for education and other advantages to all people of United States. National office urges you telegraph your Senators and get as many other organizations and individuals do so urging them vote against Holland bill and for Lister Hill amendment to use tidelands oil money for public education. Immediate action imperative. We are counting on you.

WALTER WHITE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks my amendment to the pending joint resolution, lettered "D," about which I have just spoken to the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Texas, the sponsors of the pending measure. I hope that, between now and tomorrow, they will see fit to accept my amendment.

There being no objection, Mr. MORSE's amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amend section 7 so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to amend, modify, or repeal existing law pertaining to commerce and navigation, rivers and harbors, reclamation and irrigation, national defense and international affairs, including but not limited to the acts of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 251), July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 217), March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), March 3, 1899, chapter 425, section 10 (30 Stat. 1151), June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, chapter 285, section 39 (41 Stat. 1077), as amended, and December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I see no reason why the two particular laws, that of 1899 and the Waterpower Act of 1920, should be excluded from the list of laws which are already, by specific provision, exempted from the operations of the pending measure.

I ask unanimous consent, without my taking time to repeat it, to take from the long argument I made last Friday on the pending measure certain paragraphs which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages 4283 and 4284. I want the argument readily available to the Senate tomorrow, when the Senate comes to vote on my amendment.

There being no objection, the paragraphs referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the course of the debate, on Monday, April 20, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] referred to section 7 of the bill, which specifically preserves all the reclamation laws of the United States and all the right of the United States

under those laws. The majority report seeks to impart the same assurance. However, the enumeration of laws preserved unimpaired by section 7 is, in my judgment, incomplete. Two significant ommissions—the act of 1899 and the Federal Water Power Act of 1920—would be specifically added to this section by the proposed amendment which I shall send to the desk shortly and ask to have printed and await the action of the Senate when I call it up on Monday. I respectfully submit that the enumeration of laws as presently contained in the joint resolution is incomplete, and, as I have indicated, it is also incomplete in the report. In such circumstances I think the good old Latin maxim, e jusdem generis exclusio unius, applies; in other words, any member of a class not included in an enumeration is deemed to be excluded intentionally. That is the essence of my argument, Mr. President. I believe it is a legal principle that courts are most likely to follow. Courts look at the sections of a bill and see what was included, and then they apply the old Latin principle that what was excluded was presumptively excluded intentionally.

Certainly the Senate does not want to enact subconscious legislation. We should not take the chance that Senate Joint Resolution 13 will, without the knowledge of the Congress, undermine existing laws. But, I respectfully submit, without the adoption of my proposed amendment, that result will easily follow.

For example, the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 was largely based on the reclamation laws. However, another extremely important law in the fabric of the Federal waterpower policy established by the Congress during the last 50 years became a vital part of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, under which Boulder Dam, since renamed Hoover Dam, was constructed.

Section 4 (d) of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 vested in the Federal Power Commission the authority to grant licenses to the various States, municipalities, individuals, and corporations for the construction of dams, powerhouses, transmission lines, and so forth, on any of the navigable waters of the United States. Section 3 of the act defined navigable waters in such a way as to include the uppermost reaches of all the rivers of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the New River case—*U. S.* v. *Appalachian Power Co.* (311 U. S. 377)—upheld this broad definition of navigable waters, thus affirming the authority of the Federal Power Commission to grant or withhold a license to construct a power dam on the uppermost reaches of a navigable river.

It is significant that section 6, paragraph 3, of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, provides as follows:

"The Federal Power Commission is hereby directed not to issue or approve any permits or licenses under said Federal Water Power Act upon or affecting the Colorado River or any of its tributaries, except the Gila River, in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, and California until this act shall become effective as provided in section 4 herein."

The Federal Government in this way asserted and exercised its right to control the entire upstream watershed of the Colorado River.

By the omission of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 from section 7, Senate Joint Resolution 13 may be construed to rewrite the current definition of "navigable waters."

I believe there is that danger, Mr. President, and what I am trying to do is to plug the loopholes so as to obviate the danger when the proposed legislation reaches the stage of litigation. Believe me, Mr. President, it is going to be the subject of litigation.

I desire briefly to comment on that point. Eventually, Mr. President, the joint resolution, if it becomes law, is going to go where it ought to go—to the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. President, it may be attempted to reverse the Supreme Court by what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] called legislative packing of the court; but the Supreme Court is still going to sit and function, and I think the legal shortcomings of the joint resolution are so great that when it gets before the Court it will have great difficulty in getting through the Court on constitutional grounds. When it reaches the Court I want to have it in as good shape as is possible in regard to such questions as those which I am raising today. That is why I am going to offer amendments to the pending joint resolution, and I shall ask for a vote on them.

I send forward my first amendment, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. By the omission of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 from section 7, Senate Joint Resolution 13 may be construed to rewrite the current definition of "navigable waters."

This would constitute a grave threat to the further orderly and efficient development of the rivers of the United States, such as the Missouri River, the Connecticut River, and so on, as such development is impossible without complete control of such watersheds, all the way up to their headwaters. The construction of Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government might be blocked by the State of Idaho if the State through this legislation is given the right to license power sites on the Snake River.

Therefore section 7 of the pending joint resolution must be amended to include the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, as well as all other laws relating to reclamation, irrigation, and the improvement of rivers and harbors and the other areas over which Federal control is purportedly reserved by section 6 (a).

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk my second proposed amendment and ask to have it printed and lie on the table, to be called up by me on Monday.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any Senator wish to speak in opposition to the pending amendment? If not, what is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 5, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of April 6), 1953:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. John R. Hardin (colonel, Corps of Engineers) to be a member and president of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37; 33 U. S. C. 642), and section 8 of the Mississippi River Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 537; 33 U. S. C. 702h), vice Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Carroll L. Meins, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Albert Cole of Massachusetts, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 4, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Bishop Stephen Robinson, Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Des Moines, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, our Heavenly Father, we call upon Thee for Thy blessing this morning. We are appreciative of the blessings and opportunities of life, for our great Nation, for the faithful servants of our country. We pray Thy blessing upon this assembly that these servants may be endowed with wisdom and understanding. May they seek to walk in Thy ways and observe Thy will, that the spirit of inspiration may bless their minds.

Forgive us wherein we have made mistakes. May we always be mindful of our responsibilities and trusts. Help us to be humble, full of love, courageous, and true.

May the activities of the House be blessed today.

We pay special respect to one of our Members who has served faithfully here. May Thy divine spirit be present, and may we enjoy that spirit throughout the day. Enlighten our minds with wisdom and understanding for the duties of today. In Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 30, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 108):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. GARRETT L. WITHERS, late a Representative and former Senator from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above reso-

lution the Vice President had appointed Mr. CLEMENTS and Mr. COOPER members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 53–7.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. ALLEN of California and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GEORGE and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE and to include a resolution adopted by the Illinois General Assembly.

Mr. BOLAND and include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN on Polish Independence Day, May 3, 1953.

Mr. RAINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

Mr. HÉBERT in two instances, in one to include an article from Time Magazine on John Hay Whitney, and in the other an article from the Star, also extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT and to include an editorial from the Birmingham News.

Mr. REAMS.

Mr. OAKMAN in two instances.

Mr. D'EWART in reference to a bill he is today introducing to define the surface rights vested in the locator of mining claims.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. SHEEHAN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. COLE of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include an editorial.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday and Thursday of this week, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit from 10 to 11 tomorrow while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

REVIEW AND REEXAMINATION OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 138)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 1, 1953.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In the message which I sent to the Congress on April 7, requesting a 1-year extension of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, I referred to the need for a thorough reexamination of our whole foreign economic policy.

I now recommend that a commission be established to make this review. The review should provide the basis for action during the next session of the Congress.

It is my belief that the proposed commission should be made up of Members of the Congress appointed by the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, and members appointed by myself from outside the Congress. It should be representative of both major parties. This is appropriate since commercial policy is an integral part of our total foreign policy from which broad national support is vital.

This commission naturally should work within the framework of our foreign policy and our global defense plans. Close liaison should be maintained with the group set up under the auspices of the State Department to follow up the economic and financial talks held earlier this spring between the United States and various European countries.

The commission should study all existing legislation and the regulations and administrative procedures stemming from it which bear directly on our foreign economic relations. This review should seek to determine how these laws can be modified or improved so as to achieve the highest possible levels of international trade without subjecting parts of our economy to sudden or serious strains.

An inquiry of this nature is imperative. The economic policy of this Nation exercises such a profound influence on the entire free world that we must consider carefully each step we take. Changes in foreign economic policy—even those which at first have relatively slight consequences within this country—may either strengthen our allies or plunge them into a downward spiral of trade and payment restrictions, lower production, and declining living standards.

Our foreign economic policy also has important implications here at home. Declining imports will necessarily mean falling exports, resulting in a serious loss of markets for our agriculture and other industries. Expanded imports may require some adjustments in our country. We must make sure that changes in foreign economic policy consonant with our position as the world's greatest creditor nation do not benefit particular groups at the expense of the national welfare, but we must also make sure that such changes do not place unequal burdens on particular groups.

As I indicated in my previous message, the achievement of a strong and self-supporting economic system in the free world, capable of providing adequate defense against aggression and of achieving rising standards of living, must be a cooperative effort. Through increasing two-way international trade and stimulating in every practical way the flow of private investment abroad we can strengthen the free world, including ourselves, in natural and healthy ways. By so doing, we can lessen and ultimately eliminate the heavy burden of foreign aid which we now bear. Both we and our friends abroad earnestly desire to see regular trade and investment replace grant assistance.

In launching a broad-gage study into the question of what our foreign economic policy should be, I think we can prepare the way for a fuller utilization of the economic strength of the free world in the cause of peace and prosperity.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), from May 4 through May 9, 1953, on account of official business of House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. BUSH (at the request of Mr. GAVIN), for an indefinite period of time, on account of illness.

Mr. FRAZIER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for week of May 4, on account of official committee business in New York.

THE LATE GARRETT L. WITHERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I announce the death of Hon. GARRETT L. WITHERS, a

Member of Congress from the Second District of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Mr. WITHERS was apparently in good health on last Wednesday, and that evening he was suddenly stricken with an illness and taken to the Bethesda Naval Hospital where he passed away the following afternoon.

Mr. WITHERS was a man who had the confidence and respect of his people. He held many positions of trust and profit in the State of Kentucky. He had been a referee in bankruptcy in the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky. He had been master commissioner of the circuit court, which made him vice chancellor of that court to whom most equity matters are referred. He was a member of the highway commission of the State of Kentucky, and on the elevation of Senator Barkley to the Vice Presidency the Governor of Kentucky appointed him to the Senate of the United States where he served with distinction for 2 years. He was twice elected to the House of Representatives, once in August 1952, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of John A. Whitaker and again in November 1952 to the 83d Congress. Although twice elected to the House of Representatives, he had the opportunity of serving but 4 months.

Mr. WITHERS was a man of sound judgment, fine capacity, genial and kindly in his disposition, who made friends readily. The many important positions of trust and honor which he held evidence the confidence in which his people held him. His district and the State of Kentucky have sustained a great loss, and I am sure had he remained he would have continually increased his influence and prestige here and would have rendered great service to his State and Nation.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Withers and to their sons and daughter. The finite mind cannot comprehend the workings of Providence. God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. Why this man, apparently in the best of health, with many years of useful service ahead of him, should have fallen like the sturdy oak falls before the whirlwind in the forest, we do not know.

The moving finger writes; and having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

He has left us. I know that he will be happy in that land where the good are rewarded and the faithful receive their just returns. May the light of God's countenance shine upon him and give him peace.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing on April 30, 1953, of our beloved colleague, GARRETT LEE WITHERS, representing the Second District of our great State of Kentucky, leaves me with a heavy heart. He has been summoned to that great mansion of rest by the Master of all lodges, nations, and men. Somehow, I just cannot realize that he has gone, because it came so suddenly. Only the day before he was stricken down I had talked and joked with him here on the floor. He was in unusually good spirits and he never looked better physically. When a rollcall came a few moments later, we sat side by side and voted when our names were called. When we were ready to leave the Chamber he asked me how I was feeling, and when I told him that I was better, he told me how glad he was to hear it, that he had been worried about me. He said: "Leslie, you take it easy now and get back on your feet," and when I retorted, "Lee, you always make good sense," he laughed and patted my hand. You are probably wondering why I was calling Senator WITHERS LEE, instead of GARRETT, and why he was addressing me as LESLIE, instead of FRANK. To be truthful about it, it was one of the pranks of our colleague NOBLE GREGORY. He had everybody in the Kentucky Democratic delegation calling each other by their middle names. If one of our Kentucky group happened to have a serious look on his face as if he were disturbed or troubled about something and one of our delegation would call him by his middle name, invariably he would brighten up instantly and answer with a big smile. Senator WITHERS especially got a big kick out of our calling him Lee. My colleagues, I cite this little incident to help give to you a clearer, finer picture of this great Kentuckian, this splendid American who loved his fellow men and who was deeply interested in their welfare.

GARRETT LEE WITHERS was an able lawyer, an outstanding legislator, a fine husband, a considerate father and an excellent citizen. He had an infectious smile, a warm firm handclasp, a friendly word for all and he spread sunshine and happiness wherever he went. Folks just liked GARRETT WITHERS because GARRETT WITHERS liked folks. He understood the principle of that old saying, "The only way to have a friend is to be one." Lee also was a God-loving, God-fearing man, and he practiced the Golden Rule every day of his life.

The Nation and Kentucky can ill afford to lose such champions of democracy, such stalwarts as Senator WITHERS.

To his grieved wife and family I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy. The Commonwealth of Kentucky and the entire country mourn the loss of this great statesman. May God rest his soul in peace and provide an extra special place for him in that great mansion on high.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, GARRETT WITHERS was not as well known in this body as he was among the membership in the Senate of the United States. I first met Senator WITHERS in the latter part of 1947. At that time Mr. WITHERS was commissioner of highways in Kentucky. Soon thereafter I became associated with the highway department as attorney and had the opportunity to become intimately acquainted with GARRETT WITHERS. He was always kind, helpful, considerate—an honest gentleman—and courageous in anything he undertook to accomplish. His accomplishments were many in his life. I just wish the membership of this House could have heard the remarks made by close friends yesterday concerning Mr. WITHERS as a citizen. Those remarks were from the people who knew him best in the community where he had resided all his life.

While in the cemetery, I heard one friend state, "We have lost one of the greatest citizens in this country." This was in the home county of Mr. WITHERS.

The school superintendent in Webster County told me about contacting Mr. WITHERS a few years ago about buying a farm. Mr. WITHERS at that time was disposing of his property, and after the superintendent contacted him, he described the property he had remaining. The superintendent of schools said, "I think I will just purchase the first farm that you described on your own recommendation." The school superintendent purchased the farm without even going out to look at the property. He did that because of the confidence he had in Mr. WITHERS—his honesty and his integrity. He said after he bought the property he went out and looked over the 161 acres and then came back and told Mr. WITHERS that he had not really represented the farm as good as it actually was. Mr. WITHERS stated, "I only wanted to present a true picture of the property the best I could and I am mighty glad that you feel that way."

Another remark interested me yesterday. The circuit judge down there, who had been on the bench for 26 years, stated that Senator WITHERS not only was a great and able lawyer with outstanding judgment, but he added that after Senator WITHERS had thought a proposition through, any person had better think twice before disagreeing with him. GARRETT WITHERS was a great lawyer and he was always eminently fair in his consideration of any proposition or problem that came before him. His whole life was dedicated to the building of a better community and a finer country.

These remarks just go to show some of the outstanding characteristics of this great Kentuckian. I do not think that Senator WITHERS made a speech on this floor. He was an eloquent speaker and he always knew the subject matter about which he spoke. The people of Kentucky, as manifested by the huge crowd that turned out yesterday, had confidence in Senator WITHERS. He commanded the respect of everybody who knew him, including the membership of this great body.

It has been stated that there are times when sorrow is genuine and regret is sincere; this is one of those times. Senator WITHERS was devoted to his country, to his family, and to his work here in Congress. A man of excellent moral character.

I was deeply shocked last Thursday when I was notified about his death. I want to join with my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to his family and loved ones. Not only has his district suffered a great loss, but the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and the Nation, have suffered a great loss in his passing.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from Kentucky and other Members of this House in expressing regret at the loss of GARRETT L. WITHERS, and in expressing our deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

He was a great man. He served his country faithfully. He occupied many positions of trust and honor in Kentucky and the Nation, first as circuit clerk of his home county. He told me that while so serving, that furnished him with the idea and the stimulus that prompted him to enter the legal profession. He had a long and glorious career as a lawyer in his community. He first made his appearance in State politics by holding the position as a member of the advisory highway commission. He later served with credit as commissioner of highways of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. He was appointed to the United States Senate, and I dare say, there is no man in that body who merited and received more respect from his colleagues than did GARRETT WITHERS.

He was recently elected to the House of Representatives and served here with credit and honor. It was not the offices that GARRETT WITHERS held that made him such a great man but the method by which he fulfilled the duties and obligations of those offices. He fulfilled them with honor. He was honest, sincere, and just. He was courageous in all of his stands, and he furnished the type of Christian leadership to the people of Kentucky and the people of this Nation that will long be remembered. However, I feel he will be missed more by the people in his home community than in any other place. He has made his record on the State and national level, and that will become history; but as I mixed in the funeral crowd yesterday, among the little people who had assembled there from the far reaches of his county and district, and talked something over an hour with them while I was waiting for the funeral services to begin, I know those people felt that they had been dealt a crushing blow. As I talked to them I gathered from them that no problem was too great in his local community for him to tackle, nor no man's troubles too small for him to take the time to assist him. I heard person after person say, "Well, I don't know who I will turn to now, because when I was perplexed about any subject I felt I could call on Garrett and he would give me the type of guidance and the type of advice that I needed."

It is indeed regrettable that not only will the people of his district be deprived of the type of representation in Washington to which they are entitled and that he was so capably rendering them, but the House will miss the keen mind that he possessed and the valuable knowledge of governmental affairs that he had accumulated through many years of useful and faithful service.

His death is a tragedy not only to the members of his family and his many friends but also to the Commonwealth of Kentucky and our Nation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it had been my privilege to know Mr. WITHERS ever since he came to the Senate of the United States. Our friendship grew from that day until his passing. He was appointed to the United States Senate, as was said by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], to succeed Senator Barkley when he was elected Vice President of the United States. Had he needed any recommendation to me at all, it would have been that the man who was then Governor of the State of Kentucky, an outstanding man, EARL CLEMENTS, appointed GARRETT WITHERS to the Senate of the United States. I knew then that Mr. WITHERS must be an outstanding Kentuckian; and as I came to know him better with his modesty, with his fine sense of justice, with his wonderful character, I was drawn closer and closer to him.

This is a bad time to lose a man of GARRETT WITHERS' stature in statesmanship and in citizenship.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our deceased colleague from Kentucky. It was not my good fortune to be intimately acquainted with Mr. WITHERS during his short period of service in this House. However, he leaves a daughter, Mrs. R. B. Griffith, who lives in my district and now resides in the city of Lamar, Colo. I wish at this time to extend my deep personal sympathy not only to his daughter, but to Mrs. Withers and the other members of the family. I have been very much impressed by these eulogies to our departed colleague this afternoon by those who knew him so well. I am sure that he richly deserves all of the praise given him, and much more. I sincerely feel, Mr. Speaker, that truly a great American has passed on.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker—

Why should the spirit of mortal be proud?
Like a fast flitting meteor, a fast flying cloud,
Like a flash of the lightning, a break of the wave,
Man passes from life to his rest in the grave.

I join with other Members of the House this afternoon in expressing my regret in the passing of our colleague, GARRETT L. WITHERS.

My acquaintance with Mr. WITHERS covers only a short period of time; this for the reason that his service in the House lasted for only a few months. I did, however, have a chance to get acquainted with Mr. WITHERS. He was a valued member of our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I did have a chance in those few months, by reason of our association, to become more intimately acquainted.

I learned to respect him because of his geniality and by reason of his capacity and his understanding of legislative problems. He was the type of man who bore no ill will against anyone. He was the kind of person who made friends and kept them. His service in Kentucky is an indication of the respect and the esteem in which he was held by the people of his own State, who knew him best.

It is difficult for those of us who survive to attempt to understand why a man of such great capacity and understanding and ability as Mr. WITHERS should be lost at a time when his services to his country are most needed. We who survive do, however, appreciate the impression and the example he has left with those who follow in his footsteps.

GARRETT WITHERS was one of those men who had a rare sense of justice. He had all of those qualities that make a Christian gentleman. To his widow and other members of his family, we extend our deepest sympathy.

There is a destiny that makes us brothers,
None goes his way alone.
All that we send in the life of others
Comes back into our own.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend or revise and extend their remarks on the life and public service of GARRETT L. WITHERS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I, like all Kentuckians, am shocked and grieved over the sudden passing of my long time friend and my colleague, GARRETT L. WITHERS. I have treasured his friendship throughout the years, but with the intimate association since he became a Member of Congress this friendship has ripened and become more appreciated.

GARRETT WITHERS commanded the respect of all who knew him. His record of long service to his home, to his State and to his Nation has been a brilliant record. The record he has left is a monument to a man of principle, character and courage. So long as these qualities are honored among men, just so long will the memory of GARRETT L. WITHERS occupy a hallowed place in the hearts and minds of those who knew him well.

My sympathy goes out to his lifelong companion and to the other members of his family.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I feel a very personal loss in the passing of our late colleague, GARRETT LEE WITHERS. He was my neighbor in the New House Office Building, his office being separated from my own only by the office of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

We learn a great deal about our neighbors. And while I have known GARRETT WITHERS in a personal way only since the beginning of the present Congress, that time has been adequate for me to know that he was in the truest sense a Christian gentleman, a kindly friend, a helpful neighbor, and a public servant who proclaimed and practiced the very highest and noblest principles of our American democracy.

Knowing him, even though for a short time, has been an enriching experience to me, and I shall not soon forget his hopeful and healthy outlook, his cheerful and optimistic viewpoint, and his unwavering faith in the future of this Nation, which, as he saw it, is ours to build as we will.

To his family and loved ones I extend my sincerest sympathy in their hour of grief and sadness.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 227).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. GARRETT L. WITHERS, a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of seven Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that he did on Saturday, May 2, 1953, appoint the following Members on the part of the House to attend the funeral: Messrs. SPENCE, GREGORY, CHELF, GOLDEN, PERKINS, WATTS, and ROBSION.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, May 5, 1953, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

667. A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the Air Force semiannual report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period from July 1, 1952 to December 31, 1952, pursuant to section IV of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

668. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a recommendation that a commission be established to make a review and thorough reexamination of our foreign economic policy (H. Doc. 138); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

669. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of $137,570 for the Judiciary (H. Doc. No. 139); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

670. A letter from the Attorney General, relative to the appropriation concerning salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals, Justice, 1953, pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of section 1211 of Public Law 759, approved September 6, 1950; to the Committee on Appropriations.

671. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 relating to the percent of colonels in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

672. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

673. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report from the Archivist of the United States stating that no records have been authorized for disposal during the calendar year 1952 under the provisions of section 7 of the act approved July 7, 1943, as amended July 6, 1945 (57 Stat. 382; 59 Stat. 434), pursuant to the authority as stated above; to the Committee on House Administration.

674. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting recommendations for the enactment of legislation repealing the act of June 24, 1910, as amended, entitled "An act to require apparatus and operators for radiocommunication on certain ocean steamers"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

675. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing payment of $4,449.21 to the Newport Electric Corp. of Newport, R. I., in full settlement of a claim against the United States, pursuant to 14 U. S. C. 646 (b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 30, 1953, the following bill was reported May 1, 1953:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 226. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 4974, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 342). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4975. A bill to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 4976. A bill to extend to June 30, 1954, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 4977. A bill to ratify certain payments heretofore made for the transportation of the household effects of naval personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4978. A bill to repeal the act of September 30, 1950, authorizing the transfer to the State of Iowa of Fort Des Moines, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4979. A bill to authorize congressional committees to invoke the aid of the courts in obtaining testimony from witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 4980. A bill to amend section 3250 (1) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a person entitled to drawback with respect to certain nonbeverage products may elect to receive such drawback on a monthly instead of a quarterly basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4981. A bill to amend section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the deduction of medical expenses without regard to the $2,500 and $5,000 limitations of existing law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART (by request):

H. R. 4982. A bill authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make available a loan to the Montana State Coordinator of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4983. A bill to define the surface rights vested in the locator of a mining claim hereafter made under the mining laws of the United States prior to issuance of patent therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4984. A bill to remove certain limitations upon the purposes for which the city of Miles City, Mont., may use certain land heretofore conveyed to it by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4985. A bill to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4986. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to authorize the continued employment of persons performing satisfactory service who have reached the retirement age prescribed for automatic separation from the service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OAKMAN:

H. R. 4987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from gross income certain increases in the redemption value of series E bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 4988. A bill to amend section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, so as to permit Federal land banks to make loans to corporations under such act, without any limitations upon the amount of such loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4989. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Horse Shoe Bend National Military Park in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4990. A bill relating to the spending and quarterly payment of appropriations for the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution amending and revising the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act so as to eliminate certain obsolete and inapplicable provisions thereof and to clarify and revise certain other provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HALE: Memorial of the senate and house of representatives of State of Maine, rescinding vote taken by the 90th legislature, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the leasing of re-

stricted Indian lands in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make provision for reimbursing school districts for the loss of tax revenues resulting when land is taken or used by the Federal Government for a Government plant; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States rescinding the vote taken by the 90th Legislature, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting for the purposes of taxation, the activities of a private contractor performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission be treated as activities of the Commission itself; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting into law the bill now pending before the Congress of the United States giving supervision of offshore oil and that the proceeds therefrom be contributed to education as provided therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the appropriation of additional funds for rodent control so that the United States Public Health Service will be in a position to make adequate allocations for the continuation of rodent control in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 4991. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cacciutto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4992. A bill for the relief of John Kritikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4993. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Niniema (Taha) Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 4994. A bill for the relief of Jakob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4995. A bill for the relief of Mohamad Hassan Dardari alias Hassan Choukat Dardari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4996. A bill for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 4997. A bill for the relief of Adolf Schaefer (Schafer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4998. A bill for the relief of Paul Prkovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 4999. A bill for the relief of Ernest Singer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 5000. A bill for the relief of Chan Tien Sou and his wife Li Wai-Sheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

217. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Middle Atlantic Regional Council of the National Association of Housing Officials, vigorously protesting the action of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States in the adoption of any appropriation bill which cripples the progress of the national housing policy, set forth in the Housing Act of 1949, of a decent home for every American family; to the Committee on Appropriations.

218. Also, petition of the city clerk of Trenton, N. J., condemning action of the United States Congress in rejecting appropriations for public housing and slum clearance for the fiscal year 1953–54; to the Committee on Appropriations.

219. Also, petition of the secretary, the United Veterans Legislative Committee, Honolulu, T. H., endorsing statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

220. Also, petition of David Darrin, Washington, D. C., relative to forming a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives to investigate the possibility of a finer economic civilization; to the Committee on Rules.

221. Also, petition of the Secretary, United Mine Workers of America, Local No. 6227, Toms Creek, Va., requesting the enactment of legislation which would limit the importation of residual fuel oils, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

222. Also, petition of L. W. Watson, Los Angeles, Calif., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

223. Also, petition of L. C. Pixley and others, Clearwater, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

224. Also, petition of J. Kennedy Carr and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

225. Also, petition of Mrs. Nettie Welch and others, Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

226. Also, petition of Charles H. Nutting and others, Ormond, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

227, Also, petition of Harry W. Sharpe and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this still moment make us vividly aware of the invasion of the Divine through all the areas of our needy, yearning lives. Give us, we pray Thee, the grace of hospitality to the highest. As citizens of a troubled world that carries on its bent shoulders a burden of suffering greater than humanity has ever borne, make us inwardly adequate to be Thy ministers of reconciliation in a violent time. May the poisoning evil which blights the earth not devastate our inner lives, subduing us to its low standards, confusing us by its chaos or crushing our faith under its tragedy. Praying for grace to make us worthy of so momentous a time our intercession rises for our Nation, its President, the Congress, and all who influence its policies; and for the whole body of the people that the fearful sacrifices, which are even now being paid in blood and sweat and tears, may not end in disillusionment of mankind's hopes and the despair of our children after us. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 4, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 71. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Olson;

S. 100. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 142. An act for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee;

S. 248. An act for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter;

S. 306. An act for the relief of Waltraut Mies van der Rohe;

S. 365. An act for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson;

S. 522. An act for the relief of George F. Ruckman;

S. 720. An act for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 811. An act for the relief of George Mauner;

S. 846. An act for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell; and

S. 851. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I regret to announce to the Senate the sorrowful fact of the passing of my distinguished and greatly beloved predecessor, Senator

Robert F. Wagner. Bob Wagner was my friend for more than 30 years. His passing affects me deeply. His death is mourned throughout my State, and, I believe, throughout the Nation. No man ever served the people with greater distinction nor more faithfully than he, both on the bench and in the Congress.

History will rate Bob Wagner as among the great legislators of our time, a man who left his mark indelibly on the statute books of the Nation. The father of labor's historic charter, the Wagner Act, and of social security, will long be remembered in the Senate, in the Nation, and by his host of friends in the State which he served so well and so long.

I ask the majority leader that an appropriate time be set aside next week for formal tributes to the memory of the late Senator Wagner, and for the consideration of a resolution of condolence.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I join with my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], in paying very high tribute to our late distinguished friend and former Member of, the Senate, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner. I shall not now go into detail as to the eminence of his position and record in the history of the United States or as to what he did in many ways for the country.

Senator Wagner was my senior in the Senate, and my tribute at the moment is a personal tribute to one who demonstrated again and again, after I came to the Senate, a friendship which I shall remember as long as I live. He helped me through many difficult times when I was a new Member of the Senate.

At this particular time I merely pay this word of tribute, awaiting next week, when I trust the majority leader will agree to fix an appropriate time when Senators may make further statements and pay more suitable tributes to the memory of the late former Senator Wagner.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I will set aside a time some day next week when general statements may be made in tribute to the late former Senator from New York.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senators from New York in their tributes to our late colleague, Senator Wagner. At a later time I should like to have the opportunity of making some remarks on his life and distinguished public service.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present such matters as usually come within the scope of the morning hour, with speeches not to exceed 2 minutes, the time to be charged equally to both sides. I also ask that the time for a quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 22d quarterly report on Export Control (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report (pt. I) on the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin relating to the enactment of an accelerated amortization law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See joint resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore on May 4, 1953, p. 4310, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Central Northwest Citizens Association, Washington, D. C., relating to supplemental appropriations for the District of Columbia Veterans' Service Center; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Two resolutions adopted by the Third Postwar Biennial Convention of the Pacific Southwest District Council of the Japanese American Citizens League, at Phoenix, Ariz., relating to appropriations for the settlement of evacuation claims, and for needed examiners, interpreters, and other personnel for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Estimate of the City of New York, protesting against any curtailment of Federal funds for the construction of low-income housing in the city of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relating to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore on May 4, 1953, p. 4311, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission has set aside 2 valuable channels for educational television stations, 1 each being reserved for Durham and Hanover; and

"Whereas the Governor has established the New Hampshire Commission for Educational Television, which is making studies in the direction of using these channels; and

"Whereas additional time will be needed to complete these studies and submit them for legislative action: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Federal Communications Commission extend the reservation of these channels for at least 2 years beyond June 2, 1953, and that our congressional delegation be instructed to request such extension; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of New Hampshire be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each member of the New Hampshire congressional delegation and to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D. C."

"Whereas an application for a television station on Mount Washington, the highest peak in the White Mountains of New Hampshire and the highest peak in the northeastern part of the United States, has been filed with the Federal Communications Commission in Washington for a channel, to be more specifically identified as channel 8; and

"Whereas the erection and establishment of such a television station and channel would be of great benefit in the educational and recreational fields of activity for the people of the northern section of New England and to the interest and benefit of the Nation as a whole in the expansion and enlargement of its communication system: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our congressional delegation be instructed to request the Federal Communications Commission to schedule a hearing on the allocation of channel 8 at the earliest practical date; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of New Hampshire be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each member of the New Hampshire congressional delegation; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D. C."

TAX EXEMPTION OF PRIVATE CONTRACTORS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION — RESOLUTION OF MARYLAND SENATE

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Maryland, relating to the exemption from taxes of private contractors performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 41

Resolution requesting that, for purposes of taxation, the activities of a private contractor performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission be treated as activities of the Commission itself

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the activities of a private contractor performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission are to be treated as activities of the Atomic Energy Commission itself for the purpose of securing immunity from State and local taxes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Legislature of the State of Maryland respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Atomic Energy Act so as to eliminate therefrom any language which may be interpreted

as providing for the extension of tax exemption to private contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission or to the vendors of such contractors, contrary to the well-established principles of intergovernmental relations which have assured to the States and their political subdivisions full power to impose nondiscriminatory taxation upon private persons who deal with the Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Maryland in the Congress of the United States.

FLOOD CONDITIONS IN BLADENSBURG PEACE CROSS AREA—RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Prince Georges County, Md., relating to recurrent flood conditions in the Bladensburg Peace Cross area of Maryland. Anyone who has attempted to enter or leave the Nation's Capital during these periods of flood is fully cognizant of the seriousness of the situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRENTWOOD, MD., *May 1, 1953.*

Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following is a transcript from the minutes of the board of directors' meeting of April 13, 1953:

"Whereas, after every heavy rainfall, the periodic flood conditions at the Bladensburg Peace Cross, in Prince Georges County, Md., gives rise to a problem the solution of which has received serious attention by Federal and local authorities for many years, and no relief has been afforded; and

"Whereas the rise of the waters at the Peace Cross at time of every heavy rainfall creates an impediment at that point on United States Highways Nos. 1 and 50 which interrupts the free flow of north and south traffic; and

"Whereas to effect the permament relief required, funds have been appropriated by Congress for perfecting plans under preparation by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, which plans are now available; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of Maryland, at its 1953 session, made mandatory the expenditure of State and county agencies, of $4,250,000 upon the condition that the Congress made available the additional sum of $1 million, toward promoting the Federal, State, and county program for alleviating the disastrous flood conditions at the Peace Cross; and

"Whereas it is urgent that effective and permanent relief from the present undesirable conditions at the Peace Cross, and its environs, be brought about at the earliest possible date: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress be requested to make available the sum of $1 million, to permit the carrying out of the Federal, State, and county program, as proposed by the General Assembly of Maryland, in conjunction with the plan of the United States Army engineers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Director of the Federal Bureau of the Budget, the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

PRINCE GEORGES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By CHAS. E. CALLOW,
President.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1631. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 226).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. GRISWOLD, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1831. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make certain discrimination on grounds of race, religion, color, or national origin by employers and labor organizations an unfair labor practice; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1832. A bill for the relief of Osjasz Hersh Braksmajer (Sam Braksmayer), Rysa Margolit Braksmajer, and Moshe Braksmajer; and

S. 1833. A bill for the relief of Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1834. A bill to amend section 6 of the Selective Service Act of 1948 to permit the correction of dental defects of selectees prior to their induction into the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1835. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 1836. A bill for the relief of Ernst Windmeier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1837. A bill for the relief of Leonard Reyes Isla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1838. A bill for the relief of Azzam Issac Rafidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, RELATING TO DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I send to the desk for introduction and appropriate reference a bill which carries out specifically the recommendation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and which would make discrimination by an employer or a labor organization against a worker because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry an unfair labor practice under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Besides myself, the sponsors of the bill are the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], my colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], all members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill constitutes a new approach to solving the problem of discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. Although important in itself, it should not be regarded as a substitute for S. 692, which is a far more comprehensive and effective approach in our overall effort to meet the problem of discrimination in employment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1831) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make certain discrimination on grounds of race, religion, color, or national origin by employers and labor organizations an unfair labor practice, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Script of television program Meet the Veep, participated in by Senator HOLLAND.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statement prepared by him relative to centennial celebration of Jewish Community Center movement.

Address entitled "A Foreign Policy for Peace," delivered by Senator MANSFIELD on April 29, 1953, at a dinner of the New York State Democratic Committee.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him entitled "Three Studies of Espionage and Other Security Problems," together with an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 4, 1953.

Address delivered by him at Eau Claire, Wis., on May 2, 1953, before the Wisconsin Federation of Young Republicans.

Article entitled "Family Rows Tend To Hide Need of Close British-United States Ties," and article entitled "Dutch Don't Mind Sacrifices, but Insist They Must Pay Off," both written by Crosby S. Noyes and published in the Washington Star.

By Mr. TAFT:

Address entitled "Legislative-Executive Relationships in the Administration of Programs as Viewed by the Executive," delivered by Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, April 30, 1953, before the Graduate School of the United States Department of Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN:

Letter from Committee on International Relations of the American Academy of Arts

and Sciences, relating to the work of the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.

By Mr. FREAR:

Article entitled "Highway Financing," written by Richard A. Haber, chief engineer, Delaware State Highway Department.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorial entitled "There Are Bright Spots Ahead in Farm Prices," published in the Country Gentleman for April 1953.

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "Private Power's New Hookup," published in the GTA Digest for April 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Editorial entitled "Soldiers, Not Mere Troops," written by Fred Burdick and published in Capitol Gist.

A NATIONAL SCIENCE POLICY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, under the 2-minute rule, I desire to make a brief statement and also to make an insertion in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to a situation I feel is of first importance. At the present time we as a Congress are not giving the necessary attention, financially and otherwise, toward developing a national policy with regard to basic research in the fundamental sciences.

World War II, and in particular the development of atomic energy, demonstrated the crucial importance of basic scientific research. Following the war, outstanding leaders in the field of science, men such as Vannevar Bush, sought to develop a means of assuring that the United States would maintain its lead in technological research and development—a field which was most likely to prove decisive in protecting the security of the Western World.

These efforts led to the establishment by act of Congress of the National Science Foundation. At the time the National Science Foundation Act was passed it was clearly the intention of its sponsors that the Foundation should become the central instrument of the Federal Government in developing a vigorous and well-integrated national science policy. Such an agency and policy are essential if we are to prevent the United States from falling behind the Soviet Union in technological development.

Unfortunately, the previous administration did not give the National Science Foundation the support it required to develop an effective national science policy. Numerous agencies of the Federal Government have been permitted to carry on large-scale, separate and uncoordinated programs in the field of basic research. This has not only meant tremendous waste in terms of dollars. It has also meant that we have not established clear, consistent goals and programs to make certain that America stays ahead in the technological race upon which our very survival may depend.

The failure to provide strong leadership in this field has been largely responsible for the slow start of the National Science Foundation in developing an effective national policy in this field of basic research. I am happy to report to my colleagues that under the leadership of President Eisenhower and with the cooperation of the Director of the Budget, we are now making a new start in this matter. Our present administration desires to remove the waste and duplication existing as a result of uncoordinated research programs in our various Departments. In a letter to me dated April 7, 1953, Budget Director Dodge writes as follows in support of a larger appropriation in fiscal 1954 for the scientific research work:

The revised 1954 budget request for the National Science Foundation is $12,250,000. While this is a substantial increase in the appropriations to the Foundation, it was more than offset by decreases in the justifiable requests of other agencies for similar purposes. These steps were taken in furtherance of the policy of this administration to centralize in the National Science Foundation the Government's program for support of basic research, which are now carried out by several agencies.

Mr. President, I believe that our Government now has a great opportunity to forge ahead in the crucially important field of scientific development. It is vital that we do so. Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director of the National Science Foundation, recently told the House Appropriations Committee:

In the year 1955 the estimate is that 50,000 engineering graduates will be produced in the Soviet Union, compared to some 17,000 in the United States. A similar situation exists in the United States with respect to the production of trained scientists of all types.

Dr. Waterman also stated:

Our output of young scientists and engineers is now dropping to nearly one-third of the output in 1950, at a time when our research and development effort has approximately trebled.

I hope, Mr. President, that this year the Congress will support the efforts of the new administration to make up for the mistakes of the past. Support of the President's appropriation requests for the National Science Foundation will permit the agency to move ahead with its consolidation efforts and result in substantial savings. Existing duplication among various departments now doing basic research will be reduced. But most important of all, support of the National Science Foundation can mean the beginning of a real national policy in the field of basic research. We must have such a policy if our defense program is to succeed.

Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director of the National Science Foundation, presented to the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee considering this matter on April 24, a statement which outlines the policy and functions of the Foundation and indicates its possibilities if the new policy which I am advocating should be developed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Waterman's statement printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ALAN T. WATERMAN, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES, SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, APRIL 24, 1953

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the National Science Foundation is appearing before you today to appeal from action by the House of Representatives in H. R. 4663, the first independent offices appropriation bill, which would reduce the President's revised budget for the Foundation from $12,250,000 to $5,724,000. The Foundation respectfully requests a restoration to the level of the President's revised appropriation request, $12,250,000, for fiscal year 1954. This is a request lower by $2,750,000 than the $15 million requested by the preceding administration. The Foundation also requests restoration of funds for travel, reduced in the House bill from the request for $117,000 to $78,000.

I should like, at the outset, to review very briefly the functions and activities of the National Science Foundation for which an appropriation is requested.

The National Science Foundation is directed by law to carry out three major programs and a number of others, all of them now active and functioning. The major programs are—

(a) To develop national policy in respect to science and its support by the Federal Government, and to advise the administration and the Congress regarding such matters.

(b) To plan and provide financial support for carrying on basic scientific research.

(c) To plan and provide financial support for the training of scientists and other scientific activities essential to the progress of science.

These and the other functions are described in detail in the 1954 budget document already submitted to the committee.

I believe that the record demonstrates the results which have been accomplished, and I shall review these only briefly here.

NATIONAL SCIENCE POLICY

The Foundation's first major responsibility—to develop policies on scientific issues—stems from long-felt needs for an organization within the Federal Government to perform that function. Major activities in this area fall under two headings:

1. Comprehensive studies and analyses of Federal research and development activities. Such studies encompass all aspects of Federal research: Obligations, expenditures, content, organization and management, impact upon educational institutions, etc. A variety of separate analyses are in active prosecution at the present time.

2. Activities to analyze and strengthen the national scientific effort. Some of these deal with short-range problems, others with long-range needs. Major emphasis to date has been upon analysis of current effort, and facilitating research progress in particular fields of science, examples of which are solar energy, low temperature physics, minerals exploration, physiology, applied mathematics, psychology, and high energy particle physics.

RESEARCH PROGRAM

In its research program—the second major function—the Foundation has made 260 grants for basic research being performed in 109 institutions throughout the United States and its possessions. Each of these goes to a college, university, or other nonprofit institution in support of a specific basic research project under the direction of a designated scientist. In each case, the project has been reviewed by an advisory

panel of scientists eminent in the scientific field of the project and the Foundation's scientific staff, and has been approved by the National Science Board. Most projects supported by the Foundation are initiated by the scientists and institutions which desire to do the work. The basic program is formed by selection from among the projects proposed.

The following data may be of interest. The average size of the Foundation's basic research grant is $10,355, or about $5,000 per year; the average duration of the basic research supported by the grant is nearly 2 years. During the current fiscal year, through March 31, 1953, the Foundation has considered over 800 proposals totaling more than $15 million. One hundred and sixty-four grants have been awarded; 206 proposals have been declined, largely because of lack of funds; and 43 proposals have been withdrawn. The remaining 401 pending proposals, totaling over $7 million, are for the most part highly meritorious.

SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER

In an effort to relieve the crucial shortage in scientific manpower facing this country the Foundation provides financial support for training of scientists and engineers through award of fellowships for graduate scientific training. The Foundation is the sole Federal agency supporting general purpose predoctoral graduate scientific training, the general purpose fellowship programs of the National Institutes of Health and the Atomic Energy Commission having been terminated by coordinated action of these agencies, the Foundation, and the Bureau of the Budget.

In April of 1952 the Foundation awarded 569 predoctoral and 55 postdoctoral fellowships to individuals selected from 2,977 applicants. In April of this year, 515 predoctoral and 42 postdoctoral awards were made to persons selected from 3,298 applicants. In addition 1,274 candidates were awarded honorable mention; with sufficient funds all of these would have received fellowships. Competition for these fellowships is nationwide; any United States citizen is eligible to apply. Awards are made solely on the basis of ability of the applicants, except that geographical factors may be considered in choosing between individuals of substantially equal ability. By law, those who win awards may select their own institutions of study.

OTHER SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS

The other important activities of the Foundation in support of science are: Providing a center of information and study on scientific manpower; strengthening the flow and interchange of scientific information; and participation in international scientific activities, including provision for American representation at the most important international scientific meetings.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY

The future plans and programs of the Foundation are best summarized in the new administration's statements relative to the Foundation. These are two:

(a) The letter from Mr. Dodge to me dated March 19, 1953, in which the Foundation is authorized to present a budget of $12,250,000 for fiscal year 1954. A copy of this letter was transmitted to this committee with my letter of March 23, 1953.

(b) The letter to Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH from Mr. Dodge dated April 7, 1953, a copy of which was sent to me, commenting upon S. 977 to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. This letter states in part:

"The revised 1954 budget request for the National Science Foundation is $12,250,000. While this is a substantial increase in the appropriations to the Foundation, it was more than offset by decreases in the justifiable requests of other agencies for similar purposes. These steps were taken in furtherance of the policy of this administration to centralize in the National Science Foundation the Government's programs for support of basic research, which are now carried out by several agencies. It should be made clear, however, that other agencies will be allowed to support basic research which is directly related to the solution of problems for which these agencies have statutory responsibility.

"One step toward carrying out this policy is taken in the revised 1954 budget request for the Foundation, but it will not be possible to continue it in future years if the present appropriation limitation in the National Science Foundation Act remains in effect.

"The removal of the limitation is not expected to result in an increase in total Government expenditures for the support of research. The National Science Foundation is now commencing a study which will result in recommendations as to the desirable goals and objectives of the Nation's research activities and the appropriate part for the Federal Government in this effort. When this study is completed, consideration will again be given to the proper level of Federal support of basic research. In the meantime, it will be desirable and economical to continue the gradual process of centralizing in the National Science Foundation, the general purpose basic research support programs of the Federal Government."

HOUSE ACTION

In adopting H. R. 4663 Wednesday the House has reduced the administration's estimate from $12,250,000 to $5,724,400, and has also severely cut travel funds. This action appears to be at variance with the policy of the administration.

The House committee in its report states:

"The committee is much interested in the coordination and elimination of duplication in connection with all scientific research work. It requests the National Science Foundation, during the fiscal year 1954, to exert every effort to assist in the coordination of all Federal research, including the elimination of duplication. In the opinion of the committee, a definite showing of substantial savings in this connection would encourage the Congress to consider the provision of additional funds for scientific research."

The action of the House committee, unless modified, will delay the coordination and elimination of duplication that it seeks. The expressed purpose of the administration's intention to centralize Government support of basic research is an important step toward achieving those very ends—but the centralization cannot go forward until the foundation is financially able to carry forward those programs of other agencies which the administration desires to merge into the Foundation's program. Unless a sufficient appropriation to the Foundation comes before such a merger, the national interest may be prejudiced by a reduction in the overall level of needed basic research activity.

Such a reduction is likely to occur even this year if the action of the House should stand, since the budgets of other agencies for basic research have been decreased by more than the amount of the recommended increase in the Foundation's budget.

TRAVEL

I also wish to discuss briefly recommendations in the report of the House committee on H. R. 4663 concerning travel.

1954 estimate	$117,000
House limitation	78,000
Difference	—39,000

The House committee bill proposes a limitation account for travel totaling only $78,000. The Foundation is required by the nature of its functions to seek out and utilize the best scientific minds of the Nation. We cannot hope to obtain such talent from universities and industrial laboratories throughout the country on a full-time basis, nor could we afford to do so. However, with a minimum expenditure of personnel funds we are able to obtain the services of outstanding scientists and engineers at nominal pay through the judicious use of travel money. Experience to date demonstrates that approximately $2 out of every $3 of travel money are spent for the travel of members of the National Science Board and divisional committees, and of scientific consultants in the many specialized areas of science. The proposed reduction in travel funds can result only in drastically reducing the availability to the Foundation of these experts.

The proposed limitation also is inconsistent with the position taken by the Congress in action on the 1953 appropriation of the Foundation, which included a limitation on travel of $118,750. This amount was allowed at a time when the Foundation's growing program was at a much lower level than is allowed even under the appropriation proposed in the current House bill. The proposed limitation is also inconsistent with the basic decision of the House on the appropriation for 1954; there appears to be no adequate basis for cutting the 1953 travel limitation by one-third while increasing the level of operations over that of the previous year.

The estimate of $117,000 will provide limited travel only for—

(a) Twenty-four members of the National Science Board who come from all areas of the country to attend 8 to 12 meetings annually;

(b) Thirty-six members of four statutory divisional committees who meet to advise and consult with the Board and the Director on matters of policy;

(c) About 150 consultants, specialists in the many fields of science, who provide expert advice on research proposals, on the training of scientific manpower, on the interchange of scientific information, and on matters related to the mission of the Foundation; and

(d) The small full-time staff which administers and supervises the Foundation's nationwide program.

Economy of operation by the Foundation is substantially enhanced by not having field or regional offices. This makes all the more necessary the availability of sufficient travel funds to enable the staff through personal contacts to keep its operations effective. The Foundation supports research at over 100 institutions and sponsors a fellowship program which is currently providing awards to approximately 600 fellows. The only way that the full-time staff can insure that dollars appropriated for research are prudently and economically expended is by judicious and planned personal contact with the research scientists and business administrators of the universities and laboratories. Now that the operating programs are under way and increasing attention is paid to studies involved in developing policy it is more than ever important to increase the degree of travel of the staff in order to secure reliable first-hand information. The Foundation therefore requests restoration of travel funds to $117,000.

PERSONAL SERVICES

Although the House bill does not establish a limitation account for personal services, the committee report on H. R. 4663 includes a recommendation that the estimate for personal services for 1954 be reduced to the 1953 level. The amounts involved are:

1954 estimate	$982,000
House committee recommendation	771,000
Difference	—211,000

While the 1953 level may be an appropriate ceiling for 1954 activities in agencies long established, it should be remembered that the National Science Foundation has not yet reached the stage of development required to perform its statutory functions in the manner desired by the administration and the Congress. When the National Science Foundation Act was enacted it was anticipated that several years would elapse before the Foundation would be operating at full strength since careful choice of permanent staff is a key factor in successful administration and is essential to satisfactory performance of the Foundation's responsibilities for developing national science policy and for evaluation studies. The following table presents the actual and estimated personnel strength from 1951 through 1954 as of June 30 of each year.

June 30:	*On duty*
1951 (actual)	36
1952 (actual)	83
1953 (estimate)	126
1954 (estimate)	150

There are currently 113 employees on duty. The $771,000 recommended in the report of the House committee would permit employment of 109 persons. Adherence to this recommendation would not only put a stop to the necessary completion of staffing but would, in fact, require a retrenchment involving the discharge of key staff members. This would be wholly inconsistent with the administration's plan to centralize in the Foundation the Government's basic research support program and predoctoral graduate fellowship programs and thereby enhance economy. Likewise it would be inconsistent with the proposals by the administration and the House committee that additional effort be expended on surveys of research activity.

MUTUAL AID

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning we were privileged to hear representatives of the executive department speak to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House on the subject of mutual aid. The whole program, of course, is based primarily upon what is called economic aid, in one way or another, or military aid.

Today I received a letter which I think is truly challenging. It comes from India. It tells about what is going on there, and what 200 Americans and others are doing in relation to advancing the principles which, after all, must be the foundation of peace throughout the world. I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SRINAGAR, KASHMIR, *April 29, 1953.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEX: Congratulations on getting "The Hindu" to American leaders—a statesmanlike move which has already made its mark out here.

We are in Kashmir—fairyland of lakes and mountains at the geographical and ideological heart of Asia. Just over the Himalayas on the east and Tibet and Communist China; west is Pakistan and the Khyber Pass; north is Soviet Russia and the new railroad under construction linking Moscow with Indochina.

The Srinagar premiere of Jotham Valley is under way. The theatre, as always, is crowded to the doors. Muslims, Sikhs, Hindus, and a party of Kazaks from Chinese Turkestan—lineal descendants of Genghis Khan; heads of the Indian Army and Air Force, chiefs of the United Nations Cease-Fire Commission, the mayor of Srinagar, heads of the chamber of commerce, secretaries of the sports clubs, chiefs of the radio, press, Red Cross, schools, directors of the three banks, speaker of the legislature, head of the CID, merchants and workers. This sort of a turnout to the plays seems to be normal living in Asia today.

Here are a few facts about the visit to India of the international force of 200 who have spent the past 6 months in this country:

1. The plays—Jotham Valley, The Forgotten Factor, and the new airlines revue, Take It To the World—have had extensive runs in Colombo, Bombay, New Delhi, Lucknow, Hyderabad, Madras, Bangalore, Calcutta, and now Kashmir.

2. 140,000 leaders of politics, industry, labor and education, including 400 members of Parliament and 20,000 students, attended the plays. India, with 360 million people, is run by approximately 300,000 educated leaders. This means that nearly half the country's effective leadership has had man-to-man exposure to the MRA ideology, and the balance have heard it through press and radio.

3. In a land where foreigners rarely stay in Indian homes, members of the international team lived, often for weeks at a time, with 700 different Indian families representing every aspect of the nation's life.

4. Dr. Buchman, an old friend of Gandhi and Tagore, who first visited India 37 years ago, addressed members of both Houses of Parliament in New Delhi. His award by the German Government of the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit, for contributions to Franco-German unity and world peace, took place in New Delhi in presence of Indian leaders. The President of India received the team. Prime Minister Nehru spent an afternoon at Jaipur House, which he had personally made available as an MRA center during the team's visit.

5. Devadas Gandhi, son of the father of India and editor of the Hindustan Times, referred in an interview to the principles of moral rearmament, which were always uppermost in Gandhi's mind.

6. The plays were presented by official request at the annual convention of the ruling Congress party. The MRA team were honored guests at convention meetings, being the only foreigners included.

7. Two international assemblies were held, at Colombo, Ceylon, and New Delhi, India. In addition to Indian and Ceylonese delegates, representatives attended from Japan, Thailand, Malaya, Burma, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Britain, France, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the United States, Egypt, the Philippines, and South Africa.

8. MRA supplements have been printed in eight national newspapers in Hindi, Bengali, and English. The Hindu supplement has been sent by national leaders in the West to a wide circle in their own countries.

9. Translation of MRA books and pamphlets into Hindi, Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam, and Kanarese is under way.

10. The Indian film industry, second to Hollywood in size, built a stage on the largest studio lot for the plays to be shown to members of the industry. Plans are in prospect for translating them into local dialects for village distribution.

11. Indian students—half a million of whom are currently unemployed and form communism's best manpower pool—flocked to the plays in every city. Ten thousand attended in Madras alone. The team addressed another 10,000 in 10 different colleges and universities. In Calcutta, leading Communist students were won to MRA.

12. Many Indian labor leaders have been won from class-war Marxism to the MRA ideology. Head of the Socialist trade unions (800,000 membership) came with friends most nights during a month's run of the plays in Calcutta. He studied in Moscow and is currently in Peking on a trade-union mission, but plans a month this summer for training in MRA. India's large cement workers' union has changed its motto from "Workers of the world, unite" to "Workers, unite the world." Indian labor leaders are sending the Hindu supplement to trade-union leaders throughout the world.

13. Many industrialists have reoriented their attitude toward labor. Employers of Bombay, Madras, Delhi, and Calcutta joined in sending the Hindu to industrialists abroad.

14. Politicians of different parties are beginning to work together for MRA. The Speaker of the House of the People is sending the Hindu to parliaments of the world.

15. European labor, industrial, and political leaders from France, Germany, Britain, and Switzerland joined the force in India to give evidence of the new ideology. Mr. John Craig, secretary of Colville's Steel, Glasgow, fitters of the *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth*, joined the team in Calcutta and addressed management and workers at Tata's Steel Works, Jamshedpur, largest steel mill in Asia.

16. The editor of the Bantu Mirror, African newspaper of the Rhodesias, attended the Delhi Assembly to bring news of MRA in Africa. The Indian press, Africa-conscious since Gandhi's early years there, has reported current MRA assemblies in Nigeria, Kenya, and Southern Rhodesia.

17. Chairman of the Tokyo City Council was sent by the council to be trained in MRA in Calcutta. Twenty-two delegates from Japan, including four MP's, two cabinet ministers, and a former Communist, have taken part in the current tour of India.

18. Leading Indians plan to attend the World Assembly at Caux, Switzerland, this summer for further training.

19. The Government of Thailand, center of world Buddhism, has provided in the national budget for the team's visit.

20. Many of the new Pakistan Cabinet have attended the Caux assemblies.

21. An MRA committee has been formed in Teheran, including the son-in-law of the Prime Minister, three former senators, and the Chief of the High Court.

22. In Cairo, Prime Minister General Naguib and Secretary-General of the Arab League, Dr. Hassouna, have urged Dr. Buchman to bring a team to Egypt and the Sudan.

23. Radio Moscow and Radio Tashkent recently devoted four broadcasts, echoed in dispatches by Pravda and Tass, to warning Asia and the Middle East against the "new ideology of the heart and conscience" which "has power to win over radical revolutionary minds."

With warmest messages to you and Mrs. Wiley from your friends out here.

Sincerely,

JOHN,
John McC. Roots.

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I have received from several prominent Connecticut citizens with regard to the educational needs of the State of Connecticut, and the importance of the "oil for education" proposal to the schoolchildren of their State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARTFORD, CONN., *April 21, 1953.*

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: The undersigned citizens of Connecticut, faced with the failure of our own Senators to make any effort to save Connecticut's $150 million share of revenues from the Nation's offshore oil resources or to support the Hill amendment to S. 107 to use these revenues for educational purposes, respectfully request you to present to the Senate of the United States such selections as you see fit from the accompanying facts concerning the educational needs of our State in order to show that Connecticut is in no position to have one Member of Congress give away vast sums which would aid greatly in financing our educational program in years to come.

Only 1.9 percent of our State expenditures for education come from Federal aid, a far lower proportion than many other States.

This year the appropriation for education recommended by Governor Lodge for the next biennium is $23 million, which falls $16 million short of the sum originally requested by Dr. Engleman, Commissioner of Education, as adequate to meet Connecticut's needs for that period.

Connecticut's pro rata share of the sum the Holland bill would give away would come close to financing the entire State building program for educational purposes.

We express our deep gratitude to you and those of your colleagues who are protecting Connecticut's interest for us.

Sincerely yours,

Laurence Barber, West Hartford; Robert Strider, New London; Marion C. M. Clarke, Suffield; George J. Ritter, Hartford; Theodore and Ellen Paullin, Newington; Robert Satter, Newington; Margaret Caulfield, West Hartford; Eleanor Taft Tilton, Hartford; Faith Levine, Hartford.

The total expense of Connecticut public school education is $73,040,906 (year ending June 30, 1952).

The school population is growing tremendously, from 277,100 in 1940 to an estimated 385,700 in 1959.

The per pupil cost has increased from $124 in 1943 to $228 in 1953.

Total expenditure has increased from $31,294,305 in 1943 to $73,040,906 in 1952.

Increase in school population necessitates a vast building program.

	Number	Estimated added pupil capacity	Estimated cost
Under construction as of August 1952:			
Elementary school building projects	73	21,810	$36,024,308
Secondary school building projects	19	11,775	25,852,632
On which construction will begin as of July 1955:			
Elementary school building projects	123	39,030	60,616,112
Secondary school building projects	43	24,350	52,292,900
Regional school projects	2	1,675	3,500,000
Total	270	98,640	178,285,952

CRITICAL CONDITION OF LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, lead and zinc mines in the State of Idaho, as elsewhere in this country, are now virtually shut down. The situation in northern Idaho actually is critical. Already more than 600 men in the Wallace-Kellogg area have been thrown out of work.

This situation is largely an outgrowth of competition from the heavy dumping of these metals in the United States by countries with a supply of cheap labor. The American mining industry has been left helpless in the face of this flood of cheap metal. This is not only a disaster to our mining economy but constitutes a threat to our national defense. We cannot afford to be made dependent on foreign sources of these metals.

There has been introduced in the House a bill which would impose a sliding scale-stabilization tax on imports of lead and zinc. I have introduced in the Senate a similar measure. This measure would help to some degree to restore equality in the competitive situation involving these metals. Furthermore, there is need for an investigation into the stockpiling of these and other minerals to determine whether full consideration was given to our domestic industry.

I have today received a copy of a petition bearing 5,000 signatures of citizens in northern Idaho, who have called on President Eisenhower to take action to relieve this most critical situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks 2 brief letters, 1 of which I have received in connection with the petition to which I have referred, and the other being a copy of the letter sent to the President.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KELLOGG, IDAHO, *May 2, 1953.*

United States Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: Enclosed herewith are copies of petitions signed by more than 5,000 residents of our community. The original petitions have been mailed to President Eisenhower. We are also enclosing a copy of our letter to the President.

We urge you to utilize these petitions to the best possible advantage as a means of dramatizing the critical conditions of the domestic lead-zinc industry, the miners and others in our community entirely dependent upon its continued operations for a livelihood.

Respectfully,

H. C. SEEBER,
Mayor of Kellogg, Idaho.
C. H. MAGNUSON,
Mayor of Wallace, Idaho.
HOWARD GODDARD,
International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers.

KELLOGG, IDAHO, *May 1, 1953.*

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith are petitions signed by more than 5,000 residents of our community. The petitions were circulated pursuant to a resolution unanimously adopted by a recent communitywide conference called for the purpose of doing something to preserve our community in the face of the current lead-zinc crisis.

This historic Coeur d'Alene mining district of north Idaho, which for the past 60 years has been one of the most important sources of both lead and zinc of the Nation, now faces extinction, unless quick action is taken by the Congress and the administration to remedy the chaotic conditions of the lead and zinc markets.

The lead-zinc crisis is brought about by excessive imports of foreign metals, which, in turn, has led to surpluses, rapidly falling prices, mine shutdowns, and widespread unemployment in this country. The situation has now assumed the character of a national emergency. If we are to maintain a domestic lead-zinc industry, then immediate and effective measures are demanded.

We are addressing the petitions to you at this time in order that they may be in your hands prior to the convening of the Governors' conference. We are sure that Governor Jordan, of Idaho, along with the Governors of other affected States, will want to call this disastrous situation to the attention of the conference, the Congress, and your administration.

Respectfully,

H. C. SEEBER,
Mayor of Kellogg, Idaho.
C. A. MAGNUSON,
Mayor of Wallace, Idaho.
H. L. DAY,
President, Idaho Mining Association.
HOWARD GODDARD,
International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers.

THE CHALLENGE TO OUR FUTURE—ADDRESS BY CAPT. EDDIE RICKENBACKER

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, last Friday I had the great honor and privilege of attending a luncheon of the Aero Club of Washington, primarily in honor of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, but also in observance of the 25th anniversary of Eastern Airlines, of which Captain Rickenbacker is president and general manager.

On that occasion, Captain Rickenbacker made one of the most outstanding, realistic, and forward-looking—I really believe it might be termed prophetic—addresses which it has been my pleasure to hear.

It was an address with much thought behind it, by a man whom all of us know as one of the great pioneers in the history of aviation, both civil and military.

I will not attempt to summarize what Eddie Rickenbacker said, because I feel his own words are more apt and more persuasive than any which I could utter. I do now want to point out, for the benefit of my colleagues who wish to read the speech, that in the course of his address Captain Rickenbacker made, in a very few words, one of the most convincing arguments which has been made for an active program for construction and expansion of our airport system.

Mr. President, because of its great interest, both as to subject matter, and because of the speaker himself and the affection and esteem in which he is held by most of the Members of this body, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker's speech, to which I have referred, may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the most encouraging signs of the times is the interest being shown by the people, from one end of this country to the other, in the 50 years of flying progress we are celebrating this year.

This belated recognition of that tremendous achievement of the Wright brothers is typical of aviation's history. It is a graphic example of the way aviation has become a part of our lives, with so little popular recognition of its importance, so little understanding of its problems, in the process.

As a matter of fact, this has been true of aviation from the dawn of flight itself. Orville Wright used to delight in telling this story. After he and Wilbur had made their historic first flights at Kitty Hawk, they rushed to the little telegraph station nearby to report their thrilling success to their family—adding the postscript that they would be home for Christmas.

The next morning the newspaper in their own hometown published a social notice that the boys would be home for the holidays—and ignored completely the most spectacular scientific achievement of the ages.

I like to recall that story, as Orville often did, when we are occasionally carried away by our own enthusiasm. It serves to remind me how unimportant aviation really is in the eyes of a great many people.

It is only natural, I suppose, that this should be true. We Americans, whose lives have been enriched by so many blessings from our God-given genius for creative industry, have come to expect these advantages as a part of our heritage.

More than any other people in the world, we have demonstrated our ability to assimilate progress, to adjust our lives to each new advance, and to take it in our normal stride.

This, to a marked degree, has been true of aviation. The American people have enthusiastically applauded the great feats of courageous pioneering, and have accepted aviation as a part of their daily lives. But, as a people, we still have too little appreciation of the powerful effect aviation has upon our lives and on the destiny of generations to come.

That is why I like to think that the national interest being generated this year in recognition of the 50 years of aviation progress since Kitty Hawk is providential rather than coincidental.

And I am hopeful that, out of this popular reawakening of interest in the history of flying, our people will be able to see more clearly how much we have accomplished and, even more important, why we are not accomplishing much more than we are—and can—today.

Yet, having come so far, in so few short years, we know we have accomplished only the first few faltering steps toward the future that air power as peace power promises.

We are only now just ending an era of primitive pioneering in the combined art and science of aeronautics. By trial and error and with only the tools we have always had, we have proven man's ability to master his destiny through the air.

Today we stand at the threshold of an entirely new era—an entirely new and tremendous stage of jet and rocket power, of eventual nuclear energy, that pushes our horizons to infinity.

If you only appreciate that all this has been accomplished within the span of a single lifetime, you will realize how rapidly these next advances are certain to come.

Whether or not we achieve them, whether or not we insure the full advantage of them for our people, for our country, and for the cause of peace and progress in the world, depends entirely upon one thing—how intelligently we plan, how well we project into the future the lessons we have learned in the past.

No one can speak beyond the limits of his own experience and the knowledge that has been acquired from those who have gone before. There are many, probably some here, who go farther back in aviation than I do. I doubt, however, that there is anyone who has worked harder and more conscientiously to advance the cause of aviation than I have.

It was not until 1913, 10 years after the Wright brothers made their first flight, that I became seriously interested in flying. Until then I had been absorbed with another form of transportation which was also then in its infancy—the automobile. Then, in World War I, I became actively interested in it.

My wartime mission was to make this new machine the most effective possible weapon for the defeat of our enemies. But I came out of that war with a new mission—the cause of aviation itself.

It was clear to me that the airplane would be the determining factor in another war which was certain to come, and that only the nation who controlled the skies could control its own destiny in international relations.

Many of you here, no doubt, can remember—and vividly—the trial of Billy Mitchell and his tragic fight for recognition of this new force by our military and governmental leaders. The effort was futile because, in those confused days, military aviation was a lost cause.

But to me the airplane, while a revolutionary new means of waging war, offered an even greater potential as an instrument of peace than it offered as a military weapon—because the airplane means transportation.

I would like to make clear that I am no prophet. I do not even claim to be an expert. Aviation is already overcrowded with those who claim such titles. I am only an humble worker in the cause of aviation. I can only speak to you from my own personal experience, and from my own personal knowledge. I can only point out the lessons I have learned and the principles I have been able to apply.

I have faith in those principles because I have seen them transform a debt-ridden hodgepodge of disjointed air routes and obsolete airplanes into the most successful airline in the world. Eastern Air Lines has the proud distinction of having earned a profit for 18 consecutive years, and for 13 of those years we have not taken a single penny of the taxpayers' money in subsidy.

This we have accomplished. This much we know—that air transportation, under our system of free enterprise, with prudent management and the application of sound American business principles, can stand on its own feet and grow. Ours is the only country in the world to have demonstrated this important fact.

I cite Eastern Air Lines because its accomplishments have helped to make the record from which we can project civil aviation's future realistically and confidently.

It is important to remember, too, that what we have accomplished has been achieved in a difficult period of pioneering that encompassed an energy-sapping depression, the most destructive and wasteful war in history, a costly experiment in government, and the shouldering of greater burdens of governmental regulation than any industry in the country has ever had to bear.

These facts, in my opinion, are particularly significant now, at a time when we are being forced to plan, not alone for our future progress, but for our survival as a free people. There is no longer a question in any intelligent man's mind but that airpower—and I mean airpower in being, not on paper or in theory—is vital for the defense of our own country, and for the preservation of peace in the world.

It should be equally obvious that we can never achieve adequate airpower for defense, or a sound industry to produce the elements of that airpower, without a strong, healthy industry of air transportation.

Almost 30 years ago, here in Washington, I voiced such a conviction. At that time there was a powerful group of men determined to prevent the development of aviation as an important arm of this country's defenses. Mine was not the only voice, but all were voices crying in the wilderness.

It seemed to me elementary that, with the vast distance in this great land of ours, with the natural high tempo of our industry and commerce, the greatest benefit our Government could bestow on the American people would be to provide them with the advantages of the swift transportation and communication that aviation promised.

In advancing that proposal, I was not thinking only of the economic benefits we could reap.

I championed that cause, primarily, because it would provide an economic means of developing a national network of airbases, a national system of air transportation, and a sound manufacturing industry capable of expanding tenfold, should war strike.

Yet, 15 years later, when that war did strike from the skies at Pearl Harbor, the forces upon which our very lives depended were caught with outmoded earthbound transports. At the cost of nearly crippling what air transportation we had and which was vitally important to keep our great industrial machine operating at high gear, the nucleus of a military air-transport service was hastily organized by thrusting into the breach planes and pilots borrowed from the airlines.

It is significant, for our future planning, to remember that, in 1942, we had only 12 transport aircraft in the country capable of carrying any sizable load across an ocean.

That was shameful enough. But it became tragic when, forced to fight a tremendous war of movement in every corner of the globe, we were told that air transportation had no place in the logistics of World War II. This incredible conclusion came from the so-called planners who, hidden deep in the maze of our Federal bureaus, seem to provide the thinking for so many of our leaders who make these decisions.

In spite of all the obstacles that have been placed in the path of aviation, we have accomplished a great deal. Of that achievement, we can all be justly proud.

However, we can take little comfort in the equally obvious fact that the progress we have made has so largely come from individual rather than nationally organized, effort. We have made progress in spite of an almost complete lack of intelligent national planning, through the expression of that priceless American spirit of "damn the torpedoes."

That fumbling has cost us years of progress, thousands of lives, and billions of dollars. In my opinion, it cost us not only the price of World War II, but the chaos and confusion that have followed our technical victory in that war we waged to set the world free.

The forces let loose against us in the world today are moving at too fast a speed to permit us the leisure of that isolated, individual effort, magnificent though it has been.

It is most fortunate, and inevitable, because of the professional knowledge of our military needs by the leaders of our new administration, that steps already are being taken to correct the critical weaknesses in our military position.

The course to a sounder, more adequate system of air transportation for the United States is already clearly marked. As great and spectacular as the accomplishments in the past 50 years have been, the next 10 years can see greater progress than we have accomplished in the past half century.

With the application of scientific improvements, which are already nearing the stage

of perfection, we can make giant strides toward the technological control of flight and the elimination of the one heretofore uncontrollable element in flying—the human element. We will be able to see through fog; to detect, forecast, and avoid areas of storm and turbulence; to harness winds and many other elements of nature in the upper atmosphere.

In the past 50 years we have advanced the airplane's transport speed from a bare 30 miles per hour to better than 300 miles per hour. In the 25 years of airline development the airplane has already become the primary carrier of the Nation's first-class travel. Because of the superior speed and convenience of air travel the airlines of the United States carry more than half of this class of traffic today.

Within the next 10 years we can advance today's air transport speed of 300 miles per hour to 600 miles per hour. By doubling present travel speeds we will multiply the availability of schedules and extend the practical benefits of air transportation to more and more millions of people everywhere on the face of Mother Earth.

Last year, after 25 years of pioneering growth, the airlines of the United States carried 27 million people more than 16 billion passenger-miles. Ten years from today that volume will be over 60 million passengers and the extent of that travel will exceed 40 billion passenger-miles.

Where today our airlines are flying 2 million plane-miles a day, our air transport fleets of 1963 will be flying 5 million plane-miles in an average day to meet the transport needs of passenger, airmail, and air cargo. For those who like comparisons that scheduled plane mileage will be equivalent in distance to 10 trips to the moon and back every 24 hours.

By that time jet-powered transports, carrying from 100 to 150 passengers, will be flying our long-range express schedules between all major terminals within the continental United States, to Puerto Rico, and Hawaii, and on most of our overseas routes.

Cruising through the upper atmosphere at 10 miles per minute, these supertransports will fly from New York to Florida in 2 hours and from coast to coast in a matter of 6 hours or less. No State in the Union will be more than a few hours away; no land on earth will be more than a single day's jet journey from a major airport.

At lower altitudes turbine engines driving propellers will power our medium transports, with which we will operate intermediate schedules between major cities and principal terminals at cruising speeds of 400 miles per hour.

At the base of this air transportation pyramid the helicopter, with a cruising speed of 200 miles per hour or more, and with a capacity for 20 to 40 passengers, will take over intercity schedules for distances up to 300 miles.

For building aviation into a mass transport industry there is, however, one important tool still missing. Both from the standpoint of aviation's application to industry, as well as to the national defense, a big, fast air freighter, capable of moving bulk cargo at 6 or 7 cents per ton-mile, is absolutely essential. This, I am confident, is certain to come in the not too distant future.

And, in the projection of present-day progress into the future, we must not overlook the accelerating effect of the threat of war. Should the cold war continue for another 10 years or should it—God forbid—break into a hot war, then transports powered with atomic engines may well come into being within the lifetime of many of you here.

On the drawing boards and in the research sections of our own airline, plans for this form of future are already well advanced. If they sound too optimistic, let me remind you that they are squarely based on our experiences with the past. They are easier to prove than our present development would have been even in the fondest dreams of those of us who plotted and planned a quarter century ago.

In 25 years, Eastern Air Lines has multiplied its operation from 2,000 plane miles to more than 250,000 plane miles per day. We have progressed from 220 horsepower open-cockpit 90 miles per hour mailwings, with a seat for a single passenger, to 13,000 horsepower 350 miles per hour Super-Constellations with accommodations for 88 passengers in pressurized air-conditioned cabins.

On a single flight we carry more mail than the entire airline did in the best day of its early operations. We move those mails in a tiny fraction of the price the post office paid in 1928, and the rates the passenger pays today are actually less than one-half of what they were 25 years ago.

The statistical growth of Eastern Air Lines is fairly typical. The problems that we face in Eastern Air Lines are also typical of those that lie ahead of every other progressive airline in the industry.

For instance, 2 years ago, we embarked upon the largest equipment-replacement program in the history of the airline industry. That program involved the purchase and integration of 2 new fleets of aircraft—the most advanced available—60 twin-engine Silver Falcons and 36 great 4-engine Super-Constellations. The price of these 2 fleets will exceed $130 million including auxiliary equipment and maintenance facilities.

To date we have paid two-thirds of that bill. Even before the remaining units of these fleets are delivered—the new Super-Constellations to be powered with the larger, more economical turbine compound engines—we are forced to plan for superimposing on these fleets, an entirely new fleet of turbo-jet and turbo-prop aircraft at an additional cost of $200 million within the next 7 or 8 years.

Should we be successful in inducing an aircraft manufacturer to build an efficient air freighter, this will require an additional fleet, and an additional investment of some fifty to seventy million dollars.

These are essential expenditures. They must be made if we are to continue to advance.

There are only three possible sources from which we can get this capital. First, from ourselves—through our ability to accumulate depreciation reserves, and to increase our earnings. Second—from additional equity capital which can only be attracted by a satisfactory record of stable earnings. And, third, from the already victimized taxpayers, in the form of increased subsidies.

To me there is no choice. But unless the course of our future is planned intelligently, and unless proper standards are set and our reserves protected, the next great step in the advancement of air transportation can force to the wall and into oblivion, many of our airlines whose financial existence is marginal today.

This should not be allowed to happen. Whether or not it will happen depends entirely upon the philosophy of those who have been assigned the responsibility for guiding our national civil-aviation policy.

Air transportation is still an infant industry. Yet it has, already, demonstrated its ability to stand on its own feet. It should be given that chance.

The only favor it asks is rightful protection from those who fly a false flag of free enterprise, in order to operate obsolete aircraft over our Nation's airways, where and when and how they please.

Their substandard operations are a reflection on the capacity of our Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate, and on our industry's ability to provide safe and economical air transportation for the people of our country.

This is a price too high to pay. And it is so unnecessary when, by the simple application of the same regulations by which the regular airlines are controlled, these irregular operators would be forced either to conform to our Government and industry standards, or get out of the air-transport business. This seems so little to ask.

If civil aviation is to have its rightful chance to grow, the Civil Aeronautics Board must demonstrate a clear recognition of air transportation's essential position in our economy and of its importance to our national defense.

Such direction can only come through an independent Civil Aeronautics Board alert to these responsibilities and devoted to the development of an air-transportation system, adequate to the needs of our commerce, our postal service, and the national defense, as the Congress originally intended.

But no Civil Aeronautics Board can properly discharge these high responsibilities unless it maintains, as its first objective, an ever-wider distribution of the benefits of air transportation to all of the people.

This demands a realistic understanding of the public's right to the benefits of air transportation as taxpayers, as well as passengers and shippers. In its deliberations, the Board must concern itself more with the true public interest and less with the political balance of power among the airlines themselves.

If there is any balance involved, in my opinion, it should be tipped in favor of the American people who are entitled to the best, most economical, and most adequate air transport service and the operator ready, willing, and capable of providing them.

As I have already indicated, our airlines face the very real problem of raising, within the next 6 to 8 years, well over a billion dollars in new capital to finance the reequipment of our major air fleets with turbo-jet, turboprop transports, air freighters, and helicopters.

The leading airlines of the country are today almost completely dependent upon commercial revenues. Fares, properly determined, can produce revenue which, under prudent management, can supply a substantial portion of these future capital requirements.

Yet, at the very time when operating costs are more uncertain than ever before, in a period when many airlines, after years of deficits, have been able to earn their first profits, the Civil Aeronautics Board is pursuing an investigation looking toward a reduction in fares.

The effect of such shortsighted policy should be clear. The burden that it would impose upon taxpayers in the future is certain. It has happened before, and it can happen again.

But the time may very well come when the public, falsely encouraged to put money in one pocket through uneconomic fares, will tire of having that money, with interest, taken out of the other pocket in the form of taxes because of the bureaucratic thinking which produces these false economies at the cost of continuing benefits.

By trying to regulate the dynamic industry of air transportation with yardsticks designed for surface transportation generations ago, the entire future of our civil air industry is being jeopardized. More than anything else, the adoption of an operating ratio philosophy, through which fares would be realistically determined in their true relationship to operating costs, would provide an urgently needed and sound economic foundation for the businesslike operation and development of air transportation.

We, too, like all other businesses in America, look to the promised aid of the new administration to reestablish a balanced economy and to alleviate the crushing burden of taxation which is stifling our Nation's economic enterprise.

Given a sound economic footing, and an even chance, our airlines can achieve, in record time, the development of civil aviation as a mass transportation industry.

We know this is the true destiny of aviation because it can provide a better, faster mode of transportation at less cost than any other means of mechanical motion. Every step toward the achievement of mass transportation by air produces increasing benefits for all people, everywhere, in every phase of their existence. It is a goal which justifies every practical means of acceleration because its benefits are unlimited.

But if we could buy, today, the number of airplanes we would need to move the people, the mail and the goods that would prefer air transportation at the fares such volume would justify, we could only get a fraction of that great movement off the ground.

Because we have less than one-third enough airports to handle the air traffic the next 10 to 15 years can generate, we need, and need badly, a national program of airport-planning and production. Even if we started now it would take 10 to 15 years before we had airports and airway facilities adequate to pace the growth trend of air transportation. This is apparent, not only because of the time required for their construction and installation, but because of the billions of dollars these airports will cost.

But in that pattern of air terminals we will have separate airports for passengers. There will be separate airports for air mail and air cargo, as well as for private flyers and corporate aircraft owners and operators. A fourth category will be our essential military bases. But, in time of crisis, this entire national network of airports will become defense bases, and will be equipped, manned and ready to serve at no extra cost to the taxpayer.

These things are bound to come. We can get there in 25 years by our unorganized, uncoordinated individual efforts. Or, by honestly accepting our responsibility to our country and to the American people, and by positive coordination and sound, constructive planning, we can accomplish them in half the time.

That is the choice that faces us in aviation. That is the challenge of our future.

Over and beyond everything else in that planning, there is one absolute essential. We must have an adequate, intelligent national program of research and development for the aviation industry in all its phases.

We have mastered, to a degree greater than any other nation, the complicated process of mass production. In the past, this tremendous production potential has translated our manpower and God-given resources into the tools we needed for our progress or protection.

But production alone is no longer sufficient. Our ability to out-produce our enemy is no longer enough. How much more advanced the weapons we can produce over those our enemy can command, will mark the difference between peace and war, survival or slavery.

In terms of air power, this demands a nationally organized quest for knowledge which we, as a Nation, have largely ignored because we have always been able to rely on our fabulous producing ability. What real scientific progress we have made in aviation, we have accomplished largely as a result of the individual spirit of enterprise, the urge for creativeness, which are our God-given heritage.

But we no longer have the time for this slow, leisurely rate of progress. We cannot expect the world, particularly those who are plotting our destruction to wait until we can get around to it.

During the middle thirties I was impressed, as many of you were, with German aircraft production. But the glimpse I had of what was on their drawing boards was frightening.

In those designs, which later materialized into the Stukas, glider-tractors, pilotless aircraft, guided missiles and the jet and rocket aircraft, you could see the sources of Hitler's arrogant, confident schemes of aggression. The only practical way to halt that mad course would be if we could bring ourselves abreast of this development—and exceed it in but 1 or 2 instances.

In 1935 I proposed such a planned program of research and development, calling for the expenditure of a billion dollars in the following 5 years. My thesis was simple and as old as the ages—a little man will never attack a big man—if he is sober.

I was confident then, and I am today, that had we invested that $1 billion in research—and had we backed it up with the production tooling that research called for—there would have been no World War II.

Instead, however, we gave a begrudged $25 million a year to the cause of air power through the years between our two world wars. As a result, and because we were weak, we were attacked. Because we had failed to spend a few million dollars wisely, we ended up spending $25 million a day—$50 billion for aviation alone during those tragic years of World War II.

Today, the same set of circumstances exist, only the names have changed. Instead of Hitler we have had Stalin, now Stalin has been changed to Malenkov. History has shown us only too clearly that these madmen in the Kremlin respond to only one thing—and that is superior power.

They are encouraged to push us around, to involve us in little wars, to frighten us into appeasement that costs us—and the free world—billions of dollars, untold thousands of lives, and years of peaceful progress—only because they know they have weapons of destruction more advanced, more effective than we have.

Reverse that process. Let us take the initiative in research and development, and see how fast the Iron Curtain would come apart at the seams, how rapidly the political pressure, generated by the Kremlin, would dissipate.

The American people, whose God-given genius created the airplane, have proved that from this same source, we found the means of its even greater advancement.

The atom bomb is further proof. The native genius which enabled us to break the atom and to accomplish the greatest of scientific achievements also enabled us to develop it into a superior weapon.

Certainly, it is not too much to believe that same genius, which produced the atom bomb can also create the superior means of delivering it anywhere on this globe when and if it is needed.

The immediate benefits from such a research program are military. From that standpoint they are destructive. But such forces are also immediately necessary if we are to survive as a free people. The advantages that can come out of that research, however, for all mankind in many ways are infinite.

That way, too, is clear in my opinion.

Surely by now, we have learned some lessons. Perhaps this national interest in the 50 years of aviation progress we are celebrating this year will bring about a more mature official understanding of the popular demand and popular support for an adequate program of aviation development.

Only such a program can restore to these United States, the country in which the airplane was born, the leadership for bringing to our own people, and to the world, the peace, the progress, and the prosperity that lie in the promise of that miracle at Kitty Hawk.

By rendering this genuine service to mankind, we can change the airplane, the most deadly instrument of war that God ever let man create into the Angle of Peace that God intended it to be.

OPERATION OF NEW IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have often stated that the Visa and Passport Offices of the State Department, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice endorsed the new Immigration and Nationality Act as just and fair legislation. At a recent meeting of the National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship in New York City, officers from these two governmental departments expressed satisfaction with the way the new act is working out in actual operation. This story is told in an article from the New York Times of April 18, 1953, entitled "Immigration Chief for McCarran Act," and I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION CHIEF FOR MCCARRAN ACT—MACKEY AND OTHER EXPERTS TELL CONFERENCE OF IMPROVEMENTS IN NATURALIZATION LAWS

The often-criticized McCarran Act was praised yesterday—at least, for its naturalization provisions—by immigration officials and other experts in the field. They said it had liberalized the means by which aliens residing here can acquire United States citizenship.

The speakers were in agreement that the act, which went into effect last summer, was a decided improvement over former naturalization laws. They were among 300 persons attending the annual conference at the Astor Hotel of the National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship.

Argyle R. Mackey, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, said it was inevitable that such a complex law should provoke some criticism. He declared, however, that total annual quotas are substantially the same as before, while "the requirements for naturalization have to a large extent been greatly liberalized."

"The most significant changes," he said, "are the removal of the racial bars and the requirement of a declaration of intention. The impact of these changes has already been felt by the Service [the Immigration and Naturalization Service] in the form of unprecedented numbers of applications for naturalization filed by persons of oriental stock on our west coast and in Hawaii."

GIVES LATITUDE OF EXPRESSION

Willis H. Young, Deputy Director of the State Department Passport Office, said the act is stated in more precise language, is easier to interpret, and gives the Service more latitude of discretion. He declared that "many of the features which caused undeserved hardships under the old law have been eliminated."

Allan C. Devaney, Assistant Commissioner of the Immigration Service, said that lifting racial bars and removing the declaration of intention "has more than tripled the filing of petitions for naturalization."

Mike Masaoka, of the Japanese-American Citizens League, declared that 85,000 Japanese aliens, who on the average came here 40 years ago, are now eligible for citizenship, plus the right to own property in many States. By giving them the right to share citizenship with their children, he said, "Asiatics have finally been given a sense of dignity."

A letter from Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., to the conference was read by Mr. Mackey. It assured foreign-born Ameri-

cans that they had nothing to fear under the act.

"As one phase in [our] campaign of vigilance," the letter said, "I recently stated that 10,000 naturalized persons were being investigated. • • • But these inquiries affect a minute proportional—about one-tenth of 1 percent of our naturalized citizens.

"And they are aimed only at the criminal, the subversive, and the corrupt. I wish to emphasize that the 99.9 percent of our naturalized citizens are decent, loyal, and law-abiding and do not have the slightest cause for any apprehension."

THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the St. Lawrence Seaway will shortly hold its final round of hearings on the waterway project when various governmental witnesses appear before us.

The Middle West in particular, and the Nation as a whole is closely watching to determine how strongly the Eisenhower administration will give its backing to this vital development and how effectively it will translate that backing.

There has never been any question of the fact that the project is basically supported by the President and his Cabinet.

We know that the administration is, of course, wrestling with the overall budget problem for our entire Government.

Admittedly, that problem is severe. But I should like to respectfully point out the budget considerations should not enter into this particular question at all. The $100 million requested for the seaway canals does not constitute even the proverbial drop in the bucket, in relation to our vast seventy to eighty billion dollar budget—even if the $100 million were to be spent all in the 1 year, rather than to be spread out over several years, as it will be.

No, there is no reason, financial or otherwise, why the seaway should be delayed for so much as 1 additional day.

The Nation looks to the Eisenhower administration, therefore, to give its support to this project with all the vigor at its command as a crucial contribution to America's economic health and military security.

Over and over again we have listened to the hackneyed antiproject arguments trotted out by the seaway opponents. Those arguments consist of nothing but a repetition of all the moth-eaten hobgoblin claims which the opponents have trumped up in the past.

One such particular hobgoblin—over the alleged inadequacy of the 27-foot depth—was discussed and refuted once again in a recent Milwaukee Journal editorial, and I send to the desk now the text of this April 18 editorial, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE UNTRUTHS AGAINST SEAWAY

The National St. Lawrence Project Association, backed strongly by the coal and rail interests which are fighting to block the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway, continues to send out its stream of misleading information.

A current bit of propaganda revives the old untruths that "only about 4 percent of American privately owned oceangoing vessels would be able to operate" in the proposed 27-foot channel of the seaway, and, the contention continues, "less than 20 percent of world tonnage would be able to do so."

What's the truth of the matter? First, all but the largest of ocean vessels—and practically all cargo vessels—can now travel 1,000 miles from the ocean to Montreal. Given a 27-foot channel westward, almost every type of ocean vessel in the American merchant fleet, except supertankers and the very largest ocean ore boats, could use the proposed seaway with profitable pay loads. In 1951 there were 3,425 vessels in the United States merchant fleet. About 326 of them could use the 27-foot channel fully loaded.

If ships outbound picked up their full load of fuel at Montreal and ships inbound went through the seaway with light fuel loads—as they would, having used up much fuel on the ocean voyage—75 percent of the merchant fleet could use the seaway.

The proposed seaway locks will have a minimum clearance of 30 feet over their sills and up to 35 feet. If the seaway channel were dug to 30 feet—which would entail nothing but dredging—67 percent of the merchant fleet could pass fully loaded.

But few ships travel with capacity loads. In 1949 there were 15,193 vessels checked in transit on New York's Hudson River. Of that number, only 222 inbound and 345 outbound drew more than 27 feet of water. Best estimates are that 92 percent of the world's merchant fleet could use the seaway with profitable pay loads—some under any load conditions and the rest with normal loads, which seldom require full draft.

Seaway capacity a "hoax" as the National St. Lawrence Project Association calls it? The "hoax" is in the distortion of the seaway story that the association spreads.

ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S CONSTITUTION, 1791

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relative to the anniversary of Poland's Constitution of 1791.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S CONSTITUTION OF 1791

As persons of Polish ancestry throughout the world once again commemorate the 3d of May, they do so with sorrowful realization of the fact that Poland is once again under the heel of Russian tyranny. Like many a 3d of May in the past, this one, too, must unfortunately be dedicated not to the celebration of freedom but to a protest against the subjugation of the proud and independent people of Poland by the ruthless imperialist power to the east.

Yet, to the people of Poland, subjugation of the body has never meant subjugation of the spirit. From the days when Thaddeus Kosciusko, a hero of our own Revolutionary War, as well as a national hero of Poland, led the forces of Poland against Russia, the Russian overlords knew no peace. Through more than a century of continuous struggle, Poland finally won its way to ultimate victory.

But this period of freedom and independence was short-lived. It is a tragic fact that due to the treachery of Soviet Russia, the war into which the Allied Powers entered to preserve the integrity of Poland failed to achieve that result. Thus, since the dark days of September 1939, Poland has not known freedom. Still, like on many another dark 3d of May, the Polish people will again proclaim, in the words of their national anthem, that Poland is not lost. And with the help of God, their just cause will ultimately triumph.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 13 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. BUSH's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

The question of whether the States or the Federal Government should own the submerged lands off our coasts has now been thoroughly explored on the Senate floor. After giving careful consideration to the many arguments, for and against, which have been presented, I have voted to support Senate Joint Resolution 13, which would restore to the States ownership of the submerged lands within their historic boundaries.

REASONS COMPELLING SUPPORT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Among reasons compelling my support of the resolution are these:

1. A moral principle was involved. Resources in the disputed area—the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark to the historic boundaries of the States—have been developed in good faith under State control. Many decisions of the United States Supreme Court, from the earliest times in our history until very recently, justified a conviction that the States owned this area. It was not until 1947 that a divided Supreme Court upset the long-established legal doctrine of State ownership. In so doing, the Court ignored considerations of equity. For that reason, in my judgment, the Court decided wrongly and the Congress should do justice to those who relied in good faith on the law as it was before the 1947 decision. It's a simple question of right and wrong.

2. Moreover, the present Supreme Court's decisions in the three cases which precipitated this controversy hold dangerous implications for those who believe that our constitutional system is one of shared powers between the States and the Federal Government. If extended to their logical conclusions, they could lead to all-powerful Federal Government. If the Federal Government can take these submerged lands because, as the Court suggests, it may one day need, for national defense purposes, the oil which may be produced, it is difficult to see why it could not take any land—anywhere, in any State—in which an important resource is located. As Mr. Justice Frankfurter said, in dissenting in the California case, "The fact that these oil deposits in the open sea may be vital to the national security, and important elements in the conduct of our foreign affairs, is no more relevant than is the existence of uranium deposits, wherever they may be."

3. It is important that this question be settled. This is not a new issue. Previous

Congresses have repeatedly taken the stand that these lands belong to and should belong to the States. President Eisenhower has urged that this Congress enact legislation restoring to the States the lands within their historic boundaries. The governors of nearly all the States and the attorneys general of nearly all the States have asked for this legislation. Its enactment is needed to end the confusion created by the Supreme Court's decisions and to make possible full development of the resources in the submerged lands. It should be recognized that the Congress has a constitutional duty to perform in settling this vexatious question.

4. Important rights of all the States were involved. The decisions of the Supreme Court in these cases left in a confused and unsettled state many questions of great importance in property law. Although denying the claims of the States to the disputed area, the Court refused to declare that the Federal Government had any proprietary rights therein. The attorney general of the State of Connecticut, the Honorable George C. Conway, has stated that these decisions have cast doubt on our State's right to control important activities in Long Island Sound. Similarly, Mr. Robert Moses, city construction coordinator and commissioner of parks in New York City, has said that the Supreme Court has created an intolerable situation by casting "a cloud on the city's title to the submerged lands and reclaimed lands on which its piers, many of its recreational facilities, and other waterfront improvements stand." The shore-front property in the coastal States, built on reclaimed or filled-in land seaward of the low-water mark, which was adversely affected by these decisions, is valued at many millions of dollars.

5. As a matter of policy, the public interest in the development of the resources in the submerged lands can best be served by State ownership. As it was said in the report of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, "Considering the untold millions of dollars of economic wealth represented in the port and harbor developments of our great coastal cities, in the recreational, residential, and commercial areas of Boston Harbor, Long Island, Staten Island, New Jersey, Florida, and California, and elsewhere, and the beginning of the development of the undersea oil and gas deposits within State boundaries off the gulf and Pacific coasts, the committee majority is firmly convinced that the State ownership under which all of these and many other developments have been achieved should be continued in the public interest and in the furtherance of our Federal-State system."

6. In assigning to the States what should be rightfully theirs, Senate Joint Resolution 13 protects the legitimate interests of the Federal Government. The resolution reserves the rights of the United States in the natural resources located in the Continental Shelf seaward of the States' historic boundaries, an area in which oil deposits may be discovered. It provides that in time of war or when necessary for national defense, the United States shall have first claim to purchase the oil and other resources in the submerged lands within State boundaries and may acquire such lands by condemnation if need be. It makes it clear that the United States retains paramount rights to regulate and control the entire area seaward of the low-water mark for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs.

THE HILL AMENDMENT

I voted to table the Hill amendment, the so-called oil-for-education proposal, for two reasons:

1. It was essential to attempt to check the irresponsible filibuster which delayed for far too long the orderly business of the United States Senate. It is ironic that those who in the past have loudly proclaimed their opposition to the filibuster had no hesitation in employing this undemocratic parliamentary device when it suited their own purposes. Their tactics have delayed action on legislation of the highest importance to the people, including the bill intended to give President Eisenhower authority he will need to curb inflation should we find ourselves in the future in a period of grave national emergency. The filibuster by self-styled anti-filibusterers also has set back immeasurably the efforts of those of us who are seeking changes in the Senate rules to impose reasonable limitations upon debate.

2. The Hill amendment, in itself, was an unsound and demagogic attempt to confuse the question of ownership of the submerged lands with that of Federal aid to education. The latter should be an entirely separate problem. How far we wish to go in the field of Federal aid to education deserves careful and thoughtful study. In some cases it can be justified. To take one example: I have voted for appropriations with which the Federal Government will reimburse towns and cities for the extra expense involved when activities of the Government itself impose an extra burden on local school systems. There may be other special cases where Federal grants can be justified. But whether we wish to embark on an all-out program of peacetime Federal grants for education is a question which raises serious doubts. Such a program could lead to Federal control of education; and I'm against that.

The Hill amendment was a carefully calculated political device intended to arouse emotional support for those who advocate extension of Federal power at the expense of the States. It deceived many well-meaning people who are seriously and properly concerned about the increasing burden upon local communities and States imposed by the rising costs of education. In my judgment, a careful examination of the debate on this deceptive proposal exposes its fallacies.

Propagandists for the Hill amendment have circulated fantastic estimates of potential governmental revenues from the submerged lands. These propagandists would deceive the people of Connecticut—if they could—into believing that they have hundreds of millions of dollars at stake. Nothing could be more false.

It must be remembered that we are dealing with potential reserves. They lie under water where exploration and development present tremendous obstacles. Government geologists have testified that much of the oil is not recoverable by known methods.

Moreover, even if we consider potential reserves we must recognize that 83 percent are located seaward of the States' historical boundaries. Government geologists have estimated that the total potential oil reserve in the entire Continental Shelf is 15 billion barrels. Of this, only 2.5 billion barrels are within the States' boundaries. These figures clearly demonstrate the gross exaggerations made by the propagandists for the Hill amendment, and, if reduced to dollar expectancy over a period of years ahead, they would show Connecticut's share of this phantom money to be infinitesimal.

In the unexplored areas of the Continental Shelf, the location and development of these resources will involve great risk and expense. This work will be done in the future, as it has been in the past, by private enterprise under royalty leases from governmental agencies.

In that area of the Continental Shelf which is properly under control of the United States, the resources may be so developed as to benefit the entire Nation. Whatever revenues may be forthcoming from leases of the submerged lands in that area should go into the National Treasury.

What use we should make of the money should be decided in the light of conditions as they then exist. There is danger in earmarking these revenues in advance. If we set them aside for education, we may be ignoring other needs which may be more pressing at the time—health and welfare, to name but two examples. In any event, the past history of Federal grants to the States, and the exercise of the Federal taxing power to make possible those grants, gives rise to serious doubt that there would be any real benefit to Connecticut in a program of that kind.

On the other hand, if these funds are placed in the National Treasury they may be used for tax reduction, so urgently needed and greatly desired by us all.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the Washington Star last night there appeared an article entitled "Tidelands Fight Is Not in Vain," written by Thomas L. Stokes. As the title indicates, this relates to the measure now pending before the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIDELANDS FIGHT IS NOT IN VAIN—OPPONENTS BOUND TO LOSE BUT EXPOSE GREEDY INTERESTS SETTING OUT TO EXPLOIT OUR NATIONAL RESOURCES

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Unfortunate as it is that the first major legislation of the Eisenhower administration is the bill giving offshore oil lands to the States, nevertheless it is fortunate in a way that this issue so deeply affecting our whole natural resource policy was raised and explored this early in the new regime.

For it did give a bold and determined group in the Senate, which fought in vain for Federal control, an opportunity to expose how certain powerful interests have planned to capitalize this administration for their own special benefit, if possible.

Oil was behind this raid on the marginal sea part of our national domain. Now other special interests—lumber, mineral, private utilities—are ready to pressure Congress to hand over other public land and water resources to the States where they anticipate they can exploit such resources more easily. They use the offshore oil example as a precedent.

This threat is embodied in bills now pending.

There is every indication that, so far as the public is concerned, this battle over our natural resources may become the dominant issue of the Eisenhower era. There is a clearly planned campaign to reverse the trend of the last half century, started by Theodore Roosevelt, who began to set aside parts of our domain to protect this valuable natural heritage from the plundering that he found going on when he became President. He and other Presidents since sponsored laws which seek to preserve these lands and develop them in a way that will best conserve our resources.

Luckily for the public, it discovered in the offshore oil land fight in the Senate that there is a group, including both Democrats and Republicans, which is fully aware of the long-range significance of the gigantic raid on our natural resources in which the offshore oil bill was the first step. This same group will be ready to contest further steps which will involve public lands in interior States.

This group is due great credit. It fought against great odds. It knew in advance that it was almost bound to lose, unless a miracle happened. It knew how great had been the contribution of oil to the Eisenhower campaign, and it saw the bargain signed and sealed with the Republican candidate's pledges in the campaign to put through a State ownership bill. It learned very soon after the new President took office that he would stand by his campaign promise.

But this indefatigable group in the Senate did succeed in alerting the public to a

degree. This became manifest in letters that poured in upon Senators. As a result, the public should be more conscious of what is at stake and should be able to recognize the next moves, for they have been pointed out in advance in the lengthy debate over the offshore oil bill.

A familiar pattern has developed in the Senate that is reminiscent of something else that happened quite a while ago now. The minority in the Senate which stood up so valiantly against the offshore oil giveaway recalls that other minority of another era, compounded likewise of both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not see the necessity for delaying the debate further by calling a quorum at this time. A quorum call will be had at 2 o'clock. If we do not call a quorum at this time there will be available 50 minutes for debate on each side, which is somewhat less time than was anticipated. I hope Senators may proceed with the debate and conclude it within that time. If not, later on, if a request should be made for an extension of time, we may be able to arrange for a slight extension.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his generosity.

Mr. President, when this debate is closed and final action has been taken to make Senate Joint Resolution 13 the law of the land, the American people, with heavy hearts, will look back upon the course of this debate. They will wonder what evil spirit has possessed this great deliberative body that could induce it to give away the vast natural resources involved in this measure while, at the same time, our country is threatened with bankruptcy and ruin by an overwhelming national debt.

They will wonder why a country like the United States, that claims to be the most progressive and farsighted nation in the world, would not take advantage of the opportunities here afforded to build up our national education system so as to give the children of this country an opportunity to prepare themselves for the great future which awaits our country as the foremost industrial power and greatest moral force on earth.

It is obvious that this bill sacrifices this great opportunity to preserve the resources of our country, to meet the problems of our national debt, and to prepare the youth of this great land for the future that awaits them. History will record that the defeat of the Hill amendment will be one of the greatest mistakes we have ever made.

Mr. President, it is a matter of profound disillusionment to me that the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 13 have dodged the issues and refused to enter into honest debate and answer the serious charges that have been made on this floor during the past weeks. The proponents of this measure have studiously ignored our contention—supported by the Republican Secretary of State himself, the Honorable John Foster Dulles—that the passage of this measure recognizing State boundaries beyond the 3-mile limit would encourage extravagant boundary claims by Russia and other nations.

They have produced not a scintilla of evidence to answer our contention—supported by the present Attorney General himself, the Honorable Herbert Brownell—that the passage of this measure would result in protracted litigation in the courts and in the failure to develop with dispatch oil resources which are needed to promote the national security of our country.

Mr. President, in another sense, they have failed to live up to the high traditions of senatorial debate. Their performance, Mr. President, is a low-water mark in the history of this great deliberative body.

While a large section of the press has gone to considerable extremes to inform their readers that we have been talking at length and to charge us with trying to prevent a vote on the measure—which we have never tried to do—the press has, at the same time, shied away from giving a factual report on what we have been saying.

Where we have presented cold facts and documented analyses to prove that this measure is a legislative monstrosity, the press has repeatedly maintained a stony silence.

When the papers have given reluctant attention to our remarks, they have usually done so in abbreviated stories buried in the back pages.

But the people of this country, Mr. President, are nevertheless beginning to find out that this bill is a legislative monstrosity. Let me read briefly from only 3 of the many letters which I have received protesting the passage of this giveaway measure.

These 3 letters, let me point out, come from residents of the 3 States of Texas, California, and Louisiana.

The first letter is from a man in Dallas, Tex., who says:

I am a native citizen of Texas, and I know something of the tideland-oil issue in Texas. I think that the oil should belong to the people of the United States and not just 3 States, regardless of any previous treaty. In this modern age, this atomic age, what can 1 State do to protect itself against the world as now organized?

The second letter comes from a man in Tarzana, Calif. This writer makes the following comment:

Do rank and file Texans and Californians believe by any wild stretch of the imagination that the State and its people will stand to benefit, except perhaps indirectly by taxes? The big oil interests are the ones who will benefit.

The third letter is from a union official in New Orleans, La., who strongly urges support of the oil-for-education amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks the 3 letters to which I have just referred, from residents of Texas, California, and Louisiana.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DALLAS, TEX., *February 25, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR: "I am a native citizen of Texas and I know something of the tideland-oil issue in Texas. I think that the oil should belong to the people of the United States and not just 3 States, regardless of any previous treaty. In this modern age, this atomic age, what can 1 State do to protect itself against the world as now organized?"

Please vote to keep the oil for use of all the people of the Nation.

Very truly yours,

T. C. SETTLE.

TARZANA, CALIF., *February 22, 1953.*

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have followed the tidelands-oil controversy with considerable interest, and have some thoughts on the subject that may be of help to you in your efforts to keep these valuable lands in the public domain.

Candidate Eisenhower came out for State ownership, I believe, primarily to help carry California and Texas. I do not recall that he ever gave any reasons beyond, "I'm for State ownership."

It was one of the big campaign pledges, and many Republicans who might normally be against State ownership of the lands, will be tempted to vote the other way just to save face for the President. This point should be brought out in all its political bluntness.

"Do rank and file Texans and Californians believe by any wild stretch of the imagination that the State and its people will stand to benefit, except perhaps indirectly by taxes? The big oil interests are the ones who will benefit."

If States in question claim the oil and other possible resources for themselves, perhaps they should be thinking about certain other logical corollaries. Would California and Texas, for example, want to establish their own navies and coast guard groups, their own coast and geodetic surveys, their own bureaus of fisheries, and the other Federal services extended to States bordering on oceans?

The matter of course should not properly be thought of in such narrow and limited terms, because a fleet of vessels that protects Washington, Oregon, and California, also protects Montana, Nevada, Idaho, not to say Kansas and Missouri. However, if the people who are so vocal about States rights in this matter were confronted with the cost of the maintenance of Federal services which benefit them most immediately and most directly, and then compare it with the relatively small revenue gained by the Federal Government in return, I think that the inland Members of the Congress might be made to feel that their States were contributing more to support Federal coastline services than any possible share of the tidelands-oil revenue that might come to their States in the form of benefits to education.

They wouldn't mind this so much, unless they realized that they might be taxed to help other poor States for educational and other purposes if tidelands-oil revenue were not made available for the purpose. Good luck.

WAYLAND D. HAND.

INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO,
New Orleans, La., April 13, 1953.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The officers and 1,200 members of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, Local 29, CIO, strongly urge your support of Senator HILL's oil-for-education amendment.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND RADOVICH,
Executive Secretary, Local 29, IUMSWA.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I shall refrain from introducing into the RECORD the many thousands of letters of a similar nature which we have received from residents in the other 45 States, including my own State of Montana.

In the course of time, Mr. President, I believe that those Senators who vote today in support of this giveaway measure will come to realize that they have made a serious error. In due time, they will surely understand—and their constituents will certainly help them understand—that they were victimized by one of the greatest illusions ever to have occurred in our legislative history.

Today marks the end, Mr. President, of one chapter in the long history of the struggle of those who would protect the public domain against the special interests. While we who have fought the giveaway measure will not win today, we serve notice that we have just begun to fight.

New bills are in the offing to turn over to the special interests the mineral lands, the forest lands, the grazing lands, and the great hydroelectric projects which have been developed to serve all the people of our country. We shall oppose such bills with every resource at our command.

We are told that a new bill is being prepared to provide for the development of the offshore mineral resources on the Continental Shelf beyond the so-called historical boundaries.

Although I have not yet enjoyed the privilege of seeing this new measure, I am informed that it will probably attempt to give three States the right to levy taxes on the offshore oil and gas produced on the Continental Shelf in the area which is supposed to be left under the complete control of the Federal Government.

If the new bill does indeed contain provisions authorizing such a raid upon the Federal domain, I suggest that its proponents pause, think carefully, and not be misled by the number of votes they may obtain today. If they offer a measure of this type to deal with offshore mineral reserves under Federal control, they will indeed learn that we have just begun to fight.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article by William M. Blair, appearing in the New York Times of Sunday, May 3, 1953, pointing out that the future of our Federal resources is involved in this debate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL LANDS' FUTURE IS RAISED IN OIL DEBATE—IN OFFSHORE CLAIMS OF STATES IS SEEN A THREAT TO NATURAL RESOURCES

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The administration's efforts to turn over to the States the rich offshore oil reserves have raised the bigger question of whether such action would be the first step in a giveaway of the country's western public-land wealth.

There has been increasing speculation that once the States gained control of the seaward reserves they would turn their attention to the mountains and the forests, major target of some industrial interests because of the tremendous reserves of timber, minerals, water and waterpower, and grazing rights. The western public lands also contain untapped oil reserves still unestimated in value.

The offshore-oil issue, coupled with shakeups in the Department of the Interior, guardian of the vast stores of western natural resources, has alarmed professional conservationists and partisans. And this concern has not been tempered by administration pronouncements that there is no intention of letting go of the public wealth.

In the Western States the Federal Government owns tracts ranging from 35 percent of the total area in Washington to nearly 85 percent in Nevada. This land is administered by agencies of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. From the public domain comes approximately 22 percent of all timber harvested in the West. Forty-six percent of all western livestock grazes on lands supervised by Interior's Bureau of Land Management and Agriculture's Forest Service.

RESOURCE REVENUE

In 1952 Interior's Bureau of Reclamation derived $83,257,176 in revenue from its waterpower projects, including such public giants as Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River. Federal water projects irrigated land carrying crops valued at $935 million. The Fish and Wildlife Service supervises the conservation and development of the fish industry, and last year the dollar value of the catch in California, Oregon, and Washington was $97,403,492.

Receipts from timber cut under the eye of the Forest Service totaled $63,722,986 in 1952 and revenue from grazing was $5,022,654. These funds are returned to the Government, some of it direct to the Federal Treasury.

Until this year development of water- or hydroelectric power proceeded at a rapid rate. From 1945 to 1952 installed power output in the West doubled and Federal transmission lines grew from 5,000 miles to 15,000 miles.

The Roosevelt and Truman administration proceeded under a policy of strict Federal development of western lands, arguing that private enterprise sought to exploit and deplete the natural resources which belonged to all the people and not just to westerners. This is the same basic argument used by the opposition Democrats in the offshore-oil controversy.

PROTEST OF THE STATES

Opposition forces charged that the Democratic policy was based as much on political considerations as on genuine interest in conservation, that conflicts between Federal agencies slowed down orderly development of the West, and that the increasing demand for public services under the impact of population growth was becoming an excessive burden for States and communities deprived of tax money that could come from Federal lands. California alone estimated it has lost $17 million annually since 1938 because the Federal Government had acquired so much land for defense, atomic energy, and other Federal projects.

CONFLICTING VIEWS

Private or special interests have concentrated their attacks on four major natural resources areas:

Water power: Private power interests, charging wasteful and costly public operations, seek to distribute the power generated by public projects now constructed and the right to operate the power facilities in future projects. There also is an effort to change the Federal law that requires the sale of firm electric public power to such preferential bodies as rural electric cooperatives and municipalities before any may be sold to private companies.

Public power advocates contend private interests have been too slow to develop water and other power for the West; that, in most cases, private power companies have neither the inclination nor the resources to construct efficient projects. They also maintain that private sources cannot deliver cheap power to ranchers and farmers and growing western industry, that private rates often are double and triple what the Federal Government charges.

Grazing: Western stockmen contend that Federal agencies have overprotected vast areas of lush land and that, instead of keeping it in prime condition, have permitted it to go to seed. They charge the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service with arbitrary rulings against stockmen without court review and challenge the legality of Federal actions.

Conservationists view the stockmen as predators who once almost ruined western land by overgrazing. They allege that cattle and sheep operators want grazing rights in perpetuity, to buy, sell or barter as they wish without regard to the public interest in the lands.

BILLS IN CONGRESS

Several bills have been introduced in the Congress looking to liberalizing grazing rights. Hearings on these will start late this month.

Mineral rights: Within recent years oil and gas leases in the West have increased manyfold. New oil reserve discoveries have put a premium on leases. Private enterprise believes this is one of the greatest areas for development and that the States should have control because of possible large tax revenues. These interests see Federal restrictions almost prohibiting industrial development of major resources.

Conservationists argue that wholesale mineral-rights leasing abuses the land and tends to lay it open to erosion and eventual destruction, as in the case of the strip mining of silver, gold, and coal in the last century. Here again is the fear that private industry would overrun multiple-purpose lands and deplete their usefulness.

Timber: Lumbermen are front runners among those who favor transferring public lands to the States. They argue the Federal agencies hold down even that amount of timber production cutting that can be done without permanent injury to the forests. They say that Federal services let trees stand too long, thus choking out young growth and preventing proper forest cultivation.

Federal foresters say that the policy is to prevent stripping the forests such as has occurred outside the national forests. They say no more timber should be cut than is grown and that in most cases private interests do not plan reforestation on a long-range basis.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay takes the view that protection of public lands has been Federal policy since 1902 and the days of President Theodore Roosevelt, and this policy is too strong in the public mind to be changed.

ROLE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

He would, however, reduce what he believes is too much power centralized in Washington and let the States have more say in the administration of resources within their own boundaries. How far he will go in this respect has yet to be spelled out.

In the field of water power, he views public and private interests as moving along together. He believes that on the major rivers private enterprise cannot build giant and costly multiple-purpose dams because they provide flood control, irrigation, and navigation as well as power. But on the smaller streams private enterprise can and should build dams for a single purpose—power. Likewise, he believes, private sources can distribute power and that in the main the Bureau of Reclamation has been doing more promoting than work.

Republican congressional views generally are in line with this view. The House Appropriations Committee, whose power-slash recommendation the House followed this week, said the "Interior Department should be concerned only with those functions or activities which private enterprise cannot or will not undertake."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield such time to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as he may require.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have not endeavored to take an active part in the debate on Senate Joint Resolution 13. I believed the various arguments pro and con were being adequately covered by the speakers on both sides.

However, for the RECORD, I believe I should make a brief statement, by reading into the RECORD a communication which I am sending to my constituents who have written asking my position on the subject. I shall read the text of the brief letter I am sending to my constituents.

MAY 4, 1953.

MY DEAR MR. ———: This will acknowledge your recent communication with regard to the so-called tidelands legislation. This matter has become very much confused because of the failure of so many people to understand that there are two different issues involved in the debate.

First, the issue presented by the so-called Holland resolution is simply the question of what are the boundaries of the States and to what extent, if any, do those boundaries extend into the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the Gulf of Mexico. The pending Holland resolution only includes the subject of the State boundaries.

Second, the other question involved in the debate is the so-called Continental Shelf which extends out into the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans a distance of 150 to 200 miles. This shelf also apepars in the Gulf of Mexico, which, of course, is part of the Continent of North America. Section 9 of the Holland resolution definitely confirms the jurisdiction and control by the United States outside the State boundaries. That section of the Holland resolution reads as follows and is fully agreed to by both parties to the dispute:

"Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to affect in any wise the rights of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters, as defined in section 2 hereof, all of which natural resources appertain to the United States, and the jurisdiction and control of which by the United States is hereby confirmed."

The question of how to handle this enormous area is being studied by the committee that submitted the report and presently there will be another bill introduced to determine how mineral rights in this area shall be handled. The matter involves not only United States law, but also international law. When we consider the second bill we will decide whether this alleged wealth shall be used for our national defense, to retire the national debt, or for education.

Of course, Mr. President, some Members of the Senate have advocated, in the speeches they have made here on the floor, that the proceeds from these natural resources be used for education.

I read further from the letter:

If we consider our own State of New Jersey it is obvious from the history of the original colony and the situation when the colony was admitted as a sovereign State into the Union, that the boundary extended at least 3 miles into the Atlantic Ocean. There never has been any question as to our State's sovereignty in this area.

New Jersey has always assumed that it had jurisdiction to the 3-mile limit. Unless we are protected in this, New Jersey will suddenly find the United States Government taking over jurisdiction from our low-water mark seaward, which would mean that the Federal Government would take control over our piers and other installations at places like Atlantic City, and other points on the seaboard, and we would have a sharp conflict between local and Federal government in these areas. Federal control would also jeopardize New Jersey's fishing industry, including oyster beds, and so forth, which employ many persons. Also the income for our schools from the present development of this area would immediately be cut off.

Mr. President, I may say in passing that the income for our schools from this operation is about $50 million a year.

The letter concludes as follows:

If you are interested in studying the matter further I will be happy to send you the report of the majority of the committee.

The wild talk of 50 to 300 billions of dollars being given away is mere speculation. There is no "steal" nor are those who are defending the boundaries of the States doing any unpatriotic act as alleged.

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I shall be brief in my remarks on the pending joint resolution, for, as I have indicated on several occasions, I have felt that the debate has already been too long extended and has not resulted in changing any votes. Naturally, I do not expect to change any votes by what I shall say.

My principal purpose in saying anything at all about the joint resolution is to try to correct several misconceptions which some of my good constituents have obtained from reading primarily the accounts in the Washington Post, which magnify the arguments, first, about the alleged giveaway program; second, about the alleged billions of dollars which are to be given away; and third, as has just been suggested by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], about the direful effect the passage of the pending measure would have on the glowing, bright future of the youth of the land by depriving them of 41 cents a year for education, if, as, and when they would ever get it. Of course, I venture to assert they would never get it.

Of course, I am afraid I shall have to send a copy of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to all the constituents who have written to me, in order that they may have correct information and their minds may be disabused.

The first point is that the Federal Government cannot give away something it does not own. In that connection, I point out there has never been a decision in any State court or in any local Federal court or in any instance in the Supreme Court of the United States which holds that the Federal Government has title to the submerged lands involved in the pending joint resolution. Mr. President, there have been 244 lower court decisions and State court decisions, many of which have directly passed upon the question of who has title to these lands, and all of them that have passed on the question have held that the States have title seaward to the traditional 3-mile limit. Of course, the pending measure affects only the lands out to the traditional 3-mile limit, except in the case of Texas and Florida, whose claims to a broader area or greater limit, extending farther into the Gulf of Mexico, were heretofore recognized by the Congress.

However, nowhere in the pending measure is there a gift to anyone of any portion of the Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile or 3-league limit.

The opponents of the pending joint resolution rely upon three recent decisions, namely, those in the California case, which was the first one, the Texas case, and the Louisiana case. I challenge any Member of the Senate to show where in any one of those decisions the Supreme Court has said that the United States owns title. I happen to know—it is not necessary to quote on this floor the source of my information—that Mr. Justice Black, who wrote the leading and first decision, namely, that in the California case, scrupulously refrained from using the word "title." Instead, he used an indefinite phrase, "paramount rights"; and then went on to say that under certain circumstances, paramount rights might be converted into property rights, but in that event certain equities would have to be considered.

The Attorney General of the United States was so disturbed when the Court refused to confirm the Government's contention about title, that he filed a petition for a rehearing on that issue; but the Court turned it down cold. The decisions in the Texas case and the Louisiana case followed the decision in the California case.

So my first point, Mr. President, is that there has never in the history of our Nation been a single court decision holding that the United States Government owns, in fee simple, title to the submerged resources out to the historic 3-mile limit.

Yet throughout this debate, including the very interesting and commendably short speech just made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Montana, we have been told, "This is a giveaway measure." In fact, the Senator from Montana quoted from a letter written by a resident of California who said he could not understand why the oil should be given to the coastal States.

Mr. President, I am somewhat familiar with the part oil plays in our economy. Of course, in war oil plays a very large part. But I venture the assertion, which I am sure my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from West Virginia, will confirm, that, of all the natural resources of our Nation, the most essential is coal. There can be no doubt about that. Any nation that does not have access to coal and iron is powerless in the modern industrial world. Oil can be made from coal, as the Germans demonstrated in World War II.

But if oil is so essential to the future welfare of this Nation, the inquiry might well be made—unless Senators have some court decision that backs

them up in their stand, which I deny—"Why not consider coal as the great natural resource on which the future economy of the Nation depends, and save it for all the people?" If that were done, it would be with the knowledge that the three major bituminous coal-producing States of the Nation are, first, West Virginia, then possibly, Pennsylvania, and then Virginia. The order may not be exactly correct, but I think it is substantially so. Those three States produce the bulk of the bituminous coal mined in the United States. Of course, there is some coal in the South, there is some shale in the Middle West, and there is some coal in Indiana, and in certain other States, but the three large producers of bituminous coal, as I have said, are West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. If Congress is to take from any States that which belongs to them, there is much more reason to take the coal than there is to take the oil from California, Texas, Florida, and Louisiana.

The second point I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, about which, in my opinion, there has been gross misrepresentation, is the value of the assets which may be found in the submerged lands. Time after time it has been asserted throughout the debate, that $300 billion worth of oil is involved. I have enjoyed visiting in Texas and have been to the oil fields there. I know a good many oil producers. For 10 years I served on the House Ways and Means Committee, where we heard the oil producers say, "We must have the 27½ percent depletion allowance." When asked "Why," they answered, "because so many of the oil wells we drill turn out to be dry wells, and if we cannot get a proper depreciation when we strike oil, we cannot build up sufficient reserves to enable us to drill for oil in an unproved field."

Those men had the advantage of the services of the best geologists in the Nation, and, acting on the best-informed guess of those geologists, they would proceed to drill for oil. I say in all sincerity, the oil producers are always happy when not more than half of the oil wells they drill turn out to be dry ones.

Distinguished Senators on this floor have told us that a group of geologists, standing on the shores of the ocean, and looking across the wild, restless waves, have estimated the amount of oil beneath the land under the water, which they cannot see, when everyone knows they can only guess at the amount of oil that is under land they can see. Any geologist who could go into Texas, Oklahoma, or Louisiana, and successfully predict "Here is where oil is to be found," would become fabulously rich. He would not tell someone else where to drill; he would buy up the options and would do the drilling himself. Yet we are being told that the geologists know the amount of oil under the ocean and can form accurate estimates.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have very limited time. I am sorry I cannot yield. This is the only time I have participated in the debate on the pending measure, and I merely desire to cover three major misrepresentations. If the Senator from Wyoming will excuse me, in his own time, he may then ask some questions.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I may say I was not going to argue, I was merely going to correct a statement, for the record.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But, Mr. President, geologists of the Government have attempted to make estimates. Point No. 1: Most of the oil they have estimated is on the outer Continental Shelf that is not covered by the pending measure.

In the second place, they do not tell us that the Government is going to get oil worth $3.50 or $4 a barrel. They are too sensible for that. They know that whether the States own it or whether the Government owns it, they will get one-eighth royalty. They know that to recover whatever is under the submerged lands is going to require years of exploration, drilling, and the erection of derricks. Then storms will come and wash them away, and it will be necessary for them to rebuild the derricks.

If the operators succeed in getting all the oil within 50 years, they will be lucky. They figure on what they will get by guesswork. They cannot see it; they merely guess what the production will be, on the basis of certain formations. They think the oil is there; and a few wells which have been drilled beyond the 3-mile limit are pretty good producers. Possibly in the course of 50 years the Federal Government, if it owns the land and has clear title to it, can collect in royalties something over $500 million. That is all.

Mr. President, it is said that we are giving away $300 billion. How absurd that statement is, yet it has gone all over the lines of communication throughout the Nation, it has been repeated time after time, when actually, on the basis of the most optimistic informed guess—and it is nothing but a guess by Government geologists—we are dealing here with something over $500 million over a period of 50 years. That is the issue.

All that the Holland measure does is to affirm that for 150 years the titles of the Thirteen Original States to the lands within their historic 3-mile limit, their titles to which have never been challenged. There were 52 Supreme Court decisions, not bearing directly upon the question of who owned the title, but which tacitly acknowledged the States' titles to the lands. Then came a decision containing a reference to paramount rights; and no one yet knows where those rights begin or where they will end.

It has even been suggested by some that certain of those rights were inherited by the Federal Government from King George III, the British King. Oh, Mr. President, I hope those two great Virginians, Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry, who helped the Colonies win their independence and then assisted in framing the Constitution under which there was created a central government, all of whose powers were granted to it by sovereign States, do not lie uneasy in their graves today because of the assertion which is now being made, "Oh, you were wrong; King George III had certain rights, and our Federal Government inherited certain of those rights from him." Mr. President, I know that Mr. Justice Sutherland, when he was a college student, became imbued with that theory, and that it remained in his mind throughout his legal career. He finally succeeded in writing certain obiter dicta into a decision to that effect. The subject was not involved in the case, but he had to get it off his mind; and there is a little of that flavor to be found in the three cases to which I have referred, the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases, regarding the supposed inherited right.

Not a single Member of the Senate, Mr. President, who has spoken on the pending measure, would for a minute question the rights of the Federal Government to control navigation on the ocean. That is fully set forth in section 6 of the pending measure.

Several years ago the charge was made against the tidelands bill which was then pending, that there was something in that measure, by inference, which might impinge upon the rights of the Federal Government to build hydroelectric power dams. So the authors of the pending measure, in their wisdom, have spelled that out in subsection (d) of section 3 and removed any doubt. They even included the term "power dams," so there could be no argument about them, and safeguarded all other rights which attach clearly to the Federal Government, under the commerce clause.

So, Mr. President, I emphasize first that the States have always had title up to the 3-mile limit. But the decision in the three recent oil cases threw a cloud upon their title. The pending measure merely seeks to quiet the title. It quiets the title.

I know the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is of the opinion that the State Legislature of Rhode Island contemplates financing legal action to contest it if the joint resolution shall pass, but I am informed that the senate of the Rhode Island legislature recently had the question under consideration and voted not to do so. I read in a newspaper this morning that the distinguished governor of West Virginia says he will start action in the courts. Perhaps he will. Then, if the courts, on the specific issue of title, hold that the Federal Government has title, then I shall bow to what I consider an erroneous but controlling decision.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sorry. I have very limited time. I am depending upon my very limited knowledge without notes and trying to cover three points. I have covered two of them, and I am coming to the third point.

Mr. President, I venture to say that if the joint resolution shall pass, and the Supreme Court overrules the act of Congress, it will have to depend on something more substantial than any claim of power inherited by the Federal Government from King George III of England. Navigation is not involved. Building power dams is not involved. What is involved, Mr. President? A sum

of approximately $500 million over a period of possibly 50 years.

I now come to my third point, which has disturbed quite a number of my friends in Virginia, and which was mentioned in the speech of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I refer to the statement that the money derived from the resources of the submerged lands would be given to the schools. What is the fact? The Hill amendment, which was overwhelmingly defeated, did not directly provide any funds for schools. It provided for dedicating the money to the Federal Government so long as there might be a national emergency. Unless we have been greatly misled about the duration of the present cold war with Russia, this emergency will last for a long time, and while it lasts the schools would receive nothing under the Hill amendment. But, Mr. President, assume that the emergency is over. Assume that the American lamb can lie down with the Russian bear and not be in the bear's stomach. Assume that we want to do something for the schools. What will happen? We shall first have to pass a law to appropriate the money to the schools. Even if we do pass a law appropriating the money to the schools, we shall have to pass a bill providing for Federal aid to education. Ever since I have been in the Senate there has been pending, off and on, a bill for Federal aid to education. On one occasion our present distinguished majority leader [Mr. TAFT], in opposing such a program, stated that if we ever started such a program it would cost $3 billion a year.

In my opinion, we are further away from a bill providing for Federal aid to education than we have been since I have been a Member of the Senate, because if I can make any worthwhile appraisal of the first hundred days of the present administration, I will say it is most notable not for the distance it has covered but for the direction in which it has been traveling. We are turning in the direction of private enterprise. We are turning in the direction of a simplified and less expensive Federal Government. We are turning in the direction of a greater recognition not only of the rights of the States but of the duties and obligations of the States. Certainly, Mr. President, any student of political history or any friend of the principles of Thomas Jefferson should know that public education is one of the fundamental duties of the States. That, in my opinion, is where that responsibility should always rest—in the States and their political subdivisions.

Let us assume that we shall have a condition in the world such as that described by Patrick Henry after the Revolutionary War when he said:

> The white wings of peace are spread above our fair land and contentment lies at every door.

Assume the Federal Government should say, "We do not need the oil any more," and Congress should say, "Let us give it to the schools." Suppose Congress should reverse itself and say, "We are going to place the Government in all sorts of Federal-aid projects." How much would the schools receive from the oil resources of the submerged lands? According to the very careful, and, I assume, accurate analysis which was placed in the RECORD yesterday, the school children would get approximately 41 cents a year.

With all deference to my desk mate whom I admire so much and of whom I am very fond, I want to say that, if 41 cents is going to make the difference between the degree of ignorance of our school children on the one hand, and their adequate education in a proud and glorious future to aid them in furthering the manifest destiny of our Nation, on the other hand, they will be in a tough situation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. MURRAY. I was going to make the observation that the Senator has made a very excellent speech, but it is more remarkable for its exaggeration than for the accuracy of its facts.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Those who take the trouble to read the RECORD will have to appraise the difference of opinion.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield briefly to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. The statement was made a moment ago that the Attorney General of the United States was so disturbed that he took an appeal. There is not one shred of evidence to show that that statement is even remotely in accordance with the fact.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have to admit that I shall have to produce evidence from my principal advisers, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who have been laboring with this matter for a long time. They said the Attorney General filed a petition for rehearing, asking the Court to add words of "ownership" in its decree after the original opinion was written.

Mr. ANDERSON. If they can show that, I shall be happy to retire and get off the Senate floor forever. We have been hearing that misrepresentation for some time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then, Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to clear up that discussion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to myself 3 minutes.

The only thing which is at all variant from the completely correct facts in the statement of the Senator from Virginia is in his choice of words. The fact is that the Federal Government submitted a proposed decree after the Court had indicated what its ruling would be, and included words which would have fixed title in the Federal Government. The fact is that the Supreme Court declined to put in those words, repeatedly declined, as I understand, to put them in, and that matter is still one of grave concern to the Federal Government.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, under those circumstances, does not the distinguished Senator from New Mexico feel that the Senator from Virginia has been vindicated?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is a vast difference between a person arguing for something in a judgment, and, having won a case, filing an application for rehearing. It is not correct, in my opinion, that the Government ever asked for a rehearing.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is strong basis for complete truth in the assertion I now make, that the Federal officials asked that the Court, after learning of its original opinion in the California case, find where the title was and should find that the title was in the Federal Government. That question was raised not only on the original hearing, but also, as I understand, on the rehearing, and the Court consistently and continuously took the position which has been stated.

I do not like to hear an assertion made by my good friend from New Mexico questioning the good faith of either the distinguished Senator from Virginia or of the Senator from Florida who has stated the facts as they are and as they are known to be by everyone who has studied this matter.

The Federal Government did want the decree to recite that title was in the Federal Government. It so prayed in its original petition; it so requested when it submitted the form of decree; it so requested when the matter was reheard upon petition for rehearing filed by the State of California. The Federal Government was alarmed by the fact that title was not fixed by decree, because it realized that exactly what has happened would happen, namely, that the question of title would be left in the air, and that the development of coastal areas would be not only challenged, but would be stymied, as it has been up to now. The Senator from New Mexico knows perfectly well that that is the case.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course, the Senator from New Mexico knows that my statement about what the Government has tried to do was based upon what the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] had told me. But is it not a fact that the Federal Government entered the California case in order to get title?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Federal Government asked for such a ruling in its petition.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not a fact that the question of title was never mentioned in the opinion written by Mr. Justice Black, but that he used the words "paramount right"?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Virginia is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When the Government knew how the decision would be phrased, it then tried to get a revision in order to make clear that title would be in the United States, did it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

The Government requested that the words of the decree be restated so as to include a finding of title in the Federal Government. This the Court declined to do.

Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who controls his side of the debate.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, like everyone else, I am happy to see this debate

come to a close. It has been conducted upon a high level, having been handled admirably by leaders on both sides of the question. The senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and the other proponents of the joint resolution, have handled their side of the case skillfully and, at times, convincingly.

However, in the final analysis, the determination of how one will vote on an important matter such as this must be reached in one's own mind. After hearing both sides of the question being presented ably and thoroughly, as they have been, I have asked myself these questions:

First, has Congress the authority to dispose of the lands under the sea which have, for generations, been regarded as belonging to the Federal Government? I have read carefully the testimony given by the Attorney General of the United States before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I believe that Mr. Brownell cast sufficient doubt upon the authority of Congress to dispose of those lands to warrant a great deal of hesitation before voting to do so.

The second question I have asked myself is this: If we assume that Congress does have the authority to dispose of these lands and quitclaim them to the States, is such disposal of the lands being made on a fair and equitable basis? When I ask that question, I think of all the other States where there are Federal lands, where there is Federal domain, particularly our Western States, and I realize that the income to the States where the lands are located, from leases and royalties on minerals and oil lands in those States, is restricted to 37½ percent. It is planned, under Senate Joint Resolution 13, to give to the coastal States 100 percent of the income from such resources. Certainly if the coastal States are entitled to 100 percent of the income from the undersea lands, then the inland States are entitled to equitable treatment. The third question and perhaps the most important, is this: Is the effort to transfer the undersea oil lands from Federal ownership to the ownership of the States a prelude to further raids upon natural resources of the United States by interested groups of people? For many years there has been building up in this country a determination on the part of certain groups to acquire unto themselves the natural resources of the United States which have always belonged to all the people. I think in particular of the plan to raid or to seize Niagara Falls. The efforts now being made to grab the power from the St. Lawrence development, so that instead of all the people getting the benefits, a very few will receive the profits. I think of the proposals to dispose of great public powerplants, such as Boulder Dam, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and even the TVA; and I wonder where we may be headed in that respect. Other groups would take unto themselves the forests on our publicly owned lands and all the minerals to be found thereon.

Mr. President, I am convinced that this great effort, this great raid, which has been building up will reach its climax very soon. I believe that President Eisenhower will soon be under greater pressure to permit the raiding of natural resources than any other President has been put under for a generation. May God give him the wisdom and the strength to turn back the spoilers when they come to the White House seeking acquiescence in their plans. I hope the wee, small voice of conscience may speak to each and every Member of Congress, reminding us of the sacred duty which we have to protect the heritage which properly belongs to our country and to posterity, and which has been entrusted to our keeping.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Vermont that his time has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield an additional minute and a half to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

The fourth question I ask myself is: Do we, by claiming ownership of the land under the salt water beyond the historic 3-mile distance, and the right to dispose of this land, recognize the right of other countries to do the same? If we do, the effect of the passage of the pending joint resolution may result in closing great areas of the sea which previously have been open to international shipping, and eventually may involve us in controversies with other countries.

So, Mr. President, because I am unable to justify disposal of the undersea lands which from time immemorial have been held to belong to all the people of our 48 States, I shall vote "no" on the joint resolution.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] 5 minutes, or as much additional time as he may require.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I propose an amendment to the pending joint resolution and ask that it be printed. It need not be read, because it is identical with the previously considered Anderson substitute, except the manner of the disposition of the income from the submerged lands, which will be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, will be printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to afford all the Members of the Senate an opportunity to show by the record whether they choose to give to California, Texas, and Louisiana between $50 billion and $300 billion worth of oil, gas, and other property, which the Supreme Court of the United States has 3 times solemnly decided belongs to the Federal Government, or utilize these vast resources for the benefit of all the people of the Nation in accordance with the following percentages:

First. Ten percent for the reduction of the national debt;

Second. Ten percent for research in the prevention and extermination of cancer;

Third. Ten percent for research in the prevention and extermination of heart disease;

Fourth. Ten percent for education;

Fifth. Ten percent for research in the prevention and extermination of muscular dystrophy;

Sixth. Ten percent for research in the prevention and extermination of multiple sclerosis;

Seventh. Ten percent for research in the prevention and extermination of infantile paralysis;

Eighth. Ten percent for aid to the blind;

Ninth. Ten percent for aid to disabled veterans; and

Tenth. Ten percent to the American National Red Cross to be used for the alleviation of human suffering.

The action of the Senate on this amendment will determine whether every man, woman and child of 45 States in the Union shall be forever stripped of his or her share of this vast wealth, in order that 3 States may be enriched to an extent that would have dazzled the imagination of the Caesars. It will also determine whether 250,000 of our people, who are condemned to die, during the present year, of cancer—the world's most agonizing disease—shall be completely deprived of hope of having any of the income from our offshore oil and gas utilized for the alleviation of their deplorable affliction.

A vote against the amendment will be a vote against the use of any part of the income from the offshore oil and gas for the cure or care of any of the half a million Americans who are marked for death from heart disease during the next 12 months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. The vote on the amendment will show whether the republican members of the Senate respect or repudiate the philosophy of the immortal Lincoln to the effect that concern for the Godmade man should always be superior to the concern for the manmade dollar.

Mr. President, let me entreat all Senators present to vote for the amendment and by adopting it prosper the lofty enterprises of educating our children, healing the afflicted, rescuing the perishing and comforting the dying. By thus discharging our duty in relation to our earthly treasures, let us lay up for ourselves treasures in heaven where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has again expired.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, during my service in the Senate I have steadfastly supported proposals similar to the pending measure to return submerged land within historic boundaries to the States. It has been my feeling that the minority view of the Supreme Court in the California case more properly represented the traditional and proper legal concept of the organization of our American Government. For that reason, it has always seemed to me that the restoration of the submerged lands along the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the Gulf of Mexico to the States bordering those bodies of

water was essential to the maintenance of the form of government under which our Nation has prospered during the past 177 years.

In the first place, I believe we should realize that our Federal Government was always intended by its creators to be a Government of limited powers. Our Constitution was carefully drawn in the effort to preserve and protect the functions of State government and to prevent Federal usurpation of those powers. Likewise, our Federal Government was organized into three separate branches as a part of the checks and balances to prevent excesses within our Federal Government. It is important to notice, however, that unless 1 of the 3 branches of the Federal Government—either the executive, the legislative, or the judicial—should call a halt on the others, then there is nothing to prevent the Federal Government from usurping all the powers and functions properly reserved to the States and to the people.

For example, it is possible that the Supreme Court could hold that there is no power denied to the Federal Government under our Constitution and that the powers granted under the American Constitution are sufficiently broad to permit the Federal Government to do anything that it chooses. It is even possible that the executive and legislative branches of our Government in pursuance of such a legal theory could proceed to exercise the superior power of the Federal Government in ways that could completely exclude the State and local governments from performing any functions whatsoever.

I realize that such an illustration is farfetched; yet in some respects it represents the trend of our Government during the last 20 years. I would not for a moment suggest that there has not been increasing pressure on the Federal Government to undertake vast additional functions in order to care for the needs of the people of this Nation; yet we are all familiar with the manner in which new legal theories have been developed and new interpretations have been suggested and urged upon the Supreme Court of the United States to permit the Federal Government to engage in first one vast program and then another, which has never previously been considered an appropriate function of the Federal Government. Most outstanding examples of these cases have been the expanded meaning of the interstate-commerce clause giving the Federal Government the power to regulate any business enterprise in America on the theory that such an enterprise affected interstate commerce and therefore was subject to regulation in pursuance of the Federal Government's power to regulate commerce between the States.

Likewise we are familiar with the expanded meaning of the general-welfare clause of our Constitution. In these respects attorneys for the Federal Government have been able to persuade the Court to place the interpretation upon our Constitution which has made it possible for the Federal Government to accomplish practically any result it desired in the economic field and to achieve practically unlimited power in various other phases of domestic legislation.

Of course, we realize that this new look given to the Constitution law of the United States resulted in part from the appointment of judges who were regarded as entertaining so-called liberal views. I do not for a moment criticize the appointment of liberal judges. I believe it proper that there should always be a certain number of judges on the Supreme Court who entertain views regarded as liberal. I do say, however, that the Court should never be composed entirely of liberals just as it should never be composed entirely of conservatives or reactionaries; although I believe it would be well that every member of the Court as well as every Member of Congress should be conservative in the sense that he would preserve the fundamentals of our system of government.

I submit that the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases has been proceeding upon a dangerous departure from the fundamentals of American government. In those cases the Supreme Court proceeded to hold that the States never possessed complete sovereignty and that the United States Government has powers other than those derived from the Constitution of the United States. This is a theory that can lead to all sorts of mischief, far beyond the seizure of 17 million acres of ocean bottom at issue in this instance.

I realize that such a theory has been expressed on earlier occasions. It has only been in recent years, however, that we have seen this theory of government advanced to in any way deprive the States of their rights or their property. In the California case, we found the Court saying:

> From all the wealth of material supplied, however, we cannot say that the Thirteen Original Colonies acquired ownership to the 3-mile belt or the soil underneath it, even if they did acquire elements of sovereignty of the English Crown by their revolution against it (*U. S. v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (229 U. S. 304, 316)).

With such language we find the Supreme Court denying the original sovereignty of the States of this Nation.

Now, let us look to the language of U. S. against Curtiss-Wright Export Corp., to which the Supreme Court referred in the California case. One should remember that the U. S. against Curtiss-Wright was decided upon the basis that the Congress of the United States could properly delegate to the President of the United States the power to invoke an embargo on the shipment of arms to war in foreign nations, when the President found certain facts to exist. It was not essential to such a conclusion to find that the Thirteen Original States never possessed complete sovereignty. Nevertheless, Justice Sutherland, who in that case wrote the majority opinion, expressed certain views at variance with the history of the formation of this Nation, as most of us understand it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the language which I have in mind.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Excerpt from *U. S. v. Curtiss-Wright Corp.* (299 U. S. 304, at 316 et seq.)]

As a result of the separation from Great Britain by the Colonies acting as a unit, the powers of external sovereignty passed from the Crown, not to the Colonies severally, but to the Colonies in their collective and corporate capacity as the United States of America. Even before the Declaration, the Colonies were a unit in foreign affairs, acting through a common agency, namely, the Continental Congress, composed of delegates from the Thirteen Colonies. That agency exercised the powers of war and peace, raised an Army, created a Navy, and finally adopted the Declaration of Independence. Rulers come and go; governments end and forms of government change; but sovereignty survives. A political society cannot endure without a supreme will somewhere. Sovereignty is never held in suspense. When, therefore, the external sovereignty of Great Britain in respect to the Colonies ceased, it immediately passed to the Union. (See *Penhallow v. Doane* (3 Dall. 54, 80–81.)) That fact was given practical application almost at once. The treaty of peace, made on September 23, 1783, was concluded between His Britannic Majesty and the United States of America (8 Stat.—European Treaties—80).

The Union existed before the Constitution, which was ordained and established, among other things, to form a "more perfect Union." Prior to that event, it is clear that the Union, declared by the Articles of Confederation to be perpetual, was the sole possessor of external sovereignty and in the Union it remained without change save insofar as the Constitution in express terms qualified its exercise. The Framers' Convention was called and exerted its powers upon the irrefutable postulate that though the States were several their people in respect to foreign affairs were one. Compare the *Chinese Exclusion* case (130 U. S. 581, 604, 606). In that convention, the entire absence of State power to deal with those affairs was thus forcefully stated by Rufus King:

"The States were not sovereigns in the sense contended for by some. They did not possess the peculiar features of sovereignty—they could not make war, nor peace, nor alliances, nor treaties. Considering them as political beings, they were dumb, for they could not speak to any foreign sovereign whatever. They were deaf, for they could not hear any propositions from such sovereign. They had not even the organs or faculties of defense or offense, for they could not of themselves raise troops, or equip vessels, for war" (5 Elliott's Debates 212).[1]

It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, please note that the effect of the application of this theory held by Justice Sutherland in the Curtiss-Wright case had no more effect than merely to serve as one more reason for upholding a delegation of power which the Congress felt it had the right to pass to the Executive. Nevertheless,

[1] In general confirmation of the foregoing views, see 1 Story on the Constitution, 4th ed., 198–217, and especially 210, 211, 213, 214, 215 (p. 153), 216.

it was such language as this which was relied upon by attorneys for the Federal Government to contend the States had never owned their submerged lands, although agents of the Federal Government had consistently recognized such State titles for more than 100 years.

I completely differ with that view of the formation of our Government. I believe that the States were at one time completely free and independent. I will concede that there was always perhaps 1 percent or one-tenth of 1 percent of Americans who suggested that the States were never completely sovereign at the time they won their independence. I concede that such was the opinion of Mr. Rufus King, quoted in Elliott's Debates. I would concede that a private citizen in Rhode Island made such an argument at a time when Rhode Island was withholding its agreement to join the American Union even after our Government had been in operation for several months under the Constitution. I would concede that Mr. Justice Story in one of his commentaries once made such a statement. I concede that the late Justice Sutherland held such a view and so expressed himself in the Curtiss-Wright case. Nevertheless, I believe that even today there are not more than 1 percent of the attorneys and historians who have studied the question who would agree with that point of view—Justice Black and the present Supreme Court of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

First, let me refer to previous Supreme Court opinions in which it was fundamental to the decision of the Court that the States had acquired complete sovereignty by their revolution from the King of England. First, I would quote from the old case of Martin against Waddell, in which Justice Taney, speaking for the Court, could, in some respects, qualify as an eyewitness in that he had lived through the period of the Revolution and the formation of our Federal Government:

Martin v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367 (1842)):

"For when the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government.

"And when the people of New Jersey took possession of the reins of government and took into their own hands the powers of sovereignty, the prerogatives and regalities which before belonged either to the Crown or the Parliament became immediately vested in the State."

Next, I quote from three other Supreme Court opinions, decided in 1823, 1855, and 1891, in which the Court clearly expressed the fundamentals of the formation of our American Government exactly as the enormous majority of lawyers and historians had always agreed it to be. These are only a few of the declarations of our Court which could be found describing the fundamentals of our form of government in the fashion that those of us supporting the submerged lands bill contend it to be:

Johnson v. *McIntosh* (8 Wheat. 543 (1823)):

"By the treaty which concluded the war of our Revolution, Great Britain relinquished all claim, not only to the Government, but to the 'property' and territorial rights of the United States whose boundaries were fixed in the second article. By this treaty, the powers of government, and the right to soil, which had previously been in Great Britain, passed definitely to these States."

Smith v. *Maryland* (18 How. 74 (1855)):

"Whatever soil below low water is the subject of exclusive propriety and ownership belongs to the State on whose maritime border and within whose territory it lies, subject to any lawful grants of that soil by the State, or the sovereign power which governed its territory before the Declaration of Independence."

Manchester v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240 (1891)):

"By the definitive treaty of peace of September 3, 1783, between the United States and Great Britain (8 Stat. 81), His Britannic Majesty acknowledged the United States, of which Massachusetts Bay was one, to be free, sovereign, and independent States, and declared that he treated with them as such, and, for himself, his heirs and successors, relinquished all claims to the government, proprietary, and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof. Therefore, if Massachusetts had continued to be an independent nation, her boundaries on the sea, as defined by her statutes, would unquestionably be acknowledged by all foreign nations, and her right to control the fisheries within those boundaries would be conceded.

"The title thus held is subject to the paramount rights of navigation, the regulation of which, in respect to foreign and interstate commerce, has been granted to the United States. There has been, however, no such grant over the fisheries. These remain under the exclusive control of the State, which has consequently the right, in its discretion, to appropriate its tidewaters and their beds to be used by its people as a common for taking and cultivating fish, so far as it may be done without obstructing navigation. Such an appropriation is in effect nothing more than a regulation of the use by the people of their common property."

I support the Supreme Court as one of the institutions of our Government; yet I realize that personalities of the Court change with the years, and I sincerely doubt that prior to recent years a majority of Justices on that Court would have agreed with the view of the formation of our Nation expressed in the Curtiss-Whight case and relied upon in the tidelands cases.

Next I wish to refer to a message to Congress by our fifth President, James Monroe, discussing the matter of initial sovereignty of the States.

Before reading from the message of President Monroe, let me first discuss President Monroe's qualifications to discuss the initial sovereignty of the Original Thirteen States. President Monroe served in the Army during the Revolution and was wounded at the Battle of Trenton. He studied law under Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence. During the period of Federal Government under the Articles of Confederation, James Monroe served as a Member of Congress. He was a member of the Convention in Virginia which ratified the Constitution. He was Minister to France under President Washington. He served in several diplomatic missions under President Jefferson, including the assignment as a negotiator of the Louisiana Purchase. He was Secretary of State under President Madison from 1811 to 1817 and served a brief period as Secretary of War. His close relationship to James Madison made him intimately acquainted with the arguments in favor of stronger Federal Government at the time the movement began for the adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

Inasmuch as those who argue against the States in this debate pin so much of their argument upon our international responsibilities, it is worthy of note that James Monroe, in addition to his other achievements, was responsible for the Monroe Doctrine which has to this day been a keystone to our foreign policy. The message to which I refer was dated May 4, 1822. It was sent to Congress a few days subsequent to the President's veto of "an act for the preservation and repair of the Cumberland Road," which he had vetoed "with deep regret" because he did not believe the Federal Government possessed the power under the Constitution to pass such a law, although later interpretations of the commerce clause to which I have previously referred have caused the Government to subsequently assert the same type power which President Monroe denied at that time.

It was not until recent years that any sizable group of attorneys or judges seriously differed with President Monroe's views that the Colonies won complete independence and sovereignty as a result of the American Revolution and further that the central Government possessed only those powers which were delegated to the central Government—first under the Articles of Confederation and later under the Constitution of the United States.

I now read excerpts from the message to which I have been referring:

In thus tracing our institutions to their origin and pursuing them in their progress and modifications down to the adoption of this Constitution two important facts have been disclosed, on which it may not be improper in this stage to make a few observations. The first is that in wresting the power, or what is called the sovereignty, from the Crown as it passed directly to the people. The second, that it passed directly to the people of each Colony and not to the people of all the Colonies in the aggregate; to 13 distinct communities and not to one.

And that the power wrested from the British Crown passed to the people of each colony and the whole history of our political movement from the emigration of our ancestors to the present day clearly demonstrates. What produced the Revolution? The violation of our rights. What rights? Our chartered rights. To whom were the charters granted, to the people of each colony or to the people of all the Colonies as a single community? We know that no such community as the aggregate existed, and of course that no such rights could be violated. It may be added that the nature of the powers which were given to the delegates by each colony and the manner in which they were executed show that the sovereignty was in the people of each and not in the aggregate. They respectively presented credentials such as are usual between ministers of separate powers, which were examined and approved before they entered on the discharge of the important duties committed to them. They voted also by colonies and not individually, all the members from one colony being entitled to one vote only. This fact alone, the first of our political association and at the period of our greatest peril, fixes beyond all controversy the source from whence the power which has directed and

secured success to all our measures has proceeded.

Had the sovereignty passed to the aggregate, consequences might have ensued, admitting the success of our Revolution, which might even yet seriously affect our system. By passing to the people of each colony the opposition to Great Britain, the prosecution of the war, the Declaration of Independence, the adoption of the Confederation and of this Constitution are all imputable to them. Had it passed to the aggregate, every measure would be traced to that source; even the State governments might be said to have emanated from it, and amendments of their constitutions on that principle be proposed by the same authority. In short, it is not easy to perceive all the consequences into which such a doctrine might lead.

It is obvious that the people in mass would have had much less agency in all the great measures of the Revolution and in those which followed than they actually had, and proportionately less credit for their patriotism and services than they are now entitled to and enjoy. By passing to the people of each colony the whole body in each were kept in constant and active deliberation on subjects of the highest national importance and in the supervision of the conduct of all the public servants in the discharge of their respective duties. Thus the most effectual guards were provided against abuses and dangers of every kind which human ingenuity could devise, and the whole people rendered more competent to the self-government which by an heroic exertion they had acquired.

As if there were any further need to establish the limited nature of the powers of the Federal Government or the fact that these powers were derived from the States rather than from some nebulous concept of unity such as that suggested in this debate by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], or previously by the Senator from Wyoming Mr. O'Mahoney, or the former Solicitor General, Mr. Philip Perlman, let me now refer to the Declaration of Independence.

In that monumental document it will be noted that in the resolving clauses, the Declaration in several instances uses the words "free and independent States" in referring to the new status of the English colonies. Although it is true that the word "States" is not in every instance preceded by the word "free," however in every instance the word "States" is preceded by the word "independent."

The resolving clause of the Declaration of Independence reads:

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in general congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

We all know that the Declaration of Independence was carefully drawn and well considered by Thomas Jefferson and those great patriots who joined him in the drafting and adoption of that document.

Likewise, we know that the King of England dealt with the States of this Nation as free and independent States and in the treaty of peace, he referred to them in the plural as independent States, and they were expressly enumerated.

In the treaty of peace with the King of England, article 1 reads:

His Britannic Majesty acknowledges said United States, viz (which in layman's language means "namely"), New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, to be free, sovereign, and independent States; that he treats with them as such, and for himself, his heirs, and successors relinquishes all claim to the government, proprietary, and territorial rights of the same, and every part thereof.

We know further that at the time of the drafting of the Articles of Confederation it was proposed that the States should undertake to draft Articles of Confederation by which they would bind themselves to a common effort. A committee was appointed on July 12, 1776. On November 15, 1777, the Congress agreed to the articles in form and directed that they be proposed to the legislatures of all the United States and, if they were approved by them they were advised to authorize their delegates to ratify same in the Congress of the United States.

It was not until March 1, 1781, that the articles were finally ratified by the 13th State and on May 2, 1781, that the Congress first assembled under the new form of government. Until that date, the Congress of the United States could be regarded as little more than an elaborate committee of correspondents, representing the will of the various States only insofar as those States authorized and agreed that it should represent them. A brief discussion of the background of the Articles of Confederation will be found at page 423 of the Senate Manual.

I now read excerpts from the Articles of Confederation of the United States:

EXCERPTS FROM ACT OF CONFEDERATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION AND PERPETUAL UNION BETWEEN THE STATES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, MASSACHUSETTS BAY, RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS, CONNECTICUT, NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, PENNSYLVANIA, DELAWARE, MARYLAND, VIRGINIA, NORTH CAROLINA, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND GEORGIA

ARTICLE I. The style of this confederacy shall be "The United States of America."

ART. II. Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.

ART. III. The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other, against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever.

ART. VIII. All charges of war, and all other expenses that shall be incurred for the common defense or general welfare, and allowed by the United States in Congress assembled, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury, which shall be supplied by the several States, in proportion to the value of all land within each State, granted to or surveyed for any person, as such land and the buildings and improvements thereon shall be estimated according to such mode as the United States in Congress assembled shall from time to time direct and appoint.

The taxes for paying that proportion shall be laid and levied by the authority and direction of the legislatures of the several States within the time agreed upon by the United States in Congress assembled.

From these articles it will be seen that the elements of sovereignty transferred to the Congress under the articles were extremely limited. The Government thus formed had no executive, no judiciary—only a Congress. It had no power to enforce any of its decisions upon any of the States. It had no taxing power. The experience under that form of government demonstrated for the most part that States would not even send their proportionate share of the levies which they had agreed to pay for the support of the Central Government.

It is important to notice that the articles stated that each State retained its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, not expressly delegated by the articles.

Next I refer to the Constitution of the United States. Nowhere in that document will it be found that the States surrendered any proprietary right whatsoever to the Central Government. As a matter of fact, the 10th amendment reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution makes clear that the only powers that exist in the General Government are those which are delegated by the Constitution. There simply are no powers that exist in the United States other than those that are delegated by the Constitution. Does it not make sense to realize that the purpose of that amendment was to allay the fears of those then opposing ratification of the Constitution for fear that the Central Government would usurp the rights and the powers of the individual States.

It is interesting to note that in the present debate the Senators from Rhode Island are opposing the restoration to the States of property which has been denied them by the assertion of the doctrine of paramount rights derived in part from a theory that the Central Government possesses undelegated and unlimited powers in the field of international affairs and defense other than those derived from the Constitution. Yet it was poor little Rhode Island that held out until the very last against the ratification of the American Constitution. We recall that that little nation attempted to go it alone for more than a year after the Constitution had gone into effect. History tells us that the States which had previously ratified had met in the First Congress under the Constitution—minus Rhode Island—and that they had adopted customs laws permitting Rhode Island to ship into the

newly formed Nation domestic products of that independent State duty-free for a limited time. History further tells us that it was the consensus of the new Congress that the favorable treatment of that former associate should be permitted to expire and that thereafter Rhode Island would have had to accept the same treatment as other foreign nations when it undertook to pass the customs of the United States.

A merchant in Rhode Island, fearful of the consequences of the failure of Rhode Island to join the Union, suggested that the Union had existed even without the Constitution, but that was not the view of the Congress of the United States. That is why the Congress was disposed to tell little Rhode Island, "Either join up or start paying customs when you ship your goods into this Nation."

One of the reasons why Rhode Island withheld ratification was that she wished to insist that the larger States of the Union should surrender the vast unoccupied tracts of land to the Nation for the formation of future States. In line with the general understanding of all States, such tracts of land were later surrendered for the formation of such States as Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama. Never until the present has Rhode Island been in the position of urging that the Federal Government had acquired property from the States which the States had never surrendered.

Thus we see that the history of the formation of our Nation was such as to completely negate any inference that the Government possessed paramount rights above and beyond the rights granted to the Federal Government in the Constitution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am sorry. My time is very much limited, and I do not have time to yield.

As new States were admitted to the Union, they were admitted on an equal footing with the original States and the holding of the Supreme Court in case after case acknowledged that the effect of the admission on an equal footing was to confer upon the new States the same rights of sovereignty that had existed in the original States.

A group of cases held that the admission of new States caused them to acquire that element of sovereignty that related to the position of the submerged lands within their boundaries.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement of these cases be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW STATES (ADMITTED ON EQUAL FOOTING WITH THE ORIGINAL THIRTEEN)

Pollard v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212 (1845)): Plaintiffs claimed a lot of ground below both high- and low-water mark in Mobile Bay, under United States patent, issued before Alabama was admitted to statehood. The defendant claimed under grant from the State.

The Court said that this was the first time it had been called upon to draw the line that separates the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Government of the Union and the State governments, over the subject in controversy, although many of the principles which entered into the question had been settled by previous decisions of the Court.

The Court held that when Alabama was admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, it succeeded to all of the rights of sovereignty and jurisdiction which Georgia possessed, except so far as such right was diminished by the public lands remaining in the possession and under the control of the United States and that if an express stipulation had been inserted in the agreement for the admission of Alabama as a State, granting the municipal right of sovereignty to the United States, such stipulation would have been void and inoperative, "because the United States have no constitutional capacity to exercise municipal jurisdiction, sovereignty, or eminent domain, within the limits of a State or elsewhere, except in the cases in which it is expressly granted."

The Court said further that the surrender made by the States of their waste and unappropriated lands, public lands, to the United States under resolution of the old Congress of September 6, 1780, to aid in paying the public debt of the Revolution ended as soon as such purposes could be accomplished, and then the power of the United States over such lands was to cease.

To exercise rights not granted the Court characterized as repugnant to the Constitution and inconsistent with the deeds of cession.

"Then to Alabama," the Court said, "belong the navigable waters and soils under them * * * subject to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the United States," and that "no compact that might be made between her [Alabama] and the United States could diminish or enlarge these rights."

"For, although the territorial limits of Alabama," the Court added, "have extended all her sovereign power into the sea, it is there, as on the shore, but municipal power, subject to the Constitution of the United States and the laws which shall be made in pursuance thereof."

This landmark case follows the prior jurisprudence and is important all the more for the enunciation therein made that the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction as to navigable waters and the subsoils thereof as the Original Thirteen States.

Louisiana v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1 (1905)): This suit involves the powers of two contesting States to control the oyster industry and the taking of oysters claimed by both States to be within the boundaries of each.

The Court held that under the Treaty of Cession in 1803 between France and the United States and the act of April 1812, admitting Louisiana into the Union, the waters in question were within the boundaries of the State of Louisiana.

In the course of its opinion, the Court said:

"The maritime belt is that part of the sea, in contradistinction to the open sea, is under the sway of the riparian States, which can exclusively reserve the fisheries within their respective maritime belts for their own citizens, whether fish or pearls or amber or other products of the sea."

(The term "sway" is defined in Webster's Dictionary as synonymous with "power, empire, sovereignty.")

The Abby Dodge (223 U. S. 166 (1912)): The defendant was convicted under a Federal statute prohibiting the landing of sponges taken by means of diving apparatus from waters of the Gulf of Mexico and the Straits of Florida.

The Court cited *McCready* v. *Virginia*, *Pollard* v. *Hagan*, *Smith* v. *Maryland*, and other cases herein briefed, as well as others, in saying that if the statute applied to sponges taken from land under water within the territorial limits of the State of Florida, or other States, the repugnancy of the statute to the Constitution would be plainly established. Referring to the case of *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (see pp. 11–12, herein), the Court pointed out that aquatic life "so far as they are capable of ownership while so running" belong to the States and are subject to their control, if found within the marginal waters of such States.

Borax Consolidated v. *City of Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10 (1935)): This action was brought by the city of Los Angeles (defendant in writ) claiming under a grant from the State of California, to quiet title to land in San Pedro Harbor, the other party claimed under a preemption patent from the United States.

Holding for plaintiff, under State grant, the Court held, among other things, that State ownership of tidelands extends to the mean high-water mark; that such property, acquired by the United States from Mexico, had been held in trust for the State of California.

Knight v. *United Lands Association* (142 U. S. 161): Error to the Supreme Court of California to review a judgment in favor of plaintiff, in an action of ejectment for the recovery of a block of land in the city of San Francisco, below high-water mark at the time of the conquest of California with Mexico.

The Court held:

"It is the settled rule of law in this Court that absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, the soils under the tidewaters in the original States were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the Original Thirteen States possess within their respective borders."

Mumford v. *Wardwell* (6 Wall. 423 (1867)): This was a contest over a lot of ground below high tide in California waters. Among other things, the Court held:

"It is the settled rule of law in this Court that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the original States were not granted, by the Constitution, to the United States; but were reserved to the several States; and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders" (quoting from *Pollard* v. *Hagan*, supra).

New Orleans v. *United States* (152 U. S. 1 (1894)): The United States sought in this action to enjoin the officials and inhabitants of New Orleans, La., from selling lots included in the vacant lands forming part of the common, or quay, by asserting the claim that such property inured to the United States by the Treaty of Cession in 1803.

The Court discussed the laws of France in much detail, and cited Domat for the following statement:

"There are two kinds of property destined to the common use of man, and of which everyone has the enjoyment. The first of those are so by nature—as rivers, the sea, and its shores. The second, which derive their character from the destination given by man, such as streets, highways, churches, market houses, courthouses, and other public places."

Among other pronouncements, the Court said:

"The King of Spain, like the King of France, had the power to give permission to construct buildings on grounds dedicated to public use * * *; but this does not show that either sovereign had the power to alien such lands.

"This common (quay) having been dedicated to public use, was withdrawn from commerce, and from the power of the King rightfully to alien it."

"The State of Louisiana was admitted into the Union on the same footing as the origi-

nal States. Her rights of sovereignty are the same, and by consequence no jurisdiction of the Federal Government, either for purposes of police or otherwise, can be exercised over this public ground."

"All powers which properly appertain to sovereignty, which have not been delegated to the Federal Government, belong to the States and the people."

This case is important in two main respects: (1) The sea and its shores were declared to be owned by the State; and (2) such property was referred to as being inalienable.

Shively v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1 (1894)): The land in controversy, located in Oregon, was submerged in waters beyond the high-water mark. The plaintiff claimed under a State grant, the defendant under a United States patent. (Oregon tidelands at mouth of Columbia River in contest.)

In rendering judgment for plaintiff, the Court held:

"By the common law, both the title and the dominion of the sea, and of rivers and arms of the sea, where the tide ebbs and flows, and of all the lands below high-water mark, within the jurisdiction of the Crown of England, are in the King. * * * The common law of England upon this subject, at the time of the emigration of our ancestors, is the law of this country, except as it has been modified, by the charters, constitutions, statutes or usages of the several colonies and States, or by the Constitution and laws of the United States."

There was also mentioned in the opinion the rights of new States as being equal to the Original Thirteen.

"Upon the admission of Oregon into the Union, the tidelands became the property of the State, and subject to its jurisdiction and disposal."

Skiriotes v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 313 (1941)): A case, in certain respects, similar to the Abby Dodge, supra. A Federal statute was under consideration, prohibiting the use of diving equipment in the taking of sponges from the Gulf of Mexico and the Florida Straits.

The Court sanctioned the right of the State to regulate the taking of sponges from its territorial waters, dismissing the contention that international law was involved.

United States v. *Mission Rock Co.* (189 U. S. 391 (1920)): Title to tidelands contiguous to and surrounding San Francisco Bay was at issue in this case. As against a grantee of the State to reclaim such lands, the opposing party claimed that the area had been reserved by order of the President of the United States for naval purposes.

The State-grantee prevailed. Said the Court:

"Although the title to the soil under the tidewaters of the bay was acquired by the United States by cession from Mexico, equally with title to the upland, they held it in trust for the future State."

Illinois Central Railroad Co. v. *State of Illinois* (146 U. S. 387 (1892)): A segment of the subsoil of Lake Michigan was in controversy herein.

The Court pointed out the settled law of the land as to State ownership of tidelands, citing *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212) and *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. 57), then it added significantly:

"We hold, therefore, that the same doctrine as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under the navigable waters of the Great Lakes, applies, which obtains at the common law as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea, and that the lands are held by the same right in the one case as in the other, and subject to the same trusts and limitations."

Weber v. *Board of State Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. (85 U. S. 57) 57 (1873)): This suit involved lands under an arm of the sea in California waters.

The Court said in part in its opinion:

"The title to the shore of the sea, and of the arms of the sea, and in soils under the tidewaters, is, in England, in the King and in this country in the State."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I realize that it has been suggested that all of these cases related merely to controversies over lands beneath inland waters. The point is that the doctrine announced was a broader doctrine than the States possessed all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries. The turning point to holding that a State possessed title to such land was first that the land was beneath navigable water and second that it was within the State's boundary. In no instance did the Court attempt to determine that the submerged land was beneath inland water. Thus, in a case involving Chesapeake Bay, it was not necessary to determine whether the nature of that body of water was such that it should be regarded as a historic bay or as inland water. The fact that the property in question was within the boundary was sufficient to settle the question.

The United States of America is unique among the nations of the world in that the elements of sovereignty are divided between State and Federal Government. Those who contend for Federal ownership contend, of course, that the element of sovereignty relating to the possession of land beneath the open sea within a State's boundaries is an element of sovereignty belonging to the Federal Government.

Why do our opponents find it essential to their case to rely upon a far-fetched distortion of American history? The reason is because the States never gave to the Federal Government any right to their submerged lands.

Mr. President, when the junior Senator from Louisiana was an attorney in private practice of law, he was amazed upon reading the decision of the Supreme Court in the United States against California. How well I recall that many good Louisiana attorneys urged that the California case was not necessarily controlling insofar as Louisiana was concerned and many attorneys of Texas were quick to point to the fact that Texas had reserved all of its public lands in the Act of Annexation to the Union. They learned to their sorrow that all coastal States were in the same position.

During my service on the committee, I have seen the efforts of the Federal agents of the Truman administration to allay the fears of coastal States. States were assured that although the Federal Government proposed to take the oil from the submerged lands, the States need have little worry that the Federal Government would take their fish, shrimp, oysters, crabs, kelp, sand, gravel, shells, or the soil itself. What a ridiculous argument. Anyone familiar with the law could see that the Federal Government would have every bit as much right to take all of these resources as does the Federal Government have to take the oil.

When I first read the California decision, Mr. President, the question immediately occurred to me—how about our inland waters? The State which I have the honor to represent has vast amounts of inland waters within our boundaries. The question occurred to me: "Does this mean the Federal Government will be taking our inland waters next?" By a review of the previous decisions of the Court, one could see that the Courts had definitely held lands beneath such waters to be property of the States; yet the doctrine announced in those cases was prior to the announcement of the new paramount rights theory. It is a doctrine that would have been equally applicable to submerged land seaward of the low-water mark in the ocean. It was a doctrine which the Federal Government in its successful case against California had described as unsound.

I may point out, Mr. President, that subsequent to that decision, suggestions were made that the Federal Government should use that doctrine as a means of taking other lands, particularly on the Great Lakes, as proposed by one member of the Department of Justice at that time.

How safe are the inland States in relying upon those decisions dating back more than 100 years—decisions handed down during the days when the entire Federal officialdom agreed that the States owned all submerged lands within their boundaries, and respected those States' rights without a challenge. Of course, it is true that the Federal officials who successfully took our so-called tidelands have disclaimed any desire to seek our lands beneath inland waters, but they are not bound by such declarations, nor can they bind their predecessors. In fact, it was fundamental to the Government's case against California that Federal attorneys should brush aside all previous declarations of Federal officials. One of the elements of the California case was the decision of the Court that the vast expenditure of State and private money passed in part upon Federal recognition of State titles, did not in any wise bind the Federal Government.

Mr. Philip Perlman has told us that we need have no worry, because the Court has previously decided that inland waters belong to the States; yet it is the same Mr. Perlman who has previously gone before the Supreme Court and urged that Court to reverse long lines of Supreme Court decisions. Only recently was Mr. Perlman before the Court, urging it to overrule the long line of cases announcing the famous separate-but-equal doctrine.

Of course, we recall that the most ardent advocate of Federal ownership of submerged lands was the late Mr. Harold Ickes. It was that same person who, as Secretary of the Interior, signed letters declaring that the very property which he later urged to be taken for the Federal Government belonged to the States. It simply goes to demonstrate, Mr. President, that we cannot believe what some people say. Their soothing words give one an unjustified feeling of confidence unless he looks to the record to see what has actually been done.

Some years ago, a representative of the then Attorney General, a Mr. Vanesh, suggested that the decision in the California case should serve as a precedent for the Federal Government's taking the beds of all the Great Lakes,

Subsequently, as legislation similar to Senate Joint Resolution 13 to quitclaim all submerged lands within historic boundaries to the States obtained general support throughout the Nation, other representatives of the Justice Department came before us to suggest that the States bordering the Great Lakes need have no fears. Yet for years the Justice Department nevertheless objected to confirming title to the States bordering the Great Lakes.

As I have shown, one will read the Constitution in vain if he is in search of language indicating the intention of the States to give the submerged lands to the Federal Government. I well realize that some argue that the Federal Government possesses the submerged lands seaward of the low-water mark within State boundaries in the Atlantic, Pacific, and the Gulf of Mexico, because the Federal Government has the duty to defend these lands. I ask the Senators to consider this argument in its true nature. If pursued to its logical conclusion, it would jeopardize all property rights. If it is to be held that the Federal Government owns land because it has the duty of defending it, then that argument would be even stronger when applied to land under the inland waters, which the Federal Government has a greater obligation to defend. In that event, the greater the duty to defend, the greater the power of the Federal Government to take the property. A logical extension of that argument could lead to an assertion of the power of the Federal Government to take every piece of property in the United States of America, without paying 5 cents of compensation for it.

If one is to argue from the commerce clause or the defense clause of the Constitution or the provisions which relate to the powers of the Federal Government in foreign affairs to a conclusion that the Federal Government possesses submerged lands, in that these various powers coalesce with property ownership, certainly his argument would be every bit as applicable to inland waters as it would be to land beneath tidal waters.

If the Central Government has the responsibility of defending our coast line, as surely it does, does it not have an even greater responsibility to defend our harbors? If it has the responsibility of defending the mouth of the Mississippi River, does it not have an even greater duty to defend the Mississippi itself? If the Federal Government has the duty to defend the waters a mile seaward from Long Island, does not it have even greater responsibility for the defense of New York Harbor?

Granting that the Federal Government owes us a defense of an oyster bed or a mud flat, does not it owe us a greater duty to defend our homes? Assuredly, if the Federal Government possesses vast paramount rights which enable it to claim and take property which for more than 100 years agents of the Federal sovereignty have agreed to be property of the States, then the Federal Government is equally capable by such devices of asserting such powers to take all land beneath inland waters. For that matter, practically any property that this Government feels it requires in pursuance of the duties and responsibilities of our Nation, particularly in pursuance of its powers in the field of national defense, would be subject to similar seizure. Such powers could be urged to take any given piece of private property in the Nation without 5 cents of compensation to the property owner. Of course, I seriously doubt that such a thing is likely in the foreseeable future, but if it should ever come to pass, the aggrieved individuals would be before us, just as the States are here today, asking to have their property restored to them.

From this background it can be seen that justice and fairness favor a return of submerged lands within State boundaries in their entirety to the States. Those of us who are supporting Senate Joint Resolution 13 are relying upon principles of justice and fairness consistent with our views of the nature of this Government. We do not believe we are proposing to give anyone anything. We are supporting legislation to return property to those who we felt properly owned it. We disagree with the opinion of the Supreme Court in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases. We do not seek to overrule those cases, however. We know that we have no power to overrule the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has held that the Federal Government had paramount rights which coalesced with property rights. The Supreme Court itself has recognized that the effect of its decision would work inequities and injustices upon the States. It has suggested to the States that they should present to Congress their arguments for fair treatment. For more than 7 years Congress has listened to the State's arguments. Hardly any proposed legislation has received more attention or more debate either in the committee or on the floor of the Senate. We are nearing the conclusion of one of the longest debates during my service in the Senate. I believe Congress will decide wisely in favor of the passage of the Holland joint resolution.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to refer briefly to the suggestion that the pending joint resolution to restore to the States property which had been regarded as theirs for more than 100 years is a giveaway measure. I know that some Senators argue that it is wrong to give anything to the States. Those who are opposing us make that argument. If they are sincere in taking that position, then why do the same Senators propose to give to the States 37½ percent of all the oil and gas within their historic boundaries, and to give them all the reclaimed land and all the fish and all the gravel and all the sand and all the other resources in that area?

Those who make the argument that the pending measure is a giveaway bill are urging what I believe to be an unsound and unjustified view of the constitutional history of our Nation. I do not agree with their constitutional views. Therefore, I find myself reaching a different conclusion. If they are right, of course this measure would then be a giveaway measure. However, if it is wrong to give away something, it is undoubtedly a greater evil for one to do wrong knowingly. Those of us supporting Senate Joint Resolution 13, believing that we are restoring to the States property which we felt they rightfully owned, are convinced that we are doing justice and fairness.

Can those who are supporting the Anderson amendment and those who have supported the Hill amendment and the other Federal ownership measures say as much? They have told us it is wrong to give away anything. Yet while claiming that the States have no rights to submerged lands seaward of the low-water mark, they have proposed to give away all sand, gravel, oysters, kelp, reclaimed land, and almost half of all the oil to be found in this area. They say it is wrong to give away such resources. Then why do they not stand on principle rather than expediency? Inasmuch as they propose to give away three-eighths of all the oil and practically everything else within the 17 million acres involved in this measure, why do they exaggerate the figures more than a thousand-fold, and thus give the impression that even they would propose to give away a thousand times as much as we recognize to be involved in the values of the submerged lands in question?

The fact is that they well realize that few Americans would be particularly concerned if the public understood the actual extent of the values in question. In that case, they know that the public would be completely content to leave the decision to the conscience of the men whom the people of our Nation have chosen to make these decisions. Oh, no. It is because those who oppose us today desire to overcome the confidence that the people of this Nation place in those chosen representatives, that the net value of the resources involved must be exaggerated a thousandfold by the CIO, the ADA, and other pressure groups which are clamoring against this measure.

Let us look at the actual resources involved. When President Truman vetoed the Holland bill during the previous Congress, he used the most reliable figures available to him to state the extent of the resources seaward of the low-water mark within the State's historic boundaries in the sea. He stated that there were perhaps 2½ billion barrels of oil to be discovered and 9 trillion cubic feet of gas. However, when one speaks of 2½ billion barrels of oil and 9 trillion cubic feet of gas, he is being badly deceived if he thinks those resources can be recovered without any expense to the man who recovers them.

Many oil men will understand what I am saying when I say that, many times, the cost of production has been found to so far exceed the value of the resources to be recovered that such operations were regarded as uneconomical. It is for this reason that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in opposing us makes the optimistic estimate that the State or Federal Government, as the case may be, might recover as much as 20 percent of the gross value of the resources. Why does the Senator use the figure 20 percent? With some pride, I say he uses that figure because my native State of Louisiana has succeeded in achieving such a net return, that being the highest

return based on gross value that any State has achieved, and that figure being almost 50 percent more than the Federal Government has thus far succeeded in realizing on the average Federal lease.

So, let us relate this optimistic estimate to the most reliable figures available to the former President of the United States. Based on current market prices, we would find that the gross value of the resources would be $7,360,500,000. When we multiply by 20 percent, the most optimistic net recovery to the Federal or State Government, it would then be about $1.5 billions. But remember, such resources are not recovered in a day. It takes many years to find them, and many additional years to produce such resources. A fair estimate would be that if such resources are to be recovered, it would take a period of 50 years to discover and produce these potential deposits of oil and gas. Thus, in all the submerged lands involved in this measure along the shores of 21 States, we would find that there would be an annual revenue of approximately $30 millions.

But again let me point out that this figure is probably double what could be actually expected on an annual basis because, as the Geological Survey pointed out, the cost of producing oil in the sea is far greater than the cost of producing oil on dry land. The principal difference, of course, lies in the fact that prior to commencing drilling operations it is necessary to construct in the open sea huge steel platforms from which drilling operations can be undertaken. In 40 feet of water, such a platform could cost around $300,000. In 100 feet of water, such a platform could cost perhaps a million dollars. Compare that cost to the cost of perhaps $15,000 for an oil well drilled to a shallow depth when located on dry land.

We well realize that many of the operations at sea will not be economical. In many instances it would be cheaper to produce oil from the shale that lies in Western States, which already is sufficient to produce trillions of barrels of oil at a cost well in line with the current cost of oil production. Then, too, we all know that there is enough coal in presently known reserves of the United States to supply all the fuel needs of this Nation for more than a thousand years. It would be cheaper to make oil from the coal than it would be to obtain it from the less economic deposits in the marginal belt seaward of Louisiana and Texas.

Thus, the actual figure of revenue to be expected within the submerged lands along the shores of the coastal States within their boundaries would be more nearly $20 million per year. This is not the pipe-dream figure of someone who thinks of socialistic schemes. This is the figure that a hard-headed businessman would be more likely to arrive at.

Using that figure, the amount that could be applied annually to education to every State in the Union, based upon 28 million school children, would be approximately 72 cents per child per year.

Where have all the enormous exaggerations and figures beyond the comprehension of the mind of man originated? They have originated with those who manufacture smokescreens to promote their socialistic thinking. Yet, in large measure, the $300 billion figure is based on the same fundamental data upon which my $20 million calculation is predicated. Both the CIO and I have used estimates of the Geological Survey. Why is there a difference of 15,000 to 1 between their net figures and mine? The reason, Mr. President, is that those who exaggerate the values involved never wish to talk in terms of money one can realize. But, Mr. President, let me ask this question: Is it not cruelly deceptive to send to a high-school principal a pamphlet leading such a person to believe that there is in prospect the chance of obtaining 1,500 times as much money for the children in that school as one knows to be the case? After all, would not the grammar-school teacher be more interested in knowing how much revenue the Government would have available to apply to education if the aid-for-education amendment were adopted, than in being misled by some ridiculous exaggeration? Is it not cruel to mislead a parent by giving him the impression that someone is proposing to give him $10,800 a year for the education of his child, when actually the proposal is a measure which would confer less than 72 cents revenue per year upon him and at the same time would deprive him of benefits which he would be sharing from another source, namely, his own State government?

In order that there may be better understanding of the manner in which the exaggerations have occurred, let me demonstrate the way these ridiculous distortions were arrived at:

They were arrived at by taking the gross value of resources, rather than the net amount of money that could be realized by producing those resources. Then they were arrived at by a fanciful dream that because Congress restored to the States, property which in its judgment properly belongs to those States, Congress would also give in their entirety vast tracts of land which Congress does not believe to be owned by the States, and which Congress never did believe belonged to the States. Thus they have estimated the value of oil and gas on the Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries—an area not involved in this measure, and more than 10 times as large as the area actually involved in the Holland joint resolution, again using gross figures, rather than figures of net revenue to be derived. Then they have estimated the value of resources in the great Territory of Alaska—which is not involved in this measure—for use in some cases. Again they have used gross figures, rather than dividing by 5 or 8, so as to arrive at a reasonable net figure; but they never reduce any of the figures to an annual revenue basis.

Others in turn have proceeded under the assumption that all the public lands in the Western States, whether interior or coastal, presently owned by the Federal Government, would be given to the States or to some selfish interest. They have referred to the gross value of such resources, although many of those resources even today cannot be economically produced. In doing this, their pipe-dream has been spiked with the most refined opiate. As I have sat here and listened to figures of $50 billion, $100 billion, $300 billion called out, I have day by day waited for these opponents to reach the trillion mark. Today I heard it reached.

These tactics explode the weakness of the case of our opponents. They dare not stick to the actual facts of an issue. Thus we see that they have relied upon distortions of history, dangerous theories of government, and exaggerations of figures ad infinitum, in an attempt to confuse the public.

I say it is a tribute to the sound nature of our government that even when the people do not have the exact figures, even when they do not know both sides of an argument, they instinctively understand when an argument makes sense or when it exceeds the bounds of reason. Yes, the people are wise. They are even wiser than some of our Democratic opponents realize. Even today, after all the newspaper advertisements purchased by the CIO and after all the propaganda campaign to break down figures exaggerated more than a thousandfold, in an effort to indicate to each American that a minority of this body is trying to hand him vast wealth for which he has done little, if anything, to merit, the nationwide polls taken by Dr. Gallup show that the public nevertheless favors the passage of the Holland joint resolution.

I believe the history of this Nation will show the submerged-land issue to have been the high-water mark of the strange theories advanced to justify additional powers and functions in the hands of the Federal Government. From a historic point of view, it will complete the cycle. The Executive in 1933 began, and Congress quickly implemented, decisions to assert vast new powers for the Federal Government. The Court in the first few years checked such theories by striking down legislation which it deemed to conflict with the fundamentals of the American form of government. Then an effort was made to "pack" the Court. When this effort failed, any need for it soon passed, as the Executive acquired more and more appointments on the Court. It then became the Court's turn to advance new theories of undreamed-of Federal power. Now it is the turn of Congress to check the Court. I have no doubt the Executive will do his part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield the time remaining to me to the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD].

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, my senior colleague from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, expected to be here today to speak on the pending question. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the statement he had prepared in connection with the debate on this measure.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER OF NEBRASKA

As chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the committee that in February and March held such exhaustive

hearings on the various submerged lands measures, and which then, after painstaking consideration, reported out the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 13, as amended, I feel that I should make a brief statement to the Senate as to my position with respect to the proposed legislation.

Although Senate Joint Resolution 13 has been under consideration for a full month today, I have not spoken before, Mr. President, because I did not want to delay action on the measure in any way. Action, not more words, is long overdue on this issue, Mr. President, which has been before successive Congresses since the 75th Congress in 1937.

However, now that at long last a time certain has been set for an end to the seemingly endless words and for the too long delayed vote to take place, I will very briefly state my own views.

But first, I wish to express my own appreciation and that of other Senators directly interested in submerged lands legislation to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] who so ably conducted the hearings and who presided over the lengthy executive sessions and finally reported the measure, presenting it, section by section, to the Senate. I am a businessman, not a lawyer; and although I have followed this legislation with interest during the 12 years I have had the honor to represent Nebraska in the Senate, I realized at the outset that the problem presented by the submerged lands issue involves many intricate legal matters. The very legality of quitclaim legislation, so-called, had been challenged by the Solicitor General of a previous administration.

Therefore, in order to be certain that every legal aspect of the proposed legislation was thoroughly explored, I asked the senior Senator from Oregon, who has one of the best legal minds in the Senate and who has had long and wide experience as a public-law officer in his home State of Oregon, to act as chairman for consideration of the submerged-lands measures. Anyone who attended the hearings, or who reads the printed record of the executive sessions, knows how ably he discharged the assignment I asked him to take. He has earned the appreciation of the Members of the Senate on each side of the controversy for his fairness and for the painstaking care with which he explored every aspect of the situation.

In this connection, I would also like to pay tribute to the Senators on both sides of the aisle who participated in the hearings and executive sessions. Although differences of opinion were sharp, they were honest, and founded upon honest conviction. Each member approached the problem with a determination to work out the best possible solution for what he deemed to be the public good. Discussions and actions unvaryingly were on a high plane of statesmanship.

As to the hearings themselves, I would like to say a word. Fourteen hearings already had been held on the submerged-lands problem and three Supreme Court cases decided at the time the issue came before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee at the opening of the 83d Congress. Eleven of these hearings had been held since the beginning of my service in the Senate. In addition, the basic issue of State ownership versus Federal Government paramount rights, which apparently excluded State ownership—although such ownership had existed in fact, if not in law, ever since the founding of our Nation—had been a campaign issue in the presidential election of 1952 and had been thoroughly decided by the highest judge in our democracy—the people of the United States. The printed record of the congressional hearings prior to this congress totaled nearly 6,000 pages; in addition other additional hundreds of pages were in the committee files as exhibits.

Therefore, I had hoped that the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 13 and related measures could be restricted to technical discussions of the provisions and to new evidence or information supplemental to that already before the committee, if any there could be. The hearings were no sooner underway than it became apparent that proponents on each side of the controversy felt they should be allowed to make a complete presentation of their respective cases all over again. In accordance with the Senate's great principle of perfect freedom of debate, full and complete latitude was allowed each and every witness to present to the committee any arguments or views he saw fit to present. As a result, this year's hearings cover more than 1,200 printed pages, and dozens of other memorandums, charts, maps, and exhibits were considered by the committee and are in the committee files.

Again, when the measure reached the Senate floor, I once more had hopes that, with such a full and complete record before it, the Senate could impose upon itself the self-discipline of succinct and pertinent debate, and then proceed to vote. After all, the matter had been presented on this floor some 16 years ago, in 1937. It had been thoroughly thrashed out in 1946, and again only last spring, in full debate. On both occasions, measures virtually identical in spirit and effect were passed by overwhelming majorities. These facts, coupled with the election returns, had led me to hope that the Senate could dispose of the matter in an efficient and statesmanlike manner.

But the happenings of the past few weeks show I was too optimistic. The debate that opened on the first day of April is still going on. A week or more ago the distinguished majority leader stated that more than a half-million words had been spoken on this floor in this Congress on the subject. Since then we have had day and night sessions, and I venture to say that the total now would be well over a million words.

I wonder if any Member of this body, on either side of the aisle, honestly thinks that a single vote has been changed by all this torrent of words.

In view of my remarks, it would scarcely be appropriate for me to make a long speech in support of this resolution which was reported favorably by the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. I have no intention of doing so. I further realize that, as the distinguished majority leader has stated, nothing new can be said at this stage of the debate.

However, a number of Senators have professed to be at a loss to explain how anyone from an inland State could be supporting this resolution. As a Senator from the inland State of Nebraska, a State that has no coastal lands, I thought that I might explain my reasons for supporting the resolution.

The short answer is that it is a matter of principle.

It is a matter of principle that the States should own all the lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries. This principle applies to the inland States as well as the coastal States.

It is a matter of principle that the States should not be deprived of lands which they have used and dealt with as their own since they formed or entered the Union. This principle applies to all the States alike, whether inland or coastal.

It is a matter of principle that a rule of property which had been relied upon for a century or more should not be overturned merely because a valuable mineral is discovered beneath certain navigable waters. All 48 States have a stake in this principle.

It is a matter of principle that the Federal Government does not have inherent power to take over State property without payment of compensation. This principle is vital to everyone, everywhere in the United States.

Although I am not a lawyer, I have a deep respect for the distinguished groups of lawyers who have urged that the rights of ownership in lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries must be restored to the States. Attorney General Patzer, of Kansas, who is president of the National Association of Attorneys General, told our committee that officials of 47 of the 48 States have appeared and testified in favor of such a resolution as is now before the Senate. General Patzer presented to us the resolution adopted last December at the annual meeting of the association. It reads as follows:

"Resolved by the 46th annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, That the association and its submerged lands committee continue efforts in support of congressional action confirming and restoring State ownership of lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States in accordance with the terms of the resolution on this subject heretofore adopted by the 44th annual meeting of the association on December 12, 1950, and as recommended in the report of the submerged lands committee presented at this conference."

I understand that all but three States supported this resolution passed by the National Association of Attorneys General.

The American Bar Association is another of the distinguished legal groups which have urged the restoration of the rights of ownership in these lands to the States. After careful consideration of the problem, the association expressed the following conclusion as to the dangerous implications of the Supreme Court decisions:

"The new concept that the Federal Government has the paramount right to take property without compensation because it may need that property in discharging its duty to defend the country and conduct its foreign relations can have no logical end except that the Federal Government may take over all property, public and private, and under this theory the Federal Government could nationalize all of the natural resources of the country without paying the owners therefor, wholly in disregard of the fifth amendment."

The Municipal Law Officers Association presented a resolution of their body to our committee which also is in support of this resolution. It said:

"Whereas the control of lands lying beneath tidal and navigable waters has been resolved against the States and political subdivisions thereof by the Supreme Court decision in the case of *United States* v. *California;* and

"Whereas Federal legislative action appears to be the sole remedy which States and cities have to secure title to these tidelands upon which billions of dollars have been expended by such State and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers urge the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation which will confirm the title to such lands in the States and their political subdivisions."

The present Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Herbert Brownell, also told the committee that the States should possess rights of ownership in the natural resources within their historic boundaries, as did the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Douglas McKay.

Despite these eminent legal opinions, it has been urged here that offshore waters within State boundaries are in a special category and that the States should not have the rights of ownership in them that they exercised for a century and a half and under which such great developments have taken place. Some have argued that passage of this resolution will weaken our national security. In this connection, these people have claimed that the Federal Government's responsibilities for national defense require that it have paramount rights in the oil and other resources of the marginal belt.

Speaking as a businessman and not as a lawyer, I simply cannot follow these arguments. Of course, the oil and other resources under navigable waters are important to our national defense. But so are the uranium, copper, iron, oil, and other resources which lie on private land or State-owned land which is not beneath navigable waters.

It has not yet been suggested that the Federal Government can take those resources without paying compensation, and I hope it never will be.

Yet there is no more reason why the Federal Government should be able to take the resources in the offshore waters within State boundaries. The possible need of the Federal Government for these resources in time of emergency is fully safeguarded by section 6 (b) of the resolution which gives the Federal Government first-purchase rights.

I am also mystified by the arguments that the Federal Government is entitled to some special right in the offshore area within State boundaries because it is required to defend that area. The Federal Government is charged with the defense of Nebraska, too. Yet, as far as I know, that fact has never been thought to confer any property rights on the Federal Government in Nebraska.

These arguments that this resolution will weaken our security are certainly not supported by the statements of Federal officials charged with responsibility for our defense. President Eisenhower has spent all of his mature life in distinguished service in our highest defense posts. It is inconceivable to me that he would have urged the restoration of the lands to State ownership if it would in any way weaken our security. Yet, on October 13, 1952, General Eisenhower said in New Orleans:

"So let me be clear in my position on the tidelands and all submerged lands and resources beneath inland and offshore waters which lie within historic State boundaries. As I have said before, my views are in line with my party's platform. I favor the recognition of clear legal title to these lands in each of the 48 States.

"This has been my position since 1948, long before I was persuaded to go into politics.

"State titles in these so-called tidelands areas stand clouded today.

"The Supreme Court has declared in very recent years that there are certain paramount Federal rights in these areas. But the Court expressly recognized the right of Congress to deal with the matters of ownership and title.

"Twice by substantial majorities, both Houses of Congress have voted to recognize the traditional concept of State ownership of these submerged areas. Twice these acts of Congress have been vetoed by the President.

"I would approve such acts of Congress."

Moreover, after taking office, President Eisenhower made the restoration of the offshore lands to the States 1 of the 11 points of his legislative program, and very recently restated his views in as straightforward and as clear a letter as it has been my privilege to read.

I commend the President's letter on submerged lands to the attention of each Member of the Senate. It was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the distinguished majority leader and can be found on page 3865 of the RECORD for Saturday, April 25.

Secretary of the Navy Anderson appeared before our committee and he gave no support to the charge that passage of this resolution would weaken our security. On the contrary he said that ownership of the offshore lands is a "matter of broad national policy which can rightly and properly be determined only by congressional decision."

As is indisputably clear, whether the Federal Government or the State governments control these lands, they will be developed by private oil companies. That is the way it should be. There is no reason to think that more oil would be produced under Federal control than under State management. Even the opponents of this resolution have conceded that State management in the past has been exemplary. If this was not so, I am sure that the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, would not have recommended a restoration to the States of the rights of control within State boundaries as he did in the following statement:

"I do believe that the national interest would be best served by restoring to the various States the coastal offshore lands to the limits of the line marked by the historical boundaries of each of the respective States."

Another objection which has been raised to this resolution is that it will embarrass the United States in the conduct of its foreign relations. The best answer to that is found in the statements by Jack B. Tate, the Deputy Solicitor of the Department of State, who testified as follows:

"The Department believes that the grant by the Federal Government of rights to explore and develop the mineral resources of the Continental Shelf off the coasts of the United States can be achieved within the framework of its traditional international position.

"I assume that as far as our international relations are concerned, the United States could divide up with the States any rights which it had, and those rights would be certainly the traditional right to the 3 miles, plus the right of the Continental Shelf as set forth in the 1945 proclamation."

In light of these views by the responsible officers of our Government, it appears to me that we should not be deterred in our purpose to restore these lands to the States.

In concluding this brief statement, I would like to read the conclusion of the report of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which sums up my views on the matter as follows. I quote:

"The committee submits that the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 13, as amended, is an act of simple justice to each of the 48 States in that it reestablishes in them as a matter of law that possession and control of the lands beneath navigable waters inside their boundaries which have existed in fact since the beginning of our Nation. It is not a gift; it is a restitution. By this joint resolution the Federal Government is itself doing the equity it expects of its citizens.

"The committee recommends enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 13."

I stand with my committee and urge that the joint resolution do pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had but one question which I had hoped to ask my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], after I listened to his argument about the independence of the States, and that was whether in his opinion the War Between the States did or did not settle the question of the superior sovereignty of the United States as a nation, and did or did not settle the dispute over the great tenet of Lincoln; namely, that the sovereignty of the several States when added together does not equal the sovereignty of the National Government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for an answer?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, I shall be very glad to yield for an answer.

Mr. LONG. The answer is very simple: I do not believe the War Between the States at all settled as a fact that this is a government with powers beyond those given in the Constitution of the United States. Regardless of the outcome of the Civil War, the only power the Federal Government has is derived from the Constitution.

If the Senator from Oregon believes what I regard to be a distortion of history, he can go alone with it, but I do not believe he does.

Mr. MORSE. If it is the answer of the Senator from Louisiana that the powers of the Federal Government stem from the Constitution I say he is correct. The sovereignty of the United States depends upon the Constitution. When this giveaway measure comes before the Supreme Court of the United States, it is my prediction that the Senator from Louisiana will receive a good lesson in constitutional law, for I believe the Supreme Court is going to reaffirm the Lincoln doctrine, namely, that Louisiana, Texas, Florida, and California do not have in respect to their boundaries or in respect to the offshore lands a sovereignty greater than the sovereignty of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I think I have answered the question for the time being, Mr. President.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to engage in a long discussion, but I have pinned the point I want to pin on the Senator from Louisiana, because the essence of the argument he has made this afternoon is an argument which takes us back to Calhoun; and we settled the Calhoun argument with the blood of thousands of the Blue and thousands of the Gray during the War Between the States. The Senator argued this afternoon as though there had been no War Between the States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. President, that the opponents of the pending measure take the position that in the War Between the States, the question of sovereignty was settled. I am glad that I am a member of the little band of liberals in the Senate that refuses to give to a few States what belongs to the Nation as a whole. This sad day for the American people, for the Congress to give away to the people of a few States billions and billions of dollars of wealth in the natural resources which belong to all the people of the Nation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me at this point?

Mr. MORSE. I decline to yield, Mr. President, until I finish.

In the closing minutes of this debate, I wish to reinforce the great argument made by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] in support of the amendment he submitted. The most important principle in this representative form of Government of ours is that our forefathers bound us together, in a Government of a self-governing people, to promote the general welfare. Our forefathers recognized that the great wealth of America is to be found in her people. Our forefathers recognized that what we do to promote the general welfare of the people is in keeping with the principles of the Declaration of Independence, from which the Senator from Louisiana quoted, and is in keeping with the great Preamble of the Constitution of the United States, which recognized the importance of promoting the general welfare of our people.

Yet today, Mr. President, in the Senate of the United States, the American people are about to see the spectacle of a revival of the outworn and repudiated doctrine of Calhoun—a revival, Mr. President, of States rights, in the sense that the sovereignty of the States is alleged to be greater than the sovereignty of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, we are about to see given away, by the action taken on this sad day by the Senate of the United States, precious natural resources in an oil reserve which should be left under the jurisdiction of the Navy, where Harry Truman put it in one of his last acts as President, for the protection of the security of the Nation. American boys and girls in generations ahead may need the oil, which this measure will now submit to exploitation by the oil interests of the country, at a time when that reserve should not be exploited. It should be stockpiled, under a sound conservation program, such as the one the little band of liberals that is fighting against this measure sought to have established for the protection of future generations of American boys and girls.

Mr. President, I shall be interested in listening to the arguments Senators who will vote for the joint resolution this afternoon will make on the political platforms in 1954, because we are going to take the fight to them in 1954. I am going to be interested in the arguments they advance in opposition, for example, to the Neely amendment, which proposes to guarantee the use of the income from this reserve of oil for great public causes so essential to promoting the general welfare.

Mr. President, I close by saying that I shall be proud to leave behind me the record jointly made by me and the other members of the little band of liberals that is devoted to the general welfare in opposition to this nefarious bill. We recognize that, after all, the great wealth of the United States is to be found in promoting its human resources, and that to do that we had better conserve our natural resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first of all, let me pay tribute to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for what I consider to be a concise and pointed analysis of the subject matter before the Senate. Such an analysis could not be made better or with more persuasiveness or logic.

I shall do what I can merely to fill in the details of the general outline the Senator from Oregon has stated.

First, let me say that in the course of the debate we have cleared away a certain amount of fuzzy thinking and a certain amount of propaganda. We have found, first, that we are not talking about tidelands. The use of the term "tidelands" was a matter of propaganda which for several years was foisted upon the American people.

Second, Mr. President, we have cleared away the misconception that we have been considering proposed legislation which would in any way injure or jeopardize the rights of the several States insofar as the lands under inland waters are concerned. Let the record be perfectly clear that, insofar as lands under inland waters are concerned, that is not a subject of debate or even a subject of discussion. It has been confirmed by many Supreme Court decisions that the States have general jurisdiction, control, and ownership of lands under inland waters. We cite as classic cases, for example, the Illinois Central case and the Pollard case; and there are other cases too numerous to mention. So what are we really talking about? We are talking, Mr. President, about the bottom of the ocean. We are talking about the bed of the sea. We are talking about the mud, the gravel, and the grime at the bottom of the sea, and the resources to be found under that floor of the ocean. We are talking about the ownership and control of the land, the wet, submerged land under the open sea.

It is nothing short of preposterous for anyone to come before a legislative body, or before the public in general, and say that a particular State has control and ownership over the bottom of the ocean. For better than 175 years the Government of the United States has stood steadfastly behind the principle of freedom of the seas. The doctine of the open seas is an American doctrine. The doctrine of a 3-mile territorial limit, or belt, around the coastline of the United States is an American doctrine, proclaimed by Thomas Jefferson. Earlier, the doctrine of sovereignty over the 3-mile belt around the coastline of the United States was proclaimed by the Continental Congress. It is nothing short of fantastic, Mr. President, that we should be arguing here as to whether a State has control of land under the open seas, which are international waters, and of the land within the belt of 3 miles around the coast, which is national, and which has been proclaimed as national since the beginning of the Republic.

What else are we talking about? We are talking about whether Texas and Florida have special rights in the Union. Mr. President, one of the purposes of the Constitution was to accord equal rights to the States, and to solve disputes arising between and among the States. Another purpose was to prevent the application of the law of the jungle, the law of the powerful over the weak, the law of large States over small. This is a part of the great constitutional history of the United States of America.

Yet, Mr. President, we are now hearing representatives of certain States in the Congress saying that Texas has a larger belt extending into the sea than any other State, that she has special rights, and that Florida has special rights. Yet the record reveals that every State that came into the Union came into it on the basis of an equal footing, with no more privileges than any other State, no more rights than any other. No Senator can prove to the contrary, because the resolution of admission in the case of every State of the Union proclaims the principle of equal footing.

Let me cite, Mr. President, the Articles of Confederation, to which my friend from Louisiana referred. Under article IX of the Articles of Confederation there is a provision which reads:

> The United States in Congress assembled shall also be the last resort on appeal in all disputes and differences now subsisting or that hereafter may arise between two or more States concerning boundary, jurisdiction, or any other cause whatever.

Mr. President, article IX of the Articles of Confederation placed in the Congress the right to settle boundaries. But the Articles of Confederation were repudiated and were succeeded by the Constitution of the United States of America, which removed from the Congress the right to settle boundary disputes, and placed it in the courts under article III, section 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me 2 minutes more?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield a minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A minute? Mr. President, the Articles of Confederation is ancient history, buried history, and I submit that article IX, by the fact that it was superseded by the Constitution of the United States of America, as adopted in 1789, makes it perfectly clear that what is being attempted in the Congress at this time is to go back to what the Senator from Oregon referred to as the old doctrine of Calhoun, the doctrine of the "tariff of abominations," the doctrine of the Calhoun philosophy of divided sovereignty. This, Mr. President, has been settled by two great events—the adoption of the Constitution of the United States of America, and the War Between the States.

Finally, Mr. President, I call upon the present crusading administration to crusade for the public interest. I call upon that administration to give equal rights to all the States of America, and I warn every Member of this body that if this incredible gift to and this incredible grab by certain coastal States, namely, Texas, Louisiana, and California, is consummated, the effect will be to prejudice the

economic development of every other State in the Union. It will make it possible for those three States to reduce taxes in order to entice industries to locate within their borders, to the disadvantage of the State of Minnesota, to the disadvantage of the State of Oregon, the State of New Jersey, and of the other 45 States of the Union. I submit that it is a preposterous proposal. It should be defeated; and, if it is not defeated, there will be a day of reckoning, when the American people will know that we have only legalized the scandal of Teapot Dome on the floors of the Congress.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the merits or demerits of the pending measure at any length at this time. I still think it a thoroughly unjustified measure, a measure which is not only bad in itself, but which will undoubtedly be used as a precedent for further raids upon the natural resources belonging to the Nation.

But the aspect of the consideration of the pending measure which depresses me most of all is the defeat of the Hill amendment. It is very discouraging to see a great democratic people, a great Nation such as ours, with an opportunity to lead the world such as no other country has had, certainly in modern times—to see such a Nation permit its educational system gradually to deteriorate so that its future generations will have no understanding of the world in which they live, and no idea as to how to adapt themselves to the demands of modern times.

As the able historian Toynbee has so clearly shown, the great nations of the world in the past have been destroyed primarily by internal decay, rather than by external aggression. I can think of no better way to promote the internal decay of a democracy than to neglect the education of its people. There is no excuse for our shortsightedness in that regard. Both Thomas Jefferson and George Washington very strongly emphasized the necessity of education, if we are to continue as a free, self-governing people. In these days one has only to read any newspaper to see how great is the need of better education in our country—or, for that matter, one has only to sit in the Senate.

Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the pending measure, I commend the Members of the opposition to it for their great contribution to a better understanding of the subject of this proposed legislation. All those who have spoken so well and so forcefully in an effort to defeat Senate Joint Resolution 13 deserve the gratitude and thanks of the American people. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and all other Senators who have given so much of their time and energy in opposing this measure, deserve our fervent thanks.

In delaying action upon the pending measure, the Senators to whom I have referred have in large measure performed the function which the Founding Fathers intended the Senate should serve in our constitutional system. I only regret that we were not able to force a postponement until the next session, when I feel sure a great many more Members of the Senate will understand the true character of the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I wish especially to compliment and to commend the great work done by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in leading and organizing the opposition to the pending joint resolution. They have given of their time and energy unstintingly and with rare devotion to the public welfare. As the proposed legislation is better understood by the American people, they will appreciate the true worth of these fine Senators.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has 10 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I recognize that I sometimes get more anxious about these things than the circumstances should warrant. Nevertheless, when suggestions were made a few minutes ago with reference to a rehearing of the California case, I could not avoid getting a little bit disturbed, because the United States Government was the winner, and not the individual States. If any request for a rehearing was to be made, it would have come from the losers, not from the winners.

The facts as revealed by the records of the Court will verify this, that the decree proposed by the administration included the term "owner of and possessed of paramount rights in."

The Supreme Court drew a line through "owner of," and, subsequently, in the Texas case and the Louisiana case the Government of the United States did not ask to be granted the actual title or ownership of these areas.

I noticed a few days ago, Mr. President, comments in a newspaper as to why the question of ownership had been so lightly passed over by the group of liberals. What do the court decisions say? Do they include greater ownership in the States than in the Federal Government? If they do not expressly state that the lands are owned by the Federal Government, is that because there was a question in the minds of the Supreme Court as to who had the greatest right of ownership, or does it show that the problem of title is so complicated with international affairs, so involved with the intricacies of our membership in the family of nations, that it is hard to define a mere property title in the sense that we use it for individually owned pieces of land?

Mr. President, I have selected a few words from a long line of decisions of the Supreme Court, but these few words dispose of any possibility that the States have any title to these areas lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark or have any property interest in them.

In the case of the United States against California the Court said:

> The crucial question on the merits is not merely who owns the bare legal title to the lands under the marginal sea. The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner. * * * In the light of the foregoing our question is whether the State or the Federal Government has the paramount right and power to determine in the first instance when, how, and by what agencies, foreign or domestic, the oil and other resources of the soil of the marginal sea, known or hereafter discovered, may be exploited. * * * Not only has acquisition, as it were, of the 3-mile belt been accomplished by the National Government but protection and control of it has been and is a function of national external sovereignty. * * * And insofar as a nation asserts its rights under international law, whatever of value may be discovered in the seas next to its shores and within its protective belt, will most naturally be appropriated for its use. But whatever any nation does in the open sea, which detracts from its common usefulness to nations, or which another nation may charge detracts from it, is a question for consideration among nations as such, and not their separate governmental units. * * * If this rationale of the Pollard case is a valid basis for a conclusion that paramount rights run to the States in inland waters to the shoreward of the low-water mark, the same rationale leads to the conclusion that national interests, responsibilities and therefore national rights are paramount in waters lying to the seaward in the 3-mile belt. * * * Now that the question is here we decide for the reasons we have stated that California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along its coasts, and that the Federal Government rather than the State has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area, inculding oil. * * * The Government, which holds its interests here as elsewhere in trust for all the people, is not to be deprived of those interests by the ordinary court rules designed particularly for private disputes over individually owned pieces of property.

It is important to remember that regardless of the majority opinions and the dissenting opinions and all the thousands of words involved in them, there is straightforward, simple language carried in the decree, and in the California case the order and decree points out "that the United States of America is possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark and outside of inland waters. The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein."

Here is the language in the Louisiana case:

> California, like the Thirteen Original Colonies, never acquired ownership in the marginal sea. The claim to a 3-mile belt was first asserted by the National Government. Protection and control of the area are indeed functions of national external sovereignty. The marginal sea is a national, not a State, concern. * * * The matter of State boundaries has no bearing on the present problem. * * * So far as the issues presented here are concerned, Louisiana's enlargement of her boundary emphasizes the strength of the claim of the United States

to this part of the ocean and the resources of the soil under that area, including oil.

When the Court came to the Texas case (339 U. S. 707), it dealt with dominium and imperium, which terms involve both political and property rights, and pointed out that they are united in this instance and that property interests are so subordinated to the rights of sovereignty as to follow sovereignty. Where do they follow sovereignty? Into the hands of the sovereign, of course, not into the hands of one of the individual States. Property rights and political rights coalesce, which means to grow together into one body and having grown together into one body, to unite in the national sovereign. Is not that pretty stern language on the question of where property rights have gone and where ownership must never lie?

Here are excerpts from the Texas case:

> And so although dominium and imperium are normally separable and separate, this is an instance where property interests are so subordinated to the rights of sovereignty as to follow sovereignty. * * * Property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign. Today the controversy is over oil, tomorrow it may be over some other substance or mineral or perhaps the bed of the ocean itself. If the property, whatever it may be, lies seaward of low-water mark, its use, disposition, management, and control involve national interests and national responsibilities.

The decree in the Texas case also declares that the paramount rights and full dominion and power over the lands, minerals, and other things in the Gulf of Mexico seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of Texas is vested in the United States and that the State of Texas has no title thereto or property interest therein.

Mr. President, when we were discussing this question the other day and someone suggested that Senate Joint Resolution 13 was a giveaway measure, it was pointed out that the grant to the States involved only one-tenth of the Continental Shelf, not the nine-tenths remaining to the Federal Government. But if we look at page 577 of the hearings, the true situation is there shown. It will be seen that in the estimated proved reserves landward of the traditional boundaries there may be millions of barrels of oil, but in the fields seaward of traditional State boundaries it is estimated that Louisiana has 335 million barrels of oil and 2 trillion cubic feet of gas. When we look at the number of proven fields and the oil proved therein, the word "none" is carried for the State of Texas, and for the State of California.

Where is the oil? That is the important thing. The Pacific coast breaks sharply to the west. There may be 2,000 miles of ocean lying out there, but within the 3-mile belt are all the reserves.

I was a little disturbed, Mr. President, that in the discussion there had been a steady reference to "historic boundaries." I tried to find that term in the pending measure, but was unable to do so. Is it because the proponents do not want to be confined to the historic boundaries, or do they want to redefine them to reach out into the ocean far to sea?

Mr. President, I hope the pending measure will be defeated. I hope we shall not give away to three States the property which belongs to all the people.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield the remaining time to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the issues have been pretty well cleared up in this debate. They involve the question of the ownership and the paramount rights in the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark and outside of inland waters. This question was first passed upon by the Supreme Court in the California case in 1947.

Prior to that time, in some 50 cases, the Court had dealt either with tidelands proper or with submerged lands under navigable inland waters, such as lakes, bays, ports, and rivers. The Supreme Court had held, I think properly, that the ownership of those submerged lands resided in the States. Even though legislation is not essential to the security of such State titles, those of us who have been opposing the present measure wish to confirm that by statute.

But, in 1947, the Court, for the first time, passed on the question of ownership of the paramount rights in the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark and outside of inland waters, and in the only three cases which have been decided on this point the Court has held, and, I believe, properly so, that the Federal Government has paramount rights in those lands.

There are tremendous amounts which are involved in the resources of oil, gas, and mineral rights in these lands. We have not conjured up out of our minds the estimates of oil and gas. The United States Geological Survey estimates that the potential reserve on the Continental Shelf off the coasts of California, Texas, and Louisiana amounts to 15 billion barrels. Two eminent geologists of the Standard Oil Company have fixed the potential reserves of our entire Continental Shelf at 40 billion barrels and 100 billion barrels, respectively. This would mean capital values ranging from $50 billion to $300 billion, and, on the basis of royalties ranging between one-eighth and one-fifth, amounts ranging from 6 billion to 60 billions of dollars. These are very large sums.

While it is true that the pending measure has been changed from the form in which it was reported out of committee so as to make it less bad than it was when we started, and to leave with the Federal Government certain rights in the submerged lands seaward from the 3-mile or the 9-mile limit, it is still a tremendous giveaway.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court has said that these properties and potential royalities belong to all the 159 million people in the United States. The measure before us would transfer these sums from all the people of the United States and give them to the people of 3, or at the most, 4 States.

We hear talk about States rights. But, this is a "States wrongs" measure, because it takes property from the people of 45 States and transfers it to 3 States.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there is a question of the proper leasing of the lands as well as of the ownership of them. The leasing issue has not been sufficiently touched upon in this debate, but I shall like to ask this question? Which agency would give greater equity as between applicants for leasing, the United States Geological Survey, which is largely protected by civil service, in a nation where differing and conflicting interests permit of at least some impartiality, or State authorities, where the oil groups are predominant and where they exercise tremendous political influence?

So, Mr. President, we who are urging that controls should remain in the hands of the Federal Government, want to have the leasing conducted by a body which can preserve equity and justice as between different applicants and which will not give chunks of our natural wealth to insiders and those with powerful influence.

I urge every Senator to consult his conscience as he votes on the pending measure. Do we wish to transfer the property of all the people to a few people? Do we wish to provide political leasing or nonpartisan leasing? If we ask ourselves that question, our votes will be against the pending measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McClellan
Anderson	Griswold	Millikin
Barrett	Hayden	Monroney
Beall	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Bush	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Case	Hunt	Purtell
Chavez	Ives	Robertson
Clements	Jackson	Russell
Cooper	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Kuchel	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Symington
Ferguson	Long	Taft
Flanders	Magnuson	Thye
Frear	Malone	Tobey
Fulbright	Mansfield	Watkins
George	Martin	Welker
Gillette	Maybank	Wiley
Goldwater	McCarran	Williams
Gore	McCarthy	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have two amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 13 which have been printed

and are lying on the table. I ask that they be called up at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order. It seems to me that amendments which have been discussed, and on which voting was postponed by unanimous consent, should be called up first, before other amendments are offered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought I would save time by placing in the RECORD a statement with reference to the amendments, in order to have them out of the way.

Mr. TAFT. That would be satisfactory and I would have no objection to the Senator's doing that. However, I think the order in which amendments are to be called up should be as I have stated. Of course, if the Senator does not desire a vote on his amendments——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I desire a vote on them, but only a voice vote.

Mr. TAFT. Then I suggest that the Senator wait until other amendments are disposed of.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment in order is the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for himself and other Senators, designated "4-28-53-B."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the majority leader if he would not be inclined to put over this amendment until the Senator from Tennessee returns to the Chamber. He is traveling by plane and is somewhat delayed. Would the Senator from Ohio be agreeable to deferring action on this amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator's request apply also to the amendment designated "4-28-53-C"?

Mr. ANDERSON. I had intended to make the same request with respect to that amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that those two amendments be passed over until they are officially offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The next amendment, in the order in which amendments were presented, is the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], designated "4-13-53-A."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13—PUBLIC LANDS BILL—PROTECT PUBLIC RECLAMATION FUND—TREAT PUBLIC LAND STATES ALIKE—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13 IS A PUBLIC-LANDS BILL

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, every State in the Union has public lands within its borders. My State of Nevada has the largest amount of public land, but all public-land States are vitally interested in any congressional act bearing upon a long-range policy of dealing with public lands.

HOLDING LANDS IN TRUST FOR THE STATES

Since 1841 public-land laws have been passed as the public need developed and over the years a pattern developed of holding such lands in trust for the States until such time as a Federal act can be developed and passed providing for private ownership and through individuals placed on the tax rolls of the States.

The Preemption Act of 1841 marked the real beginning of such legislation. The Homestead Act of 1862 providing for a family unit of 160 acres; and the mining statute of 1872, providing for the location of mining claims, 1,500 by 600 feet, all point to putting the land in the hands of the individuals and on the tax rolls, emphasizing that the Federal Government was holding such lands in trust for the States.

WITHHOLDING KNOWN MINERAL LANDS

For almost a century the policy has been to withhold mineral rights in known mineral lands when transferred to the States. I now say to the Senate that this policy would be changed through Senate Joint Resolution 13, deeding outright public lands to the States.

PARAMOUNT RIGHTS

Mr. President, these are public lands in which the Supreme Court has said the United States has paramount rights. In so many words the Court said that the State of California did not own the lands. According to Webster's dictionary, "paramount rights" means the highest title.

So if the century-old policy of deeding mineral rights outright to the States is to be changed, we should treat all public-land States alike, and my amendment simply would do that.

It would place every public-land State in the same category.

THE RECLAMATION FUND

Further, I would say that revenue from the oil and gas lands of public-land States—and these are public-land States according to the Supreme Court decision—should continue to be divided according to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

It is now 34 years that they have been dividing the revenue, 37½ percent to the States wherein such petroleum and gas are located, 10 percent to the Federal Government, presumably for supervision, and 52½ percent to the reclamation fund, from which money is available to build reclamation projects in the reclamation States.

There are 17 Western States, including Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota, which benefit by this fund, and the money is repaid without interest. Practically the only new money accruing to the reclamation fund in the last 25 years has come from the 52½ percent from the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. So the 17 Western States producing practically all the oil and gas in public-land States are receiving funds which are expended in those States for the development of the arid areas.

REVIEW OF PUBLIC-LAND LEGISLATION OVERDUE

Mr. President, a review of the public-land legislation and a reorganization thereof is long overdue. The 160-acre Homestead Act is no longer effective, generally speaking, in the public-land States.

There is no existing law under which the public lands can pass into private ownership for agricultural purposes. The overhauling is long overdue. If we are to start now, let us treat the States alike.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute of my time to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada if his amendment is identical with my bill, S. 807. I ask the question because it was impossible for me to be on the floor yesterday.

Mr. MALONE. It is almost identical. It provides, as an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 13, that mineral rights within the public-land States shall be transferred to the States themselves.

Mr. HUNT. Let me ask one further question. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if this proposal would not do for the western public-land States exactly what their respective acts of admission in each instance provide should be done, namely, that they should come into the Union of States on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatsoever?

Mr. MALONE. That is absolutely true. The mineral rights would go to the respective States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, speaking briefly on this matter, I should like to say that I am not at all out of sympathy with the view that in some instances the Western States are in difficulties. I stated at some length yesterday in the RECORD that I should like to see the subject investigated through hearings, before action is taken.

To try to deal with this situation, involving 200 million acres of land which was specifically reserved to the United States, the revenues from which now already go largely to the States where the land lies—37½ percent directly and 52½ percent under a reclamation fund, which must be spent in those States, in a measure dealing with 17 million acres off the shores of 21 States, which land was never regarded as Federal land, but instead, for 150 years, was regarded, used, occupied, and developed at State land, and has always equitably been so held, up until the California decision, would, I think, be most unwise. I am perfectly willing that hearings be held on this subject. I want them to be held.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming has already stated that he has a bill on this subject. Other Senators have bills on the same subject. To befog the issue in this manner by loading the joint resolution down with something on which there have been no hearings, and which in so many ways greatly surpasses in size and importance to the Nation the relatively unimportant matter involved within State boundaries off the shores of the several States, would be a very great mistake.

I hope that this amendment will be defeated, and that the Congress will be allowed to have the benefit of a mature consideration by the committees of the Congress after full hearings have been held on this very important subject. It ought not to be dealt with in a form which one Senator may prefer, no matter how wise and well informed he may

be, when the proposal has not been subjected to the careful scrutiny of any committee or of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment in order is the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], designated "4–29–53–E," as modified by amendment designated "5–1–53–C."

Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. LEHMAN's amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

"That (a) the provisions of this section shall apply to all mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof (including any extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to such lease or under the laws of such State): *Provided*—

"(1) That such lease, or a true copy thereof, shall have been filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this act, or within such further period or periods as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary;

"(2) That such lease was issued (i) prior to December 21, 1948, and was on June 5, 1950, in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it, or (ii) with the approval of the Secretary and was on the effective date of this act in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it;

"(3) That within the time specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, there shall have been filed with the Secretary (i) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction and stating that the lease was in force and effect as required by the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection or (ii) in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents, and the Secretary shall determine whether such lease was so in force and effect;

"(4) That except as otherwise provided in section 3 hereof, all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this act, which have not been paid in accordance with the provisions thereof, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease after the effective date of this act shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided:

"(5) That the holder of such lease certifies that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this act;

"(6) That such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

"(7) That such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

"(8) That such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the lease: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

"(9) That such lease will terminate within a period of not more than 5 years from the effective date of this act in the absence of production or operations for drilling: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the reduction of such period, so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

"(10) That the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may deem to be reasonable and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"(b) Any person holding a mineral lease which comes within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, as determined by the Secretary, may continue to maintain such lease, and may conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions for the full term thereof and of any extension, renewal, or replacement authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the law of the State issuing such lease: *Provided, however,* That if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on or before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease. A negative determination under this subsection may be made by the Secretary only after giving to the holder of the lease notice and an opportunity to be heard.

"(c) With respect to any mineral lease that is within the scope of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall exercise such powers of supervision and control as may be vested in the lessor by law or the terms and provisions of the lease.

"(d) The permission granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to be a waiver of such claims, if any, as the United States may have against the lessor or the lessee or any other person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this act.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any lessor or lessee of a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, its political subdivision or grantee, on tidelands or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of such State, to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in such lands or in the mineral deposits within them. The authority granted in this section shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (a) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (b) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (c) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (d) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

"SEC. 3. In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, the Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 1 of this act, and with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States, to negotiate and enter into agreements with the State, its political subdivision, or grantee or a lessee thereof, respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or with the State, its political subdivision or grantee, respecting the issuance or nonissuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy: *Provided, however,* That the authorization contained in this section shall not be construed to be a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this act. Payments made pursuant to such agreement, or pursuant to any stipulation between the United States and a State, shall be considered as compliance with section 1 (a) (4) hereof. Upon the termination of such agreement or stipulation by reason of the final settlement or adjudication of such controversy, if the lands subject to any mineral lease are determined to be in whole or in part submerged land of the Continental Shelf, the lessee, if he has not already done so, shall comply with the requirements of section 1 (a), and thereupon the provisions of section 1 (b) shall govern such lease. The following stipulations and authorizations are hereby approved and confirmed: (i) The stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to certain bays and harbors in the State of California; (ii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to the continuance of oil and gas operations in the submerged lands within the boundaries of the State of California and herein referred to as the operating stipulation; (iii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated July 28, 1948, extending the term of said operating stipulation; (iv) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated August 2, 1949, further extending the term of said operating stipulation; (v) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated August 21, 1950, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vi) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated September 4, 1951, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vii) the notice concerning "Oil and Gas Operations in the Submerged Coastal Lands of the Gulf of Mexico" issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 11, 1950 (15 F. R. 8835), as amended by the notice dated January 26, 1951 (16 F. R. 953), and as supplemented by the notices dated February 2, 1951 (16 F. R. 1203), March 5, 1951 (16 F. R. 2195), April 23, 1951 (16 F. R. 3623), June 25, 1951 (16 F. R. 6404), August 22, 1951 (16 F. R. 8720), October 24, 1951 (16 F. R. 10998), and December 21, 1951 (17 F. R. 43), respectively.

"SEC. 4. (a) In order to meet the urgent need during the present emergency for further exploration and development of the

oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized, pending the enactment of further legislation on the subject, to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of section 1 of this act.

"(b) A lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover an area of such size and dimensions as the Secretary may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon, shall require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent, and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

"(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided.

"(d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this section 4 of this act, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any submerged lands pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is submerged land beneath navigable inland waters.

"SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section—

"(1) all moneys received under the provisions of this act shall be held in a special account in the Treasury and shall be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education as Congress may determine; and

"(2) it shall be the duty of every State or political subdivision or grantee thereof having issued any mineral lease or grant, or leases or grants, covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf to file with the Attorney General of the United States on or before December 31, 1953, a statement of the moneys or other things of value received by such State or political subdivision or grantee from or on account of such lease or grant, or leases or grants, since January 1, 1940, and the Attorney General shall submit the statements so received to the Congress not later than February 1, 1954.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to moneys received and held pursuant to any stipulation or agreement referred to in section 3 of this act pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy.

"SEC. 6. (a) The President may, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security.

"(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands covered by this act.

"(c) All leases issued under this act, and leases, the maintenance and operation of which are authorized under this act, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary, upon a recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of this act, to suspend operations under, or to terminate any lease; and all such leases shall contain or be construed to contain provisions for the payment of just compensation to the lessee whose operations are thus suspended or whose lease is thus terminated.

"SEC. 7. Nothing herein contained shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person on lands subject to this act and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this act or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights of such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything herein contained.

"SEC. 8. The United States consents that the respective States may regulate, manage, and administer the taking, conservation, and development of all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life within the area of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, in accordance with applicable State law.

"SEC. 9. The United States hereby asserts that it has no right, title, or interest in or to the lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States, but that all such right, title, and interest are vested in the several States or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the laws of such States, or the respective lawful grantees, lessees, or possessors in interest thereof under State authority.

"SEC. 10. Section 9 of this act shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (1) which have been lawfully accrued by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (2) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (3) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (4) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians. This act shall not apply to water power, or to the use of water for the production of power, or to any right to develop water power which has been or may be expressly reserved by the United States for its own benefit or for the benefit of its licensees or permittees under any law of the United States.

"SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this act by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act.

"(b) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, public agency, or person, holding thereunder to the surface of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands as a result of authorized action taken by any such State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, public agency, or person, holding thereunder for public or private purpose is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

"SEC. 12. Nothing in section 11 of this act shall be construed as confirming or recognizing any right with respect to oil, gas, or other minerals in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf; or as confirming or recognizing any interest in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf other than that essential to the right to construct, maintain, use, and occupy the structures enumerated in that section, or to the use and occupancy of the surface of filled-in or reclaimed land.

"SEC. 13. The structures enumerated in section 11, above, shall not be construed as including derricks, wells, or other installations in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf employed in the exploration, development, extraction, and production of oil and gas or other minerals, or as including necessary structures for the development of waterpower.

"SEC. 14. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal, limit, or affect in any way any provision of law relating to the national defense, the control of navigation, or the improvement, protection, and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States; or to repeal, limit, or affect any provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted pursuant to the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

"SEC. 15. Any person seeking the authorization of the United States to use or occupy any submerged lands of the Continental Shelf for the construction of, or additions to, installations of the type numerated in section 11 of this act, shall apply therefor to the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, who shall have authority to issue such authorization, upon such terms and conditions as in his discretion may seem appropriate.

"SEC. 16. Within 2 years of the date of the enactment of this act, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the use and occupancy of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf for installations of the type enumerated in section 11 of this act.

"SEC. 17. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this act.

"SEC. 18. When used in this act, (a) the term 'tidelands' means lands situated between the lines of mean high tide and mean low tide; (b) the term 'navigable' means navigable at the time of the admission of a State into the Union under the laws of the United States; (c) the term 'inland waters' includes the waters of lakes (including Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario to the extent that they are within the boundaries of a State of the United States), bays, rivers, ports, and harbors which are landward of the ocean; and lands beneath navigable inland waters include filled-in or reclaimed lands which formerly were within that category; (d) the term 'submerged lands of the Continental Shelf' means the lands (including the oil, gas, and other minerals therein) underlying the open ocean, situated seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside the inland waters, and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf; (e) the term 'seaward boundary of a State' means a line 3 nautical miles seaward from the points on the coast of a State at which the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf begin; (f) the term 'mineral lease' means any form of authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; and (g) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, my amendment is a very simple one. It includes the provisions which are contained in the Anderson amendment, but it would devote all the revenues which may come from the sale of oil and other

minerals under the sea to the cause of education. It is just as simple as that.

I know of no function of government that is more important than that of education.

I think there are four great rights which are paramount, although, of course, I realize that the rights of all citizens in all matters must be safeguarded.

The four rights which I consider paramount are:

First, the protection of the health of all the people of the United States;

Second, the protection of the civil rights and liberties of all the people of the United States;

Third, the equal right to employment opportunities for all the people of the United States, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin;

Finally, the development and improvement of our educational system throughout the Nation, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to the gulf.

I think we can all agree, and will agree, that certainly the United States has no greater asset than its young people, and that the young people, if they are to be properly prepared for citizenship, in order to take their places as good citizens and as leaders of our country, need the best educational opportunities that we can furnish them.

I look on teaching as one of the noblest of all professions. It should be fostered and encouraged in every way. Even in my own State of New York, where salaries of teachers are probably higher than in any other State, salaries are completely inadequate, on the average. Many of the teachers of New York receive lower pay than dogcatchers, garbage collectors, vermin exterminators, and unskilled domestics. Yet they can teach only after a training which occupies many, many years.

The situation is far worse in many other States than it is in New York. In many other States teachers receive salaries which are so low that they can barely keep body and soul together. In many States schoolhouses are overcrowded and inadequate. Classes are far too large, and teachers are insufficiently trained.

Mr. President, in my opinion there is no greater need than that we devote these great revenues from the submerged lands which the United States Supreme Court has three times ruled belonging to the Nation to the education of all children, the young men and women, and the high-school and elementary-school pupils of this country.

We want nothing in New York that we do not want for Mississippi, Arizona, Louisiana, New Mexico, or California, and all other States. We in New York are just as much interested in the education of a child in Mississippi or Arizona as we are in the education of our own young people. They and we are all part of our great Nation.

My amendment, if adopted, would provide for the improvement and development of our educational system, not in 3 or 4 States, but in 48 States and the Territories. It would provide that education which is the right of every child in this country would be advanced. Education is the right of every one of the 159 million people of the country. It should be good on a nationwide basis. I know of nothing more important.

Mr. President, I very much hope that this amendment, which I have offered in the form of a substitute, will prevail, because it would benefit every family in the country, every child in the country, every pupil in the elementary schools, the high schools, colleges, and the universities. I think it would do much to insure continuity of prosperous and happy living, of intelligent living, of useful living throughout the entire country.

Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, replying briefly, I wish to say that I think this amendment gives us the crystal-clear opportunity to express ourselves on the basic philosophy which ought to be applied to the solution of this question.

The amendment offered and so ably debated by the junior Senator from New York is a 100-percent federalization amendment, and a 100-percent nationalization amendment. The distinguished Senator from New York does not believe that any of the coastal States have any proper interest whatsoever directly in any of the revenue to be derived from resources or other properties located within the coastal belt which lies between their low-water mark and their coastal borders.

Mr. President, the amendment of the junior Senator from New York in so many words says that this is a completely Federal asset and ought to be completely nationalized and ought to be completely used for development by the Federal Government and the Federal agencies, which would mean, of course, a large additional bureau to be added to those already in existence.

The distinguished junior Senator from New York goes still further and comes out in his amendment for what amounts to a climax of paternalism, because he said, once having made the asset an exclusively Federal asset, and having it developed as an exclusively Federal asset, he proposes to use the proceeds 100 percent by way of grants, under some scheme to be worked out, to the various States for the support of education.

Mr. President, I am strongly opposed to the amendment because it is the very climax of federalization, and because it is the very essence of paternalism. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I send to the desk amendments to the Lehman amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment, as modified, and ask that they be considered immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 4 of the amendment as modified, it is proposed to strike out "become" and insert in lieu thereof "are."

On page 14, line 5 of the amendment, as modified, to strike out "lands as a result of authorized action taken."

On page 14, after line 20, add to section 11:

(c) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or other authorized agent holding thereunder to docks, piers, wharves, jetties, or other structures on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future are constructed by any such State, political subdivision therof, municipality, or authorized agent is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

On page 15, line 20, to strike out all beginning with "SEC. 15" through "appropriate" on page 16, line 2.

On page 16, line 3, to strike out all beginning with "SEC. 16" through "act" on line 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the amendments would amend section 11 of the Lehman substitute. They would also delete entirely sections 15 and 16 of the Lehman substitute.

The purpose of the amendments I offer is to permit the States, their political subdivisions or authorized individuals, to continue building, maintaining, using, and occupying docks, piers, wharves, jetties, and other structures, and the States or their political subdivisions to continue filling in and reclaiming submerged lands for recreation and other public purposes without prior authorization from the Federal Government.

While section 11 of the Lehman substitute, in its present form, appears to acknowledge a former right of the States or their authorized agents to construct, maintain, use or occupy docks, piers, wharves, jetties, and other such structures in their ports and harbors and to fill in, make or reclaim lands adjacent to their shores, sections 15 and 16 thereof require that any such future development of submerged lands by the States first must be authorized by the Chief of Army Engineers. In effect, this would mean that all future development of ports and harbors by the coastal States, as well as the extension of all shoreline boundaries in such States, must be approved by the Federal Government. I firmly believe that this requirement would curtail such development by the States, and my proposed amendments would delete sections 15 and 16 of the Lehman substitute.

I would point out that nothing in my proposed amendments would interfere with the constitutional control of the United States over navigation. Moreover, section 14 of the Lehman substitute clearly states that no other provision thereof shall be construed to repeal, limit or affect in any way any provision of law relating to the national defense, control of navigation, or interstate and foreign commerce.

In the State of New York hundreds of acres of new lands for parks and other projects have been developed by filling in submerged land along the shores of Long Island and New York City, and I understand that further development of such land is contemplated.

I therefore submit that New York State, as well as other coastal States, should be permitted to continue to extend their coastlines by the development of submerged lands adjacent to their shores without being required to obtain prior authorization from the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I have stated the purpose and intent of the amendments. I hope they will be adopted.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I know the purposes of the amendments of my distinguished colleague from New York are of the highest. However, I doubt the wisdom of the amendments.

We have had a law on the statute books since 1890, I believe, which requires prior authorization by the Corps of Army engineers for any structures to be erected in the inland waters or harbors, and in the seaward waters adjacent to our coast. It seems to me some authority must be established to pass on whether proposed structures which are sought to be erected will interfere with the navigation features of the rivers, harbors, and other waters of the State.

I can perfectly well conceive that at one time or another the city of New York, which I mention because it is my home city, and also the greatest city in the country may wish to extend its piers in the Hudson River or in the East River, or in other waters and a very serious menace may arise to the navigation of those rivers or to navigation in the coastal waters.

I can conceive that application might be made to fill in lands which would seriously interfere with navigation.

I am reluctant to differ with my distinguished colleague. However, in my opinion, I say there is no doubt that there must be some authority which can pass on questions affecting navigation, in which the entire Nation is so greatly interested.

I may say that, so far as I know, there have been no cases in which the Corps of Engineers has refused permission to build structures or to fill in land, when applications which were made by the State of New York or by the city of New York or by other municipalities.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. Very gladly.

Mr. IVES. I shall not debate at this time the question of whether or not it would be possible to do the things my distinguished colleague says could be done under the terms of the amendments I am proposing. Let us assume for the sake of argument that they could be done. The fact remains that the city of New York would be doing almost the worst thing it could possibly do, considering its own interest, if it were to do the very things my colleague points out. Most assuredly those things would never be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the amendment, as modified, offered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amendments to the amendment were rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who is absent. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays, 60, as follows:

YEAS—30

Aiken	Hennings	Lehman
Anderson	Hill	Magnuson
Case	Humphrey	Mansfield
Chavez	Hunt	Monroney
Cooper	Jackson	Morse
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Fulbright	Kefauver	Neely
Gore	Kennedy	Pastore
Green	Kilgore	Symington
Hayden	Langer	Tobey

NAYS—60

Barrett	Gillette	Mundt
Beall	Goldwater	Payne
Bennett	Griswold	Potter
Bricker	Hendrickson	Purtell
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bush	Hoey	Russell
Butler, Md.	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd	Ives	Schoeppel
Clements	Jenner	Smathers
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Long	Sparkman
Dworshak	Malone	Stennis
Eastland	Martin	Taft
Ellender	Maybank	Thye
Ferguson	McCarran	Watkins
Flanders	McCarthy	Welker
Frear	McClellan	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams

NOT VOTING—6

Butler, Nebr.	Carlson	Knowland
Capehart	Kerr	Young

So Mr. LEHMAN's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, from this time on the amendments will be taken up in the order in which they are offered. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who has an amendment, is now present.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, but I understand that by the unanimous-consent agreement he would be relegated to the same position in which other Senators find themselves. He may offer his amendment now, as I understand, but he has to offer it if he wishes to have it voted on.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I offer amendment designated as "4-28-53-B," and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, beginning with line 18, it is proposed to strike out all through line 14 on page 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) The United States hereby releases and relinquishes unto said States and persons aforesaid, except as otherwise reserved herein, all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all said lands, improvements, and natural resources on the condition, in the case of any State which has received any payments, or to which any payments are due, from any lessee under a lease of submerged lands, which are covered by tidal waters and are outside of inland waters and the ordinary low-water line of such tidal waters, or natural resources therein (including such payments received or due under stipulation or agreement with the United States) for any period prior to the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, that such State shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount equal to the total of such payments received and due. Amounts received under the provisions of this subsection and any amounts received by the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Treasurer of the United States with respect to any lease of such lands or the natural resources therein, shall be covered into the Treasury and shall be applied to the reduction of the national debt.

On page 15, line 13, to strike out "(i)."

On page 15, beginning with the semicolon in line 20, to strike out all to the semicolon in line 6 on page 16.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to have re-declared to be Federal property money which was collected from royalties on oil wells under a stipulation which was entered into shortly after the decision of the Supreme Court in the three cases to which reference has been made. This money amounts to approximately $70,000,000, which was collected largely from royalties on oil wells in California and Louisiana.

The situation is that after the decisions of the Supreme Court in the three cases, the States gave notice that they were going to file petitions and that, also, bills would be introduced in Congress to reverse the Supreme Court and to transfer the property to the States. The stipulations which have been entered into refer both to the decree of the Supreme Court and to the enactment of further legislation by Congress.

So we now have before us the question of what will be done with the $70 million which was collected from royalties on these wells when undoubtedly the property belonged to the United States.

I wish to call attention to one paragraph of the decree of the Supreme Court in the Texas case:

The United States is entitled to a true, full, and accurate accounting from the State of Texas of all or any part of the sums of

money derived by the States from the area described in paragraph 1 hereof subsequent to June 5, 1950, which are properly owing to the United States under the opinion entered in this case on June 5, 1950, this decree, and the applicable principles of law.

So in all three cases the Supreme Court has held that the money collected from the wells after the time of the decision of the Court belonged to the Federal Government.

This amendment would take this amount and would apply it to a reduction of the national debt.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, may we have order? Senators are unable to hear what is being said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee will suspend. The business of the Senate will be expedited if Members of the Senate, as well as others who are on the Senate floor, and also our guests in the galleries, will be in order. The Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Supreme Court has held in its decrees that the money collected while the cases were being considered on petitions for rehearing, or while the matter was being considered in Congress, belongs to the Federal Government. This amendment would apply the $70,000,000 toward reduction of the national debt. It would not, of course, reduce the national debt to any great amount, but it would at least be a good beginning. It might at least be something to which we could point with pride.

Mr. President, this property will belong to the Federal Government until the measure now under consideration by the Senate, if it shall be passed, is signed by the President. I have always understood it to be a sound principle of law that, if something is earned from property belonging to Mr. Smith, Mr. Smith ought to receive the earnings. The situation here is similar to that. Unquestionably the property is now Federal property. The money in question was earned while the property belonged to the Federal Government. It will not belong to the States until and unless the joint resolution is signed by the President. So that, Mr. President, in fairness and equity, I think the Federal Government should be permitted to have the royalties which have accrued.

The proponents of the Holland joint resolution should feel amply satisfied that they are, by action of the Congress, about to be given something which the Supreme Court has said belongs to all the people. The people of the other States of the United States are getting nothing. So, certainly as a very minor concession, representing, so to speak, but a drop in the bucket, I have submitted the amendment to provide that the money now being held in escrow under the stipulation shall be applied to a reduction of the Federal debt.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to myself.

This matter was debated at great length the other day, and I cannot go through all that debate now. Suffice it to say that the funds which have accumulated have accumulated under stipulations. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee referred the other day repeatedly to the funds as "escrow" funds; and they are just that. They were created to abide the result of the final settlement of the submerged lands question. Every time a stipulation was entered into, the jurisdiction of the Congress to dispose of the money was very carefully safeguarded. Beginning with 1947, for example, in the first stipulation, we find the words:

The above provisions of this paragraph are not intended to preclude any other proper disposition by reason of any order of the Supreme Court of the United States or an act of the Congress.

In the next stipulation we find the words:

This stipulation shall remain in effect until pertinent legislation is enacted by the Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have but 3 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield for a question only?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the measure which the Senator from Florida is sponsoring pass to the States title to the escrow funds?

Mr. HOLLAND. Only to a part of those funds. If the Senator will look at page 570 of the record of the hearings on the subject of the submerged lands, he will find that part of the funds are to go to the Federal Government. The total amount of the funds there stated that are to go to the Federal Government is $11,190,797.43, and to the three States, $24 million plus. Care was taken in the preparation of the table to note the source from which the funds came.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further short question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, would all of the money be transferred to the Federal Treasury?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected, because it seems to me that it would absolutely defeat the purpose of the escrow arrangements which were necessary if production was to continue.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield, if I may, without using the remainder of my time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not stated in the stipulation that the fact of entering into the stipulation is in order not to prejudice the claim of the United States Government, and is it not correct to say, therefore, that the Congress is now at liberty to dispose of the funds in one way or another, as it may please?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, of course the Congress can dispose of the money as it thinks it should, in equity and justice. It is perfectly clear that there was an escrow arrangement, which was necessary if production were to continue. Had not the two parties, the States, on the one hand, and the Federal Government, on the other, entered into the escrow arrangement, production would have had to stop at the time the stipulation was made, to the prejudice of everyone concerned. The pending amendment would violate the terms of the escrow agreement. It would not require the money to follow the land as it will be disposed of under the pending measure, some of the land going to the Federal Government, some of it going to the State governments, the moneys being divided accordingly.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have but 2 minutes in which to urge Senators to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. The State of California has proceeded in good faith for a period of almost 7 years, under the stipulations entered into with the Federal Government, to encourage the production of oil from its offshore lands. Adoption of this amendment would completely disregard this good faith and effort on the part of California. The amendment would provide that the royalties which have come into the State treasuries and the Federal Treasury, and which have been held in escrow, pass to the Federal Government. It should be pointed out that had the State of California refused to continue the production of oil offshore, after the United States Supreme Court decision in 1947, there would now be no question before the Senate; there would be no necessity for offering an amendment dealing with the impounded royalties.

But instead California proceeded in good faith. California agreed with the Federal Government, under a stipulation entered into pursuant to the 1947 Supreme Court decision, that in the absence of any statutory authority, and solely because the Federal Government requested it, she would continue operating and continue to produce oil from her submerged lands. The State of California, acting in good faith, has so acted. The Senator from Tennessee now suggests that the moneys so derived be transferred to the Federal Government, as a condition precedent to the taking effect of Senate Joint Resolution 13, as to the State of California.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do not the moneys in hand represent and stand in the place of the oil which would have been left in the ground had not the State of California and the Federal Government, through the stipulation, agreed that production should continue?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is entirely correct. The funds are exactly the same as oil in the ground, or, for that matter, the same as any other

resources in the ground which have not been mined.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	Millikin
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barrett	Hendrickson	Morse
Beall	Hennings	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bricker	Hill	Neely
Bridges	Hoey	Pastore
Bush	Holland	Payne
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Hunt	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kuchel	Stennis
Eastland	Langer	Symington
Ellender	Lehman	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Tobey
Frear	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
George	Martin	Wiley
Gillette	Maybank	Williams
Goldwater	McCarran	Young
Gore	McCarthy	
Green	McClellan	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. LANGER and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee designated "4-28-53-B."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "C."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That for the purpose of assisting in making a proper and equitable settlement of problems and claims arising out of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court to the effect that the paramount right to the submerged lands (including the resources therein) off the coasts of the United States is in the Federal Government as against the coastal States (outside of the inland waters and harbors, the jurisdiction over which is recognized to be in the States) there is hereby established a temporary commission to be known as the Commission on Submerged Lands (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of 9 members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 3 to be appointed to represent the general public, 3 to be appointed to represent the Federal Government, and 3 to be appointed to represent the coastal States and their interests. Of the 3 members appointed to represent the coastal States, 1 shall be a resident of the State of California, 1 a resident of the State of Louisiana, and 1 a resident of the State of Texas. Any vacancy in the Commission occurring after all the original appointments are made shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The Commission shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining (1) an economically sound and equitable program for the management by the United States of the resources in the submerged lands off the coasts of the United States and outside of the inland waters, and for the disposition of revenues from such sources, including a study of the feasibility of utilizing such revenues for improvement of the educational system and/or for a reduction of the national debt; (2) the amount of losses to private citizens, States, and communities resulting from a dependence on the belief that the coastal States have the paramount rights to such lands and the resources therein; (3) which of such losses should be compensated by the United States; (4) for the purpose of establishing boundaries and lines of jurisdiction between the States and Federal Government; (5) the effect of this legislation upon experimentation now being conducted under congressional act to make potable water out of sea water; (6) the international effects of the extension of our boundaries and its effect upon treaties; (7) the effect on public power developments and flood control of the language in section 6 of Senate Joint Resolution 13, granting the States "proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, leasing, use, and development of the lands" under navigable waters; (8) the relationship of the proposed policy toward the seaward submerged lands and the policy toward public lands within the United States and possessions; (9) such other related matters as the Commission deems wise to report upon. The Commission shall complete its investigation and study and make a report of its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress not later than 6 months after the date on which the last of the original appointments to the Commission is confirmed by the Senate.

SEC. 3. Members of the Commission who are appointed from private life shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. Officers or employees of the Government who are appointed to the Commission shall not receive additional compensation for their work on the Commission; but all members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as such members. The Commission may appoint in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949 such personnel as it deems necessary to carry out its duties.

SEC. 4. The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality any information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics which the Commission shall deem necessary for the purposes of this joint resolution; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman. The Commission is also authorized to secure from any special master appointed by the Supreme Court, with the consent of the Court, any such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum, not exceeding $100,000, to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment, which is offered as a substitute for the Holland joint resolution, is to establish a commission, composed of 9 members, to be appointed by the President, 3 to represent the viewpoint of the Federal Government, 3 to represent the States involved, and 3 to represent the general public, to study the many problems in connection with this question, particularly the many problems which have not been fully considered by the committee which has considered the pending measure, and which the discussion on the floor indicates are necessary to be resolved.

The commission would report in 6 months. I think that by that time we could legislate with more light and less confusion on this very important subject matter.

The members of the commission would be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that before we pass this very important and far-reaching joint resolution, giving away values estimated to be above $50 billion, which the Supreme Court says belong to all the people of the United States, we should very carefully consider what effect it will have upon proposals to give away other great national resources, such as the public domain, minerals under public lands, and the national forests.

We should also consider what effect it will have on the treaties which have been entered into on the basis of the 3-mile limit, which has been a cardinal principle of the Government of the United States. We should consider what it will do to the experimentation now going on to make potable water out of sea water, because, under the Holland joint resolution, the water will belong to the States, and they would be entitled to charge a severance tax if any water were taken from the sea to irrigate arid lands. We should consider what effect it will have upon the industry engaged in recovering magnesium from the sea. Is that going to be curtailed? Will the States be able to impose a severance tax in connection with magnesium taken from sea water?

Furthermore, it has been pointed out that the boundaries of States have changed very frequently. To what time are we referring when we talk about the low-water mark? As it is now, or at the time when the Republic of Texas was formed?

Mr. President, I think we should also consider what the joint resolution will do in the way of bringing about retaliatory action on the part of other nations with respect to our fisheries.

I think the commission could make local adjustments and decide whether 37½ percent was the proper amount to

be devoted to public schools, or to harbor districts, and also whether the Federal Leasing Act should be applied to the property involved.

Mr. President, the Washington Post this morning published a very good editorial entitled "Time To Think." I believe it is time to stop, look, and listen before we take one of the most far-reaching and, I am afraid, one of the most harmful actions which has been taken by the Congress in a long time. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO THINK

When one considers the incorrigible character of the act and the magnitude of the treasure to be given away in the so-called tidelands bill to be brought up for a vote in the Senate today, the 6-month postponement suggested by Senator KEFAUVER seems sensible and reasonable. The Senator would have the 6-month respite used by a presidential commission for the purpose of studying the offshore oil problem and recommending an equitable solution.

The 6-month postponement of a decision on the tangled issue would be a boon for three reasons. First, it would make it possible for the public to learn what is involved in the giveaway legislation—something that has been wholly obscure until lately even to most of the senatorial supporters of the bill. Second, it would afford a chance to look thoughtfully at some of the implications of the bill which have been examined so far only in the most casual and cavalier manner—its disastrous impact, for example, on the traditional American insistence that national sovereignty extends only 3 miles out from shore into the open sea. Third, it would give President Eisenhower's administration a face-saving chance to escape, in the national interest, from a campaign pledge apparently made without full knowledge of its meaning.

A rich treasure belonging to all the people of the United States is at stake in the tidelands controversy. So is a vital principle of international law. It would be an act of statesmanship if the Senate were to decide at this eleventh hour to settle the question on the basis of reasoned consideration instead of on the basis of political passion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I was about to yield myself 3 minutes, but I am afraid I would not be acting fairly toward my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, so I yield 2 minutes to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish only to say that I am proud to be a cosponsor of the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. It appears to me to contain one particular provision of great significance. The commission as outlined by the Senator from Tennessee would give an objective study to the international effects of the extension of our own boundaries, particularly the effect upon treaties.

Very frankly, whenever we are engaged in a subject matter so controversial as this, it is not uncommon for the executive department or for Congress to establish what may be called an impartial commission. In the British Parliament such an organization is called a royal commission. In the United States we called it an executive commission or a congressional commission. Such a procedure was followed years ago in the creation of the Wickersham Commission, which made the famous Wickersham report. Likewise, it was done in many instances in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt in connection with matters affecting the public lands.

What we are seeking to have done under this proposal is to take this highly explosive, controversial measure out of the arena of political activity, where it now finds itself, and have it placed in the arena, or I should say area, of objective investigation and study. I think there is much to be said for such action.

In all candor, I might just as well say that I understand those who have this gift almost in the palm of their hand, ready to be put into their back pocket and take it out the door, are not going to be willing to be very, should I say, helpful in agreeing to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, since in this country we are now engaged in a great crusade, I submit that the best way to proceed is to get the honest facts and to obtain the material which will acquaint us with all the causes of our sin. Then we shall be able to lead ourselves into paths of righteousness. I regret to say that now that is not what is happening in the Congress of the United States vis-a-vis our support of the pending proposal.

The Senator from Tennessee by his proposal is offering a method by which disputes between the States and the Federal Government may be adjusted, and I submit that he proposes fair representation for the coastal States when he provides that there shall be three representatives of those States on the Commission. He would also give the President of the United States a glorious opportunity to be relieved of a commitment. He would give the President of the United States a chance to appoint a commission to make an objective, honorable study of the problem of the submerged lands, and later when the Commission submits its report to base a judgment on its findings. At any rate, let me say that an administration committed to a study of a situation such as this should embrace this opportunity gladly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad this amendment has come up. The question of the submerged lands in the Continental Shelf has been studied for nearly 16 years. The first study began in 1937, when the question was before the Senate. The subject has been studied sufficiently, as disclosed by the fact that in 1946, and again last year, 1952, the Congress passed, by impressive majorities, proposed legislation which was almost exactly like the joint resolution which is pending before the Senate today. Legislation of this character has been subjected to the most careful scrutiny. I submit that in the many years of my membership in the Senate no measure that has come before a Senate committee has been subjected to such intensive hearings and testimony, and then to such long consideration in the deliberations of the committee, as has Senate Joint Resolution 13, under the direction of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Furthermore, the Senate has debated this measure for 5 full weeks upon the floor of the Senate, not only in the daytime but frequently in the nighttime, and, at least, on one occasion, throughout the night.

Members of the Senate who feel that 5 weeks of debate, following 16 years of study, is not sufficient, and who would desire another such experience of 5 more weeks next fall, following 6 months' study, are, of course, free to vote for this particular amendment. But it seems to me that it is almost the height of absurdity for the Senate to take action which in effect would be a recommittal of the joint resolution, after 5 weeks of debate, and after the Senate has shown so clearly that it is following the views of the great majority of the people of the Nation, to whom this particular issue was submitted in an important way during the last presidential campaign.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota, if I have time to do so.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator from Florida feel that the proposed Commission would be any more competent than was the Supreme Court to give a final decision in the matter?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the proposed Commission probably would not be more competent than the committee which has considered and reported the resolution. I have very great confidence in their ability. I believe they have made a correct report.

Since the Senator from South Dakota is from one of the reclamation States, I desire to call attention to another item in connection with the benefits it is alleged this amendment would afford. The proposed commission would be comprised, in addition to its other members, of three members representing the States, to pass upon, among other things, the relationship of this proposed policy to the entire public lands policy within the United States and its possessions. The three representatives of the States would all come from States most affected by the joint resolution, California, Texas, and Louisiana. So the public-land States would be asked, under this disingenuous proposal, to trust their confidence in full to the representatives of the three coastal States which are affected without any direct representation of their own.

I hope the Senate will reject this motion to recommit, because that is exactly what this amendment really is. It is a motion for an additional half year of study after 16 years of study. It is a motion to render naught the 5 weeks of intensive debate and would prevent Congress from going ahead and doing the things that are needed to be done for the good of the Nation as a whole.

Incidentally I doubt that we will do anything that is more to the good of the Nation as a whole during this session than the passage of this particular joint resolution, by which we will get rid of

one trend, at least, toward an ever swollen, greater bureaucracy in Washington, and turn back to the States the handling of local problems which are intimately related to the welfare of countless millions of people, and, incidentally, which represent the investments of a lifetime for many tens of thousands of citizens of the Nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senate strikes a note for a return to sanity in government by rejecting this amendment and passing the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee I ask for the yeas and nays, and I urge my colleagues to keep their hands up until the clerk has finished counting.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] would each vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—32

Aiken	Hennings	Mansfield
Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Chavez	Humphrey	Morse
Cooper	Jackson	Murray
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Ferguson	Kefauver	Pastore
Fulbright	Kennedy	Sparkman
Gillette	Kilgore	Symington
Gore	Langer	Tobey
Green	Lehman	Wiley
Hayden	Magnuson	

NAYS—59

Barrett	Goldwater	Mundt
Beall	Griswold	Payne
Bennett	Hendrickson	Potter
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson
Bush	Holland	Russell
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Saltonstall
Byrd	Ives	Schoeppel
Case	Jenner	Smathers
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kuchel	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Long	Stennis
Duff	Malone	Taft
Dworshak	Martin	Thye
Eastland	Maybank	Watkins
Ellender	McCarran	Welker
Flanders	McCarthy	Williams
Frear	McClellan	Young
George	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—5

Butler, Nebr.	Carlson	Knowland
Capehart	Kerr	

So Mr. KEFAUVER's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I call up two amendments which I have on the desk, amendments designated "4-23-53-A," and "4-23-53-B." I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with, and that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. MAGNUSON's amendments are as follows:

On page 10, line 5, title I, strike out all down through and including line 12, page 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE I

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 2. When used in this joint resolution—

"(a) The term 'lands beneath navigable waters' means—

"(1) all lands within the boundaries of each of the respective States which are covered by nontidal waters that are navigable under the laws of the United States, up to the ordinary high-water mark as heretofore or hereafter modified by accretion, erosion, and reliction;

"(2) all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coastline of each such State.

"(3) all filled in, made, or reclaimed lands which formerly were lands beneath navigable waters, as hereinabove defined.

"(b) The term 'boundaries' include the seaward boundaries of a State or its boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes as they existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, but not to exceed a line 3 geographical miles distant from the coastline of each such State, or as extended or confirmed pursuant to section 4 hereof."

On page 17, line 12, beginning with the word "Nothing", strike down through and including line 18.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendments relate to two different portions of the joint resolution, but they are complementary. I ask unanimous consent, because there are two amendments, that 10 minutes to a side be allowed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc, and 10 minutes to each side will be allowed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to take up much of the time of the Senate on the question involved in the two amendments. It was discussed at great length during the general debate.

In effect, the two amendments limit the so-called Holland joint resolution to the 3-mile limit. In other words, they invalidate the portion of the joint resolution which would allow Texas and Florida to go beyond the historic 3-mile limit.

My main reason for the restriction to the 3-mile limit is, first, that historically, since the days of Washington and Jefferson, when Thomas Jefferson was Secretary of State, and laid down the 3-mile limit as a basis for our describing and creating what we call international waters, all our treaties, whether they relate to fisheries, navigation, or anything else dealing with the high seas, have been predicated upon the 3-mile limit.

If the Holland joint resolution should pass without this amendment, we would find that we had violated that historic precedent of the 3-mile limit and gone beyond it.

As I pointed out the other day, I see no reason whatsoever, if we go beyond the 3-mile limit, why the Dominion of Canada should not do likewise. Its Parliament has already threatened to do so. It might very well extend its territorial waters 10 miles, 20 miles, or 30 miles.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Such an enactment would invalidate all our fishing treaties. There would be no reason why the Government of Mexico should not go beyond the 3-mile limit into the Gulf of Mexico for a distance of 10, 20, or 30 miles. Mexico could say to us, "You have done it. Why can we not do it?" There would be no end to the extension of national boundaries by other countries.

Such a law would seriously affect our fishing treaties with Canada with respect to the Pacific Coast. The extension to a 20-mile line north of Puget Sound, in some of the fishing waters with respect to which we have international agreements with Canada, establishing them as Canadian waters, would mean that American fishermen or fishermen from any other nation would have to go through an entirely new procedure in order to fish in those waters.

The same situation would apply to the Gulf of Mexico. It would apply to the Bering Sea. It could apply to many other waters. All my amendments would do would be to limit the Holland joint resolution to the 3-mile limit, which historically has been the basis of all our treaties and all our international agreements with respect to fisheries, navigation, and everything involved in free international movement on the so-called high seas.

I now yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not true that the Senator's amendments would limit to 3 miles the boundaries of such States as Michigan in the Great Lakes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; the amendments would apply only to international waters and only to coastal waters.

Mr. POTTER. It would not apply to the Great Lakes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; because the Holland joint resolution basically does not apply to the Great Lakes. Therefore, the limitation on the Holland joint resolution would apply only to the scope of the Holland joint resolution, which applies only to coastal waters.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the Senator's amendment is an excellent one. He knows that most of the fishing banks, such as the Grand Banks, are a part of the Continental Shelf. His amendments would do much to prevent the fishing fleets from being driven off their traditional fishing grounds.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Other countries could justifiably do what we would be doing. Only the other day in the Canadian Parliament a member of that

body suggested, that if we go beyond the 3-mile limit Canada would have the right to extend its historic boundaries. There could develop a continuing procedure. One country would say 10 miles; another country would say 20 miles; and very soon some countries would be claiming boundaries into the ocean.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to my colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What the Senator from Washington has stated about the gulf coast is correct. Only within the past 2 or 3 weeks some shrimpers from the Gulf States were detained at certain places in Mexico because it was charged they went farther into the gulf toward the Mexican shore than they were supposed to go. The same thing could happen to the international tuna fishing industry in the waters of Peru.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, and in the waters of Costa Rica and southern California.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They would all be in the same category.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly. There is no reason why the tuna industry would not also be affected. All international agreements of all countries would be affected. I can foresee very serious complications arising. The Committee on Foreign Relations has not studied the subject, as I believe it should, because it involves international boundaries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an explanation of my amendments.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

On last Thursday I introduced two amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 13. They were printed and are lying on the table. I ask to call them up at this time.

Although the two amendments deal with separate sections of the bill, I ask that they be considered together—ask that they be voted on en bloc.

On Thursday, April 23, I gave the Senate a brief explanation of the intent and origin of these amendments. First, let me explain their intent—and here I repeat a portion of my previous remarks:

The net effect of these amendments is to restrict the application of Senate Joint Resolution 13 to a strip of marginal sea, extending 3 miles oceanward from low tide on all coasts—Pacific, Atlantic, and gulf.

If Senate Joint Resolution 13 were to pass with these amendments included, the measure would be brought into conformity with the historic position of the United States with respect to territorial waters. We would avoid, in this legislation, those problems which will arise—and the injury to industry and national security which may be done—if territorial waters off the coast of Texas and western Florida are extended 10½ miles seaward.

The Supreme Court stated that when the low-water mark is passed, we enter the international domain. I say that when you pass our historic 3-mile limit in any quitclaim legislation, you invite untold and unforeseen international complications. It seems to me, therefore, that if Senate Joint Resolution 13 is to be passed at all, we should reserve for future and thorough consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, this entire question of extending seaward boundaries beyond the 3-mile limit.

I realize that what I am proposing will not satisfy the States of Texas and Florida. It is my conviction, however, that those States would not want the Congress to take action today which might jeopardize the shipping and fishing industries and—further—might have far-reaching consequences to the movement of our Navy and military aircraft.

It seems to me that the Foreign Relations Committee is the proper committee of the United States Senate to consider the wisdom of extending the seaward boundaries of any State—whether it be 1 mile, 2 miles, or 7½ miles beyond the 3-mile limit—a limit first enunciated by Thomas Jefferson in 1793.

The seaward boundaries of the United States and the coastal States are coextensive—are indivisible. You cannot extend the boundaries of 1, 2, or more States without simultaneously extending the boundaries of the United States.

The second of these amendments deletes from section 4 of the bill the following language, which appears on page 17, beginning at line 12?

"Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing, the existence of any State's seaward boundaries beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to, or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or hereafter approved by the Congress."

The language I have just cited is particularly objectionable because it clearly hints that some of the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 13 have in mind coming here to the Congress at some later date to ask for approval of boundaries extending seaward 5, 10½, or 15 miles—or any other distance that may be required to encompass submerged oil-bearing lands.

I realize that one Congress cannot bind another—that a subsequent Congress can reconsider the boundaries of respective States. It seems to me a mistake, however, to issue a printed invitation to that effect at this time.

To restate the intent of these amendments—if adopted the application of Senate Joint Resolution 13 will be restricted, so far as territorial waters are concerned, to a uniform pattern on all coasts—namely, 3 miles seaward from the coastline—and, in title I, section 2 (a), the term "coastline" means the "ordinary low-water mark along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters."

I now want to refresh the minds of Senators as to the origin of these amendments. Mr. John J. Real, manager and attorney for the Fishermen's Cooperative Association of San Pedro, Calif., appeared before the Senate Interior Committee and spoke eloquently on the great danger to the fishing industry contained in Senate Joint Resolution 13. The following organizations joined Mr. Real in presenting his statement:

Boatowners' associations: American Tunaboat Association, San Diego, Calif.; Southern California Commercial Fishing Boatowners' Cooperative, Inc., Long Beach, Calif.; San Diego Commercial Fishing Boatowners, Inc., San Diego, Calif. (The foregoing organizations represent the owners of approximately 600 tuna clippers, purse seiners, and albacore vessels who fish for mackerel and sardines in California and for tuna off the shores of Latin America.)

Labor unions: Seine and Line Fishermen's Union (AFL), San Pedro, Calif.; Cannery Workers and Fishermen's Union (AFL), San Diego; Cannery Workers Union of the Pacific (AFL), San Pedro. (The foregoing three unions are affiliated with the Seafarers International Union of North America, AFL.) Fishermen's Union (local 33, ILMU), San Pedro, Calif. (The foregoing unions represent approximately 14,600 California fishermen and cannery workers.)

Canners' organizations: California Fish Canners' Association, Terminal Island, Calif.; Tuna Research Foundation, Long Beach, Calif. (The foregoing organizations represent 15 canners of tuna, mackerel, and sardines in California.)

At the conclusion of his remarks, Mr. Real suggested that the bill be amended substantially in accord with the amendments I have offered.

On Thursday, April 23, I dwelt at some length on the grave implications involved in extending seaward boundaries 10½ miles off the coasts of Texas and Florida, as Senate Joint Resolution 13 proposes to do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the remarks I made last week specifically regarding the fishing industry.

There being no objection, a copy of Mr. MAGNUSON'S remarks was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, important segments of our fishing industry have been concerned about the implications of Senate Joint Resolution 13. I think they have a right to be.

The proposed extension of seaward boundaries in the interest of two States, and the possible extension by Congress later of the seaward boundaries of other States, as provided in the resolution, is, in my opinion, a distinct change from our historic policy. That policy, since the time of Thomas Jefferson, has recognized the principle of freedom of the seas.

Mr. John J. Real, manager and attorney for the Fishermen's Cooperative Association of San Pedro, Calif., put the point very well, I think, in his testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

According to Mr. Real, 4 important boatowners' associations, representing the owners of approximately 600 tuna clippers, purse seiners, and albacore vessels which fish for tuna off the shores of Latin America, joined in his statement.

Five labor organizations representing approximately 14,600 California fishermen and cannery workers, also joined, as did organizations representing 15 canners of tuna, mackerel and sardines.

In fairness to Mr. Real, I must point out that he made it clear to the committee that he did not oppose the Congress giving to the coastal States certain rights to submerged resources.

He did oppose, and very ably, legislation that would expand the historic claims of the United States to territorial waters in a way that would bring newly acquired waters tradivionally considered to be high seas, within the sovereignty of the several coastal States.

Mr. Real proposed several amendments to the pending resolution which, in his opinion, would preserve our historic policy of Freedom of the High Seas, while yielding to the States certain submerged oil resources.

The committee did not see fit to incorporate these amendments in its bill.

The bill now, as it did before Mr. Real submitted his proposed amendments, would expand the historic claims of the United States to territorial waters, wherein lies the danger.

In his testimony before the committee Mr. Real pointed out that the legislation, as it stood without his proposed amendments, and as—I may add—it stands today, becomes a matter of international concern because "it represents a change in United States policy toward the principle of the freedom of the seas."

Elsewhere Mr. Real stated:

"Before pointing out specifically wherein the pending tidelands bill creates the situa-

tion we have mentioned, it is important to consider why the United States should not lead or join in any movement which changes in any manner the doctrine of freedom of the seas.

"The United States policy has always been to claim coastal water sovereignty over the narrowest possible belt of water. In the furtherance of this policy it has claimed a three mile wide territorial sea measured from lines which, except in the case of bays and certain other coastal indentations, closely hugged its beaches."

Mr. Real told the committee that there has been of late a definite tendency by many nations to usurp more and more of the high seas, and added:

"If this form of aquatic imperialism remains unchecked, the temptation will be present to make this newly claimed sovereignty more fruitful to the claiming nation by abridging the right of innocent passage and forcing maritime nations to pay tribute or route their ships and planes far out to sea."

And then Mr. Real made what I consider the most significant statement of his entire testimony:

"The easiest way to start the ball rolling in this direction is for the United States, as a world leader, to push its own boundaries further seaward."

As I stated earlier, Mr. Real suggested certain amendments which the committee did not choose to incorporate in its pending bill.

Later on in this debate I expect to present these amendments to the Senate so that the Senate may act on them as a whole, with a view to determining whether or not the proponents of this legislation are agreeable to changes in the pending bill that, in the opinion of the principal spokesman who appeared before the Senate committee in behalf of the fisheries industry, are important for the protection of their interests.

I assure the Senate that by doing so I am entirely conscientious and consistent. My concern for the protection of our American fisheries is a matter of record.

I have been diligent in my undertakings in behalf of the salmon industry, and participated in the preparation of the fisheries provision of the Japanese peace treaty with a view to protecting our Alaska and coastal fisheries from encroachment by Japan.

The commercial value of our American fisheries is too great, in my opinion, to be jeopardized by any change in our traditional policy with respect to seaward boundaries and/or the freedom of the seas.

In 1950, the latest year for which I have complete records, the value of our tuna catch amounted to more than $61 million; that of our salmon catch to $37½ million, a decline, I am sorry to say, of almost $10 million from the 1949 record.

Landings of tuna and mackerel last year at San Pedro, Calif., alone were valued at $38 million, and at San Diego, tuna only, at $17 million.

Is it any wonder that the representative of the Fishermen's Cooperative Association of San Pedro is concerned?

In the event that someone may presume that the Senator from Washington is going afield from the State he represents, let me say that important tuna fisheries are being developed by the companies of his State, in addition to our valuable salmon, halibut, and bottom-fish industries.

Should Canada, following the example which passage of the pending resolution would present to them, decide to extend the boundaries of British Columbia 10½ miles, or to incorporate within their boundaries the waters between Queen Charlotte Island and the mainland, then these industries would be seriously affected.

Let me amplify this point. A portion of the Seattle and Puget Sound fishing fleet consisting of some 200 boats and 1,500 fishermen, fish for salmon, halibut, and bottom fish off the Coast of Canada.

The fishing season runs approximately from April 15 to October 15. Naturally our people fish outside the Canadian 3-mile limit. One of the important fishing grounds is Hecate Straits lying between Queen Charlotte Island and the Canadian mainland. The straits are about 50 to 60 miles wide, and constitute one of the most fertile fishing grounds off the coast of Canada.

The importance of these fishing grounds to Seattle and other of our fishery ports on Puget Sound can be illustrated, I think, by the fact that the annual catch by our fishing fleets in and around the banks there amounts to approximately $2,500,000 a year of all species.

We take from the area approximately 13 million pounds of salmon, halibut, and bottom fish. The value of our entire catch off the western coast of Canada approximates $7,500,000 annually.

An extension of Canada's seaward boundary 10½ miles would do great harm to our fisheries industry, and closure of the Straits would cause irreparable damage to it.

I should point out here that certain Canadian interests from time to time have threatened to close these important banks to our fishing fleet, contending that the straits constitute inland waters.

They have been deterred, I think, by our adherence in the past to the traditional 3-mile limit in our own waters.

The threat to our Pacific Northwest fisheries would be augmented, and seriously augmented in my opinion, by enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 13.

For the tuna industry to the south the enactment of the pending bill would constitute an even greater threat.

Testimony was presented to the committee, and is embodied in its printed hearings, that nine-tenths of the yield in tuna comes from areas of the high seas which are contiguous to the 10 American Republics south of San Diego on the Pacific coast.

Not only are the fisheries off the Pacific coast vulnerable to any retaliatory moves that other nations might make as a result of extension, or seeming extension of seaward boundaries, but our New England fisheries might not be exempt.

In this connection I wish to cite testimony presented before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries at hearings held in 1950, by Dr. W. M. Chapman, then Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State and a recognized authority on fisheries:

"The great fisheries that have been prosecuted by New Englanders for 300 years lie for the most part in the high seas contiguous to the coast of Canada. All expansion that is anticipated lies in the direction of being farther and farther from our coasts, northward and eastward around the corner of Newfoundland and up Davis Strait past Greenland and Labrador."

Elsewhere Dr. Chapman stated:

"If we permit the loss of our fisheries that now exist in the high seas contiguous to the coasts of foreign countries we lose the biggest half of our fishing industry at one stroke."

Dr. Chapman was talking about fisheries and not offshore oil resources, I will agree, but he was talking about more than that. He was talking about our seaward boundaries, and Mr. Real quoted Dr. Chapman also in his, Mr. Real's testimony about seaward boundaries.

Mr. Real quoted, in particular, this statement by Dr. Chapman:

"If one nation can unilaterally extend its sovereign territory out to sea by as much as a quarter of a mile then there is no reason why it or any other nation cannot extend its boundaries seaward by 200 miles, by 400 miles, or by such distance it may desire.

"In the chaotic situation that such claims and counterclaims would bring about the United States would not stand to be the gainer nor, I believe, would mankind generally."

Mr. Real in his testimony commented on the Chapman statement. He said:

"For the reasons given above by Dr. Chapman, the United States has an obligation to its own fishing industry to prevent maritime aggression by others. In its role as a world leader it owes a like obligation to other fishing nations. It can't fulfill these obligations by attempts to expand its claims no matter how subtly they be disguised."

Mr. President, the very thing these eminent authorities on American fisheries fear is being done in this Senate Joint Resolution however subtle the disguise.

In my opinion the disguise is not even subtle.

As Mr. Real testified at the time of his appearance before the Senate Committee:

"Title I, section 2 (a) of the bill recognizes a power in Congress to extend a State boundary further seaward than 3 miles. A serious question, as yet not completely answered in the realm of International Law, arises as to whether any nation having once made its claim to its seaward boundaries can thereafter expand them.

"Regardless of the legal answer to that question, it would certainly be ill advised for the United States, as a matter of policy to say to the world that seaward boundaries can be expanded."

Title I, section 2, of the bill before us certainly recognizes such power, both now and in the future. The power and authority of any State to so extend its boundaries is stated even more emphatically in section 4 of the present bill, under the subtitle "Seaward Boundaries."

Let me quote just one sentence of that section:

"Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or"—please note this—"or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress."

As Mr. Real stated, the broad method of determination of boundaries permitted by the bill is not consistent with present United States policy. He said and I quote:

"In our opinion the present bills should be amended so as to eliminate all possible conflicts with the present United States policy on territorial waters. Each of the States which would gain from quitclaim legislation has some interest in fishing or other maritime pursuits. There is no need to place those interests in jeopardy. The affected States can accomplish their primary purpose without doing that. They can gain their cod without losing a whale."

Mr. Real then proposed certain amendments which, as I stated earlier in the debate, were not incorporated in the legislation now before us.

Mr. President, some of our inland friends may consider the American fisheries one of our minor industries, inconsequential when placed against the anticipated—and very much anticipated, I might add—wealth of our offshore oil resources.

But in terms of human beings who gain their livelihood from fisheries I hazard that more people are actively connected with commercial deep-sea fishing than in our deep-sea oil operation.

If I could be furnished with accurate data on how many people are engaged in offshore oil activities, other than oil company lobbyists or representatives who are now in Washington, I would welcome them. The comparison might be of great value to these debates.

I do have some data on the number of commercial fishermen, their production in terms of catch, and the value of that catch and of fishery products at various states of production.

It is contained in a leaflet, revised last month and published, its heading states, by the United States Department of the Interior, Douglas McKay, Secretary, and by the Fish and Wildlife Service, Albert M. Day, Director. I commend it to my colleagues. For purposes of identification you will find it listed as Fishery Leaflet 393.

Because I do not want to extend this debate longer than I feel is necessary to bring facts which I believe important before the Senate, I will touch only on a few of the highlights.

In 1950, the last year for which there is a complete record, America's commercial fishermen landed some 4,884,000,000 pounds of fish, valued at $343,876,492.

California fishermen led the Nation by landing 1.3 billion pounds of fish, valued at $81,605,112 to them; Massachusetts was second among the States with more than half a billion pounds of fish valued at $40 million; Alaska yielded almost half a billion pounds of fish with a value to fishermen of more than $30 million, and Louisiana came next with 316,250,000 pounds worth $23,644,000 to its fishermen.

Fishermen of my own State of Washington landed more than 100 million pounds of fish with a value of over $19 million.

The report published under the names of Secretary McKay and Director Day further informs us that 599,000 persons were employed last year in the fishery industry, that some 94,600 fishing craft were utilized, and that the Nation had 3,500 fishery shore establishments.

At the retailers level, the report states, the estimated value of fishery products last year was nearly $1 billion, and in 1951, the year previous, exceeded $1 billion.

The publication which Secretary McKay and Director Day have issued under their names also undertakes to estimate the capital valuation of fishing industries in 1951, stating that the figures were arrived at under accepted principles of evaluation among businessmen. They are:

To fishermen and boat owners	$6,281,250,000
To manufacturers and processers	1,551,303,000
To wholesalers of fishery products	1,189,971,000
To retailers of fishery products	2,054,556,000
Total	11,077,080,000

Of course I would not undertake to assume that all of this capital value is predicated on fisheries in seas contiguous to foreign nations.

But on the basis of testimony placed before committees of Congress I can assume that at least half of it is.

Dr. Chapman, in his testimony before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and repeated this year by Mr. Real at Senate hearings on the pending legislation, stated:

"If we permit the loss of our fisheries that now exist in the high seas contiguous to the coasts of foreign countries we lose the biggest half of our fishing industry at one stroke."

Personally, I do not see how we can reconcile this threat to a basic and historic industry, by approving the pending legislation.

That passage of any legislation which would permit extension of traditionally accepted boundaries does constitute a threat I think there can be no doubt. The threat was aptly stated by the Stanford Law Review of Stanford University in its issue of July, 1952, as follows:

"It may be that in the long run a policy of extending territorial waters would be detrimental to the United States. If we do this we could not complain if other nations did likewise. Our military and economic interests might be harmed as a result."

Certainly the economic interest that would be first harmed is that of our fishery industry.

It, of all our economic interests, is most dependent on the preservation of historically accepted seaward boundaries and freedom of the seas.

For that reason I wish at this time to submit the first of several amendments to the pending legislation which were proposed by the spokesman for a large and important segment of our Pacific Coast fishery industry.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not a fact that half of the American fishing industry's production comes from the high seas contiguous to foreign nations?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. So what we are doing here is jeopardizing half of the actual production of fish which is made available in the American market today. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Not only that, but the future of our fishing agreements is based upon the fact that we will not extend our boundaries farther into the ocean.

I wish it to be clearly understood that I am against extending State boundaries even out to the 3-mile limit, but if we are to turn the lands within that limit back to the States, at least we should not go beyond that limit, because on the basis of legal, ethical, international, and moral obligations which we owe to other nations, we have never gone beyond our 3-mile limit.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to my colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am disturbed by what the Senator from Washington said in answer to the question of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER]. As I read his amendments, they would apply also to the Great Lakes. Perhaps he should add a provision limiting the application of his amendments to the Pacific, Gulf, and Atlantic coasts, so as not to include the Great Lakes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from New Mexico will look at page 2 of my amendment 4/23/53–A, he will find that a paragraph has been added, which reads:

(b) The term "boundaries" include the seaward boundaries of a State or its boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes as they existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, but not to exceed a line 3 geographical miles distant from the coastline of each such State, or as extended or confirmed pursuant to section 4 hereof.

The "section 4 hereof" refers to the Holland joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendments.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	Millikin
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barrett	Hendrickson	Morse
Beall	Hennings	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bricker	Hill	Neely
Bridges	Hoey	Pastore
Bush	Holland	Payne
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Hunt	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Kuchel	Symington
Ellender	Langer	Taft
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Frear	Magnuson	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
George	Martin	Wiley
Gillette	Maybank	Williams
Goldwater	McCarran	Young
Gore	McCarthy	
Green	McClellan	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand that I have 1 minute remaining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the suggestion has been made that my amendments might apply to the Great Lakes. However, subsection (b) of my first amendment provides that the boundaries shall be consistent with or pursuant to section 4 of the original joint resolution, and section 4 of the original Holland joint resolution makes a very clear-cut distinction, for on page 17, in line 5, it is provided that "or to the international boundaries of the United States in the Great Lakes or any other body of water traversed by such boundaries."

In other words, the boundaries are confirmed by the joint resolution itself, and my amendments would apply only to the boundaries which are not confirmed by the joint resolution.

Therefore, Mr. President, in my opinion it is clear that the amendments would exclude the Great Lakes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] the time available to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment of the senior Senator from Washington would do two things which he has not mentioned:

First, by the first paragraph of his amendment, which calls for a rewording of section 2, subsection (a) (1), the Senator from Washington would delete the words "at the time such State became a member of the Union, or acquired sovereignty over such lands and waters"—

referring to nontidal waters or inland streams.

The way the Holland joint resolution is now drawn, State ownership is confirmed not only to the beds of navigable streams at the present time, but also to the beds of streams which were navigable at the time when the State entered the Union.

I do not believe any Senator from an inland State would wish to adopt such an amendment.

In the second place, I believe it is clear that the Great Lakes are included in the last paragraph of the amendment, for in reading paragraph (b), on the second page of the proposed amendment of the Senator from Washington, we find the following statement:

(b) The term "boundaries" include the seaward boundaries of a State or its boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes as they existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, but not to exceed a line 3 geographical miles distant from the coastline of each such State, or as extended or confirmed pursuant to section 4 hereof.

Then, when we read section 4, we find that this proposed new paragraph would take precedence or at least would constitute a conflict.

Mr. President, today the boundary of Minnesota extends from the coastline 32 miles out into the Great Lakes—to the international boundary. The boundary of Michigan extends from the coastline 85 miles into the Great Lakes, which have been held to be open seas.

The boundary of Wisconsin extends from the coastline 40 miles into the Great Lakes; the boundary of Ohio, 28 miles; the boundary of New York, 26 miles. Of course, the gulfward boundary of the State of Texas extends 3 leagues, or 10½ miles; and the boundary of the State of Florida, on its west coast along the Gulf of Mexico, extends 10½ miles.

Mr. President, some Senators talk about a "giveaway." Let me say that I think the Congress of the United States would really be giving some property away—to the family of nations, any time 7½ miles are cut off the coast of Florida and 7½ miles off the coast of Texas. That would be releasing to the international domain a vast area which Florida and Texas brought into the United States. It is now part of the States, and therefore it is part of the Nation. The same is true in the case of the Great Lakes States.

If we pass this joint resolution leaving the States with what they have always had within their boundaries at the time they entered the Union, or as heretofore approved by Congress, we are at least keeping all that property within our Nation. There is no property or wealth belonging to a State that is not also a part of the Nation.

Those who believe that every piece of property or every right has to be held in Washington, in order to belong to the people of the United States and in order to be enjoyed by the people of the United States, are thinking directly contrary to the principles followed by those who established our system of government.

In the case of Texas, there has been a treaty in regard to its boundaries which would be ignored by this proposed amendment. Mr. President, Texas entered the Union with boundaries which were fixed 3 leagues from shore in the Gulf of Mexico. Texas had maintained those boundaries as an independent republic for 9 years. I do not ask Senators to take my word about this matter. I have before me a book published by the State Department, Miller, "Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States of America," giving the boundaries of Texas as they existed at the time when Texas entered the Union. The 3-league boundary is set out exactly as fixed by the Congress of Texas in 1836. In this book we find that the State Department has set out the Annexation Agreement with Texas, including that agreement among the other treaties and international agreements of the United States. In that Annexation Agreement we find the following:

That Congress doth consent that the territory properly included within, and rightfully belonging to the Republic of Texas, may be erected into a new State, to be called the State of Texas.

The United States took in all of Texas, all of the 3 leagues extending into the Gulf of Mexico, not just 3 miles.

Furthermore, we find that when President Andrew Jackson recommended that Congress recognize Texas as an independent nation, he said to Congress, in a special message:

The title of Texas to the territory she claims is identified with her independence.

Later, in 1845 while the annexation proposal was being considered in Texas there was insistence on the defense of Texas' original boundaries. Sam Houston asked for specific assurances that Texas' boundary would be maintained. President Polk, speaking for the United States, replied:

Of course, I would maintain the Texan title to the extent which she claims it to be.

Mr. President, the Holland joint resolution does not fix any boundaries or change any boundaries; it simply follows the boundaries that have been in existence since the States entered the Union, or the boundaries that heretofore have been approved by the Congress.

On the other hand, the amendments of the Senator from Washington would change the boundaries. A similar amendment was offered in the House of Representatives this year, and received only 17 votes.

I ask even those Senators who are opposed to the joint resolution not to vote for the amendments of the Senator from Washington, which would lessen the boundaries of the Nation and surrender part of the lands within those established boundaries to future claims of other nations.

The United States kept its bargain with Texas when it came time to fix the boundary between the United States and Mexico, after the war with that country. In 1848 in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, between the United States and Mexico, we find that the boundary was fixed 3 leagues from land in the Gulf of Mexico.

If Senators will turn to page 411 of the printed hearings before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 13, the green volume on each desk, they will find opposite that page a State Department map showing the survey of this boundary in the Gulf of Mexico. Does that survey show that the boundary of Texas was 3 miles from shore? No, Mr. President; the survey shows that the boundary of Texas is 3 leagues from shore. My colleagues will find that this map refers to that boundary, which is the present boundary in the gulf between the United States and Mexico, as shown by a red line running into the gulf. On that red line are the following words:

International boundary begins 3 leagues from land.

That map is a State Department map of the actual survey made in 1911.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States has approved the 3-league boundary of Texas and the 3-league boundary between the Republic of Mexico and the United States in the Gulf of Mexico. That was done when the Senate approved the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848 and the Gadsden Purchase Treaty in 1853, and again in connection with a dispute between the United States and Texas over the northwestern limits of the State of Texas, after New Mexico had been ceded by Mexico to the United States. The Texas Boundary Act of 1836 was recognized and followed. At that time, after several months of debate on the question, Senator Foote, of Mississippi, when speaking in the Senate on January 16, 1850, said of Texas:

Title to all the territory claimed for her by the act of 1836, entitled "An act for defining the boundaries of the Republic of Texas," is one which no ingenuity can undermine and no sophistry elude. Indeed, I suppose that the true limits of Texas will never again be disputed in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I regret that after 103 years the prophecy of Senator Foote has been broken and Texas' boundaries have been disputed by a Member of the Congress. Those who would change the Texas boundaries after all these years would violate the promise of the President of the United States in 1845 and the treaties approved by the United States Senate. Those who take that position say, "Oh, our Nation follows the 3-mile limit." Yet the very books they cite show that certain exceptions have been made, and that Texas is one of the exceptions, that Florida is another, and that the Great Lakes States are exceptions because their seaward boundaries extend clear out to the international boundary, much farther than 3 miles from shore.

Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 13 would not give anything special to the State of Texas. It would simply follow what previous Congresses have done with reference to recognition of boundaries, confirming to Texas and to every State all lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries as they existed at the time each State entered the Union, or as heretofore approved by the Congress.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not challenge those boundaries, thus throwing the area beyond 3 miles into the jurisdiction of international law and the family of nations, giving it away and saying that it does not form any part or parcel of this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not correct to say that the same thing applies with regard to what were the Original Thirteen States? In other words, it would not be giving anything to the States other than what was recognized by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as belonging to the States?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator is correct. The pending measure has been amended. The amendment was offered by the Senator from Florida, limiting the overall extent of Senate Joint Resolution 13 to 3 miles in the Atlantic and Pacific and 3 leagues in the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. President, let me urge that, regardless of what may be done about the ownership of the lands; we should not do anything that would challenge or lessen the seaward boundaries of the States, because they are also the boundaries of the Nation. Just as established State boundaries inure to the benefit of the Nation, so does the wealth owned and developed by the States within those boundaries. In our country there is no State wealth or individual wealth which does not form a part of the total wealth of the Nation, and that does not mean that the Federal Government must own or control everything. The only way in which we may have a strong Nation is to have strong States, efficient local governments and strong individual citizens. Our country was not built from the top down, and we cannot successfully maintain it if we follow those who would ignore the States and rob them of their rights and revenues in order to centralize everything in Washington, farther and farther away from the observation and control of the people.

I hope the amendments will be rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, I desire to modify my amendments, on page 2, line 16, by adding the words "or the international boundaries of the United States in the Great Lakes or any other body of water traversed by such boundaries." That would exempt the Great Lakes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington modifies his amendments accordingly. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments of the Senator from Washington, as modified.

The amendments as modified, were rejected.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to call up the amendment which I submitted, and which is now at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. Each coastal State receiving any income from oil, gas, or other minerals in submerged lands, which are covered by tidal waters and are outside of inland waters and the ordinary low-water line of such tidal waters, shall report at the end of each 6-month period in each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1953, the gross amount of such income received (including amounts previously received and not reported) to the Secretary of the Treasury who shall determine the total such income received by all coastal States in such period. Within 60 days after the end of each such 6-month period the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to each of the several States an amount of money which shall be equal in the case of each such State to the percentage, listed in the following table, of such total, except that amounts reported by each coastal State as required in this section shall be debited against amounts to be paid such coastal State under this section. Amounts paid to each State under this section shall be used primarily for public education to the extent deemed necessary by such State. Such table is as follows:

State:	Percentage
Alabama	2.52
Arizona	.56
Arkansas	1.54
California	6.33
Colorado	.88
Connecticut	1.17
Delaware	.20
District of Columbia	.37
Florida	1.77
Georgia	2.66
Idaho	.47
Illinois	5.24
Indiana	2.61
Iowa	1.80
Kansas	1.26
Kentucky	2.13
Louisiana	2.05
Maine	.64
Maryland	1.47
Massachusetts	2.79
Michigan	4.36
Minnesota	2.05
Mississippi	1.80
Missouri	2.48
Montana	.42
Nebraska	.89
Nevada	.10
New Hampshire	.35
New Jersey	2.77
New Mexico	.55
New York	8.43
North Carolina	3.22
North Dakota	.48
Ohio	5.04
Oklahoma	1.68
Oregon	1.00
Pennsylvania	6.79
Rhode Island	.45
South Carolina	1.77
South Dakota	.47
Tennessee	2.44
Texas	5.20
Utah	.57
Vermont	.27
Virginia	2.30
Washington	1.49
West Virginia	1.60
Wisconsin	2.33
Wyoming	.24

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to suggest a modification of my amendment, on page 2, lines 9 and 10, by striking out the words "primarily for public education to the extent deemed necessary by such State," and inserting the words, "for education, in the manner to be prescribed by such State."

Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to let all the States share in this grand giveaway scheme. I am opposed to this giveaway because I believe the United States Government needs the natural resources within its lands and waters, for the benefit of all the United States, and not only of the coastal States. I believe our Government needs these natural resources, especially now in preparation for the defense of all the United States and not only of the coastal States.

However, I fear that most of my colleagues do not share this belief and so will vote for this giveaway. The Senate joint resolution, provided it is held constitutional by the courts, will effect this giveaway by giving coastal States certain lands and natural resources, and the other States will get nothing.

The objection to this discrimination and special privilege will be to a considerable extent overcome if a gift of corresponding value be made to the other States, so that they all will share alike.

This cannot be done by giving all the States rights to lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries, because there may be no such navigable waters there. It might be done, and possibly will be done later, if the giveaway policy continues by giving some of the States rights to oil, gas or other minerals beneath their lands. However, all of the States do not have such natural resources, and those that do, have them in differing amounts and kinds. So the only fair and just provision is to give the States not sharing in this giveaway a proportional amount of money corresponding as nearly as may be with that which they would respectively benefit by if this giveaway were not made.

It would not be feasible to fix such an amount now, since the value of the submerged lands has not been ascertained. On the other hand, the value of the natural resources actually obtained from time to time can be ascertained. So this value is taken as the basis for payment to all the States proportionately, the amount already received by each coastal State being taken into account. These sums are authorized to be paid at regular intervals as the resources are developed.

If national resources are to be disposed of, it is desirable that the States receiving them, or their equivalent, use such proceeds for a national purpose. Education is regarded as such a purpose, since all of us are citizens of one Nation and are free to come and go anywhere in it. So I have added the provisions that such proceeds shall be used by each State for education. The percentage each State has in the development of these resources is based on its percentage of enrolled schoolchildren aged 5 to 17.

I trust that in the interest of fairness and justice between the States the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. By what method is the percentage which each State is to receive determined?

Mr. GREEN. It is ascertained by finding the total number of schoolchildren within the State between the ages of 5 and 17. The percentage of each State is shown in the table annexed to the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have given considerable study to the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I

think I understand its meaning. I hope the Senator will follow me closely to see whether I am in error. As I understand the situation, the distinguished Senator would require, not that any funds shall be paid over by the coastal States, but that a report shall be made periodically, and that, computing from that report, the Secretary of the Treasury is required to pay certain amounts, out of an amount equal to the total reported, to the several States, which in effect would double the amount of the giveaway.

It seems to me very clear that the Senator has taken very kindly to the idea of the giveaway about which Senators have been talking so long, because he now really proposes to give something away. He proposes to augment the receipts and set up another fund equal to that and require that the funds be distributed among the States which do not participate in the products of the submerged lands.

I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island if I am mistaken in my interpretation of his amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the Senator has asked a question, so I suppose he is willing to yield to me.

The Senator from Florida is exactly right, as he usually is. I am opposed to giveaways of this kind, but I am more opposed to giving away to the coastal States than I am to giving to all the States. I propose giving to all the other States.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought I understood the Senator's suggestion, and now I am sure of it. He says he wants the Nation to grant an additional sum of money equal to that which may be produced by the submerged lands, to be given away to other States, meaning that he doubles the size of the operation, or whatever name he calls it, but he has not explained how he arrived at his figures.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island will be rejected.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, If the Senator from Florida had been paying attention to me when I had the floor, he would have found that I did explain, in answer to a question by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], how the sums were arrived at.

Mr. HOLLAND. I did pay attention to the Senator's statement.

Mr. GREEN. If the Senator paid attention, I do not think he shows much comprehension of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I regret that my intelligence is so limited, but I am satisfied with the one admission which was made by my distinguished friend, to the effect that he proposes an additional grant, equal to the total revenues from the submerged lands, to be given by the United States to other States in accordance with the rather arbitrary figures which he states in his amendment.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator's amendment will be rejected.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, my heart is large. I love not only 3 or 4 States; I love 48 States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, as modified.

The amendment as modified was rejected.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks my reasons for supporting Senate Joint Resolution 13.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

I am voting for Senate Joint Resolution 13 because I believe it to be in the public interest.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to settle once and for all the long-standing controversy between the seaboard States and the Federal Government as to who owns offshore underwater lands within State boundaries. It is the responsibility of Congress to legislate who has the right to control the extraction of the minerals and other things of value which lie in these submerged lands.

From the earliest days of our Republic it was considered the settled law of the land that the various States had title to the land under the navigable waters within their territorial limits. In the case of most of the coastal States, the territorial limits of the States were generally conceded to extend seaward from the low-water mark to the 3-mile limit. In the case of Texas and the gulf coast of Florida, the traditional boundary extended 10½ miles seaward. In the 1930's, as a consequence of agitation generated by the New Deal, disputes were raised between the States and the Federal Government, with the Federal Government asserting a proprietary right and interest in the submerged lands. These disputes eventually reached the courts and in 1947 the Supreme Court handed down a ruling in the so-called California case which had the effect of reversing what had heretofore been considered the law of the land. The Supreme Court upheld the contention of Federal paramount rights which had been raised by the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations. The Congress on several occasions has enacted legislation to define and restate the law. This legislation was fought and opposed at every turn by the New Deal and the Fair Deal. In 1946, and again in 1952, a Fair Deal President vetoed bills which had been passed by Congress confirming the States claims to their submerged coastal lands.

From the very beginning I have felt that lands beneath navigable water within State boundaries, whether they are beneath inland lakes and rivers or beneath the ocean, rightfully belong to the States. The States, not the Federal Government, should have the power to control the development of such lands. On every occasion when this matter has come before me in my capacity as a United States Senator I have endeavored to vote in a manner which would fulfill this basic belief.

In 1952 the issue finally was taken directly to the people and was put to popular vote. The Republican Party, through its 1952 platform and through the statements of its candidates, took the position in favor of confirming in the coastal States their title to the undersea lands lying within their historic boundaries. The Democratic Party, through its platform and through the statements of its candidates, pledged itself to sustain the New Deal-Fair Deal action which had culminated in the assertion of Federal ownership.

Senate Joint Resolution 13 and H. R. 4198, which has already passed the House, fulfill one of the 1952 campaign pledges of the Republican Party. They confirm and return to the States concerned the rights of title to the submerged lands which was theirs in fact prior to the ruling of the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *California*. This ruling which was handed down on June 23, 1947, held that the lands which comprise the bed of the marginal sea off the coast of California were subject to the paramount rights of the Federal Government and not the State of California as had theretofore been the law.

Senate Joint Resolution 13 and H. R. 4198 also clarify and make it plain once and for all that the Government of the United States has primary right in the submerged lands extending from the historic boundaries of the States seaward to the edge of the Continental Shelf. Thus the Congress, by clear-cut legislative action, will put to rest the vexing dispute which was deliberately generated by those who sought to take from the States the lands which had uniformly been considered to be the property of the States before the advent of the New Deal.

The Holland substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 20 of the 82d Congress was similar in intent and purpose to the Holland bill, Senate Joint Resolution 13 of the 83d Congress. I favored and would have voted for the Holland substitute, but it was evident and in fact had been announced that the President would veto the bill if it were passed by the Congress. As a consequence of this practical political situation and because of the urgent need for development of the oil resources in the submerged lands, I believed it to be in the public interest to vote for the so-called interim bill. Acceptance of the interim bill idea had the purpose of postponing the final decision as to ownership and title of the submerged lands. It sought to clear the way, however, for production of oil in this area until such time as the political stalemate, which was blocking enactment of quitclaim legislation, could be resolved.

In the 82d Congress those who opposed confirming title to the coastal States of the lands within their historic borders sought to further complicate the question by injecting Federal aid to education. This action took the form of the Hill amendment which proposed to earmark a percentage of the Federal Government's tidelands oil receipts for Federal aid to education in the various States. This legislative maneuver was designed to bring those who favored Federal aid to education on the side of those who opposed returning offshore lands to the States.

On two separate occasions I voted for Federal aid to education when that question was before Congress on its own merit. My vote against the Hill amendment to the tidelands oil bill in the 82d Congress was not a vote against Federal aid to education. At the time I cast that vote, I made the following statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 3, at page 3355:

"I voted against the Hill amendment because I believed it to be contrary to sound financial policy to earmark Federal income for special purposes or groups. I have heretofore voted for Federal aid to education each time it has been before the Senate.

"The adoption of the Hill amendment would complicate an already complex situation without giving any really dependable help to education. The vote on the motion to table the Hill amendment should demonstrate conclusively that there are not sufficient number of votes in the Senate to override a Presidential veto, which is sure to come in the event of the enactment of the Holland substitute.

"That being the case, it seems to me that the only practical thing to do to get oil developed in the tidelands area is to vote for the so-called interim bill.

"In view of the critical world situation, it seems to me that everything that can possibly be done to increase our oil supply

should be done. The interim bill would permit full development of those resources and leave to the future the settlement of the problem of final ownership of tidelands oil."

The opponents of this legislation have used every device from propaganda through filibuster in their fight to block its passage. They have labeled it a "giveaway" and a "raid on the Nation's public-land wealth." They have sought to scare the public by spreading the fear that passage of this bill will be followed by a general giveaway of the timber, mineral, water and waterpower, and the grazing rights in Federal lands in the interior of the United States. The President, who twice vetoed the so-called quitclaim bill, went so far as to call this proposed legislation robbery in broad daylight.

As a matter of actual fact Senate Joint Resolution 13 is a forthright and specific piece of legislation designed to effect a fair and honest settlement of a dispute over offshore gas and oil deposits. It does not deal with national forests or grazing rights or mineral rights in the inland States.

The Federal Government, on behalf of all of the States, continues to be the owner and controller of all the resources in the Continental Shelf seaward of the historic boundaries of the coastal States as defined in the bill. Senate Joint Resolution 13 does not rob anyone of anything. It does not plunder the public domain nor does it give anything away. It simply concedes that the coastal States have in law title to that which they had in fact prior to 1947.

The State of Utah is a public-land State. It was created out of the public domain of the United States, and to this day 71 percent, or approximately 40 million acres of the land area of Utah, is still under Federal ownership and control. Included in this vast area of Federal land within the State of Utah is: 7,870,185 acres of national forests, 286,447 acres of national parks and monuments, 39,019 acres of Federal Soil Conservation Service land-utilization projects, 24,476,743 acres of Bureau of Land Management Federal grazing land, 2,533,527 acres of Indian lands, 74,381 acres of Federal wildlife reserves, 455,540 acres of reclamation land withdrawals, 2,082,307 acres of Army and Air Force military withdrawals, 92,314 acres of naval reserve, and 8,262 acres of land for other miscellaneous Federal uses. These lands are held by the United States in trust to a large extent for the people of the State of Utah. Other public-land States are in a comparable situation.

Senate Joint Resolution 13 in no way concerns itself with these lands. It does not divest the Federal Government of a single acre of this vast area, nor does it give away any of the Federal Government's income derived from the use and development of this land.

The State of Utah has an estimated inland water area of 1,644,800 acres. That means that within the historic and commonly accepted boundaries of the State of Utah there are no less than 1,644,800 acres of submerged land. That vast area lies under Utah's lakes, ponds, reservoirs of 40 or more acres in area, and streams and canals one-eighth of a statute mile or more in width. Senate Joint Resolution 13 confirms Utah's ownership of this large acreage underlying the navigable lakes and streams located within its borders.

The oil and gas and various other minerals which lie in the offshore submerged lands are not worth a single dollar to anyone until they are extracted and put to use. They will produce no income for the Federal Government nor for any State or local government until they are extracted and marketed. Those who want to produce and market these resources are prepared to do so in a private capacity with private risk. They are prepared to pay for that privilege and they have little concern whether they shall make such payment to the Federal Government or to a State government. All they ask is that the question of ownership be settled so that they will know whom to deal with and to whom to make payment.

In conclusion, let me refer to the argument that these submerged lands belong to all the people of the United States and make this comment: These lands should belong to the peoples of the States where the divine providence placed them. The older States have had full use of their resources over the years. It is just and equitable that the younger States should have the same use of whatever resources God gave them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the only 1 of my 3 brief amendments that I intend to call up is that designated "5/1/53–D." It is a clarifying and perfecting amendment.

I wish to address a question to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], because, as I understood the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], they were going to consider the amendment overnight and then advise me, when I brought it up, whether they had any objections to it. It seeks to carry out what the proponents have stated, that they have no intention of modifying or repealing existing law pertaining to commerce and navigation, rivers and harbors, reclamation and irrigation, national defense, and international affairs.

It only adds to the list of statutes by specification now in the joint resolution the law of 1899 and the law of 1920 and makes clear that no statute pertaining to the subjects enumerated is in any way repealed, amended, or modified by this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend section 7 so as to read as follows:

SEC. 7. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to amend, modify, or repeal existing law pertaining to commerce and navigation, rivers and harbors, reclamation and irrigation, national defense and international affairs, including but not limited to the acts of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 251), July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 217), March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), March 3, 1899, chapter 425, section 10 (30 Stat. 1151), June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, chapter 285, section 39 (41 Stat. 1077), as amended, and December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Texas if they have decided that they have no objections to my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I regret to advise the Senator from Oregon that we do very strongly object to the amendment. If the Senator from Oregon has completed his argument, I will yield for discussion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I make only one additional point. I think my amendment makes very clear the intent of the proponents. We have been trying to find out whether there is any intention of modifying existing law in regard to commerce and navigation, rivers and harbors, reclamation and irrigation, national defense and international affairs. I think, from the standpoint of the legislative history of the pending joint resolution, it is very important that the Senate take a definite stand.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, while on its face this proposed amendment would appear to be only further explanatory of Senate Joint Resolution 13, I have three specific objections to the proposal from the point of view of those who have had the obligation of investigating and considering the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 13 and presenting it to the Senate.

I am making this statement in my capacity as acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the committee that had responsibility for Senate Joint Resolution 13, and I am making it because I deem it proper that the RECORD should indicate the reason why there occurs in the measure the section which my colleague seeks to amend, namely, section 7.

SPECIFIC RESERVATIONS NOT NEEDED

Mr. President, first, let me say that under the philosophy of the pending measure there is no need to specify any particular statute as being unaffected by the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 13. The joint resolution itself changes the status of property, nothing more. It expressly reserves from its effects all the constitutional powers of the Government under the commerce clause, under the obligations for national defense, and under paramount rights to conduct international affairs. They are all expressly reserved, except from the application of Senate Joint Resolution 13. Consequently, there is no need expressly to exempt any statute. So, Mr. President, the question would naturally arise, why is section 7 in the joint resolution? That section, as it appears in the joint resolution, is as follows:

SEC. 7. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to amend, modify, or repeal the acts of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 251), July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 217), March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

It is because those acts are expressly mentioned in this section that I am making this explanation. The acts in question have to do entirely with uses of water in the United States under acts and authority not included within the commerce cause. The only act which could possibly be construed to be within the commerce clause is the act of December 22, 1944. That was a rivers and harbors and a flood-control act. If one will take the time to read it, it will be found that there is expressed in it certain restrictions placed by Congress upon the Corps of Engineers in the field of flood control and rivers and harbors in the portion of the United States west of the 97th meridian.

WATER RIGHTS OF STATES PROTECTED

Certain requirements are there as conditions precedent to improvements of the waterways in anywise, and creating obstructions within flowing streams. That protection is there in order to protect the vital water rights of the Western States. It is because of those provisions,

and those only, that the act of 1944 is included as one of those specifically mentioned as being unaffected by Senate Joint Resolution 13.

The remaining acts have to do with reclamation and with mining on the public domain. They could actually have been eliminated without any danger whatsoever; but out of an abundance of caution, and at the request of attorneys general from the Western land States and of the National Reclamation Association, they were originally included in the measure because they happened to refer to the uses of water in an area where water is vital to the economy and life of the people. Otherwise, there is no reference to any statute that would come within the purview of the commerce clause, of national defense, or of international affairs. The reason for that is that there is already in the joint resolution an express reservation with reference to those matters.

One thing more. The Senator has offered certain language, in addition to a reference to the 2 sections in 2 other acts. One of those sections is section 10 in the act of 1899. That is one section out of more than 900 sections that appear in the "Navigation and Navigable Waters" title of the United States Code. That is title 33, and the Senator's amendment singles out only 1 section of the 900 or more sections in the navigation law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the senior Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CORDON. I do not desire further to transgress. We have had some experiences along that line, and I do not wish to continue them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my senior colleague has helped clarify the legislative history of section 7, which is all to the good. Most of his remarks have been directed to constitutional powers rather than to legislative powers. I think he has made the situation very clear with regard to constitutional powers, but there is still on the books the whole body of legislation providing for exercising those powers, about which there can be a great deal of litigation and many disputes.

The amendment preserving that body of statutes and the specific addition of the two statutes already mentioned would be of great aid in setting forth the legislative history, so far as existing legislation is concerned.

In my judgment, we have in the statement of my senior colleague a clearer legislative history than we had before he spoke, but I am still going to offer my amendment, because I think it would clarify the legislative history that much more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I offered and in behalf of which I briefly addressed the Senate earlier today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

That (a) the provisions of this section shall apply to all mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof (including any extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to such lease or under the laws of such State): *Provided*—

(1) That such lease, or a true copy thereof, shall have been filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this joint resolution, or within such further period or periods as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary;

(2) That such lease was issued (i) prior to December 21, 1948, and was on June 5, 1950, in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it, or (ii) with the approval of the Secretary and was on the effective date of this joint resolution in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it;

(3) That within the time specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection there shall have been filed with the Secretary (i) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction and stating that the lease was in force and effect as required by the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection or (ii) in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents, and the Secretary shall determine whether such lease was so in force and effect;

(4) That except as otherwise provided in section 3 hereof, all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this joint resolution, which have not been paid in accordance with the provisions thereof, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease after the effective date of this joint resolution shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided;

(5) That the holder of such lease certifies that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this joint resolution;

(6) That such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

(7) That such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

(8) That such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the lease: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

(9) That such lease will terminate within a period of not more than 5 years from the effective date of this joint resolution in the absence of production or operations for drilling: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the reduction of such period, so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

(10) That the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may deem to be reasonable and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(b) Any person holding a mineral lease which comes within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, as determined by the Secretary, may continue to maintain such lease, and may conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions for the full term thereof and of any extension, renewal or replacement authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the law of the State issuing such lease: *Provided, however,* That if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on or before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease. A negative determination under this subsection may be made by the Secretary only after giving to the holder of the lease notice and an opportunity to be heard.

(c) With respect to any mineral lease that is within the scope of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall exercise such powers of supervision and control as may be vested in the lessor by law or the terms and provisions of the lease.

(d) The permission granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to be a waiver of such claims, if any, as the United States may have against the lessor or the lessee or any other person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any lessor or lessee of a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, its political subdivision or grantee, on tidelands or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of such State, to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in such lands or in the mineral deposits within them. The authority granted in this section shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (a) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (b) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (c) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (d) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

SEC. 3. In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, the Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 1 of this joint resolution, and with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States, to negotiate and enter into agreements with the State, its political subdivision or grantee or a lessee thereof, respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or with the State, its political subdivision or grantee, respecting the issuance or nonissuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy: *Provided, however,* That the authorization contained in this section shall not be construed to be a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this joint resolution. Payments made pursuant to such agreement, or pursuant to any stipulation between the United

States and a State, shall be considered as compliance with section 1 (a) (4) hereof. Upon the termination of such agreement or stipulation by reason of the final settlement or adjudication of such controversy, if the lands subject to any mineral lease are determined to be in whole or in part submerged land of the Continental Shelf, the lessee, if he has not already done so, shall comply with the requirements of section 1 (a), and thereupon the provisions of section 1 (b) shall govern such lease. The following stipulations and authorizations are hereby approved and confirmed: (i) The stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to certain bays and harbors in the State of California; (ii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to the continuance of oil and gas operations in the submerged lands within the boundaries of the State of California and herein referred to as the operating stipulation; (iii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated July 28, 1948, extending the term of said operating stipulation; (iv) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated August 2, 1949, further extending the term of said operating stipulation; (v) the stipulation entered into the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated August 21, 1950, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vi) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated September 4, 1951, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vii) the notice concerning "Oil and Gas Operations in the Submerged Coastal Lands of the Gulf of Mexico" issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 11, 1950 (15 F. R. 8835), as amended by the notice dated January 26, 1951 (16 F. R. 953), and as supplemented by the notices dated February 2, 1951 (16 F. R. 1203), March 5, 1951 (16 F. R. 2195), April 23, 1951 (16 F. R. 3623), June 25, 1951 (16 F. R. 6404), August 22, 1951 (16 F. R. 8720), October 24, 1951 (16 F. R. 10998), and December 21, 1951 (17 F. R. 43), respectively.

SEC. 4. (a) In order to meet the urgent need during the present emergency for further exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized, pending the enactment of further legislation on the subject, to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of section 1 of this joint resolution.

(b) A lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover an area of such size and dimensions as the Secretary may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon, shall require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent, and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided.

(d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this section 4 of this joint resolution, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any submerged lands pursuant to section 2 of this joint resolution, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is submerged land beneath navigable inland waters.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the money received under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be used, in accordance with such provisions of law as may be later enacted by the Congress, for the following purposes:

(1) Ten percent to reduce the national debt;

(2) Ten percent for education;

(3) Ten percent for research in the prevention and extermination of cancer;

(4) Ten percent for research in the prevention and extermination of heart disease;

(5) Ten percent for research in the prevention and extermination of muscular dystrophy;

(6) Ten percent for research in the prevention and extermination of multiple sclerosis;

(7) Ten percent for research in the prevention and extermination of infantile paralysis;

(8) Ten percent for aid to the blind;

(9) Ten percent for aid to disabled veterans; and

(10) Ten percent to the American National Red Cross to be used for the alleviation of human suffering.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to moneys received and held pursuant to any stipulation or agreement referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy.

(c) If and whenever the United States shall take and receive in kind all or any part of the royalty under a lease maintained or issued under the provisions of this joint resolution and covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, the value of such royalty so taken in kind shall, for the purpose of subsection (a) (1) of this section, be deemed to be the prevailing market price thereof at the time and place of production, and there shall be paid to the State entitled thereto 37½ per cent of the value of such royalty.

SEC. 6. (a) The President may, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security.

(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands covered by this joint resolution.

(c) All leases issued under this joint resolution, and leases, the maintenance and operation of which are authorized under this joint resolution, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary, upon a recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of this joint resolution, to suspend operations under, or to terminate any lease; and all such leases shall contain or be construed to contain provisions for the payment of just compensation to the lessee whose operations are thus suspended or whose lease is thus terminated.

SEC. 7. Nothing herein contained shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person on lands subject to this joint resolution and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this joint resolution or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights of such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything herein contained.

SEC. 8. The United States consents that the respective States may regulate, manage, and administer the taking, conservation, and development of all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life within the area of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, in accordance with applicable State law.

SEC. 9. The United States hereby asserts that it has no right, title, or interest in or to the lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States, but that all such right, title, and interest are vested in the several States or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the laws of such States, or the respective lawful grantees, lessees, or possessors in interest thereof under State authority.

SEC. 10. Section 9 of this joint resolution shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (1) which have been lawfully accrued by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (2) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (3) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (4) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians. This joint resolution shall not apply to water power, or to the use of water for the production of power, or to any right to develop water power which has been or may be expressly reserved by the United States for its own benefit or for the benefit of its licensees or permittees under any law of the United States.

SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this joint resolution by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this joint resolution.

(b) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder to the surface of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands as a result of authorized action taken by any such State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder for recreation or other public purpose is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

SEC. 12. Nothing in section 11 of this joint resolution shall be construed as confirming or recognizing any right with respect to oil,

gas, or other minerals in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf; or as confirming or recognizing any interest in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf other than that essential to the right to construct, maintain, use, and occupy the structures enumerated in that section, or to the use and occupancy of the surface of filled-in or reclaimed land.

SEC. 13. The structures enumerated in section 11, above, shall not be construed as including derricks, wells, or other installations in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf employed in the exploration, development, extraction, and production of oil and gas or other minerals, or as including necessary structures for the development of waterpower.

SEC. 14. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to repeal, limit, or affect in any way any provision of law relating to the national defense, the control of navigation, or the improvement, protection and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States; or to repeal, limit, or affect any provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted pursuant to the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

SEC. 15. Any person seeking the authorization of the United States to use or occupy any submerged lands of the Continental Shelf for the construction of, or additions to, installations of the type enumerated in section 11 of this joint resolution, shall apply therefor to the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, who shall have authority to issue such authorization, upon such terms and conditions as in his discretion may seem appropriate.

SEC. 16. Within 2 years of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the use and occupancy of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf for installations of the type enumerated in section 11 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 17. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this joint resolution.

SEC. 18. When used in this joint resolution, (a) the term "tidelands" means lands situated between the lines of mean high tide and mean low tide; (b) the term navigable means navigable at the time of the admission of a State into the Union under the laws of the United States; (c) the term "inland waters" includes the waters of lakes (including Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario to the extent that they are within the boundaries of a State of the United States), bays, rivers, ports, and harbors which are landward of the ocean; and lands beneath navigable inland waters include filled-in or reclaimed lands which formerly were within that category; (d) the term "submerged lands of the Continental Shelf" means the lands (including the oil, gas, and other minerals therein) underlying the open ocean, situated seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside the inland waters, and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf; (e) the term "seaward boundary of a State" means a line three nautical miles seaward from the points on the coast of a State at which the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf begin; (f) the term "mineral lease" means any form of authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; and (g) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide for the development of the oil and gas reserves of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, to protect certain equities therein, to confirm the titles of the several States to lands underlying inland navigable waters within State boundaries, and for other purposes."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, instead of abusing the patience of the Senate by prolonging the debate on the pending amendment, I simply state its purpose in order that all concerned may thoroughly understand the important matter on which they are about to vote.

The amendment provides that the income derived from the oil, gas, and other valuable resources under the submerged lands lying off the coasts of California, Louisiana, and Texas be used for the following purposes: 10 percent to reduce the national debt, 10 percent for education, 10 percent for research in the prevention and extermination of cancer; 10 percent for research in the prevention and extermination of heart disease; 10 percent for research in the prevention and extermination of muscular dystrophy; 10 percent for research in the prevention and extermination of multiple sclerosis; 10 percent for research in the prevention and extermination of infantile paralysis; 10 percent for aid to the blind; 10 percent for aid to disabled veterans; and 10 percent to the American National Red Cross, to be used for the alleviation of human suffering.

In the economy of time, I simply urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to respond to the admonition of the prophet:

> Choose you this day whom ye will serve.

Will you serve God, or Baal? If you are going to serve humanity, and thereby serve humanity's God, vote for this amendment. If you are going to serve Baal, vote against it.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not think it will be necessary to reply at great length. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator to correct me if I have misunderstood his amendment, because it has come in only since the beginning of the session today.

As I understand, it is supposedly the same as the Lehman amendment, which was rejected earlier, with the single exception that this amendment proposes that 100 percent of the revenue shall go to the Federal Government and shall be divided among the 10 fine objectives, with 10 percent being devoted to each objective, rather than to go to schools exclusively, as provided by the distinguished Senator from New York in his amendment. If that be not a correct understanding, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from Florida is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Without further laboring the matter, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this amendment would propose to use 100 percent of the revenue from the whole belt for the 10 fine objectives stated in the amendment of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, all to be operated as a Federal proposition. The States would have no part in the income, because the States would be entirely excluded.

This is another proposal for federalization, nationalization, and paternalism, and I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment. On this amendment the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—27

Chavez	Hunt	Mansfield
Douglas	Jackson	Monroney
Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Gore	Kefauver	Murray
Green	Kennedy	Neely
Hayden	Kilgore	Pastore
Hennings	Langer	Sparkman
Hill	Lehman	Symington
Humphrey	Magnuson	Tobey

NAYS—64

Aiken	Frear	Mundt
Anderson	George	Payne
Barrett	Gillette	Potter
Beall	Goldwater	Purtell
Bennett	Griswold	Robertson
Bricker	Hendrickson	Russell
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Hoey	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Holland	Smathers
Byrd	Ives	Smith, Maine
Case	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. C.
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Cordon	Knowland	Taft
Daniel	Kuchel	Thye
Dirksen	Long	Watkins
Duff	Martin	Welker
Dworshak	Maybank	Wiley
Eastland	McCarran	Williams
Ellender	McCarthy	Young
Ferguson	McClellan	
Flanders	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—5

Butler, Nebr.	Carlson	Malone
Capehart	Kerr	

So Mr. NEELY's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "4–15–53–A." I offer the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment read at this time?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I can save time by making a brief statement and dispensing with the reading of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. ANDERSON's amendment is as follows:

On page 19, line 14, insert "titles I and II of" after "Nothing in."

At the end of such joint resolution insert the following new title:

"TITLE III

"REVENUES FROM PUBLIC LANDS

"SEC. 12. Notwithstanding any provisions of law other than those contained in this joint resolution—

"(a) 90 percent of all revenues received after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution from any public land of the United States, including revenues from the sale, lease, or use of such lands or the products thereof, bonuses, rentals, royalties, permits, licenses, or any other source, shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year in which received to the State or Territory in which such land is situated to be used by such State or Territory for any purposes it may deem proper; and

"(b) 10 percent of all such revenues shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters; to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries; and for other purposes."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this is an amendment which would provide that, with respect to the public lands, 90 percent of the revenues, instead of going partly to the States and partly to the reclamation fund, should go directly to the States.

This amendment arose partly from discussions which were had in the committee when we were holding hearings on the joint resolution. It grows somewhat out of the discussion which took place when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] was presenting his bill. It also arose partly from questions asked by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

As a matter of fact, at the present time the money going into the reclamation fund comes largely from 4 States, namely, California, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Eighty-five percent of all the money going into this fund comes from those States. I have voted in favor of legislation which would devote all the revenues derived from lands seaward from the coast to the purposes of education. I have voted for legislation which would give three-eighths of the revenues to the States and devote the remainder to education.

If we are to have a policy of permitting certain States to take all the revenue from lands lying offshore, I say that it is manifestly unfair to depend upon the States of California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming to provide the money for the reclamation fund.

Furthermore, there is an application to forest lands in the State of Idaho, represented by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], who discussed the question before the committee. Money coming from the forests goes into the National Treasury. If the forest lands were privately owned they would be subject to taxation.

I do not propose to change in the slightest the pattern of ownership. I am not trying to start a raid on the Federal Treasury. I do not believe that the four States to which I have referred should be depended upon to provide money for the Bureau of Reclamation. I do not believe that the money to provide for the activities under the reclamation fund should come solely from Wyoming, Colorado, California, and New Mexico. It so happens that they are States which own oil. God planted oil beneath the lands of those States, just as he planted it offshore. If we are going to give these resources to States which have rights to oil offshore, then I think the inland States should have the right to have the revenue from their oil areas placed not in the treasury of the reclamation fund, but in their own treasuries.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I think this is an excellent amendment. It attempts to accomplish an objective which we of the Western States have been trying to achieve since 1916, when I first went to Wyoming. At that time one of the Senators from Utah introduced a bill providing for approximately the same things the Senator from New Mexico is now seeking to accomplish.

There is behind this amendment a fundamental principle to which I think it is time the United States as a whole should begin to give serious consideration.

Speaking of my own State, Wyoming has been a State for 63 years. As yet we have not been given those things which our act of admission said we were entitled to, on an equality with all other States of the Union. As I look through the record I find that the States of Ohio, Louisiana, Florida, Illinois, Utah, Minnesota, and many other States, with the exception of the 11 Western public-land States, obtained all their mineral rights within a few years after their admission. It is about time, I think, that the rest of the United States should give to us of the public-land States the same fair treatment which has been given down through the years to all the other States in the Union.

Mr. President, we in the 11 public-land States are becoming a little weary of being treated as though we were colonies of the United States. We are long overdue in having given to us those things which are ours. As our natural resources are depleted they are depleted forever and a day. There is no way of ever replacing or giving back to the 11 public-land States their natural resources which are now being depleted, and the revenue which they provide being turned into the Public Treasury. At some future date perhaps the lands may be turned back to the States, but then it will be too late. That will be after the natural resources will be gone forever, so far as my State is concerned.

I should like to say to you, Mr. President, and to the Members of the Senate, that this amendment is not a giveaway with respect to the public-land States, but is rather a takeaway. To my way of thinking it is a partial reparation for the action of the rest of the United States in sticking its hand into the pockets of the 11 Western States and taking from them coin of the realm in the form of assets of theirs which can never be replaced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the senior Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield the remaining time to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, when Congress enacted the reclamation law more than a half century ago it provided that the income from the public domain of the West should be set aside for reclamation projects.

When the Oil and Gas Leasing Act was enacted 33 years ago it provided that the Western States should get 37½ percent of the income from the proceeds from the natural resources derived from the public lands within their borders and that the reclamation fund should get 52½ percent of the income from the public domain of the West.

The theory that impelled the Congress in both cases was simply this and when the coal, the oil and gas and other minerals are extracted of course the resources of the States are being depleted. The Congress recognized that fact and provided that a major part of the income should be used to replace that loss with another resource in the form of reclamation projects. The principle behind that theory is sound. The principle is that in the main the income from the soil of these Western States belongs to the people of those States. The income to the Federal treasury from the public lands in Wyoming during the past 50 years totals $146 million. That portion of the income set over to the reclamation fund from public lands in Wyoming and the amount repaid by the settlers on reclamation projects in our State have repaid the entire investment in water projects in Wyoming. That being the case, Mr. President, it is only fair and just that the income from the public lands of the State should now be used for the exclusive benefit of the people of Wyoming.

That is the only way in which the Western States can take their rightful place among the Union of States. We need those funds for our schools and for our university.

I submit that the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico is fair and reasonable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I regret greatly to have to oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It is even more far reaching in its effect than was the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], which the Senate rejected earlier today.

The pending amendment applies not only to the mineral and oil recovered from the public lands, but also applies—and I call the attention of Senators to lines 4 and 5 on page 2 of the amendment—to "revenues from the sale, lease, or use of such lands or the product thereof, bonuses, rentals, royalties, permits, licenses, or any other source."

In effect, it provides that all the revenues from either sale or operation, with respect to all of the public lands of the Nation—whether they be mineral lands, oil lands, forest lands, grazing lands, or regardless of what type of lands they may be—shall be disposed of under the terms of the amendment, which would be 90 percent to the State in which the land from which the revenues would come is situated, and 10 percent to be retained by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, the amendment is so far reaching in its effect that I am sure the Senate will not want to take a step of such magnitude without benefit of hearings and without understanding exactly what its effect is and what is involved. Certainly we know that many hundreds of billions of dollars of actual value are involved. As to the exact amount, I can only guess or estimate. Certainly it is close to $100 billion.

I feel sure that the amendment is even more objectionable, projected, as it is, upon the Senate without study and without report and without the facts being available, than the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], which amendment was rejected by the Senate.

I yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it is with great reluctance that I shall vote against the amendment, and I assign as my reason for voting against it the statement which I made yesterday on the Malone amendment:

> Mr. President, I shall vote against the Malone amendment, because I think it a mistake to raise and submit to decision the matters involved in that amendment, while deciding the matters involved in the Holland joint resolution. The questions involved in the Holland resolution will turn, in my mind, on claims of right. The matters covered by the Malone amendment will turn on questions of policy. The decision on one does not compel the same decision on the other. I fear that premature consideration of the matters covered by the Malone amendment will prejudice their consideration when they are brought before the Senate on their own separate merits.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate greatly the comment of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. His position has been the same as mine. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

I yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I desire to adopt as my own the reasoning just stated so clearly by the Senator from Colorado, and I shall follow him in voting against the proposed amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate reject the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 4/28/53–D, as modified. It is in mimeographed form and is now at the desk. I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 12, after "subject to the", insert "reservation to the United States of the oil, gas, and other mineral rights in such lands seaward from the line of ordinary low water and outside of inland waters and the other."

On page 13, beginning with line 18, strike out all through line 6 on page 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (b) The United States hereby releases and relinquishes unto said States and persons aforesaid all right, title, and interest (except the oil, gas, and other mineral rights in such lands seaward from the line of ordinary low water and outside of inland waters and any other rights reserved herein) of the United States in and to all such lands, improvements, and natural resources.

On page 16, lines 7 and 16, strike out "(d)" and "(e)", respectively, and insert in lieu thereof "(e)" and "(d)", respectively.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to certain natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this amendment reserves to the Federal Government the oil, gas, and mineral rights now owned by the Federal Government under the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark, but does not otherwise interfere with the transfer of ownership to the States or with their rights to the fish, oysters, kelp, shrimp, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, and other marine animal and plant life.

The very able Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], in his main speech, said that oil and gas really were not greatly involved in his measure, and that the other rights and values infinitely outweighed the oil and gas.

At page 2879 of the RECORD for April 9 he said that the vast majority of the values involved in this measure had to do with values other than oil. If this oil is such a minor matter and the measure is not primarily concerned with it, why not let the Federal Government have it?

In fact, the argument has been made that the amount of oil involved is very slight indeed, and that only a little oil is being given away by the resolution under consideration. Furthermore, it has been argued that the revenue involved amounts to only 41 cents per student per year. If these resources are as inconsequential as asserted, why not let the Nation keep that part of what now belongs to the Nation?

I would call my amendment the "turpentine and gasoline amendment," because I have noticed that the sponsors of the Holland measure are like Lady Macbeth. They rub their hands together and try to get the oil spots off their hands, while denying that there is any oil on their hands at all.

This amendment is a marvelous cleanser. It will leave the oil and the gas in the hands of the Federal Government and enable the hands of the coastal States to be cleaned with a good dose of turpentine, and at the same time it will permit the States to have their long-sought legal titles and the fish, oysters, and other forms of marine life. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Illinois has not drawn with complete accuracy upon his memory with reference to the statements made by me during the debate. I have said, and I now repeat, that the question of oil and gas is secondary in value and secondary in importance as compared with the value of the developments already existing, and the need for a continuation of those developments, along the shoreline of the 5,000 miles of coasts of our Nation.

There are a few places where oil and gas have been found, and, of course, in those places the question presented by the oil and gas is a substantial one; I have never denied that. I placed in the RECORD yesterday—I tried to do so in a way the Senate could understand—a statement, which I believe to be correct, to the effect that about $575 million of royalties throughout the life of production will be taken from the oil and gas to be found within the submerged shelf from mean low water up to the State boundaries. That compares with billions of dollars of values already existing in such places as Boston, the shores of Staten Island, the shores of Long Island, almost the entire coast of New Jersey, the Virginia coast, the Florida coast, and places on the Gulf of Mexico; and, of course, along the coast of California there are other great and additional values.

The real sum and substance of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is that by means of it he wishes to give to the Great Lakes States and to the Atlantic Coast States and to all the Pacific Coast States except California, and to the Gulf of Mexico States which do not have oil in their coastal lands, a complete assurance that all the substantial values which they have—and they are many and very great—can be given to them freely by the Federal Government under the situation we are now considering.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not yield at the moment, Mr. President, if the Senator from New York does not mind.

In other words, the Senator from Illinois finds it possible in this amendment to make a very great departure from what he has been claiming so assiduously throughout the debate, namely, his claim to the effect that there was no right to grant title to anyone in the lands off the shores of the 21 coastal States. To the contrary, however, the Senator from Illinois now proposes that all values in these areas be granted to the States, except he wishes to have the Federal Government hold on to the oil and the gas.

Mr. President, if that be consistency, then I am not able to understand it. If it be fairness to grant to many States every value they could get out of these lands—and that is exactly what would happen under the amendment—but to withhold from some States which are not in a position similar to that of other

States, the only values they could get from these lands—and those values are substantial—then I do not understand what fairness would be.

It happens that Florida has about 1,200 miles of coastline, most of which is susceptible to a high state of development, and much of which has already been developed, as my colleagues know. The values there are very great, and they would be much greater if the development had not been stymied since 1947 by the assertion that the Federal Government owns these areas. Of course, Mr. President, in the case of Florida, there is no known oil or gas in these lands, although we hope some will be found there, although millions of dollars have already been spent in efforts, up to now, to discover oil and gas there.

However, Mr. President, shall we discriminate against such States as Louisiana, which as a matter of fact, will receive precious little as a result of the enactment of this joint resolution because of the 3-mile limitation, because the nature of their coastlines is such and the nature of what is under their submerged lands is such that they must turn to the development of oil and gas if they expect to move ahead and to fulfill their destiny, just as we in Florida wish to fulfill ours, and just as we hope every other State will have a chance to fulfill its destiny?

Mr. President, this amendment is, on its face, discriminatory and inconsistent with the positions repeatedly taken by the opponents of the joint resolution.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is not proposing any grant of lands in the marginal sea to coastal States, as apparently claimed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. But having been defeated in all our efforts to stop the grant or transfer of such lands made by this resolution, I am proposing the next best thing, to save the oil and gas for the Nation.

I myself think these oil and gas resources are much more valuable than the Senator from Florida does. I think the amount on the entire Continental Shelf to from $50 billion to $300 billion. That is what we are in danger of giving to a few coastal States. And most of the other values to which he refers are ones which the States already own under prior court decisions.

The Senator from Florida and the other eminent Senators whose experience in this body is much greater than mine, however, have recently been saying that the value of the oil and gas resources involved in this measure is much smaller than the amounts I have stated. So now I propose that we take them at their own word. In other words, if the amount of the value of the oil and gas involved in this joint resolution is much smaller than the amount of the other values, then why not let the Federal Government have the gas and oil?

I think the motto of my dear friend, the Senator from Florida, seems to be:

> Man wants but little here below,
> But wants that little long and hard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment identified as "4–27–53–E," and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 13, in line 22, it is proposed to insert, before the semicolon after "natural resources", the following: "on the condition, in the case of each such State which is a coastal State, that such State shall execute an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the Federal Government to reimburse such Government for all costs incurred by it after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution (A) in constructing and maintaining lighthouses and Coast Guard stations and in providing Coast Guard services within the boundaries of such State, and (B) in constructing and maintaining improvements in rivers and harbors within the boundaries of such State."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to condition the surrender and transfer of Federal rights in the submerged lands upon the assumption by the coastal States of Coast Guard, lighthouse, river and harbor construction, and maintenance costs within their boundaries. The logic of this amendment is clear.

The sponsors of the Holland joint resolution are claiming the submerged lands for the coastal States as a right. Of course, for every right there should be a corresponding duty. I think they are being given a great privilege; but for every privilege, there should be a corresponding responsibility. There must be reciprocity.

Although these States wish to take from the Federal Government properties which I think are of enormous value, or wish to seize the submerged lands or to have the submerged lands turned over to them, yet apparently the same States are still ready to have the Federal Government bear the costs of the 3-mile zone or the 9-mile zone. If they wish to take that zone for themselves, certainly they should pay for the lighthouses in that zone and for the Coast Guard vessels which protect the shores of the zone and for the harbor improvements.

I have made some rough computations. I think this amendment, if adopted, would mean that the coastal States would pay approximately $200 million a year or, in other words, that $200 million would be removed from the shoulders of the Federal Government, and that the coastal States would thus assume responsibilities, as well as receive privileges—in short, that they would have duties as well as rights.

I mean this very intensely, Mr. President. I shall also offer a little legal advice to the sponsors of the Holland joint resolution: I think their measure may very well be upset in the Supreme Court on the ground that it gives to a few States property which belongs to the people as a whole without having the Federal Government receive any consideration in return and without serving any discoverable public interest. My amendment will permit the Federal Government to receive consideration in return. It will result in some benefit to the public interest. If I were anxious to defend the constitutionality of the pending joint resolution—which I am not—I would urge its sponsors to agree to have the States which will benefit from it assume this burden of $200 million.

Mr. President, a fundamental issue is involved here. There are all too many people who do not like the Federal Government when the Federal Government has something they want; but who like the Federal Government when it makes expenditures for their benefit. The Federal Government is alternately a milk cow, when we wish to have it make expenditures for our benefit, and a tyrant, when we wish to take rights away from it.

Mr. President, we should be consistent. If we wish to go in for a thorough program of States rights and if we wish to tear the Nation apart, the separate States should agree to accept the responsibilities as well as the privileges. Those of us who come from the States of the Union which pay the majority of the taxes are going to insist, if we see the common property ravaged, that the States which take the property shall assume the duties that go with that property. The sons who seize all of their father's property should at least be willing to bear some of the taxes.

Mr. President, in order to make this amendment more palatable, I am going to modify it so as to have it provide that only half the costs incurred for the Coast Guard, and the harbor improvements, and so forth, be borne by the coastal States. The rest of the States—the interior States, which pay the majority of the taxes of the country—will assume half of those costs; but we ask that these coastal States at least assume half the attendant costs, now that they have their hands in the Federal till for resources that may ultimately aggregate somewhere between $50 billion and $300 billion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this amendment seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana to be in some respects very similar to an amendment which the distinguished Senator from Illinois offered a year ago, to place tolls on all the waterways, except the Great Lakes. It was a proposal to make every State pay tolls so as to pay for its waterway improvements, except the Great Lakes States, as to which the Senator from Illinois was proposing that they should continue to receive their waterway improvements at the expense of the United States. The Senator now says that if the coastal States are to own out to the 3-mile belt, they should pay for all the

navigational improvements in the rivers, and all the lighthouses within the 3-mile belt. Of course, the Great Lakes States, including the great State of Illinois, own the bed of the Great Lakes. It seems to me the Senator from Illinois should be willing also to make the Great Lakes States pay for all their river and harbor improvements, and also for their lighthouses. So I hope the Senator will accept an amendment, to include the States bordering on Lake Michigan, so that those States will also pay for the same services which he thinks the coastal States should pay for, and on the same basis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say to my good friend from Louisiana, the Great Lakes States already own the submerged lands out to the half-way point. That is the result of court decisions. But, today, we are turning over to the three coastal States additional property that may eventually be worth from fifty to three hundred billion dollars. Some return should be made by those coastal States for such an enormous gift.

Mr. LONG. What I had in mind was that while the Great Lakes States own those waters the Federal Government maintains the lighthouses, and improves the harbors as well as the rivers. Inasmuch as the States own the land, and the Federal Government helps maintain all the navigational facilities, I hope the Senator will agree to an amendment to include the States bordering on Lake Michigan.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I offer that as an amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest that the Senator not merely include the States on Lake Michigan, but that he also include all the States on the Great Lakes. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment, after which I hope the Senator from Louisiana will be consistent and will vote for it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, after line 3, to insert "and States bordering on the Great Lakes," after the words "coastal States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois so modify his amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, certainly. And I shall await the vote of the Senator from Louisiana with interest. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as modified.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays, so that we may have a record of the vote.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, as modified.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment, lettered "D," which is on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 22, following the semicolon, it is proposed to strike all down to and including the semicolon on page 14, line 14.

On page 15, line 20, following the semicolon, strike all down to and including the semicolon on page 16, line 6, and insert:

(f) The rights, title, ownership, privileges, and powers conferred by this section are subject to the following conditions, viz:

(1) Of all moneys or other income derived hereafter by the respective States from the operation of this section, 87½ percent of such total of moneys or other income shall be deposited in a special account in the United States Treasury, which shall be used exclusively for the reduction of the public debt, the remainder to be retained by the States for expenses incurred in connection with the administration and operation of this section.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last night I think practically every Senator on the floor heard me explain the amendment. It will be remembered that, during the past 37 years, Federal taxes have increased 5,439 percent. At the present time the wage earner must work from the 1st day of January until the 19th day of May merely to earn his tax money; and the tax of the average farmer, it will be remembered, is $1,800 a year. It will be remembered also that I went very carefully into the matter of old-age pensions and care of the aged. I said then that I was offering an amendment, which is the amendment now before the Senate, to provide that 87½ percent of the oil money would go into the Federal Treasury, to be used in reducing the national debt of $263 billion, and that 12½ percent should go to States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield, though I have but 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I sould like to ask the Senator from North Dakota the same question I asked the Senator from Oklahoma the other day when he offered a similar amendment. What does the Senator propose shall be done with the money after the national debt shall have been paid?

Mr. LANGER. After the national debt is paid, I think we should leave it to the Congress of the United States to take proper care of the situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—34

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Anderson	Hill	Morse
Chavez	Humphrey	Murray
Cooper	Jackson	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Ferguson	Kefauver	Sparkman
Fulbright	Kennedy	Symington
Gillette	Kilgore	Tobey
Gore	Langer	Wiley
Green	Lehman	Young
Griswold	Magnuson	
Hayden	Mansfield	

NAYS—56

Barrett	George	Mundt
Beall	Goldwater	Payne
Bennett	Hendrickson	Potter
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson
Bush	Holland	Russell
Butler, Md.	Ives	Saltonstall
Byrd	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kuchel	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Long	Stennis
Duff	Martin	Taft
Dworshak	Maybank	Thye
Eastland	McCarran	Watkins
Ellender	McCarthy	Welker
Flanders	McClellan	Williams
Frear	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—6

Butler, Nebr.	Carlson	Kerr
Capehart	Hunt	Malone

So Mr. LANGER's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended. On this question the yeas and nays were ordered on April 25.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is this the vote on the final passage of the joint resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. From a substantive standpoint, that is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. After a yea-and-nay vote on the committee amendment, is there any necessity for an additional yea-and-nay vote on the joint resolution? It involves the same question. I would think that whatever the vote shows would determine the disposition of the joint resolution. The third paragraph of the unanimous-consent agreement, I think, covers it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—56

Barrett	Goldwater	Mundt
Beall	Hendrickson	Payne
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Potter
Bricker	Hoey	Purtell
Bridges	Holland	Robertson
Bush	Hunt	Russell
Butler, Md.	Ives	Saltonstall
Byrd	Jenner	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Long	Stennis
Dworshak	Martin	Taft
Eastland	Maybank	Thye
Ellender	McCarran	Watkins
Flanders	McCarthy	Welker
Frear	McClellan	Williams
George	Millikin	

NAYS—35

Aiken	Hayden	Mansfield
Anderson	Hennings	Monroney
Case	Hill	Morse
Chavez	Humphrey	Murray
Cooper	Jackson	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Ferguson	Kefauver	Sparkman
Fulbright	Kennedy	Symington
Gillette	Kilgore	Tobey
Gore	Langer	Wiley
Green	Lehman	Young
Griswold	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—5

Butler, Nebr.	Carlson	Malone
Capehart	Kerr	

So the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed, without debate, to the consideration of H. R. 4198, the corresponding House bill, which will be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of Senate Joint Resolution 13, as amended, with the exception that in lieu of the words "Joint Resolution" wherever they appear therein, the word "Act" shall be substituted.

The engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill is hereby ordered.

The Clerk will read the bill the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the passage of the bill, as amended.

The bill (H. R. 4198) was passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The title will be amended by substituting therefor the language contained in the amendment reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the title to Senate Joint Resolution 13, and the vote on the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13 will be reconsidered, and the joint resolution will be indefinitely postponed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. It is my intention to move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, after individual Senators have had an opportunity to present matters for the RECORD.

Tomorrow there will be a call of the calendar. At the conclusion of the call of the calendar, a supplementary appropriation bill will be taken up. Following that, we shall take up bills which may have been objected to on the calendar, and which appear to have merit and deserve consideration by the Senate. Altogether, that procedure will probably require Wednesday and Thursday. Then probably there will be various miscellaneous matters to occupy the Senate through Friday.

I had announced that we would take up this afternoon the Executive Calendar, three treaties, and nominations of generals, for promotion. However, it is too late to do that, so probably we shall consider those matters on Friday, as soon as we conclude the general calendar business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the distinguished majority leader plan to call up the controls bill on Monday of next week?

Mr. TAFT. I had thought that on Monday we would consider the resolution dealing with the committee assignments of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and probably begin action on the controls bill on Tuesday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader will tell us what is the imperative legislative program which it was said last week was being delayed by debate on the offshore oil measure.

Mr. TAFT. I can assure the Senator from Illinois that if he will examine the calendar, he will see that it contains many bills of importance. I can assure the Senator further that from now until adjournment, the Senate will be in constant session, every day, and that there will be plenty of business to occupy it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Last week the Senator from Ohio said there was a rush of legislative business behind the offshore oil resolution, whenever discussion on that measure should cease. Now, apparently, there is to be no substantive business until perhaps the first of next week. I hope the Senator will move speedily to the consideration of the alleged important measures, and that he will not delay the program of his President, if there is any. We want to get the work done, and I do not think there should be any delay.

Mr. TAFT. A great deal of substantial business is on the Senate Calendar. If the Senator will examine the calendar, he will observe a large number of bills which have been reported by committees in the past 5 weeks and have been accumulating. Many of them are of substantial importance.

Mr. President, purely for the information of the Senate, I should like to say that the debate which began on April 1 and has now finished on May 5 has been analyzed as to the estimated word count for each side on the subject matter of the debate.

From the beginning of the debate through Friday, May 1, which does not quite complete the debate, the total number of words spoken by the proponents of the joint resolution was 270,452; the total number of words spoken by the opponents was 970,872. I thought that information might be of interest to Senators.

Although this was the longest debate with which I have been connected, I must say that the percentage of relevancy to the subject was high compared with any other filibuster which I have observed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator estimate the cost in dollars to the people of the United States for each word—that is, the cost in giveaway of resources for each word that has been spoken?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to have that computed for the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not wish to add to the words already spoken, so I shall simply ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the measure which was just passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

During this debate we have heard learned discussions of the legal questions involved, listened to lengthy dissertations on technical and geographical considerations, and read the voluminous hearings and the majority and minority reports of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

All of these leave unanswered one question which, in a democracy, I consider vastly important. That question is: What do the people think about it? What does the man in the street and the man on the farm, the teacher in the classroom, the workman at his bench, or the mother in her home think about this proposition, to turn our oil resources, submerged beneath the seas, over to the several States?

I shall presume, of course, to speak only for my own constituents. During my 16 years of service in the Congress I have kept close contact with these constituents. Rarely is there a controversial issue that I do not receive hundreds of letters from them expressing their views frankly, pro and con, and the present controversy is no exception.

But in no previous controversy has there been such an almost complete unanimity of opinion. Of all the telegrams and letters I have received less than 3 percent favor the Congress turning our offshore oil resources over to the States; 97 percent plus want the Federal Government to retain jurisdiction and control.

These are individual letters, most of them handwritten, and 51 percent of them from women who seem particularly concerned about the inadequacy of our schools.

I have also received numerous communications from organizations; grange organizations, labor organizations, teachers organizations, and PTA's, all opposed to any giveaway or quitclaim of our offshore oil resources, and I have received one letter from a chamber of commerce and one from a mineral association taking the position that these resources should be turned over to the States.

I can assure the Senate and my colleagues that there is great interest in this issue in my State.

There is interest not only in what happens to our oil resources beyond our shores, but in what happens to our timber resources and our power resources and our fisheries resources after that.

Here is a letter from a lady from Seattle who writes: "Please do all you can to defeat any bill giving offshore oil and lands to the States. Giving title of these resources to the States would set an unfortunate precedent: Republicans might then try to give Federal power projects that all taxpayers have financed, Federal park lands, to the States, and atomic energy rights to private business."

And here is a letter from a gentleman in Port Orchard, Wash. He writes: "Please vote against the tidelands bill. If this bill passes it will be only the first step toward eventual exploitation of all our public domain by private interests without regard for conservation or the future needs of our country."

From a gentleman in Olympia, Wash., our State capitol, comes this letter: "I am one of these people who are seriously alarmed over the tidelands oil bill which has passed the House. The oil itself, of course, is vital, but even more important is the principle—the possibility that oil today means public power tomorrow and the national forests the next day. It may take long hours and many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to convince private interests and the uninformed public that "State rights" is not the issue, but in terms of the national interest, I am sure it is worth it."

A Seattle colonel writes: "The argument that the States are entitled to the tidelands oil loses its force when we consider our forest and mineral reserves. The huge forest and mineral reserves can be as consistently claimed by the States as the tidelands oil. That's the way a lot of us plain folks look at this matter.

A Bremerton, Wash. lady sends this letter: "I am writing to ask you to do what you can to keep control of our national forests and offshore oil lands in the Federal Government. Every day now there are attacks in the press on national control and I am frightened by the giant giveaway program planned by some Republicans. Please keep fighting for us small people who did not give the Republicans a mandate to take away our property. You have more backing than you perhaps know."

From North Bend, Wash., a gentleman writes: "Common sense tells me that the bill to turn the tidelands to the States with their oil rights is nothing more than an outright steal. After the tidelands will follow timber and grazing lands and after that will go parts of the national parks."

A lady in Bellingham, Wash. writes: "As president of the Bellingham Federation of Teachers I would like to see those billions of dollars rolling for education instead of being preempted by a few greedy States. The schools need those billions."

From a Seattle, Wash., matron comes this letter: "I am writing to urge you to protect the schools and the school children by voting "no" on giving away the rich oil wells offshore the States of California, Texas and Louisiana. The oil men, as you well know, have spent millions on the propaganda to get control of the oil-rich deposits which belong to all the people. I can't understand how anyone living outside those States would vote for it."

A gentleman from the same city writes in long-hand: "I am very disturbed in regard to our oil lands, hydroelectric power dams, and probably our atomic plants. As much as I would like to see the filibuster done away with, I think I would use it in a last resort to save the things that rightfully belong to the people."

This is only a sample of the many letters I have received from individuals. I have purposely excluded those which seemed to me critical of the motives of my colleagues who are supporting the committee bill, or which express in vigorous language the views of their senders. I have quite a few of these letters also, but I am endeavoring to present to you what might be considered the average sentiments of the constituents who have written me. I do this because I feel it is fitting that we in the Senate know what the rank and file of our constituents think.

A couple in Auburn, Wash., one of our lovely smaller cities, writes me: "We have a dire need which is constantly growing for more support for our school system. Our teachers are underpaid and our schoolrooms are overcrowded. It is not right that 'big business' should get their 'hooks' into these oil rights that could be considered part of the United States as a whole and part of every citizen's inherent property now and for posterity."

From Renton, Wash., this letter comes from another couple: "We are watching with interest the fight over the tidelands oil lands. It would be the biggest steal of them all, and would eventually lose to the American people all of the public lands in the country."

A nurse in Bremerton, Wash., sends me this: "I implore you to exert every effort to keep the offshore oil for the American people, and not for the oil lobbies."

From a school superintendent in Grays Harbor County comes this thoughtful communication: "I am writing to ask your support for the Hill amendment to the offshore oil bill. As you know, this measure will assist in providing much-needed funds for the education of the youth of this great country of ours. My school board and parent-teachers' association have asked that I write to you and request your support. We do not know of a more needy or worthy cause for the use of these funds than that of support of the public schools. The financial situation of our public schools has become particularly acute these past few years."

Mr. President, I think that this is a representative sample of what the people of my State think about the legislation before us, but I would like to cite also what some of the organizations in my State think.

The president of the North Kitsap Federation of Teachers, of Poulsbo, Wash., writes, in part: "The North Kitsap Federation of Teachers discussed the Hill amendment to the offshore oil bill in meeting last night and voted to urge that you back the amendment. We are fearful that the present Congress will vote to take the great national resource of offshore oil, an asset belonging to all of the people, and give it away to a few States."

There are similar letters from other teachers' organizations, including Bremerton and Seattle.

Labor and agriculture in the State I represent also are opposed to turning over offshore oil resources to the several States.

From the secretary of the Pierce County Pomona Grange comes this official statement: "These offshore oil lands belong to the United States and should remain as such. Any benefits derived from them should be for the Nation as a whole. We are opposed to giving these oil lands to any of the States."

Another letter informs me: "The Pe Ell Prairie Grange would like to go on record as not being in favor of the offshore tidelands being given to the States."

An official resolution from the Charter Oak Grange reads in part: "The move to place ownership of offshore oil lands in the hands of a few States adjacent to said lands is not in the best interests of the people of the United States. Therefore be it resolved by Charter Oak Grange in regular session • • • that we oppose any move to transfer ownership of offshore lands lying below mean low water to any States adjacent to these lands."

Humptulips Grange, in a similar action, reports not only their opposition to any transfer of ownership over offshore oil, but includes other natural resources in the public domain such as public power and mineral rights.

And from the Farmers Union of Clark County, Wash., comes a similar declaration.

Labor in my State appears united against the committee bill. I have received messages expressing this opposition from the Central Labor Councils of Anacortes, Bremerton, Spokane, Walla Walla and other cities.

From the evidence before me the answer to my original question, "What do the people think about this legislation?" is crystal clear. They don't want it.

They don't want our offshore oil resources given away, or other natural resources belonging to the people given away. They fear, as they state in many of their letters, that the committee bill is a prelude to other giveaways, to our power and water resources, our great Federal dams, and to our vital conservation programs.

This is not a partisan fear, I can assure you. The great preponderance of the letters and communications which came to me do not have a partisan approach. The people of my State, who express themselves are aware that the issue is one which the Congress will resolve—and regardless of the

political affiliation of Members who support the committee bill—the people of the State of Washington don't want it.

One of the most important and influential organizations in the State of Washington is the Washington State Grange, representing approximately 40,000 fine, progressive farm families.

Our State Grange has contributed national leadership as well as leadership in State and Pacific Northwest activities. The late Albert S. Goss, for many years master of the National Grange with headquarters here in the Nation's Capital, was a resident of Washington State.

Henry P. Carstensen, since 1941 the master of our State Grange, is a member of the National Grange executive committee. Mr. Carstensen also is editor in chief of the Grange News, published in Seattle, and contributes a weekly column to it.

On April 11, 1953, Mr. Carstensen devoted a good portion of his column to the offshore oil issue. He said and I quote:

"The super oil steal which makes Teapot Dome look like peanuts, according to National Grange spokesmen, is about to be consummated in Congress. In fact, the deed may have been done by the time this is read, events move so rapidly these days. We refer, of course, to the legislation deeding the Nation's offshore oil resources to the States of Louisiana, Texas, and California, for the primary benefit of the big oil interests.

"It was appropriate that the House passed a bill to this effect on April Fool's Day, by an overwhelming vote of 285 to 108. This is the same type of legislation which ex-President Truman vetoed twice, because to him, it smelled to high heaven. President Eisenhower, however, is on record as favoring transfer of title in the submerged oil to the States. His approval now is virtually a foregone conclusion.

"This leaves the Senate as a court of last resort for a public appeal, assuming that body has not yet acted. The United States Supreme Court is helpless to affect the outcome.

"Many billions of dollars are involved in this issue, which explains the pressure exerted on Congress by the oil interests. Opponents of the legislation, like the National Grange, have offered compromise proposals which would accord the States a share in the control or proceeds of the resources, but insisting that the submerged oil belongs to the people of all the States and should be conserved for future defense needs of the Nation. The precedents of law and commonsense are all on this side, but it seems that big money can buy anything.

"There may still be time to appeal to United States Senators on this crucial issue. Remember, they will welcome messages from their constituents because it will furnish strong support to those who are opposed to the bill. Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON and HENRY M. JACKSON are both believed to be against the oil steal.

"In the meantime, notice should be served on the congressional majority that if this legislation becomes law, the people will one day repudiate them; and that in all likelihood the oil interests will have won but a Pyrrhic victory, because it may inevitably result in expropriation of their holdings due to a public opinion exasperated beyond all patience."

Mr. Carstensen is not the only farm leader in the State of Washington opposed to giving away the submerged oil resources that lie off the coasts of the several States. Nor is the Grange the only organization devoted to the interests of the farmer and of agriculture that is opposed to the pending legislation.

The Pacific Supply Cooperative, with headquarters in Walla Walla, Wash., has time and time again voiced its opposition to the Holland bill, both editorially and in news columns of its publication, the Pacific Northwest Cooperator, which goes to 60,000 farm families throughout the region.

These farmers have a direct interest in the miscalled tidelands issue. Kenneth McCandless, editor of the Cooperator, states this interest in a recent communication. He writes, and I quote:

"Action by you and your colleagues on the tidelands bill probably will be the tipoff on this administration's attitude toward our natural resources.

"Fifteen thousand farmers in your State purchase a good many millions of gallons of oil products through their cooperatives affiliated with our organization.

"For several years they have been aware that on their behalf this organization, in conjunction with farm cooperatives throughout the United States, has applied for drilling-lease privileges in the offshore areas adjacent to Texas and Louisiana.

"If Congress and the administration prefers this major-oil-company-sponsored legislation to the bill sponsored by Senator LISTER HILL, the public schools of your State (Washington) will be deprived of $164 million revenue."

Mr. McCandless makes an important point: The direct relation of oil to farm production. Oil runs our tractors and our combines. Oil is one of the important cost items to farm production. To economize on costs, farmers in some areas have organized their own oil companies.

Here is a report in the Pacific Northwest Cooperator of just one small company of this nature. It's from Tangent, Oreg., and I will read just one paragraph:

"Sales of $817,000 and a net margin of $46,623 were reported by the Grange Oil Co. at their 19th annual membership meeting held in the McFarlane Grange Hall. Manager Richard Dal Soglio stated that these figures represented a substantial advance over last year's business volume of $676,033. About 250 people attended the meeting."

I mention this as a concrete illustration of the farmer's interest in oil, both as a commodity essential to farm operations and as a natural resource.

May I say that from the proponents of the pending giveaway bill I have heard no comment that, in my opinion, might assure the farmers of the Pacific Northwest that this resource would be safeguarded in their interest if this legislation is enacted.

This is a bill in the interest of the big oil companies with which farm companies such as I have described above are in direct competition.

To quitclaim our offshore oil resources to a few States for exploitation by the big oil companies would be identical, it seems to me, to the Federal Government quitclaiming its dams and reservoirs behind them, its powerplants, and its rights to the waters flowing through them, to the several States and through them to private and favored power interests.

The analogy is not farfetched. In effect the giveaway of our power resources already has been advocated by a leading industrialist and a former President of the United States whose administration was distinguished by the great depression.

Oil beneath our ocean beds is a source of energy for farm vehicles and equipment, as well as passenger cars. Oil in some areas of the Nation is the source of electric power.

Water in our rivers also is a source of energy. In our own great region it is the source of electric power.

Both the oil beneath our submerged offshore lands and the water in our navigable rivers is a resource belonging to all the people. Give away these oil resources belonging to the people, as proponents of this pending legislation are asking Congress to do, and a precedent is established.

Give away the oil and the first step has been taken toward giving away that other great source of energy, the water in our rivers, our great hydroelectric projects, our substations and transmission lines that the farmers and taxpayers of the Nation already have paid for.

There is a sinister parallel, it seems to me, between the plans and strategy of the forces mixing oil and politics in their attempts to divest Uncle Sam and the people of our offshore oil resources and that of the forces who want to give away our hydroelectric power resources.

Both actions, in my opinion, would pave the way for higher power rates, whether the electric energy was produced by flaming oil or falling water.

I oppose these plans; I oppose this giveaway legislation; and in opposing it I think I am working in the interests of the people of my own State of Washington, of the Pacific Northwest, and of the Nation, trying to safeguard their equities both in oil resources belonging to all the people and in their equities and rights to their own water.

As I said in the beginning of this speech, I will vote for the Hill oil-for-education amendment; I will vote for the Anderson substitute to Senate Joint Resolution 13.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared relative to the joint resolution just passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

The issue in the tidelands debate is the right of our States and private citizens to keep their own property when it is coveted by a rapacious Central Government. In voting for the right of our coastal States to keep their own lands, I am voting for a principle cherished by the people of Indiana.

We have been told that we should approve the Federal Government's appropriation of these areas, because, somehow, only a few States will lose, but all the people will gain.

This is a false issue. The real issue is the loosening of the grip of the Federal Government on our land and our wealth. I am indebted to my opponents for a correct statement of the magnitude of this tidelands question. They say that if Congress votes to return the submerged lands to the States, then Congress will want to return steam power generating systems and other Federal enterprises to private hands. The collectivists know that if they want to block the cleanup of this whole mess, they must block the first attempt to disgorge their gains.

We all know we do not have to fear Federal encroachment on the rights of citizens in the administration of President Eisenhower, but our only chance to put an end to Federal seizure of our possessions is under an administration which has no desire to seize them.

It may be said that the tidelands issue is not a question of private property, but of State versus Federal ownership, but I say the first line of defense of private property is the right and power of the 48 States to resist the Federal encroachment. If the States cannot balk the efforts of big government to seize their lands, then the farms

and factories of our private citizens are no longer safe.

The people of Indiana take their stand to preserve property rights because they know there can be no freedom without the right to keep the fruits of one's work.

We do not have to own shares in General Motors to get the benefit of private enterprise in the manufacture of low-cost automobiles. We do not have to own shares in a hotel or department store to get the bargains and the service which come from competition of many private enterprises. Those who work in steel plants do not have to own the plant to use the costly labor-saving machinery bought by the owners. Even more important, we do not have to own a newspaper to get the benefits of a free press under private ownership. And, lest we forget, we do not have to own a church building to know that the State can never tell any church what its preachers may preach, or when its young people may meet, until the State planners have collectivized all the land in our country. Why do the rulers of Russia and Poland and Hungary tell the churches when they may open and when they must close? It is not because the people do not care, but because the State owns all the land.

Indiana does not want Federal money for its schools. It can raise its own money at home.

Indiana certainly will not help the Federal Government to collectivize any State lands and open the door for big government to take over private lands. We want no easy money for our schools bought with that kind of folly.

I believe the people of Indiana want Congress to make haste in restoring to the coastal States the property rights they possessed for centuries, and then to return a large part of the vast acreage now owned by the Federal Government within the borders of our sovereign States.

MEMORANDUM REGARDING SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a memorandum prepared by the Legislative Drafting Service with respect to the joint resolution which has just been passed.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR BYRD

This memorandum is submitted in response to your request for a statement from this office with respect to the concern expressed by Mr. Robert Whitehead in his letter addressed to you relative to the provisions of section 6 of Senate Joint Resolution 13, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources. The particular matter of concern, as it appears in his letter, is as follows:

"We decided to look into the matter and the column of Robert S. Allen, which will be published in the May issue of Rural Virginia, sets forth that an amendment in section 6, now found at pages 18 and 19 of the bill, declares that the United States Government's authority under the commerce clause of the Constitution shall no longer include the power to use the beds of navigable rivers; and that this sweeping limitation could put an end to any further hydroelectric developments by the Government.

"On behalf of the association we request that you look into the situation, and if this provision is in the bill, it is our hope that you will do all in your power to get it deleted."

Section 6 of the committee amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 13 reads as follows:

"SEC. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution.

"(b) In time of war or when necessary for national defense, and the Congress or the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the prevailing market price, all or any portion of the said natural resources, or to acquire and use any portion of said lands by proceeding in accordance with due process of law and paying just compensation therefor."

With respect to section 6 (a) (Mr. Whitehead's concern seems to relate only to subsec. (a) of sec. 6), the report from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate to accompany Senate Joint Resolution 13, Senate Report No. 133, 83d Congress, explains at page 12 as follows:

"Section 6 (a) provides that the United States retain all of its navigational servitude and rights and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, the rights and powers granted to the States by section 3 of this joint resolution."

At page 20 in an explanation of amendments made by the committee the report states in addition with respect to section 6 (a):

"The added word spells out that all of its constitutional powers are retained by the Federal Government."

In addition to the above, section 3 (d) of the resolution provides further protection for Federal constitutional powers. This section reads as follows:

"(d) Nothing in this joint resolution shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation, or to provide for flood control, or the production of power."

It would seem that the above material should provide the answer to Mr. Whitehead's concern, especially section 3 (d) of the resolution (quoted last), which specifically reserves the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate and improve navigation and to provide for flood control and the production of power, the particular matter in which he is interested.

Respectfully,

PETER W. LEROUX,
Assistant Counsel of the Office of Legislative Counsel.

MAY 5, 1953.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on April 6, 1953, I introduced S. 1776 to repeal provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of a railroad annuity or pension where the individual or his spouse is entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, after research, made a report to the Senate Finance Committee on the so-called "dual benefits" or section 7 deduction. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of S. 1776 and the Library of Congress report analyzing the pros and cons of the problem which S. 1776 attempts to cure.

There being no objection, the bill and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1776

A bill to repeal those provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of a railroad annuity or pension where the individual or his spouse is (or on proper application would be) entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act

Be it enacted, etc., That the last paragraph of section 3 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended (which paragraph provides for the reduction of annuities and pensions by reason of eligibility for old-age insurance benefits under the Social Security Act) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The third proviso in section 3 (e) of such act (which proviso relates, in part, to the reduction of the spouse's annuity by the amount of certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act) is hereby amended to read as follows: "*And provided further*, That any spouse's annuity shall be reduced by the amount of any annuity to which such spouse is entitled, or on proper application would be entitled, under subsection (a) of this section or subsection (d) of section 5 of this act."

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect with respect to benefits accruing under the railroad retirement acts after October 31, 1951.

THE DUAL BENEFIT (OR SEC. 7 DEDUCTION) PROVISION OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1951—PRO AND CON

The so-called dual benefit (or sec. 7 deduction) provision of the 1951 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act[1] was designed to prevent retired railroad workers from becoming eligible for full benefits under both the social security and railroad retirement systems if their right to those two distinct benefits grows substantially out of service performed prior to 1937 when the Railroad Retirement Act went into effect. Briefly, this deduction clause, which was added in the Senate, specifies that in the case of such persons, the railroad benefit must be reduced by the amount of the social-security benefit to which the employee is entitled—or would be entitled if he filed for it—and that a spouse's benefit shall also be reduced to one-half of the employee's reduced annuity up to a maximum of $40. But it also provides that persons retired from the railroad system prior to November 1, 1951, when the law went into effect, cannot be penalized by receiving an amount less than they were receiving from the railroad fund prior to the enactment of this law.

Similarly, an aged wife (or widow) cannot receive a spouse's (or widow's) annuity and also an OASI benefit based on her own earnings. But she can receive a wife's benefit

[1] Section 7, of section 3 (b) as amended by Public Law 234, 82d Cong., 1st sess., enacted October 30, 1951.

under both programs except that her benefit as a railroad wife is subject to deductions as above.

Such a deduction is not made, however, for workers or their dependents if the railroad annuity is based exclusively on service since 1937. Thus, for those who have no prior service credit, or for those who have at least 30 years of service after 1936, there will be no restrictions against receiving full, dual retirement benefits under the two programs. It is only when the credit for prior service substantially influences the amount of the railroad retirement benefit that the deduction is made.

The major arguments advanced for section 7 are: (1) it would result in substantial and necessary savings to the Railroad Retirement fund ($1 billion by the year 2000); (2) it is justified because it applies to service prior to 1937 for which no employee contribution was made; (3) it applies to a group of retired workers who receive benefits which exceed their contributions to the system to a much greater degree, proportionately, than in the case of full-term retired workers; (4) the benefit structure of the railroad system—which about doubles amounts paid under social security—should be high enough so that no supplementation is needed; (5) its effect, or penalty, will decrease with the passage of time until about 1970 when few workers will need prior service credit; (6) it unduly rewards a selected group of workers (currently 35,000) at the expense of the whole group (currently 265,000) of beneficiaries; (7) it preserves the integrity of the railroad retirement plan as a system designed for a career service.

The major arguments against section 7 are: (1) it makes a distinction contrary to the spirit of the 1937 act which was careful to give full credit for prior service, a concept continued in subsequent amendments, which increased benefits and protection without such a discrimination until 1951; (2) it penalizes railroad workers because of their age in 1937, requiring them to bear the cost of savings to the trust fund because of a circumstance beyond their control; (3) it applies a penalty retroactively against workers who, in good faith and according to existing law, have sought to increase their retirement income by supplementing their railroad annuity with a social security benefit toward which they have also contributed; (4) it discourages workers from continuing in employment covered by social security after age 65 because they must pay the payroll tax under social security even though it may not increase their combined benefit income; (5) it imposes an indirect work clause penalty for engaging in employment covered by social security after age 65; (6) it presents administrative problems which, if the law is strictly interpreted, are unwarrantedly expensive and would create a serious public relations problem because of fluctuations in the amount of the railroad retirement benefit; and (7) a more equitable way of saving money and preserving the special benefits of the railroad retirement system would be to integrate the system with OASI by using the social security plan as a base—as do private pension systems, rather than trying to coordinate two Federal systems which differ in their basic philosophy.

Costs: A major reason given for the adoption of section 7 is that it would help meet the costs of liberalizing other aspects of the railroad retirement system included in the 1951 amendments, without increasing the payroll tax. For example, without a tax increase employee benefits were increased by 15 percent, survivor benefits by one-third, and a spouse's benefit was added. The importance of the cost factor as the major argument for the dual benefits provision in section 7 was cited by representatives of the Railroad Retirement Board as follows:

"The provision was frankly advanced by the sponsors of the legislation as a source of additional revenue to the account. The justification given for it is that railroad benefits directly and social security benefits (by means of the heavily 'weighted' formula) directly, both allow credit for service before 1937 on which no taxes were paid. It was believed that the railroad system should pay all retirement benefits attributable to service that has been taxed; on the other hand, it was held that it should avoid duplicate 'unearned' benefits by withholding annuities based on untaxed service up to the amount of any social-security benefits that may be payable." [2]

According to estimates furnished by the Board, the savings resulting to the railroad system would accumulate to somewhat more than $1 billion by the year 2000, as follows: $11 million a year for the first 10 years, $15 million a year for the next 10 years; $9 million a year for the third decade, $3 million for the next, and in steadily decreasing amounts representing a dollar saving in benefits of about $385 million, which, taking the 3-percent interest rate into account for the whole period, would yield the accumulated amount of $1 billion by the year 2000.[3]

The dual-benefits provision was advocated as a means of making these savings because only about 13.2 percent of current beneficiaries (or 35,000 of the 265,000 current annuitants) are affected. Further, it was pointed out that this proportion will become smaller as the years pass and fewer workers will need prior service credits to entitle them to annuities. Representatives of the Railroad Retirement Board and of the Railway Labor Executives Association held that it would be unwise to "dissipate" savings for the benefit of the 13.2 percent, instead of retaining them for the benefit of the other 230,000 current annuitants and the much larger number, proportionately, who will retire in the future.

The objection to meeting costs in this manner is that it discriminates retroactively against a selected group of beneficiaries, creating a group of "second class" annuitants. Moreover, advocates of the plan of integrating the OASI and railroad retirement systems—by covering all railroad workers under OASI and building the railroad plan on top of it as additional protection, in the manner of private pension plans—suggest that the substantial cost savings which such a plan would bring, would make such a choice unnecessary. The extent of those savings are suggested by the following statement of May 18, 1951, by F. J. Lawton, then Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as follows:

"The railroad workers would get more benefits for less money if OASI benefits were made available to all railroad workers, with the Railroad Retirement Board paying the difference between OASI benefits and the present railroad retirement benefits. That is, the workers would get the more advantageous OASI survivors protection and, at the same time, the present 12 percent railroad retirement tax rate could be lowered to a combined OASI-railroad retirement rate which has been estimated roughly at 8.5 percent. As the OASI rate rises over the years, the combined rate would, of course, rise also, but it would not reach its peak of about 12 percent until 1970, whereas the railroad retirement rate is 12 percent now. * * * Alternatively, railroad retirement benefits might be increased with less of a tax decrease." [4]

Benefits: A major justification for the savings effected by the section 7 deduction, is that it was, as noted, one means of making a necessary cost-of-living increase in benefit rates for most annuitants, and of improving the dependent and survivor benefit structure: all without increasing the payroll tax which finances the system. The improved benefit structure was, of course, a primary goal of the 1951 amendments.

But out of this position arises a major case made against section 7 because it does discriminate against a special group—and that retroactively—for the benefit of others. One way of demonstrating this so-called inequity is by examining how the system works in a particular and relatively simple case.

Suppose a railroad worker retires with 30 years of service, all at a wage of $200 a month, of which 20 years are charged to "prior service" (before 1937), and 10 years are not. Also assume that he is receiving an OASI benefit of $40. Prior to the 1951 amendments, his railroad annuity was $108 a month which amount, plus $40 (OASI) gave him a pension income of $148 a month. If the 1951 amendments had not included the section 7 deduction, his pension income would have increased by 15 percent ($16.20) a month to $164.20 ($124.20 RR plus $40 OASI). But because of section 7 his increased railroad benefit of $124.20 per month is reduced by $40 (OASI)[5] to $84.20 per month—an amount which is, however, raised by the guarantee against loss of the 1951 benefit rate. His pension income, therefore, has remained at $148 per month ($108 RR plus $40 OASI) but he has been denied the 15 percent increase in benefits (to $164.50), received by annuitants not subject to section 7. In the same way, if he has not been receiving the social security benefit of $40 because he is working in covered employment, he does not receive the 15 percent increase in the $108 railroad pension which he was receiving, because he is eligible for the OASI benefit even though he is not receiving it, and the deduction therefore applies.

Further suppose that this same man has a wife, eligible for spouse's benefits because she is 65 or over. Prior to the enactment of section 7, the family pension income was $168 per month ($108 railroad plus $60 OASI). But his wife also became eligible for a spouse's benefit of $40 under the 1951 railroad amendment.[6] If those amendments had not included section 7 the family railroad pension income would have increased to a total of $164.20 ($124.20 for the annuitant plus $40 for his wife) which, with the OASI payment of $60 ($40 for the husband, $20 for the wife) would yield a combined pension income of $224.20—an increase over the former $168 per month of $56.20.

But because of section 7 the husband's increased benefit of $124.20 is reduced by $40 (OSAI) to $84.20, and then increased by $40 because of the spouse's benefit (railroad) back up to $124.20[7] which, adding the $60

---

[2] Walter Matcheck and Jack M. Elkin, Recent Changes in the Railroad Retirement and Survivor Benefit Program, in American Economic Security (January–February 1952), p. 33. Mr. Matcheck is director of research and Mr. Elkin is chief statistician for the Railroad Retirement Board.

[3] Railroad retirement legislation, hearings before the Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation, 82d Cong., 2d sess., Aug. 5, 1952 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1952), pp. 61–62.

[4] Letter of F. J. Lawton, Director, Bureau of the Budget, to Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, U. S. Senate, in railroad retirement legislation, hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [1951] U. S. Senate, 82d Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951), p. 608.

[5] Since $40 is less than the part of his railroad annuity—about $83—based on prior service.

[6] The spouse's annuity is half the reduced retirement annuity up to $840 maximum but in this case the $40 maximum would apply.

[7] Since $124.20 is greater than the former railroad pension of $108, no adjustment upward of the husband's pension is made in this case.

OASI payment yields a combined pension income of $184.20—an increase over the former $168 per month of only $16.20. Thus, in effect, section 7 has reduced the family pension income by $40 ($56.20 minus $16.20). If the wife should die, however, the husband's reduced annuity of $84.20 would be raised up to the $108 he was receiving when section 7 went into effect. In this case, therefore, the family pension income has been slightly increased (from $168 to $184.20) by reason of the spouse's benefit, added in 1951, but the loss in total pension income because of section 7 is $40 a month. This represents an additional annual pension income loss of $480.

Another point raised in this connection is the effect, from a public relations standpoint, of the fluctuations in the amount of the railroad benefit, if the law is strictly interpreted. Robert J. Myers, actuary for the Social Security Administration, has used two examples, both concerned with self-employed individuals, to show this fluctuation:

Mr. Myers assumes the case of an individual retiring at age 65 at the beginning of 1951 with a railroad annuity of $150—base 1 equally on prior and contributory service[8] and with no social-security employment at that time. But after retiring from railroad work he acquires social-security coverage for self-employment and earns $2,400 each year. His railroad benefit for the first 5 years—assuming that he does not file an OASI claim—would be as follows:

Benefit from Railroad Retirement Board

Period:	Month
January 1951–March 1952	$150.00
April 1952–December 1952	90.00
January 1953–September 1953	80.00
October 1953–December 1953	83.40
January 1954–September 1954	80.00
October 1954–December 1954	82.40
January 1955–September 1955	80.00
October 1955–December 1955	81.80

If a man with the same work record and the same self-employment income becomes 65 and retires from railroad employment at the beginning of 1953 an even wider fluctuation occurs:

Benefit from Railroad Retirement Board

Period:	Month
January 1953–March 1954	$150.00
April 1954–December 1954	113.70
January 1955–September 1955	95.00
October 1955–December 1955	98.30
January 1956–September 1956	92.00
October 1956–December 1956	92.90
January 1957–September 1957	90.00
October 1957–December 1957	90.80

It should be noted that an assumption in the above computations is that self-employment income would remain constantly at $2,400, which is unlikely, and that variations in self-employment income—which is usual—would cause further fluctuations in the railroad benefit. Such fluctuations would be difficult for the beneficiary to understand, and would, it is held, be harmful from a public-relations standpoint.

Administration: The advocates of section 7 recognize that it presents some administrative difficulties, in those cases where it applies, but they maintain that the fact that only 13.2 percent of current beneficiaries are affected, and that that proportion will dwindle with time, make it a relatively minor factor when balanced against the savings which will accrue. According to their estimates, costs of administering the reduction will be around $50,000, not including similar costs to the Social Security Administration, which presumably will be chargeable against the Railroad Retirement Board under the reimbursement provisions.[8]

Opponents of the section 7 deduction, however, maintain that administrative practice, if the law is strictly interpreted, would be extremely complicated because the OASI benefit to which the individual is, or could be entitled, does not remain fixed, both because of the computation provisions of the law and because of a changing work history. Some of these difficulties are suggested by the examples given in the previous section.

In this connection, the operation of the clause "is, or on proper application would be, entitled to an old-age insurance benefit" is cited as posing special administrative problems. Under this wording, a retired railroad worker's benefit would be subject to section 7's penalty whether or not he has retired from work covered by social security. One question which arises has to do with the definition of the word "entitled." According to the interpretation of the Railroad Retirement Board, a worker is entitled to social-security benefits at the moment he becomes eligible. But according to the interpretation of the Social Security Administration, such a worker is not entitled to a benefit until he has applied for it and his benefit right has been established.

One suggested alternative is that phrase "or on proper application would be" should be stricken from the law, on the ground that it would simplify administrative problems in those cases which are the most difficult to handle—namely, those retired railroad workers who are continuing to work in social security after age 65. But the advocates of section 7 oppose this change on the ground that it would reduce savings by at least 20 to 30 percent, while benefiting only about 3,000 (1 percent) of the 265,000 annuitants now on the rolls. Furthermore they suggest that the concept of retirement from social security, upon which this alternative is based, is difficult to define, since a worker may have retired and been declared eligible, upon proper application, and then reenter the labor market.[9]

Contributions: Another reason advanced for the section 7 deduction is that it recognizes the problem growing out of the complexity of immature Federal pension systems which may entitle some retired workers to two or more annuities, on the basis of relatively small contributions, while denying any to other less fortunate persons. This point is illustrated by the "windfall" provisions of the 1950 amendments to the social security act, which made it possible for railroad workers then 62 years of age or over to leave the railroad industry (prematurely, in this view) in order to qualify also for full benefits under old-age and survivors insurance by acquiring the minimum of six quarters of coverage. Because both of these benefits are bargains from the standpoint of contributions anticipated in a mature system, it is maintained that the application of the section 7 deduction, far from being a penalty against the currently-aged group is, instead, only a small adjustment of the unusual bargains they receive because of the accident that they were approaching retirement age when the systems went into effect. This argument assumes special importance, in this view, because the Railroad Retirement System was designed for a career industry, with long experience with seniority practices, and with emphasis upon special rights growing out of special and unique skills and training.

Opponents of the section 7 deduction point out, however, that the ceiling on pension income it sets exacts a tax penalty from workers who continue in social security employment beyond the retirement age of 65, because they must pay the payroll tax under that system even though it may not increase, the pension income they will receive on retirement because of the reduction clause. Furthermore they insist that this reduction violates a basic principle of a contributory retirement plan because it is retroactive in the effect of its penalty. Thus if a railroad worker had retired prior to November 1, 1952, on the strength of the annuity toward which he had been contributing, and had then entered work covered by social security—and subject to a tax—in order to supplement his anticipated pension income with an OASI benefit, the effect of section 7 is to deny him that increase. Moreover they protest that this special reduction applies only to work covered by OASI. For example, no such deduction is made for benefits received from the Federal Civil Service system, from State or local retirement systems, or from the Armed Forces.

An example of how this retroactive principle applies to groups as well as to individuals was cited in the hearings before the Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement, in August 1952. When, in 1927, the Alton Railroad, with headquarters in Chicago and Bloomington, Ill., was merged with the Gulf, Mobile & Northern, with headquarters in Mobile, Ala., many employees with from 25 to 35 years of service elected not to move to Mobile for family or other reasons. A main factor in the decision was that they were fully covered by the railroad program and could add from 5 to 15 years of social-security credit to their income.[10] But in 1951, section 7, in effect, canceled the income from this social-security benefit. Furthermore, at the time this decision was made, the workers were aware of the fact that their railroad benefit would be somewhat more in its total amount if they remained in railroad employment by reason of the increment—but they chose to surrender that increase on the ground that the additional social-security benefit would at least compensate them for this loss. But under section 7, their pension income ceiling is set at its level on the date of their retirement from railroad employment. They are thus penalized by the deduction of their social-security benefit, by the amount by which they might have increased their railroad benefit, and by the 15 percent increase in railroad benefits in 1951, if they could have anticipated this legislation.

Such circumstances have brought forth the charge that the deduction imposed by section 7 is "unconstitutional."[11] This charge, however, overlooks the fact that the Railroad Retirement system gives a statutory, rather than a contractual, right to benefits. Indeed, it has been held by the courts that employee contributions under the railroad plan are not, in fact, a "contribution" in the ordinary sense of the term. Instead, they are imposed as Federal taxes because "it was the purpose of Congress by means of the Taxing Act, to supply revenue which would reimburse the Treasury of the United States for expenditures made pursuant to the Retirement Act for the payment of retirement allowances to employees retired under the last named [Railroad Retirement] act."[12]

The prior service principle: The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare named the duplication of prior service credit as between OASI and the railroad system as a major reason for adding the section 7 deduction. In the opinion of this committee:

"The amended Social Security Act is so weighted as, in effect, to give credit for service before 1937. In view of this, and since employees who now receive credit for service

[8] S. Rept. No. 890, 82d Cong., 1st sess., p. 24.

[9] 1952 hearings, Joint Committee on Railroad Retirtment, p. 61.

[10] 1952 hearings, Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement, p. 124.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 113.

[12] *State of California* v. *Anglin* (C. C. A. 9th, 1942) 129 F. (2d) 455 cert. den. 317 U. S. 669; and *Reynolds* v. *Northern Pacific Railroad Co.* (C. C. A. 8th, 1948) 168 F. (2d) 934.

before 1937 have not paid any taxes with respect to such service, the sponsors of the bill deemed it appropriate to continue to give credit under the Railroad Retirement Act for prior service, but only if the employee does not also receive an old-age benefit under the Social Security Act." [13]

The advocates of the section 7 reduction maintain that those beneficiaries who enjoy substantial prior-service credits, for which they made no contribution, are not being subjected to a genuine penalty, by reason of the fact that the railroad retirement fund has, from the beginning, been dedicated to the self-financing principle. It follows that the contribution rate, paid equally by all employees, young or old, was computed to assume the cost of annuities paid on the basis of prior-service credits. Thus, younger workers were required to pay a higher contribution, during their entire work life, in order that this prior-service liability could be assumed, and the slight reduction in pension income, occasioned by section 7, could therefore be condoned, especially since it was made because of benefit rights growing out of another system—OASI—which also recognized "prior service" in its benefit formula. Representatives of the Social Security Administration, however, have pointed out that the element of "prior service" credit in their system is made by a different method and for different reasons. During the hearings preceding the 1951 amendments, Wilbur Cohen, technical adviser to the Commissioner for Social Security, noted on this point:

"In a very real sense social security, too, has accepted an accrued liability for individuals who have long periods of past service. Because the very construction of the benefit formula in social security, by giving a very high weighting to people with low income, recognizes the fact that they have been employed for a long period of time previously and is an attempt, through the construction of the benefit formula, to give a past-service credit to individuals." [14]

But one important distinction noted by Mr. Cohen was that old-age and survivors insurance does not directly and specifically give credit or assume liability for specific service rendered prior to 1937. In the case of the railroad plan, prior service is credited on the basis of each individual's work record with the railroad industry.

Another distinction grows out of the fact that the railroad plan is designed as a career-retirement system, whereas old-age and survivors insurance is a social-insurance plan. Thus, Railroad Retirement follows the pattern of a conventional retirement plan in that it is geared toward a 30-year wage record in one industry, it includes an increment, it represents an extension of the private railroad plans existing prior to 1937, and it operates on the basis that it is, and will continue to be, a self-financing system. Old-age and survivors insurance, on the other hand, was designed to cover most of the working population and to help meet social need. One example of the choice of "social need" as against a strict "retirement annuity" principle is the changes in the 1939 amendments to the Social Security Act, which added survivors' benefits, and the wife's benefits not incorporated into the Railroad Retirement Act until 1951. Moreover, OASI fully insures workers after only 10 years of coverage; it now contains no increment; it was established in areas where no previous pension plans had usually been in operation; and it has evolved toward the "pay-as-you-go" principle in its financing provisions.

Thus, while it is true that both systems make allowance for a "prior service" period, they do so by somewhat different methods and for somewhat different reasons. This conflict in philosophy is in part responsible for the fluctuation of benefits under section 7, suggested in preceding illustrations.

[13] Rept. No. 890, 82d Cong., 1st sess., p. 24.
[14] 1951 hearings, Subcommittee of Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U. S. Senate, p. 543.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is on the calendar Senate Resolution 93, relating to National Mental Health Week. It seems an appropriate subject. The resolution must be passed at once, because we are already in the midst of National Mental Health Week. So I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 93, which I understand has been unanimously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 93) requesting the President to proclaim the week May 3 to May 9, 1953, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas there is presently a great need for nationwide action for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness; and

Whereas the National Association for Mental Health and the State and local mental health organizations associated therewith are working diligently in the fight against mental illness; and

Whereas the mental health fund is in dire need of public support in order to improve conditions in mental hospitals, provide more adequate treatment for the mentally and emotionally ill, carry on research in the field of the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, and promote mental health education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 3 and ending May 9, 1953, as National Mental Health Week, and urging the people throughout the Nation to cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, and inviting the communities of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

THOMAS H. MACDONALD—"MR. PUBLIC ROADS"

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, recently one of the great public servants of the country during the past 25 years retired. I refer to Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, former Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads. He has been succeeded by a very able man, I understand. However, because of the long service of Mr. MacDonald I should like to place in the RECORD following my remarks a statement which I have prepared, referring to a tribute to him which appears in the April issue of Better Roads Magazine, together with some observations by various public roads officials of the several States, speaking of the great work done by Thomas H. MacDonald as Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

"MR. PUBLIC ROADS"

A fine tribute to Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald appears in the April issue of Better Roads magazine. Mr. MacDonald had been head of the Federal highway agency from 1919 until April 1 of this year. Until Francis V. duPont took over the job the first of this month, the United States had never had any other Commissioner of Public Roads and for that reason Mr. MacDonald has been called "Mr. Public Roads."

The tribute appearing in Better Roads magazine is particularly interesting and significant because it consists of a series of tributes written by the men Mr. MacDonald always worked very closely with, the highway engineers of the States.

Because I have always found Mr. MacDonald to be helpful, practical, and progressive, a fine gentleman and a real leader in highway development, I want to add my voice to those who have taken the occasion of his retirement to praise and commend him for the work he has done over a span of 34 years in the Federal service.

I think I might do that by quoting some of the comments on Mr. MacDonald's career made by the State highway engineers.

The State engineer of Texas, Mr. D. C. Greer, pointed out one reason why State highway officials regarded Mr. MacDonald so highly.

"I feel that with all the great leadership he has displayed, his greatest contribution has been the establishment, protection and continuation of the principle of States rights in the operation of the Federal-aid highway program of this country," Mr. Greer wrote.

"Trends have changed during his long tenure of office, and pressures have been brought to bear for a change in this age-old principle of Federal highway aid. Mr. MacDonald has not only held firm; to groups urging such modification of principle, he has been most convincing of the wisdom of retaining in the rules and regulations of the Bureau of Public Roads the basic idea that the States operate the State road programs of this country, and the Federal Government participates in them, sharing equally the achievements and the disappointments."

Mr. R. H. Baldock of Oregon expressed the same thought in his remarks: "Before becoming the first head of the newly created Bureau of Public Roads, Mr. MacDonald was chief engineer of the Iowa State Highway Commission. He has consistently kept the States' point of view, and effectively prevented domination of the road system of this country by Federal bureaucracy. Through Mr. MacDonald's wise leadership, standards of construction were improved, research was carried on, and an integrated system of excellent Federal-aid highways was laid out and built over the Nation."

As Minnesota Highway Commissioner M. J. Hoffmann put it, "Tom MacDonald, more than any other man in history, has earned the right to be known as the father of integrated and correlated highway transportation facilities in America. His influence has been effective not only throughout the United States, but in the entire Western Hemisphere."

Mr. B. D. Tallamy, superintendent of New York State's Department of Public Works, observed that, "His career has encompassed the entire development of the motor vehicle, from its early sputterings to the streamlined wonders of 1953. He was at the helm during all the progressive Federal-aid road legislation from 1921 to 1952, when the interstate system of highways received special recognition for the first time."

Mr. Samuel C. Hadden, former chairman of the Indiana State highway commission, commented that, "Beginning with little more than a skeleton organization, he has created the widely renowned Bureau of Public Roads, which will stand as a monument to his memory. Of course, his enduring fame will rest primarily on the great network of public highways that he has done so much to foster and develop. It is not too early to say that he is destined to become, and rightly so, the American highway immortal.

Other State highway engineers have testified to Mr. MacDonald's contribution to our Nation's roads. Thus Mr. H. E. Sargent, of Vermont, said, "Without his farsightedness and guidance provided by the Bureau of Public Roads, the highway systems of many States would not be what they are today. And Mr. Lucius D. Barrows, of Maine, said, "Probably no one has contributed more to the development of our nationwide highway system than has Mr. MacDonald, as administrator and engineer."

During my association with Mr. MacDonald I have noticed particularly his constructive attitude toward all highway problems, big, or small. This characteristic has been noticed also by the highway engineers.

"Tom MacDonald's wise counsel and leadership at times in the past when conflicting policies resulting from local pressures from within States really threatened to destroy the unity among the State highway departments always aided in the ironing out of such matters in a reasonable way," said Mr. Thomas H. Cutler, of Kentucky.

And Mr. R. A. Harris, of Mississippi, wrote: "We can recall no instance where when this department has brought its problems to the commissioner, his wide experience and solid thinking have not helped us in ways too numerous to mention. There has never been a time when called on that his cooperation, help and understanding were not forthcoming."

And Mr. E. L. Schmidt of Pennsylvania wrote: "We have always found him cooperative and willing to expedite projects after they were called to his attention. If it was possible to get out of a given difficulty, he always carved a pathway."

At the 37th annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials at Omaha in 1951, Mr. J. A. Anderson, State Highway Commissioner of Virginia, had this to say:

"Let me pay a brief tribute to a great man, Commissioner MacDonald.

"It has been well said that an army of stags with a lion for a commander is more formidable than an army of lions led by a stag. To be a great leader, as Commissioner MacDonald is, one must be not only a great thinker in action, but always master of the situation. Such a man is a leader because he has prepared himself for leadership. Insight, foresight, and knowledge are what the world demands in leaders, men who have the power to transmute calamity into greatness. All great leaders have been inspired with a great belief.

"Let me say while Mr. MacDonald is within the sound of my voice that we of the AASHO salute him."

It is inspiring to learn of the esteem and respect felt for Mr. MacDonald by those with whom he worked most closely. Their words should be a source of great satisfaction and pride to "Mr. Public Roads" in his retirement.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1041) to abolish the United States Commission for the Construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard.

EXTENSION OF MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 140)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, recommending extension of the mutual security program.

The message was read in the House of Representatives earlier today. If there be no objection, the message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 6, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of April 6), 1953:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Henry P. Abele	Melvin S. Bassett
Dean A. Abrahamson	Donald W. Beard
Ronald E. Adler	Robert O. Beat
Frank Adorney	Clyde R. Bell
Aaron B. Agee	Gershom R. Bell
Harvey C. K. Aiau	Carl J. Benning, Jr.
William P. Albers	William C. Bentley
Richard K. Albright	Harry W. Bergbauer, Jr.
William D. Allen	
Richard E. Almen	Norman K. Berge
John H. Amendt	Eddie F. Best
Don J. Ammerman	Bion B. Bierer, Jr.
Curtis O. Anderson	David S. Bigelow
Forrest P. Anderson	Joseph W. Bird, Jr.
Robert C. Anderson	Arthur C. Bivens
Robert N. Anderson	Robert C. Blanchard
Frederick C. Andrews	Peverll Blundell
George L. Apted	Kenneth S. Bocock
Lyle O. Armel II	Steve V. Boggs
Philip McC. Armstrong, Jr.	Roger G. Booth
	Robert B. Borthwick
Richard C. Avrit	James R. Botten
Albert J. Baciocco, Jr.	Bernard C. Botula
Hallam O. Bagby	John H. Boyd, Jr.
Charles C. Baldwin	Charles L. Boyer
Arthur R. Barke	Walton T. Boyer, Jr.
Harry G. Barnes, Jr.	Stephen G. Boyett
Robert G. Barnes	Darrell D. Boyle
Thomas M. Barry	John I. Bradbury
George H. Barthelenghi, Jr.	Francis T. Brady
	William L. Britton
Edwin H. Brooks, Jr.	Donald F. Ellis
George A. Broz	John H. Ellis, Jr.
Richard L. Brummage	Henry C. Emmerling, Jr.
John T. Bucy, Jr.	
James A. Burgess	John Endlich
Thomas E. Burt	Leon J. Ezzell
Charles T. Butler	Donald P. Fagan
Jay R. Buys	Harvey A. Falk, Jr.
Sam R. Byrd	Louis McP. Fead
Jack D. Callicott	Richard L. Feeney
Eugene T. Calnan	Frederick C. Fehl, Jr.
Robert J. Cameron	Frederick G. Fellowes, Jr.
Jack Campbell	
William N. Campbell	Charles D. Fellows
Donald T. Cannell	Donald L. Felt
David E. Cannon	Ernest W. Fergusson
Leo J. Cannon	David H. Fischer
John J. Cardwell	Thomas W. Fitzgerald, Jr.
Arthur J. Carpenter	
John H. Carr	Francis A. Flood, Jr.
Nevin P. Carr	John E. Florance, Jr.
James H. Carrington, Jr.	Francis P. Flynn
	Michael D. Flynn
Charles C. Carter	John E. Foley
Robert D. Carter	Robert D. Fontenot
Jack C. Catlett	Charles W. Fox, Jr.
Donald K. Cauble	George K. Frazer, Jr.
Harland A. Chadbourne, Jr.	Joseph F. Frick
	John M. Frier, Jr.
Edgar M. Chase	John F. Frost 3d
Warren A. Chase	Shirley D. Frost
James F. Chesley	David A. Fudge
Robert W. Chewning	Laurence T. Furey
Eugene J. Christensen	John A. Furgerson
Raymond J. Christensen	Hugh L. Gallagher
	Richard G. Gantt
Richard G. Clark	Louis J. Gardner
Billy R. Clements	Joseph A. Gildea
William S. Cole, Jr.	Arthur H. Gilmore
Larry D. Collier	Alvin S. Glazier
Robert D. Conolly	John Godek
Peter C. Conrad	Robert R. Goldner
Douglas Converse	Watson W. Goldsmith
Donald L. Cooke	William D. Goodwin
Malcolm R. Corbin, Jr.	Richard M. Gowing
Michael R. Corboy	Robert Gradel
Arthur F. Cornell	Frederic A. Graf, Jr.
Myrin E. Cramer	Thomas L. Greaney
Ray F. Crater	Michael T. Greeley
Glenn Crawford	Harry J. Green
John V. Cricchi	Norman E. Griggs
David S. Cruden	Ronald A. Gurnsey
Leo P. Cuccias	Thomas M. Hackney
Kent W. Curl	Frederick Hahn, Jr.
David F. Daily	Robert B. Haig
Richard V. Dalton	Robert J. Haley
Richard G. Daly	James N. Hall
Robert P. Davidson	William C. Hall
Bill N. Davis	Charles H. Halsey, Jr.
John B. Davis	Clement D. Hamm, Jr.
Michael C. Davis	Randolph C. Hanback
John W. Davison, Jr.	Richard C. Handford
Richard E. Dearborn	Russell F. Harney
William DeHart	James W. Harris
Dean O. DeLamar	Richard A. Harris
William E. Delaney	Donald K. Harrison
John R. Devereaux, Jr.	Lewis D. Harwood
Jerry A. Dickman	Robert E. Haskin
Charles N. Diesel	Harold G. Hatch
Joseph G. DiGiacomo	Robert E. Hatcher, Jr.
Michael J. DiNola	William R. Hatfield
Edward R. Dixon	Albert M. Hayes, Jr.
Norval W. Dixon, Jr.	Jerome B. Hayes
Osmund W. Dixon, Jr.	Estel W. Hays
Robert M. Dodds	Carl B. Headland
Robert D. Doelling	LeRoy B. Hebbard, Jr.
Robert G. Donnelly	Julius L. Helvey II
Daniel D. Donovan, Jr.	Robert E. Hempel III
James G. Douglass, Jr.	John M. Henson
William J. Dowe, Jr.	Richard T. Herkner
Ingell H. Doyle	Allen B. Higginbotham
Andrew D. Dubino	Hugh W. Higgins
Paul L. Dudley, Jr.	Earl E. Hill, Jr.
Marshal D. Duke, Jr.	Melvin LeR. Hiller
John A. Dunaway, Jr.	Herbert A. Hincks
Charles B. Dunn	Albert H. Hinman
Denver D. Eddy	John E. Hoch, Jr.
John A. Eddy	James R. Hocking
Don C. Eibert	Harley E. Hoffman
David E. Ellis	Robert B. Hoffman

Carleton C. Hoffner, Jr.
Walter V. Hogan
Gordon B. Holcomb
"M" S. Holcomb
William A. Holland
Helvin M. Holley, Jr.
John J. Holt
Edgar G. Hope, Jr.
Daniel J. Hopkins
David F. Hopkins
Stephen J. Hostettler
Albert W. Houston
Ira D. Hozey, Jr.
Augustine E. Hubal, Jr.
Walter B. Hubbell
Sam H. Huffman, Jr.
Kenneth P. Hughes
Henry D. Hukill, Jr.
Kenneth F. Hutchinson
Joe M. James
George Jatras
Jack J. Jaynes
Folsom Jenkins
James R. Jenkins, Jr.
Allen L. Johnson
Clarence A. E. Johnson, Jr.
John M. Johnston
Horace B. Jones, Jr.
Thomas W. Jones, Jr.
James S. Jordan
James J. Joslin
Bernard K. Joyce
Robert K. Karcher
Robert H. Kassel
Roger H. Kattmann
Bernard M. Kauderer
Michael C. Kaye
Allen D. Keimig, Jr.
Roy A. Kelley
Patrick J. Kelly
William E. Kennedy
Harry T. Ketzner
Donald J. Killian
John E. King, Jr.
Robert E. Klee
Robert G. Kloepper
Herbert E. Kloepping
Robert H. Knight
Donovan E. Kniss
Philip L. Knotts
Donald F. Koch
Robert E. Kotick
Marshall L. Kratz
Alfred F. Krochmal
Charles H. Kruse, Jr.
Peter H. Krusi
Peter M. Kucyk
Robert W. Kuffel
Clarence M. Kunstmann
Walter W. Lake
William F. LaLonde
Francis E. Lammers, Jr.
Robert J. Lanier
Christopher S. Lardis
Marvin F. Larrew
Howard J. Larson
Gerald F. Laughlin, Jr.
William A. Lawler
Donald S. Lawrence
Horace M. Leavitt, Jr.
Joseph Leicht III
William D. Lemly
Edward L. Lenihan, Jr.
Willis A. Lent, Jr.
Sanford N. Levey
Robert B. Lindsay
Theodore L. Lloyd, Jr.
Barrie B. Locke
Joseph B. Logan
Milton A. Lucas
Richard B. Luthin
William A. Lynch
Peter W. Lyon
Wilbur J. Mahony
Thomas L. Malone, Jr.
Lewis M. Markham III
Richard M. Marshall III
Frank L. Martin, Jr.
Robert C. Martin
Walther G. Maser
Sidney F. Mason
George R. Matais
Eugene C. Matheson
Bobby D. Mathews
Max R. Matteson
William B. Matthews, Jr.
Ralph M. Mattison
Rodney E. Maxim
Philip H. Maxwell
Thomas A. Mayberry, Jr.
Clayton P. Mays
Andrew G. Merget
Charles A. Merica
Richard P. Metz
William C. Meyer, Jr.
Charles O. Middleton III
Vito R. Milano
Curtis W. Miller, Jr.
Evan K. Miller
Joseph J. Miller, Jr.
Richard K. Miller
William V. Miller, Jr.
Thomas J. Mitchell
David P. Mittell
William D. Monroe III
Raymond L. Moonan
John B. Mooney, Jr.
Carlton H. Moore, Jr.
Clarence E. Moore
Rufus J. Moore
Arthur S. Moreau, Jr.
Frank P. Morelli
James D. Morgan
Joseph R. Morgan
Edwin S. Moriarty
John H. Morrison, Jr.
Edward A. Morse
Gerald W. Meunch
Joseph A. Muka, Jr.
Thomas J. Mullender, Jr.
Charles E. Mumford
Elbridge F. Murphy, Jr.
Thomas J. Murtagh
Francesco A. Musorrafiti
Archie F. McAllaster
Marvin G. McCanna, Jr.
Charles M. McCarty
Reese S. McCauley, Jr.
Robert B. McComb
John F. McCoy
Brian P. McCrane
John G. McCullen, Jr.
Walter J. McGreevy, Jr.
Bernard R. McLaughlin
Donald H. McVay, Jr.
Frankie L. Naylor
George E. Nelson, Jr.
Keith Nelson
Harry J. Nesbitt
Antonio Nevarez
Richard L. Newnham
Richard W. Nolan
Verne G. Nomady
Merlin R. Norby
James R. Nord
Robert R. North
Robert E. Northrop
John D. O'Connell
James L. O'Keefe, Jr.
John B. O'Leary, Jr.
Perry S. Oliver, Jr.
Conrad B. Olson
John R. Olson
John S. Olson
Francis J. Ostronic
Donald C. Paolucci
William J. Pape II
Thomas C. Parker, Jr.
John E. Paulk
Raymond E. Paulsen
Dana Peckworth
Alton A. Pedersen
Henry R. Perot
James W. Perry, Jr.
Alan J. Personette
Joseph A. Pertel
Edward R. Peters
William J. Peters
Edwin J. Petersen, Jr.
George E. Peterson, Jr.
Thomas E. Pettit
John T. Phillips
Gordon D. Pickett
Alvin W. Platt
John H. Ploss
James B. Poland
James F. Pope
David N. Porter
Arthur M. Potter, Jr.
Julian B. Powell
William T. Prewett
Bruce L. Prickett
Charles R. Prieb
William H. Purdum
Fred O. Purser, Jr.
Ronald S. Purvis
John T. Quirk
William J. Quirk
Robert J. Raffaele
William E. Ramsey
Howard F. Randall, Jr.
Howard W. Randall
Charles A. Reed
Raymond E. Reffitt
George Reith, Jr.
Daniel W. Rice
Harold M. Richardson
Roland H. Rigdon
Merlin C. Ritz
Francis LeR. Roach
William A. Robinson
Harry E. Robson
James B. Rodgers
James R. Rodgers
John R. Roepke
William T. Ross, Jr.
Milton R. Rubb
George R. Ruddick, Jr.
Francis A. Rudolph, Jr.
William A. Ryan
John P. Sassano
Thomas W. Schaaf
Robert A. Schaller
James R. Schermerhorn
George E. Schmitt
Richard J. Schmitz
Jean H. Schulte
Edward T. Scott
Leland H. Sebring
George O. Selz
Ernest R. Seymour
Franklin B. Shakespeare
John R. Shappell
Ronald L. Sharrah
Fred L. Shay
Elmer E. Sheely, Jr.
William B. Shirley
Bertram H. Shoopman, Jr.
Lawrence H. Shrewsbury II
Thomas L. Shuck
Frederick F. Sima, Jr.
Arlis J. Simmons
Robert J. Skerrett
Louis J. Skomsky
James A. Sladky
Alfred A. Smith
Delvin W. Smith, Jr.
Donald B. Smith
Joseph C. Smith
Norman A. Smith
Thomas J. Smith
Abram B. Snively III
William H. Snouse
Jerry A. Snuffin
Ned "C" Snyder
John Sokol
Paul N. Sonnenburg
Thomas C. Southerland, Jr.
Edwin P. Spar
Roy S. Spencer, Jr.
Fraser W. Spiller
Frank R. Stafford
Kenneth B. Stafford
Billy G. Starnes
Richard M. Steigerwald
John W. Stoner, Jr.
Richard E. Storm
William F. A. Stride, Jr.
Franklin M. Strohecker
Robert L. Struven
Clayton A. Studebaker
John R. Stuntz
William J. Sturgeon, III
William W. Sullivan
Wendell G. Switzer, Jr.
Lewis B. Sykes
Frank R. Talbot, Jr.
Joe E. Tarlton
William A. Tarpley
Edmund B. Taylor, Jr.
Reeves R. Taylor
Thomas H. Taylor
Daniel G. W. Terry
Walter L. Thies
Charles P. Thole
Clifford C. Thomas, Jr.
Don W. Thomas
Frederic J. Thomas
William M. Thompson
James R. Throop
Hugh J. C. Toland, Jr.
Milton H. Tolman
Anthony M. Tortora
Webb deL. Trammell
Carlisle A. H. Trost
Evan C. Truax
William E. Trueblood
Joseph P. Trunz, Jr.
John R. Tuttle
Robert C. Umberger
Donald E. Upshaw
Eugene W. Vahlkamp
Joseph L. Vail
Eugene R. Van Hoof
Francisco A. Velazquez-Suarez
Albert D. Vining, Jr.
Donald C. Voelker
John H. Vosseller
Irving L. Voyer, Jr.
David F. Wagner
Charles S. Walker
James B. Walker, Jr.
Peter R. Walker
Harold L. Walters, Jr.
Gene P. Ward
Thomas C. Warren
Lawrence H. Watson, Jr.
Jerold Q. Weaver
James McA. Webster
John F. Wellings
Don V. Wells
Ralph M. Westmoreland
Richard A. Whitcomb
Charles E. White
Frank L. White
Otto W. Will
James F. Willenbrink
Edward L. Willever
Louis A. Williams, Jr.
Robert W. Williams
Jack D. Wilner
Glenn A. Wilson
Jack L. Wilson
Vaughn E. Wilson, Jr.
Peyton R. Wise II
Richard S. Wise
Victor B. C. Wolke
Edgar K. Wood, Jr.
John P. Wood
Robert C. Woods
Edward R. Worth
Charles H. Wright, Jr.
James D. Wright
Kenneth L. Wright, Jr.
Richard T. Wright
Takeshi Yoshihara
David B. Young, Jr.
Joseph A. Young
Richard P. Youngjohns
James A. Youse
Raymond C. Zahn
Joseph P. Zebrowski
Christos Zirps

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy:

Donald P. Bailey
John W. Brainard
Richard E. Curtis
Darrell D. Dempster
Scott W. Ebert
Ralph M. Evans
Burney LeR. Fishback, Jr.
Ralph F. Freese
Franklin M. Gilpen
Roy O. Girod
David M. Govan
Vincent W. Graham
Joseph L. Greenwood, Jr.
Dietrich H. Kuhlmann
Donald E. Lovell
Joseph L. Malone, Jr.
Samuel P. Massie
Arthur G. Mercier
Robert H. Osborn
Donald J. Rothenberger
Paul R. Salgado
Richard W. Scearce, Jr.
Louis C. Schlaufman
Richard W. Schwenz
Frank J. Scolpino, Jr.
James E. Thalman
James S. Van Scoyoc
Ben A. Wadsworth, Jr.
Robert J. Weber
Raymond L. Williams
Rex M. Williams
Edward P. Woodworth
Herbert T. Woolley

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

George H. Adams
Thomas H. Allen, Jr.
Edward R. Alves, Jr.
James D. Baldinger
Douglas C. Binney
Neale E. Bird
Theodore H. Black
William B. Branson
Ray E. Bright, Jr.
Frank C. Chace, Jr.
Earl D. Chaney, Jr.
Don R. Christensen
John M. Cockey
James J. Connolly
Wincheil McK. Craig, Jr.
Dale D. Cummings
Robert N. Desmarais
Anthony J. Dowd, Jr.
Thomas J. Dumont
William H. Fowler, Jr.
John W. Greene
Robert C. Hanmore
Gunnar O. Hansen
David P. Heering
Walter P. Hutchins
John K. Hyatt, Jr.
Stanley C. Jaksina
Robert T. Jones
Robert W. G. Jones
Simon J. Kittler
John P. Kraynak
Edward J. Leavitt
William G. Leftwich, Jr.
Bertram A. Maas
Albert H. Manhard, Jr.
Robert W. Martin, Jr.
William S. Miller, Jr.
Frank H. Mitchell, Jr.
John R. Muhlig, Jr.
Donald J. McAdams
Francis R. McCleskey
Patrick J. O'Connell
Bruce F. Ogden
Arnold J. Orr
Eugene E. Paro, Jr.
Richard C. Pfeifle
Billy W. Ray
Lane Rogers
Manuel Rojo, Jr.
Robert McB. Schucker
Robert R. Sheahan
John Sherlock, Jr.
Alan H. Shure
William A. Simpson
Thomas W. Slack
John H. Smith
Douglas L. Snead
Allen H. Somers
Peter L. Stoffelen
Gayle G. Stucker
Thomas L. Sullivan
Herbert R. Tiede
Jan P. Vandersluis
Albert J. Vidano
Willard G. Viers, Jr.
Stanley B. Waid
Frank B. Wolcott III
Frank Zimolzak

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Thomas P. Abrahams
Warren J. Adair, Jr.
Edgar G. Adams
Kenneth G. Adkins
Joseph A. Albert
Henry B. Allison II
Richard H. Allyn
Thomas L. Alnutt, Jr.
Andrew G. Anderson, Jr.
Billy G. Anderson
George A. Anderson
James R. Anderson
"L" C. Anderson
Sydney Anderson III
Walter W. Anderson
William J. Andre
George H. Andretta
Arthur L. Andrew
Carl Angeloff
Robert O. Angle
George L. Angus, Jr.

John N. Anton
William H. Appich, Jr.
John B. Arado
Edward L. Ardoyno, Jr.
James C. Armstrong
Joseph A. Arnold
Robert A. Arrington
John M. Ash IV
Robert J. Atkinson
Donald E. Babcock
Robert McC. Bader
Fredric N. Bailey
Charles S. Baird
George W. Baird
Leland B. Baldrick
Mahlon M. Ball
Paul H. Balser
Neill K. Banks, Jr.
Donald L. Barber
Frank M. Baker, Jr.
Charles L. Barnard
Peter C. Bascom
Mark D. Batchelder
David H. Bates, Jr.
James V. Batley
Rollin LeR. Bauchspies, Jr.
Bruce A. Bauer
John P. Baur
Neil M. Bealka
Richard N. Beals
Edward W. Bean, Jr.
Charles H. Beck
Wilfrid J. Bedworth
Robert C. Beers
Carl V. M. Bennander
Leslie W. Benner, Jr.
John T. Bennett
Richard L. Bennett
Walter B. Bennett
Bruce W. Benson
Paul R. Benson
David J. Berkowitz
Robert E. Best
Brian C. Betsworth
Michael J. Biety
Edwin A. Birkhimer
Benjimin C. Bishop, Jr.
Joseph E. Bizon
Thomas A. Blackmore
Richard P. Blake
William R. Bobo
Ralph W. Body
William L. Bohannan
Donald M. Bohrer
Harvey S. Bolan
Boyce B. Bolton
Andrew P. Boris
Richard M. Bosshardt
Thomas H. Bossler
James W. Bott
Paul T. Bourdeau
Lawrence F. Bouton
Benjamin L. Bowden, Jr.
Donald L. Bowers
Ralph W. Boyden, Jr.
Richard T. Brackmann
Robert D. Bradshaw
Richard C. Brainerd
Peter B. Brandt
Gene E. Bray
Robert J. Brearley
Charles M. Bredehoft
Ernest W. Breland, Jr.
Joseph T. Brennan
Francis N. Breslich, Jr.
Charles A. Brewster
Dale E. Briggs
Robert S. Briggs
Frank W. Broadbent
Glenn E. Brooks, Jr.
Bruce MacD. Brown
Cloyde I. Brown, Jr.
Larry J. Brown
Robert A. Brown
Robert J Brown
Walter H. Brown, Jr.
Russell E. Brubaker, Jr.
Marvin R. Buchorn
Charles W. Buck
Joseph L. Bull III
Donald J. Bunker
Robert A. Bunnell
John D. Burrington
John B. Burroughs
Lawrence A. Bush
Brent Bushong
Robert B. Bussell
James K. Butler
Frank B. Bynum, Jr.
Gerald F. Cahill
Albert P. Caldwell, Jr.
Ruel Cameron
Frank C. Campbell, Jr.
George R. Campbell
Henry G. Campbell, Jr.
Robert E. Campbell
Thomas W. Campbell
Robert H. Cantrell, Jr.
Bruce D. Cantwell
Philip C. Canup
Robert B. Carleson
Charles R. Carlsen
Olof M. Carlson, Jr.
Richard H. Carlstrom
Philip "P" Carothers, Jr.
Grant T. Carpenter
Willis H. Carrier II
James G. Carter
John G. Cartwright
Louis N. Cavanaugh, Jr.
Owen L. Cedarburg
John K. Chadwick
James P. Charles
David B. Chase
Glenn A. Chequer
Jack M. Chourre
James "A" Chrysler, Jr.
Dean E. Clabaugh
Charles R. Clark
Ralph D. Clark
Richard W. Clarke
Thomas C. Clarke
James J. Clarkin
Richard L. Clement
Robert F. Clements
John R. Click
William D. Climenson
Lawrence J. Clipper
William F. Close
Robert F. Coad
Edward E. Coates
Patrick J. Coffey
Ramon D. Coffin
David B. Cole
Edgar E. Cole
Robert A. Coleman
Thomas W. Coleman
Charles R. Collins
Philip K. Collins
William M. Columbe
William E. Conklin, Jr.
George D. Conley, Jr.
Charles Conrad, Jr.
William B. Conroy
James A. Constans
Martin Convisser
John M. Coogan
Robert N. Cook
James E. Cooke
Delbert G. Copeland
Malcolm N. Council
Jonas S. Coverdale, Jr.
Charles R. Cowap
Walter E. Cox, Jr.
Clifford L. Crader
Philip B. Cramton
Vincent G. Crane
Harold M. Crawford
William N. Crawford
George A. Crepeau
Richard E. Crews
Jean B. Cropley
Lorin R. Cross
Richard "J" Crowell
William J. Cummings
Richard T. Cunningham
John W. Curran
Duncan Curry III
Richard B. Cutler
Paul J. Czesak
Jerome R. Dahme, Jr.
Harold W. Dailey
Harry P. Daly, Jr.
Keith B. Daniels
John E. D'Anieri
Karl G. Davis
Calvin Davison
Stanley V. Dawson
John B. Deam
Orson R. Dee
Arthur A. DeFraites Jr.
Donald R. Deister
William E. de Maligmon
Edward J. DeMartini
Aristides B. Demetrios
Richard E. Dennis
Robert F. Deprez
George A. de Saulles
James A. O'B. DeWitt
George L. Dienes
Alfred J. Dietsch
Philip H. Dittmar, Jr.
Michael B. Dolan, Jr.
George W. Dolen
Paul F. Donahue
Joseph C. Donoghue
David P. Donohue
Bobby J. Dooley
Robert C. Dougherty
George L. Downing
Roland G. Downing
Anthony J. Drago, Jr.
Frazier Draper
Russell C. Drew
Donald W. Drury
William F. Dudine, Jr.
Brian B. Duff
Michael A. Duggan
Baden C. Duggins
Winslow H. Duke
Vance O. Dunbar
Richard C. Dunham
James M. Dunne
Peter Durbin
Gilbert H. Durkee
Herbert McG. Dwight, Jr.
William O. Eastwood, Jr.
Glenn L. Ecklund
George T. Eden
Donald M. Edney
Jerry J. Edwards
Kenneth H. Ehman
Robert D. Eiseman
William R. Elms
Ralph D. Engardt
John P. Engelcke
Richard A. Erb
James A. Erdman
Creed A. Erickson
David M. Erickson
Kenneth D. Erickson
Donald A. Erlandson
John R. Erskine
Francis X. Essex
Victor G. Etem
James W. Evans
Richard B. Evans
Ronald J. Everts
Charles P. Faddis
Barry R. Fahlstedt
Reginald J. Falkowski
Saverio V. Fanelli
Allan C. Feller
William O. Fellers
John C. Feltham, Jr.
George J. Feltovich
Charles E. Ferguson
Charles J. Ferguson
Theodore F. Ferriter
James T. Fifer
William C. Filkins
Robert G. Finney
Warren H. Fisher
Gerard J. Fitzpatrick
Allan A. A. Flynn
Joseph R. Fogarty
Charles L. Folkers
Carlos G. Font
Emmett Forrester, Jr.
Paul G. Fossum
Randolph V. Fox
Benjamin L. Frank
Donald R. A. Frederick
Fred H. French
Arthur J. Frenzel
Henry Frey
Floyd A. Friesen
Charles R. Frink
Joseph R. Friou
William R. Fry, Jr.
Theodore H. Fuger, Jr.
Benham Fuhrman
Richard P. Gagan
Nicholas G. Galanos
Radford G. Gamble
Pat M. Garner
Walter W. Garnett
Robert S. Gallagher
Charles A. Garney
James J. Gebhard
Robert S. Gehman
Leonard E. Gessner, Jr.
Joseph J. Giedraitis, Jr.
James W. Gilges III
William W. Gilmore, Junior
Sebastian J. Giuffrida
Charles R. Glassey
John M. Glenn
David R. Godschalk
Theodore G. Goetz
John P. Goldsberry, Jr.
Robert S. Goodell
Bruce J. Gordon
Harold J. Gordon
William J. Gorham
Irving I. Gottesman
Richard H. Gould
Edward H. G. Gowen
Robert W. Graham
George L. Graveson, Jr.
Richard V. Gray
Walter F. Greeley
General F. Green, Jr.
Marshall W. Greene
Hugh D. Greer III
Peter C. Grenquist
William C. Grinstead, Jr.
Peter F. Groff
Robert F. Grove
James P. Gruber
Robert A. Guariglia
Charles L. Gunn
Frank W. Gunn
Patrick J. Gunning
Robert J. Guttentag
Herald J. Gwilym
Irwin E. Haegele
Harry H. Hagedorn
Grant F. Haggquist, Jr.
Philip L. Hall
Donald F. Hall
Richard K. Halverson
Glenn D. Hamilton
Mark H. Hamilton
William J. Haneghan
Richard P. Hanes
Brian K. Hammula
Richard H. Hansen
Robert L. Hansen
George C. Hanson
Paul E. Harmeier
Charles P. Harris
Frank B. Harris
Henry G. Harrison, Jr.
Joseph W. Harrison
Richard C. Harrison
Andrew C. Harvey
James R. Harvey
John B. Harwood
John W. Haskins
William T. Hausle
John J. Hauss
Arthur L. Hawk
Robert P. Hawkins
William R. Haycraft
David S. Heath
Arthur J. Heins
Teddy S. Hendelman
Francis A. Hennigan, Jr.
David R. Hendrick
Charles L. Henry
Granville C. Henry III
"E" B. Herring
George G. Hespelt
Phillip N. Ness
Dean J. Hewitt
John P. Hieronimus
Patrick A. Highland
Marshall E. Hill
Hugh W. Hilleary
Thomas B. Hilton
Lloyd V. Hinton
Paul W. Hobart
Richard R. G. Hobson
Winfield P. Hock, Jr.
George H. Hodsdon
Robert T. Hogan
Robert W. Holder
Gerald R. Hollenbeck
John H. Hollister
George F. Holmes, Jr.
Eric A. Holmquist
Arthur C. Hopewell, Jr.
James W. Hopkins, Jr.
Charles A. Hornell, Jr.
Edward C. House
Ernest E. Howard
Richard P. Howerton
Alvin J. Hoyt
Leo R. Huber
Roland W. Hudson
Robert L. Huff
James H. Hunt
Myron E. Hunzeker
John B. Hurd
Wendell P. Hurlbut III
Thomas W. Hurt
Robert J. Huston
David N. Hyde
Marshall L. Ihrig, Jr.
Samuel A. Ingebritsen
William F. Inskeep
Eugene H. Irminger
Leo H. Irving
Thomas H. Irving
Marvin L. Ivy, Jr.
Clarence W. Jackson
Harry C. Jacobson
Keith A. Jacobson
Edwin H. Jaffe
William S. James
Lewis W. Jarman III
Keith B. Jefferts
Lyle M. Jenkins
James A. Jennings
Alan G. Jensen
Robert E. Jensen
Joseph W. Jernigan
John K. Jess
Berkeley D. Johnson, Jr.
Dean C. Johnson
Donald R. Johnson
Dwight D. Johnson
Grover L. Johnson
Henry C. Johnson, Jr.
Kerron D. Johnson
Martin L. Johnson
Noye M. Johnson
Philip Johnson, Jr.
Robert B. Johnson
Howard S. Johnston
Joe H. Jones
Norbert C. Jones
Ronald W. Jones
"T" E. Jones, Jr.
John A. Joslyn
Charles V. Juliano
Peter C. Kaestner
Ralph C. Kahle, Jr.
Stanley J. Kahri
William Kari
Francis X. Kasel, Jr.
William C. Kaufman
John M. Kavanaugh
Russell V. Kazmierczak
Gerald T. Keating
Jerome M. Keefe
Morris J. Keenan, Jr.
John C. Keene
Louis J. Keester
Lawrence E. Kelly
Thomas E. Kelly
Richard K. Kelly
Robert F. Kelly
Thomas G. Kelly III
William R. Kelly
Ralph E. Kemp, Jr.
Thomas J. Kenan
William O. Kendrick
David J. Kennedy
Philip R. Kennicott
David A. Kibler
William J. Kiernan, Jr.
Robert E. Kilmer
David A. Kindig
Barry L. King
Thomas L. King, Jr.
William L. Kingman
Emmett D. Kinkade
Robert L. Kirk
Roger L. Kisner
James D. Kitchin III
Marvin Klotan
Stanley W. Knapp
James R. Koch
Joseph C. Koenenn
Edgar F. Koenig
James R. Korndorffer
Johannes R. Krahmer
Theodore D. Kratt
Robert L. Krohn
Curtis F. Kruger
Keith A. Krusemark
Gordon M. Krusen
Robert P. Laegen
Otto C. Laird, Jr.
Keith W. Lallier
John A. Lamon
Donald E. Lander
William R. Lang
Rolland A. Langley, Jr.
Kenneth W. Last
Walter M. Laurence
William C. Lauterbach
Charles J. LaVally
Wayman C. Lawrence III
William J. Lawrence
Wilbur D. Layman
Richard F. Leach
Reid Ledbetter
Dana B. Lee
Raymond C. Lee
John P. Leinfelder
Joseph A. Lenhard
Roderick C. Leod
James R. Lepper
Hyman J. Levinstein
Benjamin E. Lewis II
George E. Lewis
Mark M. Lewis
Wilford A. Lewis
Charles D. Libby
Phillip C. Linwick
Edward S. Lipsey
Chester H. Lohr
Robert P. Looney, Jr.

Warren E. Loper
John A. Lord
Roger T. Loschen
John E. Lucas
Jean M. Lucke
Peter "J" Lunde
Frederick L. Lundquist, Jr.
William R. Luney
John C. Lunsford
John E. Lusche
Kenneth D. Lyders
John S. Lyman, Jr.
Robert D. Lynch
Edward T. Lyons, Jr.
Donald E. Lytle
George E. McCarthy
Vernon A. McCarty
John B. McClane
Paul H. McConnell
Richard R. McConnell
Daniel J. McCloy
William E. McCurdy, Jr.
Vincent J. McDonnell
Robert J. McGee
Donald J. McGinley, Jr.
Leslie E. McHenry
George R. McKay, Jr.
Patrick McKenna
George W. McLendon
Ramon M. McLeod
James E. McNamara
Edward J. McNelis
John R. McSunas
Robert J. McWhorter
John W. MacCormack
Ian R. MacLeod
Robert F. MacNally II
Edward T. Mahoney
Lewis A. Mahoney
Robert W. Malone
Aram H. Mardirosian
Eugene D. Marks, Jr.
Charles W. Martin, Jr.
James A. Martin
Robert E. Martin
Gerald E. Marshall
Lawrence J. Marshall
Harvey W. P. Mason
William R. Masters, Jr.
Donald W. Mathews
Peter M. Mattoon
Lawrence M. Maxwell
Charles T. May, Jr.
Thomas C. Mayers, Jr.
James D. Maynes
Robert E. Mazeikis
Donald J. Mechling
Edward C. Melton, Jr.
Don F. Memler
Nicholas C. Merrill
Richard J. Merrill
Marcus A. Merriman
John R. Merryman, Jr.
Robert M. Messner
Philip R. Meyer, Jr.
Robert W. Meyer
John E. Mhoon
William G. Michael
Edward L. Miles
Murray E. Miles
Donald M. Miller
Edward P. Miller
Emlyn M. Miller
Frank L. Miller
Frank R. Miller
George E. Miller
Robert F. Miller
Roger H. Miller
James R. Mills
George B. Milliard
Joseph E. Mirman
Clark D. Mollenhauer
William G. Moller, Jr.
William B. Moniz
Douglas G. Montgomery
Charles F. Moody, Jr.
Ernest P. Moore, Jr.
Raphael B. Moore
Norman R. Morgan
John E. Morrissey
William E. Morrow, Jr.
Paul C. Moser
Daniel B. Moulton
William J. Mouton, Jr.
Dale H. Mowery
John D. Moxley
Paul N. Mullane
Samuel M. Murdoch
James A. Murfree, Jr.
Clifford W. Murphey
Watson B. Murphy
Lewis D. Mutty
Bruce W. Myirea
Carl E. Natter
Eugene M. Nawrocki
James W. Neblett
Homer C. Neely, Jr.
Charles R. Nelson, Jr.
Frederick L. Nelson
Maurice J. Nelson
Teddy N. Nelson
John M. Nemecek
Robert G. Neville
Richard A. Newell
Donald E. Nielsen
Frank W. Nikischer
Donald L. Noah
Robert L. Noddin
George J. Norcom
Marcus O. Nordberg
Hal P. Norman
Ronald V. Norman
Francis S. Norris, Jr.
Vernon L. Norwood II
James P. Nowlin, Jr.
William G. Nuffer
Frederic L. Nystrom
Edward J. Ober
Louis A. Oberle
Robert P. Oberly
Paul H. Ode
Harry B. O'Donnell III
Terrence P. O'Donnell
Kenneth V. Oertel
James E. Oesterle, Jr.
James D. O'Hara
David E. Oleson
Thomas W. Oliver, Jr.
Doyle A. Olson
Frederick S. Olson
Jay K. Ormond
George E. Orr
William H. Orr
James L. Osborn
John W. Ost
James W. Ott
Leslie W. Ottinger
Robert V. Owens
Erwin Pacia
Edward B. Packard, Jr.
Ronald A. Paffrath
Richard Q. Palmer
William B. Palmer
John J. Palmieri
Alec A. Pandaleon
Oscar W. Pardue
James A. Park
John B. Park
Peter Parker
Richard W. Parker
William L. Parthe
Christopher M. Partridge
Charles R. Patrick
Ernest F. Pecci
Dudley P. Peeler, Jr.
William H. Penn
Philip L. Perrey
Lyle D. Perrigo, Jr.
David L. Perry
Lester R. Perry
Juergen N. Peters
Donald E. Petersen
John W. Peterson
Reuben W. Peterson
Roger S. Peterson
Roy H. Peterson
William A. Petry
Benjamin B. Phelps
Charles A. Phillips
John R. Piazza
Robert J. Piha
Alfred N. Pilz
Allan J. Place
Gayle M. Plummer
Edgar W. Pollum
Daniel K. Pope IV
Clarence A. Poppleton, Jr.
Jerome K. Porter
David P. Potter
Robert W. Powers
Paul N. Prentice
Dickinson Prentiss
Claude H. Prevots
Gerald M. Price
Leonard V. Quigley
Philip L. Randolph
Stephen D. Ratcliff
Lawrence J. Rawlings, Jr.
John R. Redmond
Raymond D. Reed
Roger F. Reedy
William M. Register, Jr.
Stuart V. Reynolds
Harry E. Rice III
Henry Rie
Robert C. Ringstad
Keith D. Rinne
Ernest E. Ritchie
William H. Rivera
Noel Robbins
George D. Roberson
Edwin J. Roberts
William H. Roberts
Edward Roddy
Harold R. Roe
Walter F. Roedelbronn
Douglas L. Root, Jr.
Paul B. Rosenberg
George R. Roslund
Angus MacK. Ross
Warren L. Rowlands
John S. Ruef
Kay LeR. Ruggles
Charles T. Russell
Richard C. Ryan
Richard M. Sakal
Teddy K. Sampsel
Winfield L. Samuelson
Oscar E. Sanden, Jr.
Robert W. Sanders
David R. Sanks III
George A. Sawyer, Jr.
Kenneth M. Sax
John B. Scannell
Donald M. Scantland
William Schempers, Jr.
Lowell E. P. Scheuer
Richard M. Schieber
Herbert H. Schmid
Wesley G. Schmidt
Richard C. Schoonmaker
Walter W. Schultz
Joseph L. Schwab, Jr.
Clarence M. Schwerin III
Ernest Sciutto
Norman H. Scott
Richard L. Seal
William P. Sears
John K. Seaward
Charles R. Seeger
Gerald K. Seiple
Richard L. Seitz
William A. N. Severance
Raymond T. Shanstrom
Richard G. Shaw
Robert W. Shaw, Jr.
Frank T. Sheehy
Dean J. Shipman
Paul N. Sholtz
Louis R. Showalter, Jr.
Milton E. Shumway
Richard J. Simier
George B. Simmons
Robert L. Simms, Jr.
Julian L. Simon
Roderick D. Sinclair
Donald A. Singer
James M. Sink
John H. Slate
Addison D. Smart
Clint E. Smith
Edwin G. Smith
Frederick D. Smith, Jr.
George F. Smith
George L. Smith
James T. Smith
Norman P. Smith
Robert S. Smith
Stuart J. G. Smith
Walton W. Smith, Jr.
William J. Smith
William L. Smith
Thomas J. Smithberger
William J. Smithers
Edward R. Snelgrove
Donald G. Snipes
Thomas V. Solan
John D. Sornson
Noel C. Sorrell
John S. Speer, Jr.
Oscar F. Spicer
Donald E. Spofford
Carl J. Spohr, Jr.
David L. Sponseller
John A. Stamper
Richard W. Stanley
Paul R. Stapp
William B. Stason
Lawrence W. Stark
Edward J. Staudt, Jr.
George H. Stauss
Kenneth A. Stead, Jr.
Samuel D. Stearns, Jr.
William D. Stemple
John T. Stenvall
Ronald E. Stephans
Robert L. Stephenson
Edward A. Stevens
James P. Stevens
Robert L. Stillwell, Jr.
Donald L. Stinson
Robert M. Stone
John D. Stoner
Robert G. Straley
William M. Strange
Joseph A. Struthers, Jr.
Raymond S. Stutsman
Joseph E. Sullivan, Jr.
Gregory L. Sutliff
Robert L. Swaney
Harold J. Taback
James R. Talbot, Jr.
Billy F. Tally
Richard R. Tarrant
Lee A. Tavis
David Taylor
LeRoy R. Taylor
Roger C. Taylor
Henry A. Tazelaar
Fred Terrill, Jr.
Conrad E. Thalmayer
Donald R. Thomas
Frank M. Thometz, Jr.
Jack C. Thompson, Jr.
Robert P. Thompson
John M. Thornley
Maurice S. Thornton, Jr.
Thomas J. Thornton
Larry D. Thorpe
Thomas N. Throckmorton
John G. Thweatt, Jr.
Albert P. Tilley
William D. Timberlake
Harry H. Timmins
Stephen P. Toadvine 3d
Louis A. Tonini, Jr.
Ralph E. Tozier, Jr.
Charles V. Trawick
Malcolm MacD. Traxler
Paul L. Trump, Jr.
John K. Tyrrell
Thomas M. Uzzell, Jr.
Daan vanAlderwerelt
Donald E. VanAllsburg
Abraham R. VanDoren, Jr.
Richard W. Vannatta, Jr.
Steven vanWestendorp
Edgar Vaughan III
Robert A. Vaughn
Everett L. Vernon
Henry C. VerValen
Charles E. Viele
Ralph H. Vogel
Nicholas Volk, Jr.
Robert D. Vonderheide
Thomas L. Voorhees
Charles M. Wade
Benjamin A. Waitman
George H. E. Walden
Daniel M. Waldorf
Leonard E. Walecka
Carleton S. Walker
Thomas McC. Wallace
John P. Wallis
Michael P. Wallner
Isaac J. Walters III
Richard V. Warden
Laurance B. Warner
James S. Warren
James W. Warren, Jr.
Thomas G. Watkinson
Clarence E. Watson Jr.
James F. Watson
James I. Webb
Richard N. Webb
Stuart G. Webb
John B. Weber
Larry J. Weber
William H. Weddleton
Randall S. Weeks
Arnold C. Wegher
John W. Weiser
Bruce L. Welch
Wallace E. Wendland
Howard J. West
Harry W. Wharton
Charles O. Wheeler, Jr.
Gilbert R. Whitaker, Jr.
Dennis G. White
Donald D. White
Richard W. White
Robert N. White
Anson M. Whitfield
Rex M. Whitton, Jr.
Gordon R. Wicker
Donald A. Wiederecht
Gerald L. Wien
Barry E. Wiggins
Leslie W. Wilde
James N. Wilfert
Raymond G. Wilkerson
Hugh D. Williams
Grant R. Williams
Oras E. Williams
Howard D. Williamson
James Williamson, Jr.
Jack R. Willis
James G. Wilson
Richard V. Wilson, Jr.
Thomas W. Wilson, Jr.
William F. Wilson
Charles R. Winder
Gordon T. Winfield, Jr.
Herman D. Winfree, Jr.
James K. Winfrey
Robert H. Winner
Michael A. Winter
Glenn C. Wiprud
John E. Withrow, Jr.
James K. Witthaus
William F. Wolff
Raymond W. C. Wong
Franklin T. Woodall, Jr.
Harry E. Workman
Garth S. Wright
Robert L. Wright, Jr.
John G. Yarosh
Donald R. Yeager
Mortimer A. Yelton
Evan D. Yoes, Jr.
Robert S. Young
Ted P. Young
William A. Young
Wesley W. Zerbe
Richard A. Zimmerman
Gerhard W. Zimmermann
Roger O. Zoellner

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Stanley E. Altenbern
Richard M. Bartunek
Ronald J. Boccieri, Jr.
Richard A. Brett
John Clatworthy
Arthur E. Crow
Darrell U. Davidson
Donald D. Dhonau
John M. Drabelle, Jr.
Charles H. F. Egger, Jr.
James V. Fowler, Jr.
Joseph W. Gower
James W. Hanson
Thomas M. Hearn
William E. House, Jr.
William L. Jordan
Erich V. Kilmer
John P. Kinney, Jr.
Robert D. Kravet
John F. McClatchey
Robert D. Nosun
Bob K. Peterson
Donald C. Rovegno
John M. Savage
Walter H. Shauer, Jr.
William J. Tabar
John E. Thomas
Russell E. Wiltsie
Charles D. Wood

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Stephen W. Bartlett
Charles H. Bladergroen
Donald A. Burgh
Donald R. Carpenter
Philip C. Clayton, Jr.
Anthony J. D'Arco
John DeNora
Thomas J. Douglas
Carl J. Eversole
Richard B. Greer
Donald W. Hils
Louis A. Hoch, Jr.
John J. Hogan

James E. Klein
Ronald M. Losee
Will A. Merrill
Olney H. Powers
Benjamin H. Reid
Ronald I. Rivard
Robert L. Snyder
William H. Tantum
William E. Thompson
Erman E. Wood, Jr.
Don L. Yelek

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Donald R. Austgen
Ralph L. Bicknell
George J. Bossert
Wilmer E. Brenneman
Arnold J. Brewer
Richard L. Brownell
Jack R. Catt
Frank A. Clark
Franklin W. Coates
Robert C. Edson
Charles T. Fairchild
Bruce Flanagan
Jack D. Fulks, Jr.
Thomas C. Fuller
William S. Gerichten
Donald E. Gillum
John W. Goar
Richard C. Goff
George O. Goodson, Jr.
Alexander J. Gordon III
Johnny O. Gregerson
Billy N. Hahn
Herbert J. Harkey, Jr.
James H. Higgins
Edward C. Johnson
John A. Kinniburgh
Thomas I. Lee
John J. McCauley
Donald C. McLane, Jr.
Hubert E. Miller
Howard F. Mushett
Charles L. Nesbit
Mortimer J. O'Kane, Jr.
John K. Parker
Lon S. Pettitt
Earl F. Pierson, Jr.
Daniel J. Quick
Wesley H. Rice
Laurence B. Robbins, Jr.
Edward J. Rochford, Jr.
Robert S. Small
Robert W. Stark
John E. Weber, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Richard J. Martin
Rex E. Sweet

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

William C. Davis
Erick R. Kolberg

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy.

Marlin D. Seiders
Eugene M. Smith

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy.

Albert J. Otto
Lawrence H. Roller

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Virgil E. Thon

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

David J. Knoedler
Ben C. Sharp

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

George L. H. Cooper
Holly H. Evans
Hamilton M. Hoyler
William J. King
Walter F. Layer
Lloyd W. Martin, Jr.
James A. Moreau
James L. Mueller
Lewis N. Samuelsen
Samuel W. Smith, Jr.
William E. Sperling
Walter R. Walsh

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of major in the Marine Corps:

George Anderson
Eldon W. Autry
Martin F. Barrett
Charles H. Beale, Jr.
William H. Bennison
Philip E. Booth
Louis V. Brooks
John R. Burnett
John J. Butler IV
Norman S. Chase
Alexander W. Chilton, Jr.
Bruce W. Clarke
Eugene P. Claude
Job C. Cook
Richard M. Cook
James A. Crotinger
Charles C. Crossfield
John A. Crown
Walter H. Cuenin
William C. Davis, Jr.
Graham T. Douglass
Kenneth P. Dunkle
Jack R. Edwards
Robert J. Edwards
Duane L. Faw
John T. Fey
Robert G. Fritch
Duane Fultz
George B. Gierhart
John E. Gorman
Leo V. R. Gross
Benjamin L. Hadley, Jr.
Andrew C. J. Hartnett
Herbert H. Hawkins
Chester R. Hermanson
Francis C. Hogan
Raymond C. Holben
Eric S. Holmgrain
Stephen Horton, Jr.
Noel A. Jackson
James M. Joyner
William W. Kaenzig
Fred E. Kiehle, Jr.
James R. Kingham
James T. Kisgen
Dorothy M. Knox
Foster C. LaHue
George A. Lavis
Earl N. Lewis
Howard L. Mabie
Glen E. Martin
Edward R. McCarthy
James F. McClanahan
Robert E. McClean
Earl R. McLaughlin
Joseph V. Millerick
John J. Padley
Stephen K. Pawloski
David H. Pepper
Harry S. Popper, Jr.
Paul F. Reese
William D. Regan
Roy H. Roark
Martin C. Roth
Bertram S. Ryder
Frederick H. Scantling
William V. Schwebke
Warren S. Sivertsen
Clement J. Stadler
Elwyn M. Stimson
Alfred A. Tillman
Frank H. Vogel, Jr.
Robert S. Wallace
William W. Wander, Junior
Richard J. Webster
Russell E. Whipple
Max M. Witzel
Thaddeus P. Wojcik
Dorian J. Wright

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Harold W. Adams
Howard A. Anderson, Jr.
William E. Antley, Jr.
Rosario J. Augeri
Haskell C. Baker
Jack B. Baker
James R. Barbour
Nolan J. Beat
William H. Bender
Robert "Q" Bekins, Jr.
Leonard S. Bethards
Wesley C. Blake
Thomas J. Bohannon
Leighton T. Bohl, Jr.
Richard R. Breen
Ralph E. Bristow
Charles M. Buell
Donald H. Campbell
David V. Carter
Thomas P. Casey
Joseph G. Cervell
George E. Chamberlin, Jr.
Vincent T. Cleveland
Glenn O. Cole
Dudley Cook
Alfred M. Cordes
Raymond C. Cowles
David M. Cox
Stanley G. Crosier
John D. Cunningham
John J. Danner
Raymond N. Davis
Rex O. Dillow
Dolores L. Dubinsky
Hoyt C. Duncan, Jr.
Paul J. Dupre
John J. Egan
James R. Einum
Karl E. Faser
John E. Finnigan
Francis C. Foley, Jr.
Leonard E. Fribourg
Donald G. Frier
Shirley J. Fuetsch
Troy L. Galford
Robert S. Geissinger
Byron Graham, Jr.
Kenneth O. Gray
Charles B. Guy
Clyde C. Hall
Jack E. Hanthorn
Charles W. Harris
Franklin J. Harte
Bruce A. Heflin
Charles T. Higginbotham
Howard R. Hinrichs
Adolph J. Honeycutt
Thomas M. Horne
Otis P. Jenne, Jr.
Irving R. Johnson
James R. Johnson
Victor M. Johnson
Lyman P. Keown
Donald E. Kramer
Ray O. Larsen
Robert N. Losse
David E. Lownds
Merlin T. Matthews
Milford A. Mathews
Gilbert J. McArdle
Warren E. McCain
John E. McDermott
James M. McGee
Robert C. McGuire
Robert A. McKinley
Robert F. Meadows
Richard L. Michael
Randall L. Mitchell
Frank V. Moise, Jr.
Henry H. Morgan
Alfred L. Nelson, Jr.
Arthur A. Nelson, Jr.
Alfred L. O'Connor
John L. Ostby
Mitchell Paige
Fred L. Parks
Walter D. Pickerell
Franklin F. Ramseur, Jr.
John J. Reber
William G. Redel
Harold R. Reed, Jr.
Herbert A. Robinson
Robert C. Ronald
John J. Rooney
Francis X. Rudenauer
Raymond H. Schannamann
Robert M. Schneider
Kenneth D. Seibert
Lawrence M. Selleck, Jr.
Charles B. Sevier
James J. Shute
Wilbur F. Simlik
Marvin A. Skeath, Jr.
Emil Skocpol
Thomas B. Sparkman
Joe B. Stribling
Lester V. Swenson
Bruce J. Thomas
Robert D. Thurston
James W. Tuma
Nita B. Warner
Royer G. Warren
William T. Westmoreland, Jr.
Roy B. Whitlock
Walter L. Williams
Robert R. Wilson
Charles D. Woehrle
Richard M. Woodard
Robert W. Yerkes

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Warren H. Allen
Raymond M. Allensworth
Nalton M. Bennett
Howard S. Bolton
Arlin E. Bubeck
Thomas W. Burke
Daniel A. Casey, Jr.
Thomas W. Clarke
Thomas L. Cobb
Albert E. Coffeen
Ted H. Collins
Kenneth J. Conklin
Samuel A. Cox, Jr.
Richard W. Crispen
Wallace W. Crompton
John P. Crowley
Earl M. Cunard, Jr.
Robert W. Dittmar
Robert H. Durning
Jack C. Elrod
Harold W. Evans, Jr.
Don D. Ezell
Clayton C. Fenton, Jr.
Benjamin F. Fox
Jean T. Fox
Frederick L. Franzman
Harry D. French
Donald L. Galbraith
William R. Glover
Peter W. Gough
Lilburn L. Harpe
Joseph S. Heitzler
Arvil B. Hendrickson
Jack Herod
Ralph A. Heywood
Norman S. Higgins
Arthur T. Hill
Franklin A. Hill
Kurt L. Hoch
William H. Holden
Thomas A. James
George Janiszewski
Robert T. Johnson
Joseph J. Kelly
William D. Kelly
Jack K. Knocke
Edward A. Koster
James M. Landrigan
John H. Lauck
James Leon
Charles P. Logan, Jr.
John B. Lund
Charles C. Matthews
James S. McAlister
Lyle S. McCabe
Harry A. McColm, Jr.
John C. McDonald
Robert B. Metcalfe
Alexander L. Michaux, Jr.
Ross R. Miner
John F. Mitchell
Charles A. Morris
Dalbor R. Nixon, Jr.
Anthony Novak
Donald L. O'Neil
Thurman Owens
Charles E. Parks
Harry P. Pearce
Richard F. Peterson
Robert M. Platt
Milton L. Raphael
Maurice A. Reep
Dwight E. Roberts
Kermit E. Rosenthal
Gerould M. Rumble, Jr.
Harrison K. Saturday
John P. Schied
Edwin R. Schick, Jr.
John L. Schwartz
Leo R. Schwartz
Louis B. Scott
Redford D. Sears
Charles M. See
Robert L. Shuford
Russell L. Silverthorn
Arthur B. Slack, Jr.
Arthur R. Smith
Jack D. Spaulding
Lester M. Stone, Jr.
John E. Swintek
Robert W. Taylor
William W. Taylor
John M. Terry, Jr.
Alfred I. Thomas
William G. Timme
Robert J. Tunnell, Jr.
Edward G. Usher, Jr.
Henry A. F. Vonderheyde, Jr.
Rex A. White

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Constance Baker
James E. Bald
Billy D. Bouldin
Joseph R. Cameron
Ralph M. Costello
Marvin E. Day
Aubrey C. Doggett, Jr.
Robert W. Dyer
Dale Francisco
Louis A. Gulling
Charles E. Holloway, Jr.
Paul R. Hunter
John E. Kaczynski
George M. Lawrence, Jr.
Wanda L. Lively
Richard J. Mahoney, Jr.
William F. Maughan
Marcus D. McAnally
Paul N. McCloskey, Jr.
Howard R. Mead, Jr.
William Netka
Carol A. Paice
Jerome J. Plant
James J. Quinn
Clinton Roberson
Henry M. Robinett
William J. Rodgers, Jr.
Rodger E. Rourke
Rylen B. Rudy
Gordon B. Schumacher
Glenn A. Stephens
William D. Stoddart III
Archie VanWinkle
Thomas P. Wareham

Helen E. Weaver to be permanent chief ship's clerk in the Navy.

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

James L. Mueller

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

John R. Burnett
Alexander W. Chilton, Jr.
Kenneth P. Dunkle
Duane Fultz
John E. Gorman

Herbert H. Hawkins	Harry S. Popper, Jr.
James M. Joyner	Martin C. Roth
James T. Kisgen	Warren S. Sivertsen
Foster C. LaHue	Elwyn M. Stimson
Glen E. Martin	Frank H. Vogel, Jr.
John J. Padley	Thaddeus P. Wojcik

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of major in the Marine Corps:

William E. Antley, Jr.	Adolph J. Honeycutt
Rosario J. Augeri	Thomas M. Horne
Jack B. Baker	Victor M. Johnson
James R. Barbour	Ray O. Larsen
William H. Bender	David E. Lownds
Richard R. Breen	Henry H. Morgan
Joseph G. Cervell	Alfred L. Nelson, Jr.
Vincent T. Cleveland	Mitchell Paige
Glenn O. Cole	Walter D. Pickerell
David M. Cox	John J. Reber
Hoyt C. Duncan, Jr.	Herbert A. Robinson
James R. Elnum	Francis X. Rudenauer
Karl E. Faser	James J. Shute
Charles B. Guy	Royer G. Warren
Jack E. Hanthorn	William T. Westmoreland, Jr.
Franklin J. Harte	

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Raymond M. Aliens-worth	Joseph J. Kelly
Howard S. Bolton	Jack K. Knocke
Daniel A. Casey, Jr.	Edward A. Koster
Thomas W. Clarke	James Leon
Thomas L. Cobb	James S. McAlister
Ted H. Collins	Lyle S. McCabe
Kenneth J. Conklin	John C. McDonald
Wallace W. Crompton	Ross R. Miner
Jack C. Elrod	Richard F. Peterson
Harold W. Evans, Jr.	Edwin S. Schick, Jr.
Don D. Ezell	Leo R. Schwartz
Benjamin P. Fox	Russell L. Silverthorn
Donald L. Galbraith	Arthur B. Slack, Jr.
Joseph S. Heitzler	Arthur R. Smith
Ralph A. Heywood	Robert W. Taylor
Arthur T. Hill	Robert J. Tunnell, Jr.
William H. Holden	Henry A. F. Vonderheyde, Jr.
Thomas A. James	Rex A. White

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Paul M. Crum	Dean L. Strong
Grant A. Millard	Walter H. Wells, Jr.

Ralph M. Evans, midshipman (Naval Academy), to be ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy as previously nominated.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy, in lieu of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps as previously nominated:

Stanley B. Waid
Robert McB. Schucker

Richard E. Almen, midshipman (Naval Academy), to be ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Thomas E. Arnold	Herbert D. Guberman
Harold E. Bisson, Jr.	James W. Hamilton
Kent A. Blakeslee, Jr.	James R. Hughes
Robert G. Carlson	Donald F. Istvan
James F. Compton	Edwin L. Jackson
Homer E. Derrick, Jr.	Arne C. Johnson
Edward C. Doerner	Stuart R. Kerr, Jr.
Warren A. Doscher	Arthur H. Kreitzer
Robert D. Drews	William E. Kriegsman
Bernard L. Epstein	John W. Marcil
Thaddeus F. Fleishman	Benjamin C. Mauthe
	Thomas C. Mayers, Jr.
John C. Frieden	Robert S. Meyer
Robert G. Gibson	David R. Neill
Luther H. Ginkinger, Jr.	John W. Nixon
	Charles H. Ostrander
Philip H. Goulston	Shubel H. Owen
William F. Glaser, Jr.	Robert L. Page
James E. Green	Raymond L. Paulson
Donald W. Peterson	Edward J. Stump
Clarence J. Profilet	Ib E. Sundt
Robert T. Rich	Thomas J. Swisher
Charles E. Rogers, Jr.	Richard R. Theriault
Baruch Rosenberg	Richard D. Thoes
Carl Schwartz	Norman C. Thomas
Max D. Sherrill	Charles B. Welchman
Richard S. Simmons	Edward E. Wills
Farquhar A. Smith	Walter Q. Wilson
William D. Stuhldreher	Louis S. Zappulla, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps), to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Duane LeR. Addison	John L. McKnight
George J. Alexander	Frank C. McLaughlin
John E. Arnold	Neil E. McNeill
William S. Baird	Donald A. Mackie
Thomas E. Baker	Terence S. Malone
Thomas E. Beck	Kenneth E. Merrill
Donald Beckman	Marvin W. Mog
John P. Boone	John C. Monjo
Allan H. Bowermaster	Charles W. Morehouse
George W. Brain	Roy McC. Mundorff, Jr.
Robert K. Bryant	
James S. Bullion, Jr.	Robert B. Nelson
James M. Butler	Wallace D. Niemela
John O. Carney	Robert J. O'Grady
Henry B. Clark II	Harvey T. Olson
Herbert B. Cohn	Orville J. Pardau
James R. Corn	Harlan R. Patterson
Samuel H. Daniell	Henry B. Patterson
Donald G. Dickason	Peter C. Paul
Daniel P. Dormer	George G. Pearse
Frank E. Dotson	Howard T. Perley
Richmond J. Dougall	Howard M. Pettebone
Norbert A. Ehrmann	John M. Peek, Jr.
Peter C. Enander	Donald G. Perwein
David W. Fagerness	Allen J. Potts
Richard C. Fahringer	Jimmie L. Potts
William J. Finnegan, Jr.	George G. Pritchard
	Richard H. Rea
Gerard J. Fitzpatrick	Merle E. Renshaw
James R. Gerard	John P. Rockart
Roger W. Gilmore	Richard P. Rohleder
William P. Gorenflo, Jr.	Leslie J. Rose
	Robert E. Roseen
Roland H. Graham	Lewis W. Ross, Jr.
James R. Haigh	Louis M. Rusitzky
George "M" Harper	Frederick R. Russell
Harrell S. Hayden	Harry W. Sankey
Richard Hendrickson	Richard K. Savage
Robert H. Jiranek	Miles M. Shatzer
Richard L. Johnson	Willis T. Smith
Glenn Jones	Donald F. Sontag
Arthur L. Kalleberg	Richard J. Steiner
"J" Riley Kapfer	Donald R. Stenquist
Stanley J. Karp	Charles A. Stewart, Jr.
Wiley O. Kennedy, Jr.	Eugene W. Stuart, Jr.
Donald A. Kirsner	Walter F. Stuhldreher
Lane A. Kispert	Wayne H. Sundquist
Robert W. Kraud	Donald J. Sutherland
Allen J. Lenz	Knute P. Temte
Donald A. Lewis	James M. Thompson, Jr.
Vernon K. Little	
Victor F. Lubke	James E. VanPelt
Clyde C. Lunsford, Jr.	Theodore Wassam
Robert R. Luton	David A. West
James E. McGee	Ronald M. Wong
James T. McGinn	

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Terrence P. O'Donnell
Donald M. Bohrer
Richard R. Tarrant

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John E. Breen	Dean M. Connett
Peter L. Bretz	Edward L. Cottingham
Arthur L. Brown, Jr.	Lee P. Hatfield, Jr.
William G. Catlin	John E. Jones
Robert K. Catterson	Thomas K. Jones
Ray E. Koskie	Sarkis S. Sarkisian
Henry W. Kramer, Jr.	James E. Tyhurst
Charles W. Newman	Frederick H. Watson, Jr.
Burton N. Phelan	
Lawrence E. Riedesel	Robert K. White
Richard W. Rodney	

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Andrew E. Andersen, Jr.	Kenneth D. Erickson
	Gerald L. Zang
Neil S. Bonne, Jr.	

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Harry J. Archer, Jr.	Gerald S. Mayer
Ronald E. Bishop	Milton P. Moeser, Jr.
John H. Blair	Thomas W. Nelson, Jr.
Allan H. Bloom	John E. O'Neill
Ernest M. Curtis	David P. Page
Paul J. Dentler	Richard L. Palmer
Charles F. Dininger, Jr.	William R. Rifino
Robert W. Fischer	Kenneth J. Skipper
Theodore C. Getten	Kenneth E. Smith
Robert H. Hansen	Joseph V. Thomas, Jr.
Joel P. Hudson	Glenn H. Van Eman
Tom C. McKenney	Charles D. Wahl
Manuel J. Martin	

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

William L. Ayland, Jr.	Ernold G. Love
Frank J. Badamo	Richard C. McDonald
William H. Baker	Jimmie L. McWhirt
George E. Bivins	Wardell C. Morrin
Clarence A. Boyd, Jr.	Charles E. Mueller
Nelson P. Deal	Francis M. Nelson
Wayne R. Dittman	John C. Paltz
John F. Dorman	Bernard P. Phillips
William F. Erickson	Norman G. Phillips, Jr.
William E. Farris	
Raymond S. Fry	Frank E. Pirman
Donald J. Fulham	Anthony S. F. Russo
Carl Gage	Ralph G. Salvagno
Jack J. Galloway	Richard H. Searle
Laurence E. Golden	Harold G. Shaklee
Lawrence E. Harry	Charles Solomon
Milton T. Hefty	Henry W. Steadman
Carl C. Hosali	Frank B. Stover, Jr.
Ralph A. Huntzinger	Herbert I. Swarts
Franklin H. Jones, Jr.	Richard E. Waldow
Richard H. Kirkpatrick	Ronald M. Westerman
	Ray W. Williams III
William A. Lemley	Josiah A. Wood
Elroy E. Lloyd	

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps in the Navy:

"J" Thornton Boswell
John T. Craighead

Jack P. Griffin, officer, to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy.

Russell R. Funk, Jr., officer, to be lieutenant in the Dental Corps in the Navy.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Joseph L. Atkins
Richard Belyea
Benjamin F. Sohn

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Willard N. Christopher	Derrell P. Thompson
Charles L. Goode	Norris W. Wilson
Robert M. Krippner	

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Richard D. Alexander	Roscoe L. Barrett, Jr.
Frank R. Andersen	Richard S. Barry
Harry E. Atkinson	John M. Batcheider
Edward S. Baker, Jr.	Vincent H. Bednarsky
Joseph L. Barr	Bernard B. Belant

Loren D. Bentley
George M. Best
Robert T. Bey
Kenneth R. Bland
Charles H. Bodley
Jack F. Boles
William D. Bollinger
Arthur R. Bousquet
Daniel J. Boyle, Jr.
Bryon P. Brady, Jr.
Everard D. Briscoe
Norris C. Broome
Charles F. Bunnell
John L. Burns
Frederick Campbell
Joseph L. Campbell
Harry D. Carrubba
James G. Cashman
Robert J. Champion
William P. Clancey
Denver D. Clark
John W. Coffman
Charles A. Cole, Jr.
Martin F. Connolly
Morris D. Cooke
Clifford D. Corn
Burton Y. Courchesne
William K. Cowie
Edward W. Critchett
Ralph K. Culver
James M. Cummings, Jr.
Marion J. Daane
Frank L. Dixon, Jr.
John J. Dowd, Jr.
William H. Draper
William W. Dutton, Jr.
Joseph M. Dwyer
Charles A. Dyer
James R. Ebert
Merritt A. Edson, Jr.
Carl J. Emma
Robert B. Engesser
Robert J. Epperson
Theodore S. Eschholz
Dean E. Eslinger
William S. Fagan
James E. Fegley
Gilbert W. Ferguson
Henry F. Finney
Truett W. Ford
William F. Gately, Jr.
Joseph A. Goss
Robert P. Gottlich
John R. Greenstone
Paul B. Haigwood
Edward H. Hall
Marvin M. Hewlett
Fowler W. Hoernel
Frank X. Hoff
Martin S. Houge
Robert S. Hoot
Armond B. Jackson
Robert L. Johnson
Russell E. Johnson
Howard J. Johnston
John J. Kagan
Owen A. Kean
Hercules R. Kelly, Jr.
William E. Kerrigan
Donald D. Kinney
Edward K. Kirby
Frederick M. Klepp-sattel
Glenn L. Knapp, Jr.
Russell W. Kuehl
Anthony R. Kurowski
Robert J. Lahr
Charles R. Larouche
Robert C. Larson
Eugene L. Libbin
Joseph W. Linn
Basile Lubka
Verle E. Ludwig
John F. Mader
Robert P. Marden
Howard M. Markus
Robert L. Martin, Jr.
Emil J. Matas
James K. McCreight
Robert C. McCutchan
John C. McIntosh
Robert E. McKelvey
Kenneth McLennan
Donald L. Meloy
Bruce F. Meyers
George F. Meyers
James L. Morgan
Charles M. Mosher
Victor P. Neshyba
Max L. Neuman
Noah C. New
Carl W. Nienstedt, Jr.
George H. Nilsen
William H. Nims, Jr.
John P. O'Connell
John E. O'Connor
Verne L. Oliver
Charles K. Olliff
Frederic O. Olson
Stanley J. Osserman
Robert G. Parrish
Eddie E. Pearcy
George R. Phillips
Warren R. Pollock
Kenneth R. Porter
Herbert Preston, Jr.
Richard J. Randolph
Joseph A. Reagan
Charles B. Redman
Dayton Robinson, Jr.
Frank W. Roether, Jr.
William S. Rump
Donald M. Russ
Robert E. Santee
George R. Scharnberg
Garlen L. Selmyhr
John W. Shaw
John A. Slayton, Jr.
Donald H. Smith
Robert A. Smith
William L. Smith
Robert L. Stevenson
Robert M. Stowers
Robert A. Stupay
John C. Thomas
Donald K. Tooker
Robert H. Uskurait
Salvatore Vacanti
Edmund Valdes
Frank Volney, Jr.
Herbert F. Voss
Harry H. Warren, Jr.
Elton L. Watts
Charles A. Webster
Wallace Wessel
Robert L. Wildey
Kenneth E. Will
Charles E. Woodul
James H. Yeaman
James Yingling
Edwin M. Young
John L. Zorack

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

George B. Addison, Jr.
Emile I. Allain, Jr.
George M. Allen
Marion A. Andrews
Harold R. Anker
Themistocles Annas
Robert A. Applewhite
Marshall Armstrong
Theo F. Aschenbeck
Conway L. Austin
Herbert M. Baker
Jason A. Baker
James M. Bannan
Charles C. Barbieri
James N. Bardin
William E. Barnes
Thomas P. Bartleson
Paul L. Bartlett
John D. Baylor
Ray H. Bell
Cecil J. Bennett
Robert E. Benson
Clyde E. Bevis
Nicholas K. Bodnar
Herbert E. Bonesteel
Richard A. Bonney
William D. Boyle
Eugene R. Brady
Robert B. Brennan
William C. Britt
Franklin Broadwell
Vance E. Brown
Donald J. Burger
George L. Bruser
John S. Bugg, Jr.
Lytton E. Bulwer, Jr.
Henry N. Burgin
Robert N. Burhans
Conrad P. Buschmann
Sylvester F. Bussing
James S. Butler
Raymond A. Cameron
William K. Capper
Richard B. Carlin
Kenneth K. Case
Clement Chamberlain
Duane W. Chisman
Robert L. Christian, Jr.
Michael A. Ciaburro
David A. Clark
Stuart T. Clark
Frederick Clements
Terrance J. Coleman
John Colia
Jack W. Conard
Billy D. Conrad
Robert E. Cook
Stevenson Cornwallis
Edward B. Corrigan
Ivan E. Crabaugh
Raymond W. Craig
John J. Creamer, Jr.
Alfred J. Croft, Jr.
Philip M. Crosswait
John H. Cullom
Geroge D. Cumming
Ralph L. Cunningham
Leslie L. Darbyshire
Marque C. Debenport
Francis L. Delaney
Charles N. Dezer III
James W. Dion
Philip J. Dooley
James G. Doss, Jr.
Francis E. Doud
William C. Drumright
John F. Duff
Frank W. Dumont
Edwin K. Dunham, Jr.
Cecil G. Dunnagan
Jacob H. Duran
Robert A. Elder
Earl T. Elstner
Thomas B. Epps, Sr.
William M. Erbe
Douglas E. Erway
Richard L. Etter
Jack W. Evans
William J. Ferrin
Herbert G. Fischer
Richard L. Fisher, Jr.
Kenneth S. Foley
Winston F. Fontaine
Charles F. Forbes, Jr.
John J. Formanek, Jr.
Victor G. Fortin
John R. Fox
Hubert I. Frey
Leonard C. Gademsky
William E. Garman
James C. Gerard
Alfred P. Gill
John H. Gillmore
Robert F. Glancy
Walter F. Glowicki
Daniel J. Goodenough
William J. Goodsell
Ralph A. Graninger
Walter W. Grant
Don D. Graves
Joseph K. Griffis, Jr.
Jack K. Griffith
William R. Grubaugh
Frederick E. Grube
Robert E. Gruenler
Robert M. Hamilton
Henry L. Harmon
Francis R. Harper, Jr.
Robert E. Harris
John F. Harrison, Jr.
John A. Hennelly
Emil W. Herich
Charles O. Hiett
Daniel C. Hinkley, Jr.
Thomas A. Hodges
Harry H. Holmberg
Charles S. Homola, Jr.
Delos M. Hopkins
Robert E. Howard, Jr.
Preston E. Howell
Henry J. Huetzinger
William Hutchisson
Robert J. Irwin
Maurice H. Ivins, Jr.
Edgar K. Jacks
William N. Jackson
Robert D. Jameson
Robert C. Jenkins
John B. Jeter
Harold A. Johnson
Kenneth R. Johnson
Charles F. Jones
Thomas M. Kauffman
John J. Keefe
Charles F. Keister
William C. Keith, Jr.
Hugh T. Kennedy
Gerard M. Kieswetter
Jack W. King
Charles W. Knapp
Frank B. Koethe
William A. Kratzert
Robert P. Kuhn
William M. Kull
Joseph M. Laney, Jr.
Lavern W. Larson
James W. Laseter
Charles R. Lee, Jr.
Clyde Lee, Jr.
Philip A. E. Leigh
Joseph R. Lepp
Eugene Lichtenwalter
Edward L. Lieland, Jr.
Roy A. Lilly
"L" "G" Linman
James J. Linn
William Livingston
William J. Longshaw
John C. Love
Theodore Lowdermilk
Dean C. Macho
Paul J. Madden
Edward R. Mahoney
Carl M. Maloy
Paul A. Manning
Richard H. Marciniak
Eugene J. Martin
James G. Martz III
David J. Maysilles
Laurence R. McCarty
William G. McCool, Jr.
Jerry L. McCord
Edward B. McDonald
James H. McGee
Robert H. McGillis
Robert W. McNamara
Phillip E. Megna
Robert P. Montague
Harry L. Morris, Jr.
Roy E. Moss
Thomas F. Moynihan
James M. Murray
Joseph Nastasi
Homer M. Neelley
Paul W. Niesen
Preston G. Nicholas
Robert E. Nicholson
William G. O'Connor
Victor Ohanesian
Martin P. Olsen
James R. Omara
John P. Ondik
Henry J. O'Neill, Jr.
Robert J. O'Neill
Joseph F. Paratore
William K. Parcell
Oswald O. Paredes
Victor E. Patrick
John J. Peeler
Edward Penico
Richard E. Percival
Arthur R. Petersen
Donald P. Plante
Gordon W. Poindexter
Donald W. Poorman
Clarence A. Pope
Vincent J. Pross, Jr.
James R. Quisenberry
Carl F. Radke
Harry B. Randall III
Stanly H. Rauh
Harry B. Register, Jr.
James R. A. Rehfus
Donald L. Rice
James L. Richard
John B. Richards IV
William F. Roberts
Donald G. Robison
Thomas F. Rochford
Palmer A. Roessle
Charles F. Romine
James E. Rossing
Harold B. Roth, Jr.
William S. Russ
Edward J. Rutty
James B. Ryckman
Victor A. Ruvo
Joseph L. Sadowski
Charles E. Sanger
Reginald G. Sauls IV
Ernest G. Schauppner
Raymond F. Schramel
William A. Scott, Jr.
Donn E. Seaman
Baxter W. Seaton
Frederick H. Seitz
Dalvin Serrin
Ronald I. Severson
Rufus A. Seymour
Ural W. Shadrick
Leo A. Shane
Duncan E. Shaw
Joseph C. Shea, Jr.
George Shoenberger
John D. Shoup
Slade W. Sibley
Robert Silverthorn
Carl W. Skaugen
Richard B. Slater
Louis Z. Slawter, Jr.
Charles B. Smallwood
Joseph T. Smith
John K. Smola
Neil O. Snepp
Michael E. Spiro
William G. Splees
Edward H. Stansel
David R. Stanton
Donald C. Stanton
Raymond J. Start
Marshall A. Staunton
Robert P. Sternefeld
William H. Stewart
Donald R. Stiver
William H. Stoetzer
Richard W. Stone
John H. Strandquist
Bernard Q. Striegel
Willard J. Suits, Jr.
Lawrence P. Sullivan
Joseph A. Swartz, Jr.
Richard B. Swartz
Raymond H. Swentek
Charles R. Swilley
Vernon L. Sylvester
William A. Thompson
Francis H. Thurston
David H. Tinius
Jerome B. Tinling
David S. Tolle
Robert E. Tougas
Robert M. Tremmel
Rodolfo L. Trevino
Joseph H. Trimbach
James A. Trout
John W. Unkle
Larry R. Vandeusen
Billy P. Visage
Harold L. Vugteveen
Cyril Wadzita
Charles H. Walker
Robert A. Walker
Ralph D. Wallace
Albert W. Wallach
John J. Walsh, Jr.
Goodsell P. Warren
Theodore H. Watson
Coyle H. Willis
Joe E. Willis
Theodore J. Willis
Daniel M. Wilson
William E. Wilson, Jr.
Warren F. Wolff
Cecil E. Woodcock, Jr.
Richard L. Woodruff
Bernard J. Ypelaar
Robert L. Zuern

Joyce M. Hamman (woman officer), for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Robert M. Krippner

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1953

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of majesty and mercy, may we daily become more conscious and appreciative of life's highest and most enduring satisfaction and values and more eager to mediate them to all mankind.

Inspire our hearts with gladness and gratitude and illumine our minds with wisdom and understanding as we endeavor to make these blessings the glorious possession of men and nations everywhere.

We penitently confess that our hearts are often cold and callous and we have

very little sense of social responsibility and sincere interest in the welfare and happiness of others.

Show us how, in these days of world-wide distress and chaos, we may enable one another to face life and its hard experiences not with fear but with faith; not with a feeling of terror but with a consciousness of triumph.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 30, 1953, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4507. An act to amend and extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

MEMORIAL SERVICES TOMORROW

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the membership the occasion of our annual tribute to deceased colleagues. The observance will be held here tomorrow, Wednesday, 6th of May, at noon. We have lost six friends since this time last year—Senator McMahon and Representatives Stigler, Sabath, Cox, Bryson, and Withers. Their memory will be honored in speeches by Representatives CORBETT and ALBERT. The Congressional Quartet, composed of Representatives PRIEST, HARRIS, PRESTON, and FRANK WILSON, will provide the hymns, with Mrs. BOLTON at the piano.

The entire program will last but 65 or 70 minutes. I hope as many of you who can, will find the time to come together with us on this solemn occasion.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to add my word to that of the gentleman in urging all Members to be here tomorrow when these services are held.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. JENNIE MAURELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 778) for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to Mrs. Jennie Maurello of 1343 North Clinton Avenue, Rochester, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for bond posted for her brother Giacomo Restivo, in November 1949: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOYD C. BARBER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2815) for the relief of Floyd C. Barber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,853 to Floyd C. Barber, of 1800 52d Street, Kenosha, Wis., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of wages and expenses resulting from being unjustly suspended from the Kenosha, Wis., post office in June of 1939 and restored to duty July 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was assumed, maybe incorrectly, that bills on the Consent Calendar would be called first. The objectors on the Consent Calendar are here. The objectors on the Private Calendar are not present at the moment. Would it be proper to call bills on the Consent Calendar first, then call bills on the Private Calendar subsequently?

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that the calling of bills on the Consent Calendar is not in order today and it was not the intention to call them today. To do so would require unanimous consent on the part of the House. The Chair may suggest that we take up the rule on the appropriations bill to be considered today, then return later to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be helpful under the circumstances if we could do that. That would give our objectors an opportunity to be here and they may have objection to the consideration of some of these bills.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the objectors on the Private Calendar is present, so we have one objector here.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed with the calling of the rule on the appropriation bill, dispose of that, and then come back to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 226 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and now yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption by this House of House Resolution 226 which would provide for the consideration of House Resolution 4974, the appropriation bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments. House Resolution 226 is an open rule, waiving points of order against the bill, and would provide for 3 hours of general debate on the bill itself. House Resolution 4974 provides for an overall decrease in the budget estimate of over 22 percent and in terms of dollars would appropriate $147,911,303 less than the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1953. This reduction in the proposed appropriation in this bill is especially significant when you consider that $632,161,925 out of the total appropriation recommended of $1,143,146,712—over 55 percent—is to provide payment for contract authorizations granted in prior years.

Breaking down the proposed appropriations by departments this bill would provide a total of $102,744,787 for the Department of State. This would mean a reduction of $48,403,803 in the amount of the budget estimates and would be $30,290,092 below the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year. No funds are included in this appropriation for the international information and

educational activities. These reductions in proposed appropriations have been made in the belief that a careful examination of the Department will disclose many activities which could be consolidated, curtailed, or eliminated, and section 103 of the bill, which has been part of the bill for several years, gives the Secretary of State, in his discretion, authority to terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he deems it necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

The appropriation for the Department of Justice is $179,265,000. This represents a reduction of $7,885,000 in the budget estimates and is $5,028,000 below the actual appropriations for the Department of Justice for the current fiscal year. However, when transfers to other agencies are deducted, the amount provided is an actual increase of $9,118,000 over the current fiscal year. The increases are principally for the FBI and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The appropriation recommended for the Commerce Department in this bill is $861,136,925 and this includes the maritime activities. This represents a decrease of $270,059,000 in the budget estimates and a decrease of $112,593,211 below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. This appropriation for the Commerce Department is significant too because $625,661,925, or over 72 percent of the amount recommended, is to provide payment for obligations authorized in prior years.

I feel as do the members of the Committee on Rules that House Resolution 4974 is worthy of the thoughtful and careful consideration of every Member of this body and for this reason I urge the adoption by the House of House Resolution 226, which would provide for the consideration of House Resolution 4974.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, while people of this country, and many of us in the Congress, are absorbed in the events surrounding the return of some of our ill and wounded prisoners in Korea, other events are taking place. These other events are so ominous that some experts feel that the Communists agreed to the prisoner return and the peace talks at this time deliberately to distract our attention. It is made to seem inconsequential that within the past few days large portions of northwestern Indochina have been overrun by a Communist attack which has been in preparation for many months.

In order to understand the full meaning of this terrible event, let us look back a few years to the time when our whole policy of dealing with communism was formulated. That policy was first announced in a strange anonymous manner in July of 1947, in a magazine article by a writer who signed himself Mr. X. Mr. X turned out to be Mr. George Kennan, our Ambassador to Russia under the Truman administration, who has recently retired from the State Department. He is now given credit for formulating the so-called containment policy under which the Truman administration attempted to deal with militant communism.

Actually, however, that policy is the product of more than one mind. It represented the entire attitude of the State Department under Mr. Acheson, which controlled our foreign policy until last year. That philosophy was a passive and negative one which allowed communism to consolidate its tremendous gains while the great and powerful United States did nothing more than provide money and military equipment for the weakest nations in the path of the next Communist advance. By this weak and defensive attitude Mr. Acheson and his fellow dreamers hoped to hold Communism in check and prevent its further extension.

In Greece the so-called Truman policy was hailed as a great success when a few guerrillas were finally defeated after Tito's break with Stalin cut them off from their sources of supply. That policy was also hailed as a success because only one-third of the Italian people remained Communist; and it was hailed as a success because the Communists have not taken over the Government of France and other Western European nations despite the fact that they are the largest political party in most of those nations.

Let us assume that the many billions of dollars we have poured into Europe have had some effect in checking communism there, at least temporarily. But let us not forget that a policy of containment, to be successful, must contain everywhere.

While we were being persuaded to believe this weak policy was working because it seemed to influence one tiny segment of the vast perimeter of the Communist world, the huge Chinese nation fell easily into Communist hands. While we were being told that the involvement of our ground forces in Korea had stopped Communist aggression, Communist armies marched brazenly into Tibet, an area of far greater strategic importance than Korea, because it opened the Communist road to India. And now, while we are tempted to believe we are bringing the Communists to terms in Korea and Europe, we see them driving down through the jungles of Indochina toward Thailand, Singapore, and the last vestiges of resistance in southeastern Asia.

Only a short time ago our State Department warned the Communists that they must not use peace talks as a cover for further aggression.

Indochina was specifically mentioned as an area into which the Communists must not launch a new campaign, yet this is exactly what the Communists have done and, as usual, nothing effective is being done to stop it. As usual we have underestimated their capabilities.

They are driving in very deeply, ahead of the rainy season, and they are having less trouble with their supply problem than has been predicted. Furthermore, the resistance of non-Communist ground forces was, as usual, much weaker than had been predicted.

So we have the same pattern repeated: First, in unjustified optimism that the Communists will not attack; second, in unjustified hope they will have the same supply difficulties we always have; and third, in unjustified expectation that weak opposition on the ground will somehow be able to stop them.

We are now confronted with another accomplished conquest, and this time we are further embarrassed because we have publicly warned the Communists they must not do the thing they have done. This invasion of Indochina is the most damaging event that has occurred since the conquest of China itself. The conquest of all Korea would have been of minor importance by comparison.

In Korea we are holding just the end of a peninsula that leads nowhere. In Indochina we are losing the gateway to a vast, rich area sometimes called the Rice Bowl of the Orient and one of the few areas left in the world that produces more food than it consumes.

It is far more important for the Communists to capture southeast Asia than for them to capture Korea and far more damaging to us if they do so. Yet we have committed our forces in Korea and in Europe and we boast we are containing communism while communism continues to drive its military spearheads into southern Asia.

At the same time the Russians are building an even larger fleet of long-range bombers that can reach us across the Arctic and a stockpile of atomic bombs for these planes to deliver. A recently published book by Gen. Bonner Fellers, whom many of us know personally, describes this appalling situation in the clearest and simplest terms. After pointing out the cost and the difficulties of our containment policy east and west of Russia, he states flatly that we have no containment north or south of Russia. Anyone who read Homer Lea's books, The Day of the Saxon and The Valor of Ignorance, had the course of Red Russia's expansion pointed out.

General Fellers goes on to explain in his book, which is entitled "Wings for Peace," and which I recommend as required reading for every adult American, how our present policies came to be adopted and why it is that despite a new and more positive diplomatic policy, we are still made impotent by our venerable and antique military policy. He explains why our present military policy, instead of being a dynamic counterthreat to Soviet superiority in manpower and territory, is just a weak compromise between Army, Navy, and Air Force plans and interests. He makes the obvious, but often overlooked, point that our military strategy is not the strategy which any one member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would recommend but it is, instead, simply a compromise which allows each service to have an equal share in the budget.

Everything has to balance in one way or another. While Air Force planes, for instance, are slightly more expensive than Army and Navy equipment, the Army and Navy each have more personnel, more officers, and more general officers per man than the Air Force has. Unfortunately the laws now in effect prevent transfers of personnel from one service to another. These laws make it necessary for each Army, Navy, and Air

Force officer to advocate the preferment and expansion of his own service or else suffer damage to his own career. By preventing transfers from one service to another we make it impossible for him to solve military problems without reference to service interests.

Recently we passed a law guaranteeing the promotion of Naval officers despite the fact that many of these officers are needed in the Air Force where their promotion would be assured as the Air Force expands in accordance with the new dominance of air power in war. This situation is not new in history. Wars have been lost and nations defeated because of service rivalries. As long as we make it necessary for every military officer to identify himself and his career completely and permanently with one service, we cannot expect to have the progressive and unbiased leadership the present situation demands.

General Fellers, in his book, proves by thorough analysis and by documents that, despite improvements in our diplomacy, we are making little progress in solving our military problems because our military policy is the same old-fashioned compromise. It is still dominated by the theory that wars can be won and nations saved only by masses of infantry.

The great lesson of Korea, and the one which has been so carefully obscured by our military leaders, is the fact that we cannot afford to pit our scarce and precious manpower against limitless Communist manpower in hand-to-hand fighting on the ground. Our military leaders, most of them, simply will not admit this fact, so they have to maintain the optimism about our policies that leads to one disaster after another.

The answer, of course, lies in superior weapons—in our ability to penetrate with these superior weapons to the sources of Communist strength. Modern war cannot be fought without tremendous industrial support and war industries can be destroyed by atomic bombs. That is why we are spending billions every year for more atomic bombs and for the air power to deliver them.

The trouble is that the Russians have spent more on air power than we have and their air force is far larger than ours. They are not afraid to challenge us when we warn them against new moves on the ground. They know we can never stop them on the ground and they know we do not have, as yet, an overwhelmingly powerful Air Force.

A few years ago we all recognized this fact quite clearly, but recently, because of a terrific amount of interservice propaganda and competition, we have become confused. Surely we will soon wake up to the fact that our old policy of containment on the ground is dooming us to one expensive defeat after another—that it will work nowhere unless it works everywhere, and that it is impossible to contain the vast Communist world ground forces everywhere.

The Russians dared to order an invasion of Korea, and the Chinese dared to enter that war, because they believed we were so weak in the air that we dared not strike back through the air. That guess proved to be a safe one—for them. They knew we could not hurt them much on the ground. They are going on into Indochina for the same reason. When will we wake up, as England and Canada are already waking up, to base our military policy on the superior weapon of air power instead of trying to satisfy each service by the creaking compromise strategy we are following today?

Reactionaries in the services tried to tie the tank to horse cavalry. Now these same muddled thinkers are endeavoring to superimpose atomic warfare on bayonet fighters. And it will not work.

What we need is an investigation of the entire Defense Establishment, especially its refusal to exploit air power to the fullest extent possible. It will save lives and money. It will prevent war. It will enable us to win if war is thrust upon us.

British military leaders see what our Pentagon chiefs refuse to see. Great Britain has refused to become a part of the European army. She knows that Russia's one hope of victory lies in ground combat. If the NATO powers, especially the United States, risk a showdown with the Red army and fail to provide air supremacy the slaughter will be unprecedented and in the end we shall lose.

Only last July the British War Ministry proposed to our Government that we pare down the present flimsy NATO ground forces and create air supremacy.

To defend England alone the British claim they need 1,000 first-line fighter-interceptors. They are increasing their heavy-bomber squadrons by 300 percent. They begged us to do likewise.

But the Pentagon infantry-minded chiefs refused to budge from our present program and intent to fight it out on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, no defense is sound which ties the atomic bomb and long-range bomber to the doughboy.

We will never solve our military problem, or balance our budget, or be able to hold the Communists in check, until we make this decision and act upon it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will resume the call of the Private Calendar.

LT. COL. JAMES D. WILMETH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 837) for the relief of Lt. Col. James D. Wilmeth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James D. Wilmeth, lieutenant colonel, United States Army (serial No. O19519), the sum of $300. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said James D. Wilmeth against the United States for recovery of the face value of the military payment certificates (series 472) which he received as part of his pay and allowances on December 12, 1950, while serving in Japan with G–2, General Headquarters, Far East Command, and which could never be converted to money or to military payment certificates of a later series because of the fact that they were temporarily lost or misplaced on June 20, 1951, the date prescribed for the conversion of series 472 certificates: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EMILY WILHELM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3446) for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Emily Wilhelm, of St. Louis, Mo., the sum of $10,000, representing the amount which the said Mrs. Emily Wilhelm would have received, as beneficiary under a policy of national service life insurance in the amount of $10,000, if Gerhart Wilhelm, corporal, United States Marine Corps (305908), deceased son of the said Mrs. Emily Wilhelm, had applied for and been granted such policy under the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, had paid premiums, and had designated the said Mrs. Emily Wilhelm as sole beneficiary of such policy. The death of the said Gerhart Wilhelm as a result of enemy action in the line of duty on November 2, 1942, in the British Solomon Islands and his sudden departure from the continental United States shortly prior thereto, did not permit registry of application for such policy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "of", strike out the remainder of line 6 and all down to and including the word "policy" in line 8 on page 2 and insert the following: "$5,000 as a gratuity for the death of her son, Gerhart Wilhelm, corporal, United States Marine Corps (305908), who was killed as the result of enemy action in line of duty on November 2, 1942, in the British Solomon Islands: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor

and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRONISLAV VYDAEVICH AND LEONID ZANKOWSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1141) for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CIRO PICARDI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1901) for the relief of Ciro Picardi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ciro Picardi, of 332 Degraw Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Ciro Picardi against the United States for refund of the amount which he posted as cash bond in the case of Dominic Cacace alias Dominic DeRosa, an alien (file No. 0300-5851), who was deported.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND D. BECKNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3823) for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Raymond D. Beckner, Fairmont, W. Va., the sum of $4,953.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Raymond D. Beckner and his wife, Lula Stanley Beckner, against the United States for hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred in the treatment of the said Lula Stanley Beckner, who suffered a paralytic stroke and became totally disabled on November 5, 1943, as the result of furnishing blood to a blood bank operated in Fairmont under the wartime blood donor program which was conducted for the armed services by the American National Red Cross: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "Beckner", insert "and Lula Stanley Beckner."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner and Lula Stanley Beckner."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIHAI HANDRABURA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 734) for the relief of Mihai Handrabura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien, Mihai Handrabura, 211 Dithridge Street, Pittsburgh 13, Pa., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted at New York, N. Y., on September 27, 1949, to the United States for permanent residence, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate immigration quota.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mihai Handrabura shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD W. OLSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 71) for the relief of Bernard W. Olson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard W. Olson, of Oakes, N. Dak., the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor child who was fatally burned as a result of falling into an open pit of scalding water located on the United States naval airbase, Trinidad, British West Indies, on January 22, 1949, and for burial and other expenses incurred as a result thereof: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DETROIT AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 100) for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the petition of the Detroit Automotive Products Co. for relief under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be held and considered to have been received by the Tax Court of the United States within the time allowed by law and regulations for the filing of such a petition.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORMAN S. MacPHEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 142) for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Norman S. MacPhee, of Underwood, N. Dak., is hereby relieved of all liability for the repayment to the United States of $284.35, representing the costs incurred by the Department of the Navy in providing transportation of household effects of the said Norman S. MacPhee from Richmond, Va., to Underwood, N. Dak., upon his separation from service in the Navy in 1946, the payment of such costs having been subsequently disallowed by the General Accounting Office on the ground that such payment was not authorized by law.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE F. RUCKMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 522) for the relief of George F. Ruckman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George F. Ruckman the sum of $250. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the said George F. Ruckman against the United States for reimbursement for expenses incurrred and paid out of his personal funds in repairing the B-17 bomber under his command which was damaged and forced to be landed in Torum, Poland, on February 3, 1945, following a bombing mission over Germany, and for reimbursement for expenses for quarters and rations for himself and his

crew paid for by him during such period required for repairs: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services render in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMDR. JOHN J. O'DONNELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 720) for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $252.67 to Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve, in full settlement of his claims against the United States for pay and allowances for active training duty actually performed by him for the period of June 19 to 29, 1950, inclusive, in compliance with paragraph 1 of appropriate duty orders issued June 7, 1950, by the Commandant, 13th Naval District, Seattle, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MARY M. MENDENHALL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 851) for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall, deceased, wife of Capt. George W. Mendenhall, United States Air Force, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Mary M. Mendenhall while she was being delivered of a child, on September 8, 1949, at the 49th General Hospital, Tokyo, Honshu, Japan: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN L. LeCOURS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 738) for the relief of the widow and children of the late John L. LeCours.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, the widow and children of the late John L. LeCours, former employee of the Boston naval shipyard, shall be entitled to receive the same annuity benefits which they would have been entitled to receive under such act if the said John L. LeCours had served continuously in a position subject to such act during the period beginning March 28, 1940, and ending on the date of his death. There shall be deducted from any annuity benefits to which such widow and children may be entitled pursuant to this act any amounts heretofore paid to them in a lump sum from the retirement fund.

SEC. 2. The annuity benefits authorized by this act shall be payable from the date of the death of the said John L. LeCours; and the Civil Service Commission shall pay to the widow and children of the said John L. LeCours, in a lump sum, the amount of the annuity benefits to whcih they are entitled as a result of the enactment of this act for the period beginning on the date of the death of the said John L. LeCours and ending on the day preceding the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN BARREL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 821) for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $29,292.10 to the American Barrel Co., Inc., of Boston, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for the purchase of surplus steel drums from the Department of State, Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, under contracts numbered W-ANL (ETO-II) 3831 and W-ANL (ETO-II) 4125, dated October 30, 1947, and February 12, 1948. Such reimbursement is due to erroneous representations made that the said steel drums were in usable condition and it was determined that they were worthless: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALFRED J. STAHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alfred J. Stahl, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $34,732.22. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Alfred J. Stahl against the United States (Philippine War Damage Commission claims Nos. 417 and 482) for compensation for certain business and property losses which he sustained as the result of enemy activities in the Philippine Islands during World War II: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$34,732.22" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONTGOMERY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1905) for the relief of Montgomery of San Francisco, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,197.97 to Montgomery of San Francisco, Inc., of San Francisco, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as a refund of the customs duty and excise tax paid on copper tubing purchased in Japan. Such tubing arrived in the United States and after both the duty and excess tax were paid was reshipped to Brazil: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. (JG.) SAMUEL E. McMILLAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2034) for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Samuel E. McMillan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. (jg.) Samuel E. McMillan, United States Naval Reserve, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $700. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lt. (jg.) Samuel E. McMillan for payment of a per diem allowance for the period from May 23 to August 20, 1945. During such period he was assigned to temporary duty which caused him to live away from his permanent duty station: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM E. AITCHESON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2813) for the relief of William E. Aitcheson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That William E. Aitcheson, Greenbelt, Md., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $794.22 paid to him for services as an employee of the Public Housing Administration during the period November 2, 1942, to September 10, 1943, when he was also employed by the Post Office Department. The said William E. Aitcheson was not eligible to receive compensation for services rendered in both positions because the combined amount of his salary as an employee of the Public Housing Administration and his salary as an employee of the Post Office Department exceeded the sum allowed by law. Any amounts heretofore credited to him or refunded to the United States by him on account of such unauthorized payment to him shall be paid to him out of any money available for the payment of salaries of employees in the Public Housing Administration. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for amounts paid to the said William E. Aitcheson for services as an employee of the Public Housing Administration during the period November 2, 1942, to September 10, 1943.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. HOMER G. HAMILTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4471) for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton for compensation for his outstanding service to the United States as a result of his pioneer work in the development of the one-quarter-ton truck commonly referred to as the "jeep."

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MORAD MALEK-ASLANI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 974) for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On lines 2 and 3, strike out the following language "immigration and naturalization laws," and substitute in lieu thereof "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISAK BENMUVHAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1211) for the relief of Isak Benmuvhar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Isak Benmuvhar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in whose case deportation has been suspended for 6 months pursuant to section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (54 Stat. 671; 56 Stat. 1044; 62 Stat. 1206), or in whose case the Attorney General has determined that the alien is qualified for adjustment of status under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219), the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings and to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of each alien in accordance with the provisions of section 244 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 216–217), upon the payment to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization of a fee of $18, which fee shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the account of miscellaneous receipts:

A–6906313, Alster, Israel.
A–6526453, Baczynski, Czeslaw Stanislaw.
A–7483136, Bayer, Bohuslav Joseph.
A–7483134, Bayer, George Otakar.
A–7483135, Bayer, Libuse Julia (nee Kvarda).
A–7849817, Wurczel, Afsi.
A–6997904, Wurczel, Rivca.
A–7197437, Banczyk, Andrzej Gregory.
A–7803731, Banczyk, Helena Stanislova.
A–7138073, Banczyk, Stanislaw.
A–9799707, Bocek, Frantisek or Frank.
A–6934989, Fogel, Samuel.
A–7184220, Hodza, Fedor Andrej.
A–6754426, Hrubec, Zdenek.
A–6699180, Eichenholz, Izak.
A–7125141, Kase, Karel Aloys.
A–6718759, Korenblit, Abram.
A–6718760, Korenblit, Aron.
A–7052361, Pall, Francis Acatius.
A–7184192, Piotrowski, Jozef.
A–8015887, Radil, Bozena Barbara.
A–7095720, Radimaka, Olga.
A–6492300, Saar, Walter Emil.
A–9765546, Salumaa, Eduard.
A–6657632, Stapinski, Julia.
A–7243054, Tychanowicz, Ludulka (nee Zarenska).
A–7184053, Tychanowicz, Rudolph Marian or Wladyslaw Filip Lawicki.
A–7184334, Zysman, Ryfka E. (nee Hufnagel).
A–4192519, Brandes, Esther.
A–6275834, Simmons, Ryden Reddington.
A–7418514, Taylor, Lucille Jean Marie Guillent.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY BOUESSA DEEB

The Clerk called the bill (S. 248) for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mary Bouessa Deeb shall be deemed to have been born in Canada.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER ODILIA, ALSO KNOWN AS MARIA HUTTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 255) for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTRAUT MIES VAN DER ROHE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 306) for the relief of Waltraut Mies van der Rohe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Waltraut Mies van der Rohe shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE MAUNER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 811) for the relief of George Mauner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Mauner may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES ANTHONY DESOTELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 846) for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immmigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Charles Anthony Desotell, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of T. Sgt. and Mrs. George G. Desotell, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN W. McBRIDE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 140) for the relief of John W. McBride.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ALAMBERT E. ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 365) for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–769), are hereby waived in favor of Alambert E. Robinson for compensation for disability resulting from loss of vision secondary to trachoma contracted prior to March 1940, allegedly by reason of his employment as an employee of the United States Indian Service at the Pima Indian Agency, Sacaton, Ariz., and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment, except in the case of such medical or hospitalization expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. LUBKIN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 890) for the relief of William H. Lubkin, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That William H. Lubkin, Jr., Beaufort, S. C., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $1,020.16. Such sum represents compensation received by the said William H. Lubkin, Jr., as an employee of the Coast Guard at Charleston, S. C., during the period beginning August 22, 1944, and ending December 30, 1945; while he was also employed by the Department of the Navy at Parris Island, S. C., and was receiving dual compensation from the United States at a combined annual rate in excess of that permitted by law. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said William H. Lubkin, Jr., an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld or credited from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for such refund: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ROSE KACZMARCZYK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 898) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Kaczmarczyk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Rose Kaczmarczyk, Bridgeport, Conn., the sum of $4,344. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Rose Kaczmarczyk (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC–364077) against the United States for the service-connected death compensation to which she would have been entitled, as the dependent mother of the deceased veteran William P. Kaczmarczyk, for the period beginning June 23, 1944 (the day following the date of the death of the said William P. Kaczmarczyk), and ending April 3, 1951, if claim for such compensation had been filed with the Veterans' Administration within 1 year after the death of the said William P. Kaczmarczyk. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KENNETH R. KLEINMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1772) for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $871.09 to Kenneth R. Kleinman, of 67–04A 193d Lane, Fresh Meadows, Flushing, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such amount represents the balance of salary due him for the period July 14, 1946, to October 4, 1947, as an employee of the War Assets Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in

this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary nowithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA A. PEMBROKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1904) for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Patricia A. Pembroke, of San Francisco, Calif., and her claim for compensation for disability from disease allegedly contracted in 1944 while in the performance of her duty as a payroll clerk in the Department of the Army, Civilian Personnel Office, San Francisco, Calif., is hereby authorized and directed to be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, if she files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 60 days after the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "act" insert: "*Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAHAM: Page 1, line 10, after the word "provisions" insert the word "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNA HOLDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3733) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Anna Holder, 409 10th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Anna Holder against the United States for payment of the proceeds of the national service life insurance (N–7951582; N–1300–2055) issued, in the amount of $10,000 to the late Edward J. Burns: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR STAVELEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4285) for the relief of Arthur Staveley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Arthur Staveley, of Warwick Neck, R. I., in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for damages sustained as a result of an accident which occurred when a plane, operating out of the United States Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I., crashed in front of his home on November 2, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Private Calendar.

EXTENSION OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 140)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend to the Congress the passage of legislation extending the mutual security program in order to enable the United States to carry out its responsibilities of leadership in building up the security of the free world and the prospects for peace both for ourselves and our allies.

The basic purpose of this program is simply the long-term security of the United States living in the shadow of the Soviet threat.

The program being submitted to you includes approximately $5,250,000,000 for military weapons and support directly to the defense efforts of our friends and allies. It also includes approximately $550 million for technical, economic, and developmental purposes designed to promote more effective use of the resources of the free nations and thus to further the freedom and security of all of us. This total represents a reduction of about one and eight-tenths billion from the previous administration's 1954 budget.

The devotion of so large a portion of this request to military purposes is a measure of the peril in which free nations continue to live. The blunt, sober truth is that we cannot afford to relax our defenses until we have seen clear, unmistakable evidence of genuinely peaceful purpose on the part of the Soviet Union. As I strived to make clear to all peoples in my recent appeal for real peace and trust among nations, we continue earnestly to hope for such evidence so that the world may turn its energies and resources to serving the needs, rather than the fears, of mankind.

Until Soviet good faith is proven by deeds, the free nations must rely on their own strength for the preservation of peace. To fail to continue vigorously to strengthen our military forces would be to risk wasting all our efforts for the past 5 years in defense of our liberties.

Since the initiation of our major bipartisan foreign aid program in 1947, the accomplishments of the free world have been very great. In Greece, the onrush of Communist imperialism has been halted and forced to recede. Out of the ruins left by that aggression, a proud, self-reliant nation has reestablished itself. Threatened economic and political collapse in Western Europe was averted through the intensive efforts of the great peoples of that continent aided by American resources. Revitalized economies in Europe today are producing more than ever before and are in a far better position to defend themselves from external or internal aggression. In the Near East and Far East, American aid is helping many new nations on their way to a better life for their citizens. And the free nations everywhere—realistically facing the threat of Soviet aggression—have in addition sought to create, with American assistance, the military strength essential to guard their security.

The mutual security program for 1954 has been developed by the new administration after the most careful study and deliberation. All elements of the program have been reviewed in great detail, all proposals subjected to thorough scrutiny.

From this study I have come to certain clear conclusions.

First. The United States and our partners throughout the world must stand ready, for many years if necessary, to build and maintain adequate defenses.

Second. To accomplish this objective we must avoid so rapid a military buildup that we seriously dislocate our economies. Military strength is most effective—indeed it can be maintained—only if it rests on a solid economic base.

Third. We must help the free nations to help themselves in eradicating conditions which corrode and destroy the will for freedom and democracy from within.

Fourth. It is necessary to do more in the Far East. We are proposing to make substantial additional resources available to assist the French and the associated states in their military efforts to

defeat the Communist Viet Minh aggression.

Fifth. Since it is impossible to forecast precisely the year and moment when the point of maximum military danger may occur, the only prudent course calls for a steady military build-up, with our partners throughout the world, sustained and planned so as to use our joint capabilities with maximum efficiency and minimum strain.

We must and shall keep steadfastly on the course we have set. We must—so long as the present peril lasts—keep constantly growing in a military strength which we can support indefinitely. These basic principles were agreed upon and applied in the successful meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Council just concluded in Paris.

While the amounts requested for technical, economic, and developmental purposes are small as compared with the military support, these programs are nonetheless of the most vital importance. They will be applied chiefly in south and southeast Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, and Africa.

Through these programs, the United States is proving its interest in helping the peoples of these areas to work toward better and more hopeful conditions of life, to strengthen the foundations of opportunity and freedom. To guard against the external military threat is not enough: we must also move against those conditions exploited by subversive forces from within.

I present this whole program to you with confidence and conviction. It has been carefully developed by the responsible members of this administration in order to achieve—at least possible cost—the maximum results in terms of our security and the security of our friends and allies. In my judgment, it represents a careful determination of our essential needs in pursuing the policy of collective security in a world not yet freed of the threat of totalitarian conquest.

Unequivocally I can state that this amount of money judiciously spent abroad will add much more to our Nation's ultimate security in the world than would an even greater amount spent merely to increase the size of our own military forces in being.

Were the United States to fail to carry out these purposes, the free world could become disunited at a moment of great peril when peace and war hang precariously in balance.

This is the way best to defend successfully ourselves and the cause of freedom.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 5, 1953.*

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House today for 20 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1954.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4974, with Mr. JOHNSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would be less than human if I did not take a moment before we start on this bill to pay tribute to the members of this committee on both sides of the House for their loyal support and the very assiduous attention and study and preparation that they gave to this bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] lent his peculiar talents as did the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON], all of whom are serving for the first time on this committee. They have done a magnificent job as has our devoted committee clerk, Mr. Jay Howe. As for the leader of the minority, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], former chairman, let me say that we have labored together several years in perfect harmony and for the most part with very few differences, and when we differed we differed in what we thought was in the best interest of the commonweal. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], who has served for several years, is well grounded, and we were also particularly fortunate in having another minority member, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], who has been a tower of strength in our committee.

I have just a very short statement I would like to make.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The total of the regular annual appropriations carried in the bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce is $1,143,146,712. The reductions in the budget estimates total $326,347,803, or a decrease of over 22.2 percent. The amount recommended in the bill is $147,911,303 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1953. This reduction is especially significant since $632,161,925 or over 55 percent of the total recommended in the bill is to provide payment for contract authorizations granted in prior years.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The bill includes a total of $102,744,787 for the Department of State. This represents a reduction of $48,403,803 in the amount of the budget estimates and is $30,290,092 below the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year.

No hearings have been held to date on items for the international information and educational activities, and no funds are included in this bill for that purpose.

The principal item of reduction is in "Salaries and expenses," for which the committee recommends $60 million, a decrease of $25,784,200 in the original budget estimates and a reduction of $15,962,750 below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. The budget estimate included $4,298,250 for activities previously financed by allocation to the Department from the mutual-security appropriations. No provision has been made in this bill for those activities. The authorizing legislation for fiscal year 1954 for mutual security has not yet been approved.

The amount recommended by the committee will necessitate a considerable reduction in present personnel.

There has been an almost unanimous agreement among various groups who have traveled abroad, that this Government has too many people and too many agencies in many of the foreign countries. A decrease in personnel in many areas should result in more efficient operations.

A careful examination of the Department will disclose many activities, both domestically and overseas, which can and should be consolidated, curtailed, or eliminated outright.

The recommendation of the committee will require them to take action.

We have eliminated the funds requested for acquisition of buildings abroad. A sizable unobligated balance will be carried over into the next fiscal year which should be sufficient to carry on the most necessary projects.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

There is included in the bill a total of $179,265,000 for the operation of the Department of Justice. This amount represents a reduction of $7,885,000 in the budget estimates and is $5,028,000 below the actual appropriations for the Department for the current fiscal year. However, when transfers to other agencies are deducted, the amount provided is an actual increase of $9,118,000 over the current fiscal year.

The increases are primarily for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The increase for the FBI is due to the ever-increasing work in the internal security field and for the Immigration Service the increase is for carrying into effect the Immigration and Nationality Act, commonly called the McCarran-Walter Act.

The committee recommended language allowing the Attorney General to appoint United States attorneys without regard to the Classification Act of 1949. The Attorney General advised the committee that the language was necessary, since he is going to require each newly appointed United States attorney to devote all of his time to the job, and not practice law on the side.

The committee also recommends language giving the Attorney General the same authority to remove employees of the Department of Justice in the interests of the United States as is now provided to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The total recommended in this bill for the Department of Commerce, which includes the maritime activities, is $861,136,925. This is a decrease of $270,059,000 in the budget estimates and a decrease of $112,593,211 below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. $625,661,925, or over 72 percent of the amount recommended, is to provide payment for obligations authorized in prior years.

CENSUS BUREAU

We have included $6,770,000 in the bill for salaries and expenses for the Census Bureau for collecting, computing, and publishing current census statistics. The requests for special censuses have been denied. The committee is of the opinion that there are many more urgent needs to be provided for at the present time, and that the taking of these censuses can be deferred without causing any undue difficulties.

CAA

The bill includes $139,950,000 for the CAA. Of this amount $105,500,000 is for salaries and expenses. I should like to point out that the continual demand for additional air-navigation facilities increases the amount required to operate and maintain them. A system of user charges should be placed into effect so that the aviation industry will pay a substantial part of this cost.

Considerable interest has been indicated in the Federal-aid airport program, a good deal of which has been generated by some of the CAA personnel.

For this present year there was appropriated $23,321,154, of which $9 million was liquidation of prior contract authority, $2,571,154 for administration, and $27,125,000 for projects.

The revised estimates called for $22,700,000 for liquidation, and language making available for administration $2 million of the unobligated balance.

The committee has included $22,700,000 for liquidation and $1,500,000 of the unobligated balance has been made available for administration.

MARITIME ACTIVITIES

The maritime activities are included in this bill for the first time. The funds for new ship construction have been denied. However, the full amount of the budget estimate of $64 million has been included for liquidation of prior contract authority for ship construction.

The full amount of the budget estimate, $25 million, has been recommended for operating-differential subsidies. The committee was advised that this amount would fall far short of what was needed to pay what is now due and owing. The proper legislative committee and the Congress should review the entire subsidy program. Operating-differential subsidies have increased from $197,000 in 1947 to over $50 million for the present fiscal year.

A total of $538,461,925 is included in the bill for the Bureau of Roads, of which $510 million is for the Federal-aid highways. The authorizing legislation gives the Bureau of Roads authority to incur obligations up to the amount stipulated. Therefore, the bills must be paid as they come due.

I shall not take up your time to cover all of the appropriation items. If you have any question, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the appropriation to the United Nations there has been a cut of less than a half million dollars.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Something like that.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that goes deep enough in an organization that has contributed very little to the warfare in Korea or in collective security or peace in the world?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I would say to the gentleman that the funds covered in that section and some other international agencies are more or less without the purview of this committee. They are granted authorities, and most of them are entered into under treaty obligations.

Mr. GROSS. We are still contributing 35.12 percent to the United Nations.

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is true, but it has been reduced year by year, and we have the promise that the 1955 appropriation will be down to 33⅓ percent.

Mr. GROSS. Why even a 33⅓-percent contribution on the part of the United States, in view of the lack of cooperation we have gotten from the United Nations?

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is not something that I might with propriety pass upon. I have been one of those who never voted for the creation of it, but once it is the law of the land and has been entered into and is the policy of the Nation, we have no other recourse than to appropriate funds. We have given people the right to make these commitments.

Mr. GROSS. I understand the gentleman's opposition generally to such propositions as this, but did not the Congress some time ago express its wish that this be cut to 33⅓ percent?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes; and they have been making a genuine effort to do that, and they assure us that next year it will be done.

Mr. GROSS. But the effort results in a 35.12-percent contribution.

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is right, but it is less than it was last year. I might say, if the gentleman were a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he would have to divide in his mind the things he favored and the things he disfavored, and remember that he was appropriating for the law of the land expressed by a majority when these laws were passed. Sometimes I have to remind myself that that is a part of my duty, and I try to perform it.

Mr. GROSS. I can see no reason for contributing 33⅓ percent to an organization that has made practically no contribution to the war in Korea. It seems to me that is the test that applies.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I would not differ with the gentleman's view on that, but it is quite aside from the appropriation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to discuss with the gentleman the provisions of section 207, which refer to the Justice Department phase of the bill at page 24, wherein "the Attorney General may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Justice whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States."

I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not the fact that this language is identical to the language of a rider which was attached to the Department of State phase of this bill as far back as 7 years ago, and has been in effect ever since, as well as to the language of a rider in the Department of Commerce phase of the bill, which has been in the bill for at least 3 years?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. And also whether or not it is the fact that it is understood that the Attorney General shall, under no circumstances, use the power given to him under the terms of this rider to destroy any provision of the Veterans' Preference Act or our civil service laws or regulations, but is merely, as was originally intended each time these riders were placed in the bill, to give him, as well as the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, the power to summarily fire subversives and homosexuals?

Mr. CLEVENGER. The gentleman is so right. As he knows, he and I have come down the aisle together on that at various times. I express some gratification in the fact that in some of the separations that are being made of these unfortunate people they have not been blackened so they could not go back and make a living for themselves which an action of that kind would have entailed, and it is one of the greatest services of my time in Congress: The part the gentleman from New York and I have played in initiating the purification of at least three sections of our Government from this sort of influence. We originated it and we followed it through, and I do not know anyone who can name one of the men who has been discharged.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Am I correct in my understanding, then, that the gentleman as chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the committee are in agreement that this section does not destroy the so-called veterans' preference bill?

Mr. ROONEY. It has not done so up to now.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman for the information which I think will be helpful to all of us.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman realizes of course that is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is why we are here under a rule.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But under the rule you are permitted to bring in legislation on an appropriation bill. The gentleman is familiar, I am sure, with legislation that has heretofore been approved by this House, being Public Law 733.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I will listen to any quotation the gentleman has to bring to my attention.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This Public Law 733 deals with the same subject matter, and then following that, and on April 28, 1953, we have an Executive order from the President of the United States. Has the gentleman read that order?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I will answer the gentleman's question by asking him one.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will be glad to answer it if I can. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Why did we have these provisions added year by year if that section 107 was doing the job?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Public Law 733 if properly adhered to would have done the thing to which the gentleman calls attention; but now to implement and even to go further and stronger in the Executive order issued less than 2 weeks ago dealing with the problem to which the gentleman directs attention I think is going pretty far and takes care of the situation he describes. The gentleman in this legislative provision does not grant any right of appeal or anything of the kind. It may be, however, as the distinguished gentleman from New York suggests, that there will be no abuse of this provision.

Mr. CLEVENGER. There has been none, and it has been in use 7 years.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But the gentleman can readily understand that if the wording of it be carried out it would probably go farther than he wants to go and go beyond the problem he wants to solve. We do not want to subvert the Veterans' Preference Act. I just want to call attention to the thing that concerns me this morning. In the first place I do not think this is the proper way to legislate, but that is now a matter behind us with the adoption of the rule. I know the gentleman does not want to circumvent in any way the Veterans' Preference Act by reason of this amendment. I want to make sure it is not the intention or expectation.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I remind the gentleman that we are dealing with this at a very high level where by the nature of things there must be discretion used by those exercising the authority. I may say to the gentleman that I went before the Rules Committee at one time to save a great Democrat from my State who was embarrassed by 29 people he could not get out of his department under the previous law, former Commerce Secretary Sawyer. I can show you the page of the hearings where afterward he said to me: "They are all gone, the 29 of them." They had gone through this whitewash board and this examining board.

I am just a little afraid of Executive orders that cover too many millions of jobs right down to the little fellows.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am concerned likewise.

Mr. CLEVENGER. It would be an excess of caution. I stand on my reason and justification for doing it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate your intention here with regard to Public Law 733 and the Executive order implementing it. On the other hand, you have legislation coming in by the Appropriations Committee seeming to deal with the same subject matter.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Did anyone deal with this but the Appropriations Committee? Did any other subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee deal with this subject except this one? We have been dealing with it for 7 years.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So have we.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to point out to the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House and to all my colleagues that the action taken by this subcommittee in inserting the riders was taken weeks before the April 27 Executive order of President Eisenhower.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from New York understands, of course, the situation. I am sure he has read the Executive order, and the Executive order at the request of the Attorney General, I think, does cover all of the ground in this bill and does afford some protection for the employees. This provision does not afford protection for them in respect to appeals and matters of that kind.

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct. If the eminent and distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee feels that that Executive order is going to adequately cover this situation and that it can be done as summarily and as promptly as under the power granted by this very language which has been in this bill for 7 years, referring to the State Department, and 3 years as to the Commerce Department, I am inclined to go along with the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think we are trying to reach the same objective, but I do want to see to it that we do not circumvent veterans' rights.

Mr. ROONEY. That is foremost in my mind.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And any rights that any other employees might have, as provided in Public Law 733. I want them protected, too.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to a provision in the bill which begins in line 18, page 36, which has to do with the payment of funds used for a vessel which is requisitioned or which is insured by the Government. As I read the section, I believe it is true that when the owner of the vessel requisitioned is dissatisfied with the price fixed under this section he can go to the Court of Claims and have the price which would be just compensation determined by the court. On the other hand, if the vessel is insured, the value would be fixed by the Maritime Board under the General Accounting Office's interpretation and there would be no such right of suit. It might follow that the full amount of insurance which the owner thought would cover the vessel would not be available to him. My question to the gentleman is this: Is that the intention of the committee in so writing the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. I think the answer to the last inquiry is, first, that this provision has been in the bill for some time and it was put in to protect the United States, the Treasury and the taxpayers from some very unfortunate experiences that resulted from determinations of the Maritime Commission. For that reason the General Accounting Office was brought in. We think it is a very sound provision. It has worked to protect the Treasury and the taxpayers in the past and we do not see any reason for modifying it at this time.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I understand there has been no difficulty with regard to payment of insurance since the provision has been in the bill. No payments of insurance have been made. There is now pending before the Committee on Merchant Marine a bill on this exact subject and hearings are supposed to start this week. But I do believe all people will agree that the effect of the provision in this appropriation bill in the future could very well be to so limit insurance that a man requested to sail a ship during an emergency would say that he would not sail with inadequate insurance. This would force the Government to requisition the ship, take it, and operate it if it needed to use it. There should be some provision under which the fair value of the ship for insurance purposes might be determined by a court.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. As I recall, that is the language that has been contained in this bill for the last 3 years. The purpose of the amendment was to prevent abuses that happened in World War II, namely, that the Government was obliged to requisition ships, or maybe to have to buy them, and then the question of compensation came up. We read into this RECORD, from this spot right here, the names of ships that the Government had to buy. They cost the shipowners, in round figures, say, $100,000, and the Government was obliged to use them for 2 or 3 years and pay rent on them, and then by virtue of appreciation in value, because of inflation, and so forth, then the Government was obliged to turn around and pay 3 or 4 times what that ship cost the owner. All this amendment does is not to prevent their remedy in law, but it says that the General Accounting Office, in sum and substance,

shall set a fair value. That is all it does, and it has been in the bill for 3 years.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I believe what the gentleman has said may be true as to those ships and those actions taken in the past, but I am equally sure that the General Accounting Office is likely to disagree with the gentleman on the effect that this provision has on the issuance of insurance in the future; not the payment of charter hire or the payment of a price, but on the issue of fixing insurance in the future. The insurance provision is one which has never been called into operation and which, I believe, is quite likely under some circumstances to make unavailable to the Government for emergency use ships or parts of ships which it would like to use into waters in which there is war risk.

Mr. THOMAS. I appreciate the gentleman's position, and perhaps there is some merit to it. But the query appears to me to be this: This has been in effect either 2 or 3 years, and we have certainly had no complaint from the Maritime Commission nor any shipowner, and until the legislative committee takes action on the subject matter I suggest that we leave the language as is, because it is for the protection of the United States taxpayers.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, to conclude the discussion at this point, I think it well to point out that if the gentleman's objections are well taken—and I agree with the gentleman from Texas that they are not wholly well founded—he does state himself that there is a bill pending before his committee on this subject, and obviously if such a bill should be enacted it would supersede this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This is regarding the veterans.

Mr. ROONEY. It has been a matter of discussion for the past 20 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was making a long distance telephone call and I was not on the floor.

Mr. ROONEY. Let me see if I can summarize the situation. The language to which objection is now made has been in this bill for the past seven years as to the Department of State. It has been in the bill for at least 3 years as to the Department of Commerce. This is the first time it has been inserted insofar as the Department of Justice is concerned. From the beginning and all along it has been understood that the Cabinet officer given such wide discretionary power, would use it only insofar as security risks and homosexuals were concerned, so as to swiftly and easily disconnect them from the payroll. It was never intended that it would interfere with the provisions and rights under the Veterans' Preference Act or with the civil service rights employees of the Government enjoy.

If it is properly administered, as it has been insofar as the Departments of State and Commerce are concerned during these past years, there is no real cause for alarm. If, however, it is used for political purposes, or used to harm war veterans and take away rights this Congress gave them in 1944, or the rights that all civil service employees have, then we might well be alarmed.

In view of the President's Executive order of April 27 which came out weeks after the action of the subcommittee, I do not feel we need these riders. I would like to sit down with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] in just a little while, when someone else has the floor to discuss this bill, and talk this over with him.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad, because I feel worried. I see a disposition to take certain services and benefits away from the veterans.

Mr. ROONEY. Not on the part of the chairman or a single member of this subcommittee, I will say to the gentlewoman; not at all.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. Veterans' organizations are apprehensive about this matter. This morning I received the following telegrams:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 4, 1953.*

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Legion strongly protests provisions sections 103, 207, and 304 of H. R. 4974, appropriation bill for State, Justice, and Commerce, granting Secretaries and Attorney General absolute discretion to dismiss any officer or employee whenever deemed necessary. Such request cannot be justified on ground national security since this is already covered in President's Executive Order 10450, April 27.

As national commander, American Legion, respectfully request you vote to eliminate these sections because they destroy veterans' preference laws. Thanks and regards.

LEWIS K. GOUGH,
National Commander, the American Legion.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 4, 1953.*

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

H. R. 4974 due for House consideration tomorrow. Disabled American Veterans worked since 1921 to place a veterans' preference act on the statute books and succeeded in 1944. H. R. 4974 contains provisions which will destroy the existing Veterans' Preference Act. Please use your influence to have this provision stricken from the bill.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director,
Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, the distinguished former chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. MURRAY. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from New York whether he has read Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress?

Mr. ROONEY. Not recently.

Mr. MURRAY. This act resulted from a bill introduced by me, H. R. 7439, at the request of the various defense agencies. Extensive hearings were held. The bill provided that any head of the Department of State, Department of Commerce, Department of Justice, Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, Coast Guard, Atomic Energy Commission, National Security Resources Board, or the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, could suspend any employee in the interest of national security, but it further provided that within 30 days after the suspension the employee so charged should be given a notice in writing of the charges, should have 30 days to reply to the charges, and should be entitled to a hearing.

Mr. ROONEY. That is very fine and fair. I do not understand how it is that the gentleman last year or the year before, since the enactment of that public law, has not objected to this language in this very bill applying to the State and Commerce Departments.

Mr. MURRAY. Because it was carried in the State and Commerce appropriation bills before. However, the appropriation bill last year did not have this rider for the Department of Justice. I thought, of course, that after a public law upon the subject was passed these riders ought to be dropped. I can see the necessity and justification for such a rider prior to the enactment of Public Law 733 and I supported such riders prior to this law.

May I ask the gentleman if he has read Executive Order 10450 of the President, which was issued on April 27?

Mr. ROONEY. I have.

Mr. MURRAY. This goes fully into the question of the discharge of employees in the interest of national security, but it says that the party charged shall be entitled to a hearing before a special board in each agency, this board to be composed of representatives or employees of other agencies than the agency of the employee charged. This Executive order states that in the interest of national security this board or the head of the department shall look into any criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct, habitual use of intoxicants to excess, drug addiction, sexual perversion, or other grounds.

There is absolutely no necessity for this rider since Public Law 733 is on the books and since the President has issued this Executive order.

Under the rider there is no provision for any kind of hearing. I say that the rider does violence to the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and also to the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912. It provides no kind of hearing. Under this rider any bad Administrator could fire, upon any whim or impulse or caprice, any employee he wanted to, and not need to assign any kind of cause or charge. All he has to say is, "You are fired in the best interests of the United States."

Does not the gentleman believe it is the best thing to go along in an orderly way and carry out the provisions of Public Law 733 as amplified by the Executive order of our President? Let us do this in the right way, and not do violence to the rights of our veterans and our civil-service employees. They are provided hearings under Public Law 733 and under the Executive order. This is a dangerous thing because the rider

does not say "You must be fired in the interest of national security." All it says is that the head of the Department can terminate the employment of any officer or any employee whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the United States. What does that cover? Why any administrator could fire anybody he wanted to without any kind of charge or any kind of hearing——

Mr. ROONEY. I dislike very much interrupting my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, but that certainly was a long although highly pertinent question or series of questions. I will give the gentleman as much time within reasonable limits to discuss this matter later on. I assure him he talks a great deal of commonsense on this matter.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. If the statements in the newspapers are correct, the Attorney General has said that 40 percent of the people in his Department will be fired within the next year. Does your committee have any assurance that he is going to give those people a chance to appeal their cases?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know who he is going to fire. I do know he is getting 60 new and additional employees under this bill, and that under its terms he is receiving $9 million more than the Attorney General whom he succeeded.

Mr. TEAGUE. Are you, as a member of this committee, confident that the employees will have their rights protected and that this will not be just a case of political hiring and firing?

Mr. ROONEY. I must say that that was discussed in committee, and that the Attorney General gave us assurance in that regard.

Mr. TEAGUE. Has he assured the committee to that effect?

Mr. ROONEY. We were assured by the present Attorney General that under no circumstances would this rider be used to infringe upon veterans' preferences and civil-service rights or result in political firing; that it was to be used solely with regard to homosexuals and security risks. But that was on March 24 and over a month before the Executive order.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman know of any abuses under this provision since it was first put into the law in 1946?

Mr. ROONEY. I know of none whatsoever. I think the record will bear me out on that.

Mr. BOW. Is there any reason to believe because of any events that have happened that there would by any abuses?

Mr. ROONEY. I have no indication at all at the moment.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to proceed with the remarks that I had originally allotted myself the time to make.

First, I would like to express my gratitude and the gratitude of the Members on the minority side to the chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. CLIFF CLEVENGER. He presided with patience, skill, and great courtesy, and it was, indeed, a pleasure for all of us to serve with him and with his associates, the majority members, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON]. I know that when I say this to the chairman in all sincerity, I also express the sincere thanks of my colleagues on the minority side, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] and the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

I should also like to express my thanks as ranking minority member to the executive secretary of this committee, Mr. Jay B. Howe. I have had the great pleasure of working with Mr. Howe over a number of years, since about the time he first came to the Committee on Appropriations from the FBI. Our association has been most pleasant. He is a very valuable member of the staff of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the bill itself, I regret that I must say that everything in it is not in as much harmony as was indicated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER]. I know I bespeak the thoughts of all of us on the minority side when I say there is quite a bit of pseudo economy being practised here; that if you take a look at the committee report you will see figures which do not mean what they appear to mean. You will find, for instance, with regard to the Department of State, a claimed reduction to the extent of $30 million in that department as compared with the appropriations in the current fiscal year. But if you take the $15 million alleged savings with regard to Acquisition of Buildings Abroad, you do not have a single penny of genuine savings, because there is not one thin dime of the taxpayers' money involved in that alleged saving. It is set forth in American dollars simply as a bookkeeping transaction and in order to get out of the Treasury foreign currency credits which we have as the result of sales of surplus property abroad in past years and following the war. At the close of the war we were confronted with a lot of our property and machinery abroad, which was rusting and deteriorating, and which would have cost us a lot of money to bring back home. Rather than spend that money for transportation, these properties were left in countries all over the world, and we were given credits in their currency for such properties. We have an immense amount of such credits all over the world, and it is in connection with the acquisition of foreign buildings abroad program of the Department of State that we have derived the best use of those credits.

Then let us take the construction of the Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande, under the title, "Construction, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico." The alleged savings of $2,700,000 as compared with the 1954 estimates are no savings at all. If you will look at the testimony on page 282 of the hearings with regard to the Department of State you will find the following:

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Wilber, I am not sure I understand this revised total budget for the Department of State, with the exception of the Voice of America, and the claimed reduction of $20,627,253, which I make out to be 13½ percent of the original budget request of the other administration, for everything in the Department other than the Voice of America.

It would seem that of the items which make up the $20,627,253, starting first with the acquisition of buildings abroad, this is what I would term a phony reduction for the reason that that is not really money out of the United States Treasury. That is the use of counterpart funds; is that correct?

Mr. WILBER. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. As to the latter part of the question. I do not expect you to say "Yes" to the preliminary statement in the question. But the $10 million is counterpart funds and is merely a bookkeeping transaction insofar as dollars are concerned; is that right?

Mr. WILBER. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Now, then, with respect to this substantial $2,696,000 of the $20 million, for "Construction, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico," which means construction of the Falcon Dam, I would term that a phony reduction, too, for the reason that the Falcon Dam has to be completed. It is expected that it will be completed within the course of the year. I would not say that that is a measure of economy in the slightest sense.

Mr. WILBER. Mr. Rooney, that is not a reduction in the total money to be available for the Falcon Dam. There is $1 million of that reduction which is a very valid lowering of the total cost of Falcon Dam. The balance of the $2.6 million was $1½ million for new money which was to be requested for the Anzalduas Dam but which, by reason of not getting started this year, we have deferred in a sense.

Mr. ROONEY. Exactly. It is not a saving in the slightest. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

As has been pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], there has been no request for the information and education program, the so-called Voice of America, in this budget or bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to my chairman.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Is it not true that in one particular area we are spending about $10 million of counterpart funds?

Mr. ROONEY. That may be correct.

Mr. CLEVENGER. If we sustain the economy of the countries by putting money in this pocket and taking a part of it out as counterpart funds, is it or is it not coming out of the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. ROONEY. I regret that I have never agreed with the gentleman in regard to this subject. I believe that we are much better off to have decent and proper buildings for our State Department representatives in a foreign city than to have an uncollected credit in a book. At least we then have something, and we are getting something out of it.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Have we been happy with some of the buildings we have built?

Mr. ROONEY. There have been a few mistakes made, surely. This foreign

buildings program was authorized by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Congress. Surely there have been white elephants in one or two cases. I have been most critical of them and you have heard me criticize the purchase of the Wier property in Bermuda.

There have been mistakes made, yes; but that does not mean that the program is not a good one, and that we are not better off to have a building to house our people in a foreign city than to have a credit on the books which we will never collect.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I do not have any argument, as I never have had, with the gentleman allowing a proper sized building, but when we get one we do not need, and more pretentious than we have any use for, then we generate a cost for public buildings maintenance that will break our backs.

Mr. ROONEY. I go along with the gentleman to a certain point in that argument, yes.

Mr. CLEVENGER. My reason for delay on this one is to take a good look at it.

Mr. ROONEY. This is a good program, and we are better off to have the property than uncollected credits which we probably will never collect. Now with regard to the Department of Justice——

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he goes to the Department of Justice?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wonder if there is anything in the hearings or any testimony given as to the attitude or the position of the present administration on a matter that is near and dear to the hearts of countless millions of Americans, the unification of Ireland.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, there is a statement with regard to that deplorable and unfair situation and the viewpoint of the present administration as to the partition question is contained in the hearings, and I shall be glad to cull it from the hearings and insert it at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman briefly state what it is?

Mr. ROONEY. The new administration feels that it is an internal matter and that this Government should take no part in the vicious manmade partition of Ireland, a partition which exists contrary to the wishes of the majority of the Irish people and which denies civil rights to a large part of the population of Northern Ireland.

The record in this regard at page 72 of the Department of State hearings reads as follows:

POLICY ON PARTITION OF IRELAND

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to ask, Mr. Merchant, that you insert at this point in the record a statement of the policy of the new administration and the Department of State with regard to the partition question in Ireland, and what, if anything, the Department intends to do about it.

(The information is as follows:)

"The administration is aware of the questions arising from the political status of Northern Ireland and of the bearing of these questions on the close and friendly relations of the United States with the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom. The United States continues to maintain that the constitutional relationship between Ireland and Northern Ireland is a matter for determination by the two countries concerned and is not a matter in which the United States could properly or usefully intervene."

Now with regard to the Department of Justice. there is an alleged savings at page 24 of the committee report of $5,028,000 as compared with the total appropriations for the Department of Justice in the current fiscal year. The fact of the matter is, and this was admitted by the gentleman from Ohio in the hearings, and it is right in the report—as a matter of fact instead of being a savings of $5,028,000 as compared with the current year's appropriations and of $7,885,000 as compared with the 1954 Department of Justice request, it is $9,118,000 more than the Department has in the current fiscal year.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to my chairman.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Was not that in my own statement? Those figures showed an increase.

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, the gentleman has been eminently fair, but I do not think he has accentuated this the way it should be accentuated.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I certainly did.

Mr. ROONEY. He mentions it in his report, but you have to read along a little ways in the report until you find it on page 7. I read from the report:

However, when transfers to other agencies are deducted, the amount provided is an actual increase of $9,118,000 over the current fiscal year.

Mr. CLEVENGER. That occurs in my statement.

Mr. ROONEY. I want to show you some more of these "phoney-boloney" figures now, with regard to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. You will find in the summary on page 24 a statement that there is recommended in this bill for 1954 $77 million for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and that this represents as compared with the current fiscal year a reduction of $7,400,000; and the gentleman from Ohio will admit—and he was very fair about this in the full committee—that this represents an increase; instead of being $7,400,000 less, it is $6,700,000 more than the current fiscal year's appropriation.

Now, when are we going to get this budget balanced? When are we going to cut these taxes that you have told the American public you were going to cut? Are you going to do it by scuttling the American merchant marine and taking $118,500,000 out of this bill asked by the new administration for new ship construction and again relegate ourselves to being a 10th or 20th rate power on the high seas? No; I do not think so. Are you going to do it by eliminating completely from this bill funds for censuses of business, transportation, manufacturers, and mineral industries, and such other items that the American businessman vitally needs?

You are going to hear from these businessmen. There are quite a few of such items eliminated that will be inserted in the bill when it reaches the body at the other end of the Capitol.

I call attention to the following testimony at page 228 of the Department of Justice hearings:

Mr. ROONEY. If I analyze this statement and the figures on the sheet before us correctly, it would appear that your revised budget totals $180,110,000, which would be $9,873,000 above what you referred to as President Truman's budget in the current fiscal year; is that correct?

Mr. BROWNELL. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Rather, what we gave them for the curernt fiscal year.

Mr. ROONEY. What the Department of Justice has available in the current fiscal year is the amount of $170,237,000.

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY. The figures now being presented to us for our consideration are almost $10 million more than the amount now being used to run the Department of Justice?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I do not think our committee approved the budget request last year.

Mr. ROONEY. We are not talking of the budget request last year, Mr. Chairman. We are talking about the amount now available to the Department.

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY. And that amount is almost $10 million less than the amount sought of this committee today.

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is right.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I notice that the bill contains the sum of $225,000 for administrative expenses for settling claims of persons of Japanese ancestry who were evacuated from the West Coast. I called the Department of Justice yesterday to find out what is being done with respect to payment of those claims and they said there were approximately $4,000,000 of claims that had been settled for the fiscal year 1952 and about three and three-quarter million dollars of claims settled in 1953 and it was proposed that those be included in a supplemental appropriations bill to be presented to the Congress in a few weeks. It will have to be in a few weeks because the current fiscal year ends in a few months. Why should not the present bill contain some money for the payment of claims adjudicated this year?

Mr. ROONEY. We were not asked for any. We were not asked for such money either by the previous administration or this administration. They are allowed practically what they wanted for administrative expenses with regard to these claims. A lot of them will be out of the way. We have given them money in the current fiscal year for the payment of such claims so by the time you get to June 30 the situation should be pretty good. I have not heard any complaint from anyone on this, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The point I make is that the claims that were adjudicated during the fiscal year 1952 are still not paid. They were supposed to come up in a supplemental appropriations bill last year, but it was never brought to the Congress. The point I should like to make is that these claims have been

pending for many years. They will have to await another supplemental appropriations bill for those claims that are settled during 1954 fiscal year.

Mr. ROONEY. We gave the Department of Justice over $10 million last year for the payment of these claims. I still remember the debate in conference with the then senior Senator from Tennessee on this.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Twelve and one-half million dollars.

Mr. YATES. Was this in a supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes.

Mr. YATES. The regular bill contained a half million dollars for the claims, in addition to administrative expenses. I wonder why a comparable amount was not included this year?

Mr. CLEVENGER. The administration did not ask for it.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has always expressed a great interest and should be commended for that great interest insofar as the claims of persons of Japanese ancestry are concerned ever since the underlying legislation was enacted. I think the majority and minority of the committee can assure him we wish to cooperate insofar as every one of the claims is concerned in order to get rid of them. We want them out of the way, we want them paid; however, we were not asked for any money by the people who are handling these claims and if they are not ready to use the money to pay them, I see no use in appropriating funds until the time comes to do so.

There are a number of other alleged savings in this report. Some of them we have accomplished ourselves in previous years. There is, for instance, the Foreign Service Retirement Fund. We take a couple of million dollars out of the bill on that and it looks good. I guess that is common appropriation practice and I should not chide our friends on the other side for it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not know whether this is a proper question to ask the gentleman or not. I am interested in a provision of this bill; one line on page 16 of the report of which reads:

> There is a time lag of 24 months for the average project between the programming of funds and actual payment to a State.

Then below it says that there is $1,501,000,000 authorized—and I assume that is authorized by the Congress, the Federal Government—which has not yet been programmed for the States. Does that mean, and is the House to understand, that the States are that far behind in the construction of roads, and the Federal Government that much in advance for Federal highway funds?

Mr. ROONEY. Inasmuch as this is one of the items in the bill that the minority and the majority did not see eye to eye on, I am going to ask my distinguished chairman the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] to answer the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CLEVENGER. As we all know, in this same appropriation supplemental this year we furnished $185 million. Because of the open winter and the building of roads, we made greater progress than ever before. They made more completions than the gentleman from New York and myself thought they would at the time. We have to give it to them when the roads are built and paid for by the State highway department. I think the gentleman put the word "program" in there. "Program" is not in the report, is it?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; it is. There is a lag of 24 months for the average project between programming of funds and actual payments to the State.

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is right. That means the surveying of roads and the letting of contracts and the completion of them. When the State highway department has bills to pay, then they make the demands on the Federal Government.

Mr. DONDERO. Just to make it clear, do I understand that we have authorized, that is, the Congress has, $1,500,000,000 which has not yet been allocated to the States for the building of Federal roads?

Mr. CLEVENGER. This year's program has been allocated.

Mr. DONDERO. But the roads have not been built?

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is right, and one of these days you will get a bill for them here.

Mr. ROONEY. I might explain to the gentleman from Michigan that the Committee on Appropriations has no discretion at all in regard to these road programs. We are merely handed a check to sign in blank because of the peculiar legislation under which the public-roads program was set up. They determine the extent to which they are going to build roads, enter into agreements with the States, and we must pay. Of course, it is a good program. I do not think anyone would want it repealed, because we collect over $2 billion a year in Federal gasoline taxes, oil, and tire taxes, and so forth.

Mr. DONDERO. And only give back to the people that pay that money about 25 percent.

Mr. ROONEY. I was going to give the gentleman the pleasure of adding that.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. On page 28 it is noted that $22,700,000 is provided under the Federal Aid Airport Act for the liquidation of obligations already incurred. That means that no funds are made available for aiding airport development throughout the United States for 1954, or in the future; is that correct?

Mr. CLEVENGER. The new Secretary just did not approve new starts for 1954, and I think it is a very healthy thing to take a look at it again. There is about $10 million unspent that could be allotted; money unobligated.

Mr. EVINS. It is my understanding that many municipalities throughout the United States have voted bond issues dependent on the Federal Government matching them in order to develop a national system of airways and airports. The Government now not making funds available, they are losing faith in the Government. They are defaulting upon an obligation which they understood would be entered into.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I think we have pretty good evidence that the CAA is out soliciting business with the money made available to them.

Mr. EVINS. It is my information that some $35 million ar $40 million was requested, but it has been cut out either by the Bureau of the Budget or at some level, and no funds are provided except for obligations already entered into.

Mr. CLEVENGER. The Secretary of Commerce entered into an agreement that they would ask for no new starts.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not remember the figures, because it is some 2 to 2½ months ago that we had the testimony, but there is a very interesting story in the Department of Commerce hearings in regard to an airport manager and a CAA regional engineer, where the airport people thought that they might get some modest sum, and then it wound up that the claim became a huge one. I do not remember the figures at the moment, but they are really phenomenal.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to take this opportunity to express my great satisfaction in the opportunity I have had this year for the first time to serve on this subcommittee, with its distinguished and genial chairman and its distinguished and genial ranking minority member and the other able and agreeable gentlemen who compose it, and with its able and industrious executive clerk, Jay Howe.

I should like also to express my satisfaction and to congratulate the administrative officials who are responsible for these three departments on the valiant and effective efforts they have made to effect real economies. My good friend from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to the contrary notwithstanding, these are effective economies. If a building is not built and is not contracted for, there is economy. When a ship is not built and is not contracted for, that is economy.

If we want to balance the budget, if the residents of Brooklyn and Manhattan and the rest of the country are ever to get the benefit of a tax reduction, we have to do what is necessary to cut expenditures and balance the budget so we can get on a sound foundation.

I think the Administrators of these departments and the members of this committee have done a good job, and I hope the House will stand with us.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time at the close of the debate. I certainly wish to echo the eloquent and true words of the gentleman from New York in praising the committee for its fair-mindedness and its effectiveness in securing this economy. However, I requested the time in order to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question.

I wonder if he would be willing to develop a little the extent of the economies in the road-building program and assure some of us who are interested in getting better and more effective modes of transportation that such will be attained even despite the economies in the program.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We have absolutely nothing to do with the road-building program. That is up to the Committee on Public Roads. Most of these projects are done in connection with the State highway departments of the various States. Our function is only to supply the Federal matching funds that are provided for in the general legislation.

Mrs. CHURCH. Nevertheless, I am inquiring whether there has been any cut in the amounts herein applied through the Federal contribution?

Mr. CLEVENGER. No; there has not. We try to estimate as near as we can the amount of the completions. Last year, as I said a moment ago, they completed more than we had anticipated, so we had to send down a supplemental amount. This year we have given them more than the usual amount.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. To put it another way, we do not participate in the determination of whether a road is to be built from A to B or C or anywhere else in the United States. The only judgment we exercise in the matter is as to how much they will be able to spend, how many checks they need to write during the coming fiscal year. We try to gage that and keep it down as low as we can. That is the only function this committee has insofar as the public-roads program is concerned.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman. The Illinois State Legislature has passed and forwarded to us memorials urging that full attention be given to the extension of roads. I wanted to be sure that adequate thought had been given to the problem.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree with the gentlewoman with regard to the extension of public roads, but, of course, we cannot have economy and extension of roads at the same time.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to present briefly to the Congress and to the country the serious situation which confronts our ship construction yards at this time.

I present it in the interest of those I have the honor to represent. I present it in the interest of national defense.

It is absolutely vital to national defense, Mr. Chairman, to preserve those construction yards which are essential in time of war, as well as those groups of skilled workers at these yards which constitute a tremendous national asset and which once disbanded, it is almost impossible to reassemble.

I was glad to note that Under Secretary Kyes of the Department of Defense in his recent address stressed the importance of maintaining the health of industries, particularly vital to the national defense.

I am sure we are all in full accord with this policy.

What is the present situation, Mr. Chairman, in our ship construction yards? Briefly, it is this.

In World War II our ship construction program required 100 shipyards. Today there are but 12 yards building vessels, and only 8 of the 12 are building vessels for overseas service.

In World War II employment at these yards reached about 1,500,000 people. Today it is less than 100,000.

In the Fore River shipyard in Quincy, Mass., with which I am most familiar, employment fell from 9,700 on January 1 to about 8,100 on April 1, and in the absence of further construction will fall to about 5,700 by January 1 next; and to 3,400 by July 1, 1954.

For the designers' force at this yard, which is a highly skilled and highly specialized group of workers, the corresponding figures are 625 as of January 1, 430 as of April 1, 160 as of January 1, 1954, and 75 as of July 1, 1954.

Why? Because of the fact that work is being completed; that almost all construction now on hand will be finished in 1953 or the first part of 1954, and that there is no further construction in sight at this time.

The community and all those interested in this yard are genuinely alarmed, and I may say, Mr. Chairman, that figures which I have received indicate that a similar situation prevails at almost all our construction yards at this time.

My attention has been called in this connection to a report of the so-called President's Committee on the Merchant Marine, a committee of five including President K. T. Keller of the Chrysler Corp., and Mr. Marion B. Folsom, now Under Secretary of the Treasury, which submitted its report to the President in November of 1947, over 5 years ago.

In this report, the committee found among other things that a modern, efficient, merchant fleet, and an effective, progressive ship-building industry are indispensable to our national security and must be maintained.

Further, that ship-building skills and the know-how of ship operations are essential, national assets which must be preserved.

The committee also stressed the urgent need of passenger carrying ships in the interest of national defense.

It stated that representatives of the Army and Navy had laid particular stress on the present lack of fast passenger-carrying vessels in the American merchant marine.

It added that the discrepancy between the Armed Services estimates of essential, initial wartime troop movements and the capacity of existing ships, both military and commercial, was such as to lead to the inescapable conclusion that construction should be started immediately on a program of high-quality passenger-carrying vessels.

It recommended the construction, over a period of 4 years—from 1948 to 1951, of 46 passenger ships.

Over 5 years have elapsed. Three passenger ships have been constructed. None are on order.

I am advised that the United States active commercial passenger ships in 1939 numbered 123 with a carrying capacity of about 38,000; that today they number about 44 with a carrying capacity of about 13,000; that our troop lift today is only about 50 percent of prewar including cargo ships with troop accommodations installed to the extent of some 65 percent.

Further elements in the picture, Mr. Chairman, are the Russian submarine fleet, said to be several times the size of the German Fleet, and capable in certain instances at least of a speed, while submerged, of 18 knots an hour.

Also the fact that Uncle Sam is under contract to subsidize the replacement of certain 20-year-old vessels under operating subsidies.

This, in a word, is the picture.

The solution of the problem confronting us, Mr. Chairman, canot be accomplished piecemeal. It calls for overall consideration; consideration in terms of naval construction, in terms of subsidized construction, in terms of any other available construction.

But a solution must be found.

To allow essential construction yards to go under—to allow essential skilled staffs to be dissipated—would destroy our mobilization base. It would be contrary to our whole mobilization policy. It is unthinkable.

The facts necessary for overall consideration are not available to us today.

We do not yet know what the naval construction program for fiscal 1954 is to be.

The Federal Maritime Board is today conducting negotiations with a view to construction under section 504 as distinguished from section 501 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. The object is to permit Uncle Sam, instead of paying the entire construction cost of the ship, less recapture of, say, 60 percent over a period of 20 years—to pay only the value of the subsidy itself, say 40 percent of the construction cost, the balance being financed privately. We do not yet know what the outcome of these negotiations will be.

Moreover, we do not yet know what other construction may be obtainable.

The full picture is not before us.

When this bill reaches the Senate, Mr. Chairman, all the facts should be available. This should permit full consideration and appropriate action.

I am assured of consideration by the Senate of this all-important matter before the bill returns to the House.

I am confident that a solution of the problem can and will be found—a solution which will provide the necessary lifeblood for our construction yards, in the interest of national defense—a solution which will be consistent with reasonable economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said this morning about the riders in this bill affecting the

Commerce Department, the Justice Department, and the State Department. I have supported those riders consistently, believing that they were very helpful and that they served a good purpose. But it is obvious now that the President of the United States, President Eisenhower, has undertaken to deal with this problem on a common basis, putting all agencies of the Government under one rule, which is only proper.

I do not think we can justify trying to apply one security rule to three departments, and the executive branch of the Government applying its security rule to all the remaining departments of the Government. Uniformity of law is essential in an orderly government; so what we are in effect doing with these riders in the bill is laying down a different rule of operation for three departments as distinguished from all of the remaining departments of Government.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. This rider was put in originally 7 years ago in State, as I recollect, and in Commerce 3 years ago. The gentleman stated at the time that he supported it. He was perfectly satisfied at that time to give that authorization to Messrs. Acheson and Sawyer. At that same period the then President was carrying out a security program, was he not?

Mr. PRESTON. But there was no basic law, no general law.

Mr. COUDERT. Wait a minute; on the contrary, there was at that time on the statute books the authority of Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress.

Mr. PRESTON. That is right. But it was enacted in 1950.

Mr. COUDERT. And during that period the President inaugurated, as I recall it, his own security program.

If the gentleman supported these measures through the years as authorized, and was content to authorize the then Secretaries of State and Commerce to carry on this kind of program and to have this authority, this law, even then on the books, even though the then President, Mr. Truman, had his own security program in operation, certainly he ought not to object to extending the same authority to the same departments, at least until we have had an opportunity to find out how effective the new program which is laid down by Executive order may be in fact. It will take some time for that to work out. There is no reason for Congress to abdicate and remove itself from this field and give up all authority over the control and elimination of subversives and other undesirables from these three vital departments.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to make the statement that neither Secretary of State Acheson nor any other Secretary of State ever requested the so-called McCarran rider which was the brain child of the senior Senator from Nevada; and I have supplied the authorship of the rider insofar as the Department of Commerce is concerned; but never at any time did any of the Cabinet members ask the insertion of such a rider.

Mr. COUDERT. I beg the pardon of the gentleman from Ohio. On the other hand, perhaps the gentleman from Ohio misunderstood me. I did not say that they asked for it; I merely said that the gentleman from Georgia who said he had supported it in the past and was now apparently objecting was content to give the authority and permit it to be exercised.

Mr. ROONEY. I feel about this as does the gentleman from Georgia. I thought we might get all the members of the subcommittee together here on the floor and agree to eliminate these riders in view of this recent Executive order. I am ready now as I have shown myself to be throughout all these appropriation matters to cooperate with the President of the United States and his Cabinet officers. I think we ought to allow an opportunity for this Executive order to be worked out.

Mr. COUDERT. Nonetheless, I say there is no justification for Congress to legislate itself out of control over these matters.

Mr. ROONEY. I feel at the present moment that the matter is in the good hands of President Eisenhower.

Mr. COUDERT. I am glad the gentleman has that confidence; and I, of course, share his confidence. But I still believe there is not any reason for Congress abdicating. This is the law and has been for years, and it has served a useful purpose. There has been no successful criticism of it. The mere fact that we are dealing with security matters in vital departments is no reason for Congress to eliminate itself and lose a vitally important weapon in the elimination of subversives in our war on subversives.

Mr. PRESTON. I had hoped we would not approach this matter on a partisan basis, but it is quite apparent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is ready to do that.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. In a moment. So far this debate this morning has indicated no one wanted to approach this on a partisan basis. Until the gentleman mentioned the attitude of the present administration as compared to the previous administration we were getting along very well.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I want to make it perfectly clear that any Member on this side who rises to defend decent legislation introduced and drafted by the gentleman from New York, my very good Democratic colleague, is certainly not taking a partisan view. He is supporting Democratic inspired and promoted legislation. It is a little surprising to me, and a little difficult to understand that the gentleman should stand up on the floor and defend these riders, as he did a few minutes ago, then come to the mike, as he did just now, and suggest that we withdraw them.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is not known for being indecisive about matters. He has always been very firm in any position he has taken in the Congress. Any lawyer, and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is a lawyer of some note, should be interested in uniformity of law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want to make an observation that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] did not deny the statement of my friend from Georgia that he is engaging in politics.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, if I am engaging in politics, I am certainly following in distinguished footsteps. I have rarely seen the gentleman from Massachusetts fail to engage in politics when he takes the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts will always proudly say when he is engaging in politics, but when I am I will not then make the statement that I am not.

Mr. COUDERT. If trying to support and improve the weapon against subversive infiltration in any department of this Government is engaging in politics, I am proud to plead guilty.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I have never known the American Legion to take a position in support of subversives and that organization is unequivocally opposed to this rider and has so indicated its attitude in a number of telegrams which have been sent to Members this morning. We have also received the same type of message from the DAV, which is not known for its willingness to support subversives in Government. I have never been known to be guilty of that sort of approach to any problem and, as I look about the Chamber this morning, I cannot see anyone present who has lent comfort to subversives in Government. We have all the same purpose. But certainly Congress should not become a party to confusion and that is what we are doing here for this reason: We have a law on the statute books, Public Law 733, which says that we shall deal with these problems in a certain manner. Now the Appropriations Committee, which is the junior legislative body of this Congress, and I am a member of that committee, says: We want to write our own rules for these three agencies. That simply adds confusion to the picture. Someone will have to determine which law takes precedence. Does Public Law 733 take precedence over the law written here today in this appropriation bill? When a man is dismissed, has he the right to inquire in the courts as to whether he is dismissed under the rider contained in the appropriation bill or under Public Law 733? This raises a very nice question for the courts to determine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, in order that the record may show just what

we are talking about and in order that everyone might know the issue, I shall insert in the RECORD under permission previously obtained in the House, Public Law 733, also a draft notice from the Executive Department to the various departments of the Government advising that an Executive order will be issued based on Public Law 733; then I wish to include also Executive Order No. 10450, issued by the President in April of this year. I also wish to include a document prepared by the Attorney General under instructions from the President, containing regulations relating to the security program.

This explains to the various departmental heads what the procedure should be. I will put them in the RECORD in order that it can be general knowledge to everyone.

[Public Law 733, 81st Cong., ch. 803, 2d sess.]

H. R. 7439

An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), as amended (5 U. S. C. 652), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State; Secretary of Commerce; Attorney General; the Secretary of Defense; the Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force; the Secretary of the Treasury; Atomic Energy Commission; the Chairman, National Security Resources Board; or the Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, may, in his absolute discretion and when deemed necessary in the interest of national security, suspend, without pay, any civilian officer or employee of the Department of State (including the Foreign Service of the United States), Department of Commerce, Department of Justice, Department of Defense, Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, Coast Guard, Atomic Energy Commission, National Security Resources Board, or National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, respectively, or of their several field services: *Provided*, That to the extent that such agency head determines that the interests of the national security permit, the employee concerned shall be notified of the reasons for his suspension and within 30 days after such notification any such person shall have an opportunity to submit any statements or affidavits to the official designated by the head of the agency concerned to show why he should be reinstated or restored to duty. The agency head concerned may, following such investigation and review as he deems necessary, terminate the employment of such suspended civilian officer or employee whenever he shall determine such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the national security of the United States, and such determination by the agency head concerned shall be conclusive and final: *Provided further*, That any employee having a permanent or indefinite appointment, and having completed his probationary or trial period, who is a citizen of the United States whose employment is suspended under the authority of this act, shall be given after his suspension and before his employment is terminated under the authority of this act, (1) a written statement within 30 days after his suspension of the charges against him, which shall be subject to amendment within 30 days thereafter and which shall be stated as specifically as security considerations permit; (2) an opportunity within 30 days thereafter (plus an additional 30 days if the charges are amended) to answer such charges and to submit affidavits; (3) a hearing, at the employee's request, by a duly constituted agency authority for this purpose; (4) a review of his case by the agency head, or some official designated by him, before a decision adverse to the employee is made final; and (5) a written statement of the decision of the agency head: *Provided further*, That any person whose employment is so suspended or terminated under the authority of this act may, in the discretion of the agency head concerned, be reinstated or restored to duty, and if so reinstated or restored shall be allowed compensation for all or any part of the period of such suspension or termination in an amount not to exceed the difference between the amount such person would normally have earned during the period of such suspension or termination, at the rate he was receiving on the date of suspension or termination, as appropriate, and the interim net earnings of such person: *Provided further*, That the termination of employment herein provided shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government: *Provided further*, That the head of any department or agency considering the appointment of any person whose employment has been terminated under the provisions of this act may make such appointment only after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, which agency shall have the authority at the written request of either the head of such agency or such employee to determine whether any such person is eligible for employment by any other agency or department of the Government.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall impair the powers vested in the Atomic Energy Commission by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 or the requirements of section 12 of that act that adequate provision be made for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee of said Commission.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall apply to such other departments and agencies of the Government as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary in the best interests of national security. If any departments or agencies are included by the President, he shall so report to the Committees on the Armed Services of the Congress.

SEC. 4. Section 3 of the act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1053), and section 104 of the act of July 20, 1949 (Public Law 179, 81st Cong.), and section 630 of the act of October 29, 1949 (Public Law 434, 81st Cong.) are hereby repealed.

Approved August 26, 1950.

To the Heads of All Departments and Agencies:

I have today issued an Executive order entitled "Security Requirements for Government Employment." This order establishes a security program for the executive branch of the Government and revokes Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, under which the loyalty program has operated. The order extends the application of the provisions of the Security Act of August 26, 1950, 64 Stat. 476, to all the departments and agencies of the Federal Government to which it has not heretofore been applicable.

With the issuance of this order, I have requested the Civil Service Commission to establish and effectuate a procedure whereby each department and agency of the Government will be furnished competent and disinterested Government employees from outside the department or agency concerned to sit as members of security hearing boards. Such boards, which would be composed of not less than three persons, would, in accordance with the act of August 26, 1950, be established by the head of the department or agency concerned and would act in an advisory capacity in making their findings and recommendations to the head of such department or agency.

I request the head of each department and agency to designate, as requested by the Civil Service Commission, persons possessing the highest degree of integrity, ability, and good judgment to be available for service as members of security hearing boards of other departments and agencies.

I have arranged that the Attorney General supply to the head of each department and agency sample regulations designed to establish minimum standards for the implementation of the security program under this order.

EXECUTIVE ORDER No. 10450

SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Whereas the interests of the national security require that all persons privileged to be employed in the departments and agencies of the Government shall be reliable, trustworthy, of good conduct and character, and of complete and unswerving loyalty to the United States; and

Whereas the American tradition that all persons should receive fair, impartial, and equitable treatment at the hands of the Government requires that all persons seeking the privilege of employment or privileged to be employed in the departments and agencies of the Government be adjudged by mutually consistent and no less than minimum standards and procedures among the departments and agencies governing the employment and retention in employment of persons in the Federal service:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, including section 1753 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U. S. C. 631); the Civil Service Act of 1883 (22 Stat. 403; 5 U. S. C. 632, et seq.); section 9A of the act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148; 5 U. S. C. 118j); and the act of August 26, 1950 (64 Stat. 476; 5 U. S. C. 22–1, et seq.), and as President of the United States, and deeming such action necessary in the best interests of the national security, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. In addition to the departments and agencies specified in the said act of August 26, 1950, and Executive Order No. 10237 of April 26, 1951, the provisions of that act shall apply to all other departments and agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The head of each department and agency of the Government shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining within his department or agency an effective program to insure that the employment and retention in employment of any civilian officer or employee within the department or agency is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.

SEC. 3. (a) The appointment of each civilian officer or employee in any department or agency of the Government shall be made subject to investigation. The scope of the investigation shall be determined in the first instance according to the degree of adverse effect the occupant of the position sought to be filled could bring about, by virtue of the nature of the position, on the national security, but in no event shall the investigation include less than a national agency check (including a check of the fingerprint files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation), and written inquiries to appropriate local law-enforcement agencies, former employers and supervisors, references, and schools attended by the person under investigation: *Provided*, That upon request of the head of the department or agency concerned, the Civil Service Commission may, in its discretion, authorize such less investigation as may meet the requirements of the national security with respect to per diem, intermittent, temporary, or seasonal employees, or aliens employed outside the United States. Should there develop at any

stage of investigation information indicating that the employment of any such person may not be clearly consistent with the interests of the national security, there shall be conducted with respect to such person a full field investigation, or such less investigation as shall be sufficient to enable the head of the department or agency concerned to determine whether retention of such person is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.

(b) The head of any department or agency shall designate, or cause to be designated, any position within his department or agency the occupant of which could bring about, by virtue of the nature of the position, a material adverse effect on the national security as a sensitive position. Any position so designated shall be filed or occupied only by a person with respect to whom a full field investigation has been conducted: *Provided*, That a person occupying a sensitive position at the time it is designated as such may continue to occupy such position pending the completion of a full field investigation, subject to the other provisions of this order: *And provided further*, That in case of emergency a sensitive position may be filled for a limited period by a person with respect to whom a full field pre-appointment investigation has not been completed if the head of the department or agency concerned finds that such action is necessary in the national interest, which finding shall be made a part of the records of such department or agency.

SEC. 4. The head of each department and agency shall review, or cause to be reviewed, the cases of all civilian officers and employees with respect to whom there has been conducted a full field investigation under Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, and, after such further investigation as may be appropriate, shall re-adjudicate, or cause to be re-adjudicated, in accordance with the said act of August 26, 1950, such of those cases as have not been adjudicated under a security standard commensurate with that established under this order.

SEC. 5. Whenever there is developed or received by any department or agency information indicating that the retention in employment of any officer or employee of the Government may not be clearly consistent with the interests of the national security, such information shall be forwarded to the head of the employing department or agency or his representative, who, after such investigation as may be appropriate, shall review, or cause to be reviewed, and, where necessary, readjudicate, or cause to be re-adjudicated, in accordance with the said act of August 26, 1950, the case of such officer or employee.

SEC. 6. Should there develop at any stage of investigation information indicating that the employment of any officer or employee of the Government may not be clearly consistent with the interests of the national security, the head of the department or agency concerned or his representative shall immediately suspend the employment of the person involved if he deems such suspension necessary in the interests of the national security and, following such investigation and review as he deems necessary, the head of the department or agency concerned shall terminate the employment of such suspended officer or employee whenever he shall determine such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the national security, in accordance with the said act of August 26, 1950.

SEC. 7. Any person whose employment is suspended or terminated under the authority granted to heads of departments and agencies by or in accordance with the said act of August 26, 1950, or pursuant to the said Executive Order No. 9835 or any other security or loyalty program relating to officers or employees of the Government, shall not be reinstated or restored to duty or reemployed in the same department or agency, and shall not be reemployed in any other department or agency, unless the head of the department or agency concerned finds that such reinstatement, restoration, or reemployment is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security, which finding shall be made a part of the records of such department or agency: *Provided*, That no person whose employment has been terminated under such authority thereafter may be employed by any other department or agency except after a determination by the Civil Service Commission that such person is eligible for such employment.

SEC. 8. (a) The investigations conducted pursuant to this order shall be designed to develop information as to whether the employment or retention in employment in the Federal service of the person being investigated is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security. Such information shall relate, but shall not be limited, to the following:

(1) Depending on the relation of the Government employment to the national security:

(i) Any behavior, activities, or associations which tend to show that the individual is not reliable or trustworthy.

(ii) Any deliberate misrepresentations, falsifications, or omission of material facts.

(iii) Any criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct, habitual use of intoxicants to excess, drug addiction, or sexual perversion.

(iv) An adjudication of insanity, or treatment for serious mental or neurological disorder without satisfactory evidence of cure.

(v) Any facts which furnish reason to believe that the individual may be subjected to coercion, influence, or pressure which may cause him to act contrary to the best interests of the national security.

(2) Commission of any act of sabotage, espionage, treason, or sedition, or attempts thereat or preparation therefore, or conspiring with, or aiding or abetting, another to commit or attempt to commit any act of sabotage, espionage, treason, or sedition.

(3) Establishing or continuing a sympathetic association with a saboteur, spy, traitor, seditionist, anarchist, or revolutionist, or with an espionage or other secret agent or representative of a foreign nation, or any representative of a foreign nation whose interests may be inimical to the interests of the United States, or with any person who advocates the use of force or violence to overthrow the Government of the United States or the alteration of the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

(4) Advocacy of use of force or violence to overthrow the Government of the United States, or of the alteration of the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

(5) Membership in, or affiliation or sympathetic association with, any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons which is totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or which has adopted, or shows, a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

(6) Intentional, unauthorized disclosure to any person of security information, or of other information disclosure of which is prohibited by law, or willful violation or disregard of security regulations.

(7) Performing or attempting to perform his duties, or otherwise acting, so as to serve the interests of another government in preference to the interests of the United States.

(b) The investigation of persons entering or employed in the competitive service shall primarily be the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission, except in cases in which the head of a department or agency assumes that responsibility pursuant to law or by agreement with the Commission. The Commission shall furnish a full investigative report to the department or agency concerned.

(c) The investigation of persons (including consultants, however employed), entering employment of, or employed by, the Government other than in the competitive service shall primarily be the responsibility of the employing department or agency. Departments and agencies without investigative facilities may use the investigative facilities of the Civil Service Commission, and other departments and agencies may use such facilities under agreement with the Commission.

(d) There shall be referred promptly to the Federal Bureau of Investigation all investigations being conducted by any other agencies which develop information indicating that an individual may have been subjected to coercion, influence, or pressure to act contrary to the interests of the national security, or information relating to any of the matters described in subdivisions (2) through (7) of subsection (a) of this section. In cases so referred to it, the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make a full field investigation.

SEC. 9. (a) There shall be established and maintained in the Civil Service Commission a security-investigations index covering all persons as to whom security investigations have been conducted by any department or agency of the Government under this order. The central index established and maintained by the Commission under Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, shall be made a part of the security-investigations index. The security-investigations index shall contain the name of each person investigated, adequate identifying information concerning each such person, and a reference to each department and agency which has conducted an investigation concerning the person involved or has suspended or terminated the employment of such person under the authority granted to heads of departments and agencies by or in accordance with the said act of August 26, 1950.

(b) The heads of all departments and agencies shall furnish promptly to the Civil Service Commission information appropriate for the establishment and maintenance of the security-investigations index.

(c) The reports and other investigative material and information developed by investigations conducted pursuant to any statute, order, or program described in section 7 of this order shall remain the property of the investigative agencies conducting the investigations, but may, subject to considerations of the national security, be retained by the department or agency concerned. Such reports and other investigative material and information shall be maintained in confidence, and no access shall be given thereto except, with the consent of the investigative agency concerned, to other departments and agencies conducting security programs under the authority granted by or in accordance with the said act of August 26, 1950, as may be required for the efficient conduct of Government business.

SEC. 10. Nothing in this order shall be construed as eliminating or modifying in any way the requirement for any investigation or any determination as to security which may be required by law.

SEC. 11. On and after the effective date of this order the Loyalty Review Board established by Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, shall not accept agency findings for review, upon appeal or otherwise. Appeals pending before the Loyalty Review Board on such date shall be heard to final determination in accordance with the provisions of the said Executive Order No. 9835, as amended. Agency determinations favorable to the officer or employee concerned pending before the Loyalty Review Board on such date shall be acted upon by such Board,

and whenever the Board is not in agreement with such favorable determination the case shall be remanded to the department or agency concerned for determination in accordance with the standards and procedures established pursuant to this order. Cases pending before the regional loyalty boards of the Civil Service Commission on which hearings have not been initiated on such date shall be referred to the department or agency concerned. Cases being heard by regional loyalty boards on such date shall be heard to conclusion, and the determination of the board shall be forwarded to the head of the department or agency concerned: *Provided*, That if no specific department or agency is involved the case shall be dismissed without prejudice to the applicant. Investigations pending in the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Civil Service Commission on such date shall be completed, and the reports thereon shall be made to the appropriate department or agency.

SEC. 12. Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, as amended, is hereby revoked. For the purposes described in section 11 hereof the Loyalty Review Board and the regional loyalty boards of the Civil Service Commission shall continue to exist and function for a period of 120 days from the effective date of this order, and the Department of Justice shall continue to furnish the information described in paragraph 3 of part III of the said Executive Order No. 9835, but directly to the head of each department and agency.

SEC. 13. The Attorney General is requested to render to the heads of departments and agencies such advice as may be requisite to enable them to establish and maintain an appropriate employee-security program.

SEC. 14. (a) The Civil Service Commission, with the continuing advice and collaboration of representatives of such departments and agencies as the National Security Council may designate, shall make a continuing study of the manner in which this order is being implemented by the departments and agencies of the Government for the purpose of determining:

(1) Deficiencies in the department and agency security programs established under this order which are inconsistent with the interests of, or directly or indirectly weaken, the national security.

(2) Tendencies in such programs to deny to individual employees fair, impartial, and equitable treatment at the hands of the Government, or rights under the Constitution and laws of the United States or this order.

Information affecting any department or agency developed or received during the course of such continuing study shall be furnished immediately to the head of the department or agency concerned. The Civil Service Commission shall report to the National Security Council, at least semiannually, on the results of such study, and shall recommend means to correct any such deficiences or tendencies.

(b) All departments and agencies of the Government are directed to cooperate with the Civil Service Commission to facilitate the accomplishment of the responsibilities assigned to it by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 15. This order shall become effective 30 days after the date hereof.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April —, 1953.*

APRIL 23, 1953.

SAMPLE SECURITY REGULATIONS

REGULATIONS RELATING TO THE SECURITY PROGRAM OF [THE DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY]

Pursuant to the authority contained in the act of August 26, 1950, 64 Stat. 476, and [other laws that may be applicable], and Executive Order No. — of ———, 1953, I hereby prescribe the following regulations relating to the security program of the [department or agency]:

SECTION 1. Definitions:

(a) As used herein, the term "national security" relates to the protection and preservation of the military, economic, and productive strength of the United States, including the security of the Government in domestic and foreign affairs, against or from espionage, sabotage, and subversion, and any and all other illegal acts designed to weaken or destroy the United States.

(b) As used herein, the term "sensitive position" shall mean any position in the [department or agency] the occupant of which could bring about because of the nature of the position, a material adverse effect on the national security. Such positions shall include, but shall not be limited to, any position the occupant of which (1) may have access to security information or material classified as "confidential," "secret," or "top secret," or any other information or material having a direct bearing on the national security, and (2) may have opportunity to commit acts directly or indirectly adversely affecting the national security.

SEC. 2. Policy: It shall be the policy of the [department or agency], based on the said act of August 26, 1950, and [other acts or applicable law], and the said Executive Order No. —, to employ and to retain in employment only those persons whose employment or retention in employment is found to be clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.

SEC. 3. Security standards:

(a) No person shall be employed, or retained as an employee, in the [department or agency] unless the employment of such person is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.

(b) Information regarding an applicant for employment, or an employee, in the [department or agency] which may preclude a finding that his employment or retention in employment is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security shall relate, but shall not be limited, to the following:

(1) Depending on the relation of the Government employment to the national security:

(i) Any behavior, activities, or associations which tend to show that the individual is not reliable or trustworthy.

(ii) Any deliberate misrepresentations, falsifications, or omissions of material facts.

(iii) Any criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct, habitual use of intoxicants to excess, drug addiction, or sexual perversion.

(iv) An adjudication of insanity, or treatment for serious mental or neurological disorder without satisfactory evidence of cure.

(v) Any facts which furnish reason to believe that the individual may be subjected to coercion, influence, or pressure which may cause him to act contrary to the best interests of the national security.

(2) Commission of any act of sabotage, espionage, treason, or sedition, or attempts thereat or preparation therefor, or conspiring with, or aiding or abetting, another to commit or attempt to commit any act of sabotage, espionage, treason, or sedition.

(3) Establishing or continuing a sympathetic association with a saboteur, spy, traitor, seditionist, anarchist, or revolutionist, or with an espionage or other secret agent or representative of a foreign nation, or any representative of a foreign nation whose interests may be inimical to the interests of the United States, or with any person who advocates the use of force or violence to overthrow the Government of the United States or the alteration of the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

(4) Advocacy of use of force or violence to overthrow the Government of the United States, or of the alteration of the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

(5) Membership in, or affiliation or sympathetic association with, any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons which is totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or which has adopted, or shows a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

(6) Intentional, unauthorized disclosure to any person of security information, or of other information disclosure of which is prohibited by law, or willful violation or disregard of security regulations.

(7) Performing or attempting to perform his duties, or otherwise acting, so as to serve the interests of another government in preference to the interests of the United States.

SEC. 4. Security investigations:

(a) Security investigations conducted pursuant to these regulations shall be designed to develop information as to whether employment or retention in employment by the [department or agency] of the person being investigated is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.

(b) Every appointment made within the [department or agency] shall be made subject to investigation. The scope of the investigation shall be determined in the first instance according to the degree of adverse effect the occupant of the position sought to be filled could bring about, by virtue of the nature of the position, on the national security, but in no event shall the investigation include less than a national agency check and written inquiries to appropriate local law-enforcement agencies, former employers and supervisors, references, and schools and colleges attended by the person under investigation: *Provided*, that to the extent authorized by the Civil Service Commission a less investigation may suffice with respect to per diem, intermittent, temporary, or seasonal employees, or aliens employed outside the United States. Should information develop at any stage of investigation indicating that the employment of any such person may not be clearly consistent with the interests of the national security, there shall be conducted with respect to such person a full field investigation, or such less investigation as shall be sufficient to enable the [head of the department or agency] to determine whether retention of such person is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.

(c) No sensitive position in the [department or agency] shall be filled or occupied by any person with respect to whom a full field investigation has not been conducted: *Provided*, That a person occupying a sensitive position at the time it is designated as such may continue to occupy such position pending the completion of a full field investigation, subject to the other provisions of these regulations: *And provided further*, That in case of emergency a sensitive position may be filled for a limited period of time by a person with respect to whom a full field preappointment investigation has not been completed if the [head of the department or agency] finds that such action is necessary in the national interest. Such finding shall be made a part of the personnel record of the person concerned.

(d) Whenever a security investigation being conducted with respect to an employee of the [department or agency] develops information relating to any of the matters described in subdivisions 2 through 7 of subsection (b) of section 3 of these regulations, or indicates that an employee has been subject to coercion, influence, or pressure to act contrary to the interests of the national security, the matter shall be referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a full field investigation.

(c) Investigation reports received from the Civil Service Commission or the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be evaluated by the personnel security officer of the [department or agency].

SEC. 5. Suspension and termination:

(a) The authority conferred by the act of August 26, 1950 (64 Stat. 476) upon the heads of departments and agencies to which such act is applicable to suspend civilian employees, without pay, when deemed necessary in the interests of the national security is hereby delegated with respect to employees of the [department or agency] to the [officer or officers to whom delegation is desired].

(b) Upon receipt of an investigative report containing derogatory information relating to any of the matters described in subdivisions 2 through 7 of subsection (b) of section 3 of these regulations, the personnel security officer of the [department or agency] shall immediately evaluate the report from the standpoint of the security of the [department or agency], and shall forward the report, together with the evaluation, to the [officer or officers having authority to suspend].

(c) Upon receipt of the investigative report and the evaluation of the Personnel Security Officer, the [officer having authority to suspend] shall make an immediate positive determination as to the necessity for suspension of the employee in the interests of the national security. If he deems such suspension necessary, the employee shall be suspended immediately. If he does not deem such suspension necessary, a written determination to that effect shall be made a part of the investigation file of the person concerned.

(d) Factors to be taken into consideration in making the determination required by subsection (c) of this section shall include, but shall not be limited to (1) the seriousness of the derogatory information developed (2) the possible access, authorized or unauthorized, of the employee to security information or material, and (3) opportunity, by reason of the nature of the position, for committing acts adversely affecting the national security. Pending final determination in cases in which ameliorating circumstances are present, the employee may, with the approval of the Personnel Security Officer, be transferred temporarily to a position in which the interests of the national security cannot be adversely affected by the employee.

(e) In case the employee is suspended, the [officer concerned] shall notify the suspended employee as soon as possible of the reasons for his suspension. Such notice shall be in writing, and shall be as specific and detailed as security considerations, including the need for protection of confidential sources of information, permit.

(f) A suspended employee shall have the right to submit, within 30 days after notification of his suspension, to [a designated legal officer] statements and affidavits refuting or explaining the stated reasons for suspension. Such statements and affidavits shall be considered by the [legal officer] for sufficiency, and, after consultation with the personnel security officer, a joint recommendation for the disposition of the case shall be made to the [head of the department or agency]. If the [legal officer] and the personnel security officer are in disagreement, individual recommendations shall be made by them.

(g) On the basis of the recommendation or recommendations of the [legal officer] and the personnel security officer and of his own review of the case, the [head of department or agency] shall make his determination of the case as follows:

(1) If he finds that reinstatement of the suspended employee in the position from which he has been suspended is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security, he shall restore the suspended employee to duty in such position, and the employee shall be compensated for the period of suspension.

(2) If he does not find that reinstatement in the position from which he has been suspended will be clearly consistent with the interests of the national security, but that employment of the suspended employee in another position in the [department or agency] is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security, he may restore the employee to duty in such other position.

(3) If he does not find that reinstatement of the suspended employee to any position in the [department or agency] is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security, he shall terminate the employment of the suspended employee.

(4) If the employment of the suspended employee is terminated, the employee shall be given a written notice of such termination.

(h) In addition to the protection granted by subsections (e) through (g) of this section to all employees of the [department or agency], any employee who is a citizen of the United States and who has a permanent or indefinite appointment and has completed his probationary or trial period shall be entitled to the following:

(1) A written statement of charges shall be furnished the employee within 30 days after his suspension. The statement shall be signed by the [officer concerned] and shall be as specific and detailed as security considerations, including the need for protection of confidential sources of information, permit, and shall be subject to amendment within 30 days of issuance.

(2) An opportunity shall be afforded the employee to answer, within 30 days after issuance of the statement of charges or within 30 days after the amendment thereof, such charges and submit affidavits. Statements in refutation of the charges and supporting documents shall be forwarded to the [legal officer], who shall consult with the personnel security officer to determine the sufficiency of the answer. The [legal officer] and the personnel security officer shall make a joint recommendation to the [head of department or agency]. If the [legal officer] and the personnel security officer are in disagreement, individual recommendations shall be made by them.

(3) The employee shall be given a hearing before a hearing board composed of at least three impartial, disinterested persons, selected in accordance with the procedure set forth in section 8 of these regulations. The hearing shall be conducted in strict accordance with the procedure set forth in section 9 of these regulations. The decision of the hearing board shall be in writing and shall be signed by all members of the board. One copy of the decision shall be sent to the [head of department or agency], and one copy shall be sent to the suspended employee.

(4) The entire case shall be reviewed by the [head of department or agency] before a decision to terminate the employment of a suspended employee is made final. The review shall be based on a study of all the documents in the case, including the record of the hearing before the hearing board.

(5) The employee shall be furnished a written statement of the decision of the [head of department or agency].

(i) Copies of all notices of personnel action taken in security cases shall be supplied at once by the personnel security officer to the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 6. Readjudication of certain cases: The personnel security officer shall review all cases of employees of the [department or agency] with respect to whom there has been conducted a full field investigation under Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947. After such further investigation as may be appropriate, such of those cases as have not been adjudicated under a security standard commensurate with that established by Executive Order No. — of ———, 1953, and these regulations shall be readjudicated in accordance with the said act of August 26, 1950, and these regulations.

SEC. 7. Reemployment of employees whose employment has been terminated: No person whose employment has been terminated by any department or agency other than the [department or agency] under or pursuant to the provisions of the said act of August 26, 1950, or pursuant to the said Executive Order No. 9835 or any other security or loyalty program, shall be employed in the [department or agency] unless the [head of department or agency] finds that such employment is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security and unless the Civil Service Commission determines that such person is eligible for such employment. The finding of the [head of department or agency] and the determination of the Civil Service Commission shall be made a part of the personnel record of the person concerned.

SEC. 8. Security hearing boards:

(a) Security hearing boards of the [department or agency] shall be composed of not less than three civilian officers or employees of the Federal Government, selected by the [head of department or agency] from rosters maintained for that purpose by the Civil Service Commission in Washington, D. C., and at regional offices of the Commission.

(b) No officer or employee of the [department or agency] shall serve as a member of a security hearing board hearing the case of an employee of the [department or agency].

(c) No person shall serve as a member of a security hearing board hearing the case of an employee with whom he is acquainted.

(d) The personnel security officer of the [department or agency] shall nominate [number of nominees] civilian officers or employees to the security hearing board roster maintained in Washington by the Civil Service Commission. The [heads of major units, as desired, outside of Washington] shall nominate [number of nominees] civilian officers or employees to the security hearing board roster maintained at the appropriate regional office of the Civil Service Commission.

(e) Officers and employees nominated to security hearing board rosters maintained by the Civil Service Commission, both in and outside of Washington, D. C., shall be persons of responsibility, unquestioned integrity, and sound judgment. Each such nominee shall have been the subject of a full field investigation, and his nomination shall be determined to be clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.

(f) The personnel security officer or the [heads of major units, as desired, in the field] shall whenever appropriate, provide stenographic facilities to the security hearing boards of the [department or agency] when needed to provide an accurate stenographic transcript of the hearing.

(g) The personnel security officer shall be responsible for the preparation of the charges against the employee to be presented to the security hearing board. Whenever possible the [head of department or agency] shall be represented at the hearing by a person designated by the [legal officer]. Such representative shall not act as prosecutor, but shall aid the board in its determination as to procedure, and shall advise the employee of his rights before the board upon request of the employee.

SEC. 9. Hearing procedure:

(a) Hearings before security hearing boards shall be conducted in an orderly manner, and in a serious, businesslike atmosphere of dignity and decorum, and shall be expedited as much as possible.

(b) Testimony before the hearing boards shall be given under oath or affirmation.

(c) The hearing board shall take whatever action is necessary to insure the employee of a full and fair consideration of his case. The employee shall be informed by the board of his right (1) to participate in the hearings, (2) to be represented by counsel of his choice, (3) to present witnesses and offer other evidence in his own behalf and in refutation of the charges brought against him, and (4) to cross-examine any witness offered in support of the charges.

(d) Hearings shall be opened by the reading of the letter setting forth the charges against the employee, and the statements and affidavits by the employee in answer to such charges.

(e) Both the [department or agency] and the employee may introduce such evidence as the hearing board may deem proper in the particular case. Rules of evidence shall not be binding on the board, but reasonable restrictions shall be imposed as to the relevancy, competency, and materiality of matters considered, so that the hearings shall not be unduly prolonged. If the employee is, or may be, handicapped by the nondisclosure to him of confidential information or by lack of opportunity to cross-examine confidential informants, the hearing board shall take that fact into consideration. If a person who has made charges against the employee and who is not a confidential informant is called as a witness but does not appear, his failure to appear shall be considered by the board in evaluating such charges, as well as the fact that there can be no payment for travel of witnesses.

(f) The employer or his counsel shall have the right to control the sequence of witnesses called by him. Reasonable cross-examination of witnesses by the employee or his counsel shall be permitted.

(g) The hearing board shall give due consideration to documentary evidence developed by investigation, including party membership cards, petitions bearing the employee's signature, books, treatises, or articles written by the employee, and testimony by the employee before duly constituted authorities. The fact that such evidence has been considered shall be made a part of the transcript of the hearing.

(h) Hearing boards may, in their discretion, invite any person to appear at the hearing and testify. However, a board shall not be bound by the testimony of such witnesses by reason of having called him, and shall have full right to cross-examine him.

(i) Hearing boards shall conduct the hearing proceedings in such manner as to protect from disclosure information affecting the national security or tending to disclose or compromise investigative sources or methods.

(j) Complete verbatim stenographic transcript shall be made of the hearing by qualified reporters, and the transcript shall constitute a permanent part of the record. Upon request, the employee or his counsel shall be furnished, at reasonable cost, a copy of the transcript of the hearing.

(k) The board shall reach its conclusions and base its determination on the transcript of the hearing, together with such confidential information as it may have in its possession. The board, in making its determination, shall take into consideration the inability of the employee to meet charges of which he has not been advised, because of security reasons, specifically or in detail, or to attack the credibility of witnesses who do not appear. The decision of the board shall be in writing, and shall be signed by all members of the board. One copy of the decision of the board, together with the complete record of the case, including investigative reports, shall be sent to the [head of department or agency] and one copy shall be sent to the employee.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. In view of the fact that the word "politics" has been injected into this discussion, I cannot help asking the gentleman and also the distinguished ranking minority member on the committee why it is that they at this point are unwilling to grant to President Eisenhower and to President Eisenhower's appointees the powers and the tools which they were willing to grant to the previous administration in this subversive fight?

Mr. PRESTON. I think you will find the people on this side of the aisle are willing to grant your President and my President most anything he wants. We have proved that already, although he has not found the same type of cooperation on the other side. We are not denying his appointees something. We are saying, "Mr. President we believe that the Executive order is fair, that it protects the Federal employee, and it also protects the Government against subversives, and we are holding up your hand in this thing." That is exactly what we are undertaking to say, and we invite you brethren to join us.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. We are glad that you are upholding his hand, sir, but we are wondering whether you are willing to give him the same tools as the previous administration had.

Mr. PRESTON. If President Eisenhower will ask these riders of the Congress, I will support it.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Did the previous administration ask for them?

Mr. PRESTON. I cannot say that they did.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to say to the gentleman from Ohio that the gentleman from Georgia has done more to uphold General Eisenhower's hands, together with most of us on this side of the aisle, than the majority of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle since the 20th of January last.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it should be known that the President's Executive order was issued largely under authority given in Public Law 733, which was passed by a Democratic Congress.

Mr. PRESTON. It was based entirely on that. Well, we will leave that subject for the moment and we will pass on to some other aspects of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am wondering, in the appropriation for various international organizations, what this appropriation for Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration means.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, the gentleman from Iowa was at the last meeting of the Parliamentary Union. I saw him sitting there, and he is as well informed as I am. I attended but one meeting; that was my first meeting, and I do not feel that I am any better qualified to answer the question than the gentleman is himself.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know that it was known as the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration. Is that the precise title of the organization, or is that another offshot of the organization to which the meeting was devoted not long ago?

Mr. PRESTON. I am not prepared to answer the gentleman's question. I have always understood it to be known as the Interparliamentary Union. The additional words that the gentleman alleges are attached to the appropriation I am not familiar with.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that the additional words are found in the committee report on page 5.

Mr. PRESTON. Perhaps they are. I do not deny that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is not truly the report of all the committee. That is the report of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] and his majority colleagues.

Mr. GROSS. There is no minority report here?

Mr. ROONEY. No; there never is.

Mr. PRESTON. I call attention of the House to the fact that this bill carries a reduction for salaries and expenses of the State Department of $15 million over the amount for the current fiscal year. It was reduced from $75 million to $60 million.

This, of course, is a very drastic cut in a very vital area. The net result of this cut will be the elimination of 2,400 employees, 800 domestically and 1,600 overseas. When we bring these 1,600 people home from overseas it will cost $3,200,000 in the form of transportation tickets, the transportation of furniture, and the various leave payments that will have to be made by the State Department.

If this is a permanent cut, we can approach this cut in a different light. If it is a temporary cut, meaning that we will fire 2,400 people this year, and next year come back and ask Congress for funds to hire other people and send them overseas, then we are not practicing any economy here today in this bill, because it will take about the same amount to send them back overseas with all of their belongings.

I realize that this is going to be a terrific blow to the Foreign Service. I think most of our agencies can get along with reductions from a domestic standpoint, but the majority of our small consulates and embassies are understaffed. You can find overstaffing in the larger ones; I concede that. I think anybody can go to Paris, London, or Rome and effect some economy, but when you get out into the hinterlands, like Rabat in north Africa, there you find our consulates understaffed, and this action is going to intensify that conditions. Most of those consulates are situated in critical areas. Last year when I visited some of them I was impressed with the need for giving them more people, rather than taking some away from them, but that seems to be the aim of the bill. I do not concur with that. I think it is a mistake.

I want to say briefly that this proposition that provoked this discussion this morning stems from one thing that the Appropriations Committee is guilty of, and that I think we should quit, that is, undertaking to legislate in our appropriation bills. We have legislative committees for that purpose. They are trained and experienced in the particular fields to handle these matters. Yet the Appropriations Committee undertakes to legislate all across the board wherever they see fit. It is not a good policy. It contravenes the concept upon which the Congress was established. I hope there will be a tendency against that, so that the trend will be to let the jurisdiction of these matters be moved into the legislative committees, where they properly belong.

Something has been said about public roads. I want to assure everybody that this committee has never cut the public roads a penny. All we do is defer the appropriations. There will be another supplemental bill in here in the latter part of June, and in it will be the exact amount we have cut out of this bill. I am confident of that. We try to guess at it. We miss it sometimes and sometimes we hit it, but we always correct the mistakes in the supplemental appropriation, and it will be corrected, if we have underestimated the projects that will be completed by that time.

I want to mention also the fact that it is regrettable that this committee has stricken from the bill funds for an agricultural census. It is important, very important, that we keep abreast of what we are doing in the way of producing food in this country. We have a rapidly growing population, and it is very vital that we keep our food production in line with the growth of our population and that we know what the trends are in agriculture, that we know whether this area has started producing cattle to such an extent that we are going to have an overproduction, taking into account the fact that cattle are produced in another section. The same thing is true of other commodities, such as crops producing fiber for the manufacture of garments.

I think this money should be put back in the bill to have this agricultural census. I think it would be well spent, and we will get value received if we continue to carry on this agricultural census.

May I also mention that amendments will be offered to take these riders out of the bill, and you will be given opportunity to vote on these questions later.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I am strongly opposed to sections 103, 207, and 304 of this bill.

In support of my position I wish to read a telegram I received this morning from Mr. Lewis K. Gough, national commander, the American Legion.

Mr. Gough's telegram reads as follows:

MAY 4, 1953.

Hon. JAMES G. POLK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Legion strongly protest provisions sections 103, 207, and 304 of H. R. 4974, appropriation bill for State, Justice, and Commerce granting Secretaries and Attorney General absolute discretion dismiss any officer or employee whenever deemed necessary. Such request cannot be justified on ground national security since this is already covered in President's Executive Order 10450, April 27. As national commander, American Legion, respectfully request you vote to eliminate these sections because they destroy veterans' preference laws.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Federal Register for Wednesday, April 29, 1953, which contains Executive Order No. 10450 issued by the President on April 27, 1953.

A reading of this Executive order of April 27 clearly shows that the President has adequately protected the United States Government insofar as certain undesirable employees are concerned. Furthermore, as has been clearly pointed out by previous speakers, Public Law 733, 81st Congress—August 26, 1950—is an additional safeguard and protection to the Government. It seems to me that since the enactment of Public Law 733 and since the issuance of Executive Order 10450, sections 103, 207, and 304 are undesirable and should be stricken from the bill, H. R. 4974. Consequently, I shall vote for the amendments that will be submitted for the purpose of eliminating these three undesirable and unnecessary sections of the bill.

I wish to further state my position in opposition to the action of the Appropriations Committee in failing to recommend an appropriation for the Federal aid airport program of the Federal Airport Act. I believe that aviation is of such great importance to the economy of our country that sufficient funds should be appropriated this year to meet the requirements of local communities who have issued bonds and have money available to meet Federal appropriations for airports to be constructed under the Federal Airport Act. I am reliably informed that throughout the United States, as of September 1952, 362 States, counties, cities, and other units had reported to the Civil Aeronautics Administration that they had available or could make available in excess of $150 million for airport development under the Federal Airport Act. Certain counties and municipalities have already set aside funds for such purpose; others can do so as soon as matching funds from the Federal Government are forthcoming.

During the past 4 months I have been actively interested in endeavoring to secure Federal aid under the Federal Airport Act for Scioto County, Ohio. Last year Scioto County voted a bond issue of $400,000 as a local contribution for a county airport to be built under the Federal Airport Act.

Committees from the Scioto County Board of County Commissioners and from the chamber of commerce of the city of Portsmouth have both been advised that no Federal funds are presently available to match this local money which has been raised and is immediately available to build an airport in Scioto County whenever Federal funds are available. Unless Congress acts favorably to appropriate money for new airport projects it will be impossible for Scioto County to proceed with the construction of a much-needed airport in that county. This particular airport project is greatly needed because of its proximity to the new atomic energy plant now under construction about 20 miles north of the city of Portsmouth, Ohio. At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to this bill to authorize an appropriation of $15 million to begin new construction this year under the Federal Airport Act.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify the record, if I may. Before doing so, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of this subcommittee and to the ranking minority member in answering the questions I asked earlier in the day.

As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I feel I should to some degree at least protect the prerogatives of that committee, and to ask, if I may, if these sections you talk of—sections 103, 207, and 304 of H. R. 4974—are intended to be used for security dismissal. If not, for what type of dismissals are they intended?

Mr. ROONEY. It is my understanding they were to be used solely for security dismissals, including homosexuals, and for no other purpose whatever.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's forthrightness.

Mr. ROONEY. The record will show that in answering a question of mine, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] very clearly stated that that interpretation of what took place in the discussion had with regard thereto is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I realize the fact that this legislation comes up each year for review and has a restraining effect with regard to abuses or any haphazard use of this broad discretion given to these agencies. I think it is fair to state—although I do not know how many there are—there have been comparatively few dismissals under the riders now in the law. I would like, however, to direct attention of the Members of the House to Public Law 733, which has already been mentioned. I would like also to call your attention again, if I may, to the recent order of the President of the United States, Executive Order 10450. The President in this order extends the causes for dismissal in the interests of national security. Under one heading, for example, this order includes, and I quote:

(i) Any behavior, activities, or associations which tend to show that the individual is not reliable or trustworthy.

(ii) Any deliberate misrepresentations, falsifications, or omissions of material facts.

(iii) Any criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct, habitual use of intoxicants to excess, drug addiction, or sexual perversion.

(iv) An adjudication of insanity, or treatment for serious mental or neurological disorder without satisfactory evidence of cure.

(v) Any facts which furnish reason to believe that the individual may be subjected to coercion, influence, or pressure which may cause him to act contrary to the best interests of the national security.

In fact, these requirements even go further than any other order or act that has been passed by the Congress.

It was my opinion that we should write the employee loyalty program into law, and I introduced legislation to do so. All I am doing now is calling to your attention the fact that this Executive order, together with Public Law 733, cover the ground. In addition, this order and Public Law 733 allow rights of appeal and spell out other procedural requirements that we would not have under sections 103, 207, and 304 in this appropriation bill, H. R. 4974.

I want to emphasize again, that there is no intention on the part of those who propose this legislation to in any way circumvent what is known as the Veterans Preference Act, and amendments thereto. I also want to make sure that this legislation does not circumvent the rights already provided for those employed in Federal civil service by the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912 and the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has expired.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. The present chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may be prepared to answer this question: When we passed Public Law 733, it was not contemplated that the authority given under that act would ever be extended to include all Government employees. We looked upon it as rather specialized legislation, applying to sensitive agencies. If we had expected that it would have been employed by all Government agencies and all Government employees, is it not the gentleman's opinion that we would have held extensive hearings and probably passed different legislation, which would have given certain protection both to veterans, who now have some protection under the Veterans Preference Act, and to civil-service employees in general?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will answer that by saying that I think the committee, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], did hold rather lengthy hearings on the matter and went into it rather carefully and did see to it, as far as could be done, that veterans' rights were protected and that other employees were likewise protected under that act. It was intended, of course, as the gentleman has suggested, that we were protecting the security of the country.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I want to ask the gentleman, because he is chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, if he considers that the Commander of the American Legion is unduly alarmed about the provisions that are in this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would not say they are unduly alarmed, but you know and I know that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans, and the AMVETS are always alert to see that the rights of veterans are protected.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is what we want.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And rightly so in this case.

My contention with respect to this matter is that it is contrary to the President's Executive order which sets out a procedure for security dismissals and employee appeal rights. In fact, we should have taken these riders out 3 years ago—after Public Law 733 was enacted.

Unfortunately, the record of the State Department with respect to security dismissals has been so miserable, both under the appropriation rider and under Public Law 733, that it has caused the whole issue to become clouded.

I do not think anyone in this House is proud of the record of the State Department in removing from their rolls persons whose suitability is questioned, irrespective of the authority given them to make such removal, which authority they had from 1946 to the end of 1952.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We want the departments to have all the authority they need for security reasons, but if I understand the gentleman's remarks, he does not feel that they need this additional authority that is granted to them under this act?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It was my opinion that this authority granted is unnecessary. That is the thing I am trying to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, if he has an observation he desires to make at this point.

Mr. McCORMACK. I simply wanted to ask my friend from Kansas a question.

I sense from what the gentleman from Kansas says that he is very much concerned, that he feels that the public law of last year and the Executive order meet the situation rather than this particular type of legislation, that it is unnecessary; and it is the feeling of the gentleman from Kansas who is chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or his preference at least, to see this rider eliminated. Is that correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman well knows that as chairman of a legislative committee the gentleman from Kansas at all times wants to protect the rights and prerogatives of his committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is all I am trying to do now. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that on other occasions under his leadership as well as under the present leadership amendments have been placed in appropriation measures rather than being sent through the regular legislative committees.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is my first objection or criticism, I should say, perhaps. My first criticism is that these matters ought to be handled by the legislative committees. No. 2: It is my own private opinion that the matters to which we have had our attention directed today in respect of these amendments are already amply cared for in Public Law 733 and under the Executive order. That is my own private opinion. I did want to suggest in view of the fact that it runs for only a year that maybe it is not as important as it would be otherwise.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. In my opinion sections 103, 207, and 304 would be subject to points of order had we not by the rule waived points of order. They would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HARRIS. It is my understanding that is true.

Mr. Chairman, I wish now to turn this discussion toward another matter which I think is very important in connection with this bill, and that is title 3, the Department of Commerce, and particularly with reference first to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

I observe that the bill includes a total of $139,950,000 for the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the next fiscal year, which is a reduction of $60 million, or a little more, below the budget estimates, and a little more than $9 million below appropriations for the current fiscal year, and a recommendation of nearly $1 million below the amount of the revised estimates.

I speak on this because I am a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has legislative jurisdiction over this subject matter; consequently I am somewhat familiar with the program. I mention this at this particular time in view of the fact that the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration was before our committee just a few days ago and announced that the number of regions in the organization is being reduced from the present 9 regions to 4.

CURTAILMENT OF ACTIVITIES OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

He stated that this is designed to save $1,500,000 annually. Newly formed regions will mean an enlargement of existing regions now based at New York, Kansas City, Fort Worth, and Los Angeles. The allocation of territories for each of the new regions has not been announced. Publicity released as of May 4 is to the effect that regional managers of the four regions will remain as managers of the enlarged regions, namely, Ora Young, now administrator of the first region in New York; L. C. Elliott, now administrator of the fourth region in Fort Worth, will remain; Leonard W. Jurden, administrator of the fifth region at Kansas City, will remain there as manager of the fifth region; and J. S. Marriott, present manager of the sixth region at Los Angeles, will remain as manager of the

enlarged region. Mr. Lee announced that those regional administrators whose jobs are abolished will get assignments to other positions within the Civil Aeronautics Administration. He states that there has been a freeze on the employment of new personnel and that no hiring has been performed since January, and that vacancies will be used in order to avoid discharging career employees.

CURTAILED AIRPORT-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

At a recent hearing before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House wherein activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration were being discussed, Mr. Fred Lee stated that no funds had been requested for airport construction in the budget for 1954 because a policy had been adopted to the effect that inasmuch as the airport-construction program had been in effect for 5 years, and that the Congress had gradually reduced the amount of money available for airport projects to a point that it might be questioned as to whether the program is doing any real good inasmuch as the amount of money appropriated by Congress is insufficient to do an adequate job. Therefore, for the above reasons he stated that the Administration had decided to temporarily suspend all activities for the purpose of reviewing the airport situation in the United States and thereafter arriving at a policy. He stated further that there is a considerable backlog of requests now pending where public agencies are desirous of building or improving an airport but because of lack of funds are unable to proceed.

I want to join with others in complimenting the committee for its effort in trying to reduce Federal expenditures with a view toward ultimately balancing the budget. I notice that the funds to be made available to the Civil Aeronautics Board include $3,750,000. The Board, as you know, regulates the economic aspects of air-carrier operations; promulgates safety rules and standards; investigates aircraft accidents, and so forth. This is about $200,000 below the original budget estimate and some $50,000 below the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

I mention this, Mr. Chairman, because our committee for some years has considered, as has the Appropriations Committee, the important question of the separation of airmail pay and subsidy. I speak primarily to this particular issue at the moment because of the effect it probably would have and may yet have on service to small communities throughout the United States.

We know as a matter of history various modes of transportation have been subsidized in their initial service to the country, permitting that service to develop. It is no different with local service carriers. Many of us have been disturbed about the general trend which may deprive local service carriers of development and progress. I realize it is important that we separate, insofar as possible, airmail pay and subsidy in order that the people of the United States may know what is going to the subsidization of transportation in this country.

There have been some developments in recent decisions of the Board that have a direct bearing on this subject.

During the last several months there has been a good deal of discussion over a recent decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board not to underwrite with subsidy the operation of Martin 202 aircraft over the routes of Pioneer Air Lines, a local service carrier which operates in the States of Texas and New Mexico.

It has been contended that the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision deprives the medium and small cities along Pioneer's routes of the opportunity to receive first-class service and that therefore the action of the Civil Aeronautics Board was in error.

I think it might be quite helpful if we review the objectives of the Congress and the Civil Aeronautics Board in initiating the so-called local service experiment which was designed to bring air service for the first time to the smaller communities. It is my sincere belief that upon such review it appears beyond question that the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision was directly in the interest of the communities and people who are dependent upon this type of service.

This experiment was initiated by the inauguration of service by Pioneer Air Lines in August 1945. At the present time there are 15 local service airlines which provide the only airline service to 246 communities in 45 States and which in addition serve communities also on the various trunklines.

These local service carriers in 1952 carried a total of 1,686,000 persons 330 million passenger-miles.

As most of the Members of this Congress know the people of the United States are making ever-increasing use of air travel because of its convenience and timesaving advantages. It is almost mandatory that people in smaller communities receive the benefit of this service not only for travel between smaller communities but in order to permit them rapid transit between their community and a major trunkline point where they may receive connections for long-distance travel. Without such a service it would be impossible to envision air transportation as fulfilling its obligation to the people of these United States. It is also worthy of note that the commerce of these smaller communities also depends to a very large extent on expedited transportation of mail and freight which is the lifeblood of industry.

It was recognized in the beginning that the inauguration of this specialized type of service would require the appropriation of million of dollars in mail-pay subsidy. It was the hope of both the Congress and the Civil Aeronautics Board, however, that as this service became stabilized and reached maturity it would be possible to serve these smaller communities with a minimum of subsidy.

After 7 years of experimentation it is evident that we have not yet reached this stage and that there has been a steadily increasing requirement for total subsidy due in part to the expanding of the services for the convenience of the public as well as to increasing costs. It should be pointed out that considerable progress has been made in lowering the ratio of subsidy to commercial revenues.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has indicated that the subsidy requirement for local service carriers was $16,714,000 in fiscal year 1951 and that this will reach a total of approximately $22,471,000 in fiscal year 1954.

Until Pioneer Air Lines inaugurated service with the Martin 202 aircraft, local service has been provided through the use of the DC–3 or smaller aircraft. The DC–3, which was originally designed for 21 seats, is recognized the world over by competent airline authorities as one of the safest and most dependable of all aircraft ever produced. It cannot be contended that the DC–3 incorporates all of the modern features of the most advanced types of aircraft, but it is nevertheless the most suitable and economical aircraft known today for service to the smaller communities.

I should also like to make the observation that after an airplane has been in existence for the length of time that the DC–3 has served the peoples of the world that practically all of the mechanical and design problems of that aircraft have been overcome through this extensive service testing.

This is the aircraft then that has been serving the hundreds of local communities throughout the United States and it cannot be controverted that this workhorse of the industry has served ably and well.

At the same time, however, it must be readily acknowledged that the art of aircraft design and manufacture has moved forward since the DC–3 came into being. We now have aircraft designed and produced by American manufacturers which are recognized as far superior to the DC–3 for the purposes for which they were designed, namely, relatively long-haul or medium-haul operations at higher speeds. It must be clearly borne in mind, however, that the modern aircraft were not designed for short-haul operations at low cost and to meet the requirements of the smaller airports usually found at the small communities served by the local service operators.

There is little doubt but that there is a need for a modern aircraft designed to meet the operational conditions that the local service operators encounter. The primary requisites of such an aircraft as developed by the local service carriers are a comfortable seating capacity of approximately 30 and operating costs comparable to the DC–3.

It must be clearly recognized, however, that local service operations will not, in the foreseeable future, require high seat density equipment because by their very nature the short-haul operations call for greater frequency and convenience of schedules rather than a greater number of seats in the aircraft.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has repeatedly stated that it favors prototype legislation by Congress to encourage the development of such an aircraft which is the heart and soul of the future success of local service operations.

With this background let us take a look at the problem presented to the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Pioneer Air Lines Mail Rate Case. During the 3

years 1949–51 preceding the acquisition of the Martins, Pioneer showed commendable progress in reducing its requirement for subsidy support and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and the 12 months ending March 31, 1952, the total mail pay for this carrier was $1,076,000. The airline decided to replace its entire fleet of 11 DC–3 aircraft with 9 Martin 202's and then applied for an increase in its mail pay to a total of $2,222,000 per year.

Under the Civil Aeronautics Board's estimates the use of Martin 202 equipment over a 5-year period would have cost the Government in mail pay more than $3,400,000 over and above the $5 million which the Civil Aeronautics Board recognizes as being required under the act. The Civil Aeronautics Board, after full hearing in which all parties were given the opportunity to introduce into evidence any material bearing on the question, found that the increased expenditures on the part of the Federal Government would continue to be substantially in excess of the expenditures required for DC–3 operations. On the basis of the record established in the proceeding it is clear that Pioneer Air Lines has never realized an average of more than 14 passengers per mile over its system although the DC–3 aircraft was operated by Pioneer with 24 seats. On the basis of all the facts revealed through a contested hearing the Civil Aeronautics Board concluded that the management decision of the carrier to convert to Martin 202 aircraft was not in accordance with the statutory requirement of efficient and economic management and therefore this additional cost under the law could not be underwritten by additional subsidy.

In my opinion the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision reflected sound long-range thinking and courageous action on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It was a decision in which the Civil Aeronautics Board kept clearly in mind the objectives of the act in endeavoring to develop and expand the air service to the smaller communities of these United States. And it is my understanding that the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board has received almost universal approbation of the other airlines, large and small, who recognized the practical problems which faced the Civil Aeronautics Board and the industry alike. The Civil Aeronautics Board kept clearly in mind the desirability of improving the strength of the local service airlines and at the same time recognized the necessity for minimizing the burden on the taxpayer.

Any other decision would have placed the future of the local service airlines in serious jeopardy and would have seriously impeded the development of modern aircraft more suitable to local service operations. The truth of the matter is that DC–3 aircraft is the best available today for that service and without this aircraft the Federal Government would be unable to provide service to these smaller communities without adding untold millions to the subsidy bill. If the additional mail pay requirements of Pioneer Air Lines had been underwritten by the Federal Government and other carriers had followed suit, the resultant increase in subsidy requirements may well have brought about a discontinuance of the experiment which the Members of this Congress and the public would not want to happen. In other words, the excessive subsidy could lead to the strangulation of the local service industry.

I regard the problem raised by the Pioneer mail-rate decision as one transcending the problems of any one airline. I think everyone of us recognizes the fine job that Pioneer Air Lines has done over the years in serving the people of Texas and New Mexico but in this particular instance the Civil Aeronautics Board unanimously found that the management of Pioneer Air Lines made a mistake, which cannot reasonably be underwritten with subsidy mail pay in view of the mandate of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

One basic problem remains. Are the people of the local communities always going to be limited to the kind of service that can be provided by DC–3 equipment? The answer to that question rests largely with the Congress. We can, by seriously considering and approving prototype legislation, open the door to the acquisition of equipment which will be clearly designed for this type of service, which will have a potential for reducing costs but which will give these local communities all of the advantages of modern, safe and fast aircraft.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss sections 103, 207, and 304 of the bill which provides for the arbitrary or summary discharge of any officer or employee in these three departments at the absolute discretion of the head of the department, whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States. I saw the necessity and justification for similar riders which were carried in various appropriation bills for the sensitive agencies like the defense agencies and the State Department, prior to the enactment of Public Law 733 by the 81st Congress on August 26, 1950.

I supported those riders prior to the enactment of this law but there is absolutely no necessity, no reason, or no justification for the continuance of these riders in appropriation bills since the enactment of Public Law 733 in the 81st Congress.

I do not know how familiar the members of the subcommitttee handling this bill are with Public Law 733 or with the Executive order of the President issued on April 27, 1953, supplementing and carrying out the provisions of this act of 1950.

What is Public Law 733? This is what it states, briefly:

It protects the national security of the United States by providing that the heads of certain sensitive Government departments and agencies may suspend or terminate the employment of civilian officers and employees when such action is deemed necessary in the interest of national security.

Then it names about eight sensitive agencies, such as the defense agencies, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the State Department and the Department of Justice. It further states that the act may be extended to cover any other departments or agencies by the President as he may deem necessary in the best interests of national security.

Then the act provides that a written statement of the charges against the accused employees shall be stated as specifically as security considerations permit and given to the employee.

Second. It provides a reasonable opportunity to answer such charges and to submit affidavits.

Third. It provides for a hearing at the employee's request by a duly constituted department or agency authority.

Fourth. It provides for a review of the case by the agency head or some official designated by him before a decision adverse to the employee is made final.

Fifth. It requires a written statement of the final decision be given to the employee by the department or agency head.

Then last week, under this act, which resulted from H. R. 7439, a bill introduced by me and which was reported out to the House by your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the President issued a very comprehensive Executive order implementing and carrying out the provisions of this act. I just cannot believe that the members of the subcommittee in charge of this bill were fully familiar with the provisions of Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress or knew about the Executive order of the President on this question when they included this rider in this bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We have had some 425 cases of these unfortunate deviates in the Department of State alone, according to our last sentence. I wonder if the gentleman knows the name of any single one of those who have been separated from the employment of the State Department?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Under your act there would have had to be charges made and trials and convictions and publicity. Under this act it has been more merciful to let some of these poor unfortunates slide back into private life and a way of earning their living without the stigma and the expense of a trial. Which is the more merciful way to do this?

Mr. MURRAY. The act provides that if the employee who has been suspended desires a hearing he is entitled to it. If the accused employee does not want a hearing, then there is no hearing. The Executive order of the President says the departments and agencies will look into questions of national security first. It will investigate any behavior, activities, or associations which tend to show that the individual is not reliable or not trustworthy. Second, any criminal, infamous, dishonest, or immoral or notoriously disgraceful conduct; habitual use of intoxicants to excess; drug addiction or sexual perversion.

If these three riders are not stricken from the bill, you do not give any employee who is charged any kind of notice of the charges against him or any kind of hearing. I stand with the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and other veterans' organizations in their fight on these riders. They are dangerous and unfair to our Federal employees. There is absolutely no cause or justification for these riders with Public Law 733 on the books and with this Executive order of the President.

Mr. Chairman, I really cannot believe that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has read in full Executive Order No. 10450 of the President. It is a fair order. It not only gives the right of suspension, but the right to terminate the service of any employee in the interest of national security. But, it says that the employee shall be given notice of the charges after he is suspended and shall be entitled to a hearing. The Executive order implements that by saying a Board shall be set up to conduct these hearings, giving these veterans and other civil-service employees their day in court. You are doing violence to the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and also to the Civil Service Act of 1912, when you vote for this rider. Oh, I wish the Members had the time to read Public Law 733 and also read the Executive order issued by our President last week. I am sure you then would all vote to strike out these riders because there is absolutely no necessity, no reason, and no justification for them. As former chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, I say if you vote to retain these riders, you are voting then to weaken and cripple the veterans' preference laws and also the act which gives every civil servant the right to a hearing before he is discharged. I appeal to the Members not to do violence to our veterans and our civil-service employees generally by adopting these riders. Under these riders, any administrator or head of a department or agency can discharge any employee without notice and without hearing and without making any kind of a charge by just saying, "I am discharging you because under these riders it is in the best interests of the United States."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the distinguished chairman of my committee.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It has been suggested on the floor that individuals might not be separated from the Government service because of the right of appeal. Of course, if the head of the agency decides that an individual ought to be separated, and the individual does not want to appeal, then there would not be any publicity; is that not correct?

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman is exactly correct. If he wants a hearing, then there would be a hearing. The man is entitled to a hearing, and if he wants it, he would get it under the law. If he does not desire a hearing, then no hearing will be held.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right, but he does not have to have any publicity, if he does not want a hearing.

Mr. MURRAY. I appeal to my friends on the left to sustain your President and my President and our President who issued an Executive order based upon the law of which I was the author. If you read the Executive order, I am sure you will vote to strike these riders out.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS].

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I arise to express a vigorous opposition to section 207, line 4, page 24, of H. R. 4974. This is the part of the bill which is referred to as the Department of Justice appropriation bill of 1954. This bill provides:

SEC. 207. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Attorney General may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Justice whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

What I say applies to all similar riders on appropriation bills.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am especially opposed to this because it is legislation in an appropriation bill. If there is cause or reason to give the Attorney General in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, the right to terminate the employment of any official or employee of the Department of Justice whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable, then this should be brought before the proper committee—in this case the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—for careful deliberation and discussion and not jammed through this House as a rider to the Department of Justice appropriation.

If it came before the Civil Service Committee, I would still be opposed to it. In my judgment there is no justice in this provision.

The civil service system was established by a great Ohioan, Senator George Hunt Pendleton in 1883. For 70 years a good stable civil service system has been the goal of the Congress and the Government. It has had its ups and downs. Some administrations have taken more liberties with the law than others. The high goal and standard set by Senator George H. Pendleton has been maintained and under it has been built a core of loyal career civil servants. These are the people who operate the business of the Government regardless of who the Chief Executive may be. This provision completely nullifies the spirit, the purpose, and even the very words of the civil-service law. It is very clear in its meaning. That meaning is that during this ensuing year the Attorney General without giving any reason whatsoever, except that he deems the termination advisable, may remove all or any one of the 30,000 employees of the Department of Justice.

It is admitted that the Department of Justice which is directed largely through a professional staff and with the changing administration is entitled to have professional people in accord with the views of the administration. This is no reason or provocation, however, for authority to destroy the confidence of 30,000 others in this one Department.

If there are more people there than are necessary to do the work, the jobs can be abolished and they can be removed. Public Law 733 of 81st Congress and President Eisenhower's Executive order of April 27 of this year takes care of any disloyalty or subversive threats within the Civil Service.

Most of these civil service people have served faithfully and well for 30 years. For the Congress to give to any executive head the unlimited authority within the fiscal year to remove every clerk, stenographer, bookkeeper, and file clerk is going a lot further than the necessities of good administration require.

When this type of legislation is enacted in a State, when a new administration comes in with control of the legislature, it is called a ripper bill. I have always been opposed to that practice and I am opposed to this ripper bill. It is certainly not carrying out justice to the people under civil service. If they are incompetent or have any other defect which interferes with the administration of justice, they can and should be removed. Otherwise, they should be continued in their work. If this can be done in one department, it can be done in all departments. If it is done in all departments, then the destruction of the Civil Service is complete.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this rider not only for the Departments of Justice, State, and Commerce but for any other Department of Government. I have no partisan feeling whatsoever in this matter. I am, however, devoted to the belief that we cannot have good government without an able and loyal core of civil service workers. We cannot have this without their having a confidence in the continuity of their position and a belief in the sense of fair play of their administrators.

The objections to these riders are threefold.

First. They are unnecessary. Public Law 733 takes care of this situation.

Second. The President's Executive order takes care of the necessary removal of improper employees.

Third. Such legislation is improper and out of order in an appropriation bill. It is a matter for the Civil Service Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to sections 103, 207, and 304 of the bill H. R. 4974, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Section 103 reads:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States. Section 207 and section 304 are the same as section 103 changed only to apply to the Department of Justice and the Department of Commerce.

These are the riders on appropriation bills that give the heads of agencies named the absolute right to discharge Federal employees at their discretion. There is no appeal or no check on such action. Let me say to the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling this bill, the gentleman from Ohio, that I have no sympathy for moral degenerates or disloyal people in any department of the Government. I am not going to allow my thinking to be warped in following his suggestion to protect the reputation of such people to the point where it is going to destroy the rights of veterans under the Veterans' Preference Act, or take from career Government workers their jobs. That is what these riders could do.

Legislation by rider has never been good legislation. It has continuously embarrassed Members of this Congress. This is legislation by rider. These sections could not only destroy civil service, but they can destroy the Veterans Preference Act. The effect of even offering these riders in this bill has created havoc in the minds of loyal public workers. People who have come into the public service through the medium of civil service, particularly disabled veterans whose efficiency may not be that of a man who is whole, are worried about what is going to happen to them. Untold mental damage has been done to these loyal public servants by proposing such legislation.

What we do under the provisions of these proposals is to make the head of the agency prosecutor, judge, and jury. He can act arbitrarily. There is no appeal. There have been too many instances, even under the present law, where discriminations have taken place against the little fellow. It was only through the medium of an appeal to Civil Service that those people were protected in their rights and in their jobs.

I subscribe to what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] has said about Public Law 733. Personally, I think it was too stringent in some of its provisions. It did not allow appeal, and I unsuccessfully proposed in committee 2 years ago to amend it by providing for appeal to the Civil Service Commission. We have all the machinery that is necessary to protect the welfare of the Government; there is enough without granting this abritrary power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. It has been said in the debate that the State Department has had this authority for the last 7 years, and that no harm has come from that. Does the gentleman take exception to that statement?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes. I take exception to it. I think this authority can be abused; that it will be abused; and if the State Department has not gotten rid of the undesirables during the period it has had this law, certainly it will not get rid of them within the next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain why I am voting in favor of sections 103, 207, and 304 of H. R. 4974, which section give the heads of the departments concerned the absolute discretion to terminate the employment of any employees whenever he deems such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

In the first place these sections are not new with respect to the State and Commerce Departments. The head of these departments had this authority under the previous administration and there has been no complaint about the abuse of the power thereunder. There has been no violations under it of the merit system or the veterans' preference.

We have been assured by both majority and minority members of the committee that it is intended solely for security purposes and for homosexuals. There seems to be no good reason for curtailing this authority under the present administration.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice publicly my approval of the untiring efforts of the House subcommittee on State Department appropriations in recommending a cut of over $48 million from the Truman request for activities in that Department exclusive of the information program. We all recall that, in the previous administration, the subcommittee on appropriations for the State Department, then controlled by Democratic members, found much room for criticism of the activities of that Department and made some pointed recommendations for changes of personnel, some of which were carried out. It seems to me that, with the present bill, far-reaching changes can be made in the personnel of the Department of State. This objective, long sought and devoutly hoped for, may be achieved if we stand fast in adhering to these recommendations. Perhaps we can even hope for the day when the State Department will resume its normal functions and stop reaching out for more power and more duties having little or no relation to the proper administration of that Department. We may even hope for the day when the personnel there will sincerely be guided by the best interests of the United States and stop their interference in the affairs of foreign nations, their obvious desire to expand giveaway programs, and their eager-beaver activities in trying to reshape foreign nations' manners and customs in the likeness of the American Nation; all to no avail, and all actually leading, at best, to tolerant sufferance of our activities abroad and, in many cases, to an endemic, smoldering hatred of tnis country, even among our so-called allies.

Apparently the results of the last national elections have not penetrated the Department of State. We see the same old familiar faces coming before our committees as its emissaries. We have seen some changes in top positions of the Department itself, but in many cases it has merely meant moving from one spot to another a man who was active in previous administrations. There have been little or no changes in the middle echelons, the policymaking positions; and the holders of those positions were dedicated to the foreign concepts of the previous administration which the American people so effectively repudiated in the last national elections. Perhaps this reduction in appropriations will shock the State Department officials, and I personally hope so, out of their complacency and convince them that we in Congress are not to be treated like amiable halfwits, with a pat of approbation on the head when we obey their orders or a verbal public spanking when we differ from their demands. To me, the historical events of the past 10 years indicate that this Department, in its top positions, has been staffed by incompetents or knaves. No country in the world enjoyed the reservoir of good will this country had at the end of World War II. No country saw such an advantage disappear so quickly as ours did; yet we have the public spectacle of State Department officers defending the sell-outs at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam.

We have heard much of the career personnel of the State Department—not Foreign Service; yet a candid view of that Department compels the observation that there are very few career officers, as we understand the term, but a great many carpetbaggers who have come in in recent years. Prof. James L. McCamy, of the University of Wisconsin, in his scholarly book, The Administration of American Foreign Affairs, 1950, showed that 77 percent of the individuals in places of influence in the Department at the time had been in the Department less than 5 years.

I venture to say, and this is something the Congress must watch, that the carpetbag holdovers in the State Department, in cutting its cloth for the next year in accordance with our appropriations, will attempt to eliminate practically all persons within that Department who have been there over 12 years.

It will be done under the guise of weeding out the inefficient, but actually will be done so that there can be no tie with the State Department of the twenties.

My thoughts at this time turn to the so-called cream of the State Department, the career Foreign Service. I am not going to take up your time repeating the criticisms that have been so effectively uttered by others about other branches of that Department. So I wish to base a few of my recommendations on the career Foreign Service itself.

Recent disclosures before the Senate Subcommittee on State Department Appropriations show that the State Department has mistaken our generosity in appropriations for a congenital weakness mentally. Apparently their appetite is insatiable, for our Government has been presented with bills, aggregating

as much as $16,000 in one case, for crating and shipping household effects of one officer. It seems they spend as much time collecting antiques as they do in their regular work. If they want to do that business, let them do it on their own time and pay cash for shipping, as well as customs duty, but not at the taxpayers' expense. Furthermore, there is a definite overstaffing of our offices abroad. The Paris payroll for 2,237 employees is expensive. It is time we get out of the "bank night" business of giveaway programs and think of the welfare of the thousands of average Americans whose income taxes pay for these parasites' joyrides. The world will not come to an end with their separation from the payroll. In fact, it might shock foreign nations out of their complacency over facing up to the Soviet threat if they realized the joyride was over and they would have to rely on themselves a little bit.

A few years ago the Congress passed an unusually generous bill, increasing salaries all along the line, providing a handsome retirement system for the career Foreign Service of the Department of State, and also permitting so-called lateral entry by permanent personnel of the Department of State into that career Foreign Service. The career Foreign Service of the Department of State, consisting of about 1,600 officers, is the top crust of the State Department—the elite of that agency. It is supposed to represent this Government abroad and these officers are our ambassadors of good will. It is also supposed to provide political leadership at the political desks of the Department in Washington. It is a tightly-knit organization, a caste system if you will, which always draws together and presents a united front when its special interests are attacked. It has a powerful lobby in Washington for its own special interests.

The Foreign Service was supposed to consist of highly trained technicians qualified to evaluate foreign trends abroad, as those trends affected the national interests of this country, and to inform the Secretary of State promptly of such trends. They were supposed to have their hand on the pulse of public opinion abroad and, by their skillful training in languages and in the appraisal of public opinion, were supposed to warn us in advance of potential changes in political situations. They were pictured as self-effacing individuals devoted to the welfare of their country and dedicated to the sole purpose of advancing the interest of that country. At least we have been told that such was the case by a certain group of commentators and columnists of the Georgetown stamp of Washington society and by the columnists of the New York Times.

In the Department of State the career Foreign Service has long been a government within a government. It has been the dominating influence and, by strategically placing its men in top policy positions, it has wielded an influence greatly disproportionate to its numbers and actually far out of all proportion to any contribution it has made for the benefit of this country. In recent years two important volumes were issued by the Department of State which are an insult to any person's intelligence and a disgrace to intellectual integrity. One was the white book on China, a postmortem effort to make look reasonable the Department's ill-advised and ill-considered postulate that the Chinese Communists were agrarian democrats and the Nationalist Government was inept and corrupt. The errors of omission and commission in that book discredited it almost as soon as it was released for circulation. The other study—and one for which career Foreign Service officers must bear heavy responsibility because they were in key positions at that time—was prepared in the Department of State during World War II. It dealt with postwar problems. That book dealt only with the Nazi movement. It made no provision for, nor mention of, the postwar international Communist revolutionary movement. These alleged studies are symptomatic of the attitude that has pervaded our career Foreign Service for the last decade or more. They expose those officers as men of limited vision, with no particular talents, and certainly not men to represent the best interests of the United States.

The recent debate on the confirmation of Charles Bohlen as Ambassador to the Soviet Union has brought this question up again. Again the bleeding hearts of the commentators and columnists were brought into play for the Foreign Service. James Reston, of the New York Times, the professional Acheson apologist, pointed the question up very neatly in the following lines from his March 18 column in the New York Times:

> John Foster Dulles now has reached the point where he must choose between defying the McCarthy-Bridges axis in the Senate or losing the confidence of the men who work for him in the Foreign Service and the State Department. * * *
>
> * * * If he takes anything except a strong position for Mr. Bohlen—even if he quibbles about it—his prestige among the men who must administer his policy here and overseas will suffer. * * * Without their respect and support, he cannot operate effectively.

That article has strong overtones of blackmail, and I wonder of what strong meat our little Caesars partake. Secretary of State Dulles, in his address of April 18 to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, had the following to say:

> We are fortunate in having a body of foreign-service career men and women who can be the main reliance of the President and myself. They are a permanent and nonpolitical part of Government. They became such under the Rogers Act, enacted by a Republican Congress during the administration of President Coolidge and Secretary Hughes.
>
> There is a tendency in some quarters to feel that confidence cannot be placed in these career officials because in the past, as was their duty, they served under Democrat Presidents and Democrat Secretaries of State. It is, however, easier than most think for our career Foreign Service men and women to adapt themselves to new Republican leadership. Like career soldiers, Foreign Service officers respect and welcome high-level policy direction such as they are getting under President Eisenhower. They are, with rare exceptions, a splendid and patriotic group of men and women, with a fine tradition. They are experts, trained to analyze and interpret foreign conditions and to carry out designated missions, usually of delicacy, sometimes of danger. Just as the Nation depends, for defense purposes, on the graduates of our military and naval academies, so the Nation, for foreign services, depends on our career diplomats.

I wonder if these tributes are deserved. The State Department had, until the past year, a 100 percent record in its loyalty board of acquitting everyone in the Department who appeared before it. Five times it had the John Stewart Service case, and five times it found him blameless. It also had the case of John Carter Vincent and many others of that ilk, but none was dismissed. The Foreign Service also had many exceptionally strong adherents to the traitor, Alger Hiss, and I venture to say that there is no record available that it ever opposed Hiss' recommendations while he was in the Department. That is only part of the debit side. I recently analyzed the first top three classes of the career Foreign Service. Those classes consist of first, the career Foreign Ministers; second, class I, Foreign Service officers; and, third, class II, Foreign Service officers. These are the real top levels of our Foreign Service, the elite of the elite. Remember that the salaries for the career Foreign Ministers begin at $14,300; for class I at $12,800; and for class II at $11,130. There are about 1,600 career Foreign Service officers. Of this number, according to the Foreign Service list of July 1, 1952, 56, or about 3½ percent, were career Ministers; 110, or about 7 percent were class I officers; and 160, or about 10 percent, were class II officers.

The average years of service in the career minister category was 30 years; in class I, 21½ years, and class II, 18⅓ years.

When this Congress passed the Foreign Service Act a few years ago, it provided handsome retirement benefits and exceedingly generous increases in salaries. Now it is possible for a man to retire after 20 years' service on a pension equal to his years of service multiplied by 2 percent of his base pay for the 5 years preceding his retirement. In these circumstances, it would have been prudent policy not to load up the Foreign Service in the top grades under the provisions of the lateral-entry section with fairly young men unless they had superior qualifications for the Foreign Service itself. By lateral entry, I mean persons from the State Department itself who receive special credit for the years of service in the type of duty which they performed. Their previous years of service in the Government count toward their retirement.

I am picking at random three cases which are slightly extreme, but indicate the dilution of the Foreign Service, without a corresponding increase in quality. These situations are bad for the morale of the career Foreign Service, but are even worse for the American taxpayers, since each man listed will be eligible for a handsome pension in a very few years.

The first case is that of John E. Peurifoy, born in August 1907, he had several years' training at the United States Military Academy, American University, and George Washington University, but he did not graduate from any of them. He

began work in 1948 in the Department of State at a salary of $2,000, having occupied very minor postions in other Government Departments for a little over 2 years. On May 21, 1945, he became consular career and secretary in the diplomatic service, but did not serve at any post, since he remained in the Department of State, and, in March 1946 became a special assistant to the Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. On the same date, he became Chairman of the Board of Foreign Service, which passes upon applicants for the Foreign Service. By virtue of his position as Assistant to the Secretary of State, he was Director of the Foreign Service. On April 21, 1949, under the lateral-entry provisions of the new Foreign Service Act, he was appointed to class I of the Foreign Service; and, on July 29, 1950, he was appointed to the class of career minister, without ever having left the Department of State. I believe this to be the prize story of all entries into the Foreign Service. In 1957, he will be entitled to an exceedingly generous pension.

In view of the above record, one might conscientiously ask what was the real motive in Mr. Peurifoy's intense interest in actively directing and spearheading the campaign to put what might properly be called the Acheson-Peurifoy Foreign Service integration plan into operation. You see, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Peurifoy was the boss of the men on the board that made the selection for the position that Mr. Peurifoy wanted and received. In my opinion, it was no accident that Mr. Peurifoy was the principal beneficiary of this demonstration of slick salesmanship when he was, in effect, promoted by himself to a class I Foreign Service position, and the position of Foreign Service Minister a year later. Without the benefit of the Acheson-Peurifoy Foreign Service integration or amalgamation plan, it would have been impossible for Mr. Peurifoy to have attained his present rank in the Foreign Service.

Another outstanding example is that of Francis Henry Russell, who was appointed to class I of the career Foreign Service in December 1951. Born in 1904, Russell first went to work for the Government in 1941, in the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. That organization had a nest of pro-Soviet Americans, such as Robert T. Miller; Charles Flato; Marshall Wolfe, now on the United Nations; Enrique Losada, now on the United Nations; and many others. Russell transferred to the State Department in October 1941, and was associated with the Office of Public Affairs there in December 1944, becoming its Director in September 1945. He was associated with the Office of Public Affairs from that time until he entered the Foreign Service in December 1951. The Office of Public Affairs, under his direction, was nothing but a propaganda arm of the Department of State, trying to sell Acheson policies to the people of the United States. Many conferences held in the Department of State were attended by representatives of civic organizations from all over the country, who thought they were going to be let in on something sensational, but invariably were given a salesmanship job of defending Acheson policies—such as the sellout of China. Another one of Russell's activities was to invite outside lecturers to address State Department gatherings. One of these lecturers was the notorious pro-Soviet professor, Frederick Schuman, but the unfavorable newspaper publicity on this lecturer resulted in a more careful screening of subsequent lecturers. The appointment of Russell to the next highest class in the Foreign Service added little to any incentive for other Foreign Service officers who are progressing regularly through the ranks, starting with class VI, upwards, a process which would take approximately 21½ years before they would reach class I.

A third case I wish to call to your attention involves the appointment to class I in the Foreign Service, in November 1952, of Durward Sandifer, born in 1900. He began work for the Government with the State Department in 1934, and, from 1934 on, was connected with United Nations affairs, since he actively assisted in the preparations for the founding convention in 1945. He has been a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in charge of United Nations affairs for a number of years, and in that job has shown a decided affinity for the supremacy of the United Nations. He has consistently espoused the doctrine that any persons assigned to the United Nations, even though only from an affiliated organization, such as the World Federation of Trade Unions, should be allowed entrance into the United States, regardless of whether they are top Communists, or not. He has had little or no experience in the activities ordinarily connected with the Foreign Service, and I am certain that his appointment does not serve as a stimulant to the men who have spent years of their life in the Foreign Service.

On April 6, 1951, I testified against this Acheson-Peurifoy amalgamation plan before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. What I learned later in 1951, on my 14 weeks' inspection trip in Europe, and from my other investigations since then, has convinced me that this integration plan has done more to break down the morale of our younger Foreign Service officers than anything that has happened in the last 50 years.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt but that the new administration has inherited a terrible mess, and the only hope I see is a thorough cleaning of the Augean stables.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, some have questioned the value of the United Nations and of America's participation in that organization. In these troubled times, when indictment after indictment is being hurled at us from within U. N. walls, there are reasons to wonder. Yet of we abandon the U. N., or if we force the Reds out of the U. N., we would not be less a target for Red indictment. And we might well be a less effective leader for the free nations. I fear that the public fails to receive a clear picture of U. N. activities. There is much more to it than Red indictments of the United States. Actually that is a very small part of its activities. Those indictments are answered and answered effectively by a strong team, but in addition the American team is providing magnificent leadership which little by little is hacking away at the problems which beset the world. That constructive and sorely needed work is less sensational than Red indictments, therefore it receives less attention from the press and radio.

I can assure you the United Nations is making progress toward world peace. I can also assure you the United States is making progress as the leader of the free world. We must tell our story and tell it well. We are telling that story at least in part, and the U. N. is providing a sounding board that is more valuable to us than to the Reds.

Having accepted the responsibilities of world leadership, we must face realistically the issues which accompany world leadership. If there be one universal yearning in the minds and hearts of the American people, it is the desire for peace. Yet it is obvious that peace can never come through appeasement or through weakness. We cannot win peace by letting ourselves be pushed around. It has taken a long time to learn that. We are not pushed around in the U. N.

I realize too, in dealing with the problems of today's troubled world, we must be mindful of the limitations of the economic system which is the basic source of American greatness and the foundation upon which the American way of life is built. If our Nation is to survive, the American system of free enterprise must be conserved and protected. Other than for necessary defense, the national spending, including our assistance to other peoples, must be carefully weighed against our ability to pay and produce. But the costs of the U. N. which we bear are not large in proportion to other costs that we have accepted.

Yes; the first wish of the American people is for peace. We must carefully explore every avenue. There is no doubt but that the Korean war and the people's desire to have it ended entered very largely into the presidential campaign of last fall. Six months have passed since that election, and the Korean war still goes on. However, that picture has brightened, not as a result of any action on the part of the American Government but because Josef Stalin died and a new government in Russia has embarked on new policies. We must appraise these new policies most carefully. It is entirely possible that for the first time the Soviet rulers actually want to end the fighting in Korea. Malenkov wants time in which to consolidate his power within the Soviet Empire. Until his power is consolidated, he does not want to risk world conflict. The simplest way to achieve those ends is to give us a pat on the back. Our worst mistake would be to look on this shift in Soviet tactics as a harbinger of real peace. Until we know differently, we must assume for our own safety that Malenkov's ultimate objectives are, like Stalin's, to weaken the West and ultimately to rule it. Russia's present-day rulers realize they can catch more flies with molasses than with

vinegar. That, I fear, may be all there is to it. I have wondered many times why the Russians heretofore have failed to realize this simple fact.

A Korean truce, if it comes, will unquestionably greatly stimulate the already existing tendency to slacken off the Western defense effort. Moreover, the Western allies have refused to negotiate directly with the Soviet as long as the Korean fighting was in progress; but an end to the fighting will open up all sorts of opportunities for Soviet political and diplomatic maneuvers.

For example, the Soviet commander in Germany has already called for a four-power conference to negotiate a German treaty; and if a Korean truce is agreed to, such an offer would hardly be refused. Negotiations on a German peace treaty could halt in its tracks the effort to create a European army capable of defending Europe.

Finally, there is the chance of an American depression, resulting from a slackened defense effort, a possibility which the Soviet rulers have long borne eagerly in mind. In short, the new Soviet regime might logically expect all sorts of practical benefits, at little cost, from a Korean truce.

For the time being, however, we will do well to adhere to the simple and practical view, born of painful experience, that the Soviets do not really mean business with their truce proposal, but hope instead to buy time and sow dissention, just as they did a year and a half ago.

This much we can see. We have had over 2 months of a Soviet peace offensive. During those 2 months peace has been proposed in many forms from many points behind the Iron Curtain, but in concrete, physical terms, we have only this and nothing more. The Communists in Korea have returned to us 149 sick and wounded American prisoners of war and they, in turn, have received 5,800 Communists. Eleven thousand five hundred and seven Americans are missing in action. We have had returned 149. That, to me, does not indicate a strong or a realistic Communist peace offensive. We must measure Reds not by what they say but by what they do. Their soft cooing does not hide the fact they are overrunning Laos—a part of Indochina and possibly the key to the entire oil rich, tea rich, rubber rich southeast Asian area—100 times more important than Korea. Until we know by the results that the Reds seek peace, I say the big fist is the only argument respected by the Russians and the prime task of the West remains continued rearmament and unified effort. I am afraid the Communists already have upset budding American plans to take strong action which might have forced peace in Korea. I fear we already are again resorting to appeasement. Therefore, I say again, let us get on with the job. Let us not condemn American youths for the next generation to the hell of Korea. Let us get that war in Korea won or get out of Korea. When the Reds find that we mean business, we will find their appetite for peace materially increased.

No, the little gestures accorded us by the Kremlin are not enough. I am not ready to forget—so easily—American prisoners of war bound and slaughtered like helpless animals. I am not ready to forget the death marches with exhausted Americans being clubbed to death or pushed over cliffs. I say we had better keep our powder dry.

This does not mean that the signs of a change in Soviet tactics are bad news. It is very good news, and a tribute to the steadfastness of this county as leader of the West. I hope my forebodings prove incorrect. But we must remember some simple truths. Words of sweet reason from the Kremlin do not affect the vast military power of the Soviet Union, nor the constantly growing Soviet stockpile of atomic bombs, nor the ultimate purposes of the men in the Kremlin.

So let us be very careful that we are not fooled. America must act boldly in the traditions of the America of old. There is much to be done. Much of the world is sick, and we alone can provide the inspired leadership it so desperately wants.

The conspiracy of crime called communism remains the great menace of the age. We must be sure that we understand the threat of communism. Men learned long ago that ideas cannot be killed with bullets, nor can communism be killed with today's superweapons. We produce atomic bombs and even hydrogen bombs in order to hold it in check, but only world education can kill it.

Let America tell the facts and tell them boldly, clearly, repeatedly. We should not be above learning from people who can teach us and the Reds can teach us much in the use of propaganda. I fear that American propaganda used in some fields shows the continuing failure of Americans to realize that we are in a war of ideas even more basically than in a war of force. Otherwise, it could not be true that a great many of the people who are in neutral nations today do not know whether to belive us or the Reds. These are times for ringing statements which set the basic differences betwen communism and democracy in their true perspective.

Russia has its weaknesses. The Red leaders fear their own people more than they fear the West. Perhaps that is what stays their hands. They have the men and the guns but they are afraid of their own people. They know that Russia is a primitive land, basically weak. Only by brutal slavery and punishment can they get things done and can they keep millions of sullen people in line. The Kremlin does not trust its soldiers; it does not trust its farmers; it does not trust its workers. Even their political supporters are suspected. They know that war might ignite revolution. The West is missing its best bet when it passes up a chance to beat Communism at its own game—to stir up counter-revolution fringes and arouse the people it fears most—their own Russians and their captive peoples. I believe the Russian aim is not big scale war but to divide and break up the Western alliances and to checkmate its operations by political means. We can beat them at their own games but we are not doing it.

Above all we must remember that this is a war for men's minds in which words are the most effective and the least costly weapons. Red Russia has used propaganda as a tool of conquest with telling effect. They have convinced millions of people in many parts of the world that we are bent on imperialistic aggression; we who have given more of our substance to other people without hope of return than any other nation in history.

We are living today in a world at war. If we exclude Korea and Indochina it is a war fought with words instead of bullets. But it is nonetheless a deadly serious war, and one in which we, if we do not win, stand to lose everything we hold dear.

Obviously we cannot afford to be halfhearted in our effort. If we do not stand by our principles and spread the truth to the world, if Russian lies continue to poison the minds of people who do not know the truth because we have failed to make them know the facts, we face a frightening alternative. That is the alternative of spending the lives of our sons and billions of dollars for an indefinite period for sufficient military might to protect ourselves against the fanatical hatred that Communist propaganda is relentlessly trying to build up.

The good faith of this Nation and its willingness to meet anyone halfway in the search for peace cannot in reason be questioned. But let us not weaken ourselves either in weapons or in the moral spirit and determination of our people if we would hope for peace in our time. The United Nations has been a weapon for peace. This is not a time to abandon it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to meet annual obligations to international organizations, the Government of Panama, and Gorgas Memorial Institute, pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific acts of Congress, $30,044,787.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 5, line 15, strike out "$30,044,787" and insert "$6,979,613."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply reduce the lump-sum amount on page 5, line 15, Contributions to international organizations, to $6,979,613 by cutting off 90 percent of the proposed funds for the United Nations. Since this is a lump-sum appropriation, I want to say expressly for the RECORD that I want the entire cut to apply to the United Nations, thus reducing available funds for that organization to $2,562,797, or 10 percent of the appropriation listed in the report for the United Nations and these hybrid

international agencies that operate under it.

Justification for this 90 percent reduction and 10 percent retention is on the basis of the 10 percent or less contribution to the fighting and dying that the United Nations and these hybrid organizations are making to the fight in Korea, compared with our 90 percent or more.

I notice in the hearings that the committee had a difficult time prodding witnesses to find out how many American employees there are in the U. N. I recommend for your reading the hearings on this bill. It is interesting reading.

My amendment is also prompted in part by a statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER]. Let me read you the excellent statement he made during the hearings on this bill:

> I want to see a foreign policy of the United States similar to the policy which defended the Western Hemisphere. I want it so short it will not cost us $100,000,000 to tell the world what it is, and I want to mean every word of it. I want young Americans, if they have to go to Korea or some flar-flung country in which they have no interest in order to die, to go there to die with an American declaration on their lips as to the reason why they give their lives; then there will not be the necessity for so many of them dying.

My amendment, I say again, would cut 90 percent out of this contribution to the United Nations and would put other members of the organization on the same basis as their fractional contribution to the fighting and dying in Korea.

It would also reduce funds for the World Health Organization. The United Nations, the State Department and Federal Security Administration, as it was formerly known, sent some 70 Americans, including Oscar Ewing, to India last year to a so-called World Health Conference. Why should this country expend money to transport 70 persons, and perhaps even more, to India to such a conclave?

We have another item, the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration. I asked a question concerning that a little while ago. I do not know who added the verbiage "for the Promotion of International Arbitration" but I do know this Interparliamentary Union is a junketing outfit. Through the Congress of the United States, the taxpayers of this country have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars upon this Interparliamentary Union over the years. Last year it held a meeting at Berne, Switzerland, and had the effrontery to adopt a resolution which said substantially that we must surrender some of the sovereignty of the people of the United States for further participation in world organizations of one description or another. I say the $150,000 earmarked for this junketeering outfit should by all means come out of the bill. As I understand it, the joyriders will come along and ask for another $150,000 later. It may be buried in this bill somewhere. This would be to entertain the Interparliamentary Union in the United States this year.

Let us get rid of expenditures of no value to the taxpayers of the United States.

I would criticize the subcommittee for one other thing and that is that during the hearings altogether too many discussions were held off the record. As far as the Interparliamentary Union is concerned, there were about 50 words exchanged between members of the committee. Then there was a discussion off the record. Why? And there is a discussion in the hearings concerning a site for an embassy in Marseille, France. Someone spent $90,000 selecting a site for an embassy or consulate building located on top of or very adjacent to a "red light" district. Practically all the discussion on that subject was off the record, too.

Mr. Chairman, how long will the American people and this Congress stand for, and finance, all the inconsistency, injustice, and subterfuge connected with the United Nations?

While there may be no actual subterfuge in this bill before us, it takes radar and then some to find the United Nations appropriation. Why this appropriation is hidden the way it is, I cannot imagine. It is impossible, from reading the bill alone, to ascertain the United Nations appropriation. I defy anyone to find in this bill any amount of money appropriated specifically to the United Nations. Is not that amazing? Particularly so when we find out, not from the bill, that about $25½ million will be plucked out of this measure for the United Nations.

Please turn to page 5 of the bill. You will find exactly 4 lines, beginning on line 12, devoted to an appropriation of $30,044,787 entitled "Contributions to International Organizations." Here is where the United Nations comes in, according to small print on page 5 of the report, to the tune of $25,627,972. In other words, about $25½ million of the $30 million appropriation apparently is earmarked for the United Nations.

Now that we have tracked down the United Nations appropriation, let us probe deeper.

Through this bill, you are clipping American taxpayers for some $25½ million for the United Nations. Keep that in mind as I proceed.

The United States pays at least 35 percent of all costs of the United Nations. Russia pays only 11½ percent.

The United States has one vote in the United National General Assembly. Russia has 3 votes.

Of the 60 countries in the United Nations, 46, with a combined population of more than a billion, have not contributed a single soldier to fight what is called a United Nations action in Korea, a war which has been going on for nearly 3 years.

The United States has furnished, and still is furnishing, 90 percent or more of all United Nations troops fighting in Korea. Other members of the United Nations have supplied, and still are supplying, only 10 percent or less of these combat forces in Korea.

The United States is paying the entire cost of the Korean war.

Americans have suffered 90 percent or more of all United Nations deaths in Korea.

On the basis of this, it would be only simple justice to cut the United Nations appropriation 90 percent, leaving 10 percent or the percentage equivalent of the United Nations effort in the so-called United Nations action in Korea. That is the purpose of my amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. It may very well be that a good many people feel as he does. That I would not know. However, his remarks were made in the wrong forum. We are not dealing here with a simple matter as to which the House is free to appropriate or not to appropriate. We are not here deciding whether we like or dislike the United Nations or these other international agencies. We are not here deciding whether we want to enter or engage in commitments to them or to get out of them. The fact is that we are engaged by treaty and agreement in every single one of these international agencies for which appropriations are carried in this bill. In carrying these appropriations and in passing them here in the House we are simply carrying out our minimum international requirements by treaty and convention for which we are under obligation, which we must do and continue to do until such time as the Government of the United States by its executive department and this Congress either abrogates the treaties under which we participate in these agencies or through appropriate provision in the treaties takes the United States out of them.

So, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this House at this time has no choice but to accept these appropriations, to vote them, so that the United States may carry out its elementary conventional obligations on an international plane.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman cite the treaty under which we are required to pay at least 35 percent of the cost of the United Nations?

Mr. COUDERT. I would be delighted to. The treaty states—and I have it right before me—that under the terms of the Charter of the United Nations the United States is represented and is obliged to accept the budget and contribution quotas decided upon by the required majority of the member states, so when the United Nations agencies settle their budget and decide what each country shall pay in the way of participation, we are thereby bound by the terms of the treaty, and we stand committed whether we like it or not.

Mr. GROSS. So there is no better time, I should say, than to give them about $2,500,000 and fold them up. Here is an organization in which we have 1 vote in 60, compelling us to carry the load. And we could be compelled to carry the entire cost if the United Nations General Assembly so voted.

Mr. COUDERT. Then the issue should be presented and the pressure put where it belongs. As a matter of fact, since the last Congress, as I recall the situation, the Department has made substantial headway in bringing down

America's contribution to many of these organizations to 33 percent.

Mr. GROSS. A little more than 1 percent less than what we are now contributing.

Mr. COUDERT. I hope it will get to 33 percent very soon.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to take but a breath or two to say I am sure the House in its wisdom will surely not support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa but will vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 12, strike out lines 6 to 13, inclusive.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike out in its entirety the section of the pending bill giving the Secretary of State carte blanche authority to fire anyone, which authority originated with the idea that it should apply solely to subversives and homosexuals. The same section is incorporated in this bill in three places, applying to the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Commerce. The rider with regard to the Department of State has been in this bill for 7 years. The rider with regard to the Department of Commerce has been in it for at least the past 3 years. For the first time it is sought to insert a rider with regard to the Department of Justice.

The subcommittee considered these sections and the incorporation of a new section in this bill for the Department of Justice toward the end of the month of March, at which time there had as yet been issued the April 27 executive order of the President. After the bill was marked up, and it was agreed, and I agreed with all the members of the committee, to incorporate such a rider in the bill in the 3 places including the Department of Justice, the President issued the executive order to which I have referred and which has been discussed here so ably by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

With this explanation, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote in favor of this amendment, which would strike out the rider. This is the first of 3 similar amendments which I shall offer to strike out.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I favor the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to strike from the bill section 103. Section 103 would authorize the Secretary of State in his absolute discretion during the current fiscal year to discharge any officer or employee of the State Department or of the Foreign Service, whenever he might deem such termination of employment necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

This authority, if section 103 should be retained in this bill, would completely nullify the veterans' preference provisions in our laws.

I realize, of course, as we all do, that authority should exist to rid the State Department and other departments of subversives, and of homosexuals. This provision contained in section 103 has been carried in appropriation bills in previous years, because of the need of authority to weed out the two classes of undesirables I have just mentioned. This proviso has been used strictly as an emergency measure. The need for it now has ceased to exist, inasmuch as Congress has passed a law, and the President has issued an Executive order under that law, which takes care of the situation. There is no longer any necessity for this blanket authority to be enacted as a matter of protection against subversives and perverts. This proviso is a distinct threat to the preference which has been given to veterans in Federal employment. For that reason I oppose it. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from New York will be adopted.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is, I believe, the sixth year I have been here in support of this provision. It has had nothing but a salutary effect on the Government of the United States. It is just as necessary as it was when I came down here to support it under another President.

I gave the reasons in my opening remarks why this law has previously been passed. This righteous indignation this morning by a former chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, does not ring very true. He was not here on the floor the last 3 years on this bill saying that there was any danger in it or making any objection to it, and it comes with rather poor grace, since he was chairman of the committee, that he did not trust his own President, and now suddenly he has broken out with so much loyalty to our President at this time. He does not exceed my admiration, or even come close to it, for the present occupant of the White House. But if for no other reason than that these people or most of them should not be faced with destructive publicity in connection with their severance from the departments, I contend that this provision should remain. I ask anyone to tell me the name of any one of the hundreds of separations that have been made, and whether that person's reputation has been dragged through the mud, or whether that person has had an unfair severance from his job. Why should there suddenly be all this hue and cry for the repeal of these provisions which have been so good and so salutary in their effect. I have helped to solve the problems of these three departments of Government, and I am proud of it. There are others who could well take a look at some of their personnel as this committee has in the past. I have no criticism of the President on his general order calling for a security check on the hiring of these people, but this is a real cure to act really quickly for some act of omission or commission after a person's confirmation, and for that reason I ask the House to sustain the same position that it has sustained a half-dozen times heretofore. I think this has been in this State Department bill seven times. We should preserve it. Let us not retrogress in our fight on Communism. Since this provision was first put in the State Department's appropriation bill, all of central Europe and eastern Europe have been lost to the free world. All of the continent of Asia has been lost or in jeopardy. Most of the continent of Africa is unsafe for a white man to live, and they are making great penetrations in Latin America and in your own country here. I just ask you not to strike down this one arm that these executive branches of our Government have in handling subversives and dangerous people in our Government.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that there is not unanimous support for this amendment. As I have stated previously, there is absolutely no cause, no reason, no justification or necessity for this rider in this bill, since we have permanent legislation, Public Law 733, dealing extensively and widely with the discharge of employees for national-security interests, and since we have the Executive order of the President. I dare say there is not a handful of Members who have read this Executive order of the President which was issued just last week on April 27. It sets up procedures under the law, which is Public Law 733. We had extensive hearings on this bill, which resulted in Public Law 733. It is sound legislation and protects the rights of the employees as well as the Government. I am sure all of the Members have received telegrams similar to the ones I have received from veterans organizations. I have one here from the national commander of the American Legion. It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 4, 1953.*

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Legion strongly protests provisions sections 103, 207, and 304 of H. R. 4974 appropriation bill for State, Justice, and Commerce Secretaries and Attorney General absolute discretion dismiss any officer or employees whenever deemed necessary. Such request cannot be justified on ground national security since this is already covered in President's Executive Order 10450, April 27. As national commander, American Legion, respectfully request you vote to eliminate

these sections because they destroy veterans preference laws. Thanks and regards.

LEWIS K. GOUGH,
National Commander, the American Legion.

I also have a telegram addressed to me from the legislative director, Mr. Francis M. Sullivan, of the Disabled American Veterans, which reads as follows:

H. R. 4974 due for House consideration tomorrow. Disabled American Veterans worked since 1921 to place a Veterans' Preference Act on the statute books and succeeded in 1944. H. R. 4974 contains provisions which will destroy the existing Veterans' Preference Act. Please use your influence to have this provision stricken from the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Not at this point.

The present law regarding suspension and dismissal of employees provides that the accused employee shall be given notice of the charges; shall be given time to answer, and shall appear at a hearing and defend himself. Of course the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] referred to the fact that no guilty man wanted a public hearing. If they do not want a hearing they do not have to request it. If they are guilty, it is certain they do not want a hearing. But if they are innocent or unjustly accused by the head of a department, certainly they are entitled to a hearing. Public Law 733 and the President's Executive order provide for that. I say to you, in all seriousness, this rider does do violence to the Veterans' Preference Act. It does destroy the provisions of Public Law 733, which provides that employees shall be entitled to a hearing. This provision says that the head of any department can arbitrarily discharge an employee in the interest of the United States. He does not have to file charges, he does not have to give any notice, and he does not have to give a hearing to the employee.

I appeal to this Committee to support this amendment and adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, politics is a strange and wondrous business. Surpassingly curious events and changes seem to occur on the surface without any apparent reason. People sometimes appear in apparently irreconcilable roles. This is one of those very curious instances that needs to be explored a little bit.

Seven years ago the provision now objected to, and which this amendment seeks to strike out, was first incorporated in the State Department section of this bill. Three years ago that same provision was incorporated in the Department of Commerce section of the bill. There was a Democratic administration. There were Democratic majorities in the Congress. The language was drafted, promoted, and passed by Democratic majorities for the purpose of giving weapons to Democratic Secretaries of State and Commerce to deal with the dangerous menace of subversive and other security risks in the great Government departments.

A bill was passed in the 81st Congress, of which the gentleman from Tennessee has just made so much, Public Law 733. Yet three times since 1950 the objected provisions have been incorporated in these bills, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] has stood significantly silent, although chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

There was another gentleman in this House in 1950, Mr. Chairman, who was not silent when this provision came along, a gentleman who no longer holds a seat in this body; you will all remember him, his name was Vito Marcantonio, and on April 20, he stood alone on the floor and objected to these provisions to protect the American people from subversive infiltration in the great departments.

Now, the unbelievable has happened, the very sponsors of this provision now stand up on the floor of the House and say: "Let's knock it out." Do they do that because they think the danger of subversion in the great departments is over? That the war is terminated? That there is no more danger of sabotage and spying? I do not think they believe that. What happened to change the situation?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it also should be stated that after the gentleman from New York, Mr. Marcantonio, objected and raised the point of order, a rule was obtained. That, of course, was under a Democratic Congress, and the rule was brought to the floor, and the matter was again put back in the bill. I see the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] shakes his head in confirmation of that. That is one situation involved; and may I say it does seem a little strange to me that there has been this sudden reversal over there when apparently it was a good provision until this very moment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York, but my time is running out.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall not object to an extension of time for the gentleman. They were good provisions, and they were put in the appropriation bills with the idea that they were needed and were necessary; and I remember when only the gentleman from New York, Mr. Marcantonio, objected. Of all the Members of the House present, he was the only one who objected to the inclusion of such a rider in the Department of Commerce phase of this bill. It was inserted by this subcommittee at a point when there was nothing else to do. But now on April 27 last, President Eisenhower issued his Executive order, and it cures the situation. These riders are now mere surplusage.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, although I may not use it, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. I would just like to point out, Mr. Chairman, one change in the situation that could explain this curious reversal. My friend from New York, I think, put his finger on it. The change occurred on the 20th of January when a new administration took over. What was good enough, what was good enough before that time was no longer good enough when the possibility arose——

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman further yield at this point?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman must admit that his statement is inaccurate if he will recall the date when we marked up this bill; we did not have the Executive order at that time in March.

Mr. COUDERT. That may be, but the fact of the matter is that Members who are opposing this now may have in mind a certain change since last year having nothing to do with the merits. I am not saying that is the difference, I am not saying that is the reason, I am merely pointing out that a fundamental change has taken place, to wit, the election of a Republican administration, and, curiously enough, on the right side of this House a curious change of position has also taken place, and now a great many Members are opposed to the legislation that seemed good enough to them 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 years ago.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman in fairness admit that there are some on his own side of the aisle who feel the same way as I do about it, including the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand this controversy, there are some, possibly along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who say that the language is no longer necessary by reason of the recent Executive order. That is a far different sort of a reason from some others I have heard assigned here, which are that this is designed to wreck the civil service system or it is designed to wreck the veterans preference law. Certainly no such contention as the latter two could be made without impugning the motives and intentions of the honorable people who now head these departments. In other words, I can say that there is no such intention and no such purpose. If that is true then the retention of the language certainly can do no harm. On the contrary, even though we do have the Executive order, and I am glad we have it, it might well be that continuing good and the best interests of the country would flow from the retention of the language that, as the gentleman has pointed out, we have had in this particular place for 7 years.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for making the point. May I add the further point that this is not a constitutional amendment. It is not engraven in marble. If by any chance there should be abuse, which I do not believe for a moment will happen,

this Congress is always in session and by joint resolution these provisions can be repealed.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I must say in fairness to the gentleman from Indiana that these riders were never conceived with the idea of hurting civil-service employees as such or of denying any veterans' preference rights. There is no question about that, but at the present time you do not need this language because you have the Executive order of the President. That is the whole matter in a nutshell.

Mr. COUDERT. I would like to say one more thing on the merits of this matter. Twelve years ago I became chairman of a State legislative committee which investigated communism in the great public education system of the city of New York. We did get results. I learned something of the business of finding and handling subversives. It is not easy, Mr. Chairman, it presents a challenge, a challenge to American political ingenuity. The old forms, the old patterns, are not enough, and sometimes in order to deal with new problems, new dangers such as this, we have to use shortcuts, and we have to bypass some standards and procedures. That is why this legislation was originally enacted, that is why it is still necessary, that is why we should keep it on the books until we see whether the President's new system works, until we see whether this provision is still necessary. It is always under our control.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the case that has been made here today has been for a government of men and not a government of law. No matter how much the members of the committee, who offer this amendment, may protest that they do not intend to interfere with the veterans' preference law, no matter how much they may protest that they do not intend to interfere with the regular civil-service procedure, the effect of the wording of these riders is such that both the veterans' preference and the civil-service rules and regulations can be destroyed.

The House Committee on Civil Service held long hearings on Public Law 733 and worked out legislation which gave to the heads of these sensitive agencies the authority which they asked for. In addition to giving them authority, it established certain procedures which the committee at least thought gave some necessary protection to the veterans and to regular civil servants.

Today we are asked to give absolute discretion to the head of a department or agency. If we are going to follow through the Civil Service Commission might very well be abolished, because it will not have any responsibility, really, in regard to the rights of its employees. It will be transformed into a kind of employment agency. Why do we not have the proper committees consider the problem of taking away from the Civil Service Commission this authority, this authority which means nothing, which is purely a matter of record but which has been taken away from the Commission, and say, "Your responsibility is only one of recruiting." Let us take away the responsibility over promotions and all other rights of employees, and say "Your job is to recruit. Once an employee is hired he is turned over to the absolute discretion of the head of the agency." My personal opinion is that the Executive order recently issued should be examined by the committees of this House having responsibility for Government employees. I do not think we need wait to see how it works. We have experienced legislators here who can look at the terms of the Executive order and judge whether it ignores or circumvents the Veterans' Preference Act, which this Congress passed. It can judge whether or not the Executive order conforms to existing Civil Service rules and regulations and laws passed by this Congress. We do not have to wait to see how it works out. We do not have to wait to see whether we have a benevolent dictatorship. Why bother to pass any laws. Why not just turn things over to one man and let him run things. If he turns out to be bad we will write laws. That is essentially what is proposed here. You say, "These are nice, good men. Let us give them a year or two to operate." But, that is not the normal procedure of the Congress. The procedure is to lay down rules and regulations, whether the civil service is full of Democrats, as some Republicans say today, or whether full of Republicans, as Democrats say. The question is one of law, of rules and regulations which this Congress lays down. The issue here is whether or not we want to continue to have the Veterans' Preference Act in effect and the civil service rules and regulations in effect, or whether we want to turn this over to the absolute discretion of a single person or his appointees, the head of an agency or department, without any right of appeal even within the agency itself.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I think the gentleman's remarks about his opposition to the Executive order are very significant, but I wonder if he will tell the House whether he opposed this provision last year or the year before.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not recall.

Mr. COUDERT. In fact, the gentleman did not oppose it.

Mr. McCARTHY. When Public Law 733 was passed, if the gentleman remembers—and he apparently has some remembrance of it—I did raise the question and offered a proposal which was intended to protect the rights of the employees against arbitrary dismissal at the discretion of the head of the agency. I think that this is our responsibility with regard to Government employees and with regard to veterans who were given protection under the Veterans' Preference Act before I came to this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, the fact remains that the situation today is entirely different than it was in past Congresses when this language was carried in appropriation bills. The gentleman from New York referred to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] as remaining silent on those occasions. I never knew the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] to remain silent when he considered it was his duty to speak out. He has always had the courage to do it and he has the ability to do it, and in speaking out today, as he has, he is speaking in accordance with the situation that exists. We passed a bill last year, a public law, which has been referred to. As the result of that, President Eisenhower has issued an Executive order, and that Executive order covers the entire field and protects the rights of Civil Service employees and also protects the rights of veterans under existing law. As a matter of fact, that Executive order, in one respect is an advancement because if an employee is under a cloud it creates a presumption of guilt rather than a presumption of innocence, and so far as I read it, the employee has to find himself innocent instead of the burden of proof being upon those who allege that he is a security or a loyalty risk. But, I have no argument to make with that under the circumstances. The Executive order does protect the rights of employees under Civil Service and the rights of the veterans. We did not have that protection when the riders were put in before.

Now there is another aspect to this.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] brings in Mr. Marcantonio. We know the purpose of that. It is to try in a sense to smear men who might speak on this matter today in the way that some of us are speaking.

We have a telegram from the national commander of the American Legion. What he said is worthy of weight by me. His telegram is not controlling upon my mind, nor is a telegram from anyone else, but when I get a telegram from the national commander of the American Legion I give full value, weight, and credit to what he states as representing his views and the views of the American Legion.

The American Legion knows and all veterans organizations know that there is danger of the rights of veterans being attacked all along the line by this Congress. Only a few weeks ago they saw a little $10 million item defeated in this House by a vote of 201 to 187, to take care of the sick veterans in our hospitals. They now see this come along, which they know is an unnecessary attack upon the rights of the veterans under existing law.

They have seen the Veterans' Administration appropriations taken out of the independent offices appropriations bill. Ordinarily such appropriations would be in that bill.

They heard the speech of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] not so many weeks ago on the floor of this House. They know there are inaccuracies in that speech. He tells us of 1 veteran who might do something he

should not do, and because of that they are going to try to have 999 out of 1,000 suffer.

The veterans' organizations of this country are aroused. They are afraid of what is going to happen during this session of Congress. As I said, they have seen things happen. They know that under the present situation the provisions contained in this bill are not necessary even from the angle of expediency or necessity.

So I suggest to my friends on both sides, those of you who are not going to be a party to any movement to destroy the rights of the veterans that Democratic Congresses have built up and given to them, whether you are Republicans or Democrats, if you believe in their rights under existing law, it is a better vote to eliminate this provision, because, as I understand, it will be part of a motion to recommit if it is not eliminated in the Committee of the Whole.

Under the present situation we do not need these riders. The Executive order issued as a result of a public law passed by the last Congress adequately meets the situation and protects the rights of civil-service employees and the rights of the veterans that we have given to them, justifiably, by law.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call to the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts that in his remarks he referred to a bill passed by Congress last year on this matter of Public Law 733. So that the record will be straight, I call to his attention that that bill was approved August 26, 1950, and this same provision has been in bills for 2 years since the approval, and yet voices have not been raised against the rider.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment because it will protect the merit system and certainly give the veterans the protection they have a right to expect from this Congress. This amendment is in line with the promises made by General Eisenhower during the campaign last year when he said the merit system would be protected and would be strengthened. But everything that has happened thus far is just about the opposite of what the President has promised during the campaign. One of the first things that happened in the attempt to disrupt the merit system was to throw out the civil-service registers for the postmasterships. That alone will cost the taxpayers about $450,000. It certainly is not the efficiency and good government that the people were promised. Last week the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission appeared before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and made the statement that he believed that Federal employees were entitled to the same protection as is given to employees in progressive private industry. Certainly the sections of the bill which this amendment would strike out does not assure the kind of protection that is given to employees in progressive private industry. I think it is a step toward the spoils system. It is not a move to wipe out subversives in government but a move to destroy the merit system and to place in an agency people who are not in sympathy with the programs that they are going to administer.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be supported by every Member who wants to be fair to the veterans and to Federal workers. It should get the support of every Member who believes in the merit system and in clean government and efficient public service.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it might be well just to go back over the facts that are involved here because some may be unduly concerned after the recitation of the positions of some of the veterans' organizations which we have just heard from the gentleman from Massachusetts. Of course, he sees in one of those telegrams, I suppose something of an opportunity to make some political hay—and he is not above trying to do that on occasion. I do not quarrel with him about it, but, of course, he was quick to resent the development of the fact here that when this was first before us a number of years ago, the only voice raised in opposition was that of my good friend Vito Marcantonio, whose positions with respect to matters of this sort we all so well remember.

What are the facts? This language was written in, as has been pointed out, for the first time 7 years ago in respect to the State Department, and that is the amendment that is now before us. There was no cry then that it was being put in the legislation to destroy veterans' preference or to wreck the civil-service system—not at all. Subsequently, it was put in for the Commerce Department and the same thing happened there.

The Public Law of 1950 has been referred to as making some difference in the situation. But, you all must realize you have been putting this same language in this appropriation bill since that public law was enacted in 1950; so that argument is out the window. There is nothing to it.

Reference has been made to the promulgation of the Executive order. As I said, I am glad that such an Executive order was promulgated, and I hope and trust it will accomplish much in the attainment of the objective toward which it is aimed. But if there is no quarrel with this order, then what harm is to follow the retention of the language in this bill? I, as a Republican, am not going to admit for a moment that the people who are now heading these departments will be any less solicitous of the rights of the true civil-service employees or of the veterans than have been the people who have been Democrats and who have been in charge of these departments.

I think it comes with mighty poor grace from some of my friends on the Democratic side to join in this hue and cry and to try to raise phony issues when their voices were so still when the language was here before.

To the Members on my side of the aisle, I do not think there will be any political repercussions on us because we do here today what we have been doing for 7 years. If I were to take that position, then I would be saying that there is less interest on the part of John Foster Dulles in veterans' preference than we have had under Dean Acheson. As far as I am concerned, I am just not going to admit it, because I know it is not true. So I hope this amendment is voted down and this language retained in the bill. It is not going to destroy the civil-service system. It is not going to destroy veterans' preference. That ought to be enough assurance to everyone who believed at least at one time that the language was good, and who has not seen anything bad flow from that language. That should be enough to go along with this amendment on this occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 69, noes 124.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 110. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person assigned to or serving in any office of any of the several States of the United States or any political subdivision thereof.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question about this section 111, which seems to deal with ideological questions far beyond the confines of an appropriation bill and states that none of the funds appropriated by this title shall be used: One, to pay the United States contribution for any international organization which engages in direct or indirect promotion of the principle or doctrine of one world government or one world citizenship, and so forth. Does the gentleman know what international organization the gentleman is referring to?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am not referring to any. This section was put in by the Senate a couple of years ago and agreed to in conference by the House conferees.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman tell us why we should pass a bill which does not seem to be directed to any particular organization with this anonymous recital?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I do not know that there is any particular organization that is referred to that will carry it out, but I certainly will vote for anything to preserve the sovereignty of the United States against all countries.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not argue that question; I just ask the gentleman whether we are directing this against anyone or whether we are just taking it on faith from the Senate.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mostly on faith from the Senate; and it was agreed to in conference by the House conferees.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman feels, therefore, I gather, that if the section is to be excised it ought to be done in the Senate where it originated.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes, if it is to be excised.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 207. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Attorney General may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Justice whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 24, strike out lines 4 to 10, inclusive.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is exactly the same and would have the same effect as the last amendment which was voted on by the Committee of the Whole a few moments ago. It contains the exact language, only that it refers to the Department of Justice.

I press my amendment and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOW: Page 24, following line 10, add section 208:

"None of the funds appropriated by this bill may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America against Fall Brook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, and others."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to protect the people in Fall Brook and the St. Margarita cases with which most of the Members are familiar who are Members of the present Congress and who have been Members of the last Congress. This is the case where the United States Government sought to move in in southern California with a very large suit involving some 12,000 defendants. The Congress last year included in this bill a somewhat similar provision although it was much broader. It would have prevented the Government from intervening in cases throughout the country, and also it would prevent the United States from entering into water suits throughout the country. I have left most of that language out of this amendment, and directed it only to the St. Margarita case and the Fall Brook case for I fear if we do not leave some language in this bill which would prevent continuation of the prosecution of the Fall Brook case and the St. Margarita case it might be an indication that the Congress no longer wants to prevent the prosecution of those matters and, therefore, they would go back into it again.

I am sure none of the Members of Congress want that to happen. I believe this case will be settled within the next 2 years and that then this provision will not be necessary; but for the purpose of protecting the people of southern California and in order to carry out the will of the Congress, I have offered this amendment and I hope that the committee will support it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I desire only to point out that although the gentleman has very properly offered this amendment, which is word for word as in the bill last year, he has spoken of it as if it were of importance only to the people of southern California. The matter is of very great importance to every citizen in the United States. If the theory of paramount right, which was asserted in this case by the Department of Justice, and which is new, could have been sustained, a new element would have entered into legal arguments which would have affected every State in the United States. Second, if the theory of disregard for State water laws had been sustained, it would have been a precedent in law and detrimental to every State of the Union.

Mr. BOW. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I agree with everything he has said.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Will the gentleman explain the reluctance on the part of some people to allow this question to go to the courts and to be settled in the courts rather on the floor of this House?

Mr. BOW. I think perhaps the gentleman from California would be pleased to answer that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is no reluctance involved. The point is that the Department of Justice, acting for the Navy Department, started serving notices upon some 12,000 little water users, requiring them to come into court and individually to defend their right to water, in a case which is so involved that many of them did not know any more than that they received the water through a municipal utility district. The whole attempt has been to bring this into court by means of test cases so that basic legal questions can be worked out. When they are worked out the whole matter will then be settled.

Mr. BOW. That would apply to the people the gentleman is referring to. In other words, this prevents the bringing in of 12,000 defendants, where the case can be determined in a single suit and not involve taxpayers' funds to this amount.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this amendment to the attention of the committee. It is very far reaching. Although it is directed to the Fall Brook case, to do otherwise would be establishing a theory of paramount rights that we ought to do everything possible to prevent. In addition to that, I would like to say in spite of the action of the Congress a year ago, there is reason to believe that funds were spent to prosecute this case after the authority was taken away by an amendment which the House agreed to a year ago in this same bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I merely wish to point out that back in February when the department was before the committee I interrogated Mr. Williams at page 78 in regard to whether or not the new administration wanted the language in or out of the bill. The proposed bill did not contain such language. I wonder if the gentleman has some additional views from the Department of Justice in regard to that, as Mr. Williams could not tell us their views at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. I will say to the gentleman I do not have. I served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the last Congress and I am quite familiar with this case. My concern, I will say to the gentleman from New York, was by leaving out any language at all—the gentleman knows I left out the controversial part of the amendment last year—my feeling was if there was no language here at all that there might be a construction that the Congress had receded from its position in the Santa Margarita case, and this simply is protection to let the Department of Justice know we still feel that they should not continue that prosecution. There has been nothing further, I will say to the gentleman, from the department that I have discussed this with.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, I cannot say that I fully agree with the gentleman in regard to this, because I have taken the position that the new Administration, the new Attorney General, should be given carte blanche authority to do what he thinks best in the interest of all the taxpayers of the United States rather than just the people in the Fallbrook district.

Mr. BOW. I quite agree with the gentleman, and I think that this does affect the people of the entire Nation and not just the Fallbrook people.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for putting this amendment in. I think it is very necessary, and I think, as one step further, when the appropriation for the Department of Defense comes up, that the navy be notified that Congress has not changed its position and a similar amendment be put in that bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know, there is no opposition on the part of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act (liquidation of contract authorization): For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts, $22,700,000.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POLK: On page 28, after line 17, insert:

"For new projects under the Federal aid airport program, Federal Airport Act, $15,000,000."

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, the reason for submission of this amendment is my belief that the airport program as contemplated under the Federal Airport Act is of sufficient consequence to warrant an appropriation for additional new projects, many of which have been favorably acted upon by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, local communities have raised the necessary money for them, and they are ready to go ahead with federally supported airport projects.

I am reliably informed that there are probably sums amounting to about $150 million throughout the United States ready for use in this type of work. Local communities have voted bond issues for new airports to the amount of approximately $150 million. There is testimony in the hearings that at least $75 million is immediately available as local contributions for new airports.

I have in my district at the present time the Scioto County airport project, where the people of Scioto County, Ohio, voted $400,000 for an airport under the Federal aid program.

Your committee has stricken out all of the funds for new construction. May I say that the hearings on page 12 use the figure of $10,241,624 as unobligated on March 31, 1953. That is somewhat erroneous because of the freeze that was on a few months ago on this type of construction. All of this money has now been obligated and there is no money available at the present time for new airport construction projects.

This situation is well explained by the following letter I have received today from Mr. F. B. Lee, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics Administration:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 5, 1953.

Hon. JAMES G. POLK,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POLK: Reference is made to your telephone request of May 4, 1953, concerning the availability of Federal aid airport funds during fiscal year 1953 for development of the Scioto County Airport at Portsmouth, Ohio.

The report of the House Appropriations Committee showed unobligated funds under the Federal-aid airport program totaling $10,241,624 as of March 31, 1953. The report did not state that practically all of these funds were committed to specific airport projects on basis of notices of tentative allocations previously written to sponsors. Therefore, most of the unobligated funds in fiscal year 1953 are actually committed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration to communities.

The status of funds as of April 29, 1953, is as follows:

Total funds available for projects, 1947–53	$195,529,672
Total funds programed on basis of grant agreements and outstanding allocations	193,074,023
Balance of funds uncommitted	1,454,649

The budget request submitted to the Congress recommended that $2 million of the unobligated funds be used to cover administrative costs of the Federal-aid airport program during fiscal year 1954. The appropriation bill, as reported to the House, reduced this amount to $1,500,000. From the above tabulation it is clear that if this transfer totals as much as $1,500,000, it will be necessary for outstanding commitments to some sponsors of airport projects to be recalled. It is, therefore, impossible for any new projects to be added to the current program for airport development during fiscal year 1953.

If you have any further questions on this or other aviation matters, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

F. B. LEE,
Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The aviation business is so important to the people of the United States that I believe the Congress should continue this Federal-aid airport program. It should not be stopped at this time. I believe that in justice to the people of the United States, because of the importance of the program, we should authorize at least $15 million for this type of Federal aid to the communities throughout the United States. This is about the same amount that we authorized for this purpose last year.

I ask for the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes, and that the time be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, the committee is opposed to this amendment. The bill carries $22 million to liquidate projects already contracted for. In addition, there is a sum of about $10 million that does not appear in the bill, because those are carryover funds unobligated as of March 31, available for the commencement of new projects in 1954.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. POLK. If the gentleman will check with the civil aviation authorities downtown he will find that all of this money is actually obligated. I was talking with them yesterday about this. For the past 4 months I have been working on this problem because of my local airport project in Scioto County. I know that all of this money is obligated, every penny of it, and there is not a dollar of it available for any new construction at the present time. That is the reason I suggested in my statement a minute ago that the statement in the report on page 12 is misleading. While it is true, undoubtedly, there was $10 million available on that date because of the freeze which was on these projects. A great pile of applications have accumulated, and all of the money has been used up. There is no money available for any new projects any place in the United States.

Mr. COUDERT. Do you mean that the Department, the CAA has obligated since the 1st of April, the $10 million remaining?

Mr. POLK. I am so advised, that applications were on file then in excess of such amount.

Mr. COUDERT. That is a very different story, Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of the House to a letter dated April 20. That was not very long ago. It is signed by the Director of the Office of Budget Management of the Department of Commerce. Let me say again—April 20.

We are advised that the unobligated balance as of March 31 is $9,656,000. If on April 20 all those funds were irrevocably and completely obligated, as a matter of fact I do not think the department would have written a letter giving the figures as of March 31. Quite apart from that, even if that were true, and I think the gentleman may well be misinformed, I say under the present circumstances, the House is entitled and under obligation to postpone any further commitments on this kind of obligation until we get the budget in balance and until we get our fiscal affairs in order. No. 2, I submit it would not serve any purpose whatsoever for the House to appropriate a sum such as the amendment proposes because there is nothing to compel the Department of Commerce to allocate any of these funds or to approve any obligations until the department comes before the House and requests funds for individual projects. The House is really not justified in making additional appropriations, and the making of such appropriations would be unproductive and utterly futile. I submit the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly what I was trying to do a while ago in getting the $23 million cut off of this international monstrosity. I wanted to balance the budget so that we here at home could activate a few control towers. I have one in my district, and it cannot be activated.

Mr. COUDERT. There is no common denominator between the two. One involves a firm international commitment while here we are free as the air to make or not to make commitments. But the time has come to make no commitments when we do not have to, and to postpone such action until we have the money to make them and God help the American taxpayers if we do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 304. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912

(37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 45, strike out lines 15 to 22, inclusive.

Mr ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, before referring to my pending amendment, I must say that as I have listened to the reading of this huge appropriation bill today, I have never in my 9 years as a member of the Committee on Appropriations heard and observed over a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money being disposed of so promptly as it has been expended today.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to the other two amendments which I have offered and would seek to strike out the similar rider referring to the Department of Commerce. I think the membership of the House thoroughly understands the situation, having voted on this proposition twice now. I trust the amendment will be approved.

I might also say at this point that I shall later offer a motion to recommit this bill with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the riders deleted therefrom.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] striking this language from this appropriation bill. It is my understanding that this completely abrogates all civil-service procedures, including the rights of veterans.

I have in my hand a telegram from the national commander of the American Legion speaking in opposition to this rider on the appropriation bill. Certainly if the object is to eliminate subversives from the Government, it is a little peculiar that the principal spokesman for the American Legion is opposed to it, because certainly there is no organization in the United States that has done a better job in fighting communism and subversives than the American Legion.

This is just another effort to impinge upon the rights and guaranties of veterans in an indirect manner.

There have been attacks made on the veterans' program in the House. We witnessed the increase in the interest rate to veterans the other day at a time when our committee was confronted with a proposal presumably asking our advice, but we were not permitted to give that advice.

These devious attempts in the name of economy or patriotism to destroy the rights and privileges and economic welfare of veterans and other patriotic elements in our community require a little exposure.

The riders in an appropriation bill to which the gentleman from New York protests by his amendment are a perfect example of dishonesty and subterfuge in enacting legislation. They would permit the firing of any Federal employees in the absolute discretion of a bureaucrat regardless of whether or not there is provable cause for discharge. Perhaps the Secretary of Commerce does not like the color of the veteran's hair or the fact that he might be a Democrat. Are we reverting to a spoils system of job tenure in Federal employment contrary to years of effort to build up an efficient civil service in which an employee is judged on the basis of merit rather than favoritism? Are we to revert to a situation where the preferential treatment accorded veterans fought for by numerous wholly American veterans' organizations is to be abandoned in favor of a purely political spoils system? I am confident that this body will say that we are not thus abandoning our principles to the detriment of our veterans and nonveteran civil-service employees.

Is this legislation necessary in order to guarantee the complete patriotism and loyalty of our employees? I say "No," and my conclusion is backed up by this telegram which I hold in my hand. It was addressed to me by Lewis K. Gough, national commander of the American Legion, a patriotic organization without doubt. It reads:

American Legion strongly protests provisions sections 103, 207, and 304 of H. R. 4974 appropriation bill for State, Justice, and Commerce granting Secretaries and Attorney General absolute discretion dismiss any officer or employee whenever deemed necessary. Such request cannot be justified on ground national security since this is already covered in President's Executive Order 10450, April 27. As national commander, American Legion, respectfully request you vote to eliminate these sections because they destroy veterans' preference laws. Thanks and regards.

The objectionable language in this bill manifests a loose regard of our obligations to our veterans and should be castigated and repudiated as a rebuke to those Members of this body and in the administration who, in the name of economy or politics or concern with the special interests of persons not so numerous as veterans, would repudiate the just gains our veterans have secured. The language in this bill is a case history of the attitude of such people. I can cite other examples.

I am a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of this House. Last Wednesday the Committee heard representatives of the Treasury and the Veterans' Administration declare the fact that there was no market for veterans' home and farm loans by reason of their asserted unattractiveness to lending institutions. The representative of the Veterans' Administration present declared that something had to be done to make such loans attractive and stated that a policy of legalized discounts would be of greater advantage to the veteran from the standpoint of the ultimate cost of the loan to him than a raise in the interest rate. Presumably he was asking the advice of our committee, the only one in the Congress with a special jurisdiction over matters affecting veterans, with respect to possible solutions. Imagine my amazement when I read in the Sunday papers that the Administration had announced a policy of raising the interest rate to veterans in accord with a hard-money policy which takes dollars out of the pocket of the average citizen every day of his life. Certainly our committee was ignored in the making of this policy decision and I suspect that no hearing was accorded the representatives of the veterans' organizations. The proposal we are asked to approve today is almost as callous an act. I am personally opposed to this so-called "hard money" policy until such time as we can all raise dollar trees or shrubs and I am particularly opposed to subterfuge in connection with it. Are these proposals for abolishing civil service standards and raising the cost of homes to veterans valid? Certainly not. Subversion is detected with a scalpel rather than an ax. The attractiveness of veterans loans could be increased by the process of lowering the interest price on competing FHA loans rather than increasing the rates of both with no net gain to anyone except the money lenders who in times less prosperous welcomed both programs.

There has been much talk about the veterans' hospital program. Certain members of this body in times past have voted for economy period regardless of what aspects of the veterans' program such economy might affect. Confronted with the justified anger of veterans' organizations over the effect on the hospital and medical program they attempt various justifications for their actions. They say, "We did not intend to cut the hospital and medical program. We left specific instructions that no doctors and nurses should be fired." Gentlemen, you cannot run hospitals without janitors and orderlies and technicians. When you tell the builder of a $12,000 house that he must cut the price $6,000 without eliminating an $8,000 living room the living room must give along with all other elements in that house and the instruction is so much hogwash. That is what happened in our hospital program. Nor is it any justification for such action to say that the administrators of a huge program will finish the fiscal year with a small surplus. By its very nature of being governmental activity surrounded by many restrictions and roadblocks and with an accompanying corollary of size the Veterans' Administration is not an exact instrument of budgeting and expenditure and deficits and surpluses in some degree are an inevitable concomitant of its activity.

Let us keep faith with our veterans and other able and loyal civil-service employees and support the amendment of the gentleman from New York. If we cannot amend this bill on the floor we should recommit it to the committee for the indicated amendment.

This is just another effort to impinge upon the rights and guaranties of veterans in an indirect manner. There have been attacks made on the veterans' program in the House. We witnessed the increase in the interest rate to veterans the other day at a time when our committee was confronted with a proposal presumably asking our advice, but

we were not permitted to give that advice.

I, in the name of the veterans, object to the present provision in the bill and urge support of the amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in order to gain the floor I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, but wish to speak in support of the Rooney amendment.

I have telegrams here from the various national and local heads of the American Legion, and the VFW; also from the heads of different post organizations endorsing the stand that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is taking.

I hope very much the amendment will be supported. I am speaking for myself and also for the veterans who have contacted me. I agree with the gentleman from California that there does seem to be a movement to curtail some of the veterans rights and privileges.

I talked yesterday with one of the head psychiatrists in the Natior. That psychiatrist told me he was working with men who were to go into the service, and families of those men. The men felt that it was awfully hard to go into a war where there seems to be no end, taking positions and losing them, fighting under horrible conditions; and then they feel when they come out that an effort is being made to take away their civil service rights, cutting their compensation, and taking away their benefits.

This psychiatrist told me that one of the things these young men who are going into the service, who are taken away from school, from college, and from work, the principal thing they need is the feeling that when they come out they will have something to look forward to.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. It happens that my only son is a legionnaire, but my wife and I have a niece and 13 nephews—that is, 11 of them are living and 2 of those crippled—out of these last 2 wars; and I just want to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs if she thinks I want to injure veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman does not, and I know that other Members do not, but I am just presenting the case as I see it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend the gentlewoman for her stand with regard to the pending amendment. I wish she had been here a while ago to have voted on the division vote at the time this amendment was first offered when not a single Member from the other side of the aisle, as far as I could see, rose in support of that amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very sorry I was not on the floor at the time. I did not realize it was coming up then. I was working on another veterans' matter, as a matter of fact.

Mr. ROONEY. Everyone here knows that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has always acted in the best interests of the veterans of this country.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think we all want to do that; it is a matter of my own good judgment. I support the Rooney amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Massachusetts whether she has received telegrams from these organizations she speaks of in the past when this legislation has been in effect?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I did receive some at the time, but I do not think the veterans felt at that time they would be so much jeopardized. I think they feel now that there is a movement going on to cut taxes, and to cut veterans' benefits, and, therefore, they are worried about that.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Does the gentlewoman feel that under the present administration of General Eisenhower the veterans' preferences are jeopardized in any way if they were not jeopardized during the past administration?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I cannot speak for the President of the United States, I will say to the gentleman. I cannot speak for anybody except myself and the people who have gotten in touch with me. I do not think the President can watch every individual case. He has suggested that taxes be cut if they can be, without hurting the national defense. Of course, I know he is interested in the veterans. He led them in war and he would not be in the White House without them.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 4, 1953.*

Hon. EDITH N. ROGERS,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars genuinely concerned over rider provisions in H. R. 4974 which would grant arbitrary authority to Justice, Commerce, and State Departments to remove employees without regard to Veterans' Preference Act or civil service laws and regulations. Such authority nullifies Veterans' Preference Act and civil service merit system even though claims are made that such authority will be used wisely. We have no brief for disloyal or incompetent Government employees, either veteran or nonveteran, but we do believe in the fundamental American principle that everyone is entitled to his day in court and that the reasonable safeguards wisely granted by Congress to civil servants should not be lightly discarded. We can appreciate need for some discretionary authority in sensitive jobs but believe the rider provisions in H. R. 4974 go far beyond the requirements of national security.

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
VFW Legislative Director.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 5, 1953.*

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building:

The Department of the District of Columbia, American Legion, urgently protests the provisions of sections 103, 207, and 304 of H. R. 4974. These sections would definitely abrogate the rights of veterans and all other civil-service employees. These sections cannot be justified on the grounds of security as that is taken care of under Executive Order No. 10450. We respectfully request a motion to strike out these sections.

ROBERT A. BUNCH,
Department Commander, the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 4, 1953.*

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Legion strongly protest provisions sections 103, 207, and 304 of H. R. 4974 appropriation bill for State, Justice and Commerce granting Secretaries and Attorney General absolute discretion dismiss any officer or employee whenever deemed necessary. Such request cannot be justified on ground national security since this is already covered in President's Executive Order 10450, April 27. As national commander, American Legion, respectfully request you vote to eliminate these sections because they destroy veterans' preference laws. Thanks and regards.

LEWIS K. GOUGH,
National Commander, The American Legion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1954."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before we leave this title I would like to ask the subcommittee chairman a question about the provision for Federal aid to highways appearing on page 39. That provides $510 million for Federal aid to highways.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I have introduced, and I think other Members of the House are interested in, bills dealing with the general situation of traffic fatalities in the United States which are today at a new all-time high, both in injuries and in deaths—apparently killing and maiming more people on the highways than are being killed and maimed by the war in Korea.

I would like to know whether the committee has considered what can be done in the way of safety regulations on the roads aided by these grants.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I take it the gentleman missed my discourse on this subject?

Mr. JAVITS. I did, and I am sorry.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We have absolutely nothing to do with the construction of the roads. As the gentleman knows, we have a national setup of road commissions that has been headed for years by Mr. McDonald. He deals directly with the States in the planning of these Federal highways. There are perhaps in the $510 million numerous projects in various stages of planning. Our only function is to provide the money to the States as rapidly as the projects are completed. As to construction, as to safety factors, we have nothing to do with that. We have a Roads Committee in the House that might have something

to say about that. It is generally a matter for the State highway departments.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, the gentleman feels it is not a proper subject for consideration on this bill?

Mr. CLEVENGER. There is much of this bill that is completely out of our hands. As I said, there are some $655 million of the bill which involve prior commitments and we are authorizing the money.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. In connection with money appropriated for the Public Roads Administration, there is money in there for education on public safety. That is in the $510 million which is a direct aid to the States, and which will match funds of the State? In turn the States have a right to use part of that money not only for construction but for safety devices.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We have the matter of testing of highway materials for strains and so forth which enters into the safety factor. However, we have nothing to do with the individual projects except providing the money.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman will, I hope, agree with me that the Government ought to use such influence as it has through these road-aid funds to do all it can toward highway safety.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes. It seems that Americans are always in a terrible hurry and it is strange that more of them are not killed.

The Clerk read as follows:

This act may be cited as the "Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriation Act, 1954."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to announce that we will call the Consent Calendar after the disposition of this bill, that is, assuming that we can get unanimous consent to call it today. A number of Members on both sides of the aisle have spoken to me about their very sincere desire to call that calendar today, and since we are concluding with this bill it will be called.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 226, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ROONEY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 4974, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 12, strike out all of lines 6 to 13, inclusive.

Page 24, strike out all of lines 4 to 10, inclusive.

Page 45, strike out all of lines 15 to 22, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on motion to recommit.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 168, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—181

Abbitt	Gary	O'Neill
Abernethy	Gathings	Passman
Addonizio	Grant	Patman
Albert	Gregory	Patterson
Alexander	Gross	Perkins
Andrews	Gubser	Pfost
Aspinall	Hagen, Calif.	Pilcher
Bailey	Hagen, Minn.	Polk
Battle	Haley	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Preston
Bentsen	Harris	Price
Blatnik	Harrison, Va.	Priest
Boggs	Hart	Rains
Boland	Hays, Ark.	Rayburn
Bolling	Hébert	Reams
Bonner	Herlong	Rees, Kans.
Bosch	Heselton	Rhodes, Pa.
Boykin	Holifield	Richards
Brooks, La.	Ikard	Riley
Brooks, Tex.	Jarman	Roberts
Brown, Ga.	Javits	Robeson, Va.
Broyhill	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Buchanan	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Burdick	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Mass.
Burleson	Kee	Rogers, Tex.
Byrd	Kelley, Pa.	Rooney
Camp	Keogh	Saylor
Campbell	Kilday	Schenck
Canfield	King, Calif.	Secrest
Cannon	Kirwan	Seely-Brown
Carnahan	Klein	Selden
Chelf	Kluczynski	Shelley
Chudoff	Landrum	Sheppard
Church	Lanham	Shuford
Cooper	Lantaff	Sikes
Corbett	Lesinski	Smith, Miss.
Cresser	Long	Smith, Va.
Curtis, Mass.	Lucas	Spence
Davis, Ga.	McCarthy	Staggers
Deane	McCormack	Sullivan
Dies	McMillan	Sutton
Dollinger	Machrowicz	Teague
Dorn, N. Y.	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Dowdy	Madden	Thornberry
Durham	Mahon	Tollefson
Eberharter	Mailliard	Trimble
Edmondson	Matthews	Van Zandt
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Walter
Engle	Miller, Kans.	Watts
Evins	Mills	Wheeler
Fallon	Mollohan	Whitten
Feighan	Morano	Wier
Fernandez	Moss	Willis
Fine	Moulder	Wilson, Tex.
Fino	Multer	Withrow
Fogarty	Murray	Wolverton
Forrester	Norrell	Yates
Fountain	O'Brien, Ill.	Yorty
Friedel	O'Brien, Mich.	Zablocki
Fulton	O'Brien, N. Y.	
Garmatz	O'Hara, Ill.	

NAYS—168

Adair	Fenton	Miller, Nebr.
Allen, Calif.	Ford	Miller, N. Y.
Allen, Ill.	Frelinghuysen	Mumma
Andersen, H. Carl	Gamble	Neal
	Gavin	Nicholson
Andresen, August H.	George	Norblad
	Golden	Oakman
Arends	Goodwin	O'Hara, Minn.
Auchincloss	Graham	Osmers
Ayres	Gwinn	Ostertag
Baker	Hale	Phillips
Bates	Halleck	Poff
Beamer	Hand	Prouty
Becker	Harrison, Nebr.	Radwan
Belcher	Harrison, Wyo.	Ray
Bender	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Hiestand	Reed, Ill.
Bentley	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Berry	Hillings	Regan
Betts	Hoeven	Riehlman
Bishop	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadlak
Bolton, Frances P.	Hoffman, Mich.	St. George
	Holmes	Scrivner
Bolton, Oliver P.	Holt	Scudder
	Hope	Sheehan
Bonin	Horan	Short
Bow	Hosmer	Simpson, Ill.
Bramblett	Hruska	Simpson, Pa.
Bray	Hunter	Small
Brownson	Hyde	Smith, Kans.
Budge	James	Smith, Wis.
Busbey	Jenkins	Springer
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Stauffer
Carrigg	Johnson	Stringfellow
Case	Jonas, Ill.	Taber
Cederberg	Jonas, N. C.	Talle
Chenoweth	Judd	Taylor
Chiperfield	Kean	Thomas
Clevenger	Kearns	Thompson, Mich.
Cole, Mo.	Keating	
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Utt
Colmer	Knox	Van Pelt
Coon	Krueger	Vorys
Cotton	Laird	Vursell
Coudert	LeCompte	Wampler
Crumpacker	Lovre	Warburton
Cunningham	Lyle	Weichel
Curtis, Mo.	McConnell	Westland
Curtis, Nebr.	McCulloch	Wharton
Dague	McDonough	Widnall
Davis, Wis.	McGregor	Wigglesworth
Dawson, Utah	McIntire	Williams, Miss.
Dempsey	McVey	Williams, N. Y.
Derounian	Mack, Wash.	Wilson, Calif.
Devereux	Marshall	Wilson, Ind.
D'Ewart	Meader	Wolcott
Dondero	Merrow	Young
Donovan	Miller, Md.	

NOT VOTING—82

Angell	Gordon	O'Konski
Barden	Granahan	Patten
Barrett	Green	Pelly
Brown, Ohio	Harden	Philbin
Buckley	Harvey	Pillion
Bush	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Byrne, Pa.	Heller	Poulson
Carlyle	Hillelson	Rabaut
Celler	Hinshaw	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chatham	Holtzman	Rivers
Clardy	Howell	Robsion, Ky.
Condon	Hull	Rodino
Cooley	Jackson	Roosevelt
Cretella	Jones, N. C.	Scherer
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Scott
Dawson, Ill.	Kelly, N. Y.	Shafer
Delaney	Kersten, Wis.	Sieminski
Dingell	King, Pa.	Steed
Dodd	Lane	Thompson, La.
Dolliver	Latham	Tuck
Donohue	Magnuson	Velde
Dorn, S. C.	Martin, Iowa	Vinson
Doyle	Mason	Wainwright
Ellsworth	Merrill	Wickersham
Fisher	Metcalf	Winstead
Forand	Morgan	Younger
Frazier	Morrison	
Gentry	Nelson	

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Frazier for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Scherer against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Nelson against.

Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Clardy against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Donohue for, with Mrs. Harden against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Bush against.
Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. King of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Latham against.
Mr. Holtzman for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona against.
Mrs. Kelly of New York for, with Mr. Velde against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Angell with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Cretella with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Green.
Mr. Younger with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Wainwright with Mr. Granahan.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Forand.
Mr. Pelly with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Pillion with Mr. Dorn of South Carolina.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Dodd.
Mr. Robsion of Kentucky with Mr. Condon.
Mr. Harvey with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Sieminski.
Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Wickersham.
Mr. Hillelson with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Patten.
Mr. Merrill with Mr. Rabaut.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House, I report back the bill H. R. 4974 with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, strike out all of lines 6 to 13, inclusive.

Page 24, strike out all of lines 4 to 10, inclusive.

Page 45, strike out all of lines 15 to 22, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 5, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—344

Abbitt	Belcher	Brooks, La.
Abernethy	Bender	Brooks, Tex.
Adair	Bennett, Fla.	Brown, Ga.
Addonizio	Bennett, Mich.	Brownson
Albert	Bentley	Broyhill
Alexander	Bentsen	Buchanan
Allen, Calif.	Berry	Budge
Allen, Ill.	Betts	Burdick
Andersen, H. Carl	Bishop	Burleson
	Blatnik	Busbey
Andresen, August H.	Boland	Byrd
	Bolling	Byrnes, Wis.
Andrews	Bolton, Frances P.	Camp
Arends		Canfield
Aspinall	Bolton, Oliver P.	Cannon
Auchincloss		Carnahan
Ayres	Bonin	Carrigg
Bailey	Bonner	Case
Baker	Bosch	Cederberg
Bates	Bow	Chelf
Battle	Boykin	Chenoweth
Beamer	Brambletl	Chiperfield
Becker	Bray	Chudoff
Church	Hyde	Price
Clevenger	Ikard	Priest
Cole, Mo.	James	Prouty
Cole, N. Y.	Jarman	Radwan
Colmer	Javits	Rains
Coon	Jenkins	Ray
Cooper	Jensen	Rayburn
Corbett	Johnson	Reams
Cotton	Jonas, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Coudert	Jonas, N. C.	Reed, Ill.
Crosser	Jones, Ala.	Reed, N. Y.
Crumpacker	Jones, Mo.	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham	Judd	Regan
Curtis, Mass.	Karsten, Mo.	Rhodes, Pa.
Curtis, Mo.	Kean	Richards
Curtis, Nebr.	Kearns	Riehlman
Dague	Keating	Riley
Davis, Ga.	Kee	Roberts
Davis, Wis.	Kelley, Pa.	Robeson, Va.
Dawson, Utah	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Deane	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Fla.
Dempsey	Kilday	Rogers, Mass.
Derounian	King, Calif.	Rogers, Tex.
Devereux	Kirwan	Rooney
D'Ewart	Klein	Sadlak
Dies	Kluczynski	St. George
Dollinger	Knox	Saylor
Dondero	Krueger	Schenck
Donovan	Laird	Scrivner
Dorn, N. Y.	Landrum	Scudder
Dowdy	Lanham	Secrest
Durham	Lantaff	Seely-Brown
Eberharter	LeCompte	Selden
Edmondson	Lesinski	Sheehan
Elliott	Long	Shelley
Engle	Lovre	Sheppard
Evins	Lucas	Short
Fallon	Lyle	Shuford
Feighan	McCarthy	Sikes
Fenton	McConnell	Simpson, Ill.
Fernandez	McCormack	Simpson, Pa.
Fine	McCulloch	Small
Fino	McDonough	Smith, Kans.
Fogarty	McGregor	Smith, Miss.
Ford	McIntire	Smith, Va.
Fountain	McMillan	Spence
Frelinghuysen	McVey	Springer
Friedel	Machrowicz	Staggers
Fulton	Mack, Ill.	Stauffer
Gamble	Mack, Wash.	Stringfellow
Garmatz	Madden	Sullivan
Gary	Mahon	Taber
Gathings	Mailliard	Talle
Gavin	Marshall	Taylor
Gentry	Matthews	Teague
George	Meader	Thomas
Golden	Merrow	Thompson, Mich.
Goodwin	Miller, Calif.	
Graham	Miller, Kans.	Thompson, Tex.
Grant	Miller, Md.	Thornberry
Gregory	Miller, Nebr.	Tollefson
Gubser	Miller, N. Y.	Trimble
Gwinn	Mills	Utt
Hagen, Calif.	Mollohan	Van Pelt
Hagen, Minn.	Morano	Van Zandt
Hale	Moss	Vorys
Haley	Moulder	Vursell
Halleck	Multer	Walter
Hand	Mumma	Wampler
Hardy	Murray	Warburton
Harris	Neal	Watts
Harrison, Nebr.	Nicholson	Weichel
Harrison, Va.	Norblad	Westland
Harrison, Wyo.	Norrell	Wharton
Hart	Oakman	Wheeler
Hays, Ark.	O'Brien, Ill.	Whitten
Hébert	O'Brien, Mich.	Widnall
Heriong	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wier
Heselton	O'Hara, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Hess	O'Hara, Minn.	Williams, Miss.
Hiestand	O'Neill	Williams, N. Y.
Hill	Osmers	Willis
Hillelson	Ostertag	Wilson, Calif.
Hillings	Passman	Wilson, Ind.
Hoeven	Patman	Wilson, Tex.
Hoffman, Ill.	Patterson	Withrow
Holifield	Perkins	Wolcott
Holmes	Pfost	Wolverton
Holt	Phillips	Yates
Hope	Pilcher	Yorty
Horan	Poff	Young
Hosmer	Polk	Zablocki
Hruska	Powell	
Hunter	Preston	

NAYS—5

Gross	Kilburn	Sutton
Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Wis.	

NOT VOTING—82

Angell	Campbell	Davis, Tenn.
Barden	Carlyle	Dawson, Ill.
Barrett	Celler	Delaney
Boggs	Chatham	Dingell
Brown, Ohio	Ciardy	Dodd
Buckley	Condon	Dolliver
Bush	Cooley	Donohue
Byrne, Pa.	Cretella	Dorn, S. C.
Doyle	Kelly, N. Y.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Ellsworth	King, Pa.	Rivers
Fisher	Lane	Robsion, Ky.
Forand	Latham	Rodino
Forrester	Magnuson	Roosevelt
Frazier	Martin, Iowa	Scherer
Gordon	Mason	Scott
Granahan	Merrill	Shafer
Green	Metcalf	Sieminski
Harden	Morgan	Steed
Harvey	Morrison	Thompson, La.
Hays, Ohio	Nelson	Tuck
Heller	O'Konski	Velde
Hinshaw	Patten	Vinson
Holtzman	Pelly	Wainwright
Howell	Philbin	Wickersham
Hull	Pillion	Winstead
Jackson	Poage	Younger
Jones, N. C.	Poulson	
Kearney	Rabaut	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Forand.
Mr. Latham with Mr. Patten.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Scott with Mrs. Kelly of New York.
Mr. Velde with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Granahan.
Mr. Cretella with Mr. Green.
Mr. Ciardy with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Bush with Mr. Doyle.
Mrs. Harden with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Wainwright with Mr. Wickersham.
Mr. Younger with Mr. Dorn of South Carolina.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Dodd.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Harvey with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Pelly with Mr. Sieminski.
Mr. King of Pennsylvania with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Rhodes of Arizona with Mr. Condon.
Mr. Scherer with Mr. Gordon.
Mr. Pillion with Mr. Heller.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Metcalf.
Mr. Robsion of Kentucky with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Holtzman.
Mr. Merrill with Mr. Roosevelt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR ORDERED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order today to call the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CLERK EMPOWERED TO CORRECT SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be given the right to correct section numbers in the bill H. R. 4974 just passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

hour today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, May 3 was the 162d anniversary of the Polish Constitution, an anniversary celebrated by the freedom-loving people of Poland and their descendants and friends everywhere. I feel it is fitting and proper that we here in the Congress of the United States should pause to pay tribute to the people of Poland whose ancestors brought forth a constitution in 1791 which has been hailed as an ideal by students of constitutional government. It is a historical fact that the Polish Constitution, a landmark in the law, was brought into being without revolution by the people. The Polish Constitution guaranteed religious liberties, and divided the powers of the Government between various branches of the Government, and abolished despotism. The famous Edmund Burke called the Polish Constitution a noble document.

The great significance of the Polish Constitution, as I see it, has been its significance to the Polish people and free people everywhere, apart from its importance as a powerful legal document.

Poland has had many trials and tribulations through her long history, but it is my opinion that she has never suffered greater than she has under the iron heel of atheistic communism whose hordes have subjugated her people and destroyed her lands.

We in America know of the many contributions to our freedom and independence by those of Polish blood like Kosciusko and Pulaski. We here in America are grateful to those of Polish blood who have done so much for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I express the fond hope that the light of liberty will soon be bright among the gallant people of Poland so that they may regain their independence, their religious liberty, their vast prestige, and the vaunted glory that once was Poland's.

I join with free peoples everywhere in the prayer that God will soon permit the people of Poland to throw off the shackles of atheistic communism. We pray the dawn of a new day will bring peace and freedom to the peoples of Poland and all the peoples of the world, and once again the great and noble Polish Constitution will be the law of their land.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to a unanimous-consent request the Consent Calendar, scheduled for yesterday, will now be called.

CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1530) to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029) relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the only proper thing to do at this time would be, in view of the consistent disagreement between these people, to ask unanimous consent that this bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FIRES IN COAL FORMATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 270) to provide for the control and extinguishment of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby recognized that outcrop and underground fires in coal formations involve serious wastage of the fuel resources of the Nation, and constitute a menace to the health and safety of the public and to surface property. It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress to provide for the control and extinguishment of outcrop and underground coal fires and thereby to prevent injuries and loss of life, protect public health, conserve natural resources, and to preserve public and private surface property.

SEC. 2. As used in this act:

"Coal" means any of the recognized classifications and ranks of coal, including anthracite, bituminous, semibituminous, subbituminous, and lignite.

"Outcrop" means any place where a formation is visible or substantially exposed at the surface.

"Formation" means any vein, seam, stratum, bed, or other naturally occurring deposit.

"Coal mine" means any underground, surface, or strip mine from which coal is obtained.

"State" means any State or Territory of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof.

"Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representative, or any organized group of persons.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior, in order to effectuate the policy declared in section 1 of this act, is hereby authorized—

(a) to conduct surveys, investigations, and research relating to the causes and extent of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations and the methods for control or extinguishment of such fires; to publish the results of any such surveys, investigations, and researches; and to disseminate information concerning such method; and

(b) to plan and execute projects for control or extinguishment of fires in coal formations.

SEC. 4. The acts authorized in section 3 of this act may be performed—

(a) on lands owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, with the cooperation of the agency having jurisdiction thereof; and

(b) on any other lands, upon obtaining proper consent or the necessary rights or interests in such lands: *Provided, however,* That expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose in any privately owned operating coal mine shall be limited to the acts authorized in section 3 (a).

SEC. 5. As a condition to the extending of any benefits under section 3 (b) of this act to any lands not owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, except where such action is necessary for the protection of lands or other property owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, the Secretary of the Interior may require—

(a) the enactment of State or local laws providing for the control and extinguishment of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations on State or privately owned land and the cooperation of State or local authorities in the work; and

(b) agreements or covenants as to the performance and maintenance of the work required to control or extinguish such fires.

SEC. 6. In carrying out the provisions of section 3 of this act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(a) to secure, by contract or otherwise, and without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act, for work of a temporary, intermittent, or emergency character, such personal services as may be deemed necessary for the efficient and economical performance of the work;

(b) to hire, with or without personal services, work animals and animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles and equipment, at rates to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior and without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5);

(c) to procure all or any part of the surveys, investigations, and control or extinguishment work by contracts with engineers, contractors, or firms or corporations thereof;

(d) to acquire lands or rights and interests therein, including improvements, by purchase, lease, gift, exchange, condemnation, or otherwise, whenever necessary for the purposes of this act;

(e) to repair, restore, or replace private property damaged or destroyed as a result of, or incident to, operations under this act; and

(f) to receive and accept money and property, real or personal, or interests therein, as a gift, bequest, or contribution, for use in any of the activities authorized under this act; and to conduct any of the activities authorized under this act in cooperation with any person or agency, Federal, State, or private. Any money so received shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in an available trust fund for disbursement by the Secretary of the Interior as the terms of the grant may require, and shall remain available until expended for the purposes for which received and accepted.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $500,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE CRIMINAL PENALTIES UNDER SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2237) to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gen-

tleman introducing this legislation would go into the matter of an explanation, because of its far-reaching import.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in answer to the gentleman I will say that the law at the present time provides a maximum fine of $5,000 for each count that a corporation may be convicted of under the criminal statute. This would increase that amount to $50,000 as a maximum within the discretion of the court. Under the present law it is no deterrent to any corporation to violate the antitrust law because the most that the judges can assess the defendant would be $5,000. This gives him discretion to go up to $50,000.

Mr. DEANE. I notice that an identical bill passed the House in the 81st and 82d Congresses.

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. DEANE. Is this an identical bill?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The same bill.

Mr. DEANE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of July 2, 1890 (15 U. S. C. 1 ff.), as amended, are hereby further amended by striking out in each section where it appears, the phrase "fine not exceeding five thousand dollars" or the phrase "fine not exceeding $5,000" and substituting in lieu thereof in each case the phrase "fine not exceeding $50,000."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1563) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph V (2), part I, Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as added by the act of July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 557; 38 U. S. C., ch. 12, note), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) A check received by a payee in payment of pension, compensation, retirement pay, subsistence allowance, or education and training allowance shall, in the event of the death of the payee on or after the last day of the period covered by said check and unless negotiated by the payee or the duly appointed representative of his estate, be returned to the Veterans' Administration and canceled. The amount represented by any check returned and canceled pursuant to the foregoing or any amount recovered by reason of improper negotiation of any such check shall constitute accrued benefits payable pursuant to the provisions of paragraph V (1): *Provided*, That the 1-year limitations of paragraph V (1) shall not apply: *Provided further*, That any amount not so paid shall be paid upon settlement by the General Accounting Office to the estate of the deceased payee, if such estate will not escheat: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this subparagraph in effect prior to the date of approval of this amendment shall be applicable in the case of any payee dying prior to said date."

SEC. 2. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed (together with the punctuation mark immediately preceding the language in each case):

(a) That portion of section 4 of the act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 383), as amended (38 U. S. C. 364c), section 5 of the act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 807), as amended (38 U. S. C. 321a), and section 5 of the act of June 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 493), as amended (38 U. S. C. 365d), which reads in each cited act as follows: "and the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which the execution and submission of a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, and it shall not be canceled, but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner," and

(b) The proviso in section 2 of the act of May 23, 1928 (45 Stat. 715) as amended (38 U. S. C. 321b).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION TO VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1730) to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automobile vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask several questions of the chairman of the committee or some member of that committee. How much is charged, if anything, for the use of these transportation facilities?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As soon as some other arrangement can be made for transportation this method of transportation will be eliminated. At the present time transportation is being furnished employees of the Veterans' Administration at Fort Harrison, Mont. I do not know if the gentleman has been out there, but I have been out there, and I know the difficulty of transportation there. This also involves transportation at facilities located at Fort Howard, Md.; Amarillo, Tex.; Lincoln, Nebr.; and Saginaw, Mich. There are very few hospitals that cannot arrange for other transportation.

Mr. FORD. I was afraid that the sum they were charging was nominal. I was hoping they would make an attempt to charge a fair but adequate rate for the cost of transportation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the cost of the transportation is very little.

Mr. FORD. I wonder if any attempt is being made to make this arrangement one that does not cost Uncle Sam anything.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The cost covers something, but at least you have to transport employees to these out-of-the-way hospitals. The gentleman knows that Fort Harrison, Mont., is a long way from a place where transportation can be easily secured.

Mr. FORD. Did the gentlewoman make any investigation as to how much the charge was for this transportation?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not know whether or not an investigation has been made, but I will have it looked up.

Mr. FORD. If so, how much is it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a comparable charge. The VA has testified that it is very close to commercial charges.

Mr. FORD. Is any attempt being made to get the Government out of this transportation business?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, every effort.

Mr. FORD. How much of an effort?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A great deal, according to the testimony before our committee. There are only a few hospitals that are not served by private transportation. Very few employees are involved.

Mr. FORD. How long does this legislation extend? What is the termination date, or is this a never-ending authority?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The present temporary authority expires on June 30, 1953. There is no termination date in the bill. It is permanent authority.

Mr. FORD. I do not see any termination date in this legislation. Would the committee be willing to offer an amendment to put in a termination date? It is rather far-reaching, with a possibility of abuse.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel that sometimes it is difficult to secure the passage of legislation before we adjourn. Otherwise, I can see no objection to having a termination date placed in the bill. It simplifies it, and I think it saves a little money.

Mr. FORD. I think in the light of the fact that it does not have a termination date, and certainly the facts do not appear, I shall ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice, in the hope that we can have an amendment prepared which will put a termination date in the bill so that it will cover a period of 2 years or 3 years. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will not the gentleman put a termination date in it now? If we adjourn soon, we shall not have very much time to pass this legislation. If the gentleman would set a date now, I think I could go along with it.

Mr. FORD. I do not think we are going to adjourn before July 1 and maybe August 1, so I believe the gentlewoman will have a chance at the next call of the Consent Calendar to get the bill considered. If the gentlewoman and her committee will come up with some proposal for a termination date, we will have ample time to get this legislation through before adjournment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If I make a proposal now that it expire in 2 years, will the gentleman accept that?

Mr. FORD. Would not the gentlewoman like to consult the members of her committee?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not believe they would mind. The bill was reported out unanimously.

Mr. FORD. If the gentlewoman is willing to make a recommendation, I would be glad to go along with it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has one place in Michigan.

Mr. FORD. That does not make any difference, as far as I am concerned.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that is absolutely true and I meant no reflection upon him.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. This is the bill, I understand, to enable employees of the Veterans' Administration to ride in Government-owned vehicles.

Mr. FORD. That is right.

Mr. SUTTON. To me, there is too much riding around in Government vehicles now. I personally would have to be against this bill, even though it were agreed to. I shall insist, if the gentleman does not, that this bill be passed over without prejudice unless I can get somebody else to object with me.

Mr. FORD. I will be glad to ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice in light of the conversation I had with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts because we may then be able to come up with some solution as to a termination date. What the gentleman from Tennessee wishes to do, of course, is his own prerogative.

Mr. SUTTON. That is to kill the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman how the employees would get there to these stations to take care of the veterans?

Mr. SUTTON. That is their problem, which they accepted when they accepted the job.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am a little bit concerned to see this bill passed over so hurriedly, because I did not think there was any controversy about the bill. I am a member of the committee, and the evidence which was presented to us showed that there was no transportation available for these employees and there probably never would be any.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that they are trying to arrange some sort of reasonable transportation which will not be too expensive.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is my understanding that they have exerted every effort in the world to get private transportation. They cannot get it. They charge these employees the same amount of money that private transportation would charge them. It is just a question of getting the job done, and unless we give them this authority, we cannot get the job done for our veterans at these stations.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Will the gentleman explain to us how these sites happened to be selected since they are so removed from any public transportation?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has more of an understanding about these veterans' facilities and their locations. But I would like to say to the gentleman that wherever these stations may be located, he probably had some opportunity to decide on that. I am just a freshman here. But I do not think that is at all the question involved here. The question is whether we are going to take care of our veterans. I think this is the thing to take care of them.

Mr. SUTTON. If the employees cannot get there, how in the world are the veterans going to get there?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Once again may I say I do not think the question here is as to the site of these veterans' hospitals. That has already been determined. The question before us now is, Are we going to take care of them by permitting the transportation of employees? I certainly think we should do that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OFFICE, REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3884) to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, whether this legislation contemplates the expenditure of over $1 million?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It simply contemplates that we continue what we are now doing in the Philippines—that is, operate a regional office. As you all know, the President drafted into the service during World War II certain citizens of the Philippines who had to fight, and then later on we passed legislation to hospitalize them and pay them compensation. They do not have the rights under the GI bill, but only a few rights regarding compensation and hospitalization. Many Americans reside in the Philippines and are entitled to all benefits. At the present time the amount of $1,640,000 is being spent for facilities in order to take care of these Filipinos and Americans who were wounded in our service—Filipinos who were drafted into our service by the President of the United States. At the present time $1,640,000 is expended for that purpose. If this office is not continued, the Department of State, or some other agency, will have to administer the function and give the service, and it will cost just as much, in my opinion, and probably more, because they would probably not have such thoroughly trained personnel. The Department of State wants this office continued.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Consent Calendar objectors have no desire to slow up veterans' legislation, but in view of the agreement on the part of objectors, and in view of the facts involved and the nature of the legislation, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that amount is being spent at the present time. It will be no increase except $100,000. Of course, you can save money by eliminating it, but I am not sure that you will save money because the State Department will then handle it. We cannot draft men into the service and refuse to give them hospitalization or refuse to pay their widows and orphans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMITTING THE ENTRY OF 500 ADOPTED CHILDREN UNDER 6 YEARS OF AGE

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 228) to permit the entry of 500 children under 6 years of age, adopted by United States citizens who are serving abroad in the Armed Forces of the United States, or who are employed abroad by the United States Government.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 201, 202, and 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175–179; 8 U. S. C. 1151–1153), not to exceed 500 special quota immigrant visas may be issued, subject to all other provisions of that act, to alien children under 6 years of age at the time the application for a visa is executed, and such children may be admitted into the United States, if they have been lawfully adopted by United States citizens who are serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or who are employed abroad by the United States Government: *Provided*, That (a) the children are found to be eligible for immigrant visas and for admission under all other requirements of that act; (b) the nonpreference portion of the quota to which the alien child would otherwise be chargeable is oversubscribed by applicants registered on the consular waiting list at the time the child's visa application is executed by an adoptive parent; and (c) the issuance of visas under this authorization shall terminate not later than December 31, 1954.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, and likewise page 2, line 3, strike out "who are" and insert "while."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to permit the entry of 500 children under 6 years of age, adopted by United States citizens while serving abroad in the Armed Forces of the United States, or while employed abroad by the United States Government."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SACKETS HARBOR MILITARY CEMETERY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 490) to authorize the use of the Sackets Harbor Military Cemetery for the burial of war- and peace-time veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Sackets Harbor Military Cemetery, which was conveyed to the village of Sackets Harbor by the Secretary of the Army, under authority of the act entitled "An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts," approved July 1, 1947, be used for the burial of persons who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRIBUTION OF MONEYS OF DECEASED RESTRICTED MEMBERS OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1383) to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes not exceeding $500, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby granted authority to disburse to the heirs or legatees of deceased members of the Five Civilized Tribes any sum of money on deposit to the credit of such deceased Indian or Indians, not exceeding $500, where said decedent died seized of no lands or the lands have since been lawfully alienated. Said funds shall be disbursed on proof of death and heirship or bequest satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and his finding thereon shall be final and conclusive.

SEC. 2. The first sentence of subsection (e) of section 6 of the act of August 4, 1947 (61 Stat. 731), is hereby amended to read as follows: "On or before the 1st day of January of each year the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be filed with the county treasurer of each county in the State of Oklahoma where restricted lands of members of the Five Civilized Tribes are situated a list of the nontaxable lands that have been sold during the preceding year."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "conclusive:", insert "*Provided*, That such transfer of funds so disbursed shall not be taxable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA GAME LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1571) to amend the Alaska game law.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fifth sentence of section 4 of the Alaska game law of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 301), is amended to read as follows: "Each member of the Commission appointed by the Secretary shall be a resident citizen of the judicial division from which he is appointed and shall have been a resident of Alaska for at least 5 years before his appointment, but not more than one resident of a judicial division shall serve on the Commission at one time, and insofar as practicable, Federal or Territorial employees shall not be appointed as members of the Commission."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, following the word "Alaska", strike out "game law of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 301), is" and insert "game law, as amended by the act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 301, 303; 48 U. S. C., sec. 208), is further."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "insofar as practicable, Federal or Territorial employees shall not" and insert "not more than one Federal or Territorial employee shall."

Page 2, line 3, strike out the word "members" and insert "a member."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACTIVITIES OF TEMPORARY AND CERTAIN OTHER EMPLOYEES OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1812) relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to ask the gentleman reporting the bill, or the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, chairman of the committee, to make a statement for the RECORD.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. A strict interpretation of the law at present would prevent any employee, no matter how temporary he might be, from acquiring any interest in lands during his employment, representing claims before the Federal Government. That would mean that even a man employed to fight forest fires or grass fires in Alaska or on a public domain——

Mr. McCORMACK. Men who work by the day?

Mr. D'EWART. Men who work by the day. It is to get around that situation of very temporary employees that this bill was introduced.

Mr. McCORMACK. This allows him to be employed 160 days a year without being subject to that unreasonable situation that exists now. Is that correct?

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct. However, the employment is not for any such length of time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate the committee, and I also want to observe that to me one of the most ridiculous situations I have seen—and I have been a lawyer for many years, and was a very active practitioner in the courtroom before I came to Congress—I have wished I was back there many times, not that I do not love my service here, but I miss my profession in the courtroom—is to see one of the most distinguished men I have ever served with indicted under one of the most unusual and indescribable conditions I can picture. I refer to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN]. The case is under advisement so I refrain from making any further comment except to say that it seems to me that this distinguished colleague of ours did everything within his power, looking up the law, getting advice, being advised that what he did was within his legal rights—only a nominal amount involved, doing as any of us might have done—a long time of service, building up of character, yet having to take the chance of being destroyed under the most innocent of conditions. Bearing that in mind, so far as any of these employees are concerned, I want to congratulate the committee on what they are doing to try and correct the thing that brought about the terrible and trying situation that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] finds himself in today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 452, Revised Statutes (43 U. S. C., sec. 11), shall not apply to any person because of his temporary, intermittent, or seasonal employment by the Bureau of Land Management for field work relating to land, range, forest, and mineral conservation and management activities, fire prevention and suppression, and cadastral surveys, if such employment does not exceed 180 working days in each calendar year: *Provided, however*, That such employees may not acquire any interest in minerals under the mining or the mineral-leasing laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 452, Revised Statutes (43 U. S. C., sec. 11), and of section 190, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 99), and of title 18, United States Code, sections 281, 283, and 284, shall not apply to any member of an advisory board of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 3. This act shall not be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, under existing law, to regulate the activities of any officer, clerk, or employee of the Department of the Interior or of any practitioner in proceedings before the Department.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "year", strike out the colon and the word "*Provided*," and strike out all of lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING FEDERAL AID FOR CERTAIN HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2832) to authorize Federal aid with respect to the costs of constructing that portion of an approved hospital project which was commenced without Federal participation and prior to January 1, 1953.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will my colleague withhold his request to permit me to make a statement? Perhaps I can convince him that he should not press his request.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I may say to the gentleman from Colorado that one of the reasons for my request is the fact that the Federal Security Agency—which is now a Department, I believe—the Federal Security Agency has submitted an adverse report on the bill. It is the only report we have from any of the departments. The Bureau of the Budget has approved that report of the Federal Security Administrator. It would appear from that that certainly the bill does have some controversy in it and I doubt very definitely whether it should be considered here in the House under consent in view of that set of facts.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to state to the gentleman that there is no controversy whatever involved in this bill. It is true an unfavorable report was submitted, but officials of the Public Health Service appeared at the hearing and made no statement whatever in protest against this bill. I might state to my distinguished colleague that in talking to them privately I found they had no objections to this legislation, which I might say applies to only one hospital, located at La Jara, Colo. It is a question of completing a hospital commenced with local funds, but with the understanding that Federal funds would be available.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Who was in favor of it?

Mr. CHENOWETH. The Public Health Service officials who are in charge of the Federal hospital program. It is true they had to submit this unfavorable report because of a policy of the Department. Privately, they were in favor of the bill and cooperated with me in furnishing necessary information. They offered no opposition when they appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the hearing on this measure.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. All I know is it has an adverse report from the agency itself and from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is true, and I have explained the reason for the same.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, this applies to only one hospital.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the circumstances are such that this hospital would have qualified except for some technical situation, some technicality.

Mr. CHENOWETH. In 1950 the President reduced the amount available for hospital construction from $150 million to $75 million at the time the Korean War broke out. At that time the sponsors of the project had fully complied with the Federal requirements, and would have obtained approval of the project except for this reduction in Federal funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. I read the report last night, I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Colorado. I read it with interest because I noticed it was an adverse report, but I thought it was only taking a technical position, it was technically adverse but in fact it was not adverse.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The merits of the case appeal to me.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I ask him to yield in order to supplement what he has already said with reference to the hearing before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I feel certain, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has just said, that the opposition of the Federal Security Agency was in large measure technical. We have had since the operation of the Hill-Burton Construction Act a number of instances where bills have been presented to take care of some technicality. I think I am correct when I say that always the report from the agency has been adverse; yet I feel certain, without quoting anybody on it, that, as the gentleman from Colorado has said, and I base this on my own knowledge of their attitude, many of those in charge of the program feel it is simply a technical matter, that this is a project that has had State approval, was in the State plan, and it was no fault of the people there, the sponsors of the project, that it did not qualify at the proper time. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin will withdraw his objection. I believe the bill is meritorious and should be enacted.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question? What we are talking about is one hospital?

Mr. PRIEST. That is true.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am wondering whether there are other hospitals that might find themselves in this same situation, and, therefore, we would be establishing a precedent here and inviting them to come in because, certainly, if we give it to one, and there are other hospitals similarly situated, we must open it up for them.

Mr. PRIEST. I tried to determine, I may say in reply to the gentleman, whether there was any other hospital in this particular category and while there may be—I am not saying that my investigation was all-inclusive, it is possible there may be—I have been unable to find another hospital in the same category. I believe there is none. So far as I have been able to determine there is none. This stands alone.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman permit my request that the bill go over simply for the purpose of determining from the agency whether they have information as to whether there are any other hospitals in this same category?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I can answer that question now. I have discussed the situation many times with the Public Health Service officials who advise me there are no other hospitals which would be affected by this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The agency states in its report that the adoption of this bill would establish a pattern for hospital construction outside of the program. It is a procedural pattern that would be violated. For that reason they express their opposition to it. I am wondering whether they have in mind the possibility there are other cases?

I might call the attention of the gentleman, the ranking minority member of the committee, to the fact we ran into a similar problem under the Airport Construction Act. There are about 20 airports that were constructed in the early days of that act. No provision was made to take care of additional costs which were brought upon the airport by reason of requirements established by the CAA and the engineers involved. After a certain date we passed a law saying they could have increases. But there are 15 or 20 that found themselves caught in a situation where the accounting had been established prior to the effective date of the act. We have not gone back and opened up and taken care of those airports. It so happens I am familiar with it because one of these airports is in my hometown. If we do this in a hospital case, are we not also obligated, may I ask the gentleman, to do the same thing in another Federal program, such as the airport-construction program, which follows a similar pattern to the hospital pattern?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman as the House author of the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, that I have been greatly interested in it and I have been as interested as anyone else in protecting that act. I think that has been well demonstrated. I think the State plans have been well considered and throughout its operation I believe it has been very successfully administered. I would be the last one to do anything that I thought would open up the floodgates and tend to eventually destroy the effectiveness of the act. On one other occasion we had a bill similar to this that was supposed to apply to only one hospital. When the committee determined at that time by hearings that 31 other hospitals would be included

if we passed that bill, the committee turned the bill down. When it comes to a question of doing justice, which I believe is the big question in this case to a single hospital, then I have no fear whatsoever that our action in approving this legislation would in any way open the floodgates and bring in a great many other projects that might not qualify except for a technicality such as this hospital.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state to the gentleman that I can assure him unequivocally, according to the information given me by the officers in charge of this program in the Public Health Service, that there are no other hospitals involved. Construction of any such hospitals would necessarily have had to commence before January 1, 1953. These Public Health Service people know pretty well what the hospital program is over the country, and they tell me that there is no other hospital to which this bill would apply.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the assurance given by the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Colorado that this is a case, in and of itself, and by itself, and that the situation arose through no fault of the people themselves in the local community, or the hospital authorities, I withdraw my request.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) clause (1) of the first sentence of section 625 (f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 291h (f)) is amended by striking out "the effective date of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1953."

(b) Clause (1) of the second sentence of section 625 (f) of such act is amended by striking out "33⅓ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Federal share."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to applications under section 625 (f) of the Public Health Service Act which are approved after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABOLISH COMMISSION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN BOULEVARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1041) abolishing United States Commission for the Construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan, or someone else on the committee, several questions. I notice on the second page of the committee report that a report was supposed to have been made periodically, and that an original appropriation of $10,000 was made for the operation of this Commission. The report of the committee states that no report was ever made by the Commission and that there has been no accounting of the $10,000 appropriation. Can there be any explanation of that?

Mr. DONDERO. I might say to the gentleman from Michigan that this Commission has been in existence some 15 or 16 years, and nothing has been done.

Mr. FORD. Except spend $10,000.

Mr. DONDERO. That is possible.

Mr. FORD. Is there any way we can get an accounting of what happened to the $10,000, just as a matter of good, orderly procedure?

Mr. DONDERO. If the Commission is in existence or any of the members are in existence from whom we could get it, that could be done. As far as I know, the gentleman from Ohio heard this case.

Mr. FORD. Can the gentleman from Ohio enlighten the House on what happened to the $10,000? Has any report ever been made?

Mr. McGREGOR. In reply to my distinguished friend from Michigan, no report has ever been made of the $10,000 and no inquiry has been made of it. I think it would be possible to get that report from the General Accounting Office, and I think it would be a very good idea to have the report.

As far as the bill is concerned, the Commission expired in 1936, and since that time no report has been given. Owing to the fact that the Highway Department of the District of Columbia and the Public Roads Administration have taken over those functions, the Commission has no reason to exist. However, I think the point of the gentleman from Michigan is well taken; we ought to find out what happened to the $10,000.

Mr. FORD. I might add that in my estimation this is a very good bill, if we can find out where the $10,000 went to.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the establisment of a commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard connecting the present Lincoln Memorial in the city of Washington with the battlefield of Gettysburg in the State of Pennsylvania," approved May 20, 1935 (49 Stat 285), is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY OF CLINTON BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2761) to revive and reenact the act of December 21, 1944, authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved December 21, 1944, entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," as amended, be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEEPAGE AND DRAINAGE DAMAGES ON THE ILLINOIS RIVER, ILL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4779) to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following report is hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers:

Illinois River, Nutwood Drainage and Levee District, Illinois; in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 144, 82d Congress, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document: *Provided*, That, in addition to the sum of $58,750 heretofore authorized in Public Law 168, 78th Cong., 1st session, and the further sum of $25,268 recommended in House Document No. 144, 82d Congress, herein authorized, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated and paid to the Nutwood Drainage and Levee District the further sum of $23,665 to reimburse said district for the additional cost of pumping incurred between January 1, 1944, to and including June 30, 1953.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOOL BOARD OF MECKLENBURG COUNTY, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4072) relating to the disposition of certain former recreational demonstration project lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia to the School Board of Mecklenburg County, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 326; 16 U. S. C., 1946 edition (sec. 459t), the Commonwealth of Virginia is hereby authorized to convey to the School Board of Mecklenburg County that portion of the former Mecklenburg wayside recreational demonstration project which is situated on the west and north side of United States Highway No. 1, comprising approximately 40 acres. Any conditions providing for a reversion of title to the United States that may be contained in the conveyance of such lands by the United States to the Commonwealth of Virginia are hereby released as to the particular lands herein authorized to be transferred.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after "County", insert "for school, recreational, or highway-widening purposes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICAL AND DENTAL TREATMENT FOR LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HALE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state the nature of his objection?

Mr. FORD. My objection to the legislation is that the Treasury Department apparently opposes the enactment of the bill on the basis that it would provide benefits to employees of the Lighthouse Service which would be greater than benefits enjoyed by other regular civil-service employees engaged in similar work.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman from Michigan permit me to inform him that we had a full hearing on the bill in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Treasury Department did not see fit to send any witness up to be heard on the bill. The Public Health Service was present and made only a nominal objection.

The bill applies to a group of only about 1,000 very elderly people, and gives them, I may say, no more rights than, as I understand the testimony of the Public Health Service, drug addicts have at the present time to medical treatment in public health hospitals. Why in the world a veteran of the Lighthouse Service, which was taken under the Coast Guard, should not have as good right for treatment in a public health hospital as a drug addict I do not know. It gives them the same rights the Public Health Service itself has, that the Coast and Geodetic Survey has, and that the Coast Guard has.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman from Maine be agreeable then to giving these same rights that he proposes for the Lighthouse Service to all other civil-service employees.

Mr. HALE. No, I think it is an entirely different situation from the ordinary civil service. The Lighthouse Service, if the gentleman will read the report on the bill, administered the entire lighthouse and aid to navigation system of the United States down to 1939 when it was taken over by the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard have this right of hospitalization.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman admit that approval of this legislation would set a precedent for the extension or expansion of this service to other civil-service employees?

Mr. HALE. No, I would not admit anything of the sort because I think this Lighthouse Service is a unique service, and highly analogous both to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and to the Coast Guard that now performs the work which the Lighthouse Service did perform.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as much as I dislike to disagree with the gentleman from Maine, I believe I will have to insist upon my request that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PORT CHICAGO CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2696) to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Consent Calendar Objectors' Committee have no reports on these last two bills on the calendar. It is probably due to the fact that had the calendar been called yesterday the bills would not have been on it long enough. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent, if it is in order, that the last two bills on the calendar be passed over without prejudice, not that there is any objection based on the merits at this time but simply the fact that we know nothing about them and are not prepared, therefore, to act upon them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further calling of the bills on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence for today, tomorrow, and Thursday may be granted the following list of our colleagues to participate in current atomic tests: Messrs. NELSON, CRETELLA, HOWELL, RODINO, Mrs. HARDEN, and Messrs. HARVEY, MERRILL, WINSTEAD, THOMPSON of Louisiana, STEED, POAGE, FISHER, CONDON, ELLSWORTH, and MAGNUSON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will Members have an opportunity to ask to extend their remarks on Memorial Day, tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. Not on tomorrow.

POLISH CONSTITUTION OF MAY 3, 1791

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, the people of Poland commemorated the anniversary of the signing of the famous Constitution of May 3, 1791. This was the eighth time since World War II had ended that this national holiday was commemorated by the Polish people while their country continued to suffer in the chains of Soviet oppression.

In the United States, and all over the world wherever people of Polish ancestry live, May 3 was observed with appropriate ceremonies paying tribute to the Polish Nation, and reminding all nations that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe. But in addition, these observances held in American cities and towns served as a special message to the people of Poland—a message of our unwavering faith and hope that the evil forces of communism which today enslave Poland will eventually be destroyed, and that Poland's independence will be restored.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed saddening to reflect on the glories of Poland when she was the bulwark of Christianity in Europe; on her benevolent and liberal tradition which was crowned in the peaceful adoption of the Constitution of May 3; on her heroic resistance and unparalleled sacrifices during World War II—and to compare those splendid achievements with her present tragic plight.

It is my fervent hope—shared by the people of our great, free Nation—that Poland may again enjoy the liberty to which she is entitled.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to include in my remarks and commend to the attention of the membership of this body, the following editorial which appeared last Saturday in Kuryer Polski, America's oldest Polish language daily newspaper, published in Milwaukee, Wis.

This editorial pays tribute to the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, and expresses a fervent hope that Poland may soon regain her rightful place among the free, democratic nations of the world.

[Translated from Kuryer Polski of May 2, 1953]

THE MAY 3 ANNIVERSARY

For the Polish Nation, and for all the Poles living all over the world, May 3 has been, and remains, a great national holiday.

One hundred and sixty-two years ago, on May 3, 1791, Poland became the first nation in Europe having a written democratic constitution.

The May 3 constitution resembles the American Constitution to a great extent, because it acknowledges the fact that "all just powers of governments are derived from the consent of the governed." Like the Constitution of the United States, so, too, the constitution of May 3 enunciates the doctrine of the separation of powers between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches of the government.

The principle of religious toleration, which reigned long before that time in Poland, also

finds its expression in the constitution of May 3 which states that all citizens, under the protection of the government and of national laws, shall continue to enjoy freedom of belief and of worship.

Adam Mickiewicz (Polish Pilgrim, Paris, 1833), wrote: "There are 2 elements, 2 spirits in the constitution of May 3. One of them, a foreigner, Frenchman, came from Paris. This spirit, in the course of the 4-year Sejm, inspired lengthy discussions concerning cardinal laws, separation of powers, titles, and the duration of the constitution. • • • But there is another element in the constitution of May 3, which outlasted the wigs, the theories of Rousseau, the dogmatic theorism of that period and even of later periods; the national element—a child of innocent and simple tradition, fed on the new needs and wishes of the nation at that time. • • • What were those wishes of the Polish Nation? To put an end to the unruliness which was spreading among the decaying nobility through the strengthening of the central government on one hand; and to extend the rights of citizenship to all the classes of the people, to regain independence and the lost position in Europe through the imbedding of liberties in Poland, on the other."

The annual anniversary of the constitution of May 3 reminds the Poles all over the world that Poland, toward the end of the 18th century, belonged to the group of nations which pioneered and led others in progress and in democracy. Today, the May constitution should again serve as evidence of Poland's right to free and independent existence as a full-fledged member of the family of nations.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the lifetime of every nation is marked by certain momentous events. From generation to generation significant anniversaries are observed for the great influence wrought upon the course of history and human relations. The Bastille, the Magna Carta, the Fourth of July have a counterpart in every country.

To the Poles there is one date which for over a century and a half retains the highest, the most honored place, and is cherished by the entire Polish element throughout the world with unmatched fervor. It is May 3 when they commemorate the adoption of the constitution by the Commonwealth of Poland in 1791, which took place amid general national rejoicing and patriotic enthusiasm.

The Poles have a deep, natural love of freedom; it is something so vital in their soul that they fight and die for it wherever it is attacked, or where it is to be gained or ransomed at the cost of wounds and blood. Upon the pages of American history their names are honorably recorded for their contribution to the independence of this country. Kosciusko and Pulaski serve not only as a classic evidence, but shall forever remain revered national heroes of Poland and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the eighteenth century was an age of revolution. New ideas were developed and new ideas appeared thoughout the Western World, especially during the last half of the period. In this country, the American Revolution produced the Declaration of Independence and a constitutional form of government. From France came the urging cry of liberty, equality, fraternity. And in Poland, despite the weight of three alien oppressors, a new spirit of freedom arose.

The Polish Constitution, for the first time, placed a real check on the absolutism of the monarchy. Irresponsible cabinet government was cast aside and ministerial responsibility was introduced in its place. Many intricate and obsolete features of the old and unwieldy system were abolished, and all class distinctions were wiped out. Personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the few were made available to all townsmen and the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. Absolute religious toleration was established.

During the dark days of September 1939, it was the Polish nation which first took up arms against the evil forces of violence and aggression. The events of war developed in such a way that many of us subconsciously forget the part that Poland played in World War II. We forget the ideals and the principles, which Poland rose to defend, and which are being fought for today by almost the entire world. We forget that the chief slogan at the outbreak of war was the struggle for individual freedom, the defense of the weaker against the stronger, the struggle for justice above evil.

Today Poland's sons, scattered through the various parts of the globe, dare not place their foot upon Polish soil for fear of unjust reprisals, uncertain of their property and life in the land of their origin because Poland's political life is dominated by Soviet secret police and puppet agents of Soviet Russia who control its political life.

The 3d of May has ceased to be an official Polish national holiday in Poland, by decree of the present regime. But the 3d of May remains a Polish national holiday in the hearts of all true Poles, and in all centers in the United States where Poles or Americans of Polish extraction live. In numerous Polish national homes, the Polish flag hangs proudly on this day, side by side with the American Stars and Stripes. Thousands of people listen attentively to the voices of the past. They hope that there will again be a Poland which in the spirit of the constitution of May 3 will be independent once more and free from foreign invasions.

On March 23 and 24, 1953, the representatives of the puppet Government of Poland brazenly introduced in the United Nations Political and Security Committee, charging the United States with interference in the internal affairs of other states. The representative of the United States, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., promptly answered stating:

> If the Kremlin leaders are really looking for the people who are subverting life behind the Iron Curtain they should look at themselves—at their laws, their decrees, their practices of oppression. They should look at the Lenin-Stalinist doctrine on which they have impaled nearly half the world.

The Kremlin has since 1939, both directly and through the forcefully imposed Red puppet government in Warsaw, exercised steady pressure against the Polish Nation and has thereby encroached upon its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The interference of the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of Poland presents a clear case of aggression which combines a steady pressure from the outside with subversive activity within the country. All basic principles and commitments of the United Nations as expressed in the charter of the United Nations are being completely violated by the Soviet Union in its relations with Poland.

Mr. Speaker, as we join in this tribute to Poland on this anniversary, the United States of America is deeply indebted to Poland for its many contributions to our progress and well-being. It is also indebted to Poland for the millions of its citizens who came to this country to help build it into the greatest nation of all times. That same zeal and warm desire for freedom, that same resistance to persecution, and the same determination to develop, which characterized the Poles through the ages, has been a dominant factor in the growth and development of our great Nation.

Let us give Poland our most sincere assurance of our moral support; to cheer them; to encourage them in the continued fight for freedom in the full sense of the word.

Poland must be free, since without a free Poland, there will be no true peace.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the cause of a free Poland is the cause of a free United States. On the 162d anniversary of the establishment of the constitution of Poland we reaffirm our determination to stand by the people of Poland, with all our strength and with all our heart, until again freedom rings throughout their land.

Here on the floor of the House in the Congress of the United States, speaking for the men and women of the district I represent, and for myself, I accept as our pledge—the pledge of the people of the United States to the people of Poland—these words of Mayor Martin H. Kennelly at a great outpouring of the citizenry of Chicago in Humboldt Park on Polish Constitution Day:

> Let the aggressors take heed. Let the tyrants take note. Let the people of Poland know that we are enlisted with them for the duration until Poland is free.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a time for plain talk. I am glad that the mayor of Chicago has gone all out in making it perfectly clear that there can be no compromise in our demand that the people of Poland shall, enjoy the right of self-government. I am glad that many of my colleagues in this body have expressed themselves in similar manner. I think it is fortunate that our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] is one of the highest ranking members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, No. 2 on the minority. The gentleman is a former city treasurer of Chicago and for years was business manager of the daily English-language Polish newspaper with the largest circulation in the world in its field. The gentleman is a great American and a tireless champion of a free Poland. From what he has heard on the floor of this body today he

will be justified in the conclusion that the Members of the Congress of the United States agree with him that being a champion of a free Poland is part of the job of being a good American.

THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIVE YEARS IN AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, there is a very good reason why the cause of a free Poland is so close to our hearts. The blood of Poland is part of our own American blood. From earliest colonial days, through all the periods of struggle and achievement, the infiltration of Polish blood into American veins has continued.

For 345 years men and women of Polish birth or descent have labored and sacrificed and achieved in the bulding to world leadership of these United States. Woven into the fabric of American life, is the brilliant thread of their contribution.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this contribution has continued for 345 years. The Polish people are no new-comers to our country. In comparatively large numbers they came in 1608. In the hard struggling days at Jamestown—345 years ago—Capt. John Smith found no more dependable support in the facing of great perils than in the faithful, hard-working sons and daughters of Poland who had cast their lot in the great American undertaking.

In our war for independence none stood higher in devotion to our cause and in brilliant execution of military duties than Kosciusko and Pulaski, who gave his life at the battle of Savannah.

Across the grim bloody pages of the history of the Civil War shines the story of the Polish nun, Sister Mary Veronica—Veronica Klimkiewicz—Sister of Charity and one of a group of Polish women, the Good Samaritans, who nursed wounded soldiers on and off the battlefield and aided the victims of the war. The story of Sister Veronica's discovery of her own brother, apparently dying on the field of Gettysburg, as she moved about aiding the wounded and comforting the dying, is a graphic illustration of the completeness with which Polish families served us in our need.

Another Polish woman, Marie Zakrzewska, a pioneer in the field of medicine and social service, founded the New York Infirmary for Women and Children and the New England Hospital for Women and Children. She assisted in the organization of the first American school for nurses and inaugurated the movement for establishing playgrounds for children in cities. Dr. Zakrzewska became known as the mother of the playground movement.

MAYOR KENNELLY'S ADDRESS

Through the courtesy of Ludwik Lesnicki, the well-known political columnist and Washington correspondent of Dziennik Chicagoski, I have been furnished with a copy of Mayor Kennelly's Polish Constitution Day address in Chicago, reference to which I made earlier in my remarks. By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the complete text of Mayor Kennelly's stirring address:

Thank you, Mr. Rozmarek, distinguished guests, fellow Chicagoans, to me the great significance of this annual observance of Polish Constitution Day is the positive proof it provides of our deep understanding that the fight for freedom is never-ending.

Like most of you, I have come here to the Kosciusko monument year after year to take part in this great demonstration.

Like you, I come in the spirit of one who goes in reverence to a shrine of liberty.

Like you, I come in gratitude for the priceless privilege of freedom.

Like you, I come to give encouragement to the people of Poland—and to the people of all the other captive nations.

Like you, I intend to keep coming back in the years ahead—as long as the Polish-American organizations continue to sponsor this great congress of patriots.

As religion is founded upon faith, so is true patriotism built upon freedom. Love of country and love of liberty go hand in hand. Patriotism languishes in the climate of enslavement. It finds no nurture in oppression. It cries out for independence.

But the history of America shows that while patriots may die for their beliefs—at the hands of despots—patriotism lives on and in the end gives flower to freedom.

Through all the 162 years since the Polish Constitution was drawn, the people of Poland have taken heart from the history-making example of our triumph over the forces that would have denied us liberty and disregarded the God-given mandate that all men are created equal.

What greater tribute could the people of Poland pay to this Nation than their desire to live under the democratic form of government we have?

What greater inspiration could we have—to appreciate our rights—than the example of thousands upon thousands of liberty-loving Polish people who have come to this Nation, and this city, through the years, to make their homes here?

Who would deny that we are Poland's debtors? Who would be so callous as to contend that we owe no support to Poland's courageous fight against the iron-handed domination that denies to them, our fellow humans, the blessings we enjoy as American citizens.

Let the message go to them, from this great Chicago meeting today, that we recognize our obligations to them.

Let the aggressors take heed. Let the tyrants take note. Let the people of Poland know that we are enlisted with them for the duration until Poland is free.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, great reforms in institutions of government have often been accompanied by violent revolutions. In America, the failure of the British to adapt their imperial structure to the needs of the colonists was a major factor in bringing about the American Revolution. In France, the failure of the upper classes to reform their political, economic, and social institutions, by creating a broader base for government by the people led to the revolution of 1789 and the sanguinary events that followed. However, not all great movements for reform have been accompanied by violence. The Polish revolution of 1791, which led to the promulgation of the constitution of May 3, effecting a fundamental reconstruction of the Polish state, was brought about by a peaceful movement and was acclaimed almost universally by the Polish people.

Today, we pay tribute to this memorable constitution, and in our tribute, we honor more than the constituiton of 1791, we honor a truly great people. And we honor those patriots of 1791 who gave Poland, at least for a time, some promise of independence, security, and democracy.

A review of the constitution of 1791 ought to furnish convincing evidence of the truly remarkable character of this historic instrument. In the 18th century, European liberal philosophers had excited the intellectual world with their advance concepts of democracy. From the works of such profound thinkers as Locke, Montesquieu, and Rousseau, the Polish reformers extracted the most progressive ideas and the most advanced forms of government, and adapting them to the Polish environment, produced something unique in Eastern European history.

Many parts of the Polish Constitution were indeed liberal and democratic, but, generally, it was a conservative instrument of government which created in Poland a royal republic. Property rights and privileges of the upper classes were acknowledged by the constitution and recognized as a "tie of society, the very essence of civil liberty which ought to be considered and respected forever." Broader forms of economic, political, and social democracy were, nonetheless, extended to other levels of Polish society. All royal towns within the dominion of the Republic were declared free, and the inhabitants of these towns were recognized as freemen. The condition of the peasantry was somewhat ameliorated by the constitution, but full freedom was not granted, and the Polish serf, like his brother-sufferers in other countries of Eastern Europe, continued in his abject social status.

Some mechanisms of government, conspicuous in the American and British constitutional systems, were adapted to the new Polish constitutional order. Powers of government were separated into legislative, executive, and judicial branches. In the legislature, which was bicameral, the Lockean concept of majority rule was an acknowledged principle. The King and his ministers constituted the executive branch. Like the British monarchy, the Polish monarchy was made hereditary, bringing to an end an elective system which was a major reason for the weakness of the previous constitutional system. On accession to the throne, the King, described by the constitution as "not an absolute monarch, but the father and the head of the people," was required to "take a solemn oath to God and the nation, to support the constitution." Most important for the furtherance of democracy in Poland was the adoption of the British concept of ministerial responsibility. In this device, which provided a mechanism for peaceful change, and which by implication asserted the principle that authority was derived from below and not from above, there lay the vital seeds from which a constitutional democracy could have developed and flourished throughout Poland if her independence had been respected and preserved.

According to standards of 1953, the Polish Constitution of 1791 is a conservative document. In its time, however, it was regarded as progressive and very liberal by statesmen both in American and Europe. Upon hearing of the Polish Constitution, George Washington, our own great leader in revolution, war and

peace, exclaimed to a friend: "Poland appears to have made large and unexpected strides toward liberty, which reflects great honor on the Polish king." And, Edmund Burke, the great British statesman, declared: "Humanity must rejoice when it considers the change in Poland."

But, in some quarters of Europe humanity did not rejoice and glory in the announcement of the new Polish Constitution. Those dissenters who conspired with the Russians to destroy the Constitution referred to that instrument as a "dangerous novelty," while others, especially Catherine the Great of Russia, considered it as a contemptible manifestation of radical French Jacobinism. Fearful that such advanced ideas as those proclaimed in the Polish Constitution might find fertile soil in Imperial Russia, and determined to carry on the historic Russian policy of tolerating only a weakened Poland, the autocartic Catherine ordered her armies to invade Poland. With a thoroughness and forcefulness reminiscent of the later Soviet invasion of Poland and her Baltic neighbors at the beginning of World War II, the Russians defeated the Polish Army, destroyed the Constitution and prepared the way for a partition of Polish territory in 1793.

Destruction of the constitution of 1791 and the partitioning of Poland had effects so disastrous that when the great powers, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, seized upon the occasion of the Kosciuszko rebellion as a pretext for further partition in 1795, the Poles, greatly outnumbered, war-weary and disheartened by the tragedy of defeat, could resist no longer. Thus, by the tragic logic of events, they were forced to acquiesce in the inevitable. Poland as an independent state was wiped completely off the political map of Europe, never to appear again until 1918.

But the constitution of 1791 lived on. It had an influence far different from that which its destroyers could ever have intended or even imagined. In the memory of the Polish people this constitution was cherished through the years and became an object of national veneration. It became for the Poles a symbol of all the imperishable, universal ideals of freedom, independence, and democracy. For generations this source of national spirit has given heart to the Poles in oppression, courage to them in war, and magnanimity in peace.

Now, as the darkness of oppression has again descended upon unhappy Poland, and as the sword of the conqueror has once again been thrust at her heart, the free world wonders what future course history will plot for the ill-fated Poles. Of one thing we can be sure, however: The yearning for freedom and national independence will never die in Poland. Today, as in her past, Poland has a treasury of spiritual strength and vitality hidden in the traditions of the constitution of 1791. May her people continue to be inspired by the great humane ideals of that constitution which so nobly sustained their forefathers through years of the darkest oppressions. May her people now and in the future continue to trust in the righteousness of their cause, and be assured that they have not been forgotten in their enforced servitude.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Polish Constitution Day, which is being celebrated on this May 3, commemorates a glorious landmark in Poland's history, in European history and also in the history of the modern civilized world. The drafting and adoption of the Polish Constitution by the Great Diet 162 years ago was a real turning point in the history of the Poles. By it they effected a peaceful revolution in their form of government without resorting to the violent and terrifying measures characteristic of the French Revolution. The framers of the Polish Constitution of 1791 succeeded eminently well in their endeavors. By adopting that liberal and popular document they led their countrymen from the feudal paths of the Middle Ages to the broad and progressive highways of modern times.

That momentous and significant document restrained the authority of the monarch, and introduced ministerial responsibility. The intricate, obstructive features of the old system and many class distinctions were eliminated. The upper legislative chamber also lost some of its preponderant powers and the second chamber, which was elective and represented the nation, was vested with genuine legislative authority. Economic barriers between the nobility and the bourgeoisie were broken down; the townsmen recovered their judicial autonomy, and received a number of political rights, especially that of admission to many of the higher offices. Finally the peasantry were taken under the protection of the law. The constitution abolished the worst abuses from which Poland had been suffering for centuries. As has been justly observed, "through the abolition of the most crying political evils of the old regime, and the granting of increased freedom of action of the middle and lower classes, the constitution marked a great advance upon all previous attempts at reform in Poland. It was highly praised by Edmund Burke and other advocates of democratic government. But this democratic document also aroused the ire of Poland's three crafty and grasping neighbors, who, fearing that through this document Poland might regain her former strength, hastened the execution of their designs for the partitioning of Poland.

As we all know, before the unfortunate Poles had any time to enjoy the benefits of this new constitution, their country was parcelled out among the autocrats of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Having lost their national independence, all Poles became subjects of alien government in their own homeland, and for about 120 years they lived under oppressive foreign rule. Yet, they managed to keep alive the spirit of national independence, drawing spiritual sustenance from the cardinal aims and principles in the constitution of 1791. Toward the close of the First World War the Poles happily witnessed the defeat of their oppressors, and they rejoiced at this opportunity to regain their freedom.

Before the end of the war Poland proclaimed her political independence. After the signature of the peace treaties, the government of the newly liberated country took its place among the free countries of Europe. The next 20 years were years of reconstruction and regeneration. Toward the end of the 1930's, however, Poland's neighbors on both east and west once more grew powerful and plotted against Poland's independence. The Communist-Nazi alliance of August 1939, sounded again the death knell of Poland's independence.

Poland's tragic history since September 1, 1939, is too well known to tell in detail here. Outnumbered and outmaneuvered, the brave Poles fought valiantly against the ruthless invaders, but in the end their armed forces were completely vanquished. Their country was once more partitioned, this time by Hitler and Stalin, and millions of Poles were driven out of their historic homeland. Many of those who stayed behind carried on the underground struggle against the invaders. For more than 4 years they fought the battle for freedom behind the enemy lines. Toward the end of World War II the Poles were liberated by the forces of the Soviet Union. One-third of Poland was annexed to Soviet Russia and a Communist puppet regime was set up in the remaining part of the country. This government proceeded to suppress all freedom and democracy.

In short, it seems that all the sacrifices made by the Poles have been in vain. Today, Poland is a veritable concentration camp in which more than 24 million Poles are not even permitted to celebrate this Constitution Day. We of the western democracies join all Americans of Polish ancestry in the celebration of this day and heartily express our hope that soon all Poles will again be able to observe freely and without fear in their beloved homeland the anniversary of their famous constitution of 1791.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, although we are gripped in war, hot and cold, with the Communist world, with American sons dying each day at the hands of Communist-fired weapons, to say nothing of the billions we are spending in foreign aid to prevent the spread of communism against the free world; and although the root of these troubles leads to Moscow, there are still some Americans who, for personal gain, close their eyes to this situation and continue to trade with America's avowed enemies, importing Iron Curtain materials which are in abundant supply either from friendly countries or from within the United States. They are putting dollars behind the Iron Curtain where they may be, and are, used to finance the Kremlin's effort to rule the earth.

I listened recently to some startling testimony affecting trade with Russia before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture. The possible implications of this testimony are such that I feel it should be brought to the attention of the House of Representatives. Reputable witnesses told us that Russian-made potash is being shipped into this country in substantial volume

and sold at a cutrate price which is less than production costs and shipping charges of American producers.

To me it is incredible that dollars paid by American farmers for fertilizer to produce food for our people and our allies should find their way behind the Iron Curtain, there to be used to buy war materials to kill American boys.

But there seems to be an even more sinister purpose behind this trade move than the immediate acquisition of American dollar credits, important though they are to her war machine.

As it was pointed out by witnesses before the subcommittee, if this dumping of Russian-controlled potash is allowed to continue, more and more American fertilizer manufacturers would be forced to buy it in order to stay in business and compete pricewise with firms who were doing so. And the more of it that is bought, the less domestic production would be bought and consumed. Thus, we have the makings of a complete disruption of a great American industry, with incalculable danger to American agriculture—and all directed by Moscow.

This attack on vital American industry is an easily recognizable part of Russia's general scheme to wreck the economy of the western free world.

Such a scheme emerged from the congress of the Soviet Communist Party last October. There, in a 25,000-word statement by Stalin on world communism and a 5½-hour report on the military economic strength and objectives of the Soviet Union by Georgi Malenkov, later Stalin's successor, some of her objectives became clear.

These objectives are set forth lucidly in a special report prepared for the Research Institute of America by Prof. Harry Schwartz, of Syracuse University, the specialist on Soviet affairs for the New York Times.

Among them he lists: Promoting disunity among the non-Communist nations; destroying American access to foreign raw materials, capturing by the iron-curtain nations of present American markets, and the probable "dumping" of surplus goods by Russian-dominated nations in order to wreck markets and industries in the western world.

Stalin's talk of "surpluses" in the Soviet bloc may well mean a new campaign of dumping on world markets, perhaps by 1955 or shortly after—

The report warned.

A surplus in any Stalinist country—

It continued—

means simply, in Communist society, a commodity which the government finds it economically or politically expedient to export.

And yet in the face of this clear threat, we continue to buy huge quantities of goods from Russia and her satellites.

The testimony before our committee regarding only one industry aroused my interest, and I have looked into this matter a little further. I want to say that I was astounded to find, from official Department of Commerce reports, that America bought more than $67,000,000 worth of goods from Russia, East Germany, China, and the rest of the Soviet bloc last year, while selling them only a little over $1,000,000 worth of our goods. This trade continued on into 1953 at about the same ratio. In other words, the Communist world conspiracy in 1952 gained about $66,000,000 in American dollars and credits for the support of its war economy and to further its avowed fight to destroy the free nations of the world.

The extent of this trade is graphically illustrated by the following table, taken from official reports of the United States Department of Commerce, Office of International Trade:

	Exports from United States		Imports into United States	
	1951	1952	1951	1952
U. S. S. R.	$55,000	$20,000	$27,443,000	$16,741,000
China	None	None	46,519,000	27,806,000
Bulgaria	30,000	24,000	519,000	275,000
East Germany	(1)	639,000	(1)	7,151,000
Czechoslovakia	1,049,000	75,000	22,403,000	1,475,000
Rumania	390,000	None	322,000	683,000
Hungary	605,000	69,000	2,791,000	2,913,000
Poland and Danzig	697,000	286,000	10,300,000	10,246,000

[1] Not reported.

Now, do not misunderstand me. I do not intend to leave the impression that I am opposed to normal foreign trade with friendly nations, for I have always held that the exchange of goods between free nations is essential to our own economy and to sound international relations.

But these enormous purchases from the Iron Curtain countries are economically dangerous and politically stupid. Through them we are arming our enemies; through them we are feeding communism.

The testimony our subcommittee heard offers good evidence that Russia's threatened dumping, insofar as potash is concerned, at least, already has begun. Unless we are vigilant and put an immediate halt to it, it will expand and spread, in this field as well as in others.

The eventual results could be disastrous. Dumping of vast supplies on an unsuspecting American market could completely disrupt the normal flow of domestic trade and force more and more American concerns to use it to meet price competition. American production would fall off sharply, mines and plants would have to close and fall into disrepair. The outbreak of a new emergency would find us completely unable to supply our own needs.

And do not make the mistake of thinking that picture is too farfetched. Many things we once thought farfetched have come to pass in recent years by direction of the shrewd and ruthless brains in the Kremlin.

Russia, operating state-controlled or confiscated property, could very easily wreck many kinds of American business if we permit her to make unlimited sales in the United States for political purposes. There is a vast difference between American industry and that of the Communist countries.

The American businessman must make a profit to exist. He must pay State and Federal taxes, and he must and should pay his labor a good wage. The Soviet industrial monopoly has none of these restrictions. They need not show a profit, they pay no taxes as such, and they pay their labor whatever the masters of the state decree.

If it suits their purpose to sell for a month or for a year at less than production costs in order to wreck American industry and disrupt American marketing channels, they will do so.

The Communists' only aim is world domination, and everything else is subjugated to that. They can ignore the economic laws that our businessmen must obey to survive. And the Communists take full advantage of this fact.

The dumping of potash, of which we have made mention, provides good proof of that, and also offers an interesting suggestion as to the economic cooperation between the world Comintern and its traitorous representatives in this country.

The Russians first broke into the American potash market in 1950 when America's New Mexico mines, which produce 90 percent of our potash, were closed down by a 3-months' strike of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union—a union which has been thrown out of the CIO because it was notoriously Communist dominated.

And at that time Russia sold her potash here at exorbitant prices, a gouge she could get by with because this Red union had shut off American supplies and this vital ingredient was in very short supply.

Now, however, with potash in ample supply from American mines and from friendly foreign nations, the Kremlin has shifted its economic attack, and our committee was told of one cargo recently sold in New England for less than the cost to American producers of mining, smelting and shipping to the east coast.

American manufacturers requiring potash do not want to buy Communist material. By far the majority of them who appeared before our committee testified that they had refused to do so, even though the price was less than American producers could afford to sell it.

I heartily commend their patriotism.

And it is a certainty that our farmers do not want to think that dollars they pay for fertilizer made with potash find their way behind the Iron Curtain to help pay for machines of war to be used against American soldiers.

The American farmer is no different from any other American. No patriotic citizen of this country, irrespective of his calling, business or profession, wants to exchange his dollars for Communist-made materials. When he does, as in the case of potash, he has no way of knowing that he has done so. Manufacturers who use such do not brag about it with a statement on the article or container disclosing its Communist origin. And since it looks no different from that produced anywhere else, he has unwittingly contributed to the Communist cause.

Once American citizens find out that goods are being sold to them which contain materials from Russia or Russian-controlled territory, they will demand that their Government put a stop to it, or that their dealers give them assur-

ance that any more they buy is not made from Communist materials.

Maybe it would be a good idea for loyal, patriotic manufacturers who refuse to play into Russia's hands and buy her material to put a tag on each article or container guaranteeing to their customers that it does not contain materials produced by unfriendly, Communist countries.

The American consumer also knows that there would be no real savings to him from using Red produced goods. Sure, if the manufacturer passes along the savings he gets by buying cheaper from Russia, each unit might cost a few cents less for a while. But just let the Russians accomplish their purpose of wrecking our own domestic industry, and then see what happens to the price—if they send us any at all.

In addition to the very powerful moral and self-preservation reasons that we should put a halt to this Russian economic scheme, there is also a good possibility that these Russian sales are being made in direct violation of one or more laws of the United States. The Tariff Act of 1930, the Revenue Act of 1916, and the so-called Antidumping Act of 1921 all prohibit the importation into and sale of goods in this country in a manner intended to injure or destroy American industry.

I certainly hope the proper authorities of the executive branch will thoroughly study this Russian import scheme and determine if legal action to halt it is possible.

One witness before our committee testified that he, for and on behalf of his farmer cooperative, had bought a cargo of potash of Iron Curtain origin at a price substantially below domestic prices.

Incidentally, I suggested to him that when fertilizer is made from it, the bags be so labeled, so his 90,000 farmer members can know that they are using fertilizer the purchase of which aided, even inadvertently, the Communist world revolution goal. And I predicted that, if he did, his members would refuse to buy the stuff.

I am glad to add, on this witness' behalf, that he told the committee his firm would not buy any more potash from Communist sources.

I cannot see how anyone would. However, I was startled to read in the papers the next day that an official of the Philadelphia firm, from which the above co-op official had testified he bought Russian potash, said it was imported from Communist-dominated territory with State Department approval. I cannot believe it.

Could it be that this administration and its Department of State actually condone and approve the importation of Communist-made goods, more particularly goods which are in ample supply from domestic sources and friendly countries? Mr. Speaker, are these the same people who last year traveled hither and yon across our fair land, leveling a blistering attack at the State Department as then constituted, charging many of its high officials with being Communists and the entire Department with being of a Red fringe? Are these the same people who were after the scalp of Dean Acheson, chanting and shouting, "We want a change"? Now, Mr. Speaker, after coming into power could it be that they give their approval to the importation of these materials from the Communist world which in turn uses our dollars to support its war economy and avowed desire to dominate free peoples everywhere? Could it be? I certainly hope this is all a mistake.

The chairman of our subcommittee announced as we recessed that we would reconvene later to get the State Department's viewpoint on this whole question. I think it is very important that we do.

It is incredible that our Government deliberately encourages trade which can only benefit our avowed enemy, and can only work to the long-range detriment of American industry and American agriculture.

We are spending billions of dollars each month to combat communism and to aid the free world to strengthen itself and rebuild a strong, democratic way of life, as well as to halt actual armed aggression by the Reds in Korea.

Then, why, in the name of all we hold sacred, should we permit, or encourage, trade which takes much needed dollar credits from our allies, and gives them instead to the world-threatening monsters in the Kremlin and their satellite cohorts?

It makes no sense to me, as a Member of Congress and as a citizen who loves my country and detests everything that communism stands for. And I intend to do everything in my power to see that it is halted.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LYLE. It is just not possible for me to conceive of what type of American would do business with Russia and China in face of the horrible slaughter that is taking place in Korea today. Did the gentleman say we did business with China last year?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Last year importing merchants in the United States imported $27,806,000 worth of merchandise from Communist China, and did not sell them a single dollar's worth. These American dollars, the most valuable and most desirable money in the world today, all went behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. LYLE. They should not sell them a dollar's worth, but it is unthinkable that we should purchase anything from that bunch of murderers over there.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is what I am objecting to. By such trading with China in 1952 and 1951 certain Americans put $44 million behind the Iron Curtain, and trade with China and other Iron Curtain countries is continuing to this very day. I am told that it is all being done with the consent of the State Department. That is a little difficult to believe, but it is said to be true.

What are we importing from these Communist countries? Just to mention a few of the items, I found that in addition to potash we are importing cheese; we are importing hams; we are importing bacon; we are importing cotton cloth; we are importing cotton gloves and mittens; we are importing woolens and worsteds; we are importing oilseeds and cloverseeds, vetch seed, broomcorn, cotton manufactures, and jute manufactures; we are importing nails; we are importing spikes; we are importing motorcycles, clay products, glass products, furs, foodstuffs of various kinds, flax, hemp, furniture, hides, cotton linters, cotton waste, asbestos, and so on and on. I have mentioned only a few of the items.

It was most shocking to learn that we were spending our money with these Communist-dominated countries and, that in 1952 American traders put $67 million behind the Iron Curtain which, of course, we all know, they are now using to maintain their war machines and kill American boys.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am most happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. I wonder if the gentleman from Mississippi who brought us this report—and I congratulate him on doing it—has a list of the people who are importing these things. Does not the gentleman think it would be possible to let the American people know?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, but I think it is readily obtainable; I think it could be obtained through the Department of Commerce. I have only one firm in mind, a concern in Philadelphia which imported—I do not remember the exact quantity but a very large quantity—of Communist-produced potash at a time when there was no shortage of domestically produced potash. This Communist-produced potash was shipped into our country in competition with potash produced in our sister State of New Mexico. Incidentally, our committee was informed by the gentlemen from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ and Mr. DEMPSEY] that potash is the second largest source of income to the people of their home State of New Mexico.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman from Mississippi certainly made a startling revelation in his discussion here this afternoon. I am wondering whether or not the imports into our country are coming directly or indirectly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand they are coming directly. The trading is no secret and is being carried on openly and brazenly.

Mr. BONNER. There are many countries we have been lending money to that are doing business with countries behind the Iron Curtain, the Communist countries, as we know. It might be interesting to know if these countries that are receiving our aid are parties to this business transaction.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not think anyone knows the exact source of the material which comes into our country from the Communist-dominated countries of Albania, Bulgaria, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania; but we do know enough about Russian and Communist policy to know that the people of those Communist-dominated countries who are not

sympathetic with communism do not get the benefit of the American dollars being spent for goods in those countries.

Mr. Speaker, let's stop feeding these Communists with our dollars. You are either for communism or against it. There is no halfway ground. The time is long since past when we should stop importing Communist goods. It should be stopped, now.

COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENDER). Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to pay tribute to President Eisenhower for his foresight and statesmanship in recommending that a bipartisan commission be established to conduct a study of American foreign economic policy and to make recommendations to the Congress and to the executive branch of the Government.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to the leadership of the House and the Senate in joining with the President in this proposal. It means that at long last a statutory commission, with representation from the Congress of the United States, will pause in the midst of the confused and conflicting forces in international economic affairs, take bearings and set a course for the future which will afford us some hope that we will arrive at the haven we have so long sought—a peaceful, stable, and flexible political and economic order in world affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the American people, the people of other free nations, indeed, even the Members of the Congress are fully aware of the importance of this simple, forthright act on the part of the President and the leadership of the Congress. It is to focus attention on the significance of this reexamination of foreign economic policy and to utter some words of caution in the execution of this program that I have asked for the indulgence of the House today.

The first significant fact about the President's proposal to create a bipartisan commission on foreign economic policy is that it constitutes an admission that we do not now have all the answers. This is a refreshing departure from the know-it-all attitude of the Truman-Acheson foreign policy experts. In President Eisenhower's message to the Congress requesting an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, dated April 7, 1953, he said:

> I now recommend that the present act be renewed for the period of 1 year.
>
> I propose this action as an interim measure. As such, it will allow for the temporary continuation of our present trade program pending completion of a thorough and comprehensive reexamination of the economic foreign policy of the United States.
>
> I believe that such a reexamination is imperative in order to develop more effective solutions to the international economic problems today confronting the United States and its partners in the community of free nations. It is my intention that the executive branch shall consult with the Congress in developing recommendations based upon the studies that will be made.
>
> No feature of American policy is more important in this respect than the course which we set in our economic relations with other nations. The long-term economic stability of the whole free world and the overriding question of world peace will be heavily influenced by the wisdom of our decisions. As for the United States itself, its security is fully as dependent upon the economic health and stability of the other free nations as upon their adequate military strength.
>
> The problem is far from simple. It is a complex of many features of our foreign and domestic programs. Our domestic economic policies cast their shadows upon nations far beyond our borders. Conversely, our foreign economic policy has a direct impact upon our domestic economy. We must make a careful study of these intricate relationships in order that we may chart a sound course for the Nation.

This humble admission speaks volumes and augurs well for a successful attack upon the complex and involved international economic problems which have thus far defied solution. If we enter upon this study of foreign economic policy without preconceived notions, with open minds, if we devote ourselves exclusively to the task of forging principles and policies which will advance the cause of a free society, we already will have taken a long first step in the direction of true progress.

Second. Another reassuring aspect of the President's proposal is that this study is to be conducted as a cooperative, partnership undertaking. The Congress of the United States is to play its part in conjunction with the executive branch of the Government and I hope with the American business community in developing the programs and policies which will guide us in the international economic field. This, too, is a refreshing departure from the practices of the past administration. It needs no citation of examples to establish that in the past two decades national policies have been generated in the secrecy of the bureaus and departments of the executive branch of the Government and were then rammed down the throat of a pliant and unresisting Congress. President Eisenhower in this, as in many other matters, has demonstrated his respect for the constitutional policy-making authority of the elected representatives of the people and has graciously invited them to join with him in a study in this field of joint responsibilities and in working out programs and policies which will have such a far-reaching effect not only on the future course of our Nation, but on the course of world affairs.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his part in this whole effort. The gentleman's bill, I think, was a very early one put in here setting up a commission to investigate the possibilities of trade and foreign investments. The gentleman, I think, has interested himself in one of the most vital subjects of our time. As the gentleman knows, as I have informed him, the foreign economic policy subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am the Chairman, has been conducting hearings which will be printed on this very subject giving all who are interested an opportunity to be heard, including administration witnesses, and I believe that the gentleman, incidentally, will be very welcome if he wishes to testify before that subcommittee. I might tell the gentleman, too, that it is the purpose of our committee to offer legislation implementing the message of the President so that a commission may be appointed, with representation from this House, just as soon as the leadership is ready to make the appointment.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. I am very well aware of the gentleman's interest in this very important field of foreign economic policy and the expansion of investments overseas and the expansion of trade. I would like to avail myself of the kind invitation to appear before his committee at some future time on this subject.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I would like to express my congratulations to my distinguished and able colleague from Michigan. I have been greatly impressed by his efforts on behalf of these proposals. His work first came to my attention before I was privileged to be a Member of this body; I believe it was something like 2 years ago. It is my judgment that this is the only way, the only constructive way, yet suggested, in which we can actually do something concrete and practical about assisting these people abroad who so badly need help and at the same time help ourselves. I join my colleague from New York in his congratulations to the gentleman from Michigan. I think he has set out on a course here that will benefit the people of the United States and of the free world. The President's action of yesterday is one that we should all commend. I hope we move ahead with this and I hope we get results. It is my hope that the distinguished and able gentleman from Michigan will be named as a member of this commission which is to be appointed. His record in behalf of this proposal is one which highly qualifies him for membership on this commission.

Mr. MEADER. I certainly thank the gentleman for those very kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, a third significant fact about the President's proposed commission on foreign economic policy is his recognition of the importance of making

this study now. I quote from his letter to the Speaker dated May 1, 1953:

An inquiry of this nature is imperative. The economic policy of this Nation exercises such a profound influence on the entire free world that we must consider carefully each step we take. Changes in foreign economic policy—even those which at first have relatively slight consequences within this country—may either strengthen our allies or plunge them into a downward spiral of trade and payment restrictions, lower production, and declining living standards.

Our foreign economic policy also has important implications here at home. Declining imports will necessarily mean falling exports, resulting in a serious loss of markets for our agriculture and other industries. Expanded imports may require some adjustments in our country. We must make sure that changes in foreign economic policy consonant with our position as the world's greatest creditor nation do not benefit particular groups at the expense of the national welfare, but we must also make sure that such changes do not place unequal burdens on particular groups.

As I indicated in my previous message, the achievement of a strong and self-supporting economic system in the free world, capable of providing adequate defense against aggression and of achieving rising standards of living, must be a cooperative effort. Through increasing two-way international trade and stimulating in every practical way the flow of private investment abroad we can strengthen the free world, including ourselves, in natural and healthy ways. By so doing, we can lessen and ultimately eliminate the heavy burden of foreign aid which we now bear. Both we and our friends abroad earnestly desire to see regular trade and investment replace grant assistance.

In launching a broad-gage study into the question of what our foreign economic policy should be, I think we can prepare the way for a fuller utilization of the economic strength of the free world in the cause of peace and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, a fourth significant feature of the President's observations on this problem is his recognition that it is not only foreign trade but the investment of private capital abroad which must be stimulated. If this study commission can do its job well, its recommendations may prove to be the foundation for an expansion and growth of a free competitive society which will put totalitarian slave socialism on the defensive in the cold ideological war.

Mr. Speaker, now that this first step has been taken, we can hope that the committees to which this proposal has been referred will invest the commission with adequate authority, a clear mandate and generous financial support to the end that it will have a reasonable chance of coping with the monumental task entrusted to it.

Mr. Speaker, we may also hope that the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House, whose duty it will be to select the membership of this commission, will appoint men with vision, zeal, and energy, men who are openminded and free from preconceived prepossessions and prejudices, without axes to grind and with fervent devotion to the accomplishment of the President's objective. Not less important than the establishment of the study commission itself is the character and the ability of the men who will compose it.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues are aware that this subject is one which has absorbed a great deal of my interest and attention since becoming a Member of this body. In the 82d Congress on April 23, 1951, I introduced H. R. 3798, and in this Congress, on March 25, 1953, I introduced H. R. 4199 to create a bipartisan study commission on foreign economic policy. My colleagues are also aware that in the 82d Congress I sought to incorporate legislation of this character in the Mutual Security Acts of 1951 and 1952. I am sure, therefore, that it is no surprise to them that I should regard the President's action of May 1 as praiseworthy.

I might say to my colleagues that I have sought continuously to obtain the advice of leaders in government and in industry in furtherance of this program for the expansion of private capital investment abroad and the stimulation of international trade. It might be of some interest to the Members of the House to know that a great many of these leaders have given unqualified approval to the method of attack now proposed by President Eisenhower, namely, that of a bipartisan study commission. I refer to correspondence I have included previously in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the hearings of the Foreign Affairs Committee—pages 777–832 of the hearings on the Mutual Security Act of 1951, July 21, 1951; pages 869–881 of the hearings on the Mutual Security Act of 1952, April 28, 1952.

There is one recent letter which I believe might be of especial interest to the Members of the Congress. I refer to correspondence in April 1953 with Henry Ford II, which reads as follows:

APRIL 10, 1953.

Mr. HENRY FORD II,
President, the Ford Motor Co.,
Dearborn, Mich.

DEAR MR. FORD: Because of your recent statement on foreign trade I thought you might be interested in the enclosed copy of H. R. 4199, a bill to establish a Commission on Overseas Investment and Trade which I introduced in the House of Representatives on March 25, 1953. I am also enclosing tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing a discussion of this measure on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Dick Frost and Bill Hall, of the Detroit Board of Commerce, are familiar with the efforts I have made in the direction of breaking down barriers to trade and private capital investment overseas. In fact, the Detroit Board of Commerce sent Frost to testify before the House Foreign Affairs Committee 2 years ago when I sought to have my proposal incorporated in the Mutual Security Act.

I would appreciate very much receiving any comments you may care to make concerning this proposal.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

FORD MOTOR CO.,
Dearborn, Mich., April 22, 1953.

The Honorable GEORGE MEADER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It was thoughtful of you to send along to me a copy of H. R. 4199, a bill to establish a Commission on Overseas Investment and Trade.

I am not an expert, of course, on the preparation of legislation, but it seems to me that the bill which you have introduced, if passed, should go a long way toward providing much information on the closely allied subjects of overseas investment and foreign trade that we have sorely needed for some time.

Very sincerely,

HENRY FORD II.

I should also like to place in the RECORD correspondence I have had with the White House on this subject. In a letter to President Eisenhower on December 9, 1952, I wrote the following:

I believe our Government should seek to demonstrate the workability of free economic institutions by encouraging friendly nations needing help to create a climate in which natural economic forces and private citizens can contribute to economic development, thus minimizing the need for government-to-government grants and loans. The task of breaking down artificial barriers to private investment in overseas economic enterprises is of such magnitude as to require unusual measures if it is to be successfully undertaken. I believe that a special commission, similar to the Hoover Commission, should be created to tackle this problem.

When, with some of my colleagues I was entertained at lunch by President Eisenhower on March 19, 1953, I left with the congressional liaison officer, General Persons, a one-page memorandum entitled "Crusade in Foreign Economic Policy" which I include at this point in my remarks:

CRUSADE IN FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

MARCH 19, 1953.

Memorandum to President Eisenhower.

It is not enough to defend, resist, and contain.

We must gain the initiative, especially in the ideological contest between the free and the totalitarian economic and political philosophy.

The effective offensive against totalitarianism is the practical demonstration—not just oratory—that men free to work out their own livelihoods can and do outproduce slave citizens. The free, competitive economy, the doctrine of abundance through mass production, through new ideas and new methods, the flexible society curbed only by the intrinsic merit of man, subject to governmental rules of fair play, has flourished in America as nowhere else. What greater benefit could we confer on receptive peoples presently unable to exploit their natural resources and to raise their standard of living and promote their internal strength and stability than to export our system of equal economic opportunity? How better export that system than through the encouragement and facilitation of the overseas investment of private capital and the expansion of trade and commerce?

Since 1943 the American people have increased their investments overseas, including reinvested earnings, by only $5 billion, two-thirds of this increase being in the Western Hemisphere. Since 1940 our Government has expended from tax funds in foreign aid in excess of $82 billion (Commerce figures). The current $13 billion of private investment abroad is a national asset and forms part of our wealth and our tax base.

What restrains overseas investment and commerce? How can these restraints be removed?

This is the $64 question. Existing agencies have failed to answer it. Double taxation, tariff barriers, inconvertibility of currencies, expropriation, discrimination, indifference, or hostility to business in the personnel of the foreign service, monopolistic and restrictive trade practices of foreign cartels are a few of the many formidable,

basic policy problems which must be unraveled. An independent bipartisan commission, free from responsibility for past policies and mistakes, able to make a penetrating analysis and forthright findings and recommendations, imbued with the single purpose of promoting the free enterprise economy, should produce results.

Success cannot be assured in advance. Should contending doubts and fears, however, halt us from undertaking a plan calculated to advance so effectively the cause of the American crusade?

GEORGE MEADER.

I asked General Persons to examine the memorandum and call it to the attention of the President, which he did. I received from him the following letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 27, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: The President has read with interest your memorandum entitled "Crusade in Foreign Economic Policy" and has asked me to assure you that your thoughtful analysis of this matter will be very carefully considered. I am sure you will hear about this very soon.

With personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY,
Wilton B. Persons,
Special Assistant to the President.

After introducing H. R. 4199 to establish a commission on overseas investment and trade, I sent to General Persons a copy of the bill and excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing a discussion of it, together with the following letter:

APRIL 1, 1953.

Maj. Gen. WILTON B. PERSONS,
Special Assistant to the President,
The White House, Washington.

DEAR JERRY: I was very pleased to get your encouraging note of March 27, 1953, concerning the memorandum entitled "Crusade in Foreign Economic Policy," which I left with you on my visit to the White House for lunch.

Last week I introduced H. R. 4199, a bill to establish a Commission on Overseas Investment and Trade. A copy of the bill, tear sheets and a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and a news release describing it are enclosed.

I read in the press about the appointment of Lewis Douglas as the chairman of a committee on long-range foreign economic policy. It immediately occurred to me that the committee referred to was very similar in purpose to the Commission created by H. R. 4199.

I want to thank you for the personal attention you gave this matter and am looking forward to an opportunity to discuss it further, as indicated in your good letter.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

P. S.—Would it be beneficial for Douglas to have a statutory Commission, with funds for study and broad governmental and business representation?

On April 14, 1953, General Persons sent me a reply as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 14, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR GEORGE: I just got back to the office yesterday morning from a brief Easter recess in Florida. Your letter of April 1, together with the bill (H. R. 4199) that you introduced and a copy of your speech, were waiting for me on my desk. I read them all with great interest. I have turned them over to the people up here who are working on this problem.

We certainly appreciate your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY PERSONS
Wilton B. Persons,
Special Assistant to the President.

Mr. Speaker, the President's sensible, practical, down-to-earth approach to this most important problem of foreign economic policy should give renewed confidence to every American that the new administration will lead the way to a new era in national and international affairs. In this quiet, determined, intelligent and businesslike method of attacking complex international economic problems, without ballyhoo and without appealing but illusory propaganda, we are witnessing a new kind of American political leadership. Let us hope that the Commission will act in this same spirit and develop an intelligent, workable and effective foreign economic policy which will advance us nearer our goal of a stable but flexible free international society.

FIRST REPORT, 83D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION—RECORD AND FORECAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for 30 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the new administration under President Eisenhower has been in office about 3 months. I believe that it has been characterized by a sense of responsibility rather than by virtuosity or improvisation. It is a proper time to take stock of what has been done and to determine what is forecast for the future.

POST-STALIN PEACE HOPES

The death of Stalin marked the end of one era in the prospects for peace. We have been treated lately to more temperate language from the Soviet Union and the Communist satellites but by small evidences of an actual change of position. Whether even the softer words are dictated by internal weakness or a struggle for power between the Big Three who succeeded Stalin—Malenkov, Beria, and Molotov—the free world does not know. In any case, our real desire for peace and world settlement requires us to take at face value any Soviet overtures toward peace and world settlement while at the same time we do not slacken our efforts for the common defense of the free world and for major improvements in its economic and social position. This has been, generally, the policy pursued by the new administration and was dramatized in the President's speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16.

There has been new consideration of a four-power conference between the United States, Great Britain, and France on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other to deal with East-West frictions. The right course is to be willing to meet with the Soviet Union under fair conditions and, if it will not drag out the situation interminably as it did in Paris in 1951, to agree upon an agenda for the discussion of all major causes of friction. Such a meeting should be held under the auspices of the United Nations as the best way to inspire confidence in those nations which do not participate. The President has already pointed out that Korea is a problem of one piece with the struggle in Indochina and Malaya; that the unification of Germany is a problem of one piece with the whole security of Europe and that trade between the free world and the Communist bloc is a problem of one piece with all of world trade. On this basis, under U. N. auspices, negotiations may prove fruitful. I shall endeavor in every way to help in forwarding this kind of policy.

The Soviet Union and its satellites initiated a wave of anti-Semitic persecution with the accusations against the nine doctors in Moscow and purges in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. I introduced a resolution urging the United States vigorously to protest, worked to get the administration to issue such condemnation which President Eisenhower and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States representative to the U. N., did most eloquently, and joined in numerous protests at meetings and over radio and television. These persecutions ceased soon after Stalin's death, as suddenly as they began, but Jewish people and all Americans are not being taken in, knowing that under a Communist regime such persecutions can start, be stopped suddenly, and start again. The Communist bloc can only prove its good faith by lowering the Iron Curtain and letting the tens of thousands of Jews who wish to emigrate, most of them to Israel, to leave the Iron Curtain countries. The persecutions should certainly have persuaded any remaining muddle-headed idealists that the Soviet Union and its satellites are just another totalitarian regime like the Nazis and Fascists.

UNITED NATIONS

The U. N. remains the great world forum where words, not bullets, are exchanged, and is therefore mankind's best—perhaps last—hope for peace. The Soviet Union has made a few conciliatory gestures like not vetoing the election of a new Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjold to replace Trygve Lie, and supporting a resolution urging the end of the Korean conflict, but the false charges of germ warfare continue and there is little diminution except for the fact that the language is less strong, in the Soviet and satellite charges of warmongering.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The mutual security program remains the main support of NATO as well as of military assistance to Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, and other parts of south and southeast Asia, and to the Philippines, the Middle East, and Latin America, as well as of the economic aid and technical assistance activities of the United States. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, appropriations for this program totaled $6,031,947,750. The previous administration requested $7,600,000,000 for this program for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953. President Eisenhower's administration cut this by $1,800,000,000 and recommended $5,800,000,000.

It is proposed that the procurement of military materials for our partners overseas, known as offshore procure-

ment, will largely replace economic aid to Europe. The program is expected to concentrate technical assistance in those areas and on projects where American and other free-world business and private investment cannot do the job while at the same time a drive is made to encourage overseas private investment.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Policy of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been presiding over a series of hearings designed to develop a foreign economic policy for the United States. We have heard a good deal about the slogan of trade, not aid, and this is indeed sound. American business can do much to improve standards of living and therefore the opportunity for freedom in many parts of the free world. But the continuing high-tariff structure of the United States, the Buy American Acts, and the complexities of our customs procedures as well as the outright embargoes and quotas respecting agricultural products figuring into our export and import trade mean that we shall have to do a lot of straightening out before an appreciable amount of trade can replace aid. I have introduced legislation to extend the reciprocal trade agreements program for one year without amendment, and I am supporting the President's request for a bipartisan commission to review our foreign economic policy.

KOREA

Our whole country is deeply grateful that the exchange of sick and wounded prisoners was consummated effectively and on time—and deeply saddened by the tragic story of those who perished by primitive maltreatment of POW's and by the typically Communist holding out of thousands of others. Truce negotiations are now proceeding. A little relaxation of the previous Communist intransigence is indicated by the concession that prisoners of war who do not wish to be repatriated to North Korea and Communist China be placed in the custody of neutrals under agreed-on conditions. All our people are very anxious for a truce, but they recognize, too, that our forces in Korea must be protected and that the U. N. mission to repel aggression such as started the Korean war and to discourage aggressors is fully justified. Nor do we wish to see a truce which will only enable the Communists to fortify their position for new aggressive attacks. In fact, a new naked international aggression of the Korea type is already going on in Laos, gravely threatening Thailand, the rice bowl of south Asia, as well as Burma, India, and Pakistan. We also do not wish to see long drawn out negotiations such as we had in 1952 in Korea, which only enabled the Communists to strengthen their position and cause our troops more casualties. With these cautions in mind, we should go forward to negotiate a truce in the utmost good faith on our side and to the best of our ability.

EUROPE

There is real disquiet over the continued delay in the approval of the European Defense Community agreement, to organize an all-European—free Europe—army for defense, the means by which the German military potential may be utilized without the danger of a recurrence of German dreams of world domination. We must continue our efforts to bring about consummation of this plan, with especial emphasis on the importance in it of the German Federal Republic and of France.

The situation of France is seriously affected by continuing financial troubles and governmental instability as well as by the drain of the struggle in Indochina, estimated to cost the French people over $1,000,000,000 a year as well as thousands of casualties.

The German situation shows elements of assurance as well as elements of danger. Optimistic evidences are approval of the agreement for indemnification of Israel and for assistance to persecutees made between Israel and the German Federal Government and amounting to payments in goods of $822,000,000 over a period of 12 to 18 years, approval by the Bundestag, the lower house of the West German Parliament of the European Defense Community agreement and arrests and prosecutions of neo-Nazis by the German Federal Government. On the other hand, delay on the European Defense Community in German constitutional courts, a renewed interest in the cartelization of industry in West Germany and proposals pressed on President Eisenhower to again review the sentences of Nazi war criminals, as well as the grave injustice of returning the Krupp family's fortune are pessimistic signs. In the field of relations with Germany, progress was made in the signing of the Debt Settlement Agreement on February 27 in London which provides for the settlement of Germany's external debt involving payments of $3,270,000,000 to creditors in some 30 countries. The key to the German problem still remains the German reaction to the Soviet offers of unification of East and West Germany which are sure to come. This will be a great test for us.

NEAR EAST AND NORTH AFRICA—ISRAEL—REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

Recent months have been signalized by the continued failure to make progress toward peace treaties between Israel and the Arab States, due to the refusal of the Arab States to negotiate to resettle the Palestine Arab refugees in the Arab States and further efforts by the Arab States to impose economic strangulation upon Israel. In March Israel agreed to release $2,800,000 of blocked bank accounts of Palestine Arab refugees and has again evidenced its intention of giving full cooperation in their resettlement and of negotiating compensation for Arab properties abandoned in Israel.

Israel has also made overtures to the Arab States by subscribing to the principle of treating the Near East as a regional area and of economic and social improvement in that area.

Efforts to establish the Middle East command for the defense of this area have been bogged down due to ultranationalist sentiment in the Arab States. The current negotiations between Great Britain and Egypt regarding the defense of the Suez Canal area (not going too well now) and the increasing recognition of the importance in the defense of the area against external aggression of Israel's armed forces will determine if there is any hope for improvement this year.

Mutual Security appropriations provided $160,000,000 for assistance to refugees and for economic and technical assistance in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953. About the same amount is expected to be provided for the next fiscal year, except that this time it is likely to be in one fund to be allocated by the President and to presage a maximum effort to bring about peace in the area without, of course, impairing the security and independence of any state there. The vital strategic character of this area, with its vast oil reserves, is well known and it is essential that important United States attention be fixed on it.

SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

I urged consideration of the whole Indochina question in the United Nations with a view toward assuring that the future of the states of Indochina will be in the hands of their people and of removing any fears of foreign administration. It should be our objective in Indochina to get its people to defend their own freedom as effectively as the ROK divisions are doing in Korea.

Pakistan, the largest Moslem state and one of the largest and most important states in south Asia, has suffered serious drought during 2 years, is short 1,500,000 tons of wheat to feed its people, and has applied to the United States for assistance to acquire 1,000,000 tons. We have a great surplus of wheat in storage and I have offered legislation and have urged that we consider immediate appropriate assistance to this great friendly people. The new Prime Minister of Pakistan has expressed great friendship for the United States and a desire to work with us.

IRELAND

I have again introduced a resolution expressing the sympathy of the United States for the unification of Ireland through a free opportunity to express the Irish people's will for union by a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland under the auspices of a U. N. commission.

PUERTO RICO AND HAWAII

I have had the privilege of a visit to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in February last and have been greatly impressed with its progress, its people and its government. I believe industrialization and more efficient agriculture will enable it to turn the corner economically in five to ten years at the present rate of development.

In addressing the Commonwealth's joint session of the Legislative Assembly on Lincoln's birthday, I urged that it is a Federal Government problem to assist those seeking to migrate from the Commonwealth, to go to areas anywhere on mainland and to seek opportunities of their choice rather than to be compelled to go only to New York City because they lack friends or finances to go elsewhere in the United States. Of course, as United States citizens they have full right to seek opportunity wherever they wish throughout the United States. The Department of Labor of Puerto Rico has done remarkably well in settlement and employment activities on the mainland and should be encouraged.

I had the opportunity of voting for statehood for Hawaii which passed the House of Representatives and is now awaiting action in the Senate. Hawaii has proven its right in World War II to be a State and President Eisenhower has recommended statehood for Hawaii now.

VETERANS

Congress enacted legislation and it became law authorizing the payment of family allotments to dependents of enlisted members of the Armed Forces. The law which was due to expire April 30, 1953, was extended to July 1, 1955, and a law also was enacted covering similarly dependents of servicemen or civilians missing in war.

Liberalization of rules for naturalization of any person serving in the Armed Forces since the start of the Korean war and before July 1, 1955, has passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate. No specific period of residence within the United States or any State is required. Just so long as the service man or woman earns an honorable discharge after completing service, the naturalization so obtained remains irrevocable.

Cuts made last year in medical staffs and hospital services have been keenly felt by veterans and their families. I joined in an effort here to restore these cuts on a supplemental appropriation bill which was for the moment unsuccessful, but I shall certainly keep on trying. There is a great issue with respect to hospitalization for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. Though all agree that these are not to be classed with service-connected disabilities they ought still to be given some consideration on the same theory that Congress has provided a pension for certain veterans permanently disabled for non-service causes.

After considerable controversy about the drying up of the sources of mortgage money on GI housing loans an increase to 4½ percent allowed interest has now been ordered. The Government must give consideration to means for keeping interest rates down and mortgage money available through establishing a secondary market for mortgages, if necessary through veterans' direct loans for the purpose or other means.

RENT CONTROL AND HOUSING

Federal rent control has been extended until July 1, 1953, affecting almost 5,000,000 housing units, about one third of all rental housing units in the United States. At the same time there have been warnings from the Congress that it will not be extended again except for strictly defined defense areas in which there are actual military establishments—not including defense plants—and that local communities must arrange for their own rent-control laws. I supported Federal rent control which is vital under existing housing shortages. The Federal law, with its 20 percent across-the-board rent increase has made for higher rentals even in controlled areas than will be made by the new New York State law.

New York City is not now under Federal rent control but under State rent control. The New York State law was renewed for two years ending June 30, 1955. In the course of its renewal, however, an across-the-board 15% rent increase was included applicable to 1943 rentals which had not been increased by as much as 15% since 1943 when rents were first frozen. Though as a Federal legislator I did not have direct participation in this law which was enacted by the New York State Legislature, I nevertheless did all I could to oppose an across-the-board rent increase, and my opposition was publicly made and noted in the press.

During the struggle in the New York Legislature over rent-control renewal I introduced a bill to extend Federal rent control to New York if the State did not act. However, there are various aspects of the New York State law which require interpretation, notably the provisions entitling tenants to maintenance of services and to rent decreases if they do not get the services. Also the conditions under which a tenant who has paid some rent increase since 1943 and who has received some added facilities in return can credit such increase on the 15%.

People in my district with rent problems may receive service without charge from my congressional rent clinics about which information may be obtained by writing to me.

The Congress is in the midst of a struggle on the Federal publicly assisted low-rent housing program. The recommendations of the Administration that 35,000 units be again authorized for the coming fiscal year—which means 10,000 units for New York City—have been defeated so far. I joined with others of my colleagues in a spirited fight for these 35,000 units and I hope that they can be saved. I was successful in receiving assurances which are reflected in the reported debate that 70,000 units already under annual contributions contracts will receive the necessary appropriations to enable them to be built and occupied. This includes General Grant Houses, constituting over 1,900 units, located in our district.

For a long time I have been concerned with the grave shortage of housing for middle-income families earning $3,500 to $4,500 per year who do not qualify for public housing and who cannot afford high-priced newly built private housing. I have proposed a new plan for middle-income housing in the Middle Income Housing Act of 1953, which includes $3,000,000,000 at a 4 percent interest rate on the mortgage debt, long-term mortgage financing, low-cost operation and high loan values.

Congress passed Public Law 5 benefiting small home owners by adding $500,000,000 to the FHA's authorization for insuring home repair and improvement loans and credits.

CONSUMERS INTERESTS AND PRICES

On the whole there is not too much change since the big rise took place after June 1950. Prices of items in the cost of living are about twice what they were in 1939.

One of the major problems here is adequate protection of the consumers' interests. For that purpose I initiated a movement, joined in by 24 of my colleagues of both political parties. Together we introduced legislation seeking the appointment of a congressional committee on consumers to protect their interests.

We are fixing attention particularly on the farm price support program about which so much is heard currently.

Farmers prices and incomes have fallen but still remain over 2½ times what they were in 1939. Government price supports of farm products are very high and very complete. The worst feature of such high price supports is shown in the current situation regarding butter with the Federal Government having 150,000,000 pounds on hand taken under price support programs, while the consumption of butter has dropped by 50% due to a great extent to high prices and to some extent to margarine competition. In addition consumers have been much concerned about the embargo on the admission from abroad of cheese, butter, and other fats and oils. This embargo has complicated our foreign relations and hurt the American consumer.

TIDELANDS

One of our great natural resources is the oil under the sea close to our shores. This is particularly extensive off the coasts of Florida, Texas, Louisiana, and California, as well as other Gulf States. Potential reserves are estimated as high as 16,906,000,000 barrels, with a value of $42,265,000,000. I joined in the fight against giving the tidelands to the States and voted against the bill in the House of Representatives. The measure will probably become law, but I still believe that all efforts must be made to do all we can to sustain the principle of the right of the whole Nation to enjoy the benefits of this national resource. The Supreme Court has decided just that.

CIVIL RIGHTS

I have introduced omnibus legislation—the first time that this has been done—to deal with segregation and discrimination in employment, education, housing, transportation, and public facilities; to establish a Fair Employment Practices Commission with enforcement powers; to provide anti-poll-tax and anti-lynching laws; and to eliminate the last vestiges of segregation in the Armed Forces. I have also sought to strengthen the civil-rights enforcement activities of the Federal Government.

The dangers to our liberties arising in congressional investigations impose grave responsibilities upon the Congress. Investigations of higher education and threatened investigations of religion have properly been of grave concern to outstanding Americans. I have introduced legislation to establish a code of rules to protect witnesses and to safeguard investigations against imposition on the individual. The right of the Congress to investigate is precious to the American people, but if abused its essential worth can be nullified. Accusations directly or by implication cannot be substituted for proof, and if the rules of evidence are not followed as they would be in court charges should not be aired as facts in the absence of proof.

A considerable storm was created in the Congress early in the session by evidence of an alleged "understanding" between the New York City Police Department and the Federal authorities that the FBI would not investigate directly

charges of excessive police action. I participated in a full investigation of this matter and believe that it was most constructive in making clear that civil rights must be safeguarded for all—and particularly by the police officers charged with directly protecting them—against violence.

Announcement has been made that all schools serving families of military personnel which are operated by the Army will be completely integrated when the fall term begins.

The Supreme Court is presently considering the Thompson Restaurant case in which the Department of Justice is seeking to bring about enforcement of laws, dormant since the 1870's, the effect of which would be to eliminate discrimination against the serving of Negro patrons in restaurants in the District of Columbia. I have called on the District of Columbia Commissioners to act to eliminate all elements of District of Columbia segregation.

IMMIGRATION

At the very opening of the Congress I introduced a resolution calling for a rewriting of the McCarran Immigration Act in accordance with the very words used by the President in his campaign speeches. The President has again requested recently that the Congress rewrite the law to eliminate injustices, and I shall do everything I can to bring this about. There is certainly some ground for the expectation that the worst features of the act will be changed before long.

The dramatic escapes from behind the Iron Curtain, and United States participation in the deliberations of PICME, an international organization seeking to deal with the burdens upon free Europe of an excess of workers, have now produced recommendations by the President for the admission of 240,000 of these refugees, escapees, and surplus workers into the United States as special immigrants in the next 2 years. This is in reality a continuation of the displaced-persons program which began in 1948 and ended in 1951 and was such an outstanding success. I have joined with Senators FERGUSON, IVES, HENDRICKSON, and WATKINS in sponsoring legislation for this emergency immigration program.

SOCIAL-SECURITY PENSIONS AND TAX EXEMPTIONS

Early this session I introduced legislation to eliminate entirely the present earnings limitation of $75 monthly placed upon recipients of old-age social-security benefits. There seems little justification for the imposition of a ceiling on the earnings of those who wish to continue in gainful employment after 65, considering the $48 monthly average payments now being received.

I have reintroduced my bills to exempt from income tax the first $2,000 of pensions received by retired Federal, State, and local employees as well as my measure to give to the physically handicapped the same additional $600 income-tax exemption now granted the blind.

I have also introduced this year legislation affording income-tax relief to an estimated 9,000,000 working mothers. My bill would permit a working mother to deduct from her gross income, in computing her income tax, the necessary expenses incurred to care for her child or children under 16 while she is at work.

Hearings have already been held on the elimination of the 20-percent excise tax imposed on motion-picture admissions, but no decision has yet been reached.

BUDGET AND TAXES

The best opinion is that tax reduction and budget reduction should go together and that we cannot allow huge deficits which only go to increase the public debt—now at $1,662 per capita and to make our burdens permanent. The previous administration recommended a budget of $78,600,000,000. This was calculated to result in a deficit of $11,000,000,000. The present administration expects to bring this budget down by some $8,200,000,000. Actual expenditures estimated at $74,100,000,000 and income at $67,500,000,000 are estimated to leave a cash deficit of $6,600,000,000. Major cuts will be in defense expenditures for which the request of the previous administration was $46,300,000,000 for the ensuing fiscal year and in foreign aid.

In the perfectly proper efforts for economy we must be sure that we are not getting false economy or perpetrating injustices. Aside from defense, great savings are possible in agriculture conservation payments now costing $250,000,000 a year and in agricultural price supports for which we appropriate about $1,000,000,000 a year. Pork-barrel projects for rivers and harbors can be sharply reduced without disturbing flood control, reclamation projects, and necessary power extensions. On the other hand, the denial of Federal aid to schools and school construction, Federal aid to deserving college students, drastic cuts in Federal publicly-assisted low-rent housing and similar savings cannot be justified. There are, also, still loopholes and inequities in the income and excise tax structure which urgently need righting.

The excess profits tax on corporations expires on July 1, and the 10% increase in income tax on individuals expires on December 31. I believe that we cannot reduce taxation either by expiration of the law or otherwise until it is clear that adequate budgetary reductions can be made. I believe also that elimination of the excess profits tax and reduction of the personal income tax should move together when the time comes.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

I have introduced legislation to restore the postal services, including 2-a-day deliveries in residential areas, which were drastically curtailed by the Postmaster General's order of April 18, 1950. The Postmaster General is presently conducting nationwide studies on postal services and has already restored some of the cuts previously made. Congressional committees are also active.

I have also reintroduced my measure calling for merit promotions in the Post Office Department.

I am supporting legislation to make postal workers' salaries compatible with the requirements of the increased cost of living and with what they would earn in private business.

The House passed legislation barring high-ranking Government officials from drawing large lump-sum payments for accrued annual leave, payments which have been as high as $10,000 in individual cases. Hearings have begun on the entire question of leave for civil-service employees, including amendment of the Thomas rider by which a Federal worker can lose earned leave if he does not use it within a specified time.

I have again introduced a resolution calling for an investigation by the Congress of laws regulating the interstate operation of motor vehicles and motor carriers, auto liability insurance rates, safety and road construction and measures which the Federal Government can take in these matters. The latest figures show 38,000 fatalities and 1,330,000 personal injuries in the United States last year due to auto accidents, far more than our fatalities in Korea. This bill is receiving increasing public support.

I have again introduced the bill to allow important congressional sessions to be televised and broadcast. The demand for this opening up of the public galleries of the Congress into 15,000,000 living rooms in the country is bound to become well-nigh irresistible.

I am sponsoring again a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment on account of age. This bill has helped fix attention on a major problem in American life—the population's age increase which will almost double in 25 years the number of those over 65, many still anxious to continue productive employment.

I have introduced legislation to provide for an Office of Government Investigation to maintain a continuing watchfulness against corruption in all Government departments.

There has been established as a department of the executive branch the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, a proposal which I supported.

NEW YORK CITY

Out of a sense of outrage and humiliation at the deplorable condition to which New York City has been brought by uninspired and machine politics administrations since 1945, I announced my availability as a candidate for mayor if desired by the good government forces. I wish to emphasize here that such contribution as I can make in bringing about a new administration of New York dedicated to efficient and honorable service to New Yorkers will be made only as consistent with my responsibilities in the Congress and to the national issues which affect so vitally the people of my district. New York is the queen of America's—indeed of the world's cities—and deserves the pride, the affection, and the close cooperation of the whole Nation; it is in this spirit that I may be able to contribute to the solution of its problems.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] for 1 hour.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, in reserving an hour for today's commemoration of Poland's Constitution Day, I am following a precedent which was first established in 1912, when the 120th anniversary of Poland's adoption of the constitution was observed in the House of Representatives and continued to this day.

I, of course, shall not consume the entire hour that has been granted to me in this special order but will gladly share the time with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who would like to join in this commemorative observance and express for themselves their personal and official feelings for a stalwart, patriotic, patient, law-abiding, and God-fearing nation—the enslaved people of Poland.

Today marks the 162d anniversary of the May 3 Polish Constitution. To all Poles, this day has the celebrated meaning of our American Fourth of July. As of May 3, 1791, the adoption of a new constitution meant the granting of increased freedom for the people of Poland.

It is highly appropriate that on this anniversary, we briefly recall the imperishable spirit in Poland that has survived partitions and conquest and stood firm against all the shifting winds of history.

Because Poland's history goes back more than 1,000 years—a history resplendent with glory and sacrifice, one asks, why have the Poles added such great significance to May 3, 1791? The reasons are many. The signing of the constitution on this day meant the end of the nobility, which at the time was the ruling class of Poland. It meant that the oppressed masses of people were emancipated. This document meant that Poland was to have a constitution modeled after our own Constitution, which was adopted only 2 years earlier, and provided for three separate and equal branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. It meant that the Polish Diet—equivalent to our Congress—was to consist of two chambers: First, the Chamber of Deputies; and, second, the Chamber of Senators, with the King at its head as presiding authority. To the Poles it meant the guaranty of religious toleration; rule by the majority of citizens; secret ballots at public election; personal security. Poland was no longer to be a government of a few, but a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

This was the substance of the constitution which was approved on May 3, 1791, by the Polish Diet and Stanislaw Poniatowski, Poland's last King. It was accepted by all Poles as a symbol of democracy and liberty. This document became a guide for Poland's future.

Progressive thinkers throughout Europe hailed it as a significant step in establishing a modern political system. But the recognition of equality of all men, the proclamation of religious liberty promised in the constitution, were more than Russia, Prussia, and Austria could tolerate, so these three neighboring countries attacked Poland with full force on all sides.

Poland fell in 1795 and was partitioned, but the May 3 constitution kept the spark of spirit and hope alive in the Polish people. The constitution brought moral victory for millions of Poles who became infused with a new patriotism and love of liberty. For 127 years, the Polish people thought, planned, and plotted for their national independence. Their struggle for independence never ceased. The Poles tried to free themselves many times through insurrections which failed. Even though all of their uprisings were unsuccessful, and many Poles lost their lives, the cause of freedom was never lost. The May 3d constitution served as a beacon of political freedom and democratic government.

From the role of living in bondage, the people of Poland were restored as a republic in 1918. The dreams of Polish patriots for 127 years were realized. The new government was set up, with a few technical changes, along the lines of the constitution of May 3, 1791. Once again Poland flourished as an independent nation. Her people enjoyed the privilege of democratic living. However, the happy, glowing picture of a free and independent Poland was blotted out by World War II. First, Germany invaded Poland and enslaved its people. Then, the Russians took over and made a mockery of freedom and all the principles set forth in the May 3 constitution.

During this second world conflict, the Poles, inspired by the ideals of freedom and love of liberty, fought bravely on all battlefronts—in Africa, England, France, Italy. They fought at Narvik, on the Maginot Line, and at Monte Cassino.

And mentioning Monte Cassino—It is almost 2 years since I visited the town of Monte Cassino and I went to the very top of the mountain; I was en route to the United States from the Interparliamentary Union meeting held in Istanbul, Turkey. The ruins of the monastery, now partially restored, faced me and my thoughts reflected the heroic fighting, bleeding, and dying Polish soldiers of the Third and Fifth Divisions who crawled up its rocky slopes and valiantly sacrificed all to dislodge the Nazis who were dug in along its heights repelling the Allied advance. Monte Cassino was taken by the Polish soldiers, and it was one of the outstanding victories for the Allies in World War II.

I would like very much to emphasize that the tremendous and incredible victory of the Polish forces at Monte Cassino—the observance of which falls on the 18th of this month—had for the people of Poland a tremendous political significance, because it was there that the Allied Powers, after many unsuccessful attempts to conquer Monte Cassino, gave that opportunity, as they put it, to the Polish forces who, if they had not succeeded, would have definitely been blacklisted and been told that no promises could ever be fulfilled to them because they had failed in their given assignment to redeem themselves.

The magnitude of this accomplishment, especially after personally visiting this battleground and studying the attack plan, now outlined at the abbey, makes it more understandable why Monte Cassino will live forever as an inspiration to freedom-loving nations.

Millions of Poles gave their lives so that other people in the world might be free. They fought not only in defense of their own freedom, but also in the defense of the threatened freedom of the whole world. The western democracies assured the Polish nation repeatedly that its great sacrifices will not be in vain, and it will regain independence and freedom. The Polish nation believed in these assurances.

Unfortunately, the victorious end of World War II did not bring the richly deserved and longed-for freedom and independence to the Polish nation. Surely, freedom and independence were earned by the Poles for fulfilling a duty beyond glory. The sacrifices borne by Poland, as our ally, were not surpassed by any nation, yet she was denied her rightful place among the peoples of the world.

For this, the western democracies must bear the responsibility, since the promises given to Poland have not been kept. Regretfully, I must confess that the past administration has been a party to the betrayal of Poland at Yalta and Teheran. It agreed to turn Poland over to the Soviet sphere of interest, to Soviet bondage and complete abandonment by the western democracies.

The Polish nation under the Communist regime knows full well the tyranny of a dictator. I shall enumerate some of the changes which have taken place since the Politburo took over in Poland: the introduction of the Soviet slave-labor system for the workers; the beginning of the collectivization of agriculture; the placing at the head of the regime, and the army, well-known and experienced international Communist agents; the speeding up of the Communist indoctrination of the youth; the complete economic dependence on the State; the open fight against the church.

Today's religious persecution in Poland, trials of clergymen, arrests and deportation of bishops, are intended by order of Moscow as a preparation for transfer of Poland to the Soviet republic.

Communism having gained complete rule in Poland is now attacking the strongest outpost, which is the church. The Communists are reaching out to gain the soul of the Polish nation through persecution of religion.

Such is the reward of a once proud nation which was the first to take up arms in the cause of freedom and independence. Surely, we cannot abandon the hopes and aspirations of a freedom-loving nation. The present sad plight of the Polish people can be traced back to the mistakes made when, at Yalta and Teheran, the western powers left Poland to the fate of Russian domination. Russia, with impunity, violated all her obligations toward Poland, and now ruling over Poland indivisibly, prepares Poles as cannon fodder for the armed clash with western democracies in its endeavors to force communism throughout the entire world.

In the name of justice, is it not time for us to rectify the wrongs of Yalta and Teheran by invalidating these pacts of appeasement? President Eisenhower early this year asked the Congress to join him in repudiating secret international agreements of the past—such as Yalta—which permitted Russia to enslave other countries.

In my opinion, the repudiation of these agreements would

First. Serve notice to the Soviet Union and the world that we do not recognize Soviet Communist domination of the enslaved peoples forced into their sphere of influence.

Second. Inform the world that we are opposed to the containment policy which has acquiesced in the domination by the Soviets of so many unfortunate peoples.

Third. Reaffirm our support for the principle of self-determination.

We must be ever mindful, especially on this anniversary, of the promises of our allies concerning the Polish nation, which are: to guarantee a free, strong, and independent Poland. In formulating our policies to eradicate communism we cannot forget this unfortunate nation which is jailed behind the Iron Curtain.

The Polish people are not without hope. They are Poles—not too cheerful—but hopeful, idealistic as their forefathers have been, imbued with patriotism and a deep love of freedom. They are mindful of the spirit of their constitution of May 3.

At long last, again there is a little spark of hope for those behind the Iron Curtain but whatever hope they have must be encouraged by those from the outside. It is my belief that the death of Stalin has given a little more vigor to whatever spark has been given Poland by friends from without the Iron Curtain. But this spark must be carefully nurtured, guarded, and perhaps guided in order that subsequent events in the chain of actions or reactions carefully observed and reviewed might be an indication of the road to freedom.

Not until something concrete is observed can full hope that the spark which is now present will smoulder and become a flame of freedom.

Today, the torch of freedom is burning in the heart of every Pole and with our help and God's blessings they will not rest until the day of emancipation is at hand. Deliverance of Poland from the communistic yoke will once again give the Polish people an opportunity to live in a land of freedom and independence as was the intention of the signers of Poland's historic constitution which was adopted 162 years ago today.

I recall, in closing my anniversary remarks on this occasion, the befitting opening words of the Polish national anthem symbolizing the indomitable resistance to foreign oppression by the sons and daughters of Poland: "Poland is not yet lost while we are living."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who asked unanimous consent to extend their remarks on Poland's Constitution Day on May 3 may have their remarks follow these proceedings in sequence rather than in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so, may extend their remarks at this point and that they may have 5 legislative days in which to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is the 162d anniversary of the founding of the Polish Constitution. As we in this great country of ours broke away from the yoke of England, so the Poles of that day tried to break away from the dominance of Russia, Germany, and Austria and set up a nation of their own.

Although completely subjugated by the three nations, they united in framing a constitution and forming a democratic form of government which was very close in purpose to our own. This was an unheard of precedence in the then present European countries.

During the years of Poland's partition, Poles had many times fought for their promised liberation. Her sons have assisted Napoleon Bonaparte to fight his battles; they have fought under Russian and German flags only to find brother fighting brother. Her assistance to the Allies during the First and Second World Wars was triumphant in Italy and other parts of the world. During World War II, she had the largest army of the subjugated nations. This is especially remarkable after the destruction of the nucleus of Poland's Army at Katyn. The forced marches of Polish patriots through Russia and Asia to reach Palestine is equivalent in determination to Xenophon's march to the sea. Poland's history from the very beginning has been a continuous struggle for freedom. Her geographical position has time and time again placed her in the path of unconquered hordes bent on destroying Europe and civilization, like the Huns, Tartars, Turks, and finally the Teutonic knights in 1410 who previously tried to subjugate the Baltic countries.

In spite of Poland's position as a defender of Europe from the hordes of the East, she was continuously beset upon by those neighbors who envied her rich heritage and love for those things that are dear to our hearts in this country. Poland's continual struggle for survival, and against oppression from foreign domination have made the Poles ever conscious of their desire for freedom.

And again today we hear the resounding shouts of the pro-Nazi wanting to take away from the present Poland the territories between the Vistula and the Oder-Neise Rivers. These "Nazyphites" seeking control of the present German Government are trying to recapture by arbitration or by arms what was originally taken from Poland by force, claiming the territories to be German. What nonsense. The Poles have settled this area way before A. D. 1000. The names of the towns and villages are of Slavic origin which have remained so for centuries. They are permanent reminders of the original settlers of this area.

We have history trying to repeat itself. The nations of totalitarian design are trying to dismember what is left, if ever freed from communism, and subjugate her peoples into slavery. It is feared by the Fascist and Communist elements of Europe that the Poles if given half a chance would become a power again in Europe, with whom they would have to contend in their aims for conquering Europe or possibly the world. The only answer to a peaceful solution of this problem is a disbandment of the aggressive spirit of conquest.

The peoples fo Poland may have been swallowed, but they have by no means been digested. Their glorious history of the past and faithful attachment to their heritage will forever stimulate them on to fight for their place in Europe.

The peoples of Poland, be it behind the Iron Curtain or those scattered about the world by circumstances and not desire, love their country as no country has been loved. The love of affection that they bear toward their country, is as we bear love to the unforgotten dead; only a warm, tender heart, ideal loving, and ever passionately clinging to the thought of freedom, which can with pride, although weary, fight for the undoing that has been brought about by others.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, constitutes a landmark in the history of Poland. It is a privilege and honor to join in commemorating this historic occasion. No place could be more appropriate than these Halls of Congress, the nerve center of American constitutional democracy, to commemorate the adoption of the Polish Constitution and to pay tribute to the Polish nation and its people at home and abroad.

America and Poland have been friends for a long time and this friendship, strengthened by the crucible of time, has for decades served as a real source of mutual understanding and inspiration. America has profited immensely from this friendship.

Late in the 18th century, when our small Nation was engulfed in the Revolutionary War, Poland sent two of its gallant patriots to help us in our cause. We do not need to recount their exploits—we know them well. Their ideals and deeds became a part of our heritage long ago. Whenever Americans reflect upon the benefits of democracy and whenever they proclaim the blessings of the American way of life, they are simultaneously paying tribute to Poland's great sons of freedom, Pulaski and Kosciusko.

The contributions of Poland to America have been so great that they could almost be called inestimable. At the end of the 19th century and during the early 20th century, America's great industrial might was being created. During this period, men came from Poland to help build it. Today, the American sons of those immigrants play a large part in the sustenance and growth of this industrial order so vast and so powerful that it is regarded as a fundamental source of America's supremacy.

The contributions of these Polish immigrants and their descendants are not limited to the industrial field alone. The sons and daughters of American Poles can be found in the professional groups, serving with great merit and distinction in law, politics, education, and medicine. The significance of Poland's contribution is not fully realized, however, until we consider the contributions of Americans of Polish descent in World War II. These servicemen and women knew no sacrifice too great to bear so

that freedom might survive in its struggle against tyranny. Those who walk through the battlefield cemeteries of Iwo Jima, Normandy, and Anzio will find mute testimony to the courage and devotion of Poland's American sons to the cause of freedom.

The firm links that bind America and Poland as historic friends will not be easily separated. Forged by the unfathomable forces of history, those links of friendship have been reinforced through the years. In sentiment and spirit, the destinies of America and Poland, so long steadfast defenders of freedom and constitutional democracy, are no more inseparable than their historic friendship.

At some future time, therefore, when the world has done with its red tyranny, when iron curtains have melted into nothingness, and when man has won his natural rights, then will the Polish people be able to enjoy the freedom they so dearly love and cherish, and of which they have so long been deprived.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday marked the 162d anniversary of a momentous event in the history of Poland—the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

May 3, 1791, saw this historic document adopted by the freedom-loving people of a country now subjugated by a tyrant Russia.

The Polish Constitution is the first written democratic constitution to be adopted by a European nation and in many respects resembles the Constitution of the United States. The Polish people are proud of the constitution; it is a testament to a nation that in its existence has seen little of national freedom.

Yet while Poland was striving toward a true democracy her neighbors were plotting the destruction of the country. In 1795 Poland was partitioned out of existence by Russia, Austria, and Prussia, but the will and spirit of the Polish people could not be partitioned or defeated. The constitution of 1791 remained the symbol of freedom-loving Polish patriots; they held on to their rightful heritage and on each May 3 rededicated themselves to the vision of a free Poland.

At the close of World War I their faith was vindicated, and the long wait rewarded, when Poland was liberated and the nation reborn.

This freedom and liberation was short-lived, insofar as ages of nations are concerned, for in September 1939 the German hordes under Hitler launched an unprovoked attack upon Poland. The Polish people, true to their glorious traditions of freedom and courage, resisted the Nazi aggressors with every ounce of effort under their command.

In the face of overwhelming odds they put up their heroic defenses to protect their capital city of Warsaw. But what is courage and heroism against tanks, bombers, and machinegun fire? In spite of the lack of armor, ammunition, and weapons of war, Poland resisted for 4 long weeks of battle, but the odds were too great—Poland fell to a despotic horde. Yes; Poland fell, but in spite of the atrocities and tortures, by the Nazis upon these freedom-loving people, they fought on. They fought shoulder to shoulder with their neighbors; there were no Quislings in Poland. We shall always remember the heroic Poland of 1939.

As World War II progressed, we found Hitler and his cohorts downed in defeat, but this did not bring back the freedom to stricken Poland. While Poland was promised freedom and independence, a shadow loomed on the horizon. And as we stood by, not realizing our responsibilities as a world power and defenders of freedom, the shadow grew larger and larger. Stalin was carrying out his diabolical plot against Poland. Under a brutal campaign of terror, purges, slavery, and tyranny, Poland was subjugated to the Kremlin and its generals in Polish uniforms.

Poland is now under the domination of a communistic regime, yet the Polish people are not in themselves Communists. They are a Christian people, who have defended their Christianity throughout the ages. They will continue to do so, even now, until the last of the Communist ideals are driven out of their country.

It will be a long and uphill fight, because the flower of Polish leadership was brutally exterminated at the Katyn Forest.

As a member of the Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre, I saw and studied the voluminous evidence of the brutality of the Russian aggressor.

Despite partitions, subjugations, and Katyns, Poland's will to be free and independent lives on, although the sad events following World War II have caused much doubt and despondency for her future, but with the spirit they possess the Polish nation will again rise to its rightful place in the world. This same spirit has also been brought over to the United States by the Polish emigrant. Today the total of Americans of Polish extraction runs into large numbers. Those who came here helped to explore and settle America. They helped to develop her resources and fight her battles against a common enemy.

We have Americans of Polish background in the industrial plants of Michigan, the farms of Pennsylvania and the Plains States, and in the mines of West Virginia and Pennsylvania. They have put their skill, strength, and intelligence into the steel mills of Pittsburgh, the industries of Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee, Los Angeles, and other busy centers of these United States.

In the arts, sciences, and professions Americans of Polish extraction have also made their contribution to the culture of this Nation.

The tradition of bravery was shown to us by the actions of Kosciusko and Pulaski in serving this country during the Revolutionary War. This tradition of bravery has been shown again and again. In World War I tens of thousands of Americans of Polish descent participated. World War II saw this number rise to hundreds of thousands, and, now, in Korea, other thousands are showing a record of devoted service to the defense of our Nation.

We cannot believe that with this background of faith, devotion, willingness to fight for their rightful place in the sun, will Poland be doomed to extinction?

If the date of May 3 means anything to us, it means that in due time Poland will again emerge from under the heel of totalitarian tyranny and oppression to resume her rightful place in world affairs as a powerful, freedom-loving, and peaceful nation.

God grant that this restoration will come soon.

I ask unanimous consent that I may insert here a copy of the remarks made by me at Belle Isle in Detroit on Sunday, May 3d, on the occasion of the celebration of the Polish Constitution by thousands of loyal and patriotic Americans.

The 3d day of May is to the Poles what the Fourth of July is to the Americans, a day on which they look with pride to the glorious past of that gallant nation and to the rich heritage which has been passed on to generation upon generation of Poles.

It was on May 3, 1791, 162 years ago, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own American Constitution, that Poland, without a bloody revolution or internal disorder, succeeded in adopting a constitution based on the sovereignty of the people in the state.

And this torch of true liberalism, so alike to our very own Constitution, was lit in an atmosphere of tyranny and absolutism of its two powerful and greedy neighbors, Russia and Germany.

So that we may understand this better, let me quote to you just one typical sentence from that constitution, which so clearly shows that the Poles and the Americans drew their philosophy of government from the same source:

"All power in civil society shall be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

We look with pride to those words as an indication of the true democracy and liberalism which has always exemplified the Polish people.

It is true that the bright dawn of the 3d of May, 1791, did not last long. Within 4 years thereafter the brutal and evil forces of Russia and Prussia, unable to tolerate such progressive thinking, crushed the Polish Nation.

But meditation on the glory and significance of this anniversary deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. And to every American, regardless of national origin, it is a reminder of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind and prophesies the ultimate certain triumph of justice over brutal force.

Poland today suffers under an even more brutal slavery than it did at the end of the 18th century. Perfected methods of torture introduced by the most hideous tyranny in the history of mankind, are stifling all phases of Polish national life. And yet, let it be said to the everlasting glory of that valiant nation, their spark of resistance to oppression and tyranny has not and never will die. No true Pole ever has or will, come what may, lose his faith in God Almighty and in the spirit of justice that freedom must again return to Poland.

What gallant example of that we have in the person of Lt. Franciszek Jarecki, who despite terrific handicaps, which might seem unsurmountable to an ordinary person, flew a Russian MIG to freedom to help the cause of the free nations against Communist imperialism.

He did not wait for any hundred thousand dollar bonus, or for any promise of favor or other consideration. It was only his burning love of freedom that spurred him on. The only reward he seeks is the return of liberty and freedom to his suffering people. I hope and pray that his sacrifice, as that of the thousands of gallant Polish officers who gave their lives in unmarked mass graves in the forests of Katyn, rather than to bow their knees to Communist slavery, that their sacrifices may not be in vain.

Poland was our first and most loyal ally in the struggle against totalitarian despotism. But we have never truly appreciated that fact. We must admit, in all fairness, that by our toleration of evil, by our compromises of principle for the sake of expediency, we share in the blame for the toleration of the conditions which brought about the suppression of freedom in Poland.

And yet we still continue to hedge and hesitate in undoing the wrong that everyone knows and admits has been done to the Polish nation. The people of Poland today are tired of hearing bare words of comfort. God knows they have heard many in the past and they have done nothing to lighten their plight.

But we still continue to recognize the Communist regime in Poland, dominated by Moscow, even though we know and admit that it is not an expression of the will of the Polish people, and that it is a threat to our own way of life. It is difficult for our loyal friends, the people of Poland, to understand that their best friends, the Americans, still regard their masters and slave drivers to be their duly constituted representatives.

The continued recognition of the Communist regime in Poland is a grave political mistake. Only by withdrawal of that recognition, by a forthright and clear stand that we will not recognize the Communist grab of Polish independence, can we prove our sincerity and gain the confidence and trust of our true friends, the common people of all Europe and Asia who long for a rebirth of honesty, decency, and fairness in international diplomatic relations.

God grant that the day may soon be here when a free Polish people may join hands with a free American people and with free people throughout the world to rejoice in a true and everlasting peace based on the highest and most noble concepts of justice and liberty for all.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues today to commemorate the 162d anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution. May 3 has always been celebrated as a holiday in the minds and hearts of the Polish people since 1791. On this memorable day, the Polish people proclaimed the most dynamic document ever devised for a government in Europe. This sacred constitution expressed the genius and tradition of the Polish people. Patterned after the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence, it established a parliamentary government, insured religious freedom, promoted the dignity of man, and secured free speech and other human liberties based upon its historical background.

One hundred and sixty-two years have passed since the adoption of the Polish Constitution. One hundred and sixty-two years of pain and suffering for the people of Poland. Poland's suffering will live forever—symbolic of the struggle of man against the forces of oppression. Poland's name signifies to the world emancipation from human bondage. It is a day of liberty and justice, not only for Poland, but for all mankind.

One hundred and sixty-two years ago there burned in the hearts of the Polish people that same love for freedom that remains alive today. The Polish people know oppression—have known it for many centuries. On this anniversary of the birth of freedom in Europe, it is proper to give some thought to the plight of the Polish people.

America has always befriended the small nations of the world. To Poland, we owe a lasting debt of gratitude; first, because it is the land of our earliest benefactors; second, because it was brave Poland that first accepted the challenge of Hitler's Nazi hordes. For her heroism shall Poland remain under the ruthless heel of the Soviet Union? Must she remain subjected to a nation whose ideologies are foreign to the Christian beliefs of the Polish people?

We should have some concern for Poland's welfare, just as Kosciusko, Pulaski, and other Polish patriots had concern for America.

As a nation dedicated to freedom—recognizing the blessings of liberty, as we do—America should exhibit the liveliest concern in the welfare of Poland and all small nations who were given such hope by the Atlantic Charter. The Atlantic Charter assured all nations that—

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial, or otherwise.

2. They desire no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

3. They respect the rights of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live; and, they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

What is our duty? What is our obligation to the Polish people? Here is our duty and our obligation too: It is our duty and obligation to regain Poland's independence as a debt of gratitude for her resistance to Hitler's aggression. It is our duty to repudiate the Yalta agreement, which gave Russia title to the territorial limits of Poland. We are obligated to restore freedom for the Polish people—that freedom which has been completely suppressed by the Soviet Union. We cannot stand idly by and watch the gradual Sovietization of all Polish institutions. We cannot permit the school system, youth organizations, trade unions, colleges and universities, churches, and even governments to become mouthpieces for the Soviet war machine. We must help the hundreds of thousands of people who have been arrested and deported to the salt mines of Russia for such petty offenses as expressing privately their displeasure with the brutal crushing of Poland's freedom. We must take action, affirmative action, against the Russian attack against the Catholic Church and other faiths. In order to preserve the friendship of the Polish people—that friendship cemented in the blood of our people since the Battle of Savannah, where General Pulaski gave his life for America's freedom—the United States should withdraw its diplomatic recognition of the ruthless agents selected by the late Stalin to be his puppets in Warsaw.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to keep faith with the Polish people, if we are to keep our solemn pledges, we should immediately sever our diplomatic relations with the present puppet government of Poland, thereby demonstrating to the Polish people that the United States does not approve of Yalta and Teheran, that we do not approve of the terrorist regime, illegally subjugating the freedom of the Poles and, by the same stroke, reaffirm our belief in the principles of freedom and justice which we have cherished in the past.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, 162 years ago, a great, yet most unfortunate nation, adopted its most liberal constitution, designed to guide Poland in the years to come. While the Bill of Rights became ratified in New York City in 1791, in Warsaw's Diet—Parliament—a great and noble new bill came into effect, known to every Pole as the Constitution of the 3d of May.

In its principles it was a document equal to the Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights. The new Polish constitution converted Poland into a hereditary limited monarchy, with great ministerial responsibilities and a duennial Parliament. It abolished Poland's evil liberum veto of the old system, which had enabled Russia and Prussia to partition Poland. All class distinctions were removed and franchises were granted to towns. Serfdom was mitigated and absolute religious tolerance established. Every citizen was declared equal before the law. Under the constitution:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of all people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The idea of good will and the sense of value for the neighbor was expressed in the truly Christian document permitting the admittance of newcomers into Poland. They were at liberty to exercise their trade and industry on equal basis with those who had lived on Polish soil for generations.

Unfortunately, Poland did not enjoy for long the fruits of its constitution. Mainly because of selfishness and despotism on the part of Tsarist Russia, and also because of an internal betrayal, known as the Targowica, Poland lost its independence to become once again a subjugated nation. She regained her liberty only once in those 162 years, from 1918 to 1939, and became one of the leading powers in the heart of Europe, and for a short time her people adhered

to the principles of the constitution laid down by their forefathers in 1791.

"It's a hundred times more beautiful to die for your fatherland, than to stay alive, chained in handcuffs," wrote Stefan Zeromski, Poland's great writer. Ever since Poland came into being, the theme of Zeromski's philosophy, written at the turn of this century, has been the spirit of every Pole. The Polish people have known how to die for their independence, they have learned it the hard way. Poles have fought off hordes of Tatars and Cossacks in the 11th and 12th century. In the 15th century Poland defeated the Germans at Tannenberg and King Warnenczyk fell at the Warna River in Hungary, where he came to repel the Turks. Poles are noted for having fought in many foreign armies always to manifest their love for freedom and liberty and that is what marks the Polish history throughout. In 1779, Gen. Casimir Pulaski fell here on our soil, where he had come together with General Kosciusko to help America win the war for independence. General Kosciusko's fight for freedom did not stop here. He goes back to Poland and with a handful of armed peasants he defeats the Russians in the Battle of Raclawice. At the same time thousands of Poles are marching along with Napoleon's army, in the belief that the Emperor will help to establish an independent Poland. Gen. Henry Dabrowski forms his famous Polish legion in Italy, and General Sulkowski follows Napoleon as far as Egypt. Other Polish soldiers scatter the battlefields of Samo Sierra, Wagran, Austerlitz, and Moscow. In 1849, a Polish legion under General Behm fights in Hungary for that country's independence. During World War I Marshal Pilsudski forms his first brigade in Austria and starts its long march deep into Poland. At the same time in France, General Haller commands a large Polish Army, which fights alongside with the armies of the coalition.

Yes, wherever there is a fight for liberty and the safeguarding of any borders involved, Polish soldiers can be found. None of them has ever fought any aggressive war, but always in the defense of his own soil or that threatened by foreign aggression.

In 1939 Poland took once again to arms. Attacked from one side by Hitler's mighty armies, and 17 days later stabbed in the back by the Red army, hundreds of thousands of Poles left their defeated country only to continue the battle from abroad. Poles participated in all major battles. With only an expeditionary force they fought hard at Narwick, Norway. They defended the fortress of Tobruck in Libya for over 9 months. The glory of the Polish airmen, fighting the battle of Britain became famous throughout the world, as did the 2d Polish Corps fighting in Italy under General Anders. Its trace along the Italian Peninsula marks glories achieved in the battles of Monte Cassino, Ancona, Bologna, and numerous other Italian localities. Meanwhile in Poland, the Polish home army causes severe blows to the German occupants. The insurrection in Warsaw, which was held for some 62 days, and lost only because the Soviet army stationed across the Vistula River, did not keep its promise to come to the rescue. Both in Germany and in the Soviet Union, slave labor camps and camps of concentration are flooded with hundreds of thousands of Poles. In Soviet Russia alone nearly one million Poles have perished, among them an estimated group of 15,000 army officers, slaughtered in the Katyn Forest.

When on V–E Day the world was cheering the end of World War II, only the Poles began to mourn. Although their country was liberated from the Germans, it was being overrun by the Russians, who brought with them a puppet government. In accordance with the Yalta agreement, Russia grabbed one half of Poland's territory, ruling the rest with a power unknown for any aggressor.

"As long as we are alive, Poland is not lost," says the Polish anthem.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that as long as there is a heart beating in each one of the 6 million Americans of Polish origin, and of those, many other Poles who have not yet succumbed to the Soviet brutality, Poland can hope for the day of her liberation, when once again the Polish people will be able to celebrate May 3d on their own soil.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrated a Polish national holiday which their compatriots in that unhappy land cannot do—the 162d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish May 3 Constitution.

Americans of Polish descent know that millions of freedom-loving Poles behind the Iron Curtain are making a mental note of this day, longing for the time of liberation, when freedom will once more come to Poland.

The adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791 was the result of the devoted effort of a small group of patriotic, dauntless and farsighted men of vision who dared to draft and to present to their country such a document of freedom. This constitution was significant in that it guaranteed freedom of religion and in many other ways was the vanguard of freedom everywhere.

It was this spirit that led those men of ideals and similar views such as Pulaski and Kosciusco to fight side by side with our own patriots to throw off the yoke of oppression and to attain our own freedom. Three of the greatest documents in history are the Polish Constitution of 1791, the French Constitution of 1792, and our own great Constitution of 1787.

These ideals of freedom and the culture which is the rich heritage of the Polish people have made their impact on American traditions.

We Americans know how much our own Constitution means to us, not only because it is the safeguard of our own freedom, but because it proclaims to the world the meaning of American citizenship. We can understand the emotions of loyal citizens of traditional Poland and their friends and relatives in this country, many of whom are now equally loyal Americans, over the symbolic meaning of Poland's Constitution Day.

Although today Poland is suffering under a godless dictatorship which has not only nullified that first Polish Constitution which gave freedom of religion to a devout people but has made a mockery of justice, freedom will once more come to Poland. Individual liberty and dignity will replace indignity, brute force and slavery.

On this Polish Constitution Day let us extend to these unhappy people the hand of fellowship, assuring them of our interest in their welfare and of our desire to assist them in any way we can when such assistance may become effective.

Let us look forward with them to a happier day and share with them the commemoration of this anniversary in which all Americans and all freedom-loving people all over the world may join in the hope and prayer for that day of deliverance when once again the people of Poland can breathe the sweet, fresh air of freedom under constitutional law and order.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this is the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, and it is with the most ardent admiration for a will that is steadfast and unswerving that I offer my words of congratulation to the friends of Poland's freedom. Perseverance in the face of this abysmal and disastrous condition which the Polish people have suffered under the yoke of Soviet domination is indeed worthy of the highest praise and support, and the occasion of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland emphasizes the direction and the will to strive toward independence and liberation.

In our troubled and divided world of today it is well to stop and look at a poignant phrase in that constitution which echoes the cause of democracy and for which we are all willing to give our lives:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It cannot but help to prove useful to pause on this day and devote our whole thought to the meaning in these lines, and by their thought strengthen the will to realize them and bring them into being all over the world.

FIRES OF FREEDOM BURN BRIGHTLY IN POLAND

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I would like to take note of an anniversary which is of great significance and importance in the long and unending struggle of mankind for freedom and liberty.

I refer to the 162d anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, which occurred May 3, and which was appropriately commemorated in various places in my district, and in the districts of many of my colleagues from a number of States. I am pleased to note that today it is receiving more than merely perfunctory attention, as it should, in the Halls of this Congress.

The day that the people of the free world join with those of Polish blood the world over in proudly remembering harks back to May 3, 1791, when the Constitution of Poland was adopted. I ask you to note that this date was barely 2 years after the ratification of our own Constitution. It is of particular inter-

est, too, of course, that this fundamental law for the people of Poland was adopted with the consent of King Stanislaus Augustus, and it is noteworthy to point out, too, that the Polish people and their sovereign were unswerving in taking this step in behalf of the rights of freemen, despite the displeasure which it caused in the sphere of influence of the Czar of all the Russias.

Since that time, the people of Poland have shared many joys and they have endured many sorrows. Today, when they should be reaping the just rewards of victory in a war in which their country was overrun by two aggressors, but in which they valiantly carried on as allies under the inspiration of their own government in exile, they are suffering from the humiliation and the frustration which is inevitable under the temporary conditions of a puppet Communist government that makes their country the cat's-paw of Soviet imperialism.

The spirit of free Poland is exemplified, not only by the event of May 3, 1791, which we commemorate as Polish Constitution Day, but also by the bravery and intrepidity of Franciszek Jarewski, the young Polish aviator who flew his jet plane to asylum from Iron Curtain domination, and who now is reported as seeking to come to the United States in the hope that he can join our Air Force.

There are millions of Franciszeks back in Poland. The fires of freedom burn brightly in Poland. They are as campfires to warm and comfort those who rest on their arms, waiting for the call to unite in efforts by freedom-loving men and nations to confound aggressors and bring peace to the world.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, Poles the world over and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate the anniversary of Poland's great constitution of 1791.

The ideas contained in this noble document were filled with too much strength and too much hope to die with the nation state after Poland's enemies had swallowed up all her territory in 1795. Elements of democracy had taken root in Poland at the early day, and once implanted in the Polish soil, they were not easily uprooted, whatever the power of the oppressor. For generations, the ideas of the constitution of 1791 remained strong, flourishing finally into a great and lasting tradition, expressing the Polish desire for freedom, independence, and constitutional democracy.

Despite that tradition and that desire, freedom has been completely suppressed in Poland today under the heel of a Soviet puppet government. The period of gradual sovietization of all Polish institutions has now been concluded. The army is in the hands of the Soviet Marshal Rokossovsky who runs it with the help of several thousand Soviet officers of all grades, parading in Polish uniforms, but not speaking the Polish language. The school system, the youth organizations, the trade unions, universities and colleges, have been made parts of the Soviet machine. The determined attack aimed at the Catholic Church has now been extended to all faiths and has resulted in the imprisonment of several hundred clergymen from all denominations.

While communism has consumed the territory and the institutions of Poland it has not, nor shall it ever consume the Polish people. In this people, the traditions of 1791 and the love of freedom is too great for them to accept as a permanent situation their present forced attachment to the Red empire. All freemen look upon this enslavement of Poland with a deep and moving sympathy for her people, and in the prayers of all there is the hope that one day Poland will again be free.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a letter from the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, together with a proclamation designating May 3, 1953, as Polish Constitution Day, which express the true esteem and affection of the people of Michigan for the enslaved peoples of Poland and our determination to work unceasingly for their liberation and freedom which we all love so dearly:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Lansing, April 29, 1953.

Hon. JOHN DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: The enclosed proclamation designating May 3, 1953, as Polish Constitution Day in Michigan is meant to express our appreciation to the Polish people for the creative energy and productiveness they have contributed to the general welfare and progress of our State and Nation, both in war and peacetime.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

On Sunday, May 3, 1953, Americans of Polish descent will join with their Polish brethren throughout the free world in commemorating a great Polish anniversary—the 162d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

This historic document was the first European constitution to equalize the rights of all citizens and is one of history's great landmarks of human freedom.

Although the political independence proclaimed by the constitution of 1791 was shortlived, the magnificent spirit of liberty, for which the Polish people stand, did not die. It has lived on despite the dark days that have come to the people of that land. It has lived on in the hearts of a people who have fought on many a battlefield and given of their treasure, their blood, and their lives for their own freedom and the freedom of other peoples.

We in America share with the Polish people this tradition of independence. Actually, our own dream of independence came true in no small measure because freedom-loving Poles such as Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciusko shared the trials and sacrifices that gave us victory at Yorktown.

This year the Warsaw regime has forbidden the celebration of Polish Constitution Day in the Polish homeland. Since the Polish people in Poland are not free to recognize their own great symbol of freedom at home, it is all the more fitting and proper that all Americans and all freedom-loving peoples join with the people of Polish descent everywhere in the free world to celebrate Polish Constitution Day.

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim Sunday, May 3, 1953, as Polish Constitution Day in Michigan, and urge all of our people to join with and assist their fellow citizens of Polish descent in their aspirations for freedom, fervently praying that their homeland will soon be free of Communist tyranny.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this 27th day of April 1953.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

C. J. CLEARY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1791, is a memorable date in the history of Poland which is most dear to all people of Polish descent. It was on that day, exactly 162 years ago, that the Polish Constitution was adopted, and this great document has since then become a landmark in the development of constitutional government.

On this anniversary, I am happy to join with all freedom-loving people in commemorating this eventful day. These are times when we should apply the lessons of that great document of democracy, human rights, social justice, and religious toleration. The desire for freedom and democracy is even stronger today than it was more than a century and a half ago when this notable document was brought forth by the Polish people as a charter of liberty.

Unfortunately, the people of Poland cannot celebrate this anniversary in a free Poland today. They are behind the Iron Curtain where freedom is not tolerated and democracy has been perverted in its meaning and purpose. Only the hope of a better day in the future and the moral support of their friends in the United States and elsewhere encourages them to continue their struggle against slavery and oppression.

In the State of New York we number many thousands of proud men and women who were immigrants from Poland or are descended from Polish immigrants. They are loyal citizens, hard-working, appreciative of what America has given them in the way of true democracy and freedom. They have not forgotten their kinsmen in Poland, and they are constantly hoping and praying that their sufferings will end soon and Poland will again rise as a free nation.

On this occasion, I wish to extend my greetings to all Americans of Polish descent and to join them in the fervent wish that Poland's delivery from her oppressors will not long be delayed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the history of Poland has been one of alternate enslavement and freedom. At present this unhappy country is under the Communist yoke but its long tradition of freedom will not be forgotten.

I append hereto a memorandum from the Polish American Congress commemorating Poland's Constitution Day, the Polish national holiday. I commend it to my colleagues:

MAY 3, THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3 Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3, in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then, as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tryranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795 Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of naziism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish 3d of May Constitution this liberalism fas formulated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernable throughout the 3d of May Polish Constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Meditation on the anniversary of May 3 deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and her territory by one of our former allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. NORBLAD), for 3 days, on account of official business.

Mr. HOWELL (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL), for 3 days, commencing with May 5, on account of official business.

Mr. VELDE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of the week, on account of official committee business.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL), for 3 days, on account of official business.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. KLEIN), for Tuesday, May 5, 1953, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MACK of Washington).

Mr. GROSS and to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. PRESTON and to include extraneous matter in the remarks he will make today on the State-Justice appropriation bill.

Mr. METCALF in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHUFORD and to include an address by Stephen A. Mitchell.

Mr. BATES and to include an address.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include telegrams, testimony, and extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YOUNG (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOPE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLLEFSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCUDDER and to include a resolution.

Mr. MORANO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a statement he made last night on Federal taxes.

Mr. NORBLAD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NICHOLSON and to include an editorial from a paper and the answer thereto.

Mr. WEICHEL.

Mr. HOWELL (at the request of Mr. HART).

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. MULTER) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a story on the Warsaw Ghetto, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $378.

Mr. CHUDOFF and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOYKIN in three instances.

Mr. BYRD and to include extraneous material.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include a study on emergency strikes taken from the Pittsburgh Press.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include a partial statement of Mr. John L. Lewis before the Senate Health and Welfare Committee.

Mr. MARSHALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include a resolution.

Mr. DONOVAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include a statement.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THORNBERRY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER in six instances.

Mr. PHILLIPS and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) to revise and extend remarks she made earlier today and to include some telegrams.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 6, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

676. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting part I of the report on examination of Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 141); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

677. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 22d Quarterly Report, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular affairs. House Joint Resolution 121. Joint resolution for admitting the State of Ohio into the Union; without amendment (Rept No. 343). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2512. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites", approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2312. A bill to repeal Public Law 820, Eightieth Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold"; without amendment (Rept. No. 345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1, certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2315. A bill to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2317. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4554. A bill to retrocede to the State of Oklahoma concurrent jurisdiction over the right-of-way for United States Highways 62 and 277 within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 5001. A bill to establish the Office of Commissioner of Refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. R. 5002. A bill to provide low interest rate loans for repair of damage caused by major disasters in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 5003. A bill to provide that newspapermen shall not be required to reveal the sources of their information in Federal courts, before Federal grand juries, or before committees of Congress, except in certain cases where disclosure is found by the court to be necessary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 5004. A bill to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by working mothers in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5005. A bill to improve the efficiency of the United States civil service; to deny benefits, under the civil service and other retirement systems, to persons convicted of certain felonies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 5006. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to promote and encourage the construction, and to expedite the financing from private sources, of vessels suitable for use in the foreign and domestic trade of the United States, and for defense purposes, and to encourage the maintenance of shipyards and to preserve the supply of skilled shipyard workers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 5007. A bill to prescribe certain limitations with respect to out-patient dental care for war veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 5008. A bill to provide that a claim for credit or refund in respect of income taxes shall be considered filed at the time deposited in the United States mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 5009. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the metropolitan area of Chicago, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 5010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a deduction for certain expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer for his own education or for the education of any other person; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5011. A bill to provide credit in the automatic grades of the postal field service for past service in the case of certain persons reappointed to positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 5012. A bill to establish a conclusive presumption of service connection in certain cases of active pulmonary tuberculosis and multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5013. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office garage building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5014. A bill to provide for the extension and remodeling of the Terminal Annex Post Office at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 5015. A bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to certain volunteer firemen injured while performing duty as firemen on real property under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5016. A bill to amend sections 502 (1) and 507 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in order to identify the drug known as aureomycin by its chemical name, chlortetracycline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 5017. A bill to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 5018. A bill to simplify and make uniform the customs procedure to be followed in the case of certain pleasure craft arriving in the United States by sea from a contiguous country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5019. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide a flexible duty on the importation of lead and zinc so as to stabilize the domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 5020. A bill to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5021. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to send simulated court process in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5022. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide more liberal income tax treatment for amounts paid for medical care, including amounts paid for hospitalization insurance and amounts paid under a voluntary plan for free-choice or group medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5023. A bill to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radio call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas requesting Congress to remove the Federal Government from the field of motor-fuel taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact an accelerated amortization law permitting industries which make antipollution installations to amortize them at an accelerated rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 5024. A bill for the relief of Maud Claer Wahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5025. A bill for the relief of Paul G. Kendall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 5026. A bill for the relief of Georgios Voutsenos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 5027. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Tyrrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5028. A bill for the relief of Petra Ruiz Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5029. A bill for the relief of Marcelo Maysonet Mirell and Maria Benitez de Maysonet Mirell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 5030. A bill for the relief of Salim Jacob Mocallem and Aziza Mocallem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 5031. A bill for the relief of Ishmael Rodriquez Chaves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5032. A bill for the relief of Jesus Dosamantes Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5033. A bill for the relief of Maria Del Refugio Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 5034. A bill for the relief of Roy Mirt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5035. A bill for the relief of Leiser, Rachela and Enoch Lampart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5036. A bill for the relief of Leiser Weitman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5037. A bill for the relief of Chahine Ohannes Khosrofian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (by request):

H. R. 5038. A bill for the relief of Anwar Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 5039. A bill for the relief of Wolfgang Tyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 5040. A bill for the relief of Maria Lanau Bull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

228. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of constituents of Sharptown, Mardela Springs, and Riverton (Wicomico County), Md., relative to proposed legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over radio and television and in our magazines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

229. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Board of Estimate of the City of New York, opposing and deploring any curtailment or reduction of Federal funds for the construction of low-income housing in the city of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

230. Also, petition of Kenneth Clark and other employees of Onondaga Pottery Co., Onondaga, N. Y., relative to inroads being made by imported china on American production of china and requesting laws that will protect their jobs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

231. Also, petition of Sueto Taguchi and 395 others, Kumamoto Junior College, Kumamoto, Japan, requesting release of the Japanese people who are serving prison terms as war criminals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 1953

Father Timothy L. McDonnell, S. J., of the University of San Francisco, Calif., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, to let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress, and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the acquisition of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate the blessings of equal liberty. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 5, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 270. An act to provide for the control and extinguishment of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 490. An act to authorize the use of the Sackets Harbor Military Cemetery for the burial of war and peacetime veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 734. An act for the relief of Mihai Handrabura;

H. R. 738. An act for the relief of the widow and children of the late John L. LeCours;

H. R. 778. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.;

H. R. 837. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. James D. Wilmeth;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of William H. Lubkin, Jr.;

H. R. 898. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Kaczmarczyk;

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani;

H. R. 1211. An act for the relief of Isak Benmuvhar;

H. R. 1383. An act to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes not exceeding $500, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1563. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1571. An act to amend the Alaska game law;

H. R. 1772. An act for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman;

H. R. 1812. An act relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management;

H. R. 1901. An act for the relief of Ciro Picardi;

H. R. 1904. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke;

H. R. 1905. An act for the relief of Montgomery of San Francisco, Inc.;

H. R. 2034. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Samuel E. McMillan;

H. R. 2237. An act to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act;

H. R. 2761. An act to revive and reenact the act of December 21, 1944, authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., as amended;

H. R. 2813. An act for the relief of William E. Aitcheson;

H. R. 2815. An act for the relief of Floyd C. Barber;

H. R. 2832. An act to authorize Federal aid with respect to the costs of constructing that portion of an approved hospital project which was commenced without Federal participation and prior to January 1, 1953;

H. R. 3446. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm;

H. R. 3733. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder;

H. R. 3823. An act for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner and Lula Stanley Beckner;

H. R. 4072. An act relating to the disposition of certain former recreational demonstration project lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia to the School Board of Mecklenburg County, Va.;

H. R. 4285. An act for the relief of Arthur Staveley;

H. R. 4471. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton;

H. R. 4779. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.;

H. R. 4074. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to permit the entry of 500 children under 6 years of age, adopted by United States citizens while serving abroad in the Armed Forces of the United States, or while employed abroad by the United States Government; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow for the purpose of attending the funeral of the late former Senator Robert F. Wagner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GREEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and for the remainder of the week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOLLAND was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and Friday.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

FLUORIDATION OF WATER—RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND STATE DENTAL SOCIETY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Rhode Island State Dental Society, reaffirming its endorsement and approval of fluoridation of community water supplies.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the fluoridation of community water supplies has been demonstrated to reduce the incidence of dental decay among children by approximately two-thirds; and

Whereas the complete safety of fluoridation has been repeatedly demonstrated in extensive scientific research; and

Whereas fluoridation has been recommended and endorsed by all major national health organizations of the United States including the American Dental Association, the American Medical Association, the National Research Council, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, and many others; and

Whereas certain individuals and groups whose motives are most difficult to understand have been attempting to delay and forestall the fluoridation of community water supplies through the spread of rumors and erroneous and misleading information: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Rhode Island State Dental Society in session here today hereby reaffirms its endorsement and approval of fluoridation of community water supplies and urges that fluoridation be adopted in all communities in the State of Rhode Island as rapidly as local conditions will permit; and be it further

Resolved, That the Rhode Island State Dental Society hereby go on record commending the excellent efforts of the local, State, and Federal Departments of Health for their enlightened efforts to make the benefits of fluoridation available to all children in all communities of the State of Rhode Island; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Dennis J. Roberts, Governor of the State of Rhode Island; to Dr. Edward A. McLaughlin, director, Rhode Island Department of Health; to each Senator and Representative from Rhode Island serving in the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Honorable Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States; and Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

Dated at Providence, R. I., this 21st day of April A. D. 1953.

RHODE ISLAND STATE DENTAL SOCIETY,
ALLYN F. SULLIVAN, D. M. D., *President.*
NICHOLAS G. MIGLIACCIO, D. M. D.,
Secretary.

PUBLIC HOUSING—RESOLUTION OF MINNEAPOLIS (MINN.) MINISTERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Minneapolis Ministers' Association, Minneapolis, Minn., on March 2, 1953, relating to the continuation of public housing.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRACE LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY CHURCH,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 29, 1953.

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Because Congress is considering the matter of public housing, I know that you will be interested in the following expression of opinion. At the regular meeting of the Minneapolis Ministers' Association on Monday, March 2, 1953, this resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the Minneapolis Ministers' Association go on record favoring the retention of public housing under the present type of public-housing authorities."

The Minneapolis Ministers' Association is the organization of Protestant ministers of this city and immediate suburbs. There are about 600 Protestant ministers in this area.

The Reverend Otto J. Magnuson, of Bethel Lutheran Church, 1115 30th Avenue North, Minneapolis, is the secretary of the association. However, I was appointed to represent the association in presenting this resolution to the State legislature and to Members of Congress.

On behalf of the association, I urge you to support the cause of public housing. You well know the poor housing conditions in sections of Minneapolis and the human need it involves. We are hopeful that the Glenwood project can be started in the near future, as the planning has been done and it is a feasible enterprise.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very sincerely,
JAMES P. CLAYPOOL,
Pastor.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 1839. A bill to amend section 32 of the Fire and Casualty Act, so as to provide that an agent or solicitor may secure a license to solicit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia under that act without taking the prescribed examination, if he is licensed under the Life Insurance Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1840. A bill for the relief of Victor Sorich (Vijekoslav Soric);

S. 1841. A bill for the relief of Carlo (Adiutore) D'Amico; and

S. 1842. A bill for the relief of Izidor Lerner, Maria Lerner, and Esther Lerner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 1843. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain property of the United States Government (in Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.) to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1844. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy J. Williams, widow of Melvin Edward Williams; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1845. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ian Yung-cheng Hu; and

S. 1846. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Neapolitakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1847. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to continue to utilize the services of local and State committees established under such act, to require that the services of such committees be utilized in carrying out farm price support and crop insurance programs, and to provide for the election of such State committees by the members of county committees; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1848. A bill to further amend the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF IMMUNITY PROVISION AFFECTING WITNESSES BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 16) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 16, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—PRINTING OF BILL

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries, be printed showing the Senate amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 270. An act to provide for the control and extinguishment of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 490. An act to authorize the use of the Sackets Harbor Military Cemetery for the burial of war and peacetime veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 1383. An act to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes not exceeding $500, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1571. An act to amend the Alaska game law;

H. R. 1812. An act relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management; and

H. R. 4072. An act relating to the disposition of certain former recreational demonstration project lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia to the School Board of Mecklenberg County, Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 734. An act for the relief of Mihai Handrabura;

H. R. 738. An act for the relief of the widow and children of the late John L. LeCours;

H. R. 778. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.;

H. R. 837. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. James D. Wilmeth;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of William H. Lubkin, Jr.;

H. R. 898. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Kaczmarczyk;

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Asiani;

H. R. 1211. An act for the relief of Isak Benmuvhar;

H. R. 1772. An act for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman;

H. R. 1901. An act for the relief of Ciro Picardi;

H. R. 1904. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke;

H. R. 1905. An act for the relief of Montgomery of San Francisco, Inc.;

H. R. 2034. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Samuel E. McMillan;

H. R. 2237. An act to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act;

H. R. 2813. An act for the relief of William E. Aitcheson;

H. R. 2815. An act for the relief of Floyd C. Barber;

H. R. 3446. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm;

H. R. 3733. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder;

H. R. 3823. An act for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner and Lula Stanley Beckner;

H. R. 4285. An act for the relief of Arthur Staveley;

H. R. 4471. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton;

H. J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to permit the entry of 500 children under 6 years of age, adopted by United States citizens while serving abroad in the Armed Forces of the United States, or while employed abroad by the United States Government; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1563. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 2761. An act to revive and reenact the act of December 21, 1944, authorizing the city of Clinton Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., as amended; and

H. R. 4779. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2832. An act to authorize Federal aid with respect to the costs of constructing that portion of an approved hospital project which was commenced without Federal participation and prior to January 1, 1953; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 4974. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article written by him entitled "Peace Is Dynamic," published in the May 1953 issue of the Intercollegian.

By Mr. POTTER:

Address delivered by Hon. Arthur Summerfield, Postmaster General, before the Jefferson National Expansion Association luncheon held at St. Louis, Mo., on April 30, 1953.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Address delivered by William D. Hassett at Warm Springs, Ga., April 12, 1953, at exercises on the eighth anniversary of the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

Address relating to the supervision of veterans' training by the Veterans' Administration, delivered by F. B. Decker, Nebraska State superintendent of public instruction, before the National Association of State Approval Agencies, on May 5, 1953, at Denver, Colo.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Editorial entitled "The New District Attorney," published in the Illinois State Journal of April 30, 1953, paying tribute to John B. Stoddart, Jr., the new United States district attorney for the southern district of Illinois.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Article relating to inquiry into the shipment of war materials to Red China, written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of May 5, 1953.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "Norway's Effort Is Sincere, but Traditions Show Results," and article entitled "Denmark: The Weakest Link in a Chain of Military Hopes," both written by Crosby S. Noyes and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 1 and May 2, 1953, respectively.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar of bills and resolutions under rule VIII, starting at the beginning of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the regular order of business.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	Millikin
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barrett	Hendrickson	Morse
Beall	Hennings	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bricker	Hill	Neely
Bridges	Hoey	Pastore
Bush	Holland	Payne
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Hunt	Purtell
Carlson	Ives	Robertson
Case	Jackson	Russell
Chavez	Jenner	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tobey
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Frear	Mansfield	Welker
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Gillette	McCarran	Young
Goldwater	McCarthy	
Gore	McClellan	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as first in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over. Neither Senator from Colorado is present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DECISIONS OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING OFFICERS—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 24) to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS rose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida withhold his objection until I have an opportunity to make a brief explanation?

Mr. SMATHERS. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to offset the decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called Wunderlich case. In that case the Court held—in an opinion written by Mr. Justice Minton—that where a Government contract provides that the decision of a contracting officer, or the head of an agency, is final, the losing party in a dispute over any decision such a contracting officer may make under a contract has no right of review of such decision in the courts, unless he can allege and prove fraud. In his decision, Mr. Justice Minton, speaking for the Supreme Court, said:

> By fraud we mean conscious wrongdoing, an intention to cheat or be dishonest.

The effect of this decision, of course, is such that even if an honest mistake has been made, it is necessary that the aggrieved party allege and prove that some Government employee deliberately cheated, or intended to defraud him, in order to get a court review of the question.

Up until the time this decision was handed down, there was no such rigid standard, and the review of administrative decisions was not so limited.

The Supreme Court itself recognized that the standard it was laying down was unusually rigid, and declared: "The limitation upon this arbitral process is fraud, placed there by this Court. If the standard of fraud that we adhere to is too limited, that is a matter for Congress." The Supreme Court thus invited

action by Congress, along the lines which this bill would take.

Senators who have looked into this matter know that this decision of the Supreme Court cuts two ways. It can hurt the Government badly, as well as doing an injustice to contractors. In a recent case, which arose since this Supreme Court decision, the Government did in fact lose. This recent case arose in Philadelphia. There had been an honest mistake by a contracting officer. The Comptroller General of the United States attempted to recover on behalf of the Government, because the mistake was against the Government. The contractor interposed a defense based on the Supreme Court decision in the Wunderlich case. The court followed this Supreme Court decision—as it was bound to do—and the result was a failure of recovery on behalf of the Government.

It was because of this case, and the possibility of similar cases, that the Comptroller General of the United States appeared and testified before the Judiciary Committee in behalf of this bill.

This bill was the subject of extensive hearings in the last Congress; and, as far as I know, the bill is not now opposed by any of the interested parties.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Personally I have no objection to this bill. I am informed that the Department of Defense objected. I should like to ask if the Senator would be willing to allow the bill to go to the foot of the calendar. I should like to ascertain if there is objection on the part of the Department of Defense. If not, I have no personal objection to the bill. However, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I should like to obtain that information.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be passed to the foot of the calendar.

The clerk will state the next order of business.

ERICH ANTON HELFERT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over, by request.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection so that I may make a brief explanation?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. There are two such bills on the calendar, one following the other. Both have been objected to by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I think his objection has merit. The persons involved came to this country as students and now wish to remain here. I think the objection of the Senator from Arkansas is well taken. In other words, if they can come in as students and remain here, they will perhaps destroy the program. However, they could go across the line to Canada or down to Mexico and come back into the United States. I do not see any way to stop that.

I cannot criticize the objection. I think it is well taken from the standpoint of the policy of the program. However, I can see how the program might be defeated in another way.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, those of us who serve on the Calendar Committee have no choice in the matter if a Senator requests us to object to a bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understand.

Mr. GORE. I have taken the liberty of suggesting to the majority leader that in cases like this, where a policy objection is made to a particular type of bill, it would be well to remove such bill from the calendar and call it up separately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Tennessee asks that the bill go over?

Mr. GORE. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill goes over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Felix Kortschok was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 152) for the relief of Fred P. Hines was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over.

J. DON ALEXANDER—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 484) for the relief of J. Don Alexander was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey what his objection is to the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask the Senator what his objection is to the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wonder whether the Senator from Colorado could give an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The bill would give Mr. Alexander the right to recover a capital-gains tax, on which he was not able to request a refund within the statutory period of time, because the matter became involved in bankruptcy proceeding. After the bankruptcy proceeding had been settled and his rights more or less determined, the statute of limitations had expired, and he was unable to make a claim for a refund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey request that the bill go over?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withhold my objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, did the Senator from New Jersey withdraw his objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No; I withheld my objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if it would be agreeable to have an amendment releasing the operation of the statute of limitations against the claim, I would not object. However, I would feel constrained to object to the passage of a bill which makes an outright payment without any adjudication of the matter. If the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado is agreeable to such an amendment, allowing the claimant to go into the Court of Claims irrespective of the statute of limitations, I would have no objection.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I suggest that the bill go to the foot of the calendar. I shall later suggest such an amendment, to meet the objection of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill goes to the foot of the calendar.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 101) for the relief of Phed Vosniacos was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 102) for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 153) for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over.

The resolution (S. Res. 57) to amend rule XIII of the standing rules relative to motions to reconsider was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of the above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 20, 1953, pp. 2139–2144.)

DR. ALEXANDERE DEMETRIO MORUZI—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 389) for the relief of Dr. Alexandere Demetrio Moruzi was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over temporarily. A telephone call has been made to determine whether the objection may be withdrawn.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator do what was done before, namely, request that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill goes to the foot of the calendar.

CHE KIL BOK

The bill (S. 486) for the relief of Che Kil Bok was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Che Kil Bok shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lt. Col. and Mrs. Ray A. Donaldson, citizens of the United States.

Mr. SMATHERS subsequently said: Mr. President, at the time when Senate bill 486, Calendar 91, was considered, I had thought the Senator from Louisiana, who had originally filed an objection to the bill, had withdrawn his objection. He has since told me that I was in error. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, be reconsidered, and that the bill retain its place on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and Senate bill 486, Calendar No. 91, will be passed over, but will retain its place on the calendar.

WILLIAM R. JACKSON

The bill (S. 712) for the relief of William R. Jackson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William R. Jackson, administrator of the estate of W. C. Jackson, deceased, the sum of $11,500 plus interest on such sum at the rate of 4 percent per annum from February 24, 1943, to the date of payment, representing the amount of damages found by the United States Court of Claims (Congressional No. 17859, decided April 8, 1952, in response to S. Res. 137, 81st Cong.), to have resulted from the unlawful taking by the Government of the deceased's fishing grounds and the deprivation by the Government of the deceased's use of his fishing nets in the vicinity of Spesutie Island, Md.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The bill (S. 18) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clause (4) of section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act is amended to read as follows:

"(4) the functions conferred by the following statutes: the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the Contract Settlement Act of 1944; and the Surplus Property Act of 1944."

SEC. 2. (a) All laws or parts of laws enacted prior to the date of approval of this act which grant exemption from the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act are repealed, and the following parts of laws are specifically repealed:

(1) Section 302 of the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 918);

(2) Section 601 of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1946 (60 Stat. 993);

(3) Section 6 (a) of the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 37);

(4) Section 210 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 201);

(5) Section 301 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 99);

(6) Section 5 of the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 323);

(7) Section 16 of the Rubber Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 108);

(8) Section 7 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (Public Law 11, 81st Cong.);

(9) Section 3 (i) of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (Public Law 421, 81st Cong.);

(10) The first sentence of section 709 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774, 81st Cong.);

(11) Section 305 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.); and

(12) Section 111 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (Public Law 9, 82d Cong.).

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to invalidate, or to require any change in, any proceedings conducted by or before any agency of the Government which were commenced prior to the effective date of this section, or to invalidate any action of any such agency taken prior to such date or any action taken after such date in connection with any such proceedings. In the administration and interpretation of the Administrative Procedure Act, no implication shall be drawn by reason of the repeal by this act of any exemption from the provisions of such act heretofore granted with respect to any agency of the Government or to any functions exercised by any such agency.

(c) This section shall become effective on the 30th day following the date of its enactment.

PROVISION FOR JURY TRIALS IN CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (S. 30) to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I make a brief explanation?

Mr. SMATHERS. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill is designed to restore the right of a jury trial in condemnation cases.

Senators will remember that Congress gave to the Supreme Court authority to promulgate rules of civil procedure, and to amend those rules, by a process of transmitting the proposed rules to Congress and waiting a stipulated period of 90 days for possible congressional action. If Congress did not act adversely within this period, the rules were to become effective.

By this process, the Supreme Court amended rule 71 (a) of the rules of civil procedure, so as to take away the right of jury trial, in Federal condemnation cases, where the court in its discretion decided the proper thing to do was to appoint a commission to determine the value of the property.

A resolution to disapprove this rule passed the Senate during the 82d Congress; but it did not get action in the House in time to be effective. I then introduced a bill, S. 1958 of the 82d Congress, with which the bill S. 30, now before the Senate, is identical, and that bill passed the Senate unanimously in August of 1951, but was not acted upon by the House of Repreesntatives before Congress adjourned.

This bill should pass. Any man whose land is taken by the Federal Government, under its power of eminent domain, should have a right to have a jury determine the value of the land.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that I have no objection personally to the bill. I have been requested to make the objection by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He has requested that the bill go over. Under the previous agreement, there is no other course I can follow.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I may be heard for a minute, I believe the bill was the subject of some discussion, and it was suggested that an amendment might be proposed. If the bill could go to the foot of the calendar—I dislike to see all these bills go to the foot of the calendar—perhaps we could present to the Senate an amendment to the bill which would be satisfactory to the Senators who are objecting to it. Therefore, I ask that it go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill goes to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, would the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] have any objection to reverting to Calendar No. 107, Senate bill 30, at this time. The reason is that consideration of the bill during the call of the calendar was objected to. However, I will offer an amendment which I understand to be satisfactory to the Senators who interposed objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is handling that bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, let me say that the senior Senator from Virginia was the one who asked that objection be interposed. I do not see him on the floor at this time. I wonder whether we can continue to pass over the bill, and the Senator from Nevada can take up the matter with the Senator from Virginia, and perhaps the bill can be reached again later in the day.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will retain its place on the calendar.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I could not hear the number of the bill which was being discussed in connection with an amendment. Was it Calendar No. 142, Senate bill 922?

Mr. SMATHERS. No; Calendar No. 107, Senate bill 30.

FURTHER IMPLEMENTATION OF FULL FAITH AND CREDIT CLAUSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

The bill (S. 39) to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill is identical to S. 1331 of the 82d Congress, which passed the Senate on June 21, 1952, but no action was taken thereon in the House.

It is neither good morals nor good law to have a divorce legal in one State and illegal in another, so that a married man or woman may become a criminal by stepping over an imaginary line. Such a situation demands congressional action to the extent that such action may provide a remedy. But all proposals for a uniform Federal divorce law contemplate an invasion of State sovereignty inimical to the basic principles of our Federal Union. What we need is not a uniform Federal divorce law, but a uniform and reasonable interpretation and application of the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution.

One approach to the problem of interstate recognition of divorces has been through the so-called Uniform Divorce Recognition Act. As of November 1, 1950, this act had been adopted by seven States. Without attempting a discussion of the merits and shortcomings of this act, it may be pointed out that it does not meet the important requirement of certainty, which is an essential characteristic for a divorce law which is to be satisfactory from a national viewpoint. The Uniform Divorce Recognition Act fails in this regard because it is necessarily subject to the constitutional requirement with respect to full faith and credit. Thus, without thorough litigation in the Federal courts, it cannot be said precisely how the Uniform Divorce Recognition Act may be construed; and it appears that the act may be unconstitutional under some existing decisions of the United States Supreme Court. It seems clear that in the light of the constitutional provision with respect to full faith and credit, the only satisfactory method of giving uniformity of recognition to divorces granted in the different States is through a Federal law, rather than by means of the separate adoption by the States of the Uniform Divorce Recognition Act, even assuming that all 48 of the States, instead of only 7, could be persuaded to enact the uniform statute.

Briefly stated, the purpose of this bill is to guarantee the divorce decree of any State full faith and credit in every other State, providing that, first, the decree is final as to divorce in the State where rendered; second, the decree is valid in the State where rendered; third, the decree contains recitals setting forth that the jurisdictional prerequisites have been met; and, fourth, the State in which the decree was granted was the last State in which the couple lived together as man and wife, or the defendant was personally subject to the State's jurisdiction or appeared generally in the proceedings.

This proposed statute, if enacted, would not derogate from the right of any State to question a decree based on fraud, where such a decree would not be valid in the rendering State. It would, however, in the absence of fraud, give full recognition to decrees based on constructive service where the rendering State was the last place of domicile with respect to the marriage relationship; and would also permit a State wherein only one spouse is domiciled to determine its jurisdiction to grant the divorce, and to render a decree conclusive against everyone, where the defendant appears or is validly personally served with process. A default judgment, entered without such appearance or service, against a spouse not domiciled in the State, and where the State was the last State of marital domicile, would be open to attack and refusal of recognition to the same degree as under the present state of the law.

This legislation had the very full consideration of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate during the 82d Congress and was carefully considered from all angles. The able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] wrote an exceptionally fine report. As I have stated before, the legislation has already been approved by the Senate; and it is my firm belief that this legislation is needed and should receive the approval of the Congress in this present session.

For the sake of the legislative history of this measure, I call attention to the questions submitted by the then minority Calendar Committee, and answered by me, at the time this legislation, then embodied in the bill S. 1331, passed the Senate during the 82d Congress. This colloquy has been included in the committee report on the bill now before the Senate, and should serve to remove any remaining doubt as to the purpose and effect of the proposed legislation.

There are just a few questions, which are repeatedly asked about this legislation, which I should like to answer here and now, for the record.

It is asked, "Will this bill legalize 'quickie' divorces, where one spouse goes out to Nevada and gets a divorce by default?" The answer is, it will not. This bill would have no effect whatever on the question of the validity of such a divorce.

Another question often asked is, "Will this bill take away from any State the right to make its own laws with regard to divorce?" The answer is, this bill will not do that. On the contrary, this bill expressly recognizes the right of every State to make its own laws with respect to divorce in accordance with its own public policy, as determined by its own legislature, reflecting the will of the people of the State.

One more question which is still heard with regard to this bill, although I think it has been fully answered before now, is this, "Will the bill legalize a fraudulent divorce?" The answer, of course, is that the bill will not legalize a fraudulent divorce.

All of these points and many others are covered in the report on the bill and in the questions and answers which were originally contained in the colloquy between the minority calendar committee and myself last year, and which are now included in the report of the Committee on the Judiciary.

This bill has been pending before the Congress for nearly 10 years. I have never pressed it, for I have felt confident that when the bill came to be fully understood by the bar of the country, it would gain approval on its own merit. The bill was brought to the floor of the Senate last year because of the interest in it demonstrated by the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. The Senate at that time passed the bill unanimously. I hope and believe, Mr. President, that the Senate will take similar action today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 39) to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, where a State has exercised through its courts jurisdiction to dissolve the marriage of spouses, the decree of divorce thus rendered must be given full faith and credit in every other State as a dissolution of such marriage, provided (1) the decree is final as to the issue of divorce; (2) the decree is valid in the State where rendered; (3) the decree contains recitals setting forth that the jurisdictional prerequisites of such State to the granting of the divorce have been met; and (4) the State wherein the decree was rendered was the last State wherein the spouses were domiciled together as husband and wife, or the defendant in the proceeding for divorce was personally subject to the jurisdiction of the State wherein the decree was rendered or appeared generally in the proceedings therefor. In all such cases except cases involving fraudulent conduct of the successful party which was practiced during the course of an actual adversary trial of the issues joined and the effect of which was directly and affirmatively to mislead the defeated party to his injury after he announced that he was ready to proceed with the trial, the recitals of the decree of divorce shall constitute a conclusive determination of the jurisdictional facts necessary to the decree.

CIVIL ACTION AGAINST UNITED STATES FOR RECOVERY OF TAXES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 252) to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "the" and insert "either"; and in the same line, after the word "party", to strike out "bringing" and insert "to", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (1) of section 1346 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any civil action against the United States for the recovery of any internal-revenue tax alleged to have been erroneously or illegally assessed or collected, or any penalty claimed to have been collected without authority or any sum alleged to have been excessive or in any manner wrongfully collected under the internal-revenue laws;".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2402 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2402. Jury trial in actions against United States.

"Any action against the United States under section 1346 shall be tried by the court without a jury, except that any action against the United States under section 1346 (a) (1) shall, at the request of either party to such action, be tried by the court with a jury."

(b) The second item in the analysis of chapter 161 of title 28 of the United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"2402. Jury trial in actions against United States."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) to revise and reprint the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized and directed to revise, by bringing up to date, the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government" as set out in House Document 465, 79th Congress.

SEC. 2. Such revised pamphlet shall be printed as a Senate document, and there be printed 100,000 additional copies of which 24,750 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; 66,150 copies for the use of the House of Representatives; 3,100 for the Senate document room; and 6,000 for the House document room.

GRATUITY TO SURVIVING CHILDREN OF MARY A. BROOKS

The resolution (S. Res. 98) to pay a gratuity to the surviving children of Mary A. Brooks was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Phillip Austin Brooks, Mary Brooks Crawford, and Martha Brooks Denz, surviving children of Mary A. Brooks, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 12 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 978) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DEFINING NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

The bill (S. 275) to further define the National Transportation policy was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to know which Senator requested that the bill be passed over, and I should like to ask him to withhold his objection until I can explain the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection?

Mr. GORE. I withhold the objection.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the bill came from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with unanimous approval, and last year a similar bill was approved unanimously by the committee, and was passed by the Senate.

The bill simply gives to the Interstate Commerce Commission the authority and right to look into the moral qualifications of any person or company who may be an applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity for the transportation of goods or commodities interstate. The bill is designed to correct situations which the Kefauver committee found in three States where gangsters had muscled into the transportation business.

We feel that this bill will eliminate that element in the transportation services throughout the United States.

I wonder whether the explanation is sufficient to satisfy the Senator who requested the bill be passed over.

Mr. GORE. I am advised by the Senator who requested that objection be made that the explanation is sufficient. Therefore I withdraw the objection.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 275) to further define the national transportation policy, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 10, after the word "unlawful", to strike out "or unethical business", and on page 2, line 1, after the words "or the", to insert "reasonable", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of September 18, 1940 (54 Stat. 899), defining the national transportation policy, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph, to read as follows:

"It is hereby further declared to be the policy of the Congress that all modes of transportation subject to this act shall be kept free of terrorism, extortion, racketeering, and similar unlawful tactics, and to this end due regard shall be given in all cases to any evidence of the use of such tactics, or the reasonable likelihood of the use of such tactics, by any applicant for, or transferee or holder of any certificate, permits, or license issued or outstanding under this act, or under any amendment thereto."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 32) temporarily increasing the membership of the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 922) to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RESOLUTION PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The resolution (S. Res. 103) citing Russell W. Duke for contempt of the Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation of the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested. Is there present in the Chamber a Senator who is ready to explain the resolution?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. If not, Mr. President, I suggest that the resolution be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

FURNISHING OF CERTAIN SUPPLIES AND SERVICES TO FOREIGN NAVAL VESSELS

The bill (S. 1524) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to furnish foreign naval vessels at United States ports and naval bases—

(1) routine port services such as pilotage, tugs, garbage removal, line handling, and utilities on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds when such routine port services are furnished on a like basis to United States naval vessels at ports and naval bases of the country concerned;

(2) miscellaneous supplies such as fuel, provisions, spare parts, and general stores on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds when a prior agreement conferring reciprocal rights on the United States and covering the reimbursement therefor has been negotiated with the country concerned; and

(3) supplies and services such as overhauling, repairs, and alterations, including the installation of equipment, when funds to

cover the estimated cost thereof have been made available in advance.

SEC. 2. Payment for the supplies and services furnished pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of the first section of this act may be credited to current appropriations so as to be available for the same purposes as the appropriation initially charged.

PHOTOGRAPHS AND SKETCHES OF PROPERTIES OF THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

The bill (S. 1448) to amend the act of June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present national emergency, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act of June 25, 1942 (56 Stat. 390), as extended by section 1 (a) (11) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82d Cong.) is amended by deleting the words "for the duration of the present war as determined by proclamation of the President" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 C. F. R. 1950 Supp., p. 71)."

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION UPON DETAIL OF OFFICERS ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST

The bill (S. 1527) to amend section 40 (b) of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 40b of the National Defense Act (41 Stat. 759, 777), as amended, is further amended by striking out so much of the second sentence as reads, "and no officer on the active list shall be detailed for recruiting service or for duty at a school or college, not including schools of the service, where officers on the retired list can be secured who are competent for such duty."

APPOINTMENTS AS OFFICERS AND WARRANT OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1528) to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and warrant officers in the Army and Air Force.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, S. 1528 proposes to correct a situation which, although it applies to a relatively few officers and warrant officers, involves a serious injustice.

Members of the Senate are aware of the fact that officers and warrant officers of the Reserve components of the Army and the Air Force were originally given commissions which expired at a definite date—usually at the end of a 5-year period.

Certain officers and warrant officers holding such commissions are currently in the status of missing, missing in action, or otherwise under enemy restraint. While in such a status, certain of these commissions will expire, and under existing law would entirely lapse on July 1 of this year if the remedial action recommended by the pending bill were not taken.

In case such commissions lapse through no fault of the individual—he being unable to extend his commission because of the fact that he is now under enemy control—an obvious administrative injustice comes about. The persons concerned would lose their military status and become civilians, and in such an event would suffer the loss of certain advantages in the way of pay and retirement; also, they would lose the status which would permit them to be hospitalized as military personnel. It is for those reasons that the committee has recommended the enactment of the bill. The bill was recommended by the Department of Defense, and involves no additional expenditure of Federal funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if the appointment as a commissioned officer or warrant officer of any person who is determined, as provided in the Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to have been in a status of missing, missing in action, interned, captured, beleaguered, or besieged at any time after June 25, 1950, and before the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 C. F. R. 71), would normally terminate before the person holding that appointment is released from active duty, the President is authorized to continue that appointment in effect until that person is released from active duty. On or before the date of his release from active duty, any such person who agrees in writing to have his appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer or a Reserve warrant officer continued in effect for an indefinite term shall be given an indefinite term appointment in lieu of the appointment which he holds at that time.

POSTHUMOUS APPOINTMENTS AND COMMISSIONS

The bill (S. 1529) to amend the act of July 28, 1942 (ch. 528, 56 Stat. 722), relating to posthumous appointments and commissions, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 28, 1942 (ch. 528, 56 Stat. 722), is amended as follows:

(a) By deleting the words "Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy", and the words "Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "appropriate Secretary";

(b) By deleting the words "in the military or naval service" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "in the military service";

(c) By deleting the words "War or Navy Department" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "military department concerned";

(d) By deleting the words "be, and they are hereby, severally" in section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the word "is"; and

(e) By renumbering section 5 as "SEC. 6" and inserting immediately after section 4 a new section 5 as follows:

"SEC. 5. For the purposes of this act, in any case where the date of death is established or determined under the Missing Persons Act, as amended, the date of death is the date of receipt by the head of the department concerned of evidence that the person is dead, or the date the finding of death is made under section 5 of that act, as amended."

SEC. 2. This amendatory act is effective June 25, 1950.

AMENDMENT OF ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT OF 1947

The bill (S. 1530) to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, to authorize the appointment in grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (c) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 42) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Commissioned officers of the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps, and commissioned officers of the Regular Air Force appointed with a view to designation as Air Force nurses, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. To be eligible for appointment under this subsection a person must be a graduate of a hospital or university training school and a registered nurse and must have the physical and other qualifications prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force for the appropriate armed force. A person appointed under this subsection shall be appointed in the grade of—

"(1) second lieutenant, if she is not more than 27 years of age on the date of nomination by the President and is not qualified for appointment as a first lieutenant under clause (2); or

"(2) first lieutenant, if she is qualified under regulations issued by the appropriate Secretary and is not more than 30 years of age on the date of nomination by the President.

The maximum ages specified in clauses (1) and (2) are increased by the period of active Federal commissioned service performed after December 31, 1947. However, such an age may not be so increased by more than 5 years."

SEC. 2. Section 102 (c) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 42) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Commissioned officers of the Regular Army in the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, and commissioned officers of the Regular Air Force appointed with a view to designation as women medical specialists, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. To be eligible for appointment under this subsection, a person must have the physical and other qualifications prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force for the appropriate armed force. A person appointed under this subsection shall be appointed in the grade of—

"(1) second lieutenant, if she is not more than 27 years of age on the date of nomination by the President and is not qualified for appointment as a first lieutenant under clause (2); or

"(2) first lieutenant, if she is qualified under regulations issued by the appropriate Secretary and is not more than 30 years of age on the date of nomination by the President.

The maximum ages specified in clauses (1) and (2) are increased by the period of active Federal commissioned service performed after December 31, 1947. However, such an age may not be so increased by more than 5 years."

SEC. 3. Section 204 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 48) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Except as provided in section 203 and 211 of this title, appointment to the grade of nurse in the Regular Navy shall be with the rank of ensign or lieutenant (junior grade), and each such appointment shall be subject to revocation by the Secretary of the Navy until such time as the appointee has served under such appointment for 3 years from the date of appointment. Officers whose appointments are so revoked shall be discharged from the service without advanced pay. Appointees shall be female citizens of the United States who shall have reached the age of 21 years on July 1 of the calendar year in which appointed. No person shall be appointed pursuant to this section until she shall have established her mental, moral, educational, professional, and physical qualifications to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy. A person appointed under this section shall be appointed with the rank of—

"(1) ensign, if she is not more than 27 years of age on the date of nomination by the President and is not qualified for appointment as a lieutenant (junior grade) under clause (2); or

"(2) lieutenant (junior grade), if she is qualified under regulations issued by the Secretary of the Navy and is not more than 30 years of age on the date of nomination by the President.

The maximum ages specified in clauses (1) and (2) are increased by the period of active Federal commissioned service performed after December 31, 1947. However, such an age may not be so increased by more than 5 years."

Mrs. SMITH of Maine subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of Senate bill 1530, Calendar No. 149, be printed in the RECORD in connection with the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

I believe that most Senators are concerned—as I have been concerned—over the fact that it is proving so difficult to attract career women into the Nurse Corps and the Medical Specialists Corps of the Regular services.

The Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 is the basic procurement legislation in this field. This law prescribes an age limit of 28 years for original appointment in the Regular Nurse Corps of the Army and the Air Force and specifies that such appointments may be made only in the grade of second lieutenant.

With respect to the Regular Navy, the act provides that nurses may be appointed only in the rank of ensign, and from among persons below age 29 on July 1 of the calendar year in which appointed.

The number of nurses and women medical specialists currently being appointed in the Regular components of the armed services under the existing authority is not proving sufficient to compensate for the losses being incurred.

The Department of Defense feels that this situation could be alleviated by relaxing the current age limitations which govern the appointment of women as nurses and as medical specialists, so that these criteria will be more in line with those employed for the appointment of physicians and dentists.

The pending bill (S. 1530) amends existing law by prescribing an age limit of 27 years for appointments in the grade of second lieutenant or ensign and authorizes appointments in the next higher grade of persons who are not more than 30 years of age. Such age limits can be increased by a maximum of 5 years by periods of active commissioned Federal service performed since January 1, 1948.

This latter provision is of particular importance under present circumstances because of the very substantial number of women reservists who have served periods of active duty and who are desirous of joining the Regular services, but who find themselves over the prescribed age limit because of the years of service which they have already rendered.

The committee, after hearing the testimony of witnesses from the Department of Defense, feels that the bill as recommended will enlarge the field from which Regular nurses may be procured and will create a more stable and a larger supply of qualified candidates for Regular appointment.

The bill is recommended by the Department of Defense and does not involve the expenditure of additional Federal funds.

STANDARD DESIGN FOR SERVICE FLAG AND SERVICE LAPEL BUTTON

The bill (S. 1546) to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of October 17, 1942 (ch. 615; 56 Stat. 796), is hereby amended by striking the words "Secretary of War" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of Defense" and striking the words "the current war" appearing at the end of the first and second sections of the act and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any period of war or hostilities in which the Armed Forces of the United States may be engaged."

Mrs. SMITH of Maine subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of Senate bill 1546, Calendar No. 150, be printed in the RECORD, in connection with the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

I feel sure that Senators will recall that during World War II many families of servicemen were very proud and happy to display the authorized service flag in the window of their homes, showing that a member of their family was serving with the Armed Forces. Similarly, it was a matter of pride to wear the authorized lapel button.

The World War II service flag and lapel button were authorized by the act of October 17, 1942. This act was effective, however, as the language specifies, "during the current war."

The United States today has military personnel scattered throughout the world. Thousands of them are fighting a bitter and bloody campaign in far-off Korea. Others are manning our ramparts across the bleak Arctic wastes. Still others are stationed at potentially explosive spots elsewhere. There is no authority whereby the members of the families of these servicemen and women can display a service flag or wear a service lapel button which proclaims that they have a service man or woman somewhere with our Armed Forces.

Certainly there never was a time when the sacrifices of our service men and women are more worthy of such recognition. The Committee on Armed Services, therefore, after a full discussion of the matter with witnesses from the Department of Defense, has recommended that the World War II authority be extended and modified so as to fix the responsibility for the design of the service flag and lapel button in the Secretary of Defense, rather than the Secretary of War, as was the case during World War II.

This legislation does not involve the expenditure of any additional Government funds. It would be applicable to "any period of war or hostilities in which the Armed Forces of the United States may be engaged."

APPORTIONMENT OF MONEYS RECEIVED FROM LEASING CERTAIN LANDS ACQUIRED FOR FLOOD-CONTROL PURPOSES—BILL TEMPORARILY PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 117) to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] wanted to be on the floor when this bill came up for consideration. I have sent for him, and he will, I am sure, be present within a few minutes. I would not want the bill sent to the foot of the calendar, but I wonder whether we could return to it presently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

ABANDONMENT OF CERTAIN PART OF THE FEDERAL PROJECT FOR THE BROADKILL RIVER IN DELAWARE

The bill (S. 639) to provide for the abandonment of a certain part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army is authorized and directed to abandon the part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware, adopted March 3, 1873, and modified March 2, 1907, which provides for an entrance channel from such river to Delaware Bay.

AMENDMENT OF IMMUNITY PROVISIONS AFFECTING WITNESSES BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 16) to amend the immunity provisions relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is Calendar No. 153, Senate bill 16, a bill to amend the existing statute with respect to immunity from prosecution of witnesses before congressional committees who are compelled to testify after having claimed their privilege against self-incrimination, under the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States. The purpose of this bill is to correct a deficiency in the present law, which renders it ineffective.

Members of the Senate are, I think, mostly familiar with this subject matter and with this bill. There has been a great deal of discussion about it, here on this floor and elsewhere. The committee report on the bill is quite full and complete.

To state the matter very briefly, the present law is deficient because it does not give an immunity as broad as the constitutional privilege. The privilege is against prosecution. The immunity granted by the present law is only against the use of the particular testimony which is compelled, as evidence in a subsequent criminal proceeding. The Supreme Court has held that this is not enough, since it would still be possible under the existing law to use the testimony of the witness as a basis for securing other evidence against him. Therefore, the bill now before the Senate would amend the law so as to provide complete immunity from prosecution, with respect to the particular matters or things concerning which the witness testifies in response to a requirement that he answer a specific question after he has claimed his immunity with respect thereto.

The bill provides that immunity could only be granted in this way when authorized by a vote of at least two-thirds of the members of a committee, including at least one member of each of the two political parties having the largest representation on such committee, or authorized by a majority of the Members present in either House.

Mr. President, enactment of this proposed legislation will go a long way to help combat the Communist conspiracy in this country, by putting in the hands of Congress the means to force Communists and former Communists to disclose what they know about the conspiracy. The American Bar Association has most strongly endorsed this proposal, as have many other patriotic and civic organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the question in my mind is whether the bill is not too wide open, in that any congressional committee—perhaps a small committee with one or two members—could grant immunity to any witness who appears before the committee. I do not desire to object particularly to the idea, but once before we had an immunity bath statute, and Congress repealed it because it was generally disapproved and thought to be too wide open. At least, it seems to me somewhat doubtful whether the bill ought to be passed on the consent calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, merely to meet the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, under the bill the question of immunity must be considered by the full committee, and two-thirds of the committee must approve the granting of immunity. Not only that, but there must also be representation by the two major parties, in any event.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I understand that the Department of Justice objected to this bill in its present form, for the reason that it contains no provision requiring the committee to get permission from the Department of Justice, so to speak, before granting immunity. In other words, the Department of Justice might be preparing to file a suit or to bring an indictment against a person, only to have the committee grant him immunity, thus destroying the case. I wonder whether the Senator would be willing to amend his bill, and have it cleared by the Department of Justice, before the Senate votes on it?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have prepared an amendment, which I shall offer, though the amendment does not go so far as the Senator has requested.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think I would object to the bill, any way, but I would agree to have it come up later today or tomorrow, and let it be discussed on its own merits by those who have indicated to me that they object to the bill. That course has been followed from time to time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to offer the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment designed to meet both the viewpoint of the Senator from Tennessee and also that of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and other Senators who feel that any provision with respect to giving notice to the Attorney General should not be a matter of law, but rather, being procedural, should be taken care of by the rules of the Senate and House or of the committees. My amendment would accomplish the purpose of requiring notification to the Attorney General in advance of taking a vote on a question of granting immunity to a witness; but the requirement would be in the form of an amendment to the rules of the respective Houses, not as legislation. I offer the amendment, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the bill at this time, but I assure the Senator from Nevada I shall bring it up on motion, this week.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to this bill, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey will be printed and lie on the table.

Objection to the bill is heard, and it will be passed over.

HOUSING IN GUAM AND ALASKA

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 71) to extend certain authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to Guam and to amend the National Housing Act with respect to housing in Alaska was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 2 (b) of Public Law 52, 81st Congress, is hereby amended by inserting the figure "(1)" immediately prior to the words "may be offered to the Federal National Mortgage Association" and by adding the following before the period at the end of section 2 (b): ", and (2) may be offered to the Federal National Mortgage Association for purchase if such loans are secured by property located in Guam and insured under any of the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended."

SEC. 2. Section 214 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking from the last sentence of said section the words "Upon application by the mortgagee," and inserting in lieu thereof the words: "Upon application by the mortgagee (1) where the mortgagor is regulated or restricted pursuant to the last sentence of this section or (2)"; and

(2) by adding the following new sentence at the end of said section: "Without limiting the authority of the Commissioner under any other provision of law, the Commissioner is hereby authorized, with respect to any mortgagor in such case (except where the Alaska Housing Authority is the mortgagor or mortgagee), to require the mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation to such an extent and in such manner as the Commissioner determines advisable to provide reasonable rentals and sales prices and a reasonable return on the investment."

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 2936) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California for use as a fairground by the 10A District Agricultural Association of California was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCEPTANCE OF VIRGINIA SCHOOL-BOARD LAND IN EXCHANGE FOR PARK LAND

The bill (H. R. 1936) authorizing the acceptance for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park of school-board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 106) increasing the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 333, 82d Congress, for the Committee on Rules and Administration, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that this resolution was reported from

the Committee on Rules and Administration. For various reasons, probably through my fault, certain circumstances have now developed which had not been anticipated. I find upon inquiry that, on May 1, the subcommittee had a balance of $58,833 to its credit, and that its April payroll was at the rate of $10,378.80 a month. There are employed by the committee at this time a chief counsel, at a salary of $970.70 a month; two associate counsel at $839.03 a month; an assistant counsel at $797.50 a month; a special counsel at $436.58 a month; five investigators at $651.66 a month, and eight clerical assistants at about $340 or $350 a month. Considering these rates of compensation, the amount which the committee now has on hand should make funds available for another 4 or 5 months.

It is my understanding that the purpose in asking for the $100,000 was to provide funds in connection with the contest over the seat of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. My information from the subcommittee is that there has been no determination up to this time as to whether it will be necessary to recount all the ballots cast in the State of New Mexico at the last election. I understand that the ballots in one county only are now about to be recounted. I also understand that there has been a request for a bill of particulars on the part of the senior Senator from New Mexico which the subcommittee must consider.

I suggest, therefore, Mr. President, that the resolution go over until such time as further facts can be developed and the necessity for additional funds demonstrated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator from Arizona again state how much money is on hand?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is $58,833, as of the first day of May.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am thoroughly in favor of an investigation being made, if anyone wants to make it, but I have been a little disturbed by stories that I find in some New Mexico newspapers. I understand that the attorneys are to be paid $200 a day, which amounts to $50,000 a year. I figured that was a pretty high rate. It is quite obvious that under such circumstances the committee could use up money in a hurry. I should like to have some indication of how the money is to be spent. I strongly support what the Senator has said about finding out the facts. I have never opposed an investigation of the last senatorial election in New Mexico. Thus far, some ballots have been recounted. That recount gained a few votes for the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HAYDEN. The question of whether it will be necessary to proceed further with the investigation has not been fully determined. The senior Senator from New Mexico has asked for a bill of particulars which would aid him in determining whether he would abide by a recount. Under the circumstances, Mr. President, it occurred to me that there is sufficient money at the present rate of expenditures to enable the committee to operate for another 3 or 4 months, and, therefore, I suggest that it would be well to let the resolution remain on the calendar, but I think it should go over at this time.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. In answer to the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico I may say that it was determined by the Committee on Rules and Administration to wait until the attorneys present their bills, and that we should not bargain with counsel in advance as to what the rate of compensation should be in a matter of this kind. The statement is correct that ballots in one county have been recounted; but there is no firm commitment on the part of the subcommittee to recount the ballots in all the counties of the State.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is my understanding that the ballots in one-third of the counties have already been recounted.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct. That was done under a State recount.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In reference to the recounting of the ballots in New Mexico, as I understand the law in New Mexico, each district has the right within 10 days of an election to have a recount. Within 10 days the Governor had a recount made of 243 precincts. In order to ascertain the facts from the board I telegraphed the Governor on April 28 as follows:

> Wire Government collect if your canvassing board has recounted votes re Chavez-Hurley election. If so at whose request and with what results? If you care to express your view as to necessity for another recount by Senate, please wire.

In answer to that telegram I received the following telegram:

> APRIL 28, 1953.
>
> Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
> *United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Re your telegram 25th instant. State canvassing board recounted approximately 222 boxes throughout the State on Hurley's application. Original count for CHAVEZ 49,684 and for Hurley 28,809. Recount shows CHAVEZ 49,799 and for Hurley 28,545. CHAVEZ gained on recount 115 and Hurley lost 264. Net gain for CHAVEZ on recount 379 votes.
>
> STATE CANVASSING BOARD,
> EDWIN L. MECHEM, *Chairman,*
> EUGENE D. LUJAN, *Member,*
> BEATRICE B. ROACH, *Member.*

This recount was made at the request of Hurley himself. I understand that it is proposed to recount all the ballots in New Mexico. If that is done, it will simply be a waste of money.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is it proposed to recount the ballots which have already been recounted?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. HAYDEN. And not to accept the action taken by the State canvassing board?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am not trying to say that I would not be willing to have every ballot in the State of New Mexico recounted, but I want to know what is to happen to the money before we undertake to provide it. I have sometimes retained the attorney who is representing the senior Senator from New Mexico. He is a very high-grade and responsible attorney. I am not sure that there should be any standard fixed. I say this as somewhat in response to the statement made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. According to a newspaper story, a question was asked as to what compensation the attorneys will receive, and a man named Ware representing a group, I believe, individually stated that they were asking for $200 a day. I recognize that that is only four or five times the salary of a United States Senator, but I think it is somewhat high in most cases.

I would only suggest that if there should be a recount of the ballots in Bernalillo County, which is a very large and important county, and serious discrepancies should be disclosed, the committee would perhaps be justified in recounting the ballots in the entire State. I shall not oppose it. I think they should finish that job first, and then go on with the next one.

Mr. HAYDEN. Were the ballots in Bernalillo County recounted by the State canvassing board?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I ask that the resolution go over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I join in that request, because I think the matter should be fully discussed. I shall bring it up again after the completion of the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The resolution will be temporarily passed over.

RECONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE TOWN OF MORRISTOWN, N. J.

The bill (S. 1292) providing for the reconveyance to the town of Morristown of certain land included within the Morristown National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the town of Morristown, a municipal corporation of the State of New Jersey; without consideration, for public use, and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem advisable, the following described property comprising a part of the Morristown National Historical Park:

That certain parcel of land comprising a part of the Fort Nonsense area of Morristown National Historical Park, bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at the twelfth corner of the eleventh tract which was conveyed by town of Morristown to the United States of America by deed dated July 4, 1933, which has been recorded at the Morris County clerk's office in book of deeds Q-33, page 433; thence—

(1) following the twelfth course therein south forty-nine degrees forty-six minutes east ninety-nine and fifty one-hundredths feet, to the thirteenth corner thereof, thence

(2) following the thirteenth course therein north forty-two degrees fourteen minutes east seventy and seventy one-hundredths feet, to the fourteenth corner thereof, thence

(3) following the fourteenth course therein north eight degrees ten minutes east one hundred eight and twenty one-hundredths feet, to the fifteenth corner thereof, thence

(4) following the fifteenth course therein north forty-seven degrees eighteen minutes west ninety-seven feet, to the sixteenth corner thereof, thence

(5) south twenty-two degrees forty-six minutes twenty seconds west one hundred seventy-four and fifty-eight one-hundredths feet to the point and place of beginning, containing approximately eighteen thousand square feet.

The above described land, upon conveyance to the town of Morristown, shall thereupon cease to be a part of the Morristown National Historical Park.

SALE OR LEASE OF CERTAIN LANDS BY THE STATE OF KANSAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 380) to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 3, after the word "to", to strike out "authorized" and insert "authorize", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale of certain lands near Garden City, Kans.," approved March 10, 1928, is amended to read as follows: "That the State of Kansas is hereby authorized to sell or lease for any purpose all or any part of the lands granted to the State under the provisions of the act entitled 'An act granting to the State of Kansas title to certain lands in said State for use as a game preserve,' approved June 22, 1916, without regard to any restrictions contained in such act, but upon condition that the proceeds of any such sale or lease be used by the State of Kansas to purchase or acquire other land in the State to be used as a State game refuge or for the further purposes and uses of the forestry, fish, and game commission of the State of Kansas as may be provided by the laws of the State."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans."

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN BURIAL LOTS AND OTHER PROPERTY IN WASHINGTON PARISH BURIAL GROUND, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The bill (S. 1545) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington Parish Burial Ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the rector and vestry of Washington Parish (Christ Church), Washington, D. C., hereinafter referred to as the "vestry," all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to 392 burial lots, more or less, and a vault located in the Washington parish burial ground, Washington, D. C., formerly designated Congressional Cemetery, in consideration of the payment by the vestry to the United States of $100 and the release from the vestry of any claim it may have against the Government for reimbursement of moneys expended by it during prior years for upkeep and special care of Government-owned lots situated in the cemetery; and to acquire eight burial lots, more or less, owned by the vestry but occupied by Government burials, cenotaphs, or monuments, by exchange, without other consideration, for a like number of Government-owned burial lots; it being the intent of this act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, for the considerations stated, to dispose of the Government-owned vault and all Government-owned burial lots in the Washington Parish Burial Ground for which there is no present or foreseeable need and to acquire from the vestry all burial lots owned by the vestry and now occupied by Government burials, cenotaphs, or monuments.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Acts To Return Old Cemetery Lots," published in the Washington Post of Tuesday, April 28, 1953, commending the legislation proposed by Senate bill 1545.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ACTS TO RETURN OLD CEMETERY LOTS

Once again the Government and Washington Parish Christ Church are dickering over burial lots, though it's been half a century since the last Federal body was laid to rest at Congressional Cemetery.

Actually, the parties have been trading in burial lots for 137 years, off and on. But the current transaction, involving $100 and 392 lots, may close the deal once and for all.

Congressional Cemetery, at 1801 E Street SE., has a real name—Washington Parish Burial Grounds. The vestry of Christ Church, at 620 G Street SE., has owned and operated the cemetery since 1812. The Government first got into it in 1816.

Back in 1816, the Government asked the vestry for 100 burial sites. It requested and got 300 more in 1823. Down the long years, it has picked up some 500 additional lots.

If this seems like a lot of lots, pay it no heed. A spokesman for the vestry says the 30-acre cemetery has more than 38,000 of them. He also says more than 80,000 persons are buried there, many in mass graves.

Well, it developed back in mid-1950 that the Government had 392 of these lots and no use for them. So the Army Corps of Engineers, which has title to them, took steps to give them back to the vestry.

For one thing, Corps representatives did some stepping around in the cemetery, surveying the lots. There is considerable confusion, it seems, stemming from the fact that some Government personages are buried in lots belonging to the vestry—and some private citizens rest in lots claimed by the Government.

This is because many records have been lost, others changed, several wars have taken place—in short, because time has dimmed some records of who rests where even as it has softened and faded the once-sharp inscriptions in the old cenotaphs.

The business has reached the point now, though, where it's moving right along. The Senate Armed Services Committee last week approved a bill permitting the vestry to buy, for $100, the 392 lots.

The bill also provides for the trading of 8 burial lots owned by the vestry but occupied by Government-placed cenotaphs or monuments for 8 Government-owned lots.

If this appears complicated, here's something to top it: of the 400 lots (392 plus 8), only 212 are vacant. The vestry, interpreting the faded records as best it can, explains that "the Government used 56 of our lots and we used 88 of theirs." Figure that out.

Many notables are buried in Congressional Cemetery, among them Elbridge Gerry, fifth Vice President, interred in 1814; Col. Tobias Lear, George Washington's secretary, 1816; Chief Push-ma-ta-ha, of the Choctaw Nation, who fought in the War of 1812 and died here of the croup in 1824, and famed John Philip Sousa, the march king, 1932.

There also is a common grave for 27 girls who were working in the arsenal here during the Civil War when an explosion cost their lives.

The bill to give the 392 lots to the vestry went through the committee without question. "They felt," a vestryman said, "that it was the righteous thing to do."

The vestry will keep right on maintaining the Government cenotaphs and monuments just the same, as it has for 169 years.

PAYMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 1547) to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That payment of the cost of transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, and unpacking) of household effects of members of the naval forces, upon release from active duty, from their homes of record to places selected by such members is hereby authorized to be made from current appropriations as may be available for such services and any payments representing the cost of such transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, and unpacking) heretofore made, are ratified and approved: *Provided*, That such transportation shall have been authorized prior to June 13, 1947, pursuant to duly promulgated regulations of the Navy Department: *Provided further*, That the transportation costs authorized to be paid hereunder are limited to the constructive costs of transportation from the last duty stations to the homes of record.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND PUERTO RICO

The bill (S. 1548) to provide for the exchange between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of certain lands and interests in lands in Puerto Rico was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, in exchange for the land identified in section 2 hereof, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to real estate briefly identified below and more fully described on maps and in descriptions on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

(a) A strip of land alongside of Muñoz Rivera Avenue, San Juan, and east of Army medical building, containing 4.8 acres; the site of the San Sebastian guardhouse at 205

Sol Street, San Juan, containing five one-hundredths acre; old walls around La Fortaliza containing sixty-six one-hundredths acre; driveway to insular department justice containing eleven one-hundredths acre, and all shown in detail on drawing No. 15-02-142, dated August 15, 1951, entitled "Fort Brooke Military Reservation."

(b) Punta Las Marias Military Reservation, comprising eighty-seven one-hundredths acre, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-150, dated November 24, 1948, entitled "Punta Las Marias SL and FC Site."

(c) Punta Cangrejos (Battery Lancaster) Military Reservation, comprising 15.08 acres, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-114, dated November 10, 1948, entitled "Battery Lancaster (No. 264) Military Reservation."

(d) Punta Maldonado Military Reservation, comprising 1 acre, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-151, entitled "Punta Maldonado SL and FC Site."

(e) Mata Redonda Military Reservation, comprising 98.47 acres of fee-owned land and 1.81 acres of roadway easements, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-155, dated December 3, 1948, entitled "Mata Redonda Gun Emplacement Site."

(f) Point Lima Military Reservation, comprising 135.82 acres of fee-owned land and 9 acres of roadway, electric transmission line, and water pipeline easements, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-152, dated November 24, 1948, entitled "Point Lima Gun Emplacement Site."

(g) Camp O'Reilly Military Reservation, comprising 906.89 acres, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-160, entitled "Camp O'Reilly Military Reservation."

(h) Fort Mayaguez Military Reservation, comprising 7.05 acres and shown on drawing No. 18-01-180, dated August 17, 1949, entitled "Fort Mayaguez Military Reservation."

(i) Tract 16 of Salinas Maneuver Site, comprising 369.98 acres, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-126, dated November 1, 1948, entitled "Salinas Maneuver Site."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to accept from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, without cost to the United States, a conveyance by the Governor of Puerto Rico of the lands briefly identified below and more fully described on maps and in descriptions on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

Area No. 1 comprising about 1,400 acres of rural and agricultural lands abutting along the upper one-half of the east boundary of the existing Salinas Maneuver Site and area No. 2 comprising about 5,100 acres of rural and agricultural lands abutting along the west and north boundaries of the reservation. These areas are shown on drawing No. 15-02-24, dated April 10, 1951, entitled "Expansion of Salinas Maneuver Site."

JURISDICTION OVER RIGHT-OF-WAY IN FORT SILL MILITARY RESERVATION, OKLA.

The bill (S. 1641) to retrocede to the State of Oklahoma concurrent jurisdiction over the right-of-way for United States Highways Nos. 62 and 277 within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of Oklahoma a retrocession of jurisdiction over that part of the Fort Sill Military Reservation for which permission to use as a highway right-of-way for United States Higways Nos. 62 and 277, 80 feet in width, with necessary borrow pits, was granted to the State of Oklahoma by the Assistant Secretary of War by permit dated October 13, 1932. This retrocession of jurisdiction is granted to the extent that all laws of the State and all laws of the United States shall be applicable within the entire area included within the said permit and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction granted shall be effective upon the acceptance thereof by the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma.

JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN HIGHWAYS WITHIN FORT BELVOIR, VA.

The bill (S. 1549) to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of Virginia a retrocession of jurisdiction over portions of highways described below within the Fort Belvoir Military Reservation to the extent that all laws of the State and all laws of the United States shall be applicable thereon and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover: United States Highway No. 1 between the easterly and westerly boundaries of the reservation, Virginia Highway No. 617 from Accotink to the northwesterly boundary of the reservation, Virginia Highway No. 618 between United States Highway No. 1 and Virginia Highway No. 613, Virginia Highway No. 613 from its intersection with Virginia Highway No. 611 (also known as Telegraph Road) to its intersection with Virginia Highway No. 618, and over the following area: Beginning at the intersection of the centerlines of Virginia Highways Nos. 613 and 617; thence westerly at right angles to the centerline of Highway No. 617, four feet; thence north forty degrees west two hundred thirty-two and forty-seven one-hundredths feet to center of bridge; thence north fifty degrees east forty-four feet to a point in stream; thence south forty degrees east one hundred eighty-eight and forty-seven one-hundredths feet to a point in Highway No. 613; thence south five degrees west sixty-two and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to point of beginning. This legislation is to be effective only as to those portions of the highways and area indicated herein over which the United States has heretofore acquired exclusive jurisdiction and shall not affect portions of such highways and area, if any, over which exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction is now vested in the State of Virginia. The general location of the numbered highways and the bounded area are shown on a map designated: War Department, O. C. E., Construction Division, Real Estate, Fort Belvoir Layout Map, approved September 22, 1944, Drawing No. MAD 37, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction provided for in section 1 of this act shall take effect upon the acceptance thereof by the Legislature of the State of Virginia.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT EAGLE MOUNTAIN LAKE, TEX.

The bill (S. 1525) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps air station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in consideration of the conveyance to the United States of America by the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 of fee-simple title to two certain parcels of land and avigation easement rights in other lands described in section 2 hereof, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convey to the said Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to three parcels of land at the former United States Marine Corps air station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex., comprising an aggregate of two hundred twenty-five and five one-hundredths acres, more or less, and indicated as sections 1, 2, and 3 of area D on Public Works Drawing No. 4847, approved February 10, 1950, a copy of which is on file in the Navy Department, reserving, however, to the United States of America avigation easement rights and such other rights in, to, and over said lands as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to accept the conveyance to the United States of America by the said Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 of fee-simple title to two parcels of land at the said former United States Marine Corps air station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex., containing an aggregate area of two hundred forty-four and thirty one-hundredths acres, more or less, and indicated as areas A and B on said Public Works Drawing No. 4847, together with perpetual avigation easement rights acceptable to the Secretary of the Navy over other lands of the said district lying in the flight-clearance zone of the east-west runway of the said air station.

REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO PURCHASE DISCHARGE FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

The bill (S. 1544) to repeal the authority to purchase discharge from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act of June 16, 1890 (26 Stat. 158), and that part of the act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. 717), which provides "and in time of peace the President may, in his discretion, and under such rules and upon such conditions as he may prescribe, permit any enlisted man to purchase his discharge from the Navy or the Marine Corps, the amounts received therefrom to be covered into the Treasury," are hereby repealed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR WEARING OF UNIFORM BY PERSONS HONORABLY DISCHARGED FROM THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 1550) to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 125 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "of ceremony" wherever they appear therein and substituting therefor the words "authorized by regulations of the President."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 793), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "of ceremony" and substituting therefor the words "authorized by regulations of the President."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in

the RECORD an explanation of the bill just passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

Mr. President, this bill proposes to clarify certain provisions of existing law relating to the wearing of the military uniform by persons who have been discharged from the military services.

Under existing law persons who have been honorably discharged from the military services are permitted to wear their uniforms on certain occasions of ceremony.

Existing law, however, does not precisely define what is meant by the term "occasions of ceremony."

As a consequence there have been instances where individuals wearing the uniform of the United States have participated in ceremonies which were unbecoming to the dignity of the uniform and to the Armed Forces. Yet, the lack of a clear-cut definition enunciated in the law has made it impossible to prosecute offenders. The bill proposes to remedy the situation by substituting for the term "occasions of ceremony" the phrase "occasions authorized by regulations of the President."

The committee feels that the testimony presented shows a clear need for the legislation and recommends its enactment. The bill was recommended by the Department of Defense with the concurrence of the Department of Justice. It involves no expenditure of Federal funds.

AMENDMENT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945

The bill (S. 1413) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. May we have an explanation of this bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation of the bill has been requested.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. My attention has been called to the fact that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], who is interested in this bill, has not returned from the meeting of the committee which has been considering the bill. Therefore, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN NATIONAL CELEBRATION OF CONTROLLED POWERED FLIGHT

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to provide for participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there are on the calendar two joint resolutions pertaining to this general celebration. The other is House Joint Resolution 241, Calendar No. 213.

Mr. McCARRAN. They are not the same, although they are designated on the calendar as being the same. They are different, because House Joint Resolution 241 carries a specific appropriation. I think it should have gone to the Committee on the Judiciary. The two measures are not the same.

Mr. President, I should like to say just one word in behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 42. I have here on my desk the personal file of Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, which shows that this celebration of the 50th anniversary of powered flight has been given the enthusiastic endorsement of President Eisenhower, has the full support of the executive departments of the Federal Government, has been endorsed by governors of a majority of the States, has been endorsed by outstanding leaders and organizations in civic and patriotic fields all over the country, by labor leaders, business leaders, and leaders in many other fields of endeavor.

Mr. President, Gen. Jimmy Doolittle is the sparkplug of this celebration of the 50th anniversary of powered flight. He has not only secured the approval and support of Government and business on the State and local levels, as well as on the national level; General Doolittle has encouraged and secured a high degree of world interest in this anniversary celebration. He wants Congress to join in the celebration, providing official notice that the whole Nation is interested in it. I am confident that my colleagues will not wish to withhold their sanction from this joint resolution.

As coauthor of Senate Joint Resolution 42, there is a statement which I feel I should make as part of the legislative history of the resolution. Question has been raised whether the last paragraph of the resolution, authorizing payment of necessary travel expenses of any Member of Congress incidental to the performance of duties and responsibilities pursuant to designation under this resolution, could be construed in such a way as to permit large expenditures, or whether this is a provision solely relating to actual and necessary minimum travel expenses by Members of Congress themselves. Of course, the latter view is the correct one. The resolution provides that the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House shall appoint Members of their respective Houses to represent the Congress at principal national events in connection with the anniversary celebration. The clause with regard to expenses would simply cover the actual and necessary travel expenses of such Members in connection with their attendance at the designated events.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas two Americans, Orville and Wilbur Wright, of Dayton, Ohio, made the world's first successful controlled powered flight in a heavier-than-air craft at Kitty Hawk, N. C., on December 17, 1903; and

Whereas American inventiveness and competitive enterprise during the half century since December 17, 1903, has developed the airplane into one of mankind's most powerful economic tools, into a social force which has recast the earth, into the most decisive element in the armor of the free world; and

Whereas the epochal contribution of the Wright brothers is an historical milestone in world aviation leadership; and

Whereas the National Committee To Observe the Fiftieth Anniversary of Powered Flight desires and the President of the United States has directed the Federal Government to participate in a broad program of commemorative activities; and

Whereas it is the judgment of the Congress that a proper coordination of Government participation in this anniversary be achieved: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the period from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953, be, and it is hereby, declared the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight.

The President of the Senate shall appoint six Members and the Speaker of the House shall appoint six Members to compose a Joint Committee on Observance of the 50th Anniversary Year of Controlled Powered Flight, and may appoint additional Members of their respective Houses from time to time to represent the Congress at principal national events during the 50th anniversary year of controlled flight.

When requested thereto by the joint committee appointed pursuant to this resolution the Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to arrange for the cooperation of and appropriate participation by the various armed services in the celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight.

Necessary travel expenses of any Member of Congress incidental to the performance of duties and responsibilities pursuant to designation under this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of which such member is a Member, upon vouchers approved by the chairman elected by the joint committee created hereunder.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 241, although designated on the calendar as being a companion measure, is not a companion resolution; it is entirely different.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The measure passed by the Senate was Senate Joint Resolution 42, Calendar No. 172.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct, that is the one that has been passed, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was no objection, and Senate Joint Resolution 42 was passed.

SUSPENSION OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) favoring suspension of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 27, 1953, p. 3908.)

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 27, 1953, p. 3915.)

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29)

favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 4, line 1, to strike out "A–6467056, Metsalo, Valentin"; in line 20, after the numerals "A–7144911", to strike out "Swoyski" and insert "Swoysik"; in line 21, after the name "Antonin", to strike out "Svojski" and insert "Svojsik"; in line 23, to strike out "A–9541479, Tani, Johannes."; on page 8, line 2, to strike out "A–7135678, Werner, Vera Stein"; on page 11, line 2, to strike out "A–7125298, Olkin, Golda"; on page 14, after line 6, to strike out "A–7021050, Fung, Corinne Lillian or Corrine Lillian Kwong"; on page 18, after line 9, to strike out "A–6903692, Bluth, Lenke Einhorn"; after line 11, to strike out "A–6852888, Feldbrand, Manci"; after line 13, to strike out "A–6857573, Halpert, Sari Meisels"; after line 21, to strike out "A–9778303, Mazurek, Eugeniusz. A–6887709, Meisels, Naftali"; on page 19, after line 7, to strike out "A–6917991, Schwimmer, Zoltan"; on page 20, after line 3, to strike out "A–6929687, Diller, Abraham Iser"; after line 11, to strike out "A–9536244, Gutmann, Villem or Willem, or Vellem, Willem, William, Vilam, or Wilheim Gutmann, Gutman, Guttmann"; after line 21, to strike out "A–6903748, Kaftanski, Seymour, alias Szepsel Kaftanski"; on page 21, after line 16, to strike out "A–6756293, Lucaci Larisa"; on page 22, after line 3, to strike out "A–6647101, Schulz, Jiri. A–6938007, Schwartz, Hillel Aron"; in line 6, after the numerals "A–7243320", to strike out "Shalmon" and insert "Shalom"; after line 9, to strike out "A–7290210, Sztrachman, Aleksander"; after line 13, to strike out "A–7197550, Waldman, Arpad"; after line 17, to strike out "A–6760585, Weil, Nicholas Andrew (Miklos Andor Weil). A–6886824, Weiss Josef"; on page 23, after line 10, to strike out "A–6565851, Hindreus, Hans Meeme. A–6159671, Joles, Joel Leib"; after line 16, to strike out "A–6903760, Morrissey, Suzanne Rath. A–6949995, Neufeld, Josef"; after line 23, to strike out "A–9776513, Stilger, Wlodzimierz Jan"; and on page 24, line 1, to strike out "A–6849828, Tai, Gertrude Loe or Hsiao Tso Loe."

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29), as amended, was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A–6963020, Amsel, Andor.
A–7898535, Avilo, Rudolf.
A–6592016, Balberiski, Miron or Bell.
A–6756307, Baqai, Mohamad Amir or Mohamad Amir Boukai.
A–6552873, Brotleit, Zofia Kusewicka.
A–9825254, Bussani, Andrew.
A–7099697, Chank, Peter Yun-Pao.
A–6431861, Chang, Jean M. Y. (nee Young).
A–6623722, Chang, Shau Hoa.
A–6623721, Chang, Tsaing Wa.
A–6625811, Chang, Yuan Lo.
A–6851532, Chao, Tsei-Yu or T. Y. Chao or Chao Tsei Yu.
A–7073396, Chechik, Luba (nee Luba Rusak).
A–6848439, Chen, Min.
A–6830501, Dischka, Zsuzsanna.
A–6917990, Domb, Moses.
A–7828138, Domb, Cyla.
A–7828139, Domb, Fryda.
A–7131176, Esop, Verner.
A–6740258, Fanaberia, Calel Morika.
A–6713644, Fanaberia, Masia (nee Rubin).
A–6886818, Feldblum, Meyer.
A–6536894, Fleischman, David.
A–6841247, Fleischman, Ilona Sara (nee Elzikovitz).
A–6769948, Frankel, Nechemie.
A–6758622, Frankel, Chana (nee Wachs).
A–7056845, Furer, Menashe or Menasze or Menasche or Menash Furer.
A–7210070, Gawronski, Antonina (nee Rittigstein).
A–6769935, Gedeon, Elie Jabra.
A–6860145, Gedrovics, Alberts.
A–6903711, Grunwald, Alexander.
A–6448004, How, Julie Lien-Yng or Julie How.
PR901282, How, Bang.
PR901281, How, Rose May Ng or Rose Howe.
A–6737212, Huang, Yao Sien or Eva Yai-Sien Huang.
A–6576346, Jacobowitz, Bela (Jakobowitz).
A–6848236, Jacobowitz, Eva.
A–7197382, Jaszkowski, Tadeusz or Ted Jaszkowski or T. Jaszkowski.
A–7427989, Karm, Meinhard.
A–6772233, Khalidi, Suleiman Faud El.
A–7491361, Kirilloff, Boris Ephim.
A–6887572, Kopelowitz, Ester (nee Tessler).
A–7178548, Laurik, Evald.
A–8091096, Lee, Margaret Chia Lin (Margaret Therese Lee).
A–6171207, Lee, Yiu Yung.
A–6953010, Lieber, Savolta (nee Berger).
A–6851545, Loo, Ching Chee.
A–7135305, Loo, Chia-Ying Chang (nee Chang).
A–6819172, Masliyah, Noory Heskel or Noory Heskel Musaleh.
A–6415978, Molnar, Theresia.
A–6923768, Muller, Vera.
A–7095882, Munteanu, George Nicholas.
A–9107940, Nakielski, Bernard or Makielski.
A–8091555, Novak, Joakim Ante.
A–6801965, Pan, John Joei-Siang or John Pan.
A–6611055, Potocka, Maria.
A–9668080, Rand, Vladimir.
A–6776588, Rotbart, Motel.
A–7094824, Saltoun, Ishaq Heshel.
A–7841095, Saltoun, Raina.
A–7841096, Saltoun, Salum.
A–9825231, Scrivanich, Antonio Nicolo.
A–7048886, Shulman, Joel or Julian Shulman or Julian Szulman.
A–6606633, Spierer, Villiam or William or Vilimos.
A–6508114, Stern, Herman.
A–9825170, Swidzinski, Czeslaw.
A–7144911, Swoysik, Emery Anthony or Emerich Antonin Svojsik.
A–7365957, Szekely, Suzanne.
A–6862642, Tessler, Margit (nee Margit Sonnenschein).
A–6258292, Tsai, Pe Chiu.
A–7934047, Tulk Johannes.
A–7243463, Tye, Josephine Chou.
A–6090780, Wagner, Wienczyslaw Jozef.
A–6701080, Weiss, Rachel Ruth.
A–6881779, Weisz, Eva.
A–7134269, Wisniewski, Roxalia.
A–7197533, Woo, Kok Liang.
A–7197534, Woo, Lily Ji-Yuen.
A–7197535, Woo, Andy Ying-Chung.
A–7197536, Woo, Benny Fong-Chung.
A–6291894, Zydorowicz, Zygmunt Stanislaw.
A–6291893, Zydorowicz, Stanislawa (nee Babel) (Bombel).
A–6615482, Cimze, Brigita.
A–6619075, Sils, Jekabs Rudolfs.
A–6615484, Cimze, Wilhelmina Albertine (nee Upmanis).
A–7181298, Ambaras, Berek.
A–7181299, Ambaras, Ruchla Leja (nee Spektor).
A–7181301, Ambaras, Szmul or Samuel.
A–7181300, Ambaras, Chaja.
A–6933862, Antos, Viktor or Viktor Adler.
A–7073948, Bajor, Laszlo.
A–7073949, Bajor, Margaret (nee Bermann).
A–7125248, Belohlavek, Ladislav.
A–8015690, Boni, Donato or Bonich.
A–7982580, Chen, Betty Shu-Hsien.
A–7350806, Chen, Chi-Cheng.
A–6542129, Deutsch, Emery.
A–6542128, Deutsch, Edith.
A–7395122, Dunn, Fung Wen-Feng.
A–6899359, Eisendraft, Jente Perl.
A–7975403, Greisman, Chaim.
A–6933870, Greisman, Dyna (nee Dyna Stern).
A–6511086, Gulewski, Chaim Ber.
A–6843542, Halberstam, Serena.
A–7143248, Hauser, Moses.
A–6896010, Kac, David or David Katz.
A–6704615, Kahan, David.
A–6819107, Konig, Simon.
A–7383019, Konig, Judit.
A–6917988, Leffel, David.
A–7841092, Leffel, Hania Sarah Leffel.
A–7841094, Leffel, Henry.
A–7066379, Leicht, Alfred.
A–6757650, Liberman, Chaja Cross.
A–7057929, Loblovics, Jirina.
A–7445230, Loblovics, Peter Stepan.
A–9669698, Loser, Ladislav.
A–6439571, Lukacs, John Adalbert.
A–7184075, Nagy, Gustav.
A–6953276, Ostreicher, Sally or Sara Ostreicher.
A–9825173, Piccini, Giovanni or John Piccini.
A–9825233, Piccinich, Antonio.
A–9825234, Picinich, Giovanni (John).
A–7048776, Pribramska, Milena Jaroslava.
A–6803937, Propper, Hinda.
A–7243272, Rofe, Clemy (nee Hassoun).
A–7243273, Rofe, Roland.
A–6542415, Ronikier, Adam.
A–6275646, Rosenthal, Cecilia Lucy (nee Rochlin).
A–6937373, Rottenberg, Laszlo.
A–6851434, Shen, Mary.
A–6441693, Shew, Lester Fook.
A–6441694, Shew, Alice Lee.
A–6450187, Shimanovsky, Alexander Eugene.
A–6450157, Shimanovsky, Xenia Nikosevna.
A–6450158, Shimanovsky, Nickolai, Alexander.
A–6450159, Shimanovsky, Natalie Alexander.
A–6905008, Straush, Leo.
A–7863422, Strauss, Elizabeth (nee Elizabeth Brody).
A–7125300, Szilas, George.
A–7125301, Szilas, Veronica Anna.
A–6913912, Tabak, Guta.
A–9825237, Tarabocchia, Antonio Giovanni.
A–6805581, Teitelbaum, Dorothy.
A–7116390, Winter, Berek Litman.
A–7427544, Winter, Mordechai.
A–7802010, Zaharoff, George Alexander.
A–6659388, Zak, Irene Anna (nee Segal).
A–6663293, Zak, Daniel.
A–6663244, Zak, Michael.
A–6779061, Abdul-Nabi, Sion Moshi.
A–6907333, Abramczyk, Abram.
A–7074032, Blumenstein, Jerta.
A–6509235, Brecher, Samuel.
A–6703334, Chang, Joyce Loretta.
A–6848604, Chien, James Tai Tze.
A–7975994, Chiu, Leung.
A–9836671, Cymer, Alfred or Alfred Ziemer or Alfred K. Cymer or Cymer Alfred or A. Cymer.
A–7934149, D'Antoni, Giuseppe Giovanni.
A–6949998, Dresdner, Desider.
A–6983006, Felkay, Miklos.
A–6983007, Felkay, Magdalena.
A–7445428, Felkay, Julia Agnes.
A–6496385, Fischman, Moses.
A–6472344, Fischman, Piri (nee Jeremias).

A-6765956, Fook, Lum or Lam.
A-6390069, Gerencser, Frank.
A-6390070, Gerencser, Anne.
A-7132030, Goldberger, Ernest.
A-6029650, Gorodecki, Aba.
A-6480449, Gorog, Frigyes or Frederic Gorog.
A-7125154, Gorog, Margit.
A-6887741, Gunsburg, Mendel.
A-6666944, Haberfeld, Eugene.
A-6922074, Halpert, Mendel.
A-7491705, Ho, Hao Jo.
A-7828496, Ho, Hsiang-Chiao Huang.
A-7828498, Ho, Lily Li-Lien.
A-7828495, Ho, Louise Li-Si.
A-7828597, Ho, William Wei-Yu.
A-7125390, Iritz, Magda.
A-7354858, Iritz, Andras Ferenc.
A-6438637, Jurisevic, Milo Tripe.
A-6438638, Jurisevic, Jelena Milo.
A-6438640, Jurisevic, Radmila Milo.
A-6438639, Jurisevic, Svetozar Milo.
A-6987919, Karastoyanova, Marguita Bogdanova.
A-7056457, Karcz, Jerzy Feliks.
A-7097876, Karcz, Irena.
A-7134826, Karlik, Oldrich (Olda) Evse Spitihnev.
A-7095980, Kovacs, Ilona Marie (nee Tovolgyi).
A-7095981, Kovacs, Judith Ilona.
A-7095982, Kovacs, Katalin Piroska.
A-6847906, Keng, Hilda Hsi Ling.
A-9506160, Kingsepp, Alexander.
A-7210424, Kotas, Jindrich.
A-7197295, Kucera, Sonia or Sonia Kucerova.
A-7802992, Kun, Jozsef Lajos or Joseph Kun.
A-9290474, Lian, Choo Joon.
A-6709345, Kwong, Tin Yu.
A-6991771, Leidermann, Susan Veronica.
A-6985787, Leidermann, Paul.
A-6848564, Lin, Ru-Kan or Ru Kong Lin.
A-8001257, Ljubcic, Maria Luca.
A-7210293, Madis, Voldemar.
A-7210288, Madis, Ilona.
A-7863133, Madis, Ilona, Jr.
A-7863134, Madis, Voldemar, Jr.
A-7991037, Maram, Maria.
A-7629040, Michalski, Stefan Antoni.
A-6555835, Milikowski, Boruch or Milikowsky or Boruch Milikowskie or Milkowski or Bouch Milikowski or Borouch Milikowski.
A-7483287, Moy, Don Tsit.
A-7095886, Miculescu, Mircea.
A-6849839, Nieh, Tseng-Lu.
A-6852886, Ostteicher, Ester or Esther (nee Peristein).
A-7868150, Pi, Teh Ho.
A-9825275, Piccini, Matteo.
A-7201404, Ripka, George Prokop.
A-7863155, Ripka, Hubert Jean Michel or Hubert Jan Michal Ripka.
A-6704266, Romanowska, Alicja Theresa or Alice Romanowski.
A-6983560, Setton, Renee Albert.
A-6746537, Shina, Isaac Saleh.
A-9825384, Tarabochia, John.
A-6403591, Tkachenko, Arkady.
A-7142101, Twardon, Gerard Edward.
A-7828393, Veres, George Stephen.
A-7828395, Veres, Catherine Renee.
A-7828394, Veres, Paul Stephen.
A-7095791, Vizer, Jozsef or Joseph.
A-7095792, Vizer, Erzsebet or Elizabeth (nee Papa).
A-7264780, Pal, Peter or Paul Vizer.
A-7915647, Wang, King-Ching.
A-7354350, Wang, Shen Kuang.
A-7379754, Wang, Chao-Chih Shih.
A-6622376, Wang, Shih Jien.
A-7427597, Yang, Bernard Kenneth.
A-7248107, Yu, Fu Ching.
A-6699842, Choye, James Hung or Tsai Hung.
A-6933906, Feder, Solomon.
A-7052513, Feher, Janos.
A-7052514, Feher, Klara (nee Vajda).
A-7052515, Feher, Agnes Julianna.
A-7053576, Friend, Jacob Lion.
A-6159672, Hudec, Ladislas Edward.
A-6159673, Hudec, Gisella Isabella.
A-6903729, Irany, Jalal Zend.
A-6704668, Jacob, Ellis Samuel.
A-9778010, Kaplur, Serge Michael.
A-9506849, Klak, Tadeusz Boleslaw.
A-7052354, Kremnitzer, Samuel.
A-7898806, Kremnitzer, Sala.
A-7298969, Ku, Ta Hai.
A-7350229, Kurzenbaum, Konstantin Paul.
A-1804133, Lillo, Rudolf Karl.
A-6460280, Lis, Josef Lisek Vel.
A-6071234, Liu, James Hsi-Hwa.
A-9825110, Maslobojew, Ryszard.
A-7356260, Metes, Mircea Virgil P.
A-7809812, Nacinovich, Francesco Giovanni.
A-9831492, Paszek, Emil.
A-7249625, Quon, Yuk Lum or Egai Kim Quon.
A-6704260, Rymarska, Stanislawa Janina or Stella Rymarski.
A-7197296, Schwarzenberg, Francis (Frantisek).
A-7197297, Schwarzenberg, Amalie (Amalia).
A-7809033, Schwarzenberg, Ludmila.
A-6982895, Sevcik, Jaromir.
A-7809012, Siao, Ruby Wang.
A-7809013, Siao, Lilly.
A-5206882, Silla, Johannes.
A-6992868, Sion, Caroline Eliahou (nee Caroline Eliahou Khazzam).
A-6943745, Somogyi, John.
A-6985795, Stransky, Frank.
A-6985796, Stransky, Kamila.
A-9716791, Strawinski, Adolf.
A-9825125, Szymankiewicz, Kazimierz.
A-6844603, Wang, Kung-Lee.
A-6848123, Yen, Jen Hwa (Moore Yen).
A-9766047, Abelnicks, Karlis Alexsandris.
A-6763814, Ahmad, Abder Raouf Sayied.
A-9621982, Baric, Slavko.
A-9825347, Bresaz, Metodio Vittorio.
A-7201326, Chao, Margaret Ellen.
A-6868652, Chasan, Samuel.
A-6843905, Chasan, Lala.
A-6843906, Chasan, Daniel.
A-6665493, Djordjevich, Ilija Milan or Eli M. Georgevich.
A-6363788, Dwek, Joseph.
A-9825078, Geba, Waclaw Stanislaw.
A-6857645, Gedeon, William Jabra.
A-7176712, Geiger, Leslie alias Leisie Laselo Geiger.
A-7197556, Geiger, Elizabeth (nee Elizabeth Klein alias Elisabeth Kozmo).
A-6870411, Gottlieb, Suszanna Gabriella.
A-6829523, Hofer, Andras or Andre or Andrew or Andre, Fernand, Francois Hofer; Andras Nandor Ferenc Hofer.
1100-23457, Huang, Yuan Chung or Wei Ta Huang or Walter Huang.
A-6652842, Kenigsberg, Szaja Abram.
A-7144083, Lederman, Abram.
A-6923751, Lewita, Pinkas.
A-7903765, Mikulich, Gildo (nee Erminegildo Miculich).
A-6819103, Pick, Teresa Zeller.
A-6555822, Rosenstein, Muzza.
A-6987833, Sebestyen, George Stephen.
A-7941803, Simicich, Giovanni.
A-9825228, Tarabocchia, Antonio.
A-6881776, Traube, Moses.
A-6949360, Traube, Frida Pessa.
A-6848504, Tsou, Kwan Shung or Tsou Kwan Chung.
A-6983523, Visoianu, Florica Corneliu (nee Balteanu).
A-8001252, Wei, Chue Sue.
A-7118818, Winkler, Thomas.
A-9634634, Adamson, Armant.
A-7074001, Alimanestiano, Mihai.
A-7052865, Alimanestiano, Ioana.
A-7118760, Blau, Sidonia (nee Weiss).
A-6953297, Brod, Ivan.
A-6739686, Chao, Pei Chu.
A-6973682, Chang, Linda Tung-Chen.
A-7111908, Chiao, Gene Liang.
A-7111909, Chiao, Wei Ying Lin.
A-6522482, Chou, Kuo-P'ing alias ChTao-Chen Chou (or Chow), alias Shou-Ying Chou (or Chow) alias Hsien-Chen Chou (or Chow).
A-6921258, Deutsch, Joel.
A-6595663, Druker, Haim Girsch.
A-6595664, Druker, Rebecca Afraim.
A-6595662, Druker, Leah alias Lillian Druker.
A-6854411, Fabry, Gavriella.
A-7135698, Fan, Kwan Chi alias Quincey Chi-Chun Fan.
A-6897918, Faybik, Alojz Stefan alias Allen Stefan Faybik.
A-6945554, Froemel, Robert Boris Ivanchenko.
A-6968029, Goldstein, Margarita Martin.
A-7395111, Hu, Helen or Yu Hsin Hu.
A-6851699, Huang, William Yung-Nien alias William Edward Huang.
A-7141717, Izsak, Julianna.
A-7279652, Izsak, Robert John.
A-6771471, Karkar, Ya-Qub (Jack) Nasif.
A-7985654, Kask, Johannes alias Johannus Kask.
A-7178540, Kask, Nelly (nee Jarg) alias N. Jarg or Nelli Jarg or Nellie Jarg or Millie Jarg or Nellie Jarge or Nelly Jarg Kask.
A-7863386, King, Peter Wei Kong.
A-6930672, Kramer, Esther or Ester.
A-6279271, Landau, Judith.
A-6521591, Loutchan, Ludmila Maria.
A-7125164, Lowinger, Ida (nee Ida Klein).
A-9914609, Pusic, Paul.
A-9825124, Puszka, Jan.
A-7184152, Radnai, Pal Andras alias Paul Andrew Radnai.
A-7197543, Radnai, Eva (nee Eva Balazs).
A-7383442, Sakin, Anna (nee Boxer).
A-7383443, Sakin, Shulamith.
A-7383444, Sakin, Judith.
A-7178370, Sihv, Eduard (or E.; or Edward Sihv; or Eduard Shiv).
A-6183233, Tamm, Igor.
A-9580292, Toomberg, Valdemar.
A-7057641, Treblinska, Rywka alias Rywka Treblinski or Regina Treblinski, or Hochsztein (nee Treblinska).
A-7967275, Tung, Chen Huan.
A-7398350, Vali, Eduard Julius.
A-6922682, Winkler, Sandor.
A-7046213, Winkler, Margit (nee Szerou).
A-6790612, Wu, Chien Keng.
A-9825045, Swiderski, Romuald.
A-6916445, Ulm, Arvo Johannes.
A-6779243, Schidlof-Vojnovic, Ivan, or Ivan Schidlof.
A-7079927, Weiss, Bernat, or Bernard Weiss.
A-6354566, Krajden, Moszko.
A-6849467, Skarzynska, Aniela, or Irena Merenholc.
A-5534198, Zombory, Ladislas.
A-7941170, Chong, King Kee, or Kee Chong King or Casey King.
A-7786119, Goraki, Boleslaw Pawel.
A-6862321, Adamus, Stanislaw.
A-7193792, Kulej, Hanna Teresa.
A-7193793, Cholewicki, Victor Stefan.
A-9677603, Aasma, August.
A-7129220, Aurel, Mozes.
A-6861310, Chao, Hieh Chang, or Frank Chao.
A-7868117, Frank, Frieda.
A-6887552, Ickowicz, Majer.
A-6983574, Indig, Abraham.
A-7841098, Indig, Irene.
A-7052337, Levendel, Irene.
A-6691413, Lin, Shuh Yuen, alias Shuh Yuen Liu.
A-6794943, Malhas, Ruhi Abdul-Hamid.
A-6612875, Masri, Mahmud Said.
A-7190317, Molostvoff, Catherine Basil.
A-7125385, Nowomiast, Mojzesz Hirsz, alias Marvin Henry Newton.
A-7125386, Nowomiast, Mina (nee Kaplan), alias Mina Newton.
A-7841884, Nowomiast, Mark, alias Mark Newton.
A-8001241, Petelka, Zofia (nee Korpowska).
A-7427649, Rzepkowicz, Michael.
A-7390586, Sedlak, Mirko Svatopluk, or Mirko Sedlak.
A-4768149, Shu, E. Hah.
A-7048743, Stern, Martin.
A-7124129, Tan, Pai Chu.
A-9766004, Toomepuu, Juhan.
A-9766003, Toomepuu, Juri.

A-6163781, Tsai, Chen Yu.
A-7144079, Wolf, Aron Nathan.
A-6862641, Adam, Moses.
A-6440636, Aizer, Salim Shaoul.
A-5876212, Ambrus, Jan.
A-8001260, Arro, Arnold.
A-6952983, Beer, Adam, Eugin.
A-7210292, Bekeffi, Laszlo, alias Leslie Bekeffi.
A-7210291, Bekeffi, Magdalena.
A-6967636, Chen, Paul Kuan Yao.
A-7483958, Cheng, Ai Ming.
A-7483959, Chen, Lilly Li.
A-9765114, Cieslak, Alfons.
A-6662080, Domb, Jerachmiel, alias Jerachmiel Donn.
A-6805594, Faber, Laszlo, alias Laszlo Theodore Faber and George Leslie Faber.
A-6567671, Friedman, Leopold.
A-6903791, Gilbert, Suzanne, alias Suzanne Goldberger.
A-6737204, Godkin, Michael Joseph, or Moses Joseph Godkin.
A-7049993, Hazzan, Leon Isaac.
A-7049994, Hazzan, Renee.
A-6862650, Herman, Michel.
A-6991850, Herman, Maria.
A-6887727, Horowitz, Majer.
A-7276014, Hwang, Lai-Yin Grace.
A-6985811, Ionnitiu, Mircea.
A-6390210, Kangro, Valdeko.
A-7085991, Kassab, David Jacob.
A-6627380, Kiang, Frederica Shu-Ya.
A-9635272, Kiploks, Ludvigs, Paul or Ludvigs Kiploks.
A-6922685, Klein, Moric.
A-7828455, Klein, Julie.
A-7828456, Klein, Tomas.
A-6386367, Kogerman, Sulev Kristjan.
56133/591, Kuljaca, Jovo Petro.
A-6847740, Kwong, Man Hong.
A-7087401, Lautman, Zoltan.
A-6983796, Lee, Joseph Alexander.
A-6694226, Li, Kuan.
A-6625627, Li, Frances.
A-6794979, Lieber, Leopold.
A-6794944, Loh, Ellen (Ai Lien Loh, Ellen Lo).
A-7757809, Loo, Ping Yok.
A-6995548, Lowy, Gustav.
A-6805570, Odinak, Alec (Elya Odinak).
A-6373385, Petrova, Olga Gregorie.
A-6904771, Pizyc, Stefa.
A-6934637, Popoff, Sergei Vasilievich.
A-6390227, Raid, Kaljo, alias Kaljo Raamann.
A-7073587, Rizk, George Sliman, formerly George Sliman Rizk Abu Judom.
A-7468362, Sabel, Bela.
A-7463363, Sabel, Ilona (nee Adler).
A-7903795, Sabel, Irene.
A-6771472, Salah, Nadim John.
A-7243320, Shalom, Yaccup Raphael, alias Jack Raphael Shalom.
A-6867165, Sommerstein, Emil.
A-6886844, Szeto, Shih-Chuan.
A-9734415, Tai, Yang Wah.
A-6983820, Taub, Ladislas Vasile, alias Lawrence Taub.
A-6628885, Vaughan, Nellie Ladd.
A-7752326, Wang, Chi-Yuan.
A-6849833, Wang, Virginia Fu-Chuang.
A-6904341, Wechsler, Samuel.
A-6844256, Wenger, Irving (Israel Wegier).
A-6844257, Wenger, Ida (Chaja Wegier).
A-7130820, Berland, Felicja, alias Felicia Berland.
A-7182346, Borowiec, Andrzej Stanislaw.
A-9758751, Bracco, Giovanni.
A-7139089, Bracco, Simon Guisto.
A-8057048, Cugliani, John, or Ivan Kuljanic or Ivan Milan Kuljanic.
A-7046293, David, Masouda M. S. S.
A-7139010, Deblinger, Srul.
A-6959748, Deblinger, Kate (nee Guttman).
A-7934151, Fable, Joseph, or Joe Fable.
A-7079925, Fulop, Jeno.
A-7144001, Goldberger, Magdalena.
A-6528723, Halpern, Aron.
A-6737779, Klein, Moritz.
A-6891804, Kohn, Judith.
A-6755538, Liang Tsich.
A-7779160, Loo, Shou Ming.
0300-299946, Paema, Ernst.
A-7244193, Picinich, Matteo.
A-7123477, Rawicki, Jerzy Jacob alias Jerry Rawicki.
A-7276711, Sang, Chang Chuan.
A-6934990, Schnabel, Moses.
A-7828578, Surian, Giovanni.
A-6620485, Tsang, John Lien-Kwei.
A-9555577, Veider, Carl (Karl) Alfred.
A-7118759, Weiss, Ervin, alias Erwin Weiss.
A-7118778, Weiss, Frieda.
A-6238175, Yang, Peter Quay, also known as Yang Quay and Yang Kwei.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, after line 11, to strike out:

A-6803930, Diamant, Robert.

On page 3, after line 13, to strike out:

A-6803965, Macsai, John or Janos Macsai.

On page 5, after line 6, to strike out:

A-7367900, Giernalczyk, Stefan or Giernalczk or Gieralczyk or Gierwalczyk.

On page 7, after line 4, to strike out:

A-6667084, Niselbaum, Echel or Yechel Niselbaum.

After line 22, to strike out:

A-6623435, Gersten, Zorica.

On page 10, after line 4, to strike out:

PR-902563, Jones, Lilla Carola.

On page 11, after line 5, to strike out:

A-7056451, Stass, Ludmila (nee Kregiel).

On page 13, line 1, to strike out:

A-6933858, Muller, William or Viliam Muller.

And on page 14, after line 4, to insert:

A-7141334, Mandukich, Svetozar Kosta.
A-7141335, Mandukich, Kosara.
A-7141336, Mandukich, Ivan.
A-7190619, Tao, Hsiang Hsia or Albert H. Tao.
A-6370112, Ling, James Gi-Ming.
A-6289221, Sopko, Frantisek (Frantisch) or Frank John Sopko.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-6571865, Azouni, Omar Suleiman.
A-6034282, Basri, Saul Abraham alias Shaoul Abraham Basri.
A-7362993, Beker, Jiri or George.
A-7056018, Bigajer, Henry.
A-7927807, Bigajer, Maria (nee Klein).
A-7184426, Bornemisza, Adele.
A-6868664, Brodt, David Majer.
A-7125013, Cerveny, Jaroslav.
A-2688593, Chang, Yaum Wen-King alias Pauline Yuan Wen-King Chang.
A-8057496, Chang, Pan Yih alias Daniel Chang.
A-6819167, Dahlan, Joseph George.
A-6886895, Deutsch, Gyula.
A-7184060, Fabian, Bela.
A-6464490, Garutso, Alexander Steven.
A-7362421, Goldstein, Miksa or Max.
A-6862635, Grandjean, Ilona Elisabeth.
A-6933905, Groberg, Abram.
A-6933836, Hajnski, Henryk.
A-6754448, Hodnette, Emilie Syrova.
A-7134271, Horowitz, Herman.
A-7182150, Horowitz, Regina Scheer.
A-7483633, Ioan, Marie Chantal.
A-7095883, Bratianu, Vintila.
A-7483207, Bratianu, Despina Marguerite.
A-6709343, Jacob, Leah.
A-6843562, Jastrob, Ibolya.
A-6794727, Joseph, Sabat.
A-6929652, Kassees, Hanna Sa'Adallah alias John S. Kassees.
A-6759331, Kourilova, Vlasta Jindra or Kouril.
A-6817969, Kuo, Chi Sheng.
A-7629852, Li, Chu Fang Wu.
A-7243067, Li, Pei.
A-7133238, Liang, Tomson Chuan-Po.
A-7795750, Ling, Theodore.
A-6196851, Ling, Leah.
A-6196853, Ling, Amy.
A-6196852, Ling, Hubert.
A-8956200, Mikolajczyk, Marian.
A-9914607, Mojsilov, Milenko Rada.
A-6985784, Mostecky, Iva (nee Eret).
A-6985785, Mostecky, Iva Vaclava Marie Luisa.
A-6922679, Oestreicher, Moric.
A-7915652, Oestreicher, Ester (nee Schon).
0500-37887, Ounapuu, Anton.
A-7915651, Pavich, Krsto.
A-5356599, Pezzulich, Emilio, alias Milan.
A-6985963, Pollak, Rudolf.
A-6830454, Qafia, Mahmoud Abdullah.
A-9716946, Rannik, George Juri alias George Tilling.
A-7802994, Rannik, Ole (nee Laanvere).
A-6093774, Rogel, Samuel.
A-6952327, Stein, Geza.
A-6887557, Stein, Herman.
A-6855671, Szamet, Josef.
A-7975176, Tercovich, Joseph.
A-6163703, Tsai, Chun Hsiang.
A-5291485, Tsai, Shu Chen or Anna Tsai or Sister M. Marda Tsai.
A-9764882, Walczat, Josef.
A-7279395, Walter, Lajos.
A-7078090, Walter, Irene Wiesner.
A-6620502, Wang, Henry Kung-Chueh.
A-6923160, Weinberger, Saul.
A-7975402, Weinberger, Cyla.
A-7975401, Weinberger, Jacob.
A-7079576, Weiss, Judith.
A-7187464, Winkels, Elena or Elena Bohdanecka.
A-6009015, Zia, Joshua E.
A-6009018, Zia, Doris Pan.
A-9825023, Sawicki, Zbigniew Joe.
A-6509234, Apter, Moses, alias Mozes Apter.
A-6422791, Autengruber, Milan or Milan Rastislav Autengruber.
A-7048870, Beckmann, Veronica Eszter.
A-6949996, Berkowiski, Mojsze or Moisze.
A-6924618, Bialkowska, Danuta.
A-7967726, Chao, Shih Shun alias Richard Chao.
A-7057123, Dolinska, Zofia Helena.
A-7197508, Frohlinger, Eugene.
A-7283199, Glikson, Josef.
A-7283200, Glikson, Cypora.
A-7283201, Glikson, Jerzy.
A-6916044, Herzer, Ivo.
A-7095740, Jogis, Arvi formerly Jurgins.
A-7095741, Jogis, Helga formerly Jurgins (nee Sulla).
A-7841818, Kucich, Oscar.
A-6330092, Lau, Johann also known as Lau Tso Han.
A-7445337, Loh, Carolyn Y-T.
A-6818121, Nessim, Abraham Salim or Ibrahim S. Nessim.
A-6903693, Nussenzweig, Olga.
A-6886828, Paneth, Alter.
A-7210287, Pill, Jerzy also known as George Pill.
A-8001229, Radovich Maxmillian.
A-7178955, Rottmann, Mozart.

A-6916032, Steinmetz, Klara (nee Polatsek).
A-6916034, Polatsek, Elsa.
A-6851519, Tao, Kwang-Yeh known as William K. Y. Tao.
A-7941175, Tao, Yu-Tsai known as Anne Tao.
A-7941176, Tao, Ke-Chiang known as David Tao.
A-6851546, Tsun-Hou, Lu.
A-6835823, Zelouf, Victor Sasson also known as Yictor Sasson Zelouf.
A-6612442, Bohosiewicz, Erwin.
A-7190311, Bohosiewicz, Pawel.
A-6958967, Chow, Lee Yuen.
A-7955269, Dimini, Milano.
A-6617748, Dimitriyevitch, Pierre or Peter Aleksander.
A-6968042, Feierabend, Ivo Karel.
A-9825160, Gornicki, Adam Waclaw.
A-9037759, Grzeta, Josip Marko.
A-6698714, Hamoui, Salomon Aslan or Hamwi or Hamwai.
A-6386627, Jizba, Zdenek Vaclav.
A-9673334, Jurkovic, Luka.
A-9542733, Kodurand, Leo.
A-7056415, Korda, Peter Bela (Krausz).
A-7056416, Korda, Marianne Rose (Engel Endrenyi).
A-7292654, Lee, Ying alias Robert Ying Lee.
A-79855399, Lo, Agnes Kit-Ling or Kit-Ling Lo.
A-6855623, Mandel, Salamon.
A-6610332, Mashal, Haskel Shaul.
A-6920582, Matrai, Bela Ludwig.
A-7174072, Negulescu, Istrate Gheorghe.
A-6528823, Nuseibeh, Hisham Zaki.
A-7809073, Skenazi, Sarah.
A-6937366, Szatai, Janos E. or Szatay, alias Jean Szatai.
A-7178989, Tasnady, Joseph alias Joseph Tasnady Tiedrenzel alias Hans Bruner.
A-6751969, Wyszogrol, Morris alias Moses Morris Wyszogrod.
A-7445765, Ye, Richard Cheng (Cheng Richard Ye (Yeh), Cheng Ye).
A-6857543, Moorma, Eino Fred.
A-7186415, Ajgengold, Symcha Jojna.
A-6669703, Alpern, Berek.
A-6952374, Balazsy, Elizabeth or Elizabeth Balazsy Barta.
A-7955268, Carcich, Romeo Peter.
A-6923157, Feig, Lea.
A-7419844, Hsia, Wei Yen.
A-7419843, Hua, Yu-Ching.
A-9685271, Kong, Lee Wing or Lee Wai Ding.
A-9542194, Kotova, Grigorija.
A-7125194, Krausz, Erno.
A-7138433, Krausz, Magdolna (nee Friedman).
A-7352275, Krausz, Eva.
A-6095041, Li, Loo-Yi.
A-6095146, Li, Yu Hwa New.
A-6095147, Li, Ronald Liang-Kuh.
A-6166808, Osusky, Stefan.
A-6704109, Paley, Iona Solomonovich.
A-7143252, Pan, Henry Cheng Hsing.
A-7686295, Perkins, Valentine Smoleff.
A-7244215, Plir, Helmut Evald.
A-7439283, Raun, Joann.
A-6771850, Saliba, George Shamoun.
A-8031934, Szubert, Jadwiga Adelberta.
A-6537002, Tang, Yueh-Mei (nee Huang, known as Madeleine Tang).
A-6665387, Treia, Stanley (Stanislaw).
A-6794976, Zeller, David.
A-6891800, Zeller, Herman.
A-9625095, Zmyslowska, Jozefa.
A-6218708, Kallab, Jiri.
A-7057982, Kallab, Aloisie.
A-8021333, Kallab, Valeriana.
A-8021334, Kallab, Anna.
0300-233579, Kallab, Maria-Jana.
A-9765892, Kurkiewicz, Marian.
A-7073954, Szalatnyaova, Louisa.
A-6316965, Tang, Chi-Chien alias Jack Chichien Tang or Jack C. Tang.
A-6821620, Tcheng, John Tsou-Ling.
A-6933872, Apel, Izchok.
A-6904306, Berger, Josef.
A-7279367, Berger, Melanie.
A-7279368, Berger, Robert.
A—7116341, Birnbaum, Dora (nee Lebovitz).
A-6819585, Borek, Feliks Rubinstein.
A-6709169, Cernius, Filomena or Filomena Vaidilaite.
A-6986499, Chaw, Frances Chi.
A-6989489, Duvan, Boris.
A-6989488, Duvan, Nadejda.
A-6989487, Duvan, Irene.
A-6884230, Farkas, Erneat.
A—6904299, Galupkin, Elja or Elia.
A-6760568, Garai, Lydia Agnes.
A-6521600, Goldner, Noemi Susan.
A-6916062, Gottesmann, Dezso or David Gottesman.
A-8031937, Hanja, Aita (nee Oiv).
A-8031938, Hanja, Rudolph.
0300-309594, Hanja, Yuri, Thomas.
A-6616280, Hariri, Mahmud Said.
A-6452910, Hawinowicki, Hara or Havinoviski.
A-6623735, Huang, Linda Min-Hui.
A-8021273, Klaas, Selma alias Selma Nilson.
A-6887212, Kennedi, Miklos alias Miklos Stern.
A-6414654, Koo, Ge-Tsung.
A-7594552, Koo, Ts-Zung.
A-6704261, Kopera, Maria (nee Rycerz).
A-7046752, Lempicki, Alexander.
A-9650707, Lepa, Mihkel.
A-6554469, Lipski, Tadeusz.
A-6251862, Liu, Li Shiang.
A-7046283, Marecek, Karel Vaclav.
A-7095897, Marecek, Maria Barbora.
A-8082101, Marecek, Karel Frantisek.
A-8082100, Marecek, Miriam Anna.
A-8082099, Marecek, Bozena Vera.
A-6999088, Menache, Esther Shaoul.
A-9731416, Peaske, Kaarel.
A-9766019, Piaskiewicz, Jan Tadeusz.
A-9765690, Rabar, Simone.
A-6949334, Rios, Eszter or Esther or Eszter Fazekas (nee Major).
A-7095380, Rubinstein, Simon.
A-6922094, Schachter, Imrich.
A-6564147, Sheng, Marie Ming-Yi.
A-6690379, Sohn, Isabella (nee Ravay) alias Isabella Herman.
A-7046265, Shurc, Ludovit.
A-7046266, Shurc, Helena.
A-7046267, Shurc, Susan Vera.
A-6858259, Ting, Pu Sheng alias Andrew Pusheng Ting.
A-6848022, Shung, Ming Cheng or Ming Cheng Ting alias Luch Shung Ting.
A-9770893, Treia, Leon Tadeusz.
A-6848499, Tsai, Nai Hsin.
A-6142235, Tung, Tze-Kuei.
A-6963104, Vali, Viktor.
A-6534362, Wainer, Dora (nee Segerman).
A-6667951, Wainer, Joseph Abraham.
A-7483336, Wang, Kwang Nien or Kenneth Wang.
A-8021362, Wen, Li Shu or William Li Shu Wen.
A-6952371, Wiener, Berek.
A-7138101, Zachariasiewicz, Wladyslaw.
A-6827524, Zakova, Marie-Antonie Jarmila.
A-7095569, Barton, Frank X.
A-7095570, Barton, Alice Margaret.
A-7863152, Benedig, Erno.
A-7863158, Benedig, Margit (nee Steinberg).
A-7196419, Chan, Kwoon Chung.
A-7118737, Chang, William or Ching-Sung Chang or Ching-Sheng Chang.
A-6851661, Chen, Christine Ching-Sung.
A-0946874, Chen, Chung Chi.
A-8021403, Chen, Fu-Hwa Yien.
A-7383215, Ettisch, Felix Hsu.
A-7934152, Fishman, Leon.
A-6917983, Fried, Magdalina.
A-6891816, Hsu, Tao-Chiuh or T. C. Hsu.
A-7821461, Ing, Z. T. or Ting Shang-Teh.
A-7052331, Kolaja, Jiri Thomas.
A-7128146, Laamann, Uno.
A-8057474, Lee, Hong-I.
A-8057472, Lee, Ya-Wei Yew.
A-8057475, Lee, Jeannette.
A-6612725, Li, Sumin.
A-7795633, Li, Suefong.
A-7795635, Li, Suetse.
A-7276375, Li, Virginia Cheng.
A-7910447, Ozolins, Brun Francis.
A-7419933, Pao, Boris or Boris Bolian Pao.
A-7419934, Pao, Krystyna Bogdanska.
A-6851541, Pastoohoff, Peter Michael.
A-6772211, Saad, Edward Theodore or Saliba Saad.
A-7064188, Schwartz, Paul or Paul Soros.
A-6624082, Sheng, Chenhua H.
A-6624081, Sheng, Dora S.
A-8057047, Shun, Wah.
A-6923163, Stern, Carol.
A-6949345, Stocki, Gabrielle.
A-6333110, Trumbic, Mate.
A-7768049, Tsu, David Teh-Wei.
A-7073968, Weiner, Jacobina.
A-7868089, Weiner, Mircea or Mitchell.
A-7868090, Weiner, Mariano or Murray.
A-6891808, Wolf, Jacob.
A-7415061, Wu, Louise Siu Ching.
A-6032950, Yang, Biau.
A-6567550, Yang, Chang-Tsing.
A-6991827, Zacharia, Esa Matuk.
A-7283179, Grossfeld, Henrik or Haym or Henry David.
A-7048905, Moravcsik, Michael Julius.
A-7048902, Moravcsik, Julius Matthew Emil.
A-6976873, Racz, Marianna Maria alias Reihard.
0500-40102, Hasal-Ova, Dagmar Zofie.
A-7141334, Mandukich, Svetozar Kosta.
A-7141335, Mandukich, Kosara.
A-7141336, Mandukich, Ivan.
A-7190619, Tao, Hsiang Hsia or Albert H. Tao.
A-6370112, Ling, James Gi-Ming.
A-6289221, Sopko, Frantisek (Frantisch) or Frank John Sopko.

ANNY DEL CURTO

The bill (S. 52) for the relief of Anny Del Curto was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I wonder if I may ask the distinguished chairman [Mr. McCARRAN] whether or not there is administrative relief available in this case.

Mr. LANGER rose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota permit me to make an explanation?

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator is the author of the bill. I will gladly permit him to make an explanation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is the case of a young woman whose mother is an American citizen and who is herself the wife of an American citizen. She is a young woman of good moral character. Her husband is a respected citizen of Reno, Nev. I know him personally. He is in the real estate and insurance business. He was born in Reno and he is a young man of excellent character, highly regarded in the community. His wife has been accepted in the community, and is in every way an asset both to her husband and to the life of the town and the neighborhood in which she lives. She is extremely well educated. She speaks eight languages. She has traveled widely and in many foreign countries. There is no blot or blemish on her record. This bill would simply have the effect of permitting her to remain in the United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I take it from the Senator's explanation that he does not think there is administrative relief available.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think administrative relief is proper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anny Del Curto shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

TONI ANNE SIMMONS (HITOMI URASAKI)

The bill (S. 193) for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Max L. Simmons, citizens of the United States.

JIMY OKUDA

The bill (S. 207) for the relief of Jimy Okuda was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jimy Okuda, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of M. Sgt. and Mrs. Melvin C. Nietzel, citizens of the United States.

KEIKO TASHIRO

The bill (S. 226) for the relief of Keiko Tashiro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Keiko Tashiro, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Juro and Shizuko Yoshioka, citizens of the United States.

GEORGIA ANDREWS

The bill (S. 371) for the relief of Georgia Andrews was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Georgia Andrews, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Gust Andrews, citizens of the United States.

WILLIAM JUNIOR JAMI AND SACHIKO SUWA

The bill (S. 448) for the relief of William Junior Jami and Sachiko Suwa was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, William Junior Jami and Sachiko Suwa, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of M. Sgt. and Mrs. Albert E. Rowe, citizens of the United States.

THOMAS DALE PAWCETT (GEORGE YAMAMOTO)

The bill (S. 607) for the relief of Thomas Dale Fawcett (George Yamamoto) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Thomas Dale Fawcett (George Yamamoto), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Dale T. Fawcett, citizens of the United States.

KIKUE TSURUKAWA

The bill (S. 674) for the relief of Kikue Tsurukawa was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kikue Tsurukawa, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lt. and Mrs. Andrew J. Dickison, citizens of the United States.

TERESA LEE TIPTON (KINUKO SAKAI)

The bill (S. 1143) for the relief of Teresa Lee Tipton (Kinuko Sakai) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Teresa Lee Tipton (Kinuko Sakai), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Wilmar D. Tipton, citizens of the United States.

KAREN RUTH BAUMAN

The bill (S. 1147) for the relief of Karen Ruth Bauman was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Karen Ruth Bauman, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of John F. Bauman, a citizen of the United States.

PATRIC DORIAN PATTERSON

The bill (S. 1228) for the relief of Patric Dorian Patterson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Patric Dorian Patterson, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of S. Sgt. and Mrs. Shirley E. Patterson, citizens of the United States.

AMI HANADA (MARGARET AMI McCLUNG)

The bill (S. 1389) for the relief of Ami Hanada (Margaret Ami McClung) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Ami Hanada (Margaret Ami McClung), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. Elbert Lewis McClung, citizens of the United States.

ANN MARIE LONGWORTH AND JOHN FRANCIS LONGWORTH

The bill (S. 1390) for the relief of Ann Marie Longworth and John Francis Longworth was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Ann Marie Longworth and John Francis Longworth, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Capt. and Mrs. Everett Longworth, citizens of the United States.

LINDA MARLENE KOLACHNY (MARIKO FURUE)

The bill (S. 1418) for the relief of Linda Marlene Kolachny (Mariko Furue) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Linda Marlene Kolachny (Mariko Furue), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Warrant Officer and Mrs. Clarence D. Kolachny, citizens of the United States.

IRENE EZITIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 228) for the relief of Irene Ezitis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Irene Ezitis shall be held and considered to be the minor child of her mother, Mrs. Ilga Ezitis, a lawful permanent resident of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCISCA EGURROLA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 383) for the relief of Francisca Egurrola, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Francisca Egurrola shall be deemed to be the minor alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Christobal Gabiola, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TAKAKO NIINA

The bill (H. R. 688) for the relief of Takako Niina was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNELIESE ELSE HERMINE WARE (NEE NEUMANN)

The bill (H. R. 748) for the relief of Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEPHANIE MARIE DORCEY

The bill (H. R. 884) for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASPASIA VEZERTZI

The bill (H. R. 886) for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAULA AKIYAMA

The bill (H. R. 955) for the relief of Paula Akiyama was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL ROBERT LEARY

The bill (H. R. 1101) for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASTRID INGEBORG MARQUEZ

The bill (H. R. 1186) for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. HELGA JOSEFA WILEY

The bill (H. R. 1193) for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JAMES M. TUTEN, JR.

The bill (H. R. 1451) for the relief of Mrs. James M. Tuten, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. SUGA UMEZAKI

The bill (H. R. 1704) for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACK KAMAL SAMHAT

The bill (H. R. 1895) for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMA SHELOME LAWTER

The bill (H. R. 2353) for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAOLA BOEZI LANGFORD

The bill (H. R. 2624) for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES RENNICK MOFFETT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 731) for the relief of James Rennick Moffett which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, in line 5, after the name "James", to strike out "Rennick" and insert "Renwick."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina rise to object to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAYBANK. Reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that following the consideration of the next bill on the calendar the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 171, S. 1413, to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate can consider only one unanimous consent request at a time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand. I said I reserved my right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from South Carolina that there can be no debate until the Senate has acted on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio to rescind the order for a quorum call. Until such action is taken the Senate cannot proceed to the consideration of other business. If the Senator from South Carolina wishes to object to rescinding the order for a quorum call, the call will proceed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Because I am interested in getting along with the business of the Senate, I do not object at this time to the request of the Senator from Ohio, the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for a quorum call is rescinded.

Mr. TAFT. What was the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the distinguished majority leader, my friend from Ohio, that I hope the Senate will consider Calendar No. 171, Senate bill 1413, amending the Export-Import Bank Act. The bill has been approved by Senators on both sides of the aisle. Unfortunately, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is not in the chamber. It is a very important bill, and I do not want it to be carried over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have very serious doubt about the wisdom of passing the bill. It would put the Export-Import Bank in the insurance business, whenever it determined that a regular insurance company was not willing to write some insurance. It seems to me it would be a step toward having the Government go into a business in which it has not so far engaged. At least it would seem that way to me from very casually looking at the bill, as I went through the calendar. Therefore I would somewhat doubt its validity; but I shall be very glad to bring it up for consideration by the Senate, together with a number of other bills.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not understand the bill would have that effect. I understood the insurance companies' representatives testified differently when they appeared before the committee. I am sure the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio, knows that I never would be one to have socialism enter the insurance business. Certainly I have always stood against any kind of socialist bill. The Presiding Officer, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], was present at the hearings. I heard no complaints of that kind.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from South Carolina is willing to let the bill go over I shall be glad to have it called up tomorrow for consideration, if the Senator wishes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to be sure that will be done. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	Millikin
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barrett	Hendrickson	Morse
Beall	Hennings	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bricker	Hill	Neely
Bridges	Hoey	Pastore
Bush	Holland	Payne
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Hunt	Purtell
Carlson	Ives	Robertson
Case	Jackson	Russell
Chavez	Jenner	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tobey
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Frear	Mansfield	Welker
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Gillette	McCarran	Young
Goldwater	McCarthy	
Gore	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of Calendar No. 207, House bill 731, for the relief of James Renwick Moffett.

Without objection——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina wish the bill to go over or to be placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Until the bill is passed, no business will have been transacted since the previous call of the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the decision of the Chair is sustained.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	Millikin
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barrett	Hendrickson	Morse
Beall	Hennings	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bricker	Hill	Neely
Bridges	Hoey	Pastore
Bush	Holland	Payne
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Hunt	Purtell
Carlson	Ives	Robertson
Case	Jackson	Russell
Chavez	Jenner	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tobey
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Frear	Mansfield	Welker
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Gillette	McCarran	Young
Goldwater	McCarthy	
Gore	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The clerk will report the next bill on the calendar.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The bill (S. 1739) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with regard to Senate bill 1739, I should like to say that it provides for an extension of the Export Control Act from 1953 to 1956. I wonder whether the committee would be willing to make the extension for 1 year. For a long time I have objected to the continuation of export controls. I think they involve a policy which is unwise as a general policy. They have been used by Americans on international commissions to assist them in a kind of cartelization of various commodities in short supply throughout the world. I have always questioned the wisdom of such power. It seems to me, in view of the fact that we are under a new administration, we should continue the authority for 1 year and make a study of the whole subject and see if we cannot get rid of export controls.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio looks at me, and I appreciate it, since I am the ranking Democrat on the committee. I have no authority to speak for the committee, and I have no comment to make on the Senator's suggestion, except to say that we have never discussed the 1-year proposal.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the last extension was for 3 years. The Secretary of Commerce suggested that the extension is necessary at this time. The purpose is to control the export of strategic and war-support materials so that they will not be shipped behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have spoken to some of the Democratic Members, and they see no objection to limiting the bill to 1 year.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the Government should make a study as to whether it is necessary to have export controls. It is contrary to anything we have done in our past history.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The second issue, so far as the bill is concerned, is with regard to the prohibition of exports of strategic materials in short supply in this country which may be essential in the war effort. That is becoming less and less important. I cannot speak for the committee, but certainly it would be satisfactory to me, as acting chairman of the committee, to agree to a 1-year extension. I think the majority leader is correct when he says there should be an extensive study made of the whole subject.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The purpose of the bill is to keep materials from reaching the Iron Curtain.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the major purpose. The second purpose is to preserve our essential supplies in this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, I have no objection, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should not be willing to abandon export controls today, because of the danger of exports reaching Iron Curtain countries. But the bill is much broader than that. It applies to almost anything in certain fields exported under the authority of the Department of Commerce. At the same time, the legislation has been used in connection with international cartels.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, it is certainly not the intention of any member of the committee to extend the act for any other purpose than the two purposes which I have mentioned. They constitute the only arguments that could be made for any extension at all.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection to the consideration of the bill. I shall offer an amendment as soon as it is under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1739) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "1953" and insert "1956", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 7), as amended by Public Law 33, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 43), is hereby amended by striking out "1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "1956."

Mr. TAFT. I move to amend the amendment by striking out "1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "1954."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRICKER. I have no objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, has the bill been passed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been passed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to address myself to the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule VIII, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, consideration of the calendar must be discontinued.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate continue with the call of the calendar to the end.

Mr. MAYBANK. Reserving the right to object, I wish to say to my distinguished friend that my private enterprise bill, which I introduced originally, and which was sponsored by the present distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], was objected to. I refer to Calendar No. 171, Senate bill 1413, to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended. I understand that the distinguished majority leader will make it the first order of business tomorrow, after the calendar is called, provided no other bill is to be taken up.

Mr. TAFT. There is another matter which I shall be obliged to take up first, which is the resolution providing additional funds for the Committee on Rules

and Administration. I shall bring up the bill in which the Senator from South Carolina is interested immediately upon the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution. However, that matter may be settled before tomorrow, so the Senator's bill may be the first one to be taken up.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the Senator from Ohio saying that the bill referred to by me will not be set aside for any other bill, after the consideration of the resolution of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from South Carolina is correct; the bill will not be set aside for any other bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to continuing the call of the calendar to the end?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma rise to object to continuing the call of the calendar?

Mr. KERR. I do not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then we must proceed with the call of the calendar.

Mr. KERR. I rise to make a statement in connection with proceedings with the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is nothing before the Senate. Until a bill is before the Senate, the Senator cannot be recognized.

ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT THAT NATIONAL BANKS FURNISH LISTS OF SHAREHOLDERS

The bill (S. 1375) to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. If I may do so without losing the floor, I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oklahoma may yield to me, without losing the floor, in order that I might make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JAMES RENWICK MOFFETT

Mr. MAYBANK. When I asked for a quorum call, I objected to a vote on Calendar No. 207, H. R. 731, an act for the relief of James Rennick Moffett. I desire to withdraw my objection. I wish to say to whichever Senator is handling the bill that I trust it will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to returning to the consideration of House bill 731?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 731) for the relief of James Rennick Moffett.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment was agreed to previously.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of James Renwick Moffett."

APPORTIONMENT OF MONEYS RECEIVED ON LEASING OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR FLOOD-CONTROL PURPOSES

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I understand that Calendar No. 151, S. 117, was passed over temporarily, not put at the foot of the calendar, until the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] could be on the floor. I observe the Senator from Connecticut now on the floor, so I wonder if the bill could be disposed of at this time.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The bill was passed over temporarily until the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] returned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 117) to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, in line 8, after the word "defraying", to insert "any of"; and in the same line, after the word "the", to strike out "general", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., The section 7 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved August 18, 1941, as amended (33 U. S. C. 701c–3), is amended by striking out "situated:" and inserting in lieu thereof "situated, or for defraying any of the expenses of county government in such county or counties."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT THAT NATIONAL BANKS FURNISH LISTS OF SHAREHOLDERS

The bill (S. 1375) to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the House has passed H. R. 4004, a bill identical to S. 1375. The House bill is now before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 4004 and that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill, and be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Banking and Currency is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 4004. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 4004, to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1375 is indefinitely postponed.

PROMOTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1063) to authorize and request the President to promote certain naval officers, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over, by request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I understand correctly that S. 1063 is objected to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been made.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator from Tennessee reserve his objection, in order to permit a brief statement, or does the Senator believe he will object anyway?

Mr. GORE. I objected by request of a Senator who is not now in the Chamber. I should be glad to reserve my objection in order to permit the Senator from Massachusetts to make a statement, but it would not affect my obligation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I think it would be a waste of time for me to make my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over, by request.

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

The bill (S. 1805) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That pursuant to subsection (b) of section 1 of Public Law 672, approved August 8, 1950, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to acquire land, undertake additional construction, and to purchase and install additional equipment at the following locations:

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Hampton, Va.: Transonic tunnel boundary-layer system, variable Mach number facility, and substation expansion, $3,235,290.

Pilotless aircraft station, Wallops Island, Va.: Preflight jet heat accumulator, $310,000.

Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif.: Modernization of supersonic tunnel, $990,700.

Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio: Acquisition of not to exceed 10 acres of land, $10.

SEC. 2. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, be varied upward 10 percent and, with the concurrence of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by such further amounts as may be necessary to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work so enumerated shall not exceed $4,536,000.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $4,536,000 to accomplish the purposes of this act.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS BY DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1307) to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment on page 4, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "Treasury." ", and insert "Treasury.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall terminate on June 30, 1954." ", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 23, 1944 (ch. 716, 58 Stat. 921; U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 50 App., secs. 1705–1707), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. Subject to regulations promulgated pursuant to this act, disbursing officers of the United States are authorized, for official purposes, or for the accommodation of members of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel of the United States Government, veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States hospitalized or domiciled in institutions operated by the Veterans' Administration and other institutions operated by agencies of the United States Government, contractors engaged in United States Government projects and the personnel of such contractors, and personnel of authorized nongovernmental agencies operating with agencies of the United States, to cash and negotiate checks, drafts, bills of exchange, and other instruments payable in the United States and foreign currencies, and to conduct exchange transactions involving United States and foreign currency and coin, checks, drafts, bills of exchange, and other instruments; and when satisfactory banking facilities are not available, disbursing officers of the United States in foreign countries are also authorized, for the accommodation of any person who is a United States citizen, to cash checks drawn on the Treasurer of the United States: *Provided*, That such checks are presented by the person to whose order they are drawn. Any official funds which are held by disbursing officers of the United States and which are available for expenditure may, with the approval of the head of the agency having jurisdiction over such funds, be utilized for these purposes.

"SEC. 2. Any gains in the accounts of disbursing officers of the United States resulting from operations permitted by this act shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to adjust any deficiencies in the accounts of disbursing officers of the United States which may result from such operations. For the purposes of this section, the heads of agencies having jurisdiction over disbursing officers of the United States are authorized, on a fiscal year basis, to apply gains to offset deficiencies in the accounts of such disbursing officers.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury and, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, the heads of other agencies having jurisdiction over disbursing officers of the United States are hereby authorized respectively to issue such rules and regulations, governing the disbursing officers under their respective jurisdictions, as may be deemed necessary or proper to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may delegate to the head of any agency, subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, authority to issue such rules and regulations governing disbursing officers who are officers or employees of such agency and exercise the function of disbursement pursuant to a delegation by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall terminate on June 30, 1954."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST AIRPLANE FLIGHT

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 241) to appoint a committee to attend the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the first airplane flight at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C., was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 213, House Joint Resolution 241, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The bill (H. R. 4664) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. This is a bill which should go over. It should not go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

The bill (S. 1376) to amend section 503 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense and for other purposes" approved October 14, 1940, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 503 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is further amended by inserting after the words "during the present war" the following: "and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in relation to the Senate bill 1376, which has just been passed, the report of the committee as now printed contains the name "Latham" in the heading. I ask unanimous consent that the name be changed to "Lanham," and that in the last sentence in the second paragraph the words, "Public Law 45," be changed to "Public Law 450."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the corrections will be made.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I now ask unanimous consent that the report on this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 213) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1376) to amend section 403 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

This bill would enact a technical amendment to the Lanham Act (42 U. S. C. 1521 et seq.) which would clarify the authority of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to give, after July 1, 1953, to any Korean war veteran whose service commences after that time the same preference for admission to housing provided under title V of that act as is given to veterans of World War II and to Korean war veterans whose services commenced before that time. The necessity for this clarifying legislation arises from the fact that certain powers will expire on July 1 of this year under the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82d Cong.), as amended by Public Law 12, 83d Congress.

The bill would not involve any expenditures, administrative or otherwise, and would prevent discrimination against some Korean veterans which might otherwise result from a legal technicality.

The Lanham Act governs the administration and disposition of World War II war and veterans' housing. Title V is the veterans' housing title of that act. Section 503 defines veterans and servicemen as those serving "during the present war," which has been construed to mean those who have served on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the Japanese Peace Treaty. Subsection 1 (a) (21) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act, as amended by Public Law 12, 83d Congress, made it clear that, notwithstanding the Japanese Peace Treaty, the preference in admission to housing which was made available to veterans by title V of the Lanham Act could be extended to persons who served in the Armed Forces after the Japanese Peace Treaty and before July 1, 1953. Thus the Congress has assured veterans' preference under title V of the Lanham Act for persons serving in the Armed Forces during the Korean conflict and before July 1, 1953.

The approaching July 1 time limitation is inconsistent, however, with the laws governing other housing preferences which make adequate provision for all Korean veterans. Public Law 214, 82d Congress, approved October 26, 1951, amended all other housing preferences administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency so as to make provision for all Korean veterans. The only reason why a consistent amendment to section 503 was not then enacted is that the Japanese Peace Treaty had not yet been made effective, thereby making such amendment unnecessary at that time.

About 250,000 family dwelling units in war and veterans' housing are now under active management of the Housing Agency, pending their disposal. The bill would affect the eligibility of future Korean veterans to be admitted to these units as vacancies occur, provided, of course, that the particular project remains in active management.

This bill authorizes the President to determine a future cutoff date for Korean war service. This is consistent with veterans' preference provisions which the act of October 26, 1951, provided for other titles of the Lanham Act and for the several acts administered by the Housing Agency which contain veterans' preference provisions.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate,

changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"AN ACT TO EXPEDITE THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, APPROVED OCTOBER 14, 1940, AS AMENDED

* * * * *

"SEC. 503. As used in this title V the term 'families of servicemen' shall include the family of any person who is serving in the military or naval forces of the United States, and the term "veterans" shall include any person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war *and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President*, and who have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable."

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS AND FISCAL RESOURCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1514) to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this is a bill which was requested by President Eisenhower. It proposes to create a joint legislative and public commission, to be comprised of 5 Members of the House, 5 Members of the Senate, and 15 members appointed by the President, to study the whole problem of Federal aid to States, and to determine the correct basis of such Federal aid, whether it has gone too far, or has not gone far enough, and what fields should be covered, if aid is approved. That is one purpose.

The second purpose is to study the sources of revenues for each division of the Federal Government and of State and local governments, in order to ascertain whether they have adequate funds to cover the particular fields within the general scope covered by the Commission, and, if not, to endeavor to suggest means whereby sufficient money may be provided for that purpose.

Roughly speaking, the Commission proposes to deal with matters of housing, health, welfare, education, highways, and other matters which have been the subjects of State aid, or which may have been the proposed subjects of State aid.

There is one committee amendment to which I shall offer an amendment. I think the bill was reported unanimously by the committee. I see no particular reason why it should not be passed on the call of the calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, not very long ago—on the floor of the Senate April 1—to be exact, I paid what I believe to be a well-deserved tribute to President Eisenhower for his prompt fulfillment of a campaign pledge on taxation policy when he proposed that the Congress establish a Commission to Study Federal-State Relations.

Of course, Mr. President, Senate bill 1514, which I rise to support today, does more than merely propose a study of taxation policy.

It will establish a Commission to examine the entire field of overlapping functions, duplication, and waste, and all the knotted vines in a jungle of confusion which have grown up and entangled our fiscal relationships and our budgets at all levels of government in recent years.

Senate bill 1514 will provide the answers to these monumental problems.

I shall ever be proud of the fact that I have made some contribution to the formulation of this legislation through my years in the Senate, and that some of my views are incorporated in the final version of the legislation before us.

All of us here assembled owe a debt of thanks to our distinguished majority leader [Mr. TAFT] and to all those on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses of the Congress who have labored over a period of years in what appeared to be forgotten vineyards.

We surely owe our deepest appreciation for the dispatch and understanding with which the distinguished Committee on Government Operations and its able subcommittee chairman on reorganization the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], handled and welded together the various proposals.

The work of such organizations as the American Municipal Association, the Council of State Governments, and the State chambers of commerce cannot go unrecognized.

Mr. President, it is reasonably estimated that the National Government may have to spend for many years to come upward of $50 billion a year for four activities, namely, foreign policy and foreign aid, the Armed Forces, veterans' affairs, and interest on the national debt.

All of these obligations are clearly the responsibility of the National Government.

More and more of the best fiscal minds in our Nation believe that it is now time to reappraise in a comprehensive manner the duties and responsibilities of each area of government in our Federal system—this reappraisal to be conducted in the light of the relatively new situation in which our country finds itself, and which will probably be with us for many years.

It has been years since an official responsible group, with power to make recommendations, has considered this major question.

During these years profound changes have taken place in our social and economic system and as well in our international relations.

Present financial difficulties and fiscal problems will be an integral part of this constructive study—a study which must result in strengthening the foundations of an American system which resides in local responsibility, local control, and local self-government.

I am grateful, Mr. President, for the opportunity which I have had in the Senate of the United States to foster this Commission study and to speed it on its way to a culminating vote here today.

Mr. President, we have an opportunity, by our prompt and favorable action, to make up for all the lost time.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader and the able Senator from New Jersey have so well covered the objectives of the bill that I prefer not to take the time of the Senate to present the statement which I have prepared. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

S. 1514, TO CREATE A COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

S. 1514, as amended by the committee, would create a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, authorized to make a broad and comprehensive study of all aspects of the proper role of the Federal Government, in relation to the States and their political subdivisions. The Commission would be directed to define Federal-State relations, and submit recommendations for the allocation of functions to their proper jurisdiction, and for readjustments in intergovernmental fiscal relations.

Specific authority would be granted to the Commission to make studies into the objectives of programs of the Federal Government shared in by the States, and the extent to which Federal activities have advanced into fields which are the primary interest and obligation of the States and their political subdivisions. It will also be directed to develop various aspects of Federal grants-in-aid, including the interrelationships of the financing of such aid, the sources of financing of governmental programs, and problems in the field of intergovernmental tax immunities.

S. 1514 was introduced by Senator TAFT, in response to a request by the President of the United States for a review and assessment of the proper roles of the Federal, State and local governments, referred to in his state of the Union message laid before the Congress in a special message on March 30, 1953.

The Commission would be composed of 25 members, 15 of whom would be appointed by the President of the United States; 5 to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and 5 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Bipartisanship is provided for in the two latter groups by the requirement that in each of these groups, 3 members will be from the majority party and 2 from the minority party. With respect to the 15 members to be appointed by the President, the committee felt that any numerical requirement based upon political considerations would constitute an undue restriction on the President's freedom of choice and might well defeat the objective of complete nonpartisanship in these appointments, which the committee deems desirable. Accordingly, the committee concluded that it would be preferable to rely upon the President to appoint these 15 members solely on the basis of qualifications and experience and without reference to political affiliation or activity. This will enable the President to appoint persons who are properly representative of various interested groups, including Governors of States, members of State legislatures and representatives of State, county and municipal associations as well as local governments. It would also leave him free to include representatives of labor, industry, commerce, agriculture, taxpayers' associations, and others with specific qualifications in the fields of health, education, and social security.

The Commission would be authorized to submit interim reports to the President, as deemed necessary by the President or the

Commission, and would be required to submit its final report and recommendations to the President for transmittal to the Congress not later than March 1, 1954, at which time it would cease to exist.

The establishment of a commission to study various aspects of Federal-State-local relations has received almost continuous consideration by the Committee on Government Operations since the Hoover Commission submitted its report and recommendations on this subject in 1949, recommending that such a study be made. During the past 4 years, the Committee on Government Operations has held extensive hearings in an effort to devise some means of initiating studies of the general problem of intergovernmental relations. Bills to establish such a commission were reported unanimously during both the 81st and 82d Congresses. They failed of approval in the Senate, due largely to differences on the part of individual Senators relative to the composition of the proposed Commission and the length of time provided for the study.

A comprehensive study of Federal-State-local relations such as is contemplated by S. 1514 is long overdue. For the confusion, duplication, and overlapping of Federal and State functions, the American people are paying a tremendous price. This bill was approved by all of the members of the Committee on Government Operations, and by former President Hoover. It is a priority measure of the President of the United States who recognized the urgent need for the study contemplated almost immediately after he assumed office. It has the wholehearted support of Senators on both sides of the aisle, and the major associations concerned with State, county, and municipal affairs have repeatedly supported similar proposals.

S. 1514, as amended by the committee, will provide the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations with adequate authority to carry out the intent of the Congress to provide for a complete study of all phases of intergovernmental relations, as recommended by the Hoover Commission and the President. The Commission's report and recommendations will serve as a much-needed blueprint to enable the Congress to take appropriate legislative action to simplify and readjust Federal-State-local relations in the various areas in which confusion, duplication, and overlapping now exist.

The proposed Commission on Intergovernmental Relations will in no way duplicate the work of the proposed Commission on Governmental Operations provided for in S. 106, the next bill on the calendar. Amendments approved by the committee will avoid any possible duplication. This was accomplished by striking from S. 106 a provision specifically authorizing a study of intergovernmental relations by the proposed Commission on Governmental Operations. The reports on both of these bills clearly state the intent of the Congress that duplication be avoided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Government Operations was, on page 2, line 11, in the subhead, after the word "on", to strike out "Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources" and insert "Intergovernmental Relations"; in line 15, after the word "on", strike out "Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources" and insert "Intergovernmental Relations"; on page 3, after line 20, to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall carry out the purposes of section 1 hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 23, to strike out "SEC. 3. (a)" and insert "(b)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 1, after the word "governments", to insert "the interrelationships of the financing of this aid, the sources of the financing of governmental programs, and problems in the field of intergovernmental tax immunities."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 4, line 2, after the word "aid", to insert the word "and"; and in line 3, after the word "programs", to change the comma to a period and strike out "and problems in the field of intergovernmental tax immunities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 2.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement as to why I offered my amendment to the committee amendment. It was to cover the case of Government plants which are moved into various places where they are not subject to taxation. The property is thus taken off the tax rolls. I feel that that subject has become of such an emergency nature that it ought not to be postponed for a year while the Commission studies it. I think the Commission ought to go about doing something at once. I do not see any reason for taking a full year to study the question.

Furthermore, the language, without the intention of the committee, very obviously covers the study of the taxability of municipal bonds. I have received a letter of very violent protest from the executive director of the United States Conference of Mayors objecting at least to inviting the Commission to open up that subject, which has been before the Congress two or three times already. While it is possibly within the general scope of the language used, certainly I do not think the language ought to include a direct invitation to enter that field.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was the letter to which the Senator referred from the Municipal Association?

Mr. TAFT. It was from Mr. Paul B. Betters, executive director of the United States Conference of Mayors.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator receive any other protests from mayors?

Mr. TAFT. I have received only this letter. The mayors are just waking up to the fact that the committee amendment covered municipal bonds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator's amendment opposed by them?

Mr. TAFT. No. I never did want the Commission to go into the other problem, that is, the problem of taxability of Government plants.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the amendment which the Senator has offered to the committee amendment would probably meet the objection which has been made.

Mr. TAFT. It would meet that objection and also meet the other objection which I had.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. It was the intention of the committee to have the wording exactly as suggested by the Director of the Budget.

Mr. TAFT. I understood that, but I think he did not realize the implications of the language in that particular respect. His other words are retained. We retain the language "the interrelationships of the financing of this aid, the sources of the financing of governmental programs." I did not change that. However, I feel that the following language went much further than the committee or the Budget Director really intended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the committee was unanimous in its approval of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. The committee was unanimous with respect to the general provisions of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. In considering this subject it should be realized that the level of government which is in the most difficult situation from a tax standpoint is the local level of government. If we expect the Government to go back to the local level, as many people are now advocating, it will be necessary for local governments to have taxes in order to perform their functions properly. Chief Justice Marshall said that the power to tax is the power to destroy. The Federal Government will eventually destroy the State governments, and the Federal Government and the State governments combined will destroy all local government unless we give local government taxes with which to carry on the functions which we expect local government to perform. I think the Congress ought to keep that principle in mind at all times. This bill, of course, provides for a study of the situation.

Before we can come to any sound conclusion, we must have taxes allocated for the three levels of government, and we must make sure that the highest level of government does not interfere with the lower levels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, in line 14, before the word "The", strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. Because existing confusion and wasteful duplication of functions and administration pose a threat to the objectives of programs of the Federal Government shared in by the States including their po-

litical subdivisions, because the activity of the Federal Government has been extended into many fields which, under our constitutional system, are the primary interest and obligation of the several States and the subdivisions thereof, and because of the resulting complexity of intergovernmental relations, it is necessary to study the proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions, with respect to such fields, to the end that these relations may be clearly defined and the functions concerned may be allocated to their proper jurisdiction. It is further necessary that intergovernmental fiscal relations be so adjusted that each level of Government discharges the functions which belong within its jurisdiction in a sound and effective manner.

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this act there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission."

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 25 members, as follows:

(1) Fifteen members appointed by the President of the United States, from among whom the President shall designate the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Commission;

(2) Five members appointed by the President of the Senate, three from the majority party, and two from the minority party; and

(3) Five members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, three from the majority party, and two from the minority party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Thirteen members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall carry out the purposes of section 1 hereof.

(b) The Commission shall study and investigate all of the present activities in which Federal aid is extended to State and local governments, the interrelationships of the financing of this aid and the sources of the financing of governmental programs. The Commission shall determine and report whether there is justification for Federal aid in the various fields in which Federal aid is extended; whether there are other fields in which Federal aid should be extended; whether Federal control with respect to these activities should be limited, and, if so, to what extent; whether Federal aid should be limited to cases of need; and all other matters incident to such Federal aid, including the ability of the Federal Government and the States to finance activities of this nature.

(c) The Commission, not later than March 1, 1954, shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress its final report, including recommendations for legislative action; and the Commission may also from time to time make to the President such earlier reports as the President may request or as the Commission deems appropriate.

HEARINGS; OBTAINING INFORMATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or by the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENSES, AND PERSONNEL

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, except that no compensation shall be paid by the United States, by reason of service as a member, to any member who is receiving other compensation from the Federal Government, or to any member who is receiving compensation from any State or local government.

(c) Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(d) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the classification laws.

(e) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(f) Without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, the Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of a Director who shall perform such duties as the Commission shall prescribe.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. Six months after the transmittal to the Congress of the final report provided for in section 3 of this act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations."

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 106) for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after "(1)", to strike out "limiting" and insert "recommending methods and procedures for reducing"; after line 12, to strike out:

(5) defining and limiting executive functions, services, and activities;

(6) eliminating services, functions, and activities more properly within the jurisdiction of State and local governments;

In line 18, to change the subsection number from "(7)" to "(5)"; after line 20, to strike out:

(8) postponing expenditures during periods of heavy defense commitments where deferral will not impair essential functioning of government;

In line 24, to change the subsection number from "(9)" to "(6)"; on page 3, line 1, to change the subsection number from "(10)" to "(7)"; in line 7, after the word "on", to strike out "Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government" and insert "Governmental Operations"; after line 10, to insert:

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

On page 4, line 1, after the word "President", to strike out "pro tempore"; after line 6, to strike out:

(b) Qualification of members: Of each class of four members appointed under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), respectively, one member, if available, shall have served on the Commission established pursuant to the act entitled "An Act for the Establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government", approved July 7, 1947.

After line 13, to insert:

(b) Political affiliation: Of each class of 2 members appointed in subsection (a), not more than 1 member shall be from each of the 2 major political parties.

On page 5, line 17, after the word "receive", to strike out "$75" and insert "$50"; in line 23, after "SEC. 7.", to insert "(a)"; on page 6, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "1923" and insert "1949"; after line 3, to insert:

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

After line 14, to strike out:

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. Ninety days after the submission to the Congress of the report provided for in section 10 (b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

In line 20, after "SEC.", to strike out "10" and insert "9"; on page 7, line 3, after the word "Report", to strike out "The Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress not later than February 1, 1954" and insert "The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time, or times, as the Commission deems necessary, shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the Congress on or before December 31, 1954, and shall submit its final report not later than May 31, 1955, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments, and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations."

And in line 16, to change the section number from "11" to "10", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—

(1) recommending methods and procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

(2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

(3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

(4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of government;

(5) eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise;

(6) defining responsibilities of officials; and

(7) relocating agencies now responsible directly to the President in departments or other agencies.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Governmental Operations (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life.

(b) Political affiliation: Of each class of 2 members appointed in subsection (a), not more than 1 member shall be from each of the 2 major political parties.

(c) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government to determine what changes therein are necessary in their opinion to accomplish the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act.

(b) Report: The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time, or times, as the Commission deems necessary, shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the Congress on or before December 31, 1954, and shall submit its final report not later than May 31, 1955, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments, and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations."

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

S. 106, as amended by the committee, would create a bipartisan Commission on Governmental Operations, similar in composition to the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (the Hoover Commission), but somewhat broader in its frame of reference and authority.

The proposed Commission would be authorized to make studies and investigations of the present organization and methods of operation of all agencies of the Federal Government, and to submit recommendations to the Congress for appropriate action designed to abolish services, activities and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of the Government, or which may be found to be in competition with private enterprise. In addition to powers vested in the Hoover Commission, to make recommendations for improvement of Federal organization, methods, and administration, the new Commission would have authority to make studies and recommendations relative to changes in substantive policies and Federal programs.

Testimony at the hearings revealed virtual unanimity on the part of all witnesses and members of the committee that there is a need for a comprehensive study of duplicating and overlapping activities, organization, methods, administration, functions, and policies, with a view to improving Government efficiency and effecting economies. The hearings also developed the fact that, although the Hoover Commission performed an important service effectively, many of its recommendations have not been fully implemented, and these recommendations should be reevaluated in the light of present conditions. That more of the recommendations contained in the Hoover reports have not been approved is due primarily to the fact that the Hoover Commission was not authorized to deal with substantive programs and policies. In many instances, the line of demarcation between organization and administration, on the one hand, and substantive policy on the other, often made it difficult to separate the two. The new Commission proposed under S. 106 would have adequate authority to examine not only all of the governmental operations previously covered by the Hoover Commission, 4 years ago, but also Federal functions, programs and policies as well. Testimony indicated further that substantial economies should result from such studies.

The Commission would be required to submit interim reports from time to time, as it deems necessary, to submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the Congress on or before December 31, 1954, and its final report not later than May 31, 1955.

As amended by the committee, S. 106 will provide for the broad study of governmental operations which is so urgently needed at this time. It is supported by former President Herbert Hoover and President Eisenhower. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget participated in the executive session of the committee at which the amendments were considered and the bill was reported fa-

vorably. The bill has the unanimous support of all members of the Committee on Government Operations, and it was actively supported by organizations and individuals who are interested in more efficient government at substantially lower cost.

There will be no duplication between the work of the Commission on Governmental Operations, created by S. 106, and that of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which would be established by S. 1514, the preceding bill. To make certain of this the committee struck out a provision in S. 106 which would have specifically authorized the Commission on Governmental Operations to conduct studies into Federal-State relations.

Approval of S. 106 is not intended to interfere with any reorganization programs which may now be under consideration by the President. If approved by the Congress, the proposed Commission will not be required to submit its findings and recommendations until December 31, 1954, and its final report until May 31, 1955. The committee stressed in its report that reorganizations presently under consideration by the President or the Congress, proposing further streamlining and reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government, should not be delayed unnecessarily, pending the submission of reports by this Commission.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 49) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a measure of this much importance should not be passed on the call of the calendar. At a later date I shall move to bring it up for consideration by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will go over.

REV. A. E. SMITH

The bill (S. 1334) for the relief of the Reverend A. E. Smith was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Reverend A. E. Smith, of Bismarck, N. Dak., the sum of $1,706.40, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for reimbursement for custom duties paid upon the importation of stained-glass windows for use in St. George's Church in Bismarck, N. Dak.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 662) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over.

MRS. MURIEL J. SHINGLER, DOING BUSINESS AS SHINGLER'S HATCHERY

The bill (H. R. 720) for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 739) for the relief of Alexander A. Senibaldi was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over.

PREVENTION OF CITIZENS OF QUESTIONABLE LOYALTY FROM ACCEPTING OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT UNDER UNITED NATIONS—BILL PASSED OVER TO NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (S. 3) to prevent citizens of the United States of questionable loyalty to the United States Government from accepting any office or employment in or under the United Nations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, at the request of the Department of Justice.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I make an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold my objection for an explanation of this bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a bill designed to implement the recommendations of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The bill seeks to guarantee by statute that only American citizens of unquestioned loyalty will be employed by the United Nations.

The bill does not impose any restrictions upon the United Nations nor does it attempt to coerce the officials of that international organization. It recognizes that there are two classes of American nationals upon which the bill may have impact: First, those who seek employment with the United Nations. The second group are those American nationals already employed by the United Nations. The bill recognizes that Congress cannot require the United Nations' administrative officials to dismiss American nationals. This bill, therefore, operates directly upon the American nationals themselves. With respect to an American national now employed by the United Nations, it merely requires the submission of certain information basic to a proper determination of the question as to whether the employee presents a loyalty or security risk. With respect to persons not presently employed by the United Nations, the bill would explicitly prohibit acceptance of such employment without first receiving security clearance from the Attorney General.

The test is to be whether the Attorney General finds evidence that there is a reasonable possibility of danger to the security of the United States by the employment of the applicant by the international organization. If he does so find, he would issue a written denial of the application for security clearance, together with a statement of his reason for such denial, and would forward that information to the United Nations or special agency thereof, so that body would have notice of the doubtful loyalty of the prospective employee. Such a denial would not of course bar the United Nations from hiring the applicant; but it would make it unlawful for the applicant thereafter to accept a United Nations job. On the other hand, if the Attorney General should find that the applicant's employment by the United Nations would not involve reasonable possibility of danger to the security of the United States, he would give a security clearance. That is all there is to this bill.

Mr. President, there is no way except by congressional action to prohibit United States nationals who are subversives from accepting employment with the United Nations. There is no way except by congressional action to require present employees of the United Nations who are United States nationals to file registration statements designed to disclose possible subversion in that group. If Congress deems it desirable to do these things, Congress will have to do them by legislation. These are the things S. 3 is designed to do.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey would like to say that he is wholeheartedly in favor of the bill. He supported it in committee, and voted to report it to the Senate.

My only reason for asking that the bill go over is that a request was made by the Department of Justice to have it go over for purpose of study, until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over to the next call of the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is my intention to bring it up tomorrow, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Nevada, after the resolution relative to the New Mexico election case, Senate resolution 106, Calendar No. 159, and the export insurance bill, are disposed of. Then I shall be glad to bring up the additional judges bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the fact that the Senate has not reached the additional judges bill. The Senate has just concluded consideration of Calendar 224, Senate bill 3, relating to the United Nations.

Mr. TAFT. I thought Calendar No. 225 had been called. I thought we had disposed of Calendar 224, Senate bill 3, because it was objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; but the Senator from Nevada apparently misunderstood the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator from Nevada requested that Calendar

224, Senate bill 3, be included in the next call of the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. I see. Certainly it will be included in the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call Calendar No. 225, Senate bill 15.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, in line with the statement I made a moment ago.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The majority leader has suggested that three measures which, as I recall, are Calendar No. 159, Senate Resolution 106; Calendar No. 171, Senate bill 1413; and Calendar No. 225, Senate bill 15, would be taken up tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Am I correct in understanding that Calendar No. 153, Senate bill 16, and Calendar No. 142, Senate bill 922, would also be considered tomorrow?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; if the Senate reaches Calendar No. 153, the immunity bill, we will take it up tomorrow. The Senate will also take up Calendar No. 142, the Johnson District of Columbia transportation bill, if we have time to consider it tomorrow.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Several Members on this side of the aisle are interested in those two bills.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In connection with Calendar No. 153, Senate bill 16, the so-called immunity bill, one of the amendments which has been suggested by the author of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], I believe would take care of the question I raised.

Mr. TAFT. A number of amendments were suggested, and I thought it would be just as easy to consider the measure tomorrow. That would be as soon as we could get to it. I thought the bill would require more discussion than could be had under the 5-minute rule. The subject is one of very general controversy, and, I think, of public interest.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Very well.

PREVENTION OF INDEFINITE SERVICE OF UNITED STATES MARSHALS AFTER EXPIRATION OF TERMS OF OFFICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 1608) to prevent the indefinite continuation of service of a United States marshal following the expiration of his term was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is hereby amended so as to read:

"(c) Each marshal shall be appointed for a term of 4 years except in the district of Hawaii where the term shall be 6 years. Unless sooner removed by the President, a marshal shall continue, for a period of not to exceed 6 months, to perform the duties of his office after the expiration of his term unless his successor is appointed and qualifies before the expiration of that period."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1631) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this measure does not appear on the copy of the calendar which is before me. Therefore, I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee refer to Calendar No. 227, Senate bill 1631?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has asked that the bill be passed over, and the bill will be passed over.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We now come to the bills which have been placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 55, Senate bill 484, for the relief of J. Don Alexander.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has requested that Calendar No. 55, Senate bill 484, be considered at this time, out of order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if consideration of the bill at this time is out of order, I am perfectly willing to wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One bill comes ahead of it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then I am willing to wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. A number of bills, one of which was Senate bill 30, Calendar No. 107, were placed at the foot of the calendar. Are not they to be considered at this time, ahead of any other measures?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is about to consider the bills which went to the foot of the calendar, and they will be taken up in their order on the calendar.

The first bill placed at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DECISIONS OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING OFFICERS IN CERTAIN CASES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 24) to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts, in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have discussed the bill with attorneys of the Department of Defense. I am afraid that at the present time I have to object to consideration of the bill in its present form.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada whether he would object to having the bill recommitted, so that the Department of Defense could perfect the language of the bill with the committee, rather than for us to try to do so on the floor.

There is some objection from contractors who do business with the Air Force, and also from the Department of Defense itself, to including the General Accounting Office under the provisions of the bill. My feeling is that the easiest way to straighten out the matter would be to recommit the bill.

However, if the Senator from Nevada objects to having that done, I must object to consideration of the bill at this time; and perhaps we could get together on the language of the bill at a later time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to make an explanatory statement, in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts.

This bill has been held up, I am informed, at the request of the Air Force. The Air Force, I am further advised, objected to the fact that the bill gave the Comptroller General the same right that was given to a contractor to question a decision of a contracting officer on the basis that it was arbitrary, or fraudulent, or grossly erroneous.

Attorneys for the Air Force have drafted, and representatives of the Associated General Contractors have submitted to me, an amendment designed to meet the views of the Air Force. I was requested to offer this amendment as a substitute for the language of Senate bill 24, as it was reported from committee. I said I would consider doing so if the Air Force got a clearance from the Budget Bureau and took up the matter with the Comptroller General and got his approval of the proposed new language, or at least an assurance that he did not object to the proposed new language.

The reason I asked that the matter be taken up with the Comptroller General is that it appears to me that the principal objection the Air Force has to the bill is that it gives the Comptroller General the same right that a contractor has to question the decision of a contracting officer.

I was informed this morning by a representative of the Associated General Contractors that the matter had been cleared with the Budget Bureau and had been taken up with the Comptroller General, as I had suggested.

Subsequently, I discovered that while the proposed amendment had been taken up with the Budget Bureau, there had been no clearance; the position of the Budget Bureau is one of nolo contendere, so to speak. The Budget Bureau

does not specifically approve this new language, but does not want to be in a position of disapproving it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Comptroller General has not approved this proposed new language. It has not been discussed with him. The matter has been discussed in principle with the General Counsel of the General Accounting Office, who informed a representative of the Air Force that the Comptroller General never could approve eliminating the Comptroller General from the bill, because the Comptroller General feels that in order to protect the interests of the Government, it is necessary that he shall have as much right to question the decision of a contracting officer on the ground, for instance, of fraud or gross mistake, as may be given to the private party to the contract.

I want to make it clear that I do not mean to imply there has been any misrepresentation to me by any representative of the Air Force. As a matter of fact, officials of the Air Force gave me the information only this morning that the Budget Bureau had not cleared this proposed amendment and that the Comptroller General—to use their phrase—"has not backed off from his opposition to the amendment."

It has been represented to me—not by the Air Force—that the Air Force has threatened to oppose this bill unless it gets the amendment it has drafted. It was stated to me that the Air Force had Senators who would object to this bill on a calendar call unless the Air Force was satisfied; who would fight any motion to bring up the bill unless the Air Force was satisfied; and who would oppose the bill if it did come up in the Senate; and that if the bill ever passed both Houses of the Congress, the Air Force would get it vetoed.

I do not know how much reliance to place in those threats, Mr. President. I reiterate that they have not been made directly by any representative of the Air Force, so far as I know. I know they have been repeated to other Senators.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I am not going to offer the amendment the Air Force has proposed, and I shall resist it if it is offered; but I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment, together with a statement of position of the Associated General Contractors of America with respect to this bill, may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the amendment and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any provision of any contract entered into by the United States to the effect that the decision of the head of the department or agency of the United States concerned, or his representative, shall be final and conclusive with respect to disputes involving questions of fact arising under the contract, shall be binding except as to such decisions hereafter made which may be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to have been arbitrary, so grossly erroneous as necessarily to imply bad faith, or not supported by substantial evidence.

STATEMENT OF POSITION OF THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA AND DEVELOPMENTS IN RE SENATE BILL 24

1. The association has no objection to Senate bill 24 as drafted.

2. Immediately following objections by Senators HUNT and BUTLER, the association received a telephone call from a representative of the Department of Defense to arrange a conference.

3. At the initial conference with the Department of Defense we were advised that Senate bill 24 in its present form would cause undue hardship to the Department, as well as to other industries, and would seriously interfere with the Department's procedure.

4. We advised the Defense Department that we had no desire to cause either the Department or any other industry any hardship, and that our primary purpose was to secure the right of judicial review so that the hardship created by the Wunderlich decision would be corrected.

5. One of the objections voiced against Senate bill 24 was that it conferred upon the Comptroller General the right to review questions of fact as well as questions of law. At present the Comptroller General's right of review is limited to questions of law.

6. The Defense Department indicated that giving the Comptroller General the right to review questions of fact would unnecessarily tie the hands of the Department and, in many instances, years would elapse before a decision could become final.

7. After many conferences, the Department of Defense submitted a proposed revision, a copy of which is attached hereto.

8. It will be noted that this draft eliminates the retroactivity objected to by the Department. It applies only to decisions made after the date of enactment. It further eliminates the right of review of questions of fact by the Comptroller General.

9. This association is primarily interested in the early enactment of legislation which will assure members of our industry the right of judicial review. The proposed revision also appears to accomplish this purpose. We are hopeful that early and favorable action may be obtained.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I further wish to serve notice that if there is objection to the consideration of this bill on the call of the calendar, I shall at the earliest opportunity move that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, what the Senator from Nevada has said will be helpful, I think, in the attempt to work out proper terminology of the bill. I am very happy that he has made his statement and has brought out the various points.

I renew my request that the bill go over at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill is passed over.

J. DON ALEXANDER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill placed at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 484) for the relief of J. Don Alexander was announced as next in order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to award $16,720.41 to J. Don Alexander, of Colorado Springs. He paid that amount of tax on a capital-gains transaction. Then there was bankruptcy litigation, in the course of which it developed that the property was not his. According to the court it belonged to the corporation. Therefore, he had paid the Government taxes which he was not obligated to pay; hence the claim.

The distinguished acting minority leader has suggested that, instead of making an outright award of the amount of his overpayment, the case should be litigated judicially. I think the suggestion is a proper one, and it is acceptable.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by my colleague the senior Senator from Colorado and myself, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof to insert:

That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of J. Don Alexander, of Colorado Springs, Colo., against the United States for recovery of income tax paid by him for the year 1929 which covered the capital net gain from the sale of 9,000 shares of stock in the Alexander Industries, Inc., which stock was later held by the United States circuit court of appeals in *Alexander* v. *Thelemen* (69 F. (2d) 610 (1934)) to be the property of Alexander Industries, Inc., and not of the said J. Don Alexander.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to cases over which the court has jurisdiction under section 1346 (a) (1) of title 28 of the United States Code. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill (S. 484) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States."

DR. ALEXANDRE DEMETRIO MORUZI—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 389) for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest that the bill go over for the time being. The junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has not withdrawn his objection to the bill. I understand that he is in correspondence with the Department of State. Therefore, I must at this time object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

JURY TRIALS IN CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 30) to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) chapter 121 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 1875. Condemnation proceedings.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of subdivision (h) of rule 71A of the Rules of Civil Procedure, any party to an action in a district court involving the exercise of the power of eminent domain under the law of the United States may have a trial by jury of the issue of just compensation, except where a tribunal has been specially constituted by an act of Congress governing the case for the determination of that issue, by filing a demand therefor within the time allowed by such rule for answer or within such further time as the court may fix."

(b) The analysis at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1875. Condemnation proceedings."

SEC. 2. Section 1875 of title 28 of the United States Code shall apply to (a) actions commenced after the date of enactment of this act, (b) actions pending on the date of enactment of this act in which the time for requesting a jury trial under the applicable provisions of law in effect immediately prior to August 1, 1951, had not expired prior to August 1, 1951, and (c) actions pending on the date of enactment of this act which were commenced subsequent to July 31, 1951; but the time within which a jury trial may be demanded under such section in any case referred to in clause (b) or clause (c) above shall be 30 days after the date of enactment of this act in lieu of the time prescribed in such section.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, since this bill was reached earlier on the call of the calendar, I have conferred with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who raised objection to it. I now send forward an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration and adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the words "any party" and insert the words "the defendant."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say that I submitted this amendment, together with the bill, to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and it was satisfactory to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CITATION OF RUSSELL W. DUKE FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

The resolution (S. Res. 103) citing Russell W. Duke for contempt of the Senate was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I believe Senators would like an explanation of Senate Resolution 103. It concerns a matter which the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee has been investigating in some detail. Mr. Duke was under subpena when he went to Canada. He was contacted by the Chief of our staff, Mr. Flanagan, and was told the date and time when he was to return to the United States, and the place at which he was to appear. Mr. Duke first said he lacked sufficient funds to come to Washington, so we sent him an airplane ticket. He then complained that he never received the ticket, so Mr. Flanagan then made arrangements for him to pick up another ticket at the airport. Mr. Duke then called back to say that he had discussed the matter with a lawyer, and that he had found that we could not extradite him in contempt proceedings, and therefore he thought he would not return to the United States. He has not returned since then. The committee met and unanimously voted to cite Mr. Duke for contempt.

If Senate Resolution 30 is agreed to today by the Senate, I shall ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a memorandum which the staff is preparing, and which will be ready this afternoon, giving a résumé of this particular case. It is a rather aggravated case of influence peddling, and has to do with the Internal Revenue Bureau.

To give the Senate a very quick 1-minute picture, if I may, Duke somehow was able to come into possession of information as to pending tax claims against various persons residing on the west coast. His typical method of approach was to contact the individual against whom the claim was made, or his lawyer, tell him all about the case, and give him all the confidential information he had, information which neither the individual himself nor his lawyer possessed. He would end up by taking a cut in the case. In this manner he obtained a total sum of $30,000 plus.

However, rather than state all the details, I ask unanimous consent to place the staff memorandum in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAFF MEMORANDUM RE RUSSELL W. DUKE

On the basis of information furnished to the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations several months ago by a reporter for the San Francisco Examiner, a joint investigation into the activities of Russell W. Duke, formerly of Portland, Oreg., was conducted by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and the Senate Subcommittee Investigating the Justice Department. During the course of the investigation, Mr. Duke on January 15, 1953, in secret session testified before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Upon completion of our investigation, it was decided to hold open hearings. Mr. Duke was the chief witness, and as Report No. 143 of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate which supports Senate Resolution No. 103, clearly indicates, Duke willfully refused to appear before this subcommittee in response to a subpena. I have proposed Senate Resolution No. 103 as I feel Duke should be cited for contempt. His open defiance of the subpena powers of the United States Senate compels me to make some of his activities a matter of record.

Investigation has revealed that Russell W. Duke about 1946 began operations as a self-styled public relations representative in connection with various tax cases that were pending in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. In one way or another, through various sources, most of which are unknown and which could not be identified, Duke would ascertain that some person on the west coast was in tax difficulty with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. In some manner, he would also obtain detailed information concerning that person's tax difficulty. Duke would then contact the taxpayer or the taxpayer's attorney, and would attempt to convince them his services should be retained so the case could be resolved to their satisfaction. In many cases, his representations to these persons that he knew prominent people in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Department of Justice and elsewhere, plus his intimate knowledge of their individual tax cases, would result in his being retained as public relations counsel. Duke was not an attorney nor an accountant. On occasions, however, during his first meeting with the taxpayer or the taxpayer's attorney, he would represent that he was an attorney.

One example of Duke's activities was his association with the L. De Martini Co. of San Francisco, Calif. In June of 1947, the San Francisco office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue proposed an additional assessment in its civil tax case against this corporation in the amount of $265,001.11 for the taxable years 1944, 1945, and 1946 because the Government disputed certain salaries which had been paid to the officials of this company. The amount of this tax deficiency was established by and recommended by Frank L. Norton, who was at that time (June of 1947) an employee of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in San Francisco. Shortly thereafter, on July 15, 1947, Norton's services with the Bureau of Internal Revenue were terminated because of a reduction in force, and a few months later, he met A. S. Kayser, treasurer of the De Martini Co., at which time they discussed the tax assessment. Norton told Kayser he had a friend in Portland, Oreg., who could get the tax deficiency figure of $265,001.11 reduced and he suggested that Kayser discuss the case with his friend, whose name Norton did not mention. Norton also told Kayser his friend would not be interested in doing anything at all unless a guaranty of good faith was put up in the sum of $5,000. Kayser agreed to make out a certified check for $5,000 and place same with an independent person to be held until the case was satisfactorily handled, at which time it should be delivered to Norton's friend.

Kayser, at Norton's specific request, made out this check to the order of E. Ward on October 17, 1947, and Norton was then given the check to hold. A short time later, a meeting between Duke and Kayser was arranged by Norton at which time Duke promised Kayser introductions to the proper people in Washington, D. C., and gave Kayser assurances of proper treatment of the tax case. On behalf of the De Martini Co., Kayser retained Duke as public relations representative, agreeing to compensate "Duke or his associates" in the amount of $65,000 provided the proposed additional tax assessment of $265,001.11 was reduced to a maximum payment of $100,000. There was a further understanding that if a higher tax payment was necessary, some other reasonable method of compensating Duke would be worked out.

Frank L. Norton, after he had received the aforementioned $5,000 check, retained the same in his possession for a few months and then, upon being advised by Duke, not Kayser, that he could keep this amount as his fee, had this check cashed in the following manner: He first endorsed the name of E. Ward and then had his wife endorse the check in her maiden name of Hogan, and cash it. Norton admitted that the reason

the check was made out in the name of E. Ward at his request and cashed in the above manner was because he did not want to have his name appear anywhere in the transaction.

On August 30, 1948, David Sullivan, of the San Francisco office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, who was then assigned to the De Martini case, had luncheon with Duke at the latter's invitation. At this luncheon, Duke informed Sullivan that he was "just the man we are looking for," and inquired if Sullivan would be interested in accepting a position, and if Sullivan were so interested, he would receive a $25,000 check on the following day and would then receive $1,200 a month in addition thereto. Duke also told Sullivan he would see that the mortgage on Sullivan's home was paid and in response to an inquiry from Sullivan as to what action Duke would take if Sullivan rendered an adverse opinion on the De Martini case, Duke answered by saying Sullivan's wife would not make a very pretty-looking widow.

The new president of the De Martini Co. terminated Duke's services on August 31, 1948. Duke had been paid $14,000 by the company, however, which amount was in addition to the $5,000 retained by Frank L. Norton.

In another case, Thomas Guy Shafer, of Oakland, Calif., was under investigation by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for willfully attempting to evade taxes for the years 1944, 1945, and 1946. This was a criminal investigation and the tax deficiency was listed as $266,907.95, with a penalty of $70,576.21 resulting in a total of $337,383.16. Shafer was eventually indicted, and on December 4, 1952, was tried for tax evasion for the years 1945 and 1946. The jury disagreed on the 1945 case and found him not guilty on the 1946 case.

Wallace Knox, an attorney in Oakland, Calif., who had represented Shafer previously, incorporating Shafer's drug store business in 1946, and who was retained by Shafer to represent him in the tax case, contacted Russell W. Duke in 1948 after having been informed that Duke could assist people in tax matters. Knox, at this time, was unfamiliar with the procedure followed by attorneys in tax cases. At their first meeting, Duke told Knox he was an attorney; that he knew everyone of importance in the Bureau of Internal Revenue including the Commissioner; and that he could steer Knox to the right persons who could forcibly present Shafer's case to the proper authorities. The following day, Duke amazed Knox with his intimate knowledge of the facts of Shafer's tax case, and as a result Duke was retained as public relations representative for $6,500. Subsequently, Shafer's case was referred by the Bureau of Internal Revenue to the Department of Justice in Washington, D. C., with the recommendation that Shafer be prosecuted. At this time, which was about August of 1948, Duke and Knox, through attorney Howard Bobbitt, of Portland, Oreg., met Edward P. Morgan, an attorney in the law firm of Welch, Mott & Morgan in Washington, D. C.

Investigation has revealed Attorney Morgan was retained by Attorney Knox to represent Shafer on a contingency fee basis. The fee was to be $20,000, which sum was to be held by Morgan's firm in escrow, contingent upon whether or not the case could be so presented to the Department of Justice by Attorney Morgan that Shafer would not be prosecuted criminally. Morgan, in connection with the activities of Mr. Duke, testified before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations on January 16, 1953. It was his testimony that the $20,000 contingent fee was returned to Shafer because Shafer was in fact indicted.

In a written statement by Edward P. Morgan to this subcommittee on February 5, 1953, he advised that the first time he had knowledge of Duke's having been paid a fee by Mr. Shafer was late in 1951, and that at the time he met Duke, he understood the latter was a public relations counselor, who had acted as a manufacturer's representative for various west coast companies during the war; that Morgan then and now regards the Shafer case as a reference case from Attorney Howard Bobbitt, of Portland, Oreg. However, on various occasions after Duke met Morgan in the fall of 1948, Duke made various inquiries of Morgan as to the status of the Shafer case as indicated by his letters to Morgan of March 3, 1949; May 6, 1949; and September 10, 1949.

Subsequent to the initial meeting between Duke and Morgan, Duke was responsible for several tax cases being handled by Morgan. During the early part of 1949, Noble P. Wilcoxon, of Sacramento, Calif., was under investigation by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for criminal tax evasion. The additional tax claimed by the Government was $89,277.68 with penalties of $44,681.51, making a total of $133,959.19. In April of 1949, Duke contacted Wilcoxon at Sacramento, Calif., stating he had come from Washington, D. C., where he had seen all of the papers in Wilcoxon's tax case. Duke also told Wilcoxon the latter would be a free man if Duke's services were retained and displayed an intimate knowledge of the tax case. Mr. Duke was verbally retained for $5,500. On April 27, 1949, Duke appeared in Edward Morgan's law offices in Washington, D. C., with Wilcoxon, at which time Wilcoxon retained the legal services of Morgan. Morgan, in his statement of February 5, 1953, and in his testimony before this subcommittee, advised he was paid a fee of $2,750 by Wilcoxon while Wilcoxon was in his office on April 27, 1949. Morgan testified he had never split any fees with Duke because it was contrary to the ethics of the legal profession. Investigation has revealed that prior to Wilcoxon's trip to Washington, D. C., with Duke to see Morgan, which was after Wilcoxon had agreed to retain Duke, Wilcoxon withdrew from his bank $5,500 in cash, which amount he had on his person when he left for Washington, D. C. Morgan also testified that it was approximately about September of 1949 that he ascertained that Duke had a criminal record, and that subsequent thereto he recalled no particular case that he handled by reference from Duke other than a simple inquiry he made in September of 1950.

In a letter dated August 2, 1949, to Mr. Wilcoxon, Morgan enclosed a receipt in the amount of $2,750 the receipt being dated April 27, 1949. It is interesting to note that by letter dated August 1, 1949, to Duke, which letter was produced by Duke in response to a subpena issued by this subcommittee, Morgan states as follows:

"DEAR RUSSELL: I have sent Noble Wilcoxon a receipt covering our retainer received from him on April 25, 1949. Enclosed herewith is the agreement between you and Mr. Wilcoxon which I believe you should transmit directly to him. I am glad to hear that your Senate bill is moving along smoothly.

"Sincerely,

"EDWARD P. MORGAN.

"Enclosure."

The enclosure, also produced by Duke, is as follows:

"MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN NOBLE WILCOXON AND RUSSELL W. DUKE, OF PORTLAND, OREG.

"This agreement has to do with the appointment of Mr. Russell W. Duke as public-relations representative for the purpose of presenting my tax case wherever necessary in order to secure proper relief. I am now involved in proceedings to determine liability in connection with Federal income tax, and do hereby appoint Russell W. Duke as my public-relations representative in connection with all tax matters. For this service I have paid Mr. Russell W. Duke the sum of $2,750.

"Dated May 1, 1949.

"NOBLE WILCOXON.

"The above accepted and approved

"RUSSELL W. DUKE."

Morgan in his prepared statement of February 5, 1953, related as follows:

"In accordance with advice from Mr. Wilcoxon, I communicated with Mr. Duke by letter on May 3, 1949, asking that he forward to me without delay the required material which I had requested be obtained in the Wilcoxon case. Again on May 5, 1949, I wrote Mr. Duke indicating that I must have the required material for filing the brief in the Wilcoxon case by May 10, 1949, inasmuch as I was leaving the city. Under the date of May 16, 1949, I supplied the Department of Justice a memorandum in which I included all of the basic facts and arguments which in my opinion indicated that criminal prosecution of Mr. Wilcoxon was unwarranted. It was not until about the first of August 1949 that I had any knowledge concerning the fact that Mr. Wilcoxon had paid Mr. Duke for his services or the amount of such payment."

In connection with the above two tax cases of Thomas Guy Shafer and Noble P. Wilcoxon, I desire to quote from a carbon copy of a letter dated at Portland, Oreg., September 10, 1949, addressed to Mr. Edward Morgan, Welch, Mott & Morgan, 7100 Erickson Building, 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

"Talent, Ed, is what I want. I am going to make my tour of the South (incidentally, Nevada and Idaho are good territory) and make one complete thrust to bring all the talent I possibly can to Washington.

"I understand there are 23 applications in Oregon for television. Can you confirm that?

"How are the horses running? I refer to Sir Laurel Guy, the Oakland-owned horse, and the Sacramento-owned horse.

"With best personal regards, I remain

"Sincerely yours,

"R. W. DUKE."

Morgan testified that he "had no recollection of the letter," and he failed to produce it, despite a subpena, because a search of his files failed to locate it. He said he would interpret the reference to the horses, Sir Laurel Guy, the Oakland-owned horse, and the Sacramento-owned horse, to mean the Thomas Guy Shafer case and the Noble Wilcoxon case. He denied he had had any code agreement or relationship or other understanding with Duke in matters of correspondence. Despite Mr. Morgan's failure to recall said letter, he produced, as a result of a subpena, a copy of a letter to Russell Duke, dated September 14, 1949, which letter obviously is an answer to Duke's letter of September 10, 1949, and from which I quote as follows:

"Mr. RUSSELL DUKE,

"Portland, Oreg.

"DEAR RUSS: I was glad to receive your letter of September 10 and was particularly interested in your reference to successful drill tests for oil that have been conducted in Oregon.

"The report that there are 23 television applications for Oregon is a phony. As a matter of fact, there are only 5 applicants and they are all for the city of Portland: i. e., KOIN, Inc. (channel 8); KOPJ, Inc., (channel 12); Edward Lasker (channel 10); Oregonian Publishing Co., KGW (channel 6); and Westinghouse Radio Station, Inc., KEX (channel 10).

"When are you coming back this way?

"With kind regards,

"Sincerely,

"EDWARD P. MORGAN."

Duke also produced, as a result of a subpena, a copy of a letter he had sent to

Edward Morgan under date of September 5, 1949, from which I quote as follows:

"PORTLAND, OREG., *September 5, 1949.*

"WELCH, MOTT & MORGAN,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR ED: I have a lot of cases in California that I have to do a lot of bird-dogging on, and I hate like sin to go down there and bird-dog without clicking on a few. I wish you would be able to secure some talent as I could use some hay. I am letting things quiet down on the coast by lying dormant and putting more effort in lining up the coming campaign. I am willing to gamble with you in any shape, form, or manner that you will be in as soon as the other chap resigns. I sincerely hope that the cases that are back there clear up so that we can start on something else. Again I repeat: I can use the hay.

"As you know, the talent is plentiful, and it is a psychological effect when one comes in cold and tells a person what he knows about him, so I hope sincerely that you will be able to secure some talent for me."

Morgan, in his testimony before this subcommittee, stated that to the best of his knowledge and belief he had never seen the above letter, and he failed to produce the original under subpena. Morgan said the word "talent" used in the letter was meaningless to him.

In still another case, Dr. Ting D. Lee, of Portland, Oreg., on February 15, 1949, was served by the Bureau of Internal Revenue with a jeopardy assessment for unexplained income for the years 1942 through 1947. The amount of the deficiency was $147,290.32, and the issue in the case, which was a civil one, was whether or not certain funds Dr. Lee had received were taxable income or were funds received as an inheritance from China, and therefore not taxable. Lee retained Attorney Ashley Green, in Portland, Oreg., to represent him in this case. Shortly thereafter Lee met Russell W. Duke, who said he could be of assistance in the case; that he knew an attorney in Washington, D. C., who had handled many tax cases very successfully. Lee retained Duke as public-relations representative, and by a written contract dated March 19, 1949, agreed to pay Duke $12,500 for his services. Investigation has revealed that on approximately March 21, 1949, Duke introduced Dr. Lee to Edward P. Morgan in the latter's law offices in Washington, D. C., and Morgan was retained by the doctor on a $4,000 contingency-fee basis. Dr. Lee has advised that the $12,500 to be paid to Duke was to include all attorney's fees. In Morgan's statement to the subcommittee of February 5, 1953, he said as follows:

"Some question appears to have been raised as to whether my fee in this case was to be paid by Russell Duke or by Dr. Lee. Under the circumstances that the case was initially presented to me, I submit that it would have been quite proper to have looked to either of these men for my fee. The fact of the matter is, however, that I always looked to Dr. Lee for the payment of my fee and that he in fact did pay my fee. I think the file in my office concerning the case clearly bears out my understanding that my fee was to be paid by Dr. Lee. It is true that at the time the case was concluded, Dr. Lee apparently was under the impression that Mr. Duke was to take care of my fee, but no such impression certainly had any consonance with my own thinking."

In testimony before this subcommittee, in response to a question as to whether Morgan knew that Duke was to be compensated in connection with the Lee tax case, Morgan answered in part, "I just feel that it would be ridiculous of me to undertake to go to the west coast and handle a case for $4,000 on a contingent basis had I known that this fellow had received eight or nine thousand dollars in the matter." Dr. Lee, however, has advised this subcommittee that during his first meeting with Morgan, he informed Morgan that the latter's fee would come from the money Dr. Lee was to pay to Russell Duke, under the terms of the previously mentioned agreement. It was Dr. Lee's understanding that Morgan's fee would be approximately $4,000 plus traveling expenses, payment to be made when the case was closed and payment to be made to Morgan by Duke from the amount paid to Duke by Lee. In substantiation of Dr. Lee's statement of the facts, I quote from the following letter from Dr. Lee to Edward Morgan, dated April 4, 1949, which letter is in the possession of Mr. Morgan. I call your attention to the fact that this letter was sent by Dr. Lee within 2 weeks after he had retained Attorney Morgan.

"Since all financial arrangements re case are handled through Russell W. Duke, although you rendered your legal services directly to me, I feel that I should have a letter of confirmation from you, along the lines suggested in the following.

" 'DR. LEE: This is to confirm my consent to accept the request of Mr. Russell Duke, your public-relations representative, to handle all legal proceedings incidental to your tax case now pending in the United States Treasury Department. It is mutually understood and agreed that Duke and not you shall assume full responsibility for my expenses and fees in connection with your case as per special agreement that I had with him.'

"Of course, as I have frankly told you, the written agreement that I had with Mr. Duke regarding fees on this case which you may verify. This letter of confirmation will prevent us from any involvement in case there should be any controversy between you and Mr. Duke (which I do not expect however) regarding the matter of fees and payments."

Mr. Morgan has in his file a copy of the following telegram from Dr. Lee to Russell W. Duke, dated June 20, 1949, which telegram was sent to Mr. Morgan by Dr. Lee:

"You verbally verified my understanding last Wednesday night that Morgan's fees and expenses are to be paid out of $12,550. Condition of payment of this sum depends upon final settlement of case previously agreed and witnessed by Talbot. To date no notice of final settlement of case received, hence condition of payment not being fulfilled. Other financial obligations make it impossible to make this unexpected payment now."

The telegrams were sent to Morgan because a request had been made by Morgan for expense money in the amount of $450. Dr. Lee paid this expense money by check to Morgan dated July 6, 1949, but investigation has revealed that this amount was deducted from the $12,500 that Duke was to receive from Dr. Lee.

Again, by letter from Dr. Lee to Morgan dated August 30, 1950, which letter is in Morgan's possession, Lee encloses a check for $3,450 in full payment of Morgan's fees as per a telephone agreement and I quote from this letter as follows:

"So you will have to look to Duke for balance of $4,000, which being $550.

"You had no idea of difficult position I was placed. To convince you that I tried my best to make payments as shown in the enclosed receipts (copies of). You will note that up to August 3, 1950, the total sum of $9,050 has been paid to Mr. Duke, leaving a balance of only $3,450. You will remember also before taking my case up, Mr. Duke, you and myself had agreed in your office that your fees are to be paid through Mr. Duke and is to be deducted from the $12,500 contract that I had signed with him for the entire case. Of course, he had the right to refuse to release me of the contract until the entire sum is paid up which he did—without having a release from Duke, I am in no position to pay you for fear he may now acknowledge such payment as part of the payment on the $12,500."

Russell W. Duke produced a release that he had executed to Dr. Lee in which he itemizes receipts and disbursements. The release reveals that he received $9,050, out of which he had credited the $450 that had been paid by Dr. Lee to Morgan for the aforementioned expenses. The release further states: "by paying Edw. P. Morgan the sum of $3,450 plus the payment of an additional $550 to be made by R. W. Duke to Edw. P. Morgan, making a total of $4,000 as attorney's fees, Dr. T. D. Lee is in full released from any contracts and agreements that he has entered into with R. W. Duke, or the R. W. Duke Enterprises of Portland, Oreg."

Canon 34 of the Court of Legal Ethics states as follows:

"No division of legal fees for legal services is proper except with another lawyer, based upon a division of service or responsibility."

Two other tax cases of interest are those of Louis Wolcher and Harry Blumenthal. On November 10, 1948, according to Morgan's own statement, Mr. Duke called at his office in Washington, D. C., and introduced him to Conrad Hubner, a tax attorney of San Francisco, Calif. Morgan was retained by Hubner to represent both Wolcher and Blumenthal. Wolcher was the subject of a criminal tax-evasion case, the deficiency being $634,799.22, with penalties of $318,352.40, making a total of $953,141.52. Wolcher, on May 7, 1951, was found guilty, sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment plus a $10,000 fine, but the case was referred to the appellate court on November 7, 1952, and is to be retried. Morgan's fees for services rendered in this case were $1,000.

Harry Blumenthal was also the subject of a criminal tax-evasion case with a deficiency of $183,455.90 and penalties of $89,817.12, making total of $273,272.92. The case was never prosecuted because Blumenthal supplied to the Government the identity of individuals to whom he had actually given the money that was in dispute. Morgan's law firm received $1,000 in fees for services rendered in connection with this case.

I should also like to bring to your attention the tax case of Inez Burns. Morgan, in his testimony before this subcommittee, stated that at the initial meeting he had with Russell W. Duke late in August 1948, Duke mentioned several tax cases to Morgan, one of which was the case of Inez Burns. Morgan produced under subpena a copy of a letter dated March 31, 1949, to Duke, which I quote as follows:

MARCH 31, 1949.

Mr. RUSSELL DUKE,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR RUSS: Pursuant to our conversation yesterday, I am enclosing herewith two photostatic copies of an editorial which may be somewhat helpful to you relative to the matter which we discussed, along with a clipping from the local Washington Times-Herald.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

EDWARD P. MORGAN.

P. S.—I don't seem to be able to get a line on Inez B. at either place back here. Who is the attorney of record in her case? Can you check at S. F. to find when they referred it to D. C.?

You will note that according to the postscript, Morgan is attempting "to get a line on Inez B.," and according to his own testimony, this referred to Inez Burns. Investigation has revealed that the attorney of record for Inez Burns was Frank I. Ford, Sr., of San Francisco, Calif., and that subsequent to the above letter Duke did in fact call Mr. Ford and recommended Edward P. Morgan as a Washington counsel in the case. Morgan, in his testimony before this subcommittee and in his statement, maintains that he was retained as Washington counsel by Attorney Frank I. Ford about December 1, 1950, and that he specifically asked Ford if Duke was in any way involved in this case, and was assured by him that Duke was not, following which Morgan did in fact become

Washington counsel. It is interesting to note that obviously Morgan was attempting to make arrangements to be retained as attorney in this case as far back as March of 1949, at which time he was making inquiry even though he did not know who Burns' attorney was at that time. It is of further interest to note that he was successful in being retained as counsel even though he alleges that Duke was in no way involved. The Burns case was a criminal tax-evasion case, being a deficiency in the amount of $93,685.82 with penalties of $465,842.91, making a total of $1,397,528.73. On May 8, 1951, Burns received a sentence of 1 year and a day and a fine of $10,000. Investigation has revealed that Morgan received the sum of $2,500 for his services in the Burns case.

May I also cite the criminal tax evasion case of one Jack Glass, of Los Angeles, Calif., whose tax deficiency was $45,480.53. There was no prosecutive action in this case because Glass became mentally ill and later died in November of 1950. Investigation has shown Morgan actually was retained as Washington counsel by Attorney Maurice J. Hindin, who has learned of Morgan through legal sources other than Russell W. Duke. During the month of June 1949, attorney Hindin contacted Edward P. Morgan, making inquiry as to whether his firm could represent Mr. Glass in Washington, D. C., but Morgan was not retained at that time because Mr. Glass indicated he would be unable to pay the fee requested by Mr. Morgan. During the latter part of June after Hindin contacted Morgan and before he retained him, Mr. Glass was contacted directly by Russell W. Duke, who also contacted attorney Hindin. Mr. Duke was hired as public relations representative by Mr. Glass for $1,000 despite attorney Hindin's opinion to Mr. Glass that Duke's services were not necessary. After Duke was retained, Hindin on behalf of Mr. Glass did, in fact, retain Mr. Morgan in this case, and Morgan received $4,500 in fees. It is most interesting to note that Duke contacted Mr. Glass and Mr. Hindin within a matter of days after Hindin had discussed this case with Morgan and had not, at the time of Mr. Duke's appearance, retained Edward P. Morgan.

In the few cases that I have related, Russell W. Duke received a total of $32,850 in fees and approximately $2,500 in expenses; and Attorney Edward P. Morgan received $13,700 in fees and $450 in expenses.

Edward P. Morgan also loaned Duke $500 on July 22, 1949. According to both Morgan's and Duke's testimony, this sum of money which was, in fact, a loan, has never been repaid.

CONCLUSION

Russell W. Duke had various contacts with Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, while Duke was engaged in some of the activities that I have mentioned. Duke at that time was a constituent of Senator MORSE, and the information in the possession of this subcommittee clearly reveals MORSE treated Duke as he would have any constituent. Our information has failed to reveal any wrongdoing on the part of Senator MORSE in connection with his association with Duke.

It is quite clear that Russell W. Duke was an influence peddler who specialized in tax cases. In the absence of any legal, accounting, or other technical ability, he used his alleged influence with his alleged contacts. There is no evidence that he performed any legitimate service to any taxpayer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution? There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 103) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the willful default of Russell W. Duke in failing to appear to testify before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate in response to a subpena, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Russell W. Duke may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the acting majority leader would like to take this opportunity to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his explanation of the resolution just agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator. I may say also, if I may, that at the time this case originally came to our attention it was referred to us by the Judiciary Committee of the House. There were certain phases which were beyond the jurisdiction of that committee. The incident occurred before the House was organized in January, and the House, not being a continuing body, could not issue a subpena for the production of documents. The Senate, being a continuing body, had authority to do so. The House committee was fearful that the documents might disappear and requested us to issue the subpena, and we did so.

One point which I desire to emphasize in this connection is that at the time this matter was first discussed in the press reference was made to the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The staff made a complete investigation, and they reported that there was no evidence whatever to indicate any wrongdoing of any kind on the part of the Senator from Oregon. I thought I should make that perfectly clear, in view of certain news stories which appeared at the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of Senators to the fact that with the adoption of the resolution, Senate Resolution 103, the call of the calendar has been completed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield to me on a question of privilege?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to a question of personal privilege. I did not know the Senator from Wisconsin was going to make any reference to my name in connection with the consideration of the resolution which has just been passed by the Senate. I appreciate the comments he made. There is no doubt about the fact that certain segments of the press have carried stories linking my name in a critical way by innuendoes and implications, which have no basis in fact, with the case referred to. I want to say on the floor of the Senate, as I have said to the Senator from Wisconsin and to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], whom I see on the floor, as well as to other members of the committee, that any time the committee or any member of the committee wants me to appear before the committee—and this applies not only to the committee in question, but to all other committees—to answer questions, or to testify in regard to any phase of my political life, I am at their service. Furthermore, my files are open to them.

My record, Mr. President, in regard to this matter, and every other matter, will stand any public inspection any committee may care to make at any time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that the Senator from Oregon offered to come before our committee to give us any information which we desired, and to give us free access to any file he might have in connection with this matter. The staff made a complete check, and thereafter reported to us that there was no basis or ground for calling the Senator from Oregon before the committee. The staff reported that there was no evidence of any nature to indicate any wrongdoing of any kind whatever on the part of the Senator from Oregon. For that reason, we can see no reason whatever for asking the Senator to come before the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin. I simply want to make this assertion, which I stand ready to support, as to what my records will show. They will show what will be shown by the records of each and every other Senator, who tries to perform his duty to his constituents. Whenever a constituent comes to my office to ask for assistance in obtaining an appointment for the purpose of interviewing a Government official concerning what he considers to be a problem he has with the Government, I have done what every other Senator does in similar circumstances, and have extended to the constituent the courtesy of rendering him the assistance he requested.

In each case I have made clear that the constituent must stand on the merits of his own case. I have never asked a Government official to consider a complaint or a problem raised by any constituent of mine except on the basis of the merits of the matter. No compensation, financial or otherwise, was ever paid to me for any service I ever rendered a constituent in connection with carrying out any of my work or duties as a Senator. If any representative of clients ever received fees from Oregon constituents or anyone else for services he rendered those clients as the result of any appointments he had with Government officials through any courtesy my office extended in arranging such appointments, I was no party in any way to the compensation. Every Senator knows that as Senators we would have no right to inquire into or interfere with the private contractual arrangements entered into between professional representatives and their clients.

I do not keep an FBI agent in my office to check into the background and business dealings of constituents who may visit my office. They are entitled to the kind of courteous service which I have rendered to all my constituents, including this particular one. When they make what appears to be a legitimate request for assistance with a problem they have with a Government department, I try to give them courteous treatment. That is one of the things they pay taxes for. That is the only position I have taken in

regard to this case or any other case, and my files will show it.

I want to thank the entire committee for the courtesies which the committee has extended to me and for the clarifying statement the chairman of the committee has made on the floor of the Senate today. The chairman some days ago notified me that upon investigation the committee had no desire to call me before the committee; nevertheless I wish to make clear to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and other Senators on the committee that my offer to appear before the committee is a standing offer, and if any new developments occur, I am at their service.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate beginning tomorrow and through Friday. Let me hasten to add that it is a matter of regret on my part that I shall not make my weekly committee report on Friday; but I shall make it next Monday if I may have consent to be absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Without objection, the Senator's request is reluctantly granted.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 214, House bill 4664, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4664) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I object to rescinding the order for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, the request is granted, and the order for the call of the roll is rescinded.

The Clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—District of Columbia, regulatory agencies, salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator of Rent Control," on page 2, line 15, after the figures "$17,000", to insert "and the limitation of $27,000 for payment of terminal leave only, in the appropriation of $125,000 for necessary expenses for 'Office of Administrator of Rent Control,' contained in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, is reduced to $5,850."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Veterans' services," on page 3, line 3, to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 3, to insert:

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Civil Defense," $78,285.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 19, to insert:

CHAPTER II

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate

Contingent Expenses of the Senate

Folding documents: The appropriation for folding documents contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby amended to read "For folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate not exceeding $2 per thousand or for the employment of personnel at a gross rate not exceeding $1.53 per hour per person."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 4, to insert:

Motor vehicles: For an additional amount for maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, $9,331.26, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Folding documents," fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 10, to insert:

Miscellaneous items: For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items," exclusive of labor, $55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 12, to insert:

Postage stamps: For an additional amount for postage stamps for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, $175.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 15, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Rotunda frieze, Capitol Building: For cleaning and restoring the sections of the Rotunda frieze decorated in fresco by Constantino Brumidi and Filippo Costaggini, $15,000, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library for personal and other services and all other necessary incidental items, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and to remain available until June 30, 1954.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 2, to insert:

Senate Office Building: For an additional amount for "Senate Office Building," $9,200, to remain available until June 30, 1954.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 5, to insert:

THE JUDICIARY

OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

Fees of jurors

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors," $350,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6 after line 10, to insert:

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Salaries and Expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $32,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Promotion and further development of vocational education," fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 20, to change the chapter number from "II" to "IV."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 11, to insert:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

For an additional amount for rural telephone loans in accordance with the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–924), and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act, $15,000,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think an explanation is required in connection with this amendment.

As Senators may recall, when this item was before the Senate in connection with a previous supplemental bill, there was included a transfer of loan authorization from rural electrification funds to rural telephones in the sum of $15 million. That was reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and was passed by the Senate. It then went to conference with the House. As a result of differences of opinion in the conference with the House the section and the appropriation for rural telephones was eliminated.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I understand that this amendment does not make an additional appropriation of funds, but provides only a transfer of funds from rural electrification to rural telephones. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. That is what the situation was in the previous supplemental bill, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. In the second supplemental bill it involved a transfer from rural electrification to rural telephones. It was the transfer which was objected to in the conference between the Senate and the House.

This is not an appropriation, but is authorization for REA to borrow from the Treasury up to $15 million for the rural telephone program, which eventually, of course, if all goes as planned, would be returned to the Treasury by amortization of the telephone lines. The situation is a little different from the way in which the Senator from Kentucky stated it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his explanation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I was present in the Chamber until about 20 minutes ago, when I left to get lunch, so I did not hear the entire explanation about rural telephones. May I impose upon the good nature of the Senator from New Hampshire to give his explanation once more?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly. In the previous supplemental appropriations bill, an amount of $15 million was taken from the Rural Electrification program, and, in effect, was transferred to the rural telephone program, because Rural Electrification seemed to have a surplus, while the rural telephones activity was in need of funds. Since the same general principle applied, it seemed wise to make the transfer. The item was reported by the committee to the Senate, it was passed by the Senate, and then went to a conference between the Senate and the House.

Although the conferees made a compromise, when the conference report was considered in the House it was rejected.

This amendment is designed for the same purpose, but instead of transfering the funds, it provides for a new authorization—not a new appropriation, but a new authorization—for rural telephones to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury up to $15 million. This amount will eventually be repaid by amortization over a period of years, as the Senator from North Dakota knows.

Mr. LANGER. May I inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire if he is supporting this item?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am supporting it in behalf of the committee. As I understand the feeling of the Senator from North Dakota, this will accomplish what I believe he desires.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 19, to insert:

CHAPTER V

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Economic Stabilization Agency

Salaries and Expenses

The amount made available under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, for the Office of Rent Stabilization is hereby increased from "$11 million" to "$11,385,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have an amendment I desire to offer at this point. Would it be all right to pass over the amendment until the others are disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 2, to insert:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITIES

For an additional amount for "Servicemen's indemnities," $650,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Compensation and pensions," and to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 9, to change the chapter number from "III" to "VI"; and in line 11, to change the section number from "301" to "601."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 19, to change the section number from "302" to "602."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments, except the one that was passed over.

Mr. BRIDGES. As chairman of the committee, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, after line 15, insert:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Mabel H. Withers, widow of Garrett L. Withers, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky, $12,500.

Mr. BRIDGES. Representative Withers died since the bill was reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and this amendment is offered in compliance with the usual tradition and rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 19, it is proposed to insert:

CHAPTER V

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Economic Stabilization Agency

Salaries and Expenses

The amount made available under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, for the Office of Rent Stabilization is hereby increased from "$11,000,000" to "$11,385,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk, to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the law—

1. No employee shall be eligible for annual leave payments in excess of 60 days.

2. Any employee who, having received annual leave payment, has been reemployed in any department or agency of the United States within 60 days after separation shall refund to the Federal Treasury an amount equal to the unused portion of his annual leave (or separation) payment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Delaware if the amendment does not propose legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am reasonably certain that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended, and that I be permitted to offer the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a matter which ought to be considered by a legislative committee. It materially affects the existing law. I do not feel competent, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to pass upon a subject of this kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My reason for offering the amendment at this time, I may say to the Senator from Arizona, is this: This particular item in this appropriation bill is to provide $385,000 for lump-sum separation pay or annual-leave payments to the employees of the Rent Stabilization Agency. I recognize that under the law we are obligated to make certain payments to such employees. I am not objecting to that. However, I point out that this is the agency which conceived the devious scheme whereby it could make a raid on the Federal Treasury by firing employees one day and rehiring them the next morning.

I have already called that situation to the attention of the Senate how that effective at 5 o'clock on one day the employees were separated and paid. The next morning at 9 o'clock they went back to the same office, walked in the same door, and were rehired. We do not want any repetition of that Pendergast machine.

My amendment would limit annual-leave payments to 60 days. I consider this liberal and it is all that Congress thought it had authorized. Also, if any of the employees are rehired in the same agency or any other Government agency after having received a lump-sum payment, they would be required to pay back into the Federal Treasury a sum representing the unused portion of their annual-leave payments. If they went back to work the next morning, they would pay it all back under my amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, of course, it is entirely proper for the

Senator from Delaware to criticize a particular agency. However, he is proposing on an appropriation bill general legislation which would apply to all agencies.

I should like to inquire of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, whether there is any legislation of this kind pending before his committee.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas for the purpose of making reply.

Mr. CARLSON. I will say to the Senator from Arizona that I just entered the Chamber. I am trying to check on the contents of the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. As I understand, it would affect annual leave.

Last week the House passed a bill dealing with the annual leave provisions. That bill is now before our committee. I wonder if it would be possible to take care of the situation in conjunction with that measure. What does the Senator have in mind?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service can and should still recommend much needed overall legislation clarifying annual leave payments. However, in the meantime it seems to me that Congress would be negligent if it allowed this particular agency, which originated a device which has been denounced by the Comptroller General as highly unethical, if not actually illegal, to repeat its past performance. It seems to me that Congress would be negligent if it were to give that agency $385,000 to do again what it did once before. My amendment would prevent a recurrence.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator objects to appropriating money in this bill, that is one thing. However, if he wishes to include in the bill legislation on the general subject, that is something else. I was trying to protect the jurisdiction of the legislative committee by objecting to any action of that kind being taken. For that reason I must insist on the point of order, that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware proposes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would be willing to let the bill go over until tomorrow, so that I may file formal notice with the Senate and bring up my amendment tomorrow, when we may have a vote on the proposal.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from Delaware that while the Senator from New Hampshire is anxious to get appropriation bills through, this is a relatively small bill. The Senator from New Hampshire does not wish to foreclose the Senator from Delaware in his desire to have this issue brought to the foreground. Is it the intention of the Senator from Delaware to make a motion to suspend the rule?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. And to give a day's notice, so that the question can be brought up and voted upon tomorrow?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not wish to delay the bill unduly. I think some of the questions raised deserve attention. If some assurance can be given that the matter will be acted upon with reasonable speed, I shall not object. I do not desire to shut off the Senator. However, when the point of order is made, the only way the Senator can proceed is by giving notice of a motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the meantime, can the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service advise the Senate by tomorrow what action his committee proposes to take on the House bill which has already been passed? I still believe that it is much better to have a legislative committee hold hearings on a question of this kind and act in the regular way rather than to have a Senator offer an amendment to an appropriation bill, when no one knows at the moment what the effect of it would be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona object?

Mr. HAYDEN. I did object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is sustained.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Generally speaking, I am opposed to legislation on appropriation bills. Such action frequently gets us into trouble.

I admit that our committee has not acted on this particular phase of this type of legislation. We received a bill from the House yesterday, I believe. It is now before our committee. Regardless of what action is taken on this bill, I assure the Senator from Delaware that we will give the subject consideration as soon as we have an opportunity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I appreciate the agreement of the Senator from New Hampshire, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to let the bill go over until tomorrow. I give notice now that I shall call up this amendment at that time. However, if it is desired to strike the appropriation from the bill entirely in order to give the committee an opportunity to act, I have no objection to that course. I am opposed to appropriating any more money for annual-leave payments for any of the agencies until we clarify the question of annual-leave payments.

I point out the fact that daily employees are being laid off. As we lay them off, let us be sure that we are not paying them 2 or 3 times, as was done once before. No doubt some of the employees laid off will find employment in some other agency. If they do, we do not want them to become eligible to draw separation pay by merely transferring to some other agency. I think this question should be acted upon one way or the other. I am perfectly willing to leave to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations the choice of approach.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, although an appropriation bill is a privileged matter anyway, I should like to have an agreement that this question will be taken up first tomorrow and disposed of, so that we may have action on the bill. The Appropriations Committee is very busy, and there are other bills to be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire wish to make a motion?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if the bill goes over until tomorrow, that it be the first order of business tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—frankly I cannot see why the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and his committee should be prevented from considering the entire subject. Certainly as a whole the people who work for the United States Government are a fine, honest group of workers who give a good day's work for an honest day's pay.

I do not understand why there should be an exception made in this particular case. Undoubtedly my friend from Delaware, as usual, has a very good case. However, I do not know anything about it, because I am no longer a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I believe the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is quite correct in his objection and in stating that the whole subject should be taken up in its entirety by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wonder whether the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations understood the statement which was made on the floor of the Senate by the majority leader with reference to the measures which will be taken up tomorrow, and the order in which they will be considered. The Senator from Ohio made a statement on that point earlier today.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was not in the Chamber at the time. I have been engaged in committee work at least a part of the time. I would appreciate it if the Senator from Kentucky would inform me on that point.

Mr. CLEMENTS. My understanding is the majority leader stated that the resolution providing additional funds for the Committee on Rules and Administration in connection with the New Mexico senatorial election would be taken up tomorrow, if it had not been disposed of previously, and also four other measures, namely, calendar Nos. 171, 225, 153, and 142, which are, respectively, Senate bills 1413, 15, 16, and 922. The majority leader stated they would be taken up tomorrow in that order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would say, Mr. President, that I would be willing to agree to limit debate on this question.

It is a subject which could be debated in 15 or 20 minutes by each side, or I would be agreeable to set any time for debate which would be agreeable to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. In that way we would not delay the proceedings of the Senate. All I am asking is that the Senate register its approval or disapproval of the conduct of Government officials in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The Chair will advise the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] that there is no positive agreement recorded that any particular measure shall be the first order of business tomorrow. Therefore, the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Delaware would be in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky did not understand that it was an order of the Senate. I called the attention of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to the statement which had been previously made by the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that to be the fact. He merely wishes to remind the Senate that no positive order had been entered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. For the RECORD I should like to state that the list of bills read by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] was stated by the majority leader as the tentative schedule for tomorrow.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], just before he left the floor, addressed the majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and got what I understood to be the very positive declaration from the majority leader that in the event the resolution having relation to the New Mexico election case should be disposed of earlier, the bill mentioned by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] would be taken up next, and might be the first order of business tomorrow.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I remind the Senator from Alabama that the bill to which he has referred is on the list read by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is the second bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No; it is not the second bill. I do not believe the list was made up in any particular order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. After the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] withdrew his objection, I heard the majority leader clearly state that the bill referred to by the Senator from South Carolina would be the first order of business, provided the Senate had disposed of the resolution regarding the New Mexico election case by that time.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. But there was no agreement to that effect.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I believe it is unfortunate to write this type of legislation on an appropriation bill. I have taken that position consistently during the years. Yet here we are, on one of the first appropriation bills this year, starting to do exactly that. I will object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator for Delaware to the committee amendment on page 7, line 19.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that objection has been made to offering my first amendment, I now move that the Senate strike out the committee amendment in its entirety and that the $385,000 appropriation for the funds covering leave payments await action by the committee. I respect the rights of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to determine the matter. However, I hope that the committee will act promptly. After the committee has acted, the Senate can then make an appropriation for this agency. In the meantime I point out that the reason they are asking for $385,000 more to make these lump-sum payments is because of the highly unethical, if not actually illegal, separation payments which they have made in the months heretofore.

We appropriated the money last year to take care of this agency but they recklessly squandered it by adopting this "fire-rehire racket."

I point out again that we are not trying to take away from bona fide employees what they are entitled to. All we are trying to do is stop a repetition of the disgraceful practice which was exposed in recent weeks, namely, the raiding of the United States Treasury for making lump-sum annual payments under the guise of separating persons from the Government service, when in fact they were not being separated. I wonder whether the chairman of the committee would agree to strike out the amendment until we determine how much will be due with the corrected law.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I support the Senator from Delaware in his motion to strike out the section to which he has referred until we have had an opportunity to look into the subject. I, too, want to state that the regular civil-service employees need have no fear that they will not get their just payments. However, we wish to have an opportunity to look into the matter. I hope the Senate will go along with the request of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I believe we should understand what we are about to do. There is no new money in the committee amendment. Legislation has been passed with respect to an extension of the Economic Stabilization Agency, eliminating a number of its duties and extending others. From the total amount previously appropriated, by means of this committee amendment we are increasing from $11 million to $11,385,000 the funds available. They are not new funds. They had been previously appropriated for the full Agency. What we did was to extend the rent division. Therefore we are making available now for the rent division a certain amount of money which previously was assigned to another division of the Agency.

Last week we extended rent control until July 31, 1953. If we had not extended rent control we could have left the Amount as it was, and the Agency would have had sufficient money with which to close up its functions and release its employees and pay them. However, since Congress has extended rent control, we must provide more money, not only a sufficient amount with which to close certain divisions of this Agency and enable them to pay their employees, but also a sufficient amount of money to continue the employment of the administrator of rent control until July 31.

Furthermore, I do not know whether there will be another supplemental bill to come before Congress this year. The only other appropriation bills to come before us, so far as we know now, are those for the coming fiscal year, which will begin on July 1. Therefore, if we fail to act on this matter now in this bill, I do not know what the situation will be. Another supplemental appropriation bill may come before us, but we have no intimation of it now.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. My understanding is that if funds are not appropriated, the employees affected will have to be discharged at once, and there will be no one to carry on the functions of rent control for the next 2 months.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say that may be, in part, the effect.

Mr. HAYDEN. If that be the case, and if the employees are discharged, under existing law they will be entitled to their terminal leave.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the situation referred to by the Senator from Arizona is the correct one, is it not likewise correct that the only reason that would be so is that this particular agency has wasted the funds Congress appropriated for it last year? I refer to the funds appropriated last year for the running of this agency during the period mentioned.

The funds now proposed to be appropriated are not for the purpose of taking care of the rent stabilization agency for the next 3 to 6 months, for on page 3 of the report we find the following statement:

> Additional funds for the year 1953 will be required if legislation extending Federal rent control is enacted.

Mr. HAYDEN. And such legislation has been enacted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and therefore additional funds will be needed.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. However, that has no relationship to the $385,000 now requested in today's appropriation. The report submitted in connection with the bill clearly states that additional funds will be needed to take care of the extension of the rent stabilization agency.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly what has happened, and nothing else. We have extended the life of the agency, and these persons will be employed. If there is to be rent control, the employees will have to be paid.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly willing to go along with that, but I point out that the $385,000 covered by this committee amendment is for nothing more than the payment of annual leave. If that is not true, and if the $385,000 is for the salaries of the employees needed for the continuation of the agency, we can very readily solve that matter by

merely including another amendment to the effect that no portion of this fund shall be used for annual leave payments. This will automatically leave the $385,000 available to pay the salaries if that is what you intend.

Mr. HAYDEN. Where would we be then, if no action were taken at the end of the time and if rent control were discontinued? Under the law, every one of these employees would have a valid claim, which he could collect, for his annual leave, because he would have earned it under existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I recognize it is a valid claim, and I shall support on the floor of the Senate the appropriations needed to pay any claim which I think is due.

All I am asking is that we make sure that we do not pay again something that is not justly due to the employees in this agency or in any other agency.

Mr. HAYDEN. All I can understand from what the Senator from Delaware has said is that he has absolutely no confidence in the Administrator who now is in charge of the Agency, and the Senator from Delaware believes that that Administrator, as such, will deliberately violate the law. That is all I can make out of the statement the Senator from Delaware has made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not say that. However, has the Senator from Arizona read the report that the Comptroller General made in regard to what happened in this particular agency?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I read the newspaper accounts of it, and, undoubtedly, the situation was scandalous. However, that does not mean that the Comptroller General thinks that situation will be repeated, and that therefore we should not appropriate any funds, but should require the employees of this agency to go to the Court of Claims in order to collect.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not a matter of what I think. The Comptroller General has said that under existing law these payments have been made, and will continue to be made, unless Congress corrects the law, and we are a part of Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a function of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and undoubtedly that committee will proceed to recommend steps to correct the law, so that such situation cannot again rise.

However, in this instance, these employees must be paid for the next 2 months if they are to perform their duties, and if this agency goes out of business, the employees must be paid their terminal leave.

The Senator from Delaware is perfectly willing to see them paid, but he wants to compel them to go to the Court of Claims in order to obtain payment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; they can come to the Congress, but I want to be sure that we know what we are paying.

I wish to point out another discrepancy in the law, as it has been interpreted by the previous administration. Congress passed the law and in doing so Congress thought the annual leave would be limited to 60 days. However, while it has been ruled that 60 days is the maximum amount that can be accumulated to the end of the year, an employee is allowed to accumulate 26 days of annual leave during the succeeding year. If an employee begins a year with 60 days' annual leave accumulation, and if during the year he accumulates 26 more days of annual leave, and is separated from the service or resigns 1 day before the year elapses, he can collect annual leave for the 60 days, plus the additional 26 days, whereas if he works 1 day longer, he cannot collect for the additional 26 days, plus the 60 days. Such a situation is absurd.

Mr. HAYDEN. But now we have a new administration and a new administrator, and the Senator from Delaware should have confidence that what he complains about will not be allowed to occur.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have confidence in the new administration, and the President has issued an order to the effect that none of the top-level employees of the various agencies can in the future participate in such raids on the Federal Treasury, as was permitted by the executive branch under the old administration.

I am proud to say that the Cabinet officers and others in the new administration have been told that in accepting their jobs, they will not be eligible for such payments; and the President has also recommended that Congress correct the law and plug this loophole. However, this Executive order does not stop the repudiated bureaucrats of the Truman regime from this last raid on the Treasury. Congress alone can stop that by outlawing the practice. This is our first opportunity to meet that responsibility.

Mr. HAYDEN. The way to correct the law is by taking the appropriate action through the regular legislative committee. The Senator from Delaware agrees that any service rendered prior to correction of the law will constitute a valid claim which will have to be paid. So not a cent would be saved to the taxpayers of the United States if we were to adopt the amendment the Senator from Delaware proposes. Thus it seems to me that it would be merely a waste of effort to adopt such an amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if we do not save a cent by adopting the amendment, at least I point out that the Senator from Arizona should not object, because if no agency is able to make such a raid, I will be satisfied, he will be satisfied, and everyone else will be satisfied. So let us adopt the amendment to the committee amendment.

I think the Senator from Arizona is well aware of the fact that adoption of the amendment to the committee amendment would save money, in that there would not be any more of these raids.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if legislation of the sort being discussed by the Senator from Delaware were to be enacted, that would be one thing. However, he now seeks to have passed on the floor of the Senate, in connection with the consideration of an appropriation bill, legislation which appropriately should come first before a committee. I would object to the course the Senator from Delaware proposes.

On the other hand, I am certain the amendment he proposes would not save a cent.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Do I correctly understand that if the proposal of the Senator from Delaware were adopted by the Senate, there would be no funds with which to pay the salaries of the employees of the rent-control agency, if we were to re-create it or to extend it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. My amendment has nothing to do with that subject. The committee report says that to the extent the agency is extended new funds will be needed.

However, in order to make sure that we would not be restricting the operations of the agency, I would support an amendment providing that the operations of the agency be allowed to be continued. Let the Senate accept an amendment in the nature of a proviso that none of the funds be used for separation payments or annual-leave payments pending the decision of the Congress.

If the intention is as the Senator from Arizona claims, namely, to use these funds merely to pay the salaries of the employees, the adoption of such an amendment would accomplish this purpose. However, I do not think that is intended.

Mr. CARLSON. I would be opposed to elimination of the funds required for the payment of the salaries of the employees of an agency we have extended. However, I am not opposed to taking a little time to look into some of the annual-leave payments, with the distinct understanding that those who are entitled to them—and, so far as I know, all the employees may be entitled to them—would receive them.

Then, at a very early date, I would urge the Appropriations Committee to bring in a measure appropriating the necessary funds, if such funds are required by this measure.

On the other hand, I do not want the Senator from Delaware to receive the impression that I would oppose the appropriation of funds for an agency which we have re-created or extended, and when such funds are needed in order to pay the salaries of the employees of the agency.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my understanding that the funds are not required in connection with the extension of the agency. However, that matter could be cleared up by merely restricting the use of the funds to payments for salary purposes only.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Such an amendment would be in order, would it not—in other words, an amendment providing such a limitation on the funds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment providing a limitation on the use of the funds would be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, Mr. President, in order to clarify the situation, I move that the amendment be amended in such manner that no funds provided in this bill shall be used for annual-leave payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before action is taken on the pending question, I think we should have a clear understanding of the situation.

There remains for this agency, for the last 2 months of the present fiscal year, namely, May and June, $1,084,555. It is estimated that the cost for the agency for May will be $583,900, and that the cost for this agency for June will be $526,900, or a total of $1,110,800.

The agency proposes to release or discharge 210 employees on May 30, and 148 more employees on June 30, or a total of 358 employees. If those 358 employees were paid their terminal pay, which under the existing conditions they claim, the amount would be $384,855. I may say that the Appropriations Committee did not allow them the full amount they requested. They requested an item representing an increase of $529,000. In providing an increase of $385,000, it is very clearly to be seen that we failed to go as far as they desired. But we have felt that such a sum would take care of the definite obligations.

As the Senator from Delaware has pointed out very clearly, it includes the terminal-leave pay for the 358 people. The only desire I have is that the Senate may understand exactly what is proposed. The motion of the Senator from Delaware would limit it solely to terminal-leave pay for all the 358 employees, leaving it to be determined later how much they shall get, and how they shall get it. That is what the Senator is attempting to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct, and that would be determined by the legislation which would be reported. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I will join in supporting appropriations to make possible the payment of whatever is required, once the amount has been established. My understanding is that the $385,000 is for annual-leave payments only.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire think it fair to treat 358 people differently from the manner in which other Federal employees are treated?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. I think all Federal employees should be treated alike.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield further, does he believe that it would be fair to the 358 employees, who may be needing the money in order that they may pay doctors' bills or rent, and who have been depending upon this financial aid, during weeks and months, suddenly to deprive them of something to which they are honestly entitled under the present law?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I do not think it would be fair. I want to say to the Senator from North Dakota, I see what the Senator from Delaware is getting at. He is upset—and justly so—because of the abuse which has been practiced on the Government, and he is endeavoring, by means of this bill, to correct the abuses.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to request the Senator from Delaware to inform the Chair concerning his amendment. The clerk has it recorded as applying to annual-leave payments, whereas it is thought that perhaps the Senator intended it to apply to terminal-leave payments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the legal definition would be annual leave. We were referring to it here as terminal-leave payments, on the assumption that the individuals were to be separated from the service. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota, I am just as sympathetic as he is to the need of these employees for the money, to be used in the payment of rent, doctor's bills, and so forth. But, to get down to the exact meat of this case, I point out that this whole problem arose from the manner in which this act was misinterpreted, or mishandled, by the same agency with which we are presently dealing. The first misuse originated on the part of a man who needed money, as he said, not for the purpose of paying rent, not for the payment of doctor bills, but because he wanted to buy a $20,000 home. So he conceived the unique device of getting himself discharged, collecting $3,654.75 as separation pay, and resuming his employment. He never missed a day. It was on Saturday night that he was discharged and collected his separation pay. On the following Monday morning, at 9 o'clock, he walked back into the same office, and entered upon the duties of the same position as the one he had previously held, and with the same pay. I am not pitying too much this poor little individual for whom the Senator from North Dakota is shedding crocodile tears. Remember this poor little fellow was also drawing over $10,000 per year as the general counsel of this Agency.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Delaware believe that the 358 employees, inconsequentially placed, for the most part, ought to be blamed because the head of the department does something that is wrong?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The 358 employees, occupying inconsequential positions, as the Senator says, will lose nothing to which they are entitled. According to the Senator from New Hampshire, they are not supposed to be separated from the service until May 30. Between now and the date of separation, there is ample opportunity for the enactment of legislation, and the appropriation of money with which to pay them such sums as they deserve. But I point out that many of the employees involved are not so inconsequential. We are proposing to close up an agency, and the top-level employees, unless we correct the law, are going to draw just what the Cabinet officers in the last administration drew, namely, large bonuses.

I tried to ascertain whether some of the Cabinet officers conducted their political campaigns last November at the expense of the taxpayers. I have received a letter stating that, by virtue of their position, it would be beneath the dignity of a Cabinet officer to keep a record of his annual leave or vacation time. I was told that the Comptroller General had ruled that their positions were so exalted that they did not have to render an accounting as did other employees. I took the matter up with the Comptroller General, requesting that he furnish me a copy of any such ruling, exempting Cabinet officers from the rules that are applicable to all other Government employees. So far they have found no such ruling. Mr. President, I may say I am sick and tired of such payments to all the top-level repudiated bureaucrats, some of whom never made a living until they went to work for the Government. I want to see them get out and go to work. I think a great many people, on November 4 last, voted to put them to work. I want to be sure that they get off the Government payroll without this last minute raid on a fund which was set up to protect the regular employee upon his bona fide separation or vacations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield further to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I certainly will join the distinguished Senator from Delaware in making the former Cabinet officers and bureaucrats work. If he can devise some method of making them work, I say God bless him, and I will go along with him. But let me say there are a great many poor employees. For example, a woman with two or three small children, or a woman who has worked for 25 or 30 years, who has a dependent mother or aunt, merely lives from hand to mouth because, in spite of what my distinguished friend says, the pay of Federal employees is, in my opinion, far too low. While the cost of living has gone up and up, the pay of the Federal employees has not kept pace with it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to reply to his statement.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to finish my question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I fear I shall forget the first part of it.

Mr. LANGER. The amount involved is only a few dollars in the case of each individual. These employees are dependent upon the money, perhaps for use in paying for some household article, such as a piece of furniture, or for use in paying a doctor's bill or some other bill. Would it not be unfair to say we are going to wait until May 30? Even then, it might be another month or 2 or 3 months before the employees could get that to which they are entitled under the present law.

The only justification offered by the Senator for the proposal is that he desires to compel certain former Cabinet officers and bureaucrats to go to work. I repeat, I sincerely hope he is able to accomplish that objective. But I do not think he ought to do so at the expense of these poor employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that the people about whom he is talking—and there is no use putting this down to the point that these people are going to starve to death—they are on the payroll until May 30, they will be drawing their pay; and, between now and May 30, we will have opportunity to clear this question up, and their pay will be ready for them on May 30. If the Senator from North Dakota will join with me in suspending the rules and adopting the amendment which I offered previous to this argument every employee will be paid. If the Senator from North Dakota is ready to go along with this suggestion, it would make it possible to pay the employees all that they are entitled to as Members of Congress understood the law. It would not pay what some of them are getting as the laws were interpreted by some of the so-called bureaucratic experts, who wanted to make one last grab from the Treasury on their way out.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be delighted to join with the Senator from Delaware in any deal which will make the bureaucrats work or prevent them from getting money in the way he has described, but I think it is wrong for the Government, which is pouring out millions of dollars to almost every country on the face of the earth, to pick out a handful of Federal employees who are doing an honest day's work for small pay, and say to them, "We are not going to give you the money to which you are entitled."

Mr. WILLIAMS. The whole principle involved should be corrected. The regular Federal employees want justice, not pity.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct—after proper hearing; but it should not be corrected by trying to legislate in connection with an appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I served under the Senator from North Dakota when he was chairman of the Civil Service Committee, and I have just as much respect for the rights of employees as he has. But I point out that the legislation under which this loophole developed was reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, while the Senator from North Dakota was chairman of the committee, and I think he should be the first to join me in trying to help correct the error. The reason why hundreds of thousands of employees are today confronted with an annual-leave program which is discredited in the eyes of the American people is because certain top-level bureaucrats have misused the law. It does not do a bit of good to stand on the floor of the Senate and say, "We are against this and against that," and then vote the other way.

I promised to yield to my colleague from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, before I pose a question I should like to make a brief comment.

I think we should congratulate President Eisenhower on the selection of his Cabinet, because I doubt that there is any member of the Cabinet who would need to depend on terminal-leave pay if he severed his connection with the Cabinet.

If I correctly understand the figures given by the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, at the end of June 358 employees will be discharged from this agency, and we are providing $385,000 to pay the annual terminal leave.

Based on the figures given, they receive an annual salary of $5,370, on the average. I do not think that is a meager salary for a Government employee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think my colleague is correct. I also point out that the misuse of the terminal-leave payment was not on the part of the lowest-paid employees. There are very few instances in which we have found that the lower-paid employees were allowed to take advantage of the loophole. It was a plan which was designed by the executive branch and put into effect and utilized only by the top executives as a device whereby they could get a little extra money. They did not pass down this opportunity to the employees who were actually doing the work. My amendment would not take away from any of the employees what we intended them to have. It merely expresses the idea that we are tired of the raid on the Federal Treasury which has been denounced throughout the Nation. It was denounced by the Comptroller General of the United States as being highly unethical, if not actually illegal. The Attorney General is still studying the case to determine whether the Government should be repaid. I think we certainly have an obligation to stop the practice. The only way we can do so is to stop appropriating the money, and amend the law.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I assume that what we are trying to do is to prevent such abuses as occurred in the past. Would the Senator be willing to accept a modification of his motion by inserting the words "unless the Administrator shall certify the payment of such annual leave"? That would place the responsibility at the doorstep of the man in whom the Senator from Delaware seems to have a great deal of confidence. He would personally have to scrutinize each case and do administratively what he should be doing. In other words, there is nothing wrong with the annual leave situation itself, except with respect to the top echelon employees who had the responsibility of seeing that the payments were properly made, but turned their backs on their responsibility.

If the money is to be paid, and the little fellows are expecting to pay their rent and their medical bills, then, what we should do is to say in the bill that none of the annual leave can be paid unless each case is personally certified by the administrator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The present Administrator of this particular agency has already denounced the program. He said he had denounced it at the time it was inaugurated, months ago. He said he thought it was highly unethical, if not actually illegal, and he personally refused to accept any payment. He refused to allow in his own department any secretary or anyone else to accept these payments. But there has been an administrative interpretation placed upon the Annual Leave Act as it is now on the books, and the present Administrator would be morally bound to carry out the act as it has been interpreted until the Congress has rewritten the law.

In this particular case I have confidence in the Administrator that he would do the best he could, but he would have to carry out the law as it is now being interpreted.

Congress must rewrite the law. My proposed amendment provides that no employee shall be eligible for annual leave payments in excess of 60 days, and that any employee who having received annual leave payment is reemployed in any department or agency of the United States within 60 days after separation shall refund to the Federal Treasury an amount equal to the unused portion of his annual leave of separation payment.

Let us assume his 60-day accumulation amounts to $2,000. Thirty days later he receives a job with the Government. He would refund half of the money.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As I understand the situation, these employees are being separated from the service through no voluntary act of their own. They are being dismissed because the activities of their department are coming to an end. A few employees have accumulated annual leave. They cannot take it because their time is up. They are entitled to it under the law. If at a later time they should reenter the Government service, why should they be denied the compensation which they have lawfully earned? There is a difference between taking a job for the purpose of cashing in on annual leave and being laid off and later getting a job with the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out this one difference. Some of the employees are going to continue working, because rent stabilization is being extended 3 months. Therefore, some of them will continue working without any interruption. Last year, when a similar case arose, the administrator gave every employee written notice that they were going to be separated. Congress extended the life of the agency, and 90 percent of the employees continued in their jobs without an hour's interruption, but because they had received notice of separation every one of them that wanted to drew their lump-sum payment. They never lost a day. They continued working at the same desks and at the same salaries.

While it is true there is a difference in connection with those who are actually separated in a bona fide separation, and that would be true of three-fourths of the employees, there are going to be some who will be continued throughout. Unless some restrictions are adopted, those who will continue can, under the existing interpretation, draw a separation payment effective April 30, then they can go back to work May 1. We do not want that to happen.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does not the Senator from Delaware feel that the adminis-

trator is absolutely competent to decide that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Surely, and he has decided it and asked the Congress to correct the law. That is what I am now trying to do.

Mr. PASTORE. That is all I am suggesting in my amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I again point out to the Senator from Rhode Island that the present administrator has asked Congress to clarify the law, so that he will not have to make payments to employees which he does not believe are justified.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I quite agree that the whole matter should be studied by the committee, but I do not see how the committee is going to change the legality of the situation if these employees, under the law, have already earned their annual leave. If they are being separated from the Government service through no act of their own, if they are being laid off because an agency is coming to an end, or if they are being laid off for some other legitimate reason, and the administrator decides that they can and should be paid their annual leave, I do not see how any investigation by Congress will change that, unless we turn our back on a contract we have made with Federal employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No one is saying that we should turn our back on contracts, but we should pass laws to protect the American people against bureaucrats who would misuse the practice.

Glaring examples have been pointed out of such misuse. Surely the Senator from Rhode Island is not defending them. Different agencies have misused the practice, and all that we are trying to do is stop the abuse. It is not intended to affect one single, bona fide Government employee from his separation payment or his annual leave. I believe in the principle of legitimate annual leave. I think it is fair. I have supported it, and I will continue to support it.

I will support an appropriation to pay what employees are honestly entitled to, but I do not want to continue appropriating money to make improper payments to a lot of broken-down bureaucrats.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. What bothers me is that if the Senator is willing to admit that annual leave is proper, if he is willing to admit that the employees who are separated from the Government service are entitled to their separation pay, there is no need for a change in the law. I cannot conceive of what change he could make by any law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That answer is very simple. The change needed is to stop Cabinet officers and other top-level appointees, including discredited Treasury officials, from raiding the Federal Treasury, as was done under the Truman administration.

What is wrong with the amendment I have offered?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not see what is wrong with placing the responsibility right in the lap of the Administrator, and let him certify each case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On November 4, 1952, the American people decided that this Government would be a Government of laws, not a Government by administrative decisions. We have had a change of administration, and that is what the people wanted. Congress must accept its own responsibility and write laws as it is intended they should be written, not pass the buck back to an Administrator, give him a million dollars, and say, "You do what you think is best." I do not like what has been done before under that loose practice.

Mr. PASTORE. I subscribe to that. I believe ours is a Government of laws. I believe we should have an annual-leave law, and we ought to clarify the law as to what annual leave is. On the other hand, I do not think we have to pass an act of Congress every time an employee of the Federal Government collects a paycheck. That is what is being attempted here.

We have passed an annual-leave law, saying to employees, "You are entitled to a certain amount of annual leave every year." We have also recognized the fact that when an employee is separated from the Government service through no fault of his own, he is entitled to a cash payment. That is the law. All we are saying is, "If you are entitled to it, you should be paid." We cannot glamorize and sensationalize this matter. These employees should not be paid their money unless they are entitled to it, and I think the man who is responsible is the Administrator. If he cannot exercise that responsibility, he is the one who should be fired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Rhode Island says the administrator is the one who is responsible; but remember there have been some administrators who were not so good.

Again I say that Congress has the responsibility to determine whether we want these payments to continue as they have been made.

The law reads very plainly, that it was set up to take care of separations of Government employees who are separated from the Government service through no act of their own, but much to the surprise of many of us, and perhaps to the surprise of the Senator from Rhode Island, an interpretation was placed upon the words "separation through no act of their own" to mean that executive officers, including Cabinet officers, who were separated as a result of the elections, were entitled to this pay and therefore they claimed separation pay averaging around $5,000 apiece. That is not the interpretation Congress intended. I do not believe there is a Senator on the floor, including the Senator from Rhode Island, who will stand up and defend that. The law was designed to take care of regular employees who are separated through no act of their own. It was never intended to take care of Cabinet officers or any administration official who loses his job solely because the American people repudiates him.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not defending any annual leave received by any Cabinet officer. Whether right or wrong, I am not now prepared to say. But I am now defending the action with respect to 358 employees, small people, in this agency, whose positions Congress is going to terminate in a period of 3 months. These employees have already been given notice of separation. The committee has already been apprised of the fact. We have already suggested an appropriation for the payment of their annual leave.

The Senator from Delaware cannot stand on the floor now and say that this is an illegal act. He cannot say these employees are not entitled to this money. He can only say they are entitled to the money. If they are entitled to the money, let the Administrator certify the fact, and let us do our jobs as Members of Congress by seeing to it that the money is available with which to pay them.

I am not defending any abuse by any Cabinet officer. I am defending 358 small employees who are going to lose their jobs within a matter of days.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Rhode Island points out that I cannot say that a single one of those 358 employees is not to be separated in a bona fide manner. To that extent, he is correct. Likewise, the Senator from Rhode Island cannot point out with any force or any factual information that some of those 358 employees are not going to be paid their annual-leave payments on a fictitious separation notice and never lose their job, but continue right on in the portion of the agency which we are extending.

Some of those men are still going to be retained. I point out a specific example. Mr. DuPree, former General Counsel of the Rent Stabilization Agency, the same one who took the $3,500 payment on the basis that Congress was going to close up the Agency about a year ago, notified himself that he was going to be separated. He took his separation payment. He reemployed himself and kept right on working. It can be done again. I do not say that it is going to be done; however, it is to prevent that possibility that the amendment is offered. There may be another DuPree who will conceive the bright idea, "Here is a chance for me to get a little extra money."

I am perfectly willing to pay any employee every dollar that is due him on the day he leaves the service, if he is really separated from the service. If he is not separated from the service he is not entitled to any payment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question first. Would the Senator from New Hampshire be willing to carry this matter over in order that we may have a vote on the proposal tomorrow, with the understanding that debate be limited to 15 minutes on each side? In that way we can have a prompt vote on the question of suspending the rule.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have no objection. Earlier I submitted a unanimous-consent request, to which the

Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] objected. I should like to see the bill disposed of as soon as possible. If we could be sure of action tomorrow, I would have no objection.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. What is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over until tomorrow, and that immediately on the convening of the Senate, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, with debate limited to 15 minutes to each side.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, to add the following words: "unless the Administrator shall personally certify the payment of such annual leave."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out that that amendment would completely nullify my corrective amendment. If that modification were accepted, it would defeat the purpose of the entire amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. [Putting the question.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment which I offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. If the amendment of the Senator from Delaware is withdrawn, how does that leave the situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As it was.

Mr. PASTORE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment——

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Delaware whether or not he intends to offer another amendment, or whether he intends to let the bill pass.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will tell the Senator from Arizona in due time what I intend to do.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then, I object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out that it is really immaterial now whether the Senate adopts the pending amendment or not. The modification offered by the Senator from Rhode Island merely puts the question back into the hands of the Administrator. The same Administrator has already said that he needs clarification of the law if he is going to correct the practice which has been going on, a practice which Congress has denounced, but a practice they have just refused to correct. In all fairness to the Administrator, I think it should be pointed out that if we have future examples of improper payments, Senators should not criticize the Administrator. He should criticize the Congress. Today, in the adoption of the Pastore amendment, you have authorized a continuation of the same practice which has been followed by the Truman administration. No one defends the practice, but you voted for it. We are refusing to do what the Comptroller General of the United States recommended that we do, namely, to amend the law in a manner which would stop the practice of paying unearned annual-leave payments to those who are ineligible to receive them.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wish the Senator from Delaware would submit this question to the proper legislative committee. I believe there is merit in what he has in mind. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that the adoption of the amendment originally offered by the Senator from Delaware might prevent one or two abuses, at the expense of doing an injustice to perhaps 350 employees. That would not be the fair thing to do. Therefore it seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that we should follow the legislative process of studying this subject to ascertain where abuses may exist. If the Senator from Delaware should submit such a proposal to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which is the appropriate committee, give the committee an opportunity to study the subject, and then offer his amendment to a subsequent appropriation bill, I would be delighted to support it, if a provision could be devised which would not do injustice to a great number of employees in order to correct an abuse by a small number.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think the Senator from Louisiana was present in the Chamber at the time I offered my original amendment. I was not seeking to stop payment to a single employee who is entitled to it. As I understand it, Congress intended that employees who are separated from the service should receive such payments. What I was trying to do was to close loopholes in the law.

I point out to the Senator from Louisiana that at least 2 months ago I called this matter to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the appropriate committees of the Senate. At that time I received assurance that we were going to get prompt action. We are still awaiting action. Every day we wait we continue to make these questionable payments to various Government officials. We are changing the executive branch of the Government as a result of the recent election; and as we change the executive branch of the Government we are moving many employees from one position to another. They may be promoted or demoted. The point is that by a little administrative interpretation it would be possible for the administrators, if they chose to do so—and they have done it—to use this device to give an employee two or three thousand dollars as he changes jobs in the Government. That is what we are trying to stop. I am not trying to take away from any employee his bona fide separation pay, as he understands it, as Congress intended it, and as we all intend him to receive it.

Now that Congress has refused to act today I hope legislation may be reported from the committee to correct a situation which has been denounced throughout the country. I am sorry that such payments will have to be continued a little longer. They should have been stopped long ago.

Again I point out that the acceptance or rejection of the pending amendment would make no difference, in that it says that the Administrator may do as he pleases. The Administrator himself says that the law needs changing and that without a change the practice will not be stopped.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The new Administrator believes that the Federal payroll can be reduced, in the interest of economy. It has been suggested that 250,000 employees should be removed from Federal payrolls. By and large, all those employees will be entitled to certain separation benefits when they lose their jobs. I would be glad to support the proposal of the Senator from Delaware if we could arrive at an arrangement which would protect the rights of employees who are separated from their jobs, and enable them to draw their terminal pay. However, I would not vote for a proposal which might jeopardize the rights of those employees merely because there might be a few who would abuse the privilege of terminal-leave pay.

When this question has been studied and when we can have entire confidence that the rights of those who are legitimately entitled to separation pay will be respected, I certainly expect to support the type of proposal which the Senator from Delaware has in mind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator from Louisiana that there was absolutely nothing in my amendment which would in any way jeopardize the rights of the 250,000 employees who would be laid off. My amendment would not jeopardize their rights to the bona fide separation pay, which they have earned, as shown by the records. All I was trying to do was to stop the practice of making payments to those not entitled to receive them. If certain

employees merely lose their jobs in X office and immediately move into another Government office, they are certainly not entitled to separation pay, any more than an employee in civilian life who stops working for X Corp. is entitled to draw his unemployment insurance because he has lost his job, when in effect he merely walks across the street and gets another job with another corporation. Such an employee would not draw unemployment insurance. It was never intended that Government employees should draw it either. The whole situation has come about as a result of the unwise interpretation that has been placed on the law by a rejected administrator. I hope Congress will wake up some day to our responsibility of changing the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following my previous remarks, an editorial entitled "Going-Away Checks," which was published in the Washington Daily News on March 12, 1953.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOING-AWAY CHECKS

On the claim that they didn't have time to take their vacations while in office, 215 high-ranking officials ($10,000 a year or more) collected $709,538 from the Government when the Truman administration moved out in January.

This happened under a system which permits Government employees to accumulate vacation time and then get paid for it when they leave the payroll.

Only one Truman Cabinet officer didn't catch this going-away gravy train. Most of the better-publicized Truman officials made it.

We are especially impressed with the accumulated leave cash which went to Oscar Ewing, the former Federal Security Administrator, and to William O'Dwyer, ex-Ambassador to Mexico.

Mr. Ewing, in his capacity of making secure the lives of everybody from Huttites to goats, roamed far and wide in the world—in the interest, naturally, of the security of the American people.

Such arduous travels, as you can see, keep a man from getting his just vacation.

So Mr. Ewing, on leaving the Government, got $4,447 to make up for the vacation he didn't get.

Consider, too, Mr. O'Dwyer. He went to Mexico to escape the heat in New York.

Mexico, of course, is a wonderful vacationland, especially for a man charged with nurturing and protecting crime and vice while mayor of the biggest American city.

But poor Mr. O'Dwyer claims he didn't get all the vacation he had coming, so the Government sent him an accumulated-leave check for $5,396, although he was in office only 2 years and 3 months.

A House committee now is investigating, and we hope it will find a way to give the taxpayers a vacation from this kind of nonsense.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an interview with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Honorable T. C. Andrews. The interview was published in the May 8, 1953, issue of U. S. News & World Report. In the interview Mr. Andrews outlines the new attitude of the Treasury Department in promising a square deal for all taxpayers. In view of the importance of this new policy to all American citizens, I am asking unanimous consent to have the article incorporating the interview printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SQUARE DEAL FOR TAXPAYERS

(Interview with T. Coleman Andrews, United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—T. Coleman Andrews is the first certified public accountant to become Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Tax practice and tax accounting have been his lifework. He has held important positions with State and city governments in Virginia as a comptroller and auditor of public accounts. He has served the War and Navy Departments in fiscal affairs and contract problems. But in 1944 and 1945 he also served in the United States Marine Corps and became a major on the staff of the Fourth Marine Aircraft Wing in the Central Pacific. From 1945 to 1947 he was Director of Corporation Audits in the General Accounting Office in Washington, and for this work received an award for outstanding service from the American Institute of Accountants, of which he became president in 1950. To discuss the relations of the taxpayer to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, U. S. News & World Report invited Mr. Andrews to its conference room. This interview is the first comprehensive explanation of the Bureau's plans and policies given by the new Commissioner.)

Question. Are you changing the attitude of the Bureau of Internal Revenue toward the taxpayer, Mr. Andrews? To many taxpayers it has seemed to be one of hostility——

Answer. I have been challenged on the question of what the attitude of the Bureau has been toward the taxpayer, and, instead of saying that we are changing the attitude to the taxpayers, let's put it this way:

Everybody in the Bureau—and there are 54,000 of us—is an employee of every man and woman whose tax return is filed with us. We are not their bosses; they are ours. We are hired by them to assist them in discharging one of their duties as a citizen. There is no excuse whatsoever for any person in the Bureau of Internal Revenue to take any attitude toward a taxpayer other than one that emanates from a sincere desire to be helpful.

Question. Are you going to give the taxpayer the benefit of the doubt? Some of the Bureau's letters in the past have seemed to some taxpayers to be almost insulting, as though the taxpayer had done something wrong.

Answer. I have that difficulty with letters that come in to me for signature. I might say that I'm requiring a great many replies to be prepared for my signature—which a few months from now I won't expect to do—just to see what kind of letters our people write. Occasionally I have to send a letter back and say, "For goodness sake, breathe into it a little bit." I might say that it isn't that our people don't want to do a better job. As a matter of fact, they seem as anxious about it as I am and they are cooperating enthusiastically.

Question. Are you aware of the popular attitude of the taxpayer toward the Bureau, which is that the Government is interested only in the revenue by any manner that it can collect the revenue, irrespective of the inequities involved?

Answer. I am very much aware of it.

My feeling about it is that the Bureau has brought this on itself, and that one of our major jobs is to get the people believing in the Bureau again as they used to, to give the Bureau character and standing in the eyes of the public. And I believe that that's a very simple thing to do.

You have mentioned giving the taxpayer a break, the benefit of the doubt. Of course, that is what we should do. There should be a square deal for the taxpayer.

We should have the attitude, I think, that we want every cent that's coming to us, but not 1 cent more, and if there is sufficient doubt, we don't want it at all.

I will give you an illustration. A case came up the other day of a dispute with a taxpayer that had arisen over 1943 income when the taxpayer was in the military service. When he came back and his returns were audited, he was told that he owed some $250. He said, "I don't think I owe you $250." And they argued backward and forward, and finally in desperation the taxpayer said, "Well, I'll give you $50 and clean it up," and that compromise was accepted.

Now, I would not have insisted on collecting the $50. Why? Because there was a reasonable doubt as to whether he owed any money or not, and I say that a compromise made in those circumstances is not a compromise at all.

Question. It doesn't prove who was right or wrong, does it?

Answer. It doesn't prove a thing. If the Government is not satisfied that it is right, then it has two courses open to it. If its doubt is sufficiently strong, it can say, "Well, let's forget it." If it is not strong, then it can say, "Well, let's let the courts decide."

Question. Isn't that the reason for the widespread belief that the Government is collecting nuisance penalties constantly from a public which doesn't want to be bothered with litigation, doesn't want to hire lawyers to defend every minor point? And aren't the sums so small in some cases that the people can't even afford the litigation and would rather pay the penalty than try to have it adjudicated?

Answer. You are probably right, and I would say that the last thing that any fair tax administrator wants is to have a tax return regarded as an invitation to a lawsuit. Way back in 1927, the Secretary of the Treasury, in a statement to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, stated: "The collection of revenue is primarily an administrative and not a judicial problem. As far as the Federal income tax is concerned, a field of administration has been turned into a legal battlefield."

I am afraid that anyone would have to admit that over the years this situation has gotten worse instead of better.

As I see it, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in his enforcement of the revenue statutes must not only see that every dollar of taxes due under the statutes is collected, but also that not one dollar is collected that shouldn't be. In other words, the Commissioner, in a sense, wears two hats—one as a law-enforcement officer, the other as a dispenser of justice—and the appellate procedures provided by the revenue laws were deliberately set up to give the Commissioner the fullest possible opportunity to discharge both of these obligations.

Now, what is that appellate procedure? First, the return is examined, and the taxpayer has an opportunity to voice at that point his disagreement with the revenue agent.

Second, if the taxpayer and the revenue agent don't agree, they can take their differences to the revenue agent's group chief.

Third, if agreement is not reached at this point, the next step is appeal to our Appellate Division.

Fourth, if agreement is not reached at this point, then the next step is the Tax Court. But even at this point there is still another opportunity for informal discussion in the form of a pretrial conference.

Now it should be borne in mind that this procedure is designed to facilitate a meeting of minds across the table by the two people, each of whom must be prepared to

give and take—the revenue agent as well as the taxpayer.

Also I call attention to the fact that our Appellate Division is not responsible to the district commissioners in matters of case settlements, but rather is responsible directly to the Commissioner, in Washington. Therefore, while it is the Appellate Division's duty to see that the laws are complied with, it nevertheless to a large extent sits as the representative of the Commissioner, functionally independent of the collecting authorities, to achieve, if possible, a just settlement of the points in controversy.

I have not yet had a meeting with the appellate people, but I am going to, and I am going to tell them: "Your function is to represent me in my second capacity. My first capacity is to collect taxes. My second capacity is to do it with justice. Your function is to find, if possible, a point at which the Commissioner and the taxpayer can agree. Remember that you are sitting there now in my second capacity to find a just solution to the difficulty if you can, and to settle the case if you can in the manner that any two people willing to give and take can always settle any argument."

Question. What do you think of the bar association's plan for a small-claims court for tax collecting?

Answer. That is a hard question to answer without indicating a negative attitude, which I honestly do not have. But I feel this way about all proposals for any supplementation of the appellate process. I believe—at least, I am strongly inclined to believe after being here now nearly 3 months—that with a proper attitude from the top the present appellate procedure is sufficient, and that any taxpayer can get justice under it.

Question. And yet there must be millions of dollars collected by the Treasury from people who cannot leave their jobs to go to your tax offices to argue. Rather than argue, whether it's $10 or $15, or whatever it is, and may be a lot of money to them—and lose a day's pay from their job by coming down to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, they just accept the penalty. Now, what procedure have you within the Bureau to review those assessments?

Answer. The difficulty with that is that if a taxpayer pays without arguing, then there is no system of review that will help him, because the reviewer would never have the taxpayer's side of the case before him——

TAX ARGUMENT VIA MAIL

Question. Could the taxpayer write a letter and try to settle his problem and not take time to come in and argue it?

Answer. If we could get an adequate letter from the taxpayer stating his position, yes, that could be and would be, and even now is, reviewed if he makes this protest, formal or informal. It is reviewed and given due consideration. But the difficulty with most of those cases is that you can never get all the facts merely by correspondence.

Take, for instance, the question of dependents. There could very easily be a question as to a person's entitlement to an exemption for a dependent which could not possibly be solved by correspondence, but has to be solved on the spot.

There is no reason that I know of, in cases that warrant it, why the revenue agent couldn't go look up the person instead of making the person come to him. As a matter of fact, I have frequently thought it probably would be a lot less expensive in the long run—not to the Government, because it would cost the Government more money, but it would bring about a lot less economic loss—if, instead of making the masses come to the tax collector, the tax collector should try to arrange some way to go to the masses.

I don't know whether this would be practical, but there is such a thing as bringing the mountain to Mohammed when you can't get Mohammed to the mountain. At any rate, such a policy deserves study and we will explore the possibilities of it.

Question. Can a taxpayer, as a practical matter, expect to go to the appellate division on his own hook, without a lawyer, without an accountant, and have any real hope for success?

Answer. Why, certainly—unless there is a complicated question of law or income determination involved. If it is nothing in the world but a question of fact, any taxpayer can do this on his own.

Question. In theory, a taxpayer can take his case to the Tax Court without a lawyer or an accountant—but he doesn't get very far, does he?

Answer. But that isn't practical at all. And that's why the small-claims court idea as an adjunct of the Tax Court probably is not the answer. The problem we were talking about is one that never gets to that stage. What we have to do to solve the problem you are talking about is simply to do our utmost to develop among the people who deal with us at the lowest level a feeling that the attitude of the Bureau is going to be one of justice, reasonableness, on the part of the agent as well as on the part of the taxpayer

Question. Might you not lose a great deal of revenue that way?

Answer. Well, personally I don't believe you would lose any significant amount of revenue, and I think it would be a good investment even if you lost a little revenue by it and achieved the confidence of the American people in their Revenue Bureau.

Question. Do you think you are losing a lot of revenue because people are not reporting all their income?

Answer. We are losing some, but whether it is a lot I don't know. "Lot" is a relative term.

Question. Do you think some people are not making income-tax returns at all who ought to?

Answer. There is no doubt about that, and we are conducting a survey right now in three cities to find out how many people in those cities who should be filing returns are not filing them. That will be used as a test sample of what we need to do in order to ferret out people who are not now filing income-tax returns.

LOOKING FOR CHEATERS

Question. Do you have any indications as to what the answer might be?

Answer. Not yet.

Question. Did you cooperate with the Census Bureau on that?

Answer. No. We can do that job through other devices with a whole lot more ease. We can cross-check with the telephone directory and other lists. There are all kinds of simple ways of doing it.

Question. What percentage of the people try to cheat? Do you have any idea? Is it high or low?

Answer. In some categories it is high.

Question. You have some definite plans, haven't you, to make it more convenient for the taxpayer to make out his returns and pay his taxes?

Answer. Oh, yes. And then, too, I think we may properly say that there really has been substantial change in the public attitude. We're beginning now to get a few letters and telephone calls from people who think we're not too bad. That, of course, is the result of a deliberate effort to improve relations with the public.

Question. How far can you go in helping the taxpayer make out his returns?

Answer. This year, for instance, we did a rather novel thing. I don't want to claim credit for it myself. What happened was that we were confronted with the problem of getting about 55 million individual returns out of the way in a very short period of time, and what we did was to say: "Now, here, we are going to give the taxpayer every bit of assistance we can, the best assistance we can give them. At the same time, we want to try to hold the line on collections, which have been slipping a bit."

So the plan was to bring into the collection offices in the various cities every person outside of the collection group whom we could make available. For instance, we brought in field agents and other personnel to assist the taxpayer in the actual making out of his returns. Now, there are other things that I will mention later. But that, of course, had a tremendous advantage from both the taxpayer's standpoint and our standpoint, because it put on the job of preparing returns those men who knew most about what the returns should contain.

THIRTY-FIVE MILLION STANDARD DEDUCTIONS

Question. Don't you find that the general run of people don't know what they can deduct and what they can't deduct?

Answer. That isn't quite an accurate statement when you stop to consider that there are probably between 35 and 40 million people who never worry about what they can deduct because they use the standard deduction of 10 percent of gross income. So, there is no great problem with all those people. The problem arises with people who have income other than salary—say, rents, interest, profits on sale of property, and that sort of thing—and who may have exceptionally large doctors' bills through the year or whose aggregate deductions will amount to more than the standard deduction of 10 percent. Now, these people have to have help. They are the ones who are most helped in the preparation of the longer form. And so we gave them the best help that's available in the Bureau. That's going to have two effects.

It got them through the line fast. I think the average time that anybody spent waiting was about 20 minutes, which is pretty fast.

Question. Is that here in Washington?

Answer. That's everywhere, the average for the country.

Question. Can you give us some idea of what the time had been in the past?

Answer. I couldn't tell you that because I don't think we have any record of it. But I'd say that it must have taken twice as long. As a tax practitioner I can say that 20 minutes is a remarkably short time.

Now, another advantage of that—the unseen advantage, the one that comes later—is that it simplifies our auditing job because we've got more correctly made returns, and that means less need for auditing.

Question. Then you can spend more time on the returns that you have to audit?

Answer. We will be able to examine more returns that ought to be looked into.

Question. What is the plan we hear you have to relieve 30 or 40 million people of making tax returns?

Answer. That is in its concept a very simple thing, but in its execution it is going to take time. It is this: Every person on a salary has his salary reported to the Social Security Board and the Internal Revenue Bureau. There are two different forms that report the same salary. Our idea is simply to coordinate the two.

We know what the man's salary is. And if that's all the income he's gotten, it is a very simple matter to take that information, calculate the tax, deduct it from what was withheld, and send him a refund check or a bill—and he never has to come to the Bureau at all.

Question. He would make no return?

Answer. None at all. We get the information from the Social Security report and salary-information form filed by his employer.

Question. These are the forty to fifty million people who have no income other than their salaries or wages?

Answer. That's right, and who use the standard-deduction form.

Question. Won't he have to sign his withholding receipt?

Answer. He will probably have to sign his withholding report before the employer sends it in. We will, of course, have to get some change in law to put this plan into operation. It is not something we can do this year, and we may not be able to do it next year. But in another year after that, it ought to——

ONE FORM LESS FOR EMPLOYER

Question. Will it not increase the burden of the employer?

Answer. It doesn't put any more work on the employer at all. It will save him one form, in fact.

Question. It will put a great deal more burden on the Bureau, though, will it not? And, where the taxpayer frequently calculates his own entitlement to a refund, the Bureau will have to detect each of those cases?

Answer. We have to audit their calculations in any case, so why not let the auditor do it all in the first place?

Question. Will he get the bill for taxes due at the same time he does now?

Answer. He will get a receipt for having already paid his tax and a remittance notice. As far as the Bureau is concerned, the handling of a simple thing like that can be done by the least expensive people we have. So, you see, it really boils down to a very low-cost operation at a minimum of trouble to the taxpayer, the employer, and the Bureau.

Question. How often would you do this, quarterly?

Answer. No; it would be done every year, once a year.

Question. Doesn't the employer make the deduction now and turn it in each month?

Answer. Yes; and they accumulate over the year.

Question. If the taxpayer still owes money, then you send him a bill?

Answer. Sure. If he gets a refund, we send it to him; if he owes money, then he is called on to pay it.

SPEED WITH REFUNDS

Question. If he has any income other than salary, the plan wouldn't work, would it?

Answer. No; he would have to file a different type of return. Now, there is another aspect of this taxpayer-help program that I think I ought to mention. By making the move that we did to increase the assistance to the taxpayer and get all this work done and preserving our collection people in their regular job of collection and holding the line in collections, we did something else very important. We got out practically all of our refunds by April 15, and so saved more than $3 million in interest this year.

Question. People are getting earlier refund checks?

Answer. Oh, yes. There are very few places that I know of where people haven't already received their refunds.

Question. Can you do anything to make it easier for taxpayers to get advance rulings from the Bureau on problems they encounter?

Answer. Yes; we are already doing something about that. We get about 4,000 requests for rulings a month, and the production reports of the technical divisions of the Bureau indicate that, under a stepped-up program, more rulings are disposed of in each month than we are receiving requests for, so that the backlog of unanswered rulings is being diminished.

Question. Are the rulings worded in such a way so that if the facts change in any way the ruling doesn't constitute approval of what the taxpayer may subsequently do? How do you handle that?

Answer. Usually you get two different kinds of requests. One will be a request for an application of the statute to a particular situation, with a statement as to what the facts are. We will answer the taxpayer in a case like that by saying to him, "Now if the facts you gave us hold, then this is your answer."

Question. Can anyone write in for this?

Answer. Sure, and they do, with the questions running all the way from very simple ones to the very complicated. Some rulings take a good deal of legal and other research.

Question. In what sort of fields do these questions come?

Answer. Every field that we are in.

Question. How can you let the public know what you are doing with respect to these rulings? You may answer 4,000 letters a month, but that information is not available to the public. It's only for the one man who writes the letter. Nobody else knows how you have ruled in particular cases. What can be done to disseminate that information to the public? Could you publish the cases without mentioning the names?

Answer. What happens is this: We have a great many rulings, of course, that are just duplicates of previous rulings; therefore, to publish every ruling we make would be a tremendous waste of time and money. So, when we get a significant question to answer, we publish the question and our answer in the Internal Revenue Bulletin. Also, we are publishing more rulings now. In other words, there are fewer office rulings and more published rulings.

Question. Hasn't that been one of the complaints from the public, that there have been so few public rulings?

Answer. Yet—let's say that there haven't been enough.

Question. Where does a person write to get these advance rulings?

Answer. To the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, stating his problem and asking for a ruling.

Question. Who determines whether these rulings are significant or not?

Answer. That is determined by the technical office. They know. For instance, today we got a question up there on a matter that is almost novel, which probably seems unusual, since we have had an income tax since 1913. But, actually, it was a brand-new question. Well, the ruling on that question will be published so that if it comes up again, and it will come up again because it is a new type of business development, then people can be guided by it.

WHERE RULINGS ARE PRINTED

Question. What is the circulation of this Internal Revenue Bulletin?

Answer. The circulation of the bulletin is available to anybody who wants it. It is not difficult to get. Anyone can write for a copy. The mailing list is handled by the Superintendent of Documents of the Government Printing Office on a subscription basis. The tax practitioners—the lawyers and accountants who actively operate in the tax field—get the bulletin when it comes out.

Question. Is that sent free by the Bureau?

Answer. There is a small charge, $3.25 a year.

Question. Well, here you have millions of people who may need to know how you are ruling on these cases, but apparently there is no medium by which the general public as a whole can learn what you are doing—unless the newspapers would print that as a service—is there?

Answer. Under the new policy of the Bureau—if I may call it that—we are releasing a great deal more information to the public through the commercial-tax services and the press. Lots of these rulings that apparently nobody heretofore thought of turning loose to the press are now being made available—not that they were ever secret before, but rather we are giving them out on the theory that maybe the newspapers might be interested in them and publish something about them.

The average taxpayer, of course, is not interested in the day-to-day rulings that come out. Even the practitioners aren't. Sometimes they just put them aside and never bother about them until pertinent cases come up; but then they go digging for them.

MAKING THE FACTS KNOWN

Question. Have you any practical suggestion as to how the rulings can be more widely disseminated? Can the newspapers do anything?

Answer. Well, the newspapers could do a great deal about it, but the question is whether they would find any real reader interest in the vast majority of those cases. I don't think they would—until somebody gets a particular problem.

Question. A few years ago the Bureau prepared a series of articles which were to be published in the press in installments prior to the date for filing income taxes. These daily articles gave the effect of various rulings in a popularized version of what the taxpayer could do, for example, by way of deductions.. Couldn't there be something like that again?

Answer. There is such a publication available for that purpose right now. It is called "Your Federal Income Tax," costs 25 cents and is obtainable at the Government Printing Office. It has a thorough explanation in simple language—as simple as we have been able to develop up to now—though we hope we can make it still simpler.

As a matter of fact, we have tried to make all of our rulings simpler. We've tried to get some human understanding in them. For instance, this morning we had a ruling in which we were more humane than technical. I took the position that it was a situation where we could rule against the taxpayer technically but we should not rule solely on such grounds, but should also be right from a humane standpoint. And I told the man who wrote the decision, "Now, take it back and rewrite it and put it in the language in which you would want to explain it to your 15-year-old son." We are trying, in other words, to put a little warmth into these rulings.

Question. This brings up a legal point. You still have a wide discretion, under your regulations, to do a great many things, haven't you?

Answer. I am told that the Commissioner has pretty wide latitude in some situations. Of course, that means he can be pretty arbitrary if he wants to, or he can be very liberal if he wants to. Now, you have to strike a balance between the two in order to do a good job of tax administration. We hope we are going to do that kind of job.

Question. How many copies of this publication, Your Federal Income Tax, do you print?

Answer. During this last filing period it sold about 210,000. It was down because of the fact that there were no appreciable changes in the internal revenue laws. With each income tax blank, of course, we give a small pamphlet which runs to about 50 million copies.

What we are trying to do is to make plain the things that taxpayers can deduct so that they can sit down and figure out for themselves whether their legitimate deductions are greater than the standard deductions.

And another thing we have done on the taxpayer-help program, and I think is going to pay big dividends: We went into the high schools of the country last year with a simplified explanation of the income tax law and the preparation of returns. They took a blown-up picture of a return, for instance, and put it up on the wall and explained the various items in the return and how it came down finally to the mathematical calculation of the tax. Then they did the same thing with other forms.

Well, now, that approach has had a great response. The school people like it because it gives them something very practical to teach and adds to their capacity to teach government. Of course, underlying this

program is the fundamental idea that, after all, we want to give the next generation an appreciation of why they have to have taxes, and, in addition to that, a knowledge of how to make out a tax return.

Imagine, if you can, the difference in the public understanding of the tax return when all these millions of school children who have been taught about it come up against the problem of making their own tax returns. It is going to simplify our problem tremendously—it's bound to—it just can't miss.

VISUAL EDUCATION ON TAXES

Question. That same method has been applied to voting machines in many States by putting these machines in the high schools when they weren't being used in actual voting. You are doing the very same thing, aren't you?

Answer. Yes. I call it using visual education to teach two things: respect for and understanding of government and its necessities and, also, a knowledge of how to discharge one's tax responsibility. We think that in the years to come we are going to have a lot less trouble with poorly and inaccurately prepared tax returns.

Question. Are you making real changes in the tax-return blanks and the instructions?

Answer. We have a group that is constantly working on changes in the wording alone to get it in simple language. One of the duties of the Assistant Commissioner in charge of administration is to take all tax forms after they have been passed as to their technical correctness and review them completely for language, to see if it is in language that he thinks the average person will understand.

Question. What is the situation with respect to deductions for individuals? There has been a lot in the papers lately about a mother who is employed and goes off to work and has to hire a nurse or someone to take care of the children. And she does not get a deduction for that expense. Whereas, in a business if you hire anybody to do anything, you get a deduction for that expense. What progress has been made in the handling of that issue?

Answer. There can't be any settlement of it so far as the Bureau is concerned, because the law is very plain on the subject—you can't take that deduction. It is not an ordinary or necessary expense of doing business under the law.

This question involves the matter of what part of income are you going to tax. Now Congress has said you are going to tax a man's gross income, with certain exceptions, and against that he is allowed certain deductions. Unless an act of Congress says that in the case of a working mother we will allow servant hire, the Bureau hasn't any right to allow it, because there is nothing in the law and regulations to justify us in allowing it.

THE WORKING MOTHER'S PROBLEM

Question. How about expenses necessary for production of income, that's allowed. Certainly that is true of a working mother?

Answer. I don't know that it could be so interpreted under that rule. We've considered it, and I think it has been honestly considered, and I think the only way to solve that problem is by legislation. The question is whether as a matter of principle you want to solve it that way.

It comes down to the whole question, then, of "What are you going to tax?" Are you going to tax an arbitrary amount of income, or rather an amount of income less certain arbitrary deductions, or are you going to tax only net income? If you tax net income, then most people spend all they make and so we wouldn't get much from individuals on that basis.

Question. What is your attitude toward the people who get income in the form of room and board? Lots of servants and hotel employees sleep in, and they get food and lodging. If they were working by the day they would go out and have to have a place to live and they would have to pay for their meals. They might work somewhere else and get increased pay, but they would pay income tax on it. Now, the person who lives in doesn't pay income tax on that income?

Answer. That is one of those borderline cases that comes under the rule, as I recall it, of whether the room and board is compensatory. This question often is very hard to decide.

Question. Now, if it is part of the employment agreement, is board and room income?

Answer. Ordinarily, no, where it is a required part of their employment for the convenience of the employer.

Question. Turning now to some of the headaches of business, what does the Bureau think it can do to accelerate the auditing of business returns, so many of which extend over so many years before a business knows whether its returns have been audited or not?

Answer. That is a problem that is bothering us a bit. As an accountant, I think I have the answer. No. 1, we regulate our volume of examination of business returns according to the number of auditors we have. In other words, it's almost a mathematical proposition that you need so many auditors for every hundred or every thousand business establishments. There is only so much work that one man can do. Some of the big returns take a number of men. We have 1 corporation for which there are a dozen men on the job 12 months a year.

But for the average 1-man or 2-man account, one way we can speed it up is to develop in the revenue agents a greater understanding of the principle which the public-accounting profession has long since adopted, and that is test checking. In other words, no public accountant today ever audits every transaction. He picks a certain number of transactions over the year and examines them thoroughly, and on the basis of his tests he concludes whether everything is generally in order and gives an opinion as to the state of the account. We can apply that principle, the principle of comprehensive auditing on the test-check basis, and considerably speed up the process that way.

Another thing we can do is this: There are a great many auditors now going into some establishments that file more than one kind of return. We propose to wrap up all these returns into one package so that when an auditor comes into your establishment to examine your books, he would examine your income-tax return, your social-security return, and, if you have excise taxes, your excise-tax returns. Then that is the last time you would see the auditor until the next year.

PLAN FOR SINGLE AUDIT

Question. You mean that all goes on one return form?

Answer. Oh, no—separate returns, but all bundled up in one package for auditing purposes. I think we can speed the process a great deal in that manner.

Question. Wouldn't you need a change in the law to do that?

Answer. No; that could be an administrative determination. So, by improved auditing methods, which we will get by an intensification of our training program, I think we can probably get our agents finishing their audits faster; also, by cutting out a lot of writing which is now done. One of the things that slows an agent down a lot is that most of them have to write their reports out in longhand. I suspect that a lot of reports don't even need to be written at all. In such cases the agent would say in a simple report form they have examined the return and everything is in order, or even in those cases where they find something they disagree with, I doubt that the agents have to go through all the gyrations they go through now.

I think the process of developing the agent's reports can be speeded up. I think the process in connection with the papers for appeals can be speeded up. For instance, you usually find in a case where there has been an appeal that practically in every step in the case the facts are completely restated, and they may run for pages and pages and pages. Why not simply incorporate the facts for reference wherever they are first stated and let it go at that?

FRANKNESS DUE FROM AGENT

Question. In the case of disputes as to items in auditing, do you think that the agent should disclose to the taxpayer that difference of opinion as to an item, or is he justified in saying nothing about it and giving the taxpayer his first notice of a disputed item when he sends him a deficiency letter?

Answer. The answer to that is that if an auditor examines anybody's returns, the first step in setting the dispute is for the agent to tell him just where he disagrees with him. I never heard of cases where——

Question. But there have been cases——

Answer. Fraud cases, maybe?

Question. No. The stories we hear are that an agent goes in to a business office and sees a lot of items on the return and he disputes those items. In writing up his report he includes some points that he thinks he can bargain with and writes them up as deficiencies, which he knows he's got to concede. And the impression you hear among businessmen is that some of their experiences with an auditor have been on a bargaining basis, that is, he might take up with the taxpayer 8 or 9 points, but when he gets back to the office he may find several others and doesn't argue with the taxpayer but simply puts them in——

Answer. Well, that just isn't cricket. I wouldn't permit that.

Question. Has the Bureau some tax cases that are still there from World War I?

Answer. I couldn't say.

Question. There are always rumors of cases being there 10, 15, 20 years——

Answer. They may be excess-profits cases, but I would imagine they are in the courts. I had one case the other day that has been hanging around there since 1928. We are finally getting that cleaned up and out of the way.

Question. Was that in the Tax Court?

Answer. No. It hadn't even gotten to the point of assessment yet.

Question. That brings us to another question. What about your rules in the various stages in the Bureau before you go to the Tax Court? The average businessman feels, when he goes before some kind of review board, that if he has some evidence or testimony, the Bureau should give weight to that evidence if it comes from competent witnesses. Can he bring in witnesses to support and substantiate his points?

Answer. Certainly.

Question. At any stage in this review procedure?

Answer. Sure.

Question. Is the Bureau in any way obligated to give weight to the testimony?

Answer. They certainly are.

Question. In a good many businesses of a complex nature which could not possibly be understood by the Bureau's personnel, unless, perhaps, a competitor came in and verified it as fact, is there an opportunity to bring in witnesses like this?

Answer. The taxpayer can bring anybody in that he wants to.

Question. Do any of them do it?

Answer. Yes.

Question. At what stage? I mean, is this done before it reaches the court?

Answer. Yes; it is done at any stage of the process, from start to finish. If a taxpayer has a case where he wants to impress the agent with the industry practice, then he may bring somebody else along who can say it is the practice. The Bureau is obligated to listen to that testimony. There is no

reason in the world why they shouldn't do it. What we're after is to get the cases settled. We want to stop this pile-up along the line.

TAX COURT DELAY: 2 OR 3 YEARS

Question. Is there much of a jam now?

Answer. It is pretty bad. It is so bad, in fact, that I am told that Tax Court cases may not get tried for 2 or 3 years.

But we are making headway on this. I've given instructions that there must be more concentrated effort to settle.

Question. Wouldn't you get more revenue that way?

Answer. We get the revenue and get the case out of our way and simplify the thing all along the line. I haven't said that we have to settle a case just to settle it, but I said to these fellows:

"Here, forget about all this business of being scared to death of investigations. Go on and make your decisions. You have the authority to make them. Make every decision you can make within the scope of your authority, and be satisfied that if it is an honest decision you will be defended in it. Now, of course, if you are a person who is not capable of making a good decision as a matter of habit, then we are not going to leave you in that position very long. That is an administrative matter. What we are after is an honest effort to reach agreement with the taxpayer, even if you have to give a little sometimes. If you think it is just to give a little, then do so and get it over with."

Question. Are these pile-up cases mostly individuals or corporations?

Answer. That I can't answer, but my guess would be that they are business cases.

Question. What do you think of the idea of this 6-percent interest charge which goes on and on and on while a case is unsettled? Do you think it is right or wrong?

Answer. I think there are some circumstances where the running of interest might be stopped. But just where that point is I don't know. I do believe, though, where there is undue delay on the part of the Government in getting around to the disposition of the case, the Government ought not to expect to collect interest beyond a certain point. But just when that point should be I frankly don't know right now. We'll have to study it. I know that I have seen many cases where I thought the interest should have been stopped at a certain point, and I have had cases where people would pay a certain amount of money in, in order to minimize the interest.

I do think there has to be an interest charge for delay in payment, and there should be, conversely, an interest payment by the Government for delay in refunds.

Question. Why couldn't it be the prevailing interest rate instead of the flat 6 percent?

Answer. Well, in my own mind there is no particular sanctity in the rate of 6 percent. I don't know that you could defend it on any grounds except that it has the effect of an additional penalty, a penalty that works both ways, however.

REGULATIONS VERSUS LAW

Question. What is your theory about the discretionary interpretations by the Bureau of Statutes in what is called the Treasury Regulations? Do you think the regulations are in conformity with the law?

Answer. One of the most serious complaints that we have been receiving has been that there is a lot of law in the regulations that Congress never contemplated. As a former tax practitioner, I can say that this complaint is justified, and all of us, at both the Treasury Department level and the Bureau level, are not only conscious of the problem, but are working on it almost feverishly.

We propose to identify, if possible, every such instance and correct it, and we certainly will not consciously allow it to happen in the future.

To give you an illustration, just the other day we were working on a regulation under the 1951 act, and we found a provision as to which we had doubt concerning its consistency with congressional contemplation, and we changed it. However, let me point out that I didn't think for one minute that the people who wrote that regulation intended to try to do something that Congress didn't intend, so let's not any of us think that the Bureau is headed by people who are using gouges instead of their heads. We must remember that the fact is the Bureau is under the Treasury Department and that in the long run the Bureau reflects Treasury policy. The present Treasury group is as anxious as we in the Bureau to see that the regulations conform to what has been contemplated by Congress.

I think the original motivation was the concept of strict interpretation, with all doubts resolved in favor of the revenue.

TWENTY YEARS OF DIFFERENT VIEWS

Question. How far back would you say it goes?

Answer. It goes back 20 years anyhow. Most of it has happened in that period. I don't want to turn this interview into a discussion of the previous administration, but I think their attitude was a shortsighted approach for immediate revenue purposes.

Question. How are you going to work with Congress on the matter of the changes in the law? Will you make the recommendations, or is the Secretary's office going to make them?

Answer. The Secretary's office is going to make them. That is all being handled by the Under Secretary of the Treasury. The Treasury team divides the tax problem between the Under Secretary, as far as legislation is concerned, and the Commissioner, as far as administration is concerned.

Question. Are you going to make some suggestions for administrative provisions?

Answer. We already have made a great many.

Question. The administrative provisions in the tax laws haven't been revised for a great many years, have they?

Answer. No, they haven't, but that whole thing is under consideration, and what we are doing now is this: We have a new policy, it might be said, of dealing with Congress. For instance, we have regular meetings with the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, in which the committee and ourselves sit down and discuss problems of administration and reach conclusions as to what we ought to do. We met with the committee only last Monday on the question of some of the new regulations that we have coming along.

You see, the regulation process is one of publishing a proposed regulation so that anyone who wishes may get a whack at it. The committee gets complaints saying we don't like this and we don't like that, and we go up and hash it out. We settled four important points at our meeting last week.

Our attitude is very simple. We say: Congress makes the revenue laws for us to administer; therefore, how can we administer these laws intelligently unless we work closely with Congress and know what it intended. So we've established the closest possible liaison with the joint committee and its staff, with the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, and other committees where the effects of taxation become involved.

Question. What are you going to do about the disclosure to Congress and the public of so-called "compromise" settlements? Do you favor a continuance of the existing practice of disclosing cases where the settlements are compromised due to incapacity to pay?

Answer. I feel this way about it: When a tax obligation is established by assessment and the liability is agreed to, then at that point any compromise of that tax is entitled to publication. I think the people have a right to know about it. I'm a taxpayer and you're a taxpayer. If you are going to get a special deal on your taxes, for any reason whatsoever, I think I have a right to know it.

Question. Then you would publish the amounts that were compromised? Would you publish the facts in the case?

Answer. We would do what we are doing now. All compromises of income, profits, estate and gift tax cases are now put on a register and are available for anybody who wants to see them.

Question. Those are cases where the taxpayer has claimed his inability to pay?

Answer. They are for a compromise for any reason.

Question. And they are available for anybody to see?

Answer. Yes. You can go right down there now and see them.

WHAT IS A COMPROMISE?

Question. In the previous administration, Commissioner Dunlap used to say that he would not introduce the other type of settlement. He used the phrase "compromise settlement" for only those instances in which a man was assessed a certain amount of money, say $1,000, and he was unable to pay, and finally the Government would accept $50. All those types of cases he made available to the public. But where there was dispute over an assessment between the taxpayer and the Government, and they finally agreed that all that was owed was X instead of Y——

Answer. That's not a compromise. It hasn't even reached the point of assessment because it isn't assessed until that agreement is reached. Now, we are having that every day. We'll have a dispute with a taxpayer over whether he owes X dollars or Y dollars and through the appellate process we finally determine the amount owed. We then bill the taxpayer for that amount.

Question. You call that an "assessment," not a "compromise"?

Answer. That's right. That is a positive obligation on the taxpayer's part. Now, if at that point he says, "I agree. I owe $100 but I can pay only $50," and offers $50 in payment of his liability, then that is an "offer in compromise."

RIGHT TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION

Question. You have much power to make changes in this matter by regulation, haven't you?

Answer. There is a great deal that can be done administratively, but there is a lot that has to be done by legislation. Take this whole question of disclosure of information as to compromises, or disclosure of information in general, I may have my own ideas about it, but there may be some phases of the thing that could come up sometime where there would be a question of whether under the law I had the right to disclose it. In that case, I would depend upon the advice of counsel.

But, generally speaking, I think that compromise of tax liability, once the liability is firmly agreed to by both sides, is a thing that ought to be a matter of public knowledge if the public wants to know, because then to the extent that the other fellow is being relieved everybody else is being taxed.

Question. That's if he cannot pay his "assessment"?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What do you do about a case like this:

A business pays its taxes, argues with an internal revenue agent, and sometimes with its own accountant about a deduction, and yet that very same moment that Bureau may be allowing that deduction in another case and the taxpayer wouldn't know anything about it. Is there any way a taxpayer can find out what competitors, for example, may be getting in the way of a break in his line of business?

Answer. Frankly, I don't think you'll find very many cases of that kind, because a good many people in business have pretty good

advice as to the preparation of their tax returns.

Question. But there is no publication of the rulings of the Bureau that would guide an industry unless they have this exchange of information among tax practitioners?

Answer. There would be no way for the Bureau, except at inordinate expense, to be able to publish the fact that deductions made by one business in an industry are different from those made by another business in the industry.

But, frankly, I doubt that we're talking about anything significant here, because through trade-association activity, conferences of tax practitioners, and other means business establishments find out pretty well what they can and cannot do taxwise; and I doubt that many of these establishments are missing much that might be to their advantage.

Question. Let me put it another way: Is there an obligation on the part of the Bureau, which is aware of its own rulings, to apply that same ruling even though the taxpayer may be unfamiliar with it?

Answer. Certainly. In other words, there is as much obligation on the part of an agent to give a taxpayer a deduction he is not now claiming as there is for him to disallow an unlawful deduction that he is claiming.

Question. Are there a great many deductions claimed that are not supposed to be claimed?

Answer. Yes; there are. There are a great many cases of revenue being lost by people claiming exemptions and deductions that are not proper.

Question. Is the expense account itself being abused?

Answer. It most assuredly is, and the Secretary of the Treasury is taking a close look at this problem from the standpoint of whether the law should be tightened up to prevent the abuse.

Question. How tough is the policy on business-entertainment expenses?

Answer. Of course, we have to look at it from three standpoints: Is it an ordinary, necessary expense, and is it reasonable? What we try to do is require pretty thorough documentation on entertainment expenses, and, if not documentation, then sufficient explanation to enable us to determine whether or not there is convincing reason to suppose the money was actually spent.

Question. And that is true of individuals as well?

Answer. Yes.

FORMULAS FOR DEPRECIATION

Question. Can you by an administrative act, by regulation, change the depreciation policy?

Answer. Many aspects of depreciation can be settled administratively, but there are some that must be dealt with legislatively. Two aspects are presently under consideration. One is the administrative aspect as to, for instance, when shall the determination of depreciation be deemed to be final? I'll come back to that in a minute. The other question is: What formula for depreciation may be adopted? For instance, could we permit a wide-scale switch from the "straight line" method of depreciation to the "diminishing balance" method? Perhaps we could, and the question is being studied by the Treasury staff.

Question. What do you mean by the "straight line" method?

Answer. It means the depreciation charge obtained by dividing the cost of the property less its probable salvage value by the number of years that the property probably will last. For instance: Cost, $1,000; salvage value, $100; probable life, 10 years; annual depreciation charge, $90.

The main thing that bothers me about depreciation is the fact that as matters now stand an agent can go into a business and say, "I think you've taken too much depreciation. I'm going to cut that down." They argue about it, and, finally, somewhere along the line they compromise. The agent says, for instance, it ought to be 3 percent and the taxpayer says it ought to be 5 percent, and maybe they settle on 4 percent. But it doesn't end there. The very next agent that comes along may take the position that the previous agent was too liberal, and then the argument starts all over again. Somewhere along the line the taxpayer has a right to expect finality.

WHEN A BUILDING WEARS OUT

Question. Isn't building depreciation fixed at 2 percent a year?

Answer. No, sir. It shouldn't be.

Question. Is that a matter of administrative determination?

Answer. There is a regulation on it, T. D. 4422, and a special bulletin, bulletin F. In bulletin F a great many categories of property and the applicable rates of depreciation are listed. But that doesn't say that the rates indicated are the only rates that will apply. Special circumstances might change any rate in the regulation.

The position I have taken on depreciation, with the group that we have studying it, is that we should have a regulation that says that once the depreciation on a particular category or type of property is established and the taxpayer and the Bureau agree to it as proper, it should not be changed after that point unless the one who wants to change it takes the burden of proof that the original determination was wrong or no longer applies.

That would save untold annoyance to business organizations and a terrific amount of money to the taxpayers and the Government in a matter which in the final analysis has really cost the Government a lot of money, for the reason that the Government has been beating depreciation charges down, down, down, and taxes have been rising; so that all that has happened has been that the deduction for depreciation has been shoved over to high-tax years and the Government has lost money by it.

Now, regardless of that, I am not just trying to save the Government money. What I am trying to do is get a reasonable policy, save annoyance to everybody, and have a rule under which, once a determination is made, there it is going to stay until the Government proves it ought to be lower or the taxpayer proves it ought to be higher.

Question. You hear very frequently among businessmen the idea that a company ought to be allowed to take just about any depreciation it wants and feels is reasonable, providing it is consistent and the Government doesn't lose any money in the long run, because if it fixes too much depreciation it is merely postponing its taxes. What do you think about that?

Answer. That is not sound accounting to begin with; nor is it good finance.

Question. Once the method has been set, Mr. Commissioner, don't you have to stick to that method in order to prevent distortions of income?

Answer. Generally speaking, that is true. If you've got the straight-line method, then you pay on the straight-line method.

Question. What do you think of the British scheme, which they announced the other day, for a tax rebate on new machinery, and so on?

Answer. Of course, that was done to encourage investment of risk capital. I doubt that we need to go that far in order to encourage risk capital. In effect, that is similar to the diminishing-balance method, under which you apply your depreciation rate to the diminishing balance (cost less previous charges for depreciation) of the asset.

For instance, if you've got a piece of property that is estimated to last 10 years, and it costs $1,000, then you take off 10 percent, which is $100, and the next year you take 10 percent off of $900, or $90, and so on.

Question. But you never completely depreciate the property on that basis——

Answer. No, but you can set the formula so that you can get back in a relatively short time the bulk of the cost of the property, and it is in effect an accelerated depreciation scheme, and you come down within the estimated life of the property to a residual balance which is approximately equal to its salvage value. But you do it much faster.

Question. Is that allowed now?

Answer. Oh, yes; there are taxpayers on that basis now.

Question. Can others who are not on it get on it?

Answer. From the standpoint of optimum application, that is a matter of tax policy and would have to be answered by the Treasury Department. That's why it is being concurrently considered by the Treasury Department.

Question. In other words, broad changes in depreciation policy would probably have to be done by legislation?

Answer. That approach should always be considered.

SMOOTHER IN BRITAIN

Question. Speaking of the British, have you made any study of their system of tax administration?

Answer. Not recently; no.

Question. The general impression we have over here is that the British sit down with the taxpayer and work out his indebtedness very promptly, without all this endless litigation. Is that true?

Answer. Yes. They do a much better job in that respect than we. For instance, I understand that a British chartered accountant can sit down with a taxpayer and work out his tax return, and when he says to the British Government, "I have made this return, I think it's all right," they will examine it, but a great deal of weight is attached to the fact that a British chartered accountant did the job. They don't seem to have as much or as protracted argument as we.

Question. Do you think we have too many disputes?

Answer. Far too many.

Question. With businesses, or individuals?

Answer. With business, primarily.

Question. Does the taxpayer in this country have a better chance to get his return approved if he has had it made out by an accountant? Do you take that into consideration in this country as they do in Britain?

Answer. Let's put it this way: The Bureau doesn't have any policy of accepting a return merely because it is made by an accountant, but I can tell you from my own experience that the taxpayer who keeps good books and has a good accountant make his tax return has very little trouble.

HAZARDS IN UNREASONABLE SURPLUS

Question. There is a great deal of interest in section 102, which prohibits the retention in business of an unreasonable surplus. After the war, many small businesses were alarmed by what they thought was an unfriendly, or rigid attitude——

Answer. And let me say that I think those who have been alarmed about it have had good reason to be. Who wouldn't object to having a sword of Damocles hanging over his head?

Question. I wonder whether the attitude has changed, whether or not an ordinary corporation can use its own judgment in retaining income?

Answer. Within reasonable limits, yes. Of course, no one should be allowed to use unnecessary accumulations of corporate profits as a means of escaping taxes that others have to pay. But I regard section 102 as a lever, not as a club, and I think that in applying it the Government should assume the burden of proof. As Commissioner of Internal Revenue I'm willing to accept that burden. I do not think that Congress put section 102 into the law to be used as a pattern for liquidation of the country's traditional en-

terprise system, to which our people's unparalleled high standard of living is so largely attributable.

Question. The burden should be on the Government?

Answer. Yes.

Question. By and large, it has been the other way around, though, has it not?

Answer. I'm afraid it has. In other words, the position of the taxpayer in that situation is just the same as it is with respect to any other question that the Commissioner raises, he has to prove his case. I don't think this should apply in the case of section 102.

From my point of view, before the Government says to a company that part or all of its profit accumulations are excessive, I think we ought to be ready to prove our case.

Question. At least by indirection, one of your predecessors as Commissioner of Internal Revenue set up a 70 percent rule. The impression was abroad that any small, closely held company that paid out less than 70 percent of its earnings in dividends was suspect under such rule——

Answer. That's right.

Question. Is that still so, are they still suspect, or is there any reason to believe that they are suspect if they pay out less than 70 percent?

Answer. I wouldn't say they are suspect, but I think for orderly and common sense administration of the tax law you've got to have some rule—whether 70 percent distribution is adequate or inadequate, I don't know. I wouldn't want to say. But I say this: You've got to require people to pay out reasonable dividends.

In this question whether accumulations of earnings are necessary in a particular case, you've got to have some standard as a basis to go on. But I don't think it can be any fixed amount—70 percent, or 50 percent, or any other percent.

I think each case has to be considered on its own merits, and when the Commissioner says, "I think you people are taking advantage of a good situation," I think he ought to be able to prove it.

LAW'S POWER TO DESTROY ENTERPRISE

Question. Can that be made policy without a changing of law?

Answer. I hope so. However, I fear that would require legislation. But as Commissioner, regardless of the legislation, that is one section of the law that I would be very reluctant to be harsh about, for the simple reason that I don't think Congress means to destroy enterprise, and I think that section 102 in unwise hands can be used to do just that.

Question. Doesn't the Government often spend more in collecting a tax debt than the collection is worth? What can be done about that?

Answer. In the case of willful and flagrant tax evasion, I don't think anything should be done about it. The time and effort spent in sending a crook to jail often costs more than the revenue that we obtain from him. But that doesn't worry me, for in the long run the deterrent effect of prosecution on would-be evaders nets us revenue far in excess of the costs of a particular prosecution. Moreover, the fellow should be in jail anyway. As between the jailing of a crook and collecting the taxes he owes, I'd rather see him in jail any time.

As to other classes of underpayments, we propose to take all the factors into consideration in each case and use plain commonsense. I certainly do not propose to make minor adjustments in the audit of tax returns just to pick up a few dollars here and there; neither do I propose to issue distraint warrants and liens on insignificant amounts of balances due but unpaid. We have the approval of the Comptroller General's office to write off small debit balances.

Question. What is the morale situation in your Bureau? Are you getting much turnover?

Answer. Well, yes; we are having some turnover, but I think we may say that morale is improving steadily. You see, this is not a spending agency; it is a necessary operating function of the Government. It's always going to be there; therefore, if a man comes to work in the Bureau and keeps his record clean and tends to his business, the chances are he will wind up with a pretty good grade and retire with a fair pension; hence, we don't have as much turnover as some agencies have had. There are a lot of people in the Bureau, and because we are a stable establishment, the average age of all the Bureau's people may be a bit high in relation to some of the other agencies.

However, by a different attitude at the top, I think we have considerably restored, or started morale on the way back up.

Question. Fear isn't a dominant factor, then?

Answer. No. We want to get injected into the Bureau, with the approval of the Civil Service Commission, the idea of accelerated recognition of outstanding merit. If we can get that, it will be a great help. Moreover, we think we have to adopt a firm policy as to discipline. We think it has been too lenient in the past.

Question. What are you going to do about gratuities that come toward these employees? Are you going to prohibit them from receiving any?

Answer. Absolutely.

Question. And what about going to lunch with a taxpayer? Is that a rule of the Bureau?

Answer. It isn't a rule of mine. I think it is unwise for a man to get too chummy with the taxpayer or his agent, but I don't know whether you can have an ironbound rule on that.

ROTATION FOR AGENTS?

Question. Do you think that agents should be moved from one locality to another occasionally?

Answer. I think certain types of personnel ought to be rotated. I haven't decided yet exactly where rotation should stop, but there certainly are types of jobs that call for rotation, and I believe it will make for better service to adopt rotation in those cases.

Question. In the past the Bureau had been accused of withholding prosecution where the Department of Justice is ready to prosecute and the Bureau is not, or vice versa. What have you done about that?

Answer. My feeling about prosecution is that when you find that you have your facts and investigation is finished and prosecution is indicated, the case should go to the Department of Justice promptly with recommendation of prosecution.

Question. There have been a number of cases where they have examined the defendant and found that he supposedly wasn't in good health and so they defer and defer the case, until they finally drop it because the defendant is not well enough to stand trial——

Answer. That's a matter, I think, to be settled by the Department of Justice and the courts. I don't think it is up to the Bureau to determine that. If the Bureau says to the Department of Justice, "Here's a fraud case. We think it ought to be prosecuted, so we are sending it to you. Whether to prosecute or not is your job." Now if they want to determine that health considerations should delay prosecution or stop it, I think that is a matter between the district attorney and the court.

Question. What proportion of your personnel is under civil service now?

Answer. Everyone except me.

REORGANIZING THE BUREAU

Question. What do you do about the deputies that got in at the last minute under the so-called questionable examinations? How are you going to handle those?

Answer. You mean the district commissioners and the directors of revenue?

As far as the reorganization is concerned—that's what you're talking about, I believe—I have said a number of times that I thought the reorganization of the Bureau was structurally and functionally a sound move. I have considerable reservations about the manner in which it was implemented. My feeling is, however, that nobody is smart enough to walk into an organization as big as that and in a matter of a few weeks, or even a few months, know exactly what he wants to do with it.

You have, moreover, a very serious personnel problem involved there. Suppose I determine tomorrow that half of my district commissioners and half of my directors are unsatisfactory. Where would I get 8 district commissioners and 32 directors right quick? Men qualified to hold those jobs aren't running around loose. I'd hope to find them in the Bureau. But in any event it would take time—a good deal of time—to find the right men.

I've asked Congress to let me handle this matter administratively, and I have assured them that, if or to the extent I find I can't handle it that way and need legislation, I'll ask for it. We will not hesitate to replace any officer or employee of the Bureau whom we find not up to his job.

Question. Would you clear up a question about your personal plans? When you took office, didn't you indicate that you were only going to be here for 2 years?

Answer. No; I did not. As to this there has been confusion of my personal plans with my official objectives. What I have said has been that as a necessary goal we are shooting at getting the situation in hand within 2 years. If we did not establish some reasonable deadline for getting our house in order we'd run the risk of wandering aimlessly. It's too early to talk about my personal plans. There's a big job to be done here, we've just started on it, my colleagues in the Bureau are cooperating with me wholeheartedly, and I intend to see it through with them.

TAX UNIT SEPARATE FROM TREASURY?

Question. Have you had any thoughts even before you came into office as to whether the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be divorced from the Treasury and made an independent agency like the Comptroller General's office?

Answer. I'd rather not get involved in that question. If I advocated independence I'd be accused of empire-building ambitions. If I opposed it, and the Treasury Department happened to be opposed to it, too, I'd be accused of submitting to domination. I do not wish to be put in either position. However, I can discuss the question generally. The important thing, it seems to me, is to settle the question on the basis of what would be best under all conditions.

It so happens that the present Treasury team is a very congenial group. We work together in mutual confidence and complete harmony. Thus, there is no domination of the Bureau; on the contrary, we operate under a grant of broad authority except as to the matters that come under the Chief Counsel of the Bureau, who is functionally responsible to the General Counsel of the Treasury Department.

Obviously, the success of this kind of setup depends largely upon the personalities involved. It seems to me, therefore, that the question is whether from the long-range point of view this is the kind of setup which under all conditions will be most likely to provide administration of the revenue laws that is as directly and as promptly responsive to the intentions of Congress as can be achieved.

So it all boils down to people. The most important thing in the world is people. If I get the right kind of people I can run the Bureau efficiently under any kind of setup.

Question. It has been argued that if you get an independent agency you're liable to get arbitrary action—

Answer. I believe that experience has shown that that can happen under any kind of setup. It's still a question of people.

Question. Have the previous commissioners been practicing accountants like yourself?

Answer. No. I believe I am the first certified public accountant ever appointed to the job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I be permitted to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations with regard to an item in chapter 2 of the bill? I should like to ask a question about the item on page 5, lines 5 to 10, which appropriates $9,331.26. I inquire how much of the amount is for the exchange of motor vehicles for the offices of the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the item covers the buying of 1 large mail truck and 2 small delivery Chevrolets. The trucks in service now have outlived their usefulness, and their continued operation involves very heavy expense. The item covers mail vehicles for the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It does not involve automobiles for the Secretary or Sergeant at Arms?

Mr. BRIDGES. Not passenger automobiles, I will say to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I express the hope that when the general appropriation bill comes before the Senate the majority will observe Spartan simplicity in matters affecting the officials of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to add to what has been said that I am familiar with the activities of the Senate Post Office. I know it is necessary at this time to make the appropriation to which the Senator from Illinois has referred. In the long run it will save money for the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, and I will look hopefully in his direction when the main appropriation bill comes before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4664) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as I shall be absent tomorrow when, as I understand, the majority leader expects to bring up S. 15, I should like to make a short statement with reference to the portion of the bill which relates to district judges in the southern district of Florida.

First, I wish to thank the committee for providing, as they do in the bill, two additional district judges for the southern district of Florida.

Second, I wish to say, since the two Senators from Florida will necessarily be absent tomorrow, attending the biennial session of the Florida Legislature for their official visit, that I should like to have the RECORD show that in making the recommendation for these two additional judges the distinguished committee has recognized the fact that our very large growth in Florida in recent years has left us in the worst condition possible, so far as congestion of dockets is concerned—the worst, I believe, that can be found anywhere in the Nation.

Our increase in population from 1940 to 1950 was 880,000, and the census figures released not long ago for the estimates as of July 1 of last year showed an additional increase of between three hundred and four hundred thousand.

The congestion of the dockets in the southern district of Florida, as compared with similar areas of large growth, such as California, Arizona, Oregon, and Washington, is so much worse in Florida that it is greatly in the interest of expediting justice and of making the courts function better to allow two additional judges as provided in S. 15.

I wanted to make this statement for the RECORD by reason of the fact that the two Senators from Florida will not be present tomorrow.

THE SECURITY ORDER RELATING TO FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, these are dark days for the many faithful and hardworking Federal employees. Under other circumstances I might refer to them as Federal civil servants—however, in view of the happenings of the past few weeks that show a strong tendency to completely destroy the civil-service-merit system, I think it a bit of a misnomer to now associate the words "civil service" with Federal employees.

The purpose of my remarks today is to insert in the body of the RECORD a letter written by George W. Ball, of Washington, and appearing on the editorial page of the Washington Post of May 5, 1953, concerning the new security order just released by the new administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW SECURITY ORDER

As a lawyer with some years of practice in Washington I had come to believe there were faults in the loyalty-security program in effect under the last administration. But the Republican substitute is worse—so much worse that any partisan satisfaction which that fact might give me as a Democrat is overwhelmed by the dismay it causes me as a citizen. The former program at least made a serious effort to satisfy two demands not readily reconcilable: protecting the Federal service against subversion, and assuring the maintenance of a fair and objective standard for hiring and job retention. The new order, in concentrating on the first objective, has lost sight of the second; in so doing it has performed a net disservice to the interests of our national security.

Contrary to the impression created by the President, the procedures elaborated by the draftsmen of the order are not new or original; in their essentials they have been borrowed from existing legislation. This legislation, intended originally to apply to a limited number of security-sensitive agencies, has now been stretched with dubious legality to blanket all Federal agencies.

The most serious procedural problem in this area has always been to give employees an opportunity, consistent with the demands of security, to be told the charges against them and to confront their accusers. The new order leaves it for the security officer to determine how much to tell an accused employee about the charges against him. Security officers, who under the order are investigators and prosecutors, will naturally tend to withhold specifications of charges as long and as completely as they can. Yet the new order offers no adequate criteria to limit their discretion. They are authorized to disclose as much as "security considerations" permit.

The order shows the same failure to cope with the question of confrontation. Experience shows that to deprive accused employees of a chance to confront and cross-examine their accusers is gravely unjust; it makes it difficult and sometimes impossible to reach the truth. Yet the new order perpetuates one of the major defects of the old procedure; not only does the accused employee have no right of confrontation, but the fact-finders themselves—the hearing boards—except in unusual cases, have no opportunity to judge the credibility of the informants.

The FBI has repeatedly stated that it does not evaluate the information it collects and that its reports include gossip and rumor. An evaluation by the security officer (who is designated as the prosecutor) is scarcely adequate. Yet the new order provides full protection for the "confidential informants." Whatever the interest in the protection of continuing sources of information—the professional informers—there is absolutely none in shielding casual informants. In fact, their willingness to acknowledge their statements may be a useful index of their credibility.

The new order offers no definition of the "confidential informant" whose anonymity it protects. The phrase can and almost certainly will be used to embrace crackpots, frustrated fellow employees, and grudge-bearing neurotics.

The principal change made in the procedures—the change in the method of selecting hearing boards—has some merit. Under the new order these boards are to be composed of officers and employees from agencies other than that of the accused employee. But while the new order takes 1 step forward toward greater impartiality, it takes at least 2 steps back when it provides that the nominees for the hearing board roster shall be picked by the personnel security officers of the various agencies. These officers, concerned exclusively with protecting security, will almost certainly restrict their choices to persons known to favor an exclusionary policy.

The Attorney General has referred to the present Loyalty Review Board as "discredited." He proposes to solve the problem of a "discredited" review by independent citizens, by providing none at all. The only check on the decisions of a hearing board picked by security officers will be by the agency head. Yet the agency head has no time to read a hearing board record and make an independent judgment.

The continuing study of general procedures by the Civil Service Commission, provided for in the new order, offers no adequate substitute for a case-by-case appeal to a tribunal free from the pressures that will weigh heavily on the new hearing boards.

If the position of the permanent employee is bad under the new order, the position of the temporary or probationary employee is impossible. He is denied even a limited hearing board procedure. His fate is, for practical purposes, in the hands of the security officer who brings the charges against him. The order gives him the right to obtain some statement of charges from the security officer and to reply in writing, but unless the head of the agency is willing to overrule his own security officer (and can afford the time to study as much of the file as the security authorities see fit to make available to him), the temporary or probationary employee is dismissed.

Even if the procedures established in the new order met minimum standards of fairness and objectivity, the criteria laid down for determining when an employee is a security risk are so broad as to threaten the integrity of the merit system. Subject only to the informal discretion of personnel security officers, an employee can be set on the road toward suspension and termination if, for example, information is developed on any behavior, activity, or associations which tend to show that the individual is not trustworthy or reliable.

This provides an opportunity to liquidate civil servants without the tedium and publicity of existing Civil Service dismissal procedures. Such an opportunity will not long escape the notice of agency heads.

The order exalts a new power group within the Federal structure. Even under the old procedures the security officer was rapidly becoming a man to be feared by all employees, however loyal and honest. The new order gives him a practical power of life or death over their careers. Its particular vice is that it offers the possibility for effective control of the Government service by a well-placed, ambitious man who can obtain the allegiance of key security officers.

The standards and procedures embodied in the new order will have destructive effects on the Federal service. They empower the personnel security officer to make the determination for which the civil-service system was organized, with all its checks and balances: the suitability of an American citizen to serve his Government. They increase the probability that an employee faced with unfounded charges can be intimidated into resigning, rather than stake his reputation in a game where the cards are stacked against him.

Those employees who remain in the service will be dull where they ought to be daring, subservient where they ought to be critical, lest an inconvenient display of imagination be held untrustworthy, or independence of thought be considered unreliable.

But the greatest dangers of the system lie in the future. We have laid the foundations in the last three generations for an independent career civil service, on which the security of our country to a great extent depends. Now we are in danger of building an army of bureaucrats who will serve their supervisors and the clock but not the public. What kind of recruits can our Government attract, and how effectively will it guard our national security, if it puts a premium on rigidity of thought and flexibility of principle?

GEORGE W. BALL.

WASHINGTON.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this well-written statement adequately points out the dangers in this new and major link in the chain of events that will ultimately completely and thoroughly destroy the Federal civil-service merit system.

I have no political ax to grind here, for I am firmly convinced these events will live to plague the Republican Party for many years to come. The only quote that can be appropriate is, "Forgive them, Father, they know not what they do."

I merely rise to call on the new Chief of State, President Eisenhower, to pay close attention to the activities of his Cabinet and staff. I can only assume that he is not aware of what is taking place. One only has to refer to his statements both before the election and quite recently to assure themselves that President Eisenhower could not possibly be aware of what his assistants are doing to the civil-service merit system.

In closing, I most certainly want to make this appeal to the various citizens' groups, such as the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Commission Recommendations, the National Civil Service League, and others: Be as diligent and forceful with the new administration as you were with the old. Continue your effective fights for a more improved civil-service merit system or, at least, for maintaining the gains made under the Democratic administrations of the past 20 years.

I plead with you, please come out of hiding and let the new President know if you approve of the new orders affecting Federal employment.

I must offer my congratulations to the Members of the House of Representatives who yesterday voted down an amendment previously adopted by its Appropriations Committee. This amendment would have granted to certain heads of agencies authority to fire employees at will, without regard to veterans' preference or civil-service rules and regulations.

Mr. President, the action taken by the House is, in my opinion, a very encouraging sign; it was most encouraging when the House of Representatives took such conclusive action yesterday, by means of its vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not the Senator from South Carolina agree with me that, because of the difficult situation which arose in the House of Representatives, particularly as a result of the action of the House Appropriations Committee, we must exercise eternal vigilance if we are to protect at all the merit system in the civil service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Minnesota is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from South Carolina also agree with me that one of the great bulwarks of honest and faithful Government service is the civil-service merit system?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There can be no question about that.

In that connection, I wish to refer to a statement made by General Eisenhower at the time when he was a candidate for the Presidency, and when he was speaking before the National Association of Letter Carriers, on September 1, 1952:

> No one could say I was fair if on the instant that the Republican Party went into power, I should authorize or condone any discharge of a hardworking civil-service employee.

Let me also refer to a statement made by General Eisenhower on September 25, 1952, at Frederick, Md.:

> The loyal efficient Federal employee—no matter where he is working—has nothing to fear from me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me, for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator from South Carolina would agree with me, would he not, that of course we would expect that any employee who was not faithful to his duty or who exhibited aspects of incompetency would be subject to dismissal; and would not the Senator from South Carolina also agree with me that certainly the administration should have the right to make any changes which might be necessary at the very highest levels of policy-making positions?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree that should be so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from South Carolina also agree with me that when we come to the great body of what we call the civil service structure of our Government, the merit system cannot be tampered with without returning to what we call the system of "To the victor belongs the spoils," thus returning to patronage and politics in the Government service, which would be a great curse?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the danger when the merit system is tampered with.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator from South Carolina will further yield to me, let me say I believe it is about

time we paid appropriate tribute to our civil servants, who have been the target of much abuse during the years. Now that there has been a change of administration, I hope that attack on them will cease, and that those who have given faithfully of their time and energy to the Government of the United States in honorable employment will be recognized as the honorable citizens they are—as good, loyal American citizens who have fulfilled their duty with integrity and honor, and who therefore are worthy of the commendation of the Congress and of the respect of the general citizenship, rather than of attack and abuse.

Does the Senator from South Carolina agree with that general philosophy?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with everything that has been said by the Senator from Minnesota, and I believe that every loyal, efficient, Federal worker should not be affected in any way by any change of administration, whether it be Democratic or Republican.

UTILIZATION OF LOCAL AND STATE COMMITTEES UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me at this time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a bill on which I shall comment later, inasmuch as the Senator from Alabama now has the floor.

The bill would require the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to continue to utilize the services of local and State committees established under such act, to require that the services of such committees be utilized in carrying out farm-price support and crop-insurance programs, and to provide for the election of such State committees by members of the county committees.

I merely say that the purpose of the bill is to protect what I consider to be one of the finest departments in American political and economic life, namely, the democratic, freely elected activities of the Production and Marketing Administration, which have done such a splendid job throughout the years.

I look with considerable concern upon the efforts being made to make over these committees into advisory groups, and, ultimately, I predict, to extinguish them or do away with them. I think that would be a blow to a sound agricultural program.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1847) to require the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to continue to utilize the services of local and State committees established under such act, to require that the services of such committees be utilized in carrying out farm-price support and crop-insurance programs, and to provide for the election of such State committees by the members of county committees, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S TAKE-AWAY PROGRAM OF HARD CREDIT TERMS AND HIGH INTEREST RATES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, much has been said about the give-away program that has been under way during the past 100 days.

What has been given away thus far is a little difficult for the citizen who has no way to know the details of his Government's day-by-day actions to grasp or to see concretely. It is to a large extent value which would have been realized or income that would have been earned at some future time. Or it might have been reflected in lower payments or lower prices to consumers at some future time, but which, because of the give-away program, will not be realized.

What I want to talk about now is something that is a lot clearer, easily understood, direct, and immediate. To be sure, it will have a tremendous effect in the future.

I would prefer to label this recent development as a take-away program. It is much bolder than any action the administration has taken to date. And yes, most unfortunately it affects our veterans—every veteran eligible to buy a home under the GI home-loan program—more than 13 million of them, and the number increases each day.

The take away is the decision of the administration to increase the interest rates on GI loans from 4 percent to 4½ percent—a decision made necessary by recent action of the Government in deliberately increasing the interest on Government bonds to 3¼ percent.

I said at the time—and events are proving me right—that the increase was more than was necessary, and that the deliberate raise to 3¼ percent would cost the people of this country billions of dollars.

In 1944, Congress, out of gratitude for our millions of servicemen, passed the GI bill of rights, and, as part of, it set up a program whereby a veteran could buy a home for himself and his family, and have the mortgage guaranteed by the Government. Over 3 million veterans have so far availed themselves of this opportunity and have established a wonderful record of repayment.

Millions of World War II and Korean veterans still hope to participate in this program. Any veteran, however, who buys a home under this program from yesterday on, will find it necessary to do 1 or 2 things—either pay up to $1,000 or more for the same house he has been getting, or take a house with 1 room less.

One-half of 1 percent sounds rather insignificant, but on a 25-year $10,000 mortgage a veteran will be required to pay $840 more in interest, or almost 10 percent of the original cost of his home.

Actually most veterans buy the best house they can afford on which they can meet the monthly payments. The effect of interest increase of one-half of 1 percent and the resultant overall cost will thus be reflected in a lower-priced home than the veteran would otherwise buy.

Construction costs are high. The veteran needs all the money he can get to pay for a more adequate home. The higher the charges for amortizing and carrying the mortgage, and so forth, the less adequate will be the home he can afford. As a matter of fact, the average veteran because of the high cost of homes has been forced all too frequently to crowd into houses too small for a growing family.

The interest increase, I repeat, will cost the veteran just about what an extra bedroom would cost, and will thus tend to perpetuate crowded living conditions.

The decision, then, of the administration to refinance the national debt at a much higher rate of interest—at least a 30-percent higher rate if the recent bond issue is indicative—which in turn brought about the increase in home mortgage rates, is just the same as taking away from the veteran, and other home buyers, that extra and often very necessary bedroom.

For the last few years approximately $3 billion in VA guaranteed loans were underwritten each year. Assuming that approximately the same amount of GI loans continues, the increase in the rate by ½ of 1 percent means an increase in the payments by veterans of $15 million annually. Thus it takes away $15 million each year from the veterans of our country.

Add to this amount the additional ¼ of 1 percent on the approximately $2 billion that purchasers of FHA insured homes will have to pay and the administration will have taken away $20 million annually from home buyers under these two programs alone. Since approximately $13 billion more in conventional loans are also underwritten each year, and the interest on these loans will also go up, one can judge just how many tens of millions of dollars will be taken away from home buyers each year as a result of the administration's high interest rate policy.

Many in the construction and mortgage industries have said with considerable justification that after the decision of the Treasury to issue a long-time debenture at 3¼, the interest rate on GI loans and FHA loans had to go up. On those, then, who made the decision to raise so sharply the interest rate on Government bonds rests primarily the responsibility for these added costs to the home buyer.

Actually, in my opinion, the increase in the interest rate on GI loans will only temporarily relieve the tight mortgage market. And, more important, it will further tighten the market for Treasury funds. With high yields on VA and FHA loans, mortgage investors will prefer them to lower yielding treasuries, municipals, and high grade corporates. This will force Treasury and others, in order for them to get their share of funds, to up their yields, and around and around it will go.

All types of Government credit needs, and Government insured mortgages, guaranteed loans, and other financing programs will compete with one another for higher and higher yields. Instead of

stability, under the present policy, there can be only instability.

This fact was pointed up by a short news item that appeared in the May 5 issue of the Washington Post, under a New York headline. The article pointed out that "marketable United States Government bonds dropped to record depths as dealers reported demand 'melting away.'" It stated that even the new 3¼'s were slightly below par.

The article further said that "securities dealers blamed the losses in bond prices on the Government-sponsored rise in interest rates and the continuing flood of new financing."

Mr. President, I may point out that in the news item which I hold in my hand it is stated that some of the Government bonds were selling for as low as 91^{20}/$_{32}$. It simply does not seem to me that we should be following a policy that pushes the value of guaranteed Government bonds down to such a low level as that.

I suspect there is some connection between the increase in home-mortgage rates and the further drop in Government bonds.

At any rate, we see the chain reaction of 3¼ bonds forcing an increase in home-mortgage rates, and that in turn forcing down the value of Government bonds.

As a leading authority in the field of GI home lending said to me yesterday, "I wonder if the GI will in the long run be able to get credit even at the new rate." In fact, I may add, the suggestion was made that perhaps now, with the interest rate increased, we find ourselves about where we were before, because the push upward to 3½ points was so great that, the first thing we know, the complaint will be made that money cannot be found even at the new rate of 3½ percent.

Those who will gain the most under these constantly rising rates are those who clip the coupons and own the mortgages. The home buyers, the taxpayers, and the consumers will foot the bill.

Indeed, the millions of people who have to have credit, who can least afford high interest costs, will be the ones hurt most.

Mr. President, the people I am talking about are the great masses of people on whom in the long run the economic well-being of the Nation depends. If they are reasonably well off, if they have reasonably adequate dollars with which to purchase goods and services, the economy will remain stable and those who know how to accumulate money will have better opportunity to do so. If, however, the cost of credit—credit, I repeat, without which these millions of business and family units cannot carry on their daily affairs—is to deprive them unnecessarily of dollars they need to run their businesses, to make their crops, to send their children to school, and to buy their clothing, food, and other necessities of life, there is bound to be, at the best, a serious economic recession, or, at the worst, a disastrous depression that would play havoc with both our domestic and foreign affairs.

While I intend primarily to talk about the adverse effect high interest rates will have on the home buyer, and especially on veterans, I am going to take just a moment to say a few words as to how the Government's deliberate policy of hard terms and high interest rates will affect other groups of our people.

First. Taxpayers will now have to pay additional millions of dollars for interest on the national debt. An increase of three-fourths of 1 percent on each billion refinanced—and that was the increase in the recent bond issue—will cost taxpayers of this country $7½ million each year. To refinance $100 billion of the national debt at the same interest-rate increase will cost the taxpayers of this Nation three-fourths of a billion dollars each year. While I recognize that all of the national debt cannot be refinanced immediately, refinancing at the same rate of interest of the total $265 billion that we owe—and almost entirely as a result of wars—would cost the taxpayers nearly $2 billion annually.

These unjustified costs will fall heaviest on the low- and middle-income groups—groups whose standard of living is already too meager.

Second. Then, look at the $330 billion of private debts. Charges on these debts are bound to increase even more than three-fourths percent. An upward adjustment of 1 percent alone on private debts will cost the consumers of this country $3,300,000,000 annually.

Everyone knows that most automobiles, refrigerators, television sets, furniture, and dozens of other items are bought on credit. To have to pay higher interest and carrying charges will simply mean in the long run the purchase of less and less of these goods.

A recent issue of the Wall Street Journal has this to say:

> The cost of on-the-cuff buying is heading higher. * * * Some of the biggest lenders of funds for installment purchases are quietly hiking their rates by at least one-half of one percentage point a year. * * *
>
> Here's what a hike of one-half of 1 percentage point means to a car buyer:
>
> Suppose he makes a downpayment of $1,000 on a $3,000 car. The $2,000 balance is to be financed over 24 months. The increase will boost his total interest charge from $220 to $240, or by more than 9 percent. His regular payments amount to around $93 a month, plus an extra fee for insurance.
>
> The installment buyer may also have to make a larger downpayment and pay off his loan in a shorter time than a few months ago. Many lenders have been tightening up on such terms.

So we see, Mr. President, that everyone is following the Government's lead of charging higher rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I saw recently in the Journal of Commerce an article containing a report of the three large consumer-credit organizations. Some of them—I believe two—are directly concerned with automobile purchases. What the Senator has said is verified by this article, which points out that the interest rate had already gone up, and that one large company, the General Motors financing group, had its highest year of earnings last year, but that, despite that, it raised its interest rate again this year; which, of course, will, as the Senator has pointed out, increase the size of the payments on a car, and will increase the total overall cost of an automobile. As the Senator has also suggested, it may very well result in a policy which will shorten the payment period, and thereby affect the market.

I think it should be further noted that at the present time the automobile industry has greatly overproduced, insofar as demand for automobiles is concerned, and the higher interest rates could have a serious effect upon consumer demand for this excess production.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator for his contribution. His statement is correct. I am glad he quoted from the Journal of Commerce. I have another quotation from that newspaper which I shall read a little later on.

I invite attention to the fact that my documentation is from newspapers, periodicals, and persons who certainly cannot be charged with being biased toward any New Deal or Fair Deal or easy-money condition. A minute or so ago I quoted from the Wall Street Journal. Only a few days ago that newspaper had a front page column in which it dealt with the problem of the increase in interest rates and what it would mean to people interested in buying houses, or buying goods and commodities, such as automobiles, refrigerators, and so forth, on time payments, as well as to other groups in our economy.

Mr. President, I said a little earlier that I felt that the increase had been too great. I am not condemning some increase in the interest rate on Government bonds. Perhaps it was necessary. I had the privilege of discussing the question with Mr. Randolph Burgess, and he said it was necessary to raise the rate of interest. At that time I told him I thought the Government had gone too far and too fast, and that certainly a lower rate should have been tried, and perhaps on a smaller scale. I believe that to be true.

I happened to be reading a newspaper a short time ago when I saw a headline as follows: "Two Economists Cite Depression Signs."

I am not here for the purpose of crying out that we are going to have a depression. I very seriously doubt that we shall ever have a deep depression such as we experienced in the 1930's. I believe the things we have done since the 1930's will shore us up against another depression such as that one, but we would not have to get into a great depression before great masses of people suffered.

The newspaper article to which I have referred tells about a program which originated in Washington last Sunday. I read from the article:

> Two economists agreed Sunday that peace will not inevitably bring depression although "there are real threats—we are in a shaky situation."

Mr. President, I was interested in knowing who those economists are. One was Mr. Leon Henderson, who is an outstanding economist, but, since he was connected with the New Deal administration, someone might say he is a New Deal economist.

I looked to see who the other economist was, and I found that it was Dr. Edwin G. Nourse. I think no one would call him a New Deal economist.

The article continues:

On that point, Nourse agreed, under questioning, that the increase to 3¼ percent in the interest rate on a recent billion-dollar-bond issue may have been a little too large.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I am sure that Dr. Nourse does believe it was too large, and I think the facts have indicated that it was too large, and that the impact it has created has been bad.

Another thing, Mr. President: It seems difficult for me to understand why the 3¼-percent bonds are already selling below par. At least, so the Washington Post reported yesterday. They are 7/32 below par. It does not seem reasonable that the very bonds themselves should have already fallen below par. What a tremendous effect it has had on other bonds.

A banker friend from Alabama who was in Washington not long ago called my attention to the fact that banks—I am speaking of the smaller banks such as are found in most of the towns in Alabama—have their reserve funds invested in Government bonds. He said that when a bond recedes to $95 from $100, as had happened at that time, the bank's reserves are weakened and they have no way of replacing them.

I read in the Washington Post this morning a column by Livingston in which he told of a couple of banks which were consolidating. They had figured out the value of the stock of each bank, but the stock of one bank had fallen 8 points because the depreciation of the bonds it held had carried down the value of its stock by that amount.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Though I join with the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama in the hope that the policies we now see being inaugurated and put into effect will not have a seriously deflationary effect, is it not true that the policies which the distinguished Senator has just described are deflationary, and, furthermore, do they not come at a time when many signs indicate that we are already having deflationary conditions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Tennessee is exactly correct. I want to be sure that he and I are in agreement on one point. I did not say they would not have a deflationary effect. What I said was that I did not believe we were necessarily headed toward a depression. I am not trying to cause any scare, but the policies are deflationary and they are having a deflationary effect. I think there are conditions that must be watched very carefully and checked before a deflationary downward spiral sets in.

Mr. GORE. As the distinguished Senator from Alabama proceeded, I made some mental additions as to the estimated increased interest payments which various groups, including the taxpayers of the country, would have to pay as a result of this policy, and the best figure I could arrive at was more than $5 billion. Will not that decrease the amount of profit that business earns? Will it not reduce the purchasing power of the interest-paying people of the country? Are we not taking this amount of added interest—when I say "We," I mean the Government—is not the Government promoting a policy which takes from the interest-paying group these dollars and adds them to the earnings of those who have money?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I believe the Senator is correct. I think that is exactly what took place in the 1920's. I am going to say more about that a little later. It is rather strange that most people think of the depression as having started in 1929. That is when it started as to those who had been accumulating funds in the great money markets of the country, but the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, a great agricultural State, knows as well as I do that the depression which affected the farm people, the small-business people, and even the small bankers in the small towns, started in the early 1920's with a deflation policy which was put into effect at that time by the administration and the Federal Reserve System.

That is exactly what I am trying to caution against. Let us remember that and not let such a movement get started again. Of course the Senator is correct. I have not figured up everything. I gave 1 or 2 rough estimates a few minutes ago, and I certainly would not think $5 billion, if one takes into account all segments of society, would be far off the mark.

Another point to remember is that simply because the Government raises its rate of interest three-quarters of 1 percent or a half percent, or somewhere in between, since the rate varies as to the different issues or debentures or terms of the bonds, the interest rate in Tennessee or in some rural county in Alabama, at the local business house or bank, will not increase by the same amount. As a matter of fact, we know that will not be the case.

Mr. GORE. It is always more.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes it is always more. I dare say that if the Government increases its rate of interest, as it has on this issue of bonds, there would be a general increase in the rate of interest throughout the country of 1 percent.

Mr. GORE. Is it not a fact that nearly every bank in the country is now raising its interest rates in conformity with the monetary policies set by the Central Government?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, and they are going further. The Wall Street Journal pointed that out. They are not only increasing their interest rates, but they are going to small-business firms and calling loans or tightening up on them. So the man who wishes to make a new loan will find not only that he will have to pay a higher rate of interest, but that he will have harder terms and a shorter period in which to repay the loan, or else he will not be able to borrow the money he has been accustomed to having.

The Wall Street Journal pointed that out in an excellent article published a few days ago. Small-business men in my State have told me that banks which have been furnishing them with funds for several years have called their loans; that under the new policy of tightening up of credit, the banks will not be able to carry them any more. Farmers in my section who have gone to banks to arrange for funds with which to meet the costs of raising this year's crops, which is a general custom in our section of the country, have found, first, that they are not going to get as much money as they did in the past; and when they purchase supplies, they find they must pay more for machinery and fertilizer, but have less money with which to pay for them. Furthermore, they are discovering it is necessary to pay higher rates of interest, and that they will not be able to borrow for as long a period.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Alabama agree with me that we seem to have a strange penchant in this country for doing the right thing at the wrong time? Had a monetary policy of not exactly this kind, but one tendency in this direction, been put into effect at the beginning of the inflationary period, it might have served the country well. However, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, there is now an overproduction of automobiles, refrigerators, and television sets, while at the same time there are signs that farm prices and real incomes are falling. There are many such painful signs. When the economic indicators clearly show that we are no longer in an inflationary period, but that we have passed the peak, a deflationary policy is being put into effect which may have disastrous effects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Again let me suggest that if the Senator wishes to read a fairly interesting commentary on this subject, he should read the leading article in the current issue of the U. S. News & World Report. It brings out the point that inflation has gone and deflation has set in. It warns against letting deflation get too big a lead.

I am not making an unreasonable argument. I am simply arguing along the lines I have read and carefully analyzed in such publications as the Wall Street Journal, the U. S. News & World Report, and the Journal of Commerce, which have seen the signs and have pointed them out.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Let us consider what increased interest rates will do to purchasing power when it comes right down to the case of a veteran who is back from the war, who desires to buy a home, who desires to buy an automobile, which he must have in order to earn a living, and who desires to furnish his home. I believe the Senator estimated that the cost of an average GI home would be increased over all by about $1,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In round numbers, about $1,000.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator able to estimate how much the increased interest rates may advance the over-all cost of an automobile?

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few minutes ago I gave some figures from the Wall Street Journal which provided some idea, but I do not know what the over-all cost would be. The Wall Street Journal assumed a down payment of a thousand dollars on a $3,000 car. That was one item it pointed out.

Mr. GORE. That is a liberal assumption.

Mr. SPARKMAN. One item pointed out in the article was that the new system would require veterans to make a larger down payment. The writer of the article said:

Assume a veteran buys a $3,000 car and pays $1,000 down.

That is a pretty sizable down payment.

Mr. GORE. Will this policy also increase the amount that veterans will have to pay down on their homes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; except as the additional interest charge is figured into the overall mortgage. However, I would say that the increase would not be very great. The amount he would pay down would not be very greatly increased.

Mr. GORE. Would it not increase the amount a veteran would have to pay down on a refrigerator for his home, unless the refrigerator were furnished with the house?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would rather not try to figure those items in terms of dollars. I have said that we could expect harder terms all along the line.

Mr. GORE. Tight money.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A large down payment, a shorter time in which to pay the balance, and higher interest rates. As to the point which the Senator makes, certainly it will cost more to make the initial investment. It will slow down buying and slow down production. If allowed to run to the extreme, it will cause a great volume of unemployment. Of course, the purpose is to slow down buying.

Mr. GORE. I am attempting by my questions to show that this policy actually will curtail drastically the purchasing capacity of the average American citizen, who must depend upon credit to buy his home and his automobile and to furnish his home. If he is a small-business man, he must depend upon credit in order to operate his business. The Senator from Alabama knows, as I do, that a vast majority of businesses in the United States must borrow money to be used as operating capital.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. That is one of the greatest problems with which the average small-business man is confronted.

Our friend, the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], could testify quite eloquently to that, because, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business, he conducted hearings in various parts of the country, and he heard small-business men tell what their problems were. I think the Senator from New Jersey will agree that that is one of the leading problems.

Mr. GORE. I have high regard for our distinguished friend, the Senator from New Jersey. I do not believe he would endorse such a policy as we have been discussing.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The hearings the Senator mentioned were conducted by the Subcommittee on Taxation of the Committee on Small Business, and they were very interesting and most enlightening. I wish to say that the big problem was taxes—high taxes—and that we did not find in any of those hearings any evidence that would reflect at all on this discussion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I doubt if the Senator from New Jersey followed me very closely. We were talking about the credit problems confronting the small-business man. We were not talking about high interest rates at the time the hearings were held.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The junior Senator from New Jersey is not subscribing to any of the policies being discussed in this colloquy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I assure the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that I am not trying to pull him into this discussion. I know that he has the interest of the average small-business man at heart.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator. I certainly have the interest of the small-business man at heart.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from New Jersey did a splendid job as chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I also have at heart the interest of the average citizen.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I had the honor of serving as chairman of the committee, and I appointed the distinguished Senator from New Jersey as chairman of the subcommittee, even though he is a member of the opposite party. The Senator from New Jersey did an excellent job.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I felt greatly honored to be appointed chairman of the subcommittee by the chairman of the parent committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It may be that we have established a precedent. As the Senator from New Jersey knows, the chairman of the committee this year bestowed upon me the honor of serving as chairman of the subcommittee. So perhaps we have established a real precedent, by making the committee truly bipartisan.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to associate myself with the generous remarks which the Senator from Alabama has made with respect to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

I wish to inquire of the Senator from Alabama if there is any evidence to show that money lending institutions, capital financing institutions, are in serious need of greater earning capacity. I know that it is very difficult to buy stock in any bank in any community of which I have intimate knowledge. I have read the indices of credit financing organizations throughout the country. Their earnings appear to me to be very large. Does the Senator know of any real need for a higher interest rate on the part of money-lending institutions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not so far as earnings are concerned; but let me say in all fairness that those who buy and exchange mortgages all say that they were having a very difficult time finding money to go into mortgages at the interest level which formerly existed. That was back when the interest on Government bonds was 2½ percent or thereabouts. When that rate is raised to 3¼, certainly mortgage money becomes more scarce. Why should a lending institution want to invest in a 4-percent mortgage, we will say, which it must service, and in connection with which it must pay out money in order to put it on its books, when it can buy Government bonds paying 3¼ percent interest and hold them, doing nothing but collecting the interest on them?

These people claim that they needed the increased interest rate before that time. Certainly if they needed an increased interest rate, when the Government increased its interest rate to 3¼ percent it made it absolutely unavoidable, I think, that interest rates on mortgages should be increased.

Mr. GORE. Was there any showing before the Senator's committee that there was real need, from the standpoint of earning capacity, for a higher interest rate on the part of the institutions lending money?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. I would not put it on that basis, because money, after all, operates in competition. Their claim simply was that they could buy other securities which would be better for them than buying 4-percent mortgages.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Was not the evidence clearly to the effect that there was no money available for these loans at the interest rate then prevailing?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I mentioned that a moment ago.

Mr. BRICKER. I merely wanted to keep the RECORD straight.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to direct an observation toward the Senator from Ohio before he leaves. My point was if the argument was anywhere near valid then, it certainly became valid when Governments went up to 3¼, because it was virtually impossible, as I see it, to persuade a lending institution to invest money in a 4-percent mortgage when it could buy Government bonds paying 3¼ percent interest.

Mr. BRICKER. For a considerable time before that there had not been any money loaned in that field.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I mentioned that fact previously. The lenders had said that. That was the situation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. This is a very difficult and complicated subject. Even though the junior Senator from Louisiana majored in economics in college, he finds it difficult fully to comprehend the subject.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I assure the Senator that he is not alone in that respect.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Alabama has given us some idea as to the figures for public and private debt in this country. The figures for the national debt and private debt approximate $595 billion, I believe.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. That does not include State debts, with which I am not familiar. However, the national debt plus private and corporate debts amount to approximately $595 billion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Further to increase the complications, it is important to realize that there is not as much currency in circulation as there is debt. Does the Senator recall the figures as to approximately how much currency there is in circulation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. I wish very much that I might call upon the Presiding Officer [Mr. BUSH]. Undoubtedly he could tell us. However, the Senator from Alabama must say that at the present moment he does not know.

Mr. LONG. Generally speaking, however, I believe the banks are in a position to lend approximately $6 for every dollar of currency in circulation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have heard that relationship stated.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the amount of reserves which the banks are required to maintain has a substantial effect upon how tight credit is in this Nation; has it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Cannot the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, acting in cooperation, have a great influence on the interest rates?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Particularly as they affect bank reserves.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They can have a great influence on credit policies. It seems to me that the greatest influence on interest rates generally is the interest which the Government pays for its money. That is a pretty good barometer.

However, so far as credit policies are concerned, as the various Treasury examiners and Federal Reserve Board representatives go out to examine the accounts of various banks, they can tighten up. Perhaps they have been a little lax. The Federal Reserve System can tighten the requirements. It can increase reserve requirements, and it can increase the rediscount rate. There are many things it can do which affect the credit policy.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Some time ago one of our ablest Members—one who is regarded generally as one of the soundest experts of this body in the fields of finance and business—told the junior Senator from Louisiana that, within reasonable limits, the Secretary of the Treasury could exercise an enormous influence over the interest rate on Government bonds and various other interest rates, provided the Federal Reserve Board was willing to cooperate with him. Does the Senator share that opinion?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not like to restrict it to interest rates, because interest rates and credit terms are tied together. Of course, the Treasury sets the interest rate on Government bonds by the amount that it agrees to pay on long-term securities. The interest on the last issue was the highest we have had in a long time, namely, 3¼ percent. That immediately carries up the interest rates throughout the country.

Mr. LONG. Up until a few months ago the Federal Reserve Board also exerted considerable influence.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator is referring to the open-market operations. They discontinued that practice approximately 15 or 18 months ago.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Did not the open-market policies have the effect of holding down interest rates, while they were being used?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; by holding up bond prices.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, if certain bonds threatened to sell below par, the Federal Rerserve, through its open-market policy, would step in and buy bonds, and thereby prop up the price of bonds, which made it unnecessary to pay a higher interest rate. I should like to say to the Senator I believe the Federal Reserve System and the Treasury should use their credit powers toward stabilizing the economy of the country, and sometimes they should be used, I think, in tightening credit. I am not arguing for loose credit.

Mr. GORE. At the right time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am arguing for a moderate handling of it and doing it in a timely way. By the way, on the question of timeliness I have a quotation from the Journal of Commerce, which says that it was not handled in a timely manner. I shall quote from the article a little later.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The question which was troubling the junior Senator from Louisiana related to the ability of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board to make credit more freely available. The point was made on the floor of the Senate that the rise in the interest rate was due to the fact that there was perhaps a shortage of credit or a shortage of money. Is it not correct to say that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have considerable powers which enable them to make credit more freely available?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say, that, if I understand correctly, what the Treasury was trying to do in this particular case was to place these bonds in such a way that they would—shall I use the term "mop up" or "sop up"?—our excess spending power, rather than to handle them through banks, which in turn simply issue more currency and put more money into circulation.

I do not quarrel with the manner in which they handled the bond issue. I even think that probably it was necessary to increase the rate of interest a little bit. However, I think they increased it too much. I think there has been too much aggressiveness on increasing the interest rates. There was a great oversubscription of the bond issue. However, let me say in all fairness that one cannot always judge by that, because many brokers will ask for more bonds than they really want, in order to be certain to get the number they want.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator from Alabama aware of what has happened to State, county, and municipal bonds, and the interest rates on them?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am aware of what will happen to them, if it has not already happened. I have not seen any issues which have been sold in the last few days. However, we all know that this is bound to carry them up, and our municipalities and other public bodies are certainly going to feel it very strongly.

Mr. GORE. I wish to assure the Senator from Alabama that it has already happened and that it has already had a very substantial effect upon the interest rate at which municipal, county, and State securities are now marketed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am certain that is true. The only reason I stated I did not know about it was because I had not found that any had been marketed since the interest rate had gone up. I know if any are marketed, it is bound to have a tremendous effect upon them, and it will cost plenty of money to handle the indebtedness, which nearly all of them will have to have in order to carry on their business.

Third. Most farmers must borrow money with which to make their crops and to modernize their farms. I have had reports from Alabama to California that farm loans are being tightened up, that terms are harder and interest rates are increasing, that farmers are becoming discouraged and are beginning to complain that this new policy of high interest rates and deflation will prove catastrophic to many of them.

In the face of declining incomes, the Government raised interest rates to 4 percent on Department of Agriculture Price Support Loans for farmers for their 1953 crops.

Farm prices dropped an additional 2 percent last month. In Alabama alone, cash income for the first 2 months of this year was $3½ million less than for the same period last year. It is admitted that farmers' incomes in 1953 will be the lowest since 1941. Yet, in spite of these concrete evidences of lower farm income, the administration persists in its policy of hard credit terms for farmers. Higher loan charges on crops may very well mean a greater cost to cotton, corn, wheat, and tobacco farmers, and indeed to all farmers.

And in spite of the fact that exports of farm crops continue to decline, the administration has raised interest rates to the highest ever charged on repayable loans made by the Export-Import Bank to foreign countries to enable them to buy our cotton, wheat, and other crops.

Some days ago, the Secretary of Agriculture pledged all-out effort to increase farm exports. I pledged at the time my full support and cooperation in his efforts. Yet, the first concrete move in

this field can only have the effect of discouraging farm exports.

Yes, Mr. President, the farmer is already beginning to feel the hardships caused by hard terms and high rates, and conditions will grow worse for him as time goes on if the administration insists on its program of deflation. The administration's new credit policy is absolutely certain to cripple such programs as REA, crop insurance, farm ownership, and farm housing.

Fourth. This new money policy will also impose an added burden on financing needs of municipalities, as was mentioned a few moments ago. Members of the Senate know that the towns and cities of this Nation have to float bond issues to maintain and modernize normal services such as schools, roads, water supply, and sewerage systems.

In the future, they will pay additional millions and millions of dollars to do so.

Fifth. Businessmen, Mr. President, particularly small-business men, will suffer because of this new policy of hard terms and high rates. Already small firms in Alabama have complained to me that they are finding it necessary to accept harder terms and to pay higher interest rates for needed capital. In fact, many of them are having their loans called.

I have urged, with partial success, a tax program that would lighten the load on small firms, and would thereby lessen the necessity for borrowing. Further tax modification would help immensely, but there would still be thousands of small firms that would need credit on reasonable terms and at reasonable interest rates. It is becoming increasingly difficult for them to obtain such credit.

All these groups—the taxpayer, consumer, businessman, farmer, municipalities—and especially those of low and moderate incomes and size will suffer, I repeat, if the administration continues to insist on its program of deflation.

I am not simply imagining this threat of deflation. I point to a significant article on the front page of the Journal of Commerce of May 4, 1953, in which there is a discussion of possible steps by the Federal Reserve System. The opening paragraph is as follows:

> Nearly everybody whose business is connected with the money market lately has been looking for signs of relaxation in the restraint the Federal System has been exerting on credit for almost a year and a half.

It does add:

> No sound basis yet exists for such expectations.

Later on in the article it has this to say.

Mr. President, I should like to direct this point to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], since we were talking about it a few minutes ago. This article was published in the Journal of Commerce of May 4, 2 days ago.

> It is no secret that many of our central bankers believe that the latest hike in money rates by the commercial banks was exceedingly ill-timed coming in the midst of the Treasury's effort to place its new issue of 3¼-percent long-term bonds.

Mr. President, I shall not read the article at length. It refers to possible steps which the Federal Reserve System might take. It plays down the fact that they are likely to take these steps now. At least, it shows that they are already talking about them, because they realize that the situation is there, and that it is time to be thinking about it.

They talk about increasing interest rates to "mop up" excessive money. If carried too far or too fast that means deflation and if continued, will surely bring about a depression. Such policies as the administration is now following is what brought on the depresssion of the 1920's. Most people, in speaking of the depression, think about it as beginning in 1929. For the farmer, and the masses of people, it began in the early 1920's as a result of the deliberate policy of hard terms and high rates at the time.

It is said that an increase of interest rates will help stabilize the economy; that it will stop inflation. But how does it stabilize the economy and how does it stop inflation? It does so by decreasing the value and the amount of goods and services that homeowners, consumers, and taxpayers are able to buy. In a word, it will result in less consumption and less production than would otherwise be the case.

This might not occur immediately. As a matter of fact, in my judgment, the increase in interest rates on the amount of residential construction, for example, is likely to stimulate construction for a temporary period.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The statement the Senator from Alabama has just made confirms the opinion which prompted my previous questioning of the Senator, to wit, that this policy will inevitably mean that the average American consumer will have less purchasing power. That will be a sure result of this policy.

The Senator from Alabama has just described as one of the purposes of the policy the mopping up of that purchasing power. There was a time—in fact, there have been two such periods, in recent years—when there was a danger from excess purchasing power. I wonder whether the Senator from Alabama thinks there is now a danger from excess purchasing power in the hands of farmers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I know there is not. As a matter of fact, the farmers are, at this very time, going through a period of deflation. It may be mild, but it is there and it is real. I have talked to farmers, and I know what they found when they tried to finance this year's crop or when they went to purchase a tractor or a combine or some other piece of necessary farm machinery. They found they had to make larger down payments, and had less time in which to pay the balance, and had to pay a higher rate of interest—that the terms were harder and the interest rates were higher and the down payments were larger.

The same situation applies in the case of those who wished to borrow money from banks or when farmers made arrangements to purchase the fertilizer they needed for the year.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In whose pocket does the Senator from Alabama think this alleged excess purchasing power rests, this excess purchasing power which it is said must now be mopped up by means of high interest rates?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course I think that is the very thing that must be watched most carefully.

Let me say that I do not have the figures before me, but I have seen the figures which have been issued by the Federal Reserve System.

Let me also point out that our Joint Economic Committee has published, every month, a little leaflet, which I hope all Members of the Senate read, called "Economic Indicators."

I think it is a rather well-known fact that at this time and for several months past the lower-income groups have been going through what we might call a dissaving period; instead of saving money, they have been drawing out their savings and have been purchasing more goods on credit and have been piling up debts.

Of course, it is wise—perhaps through some kind of consumer control, if it could be properly administered—to handle that situation; but I am very much afraid that most of the purchasing power that is being "mopped up" by these deflationary measures is the purchasing power we need the most. In other words, it is the purchasing power of the farmer, who cannot produce the food and fiber the country needs unless he can obtain the machinery, the fertilizer, the seed, and the supplies he requires; and it is the purchasing power of the small-business man who, if this process is allowed to continue—and the danger is that it will be started and will be allowed to continue, in the way that occurred in the early 1920's, although I hope to goodness it will not be permitted in 1953——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not wish to press the point upon the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that I believe I did not answer the question the Senator from Tennessee asked me. Of course, what happens——

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Alabama has answered very well, so far; but I should like to inquire whether he knows of any group in Alabama, the State he so ably represents, that has too much purchasing power in its pockets. He has eliminated the farmers and the small-business men and also the men and women who work by the hour, in the factories. What group in Alabama has too much purchasing power in its pockets—purchasing power which must be "mopped up" by the policy to which the Senator from Alabama has referred?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I were put to the test right now, I could not name any group in Alabama that has too much purchasing power, because Alabama is made up primarily of persons in the relatively low-income brackets. In Alabama we do have some persons who have high incomes, but they are not in great numbers, as is true in areas of higher income. Alabama is one of the low-per-capita-income areas, I am sorry to say; and of course that situation is true of a great part of the Nation.

Mr. GORE. Lest the Senator from Alabama turn the question upon me, I wish to say quickly that I know of no segment of the population of Tennessee which has purchasing power in such dangerous excess proportions that it needs to be "mopped up" by higher interest rates.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I venture the assertion that such groups will not be found in areas where farming is the predominant occupation, because the farmers are the ones who have been hit the first and the hardest, as is usually true. If we measure the depressions of the past, we find that it was the farmer who was hit the first and the hardest.

By the way, I previously referred to an article appearing in this week's issue of the U. S. News & World Report. That article contains a diagram which shows the various groups which have been hit, and it shows how badly they have been hit. Every article on that subject that I have seen points out that the farmer is the one who has been hit the most, and is the one who will continue to be hit the hardest if these policies are continued. The farmer and the small-business man are the two who will feel the effect of these policies the most, if they are continued.

Mr. President, a moment ago I had said that an increase of interest rates will stop inflation, but will do so by decreasing the value and the amount of goods and services that homeowners, consumers, and taxpayers are able to buy—or, in a word, that it will result in less consumption and less production than would otherwise be the case. I said that must not occur immediately, and that as a matter of fact, in my judgment, the increase in interest rates in the case of residential construction, for example, is likely to stimulate construction for a temporary period. It will enable builders, who recently were unable to obtain VA and FHA financing—and there were many of them; I admit there was a backlog—to secure it, and they will put many more new housing units under way. Home buyers who could not get a GI loan should be able to get one now, but they will have to pay one-half of 1 percent more interest for it. As soon as this backlog is taken care of, I expect the real and lasting effect to take place.

Home buyers after that will more than ever be faced with the conditions described in the May 1 issue of U. S. News & World Report. The article to which I refer says:

> Debt, even on easy terms, is a growing burden that will feel heavier any time incomes shrink. Monthly payments on homes claim twice as big a share of the consumer's dollar as in 1944, about the same proportion as in 1939.
>
> This burden will grow with interest rates rising. People seeking new homes may find it harder to fit monthly payments into their budgets.

That is where the cut-down will come.

Later in the article this timely warning is given:

> On balance, the increase in rates could be an influence to slow the building boom.

Millions of veterans and other citizens very urgently need better housing. Many have not been able to afford the high payments required. They will be less able to meet the higher payments of the future.

Moreover, there are millions of American families that will buy a new home if they feel they are getting good value for their money. The increase in interest rates will result in less value for their money, and this is the real tragedy of the whole situation. We need about a million housing units each year if we are to meet our normal needs. I am not speaking of a building boom, but I am referring to what is necessary if we are to take care of our normal needs. The only way that a high volume of housing construction can be maintained in the long run is by increasing the value of the housing dollar and by reducing the level of prices and the cost of new homes. With the prices of housing going up, the demand for housing will begin to fall off, perhaps in 1954, and once that happens and real estate prices start to topple, no one can know where it will stop.

I think much the same logic applies in other fields of production and consumption.

A couple of weeks ago, according to the Wall Street Journal, a proposal was under consideration—in fact, it was indicated that the administration had about agreed to it—that would have permitted the VA rate to remain at 4 percent, but would have legally permitted a specified discount. The discount allowed would have, I am reliably informed, been up to 3 percent. Thus, assuming a mortgage sold for 97 rather than par, the effective yield on such a loan would have been 4.4 percent or approximately the new GI rate.

As the Wall Street Journal article pointed out, such a plan would have the advantage of continuing the 4-percent yield to lenders in areas where 4-percent money is still available, while allowing increased yields in sections where money happens to be tight. Thus, in Boston or New York, where it was possible to place a 4-percent loan at par, the lender or the veteran would still enjoy the advantage of a 4-percent loan. In Alabama or some other tight-mortgage area where no 4-percent loan could normally be placed, the loan could be placed at a discount.

Admittedly there are serious drawbacks to such a plan. It would appear to have the advantage, however, of flexibility and of forcing money into the more distant areas and allowing them to compete for mortgage funds which otherwise would stay close to home on mortgages which the institutions themselves can service. The problem of channeling mortgage money into the more distant areas of the country where the greatest expansion in population has been taking place has been one of the most difficult and continuing problems with which we have been confronted. It seems that the discount plan would have been one means of approaching its solution.

According to the same Wall Street Journal article, the veteran might also benefit from such a plan. It would depend on the extent to which the Veterans' Administration officers and appraisers were successful in not allowing the discount to be included in the appraised value. While it probably is true that in some instances the builder would be successful in passing on the discount in a higher price to the veteran, with good administration and with competition it might just as frequently be the case that the discount would not be passed on.

The point is that even if the Veterans' Administration were only 50 percent successful in its supervision, the veteran would still be the gainer.

With the rate increased, however, the veteran in the long run cannot possibly gain any benefit. The veteran in New York or Boston who could get a loan at 4 percent now has to pay 4½ percent. The same builder is still going to try to get the highest appraisal he can on a Veterans' Administration home, even if the interest rate is 4½ percent.

As soon as this plan of solving the tight VA loan situation became known, a great deal of pressure was executed to kill it. In fact, it was called legalized larceny. It seemed strange that this proposal should be labeled as larceny and unworkable by some of those who for the last 2 years had been making, selling, and buying VA mortgages at discounts, and who advocated in association conventions the very plan which I just outlined.

Why was it larceny and unworkable last week, and a good solution before that? The reason is simple. The high-rate bond issue made it possible to get the 4½-percent home mortgage rate, and still leave the possibility of premium in some areas.

The builder and mortgagee would always be sure of their full profits and fees. This would eliminate the possibility of the VA not including the discount in the appraised value and the builder being thus required to take a more modest profit or the mortgagee make a smaller fee.

With the higher interest rate prevailing in all areas, it still makes possible the continuation of the discount system and other undertable deals that have been going on, only now they would take place on top of the 4½-percent rate.

The remote areas of the country will still have to compete with New York and Boston, where the interest rate is also 4½ percent. The possibility—the prob-

ability, in fact—is that the discount practice will still continue, unless we take steps right now to prevent it.

If such a legalized discount system is, as it has been represented to be, legalized larceny, with interest rates at 4 percent, I submit that it certainly would be legalized larceny at 4½ percent. I therefore am sending to the desk an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, which will make it a criminal offense to engage in such discounts or under-the-table practices in the making of VA guaranteed loans.

Before the rate was increased everybody in the building and mortgage industry who talked to me said that an increase to 4½ percent would solve all problems.

Now that the rate is increased, I do not see how anyone can advocate the continuation of discounts and under-the-table deals.

I know that it will be difficult to find out whether these practices are being carried on, and to get sufficient evidence to convict, but I do think that Congress should show by the best means at its disposal just how much it is opposed to discounts and other illegal payments of money in the making of VA loans. Those who engage in such practices, now that the interest rate is adequate, should be penalized in the same way as those who commit other felonies.

Now, when there is no justification for such discounts and under-the-table deals, is the time to insure against them before they once again become a part of the system. To accomplish this I am asking permission to introduce out of order a bill which I send to the desk for appropriate reference.

I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed at the end of my remarks, and also to have printed as a part of my remarks a very short article entitled "United States Bonds Sink to New Low," published in the Washington Post of Tuesday, May 5, 1953, an article to which I have made reference in the course of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the bill and the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1848) to further amend the National Housing Act, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., Public Law 475, 81st Congress, as amended, is further amended by designating section 504 thereof as section 504A, and by adding a subsection B to read as follows:

"Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining the guarantee on insurance of a loan under the National Housing Act, as amended, or the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, makes a certification pursuant to subsection A hereof, knowing it to be false, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both; and the guarantee or insurance thereon shall be void except as against a holder who shall have acquired the loan for value without knowledge that a false certification has been made by the originating mortgagee."

The article ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

UNITED STATES BONDS SINK TO NEW LOW

NEW YORK, May 4.—Marketable United States Government bonds dropped to record depths today as dealers reported demand melting away.

Declines of half a point and more were frequent in the Treasury list. Intermediate and long term issues were especially vulnerable. The new 3¼s lost 7/32 at 99 22/32 bid. Victory 2½s fell a half point at 91 20/32 bid and bank-eligible 2½s of 1967–72 were off 18/32 at 91½ bid. This is a record 3.07 percent interest yield on the latter issue.

The Treasury's 2⅜s of 1958 at 97 20/32 bid, a 2.82 percent yield for the 5-year paper. The 2½s of 1958 were off 10/32 at 98 12/32 bid, a 2.7 percent yield.

Securities dealers blamed the losses in bond prices today on the Government sponsored rise in interest rates and the continuing flood of new financing.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, May 7, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 7, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 6, 1953:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Catherine B. Cleary, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Leo Martin Boyle, O266202, Illinois National Guard, to date from November 24, 1952.

Maj. Gen. Harold Gould Maison, O141515, Oregon National Guard, to date from November 24, 1952.

Maj. Gen. Hal Lowndes Muldrow, Jr., O250319, Oklahoma National Guard, to date from November 24, 1952.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Claude Thomas Bowers, O183291, North Carolina National Guard, to date from November 24, 1952.

Brig. Gen. James Francis Cantwell, O396657, New Jersey National Guard, to date from March 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. George Samuel Cook, O251434, Washington National Guard, to date from November 24, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Alvin Daugherty, O337212, Oklahoma National Guard, to date from November 25, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Frank Dunkley, O240437, Kansas National Guard, to date from January 1, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Frank Edwin Fraser, O222901, Arizona National Guard, to date from November 25, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Edward Foster Griffin, O198652, North Carolina National Guard, to date from November 24, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Orland Gerrard Hunt, O280504, Washington National Guard, to date from November 25, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Otto Kerner, Jr., O358530, Illinois National Guard, to date from November 24, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Reginald Alfred Maurer, O180740, Massachusetts National Guard, to date from November 24, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Henry William McMillan, Jr., O323208, Florida National Guard, to date from November 24, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Charles Coudert Nast, O298840, New York National Guard, to date from November 24, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Brainard Edwin Prescott, O294210, New York National Guard, to date from November 25, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Maxwell Cook Snyder, A242582, Florida National Guard, to date from November 24, 1952.

Brig. Gen. George Weaks Trousdale, O189048, Louisiana National Guard, to date from December 1, 1952.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, we rejoice that daily Thou art seeking to strengthen and sustain us with a reassuring sense of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

May every thought of our mind now be brought into a glad and willing obedience to the spirit of our blessed Lord.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 5, 1953, was read and approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the Chair declares the House to be in recess for the purpose of holding memorial services as arranged by the Committee on House Administration.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, to meet at the call of the Speaker.

MEMORIAL SERVICE PROGRAM, MAY 6, 1953

Prelude, sacred selections (11: 30–12)..... United States Army Band

Presiding officer.....The Speaker

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Invocation.....The Chaplain

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D.

Quartet, Have Thine Own Way, Lord (Stebbins).....

Hon. J. FRANK WILSON, Hon. PRINCE PRESTON, Hon. OREN HARRIS, and Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST.

At the piano.....Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON

Representative from the State of Ohio

Scripture reading and prayer...The Chaplain

Roll of the deceased Members.....The Clerk of the House of Representatives
Rose ritual...Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH Representative from the State of Illinois
Devotional silence.
Address.....Hon. ROBERT J. CORBETT Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.
Quartet, Rock of Ages (Hastings).....Congressional Quartet
Address.....Hon. CARL ALBERT Representative from the State of Oklahoma.
Taps.....Sgt. George Myers
Echo.....Sgt. Victor Christensen
Benediction.....The Chaplain

The Members of the House rose and stood while the relatives of the deceased Members were escorted to seats in the House Chamber by the Committee on House Administration, preceded by the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives.

MEMORIAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER presided.

INVOCATION BY THE CHAPLAIN

Most merciful and gracious God, who art the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, and the glory of all that is beautiful, we are again approaching Thy throne of grace through the old and familiar way of prayer which is always open to those who come with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

Grant that in this hour of solemn and sacred memory we may enter into a blessed and intimate communion with Thy divine spirit and with the spirit of our beloved upon whom Thou hast bestowed Thy glorious benediction and the diadem of Thy praise, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

In Christ's name we bring our petitions. Amen.

QUARTET

Hon. J. FRANK WILSON, Hon. PRINCE PRESTON, Hon. OREN HARRIS, and Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST sang Have Thine Own Way, Lord, by Stebbins.

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, a Representative from the State of Ohio, accompanied at the piano.

SCRIPTURE READING AND PRAYER

The CHAPLAIN. The Old Testament Scripture readings are selections from the 90th and the 103d Psalms:

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations.

Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.

So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him.

For He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust.

As for man, his days are as grass; as a flower of the field, so he flourisheth.

For the wind passeth over it, and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more.

But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him, and His righteousness unto children's children.

To such as keep His covenant, and to those that remember His commandments to do them.

The New Testament readings are taken from the 14th chapter of the Gospel according to St. John:

Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me.

In My Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.

And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.

Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.

May God add His blessing to these readings from His Holy Word.

The following poem entitled "The Other Room," written by Robert Freeman, is a beautiful commentary on the gracious words which came from the lips of our blessed Lord:

"No, not cold beneath the grasses,
Not close-walled within the tomb;
Rather, in my Father's mansion,
Living in another room.

"Living, like the one who loves me,
Like yon child with cheeks abloom,
Out of sight, at desk or schoolbook,
Busy in another room.

"Nearer than the youth whom fortune
Beckons where the strange lands loom;
Just behind the hanging curtain,
Serving in another room.

"Shall I doubt my Father's mercy?
Shall I think of death as doom,
Or the stepping o'er the threshold
To a bigger, brighter room?

"Shall I blame my Father's wisdom?
Shall I sit enswathed in gloom,
When I know my beloved are happy,
Waiting in the other room?"

Let us have a moment of silent prayer.

O Thou infinite and eternal God, in whose divine keeping and control are the coming in and the going out of all our days and years, in the life of each of us there are times and experiences when our feelings seem to impose silence.

Humbly and reverently we are calling upon Thy great and holy name, encouraged and constrained by every gracious invitation and promise in Thy word through which Thou hast spoken unto us.

Thou alone art the author and disposer of human life and from Thee our spirits have come and unto Thee they return. We beseech Thee that unto all Thy righteous dealings we may yield ourselves with due resignation and patience for Thou art too wise to err and too kind to injure.

We pray that this may not be for us an hour of sadness and gloom but of thanksgiving and rejoicing as we call to mind the life and character of Thy servants unto whom Thou hast opened the gates to the larger life and received into Thy nearer presence.

We thank Thee for the high and holy privilege which we have enjoyed of walking and working with them for a little while upon this earth. We have not said farewell unto them but only goodnight. Assured that on some bright and blessed morn we shall meet again and dwell together in hallowed union in that fairer land whose language is music and where there is fullness of joy and peace.

Grant unto the members of their families the consolation of Thy grace and some special token of Thy covenant love.

Show us, as we continue our earthly pilgrimage, how we may carry on in faith and in the fear of the Lord and at the eventide of life, when Thou dost call us to Thyself, may we be worthy of receiving the blessings which Thou hast prepared for the faithful.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

ROLL OF DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. Lyle O. Snader, Clerk of the House of Representatives, read the following roll:

BRIEN MCMAHON, a Senator from the State of Connecticut: Born October 6, 1903; attended public schools, graduated from Fordham University, New York, and from the law school of Yale University, New Haven; admitted to the bar and practiced law in Norwalk; city judge in Norwalk in 1933; resigned to become special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, 1933–35; Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, Department of Justice, 1935–39; elected to the United States Senate in 1944; reelected 1950; died July 28, 1952.

WILLIAM GRADY STIGLER, a Representative from the Second Congressional District of the State of Oklahoma: Born July 7, 1891; attended public schools, graduated from Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, and attended law school at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, and the University of Grenoble in France; First World War Infantry lieutenant at St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne engagements and with Army of Occupation; admitted to bar, 1920, and practiced law in Stigler; city attorney of Stigler, 1920–24; State senator, 1924–32, serving as president pro tempore in 1931; lieutenant colonel, Oklahoma National Guard; Member of the 78th Congress and the four succeeding Congresses; died August 21, 1952.

ADOLPH JOSEPH SABATH, a Representative from the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois: Born April 4, 1866; attended schools of Zabori, Czechoslovakia and, after immigrating to the United States in 1881, graduated from the Chicago College of Law; admitted to the bar and practiced law in Chicago; ward committeeman and district leader in Chicago, 1892–1944; justice of the peace, 1895; police magistrate, 1897–1906; delegate to all the Democratic State conventions since 1890; delegate to all the Democratic national conventions, 1896–1944; Member of the 60th Congress and the 23 succeeding Congresses; died November 6, 1952.

EDWARD EUGENE COX, a Representative from the Second Congressional District of the State of Georgia: Born April 3, 1880; attended public schools, the academic department of Mercer University, Macon, and graduated from the law department of Mercer University; admitted to the bar and practiced law in Camilla; mayor of Camilla, 1904–06; delegate to the Democratic National Convention, 1908; judge of the superior court of the Al-

bany circuit, 1912–16; Member of the 69th Congress and the 14 succeeding Congresses; died December 24, 1952.

JOSEPH RALEIGH BRYSON, a Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of South Carolina: Born January 18, 1893; attended public schools and was graduated from Furman University, Greenville, S. C., and from the law department of the University of South Carolina; enlisted in First World War, September 28, 1915, and reenlisted August 3, 1917, and was discharged as a second lieutenant of infantry; admitted to the bar in 1920 and practiced law in Greenville; member South Carolina House of Representatives, 1921–24; member of State senate, 1929–32; elected to the 76th Congress and the seven succeeding Congresses; died March 10, 1953.

GARRETT LEE WITHERS, a Representative from the Second Congressional District of the State of Kentucky: Born June 21, 1884; admitted to the bar in 1908; served as clerk of Webster County Circuit Court, 1910–12; master commissioner of same court, 1913–17; served on Kentucky Highway Commission, 1932–36; referee in bankruptcy, 1941–45; commissioner, Kentucky department of highways, 1947–49; appointed to the United States Senate January 20, 1949; elected to Kentucky State Legislature, 1951; elected to the 82d Congress, August 2, 1952; reelected to the 83d Congress; died April 30, 1953.

ROSE RITUAL

Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, a Representative from the State of Illinois, standing in front of the Speaker's rostrum and assisted by Page Daniel B. Havens, placed a memorial rose in a vase as the name of each deceased Member was read by the Clerk.

DEVOTIONAL SILENCE

There followed a period of devotional silence, during which the Members stood.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Hon. ROBERT J. CORBETT, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, we have gathered here to pay homage to those Members of Congress who died during the year. Without exception these men were best citizens in their own communities. They were loved and respected wherever they were known. Proper religious devotions have been held for them, and proper eulogies have been pronounced by their close friends here in Congress. I could add nothing to the splendid tributes paid to them. I cannot minister in a religious spirit to their loved ones. No one can add to their stature or the respect in which they were held by all of us. But speaking as a contemporary historian, I can spread here on the record one salient thought, one final accolade that they so justly merited and that a grateful nation should well remember.

Mr. Speaker, it is good that we should set aside one day each year to memorialize our departed colleagues. There were not ordinary men who worked and lived with us. They were truly men of distinction. The very fact of their membership in the Congress of the United States so stamped them for all time.

The honor of being a Member of the Congress is an honor that cannot be taken away by defeat or death. And it is a distinction that comes to relatively few men and women. Out of all the hundreds of millions of people who have lived in this great land only approximately 10,000 persons have had the privilege of serving in the Halls of Congress.

Membership in the Congress of the United States is seldom easy to achieve or maintain. It should be constantly reemphasized that no citizen can take the oath of office as a Representative in Congress unless he has been selected and elected by the people of his home district—by his friends and his neighbors—those who know him best. Likewise, except when appointed to fill an unexpired term, no one can serve in the Senate of the United States unless the people of his own State have voted him that high office. That fact makes the Congress definitely the part of the Government which is uniquely the people's own.

It is that part of the Government to which they can most readily appeal for the redress of wrongs, for changes of policy, for information, for assistance, and for protection. And the Congress is that part of the Government which can most easily be changed when it becomes unresponsive to the will of the people.

The fact that membership in Congress is almost exclusively reserved for those who have been elected obviously makes such membership an honor and distinction that much more to be cherished. Equally obvious the fact of elected membership makes our Government so distinctly a representative republic—a Government of and by the people. And just so long as our Congress retains its full power in the affairs of state our Government will continue to be a Government for the people—providing and preserving the maximum of freedom for everyone.

The Congress of the United States is often held up for ridicule and harsh criticism by the thoughtless, the frustrated, the indolent, the vicious. Confidence in it is also deliberately diluted by those who know that they cannot destroy free government in the United States until they first destroy public faith in the Congress.

Criticism and ridicule of individual Members of Congress is part of the American political scheme of things. The Member generally takes this in his stride with a shrug or a smile. But when the criticism tends to destroy faith in the institution that is Congress then a menace appears that cannot be regarded lightly. I will tell you why.

In all of our sprawling executive with its approximately 2,500,000 civil employees, only two, the President and the Vice President, hold their offices by the will of the people. All the rest owe their responsibility to the appointive power of someone superior. It is likewise true that the other great check in our check-and-balance system, the Supreme Court is an appointed body far removed from popular control. All of this may be good and proper, but it results in a very serious and constant danger.

Should the Congress of the United States, because of the carelessness of the cartoonists, the indolence of the editorial writer, or the commentator, who has no other easy target for the day, the denunciation of the frustrated pressure-group leader, the profanity of the defeated, or the subversive activity of the totalitarian—should the Congress, because of all these things, be destroyed in the confidence of the people and thus become powerless as a check on the executive, then free government, as we know it, ends in America.

Thus it has been in every country in the history of civilization where government of the people has given way to dictatorship. The Republic of Rome became the dictatorship of the Caesars when the senate had become an object of scorn and derision. Napoleon reduced the legislative bodies in France to a sounding board of his wishes before he became Emperor. Mussolini became the sovereign power of Italy by supplanting the Chamber of Deputies with the powerless Chamber of Corporations. Hitler became the dictator of Germany by reducing the members of the Reichstag to a chorus of "jahs." Throughout history, where and when the power of, and the confidence in the people's representatives could be ended, dictatorships resulted.

Hence, it is true that so long, and just so long, as the Congress of the United States retains the confidence of the people and asserts and preserves its proper place in our governmental scheme of things, that long democracy will flourish in our Nation. Likewise, so long as our republican democracy is maintained, so long will those throughout the world who pray for personal and political freedom have a beacon to inspire them.

Consequently, those who serve, or who have served, in the Congress of the United States have not only been honored through election by their constituents, they have also been honored by being a part—a vital part—of the greatest institution in the world, working for the preservation of a free way of life in America and everywhere.

These departed Members who have passed on during this year and all of those former Members they have joined in God's somewhere were part of the great tradition that first sent men and women to these shores in search of liberty, part of the great tradition that has carried us forward from Lexington and Concord through many trying times and finds us now in a position of world leadership, resisting dictatorship and tyranny on the bloody ridges of Korea and building defenses, political, economic, and military, against aggression and slavery everywhere in the world. There has been and cannot be any finer tradition in all history.

It is for us today as we formally and sorrowfully say farewell to our departed colleagues to remember them as men who in their humbleness and sincerity and vigor worked for the best interests

of their people and their country; men whom differences of opinion, criticism, praise, or political gain never made them forget that they, as Congressmen, were servants of the people, devoted to the preservation of human liberty and happiness. They are gone, and someday, even as you and I, they may be forgotten as individuals; but if we, the living, and those who are to follow after, will devote ourselves as they did to maintaining the Congress of the United States as the greatest of all institutions working to preserve freedom, theirs and our collective handiwork will remain as a shrine, a beacon, a thing to be blessed by all of those who will come here after.

Above this rostrum the challenging words of Daniel Webster are chiseled in stone. They read:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Our colleagues whom we honor today and who honored us by their lives and work so did.

With that, to them we say farewell, a long and fond farewell.

QUARTET

The Congressional Quartet sang Rock of Ages, by Hastings, accompanied at the piano by Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, a Representative from the State of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Hon. CARL ALBERT, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY HON. CARL ALBERT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has called the roll of Members who during the past 12 months have answered to a higher call in a far greater forum than this. Here on earth—

Our flowers are merely flowers,
And the shadow of thy perfect bliss
Is the sunshine of ours.
—*Poe.*

Mr. Speaker, I accept the principle of the indestructibility of matter: much more do I believe in the immortality of the human soul.

There is no death.
What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life elysian,
Whose portals we call death.
—*Longfellow.*

Life is ever lord of death,
And love can never lose its own.
—*Whittier.*

Our colleagues are with us in spirit. Their kind and loving deeds live on. We feel their presence in our lives. They give us a sense of real communion with the infinite. They were with us so recently.

It is fitting that the family, friends, and loved ones of our late colleagues should meet in their honor in this Chamber, which they knew so well and loved so dearly. We meet to pay them humble tribute.

Our colleagues have had a total service in the Congress of more than 100 years—weighty, burdensome years. All of them served here during the Korean war. All but one served during World War II and the trying postwar years. Two of them were here through the great depression, and one of them through two World Wars.

There is little doubt but that the strenuous duties of their work here shortened their lives. Only one who has experienced it can comprehend the burdens of congressional service in this age. Yet it has its compensations.

Sometimes the multiplicity of little things we are called upon to do over and above the constitutional duties of our offices seem almost all-consuming. It may well be, however, that these little things are the ingredients of great and important service.

Our people have borne heavy burdens during the past 12 years. In World War II they gave of their blood and treasure with the high hope if, indeed, not with the expectation of emerging from that war into an era of peace and sanity that might justify the sacrifices they had made. Instead, endless war and endless sacrifice seem to have been their only reward. It may well be then that the little things we are able to do for them may spell the difference between success and failure in the grim responsibilities that lie ahead.

Our colleagues kept the faith with their country and their constituents even to the end.

Mr. Speaker, there are many good men in this world. The men we honor today were extraordinary men by any standards.

To their families and loved ones we can give personal testimony to the fidelity of their service. In the hours of sadness, there is the glorious consolation that they lived their lives fully and served their country well.

To me, the lives of our departed friends summarize the magic story of America. Let us call the roll again:

BRIEN MCMAHON, brilliant, youthful New England Yankee of whom it was well said by his distinguished successor:

Senator MCMAHON was Connecticut's outstanding statesman.

ADOLPH SABATH, a lowly immigrant, who at the age of 15 believed the American story. Unable to speak English when he arrived in this country, he lived to become the dean of this body, to which he was elected 24 successive times, an all-time record of legislative public service in America. Those of us who knew this great American, whose service spanned two generations, can only repeat with our distinguished minority whip who said:

There was only one ADOLPH SABATH. When he was born, the mold was broken.

GENE COX, southern gentleman, in the noblest sense of the term, who in courage, ability, and resolute purpose had no superior, but of whom it was so rightly said by our distinguished majority leader:

I shall remember GENE COX primarily as a generous-hearted friend.

JOE BRYSON, another lovable son of Dixie, who rose from the textile mills of South Carolina to a place of preeminence among his comrades, and of whom our great minority leader and former Speaker has said:

He typified the Christian gentleman. He practiced what he preached.

BILL STIGLER, from my own State of Oklahoma, in whose veins ran the blood of the original American. He had all those qualities of chivalry, patience, and generosity of the great race that was the first to inhabit this continent.

GARRETT WITHERS, who left his Old Kentucky Home to be with us but a little while, and yet in whom we caught a fleeting glimpse of that loving soul so dearly loved by all who knew him.

There is nothing I can say, Mr. Speaker, about our late beloved friends that has not already been said by tongues more eloquent than mine. This, however, we can all say, that their lives reaffirm the miracle of America. They demonstrate anew that in this country the doors of opportunity are open to all, regardless of race or national origin, regardless of religious belief or occupation, alike to the descendants of the first inhabitants and earliest settlers and to the newest immigrant in our land.

In reviewing the story of America, historians are wont to pause and to linger at the door of a tiny reconstructed cabin amid the tall oaks of Hardin County, Ky., and there to contemplate the life of the mysterious rail splitter who changed the destiny of mankind. The whole world marvels at the amazing consistency of the evidence of the honesty, the integrity, the ability, and the devotion to principle of this lowly man who scaled the mountain peaks. Yet, I sometimes wonder whether the real story in the life of Lincoln is in his inherent qualities, lofty indeed though they were, or rather in the assurance he gave us of what a man, however humble, when blessed with qualities of honesty, integrity, and devotion to ideals, may do for his fellow man under a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Mr. Speaker, in this age of doubt and skepticism, in this day when the very foundations of free government are under attack throughout the world, the lives of those whom we honor now give us new faith in the principles of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, after more than 160 years this is still the best government on earth for financier and farmer, for industrialist and industrial worker. After all this time no man may close the doors of your church against you. No man may sell your private property on the public auction block without due process of law. No man may cross the threshold of your home without a search warrant. No man may cast you in prison without a trial by a jury of your peers.

After all the centuries, Mr. Speaker, history is still on the side of freemen. So—

Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail
And not a rent made by the gale.
—*Longfellow.*

The government of Cromwell went down with him to his grave. The government of Napoleon changed with his defeat. The government of Kaiser Wilhelm died in the Hall of Mirrors. The government of Hitler was destroyed in the flames that consumed him. Yet, after more than a century and a half, the Government of 160 million Americans still stands tall and rugged. It emerged from the War of 1812 strong and secure. It emerged from the Civil War unimpaired. It emerged from World War I grand and glorious. It emerged from the Second World War mighty and colossal. That Government stands today, a palace of your liberty, a castle of your happiness, a tower of your strength. It is your heritage. It has justified your faith.

This country was founded on faith. It was founded by men of deep religious convictions, by men of faith in God. It was because they were men of faith that they had faith in freedom of worship. They knew with Emerson that—

The faith that stands on authority is not faith.

Aye, call it holy ground,
The soil where first they trod:
They have left unstained what there they found—
Freedom to worship God.
—*Herman.*

For faith, those who settled this country broke the ties of home and fireside, broke the ties of centuries. For faith, they braved the oceans and faced the perils of the wilderness. For faith, they built their homes, their churches, and their communities.

In this dangerous, materialistic age, in this age of confusion and doubt, God give us a new birth of faith. Faith is the answer to the cynic's horrible vacuum of death.

Faith is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen. (Hebrew XI, 1.)

Faith moveth mountains—

And yet—

There are no tricks in plain and simple faith. (Shakespeare.)

Our colleagues live on: they were men of faith.

TAPS

Sgt. George Myers, United States Army, sounded taps, the echo being sounded by Sgt. Victor Christensen, United States Army.

BENEDICTION

The Chaplain pronounced the following benediction:

The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift upon you the light of His countenance and give you peace.

Amen.

AFTER RECESS

At the conclusion of the recess (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Speaker called the House to order.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 199, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 7, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

678. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to repeal section 4 of the act of October 30, 1951, relating to the postage rates on books"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

679. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of March 31, 1953, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act, as amended, July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

680. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Rafael Garcia-Rodriguez, A-7992898, involving suspension of deportation, requesting that the case be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

681. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act approved July 1, 1948, Public Law 863, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

682. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4605. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 5041. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 5042. A bill to exempt Puerto Rico from the requirements of the act of April 29, 1902, as amended, relating to the procurement of statistics of trade between the United States and its noncontiguous territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5043. A bill to establish the National Physical Sciences Laboratories; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution of June 16, 1938, creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the taxation by a State of the income of nonresidents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. Res. 228. Resolution directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate personnel practices in the executive branch, with particular reference to their effect on job security of career employees; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature requesting Congress to cause a study to be made of the Taft-Hartley Act with a view to revising certain portions thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature urging immediate action in constructing the Boston lifeboat station at Castle Island in Boston Harbor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the Massachusetts State Senate urging immediate action in constructing the Boston lifeboat station at Castle Island in Boston Harbor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of the Massachusetts State Senate memorializing the Congress of the United States to cause a study to be made of the Taft-Hartley Act, with a view to revising certain portions thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation granting to the Territory of Hawaii the sum of $20,000,000 for the purpose of opening land suitable for house lot, farming, and pastoral purposes and developing the water resources of the Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DODD (by request):

H. R. 5044. A bill for the relief of Francesco Mibelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5045. A bill for the relief of Maria Ruggieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5046. A bill for the relief of Jakob Nosella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5047. A bill for the relief of Ludwig and Helena Landau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5048. A bill for the relief of Julia Telegdy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

232. By the SPEAKER. Petition of the executive director, National Rifle Association of America, Washington, D. C., urging that adequate funds be provided in the 1954 and all future budgets and appropriated to the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and the office of the director of civilian marksmanship, to enable them to carry out the directives of the National Defense Act in the marksmanship training of those citizens, of whatever age, who may now or in the future be required to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, to the Committee on Appropriations.

233. Also, petition of Anna H. Russell and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2440 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

234. Also, petition of H. G. Lundquist and others, of Sanford, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

235. Also, petition of Polish-American Congress, Inc., Jersey City, N. J., to take immediate action to pass legislation refuting the diplomatic blunders at Potsdam and Yalta, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1953

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, help of the ages past, hope for the years to come: In the hush of this moment closing the door of prayer on the outer world with its tumultuous and unpredictable events, in the white light of Thy holiness we know ourselves for what we are, petty and proud creatures who seek their own wills and whims in spite of the polished courtesies and noble professions with which we, alas, sometimes come to Thee.

Cleanse the inner fountains of our hearts from all defiling foulness and from the secret sin of pretense. Fit us, we beseech Thee, faithfully to protect the Republic from outward aggression and from inner selfishness. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 6, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 71. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Olson;

S. 100. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 142. An act for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee;

S. 248. An act for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter;

S. 306. An act for the relief of Waltraut Mies van der Rohe;

S. 365. An act for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson;

S. 522. An act for the relief of George F. Ruckman;

S. 720. An act for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 811. An act for the relief of George Maurer;

S. 846. An act for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell;

S. 851. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall;

S. 1041. An act to abolish the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard;

H. R. 688. An act for the relief of Takako Niina;

H. R. 720. An act for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann);

H. R. 884. An act for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi;

H. R. 955. An act for the relief of Paula Akiyama;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary;

H. R. 1186. An act for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez;

H. R. 1193. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. James W. Tuten, Jr.;

H. R. 1704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki;

H. R. 1895. An act for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat;

H. R. 1936. An act authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter;

H. R. 2624. An act for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford;

H. R. 2936. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California, for use as a fairground by the 10–A District Agricultural Association, California; and

H. R. 4004. An act to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE FORMER SENATOR WITHERS, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in accordance with a previous understanding, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may address the Senate in eulogy of the late Honorable GARRETT L. WITHERS, a former Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, today the United States Senate pauses to pay tribute to a former Member of this body, Senator GARRETT LEE WITHERS, of Kentucky, who passed away last Thursday, April 30. As a lifelong admirer and close personal friend, I rise to voice the deep affection and wholehearted respect with which I regarded him, and to express again my profound sorrow over the passing of a great Kentuckian, whose devotion to his fellow men, his community, his State, and his Nation is legend in Kentucky.

The death of GARRETT WITHERS has left an irreparable and permanent void in the lives of those whose privilege it was to know and observe him at close range over the years; whose opportunity it was to evaluate the sturdy character and fine qualities of this wholly unselfish man who was content to cheerfully "live by the side of the road and be a friend to man," seeing each one as he ought to be, rather than as he was. His was the rare gift of keen, but tolerant, discernment, unmixed with the harshness of criticism; of readily recognizing, accepting, and emphasizing the good and praiseworthy in every contact and situation, seemingly ignoring all blemishes and defects, however apparent to others, and still with remarkable precision being able to select the right time and the proper place impersonally and effectively to advance suggestion and counsel, and, if need be, stern warning, when some good, some improvement, or remedy, could be accomplished thereby.

It has been said that "simplicity is the mean between ostentation and rusticity," which somehow defines the personality of GARRETT WITHERS, who so often was described as "homespun," even though in the minds of those who knew him best the memory of the man always will remain luminous. The simple statement that he was a thoroughly good man sums up the life of my friend. Indeed, his exemplary life long influenced and inspired his own and the rising generations around him. Even though he has passed from the scene of his earthly labors, the pattern he wove out of the years allotted to him will continue to be emulated by those sufficiently wise to seek a sane and solid way of life, productive of the good and worth-while satis-

factions he attained and cherished—contentment, developed and nurtured out of the knowledge of sound achievement through practical application of the Golden Rule. Just such a man as GARRETT WITHERS, Holmes must have known when he wrote—

'Tis said that in his prime
Ere the pruning knife of Time
Cut him down,
Not a better man was found
By the crier on his round
Through the town.

A loving and devoted husband and father, a kindly and sympathetic neighbor, a substantial and civic-minded citizen, an able lawyer, who would have preferred the uninterrupted practice of law to any other endeavor, but whose fine character, splendid ability, independence of thought, and genial personality periodically elevated him to the enviable and almost unique plane where public office sought him, even though only once throughout his entire career did he actively seek such office.

In 1908, GARRETT WITHERS was admitted to the bar. Two years later he was elected as circuit court clerk of Webster County, which single voluntary foray into active politics, I venture to say, was motivated by a desire to prove his mettle and build his way into the consciousness and confidence of his fellow countians. Despite the urging of his friends, he declined to stand for reelection but he sustained a selfless interest in public affairs throughout a period of 40 years, steadily growing in stature and before long recognized throughout Kentucky as a stalwart figure in the Democratic Party and a sage and influential adviser in its councils.

Regardless of his obvious preference and determination to devote his undivided attention to the practice of law, from time to time the call to public service came—in his early years, GARRETT WITHERS served as master commissioner of his county circuit court, as a member of the Kentucky Highway Commission, and as referee in bankruptcy proceedings, but always his chief interest was in his law practice which, as the years rolled on, entailed considerable corporation work, although from beginning to end he found his greatest gratification in solving the legal problems of his friends and neighbors—adjusting their difficulties, arranging their affairs, settling their estates—and respecting their confidences. Long ago I gleaned the impression that GARRETT WITHERS probably knew more and told less than any man in western Kentucky, and that it was with both reason and direction that casually he placed a restraining hand on a shoulder or reached out to give an encouraging pat on the back.

In his later years, twice I was directly responsible for diverting him from his law practice and, as the wheels of fate and politics turned, I may have been a factor, too, in permanently separating him from the profession of his choice. As Governor, I persuaded him to serve as commissioner of the Kentucky Highway Department, in which office he had supervision of some 12,000 employees and sole jurisdiction over the annual expenditure of many millions of dollars of public funds. During my tenure as Governor, I also persuaded him to fill the unexpired term of Kentucky's distinguished senior Senator, Alben W. Barkley, upon his elevation to the high office of Vice President of the United States. With relief, rather than regret, in November 1950, upon completion of his assignment as a Member of the United States Senate, GARRETT WITHERS returned to his home at Dixon, Ky., to resume his law practice, but within the year his homefolk insisted that he go to the State legislature and, when subsequently the untimely death of Representative John A. Whitaker vacated Kentucky's Second District congressional seat, again the call came for GARRETT WITHERS to return to the Halls of Congress to carry on for his district and State. Experience, plus an innate willingness to do his part, had schooled and reconciled him to heeding the call to public service; the demands of the past had taught him to accept—

What each day needs—that, thou shalt ask,
Knowing each day will set its proper task.

So upon the convening of the 83d Congress last January GARRETT WITHERS took his seat as the Representative of the Second Kentucky District.

A week ago yesterday, April 29, the House not being in session, he dropped by my office for a visit; late that afternoon he left his congressional office in his usual good spirits and, seemingly, a well man. Early that evening a telephone call from his sweet and devoted wife conveyed to me the distressing news of his sudden illness. I soon reached his bedside, and arrangements were quickly under way to rush him to the hospital. The night wore on, and dawn found him still conscious, but by noon he sank into a coma, and before dusk the long, deep sleep from which he will not arouse in this world descended upon him. As he had lived—quietly, gently, unafraid, at peace with his God, himself, and his fellow men—so he died.

To his wife, his children, and his grandchildren, GARRETT WITHERS left a proud heritage, wreathed in happy memories of a devoted husband, a loving father, and an affectionate and appreciative grandfather.

His was the good life. Drawn into the folds of eternity, gathered to the bosom of his Maker, serenely he rests.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to pay my tribute to GARRETT WITHERS.

I was privileged to serve with him on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and I worked together long and hard as members of a subcommittee of the committee which was considering legislation dealing with what was commonly called overtime on overtime under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The problems involved in the legislation presented difficult, intricate questions of law. In our services on the subcommittee I was impressed again and again with GARRETT WITHERS' rare common sense, his sound judgment, his fine grasp and understanding of the law, his zeal for justice and fair play, and his devotion to our country and the public welfare.

GARRETT WITHERS was a genial, homespun, kindly man, with a warm smile, a hearty handclasp, and always a helping hand, but he was also a warrior who fought valiantly for the right as he saw it, a patriot who waged battle for his country's cause.

Theodore Roosevelt declared, "There are many qualities which we need alike in private citizen and in public men, but three above all, courage, honesty, and commonsense." Courage, honesty, and commonsense were the qualities that most marked the life, the character, and the services of GARRETT WITHERS. Kentucky, which has given to the Nation so many illustrious sons, may well be proud of GARRETT WITHERS. He brought honor and distinction to her.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I rise to pay my humble tribute to the memory of our late friend, the great Senator WITHERS, of Kentucky, who exemplified in his life and public service many fine virtues. I endorse everything that has been said of him by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

I wish especially to mention the old-fashioned virtues which GARRETT WITHERS so well personified on the floor of the Senate and in committees. I believe that every Senator who served with him on committees during the short time he was here was tremendously impressed with his sincerity, his very fine purposes, and the homely virtues with which he measured everything.

I remember quite well serving with him on a committee when the testimony changed his mind on an important subject. He did not hesitate to announce that change to his people at home and to his associates here.

I like to remember him as the very best type of old-fashioned country lawyer. When I say "country lawyer," I refer to one who lives in a small town or in the country, and who upholds the very finest traditions of the great legal profession, a profession into which inroads have been made in recent years by the so-called business lawyer. GARRETT WITHERS represented the fine old-fashioned virtues which characterize the oldtime country lawyer, whose statement of fact in a courtroom, whether to a jury or to the judge on the bench, can be taken at face value.

I myself have had the responsibility, as a judicial officer, of passing upon questions of an important nature. Lawyers have stood up in court and told me facts which I accepted on their word alone, upon the strength of which judgments involving thousands of dollars were set aside. Likewise, the verdicts of juries have been set aside on the same basis, in cases in which men had been convicted

and were due to be sentenced to the penitentiary.

GARRETT WITHERS was the kind of lawyer, the kind of legislator, and the kind of man who, to the fullest extent, measured up to the standard which I have attempted to describe.

I noticed in one of the news items dealing with his passing he was quoted as having said that he would rather be known as a fairly good country lawyer than to have any other kind of compliment paid him.

I am very glad to salute his memory and his fine record, not only as a great public servant but also as a fine country lawyer, representing the very best and noblest in that great profession.

I believe his public service might well be illustrated by the fact that after he had served in this august body and had served as a commissioner of highways in his home State, still, when he went back home he responded to the call of duty by serving the house of representatives of his own State legislature, which, on the legislative side, is perhaps the highest honor that can come to an American citizen.

We treasure his memory, we admire his courage and his character; his county, State and Nation have benefited greatly by his example. We can best honor him and serve our country by emulating his virtues and his example.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I cannot let the occasion pass without saying a few words in tribute to the memory of my late good friend GARRETT WITHERS, of Kentucky.

Although we came from different sections of the United States, we became very good friends soon after he entered the Senate. I learned to like him and respect him and admire him very much. He had the qualities which I admire most in a public servant. He was friendly. He instinctively made friends with those with whom he became acquainted, whether they agreed with him on political or other matters.

He was a humble man. He was never swayed by the importance of any office he held. I believe that is best proved by the fact that after he retired from the Senate and went back to his native State of Kentucky he became a member of the State legislature of that State.

That to my mind shows the mark of greatness in the man, namely, that he would serve in whatever capacity the people of his community and of his State saw fit to place him. Later he was elected to the House of Representatives in Washington.

He was conscientious in arriving at his conclusions. He did not run with the herd because it was the popular thing to do. He made up his own mind as to what he ought to do on the various issues which came before him, and when his mind had been made up, it was usually on the basis of the sound judgment that was found there. When he had once decided what he ought to do, he had the courage to do it. Having decided to do it, it was useless for any group or faction or force to try to sway him from the course he had decided to follow as the right course to pursue.

GARRETT WITHERS was a great credit to his State, and in his passing I have lost a friend, and the great State of Kentucky has lost an able legislator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in testimony of my great respect and admiration for GARRETT WITHERS.

I served with him for 2 years while he was a Member of the Senate. He was a Member with me of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I can testify to every good thing which has been said about him by other Senators.

He approached every problem from a very fresh point of view and with an abundance of commonsense.

He did not seem to have any prejudices. He simply looked at whatever problem came before him from the point of view of the average man who might come in from the outside, and decided what was the right thing to do.

In reaching his decision he was entirely devoid of prejudice, including political prejudice. Very few men with whom I have served have had greater integrity, greater character, and greater determination to serve the public interest than GARRETT WITHERS.

By his death the State of Kentucky has lost a noble citizen and the Congress of the United States a fine legislator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what has been said by other Senators with respect to GARRETT WITHERS, his public service, his high character, his unimpeachable integrity. I knew him well; and I am confident that the tributes paid to his memory by the Senators who have preceded me represent the feeling of everyone who knew GARRETT WITHERS well.

He was deeply interested in matters of public works. I do not know of any other Senator who devoted more time and energy and effort to bring about good public roads and to questions affecting flood problems and rivers and harbors, than did GARRETT WITHERS.

I know the House of Representatives has lost a very fine public servant. I am glad those of us who knew him well in the Senate have been afforded an opportunity to express our admiration for Senator GARRETT WITHERS and to extend our condolences to his family.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late GARRETT WITHERS, formerly a Member of the Senate, and a Member of the House of Representatives at the time of his death.

During the past 25 years, I have known nearly all the political figures of both parties who have served Kentucky. I have known few among them who possessed the ability, the integrity, and the humanity which characertized GARRETT WITHERS. He was honored many times by the people of Kentucky, by election to county, State, and national offices.

In his private life he gained success as a farmer, banker, and lawyer. In every position he held, either public or private, he achieved distinction. His service in every position was marked by a high sense of conscience and duty.

But the qualities which endeared GARRETT WITHERS to those who knew him were his devotion to his family and friends, his rugged integrity, his simplicity, his commonsense, and his never-failing sense of humor.

One of the articles which appeared in the Washington newspapers, following his death, described him as "one who took his duty—but never himself—seriously."

Mr. President, I held GARRETT WITHERS in great respect, and I valued his kindness and his friendship.

In this very inadequate way, I wish to express my regard and affection for him, and my deep sympathy for Mrs. Withers, his children, his family, and his friends.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MONRONEY were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. WELKER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. AIKEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPEAL OF SECTION 4 OF THE ACT OF OCTOBER 30, 1951, RELATING TO POSTAGE RATES ON BOOKS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 4 of the act of October 30, 1951, relating to the postage rates on books (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts

and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Rafael Garcia-Rodriguez from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on March 17, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of sundry aliens from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, heretofore transmitted to the Senate, together with copies of orders entered in each case (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission, as of March 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON ADVANCE PLANNING OF NON-FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 13th quarterly report on advance planning of non-Federal public works, for the quarter ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 44

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation granting to the Territory of Hawaii the sum of $20 million for the purpose of opening land suitable for homelot, farming, and pastoral purposes, and developing the water resources of the Territory

"Whereas the future economic well-being of the people of the Territory of Hawaii is largely dependent upon the fullest possible development of the Territory's land and water resources; and

"Whereas there is now an acute shortage of land suitable for homelot, farming, and pastoral purposes, and water therefor; and

"Whereas the government of the Territory is keenly aware of these needs and is desirous of establishing immediately an integrated and forward-looking program for the development of land and water resources within the Territory; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii continue to pay their full share of taxes to the Federal Government, while having only one nonvoting Delegate in the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested, through the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to enact legislation which will grant to the Territory of Hawaii the sum of $20 million, out of Federal tax realizations from the Territory, for the purpose of opening up land in Hawaii suitable for homelot, farming, and pastoral purposes, and developing the water resources of the Territory; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, and to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Department of New York, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, New York, N. Y., protesting against any curtailment or reduction of Federal funds for the construction of low-income housing in the city and State of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolutions adopted by the Alameda County Wine Growers Association, of Livermore, and the San Joaquin Valley Wine Growers Association, of Fresno, both in the State of California, favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 4294) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter from the National Urban League, New York, N. Y., signed by Robert W. Dowling, president, transmitting a petition approved by that league, relating to a study of the South African question; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Polish-American Congress, Inc., Jersey City, N. J., favoring the passage of legislation to refute certain diplomatic actions at Potsdam and Yalta; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting commemorating the 162d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, at the Polish Home, Lackawanna, N. Y., pledging allegiance to the United States, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Citizens-Taxpayers Association of Westerly, R. I., and member of the Maine Three-Quarter Century Club, signed by A. Fred Roberts, secretary, favoring the designation of a day to be known as Douglas MacArthur Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from J. Joseph Mahoney, Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to the enactment of legislation to provide for a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATOR FREAR'S POSITION ON KOREAN PRISONER-OF-WAR ISSUE—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF DELAWARE LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution unanimously adopted by the 117th General Assembly of the State of Delaware, commending my colleague, the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], for the position he has taken in regard to having the United States consider with caution any and all Communist proposals for a settlement of the prisoner-of-war issue, or the Korean conflict itself.

The resolution was introduced by State Senator John M. Longbothom, and after its unanimous adoption by both houses of the general assembly, was approved by his excellency, the Governor of Delaware, J. Caleb Boggs.

I am sure the Senate would wish to know of the high regard in which Senator FREAR is held by his fellow citizens of the State legislature in Delaware.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 19

Concurrent resolution commending the Honorable J. ALLEN FREAR, junior United States Senator from the State of Delaware, for the position he has taken in regard to having the United States consider with caution any and all Communist proposals for a settlement of the prisoner-of-war issue, or the Korean conflict itself

Whereas our country is involved in a great struggle to preserve freedom; and

Whereas the Communists of the world have yet to prove their sincerity of purpose in connection with peace proposals heretofore made; and

Whereas our illustrious junior Senator from the State of Delaware has seen fit to recognize the apparent difficulties facing this country when dealing with Russia and the satellite countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 117th General Assembly of the State of Delaware (the House of Representatives concurring therein) as follows:

1. That Senator FREAR be congratulated upon the stand he has taken in urging the United States to proceed with caution in connection with the Communist proposal for a settlement of the prisoner-of-war issue, or the Korean conflict itself.

2. That the 117th General Assembly of the State of Delaware go on record as supporting Senator FREAR in this cautionary attitude.

3. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the illustrious Senator from Delaware and a copy made available to the press.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to

have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring a study of the Taft-Hartley Act, with a view to revising certain portions thereof, and urging immediate action in constructing the Boston lifeboat station at Castle Island, in Boston Harbor.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to cause a study to be made of the Taft-Hartley Act, with a view to revising certain portions thereof

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby urges the Congress of the United States to cause a study to be made of the Taft-Hartley Act, with a view to revising those provisions of said act, if any, that such study may reveal as tending to be detrimental to legitimate aims and interests of labor; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolutions urging immediate action in constructing the Boston lifeboat station at Castle Island in Boston Harbor

"Whereas certain funds have been appropriated by the Congress of the United States, in the fiscal year 1952, and approved by the President for a project in the city of Boston, to wit: The construction and maintenance of a lifeboat station at Castle Island in Boston Harbor to replace the floating lifeboat station, which was established in 1896 and continued in operation until destroyed by storm in 1950; and

"Whereas said project, as authorized in the 1952 fiscal budget has been discontinued in the interest of economy by reason of an executive directive; and

"Whereas this project is of vital importance in protecting and safeguarding the many thousands of bathers, the yachtsmen, and the property in that portion of Boston harbor; and

"Whereas plans have already been completed by the city of Boston to transfer certain land on Castle Island necessary to the establishment of said lifeboat station to the United States; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts did in June 1952 appropriate $200,000 for the dredging and sheltering of a proposed auxiliary harbor as its contribution to the completion of said project; and

"Whereas the Massachusetts Senate recognizes the immediate need for the establishment of the Boston lifeboat station, which was successfully advocated by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, in whose congressional district the proposed station is to be located: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby urges the President of the United States and the Congress thereof to take immediate action to construct and maintain said lifeboat station; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, to Vice Adm. Merlin O'Neil, United States Coast Guard, to Rear Adm. Harold G. Bradbury, commander of the Coast Guard, Boston, and to Joseph M. Dodge, Director, Bureau of the Budget."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1151. A bill authorizing the transfer to the State of Tennessee of certain lands in the Veterans' Administration Center, Mountain Home, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 228);

H. R. 1334. A bill for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl; without amendment (Rept. No. 229); and

H. R. 1563. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 227).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 7, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 71. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Olson;

S. 100. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 142. An act for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee;

S. 248. An act for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter;

S. 306. An act for the relief of Waltraut Mies van de Rohe;

S. 365. An act for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson;

S. 522. An act for the relief of George F. Ruckman;

S. 720. An act for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 811. An act for the relief of George Mauner;

S. 846. An act for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell;

S. 851. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall; and

S. 1041. An act to abolish the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1849. A bill to authorize the transfer of local board jurisdiction for certain individuals registered pursuant to the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY (for Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 1850. A bill for the relief of Doctor John D. MacLennan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1851. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, to promote the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the last abovementioned bill (for Mr. LEHMAN), which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 1852. A bill for the relief of Juan Antonio Gorrono Lajarzabulo and Jesus Maria Ojenola Guernica; and

S. 1853. A bill for the relief of Maria Stela Leitao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1953

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the absence of the junior Senator of New York, Mr. LEHMAN, who is absent by leave of the Senate, he has asked me to introduce on his behalf for appropriate reference a bill for the public redevelopment of the Niagara. On his behalf I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement he is issuing today jointly with Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT JR., of New York, and an analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, joint statement, and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1851) to preserve the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, to promote the national defense, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for Mr. LEHMAN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to fulfill the obligation of the United States to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and river, including the accessibility of the river shore line, and to provide for the most beneficial use of the waters of that river for development of power, navigation, and the control of floods, and to promote the national defense, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that the share of those waters available to the United States for power purposes, pursuant to the treaty between the United States of America and Canada, signed February 27, 1950, which on August 9, 1950, received the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States to its ratification, shall be used to develop power in the public interest by a public agency as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. To implement that policy, there are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, works of improvement for redevelopment of the Niagara River in substantial accordance with the project plans outlined in the report of the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission, dated September 28, 1949, entitled "Possi-

bilities for Redevelopment of Niagara Falls for Power—Niagara River—New York." Such works of improvement (hereinafter referred to as the "project") shall be subject to such modifications not inconsistent with this act as may be found advisable by the Secretary of the Army upon investigation and recommendation by the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission, and after consultation with the Governors of New York and other interested States and with other interested Federal agencies. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work in connection with such project shall be prosecuted as soon as funds shall be available from appropriations hereinafter authorized, in order to provide for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided*, That the construction of remedial works in accordance with article II of the treaty referred to in the first section of this act shall not be undertaken until the United States of America and Canada have approved the recommendations of the International Joint Commission with respect to the nature and design of such remedial works and the allocation of construction as between the two countries, and that the construction of such remedial works shall be under the supervision of the International Joint Commission.

SEC. 3. (a) The President is authorized and directed to transfer the power facilities of the project to such public agency of the State of New York as its government may designate and properly authorize for that purpose, if the following conditions are satisfied in full before power is available from any generating unit of the project—

(1) an agreement between the United States and the State of New York shall have been negotiated by the President or his designated agent with such agent of the State of New York as its government may designate and authorize for that purpose, and such agreement shall have been approved by the Legislature of the State of New York and the Congress of the United States. The President is hereby authorized and directed to initiate negotiations for such agreement upon the passage and approval of this act; and

(2) the public agency designated and authorized by the government of the State of New York to accept transfer of the power facilities of the project shall have made proper application for, and shall have accepted, a license under the provisions of the Federal Power Act (49 Stat. 838), as amended, which license the Federal Power Commission is hereby authorized and directed to issue after consummation of the agreement referred to in condition (1) above: *Provided*, That, in the event of any conflict between the provisions of this act and of such agreement and the provisions of the Federal Power Act and of the license, the provisions of this act and of such agreement shall govern in respect of the project herein authorized.

(b) The agreement provided for in subsection (a) shall include, but not be limited to, provisions for ultimate repayment of all costs properly allocable to power as determined by the Federal Power Commission after consultation with such agency of the State of New York as its government may designate and authorize for this purpose, and provisions for maintenance and operation of the project in the public interest, including especially the interests of the State of New York and other States within economic transmission distance, and provisions for the maintenance and enhancement of the scenic beauty of the falls, including the accessibility of the river shoreline. Such agreement shall assure, among other things, that—

(1) no part of the United States share of the waters of the Niagara River made available for power purposes to the designated agency of the State of New York shall be diverted by it to any person or private company; nor shall the use of any part of said waters or the rights pertaining thereto be sold, leased, or otherwise alienated by such agency to any person or private company for the generation of hydroelectric power; nor shall the power facilities be sold, leased, pledged, mortgaged, or otherwise alienated to any person or private company: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting any valid existing rights under licenses heretofore issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Power Act (49 Stat. 838), as amended, or as now or hereafter affecting the applicability of the provisions of that act in the case of waters of the Niagara River presently authorized to be diverted for power purposes under licenses heretofore issued under that act;

(2) full recognition shall be given to the interests of national security as provided in section 15 of the Federal Power Act (16 U. S. C. 809);

(3) in contracting for the disposition of project power, (A) preference shall be given to States, counties, and municipalities, including agencies or instrumentalities of any of them, and to cooperative or other organizations not organized or administered for profit but primarily for the purpose of supplying electric energy to their members as nearly as possible at cost, and to the Department of Defense, and other defense agencies, and on fair and reasonable terms to other Federal agencies and to private enterprises requiring power to fulfill defense contracts, and (B) arrangements shall be made sufficiently flexible so that the foregoing recipients of preference, now or hereafter authorized by law to engage in the distribution of electric energy, may secure a reasonable share of the project power;

(4) such transmission lines and related facilities shall be constructed, or acquired by purchase or other agreement, as may be necessary in order to make project power available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, rural consumers, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies;

(5) project power shall be sold and distributed primarily for the benefit of the people as consumers, and particularly for the benefit of domestic and rural consumers, to whom it shall be made available at the lowest possible rates and in such manner as to encourage the widest possible use;

(6) in the event project power is sold to any purchaser for resale, contracts for such sale shall include adequate provisions for establishing resale rates which shall be fixed by the seller and which shall not only provide for passing on to the consumer savings in costs of generation, but shall also be promotional in character and designed so far as practicable to result in periodic rate reductions: *Provided*, That such contracts shall be for a period of time not exceeding 20 years;

(7) if and when a northeastern power pool or other agency for the coordinated operation of power facilities in the Northeastern States shall be created or provided for by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress or pursuant to a compact adopted by the States concerned and approved by the Congress, arrangements shall be made for coordinated operation of the power facilities of the project with those of such pool or other agency; and

(8) in contracting for the disposition of project power, commitments shall be so made as to provide and allow for a determination of disputes as to apportionment of project power among States within economic transmission distance whereby the Governor of any State, believing that his State is or may be denied its fair share, may make complaint to the Federal Power Commission which, after due notice to all States which may have an interest in the availability of project power and opportunity to them for hearing under the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, shall determine reasonable and practicable arrangements whereby and the extent to which project power shall be made available in the public interest to purchasers in States within economic transmission distance of the project: *Provided*, That such determination shall be final and binding in the operation of the project except as it may be thereafter revised in further proceedings before the Federal Power Commission as herein provided;

(9) (A) in order to render financial assistance to those States and counties in which the agency carries on its operations and acquires properties previously subject to State and local taxes, the agency of the State of New York shall pay to such States and counties for each calendar year such amount as the agency deems fair and equitable, taking into account the State and local taxes which would be payable if such operations were carried on by private corporations, but in no event more than percent or less than percent of the gross proceeds derived from the sale of power by the agency for the preceding calendar year, except as hereinafter provided;

(B) the payment for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among such States and counties in the following manner: One-half of such payment shall be apportioned by paying to each State (including payments to counties therein) the percentage thereof which the gross proceeds of the power sales by the agency within such State during the preceding calendar year bears to the total gross proceeds from all power sales by the agency during the preceding calendar year; the remaining one-half of such payment shall be apportioned by paying to each State (including payments to counties therein) the percentage thereof which the book value of the power property held by the agency within such State at the end of the preceding calendar year bears to the total book value of all such property held by the agency on the same date. The book value of power property shall include that portion of the investment allocated or established to be allocable to power: *Provided*, That the minimum annual payment to each State (including payments to counties therein) shall not be less than an amount equal to the 2-year average of the State and local ad valorem property taxes levied against power property purchased and operated by the agency in such State. Such 2-year average shall be calculated for the last 2 tax years during which such property was privately owned and operated or such land was privately owned. The agency shall pay directly to the respective counties the 2-year average of county ad valorem property taxes (including taxes levied by taxing districts within the respective counties) upon power property and reservoir lands allocable to power, determined as above provided, and all payments to any such county within a State shall be deducted from the payment otherwise due to such State under the provisions of this section. The determination of the agency of the amounts due hereunder to the respective States and counties shall be final.

(c) Eighteen months after the enactment of this act, the President is directed to transmit a report to the Congress on the status of negotiations for an agreement as provided for in subsections (a) and (b) hereof.

SEC. 4. When power is available from any generating unit of the project, if transfer of the power facilities of the project shall not have been consummated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) hereof, the project shall be maintained and operated, and project power disposed of, by such agency of the Government of the United States as may be hereafter created for such purpose: *Provided*, That, if such agency shall not have been created when construction of the project is complete, it shall be maintained and operated under the direction of

the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and project power shall be delivered and disposed of in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890), pending the negotiation and approval of the agreement provided for in subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 of this act or pending further disposition by Congress.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the "Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1953."

The joint statement referred to is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT OF SENATOR LEHMAN AND REPRESENTATIVE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

We have today introduced, simultaneously in the Senate and in the House, a bill for the public development of the waters of the Niagara River under the terms of the Canadian-United States Treaty of 1950 and in the spirit of the Senate reservation to that treaty holding that the Niagara power potential made available under the treaty should be developed for the public use and benefit.

The bill we have introduced is very similar to the so-called Lehman-Roosevelt bills introduced in 1950 and again in 1951. Some changes have been made, a summary of which is attached. Our bill has been delayed in introduction this year because we have been working to improve some of these provisions.

We have asked the Committees on Public Works of the House and the Senate to include consideration of this bill in any hearings scheduled on the subject of power development at the Niagara.

The only other bill now pending before the committee is a measure which would authorize the turning over of the Niagara water power potential to private interests. It is inconceivable to us that the Congress would seriously contemplate giving away to private interests the precious resource of the Niagara River, the development of which under public auspices for the public benefit is so clearly indicated as part of our traditional national power policy. These waters were made available for power development by the exercise of the sovereign treatymaking powers of the United States Government. Under the terms of the treaty the Niagara development must have a double purpose: (a) to preserve and enhance the scenic beauties of Niagara Falls, and (b) to develop the hydroelectric potential of the waters made available under the treaty to promote the national security of both Canada and the United States.

In our judgment the turning over of these waters to private enterprise for development as a private power project would be tantamount to a violation of the spirit of the treaty. It would certainly violate the sense of the Senate in approving the treaty when it attached the reservation expressly forbidding the leasing of these waters to private enterprise and calling for congressional action to authorize this development for the public use and benefit.

We very much fear that there may be a concerted effort to ram the private development bill through the Congress without due consideration of the startling implications of such a proposal. It may well be that the power potential at the Niagara is the first prize being sought by national private power interests: That this proposal to turn the Niagara over to private enterprise is the bellweather of a great flock of proposals soon to be made to strip the Nation of all its power projects and power potential and turn them over to private interests. Statements by President Charles E. Wilson, of General Electric, and more recently by former President Herbert Hoover, point unmistakably in this direction.

Under the terms of the 1950 treaty the United States is entitled to use sufficient water to develop 8 billion additional kilowatt hours of electric power annually. Engineering surveys indicate that the additional waters made available justify power facilities with an installed capacity of 1,300,000 kilowatts on the United States side alone.

This great potential belongs to the people. It should be developed for the benefit of the Nation and especially for the benefit of the people of New York and of other States within economic transmission distance of the power site. It should be developed in such a way as to enhance the beauty of the Falls; to promote our national security and provide essential preferences for defense industries, governmental bodies and agencies, rural consumers and rural electrification co-ops.

Our bill carries out these purposes by providing for Federal construction of the Niagara project and for turning over this project to the State of New York under proper safeguards of the national and consumer interests, upon repayment to the Federal Government of the cost of construction.

In the 82d Congress there was a third proposal supported by the New York Power Authority, authorizing the construction of the project by New York State, but without safeguards of the national and consumer interests. We felt that this proposal was a disguised attempt to make the power available to private utilities, at the bus bar, thus robbing the public of the benefit of low-cost hydroelectric power development and the protection of the safeguards already referred to. Now, this year the disguise is thrown away. The New York Power Authority has discarded its pretense of advocating public development of the Niagara power and is lending its tacit support to the pure giveaway of this public resource to private interests.

We will oppose such a proposal to the last ditch. We expect to be joined in this opposition by all those in the Congress who are sensitive to the incredible implications of this plan.

Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent by the private utilities for propaganda designed to prove that the proposal to develop the hydroelectric potential at the Niagara under public auspices is creeping socialism. If our proposal is creeping socialism, so is the United States Postal System and so is our system of public highways. Incidentally, official figures show that the private power interests spent more for lobbying in Washington in 1952 than any other single special-interest group in America.

Our proposal attempts to meet the objections of those who fear to vest the control of all our power projects in the Federal Government. Our proposal would vest control of this project in the State of New York, surrounding that grant by proper safeguards. As a result, the private power interests, in this instance, have been forced to discard the disguise of States rights and are fighting the naked battle for private monopoly and usurpation of public resources.

CHANGES MADE IN PROPOSED BILL AS COMPARED TO PREVIOUS LEHMAN-ROOSEVELT BILL, 82D CONGRESS

1. Language to affirm the national defense interest in the proposed project.

2. Terms specifically to authorize the inclusion in the Federal-State agreement of provision for the preservation and enhancement of the scenic beauty of the falls, including the accessibility of the river shorelines.

3. Provision for preferences in the disposition of power, at cost, for all defense agencies, and, on fair and reasonable terms to other Federal agencies and to defense industries requiring the power to fulfill defense contracts.

4. Provision to insure that negotiations for the Federal-State agreement shall commence immediately upon the enactment of the act, rather than after the appropriation of the first funds, and dating the report which the President is called upon to make to the Congress on the status of the negotiations from the time the enactment of this act rather than from the time of the start of construction.

5. Provision to insure that even if negotiation and approval of the Federal-State agreement is not completed by the time the first power is available from the project, the project can be turned over to New York State by subsequent agreement and approval by Congress and the Legislature of New York, or the Congress may make other disposition.

6. Provision authorizing the making of payments to State and local authorities in lieu of taxes, on the model of TVA.

The analysis referred to is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1953

Section 1: To fulfill the obligation of United States to preserve the beauty of Niagara Falls and beneficial use of water power, it is the policy of the United States to develop its share of Niagara power in the public interest by a public agency.

Section 2: Authorizes works of improvement (power and remedial works) under supervision of United States Engineers in accordance with plans previously approved. Remedial works must have approval of United States and Canada.

Section 3: (a) The President is directed to transfer power facilities to a public agency of New York State if—

1. An agreement between New York State and United States is reached and approved by State legislature and Congress of the United States; and

2. The State agency shall have obtained a Federal Power Commission license to operate the power facility at Niagara.

(b) The agreement shall include provisions for repayment to United States of all power costs; maintenance and operation in the public interests, including the interests of New York and other States within economic transmission distance; maintenance of the Falls, and—

1. No part of United States share of water used for power shall be diverted to any person or private company or leased or sold.

2. There shall be full recognition of interest of national security.

3. When contracting for the disposition of project power, preference shall be given to States, counties, and municipalities or their agents not organized for profit; defense and other Federal agencies.

4. Such transmission lines shall be constructed or acquired as are necessary to bring profit power in wholesale lots to ultimate consumers.

5. Power shall be sold for the benefit of the people as consumers, particularly rural and domestic, at lowest possible rates.

6. Contracts for power sold for resale shall specify that saving will be passed along to ultimate consumer.

7. If a power pool is created, coordinated operation of Niagara power facilities with the pool shall be arranged.

8. Settlement of disputes over distribution of power shall be by the Federal Power Commission.

9. A. To render financial assistance to States and counties, payments in lieu of taxes shall be made by agency of State of New York.

B. Method of apportioning payments in lieu of taxes to States, counties, etc.

(c) Eighteen months after enactment of act, President will transmit to Congress a report on status of negotiations between New York State and Federal Government on transfer of Niagara power project.

Section 4: If New York State has not or does not accept transfer of project upon completion, it will be maintained and operated

by an agency of the United States pending acceptance by New York State.

Section 5: Appropriations authorized.

Section 6: Title section.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, RELATING TO PAY OF PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, in the past two Congresses, I have endeavored to associate myself with efforts taken by the Congress on behalf of giving to our service men and women the best possible medical attention.

I supported the original bill which authorized the payment to physicians and dentists of a special pay of $100 per month. During the last Congress, serving as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I reported S. 3019, which extended until July 1, 1953, the authority for the payment of special pay to physicians and dentists.

I note that the expiration date of the extension authorized last year is approaching and that the current amendments to the doctors draft law do not contain any provisions extending the authority to qualify for this special pay.

Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1531) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, or to H. R. 4495, the corresponding House bill. The amendment would extend until July 1, 1955, the authority contained in section 203 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, regarding the special pay to physicians and dentists serving with the Armed Forces. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Insert at an appropriate place the following new section:

"SEC. —. Section 203 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by deleting the date 'July 1, 1953', wherever it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof the date 'July 1, 1955'."

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Statement by him relating to the 162d anniversary of the Constitution of Poland.

Correspondence between himself and the Secretary of the Treasury relating to the importation into the United States of South American wool tops.

Editorial entitled "Separating Subsidy Payments From Mail-Carrying Earnings," published April 15, 1953, in the Berkshire Eagle of Pittsfield, Mass.

By Mr. POTTER:

Address on Transportation Policies of the Eisenhower Administration, delivered on April 29, 1953, by Hon. Robert B. Murray, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, to 41st annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, at Washington, D. C.

By Mr. STENNIS:

Address delivered by 2d Lt. H. K. Twitchell to officers of division faculty, Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pa.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Prize-winning speech entitled "The Constitution, Guardian of the People's Rights," delivered by Herbert Lassiter in the oratorical contest of the Illinois Department of the American Legion, in Peoria, Ill., on March 20, 1953.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Release prepared by the Subversive Activities Control Board with reference to the swearing in of Thomas J. Herbert as Chairman thereof.

By Mr. FREAR:

Editorial entitled "Today Is Not Mother's Day," published in the Index of April 28, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Operation Prayer," published in the Index of April 28, 1953.

By Mr. GEORGE:

Three articles by Crosby S. Noyes, published in the Washington Star of May 4, May 5, and May 6, 1953, entitled, respectively, "West Berlin in Grave Danger of Economic Strangulation," "Italy—Up by the Bootstraps, With Tug From United States Economy," and "Dollars Purchased a Toehold, Not Guns in Strategic Portugal."

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Article by Soterios Nicholson, entitled "The Youth Problem in America."

Article by Kilsoo K. Haan with reference to conference to negotiate Pacific-Asian pact urged by influential Chinese in the United States.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Editorial in the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., on the subject of the Libby Dam project, with a statement by the Army engineers on the status of the project.

By Mr. DANIEL:

Editorial from Washington Evening Star entitled "Congress and Tidelands."

By Mr. AIKEN:

Editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence's Critical Year," published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 30, 1953.

By Mr. WELKER:

Two articles by Bing Crosby, one entitled "Bing Crosby Tells About the Way to Peace," published in the Way; the other entitled "On Behalf of Clear Thinking," published in the Freedom Club News.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Article entitled "Benson Ends 100-Day Gantlet," written by Frank Hewlett, and published in the Salt Lake City Tribune of May 3, 1953.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Article entitled "Domination of Asia Old Policy of Russian Czars," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of May 3, 1953.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Editorial in tribute to Paul M. Herzog, recently Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 5, 1953.

Letter by J. B. Worthy, of White Bluff, Tenn., regarding the future of the TVA, published in the Nashville Tennessean.

By Mr. LANGER:

Editorial entitled "Second Smith Act?" published in the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of January 12, 1953, relating to the bill introduced by Senator SMITH of Maine, to outlaw the Communist Party and similar organizations.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION'S STOCK POSITION ON FATS AND OILS AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on March 17 I addressed a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, requesting certain information regarding the stocks of fats and oils and dairy products which the Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand as of March 31 of this year.

Under date of May 1 I received a reply from Secretary Benson, together with some material in the form of memoranda and charts.

I believe the information is of sufficient importance to be read by as many people as possible, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 17, 1953.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would like to obtain a full picture of Commodity Credit Corporation holdings. The recent hearings held by this committee presented the general overall situation with respect to holdings at the time the new administration came into office. It is my understanding that the figures cited by Mr. Davis and Mr. Gordon at these hearings were those which were available to you from records acquired prior to your taking office.

I am writing to ask you for some supplemental information. I would appreciate your sending me a rather complete picture of the butter, cheese, and dried-milk holdings of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of March 31, when the old program expires and the new program begins.

Also, I would like a complete picture of the situation with respect to all types of fats and oils held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Included with this, might well be a presentation of the facts with respect to cotton linters and cottonseed meal.

I would appreciate some analysis as to why current stocks are as large as they are.

In view of the strong probability that excessive carryovers of wheat and cotton will necessitate acreage allotments and marketing quotas next year, I would like to know if the Department of Agriculture has adequate records of farmer plantings during recent years upon which to base the necessary allotments and controls.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 1, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: In reply to your letter of March 17, 1953, we are enclosing a statement and several tables giving the

March 31, 1953, Commodity Credit Corporation inventory position for cottonseed products, flaxseed, and linseed oil, olive oil, and dairy products, and some of the factors responsible for the present stocks.

The Department does not have adequate data upon which to base individual farm acreage allotments in the event it becomes necessary to proclaim acreage allotments and marketing quotas on wheat and cotton. In applying the statutory factors for the establishment of acreage allotments, it is necessary that the farm acreage history for the past few years be used. Acreage allotments have not been in effect on wheat since 1951 (suspended in January 1951), and acreage allotments and marketing quotas have not been in effect on cotton since 1950. This means that it will be necessary to bring farm history up to date. In the case of cotton, maximum use will be made of available data which have been maintained on acreage planted to cotton in 1951 and 1952.

There has been submitted to the Congress, for its consideration, a proposed supplemental estimate for funds required in formulating and administering acreage allotment and marketing-quota programs on the 1954 crops of wheat and cotton.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

DISCUSSION OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION'S STOCK POSITION FOR COTTONSEED PRODUCTS, FLAXSEED AND LINSEED OIL, OLIVE OIL, AND DAIRY PRODUCTS, UNDER THE PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM, AS OF MARCH 31, 1953, AND MAJOR FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO IT

COTTONSEED OIL, MEAL, AND LINTERS

Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, including purchase commitments, of cottonseed oil, meal, and linters, as indicated in attached table 1, include some stocks of oil and linters carried over from the 1951 cottonseed price-support program. However, the great bulk of these stocks, including purchase commitments, were acquired under the 1952 cottonseed price-support program. Stocks of cottonseed meal held by CCC are entirely from the 1952 crop.

The price-support program for cottonseed: The principal method of supporting the price of cottonseed, considered to be a semiperishable commodity, of the 1951 and 1952 crops has been through a cottonseed products purchase program—although direct loans and purchase agreements for cottonseed have been available to producers. The cottonseed products purchase program provides for the purchase at specified prices, by CCC from participating oil mills, of each of the three products, cottonseed oil, meal, and linters. Participating mills must tender on a package basis, and quantities required to be tendered are the approximate average outturns of the products from a ton of cottonseed. Only products from cottonseed for which producers have been paid the support price are eligible for tender to CCC. The value of the package of cottonseed products from a ton of cottonseed, at acquirement prices for such products under the 1952 support program approximates $90.82, national average basis. Decisions to tender by participating mills are made on the basis of the value of the package both at current market prices and based upon their judgment of future prices, as compared with the package value at program-acquirement prices.

Cottonseed oil: At current market prices cottonseed oil represents slightly more than half the value of all cottonseed products from the outturn of a ton of cottonseed. In determining why CCC's current stocks, including purchase commitments, of cottonseed oil are so high, it seems desirable to review briefly the world edible fats and oils situation including the relationship of the cottonseed price-support program. Prior to World War II the United States was a net importer of edible fats and oils, but in the postwar period it has become the world's major exporter and supplier. Domestic consumption of edible fats and oils tends to remain at about 44 pounds per capita irrespective of price fluctuations. The last two crops, that is, the 1951 and 1952 crops of both cottonseed and soybeans have been supported at 90 percent of parity. Butterfat also has been supported at this level during the past 2 years. The price of lard has not been supported and lard has been selling at an abnormally low price in relation to other fats and oils; surplus lard thus has moved into export channels. Exports, however, have not absorbed the combined surplus production of soybean and cottonseed oils. Cottonseed under present conditions is in a relatively weak competitive position compared with soybeans at the 90 percent of parity support level; a detailed discussion of this point appears later in this text. As a result CCC in effect has been acquiring and holding in the form of butter and cottonseed oil of the United States surplus of edible fats and oils which has not moved into consumption channels at support levels.

World production of edible fats and oils reached an all-time high in the 1951–52 marketing year. This large production became evident and the full weight of it affected the market in 1952 with the price of cottonseed oil falling to a low in April. Consequently, tenderings of cottonseed products from the 1951 crop, mostly from mills in the West, were made relatively late in the 1951–52 cottonseed-crushing season. Approximately 136 million pounds of crude cottonseed oil from the 1951 crop were acquired by CCC (see table 1). The 1952–53 year opened with high world stocks of fats and oils and large prospective United States crops of cottonseed and soybeans. Thus, in spite of a decline in the production of olive oil in the Mediterranean basin, the general price level of edible oils through most of the 1952–53 crushing season has been such as to encourage the tendering of cottonseed products to CCC. The market price for linters remained fairly strong throughout the 1951 season. However, prices declined rapidly in the early part of the 1952 season and by January 1953 chemical grade linters were selling at prices which were about half of the acquirement price under the support program. During March 1953 tenderings to CCC continued heavy even though there was a rise in the market prices of cottonseed oil and linters. The acquisition of considerable quantities of oil in excess of that indicated as surplus to export and domestic needs during this marketing year was due in considerable part to crushers uncertainty as to the future movement of market prices for cottonseed products after March 30, the final tender date. Approximately 50 percent of the anticipated 1952–53 production of oil with comparable quantities of other cottonseed products, meal and linters, have been tendered to the CCC (see table 1). It is anticipated that considerable quantities of CCC's cottonseed oil stocks will be sold back to the trade by next October to fill normal domestic and export requirements. Sales of 1951 and 1952 crop oil have totaled about 18 million pounds to date, including quantities disposed of through the school-lunch program.

Cottonseed linters: At current market prices linters constitute about 12 percent of the cottonseed products value. This is about the same percentage as prevailed during the 10-year period, 1941–50. However, during the 2 years 1949–50 linters constituted over 18 percent of the cottonseed products value. The price of linters relative to the average price in recent years, has declined by one-third. While the acquisition of large stocks of linters by CCC has kept the price of linters at higher levels than would otherwise have resulted, this price weakness has been an important factor in the tendering of large amounts of cottonseed products under the support program. Sales of 1951 and 1952 crop linters have totaled about 117,000 bales to date.

Cottonseed meal: At current market prices meal constitutes about 34 percent of the cottonseed product value. The market price of meal remained relatively high throughout 1952. Since OPS price ceilings were remanded March 17, 1953, prices have weakened substantially. All of the 1951 crop acquisitions of cottonseed meal under the support program have been disposed of. 1952 crop acquisitions through March 21 total about 650,000 short tons, 403,000 of which have been sold. Further deliveries to CCC will be about 500,000 tons. CCC recently reduced its selling price to a competitive level with other meals and is offering its stock for export. Because of probable difficulties in long-term storage of meal every practical effort will be made to dispose of CCC's entire stock as it is delivered to CCC. Cottonseed cake will store better than meal, accordingly efforts will also be made to obtain deliveries of cake to CCC in place of meal.

Factors bearing on prices for cottonseed and soybeans: CCC has acquired the products of about 50 percent of the 1952 cottonseed crop. This compares with a total of loans and purchase agreements—not acquisitions—of 1952 crop soybeans of only about 14 million bushels, or less than 5 percent of the crop. With the strengthening in the current market price of edible oils it is unlikely that CCC will acquire much, if any, of the 14 million bushels.

Major reasons for this contrast in price-support activity for the two commodities, cottonseed, and soybeans, both supported at 90 percent of parity are believed to be—

(1) The higher-than-average price prevailing for oil meals during the past season, coupled with the fact that the average unit outturn of meal from soybeans is almost twice that for cottonseed.

(2) A higher proportion of soybean meal, relative to cottonseed meal, which has been used in mixed feeds, coupled with the strong demand for mixed feeds during the past season.

(3) The price strengthening effect on soybeans attributable to their excellent storability, and to the relative availability of both farm and public storage.

(4) The strengthening effects on the price of soybeans due to (a) a continuing strong foreign demand for beans and (b) a highly competitive domestic bean market.

(5) A weakness of linter prices in relation to those for recent years. Linters, a product of cottonseed, does not have a corresponding counterpart produced from soybeans.

FLAXSEED AND LINSEED OIL

CCC stocks of linseed oil as of March 31, 1953, as shown in attached table 2, approximate 489 million pounds of which 300 million pounds is held for the account of the Secretary of Agriculture as stockpile pursuant to section 304 of the Defense Production Act of 1950. In addition, 5.4 million bushels of flaxseed from the 1952 crop (equivalent to about 108 million pounds of linseed oil) have been placed under price support. In view of both present and prospective prices for linseed oil and meal and the large 1953 crop in prospect based upon farmers' intentions to plant, it seem likely that CCC may acquire substantial quantities of the flaxseed now under price support. Thus, additional acquisitions by CCC of linseed oil are in prospect.

How stocks were acquired: Linseed oil stocks now held by CCC were acquired under the price-support programs of 1948 and 1949. A high support level for flaxseed was in effect for the 1947 and 1948 crops as an inducement to farmers to produce needed requirements of linseed oil. Purpose of the sup-

port program was to free the United States from dependence on uncertain foreign supplies of linseed oil which is a basic industrial oil in the United States economy. The major world supplier at that time was IAPI, the Argentine Government export monopoly. Greatly increased plantings combined with a high yield resulted in a large crop in 1948 and a sizable surplus accrued to CCC under the support program. In 1949 the support price was dropped to 90 percent of the parity price. Although this represented a reduction of about $2 per bushel of flaxseed, nevertheless favorable conditions resulted in another bumper crop and a further buildup of CCC stocks.

All of the flaxseed acquired was crushed by 1951; the linseed meal subsequently was disposed of with the bulk of the linseed oil remaining in inventory. The flaxseed was crushed because (1) linseed oil is cheaper to store than flaxseed, and in general it keeps better, (2) the resultant linseed meal could be made available for feed, and (3) valuable elevator space needed for the storage of bumper crops of grain thus was released.

Disposal problems: On June 21, 1951, 300 million pounds of CCC's inventory of linseed oil were transferred to the account of the Secretary of Agriculture as stockpile pursuant to section 304 of the Defense Production Act of 1950. Through March 31, 1953, CCC has sold for other purposes only 99 million pounds of total quantities acquired.

Principal difficulties involved are discussed as follows:

1. Domestic demand: The domestic demand for drying oils, of which linseed is by far the most important, has been steadily declining since the period of temporary shortage during World War II which provided a strong incentive for the production of synthetic substitutes, a trend which has continued to the present time. In the 1951 marketing year domestic production of flaxseed was slightly greater than domestic disappearance including use for seed, and this situation has continued through the 1952 marketing year when the new crop was somewhat smaller.

2. Foreign demand: The foreign market for linsed oil historically has never depended on United States linseed oil production. Prior to World War II the United States was a net importer of flaxseed and linseed oil, importing about 50 percent of its requirements. During World War II, and for a period afterwards, the price support program assisted the United States in becoming self-sufficient. In June 1949 the duty on flaxseed and linseed oil was increased, and in 1951, under the Defense Production Act of 1950, imports of both linseed oil and flaxseed were embargoed. The support level for the 1950 crop of flaxseed was reduced to 60 percent of the parity price, and this level was continued for the 1951 crop. The level of support was increased to 80 percent of the parity price for the 1952 crop of flaxseed and maintained at this level for the 1953 crop.

While the 1951–52 crop surplus above domestic requirements was exported, largely as flaxseed through commercial channels, CCC during 1952 sold only about 24 million pounds of linseed oil, in spite of an abnormally small flaxseed crop in Argentina last year. Experience has shown that Europe, a major importer of flaxseed and linseed oil, obtains her requirements from other sources, and turns to the United States for supplies only as a last resort to fill essential needs. This is attributable to many factors, including a continuing shortage of dollar exchange, relative prices, and a tendency to trade with historic suppliers through long-established trade channels.

OLIVE OIL

Stocks of olive oil held by CCC on March 31, 1953, consist entirely of acquisitions under the 1951 support program. These stocks, as shown in table 2, amount to about 331,000 gallons, equivalent to about 2.5 million pounds.

Under the 1952 program, price support loans have been made on about 106,000 gallons of olive oil, as of March 31, 1953. Under the provisions of the 1952 support program, stocks covering unredeemed loans and deliveries under purchase agreements, would be acquired by CCC on January 1, 1954.

The level of price support was $2.50 per gallon of olive oil under both the 1951 and the 1952 programs.

How stocks were acquired: The quantity of olive oil acquired largely may be attributable to two factors, (1) a domestic production of all olives substantially in excess of the requirements of the domestic canning industry, for pickling and canning olives, and (2) a low price for olive oil imported from the Mediterranean countries, as a result of their record 1951 crop production. During the latter part of the season the market price was depressed below the support price of $2.50 per gallon.

Outlook for disposal: Production of olive oil in Mediterranean countries in 1952 is estimated at only 43 percent of their previous years' production. If prices remain at or above present levels it is expected that remaining stocks now held by CCC representing a small part of total domestic requirements, will be disposed of without serious difficulty or substantial loss. Under such conditions it is considered unlikely that any large quantity of olive oil will be acquired by CCC under the 1952 support program.

BUTTER, CHEDDAR CHEESE, AND NONFAT DRY MILK SOLIDS

CCC stocks on March 31, 1953, include 122 million pounds of butter, 74 million pounds of American Cheddar cheese, and 169 million pounds of nonfat dry milk solids. A year ago CCC inventories of these commodities, included only 25 million pounds of nonfat dry milk solids.

The price support program for dairy products: The Agricultural Act of 1949 requires the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices of whole milk, butterfat, and their products at such level between 75 and 90 percent of parity as he determines necessary to assure an adequate supply. The act prescribes that such supports shall be carried out through loans on, or purchases of, the products of milk and butterfat.

Pursuant to this requirement, during the marketing year April 1952 through March 1953, prices were supported at $3.85 per hundred pounds of manufacturing milk of 3.95 percent butterfat (yearly average test) and 69.2 cents per pound of butterfat. These prices were equal to 90 percent of the parity equivalent price of manufacturing milk and to 90 percent of the parity price for butterfat, estimated as of the beginning of the marketing year. Support was carried out through offers to purchase carlot quantities of bulk dairy products produced in the United States at the following prices:

	Cents per pound
Butter:	
U. S. Grade A or higher	67.75
U. S. Grade B	65.75
Cheddar cheese, U. S. Grade A or higher, standard moisture basis	38.25
Nonfrt dry milk solids, Extra Grade:	
Spray process	17.00
Roller process	15.00

How stocks were acquired: Price-support purchases of dairy products during the 1951–52 marketing year were light, and CCC began the 1952 marketing year on April 1, 1952, with only 25 million pounds of nonfat dry milk solids, and no butter or cheese. The demand for milk and dairy products generally continued relatively strong during the 1952–53 marketing year. Consumption of butter continued the decline of the past several years, but this was offset by increases in the consumption of milk and other dairy products. This demand, coupled with lower production resulting from summer drought conditions, kept prices of dairy products firm during most of 1952. Up to late November CCC purchased no butter, 1.1 million pounds of Cheddar cheese, and 40.5 million pounds of nonfat dry milk solids under the support program. The cheese, purchased in late spring and early summer, was sold back into domestic markets by early fall.

In late 1952 and early 1953 the dairy situation changed quite drastically. Mild winter weather, coupled with improved roughage, a heavy rate of concentrate feeding, and increased cow numbers, resulted in a much smaller than usual seasonal decline in milk production. On an annual rate basis, milk output increased from a level of 110 to 115 billion pounds in the July-September quarter of 1952 to more than 122 billion pounds in the January-March quarter of 1953.

Despite the relatively strong demand for milk and dairy products, the sharp increase in supplies in late 1952 depressed dairy prices to support-purchase levels. CCC made the first purchase of butter under the 1952–53 support program on November 28, and this was followed by increasing purchases of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids during the next several months. CCC's total purchases, disposition, and stock position of dairy products during the 1952–53 marketing year are as follows:

CCC purchases, sales, and stock position

[In million pounds]

	Butter	Cheese	Nonfat dry milk solids
Stocks Apr. 1, 1952	0	0	25.1
Support program purchases	143.4	75.3	212.1
Sales:			
Domestic trade	0	1.1	10.0
U. S. Army	0	0	5.0
Negotiated exports	0	0	42.4
Sec. 32	20.9	0	10.5
Total sales	20.9	1.1	67.9
Stocks Mar. 31, 1953	122.5	74.2	169.3

With milk production 7 to 8 percent higher than a year earlier, and consumer demand relatively stable, the increased milk beginning in late 1952 was channeled into those products which were being purchased under the support program. Production of butter and cheese increased to a level one-third higher, and nonfat dry-milk solids two-thirds higher, than a year earlier. The resulting large quantities of these products purchased under the price-support program represented the surplus of the entire dairy industry. Total support purchases for the 1952–53 marketing year were the equivalent of about 3 percent of milk production for the year.

Production of milk and dairy products during the remainder of 1953 is expected to continue above a year earlier, although somewhat below recent levels. Milk production for the calendar year 1953 may approximate 118 billion pounds, compared with 115.1 billion pounds in the calendar year 1952. With this level of production, it is expected that support purchases of dairy products will continue at least through the spring and early summer months of seasonally heavy production.

During the past year import controls have been imposed on a number of dairy products under authority of section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950. These controls have been tightened during recent months as the dairy situation deteriorated and price-support purchases increased. It appears that controls must be continued long as CCC has in inventory, and is

continuing to acquire, large supplies of commodities under a price-support program.

A continuation of the support program for milk and butterfat at 90 percent of their parity prices for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1953, recently was announced, with the understanding and expectation that the dairy industry would immediately consider and develop a more satisfactory solution to the dairy problem. More than 75 representatives of all segments of the dairy industry recently met with us to begin work on this program. If the dairy industry would join in a united effort to increase consumption of milk and dairy products, it is believed that CCC's holdings could be reduced to more manageable proportions during the coming year. We are working with the dairy industry in the hope that this can be achieved.

TABLE 1.—*Cottonseed price support programs for 1951 and 1952: Commodity Credit Corporation acquisitions of cottonseed products compared with sales and stocks as of Mar. 31, 1953*

Commodity	Unit	Total deliveries under 1951 program (1)	Deliveries and purchase commitments under 1952 program [1] (2)	Total deliveries and purchase commitments under 1951 and 1952 programs (1)+(2) (3)	Sales through Mar. 31, 1953 [2] (4)	CCC stocks including purchase commitments as of Mar. 31, 1953 [1] (3)−(4) (5)
Cottonseed oil (crude basis)	Million pounds	136	875	1,011	18	993
Cottonseed meal	Tons	187,454	1,194,757	1,382,211	590,689	791,522
Linters	Bales, 600 pounds net weight.	134,690	837,800	972,190	116,715	855,475

[1] Notice of tender was required by Mar. 30, 1953. Actual delivery to CCC can be made through Sept. 15, 1953.
[2] Includes sales of both 1951 and 1952 crops, as applicable.

TABLE 2.—*Stocks of selected commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price-support program as of Mar. 31, 1953* [1]

Commodity	Unit	Stocks, including purchase commitments, as of Mar. 31, 1953 [2]
Cottonseed oil	Million pounds	[3] 993
Olive oil	1,000 gallons	331
Linseed oil	Million pounds	[4] 489
Cottonseed meal	1,000 tons	[3] 792
Linters	1,000 bales, 600 pounds, net weight.	[3] 855
Butter	Million pounds	122
American cheese	do	74
Nonfat dry milk solids	do	169

[1] Includes purchase commitments of cottonseed oil, cottonseed meal, and linters under the 1952 cottonseed products price support program, for which delivery to CCC can be made through Sept. 15, 1953. Notice of tender was required by Mar. 30, 1953.
[2] Includes 300 million pounds held for the account of the Secretary of Agriculture as stockpile pursuant to sec. 304 of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

NOTE.—Data are operating figures, and are not susceptible to comparison with inventories appearing in the official financial reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Edible fats and oils: Supply and disposition, 1951–52, and estimated, 1952–53

[In millions of pounds fat]

Marketing year beginning Oct. 1	Beginning stocks	Production	Imports	Total supply	Domestic disappearance	Exports	Total disappearance	Ending stocks	CCC stocks Mar. 31
1951:									
Butter (fat content)	91	1,133	(1)	1,223	1,133	1	1,134	89	0
Lard	57	2,951	6	3,014	2,183	688	2,871	143	0
Cottonseed oil	193	1,722		1,915	1,400	123	1,523	392	[2] 26.8
Soybean oil	171	[3] 2,608		2,779	2,151	[3] 434	2,585	194	0
Olive oil	20	4	39	63	57	(1)	57	6	0
All others	35	517		552	467	52	519	33	0
Total	567	8,934	45	9,546	7,381	1,398	8,689	857	
1952 (estimated):									
Butter (fat content)	89	1,260		1,349	1,148	1	1,149	200	[4] 122
Lard	143	2,625		2,768	2,113	575	2,688	80	0
Cottonseed oil	392	1,760		2,152	1,257	75	1,332	820	[4] 993
Soybean oil	194	[3] 2,900		3,094	2,524	[3] 445	2,969	125	0
Olive oil	6	5	50	61	56		56	5	2.5
All others	33	435		468	402	36	438	30	0
Total	857	8,985	50	9,892	7,500	1,132	8,632	1,260	

[1] Negligible.
[2] Includes oil equivalent of soybeans exported.
[3] Official inventory; total deliveries under the 1951 cottonseed products price support program were 136 million pounds, crude basis.
[4] Product weight.
[5] Includes purchase commitments under the 1952 cottonseed products price support program for which delivery to CCC can be made through Sept. 15, 1953. Notice of tender was requested by Mar. 30, 1953.

Oilseeds and meals: United States supply and disposition, 1951–52, and estimated, 1952–53

Commodity and date	Marketing year beginning—	Unit	Beginning stocks (1)	Production (2)	Imports (3)	Total supply (4)	Domestic disappearance (5)	Exports (6)	Total disappearance (7)	Ending stocks (8)	CCC stocks Mar. 31 (9)
1951:											
Cottonseed	Aug. 1	Thousand tons	66	6,286	0	6,352	6,204	11	6,215	137	0
Soybeans	Oct. 1	Million bushels	4.2	282.5	0	286.7	266.0	17.1	283.1	3.6	0.02
Meals:											
Cottonseed	Aug. 1	Thousand tons	72	2,543	147	2,762	2,673	44	2,717	43	[1] 187
Soybean	Oct. 1	do	36	5,702	24	5,762	5,668	42	5,710	52	0
Linseed	July 1	do	30	547	5	581	540	22	562	20	0
1952 (estimated):											
Cottonseed	Aug. 1	Thousand tons	137	6,108	0	6,245	6,137	8	6,145	100	0
Soybeans	Oct. 1	Million bushels	3.6	291.7	0	295.3	261.3	30	291.3	4.0	0
Meals:											
Cottonseed	Aug. 1	Thousand tons	45	2,550	175	2,770	2,630	25	2,655	115	[1] 787
Soybean	Oct. 1	do	52	5,750	40	5,842	5,780	40	5,770	72	0
Linseed	July 1	do	29	500	40	569	530	5	535	34	0

[1] Includes total deliveries under the 1951 cottonseed price support program. See table 1.
[2] Includes deliveries and purchase commitments under the 1952 cottonseed price support program. See table 1.

Cotton linters: United States supply and disposition, 1951–52, and estimated, 1952–53

[In thousands of running bales]

Marketing year beginning Aug. 1	Beginning stocks (1)	Production (2)	Imports (3)	Total supply (4)	Total disappearance (5)	Exports (6)	Total disappearance (7)	Ending stocks (8)
1951	264	1,752	114	2,130	1,424	233	1,657	473
1952 (estimated)	473	1,700	150	2,323	1,250	100	1,350	973

Flaxseed and linseed oil: United States supply and disposition, marketing year beginning July 1, 1951–52, and estimated, 1952–53

Commodity and year	Unit	Beginning stocks (1)	Production: Crop (2)	Production: Crush (3)	Imports (4)	Total supply (5)	Domestic disappearance (6)	Exports (7)	Total disappearance (8)	Ending stocks (9)	CCC stocks Mar. 31 [1] (10)
1951:											
Flaxseed	Million bushels	12.3	34.7			47.0	31.3	4.2	35.5	11.5	.17
Linseed oil	Million pounds	678.8		609.2		1,288.0	585.2	28.2	613.2	674.6	[1] 511.9
Total equivalents: [4]											
Flaxseed	Million bushels	46.0	34.7	30.2		[2] 80.7	[3] 30.2	5.6	35.8	44.9	25.6
Linseed oil	Million pounds	927.8	699.9	609.2		[2] 1,627.7	[3] 609.2	112.9	722.1	905.6	[1] 511.9
1952:											
Flaxseed	Million bushels	11.5	31.0			42.5	29.8	1.0	30.8	11.7	0
Linseed oil	Million pounds	674.6		540.0		1,214.6	575.0	10.0	585.0	629.6	[1] 488.6
Total equivalents: [4]											
Flaxseed	Million bushels	44.9	31.0	27.0		[2] 75.9	[3] 31.5	1.5	33.0	42.2	24.4
Linseed oil	Million pounds	905.6	620.0	540.0		[2] 1,525.6	[3] 630.0	30.0	660.0	865.6	[1] 488.6

[1] Includes 300 million pounds linseed oil held for the account of the Secretary of Agriculture as stockpile pursuant to sec. 304 of the Defense Production Act of 1950.
[2] Beginning stocks plus flaxseed crop.
[3] Disappearance as oil adjusted for seed and other disappearance.
[4] Based on oil outturn of 20.17 for 1951–52, and estimated 20.0 pounds for 1952–53, per bushel of seed.

Butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids: United States supply and disposition, 1951–52, and estimated, 1952–53

[In millions of pounds]

Marketing year beginning Apr. 1	Beginning stocks (1)	Production (2)	Imports (3)	Total supply (4)	Domestic disappearance (5)	Exports (6)	Total disappearance (7)	Ending stocks (8)	CCC stocks, Apr. 1 (9)
1951:									
Butter	33	1,440		1,473	1,459	7	1,466	7	0
American cheese	131	860	8	999	816	49	865	134	0
Nonfat dry milk solids	59	727	1	787	583	127	710	77	25
1952 (estimated):									
Butter	7	1,510		1,517	1,391	1	1,392	125	122
American cheese	134	915	9	1,058	870	3	873	185	74
Nonfat dry milk solids	77	912		989	697	52	749	240	169

THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the 1952 report of the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust has just been issued. One of the very fine things which has been done for our country was the establishment by Mr. A. W. Mellon, who was Secretary of the Treasury longer than any other man in the history of our Nation, of the National Gallery of Art. So I think it will be of particular interest to have printed in the body of the RECORD the portion of the report dealing with the National Gallery of Art. The chairman of the board administering the trust is Paul Mellon, the distinguished son of the late Secretary of the Treasury.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the portion of the report relating to the National Gallery of Art.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

One of the principal objects of the philanthropy of the donor and the first major project of the trust was the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D. C. Contributions to the National Gallery by the trust amounted to $72,518,532 through 1951.

An endowment fund of $5 million, given in 1942, was earmarked for the special needs of the gallery over and above those provided for by congressional appropriations. By 1952 the great increase in the size of the gallery collections and its facilities to house these collections made it apparent that additional endowment would be necessary to maintain the high standards and quality of the institution. As a result of discussions held with the gallery trustees and officers over several years, the trustees decided to provide the gallery with a larger endowment fund. This was accomplished during 1952 by the transfer of securities which at date of gift had a market value of $5,426,750.

At the time the building was dedicated on March 17, 1941, only about one-half of the space allotted to exhibition galleries was finished, and it was not anticipated that the remaining galleries would be required for many years. Other major art collections were contributed to the gallery in rapid succession, however, and $792,000 was provided by the trust in 1949 and 1950 in order to finish additional galleries to exhibit these new collections. Subsequently, officers of the gallery estimated that $1 million would be required to complete the remaining unfinished space in future years; accordingly, the trust made an additional grant of $1 million to the gallery during 1952 for the purpose of completing all remaining unfinished galleries and other areas.

The trust also contributed $103,600 to the Gallery for urgent miscellaneous purposes during the past year, which added to grants made in previous years for similar purposes, brings the total of such contributions to $772,700. These grants have been for emergency construction, paintings valued in 1947 at $71,100, the authentication and preservation of works of art, publications, and general purposes.

These grants of $6,530,350 during 1952 bring the total contributions from the trust to the National Gallery of Art since its establishment to $79,048,882. They are summarized as follows:

Works of art	$50,000,000
Building, galleries, landscaping	17,849,432
Endowment fund	10,426,750
Miscellaneous	772,700
Total	79,048,882

RESIGNATION OF PAUL M. HERZOG AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, by the resignation of the Honorable Paul M. Herzog as Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, our country has

lost a distinguished and outstanding public servant.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in connection with my remarks, two editorials, one appearing in the New York Times of Saturday, May 2, 1953, and the other appearing in the Washington Post of May 7, 1953, both relating to the resignation of Mr. Herzog.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 2, 1953]

PAUL HERZOG RESIGNS

Paul M. Herzog, whose resignation as Chairman and member of the National Labor Relations Board has been accepted by President Eisenhower, has always taken the position that the Board is the administrator and trustee of congressional policies, not the advocate of any particular labor policy of its own. As the "swing" man on the five-member board he has had marked success in the difficult task of maintaining a fair balance between differing points of view. His 20 years in public service, which have included 7 years on the New York State Labor Relations Board, and 8 years on the Federal Board, have been characterized by a high degree of competence and integrity. He deserves commendation for a task well done.

[From the Washington Post of May 7, 1953]

MR. HERZOG'S RESIGNATION

In the 8 years that he has served as Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Paul M. Herzog has been a frequent target of criticism but he has won and held widespread respect. Avoiding any tag as a conservative or a crusader, he has exhibited in high degree the attitude of a public servant dedicated to the public interest. He has well understood the quasi-judicial nature of his office, as indicated by his recent testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. "We appear here," he said, "in the capacity of Congress' trustees for the administration of the Labor Management Relations Act, ready to give a periodic accounting of the Board's trusteeship." His sense of obligation to carry out the policy enacted by Congress, instead of initiating policies of his own, has notably enhanced the standing of the NLRB.

Within the Board Mr. Herzog has been known especially for his attention to administrative details. His persistent drive, his personal industry and skillful management have been large factors in reducing the Board's backlog of cases and in bringing its operations to the highest point of efficiency reached in its 18 years of existence. These are real achivements. Between now and June 30, when Mr. Herzog's resignation becomes effective, we may reasonably assume that there will be much repetition of President Eisenhower's thanks to the NLRB Chairman for his "fine public service." Certainly Mr. Herzog has given the President a high mark to shoot at in selecting the new Chairman.

GIFTS FOR CITIZENS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, an unconscionable letter which I have just received, with the contents of which I wholly disagree, but which I think should be read and placed in the RECORD.

The letter reads as follows:

MAY 2, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I understand that in pursuit of efficiency, economy, integrity, private enterprise, and Americanism, and in a valiant effort to stem the Socialist tide in our country, the Congress is distributing the Federal assets to deserving citizens of the Republic; and I wish you would keep me in mind for my share of those assets. Specifically, I would like to get some oil—I believe my share is about 100 barrels (just have the oil shipped to me by freight or truck)—and a hydroelectric plant and a national park, or, if that is impractical, a national forest, with a reasonable amount of grazing land.

As to the national parks, I do not want a large national park, but only one of modest proportions. My preference would be for Yosemite, Crater Lake, or the Glacier Park. I would not care too much for a park as large as Yellowstone or Grand Canyon, because I doubt if my income would enable me to develop and maintain it, unless you could get me a fairly hydroelectric plant. I would not care too much for a cave park, for I like to be above ground as much as possible, for the benefit of the sunshine on my rheumatism.

If others should beat me to the national parks, I would not complain if I could get a nice national forest—Dixie National Forest in Utah, or the San Juan National Forest in Colorado, or the Kaibab Forest in Arizona—a forest with plenty of trees to cut, some deer and bears to kill, and a good fishing stream. In any case, I should have a few thousand acres of grazing lands near so I could keep a few cows and sheep and goats. Does the Government give away any cows and sheep and goats?

If the Congress decides to distribute Federal buildings, I wish you would try to get the White House for me. I would even to able and glad, if necessary, to pay the same proportion of value that the corporations pay when they buy Federal plants. I would really prefer the White House to the Capitol or the Pentagon, for my wants are simple, being just a farm boy trying to get ahead. My wife could rent out a few rooms for a modest revenue. I really need the White House very badly, but if you can't get it for me, please try to get me an embassy or a good post-office building. I would get by with that, but not very comfortably.

If only the basement remnants of Federal assets are given to Democrats, could you perhaps get me a harbor or a navigable river or a lighthouse, or perhaps a battle cruiser or an airplane carrier? An airplane carrier would be useful for summer vacations. I would not care for a big airplane because I couldn't drive it very well, and I suppose it would be needed in the war.

It is a delicate matter to mention, to a man of your well-known punctilliousness regarding senatorial proprieties, but I will of course be glad to pay—

Then there appear some statements regarding 5 percent and 10 percent which I think for the sake of decorum should not appear in the RECORD.

I read further from the letter:

Now, Senator DOUGLAS, I am really anxious to get a little chunk of Federal property, and am even more anxious to do my full part in stemming the tide of socialism in America. I hope you will be able to help me for the sake of the country and freedom and democracy and private ownership and initiative.

Very sincerely yours.

Mr. President, I am suppressing the name of the writer of the letter, but it is an authentic letter which I have received. I wish to make clear that I disagree with the sentiments expressed in it.

PROPOSED PEACE TERMS FOR KOREA

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum which I have prepared dealing with peace terms for Korea. It is a memorandum which I prepared for a high official in the administration, and I should like to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 7, 1953.

PEACE TERMS FOR KOREA

The following peace terms are suggested to be unilaterally offered the combatants in the present conflict in Korea:

1. Set up a neutral zone along the Yalu River covering also the Siberian frontier. This offers assurance that so long as neutrality is maintained there will be no military action against the Manchurian border. Conversely there can be none against Korea. This meets the only interest in the Korean conflict which the government of Communist China has admitted.

2. Set up a commission composed entirely of Asiatic nationals to inspect and administer neutrality in this zone. This does two things. First, it removes from consideration the idea that we are seeking military advantage in the Korean peninsula. Second, it puts a serious responsibility for the maintenance of peace on the Asiatics themselves.

3. Proceed with the political unification of North and South Korea. The political jurisdiction of the government should extend to the Yalu but military operations would be forbidden within the neutral zone.

4. Rebuild in usable form, though not elaborately, the housing, transportation, and industry of the united country. The two halves belong together—the industrial north cannot exist without other sources of food. The agricultural south needs manufactures from the outside. Together they will support each other in a standard of living that is high for Asiatic nations.

5. After political integration and economic reconstruction, carry out the original United Nations purpose of free elections throughout the entire peninsula to determine the form of government under which the Korean people desire to live.

Some of the advantages of this plan are mentioned in the above five points. In addition, it has the characteristic of being to the greatest possible advantage of the peoples concerned, whether they are soldiers in the two armies, civilians of North Korea, or civilians of South Korea. It would be difficult to change the terms except to the disadvantage of people.

The maximum advantage to people should be the cornerstone of a new diplomacy adapted to the world in which we live.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and that nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with new reports, be considered.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting

several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Carroll L. Meins, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.;

Albert Cole, of Massachusetts, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.; and

Catherine B. Cleary, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry new reports nominations in the Army.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the new reports nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, do these nominations include the first one on the list?

Mr. TAFT. The nominations to which I refer begin with that of Maj. Gen. John Francis O'Ryan—in other words, the new reports.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Army, beginning with the new reports, are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter Bruchhausen to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sherman F. Furey, Jr., to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John O. Henderson, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of A. Pratt Kesler to be United States attorney for the district of Utah.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George W. Beach to be United States marshal for the district of New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

NOMINATIONS LYING ON THE TABLE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has a group of executive nominations concerning which request has been made that they lie on the table and not be printed, because of the expense involved.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is not present, I prefer to let those nominations remain on the table. May they continue to lie on the table?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1739) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4465) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, in which it fequested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	McCarran
Anderson	Goldwater	McCarthy
Barrett	Gore	McClellan
Beall	Griswold	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Murray
Bridges	Hennings	Neely
Bush	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Hill	Payne
Byrd	Hoey	Potter
Carlson	Humphrey	Purtell
Case	Hunt	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Kerr	Sparkman
Douglas	Kilgore	Stennis
Duff	Knowland	Symington
Dworshak	Kuchel	Taft
Eastland	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Long	Tobey
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Welker
Frear	Mansfield	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Young

Mr. TAFT. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). A quorum is present.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the morning business is concluded, I should like to say that pursuant to the announcement which was made on yesterday, the next order of business will be Calendar No. 159, Senate Resolution 106, increasing the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 333, 82d Congress, for the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 106.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 106) increasing the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 333, 82d Congress, for the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of

the Senator from Kansas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 106.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the only suggestion I have to make is that which I stated on yesterday, that at the present time the subcommittee has on hand approximately $58,000, and that so far as I have been able to ascertain, there is no likelihood that any additional sum above and beyond that may be needed for at least some weeks. My understanding is that it is proposed to make a recount of the ballots in one county in New Mexico. If, as a result of the recount, it is decided to examine all the other ballots in the State, probably more than $50,000 would be required.

I should like to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee just what the situation is at the present time.

Mr. BARRETT. The purpose of the resolution is to provide additional funds to proceed with the investigation of the senatorial election in New Mexico. There has been a preliminary investigation, and about 2 weeks ago the subcommittee unanimously ordered a thorough investigation, including a recount of all the ballots in New Mexico. We are presently trying to carry out that order. We have no way of knowing precisely how much it will cost to carry on the work. We do know, however, that it cost $1,000 in March and $16,000 in April. When the work of recounting the ballots gets under way it will cost approximately $26,000 a month.

We find ourselves in this predicament: We have on hand at the present moment approximately $55,000, and we are going to run out of funds next month. We think the sum requested is a modest amount. The Senate has been very liberal in previous years in allotting funds for similar work. In 1947, $215,000 was provided; in 1948, $41,000; in 1951, $85,000; and in 1952, $175,000.

The work of canvassing the ballots in New Mexico is comparable to similar work in the contest which was conducted in Maryland some 5 or 6 years ago. In the Maryland case there were approximately 220,000 ballots, and there are about the same number in New Mexico.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. In a moment.

I may say that the Maryland recount took about 18 months.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the subcommittee has agreed unanimously upon making a request, through the Committee on Rules and Administration, for $100,000?

Mr. BARRETT. I do not think I said that. I was not in Washington at the time when the members of the subcommittee requested action by the Committee on Rules and Administration. Our original idea was to request $150,000, but, after discussing it with the leadership, the request was pared down to $100,000.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Is it not contemplated at this time to recount only the ballots in Bernalillo County with a view to determining from such a sample recount what the subcommittee may do as to the ballots in the rest of the State?

Mr. BARRETT. I would say to the Senator that I think he is mistaken. The committee has decided to make a recount of all the ballots in New Mexico.

It is true that the subcommittee has reserved, as I assume any committee with good judgment would reserve, the right to reconsider its action at some point along the line. But I know of no understanding by the committee that the recount shall be stopped after the ballots in Bernalillo County have been recounted. However, it might be that at some time, perhaps during the late fall of this year, after several counties in the State have been canvassed, the committee itself, in its wisdom, might reconsider the question of a full recount.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming, the chairman of the subcommittee, yield further?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Do I not recall correctly that it was determined by the subcommittee to take what would be in effect a sample recount, without binding the subcommittee to make a recount of all the ballots in the State, for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not some of the charges were well founded or ill founded, and for the further purpose of determining whether a full recount, so to speak, would in any sense tend to affect the result of the election or justify the Senate in declaring the election a nullity?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the Senator from Michigan, who is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. POTTER. I should like to reply to the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I believe he will recall that it was the consensus of the subcommittee that there would be a recount of the ballots cast in the State of New Mexico, and that the first county to be considered would be the large county of Bernalillo, in which the city of Albuquerque is located. I believe that about 25 percent of the total votes cast in the State of New Mexico are cast in that county. At the time of the decision, I think we were more or less informally agreed that we would take a look to see what we could ascertain in New Mexico. I do not believe there was any commitment that we would do one thing or another after looking into the situation in the one county. However, according to my understanding, the arrangement agreed to by the subcommittee was to have a recount of all the ballots in the State of New Mexico. If at any time during the course of the recount no justification for further action was found, then, in the wisdom of the committee, I am certain the recount would be called off. Is not that the understanding of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe there was what might be called a seeming meeting of the minds of the members of the subcommittee. However, I feel certain the subcommittee does not wish to seem to present the spectacle that some members did not understand others. I think I am substantially correct in expressing the understanding that if the results in Bernalillo County do not seem to justify proceeding further in the State, then, in conformity with what the able Senator from Michigan has just stated, there is a possibility that the so-called recount, or extension of what might be termed a preliminary investigation, will stop. Am I substantially wrong in so paraphrasing our understanding?

Mr. BARRETT. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that no one can foretell with any reasonable degree of certainty what the recount of ballots in Bernalillo County may disclose, but if the recount in that county should reveal that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has gained 5,000 or 10,000 votes, I assume everybody would agree, under those conditions, that the contest should be called off. That is about as nearly as I can come to predicting what the action of the subcommittee might be under those circumstances.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. It seems to me that we are making a mountain out of a mole hill. We are talking about what might happen if such and such a situation should develop. In a case of this kind, we have no way of knowing what will transpire.

Certain allegations have been made. On the basis of the findings of the subcommittee's workers in the field, and on the basis of our preliminary investigation, the subcommittee decided that a recount was warranted. Certainly at any time during the course of the investigation and recount the subcommittee could call off its activities, or, I assume, the subcommittee could broaden its work. I am sure that this subcommittee or any subcommittee entrusted with such responsibilities, would take action as determined by existing conditions.

If I may comment further, I understand the question in controversy is whether the committee needs the $100,000 requested in the pending resolution. I understand that approximately $55,000 is on hand. Of course, the subcommittee has no way of knowing what will happen, but it is conservatively estimated that the cost will be about $26,000 a month. We are paying the cost of subsistence of our workers in New Mexico. I should like to have our staff do their job and then go home, so that we shall not continue paying subsistence money. In the long run it would be cheaper to have the subcommittee staff ascertain the facts; then their work would be ended. But if we are to continue the investigation and are hampered by lack of sufficient funds from carrying on a full-scale investigation, which the committee has said it desires to make, then I believe the inquiry will cost more in the long run.

If the committee has $55,000, I assume that money will run out, at the present rate of expenditure, in the middle of next month. I have never heard

of a committee requesting funds for half an investigation. The committee requests funds for what it thinks it might need. Perhaps $100,000 will not be sufficient, but I hope it will be. We know that more than the $55,000 we now have on hand will be needed. I cannot understand the questioning of an appropriation at this time.

Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. SCHOEPPEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield first to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. In the interest of time, and in an attempt to clarify the situation, I should like to say, first, that certainly I, as a member of the subcommittee, and I believe I can speak for a substantial number of Senators on this side of the aisle, do not wish to hamper, impede, obstruct, or, as the able Senator from Michigan has suggested, in any wise delay or do anything whatever to frustrate any investigation or recount, if such it be, that the subcommittee is now engaged in undertaking and considering. The question that arises in my mind relates to the fact that there is now a fund of $55,000 in the control of the subcommittee. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has suggested that the recount may be terminated at any point, if it is found that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has gained as many as 5,000 votes. I do not know that we can fix on an arbitrary criterion as to that.

In any event, if it is shown that in Bernalillo County, upon the ballots being counted, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is making substantial gains, which would indicate a pattern or which would tend to show that the alleged frauds, improprieties, and failures of the election procedures affected adversely the vote for the Senator from New Mexico rather than the vote for General Hurley, it is entirely conceivable that the committee would order and direct that the recount stop before all the votes in Bernalillo County were tabulated. I think we all agree upon that.

Mr. BARRETT. No. I will say to my colleague that I am sure the majority of the committee do not agree.

Mr. HENNINGS. Apparently we are not agreed on that point. I pass on to another point.

As I recall, it was understood that the so-called recount was to be in the nature of an extension of the investigation of the subcommittee.

Mr. BARRETT. I will say to my colleague that I am sure he is mistaken on that point.

Mr. HENNINGS. I recall distinctly using the word "extension," because in the past few years our committee had the same problem to consider in the Michigan case, and we determined at that time to inaugurate an investigation, if possibly we could obtain the cooperation of the State authorities in conducting a simultaneous recount of the votes for the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] and the votes for former Senator Moody at the same time the election recount in the Williams-Alger contest which was then contemplated was underway.

If the chairman of the subcommittee will bear with me a moment, without undertaking to burden the Senate with what may be misinterpretation and honest misunderstanding among members of the subcommittee as to the extent, scope, and nature of this investigation, I am certainly willing to suggest, if it can be shown at this time that $100,000 is needed immediately, making a total of $155,000 for the purpose of a recount in one county of New Mexico where it seems to be conceded the recount might stop, that we all go along with the proposal. If we cannot agree, perhaps in 2 or 3 weeks, when we shall have determined just what we are going to do, we can proceed accordingly and request whatever sum of money seems meet and proper.

Mr. BARRETT. In reply to my colleague from Missouri let me say that the only way I can judge how long a time may be required to conduct a recount in one county alone is by referring to the O'Conor case in Maryland, a contest in which approximately the same number of votes were counted. It required 18 months to complete the count of the same number of ballots; namely, 220,000 ballots. So I assume that a count of one-fourth that number would require about 4 months.

We find ourselves in this predicament: We are just about to start a recount in New Mexico, and we have $55,000 available. It will not last beyond next month. We shall run out of money sometime in June. Even though the committee should decide to call off the recount after the recount in 1 county had been completed, we still would not have sufficient money for the recount in 1 county.

In fairness to my colleague from Missouri, I wish to say that it is very clear in my mind that there never was any understanding, agreement, or decision by the subcommittee to call off the investigation after the completion of the count in Bernalillo County.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I believe that the reference by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] to the continuing investigation was correct. The reason we used the wording calling for a continuing investigation rather than a statewide recount was that investigations were to continue with the recount, based upon findings of the preliminary investigation with respect to irregularities which existed or might exist, that would call for further investigations.

As my distinguished colleague recognizes only too well, service on this subcommittee is not the most pleasant position in the world. I speak as one member of the subcommittee, but I am sure we can say the same for our colleagues on the committee. Certain charges have been made. Allegations were made by one of the contestants. Preliminary investigations were conducted and the subcommittee found that some substance to the allegations did exist. Accordingly, the subcommittee has recommended that a full investigation be conducted.

The only concern we have as a subcommittee is to determine who won the election in New Mexico. We have been given a petition of alleged charges of violations of election laws, but the committee has not acted on that petition. We are interested only in ascertaining the facts and supporting these facts with concrete evidence.

I know we can do this without partisanship. I do not know where the chips may fall in the State of New Mexico as a result of the recount, but I believe it is a mistake for us to haggle at this time over whether we are to proceed with the investigation, or be forced to return 4 weeks from now and go through the same procedure.

After the ballot boxes are opened in New Mexico, political intrigue and political pressures are bound to arise.

Unless we have the necessary funds to complete this investigation, the objective recount which we hope to conduct may be impossible.

It seems foolhardy for us to quibble at this time as to whether the Senate will provide funds to conduct an investigation which the committee said we were to conduct. If the request for funds were made again 4 weeks from now, then we would be confronted with all the bitterness, political intrigue, and political pressures which are bound to develop.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is there any point in any particular Senator holding the floor? As I understand, this subject is open to debate and discussion. I do not object in the slightest to the Senator from Wyoming holding the floor, but I think he can claim it at another time and retain it as long as he desires.

Mr. BARRETT. I have not completed my statement. I should like the opportunity to complete it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have no objection. I was merely trying to ascertain whether there would be opportunities for other Senators to make statements.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] yielding while a quorum call is had? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Carlson	Dworshak
Anderson	Case	Eastland
Barrett	Chavez	Ellender
Beall	Clements	Ferguson
Bennett	Cooper	Flanders
Bricker	Cordon	Frear
Bridges	Daniel	Fulbright
Bush	Dirksen	George
Butler, Md.	Douglas	Gillette
Byrd	Duff	Goldwater

Gore	Langer	Robertson
Hayden	Long	Russell
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Hennings	Malone	Smith, Maine
Hickenlooper	Mansfield	Smith, N. J.
Hill	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Hoey	Maybank	Sparkman
Humphrey	McCarran	Stennis
Hunt	McCarthy	Symington
Jackson	McClellan	Taft
Johnson, Colo.	Millikin	Thye
Johnston, S. C.	Mundt	Tobey
Kefauver	Murray	Watkins
Kennedy	Neely	Welker
Kerr	Pastore	Wiley
Kilgore	Payne	Williams
Knowland	Potter	Young
Kuchel	Purtell	

Mr. TAFT. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, as I said earlier, it seems to me it is only common sense that the committee be provided with funds with which to carry on the work that will need to be done to complete the recount in New Mexico. It is not easy to foresee all the expense the committee might encounter; but as nearly as we can tell, if we can make arrangements with the counsel for the contestant and with the counsel for the contestee, to pay them a reasonable sum for their services for their clients, not to exceed $1,000 a month for each side, or at the most an amount equal to the salary of Members of this body, then we think we can conduct the recount at a cost of approximately $28,000 a month. If it is necessary for us to employ other persons for the purpose of tallying the votes and acting as judges for each side, as it will be, then the committee will find that its funds have been exhausted some time during the month of June.

If the Senate agrees with the committee that the grounds for investigation are sound and that the charges made require a thorough study, investigation, and recount of ballots, then the committee should be provided with adequate funds, so it can pursue its work in an orderly manner.

So I hope the resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. There seems to be a mistake in the comparison the Senator from Wyoming has made between the situation in New Mexico and the situation which formerly existed in the State of Maryland. I refer in particular to the statement the Senator from Wyoming made to the effect that it took 18 months to complete the total count of 220,000 ballots in Maryland, whereas only one-fifth or one-sixth that number of ballots—those in one county—are involved in the present case in New Mexico.

Mr. BARRETT. What I said was that the number of paper ballots in the State of Maryland was approximately the same as the number of paper ballots in the State of New Mexico.

Mr. HAYDEN. However, it is true that every individual ballot in Maryland was examined, first in the field; and then the disputed ballots were brought to Washington.

Will that be the proceeding in this case?

Mr. BARRETT. Approximately so, I may say to my distinguished colleague from Arizona, although, instead of bringing the disputed ballots to Washington, it is probable that the committee will go to New Mexico and will hold hearings there. That has not been decided, however.

Mr. HAYDEN. My recollection is that it costs about $50 a box to reexamine the ballots.

Mr. BARRETT. I do not know the cost per box; but the committee will also have the expense of paying a reasonable fee to the attorneys for each of the parties, and the expense of paying for the help the parties will need, which has been customary in cases of this sort; and it will cost nearly $30,000 a month.

Mr. HAYDEN. The counting should be finished with the amount of money now available to the committee, I believe. I note that the committee estimates the cost of the counting at approximately $25,000 or $28,000.

Mr. BARRETT. I have no reason to believe that we can complete the recount in Bernalillo County until some time in September or October. In making that estimate I am taking as a guide the record in the case of the committee investigation of the election in Maryland. There is no actual way to tell for certain.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming must be mistaken in his estimate as to the length of time—from May to October to make the count in only one county.

Mr. BARRETT. There are approximately 55,000 ballots to be counted in Bernalillo County, whereas in Maryland 18 months were required to count all the paper ballots, numbering 220,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are 50,000 ballots in this one county, I understand.

Mr. BARRETT. There are 55,000 ballots in this one county.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is one-fifth the number of ballots that were counted in Maryland.

Mr. BARRETT. Approximately one-fourth.

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, whatever the proportion may be. Of course, in the field the ballots are examined. If an individual ballot is a clean ballot, and if it is evident that nothing is the matter with it, it is accepted one way or the other; but the disputed ballots are brought to Washington, or are examined by the committee itself in the field.

It seems to me the committee has ample funds with which to carry on for a time, until it determines what it is going to do in Bernalillo County.

Mr. BARRETT. The committee would not have funds sufficient really to carry on the work in that one county; I am sure of that.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. In the Maryland contest about 230,000 paper ballots were inspected. In New Mexico there are about 220,000 to be examined. In Maryland approximately 60 percent of the ballots came from voting machines. It required less than a week to count the ballots from the voting machines. So, if we use that as a criterion, I believe we shall be able to speed up our procedure so that we may progress much faster than was possible in Maryland.

But I cannot for the life of me understand the contention of the opposition. The result of the defeat of the resolution would not be to save money. All unexpendable funds of course would be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate. The one thing about which I am most concerned is that, if the additional appropriation is not made, then 4 weeks from now, after the ballot boxes shall have been opened, it will be necessary for the committee to come to the Senate to request additional funds. In that event, and I repeat emphatically, all possible political pressure from the State of New Mexico will be brought to bear on the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, if Senators desire to back up the committee in its unanimous recommendation for a full investigation, the Senate will supply the funds. Senators who do not want to back up the committee, will, of course, be expected to vote against so doing.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. GILLETTE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as every Member of the Senate knows, an investigation of the senatorial contest in New Mexico has been authorized, and the contest was referred to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, which has selected a staff, the staff has gone into the field, and already approximately $40,000 has been spent out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

It has been disclosed that the subcommittee has estimated its workload, it has laid out a policy, and it is prepared to go to work. Because of that situation, there is before the Senate a resolution requesting an increase of $100,000 in the authorization of funds for the investigation. I am advised that, as of this time, there is, roughly, $54,000 or $55,000 in the fund, and the subcommittee will be without funds probably about the end of June.

Mr. President, on many accounts it would be singular, indeed, if the Senate failed to authorize the appropriation requested. Certainly it cannot be said that the $40,000 has been lost. The investigation began in complete good faith. It is a bona fide investigation. It would be a strange and singular reflection upon the Senate of the United States if it should fail to proceed with it.

The point is now made that the subcommittee may request additional funds at some later time. Who shall say what will develop in the course of an investigation of this kind? Leads and suggestions of all kinds develop in the course of an investigation, which could in the instant case conceivably take the subcommittee and its staff into every section of the State of New Mexico, into every county, for that matter.

Suppose the subcommittee were to run out of money in the middle of the investigation. What a fantastic situation that would be, with a staff of perhaps 30 people in New Mexico, waiting upon the caprice and whim of the Senate to vote more money before the subcommittee could continue its oper-

ations. It seems to me such an eventuality would make the Senate a laughing stock among those who have a very primary interest in the matter, namely, the electorate in the great commonwealth of New Mexico. Under circumstances of this kind we cannot send a subcommittee abroad inadequately supplied with money, so that it may run out of money in the middle of its proceedings. What an amazing picture that would present.

But, Mr. President, there is even a larger consideration involved. What will the people in New Mexico say if the Senate fails to vote this money? They will say, "Evidently the Senate is not interested. Evidently, after having initiated the investigation, they will run out their string, so far as available money is concerned, and that will be the end of it."

How are we to expect to get a circumspect and honest investigation under such circumstances? People who may have to be brought before the bar of public opinion would say, "Well, we will be reasonably secure if the money runs out; so let us just sit idly by, wait, twiddle our thumbs, not disclose anything unless it must be disclosed, and the investigation will fall of its own weight."

Why haggle about this matter? If there is any money left over, it will be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate. The funds can be expended for no other purpose than the one specified. We would put the Senate in a sorry light, indeed, in the eyes of the people of the country, and particularly of the voters of New Mexico, if, after the expenditure of $40,000 for the investigation, we became so niggardly at this good hour, as to say, "Well, let the investigators come back."

Mr. President, let me admonish Senators and remind them that a resolution authorizing the appropriation of funds is not a privileged matter under the Senate rules. We shall be deluged with work in the Senate within the next 30, 40, or 50 days because of the consumption of nearly 35 days in the consideration of a legislative proposal which was just concluded on the Senate floor. Let the committee come to the Senate with a resolution and see what difficulty would be met in obtaining action on it. On the call of the Consent Calendar, consideration of such a resolution could be stopped by a single objection from the floor of the Senate. That having been done, it would become necessary to make it the order of business by motion, and it would have to be squeezed into a very heavy schedule.

That would be a fine kettle of fish in which to leave a committee that has been duly authorized, and solemnly authorized, under the rules of the Senate, to go about the business of investigating the purity of an election, to determine who, validly, is entitled to the seat in question. I think the people would look with baleful eyes upon this body if we failed to vote adequate funds for the conduct of the investigation.

There will be no waste of the funds. If in the middle of the investigation it should be decided not to proceed further, all of the money not expended would be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate. I earnestly hope that the Senate will not put itself in so pitiful a light in the contemplation of the people of the country, and I hope earnestly it will not be done through votes on this side. Certainly the investigative committee is simply trying to find the facts. That is the duty of the subcommittee; that is its responsibility.

Mr. President, in view of the petitions which have been regularly filed, there is involved here today a question as to who was elected to the Senate in the State of New Mexico. There are allegations in the petitions which raise the question of the purity of that contest. The Senate would not dare deny the necessary funds.

Let us not compel a committee to come back to the Senate in the middle of its activities, or to toast its toes in Albuquerque or Santa Fe until we in our wisdom, and in good time, if we please, decide to vote the money with which to continue the operations of the committee. That would be a sorry spectacle indeed.

So, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that no Senator, on either side of the aisle, will be willing to help gain for this body a critical attitude of mind on the part of the people of the county, so that we will be put in a bad light. I submit that the authority requested in the resolution ought to be voted unanimously, and without undue delay.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on the basis of the colloquy which took place between the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BARRETT] and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] there does not seem to be any unanimity as to what was done by the subcommittee. There appears to be a question as to whether a decision was reached to count all the ballots throughout New Mexico, or whether it was decided to count the ballots in only one county. Because of that fact, and because of other considerations which I shall subsequently point out, I shall move to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Since the investigation in Maryland has been mentioned on two or three occasions, I wish to refer briefly to that investigation. It was my privilege during the 79th Congress, to be chairman of a special committee that dealt with the investigations in Maryland, Mississippi, and other States.

For the entire 2 years our committee spent $34,000 in conducting hearings in Mississippi, in Montana, and in making a recount of more than 50 percent of the votes in the State of Maryland. At the time the Maryland recount was requested, I, as chairman of the committee, took the position that it would be money wasted to spend the funds necessary to recount all the ballots in that State. Mr. Markey, who was defeated, came before the subcommittee with a petition almost identical to the one filed by General Hurley in the present contest. It was a shotgun petition—one which does not allege anything specific, but merely states in broad and general terms that everything was done wrong. If there was fraud in New Mexico, let me suggest that the present governor was elected in the same election. He is a Republican. The votes cast in New Mexico helped to elect General Eisenhower. If there was fraud in one, there must have been fraud in all contests, since the ballots were cast at the same time.

Mr. President, it strikes me that if the committee wants to consider the petition which was filed it should require General Hurley to be more specific in his allegations as to what fraud was committed, and matters of that kind, otherwise he would be in the same position as he was in 1946 when he appeared before our committee.

It will be recalled that General Hurley was the opponent of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] in 1946 also, and he filed with our committee a petition alleging everything generally but nothing specifically as an aftermath of that contest, too.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment.

The committee asked him to be specific, to file a petition showing what fraud, if any, occurred, but up to this moment the general has never done so. The committee took no further part in the contest.

In respect to the State of Maryland, Mr. President, the subcommittee in 1947 suggested to General Markey that he present to the committee the results in five counties in which he felt there would be a great change in the number of votes—a sufficient change—which would, if upheld, have elected him to the Senate instead of Senator O'Conor. He agreed to that. In the meantime, the 80th Congress, which was a Republican Congress, came into being, and the subcommittee which I headed had to surrender our authority to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which was then organized under the chairmanship of the then Senator Brooks, of Illinois.

Our committee took the position that the expenditure of the money anticipated in connection with the Maryland election investigation would be a waste of funds. The committee reported that after recounting more than half of the votes cast in that State, there was a difference of only approximately 400 votes. Our statement did not satisfy the new subcommittee, which proceeded to count all the paper ballots in the State of Maryland at a tremendous cost. That recount cost in excess of a quarter of a million dollars.

What was the result, Mr. President? After all the ballots were counted, there was a difference of 608 votes, and, in due course, Senator O'Conor was declared to have been elected a Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, the 80th Congress in its useless investigation in a West Virginia case, cost the taxpayers $150,350.93.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. POTTER. Does the Senator know that the action of the subcommittee was not based upon the petition of General Hurley, but upon the findings of a preliminary investigation?

Mr. ELLENDER. But the committee had to have a petition before the investigation started.

Mr. POTTER. I might advise the Senator that it has been the practice of the subcommittee to make preliminary investigations. I well know——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yielded for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. POTTER. I understood that the Senator asked me a question. I do not want to labor the point, but if the Senator will allow me——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yielded for a question.

Mr. POTTER. Does the Senator not know that it has been the practice of the subcommittee to conduct a preliminary investigation? In my own State the Federal Government last year employed men to make a preliminary investigation. It is not an uncommon practice. That is what happened in this case. After a preliminary investigation, the subcommittee unanimously agreed to go ahead with a full investigation. So it is not wholly on the basis of the petition of General Hurley.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the committee did not conduct the investigation on its own motion. It was based on charges which were made by General Hurley. General Hurley has made such charges in every election in New Mexico in which he participated. He started in 1946 against my distinguished friend the senior Senator from New Mexico, and the senior Senator from New Mexico won by 4,000 votes.

In 1948 the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] faced Mr. Hurley. What did Mr. Hurley do then? Although the junior Senator from New Mexico defeated Hurley by 28,000 votes, Hurley made substantially the same charges and asked for a recount.

Mr. ANDERSON. I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not think he made charges.

Mr. ELLENDER. I stand corrected; he made complaints which were investigated by staff members of the Subcommittee on Rules.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. The question involved is not the relative merits of either General Hurley or the senior Senator from New Mexico. The committee has already acted on the question as to whether there will be an investigation. This resolution pertains to a fund with which to carry out the wishes of the Senate. I am not concerned, and I do not believe the Senate should be concerned, about the charges made by General Hurley. The Senate is acting on an investigation being made by one of its own committees, and on the findings made by that committee. The subcommittee decided unanimously to conduct a full investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. There seems to be a difference of opinion as to the unanimous action on the part of the subcommittee.

Mr. POTTER. There is no difference of opinion. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], who is presently in the Chamber, could testify to that.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I think the misunderstanding arose over whether the subcommittee had requested, through the Rules and Administration Committee, any given sum of money at this time for the purpose of continuing the investigation. The Senator from Michigan is correct in stating that there was no difference of opinion as to the propriety and desirability of an investigation in the State of New Mexico.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BARRETT. Does the distinguished Senator from Louisiana know that our subcommittee, after preliminary investigation, unanimously made this finding and report:

> The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections has carefully considered the report made by its staff as a result of the preliminary investigation, and the committee finds that there is ample evidence to warrant a continuation of the investigation of the senatorial election contest in New Mexico, including a recount of the ballots. It has been impelled to this conclusion because the findings of the staff indicate that—
>
> (a) Failure to supply voting booths in many precincts.
>
> (b) Inadequate registration procedures.
>
> (c) Failure of election officials to observe laws relating to election procedures.
>
> (d) Evidence of unqualified persons voting.
>
> (e) Discrepancies in totalling votes.
>
> (f) Evidence of illegal practices by election officials and others.
>
> (g) Premature burning of ballots.
>
> (h) Coercion and intimidation of certain voters.
>
> The committee feels that in the final analysis the opening of the boxes and examination of the ballots is the only method available to determine the result of this election.

Therefore, I submit to the Senator from Louisiana that the subcommittee itself decided to make a complete recount of all the ballots in New Mexico.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was being guided by the colloquy which took place between the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. I feel certain that many other Senators who heard the colloquy likewise would conclude that there seemed to have been a little difference of opinion as to what was contemplated.

Mr. BARRETT. No; I do not think there was any difference of opinion in the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am speaking about what has occurred on the Senate floor. That is where I got my impression that there was a difference of opinion.

Mr. BARRETT. I thought I made it perfectly clear that the subcommittee reserved the right to reconsider its determination at a future date. There was nothing said about stopping at any time after a recount had been made in 1 county, or in 2, 3, 4, or 5 counties, or all of them, for that matter.

While I am on my feet, I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana would be kind enough to yield to me for one more observation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], before he was a Member of the Senate, initiated a contest against the late Senator Cutting, who was at that time a Member of this body. After omitting the preliminaries of his petition, I read as follows:

> And I request and petition for a recount and recanvass of the ballots cast and the returns made at the general election held throughout the State of New Mexico on the 6th day of November 1934, and an investigation of the wrongful and unlawful practices and conduct of said Bronson M. Cutting, and his agents and representatives, and by various and sundry persons, associations, corporations, and organizations and election officials in his behalf and with respect to the general election and campaign preceding the same, and the matters incident thereto, and also instances of undue influence, deception, and intimidation of voters, and the unlawful use of money in and about said campaign and election and of fraudulent, wrongful, and unlawful conduct of various and sundry persons who were election judges, clerks, and counting judges, challengers, and party workers in and about said general election.

I submit it is only fair to say that the State of New Mexico has been pressing on this floor for a long period of time the matter of charges and countercharges, so it seems to me it is high time for the Senate to proceed to make an investigation and determine just what the facts are.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it was not my purpose to participate in this discussion whatsoever. However, inasmuch as the junior Senator from Wyoming has seen fit to discuss the petition which was filed on my behalf, I may say to the junior Senator from Wyoming that, contrary to what is being done now by the subcommittee of which he is chairman, in every instance where an allegation was made in the petition a bill of particulars was furnished, indicating names, precincts, counties, and what it was alleged took place.

I ask the Senator from Wyoming if it is not a fact that the attorneys who now represent me have filed a petition with the honorable chairman of the subcommittee, asking for a bill of particulars indicating where there was fraud, who voted wrongfully, who voted who was not entitled to vote, in what precincts, what counties, and in what part of the State? And is it not a fact that up to this moment no opportunity has been given to my attorneys to discuss the matter with the subcommittee which the distinguished Senator heads?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I decline to yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, since the Senator from New Mexico has made a charge, I think the Senator from Louisiana should yield to me for the purpose of making answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wyoming for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Wyoming to answer the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from New Mexico is entirely mistaken about the matter. One of the Senator's attorneys, Mr. Grantham, was in Washington during the last few days, and he came to see me. I asked him then if he desired to appear before the subcommittee and argue the point he had in mind. He said he did not. That is all I know about the matter. I explained the situation to him, saying that I would be glad to call the subcommittee together and give him an opportunity to argue the matter. I said that if the subcommittee then decided to consider the motions made by the Senator's chief counsel, former Governor Hannett, and by the Senator, that would be perfectly agreeable to me. After discussing the matter, Mr. Grantham said he did not wish to have me go to the trouble of calling the subcommittee together.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator will yield for the purpose of my undertaking to make a clarification, I believe it may enable the Senator to understand that the committee does not feel this is the proper time or place to try the contest in New Mexico. I do not say this by way of criticism of the Senator from Louisiana. I mean that the subcommittee is charged, as we all know, with a quasi-judicial function. Heretofore in our deliberations we have been getting along well. We have tried to act without partisanship. We have undertaken to be objective.

I think my distinguished friend from Louisiana misunderstood what I had to say with respect to the funds required. That is really the issue before us. I did not understand that the subcommittee had ever requested, through the Committee on Rules and Administration, any sum whatsoever. It was also my understanding that we were to recount some of the ballots in one county to determine the trend or pattern. Whether the other members of the committee understood it to be a statewide recount or not would seem to beg the question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I correct in my assumption that the committee vote was not unanimous?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is entirely correct so far as funds are concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before I was interrupted I was giving a little background information with reference to the Maryland election. One of the primary reasons why the committee considered going into the Maryland election contest by way of a recount was that there was no provision in the Maryland law under which a defeated candidate could have obtained a recount. The subcommittee which succeeded the subcommittee which I headed agreed to proceed in the manner that we had first indicated, that is, to count paper ballots in 5 counties instead of 17 in the State of Maryland.

Lo and behold, when that decision was reached, what did Mr. Markey do? Was he agreeable to the recount in five counties? Oh, no. He insisted that the entire 17 counties be counted. That is why this enormous sum was uselessly spent in the State of Maryland.

As I indicated a while ago, after all the ballots were counted, there was a difference of a little more than 600 ballots. That recount in Maryland and the investigation made in West Virginia cost the taxpayers in excess of $350,000.

What is the situation in New Mexico? There is a provision in the New Mexico law which gives the defeated candidate the right to have all the ballots counted again within a prescribed period. Pursuant to that law, Mr. Hurley, the defeated candidate, went to court and asked for a recount. He asked for a recount of the boxes in which he felt he should have received more votes. He made his own selection. He put up the $50 per division required by the canvassing board, so as to have a recount of 222 boxes in New Mexico. What happened? The ballots in those 222 boxes were counted again. It was accomplished under the New Mexico law. Here is the final result, Mr. President. I read from a telegram I received from the Governor of New Mexico, a member of the canvassing board, and who, by the way, is a Republican. He said:

APRIL 28, 1953.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Re your telegram 25th instant. State canvassing board recounted approximately 222 boxes throughout the State on Hurley's application. Original count for CHAVEZ 49,684 and for Hurley 28,809. Recount shows CHAVEZ 49,799 and for Hurley 28,545. CHAVEZ gained on recount 115 and Hurley lost 264. Net gain for CHAVEZ on recount 379 votes.

STATE CANVASSING BOARD,
EDWIN L. MECHEM, *Chairman.*
EUGENE D. LUJAN, *Member.*
BEATRICE B. ROACH, *Member.*

Here we had a recount by the New Mexico Canvassing Board of a third of the votes cast in that State. This recount was made at the request of Mr. Hurley, a right which was his under the law, and he lost more than 300 votes in the recount.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. He had the opportunity, under New Mexico law, to have a recount of all the boxes in that State. Did he request it? No. He requested a recount of only 222 boxes in connection with which he thought there was fraud, or in which he thought he would show a gain. But he was very much disappointed, in that the recount shows a net loss of over 300 votes.

What is Mr. Hurley trying to do now? He is trying to get the United States Senate into the fight in New Mexico. He is trying to get the taxpayers of the United States to spend half a million dollars to recount all the ballots cast in New Mexico. That will be the amount of the expenditure if we provide as much as my distinguished friend from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] says will be necessary. If the cost is to be $28,000 a month, and if 18 months are required to complete the count, the total cost will be half a million dollars. That is what would be required. The result would, I am convinced, be similar to the result in the State of Maryland.

Why do we not depend on the laws of the State of New Mexico in this case? The contestant had his right to go to court, which he did, to obtain the recount. Why should he today impose on the taxpayers of the United States by asking to have all these ballots recounted?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to yield now.

Mr. President, I am pleading with Senators to send this resolution back to the committee, and let the committee further look into the subject. I say let the committee study the petition which has been filed by Mr. Hurley in this case. If the petition, a copy of which I have before me, is the one upon which the committee is depending, I invite attention to the fact that there is not a single allegation in the petition as to any connection with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. There is only a blanket charge of fraud.

The petition does not even name the precincts in which there was alleged fraud, if any there was. The petition does not name anyone. It strikes me that before the Senate is called upon to put more money into this venture, the committee is dutybound to go into the subject further, in an effort to give the opposition an opportunity to obtain a bill of particulars. That is the process which should be followed before any more money is spent.

During the 81st and 82d Congresses, when the Democrats were in power, the Senate authorized election investigations which cost some $260,000. The entire amount of money was authorized for investigations, during that 4-year period, in Ohio, New York, Nevada, Idaho, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Florida, Maryland, Maine, Michigan, and the McCarthy-Benton contest. The entire amount spent was $154,014.67. That is for 2 full sessions of Congress, or 4 years.

As I stated a short time ago, during the 80th Congress, when the Republicans were in power—for the 2 years that they were in power—there was spent $350,153.93.

Now we are confronted with a case in which the Republicans claim they require an expenditure of not $100,000, but probably a half million dollars. Before we get started on any such program it it strikes me that the subcommittee is duty-bound to proceed and hear these pleadings, in order to decide whether or not the attorneys for the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are entitled to a bill of particulars.

The whole matter could perhaps be cleared up in the same way that a similar matter was cleared up in 1946, when a subcommittee, of which I was chairman, requested and demanded a bill of particulars from Mr. Hurley. When he failed to furnish it to the subcommittee, we refused to take action.

Mr. BARRETT and Mr. POTTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not care to yield at the moment. All I am asking, before we go into a venture which may cost the taxpayers of this country as much as $500,000, is to have the subcommittee look further into the matter, and cause Mr. Hurley to file a bill of particulars. I do not believe that a series of blanket charges justifies the expenditure of a half-million dollars in tax revenues. Blanket charges are the only thing Mr. Hurley has laid before the committee. I remind the Senate of the fact that similar situations arose in every election in which Mr. Hurley was engaged. First it was his election contest against the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], wherein there was a difference of 4,000 votes. Then an investigation was initiated after Mr. Hurley's election contest with the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Now here he is again requesting a recount.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has been in Congress since 1930. He is not a newcomer. I believe the Senate and the subcommittee owe it to him to look further into the matter and to provide his attorney with at least the opportunity of obtaining a bill of particulars, so the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] may know how to answer Mr. Hurley. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan for a question.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I am sure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana does not mean to imply——

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Michigan wish to ask me a question?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. POTTER. I am sure the Senator from Michigan does not mean to imply that the subcommittee's action up to now has been based upon the petition filed by General Hurley. Certainly we are not going to make public in an open session of the Senate 145 pages covering preliminary investigations which have been reported to us by the staff, naming precincts and listing names. It is on the basis of this investigation that the subcommittee recommended a full investigation—not upon anything else.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator from Michigan believe that, before any hearings are held or any further steps are taken, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] ought to be apprised of that fact, and that he ought to be told in advance where the hearings are to be held, so he may prepare his defense? It seems to me the subcommittee is trying to do it all in secret.

Mr. POTTER. I am sure the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not at this time.

Mr. POTTER. This is a legislative inquiry.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator can speak on his own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana declines to yield.

Mr. GILLETTE rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I shall request recognition on my own time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the new administration has a chance today to save probably a half million dollars, if only the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration will look into this matter further before insisting on an immediate canvass of the votes, by finding out, for example, what the attitude of the Republican leadership in New Mexico is with respect to the matter. It may have a bearing on the subject. I understand the leadership is not with General Hurley.

If an effort is made toward a further study, I am satisfied we can probably save a half million dollars. That is all I am asking, Mr. President.

Therefore I renew my motion that the resolution now pending be recommitted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Louisiana is not in order. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 106. The Senator's motion is not in order until the pending motion has been disposed of.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of expressing my interest in and support of the motion to recommit if and when it is made by the Senator from Louisiana.

I wish to address myself very briefly to that subject. The Senator from Louisiana referred to the fact that it was his privilege to act as chairman of a similar subcommittee at one time. That is correct. He served very efficiently, I may say.

It was not my privilege but, rather my very dubious responsibility, to serve as chairman of a similar subcommittee for approximately 6 years. I believe I am in a position to know something about the responsibilities of such a subcommittee.

I do not wish to suggest, Mr. President, that the members of the subcommittee have acted in any improper way whatever. I know what their job is. I know how earnestly and sincerely the members of the subcommittee have undertaken the job.

However, the Senate must act on what is before it, not what the members of the subcommittee hope to do. There is before the Senate at the present time Senate Resolution 106. It is not accompanied by any report from the Committee on Rules and Administration. Of course, there is no requirement that a standing committee shall file a report with the Senate on a resolution under the circumstances. Of course, that is not necessary.

But the fact remains that all the Senate has before it now is Senate Resolution 106, without any report or explanation of any kind.

Let me read the resolution:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized under Senate Resolution 333, 82d Congress, 2d session, agreed to June 12, 1952 (authorizing the expenditure of funds and the employment of assistants by the Committee on Rules and Administration—

Not the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, but the Committee on Rules and Administration—

or any authorized subcommittee thereof, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (o) (1) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate), is hereby increased by $100,000.

Mr. President, in the resolution there is not one word of suggestion that that sum of money or one nickel of it is to be used in connection with the recount of ballots in the State of New Mexico in connection with the complaint which has been filed with the Committee on Rules and Administration.

If the Senate agrees to the resolution today, every dollar of the $100,000 could be used by the Committee on Rules and Administration, or by any subcommittee thereof, in connection with the duties imposed upon that committee by the Standing Rules of the Senate, from which I read:

(D) Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession.

That entire area is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration. That committee as a matter of convenience and practice has set up a Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, of which these distinguished Senators are members.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the Senator from Iowa. He was present in the Committee on Rules and Administration when this resolution was brought up for consideration, and he knows the resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that at that time the understanding was that, although the money would go to the contingent fund of the Committee on Rules and Administration, all the money would be used for the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. Is not that true?

Mr. GILLETTE. I reply to the Senator from Wyoming that I would not be willing to take an oath that I was present at the time. Like every other Member of the Senate, I have a number of committees to attend, and I know that many times I have been in and out of the Committee on Rules and Administration and have left that committee to attend other committee meetings.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that I have no recollection of having been present at the time when this resolution was acted on by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I would not take an oath that I was not there, but I have no recollection whatever of it.

Mr. President, what is before the Senate? A proposal to make a recount in one county in New Mexico, or in any of the counties or in all the counties of New Mexico, or to use the money for any one of 100 different purposes that come with-

in the purview of the Committee on Rules and Administration? I agree with the junior Senator from Illinois that the greatest care must be used in connection with making these funds available. I also agree with him that we should not lightly refuse the request of a committee which requests additional funds. However, when such a request is made, we have a responsibility to meet.

In connection with this matter, let me say there has developed on the part of many efficient attorneys an unjustified conclusion that the Senate stands ready to pay attorneys' fees in the case of attorneys for contestants and attorneys for incumbents, and that a certain amount a day will be paid. It was my unfortunate experience to learn in a number of cases that came before our subcommittee when the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], who now graces the chair of the majority leader of the Senate, and I served on the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, that reputable attorneys who appeared before us would state that it was an accepted practice for a certain sum of money to be paid to such attorneys for each day they served, and that they had a right to expect to be paid a certain amount for each day's service while they represented the persons who employed them, namely, contestants or incumbents. In that respect it seems to me it is time for us to call a halt.

Today, in connection with the matter now under consideration, there is a difference of opinion among the members of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections as to what they actually agreed upon. I do not know. I know the three Senators who compose the subcommittee, and I know that not one of them would make an assertion as to what was understood unless in his heart he believed that was the actual understanding.

However, the question now presented is what the Senate will do and determine regarding the matter that is before it. Will the Senate adopt a resolution of this kind, under which not one nickel need be spent in New Mexico or New York or California or anywhere else, if the committee does not see fit to do so?

Mr. BARRETT and Mr. POTTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GILLETTE. I believe the Senator from Wyoming was first on his feet. Therefore, I yield first to him. Thereafter, I shall be very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Iowa must remember distinctly that when this matter was under discussion in the Committee on Rules and Administration, it was decided at that time by the full committee that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections should enter into negotiations with the attorneys for both the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and General Hurley, and should arrive at an agreement as to the attorneys' fees, but not to exceed $1,000 a month for each.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I reply that although there was a doubt in my mind that I might have been present at the time when this matter was before the Committee on Rules and Administration, I absolutely know that I was not present when there was any discussion of attorneys' fees, because I certainly would have taken an exception, as I do now.

Mr. BARRETT. I understand the position of the Senator from Iowa, and I agree with it, if I am correct in stating it; namely, that he is under the impression that the committee is under no obligation whatsoever to pay the counsel for either party to the contest.

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. BARRETT. And that regardless of what payments may have been made in the past, the committee is wholly within its rights if it restricts the amount to, let us say, an amount comparable to that received by the Members of this body.

Mr. GILLETTE. Subject, of course, to the action in approval by the Senate itself, for the Committee on Rules and Administration is but an agent of this body; that is all.

Mr. BARRETT. I agree.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President——

Mr. GILLETTE. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I am a little chagrined to have the distinguished Senator from Iowa take exception to the form of the resolution. It is our understanding, and we have been so advised, that resolutions of this kind have been submitted for many years past without being accompanied by reports, and that that has been the normal procedure.

If a new procedure was to be established, I would say it did not come to our attention, because we adopted the same procedure and the same type of resolution used by the Senate and also by the House of Representatives for many years.

Mr. GILLETTE. I agree that at times this procedure has probably been followed. I do not agree that it is normal. I insist that it is abnormal or subnormal, because it is not the proper procedure under which a body of the dignity of the Senate should proceed. I am aware that such procedure—improper procedure, if I may say so—has been followed in the case of other measures, but no objection was made, and the measures went through.

However, the fact remains that this afternoon on this floor there is a difference of opinion as to what was agreed upon even in the subcommittee. There is no report as to what was agreed upon in the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Let me preface my question by remainding the distinguished Senator from Iowa that he alluded to the fact that he and I served on this—at times—most troublesome committee, and some reference was made to attorneys who came before the committee and expected to obtain stated fees and stated sums of money for the services they were alleged to have rendered.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am sure the Senator from Iowa does not wish to leave the impression with the Senate of the United States that those attorneys actually received what they requested from the committee, upon which the distinguished Senator from Iowa and I served.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad the Senator from Kansas has made that point. Thanks to the alertness of the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Mississippi, who was a member of the committee at that time, those attorneys were informed that they could not demand from the committee what they thought they should have; they were informed that there was no obligation whatever on the part of the Senate of the United States to pay one nickel.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that I have no desire to hamper any agency or subagency of the Senate in its work; and, if it is the opinion of the Committee on Rules and Administration, supported by action of the Senate, that a recount ought to be made in New Mexico, Iowa, or in any other State, the investigative agency is entitled to receive the funds necessary to execute its responsibilities properly. But because there is this difference of opinion, because the Senate does not have anything before it except the resolution, I shall support a motion to recommit, if and when such a motion is made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 106.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the people of my State are very much interested in what the Senate will do this afternoon. I have been trying to ascertain from the newspapers of my home State, exactly what is at issue. I say it is very difficult to ascertain here what is actually going on. The trouble I face now is that I find there have been certain conferences and discussions among the attorneys who are representing the respective sides of the question under investigation, and they are trying to reach a decision as to what they will do with specific ballots.

One of the points raised in connection with the election in New Mexico is whether the ballots of a great many voters should be thrown out because they were marked with an ordinary pencil, rather than with an indelible pencil or pen, as required by law. I know what I used to mark my ballot. I used an ordinary pencil; and my wife, who accompanied me to the election booth, also marked her ballot with an ordinary pencil. I do not think our ballots should be thrown out. We voted with what was available. There was neither an indelible pencil nor pen and ink in the election booth. I feel that my wife and I had a perfect right to vote with whatever was available to us for that purpose. My son and his wife followed us into the election booth. They voted with whatever was available to them. We pay our taxes in the community where we voted. We live on a farm. Our neighbors who were present at the voting booth were mostly farmers, or people who worked in

town and lived on farms. No one questioned my right to vote, no one questioned the right of anyone else to vote.

Mr. President, I submit that if we are to spend a great deal of money in order to recount the votes in the one county, we ought first of all to determine whether the ballots of my wife, of my son and his wife, and my own ballot, are to be thrown out because we marked our ballots with an ordinary pencil. That is a matter to be determined by the courts. I have never known of that question having been tested. We have suggested that it ought to be tested at some time, but until it is tested, I certainly am going to be opposed to somebody's picking up my ballot and saying, "It is marked with an ordinary pencil; therefore it shall be thrown out."

The suggestion has been made frequently that certain people would very much like to examine some of those ballots to see how many of us voted. I should be very happy to have them look at mine. My method of voting has not changed for a great many years. It continues to have one cross at the top of the ballot, and I should be glad to have my ballots examined, as I would others. But I do not believe that is the business of the United States Senate at the present time.

Secondly, a complaint has been made that there were not enough voting booths. The county in which I live has been growing very rapidly. In 1917, afflicted with tuberculosis, I went to the city of Albuquerque. I did not expect to remain there long. But by 1920, when I was perhaps able to leave, the community was beginning to grow. There were 15,000 inhabitants. By 1930 there were 22,000, by 1940 there were 36,000, and by 1950, within the city limits, there were 97,000 residents, with another 50,000 scattered in the community close to our town.

The result was that the election officials, perhaps through no fault of theirs, were not equipped with enough booths. If my ballot is to be thrown out because I voted upon the top of a school desk, I must say I do not think that would be proper. If all the proposed investigation is going to reveal is that we did not have enough voting booths, then I say those responsible in many other parts of the country should plead guilty, because in communities in which there is unusual growth, it is sometimes impossible to keep up with it by providing the proper number of voting booths.

What disturbs me most about the resolution is what I indicated the other day. I should like to have some indication as to how the money is to be spent. I have been trying to have money made available with which to conduct surveys and examinations of the rivers and watersheds of our State. We have been told recently that money is very, very hard to get, and that we may not get any money for our pet projects. Therefore I shall do what I can to keep money from being thrown away on committees unless a program is developed as to what is going to be done.

I am not asserting that the report I am about to give is accurate, because it is based only on a story written by newspapermen upon whom I rely, but it is said that the district attorney in my home county, a young man whom I have known since he first came from law school and began the practice of law, has written a letter saying that, under the law of the State of New Mexico, the recount must be made in the presence of the district judge and the county clerk, or persons designated by them. I do not know whether the Senate committee has a right to count all the ballots in my home county or not, and therefore I think a very simple attempt to find that out in a court of law before we vote to authorize the requested appropriation would be proper.

I must say that, up to the present time, I have not opposed in the slightest way one step which has been taken in the investigation. I have never, by one action on the floor of the Senate, tried to stop or prevent the most complete inquiry into the election if fraud has been charged and people have been accused of doing improper things. But I know of no particular accusation of fraud in the present instance.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] referred to the fact that certain complaint had been made in respect to the 1948 election, in which I was a candidate. The complaint was not with respect to the results of the election, but, immediately preceding the election, a statement was made that the highways of the State were so crowded with Washington bureaucrats who were campaigning for me, that people engaged in ordinary business could not travel up and down the roads of the State.

I regret to say that unfortunately the statement was not true. There were some people in responsible positions in Washington who were not for me, and who, in subsequent years, were not particularly my friends; and they perhaps were willing to do everything they could to bring about what they were hoping would happen to me. Such situations exist frequently in elections.

The accusation was made that certain specified persons were out working for me. I asked for the names of those persons. It was significant that no names were furnished at any time. I found it impossible to ascertain who was supposed to be in my State working for me, so that I might reward them when the election was over.

Finally, Mr. President, there was a report filed, a copy of which I found. That report asserted that various persons were busily at work for me. Some of them may have been, I am happy to say. Others, I regret to say, were not. But, at least, there was a specific charge that a person was doing a particular thing. I would not mind so much the expenditure of $100,000 if we could point our finger at the individual who improperly marked a ballot. I would not mind it so much if an individual voted when he was not registered and qualified to vote. I would not mind it so much if a man voted 3 or 4 or 5 times, particularly if he voted correctly the fifth time.

I should like to have a bill of particulars drawn, and then I should like to have some of the questions of law settled. I should like to know that the Federal Government has a right to count all the ballots in New Mexico. Then I should be perfectly willing that more money be provided.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have never heard any question raised as to the power of the Senate to do exactly that. This is the first time I ever heard the suggestion that it cannot do that. How could we get a court to determine the question before hand?

Mr. ANDERSON. I recognize that the distinguished majority leader has the advantage of me, because I am not a lawyer, but I invite his attention to the fact that the district attorney in and for the county in which I reside has written a letter challenging the right of the Senate to make such a count. I do not think he is a partisan. I regard him as a very high-grade young man. The fact that he is married to a daughter of one of my friends does not detract from my regard for him. I do not think he would have written the letter if there were no question about the right of the Senate to count all the ballots in my State.

Mr. TAFT. The Senate did that in Maryland.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not true that the State of Maryland does not have a law providing for a recount?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that makes any difference.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say, frankly, that I do not know, but I suggest that the district attorney in my home county, who is a very good public official, ought to know, and he has raised that question.

Another thing which bothers me, Mr. President, is that I read in a newspaper story that the committee was to start early in the Federal Court Building, and that one of the issues to be discussed was the fact that the platoon of lawyers representing both the senior Senator from New Mexico and General Hurley were to have their expenses paid by the Federal Government. The story says, further, that the chief counsel for the senior Senator from New Mexico told Mr. Ware at the opening session last Monday that he would ask a fee of $200 a day, plus expenses, and other lawyers indicated that they would ask for similar fees.

I do not know how many lawyers are going to do that, but I assume that the three attorneys for General Hurley and the three attorneys for the senior Senator from New Mexico could conceivably ask for a substantial sum of money.

I think there should be some restriction on the amount of money to be spent for attorneys.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think there should be some limitation made in advance as to the fees of the attorneys. I have seen cases in which fees were so settled.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from New Mexico has referred to a newspaper story with respect to how much the counsel will ask for a fee. What he will ask for

and what he will receive are quite different. I think the question would have to be settled and a reasonable amount agreed upon.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator. I think the question should be settled. There are many more lawyers here than there are insurance agents, and I have found it easier to settle with a lawyer prior to going to court than afterward.

Mr. POTTER. That is what the committee is endeavoring to do.

Mr. ANDERSON. But I do not think it has been done. That is what I am trying to say.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. As I said earlier this afternoon, the committee decided 2 weeks ago that $1,000 a month would be paid to the attorneys on one side, and $1,000 a month to the attorneys on the other side. The staff has been so advised, and, to the best of my knowledge, they have communicated that decision to the attorneys for both parties.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not question in the slightest the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. The staff in New Mexico did not have that information a week ago. If that action was taken 2 weeks ago, the staff is still negotiating on a different basis.

Mr. BARRETT. I think either the Senator or the newspaper is mistaken. I have stated the amount which was agreed upon.

Mr. ANDERSON. All I know is what I read in the newspapers. I am not trying to conduct this case, but I say to the Members of the Senate that in 1924 there was an election in the State of New Mexico, and the man who was certified as governor is the man who is now chief counsel for the senior Senator from New Mexico. His election was challenged by a citizen of my home county of Bernalillo. The contest was started in another county, but the contestants moved into Bernalillo County. The Governor had not been very well pleased with the results in the first county, and he asked me if I would take charge of examinations in my home county of Bernalillo. The contest never got beyond my home county. So many avenues for consideration were opened that the investigation came to an end.

I know that if there is not some time limitation or some salary limitation, such as the Senator from Wyoming suggests there has been, these things can drag on interminably.

I am not trying to charge any member of the subcommittee with the slightest failure adequately to protect the interests of the Government. I have full confidence in the three members of the subcommittee, and I am sure they will try to do a good job. But, experience has taught me that election contests can be long and expensive, and that if a limitation of some kind is provided, it sort of reduces the lucrativeness of the contest and it may close within a shorter period of time.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from New Mexico realizes, of course, that it is not a pleasant task at best, and that the effort on the part of the subcommittee is to do an impartial job and try to determine the correct outcome of the election. We want to keep out of the political arena as much as possible. What disturbs me is the fact that if we come back a month from now, after the ballot boxes have been opened, we shall be confronted with a far more serious situation than that with which we are faced today. We do not want to bring out a report as the result of our preliminary investigation. The Senator would not want that to be done. We have had to accept the charge that the subcommittee is acting blindly, without knowing what it is doing. That is a little difficult, because I am sure the Senator would not want us to present on the Senate floor the results of a preliminary hearing which was held in executive session and which was the basis for a further investigation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am only trying to say that I believe that if the committee began to count the ballots in Bernalillo County, and it became apparent that there was a substantial shift from what had been certified as the results of the election, and if that shift were in a direction favorable to General Hurley, the committee would surely be justified in returning and asking for a substantial appropriation, and I hope I might stand on the floor and ask that the committee be granted what it requested.

Mr. POTTER. It would be most difficult for the Senator to do so after the ballot boxes had been opened. The Senator is enough of a realist to know that once ballot boxes are opened, irrespective of the way the trend might be, the situation then becomes most difficult. If the subcommittee is to accomplish its task, nothing will be gained by waiting a month. For example, after the ballots have been counted in 1 county, 2 counties, 5 counties, or half the counties, if we find that none of the charges has been established, and we know that the outcome of the election has not been changed, I feel certain the subcommittee would have enough wisdom to call off the investigation.

Mr. ANDERSON. In answer to what the Senator from Michigan has said, I point out that Bernalillo County has been looked into very carefully. Not all the interest in Bernalillo County centered in the race for the senatorship. There were some red hot races for membership in the State legislature, and some red hot races for county offices. Some of us have put up money for recounts, which gave an opportunity to check the results in those races, and other results, as well.

Let me call attention to what happened. In 117 boxes in Bernalillo County the certified official election returns showed that Senator CHAVEZ received 26,983 votes, while General Hurley received 30,690 votes. The ballots in 39 boxes out of 117 boxes were recounted. The official count of those boxes showed that CHAVEZ received 10,930 votes. When the recount was finished it showed that CHAVEZ received 10,865. The official count showed that in those boxes Hurley received 6,249; the recount showed 5,985. In other words, Senator CHAVEZ lost 65 votes and General Hurley lost 264 votes.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I am reluctant to discuss this matter on the floor of the Senate, but it is my understanding that the Senator refers to a physical count. No effort was made during the so-called recount to determine the validity of the ballots.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I would agree that that is true; that is, no one opened a ballot to see if it contained a proper number, or any of various other necessary items. Of course, we in New Mexico desire to protect the ballot as much as possible.

Mr. POTTER. That is correct. I am not certain whether the recount the Senator mentioned involved any more than merely going through the boxes and counting the ballots which were marked.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; they were counted name by name.

Mr. POTTER. Were they checked against the poll lists?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall not answer that question, because I cannot answer it. I will not state something to the Senator that I do not know of my own personal knowledge. I do know that when the recount was in progress the proper officials were present, watching it carefully, and there is no possibility that the figures I have given are not the figures they arrived at as they went through the ballots. I shall not attempt to discuss the question of the validity of the ballots.

Mr. POTTER. I am certain the junior Senator from New Mexico does not desire to have the committee return 4 weeks from now to debate on the floor of the Senate all the charges and counter charges which have been made in the reports of our investigation, which we should like to keep in executive session.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask permission that I may be permitted to yield to my colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico, to ask a question of the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUFF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that I am now a United States Senator?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that the reason why I am now a United States Senator is that I was so certified by the people of New Mexico, who had the right to certify that fact?

Mr. POTTER. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Michigan has spoken about some kind of report he has received from so-called members of a staff. Does not the Senator from Michigan think that a United States Senator who is accused of the things of which I have been accused should be told what the charges are?

Mr. POTTER. I am certain the senior Senator from New Mexico realizes that the subcommittee is charged with a responsibility and, I think, a duty, to keep

the results of our investigation confidential. This is a preliminary investigation. I do not know whether some of the matters contained in the report made by our own staff are completely accurate, and accordingly I would not want these made public.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand.

Mr. POTTER. I am certain that you would do likewise if in my position.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Since I am just as much a United States Senator as is the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, and since charges have been made against me, does not the Senator from Michigan think that I should be entitled at least to satisfy the Senator from Michigan? Does not the Senator from Michigan think that I am entitled to the same kind of treatment he received when his election was under investigation?

Mr. POTTER. The charges made in the petition filed by General Hurley are available to the Senator from New Mexico. What we are now talking about is a preliminary study of the result of an investigation under that petition, which I will not make available to the Senator, and I will not make available to anybody else.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am becoming tired of the insults being hurled at the people of New Mexico. Soldiers from New Mexico are dying in Korea. Every American cemetery in the world bears the names of soldiers from New Mexico. All we ask is fair play and common, ordinary American decency. I know about the report, and I know who made it. I do not mind the committee—the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]—making an investigation. But I know also the members of the staff, and I do not wish to be investigated by members of the staff. I want the United States Senate to decide whether I am entitled to stay in this body or not. I do not want a clerk of a committee to decide that question.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan to reply to the senior Senator from New Mexico, but I do not wish to yield further. I do not desire to precipitate a discussion between the Senator from Michigan and the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. POTTER. It is most embarrassing and most unfortunate that the very thing has happened which I feared would happen, and which I wished to avoid. I do not know where the chips are going to fall in this matter. If a Senator accepts the responsibility as a member of this committee, a most unpleasant assignment, he must be fair and impartial. As the Senator from New Mexico well knows, no matter what happens, the Senator having such an assignment is chastised. If the committee, acting upon the petition, had said, "We will not take any action," that would have been called a whitewash. So the committee created a staff of workers and made a preliminary investigation. As a result, we found that there were sufficient irregularities to warrant further investigation. That does not mean that charges have been made. It simply means that further investigation was deemed advisable.

I hope the Senator from New Mexico will recognize that the subcommittee is not out to "get" anyone. I sincerely hope the investigation will be completed as soon as possible. That is the reason for the debate which has occurred in the Senate today. If the motion of the Senator from Louisiana prevails, the debate we shall have 4 weeks from now will compound a nasty situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate. It seems to me that the discussion has taken a rather strange turn. We are debating the issues involved when, as a matter of fact, they are not before us. Four months ago and $40,000 worth—because that is what was spent—we told the committee to go ahead. It has $54,000 left. It asks for $100,000. A very strange issue is raised.

It is said that the resolution is not before us in proper form. At one time I was a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. This resolution is in the same form as other resolutions which were reported when I was a member of the committee.

Mr. friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] discusses the possibility of a motion to recommit. We are prejudging the case on the floor of the Senate. We authorized the Committee on Rules and Administration, and its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, to do a job. Should we now be in the unholy position of saying, "You cannot have the money to go ahead and do the job"? How can we tell the committee whether the amount requested is too much or too little? How can we judge? The committee has 150 pages of testimony and evidence and staff data. Can we judge the case here on the floor? Certainly not.

I think we are in a strange and anomalous position, when we undertake to say to the committee, "You shall not have the money." I think it would put the Senate in a bad light before the entire country. This request ought to be approved on both sides.

If my friend from New Mexico will permit one further observation, there is nothing personal about this. I esteem the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] as a friend. We served in the House of Representatives together. I have served with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. This is a case of doing a job which has been entrusted to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and in turn to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. It certainly would be niggardly on our part to say that in a contest which involves many kinds of issues the committee shall not have the money necessary to do the job. That is why the committee was created. It was created to investigate, to evaluate, to go through the entire book and determine what the outcome should be, or is, or was.

I do not think we can determine the substantive issues on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. We should give the committee the money it has requested.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish only to say that I recognize that the task which is placed upon the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is one of the most difficult and unpleasant tasks that can be imposed upon any Senator.

I have not tried in any way to be critical or harsh in what I have said concerning what the committee has been attempting to do. I do say that the people of my State feel that wholesale recounting, without trying to find out what the recount may show in the first county, is not wise. It might be well to recount ballots in one large county and ascertain what the results are from such a recount. If the committee should then feel that it should go ahead, I should be in favor of giving them additional money.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Do I correctly understand that the only difference between the Senator and the committee is that the committee thinks 4 or 5 counties should be recounted, whereas the Senator from new Mexico thinks only 1 county should be recounted?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. My contention is that the committee has ample funds to make a recount in one county. When it has finished that recount it can come back to the Senate and say, "We need to count the rest of the State." I think the staff will continue to function until all the money has been spent.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite agree with the Senator that a final determination can be made on the basis of the recounting of one county. So far as fraud cases in Ohio are concerned—of which I have any knowledge—I should say clearly that the great bulk of counties were perfectly straight, but certain other counties might be open to question. It seems to me that in order to enable the committee to obtain sufficient information to decide whether there is any use in continuing the recount, it must recount the ballots in more than one county. If the Senator admits the principle, it seems to me that he ought to agree that the committee should have sufficient money to do the job. After all, only about 10 percent of the ballots cast in the State has been recounted.

No final determination can be made merely on the basis of a charge. There must be an investigation. It is the final determination which answers every question. It seems to me that the committee should be enabled to reach a final determination.

Mr. ANDERSON. The point is that more than 10 percent of the ballots of the State has been recounted, and shows no gain.

Mr. TAFT. But the recount was made on a basis which was questioned by the committee. The recount did not go into the question of the eligibility of voters.

All that was done was to recount the paper ballots.

Mr. ANDERSON. The majority leader is correct. However, in the particular county we are talking about recounting there reside between one-fifth and one-fourth of all the voters in the State.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that necessarily means that the county is typical. I do not think it proves a thing. If 4 or 5 or 6 typical counties throughout the State were recounted, then it seems to me we would have a fair cross-section.

Mr. ANDERSON. The county referred to is the very one which General Hurley wanted counted. Therefore, I say it would furnish a satisfactory result.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall try to keep going. I have a rather sore throat. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BARRETT. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that the committee will be out of funds some time next month, shortly after we are nicely started on recounting the ballots in Bernalillo County. If the Senate wants us to proceed with the job which has been assigned to us, we must have the money available at least 30 days in advance of the time when it is needed.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it should cost $54,000 to recount the ballots in that one county. That is all I am trying to say.

THE NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I note that there are pending on the Executive Calendar three agreements submitted to the Senate by the President of the United States. These agreements were largely worked out during the past administration. These treaties involve the very lives and interests of all American soldiers on foreign soil. Today we have on foreign soil some 700,000 or 750,000 American boys.

I wish to discuss these treaties very briefly this afternoon, so that the information may be before Senators when the treaties are taken up next week. I am glad to note that some members of the Foreign Relations Committee are present in the Chamber this afternoon, because my discussion involves a hearing which was recently conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee, which has reported these treaties to the Senate.

The NATO Status of Forces Treaty would subject members of the United States Armed Forces to trial in the courts of NATO countries for nonmilitary offenses committed within those countries. As the Under Secretary of State, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, conceded at the hearings—record of hearings, page 53—the proposal is "unprecedented." Believing that this unprecedented agreement reflects a callous disregard of the rights of American Armed Forces personnel, I shall propose the following reservation:

> The military authorities of the United States as a sending state shall have exclusive jurisdiction over the members of its force or civilian component and their dependents with respect to all offenses committed within the territory of the receiving state and the United States as a receiving state shall, at the request of a sending state, waive any jurisdiction which it might possess over the members of a force or civilian component of a sending state and their dependents with respect to all offenses committed within the territory of the United States.

The proposed reservation affects only the criminal jurisdiction provisions in article VII of the Status of Forces Treaty. In my judgment, the other provisions of that treaty should be approved. In addition, the two companion treaties relating to the status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the NATO military headquarters should be approved by the Senate.

At the outset, I wish to make one fact absolutely clear. Nothing in the proposed constitutional amendment sponsored by 63 other Senators and myself would prevent the United States from becoming a party to a treaty like the NATO Status of Forces Treaty. Senate Joint Resolution 1 is designed to protect only domestic constitutional rights from being undermined by treaty. As I have said many times, Senate Joint Resolution 1, if adopted, will not prevent the making of bad treaties. The NATO Status of Forces Treaty in its present form is one of the worst I have ever seen. My examination of proposed treaties over the past 2 years has not been casual.

To approve the criminal jurisdiction provisions of this treaty would amount to penalizing the American soldier in an effort to please our NATO allies. Of course, I attribute no such motive to the President, to the Secretary of State, or to any Member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Nevertheless, that is the result and effect of the treaty before us.

Moreover, I do not criticize any member of the Foreign Relations Committee for not exercising due care and diligence in reporting this treaty favorably to the Senate. In the light of statements made by Government witnesses at the hearings, the committee's action was sound and logical. Unfortunately—and this is very important—the committee's action was based on false and misleading representations. As to whether the misrepresentations were deliberate or grounded in stupidity, I express no opinion.

They might have been prompted by those who were in the State Department—and who are still there—when these agreements were worked out, as a way of vindication. They might have been suggested, Mr. President, in an effort to cover up the executive agreements already illegally made.

THE FUNDAMENTAL FALLACY

The crux of the matter is what rights can properly be claimed for American servicemen abroad under generally accepted rules of international law. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee was informed by the legal adviser of the State Department, Herman Phleger, as follows:

> Now with respect to the statement * * * that as a sovereign nation we are not subject to the sovereignty of any country in which our troops are located, I do not view that as a correct statement of the law.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> Individuals wearing our uniform and part of our military force do not have sovereign immunity, and there is no doctrine which says that a nation which has on its soil representatives of a foreign nation must give immunity to those persons. Immunity is restricted to those which the receiving nation chooses in the handling of its diplomatic affairs to give immunity to, such as Ambassadors, and so forth (record of hearings, p. 49).

Those are the words of Mr. Phleger, who is the legal adviser of the State Department, in his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Believing this to be an accurate statement of international law, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee might reasonably have concluded that the Status of Forces Treaty was the best bargain that could have been made under the circumstances. Mr. Phleger, however, was dead wrong. His statement to the committee reveals his total lack of experience in the field of international law.

The rule of international law as laid down by Chief Justice John Marshall and many other later authorities is that troops of a friendly nation stationed within the territory of another are not subject to the local laws of the other country, but are subject only to their own country's laws and regulations for the government of the armed services.

At this point I should like to offer, as a part of my remarks, and to be included in them, an article published in the American Journal of International Law. It is entitled "Jurisdiction Over Friendly Armed Forces" and is written by Mr. Archibald King. It is the most complete review of the subject which has been made in recent years. I wish the article to be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD so that Members of the Senate, particularly members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, may read it, together with the citations given. It shows how clearly erroneous were the remarks of the legal adviser of the State Department.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JURISDICTION OVER FRIENDLY FOREIGN ARMED FORCES

(By Archibald King)

There are at present Armed Forces of the United States in England, Northern Ireland, Egypt, Australia, New Zealand, New Guinea, China, India, Iceland, in British possessions in the Western Hemisphere from Newfoundland to British Guiana, and in other friendly countries. There are troops of Great Britain or her dominions in Egypt, Iraq, Iran, and a few of them in the United States. English forces were a few months ago in Greece, and ours in the Dutch East Indies and Burma. There are troops of various exiled governments in England. The armed forces of Germany are in Italy, Libya, Hungary, and Rumania; and those of Japan in French Indochina and Thailand. In every case mentioned, the visiting forces are in the foreign country by invitation, or at least with the consent, of its sovereign or government.

The situation, it may be admitted, is not new. It has occurerd in almost every war in which two nations have been allied. It occurred on a very large scale during the

First World War, when there were millions of American and British soldiers in France and a few divisions in Italy, and no doubt a considerable number of German soldiers in Austria and vice versa. But never before have there been American forces in so many friendly foreign countries. They are likely to increase both in number of men and number of countries. It therefore becomes pertinent and timely to examine the legal status of such forces with respect to the government and people of the country in which they are; and, in particular, the question whether and to what extent that country may exercise jurisdiction over them.

It is elementary that a civilian national of country A, who enters friendly country B, by the mere fact of doing so subjects himself to the laws of B and to the possibility of civil suit and criminal prosecution in its courts. The same is true of an officer or soldier of A's army who enters B unofficially as a visitor or tourist. Is the same true of Captain M and Private N, of the army of A, who enter B as a part of an expeditionary force at the invitation of the government of B? To consider and to attempt to answer that question is the object of this article.

The present writer's father, for many years before his death a member of the American Society of International Law and a contributor to this Journal,[1] used to say that judicial opinions fall into two classes: first, those of Chief Justice Marshall; and second, all others. It is therefore a pleasure to begin with a case in which the opinion is from Marshall's pen. American lawyers are apt to think of him only as the expositor of the Constitution, but to foreigners he is known primarily as America's earliest and one of its greatest authorities on international law.

The case in question is *The Schooner Exchange* v. *McFaddon*,[2] a libel in admiralty in the United States District Court for Pennsylvania against *The Exchange*, in which the libelants, merchants of Baltimore, alleged that that ship had been wrongfully taken from their captain and agent on the high seas by persons acting under orders of Napoleon, Emperor of the French, and was at the date of the libel, August 24, 1811, at Philadelphia; that she had not been condemned by any court of competent jurisdiction; and praying that she be restored to the plaintiffs, her rightful owners. The United States attorney filed a suggestion that the ship libeled was a public vessel of the French Emperor, which, having encountered stress of weather, was obliged to put into Philadelphia for repairs; that, if the ship ever belonged to the libelants, their property had been divested and become vested in the Emperor within a port of his empire according to the laws of France. The United States attorney submitted whether the attachment ought not be be quashed and the libel dismissed.

The case went on appeal to the Supreme Court. The Chief Justice, speaking for the Supreme Court,[3] referred to the "perfect equality and absolute independence of sovereigns," and the "common interest impelling them to mutual intercourse, and an interchange of good offices with each other," which "have given rise to a class of cases in which every sovereign is understood to waive the exercise of a part of that complete exclusive territorial jurisdiction, which has been stated to be the attribute of every Nation." Mentioning first the admitted "exemption of the person of the sovereign from arrest or detention within a foreign territory," and secondly "the immunity which all civilized nations allow to foreign ministers," Chief Justice Marshall proceeded:

"3d. A third case in which a sovereign is understood to cede a portion of his territorial jurisdiction is, where he allows the troops of a foreign prince to pass through his dominions.

"In such case, without any express declaration waiving jurisdiction over the army to which this right of passage has been granted, the sovereign who should attempt to exercise it would certainly be considered as violating his faith. By exercising it, the purpose for which the free passage was granted would be defeated, and a portion of the military force of a foreign independent nation would be diverted from those national objects and duties to which it was applicable, and would be withdrawn from the control of the sovereign whose power and whose safety might greatly depend on retaining the exclusive command and disposition of this force. The grant of a free passage therefore implies a waiver of all jurisdiction over the troops during their passage, and permits the foreign general to use that discipline, and to inflict those punishments which the government of his army may require."

The Chief Justice went on to say that a license for foreign troops to enter a friendly foreign country is never presumed but always express, but that the case is different as to ships; and that, unless particular ports be closed to foreign ships of war, and notice thereof be given, "the ports of a friendly nation are considered as open to the public ships of all powers with whom it is at peace."[4] After mentioning the case of private ships seeking an asylum, but declining to decide what jurisdiction the sovereign of the port might have over them, the Chief Justice continued:[4]

"But in all respects different is the situation of a public armed ship. She constitutes a part of the military force of her nation; acts under the immediate and direct command of the sovereign; is employed by him in national objects. He has many and powerful motives for preventing those objects from being defeated by the interference of a foreign state. Such interference cannot take place without affecting his power and his dignity. The implied license therefore under which such vessel enters a friendly port may reasonably be construed, and it seems to the Court, ought to be construed, as containing an exemption from the jurisdiction of the sovereign, within whose territory she claims the rites of hospitality."

The Supreme Court accordingly held that *The Exchange*, as a public armed vessel of a friendly power, entered Philadelphia upon an implied promise of exemption from the jurisdiction of the local courts, and the Court therefore directed the dismissal of the libel and the release of the vessel.

It is true that the case before the Supreme Court concerned a ship, and our present problem relates to personnel of the Army or Navy, but it does not follow that Marshall's statements about troops are mere dicta. Those statements are an indispensable part of the reasoning which led him to his conclusion and cannot be rejected without rejecting the conclusion as well.

The essence of the decision is not that an armed public vessel, but that any public armed force, whether on land or sea, which enters the territory of another nation with the latter's permission, enjoys an extraterritorial status.[5]

The Supreme Court did not again mention the subject until after the Civil War. In *Coleman* v. *Tennessee*,[6] the Court said:

"It is well settled that a foreign army permitted to march through a friendly country, or to be stationed in it, by permission of its government or sovereign, is exempt from the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the place."

The foregoing is, strictly speaking, a dictum, since the case before the Court involved a hostile and not a friendly occupation. Another statement by the Supreme Court to the same effect, which for the same reason is also a dictum, is found in *Dow* v. *Johnson*.[7] But even dicta of the Supreme Court are entitled to great weight, especially when they concern a matter which only becomes the subject of actual litigation once in a generation, if so often.

In *Tucker* v. *Alexandroff*,[8] the Supreme Court decided, upon the authority of article IX of the treaty of 1832 between this country and Russia, and Revised Statutes, section 5280, that the commanding officer of a detachment of the Russian Navy, sent to the United States with the consent of the Government to man a ship being built for that navy in this country, was entitled to have a deserter arrested and returned to his control. The Court discussed the case of *The Exchange* at length and said of it:[9]

"This case, however, only holds that the public armed vessels of a foreign nation may, upon principles of comity, enter our harbors with the presumed license of the Government, and while there are exempt from the jurisdiction of the local courts; and, by parity of reasoning, that, if foreign troops are permitted to enter, or cross our territory, they are still subject to the control of their officers and exempt from local jurisdiction."

The case amounts to a reaffirmation, at least by way of dictum, of the doctrine laid down in the case of *The Exchange* that the armed forces of one friendly nation within the territory of another by its consent enjoy an extraterritorial status.

In *Chung Chi Cheung* v. *The King*[10] the facts were these: *The Cheung* was a Chinese maritime customs cruiser, a public armed vessel of China. While that ship was in the territorial waters of the British crown colony of Hong Kong, the appellant, a cabin boy, shot and killed her captain and wounded the chief officer and himself. Later the launch of the Hong Kong police came alongside and took the appellant and the chief officer to the hospital. The appellant was tried in Hong Kong for murder "in the waters of this colony," convicted, and sentenced to death. He carried the case on appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and Lord Atkin delivered the judgment. He first referred to the report of the Royal Commission on the reception of fugitive slaves in 1876, in which the extraterritoriality of a public vessel was discussed at length by Chief Justice Cockburn and other distinguished English lawyers.[11]

---

[1] George A. King, "French Spoliation Claims," vol. 6 (1912), pp. 359, 629, 830.

[2] 7 Cranch 116.

[3] P. 137 et seq.

[4] P. 144.

[5] Chief Justice Marshall's opinion in the case of *The Exchange* has often been praised. In a letter to the late Albert J. Beveridge, Dr. John Bassett Moore—and surely there is no one better qualified to judge in such a matter—said that that opinion is Marshall's greatest in the realm of international law. (Private letter, Moore to Beveridge, cited by Beveridge, Life of Marshall, IV, p. 121.) Elsewhere Judge Moore called it the basis of international law on the subject with which it deals. (Moore in Dillon, John Marshall; Life, Character, and Judicial Services, as portrayed in the centenary proceedings throughout the United States on Marshall day, 1901, I, 521.)

In England, Brett, L. J., said, in *The Parlement Belge* (L. R. 5 P. D. 197, 208): "The first case to be carefully considered is, and always will be, *The Exchange*."

More recently in *Chung Chi Cheung* v. *The King* (1939 A. C. 160, 168), a case discussed in detail hereafter, Lord Atkin, speaking for the judicial committee of the Privy Council, called Chief Justice Marshall's opinion in the case of *The Exchange* "a judgment which has illumined the jurisprudence of the world."

[6] 97 U. S. 509, 515.

[7] 100 U. S. 158, 165.

[8] 183 U. S. 424.

[9] P. 433.

[10] 1939 A. C. 160.

[11] 1876, Cmd. 1516.

Lord Atkin rejected, as had Chief Justice Cockburn in that report, the theory of "objective extraterritoriality," of a ship being a floating island, a detached piece of the territory of the nation whose flag she flies. He quoted at length and with approval the opinion in *The Exchange*, and concurred fully in the general principle that the armed forces of one power allowed by another to enter its territory enjoy immunity from the local courts, but held that in the case before him the Chinese Government had waived that immunity.

In the Casa Blanca case [12] the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague recognized the general principle of the immunity of troops in a friendly foreign country. On September 25, 1908, 6 deserters from the French Foreign Legion, 3 of whom were Germans, applied for protection to the German consul at Casa Blanca, Morocco. Morocco was nominally an independent country under the rule of its own sultan, but troops of the French Foreign Legion were with his consent camped in and around Casa Blanca. Citizens of the European Powers enjoyed an extraterritorial position and could be tried only by their own consuls. Representatives of the German consul attempted to escort the 6 deserters to the waterfront and place them upon a German vessel about to depart. On the way a detachment of French soldiers forcibly took them from their escort. Germany protested and demanded the restitution to her of the three deserters who were German nationals, and the matter was submitted to the Permanent Court of Arbitration. It will be observed that there was in this case a conflict between two different sorts of extraterritorial immunity: first, that of soldiers in a friendly foreign country subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of their own officers and military tribunals; and, second, that of Europeans in a semicivilized country subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of their own consuls under the regime of capitulations. Among the considerations motivating its decision, the court mentioned the following:

"Whereas under the extraterritorial jurisdiction in force in Morocco the German consular authority as a rule exercises exclusive jurisdiction over all German subjects in that country; and

"Whereas on the other hand, a corps of occupation as a rule also exercises exclusive jurisdiction over all persons belonging to it; and • • •

"Whereas the jurisdiction of the corps of occupation should have the preference in case of a conflict when the persons belonging to this corps have not left the territory which is under the immediate, lasting, and effective control of the armed force."

The court decided, in the first place, that the German consulate was in the wrong in attempting to place on board a German ship deserters from the French Foreign Legion not of German nationality; and, further, that it "did not, under the circumstances of the case, have a right to grant its protection to the deserters of German nationality," but that the French military authorities ought to have respected "as far as possible" the actual protection being granted in the name of the German consulate. The court did not direct the restitution of the deserters to Germany. The award has been severely criticized as obscure and ambiguous;[13] but one fact stands out, that the court recognized the exclusive jurisdiction of the officers and military tribunals of a nation over its own troops in a friendly foreign country.

When we turn from adjudicated cases to authoritative writers on international law, we find the same doctrine stated. Thus Wheaton says:[14]

"A foreign army or fleet, marching through, sailing over, or stationed in the territory of another state, with whom the foreign sovereign to whom they belong is in amity, are also, in like manner, exempt from the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the place."

In section 99, Wheaton adopts as his own a part of the language in Chief Justice Marshall's opinion in the case of *The Exchange*.

Dr. Charles Cheney Hyde says:[15]

"Strong grounds of convenience and necessity prevent the exercise of jurisdiction over a foreign organized military force which, with the consent of the territorial sovereign, enters its domain. Members of the force who there commit offenses are dealt with by the military or other authorities of the State to whose service they belong, unless the offenders are voluntarily given up."

The late Major Birkhimer said:[16]

"It is well settled that a foreign army permitted to march through a friendly country, or to be stationed in it, by permission of its government or sovereign, is exempt from the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the place."

When we turn to England, we find the same doctrines announced. Wheaton's classic work has gone through six English editions, and the several learned editors have never seen fit to question the original text.

An English writer of high authority, the late Professor Westlake, contented himself with quoting with approval the passage already cited herein from Wheaton.[17]

In Hall's International Law [18] it is said:

"Military forces enter the territory of a state in amity with that to which they belong, either when crossing to and fro between the main part of their country and an isolated piece of it, or as allies passing through for the purposes of a campaign, or furnishing garrisons for protection. In cases of the former kind, the passage of soldiers being frequent, it is usual to conclude conventions, specifying the line of road to be followed by them and regulating their transit so as to make it as little onerous as possible to the population among whom they are. Under such conventions offenses committed by soldiers against the inhabitants are dealt with by the military authorities of the state to which the former belong; and as their general object in other respects is simply regulatory of details, it is not necessary to look upon them as intended in any respect to modify the rights of jurisdiction possessed by the parties to them respectively. There can be no question that the concession of jurisdiction over passing troops to the local authorities would be extremely inconvenient; and it is believed that the commanders, not only of forces in transit through a friendly country with which no convention exists, but also of forces stationed there, assert exclusive jurisdiction in principle in respect of offenses committed by persons under their command, although they may be willing as a matter of concession to hand over culprits to the civil power when they have confidence in the courts, and when their stay is likely to be long enough to allow of the case being watched. The existence of a double jurisdiction in a foreign country being scarcely compatible with the discipline of an army, it is evident that there would be some difficulty in carrying out any other arrangement."

Lawrence, another English writer, said: [19]

"The universally recognized rule of modern times is that a state must obtain express permission before its troops can pass through the territory of another state. • • • Permission may be given as a permanent privilege by treaty for such a purpose as sending relief to garrisons, or it may be granted as a special favor for the special occassion on which it is asked. The agreement for passage generally contains provisions for the maintenance of order in the force by its own officers, and makes them, and the state in whose service they are, responsible for the good behavior of the soldiers towards the inhabitants. In the absence of special agreement the troops would not be amenable to the local law, but would be under the jurisdiction and control of their own commanders, as long as they remained within their own lines or were away on duty, but not otherwise."

Another learned British author, Oppenheim, until his death Whewell professor of international law at the University of Cambridge, said: [20]

"Whenever armed forces are on foreign territory in the service of their home state, they are considered exterritorial and remain, therefore, under its jurisdiction. A crime committed on foreign territory by a member of these forces cannot be punished by the local civil or military authorities, but only by the commanding officer of the forces or by other authorities of their home state. This rule, however, applies only in case the crime is committed, either within the place where the force is stationed, or in some place where the criminal was on duty; it does not apply, if, for example, soldiers belonging to a foreign garrison of a fortress leave the rayon of the fortress, not on duty but for recreation and pleasure, and then and there commit a crime. The local authorities are in that case competent to punish them."

French legal writers express the same view. Thus Maitre Clunet in a note on La Présence des Alliés en France et l'Exterritorialité, says: [21]

"En principe, là ou une armée est réunie sous le drapeau national, pour défendre la cause nationale, elle transporte avec elle un pouvoir juridictionnel et les éléments de puissance utiles à sa propre conservation. Par le moyen de ses conseils de guerre et dans l'aire du territoire où ses troupes évoluent encore que ce territoire soit étranger,—l'armée occupante réprime les infractions par les individus, militaires ou non, prévues par la loi militaire."

Mademoiselle Aline Chalufour, in an able thesis, says: [22]

"Le principe dominant en la matière est celui-ci: Une armée opérant sur un territoire étranger est entièrement soustraite à la souveraineté territoriale et possède une juridiction exclusive sur les membres qui la composent. Sur ce point la doctrine, les législations et la pratique sont d'accord, qu'il s'agisse d'occupatio bellica, d'occupation convenue résultant d'un traité, d'occupation de police ou simplement comme dans le cas qui nous occupe, de la présence des troupes sur un territoire dans un but de coopération avec l'armée du pays."

A learned Dutch writer, L. Van Praag, is even more definite and positive. He says: [23]

"Le consentement donné par un état, relativement au séjour sur son territoire de troupes organisées, n'implique pas seulement—on l'admet généralement—en l'absence de conditions mises a l'octroi de ce consentement, la reconnaissance de la compétence de leur propre juge militaire pour exercer la juridiction sur ces troupes; il entraine en même temps pour elles l'immunité

[12] This Journal, vol. 3 (1909), p. 755; Martens, Nouveau Recueil Général, 3d series, II, 19; Wilson, Hague Arbitration Cases, p. 86.

[13] This Journal, ibid., p. 698; Oppenheim, International Law (4th ed.), I, 672, n. 1.

[14] Elements of International Law, Sec. 95.

[15] International Law, I, Sec. 247.

[16] Military Government and Martial Law, Sec. 114.

[17] Westlake, International Law (1910 ed.), pt. I, p. 265.

[18] 7th ed., sec. 56.

[19] Principles of International Law (6th ed.), sec. 107, p. 246.

[20] International Law (4th ed.), vol. I, sec. 445.

[21] Journal du Droit International, vol. 45, pp. 514, 516. An earlier note to the same effect by the same learned author is found in the same journal, vol. 9, pp. 511, 520.

[22] Le Statut Juridique des Troupes Alliées pendant la Guerre 1914–1918, p. 45.

[23] Juridiction et Droit International Public, sec. 246.

de la juridiction locale en affaires pénales, aussi longtemps qu'un lien existe entre l'auteur d'un délit et sa troupe."

Dr. Van Praag appends to the section quoted many citations, especially of continental writers, in support of his statement.

The German statute law, unless it has been changed by the Nazi government since the outbreak of the present war, is and has been for many years that the German Army has the right to try its own personnel in its own courts and under German law, wherever they may be serving.[24] The German forces serving in the territory of their ally, Turkey, during World War I, exercised such jurisdiction to the exclusion of the Turkish courts.[25]

When we turn to Latin America, we find the same view to be held. In *Republic of Panama* v. *Schwartzfinger*, the supreme court of that republic had before it a prosecution of a soldier of the United States Army who, while driving an ambulance on duty in Panama, caused the death of a civilian. The court held: [26]

"It is a principle of international law that an armed force of one state, when crossing the territory of another friendly country, with the acquiescence of the latter, is not subject to the jurisdiction of the territorial sovereign, but to that of the officers and superior authorities of its own command."

The Bustamante Code, annexed to the Convention on Private International Law, adopted at Habana, February 20, 1928,[27] and now in force between most of the states of Latin America, provides as follows:

"ART 299. Nor are the penal laws of the state applicable to offenses committed within the field of military operations when it authorizes the passage of an army of another contracting state through its territory, except offenses not legally connected with said army."

Let us next turn to another continent, Africa. A British soldier driving an automobile on duty in Egypt ran over the plaintiff. The British civil authorities found the driver without blame and refused to make compensation. Thereupon the plaintiff sued Colonel John, the British commander in chief, in the Egyptian courts. In *Amrane* v. *John*,[28] in 1934, the civil tribunal of Alexandria held itself to be without jurisdiction and said that by custom and without formal convention British military personnel had been exempt from process of the local courts.

The foregoing citations show that, according to a principle of international law recognized by British, American, and other authorities, permission by one nation for the troops of another to enter or remain in the former's territory carries with it extraterritoriality, an exemption of the troops in question from the courts of the country and a permission for the operation of the court-martial of the visiting army. The above principle is in truth but an application of a much larger principle, which is expressed in a Latin maxim, "Cuicunque aliquis quid concedit concedere videtur et id sine quo res ipsa esse non potuit." [29] The illustration of this principle, with which Americans are most familiar, is the doctrine of implied powers in constitutional law, laid down by Chief Justice Marshall. With respect to that doctrine, the Supreme Court said in *Marshall* v. *Gordon:* [30]

"The rule of constitutional interpretation announced in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316), that that which was reasonably appropriate and relevant to the exercise of a granted power was to be considered as accompanying the grant, has been so universally applied that it suffices merely to state it." [31]

Let the above general principle, enshrined in a maxim, be applied to the present problem. Nation B has invited the troops of Nation A to enter its territory, or at least consented to their entry. That permission would be nugatory if no courts-martial might be held in those forces. Without such courts, discipline could not be maintained and those forces would cease to be an army and would become a mob. Also, the intervention of the courts of a foreign even if friendly country in the discipline of an army would be destructive of that discipline and inconsistent with the control which any sovereign nation must have of its own army.

In nearly every civilized country the carrying of arms and the possession of explosives are forbidden, or at least regulated, by law. Let it be supposed that such is the case in nation B, the host nation. Would the soldiers of nation A, in B by B's invitation or consent, be subject to trial and conviction in the local courts because they had not complied with the law of B on such matters? Clearly, the answer must be in the negative. No one would contend otherwise. Why is this so? Because of the principle above mentioned. B has granted to A permission to land and maintain its troops in B. Even though the grant contains no express authority for them to carry arms or possess explosives, permission to do so is implied, since otherwise they would not be military or naval forces, and could not perform the duties for which they were sent to B. The same is true with respect to the functioning of courts-martial and exemption from the civil courts. If its courts-martial could not function to repress crimes and military offenses, or if the courts of B might concern themselves with the discipline of the army of A, it would lose its discipline and efficiency and cease to be an army worthy the name.

The theory of Chief Justice Marshall's opinion in the case of *The Exchange* and of the other authorities quoted is that there is an agreement between the host nation, B, and nation A, implied from B's consent for A's troops to enter B's territory, that those troops while in B shall be under the exclusive jurisdiction of their own military courts. It is, however, clearly permissible, and in many cases highly desirable, to have an express agreement on the subject, rather than for the matter to be left to implication. It is therefore appropriate to ascertain what, if any, agreements have been made on various occasions. In many instances A's troops have entered B under a general invitation without stipulations as to jurisdiction, and later an agreement on the subject has been made and reduced to writing.

As has already been said, the example of the presence of friendly troops in another country involving the largest number of men occurred during the First World War, French and English troops were in Belgium by invitation of that country from the early days of that war until the armistice. The first argeement between two of the Allied Powers with respect to jurisdiction over troops in a friendly foreign country was between France and Belgium, made August 14, 1914, when the war was less than 2 weeks old. By it, each country recognized the exclusive jurisdiction of the other over the personnel of its own forces.[32] That agreement served as the model for many others which followed it.

During the First World War, millions of soldiers of the United States, the British Empire, and other allied countries were in France by invitation of the Government of that nation. The English were present from the early days of the war in August 1914. There was at first no agreement regarding jurisdiction over them; but on December 15, 1915, nearly a year and a half after the beginning of the war, the two Governments made a joint declaration of which the following is the important paragraph:

"His Britannic Majesty's Government and the Government of the French Republic agree to recognize during the present war the exclusive competence of the tribunals of their respective armies with regard to persons belonging to these armies in whatever territory and of whatever nationality the accused may be." [33]

Mlle. Chalufour mentions [34] the following conventions as recognizing the same immunities in the case of other friendly foreign forces: Franco-Servian, December 14, 1916; Franco-Italian, September 1, 1917; Franco-Portuguese, October 15, 1917; and Franco-Siamese, May 24, 1918.

General Pershing landed in France at the head of the first detachment of the American Expeditionary Forces on June 13, 1917. Brig. Gen. (later Maj. Gen.) Walter A. Bethel, who was judge advocate of those forces during their entire stay in France, said in his final report to their commander in chief, August 19, 1919: [35]

"There had been received from France a bare invitation to send our armies to cooperate with hers without any agreement whatsoever as to the legal relations of the forces and as to the status of an American Army on French soil. On inquiry, however, at the French War Office, upon our arrival in France, it was found that the French view was precisely the same as our own; that under the general principles of international law mem-

---

[24] Militärstrafgesetzbuch für das Deutsche Reich, June 20, 1872, sec. 7, republished June 16, 1926, in Reichsgesetzblatt, part I, p. 275 et seq.; Militärstrafgerichtsordnung, Dec. 1, 1898, sec. 1. I am indebted for these citations to Dr. George M. Wunderlich.

[25] Die Gerichtsbarkeit der Heeresgruppe Yildirim, by Dr. Georg Wunderlich, Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Völkerrecht, Heft II, 1932, pp. 79, 87–89.

[26] This journal, vol. 21 (1927), p. 182. The headnote quoted was prepared by the present writer's learned colleague, Col. William C. Rigby, U. S. Army, retired.

[27] Final act of the Sixth International Conference of American States, p. 16.

[28] Journal du Droit International, vol. 62, p. 194.

[29] Broom's Legal Maxims, 8th ed., p. 367. For the benefit of him whose recollection of Latin pronouns has been dimmed by the lapse of years, the foregoing may be translated, "Whoever grants a thing to anyone is deemed also to grant that without which the grant itself would be of no effect."

[30] 243 U. S. 521, 537.

[31] Another and older application of this broad principle is a way by necessity. Blackstone says (2 Commentaries 36): "A right of way may also arise by act and operation of law; for if a man grants me a piece of ground in the middle of his field, he at the same time tacitly and impliedly gives me a way to come at it; and I may cross his land for that purpose without trespass. For when the law doth give any thing to one, it giveth impliedly whatsoever is necessary for enjoying the same."

To the same effect is 19 Corpus Juris: "Easements," sec. 117.

Among the many English cases recognizing and applying the maxim are *Kielley* v. *Carson* (4 Moore, P. C., 63, 87) and *Clarence Railway Company* v. *Great North Railway Company* (13 Meeson and Welsby 706, 719). In the latter case it was held that when an act of Parliament empowered one railway company to carry its line across that of another by a bridge, the former might place temporary scaffolding on the land of the latter without its permission, if that were necessary for constructing the bridge.

[32] Chalufour, op. cit., p. 47.

[33] London Gazette, Dec. 15, 1915; Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918, Supp. 2, p. 735.

[34] Op. cit., p. 51. These conventions were published in the Journal Officiel on the dates mentioned, respectively.

[35] P. 12.

bers of the American Expeditionary Forces were answerable only to American tribunals for such offenses as they might commit in France. As the principle needed a somewhat broader scope, however, than its mere application to our Army in France, it was later agreed between the diplomatic departments of the Governments that each should possess exclusive criminal jurisdiction over its land and sea forces whether in the territory of either nation or on high seas. This agreement was published in Bulletin No. 13, G. H. Q., February 18, 1918."

The agreement to which General Bethel alluded took the form of an exchange of notes between the Secretary of State and the French Ambassador at Washington.[38] The important part of it is in language almost identical with that of the earlier Franco-British agreement. That part reads thus:

"The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic agree to recognize during the war the exclusive jurisdiction of the tribunals of their respective land and sea forces with regard to persons subject to the jurisdiction of those forces whatever be the territory in which they operate or the nationality of the accused."

There were in France at the date of the armistice about 2,100,000 American soldiers. Their behavior and discipline were generally excellent, but a few of them occasionally misconducted themselves. When they did so, they were arrested by their own officers, their own military police, or French police, whichever might have observed the offense or first caught the offender; but, if the French police made the arrest of an American offender, they invariably turned him over to the American military authorities at the first convenient opportunity, and he was always tried by a court-martial of the United States Army and never by a French court.[39] This was true whether his offense was a purely military one, such as desertion; or a crime against another American, such as larceny from an American fellow soldier; or one against the person or property of a Frenchman, such as assault and battery upon him or burglary of his house; and whether the offense was committed in an American camp or a French village. There were scores of trials of American soldiers before American courts-martial for offenses against French men or women or their property, ranging from cases of street brawls or petty larceny in which a minor penalty was inflicted to a few of rape or murder in which the American court-martial imposed the death penalty and the offenders were hanged. The French civil and military authorities cooperated by summoning any French witnesses who might be needed. If an American soldier was charged with an offense against the person or property of a Frenchman, and the French authorities so desired, they were allowed to have an observer present at the trial. In general, the sentences imposed by American courts-martial were at least as severe as would have been given by French courts for like offenses, and there was no complaint by the French authorities against the working of the American system of military justice.

The case of *Ministre Public* c. *Pratt* [40] illustrates the caution of the French courts in prosecuting an American who might fall within the Franco-American convention. Pratt, formerly a captain in the American Expeditionary Forces, was charged with the fraudulent conversion of property of the French Republic. The court of first instance and the court of appeal held that the French courts were incompetent, and that Pratt was subject only to the American military jurisdiction. Thereafter the American military authorities stated that, because Pratt had been separated from the service, they no longer had power to try him. Nevertheless, it was only after the French Government had certified that there was no objection from the point of view of France's international obligations that the French judiciary would entertain the prosecution.

An agreement in identical language with that between the United States and France was made by exchange of notes between the Secretary of State and the Belgian Ambassador in Washington.[41]

Negotiations on the subject between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain extended over a period of 2 years and a half during the World War.[42] The British Government began those negotiations September 11, 1917, by admitting the extraterritoriality of organized bodies of United States troops in Great Britain "within the limits of the quarters occupied by them," but contended that outside their quarters "they are liable to be dealt with by the English criminal courts for any offenses against the English criminal law but could not be apprehended for any purely military offense (such as desertion, absence without leave, etc.) either by their own or the English military police or by the civil police." The United States Government did not accede to the foregoing; and the British Government, as an interim measure while negotiations were going on, promulgated a regulation under the Defense of the Realm Act, of which the most important paragraph was the following:

"It is hereby declared that the naval and military authority and courts of an Ally may exercise in relation to the members of any naval or military force of that Ally who may for the time being be in the United Kingdom all such powers as are conferred on them by the law of that Ally." [43]

Later the British Government appears not to have pressed the broad claim of jurisdiction which it first made, and submitted a memorandum proposing that a member of the United States forces within British territory should not be tried by a court-martial of the United States if the charge against him were treason or any one of three other offenses, but should be tried by a civil or military court of the United Kingdom.[44] In answer thereto, by its dispatch No. 264, dated July 17, 1918, the Department of State said: [45]

"The note of the British Foreign Office dated April 26 last, with its additional proposals, is regarded by this Government as containing conditions which would create a very dangerous situation as regards the forces of this Government in British territory. The competent authorities of this Government are of the opinion that the result of entering into an agreement such as that proposed in the above-mentioned note would be a partial surrender by the American forces to the British Government of jurisdiction over the military forces of the United States located within British territorial limits for offenses committed on American warships or in American camps and would involve the lack of proper recognition of the character and competency of the existing American military tribunals."

The Department of State went on to suggest that an agreement on the subject be made between the United States and Great Britain like those already concluded between Great Britain and France and between the United States and France, which agreements recognized the exclusive competence of the courts-martial of each country to try members of its own forces. The British Government then withdrew its proposal that American soldiers charged with certain offenses be tried in British courts, and inquired whether the United States would enter into an agreement with it like that with France,[46] and later transmitted a draft of such an agreement; [47] but, as the armistice had been signed and the troops of the United States were being withdrawn from the British Isles, it was never executed.[48] Nevertheless, so far as is recalled by officers of our Army who were in a position to know the facts, no trial of a soldier of the American Expeditionary Forces by a British court actually occurred.

In article 10 of the military agreement subsidiary to the Treaty of Alliance between Great Britain and Iraq of October 10, 1922,[49] it was stipulated that the British Government should exercise military jurisdiction over its British and Indian forces, and that the members of such forces, civilian officials, and "Indian public followers" should be immune from arrest, search, trial, or imprisonment by the civil power in Iraq in respect of criminal offenses, and immune from civil process in respect of any act done in performance of military or official duties. These immunities and privileges in jurisdictional matters were confirmed and continued by article 2 of the annex to the Treaty of Alliance of June 30, 1930, between the same governments.[50]

In 1936, 2 years after the case of *Amrane* v. *John*, *supra*, the British Government recognized the complete sovereignty of the King of Egypt and entered into an alliance with him, one of the conditions of which was a convention concerning the immunities and privileges to be enjoyed by the British forces in Egypt.[51] Article 4 of that convention provided:

"4. No member of the British forces shall be subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the courts of Egypt, nor to the civil jurisdiction of those courts in any matter arising out of his official duties."

Other articles extend judicial immunity also to certain British civil officials and to the wives and children of British military and civil personnel.

After the present war began, but before the United States became a belligerent, by exchange of diplomatic notes of September 2, 1940, in return for the cession of 50 destroyers, the United States obtained from Great Britain the right to lease naval and air bases in Newfoundland, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Antigua, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad, and British Guiana. The United States Government soon afterward sent a delegation to London, including representatives of the Department of Justice, the Army, and the Navy, to negotiate under the supervision of the American Ambassador at London with the British Government as to various matters concerning those bases. After several months of discussion, an agreement was signed at London on March 27, 1941, article

[38] It is published in Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918, Supp. 2, pp. 735–737.

[39] Final Report of the Judge Advocate, American Expeditionary Forces, p. 13; Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918, Supp. 2, pp. 745–747; sec. I, Bulletin 86, General Headquarters, AEF, Oct. 31, 1918; Chalufour, op. cit., p. 57.

[40] Cour de Cassation, Chambre Criminelle, Aug. 13, 1920; 48 Journal du Droit International, p. 970.

[41] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918, Supp. 2, pp. 747, 751.

[42] Ibid., pp. 733–760.

[43] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918, Supp. 2, p. 742; Final Report of the Judge Advocate, A. E. F., p. 12.

[44] Foreign Relations, ibid, p. 745.

[45] Ibid., p. 748.

[46] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918, Supp. 2, pp. 751–752.

[47] Ibid., p. 754.

[48] Ibid., p. 760.

[49] Great Britain, Treaty Series No. 17 (1925), Cmd. 2370.

[50] Ibid, No. 5 (1931).

[51] Ibid, No. 6 (1937), Cmd. 5360; this Journal, Supplement, Vol. 31 (1937), p. 77.

IV of which, quoted in full in the margin, deals with jurisdiction.[50]

That article does not, in so many words, allow to the United States military and naval personnel in the British colonies containing the leased bases that full and complete immunity from jurisdiction of local courts allowed to visiting forces by Marshall in the case of *The Exchange*, by other judges and writers, and by the several conventions already mentioned. It mentions certain classes of offenses, as to which "the United States shall have the absolute right in the first instance to assume and exercise jurisdiction"; but goes on to say that, if the United States does not elect to do so, the offender shall be surrendered to and brought to trial by the appropriate local authorities. Among such are offenses of a military nature, including treason, sabotage, and espionage, which may be committed by members of the United States forces in the colonies in which the bases are located, either within or without the leased areas, and offenses "of any other nature" (which includes the usual common law and statutory felonies and misdemeanors) when committed by "a person other than a British subject" (which, of course, includes members of our Armed Forces) within the leased areas. The agreement is surprisingly silent with respect to jurisdiction over our military and naval personnel in respect of nonmilitary offenses committed by them outside of the leased bases, e. g., a larceny by one of our soldiers of the property of a native in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, or an assault by a sailor of our Navy on a Newfoundlander in the streets of St. John's. Under our own military law, such offenses are undoubtedly triable by our own Army or Navy courts-martial, as military and naval jurisdiction is personal, not territorial, and follows the soldier or sailor wherever he may go on the face of the earth.[51]

It may be argued that, in view of the silence of the agreement with respect to this class of offenses, the general principle stated by Marshall and so many other authorities applies, namely, that the visiting forces are subject only to their own military tribunals, and not to the local courts. It may also be contended that, as the commission of any crime or offense by a soldier at any time or place, on or off duty, is a breach of discipline, paragraph (5) of the article governs and gives the United States exclusive jurisdiction.

These arguments are not convincing. This appears to be an appropriate occasion for the application of the maxim, expressio unius est exclusio alterius. Article IV mentions certain classes of cases in which the United States is to have a preferential right to exercise jurisdiction. If it had been intended to include the class now under consideration, that class would have been mentioned. Its inclusion would have given the United States a preferential right to try its own soldiers and sailors in all cases; and, if that had been the intention of the negotiators, no enumeration of classes of offenses would have been necessary. The argument based on paragraph (5) may also be answered by calling attention to the fact that the word "discipline" is joined with the words "internal administration," and the latter expression clearly shows that the former is not intended to have so broad a meaning as the argument attributes to it.

It may be concluded, therefore, with respect to offenses of a nonmilitary character committed by our soldiers or sailors outside of the leased bases that article IV contemplates concurrent jurisdiction in the American courts-martial and the local courts. The offender is triable in either tribunal.

This brings us to the present war. The first allied country to which the United States sent a considerable force was Australia. On December 17, 1941, 10 days after the entry of the United States into the present war as a belligerent, but before any United States forces had reached that country, the Government of Australia issued an order in council or statutory rule[52] with respect to courts-martial of foreign forces in that country, which undertook to restrict such courts to matters concerning discipline and internal administration and contemplated the concurrent jurisdiction of local courts over the personnel of such forces. Later, on May 27, 1942, the Government of Australia promulgated an amendment to the foregoing,[53] providing as follows:

"6. (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in regulation 4 of these regulations, where any member of the United States Forces in Australia is arrested or detained on a charge of having committed an offence against the law of the Commonwealth or of any State or Territory of the Commonwealth, the appropriate officer of the United States Forces shall be notified and, if he so requests, the member shall be handed over to him and shall thereupon cease to be subject to the jurisdiction of the criminal courts in Australia, and the appropriate naval or military court constituted in accordance with the law of the United States of America applicable to the United States Forces in Australia may exercise in relation to the member such powers as are conferred upon it by that law."

The above quotation shows that the United States forces in Australia have, in every case in which they care to ask for it, exclusive jurisdiction over their own personnel. From an Associated Press dispatch from Canberra of May 27, 1942,[54] the date of issue of the amendatory order, it appears that the Australian Ministry was questioned about the matter on the floor of the House of Representatives of that Commonwealth; and that Mr. Curtin, the Premier, answered as follows:

"Having regard for the practice we ourselves insisted on for years—that members of the Australian Imperial Force serving in other countries should be adjudged by the law of this land and under the authority of our commanding officer—this regulation is entirely consistent with the development of policy governing the matter."

News dispatches have told of the trial in Melbourne in July by a general court-martial of the United States Army of Private Edward J. Leonski, Signal Corps, United States Army, for the murder of three Australian women, of his conviction, and of the imposition by the court of the death sentence.

There are also American forces in considerable number in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Before the United States entered the war, the British Parliament passed the Allied Forces Act, 1940.[55] Notwithstanding the encomiums of English judges on the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *The Exchange*, *supra*, the draftsman of that act appears to have overlooked or disregarded it, as well as the views of authoritative English writers on international law and the agreement between his own country and France during the World War, all recognizing the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts-martial of visiting forces over the personnel of those forces. The act begins, section 1 (1), as follows:

"1. (1) Where any naval, military, or air forces of any foreign power allied with His Majesty are for the time being present in the United Kingdom or on board any of His Majesty's ships or aircraft, the naval, military, and air-force courts and authorities of that power may, subject to the provisions of this act, exercise within the United Kingdom or on board any such ship or aircraft in relation to members of those forces, in matters concerning discipline and internal administration, all such powers as are conferred upon them by the law of that power."

A mere legislative recognition by the Parliament of Great Britain of the right of courts-martial of foreign forces in Great Britain to function, in accordance with the principle of international law above men-

---

[50] Art. IV. Jurisdiction:

(1) In any case in which—

(A) A member of the United States forces, a national of the United States or a person who is not a British subject shall be charged with having committed, either within or without the leased areas, an offense of a military nature, punishable under the law of the United States, including, but not restricted to, treason, an offense relating to sabotage or espionage, or any other offense relating to the security and protection of United States naval and air bases, establishments, equipment, or other property or to operations of the Government of the United States in the territory; or

(B) A British subject shall be charged with having committed any such offense within a leased area and shall be apprehended therein; or

(C) A person other than a British subject shall be charged with having committed an offense of any other nature within a leased area, the United States shall have the absolute right in the first instance to assume and exercise jurisdiction with respect to such offense.

(2) If the United States shall elect not to assume and exercise such jurisdiction the United States authorities shall, where such offense is punishable in virtue of legislation enacted pursuant to article V or otherwise under the law of the territory, so inform the government of the territory and shall, if it shall be agreed between the government of the territory and the United States authorities that the alleged offender should be brought to trial, surrender him to the appropriate authority in the territory for that purpose.

(3) If a British subject shall be charged with having committed within a leased area an offense of the nature described in paragraph (1) (A) of this article, and shall not be apprehended therein, he shall, if in the territory outside the leased areas, be brought to trial before the courts of the territory; or, if the offense is not punishable under the law of the territory, he shall, on the request of the United States authorities, be apprehended and surrendered to the United States authorities and the United States shall have the right to exercise jurisdiction with respect to the alleged offense.

(4) When the United States exercises jurisdiction under this article and the person charged is a British subject, he shall be tried by a United States court sitting in a leased area in the territory.

(5) Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to affect, prejudice, or restrict the full exercise at all times of jurisdiction and control by the United States in matters of discipline and internal administration over members of the United States forces, as conferred by the law of the United States and any regulation made thereafter. (H. Rept. Doc. 158, 77th Cong., 1st sess.; this Journal, supp., vol. 35 (1941), p. 136).

[51] Articles of War, introductory sentence, art. 2, 93, and others; 10 U. S. Code, 1471, 1473, 1565; Digest of Opinions of the Judge Advocate General, U. S. Army, 1912, p. 511, par. VIII B; this author, The Army Court-Martial System, 1941 Wisconsin Law Review, 311, 320; Articles for the Government of the Navy, introductory sentence, 34 U. S. Code, 1200.

[52] No. 302, 1941.

[53] Statutory Rule No. 241, 1942.

[54] Evening Star, Washington, D. C. May 27, 1942.

[55] 3 & 4 Geo. 6, ch. 51.

tioned, would be unobjectionable to any other country and might be advantageous from the British standpoint; but the language of the act shows that subsection 1 (1) is something quite different. That subsection itself, above quoted, says that foreign courts-martial may function in England "subject to the provisions of this act." In other words, the foreign court-martial may function insofar as the British act of Parliament authorizes or allows it to do so.

Subsections 2 (2) and 2 (3) also speak of the courts-martial of the visiting forces having jurisdiction "by virtue of the foregoing section," i. e., section 1, showing that it is the theory of the Allied Forces Act that foreign courts operate in Britain by authority of that act, that it is a delegation of power to them. This view is believed to be unsound. The courts-martial of the armed forces of any nation derive each and all their powers from the laws of that nation, and can accept no grant of power from any other.

Section 2 (1) of the act expressly recognizes the concurrent jurisdiction of British civil courts over the personnel of visiting forces, and is therefore inconsistent with the well-established principle of the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts-martial of the visiting forces. Section 2 (3) of the act says that the courts-martial of visiting forces shall not have jurisdiction of certain cases. No nation can admit that another shall tell it that it may not try its own soldiers before its own courts-martial in certain cases.

It is, therefore, not surprising that, as soon as it was foreseen that United States forces would be sent to the British Isles, negotiations were begun between the two Governments as to the status of those forces. After considerable discussion, the British Government agreed that the United States should have exclusive jurisdiction over the personnel of its own forces, whether on duty or off, and whether within their own quarters or without. That agreement has been embodied in an exchange of diplomatic notes, dated July 27, 1942, and in an act of Parliament approved by the King August 6, 1942.[86] The notes are printed in the schedule annexed to the act. The notes and the act recognize to the fullest degree the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts-martial of the United States over our soldiers and sailors. Section 1 (1) provides:

"1. (1) Subject as hereinafter provided, no criminal proceedings shall be prosecuted in the United Kingdom before any court of the United Kingdom against a member of the military or naval forces of the United States of America: *Provided*, That upon representations made to him on behalf of the Government of the United States of America with respect to any particular case, a Secretary of State may by order direct that the provisions of this subsection shall not apply in that case."

The British note speaks of "the very considerable departure which the above arrangements will involve from the traditional system and practice of the United Kingdom." In the debate in the House of Commons, members referred to the bill as a "striking innovation" and as being "of a completely revolutionary character."[87] The act does not deserve such description. As has been shown, substantially all the authorities and precedents support it, including the precedent of the exclusive jurisdiction exercised by the British Army over its personnel in France during the First World War, and the like exclusive jurisdiction conceded in fact to our forces over their personnel by Great Britain during the First World War, though that concession was not embodied in a formal exchange of notes. Since the passage of the act, the newspapers have carried an account of the trial and acquittal by court-martial of the United States Army of an American soldier tried for rape of an English woman.

It goes without saying that it is the right and duty of the government of the host country to make sure that the persons and property of its nationals are effectively protected against crimes by members of the visiting forces, and that the latter's immunity from prosecution in the local courts is not used as a cloak to enable them to commit such crimes with impunity. In the several expeditionary forces which the United States sent to friendly foreign countries in the First World War and in others, the military and naval officers in command have always been ready to prosecute before their own courts-martial any member of their own forces against whom the local authorities (or any individual national of the host country) presented prima facie evidence of having committed a crime or offense. In his note to the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, dated July 27, 1942, the American Ambassador at London wrote:

"In order to avoid all doubt, I wish to point out that the military and naval authorities will assume the responsibility to try and on conviction to punish all offenses which members of the American forces may be alleged on sufficient evidence to have committed in the United Kingdom."

What does the foregoing survey show to be the legal situation of friendly foreign armed forces? It shows, in the first place, by substantial unanimity of opinion among judges and writers on international law, and according to many international agreements, that the invitation or permission of the host country to enter its territories carries with it, at least unless clearly denied, an implied exemption or immunity of the personnel of visiting forces from the jurisdiction of the local courts and a consent to the functioning of the courts-martial of such forces. In other words, the permission to enter carries with it an implied but nonetheless clear and definite consent to the exclusive jurisdiction over such forces of their own courts-martial.

The only question in doubt is how far such immunity from the local courts extends. In the first place, does it follow the visiting soldier at all times and in all places while he is within the host country, or only part of the time and in some places? In its negotiations with the United States during the First World War, the British Government began by admitting the extraterritoriality of United States troops "within the limits of the quarters occupied by them."[88] Lawrence, in the passage already quoted, says that the visiting troops would not be amenable to local law, but would be under the jurisdiction and control of their own commanders, "as long as they remained within their own lines or were away on duty, but not otherwise." Oppenheim, in the paragraph previously quoted, says that the exemption from the local courts "applies only in case the crime is committed, either within the place where the force is stationed, or in some place where the criminal was on duty; it does not apply, if, for example, soldiers belonging to a foreign garrison of a fortress leave the rayon of the fortress, not on duty but for recreation and pleasure, and then and there commit a crime."

On the other hand, neither the other writers on international law nor Chief Justice Marshall in his opinion in the case of *The Exchange* make any exceptions based upon whether the soldiers are on or off duty, or are within or without their own camps. None of the several international agreements which have been mentioned makes any such distinction, except that between the United States and Great Britain respecting the leased bases in British possessions in the Western Hemisphere.

The objection to the distinction is that, under the conditions of modern warfare, it becomes illusory. There no longer exists such a situation as that of which Professor Oppenheim spoke, of soldiers belonging to a foreign garrison leaving "the rayon of the fortress." There were millions of American and British soldiers in France during the First World War. The majority of them were not in separate camps or reservations, but were quartered in every village, often in the houses of the inhabitants, as this writer was on many occasions. That the situation is substantially the same in the present war is shown by the following quotation from the syndicated column of Ernie Pyle, written from "Somewhere in Northern Ireland":[89]

"There is no such thing over here as an immense camp of thousands and thousands of men like the camps back home. Anything more than a few hundred in one camp is unusual here.

"The troops are dispersed all around Northern Ireland, usually in quarters formerly occupied by the British. Although most of the troops are living in small camps, in Nissen huts, not all of them are. Others live in every conceivable way. They live in old mills, in castles, in barns, in private homes, and what not."

To say that the visiting soldier who lives under such conditions loses his immunity when he steps outside of the house in which he is billeted would make that immunity meaningless and nugatory, and defeat the very purpose which brought it into existence. Nor is the distinction between "on duty" and "off duty" more helpful. In modern warfare, that distinction also fades out. In these days of bombing from the sky, the members of an antiaircraft battery may have to jump to their guns at any moment, the pilot of a plane may be called upon to take off at any time, and the infantryman must always be prepared to repel paratroops or commandos. Any of these things may happen when he is walking in the town square with his girl friend or drinking beer in the inn; and, in a broad but nevertheless accurate sense, he is always on duty.

Let us carry the matter a bit further. Suppose foreign allied troops are in a country where fighting is going on. A column on the march to battle is halted and the men are allowed to break ranks and relax for a few moments. May a soldier who then enters a tavern and gets into a fight with a villager be held by the town constable for trial at the next assizes, because the offense was committed outside of his quarters and when off duty? No captain in any army would permit a man to be taken from his company at such a time for such a reason.

It is noteworthy that, in the one international agreement which accepted the view of Lawrence and Oppenheim, the facts more closely resembled the now obsolete situation which they had in mind. In the bases leased by Great Britain to the United States, our troops are not scattered through the villages and over the countryside, or billeted on the inhabitants. There, there is in substance a foreign garrison of a fortress, to use Oppenheim's expression. In each colony one or more tracts, accurately described by metes and bounds and usually of considerable extent, have been leased to the United States for 99 years. It is within those leased areas only that the soldier or sailor normally performs his duties and is quartered. Furthermore, those bases are so far from the enemy

[86] 5 and 6 Geo. 6, c. 31.

[87] Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Official Report, Aug. 4, 1942, vol. 382, pp. 902, 910.

[88] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918, Supp. 2, p. 733.

[89] Washington News, Aug. 6, 1942.

countries that they are relatively free from danger of bombing or invasion by paratroops or commandos. The soldier or sailor may, therefore, well submit to some change in his status when he leaves the leased area for pleasure.

It may be concluded, however, that in the absence of an agreement providing otherwise, such as that made with respect to the leased bases, the exemption of visiting forces from the jurisdiction of local courts is not limited to offenses committed in their own camps or quarters or when on duty, but exists at all times and in all places within the country which has invited or permitted the foreign troops to enter its borders.

The next question is whether the immunity of the visiting soldier or sailor extends to civil suits. In his opinion in the case of *The Exchange*, already quoted, Chief Justice Marshall referred to a waiver of "all jurisdiction" over visiting troops. In *Coleman* v. *Tennessee*, supra, the Supreme Court said that the soldier in a friendly foreign country is exempt from the "civil and criminal jurisdiction of the place." The above phrase was repeated with approval in *Dow* v. *Johnson*, supra. The view of the Supreme Court of the United States seems clearly to be, therefore, that the visiting soldiers or sailors are exempt from the civil as well as the criminal jurisdiction of the host country, i. e., they may not be sued civilly in its courts. In passages already quoted, Wheaton and Birkhimer refer to exemption from the "civil and criminal jurisdiction of the place." On the other hand, in the quotations hitherto made, Hall and Hyde refer to "offenses," Oppenheim to "crime," Clunet to "conseils de guerre" and "infractions," Van Praag to "affaires pénales," and the Bustamante Code to "penal laws," all expressions indicating that the visiting soldier is exempt from the criminal jurisdiction of the host state; but it is impossible to say whether those learned authors intended to hold that he is not exempt from civil suit, or whether the question of civil liability had not occurred to them.

In the passage already quoted from the agreement made between France and Great Britain during the first World War, the two countries recognized "the exclusive competence of the tribunals of their respective armies." The agreements between the United States and France and between the United States and Belgium use almost identical language. Those expressions standing alone are broad enough to cover civil suits against visiting soldiers; but in each case they are followed by other passages relating to "infringements" (probably an inaccurate translation of the French word "infractions") or "offenses," which indicate that the draftsmen of the agreements had criminal jurisdiction mainly, if not exclusively, in mind. So far as is recalled by the present writer and other officers of the United States Army who were in a position to know of it if that occurred, no civil suit was brought against any member of the American Expeditionary Forces in a British or French court during the first World War.

There is a practical reason against extending immunity so far. As has been said, the government of the host country is entitled to demand that the immunity which its visitors enjoy be not used as a cloak to enable them to commit crimes against its nationals with impunity. This may be easily prevented by prompt and adequate punishment of such offenders by the courts-martial of their own forces. But the government of the host country is also entitled to demand that immunity from civil suit on the part of the members of the visiting forces be not used by them as a cloak to enable them to escape paying their just debts to nationals of the host country. Though the ancient High Court of Chivalry, composed of the Lord High Constable and the Earl Marshal of England, had civil as well as criminal jurisdiction over military men, that court has not sat since the reign of Queen Anne;[58] and modern courts-martial, neither in the British service, nor in our own, nor in any other of which this writer is aware, have any jurisdiction of civil suits against military personnel. The only thing that a court-martial can do in such a matter is to punish a soldier for bringing discredit on the military service by dishonorably failing to pay his debts, in violation of the 96th Article of War;[59] or, if the debtor is an officer, for conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman in failing to do so, in violation of the 95th Article.[60] Such action is not infrequently taken, but it benefits the creditor only insofar as the fear that it may be taken impels the debtor to pay up. The court-martial can only impose a sentence; it cannot give a judgment ordering the debtor to pay his creditor, levy on his goods, or attach his pay. And punitive action may be taken only if the debt be undisputed. Neither a court-martial, nor the debtor's commanding officer, nor any other military authority has jurisdiction to decide whether a disputed debt is or is not legally owed; and still less has any of them authority to adjudicate an unliquidated claim sounding either in contract or tort.[61]

An officer or soldier of the visiting forces may make purchases on credit at a store in the town where he is quartered, and fail to pay for them. If his own government does not furnish him quarters and subsistence, but pays him an allowance in lieu thereof and expects him to provide for himself, he may run up a bill with his landlady and fail to pay it. He may negligently or intentionally injure a national of the host state or the national's property. Another class of civil controversy which unfortunately often arises during military occupations is the question of paternity. An unmarried woman of the host country may charge that a soldier of the visiting army is the father of her child and should support him. The alleged debtor or defendant may contend that he has a good defense in each of the cases supposed. If he is clothed with immunity protecting him from civil suit in the local courts, there is no tribunal whatever in which, as a practical matter, he may be sued and the case decided according to law. Such a situation may constitute a serious wrong to the nationals of the host state, of which its government may justly complain.

Is there any way to reconcile the antinomy between the necessity that a military commander in war have complete and exclusive control of his men and the necessity that those men pay their just debts and obligations to the people of the country whose guests they are? Of the litigated cases in which the status of visiting forces has been in issue, *The Exchange*, *Dow* v. *Johnson*, and *Tucker* v. *Alexandroff*, *supra*, were civil and not criminal proceedings. The Casa Blanca case was an international arbitration, which, if it had been before a national and not an international court, would have been a civil and not a criminal proceeding. *The Exchange* case involved the right to control a public armed vessel of a friendly foreign sovereign. The Alexandroff and Casa Blanca cases involved the right to control the person of a visiting sailor or soldier. Dow against Johnson was a suit against an army officer with the object of holding him personally liable for acts done in the line of his official duty. All the cases held that the soldier or sailor concerned was subject to the exclusive control of the officers and tribunals of his own country.

The foregoing cases point a way out of the difficulty. It is believed that, in the first place, the courts of the host country ought not to take jurisdiction of any civil suit tending to control the person of the visiting soldier or sailor. In order that the military duties, to discharge which he came to that country, may be promptly and efficiently performed, his person must at all times be within the exclusive control of his own commanding officer. Fortunately arrest or imprisonment for debt is obsolete in Great Britain, the United States, and in most, if not all, other countries; but a court may still commit for contempt. No such committal ought to be permitted of a member of the visiting forces.

But, further than that, no suit should be entertained which even questions that complete control which the commanding officer ought to have over the persons of the members of his command, such as a petition for habeas corpus. No self-respecting nation would allow the courts of another, even though friendly, country to inquire into the validity of the enlistment or induction of one of its soldiers, or the legality of his confinement in its own guardhouse. Merely to permit such an inquiry to be carried on would be destructive of discipline and an affront to the ally to whose forces the soldier belongs. Our own State courts may not make such an inquiry,[62] and still less ought a foreign court to be allowed to do so.

It goes without saying that the arms and equipment of the visiting soldier or sailor are not subject to the process of the local courts. Usually they are the property of his country, and the property of a friendly foreign nation in the possession of its agents is immune to interference by the courts of the place.[63] Even if any arms or equipment should be the personal property of the soldier, they are required for his use in the public service of his country, and ought to be exempt on the clearest grounds of public policy.

Neither ought the visiting soldier's pay to be subject to attachment or garnishment by a court of the host country. The pay of one of our soldiers or sailors may not be attached by our own courts.[64] A fortiori a foreign court should not be allowed to do so.[65] Such an attachment would in effect be a suit against a friendly foreign nation, and an interference by the court of the host country with money which is the property of another nation and with the official duties which the paymaster is directed by the statutes of his own country and the orders of his superiors to perform. No nation will tolerate such interference. From the standpoint of the soldier's military efficiency, which is the determining consideration in time of war, nothing could be worse than a total stoppage of his pay.

It is also quite clear that no civil suit should be entertained by any court of the host country against an officer, soldier, or

---

[58] Winthrop, Military Law and Precedents, original p. 49, reprint p. 46; this author, "The Army Court-Martial System," loc. cit., p. 318.

[59] 10 U. S. Code, 1568; Manual for Courts-Martial, U. S. Army, 1928, par. 152b.

[60] 10 U. S. Code, 1567; Manual for Courts-Martial, U. S. Army, 1928, par. 151.

[61] Manual for Courts-Martial, U. S. Army, par. 152b; Digest of Opinions of The Judge Advocate General, U. S. Army, 1912, p. 510, pars. VIII A 1 and 2.

[62] *Tarble* case (13 Wall. 397).

[63] *Vavasseur* v. *Krupp* (L. R. 9 Ch. D. 351); *The Parlement Belge* (L. R. 5 D. P. 197); *Kingdom of Roumania* v *Guaranty Trust Co.* (250 Fed. 341); *Mason* v. *Intercolonial Ry. Co.* (197 Mass. 349, 83 N. E. 876).

[64] *Buchanan* v. *Alexander* (4 How. 20).

[65] See *Kingdom of Roumania* v. *Guaranty Trust Co.* and *Mason* v. *Intercolonial Railway Co.*, *supra*.

sailor for any act or omission in the line of his duty. The agreements between Great Britain and Iraq and between Great Britain and Egypt, already cited, provide for such immunity. In so acting or failing to act, he is the representative of his country, and the suit would be in substance a suit against it. Congress has passed acts setting up machinery for the payment of claims against the United States by nationals of foreign countries arising out of the operations of our forces therein.[69] If the state to which the visiting forces belong should have no such legislation, or if a particular claim should be outside its scope, the claimant should present his claim through diplomatic channels.

Furthermore, no civil suit against a visiting soldier or sailor should be brought to trial, or a default judgment rendered against him, at a time and place when it is impracticable for the soldier or sailor to appear and defend the same because of his military duties, which in time of war must come first. The members of the visiting forces ought to have the same sort of protection as is afforded to our own personnel by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.[70]

Subject to the foregoing exceptions and limitations, it is believed that civil suits against members of the visiting forces ought to be allowed, though no specific authority can be cited in support of that view. To that extent the theory of total immunity of the visiting soldier should yield to the practical necessity for a tribunal which can pass upon disputed civil liabilities of the visiting soldier, and the nation to which the visiting troops belong should waive the exemption to which in strict law they may be entitled.

It may be argued that a right to sue so limited will be valueless. Is that true? At least a forum is provided where the legal existence and validity of the debt may be adjudicated. If the decision is for the plaintiff, the matter becomes res judicata in his favor and he may sue on the judgment in a court of the debtor's home country. But the creditor has a more practical remedy, and one nearer at hand, if the debtor be an American soldier. Our War Department holds that when a debt has been reduced to judgment, it is no longer open to dispute by the soldier debtor; and his continued failure to pay it, insofar as his means allow, constitutes conduct bringing discredit upon the military service, for which he may be tried and punished by court-martial.[71]

In paragraph 7 of his note of July 27, 1942, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs stated that, though the arrangements in regard to American forces in the United Kingdom are not dependent upon a formal grant of reciprocity, it would be agreeable if the American Ambassador were to inform him that the Government of the United States would take all steps in its power to insure to British forces in the United States a like position. The American Ambassador did not answer the foregoing further than to say that "my Government agrees to the several understandings which were raised in your note." There are a few British troops in the United States. The question is therefore presented: What is their legal status? If one of them should commit a crime or misdemeanor, what court would be entitled to try and punish him?

It is submitted that the United States should allow full reciprocity on this subject, that is to say, the United States should concede to Britain the same exclusive criminal jurisdiction over the personnel of British armed forces on United States soil as Britain has conceded to us. From the exchange of notes, it is to be inferred that the Department of State is willing to do so. But the more serious question is, Will American courts, State and Federal, recognize the agreement embodied in the exchange of notes and hold themselves to be without jurisdiction over offenses committed by personnel of British forces who are in this country with the permission of our Government?

If the agreement were in the form of a treaty by which each nation conceded to the other exclusive jurisdiction over that other's military and naval personnel on its soil, there would be no doubt. As treaties are, pursuant to article VI of the Constitution, "the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." such a treaty would be binding on both the Federal and State courts.[72]

Is a treaty necessary in order that the courts, Federal and State, shall be bound to give up jurisdiction over British military and naval personnel to their own courts-martial? The question should be answered in the negative. The agreement by exchange of notes may not be binding upon our courts, but international law is a part of the law of the United States and is binding upon them.[73]

In the *Schooner Exchange* v. *McFadden, Coleman* v. *Tennessee*, and *Dow* v. *Johnson*, all previously discussed herein, the Supreme Court of the United States said in the most positive language that the courts-martial of foreign troops permitted by the government of the host country to enter its territory have jurisdiction over the personnel of their own forces, to the exclusion of the local courts. Those cases, it will be noted, do not depend upon any treaty or exchange of diplomatic notes, but upon the view that the exemption of friendly foreign troops from the jurisdiction of the courts of the nation in which they are is a principle of the unwritten law of nations. It is of course impossible to foretell with mathematical accuracy how a court will decide any case; nevertheless there can be little doubt that any Federal court, before which the like question should come, would follow three decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, one of them from the pen of the illustrious Marshall. Unless the court should disregard those opinions, it would be obliged to hold, without regard to the exchange of notes, that British military personnel forming part of an organized force entering the United States with the consent of our Government are exempt from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States.

A case arising in a State court ought to be decided the same way, and probably would be if the above decisions were brought to the attention of the court. It is, however, possible that one or more judges of inferior courts sitting under the authority of a State, such as city police courts or rural justices of the peace, unskilled in matters of international law, might in the first instance undertake to assert their jurisdiction over such British personnel brought before them charged with an offense, and might even convict and sentence such personnel. If the Department of State should make public announcement that, in its view, the personnel of British armed forces permitted by this Government to enter the United States are subject to the jurisdiction of their own courts-martial only and exempt from that of courts of the United States and the several States; and if the Department of Justice should follow the example set in the case of *The Exchange*, and direct the appropriate United States attorney to file a suggestion, as was done in that case, that the case before the court is within the exclusive competence of a British court-martial, the likelihood of such a conviction would be still further diminished. Even if such a conviction should take place in a police court or before a justice of the peace, it should be reversed and the sentence set aside by the proper appellate court upon such a suggestion by the United States attorney and upon the three cases above mentioned being cited.

It is concluded that the general principle is abundantly established by reason, authority, and precedent, that the personnel of the armed forces of nation A, in nation B by the latter's invitation or consent, are subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of their own courts-martial and exempt from that of the courts of B, unless such exemption be waived. That principle has already been expressly recognized by several of the United Nations. Its recognition by all of them, by means of formal agreement or otherwise, will contribute greatly to the military efficiency of friendly troops on the soil of an ally and will help win the war.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be included in my remarks at this point an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. George Finch, who is the managing editor of the American Journal of International Law, and one of the recognized authorities on international law and constitutional law in our country.

Mr. Finch gave his testimony before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate on April 10, and 11, 1953, and the excerpt which I ask to have printed in the RECORD is found at pages 86 through 89 of a booklet entitled "The Erroneous Arguments of the Opponents of a Constitutional Amendment on Treaties and Executive Agreements. An Analysis and Answer." Mr. Finch's testimony also shows how erroneous were the statements and conclusions arrived at by the Legal Adviser to the State Department.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A curious criticism was made by representatives of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York in their testimony before this subcommittee on February 19. They envisioned an enemy invading the United States by way of Alaska and a Canadian motorized division being rushed to our aid through United States territory under an agreement with the President.

It was argued that unless and until Congress, under our proposed amendment, if it were adopted, passed a law making the agreement effective in this country, the Canadian Army would be subject to all the State laws forbidding the carrying of firearms, traffic regulations, and so forth.

I must say, Senators, I sat in amazement to listen to such a statement by people claiming to be qualified to testify on the subject.

No situation like that could arise under the rules of international law.

And you must remember in all these subjects of international relations you are not

[69] Acts of Apr. 18, 1918 (5 U. S. Code, 210); July 1, 1918 (34 U. S. Code, 600); Jan. 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 880).

[70] Act of Oct. 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1178, 50 U. S. Code, 501, et seq.).

[71] Dig. Op. JAG, 1912, p. 879, par. V; ibid., 1912-40, par. 454 (46).

[72] *Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 Dallas, 199, 236); *Worcester* v. *Georgia* (6 Peters 515, 561); *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 483).

[73] *The Paquete Habana* (155 U. S. 677, 700).

only in the field of constitutional law, but you are in the field of international law to which we as a member of the family of nations are obliged to give respect.

Under international law a friendly foreign army passing through this country by official permission would not be subject to either Federal or State jurisdiction unless there were conditions in the treaty or executive agreement to that effect, a highly improbable situation.

The exemption from domestic jurisdiction of a foreign army passing through our territory is in the same category of sovereign immunities as the sovereign himself and his diplomatic representatives while in this country, and of his public ships of war in our waters.

The reasons for these immunities from territorial jurisdiction were stated by Chief Justice Marshall as follows:

"One sovereign being in no respect amenable to another, and being bound by obligations of the highest character not to degrade the dignity of his nation, by placing himself or his sovereign rights within the jurisdiction of another, can be supposed to enter a foreign territory only under an express license, or in the confidence that the immunity depending on his independent sovereign station, though not expressly stipulated, are reserved by implication and will be extended to him."

Mr. Chief Justice Marshall made that statement in the very celebrated *Exchange* v. *McFadden* case.

You will find that case as one of the cases I teach my students in the class of international law at the Georgetown School of Foreign Service.

For further information on this subject and to bring you up to date, those who are interested in the matter should read an article in the American Journal of International Law, published in 1942, volume 36, pages 539 to 567, entitled "Jurisdiction Over Friendly Foreign Armed Forces," by Col. Archibald King, a very distinguished member of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the United States Army.

In this case these gentlemen put up a hypothetical situation that we were being invaded from Alaska and that the President in order to help us get up a quick defense before it could get down here, asked Canada to send us a motorized division in order to help us defend, and this division to get here quicker came down through the United States.

Then this gentleman said if you adopt that amendment you defeat the attempt of the President to defend the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Your argument is that they are here by official permission?

Mr. FINCH. Yes.

Now Mr. Nash talked about the stationing of troops in the United States under certain of our agreements, under the defense agreements, and foreign troops being sent here for training and what would be the law governing those troops.

Now, I have not had a chance to write a brief on that, but I should say offhand the law would be this: As long as foreign troops are over here as organized bodies under the command of their own officers, this rule cited by Chief Justice Marshall would apply.

If troops are permanently stationed and garrisoned here, and still under the control of their own commanders, the rule would probably also apply.

If they come here as student officers, not under the command of their own people, but going to some of our military colleges, or somewhere else, they would certainly be under the same rules as our own soldiers and officers at those colleges would be governed by.

If Congress passes a law authorizing some foreign cadet to go to West Point, you would not say he carried immunity from our laws there, but he would be governed by the rules governing West Point cadets.

Now it was argued that this amendment of the American Bar Association would prevent the making of agreements changing this rule of international law where it might be desirable to place some of these men under local jurisdiction for certain purposes, that you could not do that under our amendment, because it requires the consent of the States. That is an argument in reverse, because the States, to begin with, do not have this power.

The laws that apply, under Chief Judge Marshall's ruling, are the laws of the United States.

Now if we wish to make agreements, as we probably have made agreements, it is necessary to make agreements for troops to be stationed a long time in order that these friendly troops may not themselves become a cause of friction because of their relation to the local population—the proposition is not to take away from the States any jurisdiction because they do not have it.

The proposition is to confer on the States jurisdiction which they do not have.

So, the gentlemen who made that argument are arguing the question in reverse.

Now, you might say, and this would apply either to a treaty or Executive agreement, the President or the Congress or the treaty-making power wishes to enter into an agreement that troops stationed here shall be subject to certain suits in our civil courts or certain of our criminal courts. That is conferring a power on the State.

It is not taking anything away, because they do not have it to take away.

Can you imagine a State then saying, "We don't want this jurisdiction?"

The only reason why the executive or the Congress would make such an agreement would be because the State wanted it.

I cannot imagine any State where foreign troops were stationed objecting to any agreement made by the Federal Government which would say these troops when they are down here in your territory in certain matters affecting your population shall be subject to your courts, and if the Federal Government agrees to that, that is all you have to do in order to make it legal according to international law.

I just could not understand those arguments, arguments in reverse against our amendment.

They are not only trying to argue that our amendment would take away certain rights of States according to their laws, but they also say you cannot confer any rights on them.

THE SPECIOUS STATES RIGHTS ARGUMENT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, to shore up his case for the criminal jurisdiction provisions of the treaty, Mr. Phleger resorted to a specious States rights argument. For example, he advised the committee:

> Now, when these [treaties] were under consideration the question was, Will the United States surrender its sovereignty? Will the United States agree that if a French soldier goes into the city of Richmond and gets drunk and kills a citizen of Virginia that the court-martial proceeding shall be the exclusive remedy before a French court-martial? We could not conceive, the negotiators, that this Senate or the United States would ratify any such treaty (record of hearings, p. 56).

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee appears to have accepted Mr. Phleger's States rights argument. For example, reference is made on page 15 of the report to the undesirability of depriving State courts of jurisdiction except in certain cases. Here, again, Mr. Phleger was 100 percent wrong. When armed forces of foreign countries are invited to come to the United States it is not a question of depriving the States of jurisdiction over their nonmilitary offenses. The States have no such jurisdiction unless it be conferred by the United States with the consent of the foreign power.

That, again, is clearly outlined in the testimony of Mr. George Finch, which is a part of the record at this time.

A STRANGE QUID PRO QUO

Perhaps the most fantastic argument advanced by Mr. Phleger is that the criminal jurisdiction provisions of the treaty constitute a good bargain. This is Mr. Phleger's statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

> I have no doubt when these negotiators sat down the objective which the United States negotiators had was to get the maximum of jurisdiction over its own forces while abroad, tempered, however, by the realization that if they acquired that abroad they would have to grant it in the United States, and I cannot see the possibility of the United States Senate agreeing that if a foreign soldier on United States territory, not in the performance of his duty, were to commit a crime, that the foreign military force could try him, and the civilian courts would have no jurisdiction. That, to my mind, cannot be considered (record of hearing, p. 26).

The committee accepted, uncritically I fear, Mr. Phleger's assertion that a hard bargain had been driven. For example, on page 11 of the committee report, this statement appears:

> The committee would not look with favor upon a complete surrender of criminal jurisdiction over foreign troops in the United States to a foreign power.

I ask the question: Why not? Let us refer back to Mr. Phleger's example of the French soldier who gets into trouble in Richmond, Va. It is at least 100 times more likely that an American soldier will get into trouble in France. The hearings disclose that only about 3,000 NATO troops are in the United States at any one time. How can anyone seriously believe that the American people would rather have criminal jurisdiction over foreign troops here than to have 100 times that number of Americans overseas tried by their fellow-Americans under the laws prescribed by their representatives in Congress. Americans in Richmond will gladly turn over the French soldier to his commanding officer when they realize that Americans in Marseilles will thereby be kept out of the court of a Communist judge. To trade a dollar for a penny is not a good bargain, Herman Phleger to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. President, other arguments strange to American ears were advanced for this weird bargain. General Smith said that we must "reduce the administrative burden on the troop commander"—record of hearings, page 3.

In my judgment, any good commander knows that the morale of his troops far outweighs the administrative burden of insuring them a fair trial. In addition, Congress has appropriated large sums of money to send officers through law school. Many lawyers have volunteered in the Armed Forces or have been drafted, and are also available. Their services should be utilized to give all members of our Nation's Armed Forces, here and abroad, the best possible type of military justice possible.

Messrs. Smith and Phleger also argued that failure to give foreign countries criminal jurisdiction over American troops would jeopardize the maintenance of friendly foreign relations. That is about the flimsiest argument which could be advanced.

That is hard to believe. American servicemen are stationed in Europe to defend that soil against overwhelming odds. If the host countries cannot find the manpower for their own defense out of a population far greater than ours, if they cannot pay the full cost of maintaining their own forces, if they cannot exact from their forces the same military service we demand of ours, then surely they will not refuse to contribute to the common defense effort by permitting the trial of Americans by Americans. But if their hostility toward America runs so deep, which I doubt, that is an additional reason for not submitting American forces to trial in their courts.

Mr. President, a high official of this Government, only recently returned from abroad, said the hatred toward Americans was increasing, particularly in European countries. In view of that, I, for one, do not wish to have our troops, who have been drafted from our homes and taken to foreign soil, submitted to trial in the courts of those countries, where the feeling against Americans seems to run so high.

As pointed out in the committee report, page 11—

> The United States cannot demand treaty rights for its troops abroad that it is not willing to accord to foreign troops here.

Equality of treatment is provided in the reservation I have proposed, Mr. President. The military authorities of the United States would exercise exclusive criminal jurisdiction over American forces abroad. The same right is recognized with respect to the troops of other NATO countries in the United States. That is the bargain which should have been made originally. It is the only bargain consistent with the legal rights of American servicemen, with generally recognized principles of international law which have stood for 150 years, and with the harsh realities of international relations.

THE SECRET AND ILLEGAL EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. President, at this point I wish to discuss the secret and illegal executive agreements which have been made in connection with this matter. I wish the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], were in the Chamber at this time, because he presided at the meeting when this proposal was made and when an excuse was given by the representatives of the State Department that already the United States has delivered troops to foreign courts, under Executive agreements. If that be true, it is clearly an illegal usurpation of authority by the Executive, in violation of the act of Congress in enacting into law the military code.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the record show that executive agreements were entered into in regard to the trial of American troops by various courts of other nations?

Mr. BRICKER. The executive agreements were not produced at the committee hearing. The State Department's representatives said those documents were classified, I believe; and I do not know that the members of the committee or even the staff of the committee were permitted to see them. However, that is clearly the situation, and the report shows it.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt of it.

Mr. BRICKER. The State Department admitted that the troops had been turned over to such courts of foreign countries, under executive agreements illegally made, contrary to the Military Code of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. And various sentences have been imposed by foreign courts; the record clearly shows that is the case.

Let me say that, upon my request, those records have been delivered to me; and I should like to have them made a part of the RECORD, if the Senator from Ohio is willing to have me so request at this point.

Mr. BRICKER. I shall be very happy to have them submitted, for printing at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the records may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the records were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. HOLT

APRIL 28, 1953.

In response to your oral query to me of April 23, 1953, inquiring the statistics as to the number of trials in local civilian courts, and sentences imposed, in NATO countries, the Department of Defense has supplied the following information, all dealing with the period since January 1, 1951:

The Department of the Navy reports as follows on cases dealing with Marine personnel:

There were seven cases, involving charges of assault and battery and robbery. There were no acquittals. The average sentence ranged between $30 and $175 fines and sentences of 6 months' confinement. All sentences of confinement were suspended.

Cases involving Navy personnel were as follows:

Fifty-four cases involving assault, theft, and disturbing the peace; 1 case of rape; 3 involving involuntary manslaughter. There were 11 acquittals. The average sentence varied between $30 fine and 12 months' imprisonment. All sentences of confinement were suspended except those involving the 3 manslaughter cases, which were of 18-month terms each.

The Department of the Army reports that in France there were 64 cases involving military personnel and 14 civilians; in Italy, 17 cases involving military personnel and 60 cases involving civilians; in Turkey, 12 cases involving military personnel and 12 cases involving civilians; in the United Kingdom, 3 cases involving military personnel and no cases involving civilians. Negative reports were received from all other European countries. Statistics with regard to Canada not yet received.

The cases in France involved the following: 2 hit-and-run cases, 4 accident cases, 15 serious assault cases, 13 simple assault cases, 3 negligent homicides, 9 larceny cases, 4 cases of use of narcotics, 3 robbery cases, and 25 miscellaneous petty and traffic-violation cases.

The United Kingdom cases all involved minor traffic offenses.

The cases in Italy included 1 case of possession of an unauthorized weapon, 2 cases of housebreaking and attempted larceny, 1 case of reckless driving, 1 case of attempted fraud, and 72 minor traffic offenses.

The cases in Turkey were composed of 2 cases of selling duty-free goods to unauthorized persons, 9 violations of foreign-exchange regulations, 3 cases of assault and battery, 4 cases of involuntary manslaughter, 1 case of aggravated assault, 4 cases of reckless driving, and 1 case of murder in which the defendant was acquitted.

Tentative reports from the Air Force indicate the following: In France there were 43 cases, of which 18 involved minor traffic violations. The others involved serious personal-property offenses, bodily injury, or death.

In Bermuda, in 1951, there was 1 rape case (sentence of 3 years), 1 case of indecent assault (sentence of 5 pounds' fine), 3 cases of assault and battery (fines of 5 pounds each), 3 offenses of misappropriations of a vehicle (sentences of 5, 10, and 20 pounds), 1 case of larceny (sentence of 5 pounds), 1 case of prowling (5 pounds). In 1952 there was 1 case of indecent assault (5 pounds), 3 cases of assault and battery (5 pounds, 5 pounds, and 3 months in prison, respectively), 2 misappropriations of vehicles (one 12-pound fine and one 3-month sentence), 1 case of forgery (3 months). In 1953 there was 1 case of misappropriating a vehicle (10 pounds), 1 case of forgery (4 months), and 1 case of housebreaking (suspended sentence).

Negative reports have been received from the Air Force with respect to Norway, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Italy, Greece, and Newfoundland.

It has been necessary to compile the foregoing information in the field in response to the special request made on April 23. The study is still pending and the responsible field commanders report that the statistics are being completed and will be forwarded as soon as possible, approximately May 4.

The Department of Defense is not advised of any penalties more serious than a prison sentence of 3 years' confinement. As noted above, a 3-year sentence of confinement was applied in 1 case of rape, as well as in 1 case of black marketing. In the latter case the sentence was actually 1 year's imprisonment and $75,000 fine, with the defendant electing to serve a 3-year prison term.

JOSEPH J. WOLF,
Officer in Charge, Political-Military Affairs, Office of European Regional Affairs.

MAY 4, 1953.

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. HOLT

Supplementing my memorandum of April 28, 1953, concerning the number of trials in local civilian courts and sentences imposed in NATO countries, the Department of Defense has supplied the following additional information.

The Department of the Army gives the following as to the nature of sentences imposed in cases involving United States military personnel in France, Italy, and Turkey:

Country	Number of military persons	Offense charged	Sentence
France	28	Assault	1, 40,000-franc fine; 1, 30,000-franc fine; 2, 10,000-franc fine; 1 month confinement suspended; 2, 10,000-franc fine; 4, 30,000-franc fine; 1 month confinement; 1, 1,000-franc fine; 2, 2,000-franc fine; 3, 20,000-franc fine; 3, 5,000-franc fine; 1, 15,000-franc fine; 1, 30,000-franc fine; 1, 1 month confinement suspended; 2, 20,000-franc fine and 2 months' confinement suspended; 1, 15 days confinement suspended; 1, 6 months' confinement; 3, unknown.
	2	Assault with knife	1, 50,000-franc fine; 1, 1 year confinement.
	8	Auto accident	1, 50,000-franc fine plus damages; 1, 10,000-franc fine; 1, 25,000-franc fine; 1, 1,900-franc fine.
		Auto accident	1, 3,000-franc fine and 23,646 francs damages; 1, 40,600 francs damages; 1, 10,000-franc fine; 1, unknown.
	2	Attempted rape	1, 10,000-franc fine for assault, 2 months confinement; 1, acquitted.
	5	Fatal accident	1, 50,000-franc fine; 1, 3,000,000-franc fine and 6 months confinement; 1, 50,000 franc fine, 2 months' confinement and 20,000-franc damages; 1, 50,000-franc fine and 570,000 francs damages; 1, unknown.
	2	Hit and run	1, 20,000-franc fine, 8 days confinement suspended; 1, 1-month confinement suspended and 60,000-franc damages.
	2	Traffic accident	1, 20,000-franc fine; 1, unknown.
	1	Drunk driving	2,700-franc fine.
	1	Public incident	2 months' confinement suspended.
	1	Pimping	6,000-franc fine.
	1	Drunkenness and assault	300-franc fine, 6 weeks' confinement, and 15,000-franc damages.
	6	Larceny	1, 13 months' confinement suspended; 2, 15 days' confinement suspended; 1, 1,000-franc fine and 1 month confinement suspended; 1, 30,000-franc fine and 1 month confinement suspended; 1, 10,000-franc fine.
	2	Robbery	2, 10 months' confinement plus damages.
	2	Unlawful entry	2, 12,000-franc fine.
	3	Narcotics	3, 50,000-franc fine.
	1	Unknown offense	Acquitted and Government appealed.
Italy	1	Possession of unregistered weapon	10 days' confinement, 10,000-lire fine suspended.
	2	Housebreaking and attempted larceny	Each case, 20 months' and 20 days' confinement, 3,000-lire fine (suspended).
	1	Reckless driving and leaving scene	1,000-lire fine and costs for leaving scene only.
	1	Attempted fraud	Acquitted.
	3	Assaulting police	1, acquitted; 1, 7 months' confinement; 1, 6 months' confinement (suspended).
	2	Smuggling gasoline	Pending.
	3	Negligent homicide	Do.
	5	Reckless driving	Do.
Turkey	1	Assault and battery	50 days' confinement (suspended), 100-lire indemnity and costs.
	2	Involuntary manslaughter	1, 10 months' imprisonment; 1, acquitted, but Government appealing.
	1	Failure to report change in civil status	5-lire fine and costs.
	1	Reckless driving	Sentence not reported by civil authorities.

The Air Force reports as follows on sentences in cases in Turkey and in these cases for one air depot wing in France:

Countries	Number of military persons	Offense charged	Sentence
France	5	Theft	1, 15 days, suspended; 1, 8,000-franc fine; 1, 8 days in jail; 1, 4 months, suspended, and 50,000-franc fine; 1 acquittal.
	11	Injury by accident (motor vehicle)	8, 10,000-franc fine each; 1, 30,000-franc fine; 1, 15,000-franc fine; 1, 3,000-franc fine.
	2	Involuntary manslaughter	1, 20 days jail and 9,000-franc fine; 1, 2 months jail (suspended) and 50,000-franc fine.
	1	Carrying concealed weapons	1, 3,000-franc fine.
	4	Assault	1, 1 month jail (suspended) and 15,000-franc fine; 1, 5,000-franc fine; 1, 3,000-franc fine; 1, fine of unknown amount.
Turkey	5	Violations foreign exchange controls	1, 1 year and 13 days confinement and $75,000 fine; 4 acquitted.
	2	Drunk and assault and battery	1 day confinement and 2½ lire fine, each.

In addition to the above, the Air Force states that there have been a number of purely traffic-type cases which have been settled between local authorities and the United States personnel by payment of standard fines and without reference to United States military authorities. No statistics have been maintained on such cases.

The foregoing data, I understand, supercedes the information presented in my previous memorandum with respect to Army cases in France, Italy and Turkey. It will be noted that the new Air Force data is still incomplete, but contains the fullest detail submitted from the field in response to special requests. Although the figures are for only one air depot wing, they constitute a preponderance of the total cases involving United States Air Force personnel in France. I understand that, except in the categories of serious offenses, this type of data is not compiled centrally as part of standing procedure and has had to be pulled together at lowest levels.

JOSEPH J. WOLF,
Officer in Charge, Political-Military Affairs, Bureau of European Regional Affairs.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Michigan that not only were our troops delivered to such foreign courts in violation of the Military Code of the United States, but it was done contrary to the accepted principles of international law which have prevailed for 150 years, ever since our country has been a sovereign power.

The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have power "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces"—Article I, section 8, clause 14. That power applies to forces outside the continental limits of the United States, as well as within the United States.

Congress exercised its constitutional authority. The executive branch of the previous administration flouted the Congress' exercise of its constitutional power by making these secret, executive agreements. Under these agreements, some NATO countries are already trying American servicemen for nonmilitary offenses, according to the reports placed in the RECORD a moment ago by the Senator from Michigan.

Although Mr. Phleger was not responsible for making these secret executive agreements, he defended their legality by citing the President's power as Commander in Chief—record of hearings, page 66.

This is not a case where the President's action, though unauthorized, was not prohibited by the Congress. The executive agreements surrendering American servicemen to the local courts of NATO countries are in direct violation of the congressional exercise of power to make rules for the regulation of the land and naval forces.

As indicated in the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—page 5—the Uniform Code of Military Justice permits any offense against the law of the country where troops are stationed to be treated as an offense against the code. Article 2, paragraph 1, of the code provides that "all persons belonging to a regular component of the Armed Forces" are subject to its provisions. Article 5 provides that the code "shall be applicable in all places," either in the United States or in any foreign countries, wherever our troops may be.

The only exception to extra territorial application of the code is with respect to persons not belonging to a regular component of the Armed Forces, who

serve with, are employed by, or accompany the Armed Forces outside the United States. That exception has to be exercised by means of treaty.

Such persons, except in time of war, and subject to the provisions of a treaty or agreement, may be excluded from the operation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. What stronger evidence could there be of Congress intent to make the code applicable to every American serviceman wherever stationed? Moreover, I am confident that Congress never intended that civilian components or dependents of the Armed Forces personnel should be turned over to local authorities for trial pursuant to the terms of secret executive agreements, which the Department refused to submit to the Foreign Relations Committee, on their own assumption and their own contention that those documents were classified.

Now we come to the most startling argument of all in favor of the criminal jurisdiction clauses of the Status of Forces Treaty.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRICKER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. When these treaties came before the Foreign Relations Committee, I first raised this entire question. By the way, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I did not vote for the agreements we are now discussing.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio a question. Contention was made that if we did not go through with the agreements, of course the foreign troops who are in the United States, particularly foreign airmen, who might commit crimes would be tried in foreign countries. As an extreme case, let us suppose that a foreign airman raped an American girl. Certainly the American people would not want that foreigner taken to Yugoslavia, for instance, and tried there. That is the problem that is confusing to me. I wonder whether we can obtain some light on that phase of the question.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes. I discussed it a moment ago when I said that according to the testimony, there are about 3,000 foreign troops in the United States, and they cannot be tried in the United States, anyway, except by treaty giving our courts jurisdiction over them. That has been the situation for 150 years.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, the exact number of troops involved is not of particular importance, because in succeeding years the number might be 40,000 or 50,000.

So I return to my original question, namely, that if we take our troops out of the jurisdiction of foreign courts, then if foreign troops who serve in our country commit crimes against people of the United States, would we permit those troops to be tried in the courts of their own countries?

Mr. BRICKER. They would be tried by court-martial, in the same way that our troops are; and there is no reason why that should not be done. Of course there are 750,000 American troops in the NATO countries, but only a small number of foreign troops in the United States. In that respect, the situation reminds me of the old campaign slogan about having the elephant and the rooster stop stepping on each other's toes.

What I am trying to do is to protect the American boy. The foreign soldiers are not in this country defending the soil of the United States. Their situation is a little bit different from that of American boys who have been drafted, called from their homes, and sent abroad. Foreign soldiers who may be in this country are here more or less voluntarily, contrary to the situation of our boys, who are in foreign countries involuntarily.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What the Senator has just said was my reason for raising the question.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the only question that is involved.

For the State Department to contend that that is a fair bargain, simply does not seem to be either sensible or to give proper consideration to the rights of American boys.

An article appeared in last night's newspaper, which the Senator may have read, telling of an American soldier who was incarcerated in a prison in Turkey, I believe it was. If an American soldier is tried by an American court-martial, he has the right of appeal. He may appeal to the President of the United States. The President has before him one such case now, the case of an American soldier who was charged with having committed a grievous crime in Korea.

Mr. LANGER. What I am suggesting is, can the distinguished Senator think of some method whereby foreigners who commit crimes in this country could still be tried by court-martial? Could that be done without involving us in international disputes?

Mr. BRICKER. That matter has been provided for in international law certainly for 150 years, anyway.

Mr. LANGER. I know that treaties have dealt with that subject, and have changed the situation.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes, it has been changed by treaties, because there are approximately 3,000 foreign soldiers in the United States compared to 750,000 American soldiers abroad. The State Department is neglecting the interests of some of our soldiers, in order to try to persuade certain countries that they are giving up something which ought to be reserved to the United States. It is a part of a give-away program with respect to the rights of American soldiers.

I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that when this feature was first called to my attention, it was when a certain treaty was before the Judiciary Committee. Judge Orie L. Phillips was asked what he thought of it. He immediately ran through it, picking out very patent flaws, such as the failure to provide the right of trial by jury, the right of appeal, the right to public trial, and all the other rights given by our Constitution to our own soldiers.

Mr. LANGER. Did it include the right to bail?

Mr. BRICKER. It included the right to bail. All of the rights protected by our Constitution would have been violated under the proposed treaty.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I may point out to the Senator that Judge Phillips, on that occasion, said that one of the most secred rights which was not protected by the treaty was the right to see that a confession, obtained from the accused through inducement or some other irregular method, was not used against him at his trial.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the situation; and that, of course, was one of the first things that attracted my attention to the treaty.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Whose idea was it that a treaty of that sort should be proposed? Who originated it?

Mr. BRICKER. The suggestion was sent to the Senate by President Truman. The treaty was negotiated by Secretary Acheson.

Mr. PASTORE. I mean, so far as the NATO countries are concerned, was it the idea of the NATO countries, or was it America's idea?

Mr. BRICKER. The record does not show.

Mr. PASTORE. Why does the Senator assume that the reason for our being a party to this treaty is that it was the attitude of America that we would inspire the NATO nations with the belief that we were trying to give them something, trying to make a concession?

Mr. BRICKER. The treaty reflects that suggestion. I do not know who inspired it. I suppose it came up in the round-table negotiations. I have no idea. The record does not show.

Mr. PASTORE. It would appear to me to involve a very fundamental question.

Mr. BRICKER. There can be no doubt about that, for it is a reversal of established international law. If the Senator will read the article which I placed in today's RECORD and which will be available tomorrow, he will see that there is a complete reversal of international laws, laws which have been established for centuries.

Mr. PASTORE. We have been talking about the right of trial by jury. So far as the military forces are concerned, they are tried by court martial, are they not?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. There is no jury trial in such a case, is there?

Mr. BRICKER. They are tried by Americans, by our own American officers. Furthermore, the Congress established the military code, and the procedure. Last night's newspaper carried a story about the Navy's traditional penalty of bread and water, which is ruled out by the United States Court of Appeals, under the Military Code.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Am I correct that the Senator is not raising any constitutional question as to the making of the treaty, but is speaking directly to the treaty itself?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct; but I do raise the constitutional question as to whether the executive agreements which have already been entered into are legal. I think they are clearly unconstitutional and clearly illegal.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me understand this properly. If the treaty is not ratified, will we still be subject to the same situation, under the executive agreements?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes, under the illegal executive agreements. I am asking the Armed Services Committee to make a complete investigation to discover who entered into them, why they did it, and under what authority it was done. I think the committee will report that the executive agreements are absolutely without authority, are illegal, and in violation, not only of the constitutional power, but also in violation of the express terms of the Military Code enacted by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. As a general proposition, law enforcement is always a burden upon the taxpayers. It would occur to me that the NATO countries would not be to willing to assume this responsibility, because it involves arrest, investigation, incarceration, and trial. Under those circumstances, it would occur to me that in all probability the initiative was assumed by America in this connection.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not think we could assume that. There is certainly nothing in the record which shows it.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator not think it ought to have been determined?

Mr. BRICKER. It might very well have been. I think the Foreign Relations Committee should have ascertained all the facts. Nevertheless, the committee simply took the statements of representatives of the State Department, and of the Legal Adviser to the State Department. No one else was called in—no representatives of American boys who today are being tried in foreign courts, where cruel and unusual punishments may be inflicted upon them. No representatives of servicemen's organizations were heard at any time by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. PASTORE. Do I correctly understand that the record does not indicate why we entered into this treaty?

Mr. BRICKER. The record indicates only that it is a better bargain than we had previously.

Mr. PASTORE. What is the bargain we have now?

Mr. BRICKER. The executive agreements, which are illegal, but which turned American boys over to other nations for trial, according to the record presented here a while ago by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the record not indicate why we entered into the executive agreements in the first place?

Mr. BRICKER. No; it does not. It was merely assumed that there was authority for entering into them. Under those agreements American boys were turned over to foreign courts. Those agreements, Mr. President, were claimed by the State Department to be classified information, and were not even presented to the committee. I do not know why.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it fair for me to assume that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that one of the boys might be tried before a judge who has a communistic inclination?

Mr. BRICKER. I have referred to the fact that an American was tried in a Turkish court, I believe; I am not certain it was in Turkey, it may have been in one of the Balkan States. That was reported in the press last night. The penalty inflicted in some middle eastern countries for theft is that the hand of the offender be cut off. Mr. President, do we want to subject our boys to that kind of cruel and inhuman treatment?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The treaty has provisions to cover the more important cases. In a case of importance, we may have the right to have the jurisdiction of the foreign power waived.

Is there anything to indicate what is meant by that language?

Mr. BRICKER. The foreign power could waive it, I presume, under the treaty, but there is no way we can force them to waive it, because we give up jurisdiction. The treaty itself lists those cases in which we have exclusive jurisdiction, those in which there is concurrent jurisdiction between the receiving and defending governments, and those in which there is exclusive jurisdiction in the receiving country.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The treaty itself does not give that right?

Mr. BRICKER. No. The treaty simply takes away our power to ask to have someone returned.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. All the foreign government would do would be to give sympathetic consideration to our request, but if they did not want to relinquish it, they would not be obliged to do so.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not a fact that most of our troubles arise because we have joined the United Nations?

Mr. BRICKER. Many of them would not have arisen if we had not, but this is a NATO agreement; it is not a United Nations agreement.

Mr. LANGER. But it goes right back to the United Nations.

Mr. BRICKER. If we had not sent troops to every place in the world it would not be so difficult. There is now an agreement with Japan that as soon as this treaty is entered into, Japan will be enabled to negotiate the same kind of a treaty. I do not know what the law is in Japan.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is there any limitation as to the type of crime involved?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes. The treaty sets forth pretty clearly the jurisdiction of the countries sending troops and the countries receiving the troops, with respect to civil crimes or crimes against the receiving country. When the accused man is not on duty the jurisdiction is given exclusively to the foreign country. In such cases American boys are turned over absolutely to jurisdiction of the foreign country.

I am talking only about the criminal section of the law.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It does not apply to an offense committed against one of his own countrymen?

Mr. BRICKER. No.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Even though the offender was off duty at the time?

Mr. BRICKER. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The treaty gives a certain status to our military forces with respect to all the 12 NATO countries, does it not?

Mr. BRICKER. It does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it fair to assume, on the basis of what has been developing, that some day there will be a PATO as well as a NATO, and if that precedent is set, and treaties are entered into, the same right will have to be accorded to the countries in the PATO agreement, and in due course we will be under treaty obligation with nearly every country in the world, no matter what their jurisprudence may be, so far as the rights of American soldiers, dependents, and civilian components are concerned? That is a fine kettle of fish, if we think of a soldier as a representative of the sovereign power of this country, and it seems to be rather strange. I remember that during a tour I saw ice cream plants in the Middle East. We built the plants to manufacture ice cream for our soldiers. We built Coca Cola plants. We have virtually sent our civilization abroad in every case in which we have dispatched an army, and it is now proposed that our traditional and constitutional rights will not accompany American soldiers who are sent abroad. The young Americans serving in foreign countries will not like that very much.

Mr. BRICKER. There are 40 nations in which American soldiers are stationed under command of American officers, and if we give this right to one nation we have to give to the others. As I stated a moment ago, we have already agreed with Japan that the same law will be extended to that nation in a matter of 60 or 90 days, possibly, and it will have to be extended to all other countries in the NATO agreement, or, as the Senator from Illinois says, in a PATO agreement.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it true that if this treaty should be ratified by us one of our servicemen found guilty of an offense in a NATO country would have to pay the penalty in that country, that is if the sentence was that he be imprisoned he would be incarcerated away from his home, his family, and his friends, and they would have no access to him at all?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I cannot think of anything more outrageous.

Mr. BRICKER. In many instances not even a soldier in his own unit can be present at the trial if the law of the foreign country prohibits it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In other words, the mother, wife, or family would have to go abroad to see him?

Mr. BRICKER. Then they could not be at his trial. They could not even see him unless permitted to do so by the country which convicted him.

We now come to the most startling argument in favor of the criminal jurisdiction clause.

According to General Smith, the Senate should approve the treaty because it confers more rights on American servicemen than the secret and illegal executive agreements made by the previous administration—Executive Report No. 1, pages 12, 13. There is more to this bootstrap lifting argument. According to General Smith and Mr. Phleger, if the treaty is not ratified as written, Americans will be turned over to local authorities for trial with even less protection than that provided in the treaty—record of hearings, pages 30, 44 to 45. Never in my experience as a United States Senator have I heard a more brazen challenge to the constitutional authority of the Congress. The Senate is commanded, in effect, to lie down and roll over. I hope that the Senate will not only adopt the reservation I have proposed, but that the Senate Committee on Armed Services will do everything possible to rectify the illegal actions already taken in regard to the trial of American troops abroad.

Mr. President, I now desire to discuss diplomatic immunity for top NATO officials, and double jeopardy for the American GI. Double jeopardy is abhorrent to the common law, as we all know.

It is shocking that the Senate should be asked to approve at this time a treaty—Executive U, 82d Congress—which confers diplomatic immunity on representatives of member states to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, on members of their official staff, on officials of the Organization, and on experts employed on NATO missions. All these individuals will enjoy varying degrees of immunity from personal arrest or detention. All of them have undertaken their work voluntarily; they receive high salaries; and many of them are exempt from income taxation. Some of the persons who will enjoy diplomatic immunity under the terms of the Organization treaty no doubt helped to draft the criminal jurisdiction provisions of the Status of Forces Treaty.

Contrast the diplomatic immunity conferred under one treaty with the double jeopardy authorized by the other. The average American subject to the Status of Forces Treaty would prefer not to be in military service; is not enjoying any high or tax-free salary; and is not likely to survive if the Soviet Union moves against NATO forces in their present condition of readiness. The discrimination cannot be defended.

Although the committee report refers to safeguards against double jeopardy—page 5—Mr. Phleger conceded that double jeopardy was possible—record of hearings, page 48. On this point, Mr. Phleger is right. Article VII, paragraph 8, of the treaty cannot be interpreted in any other way, except to penalize our soldiers with the possibility of double jeopardy.

Strange to say, the hearings contain no indication whatever of the views of those most directly affected by the criminal jurisdiction provisions. Only Government witnesses were heard.

I do not know whether or not representatives of national veterans' organizations were invited to express their views. Nothing in the hearings, however, indicates that American servicemen favor the criminal jurisdiction provisions of the treaty. In the negotiation of the treaty, it would appear that the American GI was completely forgotten in the pursuit of global abstractions. This colloquy at the hearings is quite illuminating.

I am sorry the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is not on the floor at this time. He asked this question:

> Do you not think there is a difference between a situation where citizens voluntarily go to a foreign country, and a situation where men are drafted into military service or voluntarily go into military service, and then are sent as an army to a foreign land?
>
> Mr. PHLEGER. I do not see that that distinction, if it is one, is applicable here. (Record of hearings, pp. 55, 56.)

If Mr. Phleger is still unable to see the difference between an American who goes abroad voluntarily for reasons of business or pleasure or an American drafted into the Army and ordered overseas to defend foreign soil, he is not qualified to be the State Department's legal adviser.

Mr. President, this would be a precedent for the benefit of communism, as I shall show.

It is my judgment that United States approval of the criminal jurisdiction article of the Status of Forces Treaty would be of immense benefit to the Communist cause. The reason is that the United States must treat all its partners in the fight against Soviet communism equally as was pointed out a moment ago by the Senator from Illinois. At the same time, it is unthinkable that American lives should be entrusted to the jurisdiction of every nation outside the Iron Curtain.

In his prepared statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, General Smith said, "This is a rather precedent-making request"—record of hearings, page 2. It is indeed, even though General Smith later said the treaty should have been described as unprecedented. It is that too. It is both. General Smith, however, made it abundantly clear that approval of the treaty would establish a precedent, and one which could be broken only at the cost of alienating potential allies in the fight to stem Communist aggression.

No one denies that approval of the treaty would establish a precedent with respect to Japan. The United States is already obligated to surrender the same criminal jurisdiction to Japan that is surrendered to the NATO countries. I doubt that there is a Senator among us who can describe criminal law and procedure as it actually operates in Japan. I doubt that there is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations who understands it. Certainly there is nothing in the record to show what it is.

On page 53 of the record of hearings, Senators will find a statement by General Smith which disclaims the creation of any precedent, but which proves that fact beyond reasonable doubt. General Smith, quoting Lord Ismay, refers to NATO "as a sort of gentleman's club; you had to demonstrate gentility to the unanimous views of all the other members before you could be admitted." According to newspaper reports, General Smith's unedited statement was that prospective members of NATO had to prove they were "housebroken."

Membership in NATO does not mean that all members recognize the same degree of civil and political liberty. Not even Clarence Streit, head of the Atlantic Union movement, contends that all NATO countries are so alike as to make a political union of all of those countries feasible. He would exclude from Atlantic Union, as not sufficiently housebroken, Greece, Turkey, and several other NATO members.

References were made in the hearings to certain countries in the Middle East where the punishment for theft is to cut off the hand of the offender. For the benefit of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I refer to the Record of Hearings, pages 50, 52. Surely no one wants to subject American servicemen to such cruel and inhuman punishment. But how can that be avoided if the treaty before us is approved without reservation? Is General Smith going to tell countries of the Middle East that they are not genteel, or that their system of justice is inferior to that of the NATO countries? I think not. The Middle East is too important to be thrown into the arms of the Communists. We have no alternative but to treat all nations on the same basis so far as jurisdiction over American troops is concerned.

Not being in the State Department, I have no hesitancy in saying that Marshal Tito is not housebroken. But can General Smith say the same? Of course not. If there is any hope of making Tito a trustworthy ally, the State Department cannot make any invidious comparisions between the Yugoslav and Italian systems of jurisprudence.

At the present time, the United States has military forces stationed in about 40 countries. Are we to tell all but 14 of those nations that they are not genteel, not housebroken? The probability is that rather than alienate their friendship we would subject American boys to their criminal jurisdiction, no matter how bizarre or inhuman according to our standards.

For this dilemma, there is a very simple remedy. The United States can treat all nations alike by standing on the generally accepted principles of international law which it has followed for more than 150 years.

Reference has been made to Americans as being a special, privileged class.

One argument for approval of the Status of Forces Treaty is more disturbing to me than any other. On pages 11 and 12 of the committee report, this statement appears:

> Exclusive criminal jurisdiction, amounting to extraterritoriality, itself creates difficult problems. In the eyes of the local population, it sets Americans apart as a special, privileged class, and this fact acts as a constant irritant. * * * Regardless of how fair and just American courts-martial may be, the existence of exclusive criminal jurisdiction seems to the other country to be an infringement of its sovereignty.

I suppose that has been dated back to the time when extraterritoriality was looked upon as something invidious, as applied to the civilian population. It has been done away with in most places in the world today, and it should be wiped out. But that is an entirely different problem from dealing with troops under the command of the United States.

So long as Americans insist on a higher standard of civil and political rights than their neighbors, they will, to that extent, seem to stand alone as a special, privileged class. Of course, the contrast would not be so great, if Americans were willing to accept European concepts of freedom. Even in trials before courts-martial, Americans are guaranteed the presumption of innocence; protected against cruel and inhuman punishment; convicted only on proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt; granted the privilege against self-incrimination; and granted the rights to various appeals, even up to the President of the United States. None of these safeguards for American forces is guaranteed by the Status of Forces Treaty, which will be before the Senate next week.

The proposed treaty does not even give the accused the right to public trial. In fact, such a right is denied by implication in article VII, paragraph 9 (g), providing that the accused shall be entitled:

> To communicate with a representative of the government of the sending state—

That is, our court—

> and, when the rules of the court—

That is, their court—

> permit, to have such a representative at his trial.

Thus, it is clear that under certain circumstances even representatives of the accused's commanding officer may be excluded from the trial. His trial will be secret.

It is true that the Uniform Code of Military Justice does not guarantee any right to a public trial. But the American tried by courts-martial is tried by Americans. He is surrounded by numerous safeguards provided by Congress. In liberalizing court-martial procedure by enacting the Uniform Code, Congress created a Court of Military Appeals, on which three distinguished judges are now serving. Congress has the power to improve the code at any time it sees fit. But if the Status of Forces Treaty is approved without reservation, neither Congress nor the President can correct an injustice done to an American serviceman. The treaty cannot even be denounced until 5 years after ratification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Navy's Traditional Penalty—Bread and Water—Ruled Out," published in the Washington Post of May 7, 1953. The editorial refers to a decision by the court to which I have been referring.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY'S TRADITIONAL PENALTY—BREAD AND WATER—RULED OUT

One of the standbys of Navy justice—bread and water—has run afoul of the United State Court of Military Appeals.

A court-martialed serviceman can be confined on bread-and-water rations only if he's aboard ship and then only for 3 days or less, the highest military tribunal has ruled.

During World War II, sailors and marines who ran into the "rocks and shoals"—as the Articles for the Government of the Navy are called—frequently got 30 days on bread and water. Some of them spent more time on bread and water than they did on ordinary rations.

But the court unanimously struck down the traditional penalty in the case of Marine Pvt. Warren L. Wappler. He pleaded guilty before a court-martial at Camp Pendleton, Calif., to being absent without leave and missing a transfer of his unit through neglect.

He was sentenced to solitary confinement on bread and water for 30 days with a full ration every third day, 60 days at hard labor, forfeiture of $150, and a bad-conduct discharge.

The Navy Judge Advocate General asked the court three questions: Whether a court-martial may impose confinement on bread and water where it also orders a punitive discharge; whether it may impose bread and water where the accused is not "attached to or embarked in a vessel;" and whether it may extend the bread-and-water sentence beyond 3 consecutive days.

The court answered "No" to all three questions and sent the case back for further consideration by a Navy Board of Review.

In limiting bread and water to men attached to ships, the court cited an article of the United States Code which forbids flogging, branding, marking, tattooing or any other cruel or unusual punishment.

The opinion by Judge Paul W. Brosman said bread and water is thus prohibited except when imposed under the 3-day, aboard-ship limitation prescribed by another article of the code.

Following precedent, the court said the code's provisions prevail over the Manual for Courts Martial, which conflicts by allowing bread-and-water sentences up to 30 days.

The court also cited statements by witnesses before a House subcommittee considering the code's provisions. These witnesses called the bread-and-water punishment cruel and barbaric and a relic of earlier days.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Ohio for the words of wisdom he speaks here today.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, it is not enough merely to look at excerpts from the constitutions and laws of other countries. Many fine phrases are qualified by other provisions effective in national emergencies proclaimed by the authorities. There is not one United States Senator—I think I speak advisedly—who really knows the type of trial given to persons accused of crimes in all the NATO countries and Japan. I might add to that the Moslem countries, because soon it will be extended there.

The hearings do not mention how prisoners are treated in NATO countries and in Japan. We know that confinement by our own military authorities takes place under conditions that are humane and sanitary. Will the Senate Foreign Relations Committee certify to the American people that the same conditions prevail in the penal institutions of NATO countries and Japan? We are entitled to know that before we enter into such an agreement as this.

If Americans, by reason of their unique respect for fundamental human rights, are a special or privileged class, they have not shirked their responsibility to people less fortunate. Billions of dollars have, for example, been poured into NATO countries. That contribution would have been impossible without the concept of freedom which distinguishes Americans from other people. Reasonable and honest men may differ in regard to the number of dollars Congress may give away with safety, both with respect to our own economy and with respect to help to others. But to give away the rights of Americans serving in the uniform of their country on foreign soil is unthinkable.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 106) increasing the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 333, 82d Congress, for the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] who made the motion to take up the Jenner resolution, Senate Resolution 106, I now withdraw that motion. I give notice that I will renew the motion some time next week, after giving a day or two notice ahead of time as to when I shall make the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 4465) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consid-

eration of Calendar No. 171, Senate bill 1413.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1413) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The corresponding House bill just came over from the House of Representatives.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that; but as a rule we consider the Senate bill first, and then substitute the House bill. That is the usual procedure. If the Senate prefers to discard the Senate bill first, it may do so.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I suggest that we follow the usual procedure.

Mr. TAFT. The printed Senate bill is before us. I do not know whether it is exactly the same as the House bill.

Mr. BUSH. I will deal with that.

Mr. TAFT. Then I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1413.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1413) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the word "is", to strike out "in transit to or", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the following as subsection (c):

"(c) (1) The Export-Import Bank of Washington is further authorized, in the manner and to the extent herein specified, to provide insurance in an aggregate amount not in excess of $100 million outstanding at any one time for the benefit of citizens of the United States, including corporations, partnerships, and associations organized and existing under the laws of the United States or any State, district, Territory, or possession thereof, against the risks of loss of or damage to tangible personal property of United States origin which is exported from the United States in commercial intercourse and is located in any friendly foreign country, to the extent that such loss or damage results from hostile or warlike action in time of peace or war, including civil war, revolution, rebellion, insurrection, or civil strife arising therefrom, or from an order of any government or public authority confiscating, expropriating, or requisitioning such property and to the extent that such property is owned in whole or in part by the assured or constitutes security for financial obligations owed to the assured.

"(2) Insurance may be provided pursuant to this subsection only to the extent that it cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions from companies authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States and to the extent that it cannot be obtained from any agency of the United States Government providing marine or air war-risk insurance.

"(3) In providing insurance pursuant to this subsection, the Bank may reinsure in whole or in part any company authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States or may employ any such company or group of companies to act as its underwriting agent in the issuance of such insurance and the adjustment of claims arising thereunder.

"(4) Subject to the limitations herein provided, the Bank shall from time to time determine the terms and conditions under which it will provide insurance pursuant to this subsection: *Provided, however*, That such insurance shall be based, insofar as practicable, upon consideration of the risk involved: *And provided further*, That the term of coverage of any such insurance shall not exceed 1 year, subject to renewal or extension from time to time for periods of not exceeding 1 year as may be determined by the Bank."

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, is amended by substituting in lieu of the words "loans and guaranties" the words "loans, guaranties, and insurance."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, by agreement yesterday the consideration of Senate bill 1413 was set for today. Meanwhile, the House has passed House bill 4465. The House bill differs from Senate bill 1413 only in that it contains the four words, "in transit to or" which the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency deleted from the bill, as shown in line 4 on page 2 of Senate bill 1413, as reported.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4465, with the understanding that I shall immediately offer an amendment to delete the words "in transit to or" from the House bill, in order to make it conform to and be identical with the text of Senate bill 1413, as reported by the Senate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Connecticut include in his request a request to postpone indefinitely Senate bill 1413?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That may be done after the House bill is passed.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4465) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am quite willing to include the suggestion of the majority leader if it is necessary. On the other hand, I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. First, I should like to have the privilege of voting on the Senator's amendment before we postpone the Senate bill.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike out the words "in transit to or" from the new subsection (c) (1) proposed to be added to section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended. I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 5, in subsection (c) (1) proposed to be added to section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, it is proposed to delete the words "in transit to or."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Connecticut still had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will my distinguished friend, who has so ably handled this bill, request that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1413 be indefinitely postponed. It is now identical with the House bill, the House bill having been amended to conform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1413 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Connecticut propose to speak on the bill?

Mr. BUSH. I should like to make a few remarks about the bill.

This bill would amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, by broadening the authority of the bank to include certain insurance operations. It authorizes the bank to insure, against certain specified risks, tangible personal property of United States origin which is exported from the United States in commercial intercourse and is located in any friendly foreign country, to the extent that such property is owned in whole or in part by citizens of the United States, or constitutes security for financial obligations owed to citizens of the United States. Coverage would be limited to loss or damage resulting from hostile or warlike action in time of peace or war, or from an order of any government or public authority confiscating, expropriating, or requisitioning such property. The total amount of insurance oustanding at any one time could not exceed $100 million. Insurance by the bank would be provided only to the extent that it could not be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions from commercial insurance firms or from any United States Government agency providing marine or air-risk insurance. The bank is authorized to reinsure in whole or in part with commercial insurance companies and to employ such companies to act as its underwriters or for claim adjustment.

The bill simply gives American exporters an opportunity to obtain insurance for goods which have been shipped abroad and are located there. There is no insurance in connection with transportation of the goods, but only insurance which cannot now be provided by private sources for goods which have been landed in ports abroad.

The various agencies of the Government which have been asked to comment on the bill have not objected. Mr. Stassen's department has no objection, and has so advised us. The Treasury Department says the same thing.

The State Department actually supports the objectives of the bill. The Commerce Department has no objection, and in general has expressed itself favorably with respect to the bill.

It has also been supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Association of Steel Exporters, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the American Cotton Shippers Association, the National Cotton Council, and others.

The very slight opposition to the bill is limited to the Association of Marine Underwriters. I believe the amendment which we have adopted concerning goods in transport takes care of most of that objection. Otherwise, there has been no opposition to the bill of any kind, and the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank has advised the committee that private insurance companies are not at all opposed to the bill. I may say that we have had no opposition to it, with one exception, which I personally do not consider to be very important. I shall be very glad to answer any question which any Senator may wish to ask about the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to state the reasons for my opposition to the bill. I do not expect to defeat the bill. I believe it is an unfortunate development of governmental policy. I think it is out of line with everything which the Republican Party has said it was going to do. I believe it adopts a policy which Democratic Congresses themselves have rejected in recent years. I think it is a very unfortunate extension of Government in business. It is an attempt to put Government in business to the extent of $100 million, a large part of which would be lost to the Government in case of war. Certainly it is generally admitted that the only reason private insurance companies do not today write war-risk insurance is because they know they will lose their shirt if they write such insurance. That is undoubtedly true.

Mr. President, the pending bill provides:

(c) (1) The Export-Import Bank of Washington is further authorized, in the manner and to the extent herein specified, to provide insurance in an aggregate amount not in excess of $100 million outstanding at any one time for the benefit of citizens of the United States, including corporations, partnerships, and associations organized and existing under the laws of the United States or any State, district, Territory, or possession thereof, against the risks of loss of or damage to tangible personal property of United States origin which is exported from the United States in commercial intercourse and is located in any friendly foreign country, to the extent that such loss or damage results from hostile or warlike action in time of peace or war, including civil war, revolution, rebellion, insurrection, or civil strife arising therefrom, or from an order of any government or public authority confiscating, expropriating or requisitioning such property and to the extent that such property is owned in whole or in part by the assured or constitutes security for financial obligations owed to the assured.

Mr. President, not only does the bill cover that kind of insurance, but if the goods are taken abroad and sold to someone and a lien is retained for payment, the foreigner is insured also.

Mr. President, there are a number of reasons why I am opposed to the passage of the bill.

In the first place it puts government into business. I do not believe the Government should go into any business unless the reason is overwhelming. That is reason enough, I believe, a sufficient ground for opposing the bill.

In the second place, it provides insurance particularly against seizure by foreign governments. For the past 6 years, under the point 4 program, we have done exactly that. In the case of plants of all sorts constructed abroad by American investors the Federal Government undertakes to insure them against confiscation by a foreign government.

Previous Congresses have rejected or refused even to consider this kind of proposition. It would substitute the Federal Government as the claimant against a foreign government.

It has always seemed to me to be unwise that in connection with the point 4 program we should undertake to insure against confiscation by a foreign government. Yet now we would do it with all personal property that may be of United States origin. Certainly it would be only another step to insure all American investors abroad in the same manner.

From a peace-and-war standpoint, the bill has two phases. In the first place, it provides war-risk insurance. That is, it provides exporters with insurance against a war occurring. If a war should occur millions of people in the United States would lose their shirts. Because of war millions of people in this country would sustain overwhelming losses, for which they would not be recompensed. Many things may happen.

When we actually get into a war we will try to do what we did before, namely, carefully select the fields in which the Government may properly engage in time of war, such as the field of war-risk insurance.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to yield after I have concluded my statement.

In previous wars we passed laws making provision against bomb damage, for example. Probably we would do it again if we were engaged in another war.

However, Mr. President, why should we single out exporters and insure them against the possibility of the danger of losses in time of war, when everyone in the United States may suffer from it?

The argument is made that we must do it now in time of peace to provide against insurrection or confiscation, because we are in a kind of emergency situation.

Mr. President, I dislike to see the emergency argument come up again. The condition we are in today, while it is not exactly peace, is nevertheless one that may go on for 10 or 20 years. I believe we must settle down and recognize it as a condition which hardly justifies emergency action. It is not a time in which to change the normal activities and scope of what the Government should do, outside of actual defense operations themselves.

Therefore, I wanted to place on record a statement of my opposition to the bill. It represents a policy which I think is unfortunate, and which we have tried to avoid in the past. I believe it will be regretted and probably cause a large loss to the taxpayers of our country in the event war should occur.

Whatever may happen in time of peace, certainly if war should occur the bill would cost the taxpayers of our country a large part of the $100 million involved.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I regret very much to take issue with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Ohio, on any matter, and I certainly regret that I must take issue with him on this subject. Whether we like it or not, the fact is we are in an emergency. If we were not in an emergency we would not be appropriating $40 or $50 billion for defense. Because we are in an emergency things have been thrown out of gear, and it is impossible to get this kind of insurance with private companies. Private companies have so stated; but they are willing to cooperate with the Export-Import Bank in connection with this matter.

I believe with the Senator from Ohio that it is not proper for the Government to invade the field of private enterprise or business. However, it is the job of the Government to do those things which are necessary in the common interest and which the people cannot do for themselves. That is why we have a government. It goes on up from the local to the State to the Federal level. When private enterprise cannot assume a task of this kind, it is up to the Government to assume it when the Government is in a position to do so, because it is in the interest of the whole country to keep markets open and to keep trade flowing. So long as the insurance will not cost the Government anything, it is the reasonable thing to do. Therefore I strongly urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand the bill has been passed. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say that I thoroughly agree with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. With all regard to my appreciation and affection for the distinguished majority leader, I am glad the bill has passed.

Mr. PURTELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show, in connection with the action taken on Senate bill 1413 and House bill 4465 and the amendment, that since I was not present during the entire de-

bate, I had misunderstood what the action would be; and I desire to go on record as having opposed the bill, which is what I would have done if I had been here at the time when the vote on the bill was taken.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 15, Calendar No. 225, providing for the appointment of addition circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

I do not intend to have the discussion of this measure begun tonight; I merely wish to have the bill made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to ask the majority leader what measures will be taken up immediately following the disposal of Senate bill 15?

Mr. TAFT. As I said earlier today, the other two measures to be taken up are Senate bill 16, Calendar No. 153, granting immunity to witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees; and Senate bill 922, Calendar No. 142, dealing with regulation of public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understand that Senate bill 15, providing for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, will be debated tomorrow. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. That measure is already the unfinished business to be taken up the first thing tomorrow.

SIZE OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD a statement by myself regarding the announcement made today by the Secretary of Defense that he intends to cut down the Air Force from 143 wings.

Previously I discussed in the Senate the intention of former Secretary Johnson to cut down the Air Force, and, of course, he took such action, under the administration of a former President. Today our troops are fighting in Korea.

So I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the body of the RECORD. I intend to speak for hours before the Air Force of the United States is destroyed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

In my opinion, it is becoming more tragically evident every day that we are not benefiting from the lessons of past errors.

I have in mind the announcement I read in this morning's paper that Defense Secretary Wilson has approved a large cut in production money for the Air Force and the Navy. As I understand this action, it will halt the expansion of the Air Force at 120 wings or less instead of the 143-wing goal. This is an alarming decision at this time.

A man's memory does not have to be exceptional to remember the actions taken shortly after the end of World War II by another Secretary of Defense. The ill-advised use of the economy ax by Secretary Louis Johnson cut the heart out of the Air Force and Navy programs to the extent that we were woefully unprepared to challenge the Communists in Korea. The state of our unpreparedness became more and more apparent as the so-called police action turned into an extended shooting war.

I have fought the battle for an adequate Air Force and an expanded naval air arm for many years. I do not intend to stand by idly this time while we again try to commit national suicide with ill-advised economy measures. There are many ways in which substantial reductions may be made in Federal spending. Our first line of defense is certainly not the place to fulfill a campaign promise.

HAWAIIAN COMPROMISE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, for several weeks and months I have been studying the question of Hawaiian statehood, and I have collected some data which I believe will be of assistance to the Senate. At this time I wish to present some of my findings.

Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 14, Joseph Kealalio, a principal figure in the Communist-dominated International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, issued a direct and threatening challenge to law and order in the United States. In a manner perhaps unprecedented in the history of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, Kealalio attempted to coerce and intimidate the Supreme Court of the United States.

The threat by Kealalio, a notorious Communist, was made before the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union convention in San Francisco. I should like to read to you the report filed by the United Press:

KEALALIO PROPOSES STOPPAGE IF BRIDGES' CONVICTION UPHELD

SAN FRANCISCO, April 14.—Joseph Kealalio, chosen by Harry Bridges as No. 2 "standby" man if Bridges is jailed, told the ILWU convention Thursday that the union should "do anything to see that the leadership stays out of jail."

Kealalio, a delegate from Hawaii, said that if Bridges' pending appeal from his 5-year perjury-conspiracy conviction is denied by the Supreme Court "the ships ought to stop, the plantations ought to stop, and the factories ought to stop."

These are not the words of the United Press. They are the very words of this Hawaiian Communist, voiced in a threatening and intimidating manner toward the Supreme Court of the United States. Listen to them:

The ships ought to stop, the plantations ought to stop, and the factories ought to stop.

Mr. President, every Member of this body is aware of the fact that the Communists in Hawaii exercise a powerful control and domination over the economic life of that Territory. Kealalio's threat is a serious one. For no one will deny that the Communists controlling the ILWU in Hawaii have the power to stop the ships, to stop the factories, and to stop the plantations in the Hawaiian Islands. This is not the first time that the Communists have come to the aid of Harry Bridges in his tangles with the law.

In August 1950 a wave of strikes took place on almost all of the plantations in Hawaii, and basic workers refused to work, in protest against the jailing of ILWU President Harry Bridges. Jack Hall, an avowed Communist and regional director of the ILWU in Hawaii, made it clear at that time that he supported the workers in that strike.

Just last September 1952, Hawaii's 23,000 members of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union walked off their jobs on the docks and on the plantations in protest against the Ninth Circuit Court's ruling upholding the perjury conviction of Bridges. The walkout, which began at the Waiahua Agricultural Co., rapidly spread to plantations and to all island docks and, finally, to the strategic United States Naval Base at Pearl Harbor. That strike—called and engineered by the Communists—was the closest thing to a general strike ever staged in the Hawaiian Islands.

No, Mr. President, we, in the United States Senate cannot deny, and we dare not ignore, the seriousness of Kealalio's threat.

Senators will recall that in 1949 we almost lost Hawaii to the Reds. For 178 days in 1949 the American Territory of Hawaii was held a virtual captive by Communists, who control the major labor unions in the islands. Not a freighter could be loaded, or leave a port, or discharge its cargo, except by the grace of Communist Harry Bridges. Not an ounce of food could be imported—and the food supply for Hawaii's people fell to a dangerously low level. Hardly a commercial transaction was carried on with the outside world—with the result that scores of business failures and job losses occurred. That strike cost Hawaii's economy an estimated $100 million. The Communist-dominated ILWU exerted, for more than 6 months, a slow strangulation on the economic life of this American community of more than 500,000 men, women, and children—and it succeeded, for all practical purposes, in isolating the Hawaiian Islands from the rest of the world.

We were warned—at the time—that the next attack could be worse. We may ask ourselves in the United States Senate today whether Kealalio's threat is the signal for that new attack.

Mr. President, hearings we have held in the Subcommittee on Internal Security disclose a threat even more serious to American interests in Hawaii. Evidence reveals, beyond any doubt, that the Communists in Hawaii have gained a strategic voice and influence in Territorial politics and government. We have documentary evidence to prove that:

First. Communists have captured control of the Democratic Party in Hawaii.

Second. Communists have supported, when it suited their own purposes, the Republican Party and candidates in Hawaii.

Third. Communists control, or influence, at the present time a number of the delegates to the Territorial House of Representatives.

Fourth. Communists hold domination over the Mayor of Honolulu, through the aged mayor's administrative assistant, W. K. Bassett, editor and contributor to Communist papers, and friend and counsellor to Harry Bridges and Jack Hall, who are well-known Communists.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to my friend and senior colleague, for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to congratulate the Senator upon his excellent speech. I merely wanted to say that, in the 1941 and 1942 records of the Senate Committee on Immigration, a committee which existed in 1941, and of which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was chairman, statements by General Summerall will be found regarding Hawaii. Anyone who will examine the records of the former Immigration Committee, and will read the statements made by General Summerall, at a time when he was the commanding officer in Hawaii, will observe that General Summerall fully substantiates what my distinguished colleague is saying at the present time. General Summerall, while he was Chief of Staff of the Army, submitted a report to the late Calvin Coolidge, then President of the United States. A copy of that document was also filed with the Senate Committee on Immigration. The report is well worth a study by every American. It will be found to support fully what my distinguished colleague is today stating—though he is stating it even more ably.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly thank my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina, for his remarks. I am particularly pleased with his mention of General Summerall. There is no finer military man or finer Christian gentleman in the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that my colleague, as a former veteran, is himself very much appreciated by General Summerall.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina, for a question.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator whether the W. K. Bassett, to whom he has referred, is the man who is reported to have given out an interview following a speech by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], in which he called the Senator from Mississippi a liar and certain other vile names, for having called Bassett a Communist? Is it the same man?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is the same man. I started to say, the same gentleman, but I will say, it is the same man.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. From his research, has the Senator from South Carolina any doubt that it is the same man, and that he was formerly, and perhaps still is, a Communist?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is the same man. As I proceed with my speech, I think I shall perhaps have more to say about him.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield for one more question, does he know whether General Summerall has been called to testify at any of the hearings on the matter of statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If he has been called, I know nothing of it; and, had he been called, I think I would know of it, since he is from my State. I think General Summerall would have come to see me, had he been here.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. What prompted the question was, would not the Senator from South Carolina think that General Summerall is the kind of citizen who ought to be asked to testify on the subject of Hawaiian statehood before a congressional committee, if and when the matter comes up?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am certainly glad the Senator from North Carolina mentioned that. In my opinion, General Summerall is a man who, so far as present conditions are concerned, could throw more light on the subject of Hawaii than any other living man.

Mr. President, before I yielded, I was stating that we have documentary evidence to prove a number of things, four of which I had enumerated. I continue the enumeration.

Fifth. Communists hold the balance of power in political voting through their control of the strategic labor vote, and political candidates of both parties have vied for that vote as a matter of political expediency.

Sixth. Communist Jack Hall, leader of Hawaiian Communists, who is now being tried for conspiring to overthrow the United States Government, has openly boasted about the number of representatives his party is able to elect to the Hawaiian Legislature.

This is but a brief summary of the infiltration of Communists into the political life of Hawaii. Behind this summary is the detailed documentation in the files of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

Mr. President, this evidence is not new to the Senate. In June 1949 and in every subsequent year, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] has warned this body of the danger of communism in Hawaii. In a penetrating and authoritative report, the Senator from Nebraska told the Senate in 1949:

> International revolutionary communism at present has a firm grip on the economic, political, and social life of the Territory of Hawaii. Communist strength in Hawaii is far, far greater than in any part of the continental United States. It is so great that it controls the one large labor union there. It has infiltrated and has secured what may be a controlling influence over one of the two major political parties. It has permeated other institutions of the Territory to the point where its influence is felt everywhere.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has quoted the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] as saying that 1 of the 2 major political parties in the islands is controlled by Communists. Is it not a fact that the two major political parties there are practically evenly divided, so that if the Communists control one of them they would have a hand in the political life of the islands?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. As I remember, in the last election there was a difference of only 10,000 votes between the 2 parties.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it the Senator's judgment that the Communists would control the policies of the Democratic Party in the islands?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think that is true, without a doubt.

With regard to our national defenses, the Senator from Nebraska warned:

> There is a large and well-organized fifth column, devoted to the cause of our potential enemies in the Territory that would create for the military a serious security problem in the event of hostilities.

Senator BUTLER's incisive report, entitled, "Communist Penetration of the Hawaiian Islands," concluded that:

> A relative handful of Moscow adherents, operating chiefly through the ILWU, has made the Hawaiian Islands a central operations base and strategic clearinghouse for the Communist campaign against the United States.

The Senator's intensive investigation of Communists in Hawaii caused the present chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to recommend to the Senate "without equivocation" that statehood be deferred indefinitely on the ground that:

> Neither Congress nor the American people should risk a permanent league with communism within the structure of the Federal Union.

In May 1951, in minority views expressed in Senate report No. 314, signed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the case against communism in Hawaii was tersely stated:

> 1. The single really big labor union in Hawaii, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which controls shipping, loading, and unloading sugar and pineapples, is itself absolutely controlled by known Communists. Communism has also penetrated very deeply into many of the

leading political and social organizations of the islands.

2. International communism, through its firm grip on the ILWU and its influence on the political structure, can completely dominate the economic life of the islands. By strikes or other means it can bring all economic activity in the islands to a dead halt for an indefinite period, and in fact virtually starve them into submission to its demands. Since the allegiance of Communists is to Moscow rather than to the United States Government, this power is likely to be used for political ends rather than for the attainment of economic goals. It undoubtedly can and will be used to hamper the rearmament effort and the conduct of military operations in Korea.

3. It would be a terrible mistake to grant statehood to any Territory whose economic life and policy is so completely dominated by Communists. If statehood should once be granted, under our Constitution, it can never be revoked, no matter how strong an influence Communists may attain in the new State.

The first two propositions given above are based on irrefutable facts which have been developed fully on a number of occasions. * * * The facts have never been challenged or denied by any responsible source.

I have been quoting from the minority views signed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. President, despite these authoritative warnings from able and respected Members of this body, I regret to say that the United States Senate has not fully measured up to its responsibility in meeting the issue of communism in Hawaii. To the contrary, the Senate is urged at this time, while Kealalio incites action to intimidate the United States Supreme Court, to admit Hawaii as a State into the Union. The Senate is urged—in the face of the realization that communism and left-wing unionism threaten the freedom of the Hawaiian Territory—to forego or postpone meeting the issue of communism in Hawaii.

At the same time, Mr. President, we are considering making Hawaii a State, we have the FBI running down one little Communist who may want to be only a minor employee of the United States. Think how silly that is, Mr. President, when we are asked to bring in literally thousands of Communists who are residents of Hawaii, by making Hawaii a State.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from South Carolina has said is certainly correct. Is it the Senator's judgment that if Hawaii were admitted into the Union and had two United States Senators on this floor, the Communist Party in Hawaii would be strong enough to influence the actions of those two Senators?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In my opinion, if we should have two Senators from Hawaii, whoever they might be, the Communists in Hawaii would certainly have a very potent effect upon their views.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator is saying is that Moscow would have influence in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Moscow would have an influence in the United States Senate by reason of our admitting Hawaii into the Union as the 49th State.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would that also be true as to Members of the House?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It would.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator think, then, that the Communists in Hawaii would try to influence the Government of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Communists are very influential in Hawaii, and I see no reason why they would not try to influence the Government.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that when all these additional officers are elected, the Communist Party in Hawaii, through its control of the labor movement, would be in a much stronger position, and therefore it would have more influence over the political life of the islands than it has at the present time under a territorial form of government?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They would have much more influence.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that admitting Hawaii as a State would increase the Communist influence in the islands?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it would increase the influence of the Communists in the islands.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has stated that the Communist Party has tremendous influence in Hawaii. He has also stated that the Communists control nearly half the political life of the islands through their control of the Democratic Party.

If that be true, does not the Communist Party today have more influence in the Hawaiian Islands than the Communist Party had in the average European satellite states when they were taken over by Moscow?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In my humble opinion, the Communists have in Hawaii far more influence than the Communists had in a great many satellite states when they were taken over by Communist governments.

But I say, Mr. President, that the United States Senate cannot, and it must not, blindly ignore the acts of Communists in the economic and political life of Hawaii. We must be sure that communistic elements could not control elections for local, territorial, and congressional posts. We cannot afford to establish Hawaii as a State 2,000 miles distant in the mid-Pacific until that issue is settled.

The New York Times, in dealing with this very question, quotes Mr. Walter F. Dillingham, who represents the third generation of his family in the islands and is conceded to be one of the most influential residents of the Territory. His words are these:

I don't consider this a time to become a State. I don't think we should be a State until we are perfectly sure that through the vote we could control these islands according to the American way of life.

This lifelong resident of Hawaii continued in these significant terms:

We must be sure we hold this place against any infiltration of communism. If we don't, we'll practically nullify the strength of the Army and Navy here. We're subject out here to union dictators, who want to get control of this spot politically, economically, and militarily.

Mr. President, these reasons compel me to urge today that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or the Internal Security Subcommittee, or the two committees acting jointly, go to Hawaii with expert counsel and investigate the infiltration of Communists into their political, economic, and educational institutions.

Such an investigation should aim, among other things, at ferreting out the facts in these areas:

First. The infiltration of communism into the economic life of Hawaii, including:

(a) The number and identity of Communists, or those subservient to its influences, holding offices in labor organizations.

(b) The degree to which Communists control members of the labor unions in Hawaii, embracing shipping and inland transportation, agriculture, refineries, communications, and United States military installations.

Second. The infiltration and control of Communists in the political institutions and government in Hawaii, including:

(a) The political alinements among political parties and communism.

(b) The number and identity of Communists, or those subservient to its influences, serving as officers of political parties.

(c) The number and identity of Communists, or those subservient to its influences, currently holding elective political offices.

(d) The number and identity of Communists, or those subservient to its influences, currently in appointive public offices.

(e) The extent of the power of the Communists to force block voting among labor groups and their families.

(f) The political compromises which the Communists could force, as a consequence of their voting strength, (1) in electing Senators, Representatives, and a governor, and (2) in effecting compromises on the views and policies of non-Communist officeholders.

Third. The number and identity of Communists, or those subservient to its influence, in the press and radio.

Mr. President, an investigation of Communist infiltration into the political life of Hawaii is basic to any consideration of statehood. Especially is this appreciated when we pinpoint the inroads the Communists have already made.

For example, it is a well-known fact that Mayor John H. Wilson himself was elected mayor of Honolulu with the powerful support of a coalition of Communists and leftwing elements. The mayor's administrative assistant, Mr. W. K. Bassett, is cited by both the House Un-American Activities Committee and the American Legion as the former editor of a Communist newspaper.

Evidence indicates that Mayor Wilson, who is 81 years of age and in ill health, has himself fallen under the influence of these Communist conspirators. For instance, the mayor just recently appeared at a rally to support and organize the defense of Jack Hall and other Communists who are now on trial in a Federal court for overt acts to overthrow by force and violence the Government of the United States. Mayor Wilson appeared voluntarily as a defense witness for Jack Hall, Communist leader of the islands, whose Communist ties are widespread and notorious. Moreover, he has permitted public-school buildings in Honolulu to be used for rallies of the Communists supporting the defense of the indicted Communists. In view of these events, it is difficult to evade the conclusion that Mayor Wilson himself is influenced by the Communist machine in Hawaii.

Particularly is this true when we find that the mayor's top assistant, W. K. Bassett, has been identified with Communist causes for 20 years. Mr. Bassett is a former publisher and editor of the Pacific Weekly. The Pacific Weekly has been identified by numerous official committees, as well as by the American Legion, as an arm of the Communist press. The Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, includes this citation on page 145 of its report of May 14, 1951:

SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS—PACIFIC WEEKLY

1. This Communist publication was alleged to be a western journal of fact and opinion. It was published at Carmel, Calif. The editor and publisher was W. K. Bassett. Ella Winter, veteran California Communist, was literary editor. (California Committee on Un-American Activities, report, 1948, p. 341.)

As long ago as 1937 the American Legion cited the Pacific Weekly as a Communist journal:

PACIFIC WEEKLY

A western journal of fact and opinion, published every month at Carmel, Calif., post-office box 1300. W. K. Bassett, editor and publisher; Lincoln Steffens, associate editor; Ella Winter, literary editor.

This citation appears on page 195 of the American Legion's publication Isms, published in 1937, under the caption of "Communist Press."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a known fact that Lincoln Steffens is one of the most notorious Communists in this country?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the information I have.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator know that the Subcommittee on Internal Security has received testimony about a radio device in the home of Lincoln Steffens that was used to communicate with Russian ships as they moved along the coastline before entering San Francisco harbor?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Such evidence has been produced.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not also true that Lincoln Steffens was one of the editors of Pacific Weekly, of which W. K. Bassett, the man who today actually runs the city of Honolulu, was publisher?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That certainly is a well-known fact.

Mr. President, it may be appropriate at this time for me to read excerpts from a number of Mr. Bassett's articles written while he was editor and publisher of the Pacific Weekly:

If there is one human emotion prevalent in Soviet Russia today, it is hope; if there is one human emotion lacking in America among those who might well be unfavorably compared with the Russian peasant, it is hope. (Vol. 3, No. 11, Monday, September 6, 1935, page 122, signed by W. K. Bassett.)

Another article appearing in the Pacific Weekly and signed by W. K. Bassett, while he was editor and publisher, reads:

I have almost convinced myself that perhaps 20 years from now I will prefer living in Russia to living in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Would not that indicate that at that time this man Bassett was planning by some method to get America into the Communist orbit and under the Communist regime, rather than go to Russia himself?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It seems that he was using his pen to try to entice the people to become Communists.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. There is no doubt, is there, from what the distinguished Senator has read about this man Bassett, and judging by what he is alleged to have written, that he is a Communist? He could not be anything else.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. He speaks like a Communist.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Has the Senator himself any doubt about it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have no question about it. The evidence we have gathered establishes it as a fact.

Quoting further:

Twenty years from now, I believe that that ideal will be so nearly realized that Russia will be a far more comfortable place to live than my own country which persists in facing wrong, despite all its own repeated failures; which harbors and fosters an iniquitous system because the beast, then young, tame and harmless, was presented to it by reverenced forefathers.

I believe that the capitalist control of my country is surely driving it into a revolution far more bloody than that Russia has experienced, far more terrible than any of the exaggerated fixtures of Russia provided us by the Hearst press. I know that repeated and persistent trampling on the rights, on the privileges of the workers of this country; repeated and persistent efforts to force down the wages of labor; repeated existence, will some day dash my country into the hell of a terrible revolt and just as I don't want to be in Russia today, I don't want to be here then. (Pacific Weekly, vol. 2, No. 16, Friday, April 19, 1935.)

W. K. Bassett, the mayor's administrative assistant, also wrote these words when he was editor and publisher of the Pacific Weekly:

If Pacific Weekly has a Communist or Socialist tinge, or taint, it is because people of these faiths have something fundamental, essential, thoroughgoing, unsparing, extreme to say and also the ability and the courage to say it. These are times that try men's souls, and a solution for the ills that are upon us must come from somewhere. How better can we find it than by listening to those who believe that they have it; those who by study and training and experience are fitted to voice their expression of opinion and compel attention to their views. (Vol. 2, No. 3, Friday, January 18, 1935.)

Mr. President, other contributors to Pacific Weekly, as well as most of the staff, were Communists. There were Robert Merriman, Lincoln Steffens, Ella Winter, and others.

Since he has joined Mayor Wilson as administrative assistant, Mr. Bassett has contributed articles, under his own name, to the Honolulu Record, also identified as a Communist paper by the House Committee on Un-American Activities—Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, Report on the Honolulu Record, October 1, 1950. Mr. Bassett has spoken on the same platform with Jack Hall, who is regional director of the ILWU and the Communist leader in Hawaii. In November of last year, when Harry Bridges, the Communist head of the ILWU arrived in Honolulu, Mr. Bassett, the mayor's aide, met him at the airport, placed a lei around the neck of Harry Bridges, who was then convicted of perjury, and escorted him to greet Jack W. Hall, Hawaiian Communist leader. Hall, even at that time, was under indictment for attempting to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence.

No, there can be no serious doubt that Mr. Bassett is a Communist. And, yet, he occupies the position as administrative assistant to the mayor of Honolulu, a city which contains more than half of the population of the Islands. Honolulu is such a dominant part of the Islands that it reaches out to include the island of Palmyra, roughly 900 miles to the southwest. The city of Honolulu controls the economic and political life of the islands. Yet, because of the age and illness of the mayor, who spends a great deal of his time in the hospital, the administrative control of this vast city is in the hands of his administrative assistant, W. K. Bassett, intimate of Communist persons and causes.

Mr. President, Mayor Wilson has not been the only high official who has fallen under the influence and domination of the Communists. Former Federal Judge Delbert E. Metzger has been linked with the Communists in numerous public actions. Senators will recall that it was Judge Metzger, of the United States District Court of Hawaii, who lowered the bail for the 7 Communists in Hawaii from $75,000 to $5,000. Judge Metzger, who is also a member of the Statehood Commission for Hawaii, then traveled about 6,000 miles to New York City to receive an award from the Lawyers' Guild, cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist organization. Yet, Judge

Metzger is still a leading member of the Statehood Commission for Hawaii. Last November Judge Metzger won the nomination for Delegate, with the support of the Communist-controlled ILWU and was defeated in the race for Delegate by Mr. FARRINGTON by a slim lead of only 10,000 votes. Mr. President, the significance of that election is that the Communists came within 10,000 votes of electing a "Communist-captive" as a Delegate from Hawaii to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is this the same Judge Metzger who is now a member of the Statehood Commission of Hawaii, a governmental agency appointed by the Governor, which is directing the lobbying and the fight for Hawaii's admittance into the American Union?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from South Carolina has stated that Judge Metzger is a "Communist captive." Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. Our investigation has produced evidence to that effect. If he were elected with their support, he would certainly listen to them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from South Carolina know that Judge Metzger, in the past few days, has appeared as a character witness for Jack Hall, the Communist leader who is on trial now for conspiring to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, and that Judge Metzger testified to the good character and loyalty of this man Hall?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. He testified in the Smith-Act trial.

We may ask ourselves, "What would have been the outcome of that election had Judge Metzger been opposed by a man of lesser stature, integrity, and vote-getting ability than the distinguished Delegate, Mr. FARRINGTON?"

Speaking of politics, I regret to say that the Communists have in fact infiltrated and now have control of the Democratic Party in Hawaii. The House Un-American Activities Committee found this to be the case in its investigation in April 1950. The situation has not changed since. This does not mean, of course, that the Jefferson-Jackson Democrats in Hawaii are Communists or even left-wingers. But it does mean that the party "label" and the party organization has been captured by communistic elements and the true Democrats have not been able to regain their control. Instead, the control of the party in Hawaii is in the hands of the "reluctant 39," who are the party officers. As Senators know, they are called the "reluctant 39" because they refused to say under oath whether or not they were or had been members of the Communist Party.

Mr. President, the Republican Party has adopted a surprisingly pious attitude about Communists in their own organization in Hawaii. For, while it has not been affected to the extent of the Democratic Party, there is evidence to indicate that the communistic elements support the candidates of the Republican Party when it suits their particular designs and purposes. We have evidence to prove, for example, that the Political Action Committee, a captive organization of the Communist Party in Hawaii, has supported certain prominent Republican candidates in Hawaii during its existence. In fact, I have before me at this time the PAC slate in 1946 which lists prominent Republicans whom the communistic organization supported.

I want to say that this is, by no means, a criticism of the Republican candidates. They are, so far as I know, fine men and able office holders. But I do think I should point out, in appraising the strategic position of the Communists in Hawaiian politics, that the Republican candidates did not rebuff the Communists in their support. They did not go on record as being opposed to communistic support. To the contrary, the evidence is clear that both major political parties compete for the strategic vote represented by the Communist-dominated ILWU in Hawaii. They compete for that vote as a matter of pure political expediency, for they realize that it could mean victory or defeat at the polls.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say in response to what I have heard the Senator from South Carolina say about the Republican Party in Hawaii, that the Republican Party of Michigan and the Republican Party of the United States repudiate any help from the Communists, and always have repudiated such help. We in Michigan will certainly have no part of such help and we want no votes from Communists for sake of expediency or for any other purpose.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the Senator from Michigan is right. I think he will find the same thing to be true in South Carolina.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure of that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the Senator from Michigan will further agree that he will not find that to be true of all the candidates in Hawaii. Not all of them feel that way about it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am certainly surprised and shocked that any man who would call himself a Republican would accept the aid and support of a Communist for expediency or for any other purpose.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like, at this time, to hand to my colleague from Michigan a list issued by the PAC, showing the persons who were indorsed by the PAC as candidates in 1946. The list includes both Democrats and Republicans. That list was put out by the PAC, which, I believe the Senator will agree, was Communist dominated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Such support should have been repudiated immediately by the Republican and Democratic candidates.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. When the Hawaii statehood bill comes before the Senate, would that not be a glorious opportunity for the Republican Members of the Senate, as well as for the Democratic Members of the Senate, to repudiate a plan which, in granting statehood to Hawaii, would result in having two Communists become Members of this body?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the way I feel about it. I believe other Senators should feel that way about it too.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I commend the Senator from South Carolina for bringing out these facts, as I also wish to commend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] for the statement he made on the subject a few days ago.

In speaking to my constituents within the past week or 10 days I have found that people in my State are waking up to the possibility that while we are fighting the Communists on the war front we are apparently, it would seem from what the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has stated, plus what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has stated, preparing to admit into this body two representatives of the Communist Party. I think it is time to call attention to that fact, and I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Michigan said what he did in defense of the Republican Party, as well as what we say in defense of the Democratic Party, because neither party should tolerate for one moment any Communist in this body or in the councils of our respective parties.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his statement on this subject.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the Hawaiian Communists will not—under the present Territorial organization—be able to elect the Delegate to Congress. I will admit, however, that they came within 10,000 votes of defeating the highly respected and able Mr. FARRINGTON. And by swinging their strategic support to Mr. Wilson, the communistic elements were able to cast the deciding vote in electing the mayor of Honolulu. Mr. Bassett himself has openly boasted about his determining role in that election. Nevertheless, I do not believe that they have a sufficient majority to elect the Delegate to Congress under the existing Territorial organization.

What the Communists in Hawaii urgently need, therefore, is to gain a bargaining position with the strategic votes they hold. That bargaining opportunity is available in the bill for Hawaiian statehood. The statehood bill, in its present form, is tailormade for political compromise. To wit: the bill provides for the election of 2 members

to the United States House of Representatives and 2 members to the United States Senate.

It takes only a rudimentary knowledge of politics to grasp the fact that, under such an arrangement, the Communists and left-wing elements would trade their huge strategic vote with other groups and, in turn, obtain support in the way of a compromise for at least 1, and maybe other, of the congressional offices. The Communists are able, at the present time, to defeat anti-Communists in the primaries of the Democratic Party in Hawaii. Both political parties in Hawaii now fight for the powerful Communist vote—or labor vote—through the 32,000 members who belong to the Communist-controlled ILWU.

There is, therefore, a real and imminent danger that if Hawaiian statehood is granted under the terms of the present bill, Communists or captives of the Communist Party will be elected and will come to Washington to represent Hawaii in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

Should there be any doubt as to the validity of that argument, I should like to read what the Communists themselves think of statehood. In the book, Hawaii, the 49th State, Jack Hall, Communist leader of the islands, is quoted as saying:

> We're for statehood—unqualifiedly—at once.

With specific regard to the election of Representatives and Senators to serve in the Congress of the United States, Jack Hall states:

> If Hawaii becomes a State, we can send some good men to Washington from here—not only to represent the majority in the islands but also to strengthen liberal forces in the National Congress.

Mr. President, the acts of economic domination, the growing political infiltration, as well as the recent attempts to intimidate the circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States are warnings enough that we in the Senate must assume our full responsibility to protect this country against the admission of a State which harbors a dangerous communistic element. If we fail, the risk is the admission of a Territory not as a free State, not a State like California, Washington, or New Mexico, but a State which would enter this Union as a captive Territory, the captive of a foreign influence, exercising such a control over the area that it could ultimately represent the view of the Kremlin within this Union of ours.

Mr. President, our form of government was established and is dedicated to ideals and principles of orderly processes. It is designed to be immune to group intimidation. It was created to benefit all groups and yet to achieve and protect the freedom of the individual. With new generations, we have not, as the Communists have accused us, fostered our democracy only out of reverence for our forefathers, but we have nourished our democratic concepts and we have breathed new life into them so as to insure meaningful, free, and independent lives for our future generations.

The crossroads of history confront us. We are urged to compromise. But the compromise that is being offered the United States Senate in its deliberation of statehood for Hawaii is a compromise not related to boundaries, to longitudes and latitudes, and not related to the subjugation of a race; but this compromise deals with the subjugation of American ideals and principles in a compromise of political expediency—a compromise with communism.

Is there or can there be in the minds of any a doubt as to the solemn obligation of the United States Senate to prevent such a compromise? The question is: What will the Senate do with this most important matter which is pending before this session of Congress?

PERPETUATION OF FARMER-ELECTED COMMITTEE SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a bill to preserve and perpetuate the great farmer-elected committee system developed throughout rural America in the last two decades. It is a system through which farmers themselves administer their own farm programs. That bill would require the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to continue to utilize the services of local and State committees established under such act, to require that the services of such committees be utilized in carrying out farm-price support and crop-insurance programs, and to provide for the election of such State committees by the members of county committees.

During the past 20 eventful years, farmers have come to a new awareness, that they must make their voices heard if they are to have the kind of program they want and need. They realize more than ever that they must actively participate in guiding these programs along sound and practical lines if the desired results are to be obtained.

Through practical experience over the years, and with the valuable help of sympathetic legislators, farmers have developed the democratically elected farmer-committee system.

This system has proved to be a most effective means for farmers themselves to share in the formulation and administration of farm programs. Regardless of partisan political differences over farm policy or its administration, the principle of farmers running their own farm programs, through farmer-committees they themselves elect from among their own neighbors, has become a proven success.

I have long been convinced that the system of freely elected farmer committeemen is an example of practical working democracy which no other country, and no other branch of American free enterprise, can equal.

This system of farmer participation in the administration of farm programs has been a very real factor in the amazing progress of our agriculture during the past 20 years. In my opinion, and in the opinion of most farmers with whom I have talked, it should certainly be maintained to meet adequately the new challenges to agriculture that still lie ahead.

I am deeply concerned, however, over indications that the Department of Agriculture is now seeking to minimize the participation of such farmer committees in the operation of our farm programs.

There has always been some who, for one reason or another, have objected to farmers having a direct voice in the administration of their farm programs. In the main, the opposition has come from foes of the farm price-support programs who realize the difficulty of undermining those programs, or rendering them useless and ineffective, as long as farmers themselves are responsible for administering them.

The opposition has not come out into the open with frontal attacks upon the right of farmers to have an active voice in their own affairs; rather, it has used more subtle approaches in an attempt to discredit the farmer committees, or to trim their sails by making them only advisory instead of having any real administrative authority.

I regret to say that the new Secretary of Agriculture appears to have been taken in by some of this subtle propaganda. That is my interpretation of the Department of Agriculture's order of March 20, sharply curtailing activities of the farmer-elected committees, and in fact reducing such activities to the bare minimum level possible without action by Congress.

The order requires the farmer-elected county PMA committees—men chosen by their own neighbors, to administer the agricultural conservation, price support, crop insurance, and other programs—to turn over their policy-execution functions to a county office manager. The same order requires the State PMA committees to turn over their policy-execution functions to an executive officer.

I am sure Secretary Benson would disclaim any intent at this time to abolish the farmer-elected committees. Yet, that may well be the eventual effect of his recent order. It decreases, rather than increases, farmer participation in the administration of farm programs. It makes such committees only advisory in fact, with no real functions to give them purpose and no real responsibility to make them any more than figureheads.

Such a move at this time assumes much greater significance in view of the increased authority requested for the Secretary of Agriculture under Reorganization Plan No. 2, now before the Congress. If Reorganization Plan No. 2 is approved, it would give the Secretary of Agriculture full authority to complete the job of emasculating the committees, transferring from the control of such farmer committees the agricultural conservation program and other programs now assigned to them under existing law.

That is exactly what my bill seeks to prevent.

It is entirely in accord with the spirit and the letter of pledges made to American farmers by President Eisenhower during his campaign.

Repeatedly, President Eisenhower assured farmers he would let them run their own farm programs.

At Kasson, Minn., he said:

I pledge you that the Republican Party is going forward with positive, aggressive, farmer-run farm programs. • • • Our goal will be sound, farmer-run programs that safeguard agriculture • • • the programs must be transferred into genuinely farmer-run operations.

At Columbia, S. C., President Eisenhower, at that time candidate of the Republican Party, said:

Management and direction of the farm program, • • • Federally financed though it will be • • • must be turned over to the farmer.

At St. Cloud, Minn.:

At Kasson, I had the opportunity to outline a part of the farm program that the Republicans will support and urge and operate. • • • There was another part of it; that every kind of program adopted for the future would be farmer run, locally run.

At New Orleans:

What we need is to start from here and build a better program based on more farmer participation.

At Memphis:

I pledge you an administration that will cleanse all farm programs of partisan politics, that will decentralize their administration, that will increase farmer participation in their own programs.

And, in a televised interview on October 28, President Eisenhower firmly pledged:

We want farmer-built policies, with farmer-run programs.

Mr. President, I submit that today we are being herded along the opposite course. The recent action of Secretary Benson in regard to farmer committees is directly contrary to President Eisenhower's campaign pledges.

The big commercial farmers, the big processing and trade groups and economists, are all represented in the new administration, but the voice of the average farmer is in danger of being lost.

The middleman seems to have replaced the farmer as the key adviser in the Department of Agriculture these days. Meat buyers are invited in for a discussion about whether cattle prices are falling too low. Big city bankers are called to Washington to discuss whether or not farmers have enough credit available. Food dealers and processors are named to various advisory committees, and fewer and fewer farmers are evident, real farmers who must make their living by their farming enterprises.

Let me cite but one example.

Many of us are seriously concerned with the depressed situation in the dairy industry. Our concern is with the plight of dairy farmers—the milk producers. After repeated insistence that he assert some leadership toward improving conditions for dairy farmers, Secretary Benson called a dairy conference in April to discuss the formulation of some new program for dairying. It was announced at that time that analysis and coordination of the various recommendations by a smaller "task force" committee would be necessary. He has now named that "task force" to write and make public the dairy industry's suggestions, and here is how it is constituted: 3, out of 20 members, represent dairy production; 3 represent fluid-milk distribution; 6 represent manufactured dairy products; 4 represent wholesaling and distribution firms; 2 represent retail stores and restaurants; and 2 represent the realms of research, education, and promotion.

The classifications are Secretary Benson's, not my own.

I am sure we all welcome any contribution any of these dairy distributors, processors, wholesalers, or retailers can make; but I am sure too that many dairy farmers are going to be skeptical about such a group being primarily concerned with the producers' welfare. And here I make note again of the fact that, out of the group of 20, only 3 represent dairy production.

Secretary Benson says "We are here to help—not dictate." The question beginning to arise is, "Help whom?" It has always been my understanding that the primary responsibility of the Department of Agriculture was to the agricultural producers—the farmers. Now, it seems, a new concept is arising.

Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse, addressing the annual meeting of the National Cheese Institute in Chicago April 28, had this to say:

Agriculture must be dealt with as a total industry, taking in all those who produce, store, finance, sell, process, and otherwise work with farmers and farm products. The narrow view is to consider only the 16 percent of the population now living on farms. Such a limited approach will restrict agricultural progress.

Is the voice of big business going to squeeze out the voice of agriculture—in the Agriculture Department itself?

I am sure we hope not. Yet I am disturbed at the extent to which those whose primary concern is not about the welfare of the individual farmer, are suddenly emerging in the forefront of attempts to make over our farm policies. I do not like seeing Wall Street farmers—businessmen and speculators who farm the farmers—attempting to dictate farm policy for this country.

I do not mean to attack processors and buyers and middlemen handling farm products. I wish them well; I want them to be successful and to make a profit. But I do not want them to be manipulating farm policies to protect their own interests at the expense of the farmers. If they are going to be given such a friendly ear in the Department of Agriculture, I want to make sure the farmer is not forgotten either. I want to make sure the farmer is not lost in the shuffle.

That is why I am asking the Congress to enact the bill I introduced yesterday to establish by statute the functions of the farmer-committee system, to assure the farmers they will not entirely lose a voice in what should be their own department of government.

I realize there has been a great deal of talk by Secretary Benson and his aides about the extensive use they are making of advisory groups. I have tried to illustrate how far outvoted the farmer is on one such group. It is just as true of other groups. But even when farmer members are included on such committees, there is good reason to question how closely they represent the average farmer.

Let me state why. When the Department of Agriculture felt in need of special consultations with farm people in the past, it invited representatives in from various areas of the country, and paid their expenses so they could come. Secretary Benson has changed all that. He has invoked new rules. Members of such advisory committees must meet their own expenses.

This creates no problem for agricultural business firms sending representatives. They pay the expenses, and deduct it from income taxes. It is no problem for trade groups maintaining professional lobbying staffs here for just such purposes. But it is quite a problem for the average farmer. How many average-family farmers do we suppose are in a position to drop their work and run to Washington at their own expense, to try and make their voice heard against the voices of processors and other middlemen?

Let us remember this, when we hear about the advisory committees. The kind of committees I want to see representing agriculture are farmer committees, chosen by the farmers themselves. That is why I want to see the farmer-committee system written into law where it cannot be tampered with.

Let me explain the bill I have introduced.

It merely requires the Secretary of Agriculture, in carrying out provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, to continue to utilize the services of local and State committees established under that act; it requires that the services of such committees be utilized in carrying out farm price support and crop-insurance programs; and it provides for the election of State committees by members of county committees.

The statutes now provide for the agricultural conservation program to be carried out by such committees. All this bill does is to assure that the provision remains in effect regardless of any reorganizational proposal.

Price-support programs and crop-insurance programs have in the past been administered by these committees, and successfully so. All this bill does is to make that accepted practice a statutory requirement—to prevent any change from the farmer-run administration of programs now in existence.

The only new proposal in my bill is for the election of State committees by members of county committees, instead of appointment by the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe such a change is the real way to end, once and for all, the various charges that the farmer-committees are being used for partisan political purposes.

The Republican Party talked much during the campaign about taking agriculture out of politics. Here is a chance to do it. Farmers now elect their own community and county committees, following truly democratic processes. My proposal is that members of the farmer-elected county committees, in turn, should themselves elect the State committees.

Farmers have frequently expressed the hope that the principle of democratically elected committees could be carried to its logical conclusion, by leaving the choice of State as well as county committees up to the farmers themselves, rather than risk its becoming a plaything of political patronage.

Mr. President, we have heard many times on this floor charges of politics hurled at the PMA committees. I have never concurred in such charges, because I know that I had nothing to say about the appointment of the State PMA committees in Minnesota; it was not chosen as a matter of patronage, it was chosen from farmers out of the ranks of county committeemen and fieldmen.

There is cause to question whether that policy is still being followed. When a new PMA chairman was chosen for my State, newspapers reported he had been cleared through the Republican organization from Minnesota.

If the administration meant what it pledged about keeping patronage out of the Department of Agriculture's field organization, I would welcome some evidence of it by support for my proposal.

My bill is concerned only with the local administration of farm programs out in the States and counties, not with the internal supervisory structure of the Department of Agriculture in Washington. It will not interfere with structural reorganization of the Department, unless it is the Department's intent by such reorganization to abolish the use of farmer-elected committees.

My bill requires the use of such committees and assigns them specific functions, but does not label the farmer-committees as belonging under the Production and Marketing Administration or any other individual agency of the Department. My concern is with protecting the farmer's voice in these programs, not with what any agency is called in any reorganization shuffle.

I believe the bill I am proposing is a constructive one entitled to widespread support. In view of President Eisenhower's determined pledges to strengthen, rather than weaken, the principle of farmer-run programs, I see no reason why this bill should not be welcomed by many of my colleagues from farm areas on the other side of the aisle. They know, I am sure, that farmers want to preserve their right to help shape and administer the farm programs through their own direct participation in choosing county committees. They know, as a general rule, farmers are not as concerned with partisan politics as they are with agricultural politics; they just want a fair break for agriculture, and they seek the support of both parties.

I would offer just one more thought for my colleagues in the Senate in regard to politics in our farm programs.

I pose this question to experienced, practical politicians: If you were trying to build a political machine, which would be more useful and more easily controlled, a corps of new Federal employees appointed outside civil-service regulations, covering every rural county in every State in the country, or a group of farmer-committees elected by the local farmers themselves over which there is no appointive or disciplinary power?

I think the answer is very obvious, Mr. President, that an appointed group of Federal employees on a patronage basis, outside the civil-service regulations, would indeed be equal to a nationwide political machine, and that what is needed is a truly objective and a truly honorable organization for the benefit of the farmers.

I want the Senate to think that over, in view of the Benson plan for substituting appointive county managers for elected farmer committees in every PMA office in the country.

Let me briefly contrast the new administration's apparent patronage approach to agriculture's field organization with a description of what I feel the real role of farmer committees should be.

I want to quote that description from an address by former Under Secretary of Agriculture Clarence J. McCormick, last September 24, at the annual State meeting of PMA county committeemen in Indianapolis, Ind.:

> Your responsibility, as farmer committeemen, is to provide the grassroots leadership in maintaining and conserving our productive resources.
>
> It is your responsibility to help inspire the kind of teamwork that will be needed to get the job done.
>
> That responsibility is not owed to the Department of Agriculture, or to the Government. Instead, your responsibility is to your fellow farmers who have chosen you for your work as committeemen; your responsibility is to agriculture, and agriculture's responsibility is to all the people of the Nation.
>
> And, by the same token, that is where the Department of Agriculture's responsibility belongs, and that is where those of us who have come up through your ranks to posts of leadership in the Department are constantly striving to keep it.

Mr. President, I submit that that is an honorable statement of a fine and honorable program by a great public servant.

That is what the farmer-committee system means to American agriculture, and that is the kind of leadership it produces from its own ranks.

It is becoming increasingly clear that agriculture now needs, more than ever, the watchdog protection of the farmer-elected committees.

When some among us sought to sound a note of warning about falling farm prices earlier this year, we were at first scoffed at. Then, when it became apparent that was not enough of an answer for farmers, the line was switched to how long ago the decline in prices started. Farmers finally made it rather clear they were not interested in wrangling about when things started going to pot; they were concerned with what is happening to farm prices right now—today.

So the Department of Agriculture waved a wand and announced prices were stabilized, the drop had been halted in cattle prices, and that everything would be all right from now on. That was more than a month ago. But everything has not been all right. Cattle markets must not have seen the Department's press release, prices have continued to fall. For the month ending April 15, according to a Bureau of Agricultural Economics announcement last week, the index of all farm prices fell 5 more points or 2 percent. The parity ratio, which was 100 up to the November election, is now down to 93.

I make note that during January and February the cash receipts from marketing livestock and livestock products in the State of Minnesota were down $21,420,000 as compared with the same 2 months of last year. That is why farmers in the area which I represent are deeply concerned about the fall in farm prices.

Farmers are still disturbed over the uncertain future of our farm programs. Crippling budget slashes indicate a desire to wipe out some of the programs through the back door of appropriations, if it cannot be done directly and more aboveboard by specific legislation.

We still have very little assurance of what kind of price support farmers are going to get after next year—if any. Several bills have been introduced to improve the price-support legislation, among them one of my own. I have been unable to learn, however, of any plans to hold hearings on these price-support bills.

In view of all these uncertainties facing the farmer, in view of repeated pledges that he was going to get a bigger voice in farm affairs rather than be squeezed out of the picture, I suggest that the very least we can do is to save the farmer-committee system from destruction through the measure I have proposed, to give that accepted principle permanent status of law.

Perhaps this will bring a showdown on where the farmer stands with the new administration.

I have been told repeatedly that the basis of the Benson plan for agriculture is that farmers should shift for themselves.

Now perhaps we can learn if the Benson plan contemplates letting farmers have any voice at all in the future conduct of their affairs.

In my opinion the farmer has a right to know.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

THREAT OF FAMINE IN PAKISTAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment for a moment upon a measure which I introduced in the Senate a few days ago, namely, a bill to provide economic assistance to the people of Pakistan by a loan for the purchase of wheat.

Mr. President, the threat of a famine to the people of Pakistan is serious for the whole free world. We cannot allow that country, a bastion of democracy in Asia, to suffer while we have plenty; nor can we allow it to face a political crisis as a result of the natural catastrophe which has hit it.

On April 14, therefore, I wrote Secretary of State Dulles, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and Mutual Security Administrator Stassen, urging the United States to offer assistance from our abundant wheat reserves to avoid famine in

Pakistan. Members of the Senate are also aware that I subsequently introduced a bill, S. 1782, authorizing an emergency wheat loan program to Pakistan through MSA.

In recent days I have received replies to my letters from the Department of Agriculture through Under Secretary Secretary True B. Morse, and from the State Department through Assistant Secretary Thruston B. Morton. Those replies indicate that both Departments share my concern over Pakistan's plight.

I was interested to learn from Mr. Morton's letter that the Government of Pakistan has formerly requested our assistance in providing 1 million tons of wheat by late fall. I was pleased that the State Department responded to that request by sending a three-man commission to Pakistan to study the situation. That mission is expected to submit a report by the end of May. It is my hope that immediately following that report the State Department will make a firm recommendation to the Congress as to the amount of wheat Pakistan will require to escape mass starvation.

I have written the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, requesting that this question be placed on the agenda of our next committee meeting.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters from the Department of State and Agriculture which I received be published in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 30, 1953.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Reference is made to your letter of April 14, 1953, and to the Department's interim telephone acknowledgment of April 17, concerning the serious food situation in Pakistan.

The Department is deeply concerned over the aforesaid severe wheat deficit in drought-stricken Pakistan, and is taking steps to determine the form and extent of any United States assistance which may be requested from the Congress. An interdepartmental working group has gathered and studied facts on the situation, and the facts currently available indicate that Pakistan will again need to import substantial quantities of wheat equaling or exceeding its imports during the May 1952–April 1953 food year of well over 800,000 tons.

Pakistani officials have discussed the Pakistan wheat situation with officers of the Department, in the course of which the former mentioned the figure of 1.5 million tons as their estimated total import need in the food year beginning May 1, 1953, and have formally requested United States assistance in providing 1 million tons by late fall of this year. The wheat crop now being harvested (April–May) in Pakistan is expected to meet the country's requirements for the months immediately ahead and to largely determine the extent of the anticipated sharp deficit, which would begin to be felt directly this fall in the absence of adequate imports.

The Secretary of State and the Director for Mutual Security are sending Dr. Harry Reed, dean of the College of Agriculture at Purdue University, to head a three-man mission to Pakistan for an on-the-spot survey of the wheat situation. It is hoped that Dr. Reed will have a first-hand report ready in May. It will greatly assist in reaching a decision on Pakistan's request for United States aid.

I appreciate having your expression of concern in this matter, and hope that the foregoing comments will be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is in response to your letter of April 14, in which you voiced concern over the food situation in Pakistan and expressed the hope that the Department of Agriculture would make available to Pakistan some of the surplus food supplies in the United States.

I assure you that I share your conviction that no nation like ours with an abundance of food should stand idly by while a less fortunate nation starves. The people of the United States have a tradition of generosity toward their fellow men in other countries which precludes such a possibility.

The Department of Agriculture for several months has been aware of a possible food shortage developing this year in Pakistan. A member of the Department has served on an informal committee composed of members from several interested agencies of the Government in an effort to determine the magnitude of the wheat shortage in Pakistan and in trying to determine to what extent and in what manner the United States Government could best be of assistance if a real crisis developed.

In normal years Pakistan is about self-sufficient in food supplies with a small surplus of food grains available for export, but for the second successive year drought at planting time and a shortage of canal water has reduced Pakistan's wheat crop. Last year's crop was about 900,000 long tons (33,597,000 bushels), of 16 percent, below the 1949–50 to 1951–52 average. Pakistan will have imported an estimated 800,000 tons (30 million bushels) of food grains during the 12 months ending May 1. Of this amount about 162,000 tons (6 million bushels) were purchased in the United States with funds provided by an Export-Import Bank loan. Data on the annual carryover of foodgrains are not available, but we may safely assume that these are largely exhausted at the present time. The present food grain shortage is due to the second successive short wheat crop in West Pakistan. The wheat harvest in West Pakistan is just getting under way and will be largely completed by the end of next month. The latest estimate by our agricultural attaché in Karachi places the current crop at 2,900,000 to 3,000,000 long tons (108 million to 112 million bushels), which is about 1 million tons below the 1949–50 to 1951–52 average. A reduction of this size in the wheat crop may require food grain imports of 1 million tons (37,330,000 bushels) if normal consumption levels are to be maintained. Most other food grain crops, not yet planted, will be harvested beginning in August.

Since Pakistan's wheat harvest is currently in progress, a supply of domestic wheat is assured for the time being. The real need for imported wheat probably will not be felt until October or November. However, unless the Government of Pakistan can announce at an early date that arrangements have been completed to meet the deficit, local hoarding and high prices of food may develop in the near future.

If the Government of Pakistan formalizes its announced intention to request a wheat loan from the United States, the formal request will be made through regular diplomatic channels. If such formal request is made, the Congress probably will be giving consideration to the use of United States funds for a wheat loan. The Department of State and the Mutual Security Agency are aware that our wheat stocks are sufficient to take care of Pakistan's needs.

If the Congress decides to make funds available, this Department will assist in every way it can to insure the people of Pakistan against suffering for lack of food.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I make note that on an earlier date I presented for the RECORD and had incorporated in the body of the RECORD the letters which I wrote to the Department of Agriculture and to the State Department.

RECESS

Mr. FERGUSON. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 8, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 7 (legislative day of May 6), 1953:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Nathan Farragut Twining, 10A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general, for a period of 2 years beginning from date of appointment, under the provisions of section 202 of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951.

Lt. Gen. Thomas Dresser White, 22A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, for appointment as Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 7 (legislative day of May 6), 1953:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Walter Bruchhausen to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Sherman P. Furey, Jr., to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho.

John O. Henderson to be United States attorney for the western district of New York.

A. Pratt Kesler to be United States attorney for the district of Utah.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

George W. Beach to be United States marshal for the district of New Mexico.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of section 224, the Armed Forces Reserve Act (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John Francis O'Ryan, O135904.
Maj. Gen. Walter Perry Story, O171629.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Frayne Baker, O134923.
Brig. Gen. Stanhope Bayne-Jones, O170753.

Brig. Gen. George Harris Cosby, Jr., O167827.

Brig. Gen. Clyde Emerson Dougherty, O190855.

Brig Gen. Charles Merville Spofford, O919215.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. John W. Roper, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral:

To be rear admirals, line

Bernard E. Manseau	Burton Davis
Logan McKee	Murr E. Arnold
Ralph Earle, Jr.	John B. Moss
George A. Holderness, Jr.	Irving T. Duke
	Truman J. Hedding
Selden B. Spangler	Chester C. Wood
Joseph N. Wenger	Clarence E. Ekstrom
Neil K. Dietrich	Rufus E. Rose
Frederick Moosbrugger	Charles W. Wilkins
Francis M. Hughes	

To be rear admirals, Medical Corps

Sterling S. Cook	Winfred P. Dana
Charles F. Behrens	Robert M. Gillett

To be rear admirals, Supply Corps

Walter W. Honaker
Frederick L. Hetter
Frederic W. Hesser

To be rear admiral, Civil Engineer Corps

Joseph F. Jelley, Jr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grades indicated:

To be major general

Vernon E. Megee

To be brigadier general

Albert D. Cooley

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are again turning our thoughts toward Thee in supplication and petition, for Thou alone canst give wisdom to guide, strength to sustain, and hope to cheer us in these troublous days.

Grant that we may yield ourselves more completely to the sovereign will of Thy divine spirit in order that our own finite spirits may be taught by Thee and touched to finer issues.

We pray that, in our desires to find and fulfill the meaning and mission of life and have a worthy place in the annals of history, we may be ambitious without being unscrupulous, high-minded without being supercilious, venturesome without being foolhardy and presumptuous.

Show us how we may help all mankind achieve a larger measure of happiness and relief from life's burdens and struggles and worries.

Inspire us to hasten the fulfillment of the day when peace and good will shall prevail among men and nations.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 688. An act for the relief of Takako Niina;

H. R. 720. An act for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann);

H. R. 884. An act for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi;

H. R. 955. An act for the relief of Paula Akiyama;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary;

H. R. 1186. An act for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez;

H. R. 1193. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. James M. Tuten, Jr.;

H. R. 1704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki;

H. R. 1895. An act for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat;

H. R. 1936. An act authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter;

H. R. 2624. An act for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford;

H. R. 2936. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California for use as a fairground by the 10–A District Agricultural Association, California; and

H. R. 4004. An act to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 731. An act for the relief of James Rennick Moffett;

H. R. 4198. An act to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf;

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; and

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 18. An act to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom;

S. 30. An act to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts;

S. 39. An act to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution;

S. 52. An act for the relief of Anny Del Curto;

S. 106. An act for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations;

S. 117. An act to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood control purposes;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki);

S. 207. An act for the relief of Jimy Okuda;

S. 226. An act for the relief of Keiko Tashiro;

S. 228. An act for the relief of Irene Exitis;

S. 252. An act to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury;

S. 275. An act to further define the national transportation policy;

S. 371. An act for the relief of Georgia Andrews;

S. 380. An act to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans.;

S. 383. An act for the relief of Francisca Egurrola;

S. 448. An act for the relief of William Junior Jami and Sachiko Suwa;

S. 484. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States;

S. 607. An act for the relief of Thomas Dale Fawcett (George Yamamoto);

S. 639. An act to provide for the abandonment of a certain part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware;

S. 674. An act for the relief of Kikue Tsurukawa;

S. 712. An act for the relief of William R. Jackson;

S. 1143. An act for the relief of Teresa Lee Tipton (Kinuko Sakai);

S. 1147. An act for the relief of Karen Ruth Bauman;

S. 1228. An act for the relief of Patric Dorian Patterson;

S. 1292. An act providing for the reconveyance to the town of Morristown of certain land included within the Morristown National Historical Park, in the State of New Jersey;

S. 1307. An act to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1334. An act for the relief of Rev. A. E. Smith;

S. 1376. An act to amend section 503 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

S. 1389. An act for the relief of Ami Hanada (Margaret Ami McClung);

S. 1390. An act for the relief of Ann Marie Longworth and John Francis Longworth;

S. 1418. An act for the relief of Linda Marlene Kolachny (Mariko Furue);

S. 1448. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present emergency;

S. 1514. An act to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations;

S. 1524. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes;

S. 1525. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps air station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex.;

S. 1527. An act to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777); to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers upon the active

list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units;

S. 1528. An act to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force;

S. 1529. An act to amend the act of July 28, 1942 (ch. 528, 56 Stat. 722), relating to posthumous appointments and commissions, and for other purposes;

S. 1530. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy;

S. 1544. An act to repeal the authority to purchase discharge from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps;

S. 1545. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington Parish Burial Ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots;

S. 1546. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button;

S. 1547. An act to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel;

S. 1548. An act to provide for the exchange between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of certain lands and interests in lands in Puerto Rico;

S. 1549. An act to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va.;

S. 1550. An act to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom;

S. 1608. An act to prevent the indefinite continuation of service of a United States marshal following the expiration of his term;

S. 1641. An act to retrocede to the State of Oklahoma concurrent jurisdiction over the right-of-way for United States Highways 62 and 277 within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla.;

S. 1739. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes;

S. 1805. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research;

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled power flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953;

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to extend certain authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to Guam and to amend the National Housing Act with respect to housing in Alaska;

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens;

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution to revise and reprint the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government";

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4664. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I notice the so-called tidelands bill has been messaged over from the Senate. Many Members are interested in when this matter may come up for consideration in the House. I was wondering if the gentleman from Indiana had come to any conclusion about that matter.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say I think I can make a fairly definite statement about it at this time. At this moment it might be well to generally speak of the program as I see it for next week, because I expect, upon the conclusion of the matters scheduled for today, to adjourn over until Monday.

First, Monday is District of Columbia day. I do not know whether there are any bills ready to be considered at that time or not. If there are, we will try to have them specified in the whip notice, so that Members will be aware of them.

Mr. REED of New York. I have a matter that will come to the floor any time you are ready for it.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand. That is right.

On Tuesday I am hoping we can dispose of the so-called tidelands legislation. The Senate bill does not contain a provision that was in the House bill, known as title III. The measure may be sent to conference, or action may be taken here which would accept the Senate bill.

My present belief is that in all probability we shall try to get a rule on Monday which would make in order for action Tuesday the adoption of the Senate bill. In the event that action is taken it is based upon assurances from both sides of the aisle in the other body that the matters contained in title III which have to do with the Federal control of the Continental Shelf beyond the historic boundaries of the States—legislation dealing with that will be sent over here within the next 2 or 3 weeks from the other body.

Mr. RAYBURN. I insist on that point. I would like to know if the gentleman has an agreement with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House that they may do the same thing that the Senate is going to do.

Mr. HALLECK. I am quite sure that our members on the Judiciary Committee would be very insistent that the matters dealt with in title III should be again dealt with. If the Senate bill is accepted, of course, that would be obvious from the fact that our committee and the House itself did insist upon the inclusion of title III in the original bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. What I was intending by a little speed, I think we are all tired of this thing and we want to get it out of the way as quickly as possible, both the Senate bill and the Continental Shelf.

Mr. HALLECK. I see the chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee here. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. With reference to the matter of speed, we put this bill through the House in 2½ days. The delay was occasioned by the other body. They took 6 weeks to do what we did in two days and a half.

Mr. RAYBURN. We can always do that, but what I was trying to inquire about is as to whether or not if the Senate bill is accepted, which leaves out the matter of the Continental Shelf, will the Judiciary Committee of the House go ahead and deal with the problem as quickly as possible?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will begin on Monday morning.

Mr. HALLECK. Rules have been granted on two bills: H. R. 4605 to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and H. R. 4495 to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, having to do with the induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialized categories. Those two measures will be on the calendar for next week either Tuesday or Wednesday.

I am informed by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that they will file the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill on Wednesday. If the insistence is made that we wait 3 days before we take the bill up, we could not take the measure up until Saturday. It must be disposed of next week, because we have two appropriation bills for the following week which will probably occupy us during all of that week, so I am very hopeful that while I recognize the validity of the 3-day rule and while I also recognize that in previous Congresses consent has been given very often for the consideration of appropriation bills earlier than the expiration of the 3 days, I am very hopeful that we can arrange to take that measure up either Thursday or Friday of next week.

As far as I know that is the program for next week.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING CLERK

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Desiring to be away from my office for a few days, I hereby designate Mr. Robert

W. Malone, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III of the House.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

AMENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 229, Rept. No. 351), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee on the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING SECTION 10 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 230, Rept. No. 352), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4605) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the respect and honor in which peoples and civilizations have held their women has long been a yardstick of the height and strength of those civilizations and peoples. If an era mocks and scorns qualities and high moral character in women, that era and its people have always come very close to the borders of barbarism. It is equally true that as a people respect and revere these high qualities, their civilization will prove to be more sensitive and therefore more advanced culturally.

In our country, in our time, our people have firmly established Mother's Day as an American institution.

From its very inception, Mother's Day took on the nobler traits of our Republic. It began in the mind of an individual—Miss Anna Jarvis. It found its first expression as a community service. It was variously honored in the widely separated States who pioneered in its adoption as a State holiday. It was incorporated in a resolution by a Member of the House of Representatives. A resolution commending Mother's Day for observance passed both Houses of Congress. The President of the United States proclaimed the second Sunday in May as a national day of remembrance.

Anna Jarvis came from West Virginia. She lived in Philadelphia when she originated her great idea, and it was in that City of Brotherly Love where the day was first honored in official services 45 years ago.

Governor Colquitt, of Texas, started the practice of granting pardons to deserving State prisoners on Mother's Day 1912. It was made a State flag day by the Nebraska Legislature in 1913. Also in 1913, Pennsylvania made it a State holiday. And in 1914, as a national holiday, it brought its breath of beauty to every American citizen.

Since that time its ringing message has spread to scores of nations and to every continent on the face of the earth.

A quarter of a century ago, the Reverend James E. Freeman, then Episcopal bishop of Washington, said:

> Mother's Sunday compels us to think more definitely of those fundamental things that constitute the strength and the sanctity of home life.
>
> The moral and spiritual ideals of the Nation, as a whole, are largely determined by its mothers.
>
> No social occupations, no indulgence in those things that concern the State and the Nation, may be substituted for those holier responsibilities that have to do with home and family life. The greatest trust that God has committed to His children is that which is given to the mother of the household.
>
> We may change our customs and our ways of living, but we dare not lower those high and holy standards that give to the mother the sovereign place to which by divine sanction she was appointed. She must continue to be the guardian of a nation's character.

Mr. Speaker, the sympathy and understanding embodied in Mother's Day bridges the cracks and chasms between differing religious denominations.

The universality of Mother's Day surmounts the barrier of color.

All languages are intelligible when raised in the praise of motherhood.

The tenderness of Mother's Day knows no seas nor mountain ranges, no boundaries of community, county, State, and Nation.

Men and women alike look to their mothers as the noblest expression of all that is good and true and beautiful.

An American poet, Samuel Davenport, epitomized the miracle of motherhood when he wrote:

> Man may be an angel,
> Man may be a clod,
> But ev'ry mother's Mary,
> And ev'ry babe is God.

Let us approach Mother's Day, 1953, both eagerly and reverently to commemorate what we owe to our mothers, to give meaning to their self-sacrifice and to their undying love.

ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS (PENNSYLVANIA)

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, my particular district has a good many Army, Navy, and Air Force installations in it and, of course, with the slackening of the work at hand and in view of a reconsideration of Department of Defense requirements there must be layoffs. Our main camp at Indiantown Gap, which is a beautiful installation, has come in this category and is to be inactivated as of September 1. Personally, I do not feel we have been imposed on or treated too unfairly, if at all, because 11 other installations were inactivated before ours was chosen and others will follow. The factor of reduction in our military forces enters into the situation at Indiantown Gap. Its inactivation will affect some of our area quite badly, the blighted hard-coal regions particularly. All told, the number of civilian employees involved is 1,045.

I have been in touch with the chambers of commerce at Lebanon and Harrisburg and have asked them to conduct a survey to see what employment is available. I have requested everyone who has written me to go out and try to get a job. Those losing employment at Indiantown Gap have until September 1 to do this.

I firmly feel that the effect of the layoffs at this camp can be alleviated by a little individual effort, working in conjunction with the chambers of commerce and the employment agencies in our own districts.

I am sure that in the long run the people of our community will not unjustly criticize the administration for endeavoring to thoughtfully and practically

solve the question on most of our minds—reduction in taxes and efficiency in government. The mothers of families will see in this reduction of military requirements a tendency to keep the boys at home, thus reducing the number of boys who do not come back or come back in a wounded or disabled condition. Let us hope the day is rapidly approaching when we have real peace—not just a postponement of the agony.

Mr. Speaker, my views in this matter have the support of the leading newspapers in my district, and I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials relative thereto. I hope you will read them because sooner or later I believe your districts will be similarly affected.

REHABILITATION OF DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States taxpayer will gain millions of dollars if the provisions in the bill which I have introduced to rehabilitate disabled persons who worked in employment covered by social security is made law.

The provision is included in my bill to protect the social-security benefits of those who become totally and permanently disabled before reaching 65, the retirement age under the system. It provides for the rehabilitation of those disabled to be paid out of the social-security trust fund.

Most totally disabled people raise a relief problem. A disabled breadwinner is a relief problem for his dependents as well as himself. In fiscal 1953, for instance, 12,000 disabled people on relief rolls will receive more than $8,500,000 in public assistance.

This amounts to about $700 a year for each disabled person who is on relief, an expense that goes on year after year unless the person can be rehabilitated.

The cost of operating the entire program for public vocational rehabilitation for fiscal 1952 amounted to $514 for each individual rehabilitated. I would like to emphasize that this $514 is paid once. The $700 for relief can go on and on.

Further research shows that for every $1 the Federal Government spends rehabilitating a disabled person, the person pays back $10 in Federal income tax. Certainly the best and most economical way to meet the problem of disability is through rehabilitation.

The year 1948 is an excellent example of what can be done with rehabilitation. That year 53,000 disabled men and women moved back into gainful employment. At the time they started receiving vocational rehabilitation, this was the picture:

Of the 53,000, 74 percent were unemployed. About 45 percent were dependent on their families for support although many had families of their own to support. Another 8 percent received insurance benefits and an equal percentage relied on public assistance.

To them and their families rehabilitation meant increased stability and to their community, their State and the Nation it represented more citizens contributing to the general welfare.

FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened, during recent weeks, to some of the Members on the right side of the aisle who expressed much concern regarding the imminence of a recession in business or what is still worse the prospect of a bad depression. During the last session of the Congress, the specter of depression was trotted out when any mention was made of the Republican Party returning to power.

I have just been reading Dunn's Review of Economic Conditions, for the early months of this year, and I do not find any support for the concern which my Democrat friends have manifested.

This report shows that during the first quarter of this year the production of consumer goods was 40 percent above a year ago; the output of both cars and trucks was 35 percent above a year ago; passenger cars were assembled at a near record rate of almost six million a year; there was an increase of 13 percent in durable goods over a year ago; petroleum refining and chemical plants sustained operations at an accelerated rate; led by steel, the heavy industries operated at, or near, record levels, and 7 percent above a year ago; and lastly, electric output kept production about 10 percent above a year ago.

Civil engineering construction reached an unprecedented volume in the first 2 months of 1953. Contract awards for the most recent period were 47 percent above a year ago comparative. Contracts for new sewers, bridges, and airports were awarded in record volume by States and municipalities. Private housing was sustained during the first 2 months of 1953 at a level 75 percent above the high volume of a year ago.

At the highest level ever recorded for that time of year, employment in February 1953 reached 60.9 million persons. The jobless in February was about 3 percent of our labor force, compared with almost 8 percent 3 years ago. While all this was being accomplished, the Dun & Bradstreet's Wholesale Commodity Price Index was 7 percent below a year ago—this in sharp contrast to the inflationary spiral of prices that has accompanied increases in production during the previous administration.

An article in the Wall Street Journal under date of April 29, 1953, describes our economic situation in the following manner:

> The Nation's factories and mines chalked up peace-time production records for the seventh straight month in March, the Federal Reserve Board reported.
>
> The Board's industrial production index rose two points from February levels to reach 242 percent of the 1935–39 average at the end of March. This was 10 percent higher than a year ago and about 20 percent above mid-1950 production levels.
>
> The March figure of 242 percent of the 1935–39 average came within five points of the record high reached in November 1943, under the impetus of full war production.
>
> Output of nondurable goods rose further in March about to the peak rate of early 1951, as activity in the chemical, rubber products and food industries continued to expand, according to the Board.

Whether the remarks made in recent weeks on the floor of the House represent wishful thinking or lack of understanding, I am unable to determine.

The results of the Eisenhower administration is evidence of the tremendous productive capacity of our country when the shackles of controls are lifted, and business is again given a chance to operate under a free enterprise system. The specter of runaway prices, which has been shouted on the floor of the House each time mention was made of the elimination of controls, has certainly not materialized.

WASHINGTON-LINCOLN MEMORIAL GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, during the consideration of the Consent Calendar, and specifically consideration of S. 1041, the distinguished and very capable gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] raised the question as to what happened to the $10,000 that was originally in the authorization. I am happy to advise the House this morning that in checking with the Public Roads Administration I find that back in 1936, although there was a $10,000 authorization, the appropriation was never made and the money was never spent.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the Commissioner of Public Roads, Mr. Du Pont, which reads as follows:

> DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
> BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
> *Washington, May 6, 1953.*
>
> Hon. J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. MCGREGOR: In compliance with request from Mr. Tierney, of the Public Works Committee staff, the following is submitted with respect to question of an appropriation for the Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard.
>
> We have searched the old records and can find no record of any appropriation ever having been made for the expenses of the Commission. The following is quoted from a

letter written by Mr. MacDonald under date of March 25, 1949, to Senator EDWARD MARTIN:

"While the joint resolution authorized the appropriation of $10,000 to be expended by the Commission, such an appropriation was never made. The Public Roads Administration performed the necessary work leading to the report with its own personnel."

The report referred to is a 12-page document, with an accompanying map which shows several possible alternate routes with approximate estimates of cost.

I trust that this will give you the desired information.

Very truly yours,

F. V. DU PONT,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

INVESTIGATION OF THE FORCED INCORPORATION OF LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA INTO THE U. S. S. R.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the President has stated that the return of the right of self-determination to the enslaved nations is the necessary condition to true world peace.

The United States has never acquiesced in the forced incorporation of the independent nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the U. S. S. R. We still maintain diplomatic relations with the free governments of the Baltic nations, although their homelands have been gobbled up by the Communist conspiracy.

We cannot permit this international crime to be minimized or forgotten, certainly not while these victim nations are still enslaved.

A true appraisal of the facts in connection with the Communist subversion of the Baltic nations is necessary at the beginning of any program to aid the Baltic peoples by all peaceful means to regain their liberty. To that end I have today introduced a resolution calling for a select committee of Congress to investigate the fraudulent elections and forced incorporation of the Baltic nations into the U. S. S. R., the text of which I have set forth in an extension of remarks in the Appendix.

I wish to include herewith in my remarks the text of a speech given by me before the Lithuanian American Council at Webster Hall, New York City, on February 15, 1953, the text of which is as follows:

THE SOVIET CHARGE OF AMERICAN INTERFERENCE

Ladies and gentlemen, Igor Bogolepov, who I understand was the No. 5 man in the Soviet Foreign Office, and in charge of Baltic affairs—but a secret anti-Communist—was captured during the war and thereafter spent several years teaching in the American Intelligence School in Germany.

Bogolepov came to this country a short time ago and recently told me of an interesting conversation he had had in Moscow with Malenkov before his capture. He was trying to persuade Malenkov that it might be expedient for the Soviets to use a little more humaneness in their policy in the Baltic States. Malenkov eyed Bogolepov narrowly and said, "Damn you, are you a real Communist? Don't you know that the Baltic nations must be exterminated?"

Thus, the weird practice of the Communists in their process of attempting to exterminate Lithuania, of replacing Lithuanian citizens who have been liquidated with Mongolians brought from the Orient, giving the Mongolians the same Lithuanian name, house, and job as the liquidated victim.

This diabolical practice is typical and symbolical of the Soviet policy of "liberation." It is not only an interference in the internal affairs of its victims. It is the annihilation of their internal affairs and the annihilation of the population. And this process of exterminating the people of the victim nations and replacing them with a people of another race is carried on not only in Lithuania but in other Eastern European countries and among the nations of the Soviet Union itself.

The process that I have described is one instance of the Communist conspiracy in action to remake the world in the pattern of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. It is a plenary intervention in the affairs of mankind. It is a basic attack on civilization itself.

Any attempt, therefore, on the part of mankind to stop the execution of this diabolical plan is, naturally enough, termed by the Communists as an interference in their affairs.

It is like the wolf who claims interference with his affairs when someone tries to disengage his jaws from the throat of the sheep.

In an attempt to cover up its brutal and naked aggression upon the affairs of the victim nations the Soviets have recently filed a charge in the U. N. against the United States. The Communist charge is as follows:

"Interference by the United States of America in the domestic affairs of other states as instanced by the United States Government's organization of subversive activities and espionage directed against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the People's Republic of China, the Czechoslovak Republic, and other people's democracies."

The Communist charge was actually filed by the Czechoslovak Communist representative. It was aimed at that amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1951, which provides for aid to keep the spirit of freedom alive behind the Iron Curtain and for measures that look toward the liberation of the enslaved nations.

The attempted deception on the part of the Communists by making this charge is to take the spotlight off of its own aggression, but it actually turns the spotlight on the broad and burning issue of our times: the whole issue of intervention and aggression against victim nations.

Whose affairs are being interfered with? The wolf's or the sheep's?

The Soviets have given us a lead in this entire matter, as liars and deceivers frequently do.

With the filing of this charge by the Communists in the United Nations the whole question of interference in the internal affairs of other nations and the whole question of international intervention is opened up. And when that question is opened up the relevant facts are eloquent as to who is the international criminal.

But first let us consider whether or not any aid that we might give to the victim nations can by any stretch of the imagination be considered interference in the "people's democracies. Such aid as we might give to the victims is in the very defense of the principle of nonintervention. It is the Communists who have interfered in the internal affairs of the captive nations. And any attempt to aid the people of the captive nations is an attempt to stop the brutal interference of the Communists.

But why has the Western World been so hesitant to pass swift judgment on Communist aggression? Has the Soviet propaganda of the big lie had efficient effect? Actually, on many occasions they have made the lie look like the truth.

But the civilized world has come to know that we cannot take seriously, at their face value, the charges of the Communists. But we must regard seriously the reason why the truth is not in them. When we fully understand that we will know that we can never deal with them as normal people.

There is a fatal ailment in the Communist mind. That mind is cast into the tortured mold, shaped by Marx from the philosophies of Hegel and Feuerbach. Marx denied objective truth. He denied the spiritual nature of those faculties of the man by which he discerns the truth in the world about him. He denied the existence of the Author of truth.

Truth for the Communist is only what the all-powerful Communist state says, for the moment, that it is. The sincere Communist really believes this. In the credo of the Marxist the almighty state is his almighty god. So, whatever the state says is true for him is true regardless of the testimony of his own senses. If Stalin describes the sun as the moon, it is the moon, my lord. If he calls the enslaved nations "people's democracies," for the Communist they are the people's democracies. In their own minds and hearts they have sought to destroy the real Author of truth. So it is Stalin who speaks with the voice of final authority.

That is why there is a Red biology, Red music, and Red art. That is why there is a Red truth.

Under this system peace can mean war, freedom can mean slavery, and love can mean hate. It all depends upon what Stalin wills the truth to be for the expediency of the moment.

These are among the reasons why we cannot ever hope to cooperate in civilized society with people who deliberately choose the Communist way of life. We cannot be affected by what they say because what is truth for them is not truth for us.

But while the charges and the claims of the Communists cannot be taken seriously by normal people because we do not have the same mental concepts of truth their actions must be taken very seriously—much as the actions of a shrewd criminal of unbalanced mind must be taken very seriously.

Representatives of civilized nations—including our own—cannot long continue to deal in the methods of ordinary international diplomacy with a fanatical cult which now has a 35-year criminal record of an insane but scientific and effective design to destroy civilization.

According to any rational norm the Communist regime and the other puppet government members of the international Communist conspiracy should be ostracized from the society of nations. This conspiracy is not only our enemy, but it is an even greater enemy of the 800 million people in that graveyard of nations euphemistically known as the Soviet Union.

The Soviet regime is guilty of conquest by naked aggression of the once free and independent nation of Lithuania and for that reason should be expelled from the United Nations.

Let us, on this historic day take the case of your beloved and brave martyr nation of Lithuania. Its independence was proclaimed on February 16, 1918, in the city of Vilnius, and was the result of a long, hard, but unflinching struggle for freedom and justice. As defenders of Christendom your forefathers repelled the Tartar invasions of 1399; they

succeeded in 1529 in laying the solid foundation of your country.

So Lithuania started on the road to a Christian nation, revealing her constructive virtues in the fields of social progress, economic development, and culture. But the apparition of the Muscovite imperialistic hordes at the gates of Europe put an end to any hope of normal development. For more than a century you Lithuanians fought against oppression by the Russian czars, against the attempt to destroy you as a nation; but at last, after sufferings and hardships, your resistance and your faith brought you to the great day of liberation.

It was a glorious day when the Council of Lithuania, in consultation with American Lithuanians, formally declared the country to be free and independent. It was a day which cannot be erased from the hearts and minds of mankind, a day, the inspiration and the urge of which are not extinguished, a day on whose foundation the coming liberation of Lithuania will ultimately be built.

Let us recall the position of Soviet Russia in regard to your country. This position throws a crude light on the real meaning of Soviet international commitments. On July 12, 1920, the Soviet Union concluded with you a peace treaty in which it was stated that Russia without any prejudice recognizes the self rule and independence of the State of Lithuania with all the juridical consequences—and for all times renounces with good will all the sovereignty rights of Russia, which it has had in regard to the Lithuanian Nation or territory.

What noble expressions; it is the same language the Soviets are using today. What a chasm between their words and deeds. They have a remarkable propensity for every piece of paper which could lull the intended victim into a sense of security.

Thus on September 28, 1926, a treaty of nonaggression was signed in Moscow between the Soviets and Lithuania. Article II of this treaty proclaimed in the same noble language that the two countries will respect their respective sovereignty and also their integrity and territorial inviolability in all circumstances.

The love of the Soviets for nonaggression is so great that on April 4, 1934, this nonaggression pact was extended until December 31, 1945.

Your country and the world were loaded under the weight of so many solemn Soviet assurances and noble obligations. But behind this screen of pacts and treaties Molotov and Ribbentrop were proceeding on August 23, 1939, to the brutal partition of Eastern Europe. You know that the secret agreements concluded between the two at that moment gave to the Soviet Union the Baltic States.

Molotov, 2 months later, stated with his well-known sincerity: "We declare that all nonsense about Sovietizing the Baltic countries is only to the interest of our common enemies and of all anti-Soviet provocateurs." This is the perfect symbol of Soviet political ethics and of the value of their international commitments.

So when the critical moment comes, when the Soviet respect for treaties is put to the test, the mask is brutally thrown aside and the genius of evil appears.

This happened in June 1940 when the Soviets invaded Lithuania. It was estimated that during the first Soviet occupation over 10,000 Lithuanians were slain and over 40,000 banished to Siberia.

In the last months of 1944 over 37,000 are estimated to have been slain or banished to remote parts of Russia.

Altogether some 600,000 Lithuanians were deported to slave-labor camps in Asiatic regions of the Soviet Union. Only 200 of the 2,000 priests in the Baltic countries still survive Soviet persecution against Christianity. The colonization of Lithuania, especially with Mongolian elements that I have mentioned, loyal to the Soviet Union, is under way. Everything points to an organized plan to destroy the Lithuanian national entity. This is the established course of Soviet policy as regards all anti-Communist national groups.

The genocidal attack on your country is monstrous and overwhelming.

But this ruthless persecution without precedent in history has been unable to destroy the roots of human dignity and spiritual strength. A few days ago as you know, the first secretary of the Communist Party in Lithuania, the Soviet agent Snechkus declared in Kaunas that every effort must be made in Lithuania to uproot and eliminate "all secret and masked enemies" of the social state. It added of course, that this nationalist resistance in Lithuania is the work of American and British intelligence. This cry is now heard in every Soviet agency from the Communist hirelings in Tolana to those in East Germany.

There is no doubt whatsoever that these squeals are but the execution of a precise order from Moscow. A great staging has been under way this last year with trials, purges, and killings, with the visible objectives of branding any kind of resistance behind the Iron Curtain as a product of American interference. The Soviet leaders are aware of the inextinguishable forces of the human desire for liberty. Worried by the tremendous unrest in the subjugated areas, they try to maintain their control through the genocidal techniques of deportations, forced labor, mass arrests, and a discrimination which means condemnation to death.

But this is not enough. In order to discredit the immense forces which are shaking the Soviet tyranny on its borders they use every effort to present them as merely sporadic incidents engineered by American interference. They thus hope to cover up that devastating force of human beings fighting for their existence as free men and for their spiritual integrity, which always has been the greatest creative source of our civilization.

This liberation drive which 13 years of incredible horrors has not succeeded in crushing is now becoming the most powerful disruptive force within the boundaries of Soviet tyranny. This force has penetrated through all obstacles and has imposed itself upon the conscience of the leaders of the free world.

The year 1952 has been decisive in this historical process. When General Eisenhower, in his speech to the American Legion proclaimed that the American conscience will not be at rest until the enslaved peoples regain their liberty, he was not only stating our long due moral position, if we are to be faithful to ourselves and to our traditions, but he was also recognizing, I believe, the immense potential of the liberation idea in the struggle for achieving international order.

A constructive American policy has therefore to take into consideration the converging interests of the enslaved peoples and the free world. This cannot be done by the containment policy which alienates this immense force. "A policy which only aims at containing Russia where it now is, is, in itself, an unsound policy," stated Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on January 14. "But," added he, "it is a policy which is bound to fail because a purely defensive policy never wins against an aggressive policy. If our only policy is to stay where we are, we will be driven back. It is only by keeping alive the hope of liberation, by taking advantage of that wherever opportunity arises, that we will end this terrible peril which dominates the world, which imposes upon us such terrible sacrifices and so great fears for the future."

This is the stand of a great statesman, the Secretary of State, the man whom President Eisenhower has entrusted to implement his foreign policy. The policy of liberation is thus opening a new period in the history of our times. Liberation is therefore becoming the enemy No. 1 of the worldwide Communist conspiracy. That is why wherever Communist multiform action is manifest from Moscow to Washington, voices are raised against liberation. The great cry "liberation means war" has been coined in Moscow and thrown on the American fellow traveler's market by no less an authority than the Daily Worker.

So they say that liberation means war precisely for the reason that the liberation policy is gravely endangering their aggressive military buildup. It is therefore natural that liberation, which means primarily the ceasing of Soviet subjugation and brutal interference in the life of other nations, be stigmatized by the Soviets, through their well-known upside down technique, as interference in their domestic affairs. Certainly, the liberation of the victims is interference in the affairs of the criminal, and the criminal is coming to the United Nations to demonstrate that we want to interfere with his crimes.

Through the secret agreements made with the Soviets during the war, a tragic continuation of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pacts of 1939, our leaders, without the knowledge of the American people, ceded Eastern Europe to Soviet rule. So we found ourselves in the situation of condemning aggression and interference, while recognizing governments of Eastern Europe, imposed forcibly by aggression, and interference. We found ourselves in the situation while preaching of free elections and self-determination we dealt with governments of rigged elections and Soviet determination. We even went so far as to conclude peace treaties with those Soviet agents whom we knew pertinently did not represent the countries concerned. There is only one bright spot in this dark picture, and that is the fact that we have never recognized, and never will, the enslavement of the Baltic countries.

An historical moment has now been reached. President Eisenhower has proclaimed the repudiation of all secret agreements, which means we have no longer the burden of being in such a false position toward the enslaved countries and our own consciences. The door is now open for redeeming one of the most tragic mistakes of history. Let us therefore keep faith with our ideals and speak the truth in the proud tradition of us Americans; let this Nation, under God, accuse the Soviet Union with unwarranted and criminal interference in the domestic affairs of the Baltic States, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania, Eastern Germany, Austria, and China. Yes, of the peoples of the nations within the Soviet Union itself.

As you know, one of the great principles of American foreign policy has been and is the principle of noninterference. We are against interference in the life of other peoples. We are solidly behind this principle, we believe in it and are decided to do everything in our power that it be respected, that it be true and real. We, therefore, solemnly ask the Soviets and their agents to cease their flagrant, their brutal, open, and tyranical interference in the countries behind the Iron Curtain and in China. We ask that the juridical masquerade, whereby the author of the most monstrous interference in the life of free nations is accusing us of interference, be drastically denounced in the United Nations.

It is for all free people, and us in particular, to accuse and call to account the Soviets. If we Americans really believe in the principle of noninterference we must work for the ending of Soviet interference in the life of other nations.

What my amendment to the Mutual Security Act is doing, is just the beginning of an action in this direction. We want to help people in their defense against interference, against the most cruel and barbarous interference history has ever seen. Interference by Soviet military occupation, interference by imposing puppet governments of Soviet agents, interference by annexation, interference by exploitation and interference by Sovietization, interference in every step, every phase of human life, interference even in the soul of men, this is the interference which we are fighting against, this is the Soviet interference which we demand should cease.

You know of the Soviet interference on June 14, 1940, at 11 p. m. when the ultimatum was given to Lithuania? You know that the reply was expected before 10:30 a. m. on June 15, but that even before the expiration of this term, armored units of the Red Army and cavalry divisions, 300,000 men in all, poured into Lithuania. The legal government was dismissed and a new government composed of Moscow stooges was installed, then so-called elections for the people's diet was staged and the incorporation into the Soviet Union proclaimed on August 3, 1940, by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow. You surely remember that on June 30, 1940, Mr. Molotov bluntly declared to Prof. Kreve-Mickevicius, vice premier of the Lithuanian puppet government that "the traditional Russian policy, practiced since the days of Ivan the Terrible, necessitated the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union." Was that not interference? Was that not aggression? What happened simultaneously in Estonia and Latvia? Let each of us Americans look for one moment into the greatest tragedy caused by Soviet brutal interference and aggression of mankind. Let us follow on a map the heartbreaking forced migrations of millions toward the Kazakk Desert at Karaganda, toward Lake Baikal in Siberia, to the concentration camps of Dalstroi in the Far East, the Yagry group in the Archangel region and the groups in Lapland, Novaya, Zemlya, Sakhalin, and Kamchatka, and farther on in the Novosibirsk, Krasnoyarsk, and the Arctic regions. Let each of us bow down before this immense suffering and pray God to help and guide us that we may be able to do our part in bringing it to an end.

Yes, my friends, it is in this way that we reach the core of the matter. If we bring hope to this empire of the dead, if we come with faith in their liberation we can call once more to life those tremendous spiritual forces of the enslaved which we are on the verge of losing by abandoning them, our brothers. This is the dramatic significance of a message of liberation which will restore their confidence in us and so create that brotherhood so indispensable in the fight for human liberty. Ladies and gentlemen, permit me before concluding, to pay once more homage to your nation. I see in your trials, besides the glorious example of a little and heroic people fighting for its survival, also a symbol—the symbol of the decisive moments in history, the symbol of the few and the faithful fighting against terrific odds, for truth and justice, which are not yet seen by the numerous and the lukewarm. I see in your fight the image of those who always led the human striving for right and freedom. I see those who were ignored and isolated in the beginning of their fight, but whose fight brought eventually to humanity freedom and progress, dignity and brotherhood and if we look deep enough into this tragedy of our time, we see no more frontiers, we see no more different groups. We see only those who are fighting for freedom and justice; on the other side the infamous gang of those who are bound by their complicity in crime and terror to fight for tyranny and oppression. This is the decisive, the global struggle of humanity, the struggle of faith against subhuman materialism, the struggle of freedom against jungle despotism. Blessed be those, who, like Lithuania, were from the beginning soldiers of freedom and truth under God.

NATIONAL COTTON WEEK

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate for me today to call the attention of the House to the fact that National Cotton Week will be observed May 11 to May 16. This annual event, conceived and promoted by the National Cotton Council, typifies the efforts of this great industry to work out its own salvation. Through the medium of National Cotton Week, the consuming public is made aware of the great advantages of cotton, of the many new and revolutionary developments that have occurred in the growing and processing of cotton in recent years. The consuming public is reminded once again that cotton richly deserves the title of the world's most versatile fiber.

The production, marketing, and processing of cotton is one of the country's major industries. The cash value of the crop ranges between three and four billion dollars annually and several additional billions are realized by the people who handle the lint, oil, and other products. About one third of the country's farms grow cotton and, roughly, 13 million people are dependent wholly or to a great extent upon cotton for a livelihood.

Thus, it is obvious that the prosperity of this great agricultural industry is of vital concern to every person in the country. Prosperous cotton farmers provide a rich market for the products of our mills and factories. Conversely speaking, if cotton farmers suffer financial reverses and are unable to buy the things they need and want, the effects are felt through the entire American economy.

It is pertinent and significant that through promotional activities such as National Cotton Week the industry itself has succeeded in retaining its old markets and winning new ones against the competition of manmade fibers. The industry itself has developed an aggressive program of these activities. The industry is ever alert to the possibilities of expanding cotton's markets through promotion and research. One of the most convincing examples of the success of the industry's promotion campaigns is the growing acceptance of cotton as a fashion fabric. Members of the House who attended an all-cotton fashion show held recently by the National Cotton Council can readily understand why this is so. Shown were cotton dresses of all types—from beach wear to formal evening wear—made of cotton fabrics that defy description. It is no wonder that American women, the most critical buyers in the world, are turning more and more to cotton to meet their clothing needs.

In connection with National Cotton Week, the Department of Agriculture is holding an exhibit in the patio of the Administration Building depicting all phases of cotton production and marketing. All Members of Congress are invited to stop at the Department to see this show. The exhibit will be formally opened Friday, at 2:30 p. m. by Secretary Benson and it will remain open next week from 11 a. m. until 5 p. m., Monday through Thursday.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind Members of this House that cotton's secure place in the economy of our country did not just happen. Behind this success are years of intensive and effective promotional, educational, and research activities and on the eve of National Cotton Week I wish to commend leaders of the industry for their initiative and enterprise in solving many of their own problems.

B'NAI B'RITH

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, according to the May 4 edition of the New York Times, the national chairman of the Antidefamation League of B'Nai B'rith is quoted as saying that the new immigration law is "an area in American law where the leaders of the lunatic fringe, the anti-Semite, the Fascist, and the Communist can look with pleasure upon what he sees."

Mr. Herman Edelsberg, who is the local representative, called on me yesterday, on his own initiative, and assured me that the chairman of his organization had been misquoted.

I am sure the American people will be very happy to know that that is the fact, because otherwise there would be repercussions which might be very unfortunate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, earlier in announcing the program for next week, I expressed the hope that the

Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, which would be filed on Wednesday, could be taken up on Thursday and Friday of next week. Since that time contact has been made with certain Members who have heretofore objected to such a request. I have been informed in view of the fact that there is no controversy about this bill, no objection will be made. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday and Friday of next week to consider the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. Has the gentleman from Indiana any information as to when the other body will pass all these bills, if we get them through so that we may make some plans as to adjournment?

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan, we are very anxious to get these bills over to the other body so there will be at least some pressure on that body to act on them. I join with the gentleman in expressing hope that we can get through with our business in the House and adjourn.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object because it is perfectly agreeable to me, there is only one observation I want to make for the RECORD—I do not want to leave the RECORD stand that there may not be any controversy on the bill. There might be.

Mr. HALLECK. At least there was no controversy in committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

SPANISH WAR PENSIONS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous request to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think the war veterans in this body will be interested in H. R. 4490, and the reason for its introduction. It may come as a surprise to them, as it was to me, to learn that in the matter of Spanish War pensions there is a discrimination between Navy veterans and Army veterans.

An Army veteran with 30 days' overseas service may obtain a pension. A Naval Veteran whose entire service may have been in active operations at sea must have a minimum service record of 90 days.

It happened this way: On August 28, 1898, General Order No. 130 of the War Department granted to Army enlisted personnel who had served in the Spanish-American War a furlough of 30 days if their service had been in the United States, and 60 days if their service had been overseas. Such furlough was in the nature of a "bounty," but this furlough time later was credited toward pension.

By virtue of General Order No. 130 overseas enlisted men of the Army who actually served only 30 days are credited with 90 days' service and are eligible for pensions.

There were sound reasons to justify this extension by furlough of the period of actual service. It is unnecessary to go into them now. The present concern is to remove the discrimination against naval personnel. I have introduced H. R. 4490 for that purpose.

The United States Government was served by both branches of the armed service. Under General Order No. 130, service credit for furlough time has been given to the Army. Similar credit has never been granted to the Navy. It is the purpose of H. R. 4490 to correct an inequity by placing individuals who served in the temporary forces of the United States Navy during the Spanish-American War in the same status as those who served in the Army.

The Spanish-American War period was one of confusion in records, informality in procedures, and a complete lack of coordination as it is known today. This accounts for what amounted to a violation by inadvertence of the American tradition that the Army and the Navy hold equal place in our regard. After 55 years it should be corrected. Sound public policy, no less than a sense of fair dealing with the Army and the Navy in a spirit of impartiality, commands that General Order No. 130 should be made applicable to the men of the Navy as well as to the men of the Army. That is all that is sought by H. R. 4490.

The bill, if enacted, would affect possibly 20 veterans. All of these veterans actually served in combat areas for at least four months, but because of an informality in swearing in—characteristic of the period, but difficult for the present generation to understand—are credited with some 17 days short of the requisite 90 days for pension rights. It was in the course of my efforts in behalf of these naval veterans that I learned of General Order No. 130 and the discrimination by inadvertence against the Navy of the Spanish-American War, which wrote such a brilliant page in American history.

U. S. S. "HARVARD"

My deep personal interest stems from the following:

On June 22, 1898, I embarked—with the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry and part of the 9th Massachusetts—at Old Point Comfort, Va., on the U. S. S. *Harvard*, which after landing us on the beach off Siboney, Cuba, joined Admiral Sampson's fleet in the blockade of Santiago. Prior to that time, and since April 27, 1898, the U. S. S. *Harvard* had been in active naval duty under command of Capt. C. S. Cotton, United States Navy.

On April 27, 1898, Captain Cotton's naval permit was hoisted, the crew of the *Harvard* questioned, and personnel not accepted by the Navy sent ashore. The others were lined up on the deck and informally sworn in by Lieutenant Beal, United States Navy, of Captain Cotton's staff.

On April 30, 1898, the *Harvard* sailed under sealed orders and played a conspicuous part in the discovery and running into Santiago Harbor of Cervera's Spanish fleet. On June 22, 1898, the oath again was administered to the crew, this time formally, and it is this date which is official in the records.

As the *Harvard* was decommissioned on September 2, 1898, the crew members are credited with only 73 days service, 17 days short of the requisite 90 days for pension rights. Actually they had served 128 days.

U. S. S. "YALE"

After the surrender of Santiago the 33d Michigan returned to Montauk Point, N. Y., on the U. S. S. *Yale*. The *Yale* had been in commission since April 27, 1898, when her crew was informally sworn in as in the case of the *Harvard*. In May of 1898 her capture of the Spanish ship *Rita* filled the front pages of American newspapers. Because the formal swearing in of her crew members was delayed until the job at hand had been done these veterans are credited with only 73 days' service whereas they actually served 126 days.

U. S. S. "ST. LOUIS"

With the U. S. S. *St. Louis* the facts were similar. The *St. Louis*, under heavy fire, cut the cables around Cuba, cutting Cuba off from the outside world. Then she captured the Spanish steamer *Twickenham* loaded with coal for the Spanish fleet. She was kept so busy doing the job at hand that the formality of swearing in the men was delayed until the emergency was over. The result is that although the men on the *St. Louis* served for 128 days they are officially credited with less than the requisite 90 days.

U. S. S. "ST. PAUL"

Of the four ships available for naval operations in the crisis existing—Cervera's Spanish fleet, it must be remembered, was at large on the open sea—the U. S. S. *St. Paul* alone took time for the formality of swearing in. On April 16, 1898, Captain Sigsbee, United States Navy, took over command, formally enlisted his crew, and sailed from New York on May 15, 1898. The ship was decommissioned September 2, 1898. All those on the *St. Paul* received the pension based upon a 90-day minimum service, and on their deaths their widows received the pension. It is interesting to note here that by May 15, 1898, the date of the sailing of the *St. Paul*, the *St. Louis* had already been under fire, the *Yale* had engaged and captured a Spanish prize, and the *Harvard* had discovered the Spanish fleet at Martinique.

The naval volunteers who served in the temporary forces beyond the limits of the United States, and who would be affected by H. R. 4490, has now dwindled to some 20.

PURPOSE OF H. R. 4490

While the feeling in the Congress has been friendly, previous bills calculated to correct a palpable injustice have been objected to on the grounds that (a) they sought to legislate in the field wherein the Congress had voted authority in the Board for the Correction of Naval Records, and (b) they might establish a precedent applicable to, and to a larger extent in, the care of veterans of later wars.

I appreciate the validity of such objections. H. R. 4490 I am assured is not subject to either of said objections. I understand that it meets with the approval of the Board for the Correction of Naval Records. It merely goes back to 1898 and puts the naval veterans and Army veterans on exactly the same footing, without favor to one group or discrimination against another group. It is, in substance, an amendment to General Order No. 130, making it apply alike to Navy and to Army. Such doubtless was intended at the time of the issuance of the order, but through an inadvertence and the confusion of the period, was neglected.

CREDIT TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE

I am deeply appreciative of the splendid cooperation given by the Board of Correction of Naval Records in individual cases affecting Spanish War veterans. The patience, tireless industry, courtesy, and efficiency of the Board personnel constitute a testimonial to the public service. This has been especially true of Mr. Henry Pons in his assistance to my office.

The Board, however, was established to handle each case on its merits. It cannot correct errors which apply to a class. Such correction must be made through legislation. Such is the purpose of H. R. 4490. Its enactment will supplement and not conflict with the work of the Board. I earnestly urge its support.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE WATERS OF NIAGARA RIVER

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Senator LEHMAN and I today introduced, simultaneously in the Senate and in the House, a bill for the public development of the waters of the Niagara River under the terms of the Canadian-United States Treaty of 1950 and in the spirit of the Senate reservation to that treaty holding that the power potential of the Niagara made available under the treaty be developed for the public use and benefit.

The bill we have introduced is very similar to the so-called Lehman-Roosevelt bills introduced in 1950 and again in 1951. Some changes have been made, a summary of which is attached. Our bill has been delayed in introduction this year because we have been working to improve some of the provisions.

We have asked the Committees on Public Works of the House and the Senate to include consideration of this bill in any hearings scheduled on the subject of power development at the Niagara.

The only other bill now pending before the committee is a measure which would authorize the turning over of the Niagara waterpower potential to private interests. It is inconceivable to us that the Congress would seriously contemplate giving away to private interests the precious resource of the Niagara River, the development of which under public auspices for the public benefit is so clearly indicated as part of our traditional national power policy. These waters were made available for power development by the exercise of the sovereign treaty-making powers of the United States Government. Under the terms of the treaty the Niagara development must have a double purpose: (a) To preserve and enhance the scenic beauties of Niagara Falls, and (b) to develop the hydroelectric potential of the waters made available under the treaty to promote the national security of both Canada and the United States.

In our judgment the turning over of these waters to private enterprise for development as a private power project would be tantamount to a violation of the spirit of the treaty. It would certainly violate the sense of the Senate in approving the treaty when it attached the reservation expressly forbidding the leasing of these waters to private enterprise and calling for congressional action to authorize this development for the public use and benefit.

We very much fear that there may be a concerted effort to ram the private development bill through the Congress without due consideration of the startling implications of such a proposal. It may well be that the power potential at the Niagara is the first prize being sought by national private power interests: that this proposal to turn the Niagara over to private enterprise is the bellwether of a great flock of proposals soon to be made to strip the Nation of all its power projects and power potential and turn them over to private interests. Statements by President Charles E. Wilson, of General Electric, and more recently by former President, Herbert Hoover, point unmistakably in this direction.

Under the terms of the 1950 treaty the United States is entitled to use sufficient water to develop 8 billion kilowatt-hours of electric power annually. Engineering surveys indicate that the additional waters made available justify power facilities with an installed capacity of 1,300,000 kilowatts on the United States side alone.

This great potential belongs to the people. It should be developed for the benefit of the Nation and especially for the benefit of the people of New York and of other States, within economic transmission distance of the power site. It should be developed in such a way as to enhance the beauty of the Falls; to promote our national security and provide essential preferences for defense industries, governmental bodies and agencies, rural consumers and rural electrification co-ops.

Our bill carries out these purposes by providing for Federal construction of the Niagara project and for turning over this project to the State of New York under proper safeguards of the national and consumer interests, upon repayment to the Federal Government of the cost of construction.

In the 82d Congress there was a third proposal supported by the New York Power Authority, authorizing the construction of the project by New York State, but without safeguards of the national and consumer interests. We felt that this proposal was a disguised attempt to make the power available to private utilities at the bus bar, thus robbing the public of the benefit of low cost hydroelectric power development and the protection of the safeguards already referred to. Now, this year the disguise is thrown away. The New York Power Authority has discarded its pretense of advocating public development of the Niagara power and is lending its tacit support to the pure giveaway of this public resource to private interests.

We will oppose such a proposal to the last ditch. We expect to be joined in this opposition by all those in the Congress who are sensitive to the incredible implications of this plan.

Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent by the private utility interests for propaganda designed to prove that the proposal to develop the hydroelectric potential at the Niagara under public auspices is creeping socialism. If our proposal is creeping socialism, so is the United States Postal System and so is our system of public highways. Incidentally, official figures show that the private power interests spent more for lobbying in Washington in 1952 than any other single special interest group in America.

Our proposal attempts to meet the objections of those who fear to vest the control of all our power projects in the Federal Government. Our proposal would vest control of this project in the State of New York, surrounding that grant by proper safeguards. As a result, the private power interests, in this instance, have been forced to discard the disguise of States rights and are fighting the naked battle for private monopoly and usurpation of public resources.

CHANGES MADE IN PROPOSED BILL AS COMPARED TO PREVIOUS LEHMAN-ROOSEVELT BILL, 82D CONGRESS

First. Language to affirm the national defense interest in the proposed project.

Second. Terms specifically to authorize the inclusion in the Federal-State agreement of provision for the preservation and enhancement of the scenic beauty of the falls, including the accessibility of the river shorelines.

Third. Provision of preferences in the disposition of power, at cost, for all defense agencies, and, on fair and reasonable terms to other Federal agencies and to defense industries requiring the power to fulfill defense contracts.

Fourth. Provision to insure that negotiations for the Federal-State agree-

ment shall commence immediately upon the enactment of the act, rather than after the appropriation of the first funds, and dating the report which the President is called upon to make to the Congress on the status of the negotiations from the time the enactment of this act rather than from the time of the start of construction.

Fifth. Provision to insure that even if negotiation and approval of the Federal-State agreement is not completed by the time the first power is available from the project, the project can be turned over to New York State by subsequent agreement and approval by Congress and the Legislature of New York, or the Congress may make other disposition.

Sixth. Provision authorizing the making of payments to State and local authorities in lieu of taxes, on the model of TVA.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT F. WAGNER

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, this week the State of New York and the Nation lost one of its most dedicated public servants, our beloved Robert F. Wagner.

Senator Wagner represents the American dream; the American ideal. He was an immigrant to our shores who in his all too short life endowed this Nation with the benefit of his wisdom, kindliness, energy, and spirit.

Senator Wagner came to this country at the age of 8, having been born in Hessen, Germany. He could neither speak English nor did he know anything of the customs of this country. He started in the public schools of New York City to learn our language. He supported himself and his family by selling newspapers in the morning and running errands for neighborhood grocery stores in the evening. He showed an ever-increasing interest in the conditions of his city, his State, and ultimately of his Nation.

Senator Wagner's name will always be engraved in the history of our State along with that of Alfred E. Smith, Herbert H. Lehman, and my own father.

He was first elected to serve in the New York State Legislature in 1904, when he was only 27 years of age. He was a devoted public servant for 45 years, until his retirement from the United States Senate in 1949 because of ill health.

During his service in the State legislature and subsequently, during his 23 years in the United States Senate, he sponsored many, many separate pieces of legislation designed to improve the lot of the average American citizen. Of course, having been born abroad, he could not aspire to nationwide office, although his name was often mentioned as a Democratic candidate for the office of President and Vice President. He was satisfied, on the other hand, to serve his country in gratitude for what it had done for him, in the highest office to which a foreign-born citizen could aspire, the United States Senate. He will always be remembered as the author and sponsor of the National Labor Relations Act, passed in 1935, often referred to as the magna carta of labor, and the Wagner Act. He was the father of the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Social Security Act, the Federal Housing Administration, and various banking-control acts. At the time he resigned from the United States Senate he was the principal sponsor of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill for a Federal housing program and the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill to establish a system of national health insurance. While a member of the State legislature he was responsible for one of the first workmen's compensation acts in the Nation.

I was never privileged to have an official association with Senator Wagner, although many of my colleagues were so privileged. Nevertheless, he was an old and dear friend of mine and of my family. We all mourn his passing, along with the rest of the Nation and his family.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Wagner's funeral is being held this morning and I want to take this opportunity to express to his family and friends my regret that the official duties of many of his friends who are Members of this body prevent our attendance. I am sure my colleagues join with me in expressing our sincere condolences to Senator Wagner's family. Their loss was a great loss to all of us and to the Nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The life of the late United States Senator Robert F. Wagner is like the story of Horatio Alger that we all read as young men, and which to me was an inspiration in the forming of my thoughts and my character.

Bob Wagner was a man whose nobility of character, sweetness of disposition, and kindness, his tolerant understanding in his association with his fellowmen impressed itself upon the minds of all who met him and who knew of him.

He led a great life as a human being, as a citizen, and as a public official. His life was one of contribution to the strength of our Nation and to the progress of America and mankind. The life of a man like Bob Wagner leaves a heritage for others to follow and to aspire to follow. The great contributions made by Bob Wagner during his lifetime do not cease at his death. He has left a heritage that for countless future generations will impress the youth of America.

I had the pleasure of knowing Bob Wagner personally, and it is one of the memories I shall always treasure. He led a fruitful life, a constructive life, a progressive life; he gave to life the best that was in him. He did not think the world owed him a living; he felt that he owed to the world and to mankind the duty and the obligation of making every contribution that the great mind he possessed could make to mankind and to progress.

His death is a sad blow to the country, the State of New York, and a personal loss to his countless friends and admirers throughout the United States. To the loved ones he left behind I join with my friend from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] in extending my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who desire to do so may be given permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF FIRING OF CAREER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution calling for full-scale investigation of the charges that holdover Fair Dealers in top positions are deliberately firing career Federal employees in an attempt to embarrass the Eisenhower administration. A number of career workers, some of them with as much as 25 or 30 years of service, have consulted me about this situation. Having devoted the best and most important years of their lives to the service of their Government, they now find themselves separated from their jobs without any valid reason, and in direct defiance of the announced policy of the President of the United States. If allowed to continue, this sort of thing could destroy completely the morale and efficiency of Federal workers as a whole. "Something is rotten in Denmark" and I believe that this Congress has an inescapable responsibility to correct the situation. I hope that this investigation will be promptly authorized.

Now let us look at this situation a little more closely. President Eisenhower has assured and reassured Federal career employees that they have nothing to fear. He has made this statement not once, but at least twice, and each time he has made it clear that this was a reasoned and deliberate pronouncement and not just something that happened to come up in a press conference. The President has made it plain that he expects to accomplish the reduction of the Federal work force largely through permitting jobs vacated by resignation, retirement, and normal turnover to remain unfilled. In 1952, 27.3 percent of all Federal employees left their jobs. In January of this year alone, 41,126 Federal employees were separated; 26,625 quit; 1,090 went into military service; 1,567 were fired, 2,825 were reduced in force; 4,426 appointments terminated; 2,191 went on extended leave without

pay; and 2,402 retired or died. It is clear that the President is absolutely correct in his assumption that the necessary reduction of Federal employment can be accomplished through normal turnover.

There is no argument about the policy of reducing Federal employment. The very people who are complaining about the way in which they have been fired agree that there is room for reduction in the number of Federal employees. They realize that there is duplication and waste in the Government, that there is a great deal of overlapping of functions. They have no objection to reducing the number of employees; on the contrary, they are in favor of it, as, indeed, all good Americans must be. What they object to is the way in which it has been done. If only 1 or 2 cases were involved, we could dismiss this matter as just a couple of soreheads who probably got what was coming to them. But when employees descend upon my office in droves, and I am only one of the Congressmen from this area, and all of them tell the same story of dirty work afoot, then it is high time that we look into the situation. If the ward heelers who came into office under the New Deal and the Fair Deal and who still retain high positions in the Federal Government are deliberately using this method to stir up resentment against the administration, then I say that we should send every last remnant of the Missouri gang packing. There is no room in the new administration for political hacks who will resort to such low tactics to gain their own sniveling purposes.

We have agreed that there is need for reduction in the number of Federal employees, and the employees themselves do not dispute this fact. We have seen also that the necessary reduction can be made by utilizing the normal turnover in Government positions. To be sure, some reassignments may be necessary when a particular function of the Government is eliminated, but it should be possible to place every career Federal employee in another position for which he is qualified. If necessary, the turnover rate could be accelerated by encouraging retirement of those employees who have had 30 or more years of service. I cannot emphasize too strongly that we can achieve economy and efficiency in the Federal Government without resorting to the indiscriminate firing of career Federal employees who have served their country faithfully and without regard to partisan politics for many long and eventful years.

Obviously, somewhere along the line, this policy is not being followed. The President has affirmed and reaffirmed his support. I have talked with some of the Cabinet members and I find that they too are in agreement. The fact remains, however, that in the departments and agencies, and presumably at a high level, these firings are being approved. What is the result of such a practice? First of all, employee morale in Washinton has dropped to what I fear is rapidly approaching an all-time low. When morale is destroyed, so is efficiency. No employee who is dependent upon his job for the support of a family can do his best work when he is uncertain whether or not he will have a job the next day. It is to be expected that when a new administration comes into power there will have to be some changes among the political appointees at the top level. We Republicans have assumed that below those top policy making positions, personnel practices would be carried on according to the rules and regulations established by the Civil Service Commission. Apparently, this is not the case. Another result of the deliberate firing of career Federal employees is the deterioration of the economic situation in the Washington Metropolitan Area. Merchants and business people are already complaining that sales have dropped, that people just will not buy when they do not know whether or not their incomes will be reduced or completely removed. There is no reason why this situation should prevail. We should be able to say to the career Federal employees that they have nothing to fear. As a matter of fact, we have said exactly that and we have said it through the President of the United States. If his word is being ignored, we should find out why, and who is doing it, and take immediate steps to remedy the situation. Our first move must be an investigation to get all the facts. Then we can act to rid the Government of the political hacks, the irresponsible little men who are trying to hurl monkey wrenches in the wheels of efficient Government.

INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am for the investigation suggested by the gentleman from Virginia. I am for the investigation because if he wants it I have no objection, but not for the reasons stated by him. Before the election the Democrats were damned by the Republicans. Now since the Republicans have been in office for over 100 days, all they can do is still damn us.

When are they going to take on their own responsibility? I think one of the most illogical reasons for an investigation I ever heard was the one mentioned, that is, to find out why Democrats are firing career employees in a Republican administration that is now over 100 days old. It must be that my friend is on the spot. I have been on the spot many times during the past 20 years in connection with reductions. I did not blame the Republicans or any coalition. I had to take it.

All I can do is suggest to my friend that during the next 4 years he better ride the waves. I am for the investigation if he wants it. This is the most investigating Congress I have ever seen. So if they want to have another one let them have it, but not as to why Democrats are firing career employees but, rather, to find out why the Republicans are firing them.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the House not having been in session on May 3, today I take personal satisfaction in again expressing to the Polish nation and to my many friends of Polish descent in America felicitations on this anniversary of the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

During this month particularly, because of the many exercises throughout our country observing this holiday, the hearts of all free people are filled with pride of the accomplishments of this great nation, one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe, and with determination and hope that the innate love of the Polish people of freedom and democracy will soon prevail against the yoke of tyranny under which they are now suffering.

May God bless them and, with a strong hand, direct their rebirth in liberty and freedom.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AMENDMENT TO EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4465) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what, then, will be the parliamentary procedure? How much time will there be for debate?

The SPEAKER. Debate will be under the 5-minute rule. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the following as subsection (c):

"(c) (1) The Export-Import Bank of Washington is further authorized, in the manner and to the extent herein specified, to provide insurance in an aggregate amount not in excess of $100 million outstanding at any time for the benefit of citizens of the

United States, including corporations, partnerships, and associations organized and existing under the laws of the United States or any State, district, Territory, or possession thereof, against the risks of loss of or damage to tangible personal property of United States origin which is exported from the United States in commercial intercourse and is in transit to or located in any friendly foreign country, to the extent that such loss or damage results from hostile or warlike action in time of peace or war, including civil war, revolution, rebellion, insurrection, or civil strife arising therefrom, or from an order of any government or public authority confiscating, expropriating or requisitioning such property and to the extent that such property is owned in whole or in part by the assured or constitutes security for financial obligations owed to the assured.

"(2) Insurance may be provided pursuant to this subsection only to the extent that it cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions from companies authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States and to the extent that it cannot be obtained from any agency of the United States Government providing marine or air war-risk insurance.

"(3) In providing insurance pursuant to this subsection, the Bank may reinsure in whole or in part any company authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States or may employ any such company or group of companies to act as its underwriting agent in the issuance of such insurance and the adjustment of claims arising thereunder.

"(4) Subject to the limitations herein provided, the Bank shall from time to time determine the terms and conditions under which it will provide insurance pursuant to this subsection: *Provided, however,* That such insurance shall be based, insofar as practicable, upon consideration of the risk involved: *And provided further,* That the term of coverage of any such insurance shall not exceed 1 year, subject to renewal or extension from time to time for periods of not exceeding 1 year as may be determined by the Bank."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this bill very simply authorizes the Export-Import Bank to insure exports of goods which move in foreign trade. It does not insure the goods while in transit until they get to the foreign country. Now private insurance companies and Government under war-risk insurance cover these goods while in transit on the ocean and for 15 days after they arrive at the port of destination. When they are unloaded at the port of destination they can apply for insurance under this act.

The purpose of this bill is to move American goods abroad which are now not moving. It applies particularly to cotton and tobacco and other agricultural commodities, but it is not limited to agricultural commodities, so in practice and in effect all goods which are to be warehoused abroad and are not sent to a foreign consignee can be insured so long as the title to the goods is in a citizen of the United States abroad.

I think it might be recognized that our export of cotton has fallen down materially in recent years. This will allow the cotton exporters to warehouse cotton abroad for the purpose of moving into the foreign markets upon demand.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any prohibition in the bill that would stop indemnification of machine tools located in a factory that was shipped overseas, and stored in a factory in some foreign country?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The gentleman means not warehoused for resale?

Mr. GROSS. That is right; not for resale, but used in a factory.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. They would not then be in commercial intercourse.

Mr. GROSS. Where is the prohibition?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In lines 4 and 5 on page 2, which reads "which is exported from the United States in commercial intercourse."

The goods to which the gentleman refers would not be in commercial intercourse.

Mr. GROSS. Suppose they were machine tools shipped to Ford automobile plants in Paris or somewhere in England?

Mr. WOLCOTT. They would not be in commercial intercourse. Whenever title passed to the Ford people at wherever the Ford plant is located this insurance would no longer apply.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to get the gentleman's answer to this question: We will say that Anderson Clayton Co. ships abroad $100 million worth of cotton and stores it in other countries of the world. Can that cotton be insured at full value up to the $100 million; and if so, for how long?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is left to the discretion of the Export-Import Bank. I do not think I have made it clear that these goods are insured against loss only from hostile or warlike action which occurs in time of peace or war, including civil war, revolution, rebellion, insurrection, or civil strife arising therefrom, or from an order of any Government or public authority confiscating, expropriating, or requisitioning such property.

The purpose of the bill is to insure these exports against losses due to expropriation, revolution, civil war, or acts of a hostile or warlike nature. So I presume there would be a limitation upon the amount of cotton or the amount of any other commodity warehoused abroad.

I might say also that we took into consideration the question of premiums. The premiums may vary from country to country. This is no actuarial history. They have had no experience in this type of insurance. They cannot now put a present evaluation upon the probable losses. They will have to feel their way along on it. So the premiums which are to be paid are to be set under regulations by the Export-Import Bank, taking into consideration the probable losses. Of course, the premiums constitute a limitation upon the length of time the cotton or other commodity can be profitably warehoused abroad.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then, as I understand, it does not cover spoilage, or deterioration, or loss by fire?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the phrase in the bill is "friendly foreign country." Would that apply to Yugoslavia, for instance?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know. I think we must take into consideration that the National Advisory Council, which is the umbrella over all the financing agencies of the United States Government, financing foreign loans, shipments, and insurance, is the advisory council of the Export-Import Bank. The Secretary of State is a member of the National Advisory Council, so I presume that in determining whether a foreign country is a friendly country the administrators of this law, who will be the Board of the Export-Import Bank, would consult with the National Advisory Council and get the benefit, of course, of State Department thinking in respect to whether a country classifies as a friendly country.

Mr. GROSS. Who asked for this bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Representatives of the Department of Commerce testified, and the Department of Agriculture. It is cleared with Treasury, and cleared with the administration generally. I personally cleared it with the Treasury Department. We had statements that the bill was advocated by the Department of Commerce, but I think primarily it was sponsored by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman stated why the private insurance companies will not insure these goods?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, because they are not set up to do it, but they do insure shipments in transit. If you will read section 2 of the bill, you will find the following language:

(2) Insurance may be provided pursuant to this subsection only to the extent that it cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions from companies authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States and to the extent that it cannot be obtained from any agency of the United States Government providing marine or air war-risk insurance.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa that this particular bill has the full support of the Department of Agriculture, and it is also supported by producers of such crops as wheat, cotton, and tobacco, which are exported in large quantities. The domestic economy in those fields depends to a very great extent on our success in exporting such crops. At the present time, insurance is not available to the extent that it is needed. I understand that the only offer of this type of insurance was from Lloyds of London, but the rates quoted make it prohibitive.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Lloyds will insure anything, if you pay a high enough premium.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from California surely is not saying that this bill applies only to agricultural products because there is no such statement in the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not think he intended to make that statement, and

I made the statement most definitely that although the purposes of the bill primarily were to move agricultural commodities, the bill is not limited to agricultural commodities, but applies to all exports.

Mr. GROSS. I know the gentleman from Michigan made that statement. But I gathered from the statement made by the gentleman from California that he was confining it to agricultural products. There is no such definite statement in the bill.

Mr. HUNTER. What I said was that the bill was supported by the Department of Agriculture and by the producers of the crops which I enumerated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Iowa made a very sound and pertinent inquiry to which the gentleman from Michigan replied that if private insurance companies could not insure in connection with this business, then the Government would, is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. And even where the Government has to insure, if later the private insurance companies can cooperate or participate in part, they are permitted to participate under the provisions of the bill; is that not correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Section 3 provides that they may participate with private insurance companies. It is quite general, as the gentleman well knows, that many insurance companies sometimes pool the risks, and the Export-Import Bank can pool its risks with private insurance companies with respect to this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether the question is that the private insurance companies cannot or will not provide this insurance. I think there is great difference.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is. But, on the other hand, the situation, as I understand it, covers the field where if they either cannot or will not, then the Export-Import Bank as provided in the provisions of the law can do it. But, if private insurance companies can or will do it, then this bill says that they can do it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We do know that private insurance companies will provide this insurance but at a prohibitive premium. Lloyds of London will insure anything, but you have to pay a prohibitive price for it; so, of course, if we provided that this insurance cannot be had unless it can be obtained from private enterprise, then we would nullify the whole purpose of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I simply wanted to ask the gentleman from Michigan if my understanding of the bill is correct, from my reading of the bill and the report, that even if the Government does go in to the extent of 100 percent to make this insurance if the private insurance companies are willing to take part of the insurance, they may do so through the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. From my reading of the bill and the report, which is very brief, I got the distinct impression that the object of this whole legislation is to give our farmers and producers an opportunity to have their goods on the ground in these foreign ports so that they will have a better opportunity to compete with other countries in the disposition of our farm products and manufactured goods.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Instead of selling f. a. s. New York or Baltimore, they sell f. o. b. their warehouse in the foreign country and thereby take advantage of the market in the foreign country.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the United States are in an extremely difficult situation as a result of the loss, to a great extent, of our export trade. They have gone all out in their effort to supply food and fiber which their Government told them would be required for their own use in this period of mobilization and for the use of our friends and our allies abroad. Now they find they cannot dispose of their production. Prices are tumbling on all of the principal agricultural commodities. For instance, in the last year cotton prices have declined about 20 percent, corn and oats 13 percent, beef cattle 28 percent, lambs 24 percent, wheat 6 percent, and milk 9 percent. In most cases the reason for this drastic decline can be found in the reduction of our agricultural exports. Ways and means must be found to stimulate our exports in order to prevent drastic curtailment in crop production and in farm income which would be hard not only on the farmers but on the whole economy of this country.

One way in which we think we can help stimulate exports of agricultural commodities is through the passage of H. R. 4465 to amend the Export-Import Bank Act to provide insurance protection abroad against the unusual risks of war, insurrection, confiscation, etc., for commodities which are owned by United States exporters or which are held as collateral by United States interests. This bill would, in my opinion, stimulate and facilitate exports of a number of our agricultural commodities. It could also be used for manufactured articles which are able to qualify.

The present administration and the business people of this country fully realize that something must be done to regain our export trade. Thus, this bill is endorsed by the Directors of the Export-Import Bank, by the Secretary of Commerce, by the Department of Agriculture, by the American Farm Bureau Federation, by the National Cotton Council, by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, by the banks, by the Cotton Shippers Association, by the United States Treasury, and by the State Department, and it was voted out of the Banking and Currency Committee by unanimous vote.

The continued prosperity of American agriculture may depend to a large measure on our ability to maintain agricultural exports in the future. Since agriculture provides the largest single market outlet for the industries of this country, the prosperity of the entire economy will be influenced by the level of agricultural exports.

The dependence of agriculture on export markets is illustrated by the figures for some of the principal crops. United States has been exporting over half of its rice, over 40 percent of its wheat, better than a third of its cotton, at least one-fourth of its tobacco, approximately one-fourth of its fats and oils, and from 20 to 30 percent of many of its fruits in fresh or dried form. The free world depends upon these American farm products which are simply not available in adequate quantities anywhere else. The continued supply of these essential commodities may well influence the peace and security of the free world.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say to the gentleman that the committee listened most intently to what the gentleman from Georgia had to say on the bill; and the House should also, for the gentleman from Georgia introduced a bill identical to this one and he is recognized on the committee and should be recognized on this floor as an outstanding expert in the marketing and merchandising of cotton. Throughout the years we have served together it has been my pleasure to bow to the intense interest the gentleman has had in this problem, and I know it is actuated primarily with the idea that we have got to move our cotton crop.

We up in the North likewise are interested with the gentleman in moving the cotton crop and in doing what we can for the export of his cotton. It is bound to be of tremendous service to the economy of the United States, because unless they sell cotton down South we are not going to sell very many automobiles in Detroit.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I greatly appreciate the fine compliment of my distinguished and able friend, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I respectfully submit that there is no limitation in this bill. It may be cotton, it may be machine tools, it may be anything else.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes; the Export-Import Bank will decide that. Here we have tremendous surpluses and this is one way to move same. This will be at no cost to the Federal Government because the premium on this insurance is paid by the exporters of the country.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Two years ago we exported 32 million tons of soft coal largely due to the Marshall plan, but it has been reduced in the current year to something less than 7 million tons. Does the gentleman see any way by which the coal of my State could benefit by this plan?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Coal can come in like other commodities. That, of course, would be passed on by the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. BAILEY. Then we could expect this to assist them to regain the markets they have lost?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes.

Foreign sales of most of our important agricultural commodities have declined precipitously in the last few months and if something is not done to arrest the trend it may continue even further. Cotton exports are running only half of what they were a year ago. Wheat shipments are down almost a third, tobacco sales in foreign markets are down approximately 10 percent, and other agricultural exports have also been dropping. In value, agricultural exports, according to the Department of Agriculture, are running at an annual rate of only $2.9 billion as contrasted to about $4 billion only a year ago. Measured in tons, total shipments of agricultural commodities currently are down at least 20 percent.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. How much of the surpluses the gentleman is trying to find a market for are held by the individual farm people? We are talking about surpluses in cotton and tobacco and wheat. Now, how much is held by the Government that have been taken up in the way of support prices?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am not in a position to tell the gentleman what that is. Wherever it is, the point is, it is surplus.

I would like to explain the way in which this insurance could stimulate exports by using cotton as an example. As I stated earlier; cotton exports for the first six months of the season were only about half of what they were for the same period last season and considerably below what we think of as normal. Much of this decline has come about as a result of a reduction in foreign stocks. The pipeline stocks of cotton (that is, the stocks in mill and merchant establishments) in the cotton consuming countries of the world have been reduced drastically and are now thought to be at the lowest level of peace-time and far below what is considered to be desirable or efficient. Most of the reduction has been in the stocks of U. S. cotton. The reasons for the reduction are the lack of dollars to buy this cotton, the difficulty and high cost of obtaining credit, the general feeling of uncertainty as to market conditions, and the fear of another inventory devaluation as the result of a further decline in the level of the cotton market. This fear is accentuated by the uncertainty of export policies, especially in Brazil, Pakistan and Turkey.

It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for foreign mills and foreign merchants to protect themselves against inventory losses by hedging their stocks on the cotton-futures exchanges. There are no futures exchanges operating except in the United States, and here the operation requires dollars which are not usually available to foreigners in adequate amounts for this purpose. While the cotton market was advancing this was no problem, but since the market has been declining those unable to hedge their stocks have been forced to reduce their stocks to avoid a possible loss. Then, too, many foreign mills took tremendous inventory losses in the last few years when market prices tumbled after being bid up from scare buying, and these losses seriously impaired their operating capital and forced many mills to restrict their buying to a hand-to-mouth basis.

The cotton pipeline must be rebuilt for the security of the foreign mills and to permit maximum efficiency in their operations. It would take more than a million bales to rebuild the foreign pipeline to a level that is considered by foreign mills to be desirable. If insurance can be provided so that American shippers and American banks can be protected against the so-called political risk, then American interests can assume much of the responsibility for rebuilding and maintaining the pipeline. The dollar outlay of the cotton-consuming countries will be reduced to the extent that the cost of the pipeline is financed by United States private interests. During this period when foreign countries are all short of dollar exchange and when foreign mills have a very limited operating capital it will be a real benefit to them if they can be relieved of at least part of the financial obligation of carrying these inventories. This also reduces the problem of the Mutual Security Agency in helping these countries pay their own way.

United States shippers can finance these stocks cheaper and with less hazard than foreign mills can. In the first place, interest rates in the United States are from one-half to one-third what they are in most foreign countries. Then the United States firms can protect the cotton on the futures exchanges in New York or New Orleans.

Another real advantage of this proposal is that it would increase consumption of United States cotton. Under this arrangement cotton would be stored in foreign ports and would be available to the mills as they required it. Mills would be permitted to make selections of the qualities they desired. Since the proposed insurance would be limited to United States cotton other cotton would not be available to the mills to the same extent and under the same conditions. This would be a real advantage to increasing the consumption of United States cotton, particularly when the foreign mills are operating on a hand-to-mouth basis.

Another real advantage of this insurance would be to permit United States merchants to sell on deferred payment terms. At the present time only a few very large firms with ample capital are in a position to sell on deferred-payment terms because of the risk involved. Banks will not usually accept cotton stored in foreign countries as collateral against loans so that firms selling on deferred-payment basis must finance such sales with their own capital. For these reasons only a small volume of business is done on this basis. With this insurance the banks have indicated that they accept cotton in foreign countries as collateral and will assist United States merchants generally in financing cotton sold for deferred payment, especially sales providing payment on arrival. This should be of particular advantage to the smaller shipper. In view of the reduction in operating capital in foreign mills and the limitation and high cost of credit, permitting mills to pay for cotton after arrival in the foreign country instead of before shipment is a real advantage. Such advantages in selling terms may be very helpful in offsetting price disadvantages which United States cotton now has.

Under normal conditions this insurance program should not cost the Government anything, as premiums charged should be sufficient to cover cost. Even in the event of all-out war it is inconceivable that all the commodities insured would be lost. The total liability to the Government under any and all conditions would not exceed $100 million.

H. R. 4465 is not in itself a complete and final answer to all problems of agricultural exports but it is one way to help private industry help itself increase exports and thus further improve the position of agriculture.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district that grows a considerable amount of cotton. In fact, half of the counties in my district in North Carolina produce cotton in a considerable quantity. Naturally, I am very concerned over the outlook of our cotton farmers and the factors which influence the price of cotton.

Lately, I have grown apprehensive over the effect of the rise of synthetic fibers in competition with cotton in the domestic market and the shrinking of outlets for our cotton in foreign markets. At this time, I think that it behooves us to make a careful analysis of these factors which will have great effect upon the price of cotton in the months and years ahead and to take the proper steps to protect the cotton-growing industry in our country.

In the South there are limited opportunities for alternative crops which would give farmers anywhere near the same income they now receive per acre from cotton. Shifts into other major crops of any sizable acreage over a short period of time simply contribute to the oversupply conditions for the other crops. Shifts into livestock production take time. A permanent loss of two to three million bales of cotton exports would mean a reduction of income that would be disastrous to the economy of the South.

DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

Although domestic consumption of cotton is averaging nearly one-third above that of the 1930's and appears to be holding its own at nine to nine and one-half million bales, cotton is meeting stiffer and stiffer competition from synthetic fibers. Price is a major factor in this competition. It is in industrial uses that cotton is meeting the keenest competition and is losing out. From what we hear cotton has just about lost out completely in the tire-cord market. Also, many other industrial products are now being made from synthetic fibers. Cotton has also lost much ground in the bag market. Competition from jute and paper is very keen in this field.

Despite the intense competition in industrial uses, cotton has been able to hold its own in the domestic fiber market only because gains have been realized in many household and apparel uses.

FOREIGN CONSUMPTION

The recent decline in cotton exports, which for the current season are averaging just about one-half of the rate for last season, is the major cause for concern. Unless exports pick up soon, it looks as if marketing quotas will be inevitable for next year. This will require production controls. With production curtailment and lower prices, farm incomes will suffer. In this connection I might add that net farm income may very likely suffer to a greater extent than gross farm income. This is because farmers today, who have mechanized their operations and have adopted other scientific and improved techniques, have increased their cash operating costs as compared to a generation ago. Farmers will find it more difficult to cut back production today and continue to produce profitably. I might add, here, that this is not only true for cotton farmers but for all farmers as well. The maintenance of our export markets will have a tremendous impact upon American agriculture's ability to continue its progress toward greater efficiency.

A large volume of production in agriculture as in industry leads toward lower unit costs.

There are many aspects of the foreign demand picture for cotton which indicate that many of the reasons for the slow movement of cotton this season are to some extent temporary. We understand that the great upheaval in the foreign textile industry following the outbreak of the Korean war has now for the most part run its course. Cotton mills and the textile trade in foreign countries which were caught with inventories based on the fantastically high prices of 75 to 80 cents a pound for raw cotton in early 1951 lost heavily when cotton prices declined later in the year. These mills are now buying cautiously partly because they remember their recent experiences and partly because their capital reserves have been whittled down to bare operating levels. Credit is expensive and hard to obtain in the rest of the world. As a result raw cotton stocks in the principal consuming countries are too low to permit the most efficient operation.

The fact that the total world supply of raw cotton is not far out of line with present consumption rates also lends encouragement to the hope that the recent drop in United States cotton exports is temporary.

With this background it is apparent that we should do everything in our power to expedite the recovery of normal trade.

In view of these conditions, Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor H. R. 4465 that would give authority to the Export-Import Bank to issue war-risk and expropriation insurance on goods and commodities of United States origin and ownership which are commercially exported from the United States and located in, or in transit to, any friendly foreign nation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can overestimate the importance of expanding our foreign market for agricultural products. I know how strenuously, how earnestly, the tobacco raisers of my State have sought this market. This bill will stimulate the export of American agricultural crops and all other goods because there is no limitation on what can be insured.

Another argument in favor of the bill is that it will be administered by the Export-Import Bank. There is no agency of our Government that has operated with greater success or with finer judgment than has the Export-Import Bank. It has sustained but small losses and made immense profit.

It has done something else that is not stated in the report. It has been more than anything else an instrumentality of international good will. You cannot make friends by gifts. The way to make friends is by constant association and by contact of business interests. The Export-Import Bank has been the means of reconstructing many of the destroyed factories, mills, and other great industries of our allies.

I had the pleasure of visiting and investigating these investments a couple of years ago and I was impressed with the great results that had been achieved by the investments and by the continuing influence and advice of the Export-Import Bank. The people over there, the Governments and the industries, are vitally interested in this great agency of ours. We met with them and discussed their problems. They have had the advice of the American experts on the work they were doing. I saw where their great industries that had been absolutely destroyed by the war had been reconstructed and were going at full speed again. If you are going to judge the future by the past, you can place confidence in the Export-Import Bank and the way in which it will administer this insurance. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has stated, this insurance might be obtained from some gambling institution, but it would not be obtained at rates that would persuade the American exporter to take it. He can get marine insurance while the goods are in transit, but when they come to rest in a foreign country that insurance expires and he has no means of obtaining reliable insurance at anywhere near reasonable rates. It will enable us to establish an American market over there through which we can sell to the people the goods of America as they need them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, what does the gentleman fear in these friendly nations? What does the gentleman fear by way of expropriation or confiscation?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not know what conditions will arise that may cause loss that will be insured under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. This indemnification, these loans are for 1 year.

Mr. SPENCE. Well, I do not think that is a valid argument against this bill.

Mr. GROSS. No, the insurance companies will not be hurt, but the taxpayers of the United States will be hurt.

Mr. SPENCE. We heard of no objection from anybody in regard to this bill. The committee reported it unanimously. It is a good bill, and it ought to be passed.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of H. R. 4465, the bill now before the House. This measure, as reported out by the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, I am convinced is a good one. My only criticism might be that it does not go far enough in some respects.

As I understand it, the bill had its inception as a means chiefly of curing some of the difficulties now encountered by American exporters of cotton and tobacco in connection with stocks maintained in friendly foreign countries.

That is well and good. Cotton and tobacco bulk large among the commodities exported from the United States. Anything that can be done legitimately to expedite and increase such exports on a sound and profitable basis should be done.

But cotton and tobacco, Mr. Speaker, are not the only American products which are exported each year in large quantity. Many other commodities of equal or even greater importance are exported. These include not only the other agricultural staples, such as grain, but also manufactured products, including automotive vehicles, parts and equipment, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, and so forth.

The bill now under consideration authorizes the United States Export-Import Bank to issue insurance against certain war risks and against expropriation on American exports located in or in transit within friendly foreign countries. The bill does not expressly limit the number or kinds of commodities eligible for such insurance. Yet it does in effect provide a limitation.

This effective limitation on the number and kinds of goods which might expect to be insured rests in the fact that the bill would authorize the Export-Import Bank to provide insurance in an aggregate amount not in excess of $100 million outstanding at any one time.

But in the course of committee hearings on the bill, it was testified by representatives of the cotton and tobacco growers and exporters that these 2 commodities alone would require insurance each year totaling somewhere between $75 million and $100 million. And these are only two of the vast number that are exported.

Then it is easy to see, Mr. Speaker, that such insurance to the extent of $100 million would not go far in covering the vast total of insurable goods exported from the United States each year. If I am not mistaken, American exports last year amounted to about $15 billion.

I grant you that the bill, in its present form, provides for a limited insurance program on grounds that it is as yet purely an experimental program. It was so stated in the committee report. Perhaps it should properly be so regarded. Possibly the Congress, in its wisdom, should wait to see how the limited program works, before increasing the insurance authorization.

To await results before expanding the coverage and hence the amount of money risked, no doubt is the course of prudence. But there are reasons to think that the success of this program is assured before it ever is put to the test.

The purpose of the Export-Import Bank, as laid down by the Congress is "to aid in financing and to facilitate exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States or any of its Territories or insular possessions and any foreign country or the agencies or nationals thereof."

Over a period of 18 years the bank has had a remarkably successful experience. In spite of what might appear to be excessive risks, involved in extending credits to foreign agencies and foreign nationals for the purchase of American goods, and involved in the conduct of business in a world of economic confusion, the bank is not only solvent but has shown a substantial profit. A profit for the American people.

On an authorized capital stock of $1 billion, and with loaning authorization up to $4.5 billion, the bank showed at the end of the last calendar year a total of $292,400,000 in accumulated net earnings available as a reserve against any future losses, and gross interest earnings for the fiscal year of $70 million.

After paying operating expenses approximating $1,000,000, after paying $17,200,000 for interest on money borrowed, and after paying a $20 million dividend to the United States Treasury, the bank added a net profit of $31,800,000 to its earned-surplus account.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, does not look like a record of accomplishment that would leave room for doubt concerning the bank's ability to conduct an insurance business, such as proposed here, on a sound and profitable basis. The same management that has succeeded with the Export-Import Bank would be responsible for the insurance operation.

For those who might object to Federal Government entry upon still another field of insurance, let me recall once more the fact that this bill provides in effect that the bank shall operate solely to assist, encourage, and not to compete with privately owned insurance companies.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should add that other and, it seems to me, equally important safeguards against wrongful, and perhaps political, operation of the insurance program are provided in this bill.

Under these provisions, insurance issued and outstanding would be treated by the bank as a charge against its existing loan and guaranty authority. Thus no vast and burdensome increase in such authority would be necessary.

The insurance would not cover goods that are moving with reasonable ease and expedition through the channels of foreign trade, but only goods, normally constituting an exportable surplus, which really need such insurance in order to be sold abroad through regular commercial channels.

In no instance would the insurance be permitted to assume any form or application which would in effect shield businessmen from normal risks of business, nor would it in any sense insure profits or prices.

When everything is considered, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the bill now under consideration, if enacted, would constitute an important factor in helping to stimulate trade, not aid, a desirable end toward which the Congress is striving on a broad front, comprising reciprocal trade agreements among other things.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, for the last few days I have been reading newspaper articles which at first did not worry me too much or concern me too much. I made no plan to discuss them on the floor—even give them any attention—until the matter appeared in my home newspaper. Because the ridiculous charges of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] regarding the discharge of civil-service employees "by holdover supervisors" have spread throughout the country, I think the people are entitled to know the truth; at least, I want the people back in my home area to know the truth. For that reason I rise here this afternoon in support of the resolution offered in this House yesterday by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL]. I think the resolution should be unanimously supported by every Member of this House. I know every Democrat will support it. I think the people are entitled to know the truth about who is firing top-career people in the Government service.

I think the gentleman from Virginia, like most other Members fighting for congressional seats last fall, campaigned on the issue of economy, charging that the Government had far too many employees, and that if they came down here to Washington to sit in the new Congress they would work toward reducing the number of Federal employees. Now we find when the time comes and the number of Federal employees are being reduced the party that was blamed for having too many Federal employees is now blamed for reducing the number of Federal employees. So I think we should find out who is responsible, who is discharging these career employees of the Federal Government. Mind you, I do not know nor have I any opinion on whether the various individuals with whom the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] concerns himself should have been the victims in reductions in force. I certainly am sympathetic with the career employee who suddenly, after 20 or 30 years of service, finds himself without employment. I think he is entitled to know why he must be separated from Government service. Frankly, I think he will find more Republican than Democratic politics involved, claims of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] notwithstanding. But I think we should be fair in this matter. For that reason I think the House should act on the resolution of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. I heard as a campaign slogan last fall something about a new broom sweeping everything out. I just wonder how this fits into the picture.

Mr. PRICE. I do not know how it fits into the picture. Maybe some of the people do not want to be swept out, or maybe the broom is sweeping too close to home, catching many of those who honestly believed a change would be good even for Federal workers. I do not know what the answer is.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I recall, the Republican candidate for the Presidency has said he is opposed to wholesale firing. Has he ever defined what he meant by "wholesale firing"?

Mr. PRICE. No; I do not believe he has.

There is not a Member of the House who does not believe in economy and efficiency in Government, but wholesale firing for political purposes is a threat to the merit system and will lead to the destruction of our civil-service system.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the gentleman suppose the committee that is being proposed might make a definition of it?

Mr. PRICE. Perhaps. I certainly hope the Civil Service Committee acts on the resolution of the gentleman from Virginia. And since this is an investigation Congress, I also hope it goes into an investigation as to the necessity of reholding civil-service examinations to establish eligible registers for postmasterships. I amagine that is going to cost the Government considerable money. There certainly is no economy in such action.

Over 2 weeks ago I asked the Civil Service Commission to define for me the difference in the standards of applicants for postmasterships now as compared to the previous standards. Up to this time I have had no reply.

The reason I take the floor this afternoon is to support this resolution. Let us find out who is dicharging these career employees.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Some weeks ago the newly appointed Secretary of Commerce in a speech said that he felt there were some Trojan horses still left by the previous administration that were impeding the new administration. Could that be what the gentleman from Virginia is proposing the situation is? If it is a fact, I think we should have this investigation to find out.

Mr. PRICE. I cannot speak for the gentleman from Virginia. I appreciate the situation of the gentleman from Virginia. His constituency last fall voted for these reductions, and now that they are getting them the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] tells us, they do not want them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order for 2½ minutes of my 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would live long enough, and I have lived a long, long time, to hear as much sobbing and crying and unsportsmanlike conduct, if I may use that word and not violate the rules, on the part of our friends on the other side of the aisle. For 20 long years——

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is speaking in a derogatory manner of Members on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If it is offensive, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that "unsportsmanlike."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan be granted unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I already have that.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Did I not have 2½ minutes to proceed out of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman certainly did.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his attempted gratuitous insult.

Now, for 20 long years, for 20 long years they have been putting into office not only the members of the Pendergast outfit——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Regular order. I decline to yield—but many other individuals likewise distinguished. Now, after the people decided last November that they wanted a housecleaning, and after the administration began its effort in the mildest, most feasible way to carry out that promise and to clean up the mess, a mess which stinks, which last November stank to high heaven, they began——

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Regular order. The gentleman heard me say I decline to yield.

Mr. PRICE. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to contribute to what he is saying.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1½ minutes additional because of these interruptions.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in that case I will withdraw my request.

Did you ever in all your life hear such a sobbing and a wailing? Does your heart not bleed for these poor career individuals?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 2½ minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the House is appropriating again, as I understand it, several millions of dollars or whatever the amount may be to help foreign trade. From the papers, I gather we are also going to appropriate——

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman wants to correct my statement, he can correct it in the RECORD. I will accept his correction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may correct my statement in the RECORD and put in whatever he wants to put in.

Mr. Speaker, we are to appropriate millions of dollars for Indochina or some other place over there. I do not know all of the places. What I am trying to call to your attention is this. While you are worrying—worrying about a depression which may follow peace, if we have it, just recall this—that over in my own district we have a corporation, the Whirlpool Corp., which gives employment to several thousand people, which is doing more than its share to make the washing machines, and the driers, and the ironers which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] said his people had so long gone without. We are trying to supply those people down there in the gentleman's district with these conveniences of life, but we are having trouble with the excess-profits tax. You all received a little booklet the other day telling you the situation which confronted that company and every other worthwhile company. If we will reduce the excess-profits tax, which applies to washers and driers and many other items which today are necessities, which some people still have to use, we will be helping our own people—not only the workers in this factory, and not only the stockholders, and not only the people down in Texas—but those poor, poor people in the district of the gentleman, the former Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN], who labor so hard and so long, who did not have some of the conveniences of life, which most people use and enjoy, I ask you to give serious consideration while you are considering the provisions of this bill, designed to help foreign trade and the cotton industry, and I understand everything else except the local people, to help out the people of this county at least a little. Let us avoid a depression.

ONE WAY FOR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY TO HEDGE AGAINST A DEPRESSION

Responsible business management, governmental authorities and the Members of the Congress are sensitive to the possibility of a business recession.

One effective way to make sure there will be no recession is to take the excess-profits tax shackles off of the vigorous, dynamic, and growing companies. These are the very companies upon whom our economy must depend for continued employment and the prosperity of our communities.

If we extend the excess-profits tax for another year, these growing businesses will be forced to restrict their manufacturing and employment potential.

A documented case in point is the brochure submitted today by the Whirlpool Corp., of St. Joseph, Mich., to the Members of the 83d Congress. Here, for the first time, is unfolded the whole, sad story of the crippling and paralyzing effects of 3 years of the excess-profits tax.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, is amended by substituting in lieu of the words "loans and guaranties" the words "loans, guaranties, and insurance."

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman—but first I must say I do not intend to object—what particular political issue he intends to speak about?

Mr. LANTAFF. The issue which you just finished discussing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman; it is well worthy of your attention.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, of course, the Committee on Banking and Currency has built up a reputation for dealing with controversial subjects. Today, we brought to the floor of the House a bill which we did not think was controversial. I would like to keep it from becoming controversial, if I can, even if we have to object to the gentleman speaking out of order. So, I think perhaps while I will not object to the gentleman at this time speaking out of order, may I suggest that no other Members ask permission to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am a little embarrassed for my good friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle. His timing was not up to the gentleman's usual sagacity. It was an unfortunate time for a Republican to make philosophical comments and to draw partisan conclusions on the last 20 years. I respectfully suggest that the unanimity of favorable sentiment for the bill now before us is evidence that they were 20 years of good, sound, constructive legislation.

H. R. 4465 is a bill which well may have an important part in warding off another depression. It would not be before us today if 18 years ago a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress had not united in the establishment of the Export-Import Bank. Just another case of New Deal legislation, having served to lift us out of the last Republican depression, now affording the strongest buttress against another Republican depression.

It is a happy augury, and reflective, I think, of the real statesmanlike character of the House, that there is no controversy of a partisan or other nature on the passage of H. R. 4465. It was reported from the Banking and Currency Committee by unanimous vote.

It is admittedly experimental, but is expected to bolster up the cotton market—which has been showing some signs of weakening—by making it possible to finance—through necessary war-risk and expropriation insurance—the storing of American exports in foreign warehouses until advantageous sales are arranged. Manufactured exports usually are transferred to foreign purchasers on delivery; not so in the case of cotton and some other agricultural products.

Times are too ticklish to toy with situations which might blow up and destroy our entire economy. The collapse of the cotton market could have tremendously serious repercussions. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] always has shown sympathetic understanding of the problems of the urban centers and of the agricultural areas of the North. With the great chairman of our committee [Mr. WOLCOTT], whose gracious and deserved words of esteem for the gentleman from Georgia we all appreciated, and with the great and beloved ranking minority member [Mr. SPENCE], I accept as authoritative the gentleman's judgment of how best to meet the problems in the cotton market.

In committee I was entirely easy in mind over the authorization to the Bank to insure American goods in foreign lands against what might be regarded as political risks. Assurance was given, however, (a) that the Bank would act in close cooperation with the State Department, and (b) that the insurance would be of such a character as to preclude the posibility of it being construed as a guarantee of the stability of a foreign government. With this assurance I supported the bill in committee because of the good reputation of the Export-Import Bank and because I think it tremendously important to do all that we can to encourage and build up our export trade.

The Export-Import Bank has $1 billion of authorized capital stock, all of which has been subscribed by the United States. It also may borrow from the Federal Treasury up to $3.5 billion, which gives it $4.5 billion for its work in aiding the financing of, and in facilitating exports and imports. It is the principle instrumentality of the United States in advancing loans in foreign countries under point 4.

In its 18 years of operation the Bank has accumulated net earnings—available as a reserve against future losses—amounting to $292.4 million. Last year it paid into the Federal Treasury in interest and dividends $37.20 million and still had a remaining net profit of $31.8 million.

With other members of the Banking and Currency Committee, I share real pride in the record of the Export-Import Bank. Through the Export-Import Bank the United States pumps tremendous sums into foreign lands, strengthening the economies of those lands and building expanding markets for our manufactured products, and shows a handsome profit. On its record it has almost solid bipartisan support, despite its New Deal origin.

The United States today is, first, the world's greatest creditor nation; second, the world's largest importer; and third, the world's largest exporter. We are more and more dependent for continuance of our prosperity upon our export trade. H. R. 4465 makes contributions to that end. I urge its passage.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, discussion has been had this afternoon about speeches and campaign speeches with reference to employees of this Government and the political way in which they are now being treated. I would like to call attention to a campaign speech made, prior to the election, by President Eisenhower.

In a campaign speech prior to the election, President Eisenhower stated: "The single choice, the single standard"—for Federal jobs—"shall be merit and not political awards," and the Republican Party assured the people of this country that if elected, they would promote efficiency and economy in Government. Notwithstanding these campaign pledges the first major action of the Postmaster General was to request the Civil Service Commission to discard Civil Service registers for 1,700 postmaster positions and give new examinations. The announced policy of careful personnel planning seems to have been forgotten in a wild scramble for political patronage that could well lead to a breakdown of our civil-service system.

Upon investigation, I was astounded to learn that of the 1,700 examinations to be discarded, 1,666 examinations had been completed or partially completed. Of this number, 205 are registers containing less than 3 eligibles and for which the Postmaster General requested new examinations immediately after he took office.

The Civil Service Commission had already expended $265,777 in completing the 1,461 examinations which the Post Office Department has now requested be canceled. In addition, it is estimated that it will cost $450,000 more to conduct these examinations over again. Based on these same figures, the cost of calling new examinations for the 205 registers containing less than 3 eligibles will approximate $61,500. The total cost to the taxpayers, therefore, of this patronage-inspired move will add another half million dollars to the taxpayers' burden.

But, what is the reason advanced for this wasteful and extravagant action? It is stated that the new administration seeks to raise the standards for the postmaster examinations. I have always been under the impression that the Civil Service requirements were very high. According to the Civil Service manual, all applicants for a first-class postmastership must show they have had business training and experience comparable with the duties of a postmaster. Since I came to Congress, there has only been one vacancy in this classification in my district. Nine businessmen in that town took the examination, but eight of these men failed to meet the stringent requirements established by the Civil Service Commission and the Post Office Department. Constituents complained to me that the established requirements for this particular examination were too high; but I felt that they should be high for this important position, and I appointed the man recommended by the Civil Service Commission without regard to his political affiliations.

Based on this experience, it seems rather obvious to me that the only reason for throwing out current civil-service registers is to sabotage the merit system and resort to the spoils system rather than to follow the mandate of President Eisenhower that the only standard for such positions shall be merit, rather than political reward.

But the Postmaster General did not stop here. He has notified Republican State advisers that even acting postmasters can be replaced. It will be

noted that no consideration is to be given as to whether or not the acting postmaster is doing a good job. Isn't it inconsistent for the Post Office Department to state on one hand that its aim is more efficient postal service at less cost to the taxpayers and better employee morale, and then remove from office acting postmasters who are serving their communities well, in order to replace them with totally inexperienced men for a period of only a few weeks until results of the new examinations are known.

I have also been reliably informed that the administration has instructed local Republican committees that no employee in the postal service will be promoted to a supervisory position upon the recommendation of a Democratic postmaster without approval of the Postmaster General, who, in turn, will call on the local Republican political committee for approval. This is further indication that political reward, and not merit, will be the new standard in the Post Office Department.

The efficiency of the postal service can never be improved if political reward rather than merit of the individual is the criteria to be established for these positions. Much could be done to improve the Post Office Department and to cut down on the postal deficit. I have cherished the hope that the new Postmaster General would recommend an increase in second- and third-class postal rates covering special services performed by the Department, as recommended by the Hoover Commission. Because of services rendered the general public, the Post Office Department will always operate with a so-called deficit, but certainly the Post Office Department should not be used to subsidize certain select business operations.

If the Postmaster General is truly interested in efficiency and economy in his Department, he will direct his efforts toward correcting this faulty rate structure, rather than to spend taxpayers' dollars in order to repay political obligations by discarding civil-service registers established on the basis of merit and qualification.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LANTAFF. I will not object to that, if I can have 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the large number of Members standing I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on the observance of Mother's Day and the history of Mother's Day with recognition of the role that the Fraternal Order of Eagles has played in the establishment of this typically American observance.

The observance of Mother's Day by the American people is an apt commentary on the Christian spiritual base of our society. This magnificent Nation of ours is founded on the American family and the keystone of the American family is the American mother. So long as we preserve this reverence for the concept of home and family we are in no danger of succumbing to any form of totalitarianism.

We in America are justifiably proud of our institutions of public education and institutions of private education and mass methods of communication and enlightenment which we have encouraged by creating a climate wherein they can prosper and expand; however, the primary job of education and instruction remains with the family. This is particularly true with respect to those religious and ethical values which dictate the course of development of personality and idealism. The principal credit for the wide public observance of Mother's Day in this country and in other countries belongs to the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of which I am proud to be a member. The Fraternal Order of Eagles is another of the great American institutions which carry on our tradition of love of family and propagation of the moral and spiritual values which are a part of the American tradition.

The program for national observance of Mother's Day was initiated in 1904 by Frank Hering, a member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. In that year he urged upon the membership and officers of this order that they observe a day each year in honor of mothers. The Eagles as an organization eagerly adopted the idea and sought to expand the observance outside the limits of their organization. As a result Congress recognized Mother's Day as a national holiday and the practice of special recognition of a day for tribute to and remembrance of mothers was unanimously adopted by the people of America.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles has often been commended for its roll in establishing the observance of Mother's Day. In 1930, Senator C. C. Dill, of the State of Washington, in an address referred to the activity of Mr. Hering and stated:

> The Eagles throughout the country carried out the suggestion and it soon became a national institution. Americans owe Mr. Hering and this great fraternity a debt of gratitude which can only be repaid by a renewed reverence for mothers year by year.

By virtue of worthwhile activity of this character the Fraternal Order of Eagles has acquired a membership which has permitted it not only to exist as a solvent fraternal order but to expand its membership throughout the most difficult and trying times through which our great Nation has passed. In California on May 22, 23, and 24 the California Aerie of the Eagles will celebrate 50 years of existence at a golden anniversary in Fresno. That convention will be productive of recognition for the great work of this order and will be the birthplace of new activities in the American tradition which will be felt certainly in every community in California, and less directly in every community in the Nation. I commend the Fraternal Order of Eagles for its interest in furthering Americanism on this occasion of our last meeting prior to the observance of Mother's Day of 1953.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the decline in the export market for United States agricultural commodities is one of the most perplexing and serious problems facing our farmers. The amount of cotton, wheat, tobacco, and other farm products shipped abroad are down sharply from last year and all indications point to a continued slackened demand on the part of our foreign consumers. And a consequence of this contraction of a major market has been a sharp decline in price. Farmers are concerned, and rightfully so, over the outlook for the year ahead, particularly as the prices of the things they must buy to stay in business have shown no decrease.

Improvement in the export market is imperative. It is the key to continued prosperity for our farmers. From this pressing need has sprung a great variety of proposals—some costly and utopian in their scope and others reminiscent of Government-dominated trading which we in this country are most anxious to escape.

The bill under discussion today is not the cure-all for the agricultural export problem. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] would be the last to claim for this proposed legislation a miraculous solution for the many problems besetting the farmers. But they do assert, and I agree, as do the members of the House Banking Committee who have made a study of the problem, that this bill offers an intelligent approach to one facet of this overall problem, namely, the granting of onshore war-risk insurance on American-made commodities shipped abroad for sale. To me, this bill offers an opportunity to private industry to help itself increase exports and thus strengthen generally the position of agriculture.

Briefly stated, the objective of the legislation is to set up a privately financed insurance program against presently uninsurable losses through war, seizure, expropriation, and other unusual acts over which neither the farmers nor exporters of this country have any control. The insurance would be written by private firms with the Export-Import Bank given authority to reinsure the risks up to $100 million. Experts are of the opinion that under normal conditions the insurance program should not cost the Government one cent; the premiums charged should be sufficient to cover all costs.

How could an insurance program of this type facilitate and stimulate exports of agricultural commodities? This can best be illustrated by using cotton as an example, because the peculiar circumstances surrounding world trade in cotton are best adaptable to the terms of the legislation.

First, it would help foreign mills rebuild their stocks of cotton to safe and efficient levels. At the present time, the

pipeline of cotton is about 1 million bales below normal, a condition which our foreign customers are powerless, to a great extent, to meet. Foreign spinners do not have the dollars with which to buy the American cotton, credit is difficult to obtain and when available is too costly. Also, the spinners are fearful of building up stocks on their own because they cannot hedge on the future market against possible price declines and they cannot afford risking large inventory losses. American cotton exporters are anxious to take the responsibility for rebuilding the depleted stocks; they are handicapped by the lack of an adequate insurance against so-called political risks. Given the proper insurance for which they are willing to pay reasonable and adequate premiums, the shippers, in cooperation with banks, can ship the needed cotton abroad, thus relieving the foreign buyers of the necessity of further depleting their supply of dollars and the Mutual Security Agency of a share of its problems.

Second, properly insured against political risks, cotton could be stored in ports abroad for use by foreign spinners as they need it. Also foreign spinners could select the grade and quality they desire, placing American cotton in a decided competitive advantage since growths of other countries are not afforded equal protection. The net effect will be to increase consumption of American cotton, particularly by mills operating on a day-to-day basis.

Third. The insurance program will enable American cotton shippers to sell on deferred terms or cash on arrival. This also will strengthen the competitive position of American cotton over other growths. Foreign mills will not have to use their operating capital, or arrange costly credit, to pay for cotton in advance of shipment as is now the case. This will, in effect, offset to some degree the price advantage enjoyed by foreign growths.

The impressive fact about the committee hearings on the bill is that it attracted almost unanimous support. The Administration strongly endorsed it as fitting perfectly into its efforts to promote free world trade and lessen the demand for economic aid. Cotton shippers and the banks which finance the shippers convincingly demonstrated that the lack of an adequate onshore war risk insurance program is limiting their efforts to step up sales abroad. The cotton farmer endorsed the bill as the most logical plan advanced thus far to increase the foreign market for his product. Furthermore, I am convinced this legislation would be fair to all groups in the cotton export business. In fact, it would definitely help the smaller firms, because with the insurance behind them, the smaller firms can secure the necessary financing, now denied to them, to sell on a cash on arrival basis, or to store cotton abroad, placing them in a better competitive position with the larger firms.

This is a bill which deserves speedy passage by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, now that all the political woes of the country have been settled, I think we should get back to the bill before us and which authorizes the establishment of a fund of $100 million—no small amount—for the alleged purpose of indemnifying exporters who in their dealings with so-called friendly foreign countries may suffer loss or damage as a result of civil war, revolution, rebellion, insurrection, civil strife, or expropriation, which means nationalization.

Which are the friendly nations we are going to deal with under the terms of this bill? No one seems to have an answer. Is it Argentina? Is it Yugoslavia? Is it Spain? In each of those countries there is a dictator who on 15 minutes' notice could confiscate or expropriate the property which you propose here to indemnify to the extent of $100 million.

Why is this sort of bill necessary? The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], speaking a few minutes ago, said we suffer no loss in this bill unless we have an all-out war. I do not think he means that precisely—that the only occasion by which we can suffer a loss under this bill would be from all-out war. I say again that any of these dictators could confiscate or expropriate anything shipped to their countries.

Why the need for this bill? We have spent some $120 billion upon our so-called friends since 1940, yet we have no favorable climate for private investment; we have no favorable climate for foreign trade among these so-called friendly nations. Let me cite to you for just a moment the February issue of what is known as the Guaranty Survey, published by the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York—no small crossroads bank but a bank with assets of $3,149,000,000, and which has branch banks in London, Paris, Brussels, and perhaps other places in Europe. What does the Guaranty Trust Co., through the Guaranty Survey, its publication, say about foreign investments in its February issue?

Listen to what it says:

> The outlook for the economic development of the free world has received a serious setback at the hands of the United Nations, an organization that has not only professed to favor such development but in some ways has gone to considerable lengths to promote it.
>
> By an overwhelming majority the U. N. General Assembly has adopted a resolution approving the nationalization of economic resources by member states. The resolution does not contain a word in defense of private enterprise.

Remember, this resolution was passed by the U. N. only a few months ago. The United States delegation voted against it, but it passed anyway, and so we are stuck with it. Now the Guaranty Survey continues:

> It does not mention the rights of private investors who have risked their savings in the development of such resources. It says nothing about the sanctity of contracts or the long-established principles of international law. It deprecates any action by a member state to uphold the rights of its nationals against the confiscation of investments made in good faith.
>
> If this resolution reflects prevailing views of busines morality and the rights and needs of free peoples, the prospects for industrial progress and higher standards of living in underdeveloped nations through investment of private capital are dim.

The [U. N.] resolution as drawn up by the Economic and Financial Committee declared:

> "The General Assembly • • • remembering that the right of peoples freely to use and exploit their natural wealth and resources is inherent in their sovereignty and is in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations; recommends all member states, in the exercise of their right freely to use and exploit their natural wealth and resources wherever deemed desirable by them for their own progress and economic development, to have due regard, consistently with their sovereignty, to the need for the maintenance of mutual confidence and economic cooperation among nations; recommends further all member states to refrain from acts, direct or indirect, designed to impede the exercise of the sovereignty of any state over its natural resources."

Continuing, the Guaranty Trust Co. says:

> The resolution is objectionable for what it omits as much as for what it contains. No one questions the right of a sovereign state to take private property for public use.
>
> Capital flows to borrowers with acceptable credit standing. Investors require a fair opportunity to earn a profit, and the right to bring the profit home. They must be able to liquidate their investments in case such a course becomes necessary. They need a politico-economic climate in which contracts are performed and private rights are respected.

There is no such climate despite all the billions of dollars extracted from American taxpayers for so-called foreign aid. Let us read further in reference to American investors:

> They are prepared to incur the ordinary risks of business enterprise, but not such political hazards as confiscation, arbitrary exchange rates and restrictions, and other ruinous measures completely beyond their control and foresight. Lip service to "the need for maintaining the flow of capital in conditions of security, of mutual confidence and economic cooperation among nations" is not enough. What is needed is explicit and unconditional assurance against governmental policies that contravene long-accepted standards of honesty and fair dealing.

That is what we should insist on in connection with foreign trade. Please absorb this additional paragraph by the Guaranty Trust Co.:

> It is an understatement to say that the United Nations resolution gives no such assurance. On the contrary, its effect must be to make worse an international investment climate that is already bad. The chief victims of this ill-advised action will be the economically retarded countries that voted for it. These are the countries that most need foreign capital but that seem ready, in some cases at least, to commit economic suicide rather than admit it on fair terms.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this bill is loosely worded; that we are embarking here upon something that can come back to haunt us in setting up a fund of $100 million to in effect subsidize exporters.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that as I understand it he is reading from the monthly letter of the Guaranty Trust Co.?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In opposition to this bill?

Mr. GROSS. No, in opposition to a resolution by the United Nations General Assembly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thought the gentleman was speaking in opposition to the bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am speaking in opposition to this bill and citing the reasons why apparently this legislation is brought in. That is, because there is an unfriendly climate abroad. I am trying to point out that there is no favorable climate for foreign investments and no favorable climate for the acceptance of our goods in foreign trade.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to call attention to the fact that William A. McGregor, vice president of the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, appearing in behalf of H. R. 4465, said that he thought it would stimulate the export of certain American products, cotton being one of the most important items.

Mr. GROSS. I repeat to the gentleman that I did not say that the Guaranty Trust Co. was opposed to this particular bill. It is opposed to the adoption of a resolution in the United Nations General Assembly which says in effect, that the foreign countries which voted for this resolution in the General Assembly have the right to confiscate or expropriate property, which includes, perhaps, plants that we build and finance in those foreign countries, and an apparently unlimited variety of export goods. In view of the material which I have quoted from the Guaranty Trust Co., it seems inconceivable that the company's vice president would testify in favor of such a bill as this, unless the measure is looked upon as a program to guarantee bank loans made to exporters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 222 was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4882) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 7), as amended by Public Law 33, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 43), is hereby amended by striking out "1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "1956."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this bill extends the Export Control Act of 1949 for 3 years. I think the report speaks pretty well for itself. We have had export controls since about 1940, and they have been used primarily to protect the domestic economy from excessive drains of scarce commodities and safeguard the national security insofar as it might be adversely affected by exports of strategic commodities, and to further our foreign policy. I think this program is so well known that further explanation is not required.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Congress has been extending this act for 1 year. I believe this extends it for 3 years; is that right?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right. We have extended it for 2 years on occasion.

Mr. GROSS. Why the 3-year extension, if I may ask?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think that they justified the 3-year extension, because it authorizes the exporters to plan further into the future. As a matter of fact, they wanted a 5-year extension. It has been the impression that if we are going to take up the slack when and if there is any cut-back in defense production, we will take up that slack through the production of heavy and light consumer goods, many of which will be exported.

In order to give industry an opportunity to plan their marketing, to bring it into line with their proposed planning of production, the 3-year period is suggested. Also, the authority contained in the bill should be continued for security purposes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I had the pleasure of listening to a part of the testimony of the president of the National Grange before the Committee on Ways and Means this morning. He was complaining there that the plight of agriculture that has developed over the past few months is to a certain extent attributable to the program of licensing of exports, and he mentioned as an illustration the fact that they had an opportunity to sell rice abroad but under this export licensing plan they could not even sell it abroad. Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. We all know the president of the National Grange, Mr. Housmann, as a good American. He would not intentionally sell agricultural commodities to feed the armies of our enemies. He would not consciously sell rice to the North Koreans or the Chinese Reds. This bill makes it possible to prevent that. Of course, we all have to recognize the fact that through some bootlegging process perhaps some rice and some other commodities get to our enemies, but this is a program which prevents the flow of goods to our unfriendly nations, we might put it that way. It has been recognized as a very efficient and very effective program to prevent the movement of American goods into unfriendly hands. The export control program also permits us to channel goods which are in short supply to our friends abroad.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I was asking for information and I got it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman feel under the present law the Secretary of Commerce is compelled to go too often on too much of a bended knee to the Secretary of State to make the export program of the United States conform to foreign policies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Under a republic there must be a coordination of thinking, there must be a coordination of action. Under our sytem of government as I understand it, the President is the coordinator over the different executive departments of the Government. Of course, we might expect that there will be consultation among all of the departments of the Government in respect to policy, the President himself being the coordinator of those policies. So if the President suggests to the Secretary of Commerce that the Secretary of Commerce consult with the State Department, or the Department of Agriculture, that is up to him in the process of coordinating the program.

Mr. GROSS. I think our export program ought to be based on what is good for Americans and not what is good for foreigners.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It surely is not good for Americans to be channeling these American products into enemy hands, and that is what this program seeks to prevent.

Mr. GROSS. I heartily agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 224 was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1739) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 7), as

amended by Public Law 33, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 43), is hereby amended by striking out "1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "1954."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1739 and insert the provisions of the bill, H. R. 4882, as agreed to, as follows: "That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 7), as amended by Public Law 33, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 43), is hereby amended by striking out '1953' and inserting in lieu thereof '1956'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill, H. R. 4882, was passed were vacated and that bill laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bills H. R. 4882 and H. R. 4465.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Monday, May 18, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a request which I think might properly be made as a point of personal privilege, but I do not want to do that. I would like, if I might, to speak for 10 minutes or less on the subject right now because I have an appointment downtown at the Bureau of the Budget, which would prohibit me from waiting until all the special orders are concluded. I dislike to do this, Mr. Speaker, but the matter is of some urgency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Permit the Chair to inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] if he has any objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. PATMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for not over 10 minutes, and probably not over 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. This is a matter, which I think should be brought up today, and I hope sometime I may be able to reciprocate the favor. When I picked up the RECORD this morning, Mr. Speaker, I discovered a statement (Appendix, A2414), inserted by my friend, another gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], under the heading, "Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS Does Not State the Facts." I think the heading is a little rough, if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, but I am not raising that point at issue. It is sort of like saying to a man with deep religious convictions that he is a heretic, or saying to a man with great pride in his dog that the dog would not win the Westminster dog show, when you say to a man who has dealt for the last 30 years in figures, and who is careful about figures, that he does not state facts.

I think perhaps the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] himself will want to change that heading, and I think perhaps he will want to conform to the rules of the House and not make the personal references which appear in the article.

But let us get to the facts, which is what I want to talk about now.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and I have been on the same side of the question of waste in the Veterans' Administration for many years. As far as I know, we have always been on the same side; and as far as I know, we are on the same side now. In fact, the curious thing about this whole discussion is the very little difference between those of us who seem to be in an argument on the subject.

Yesterday afternoon several very able representatives of the DAV were in my office and handed me a list of recommendations which had just been made by the national commander of the DAV to the President of the United States. If those had been taken out of the statements I made on the floor on April 1, 2, and subsequent days, they could not have been more alike. If I had written them myself, or any member of the Appropriations Committee had written them, they could not have been more like the suggestions that we say should be carried out as changes in the Veterans' Administration for the benefit of the disabled veterans. Two organizations, the DAV and the AMVETS deserve a great deal of credit for the way they came forward with constructive suggestions for improving conditions and services for disabled and deserving veterans.

I have a feeling there are many people who would like to see those of us in the Congress who are interested in this subject attack each other and argue with each other. I have no desire to get into an argument of that kind. I have no desire to get into an argument which may even remotely resemble an argument between Republicans and Democrats. I try to deal with facts, and I will give you some facts now.

The gentleman from Texas said that I had made a statement that no additional sum had been requested by the Veterans' Administration. The gentleman says this statement is in error, and then goes on to point out that a larger amount had been requested and discussed before the Veterans' Affairs Committee. He said further:

Mr. PHILLIPS should restrict his statements to his own subcommittee.

Of course, I was speaking only of my subcommittee. I was speaking of no other committee, because I have no idea of what goes on in the Veterans' Affairs Committee. No such request was made of our committee, except under the conditions which I have already stated in the RECORD, and which I have had reprinted and placed on the desk of every Member of Congress.

The gentleman from Texas said that $17 million had been requested and not granted. I explained that in detail in my statement on the floor and in my statement when the bill was before the Congress. The actual amount was $18 million. It was $18 million, from which $3 million had been removed by agreement between the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration before the request reached Congress. When it came down to us it was $15 million, and as a result of the freeze order last February, which froze the number of employees which might be asked for, we took off less than the money represented by that freeze order reduction. When that freeze order is raised, we will certainly listen again to any requests on that point. I doubt if there would be any under proper administration.

What I speak of briefly today is the fact that I am challenged on the statement that I said there would be $10 million left in Veterans' Administration funds at the end of the year. I do not give figures like that out of the sky; that is directly out of the budget section of the Veterans' Administration. It is an admitted amount. They would like to say it is over $10 million, and if you wish to argue with me over $3 million, I will not argue; I will be satisfied with ten, because nobody can tell the exact amount that is going to be left over at the end of

a budget year. But anyone knowing the Veterans' Administrtaion as well as I know it knows that there will be at least the amount they say. In my 7 years' experience the VA has never hit it right yet. It would be too difficult. I think the best person I can bring to my support, by indirection if I may today, is the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration himself, through a statement he made in a letter addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He waited 3 or 4 days before mailing me a carbon copy of the letter. He said, in effect—this is not an exact quotation—"Congressman PHILLIPS is not correct. He says there will be $13 million left over at the end of the year."

And then Mr. Gray figured it out: The VA will have only $2 million left over in the Administration funds; it will have only $6,500,000 left over in the hospitalization fund; and it has transferred $5 million over to the out-patient dental fund.

If you will add up $2,000,000, $6,500,000, and $5,000,000, and recall that this last June is added to the $5,135,682 already there in March, perhaps Congressman PHILLIPS was not so far wrong when he said there would be $13 million left over in it. We are estimating only to June 30. I think the orderly way to make budgets is not to put $10 million in on the floor but to have it come through the committee where it can be assigned to the specific places where it is needed to take care of hospitalized and deserving veterans.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman from California may be interested in knowing that today I placed an extension in the Appendix of the RECORD regarding a meeting which was held in the office of the senior Senator from Michigan on the morning of April 28. Those in attendance at this meeting were the two Senators from Michigan, the members of the Michigan delegation in the House, representatives of the various veterans' organizations, and the press. That meeting was held with General Gray and Admiral Boone representing the Veterans' Administration in attendance.

The primary reason for the meeting was to discuss the hospital situation as far as veterans were concerned in the State of Michigan. However, we did get into the question of the $10 million extra which was provided in the so-called Teague amendment. It may be interesting to this House to know that at that meeting, after some discussion, General Gray very definitely stated this—and there is ample verification because it was covered in all of the Michigan newspapers, and members of the Michigan delegation and the Senators from the State as well as others can verify it—he said the only result that would have happened as far as the $10 million was concerned was that they would have had $10 million extra carryover above whatever balance they might have had at the end of the fiscal year. I think that is information that should be made known to the Members.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. The committee has an accountant working with the officials of the administration and with their budget officers; and that is one source of the facts I have used on this floor.

I conclude with a restatement of my personal respect and regard for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and for the committee on which he serves. My committee has repeatedly said good-humoredly but with considerable meaning that if his committee will get to work and correct, by an orderly process, these things that are seriously hindering the Veterans' Administration, and which make it difficult to appropriate the money with any assurance that it will be used for the purposes intended by the Congress, my committee will be very glad to leave legislative questions to them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are other special orders pending.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. How does my special order come, I would like to ask?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's special order is the last.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I for one would be very glad to have the gentleman from California appear before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs some time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If that is an invitation I am very happy to accept. We have invited the gentlewoman from Massachusetts to come before our committee; she graciously consented, and gave us some very excellent advice.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like very much to have the gentleman appear later; I think it would be very helpful to my committee to have his suggestions.

THE BEREA HOUSING PROJECT

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, officiousness on the part of bureaucrats is nothing new. It exists on all levels of Government when public servants take their authority so seriously they become little dictators. Newspaper reports from Cleveland, Ohio, dated April 24, April 29, and April 30 tell the unfortunate story of Mrs. Don Walko, mother of 10, who is threatened with eviction from her home in the Berea Homes housing project unless she removes the new wallpaper which she and her husband hung on the walls of their four-bedroom home "to make my rooms more attractive."

James Bennett, manager of Berea Homes, an employee of the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority, not only threatened to evict the Walkos and their 10 children, but took an unscientific and wholly unjustified slap at a small and struggling American industry when he attempted to pose as an authority on wallpaper and its use.

"Wallpaper isn't sanitary," asserted this autocratic bureaucrat. "Wallpaper makes pest control difficult. Once vermin gets inside the paper it's difficult to get them out," he said.

As a small wallpaper wholesaler representing an extremely small industry, let me assure you that Mr. Bennett's pseudo-scientific prattling is as untrue as his grammar is atrocious. Testing laboratory evidence indicates that wallpaper tightly pasted to the wall is as sanitary as any other type of decorative finish used in the living rooms of homes today. As a matter of fact, most wallpaper adhesives contain minute quantities of preservative chemicals which would actually be insect repellent.

The Berea Homes project was financed to a great extent by Federal funds. I have reported the highhanded conduct of Mr. Bennett to the office of Albert Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, with an inquiry as to whether this policy enunciated by dogmatic Mr. Bennett meets with the approval of the parent agency, which has long authorized the use of wallpaper on homes financed by FHA mortgages.

I am also concerned with this example of dictatorship on the part of a manager of a federally financed low-cost housing project. The newspapers report that Mrs. Walko, who has lived in the project 9 years, is an immaculate housekeeper. Their small yard is green with tulips about to bloom, shrubs, and small trees. Her only crime is that she and her husband took pride in their small unit, bought tastefully coordinated wallpaper at their own expense and worked nights and weekends to bring the beauty of modern design into their home. Mr. Bennett, self-styled authority, must sense that pride of home occupancy might spread from the Walko's project because he says, "If I let her have wallpaper, everyone out here will want it."

Of course, as an eminently qualified bureaucrat, Mr. Bennett feels an irresistable urge to make sure that the taxpayers do not get what they want.

The tiny wallpaper industry has survived the competition of low-priced imports, the development of rubber base paints and modern architecture which eliminates wall space in favor of picture windows, window walls, and storage walls. I have no doubt it will survive Mr. Bennett's unwarranted and unsupported assertations. In the meantime,

I am awaiting with interest information from Mr. Cole's office on the basis of which I expect to ask the House Committee on Small Business to look into this matter of discrimination against the industry that brings low-price beauty of color and design into so many American homes.

[From the Cleveland Press of April 24, 1953]

Photograph caption: "Housecleaning time means just the opposite for Mrs. Don Walko, of Berea Homes housing project; unless she tears down the wallpaper she and her husband have put up they and their 10 children face eviction."

WALLPAPER CARRIES DESIGN FOR EVICTION

Unless Mrs. Don Walko, mother of 10, rips down all her pretty wallpaper by May 1, she is threatened with eviction. It will do her no good to point out that her home is one of the most attractive in the Berea Homes housing project. It won't help her to remind her landlord that she and her husband paid for the wallpaper and did a fine job hanging it. Her landlord is the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority, a mighty unit of government which has decreed there shall be no wallpaper in its housing units.

"There can be no exception," insists James Bennett, manager of Beria Homes. "Wallpaper isn't sanitary."

"All I want to do is make my rooms more attractive," stormed Mrs. Walko. "We've spent money and time fixing this place up, and now we're told we've got to undo all this and get out."

Mrs. Walko, 43, has lived at 848 Hazelnut Lane in the Berea project for 9 years. Five years ago she said she and her husband, an expediter at Electro-Motors Division of General Motors Corp., decided to redecorate.

"We just got tired of using the paint they gave us over here for that purpose," she said. "You can have pale green or blue or yellow. You can get white for the ceiling and that's all. It's cheap paint and drab in color. We decided to wallpaper."

The four-bedroom unit occupied by the Walkos shows the result of their work and pride in their home. The small yard is green with tulips about to bloom, shrubs and small trees. Inside the rooms are tastefully decorated with matching wallpapers. Last month in a routine inspection, according to Mrs. Walko, a maintenance man noted the wallpaper. On April 1 the Walkos got a letter from Bennett notifying them that they had 30 days to take down the paper or move.

"I'm not going to be unreasonable about this," Bennett said today. "If they want another 30 days, they can have it, but wallpaper makes pest control difficult. I have no question whatsoever about the cleanliness of Mrs. Walko's home, but if I let her have wallpaper, everyone out here will want it."

[From the Cleveland Press of April 29, 1953]

MOVE TO EVICT FAMILY IN ROW OVER WALLPAPER

Eviction proceedings against a family of 10 children began today in Berea Homes housing project, scene of the great wallpaper hassle.

That's the situation described in The Press last week in which Mrs. John Walko had put paper on the walls of her home at 848 Hazelnut Lane.

Her landlord, the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority, insists that she take it down or get out.

Mrs. Walko says the paper stays.

In fact, it was right there on the walls when a maintenance inspector visiter her home today to see if she had started taking it off.

There'll be an eviction notice in the next mail, said James Bennett, manager of Berea Homes.

The Wallpaper Institute is in the act now, too, rising with outraged dignity to the defense of their product.

Bennett explained that wallpaper is taboo in low-rent housing projects here because of the difficulty of controlling pests if the walls are papered.

"Once vermin get inside the paper, it's difficult to get them out," he said. "We don't hire men to take paper off walls. Mrs. Walko knew she was breaking a rule when she put that paper up. There can be no exceptions. Other people out there got the same notice, and they're complying."

"We're not going to touch the wallpaper," said Mrs. Walko, 8 of whose children live in the 4-bedroom suite. "We'll move first."

"This situation is a challenge to the entire wallpaper industry," said Jerry Blonder, vice president of the H. Blonder Co., wallpaper and paint distributors of 3950 Prospect Ave.

"The Wallpaper Institute will gather scientific data to refute Bennett's argument about pest control," Blonder promised.

Bennett, meanwhile, said that Mrs. Walko would get a 15-day eviction notice, giving her that long to take the wallpaper off.

If the paper is still on her walls at the end of that time, he said, the housing authority will carry the eviction case to court.

[From the Cleveland Press of April 30, 1953]

WALLPAPER EXPERTS JOIN BEREA EVICTION HASSLE

Mrs. John Walko found a powerful ally today in her wallpaper war with Berea Homes housing project. The whole wallpaper industry rushed to her defense.

Mrs. Walko is the woman who papered her home in the project at 848 Hazelnut Lane. James Bennett, project manager, told her to tear off the paper or get out.

Today, Jerry Blonder, spokesman for the Wallpaper Institute, said, in effect, it will be over the dead body of the industry that Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority enforces any no-paper rule.

Blonder, who is vice president of the H. Blonder Co., wallpaper and paint distributors, 3950 Prospect Avenue, declared it was ridiculous to ban wallpaper because pests get into the paper.

"Once vermin get inside the paper, it's difficult to get them out," Berea Manager Bennett said. "We don't hire men to take paper off walls."

"This situation is a challenge to the entire industry," Blonder rejoined. "The Wallpaper Institute will gather scientific data to refute Bennett's argument about pest control."

Meanwhile, Mrs. Walko is staying put—"and we are not going to touch the paper." She said she hasn't received any eviction notice. But Bennett said today she will get one, giving her 15 days to tear off the wallpaper.

By that time, too, the wallpaper industry no doubt will have its battalions ready for the fray.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 1, 1953]

PAPER WALLS, WILL LOSE HOME

CLEVELAND, April 30.—The Metropolitan Housing Authority started eviction proceedings today against a mother of 10 children because she put up wallpaper in her apartment.

Housing Authority rules forbid papered walls as a sanitary measure, holding that wallpaper in low-rent projects brings difficulty in controlling pests which get under the paper.

Mrs. John Walko, who said she was tired of painted walls, was given a notice several weeks ago to take off the wallpaper. An inspector visited the apartment yesterday to see if she had complied. She hadn't, so the eviction proceedings were ordered.

GOVERNMENT BONDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for 20 minutes, under previous order of the House.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE PAST 90 DAYS GOVERNMENT-BOND PRICES REACHED LOWEST POINT IN 20 YEARS—INTEREST RATES REACHED HIGHEST POINT IN 20 YEARS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 3 months the Government bonds on the market have gone lower in price than at any time in the last 20 years. During the same period of time interest rates have gone the highest of any time in the last 20 years. It occurs to me that we should look at those signs and try to interpret them and determine whether or not we should recognize them as definite warning signals. It is my belief that we are following too closely the same pattern that was followed before the three previous depressions in this country. When I say "We" I refer to monetary policy makers.

There are only two groups that are responsible for monetary policy—not the Congress, except possibly through the appropriations that it makes and the effect that the appropriations may have upon the economy of the country. Monetary policy is fixed by the Executive branch of our Government and far more importantly it is carried out by the Federal Reserve Board composed of seven members. These seven members of the Federal Reserve Board have more power to cause good times or bad times in our country than any other independent agency or branch of our Government. These seven members of the Federal Reserve Board are not selected by the people; that is, they are not elected by the people; they are appointed by the President of the United States for a term of 14 years. But they do not feel obligated to the President of the United States who appointed them. They always go out of their way, if necessary, to make it plain that they are not subservient to the executive branch of the Government or to the President who appointed them, or under any obligation whatsoever to the President of the United States.

Now the administration in power is charged with the responsibility on interest rates and on protecting the United States Government securities. I know, or at least I believe that if the President of the United States were to tell the Federal Reserve Board to support the United States Government bonds at par, the Federal Reserve Board would gladly comply with the request; I believe that; I do not believe there is a doubt about it. The President could do that, but he has his advisers. Necessarily, the President cannot know about all these things. He must have the advice and counsel of other people and evidently there are many people who believe that Government bonds should not be supported at par, that is, people in the executive

branch of the Government who advise the President. And, they are doubtless advising him not to encourage support of the Government bond market. But, I hope on reconsideration that the President's advisers will persuade him that the way to get this country back stable right now is to support Government securities at par. This can be done without any cost to the Government at all. It would save the taxpayers money. The people who bought these bonds had a right to expect that they would remain worth 100 cents on the dollar. March 1951, was the first time in more than 15 years—I have not checked it up for sure; some say 30 years, but I know it was the first time in 15 years, at least I am confident it was—that Government bonds, long-term bonds—and that is the only kind that would go down—have ever gone below par in value. But in March 1951, a policy was adopted by the Federal Reserve Board to not continue to support the Government bond market, and that has caused bonds to go down and down and down until today long-term bonds are selling for 91. Even 3¼ percent bonds, issued recently, are now selling below par. Imagine that. That should not be permitted at all. The people during this period of time, before March 1951, who put their life savings into United States Government bonds believed in the traditional policy of our Government through the Federal Reserve Board that long-term Government bond prices would be supported and they would remain at par. And, they had a right to believe that. Of course, they are told now, "Hold them until maturity and you will get par," but a lot of good people who put their life savings in those bonds will not be here at the time of the maturity of those bonds. They had a right to expect that those bonds would be supported at par, but they were not.

TAX-EXEMPT BONDS FOR GREAT WEALTH

Now then, bonds going down in value, and especially the securities known as short-term securities of our Government going up in interest rates, has caused municipal bonds to go up in interest rates, too. Last Sunday's New York Times contained an advertisement advertising the sale of bonds issued by good, strong, substantial cities in this country at a price that would yield the purchasers of these bonds 5 percent interest. They are tax exempt; the holders pay no tax of any kind whatsoever on the interest collected.

Imagine tax-exempt bonds paying 5 percent, caused by the policy that has been put into effect of not supporting and protecting United States Government bonds at par.

ADMINISTRATION MUST ACCEPT THE BLAME OR GET THE CREDIT

We are in serious danger of the big wealth of this country being driven into such tax-exempt bonds. People do what is best for themselves, and it is best for them under these conditions to invest in tax-exempt securities. You would do, probably, exactly what they are going to do if you were the possessor of great wealth. You would invest in tax-exempt securities and pay no tax of any kind whatsoever. So that is one disastrous thing among many caused by this devastating policy of the Federal Reserve Board, for which the administration must accept the blame or receive the credit, because the administration could change it.

REQUEST OF ADMINISTRATION

I call on the administration to give serious consideration to this matter. I know they have not had time to look into it as carefully, probably, as they should, but I hope from now on they will, and change this policy.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am interested in what the gentleman from Texas said about the effect of this upon the increased interest on municipal bonds. We in the city of Chicago have great difficulty in getting money for the operation of our municipal government. I wonder if the gentleman has any idea of the extent of the increase in the tax burden in Chicago and the other cities that will come from this action of the Federal Government in raising the interest rate.

Mr. PATMAN. It will be enormous. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I can give him an illustration.

Some of the largest and most substantial utility companies in the country have recently had to pay an enormous interest rate increase when they floated their new securities. The Bell Telephone Co. a few days ago refused to pay the enormous increase they would have to pay in order to sell their most recent securities that were offered. Tomorrow, I understand, Business Week magazine will send out an editorial admonishing the administration in power of the serious consequences of this act, and ask for a reappraisal and restudy of the whole program for the purpose of taking an about-face and softening up on this hard, drastic, devastating policy.

I am inserting herewith a news item on this that appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald this morning. It is as follows:

EDITORS ASK TIGHT MONEY PLAN BE EASED—BUSINESS WEEK HOLDS PERIL POINT REACHED

(By Walter S. J. Swanson, Times-Herald financial editor)

The editors of Business Week magazine, who include Elliott V. Bell, national Republican leader and fiscal expert, are asking that the Government loosen up on its tight-money program, which has brought a slump in market prices of both Government and industrial bonds.

The editors say that otherwise the country faces a dangerous financial situation.

The business publication is echoing a concern that is being felt generally in business circles to some degree, although many businessmen believe the Federal Reserve System is still on safe ground in its effort to make money dearer and believe also that the System will act quickly to ease the situation when necessary.

RESERVE HEADS OVERDOING

Business Week believes the peril point has already been reached, as it will say in a special editorial Saturday.

It contends that events in the money market last week seem to be saying pretty plainly that the Federal Reserve is overdoing the tight-money business. One development to which it might be referring was the decision of a big utility company to drop out of the new money market when it was asked to pay 3⅞ percent on prime obligations. Another was the continued slump in bond prices.

Of this, Business Week says:

"Every bank, insurance company, and other moneyed institution has an unrealized depreciation in its bond portfolio that feels like a lump of lead in the stomach, and results in freezing a portion of the assets of those institutions."

Money thus frozen cannot be put to work productively in financing enterprise.

DEFENSE BOOM CHECKED

Business Week adds:

"The Federal Reserve System has accomplished what it set out to do. It has put an end to the easy-money policy, thus halting the inflationary trend that so long held sway. It has applied brakes to the great postwar defense boom; it has put the fear of God into the money markets of the country. * * * The great limitation of credit management is that it is a good deal easier to halt an inflation than it is to check a deflation once started. * * * We are glad to know the brakes work, but we don't want to go through the windshield."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wonder if our colleague from Michigan [Mr. OAKMAN] could make a contribution on this? He was comptroller of the city of Detroit. I wonder if he can tell us to what extent this will affect the city of Detroit.

Mr. PATMAN. I would like to answer the question the gentleman asked me first.

You take the electric companies. As they have to borrow more money they have to pay more interest. What does that mean? It means they will go to the city council and ask for an increase in electric rates. It is inescapable. They must do it. What does that mean? It means higher electric rates on the consumer.

All right. The water company does the same thing. They raise rates as the interest rates go up. All of it falls right back on the consumer. Also rents will go up because whenever you raise the utility bills the rents go up in proportion, so it forces everything up with the little increase in interest rates. So it is awfully hard on the cities of this country. The city must pay higher interest; that means higher city taxes.

Now is the time if it is going to be stopped. It must be stopped right away. Otherwise, there is no way to repair the damage. If it is not stopped, we have not had any depression such as we are likely to have if this continues without anything being done to change it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman discuss for just a minute, or estimate or tell us, if he knows, the additional cost to the American taxpayer of the 3¼-percent interest rate that we are now paying for money which the Government borrows with which to refinance its maturing obligations?

Mr. PATMAN. We can take it this way. The national debt is about $260 billion. If there is a 1-percent increase, that would be $2,600,000,000. Am I correct in that? It would be $2,600,000,000.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. The national debt today is $264,500,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. One percent of $264,500,000,000 would be $2,645,000,000. One-half of one percent would be $1,325,000,000. This rate of 3¼ percent was three-fourths of one percent higher than most of the other outstanding United States Government bonds. So there with one stroke of the pen, you are setting an example to increase the interest rates on the national debt over $2 billion a year.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a result of this 3¼-percent interest rate on a billion-dollar issue, why would not everybody else who is holding long term Government bonds be entitled to get it? If they give it to one, why should not everyone get it?

Mr. PATMAN. That is a question we should pass on.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a result of this, the value of Government bonds went down so that the person buying the bonds now at 91 and 92 might get the equivalent of 3¼ percent on the outstanding bonds paying 2½ percent, for example, the 1967's.

Mr. PATMAN. That is exactly where they will go down to.

Mr. McCORMACK. They have sustained a loss on their holdings.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. They have sustained a capital loss.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, any person who paid $1,000 for a bond, could only sell it for $910 or $920. If not only affected Government bonds, but it affected the bonds of private companies. I noticed in looking through the stock market reports that all of the bonds went off correspondingly.

Mr. PATMAN. They certainly will.

Mr. McCORMACK. The result has been a loss of hundreds of millions of dollars to the bond holders of this country.

Mr. PATMAN. There is no question about that. It has already broken one insurance company. It will not hurt the banks because they allow them—it is not exactly honest bookkeeping—but the banks are allowed to carry their bonds at 100 cents on a dollar although they are only worth 91 cents. Only the banks can do it. Individuals cannot.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. OAKMAN. In answer to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts who inquired, why if one bondholder is given 3¼ percent, why should not all bondholders get it, there is a contract on each bond. If the interest rate went down, you would not ask the bondholder to come in, would you, and ask him to take a lesser coupon? The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] asked, together with the distinguished gentleman from Texas, what effect the increased rate on Government bonds has had on municipal borrowing. I am very happy to tell the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that the city of Detroit today is borrowing money at a lower interest rate than it did 12 years ago. Why? Because we have restored faith and credit in the city—something this Nation has not had in 20 years. The rates of interest today are what they are because of the profligate spending and an unbalanced budget, and because of the criticism that has been heaped upon anybody by the administration of the past 20 years who even said that a balanced budget was a decent or an honest thing. They said we were old fashioned and came from the old school. I would just like to tell the gentleman from Texas that for the past 4 years in Canada, they have been selling their bonds above par. Why? Because they have balanced their budget, Mr. Speaker, and each year for the past 4 years they have paid $500 million or more on their national debt.

When the new administration puts the finances of this Nation in the same good shape, we will not have to pay rates of interest that high. We are only paying it because you have got a 52-cent dollar.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not agree with the gentleman at all. It is a deliberate policy of forcing up interest rates. If bonds were supported by the Federal Reserve banks, as they were traditionally for more than 10 years, for at least 15 years, and no bonds allowed to go below par, we would not have to pay these outrageous interest rates.

One of the first acts passed by this Congress was to hurry through a bill to guarantee loans to banks, 9.7 percent interest on FHA modernization loans. That is bordering on usury. The whole trend has been higher interest rates, higher interest rates.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am amazed to listen to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. OAKMAN]. In other words, he is saying to the millions of bondholders throughout the United States who are entitled to the feeling that their bond is worth 100 cents on the dollar, on Government bonds at least, that we have driven them down to 91 or 92 cents, and then he tries to give the old orthodox Republican argument to cover up their own misdeeds.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, I want to say something myself. Bonds will seek their level. The 2½-percent long-term bonds went down to 92; because, if they sell at 92, it compares with a 3-percent return. But by the time they got down to 92 they made the interest rate 3¼ percent on a new issue and now they will have to go down to 88 in order for the 2½-percent bond to have a return equal to 3¼ percent. So that is where they are headed for. They will not stop at 91 or 89. They will have to go to 88 in order to compare favorably with the 3¼-percent bonds just issued.

NEW FEDERAL RESERVE BANK BUILDINGS BILL TO COME UP SOON

The Committee on Banking and Currency has reported favorably a bill to allow $20 million more to be spent for the erection of branch bank buildings for the Federal Reserve System. If this $20 million were paid on the national debt, it would save the taxpayers, based on a 3¼-percent rate, more than $2,000 a day. The money to be appropriated is actually public money—money belonging to the Government, although it is in the possession of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. It occurs to me that the Board of Governors' sponsorship of this measure is sound evidence that the Board believes that we are going into a deflationary situation, otherwise, the Board would not have recommended expenditures of money for this purpose, which involves not only more inflation if we have an inflationary condition, but scarce materials, supplies, and labor if we have an inflationary condition.

These branch bank buildings will not be used by the public, but they will be used principally for clearing houses for checks and bookkeeping operations. They will not be buildings that the public will have access to or be permitted to use, but will be buildings only visited by Federal Reserve bank officials and officials of member banks. In other words, they will not be buildings for general public use.

There are a lot of places in the United States where post-office buildings are badly needed. This money could be used for that purpose, if we are not going to pay it on the national debt.

The Members should not be deceived by the language of the report of the committee, which says:

> The bill would authorize the Federal Reserve banks to use from their own funds an additional total of $20 million for the construction of branch bank buildings.

NO AUDIT IN 40 YEARS

I respectfully invite the Members of the House to consider the arguments presented by me in minority views on the question of whose money is being used. It is as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS BY CONGRESSMAN PATMAN

Since I will have only a very short time to prepare this minority report, I shall necessarily be brief in my comments.

This bill involves $20 million for the construction of new bank buildings. It is a small amount of money compared to the earnings of the Federal Reserve banks annually or the volume of business that is done annually by the Federal Reserve System. In the hearings on the bill, I showed by questioning the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System that a congressional committee has never been furnished a copy of an audit of the Federal Reserve Board or a Federal Reserve regional bank or of the Open Markets Committee during the 40 years of the existence of the Federal Reserve System. Up until less than 2 years ago, when I raised the question before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, there had never been an independent audit of the Federal Reserve Board. Since that time, I understand such an audit has been made by auditors selected by the System's officials.

The Federal Reserve banks have tremendous power. They have the power to issue money on the credit of the Nation, which is in effect the power to use a blanket mortgage on all the property of all the people and a lien upon the incomes of all the people as a backing and as security for the issuances of money on the credit of the Nation. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing turns out Federal Reserve notes by the billions of dollars every year. These notes are put into circulation by the 12 Federal Reserve banks. Each note provides: "The United States of

America will pay to the bearer on demand $20" or whatever the denomination of the bill happens to be. In other words, the Federal Reserve bank does not promise to pay this bill. It is not secured by any assets owned by the Federal Reserve banks—that is, such assets are not depended upon for redemption—but the credit of the entire Nation is relied upon to redeem this bill, which includes the taxing power.

The 12 Federal Reserve banks, acting through the Open Markets Committee, trade non-interest-bearing United States currency, printed at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, for other United States obligations which are interest bearing, also printed at the Bureau of Engraving. In other words, these banks trade non-interest-bearing obligations, currency, greenbacks, or whatever you want to call them, issued by the United States Government, for interest-bearing obligations of the same Government. These 12 banks have about $23 billion of such interest-bearing obligations of our Government that they have secured this way.

Over the years, these banks have done an annual business running into hundreds of billions of dollars. They have had unlimited power through the Federal Reserve System to take currency and trade for bonds. The Federal Reserve System has complete control of the gold certificates that are used in the place of the actual metal that is stored at Fort Knox, Ky. The gold at Fort Knox was recently checked and all found to be there. The Government has not checked the gold certificates in charge of the Federal Reserve System; neither has it checked or audited the books of the System to determine whether or not the trillions of dollars of money that has gone through the System during the past 40 years has actually been properly accounted for.

The General Accounting Office has never audited a Federal Reserve bank or the Federal Reserve Board. I must confess my complete ignorance in that I thought, until 2 years ago, that the audits of the Federal Reserve banks and the Federal Reserve Board, required by law to be made, were filed with congressional committees. I discovered, to my amazement, that no audit of the System or any part of it has ever been filed with a congressional committee. Naturally, over the years, the law of averages applying to people working for the System that applies to all other groups, there have undoubtedly been certain practices and possibly acts of misconduct that have been engaged in. If so, they have never been brought to the attention of Congress or any department of the Government. They have all been settled within a sort of Kremlin of their own.

Audits usually disclose criticisms that are constructive. Over the years, doubtless many criticisms have been made by auditors, although they were auditors of the System, that would be helpful to congressional committees. But these audits have never been made available—not one of them—to a congressional committee. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are quick to admit that the System is an agency or servant of Congress for the obvious reason that they want to remain just as far away from the Executive as possible.

Consider the fact that this agency of Congress has not only never filed an audit of any part of its System with Congress or a congressional committee, the officials of the System object to filing any such audits with a congressional committee and strenuously object to the Government's having an audit of its own through the General Accounting Office.

In view of this situation, which I have hurriedly presented, I think the least the House of Representatives can do is to turn down this bill and all similar bills relating to the conduct of the Federal Reserve System until we know more about what the System has done in the past 40 years and until at least we have seen the most recent audits of the Board and the Federal Reserve banks.

Respectfully submitted.

WRIGHT PATMAN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

BUNDLES FOR BILLIONAIRES AND THE GIVEAWAY CONGRESS

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to sound a word of warning, knowing full well, however, that it will probably be ignored. I say that because on three prior occasions I took the time and the trouble to take the floor of this House and direct its attention to the same subject. Not only were my warnings ignored, but the very course of conduct I was protesting against is now in full swing.

The dire results I predicted are beginning to appear.

On February 28, 1951, I discussed at great length the necessity for the Federal Reserve System supporting the United States Government bond market. My remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day, volume 97, part 2, page 1695. On March 14, 1951, I introduced my bill, H. R. 3239, calling for such support of Government securities at par, and the same day I took the floor of this House and pointed out that for the first time in 10 years the Federal Reserve Board had failed to support the Government securities market. The excuse given by the Federal Reserve Board for its action then was that it was seeking to control inflation by contracting bank credit, which incidentally did not contract. I charged that that action would give the billion-dollar boys an opportunity to raid the United States Government securities market. My remarks appear in the RECORD of March 14, 1951.

On June 19, 1952, I pointed out how the big money boys were cashing in on Treasury bonds. Those remarks will be found in the Appendix of the RECORD of June 30, 1952.

On January 7, 1953, I introduced my bill, H. R. 1287, which was identical with my bill H. R. 3239 of the last Congress, and the purpose of which was to require support of the Government bond market.

Last month the Treasury Department announced that it was going to issue $1 billion worth of Government 30-year bonds on which it would pay an interest rate of 3¼ percent per annum, an increase of three-fourth of a percent over the highest rate of interest paid on Government bonds in the last 30 years.

On April 13, 1953, various Members of the other body of the Congress joined in a statement read upon the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, protesting against such action, and pointing out the dire consequences that would follow if it were persisted in. The statement appears in the RECORD of April 13, 1953, at page 2992.

The selling of Government bonds under par on the open market and the issuance of Government bonds by the Treasury Department at increased rates of interest are interrelated and necessarily have the same effect upon our economy. Both actions are deflationary and the danger is that while bringing about deflation and speeding the economy downhill into trouble it at the same time increases costs to the Government and to the consumer alike. Before this action was taken by the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board it was obvious that we had reached the top of the inflationary spiral and prices were on the way down and the economy was beginning to stabilize and normalize itself.

There can be no doubt but that those responsible for this policy must well remember the last three depressions that hit this country. They had no right to overlook, and have had forcefully called to their attention, the fact that this same course of conduct, to wit, the increasing of Government interest rates and the depressing of the Government bond market preceded and helped hasten, if not bring about those depressions.

In 1920, in 1929, in 1937 we saw the economy of the country almost completely destroyed following immediately upon the stiffening of money rates resulting in scarce money and credit and higher interest rates.

We are going through the same thing again now because the moneyed interests of the country would like to buy our bonds at less than a dollar and to sell them for more than a dollar.

This administration contends that it was elected on a platform promising economy in Government and stabilization of the economy of the country.

Actually it is pursuing the opposite course while pretending to be economy-minded.

This $1 billion bond issue will cost the taxpayers $7½ million a year more interest than they should be paying. The increase of three-fourths of 1 percent in the interest payable on these bonds will cost the United States taxpayers a total of $225 million. If it stopped there it would be bad enough, but the policy announced by the administration is that it intends to similarly refinance its so-called short-term bonds. By short-term bonds the administration means any bond that comes due within 12 years.

The total Government debt as of today is $264½ billion. If the administration refinances only $100 billion of that debt in the same manner as the last issue of bonds, the American taxpayers will pay in additional interest alone another $22½ billion.

If you want to know who will benefit by this, then look at the Federal Reserve Board's statistics and you will find that 50 percent of these higher-interest securities are held and will be held by the moneyed interests of the country. Bear in mind, too, that the interest rate on the savings bonds held by individuals is not, and will not be, increased by this action of the Treasury Department.

The results of this bad financing are already being felt. On May 5 bonds were selling at the lowest price in 20 years, and the cost to the Government for financing was at the highest in 20 years. This business of increasing in-

terest rates on Government securities does not stop with the single higher cost to Government; it increases costs like wildfire throughout the entire economy.

On April 13, 1953, Walter G. Stackler, president of the Long Island Home Builders Institute, said:

> The recent action of the United States Treasury in issuing a 30-year bond bearing 3¼-percent interest has made mandatory an increase in interest rates on mortgages insured or guaranteed by Government agencies.

On April 28, 1953, the National Savings and Loan League letter said:

> Informed official circles continue to advise that the problem of adequate GI and FHA loan interest rates is still under active discussion and consideration, but no decision has been reached at higher levels as to whether the rates will be increased.

Nevertheless, and attributable directly to the action of the Treasury Department, on May 2, Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, issued an announcement that as of May 5 the interest rate on all GI loans would be increased by one-half of 1 percent. That, despite protests against such proposed action which have been coming in from all quarters.

On April 30, 1953, the Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn sent to me a copy of a telegram dated April 29 which its president, George C. Johnson, sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to the Director of the Loan Guaranty Service of the Veterans' Administration, protesting against the intent of the Veterans' Administrator to allow a 3-percent discount on GI loans. In the same communication he pointed out that the bank has been one of the stanchest supporters of the VA home loan program, having originated and holding 18,000 loans to veterans. He said the proposed action gives rise to the possible necessity of that bank withdrawing its support of the program. He closes his telegram by saying:

> We consider the proposal of VA not only unsound but feel that it would in fact perpetrate a fraud on the veterans the VA is supposed to protect.

Coincident with the action by the Treasury Department and the Veterans' Administration we find FHA raising interest rates and the Commodity Credit Corporation raising its interest rates by one-half of 1 percent. At the same time Mr. I. W. Duggan, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, tells a House appropriations subcommittee that his Administration may increase the interest rate on farm mortgage loans.

But the damage does not stop there. Every investor will now look for higher interest rates from private industry. Private industry must compete with the Government in the money market to obtain funds with which to operate. Private loans which do not carry Government guaranties also require a higher interest rate.

When the interest rate on Government bonds goes up the interest rate for private funds climbs higher. When private industry, whether it be a manufacturer, a utility, a carrier, a producer, a wholesaler, or a retailer borrows money, the interest it pays is part of the cost of operation of business and that cost is passed on to each purchaser all the way down to the consumer. Every time the interest rate is raised for private industry a consumer somewhere will pay for it.

The net result is that the taxpayer, who is the consumer, and the consumer, who is the taxpayer, pays the bill both ways.

Every time a railroad borrows money at a higher rate it will have to seek a higher passenger and a higher freight rate. Mr. Consumer pays the bill. When loan rates go up for factories Mr. Consumer pays the bill when he buys the product of the factory. When mortgage rates go up on housing, the purchaser of the house, or the tenant of the house pays for it. The biggest lenders of funds for installment buying have hiked their rates one-half of 1 percent. That means an increase of 9 percent in the cost of carrying a $2,000 loan for 2 years.

As part of the price of every product that the taxpayer must have, whether it be wearing apparel, or food, autos, televisions or household appliances, whether it comes from the farm or from the corner store, Mr. Consumer must pay every increase in interest rates.

The dictionary definition of economy should be changed to this administration's new definition—"Bundles for billionaires."

I call these things to the attention of the Congress so the American people will know that this "giveaway" Congress condones the new policy of bundles for billionaires.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I would like to get this straight in my own mind. As I understand the distinguished gentleman, what the new administration has done amounts to taking almost a dime out of every dollar of savings American families have put into Government bonds. Does this mean that for every $1,000 in bond savings only about $900 now remains after the first 100 days—a loss of a dollar a day from every $1,000 of savings?

Mr. MULTER. In practical effect, it means just that. It also means that it destroys the confidence of every individual who holds Government bonds in this country. It destroys the confidence of that individual in the Government's fiscal policies.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I compliment the gentleman on the clarity of his presentment. He has made it perfectly clear that the average good American, saving a little for family illness or emergency, and trusting it to his Government, is paying a pretty heavy price for a change. You might call it shortchanging. His $1,000 of savings in bonds under a Democratic administration was worth $1,000. If family illness came and he needed his money he could get every cent of his $1,000. Now he can get about $900. It is so terribly disillusioning. He voted for a change and he got shortchanged.

Mr. MULTER. Yes. You must bear in mind, too, that these high interest rates are not being given to your friends and my friends, the voters of the country, the little fellows who own the smaller bonds, the so-called E bonds. This higher interest rate is given the long-term bondholders, the big fellows, the big institutions that put their money into long-term bonds.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I appreciate that the high interest rates are not going to the little people. That is what concerns me. The little people have their savings in these small bonds that the administration has permitted to drop from par to 90 and lower. The bite is on them to make possible the gravy train for the favored purchasers of the big long-term securities with the boosted interest rate. It smacks at a raw deal for the little people.

Mr. MULTER. To some people in this administration the little fellow does not count today. The administration and those in control of this policy trust that by the next presidential election they will have forgotten about that and will have become accustomed to losing money.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Even though there is temporarily a Republican administration on earth, in heaven there is still a God. What is unfair to the average decent and honest American, and makes him the victim to another's ruthlessness, cannot continue very long.

Mr. MULTER. That little fellow is going to remember. In my travels around the country since the election I found that the reaction has already set in and those who pay no heed now will suffer in the next elections.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Certainly the little fellow is not going to be very happy when he finds his own Government reaching down into his pocket and taking a dime out of every dollar he has saved. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. MULTER. I would like to believe that that is the end, but I am afraid it is only the beginning.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wonder if the gentleman could inform me if what is being done today is exactly similar to that which was done in the Hoover administration? Is it the same fiscal policy?

Mr. MULTER. Precisely the same thing. Take the Federal Reserve Board records, take the records of any of the credit agencies of the country for 1928 and 1929, and you will see that precisely the same thing was done then as is being done now.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. What the gentleman is trying to do is to save the country from the consequences that came when the same policy was followed in the Hoover days?

Mr. MULTER. That is the warning I am trying to sound.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that preceding the depression of the early twenties, the Federal Reserve Board caused rediscount rates to be increased, which caused interest rates to be increased, and on every hand you could very quickly see it going upward to the point where there was a bust. In 1920, of course, the rediscount rates went

down and those interest rates, then in a few years after that they start up again just before 1929 just exactly the same way as they are doing now. Then they had a bust. Now then in 1937, preceding that, it started up this same way. All right. Now then, that was so slight they recovered from it. Now they are doing exactly the same thing, following in the same pattern. Do you not think that if a person makes a mistake one time that can be tolerated and condoned, but the second time you would certainly question his judgment? But how can any Congress permit the same mistake and the same identical pattern to be followed the third time and cause this country to go into a devastating depression without complaining?

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman is absolutely right. But the terribly frightening thing about that is this: The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board came before the House Committee on Banking and Currency this very week and showed that he knew the history of our economics as so clearly related here today. He told us the Federal Reserve Board had approved this policy of the Treasury Department in hiking the interest rates, and they knew what had happened in the depression years just mentioned. As a matter of fact, only last night in Boston, the same Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board said that he knows that this raising of interest rates and this selling of bonds under par on the market is deflationary; it is bringing prices down. It was pointed out to him in our committee that prices were already on the way down when they developed this new fiscal policy. So, they are obviously doing this with their eyes wide open. As the Wall Street Journal said this morning, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board are doing this with their eyes wide open, knowing that they are likely to slide us into a depression.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the very able and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. When you see these things happening, I like to look for something underneath the surface. I have a feeling that the overall attack is upon labor; to try and sap the strength or the backbone of labor.

Mr. MULTER. It is certainly going to have that effect. Who is the man that is hurt first? It is the little farmer and the little worker. He is the fellow that is hurt most and worst in any depression or in any recession, and he is going to get it again.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I would like to know whether I understood the gentleman correctly, and I think I did, that this billion dollar loan will cost the taxpayers $7,500,000 more a year for 30 years?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. And our present administration claims that they are for economy?

Mr. MULTER. That is the claim; that is the way they economize. They passed an appropriation bill here a week ago and they said they reduced the budget by about $368 million. What did they do? They did not save a nickel. They postponed the payment of $368 million that should be paid into the pension fund now to keep it solvent. They postponed its payment to a future date, and that is how they tell the public they saved money. Now they come forward and spend $225 million of the taxpayers' money while yelling economy. That is what this amounts to.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I cannot see that that is economy for the taxpayers, only that it will put more money into the hands of the real rich.

Mr. MULTER. There is no doubt that that is the effect of this new fiscal policy.

SLOVAK FREEDOM RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution introduced by me today and also a statement of John T. Kmetz, former Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the grim struggle which the world has been witnessing for free self-government the Slovak nation emerges as a nation which has played a conscious and proud part in this drama of history.

During my trip to England and Europe last year as chairman of the committee investigating the Katyn Forest massacre, I met many brave Slovak patriots associated with the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia. Many escaped from behind the Iron Curtain only a short time ago with the hope to fight for democracy and thus for their own freedom and independence. I heard many stirring stories of how the people of Slovakia resist communism and how in that Slovak area of the Carpathian Mountains, a powerful underground exists and maintains itself with great courage and determination. This is an underground whose confidence and friendship we must secure in order to enhance the security of Western Europe and also the security of our United States of America in that strategically important central Europe.

Today, the eyes of all underground fighters in Slovakia are turned toward the beloved figure of their legendary Gen. Milan Rastislav Stefanik, who died May 4 under mysterious circumstances 34 years ago. The deceased General Stefanik, who in the First World War led his people out of a 1,000-year enslavement, became the symbol of the long struggle for freedom and equality of Slovaks.

Neither arrogant nor regarding himself as superior to other men, whether of his own or of another nation, Stefanik stood on his rights and on the rights of his people. One of his favorite expressions was "The average Slovak is the equal of the average man of any other country."

Nourished by such ideals of Stefanik as this, it is evident that the Slovaks not only resent but also resist the superiority imposed upon them by both Communist Prague and Communist Moscow. Slovaks do not want to be governed by anyone but Slovak leaders. That is why they oppose oppression and use any means to destroy tyranny. Hence their underground. But General Stefanik typifies the great Christian and democratic ideals of Slovaks against the soulless and mechanical statism of Communist perversion of government.

To what extent the opposition of the average man in Slovakia goes against communism—an opposition, as I said, grown out of ideals symbolized by the legendary Stefanik.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the spirit of independence is fully evidenced by the acts and deeds of the Slovak underground. I am also convinced that Americans of Slovak origin whose relatives still live in Slovakia, long to see them liberated.

Therefore, on this Stefanik Day, it seems to me that we should not stop by simply admiring and applauding the heroic deeds of Slovakia's fighters for freedom. It is in the spirit and in the name of the basic principles adopted by the fathers of our freedom that I appeal to you to help the Slovaks in their fight for freedom.

I have this day introduced the following resolution for Slovak freedom to which I hope the Congress will give favorable action:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby reaffirms the historic friendship of the American people and the Slovak peoples, with whom we share innumerable ties of kinship as well as mutual aspirations for democracy, liberty, and justice deeply felt by the American people because of the fact that the United States was founded and largely built by oppressed peoples from all countries.

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby expresses the firm conviction of the American people that the Slovak people have the right of self-determination and the right to be governed by their own consent based on the free expression of popular will in free elections, and that no nation may deprive them of their territory by force or threat of force or keep their territory by force.

(b) The Congress further expresses the firm conviction of the American people that the Slovak peoples have the right to the basic freedoms for which they have long struggled and for which, together with other free peoples in World War II, they shed their blood.

SEC. 3. To give meaning to our historic friendship for the Slovak peoples, the Congress of the United States hereby expresses the strong hope of the American people for the early liberation of the Slovak peoples from their Communist enslavement. To assist in bringing about this liberation at the earliest possible date, the President is requested—

(1) to demand that free election be held for the Slovak peoples, under police supervision of the United Nations, in order that they may, without pressure, organize their own Government founded on such principles as may seem to them most likely to effect their safety and happiness and secure for themselves the blessings of liberty; and

(2) to explore the methods whereby the American people, through their Government and by private means with Government assistance, and otherwise, may offer aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of the Slovak peoples and other Communist-dominated countries.

(3) to recognize an effective government in exile representing the anti-Communist Slovak people as well as governments in exile for the people of other nations now subjugated and enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate in my remarks the following account written by John T. Kmetz, former Assistant Secretary of Labor, concerning his visit to his boyhood home, entitled "Communism Comes to Lopuchovo:"

During the next few days we found out how things were in Lopuchovo in the summer of 1947, a few months before the Iron Curtain descended on Czechoslovakia. Also in Abrahamovce and Raslavice, two neighboring villages in the northeastern corner of Slovakia, near the Polish border. We found the people poor and hungry, even poorer and hungrier than they were almost a half century earlier when my father decided to take his family to a more promising land. But we found something far worse than hunger and poverty. We found people afraid of rule by Russian Communists in the way that children are afraid of storybook ghosts.

At first they were cautious about their fears to me. But they talked very freely once they were sure that this man who came in an automobile, wearing good clothes, really belonged to the Kmetz family and to Lopuchovo. I had brought scores of messages to these people from their American relations. There has always been a close bond between those of us who came to the Pennsylvania mines and those who remained behind in Slovakia. Once I was identified as one of the Kmetz boys who went to Nanticoke, Pa., the people took us in. As we listened to their stories of what was happening to them and what they expected to happen, we knew we were listening to the overture for another historic tragedy.

They knew that the republic founded by the elder Masaryk with the help of Woodrow Wilson was about to be taken over by the Soviet Union—that the advance agents of occupation were, in fact, already among them. They spoke in low tones but with bitter scorn of the few families from the east which had moved into their towns in recent months. Those families, whether innocent or not, were suspected of being foreign spies. Some of them doubtless were. They seemed to be natives of Russia. Why they had come to this poor valley, if not to spy and eventually to rule, nobody could have guessed. One new family in Lopuchovo was always referred to as the "bad ones." Nobody spoke his mind before the members of this family and everyone feared that the bad ones might be paying weak but otherwise good ones to report the doings and sayings of other people.

In Lopuchovo and in other eastern Slovakian villages the people fully expected what was only feared in Prague—that the Communists, backed by Russian power, would shortly gobble up Czechoslovakia. The simple villagers had read the signs more accurately than the better-informed townspeople. They knew that the police and the army already were in the hands of the Communists. They thought of all men in uniform as their enemies. When they saw planes from the military airfield at Presov and Kosice circling low over the forests, they nodded their heads knowingly; it meant, they said, that guerrillas had come out of the hills the previous night to harass the police and that they were now being hunted. The sympathies of the people were with the hunted, not with the hunters.

It was obvious even before we reached Lopuchovo that this corner of Europe was at war again—a kind of war of nerves between the native populace on one side and Russian interlopers, backed by the army and by a minority of Communist fifth columnists on the other. And this was at a time, remember, when Czechoslovakia was nominally a free Republic presided over by President Eduard Benes. Our car was stopped no less than 20 times between Presov and Lopuchovo. The driver was questioned about the identity of his passengers, about his license to drive the cab, and about his ownership of the cab. I developed a technique of pretending not to understand what was going on and then startling patrol leaders by protesting to them in Slovak and making it clear that I had understood their insulting references to the American passengers.

In the village, when we finally got there, my curiosity was aroused about the only new dwelling—a prefabricated bungalow-type house, looking oddly out of place among the ancient dwellings. It developed that this had been UNRRA headquarters for the Lopuchovo area after the war and, to judge from reports, the seat of many present evils. UNRRA supplies from the United States had been handled by two Russians. The people needed these supplies desperately after the German occupation and rejoiced when the distribution point was set up in their village. But they soon learned that UNRRA goods were high priced—that the Russians demanded chickens, eggs, and produce for soap, sugar, tobacco, and textiles. Only the favored few who embraced communism found means of buying UNRRA goods in satisfactory quantity. When one saw well-dressed men or women in this country one knew, without asking questions, that they had adopted the Russian faith.

Lopuchovo found this hard to understand—supplies from their friends and relations in the fabulously rich United States used to buy up support for the Russian Communists in Czechoslovakia. I did not have much success trying to explain it. Even in America, I said, mistakes are made and this was one of them. At least that satisfied mama who didn't pretend to understand very much about this strange new postwar world in which one was as poor as ever but in which men seemed to have heads as empty as their bellies. In the old days, under Franz Joseph and the Austro-Hungarian empire, they had been relatively free and happy; the adventurous could go to America and the contented could make a decent living from their small fields outside the village and the bounty of the forests. After the First World War, too, men had been hopeful of improvement under the republic and had plunged into the process of self-government seriously and with understanding. Now men were afraid to speak out loud. Even the priest dared not deliver a sermon on Sunday unless he spoke well of the Russian Communists—something he couldn't do in good conscience—and therefore there were no sermons.

It was at night, after the people had led their cows in from the woods and brought their fiddles out into the streets, that I got most of my information. Young men, who didn't seem so fearful of expressing themselves, and who hadn't been in evidence by day, filtered into the villages. They came in groups of three or four to mingle with the fiddlers and the singers. These, I soon learned, were the cadres of the anti-Communist Slovak underground. They did not spend much time in the homes of their parents but they helped, when needed, in the fields. At other times they were off in the mountains training to fight the Russians as they and their brothers had fought the Nazis through the war years.

"There are many of us in these mountains," they told me. "We are well trained and we are armed. We shall give them no peace."

Later in Prague, where I talked with government officials as well as businessmen and labor leaders, I was told—confidentially and secretly—that there were between 60,000 and 70,000 organized guerillas in the Carpathian Mountains of Slovakia, Poland, and Ukraine. I was further told that an uprising was planned last fall—that guerilla leaders, Slovak or Ukrainian—knew it would probably be then or never. Having seen Russian fighter planes in the airports at Bratislava Kosice and Presov on my way to Lopuchovo, I was skeptical about the possibility of a successful revolution against the incoming Communists for that simple reason that these anti-Communist guerillas were not even backed by the weak democratic parties in Czechoslovakia. But my informants told me that many of the fliers would change sides if a revolution were started.

Some of the young underground fighters, veterans of the Second World War already had been captured by patrols from Presov. Leading politicians also disappeared when Communist candidates were badly beaten in a post-war election. Once arrested, they were marched off and nobody ever heard of them again. It was taken for granted that they had been shipped off to Russia as slave laborers, just as their predecessors had been driven away to labor camps in Germany and Austria while the war was still on. But those who remained vowed that this would not stop them from training and fighting in the underground.

I asked one of those young men what had happened to the Russians who had formerly been UNRRA's administrators in Lopuchovo. "The devils got them," he said. "Anybody will tell you so. We of the hills are the devils in these parts."

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to transfer the special order of 5 minutes granted her for today to Monday next.

KOREAN VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep regret that the Korean veterans who have been returned to Valley Forge are supposed to be there for what they call "brain washing." This makes them feel there is a stigma upon them. It is very unfortunate that any such expression was used. If the national defense officials felt that the boys should be hospitalized for any reason, I wish they had just said they would be hospitalized. I understand now those boys feel that they are being taken good care of and do not feel as bitter as they did, but it would be terribly unfortunate if there should be any unjust stigma cast on the boys who fought and suffered so horribly for us. They deserve the best we have to give them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW and to include an article.

Mr. SCOTT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE and to include a concurrent resolution adopted by the 55th General Assembly of Iowa.

Mr. COON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OAKMAN and include a talk by James Cope, vice president, Chrysler Corp.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER and to include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York in three instances and in each case to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONIN and to include an editorial.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH and to include an address by the Under Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. LONG and to include a statement before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HAND in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a newspaper article and editorial about the late Senator Robert F. Wagner.

Mr. PRICE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REGAN and to include an editorial from the El Paso Times.

Mr. MILLER of California and to include a statement on the Civil Service Retirement Act and its problems and to include a table of figures.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an editorial.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) in two instances.

Mr. DELANEY and to include a speech.

Mrs. BUCHANAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. GRANAHAN and to include a resolution of the City Council of Philadelphia.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. BROOKS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RADWAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANTAFF and to include two newspaper articles.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in two instances.

Mr. WILSON of California and to include an editorial.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona and to include an essay.

Mr. MULTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. Bow) and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 18. An act to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 30. An act to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 39. An act to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 52. An act for the relief of Anny Del Curto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 106. An act for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 117. An act to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 193. An act for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 207. An act for the relief of Jimy Okuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 226. An act for the relief of Keiko Tashiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 228. An act for the relief of Irene Ezitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 252. An act to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 275. An act to further define the national transportation policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 371. An act for the relief of Georgia Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 380. An act to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 383. An act for the relief of Francisca Egurrola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 448. An act for the relief of William Junior Jami and Sachiko Suwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 484. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 607. An act for the relief of Thomas Dale Fawcett (George Yamamoto); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 639. An act to provide for the abandonment of a certain part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 674. An act for the relief of Kikue Tsurukawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 712. An act for the relief of William R. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1143. An act for the relief of Teresa Lee Tipton (Kinuko Sakai); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1147. An act for the relief of Karen Ruth Bauman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1228. An act for the relief of Patric Dorian Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1292. An act providing for the reconveyance to the town of Morristown of certain land included within the Morristown National Historical Park, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1307. An act to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1334. An act for the relief of Rev. A. E. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1376. An act to amend section 503 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1389. An act for the relief of Ami Hanada (Margaret Ami McClung); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1390. An act for the relief of Ann Marie Longworth and John Francis Longworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1418. An act for the relief of Linda Mariene Kolachny (Mariko Furue); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1446. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1514. An act to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1527. An act to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers upon the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1528. An act to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1529. An act to amend the act of July 28, 1942 (ch. 528, 56 Stat. 722), relating to posthumous appointments and commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1530. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1544. An act to repeal the authority to purchase discharge from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1545. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington Parish Burial Ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1546. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1547. An act to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1548. An act to provide for the exchange between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of certain lands and interests in lands in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1550. An act to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1608. An act to prevent the indefinite continuation of a service of a United States marshal following the expiration of his term; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled power flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to extend certain authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to Guam and to amend the National Housing Act with respect to housing in Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution to revise and reprint the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 688. An act for the relief of Takako Niina;

H. R. 720. An act for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Anneliese Else Harmine Ware (nee Neumann);

H. R. 884. An act for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi;

H. R. 955. An act for the relief of Paula Akiyama;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary;

H. R. 1186. An act for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marques;

H. R. 1193. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. James M. Tuten, Jr.;

H. R. 1704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki;

H. R. 1895. An act for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat;

H. R. 1936. An act authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter;

H. R. 2624. An act for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford;

H. R. 2936. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California, for use as a fairground by the 10-A District Agricultural Association, California; and

H. R. 4004. An act to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 71. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Olson;

S. 100. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 142. An act for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee;

S. 248. An act for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter;

S. 306. An act for the relief of Waltraut Mies van der Rohe;

S. 365. An act for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson;

S. 522. An act for the relief of George F. Ruckman;

S. 720. An act for the relief of Commander John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 811. An act for the relief of George Mauner;

S. 846. An act for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell;

S. 851. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall; and

S. 1041. An act to abolish the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KRUEGER, for May 13, 14, 15, and 16, on account of official business (committee).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 11, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

683. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the 13th Quarterly Report on the administration of the advance planning program, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 352, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 142); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

684. A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the court's orders in re *Old King Coal Company* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 11-52, pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

685. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a list of cases involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 229. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4495. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 351). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 230. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4605. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 352). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1815. A bill to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4976. A bill to extend to June 30, 1954, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 1561. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration (in Johnson City, Tenn.) to the State of Tennessee; with amendment (Rept. No. 355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4730. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, of certain lands formerly owned by that city; with amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2456. A bill to amend the act of October 11, 1951, authorizing the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2313. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter; with amendment (Rept. No. 365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Preliminary report pertaining to a survey and study of post office operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 366). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report of the General Accounting Office on the financial management of the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 367). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 978. A bill for the relief of Haruo Fukushi; with amendment (Rept. No. 358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1143. A bill for the relief of Mary Francina Marconi, Fernanda Guzzi, Anna

Ferraro, Mary Laudano, and Julia Pisano; with amendment (Rept. No. 359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1330. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu; with amendment (Rept. No. 360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2160. A bill for the relief of Clementina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gazzarrini; with amendment (Rept. No. 361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2392. A bill for the relief of Lee Kwang Nong (George Clifford Roeder); without amendment (Rept. No. 362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4110. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Weir; with amendment (Rept. No. 363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 837. An act for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky; without amendment (Rept. No. 364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 5049. A bill to provide for two additional judges for the northern district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5050. A bill to amend section 1701 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to a planetarium, or a museum, or similar educational institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5051. A bill to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell as expeditiously as possible lands acquired or being administered under the provisions of said title III to private persons for purposes not inconsistent with the provisions of the said title III, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 5052. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to expedite consideration of general rate increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 5053. A bill authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma, through its business committee, to sell and convey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Wyandotte Indian public burial ground in Kansas City, Kans.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that compensation of enlisted members of the Armed Forces shall be exempt from the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 5055. A bill to amend sections 401 and 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the establishment of food standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 5056. A bill to exempt amateur and semiprofessional baseball games and rodeos conducted by certain nonprofit organizations from the admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 5057. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1955, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 5058. A bill to clarify the deduction for income-tax purposes of allowances for salaries or other compensation for personal services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5059. A bill to allow an exemption of $25,000 corporate-income taxes on corporations which has been expended by the corporation for capital expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5060. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small-business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN (by request):

H. R. 5061. A bill to encourage expansion of business by allowing a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of certain capital expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5062. A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 5063. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 5064. A bill to authorize the return to the estate of certain decedents of property and interests devised or bequeathed to or inherited by certain persons ineligible for return thereof under the Trading With the Enemy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5065. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of a railroad annuity or pension where the individual or his spouse is (or on proper application would be) entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5066. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, to promote the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 5067. A bill to amend section 113 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for carrying charges on unimproved and unproductive real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 5068. A bill to provide refunds of certain deposits made for the purpose of obtaining credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or Coast Guard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 5069. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAND (by request):

H. J. Res. 254. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution expressing the friendship of the United States for the Slovak people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 231. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the "elections" which were held in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in 1940 and other circumstances which led to the "incorporation" of those countries into the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to a repeal of the 1952 amendment to the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, the Fulbright amendment, so-called; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to extending certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Juan Antonio Gorrono Lejarzaburu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5071. A bill for the relief of Jesus Maria Ojenola Guernica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5072. A bill for the relief of Carmen D'Ottavio, also known as Cameron D'Ottavio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 5073. A bill for the relief of Henri Suderman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 5074. A bill for the relief of Themistocles Zervos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLELSON (by request):

H. R. 5075. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Donald McIntyre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5076. A bill for the relief of Doreen McIntyre, Anne McIntyre, David McIntyre, and Robert McIntyre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5077. A bill for the relief of Sophia Nassopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 5078. A bill for the relief of George C. Sayo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5079. A bill for the relief of Nicola Adragna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5080. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Mancuso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5081. A bill for the relief of Angelo La Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5082. A bill for the relief of Zofia Kuchta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 5083. A bill for the relief of Francisco Gomez-Guzman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5084. A bill for the relief of Hugo Tamayo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 5085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tcherepnin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5086. A bill for the relief of George Eldred Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5087. A bill for the relief of Olga Rubin Donn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 5088. A bill for the relief of Carlos Nava; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL (by request):

H. R. 5089. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Billise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Magdalene Zarnovaki Austin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hedeuk Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 5092. A bill for the relief of Robert Leon Rohr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 5093. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy J. Williams, widow of Melvin Edward Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 5094. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 5095. A bill for the relief of Hugo John Kothe, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. R. 5096. A bill for the relief of Alex Premysler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

236. By Mr. GATHINGS: Petition of Piggott Community Civic Association, Piggott, Ark., requesting Congress to appropriate the funds necessary to reclean Big Slough drainage ditch; to the Committee on Appropriations.

237. By Mr. LESINSKI: resolution of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, urging the changing of the social-security law so that there would be a liberalized ceiling on the amount of income earned by people receiving social security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

238. By Mr. MILLER of California: Petition of Annie Eilenberger, asking for a redress of grievances for which there is now no remedy at law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

239. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Wisconsin Berry and Vegetable Growers Association regarding the standards of tolerance for insecticides and fungicides on food crops; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

240. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, New York, N. Y., opposing and deploring any curtailment of Federal funds for the construction of low-rent housing in the city of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

241. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

242. Also, petition of A. Fred Roberts, secretary, the Citizens-Taxpayers Association of Westerly, R. I., and Member Maine Three-Quarter Century Club, designating a day and date for observance of faith, hope, and charity; the same to be of annual provision and be dedicated or known as Douglas MacArthur Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

243. Also, petition of Miss Agnes E. Lewis, New Orleans, La., requesting passage of relief legislation that will recognize Miss Agnes E. Lewis and Miss Annie C. Lewis as heirs to certain extensive tidelands, et cetera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

244. Also, petition of president, National Urban League, New York, N. Y., requesting immediate and appropriate action to right the great wrong and voicing their disapproval of the happenings in South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1953

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and beauty, we thank Thee for eyes to see and for hearts to thrill at every sacrament of loveliness, as earth again clothes itself in the blooming garb of spring. We would pray for the beauty of holiness within and that there may be those virtues and graces which will make our own lives as the garden of the Lord. Unto our keeping, Thou hast committed a national heritage luminous with freedom's glorious light. For all the glory which is America, we bless Thy name: For borders without guns, for unity in diversity, and for equality which beckons all to the summits.

In this sacred Chamber, facing decisions of destiny, unite the hearts and minds of these Thy servants, we beseech Thee, in a mighty purpose that they fail not man nor Thee. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 7, 1953, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DANIEL and Mr. SYMINGTON were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE AND PERMISSION FOR A SUBCOMMITTEE TO SIT IN NEW YORK

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the sessions of the Senate at least during the early part of next week, for the purpose of attending hearings of the Subcommittee on the Information Program, to be held in New York City.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask the same permission for the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Information Program be permitted to hold hearings at the Information Center in the city of New York during the sessions of the Senate next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

PERMISSION TO SENATOR MARTIN TO ADDRESS THE SENATE ON TUESDAY NEXT ON A QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next immediately after the morning hour is completed I may be recognized for not exceeding 10 minutes on a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that he may be recognized on Monday next at the opening of the session on a question of personal privilege, for a period not exceeding 10 minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MARTIN subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I made a unanimous-consent request to be allowed to speak for not exceeding 10 minutes on Monday next, in connection with a personal matter. I ask unanimous consent that I have the same privilege on Tuesday of next week instead of Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact such routine business as is usual in the morning hour, without debate, speeches not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

USE OF INTERCEPTED INFORMATION IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use in criminal proceedings in any court established by act of Congress

of information intercepted in national security investigations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF ORGANIC ACT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution 46

"Whereas during World War II the Congress of the United States imposed a 20 percent excise tax on ladies' handbags to restrict consumer purchases and to preserve basic raw materials, which were then in short supply, and make them primarily available for war use; and

"Whereas this need no longer exists and the tax on handbags is a tax on a commodity which is a necessity; and

"Whereas the discriminatory taxing of a handbag works a hardship and inequity upon women only: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to immediately enact legislation to repeal the inequitable and discriminatory excise tax on ladies' handbags; and that suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman and each member of the Committee on Taxation in each House of Congress and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Illinois in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 42

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the transfer of 11.223 acres of land located at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., from the Government of the United States of America to the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has a revocable permit from the Government of the United States since September 23, 1946, for the use of 11.223 acres of land, more or less, located at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., known as the Waimano Civilian Housing, title to which property is vested in the United States of America; and

"Whereas a civilian subcommittee of the Land Use Committee operating under provisions of Presidential directive dated October 1, 1946, to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Interior Departments for the purpose of examining all land acquired by the Departments of War and Navy for military purposes in Hawaii with the object of promptly releasing to the civilian economy that which was not necessary for the national security, recommended in its report to the Interior Department return to the civilian economy of the above area under revocable permit (Folder XIX: Tax Map Key 9-17-10-35, area 11.223 acres, acquired by civil 724 et al.); and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has used the land and buildings covered by the revocable permit to provide domiciliary care for tuberculosis patients from 1946 to 1949; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has since October 12, 1949, utilized the land and buildings covered by the revocable permit as a hospital for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease (leprosy); and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has, by Public Law 411, undertaken full responsibility for the costs of care and treatment of Hansen's disease in the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the Hansen's disease program in the Territory of Hawaii is outstanding in its modern medical and sociological approach to the problems involved and has made definite progress toward the eventual eradication of this disease from Hawaii and has been commended by various authorities, including officials of the United States Public Health Service, the Leonard Wood Memorial Foundation, and health authorities of both private and public health agencies in foreign countries as being sound and effective; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has improved and renovated the grounds and buildings covered by the revocable permit referred to above for its special use in the care and treatment of patients with Hansen's disease; and

"Whereas the stability and effectiveness of the Hansen's disease control program in the Territory of Hawaii would be enhanced by the transfer of the title of the land and buildings from the Government of the United States of America to the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to enact legislation which will transfer title to 11.223 acres of land, more or less, located at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., known as the Waimano Civilian Housing, title to which property is now vested in the United States of America, to the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of the United States, the Surgeon General of the United States, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of New York, N. Y., protesting against any curtailment of Federal funds for the construction of low-rent housing in the city of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting commemorating the adoption of the Polish Constitution, at the Polish Union Hall, Buffalo, N. Y., relating to the restoration of the just rights of the Republic of Poland, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FARM PARITY PRICES—RESOLUTION OF WATFORD CITY (N. DAK.), LOCAL OF FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Watford City, N. Dak., Local of the Farmers Union, signed by Ernest Sondrol, president, and Dora B. Erickson, secretary, relating to farm parity prices.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATFORD CITY, N. DAK., *April 25, 1953.*

At a regular meeting of the Watford City Local of the Farmers Union, with a membership of 175 paid-up members, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it is generally agreed that agriculture is our Nation's basic industry, and that our entire economic structure can be prosperous only if the farmers can operate on an equal basis with labor and other industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That all the different branches pertaining to the agricultural setup over the past years be retained and strengthened, and that a basis of not less than 90 percent of parity be continued as a permanent plan; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Secretary Benson, to our Senators and Congressmen, and to our National Farmers Union president, James Patton."

ERNEST SONDROL,
President,
DORA B. ERICKSON,
Secretary.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR RIFLE-TRAINING PURPOSES—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously addressed the Senate regarding the very splendid work of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and the Office of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship in encouraging adequate rifle training among our American people.

The importance of such training is attested by experiences in every war in which the United States has been engaged. Certainly in these days when we are all so keenly aware of the relative lack of adequate preparation for civil defense, and the relative unpreparedness of our Nation to defend this continent in the event of a direct assault upon it, the importance of rifle training can hardly be ignored.

I present a letter which I have received, along with my other colleagues in the Congress, from Maj. Gen. Merritt A. Edson, with regard to appropriations for rifle-training purposes.

To the letter was attached a resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the association in March. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Appropriations Committee.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Because the National Rifle Association is the only organization, outside the Armed Forces, dedicated to marksmanship training, its members have an earnest interest in maintaining an adequate national defense. Today, as has been true for over 80 years, its primary purpose is to instruct citizens of military age in rifle marksmanship in order that they may be better prepared to render useful service in the defense of their country. NRA clubs are the instruments through which the program of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice is projected to the great mass of potential citizen soldiers.

Although any appropriation which Congress may make for promotion of rifle prac-

tice is not an appropriation to the National Rifle Association, its membership of more than a quarter million citizens is vitally concerned with civilian marksmanship. The enclosed resolution, which was passed at the annual meeting of the association on March 26, 1953, is an expression of their concern and is forwarded for your information at their request.

Sincerely yours,

MERRITT A. EDSON,
Major General, USMC (Retired),
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Whereas the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and the Office of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship were constituted by the National Defense Act of 1916 for the express purpose of promoting training in marksmanship throughout the Nation; and

Whereas, in order to carry out that mission, the act authorized the issue of Government arms and ammuntion to those citizens of the United States who by their enrollment in the National Rifle Association have manifested their desire to assist in that mission; and

Whereas the accomplishment of that mission is impossible without such issue and sale; and

Whereas both senior and junior rifle clubs have been, because of inadequate funds appropriated to the Director of Civilian Marksmanship, assisted to a limited extent only in carrying out that mission; and

Whereas experience has taught that as a result of the assistance which has been furnished by the Director of Civilian Marksmanship, members of those clubs and other members of the National Rifle Association have expended of their own funds many times the largest appropriations ever expended through the Office of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship; and

Whereas the vital task of teaching shooters, below the draft age, as well as citizens subject to the draft, in the principles of effective marksmanship and the lessons of safe handling of firearms has been greatly facilitated by the issue and sale of such Government equipment; and

Whereas the appropriation of only $100,000 for the Office of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship, while barely sufficient to keep that office open, is utterly inadequate to enable the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and the Office of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship to carry out the mission assigned to them by the National Defense Act; and

Whereas experience in World War I, World War II, and the Korean police action has emphasized and reemphasized the necessity of well-trained marksmen on the battlefield and the value of training our citizenry, before they enter the armed services, to insure that they will not be sent into combat without adequate marksmanship training: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Rifle Association in meeting here assembled urges that adequate funds be provided in the 1954 and all future budgets and appropriated to the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and the Office of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship, to enable them to carry out the directives of the National Defense Act in the marksmanship training of those citizens, of whatever age, who may now or in the future be required to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Passed and adopted by unanimous vote of the members of the NRA at its annual meeting at Washington, D. C., March 26, 1953.

Attest:

F. L. WYMAN,
Secretary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 731. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 230).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1854. A bill to provide for the deduction of funeral expenses for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1855. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

S. 1856. A bill for the relief of Alexander Abdul Ghane Tassie; and

S. 1857. A bill to amend certain statutes providing expeditious judicial proceedings for the condemnation of lands for public purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1858. A bill for the relief of Sister Antonella Marie Gutterres (Thereza Maria Gutterres); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1859. A bill for the relief of George K. Bartlett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

OPERATIONS OF FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated May 4, 1953, addressed to me by Richard C. Joyce, assistant to the president, North Dakota Farmers Union, Jamestown, N. Dak., together with an enclosure, dated May 4, 1953, addressed to me, by Richard C. Joyce, assistant to the president, North Dakota Farmers Union, both relating to the Farmers' Home Administration.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
Jamestown, N. Dak., May 4, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We wrote to you on April 14 with reference to some attacks made on the Farmers' Home Administration and carried under your extension of remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A1806.

After studying the report of the Farmers' Home Administration for 1952, prepared by Dillard B. Lasseter, Administrator, we have composed the enclosed letter and would appreciate it very much if it were carried in your extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the same prominence as the material referred to above was given.

Thank you very much for this courtesy, and best regards.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD C. JOYCE,
Assistant to the President.

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
Jamestown, N. Dak., May 4, 1593.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Your extension of remarks on page A1806, of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, have caused us some concern because certain statements contained therein are at considerable variance with the facts as disclosed in the 1952, report of the Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration.

That agency has something over $600 million outstanding against which the $29½ million administrative expense rightfully might be charged. That represents an operating cost of only 5 percent, which is rather favorable when we consider that FHA is operating almost entirely in the field of supervised credit to low-income farm families.

During fiscal 1952 FHA provided financial assistance to some 96,000 farmers who had no local source of credit available to them. They constituted only a part of the 235,000 farm families who cooperated with FHA in the supervised credit program that year.

Approximately $212 million was loaned or insured by FHA during fiscal 1952. These funds were advanced mainly for livestock and machinery; farm real estate; farm housing improvements; water facilities; and seed, fuel and repairs. These advances were made to families who could not obtain adequate credit from private sources.

Veterans receive preferential assistance from FHA as evidenced by the fact that last year 50 percent of the initial chattel loan funds were advanced to veterans and 94 percent of the appropriated farm ownership funds likewise. This despite the fact that less than half of the applications came from veterans.

A total of more than $2½ billion has been loaned by FHA and its predecessors since 1918. Something over $106 million of that indebtedness has been charged off, which is just over 4 percent of the total loaned. Most of the amount charged off was money loaned during the period of agricultural distress administered under the emergency crop- and feed-loan program. More than $1.8 billion has been repaid on principal, plus more than $245 million on interest. The interest repayments more than double the amount charged off.

Further indications of the repayment record being set by farmers who have borrowed from the FHA and its predecessor agencies is shown in the records of the old farm security rehabilitation loan program. That agency loaned approximately $1,004,870,000. As of June 30, 1952, the repayments of principal and interest on those rehabilitation loans totaled $1,008,240,000. That record appears most remarkable when we consider the circumstances under which those advances were made and the fact that most of the loans were extended during a period of agricultural distress to farm families who could not obtain credit elsewhere.

If we stress the financial aspects of the FHA program too much we lose sight of its most important function: that of providing supervised credit and opportunity to thousands of farm families who otherwise would be forced out of the only business they make any pretense of knowing anything about. Farming is their chosen field by virtue of background, experience, and natural inclination. It would seem that those people have the right to participate in the industry of

their choice, and certainly from the standpoint of a sound national economy they are contributing far more to the welfare of their Nation in that field than they would if they were forced into the unskilled labor market.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD C. JOYCE,
Assistant to the President.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Address entitled "Impact of Imports on Conservation," delivered by Russell B. Brown, general counsel, Independent Petroleum Association of America, before spring meeting of Interstate Oil Compact Commission, Roosevelt Hotel, New Orleans, La., on April 25, 1953.

Article entitled "British Ally Reveals Cold Heart," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1953.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Article entitled "Certificate of Merit Presented Fire Branch," published in the Charleston Navy News of May 1, 1953.

Article entitled "Shipyard Firemen Top Nation," published in the Charleston Evening Post of recent date.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Article entitled "Mr. Dulles and the Treaty Power," published in the Wall Street Journal of April 9, 1953.

Article entitled "The Power of Treaties: Its Threat to Constitutional Safeguards Raises National Debate," written by William H. Fitzpatrick and published in the Wall Street Journal of April 9, 1953.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

Editorial on the submerged-lands issue written by Louis Graves and published in the Chapel Hill Weekly on May 7, 1953.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Editorial entitled "Indian Citizens," from the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., of April 27, 1953.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, S. 15, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I make a preliminary statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield at this point?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator is about to speak on the proposed legislation, would he mind if we had a quorum call at this point?

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, on page 1, line 5, after the words "circuit and", to strike out "two" and insert "three."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill, as amended, provides for an increase in circuit and district court judges where such need appears to have been presented and justified. This legislation provides for the creation of 4 additional circuit judgeships and 34 additional district judgeships.

The bill is intended to supplement the judgeships provided by Public Law 205 of the 81st Congress. In that Congress additional judgeships were authorized in a minimum amount for the very minimum needs existing at that time.

In the 82d Congress S. 1203 was introduced, and extensive hearings were held thereon. This bill provided for additional judgeships, all of which are included in the present legislation. That bill passed the Senate on October 9, 1951, but did not pass the House. At the hearings on S. 1203 in the 82d Congress it was determined that the judgeships were needed in the districts embraced in that legislation. Two years have passed since those hearings, and the condition of the dockets throughout the Nation has steadily and increasingly worsened. It is my firm opinion that what was needed 2 years ago to alleviate the congestion in the courts is now a necessity if we are going to assure the litigants throughout the Nation expeditious treatment of their causes.

Members of the Senate will note that extensive hearings have been held on S. 15 and that each and all of the provisions of the bill were amply supported by the evidence induced at those hearings. In a great measure the judicial conference of the United States has endorsed the provisions of this bill and it has been stated in the hearings that as to those which have not been discussed by them, there is no objection to them.

Above all, this legislation is being reported in the belief that the changes it will accomplish will, without question, advance the welfare of the public. It must be remembered that S. 15 is not intended to be a cure-all for conditions existing in the circuits and districts but only to aid in those situations to which S. 15 relates. There can be no doubt that congestion exists in other circuits and districts, but without further evidence the committee has refrained from passing upon them.

The aim of this type of legislation is to provide for the speedy and efficient disposition of litigation before the Federal courts, in an effort to adequately serve the public. Inefficiency or inadequate personnel should not be permitted to undermine the functions of the Federal courts, for, to use an old expression, "Justice too long delayed may be, indeed, justice denied."

The Federal judiciary of the United States is one of the three major branches of this Government and its courts act daily close to the people throughout the Nation. We cannot let anything happen that will in any way tend to lessen the respect and esteem in which our courts are held. To do so is to do the United States Government a disservice and to do the people of the United States a like disservice. They are entitled to have forums to which they may appeal for redress under the law and have their causes disposed of carefully, speedily, and efficiently. Only thus can we maintain the integrity and value of our courts in the American system of government.

The additional circuit judgeships are 3 additional judges for the ninth circuit and 1 additional judge for the fifth circuit.

The new district judgeships created will provide additional judges, where needed, as follows: 1 additional district judge for the district of Arizona, 1 additional district judge for the southern district of California, 1 additional district judge for the district of Colorado, 1 additional district judge for the district of Delaware, 2 additional judges for the southern district of Florida, 1 additional district judge for the district of Idaho, 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana, 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Indiana, 1 additional district judge for the western district of Kentucky, 1 additional district judge for the district of Massachusetts, 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, 1 additional district judge for the western district of Michigan, 1 additional district judge for the district of Nevada, 1 additional district judge for the district of New Jersey, 1 additional district judge for the district of North Dakota, 2 additional district judges for the northern district of Ohio, 2 additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, 1 additional district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas, 1 additional district judge for the district of Utah, 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, 1 additional district judge for the western district of Washington, 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, and 1 additional district judge for the district of Alaska.

The bill, as amended, also provides for the creation of 1 temporary judgeship for the district of New Mexico, 3 temporary judgeships for the southern district of New York, 1 temporary judge-

ship for the western district of Pennsylvania, 1 temporary judgeship for the district of South Dakota, and——

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. CASE. I merely wish to comment on the additional judge for South Dakota.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to conclude my statement first. Then I shall be very glad to yield.

One temporary judgeship for the middle district of Tennessee.

The presently existing temporary judgeship for the southern district of Texas and the presently existing temporary "roving" judgeships for the eastern and western districts of Missouri and for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia are made permanent.

This bill also provides for a realinement of the judicial districts in the State of Michigan. It does not create any new districts but simply transfers counties from one district to another and provides for the proper places of holding court in those districts.

Provision is made for the designation, by the district judges of the district, of an additional place for holding terms of court in the southern division of the western district of Washington.

A further provision is made in section 4 of the bill that if a vacancy shall occur in the middle district of Pennsylvania while the incumbent "roving" judge appointed for the eastern, middle, and western districts of Pennsylvania under the act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 654) is serving, then such "roving" judge shall become a judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania to fill the vacancy occurring.

Section 5 of the proposed legislation provides for the term of office of the judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands to be for a term of 8 years instead of the 4 years as under existing law.

Section 6 of the bill amends sections 371 and 372 of title 28, United States Code, in the following respects: Section 371 provides that a judge or justice of the United States may retain his office but retire on full salary from regular active service after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years. The change accomplished in this amendment is to allow the judge to retire on his salary after attaining the age of 65 years and after serving at least 15 years. Thus, he may retire if either of the above situations exists. This section also amends section 372 of title 28, United States Code, so as to provide that the President may appoint an additional judge when a judge eligible to retire for disability under section 372 fails to do so.

Section 7 of the bill amends section 373 of title 28, United States Code, so as to provide that any judge of the Territorial courts who resigns after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years, or resigns after attaining the age of 65 years and after serving at least 15 years, shall receive his full salary for the balance of his life. This provision further provides that any judge of such courts who is removed from office or who fails reappointment upon the sole ground of mental or physical disability shall, upon the attainment of the age of 65, if his judicial service aggregated 16 years or more, receive, for the remainder of his life, the salary he received when he relinquished office or, if his judicial service aggregated less than 16 years but not less than 10, he shall receive, during the remainder of his life, that proportion of such salary which the aggregate number of years of his judicial service bears to 16.

Now I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I merely wished to mention—and I believe the Senator from Nevada stated it—that the additional judgeship in South Dakota is a temporary one.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I notice that in the proposed legislation no provision is made for the creation of an additional judgeship for the district of Kansas.

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. CARLSON. The State of Kansas comprises a single judicial district. I should like to read some figures which I received from Mr. Will Shafroth, Chief Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office, United States Courts. According to these figures, the case load per judge of civil cases filed in the district of Kansas was 278, as compared with a national average of 236. Mr. Shafroth states further that the number of diversity cases per judge filed in the district in 1952 was 192, as compared with the national average of 75.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada if any recommendation had been made by the Judicial Conference for an additional judge in Kansas.

Mr. McCARRAN. There was no such recommendation from the Judicial Conference. However, let me say that I have had a conference with the Administrative Office, just as the Senator has had, and it is my impression that the Judicial Conference did not have the situation in Kansas brought to its attention; at least there was no recommendation made by the conference.

Let me say to the Senator from Kansas that we went largely by, and we gave great attention to, the recommendations of the Judicial Conference because it had made a study of this matter over a number of years.

Mr. CARLSON. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield further, let me say I note that, on page 6 of the report, there is stated to be a possibility that if future recommendations come in within the year or during the present session of Congress, such further recommendations from the Judicial Conference would be considered by the Senator and the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement of Mr. Shafroth made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

The State of Kansas consists of a single judicial district. For many years it was presided over by a single district judge, but by the act of October 16, 1945, an additional temporary judgeship was provided for. Judge Arthur J. Mellott was appointed on November 27, 1945, to the position thus created, but the district again became a one-judge district with the death of Judge Helvering on July 5, 1946. By the act of August 3, 1949, a permanent additional judgeship was created which was filled by the appointment of Judge Delmas C. Hill. The total number of civil cases filed in this district has about doubled since the prewar year 1941, as shown by the figures in table 1 attached hereto. For the last 5 years, including the first half of the fiscal year 1953, the total civil cases commenced, terminated, and pending have been as follows:

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1948	491	561	219
1949	603	530	292
1950	625	557	360
1951	554	578	336
1952	555	505	386
1st half 1953	337	287	436

During this 5 year period, the increase in private civil cases, which on the average take much more time than cases in which the United States is a party, has been larger than the figures for total civil cases given above by reason of the fact that the United States cases have actually decreased during this period. The figures for the private civil cases commenced during the last 5 years and the first half of the fiscal year 1953 are as follows:

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1948	156	185	116
1949	200	180	136
1950	284	216	204
1951	239	237	206
1952	241	221	226
1st half 1953	147	99	274

The median time from filing to disposition has increased constantly since 1949 and in 1952 was 12.5 months compared with the national median of 12.1 months. This is in spite of the fact that the median from issue to trial was only 3.1 months compared with the national median of 7 months.

The caseload per judge of civil cases filed in this district in 1952 was 278 compared with the national average of 236. The difference was largely in habeas corpus cases brought by the defendants in the Leavenworth Penitentiary. These cases do not usually require much time for hearing but often the decision of the constitutional questions involved and the writing of opinions are burdensome. The number of diversity cases per judge filed in the district in 1952 was 109 compared with the national average of 75. The principal difference was in automobile personal injury cases of which 55 per judge were filed in the district of Kansas compared with the national average of 28 per judge. A considerable proportion of these cases reach trial and as they are usually tried to a jury, they take a considerable amount of time.

The criminal docket of the district appears to be in excellent shape and on December 31, 1952, there were 73 criminal cases

pending about one-fifth of which involved fugitive defendants who could not be found.

There has been a decided increase in the civil business of the district in the first half of the fiscal year 1953 as compared with the same period in the previous year. Figures for civil cases filed in the two periods are as follows:

Fiscal year	Total civil			United States civil			Private civil		
	Commenced	Terminated	Pending	Commenced	Terminated	Pending	Commenced	Terminated	Pending
1st half 1952	256	216	776	139	115	154	117	101	222
1st half 1953	337	267	436	190	188	162	147	99	274

Respectfully submitted.

WILL SHAFROTH,
Chief, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office, United States Courts.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Kansas that I have just been informed that the Judicial Conference is in session today, and probably will be in session for several days. I mention that simply in order that the Senator from Kansas may be advised.

Mr. CARLSON. I merely wish the RECORD to show, Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield further to me, that the Federal court in Kansas is doing more work than is done on the national average, which is based on a considerable number of judges. Thus, if we are to create more judges, I think the situation in Kansas should be called to the attention of the Judicial Conference. I am not offering an amendment, but I ask that this matter be called to the attention of the committee and the Judicial Conference.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to express our appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the committee, our good neighbor to the north, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and also to the distinguished former chairman of the committee, our good neighbor to the west, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], for having provided in the bill for an additional temporary judgeship for the district of South Dakota. In that connection, I wish to point out that that provision will not require an additional appropriation of funds, but is simply an arrangement for a judge to retire after he has reached advanced years and after he has rendered splendid service to the public.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the portion of the committee report dealing with the situation in South Dakota.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The bill, as amended, provides for an additional temporary judgeship for the district of South Dakota.

Civil cases filed in the district of South Dakota have increased from 78 in 1941 to 189 in 1952. United States civil cases filed during this same period have increased from 52 in 1941 to 143 to 1952. Private civil cases have increased from 26 to 46 and criminal cases have remained about the same in number, 155 having been filed in 1941 compared with 148 in 1952. Filings during the first half of the fiscal year have increased to 102 from 88 in the like period in the previous year, an increase of 16 percent. Criminal cases have increased during the same period from 60 to 91, an increase of 52 percent. The pending civil cases which was 68 on June 30, 1941 have increased to 161 on June 30, 1952, and criminal cases from 39 to 91 during the same period. The civil caseload per judgeship in 1952 was 189 compared with the national average of 236. The number of United States civil cases filed per judge was 143 compared with the national average of 110 and private civil cases were 46 compared to the national average of 126. Criminal cases were 148 compared with the national average of 177. The percentage of civil cases terminated after trial in which less than 6 months had elapsed from filing to disposition was considerably greater than the national average and the percentage of these cases in which the interval from issue to trial was less than 3 months was also greater in South Dakota than in the Nation as a whole giving some indication of a satisfactory docket position. It should be added that there have been a considerable number of condemnation cases filed in this district and since many tracts are often included in a single case, the burden of these cases is not adequately reflected in the statistics of cases filed.

The present judge qualified for his position on May 19, 1929, and is approximately 79 years old. While his health is considered to be good, the weight of the workload is bound in time to have its effect. The present judge was eligible for retirement 9 years ago, and by remaining on the bench has materially aided the Government from a financial standpoint. However, as indicated by the statistics, the pending caseload has doubled, so that if there is to be an alleviation of this situation added judgepower is necessary.

It will be noted that this provision provides only for a temporary judgeship, so that upon retirement of the present judge the judge power of the district will return to one. Attention is invited to appendix 21 for facts and statistics relating to this provision.

The committee is of the opinion that under the circumstances a temporary judgeship for the district of South Dakota is warranted.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to say that I think the distinguished Senator from Nevada has done an excellent job on the bill. He has worked on it for months. The provisions of the bill are in line with the definite needs of the Nation, to wit, for more judges in order to expedite the handling of the essential work of the Federal courts. I commend the Senator and the committee for the bill, and I take pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, there is one provision of the bill in particular to which I should like to call the attention of the Senate. After all, human nature is human nature, wherever we may find it; and we find that the men on the bench who have served arduously and long may on occasions, in certain instances, become incapable of carrying the load. For many reasons, they may not wish to retire. Frequently that reason is because of financial conditions; and they do not retire, although they are unable to carry the load, and they realize it, and others realize it. Nature takes its toll on us, wherever we may serve.

The question has been as to how we could deal with that subject. The bill contains a provision that where a condition of that kind exists the judge of the district or the chief judge may certify to the Department of Justice, and the President may appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, a judge to serve in that district. Such appointment will not remove the judge against whom the impediment may lie; in order to remove a judge, impeachment is about the only course. So the course here proposed would not remove him; he would remain as he was, namely, still a judge; but another judge would be appointed; and when a vacancy took place, no additional judge would be appointed.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to that feature of the bill because it is a slightly new one. It is one which the chairman of the subcommittee tried to work out as best he could, in order to see whether we could meet a condition which every Senator realizes exists. I do not wish to mention specific instances, because that would not be best. However, Senators know of instances in which such conditions have arisen. The result is that the caseload keeps piling up and the litigants are deprived of their day in court. Such a condition is unfortunate, but we cannot help it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The situation referred to by the distinguished Senator from Nevada undoubtedly arises from time to time. It has done so throughout the entire history of our government. We have had judges who were disabled and who were entitled to retire, but who refused to retire. Time and again, when that situation has existed, the Congress of the United States—which, under the Constitution, is charged with the responsibility—has created additional temporary judgeships. I assume that probably some of the judgeships provided for in the pending bill may fit into that category.

I may say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nevada, that I am very apprehensive about that particular phase of the bill. It seems to be an abdication by Congress of its power and authority to the Judicial Council or to the Chief Justice of the United States or to the chief judge of the Court of Claims or of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. So I am very apprehensive about that provision of the bill.

Of course, Congress cannot move as rapidly as could the Chief Justice, in certifying that a judge was disabled. However, I do not think any great deprivation would result from leaving the power to create such temporary judgeships where it is vested under the Con-

stitution, namely, in the Congress of the United States.

The provision referred to by the Senator from Nevada certainly constitutes a radical departure from any provision which has been submitted to the Senate heretofore in my service in the Senate.

Furthermore, the provision does not apply to the Supreme Court of the United States. What would be the case if some member of the Supreme Court were disabled, but refused to retire? It would be necessary to have Congress pass a bill to take care of that situation.

I do not like the constant delegation, in the name of expeditious action, of the power which Congress has under the Constitution of the United States. If we are going to be governed entirely by the need for speedy action, then Congress should be abolished, because one man can move much more rapidly than can a legislative body.

So I am very much disturbed by this provision of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that is the reason why I especially drew the provision to the attention of the Senate, because it is new and is novel. Let me also say there is no Member of the Senate who is more opposed than I am to centralized authority.

However, I have seen this situation so long that I did try to find a solution for it. If the Senate believes my proposed solution is not a good one or that we would be sacrificing too much of democratic government in order to expedite, I am not wedded to the suggestion. I am only trying to solve a problem.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator from Nevada will not press for the adoption of this provision of the bill. Here we are creating 38 new judgeships, some of whom are to meet conditions along the line of the one referred to by the Senator from Nevada as being the reason for proposing this provision of the bill. Certainly we are going a long way when we delegate to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and, particularly to a Judicial Council in the case of circuit and district court judges, the power to determine whether a judge is disabled and, in effect, the power to create a new judgeship in the Federal judiciary. Such an arrangement would amount to giving to the Judicial Council, which of itself is a creature of the Congress, I believe, a power which, in my opinion, is vested solely in the Congress, under the Constitution of the United States, which provides that Congress shall from time to time ordain and establish such inferior courts—that is inferior to the Supreme Court—as it may see fit.

Mr. McCARRAN. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that nothing is lost, since all Judicial Council or the chief justices would do would be to certify that the condition already exists. The President would then make a nomination which would come to the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, under the Constitution, confirmation could not be waived. The Congress itself cannot by statute waive the confirmation power. We have from time to time waived nearly all other powers that we have, but that is one that we cannot waive by statute. It would require an amendment to the Constitution in order to waive the power of confirmation vested in the Senate by the Constitution.

Mr. President, it seems to me the pending proposal involves another delegation of congressional responsibility, a delegation to the very persons who are affected by it. It is a proposal to permit the judicial branch of the Government to assume unto itself the power to say when new judges are needed, whereas, according to the division of powers existing under the Constitution, it is purely a congressional prerogative and a congressional function and duty to act. I think enactment of such a measure would establish a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I have merely drawn his attention, and the attention of the Senate, to the facts. I am not wedded to the provision. I am not responsible for the facts. If the argument is not deemed cogent, I am perfectly willing to eliminate the provision from the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from Nevada move to eliminate it, or does he wish me to offer an amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am agreeable to its being done either way. If the Senator wishes to make a motion, I will go along with it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Nevada does that, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia what he would do with a situation which developed before the committee. The testimony showed that in one State, a short time ago, there was but one Federal judge in the entire State. The judge was childish. The lawyers agreed that he was childish, yet there was no way of getting rid of him, except by impeachment proceedings.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not saying there should not be a new judge under such conditions.

Similar conditions have arisen since the very earliest days of the Republic.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. When Federal judges have become incapacitated, what has happened? The matter is brought to the Congress of the United States with a request for an additional judge, on a temporary basis, and the Congress has done what was asked, under the power vested in it. There will not be any great lapse of time when Congress will not be in session. I submit that even if there were involved a delay of 2 or 3 months in the appointment of a judge, before the Congress could act, that would be better than to give to one branch of the Government power to expand itself and to pass upon the need for new and additional judges.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that the subject was debated for a long time in committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I call attention to the fact that the presiding judge in a circuit has authority to designate a special judge, when necessary, in order to dispose of cases on the docket. Is that not correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is correct. But the proposal in the pending bill is to create 38 new judgeships. The enactment of the bill should certainly eliminate any grave danger of a delay of justice. I have served in this body for some time, and I have seen many Federal judgeships created. We are largely guided by the recommendations of some of the judicial agencies in creating new judgeships, but I see no reason to give to the judiciary the power—if we can give it under the Constitution—to create new judgeships. There might be a judge who, in the judgment of the Judicial Council, or some judge, should be denied the power to sit as a judge. The Judicial Council might claim he was disabled when, in fact, he was not disabled, and thereby exclude him from presiding. The Congress and the Congress alone should determine an issue of this nature.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I may say the distinguished Senator from Nevada has stated that he is not wedded to the provision now under consideration. But a situation in two different States has been brought to our attention, in which there ought to be a way, without impeaching a judge, by which another judge might be called in.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending bill contains no provision for getting rid of a judge. It merely proposes to create a new judgeship. I say it is a function of the Congress to create new and temporary judgeships, not of the judicial council or of the Chief Justice of the United States or of the chief judge of the United States Court of Claims. It is a function of the Congress of the United States, and it is a function we can meet and discharge if the occasion requires.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think there is much in what the Senator from Georgia says. I have thought about this subject a great deal for a long time, and I have been trying to find a solution for the condition which I have depicted to the Senate. I want the Senate to act on the committee amendments first. After that has been done, I shall offer an amendment to delete the language commencing on line 7, page 14, down to and including line 5, on page 15.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I hope the committee will give the matter further study. I do not think the Senate should, on such brief notice, make such a drastic departure as is proposed. I appreciate the fine spirit of fairness on the part of the Senator from Nevada in bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate. It is consistent with the record the Senator has made here at all times, and I am grateful to him for agreeing to defer the matter for further discussion.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill, I may say that I was engaged on other committee work and was unable to hear much of the testimony and discussion in the committee,

I have been reading the bill this morning and find serious question about one particular feature of it. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Georgia brought it up, and I appreciate the attitude of the chairman of the subcommittee in being willing to strike from the bill the provision which I think should be eliminated.

There is another possibility that enters into the consideration of a subject of this kind. If a judge knows that another judge will be appointed to do the work of his court, and that he can remain on the bench at full salary, there is a temptation to him not to retire, particularly if he would be required to go on a half salary basis upon retirement. It seems to me that is another abuse which might possibly occur, although I do not think we have any judges at present who would do that.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in no event could we take away the retirement benefits of a judge who was being superseded. So it seems to me that the simplest and best way to proceed is to follow the established practice whereby, in case a judge in a certain district is disabled, an additional judge is provided, but without succession, so that there will be no increase in the number of judges when the disabled judge in question passes away. But so long as he is living, he draws his salary under the provision for retirement benefits. I think that would be much preferable to vesting such authority as that proposed in any particular officers connected with the judicial branch of the Government.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "and", to strike out "two" and insert "three."

The amendment was agreed to.

The remaining committee amendments were, on page 2, line 7, after the word "Ninth", to strike out "Nine" and insert "Ten"; in line 10, after the word "Senate", to insert "one additional district judge for the district of Arizona"; in line 14, after the word "Delaware", to strike out "one" and insert "two"; in line 15, after the word "district", to strike out "judge" and insert "judges"; in line 16, after the word "Florida", to insert "one additional district judge for the district of Idaho"; in line 19, after the word "Indiana", to insert "one additional district judge for the western district of Kentucky, one additional district judge for the district of Massachusetts, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, one additional district judge for the western district of Michigan"; on page 3, line 1, after the name "New Jersey", to strike out "one" and insert "one additional district judge for the district of North Dakota, two"; in line 2, after the word "district", to strike out "judge" and insert "judges"; in line 6, after the name "Texas", to insert "one additional district judge for the district of Utah"; in line 7, after the word "one", to insert "additional"; in line 9, after the word "eastern", to strike out "and western districts" and insert "district"; after line 11, to strike out "(2) The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the western district of Virginia shall not be filed."; in line 14, to change the subsection number from "(3)" to "(2)"; on page 4, line 5, to change the subsection number from "(4)" to "(3)"; after line 10 to insert:

Arizona	3

In line 23, after "Southern", to strike out "4" and insert "5"; at the top of page 5, to insert:

Idaho	2

After line 6, to insert:

Kentucky:	
* * * * *	
Western	2
* * * * *	
Massachusetts	5
Michigan:	
Eastern	6
Western	2

After line 23, to insert:

North Dakota	2

On page 6, line 2, after the word "Northern", to strike out "5" and insert "6"; after line 13, to insert:

Utah	2

After line 17, to strike out:

Western	1
Eastern and western	1

And insert:

Eastern	3

On page 7, line 12, after the word "Senate", to strike out "two" and insert "three"; at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "two" and insert "three"; after line 15, to insert:

(3) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

(4) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the district of South Dakota. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

In line 25, to change the subsection number from "(3)" to "(5)"; on page 8, after line 4, to strike out:

(4) The second sentence of section 102 (a) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows: "Court for the northern division shall be held at Bay City, Port Huron, and Flint."

After line 8, to insert:

(6) (a) Section 102 (a) (1) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The southern division comprises the counties of Hillsdale, Jackson, Lapeer, Lenawee, Livingston, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, Sanilac, Washtenaw, and Wayne.

"Court for the southern division shall be held at Detroit."

(b) The second sentence of section 102 (a) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Court for the northern division shall be held at Bay City, Port Huron, and Flint."

(c) Section 102 (b) (1) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The Southern Division comprises the counties of Allegan, Antrim, Barry, Bensie, Berrien, Branch, Calhoun, Cass, Charlevoix, Clinton, Eaton, Emmet, Grand Traverse, Ingham, Ionia, Kalamazoo, Kalkaska, Kent, Lake, Leelanau, Manistee, Mason, Mecosta, Missaukee, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newaygo, Oceana, Osceola, Ottawa, St. Joseph, Van Buren, and Wexford.

"Court for the Southern Division shall be held at Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, and Mason."

(7) The second sentence of section 125 (a) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Court for the Central Division shall be held at Salt Lake City and Cedar City."

On page 9, line 13, to change the subsection number from "(5)" to "(8)"; in line 19, to change the subsection number from "(6)" to "(9)"; on page 10, line 3, to change the subsection number from "(7)" to "(10)"; in line 10, to change the subsection number from "(8)" to "(11)"; on page 15, line 15, after the word "of", to insert "the United States District Courts for the District of Hawaii and Puerto Rico"; and on page 16, after line 20, to strike out:

SEC. 2. (a) The United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code shall henceforth be courts of the United States with judicial power derived from article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the terms of office of the district judges for the Districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico in office at the time of approval of this act shall then terminate and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the District of Hawaii and one district judge for the District of Puerto Rico, all of whom shall hold office during good behavior.

(b) The amendments made by this section shall not affect the right of any judge who resigned, retired or failed of reappointment prior to the enactment of this act or who fails of reappointment under this section to continue to receive salary under the provisions of section 373 as originally enacted. Service as a judge of the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii or of the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico or of the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico shall be included in computing under sections 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in commission as a judge of one of said courts on the date of enactment of this act or who may thereafter be appointed as a circuit judge under section 44 or a district judge under section 133 of title 28, United States Code.

(c) The second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico."

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 14, commencing with line 7, to strike out the language down to and including line 5, on page 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, beginning with line 7, it is proposed to strike out:

(b) Whenever any judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good

behavior who is eligible to retire under this section does not do so and a certificate of his disability signed by a majority of the members of the Judicial Council of his circuit in the case of a circuit or district judge, or by the Chief Justice of the United States in the case of the chief judge of the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or Customs Court, or by the chief judge of his court in the case of a judge of the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or Customs Court, is presented to the President and the President finds that such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of permanent mental or physical disability and that the appointment of an additional judge is necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, the President may make such appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Whenever any such additional judge is appointed, the vacancy subsequently caused by the death, resignation, or retirement of the disabled judge shall not be filled. Any judge whose disability causes the appointment of an additional judge shall, for purposes of precedence, service as chief judge, or temporary performance of the duties of that office, be treated as junior in commission to the other judges of the circuit, district, or court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] wishes to be heard in connection with this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Pennsylvania had an amendment he wished to offer.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I did not have an opportunity to appear before the committee. The situation in Pennsylvania is that there is a great deal of work in the courts, and there is a question as to whether the roving judge should be eliminated at this time. Of course, he is not to be eliminated until there is a vacancy in the middle district, but if there should happen to be a vacancy in the middle district, he would immediately be eliminated. At the present time there is great congestion of work in both the eastern and western districts. I thought it might be wise to eliminate the section which covers that situation, but I have about concluded that I will not offer such an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 5, after the comma, it is proposed to insert the following: "one additional district judge for the district of Puerto Rico."

On page 6, line 8, strike the asterisks, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Puerto Rico..... 2

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to the bill under consideration which will provide for an additional district judge for the district of Puerto Rico.

This district at the present time has one judge, and the caseload in the court has been varied. In 1941 there were 1,604 civil cases commenced and throughout the years that number vacillated to a low of cases commenced of 219 in 1947. This low figure approximates the average caseload per judge on the national average of 236 civil cases per judge for the year 1952. In 1952, however, the cases commenced in Puerto Rico numbered 646 and in the first half of 1953 the number had risen to 1,166. While a memorandum from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts indicates that the type of cases dealt with were normally disposed of more quickly than the average civil case, the cases dealt with by the court is nearly five times the average of cases commenced over the Nation.

The number of pending civil cases in 1941 was 230 and this figure has risen to 453 in 1952 and 521 in the first half of 1953. These figures show that even though the great majority of the cases are disposed of, the backlog of pending cases are increasing. While the court is making every effort to keep the dockets current, it is not possible to dispose of the backlog or keep it from increasing.

As to the criminal side of the docket, those cases approximate the national average of 177 for the district of Puerto Rico, which had 161 in 1952. Often in the past the criminal cases have exceeded the national average. When these cases are added to the civil cases, it can readily be seen that there is a tremendous amount of work before the court. This volume of work not only is a tax upon the health of a judge but may incline a court inadvertently to sacrifice quality for quantity. This we should not allow to happen, nor should we even allow a condition to exist in which it could happen.

In addition to what I have said, there is a condition in the district of Puerto Rico that further complicates the whole matter.

When the Federal district judge of this district finds himself disqualified to hear a case, there is a provision in the United States Code to the effect that in the case of a vacancy or the death, disability, or absence for other cause on the part of the judge of the district court, the President is authorized to designate one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico to act as a district judge during the period of absence or disability of the regular judge. We have here a situation wherein a Territorial judge takes over the duties of a United States district judge.

Since last year we gave Puerto Rico the right to act under its own constitution, which provides that a judge or any other public officer cannot hold two offices, a judge on the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico is certainly going to hesitate in the future to hold court for a Federal district judge, because someone may raise the question that he is exceeding his authority. That is another complication which has arisen during the past year.

In a letter addressed to me by Chief Judge John Biggs, Jr., of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit he stated that he was informed that there was a feeling among the justices of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico that they should not sit in the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico under that statute, for fear of possible disqualification in their own court. Possibly a judge could be assigned from the first circuit to take the place of the absent or disqualified judge and avoid this difficulty, but that, of course, is no solution to the situation, because this would simply mean the taking of a judge in the first circuit away from the business of his own court. The addition of another judge to the District Court of Puerto Rico would take care of this situation as well as provide additional aid in the work of the present judge in an effort to reduce the backlog.

I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this legislation and am informed that insofar as they personally are concerned this amendment will be acceptable to them.

I have, therefore, offered this amendment to the bill in the hope that it will meet with the favorable consideration of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the hearings conducted quite at length brought nothing to our attention concerning Puerto Rico. The Judicial Conference evidently gave no consideration to the problem referred to by the able Senator from South Carolina. From the statistics he has read, it seems to me that there is merit in his amendment. Therefore, so far as I personally am concerned, I will offer no objection to it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] in the amendment he has offered. I am happy the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has agreed to accept it.

Puerto Rico has a population of 2,500,000. Possibly 250 or 300 American concerns have gone to Puerto Rico in recent times. The backlog of work of the Federal court there certainly has increased. So I hope that in justice to the United States judge and in justice to the people of Puerto Rico, the Senate will agree to the amendment suggested by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to read the backlog of cases in Puerto Rico. In 1951, it was 151; in 1952, it was 453; in 1953, at the present time, it is 521.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I think there is merit in the contention of the Senator from South Carolina and in the amendment offered by him. I was in Puerto Rico last January and talked with a number of leading lawyers about the situation in the court there. They were quite well pleased with the activities of the present judge, and felt he was doing well, but they did mention the fact that his court had a pretty heavy caseload. I think if such

an amendment had been called to the attention of the committee, it would have been accepted. I join with the chairman of the committee in saying that I personally would be willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada if there are any existing provisions, rules, or regulations whereby the resignation of a Federal judge may be requested.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; Federal judges are appointed to serve for life, except that they may be impeached.

Mr. HUNT. Would the distinguished Senator from Nevada agree with me that the work of the Federal courts could be greatly facilitated if there were some method whereby a judge would be required to meet certain physical and and mental qualifications in order to show he was capable to continue functioning as a judge?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think there is much in what the Senator has in mind, but the Constitution and statutes provide for the Federal courts. Under the Constitution, Federal judges are appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. After their appointment, they serve for life, and the only one way they can be removed is by impeachment, and the impeachment must be for certain specified reasons. That was one of the things I was aiming at in the provisions of the bill which I have mentioned and to which I indicated there was valid objection.

Mr. HUNT. Could not Congress by legislation provide a method whereby a judge who was incompetent for any reason whatsoever could be removed from his judgeship?

Mr. McCARRAN. That has been a matter of study and of thought on the part of many people for a long time. I have grave doubt that it could be done without a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the distinguished Senator for answering my questions.

For a long time I have been of the opinion that, not only in the Federal courts, but also in some State courts, the practice of allowing a judge to be appointed for life was unsatisfactory, because the work of his court may suffer, and persons having litigation before his court may not be able to have it properly disposed of. At present no way exists whereby an incompetent judge can be removed. A Federal judgeship is the only privileged office I know of in which an incumbent who becomes physically incapacitated cannot be required to give up his position.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 15) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMMISSION TO REGULATE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION OF PASSENGERS IN THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada does not object, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is very anxious to leave the Chamber, and would like to have called up first the bill to provide for a commission to regulate public transportation of passengers in Washington, D. C. I understand the Senator from Virginia desires to make a brief statement against the bill. He does not otherwise oppose it. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Nevada, I shall ask to have that bill called up first, and then move to take up the immunity bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. The only point I make is that I have asked permission to be absent after Monday.

Mr. TAFT. I see no reason why all three of these bills should not be dealt with completely today.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 142, S. 922.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 922) to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Millikin
Anderson	Hennings	Monroney
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Hill	Murray
Bricker	Hoey	Neely
Bridges	Humphrey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Payne
Byrd	Jackson	Potter
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Purtell
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Clements	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Cooper	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Kuchel	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	Magnuson	Thye
Fulbright	Malone	Tobey
George	Mansfield	Watkins
Gillette	Martin	Welker
Goldwater	Maybank	Wiley
Gore	McCarran	Williams
Griswold	McCarthy	Young
Hayden	McClellan	

Mr. TAFT. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] are necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from Texas [Mr. DANIEL and Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 922) to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on March 20, 1953, and subsequently reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, through the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who is in charge of the bill, I am privileged to make a brief statement of my opposition to the bill, in order that the debate may be somewhat shortened. When the Senator in charge of the bill presents his reasons for its favorable consideration by the Senate, he may at the same time analyze the reasons I shall advance for the motion I intend to make to recommit the bill.

The junior Senator from Virginia recognizes that a problem exists. He knows, for instance, that in the metropolitan area some complaint has been made that public-service companies in Maryland, for example, have curtailed facilities too much, and that some complaint has been made that Virginia companies have not worked out a through rate, as a result of which in the case of a trip into Washington, with a part of the trip in Washington and the remainder of it in Virginia, instances occur when a passenger pays a full fare in Virginia, and another full fare in the District, the trip thus costing more per mile than the same trip probably would cost if it were made wholly within the District.

The junior Senator from Virginia is eager, of course, to have the matter fully explored and properly settled.

The pending bill, which would provide for establishment of a new commission to regulate public transportation of passengers within the Washington metropolitan area, was introduced on February 13 and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which reported it to the Senate on March 20 without holding a public hearing, but merely considering it in executive session.

Because of this hurried treatment, when the bill came up on a call of the calendar on March 30, it was referred to

the Committee on the District of Columbia for further study, but, unfortunately, that committee was instructed to report back to the Senate within 2 weeks. Later the committee was given an additional week to consider the bill, but only one brief hearing was held and so little notice of that hearing was given that the Virginia State Corporation Commission, which is opposed to the bill, did not have an opportunity to send its counsel to the hearing and the attorney for one of the principal transportation companies involved, which operates in Virginia and the District, stated that he was not prepared to present the views of this company and had to ask permission to file a statement at a later date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of the statement signed by the three members of the Virginia Corporation Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF VIRGINIA IN OPPOSITION TO SENATE BILL 922

The State Corporation Commission of Virginia is opposed to the proposed legislation as set forth in Senate bill 922 because it is unnecessary to set up an independent commission with the expense that will be attached thereto.

The State Corporation Commission of Virginia has jurisdiction over all forms of intrastate transportation in Virginia. We are thoroughly familiar with motor transportation within the metropolitan area as defined in S. 922. We have, as agent of the Governor of Virginia, operated both of the motor vehicle common carriers serving this area when it became necessary for the Governor to take over these operations because of labor disputes, as it is his duty to do under the Virginia labor relations law. Service was continued by the State to the essential users and a complete tieup of the traffic was avoided. There is no provision in the pending legislation for any relief if these carriers should become involved in a strike which will most likely arise when the present contracts expire. We know that there is much complaint as to the service in some parts of this area in Virginia and, of course, there are some complaints as to rates and always will be. We believe that the cost of service to the public will not be reduced if this legislation is enacted. It will take much more than the proposed authority under S. 922 delegated to the commission provided for therein to reduce the cost of service or to improve the service the public is now experiencing.

However, if it should be decided that the transportation systems operating within the metropolitan area of Washington should be independently regulated or coordinated, then a representative from the commissions of Virginia, District of Columbia and Maryland and the Interstate Commerce Commission should be designated to supervise and regulate such coordinated service. It is wholly unnecessary to set up an independent commission at great expense to the Government when for a very nominal expense this service can be performed by the jurisdictions involved. We do not believe that there is any meritorious reason for any independent regulation of these carriers. The jurisdictions involved can do a better job than any new commission as proposed in S. 922.

So far as the Virginia commission is concerned we have had excellent cooperation between the State of Virginia, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and the Interstate Commerce Commission and we believe the interests of the public have been reasonably well served as well as protected. The creation of a new commission as proposed would be confusing to the public and be added expense on the transportation companies serving this area for which added expense the public would have to pay. Whenever new commissions are created added burdens and expenses are incurred which must be paid for by the public. It cannot be seriously questioned that the jurisdictions involved can do a better job of regulating the motor carriers for the transportation of passengers in this area than any new commission.

It is quite clear that this is another proposal that the Federal Government duplicate and encroach upon State regulation which, in our opinion, is detrimental to the best interests of the public.

We have no objection to H. R. 2236 which proposes a commission to make a study of this matter and report to the Congress. In fact, this is the only wise way to do it. Get the facts rather than to take a leap in the dark as is proposed by S. 922.

STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF VIRGINIA,
By W. MARLAN KING, *Chairman.*
RALPH T. CATTERALL, *Commissioner.*
H. LESTER HOOKER, *Commissioner.*

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in this statement the State Corporation Commission of Virginia expresses opposition to the proposed Metropolitan Transportation Commission, because it is unnecessary and would involve needless expense. They recall that there have been occasions in the past when it was necessary for the Governor of Virginia to take over operations of bus lines in the Arlington-Alexandria area when labor disputes disrupted necessary public service, and they point out that S. 922 makes no provision to deal with future situations of this kind.

The Virginia commission also states that if independent regulation and coordination of the transportation systems in the Washington area is needed, this could be accomplished by joint action of representatives of the Virginia, Maryland, and District commissions more economically and more efficiently than by the proposed new Commission.

The statement then says:

The creation of a new commission as proposed would be confusing to the public and be added expense to the transportation companies serving this area for which added expense the public would have to pay. Whenever new commissions are created, added burdens and expenses are incurred which must be paid for by the public. It cannot be seriously questioned that the jurisdictions involved can do a better job of regulating the motor carriers for the transportation of passengers in this area than any new Commission.

It is quite clear that this is another proposal that the Federal Government duplicate and encroach upon State regulation which, in our opinion, is detrimental to the best interests of the public.

Mr. President, I am aware that public transportation in the Washington metropolitan area has not been entirely satisfactory in the past and I am eager to have any reasonable steps taken to improve the service for all those concerned, and especially for my Virginia constituents who work in the District and must make daily trips from their homes to and from their places of business.

I am concerned, however, by the questions raised by the Virginia Corporation Commission as to whether or not the proposed new Commission would involve needless expense, and particularly whether or not its establishment would represent a further step of Federal encroachment on States rights. To such encroachment I am emphatically opposed.

In addition to Senate bill 922 there also is pending in this Congress House bill 2236, which was introduced by the Representative from the Virginia district which is directly involved in this problem. H. R. 2236 would create a Commission to make a thorough study of the matter and report to the Congress which then could decide whether a new permanent regulatory organization is needed. This bill has the approval of the Virginia Corporation Commission and I believe it is a more sensible way to approach our problem.

I am interested, therefore, in having S. 922 recommitted to the District of Columbia Committee for further study and to be held in that committee at least until the House has had an opportunity to act on H. R. 2236 and, if it is passed by the other body, until the Senate has had a chance to act on it.

Mr. President, I therefore move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the bill (S. 922) was introduced by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]; referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; reported from that committee by Senator JOHNSON, and reached on the call of the calendar of March 30, 1953. On the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], unanimous consent was granted to refer the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia for further study, and in turn it was referred to the Business and Commerce Subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

We conducted hearings on the bill, and then following an executive sessions, it was favorably reported to the full committee by unanimous vote. The Committee on the District of Columbia reported the bill favorably by a unanimous vote on April 15, 1953.

S. 922 provides for a Metropolitan Area Transit Commission in which would be vested the necessary powers to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railway within the so-called metropolitan area. This area includes the District of Columbia, the counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges in Maryland, the counties of Arlington and Fairfax, and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in Virginia. This authority in turn, would be taken from the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Intrastate travel entirely within the States of Virginia and Maryland is specifically excluded from the application of this bill.

The bill provides that the Commission shall be an independent agency within the executive branch of the Government, with three members, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. All 3 members shall have resided, for at least 2 years prior to appointment,

within the metropolitan area, and appointments will be made from residents of the Washington metropolitan area. Not more than 2 Commissioners shall be members of the same political party, and their salaries are fixed at $15,000 annually. Provisions for removal of Commissioners, selection and duties of a Chairman, and the employment of personnel are provided in the bill.

The bill vests the Commission with the power to establish reasonable requirements for the operations of carriers under its jurisdiction and to promulgate regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of this bill.

It has been stated that representatives of the State of Virginia and others who may have wished to appear in opposition to this measure and in connection with it did not have ample opportunity to do so. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that approximately 15 witnesses appeared before the committee. One of the witnesses from Prince Georges County stated, toward the close of his testimony, that a Mr. Waters, who, I believe, also came from Prince Georges County, Md., had intended to appear at the hearing, but was unable to do so, and had authorized the witness, who was testifying, to reaffirm the support of Senate bill 922 by the Board of County Commissioners of Prince Georges County. Other witnesses appeared in behalf of this measure.

The witnesses appearing from Virginia were, for instance, Walter Kingsbury, chairman of the public utilities committee of Arlington County Civic Federation; O. B. Allen, chairman of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Committee, from North Arlington, Va.; William C. Nemeth, chairman of the Arlington County Public Utilities Commission; Gerald J. Glassman, executive assistant to the Arlington County Public Utilities Committee, and secretary of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Committee.

Mr. President, this bill merely sets up an area transit authority which is vitally needed at this time, in the opinion of this Senator, because it will permit orderly regulation of interstate commerce, which is essential because the metropolitan area of Washington has now expanded beyond the bounds of the District of Columbia, which originally was self-contained and was able to furnish transportation to those living within the District. The Washington metropolitan area has now spread out into Virginia and into Maryland, with the result that there are two authorities which come into the picture in the case of interstate travel, namely, the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission, within the District of Columbia, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, when interstate travel is involved.

The question has arisen as to whether this measure is constitutional or whether it would encroach upon the rights of either the State of Maryland or the State of Virginia. According to the best legal authority that has been available to the committee, such is not the case, because the bill merely establishes what could perhaps be better known as a baby interstate commerce commission which would control transportation within the so-called metropolitan area boundaries or area limits.

The taxicab group have perhaps also had some apprehension about the measure, from the point of view that it would result in an increase in their insurance rates if their taxicabs traveled over the District of Columbia line. Of course, at the present time there is no authority, under the present District of Columbia jurisdiction, to establish rates for passengers or for persons who reside outside the District of Columbia, but who work in the District of Columbia, and who wish to use that form of conveyance in order to travel back and forth. So the charge can be almost anything. Therefore, taxicab operators, it is my understanding, who would be licensed under the District of Columbia purely for the conveyance of passengers within the limits of the District of Columbia would fall in the same category as they do at the present time; but if they desired to enter into interstate traffic or commerce and travel over the District of Columbia line into Maryland or into Virginia, and be licensed accordingly, they would necessarily have to pay an increased rate for that privilege, and in turn would receive increased revenue.

Mr. President, it is certainly my hope that this measure will be favorably considered by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Madam President (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair), the Congress of the United States historically and traditionally has undertaken the regulation of transportation under the commerce clause of the Constitution. That history goes back to 1887. Yet here in the Capital City, the seat of our Government, we discover what has developed into a no man's land, so far as transportation is concerned.

The city of Washington has outgrown the District of Columbia, and has spread into Maryland and Virginia. The resultant situation is such that a person traveling on the streets of Washington cannot say when he passes from the District of Columbia into Maryland or into Virginia; all that area is a part of the metropolitan area.

This great metropolitan area has a distinct problem of transportation. Of course it also has many other problems. But, if we cannot solve the transportation problem, which perhaps is one of the smaller problems confronting the District of Columbia, we shall not be in a position to solve other problems of the metropolitan area.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has complained because it is alleged that sufficient hearings have not been held. Madam President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been attempting to solve this problem for 6 years. Someone always wishes to delay. We have tried various means of solving the problem. We tried a plan similar to one which has been used in New York and in other places, namely; a compact arrangement—in this case, a compact between the States of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia. Such an arrangement would seem to be the sensible approach to the solution of a problem of this kind. Yet the Legislature of the State of Virginia turned down and voted against a compact plan. So we have brought up the plan provided by this bill.

It so happens that the Congress of the United States is entrusted with the responsibility of regulating interstate commerce. It so happens that the Congress of the United States has also been given the responsibility of regulating the public utilities in the District of Columbia.

So, under the Constitution the Congress is the body which must solve the problem of interstate transportation between Maryland and Virginia, through the city of Washington—in short, transportation from Maryland into the city of Washington, and transportation from Virginia into the city of Washington, the District of Columbia.

Congress has the responsibility and the authority to solve the great problems that exist in the city of Washington. Various transportation companies serve this city. In some instances they originate in Virginia, in some instances they originate in Maryland, and in some instances they originate in the city of Washington, D. C. However, these transportation systems—by motor vehicle, by streetcar, and by transit company—have no coordinated system. One cannot get a transfer from one of the systems to another. There is nothing coordinated about them; they are all separate systems. Most of the systems from Maryland and Virginia use the streets of Washington as their terminals; their motor vehicles drive along the streets of Washington and unload their passengers there and take on other passengers there; all that is done on the streets of Washington, D. C. Those companies have no terminal facilities; they have no joint terminal facilities; they have no place where passengers transfer from one system to another. The situation is a very sad one. Those systems curtail the service from Maryland or the service from Virginia, into the city of Washington, as they please; there is no one to regulate them. The utility commissions for the State of Maryland and for the State of Virginia have no authority over them.

Of course, the transportation systems object and complain when any effort is made to work out a coordinated system of transportation. They oppose any such effort.

Of course, witnesses appeared in opposition to the bill. I sat through many days of hearings, and, so far as I know, the only opposition came from the transportation companies whom we seek to regulate. We cannot blame them. Of course, they do not want to be regulated. They prefer not to be regulated. It is to their interest not to be regulated. It is to their interest, as they see it, to do as they please. But it is not in the interest of the people who live in Virginia and in Maryland to have the transportation companies in complete control of the kind of service that is to be rendered.

A few weeks ago I was invited to make a Jackson-Jefferson Day talk in Virginia. Before I spoke, 5 or 6 different groups from Virginia called upon me, stating that they wanted me to discuss Senate bill 922. I replied, "I am going to talk about Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Jackson tonight. I would be glad to talk about the

Senate bill at another time." They said, "We are tremendously interested in that bill."

Citizens of Virginia and Maryland appeared as witnesses before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, urging our committee to do something about the matter, since our committee is entrusted with responsibility of considering questions affecting interstate commerce.

I notice that the motion of the Senator from Virginia is that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia for further consideration. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is the committee which handles matters affecting interstate commerce. The bill was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia on March 30, 1953. The committee conducted hearings, was satisfied regarding the merits of the bill, and proposed a constructive amendment, which I think represents an improvement of the bill.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I wonder whether the Senate might not at this time agree to the amendment, without debate, regardless of what may be done with the motion to recommit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So far as the Senator from Colorado is concerned, he would be glad to agree, and would urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota, for the purpose of offering his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may state that the amendment cannot be accepted, unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment proposed by the Committee on the District of Columbia be considered at this time, and that it be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 4, it is proposed to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(c) All provisions of law (including those providing for judicial review) applicable to the decisions, orders, rules, regulations, or other actions taken or issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia with respect to such common carriers shall be applicable to the decisions, orders, rules, regulations, or other actions of the Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CASE. Madam President, I may say for the purpose of the record that all the amendment would do would be to make possible a judicial review of decisions of the proposed commission. That is in harmony with the judicial review provided in the case of the Public Utilities Commission operating within the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment which has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia made a motion to recommit to the Committee on the District of Columbia, because that is the committee to which the Senate last referred the bill and from which it was last reported; hence the motion to recommit it to that committee. Senators should realize that, if the bill is sent back to the committee for further study, the study will involve two questions: First, is it necessary to have a new commission, in order to do what the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia is now doing? That Commission exercises jurisdiction over gas, electricity, street railways, taxicabs, and other modes of transportation. The second question is, How shall we act on a proposal which in some instances, so far as passenger transportation is concerned, takes away a power of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and in some instances, a power of the State regulatory bodies of Virginia and Maryland, as well as the power of the regulatory body of the District, and concentrates all such power in the hands of a new commission, created under the provisions of the pending bill?

Under the circumstances, the Senator from Virginia asks leave to modify his motion, by providing that the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia modifies his motion accordingly.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, the Senator from Virginia, of course, has that right. He at first asked unanimous consent to modify the motion, but it seems now he has modified it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia had that right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Madam President, motion of the Senator from Virginia, while a very proper one, of course, is not made any more palatable by sending the bill back to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, instead of the Committee on the District of Columbia. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has exhausted its efforts and its ideas with respect to the subject, not only this year, but during the past 6 years. We have conducted lengthy hearings. We invited all interested parties to appear before the committee for the purpose of testifying and giving their views. I repeat, no one appeared in opposition to the bill, either from the general public, or from the traveling public, the people who pay the fares. The only opposition came from those whom the bill seeks to regulate. The Senator from Virginia suggests that we are proposing to take certain powers from the public utilities commissions of the adjoining States. That, of course, is incorrect. We are not proposing to deprive anyone of vested prerogatives or authority.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I may say, although I do not happen to have the transcript before me, that during the hearings on the bill several representatives of various organizations in the State of Maryland appeared.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Would the Senator permit me to read the names of those persons who appeared before the Senate District Committee when the bill was referred to that committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. CASE. They are as follows:

Hon. DEWITT S. HYDE, a Representative in Congress from the Sixth District of the State of Maryland.

Kenneth W. Spencer, acting chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

Walter Kingsbury, chairman, public utilities committee, Arlington County Civic Federation.

O. B. Allen, chairman, Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Committee.

William C. Nemeth, chairman, Arlington County Public Utilities Committee, and secretary, Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Committee.

Gerald J. Glassman, executive assistant, Arlington County Public Utilities Committee, and secretary, Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Committee.

Winters Haydock, member of Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Committee.

L. H. Pou, attorney, representing the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Joseph D. Malloy, chairman, public utilities committee, Federation of Citizens' Associations, Washington, D. C.

Charles H. Reighner, chairman, public utilities committee, Allied Civic Group, Inc., Montgomery County, Md.

John H. Hessey, chairman, Maryland Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, will the Senator from Colorado yield so that I may ask the Senator from South Dakota a question at this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator, provided I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator from South Dakota tell me whether he was present at the time Mr. Hessey appeared before the committee?

Mr. CASE. No; I was not present, but I have a transcript of the testimony before me.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Did he approve of the proposed legislation?

Mr. CASE. The testimony is not very long. I think it might be placed in the RECORD. I may say that a quick review of the testimony of Mr. Hessey, which appears at pages 50 to 65 of the transcript of the record, indicates that he stated he was there to answer any questions, and was expressing his personal views because he did not have an opportunity to present the matter before the committee as a whole, but he indicated that he thought the bill would be a salutary solution of the problem.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Can the Senator tell me when Mr. Hessey appeared before the committee?

Mr. CASE. The hearing was held on Thursday, April 2, 1953.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Has the Senator received any further communication from Mr. Hessey in connection with this proposed legislation?

Mr. CASE. I have not, but after consultation with the clerk of the committee I am advised that there has been no further communication from him.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. So far as the Senator from South Dakota knows, no objection was interposed on behalf of the State of Maryland; is that correct?

Mr. CASE. To the best of my knowledge, there has been none.

A few other witnesses appeared, and, if I may, I should like to complete the list which I started to read:

Malcolm D. Miller, Arlington County Civic Federation.

E. Erwin Dollar, president, Associated Taxicab Operators.

Robert T. Mitchell, vice president, A. B. & W. Transit Co.

Frederick Gutheim, representing the upper Montgomery County planning division.

Edwin A. Glenn, representing the Republican Club of Prince Georges County, Md., and the taxicab industry committee of the District of Columbia.

It seems to me that this list would indicate that we did have at the hearing a very representative group from both Montgomery County, Md., from Arlington County, Va., and from the District of Columbia. After listening to them, it was the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee, supported by the full committee, that the bill should be passed, with the one amendment which we reported.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

The Department of Defense has several times expressed their views regarding the inadequate service provided the employees of that agency and the continued failure of the transportation agencies to establish through routes and joint fares for employees commuting to the Pentagon.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that I joined with him last year to have a study made to the end that Maryland could enter into a compact with Virginia and the District of Columbia to accomplish what is sought to accomplish by this bill. I think this is excellent legislation and in my judgment a good way to accomplish the desired result.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. The Senator from Maryland joined in the effort to work out a compact, but the Legislature of Virginia did not cooperate with us, so that we had to give up that idea.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Gutheim, who appeared before the committee, made a very significant statement, from which I should like to read three paragraphs. He started out by saying that he was a member of the Upper Montgomery County Planning Commission and was appearing before the committee representing the Montgomery County Council. He also stated:

I am also a member of the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

The bills under consideration here today, S. 922 and H. R. 3771, are substantially the same as S. 3296 of the 82d Congress, 2d session. I am familiar with that measure and have read the transcript of the hearings on it and related measures, and the committee reports, which state the case with both precision and a comprehensive grasp of the issues involved.

In the last Congress the Montgomery Council indicated its support of the proposal to regulate public transportation within the metropolitan area by a single regulatory commission. It also endorsed proposals for related studies.

I wish to reaffirm the stand of the Montgomery County Council which supports the bill you are considering here today.

I invite the Senate's attention to the fact that this man studied the matter and was familiar with the bill in the prior Congress, that he had read the transcript of the prior hearings, and that he reaffirmed his support of the bill in behalf of the Montgomery Council.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for the fine contribution he has made in bringing to the attention of the Senate the interest of the metropolitan area in this proposal.

I hope that for the reasons which have been stated the Senator from Virginia will be objective. He has already indicated that everyone realizes there is a serious problem, but he wants to cure it by waiting for a further study, when everyone knows there is a problem and knows the nature of it. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] said a while ago, "Justice delayed is justice denied." The Senator from Virginia would like to have the matter delayed still further.

I hope we can pass this bill today and get it started on its way. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has twice reported the bill by unanimous vote, and the District Committee has reported it by unanimous vote.

The service in the metropolitan area has increasingly grown worse year by year, fares have gone higher and higher, and service continues to decline. It is absolutely essential that a solution be forthcoming to this problem at an early date if the Government workers and the commuters in this area are to continue the use of public transportation.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks three excerpts from the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in respect to this matter.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1947, 84 percent of all employment in the metropolitan area was concentrated within the District of Columbia, though only 63 percent of the area's population lived in the District. This trend has continued; in 1950 only 55 percent of the total population remained within the District boundaries. It becomes fairly obvious, then, that the areas surrounding the District could not live without the jobs of central Washington; and likewise the District could not long survive without the areas in Maryland and Virginia which are now essential parts of the metropolitan region. The need for efficient transportation between the District and other portions of the metropolitan area is manifest.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the Washington area has not enjoyed the service it should. This closely knit, single metropolitan area is presently served by a transit industry consisting of some 14 distinct and separate operating companies. Even the operations of the four major carriers are separate and uncoordinated. In addition to this condition, further conflict and confusion has been brought about by the existence of four regulatory bodies, more or less regulating public transportation in this area, each of which acts independently and sometimes at odds with each other.

Between 1947 and early 1950, the number of revenue passengers carried by the four major carriers in the metropolitan area decreased by 32 percent, although the area's population increased 6 percent. During this same period, overall activity was increasing in the area, along with its population, while the number of vehicle miles provided by the four major carriers decreased by 19 percent and passenger fares increased in some instances 100 percent. Here is evidence of a vicious cycle: passenger loss, fare increase, service reduction, passenger loss. In the year 1950–51, passengers decreased another 5 percent, service was entirely abandoned to certain areas in Maryland, and total miles of service were reduced by 3 percent among the four major carriers.

Mr. HUNT. Madam President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. As I understand, the bill provides for transferring the functions of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, so far as they pertain to transportation, to the proposed new Commission. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. HUNT. Would not the transfer of such authority be practically unanimously acceptable to the people of the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have heard of no objection on the part of anyone in the District of Columbia to such a proposal, because the people of the District are anxious to have the public transportation improved. Many of the people use public transportation to and from Washington several times a day, in serving the business houses of Washington. Of course, they would be very glad to have the transportation facilities improved, and perhaps not have rates increased until the entire question of public transportation has been thoroughly examined.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, attention has already been directed to the testimony given by representatives of the metropolitan area in Maryland with reference to the proposed legislation. It seems to me that the record, to be complete, should contain the testimony of representatives who came to the hearing from Arlington County, which is the area in Virginia that is most directly affected, so far as the people who have to use public transportation are concerned.

Two representatives from Arlington County appeared before the committee. One of them was Mr. Malcolm D. Miller, who said he resided at 1839 North Quintana Street, Arlington, Va. He stated that he was a delegate of the Arlington County Civic Federation, and a member of the legislative and legal action committee, and that he appeared before the Senate committee by direction of the chairman of his committee, and also by direction of the president of the federation. Certainly he should have been qualified to speak. He gave the committee considerable testimony. I read his positive statements, as they appear on page 69:

Therefore, I wish to affirm again the position of the Arlington County Civic Federation that Senate bill 922 be passed.

In other words, this man was delegated by the Arlington County Civic Federation to appear before the committee, and it was his firm position that the bill should be passed.

The committee also had before it Mr. Walter Kingsbury, chairman of the public utilities committee of the Arlington County Civic Federation. Mr. Kingsbury testified that he was representing that federation, which was composed of representatives of 38 civic bodies in Arlington. Then he testified as follows:

The people in Arlington County are very much interested in improved public-transportation service, both within the county and between the county and the District, particularly those who still ride the buses; and, as evidence of that interest, I would like to read a resolution that was passed at the regular meeting of the federation on February 3 of this year. Omitting the whereases, the resolution reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Arlington County Civic Federation respectfully but urgently requests that introduction and consideration of legislation to provide unified regulation of public transportation in the metropolitan area be placed among the first items of business by the appropriate Senate and House committees in order that affirmative action may be taken by Congress at the earliest date."

So it seems to me that the Senate is warranted, by reason of the testimony of persons who live in the area concerned, in taking action at this time. Nothing would be gained by recommitting the bill to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which held hearings in the previous Congress, or to the Committee on the District of Columbia, which held hearings at this session, if we are to give heed to the wishes of the people who live in the area.

It may be that the regulatory body for the entire State of Virginia may think that this would in some way be a whittling away of some power they might have, but actually it is not, because the powers contained in the bill are restricted to the regulating of interstate commerce, not of intrastate commerce. But even if, in some way, the bill reduced the regulatory powers of the commission for the entire State of Virginia, I submit that the people of Arlington County are those who are entitled to consideration. We have their statement that they "respectfully but urgently" request the passage of the bill. "Urgently" does not call for recommittal. "Urgently" calls for action. One delegate said they wanted unified regulation to be placed among the first items of business. We cannot make it any earlier than by passing the bill this afternoon. We will be responding to the wishes of the Arlington County Civic Federation, composed of representatives of 30 civic bodies of Arlington, if we vote against the motion to recommit, and vote to pass the bill this afternoon.

Mr. CASE subsequently said: I wish to say a word or two about the service rendered by the subcommittee which handled the bill for the Committee on the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I am about to make may appear at the conclusion of my remarks immediately preceding the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. As chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I wish to express for the record my personal appreciation for the time which was given by members of the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], which handled the bill. I think it is evident to every Senator who heard the explanation given by the Senator from Maine this afternoon that he was thoroughly familiar with the bill, that he had given it study, and that he was in a position to give the Senate the benefit of his views with respect to this well-considered measure.

It is a pleasure to one who has the responsibility of acting as chairman of a committee, particularly one who has the responsibility of working with the District of Columbia, to know that we have members of the committee who will address themselves to the problems of the District of Columbia, for which Senators get no particular thanks in their own States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota in paying tribute to the splendid service rendered by the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. It is really commendable that there are Members of the Senate who will render that kind of service. Certainly I appreciate the fine efforts and excellent service the members of the subcommittee rendered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], as modified, to recommit the bill to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 922) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Act."

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "metropolitan area" means the metropolitan area of the city of Washington, D. C., including the District of Columbia, the counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges in the State of Maryland, and the counties of Arlington and Fairfax and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in the State of Virginia.

(b) The term "motor vehicle" means any automobile, taxi, bus, or other vehicle propelled or drawn by mechanical or electrical power on the public streets or highways of the metropolitan area and used for the transportation of passengers.

(c) The term "street railroad" means any streetcar, bus, or other similar vehicle propelled or drawn by electrical or mechanical power on rails and used for the transportation of passengers.

(d) The term "carrier by motor vehicle" means any person which engages in the transportation of the general public by motor vehicle for compensation in the metropolitan area but does not include any person which engages in such transportation solely within the State of Maryland or the State of Virginia, and does not include any person which engages in such transportation in the metropolitan area as part of an interstate operation which is in the major portion outside of such area.

(e) The term "carrier by street railroad" means any person which engages in the transportation of the general public by street railroad for compensation in the metropolitan area but does not include any person which engages in such transportation solely within the State of Maryland or the State of Virginia, and does not include any person which engages in such transportation in the metropolitan area as part of an interstate operation which is in the major portion outside of such area.

(f) The term "person" means any individual, firm, copartnership, corporation, company, association, or joint-stock association; and includes any trustee, receiver, assignee, or personal representative thereof.

TITLE I—WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT COMMISSION

SEC. 101. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall be composed of three Commissioners appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall have been residents of the Washington metropolitan area for at least 2 years prior to appointment. Not more than two Commissioners shall be members of the same political party. Each Commissioner shall be appointed for a term of 6 years, except that the Commissioners first appointed shall be appointed 1 for a term of 2 years, 1 for a term of 4 years, and 1 for a term of 6 years, and whenever a vacancy shall occur, other than by expiration of term, the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of his predecessor. Each Commissioner shall receive a salary of the rate of $15,000 per annum.

SEC. 102. Any Commissioner may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. No person in the employ of or holding any official relation to any carrier subject to this act, or owning stocks or bonds thereof, or who is in any manner pecuniarily interested therein, shall enter upon the duties of or hold such office. No vacancy in the Commission shall impair the right of the remaining Commissioners to exercise all the powers of the Commission. Upon the expiration of his term of office, a Commissioner shall continue to serve until

his successor is appointed and shall have qualified.

SEC. 103. The Commission shall have a Chairman, who shall be selected annually by the Commission from among its members, and may serve in such capacity for more than one term if reselected by the Commission. Such Chairman shall be vested with responsibility for administrative functions, efficiency, and staff supervision of the Commission, and shall assign, and reassign for expedition, matters for hearings, and for reports, all to the end that the public interest may be promptly and adequately served.

SEC. 104. The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and to make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The Commission may delegate any of its functions to such of its officers and employees as it may designate.

TITLE II—REGULATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION OF PASSENGERS IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA

SEC. 201. (a) All functions of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia with respect to common carriers (as defined in sec. 8, par. 1, of Public Law 435, 62d Cong., approved March 4, 1913, as amended) of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad are hereby transferred to the Commission, and are made applicable to carriers by motor vehicle and street railroad, respectively, as defined in this act.

(b) All provisions of law applicable to common carriers (as defined in such Public Law 435) of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad are made applicable to carriers by motor vehicle and street railroad, respectively, as defined in this act.

(c) All provisions of law (including those providing for judicial review) applicable to the decisions, orders, rules, regulations, or other actions taken or issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia with respect to such common carriers shall be applicable to the decisions, orders, rules, regulations, or other actions of the Commission.

SEC. 202. The Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia shall transfer any of its records pertaining to the functions transferred under the provisions of this act to the Commission and shall furnish the Commission such information with respect to such functions as may be requested by the Commission.

SEC. 203. Any order, rule, regulation, permit, or privilege made, issued, or granted by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia with respect to any function transferred under the provisions of this act, and in effect at the time of the transfer, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred until modified, superseded, or repealed by the Commission.

SEC. 204. Any provision of law granting the Interstate Commerce Commission any authority over transportation to which this act is applicable shall be inapplicable after the date of the enactment of this act, but any order, rule, regulation, permit, or privilege made, issued, or granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to such transportation and in effect on such date shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, or repealed by the Commission.

SEC. 205. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia or any officer of the United States in his official capacity or in relation to his discharge of his official duties shall abate by reason of any transfer of functions under the provisions of this act. The court before which any such suit, action, or other proceeding is pending, may, on the filing at any time within 12 months after such transfer takes effect of a motion or supplemental petition showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding in order to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the Commission or any officer thereof to whom such functions have been assigned.

SEC. 206. (a) The Commission shall have the power to establish, in addition to requirements established under the functions transferred to the Commission under the provisions of this act, such other reasonable requirements for carriers by motor vehicle and street railroad as it may deem necessary and proper in order to provide for continuous and adequate service throughout the metropolitan area, uniform systems of accounts, records and reports, preservation of records, qualifications and maximum hours of service of employees, and safety of operation and equipment.

(b) The Commission may make such regulations as it may deem necessary and proper to carry out the provisions of this act, and the penal provisions applicable to rules, orders, or regulations established by the Commission with respect to functions transferred to it under the provisions of this act shall be applicable to any other rule, order, requirement, or regulation established by the Commission under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 207. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be applicable to the Commission and its functions.

SEC. 208. The Commission may, with the consent of any department or agency of the Government, avail itself of the use of information, service, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 209. The Commission shall make an annual report of its operations to the Congress as soon as practicable after the 1st day of January in each year, and shall include in such report its recommendations for the improvement of passenger transportation facilities in the metropolitan area.

SEC. 210. Any carrier by motor vehicle or street railroad which is carrying on a bona fide operation on the date of the enactment of this act without a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued either by the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and is requested to have a certificate of public convenience and necessity under the provisions of this act shall be issued such a certificate by the Commission with respect to such operation without further proceedings and without proof that public convenience and necessity will be served by such operation, if application is made for such certificate within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this act. Pending the determination of any such application the continuance of such operation shall be lawful.

SEC. 211. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 212. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out the provisions of this act and to perform any other duties which may be imposed upon it by law.

GRANT OF IMMUNITY TO WITNESSES BEFORE EITHER HOUSE OF CONGRESS OR CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 153, Senate bill 16.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 16) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees.

PHILOSOPHY OF CONTROLS

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, on Tuesday next it is the intention of the Senate to take up Senate bill 1081, a bill to impose standby controls on the American economy. As one of the three members of the committee who opposed this bill during the committee consideration, I rise today to suggest the background upon which our opposition, and particularly the opposition of the junior Senator from Utah, is based.

I expect to have a great deal to say on the floor of the Senate when the bill is before the Senate for discussion, but I feel that I should like to present this preliminary material at this time, before the discussion begins, for whatever value it may be to my colleagues in the Senate.

Madam President, during all the weeks the committee considered the two control bills, S. 753 and S. 1081, I found myself in almost constant and complete disagreement with the program of direct consumer controls which these bills proposed to set up. S. 753 was abandoned even by its author, but title 8 of S. 1081 as reported contains many provisions to which I am still opposed.

I oppose title 8 because of three definite convictions that I have. First, I am convinced that the basic philosophy behind this title is fallacious. Second, I believe that the delegation of powers under the standby idea is unnecessary and improper. Third, I believe that title 8 is not really an effective freeze, as its proponents claim. In this presentation I shall confine myself to the question of the philosophy behind the bill. I shall present arguments on my other objections in later speeches.

To the junior Senator from Utah this title seems to be built on a serious misunderstanding of the pattern and genius of our American free economy. The title seems to rest on the assumption that our free private-enterprise system is weak and unstable by itself and that it needs Government control to steady it even in normal times. In the declaration of purpose the authors of the bill say, beginning on line 24 of page 8:

> Prices are now generally in normal relationship, and the economy as a whole is relatively stable. It is the sense of Congress that this stability can be maintained by the full and effective use of indirect controls, barring adverse international developments.

Again, in line 1 on page 10:

> However, if such an emergency should develop, the President must have the power to employ immediate economic controls—

Meaning, of course, the direct consumer controls listed in title 8. In other words, this bill assumes that free enterprise cannot stand by itself but needs the steadying support of the full and effective use of indirect controls even in normal times. It also assumes that these indirect controls are weaker and less effective than direct controls and that because direct consumer controls have the greatest strength, they are our only salvation in time of crisis and emergency.

To the junior Senator from Utah this whole approach to our economy is unthinkable. Stability is desirable as an economic condition, but our real goals are of much greater importance. These include a constantly increasing productivity, a constantly growing production of an ever-widening variety of goods and services, and the flexibility and adaptability of free markets. When all of these work together, they provide greater opportunities for men with ideas and initiative and a constantly rising standard of living for us all. Measured by these real standards, is our economy after all so weak and flabby as to require the corset of controls? Let me quote a paragraph from the testimony of Allan Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, when he appeared before our committee. Mr. Kline said:

The strength of the United States lies in the productive ability of the American people. Our ability to outproduce the rest of the world is a natural and direct result of our American system of individual initiative and a reward based on service rendered. We can outproduce those countries which suppress individual freedom, but it is doubtful that we can ever outcontrol them. The logical thing for us to do is build on the techniques that have made it possible for the United States, with 6 percent of the world's people and 7 percent of the earth's land area, to produce one-half of the world's steel and one-third of the world's meat. This means we must seek to minimize Government interference with the things that have made our economic system the most productive in the world. Carried to their logical conclusions, price and wage controls, rationing, subsidies, and other devices that inevitably are proposed to mitigate the effects of these controls would mean the complete abandonment of our present economic system.

Does the need for our American productive magic disappear in times of emergency? Of course not. Those are the times we must call upon our great machine for its greatest burst of productive effort.

Do controls contribute to increased production? Everyone agrees that they do not. On the contrary, they slow up the wheels and retard the flow of production. Since all the evidence indicates that controls always tangle up business in networks of red tape, hamper production, and waste manpower, it appears that they should be especially avoided in times of stress.

During World War II and the Korean war the leaders of our Government recognized the need for the greatest possible production. If controls would help, you would expect these men to insist on applying them vigorously to Government contracts. On the other hand, the official attitude of government with respect to the interference of price and wage controls with needed wartime production is eloquent testimony of their futility. Most significant is the fact that strictly military items were exempted by both OPA and OPS, so the astonishing military production record of these two periods was in the category of goods completely outside of price control. But even in the case of goods involved only indirectly in defense, the Government has in its own words and by its own actions admitted that such controls hinder production. Here are two examples: First, in the order suspending price ceilings on aircraft and aircraft parts, OPS explained that there "is no practical method of establishing price ceilings at the present time without at the same time impeding the flow of these essential defense items." This has been quoted from the General Overriding Regulation 9, amendment 12, of December 19, 1951. Second, with respect to machine tools, which are the basis of all defense production, OPS was forced by the Office of Defense Mobilization to modify and ease price controls on new machine tools. The ODM directive made it clear that this was necessary to give manufacturers "the stimulus to expand their production for essential defense needs." This is quoted from Ceiling Price Regulation 30, Supplementary Regulation 2, Revision 1, August 21, 1951.

One could go on for many hours piling up examples of how price and wage controls have sabotaged production, but this is not their only evil effect in times of war. There are many others equally obvious. Let me just touch lightly on a dozen.

First. Controls actually contribute to inflation rather than curing it. Artificially low prices held down by controls are a green light encouraging increased consumption and a red light to the producer discouraging him from continuing or increasing production. Thus, controls act directly to widen the inflationary gap.

Second. At the same time they conceal the evils of inflation. Everyone has agreed that they attack only the symptoms. Few realize how effectively they conceal the real disease. They are a smoke screen which actually makes the job of controlling inflation more difficult by concealing from the people the fact that inflation is at work destroying the purchasing power of their money. They also divert attention from the things that must be done if we are really to control or limit inflation. They tend to lull us in a sense of false security.

Third. Direct controls tend to disrupt the pattern of the economy. Old, experienced producers caught with low price ceilings are forced out of the market, while new ones with no restrictive base period and no tradition of quality may come in to the market at legally higher price levels, thus both effectively nullifying the law and at the same time destroying quality standards.

Fourth. These controls are inflexible. Therefore, they are false to the basic philosophy of a free market. Dr. Harold DeGraff, of Cornell University, told our committee:

No one can even accurately describe the pattern of our free market from one day to the next. Actually, our American economy is composed of hundreds of millions of interrelated prices, prices which are constantly in a state of flux and readjustment relative to each other. These relative prices tend to adjust supplies of goods and services in line with consumer demands and to adjust consumer demands in line with available supply. These adjustments are fleeting and approximate. They are seldom, if ever, exact, because both supply and demand for most goods and services keep changing. Consequently, relative prices change constantly to create new adjustments. Free and flexible prices, which mean free and flexible markets, are the keystone of the most efficient economic system man has ever devised, a system in which willing buyers trade freely with willing sellers to the maximum satisfaction of each. It is an automatically adjusting system in which every citizen may be said to sit on the price determining committee and he casts his vote as to what prices ought to be every time he spends or takes in a dollar. Moreover, in this system of automatic price control no one has to be paid for doing the job.

But any time the price-making function is removed from the market place, as it is when price controls are put into effect, then some agency or committee or bureau has to assume the function of guiding both production and consumption. The automatic adjustments which characterize a price-free economy are lost. Fixed prices do not change automatically in line with the constant and complex and interrelated changes of demand and supply. When prices are frozen, a given set of price interrelationships existing at that particular moment is fixed. Even though these were the right interrelationships at the moment, they will not remain the right ones for long in a dynamic economy. The stability which they would create and which the proponents of this bill seem to prefer to our natural vitality, is in itself a distortion of the facts, becoming increasingly so with the passing of time. Then at some point a Government bureau steps in to assume the functions of guiding both producers and consumers. The bureau has no power to do anything beyond the enforcement of the distortion.

No matter how superbly such an agency may be staffed, to wish upon it the task of guiding the economic life of the country is to ask the impossible. Our economy is too complex for any person or group of persons even to describe. What we do not know how to describe, we certainly do not know how to control. When we try to control what we do not understand, our actions are certain to exceed our knowledge, and this is an invitation to sure disaster.

Fifth. The retreat to direct consumer price, wage, and rent controls is a return to the bureaucratic and political jungle from which the American economy has just emerged. By passing this bill we would be voting that at some future time, if not now, we shall reverse the decision the American people made at the last election and deny them their continued march to economic freedom.

I can best express my opinion of the bureaucratic burden by quoting, as I did 2 years ago, the words of a great master of words. I give you now the description of the control bureaucracy in action contained in the resolution of the United Mine Workers dated May 25, 1951, concerning the Defense Production Act of 1950. I assume these are the words of John L. Lewis:

Under the terms of this act—an almost unparalleled and unlimited grant of powers to the Chief Executive and the grant by him of these powers to the Economic Stabilization Agency and other agencies—there were thereby created, among other departments, agencies, and bureaus, the Office of Price Stabilization and the Wage Stabilization Board; and, from the date of their creation, there has been one never-ending and continuous stream of orders, rules, regulations, decrees, promulgations, amendments, interpretations, and declarations set off by such agencies and manifold respective administrators, directors, chairmen, and other officials and unofficial spokesmen, as to, in effect, virtually overwhelm and flood all industry, business, and labor—large and small—with long, involved, technical, legalistic, complex, complicated, duplicitous, confusing, and confounding rules and standards of conduct,

restricting, limiting, prohibiting, circumscribing, and choking their otherwise normal and ordinarily successful and smooth operations—all running to full and complete defeat of the above declared purposes of the act.

Having just been freed of these burdens by our new President, we should hardly need reminding of them this early in 1953, nor should we need reminding that this path of political control leads to ever higher reaches for power. Surely we cannot have forgotten the crisis of the steel seizure, which was a direct result of the operation of the price and wage control system. It was a stern warning that in the long run price and wage controls tend to force the Government to take over private property in order to enforce its control dictates.

Sixth. In times of great crisis we strain to stretch the manpower of our Nation to its limit, and yet we adopt controls, which waste manpower, our most precious resource. This is true not only in the Government, where millions of manhours must be spent on the unproductive job of writing regulations and the impossible job of enforcing them, but at every level of industry where people subject to regulation must interpret the regulations and comply with them, and must spend endless hours in interminable paper work.

Seventh. Direct consumer controls create shortages. It is totally unrealistic to discuss price control without pointing out that any successful effort to depress prices below the free market level will inevitably lead to shortages and eventually to rationing.

Eighth. Because these controls are unenforceable they lead to disrespect for law and reward dishonesty. That they are unenforceable is axiomatic even though a few transactions are policed and a few offenders caught. The millions upon millions that are not checked encourage dishonesty. To the lesson the American people learned with respect to the 18th amendment we could well add the lessons we should have learned about unenforceable laws from OPS and OPA.

Ninth. Because direct consumer controls are never more than partially enforced, they are always unfairly administered. Those with political power or influence have always found loopholes and been given preferential treatment. Again, witness the original decision in the steel case—to permit and enforce a wage increase by Federal power—and to seize the steel industry rather than allow a compensating price increase.

Tenth. Whenever price controls are proposed, someone usually says that in order to be effective they must be applied promptly and eliminated just as promptly. After two experiences the American people are beginning to realize how difficult it is to get rid of controls once they are installed. Rent controls have been with us for 11 years and have denied to the landlords the benefit of our increased rate of production and any opportunity to adjust to the inflation of those 11 years. There are on the committee those who would like to cling to them indefinitely, even if on an almost month-to-month basis. It has been the history of our experience that controllers always want to hang on to their power long after the conditions, which provided an excuse for the bringing of the controls into existence, have passed into history. Although this bill is written for a 2-year term, all of us must realize its proponents expect it to be extended indefinitely.

Eleventh. As one witness has summarized it:

> The evils of direct price, wage, and rent controls are many and inescapable. Reduced production, less efficient processing and distribution, poorer quality products, black markets, rationing, proposals for subsidies in lieu of realistic prices, and more and constantly expanding controls of every sort—all are their natural consequences.

Twelfth. And finally, we have the record of history. If this were our first modern experience with controls, perhaps we could be forgiven for not understanding the situation clearly, but OPS is not dead yet, and the memory of OPA is still painfully green. Experience with these two control agencies, and with OPS particularly, produced concrete evidence of all the difficulties in the undesirable trends I have cited. That we did not experience far greater difficulties merely reflects the fact that the whole story of OPS from the day when it was set up was a story of retreat. Whenever the control program did succeed in exercising any real effect on prices for any substantial period of time, the results were so disastrous that public opinion forced changes.

Our recent experience is backed up by earlier history. I am not going to take the time to recite the long and complete record of the failure of price controls, that can be gathered since the days of the Roman Empire. I shall quote only 2 statements out of history, hoping that at least these 2 will be new to my hearers. My first witness is an Englishman named John Mason, who commented on price controls in the year 1550 as follows:

> I have seen so many experiences of such ordinances, and ever the end is dearth and the lack of the thing that we seek to make cheap. Nature will have her course, and never shall you drive her to consent that a pennyworth shall be sold for a farthing. * * * For who will keep a cow that may not sell the milk for so much as the merchant and he can agree upon?

My other witnesses are closer to us here in this Congress. I shall quote from the journals of the Continental Congress, June 4, 1778; and who will say that that was not a time of grave emergency? In the face of their great need, after some very unsatisfactory experiences in attempting to control prices and wages, our Founding Fathers wisely said:

> It hath been found by experience that limitations upon the prices of commodities are not only ineffectual for the purposes proposed, but, likewise, productive of very evil consequences to the great detriment of the public service and the grievous oppression of individuals.

Mr. President, I realize that what I have recited is an old story, and that on the surface most of those who favor this bill will agree to all of it as far as the reimposition of controls now is concerned. I have yet to hear one of my colleagues say he regrets that price controls were recently lifted from the American people. No one came forth and asked that they be restored on prices and wages, although there are still some who feel that controls on rents should be continued even after 11 years. But the majority of the committee say we must plan now for their imposition again in the future as a safeguard against the risk of a great emergency.

During the committee debates, much was made of the need of mobilizing the economy as we mobilize our strength for war, of drafting prices as we draft men, or, if you please, of stockpiling controls as we stockpile materials of war. To me these are risky similes. They may convey a false impression. They may suggest that the committee studied the whole problem and rejected all other solutions. The fact is that the committee considered only direct consumer controls. The original bill was written for the purpose of producing controls; and during the hearings, the majority of the committee brushed off every suggestion of any alternative. So now as we breathe a sigh of relief at the end of price, wage, and rent controls, the whole barren program is offered to us again in sterile repetition of a proven failure. But there is a difference. Title 8 of this bill has a new gimmick. It is presented, not as a present threat, but as a time bomb. Knowing that if an attempt were made to continue them now it would be overwhelmingly rejected, the proponents of this philosophy sugarcoated it with the idea that there is less evil in adopting it now for some far-off future. Maybe, they tell us, we shall not even have to impose controls at all. By making their evils seem remote, they hope to make them more acceptable. But, Mr. President, to me evil is evil—past, present, or future.

I oppose title 8 of Senate bill 1081 because I believe the basic philosophy behind it is fallacious. I believe that reliance upon this device in times of great emergency rests on what is to me a false concept of our free economy; namely, that its greatest goal is stability. True, controls will produce the rigidity of stability if you can apply them in totalitarian completeness but all witnesses agree that controls can never produce the greater goals of production, opportunity, and growth, which to me are paramount, and are particularly important in an emergency. They can never create the atmosphere of flexibility and incentive which is the manifestation of freedom. Those who accept the philosophy of this bill, perhaps without realizing it, confess that they have no faith in economic freedom. To take their phrases again from the declaration of policy in the bill itself, they do not believe that our economic system can preserve its stability in the face of adverse international developments even when full and effective indirect controls are applied. They fear that the ever-present threat of Communist aggression will seriously jeopardize our free economy—this, Mr. President, in the face of the fact that that threat has been in existence at least since the end of World War II, and that during this time our economy has bridged the postwar readjustment period, and has taken rearmament in its stride, and has been able to throw off the controls that had been imposed in the meantime.

They tell us that because modern warfare is speedily destructive, the only safeguard that can exist is the power to impose direct consumer controls, and that this power must be given to the Chief Executive alone, because he is the only one who can act without delay. Philosophically, this bill, to me, is based on assumptions that I consider to be unwarranted. In later speeches I hope to discuss other objections to the bill.

For this and many other reasons, Mr. President, when the bill is before the Senate, I hope title 8, at least, will be overwhelmingly rejected.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of its business today, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, May 12, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

GRANT OF IMMUNITY TO WITNESSES BEFORE EITHER HOUSE OF CONGRESS OR CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 16) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, most Senators are, I believe, familiar with this bill. There has been on the statute books for a hundred years a statute designed to give Congress the right to compel the testimony of a witness even in cases where he claimed his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination. Of course, in order to compel such testimony, it is necessary to grant the witness immunity from prosecution with respect to those matters concerning which he is compelled to testify.

The law now on the statute books has become ineffective in recent years by reason of the holding by the Supreme Court that it is not broad enough—that is, the law does not grant an immunity as broad as the constitutional privilege under the fifth amendment.

Senate bill 16 would cure this defect in the existing law and make it effective once more as an instrument by which Congress can secure the testimony of a witness when it deems that testimony sufficiently important to justify granting the witness a limited immunity.

The immunity under the bill would be limited to those matters testified to in response to questions which the witness might be compelled to answer. I stress the words "in response" because under the bill no immunity would attach with respect to testimony given in an answer not responsive to a question. To put it another way, the bill will not permit a witness to make voluntary confession and thus get an immunity bath.

This bill was referred to on the floor of the Senate yesterday—facetiously, I hope—as an "immunity bath" bill. Of course, it is important that the bill provide for granting only such immunity as is necessary to be granted under the constitutional requirements, in order that the committee may obtain the testimony it desires.

Under this bill, in order to grant immunity, it would be necessary for a majority of either House of the Congress, or for two-thirds of the members of a committee, including at least one member from each major party represented on the committee, to vote the authority to require the witness to answer and to extend the immunity.

There could never be any question of surprise, because before any immunity granted would be effective the witness would first have to refuse to answer the question on the ground of his constitutional privilege under the fifth amendment; and then the witness would have to be ordered to answer, in such terms that the record would show that he was being granted immunity with respect to his responsive answer and that the granting of such immunity had been authorized by a proper vote, as I explained a moment ago.

There has been some fear expressed, Mr. President, that a committee might act hastily or unwisely under this statute. I do not share that fear, even under the language of the bill as reported from committee. However, I submit that the amendment which I have offered, in order to meet the views of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and other Senators with respect to advising the Attorney General in advance before any vote is taken on a proposed grant of immunity, is an amendment which will also operate to remove any fears of possible hasty or ill-advised action. Under this amendment, it would be a rule of the Senate that the Attorney General should be advised, at least 1 week before a vote on the question of granting immunity to a particular witness, of the intention to consider that question. In other words, the Attorney General would have a week in which to furnish information or make such representations as he might see fit to the committee or its chairman or to individual Senators or Members of the House with respect to the particular grant of immunity under consideration. Of course, if the Attorney General should see any basis for objection to granting immunity in a particular case, he would tell the committee and outline the basis for his objection. Under those circumstances, I cannot imagine any committee of the Congress taking hasty or uninformed action under the terms of this bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his amendment. I think it throws every necessary safeguard around the bill. As the Senator from Nevada well knows, I had offered a similar amendment, but I think the one offered by the Senator from Nevada is so very much stronger and better that I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, does not the amendment cover the only objection which was raised in the full committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, legislation of this nature is urgently needed, especially in connection with investigations conducted by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, dealing with national security and the threat of the Communist conspiracy. If this bill becomes law, it will go a long way, as I told the Senate yesterday, to help expose the Communist conspiracy in this country.

Mr. President, may my amendment to the bill be read at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Nevada be willing to have action taken, first, on the committee amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, at the beginning of line 11, it is proposed to strike out "committee." and to insert "committee".

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, the amendment was read so rapidly that I did not understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise that the amendment merely strikes out a period.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new title:

TITLE II—CHANGES IN RULES OF SENATE AND HOUSE

RULE-MAKING POWER OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE

SEC. 101. The following section of this title is enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively; and shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in

such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

NOTICE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL IN ADVANCE OF VOTE ON GRANTING IMMUNITY TO WITNESS

SEC. 102. At least 1 week before any vote on a question of granting immunity to any witness, notice shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States of the intention to consider such question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I prefer to make an explanation of the amendment, and then I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. President, this amendment is designed to meet the viewpoint of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and also that of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and other Senators who feel that any provision with respect to giving notice to the Attorney General should not be a matter of law, but should be taken care of by a rule. This provision would accomplish the purpose of requiring notification of the Attorney General in advance of taking a vote on a question of granting immunity to a witness; but the requirement is placed in the form of an amendment to the rules of the respective Houses, not as legislation.

This amendment as printed contains certain typographical errors in the placement of quotation marks at certain points. All quotation marks should be deleted and have been deleted in the amendment as I offer it.

Senators are, I think, familiar with the language used in this amendment. Admittedly, the language sounds awkward. However, this is the form worked out a number of years ago between Representatives of the Senate and the House on the first occasion when it was desired in connection with a bill to make a change in the rules but without foreclosing the right of either House to make further changes at it might see fit. This language has been used in each reorganization bill which has passed the Congress and will be found also in the legislative reorganization act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I filed minority views setting forth the necessity for an amendment, and I have an amendment to the bill which I should like to offer.

I should like to discuss the matter at some time before the bill is voted on and have an opportunity of offering my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may offer his amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering does not come at the end of the bill; it comes in the middle of the bill. I do not think it could be properly offered as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada purports to amend the rules of the Senate and the House. The amendment I wish to offer is a direct amendment to the bill.

I send the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 17, it is proposed to change the period to a colon and to insert the following:

Provided, That at least 1 week in advance of voting on the question of granting immunity to any witness under this act the Attorney General shall be informed of the intention to consider such question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the question is on agreeing to the amendment which I offered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I be heard on the matter?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield the floor to the Senator from Tennessee, not for the purpose of having his amendment considered, because the question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by me.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to know if it is necessary that I offer my amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Nevada, or, if the amendment comes first in the bill, which amendment would have priority of consideration and voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is the pending question. If the Senator from Tennessee desires to explain the provisions of his amendment, it will be perfectly proper for him to do so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. For the time being, I now offer my amendment as a substitute for the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that is in order.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is the Chair advised that that amendment may be considered as a substitute?

Mr. McCARRAN. I question very much the propriety of the statement that it is a substitute. It is of an entirely different nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that germaneness is not required.

Mr. McCARRAN. Since the Senator from Tennessee desires the floor, I yield to him.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I merely wished to explain my amendment sometime during the afternoon.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator may explain it now.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This question was before the Committee on the Judiciary on several occasions. As is explained in the individual views which I have filed, and which I hope Senators will read, I feel that general legislation granting immunity in certain rare cases, in exchange for the testimony of witnesses, is proper, and that there should be an authorization for congressional committees to grant such immunity. However, the whole procedure should be closely guarded.

Senators may remember that the present immunity statute, while it may have been intended to grant full immunity, does not, under an interpretation of the Supreme Court, do so. The present immunity statute has been interpreted to mean that testimony given before a congressional committee, where immunity has been claimed, cannot be used in a prosecution under a Federal law against the one who testified. But it does not grant him complete immunity in Federal proceedings from the offense about which he may have testified. Therefore, on some occasions, it has been difficult to secure certain testimony because of the present ruling upon the existing immunity statute.

As a result of the Crime Investigating Committee hearings, the committee recommended passage of a law of this kind, with strong safeguards, to allow congressional committees to grant immunity, and also to allow the Attorney General to give immunity, under safeguards, in certain cases, or in the giving of testimony before grand juries.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Are the minority views of the Senator from Tennessee printed?

Mr. KEFAUVER. They are printed. They contain my individual views.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to have a copy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I had assumed a copy was on the Senator's desk.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I now have a copy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I stated to the Committee on the Judiciary and to the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] that I favored the general purpose of the proposed legislation, but that I felt there should be an amendment which would at least require that the Attorney General of the United States be notified before a congressional committee granted immunity to a witness.

Frankly, I would be glad to see even more stringent requirements for granting immunity than are required in the bill, whenever the Attorney General is opposed to granting immunity, but it seemed to me that at least before a congressional committee granted immunity to a witness, which might destroy a prospective prosecution against an infamous criminal or which might ruin a case for the Department of Justice, and thus result in freeing a criminal, perhaps even a spy against the Government of the United States, the Attorney General should have the opportunity of discussing the matter with the particular committee concerned and trying to persuade the committee that it would not be in the public interest to grant the particular immunity under consideration.

It ought to be remembered that the statute is to apply to all committees of the Senate and the House, both standing and special committees, and that while the Committee on the Judiciary might be more than cautious to see that the Attorney General was notified, other committees, not appreciating fully the importance of protecting cases that

might be in the making against prospective defendants or against witnesses, might not be so thoughtful, and might inadvertently grant immunity to someone, thereby doing great harm to the enforcement of the penal laws of the United States.

The individual views which I filed are not lengthy. They consist of only 2½ pages. I do not wish to read them in full, but I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the individual views of Mr. KEFAUVER (pt. 2 of Rept. No. 153) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

(To accompany S. 16)

I am thoroughly in accord with the purposes of this bill, which would amend the present immunity statute so as to enable committees of the Congress to grant complete immunity in rare instances in order to secure pertinent testimony from witnesses appearing before congressional committees. I believe that such legislation is desirable and necessary.

I oppose the action by the majority of the committee in reporting out S. 16 in its present form.

Granting immunity is a power of great magnitude. It should be closely guarded, and, on those occasions where its use is necessary, it should be undertaken with great discretion and care. It is my conviction that before any committee of the Congress acts to grant immunity to a witness, the Attorney General of the United States should be consulted. When S. 16 was being discussed in committee, I offered an amendment which would require that the committee notify the Attorney General before any action is taken by the committee. This amendment was defeated in committee. Had it been adopted, I would have voted for S. 16. If this amendment is agreed to by the Senate, I shall support the bill.

Why is it so necessary that the Attorney General be notified before complete immunity is granted to a witness by either House of Congress or a committee thereof?

The Attorney General is the chief legal officer of the Government of the United States. As such, it is his responsibility vigorously and effectively to prosecute persons who offend the criminal laws of the United States. If this bill be not amended, as I suggested, the grave possibility exists of action taken by a committee of either House which might interfere with the Attorney General's carrying out his duties as chief prosecutor for the Government.

This proposed legislation applies to all congressional committees—those of the House as well as the Senate, standing and special committees alike. Many members of these committees are not lawyers. It is to be presumed that committee members would not ordinarily know of criminal actions pending against various witnesses who might be granted immunity in exchange for their testimony. Committee members would have no way of knowing of contemplated criminal prosecutions; of criminal charges which may be pending and involving witnesses who may be testifying before congressional committees. The Attorney General, through the nature of his duties, would have all pertinent information, and under the amendment I proposed would apprise any committee of any facts relating to any witness and thus eliminate or greatly reduce the danger of interfering with a Government case or the granting of immunity to a pernicious law violator.

I use the Rosenberg spy case[1] by way of illustration. Had David Greenglass been called as a witness before a congressional committee, and assuming that the committee had granted immunity to him in exchange for certain testimony, before it was known of his involvement in giving United States atomic secrets to the Russians, and had questioning substantially as follows taken place before the committee, the Government's case would have been irreparably damaged:

"Question (by Senator). Mr. Greenglass, did you visit and talk with certain Russian agents on a farm in New Mexico?

"Mr. GREENGLASS. I refuse to answer on the grounds that my answer might incriminate me.

"SENATOR. Since you have claimed your constitutional privilege, I am authorized by the committee and by law to grant you immunity from prosecution for your answer to that question. I now grant you immunity. With that knowledge, I now direct you to answer the question.

"Mr. GREENGLASS. Yes; I did.

"SENATOR. What did you discuss with these Russian agents?

"Mr. GREENGLASS. I refuse to answer, relying upon the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

"SENATOR. Since you have claimed your constitutional privilege, I am authorized by the committee and by law to grant you immunity from prosecution for your answer to that question. I now grant you that immunity. With that knowledge, I now direct you to answer the question.

"Mr. GREENGLASS. I discussed with them plans for stealing and giving to the Communists certain atomic secrets."

Had this event occurred, the Government could not have prosecuted David Greenglass. I believe that if S. 16 is enacted in its present form, the danger exists that some committee of the Congress might innocently use this line of questioning, not realizing the possible criminal charges against a witness, thus ruining a case which to the Government prosecutors could have been airtight and a conviction otherwise assured.

What harm can result from submitting the matter to the Attorney General before the committee acts in granting this immunity? My amendment in no way forces or compels the committee to follow the recommendation of the Attorney General. The amendment does not derogate from any power of the Congress or add to the powers of the Attorney General. It merely assures that any committee of either House will have the benefit of information which is available to the Attorney General and ordinarily not available to the Congress relating to prospective witnesses. I support this approach, because I feel that it is practically impossible for our committees to secure by itself the information that the Attorney General is able to obtain through his own agency and the FBI. I suggest that S. 16 with my amendment is the only approach that guarantees committees of the Congress from innocently granting immunity to a witness, who might be an important key in a Government prosecution.

It is contended that since the bill requires a majority vote of the committee before immunity can be granted little danger exists of the results. I fear the fact is that, while the general authority to grant immunity will have to be determined by a majority of the full committee, the actual hearing and application of the authority might possibly be applied by a few or even one Senator who would have been authorized to take sworn testimony.

The dangers of interfering with necessary Federal law prosecution and innocently granting immunity to dangerous and heinous criminals is too great under this bill. The Attorney General and the FBI should at least be notified before immunity is granted. Congressional committees should, and I believe would, welcome information from the Attorney General and the FBI before acting upon such important questions.

Accordingly, I recommend that S. 16 be amended to provide that the Attorney General be informed of the committee's intention to consider the question of granting immunity to such witness.

ESTES KEFAUVER.

[1] 195 F. 2d 583.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we are all familiar with the Rosenberg spy case. On page 2 of the Individual Views a hypothetical case is set forth. It might have happened that a Senate committee had Mr. Greenglass before it, before anything was known about the stealing and giving away of atomic secrets. The committee might have had no information whatsoever about that. It might have innocently fallen into a trap or a situation that would have ruined or would have made impossible the prosecution of the persons who have been convicted of this infamous crime. If the Senator had asked Mr. Greenglass whether he had visited and talked with certain Russian or Communist agents on a farm in Mexico, if he had refused to answer on the ground that his answer might incriminate him under the fifth amendment, and if he had been forced to answer, and he answered "I did," then if he had been asked what was discussed and he refused to answer and was required to answer, and he went on to tell what was discussed, namely, the stealing and giving away of atomic secrets, describing, in response to the question, what transpired, I think the New York prosecution of those people would have been impossible. They would have been granted immunity.

It is true that the bill requires that before any immunity is granted at least two-thirds of the membership of the full committee, and at least 1 member of each of the 2 major political parties represented on the committee, should vote in favor of granting the immunity. But we know that that does not envision that at the time when a question is asked in a hearing room and the answer demanded, two-thirds of the entire membership of the committee will be present. Committee hearings simply do not work out that way. What this bill envisions is that sometime before a hearing the full committee will have a meeting, and at that time the chairman of the full committee or the chairman of the subcommittee carrying on the investigation may explain that in an investigation to take place in a few days or a few weeks certain witnesses are to be called, and that it might be impossible to get them to answer because they would be expected to claim their immunity. The chairman of the subcommittee might recommend that in the event they should claim their immunity and refuse to answer, they be granted immunity under the statute. A two-thirds vote at that time authorizing that to be done in the discretion of the chairman of the subcommittee, and there may be only one member of the subcommittee holding the hearing who would put into operation this statute.

That is a situation fraught with dangers. It is a situation which might result in a great deal of criticism of Congress, if we should inadvertently, and not knowing the full facts, spoil some cases for the Department of Justice by granting immunity. We all know that, particularly in espionage cases and narcotics cases, considerable time is required to work up a case. There must be a great deal of secrecy as to who is to testify. The case must not be broken until it is ready to be presented in court. I remember that on many occasions during our Senate Crime Committee hearings Mr. Anslinger, the head of the narcotics enforcement agency, would ask us not to allow a certain witness to testify, or not to ask him certain questions, because if we did it would ruin a case on which his agency had been working on for years. It would give notice to others who were unaware of the fact that they were then being investigated, and that they might be indicted. It would give notice to various persons concerned, so that witnesses could be dispersed, and it would be very difficult for the enforcement agency to make a case.

Mr. President, it seems that in order not to interfere with the proper enforcement of laws by the Department of Justice, at least committees ought to be required by law to notify the Department of Justice 1 week in advance. Congress is a legislative body. Most committees of Congress have no way of knowing what cases may be pending against people in various parts of the United States. They have no way of knowing what involvements witnesses may have, or what investigations may be in progress at that time by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Narcotics Bureau.

The Department of Justice, having access to the FBI files, and having a coordinating working arrangement with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, maintains indexes and lists of people who are under prosecution or against whom prosecution is being considered. So they could give us the full facts. Under my amendment, what the committee would do after securing information would be up to the committee. If the committee wishes to disregard the recommendation of the Attorney General, that is a responsibility the committee would take.

I think there is much to be said for not allowing immunity when the Attorney General advises against it. There may be much to be said in favor of requiring a larger percentage vote of the committee when the Attorney General is against it. But certainly no one should complain at the requirement that the committee notify the Attorney General and obtain his recommendation before action is taken.

It should be remembered that law violators are very shrewd. If this measure is passed without some protecting clause, without some method of making sure that committees have full information, there will be many efforts to obtain immunity from prosecution by devising some method of getting before a committee to give information in response to a question.

Members of Congress might fall into traps which would be cleverly set to elicit questions by some member of the committee or counsel. In answer to a question, after an answer had been ordered, the witness might obtain immunity, or at least place the Government in a very difficult dispute.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. What would be the situation if the Senator's amendment were enacted into law and had the force of statutory enactment? Suppose the committee had a witness before it and had failed to notify the Attorney General 5 days in advance, or whatever time might be specified. A question might arise as to whether the notice should be 3, 4, or 5 days. Suppose the committee, acting in perfectly good faith, should say to a witness, "We are going to grant you immunity. Go ahead and answer all these questions." Then suppose the witness proceeded to answer questions, upon some member of the committee stating that he would be granted immunity. Suppose he told the entire story, and then the Attorney General or someone else should come along and say, "What you have done is illegal, because the committee did not notify the Attorney General in advance."

What sort of advantage could be taken of such a situation, not only by the witness himself, but by other persons whom he may have exposed in his testimony? What would be the situation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In my opinion, since the committee has the right to do whatever it wishes to do anyway, this would be considered a matter of procedure rather than one of substantive right.

That is my opinion about it. However, I say it ought to be written into the law under which we would operate. In that way, every committee, when considering granting immunity, would have notice of the provision by the fact that it was written into the law, and it would know what it must do; and prospective witnesses themselves would find the provision in the law itself. I think the provision should properly be a part of the bill itself, and should not be adopted as a separate rule of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. The question was as to what would happen in the situation which I described. Of course, a committee must protect an innocent man, who does not know what the law is. Let us assume we bring a man before our committee and we say to him, "We will grant you immunity," and he relies upon our word and testifies. Then it turns out that the Attorney General, instead of getting 5 days' notice, received only 4 days' notice. The situation is that the witness, in good faith, relying upon our assurance of immunity, has disclosed a state of facts which involves not only himself but other persons as well. Therefore, I should like to know what would be the status of the other persons who may have a right to complain? And I ask the same question with reference to the witness himself. In other words, what would be their status?

Mr. KEFAUVER. My opinion is, as I stated to the Senator before, it would not be a matter of substantive right, but a matter of procedure. I believe if such a witness were required to testify, notwithstanding the fact that there existed the requirement with respect to notifying the Attorney General and that such requirement had not been complied with, the situation would not be altered, and would be granted immunity.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. He would be granted immunity?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is my opinion.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Yes. If that be so, why would not the amendment suggested by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] accomplish the same result? I believe a rule of the committee ought to be sufficient, particularly when it would be necessary for two-thirds of the membership of the committee to pass on the question. If it could be done in some other and more definite way, I would be entirely agreeable.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada is an amendment of the rules of the House and of the Senate. It seems to me, inasmuch as we are dealing with a judiciary bill, not a bill dealing with the rules of the House and the Senate, such a provision ought to be included in the bill itself. I believe there is great value in having the rights and liabilities and requirements of complying with the law, and what must be done in order to comply with the law, written into the law itself. I believe all the provisions and requirements ought to be included in one document.

Furthermore, since the amendment would affect the rules of the House and the Senate, the Rules Committees of both Houses would feel they should be consulted in the matter, instead of having it handled only by the Judiciary Committee, particularly if it concerns an amendment to the rules of the House and of the Senate. The House might not like this change of rules and if the House struck it out, the rules would then apply to the Senate alone. This would be unsatisfactory. Furthermore, either body of Congress can by simple resolution change its rule. This requirement of notifying the Attorney General should be a definite part of the statute which could be changed only by an act. It should not be subject to the confusion which would result if the House had one rule on the subject and the other House another rule.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is not a novel matter. It was dealt with by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Case of Shapiro against United States. In that instance the footnote to the decision shows that the right of granting immunity is one which is exercised by executive agencies of the Government under the Shipping Act, the Packers and Stockyards Act, the Commodity Exchange Act, the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, the Communications Act, the Securities Exchange Act, the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, the Federal Power Act, the Industrial Alcohol Act, the Motor Carrier Act,

the National Labor Relations Act, the Social Security Act, the Merchant Marine Act, the Civil Aeronautics Act, the Bituminous Coal Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Natural Gas Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, the Water Carriers Act, the Freight Forwarders Act, and so forth.

The Senator from Tennessee, I believe, loses the point when he says the provision should be a part of the act. If my amendment is adopted, it will be a part of the act, and will be considered by both Houses of Congress. What is more, the substitute offered by the Senator from Tennessee would be jurisdictional, whereas the provision in the amendment which I have offered would be procedural. It would be a procedural proposal which would be passed upon by both Houses of Congress, and become a part of their rules, the same as in the case of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

The Senator from Tennessee treats my amendment as though it were something apart. If my amendment is adopted it will become a part of the law and a part of the rules of the two Houses of Congress, and therefore no committee could act without complying with the act.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if the bill becomes a law, with my amendment, the Attorney General would be notified, just as would be the case under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee. He would be notified, and he would have 1 week's notice. If he should then come before the committee and say, "Here is a condition, which I recite to you, which warrants my asking you to defer this action, because we have prosecutions pending," the Judiciary Committee, or any other committee which would have the right to make the decision, would determine whether a deferment should take place.

Safeguards of all kinds would be thrown around the act with the adoption of my amendment. The amendment makes it a procedural matter, rather than a jurisdictional matter.

It would not be necessary to say the notice was of only 4 days or only 6 days. It is a procedural matter, and by my amendment it would be written into the law and into the rules of both Houses of Congress. Therefore, it would become a part of the substantative law.

I am exceedingly pleased that the Senator from Tennessee agrees legislation of this kind should be passed. I say such legislation should be passed; indeed, I believe all of us agree on that point. However, it is legislation which must be very carefully safeguarded. Every precaution should be taken to make certain that no rights are lost and that the Congress is not deprived of the right to deal with subjects which come before it in its investigatory province.

To show that the granting of immunity, without any rule at all, is exercised by the administrative departments of the Government, I have read the list of acts of Congress—some 20 in number—cited by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Shapiro case, under which executive agencies exercise the right.

I respectfully submit that the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will, in my opinion, destroy the bill because it will make it not procedural, but jurisdictional; and the matter should be a procedural one, dealt with by both Houses of Congress by rule, and the rule is written into the amendment I have offered.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I should like to call attention to two provisions of the bill. The first appears in the second paragraph on page 2 of the bill, and reads as follows:

> (1) In the case of proceedings before one of the Houses of Congress, that a majority of the Members present of that House, or—

If the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee were adopted, it would mean that either the House or the Senate would first have to give notice to the Attorney General, before it could proceed, although each is an autonomous body. Certainly we do not wish to provide that the Senate itself should not have a right to proceed to grant immunity at a session of the Senate, without first going to the Attorney General to obtain permission. To me that would be abhorrent, for it would be one more step in the direction of obtaining permission from the executive for the legislative branch of the Government to transact business.

A second point which I should like to make is in reference to paragraph (2), on page 2 of the bill, reading as follows:

> (2) In the case of proceedings before a committee, that two-thirds of the members of the full committee, including at least 1 member of each of the 2 political parties having the largest representation on such committee—

That is the provision of the bill which would be modified or amended by the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, I submit that certainly it is an exercise of the greatest precaution and the greatest care, when we provide that two-thirds of the full committee must be present before immunity can be granted, and, furthermore, when we provide that a representative of each party must be present, even when the two-thirds vote is taken. That provision affords ample protection, even if the party division in the Senate or the House of Representatives should be in the ratio of 9 to 1.

I have great regard for the idea back of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], because I believe we should always notify the Attorney General if we are going to grant immunity. I believe that should be done either in the case of such action on the part of the Senate or on the part of the House, as autonomous bodies, or in the case of such action by a committee of either House. Certainly we should always cooperate with the Attorney General.

Of course, as I view the matter, there could not be such lack of information or woeful ignorance as to the person to whom either House of the Congress was about to grant immunity, inasmuch as both Houses of Congress cooperate with, and get the benefit of the services of, the FBI and other executive agencies engaged in similar work.

Although I thought that all we needed was a resolution or rule of the committee itself, to the effect that before the committee took action it would notify the Attorney General or the Department of Justice, and although I believe such a rule would be sufficient, yet the distinguished Senator from Tennessee thought that such provision should be made in the bill itself.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not quite understand what the Senator from North Carolina said about the necessity of having the House or the Senate notify the Attorney General, under the provisions of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I said that page 2 of the bill itself deals with two situations, one being in the case of such proceedings before one of the House of Congress, and the other being in the case of such proceedings before a congressional committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield further to me?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, proceedings before either the House or the Senate, when immunity might be granted, would not happen more than once in 50 years, I assume. Under those circumstances, would the Senator from North Carolina have any objection to having the Speaker of the House or the President of the Senate notify the Attorney General?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Yes; I would, as a matter of principle, because I do not believe the legislative branch of the Government should have to run to the executive branch of the Government to obtain permission to do something which falls within the province of the legislative branch. If it happens only once in 50 years, it is still wrong.

Mr. KEFAUVER. My amendment would not require either House to obtain permission; the result would simply be to secure information.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. My understanding is that under the amendment, the Senate itself could not proceed in such a case without notifying the Attorney General. Am I correct in my understanding of that part of the amendment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senate could proceed at its own hazard, although I think it would be subject to the censure of public opinion if it should proceed without notifying the Attorney General.

But so far as what the Senator from North Carolina has been discussing is concerned, there would be no difference, in respect to its application to the Senate and the House, between my amendment and the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. In other words, the amendment of the Senator from Nevada would provide the same requirement.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. In my opinion there is a vast difference between the two, because in the case of

the amendment of the Senator from Nevada, there would be a rule which either House could change of its own accord or volition, and such a change would not require a complete legislative enactment, meaning that the House and the Senate would have to pass a measure, which would then have to be signed by the President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield further to me?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator from North Carolina mean that when we considered some question which, under the amendment, would involve notification to the Attorney General about a proposed grant of immunity, we would wish to change the rule, so as to meet a particular case?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I was comparing the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, as it has been read, and the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think that difference is another persuasive argument why my amendment should be adopted, namely, under my amendment such an arrangement could not be changed every 2 or 3 days simply by changing the rule. I think a matter of this kind is so important that it should be enacted into law itself, so that the public and everyone else would have notice of it.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. In answer, Mr. President, let me say I have not observed that the rules of the Senate have been changed every 2 or 3 days, no matter what the situation may have been.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But the Senator from North Carolina just argued that either House might wish to change its rule in connection with such a matter, and I am taking the Senator from North Carolina at his own word.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Either House might very well wish to do so; and if it wished to change its rule, it should not have to notify the Attorney General of the United States either. In fact, that is the basis of the first objection I had, namely, that neither House of Congress, neither of the two parts of the legislative branch of the Government, should have to obtain permission from the Attorney General or should have to place him on notice as to what it intended to do. That is my first objection.

I think the other objection, to the effect that a committee might proceed without sufficient control or information, has been taken care of, because I cannot imagine that any committee, having two-thirds of its members present, would not notify the Attorney General about the matter which was to come before it. After all, the bill provides that two-thirds of the members of the committee shall be present.

Even if we assume that a committee might not be competent to pass on a matter—of course it has been stated that some committee might not include in its membership a number of lawyers, whereas the Judiciary Committee has many lawyers among its members—yet certainly two-thirds of the members of a committee, with at least one representative of each political party present, would know what should be done.

However, I am confident the Senator from Nevada knows more about the matter than I do, and I am confident that he is correct when he believes that no part of the executive branch of the Government should be allowed to tie the hands of the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, every possible safeguard has been provided. The amendment I have offered is by way of a safeguard, which would be provided by a rule of both Houses.

The Senator from Tennesese seems to think that amendment will not be a part of the bill. However, it will be a part of the bill, and, furthermore, will be a rule of both Houses, as well as a part of the law, if the bill is enacted.

Mr. President, there is no use in discussing the matter further. The safeguard we propose is the greatest safeguard which can possibly be provided.

So, Mr. President, I submit the matter.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I request that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, it is proposed to change the period to a colon and insert the words:

Provided, That at least 1 week in advance of voting on the question of granting immunity to any witness under this act the Attorney General shall be informed of the intention to consider such question.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I had reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada. I did not hear the reading of the amendment. I presume it has been adopted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No, it has not been adopted.

Mr. GEORGE. Is that the pending question?

Mr. McCARRAN. The pending question is on agreeing to a subsitute for my amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Nevada be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add the following new title:

TITLE II—CHANGES IN RULES OF SENATE AND HOUSE

RULEMAKING POWER OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE

SEC. 101. The following section of this title is enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively; and shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

NOTICE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL IN ADVANCE OF VOTE ON GRANTING IMMUNITY TO WITNESS

SEC. 102. At least 1 week before any vote on a question of granting immunity to any witness, notice shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States of the intention to consider such question.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it was that amendment in which I was interested. The language of the amendment would seem to make it mandatory upon the committee, before granting immunity, to give 1 week's notice to the Attorney General. I presume that is what is intended.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is what is intended.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall not oppose the amendment, because I am quite sure the Committee on the Judiciary has given it careful consideration; and the abuses which have been observed, not only by the Congress but also by the American people, in regard to the claiming of constitutional immunity by witnesses appearing before committees, have been so flagrant and so gross that I am constrained to go along with the amendment—with much misgiving, I wish to say.

I seriously doubt the wisdom of the bill as a whole. In the first place, although the question may be said to be an open one, I do not believe that the Congress of the United States can grant immunity in connection with the violation of State laws for offenses committed within a State. I think that perhaps when the question is squarely presented to the Supreme Court again, it will be held that immunity cannot be granted under the act against prosecution in State courts upon the basis of facts which constitute an offense under the law of the State.

Mr. President, my objection goes a bit deeper than that. Perhaps it is because I have been engaged in the practice of law for a long time, with occasional efforts to administer the law, but my views in respect to compelling witnesses to testify are somewhat broader than the provisions of the fifth amendment. If one were to examine the precedents upon which the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States rests, he would find that underlying our whole concept of jurisprudence is the personal right of a witness, not only to refuse to testify or to answer a question which would tend to incriminate him, but it is also the right of the witness to refuse to testify when his testimony would necessarily bring into public contempt and disrepute the members of his immediate family. It is a much broader right than the mere right of the defendant himself to escape punishment for a criminal offense.

While the Constitution of the United States, of course, simply provides against self-incrimination, at the same time the philosophy of the whole principle of the law is much broader than that. But I must, with great reluctance, refrain from opposing the bill, out of deference to the opinion of the committee itself, which has given so much study to the question and has seen so many abuses which seem to indicate that the existing Federal law ought to be clarified and amended, or at least that prior acts of

the Congress should be clarified and strengthened, as is now proposed. I most reluctantly concur in the enactment of legislation of this type.

In a free country we sometimes have to put up with abuses which are most inconvenient to all lawmaking and law-enforcing agencies of the Government, in order that freedom may be preserved. I can conceive that not only would it be possible for someone, by pleading immunity, to escape just prosecution, but I can also conceive that under the amendment one might be called upon to testify to things which would utterly disgrace and entirely place in public contempt the immediate members of his family. It is not proposed to grant immunity against that; and, of course, none could be granted, since the harm and injury would come from publication of the facts themselves.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nevada is the correct approach, qualifying it all with a renewal of my statement that I am most reluctant to go along with any of it. But I think the Senator from Nevada has correctly approached the problem. I would construe his amendment to be mandatory, not merely directory, so far as the giving of notice to the Attorney General by the legislative branch of the Government is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, if I may add one more word, I do not believe reference has been made this afternoon to one type of case which would be cared for by the pending measure. I understand that witnesses have been called before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee who were involved in certain matters then under investigation. They were willing to give the committee the benefit of whatever information they had, provided they were protected and were given immunity. From our investigators, and from others, I have been given to understand that in many cases a witness was perfectly willing to testify and to disclose facts which were needed by the committee in its investigation, but was afraid to do so, lest he or she be prosecuted.

There are a great many cases in which the committee, rather than force a man to testify against his will, would be willing and able to offer him an inducement that, if he would tell the truth and give the committee the facts, he would be granted immunity. Of course, that involves a question of judgment on the part of the committee and, for that matter, on the part of the Attorney General, assuming that he will be working with us, as I would expect to be the case, in determining whether the granting of immunity would be too great a gift to make to a man in exchange for the testimony to be obtained from him. In a large number of cases it is not unreasonable to grant immunity to a witness, in order to obtain his testimony before a committee, or at least it is not unreasonable to give the witness an opportunity to testify without fear of being prosecuted upon the basis of his testimony, after it had been given before the committee.

That, of course, means that there probably will be many instances of the testimony of a witness involving those who may have participated with him. As we have seen in courts all our lives, sometimes a man turns state's evidence. That is sometimes the only way of reaching the main participants in a crime. I think that is a class of cases we must consider. There are many cases in which a committee could get information which it ought to have if it had a right to grant immunity under the safeguards provided for in the bill, plus the safeguards provided for in the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it is important, in view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], that we make clear that this bill, at least, in the opinion of the Judiciary Committee and of its able counsel, would not grant to a witness immunity from prosecution in a State court. The opinion of the committee is that Congress does not have a right to pass any immunity statute which would grant immunity to a defendant in a State court. So, Mr. President, I think that should be a part of the RECORD so that anyone reading the proceedings will know exactly the legislative history of the measure and the opinion of the committee on that point. Is that the understanding of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. That question was raised before the committee. I do not recall who raised it; possibly it was the Senator from Tennessee. I do not recall that there was any well-considered opinion rendered at that time. There was a difference of opinion. Some Senators thought there was some way by which it might be done.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Was it not the opinion in the Hitchcock case that the Congress could not deal with State matters? Someone thought that later Supreme Court decisions might take a different view, but that at the present time Congress could not grant immunity in the case of State jurisdiction.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I should not like to express my opinion as to what was the opinion of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may say that in one instance the Supreme Court has intimated that Congress might grant immunity from State prosecution, but other decisions hold to the contrary. I would not say it is a settled doctrine, but it is largely settled to the extent that immunity is not granted in the case of prosecutions in a State court.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I was going to observe that I raised that question at the time of the hearing. I think it seemed to be the opinion of the committee at the time, certainly, that it is impossible for a Federal court or a Federal prosecuting officer or a committee of the Congress to grant immunity as relates to a prosecutable offense under State law. In associating myself with the impressions of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, I believe many of us felt that we would support this measure in the hope, but with some misgivings, that it might ultimately be found to be constitutional or that it might be a step in the right direction toward what is a most desirable objective.

There is also involved the element of coercion or of duress, where a witness is called before a committee and offered the opportunity to avail himself of immunity, knowing that if he does not, he might be cited for contempt. That enters the realm of public policy and, to my mind, is another very serious question which I am sure has troubled not me alone, but other members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to say at this point that I share the same concern which has been expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I share it both as a member of the committee and as an individual Member of the Senate; but I think the situation which confronts the Congress today is one which fully justifies the enactment of the pending bill. As I stated earlier in the discussion this afternoon, I think the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nevada throws safeguards around the bill which will prevent any abuses under the procedure provided in the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will not be adopted, and that my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Butler, Md.	Hennings	Martin
Carlson	Hill	Maybank
Clements	Hoey	McCarran
Eastland	Jackson	Russell
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Fulbright	Kefauver	Sparkman
George	Knowland	Watkins
Hendrickson	Kuchel	Welker

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator

from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Texas [Mr. DANIEL and Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] are absent on official business.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before the motion is made——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. To afford an opportunity for the Senator from Nevada to speak, I withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That cannot be done until a quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. I desired only to ask permission to be absent from the Senate for 10 days.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Can I attend to that for the Senator on Tuesday?

Mr. McCARRAN. The permission can be requested later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, May 12, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 11, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art our Father and Mother—God, we thank Thee for yesterday, that blessed day of lofty and worthy sentiment in the calendar of the church and state called "Mother's Day."

We rejoice that we again had the high and holy privilege of rendering tribute and honor to our mothers whose relationship to us is unlike that of any tie which binds us to our fellow men.

May our hearts continue to go out to Thee in gratitude for the vast host of noble and God-fearing mothers who are safeguarding the home against those evil forces which threaten its stability, its security, and its sanctity.

Grant that our annual observance of Mother's Day may inspire us with a prayerful longing to make every heart and home in our beloved country a sacred shrine and sanctuary of faith, peace, and love.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 7, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4465. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 15. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; and

S. 922. An act to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file any reports or resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Committee on Rules can meet this afternoon to report a rule regarding the tidelands bill, but in the event that they are unable to do so, the tidelands bill will not be brought up tomorrow. But there are two bills which can be brought up. Rules have been reported on them. One is on the bill (H. R. 4605) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield for an observation by the Chair?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] may not be able to go on with that bill tomorrow.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Then, Mr. Speaker, the other bill which can be taken up for consideration is the doctors' draft bill. That is, in the event that a rule is not reported on the tidelands oil bill this afternoon.

GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, together with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out line 10.
Page 3, strike out line 12.
Page 5, strike out lines 5 and 6.
Page 7, strike out line 4.
Pag 7, strike out line 22.
Page 10, strike out line 4.
Page 11, strike out line 6.
Page 12, strike out line 24.
Page 14, after line 3, insert:
"A-7141334, Mandukich, Svetozar Kosta."
Page 14, after line 3, insert:
"A-7141335, Mandukich, Kosara."
Page 14, after line 3, insert:
"A-7141336, Mandukich, Ivan."
Page 14, after line 3, insert:
"A-7190619, Tao, Hsiang Hsia or Albert H. Tao."
Page 14, after line 3, insert:
"A-6370112, Ling, James Gi-Ming."
Page 14, after line 3, insert:
"A-6289221, Sopko, Frantisek (Frantisch) or Frank John Sopko."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the effect of these amendments to delete the names of people who were approved, and the substitution of other names?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct. Eight names were stricken off and six are added.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES RENNICK MOFFETT

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the table the bill (H. R. 731) for the relief of James Rennick Moffett, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "Rennick" and insert "Renwick."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of James Renwick Moffett."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION FAVORING GRANTING OF THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. WALTER.

TO AMEND THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4465) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "in transit to or."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NURSING: AN ESSENTIAL PUBLIC SERVICE

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 I was privileged to celebrate National Hospital Day at the great Veterans' Administration hospital in Chillicothe, Ohio. I wish it were possible for me to paint so vivid a picture of it all that each Member of this House would feel he—and she—had been there in person. The celebration was under the auspices of the American Legion. All the forces had set up unusually interesting exhibits for everyone to see. Even the Lucky Lady was there—showing herself and her air cruising lines off to good advantage. Eight bands participated in the parade in which the various services marched—as did nurses, aides, volunteers, and so forth. A few historical floats added to the interest of guests and patients alike. Drill teams and drum corps performed on the athletic field where the main commemorative program was held before 23,000 people.

It was a very satisfying experience to me to speak to this great audience on the theme of Nursing: An Essential Public Service.

It is my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to report to this House my impressions of this great veterans' hospital as well as of the veterans' facility at Tuskegee, Ala., which I visited during the days I spent at the spring meeting of the board of trustees of Tuskegee Institute, of which I am a member, so at this moment, Mr. Speaker, I will ask only for unanimous consent to include herewith my remarks at Chillicothe:

It is indeeed a delightful privilege to come to Chillicothe, once Ohio's capital, to celebrate National Hospital Day in this great veterans' facility. Chillicothe has played a vital part many times in the building of our State and of our Nation.

Only this spring, you here and we on Capitol Hill reenacted the famous November 1802 ride of Thomas Worthington to bring to the President of the United States copies of the newly adopted Ohio State constitution. I wish you might have been on the steps of the Capitol as Mr. George Murphy and Mr. Don Strausburgh, in the picturesque costumes of other days, brought their weary horses to a halt and gave over copies of the old documents. Not only did this bring history before our eyes, but it brought you fine people of Chillicothe close to our hearts.

My thoughts flew back to the first world war in the teen-age years of this century when Chillicothe was a training center for Ohio troops. Clevelanders will long remember the wonderful hospitality given the members of our National Guard cavalry, the famous Black Horse Troop. They and their families bless you to this day.

And now you have this great veterans' hospital here. What a place it is. I remember well when it was opened on part of the site of Camp Sherman in 1924. I believe there were less than 500 beds then for neuropsychiatric patients. Bit by bit, new buildings have been added as the patient load has increased—until now you have a capacity for some 2,000. And I assure you that I can well understand how Dr. Botts feels impelled to stretch the space to its utmost. Having talked with the good doctor, I can readily see how his intense desire to give every veteran possible a chance to renew himself, helps him do the impossible. He is a fortunate man to have at his right hand a chief nurse of the quality and the experience that Florence Hennessey brings with her. Miss Hennessey, I wish there were ways to multiply you a hundredfold.

Before I left Washington I talked with Dorothy Wheeler, long head of the Veterans' Administration Nursing Service, which now employs 14,023 registered nurses who are helped in thousands of ways by literally thousands of auxiliary personnel—practical nurses, clerical workers, aids, both paid and unpaid, and volunteers of every sort and kind. We have worked together for many years, Miss Wheeler and I, and I want to take this opportunity to tell everyone within the sound of my voice about the work she has done to raise the nursing standards in our veterans' hospitals, to make available to affiliated groups of student nurses experience in psychiatry and tuberculosis. At the moment she is initiating field instruction to graduate nurses on an experimental basis, another instance in which she is making her splendid Department of Nursing more and more a credit to the Veterans' Administration, increasing service to the men whose need is so very great, while at the same time doing its bit in the general problem of nurse training.

Before I discuss nursing itself, I really must speak for a moment of one phase of every veterans' facility that is often too little recognized; the voluntary service awards this morning. Every sort and kind of welfare, religious, civic and veterans' organization is represented on the rolls. Do you realize that more than 80,000 men and women are giving themselves in such measure as they can to this work? I was thrilled as I read Miss Wheeler's report and found that over 300 organizations are contributing an average of 400,000 hours of voluntary service a month to the patients in the 161 veterans' hospitals across the country.

Right here at this great hospital under the supervision of the paid professional staff and the inspired leadership of Eveline Williams, men and women from the surrounding community through some 40 organizations have made themselves a part of a nationwide program dedicated to the men and women disabled in war service to this great free country of ours. Every department of the hospital benefits from their consecrated activities. Every veteran is reminded daily that America cares. Where else but here would thousands of men and women of their own free will and desire, with no compulsion but that of their own hearts, give themselves to such work? Surely this is but one more way that freedom rings out its song of service to all mankind.

I am sure I speak for Miss Hennessey and for Dr. Botts when I say to you that the hundreds of you, who give yourselves so unstintingly, so heartfully, to this great hospital, bring to the professional staffs a constant renewal of courage for the task no matter how difficult some of the problems appear. Surely no veteran whom you contact could be anything less than certain that the people of America care, not in fits and starts, but steadily, all the time.

It is fitting that on this hospital day we should do homage to that amazing woman whose 133d birthday falls on May 15—Florence Nightingale.

Born in Florence, Italy, in 1820, she was educated in England and in Paris. From her childhood on, she was on fire to do something about it all. She wrote a friend, "I would far rather than establish a religious order, open a career, highly paid."

You know that she gave herself to a health crusade, advising on ventilation, drainage, disinfectants, and general cleanliness, the kind of things we today call public health. I but remind you she was first to demonstrate dramatically that nursing is an essential public service.

I am happy indeed that on this Ohio Sesquicentennial Hospital Day you have asked

me to emphasize this fact, that nursing is an essential public service.

We know that being a nurse is perhaps as deeply satisfying a way of life to the individual as can be found. We think of it as a dignified, recognized career. We have been discovering of late that it is indeed an essential public service. Can hospitals exist without nurses? Can communities really prosper without them?

We hear on every side that hospital wards are being closed for lack of them. It does not take long to find out that there is an estimated shortage of some 60,000 across the Nation, in spite of the fact that more nurses than ever before are on active duty. (I believe 320,000.) One of the reasons for this shortage is that on top of our having kept on building more and more hospitals and setting up more and more public-health services of every sort and description, industry is drawing nurses out of the general pool and paying them more liberally while giving them assured work and regular hours, and the Government services are offering them much of the same with the added inducement of security when the working years are done.

What are we all going to do about it? I say "we all" very purposefully because unless we all get in and push, the wheels of student recruitment will turn over all too slowly. Unless we all do our part in our communities to support our schools of nursing and the hospitals in which the teaching is done, they in turn will be unable to carry their part of the load.

Unless we of the laity and all professional groups touching the problem at any point see to it that the training programs and the working conditions are such that young people will want to be nurses rather than to go into business and industry, we shall be faced with a continuing shortage in a field of endeavor that is an essential part of a strong and healthy people.

In studying this difficult problem of supply, I have formulated a six-point program which I feel sure would, if activated in every community, solve most of our present difficulties. Here it is:

1. Give economic security to nurses commensurate with their responsibilities and professional training.

2. Establish uniformity of State laws to eliminate confusion in the licensing of nurses.

3. Supplement and expand present counseling and placement service for nurses on a professional basis in all States and local communities to ensure best distribution of nursing service.

4. Intensify present recruitment methods necessary to the health of the public, establishing a well-planned recruiting and enrollment service. This must be done on a large scale with full public cooperation and support.

5. Nurses, through their official, professional organization, the American Nurses Association, recognize their responsibility to provide good nursing service. They must continue to give superior service and make their efforts known to the public.

6. The public must be educated to the importance of the nurse in maintaining the health of the American people. This will ensure public support of measures in the interest of nurses. Community responsibility is an essential part of such a program.

These steps are important and necessary if we are to do what must be done—enlarge the educational facilities and increase the teaching personnel. It is all very well to rejoice that there are 102,000 students enrolled in our basic professional schools. But we must realize that each year we need an enrollment of new, incoming students of at least 58,000. And that is only in the basic professional schools. In addition, we must have the enrollment in accredited practical nurse schools tripled and quadrupled and we must busy ourselves—all of us—to see to it that the fly-by-night schools for this splendid group are done away with and that minimum standards be insisted upon so that the States will see the importance of licensing this greatly needed group, that adequate care of our sick may be achieved in the near future.

Licensing will protect the professional nurse's position and more than all else will protect the patient. This will give us a team—doctor, professional nurse, practical nurse, aid, and volunteer, with the related professional dietitian, physical therapist, and occupational therapist, etc.—a team that will bring to bear on the patient all the knowledge and the skill we have today. But it will take all of us to build the team.

I have had the privilege here today of seeing an institution which demonstrates the very thing I have described. I shall go back to Washington tonight with a vivid picture of these buildings, of some of the most noticeable needs perhaps, but most of all I shall take with me the sense of the wonderful spirit that pervades this place. I am quite certain that no matter how wonderful your professional staffs might be, the fact that they have the heartful daily contact with the volunteer workers gives them an ever new revelation of what it means to the thousands of veterans who come and go in their need. Surely this, too, is a service to America that cannot be measured.

May I thank you once again for the privilege of sharing this Sesquicentennial Hospital Day with you.

WYOMING SWISS CHEESE

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I believe a great many Members of the House of Representatives do not know that the State of Wyoming produces some of the finest swiss cheese in the world. This swiss cheese is produced in a modern factory located at Thayne, in the heart of the beautiful Star Valley on the west side of the State of Wyoming.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Ernest Brog, general manager of this plant, I have placed in each of the cloakrooms a sample and hope you will enjoy it.

While the amount of swiss cheese produced in the Star Valley in western Wyoming is small as compared to production in Wisconsin and Ohio, our Wyoming swiss cheese industry is no less affected by the lifting of import quotas nearly a year ago. The nationwide price tumble of approximately 25 percent on swiss cheese at the factory should give this House real concern. The decrease is especially significant because it came at a seasonal period when the industry ordinarily is receiving its highest prices.

I am sure that swiss cheese experts will confirm that point. As I understand it, the price of swiss cheese usually rises during the winter months and drops in spring and early summer, during the so-called fluid milk flush period.

The normal situation has been upset this year, and it seems to me that there is no question that removal of import quotas was the primary factor.

Within a few months after removal of these quotas, our markets were flooded with low-priced Danish, Finnish, and West German swiss in amounts far in excess of normal imports from those countries.

I have been advised that the Department of Agriculture, in removing import quotas on swiss cheese last July, claimed that imported swiss is not competitive with domestic swiss. It is rather generally agreed that in the case of Switzerland swiss, the Department's claim is correct, since swiss cheese from Switzerland as a rule wholesales in New York at an average of 25 cents per pound above domestic swiss.

However, I submit that the very fact that imports from other western European nations have increased so tremendously is proof in itself that swiss cheese from those countries is competitive. Obviously, importing firms would not be bringing in these huge shipments from Denmark, Finland and West Germany unless they found it financially advantageous to do so.

In my mind it is completely unreasonable to expect the swiss cheese industry of my State of Wyoming, or of any other State, to compete with a product bearing the label "Imported swiss" when that product is permitted to come into this country at a price very nearly in line with our own, and without any regulation as to the quantity of such imports, despite the superior quality of much of the domestic swiss.

I am convinced that this is a very clear case of the necessity of protecting a domestic industry from unfair foreign competition. I urge this House to give serious consideration to legislation which will result in reimposition of import quotas on swiss cheese, in order to prevent a recurrence of the situation prevailing in the domestic swiss cheese industry this year.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the members of the Appropriations Committee for the very fine and courageous work they are doing in trying to balance the budget. I stand here before you amazed to see the white flag run up downtown; they seem to have surrendered to the spenders, and the spenders seem to have taken over. I am sure that will not discourage the Appropriations Committee. I do not know whether the would-be budget balancers downtown are wet behind the ears or not so far as this balancing the budget is concerned, but I recount to the Members of the House that, in the 80th Congress, while we started the Congress with a deficit of $20 billion, 2 years later we had wiped out that deficit and reduced the debt by $5 billion, and left $8 billion balance in the Treasury.

They will never balance the budget until they follow the course of tax reduction and release the shackles from

business. The only way to get reduction is through production, made possible by tax reduction. I am putting in figures here that show definitely that this budget can be balanced if the Congress has the courage to do it.

I have the report of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimating Federal receipts for the fiscal year 1954. On the basis of the staff report, the deficit for the fiscal year 1954 is $5.9 billion as compared to the $9.9 billion estimate in the Truman budget submitted in January. This deficit may be further reduced in 1954 through the sale of certain national mortgage association bonds at a discount as well as the sale of Government synthetic-rubber plants to private owners. I have been informed that because it is not definitely known when such sales will take place and because the amount which may be realized from the sales cannot now be accurately predicted, it was not possible to reflect such transactions in the staff pamphlet relating to the fiscal year 1954. However, if such sales are made, it is likely that the deficit for 1954 may be reduced by another billion dollars, which would bring the deficit down to $4.9 billion. The expenditure figures used by the staff in the report were approximately the current level of expenditures. Undoubtedly the Congress will succeed in making a further reduction in expenditures beyond the current level of $73.5 billion.

In the staff report the total receipts for the fiscal year 1954 are estimated at $67.6 billion. This is about $1 billion less than the estimate in the January 1953 budget. This estimated decline in receipts is due to the fact that corporate profits and personal income are expected to be at lower levels in the first half of the calendar year 1954 than they are in 1953. I am convinced that we should act now to meet this anticipated decline by making a tax reduction effective in 1953. We should not wait until we are faced with the actuality of such a decline. While it is true that a reduction in individual income tax may result in some immediate additional loss in revenue to the Government, this loss would only be of a temporary nature. This is made clear in Babson's reports of April 27, 1953, which states in referring to any loss in revenue resulting from 1953 tax relief as follows:

> But this would be only an initial loss. The concurrent boost in morale and incentive would increase future revenues. And any such increase could then be maintained, and possibly improved upon, when the new long-range (and long-needed) revision of the whole tax structure becomes a reality.

Our present difficulty is that we are in a state of inertia. The administration has not given the country any definite assurance that the excess-profits tax will be terminated on schedule, namely on July 1, 1953. The administration has given no assurance that individuals will receive income-tax relief in 1953. The Committee on Ways and Means is strongly of the opinion that individual income-tax relief must be made to coincide with the termination of the excess-profits tax and I have found no sentiment in the House for continuing the excess-profits tax beyond the scheduled termination date. As I have pointed out in the past, any revenue loss from the termination of the excess-profits tax is more mythical than real and would be made up through increased production and efficiency. Tax reduction is also needed now to offset any effect of the economy from reduction in Government spending. To quote a distinguished economist, Sumner H. Slichter, in an article appearing in the February 1953 issue of Harper's magazine:

> If individuals and business concerns raise their spending for goods as fast as the Government cuts its defense spending, the total demand for goods will not drop, and there will be no recession. The Government can help individuals and business concerns to spend more by taking less from them in the form of taxes. Hence it is important that cuts in defense spending be promptly matched by cuts in taxes.

My colleagues, you have heard the familiar slogan that "what the country needs is a good 5-cent cigar." Today that slogan has been changed to "what the country needs is relief from oppressive taxation." The country needs assurance that taxes are going to be reduced, and this assurance must be in the form of legislation actually reducing taxes. Long-range studies looking toward tax reduction in the future will not satisfy a nervous public. The administration has made no concrete move toward tax reduction. It is, therefore, up to the Congress to take the initiative and enact tax reduction legislation. H. R. 1 is now before you. Each Member can make his record clear by signing the petition which is now on the Speaker's desk to bring H. R. 1 to the floor for action. The time for action is now. We must not lag behind. The Canadians have adopted their tax reduction proposals for the fiscal year 1953. The British for the first time have seen the danger of oppressive taxes on their economy and have presented a budget to reduce taxes. France and Italy have also reduced taxes. We must act now in order to boost the morale and incentive of the people to earn, invest, and produce. Time is running short. If we wait until a decline sets in, it may be too late to avoid a recession.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on today and 20 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. FORRESTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, although I am not a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I should like to call attention to tomorrow's session of the hearings on the bill to extend the Trades Agreements Act. The meeting will give management and labor representatives of the coal and railroad industries an opportunity to explain the vital importance of that provision of the bill which is intended to place a curb on the amount of foreign residual oil that may be admitted into this country.

I am hopeful that the committee's full membership will be present, and I also hope that all Members of Congress will have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the material to be presented by coal and railroad witnesses. I am confident that the testimony will satisfy even our most zealous opponents that any case involving the welfare of thousands upon thousands of American workers, as well as the national security, merits the closest consideration of every Representative and Senator. And I feel that those who have not yet made a decision on which course to follow in our foreign-trade program will be readily convinced of the need for legislation to defend our domestic economy and preparedness program against the erosive action of excessive oil imports.

You have heard me and a number of my colleagues discuss our problem in the past. We have, in fact, introduced more than a score of bills—all with the single purpose of giving relief to our workers and our industries from the damaging effects of foreign residual oil—since this Congress convened 4 months ago.

With our objectives incorporated into the bill now being studied by the Ways and Means Committee, the time of decision is near, and tomorrow's hearings will bring conditions in our mining districts into clear focus so that you will have an opportunity to recognize the reasons for our insistent pleas in behalf of our working people. I implore you to give your kind attention to this meeting, for your final decision will directly affect the 350,000 families of United States mine workers, as well as the many other men, women, and children whose livelihood is dependent upon a going coal industry.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FEDERAL RESERVE CALLED UPON TO SUPPORT GOVERNMENT BONDS AT PAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today for the joint sponsors a resolution calling on the Federal Reserve Board and the Open Markets Committee of the Federal Reserve System to support United States Government securities at par. In the resolution the phrase "should support," and

so forth, is used; the reason the word "direct" is not used is because the Federal Reserve System is an agency of Congress, and its officials will certainly carry out any expressed will of Congress.

In the House, although a bill or resolution can only bear the name of one Member, I have introduced the resolution, but the other cosponsors of it are: Representatives RAYBURN, MCCORMACK, SPENCE, MULTER, RAINS, DEANE, O'HARA of Illinois, ADDONIZIO, DINGELL, EBERHARTER, BAILEY, PRICE, PERKINS, and ROGERS of Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, it was the traditional policy of this Government through the Open Markets Committee of the Federal Reserve Board System for more than 15 years to support United States Government securities at par. That policy commenced prior to World War II, it was in effect all during World War II, and it was not until March 1951 that the Federal Reserve Board refused through the Open Markets Committee to further support Government securities. As a result of that, long-term Government bonds have gone down to 97, 96, 95, 92, and finally to 91.

The new policy is breaking faith with the people of this country who have a reason to believe and who had a reason to rely upon the traditional policy of the Federal Reserve System in the support of those bonds. It has broken that good faith.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is offered for the purpose of restoring that traditional policy. I hope that there will be an early hearing and a favorable report and that the resolution will be adopted. It is not in the form of a bill, because a bill is unnecessary. The Federal Reserve System is an agency of the Congress. Anything that the Congress says that the Federal Reserve System should do, that System must do. It is supposed to represent the will of this body and the Senate. This resolution expresses that will for the purpose of getting those bonds supported again as they were traditionally before March 1951.

In the Senate the resolution is cosponsored, in addition to Senator MURRAY, by Senators LONG, GREEN, KILGORE, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, and HUMPHREY.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Concurrent resolution to provide for support of the credit of the United States of America by the Federal Reserve System

Whereas millions of loyal and patriotic American citizens supported their Government during World War II by buying Government bonds and have continued to do so since the end of World War II;

Whereas the Federal Reserve System has been pursuing a policy of refusing to do its part in supporting the credit of the United States of America by buying its proper share of Government bonds and other Government securities;

Whereas the credit of the United States of America has been impaired thereby;

Whereas as a consequence, Government securities have fallen below par and the capital position of those with investments in previously issued Government securities has been seriously impaired;

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System has made it easier for banks, insurance companies, corporations, and private investors to obtain higher interest rates, and thus higher profits, on money loaned to the Government;

Whereas the increased interest rates on Government securities will result in vast additional expenditures by the Federal Government and a substantial and unnecessary increase in the national debt;

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System has increased interest rates not only on funds borrowed by the Federal Government, but has also helped to bring about a dangerous rise in interest rates on funds borrowed by (1) farmers, (2) foreign purchasers of American agricultural products, (3) home builders, (4) veterans who are buying homes and all other home buyers, (5) businessmen (particularly small-business men), and (6) local governments for the construction of schools, roads, water supply and sewage systems, and other essential public facilities;

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System may tend, in combination with other factors, to bring on a decline in business activity throughout the economy and to accentuate the deflationary trend in American agriculture;

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System is an ineffective and inappropriate substitute for soundly conceived measures to control the supply and use of credit and to maintain the value of the American dollar;

Whereas whatever flexibility is needed in the prices of Government bonds should take place above par under the alternative policy of Federal Reserve System support of Government bonds at par;

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System undermines the ability of the United States of America to meet the financial problems that would inevitably result from a new international emergency;

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System violates the purposes of the Congress in the creation of the Federal Reserve System;

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System is inconsistent with the maintenance of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power as called for in the Employment Act of 1946;

Whereas a policy of supporting United States Government securities at par will not only cost the taxpayers nothing, but will also result in a saving to the taxpayers and a profit to the Treasury: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Federal Reserve Board and the open market committee of the Federal Reserve System should support the price of United States Government securities at par, but not exceeding par, as was done before the so-called Treasury-Federal Reserve accord which was announced March 4, 1951.

The joint statement that was prepared by the sponsors and released today was as follows:

A group of Senators and Representatives announced their intention to introduce in both Houses today a resolution to help stop the rapid and reckless interests rate increases resulting from the policies of the Federal Reserve System and the Treasury Department.

The resolution would require the Federal Reserve System to support United States Government securities at par, thereby enabling the Government to borrow at lower interest rates. This in turn would permit low rates for farmers, businessmen, home buyers, local governments, and other borrowers.

Speaking on behalf of the group, Representatives WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, Texas, and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, Montana, charged that in the brief 3-month period from December 1952, to March of this year, while the Government had to borrow large sums of money, the Federal Reserve System dumped about $900 million worth of Government securities. The Federal Reserve System also refrained from buying any new Government securities. As a result, the price of long-term Government bonds has hit a new historic low.

"The refusal of the Federal Reserve System to support the credit of the United States," stated Representative PATMAN and Senator MURRAY, "would be bad enough if it resulted only in additional billions of dollars in Government expenditures and the national debt.

"But it has also led to a dangerous spiral of interest-rate increases for private borrowers.

"First, there was an increase in the interest on support loans to farmers and on Export-Import Bank loans for the purchase abroad of American cotton. Then came an increase in the commercial-bank rate on prime-business loans. This was followed by a rise in rates on consumer-installment loans. Over the last week-end the interest rate on VA- and FHA-insured home mortgages was boosted. All of this is happening at a time when there is a serious decline in agricultural prices and a growing danger that the agricultural price decline may spread to the rest of the economy.

"The adoption of our resolution will help protect American farmers, veterans, home buyers, and small-business men against the harmful effects of further interest-rate boosts and of undue tightening in the supply of credit. The adoption of our resolution will also provide invaluable insurance against the threat of future depressions, foreclosures, bankruptcies, and unemployment."

In past years Representative PATMAN and Senator MURRAY have coauthored many important legislative measures, including the Employment Act of 1946, the legislation which established the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and other statutes protecting American small-business enterprise.

PACKING THE TARIFF COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the Simpson bill, H. R. 4294, on which the Committee on Ways and Means is currently holding hearings, seeks to insure a complete abandonment of our reciprocal trade agreements program as we have known it. Even an administration spokesman, the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Mr. Morton, has stated that the Simpson bill "would tear the vitals out of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act."

The Simpson bill uses a two-pronged approach; not only would the present act be extended with crippling amendments by the bill, but it would also take care of any possible slip by raising membership of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7, no more than 4 of whom "shall be members of the same political party."

The proponents of this provision claim that it is designed to break a tie in case of an even split in decisions by the Tariff Commission. They must make this claim with their tongues in their cheeks, because of the 21 completed investigations under the escape-clause procedure, recommendations

have been made to the President in 7; 5 of these were unanimous and 2 were by a vote of 4 to 2. No injury was found in 14 cases, 4 by unanimous decision, and 10 by divided votes as follows: Two, 4 to 2; two, 5 to 1; four, 3 to 2; and two, 3 to 1. It can be seen from this that the findings have always been either unanimous or by a majority vote.

The real purpose, of course, is to change the traditional nonpartisan makeup of the Tariff Commission to a partisan makeup. This is so obvious that argument on this point is unnecessary. As a matter of fact, an administration spokesman, Secretary of the Interior McKay, through an apparent inadvertence, admitted before the Committee on Ways and Means on May 6 that the Commission, in effect, by new appointments, will become more protectionist when he stated:

Moreover, the composition of the Tariff Commission has changed; an industry application in effect now goes before a new and different commission.

The exchange which I had with Secretary McKay on this point is most revealing. The transcript is uncorrected and unrevised. It follows:

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Secretary, on page 9 of your prepared statement, in the second paragraph, you say:

"In addition, during this interim period of study the affected industries continue to have before them the opportunity to take their cases to the Tariff Commission for escape-clause investigations, which after due consideration may result in modification of the tariffs or imposition of quotas."

Further down in the same paragraph you say:

"Moreover, the composition of the Tariff Commission has changed; an industry application in effect now goes before a new and different commission."

Just what do you mean by that, "new Commission"?

Secretary McKAY. I must admit I do not know. I thought it had changed from the information I had. I thought it had changed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In what respect?

Secretary McKAY. In the composition of it. I did not write this particular paragraph, as you may well know. I suppose they had information that it had changed. Has it not changed?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is what you mean? You mean it has a new member now?

Secretary McKAY. Just one, is it? I did not know.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, the person who wrote this statement, then, probably meant by that that it has a new member whose views are well known with respect to tariffs. Do you think that is what he meant?

Secretary McKAY. I suppose so.

Mr. EBERHARTER. So you could practically depend upon anybody going before the Commission receiving a very sympathetic hearing on his complaint?

Secretary McKAY. I would think if there is a Tariff Commission that is not giving industry sympathetic hearings, something would be done about it administratively. The appointing power certainly has power to remove, has it not?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is a doubtful question. The terms of the Commissioners are fixed by law, and if there is a change of administration, it is very doubtful whether a change in administration could force the removal of a member of the Tariff Commission.

Secretary McKAY. I see.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The Tariff Commission has been in existence for nearly 40 years. Are you aware of the fact that it always has been nonpartisan?

Secretary McKAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Do you think that the statement here may mean that the Commission is now not nonpartisan?

Secretary McKAY. Oh, no.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The composition of the Commission has been changed, you say. Would you say it is still nonpartisan?

Secretary McKAY. I would think so.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I cannot get away from the fact that the impression from that statement is that the change in the personnel of the Commission will result in different findings.

Secretary McKAY. Well, you are entitled to your impression of it, sir.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It does not give you the same impression, though?

Secretary McKAY. Not necessarily.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Inferentially, then, instead of not necessarily?

Secretary McKAY. Very well. You know, this is testimony submitted to you. You are not going to act on this testimony alone. You are going to act upon the combined testimony. If this is not satisfactory, throw it out the window.

Mr. EBERHARTER. We are just trying to get an explanation of what you meant by your official statement. That is an official statement, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary McKAY. I will stand on it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is not an off-the-cuff opinion, you know.

Secretary McKAY. This is submitted; and if it is not right, we will have to correct it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. There may be some faults in it, is that it?

Secretary McKAY. We are not perfect.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Thank you.

The Tariff Commission was established in 1916 as a means by which the Congress could obtain nonpartisan fact-finding assistance in tariff making. In the Dictionary of Tariff Information published by the Tariff Commission in 1924, the Commission was described as "an independent nonpartisan body whose principal function is to ascertain facts upon the basis of which Congress may determine tariff policies, the rates of duty to make the policies effective, and the methods of customs administration, and on which the President may base certain administrative acts in relation to these matters."

This dictionary further states:

Nonpartisanship was to be secured by the requirement that not more than three of the Commissioners were to be members of the same political party.

The 1929 tariff bill, when it passed the House, contained a provision similar to the Simpson bill increasing the Tariff Commission membership from 6 to 7. This was eliminated in the Senate.

The Simpson bill boldly and definitely aims at establishing a partisan Commission, since it provides that "no more than four of the Commissioners shall be members of the same political party."

Even the attempt in 1929 was mild compared to this, because the report of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1929 made it clear that the elimination of the reference to political affiliation was intended to eliminate partisan appointments to the Commission, and to have appointments based purely on merit. The Simpson bill window dresses by mentioning merit as a qualification and then specifically provides for a politically partisan Commission.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The composition of the Tariff Commission has always been 3 and 3, has it not?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes; it has always been composed of six members equally divided.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it has been that way since the original bill was passed establishing the Commission?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes; since 1916. It has been that way for nearly 40 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now they want to make it 4 and 3?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That eliminates the bipartisan composition of the Commission; is that not correct?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct. That is definitely the intention. My point, Mr. Speaker, in bringing this subject up today is that the Secretary of the Interior himself in an official prepared statement for the Committee on Ways and Means said that now industry can appear before what is a new Commission in effect. The composition of the Commission has changed. Of course, what he meant by that was the appointment of a high-tariff policy man to what has always in the past been a nonpartisan Tariff Commission.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is not only a prominent Member of the House, but a prominent member of the Committee on Ways and Means. I wonder if the gentleman can state what the reason is and what the purpose is of this elimination and wiping out the bipartisan composition of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The reason, of course, is very obvious. The purpose of it is by the appointment of a high-tariff Commission man to the Commission the escape clause would be invoked in many instances, and it would do away with the reciprocal trade-agreements program by giving the special pleaders who come before the Tariff Commission what they ask for in effect. In other words, it was realized from 1916 that the Tariff Commission was a fact-finding Commission, a nonpartisan Commission to the last degree, and it has always been such. This is really a suggestion of an historic departure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Even when the Republicans had only 89 Members in the House of Representatives, we Democrats did not undertake to do that, did we?

Mr. EBERHARTER. We certainly did not.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the Republican representation in this body was down to 89, and we had well over 300 Democratic Members, but we never entertained a thought of changing the bipartisan composition of the Tariff Commission, did we?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is absolutely correct. The departure from the historic position of a nonpartisan Tariff Commission, in my opinion, is the most important suggestion made in this Simpson bill, because if we are going to make

the Tariff Commission a partisan Commission with a change in administration, then we will have either a high tariff policy or a low tariff policy, depending in the change in administration. Then what would happen to our trade? It would become nothing but a political football, and no nation could depend on what our policy was going to be.

In other words, we would be going back to the old system of logrolling, such as was perpetrated by the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. It is a very important proposition, and I hope that the country and the Members will become aware of this program to scuttle the great program of reciprocal trade agreements initiated by the great Cordell Hull. Administration spokesmen themselves have been for a continuation of that policy, but there are a surprising number of men in Congress who are fighting the administration. We who believe in the reciprocal trade agreements are fighting on the side of President Eisenhower. It is another instance where the Democrats are bailing out President Eisenhower.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Democrats are giving the same constructive legislation in the minority that we always did when we were in the majority?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. If President Eisenhower will do a little inside work and pick up a few Republican Members on the Ways and Means Committee, we Democrats will save the day for them, the same as we did on the extension of the reorganization plan. Is that not right?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is right. Of course, by "inside work" you mean converting some of the Republican Members.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. On that other occasion we had the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretary working with us for 3 months before it came up.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Since the creation of the Tariff Commission, Congress has very carefully avoided the characterization of the Tariff Commission as a partisan agency. I feel it highly important, in light of the critical condition in the world today and the great need of economic stability by the promotion of trade between the free nations of the world, that this attempt to frustrate what has always been the policy of Congress should be brought to the attention of the Members of the House and the Nation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House love HERMAN EBERHARTER. We know him to be the best humorist in the House; the outstanding jester since the departure of Mike DiSalle. All of his political digs about Republicans and his remarks about how the Democrats are bailing out President Eisenhower are a lot of malarky. Brother, I am sure the Democrats in your part of the country did nothing to help President Eisenhower in the last election. They did in a number of places but not in Pennsylvania. You did your best to defeat him, and we are aware of it. You are not trying to help him now. All you are doing, and have done consistently, is to endeavor to create turmoil and strife, and, of course, you have not succeeded. We Republicans are back of the President. On occasion, of course, we disagree. Republicans are supporting the administration, as they did at election time and as they will during all of the 83d Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

THE LATE REVEREND LEO G. BURKE, OMI

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this morning I attended Mass for the Reverend Leo G. Burke at the Immaculate Conception Shrine here in Washington. It was a very moving and very beautiful funeral service. We in Lowell and in Massachusetts and all over the Nation mourn Father Burke. There never lived a finer, more patriotic, more religious man. He was very much beloved by all who knew him of all denominations.

In the days of our battle against communism and our battle against many other ills, men of his caliber can ill be spared; but his example is always before us. I should like to read to you an editorial entitled "Father Burke, OMI," from the Lowell Sun of May 8, 1953:

The sudden and unexpected news yesterday that death had taken Rev. Leo G. Burke, OMI, in Washington at the age of 55 came as a great shock to his many friends here in his hometown, Lowell.

Father Burke was well known here, and beloved to a point rarely equaled by all who knew him. He was born in that citadel otherwise known as the Secred Heart parish. Years later as a priest he was to become the benevolent pastor of the Immaculate Conception parish.

Yet, for all his local activity, we doubt that many people realized, fully or otherwise, the sheer intellectual brilliance of Father Burke as a priest, scholar, and man among red-blooded men.

As we ponder these few meager words we think that Father Burke might be compared to Bishop Sheen but the thought doesn't quite ring as true as it should.

Maybe this expresses it more accurately: Bishop Sheen is another Father Burke with a truly great flair for showmanship which Father Burke never had—and this is suggested with no idea of detracting one iota from Bishop Sheen who is a tremendous new force for good on the American scene at a moment when it appears to be most needed.

With the mournful passing of Father Burke a great and good soul goes to its reward. And with it goes one of the most truly brilliant minds that has come out of our Lowell in the last century. That's a long time. May his immortal soul rest in the eternal heavenly peace it so richly deserves by all earthly standards.

From the same paper I read the following article:

REV. LEO G. BURKE, OMI, DIES AT 55—SUCCUMBED TODAY IN WASHINGTON, STRICKEN YESTERDAY

LOWELL.—Rev. Leo G. Burke, OMI, STL, former pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church here, and regarded as one of the most brilliant members of the Oblate order, died this morning in Washington, D. C. He was stricken yesterday morning and succumbed today, despite all medical attention possible. He was 55.

Rev. Father Burke, OMI, had been assigned to the Oblate scholasticate in the Capital for the past several years as professor of pastoral theology, and prior to his latest assignment served 2 terms as pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church.

Officials at the scholasticate stated that Rev. Father Burke, OMI, became suddenly ill yesterday morning and was removed to Georgetown Hospital. He died at 7:30 o'clock this morning.

Born in this city, on March 23, 1898, the son of the late Daniel and Mary (Hayes) Burke, Rev. Father Burke, OMI, was educated in the Moody Junior High School and Lowell High School, graduating as a Carney Medal scholar from the latter with the class of 1916. At one time, he was stationed at the Sacred Heart Church here, and held many important assignments in the Oblate order.

BOSTON COLLEGE GRADUATE

A star scholar at Boston College, he was graduated with high honors in 1920 after which he entered the Oblate novitate in Tewksbury for 1 year.

After leaving Tewksbury, he matriculated at the Oblate scholasticate in Washington for 4 years, being ordained there in 1925. He then studied for his licentiate of sacred theology degree at the Catholic University of America, Washington, for 2 years, receiving it in 1927.

ASSIGNED TO TEACH

Immediately upon receiving his law degree, Rev. Father Burke, OMI, was assigned to teach at the Oblate School in Washington, remaining there 6 years at which time he was assigned to Ligonier, Ind., where he remained until 1937.

He was assigned to this city in 1937 as pastor of the Immaculate Conception parish, remaining there for two terms, through 1943 when he was succeeded by Rev. John J. Donnelly, OMI.

After completing his assignment here, Rev. Father Burke, OMI, was stationed at the Oblate headquarters in Buffalo, N. Y., later performing missionary work in the Midwest for several years. He was later transferred back to Washington, where he not only served as professor of pastoral theology at the Oblate Scholasticate, but assumed the added burden of teaching at the law school of Catholic University.

DEATH CAME AS SHOCK

Rev. Father Burke, OMI, although not considered in excellent health for the past year, was not prevented from continuing his teaching duties and his sudden illness yesterday and death today, came as a complete shock to both fellow members of the Oblate order and his host of friends and former parishioners here.

Surviving him are three sisters, Rev. Sister Mary Veronica of the Grey Nuns of the Sacred Heart, stationed at Melrose Park, Oak Lane, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Gerald M. White and Miss Mary E. Burke, both of this city; several nieces and nephews, and an uncle, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

INVITATION TO DEMONSTRATION OF PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES BY KOREAN VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Members of the House again that they have been invited by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to a demonstration which will be made by Korean veterans in the use of artificial arms and artificial legs. These young veterans have worked tirelessly in order to explain and show to all, not only those in the service who have met with such cruel disability as the loss of arms and legs or the loss of use of those members, but to civilians as well, what can be done, what progress has been made in improving the manufacture and in the use of these prosthetic appliances.

The House will remember that some years ago we passed a bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and one by myself which provided a million dollars each year for research on prosthetic appliances. I know that every veteran who has to use these appliances is grateful to the House and the Senate for the passage of that bill. These veterans would like to show to the Members of the House—and members of the Cabinet have been invited also, together with members of the armed services—these veterans would like to show them what has been accomplished with the money that is expended every year in order to give them as nearly as may be possible some usefulness of the members they have lost even though the best possible substitute cannot take the place of a real arm or a real leg. We cannot give them back what they have lost, but we can help them.

Following is a copy of the invitation which has been sent to each Member of Congress and to many others:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1953.

DEAR SIR: I have called a special meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs at 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 13, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, to review the artificial limb research program being conducted by the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense. As you doubtlessly know, this program has won a much-deserved worldwide reputation for its unique accomplishments in this humanitarian field.

Profs. Howard D. Eberhart and Craig L. Taylor, of the University of California, and members of the National Research Council's Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs, will describe the remarkable progress in artificial limbs that has been achieved under this program.

Professors Eberhart and Taylor will be assisted by a group of combat amputees, who will demonstrate various devices that have been developed.

This program is being carried out under the provisions of Public Law 729 which was initiated by this committee and passed by the 80th Congress.

I am sure you will find this demonstration most interesting and informative and well worth your time to witness. Every advance achieved under this prosthetics program is made fully and freely available to civilian amputees as well as veterans. You and any guests you may care to bring, or invite, will be most welcome.

The meeting will be held in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building.

Sincerely,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLELSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KILBURN and to include an editorial.

Mr. MERROW and to include an editorial.

Mr. FORAND (at the request of Mr. STAGGERS) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an editorial.

Mr. RIVERS and to include an address by a very able soldier, Maj. Gen. Miles Reber.

Mr. YORTY in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY and to include an address entitled "Juridicial Status of the Continental Shelf" by Joseph Walter Bingham, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $336.

Mr. KIRWAN and to include an editorial from a Youngstown newspaper.

Mr. WICKERSHAM in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOSS and to include a newspaper article.

Mrs. BUCHANAN and to include a letter.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri and to include a sermon.

Mr. HOWELL and to include an editorial.

Mr. MOLLOHAN and to include an article from a newspaper.

Mr. WILSON of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRUMPACKER.

Mr. CRETELLA and to include an article appearing in the May issue of the Journal of Health.

Mr. SCUDDER (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Illinois).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, for the week of May 11, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 15. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 922. An act to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 7, 1953, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 688. An act for the relief of Takako Niina;

H. R. 720. An act for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann);

H. R. 884. An act for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi;

H. R. 955. An act for the relief of Paula Akiyama;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary;

H. R. 1186. An act for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marques;

H. R. 1193. An act for the relief of Helga Josefa Wiley;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. James M. Tuten, Jr.;

H. R. 1704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki;

H. R. 1895. An act for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat;

H. R. 1936. An act authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter;

H. R. 2624. An act for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford;

H. R. 2936. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California for use as a fairground by the 10-A District Agricultural Association, California; and

H. R. 4004. An act to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 12, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

686. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of Army research and development contracts during the 6-months' period ended December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

687. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the annual report of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

688. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to revise the Organic Act

of the Virgin Islands of the United States"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

689. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the use in criminal proceedings in any court established by act of Congress of information intercepted in national security investigations"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GROSS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4091. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to make the exclusion from such act of temporary employees of Congress inapplicable to such employees who are appointed at an annual rate of salary; without amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2828. A bill to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JAVITS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 307. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.," without amendment (Rept. No. 372). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 1219. A bill authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4689. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; with amendment (Rept. No. 374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 779. A bill for the relief of Ida Baghdassarian; without amendment (Rept. No. 368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 781. A bill for the relief of Johanna C. Willemsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 5097. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of a railroad annuity or pension where the individual or his spouse is (or on proper application would be) entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 5098. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands and the improvements thereon to the county of Missoula, Mont.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5099. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Fort Peck Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5100. A bill to establish an equitable basis for the application of the Federal income tax to mutual fire insurance companies which operate on the deposit plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 5101. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5102. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5103. A bill to authorize the provision of insurance against flood damage in areas where flood-control projects have been authorized by Congress but have not been completed; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 5104. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to historical sites and museums operated by the United States, the several States, or political subdivisions thereof, or by any municipality, or by any nonprofit institution or organization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 5105. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to amateur, semiprofessional, or minor league baseball games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5106. A bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5107. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 5108. A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," so as to make it applicable in time of armed conflict as well as in time of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 5109. A bill to provide a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of certain expenses incurred by farmers for soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution providing for support of the credit of the United States of America by the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to Federal assistance in the construction of State piers in the city of Newport; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation to repeal the inequitable and discriminatory excise tax on ladies' handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation providing for the transfer of 11,223 acres of land located at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., from the Government of the United States of America to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 5110. A bill for the relief of Andrew W. Garfield; Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 5111. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Pavlides (Harry Pavlos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 5112. A bill for the relief of Gloria Yamada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5113. A bill for the relief of Hitomi Ohtake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5114. A bill for the relief of Tommy Akimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLYLE:

H. R. 5115. A bill for the relief of Pavlos Michael Campourelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5116. A bill for the relief of Spiros Kaloniktis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 5117. A bill for the relief of Angelo Palazzolo Licari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5118. A bill for the relief of Louise Kaden and Elke Beate Kaden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 5119. A bill for the relief of Augusta Oppacher Bialek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 5120. A bill for the relief of Piotr Wedrogowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5121. A bill for the relief of Abraham Kasirer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5122. A bill for the relief of Kurt Grossman and Mrs. Theresa Grossman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 5123. A bill for the relief of Vania Angel Dimitrova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5124. A bill for the relief of Meyer Urechi, Estera Urechi, and Nathan Urechi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5125. A bill for the relief of the children of the late Mateo Ortiz Vazquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 5126. A bill for the relief of Rahim Uddin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5127. A bill for the relief of Sonahar Miah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5128. A bill for the relief of Gulam Kader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5129. A bill for the relief of Walayat Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5130. A bill for the relief of Miss Greta Thyssen (Mrs. Ralph Padula); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5131. A bill for the relief of Samuel Pilicer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 5132. A bill for the relief of Franz Joseph Horwath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 5133. A bill for the relief of Teresa Langone Venafra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

245. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Petition of the Kansas Food Dealers Association, asking support of Congress in building ample flood protection such as dams, dikes, reservoirs, ponds, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

246. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ruth O'Reilly and others, Detroit, Mich., urging passage of legislation to reduce the heavy tax burdens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

247. Also, petition of Grace Hardy and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

248. Also, petition of Clerk of Council, Savannah, Ga., requesting that the United States Marine Hospital in Savannah not be closed by the Public Health Service and further contribute to the overcrowded Savannah hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

249. Also, petition of Kameo Uemura and others, Kumamoto Junior College, Kumamoto, Japan, requesting release of the Japanese people who are serving prison terms as war criminals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, whose inward fellowship means cleansing, forgiveness, peace, and power, dissolve the barriers that keep our souls from Thee; the self-sufficiency that will not recognize our need; the spiritual blindness that sees the visible but is unaware of the invisible and eternal. Thy sun is shining, but often our windows are shuttered. Grant to us the grace of spiritual hospitality to Thee, of open windows and receptive hearts.

As in this violent day the winds grow harder may our roots strike deeper. Whatever outward things these dangerous times take from us, may they by Thy grace make us inwardly more adequate and wise, dependable and strong. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 8, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 11, 1953, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 71. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Olson; and

S. 522. An act for the relief of George F. Ruckman.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 73') for the relief of James Rennick Moffett.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4465) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. WALTER had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 731. An act for the relief of James Renwick Moffett; and

H. R. 4465. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARRAN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the next 2 weeks.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. WATKINS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on research and development, Department of the Army, for the 6 months' period ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Public Health Service, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PAUL D. BANNING

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Resolution 117

"Resolution memorializing Congress to appropriate funds recommended in the budget for the Missouri River Basin program and to enact soil-conservation legislation to be coordinated with such water-conservation program

"Whereas the people of the Missouri River Basin and the economy of the Nation as a whole sustained staggering losses in the floods of 1951 and 1952, and the basin and the Nation will remain vulnerable to similar disasters until the authorized program now partially under construction is completed as a whole; and

"Whereas a soil-conservation program should be coordinated with the existing authorized conservation program in the Missouri River Basin: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Missouri Senate respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to appropriate the funds recommended in the budget for the fiscal year 1954 for carrying forward the Missouri River Basin program, especially the funds for work by the Corps of Engineers on the Garrison, Oahe, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point Reservoirs on the Missouri River, and Tuttle Creek Dam on the Kansas River, on the agricultural levees, and for the channel stabilization work from Omaha to St. Louis; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress be requested to enact legislation to authorize a soil conservation program coordinated with the existing authorized water conservation program in the Missouri River Basin by the Department of Agriculture at an accelerated rate; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 65

"Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to consider the nomination of judges for the circuit court of the first judicial circuit of the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the circuit court of the first judicial circuit of the Territory of Hawaii handles most of the cases in the circuit courts of the Territory; and

"Whereas for years the said circuit court has lacked its full complement of judges; and

"Whereas, as a result of this situation, a large number of pending cases have accumulated, and each case is forced to wait too long before being reached for trial or other disposition: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring)*, That the President of the United States be and he is hereby respectfully requested to consider the nomination of judges for the circuit court of the first judicial circuit of the Territory of Hawaii to the end that the said circuit court be maintained at full strength of properly nominated and appointed judges; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Women Lawyers, relating to widows' pensions under all social security laws; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting at the American Legion Post 1041, Buffalo, N. Y., relating to the restoration of the Republic of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Rhode Island Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Newport, R. I., favoring an amendment of the Constitution relating to equal rights for men and women; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition signed by Virginia Sheridan, and 616 other citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the use of the words "In God We Trust" on postage stamps and stamp-canceling machines; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

JOINT MEMORIAL OF OREGON LEGISLATURE RELATING TO INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD House Joint Memorial No. 4 of the Oregon Legislature, asking the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the proposal of the Department of the Interior in regard to Indian affairs—in particular, the proposal that, as rapidly as possible, the Indians be emancipated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorial will be printed in the RECORD in full, under the rule, and appropriately referred.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 4

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 47th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the recently announced general policy of the United States Department of the Interior with regard to Indian affairs is to effect the termination of Federal responsibility for administering the affairs of the several Indian tribes as rapidly as the circumstances of each tribe will permit, this to be accomplished by means of arrangements with State and local authorities for the assumption by such State and local authorities of responsibility for activities of and services to Indian residents in the same manner as they are responsible for the activities of and services to non-Indian residents, by the distribution of tribal assets to each tribe as a unit or by division among the individual members of the tribe, and by transfer to each tribe or the individual members thereof of responsibility for trust properties; and

Whereas the State of Oregon, through its 47th Legislative Assembly, concurs in and endorses the above general policy of the United States Department of the Interior; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced and is being considered by the Congress of the United States which would tend to carry out and put into effect at least a portion of the above policy of the United States Department of the Interior with regard to Indian tribes in the State of Oregon, such legislation concerning particularly the providing for final settlement of shares in the tribal estate and assets of the Klamath Indians through voluntary withdrawal from membership in the Klamath Tribes, authorizing the deposit of Klamath tribal funds in approved depositories, conferring upon the State of Oregon criminal and civil jurisdiction over Indians in Indian country in the State of Oregon, and authorizing the Klamath Tribes to adopt an enforcible code for fishing, hunting, and trapping on the Klamath Reservation in the State of Oregon and for conserving and restoring fish and wildlife thereon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein). That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to consider the merits of the above general policy of the United States Department of the Interior and, if it concurs therein, to enact legislation which it believes necessary and desirable to carry out the program proposed and outlined by such general policy, of which the particular legislation mentioned above is a part; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior of the United States; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States, and all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

LOW-INCOME HOUSING IN NEW YORK CITY—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF ESTIMATE, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received a certified copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Estimate of the City of New York on April 23, 1953, opposing any curtailment or reduction of Federal funds for the construction of low-income housing in the city of New York. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives has recommended and the House of Representatives has approved substantial reduction in Federal subsidized funds allocated for low-income housing; and

Whereas this contemplated curtailment of Federal funds will cause the abandonment of 19 low-cost housing projects in the city of New York; and

Whereas the reduction of Federal funds will prevent the construction of as many as 24,000 low-rent apartments in the city of New York; and

Whereas such curtailment of Federal funds will curtail the efforts of the city of New York to provide sanitary, decent, and livable homes for veterans, their families and nonveterans alike; and

Whereas the proposed curtailment or reduction of Federal funds for low-income families is a grave threat to the morale of those seeking livable homes within their ability to pay; and

Whereas there is presently about 200,000 applications filed with the New York City Housing Authority in 1952, and about 60,000 applications to date in 1953 for apartments in the low-income category by veterans and nonveterans; and

Whereas the curtailment or elimination of Federal funds for subsidized low-income housing for veterans and nonveterans, not alone will impair the morale of their families, but will make them amenable to the subversive ideologies of foreign propaganda; and

Whereas it is the obligation and responsibility of the Federal Government to aid in the present emergency to provide decent and sanitary housing for veterans who have fought to keep this Nation free and maintain our freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Estimate of the City of New York opposes and deplores any curtailment or reduction of Federal funds for the construction of low-income housing in the city of New York; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each of the United States Senators of the State of New York and the Members of the House of Representatives from the city of New York.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from the National University Extension Association a resolution adopted by the conference which it held at Michigan State College between May 3 and May 6, endorsing continued United States contributions to the United Na-

tions Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, preceded by a listing of the distinguished member institutions of that association.

There being no objection, the list of member institutions and resolution were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

University of Alabama, University of Arizona, University of Arkansas, University of California, University of Southern California, University of Colorado, University of Connecticut, University of Delaware, University of Florida, University System of Georgia, Georgia Institute of Technology, University of Hawaii, University of Illinois, Southern Illinois University, University of Chicago, Loyola University, Indiana University, Purdue University, State University of Iowa, Iowa State College, University of Kansas, Kansas State College, University of Kentucky, University of Louisville, Louisiana State University, University of Maine, University of Maryland, Johns Hopkins University, Harvard University, Massachusetts Division University Extension, University of Massachusetts, University of Michigan, Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Michigan State College, University of Minnesota, University of Mississippi, Mississippi State College, University of Missouri, Washington University, Montana State University, University of Nebraska, University of Omaha, University of New Hampshire, Rutgers University, University of New Mexico, New York University, Cornell University, Syracuse University, University of North Carolina, University of North Dakota, North Dakota Agricultural College, Ohio University, Western Reserve University, University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma A. and M. College, Oregon System of Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State College, University of Pittsburgh, Temple University, University of Rhode Island, University of South Carolina, University of South Dakota, University of Tennessee, Southern Methodist University, University of Texas, Texas Technological College, University of Utah, Brigham Young University, Utah State Agricultural College, University of Virginia, University of Washington, State College of Washington, West Virginia University, University of Wisconsin, University of Wyoming.

MAY 8, 1953.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator from Wisconsin; Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On May 6 we sent you in abbreviated form the gist of a resolution passed unanimously at the May 3–6 National University Extension Association conference held at Michigan State College.

The resolution in full follows:

"Whereas the National University Extension Association, representing in its institutional membership 76 of the universities and colleges of the United States from 45 States thereof, has always been deeply interested in the role of the United Nations and its specialized agencies in bringing about world order and world peace; and

"Whereas it heartily endorses and supports the President of the United States in his recent declaration that 'a nation's hope for lasting peace cannot be firmly based on any race in armaments, but rather upon just relations and honest understanding with all other nations'; and

"Whereas from the experience of our member institutions severally with the work of UNESCO and jointly through representation upon the United States National Commission for UNESCO with the purposes and programs of UNESCO, we are firmly convinced that this specialized agency of the United Nations is conscientiously and effectively laboring to bring about such "honest understanding with all other nations"; and

"Whereas these labors for understanding and peace through education and cultural and scientific interchange among peoples are in true conformity with the fundamental principles of American policy as enunciated in 1776 and subsequently embodied in our basic laws and customs: Therefore be it

"Resolved by this 38th annual conference of the National University Extension Association, That in our considered judgment the participation of the United States in UNESCO should be generously supported by the Congress of the United States and the budgetary requirements for this purpose as set before Congress by the Secretary of State should be met in full; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution shall be sent forthwith to the appropriate committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

Very truly yours,

W. S. BITTNER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MENTAL HEALTH—LETTER, COMMUNICATION, AND ARTICLE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week there was celebrated National Mental Health Week—a most important occasion for all the healing arts in the realm of men's minds.

Currently, the problem of appropriations for the National Institute of Mental Health is receiving the consideration of the appropriations committees of the Congress.

In this connection, I have received from Mrs. L. C. Senescall, president of the Wisconsin Association for Mental Health, a letter which has been directed by that fine group of public-spirited citizens to the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees, which will be reviewing the problem of research funds.

It has always been my feeling that research pays handsome dividends, particularly in the field of banishing illness, which inevitably proves far costlier to our Nation, if unchecked.

We are all, of course, keenly aware of the very difficult budget problem facing our Government. But we are also aware that economy should be practiced only where it represents a genuine saving, rather than when it actually ultimately causes losses to our Nation—in terms of the national well-being and prosperity, as mental illness does so severely.

I present the letter as forwarded to me by the Wisconsin association, along with its attached communication to the Appropriations Committees, pointing out the grassroots effort that is being made in my State.

I attach to it the text of an article published in the Sunday, May 10, Milwaukee Journal describing the current effort to raise funds to finance education of the public on mental-health problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, communication, and article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter, communication, and article were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION FOR MENTAL HEALTH,
Madison, Wis., May 8, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As our spokesman, and knowing that you are well aware of our mental health problems, we are sending you a copy of our letter to Senator THYE and to Representative BUSBEY, chairmen of the Appropriations Committees, in Senate and House, respectively. We will appreciate hearing from you after you have contacted these chairmen.

We are aware of current trends to reduce budgets. We hope however we have pointed out the urgency of support for the prevention of mental illness as a project to be maintained and broadened to reach all parts of our area.

Sincerely yours,

JANS HORTON SENESCALL,
Mrs. L. C. Senescall,
President.

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION FOR MENTAL HEALTH,
Madison, Wis., May 8, 1953.

Mr. FRED E. BUSBEY,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BUSBEY: Those who are close to the National Institute of Mental Health in action, feel the amount of financial asistance received from the Federal Government has been well utilized. We know, however, that you as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, will have to justify the present amount received and any increases requested in your recommendations.

We have endeavored to inform ourselves about the situation in Wisconsin. Here is a listing of some of the things which have been accomplished with the Federal funds:

1. Twelve years ago nothing was being done in Wisconsin, except in Milwaukee County, to establish and promote clinical centers for training persons to staff clinics to aid in the prevention of mental illness.

2. At the present time Wisconsin has 18 places outside of the State hospitals where training and/or prevention programs are established. This distribution of centers extends to the borders of our State.

3. Federal funds were used to establish and promote these centers, and not to continue maintenance thereof, generally speaking. Local communities through organized fund raising and private funds have taken over after the centers became well established.

4. The plan in using Federal aid is to establish and promote rather than subsidize maintenance, and that plan has proven practical.

5. It is hoped that more clinics may be added as soon as funds are available, in new areas. A clinic, as you know, needs a psychiatrist, psychologist, and a social worker.

6. With our State population of about 3½ million we feel we should have about 30 training and prevention clinics. As stated in item 2, we have 18 at this time.

7. We are working toward more detailed plans to acquaint the lay and professional groups, including parents of course, with the need for prevention of mental illness and to recognize early symptoms and obtain early diagnosis and treatment.

Your deep concern so far reflected in appropriations approved is appreciated. We ask that you support legislation which will improve the treatment of our mentally disturbed fellow citizens.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. L. C. SENESCALL,
President.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 10, 1953]

MENTAL HEALTH FUNDS SOUGHT—GOAL HERE $45,000

Money to intensify the fight against mental illness is being sought for the first time by the Milwaukee County Society for Mental Health and its parent group, the Wisconsin Association for Mental Health. The goal of the statewide Wisconsin mental health fund drive, being held this month, is $100,000, including the goal in Milwaukee County of $45,000.

In general, the money will be used to finance education of the public about mental health problems and how to deal with them, to secure better care for the mentally ill, and for research.

Both mental health organizations are affiliated with the National Association for Mental Health, which seeks to raise $5 million.

PREVENTION IS GOAL

Mental and personality disorders overshadow all others, both in numbers and in cost. There are about as many persons under treatment for mental illness in hospitals as under treatment for all other illnesses.

But at present the money available for research on mental illness amounts to only $4.15 per patient under treatment, compared with $28.20 for polio patients, $26.80 for those with tuberculosis, and $27.70 for cancer victims.

Mental health organizations, such as the State and county groups, combat lack of mental health by teaching why people act the way they do. They try to teach sound habits of mental health so that individuals will cope with their frustrations in socially acceptable ways. The mental health organizations are fighting mental illness by trying to prevent it.

FORMED 4 YEARS AGO

The Milwaukee County Mental Health Society was organized 4 years ago. To date it has been financed by its own membership, which numbers about 3000 It has been a working organization, with membership limited to those who will participate actively in the society's program. Members who join only to have their names on the membership roll soon are dropped.

The society has conducted panel discussions and has sponsored lectures by qualified speakers to educate the public about mental health.

For 3 years the society has conducted a mental health workshop at Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee, in cooperation with the college. The program has reached hundreds of parents and teachers—two groups especially influential in the developing personality of the child.

SPONSORS OTHER SERVICES

The county society's volunteers have visited patients at the county asylum and taken them on excursions. Other volunteers have given square dances at the county hospital for mental diseases—a form of recreation that has become recognized as a sound treatment in mental disorders.

The society has participated in such programs as alcoholism conferences. It has promoted a child-study center, a low-cost diagnostic center for mental illness, and a new detention home. The county group wants to step up its program, working within the framework of the State organization, which it joined last year.

The State Mental Health Association plans to start a program of volunteers called gold ladies to visit and help at county mental institutions.

A training course for community mental health executives, publication of a professional handbook of mental health services, a series of industrial mental health institutes, weekly radio programs, and a research project are some of the goals of the State association.

BETTER LEGISLATION SOUGHT

The association last year was given a $25,000 grant from a private foundation for 3 years. In the last year it has organized chapters in Sheboygan, Outagamie, Eau Claire, Dane, Marinette, and Brown Counties. It hopes to organize 12 chapters in all.

In the 18 years the State organization has been in existence it has used its influence to work for better legislation and better understanding of the mentally ill.

District Judge Harvey L. Neelen is campaign chairman for Milwaukee County. Governor Kohler is honorary State campaign fund chairman. Firemen and letter carriers in several Wisconsin communities will participate as groups in helping solicit funds.

Of the $100,000 the drive hopes to raise, the county organizations will get $21,000. The rest will be allocated as follows:

State association, $36,950; national association, $18,750; other local chapters in Wisconsin, $12,000; fund-raising expenses, $12,000.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 3406. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 231).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 1242. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 232);

H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16); without amendment (Rept. No. 233);

H. R. 1244. A bill to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 234); and

H.R. 2364. A bill to terminate restrictions against alienation on land owned by William Lynn Engles and Maureen Edna Engles; without amendment (Rept. No. 235).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 714. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken; without amendment (Rept. No. 269).

By Mr. BARRETT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 444. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1947, so as to increase the percentage of certain trust funds held by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation which is to be distributed per capita to individual members of such tribes; without amendment (Rept. 263).

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 261. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River Flood Control Compact; with amendments (Rept. No. 236).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 4663. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 237).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 64. A bill for the relief of Teodoro Egues Munagorri (Rept. No. 242);

S. 313. A bill for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama (Rept. No. 243);

S. 324. A bill for the relief of Gregory Leon Baranowski (Rept. No. 244);

S. 349. A bill for the relief of May Ling Ng (Rept. No. 245);

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Angelo Gurisetti Podesta (Rept. No. 246);

S. 815. A bill for the relief of Steven M. Pivnicki (Rept. No. 247);

S. 816. A bill for the relief of Bruno Lanier (Rept. No. 248);

S. 1516. A bill for the relief of Akemi Terada (Rept. No. 249);

H. R. 746. A bill for the relief of Tibor Kalman Jalsoviczky (Rept. No. 250);

H. R. 880. A bill for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen (Rept. No. 251);

H. R. 974. A bill for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Asiani (Rept. No. 252); and

H. R. 3042. A bill for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco (Rept. No. 253).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 297. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arthur Tye (Rept. No. 254);

S. 1579. A bill for the relief of Mieko Kristine (Rept. No. 255).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Owen Lowery (Rept. No. 256);

S. 604. A bill for the relief of Maria Neglia, Angelo Neglia, and Guiseppe Neglia (Rept. No. 257);

S. 694. A bill to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 258); and

S. 1262. A bill for the relief of Stefanos A. Spilios (Rept. No. 259);

By Mr. LANGER (for Mr. MCCARRAN), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 28. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 260);

S. 1349. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; with amendments (Rept. No. 261); and

S. 1663. A bill to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 262).

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 360. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; with an amendment (Rept. No. 238);

S. 677. A bill to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 239);

H. R. 2277. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 240); and

H. R. 2990. A bill to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 241).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 25. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bank-

ruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; with amendments (Rept. No. 265).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1679. A bill to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States, Territories, and possessions receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 266).

By Mr ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 3480. A bill to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title; with amendments (Rept. No. 264).

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 20. Resolution amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion; with an amendment (Rept. No. 268).

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 4663) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 237) thereon.

We should like to have the bill considered by the Senate at the earliest opportunity. I respectfully ask the majority leader when he thinks that opportunity might come.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I hope the Senate can take up today the Defense Production Act and proceed with its consideration. If that measure can be finished in 2 days, I should like to take up the appropriation bill on Thursday next. If it appears that the Defense Production bill will require a longer time—for example, a week or more—I shall move to take up the appropriation bill Thursday anyway, and set aside the other bill temporarily, until the appropriation bill is disposed of. I think I can assure the Senator that the appropriation bill can be handled on Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—PERMISSION TO SUBMIT INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 267)

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) providing for a Consolidated General Appropriation Act, and I submit a report (No. 267) thereon.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has not quite completed the preparation of his individual views. He will request permission to submit them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 days of actual session of the Senate within which to submit my individual views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1860. A bill for the relief of Amalia Sandrovic; and

S. 1861. A bill for the relief of Jean Rosenthal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1862. A bill for the relief of Jacob Fraim Zubli; and

S. 1863. A bill for the relief of Leo A. Ribitzki, Mrs. Charlotte Ribitzki, and Marion A. Ribitzki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1864. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1865. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Manolitsakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1866. A bill to amend sections 502 (1) and 507 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in order to identify the drug known as aureomycin by its chemical name, chlortetracycline; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1867. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of stamps in commemoration of the life and works of Sir William Johnson, founder of Johnstown, N. Y.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1868. A bill for the relief of Miyoko Ezaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1869. A bill to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Union Iron Works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1870. A bill to extend the time for filing a report by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel established by the act of July 16, 1952; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1871. A bill for the relief of Antonio Fopp; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 1872. A bill for the relief of Maj. Matthew J. Redlinger, Jr., United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1873. A bill for the relief of Ursula Wilke; and

S. 1874. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Marchetti Belluomini, Mirena Belluomini, and Salvatore Belluomini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1875. A bill for the relief of John Gregory Lovejoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 1876. A bill for the relief of Wayne Guillory Phillips (Hasuo Tomita); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 1877. A bill relating to the repacking of fresh vegetables which have been, or are to be, transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1878. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended;

S. 1879. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to promote and encourage the construction, and to expedite the financing from private sources, of vessels suitable for use in the foreign and domestic trade of the United States, and for defense purposes, and to encourage the maintenance of shipyards and to preserve the supply of skilled shipyard workers;

S. 1880. A bill to give owners of certain special-purpose vessels purchased or requisitioned by the United States an opportunity to reacquire such vessels when they are no longer needed by the United States; and

S. 1881. A bill to amend section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1882 (by request). A bill for the relief of Antonio Jacoe; and

S. 1883 (by request). A bill for the relief of Dr. Takeo Takano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution designating the week beginning June 14, 1953, as "Theodore Roosevelt Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO CAPITAL GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend subsection 106 (e) of the National Housing Act of 1949 relating to capital grants for slum clearance and urban redevelopment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following these remarks the text of the amendment and a short explanation of its provisions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1864) to amend the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. IVES, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of section 106 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U. S. C. 1456 (e)), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator may enter into contracts for capital grants aggregating not to exceed $35 million (subject to the total authorization provided in sec. 103 (b) of this title) with local public agencies in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum capital grants permitted in the respective State under this subsection has been previously obligated."

The explanation by Mr. IVES is as follows:

EXPLANATION BY SENATOR IVES

Subsection 106 (e) of the Housing Act of 1949 limits Federal grants for slum clearance and urban redevelopment which may be made in any one State to 10 percent of the total authorization (which will be $500 million effective July 1, 1953). Although the total authorization is far from exhaustion, some few States may soon reach their limitation. The proposed amendment would permit the Housing Administrator to enter into capital grant contracts, not exceeding $35 million out of the present capital grant authorization, without regard to the 10-percent limitation. However, no State would be eligible for any share of this $35 million of capital grants unless contracts have already been entered into with local public agencies in that State which call for capital grants exceeding two-thirds of the amount which the law presently permits for that State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT WEEK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution designating the week beginning June 14, 1953, as "Theodore Roosevelt Week." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following these remarks, the joint resolution, and a statement I have prepared on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) designating the week beginning June 14, 1953, as "Theodore Roosevelt Week," introduced by Mr. IVES, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the week beginning June 14, 1953, is hereby designated as "Theodore Roosevelt Week" in honor of our former President. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week by paying tribute to the achievements and memory of the late Theodore Roosevelt.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

I consider it a very great privilege to introduce in the Senate of the United States a joint resolution designating the week beginning June 14, 1953, as "Theodore Roosevelt Week."

It is particularly appropriate that this week be set aside in tribute to the memory and achievements of this illustrious personality, the 26th President of the United States. On June 14, 1953, Sagamore Hill, Theodore Roosevelt's home at Oyster Bay, N. Y., will be opened as a national shrine. President Dwight D. Eisenhower will deliver the dedicatory speech on this important occasion.

The highlights of Teddy Roosevelt's varied career are well known to every American. His monumental service to the people of his beloved land, in war and in peace, in domestic affairs and in foreign affairs, has secured for him a hallowed place among the very great leaders of the Nation. I am certain the people of the United States welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to this outstanding American.

SUPPORT OF CREDIT OF THE UNITED STATES BY FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. NEELY) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Whereas millions of loyal and patriotic American citizens supported their Government during World War II by buying Government bonds and have continued to do so since the end of World War II; and

Whereas the Federal Reserve System has been pursuing a policy of refusing to do its part in supporting the credit of the United States of America by buying its proper share of Government bonds and other Government securities; and

Whereas the credit of the United States of America has been impaired thereby; and

Whereas as a consequence Government securities have fallen below par and the capital position of those with investments in previously issued Government securities has been seriously impaired; and

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System has made it easier for banks, insurance companies, corporations, and private investors to obtain higher interest rates, and thus higher profits, on money loaned to the Government; and

Whereas the increased interest rates on Government securities will result in vast additional expenditures by the Federal Government and a substantial and unnecessary increase in the national debt; and

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System has increased interest rates not only on funds borrowed by the Federal Government, but has also helped to bring about a dangerous rise in interest rates on funds borrowed by (1) farmers, (2) foreign purchasers of American agricultural products, (3) home builders, (4) veterans who are buying homes and all other home buyers, (5) businessmen (particularly small-business men), and (6) local governments for the construction of schools, roads, water supply and sewage systems, and other essential public facilities; and

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System may tend, in combination with other factors, to bring on a decline in business activity throughout the economy and to accentuate the deflationary trend in American agriculture; and

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System is an ineffective and inappropriate substitute for soundly conceived measures to control the supply and use of credit and to maintain the value of the American dollar; and

Whereas whatever flexibility is needed in the prices of Government bonds should take place above par under the alternative policy of Federal Reserve System support of Government bonds at par; and

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System undermines the ability of the United States of America to meet the financial problems that would inevitably result from a new international emergency; and

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System violates the purposes of the Congress in the creation of the Federal Reserve System; and

Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System is inconsistent with the maintenance of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power as called for in the Employment Act of 1946; and

Whereas a policy of supporting United States Government securities at par will not only cost the taxpayers nothing, but will also result in a saving to the taxpayers and a profit to the Treasury: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Federal Reserve Board and the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System should support the price of United States Government securities at par, but not exceeding par, as was done before the so-called Treasury-Federal Reserve accord which was announced March 4, 1951.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN MATTER RELATING TO SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. JENNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 109), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to have printed for its use 8,000 copies of Senate Document No. 41, 83d Congress, entitled "Subversive Activities Control Board."

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. SCHOEPPEL) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BENNETT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1081, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1081, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HELMUTH WOLF GRUHL—AMENDMENT

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1334) for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DALLAS S. TOWNSEND TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, May 19, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Dallas S. Townsend, of New Jersey, to be an assistant attorney general, vice Harold I. Baynton, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG:

Radio addresses on the agricultural situation delivered by Senator THYE and Senator MUNDT broadcast by a network of stations in North Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article regarding the St. Lawrence seaway, written by him, and published in the Heartland magazine.

Article entitled "Germany Still Faces Woes Despite Energy and Purpose," written by Crosby S. Noyes, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of May 3, 1953.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Address entitled "Educating Ourselves for Peace and Freedom," delivered by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch at the Charter Day exercises of the College of the City of New York in New York on May 7, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Excerpt from speech entitled "Rational Inquiry and the Triumph of Wisdom," delivered by Judge Learned Hand at 86th convocation of the University of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., October 24, 1952.

Resolutions on human rights, anti-Semitism, religious persecution, and immigration, adopted by the executive committee of the American Jewish Committee.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Address delivered by Bryant S. Hinckley upon the occasion of appointment of William R. Wallace to the Utah Hall of Fame, Salt Lake City, Utah, April 8, 1953.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article entitled "The Fulbright Program," written by Francis A. Young, executive secretary, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, Conference Board of Associate Research Councils, and published in the New Report, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, for March–April, 1953.

By Mr. IVES:

Editorial entitled "Mr. Herzog Resigns," published in the Washington Evening Star of May 5, 1953.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Article entitled "McKay's Gift to Idaho Power Co.," written by Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 8, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Two statements dealing with educational television channel reservations.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Editorial entitled "A Question of Immunity," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 11, 1953.

By Mr. BUSH:

Article entitled "At Last—A Lender's Market," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 11, 1953.

IMPOSSIBILITY OF BALANCING THE BUDGET—CABINET VOTE SUPPORTING CONSTRUCTION OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter this day received from a prominent, lifelong Republican who has substantial interests in West Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. The communication briefly discusses two articles which appeared in adjoining columns of the New York Times. One of these refers to a statement made by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury relative to the impossibility of balancing the budget; the other to the action of the Cabinet in voting to support the hundred-million-dollar seaway canal. The author of the letter modestly shuns publicity. Consequently, his name and post-office address will not be printed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR NEELY: Two very revealing articles in connection with the present administration appeared side by side in the New York Times of Saturday, May 9.

One article bore the headline "Humphrey Asserts Defense Costs Bar Balanced Budget." This article went on to recite Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey's appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and of his expressions of grief over the fact that not only had he learned the budget could not be balanced but that the present statutory limit of the national debt of $275 billion would likely have to be increased.

Next to this article was one entitled "Full Cabinet Vote Supports Seaway at $100 Million Cost."

The so-called St. Lawrence seaway is Mr. Humphrey's particular baby. As president of the M. A. Hanna Co., he led a small group of Midwest steel operators into investing in an iron-ore development in Labrador-Quebec. And he has been the ringleader in the movement to have this country build the seaway-canal as a means of giving these interested companies a competitive advantage in the movement of this ore to their plants. Undoubtedly, he was the most persuasive influence in the action of the Eisenhower Cabinet in endorsing this project.

Mr. Humphrey, while lamenting the fact that there can be no tax reduction for the American people, is perfectly willing to add to the national indebtedness for a project in which he is personally interested. If this is the spirit of the new administration which promised so much and is delivering so little, I think the American people should be informed about it.

STABILITY IN CREDIT MANAGEMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point, in connection with my remarks, an exceedingly important editorial which has just appeared in the May 9 issue of Business Week. This editorial is entitled "Time To Ease the Money Squeeze." In it, the editors of Business Week suggest that it is time for the Federal Reserve to ease up a little on its tight money policy. Business Week further states: "We are glad to know the brakes work, but we don't want to go through the windshield."

I should like to urge that this editorial be read carefully by all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO EASE THE MONEY SQUEEZE

For more than 2 years the Federal Reserve System has been pursuing a restrictive credit policy designed to combat inflation.

It began in March 1951 by withdrawing from the Government bond market the rigid price-support pegs it had been maintaining since 1942. It followed this with a policy that checked the creation of additional bank reserves, thereby limiting the power of the member banks to expand loans and investments. Finally, early this year it raised the rediscount rate, thus increasing the cost of borrowed reserves to the commercial banks and still further inhibiting bank lending.

This has resulted in a fall in the price of Government bonds that has carried the Victory 2½s down from above par to almost 92 last week. With over $3.8 billion of that issue outstanding, the aggregate market depreciation suffered by holders of that one issue alone now totals about $350 million.

As the price of governments has dropped, the market prices of all other high-grade bonds have likewise dropped. Every bank insurance company, and other moneyed institution has an unrealized depreciation in its bond portfolio that feels like a lump of lead in the stomach and results in freezing a portion of the assets of these institutions. The cost of borrowing—whether in the new issue market or at the banks—is now higher than it has been since the panic year 1933. For some time now bankers, in their colloquial way, have been saying to themselves and their customers that money is "damned tight."

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

In short, the Federal Reserve System has accomplished what it set out to do. It has put an end to the easy money policy, thus halting the inflationary trend that so long held sway; it has applied brakes to the great postwar defense boom; it has put the fear of God into the money markets of the country.

For all this, we applaud the money managers. We were among those who urged this course long before it was adopted. We predicted it would be effective. It has been. Now we think the time has come to take another look at the program.

The great limitation of credit management is that it is a good deal easier to halt an inflation than it is to check a deflation once started. There is sound reason for believing that the threat of dangerous inflation has been removed for the present. For example, farm prices have declined some 17 percent from their peak in March 1951; in the last year alone, the farm index has dropped 10 points, and now stands a full 7 points below parity. And prices of other commodities have slowly but steadily weakened. The result is reflected in the cost-of-living index, which for a considerable period has been stable.

Federal Reserve policy is not alone responsible for this. The whole trend of the Eisenhower administration has been to reverse the inflationary policies of its predecessors. Government spending for defense and foreign aid is being drastically cut; Government employees are being discharged; the activities of Government bureaus are being curtailed. Spending programs, such as those for public housing and public works, are being cut down or cut out.

THE GOAL: STABILITY

This sound-money approach is badly needed and was past due. At the same time it must be recognized that all these factors coming together tend in the same direction. They are anti-inflationary, which is another way of saying that they are deflationary. The goal of credit management is, of course, neither inflation nor deflation; it is economic stability. That means the golden rule for central bankers is the antique motto: "Nothing in excess."

Events in the money market last week seemed to us to be saying pretty plainly that we may be overdoing this tight-money business. The victory 2½'s, as we have mentioned, went to 92 contrasted with a high

of 106½ in 1946. The leading banks raised their rates for prime short-term commercial borrowers to 3¼ percent—highest in a generation. And the United States Treasury suffered the ignominy of seeing its first big refunding issue, the new Humphrey 3¼'s, go to a discount before they had even been issued.

All these events suggest that it is time for the Federal Reserve to ease up a little on its tight-money policy. We are glad to know the brakes work, but we don't want to go through the windshield.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the Chair lay before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and as in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

NOMINATIONS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MAY 12, 1953

Adm. Arthur William Radford, United States Navy, for appointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Department of Defense; and

Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the President will appoint Admiral Carney to succeed Admiral Fechteler as the Navy member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. When is the appointment of Admiral Carney to be effective?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know about the appointment of Admiral Carney. The appointments of the other two officers will take effect in August.

Mr. STENNIS. The appointment of the other Chairman will not expire for 2 years.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know about that, but the other two officers will take office in August.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 10 minutes on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, 55 years ago yesterday I took my first oath as a soldier of the United States. I have repeated that oath many times since, and have always been proud of the opportunity to do so. I cannot see how any American can hesitate when called upon to take an oath of allegiance to this country.

Three other Members of this body wore the khaki uniform of Uncle Sam in those days, and I ask the indulgence of the Senate while I salute my comrades of the Spanish-American War—the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

When I took the oath as a soldier for the first time the national debt of the country was a little more than $1,200,000,000, or a per capita of $16.77.

The population of the United States was a little under 76,000,000.

There were 200,000 Federal employees.

In that year, 1898, the national income was a little more than $15 billion, and the money in circulation was less than $2 billion.

At that time there were 45 stars in the flag, representing the Union of 45 sovereign States.

At that time there were less than 1,000 automobiles in the world. There were dreamers who thought that some day we might travel in the air. There was no thought of radio or television.

There was not a single mile of paved road in the United States. Less than one-fourth of the homes of the country were equipped with plumbing. Practically every house had its own source of water supply.

There was practically no preventive medicine. Each year there was a heavy toll from fevers, pneumonia, measles, and diptheria. Very little progress had been made toward modern sanitation.

Many people still lived in log and sod houses and miner's cabins. The greater number of our people still maintained themselves by work on the farm. There were few labor-saving devices. Mining, farming, and work in the mills was only for the physically fit.

A very small majority of our young people had the opportunity to complete a high school education, and only a few were able to go to college.

The intense feeling between the North and the South still existed.

The Regular Army of the United States consisted of 25,000 officers and men, and the National Guard of the United States less than 200,000 men.

The pay of a private soldier was $13 a month, but it was paid in gold and silver. The currency of the United States commanded a premium all over the world.

The food of a soldier was based on meat, beans, potatoes, and hardtack.

It took a troop train 8 days and 8 nights to cross the continent, and soldiers were carried in second-rate day coaches.

It required 30 days to go from San Francisco to the Philippine Islands.

We are now the greatest power of all history. Our Capital City is the center of the world. While we possess only 7 percent of the world's population and area, yet we produce more than half of the world's goods.

But with all these superior advantages we are confronted with great responsibilities and difficulties.

We are in a great cold and hot war to determine whether our form of government, which has produced the finest living standards and the highest cultural and spiritual attainments of any nation of all history, can endure.

What is confronting us now?

We have inflation and a dollar depreciated to one-half of its value only a decade ago.

We have a Federal debt of more than $260 billion, or more than the combined debt of 75 other nations of the world, including Soviet Russia.

The debt of State and local governments is the highest in all history, and State and local governments are continuously asking for more taxes.

Individual indebtedness is the highest in the history of the United States.

The taxes imposed on the American people are greater than the combined taxes of 75 other nations of the world, including Soviet Russia.

Our high taxes are destroying the incentive of our people to work, to save, and to invest in productive enterprise. They are a barrier to the expansion of industry, without which we cannot have more employment and greater production.

What is there for us to do?

We must all work for economy in Government.

We must have sound fiscal policies at all levels of Government—Federal, State, and local. Government should be on a pay-as-you-go plan. Government should be on a business basis.

We must have a stable dollar, supported by a free economy, producing plenty of things to buy with the money that we possess.

Our fathers and mothers, in the development of this great country, carried with them the ax, the rifle, and the Holy Bible.

The ax is the symbol of work and self-reliance.

The rifle symbolizes the individual responsibility of every American to defend the way of life we are privileged to enjoy.

The Bible calls for faith in the Greater Power that rules the world and will protect those of courage, understanding, and righteousness.

America will solve the great problems confronting us—financial and moral—if we get back to those humble ideals.

There are certain characteristics that have made America great. They are courage, freedom, justice, temperance, tolerance, faith, hope, and love of God. These characteristics, practiced by the individual, are the strength of our Nation.

Let us fill our knapsacks with those noble ideals and march forth, as have the men of every generation, in the defense of our country.

We must always remember that a Republic is the most difficult form of government to sustain. Its success or failure depends upon the attitude and work of the people themselves. Let us remember always that God stands at the portals of destiny. If we obey His laws, our work will be crowned with success.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1081, Calendar 138, a bill to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. The bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. What is the status of Senate bill 16, to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees, which was the unfinished business when the Senate adjourned on Friday last?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will come before the Senate automatically at 2 o'clock.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I propose to renew my motion at 2 o'clock. My intention is to move to set aside the bill dealing with the question of the immunity bath, for several reasons.

A number of Senators have expressed great doubt about it. They desire more time to consider it.

I have received a communication on the subject from the Attorney General.

The distinguished author of the bill [Mr. McCARRAN] is to be absent from the Senate for nearly 2 weeks.

On Friday afternoon the first request I received in this connection was that the bill be passed over until the Senator from Nevada returned to the Chamber. Later he changed his mind, and asked that consideration of the bill be continued.

Under all the circumstances I think it would be better to lay the bill aside temporarily. I can assure the Senator from North Carolina that within 2 weeks, or a reasonable time, I shall move to take up the bill again.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Ohio is not debatable.

Mr. TAFT. It is not debatable at this time. It would be at 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina have any further parliamentary inquiries?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, what is the pending motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1081, a bill to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. A really effective motion cannot be made until 2 o'clock. This is only temporary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, which has been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Senate is considering what is known as Senate bill 1081, a bill to extend the present Defense Production Act, passed originally in 1950, as a result of the Korean war. The Committee on Banking and Currency reported the bill favorably by a vote of 12 to 3.

The bill eliminates some of the titles of the existing act, extends other titles, corrects some of the technical errors which we found in the act, and adds a new title, known as title VIII.

The Committee on Banking and Currency held extensive hearings over a period of 4 weeks. It heard possibly 150 witnesses.

Of course, controls are never pleasant, and no one likes controls, or legislation permitting their imposition.

The Committee on Banking and Currency, which was called upon to act on price, wage, and rent controls, as well as other features of our control legislation, had a very disagreeable job to do, but it realized it is a job that must be done. I want to say that I, as chairman, and the other members of the committee, accepted our responsibility by holding extensive hearings, and I wish personally to thank every member of the committee for the cooperation he gave the chairman and the hard work that was done on the pending bill by every member of the committee.

I do not believe there exists any controversy on any portion of the bill except with reference to the new title VIII.

I have just gone over the amendments which have been submitted by Members of the Senate, and I find that all of the amendments submitted up to this time deal with title VIII.

There was very little disagreement among the members of the committee with regard to any of the features of the bill other than title VIII, except with reference to rent controls, and, of course, the rent control feature was handled about two weeks ago by the passage of another bill which the President has signed into law. As a result of this action your committee subsequently reported a committee amendment which strikes out the language which has to do with rent control on page 27, line 3, of the bill through line 19 on page 30 from the bill. Therefore, the question of rent control is not involved in the pending legislation.

I shall go through the bill in a moment, title by title, and explain exactly what the committee did. I shall be very happy to answer any questions which any Senator cares to ask me as I go along with the explanation.

With reference to the new title VIII, which permits the President of the United States to freeze prices, wages, and rents, for a period of 90 days in case of a serious emergency, we found among the witnesses, as we did among members of the committee, and as we learned from the press and other sources, possibly four schools of thought on that subject.

First, we found the school of thought—and testimony was given regarding it—of those who are in favor of what might be called a detailed standby-control bill or a bill in which Congress would spell out every phase of a control statute, in the same manner in which Congress would be asked to act, in my opinion, if our country were faced with a great war. We had much testimony on that question from very responsible persons, who felt that Congress should enact such a detailed standby-control bill. That feeling is shared by many people in the United States. Of course, the committee did not recommend the enactment of such a bill.

There is a second school of thought, as we found from the witnesses who appeared before the committee and from the members of the committee, which argues and takes the position that if a serious emergency should confront the United States, Congress would at such a time have sufficient time to meet and pass the needed legislation.

Some witnesses before the committee—and they were in the minority—took the position that even in a great war or in a serious emergency or in an emergency situation in which the Government takes a great percentage of our national product—for instance, as much as 50 or 60 percent of many of the items our economy produces—even under those circumstances, the Federal Government should not have the authority to control prices, wages, and rents.

Your committee took the position, and correctly so, I believe, that the least Congress can do is give the President the right, in case of a grave emergency, immediately to freeze prices, wages, and rents for a period of 90 days, during which time the Congress would, while in session, decide exactly what should be done and what should not be done. Your committee, by a vote of 12 to 3, voted to report that proposal.

Before I begin a detailed explanation of the bill, I should like to make one point crystal clear, and I shall do so in order to save time. Many persons have tried to misrepresent what your committee and its chairman were conscientiously trying to do and felt it was their responsibility to do. I wish to make indubitably clear that not a single member of the committee felt that price and wage controls were needed at the moment. Not one member of your committee recommended that they be continued. Not one member of your committee recommended that price and wage controls or any kind of controls be used by the Federal Government at any time when they were not needed. I want no misunderstanding about that point.

I also wish to make crystal clear that no provision of the pending bill would continue price and wage controls at the moment. The authority to impose price and wage controls expired on April 30, under the previous act passed by Congress, and 60 days prior to April 30, the President, under the authority given to him in that act, eliminated price and wage controls.

So we are not talking about a continuation of price and wage controls at the moment. We are not talking about price and wage controls under normal

conditions. We are talking about price, wage, and rent controls only if and when a grave emergency faces the United States, making it necessary for our Military Establishment to use or to take a large percentage of our national product. That is all we are talking about.

Yet we found continuously and continually that some witnesses who appeared before the committee and some other persons have tried to make the people of the United States believe we were proposing to continue controls under existing conditions.

A few days ago a very able member of our committee made a speech on the floor of the Senate. I was not present at the time, but I hold a copy of his speech in my hand, and I wish to discuss it for a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee is making a very able address in pointing out the committee's recommendations. In speaking for Senators on this side of the aisle, I wish to say that every Democratic member of the committee voted for the bill as it is.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Indiana says the bill is not a control bill; and it is not. It is only a freeze bill, which will let the Congress of the United States act within its constitutional rights within 90 days.

So the bill is not a control bill; it is merely a freeze bill. I hope the Senator from Indiana agrees with me about that. If he does not, I hope he will correct me at once.

I say the bill merely provides for a freeze for not to exceed 90 days, during which time the Congress will have a chance to decide yes or no on the question of controls during a grave national emergency, which means a great economic upheaval of some kind, as in the case of war.

Does the Senator from Indiana agree that the statement I have made is a correct one?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct; the freeze can occur only during a grave national emergency, and then for only 90 days.

Mr. MAYBANK. And before that time, Congress can be in session and decide what to do.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; or Congress can meet on the first day of the 90-day period, and can cancel the freeze.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. However, under the bill the President would be the one who would determine that an emergency existed.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. All the time I have been in Congress, I have opposed giving the President the power to declare emergencies; and I am just as much opposed now to giving that power to the present President as I was when Mr. Truman and other Democratic leaders were in control.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand that is the opinion of the able majority leader. However, I do not think it is necessary for him to become excited about it, until we proceed further into the debate.

Mr. President, I shall present our arguments in behalf of the proposal. I, too, oppose giving the President of the United States unlimited power.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield again to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Who is to be given such power, if it is not to be given to the President, who was elected by the people, by a 7 million majority?

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, that is the point.

Mr. President, let me say that I do not know whether Senators who oppose giving the President power in connection with this bill voted to give the President power in connection with the matter to which I now refer; but the Congress, including the able Senator from Ohio, did not hesitate to give the President of the United States the right to "pull the trigger" to draft 10 million or 15 million of our men to go to war, and did not hesitate to give the President the right to say that next month none would be drafted or that 100,000 or 200,000 would be drafted.

So I should like to have some of the Members of the Senate who are opposed to giving the President the right to order a "freeze," under the proposal now before the Senate, tell us whether material things in our country are more important than the lives of American boys. I should like to have them tell us which is the more important. Congress voted to give the President the right—by virtue of a draft act—to draft 5 million, 10 million, or 15 million men; and under that measure the President is to be the sole judge of whether the then-existing emergency requires that they be drafted. That matter is to be decided solely according to the opinion of the President. He, and he alone, is to decide whether 50,000 of our men will be drafted next month or whether 500,000 or 1 million men will be drafted.

So I ask, what is the difference between giving the President that power and giving the President the power to place into effect a temporary freeze, during which time the Congress can decide what permanent action shall be taken?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield again to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to repeat that the Senator from Indiana is making a most able speech. Certainly he was entirely correct in asking whether there is a difference between giving the President the power to draft and giving the President the power to declare a temporary freeze in a grave national emergency. The Senator from Indiana pointed out that the President is given, by Congress, the power, through the Selective Service System and through the head of that System, to decide whether 10,000, 50,000, or 100,000 of our boys will be drafted, whereas some Senators oppose giving the President the power only to freeze prices, if necessary, for not to exceed 90 days, until Congress can write a law on the subject.

So I repeat my former question, which was, Who is to be given the power to take such action, if that power is not to be given to the President?

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, as I have pointed out, the Congress has given the President unlimited power to draft our boys.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The proposal now made is an entirely different one. Congress itself determined how many men were to be drafted and how many men were to be in the armed services—in short, approximately 3,500,000. Congress, not the President, determined that policy. Congress determined that those troops could not be obtained except by means of a draft. That determination by the Congress gave the President no authority. The President may, within 1 month, decide how many men have to be taken and how many do not need to be taken; but so far as drafting is concerned, that has been a congressional policy.

Congress has never given the President the power to determine whether a draft shall be used or shall not be used. Congress has said in effect, "We need to have 3,500,000 or 3,700,000 men in the Armed Forces, and we give the President the power to draft, if that is necessary."

Of course it is necessary; every one knows it is.

Congress determined the policy. Congress did not allow the policy to be determined by the President.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, we are doing exactly the same thing in this instance. In the event Congress passes the measure providing for a 90-day freeze, it obviously will have passed a law saying to the President of the United States, "If in your opinion there is a grave emergency, we authorize you to freeze prices, wages, and rent, for a period of 90 days only."

We propose to limit the period to 90 days, just as the able Senator from Ohio pointed out that we limited the number of men whom the President may draft. I forget the number, but I believe it is 3,500,000. In the pending proposal we would authorize the President to act for a period of 90 days.

Is there a difference in principle? If so, let someone demonstrate it. Congress authorizes the President to determine the number of men who may be drafted. He need not draft any of them if in his judgment he should not do so. But he is authorized to draft not exceeding a specified number, at a rate of so many a month. All the committee is

asking the Senate to do is to authorize the President of the United States, in case of a grave emergency, and for a period of 90 days only, not indefinitely, to freeze prices, wages, and rents.

It may be asked why this action is taken. The pending bill has been called a standby measure. Standby laws are not new to the Senate. There is a standby law under which we have been appropriating many billions of dollars for the purpose of increasing our military might. It is a standby law which enables us to defend and protect the country in case of emergency. It contemplates a standby Military Establishment. We appropriate billions of dollars, and, so to speak, we authorize the President to pull the trigger in deciding what he shall or shall not do with the money. Yes, Mr. President, we have a standby law, so far as the military is concerned.

Likewise, as I said a moment ago, we have a standby law under which the President of the United States is authorized to draft our boys. In addition to that, we are spending millions and millions of dollars in the education of our civilian population in connection with civil defense. Under that program the people are being instructed what to do in case of a bombing and how to protect themselves within the United States. I repeat, we are spending millions and millions of dollars upon that program. The Federal Civil Defense Administration is a standby organization set up so that our people may be prepared to meet any situation of grave emergency which may arise.

Therefore, Mr. President, we have protected ourselves, in my personal opinion, as well as in the opinion of the majority of the committee, through standby legislation; we have a standby military organization, or a standby manpower situation, by virtue of the draft. We are making progress. We are spending millions of dollars on the Civil Defense organization, in an effort to instruct our people how to defend themselves against possible attack.

Yet, Mr. President, when it comes to the economic phase of preparation, there are those who are unwilling to vest in the President of the United States authority, in case of a grave emergency, to invoke controls for a period of 90 days, during which time we could be expected to decide upon a course of action.

Mr. President, I am not going to become angry—I did not become angry during the days and days of hearings—with those who take a view opposite to mine. One school of thought takes the position which apparently is taken by the able Senator from Ohio. The Senator is entitled to take that position, and I admit that there is certain merit in his argument to the effect that in the event of an emergency the Congress of the United States, if it is in session at the time, ought to pull the trigger. By that I mean that the Congress should pass the necessary legislation; and that, if the Congress is not in session, a special session could be called.

I do not agree with that idea. I think it is dangerous. I believe it should be possible for action to be taken quickly. I think Congress ought to meet during the 90-day period, when the freeze is in effect, for the purpose of deciding what is to be done, this would assure that the Congress is not acting under pressure and under stress.

Congress might then decide that controls were unnecessary, or it might decide that hearings should be conducted and that the question should be discussed so as to determine what was necessary in order that the economy of the Nation might be kept in status quo.

Mr. President, can one repair the brakes on an automobile when the car is running downhill? Of course not. The car must be stopped before its brakes can be repaired. The car must be stopped before a determination is made as to what is wrong with it.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah is very much interested in the analogy being drawn by the Senator from Indiana. Is it the intention of the Senator that the Senate shall understand that he wants to stop the economy completely, and that there shall be no transactions, no operations, when an emergency threatens?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator, of course, knows that that is not at all what I mean. He knows that I am talking about freezing prices, wages, and rents, in order that there may be a 90-day period within which prices, wages, and rents will not advance, and during which time the Congress may have an opportunity to decide what action it wants to take. The able Senator from Utah knows that we are not proposing to do what he suggests. The Senator sat through all the hearings, as I did.

Let me say, since the able Senator from Utah has asked the question, that he made a speech here 3 or 4 days ago which indicated, if I read his speech correctly, that he would be opposed to price, wage, and rent controls even in case of a big war. In the course of his speech, the Senator left the inference that the 12 members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency who voted for the pending measure when it was before the committee were interested in maintaining controls in America during peacetime. I hold in my hand four volumes of the printed hearings. I had the staff go through the hearings and mark the pages on which I, as chairman of the committee, assured everyone that all we were talking about was the subject of controls in case of grave emergency.

I wish Senators might have an opportunity to read the memorandum. It shows that over 200 times I made that statement and gave that assurance to the committee. Yet, in spite of my having made that assertion more than 200 times, I still find Senators and others who would create the impression, by means of speeches, that I and other Members of the Senate are interested in foisting economic controls upon the American people in peacetime.

Mr. President, I always try to be fair, and I shall endeavor to be fair in this debate. I have always endeavored to see the viewpoint of the opposition, and to give members of the opposition the benefit of a doubt. But, Mr. President, I also want to say that I do not appreciate, and I shall not appreciate, an argument by a Senator on the floor of the Senate at any time to the effect that either the committee or its chairman is interested in the imposition of controls at any time other than during a period of grave national emergency. I am just as certain as I am that I am standing on this floor that if we were to become involved in a big war, a war as big as World War II, the Congress would enact price, wage, and rent controls. My position is, therefore, that we ought to prepare in advance to meet such an emergency. Others may disagree with my views. Senators will vote for or against the pending measure, according to whether they feel that, during a grave emergency—meaning a big war—we need price, wage, and rent controls. If Senators believe that in such an emergency controls would not be needed, they will then vote against title VIII of the pending bill. If, on the other hand, they feel that during a big war we must have controls of some kind, they will then vote for title VIII. If we do not vote for title VIII now, and if we later become involved in a serious emergency—which we pray to God will never happen—the Congress of the United States will be called into special session, and at that time, in my personal opinion, Senators will be voting upon and will be voting for legislation of this type.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to repeat what I previously stated. The whole point of the argument is, if this bill shall pass, it will give Congress 90 days within which to enact whatever law Congress thinks appropriate.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. It leaves the entire matter in the hands of the Congress of the United States, with the exception that if a grave emergency should come upon us, it gives the President of the United States the right to pull the trigger and freeze prices, wages, and rents, until such time as the Congress may decide what it wants to do in such a situation.

Mr. MAYBANK. In not to exceed 90 days.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. That is all the committee intended the bill should do; that is all the committee wants the bill to do. As I have indicated, there are two schools of thought: One is that the Congress can act quickly enough in case of a grave emergency. The other school of thought is that even in a grave emergency, in a great war such as was World War II, we do not, even then, need price, wage, and rent controls.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that even in the limited emergency of Korea in 1950 instead of our acting on the question of controls quickly it took nearly 11 weeks for Congress to pass a control bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a further question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that during the first week or 10 days after the Korean trouble started prices greatly increased, whereas if power to take action had been lodged in an agency of the Government other than in the Congress of the United States we could have acted quickly and prices could have been maintained at the existing level and the great cost to the country, from the standpoint both of the consumers and of our defense effort, could have been greatly minimized, if not prevented?

Mr. CAPEHART. When a grave emergency occurs, the people, of course, naturally become hysterical. They start hoarding, because they do not know how long the emergency will last, and they do not know what to expect. It is the first day or the first week of the uncertainty existing in the minds of the people that is dangerous. In the mind of a businessman it is that period in which he would like to see some action taken, if it is going to be taken. If we wait 30, 60, or 90 days the harm has been done; prices have risen and are out of balance. The line runs up and down. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to keep a straight line as regards prices, rents, and wages, to keep them in balance.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. With reference to the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], does not the Senator remember that Mr. Truman not only would not exercise the power immediately after Korea, but as late as September we opposed giving him any such power, and does not the Senator remember that we would have had no controls, even if there had been a law such as that which is proposed?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. In my personal opinion, if there had been such a law and it had been applied the day we went into the war, prices would have been much lower than they are and we would have saved the American people billions of dollars and would have saved the Government billions of dollars in its purchases of war materials. The result would have been that we would have had a balanced budget today, with fewer expenditures and lower taxes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems very ironic to me that I, a Democrat, should give a demonstration of greater confidence in the Republican President of the United States, than has the distinguished majority leader, and other Republicans.

I am willing to place in the hands of a Republican President the authority to protect this country in the event of a great emergency. To me it would seem the height of folly not to give some agency the right to act quickly in protection of the Nation. Will not the Senator from Indiana agree with me that it is perfectly conceivable, although God grant it shall never come to pass, that in the event of a grave emergency there might not be any Congress of the United States to convene—or, at least, not in sufficient numbers to take action?

Mr. CAPEHART. Washington could be bombed, of course. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As I recall the history of 1950, war was not declared by the Congress of the United States on June 25. Congress met and worked out a system of controls. Congress did give the President of the United States an opportunity to make those controls effective. We passed a law early in September, and the President of the United States did not make it effective until January 25, 1951. That is my recollection.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wonder whether the 90-day limit may not be an illusion. If we should have a major war, we should have controls.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is convinced that during a major war we must have controls; is he not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. There can be no question about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am thoroughly convinced we must have controls in such a situation. But if we pass permissive legislation, and Congress sits back and says, "Well, we gave the President permission to apply controls," possibly the President will not put them into effect. In 1950, we would have been better advised, I think, and would have been in a better position today, if we had made compulsory the controls and put them into effect in September, instead of having only permissive controls. Instead of relying on the President to put the controls into effect during that 90 days, I think Congress might very well itself have put them into effect.

I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana a question. Does he think we are going to get into a world war equal to World War II, by Presidential action, or does he think Congress will take action?

Mr. CAPEHART. All I know is that we are today at war in Korea. There have been approximately 138,000 casualties. We are spending many billions of dollars every year on our military, and we are told by those in responsible positions in our Government that there is great danger. There are approximately 500,000 American boys in Korea and in Japan. It seems to me that as long as we are at war there is the danger of its developing into a big war, and that, at least until the Korean war is settled, until we quit losing American boys in battle there every day, there should be some such legislation as that which the committee is now recommending.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Constitution gives Congress authority to declare war. Congress has not only the authority, but the responsibility to declare war.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But war has not been declared in Korea, even to this hour.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Colorado is correct. The war was not declared by the Congress. I cannot argue that point, and I do not think the Senator from Colorado wants to argue it. But the fact still remains that we are at war in Korea. There are approximately half a million American soldiers there; there have been approximately 138,000 casualties; and, at the rate they are happening, I presume that during the time I have been speaking, during the past 30 or 40 minutes, there have been additional casualties in Korea.

It seems to me that at least during the period of the Korean war we ought not completely, 100 percent, abandon all our machinery for controlling the economy of the Nation during a war era. The United States is at war today, and all that is sought by the legislation now proposed is to say to the American people, "Controls are not needed at the moment. They have been completely removed." But in the next breath, we are saying to them, "If a big emergency should occur, we have given the President of the United States the right to freeze prices, wages, and rents for 90 days, in order to give Congress itself an opportunity to decide what should be done."

If it so desired, Congress on the first day might dissolve the freeze order of the President.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to ask two questions. Does the distinguished chairman remember that Mr. Flemming, when he appeared before the committee, stated:

> Consistent with the President's desires to free the economy of controls, we hope that the Congress will decide that, in the event of an emergency situation, it could move rapidly enough in providing authority for a freeze to deal with the problem in an adequate manner.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. Flemming made that statement; there is no question about it. But it will be remembered that my answer was that action in the premises was the responsibility of Congress, not of the President. If a grave emergency should occur, and there should be no legislation, the criticism rightfully would be directed against Congress, not against the President of the United States, because the President cannot do anything unless Congress, by legislation, gives him authority.

I am not one who wishes to "pass the buck" to the President of the United States. Action on controls is the responsibility of Congress, and, in my opinion, Congress ought to accept the

responsibility. The President of the United States cannot act unless Congress passes legislation. Therefore, it is our responsibility, and not his. Congress ought to decide what it wants to do.

Mr. BENNETT. Did not the President express his confidence that Congress could act with sufficient speed in the event of an emergency?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know whether or not he did, but I know that history definitely proves that Congress cannot and does not. Furthermore, as a United States Senator, I would rather not be called upon, in case of grave emergency, to act as quickly as we might be called upon to act. I would want time to think of what I was trying to do. That statement is based upon experience. It is not any pet theory of mine. I am a free enterpriser. I am so independent as a businessman, and individually, that I do not even like to sleep in a little room; I like to sleep in a big room. I do not want to be hemmed in from any direction. That has always been my record. Particularly, it has been my record in the United States Senate. I have been a Senator almost 9 years. I was here practically throughout World War II, and I have been in the Senate during the Korean war. To me, as a businessman, the proposal before the Senate now makes sense. In business we prepare for emergencies. We decide exactly what shall be done if certain things happen. We do not wait until an emergency is upon us and then act under pressure.

If I have found fault with controls in the past, if I have had any criticism of Congress, of President Roosevelt, or of President Truman, or of anyone else, in respect to OPA, OPS, and other control agencies, it is that they were not properly thought out far enough in advance. The previous emergency measures were passed under pressure and were placed in operation under pressure. The personnel to operate them was recruited under pressure. The control agencies were put together hurriedly; they were not properly thought through.

As chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I have felt it my responsibility to endeavor to call to the attention of the Senate, the Congress, and the people, the fact that we ought to use the experience derived in World War I, World War II, and the Korean War, in deciding exactly what we should do if and when another emergency occurred. We should try to avoid all the mistakes which were made during the other three periods, and endeavor to establish a system which would work in the best interests of private enterprise, the best interests of the people, and the best interests of the Government. That is all I am trying to do in this instance.

I do not have any pet ideas. There is no one in the wide world, particularly no Member of the Senate, who can point his finger at me and say, "There is a Socialist; there is a fellow who does not believe in the private enterprise system." My record speaks for itself. But in this instance we Republicans have a responsibility. We have a Republican President, and we control both Houses of Congress. If during our tenure of office a grave emergency strikes, we, and we alone, will have to deal with it. We will have to take the responsibility for it. I have been in business for more than 30 years. I have never been afraid to accept responsibility, and I am not afraid to do so in this instance.

I know from many sources that what we are advocating, or what I am advocating, is unpopular. But that does not make any difference to me. In my own mind, I am convinced that, at least so long as the Korean war continues, so long as American boys are dying in Korea, we ought to know what we will do in case of a big war or in case of a great emergency.

If we should become engaged in a big war, and our Government should take the lion's share of the goods produced by the Nation to provide the materials of war; for instance, if it should take from the civilian economy and out of civilian trade 50 percent of the goods produced in the United States, leaving only 50 percent to be divided among 160 million Americans, I am just as convinced as I am standing here that the Government would have to allocate that 50 percent and control the prices of it. If the Government should not regulate the economy, prices would go completely sky high. I may be wrong, although I do not believe I am, but I feel that under such conditions the Government must control the price of each item that is allocated. I am convinced of that.

I know there are persons who argue that even in the event of a large-scale war, and even under the conditions I have described, the Government does not need to do that, and that we would be better off without Government controls. I cannot make myself believe that. Personally, I am simply trying to be realistic; that is all.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator made the point that he did not believe Congress would act with sufficient speed, and he said that history would bear him out. Our most recent history, as has already been pointed out, indicates that the President will probably not act with sufficent speed.

Mr. CAPEHART. The last President did not. President Truman did not act as quickly as he should have acted, but I do not think that is any reason for our giving up our responsibility as the Congress of the United States. I have confidence in President Eisenhower. I think if we give him this legislation he will never use it unless there is a grave emergency, unless the need for its use is obvious to everyone in America. I am also certain that if such authority is needed, he will use it and use it promptly.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Indiana remembers, of course, that President Eisenhower did not ask for it.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. He indicated that he would accept it if we asked him to take it.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. But he did not ask for it.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. However, I again say that it is not the responsibility of the President. It is the responsibility of the Congress. I again invite attention to the fact that when President Eisenhower made that statement he had been President only a few days. I believe he felt, in making that statement, that we who have been in the Congress for many years are perhaps better judges of what ought to be done. I feel very strongly that we ought to give him this authority.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the question asked by the very able Senator from Utah, is it not also true that Mr. Flemming, who said that he represented the President and had had conferences with the President, replied as follows to the Senator's question, as set forth on page 1317 of the record:

> Mr. FLEMMING. On the freeze bill, it is our hope that the Congress would decide it could move fast. If the Congress decides it couldn't the authority to impose a freeze would be acceptable.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is exactly correct.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation on this point?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. On the point as to why the President took the position which he took, does not the Senator agree with me that it is consistent with President Eisenhower's philosophy of government that he does not dictate to the Congress what he wants and what he does not want? He realizes that the Congress has the responsibility for making the laws. As my very good friend from Utah pointed out, he expressed the hope that the Congress could and would be able to move fast enough to deal with the situation; but Mr. Flemming went on to say, speaking for the administration:

> If, however, the Congress should arrive at the contrary conclusion I am authorized to state that a bill containing a provision granting authority to the President to impose a freeze on prices and wages would be acceptable.

I also ask the Senator if he does not agree with me that, if there were administration opposition to the bill, it would likely have been stated by the Secretary of Commerce. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Also by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Does not the Senator recall that both of those gentlemen, who appeared before the committee, expressed approval of the 90-day price freeze bill giving the President authority to act?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the President's attitude is a challenge to the Congress. He says, in effect, "You are the Congress. It is your responsibility, not mine."

Mr. BUSH. Does not the Senator agree with me that the appearance of those Cabinet officers and what they said before our committee indicate administration approval with respect to title VIII when taken in connection with the remarks of Mr. Flemming?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think there is any question about it.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield first to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I read from the testimony of Secretary Weeks:

> I am opposed to the continuance of price and wage controls on any basis. It is my opinion that such controls are both unnecessary and undesirable. We believe that this country is capable of taking prompt and effective action in the event of an emergency requiring such controls.

He did not say, "We believe the President is capable of taking prompt and effective action."

Mr. CAPEHART. That is the statement of Secretary Weeks, a businessman, who had been in office a week, 10 days, 2 weeks, or 30 days.

Mr. BENNETT. He is also a former Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. I gather from his testimony that he takes the position that even in a large war we do not need such controls. If he belongs to that school of thought, and feels that we do not need controls in a serious emergency, then he certainly would not believe that we need this legislation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Will not the Senator agree with me that we can associate ourselves with the statements of Secretary Weeks and still favor title VIII? I do.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question that every member of the committee is against controls when they are not needed. Those who testified were against controls when they are not needed. But we feel that when they are needed, during a grave emergency or a big war, we ought to have them, and have them quickly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will not the Senator agree with me that in the event of a great emergency—and that is the only contingency with which we are dealing in this bill—it is perfectly conceivable that the Congress of the United States may not have 11 weeks in which to act, may not have 4 weeks in which to act, may not have 1 week in which to act, and may not have even 1 day in which to act? Yet certainly the authority to act and act promptly, must be lodged in the hands of someone. Whom can we trust in greater degree to exercise that authority properly than the President of the United States?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator from Indiana realize that the Senator from New York is apparently proceeding on the assumption that if Congress met it would have to enact complete legislation to control the economy? Is it not conceivable that a simple resolution to freeze the economy could be passed within a day?

If the Senator will further yield——

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me answer that question. We spent 30 days or more in hearings. Most of that time was spent upon the 90-day-freeze provision which the Senator is discussing. Knowing the viewpoint of certain Senators and many other persons in the United States, there is no question that if an emergency should strike, even to get a simple 90-day-freeze resolution through the Congress would require hearings. At least we ought to give the people an opportunity to be heard. I know that there would be many Senators who would insist that hearings be held.

Let me put it this way: If Senators feel that during a grave emergency or a big war we do not need price, wage, and rent controls, let them vote against title VIII. If they feel that during a grave emergency or a big war we must have price, wage, and rent controls, then, in my opinion, they should vote for title VIII because it would enable us to freeze prices, wages, and rents immediately and eliminate the critical period of time. I do not know whether it would be 1 day, 2 days, a week, 10 days, 30 days, or 60 days; but whatever the period of time is, in my opinion, it is the most serious period of time because it is the period in which prices get away from us, since during that period people buy and hoard. That is the time when controls are needed. If we do not have the 90-day-freeze provision, and an emergency strikes and Congress is not in session, and the President calls Congress in session to enact a 90-day freeze, we accelerate the very thing we would like to control. That is a signal to the American people to push their prices up immediately.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Did the Senator hear the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], an able member of our committee, when he stood on the floor of the Senate during the late lamented tidelands debate and said, on April 21:

> One may say that in the modern world it is necessary for legislatures to act quickly. I reply that when it is necessary we do act quickly. When the Nation feels itself in danger from war or from depression, the Congress of the United States can do whatever is necessary in a day's time.

That statement impressed me very much.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of the very able speech which the Senator from Utah made a few days ago on the floor of the Senate. If I am wrong in my statement, I hope the Senator will correct me, because I want to be very fair about it. As I understand, however, the Senator from Utah would be opposed to price, wage, and rent controls at any time, even in a big emergency. Therefore, I do not think he is qualified to pass upon the subject of what Congress could or could not do under the circumstances we have been discussing, because if he were in the state of mind in which he is today he would vote against the 90-day freeze even though we were involved in a grave emergency. Am I correct?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may answer him?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. My position may not be completely clear. However, I am opposed to the idea that price, wage, and rent controls are our sole recourse in a great emergency. I believe they could be considered along with many other controls. One of my chief objections to the bill is the assumption that price, wage, and rent controls are our only recourse, and that the only purpose of the bill is to set those controls in motion, instead of providing an overall program to meet the situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator from Utah opposed to price, wage, and rent controls during a grave emergency?

Mr. BENNETT. My position would be that they should be the last recourse, rather than the first.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the Senator is opposed, then?

Mr. BENNETT. I shall be very happy to repeat what I have just said, namely, they should be our last recourse, rather than our first recourse. I am not opposed to their ultimate use.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, the Senator from Utah is not qualified to speak as to whether Congress in an emergency could act quickly on a 90-day freeze order, because he would be opposed to such an order at that time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Indiana recalls, during the hearings, the hundred or more witnesses who appeared before the committee, and whether he would not say that the great preponderance of those witnesses, probably 98 percent, were against the same principle to which the Senator from Utah and I are opposed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, I would not say 98 percent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Well, 95 percent, then.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not——

Mr. GOLDWATER. The great majority, at least, were opposed.

Mr. CAPEHART. If we took the American people as a whole, all 160 million of them, probably the great preponderance would be in favor of this type of legislation; all the labor organizations are in favor of it, and they represent millions of people. With respect to the National Manufacturers' Association, it should be noted that the president of the National Manufacturers' Association testified they would be opposed to price, wage, and rent controls even in a grave emergency. Others testified to that effect.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Indiana recall that groups from his own State—not only from the National Manufacturers' Association and chambers of commerce—groups of small-business men contended that such con-

trols would not work and could not work, and therefore they were opposed to them?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Those are the views of the Senator from Utah, as well as my own views, and I do not think the Senator from Indiana is justified in saying we are not qualified to be opposed to a 90-day freeze. Should there be no opposition, Mr. President?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was taking the position that Congress, in the event a grave emergency should occur, could pass quickly a 90-day freeze order. My point was that he was not qualified as a witness in that respect because in such a grave emergency he would vote against a 90-day freeze order. He does not believe that even in a grave emergency prices, wages, and rent controls are needed. I understand that the Senator from Arizona shares the same view.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes; that is my position.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, I do not understand why we should consider the views of Senators who, even in the presence of a grave emergency, would not vote for such a bill, but would vote against it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We are against the bill in principle. We are against the bill as written, because, instead of benefitting by the history through which we have just passed, the pending bill has incorporated in it language which would defeat its purpose. We will point out such defects later in the debate.

Mr. CAPEHART. I regret that the Senator from Arizona did not do so during the hearings, because we would have been delighted to incorporate some of his views in the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I recall some delightful arguments in committee during the course of the hearings.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with what has been discussed, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an excerpt from the committee report, found at page 11, headed, "Experiences of Delay During World War II and Korea." I do not blame the situation entirely on the law. I believe the President was negligent in waiting until February to appoint an administrator. However the excerpt which I am asking to have printed in the RECORD shows what could happen under similar circumstances. I ask that the excerpt be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPERIENCES OF DELAY DURING WORLD WAR II AND KOREA

At the time of World War II, although our allies already were in a total war and although it was generally agreed that it was only a matter of time before we would also be involved, the National Defense Advisory Board spent the first half of 1941 attempting to draft price control legislation, and finally a bill was introduced on August 1, 1941. It took 6 months before the bill became law on January 30, 1942. And the General Maximum Price Regulations were not issued until 3 months later, on April 28, 1942.

In the meantime prices moved sharply upward. By February 1942 the Consumers' Price Index had increased by 12 percent over January 1941 and by 6 percent from the time the bill was introduced in August 1941. Wholesale prices had increased by 20 percent and 7 percent over the same periods. Wage rates were keeping pace with these increases, and the take-home pay of industrial workers was increasing much more rapidly.

The North Koreans crossed the 38th parallel on June 24, 1950. It was almost a month later, on July 19, 1950, that the Defense Production Act was introduced. Congress acted as expeditiously as possible, as many Members of the 81st Congress will recall, yet it was September 8, 1950, before the bill became law. The general ceiling price regulation was not issued until almost 5 months later on January 26, 1951. In the meantime the price-wage spiral accelerated upward. The import spot-market index stood at 101.5 on June 23 and rose to 130.9 by September 8, when the act became law, and increased to 159.5 by January 26, 1951. The domestic spot-market index moved a little less violently being at 100.8 on June 23, 1950, 119.1 on September 8, and 135.7 on January 26, 1951. Wholesale prices moved from 100 on June 27, 1950, to 107.5 on September 12, right after the act was signed, and to 115 immediately following the freeze on January 30 1951. The Consumers' Price Index reflected the same trends, moving from 100 in June 1950 to 102.6 in September and to 106.6 in January 1951. The average hourly earnings kept pace with Consumers' Price Index increasing from 100 in June 1950 to 101.8 in September and 107 in January 1951.

The cost of inflation during fiscal year 1951 to the Department of Defense alone was estimated at $7 billion. The consumers of the country had to pay an estimated $18 to $20 billion more for the goods and services they bought because of the price increases which took place between the outbreak of hostilities in Korea and the date of the issuance of the general ceiling price regulation on January 26, 1951.

It is obvious from these experiences and these facts that Congress cannot be expected to act rapidly enough to prevent the inflationary forces from being unleashed on the economy with all their disruptive and ramifying effects.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. In view of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Utah and the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arizona, to the effect that Congress could act promptly and with great force and effect, I ask the Senator from Indiana whether there is anything in the pending bill which would prevent Congress, in its wisdom, if it saw fit to do so, from passing mandatory legislation or, on the other hand, revoking the powers which are given to the President in the pending bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. If I understand the Senator's question correctly, the Congress, of course, in a few minutes, if it wanted to do so, could rescind the President's power to invoke the 90-day freeze.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is the question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. The point I am trying to make is that Congress retains the power to do anything it wishes to do, if it is in a position to act promptly.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Personally I doubt whether this Congress or any other Congress ordinarily is in a position, on a matter of this sort, to act quickly. In this particular instance I again wish to point out that it is perfectly conceivable events may progress so rapidly that Congress may be rendered completely impotent, even after a delay of days or weeks.

Mr. CAPEHART. That could very well happen, of course. We are reminded in the press almost daily, or at least weekly, that in this atomic age and long-range bombers we might well be bombed. I do not believe anyone can clearly foresee what might happen.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that between June 25, 1950, when the Communists attacked South Korea, through the first of September 1950, or a total of 68 days, the spot-market prices on imported goods went up 31 percent, and spot-market prices on domestic goods went up 19 percent?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that the wholesale prices, including all commodities, rose 7 percent?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the consumers' index rose by a little less than 3 percent?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. By January, when controls were first made effective, spot-market prices went up 59 percent on imports, and 30 percent on domestic goods?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The general index of wholesale prices went up 15 percent, and the consumers' index went up 6⅔ percent?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the horse had been stolen by the time the barn door controls were imposed.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not also true, measured in terms of the cost of living, as shown by the consumers' index, that the consumers' index went up substantially more after the President had the power to impose controls than it did between the time the Korean war began and the time when Congress gave him that power?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

I believe that the answer is that the Chinese Communists came into the war during that period, which, of course, was indicative to the American people, particularly to business interests, that the war was going to be a bigger war and would last much longer than anyone had anticipated.

I think that was perhaps the chief reason why prices rose as high as they did during that period. We remember that General MacArthur occupied all of Korea and was almost up to the Yalu River; I believe he arrived there in November. Then hordes of Chinese Communists, half a million of them as I recall, crossed the Yalu and immediately pushed General MacArthur back. That was the beginning of what I think should be called the Chinese war, rather

than the Korean war; and, in my opinion, that was perhaps the big reason for the second upsurge of prices.

However, that was no excuse for the President not to put the controls into effect very quickly after Congress passed the control law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me at this point?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the first place, in commenting on the delay of President Truman in putting full controls into effect, I am informed that he offered the appointment of Director of Price Stabilization to 33 men, and had refusals from all 33, and it was only the 34th man who accepted. So, in fairness to President Truman, I do not believe he should be charged with very much of the delay after September 8th.

With reference to the point the Senator from Utah made, namely, that the increase in the cost of living occurred in large part after January 26, 1951, is it not true——

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I believe the Senator from Utah said it was between September and January.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well, and there was a further increase after January. But I think that was also caused by the increases in wholesale prices—increases upstream, so to speak—which took time to translate themselves into increases in the cost of living—or increases downstream, so to speak. Is not that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that in connection with World War II, a general price-control bill was introduced in Congress on August 1, 1941, or more than 4 months before Pearl Harbor, but it was not passed until January 30, 1942, or 6 months later, or almost 2 months after Pearl Harbor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; those dates are correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that an effective controls law was not put into effect until May 28, 1942, or 5½ months after Pearl Harbor?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is the point I make. I repeat my position on this matter. Controls are not a hobby with me. I am trying to be purely factual about the matter, and I am trying to face the facts as they are and to read history as it should be read.

I point out that in the past, when we needed controls, at the times when controls would have done the most good, we did not have them; but after a period of time, Congress enacted controls, and then it took the President several months to put them into effect. The result has been, in all three instances, namely, World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, that the businessmen of the United States got controls, regardless of whether they liked them; but Congress did not impose them until after the harm had been done.

In this instance I am trying to have Congress establish machinery to take care of the situation, so that if there is another need for controls—and let us hope there will never be one—we shall be able to use them when they are needed, and shall be able to do so quickly.

So let us decide now what we are going to do and how we are going to do it. If controls never are needed, that will be fine.

Of course, the question of whether the country would have been better off in World War I, World War, II and the Korean war without any direct price, wage, and rent controls, is an entirely different one.

On the other hand, if we believe that in a big war we must have controls, then let us arrange for them now, and let us know what we are going to do, how we are going to do it, and when we are going to do it, so the necessary steps will be taken the first minute, before there are any price increases.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to comment on what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Indiana and the distinguished Senator from Illinois, namely, that there should be such a law on the statute books.

Without approving or disapproving what was done by a former President, at least it is proper to point out that no such law was then on the statute books. Perhaps the matter was allowed to drag.

At any rate, if such a law had been on the statute books then, Congress could have insisted that the President at once impose a freeze across the board.

On the other hand, when we got into the Korean war—and I have always regarded it as a war—we had no such law on the statute books, and Congress then had to write such a law, as the Senator from Illinois has pointed out.

However, under the provisions of this bill, in such a situation we would have an immediate freeze for 90 days, during which time Congress could proceed to write the necessary law.

With all due respect to the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Illinois, let me say that an equally able statesman was in Washington—I refer to Mr. Bernard Baruch; and I like to regard him in that way—during another war under another President; and it was Mr. Baruch's belief that there should be an immediate freeze.

Of course, I cannot speak for former President Truman; he can speak for himself. However, if there had been such a law on the statute books, President Truman could have used it, and thus could have avoided any dilly-dallying or wasting of time.

I thank the Senator from Indiana for yielding to me.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. BARRETT. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, inasmuch as we shall have time in which to discuss later the feature of the bill with respect to the 90-day freeze, I think at this time I should take up the bill title by title, go through it, and explain it. If Senators have any questions they desire to ask, I should be very glad to endeavor to answer them.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CASE. I am disturbed by the declaration of policy, which appears at the very outset of the Senate Committee amendment, on page 8. In the paragraph beginning at line 23, in the declaration of policy this sentence occurs:

> In spite of substantial increases which have occurred since the outbreak of the conflict in Korea, prices are now generally in normal relationship and the economy as a whole is relatively stable.

Personally, I could not subscribe to a statement of that kind. I could not defend it to the cattlegrowers of the West, who have seen prices decline as much as they have fallen within the past 9 months. I would not want them to think I was voting for a bill which would give anyone power to freeze a price situation which is 82 percent of parity or below.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator not think that, considering all prices throughout the United States, those prices are in normal relationship, generally speaking?

Mr. CASE. I do not, because while cattle prices have gone down, the prices of farm machinery and automobiles and things of that sort are still as high as they have been, with the exception, possibly, of one car manufacturer, the price of whose product was revised recently.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it the Senator's position that cattle prices are low at the moment?

Mr. CASE. They certainly are out of normal relationship.

Mr. CAPEHART. I may say, having been a farmer, and having owned cattle, there is no question that the prices of cattle are low. But, I doubt that there ever will be a time in this country when the prices received by certain segments of the economy will not be found to be possibly lower than they should be. However, in applying the 90-day freeze, the President would have the right to make any adjustments he might think necessary during the 90-day period. For example, if the President desired to do so, he could refrain, during the 90-day period, from freezing cattle prices on the basis of the old rigid parity.

Mr. CASE. It might be a good thing to incorporate such a provision in the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is in the bill now.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator mean that the provision for farm parity is already in the bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. The provision simply says that the President shall have the right to make any adjustments he may care to make.

Mr. CASE. What advantage is there to the bill as a whole by incorporating the particular sentence quoted by me in the declaration of policy?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know. Personally, as the author of the bill, I should have no objection to striking it out, because I never have been too much sold on declarations of policy.

Mr. CASE. I agree with the Senator about that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think they are to be read, and that is about all. I have no objection to striking it out or amending it, because I do not think it would change the substance of the bill.

Mr. CASE. There is a great deal of special pleading in the declaration of policy, and, so far as I am concerned, I should like to see it eliminated from the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection. Declarations of policy are something that seem to be a part of all legislation. They are not a part of the substance of the bill. If any Senator can write a better declaration of policy, or wants it to be amended or changed, I should have no objection.

Mr. CASE. Would there be any objection to striking out lines 23, 24, and 25 on page 8, and lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 9, and the word "However" at the beginning of line 4?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would suggest that the able Senator prepare such an amendment and discuss it when we get down to the point of considering amendments.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Title VIII of the bill provides that whenever the President shall find that a grave national emergency exists, he shall have the power to invoke the provisions of that title. In discussing this title, I note that the Senator refers to another war. Is it the Senator's idea that the grave national emergency referred to is equivalent to a world-war situation?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the testimony before the committee is perfectly clear, but I have no objection to trying to clear it up on the floor, because I think the better record we make in that respect the better off we shall be. I may say that we were thinking in terms of an emergency whereby the Federal Government would be using a large proportion of goods and merchandise, taking them out of the civilian economy. For example, let us say that the military needed 50 percent of the steel production. We could use any other product as an example. But let us assume that the Government will be required to take from the civilian economy 50 percent of the steel, 60 percent of the copper, 70 percent—or even 30 percent—of some other products. In my opinion, there would be an emergency which would require the control of prices, wages, and rents, at least as applied to those categories.

Mr. BARRETT. Does not the Senator feel that the only time the Government would be justified in taking such quantities of products out of the market would be under war conditions?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot see any other condition at the moment which would require the military to take such quantities of goods. It was never intended that the 90-day freeze would go into effect except in a grave national emergency in which defense is involved.

Mr. BARRETT. I should be quite agreeable to that title of the bill if it were based upon a declaration of war by the Congress.

Mr. CAPEHART. The committee gave a great deal of thought to that subject, and we believed that when we used the term "grave national emergency", we were making the language about as strong as language can be made, because "grave" is a very strong word.

Mr. BARRETT. I may say to the Senator that we have been living under emergencies for the past 20 years, and we have had hope that since the new administration took office we might get away from so-called emergencies which have been brought about so frequently.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, that is exactly what we all want to get away from, and we want to get away from wars, 100 percent. But I do not believe, so long as we are at war in Korea, that we can close our eyes and say there is no possibility that we may get into a big war. If we do, then the purpose of this proposed legislation is to be prepared to control our economy from the day the war starts.

Mr. BARRETT. I hope the Senator does not misunderstand my remarks.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I do not think I do.

Mr. BARRETT. I might agree that if Congress should declare war, it might be advisable to have this proposed legislation ready to become immediately effective. But the emergencies of which I am speaking are not wartime emergencies; I am speaking of the phony emergencies under which we have been living for quite a long time.

Mr. CAPEHART. But those phony emergencies were completely eliminated when Mr. Eisenhower was elected President of the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. I agree with the Senator that the present occupant of the White House will not abuse the power granted, but I submit that it is unwise to grant such power in any event.

Mr. CAPEHART. This proposed legislation is only for 2 years, and the freeze would last only 90 days.

Mr. BARRETT. That is quite true. Did the committee consider the advisability of using language that would confine the legislation to a declaration of war by the Congress?

Mr. CAPEHART. We did, of course, but we were confronted with the problem of the Korean war. We are at war in Korea without there having been a declaration of war. As a member of the United Nations, of course, it was not necessary for us to declare war, yet the end result of what happens to our people and to our economy is the same as though we did declare war.

Mr. BARRETT. I hope Congress will reassert its power in that respect.

Mr. CAPEHART. I certainly can agree with the Senator in that respect, but, as the Senator well knows, we have not yet done it. Therefore, we have got to be realistic and deal with circumstances as they exist.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I think it is fair to say that the committee was influenced very considerably by the fact that the bill is only for 2 years after June 30, and that the President of the United States, because of his background of experience and because of his philosophy of wanting to work with the Congress and not to impinge upon or challenge its authority, had an influence on some of the members of the committee in causing them to vote favorably.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to make the observation that once this type of legislation gets on the books it is a relatively easy matter to have it extended from 2 years to 4 years, and then to 6 years, and the next thing we know, it is permanent legislation. That is one of the objections I have to this type of legislation. Notwithstanding the fact that it is limited to a 2-year period, its life can be extended by continuing legislation every 2 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question but what the Senator is correct. We are all opposed to that sort of thing, but, nevertheless, we have the responsibility at the moment of legislating for the Government, and the Banking and Currency Committee, whether it liked it or not, felt that it had the responsibility to take some action. We did what the majority of the committee thought was the proper thing to do. We simply could not do very much with it, because many features of the present act are extended in this new bill. We felt that, inasmuch as we were discontinuing controls, it was wise, at least so long as the Korean war continued, to have some sort of machinery for almost instantly controlling the economy in case, overnight, a grave emergency should arise.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. He answered the point on which I wished him to comment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, section 2 is the declaration of policy, which I shall not read.

Section 3 covers allocations and priorities. That section gives the President authority to make certain that the Military Establishments receive all the materials it needs and can use before any materials are used in the civilian economy.

Section 101 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as written in the bill, restricts the power of the President to allocate materials for general distribution in the civilian market to cases where he finds, first, that it is a scarce and critical material essential to national defense; or second, that national defense requirements for the material cannot be met without creating significant dislocation of distribution in the civilian market to

a degree creating appreciable hardship. I think that is as good a way as any to explain section 3. In substance, I have stated exactly what it does, and we made no alterations in that section other than some technical changes in language.

Mr. President, section 4, relating to import controls, was the so-called famous section 104 in the old act, which controlled the imports of fats, oils, and dairy products. The committee provided for a complete repeal of that section, on the recommendations of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Section 5, which relates to V-loans, would be continued for 2 years. It was amended to allow V-loans to be made in connection with termination of Government contracts; and declared that no small-business concern shall be denied a V-loan merely because an alternative source of supply exists for the item to be procured on Government contract.

Section 6, relating to long-term contracts for the purchase of scarce materials, is to be extended for 1 year, from 1962 to 1963, on the recommendation of the Department of Defense and others.

Mr. BUSH. Did the Senator refer to section 6, or title VI?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. I referred to section 6 of the bill.

Section 7 of the bill refers to transfer of materials to the stockpile. It amends section 303 of the Defense Production Act to provide that any materials acquired by the Government under long-term contracts which are in excess to programs under the act shall be transferred to the national stockpile. Stockpile appropriations are not charged for the cost of acquisition of such materials. The Treasury is directed to cancel notes of Defense Materials Procurement Administration equal in amount to the cost of acquisition of materials so transferred to stockpile. The borrowing power from the Treasury under section 304 of the Defense Production Act is thereupon reduced by the amount of the acquisition cost of materials so transferred to stockpile.

Under the present act, nothing whatsoever is said about what would happen to the goods if and when the Government became the owner, so it was felt that we ought to establish ownership, so that at least some governmental agency would be responsible for the goods in case the Government were called upon to make good.

Section 8 relates to credit controls. Since the reporting of the bill and the printing of the report, the committee, by unanimous vote of all members present, reported out a committee amendment which would allow credit controls to be invoked only if and when the President exercises his authority to freeze prices, wages, and rents in title VIII. Such credit controls could only be put in effect for a period of 90 days.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Is it not true that the bill as originally approved by the committee sought to give to the Federal Reserve Board power over consumer credit?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is true.

Mr. BUSH. Such as the power covered by regulation X and regulation W.

Mr. CAPEHART. The bill originally approved by the committee gave that power to the Federal Reserve Board, not to the President.

Mr. BUSH. That power was to be given them, not contingent upon war or a national emergency, but was to be a continuing power, such as the Board now has to control credit, was it not?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Am I correct in understanding that later an amendment was accepted by the committee?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Would that amendment take such power away from the Board?

Mr. CAPEHART. The committee adopted an amendment to tie consumer and housing credit into the 90-day freeze, to be used only in case the President invoked the 90-day freeze authority.

Mr. BUSH. That would be the only time the Federal Reserve Board would have power to exercise the consumer-credit controls.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator believe that that is a wise amendment, or would he wish to postpone his remarks on that question?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board testified that personally he would like to have that authority as permanent law. However, he said he was testifying for himself personally, not for the Board. As the Senator from Connecticut may remember, such a provision was placed in the bill originally. Then it was decided that it ought to be tied in with the 90-day freeze, so that all segments of our industry would be treated the same.

In other words, if there were a grave national emergency, as the act would read if this amendment were agreed to, the President would be given the right, for a 90-day period only, to freeze prices, wages, and rents; and the Federal Reserve Board would be given the right, during the 90-day period, to control housing credit and consumer credit.

Mr. BUSH. Would the Senator from Indiana agree with me that these indirect controls, if placed in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board, would be one of the strongest weapons for combating inflation?

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question that indirect controls are necessary to combat inflation, and we are using them today. As the Senator probably well knows, the present administration is using them in connection with the regulation of Government bond interest rates, mortgage interest rates, and rediscount rates.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator agree that if this type of control is allowed to expire, there will be no power of that kind in the Federal Reserve Board?

Mr. CAPEHART. There would be no law to give the Federal Reserve Board or the President the right to control consumer credit.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator agree with me that we are still faced with the danger of inflation so long as we are engaged in a war in the Far East, and actually are imperiled with the possibility of war elsewhere?

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator that we might have a series of smaller emergencies which could cumulatively push the price level up, a series of emergencies which might well develop into a big emergency.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator agree with me that the Federal Reserve Board has, by its behavior, action, and wisdom, earned the respect of the economists of the United States, and of the people generally, and that in the common interest, so as to protect consumers, and persons with fixed incomes, those who are hurt the worst by inflation, it would be desirable to have the Federal Reserve Board at all times enjoy this very important control over credit, just as the Board enjoys control over credit in other ways, but not directly connected with consumer credit? Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have the highest respect for the Federal Reserve Board and its Governors. I think they have done a good job, and I believe they will continue to do a good job. In connection with a previous bill, I voted to give them the right to control consumer credit. That control was known as regulation W. In connection with housing it was known as regulation X. However, as the chairman of the committee and manager of the bill, I must follow the recommendations of the committee unless amendments are offered to do otherwise.

GRANT OF IMMUNITY TO WITNESSES BEFORE EITHER HOUSE OF CONGRESS OR CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business at its adjournment on Friday last; namely, Senate bill 16.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 16) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a procedural matter?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1081, a bill to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, and make that bill the unfinished business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Cur-

rency with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. It is the policy of the United States to oppose acts of aggression and to promote peace by insuring respect for world law and the peaceful settlement of differences among nations. To that end this Government is pledged to support collective action through the United Nations and through regional arrangements for mutual defense in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. The United States is determined to develop and maintain whatever military and economic strength is found to be necessary to carry out this purpose.

"In spite of substantial increases which have occurred since the outbreak of the conflict in Korea, prices are now generally in normal relationship and the economy as a whole is relatively stable. It is the sense of the Congress that this stability can be maintained by the full and effective use of indirect controls barring adverse international developments.

"However, defense production now requires a limited diversion of certain materials and facilities from civilian use to military and related purposes. It requires expansion of productive facilities beyond the levels needed to meet the civilian demand.

"Moreover, there is the ever-present threat of further Communist aggression which may seriously jeopardize the American economic system unless proper safeguards exist for the imposition of certain economic controls in the event of a grave national emergency. The necessity for such safeguards is emphasized by the speedily destructive force of modern warfare which allows no delay in the taking of Executive action to insure the preservation of the well-being of the economy. This act provides a basis for the imposition of price, wage, and rent controls for a temporary period in the event serious economic dislocations develop which threaten the national security or welfare.

"It is the sense of the Congress that direct economic controls are incompatible with the American free-enterprise system and should be invoked only if an emergency arises serious enough to threaten the economic well-being or security of the United States. However, if such an emergency should develop the President must have the power to employ immediate economic controls for such reasonable period of time as will give Congress an opportunity to act."

SEC. 3. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. (a) The President is hereby authorized (1) to require that performance under contracts or orders (other than contracts of employment) which he deems necessary or appropriate to promote the national defense shall take priority over performance under any other contract or order, and for the purpose of assuring such priority, to require acceptance and performance of such contracts or orders in preference to other contracts or orders by any person he finds to be capable of their performance, and (2) to allocate materials and facilities in such manner, upon such conditions, and to such extent as he shall deem necessary or appropriate to promote the national defense.

"(b) The powers granted in this section shall not be used to control the general distribution of any material in the civilian market unless the President finds (1) that such material is a scarce and critical material essential to the national defense, or (2) that the requirements of the national defense for such material cannot otherwise be met without creating a significant dislocation of the normal distribution of such material in the civilian market to such a degree as to create appreciable hardship."

SEC. 4. Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. Subsection (a) of section 301 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out ", or in connection with or in contemplation of the termination," and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or for the purpose of financing any contractor, subcontractor, or other person in connection with or in contemplation of the termination, in the interest of the United States, of any contract made for the national defense; but no small-business concern (as defined in sec. 714 (a) (1) of this act) shall be held ineligible for the issuance of such a guaranty by reason of alternative sources of supply."

SEC. 6. Subsection (b) of section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out "1962" and inserting in lieu there of "1963."

SEC. 7. Section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, metals, minerals, and materials acquired pursuant to the provisions of this section which, in the judgment of the President, are excess to the needs of programs under this act, shall be transferred to the national stockpile established pursuant to the act of June 7, 1939, as amended (50 U. S. C. 98–98h), when the President deems such action to be in the public interest.

"Transfers made pursuant to this subsection shall be made without charge against or reimbursement from funds available under such act of June 7, 1939, as amended, except that costs incident to such transfer other than acquisition costs shall be paid or reimbursed from such funds, and the acquisition costs of such metals, minerals, and materials transferred shall be deemed to be net losses incurred by the transferring agency and the notes payable issued to the Secretary of the Treasury representing the amounts thereof shall be canceled. Upon the cancellation of any such notes the aggregate amount of borrowing which may be outstanding at any one time under section 304 (b) of this act, as amended, shall be reduced in an amount equal to the amount of any notes so cancelled."

SEC. 8. Title VI of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE VI—CONTROL OF CONSUMER AND REAL ESTATE CREDIT

"THIS TITLE AUTHORIZES THE REGULATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT AND REAL ESTATE CONSTRUCTION CREDIT ONLY

"SEC. 601. To assist in carrying out the objectives of this act, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 386, 80th Congress (61 Stat. 921), to exercise consumer credit controls in accordance with and to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 8843 (August 9, 1941).

"SEC. 602. (a) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, the President is authorized from time to time to prescribe regulations with respect to such kind or kinds of real estate construction credit which thereafter may be extended as, in his judgment, it is necessary to regulate in order to prevent or reduce excessive or untimely use of or fluctuations in such credit. Such regulations may, among other things, prescribe maximum loan or credit values, minimum down payments in cash or property, trade-in or exchange values, maximum maturities, maximum amounts of credit, rules regarding the amount, form, and time of various payments, rules against any credit in specified circumstances, rules regarding consolidations, renewals, revisions, transfers, or assignments of credit, and rules regarding other similar or related matters. Such regulations may classify persons and transactions and may apply different requirements thereto, and may include such administrative provisions as in the judgment of the President are reasonably necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this section or to prevent evasions thereof.

"In prescribing and suspending such regulations, including changes from time to time to take account of changing conditions, the President shall consider, among other factors, (1) the level and trend of real estate construction credit and the various kinds thereof, (2) the effect of the use of such credit upon (i) purchasing power and (ii) demand for real property and improvements thereon and for other goods and services, (3) the need in the national economy for the maintenance of sound credit conditions, and (4) the needs for increased defense production.

"(b) No person shall extend or maintain any real estate construction credit, or renew, revise, consolidate, refinance, purchase, sell, discount, or lend or borrow on, any obligation arising out of any such credit, or arrange for any of the foregoing, in contravention of any regulation prescribed by the President pursuant to this section. Any person who extends or maintains any such credit, or renews, revises, consolidates, refinances, purchases, sells, discounts, or lends or borrows on, any obligation arising out of any such credit, or arranges for any of the foregoing, shall make, keep, and preserve for such periods, such accounts, correspondence, memoranda, papers, books, and other records, and make such reports, under oath or otherwise, as the President may by regulation require as necessary or appropriate in order to effectuate the purposes of this section; and such accounts, correspondence, memoranda, papers, books, and other records shall be subject at any time to such reasonable periodic, special, or other examinations by examiners or other representatives of the President as the President may deem necessary or appropriate. The requirements of this section apply whether a person is acting as principal, agent, broker, vendor, or otherwise.

"(c) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this section, the President by regulation may require transactions or persons or classes thereof subject to this section to be registered; and, after notice and opportunity for hearing, the President by order may suspend any such registration for violation of this section or any regulation prescribed by the President pursuant to this section. The provisions of section 25 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, shall apply in the case of any such order of the President in the same manner that such provisions apply in the case of orders of the Securities and Exchange Commission under that act. In carrying out this section, the President may act through and may utilize the services of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Reserve banks, and any other agencies, Federal or State, which are available and appropriate.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, unless the context otherwise requires, the following terms shall have the following meanings, but the President may in his regulations further define such terms and, in addition, may define technical, trade, accounting, and other terms, insofar as any such definitions are not inconsistent with the provisions of this section:

"(1) 'Real estate construction credit' means any credit which (i) is wholly or partly secured by, (ii) is for the purpose of purchasing or carrying, (iii) is for the purpose of financing, or (iv) involves a right

to acquire or use, new construction on real property or real property on which there is new construction. As used in this paragraph the term 'new construction' means any structure, or any major addition or major improvement to a structure, which has not been begun before the effective date of any regulation issued under subsection (a) of this section after the date of enactment of the Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953. As used in this paragraph the term 'real property' includes leasehold and other interests therein. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, the term 'real estate construction credit' shall not include any loan or loans made, insured, or guaranteed by any department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch of the United States Government, or by any wholly owned Government corporation, or by any mixed ownership Government corporation as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended.

"(2) 'Credit' means any loan, mortgage, deed of trust, advance, or discount; any conditional sale contract; any contract to sell, or sale or contract of sale of, property or services, either for present or future delivery, under which part or all of the price is payable subsequent to the making of such sale or contract; any rental-purchase contract, or any contract for the bailment, leasing, or other use of property under which the bailee, lessee, or user has the option of becoming the owner thereof, obligates himself to pay as compensation a sum substantially equivalent to or in excess of the value thereof, or has the right to have all or part of the payments required by such contract applied to the purchase price of such property or similar property; any option, demand, lien, pledge, or similar claim against, or for the delivery of property or money; any purchase, discount, or other acquisition of, or any credit under the security of, any obligation or claim arising out of any of the foregoing; and any transaction or series of transactions having a similar purpose or effect.

"SEC. 603. Any person who willfully violates any provision of section 601, 602, or 605, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 604. All the present provisions of sections 21 and 27 of the Security Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (relating to investigations, injunctions, jurisdictions, and other matters), shall be as fully applicable with respect to the exercise by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System of credit controls under section 601 as they are now applicable with respect to the exercise by the Securities and Exchange Commission of its functions under that act, and the Board shall have the same powers in the exercise of such credit controls as the Commission now has under the said sections 21 and 27.

"SEC. 605. To assist in carrying out the objectives of this act the President may at any time or times, notwithstanding any other provision of law, reduce, for such period as he shall specify, the maximum authorized principal amounts, ratios of loan to value or cost, or maximum maturities of any type or types of loans on real estate which thereafter may be made, insured, or guaranteed by any department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch of the United States Government, or by any wholly owned Government corporation or by any mixed-ownership Government corporation as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, or reduce or suspend any such authorized loan program, upon a determination, after taking into consideration the effect thereof upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy and the needs for increased defense production, that such action is necessary in the public interest: *Provided*, That in the exercise of these powers, the President shall preserve the relative credit preferences accorded to veterans under existing law. Subject to the provision of this section with respect to preserving the relative credit preferences accorded to veterans under existing law, the President may require lenders or borrowers and their successors and assigns to comply with reasonable conditions and requirements, in addition to those provided by other law, in connection with any loan of a type which has been the subject of action by the President under this section. Such conditions and requirements may vary for classifications of persons or transactions as the President may prescribe, and failure to comply therewith shall constitute a violation of this section."

SEC. 9. Subsection (c) of section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Whenever the President invokes the powers given him in this act to control the general distribution of any material in the civilian market, he shall do so in such a manner as to make available, so far as practicable, for business and various segments thereof in the normal channel of distribution of such material, a fair share of the available civilian supply based, so far as practicable, on the share received by such business under normal conditions during a representative period following June 30, 1953, and having due regard to periodic changes in the current competitive position of established business: *Provided*, That the limitations and restrictions imposed on the production of specific items shall not exclude new concerns and newly acquired operations from a fair and reasonable share of total authorized production, and shall give due consideration to the needs of new concerns and newly acquired operations: *Provided further*, That if the President continues or reimposes controls after June 30, 1953, on the general distribution in the civilian market of any materials subject to such controls on June 30, 1953, he shall do so in the manner above provided but on the basis of the share received by such business during a representative period preceding June 24, 1950, adjusted to reflect, since such date, attained competitive position, the requirements of new concerns and newly acquired operations."

SEC. 10. Section 702 (d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'national defense' means the operations and activities of the Armed Forces, the Atomic Energy Commission, or any other Government department or agency directly or indirectly and substantially concerned with the national defense, or operations or activities in connection with foreign economic or military assistance programs."

SEC. 11. (a) The fourth sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this section, a small-business concern shall be deemed to be one which is independently owned and operated and which is not dominant in its field of operation, including producers of strategic and critical minerals and metals."

(b) Paragraph (4) of subsecton (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955."

SEC. 12. Paragraph (3) of subsection (f) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "allocated" the first time it appears therein the words "in the civilian market."

SEC. 13. Paragraph (4) of subsection (f) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is repealed.

SEC. 14. Subsection (a) of section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) Titles I, III, VI, VII, and VIII of this act, and all authority conferred thereunder, shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1955, or at the expiration of 90 days after the issuance on or before that date of an executive order establishing ceilings under the provisions of section 801 (a) of this act, whichever is later.

"(2) Title II of this act, and all authority conferred thereunder, shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1953; and titles IV and V of this act, and all authority conferred thereunder, shall terminate at the close of April 30, 1953."

SEC. 15. Subsection (c) of section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or the taking of any action (including the making of new guarantees) deemed by a guaranteeing agency to be necessary to accomplish the orderly liquidation, adjustment or settlement of any loans guaranteed under this act, including actions deemed necessary to avoid undue hardship to borrowers in reconverting to normal civilian production; and all of the authority granted to the President, guaranteeing agencies, and fiscal agents, under section 301 of this act shall be applicable to actions taken pursuant to the authority contained in this subsection."

SEC. 16. The Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VIII—TEMPORARY EMERGENCY PRICE, WAGE, AND RENT CEILINGS

"SEC. 801. (a) The President is authorized and directed, whenever he shall find and declare that a grave national emergency exists and that the exercise of such authority is necessary in the interest of national security and economic stability, to establish simultaneously by executive order ceilings on (1) the price, rental, commission, margin, rate, fee, charge, or allowance paid or received on the sale or delivery, or the purchase or receipt, by or to any person, of materials and services, (2) wages, salaries, and other compensation paid or received with respect to employment, and (3) rents paid or received for the use or occupancy of housing accommodations, at the levels prevailing as of the close of business on the business day next preceding the day on which the action is taken, or those prevailing on the nearest date during the preceding 30 days on which, in the judgment of the President, they are generally representative, or if none prevailed during such 30-day period, then those prevailing on the nearest date on which, in the judgment of the President, they are generally representative. All ceilings established under this title shall terminate 90 days after the issuance of such order, or at such earlier time as Congress may by law or concurrent resolution provide, and the authority conferred by this title to establish ceilings shall not thereafter be exercised.

"(b) The President may provide exemptions from, suspensions of, or adjustments to ceilings in the case of any materials or services or transactions therein, or types of employment, or housing accommodations of any class or in any area, if he finds that (1) such exemption, suspension, or adjustment is necessary for national defense, or (2) the imposition or maintenance of such ceilings would be impracticable or unnecessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this title.

"SEC. 802. The President may make such rules, regulations, and orders as he deems necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title. Whenever in the judgment of the President such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to the

recovery of possession) in connection with any housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or are likely to result in rent increases inconsistent with the purposes of this title.

"SEC. 803. (a) Regardless of any obligation heretofore or hereafter entered into, it shall be unlawful—

"(1) for any person to sell or deliver, or in the regular course of business or trade to buy or receive, any material or service, or to demand, accept, receive, or retain any rent for the use or occupancy of any housing accommodations, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of this title or any regulation, order, or requirement issued thereunder, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing; or

"(2) for any employer to pay, or any employee to receive, any wage, salary, or other compensation in contravention of any regulation or order promulgated by the President under this title.

The President shall prescribe the extent to which any payment (including any wage, salary, or compensation payment) either in money or property, made in contravention of any such regulation, order, or requirement shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any person for the purposes of any other law or regulation, including bases in determining gain for tax purposes.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 804. Nothing in this title shall be construed to require any person to sell any material or service, or to offer any housing accommodations for rent, or to perform personal services.

"SEC. 805. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'rent' means the consideration, including any bonus, benefit, or gratuity, demanded or received for or in connection with the use or occupancy of housing accommodations, or the transfer of a lease of housing accommodations.

"(b) The term 'housing accommodations' means any building, structure or part thereof, or land appurtenant thereto, or any other real or personal property rented or offered for rent for living or dwelling purposes (including houses, apartments, rooming or boarding house accommodations, and other properties used for living or dwelling purposes) together with all privileges, services, furnishings, furniture, and facilities connected with the use or occupancy of such property.

"SEC. 806. This title shall become effective on May 1, 1953."

SEC. 17. Section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended—

(a) By striking out "1953" in subsection (e) of said section and inserting in lieu thereof "1954"; and

(b) by inserting after the words "veterans of World War II" wherever they appear in said section the words "and of the Korean conflict."

SEC. 18. (a) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) (A) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection—

"(i) the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of September 30, 1953, in the areas described in subparagraph (1) (B) and (C) of this subsection in which maximum rents were in effect on April 30, 1953; and

"(ii) the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of April 30, 1954, in any area which has been or is certified under subsection (1) of this section as a critical defense housing area.

"(B) Any such area which was certified as a critical defense housing area prior to the date of enactment of the Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953 shall be reviewed in the light of the new criteria applicable to critical defense housing areas and shall be continued under control after such review (which must be concluded by September 30, 1953), only if, after such review and prior to such date, it is recertified in accordance with the provisions of subsection (1) as amended by such act."

(b) Paragraph (3) of subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(5)."

(c) Paragraph (4) of subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "(1) or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3) or (5)."

SEC. 19. (a) The last sentence of subsection (k) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "In establishing or maintaining any maximum rent for any housing accommodations under this subsection the President shall give due consideration to the rents prevailing for such housing accommodations or comparable housing accommodations during the period from March 1, 1953, to April 1, 1953, and he shall make adjustment for such relevant factors as he shall deem to be of general applicability in respect to such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such State, incorporated city, town, or village, or unincorporated area."

(b) The third sentence of subsection (l) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "In establishing or maintaining any maximum rent for any housing accommodations under this subsection, the President shall give due consideration to the rents prevailing for such housing accommodations or comparable housing accommodations during the period from March 1, 1953, to April 1, 1953, and he shall make adjustment for such relevant factors as he shall determine and deem to be of general applicability in respect to such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such area."

SEC. 20. (a) Paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (i) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are amended by striking out the phrase "defense plant or" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "military, Atomic Energy Commission, or other Government."

(b) Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by striking out "plant or" and inserting in lieu thereof "military, Atomic Energy Commission, or other Government."

SEC. 21. Subsection (o) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out "on the date of enactment of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof "on the date of enactment of the Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953", and (2) by striking out "120" and inserting in lieu thereof "130."

SEC. 22. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(r) Regulations or orders under this title shall be subject to the same proceedings for protest and review as are provided for regulations or orders relating to price controls by sections 407 and 408 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for such purpose such sections are hereby continued notwithstanding the provisions of section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended."

SEC. 23. The first sentence of section 208 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The President shall administer the powers, duties, and functions conferred upon him by this act through such officer or agency of the Government as he may designate."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The several references to various titles of the Defense Production Act are a bit confusing to Members of the Senate—or at least to myself. I am not familiar with the contents of the titles by title numbers. What is the subject matter of titles II, IV, and V of the Defense Production Act, which will terminate, respectively, on June 30 for title II, and, for titles IV and V, as of April 30, 1953?

Mr. CAPEHART. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. CASE. Page 27.

Mr. CAPEHART. Title II is the authority to requisition, which we eliminated entirely. Title IV relates to price control, which has been eliminated.

Title V relates to labor disputes. It has been eliminated.

Mr. CASE. One further question along the same line. On page 11 of the bill, as the Senate has already pointed out, section 4 repeals section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. That is the one relating to dairy products, and so forth. On page 22 of the bill the following language occurs:

(a) (1) Titles I, III, VI, VII, and VIII of this act, and all authority conferred thereunder, shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1955, or at the expiration of 90 days after the issuance on or before that date of an Executive order establishing ceilings under the provisions of section 801 (a) of this act, whichever is later.

To make the record perfectly clear, does that mean that section 104 of the Defense Production Act will become effective again as of June 30, 1955, or is it repealed outright, without modification in any respect, by the termination date?

Mr. CAPEHART. It is repealed 100 percent on June 30, 1955.

Mr. CASE. The termination date does not terminate the repeal and reinstate the section?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Section 9 relates to civilian market allocations. It amends section 701 (c) of the Defense Production Act to say that whenever the President allocates materials in the civilian market he shall try to do so on the basis of giving, first, a fair share to business based on the share business receives under normal conditions in a free competitive market following June 30, 1953, with regard being given, after allocations are imposed in the civilian market, to periodic changes in current competitive position, the needs of new concerns and newly acquired operations of existing concerns, for materials not under control on June 30, 1953; and, second, a fair share based on the amount received by business during a representative period before June 24, 1950, adjusted to reflect changes in competitive position, needs of new concerns and newly acquired operations since that date, in the case of materials still under control on June 30, 1953.

Section 10 deals with the definition of "national defense."

National defense is redefined to remove the specific reference to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as

amended, and substitutes for that a reference to the foreign economic or military assistance programs.

Section 11 deals with the definition of "small business." It is the same definition as was used previously, with one exception. We say:

SEC. 11. (a) The fourth sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this section, a small-business concern shall be deemed to be one which is independently owned and operated and which is not dominant in its field of operation, including producers of strategic and critical minerals and metals."

That language was placed in the bill at the suggestion of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and also, I believe, of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], because it has to do with small producers of minerals, which materials are so badly needed at the moment in our defense production effort.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator a question with respect to section 802. Will the Senator give his opinion as to what powers the President would have under that section? The language is as follows:

SEC. 802. The President may make such rules, regulations, and orders as he deems necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title. Whenever in the judgment of the President such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to the recovery of possession) in connection with any housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or are likely to result in rent increases inconsistent with the purposes of this title.

What does the Senator think is the purpose of the title?

Mr. CAPEHART. It is simply a general housekeeping section giving the President the right to make rules and regulations under which he places title VIII in effect. I think the Senator will find that the language is practically the same, if not the same, as that which we have been using in such legislation for many years. It is exactly the same, I think, as that which is found in the present Defense Production Act. I do not think there is any change whatsoever in section 802.

Mr. BYRD. In this case the situation is slightly different. Congress passed the act referred to. The proposed act is to be placed in operation by a declaration of the President. It seems to me that section 802 gives the President very great authority, in addition to the mere freezing of prices.

Mr. CAPEHART. The first Defense Production Act, which we enacted in 1950 after the beginning of the Korean war, gave the President the right to do certain things if he wanted to do them. It was not a mandate. As the Senator knows, he did not act until several months later.

Mr. BYRD. What is the definition of a grave national emergency?

Mr. CAPEHART. I will say in all fairness to the Senator that that was not an easy problem for us to handle. We had a great many wordy words, and we finally came to the conclusion that the strongest language we could use in the protection of our people was "a grave national emergency," having in mind that the President would use the authority only when it was obvious to everyone in America that it ought to be used.

Mr. BYRD. In the mind of the Senator from Indiana, who had more to do with the preparation of this proposed legislation than anyone else, what is meant by "a grave national emergency"?

Mr. CAPEHART. A grave national emergency might be any one of a number of things. For example, I would consider it a grave national emergency if tomorrow Russia should bomb Japan, or if tomorrow Russia should start sinking our ships on the high seas. I would consider it a grave national emergency if some foreign nation should drop a bomb on the United States.

Mr. BYRD. That would be war.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. The bombing of Pearl Harbor certainly was a grave national emergency. I should say that when the President sent our troops into Korea, that was a grave national emergency. Certainly it affected the lives of 160,000,000 Americans. We are thinking only in terms of military activities and in terms of war and in terms of situations in which the military would be needing a large percentage of our national products—perhaps 90 percent of our nickel and 80 percent of our copper, for example.

Mr. BYRD. However, as the authority is worded in the bill there is no confinement of the situation to a military emergency.

Mr. CAPEHART. A grave national emergency, in other words. That is the intention of the committee. I wish to assure the Senator from Virginia that it is not our intention that anything other than a grave national emergency is intended. It would have to be a grave national emergency, identified with the military, or identified with our defense needs from a military standpoint, or identified with the protection of our people from attacks by a foreign enemy. Or it could be a situation in which we would have to build many more airplanes than we now have, as well as tanks and other equipment, and use tremendous quantities of available domestic materials, leaving only a small portion for civilian uses. Under such circumstances we would have to allocate commodities, and control prices, wages, and rents. That is the purpose of the bill.

As the able Senator from Virginia knows, it is not easy always to find the right words to express what one wishes to do. We made a very sincere effort to do it. I believe the record of the committee makes it crystal clear that what we had in mind was a grave national emergency.

Mr. BYRD. What is said in the committee is entirely different from what is written into law. The law governs, not discussions in committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the record of discussions on the floor of the Senate and in the House, as well as in committees and the reports of committees, while they are not binding, certainly show the intent of Congress.

Mr. BYRD. But the Supreme Court and other courts must define laws as they are written. I have found in my service in the Senate that very often not even two Senators can agree. If a court were to try to interpret what one Senator said in stating his views and then tried to interpret what another Senator said in stating exactly the opposite views, it would find itself in very great confusion.

Mr. CAPEHART. As author of the bill and as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I thought it was my responsibility to call this matter to the attention of the American people and of Congress, because the law expires on June 30, and we have to take some action about it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Indiana for the work he has done. However, I respectfully submit that the language of section VII as written is not confined to a military emergency. The President can determine as he pleases what kind of emergency would justify his invoking these enormous powers.

Mr. CAPEHART. For argument sake, let us assume that the Senator is correct. I do not believe the President would do it, and I do not believe the powers are quite so broad as the Senator indicates, although they might well be. However, in any event, they are powers which are granted for only 90 days. If the President went against the wishes of Congress, Congress, if it wanted to do so, could within 24 hours rescind his order, placing the 90-day freeze in effect.

Mr. BYRD. I believe the Senator from Indiana will agree that the bill, if enacted into law would vest tremendous powers in the President, and that we should be as clear and as concise as we can be in writing such a law. I assume the Senator will agree with me.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I agree with the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Senator from Indiana object to an amendment which would provide for such powers to come into effect upon a declaration of war or upon the adoption of a concurrent resolution by Congress, which would make it absolutely clear with respect to the fact that Congress itself would have the authority as to whether such power should be invoked? If there were a declaration of war, such powers would become immediately operative.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have——

Mr. BYRD. May I finish?

Mr. CAPEHART. What we are trying to do in this instance is to protect the American people from an upsurge in prices as a result of a national emergency. With respect to a provision for a declaration of war, of course there has been no declaration of war in the Korean situation.

Mr. BYRD. But there should have been a declaration of war. Does the Senator agree with me in that respect?

Mr. CAPEHART. Certainly. But there was no declaration of war.

Mr. BYRD. If there were no declaration of war, then Congress, by concurrent resolution, could, in accordance with the amendment which I have suggested, make such controls effective.

Mr. CAPEHART. I would much rather have no question about Congress declaring a war, and I shall vote for any legislation which is designed to provide for it. However, I also want to be realistic. I realize that until Congress finds it necessary to make a declaration of war, before our boys are sent into battle, we ought to try to protect the domestic economy.

Mr. BYRD. I do not know whether the Senator from Indiana has read my proposed amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I have read the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. It provides, first, that a declaration of war makes the act operative at once.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Second, it can be made operative at once by concurrent resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. Of course, a concurrent resolution would be debatable.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; it would be debatable.

Mr. CAPEHART. And if Members of Congress were scattered all over the country, while Congress was not in session——

Mr. BYRD. If such an emergency should occur, Congress would be in session the next morning. We would not remain at home if an emergency of this nature should occur.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not agree——

Mr. BYRD. Would the Senator let me finish, please?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. We are doing something which has never been done before. We are freezing all prices and wages and rents. That has never been done in any other price or other control bill. The Senator knows that to be a fact.

Mr. CAPEHART. But with respect to a concurrent resolution hearings would have to be held.

Mr. BYRD. Not necessarily.

Mr. CAPEHART. Not necessarily, of course.

Mr. BYRD. Hearings have been held on the pending bill, and it is the wording of the pending bill which would become operative on the adoption of a concurrent resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Virginia feel, if we were to get into a national emergency, that we would need price, wage, and rent controls?

Mr. BYRD. I do. However, I do not think their going into effect should be left in a state of uncertainty.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator's position is——

Mr. BYRD. I believe Congress should have some voice in such a situation. Never before in our history has there been enacted such legislation as is proposed by the pending bill, under which on a given day a freeze would be put on all prices, wages, and rents.

Mr. CAPEHART. Not on any given day. We do not know what day it would be.

Mr. BYRD. It could be a given day if the President chose to apply the law.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to call the able Senator's attention to the fact that the Defense Production Act of 1950 contained much broader powers than are contained in the proposed 90-day freeze legislation. That law gave the President of the United States the right to fix prices and wages.

Mr. BYRD. Did the President exercise that right?

Mr. CAPEHART. It gave him the right to do so.

Mr. BYRD. Did he do it?

Mr. CAPEHART. Eventually, he did.

Mr. BYRD. He never froze wages.

Mr. CAPEHART. It gave him the right to control them.

Mr. BYRD. Controlling is not the same as freezing. The only way the former President acted in that regard was to increase wages.

Mr. CAPEHART. That was not the law. I am sure the able Senator from Virginia voted for the 1950 Defense Production Act, which gave the President of the United States the right to control all wages, rents, and prices. The 1950 act was much more drastic than the proposed legislation, because it was effective for 12 months, whereas the proposed legislation would be in effect for not more than 90 days.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say to the Senator that this is something which has never been done in the history of America. Prices have never been arbitrarily frozen.

Mr. CAPEHART. Possibly not, but I believe that prices, wages, and rents at the beginning of the Korean war should have been frozen.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator so far as a 90-day period is concerned. However, they were not frozen. The President did not freeze them. Therefore, we are proposing to do something now that has never been done before. If we freeze the price of everything—agricultural products and industrial products, wages, and so forth—that is something that has never been done before.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator had voted to give the President the right to do it. Under the proposed 90-day freeze order the President could make adjustments.

Mr. BYRD. I am not opposing a bill for a 90-day freeze, I want the Senator to understand, but I do feel Congress should have some voice in when the freeze is made operative. If we are to impose a complete freeze, which I say has never been done before, then it should be done under the terms of my amendment, namely, first by a declaration of war, or, by a concurrent resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, the Senator from Virginia knows that if on tomorrow we were to be face to face with a grave emergency or should become involved in a third world war, we would not get into it by means of a declaration of war. We are at war now, and such a larger war or third world war would be only a continuation of the so-called little Korean war.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Indiana mean that if we had a war with Russia, there would not be a declaration of war?

Mr. CAPEHART. There could be one, but in my judgment such a war would be more likely a continuation of the present war in Korea.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Indiana would not favor a world war without a declaration?

Mr. CAPEHART. No, I am opposed to having our Government go to war without a declaration of war. However, we have to be realistic about the matter. After all, we are now under the United Nations.

Mr. BYRD. The United Nations cannot declare that we are in a war. That point was brought out at the MacArthur hearings, when I examined Secretary of State Acheson. I said to him, "Mr. Secretary, how do you justify the fact that our troops were sent to Korea without a declaration of war? Was it the United Nations?"

He said, "No; the United Nations had nothing to do with it. We justify it because Americans would be attacked in Korea"—which I think is a very far-fetched point, for the only Americans then in Korea were civilians.

Mr. CAPEHART. But we did send our troops to Korea, and they are now in Korea, and we did not have a declaration of war.

Mr. BYRD. However, I am not willing to concede that Congress has abdicated the greatest power it has; namely, the power to declare war.

I believe that one of the greatest of all the blunders Mr. Truman made was to send our troops to Korea without a declaration of war by Congress and thus having the backing of Congress and the backing of the country. The Senator from Indiana knows that is my feeling.

I am not willing to assume, as apparently the Senator from Indiana is, that we are going to engage in bigger wars without a declaration of war.

However, my amendment also provides that if there is not a declaration of war, the matter can be handled by concurrent resolution. In other words, I believe Congress should have some voice in these matters. I am willing to trust the present President of the United States, and I have great admiration for him. But there will be other Presidents; and the bill proposes the establishment of a precedent. In my service in the Senate, I have found that precedents are very strong in this body. If we do this for one President, we shall be asked to do it for other Presidents.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is not unusual for Congress to give the President broad powers to do something at a future time. I do not understand that is very unusual.

Mr. President, section 11 would extend the life of the Small Defense Plants Administration to June 30, 1955. In that respect the bill will extend the provision found in the present act.

Section 12 provides for allocations to small plants. It amends section 714 (f) (3) of the Defense Production Act to require that whenever the President allocates materials in the civilian market a fair percentage thereof shall go to small

plants unable to obtain them from usual sources.

Section 13 would repeal section 714 (f) (4) of the Defense Production Act, because it was practically a repetition of section 701 (c) of the act which has been continued. The only differences appearing in section 714 (f) (4) referred to the needs of new concerns during a period of allocation. That provision has been incorporated in section 701 (c) as extended.

Section 14 provides new termination dates. In other words, under this section, all features of the present act are extended for 2 years, except the titles which are completely eliminated, and I have already referred to them. So section 14 amends section 717 of the Defense Production Act covering termination dates. Title I, relating to priorities and allocations; title III, relating to financial aids; title VI, relating to consumer credit and real estate construction credit controls; title VII, relating to the Small Defense Plants Administration, voluntary agreements exempt from antitrust procedures, and general housekeeping provisions; and title VIII, the new title which provides for a 90-day freeze, will terminate on June 30, 1955, under this section of the bill, or not more than 90 days thereafter if that much extra time is needed in order to give effect to a 90-day freeze invoked shortly before June 30, 1955.

Of course the new title VIII, which provides for a 90-day freeze, has been discussed at some length today, and I shall not discuss it further at this time.

Title II, relating to requisition and condemnation, of the Defense Production Act is allowed to lapse June 30, 1953.

Titles IV and V, relating to price and wage controls, are allowed to lapse April 30, 1953.

Section 15 of the bill allows the continuation of V-loans which have been granted, including those for reconversion for civilian production, even after expiration of the Defense Production Act.

Section 16 adds the new title VIII, providing for a 90-day freeze on prices, wages, and residential rents whenever the President finds a grave national emergency to exist and that the use of such freeze is necessary for national security and economic stability. The base date for the freeze is, first, the level prevailing on the business day before the freeze, or second, those prevailing on any of the preceding 30 days which in the judgment of the President are generally representative, or third, if none prevailed during the 30-day period then those prevailing on the nearest date on which in the President's judgment they are generally representative. The freeze ends 90 days after issuance or earlier if Congress so provides by law or concurrent resolution. The freeze may be used only once. The President is authorized to provide exemptions from the freeze and suspensions or adjustments of ceilings where necessary for national defense or where ceilings would be impracticable or unnecessary.

The President may issue orders controlling evictions. It is made unlawful to violate any regulation or order under the title and allows the President to impose administrative sanctions for violations, such as denial of tax benefits. A criminal penalty of $10,000 or 1 year imprisonment, or both, is set for willful violation. Title VIII is made effective May 1, 1953.

Section 17 continues veterans' preferences, as they now exist.

Section 18 provides for extension of rent control. That has been completely eliminated, however, because Congress passed a separate rent control several weeks ago.

So, Mr. President, I have stated briefly an outline of the bill.

The only controversial part seems to be title VIII, the new title providing for standby controls. I repeat that so long as the Korean war is going on, I believe it is folly for us to refuse or to fail to provide standby controls.

Of course, the question of whether the Korean war was declared by Congress; or whether the President acted, under powers he had, to take us into that war; or whether the President had no authority to do so, is aside from the question now before the Senate.

The question now facing us is whether such standby controls should be provided for. The fact is that our troops are now in Korea, at war. So long as that war continues, I believe the President of the United States should have authority to provide for a 90-day freeze, under the circumstances set forth; and I believe there should be a small standby organization which will be available in that connection, when needed in a grave national emergency.

I cannot conceive that our country would spend billions upon billions of dollars for the military services and would be engaged in war in Korea and would be drafting American boys—as is now being done; and of course many of our boys are dying in Korea—but would leave the civilian economy absolutely wide open, without any protective legislation, without any plan or policy or organization, not knowing what we would do or how we would proceed or when we would take action to prevent price rises in such a grave national emergency. Frankly, I cannot conceive of that sort of management or mismanagement.

I also realize that we should avoid giving too much authority to the President of the United States. I have always been opposed, and still am, to controls when they are not needed. I voted against continuation of price, wage, and rent controls last July, when the extension bill was before us. I voted against that bill because I did not think such controls were any longer needed. I did think they were needed at the beginning of the Korean war. I did not think they were needed last July. I do not think they are needed today, and your committee is not recommending a continuation of them.

However, Congress alone has the responsibility of passing the laws and deciding what expenditures shall be made by the Federal Government and what appropriations shall be made. Congress also has the responsibility of enacting the tax laws and the laws governing the Military Establishment. Those are the responsibilities of Congress, not the responsibilities of the President of the United States.

I cannot conceive that we would leave an open end to this one matter, particularly when prices are as high as they are at this time, and when so much inflation exists. After all, if we were to face a grave national emergency, prices would be much higher, and all control of the situation would escape us. If we got into a war which would require the use of more materials, then, instead of talking about a $70 billion budget for 1 fiscal year, we would be talking about $90 billion or $150 billion budget, in view of the effect of further inflation and greater price increases.

Mr. President, perhaps the Banking and Currency Committee has not done so good a job as possibly could be done on this subject. Perhaps other Senators could do a better job, and perhaps there are other ways of accomplishing what we have tried to accomplish.

However, I wish to say that every member of the committee has made a sincere effort in connection with this problem. The committee held hearings for weeks. The hearings were far from one-sided, either. Witnesses on both sides of the question appeared at the hearings and gave their appraisals of the bill. In the same way, many members of the committee were sincerely and honestly opposed to the bill. Such a condition always makes for a healthy situation, for then both sides of the question are presented to the committee. In the committee we tried to consider both sides, and we did so.

I emphasize that the 90-day freeze provision is merely that—a provision for a freeze for only 90 days.

So we return to the question of what should be done in this situation. If any Senators believe that price, wage, and rent controls are not needed, even in a grave emergency, then such Senators should oppose this bill.

If any Senators feel that they wish to take a chance on leaving the matter entirely open, and do not desire to make any standby provision whatsoever, and wish to leave the executive branch in such a position that it cannot make any preparations whatever to deal with a grave emergency, but that Congress, if it is then in session—or, if it is not in session that it could be called into special session—hold hearings and then decide what should be done, they should also vote against the bill. They should realize, however, in the meantime prices would rise and rise—which is certainly what would occur, and then, when the necessary legislation was finally enacted, instead of finding that prices had been maintained at a constant level during the intervening period, they would find that prices had risen very greatly. In that event Congress would have to do exactly what was done 2 years ago, when first one price and then another price was rolled back, and then one price and then another price was rolled up. If Senators feel that such a procedure is in the best interests of the United States, of course, such Senators will vote against this bill.

If Senators intend to stand upon the argument that it is completely wrong in principle to give unlimited power to the

President, I can see their viewpoint. But I must say that those who voted for the 1950 Defense Production Act, authorizing the President of the United States to control prices, wages and rents, will, it seems to me, be very inconsistent in taking that view. That act was not mandatory in its terms; it merely authorized the President to impose controls in the event he saw fit to do so. In that case the authorization was for 12 months, not for a mere 90 days.

What, then is to be said in support of the argument as a matter of principle? Why was not such an argument made in 1950, when the Senate was considering the first Defense Production Act, which, as I have said, was not mandatory in its terms, but which merely authorized the President to impose controls if in his judgment it was deemed necessary?

What is the basis of the argument regarding the principle of giving power to the President? The President has been given power to call American boys into military service. True, the number was limited, I think, to 3,500,000. The law did not require the President to call up so many men a month, as, for example, 50,000. In view of that situation, why is a different principle to be applied in this instance?

Mr. President, I do not like to be talking about controls, but, fortunately or unfortunately, I happen to be chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and it becomes one of our responsibilities to deal with controls. We have therefore considered the subject. The argument is made that, under legislation of the kind now proposed, there would be a tendency to maintain high prices. I think there is no valid support for that argument. I am a businessman and have been for many, many years, and, as a businessman, Mr. President, I may say I would much prefer to be in a position to know that, if our country faced a grave emergency tomorrow or the next day, or 6 months from now, prices would be held stable, rather than be in the position of not knowing to what levels prices would go.

The argument in opposition to the bill reduces itself to an argument based upon an alleged principle that is thought to be involved. I might well agree with that argument were we not at war. But our country already is at war. At least, our forces are fighting. It is unnecessary for us to incorporate in the pending bill a declaration of war provision, for we are already at war. If Senators desire to write something of that sort into the bill, possibly they should write into it a provision that the controls would automatically expire at the termination of the war in which we are presently engaged.

Are we to ignore completely the fact that there is a war in Korea? How can we do that, when our forces have suffered 138,000 casualties, and when the war has been going on now for nearly 3 years? So far as the fathers and mothers of those 138,000 boys are concerned, it is a war. So far as the home folks of the 500,000 boys who are in Korea are concerned, it is a war. Why should it be thought necessary to include in the pending bill a provision relating to a declaration of war? I repeat, we are already at war. A declaration of war is unnecessary.

Fortunately, we are carrying on that war, at the moment, with the knowledge that there are sufficient civilian goods to supply the demands of our people at home. Let us pray that that situation will continue until the war in Korea is ended. But suppose it does not continue. Let us suppose that tomorrow, or within 6 months from now, the military requires such a large percentage of some particular categories of goods that a sufficient amount of that class of material will not remain available for the civilian population. I am speaking of a continuation of the war in which we are now engaged.

I repeat, why should we be asked to write into this bill a provision regarding a declaration of war, when we are already at war? I have absolutely no objection to such a provision. I will agree with any Senator who says the Congress ought to declare war. I shall vote for any bill that may be introduced which makes it impossible for the President of the United States to send our Armed Forces into war at any place without a previous declaration of war. I would vote for such a measure, because I think such a stand would be sound.

The fact is, Mr. President, we are at war, and we have been at war since June 1950. It is therefore unnecessary to write into the pending bill a provision as to a declaration of war. We do not need to talk about really getting into a war, we are in a war. We will have been in a war 3 years the 21st day of next month.

All I am trying to say, and all our committee is trying to say, is that under present circumstances, even if the fighting continues, we do not need controls. We do not need them now. I repeat, I hope we shall never need them. Let us hope that, even if we were to become involved in a much bigger war than the one in which we are now engaged—and let us pray God we may not—the productive genius of America would be great enough to supply the necessary military goods and also to supply what the civilian population needs, so that everything would be in balance, and prices would not rise. Let us pray that that will happen. I hope it will. I think that is the situation at the moment.

Does anyone know that conditions will continue as they are as long as the Korean war lasts? Why does anyone talk about getting into a war, when we are already engaged in one? Why does anyone take that position?

We ought to protect the economy of the United States. We ought to protect the millions and millions of people who are living on fixed incomes. I do not believe we ought now to take the position that we are at peace, that everything is normal, that there is no fighting. I do not believe we ought to take the position that there is no war, when there is a war.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say I have no objection to changing any language in the pending bill that will make it a better piece of legislation. I have no objection to doing anything that will protect the fundamental principles of the American system of government. My desire is to protect the private enterprise system, because that is the American system.

But, Mr. President, I am one Senator who will not close his eyes to the fact that we are already at war. I will not close my eyes to the possibility that it can become a bigger war. I do not believe that we should leave ourselves open to the possibility of finding ourselves in even a bigger war with absolutely no laws on the statute books to deal with what I consider to be the very vital needs of 160 million Americans.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Some time back, the Senator will remember, he had something to say about not having a standby organization. I wanted to make sure that the Senator had the understanding that there was no provision within the pending bill to set up a standby organization.

Mr. CAPEHART. The bill provides for a 90-day freeze. But the Senator will remember that Mr. Flemming, who represented the President, made a statemen on this subject. He stated that, whether the Congress of the United States took any action on this subject at this time or not, the executive branch intended to do everything that could be done under existing law, with the facilities that were available; that the executive branch would work to set up and maintain an organization to deal with the subject of controls, if and when the need should arise. The Senator remembers that, does he not?

Mr. BENNETT. I am perfectly clear on that point. The work of the Department of Commerce and of the Office of Defense Mobilization will continue, whether or not the bill is passed.

I have one other question, and then I shall be through. The distinguished committee chairman has made it perfectly clear that he feels, as we all do, that we are now at war. Earlier he made the point that whenever we were at war we needed direct price, wage, and rent controls. Yet, we have been able to go along without them, and, in the face of the present war in Korea, our President has removed such controls.

I make the point only to suggest that I do not believe it is inevitable or necessary that whenever we are at war we must have direct price, wage, and rent controls. I think the Senator from Indiana and I are in agreement, so far as the present situation is concerned. I suggest that our ability to get along without such controls and still be at war indicates that there may be other circumstances in which such controls may not be necessary.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Utah is correct. I have no quarrel with what he has said. I hold in my hand four volumes of the hearings in which more than 200 times I invited the attention of everyone to the fact that we were talking only about a grave national emergency, and it will be found

that in practically every instance when I used that phrase it was used in connection with the Federal Government taking such a great percentage of domestically produced goods that there was not sufficient remaining to go around among our civilian population; that the amount left over was so small that it would have to be allocated and the price must be controlled. If I said it once, I said a hundred times, and I repeat it today, that we are now at war. We did have controls, and they were taken off, rightfully so, in my opinion. They could well have been taken off last July. I said a moment ago that I hoped we would always have such a great production in this country that we could carry on and furnish our civilian population with all it needs, as well as supplying the military. But the time may come when the military will need such a large percentage of our goods that we shall have to have direct price, wage, and rent controls, which is the purpose of this 90-day freeze. If a grave emergency should suddenly come upon us, the President could use this proposed legislation.

I do not think there is too much difference between our viewpoints on this question.

The argument will be made that such a bill has a tendency to keep up prices. I do not think there is any merit in that argument.

Another argument will be made that price controls have never worked, and are of no value.

There will be those who may take the position that in voting for this sort of a bill we are voting for permanent controls. That, of course, ought not to be said or even intimated, because the record is crystal clear that that is not what we are talking about.

I do not believe, Mr. President, there will be any controversy over any other features of this proposed legislation. I am hopeful that we can get through with this bill tomorrow.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly a question of principle in connection with the pending bill. The question was brought up by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. In my opinion, the bill involves a principle inherent in our free-enterprise system. We may ask ourselves, since free enterprise is such a dominant feature of our economic life and has made this Nation the greatest in the world, why at a time when we most need the strength it gives should we turn away from it and go to Government controls. That, it seems to me, is the principle involved in this debate today and probably tomorrow.

Before coming to the Senate I was engaged in a small business and because the experiences with controls are still ripe in my mind I thought it would be wise to present to the entire body a discussion of controls and what they have done from the viewpoint of a businessman.

We sometimes feel that in price controls we have discovered something new and that we embarked on some spectacularly new thing in the last war when we made use of them; but the history of price controls is old.

HISTORY OF PRICE CONTROLS

On the Archives Building, on the stone shoulders of the steps facing Constitution Avenue, are eight words. On one side it says, "What is past is prologue," and on the other side it says, "Study the past." The experiences of history should be of great value in determining whether to repeat control legislation, or whether to even threaten the economy of this country by their heavy weight hanging above for use, as the proponents suggest, in an emergency.

The mistaken idea that by government edict prices or wages or both can be controlled and thereby provide an effective control to inflation is not an idea that has been developed in modern times. There are records of a great many such controls, going back to the very dim beginning of history. Because of these recorded events and because of the equally well-documented record of their constant failures, it is surprising that the proponents of such controls have not looked to history to find proof of their failures.

A discourse on the historical phase of this subject would, in itself, provide a highly educational and prolonged discussion but, not wishing to burden this body with such a discussion, I would like at this time to only briefly skim over what history provides in the way of witnesses to the subject of price controls.

As early at 3000 B. C., we find in the records of Egypt indications that the Pharaohs exercised control over the production and distribution of food and other necessary items of life, and they did this with varying degrees of thoroughness.

Tablets believed to have been created about 2400 B. C. in the Empire of Sumer, occupying Mesopotamia, the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers in eastern Asia Minor, had inscribed on them laws controlling prices, wages, rents, and fees. Probably the best-known of these early laws set down in an attempt to control inflation of money was found in the Code of Hammurabi. It is the best known because practically all of its provisions have been recovered and translated. Price controls under this code were only generally directed, but the main object of these Babylonian monarchs was to keep prices down as a proof of the good government and the prosperity of their reigns. In contrast to earlier attempts, the Babylonian kings allowed some flexibility to exist in prices so that they could meet the conditions of the time. So we find, as early at 2285 B. C., men trying to control inflation, but allowing, as we find allowed in section 8, paragraph (b), the power of discretion which absolutely prevents price and wage controls from being an effective instrument in the control of inflation.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed, as a part of my remarks, data dealing with the history of this subject in ancient times. By the way, this matter was printed once before in the RECORD. It is a study made by Representative RALPH W. GWINN, of New York, and is one of the finest treatises on the subject I have ever had the privilege and pleasure of reading.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROLS TRIED 4,000 YEARS AGO

The temptation for people in power to tamper with prices and production seems to be a very ancient human game. Thus, in the laws of Hammurabi, king of Babylon—2285 to 42 B. C.—we find wage controls for boatmen, reapers, threshers, shepherds, laborers, artisans, bricklayers, tillers, stonecutters, milkmen, and carpenters. Regulated also were builders' fees and warehousing, as well as rental of cows in milk, calves, oxen, wagons, and freight and passenger boats. On the basis of historical evidence, we know that ancient history, throughout the changing centuries, is characterized by a never-ending succession of popular upheavals against tyrannical rules and regulations imposed upon the people from above. This continued strife reveals one of the fundamental themes of human history—a struggle between regimentation and freedom.

We find later laws in ancient history like, for example, the Hittite Code—1350 B. C.—which was discovered in Baghaz Koi in Asia Minor, that attempted to establish provision for wages and prices. The very fact that such laws had to be abolished or drastically revised under popular pressure indicates that even in ancient times rulers met with deep-seated resentment against their attempts to block the activities and trade of their citizens.

ROME HAD FREEDOM

History tells us that the Roman Republic, under a constitution guaranteeing freedom, became the envy of the barbarians of other countries. Its soldiers were increasingly victorious in their conflicts with the half-hearted mercenaries of neighboring nations that enjoyed little freedom. The glory that was Rome extended throughout what is now Western Europe and northern Africa because Rome was the center of freedom. There were no planned economies. As Gibbon tells us, freedom, honor, and justice were universally recognized virtues. And the freedom of Rome extended to its colonies.

The recurrent famines of earlier days were experienced with less and less frequency. Rome gave the civilized world the highest standard of living then known to mankind. But what happened? The leaders reached out for power. The republic became an empire. At first the emperors were cautious. They talked freedom as they planned a police state. Gibbon says, "Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation that the senate and the people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom. A feeble senate and enervated people cheerfully acquiesced in the pleasing illusion." And so the people were fooled by bread and circuses. They looked to the government to supply more and more of their needs. Production declined everywhere. Prices skyrocketed.

ROMAN CONTROLS FAILED MISERABLY

Emperor Diocletian decided to maintain his popularity with promises to fix prices and reduce the cost of living. So in A. D. 301, he issued an imperial edict fixing the prices of commodities for the whole Roman Empire. His grandiose scheme was ushered in with a fanfare of benevolent propaganda. In fact, in the preface to the edict, the Roman Emperor shows an insight into the laws of psychological propaganda technique which is as startling as it is up to date. He assures his people that the coming economical control system is built on the highest motives of making the whole nation participate "in the blessings of that peace for which we have laboriously striven." He continues

that in order to make this price-fixing system work, it is necessary for the rulers like "watchful parents of the whole human race" to help the people with remedies from above, and that such measures have become necessary, since humanity cannot achieve such good results by its own free action.

The edict goes on to explain how the people have become greedy; how exorbitant profits were being made; how monopoly was running wild, and the people, therefore, needed protection from foes within as well as foes without. The only cure was a complete overall control of food, clothing, wages, and so forth. Reading the list of commodities which the emperor asked his Mike Disalle of that day, Maximianus, to take control of, reads astonishingly like our own modern OPS lists: Farm products, dyes, needles, feathers, filling for upholstery, seeds, wine, oil, meat, poultry, fats, seafood, building timber, wooden posts, finished wagons, agricultural implements, and so on ad infinitum.

In order to enforce his imperial law, Diocletian built up a huge bureaucracy to administer his universal price-control system. A contemporary observer has characterized the situation in the following words: "The number of ministers, of magistrates, of officers, and of servants who filled different departments of the state, multiplied beyond the example of former times."

The price-control police forces of Diocletian had as their legal weapon, severe penalties against any breach of the law. Death was the punishment for those who dared sell above maximum prices. Death also for the buyer who aided and abetted him. Death, too, for those who bought and sold illegal stocks. However, human nature being what it is, these penalties did not affect the general picture, and no bureaucratic machinery or legal apparatus could prevent a complete breakdown of the law of supply and demand with all the economic and social evils resulting from it.

Economic historians of the Roman Empire find that a situation developed which was as tragic as it was prophetic. Because the scarcity of production was heightened by the interference from price-control laws, prices on consumers' goods in the actual market rose to catastrophic heights. The control system which was put into operation to combat inflation, in this manner actually created inflationary trends which broke the backbone of the economic life of a great empire. Everywhere the results soon became visible: Building and construction stopped entirely. The arts and sciences fell into decay to such an extent that modern historians can recognize immediately the crudity and puerility of the craftsmanship of this period. Artistic creativeness and inventive skill did no longer thrive in this new atmosphere of economic tyranny.

History goes on to point out that while the economic waste was incredible the trades sank to even lower levels. Poverty was created among the broad masses, while the merchants and small entrepreneurs were impoverished into bankruptcy. Landowners and manufacturers, who were the hardest hit, lost interest in a system of economic slave control that took away the private inventiveness and enterprise of the human genius.

In the realm of agriculture the situation became so bad that the Emperor found it necessary to order the farmers and the farm laborers controlled by serfdom under state supervision. That this measure could only lead to a worsening of the agricultural situation is perfectly explainable by the well-known historical law, that soil tilled by slave labor never yields abundant fruits such as land cultivated by free farmers.

To meet this general extremity of national economics the Emperor, therefore, naturally turned to the device which is as common as it is artificial, namely, of exorbitant taxation. Taxes and surtaxes multiplied in a hopeless effort to fill an ever-empty treasury.

Thus ends the only total price-control system which the history of the Roman Empire records. Diocletian alone, of all the Roman emperors, was foolish enough to attempt it. If he had listened to the history of his empire, he might have observed how earlier attempts of partial price fixing under emperors like Tiberius, Commodus, and Alexander Severus all had broken down. However, like many panic-stricken tyrants in the history of mankind, Diocletian apparently fancied that, if the price-control system only could be made totalitarian and foolproof, it would work where partial attempts have broken down. He lived to see the tragic mistake of his economic tyranny over a whole nation's life, since his experiment ended with such a complete failure that the edict had to be repealed as useless and unenforceable. Soon after the poverty-stricken and indignant people forced his abdication on May 1 A. D. 305.

The more serious lesson of this Roman price-control experiment is grasped, however, only if one realizes that its long-range effect on the Roman empire was directly connected with the economic destruction of the greatest empire of ancient history. As the historian, Jules Toutain, has pointed out, the economic breakdown of the Roman empire made it fall an easy prey to the attack of the barbarians who, a few generations later, poured in over the borders of the empire south of the Danube and west of the Rhine. What had once been a proud and great nation had deteriorated into a mass of people which had lost both the productive initiative and the national self-esteem which make a people strong and healthy. One of the fundamental laws of national defense is that only a nation in which freedom has been preserved under law is able and willing to take up arms in defense of human rights and human dignity.

Upon the grave of the Roman Empire the well-known historian, Samuel Dill, of Oxford, has written the following epitaph, which we may do well to remember:

"The system of bureaucratic despotism, elaborated finally by Diocletian and Constantine, produced a tragedy in the truest sense, such as history has seldom exhibited: In which, by an inexorable fate the claims of fancied omnipotence ended in humiliating paralysis of administration; in which determined effort to remedy social evils only aggravated them until they became unendurable; in which the best intentions of the central power were, generation after generation, mocked and defeated alike by irresistible laws of human nature and by hopeless perfidy and corruption in the servants of government."

It is not surprising that kings, who were notorious for their excessive egotism, should be found in the list of rulers bent upon price control. There is Philip IV, of France, who, in 1306, antedated Hitler's Jewish pogroms by six centuries, and who created a dire scarcity of wheat, bread, and clothing throughout his nation by his price-control system.

There are English kings, like Henry III and George II, who tampered with prices of grain and bread until Parliament rose up in indignation and repealed these royal price-control attempts.

There was Edward II, who, on an island like England, hit upon the ridiculous scheme of safeguarding production level on seafood by a control system which was inaugurated as a benefit for the people, but actually turned out to be such an impossible flop that all fish disappeared from the markets in the British Isles.

FRENCH CONTROLS FAILED

A complete survey of ancient, medieval, and modern price-control systems proves that they created scarcity instead of production and ill will instead of cooperation. One of the most illustrious and meaningful examples of this historical law we find as we turn to the history of the French Revolution.

When the leftists of that day—the Jacobins—decided to destroy French culture and French enterprise, they made use of the old tyrannical medium of a violent price control. Being experts in revolutionary technique, they chose to place iron control upon 39 necessities of life under the agency called committee of public safety.

The picture of what happened to the French revolutionary price-control system runs true to pattern.

As one historian, Andrew Dickson White, wrote in 1876:

"The first result of the maximum was that every means was taken to evade the fixed price imposed, and the farmers brought in as little produce as they possibly could. This increased the scarcity, and the people of the large cities were put on an allowance. Tickets were issued authorizing the bearer to obtain at the official prices a certain amount of bread or sugar or soap or wood or coal to cover immediate necessities."

As another historian reports this era:

"Prices were fixed. Any attempt to profiteer on necessities was made punishable by death. To break all opposition, the terror was established. The tribunal revolutionaire began sending scores of innocent people to the guillotine every day. Between March of 1793 and July of 1794 nearly 3,000 people were executed in Paris and about 15,000 in the provinces. At Nantes three or four thousand prisoners were thrust into old boats that were sunk in the middle of the river; at Lyon they were shot down in groups of as many as 200 at a time.

"The Civil War of the Vendee began in 1793. Insurrection against the revolutionary government spread into Poitou, Anjou, and Brittany. Threat of famine compelled the rationing of food. There was much discontent on that account. The Hebert group attempted to incite the famished people to an attack on the convention. Robespierre acted swiftly. Hebert and his chief lieutenants went to the guillotine. That was in March 1794.

"Robespierre, then 35, became the uncontested master of the situation. From April to July 1794, his authority was unchallenged. He moved rapidly toward his goal of complete social equality. It was ordered that the confiscated properties of enemies of the Republic should be given to deserving patriots. Saint-Just was charged with this distribution, and was authorized to revise the code of social institutions in the interest of pure democracy * * * trial by jury was denied to those suspected of conspiracy and the tribunal was authorized to make condemnations without the hearing of witnesses. Heads began to fall faster than ever. It was the great terror. In 45 days there were 1,285 executions.

"The great terror was an expression of Robespierre's impatience to realize his ideal state. He wished to destroy all opposition to the establishment of social and economic equality. But he had overreached himself. The razor of the Republic began to lose its popularity. The pitiless apostle of liberty, fraternity, and equality began to lose prestige. The word 'tyrant' was murmured. * * * On July 28, 1794, Robespierre and his brother, Saint-Just and 19 others were executed. That ended the terror, and it all but ended the Republic.

"Democracy had followed autocracy to the guillotine. The death of Robespierre ended the dream of pure democracy and equality. No man dared to espouse the perilous cause that had brought death to its devotees. The Robespierre legislation in the interest of equality was either suppressed or ignored and, to the delight of the merchants, price control was abandoned."

All price fixers do not meet so violent an end as that of Robespierre but the wrath of the hungry and disillusioned people always descends upon them.

A sigh of relief and a new spirit of self-governed activities swept through France. The farmers plowed and planted, and during the month of July 1795 they could once again harvest their crops as freemen after the disastrous and negative years of revolutionary price control. Liberty had conquered once more.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, to augment this fine presentation of the Honorable RALPH GWINN, and to provide my colleagues in the Senate with additional historical data as they pertain to the American scene, and not wishing again to burden the RECORD with unnecessary words, at this time I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my speech, a portion of a work being prepared by the eminent economist, Paul H. Nystrom, entitled "An Outline of Government Price and Wage Controls." This particular portion deals with price controls in early American history during the period of the American Revolution.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OUTLINE OF GOVERNMENT PRICE AND WAGE REGULATIONS

(By Paul H. Nystrom)

EARLY AMERICAN

The early American Colonies from their beginnings were governed by economic and political policies, as well as by the laws of their mother countries.

In Florida the laws of Spain prevailed. In Louisiana the colonial government administered the laws of France. In New Amsterdam the laws of Holland were adopted. Along the Atlantic seacoast the English settlements from New England to Georgia patterned their laws and administration on British models.

Most of the Colonies were established in the 17th century. Consequently, colonial administration was determined by the policies or regulations prevailing in the mother countries during the 17th century. Since this was the era of extreme efforts to regulate both prices and wage rates in the European countries, similar attempts were made to establish such controls in the Colonies. Price and wage controls in the English Colonies followed the laws of England of the same period.

The Plymouth Colony, in 1620-21, attempted to carry public regulation even to greater lengths than had been attempted in England. The small band of Pilgrims organized themselves to carry on the activities of their settlement on a communistic basis in which each able-bodied man and woman was expected to contribute his or her labor in accordance with his or her ability and the products of their toil were to be distributed among all in accordance with their needs. William Bradford, the first Governor of the Colony and its early historian, later reported that under this experiment, production during the first year under these principles of communism was not only disappointing but practically disastrous. The men and women gave as little labor as they could to the common cause, but were highly insistent on getting their full shares of the total product.

At the end of 1621 the communistic experiment was deemed a failure and abandoned. In the years that followed, each family sought to gain its own livelihood by clearing the land, raising food, and by hunting and fishing. Within a short time, under individual enterprise, the Colony and its people began to prosper.

The Plymouth, Massachusetts Bay, Connecticut, and other New England Colonies, all enacted public price regulations covering many products. Pennsylvania in 1721 and again in 1772 experimented with price regulation for leather and shoes. In the southern Colonies, there were fewer general price regulations, but most of them concentrated their efforts on the regulation of tavern rates.

From the very beginning the General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony attempted to fix prices in the same manner that prices had been and were being established in England under the assises of bread and beer. The Massachusetts General Court fixed a price of 2 pence per 12-ounce loaf of bread, and a ceiling price of 8 shillings per barrel of beer. Innkeepers were not permitted to charge more than 6 pence per meal.

Later the prices of bread in the Massachusetts Bay Colony were permitted to vary as the prices of wheat changed.

A general price order covering imports from England in 1633 specified that the prices of necessities, such as provisions, clothing, and tools, must in no case be more than 4 pence above the cost price per shilling of such goods imported from England. Thus, importers and dealers might not secure gross markups on cost of more than 33⅓ percent. This margin had to cover all importation costs, including their labor for handling goods. It is easy to guess that the importers and traders found numerous ways of getting around such a burdensome and unreasonable regulation.

In 1641 the General Court gave up its effort to control the prices of imported goods, but authorized the towns within the Colony, if they so desired, to fix the prices of commodities.

The New Haven Colony, in many respects, followed the practices of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, with a lag of some years. Thus, in 1640, the General Court of the New Haven Colony adopted an ordinance restricting profits on imports to 3 pence per shilling of original cost. Thus, the markup on costs attempted by the New Haven General Court was but 25 percent, as against the 33⅓ percent fixed by the Massachusetts General Court. Historical accounts of how this provision worked are strangely lacking, as if after the adoption of the ordinances the whole matter had been forgotten.

Attempts to control the profits on imported goods were also made in New Amsterdam and in Virginia. A Maryland ordinance in 1640, like the New Haven Ordinance, fixed 25 percent on cost, as the maximum on imported goods.

By the middle of the 17th century, general Colonial regulations intended to fix the prices either of domestic or imported goods fell off, presumably because of the impossibility of enforcing such provisions.

A more intensive effort was made by the Colonies to regulate wages. Following the provisions of the Elizabethan Great Statute of Artificers, work was required of all able-bodied men and women. Provisions for apprenticeship were introduced for boys. Wage rates were fixed by local magistrates. Workhouses were established similar to those in England for those unable to find work but who were deemed able to work. Severe penalties were laid down for violations of these provisions.

The regulations adopted by the Massachusetts Bay Colony were fully recorded and may be considered as typical of the regulations attempted in New England. On May 17, 1630, this Colony established wage rates for building craftsmen at the rate of 2 s. per day. This was apparently lower than the rates actually paid for such labor. A howl went up from the craftsmen to the effect that they were being oppressed by their employers, that prices were rising, and that these wage rates were insufficient to cover their costs of living. The following year, in 1631, this regulation was repealed.

In 1633 the Massachusetts General Court enacted another ordinance fixing the wage rates. Masons, bricklayers, tilers, carpenters, joiners, wheelrights, and mowers were to receive 2 s. per day, or 14 d. if the wage included food and lodging. The best unskilled manual laborers, the ordinance declared, were to receive 18 d. per day, or 14 d. with food and lodging. Local constables were authorized to fix the wage rates of inferior labor. Skilled tailors who boarded with their customers and went from home to home, had their wages fixed at 1 s. per day. Inferior tailors were to receive 8 d. per day.

The enforcement of the wage regulations of 1633 became a problem immediately. Laborers demanded higher wages and employers were not only willing but actually did pay such higher rates in violation of the ordinance. In 1634 the general court repealed the provisions setting the fines for violation.

In 1635 the general court approved an ordinance setting fines and even jail sentences for the payment of wage rates in excess of 2 s. and 6 p. per day. By this time it had become obvious that the efforts to control wages by regulation were completely ineffective and, later, during the same year, the entire ordinance was repealed. A similar ordinance in the Plymouth colony continued and was not repealed until 1639.

The feeling lingered among the officials of the Massachusetts Bay colony that something should be done to stop the rising trend of wage rates. In 1636 the Massachusetts general court authorized the towns of the commonwealth, if they so desired, to fix the wage rates within their own boundaries. Some of the Massachusetts towns exercised this authority. In Plymouth, for example, in 1639, there were laborers who were fined for accepting excess wages.

In 1640 a change in economic conditions of the colony occurred. For a brief interval there were more laborers than jobs. Consequently, wage rates began to decline and the general court, like King Canute who ordered the ocean tides to recede, passed an ordinance authorizing wage decreases. There were, however, no apparent effects of this ordinance upon the wage rates paid within the Colony.

By 1675 the attempts of the general court to fix wage rates had come to an end. The laws remained on the statute books unrepealed, but little or no attention was paid to them until the outbreak of the Revolution.

In the New Haven Colony, the general court in 1640 established maximum wage rates, but following complaints from laborers amended the act in 1641 to permit the basing of wage rates on the price of grain.

As the price of grain increased, wage rates were increased. Similarly, if the price of grain declined, wage rates were supposed to be reduced.

In New Amsterdam, wage rates were fixed by municipal ordinances in 1639, in 1648, and again in 1658, in each case, apparently, at levels approximating the going rates of wages within the community. Consequently there was no great commotion about the establishment of these ordinances.

In Pennsylvania there was less attempt to control wages as well as prices. In 1685, William Penn reported a law that fixed the hours of work. There were wage regulations in the southern colonies, as well as in the north, but the regulations were mainly established by local, rather than by colonial administrations.

In Virginia an ordinance was drawn up fixing a wage schedule for various types of labor in 1621. In 1639 the Virginia Assembly also established the rates of fees for physicians, surgeons, and apothecaries. In 1640

wage rates for artificers were fixed in the Maryland Colony.

In the Carolinas and in Georgia, wage rates and the establishment of the wage rates was attempted by local communities. In 1696 an interesting deviation in the type of wage rates was ordered in the Colonies of South Carolina and Georgia. In order to obtain an adequate supply of servants from the British West Indies, minimum wage rates of pay were established to attract labor.

In general, while the regulation of prices and of wages in the American Colonies, followed the patterns of such regulations in England, there were even greater failures in the Colonies than there were in England. In spite of the best intentions of both colonial and local governing bodies, such regulations by the 18th century had come to be considered as not merely ineffective, but merely as troublesome nuisances.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The Continental Congress in 1774, in its Articles of Association, agreed to keep prices from rising above those of the preceding year. Little was done, however, to implement this purpose. In 1775, more specific provisions were enacted by the Continental Congress for maximum prices of tea, coffee, salt, pepper, sugar, and other imported goods. In 1776, the Continental Congress authorized local communities to set the prices of goods within their respective jurisdictions. The Continental Congress also enacted an ordinance fixing a gross profit of 5 percent above production costs on goods purchased or seized for military use.

In spite of these provisions, both prices and wages began to rise rapidly through the Revolutionary War years. There were endless debates not only in the Continental Congress, but in the Colonial Assemblies, on what types of regulation might be introduced to prevent these increases. Some of the Colonies enacted their own price and wage regulations. In 1776, Connecticut attempted such regulation. Similar ordinances were passed in that year in Providence and Newport plantations. The following example of a maximum price and wage rate regulation established in Rhode Island may be of interest.

Maximum prices and wage rates fixed by the Rhode, Island Ordinance of 1776 are shown in the accompanying table:

Commodity	Ceilings	Values in current American money
Commodity prices:		
Rum.....per gallon..	4s. 6d.....	63 cents.
Milk.....do....	8d.....	9 cents.
Tobacco.....per pound..	4d.....	5 cents.
Turkeys and Dunghill fowls.....do....	8d.....	9 cents.
Best beaver hats.....each..	42s.....	$6.30.
Hotel services:		
Full meals for travelers, exclusive of wine.....	16d.....	21 cents.
Lodging per night.....	4d.....	5 cents.
Wage ceilings:		
House carpenters.....per day..	5s.....	70 cents.
Barbers.....per shave..	3d.....	3½ cents.
Tailors.....per day..	3s.....	5 cents.

Source: New York Times, July 27, 1951.

Before the end of the war, the futility of controls was generally accepted. Even as early as 1777, it had become evident that "regulation of prices always has and always will be impractical in a free country."

In 1779, a petition was drawn up and signed by a large number of people, and presented to the Philadelphia city authorities, urging that fixing a price at less than could readily be obtained in the market, is a form of confiscation, a class tax, and "an invasion of property rights."

By 1780 prices had increased at least to 20 times what they had been in 1774.

The real difficulty was, of course, the depreciation of continental currency and similarly of currency issued by the Colonies. The value of colonial paper money declined to the point that some of the Colonies finally repudiated their entire obligations. Continental currency continued at a great discount, "not worth a continental," until after the Federal Government had been established, and an Act of Resumption of Payments was passed in 1789.

This background of disastrous experience with artificial attempts at control in the face of inflationary and unredeemable paper currency, led in a few years to the general abandonment of all price and wage controls in this country. The renunciation of such controls was likewise stimulated by the general rise in the western countries of Europe of ideas of liberalism that objected to all forms of governmental interference with the ordinary economic affairs of the people.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, few people remember, but price and credit controls were attempted in World War I. Because these few controls were supported by patriotic reduction in general consumption and because, on the other hand, raw materials and transportation facilities were strictly rationed, this program did a fair job during a brief period of World War I. However, again we find that prices of uncontrolled items moved steadily upward. This price control broke down in the summer of 1918, and within 3 months, prices went higher than they had moved during the preceding year.

For a brief summation of the Government's efforts in this line in the First World War, I should like to read what was said by the authors, Shultz and Cain, in Financial Development of the United States, Prentiss-Hall, 1937, pages 564 to 568:

Immediately following America's declaration of war, before even the Government could put its war purchasing or borrowing programs into full effect, prices began to mount above the already high prewar levels. Within 3 months, prices had risen by nearly 15 percent. A continuation of this tendency would certainly have rendered the Government's financial problems more difficult.

To halt the rise, the Government fixed prices for its own purchases of war materials, for foodstuffs and other consumption necessities, and for a number of basic producers' goods. In all, 573 commodities were brought under Federal price control. Their prices were, in principle, fixed to yield a fair profit to the bulk of the concerns in each industry, but the application of this principle was frequently inconsistent. The price-fixing agencies were the War Industries Board and the Food and Fuel Administrations. Voluntary agreement was the method of control in most general use, with the licensing, rationing, and priority powers of various war agencies held in reserve to coerce recalcitrant sellers.

I reminded Senators earlier of the inscriptions to be found at the entrance of the Archives Building, "What is past is prologue" and "Study the past." Let us, for a brief moment, consider history and consider what is to be gathered from a study of the history of early attempts to control prices and wages.

As we have seen, they are as old as recorded history. Practically all of the devices of control we have tried recently were tried many times before. The history of these controls, as far as the record has been available for study, indicates to us that very few attempts seem to produce the desired effect, and then only for a brief period of time. Most of these efforts on which we have information failed utterly and dismally. No historian who has written on these controls has judged the effects of the controls to be favorable.

Modern history is replete with instances which all of us in this Chamber can well remember, and should heed in our consideration of the pending proposal. Let me quote what Goering said to Henry J. Taylor long after Goering and Ribbentrop and others had been put in jail following the surrender of Germany:

Your America is doing many things in the economic field which we found cut caused us so much trouble. You are trying to control people's wages and prices—people's work. If you do that, you must control people's lives. And no country can do that part way. I tried it and failed. Nor can any country do it all the way either. I tried that too and it failed. You are no better planners than we. I should think your economists would read what happened here.

Germany has been beaten, eliminated, but it will be interesting to watch the development of the remaining great powers, the stupidities they practice within their homelands, their internal strife, and their battles of wit abroad.

Will it be as it always has been that countries will not learn from the mistakes of others and will continue to make the mistakes of others all over again and again?

Now, believe it or not, this same opinion was expressed by the then Vice-President of the Council of People's Commissars and People's Commissioner of Foreign Trade in an interview that was printed in Soviet newspapers on May 18, 1945—supplied through the courtesy of Prof. Jacques Rueff, of the Institut d'Etudes Politzues, Paris, France. This man blamed the Hitler regime for the serious food situation in Germany existing at that time, saying that Hitler had forbidden free trade in all articles of daily consumption.

I would call attention to a fact stated in the Economic and Political Hazards of an Inflationary Defense Economy, prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by the committee staff in 1951, page 19:

It is significant that almost without exception every country suffering a runaway inflation in recent years has not only had rigorous laws on its books providing for direct controls over prices, wages, and materials, but certainly astronomical interest rates and drastic penalties for noncompliance.

So, if we will follow the sage advice of experience as taught by history, we will forever abandon the idea that the freedom of this economy of ours can be hampered and hamstrung by controls for any period of time. Certainly it is well to remember the admonition of those inscribed words:

What is past is prologue. Study the past.

WHY CONTROLS WON'T WORK

One of the basic reasons why price and wage and rent controls have not worked

has been the flexibility allowed in the laws providing for these controls. We find, in spite of extremely recent history—as short a time ago as 6 months—that incorporated in S. 1081, title VIII, section 801, paragraph (b), is language which, in the event the bill becomes law and this provision is allowed to stay in the bill, will preclude from the start any possibilities of success for this repeat venture. Paragraph (b) says, in part:

The President may provide exemptions from—

In the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, we find provisions that exempted some 11 categories containing many segments of our economy. These include, among others, the fees charged for professional services, such as fees of doctors, lawyers, professional engineers, architects, certified public accountants; the prices on rentals of materials used by press associations in books, magazines, motion pictures, newspapers, or rates charged by newspapers, magazines, radio stations and theaters.

They include also rates charged by insurance salesmen and underwriters; prices and wages of barbers, beauticians; wages and salaries paid to employees of small businesses; prices charged and wages paid by bowling alleys; wages paid for agricultural labor, and others too numerous to mention.

Because of these exemptions provided by law—and, mind you, these can be provided again under the terms of the proposed legislation—we find a total of 11.9 cents of each dollar spent by the consumer in my State of Arizona uncontrolled.

I use my State because of my closer and greater knowledge of the economy of that State. We find 11.9 cents of each dollar spent by the consumer in my State of Arizona uncontrolled. If we incorporate the same language as in the expiring act, which, by some chance, might become law, which language would exempt rent, we can add another 10 percent to the percentage which I have stated. However, under existing laws, practically 12 percent of each dollar spent was never controlled, and we wonder why price and wage controls did not work. We did not freeze the economy. I contend that title VIII will not freeze the economy.

Bernard Baruch said, "Put a freeze on, a solid, across-the-board freeze. That means every man's job, every man's salary, and every man's income. Make it work." If that were done, I would be the first to agree that price and wage controls under that situation could work. But we will never do it in this country.

As I have said, I used the breakdown of the dollar in my own State of Arizona, but I have prepared also a breakdown of the dollar spent over the United States. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a breakdown of the wage-earner family dollar spent in Arizona, and also a breakdown of the consumer dollar, as prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percentage distribution of expenditures for current consumption, Phoenix, Ariz., wage-earner families

Percent of expenditures for current consumption	100.0
Housing	[1] 10.6
Fuel, light, refrigeration, and water	3.6
Household operation	3.3
House furnishings and equipment (total)	8.2
Household textiles	.7
Furniture	1.8
Floor coverings	.4
Kitchen, cleaning, laundry equipment	3.4
Miscellaneous	1.9
Food	30.0
Alcoholic drinks	1.3
Tobacco	1.7
Personal care	[1] 2.2
Clothing (total)	9.5
Women and girls (total)	4.1
Outerwear	1.9
Underwear and nightwear	.7
Hosiery and footwear	1.0
Hats, gloves, and accessories	.5
Men and boys (total)	3.9
Outerwear	2.2
Underwear and nightwear	.4
Hosiery and footwear	1.0
Hats, gloves, accessories	.3
Children under 2 years (total)	.2
Clothing materials and services (total)	1.3
Medical care	[1] 5.3
Recreation	[1] 3.8
Reading	[1] .6
Education	.4
Automobile transportation	16.8
Other transportation	[1] 1.4
Miscellaneous	1.3

[1] Family, including expenditures and savings in 1950 (Bulletin 1097, Department of Labor).

Source: Department of Labor, July 1952.

Items

	Percent
All items	100.0
Food	30.1
Cereals and bakery products	3.1
Meats, poultry, and fish	8.0
Dairy products	4.2
Fruits and vegetables	4.5
Other foods bought to be prepared at home	5.7
Food away from home	4.6
Housing	32.0
Rent and other shelter	17.2
Gas and electricity	1.9
Solid fuels and fuel oil	1.3
House furnishings	6.6
Household operation	5.0
Apparel	9.7
Men's and boys' clothing	3.1
Women's and girls' clothing	4.3
Footwear	1.5
Other apparel	.8
Transportation	11.0
Medical care	4.7
Personal care	2.1
Reading and recreation	5.4
Other goods and services	5.0

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is ridiculous to say that we can control 100 percent of the dollar when we eliminate even a small fraction of that dollar from controls. The eminent Mr. Bernard Baruch recognizes this. In his statement before the Banking and Currency Committee on Monday, March 23, 1953, under the paragraph heading of "Not the Same Mistakes," he said:

All segments of the economy should be treated alike, with special favors for none.

The flexibility under which we have been living in recent price controls, and which is provided for in this current legislation before us, can receive the brunt of the blame for the failure of these controls, just as this flexibility has been the cause of failure during the years of history. For example, the law was supposed to maintain a control on wages, but we find that the average hourly wage of factory workers in January 1951, when wage control went into effect, was a dollar and a half. As of January 1953, the average rate per hour was up to $1.69. With wage control, the average hourly factory wage rose 12.7 percent in 24 months, a sharper rise in wage rates than in the 29 months from August 1948 to January 1951, when there was no wage control. The flexibility allowed under the law did accomplish one thing. It allowed us to perform the greatest of economic feats. We had our cake and ate it, too.

By freezing some prices and letting wages and other things run wild, we, of course, created the greatest pent-up inflation in history.

Another reason for failure is that price-and-wage controls require bureaucracies to supervise, inspect, and investigate. It is historical that, as bureaucracies are created, bureaucracies in turn, by their own edicts and regulations, change the original intent of the law which created them. Bureaucracies cost money; and as they live, they tend to grow. For example, it cost $758,429,000 to operate the OPA from 1942 through 1947. Early OPA planners envisioned a paid staff of 90,000. While it never reached this figure, it did approach a level of 64,000 persons in 1945, and of this total 4,000 were employed in the Washington office. Most of OPA employees were found in 9 regional offices, 94 district offices, 4 territorial offices, 288 defense rental area offices, and 5,556 war, price and rationing boards. These figures do not take into account the many thousands of volunteers who assisted during this program. Likewise, the Office of Price Stabilization mushroomed into a gigantic bureaucracy. By October of 1951 the number of OPS employees had passed 11,000. Of this total, 2,410 were in Washington, and 8,839 in 14 regional offices, and 91 district offices. The administration's price-control plans included 19,000 permanent positions in the OPS for the fiscal year 1952, and we find in the 82d Congress, as expressed in House Document 172, June 21, 1951, a request for funds totaling $142 million for the Economic Stabilization Agency. The major share of this was slated for OPS.

This tremendous cost in dollars, personnel, and time does not reflect a similar, and probably much greater, cost to the business concerns of this Nation. Untold millions of man-hours were required to adjust prices, to list inventories, and otherwise meet the requirements of

OPS by businesses. Expenditures of astronomical figures were necessary in the American business world to attempt to bring business houses into compliance with the law. It is very doubtful, as we look at controls in the cold light of history, whether controls have ever justified their costs.

As I sat in committee hearings and listened to the pleas of the small-business people and big-business people for the discontinuance of any thinking about controls, I knew that in the back of their minds was the memory of days, nights, and weeks spent on inventory records and price-adjustment records, which, in 99 cases out of 100 were never examined by the bureaucrats who operated the OPS. That was a flagrant waste of the manpower and womanpower of this country. Both big- and little-business men came before the committee pleading for no more of what they had been through.

Advocates of the emergency freeze stress the point that it is supposed to be only temporary, but I point out to this body one of the inherent characteristics we have found about Government bureaucracies set up to take care of many such emergency conditions. Bureaucracies do not cease existence without a struggle. They become empires unto themselves and, as such, contrive every excuse and reason known to man to justify their existence. To point out this danger, I quote from an editorial of the New York Times of December 13, 1952:

> Most Americans, however, who have informed opinions on the matter are convinced that direct controls are alien to the spirit of the free-enterprise system, and that the burden of proof is at all times on their advocates to justify their continuance a single hour longer than necessary.
>
> This view is strengthened by the fact that while stabilization officials invariably profess to hold controls in very low esteem conceptually, they have a habit that is just as invariable of discovering that the particular controls they are administering just happen to be an exception to the general rule, or that the particular moment is peculiarly inappropriate for decontrol. (It may be set down as an almost unexceptional generalization that there is one time that is always regarded by stabilization administrations as decidedly inauspicious for purposes of decontrol; that is the present.)

Price and wage controls which are reasonable in the public interest and which have the support of patriotic public opinion are likely to have the good will and support of the people.

In emergencies people want to cooperate; they want to help win wars; they want to do their part; and they want to do the best they can under the regulations. We found this to be true in the early years of World War II, but in spite of strong patriotism and more or less general acceptance of controls, retail prices from 1941 to July of 1946 went up 51.9 percent, and, at the same time, factory straight-time wage rates went up 52 percent. That was under control. We cannot because we do not have the information, take into consideration what additions to these amounts would have been made by the adding of black market operations or overtime wage rates, fringe benefits, and so forth. Because of these things, we find a control program that had met with popular reception at the outset of World War II failing; and there is room for serious question as to just what was accomplished by the OPA.

In presenting this general discussion on price and wage controls I think it is very appropriate that I refer briefly to what price actually is. I find that many people in the United States, and particularly in Washington, have no conception of what price means to our system of economics, and how it regulates and controls the entire structure under which we live.

WHAT IS PRICE AND ITS FUNCTION?

For a better understanding of this subject, I would like to discuss briefly with you the functions of the price system. This is not understood by all people, and this is because price is something that is fixed in their minds as a number on a tag or an amount on a contract.

The price system in our economy performs three basic jobs:

First. It guides the consumer in choosing the goods and services upon which he will spend his income;

Second. It facilitates the movements of goods and services through the marketing system from producer to consumer; and

Third. It tells the merchant, and through the merchant, the producer, what the wishes of the consumer are, and thus guides in the allocation of resources by indicating to merchant and manufacturer what the public wants and what they will pay for it.

Price is not something that is arbitrarily arrived at by a manufacturer or a retailer. Price is established from experience, and prices are never set in their amounts. Prices are variable, and they vary from day to day and from season to season, as the consumer expresses his desires by buying, or not buying, at the prices offered.

Members of this body have expressed great interest in the ultimate consumer, and legislation has been introduced aimed at protecting this consumer. I suggest here that the price system of our economy does just that.

Our price system is probably the greatest bureau of standards we have ever had. The consuming public will not stand for exorbitant, high prices. It will not stand for poor quality. They want to buy what they want, when they want it. As a merchant I can tell Members of the Senate one of our great problems is to try to anticipate the needs and desires of our customers.

Our great competitive system does not limit selection to one, but rather it provides a multitude of selections in each category that the customer is interested in. No matter what is manufactured that is new, it is copied overnight at lower prices and at varying degrees of quality and it is the customer's acceptance or rejection of these prices or quality that indicates to our economy what people want and what they want to pay for it. If he decides the price of one article is too high he substitutes another for it. In this way he lets the producer know what to produce.

This all happens in a free market economy, or a free enterprise economy, whatever we want to call this economic system under which we work.

Merely because there may be some people in this country who do not like the system and what it entails, I should like to inject here a few remarks of explanation, or at least what I believe to be the basis of our thinking on the free enterprise and free economic system under which we work.

First. The natural resources and the instruments of production are for the most part owned and developed by private citizens, either individually or in groups.

I felt during the debate on the so-called tidelands legislation that a division was clearly marked for the future of this country and for history. On one side were those who said the Federal Government should dominate everything, and, on the other side, those who said the States have rights in this picture.

Second. The individual is left free within his means and ability to become job-holder, job-maker, or self-employed.

Third. The consumer, through his freedom of choice, directs production—determines what is to be produced, in what quantities, and in what form and quality and at what price.

Fourth. Through this open opportunity and through the competitive motive, the productive work of society gets done. By harnessing the ambition to get ahead, the benefits of invention, of discovery, and of the products of others are broadly shared by all groups in society.

Fifth. A free economic society is essentially voluntary; directives, orders, and regimentation are kept to a minimum.

But let us see what happens when prices are held below market levels, as has been the case in the last 11 years.

First. Restraints upon consumption are lifted and the consumer is encouraged to buy.

This is a natural chain, Mr. President.

Second. But producers are not encouraged to raise production. In fact, the restraints placed upon prices serve notice on producers to reduce production. Consequently, shortages develop and available supplies have to be rationed.

Third. With artificially restrained prices encouraging consumption and discouraging production, inevitably subsidies to producers have to be adopted in order to maintain any degree of production.

It is evident that, if price controls are imposed over any length of time, rationing and subsidies become inevitable and, in this respect, I would like to quote from Prof. Don Paarlberg. This excerpt is quoted from Price Freedom—The Key to Economic Freedom, in an address the professor made at Purdue University:

> Ceiling prices, rationing and subsidies are the three-legged stool of an economy which endeavors to hold prices below the equilibrium level. A stool will not stand for any length of time on 1 or 2 legs, but needs all 3.
>
> In England, they understand this better than we do, for they have been at it longer. They fix prices, ration and subsidize agricultural commodities pretty well across the

board; they have had to do this to make the system work. We will have a similar experience if we stay with it long enough. If we won't let the price system function, we shall have to step in and do the jobs that the price system formerly did for us.

We can see, therefore, that along with price and wage and rent-control legislation, we must also provide for rationing and for subsidies, and we need go back no further than the history of the law that is now expiring to find this to be true.

The costs involved in these subsidies are not small. In World War II, under the stabilization program, subsidies alone were in the neighborhood of $5 billion, and the administration of price and rent controls and rationing under OPA amounted to more than $750 million.

In concluding my brief discussion, I should like to deal also with the subject of wages.

WAGES

While discussing prices it is also proper to discuss briefly, wages and their place in this whole scheme of things. Wages are the prices paid for labor, and we find in the labor market competitive conditions just as we find in the wholesale and retail markets. Under controls, instead of wage increases following price increases, as has been historically the case, we find the opposite happening where labor is led to believe that it can obtain advantageous wage advances. In any event, it knows that a wage advance will not lead to an immediate advance in retail prices because of the influence of ceiling prices on inventory and the historical slowness of bureaucratic adjustment to changed conditions.

As a result of wages being forced upward before prices, currently generated purchasing power is always more than adequate to buy the products of industry at ceiling prices. In other words, inflationary pressures continue, and a need for price control seems to be present. The only way that this vicious circle of wage increases followed by price rises could ever be broken would have been to abolish price and wage controls.

I should like to mention a study made by the United States Department of Labor, entitled Productivity Trends in American Industry, in which they show a remarkably close correlation between unit labor cost, or hourly earnings divided by productivity, and wholesale prices for the period 1909 to 1939. If we bring this index up to date, it continues to show the same close relationship with the price level. Production costs of the marginal producer—the one with the highest unit labor cost, who is in production to meet the demand—determine the industry price level. As a result, it was not at all surprising that prices continued to follow unit labor cost even during the period of OPA control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks, to have printed in the RECORD a table showing this relationship of unit labor cost to the wholesale price of manufactured products. I have before me a graph on this matter, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the closeness of the trends of the two lines shown on the graph. I may say that I realize there is a rule which prevents the printing of graphs in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so at this time I merely submit the table.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wholesale prices of manufactured products and unit labor costs in manufacturing 1914–52

[1947–49=100]

Year	Unit labor costs [1]	Wholesale prices of manufactured products [2]
1914	40	45
1915	(3)	45
1916	(3)	54
1917	(3)	72
1918	(3)	82
1919	84	86
1920	93	98
1921	76	68
1922	64	63
1923	70	65
1924	69	63
1925	65	66
1926	64	66
1927	62	62
1928	59	63
1929	59	62
1930	58	58
1931	52	51
1932	49	46
1933	45	46
1934	50	51
1935	48	54
1936	49	54
1937	55	57
1938	56	54
1939	53	53
1940	52	54
1941	56	59
1942	63	65
1943	70	66
1944	76	66
1945	76	67
1946	87	76
1947	96	96
1948	102	105
1949	103	99
1950	102	103
1951	110	115
1952	115	115

[1] Computed by the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report based on data from the National Bureau of Economic Research, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Federal Reserve Board, and the U. S. Bureau of the Census.

[2] Based on the old wholesale price index of manufactured products which was published up through 1951 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on a base of 1926=100. The index was shifted to the one now used, namely, 1947–49=100, and the annual index for 1952 estimated on the basis of movements of selected groups in the new wholesale index thought to best represent the movements of manufactured products prices. No official revised index on the 1947–49 base is published at present covering the wholesale prices of manufactured products as an economic group.

[3] Not available.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to study the table, which shows, as I have just stated, that unit labor costs in manufacturing and the wholesale prices of manufactured products have never been more than 6 or 7 points apart from 1909 to 1939. This chart shows very plainly that prices are intimately connected with wages and salaries, and that the wholesale index, likewise the retail index at a higher level, follows wages and salaries. This is further proof that for effective price control we must have, as a basic factor, effective wage and salary control, which, as I have pointed out before, we have never had.

THE MORAL EFFECTS OF CONTROLS

Mr. President, this is one aspect of the effect of price and wage controls which came out one day at the committee hearings. I believe that the lady who began the discussion was from the State of Indiana. I may say, with all respect to that great State, that it is proper for a person from Indiana to be concerned with the morality of the people of the United States. I speak knowingly on that point, because I have the distinct honor of being married to a girl from Indiana. So I share the pride of the eminent Senator from Indiana in his home State.

At the hearing we got into a discussion of the moral effects of bad laws. I should like to discuss this point briefly at this time, because I believe the Senate will be interested in it.

Although many of my colleagues will wonder why I include this subject in a discussion of price and wage controls, it is to me a rather important one, because it points up the old adage that a bad law breeds contempt for law in general. I may even be wrong in my conclusions in this field; but, nevertheless, the figures are interesting, and I think they are worthy of discussion at this time.

A bad law breeds contempt for law in general. Let us remember prohibition and what happened in the 1920's. It became a very popular game to beat the prohibition law. Too many times a man's popularity and ability were judged by his ability to procure alcoholic beverages specifically prohibited by law. It was a bad law, and the country recognized it and repealed it. Nevertheless, its impact was left upon the children of that age who witnessed their parents breaking the law, and oftentimes listened to their parents brag about their lawbreaking ability.

We find a similar situation in connection with the imposition of price and wage controls on our economic system. Laws that attempt to restrict normal business relations that, in their very essence, are difficult to interpret and understand, and require considerable enforcement, soon earn public contempt. The public resentment against those who violate such laws is weakened, and law-abiding citizens are led to break them. Many merchants were forced during these periods to violate the letter and spirit of the law in order to get the necessary materials and merchandise to keep their businesses running. Many businessmen in this country were unable financially, or from the standpoint of staff, to comply with all the confusing regulations and rules and edicts emanating from the OPA and the OPS. They did not want to break the law; but to maintain their very existence, many of them knowingly, and many of them unknowingly, violated the law in these cases. It would have been almost impossible to have complied with all the regulations without somewhere, somehow, overlooking some requirement of the regulations; and, in these instances, businessmen were held in contempt of the law.

I need not relate what the black market was. It is too familiar and too recent a part of our American life for me to find it necessary to explain what the black market meant. The flagrant violation of the law by the operations of the black market assumed the proportions of a national scandal.

We are concerned with butter in this very day, so let us look at what happened to butter in the black market. Testimony before a congressional committee indicated that butter production had reached

a 25-year low in 1946, and that 70 to 80 percent of the butter being manufactured was going into the black market.

In my own field of business, manufacturers resorted to such practice as tie-in sales, where, in order to buy a line of dresses, it was necessary also to buy a line of something else that the retailer knew would not sell; but he bought it in order to keep the line, because if he did not buy it his competitor would.

It is fairly evident, after watching prohibition and after watching two attempts at price control, that when we try to legislate against the normal habits of our people, they find ways to evade the law. The dangerous thing here is not the black market, bad as it is, or the evasion of law by adults. It is the impact of those evasions on our young people.

During World War II, juvenile delinquency among those between the ages of 18 to 24 took a dip because most of these young people were busy fighting the war.

However, among those 17 years of age or less, juvenile delinquency increased. Is not it possible—mind you, I do not say it is—that this increase among the younger group might be attributable in part to the fact that, day after day and week after week and month after month during the periods of controls, these youngsters heard their parents brag about how they bought a cut of meat or a set of tires or some extra hosiery under the counter or on the black market?

I submit, too, that the increase in juvenile delinquency immediately following the war, among those from 18 to 24, might be attributable, in part, to the same source. That is, these young people had heard of their parents' activities, and when they returned from the war their respect for the law had diminished.

EMERGENCIES

The proponents of title VIII of Senate bill 1081, which would give the President emergency price and wage control authority, have repeatedly referred to dire national emergencies, and so forth—or, as I believe it is now referred to, "grave national emergencies"; I believe that is the approach now being used that would take the great bulk of our national productivity. So that the Senate may be informed as to the history of consumption of our gross national product for security purposes, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a table showing the amounts and percentages of the gross national product spent for national security in World War I, World War II, and world war III.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Figures for gross national product and national security expenditures during World War I, World War II, and the rearmament period since 1950

(It should be noted that the figures for World War I are not on the same basis as the others, nor are they as accurate.)

Periods (1)	Gross national product (2)	National security expenditures (3)	(3) as percent of (2) (4)
	Billions	*Billions*	
World War I: [1]			
1917	$59.5	$1.8	3
1918	65.5	13.0	20
1919	76.5	17.3	23
World War II: [2]			
1941	126.4	13.8	11
1942	161.6	49.6	31
1943	194.3	80.4	41
1944	213.7	88.6	42
1945	215.2	75.9	35
1946	211.1	21.2	10
Post-Korean: [2]			
1950	284.2	18.5	7
1951	329.2	37.1	11
1952	346.3	49.2	14

[1] For World War I, gross national product is given by calendar years, and national security expenditures by fiscal years. Comparison of the 2 is therefore approximate at best. Sources: GNP—J. F. Dewhurst & Associates, America's Needs and Resources, New York, The Twentieth Century Fund, 1947, p. 696. National Security Expenditures: United States Secretary of the Treasury, Annual Reports.

[2] For World War II and the period 1950–52, both figures are by calendar years. Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Markets After the Defense Expansion, 1952, table 5, p. 18.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this table is quite an interesting one. It is interesting to note what happened during the second World War. We find the Government taking up to 42 percent of our gross national product. Yet, as our great productive capacity increased steadily from 1942 through 1945, we find a peak of 42 percent being reached in 1944, and a decrease in percentages in the ensuing years. Then, if we look at the percentages taken by the Korean war—which was referred to this afternoon; it is the war that all of us realize we are in—we realize the tremendous extent to which our fast-growing industrial capacity has overcome the production handicaps of earlier years. Comparing 1952, for instance, with 1942, we find almost an identical amount of money being spent for security purposes. Yet the expenditure in 1952 represents but 14 percent of the gross national product, whereas the same expenditures in 1942 represented 31 percent.

It is highly possible, and certainly history would bear out this possibility, that with the proposed stockpiling of tools and the facilities that use tools, this country can find itself in a position of production adequate to take care of our war needs at a much earlier stage of any possible war than has been possible in wars we have gone through in the past.

CONGRESS SLOW

Another argument that is used by the proponents of this legislation is that Congress cannot act fast enough. This subject, too, I think bears a little investigation, particularly as to the need for too swift action, and it is well again to look into the past.

I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a chart showing the Consumer Price Index in the United States, using 1947–49 as 100, for the years 1913 through the first 2 months of 1953.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Consumer price index—United States: All items, 1913 forward—Series A–1

[1947–49=100] [1]

	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923
Annual average	42.3	42.9	43.4	46.6	54.8	64.3	74.0	85.7	76.4	71.6	72.9
January	42.0	42.9	43.2	44.7	49.9	59.6	70.7	82.5	81.4	72.4	71.8
February	41.8	42.5	43.0	44.7	51.1	60.3	69.1	83.4	78.8	72.1	71.7
March	41.8	42.3	42.6	45.0	51.4	60.0	69.9	84.3	78.1	*71.4	*71.9
April	42.0	42.0	42.9	45.5	—53.6	60.6	71.2	86.7	77.2	71.3	72.3
May	41.7	42.2	43.1	45.7	54.8	61.8	72.1	88.2	*75.7	71.3	72.4
June	41.9	42.5	43.2	46.2	55.3	63.0	*72.4	*89.4	75.3	*71.5	*72.7
July	42.2	42.9	43.2	46.2	54.9	64.5	74.3	89.0	75.4	71.6	73.5
August	42.5	43.5	43.2	46.8	55.7	65.6	75.6	86.6	75.7	70.9	73.3
September	42.7	43.7	43.4	47.6	56.7	67.3	76.1	85.7	*74.9	*71.0	*73.6
October	42.9	43.4	43.8	48.2	57.7	68.4	77.3	85.2	74.7	71.5	73.8
November	43.1	43.5	44.1	49.1	57.8	69.4	79.1	84.7	74.3	71.8	74.0
December	*43.0	*43.4	*44.3	*49.3	*58.5	*70.6	*80.9	*82.7	*73.9	*72.0	*73.9

[1] The CPI, formerly calculated on the base period (1935–39=100), has been converted to the new base (1947–49=100) in compliance with recommendations of the U. S. Bureau of the Budget, Office of Statistical Standards. For the years 1940 through 1952, 2 index series were published. The index identified as the "old series" is discontinued after December 1952. Index numbers shown here which form a continuous series from 1913 to date, include the "adjusted series" on the 1947–49=100 base from 1940. Beginning January 1953 the index structure has been revised. (See February 1953 issue of the Monthly Labor Review.)

*Indexes marked with an asterisk (*) and indexes for all months after September 1940, are based on prices collected for all groups of items. Indexes for other months before September 1940 are based on food prices and estimates for other goods and services, assuming an even rate of change between pricing dates.

Consumer price index—United States: All items, 1913 forward—Series A–1—Continued

	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934
Annual average	73.1	75.0	75.6	74.2	73.3	73.3	71.4	65.0	58.4	55.3	57.2
January	73.7	74.0	76.7	74.9	73.7	73.0	73.1	68.0	61.1	55.1	56.4
February	73.5	73.6	76.3	74.3	73.1	72.9	72.8	67.0	60.2	54.2	56.9
March	*73.0	73.7	76.0	73.9	73.1	72.6	72.4	66.5	59.9	53.8	56.9
April	72.7	73.6	76.6	73.9	73.3	72.4	72.7	66.0	59.5	53.6	56.8
May	72.7	73.9	76.2	74.5	73.6	72.8	72.4	65.4	58.7	53.9	56.9
June	*72.8	*74.7	*75.6	*75.2	*73.0	*73.0	*71.9	*64.7	*58.3	*54.3	*57.0
July	72.9	75.7	74.8	73.8	73.0	73.7	70.9	64.5	58.1	56.0	57.1
August	72.8	75.7	74.5	73.4	73.2	74.1	70.6	64.4	57.5	56.4	57.2
September	*73.1	75.4	75.0	73.8	73.8	74.0	70.9	64.1	57.2	56.5	57.6
October	73.4	75.8	75.2	74.2	73.6	74.0	70.6	63.7	56.8	56.5	58.0
November	73.6	77.0	75.5	74.1	73.5	73.7	69.9	63.0	56.4	56.4	57.7
December	*73.7	*76.7	*75.4	*74.0	*73.2	*73.4	*69.0	*62.3	*55.9	*56.2	*57.5
											57.4

	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
Annual average	58.7	59.3	61.4	60.3	59.4	59.9	62.9	69.7	74.0	75.2	76.9
January	58.2	*59.1	60.2	60.9	59.6	59.5	60.3	67.0	72.2	74.4	76.1
February	58.6	58.8	60.4	60.3	59.4	59.9	60.3	67.5	72.4	74.2	76.0
March	*58.5	58.5	*60.9	*60.3	*59.3	*59.7	60.5	68.4	73.5	74.2	76.0
April	59.0	*58.5	61.1	60.5	59.2	59.7	61.1	68.8	74.3	74.6	76.1
May	58.8	58.5	61.4	60.3	59.1	59.9	61.5	69.4	74.9	74.9	76.7
June	58.6	59.2	*61.5	*60.3	*59.0	*60.1	62.6	69.6	74.7	75.1	77.3
July	*58.4	*59.4	61.7	60.4	59.2	60.0	63.0	70.0	74.2	75.5	77.5
August	58.4	59.8	62.0	60.2	59.0	59.8	63.5	70.3	73.9	75.7	77.5
September	58.7	*60.0	*62.4	*60.2	*60.2	*60.0	64.7	70.5	74.2	75.8	77.2
October	*58.6	59.8	62.2	60.0	60.0	59.9	65.4	71.2	74.5	75.8	77.2
November	58.9	59.7	61.8	59.8	59.9	59.9	65.9	71.7	74.4	75.8	77.5
December	59.2	*59.7	*61.6	*59.9	*59.6	60.2	66.1	72.1	74.5	76.1	77.8

	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956
Annual average	83.4	95.5	102.8	101.8	102.8	111.0					
January	77.8	91.9	101.3	102.7	100.6	108.6	113.1	113.9			
February	77.6	91.8	100.5	101.6	100.4	109.9	112.4	113.4			
March	78.0	93.7	100.2	101.9	100.7	110.3	112.4				
April	78.5	93.7	101.6	102.1	100.8	110.4	112.9				
May	78.9	93.5	102.3	101.8	101.3	110.9	113.0				
June	79.8	94.2	103.1	102.0	101.8	110.8	113.4				
July	84.6	95.0	104.3	101.4	102.9	110.9	114.1				
August	86.4	96.1	104.8	101.6	103.7	110.9	114.3				
September	87.4	98.3	104.8	102.1	104.4	111.6	114.1				
October	89.1	98.3	104.3	101.5	105.0	112.1	114.2				
November	91.2	98.9	103.5	101.6	105.5	112.8	114.3				
December	91.9	100.2	103.0	101.0	106.9	113.1	114.1				

*Indexes marked with an asterisk (*) and indexes for all months after September 1940, are based on prices collected for all groups of items. Indexes for other months before September 1940 are based on food prices and estimates for other goods and services, assuming an even rate of change between pricing dates.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe that a study of the chart will indicate that speed was not of the essence. In fact, if a little more time had been taken in thought and preparation in 1942, it is possible that legislation might have developed that would have gotten at the real source of inflation, and that we would not have had what did result, which was legislation that attempted to correct the result.

From the time when hostilities opened in Europe in October of 1939, to the time when the United States entered the war in December of 1941, we find a rise of 6.1 in the cost of living, or from 60.0 to 66.1, which is an increase in the neighborhood of 9 percent. I use that period because certainly it was quite evident that the United States would be drawn into the war, and this could have been a period of scare buying. We must remember, also, that at this particular period in our economic history, we were just on the road to recovery from a depression. Despite what one political party would have liked the people to believe, we did not come out of the depression of 1929 until war came over the horizon in the late thirties. So we could have expected normally to have some increase in the cost of living without the existence of a war.

If we take the period of January 1942, which was immediately after our entrance into the war, and run along until July of the same year, we find an increase of about 4.5 percent. I say "about" in these percentages because I extended them on a sliderule and, of course, extreme accuracy down to the decimal point is difficult with this instrument. So we find ourselves in a state of war, and 6 months passed wherein we had a 4.5-percent increase in the cost of living, which is 3 times the normal rate of 3 percent over the years of our history.

It might be said at this point that we have inflation constantly; that it is a phenomenon of our economic system itself, and indeed of any economic system, and that it must increase. The problem is always to limit that increase, and the increase of 3 percent a year is generally accepted as the figure of normal inflation in this country.

Now, let us move up to Korea. This is fresher in our minds, and it is well here to discuss this venture into the wonderland of controls with some detail.

The price controls put into effect in January 1951 were authorized by the Defense Production Act of 1950, which became effective September 8, 1950. It was not until January 25, 1951, however, that a comprehensive freeze of prices and wages was ordered put into effect. This freeze was based on the highest prices at which goods had been sold during the period between December 19, 1950, and January 25, 1951. Prior to this comprehensive freeze, only two selective control orders had been issued, one applying to the price of automobiles and the other to the price of hides. Aside from this, reliance was on voluntary cooperation.

The rise in prices after Korea had largely taken place before controls became effective. Wholesale prices had risen from 100.2 (1947–49=100) to 115.0 in January 1951, a rise of 14.8 percent. The peak of 16.3 percent above June 1950 was reached in February.

In the consumer price field, the rise was from 101.8 (1947–49=100) in June 1950 to 108.6 in January 1951, a rise of 6.7 percent. Following the imposition of price controls, consumer prices continued to rise until the latter part of 1952, when they reached a level about 12.2 percent above June 1950. On the other hand, wholesale prices declined until they were only about between 10 and 11 percent above June 1950.

It seems plain that the major reason for the increase in prices that followed the outbreak of hostilities in Korea was speculative buying on the part of both consumers and business, particularly business, in anticipation of shortages of civilian goods caused by a rise in Government expenditures far greater than actually occurred. There was an anticipation of an immediate rise in military expenditures. Actually, the rise in defense expenditures took place much more slowly and over a much longer period of time, with the result that by the spring of 1951 the defense program had been discounted so far in advance that the wholesale price structure was out of balance with the retail price structure and with personal income. Since the first quarter of 1951, wholesale prices have declined, while the wholesale price rises prior to February 1951 have been reflected forward in a rising consumer price index. These contrary movements have now brought the two price levels into some sort of rough balance.

It seems doubtful that price controls imposed in January of 1951 had much effect on prices, except that they shut off some anticipatory buying.

I felt impelled to mention those facts in all fairness because there is a possibility that the pending measure might have checked prices, but, mind you, it would not have checked inflation because of the weaknesses I have outlined. That is something we must keep in our minds constantly as we discuss this subject—that what Senate bill 1081, or title VIII of that bill, is reportedly aimed at is the control of inflation. We are not by this act controlling inflation; we are only controlling the effects—the results—of inflation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator is possibly wrong about that. Title VIII, in case of a great emergency, would freeze prices, wages, and rents temporarily, for 90 days, or until Congress could decide what ought to be done or what ought not to be done. That, in my opinion, is all that Title VIII would do.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But the purpose of the language of the act is the same as that of the old one—that is, to control inflation.

Mr. CAPEHART. The purpose of the act is to make sure that, in case of a grave emergency, it would operate quickly to hold the line until Congress might decide what ought to be done. Certainly it could not do much harm to wait for 90 or 100 days, during which time the Congress might decide that the controls were unnecessary.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to hear the Senator say it could not do much harm in a period of 90 or 100 days.

Mr. CAPEHART. It could not do much harm within that time, because it would be a matter of only 90 days, and the Congress, during that period, would be acting upon the subject.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What I am attempting to point out in my discussion today is the fact that it will not work for 90 days or for 90 years, and that what we are getting at is a control of inflation. I shall reach that subject in a few moments.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator from Arizona will yield, I may say that I think that what he is trying to prove is that under no circumstances and under no conditions should we have price, wage, and rent controls. Is that not correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In this discussion I wish to give Senators enough material to think about, so that they can make up their minds on that subject. In debating the subject with the Senator from Indiana, I have postulated a time when this country was in utter collapse. If everything was flung apart, possibly yes, we might need controls. I do not think we can judge that now, but I can say to the Senator that, in view of history, in view of what has gone on, in view of the fact that imposing controls has never accomplished the purpose which was designed to be accomplished, we should consider these things.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me give the Senator certain figures. The Defense Production Act was passed in June 1950. It was in effect until April 30, 1952. The national income in 1950 was $239 billion. In 1951 it was $277 billion; and in 1952 it was $291 billion. It is now running at the rate of $304 billion a year, with price, wage, and rent controls.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. The income is the greatest in the history of the Nation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes, but——

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me continue a moment. During this same period, we have had the greatest production and the highest prices in the history of the Nation. How does the Senator account for that?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not see that that is particularly germane to the subject we are discussing.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is certainly germane that it has not particularly interfered with the economy, since production is the highest today that it has ever been in the history of the Nation. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me call to the Senator's attention what I repeatedly tried to bring before him in committee.

The population of the United States has been growing almost astronomically. We should not forget that. Our free enterprise system is so strong that we cannot hamstring it, even though at times we seem to try to do it. It is going to develop. I think we shall have continued good business and high incomes in this country. I do not share the views which I have heard expressed on the floor of the Senate when I have reluctantly heard Senators who have stated that, looking forward, they could see a depression. I do not think this floor is the place to express such a thought. This is the place to express the truth. I shall offer figures later to show that the American economy does not need Government meddling now or at any time, for 90 days or for 90 weeks. As I stated in one of the committee meetings, and it is a rather sad commentary upon the American brain, I defy a legislative body to write a law which some American cannot figure out a way to evade. My personal argument against the proposition is that I do not want to see anything happen to our economy which will strangle it or throttle it for even a second.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is just my point. We have had controls since 1950, and yet the Nation has had the greatest income and the greatest number of people employed in its history.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then, does the Senator suggest that we adopt all-out control?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. The point is that when controls are needed, we should use them, and when they are not needed, we ought not to use them. What the Senator is saying by inference is that we who advocate a 90-day freeze are in favor of permanent controls.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. I think the Senator from Indiana did the country a great service in bringing up the subject for open debate, so that Congress could decide. I say the Senator has done a remarkably fine thing in bringing it out into the open so that the American people and their representatives can discuss it.

Mr. CAPEHART. That was the purpose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know it was. I heard the Senator debate with former Senator Benton on the radio. I said to the former Senator, "You should have 'stood in bed.'" He has never talked to me about it since that time.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator from Arizona know that price controls have never been applied to Federal purchases, so that the tremendous increases in productivity, represented largely by our increase in production for war, have not been subject to price control?

Mr. CAPEHART. I read in the Senator's speech that price control had not been applied to Federal purchases. It applies only to special items. It does not apply to food or to a great many other things. The Senator also referred to machine tools. An increase in the price of machine tools was permited, but I have never understood that that applies to everything the Government bought. Furthermore, under our Federal laws, we have renegotiation to take excess profits away from the producers, and we also have an excess-profits tax.

But I never understood that price control had been eliminated from coffee, sugar, livestock, or articles of that sort the Government bought. It only applied to special items as to which it was impossible to establish a price. I should like to be corrected, if I am wrong about that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It was found necessary in World War I to exempt Federal purchases, such as tanks, airplanes, and so forth, from price control.

Mr. CAPEHART. How could we have price control on a tank?

Mr. GOLDWATER. We could not. We cannot properly have it on anything if we do not have it on everything.

Mr. CAPEHART. A tank is a special item. It is not sold to anyone except the Government, so the Government negotiates a price. That, in itself, is price control, because the Government sets the price and says what it will pay for the item. No one else buys such items.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have some figures here which, I think, will answer the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. I might well be incorrect in my statement.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I said in my speech of last Friday that I understand the Federal Government, being sovereign, can pay any price it chooses to pay for anything it wishes to buy. If it cannot purchase an article except at a price above the price ceiling, it is not in the same position as an individual. It has the power, as sovereign, to pay any price it pleases.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The seller of a standard item which is under price control would not sell to the Government at a higher price than the price ceiling established by the OPS. There are thousands of items which are not sold to anyone but the Government, and in all such instances the Government negotiates a price which becomes the ceiling price, because the Government is the only purchaser.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not true that much of the great increase in production during the past few months has been in categories in which, obviously, no price control could have been applied?

Mr. CAPEHART. If price control has not been needed, certainly the Government did not use it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have yielded to the Senator from Utah. I shall be glad to yield for a question from the Senator from New York when the Senator from Utah has finished.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator know that in December 1951 the OPS said:

> There is no practical method of establishing price ceilings at the present time without at the same time impeding the flow of these essential defense items.

Referring to aircraft and aircraft parts.

Mr. CAPEHART. If one is a manufacturer and is manufacturing tanks, and the Government is the only buyer, of course, the Government establishes the price of those particular items. Being the only buyer, the price becomes the ceiling price. No one else buys such items. In such an instance, of course, the price the Government pays is the ceiling price.

Mr. BENNETT. Yet in this instance OPS had to make an exception and remove this area from the ceiling prices.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point was that they were going to establish ceiling prices, but found there was no necessity, because the Government was the only buyer. The items involved were made specifically for the Government, and the Government negotiated with the producers to manufacture at a certain price, which was the ceiling price. In that instance the ceiling price was established by the National Defense Procurement Officers.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe this little colloquy started because of a comment of the Senator from Indiana. I think in the next paragraph or two I will give the answer.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether it is not a fact that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] have been addressing their remarks to the continuation of controls in normal times. The distinguished chairman of the committee is not urging the continuation of price controls at this time, but what he and other Sentors are urging exclusively is the establishment of machinery through which the freezing of wages, prices, and rents can be invoked by the President of the United States in the event of a great emergency. Certainly the Senator from Arizona would agree with me that there is always a great possibility of an emergency. If we do not recognize the possibility of an emergency, why should we be appropriating $45 billion or $50 billion for national defense? Certainly we must be in a position to protect ourselves against sudden attack on sudden emergency. The only way in which we can be in a position to act promptly is by the enactment of standby legislation such as that proposed by the committee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from New York was not in the Chamber when I began my remarks, when I stated that I recognized that point, and that that is an area of argument, but I said I believed it was time that all Senators should have an opportunity to study the history and effect of price controls. I am talking against price controls, but I am trying to get back occasionally to the specific point. If the able Senator had been here earlier, he would have understood my position.

I recognize what the Senator has said to be true in part, but I know that our great free enterprise system, which has done so much for this country, has great strength in peacetime. We talk about everything depending upon it, yet the first time the world gets into a little bit of trouble, that system is not good enough for us, we have to tamper with it a little. I am trying to show that tampering will not work.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe in the free-enterprise system. I was brought up under it, worked under it, and prospered under it. But I think that where the Senator from Arizona and I differ is in our views as to the necessity when an emergency comes of letting the President take some action until Congress has an opportunity to devise a new method of controls. We may be thrown into a situation so urgent that action will have to be taken immediately. Congress may not even be in session. As I have said, there may not be a Congress. Congress may be dispersed. Many Members of Congress may be no longer in the land of the living, although I pray to God with all my heart that that will not happen. However, it is a possibility, and we must face it.

All that we are asking is that the President of the United States shall be given the right to take action in the face of a serious emergency. I wish to repeat what I said earlier today, that to me it seems ironical that I, a Democrat, should be showing far greater confidence in a Republican President than the leader of the Republican Party, the majority leader, shows, or than some of the other members of the Republican Party show. I am willing to place my confidence in the President. I feel certain that so far as the handling of an urgent emergency is concerned the President will not fail us, and that he will use the best possible human judgment in connection with it. However, I do not believe that the feeling of confidence is shared by some of my colleagues.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to hear the Senator from New York express those feelings, because I share them. I am glad also to observe that the Senator from New York recognizes the possibility of the people's confidence in the President being exhibited again in 1956, so that we may have President Eisenhower as Chief Executive for 8 years. But the Senator keeps talking about an emergency as though it were going to happen under President Eisenhower. I have a little more confidence in this world. Perhaps I am wrong, but I do not like to think we shall have an urgent emergency under President Eisenhower.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. What is the life of the proposed legislation now before the Senate?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Two years.

Mr. THYE. Then it must come to an end under the present administration, if it is to expire in 2 years.

But that was not primarily the reason why I asked the Senator to yield. The matter to which I have objection rests primarily in section 16 of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. I have one other objection, when I shall state later, but section 16 provides for a 90-day freeze. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Under that provision, the President, if an emergency should occur, would have an opportunity immediately to freeze all prices, wages, rents, and so forth, at given levels, and that could be only for a 90-day period.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. If the President did not exercise such authority within the 90 days he could not use the act. If he acted within 90 days Congress could reassemble and enact such legislation as might be necessary in order to continue controls beyond 90 days. Am I correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct. That is substantially the purpose of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for my other question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I notice that section 104 has been stricken from the Defense Production Act. That is of concern to me, because I can recognize that there is a serious threat of a great influx of fats and oils into this country. Already a distressed economic situation exists with respect to fats, oils, and butter. So I am concerned about that phase of the act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that I am addressing myself only to section 16. The chairman of the committee discussed the other sections this morning, and I believe he intends to discuss them further tomorrow. At this time I am not prepared to discuss that matter with the Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator further feel that it is wrong to place in the hands of the President the administrative responsibility to freeze prices, wages, and rents for a period of 90 days?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator have the feeling that, regardless of who is President, the President should not have that power?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator further believe that inflation could pose a threat to our entire economy?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly.

Mr. THYE. If inflation got out of hand, it could affect not only the businessman himself, but of course ultimately, it could affect agriculture; and today there is a distressed situation in agriculture, because of an inflationary trend in our economy dating back 2½ or 3 years. That trend has carried the operating expenses of the farmer to an inflationary level, and they are still at that inflationary level, while the farmer's income has tumbled to a low that is lower than parity, or normal, in relation to other segments of our economy. So the net earnings of the farmer are squeezed to a relatively close margin, and he is exceedingly in distress.

Therefore, I return to my question: Would we have been better off if, on the day the Korean crisis began, everything could have been frozen for a period of 90 days, until, generally, Congress could have enacted measures that would have controlled our economy and kept it in balance, so that it could not have gone out of balance as drastically as some of our economy went out of balance? I am searching for information.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I discussed that subject earlier; I shall be glad to go over it briefly.

We speak about controlling inflation. I have a section of my remarks devoted to inflation. We in the United States have tried to stop inflation, but ineffectually. We can stop inflation in this country. We can stop it by action in the halls of Congress. But we have never done so. We have said we would control prices, wages, and rents. Increases in those three elements are the effect; they are what inflation brings about; they are not what causes inflation. We are talking about curing a headache by scratching our feet.

I hope the Senator from New York will have the opportunity to remain in the Chamber while I develop my argument, because I shall make suggestions as to how to control inflation. I hope Congress will listen to them and will think about them.

We can control inflation in this country, but we cannot control prices and wages through the pending bill, because it gives the President the power to exempt. The livestock people do not want price controls. They would fight them. The newspaper people say it would injure the freedom of the press to place ceilings upon any function of the newspaper industry.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Just a moment. This is most important.

This is where the confusion exists in the minds of the people. It is thought that we can cure inflation by scratching the symptoms. I shall try to point out, as I go along, my thinking on that subject. It is growing late, and I should like to proceed with the development of my argument.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has implied that this bill would relate to whoever was President in 1956 or 1960. He has already acknowledged that the bill has a termination date 2 years from now. But is it not also a fact that there is nothing in the bill which would prevent Congress, in its wisdom, from revoking the powers given to the President at any time? It could do so whenever it saw fit.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. So there is no continuing restriction on the President, or no continuing authority given to the President.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think we have extended rent control 11 times. We told the people every election year, "This will be the end of rent control." Yet the other day we sneaked it in for another 3 months.

Mr. LEHMAN. We are not continuing controls in this bill. It deals only with some great emergency which may happen.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am trying to show that these programs die a very slow, hard death. They must be shot several times.

I should like to continue—and I think this may answer the question of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

In looking back at the Korean incident and the imposition of price and wage controls near the outset of that period, I point out again that the probability of our increasing industrial capacity in this period was very, very good and such indications were evident even at the time of imposition of controls.

I refer again to the table which I have heretofore submitted, showing the increase in the gross national production, which has been steadily on the rise since the low point in the late summer of 1949.

In June 1950 the economy was operating below capacity, although the rate of operations was rising from the low point reached in the late summer of 1949. Furthermore, due to a period of 5 years of very high rates of private investment in new plants and equipment, output per man-hour was risihg at a rate well in excess of the long-term trend of about 2 percent a year. The result was that the economy was capable of expanding, and did expand output after the second quarter of 1950 steadily, quarter by quarter, as fast as or faster than the increase in Government expenditures. Under the particular circumstances that existed then, therefore, the economy could and did produce sufficient goods to meet the actual demands that were made, with the result that the shortages were confined to a very small list of items which were of particular importance to the military program, such as nonferrous metals, certain grades of steel, and so forth.

To the extent that the inflationary increase from 1950 to 1951 was based upon an anticipation of shortages, it proved in retrospect to have been unwarranted. However, it should be noted that the economy was in the recovery phase of an inventory correction in June 1950, which had resulted in a fall in prices in the previous year, 1949. Increases in prices were already underway, both at the wholesale and retail levels; and part of the movement after June 1950, was doubtless a continuation of these price movements based upon peacetime economic factors.

In retrospect, therefore, it appears that the economy was capable of handling a situation of the magnitude that developed, but that the price increases were largely based upon speculative forces born of fears of shortages of goods and services under the defense program.

CONCLUSIONS

In summing up the cost, impact, adequacy, and results of price control during the periods we have been discussing, I think we can say briefly that it has had no effect except to delay price changes which would have been accomplished by normal economic pressure. I think we can safely say that such delays ran from 7 to 11 months.

First. Price controls are ineffectual in fighting inflation at its source. Inflation is a monetary phenomenon. Price controls do not reach the sources of inflation. They deal only with symptoms or results.

Second. Price controls lead to a lowering of moral standards. Consumers are driven into black markets for needed items. Law-abiding citizens are thus encouraged to evade regulations.

Third. Price controls involve heavy burdens on business and industry. To comply with all the regulations which are written whenever controls are put into effect places on the businessmen of this country a burden whose size is difficult to estimate. Small business is hit the hardest, because small business is not equipped to keep the required kinds of records and submit the constant reports which are necessary.

Fourth. Price controls fool the consumer. Controls result in a deterioration of quality. They mean standing in line for scarce items, and they put a premium on knowing the right people. They force the customer into the black market.

Fifth. Price controls curtail production. In this connection the proponents of this legislation will point to the increased productive capacity of the Nation during the time of price controls. But they overlook one basic fact, namely, that this country is increasing in population at a tremendous rate, and that our productive capacity must, of necessity, increase to meet the increased demand. By reference to the charts provided, one can see that productive capacity would have increased, controls or no

controls. Controls actually do not permit the price system to exercise its proper function in connection with distributing goods and guiding production.

Sixth. The after effects of price controls are a potential danger to our economy. Price controls only cover up inflation. We might say that they only delay inflation. In the main, price controls have been a political gesture toward an evil—the evil of inflation. I need only refer to a chart which I shall subsequently submit which will show that during periods of control, when we attempted to control prices and wages only, the total personal saving based on current dollars constantly rose. This created a pent-up purchasing power which unleashed its fury on our economy as controls were released, particularly after OPA.

Seventh. The threat of emergency controls is a big danger.

It is probable that during the period under review, the anticipation of the imposition of mandatory controls raised prices at least as much as they were held down by the use of hortatory techniques and by the two controls actually imposed. (Report of the Subcommittee on General Credit Control and Debt Management, in sec. I, entitled "Fiscal and Monetary Policy Since the Outbreak in Korea," p. 14.)

"What is an emergency?" will be the question in the businessman's mind. Will each breach of international etiquette be a signal for increase in prices? When will the businessman feel it is safe, in this emergency-ridden world, to lower his prices? With the 30-day provisions written in this bill, what businessman will ever feel safe in reducing his prices for fear that such reduced prices will be his base during any approaching emergency?

It is far better to allow the free economic system that has created our great productive capacity to operate freely in times of emergency. Certainly if the benefits of this system are so great in peace and if the strength of this system is so universally obvious, we should depend on it, rather than reject it, in times of emergency.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Secretary of Commerce Weeks, in his testimony before the committee, suggested that his Department was in a position to make a continuing study of the subject of price and wage controls. It would, in my mind, be a proper thing to suggest to the Secretary that he do just this and that the study be carried on constantly, so that, should the Congress ever decide to impose price and wage controls, that body would merely ask the Secretary of Commerce for his latest studies, and from that document they would be able to formulate legislation immediately.

INFLATION

In the discussion of price and wage controls we delved into history to find what had happened before so that we might benefit in the future. In beginning this brief discussion of inflation, its causes and control, I should like to again look back into the pages of time so that in our deliberations we might benefit by what has preceded us.

War has always brought inflation. This we have learned from long experience. During every war period of our history, inflation has been a serious problem never properly met.

Mr. President, to save time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a brief outline of inflationary history during the wars, from the Revolutionary War up to the present time.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR

The Continental Congress did not have the power to levy taxes and had to finance the Revolution through such makeshifts as borrowing, gifts, appropriations by the States, and, finally, through the issuance of paper money.

The Revolutionary War brought with it an enormous increase in prices. Therefore, at the insistence of the Congress, some States tried price control. Their efforts were nullified, however, by lax enforcement and by the use of their own printing presses to grind out currency. Despite this effort at control, prices rose faster than at any time in our history. The new currency lost value so fast that people began to say, "Why, that's not worth a continental." Even today, that expression is heard occasionally. All in all, the successful outcome of the war, as one historian pointed out, "owed much to military prowess and considerably less to wisdom of economic policy."

THE WAR OF 1812

With the War of 1812 came another era of inflation. Customs duties, on which the National Government depended for most of its revenue, dropped sharply. By 1814, revenues were less than one-half of expenditures. New direct taxes were inadequate. The Government had to borrow again. The Federal debt increased almost 200 percent. Credit expansion played a greater role than it had during the Revolutionary period. Nearly all the banks, except those in New England, overextended themselves.

The sharpest price increases were in import goods, which were largely cut off by the British blockade, although prices of domestic goods also rose markedly. Between 1811 and 1814 food went up 39 percent; farm products went up 37 percent; commodities in general went up 44 percent.

THE CIVIL WAR

The American economy was broken in two parts by the Civil War, and neither escaped the effects of inflation.

Tax methods were poor and borrowing to finance the war was heavy. The outright printing of paper money, which rapidly lost in value, made matters worse. The Government hoarded gold and requisitioned goods at prices below the current market. The net result was to discourage production for war use.

The Confederacy was even worse off, for the Confederate government lacked the power to tax sufficiently. By 1864, $22 in Confederate money was worth only $1 in gold. Flour sold that year in Richmond at $300 a barrel, and shoes were worth $150 a pair. Before the end of the war, there were food riots in Richmond, Atlanta, and Mobile.

Postwar reactions were allowed to run their course unbridled. At the end of the conflict, no plans had been made for the sudden reversal of economic conditions. The situation in the South was grave, since its manpower had been greatly reduced and its whole economy upset. In the North, wholesale prices fell sharply in 1865, but the full impact of deflation was not felt until 5 years later.

Price trends in the 30 years following the Civil War were steadily downward.

The increase in the production of gold, due both to the discovery of new deposits and improved methods of refining the metal, enlarged the base for expansion of credit and resulted in the reversal of this price trend in the middle of the 1890's. Mechanical genius and enterprise pulled our country out of its fiscal plight.

WORLD WAR I

For a number of years prior to World War I, prices were fairly stable, but by 1915 a flood of war orders from abroad increased business activity. The prices rose 22 percent while wholesale prices soared 63 percent.

The United States had to find new sources of revenue to finance our war expenditures. The Congress increased old taxes and added new ones, including a tax on excess profits. This was not enough. Liberty-bond sales furnished over half the money needed, but much of the benefit from this support was nullified by the increase in credit. "Borrow and buy Liberty bonds," became a slogan.

Prices fairly leaped upward in the first month after we went to war—and the public demanded that our National Government do something to keep prices stable.

The first move came in the late summer of 1917, and by the armistice almost half the commodities were under some kind of control, although broadscale direct control was not attempted. The price level on controlled items remained stable until war's end, but that of uncontrolled commodities continued to rise. As soon as restrictions were removed, prices that had been controlled suddenly spiraled.

I have not included World War II and Korea because they are immediately fresh in our minds, and the bulk of this discussion will rest on inflation as we have lived through it in the last 10 or 11 years.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during the period from 1940 to the present time, this country has experienced a serious inflationary trend and in the attempts to curb this evil, the Federal Government has been content to bury its head, ostrichlike, in the economic sands and suggest remedies that only attack the results, not the cause. Prominent economists all over the Nation have repeatedly discussed this subject of inflation and have made pertinent suggestions as to how to control it. Leaders in Government have likewise recognized the methods that should be used to curb inflation.

When we add the advice of business people to these, it is indeed astounding to find the United States Government totally ignoring the sound recommendations offered on the subject.

Inflation is simply a situation in which we find more money than goods. It is a state of unbalance in that relationship in the favor of money.

I would like to quote from the book Money, Men, and Machines, written by Catchings and Roos:

More money can come into the hands of people in several ways, and it is well that we mention these.

1. The Government can create money by printing more of it or by bank borrowing, or the people themselves can do the same by commercial loans and investments.

2. Advances in the wage level without corresponding increases in output or offsetting decreases in unit labor costs.

3. Advances in the price level resulting from Government purchases for the purpose of raising prices.

4. From corporation and income taxes that cause higher prices as a result of higher costs.

5. Higher price levels caused by reduction in output, due to featherbedding and other labor restrictions upon work and by monopolies and general price agreements.

6. Higher price levels due to Government price controls and other Federal interferences with supply and demand and the productive machinery of competitive enterprise.

It is recognized that, as our population increases and our productivity likewise increases, there is a normal rate of inflation and this has held true, with the exception of the war periods, where it is evident by now that Government has not learned the lessons that these wars have taught.

As we go into any period of war, we begin to produce at tremendously higher levels than we produce in peacetime. The goods and hardware of war that constitute this increased productivity are not available to the general public and this production in itself limits what can be purchased by the public. During war years, income accrues to individuals in payment of services not used for the production of goods which could be purchased by the public. These income payments go to persons engaged in war production and to military and other Government personnel. In other words, war creates a vastly higher rate of income among individuals than does peacetime. This increased income has no normal outlet. This unusual purchasing power becomes deferred claims to goods in the form of currency, checking accounts and savings by individuals.

To finance war, this country has historically resorted to borrowing, and it unquestionably will have to use some amount of borrowing in any war emergency of the future. But, one of the solutions to inflation lies in this field. As I mentioned before, the Government can create inflation by either printing money or borrowing it. During the recent inflationary period, the Federal Government borrowed to an extent that made this action one of the major contributing causes of inflation. Borrowing was in the form of the sale of bonds to the people, and the borrowing of money from banks.

Instead of attempting to drain off the surplus money of the country, whether of individuals, partnerships, or corporations, the Government attempted to control this pent-up purchasing power by freezing prices, wages, and rents. At the same time, the Government practiced no economy in their own operation. Employment in the Federal service rose to an all-time high. To finance this expansion over and above the income from taxes and sales of bonds to the people, the Government turned to the banks.

The mounting Federal deficit led our price index by the nose up a correspondingly steep incline. To better illustrate this point, I have prepared a chart and 2 tables which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, with the same understanding as to the status of the chart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the chart and tables will be printed in the RECORD, subject to approval by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The tables are as follows:

Consumer prices, 1913–53, and public debt, 1910–53

Year	Consumer price index (1947–49=100)	Total gross debt [1]
		Billions
1910		$1.1
1911		1.2
1912		1.2
1913	42.3	1.2
1914	42.9	1.2
1915	43.4	1.2
1916	46.6	1.2
1917	54.8	3.0
1918	64.3	12.2
1919	74.0	25.5
1920	85.7	24.3
1921	76.4	24.0
1922	71.6	23.0
1923	72.9	22.3
1924	73.1	21.2
1925	75.0	20.5
1926	75.6	19.6
1927	74.2	18.5
1928	73.3	17.6
1929	73.3	16.9
1930	71.4	16.2
1931	65.0	16.8
1932	58.4	19.5
1933	55.3	22.5
1934	57.2	27.1
1935	58.7	28.7
1936	59.3	33.8
1937	61.4	36.4
1938	60.3	37.2
1939	59.4	40.4
1940	59.9	43.0
1941	62.9	49.0
1942	69.7	72.4
1943	74.0	136.7
1944	75.2	201.0
1945	76.9	258.7
1946	83.4	269.4
1947	95.5	258.3
1948	102.8	252.3
1949	101.8	252.8
1950	102.8	257.4
1951	111.0	255.2
1952	113.5	259.1
1953	[2] 113.9	[3] 267.5

[1] As of June 30.
[2] January.
[3] Mar. 12.

Consumer and wholesale prices, 1913–52; gross national product in constant (1951) dollars, 1910–52; and Federal cash surplus or deficit, 1910–52

Year	Consumer price index (1947–49=100)	Wholesale price index, all commodities (1947–49=100)	Gross national product	Federal cash surplus (+) or deficit (−)[1]
			Billions	*Billions*
1910			$99.2	(2)
1911			99.3	(2)
1912			108.4	(2)
1913	$42.3	$45.4	106.7	(2)
1914	42.9	44.3	105.7	(2)
1915	43.4	45.2	104.2	(2)
1916	46.6	55.6	112.0	(2)
1917	54.8	70.4	118.2	−$0.9
1918	64.3	85.3	124.2	−9.0
1919	74.0	90.1	123.9	−13.4
1920	85.7	100.3	120.1	+.3
1921	76.4	63.4	105.1	X.5
1922	71.6	62.8	121.7	+0.7
1923	72.9	65.4	137.3	+.7
1924	73.1	63.8	136.5	+1.0
1925	75.0	67.3	149.5	+.7
1926	75.6	65.0	156.6	+.9
1927	74.2	62.0	157.1	+1.2
1928	73.3	62.9	159.2	+.9
1929	73.3	61.9	167.7	+.9
1930	71.4	56.1	151.7	+.9
1931	65.0	47.4	141.4	−1.0
1932	58.4	42.1	119.7	−2.7
1933	55.3	42.8	117.7	−2.6
1934	57.2	48.7	129.6	−3.3
1935	58.7	52.0	143.8	−2.4
1936	59.3	52.5	162.3	−3.5
1937	61.4	56.1	172.1	−2.8
1938	60.3	51.1	164.7	−.1
1939	59.4	50.1	180.0	−2.9
1940	59.9	51.1	197.4	−2.7
1941	62.9	56.8	229.4	−4.8

[1] For fiscal years ending June 30. Includes trust-fund accumulations.
[2] Less than 100,000,000.

Consumer and wholesale prices, 1913–52; gross national product in constant (1951) dollars, 1910–52; and Federal cash surplus or deficit, 1910–52—Continued

Year	Consumer price index (1947–49=100)	Wholesale price index, all commodities (1947–49=100)	Gross national product	Federal cash surplus (+) or deficit (−)
			Billions	*Billions*
1942	69.7	64.2	261.2	−19.4
1943	74.0	67.0	293.7	−53.8
1944	75.2	67.6	316.0	−46.1
1945	76.9	68.8	306.8	−45.0
1946	83.4	78.7	272.0	−18.2
1947	95.5	96.4	271.1	+6.6
1948	102.8	104.4	282.9	+8.9
1949	101.8	99.2	281.6	+1.0
1950	102.8	103.1	303.5	−2.2
1951	111.0	114.8	329.2	+7.6
1952	113.5	111.6	338.4	+.1

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the eminent Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in his book Economy in the National Government, recognizes these facts when he writes:

Budgetary deficits in periods with comparatively full employment cause inflation.

Incidentally, I would recommend the book by the Senator from Illinois as one of the fine works that has been produced on the subject of the Federal budget. It deals with last year's budget, but many of the remarks and observations which the distinguished Senator makes are pertinent today.

A study of this chart will indicate the surprising relationship of the trend of the total gross debt to the consumer price index. Mr. President, if you will look at the peak of our inflation in 1920, you will notice that the national debt had peaked in 1919 and had only fallen off slightly in the following year. Prior to this time, the national debt had been climbing since 1916, and in 1916 we see a sharp increase in the price index. This increase maintains its almost constant rate of ascent with a similar rate of ascent in the gross debt.

In the period following this inflation, the gross debt continued to decline until 1930. We see a gradual increase of the national debt, starting in that year and continuing unchecked until 1946, when it reached its peak. Inflation really got underway in 1940. Inflation continued unchecked until 1948, which was the year that the budget was balanced and a surplus occurred.

I do not know whether it was coincidental, but if my memory serves me aright that was the year in which the Republicans had control of Congress.

Because this subject is of such extreme importance to the economy and security and the future of our country, I should like to say that I was disturbed, disappointed, and amazed to read that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey had given up his attempt to balance the budget this year.

As I said, Mr. President, I am a small-business man. I balance my budget. The housewives who sit in the galleries do not spend $500 a month if their husbands bring home only $350 a month. Oh, everyone would like to do it. It is a wonderful temptation. The Federal Government does it.

I do not like to see an admission by the Secretary of the Treasury that we

must give up our attempt to balance the budget. It is a simple thing to me. If we take in $69 billion, we cannot spend $78 billion. I should like to have a continuing study made of this subject. It has been adequately pointed out that inflation is tied to the amount of the national debt. If we wish to stop inflation, we must practice more economies in the Federal Government.

I am one of those who do not believe that we must give our resources away in order to maintain peace. I believe we can start living within our means in this country and achieve far greater success in the field of peace than we can by breaking the back of our economy with constant deficit spending.

In 1924 Stalin said the way to defeat the free world was to defeat its great economic power.

Mr. President, I suggest if we in Government take the position that we cannot balance the budget, Stalin is sitting behind some dark cloud, in the hell where he must live today, laughing to himself and saying, "What did I tell you? They will spend themselves into a disaster into which our strength of arms could never drive them."

I suggest we are living at a Cadillac pace on a Ford income. I think we should get down to the fundamental facts of life. If we could balance the budget in 1948, I think we can balance it in 1953, if we work on it. If we say we cannot do it, we are beaten before we start.

Mr. President, the inflation trend continued down until 1949, when the debt started to increase again, and inflation went along with it.

When the Government fails to get at the cause of inflation, which is excess money, and in turn adds to inflation by its own actions in the form of borrowing, it is like pouring gasoline on a fire. Here is briefly how Government borrowing adds to inflation.

If I save money by useful work, producing goods which others have bought, and if I lend a thousand dollars of my savings to Uncle Sam by buying a bond, there has been no increase in the Nation's money supply. Uncle Sam has a thousand dollars more. I have a thousand dollars less. But if the Government borrows a thousand dollars from a commercial bank, the money supply of the Nation has increased by that amount. The bank takes Uncle Sam's promissory note, in the form of a Government bond, and credits him with a thousand-dollar deposit against which he draws checks to pay his bills. As the debt goes up, as more bonds are sold to the banks, the money supply goes up; and it stays up, moving from hand to hand and from bank to bank, until the Government pays what it has borrowed. This creates a continuing demand for goods; and there already being a scarcity of goods because of war, prices naturally press upward.

When price controls were removed, after World War II, this pent-up purchasing power was turned loose on an economy that was slowly adjusting itself to peacetime demands.

It is well to consider here the terrific impact of Government on our economy at the present time. This impact has been growing ever since the Government started to inject itself into our economic system. The role of Government should be that of assisting in the creation of a proper atmosphere in which this system of ours works, and also as an occasional referee where laws are needed to regulate the activities of those engaged in commerce, where those activities affect each other or the general public. Government has gradually assumed a too-important place in our economic scheme of things, and it is gratifying to see this administration bent on getting Government out of that role as much as possible.

When in response to enlightened public opinion, Congress defines the purpose of managing money in the United States, recognition at last will be given to the fact that in our system of competitive enterprise, it is a function of the State to make available an adequate, but not excessive, supply of money. Then, for the first time, our monetary policies will be in line with the fundamental truth that economic life in our country is directed by the actions of 158 million people as they decide what to buy, what to produce, how much to save, and how much to invest.

With an adequate supply of money available, the younger generation will see to it that the stream of circulating funds grows larger every year. They will accomplish this with their ever-recurring, ever-increasing demand for the means to obtain ownership and control of our economic facilities, as youth takes over from old age.

Young farmers and businessmen are ready borrowers to establish themselves in agriculture, industry, trade, and commerce. Young people in the process of building and furnishing their homes, in acquiring the necessities and conveniences of life, are always eager to get the benefits today of their earnings tomorrow. At the same time, the money borrowed and used by these young people offsets the funds withdrawn from circulation and set aside for the security of old age.

The commercial banks of the United States are effectively organized and equipped for providing money when it is needed for the growth of small businesses and the development of production and distribution. There are 14,000 of these banks throughout the country. Each is an integral part of our system of competitive enterprise. In every community they offer opportunities to people of integrity, ability, and initiative who want to better themselves and get ahead in the world. (From the book Money, Men, and Machines, by Catchings and Roos.)

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks a table entitled "Inflation's Growth," which shows the effect of inflation upon one's earnings.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION'S GROWTH

Inflation and taxation have levied a heavy toll on the Nation's economy over the past few years.

For example, a single man whose net income before taxes in 1939 was $3,000 would in 1953 have to earn $7,300 to be as well off as he was 14 years before. A married man with two dependents whose net income before taxes in 1939 was $7,000 would have to earn nearly $17,000 in 1953 to be as well off.

The extent of the change in the cost of living and purchasing power of the dollar is illustrated in the second table. The consumer price index for moderate-income families in large cities jumped from 100 in 1939 to 190 late in 1952, meaning that consumer prices have risen about 90 percent in a short 14 years. This in turn means that the dollar will purchase just about half as much as it did in 1939.

1953 equivalents of 1939 net incomes[1]

1939 net income before taxes	1953 equivalent net income before taxes	
	Single person, no dependents	Married couple, 2 children
$1,000	$2,271	[2] $1,900
$1,200	2,756	[2] 2,280
$2,000	4,706	4,200
$3,000	7,338	6,649
$4,000	10,210	9,139
$5,000	13,428	11,641
$6,000	17,067	14,209
$7,000	21,427	16,981
$8,000	26,241	19,760
$9,000	31,752	22,712
$10,000	36,824	25,607
$15,000	73,061	44,384
$20,000	141,905	69,028
$25,000	229,197	96,447
$35,000	412,077	171,177
$50,000	643,878	376,308
$75,000	879,003	734,484
$100,000	1,055,228	1,005,381

[1] Net income required in 1953 for a taxpayer to be as well off after taxes and the depreciation of the dollar as in 1939.

[2] No tax either in 1939 or 1953.

SUGGESTIONS TO CONTROL INFLATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have a few suggestions to make. Certainly there are other suggestions than these, but these are a few for us to be thinking about, in connection with the problem of how to control inflation.

To bring about an approach to proper control of inflation, I would suggest that the Department of Commerce be instructed to prepare continuing studies on this subject, as earlier suggested in the case of direct controls. When an emergency that would create inflation again confronts our country, these indirect-control suggestions could be immediately put into effect, and those that require congressional action could get it quickly.

First. The first indirect control would be strict governmental economy. Available moneys should go into the direct war effort, and not into the building up of nondefense agencies. It is to be hoped that in the near future, and even this year, the budget will be balanced, and that the budget will be maintained in the state of balance.

Second. A proper tax structure that will drain off excess earnings and profits, thereby eliminating some of the dangers that we have seen in the past 10 years.

Mr. President, it is very hard, politically, to increase taxes. It is difficult for Congress to say to a man, who suddenly is earning one-third or one-fourth more than he formerly earned, that, "Because of the war and because of the source of your increased earnings, we must take part of your earnings from you, to be used for the war effort." Of course, increased taxes are necessary if the Government is to operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. We hear constant references to the underdog and the low man on the totem pole, and to soak the rich. I was in the war, and I never heard any soldier ask the fellow next to him whether he was rich or poor. Such a question was never asked of a man who was in the fighting. However, in a war we must recognize that the people at

home have to do their part, and that in some respects their part is even more difficult than the part played by the men who are sent to the front. For the people at home to play their part, they will have to be deprived of some of the niceties of life; instead of having 2 cars in every garage, perhaps there will be only 1, and perhaps it will not be possible to have as many television sets. I believe that our people must do without some of those luxuries so that the country will never be in danger of an economic collapse.

On the other hand, if we were to go through another war while following the same policies that were followed by our country in the last war, I would fear for the future of our Nation.

Third. Controls must be extended over credit in these periods of war emergency.

Fourth. If the Government is operated on a sound fiscal policy during war, it will be easier to sell Government bonds to the people, thereby borrowing directly from the source of currency and not creating new money.

Mr. President, it is not very encouraging for a man who bought a piece of merchandise, a Government bond, for which he paid $75 10 years ago, to find, when he sells it for $100, that when he goes to the store to buy merchandise with the $100, he is able to buy only $53 worth of merchandise for the $75 he invested in that bond 10 years before. That is not a very pleasant situation.

These indirect controls have been tried in part in our history, but neither Congress nor the administration has ever applied itself assiduously to the rather unpleasant task of making them strong at the right time. It was the general consensus of opinion of the witnesses who appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee that we should explore indirect controls and should apply them when they are needed, at the outset of emergencies. By doing this, it is felt that we can successfully combat inflation when inflation threatens us.

Inflation is a wicked thing. It hurts those who least can afford to be hurt, the older people on fixed pensions, pensions from either insurance programs, company programs, or Government programs. The dollar they so laboriously worked for, to invest in these programs, comes back to them today a dollar worth only about half what it was worth when they earned it.

Mr. President, I hope that in the presentation I have made this afternoon, I have given my colleagues material they can use in deciding about the merits of the proposed legislation. This matter is of extreme importance to our economic life.

I personally feel that the pending bill is not needed. I think I represent the views of thousands and thousands of small-business and big-business people in the United States, and also of thousands and thousands of consumers, who feel that the freer our economic system can be, with a minimum of governmental interference, the better off all of us will be.

CHALLENGE TO BUSINESS

In closing, Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that the businessmen of the United States today are confronted with the greatest challenge with which they have ever been faced. The Government is out of the business of control. The Government is doing what it can for the businessmen. If the businessmen do not respond by building new buildings and investing their money and extending credit, through the banks, to the people who need credit, if the businessmen do not live up to the axioms of the free-enterprise system, then perhaps next time the people will turn to the Government for the things that business should provide but has not provided; and perhaps thereafter the Government will not get out of the business of control and will not turn control back to business again, as the Government has done now.

So I urge the businessmen of the United States to accept this challenge and to show the people of the United States that the free-enterprise system can continue to be great and can continue to meet the challenge that is presented to it, and can accept its responsibilities, and can do so in a way that will mean a better, richer, and more satisfying life for all the people of the United States.

ORDER ACCORDING THE FLOOR TO SENATOR BENNETT TOMORROW

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes at 12 o'clock tomorrow the able Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] may be permitted to have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTEREST RATE ON GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a member of the present administration, the Secretary of the Treasury. He has accomplished something which, so far as I know, no other Secretary of the Treasury in the memory of living man has ever accomplished. He has succeeded in putting up the interest rate on Government bonds, and in bringing down their value on the market, and in doing both things simultaneously.

A few days ago, financial interests that had not been tipped off in advance were surprised to learn that an issue of long-term Government bonds, for 30 years' duration, was to be placed on the market at 3¼ percent, which was one-half of 1 percent above any other long-term Government bonds in existence. Many reasons were given for fixing that rate of interest so high. I think probably the columnist David Lawrence has voiced a rather generally felt viewpoint on that question. I read now from the Evening Star of yesterday, in which appears the following article by David Lawrence:

AT LAST, A LENDER'S MARKET—HIGHER INTEREST RATES FINALLY REVERSE 20-YEAR INJUSTICE TO THOSE WHO HAVE MONEY TO LEND FOR PRIVATE GAIN

The article begins:

Perhaps because the topic is a technical one, the most significant development in a quarter of a century has passed unnoticed by the general public.

Mr. President, Mr. Lawrence could not be more sadly mistaken. I think he is correct in referring to the topic of finance as being a "technical one." But when he says that the action has passed unnoticed by the general public, I submit that he has been totally unaware of the tremendous reaction which has swept across the length and breadth of this country and which will continue to roll and roar until even the obtuse Mr. Lawrence will become aware of the tremendous storm that has been set in motion. I read further from his article:

It is a fact that at last the wages of money have finally been awarded an increase.

Mr. President, he did not know it, but the wages of money had been steadily increasing for months. I recall that a few years ago, when 91-day bills of the Federal Government bearing three-eighths of 1 percent interest were offered, they were oversubscribed. In the last 6 months of 1952, 91-day bills of the Government were being issued at an average of about 1¾ percent interest. I should think that even Mr. Lawrence would be aware that an increase from three-eighths of 1 percent to 1¾ percent was not an insignificant action on the part of the Government. Further, I am sure that, had Mr. Lawrence taken the time, he could have apprised himself of the fact that only a few days ago the Government issued 91-day bills at nearly 2⅜ percent of interest. So, when he makes the statement that finally the wages of money have been awarded an increase, I believe he makes a statement that creates an erroneous impression.

Reading further from the article, I find this statement:

Most persons do not realize that money earned and saved is entitled to a decent wage.

I believe he is mistaken in that regard. I think all right-thinking people believe that money should have a decent wage. But few would agree with the next statement Mr. Lawrence made:

The fruits of labor are as important as labor itself.

Therein, Mr. President, Mr. Lawrence voices the great principle of those who agree with his political philosophy, namely, that things are as important as men and women. I believe Mr. Lawrence will have difficulty in persuading the American people to accept that philosophy, but I am grateful to him for stating it in its stark and brutal reality.

He continues in his article to discuss the action on the part of the Government which resulted in veterans' loan interest going up from 4 to 4½ percent; and interest on Government housing loans increasing from 4¼ to 4½ percent. He then says:

Immediately a hue and cry arose from some of the political folks—the radical Democrats—who saw an end coming to the flow of Government capital for socialistic enterprises—

Since he has referred to Government loans and Government housing loans in the preceding sentence, I take it he was

referring to those projects as being socialistic enterprises—

including public ownership projects that are first cousin to the state socialism of either the Fascist or Communist type.

He continues:

But the truth is the step just taken emancipates a vast number of people—the lenders or savers—from the bondage of cheap money and inflation. For when money is made cheap deliberately an artificial boom is created by the Government itself and prices of everything go sky high.

He says that as a predicate for the declaration of the principle that, by the same token, the action of government can result in the prices of everything hitting the skids and going to the bottom. Mr. President, it is rapidly becoming apparent to the American people that such a cycle has been set in motion.

I desire to read a few words from an editorial in a great business magazine, Business Week, of May 9, 1953. I read:

Events in the money market last week seem to us to be saying pretty plainly that we may be overdoing this tight-money business. The Victory 2½s, as we have mentioned, went to 92, contrasted with a high of 106½ in 1946.

Mr. President, that points to one of the sad commentaries on the amazing action by the Secretary of the Treasury. By this action of his he cost the holders of present Government bonds from fifteen to twenty billion dollars—a poor reward, I must say, for what they did in buying the bonds in order that the Government of the United States might have the money with which to fight and win World War II. In that statement, Mr. President, is told the story of the Victory 2½s—that is, the Government bonds bearing 2½ percent interest, which were issued during the war.

Further referring to the editorial in Business Week, it calls dramatic attention to the fact that under the operation of the Treasury Department, Government bonds drawing 2½ percent interest sold at a premium of 6½ points above par, and that those same bonds, by reason of the action taken by the present Secretary of the Treasury, have so declined in value that at the time this article was written they were selling at 92 cents on the dollar.

But the story has not ended, Mr. President, because I read this morning an Associated Press dispatch which stated:

Losses among the long-term Treasury obligations today extended to as much as six thirty-seconds in over-the-counter trading. The Victory Loan 2½s—

Those were the ones referred to in the editorial in Business Week—

returned to their all-time low of 91^{16}/$_{32}$ bid—a drop of four thirty-seconds from the previous day's closing.

So, Mr. President, the action of the Secretary of the Treasury is the culmination of those which have resulted in the market value of these bonds being reduced approximately $16 per $100 bond.

Reading further from the editorial:

The leading banks raised their rates for prime short-term commercial borrowers to 3¼ percent, highest in a generation, and the United States Treasury suffered the ignominy of seeing this first big refunding issue of new Humphrey 3¼s go to a discount before they had even been issued.

Mr. President, that is why I was paying tribute to the Secretary for having accomplished something that no other Secretary of the Treasury has accomplished. At no other time in the memory of living men has a long-term Government bond issued at a rate of interest from one-half to three-fourths of 1 percent higher than any other outstanding long-term Government bond sold at less than par either just before or just after being issued.

I read further:

All these facts suggest that it is time for the Federal Reserve to ease up a little bit on its tight money policy. We are glad to know the brakes work, but we do not want to go through the windshield.

Mr. President, the action of the Secretary of the Treasury in thus tightening money, starting on the long road to the restoration of hard money, has enabled him to succeed in doing many other things. In the first place, each GI who hereafter finances a home purchase will be penalized to the extent of $600 for the financing of a $9,000 home. Farmers will have to pay more interest on all new credit. Every person who buys an automobile or a truck or a household appliance on time payments will be penalized by stiffer carrying charges. Businessmen, big or little, every town, county, or State, will have to pay more interest.

Mr. President, the new Secretary of the Treasury has succeeded in making himself felt by more people in less time than has anyone who has ever held that office, and, so far, every person who has felt the impact of this action has been hurt except only those who lend money. I am sure those who lend the money are grateful to the Secretary. I would doubt that their situation, however, is one which required this friendly action, this tender treatment on his part.

I noticed a press dispatch a few days ago which stated that the banks of our country in 1952 had earned approximately 11 percent more profit, after all taxes and expenses had been paid, than in any other year in their history. I do not believe, Mr. President, that the homeowners or the farmers or others whose requirements compel them to borrow money occupy a position which justifies action that penalizes them to reward others already in the most fortunate position in which they have been in a lifetime.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would not the Senator from Oklahoma include among those hurt by this policy every holder of a bond which has been driven below par?

Mr. KERR. I stated a little while ago that the first result of the policy culminating in this act of the Secretary of the Treasury was to destroy approximately from fifteen to twenty billion dollars of the value of outstanding Government bonds; and I may say to my good friend from Tennessee that the process has just started. Unless the policy changes, the Secretary of the Treasury, in refinancing a part of the many billions of dollars which must be refinanced this year, will find himself the victim of the competitive situation which he himself has created, and will have to pay 3½ percent on the next issue of long-term bonds. It will accelerate the entire process of penalizing those holding Government bonds and those borrowing money in any capacity in which they are compelled to borrow money.

Mr. President, this action of the Secretary of the Treasury reminds me of the story of Aaron and the Golden Calf, one of the saddest events in the history of the Hebrew people, which came about in a moment of yielding to the baser impulses which at times afflicted them. In the absence of their great leader, Aaron either seduced them, or permitted himself to become a party to a situation by which they seduced themselves, by building a golden calf to worship. I should like to read into the record the 9th verse of the 32d chapter of Exodus, which tells of the reaction on the part of God to this sad tragedy brought upon themselves by His people:

And the Lord said unto Moses, I have seen this people, and, behold, it is a stiff-necked people.

That is a very dramatic and eloquent description of the subject addressed at the time, and of the one to which I now address myself. However, I should like to warn the Secretary of the Treasury what happened to those who violated the obligation of their position and the trust that had been imposed upon them, and to all those who were parties to the sad affair. I read the 19th and 20th verses:

And it came to pass, as soon as he came nigh unto the camp, that he saw the calf, and the dancing: and Moses' anger waxed hot, and he cast the tables out of his hands, and brake them beneath the mount.

And he took the calf which they had made, and burnt it in the fire, and ground it to powder, and strewed it upon the water, and made the children of Israel drink of it.

Mr. President, before this cycle of the creation of hard money, and the placing of a penalty upon every American citizen who uses it or borrows it, has run its normal course, those who are responsible for it are going to find their action burned in the fury of public indignation and ground into powder, and they, by reason of their repudiation and humiliation, will be compelled to suffer for what they have done and are doing.

Mr. President, one of the sad manifestations of this hard money, this increase in the interest rate, is being felt by every farmer who borrows money on a support loan. About the 22d of April I saw an article in the Washington Post which has in it some statements of very great interest. The headline is: "Support Loan Interest Rate Boosted to 4 Percent."

The article reads:

The Agriculture Department, in an unannounced move, has boosted interest rates on price-support loans to farmers from 3½ to 4 percent, it was disclosed yesterday.

I call attention to the language of that story.

"In an unannounced move" the Department of Agriculture had increased the interest rate which every farmer with

a basic commodity in the loan program would have to pay. I continue to read from the article:

The new rate, which will apply to Federal loans on 1953 crops, was approved March 24 at a meeting of the directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which handles the price-support program. Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson is Board Chairman.

In other words, action was taken on March 24, and it was unannounced. Not until about the 22d of April was it learned, and then evidently by reason of the fact that curious newspaper reporters, alert as to what was going on, but which had not been announced, discovered it and published it. I read further from the article:

A Department spokesman, asked why no announcement was made, replied it was considered just one of those technical details.

It was one of those little things, Mr. President, which they had thought, in an off moment, unworthy of public announcement. I declare that the action should have been announced, but that it alone cannot be designated as unworthy. I think those who took the action and declined to announce it were the ones who demonstrated unworthiness.

I continue to read from the Washington Post article:

Banks and private lending agencies, which handle 80 to 90 percent of price-support loans with Government guaranties, are expected to benefit most from the interest boost.

I believe that is an accurate statement. I have studied the situation as carefully as I could; and, so far as I have been able to determine, banks and lending agencies are the only ones which will benefit by this boost. The Government will not benefit, although it guarantees the loans. The farmer will not benefit, although he pays the interest and repays the loan. I am convinced that banks and lending agencies are the only parties to the transaction that can benefit by this forced increase in interest rate brought about by the action of the Commodity Credit Corporation, under the directorship of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the eloquent Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to my great friend, the Senator from West Virginia, for a question.

Mr. NEELY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma suppose that the banks that, as he stated a few moments ago, during the last year of the late Democratic administration, made greater profits to the extent of more than 11 percent, after the payment of taxes, will be among the ones that will profit by this action that was taken by the Secretary of Agriculture and his board, and which was deemed to be so unworthy of notice as not to be announced to the press?

Mr. KERR. I say to my great friend, the Senator from West Virginia, that this article says:

Banks and private lending agencies are expected to benefit most from the interest boost.

I have examined the article as carefully as I can, and I have reached the conclusion that banks and lending agencies are the only ones in the transaction who can possibly benefit from the action.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia for a question.

Mr. NEELY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma suppose that these very banks are the one that made 11 percent greater profits than they had ever made before?

Mr. KERR. They are, indeed, and the farmers affected are the ones who last year suffered an 11-percent decrease in their net incomes. The farmers who are thus compelled to pay a higher rate of interest are the ones who last year received the smallest percentage of the national income compared to what farmers have received in 20 years, with the sole exception of 1932. These farmers are the same ones who last year received, or were able to keep as net, the lowest percentage of their income which they had been able to keep in 15 years.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator from Oklahoma undertaking to tell the Senate that this policy will take from those who have the lowest percentage of income in 20 years and add to the income of those who last year received the largest income in the history of the country?

Mr. KERR. It will add to the income of those who last year had the largest income they had ever received in their history; that is correct.

Mr. GORE. How do the Secretary of Agriculture and the Board justify taking of this action, which was unannounced?

Mr. KERR. Ah, the article tells the answer to that question.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Tennessee will be very much interested to hear it.

Mr. KERR. I am going to read it to him. I quote further:

Lionel C. Holm, secretary of the CCC Board, said banks were pressing for the increase.

Ah, Mr. President, what a justification. What a basis for an action to take from those who in the economic scale of today are in the most disadvantageous position of any group in our economy, and coerce and compel them to pay additional tribute to those who are in the most advantageous position of any in our economy, and in the most advantageous position in which they have been in their entire history.

Does that answer the question of my great friend from Tennessee?

Mr. GORE. The Senator has answered the question; but the answer is far from satisfactory. It may be the correct answer, but it is a disturbing answer.

Mr. KERR. I concur in what the Senator has said. I am convinced that it is an accurate answer.

The secretary of the Commodity Credit Corporation Board said the banks were pressing for the increase. Mr. President, this article discloses whose voice is heard in the councils of this administration. It discloses the names of the groups who are persuasive; but at the same time it makes it crystal clear that the agricultural group is not one whose pleas are heard or whose voice is listened to.

Mr. President, since we have mentioned the Secretary of Agriculture, I should like to refer to a release of his Department dated March 6, released on Sunday, March 8, in which he discloses his total lack of realization of the realities of the situation which he discusses.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to my great friend from Oregon for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that it would be proper to characterize the Eisenhower administration, so far as its farm program is concerned, as one which has substituted for farm support the collection of tribute from farmers?

Mr. KERR. I should say that the basis exists for such a characterization. I say to my distinguished friend from Oregon that it occurs to me that the action of the Secretary of Agriculture is inconsistent not only with the published statements of the man now in the White House, but also inconsistent with any purpose which, so far as I know, he has ever declared. But I am as well aware as is the distinguished Senator from Oregon that the Secretary of Agriculture is clothed with all the power of the executive branch of this Government in the administration of laws which have been enacted by the Congress; and there is no way for the administration itself to avoid responsibility for the actions which have been taken and are being taken with such devastating effect upon the agricultural population of the country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that the President of the United States made clear in the press not so many days ago that he had turned these powers and authorities over to his Cabinet officers, with full authority to go ahead and use their judgment, and that therefore the responsibility clearly rests on the doorstep of the White House for the horrible blunders the Cabinet officers have been making, one after another, ever since the present administration came into power?

Mr. KERR. I cannot disagree with my distinguished friend from Oregon. I must say to him that the record substantiates and confirms an affirmative answer to the question he has asked.

I read from the release, as follows:

Prompt and aggressive action to check the drop in livestock prices inherited by the present administration has been taken by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. * * *

"The increase in sales volume," stated Mr. Benson, "plus the cattlemen's adoption of orderly marketing, quickly firmed up the price situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Reading further from the release:

Within 30 days after taking office we had checked the price decline that had been under way for almost 2 years.

I now yield to my distinguished friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture indicate that he has yet caught up with the most recent figures in regard to the trend as to the falling off in purchases of farm machinery, which is one of the early symptoms of an oncoming farm depression?

Mr. KERR. If he has issued a statement which demonstrates consciousness or realization of that fact, or of any of the many other factors of elemental reality in the declining economic welfare of our farm population, he has kept it a closely guarded secret.

In this statement the Secretary of Agriculture claims that within 30 days after he had taken office the price situation was quickly firmed up, and that the decline was halted and checked. Yet, Mr. President, in spite of that claim, since that date the price of cattle to the farmers of the country has declined a minimum of 30 percent as compared with what the price was at the time referred to by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that across the Nation today the feeders of cattle are so disturbed that they do not want to take a chance on buying the number of feeders usually bought at this time of the year, because they are afraid that an Eisenhower depression will put them out of business if they buy even at the reduced prices as of today?

Mr. KERR. They know that a continued decline, or even a continuation of present prices of the cattle after they are fed, or a continuation of the present prices of feed, based upon the supported market, would bankrupt them.

I am not sure that the Secretary of Agriculture knows what is going on. I would not be uncharitable to that distinguished gentleman, nor would I be unfair to him. In fairness, I must at least state the strong probability that he is totally unaware of what is going on. I think his head is hidden in the sand of economic isolation; I think the irresponsible tail feathers of his errors are waving in the breeze and that contact between the two was either never established or has been lost. I do not believe that his consciousness has been dented by receiving knowledge of any of the realities of the present moment, or any of the realities during the period he has been in office, for that matter.

I should like to read into the RECORD a little note which I received from an Oklahoma farmer. It is dated April 13. He was in Washington, and I read him the release from the Department of Agriculture dated March 6. I said, "Do you not realize that, according to the Secretary, the price decline has been checked and stabilized?"

He said, "That is odd. Buyers in Oklahoma do not know that. I will go back and check up on the situation."

He did, and he wrote me a letter. I hesitate to offer this pitiful exhibit in the Senate of the United States, because it comes from one of the finest men in Oklahoma. It is silent but immutable testimony of the inadequacy of his economic means even to provide adequate writing facilities with which to send to me a message and information of what the reality is. I read:

> Cattle prices are off 22 percent in the past 2 weeks in Oklahoma City. This is a fact. I sold some. Percentagewise cattlemen are worse off than in 1932. April 13, 1953.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. What does the Senator from Oklahoma think will be the attitude of this very fine citizen, from whose letter the Senator from Oklahoma has just quoted, when he goes to the bank and finds that one of his new experiences in the Eisenhower administration is going to be the privilege of paying higher interest rates in order to get the necessary money to carry himself over with the herd of cattle which he cannot sell because of the terrific loss he would take?

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the question of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. It will further dramatize the fact that he who produces and he who borrows are the forgotten men of this administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma think the citizen will be very much impressed with the argument of the Eisenhower administration that the privilege of paying higher interest rates will be anti-inflationary and really have an anti-inflationary effect on him, when he needs the loan in order to prevent a tremendous loss which he will suffer if he cannot buy feed for his cattle to carry him over until the fall?

Mr. KERR. I must say that he will not be favorably impressed, but I must admit to my distinguished friend from Oregon that he will at least be impressed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. He will be very unhappily and very tragically impressed by the realities of a situation which he did not any more contemplate than did the occupants of a building in the great State of Texas when a tornado hit the building yesterday. I must say to my great friend that economically the result to the average cattle producer and farmer will be just as terrible and just as devastating as was the fate of those who were in that building when the tornado struck it. I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee for a question.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from Oklahoma elucidate his description of the producer and borrower as the forgotten men of this administration? Does the Senator imply that the producer and borrower are neglected or untouched? What does he mean by forgotten?

Mr. KERR. I must say to my friend from Tennessee that I do not claim they are either neglected or untouched. They have been touched in a way they will long remember. The brand implanted by the red hot iron on the hide of a steer makes no more lasting or burning or terrible impression than the economic tragedy which is happening to these people is making on them.

I will answer my distinguished friend from Tennessee with reference to what is happening to them in the matter of an impression.

They are learning the meaning of the promise of the administration to restore the hard dollar. That was merely a high-sounding phrase a few months ago. It sounded good. They were promised that their dollar was going to be restored in value and integrity. The hard dollar was going to be brought back. What they did not realize was that in order for the dollar to be worth more, the labor and the products of the soil had to be worth less.

Mr. President, all that we need to do to restore the dollar of other days is to reduce the price of labor to 10 or 15 cents an hour, and the price of cattle to 2 or 4 cents a pound, the price of corn to 12 or 15 cents, and the price of wheat to 15 or 20 cents. That is all that is needed to be done, Mr. President, to restore the dollar to the exalted position it once held.

However, I wish to remind the Secretary of the Treasury and this administration that they did not have to reduce the price of products to these terrible low levels to protect every farmer in America.

It should be remembered that, whereas a few short years ago a farmer could make a crop with animals for power and with members of his family for labor, today he must make a crop with expensive mechanized equipment.

I say that the price of cattle at the present level will break every feeder and every cattle producer in a long enough period of time.

I wish to refer again to the words of the Department of Agriculture, because they show not only the unconsciousness of the Secretary as to present day realities, but also pronounce doom to the hopes of the farm producers for the days to come:

> All of our actions—
>
> Reports Secretary Benson—
>
> have been taken with the full advice and cooperation of the Members of the Congress, the producers, and industry.

Mr. President, I deny that statement.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in my absence—I was on the way to the Chamber—spoke about the raising of the interest rate by the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. KERR. I was waiting until my great friend from South Carolina came to the floor. I had not addressed myself to the increase in the interest rate by the Export-Import Bank, but if he wishes to ask a question on that point I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Oklahoma is aware of the fact, is he not,

that the Export-Import Bank raised its interest rates?

Mr. KERR. I am aware of the fact that on April 14, the Export-Import Bank increased its rate on the $40 million loan to Japan, on the 1952 cotton crop. I understand that the interest rate on the 15-month loan is 3½ percent. This is the first instance of the interest rate for a cotton loan being greater than 2¾ percent.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator. Is the Senator further aware of the fact that the same thing was done with reference to Spain, on the Spanish loan?

Mr. KERR. I am not familiar with that fact.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the fact. I was on my way over to the Chamber when I understood the Senator was speaking about the raise in the interest rates. Does the Senator from Oklahoma realize that Reorganization Plan No. 5 would put the Export-Import Bank practically out of business so far as finally determining loans is concerned?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Has the Senator from Oklahoma studied Reorganization Plan No. 5?

Mr. KERR. Only to a limited extent.

Mr. MAYBANK. Probably I should not ask the question of the Senator from Oklahoma. I should refer to it myself. However Reorganization Plan No. 5 denies the Export-Import Bank a vote and throws the decision into the International Bank, with which many foreigners, according to what I have been told, do not choose to do business. They want to do business with America. The Export-Import Bank was founded to aid the exports and imports of America in doing business with foreign nations. Under Reorganization Plan No. 5—and if I am incorrect about it I hope the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma will correct me tomorrow or the next day, or whenever he makes a study of the plan—will ruin the Export-Import Bank.

I speak only for myself, Mr. President, not for the policy committee of the Democratic Party, of which the Senator from Oklahoma is a member. I do not speak for the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which my distinguished friend, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is chairman. However, in my humble judgment, if Reorganization Plan No. 5 goes into effect it will hurt this country even more than the increase in interest rates to which the Senator has referred. I thought I would call that matter to the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his very pointed remarks. Referring briefly to the matter about which he asked me, which was the increase in the interest rate to a friendly foreign nation, which was buying surplus agricultural products from us, I can only say that that act is consistent with the other acts of this administration with reference to money. It was senseless, useless, and calculated only to increase the value of money, but actually it put a tariff in reverse against the exportation of surplus American cotton.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In addition to cotton, it affects the exportation of tobacco and wheat, the main commodities, for instance, that Spain wished to buy. Furthermore, under the Reorganization Plan No. 5, the industries of the United States cannot be treated in the same way an international industry may be treated.

If I may draw a parallel from my experience with banking, what is now being attempted to be done is to have certain interest rates apply domestically and also internationally. However, we can never apply domestic interest rates to international trade, as the Senator from Oklahoma, who is so familiar with international trade matters, realizes.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. I am aware of the fact that in the past we have exported half of our wheat, one-third of our cotton, and one-fourth of our tobacco. Any time that barriers are raised against or penalties are imposed upon the exportation of these surplus products, the economic welfare of every American farmer is jeopardized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The interest rate is one of the barriers, is it not?

Mr. KERR. Exactly, and that is what it was calculated to be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Along the same line as that of the question just asked by the Senator from South Carolina, does the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that the high-interest-rate tribute policy of the Eisenhower administration—whether in connection with the Export-Import Bank or in connection with the local bank from which a farmer seeks to obtain a loan in order to carry him over a few months, or whether it is the interest-rate policy reflected by the large investors in Government bonds—is but a forerunner of the possibility of a tremendous depression in the United States that will make 1932 look like prosperity?

Mr. KERR. I must say to the Senator from Oregon that it is an act calculated to bring about a condition which will inevitably be followed by recession and depression. The tightening of money brought it on in 1920, when it forced the prices of farm products down to where they sold for less than one-fifth of what they had previously sold for.

Thus, control of the price and the availability of money eventually will control the price at which every commodity we produce is sold and the wage every laborer is paid for his daily work.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for another question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma recall, among the many causes of the depression of 1932, that during the 1920's millions of Americans borrowed beyond their ability to repay, but they borrowed from a sense of economic desperation because they thought prosperity was just around the corner, as the Senator remembers was so often said in those days.

Mr. KERR. I do.

Mr. MORSE. They soon got themselves so much in debt that the bankers collected tribute from them by means of excessive interest, which was one of the major causes of the terrible economic collapse of the 1932 period.

Mr. KERR. It was, indeed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I am a little in doubt about the meaning of one of the statements the Senator from Oklahoma made; I did not quite understand what he said. If I understood him correctly, he said the increased interest rate and what is happening to the farmers today are calculated to throw this country into an economic downward spiral which ultimately will end in economic collapse. I cannot understand why this administration should want to bring about such a catastrophe.

Did I correctly understand the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KERR. I did not say the administration wished to bring that about. I said what the administration is doing is calculated to bring it about.

Furthermore, I do not think it is the purpose of the Secretary of the Treasury to bring on a recession beyond a certain point, and certainly not to the point of a depression; but it is the purpose of the Eisenhower administration to increase the value of money. It is the purpose of the administration to make money worth more, relatively, than the products of the hand or of the soil. Once those processes are set in motion, it is impossible to stop them.

Along that very line, I wish to refer to an editorial which I read in Business Week. That editorial contains a statement to the effect that—

> The great limitation of credit management is that it is a great deal easier to halt an inflation than it is to check a deflation, once started.

One great economic authority said that to try to halt a deflation is like an attempt to push on a string.

However, what the administration is doing—the enforcement of deflation—cannot result otherwise than in creating the beginning of a recession. Having set those processes in motion, they have loosed something which, unless checked soon, cannot be checked either by them or by anyone else.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield again to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Regardless of whether it is intentional or unintentional, what is the difference in the end result?

Mr. KERR. There is no difference at all. It is similar to the case of a man who was run over by a truckdriver who said he did not mean to hit him. However, the man who was run over was just as dead as if the truckdriver had meant to hit him.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at this time for a question along a different line?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I was very much interested in what the Senator from Oklahoma had to say regarding the price of steers. What has happened to the price of fluid milk in the past 30 or 60 days? Is the Senator from Oklahoma aware of an increase in the price of fluid milk to the producer?

Mr. KERR. I am not aware of the exact details of that situation, and I would be glad to have the Senator from Delaware advise me of them, if I may obtain unanimous consent to have him do so, without causing me to lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Delaware may proceed.

Mr. FREAR. The question asked by me of the Senator from Oklahoma was whether he was aware of an increase in the price of fluid milk to the producer in the past 30 to 60 days. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma is aware of the fact that the producer has not had an increase in the price of fluid milk, but has had a very severe decrease in it. I realize that of course at this season it sometimes happens that the producers of fluid milk do not receive as much for the milk as they receive for it at other seasons of the year. However, the decrease the farmer has experienced in the past 30 days is much more material in dollars and cents than it has been for many a day in a corresponding month. As a matter of fact, I think the decrease has been more than 20 percent.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Delaware. I must say that my hesitancy in answering his original question was based on my belief that at this time there has been a decrease, instead of an increase.

I wish to say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Delaware, with reference to the producers of fluid milk and the producers of cattle and the producers of every other agricultural or farm product in this country, that the producer is in somewhat the situation as that of an Oklahoman who, when he came to the inauguration last January, was going down Constitution Avenue in a taxicab, and passed the Archives Building, above the door of which is engraved "What Is Past Is Prologue."

He asked the taxicab driver what that meant. The taxicab driver was being paid fairly well for his time, and he did not wish to let the passenger go without an answer, so he said to him, "I am not right sure, but I think it is some of the high-sounding Government language which means 'You ain't seen nothin' yet' " [Laughter.]

I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from Delaware, that the producers of agricultural products in the United States "ain't seen nothin' yet," as is indicated by the amazing release to which I referred a while ago, and from which I wish to read further.

Mr. FREAR. Before the Senator does so, will he yield again to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. What the Senator from Oklahoma has just said reminds me of a statement he made a few minutes ago, when he called attention to the depressed condition of the cattle raisers. I believe he said all cattle producers are in the same predicament financially and economically. Is it true or is it not true that the cattle producer who has only a small herd is more affected than are the producers who have large herds?

Mr. KERR. It depends entirely on the type of operation. The position of the feeder of steers or of cattle which are being prepared for the grain-fed market is, of course, different from the position of the man who owns pasture, and who has what are called "she" cattle, which brings about the production of an annual calf crop, which is carried forward to a certain weight and value without the producer's having to provide anything except the grass and fodder which the mother of the calf consumes. If he owns his own land, owns his own herd of cows, and produces an annual calf crop, he is in a far better economic position than the man who buys a 1-year-old, 2-year-old, or 3-year-old steer, puts it into the feed pen and feeds it products which he has to buy in a supported market, because at this time feed is supported at 90 percent of parity, while cattle are selling at about 70 percent of parity or less. So every day the feeder operates he loses money.

Mr. FREAR. Assuming, a feeder of 100 steers, normally, as compared to one who feeds 1,000 steers, is it or is it not generally understood among cattle producers that the man who can afford to have only 100 steers on his feed lot, as contrasted to one who can afford to have 1,000 steers on his feed lot, may be the one who would go under the sooner?

Mr. KERR. Oh, undoubtedly, the fellow who produces a few cattle as his main source of income is in a position different from that of the man who has a varied interest. Actually, under our present law, an amazing situation can exist which it will take me but a moment to relate.

A man with a high personal income can buy a cow for $300, let the cow produce a calf, then let the owner sell the cow for $200, and he will clear the calf and an amount close to $100, although it cost $300 to buy the cow. That is because of the position he might have income-tax-wise. I am talking about those fellows. I am talking about the average man whose family's economic welfare is dependent upon the net income which he can produce from the raising or feeding of the limited number of cattle he can handle and produce himself.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator think the tendency would be to drive the small producer into bankruptcy, and to give an advantage to the larger producer?

Mr. KERR. It certainly would. It would drive out of business and destroy every little producer who does not have economic means from some other source.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has made a most able statement, and has explained how it is possible for one who owns cattle to circumvent certain acts which have been passed by the Congress.

Mr. KERR. I have explained how he can become the beneficiary of them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. I think the same benefit should be given to the chicken and turkey raisers. The distinguished Senator from Delaware comes from an area where fowl are raised. I have raised several hundreds of chickens and turkeys myself. If I speak inappropriately, probably the Senator from Delaware will correct me. I think the program described by the Senator from Oklahoma could be of benefit to the raisers of chickens and turkeys. The Senator from Delaware is one of my colleagues on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and he and the Senator from Oklahoma are members of the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I want to answer the question of the Senator from South Carolina first, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee. I remind the Senator from South Carolina that, either last year or the year before, the Senate passed a bill which would have given certain privileges to the producers of turkeys, but I think the provision was eliminated in a conference with Members of the House.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am fully aware of that. I am hopeful that we will have an opportunity to do something about the matter later in the present session.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to my very great friend from South Carolina that if we have to wait for that provision to be written into the law, until provisions for reduction of the national debt are enacted by the Congress, the matter may be delayed until it will not do very much good to those in whom the Senator is interested.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The exchanges of remarks by the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Delaware, and the Senator from South Carolina are very enlightening with reference to the plight of farmers, but I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the danger to our whole economy if a policy of unwise management of the debt were followed. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a few moments ago compared the danger of a tight-money policy at present with the tight-money policy of the twenties. I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that there is a vast difference. We now have a public debt of $265 billion. That is dangerous. It must be managed, and it must be managed wisely, or it will devour us. The Senator referred

earlier to the fact that the $1 billion bond issue sold below par before it was even fully offered on the market. Is the Senator aware that, even so, it was oversubscribed 5 or 6 times? That being so, there is but one explanation, namely, that the bonds went, not to permanent holders, but to speculators.

Furthermore, within the fortnight, the Treasury of the United States must refinance not $1 billion, but $5,600,000,000; and between now and December 1, the Treasury must refinance more than $27 billion. If Wall Street is to be allowed to continue to fix the rates on United States Government bonds, does not the Senator foresee a far worse catastrophe to the Nation's economy than could happen when we had a comparatively negligible public debt?

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for making that reference.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to answer the suggestion by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KERR. In one moment I will yield. I should like to say further that not only is the present situation, considering the great national debt, fraught with far more danger and cause for concern than the one referred to by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, but also at this time we are confronted with the necessity of providing from $45 billion to $50 billion annually for the defense and security of the Nation.

Mr. President, if this administration permits such a condition to develop that the economic position of our people will make it impossible for them to provide the $45 billion or $50 billion annual defense cost out of their annual earnings, in the form of taxes they can pay, not only will the economic security of our Nation be jeopardized, but its very existence will be gravely threatened.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I should like to read for the Senator's information, from the financial page of the New York Times of last Sunday, an article written by Paul Heffernan. He says:

> It is now clear that the new bond issue was fashioned by the Treasury for permanent investors but was grabbed up instead to a large extent by temporary—that is, speculative—investors.

I read another paragraph:

> The disillusioned market place was disposed last week to write off the new 3¼-percent bond as a fiasco that had been handled ineptly.

If our public debt, huge and enormous as it is, is to be handled ineptly in the future, what does the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma foresee?

Mr. KERR. There can be but one result, and that is one which will be detrimental to the economy of the United States and to its fiscal security.

I appreciate the question of the Senator from Tennessee, because it dramatizes the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury is not making the fiscal policy of the Government; the President of the United States is not making the fiscal policy of the Government——

Mr. GORE. Nor is the Congress.

Mr. KERR. Nor is the Congress making the fiscal policy of the Government. But the Secretary of the Treasury, with the President's acquiescence, is permitting Wall Street and the financial interests of the country to make our fiscal policy and fix it as they want it to be, not as it should be for the welfare and security of our country.

Mr. MORSE. And for the tribute they want to charge by the increased interest rate.

Mr. KERR. I must say that that is certainly their primary interest, as evidenced by the record in this transaction.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As the distinguished Senator will recall, I talked with him in the policy committee about this question. What has worried me and what I have been quite concerned about is the statement I read in a newspaper. I do not have it in front of me at the moment, but I read that the Treasury thinks it may have to increase the national debt to $300 billion. That subject was discussed with me when I was chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, some years ago, and I thought it would be the most unwise thing I ever heard of. I discussed it with some of the members of the committee. I do not know whether any of them are present at this time. I do not know their attitude, and I would never ask anyone's attitude. But I was entirely opposed to it. I believe in reducing taxes, but I would never vote to reduce taxes if we are going to raise the debt limit to $300 billion.

I should like to know what the Senator from Oklahoma thinks about it, whether it would be best to reduce taxes, under the circumstances, or whether it would be best not to reduce taxes.

Mr. KERR. I will answer the Senator's question, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The Senator from South Carolina is just as aware as I am that we are now governed by an administration which promised to balance the budget and to reduce taxes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe in balancing the budget.

Mr. KERR. I remind my friend from South Carolina that the law as it now exists, as passed by the last Democratic Congress, made provision for certain tax reductions to become effective, beginning——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at that point?

Mr. KERR. I promised to yield to the Senator from Indiana next.

Under existing law, on June 30, this year, the excess-profits tax expires.

On December 31, this year, personal income taxes will be reduced approximately 11 percent.

On March 31, next year, certain excise taxes will be reduced and corporate taxes will be reduced, and normal taxes from a total of 52 percent to a total of 47 percent. Certainly I would hope that further reductions may be possible. There are certain excise taxes which today, in my judgment, constitute the difference between survival and extinction for many businesses. As I see it, the problem is not whether further reductions can be effected, but whether those already provided for can be made. I am waiting, as are the American people generally, for a program which will make it possible for the American people to have the reality which was promised them—tax reduction and a balanced budget.

I want to say to my distinguished friend that I am not going to hold my breath until that happens.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I told the Senator from Indiana that I would yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wonder how long it will take to settle this matter.

Mr. KERR. I may say to my good friend from Indiana that, according to the promise which his party made to the people of this country, the solution is already long overdue. I have given up most of the hope I had that it would be made a reality today or tomorrow, and I may say further, to the Senator, that, in my judgment, it will not approach reality until there has been a change.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Along the same line, I noticed a front-page headline this afternoon to the effect that one of the leading Cabinet members of the present administration, Mr. Wilson, has now postponed to 1956 the possibility of balancing the budget. Did the Senator from Oklahoma understand, during the campaign last fall, that the Republican Party was promising the American people anything like that?

Mr. KERR. They promised them just the opposite of that, and they have been promising it repeatedly since that time. Only a few days ago the Secretary of the Treasury said he was now compelled to acknowledge that it could not be done before 1954, and by implication it would be postponed a little beyond that.

Now my distinguished friend from Alabama tells me the Secretary of Defense is quoted as saying that it cannot become a reality by fiscal 1956.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I heard the Secretary of Defense when he testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and he used this language:

> I do not believe that we should try to balance the budget in fiscal 1954.

That threw a pretty good shock into some persons, who remembered the campaign promises. I wonder how much more greatly people will be shocked when they read what the Secretary of Defense said today.

Mr. FREAR and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KERR. I yield first to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. I do not desire to detain the Senator from Oklahoma, but I should like to return to our previous

colloquy and ask him this question: Does not the Senator believe that if we push into bankruptcy the small farmer engaged in cattle raising, and likewise push into bankruptcy the small farmer who is a producer of broilers, or a producer of fluid milk, and eventually cause the large farmers to go bankrupt, and thus destroy the economic stability of agriculture, we will be approaching total economic collapse in the United States? The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] much more forcefully stated the situation to the Senator from Oklahoma than I could have done, but were we not attempting to do 2 years ago that which he suggested?

Mr. KERR. I must say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that when conditions are created or permitted to exist they begin a process or a cycle tending to bring bankruptcy to the small farmer and then to the big farmer, whether they be producers of broilers or of beef, producers of milk or of cotton, producers of tobacco or of corn, or whatever they may produce, the dawn will have arrived of the day in which national bankruptcy will be the portion by sunset, unless such untoward conditions shall be stopped and corrected.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if that could be the point to which the Secretary of Agriculture referred when he said the Department should step in to prevent undue disaster.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the Senator from Alabama asking that question, for he has reminded me that the Secretary of Agriculture has given us his policy of a minimum program to protect the American farmer against undue disaster.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I ask the Senator if he can tell us what is due disaster?

Mr. KERR. I was just about to address myself to that point. I find that farmers in Oklahoma are of the opinion that if it is to happen in their economic lifetime, the Secretary should not wait until it becomes undue disaster; he should begin to move in long before even disaster occurs, to prevent undue disaster from overtaking the farmers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Democrats must have got the finances of the country into terrible condition, if such wise men as President Eisenhower and Secretary Humphrey cannot balance the budget. Conditions must have been terrible when they took over.

Mr. KERR. Conditions were so terrible that Government bonds were selling at par or above, while today, after only a few months of the new administration, they are selling at 9 and a fraction below par.

Conditions were so terrible that 91-day bills at 1¾-percent interest were oversubscribed, but we have been brought to the day when 91-day bills drawing 2⅜-percent interest are a drug on the market.

Conditions were so terrible that when the Republican administration moved in, cattle were selling at above 90 percent of parity. Today they are selling for less than 70 percent of parity.

I say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Indiana, that in the last 5 months the price of cattle has had the most disastrous decline of any similar period in history.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I feel certain the Senator from Oklahoma has seen the estimate made by the Department of Agriculture to the effect that farm income for this year will be lower than at any time since 1941.

Mr. KERR. I have seen that estimate. I say to my great friend, the Senator from Alabama, that the net farm income is already at a 15-year low. But the most terrible feature of the picture, so far as agriculture is concerned, is indicated in the final paragraph of this amazing release of Secretary Benson, dated March 6:

> In concluding, the Secretary indicated that the pattern established in handling the meat price decline, would be followed in solving the many other problems inherited by his administration.

In other words, what the Secretary is saying to the producers of all agricultural products is that they can expect their problems to be handled in such a way as to accelerate bankruptcy, instead of avoiding or preventing it.

Mr. President, in closing these remarks with reference to the mismanagement of the fiscal affairs of the Government by the Secretary of the Treasury, and in the handling of affairs of his Department by the Secretary of Agriculture in such a way as to bring about bankruptcy to so many tens of thousands, and the threatening of it to so many others, I would remind the administration of the promises it made to the American people that the gains of the past 20 years would be guarded and kept; that agriculture need have no fear of a Republican administration, because not only would the provisions which gave them 90 percent of parity with reference to basic commodities be retained, implemented, and carried out, but also that the administration would seek to give them 100 percent of parity.

Mr. President, I say to the great man in the White House—and he is a great man, though I think he is woefully uninformed with reference to realities of the present picture—it is late; and the day will soon dawn when it will be too late to avoid a disastrous tragedy to the agricultural economy of America, unless all the authority which the Secretary now has to support the prices of products of the American farmer is used, and used in such a way as to make it an instrumentality of assistance and deliverance, rather than to use it in such a way that disaster and tragedy will be his lot.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if I may call the Senator's attention to the following statement in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal:

> At a recent secret briefing President Eisenhower held for all the State governors, some farm State chieftains complained about the high-interest rates on the grounds that farmers couldn't borrow money to buy seed for spring planting. Their contention was not so much that the interest rates were prohibitive, but simply that the Treasury policy was drying up the money supply for such credits.

Also, I wonder if the Senator is familiar with this headline, that appeared over the opening paragraph of an article I read in a newspaper only yesterday, under a Washington dateline:

> FARMERS PULL IN CREDIT BELTS
>
> The Agriculture Department said today it appears that farmers—facing prospects of lower incomes—are tightening their credit belts.

Has the Senator heard of this new policy, with reference to farmers being forced to tighten their credit belts, going without necessary financing for putting in their crops, and facing the disaster referred to by farmers throughout the country as the new Benson plan?

Mr. KERR. I have heard it referred to as the tragic development of this new administration. We are confronted with this basic fact, that last year the American farmers spent $22 billion for their purchases. Such purchasing power is one of the great elements of power moving into the lifestream of the Nation's economic body. As that purchasing power is curtailed by loss of income on the part of the farming population, the economic effects will become the source of continuing trouble and continuing sickness in the entire economic structure of the Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, there is no question in my mind that the prosperity of the Nation depends upon the prosperity of the farmer. There is no question in my mind that the Eisenhower administration will make certain that the farmers of the Nation are prosperous. My best judgment is that they will continue to be prosperous. I do not share the feeling of gloom which has been expressed by the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and other Senators on the other side of the aisle. I have confidence in President Eisenhower, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, and Secretary of Agriculture Benson. The people need have no fear, because those gentlemen and the other members of the Republican administration will accept the responsibilities of leadership. We shall maintain prosperity in this Nation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few minutes ago a statement was made—and I should like to have the Senator from Oklahoma listen to this—with reference to the fixing of interest rates. I believe the statement was that the Executive was not setting the interest rates. It was said that certainly Congress was not setting the interest rates or the credit policies of the country.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking

and Currency this question: He will recall that some time ago the question was asked Mr. Cole, the administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, whether or not interest rates on housing loans would be changed without consulting the appropriate committees of Congress, that is to say, the Banking and Currency Committees. He assured us that they would not be changed without consulting the committees.

I was not present at any committee meeting at which we were consulted. I should like to ask the chairman whether there was any consultation with him, as chairman of the committee, or with any other member of the committee, before interest rates were raised on home mortgage loans.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. Cole did consult me. He spoke to me about the subject, and I discussed it with him. If there is any blame for not taking the subject up with the committee, the blame lies with me rather than with Mr. Cole.

However, I did not feel that it was necessary for me to take it up with the committee. I saw nothing particular to do. It was decided to increase the rate, and the authorities went ahead and put the increased rate into effect. In all fairness to Mr. Cole, and in direct answer to the Senator's question, he did consult with me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly do not want to be understood as implying any criticism whatsoever of the chairman of the committee. I agree with him that it was not necessary to consult the committee, because the instant that Government bonds went up to 3¼ percent, there was no way to prevent the raising of interest rates on houses which veterans had to buy, if we expected houses to be built and sold to them. Such action became inevitable.

ADDITIONAL EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Horace A. Hildreth, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Pakistan.

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

Brig. Gen. John R. Hardin (colonel, Corps of Engineers) to be a member and president of the Mississippi River Commission.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Julius J. Hoffman, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois; and

Win G. Knoch, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

RECESS

Mr. CAPEHART. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 13, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12, 1953:

CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Adm. Arthur William Radford, United States Navy, for appointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Department of Defense.

CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY

Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Army.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grades and corps indicated:

CAPTAIN, LINE

Benjamin P. Field, Jr.	Alvin F. Richardson
James T. Smith	David L. Roscoe, Jr.
Robert S. Fahle	Robert D. King
William H. Johnsen	John W. Byng
Richard N. Antrim	Lester O. Wood
Vincent J. Meola	Joseph B. Swain
Andrew L. Young, Jr.	Richard S. Andrews
Clarence L. Gaasterland	Clifton Iverson Hylan B. Lyon
Thomas W. Hogan	Joseph D. Black
Harlan T. Johnson	Andrew J. Hill
Charles M. Howe III	Andrew J. Smith
Henry Williams, Jr.	Francis M. Peters, Jr.
Arthur A. Cumberledge	Robert F. Jones Ernest W. Longton
Wilmer E. Gallaher	Thomas B. Payne
William W. Fitts	William A. Dunn
Frederic S. Steinke	Edward J. O'Neill
Jack B. Williams	Hiram Cassedy
Ernest B. Ellsworth, Jr.	Jerry C. South Thomas C. Phifer
Ward T. Shields	Evan W. Yancey
Albert H. Wilson, Jr.	Richard W. Peterson
John R. Moore	Robert W. Cooper
William C. Hughes, Jr.	Carleton E. Mott
James D. Grant	Reginald R. McCracken
Henry R. Wier	Raymond H. Bass
Charles L. Werts	Forsyth Massey
John W. Gannon	Henry H. Hale
James I. Cone	Alvin A. Jones
Madison Hall, Jr.	Frederick J. Becton
Arnold H. Holtz	Ralph G. Gillette
Daniel A. Stuart	Francis T. Williamson
Louis J. Bellis	Robert R. Sampson
Robert E. C. Jones	Carson Hawkins
Edward L. Foster	Justin A. Miller
Joseph W. Leverton, Jr.	Rathel L. Nolan, Jr.
Marvin J. Jensen	Frederick J. Brush
Kinloch C. Walpole	Karl E. Jung
James C. Dempsey	Marshall T. Martin
Charles W. Aldrich	Michael G. O'Connor
Mann Hamm	Lawrence B. Cook
Prentis K. Will	William V. McKaig
Warren G. Corliss	Elwin L. Farrington
Thomas H. Copeman	William P. Woods
Peyton L. Wirtz	William C. Norvell
James B. Weiler	John S. McCain, Jr.
Charles T. Straub	Josef M. Gardiner
John C. Parham, Jr.	James H. Davis
James B. Vredenburgh	William K. Parsons
George DeMetropolis	Earl P. Finney, Jr.
Joseph C. Toth	Alfred L. Cope
Carlton C. Lucas	Charles M. Sugarman
Donald W. Todd	Charles J. Odend'hal, Jr.
William C. Chambliss	
Richard S. Mandelkorn	Ray M. Pitts
Floyd B. Schultz	Jack I. Bandy
Emerson E. Fawkes	Norman E. Blaisdell
Edward A. Ruckner	William T. Zink, Jr.
Charles L. Frazer	William P. Schroeder
Harold E. Baker	William B. Perkins
Odale D. Waters, Jr.	Richard H. Blair
Harry Sosnoski	Ernest M. Snowden
Alfred G. Ward	Alvin W. Slayden
Lloyd M. Mustin	Herbert J. Campbell
William W. Brown	George W. Kehl
Joseph A. Jaap	Charlton L. Murphy, Jr.
Francis J. Foley	
Edwin A. McDonald	Nicholas J. Nicholas
Edward S. Burns	Barry K. Atkins
Robbins W. Allen	Ralph M. Wilson
Frank G. Gould	Jacob C. Myers
Ronald J. Woodaman	Wallace H. Weston
Charles M. Keyes	Paul E. Emrick
William R. Miller	Robert O. Beer
Louis A. Bryan	Daniel L. Carroll, Jr.
Henry G. Munson	Earl R. Eastwold
Thomas K. Bowers	Frank M. Parker
Charles J. Palmer	William A. Thorn
Harry Hull	Allen M. Shinn
Paul W. Pfingstag	Rex B. Little
George W. Bailey	Frederic N. Howe
Sheldon W. Brown	Ralph C. Johnson
William D. Kelly	Harry G. Moore
Paul J. Burr	William L. Tagg
Walter E. Premo, Jr.	William Outerson
Frank R. Putnam	John D. Andrew
Dale R. Frakes	Robert C. Young
Raymond J. Zanzot	William A. Stuart
Robert L. Evans	Alfred R. Matter
David D. Scott	William E. Kenna
Frank H. Brumby, Jr.	Robert J. C. Maulsby
John H. Morse, Jr.	William R. Cox
David F. Kinert	Burdette E. Close
Harry L. Reiter, Jr.	Allen B. Adams, Jr.
Ernest P. Abrahamson	Richard S. Craighill
Ronald L. Wilson	Salem A. Van Every, Jr.
Richard H. Lambert	
Fred L. Ruhlman	James G. Craig
Burl L. Bailey	George R. Luker
Robert H. Weeks	William H. Groverman, Jr.
John G. Spangler	
Halford A. Knoertzer	Edwin C. Asman
Walter D. Coleman	John S. Lewis
George L. Raring	Marcus W. Williamson
William J. Dimitrijevic	George W. Pressey
Robert B. Fulton, 2d	Robert P. Walker
Roland H. Dale	Harmon T. Utter
John M. Lietwiler	Daniel C. Goodman
Frank C. Acker	Ed B. Billingsley
Howard P. Stoner	Thomas G. Warfield
Selden C. Small	Frank P. Gill
Albert A. Wellings	Lawrence W. Smythe
Joel C. Ford, Jr.	Alton E. Parker
William R. Franklin	Francis E. Nuessle
Joseph H. Kuhl	John L. Chittenden
Clayton R. Simmers	Malcolm E. Garrison
Howard R. Prince	Charles E. Phillips
Gordon W. Underwood	Charles W. Musgrave
Jacob A. Lark	Paul D. Williams
Paul H. Grouleff	Frederick Wolsieffer
Joseph C. Wylie, Jr.	Mark E. Dennett
Anthony H. Dropp	Alden C. Packard
William L. Richards	John P. Lunger
Francis D. Foley	Terrell A. Nisewaner
Scott K. Gibson	Bernard W. Freund
Paul H. Harrington	Brooks J. Harral
William I. Bull	DeWitt C. McIver, Jr.
Levering Smith	Michael B. O'Connor
Leon S. Kintberger	John W. Ramey
John R. Leeds	Norman J. Sampson
Thomas M. Fleck	Lindsey Williamson
John Munholland	John S. Fahy
Louis J. Kirn	Edmond G. Konrad
William B. Short, Jr.	Glennon G. Price
Earl T. Hydeman	Ralph A. Wilhelm
John R. Van Evera	Morgan H. Harris
Charles C. Gold	Richard D. Harwood
Stephen M. Archer	Ennis W. Taylor
Theodore H. White	Allan A. Ovrom
Richard V. Gregory	George C. Shepherd, Jr.
John M. Grider	

Thomas W. Wagner
Clare B. Smiley
Robert C. Leonard
Malcolm T. Munger
Aquilla G. Dibrell, Jr.
Robert B. Moore
John J. McCormick
Robert T. Simpson
Thomas E. Chambers
Harry W. Seely
Albert S. Major, Jr.
Samuel A. McCornock
James A. Thomas
Daniel P. Smith, Jr.
Samuel P. Moncure
James A. Flenniken
George S. James, Jr.
John P. Roach
Jack Roudebush
Everett L. Phares
Garry W. Jewett, Jr.
Albert D. Kaplan
Donald C. Brown
George P. Rice
Irwin Chase, Jr.
Kenneth P. Letts
William C. Jonson, Jr.
James M. Clement
James D. Collett
Magruder H. Tuttle
Roland E. Stieler
John D. Lamade
Thomas W. Hopkins
Arthur A. Goodhue
William H. Raymond
Charles B. Lanman
Victor B. McCrea
Lloyd H. McAlpine
William J. Widhelm
Clifford A. Johnson
Charles M. Lyons, Jr.
Otto A. Scherini
Alexander B. Coxe, Jr.
Howard E. Born
Herbert L. Jukes
Thomas P. Lowndes
Joseph A. McGoldrick
Richard O. Greene
Wallace C. Short, Jr.
Hinton A. Owens
Charles H. Smith
Lloyd W. Parrish
George R. Wilson
John D. Shea
Harry E. Townsend
Philip D. Quirk

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

Matthew J. Hantover
Dunné W. Kirby
George H. Davis
Theodore H. Armstrong
Derrick A. Hoxie
Thomas W. Bennett
Leo E. Potter
Silas A. Keim
John J. Eberhart
Robert P. Carmody
Harold J. Rickard
Evans H. Wangelin
Sheri J. Winter
John L. Flannery
Russell H. Blood
Raymond R. Callaway
Theodore R. Austin
Anton Zikmund
Martin T. Macklin
John J. Brown
Eldon C. Swanson
Robert B. Simons
William N. New
John F. McMullin

CAPTAIN, SUPPLY CORPS

Harry C. Graves
Charles L. Keithley
Walter R. Wright
Frederick A. Kinzie
Bernhard Tieslau
Francis B. Risser
Arnold J. Carlson
Frederick D. Witzel
William E. Moring
Charles M. Boundy
Thomas J. Montgomery
Thomas C. Herlihy
John C. DeWitt
Lawrence Smith
Charles H. Kretz, Jr.

CAPTAIN, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Alvo O. Martin
Roy E. Bishop

CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS

Harry E. Denen
Lewis M. Smylie
Paul A. Schnell
James J. Dempsey
Joseph L. Parker
Bernard H. Faubion
Jack H. Sault
John H. Paul
Carl A. Schlack
Benjamin W. Oesterling
Galen R. Shaver
Frank M. Kyes
Eric G. F. Pollard
Gerald L. Parke
Kenneth O. Turner
John J. Flaherty
Arthur R. Frechette
Stanley W. Brown
Lewis H. Daniel
Robert S. Snyder, Jr.
Rush L. Canon
Frank E. Jeffreys
Stephen T. Kasper
Kenneth M. Broesamle
Reimers D. Koepke
Walter W. Crowe
Ralph Bates
Richard F. Redden
William A. Smith
William M. Fowler
Edward J. Holubek
William H. Snyder

COMMANDER, LINE

Robert E. Jeffery
George W. Kittredge
Calvert B. Gill
Henry L. Vaughan
Denny P. Phillips
Joseph A. Wallace 3d
Julius F. Steuckert
James G. Egan
Martin J. Mulderrig, Jr.
William J. Hughes, Jr.
William B. Morton
Richard W. Long
Marion K. Smith
William J. Bowers
Raymond E. Moore
William J. Denholm, Jr.
Sylvan R. Bland
Alton L. Gardner
Hartsel D. Allen
Herbert C. Weart
Stanley R. Stanul
Samuel C. Walls
Joseph Garrett
Carl C. Schmuck, Jr.
Warren Weeks
Irving A. Kittel
Barton F. Jones
LaVell M. Bigelow
Clem B. Connally
Joseph A. Houston
Douglas F. Chamberlin
Robert W. Savage
John E. Tuttle
Edmund J. Newbould
Charles L. Best, Jr.
Elphege A. M. Gendreau
Ira Dye
Wilmon H. Ayer
Elbert W. Pate
Frank G. Vessell
James A. Cooper
James W. Hardy
Donald E. McCoy
Julius E. Gibbs
Robert J. Fleming
Ralph L. Werner
Charles C. Ainsworth
John F. Schrefer
Herbert R. Hein, Jr.
Norman D. Johnson
Marvin E. Barnett
Lukas V. Dachs
William L. Pack
William I. McGowan
Harold O. Hilmar
David M. Sharer, Jr.
Joseph J. Keim
William E. Weisert
John S. Hill
Thunnison H. T. Norris
Max P. Bailey, Jr.
Marshall W. Nicholson
Robert B. Clark
Radford K. Arner
Henry L. Anderton, Jr.
Edward Heck, Jr.
Harvey N. Hop
Robert P. Williams
Everleigh D. Willems
John F. Litsey
William D. Harrington
James W. Grant
Richard L. Karl
William E. Judge
William F. Heyer
Norman L. Paxton
Douglas C. Davis
David R. Flynn
Frank M. Graham
William C. Rivers
Donald G. White
Richard T. Miller
Elbert F. Durfee, Jr.
Norman I. Lee, Jr.
Fred C. Herriman
Arnold E. Aliemand, Jr.
Raymond L. Milner
Donald L. Garver
Calvin T. Durgin, Jr.
John A. Montgomery, Jr.
James F. Merritt, Jr.
William T. Roddy
William H. Chester
William E. Rouse
Arthur J. Schultz, Jr.
Nelson C. Bliven
Van Dyke Johnson
Robert L. Dahllof
Dudley S. Billett, Jr.
Harry M. Pugh
Murl A. Larkin
Benjamin P. Jacobs
Malcolm J. Bradbury
DeWitt D. Chapman, Jr.
Robert H. Rathbun
Ray C. Tylutki
Eli B. Rogers
George F. Roe, Jr.
Samuel E. Hazelett
Thomas B. Owen
Ovid C. Foote, Jr.
Harold A. Moody, Jr.
Paul P. Borden
John T. Garrow
Edward V. P. Horne
Robert O'Toole, Jr.
Stephen R. Towne
Charles K. Holzer
Theodore Hechler, Jr.
John E. Lacouture
John P. Barron
Charles A. Blocher, Jr.
Mark M. Gantar
George R. Palus
Robert C. Fletcher
Henry E. Surface
John A. Skinner
Carl E. Lundin, Jr.
Saul Katz
Frank W. Ackermann
Heinrich Heine, Jr.
Enser W. Cole, Jr.
John P. Gibbons
John W. Freeborn
Robert B. Rueger
Howard L. Smolin
Emmett W. Wood
John C. James
Thurlow G. Doyle
Richard Bacharach
Robert E. Parkas
Albert L. Dodson
Charles S. Coombs
Benjamin F. Rowe
Howard H. Hickman, Jr.
Howard A. I. Sugg
Edward A. Lane, Jr.
Gordon K. Nicodemus, Jr.
Forrest A. Pease
Frederick W. Luebke
Horace H. Epes, Jr.
Shelton R. Beacham
Paul D. Mitchell
Forrest M. Divine
Ralph A. Groom
Gale E. Krouse
John "T" Davies
Michael J. Burns, Jr.
James T. Warns
Robert M. Nelson
John W. Pickens
Walter C. Avery
Eugene N. Curtis
Daniel Flynn
George A. Gowen
Paul J. Bruneau
William P. Tyler
Royal C. Carrington
Edwin D. Ferretti
Robert M. Brown
Joseph A. Eddins
William A. Shryock
Richard J. Selman
Fred Y. Boyer
Tony F. Schneider
Charles A. Skinner
Frederick C. Wiseman
Horace R. White
Frederick W. Snyder
William Tessin
Charles N. Shane
Chester G. Hall, Jr.
Howard A. Patrick
Thomas S. S. Medford, Jr.
Bradford G. Swonetz
George R. Wells
Donald D. Chapman
Francis L. Forshee
Julian I. Schocken
Robert R. Crutchfield
John C. Borden
Frederick G. Lewis
Otis C. Ferrell, Jr.
Paul J. George
Frank T. Ratchford
William R. McClintick
David R. Fitzgerald
Noel A. Burkey, Jr.
Floyd J. Greene
William G. Thatcher
Richard B. Franklin
Lawrence J. Mack
Thomas B. Root
Claude L. Kishler
Daniel B. Elmore
Donald C. Tabb
George A. Hayes
Claude O. Lowe
Robert E. Lee, Jr.
Robert F. Milota
George P. Kurtz
Elwood C. Mildahn
Raymond A. Mazalewski
Jerry M. Barlow
Fred P. McDaniel
Jack L. Kenner
Myron T. Ebright
William E. Henry
Julius P. Damrow
Norman E. Petersen
Leonard J. Reintjes
Roger A. Wolf
August V. V. Vorndam
William H. Christensen
James E. Shew
Chester V. Zalewski
Warren C. Kiracofe
William H. Thornton, Jr.
George J. Leger
Kenneth S. Nelms
Roy G. Shults
James S. Cooper
Levern E. Forkner
George C. Cook
Eugene P. Wilkinson
Mortimer J. Prince
Albert J. Beede
Thomas E. McCormick, Jr.
Harry W. Wood
Ben W. Blee
Joseph B. McDevitt
Russell W. Cash
John F. Felter
Milton J. Morgan
Leopold R. Tilburne
Jack S. Ross
Addison S. Archie, Jr.
Howard N. Moore
Eugene Sobczyk
Ira M. King
John E. Whyte
George S. H. Sharratt, Jr.
Ashton C. Miller, Jr.
Harvey W. Hall, Jr.
Milton A. Zimmerman
Samuel H. Alexander
Albert A. Richards
Edwin S. Memel
Ralph K. Brandt
Thomas P. Smith, Jr.
Robert A. Kincaid
William W. Hargrave
Robert H. Alexander
Edmond M. Jacoby
Philip A. Murray
Paul J. Brownlow
Clarence J. Zurcher
Roy A. Norelius
John A. Mullen
Phillip T. Krell
Ralph C. Smith, Jr.
Richard A. Markham
Curtis C. Worley
Lawrence B. Caine, Jr.
Elbert H. English, Jr.
Francis X. Markey
Cecil Clark
William W. Meadors
Wayne W. Watkins
Earle Bennett
Vining A. Sherman
Edward M. Higgins
Joseph H. Rayburn, Jr.
Joseph S. Phillips
Raymond M. Harris
Harold Hutchinson
Charles L. Bardwell
James P. Drake
James W. Reed
Frank J. Reiser, Jr.
Edward G. Rifenburgh
Thomas R. Weschler
Robert L. Tully
Louis R. Burnett
Donald K. Olson
John M. Watson
Frank Grime, Jr.
Stiles M. Decker, Jr.
Arthur E. Vickery
Odin H. MacPhee
Walter J. Frazier
Douglas K. English
William A. Hudspeth
James W. Austin, Jr.
Francis V. Kenney
William M. Nicholson
Frank M. Sanger, Jr.
Francis P. Cuccias
Sherman Naymark
James W. Steidley
James P. Jamison
Victor Delano
Harold L. Graham, Jr.
Hubert P. Wirth
Clarence C. Wright
Victor A. Moitoret
Arlie G. Capps
Thomas C. Buell
Archie P. Kelley
Dante R. Marzetta
John M. Duke, Jr.
George S. Morrison
Robert L. Baughan, Jr.
Dick H. Guinn
Waldo W. Simons
Walter D. Gaddis
Charles H. Carr
William H. Rowen
Lewis E. Larson, Jr.
David H. Jackson
John R. Beardall, Jr.
Frederick W. Maxwell, Jr.
Enders P. Huey
Thomas V. Hennessey
Lionel A. Collins, Jr.
Robert M. Hill
Frank H. Price, Jr.
John R. Newland
Roderick O. Middleton
Francesco Costagliola
Jack A. La Spada
Collis O. Marshall
Stuart C. Jones
John Sweeny
Oscar D. MacMillan
Gerald M. Reeves
Burton H. Andrews
Robert C. Starkey
Malcolm W. Whitaker, Jr.
Pleas E. Greenlee, Jr.
Charles L. Fears
Charles W. Rush, Jr.
William W. Jones
George H. Nolte
Leon C. Klingaman
Russell S. Crenshaw, Jr.
John G. Messer
David M. Armstrong
Bruce T. Simonds
John M. Caster
Sheldon H. Kinney
James R. Thomson
Charles P. Trumbull
Eugene W. Krebsbach
Harry M. Simpson
Randall T. Boyd, Jr.
Edwin A. Tucker
Vincent U. Muirhead
Clarence M. Hart
William J. Maddocks
Donald F. Quigley
John E. Kirk
Joseph C. Zirkle, Jr.
Richard G. Shutt
Lloyd V. Young
John W. Palm
James P. Lynch
Richard E. Foster
Robert M. Strieter
Oscar P. Dreyer
George G. Ball

William B. Rodman 4th	Lyttleton B. Ensey
David G. Fleming	Richard G. Hill
Herbert H. Anderson	David L. Byrd
Malcolm W. Cagle	Stoughton Sterling, Jr.
Ralph B. Carlson	George E. Everly
Donald A. Reader	Damon W. Cooper
Howard H. Montgomery, Jr.	Heber J. Badger
	Roger H. Allen
Oliver S. Dwire	Melvin H. Warner
Walter P. Murphy, Jr.	Edward C. Svendsen
Donald E. Carr, Jr.	Thomas G. Burley, Jr.
Frederick C. Wyse, Jr.	Thomas B. Wolfe
Joseph E. Hokr	James A. Oliver, Jr.
Herbert E. Weyrauch	Elwin A. Parker
Quentin C. Crommelin	Grant A. Palmer, Jr.
	Maynard H. Dixon
Donald C. Kirk	Malcolm E. Wolfe
Aubrey D. Engle	Pemberton Southard
Charles W. Gunnels, Jr.	William L. Coniey
	Roland G. Bienvenu
Mark V. Montgomery, Jr.	James V. Rowney
	Pride C. Brown, Jr.
Joseph K. Taussig, Jr.	Willis H. Fisher
Ralph S. Chandler	Joseph Lynn
Joseph P. Dorrington	Robert P. Luker, Jr.
William G. Matton, Jr.	Harold G. Leahy
Percy A. Lilly, Jr.	John B. Thro
Lowell C. Savage	Lynn P. Barry
Mohl C. Norton, Jr.	Welby N. Pugin, Jr.
Alan Ray	Powell P. Vail, Jr.
Charles D. Fonvielle, Jr.	Russell F. Trudeau
	Victor A. Blandin
William C. Walsh, Jr.	Maurice F. Weisner
Kenneth M. Tebo	Ramon M. Perez
Leon Grabowsky	Edward G. Miller
Charles E. Nelson	Victor S. Mauldin
Neil A. MacKinnon	Tom B. Martin, Jr.
Gale S. Felton	Robert Halley
Joseph M. Jones	William S. Daubin
Raymond V. Welch	Paul H. Backus
William E. Lemos	Paul N. Gray
Robert E. Tugend	Richard M. Wright
Robert W. Hayler, Jr.	Franklin F. Penney
Joseph F. Zawacki, Jr.	Charles W. Smith, Jr.
Burns W. Spore	Earl A. Luehman
Arthur G. McIntyre	Asa A. Clark 3d
Geoffrey E. Carlisle	Edward R. Blair, Jr.
Benjamin C. Byrnside, Jr.	George C. Ball, Jr.
	David M. Rubel
John C. Doherty	Harold W. Calhoun
Hoke M. Sisk	Burton L. Parke
James W. Botten	John C. Bangert, Jr.
Charles G. Strum	William H. Withrow
Archie R. Fields	Kenneth Steen
Francis R. Molitor	Arnold G. Plemons
Ross B. Spencer	Paul S. Bazler, Jr.
James C. Houghton	John E. Bennett
Robert W. Windsor, Jr.	Robert D. Macklin
	John W. Newsom
George M. Hagerman	Frederick J. Ruder
George E. Brandt, Jr.	Henry J. Conger
August W. Elliott, Jr.	Joseph C. Wheeler, Jr.
Robert J. Celustka	Edward A. Taber, Jr.
William D. Owen, Jr.	John A. Camera
Charles L. Burbage	Henry M. Easterling
James H. Batcheller, Jr.	Clarence R. Deller, Jr.
	David P. Polatty, Jr.
John M. Reade	Guiseppi Macri
John B. Davenport	James M. Werth
Charles W. Styer, Jr.	Joseph E. Reedy
Milton J. Silverman	William J. Henning
Frank G. Edwards	Charles W. Lynn, Jr.
Pierre N. Charbonnet, Jr.	Robert H. Mathew, Jr.
	Edward C. Hines, Jr.
Joseph C. Spitler	Alexander H. Clark, Jr.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Quentin J. Florence	Maurice Schiff
John W. Trenton	Milton M. Small
Arthur R. Errion	Scott Whitehouse
John J. Rieder	Henry H. Meadows, Jr.
Francis J. McMahon	

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Virgil J. Harris, Jr.	James W. Parker
William F. Mims	Stephen B. Lee
Daniel R. McComish	Ronald Eicher
Kent D. Algire	Robert W. Rieseberg
John C. Hetler	Paul L. Mansell, Jr.
Bennett H. Hunter	Phillip A. Rollings
Shelby C. Leasure, Jr.	Sydney E. Cross
Richard G. Brown	Everett A. Malcolm
Junius P. Hobbs	Josiah B. Hennenberger
William D. Ellis	
William T. Rossell, Jr.	Thomas C. Watts
Hugh R. Mellon	William W. Hobgood
Joseph M. Shea	Jacob H. Kettler
Edward R. Kingman	Julian W. McClure
Millard C. Snyder	John J. Shea
Ralph L. Shepard	Stanley D. Parker
Frederick M. Mansfield	John T. Dollard
Stanley B. Freeborn, Jr.	Robert L. Clark, Jr.
	James K. Lytle, Jr.
John B. Warner, Jr.	John D. Sullivan
George C. Smith	Robert J. Gregory
Jack E. Nettles	Andrew M. McCrone
Homer C. Thiele	Marion V. Fowler
Elliott Bloxom	Oliver W. Fraser, Jr.
Louis W. LeForge	Stuart M. Ball
Charles M. Quinn, Jr.	Daniel G. Cone
John W. Hirst	John B. Paist, Jr.
Thomas C. Cain, Jr.	Wendell C. Thompson
John P. O'Leary	Stanford F. Zimet
Lloyd K. Hoffman	William A. Rapp, Jr.
Roger C. Vaughn	William H. Ross
Roland Rieve	Leon C. Covell, Jr.
William J. North	

COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Glyn Jones	Herbert W. Buckingham
Fenelon D. Hewitt, Jr.	
Sidney H. Shears	Aln R. Reed

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Ordis E. Forbess	Richard D. Pinkerton
John M. Raymond, Jr.	Waldron M. McLellon
Ingram L. Herring	Thomas P. Cocke
Thomas L. Stamp	Charles J. Merdinger
Jacob W. Updegrove	Robert E. Thomas, Jr.
Frederick A. F. Cooke	Arthur C. Neumann
Thomas E. Barnett	

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Oliver S. Levitz	Joseph R. Grysbeck
Odin F. Leberman	Francis P. Scola
Bruce H. Carney	David P. Dobson
Stanley Jakubs	Clarence Y. Murff, Jr.
Wade E. Couvillon, Jr.	James C. Reader
Paul G. Lang	Raymond J. Graves
Oscar A. Combs	Walter A. Weaver
Edward A. H. Gargiulo	John W. Pepper, Jr.
Damon E. Bernard	Herbert J. Towle, Jr.
Walter N. Gallagher	William S. Rusk
David A. Hill	Charles W. Miller
Eugene J. Kops	Robert S. Collins
Edwin J. Madden	William C. Brandon, Jr.
Walter V. Pelcyn	
Harold R. Superko	

COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Kenneth L. Knight	Francis W. Chambers, Jr.
Sidney Goren	
William W. Taylor, Jr.	Richard T. Holway

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Ralph Maher, St. Michael's Church, Silver Spring, Md., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

O God, from whom all holy desires, right counsels, and just works do proceed, give to Thy servants that peace which the world cannot give: that our hearts may be disposed to obey Thy commandments and our legislation according to Thy law, and the fear of enemies being removed, our times, by Thy protection, may be peaceful. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Mary, Queen of Peace, pray for us.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE PROS AND CONS OF TAX REDUCTION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, there are two schools of thought in the Congress on tax reduction. The one school believes that we should first determine our income by adjusting our tax rates; then balance the budget by cutting the expenditures to fit the income. The theory that activates this group is that many of our tax rates have already passed the point of diminishing returns; that the only way our tax rates can go is downward; and that the expenditures can be reduced to fit the income. This is the Reed-Mason group.

The other school believes that we should first determine our expenditures; then balance the budget by adjusting the tax rates to cover the expenditures. The theory that activates this group is that it is easier to adjust the tax rates to cover the expenditures than it is to cut the expenditures to fit the income. This is the Martin-Halleck-Allen group, the administration leaders.

Both groups insist that the budget must be balanced but disagree as to the best way to bring about a balanced budget. One group says, "We should cut the expenditures to fit the income." The other group says, "We should adjust the tax rates to cover the expenditures."

Every sensible family balances its budget by first deciding what its yearly income will be; then planning its expenditures to fit that income. Why should not Uncle Sam do the same?

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file any reports or resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AMENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 229 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to

provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve one-half hour on the rule for this side and yield one-half hour to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. This matter came to the Committee on Rules without any opposition from the Committee on Armed Services. No one has asked for any time so far as the rule is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and there is no objection to the rule. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4495, with Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is entitled to 1½ hours and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] 1½ hours.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill involves the drafting of doctors and other specialists. I would want to go on record as saying that you cannot explain this bill as being any type of justice, as it is highly discriminatory, but we happen to have a necessity for doctors, and I think everyone will agree that we must pass an extension of this legislation, which is highly discriminatory but completely necessary.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is this a correct statement: that the present situation is discriminatory with respect to quite a group of physicians and surgeons who are being called into the service? In other words, the gentleman believes that, does he not?

Mr. KILDAY. I believe that in this bill we have corrected most of those discriminatory features which existed in the prior law. I really believe that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So it is an improvement over what we had?

Mr. KILDAY. That is right, but still it is discriminatory, becaue you are drafting doctors when you are not drafting anybody else.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman on that, and I introduced legislation on this subject, H. R. 4416, that was considered by the committee, and it appears that the legislation being considered today is a sort of compromise, going a little further than I would have gone in the legislation that I proposed.

Mr. KILDAY. But the gentleman will agree that it is highly necessary?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, I do, yes.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. With reference to discrimination, any type of selective service which compels one man to serve and permits another man to stay at home of course is discriminatory.

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to my colleague from Texas that I stood on this floor and urged with all my might universal military training.

Mr. LYLE. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. Until you reach universal military training, it is bound to be discriminatory.

Mr. LYLE. That is correct, but I did want to state to the gentleman how much confidence this House has in the manner in which he approaches this legislation and presents it. It is a source of great comfort to have that type of judgment and consideration on this type of bill.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I wonder if the gentleman can give us some assurance that those doctors who are drafted will be fully utilized. The complaints that I have received is that they draft doctors and in many cases they have nothing for them to do, and they could provide more medical service by staying at home.

Mr. KILDAY. As the gentleman from Connecticut understands, we cannot administer these things.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I appreciate that.

Mr. KILDAY. But I think by constant pressure on the armed services, we have caused them to agree. It was 4.7 doctors per 1,000 in the military service. We have it down to where it is 3.5, and we have an absolute agreement with the Army that it will be 3 doctors per thousand men. Now that is the best we can do. That is the only way we can handle this thing. We do not administer these laws. We have done the best we know how.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. Will the gentleman take a few minutes and explain the changes that the proposed bill makes in the law now with reference to the drafting of doctors.

Mr. KILDAY. We have attempted to avoid those things which have been most irritable. I would prefer that the chairman of our committee handle the bill; I am only a minority member.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, because of the complexity and difficulty of this legislation I would appreciate it if Members would be both attentive and patient, and allow me to conclude my statement before interrogating me. I think that when I have finished this statement I will have answered at least nine-tenths of the questions—and there are many, I am sure, in the minds of you all.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, if there is a more complicated subject than the bill under consideration today I have never seen it.

The bill, H. R. 4495, as amended, in effect would extend until July 1, 1955, the authority to require registration and possible induction of physicians, dentists, and allied specialists. It is discriminatory legislation, and make no mistake about that. Physicians, dentists, and veterinarians are the only professional groups in the country who have been singled out for special registration and induction. While the draft age for the regular draft law is 18½ to 26, the doctors' draft law requires the registration of doctors who are under 50, and permits their induction up to the age of 51. The first question, then, that must be answered, is why do we need such a law?

Well, obviously, we must provide competent medical and dental care for members of our Armed Forces. Previous experience has proved conclusively that we would not be able to obtain the necessary medical and dental personnel without such a law. As a matter of fact, I think you all should note carefully the statement in the report which says that since September 9, 1950, only 667 physicians and 271 dentists have joined the Regular service. Contrast this with the fact that as of February 1, 1953, 9,199 Reserve physicians and 4,499 Reserve dentists were on active duty. We are not getting doctors for our Regular service, and I know of no other workable system that would provide us with the medical and dental personnel so urgently needed.

We must also bear in mind that our Armed Forces today have the finest health record of any nation in the history of the world. Our deaths from wounds are the lowest in the world. Never in the history of warfare have so few people died of wounds received in

action. This is a great tribute to the physicians and dentists who are serving our Armed Forces today. It is also a very important contributing factor to the high morale of our troops engaged in combat.

There is not any question about the fact that we must extend the authority to draft doctors. The only question that arises is who should be liable for induction and in what order should the doctors be called. We spent 1 solid week hearing testimony on this subject from persons with divergent views and we also spent 2 days in executive session writing the new amendment which is before the House today.

But first let me say something about the number of doctors that will be required in our Armed Forces for the next 2 fiscal years. When the Department of Defense first computed the number of doctors that would be required for the next 2 fiscal years they came to the conclusion that they would need 9,327 physicians as replacements. Then the Secretary of Defense issued a directive lowering the Medical Corps authorizations of the three military departments. As a result of this action the Department of Defense now concludes that it will need 7,707 physicians and 4,552 dentists. Only 2,081 physicians could be supplied through the regular draft process, that is, from those registered under the Universal Military Training and Service Act for regular induction. Only 2,122 dentists could be furnished through the regular draft process. It is obvious, therefore, that we must seek doctors from sources other than the regular draft process. That is what the bill before the House today would accomplish.

In other words, there is no solution to this problem except to extend this law.

Now back in 1950, after the outbreak of war in Korea, we passed the basic doctors' draft law. We were faced with an emergency so we acted rapidly and perhaps in some instances not wisely. But it must be remembered that at that time the war in Korea looked like a short affair, and we thought we probably could satisfy our medical and dental needs by calling only those doctors who had been educated at Government expense during World War II or who had been deferred to complete their medical or dental education during World War II. Three years later we find the war in Korea still continuing and the need for medical and dental officers as urgent as ever.

When we wrote that law in 1950 we inadvertently created some inequities which the proposed committee amendment before the House today would correct. But before I turn to that, let me briefly explain to you how the present law operates.

As I have previously stated, doctors up to the age of 50 must register, except doctors who are members of a reserve component. After registration, doctors are divided into four priorities and it is most important that you keep in mind these four priorities for they are the keystone of the entire doctors' draft law. The first priority, that is, the first to be called, are those doctors who were educated at Government expense during World War II or who were deferred to complete their education at their own expense during World War II and who subsequent to the completion of their medical or dental training served on active duty in the Armed Forces for a period of less than 90 days. Now in priority II we find the same type of doctor. That is, one who was educated at Government expense or deferred to complete his own education during World War II, but this doctor served on active duty following the completion of his training for a period of 90 days or more, but less than 21 months. Priority III consists of doctors who have had no active service whatsoever since September 16, 1940. This consists of a large number of doctors. Approximately 33,000 physicians and 15,000 dentists are in the priority III classification and it is from this group that we expect to man our medical and dental needs for the next 2 years after priority I and priority II doctors have been called.

Priority IV consists of all doctors who are not in priority I, II or III. These doctors may have had as little as 1 day of service or as much as 5 or 6 years of service and the law says that if they are called to active duty, or inducted, those with the least amount of service will be taken first.

Now while we refer to this as a "doctors' draft law," for all practical purposes it is not a draft law at all, because only 24 physicians and 18 dentists have been drafted throughout the United States. What happens is this: A doctor who is in priority I or priority II, or perhaps priority III, receives a notice that he has been classified as D–A and is available for induction. He therefore applies for a reserve commission knowing that if he does not he can be inducted, and perhaps serve as a buck private. Now in most cases these doctors go into the Army because the Navy and Air Force still have a rather substantial number of reserve officers. But at any rate the doctor who applies for a reserve commission is then ordered to active duty and he must serve on active duty for a period of 24 months. Under present law, if he had 12 months of service between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, he will be released after 17 months of service.

To assist the local board in determining who should serve and who should be deferred, there is a National Advisory Committee made up of doctors, and there are also State and local advisory committees made up of doctors so that in effect doctors themselves recommend to local boards those doctors who should serve and those who should be deferred. It is not an easy thing to decide because any dislocation of any doctor from his practice is bound to affect the doctor personally, as well as his patients.

Now I said that there were some inequities in the present law and I want to discuss these with you. We have corrected most of them in the proposed committee amendment. However, it must be frankly stated that it is exceedingly difficult—if not impossible—to write a formula that will do exact, uniform or universal justice. Probably the most glaring inequity is that which is applicable to the young doctor who was accepted for medical or dental training at Government expense while he was serving in the Armed Forces either as an enlisted man or as an officer. Existing law does not permit that service to be counted for the purposes of classifying the doctor among the four priorities. We have changed the law so that all service performed will count regardless of whether it was before or after that medical or dental training. This will take care of the situation with which many of you are familiar, where a doctor with perhaps as much as 52 months of previous service found himself back on active duty since Korea because he had medical training at Government expense and his prior service did not count. That doctor will be released not later than 90 days after the enactment of the committee amendment.

Then there is the doctor who served with a country allied with the United States during World War II and prior to September 2, 1945. The regular draft act exempts this man from induction, but the doctors' draft law as it now exists does not. We think this is an inequity and we have corrected it so that any doctor, whether he served as an American citizen with, or as a citizen of a country allied with the United States during World War II, who has since come to this country, will be able to count that service for the purposes of this law. If such a doctor is on active duty he will be released within 90 days.

Finally, there is the priority II doctor, the doctor who received a part of his education at Government expense or who was deferred during World War II to complete his education and who served on active duty following his training for less than 21 months. There were a great number of complaints about this qualifying period, particularly from doctors who served for 20 months and 29 days or doctors who served for 19 months and some from doctors who served for 18 months. To correct this inequity we have reduced the qualifying period for placement in priority IV of those doctors from 21 months to 18 months. Any doctor on active duty now who would not have been inducted or ordered to active duty had the committee amendment been in effect at the time he was ordered to active duty will be released within 90 days.

Now, I want to mention terminal leave because that question has come up time and time again in this subject. No one discharged or released after September 1, 1946, was permitted to count his terminal leave as active duty. You will recall that that was the day the Armed Forces Leave Act went into effect, the act which extended terminal-leave benefits to enlisted personnel but eliminated the counting of that leave as active duty. That was a very major decision because if we had permitted terminal leave to be taken as actual leave then there would have been millions of people throughout the country who would have been civilians for all practical purposes but who would have been members of the Armed Forces for purposes of discipline, hospitalization, and all the other myriad details that arise among people on active duty. If an enlisted man or officer on terminal leave had been required to

consider that leave as active duty, and had gotten into trouble, he would have been subject to military discipline. If he had been hit by an automobile he would have been entitled to enter a service hospital and then his terminal leave would have stopped and he would have been back on active duty and again he would accrue additional terminal leave.

If we had permitted doctors to count their terminal leave as active duty, we would be discriminating against thousands of other reservists who are now on active duty and that would have been most unfair. And if we permit terminal leave to be counted for all persons on active duty, we will again be creating all of the problems that the Armed Forces Leave Act so carefully eliminated. So, I hope that no effort will be made to include terminal leave as active duty in this bill. By reducing the qualifying period from 21 to 18 months for placement in priority IV of many present priority II doctors, we have in effect solved the terminal-leave problem for that group. That, in our opinion, is the best solution.

There is one other complaint that requires special attention by the House. Under the doctors' draft law all doctors up to the age of 51 are liable for service. This is true in spite of the fact that there are literally thousands of doctors in the United States without any previous military service. Many of the doctors who served in our Armed Forces during World War II are concerned because it is possible that we might reach the priority IV veterans unless some protection is provided in the law. In other words, the veteran doctors want some kind of assurance that they will not be called. The committee amendment provides that protection by specifying that any person who served on active duty for 21 months or more after September 16, 1940, may not be inducted or ordered to active duty under the doctors' draft law. I think this is one of the most important provisions of the committee amendment because it is this provision which will compel the services to look for their replacements among the priority III doctors. This provision puts the armed services on notice that they cannot take veterans with 21 months of service and must seek their replacements from doctors without prior service.

You all have copies of the committee report in front of you. It is lengthy, but I think comprehensive. It explains in detail how the present law operates, the number of doctors within each priority, and what the committee amendment seeks to do. So I will only attempt to summarize what the committee amendment does. But, in summarizing, I think you will see where we have corrected many of the inequities that exist under the present law.

Now, as I have previously stated, but I wish to emphasize again, the most important provision in the bill prevents the induction or order to active duty under the doctors' draft law of any doctor who completed 21 months or more of active duty since September 16, 1940. This includes all forms of active duty except certain types of service which are specifically excluded in the proposed law. This protects the enlisted man who had service prior to his being accepted for medical training. It protects the man who served in the armed forces of a country allied with the United States during World War II. Above all, it protects the veteran doctor who might otherwise be liable for call in spite of the fact that we have thousands of doctors who have had no service at all in the Armed Forces.

Secondly, the committee amendment provides that any person who had 12 months or more of active service after September 16, 1940, but prior to his recall or order to active duty under the doctors' draft law, will be released or discharged after 17 months of active service. In fact, we even go further and say that persons who accepted commissions under the doctors' draft law will have those commissions terminated when they have completed their obligated service. This has a twofold effect: First, it protects the doctor who has had to accept an indefinite commission, by removing the sword of Damocles that hangs over his head by his acceptance of that commission following his release to inactive duty. Secondly, this automatic termination of a commission for the doctor who is commissioned as a result of the operation of the doctors' draft law protects the great bulk of other Reserve officers who have had to earn their promotions through selection and length of service. Under the doctors' draft law, as amended by the committee, all doctors must be given commissions commensurate with their age, ability, and experience. This is only proper, but at the same time it would not be proper for these doctors to continue to hold these Reserve commissions and thereby possibly preclude the promotion of other Reserve officers below them who are not doctors.

Now the committee amendment also permits doctors who are members of Reserve components and not required to register, to submit their resignations after they have completed their obligated period of service since September 9, 1950. We have done this because Army and Air Force doctors who heretofore have had 5-year commissions will have or have had an opportunity to accept or reject an indefinite commission under the Armed Forces Reserve Act. We have given the same right in the proposed law to Navy Reserve doctors who have been or may be recalled to active duty since September 9, 1950.

Now, the proposed committee amendment also permits the commissioning of aliens which has heretofore not been possible because of certain restricting laws. Since it was unfair to induct an alien physician and only pay him a private's pay, Selective Service has not been inducting aliens, but with this law they will be able to commission alien doctors and they will promptly proceed to order them up for induction, allow them to apply for Reserve commissions, and then the services will order them to active duty.

Remember, the bill also permits service in the Armed Forces prior to obtaining a medical or dental education to be counted as active duty. Heretofore that service has not been counted. And as I have also stated, the committee amendment also reduces the qualifying period from 21 to 18 months for doctors who received their education at Government expense or were deferred during World War II to complete their medical or dental education. This will permit the transfer of many priority II doctors to priority IV and likewise will permit the release to inactive duty of some priority II doctors who would not have been ordered to active duty had the committee amendment been in effect at the time they were ordered to active duty.

Now, another very important provision of the bill which must be noted carefully is that part of the bill which permits the call to active duty of doctors who accept or have Reserve commissions. Heretofore doctors have been ordered to active duty under section 21 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, but this law expires on July 1, 1953. Thus, it is absolutely essential that we give the armed service authority to order to active duty these doctors who apply for Reserve commissions or else they would have to be inducted and thus would lose the $100 bonus now paid to such doctors. In addition, if such doctors applied for Reserve commissions and asked for active duty, they could change their minds and cancel their request and the service would be in the embarrassing position of having Reserve officers who could not be inducted or ordered to active duty unless we give them authority to order these Reserve doctors to active duty involuntarily.

The committee amendment also clarifies and expands the present law dealing with the advisory functions of the advisory committees. We realize the importance of maintaining medical and dental college faculties and we also realize the importance of physicians and dentists engaged in essential laboratory and clinical research, and we want to make it clear that consideration should be given to the deferment of certain of these people, at least until adequate replacements can be obtained.

Finally, the proposed committee amendment requires that all reserve doctors be given a grade or rank commensurate with their age, experience, and ability. Heretofore the law has given this privilege only to reserve doctors not required to register who had service during World War II.

There are other provisions in the bill, such as that dealing with conscientious objectors and the right of physicians and dentists to volunteer for active duty as reservists, but I think I have covered most of the significant features. Perhaps I should mention that the bill also extends the life of certain Army and Air Force reserve commissions, for persons holding 5-year commissions, who are ordered to active duty whose commissions might expire shortly after they are on active duty. This, of course, is necessary in order to treat everyone on a fair basis.

Before I conclude, let me give you a few examples of what the committee amendment does, using specific cases. Let us say that a priority II doctor who was educated at Government expense during World War II is now on active duty. Following the completion of his

education he was commissioned and served 20 months on active duty, then he was released. He has since been recalled and has served for 7 or 8 months. What happens to that doctor? Well, he must be released within 90 days after this law is enacted. And since after his release he will have completed more than 21 months of active duty he cannot be inducted or ordered to active duty under the doctors' draft law.

Now, let us take a doctor who served as an enlisted man for 18 months prior to being accepted for the Army specialized training program. Following his training he went on active duty for a period of 11 months and then was released to inactive duty. He has since been recalled as a priority I doctor and has served for 10 months on active duty. Since under the committee amendment he had over 21 months of combined service prior to September 9, 1950, he would be released to inactive duty within 90 days and since his total service exceeds 21 months, he cannot thereafter be inducted or ordered to active duty under the doctors' draft law.

Now let us take an American citizen who served with the Canadian Army during World War II. He returned to this country and went to medical school at his own expense and has since been graduated. Because his service in the Canadian Army did not count, he is a priority III doctor about to be ordered to active duty or inducted. Since under the committee amendment his service with the Canadian Army will count, he thus will be placed in priority IV, and if he had more than 21 months of service in the Canadian Army, he cannot be inducted or ordered to active duty under the doctors' draft law.

Take a veteran doctor who served for 20 months during World War II and is in priority IV. Where does he stand? Well, since he had only 20 months of active duty he is in priority IV and can be inducted or ordered to active duty upon applying for a commission but only after all priority III's otherwise qualified have been called. But, since he had over 12 months of service prior to September 9, 1950, he can be called for only 17 months.

Now, let us take a priority I doctor with only 2 months of active duty served after his medical education had been completed, who has since been recalled to active duty. Since he did not have 12 months of previous service prior to September 9, 1950, he will be required to serve 24 months, but upon the completion of that 24 months of service his commission will be terminated unless he was also required to register under the regular draft law, which imposed a total obligation of 6 or 8 years, depending upon the date he was inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces.

Then, let us look at the doctor who had no service whatsoever in World War II and is now in priority III. What will happen to him? Well, the answer to that is relatively simple. Unless he is deferred as being essential, he will soon find himself on active duty for a period of 24 months.

Finally, let me say one word about physical standards for inducting or commissioning doctors. They are the lowest in our history—if we make them any lower—we will pay for it in disability retired pay for many years to come.

Mr. Chairman, this has not been an easy bill to write. As a matter of fact, I think I can say without fear of contradiction that it is one of the most complicated pieces of legislation I have ever encountered. It is discriminatory beyond all doubt, but we have tried to make it as equitable as possible. Not everyone will like what we have done, but I can say sincerely that we have tried our very best to present a bill to this House which spreads the obligation to the greatest extent possible, removes existing inequities, and at the same time permits the Armed Forces to have the medical and dental personnel required. No matter what we presented to this House, there would be some who would find fault. We realized that when we began the hearings, but I think we have done the very best possible job. I hope that you will accept this bill. Believe me when I say that if there is a fairer way of doing this, it was never presented to the committee.

I urge all Members of the House to support this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4495, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 5134.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AMEND UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4495, with Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such additional time as I may require to answer questions.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Alien physicians who will go into the Armed Forces, I presume, will become citizens of the United States.

Mr. SHORT. Not necessarily. There is no guaranty of citizenship.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thought that under previous provisions adopted in the House aliens serving in the Armed Forces automatically became citizens of the United States.

Mr. SHORT. No.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. At the present time every State has a so-called selective board for doctors, physicians and dentists. Will that board still be operative and will the board still say whether Doctor X in Town A is essential to the community or will the armed services say "that makes no difference; we will take him anyway?"

Mr. SHORT. The local boards will continue to function as they do now, but they will act on the recommendations given by the local or the State advisory board. There is a local board, there is a State advisory board and there is a national advisory board. In the hearings I pointed out that under the provision some particular doctor might vent his wrath or spleen on a strong competitor. It opens the door to possible abuses, but the local draft boards have taken pretty good care in most instances, and they will be the ones to decide.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the local boards have the final say or be overruled by someone at the national level?

Mr. SHORT. No; they have the final say. Well, I should not say "final say" but the experience we have had with our draft boards is that when you appeal from the local board to the State board, they usually affirm the decision of the local board, and 9 times out of 10 the national board does the same.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. NEAL. There will be no change whatsoever in the general advisory board at the State level?

Mr. SHORT. No.

Mr. NEAL. Their powers will be just the same under this act as they have been heretofore?

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why did the committee accept the age of 51 as a maximum for drafting? Is not that rather high?

Mr. SHORT. No. The preponderance of evidence was that it was too

high, that after a man passes the age of 45 or 46 he does not have much business with combat troops anywhere.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said, Does not the gentleman think that age is high?

Mr. SHORT. I am inclined to think so, myself, but the American Medical Association registered no protest. We all know there are many doctors between the ages of 45 and 50 that are in good physical condition. They can serve in hospitals in this country and back of the lines, some even in combat areas.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the committee have a breakdown of the doctors available between the ages of 45 and 51 who would be subject to the provisions of this law?

Mr. SHORT. Yes. The number of physicians in priority 3 is 33,000, and about 15,000 dentists. Of those physicians born in 1907, at the present time there are 1,926; of those born in 1908, 1,909; of those born in 1909, 1,761; of those born in 1910, 1,721; of those born in 1911, 1,548; of those born in 1912, 1,429; and of those born in 1913, 1,289. You see this is a pretty close average for those years between 45 and 50 years of age. I think the chief reason we included those physicians is because they have never had any kind of military service.

Mr. McCORMACK. A lot of those physicians have developed very important practices. Probably most of them have. The life of a doctor is entirely different from the life of almost any other professional man. It is more than taking a man into the service, there is involved the effect upon a community, particularly where the doctor is a general practitioner.

Mr. SHORT. A doctor within that age bracket could be deferred if the advisory committee considers him essential.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, but the burden is pretty hard to establish a case, and oftentimes personalities enter into those things.

Mr. SHORT. I think we will all admit that it is a pretty cruel thing to take a doctor between the ages of 45 and 50 who has established a good practice and is serving many patients in his community, but does not the gentleman feel that if that doctor has had no military service at all it would be much worse to take a younger doctor who has had 3 or 4 years of combat service, who has been called back a second time after he has returned from the wars, whether he was in Europe or Asia or Korea, who has married and has a wife and maybe 1 or 2 children, who has bought expensive medical equipment, and who has purchased a home and has a mortgage on it? It certainly is unfair to the veteran doctor to recall him and let this other, older doctor who has never had any service at all go scot-free.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Missouri very frankly stated and reiterated that this is a discriminatory piece of legislation.

Mr. SHORT. It is.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that when you give comparisons they are not comparisons in the normal journey of life. You have to apply the statement of my friend, and I agree with him, that it is discriminatory, but it is based on necessity.

Mr. SHORT. It is based on necessity.

Mr. McCORMACK. I recognize that. I think the gentleman from Missouri made a very able argument. He frankly stated the difficulty. I think his was one of the fairest presentations I have ever heard.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. He frankly stated it was discriminatory, and then based it purely on the ground of necessity. But my particular inquiry is with reference to the fact that when you have a doctor 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, or 51 years of age, in terms of usefulness to the community and in the development of his practice, he might be as old as a person 75 years of age in some other profession.

Mr. SHORT. I would like to point out for the record here that 25.3 percent of the doctors in priority III are between 40 and 45 years of age. There are 8,000 doctors between 40 and 45 years of age. There are over 10,000 doctors between 45 and 50 years of age. There is such a large number of men in that age bracket that if we do not take some of them, then you are going to have to dip down and take these younger doctors and veterans.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. The total number you have here in priority IV amounts to 51,735. Of the ones born in 1900, you have only 13. So you are only getting 13 physicians in this 51-year-age group, if you draft them all. In the 1901 class you have 856. In the 1902 class you have 1,116, and so on down the line. I have the complete chart here, and I shall ask permission to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. SHORT. I think it would be very appropriate if the gentleman would insert that in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My inquiry, of course, is not made with any hostility to the bill because I recognize and join with the gentleman in his frank expression regarding the situation. I was trying to read the gentleman's mind. As I see it, he is basing it purely on the ground of necessity in the light of the present emergency. But, I was inquiring particularly about the doctors between the ages of 45 and 51, and if I may make a further inquiry for the record, may I state, of course we all recognize that doctors of that age, not taking into consideration of course physical disability and the fact that the man may have a family because everyone may have that problem whether they are over or under 45 years of age, but there is a question involved of building up of a practice and the burden of many responsibilities. Is it the intention of the committee that the Medical Advisory Board and the draft board and any others who pass upon the question should view applications for deferment of men between 45 and 51 with close attention and broad considerations in mind?

Mr. SHORT. I think I can fairly answer that by saying, yes. We did not particularly stress or emphasize the point, but we took it more or less for granted that these boards and commissions would exercise discretion in considering these older men.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the gentleman's statement to the committee, he said that credit for service in the Armed Forces, whether as a commissioned doctor or as an enlisted man would receive priority for men being discharged who had had the 21 or 24 months of service. My question is whether the gentleman has any figures to indicate how many men may be discharged if this bill becomes a law as a result of that amendment.

Mr. SHORT. It is very hard to give an exact number, but there will be a considerable number who will be discharged under the provisions of this; and those who would not have been subject to induction or recall had the committee amendment been in effect would be discharged within 90 days after enactment of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In other words, they would be discharged.

Mr. SHORT. It gives relief to a large number.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I believe the gentleman stated that those who had not been inducted or who did not have service during World War II would be immediately inducted, or the draft board would soon call upon them. I wonder if this bill gives any consideration to those doctors who were deferred in the various communities, at the request of the communities, when the individual doctors may have wanted to have gone into the military service.

Mr. SHORT. I should think that is still a matter for the advisory committee to recommend. We cannot legislate that because conditions change a great deal in different communities over a period of time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If a man served as a buck private in World War I or World War II, and later on got his medical training and is called back under this law, how long will he have to serve? Suppose he served 12 months prior.

Mr. SHORT. He will have to serve 17 months if he had previously served more than 12 months.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So the maximum service is 24 months, altogether?

Mr. SHORT. A maximum 24 months; but if he had served a year since September 16, 1940, then he will have to serve only 17 months. His period of service is cut down by 7 months.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. In this bill I think you have corrected some of the inequities that have existed since the passage of

the last bill. My purpose in rising at this point in the discussion is to say this: I am sure the chairman has already had it brought to his attention, as I have in the past around Government service hospitals, that there can be no question about the fact that the armed services have been using entirely too many doctors as administrators and clerks, doing clerical work in the offices of these hospitals. Some of them have been entirely removed from practice. I think a proper administration of the hospitals could be handled by others than physicians.

Mr. SHORT. I want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina no one could agree with him more wholeheartedly than the gentleman from Missouri, because I witnessed the waste of doctor manpower in World War II. It was shameful, disgraceful, and inexcusable in many instances, but I am happy to report I think we have corrected most of those evils, and have also reduced the number of doctors per thousand, appreciably. We have cut it down to not 4 to the 1,000 but 3.5 to the 1,000, and we soon hope to have it cut down to 3.2 per thousand.

Mr. BARDEN. I am sure the gentleman has given attention to that, and a reduction from 5 to 3.2 per thousand is a step in the right direction. Of course, 3.2 per thousand in combat areas is certainly not too many. There must not be a shortage in combat areas and I doubt very much if 3 or even 5 at times are enough in a combat area. But I say this, and I put this in the RECORD for the purpose of calling to the attention of those who allocate these doctors, the fact that they must be mindful of the fact that in most areas of this country one doctor has to look after from three to five or six thousand population. It is a tremendous burden. If we further increase that, one doctor will be looking after five, six, or seven, or eight thousand people, none of them in the best physical condition, but includes the old, the infirm, the crippled, and the children, and all sorts of people. So when they are drawing these doctors from the areas, I think they should show a little better judgment than they have shown in some instances in the past in taking a doctor from a community serving seven or eight or ten thousand people and putting him in a hospital where there are 5 doctors serving 1,000 selected human beings who are in the best possible physical condition. We, of course, are short of doctors, the Armed Forces should be made to realize this and forced to govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. SHORT. When I went before the Rules Committee asking for a rule on this particular bill, I pointed out the fact that in World War II in my home county of Stone in the Ozarks in southern Missouri we had one poor old broken-down doctor serving a total population of 12,000 people in that community. At the same time you had doctors punching typewriters and doing menial tasks in the hospitals of this country. It infuriated me. But I am happy to say that our Secretary of Defense has already forced them to cut down the number per thousand.

Mr. BARDEN. I hope they will read our remarks and construe them as representative of the feeling of the membership of this House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to pursue my inquiry a little further. Assuming that a man has served for 18 months and then taken his medical education either by paying for it himself or being helped by the Government, how much longer will he have to serve if he is called back into service or drafted?

Mr. SHORT. Had he served 18 months before he took his medical or dental training?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not understand that makes any difference.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, yes; under present law it does, but under the committee bill it does not. He gets credit for previous service under our amendment; he is given credit for all service of any kind.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. All right, how much longer will he have to serve if he is drafted, having previously served 18 months?

Mr. SHORT. Under existing law he is in priority II. Under our bill he would be transferred to priority IV, and for all practical purposes he would be entirely safe.

Mr. RIVERS. Provided he is called. He goes into priority IV.

Mr. SHORT. Under present law if he has served more than 90 days and less than 21 months he would be subject to recall, but under the committee amendment he is given credit for the 18 months of service; he would go into category 4. If already recalled, he would be discharged in not to exceed 90 days after this bill is enacted.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then he would not have to serve 17 months?

Mr. SHORT. No. If he is recalled into active service he gets credit for the 18 months previously served.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In other words, if he is called back to active duty under this bill he would not have to serve 17 months.

Mr. SHORT. He would be in a category subject to recall for 17 months, but they are not going to recall him from priority IV until they have exhausted priority III.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 58 minutes. Under the rules of the House the gentleman cannot proceed for more than 1 hour without unanimous consent.

Mr. SHORT. I think that is an excellent rule.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri this question. Most of us have been bothered and concerned about various small communities which have only one doctor. He has been recalled to service and the community is left without a doctor, although they have tried diligently to get a replacement but have been unable to do so. What happens under this new proposal?

Mr. SHORT. It is up to the advisory committee and the local board. I just mentioned the hardship we suffered in my home county during World War II. It is a matter you cannot legislate.

Mr. SCHENCK. Are you going to leave communities without medical attention?

Mr. SHORT. I hope not; I hope not. But I do not know whether an atomic bomb is going to fall on my town or your town, whether the gentleman or I is going to be struck by lightning before we leave this Chamber; I cannot answer this question.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 59 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, there really is not much left to discuss after the very clear explanation of this bill by our very able chairman; his clarity of presentation leaves very little for the rest of us to add as committee members. But I would like to mention very briefly some of the high spots to which I will address myself.

I want you to get in your minds what the priorities are. There are four priorities. The first priority is for the man who has served because of the ASTP or the V–12 program from 1 to 90 days, where he has had part of his education paid for or whether he has been deferred and paid for it himself. That is priority I.

Priority II is that same man with 90 days or over up to 21 months. Under our bill we cut that 21 months to 18 months.

Priority III is another category and involves one who has not served any time since 1940. There are 33,000 physicians and 15,000-plus dentists composing this group.

Priority IV is that group which has served possibly 1 day or has served possibly 21 months. That 1 day, or whatever it may be because of some physical disability usually is in priority IV.

What have we done about those groups? Under this bill we say that priority II—90 days to 21 months—has been cut down to 18 months. If you have had 90 days up to 18 months service you would be called for 17 months if you have served a year. If you have served less than a year you will serve 24 months. But if you have served 18 months and you are now in priority II, you are picked up from priority II, if you have served 18 months, and put over into priority IV, and then you can only be called after priority III have been exhausted in your community. We could not say "all over the United States" because if anyone living in a community happened to be in priority III, that would be an existing situation, of course you would have a legal question there, so we say if you are in priority IV of our bill you will not be called until priority III has been used and dissipated in your community. And there are 33,000 physicians and 15,000 dentists in that category.

There is another high spot in this proposed legislation. We did not go like the Defense Department wanted. We did not agree with them and we did not write it according to their likes. We say that if

you have served 21 months you are free. You have served your time in your generation, you are free and you cannot be called unless you are otherwise obligated by contract unless the Congress of the United States, and we are in constant session, calls you. In addition to that, if you have served 21 months since 1940 regardless, you have served your time. If you are now on active duty and you have served 18 months you will be released in 90 days, if you desire. Of course, if you want to stay on that comes under the heading of your own business. But you can be released in 90 days.

We think this is a very fair piece of legislation. I have one little clarifying amendment I shall propose—I think the committee will accept it—cutting the 18 months to 17 months and making it consistent across the board in keeping with the statement of the Secretary of Defense who has reappraised his total overall strength. But this bill in total form presents a clear, clean-cut piece of legislation, and, as the chairman has said in his usual fine way, there is an emergency. We are drafting doctors because there is an emergency. We have drafted other boys. We have invaded the homes, the factories, the apartment houses, the private houses, we have invaded everywhere to send young men to Korea.

We feel we owe a responsibility to them and to their families that medical care be made available.

Hence the reason for this legislation, Mr. Chairman. We are living under unusual conditions and we face unusual circumstances.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand it is still left to the State advisory board to determine a man's eligibility to be drafted into the service; that is, as to the need for this particular doctor?

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman mean essentiality in the community?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. That is left to the advisory board.

Mr. JENSEN. All right. Now I have a case in my district where a dentist a few years ago received a shot gun wound in his hip. He has to have a certain chair in which to sit in order to do his dental work. He is in very bad physical condition. Now they have called that man into the service.

Mr. RIVERS. He has been called?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. He has been called, and he is asking to be released.

Mr. RIVERS. Has the State advisory group made any sort of recommendation on it?

Mr. JENSEN. Apparently they have.

Mr. RIVERS. What was it?

Mr. JENSEN. That he could work in the Army in a device of this nature as well as he could work in his own office.

Mr. RIVERS. I want my chairman to check me. I think he is available, but it is a matter for the local and State advisory groups. Is that right?

Mr. SHORT. That is right. They use the usual yardstick or the measure that if a man is well enough to render valuable service to his patients in an office he could render that same type or kind of service, perhaps in a limited or circumscribed way or capacity, to men in some branch of the service.

Mr. RIVERS. But the authority does vest in the local board. They could have deferred him.

Mr. SHORT. The thing I pointed out in my statement is that while we urge that the physical standard should be lowered in order to have a wider distribution of service among all our people, we should exercise great care and caution in lowering the standards to the point where we will be called upon to pay large pensions for years and years to come.

Mr. JENSEN. I am afraid that is what is going to happen in the case of this man, because you take him away from his home and family and children; you take him away and he is very apt to become a charge on the Federal Government.

Mr. SHORT. And after his death his family will draw more money than he himself will draw when he is alive.

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely.

Mr. SHORT. There is no question about that, but I do not know, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, how in the world we are going to control or regulate that by legislation. I just do not know how we can regulate it.

Mr. JENSEN. I am concerned like everybody else. I have a number of small towns in which there is only one doctor, and they are calling that doctor into the service. There are some neighboring towns with 10, 20, and 35 doctors and they are only calling one. I do not understand the fairness in that.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to say this in conclusion. There is not much left in the discussion of this bill. The Chairman has, in my opinion, made a splendid presentation with his usual clarity. I also want to impress on the committee that we did not take this legislation lightly. We were in constant session for in excess of an entire week, and in executive session we spent two days in reporting and writing this bill. We hope it will meet with your approval and commend it to you most highly.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, whatever I say in explanation of the bill I think would be rather superfluous, because our chairman has explained it in great detail. As he has stated, it is a very complicated measure and one that cannot be explained very easily. The best recommendation I can give the Members of the House is to get a copy of the hearings and read them. The hearings were extensive, held over a period I believe, of 7 days, and then we had 3 or 4 days in executive session in considering this measure. So we have put a good deal of time in trying to write what is a piece of fair legislation.

I know every Member of this House desires that the men in the service today shall receive the highest type of medical service, and that they do. There is no soldier in the world who receives the same type of medical care as our soldiers do.

There is some complaint as to the number of physicians we use in regard to the number of soldiers, that is, about 3 per 1,000 men. That is one thing this committee of yours has hammered on for the past 15 years. I was a member of the subcommittee that wrote the allied medical bill. We wrote that bill primarily to put into this field of medical operations in the services all of the skills, so that we would be able to relieve the physician and not have him do bookkeeping. It does not make sense to have a physician today in a hospital in the country, in the services, or anywhere else, keeping books, because we all know what is demanded of the medical services today in our home communities.

We did not, of course, relish the idea of passing a Doctors' Draft Act in the beginning. I did not. My profession is in that field. So we have been forced into it for the simple reason that there is not enough medical skill in this country to go around.

The requirements of the next 2 years under this bill are estimated to be 9,327 doctors. That is what we are going to have to take out of the civilian services and put into this service under this measure.

A question was raised a while ago by the gentleman from Ohio, I believe, in regard to whether or not we were going to take from the communities all of the medical services. It certainly is not the intention of the committee to do that, and there is no reason to do it, because we have made the same provision we did in the draft legislation; we left it in the hands of the local doctors to make the recommendations as to who should go. That prevails. It prevails here in Washington. It prevails at the State level. How many doctors have been deferred under this request? In this first priority of physicians the draft board here in Washington has deferred 969 physicians for that purpose in the United States and Territories. In the second priority we have deferred 530. In the third priority we have deferred 4,206. So that the deferments have been fairly large on the basis of the number inducted.

I think the local communities have handled the thing exceptionally well. There was a movement on to move this thing to the Federal level. Your committee opposed it, because it did not make sense to me as a member of that committee to move everything with the authority here in Washington, as they always want to do it. But you did see fit not to do it, and it is so in the measure, and it will not be done. If it is done, I believe the committee will correct it.

How many young physicians are coming into the service? That is another thing, of course, that is important in this whole legislation. The medical schools will graduate this year, 1953, something over 6,000. Under the present draft law, there would be subject to the draft 1,494 doctors and our requirements being more than 4,500 doctors per year for the different branches of the service—Army, Navy, and Air Force—it makes it necessary that we reenact the Doctors' Draft Act. So, gentlemen, it is just as simple as that. You have to go out and draft these people from civilian life, if you want your soldiers to have medical service. That is why we have to pass this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into the question of priorities because that has been explained to you pretty well as to just what the priority system is. I think it has worked fairly well. There have been some discrepancies and some discriminations, especially where a boy was in the service and then later studied medicine under the GI bill. Some of them had as much as 5 years service. Then, we turn around and draft them. It just does not make sense. That man is a soldier and he should be credited with his service just the same whether he was a GI or a doctor in World War II. The committee has corrected that, and that will not happen again.

The primary responsibility, as I said before, still rests in the hands of the local committee. I think Members of the House can feel pretty confident it will be pretty well taken care of. I have had complaints just as all of you have received. They get scared that their doctors are going to be taken. In the end, it has usually worked out pretty fair when the local committee has seen fit to defer a man that he may carry on his medical profession in the local community.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the very clear exposition of the terms of this bill by the able chairman of the committee and the gentlemen on the other side. Unhappily, no amount of sugar coating of the pill can alter the essential fact that this bill creates a special class of peons in the United States, and to that degree repeals the Emancipation Proclamation. The doctor class, if this bill becomes law, as I am afraid it must, will become for all purposes a special slave class in the United States subject to call at any time up to the age of 51 regardless of the cost to themselves and regardless of what may happen to anybody else. Now, I should be the last one to say that we do not have to do everything necessary to protect the health and welfare of the young men we call up to serve in our Armed Forces. It well may be that this bill is necessary. But the fact that it is necessary need not preclude us from considering, in fact, makes it even more necessary for us to consider, the conditions that make this necessary and that bring this bill to the floor of this House where we are forced to do something so at variance with all American tradition, when we are forced to take a class in the community and point the finger of government at the members of that class and say, "You are marked apart for calling into the public service regardless of what is may mean to you, your family, your patients, or your position in life at any time that it suits government." If that is not tyranny, if that is not peonage, if that is not slavery, I would like to know what it is. How did we get that way? How did we get there? We got there because we are attempting to maintain on an active footing military forces far beyond our manpower capacity. We are living beyond our means on manpower. That is why we are here today, and not because there are not enough doctors in the country, but because we are drafting and maintaining in uniform more men than the population of this country can reasonably sustain over a period of time. Eight hundred thousand valid young men become of age each year who are available for military service. I believe that is the number. Yet we are planning to maintain and are now maintaining over 3,400,000. That is over 4 times 800,000. But the draft calls for only 24 months. Now, if you are going to maintain 3,200,000, why is this bill not going to be followed in the next year or two by a necessary extension of the draft term to 3 years or 4 years? Let us stop and think about that. That is the issue that is before us today. That is the issue that this committee ought to consider. The only argument we are getting is the age-old argument of "necessity." Certainly it is a necessity right now, but why is it necessary? Should we not consider ways and means of dealing with it? The source of the necessity is carrying too large Armed Forces. We should consider the possibility in the very near future of reducing very substantially the Armed Force in active service. When we do that it may no longer be necessary to deal with special classes, like doctors, today, perhaps scientific men tomorrow, and ultimately an extension of the draft period.

Emergency—oh, yes, we talk about an emergency. How long must an emergency last before it merges into normalcy? The truth of the matter is we are living in normal times. Everybody says so, from the President down. We may be in the same international situation for years to come. Are we going to continue to maintain an active force of over 3,200,000 while 50,000,000 Germans do not carry a sword, while other Europeans do not draft for foreign service? Are we going to continue as a garrison state, or are we going to reconsider our military commitments in the light of our own limitations?

I am considering offering an amendment to raise the issue at the end of this bill to limit the effectiveness of this act to 1 year, unless by the end of that year there has been a substantial reduction in the total number of uniformed personnel on active service. Mr. Chairman, that is the only way we are going to get down to a sound basis upon which we can carry this burden indefinitely. If we do not reconsider this problem, we will be called upon for a 4-year draft term before long.

I wonder if the Armed Forces Committee, in its wisdom, has really exhausted all possibilities of inducing this relatively small number of highly trained professional men to volunteer for service. It would be far cheaper in the long run for the people of the United States, to find means to induce doctors beyond the age of 26 to volunteer rather than to risk our essential liberties by this kind of action.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. The committee has done what it could. I will have the gentleman understand we have made available $100 a month extra in an effort to get doctors. We have tried everything under high heaven, and we had no doctors when we found ourselves in Korea.

Mr. COUDERT. I am not talking about money alone.

Mr. RIVERS. You can call it anything you please, but we did not have the doctors.

Mr. COUDERT. I am talking about doctors who are over 26. As to the younger men, they should be subjected to the same burdensome requirements as the younger men are who are drafted as privates or anything else. The older doctors should be given every inducement, in order to avoid forcing us into the position of imposing involuntary servitude upon a class. How many doctors do you think we will get in the future if at the age of 45 they are going to be ripped out of their homes, away from their families and practices, and forced to give up their offices and serve 2 years in the Armed Forces and come back and find their places taken? Oh, no, Mr. Chairman, the doctor business is going to be at a discount after a few years of this kind of business.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is making an excellent statement. I wonder if the gentleman touched on the contribution that other nations are making to the medical staff over in Korea?

Mr. COUDERT. That I am not now discussing. I expect that this bill will have to be passed because there is no present alternative. But I do hope the members of this distinguished committee will consider the whole question of overall manpower so that we will not have to continue this indefinitely, and that we will not have to become a garrison state with a 3- or 4-year term of duty in the Armed Forces and professional men and specialists subject to call at any time up to age 51, even in times short of war.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment. After all, there is no easy way to draft men into the Army; there is no easy way to take a man away from his home and his loved ones to go out and serve his country in the Armed Forces. On the other hand, this is a difficult task to do.

I speak here today as a member for many years of the American Dental Association. I know that the patriotism of the dentists and the doctors of this country is not on the auction block, and they are in favor of this bill as the best possible type of legislation that can be had at this time under all the circumstances, and they recognize that an emergency does exist and that the dentists and doctors are called on to face the emergency and that they are called on to go into the Armed Services of this beloved America just like the young men who are called to arms to fight in the front lines.

In the case of a doctor 50 years old or more, this will do his family more

good than it will the doctor himself; it will cost the Government more money to take a man 50 years old or more; but when an emergency arises, it must be met, and I tell you it will be met. You may talk about the pittance of payments, and that is true. But there is no way to pay a man for patriotic service in this country, and I think the doctors of this Nation, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, would resent their services and patriotism being placed on an auction block in any quarter of this country. Certainly you have to pay the doctors to go in the Army and serve their country, and they should be paid in proportion to the service they render.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the dentists and doctors of the United States of America are in favor of this bill; and when the time comes to enact a more favorable measure, and if an emergency does not exist, then we will come to the Congress with confidence that they will take care of us, and we will look to Congress with the same confidence that the people look to the doctors in this crisis.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute merely to corroborate what the gentleman from Louisiana has said. We all know that this is a bitter pill. We do not like the legislation. I can truthfully tell the Members of this House that the witnesses who appeared before us, both doctors and dentists belonging to various organizations stated that the legislation is essential, that it is necessary; and I am pleased and highly gratified at the number of letters I have received from doctors since our committee reported this bill. Many of them from those who previously had opposed the legislation now congratulate us for the fine job we have done.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, there is no easy solution for the problem before us; there is no simplification of it. I think that has been brought out very eloquently by the chairman and the members of the Armed Services Committee who have preceded me. It was particularly stressed by the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. LONG, a member of the dental profession.

If you will read the hearings, as has been suggested, you will find that this was stated better than I can state it by General Hershey. He warned us to look to the mass of this problem that confronts us and not at the fringe; that if we look at the fringe we can become so confused in trying to reconcile irreconcilable differences that we get nowhere. If we look at the mass, the substance, of the problem, it is immediately apparent to all of us that this legislation is necessary.

What is the mass, the substance, of this problem? The mass, the substance, is an adequate medical service for the men in the armed services, particularly those men who are fighting in Korea. That is the problem we are here to solve. Surely there are inequities in it, certainly it is not in keeping with the American tradition; no one can defend it, but, again, let us keep our eyes on the mass of the problem.

The question has been raised as to whether the law should be extended to July 1, 1955, as recommended by the committee or continued for 1 year. Should we temporize or act forthrightly and with decision. I urge that we do not accept any amendment to the termination date.

Let me point out to you—you will find it on page 550 of the printed hearings—the testimony that came in through General Armstrong, Surgeon General of the Army and the spokesman for the Department of Defense and his staff. They presented a graph showing that for the next 3 years we would be at the bottom of the curve as far as available doctors are concerned. Many of the young men graduating from medical college today saw service during World War II. Many used their GI training to help them through medical or dental school. This puts them in a category where they cannot be drafted or cannot be brought into the service. As time goes on the preponderance of graduates will be young men who saw no military service, who have not fulfilled their obligation. They will be available to come into the service.

In 1952 only 1,549 graduate doctors were in the classification where they had had no military service. They are the people who we can expect to fulfill their military obligation. By 1953 2,289 people in this group will graduate from college and by 1955 over 5,059 of them will be available. So that as we begin to catch up and pass the group of new medical students who have had prior military service, therefore are exempt from service, we will begin to lessen the present tension and necessity for this type of legislation. By 1955, unless some intervening emergency takes place, the necessity for this type of legislation will have completely passed.

I do not know that I can add to anything that has been said, but, again, I want to ask you to look beyond the fringe. There is not a case that you can cite that we have not had a parallel case laid before us or have not come in contact with as individual Members of Congress. There is no other solution that we can devise. Look to the mass of the problem—the necessity for adequate medical service for men fighting for this country's preservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, being a member of the House Armed Services Committee, from which this very important bill, H. R. 4495, emanated after a week's hearings and consideration, and, by reason of the sponsorship of this bill, Mr. SHORT, of Missouri, the distinguished chairman of said committee, I choose to make a few remarks. And, because I am also a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, I believe it is important for me to call your attention to certain experiences had by me over in Korea and the Far East a few months ago when I was there officially for Congress. It should be clear as crystal to all of us by this time, that certain world conditions presently exist over which we, as American people, have neither absolute control nor dictation. These conditions concern our very national existence as a free people.

A few minutes ago a distinguished Member from New York, Mr. COUDERT announced he intended to submit an amendment to reduce the period of the effective date of H. R. 4495 to only 1 year. And, while I have great respect for his reasoning and brilliancy, I now state that such amendment, if adopted, would, in its normal result, be entirely inconsistent with the safety of the health conditions of the members of our own American military.

Has not the President of our United States made it perfectly clear that, based upon his own personal knowledge and expert information furnished him, we, as a nation, must tighten our belts to hold ourselves in a safe and sound condition against the military aggression of a totalitarian thinking and planning nation, under present policy?

Does not the budgetary proposals by our President for our national defense against aggressive totalitarian communism make it fully clear that he, as our Commander in Chief, and his advisers, believe we must plan on far more than 1 more year of stresses and strains?

In fact, the committee report accompanying this H. R. 4495, on page 17 thereof, states:

> Extension of the induction authority is considered to be the only means by which the replacement needs of the Armed Forces for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians can be met during fiscal years 1954 and 1955. Since the beginning of the Korean incident, and as a result of the consequent expansion in the size of the Armed Forces and of their participation in combat activities, the number of medical, dental, and veterinary personnel on active service has been increased substantially. * * * Therefore since it must be assumed for planning purposes that there will be no material reduction in the size of the Armed Forces before the end of fiscal year 1955, there will be a continuing need for medical, dental, and veterinary officers to replace those officers similarly qualified who will complete their periods of active service before that time.

Also in the same report explaining this bill before you on page 18 thereof we find the following significant statement and table:

> It is estimated that replacement needs for medical, dental, and veterinary officers during years 1954 and 1955 will be as follows:
>
> Medical officers, fiscal year 1954, 4,500; fiscal year 1955, 7,000.
>
> Dental officers, fiscal year 1954, 1,554; fiscal year 1955, 3,755.
>
> Veterinary officers, fiscal year 1954, 139; fiscal year 1955, 194.

Because we are in the sort of a world we are, it appears essential to me, that all of our legislation dealing with the military, including the necessity of doctors and dentists, optometrists, osteopaths, nurses, medical schools, hospitals, and related subjects, should be considered and enacted by us with the thought ever present in our deliberations, that our Commander in Chief and the best

experts and advisers he has, have made it clear this very week that there is not to be a 1-year term of national stress and national defense in military matters.

Therefore, this doctors' draft should be for the extended term stated in the bill; to wit, until July 1, 1955.

And now, just a few words about one experience I had in Korea, Japan, the Philippines and the Far East as it relates to this presently considered legislation. Because I am also a Member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, I naturally was interested while over there, in what information and factual answers I could acquire from the field of considered opinion and knowledge by those who knew much of the relationship, if any, there was between the military aggression of the Communists in South Korea and the subversive activities and propaganda of the Communists in the United States. I must say, that the many GI's I asked this question of over there, all answered that in their judgment it was one and the same aggression; it was one and the same conspiratorial program. And then, when I asked certain other official persons from our own Nation and certain other foreign nations substantially the same question, they also replied 100 percent, that in their judgment, it was one and the same international conspiracy of the Communists to take over the freedom-loving peoples and governments of the world and place them under the Marxist Communist totalitarian dictatorship.

Mr. Chairman, assuming, therefore, that these authorities who are in a position to know, have grounds for their conclusions; I cannot but this day believe, that this doctors' draft bill should be enacted as submitted. And, that while it is admittedly discriminatory; it is nevertheless absolutely necessary at this period in our own national security. I shall not object to the worthy amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] should he submit the proposition to reduce the term from 18 months to 17 months.

And when the same gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] suggested that we should offer the doctors and dentists of our great Nation enough money and pay in dollars, to get their services in the Armed Forces, I immediately responded to that suggestion, by the distinguished gentleman with a feeling of regret and vigorous repugnance against his plan. I am not willing to believe that the doctors and dentists of our Nation are any less patriotic than are those who happen to be gaining livelihood in any other segment of our professions. God forbid that the time has come when we have to buy and purchase necessary protection for the injuries and sicknesses and even the lives of men in the uniform of the United States of America by paying bonuses or exorbitant fees to those who are the only ones who can furnish this expert medical protection to those who are offering, and in thousands of cases actually giving, their life for our national security and defense. That time has not and will not arrive, I pray.

I say with pride that as is always the case, the Armed Services Committee has considered this important legislation with utmost sincerity and thoroughness as will be evidenced by the fact that we received testimony from the following organizations and individuals, all of whom were concerned directly or indirectly with this doctors' draft law.

Listen to the names of those. Department of Defense witnesses: Director of Selective Service, the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, American Veterinary Medical Association, Reserve Officers Association, Medical Veterans Society, Massachusetts Medical Society, Mennonite Central Committee, Physicians Veterans Society of Denver, Colo., National Dental Veterans, American Drug Manufacturers Association, National Service Board for Religious Objectors, Minneapolis Physicians Veterans Society, American Osteopathic Association, Friends Committee on National Legislation, and individuals who presented their personal views on this important subject. With the exception of the witnesses who have historically been opposed to conscription of any type, all witnesses indicated that there was justification for extending the present law.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has been in the Far East. Can the gentleman tell me what contribution other nations are making to the military medical force in Korea?

Mr. DOYLE. I do not happen to be personally acquainted with what the actual answer may be to that, but I know the gentleman who has just asked me that question was part and parcel of a congressional tour to New York City this last Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, and I know the gentleman was present when the distinguished American Ambassador to the United Nations, former United States Senator Lodge, was asked the question as to the contribution of the other nations to the armed forces in Korea and also the contribution of the United States to the United Nations organization, and I am sure the gentleman will not contradict me when I say that the American Ambassador to the United Nations made it very clear that the Koreans in Korea and certain other nations in Korea were doing a mighty good job of taking their part of the battle-front responsibility.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows that the South Koreans are not members of the United Nations.

Mr. DOYLE. I am saying to the gentleman that the distinguished American Ambassador said—I heard him say it, and so did the gentleman—that nevertheless the Korean forces in South Korea now had 12 divisions in the front fighting line. Whether they are members of the United Nations or not, they are apparently doing their part.

Mr. GROSS. That is no contribution on the part of the United Nations. I am asking what the other nations of the United Nations are contributing to the medical forces in Korea today.

Mr. DOYLE. I do not know. If the gentleman knows, I would like to have him give us that information.

Mr. GROSS. Did you not develop any information on that in your hearings before the committee on this bill?

Mr. DOYLE. At least, I was not present and heard no such information.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. We have been assured that the other nations take care of their own medical services. They furnish ambulances and everything else. The South Koreans have even done that. They have furnished all the doctors that were available in South Korea. Certainly, we did some of that work.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, insofar as that contribution is concerned, but if they are limited to the forces they have in Korea, that is less than 10 percent of the United Nations forces in Korea.

Mr. DURHAM. I am not familiar with the figures as to that. I do not imagine they have 10 percent of the medical services to begin with that we have in this country.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the distinguished veteran from my native State of California.

Mr. HOLT. The other countries such as the Danish, the Dutch, and India already have teams there. The percentages of the medical teams they have there are not controlled by the number of troops they have there.

Mr. GROSS. No, that is right. They are not.

Mr. HOLT. They have a great many medical troops there. They are doing a good job in Korea.

Mr. DOYLE. I thank the gentleman. I know he personally served in the United States forces in Korea.

I believe that the doctors and dentists, osteopaths and optometrists, and all the related medical and health services will do their fullest duty, possessing a sense of patriotic devotion to their highest responsibilities as American citizens.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of hearing all of the witnesses who have been before the committee on this legislation. In my opinion, this legislation is necessary.

There have been things said today which call for comment on the question of the willingness of doctor to serve. I think nothing could be clearer to us on the committee than the fact that doctors are very willing to serve.

Their organizations were well represented before the committee. In each of the hearings they presented their ideas; and most of their ideas were embodied in this legislation.

It seems to me that they have been very fairly treated. True, this law is a discriminatory law, as is any draft law. But, I would like to point out that despite the fact that this law is in a sense discriminatory, nevertheless, the doctors have been fairly treated in a very real

sense. In the first place, they are given commissions. People who have commensurate education in other fields of endeavor, such as lawyers, are not automatically offered commissions. As a matter of fact, most of them do not obtain commissions. In the platoon in which I served as an enlisted man, I think there were about 4 lawyers out of a total of 20 men. Some of them were very able, and financially well fixed. They were serving as privates. That does not happen with the doctors. They come in with a commissioned rank. In addition to that, they are given an extra $100 a month, which is not available for ordinary persons who are drafted, even those with comparable education. In addition to that on pages 9 and 10 of this bill, you will find a provision that allows, under proper regulation, the appointment, reappointment or promotion at such grade and rank as may be commensurate with professional or educational experience or ability in this particular profession. So it seems to me, they have been very fairly treated. Certainly if any draft law is fair, this is a fair draft law, in my opinion. It discriminates against some people, it is true, but the discriminations have been minimized as much as possible. When comparison is made with the situation of the average person who is drafted for service in the Armed Forces, I think doctors have done very well under this law.

Something has been said here about a needed reduction in the number of doctors for the number of people in the armed services. I certainly would agree that something along this line must be done, and I will also add that it is being done. Very definitely within the last few months, the Department of Defense has been able to reduce the percentage quota of doctors in the armed services. Of course, none of us want to see any reduction take place in the front ranks. It is not taking place in the front ranks. It is taking place in the installations back in this country.

A possible way to reduce the number of doctors in the Armed Forces would be to have a broader system of contract arrangements with civilian doctors. I would like to see that explored more fully by the Department of Defense. Another way of reducing the need for doctors in the armed services would be the establishing of plans of health insurance, particularly for the dependents of people who are in the armed services. Many of us who ask young people of our country to serve our country wish to see that their dependents are adequately taken care of. At the present time, it is a sort of hit-or-miss arrangement. I think it can be improved upon. I think perhaps either the contract arrangement of which I have spoken or the insurance method might be the way we can achieve a decreased requirement in the number of doctors in uniform.

Before I close, I should like to say I think the remarks made by the gentleman from New York with regard to the necessity for calling young men into the service should be weighed in connection with the request which the Armed Services Committee has made for a universal military training bill. I think we should have universal military training legislation. I think the fact that we are having difficulty now in getting young men to come into the service in the way we would like to have them come in, and in the most economical way to come in from the standpoint of manpower and the finances of this country, indicates that we should, as soon as possible, have an adequate UMT bill.

The bill before us today for drafting doctors is a fair bill which has been thoroughly studied. I hope the House will pass it unanimously.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I believe we all agree that basically this legislation may appeal to us as somewhat discriminatory. But, I think it is born and bred out of a condition over which we really have little if any control; it is unfortunate that doctors should be the victims in this unforeseen situation. Since we are confronted with that situation, we ought to make the legislation in behalf of the doctors just as liberal as we possibly can with reference to time, with reference to promotion, and with reference to every other convenience that we can confer upon them. The very nature of this bill creates a hardship upon these professional men.

It is too bad that we have to meet this contingency as it is placed before us today, but in the interest of our national defense and the best interest of our soldiers, we must have doctors.

What I regret about this situation is that by trying to fulfill one very pressing need we curtail another. The drafting of doctors has a great tendency to discourage young men to go to medical schools and study to be doctors. At the same time it is interfering with the scientific progress of the profession, because young men are in a quandry now, as well as in a frustrated state of mind. After they receive their medical certificates and licenses they do not know whether they will be allowed to practice their profession or whether on short notice they will be drafted into the Army. After all, we have to take these factors into consideration. I would like to do away with this kind of legislation. I know the hardships it creates, but we have reached a state of affairs in this country where we cannot with good conscience disregard the pressing need for doctors and dentists in our endeavor to maintain the national defense of our country. Therefore, I will support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That subsection 4 (1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (64 Stat. 826), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(4) As used in this subsection, the term 'active duty' and 'active service' shall include (A) active duty and active duty for training, as defined in subsections 101 (b) and (c), Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481); (B) active service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or the United States Public Health Service, including the Reserve components thereof; (C) service in the national health, safety, or interest performed pursuant to subsection 6 (j) of this act and work of national importance performed pursuant to subsection 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; and (D), prior to September 2, 1945, equivalent service in the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II, while so allied.

"(5) For the purposes of computation of the periods of active duty or active service referred to in this subsection, credit shall be given for all periods of 1 day or more performed under competent orders except that no credit shall be allowed for—

"(A) periods in which the duty or service consisted solely of training under the Army specialized training program, the Army Air Corps college training program, or any similar program under the jurisdiction of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or while being processed for entry into or separation from any such program;

"(B) periods spent in intern training, residency training, other postgraduate training, or in senior student programs prior to receipt of the appropriate professional degree; and

"(C) periods of active service performed for the sole purpose of undergoing a physical examination.

"(6) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this subsection or the act of September 9, 1950, as amended, except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, no person who has served in the active service since September 16, 1940, for a period of 21 months or more, shall be liable for induction, or reinduction, under this subsection or liable for call or order to active duty under the act of September 9, 1950, as amended.

"(7) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except section 314 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163, 241), no person liable for induction under this subsection shall be held to be ineligible for appointment as a commissioned officer of an armed force of the United States on the sole ground that he is not a citizen of the United States or has not made a declaration of intent to become a citizen thereof."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE]. Yes; I went on a tour of the United Nations last Sunday morning, and I heard the Ambassador—I believe that is what he is called—answer a few questions. In my opinion, he never adequately answered most of the questions he was asked. The United States Ambassador to the United Nations, if that is the correct title, is a rather suave operator, I will say to the gentleman from California. I would also say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] that I was impressed by the lavishness of the establishment that I saw. I will say to the gentleman that I do not think a great deal of the accomplishments of the United Nations, as evidenced by an amendment I offered when the bill providing for the appropriation for the United Nations was before this House.

But I want to call attention to this particular bill. Page 8 of the report provides a limitation of service to 17

months for those who have already completed 12 months or more of service after September 1940, regardless of whether the service was in an officer or enlisted status, and regardless of whether it was medical or dental service, or line duty. I certainly believe recognition should be given for previous service, and that this credit should extend to those who were drafted after World War II, who may have served 11 months and 29 days, lacking 1 day of a year, who were discharged at the convenience of the Government, and who then were redrafted when the fiasco in Korea was started and are now called upon to serve, not a total of 24 months as are other draftees, but 24 months plus the period of military service they gave to the Government between the end of World War II and the start of Korea. Before the reading of this bill is concluded I intend to offer an amendment to provide the same justice for these boys who were drafted, and who have been given no credit for previous service that you here provide for physicians and dentists who will be called under this act.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. In view of the fact that the gentleman has mentioned my name, I cannot help but disagree with the gentleman as to his appraisal of the attitudes or ability of the distinguished American ambassador to the United Nations. Contrary to the gentleman's opinion I very definitely gained the impression that he was a very able, a very brilliant, and a very vigorous representative of the United States in the United Nations organization.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is entitled to his opinion, and I hope he will permit me to have my opinion. I did not say that he was disreputable; I said he was suave and I repeat it.

Mr. DOYLE. I did not get the impression that he was even suave. I came away with the very definite opinion that he was frank, honest, and able. He was very frank; he did not try to be suave. He gave us forthright answers, and I would not be doing my duty if I did not say so.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman from California that I am still waiting for definite answers to a couple of questions I asked him.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: Page 8, line 14, after the words "as amended", insert the following: "Any person who has served in active service since September 16, 1940, and involuntarily separated from the service by reason of physical disability shall on reinduction receive credit for such prior service for the purpose of computation of service under this act."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this rather simple amendment to protect those who have been in the medical service, for this reason: I have had numerous cases brought to my attention, and I will refer to one or two in particular, cases of men serving in the Armed Forces, receiving a physical disability—I have one case of a man who served for 15 months; arthritis set in and he was unable to use his left arm; he also had ulcers. He was separated involuntarily from the service and his discharge said he was unfit for further military service. Because of the lowering of the standards of physical requirements now many of these men are being reinducted. The men I refer to were not trained at Government expense. Having once disrupted their medical practice, gone into the service voluntarily, served but did not remain the full 21 months, were involuntarily separated by the Government because they were not physically fit to continue, yet now because of the lowering of the standards, they are called back but given no credit for the period of time they served—in the one instance to which I referred, 15 months. What this amendment does is simply this: That if they are reinducted after having been involuntarily separated from the service they will be given credit for the time they actually spent, so they will not have to serve longer than the man who had not previously served his country in this type of service.

I believe it is a fair amendment. The question could be raised about some of the boys the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], spoke about, who had served previously in the draft in World War II and then were called back. I agree with the gentleman that those men should receive credit. So that the man who has actually given time to the military service is not discriminated against in favor of ones who have never served.

I offer this amendment as a matter of fairness and justice to these men who once disrupted their practice and are now called upon to serve again in order that they be given credit for the time they have served. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. I think the gentleman is sound in his amendment and everyone should support it. However, his amendment ought to go further and give credit to any enlisted man for any period of time that he served if he comes under this bill. That would straighten out a lot of inequities I see in the bill. I think the gentleman's amendment should be extended so as to include the service of any enlisted man if he is later on taken in under the provisions of this Act.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will offer such an amendment I shall support it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Kentucky will have an opportunity to vote for just such an amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to have to oppose my good friend from Ohio and other Members here, but it is absolutely necessary that we have a definite cutoff somewhere. If you are going to try to have this sliding scale by giving credit for 1 month, 2 months, or 6, 8, or 9 months of service, you will make it absolutely administratively impossible to carry out this law. It would be confusion compounded.

In the case of the doctor constituent of my friend from Ohio, he served 15 months. If we would have lowered the service to 15 months, of course, he would have been exempted. It was brought out very clearly in our hearings that we had to have some period of service of appreciable length. We decided that 12 months—1 year—should be the minimum time that we should give credit for. Not only have doctors been recalled who had been involuntarily separated from the service but thousands of inductees and enlisted men have likewise been recalled because of a change in times, conditions, and physical standards.

I hope the members of the Committee will vote down this amendment.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services what happens to a doctor who was rejected for military service in World War II and is now being called upon and classified as 1–A? Does he go into the service under the bill?

Mr. SHORT. If he can meet the physical requirements at the present time, he goes in, unless he is exempted under other provisions of the law.

Mr. MORANO. Are the physical requirements lowered?

Mr. SHORT. Oh, considerably; not only for doctors but for inducted men and enlistees.

Mr. MORANO. Then it is generally understood that if a man can practice medicine privately he is capable of rendering a service to the country?

Mr. SHORT. That is the sort of general yardstick that is used; yes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. May I say that we went into this thing very thoroughly in executive session. Is that correct?

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. The Chairman is correct. If you go into the matter and try to administer this law under this amendment I think you will have the greatest confusion we ever had in the history of the country.

Mr. SHORT. It cannot be done.

Mr. DURHAM. Because you would have to go into every individual case in this country; practically every one of them. We have tried to write this bill so that it will work, so that it will be fair to the communities and also fair to the services. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

Mr. SHORT. You take the general pension law. If a woman had married some old Civil War veteran before a certain date she would be entitled to a pension, but if she married him a week after that date she would be denied that pension.

Mr. BOW. Under the amendment we do not relieve him from his services. He serves the amount of time he would serve under your bill but he is given credit for this service.

Mr. SHORT. But he is required to serve at least 12 months or 1 year before we give him credit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed at this point, and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SEC. 2. Subsection 4 (j) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (64 Stat. 826) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"It shall be the duty of the National Advisory Committee in conjunction with the State and local volunteer advisory committees to make determinations with respect to persons in residency training programs who shall be recommended for deferment for the purpose of completing such residency programs, and in making such determinations shall give appropriate consideration to the respective needs of the Armed Forces and the civilian population. The National Advisory Committee in conjunction with the State and local volunteer advisory committees are further authorized to make appropriate recommendations with respect to members of the faculties of medical, dental, veterinary, and allied specialists' schools, schools of public health, and with respect to physicians and dentists engaged in essential laboratory and clinical research, having due regard to the respective needs of the Armed Forces and the civilian population."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 826), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding subsection 217 (c) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481) or any other provision of law, any member of a reserve component who has been or shall be ordered to active duty on or before July 1, 1955, as a physician, dentist, or in an allied specialist category in the Armed Forces (including the Public Health Service) of the United States shall, under regulations prescribed by the President, be appointed, reappointed, or promoted to such grade or rank as may be commensurate with his professional education, experience, or ability.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who registers under the provisions of subsection 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (64 Stat. 826), as amended, but who is not at the time of such registration or thereafter registered under section 3 of the same act, and who subsequently accepts a commission in a reserve component of the Armed Forces and thereafter serves on active duty for a period of 17 months or more after September 9, 1950, shall upon his release from active duty or within 6 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, whichever is later, be discharged from such commission, provided he is not otherwise obligated to serve on active military training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in a reserve component by law or contract: *Provided*, That any person who is not required to register under the provisions of subsection 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (64 Stat. 826), as amended, for the sole reason that he was a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces and who is not or was not required to register under section 3 of the same act, and who is called or ordered to active duty from a reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States after September 9, 1950, and thereafter serves on active duty for a period of 17 months or more shall, upon his release from active duty or within 6 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, whichever is later, be afforded an opportunity to resign his commission from the reserve component of which he is a member provided he is not otherwise obligated to serve on active military training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in a reserve component by law or contract: *Provided further*, That except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, any person who is discharged or who resigns his commission under the provisions of this subsection shall not thereafter be subject to induction under the provisions of subsection 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (64 Stat. 826), as amended. This subsection shall be effective as of September 9, 1950.

"(c) Until July 1, 1955, the President is authorized to order to active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, with or without their consent, those members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States who are registered under section 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (64 Stat. 826), as amended, and those persons who would be, but for such membership, liable for registration under the provisions of said subsection. Such persons shall so far as practicable be ordered to active duty under this subsection in accordance with the priorities established under subsection 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (64 Stat. 826), as amended. The period of active duty such persons may be required to perform shall not exceed 24 months, and if they have performed a total of 12 months or more of active service, as defined in paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, since September 16, 1940, but prior to the date of their order to active duty under this subsection, such period shall not exceed 17 months.

"(d) Nothing in subsection (c) of this section shall be construed to affect or limit the authority to order members of the Reserve components to active duty contained in section 233 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481)."

SEC. 4. Any person now serving on active duty who was required to register under the provisions of subsection 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, or who, but for membership in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States, would have been required to register under said subsection, and, who, under the provisions of the act of September 9, 1950, as amended, would not be subject to induction or order to active duty as a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States, shall be released to inactive duty, discharged, or afforded an opportunity to resign his commission, as otherwise provided in the act of September 9, 1950, as amended, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than 90 days after the effective date of this amendatory act: *Provided*, That no person required to register under section 3 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, shall have his commission terminated under the provisions of the act of September 9, 1950, as amended.

SEC. 5. Persons ordered to active duty under the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, or under this amendatory act, who hold a commission in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, or in the Army of the United States without component or Air Force of the United States without component which by operation of law would expire before the end of the period of active duty which they may be required to serve under the provisions of the act of September 9, 1950, as amended, may be retained on active duty until they have completed such period of duty and such commissions shall be deemed to be continued in effect until the date of their release from active duty.

SEC. 6. (a) Section 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (64 Stat. 826), as amended, is amended by striking out the words "21 months" where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "18 months."

(b) Section 4 (i) (1) and (2) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (64 Stat. 826), as amended, is amended by striking out the words "subsequent to the completion of or release from the program or course of instruction," where it appears in two instances.

SEC. 7. Any physician or deptist who meets the qualifications for a Reserve commission in the respective military departments shall, so long as there is a need for the services of such a physician or dentist, be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for a period of active duty of not less than 24 months. Any physician or dentist who so volunteers his service, and meets the qualifications for a Reserve commission shall be ordered to active duty for 24 month, notwithstanding the grade or rank to which such physician or dentist is entitled under the provisions of the act of September 9, 1950, as amended.

SEC. 8. Section 7 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 826), as amended, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1953" and by inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1955."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: On page 14, line 1, strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "seventeen."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the committee for the purpose of accepting the amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee cannot accept the amendment; he is not in favor of it. We lowered the requirements from 21 to 18 months. But I will say that since General Armstrong, Surgeon General of the Army, testified, and he repeated it on different occasions, that they could get along with 17 months' service instead of 18 months, I am not going to object to it. I will not accept it, but I will not object to it. I would take it if forced upon me.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to talk myself out of court. I agree that we should accept this amendment.

Mr. SHORT. The committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 14, line 21, strike out "July 1, 1955" and insert the following: "July 1, 1955: *Provided*, That this act (except for such sections) shall terminate 12 months after the date of the enactment of this proviso unless by such time the overall strength of the Armed Forces has been reduced to below 3,000,000 persons on active duty."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I am very reluctant to offer an amendment

to this bill because I know that the members of this committee have struggled long and manfully with a very difficult dilemma. They have probably come up with the only answer possible under existing circumstances so that I think we have to adopt the bill. I think those gentlemen are entitled to our appreciation in view of having done the best they could with a very difficult situation.

The fact nonetheless remains, Mr. Chairman, that we are not only living on borrowed money, we are living on borrowed manpower. Borrowed money you can take care of by having some paper sent to the Bureau of Engraving but you cannot get manpower as easily as that. Because we have been living on borrowed manpower we are here today with this slave-labor bill that sets up a special class of peons in the United States. We all recognize, all the members of the committee recognize, and our very distinguished chairman very properly and very fairly recognizes the difficulty with which we are confronted. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is high time for this committee and this House to consider the whole problem of military manpower and not go on bit by bit, from problem to problem, emergency to emergency, because there comes a point when emergencies become normalcies. Now if this is not a normal situation we cannot believe the President and we cannot believe all the other statesmen who say we are in this for 5, 10, or 20 years, perhaps. Well, if we are, let us get control of our manpower. Let us organize ourselves so that we can live reasonably on the basis of our annual increment of young men each year which is something like 800,000 who are physically fit. We have a 2-year draft. Twice 800,000 is 1,600,000. Yet we are trying to maintain 3,400,000 or 3,500,000 or 3,200,000. If we go on with that and try to keep that total number, we are going to have to continue this kind of draft. We are going to have to do the same thing for scientists and other specialists. On top of it all, within the next year or two we are going to have to extend the period of draft service to 3 or 4 years in order to maintain the present number of men in uniform on active footing.

Therefore, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, let us support the amendment limiting this unhappily necessary bill to 1 year unless some progress is made toward reduction of the overall total to the end that somewhere along the line our total manpower in the country, our professional manpower, may all be brought into balance and this kind of specialist peonage may no longer be necessary.

I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has frankly admitted this is discriminatory legislation and that there are many unavoidable inequities in the legislation, he by no means has admitted that it is specialist peonage or that it is a slave-labor bill.

I want to repeat to the Members of the House that all the doctors, representing divergent views, who testified before this committee are agreed that the legislation is necessary. Since we reported the bill most of those who opposed it in the beginning are pleased with the product we brought forth, imperfect as it might be.

I hope this amendment will not prevail. The committee in its wisdom made the termination coincide with the termination of the draft law, on July 1, 1955. The truth of the matter is we will need this law perhaps more then than we need it today. If we reduce our armed services from their present total strength of 3,554,000 to 1,000,000, if we reduce it to just one-third of what it is today, and if we reduce the number of doctors, three to 1,000 men, which we are rapidly approaching, we will still need 3,000 doctors to man 1 million men in our armed services. The fact of the matter is we are having only about 3,000 doctors graduating from our medical schools throughout the country now each 2 years. So it is very obvious that if this amendment would carry, it would absolutely paralyze and make impossible the getting of the required number.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Let us be perfectly frank. Next year is election year, so that we would have this bill up for a further extension at election time, and the gentleman knows what difficulty we would have.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is right. We would have to at least spend a lot of time and effort in considering the same old thing next year. It would be like daylight saving here in the District of Columbia. Who wants to go through all that unnecessary work and worry?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I might point out this fact. The President has told them over in the Pentagon what they have to do. They have already told the Secretary of Defense that he has to lower the number of doctors per thousand men without impairing our security. That has been done.

Mr. SHORT. And the Secretary of Defense has served notice too on our military authorities.

Mr. DURHAM. That is right. We all have great faith in our President. He is a man who has more knowledge of military affairs than all of us put together. He can stop this draft tomorrow, if he wants to. He can stop the other draft tomorrow, if he wants to: I, as an individual, believe he will do it, if possible. If we limit this to 1 year, we just have an administrative thing here which will muddle up affairs, and you will get only 1,500 doctors this year, and you have to have 4,000 and some odd doctors. So you have no way of forcing all of this group outside of the draft age into it. So you will not get the doctors under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SHORT. And if we can, without impairing our security, reduce the number of our Armed Forces, which all of us hope will be possible, then if the doctors are not needed, they will not be called.

Mr. DURHAM. You cut the number in half with this amendment as well as the time limit. The President can stop it any day or any hour that he wants to.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. I just want to make sure that this amendment is not misunderstood. This amendment does not propose cutting off unconditionally at the end of 1 year. It merely imposes a condition upon continuing beyond 1 year. It does not seem to me an unreasonable condition at all. The Secretary of Defense has recently announced he is already planning to reduce to 3,200,000. All I am asking, and the only reason I am proposing this amendment is to again call attention to the House and to readers of this RECORD, that we are living on borrowed manpower, and we have got to put our thinking caps on and find out how in the world we are going on maintaining our armed position with borrowed manpower, to wit, more than the country can stand.

Mr. SHORT. I repeat, the gentleman's amendment would not furnish the doctors sufficient for a million armed forces.

Mr. DURHAM. Our draft act today, of course, is for 24 months just the same as this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 14, after line 21, add the following new section: "SEC. 9. Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other act, the period of active service now or hereafter prescribed by law for any person heretofore or hereafter inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States under any law relating to the Selective Service System is hereby reduced by any period of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States (1) which such person may have performed before such induction, and (2) from which such person shall have been separated under conditions other than dishonorable."

Mr. GROSS. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has well pointed out, this bill brings us back to facing some of the facts of life; that we are committed now to fight and finance wars all over the world through that lavish monstrosity known as the United Nations. I predict that if we continue the course we are traveling, we will have more and better peonage bills before this Congress.

What does my amendment do? It provides simply that draftees be given credit for prior military service performed before they were discharged, not at their own behest, but at the convenience of the Government, and before these draftees had served 1 year. As many Members of the House know from letters received from service personnel and their families, many draftees served within a few days of 12 months and then were discharged at the convenience of the Government. Later they were drafted again, but given no credit for prior conscripted service, meaning they must serve

a total of almost 3 years, while others not previously drafted are required to serve 2 years. This is obviously unfair, and it was never the intent of Congress. Incidentally, let me add that I am as interested in the welfare of the Nation's Reserves as any Member of the House. You may recall that not long after the start of the Korean war, I offered legislation which would have permitted World War II reservists to resign after 12 months of active duty. The measure failed to pass, however, and repeated injustices were perpetrated, doing irreparable damage to the time-honored American concept of a voluntary Reserve.

But this is an entirely different matter. The Reserve program has nothing to do with the present discriminatory system of requiring 2 years of active duty for some draftees and up to 3 years for others—even longer in the case of physicians and dentists who served more than a year, were discharged, at the convenience of the Government, thrown into the draft pool, and then drafted for 2 more years of service.

Nor does the military's clamor for manpower mitigate these discriminatory circumstances. In the American tradition of fair play, it is the duty of Congress to require no more and no less than equal service and sacrifice from each and every conscripted citizen.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in this particular bill we have tried to give the doctors equal treatment with the enlisted men and with the Reserves in all branches of the service. Congress has repeatedly sustained the committee in the passage of various pieces of legislation in not giving credit for any service less than 12 months. We know that when they are coming and going in 2 or 3 or 6 months, it is almost impossible, if not entirely impossible, to administer such a law. You would be spending all your time in paper work rather than fighting a war.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we also had testimony to the effect that the disruption of a doctor's practice was the thing that counted. Whether it was for a year or 6 months did not make so much difference. It was the fact that he had to go out of practice. Again, if we accept this amendment for less than the period we have set up, it is greatly to the disadvantage of the Government, because a month of their time has to be spent in reindoctrination; another month, perhaps, to get to their station, if they are sent to Korea. The same thing happens at the end of their service. So we would be bringing these people into service and getting no service out of them, and we would be disrupting their own private practice for naught.

Mr. SHORT. We would not only disrupt their private practice but we would bankrupt the Nation. As the gentleman from California points out, it takes a month to call a man in, register him, give him his clothes and his training, and it takes a month to get him overseas. After 2 or 3 months, scarcely learning how to fight, it would take another month or 6 weeks to get him back home again.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it any more important to give consideration to a doctor and breaking up his practice than it is to take an added 6 months out of the life of a boy who may be sent to Korea and killed in that 6 months? Why should we favor doctors over a boy that is being inducted into service?

Mr. SHORT. Under this law we are giving them equal treatment. The point the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] was making was that if you jerk a doctor out of his practice and send him in for 1 or 2 or 3 months, it has disrupted him almost as much as if it kept him a whole year.

Mr. GROSS. But it could mean the difference between life and death for this boy, could it not?

Mr. SHORT. Certainly.

Mr. GROSS. It can disrupt his whole life.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I think, in listening to the gentleman's amendment, it would apply to all enlistments; not just to doctors, but it would apply to everybody. Does the gentleman intend his amendment to apply to everybody?

Mr. SHORT. No, that would not apply to everyone; it applies to drafted personnel. It does not apply to physicians.

Mr. DURHAM. Everyone who is drafted. This applies to all men inducted.

Mr. SHORT. Into any branch of the service?

Mr. GROSS. No; it would not apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 229, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

IMPORTS OF PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Simpson bill, which would cut down imports of petroleum and petroleum products, is another blow at the New England economy.

Not that it was intended as such, but the effect is just as damaging, whether the motive was good, bad, or indifferent.

We in New England cannot go on making heroic sacrifices to help or protect other areas of the Nation.

The storm signals are up in several northeastern communities. Business has sent out calls for help. The unemployed ask for work. The Federal Government has recognized the danger, but what concrete steps has it taken to assist us in this trouble? To date, none.

No Government orders are coming to the rescue of the textile industry. No new business is being encouraged to locate here. No instrumentality of government is doing anything to produce results.

On the contrary, legislation like the Simpson bill, which would worsen our situation, is allowed to proceed along its way without opposition.

What with long freight hauls and high freight rates, New England industries must import residual fuel oil in order to remain in competition with industries located nearer to the sources of our domestic supply.

In 1951, we used over 60 million barrels of this oil. Three-quarters of it came into New England ports, 64 percent of it from other nations. The Simpson bill would choke off this supply and make what we get much higher in price. We might be forced to change over to some other type of fuel to meet our demands, at a conversion-time loss and monetary

loss that might strain us to the breaking point.

There are some people who would shut off our supply of foreign wool, even though it is of better quality. Now they want to shut off the fuel oil that is needed by the mills. They would wreck everything just to make a monopolistic profit for themselves. No thought is given to the closed factories or the tens of thousands of jobless workers. Seeing only as far as the ends of their respective noses, they do not realize that an economic decline, like the measles, is contagious. But how they would howl if they had to pay more taxes for relief, which is inevitable, unless we show more give-and-take in sharing responsibility for the economic problems of any and every area of this country.

The petroleum industry of the United States seems to be doing quite well. It is working full time and it is showing a healthy profit. I do not see any reason why it should lean for support on sick industries. Shotgun sales, via special legislation, will not win friends or influence people.

Then there is the case of Venezuela, from whom we get this important fuel, slated to be dropped from our good-neighbor circle of friends, because the booming oil industry of the United States wants more and more.

This same industry would protest mightily if Venezuela, against whom they would lock the door, should drift into the Communist camp, or any other camp, looking for the two-way trade that free enterprise is always talking about.

People have a way of comparing words with actions and noting the discrepancies.

It is the oil industry which will suffer eventually if this bill is passed.

New England will not accept this pressure passively.

We hope that this harmful bill will be defeated. We will do all that we possibly can to kill it.

If we fail, we will change to other fuels, remembering how we were hit when we were down.

The Simpson bill is a force play which will not work.

MEDIOCRITY: THE PRICE OF TOO MUCH CRITICISM

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor in the past to point out where I might feel that the military have failed or where they might improve their operations. This I did in order to effect some much-needed economy to the public; so, today, for that very same reason I should like for a few minutes to talk about what unwarranted or unjust criticism of our armed services can do.

To criticize, to carp, to ridicule, to make sensational charges attracts public attention, as we all know. Yet we must be mindful of the effects of such action on the circumstance of the overwhelming majority of fine men and women who make our fighting forces the mightiest arm of defense in the free world. When we find fault it should always be stressed that the small percentage of the program or operation that is perhaps wasteful or uneconomic is never the entire picture. We should retain our sense of proportion. In criticizing the smaller segment, let us not sap the morale of the larger.

Today it is popular to condemn the military. "Brass" and other terms have acquired a popular and almost derogatory meaning which does not bolster confidence in our military leadership, nor does it instill in the military services the best regard for our motives. Any derision, innocent or otherwise, which brings about this result is an occasion for rejoicing in the Kremlin.

Men wear the uniform and have pride in their service; our future and freedom are in their keeping. It would be extremely unfortunate if anything were to disturb this. The public should know that no matter how large the print of any headline, the vast majority of the armed services are doing their job and doing it very well. There may be mistakes of judgment, here and there, some parts of the program may receive undue or ill-advised emphasis, but I say to you that virtually every man jack of them are doing what they are told to do.

Aside from the effect of unjust criticism of military leadership on the public, I should like to mention another sidelight. Recently, General Bradley pointed to the fact that the military career is less attractive today than it used to be. I concur in that from what I have seen. The result is traceable in some measure to the spotlighting of every minor mar in military life. Our Academy graduates are not coming into the services in the numbers we should expect; the fringe benefits of commissary and post exchange and so forth are no longer much of an inducement; there is a narrowing margin between the pay of the leader and the team; lastly, the security is not nearly so sure, and the pension does not cover much more than appearances, with the possible exception of the highest ranks. Thus the stage is set for the accent on the mediocre.

Yes; let us continue to speak out boldly about the direction of our Armed Forces; but let us say it responsibly; let us say it with facts; emphasize the big picture first and then pin down the area that is out of step. Our men and women in the military services deserve no less.

RETURNED AMERICAN PRISONERS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, as additional information is published concerning the so-called brainwashing or debrainwashing of American prisoners returned by the North Korean Communist Army, the whole operation begins to look more and more like an atrocity perpetrated by our own officials.

Who is responsible? The Congress has ultimate responsibility to find out and to take remedial action. Is this an outgrowth of the C. D. Jackson psychological warfare program, which, in his own words, calls for us to be "fanatics"; which must be conducted as he said, "with no holds barred, and no questions asked."

Did Air Force officials make this decision on their own responsibility? The press has been accused of irresponsibility.

If this is the case we should know; the information or press officers of the armed services are answerable. Let us find out so as to prevent a recurrence of a similar incident in the future.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

THE AFFAIRS OF NATIONS

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

ON LITTLE FAITH

WASHINGTON.—As expected, Allied prisoners held by the Communists in Korea were subjected to Communist indoctrination. Some of them showed on reemergence traces of influence from the process. There is a marked, even a jolting, contrast in the respective treatments employed in Britain and America toward this problem.

In Britain, soldiers who expressed dubiousness about the superior merits of the Allied cause in Korea were sent to their homes on the urbane theory that "home influence and a return to normal surroundings would give them a more balanced view."

In America, 23 men who were classified as "misled" were flown secretly—until the whole story leaked out—to a veterans' hospital at Valley Forge, Pa., where, it was intimated originally, they would be given psychiatric therapy to correct the mental results of Communist contamination.

Not the slightest effort was made in Britain to isolate the returned soldiers holding unorthodox points of view.

The American soldiers who came back were not in the end isolated from all contact with the public. Those who were willing to face the ordeal were allowed to give interviews at the hospital to visiting reporters. They were allowed to communicate with their families. But they were kept at the hospital, and therefore kept in substantial isolation from the general public. They were not allowed to circulate freely in the broad stream of public life.

The essential difference in the treatment is that the British method expresses confidence in the health of the British mind, the superiority of the British system of life over the Communist system, the immunity of the British system to Communist ideas which may have been carried back by men immured for weary months in Communist prison, and the ultimate mental recovery of the mentally infected soldiers.

By contrast, the American method of treatment expresses lack of confidence in the immunity of the American system to Communist infection. These returned soldiers were not isolated from the public for their own welfare. They were isolated as though they were mental lepers who might contaminate the general public. The very action implies lack of confidence in the health of the American mind, lack of confidence in the American system of life.

The London Daily Express, one of the most conservative newspapers in the British Isles, and as impeccably anti-Communist as the New York Herald Tribune, made the following comment on the problem:

"If any of the returning prisoners have come back to the United Kingdom as converts to communism, it should make no difference to the warmth of the reception they

are given. The people at home understand that in the enforced loneliness of captivity many issues can appear in a distorted guise. The old familiar scenes, the British way of life, with its easy tolerance and its reasonable distrust of rigid political dogma, may quickly reconvert them."

The American soldiers who had been classified as "misled" expressed bitter resentment over their treatment. When they were allowed to talk to reporters, they denied that they were "tinged with communism."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday, May 25, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

TORNADO DISASTER: GEORGIA

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, a storm or tornado struck Columbus, Bibb City, and other areas of Muscogee County, Ga., with a fury that cannot be described with words. Only one who was a witness to this tragic disaster can realize how fiendish nature can be when nature gets out of control. Four hundred and ninety-nine homes were destroyed and 2,699 homes were heavily damaged. School buildings were demolished and the water-supply systems damaged heavily. Debris covered the streets, the yards, the lawns. Hundreds of trees hung over live electric wires, and over homes and streets, creating a horrible menace to all forms of life. So awful was this catastrophe, that the military, the National Guard, the highway patrol, and every State and local agency, assisted by private enterprise, worked like beavers for days to restore a little order in these communities. Order has not been restored, and it will be many months before order reigns again.

With the above description, I have not begun to truly enumerate the damage caused; I cannot, no one else can; it is beyond the human vocabulary so to do.

On April 30, a tornado swooped down on Warner Robins, Ga., a town of between 14,000 and 16,000 inhabitants, leaving that little city prostrate. This is a town that owes its existence to Robbins Airfield, located there, and is a highly critical defense area, and most of the people in that town are workers at that important airbase. At least 19 were killed and hundreds were injured. At least 350 apartment units were leveled to the ground and 300 or more homes were destroyed.

In the first disaster mentioned, Columbus, Bibb City, and Muscogee County moved for assistance from our Government under Public Law 875, and asked for monetary assistance. This request went from the Governor of Georgia to the President of the United States, exactly as provided by that law. As Congressman of the district in which this disaster occurred, I followed this request, which was referred by the President to the Civil Defense Agency, the Agency charged with administering Public Law 875, with every energy I possess. I do not think anyone could or would charge me with leaving a stone unturned in representing those people in their pleas. I have met with the Civil Defense on many occasions personally. The telephone calls that I made to that Agency were so many, I cannot estimate them.

The mayor of Warner Robins requested, through the same channels, 400 United States trailer cars, which the United States undoubtedly has, plus many more, bought with the taxpayers' money, for temporary use of Government workers at Warner Robins whose living quarters had been destroyed, only until other arrangements could be made, and until Government housing units in this critical defense area could be rebuilt. As their Congressman, I have represented Warner Robins before the Civil Defense Agency as earnestly and as vigorously as I could.

Nevertheless, I report that each and every plea has fallen on deaf ears. I was told that we had a new philosophy of government. It could be, that in days gone by, Public Law 875 may have, on occasions, been too liberally interpreted, and if so, that was wrong. But, this new interpretation is so strict and so heartless that Public Law 875, so far as monetary assistance is concerned, has in effect been abolished by this new interpretation.

Columbus, Bibb City, and Muscogee County have been denied any monetary grants whatever from the Government. To be fair, and I hope my legal training permits me to be reasonably fair, some items in those requests are of doubtful legality under that law, but other items in those requests were completely in harmony with the purposes and the plain language of that law. The denial was evidently on the basis that additional heavy taxation by these local authorities on the people of those areas would some day pay these damages. That kind of argument would have been true with Missouri when that State suffered disaster, although it might have taken 50 years to pay those expenses. That kind of philosophy simply means that no State or locality can ever qualify under the law.

Warner Robins was denied these trailer cars, or any trailer cars whatever, although the Government has trailer cars, bought with taxpayers' money. This refusal was based on the illogical reason that the Civil Defense Agency says that 200 apartment units are available at Macon, Ga., at about $20 per month higher rent, and that these Government workers can travel by automobile, private bus, and military bus from Macon to Warner Robins and their work and from their work to Macon daily. Unfortunately, lots of working people do not have automobiles or extra rent money. Besides, these residents would be required to go from one county to another, a requirement which does not make sense at all. Such requirement means swelling the population of Macon, a larger city, at the expense of Warner Robins, a smaller city. This requirement further means that the larger city will rent the houses, sell the clothes and groceries, and even collect taxes from Warner Robins citizens. The Civil Defense Agency did offer one alternative, the same being that these Government workers could live in tents furnished by the Red Cross. What a horrible alternative. Compliance with that alternative would mean that these Government workers would live in tents with the ground for a floor, without water, sanitary facilities, without cooking arrangements and as lower animals.

It is completely apparent that Public Law 875 is without further utility. There is a middle road which we must travel. I quarrel with no one who is careful about spending taxpayers' money, for I approve a good steward. I do say, however, that one assuming any office must face up to the responsibilities of that office, and that they must say "No" when the facts do not justify "Yes," but that they must with equal courage say "Yes" when the facts justify a "Yes."

These people in these areas in my district must work their way out of their misfortunes alone. Temporary relief and repairs have been denied them. It is true that if any people on earth can rise again solely on their own efforts, my people can do it, but more is the pity on that account that people like my people must be told that our Government agencies insist on them bearing their travails and misfortunes alone.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I take this opportunity to say that I have noted the efforts the gentleman from Georgia who has just spoken has put forth from day to day in behalf of the people who suffered so tragically from the tornado about which he has spoken. I feel that the gentleman deserves great commendation for the earnest, sincere, and continued effort he has exerted from the time this tragic event occurred up to the present time. I appreciate the gentleman's bringing these facts to us today. I regret very much that the Government agency to which he appealed has not seen fit to grant the relief he has so earnestly sought for his constituents.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman. I have done everything I could, because I know that if there ever was a time since I have been in Congress that I should come to the assistance of my people it is in connection with these two catastrophes which I have just described. I am very grateful for the kind expressions of my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

EXCESSIVE AND INCREASING IMPORTS OF FOREIGN OIL ARE INJURIOUS TO OUR MILITARY AS WELL AS OUR ECONOMIC SECURITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a matter which is causing serious injury not only to the economy of my State of Kansas but to that of many other States. It is a matter which goes

beyond the economic effects upon the Nation—it is one which reaches the very heart of our Nation's military security.

I refer to the excessive and increasing rate of imports of foreign oil.

The increase in imports in recent years has been steady and rapid. During the prewar period—1935–39—imports averaged about 150,000 barrels daily. Following World War II imports have increased sharply year after year, until today they average over 1 million barrels daily.

In addition to this year after year increase in quantity, imports have steadily taken over a larger portion of the domestic market. Prewar imports amounted to 5 percent of the domestic market. Since World War II, imports have averaged 10 percent. The current rate of imports is 14 percent of the domestic market.

As imports have increased, the domestic oil producer has had access to a shrinking portion of the domestic market. This means that his income, his incentive, and his ability to explore and develop new oilfields is shrinking in relation to our growing needs.

These imports are adversely affecting the domestic oil industry. They are retarding development and expansion. In contrast to the continuous increasing trend of imports, there is a slackening of domestic oil activity, which is an unhealthy condition. Under State conservation laws, allowable rates of production have been reduced in the leading oil States, including Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Kansas. If imports continue at the current excessive rate, there will be further substantial reductions in domestic production during 1953. The oil producer's future economic position is uncertain. He cannot make plans to expand while being faced with a reduced market outlet. Drilling activity which is the forerunner of exploration and development efforts leading to new and expanded oil reserves has slowed down. The number of active drilling rigs is less than 90 percent of the rate of last year. Just recently there has been a further reduction in the allowable amount of production in the Midwest. It is claimed that such action is necessary because of the increased imports of crude oil and residual fuel oil into the United States. These and other conditions are evidence that the current rate of imports is serious and dangerously threatening our domestic oil economy.

These adverse effects of excessive imports of foreign oil are a serious threat to the economy of my State of Kansas. Kansas is the fifth largest oil-producing State, exceeded only by Texas, California, Louisiana, and Oklahoma. Kansas produces over 300,000 barrels daily from 28,000 wells, employing 64,000 people in the industry and adding $300 million yearly to the economy of the State. Over $14 million are paid to Kansas farmers each year for lease rental of their land, and $45 million is paid in royalties to the landowner. Petroleum is of second importance to Kansas, exceeded only by the income from crops and cattle. Any adverse effect on oil in Kansas brings repercussions throughout our State's economy. State revenues fall off, funds for schools, roads, hospitals, and other public activities suffer. I remind you that this is not because of competition within this country but competition from great American companies producing oil in other countries in competition with our own independent producers.

Since oil is produced in 27 of the 48 States, and is vital to national defense, it follows that any disruption of the domestic oil industry becomes a national problem. That is why I feel that excessive oil imports are a problem for the Congress.

In 1932 the Congress was faced with a similar problem. The Congress met the problem by establishing an excise or import tax of 21 cents per barrel on crude oil and residual fuel oil, the two principal products that are imported. Varying taxes were established on other products. This action constituted a congressional policy of encouraging the domestic oil industry. In effect, this action said to the importers, "The Congress will not permit foreign oil to push back and retard the development of the domestic oil industry." As a result the threat of imports was removed and the domestic industry was stimulated into one of the greatest expansion programs in its history. Our Government's policy of encouraging the domestic industry worked. It brought results. The domestic industry became strong.

When we were faced with World War II a few years later, the United States was the envy of all the world because we had ample oil within our own borders. In the early days of the war, when the enemy submarines were taking their deadly toll, it was the oil of our domestic industry that fueled the war machines not only of ourselves but also our allies.

This was a history lesson in oil and one we should not forget as we again face the uncertainties of a disturbed world.

But what has happened to this congressional policy of encouragement of domestic oil. It has been nullified and reduced to ineffectiveness. Under the Trade Agreements program the taxes established by Congress in 1932 have been made wholly meaningless as a deterrent against foreign oil. Today the tax on the two principal products—crude oil and residual fuel oil—is 5¼ cents per barrel—one-fourth the 1932 rate—on the heavier types and 10½ cents on the lighter types. These reduced rates are no impediment to imports. The policy established by Congress in 1932 of encouraging domestic oil has been reversed into a policy of encouraging foreign oil.

So again now, just as in 1932, the Nation is faced with the problem of excessive oil imports. And, just as in 1932, the Congress should meet this problem squarely and forthrightly by establishing in the laws of our land a clear policy on oil imports.

The action or inaction of Congress on this question will determine the future of the Nation's oil supply; it will determine whether we continue in the future as in the past to be self-sufficient in oil, or whether we become dependent upon uncertain and insecure foreign oil.

It is recognized and admitted by those in Government and industry who are familiar with the oil situation that today we are far from the fortunate position we were in at the beginning of World War II.

Today our domestic oil industry is capable of meeting peacetime requirements. But we do not have sufficient reserve-producing capacity for a war emergency as we did at the outbreak of World War II. We are spending billions for defense but the defense program is failing because excessive imports of oil are preventing the domestic industry from expanding as it should. One of the most essential munitions of war is being neglected. Without oil our mighty war machine will come to a helpless standstill.

The Congress must face this problem as it did in 1932.

In an effort to meet this problem, I have today introduced a bill, which provides that oil imports into the United States shall be limited to 10 percent of the domestic demand. Imports during the postwar period—1946–51—averaged about 10 percent of domestic demand as compared with the current rate of about 14 percent. I believe that a 10-percent limit is reasonable for the importing companies. At the same time, it will give some relief to the domestic industry from the current excessive rate. It will also provide incentive for the domestic industry to expand producing facilities needed in the event of an emergency. The 10-percent limit which is based on domestic demand would be flexible. It would permit imports to increase as domestic demand increases. It would permit imports during 1953 to average about 730,000 barrels daily as compared with the 1946–51 average of about 600,000 barrels daily.

We know that in 1949 and 1950 the import problem was a serious one and no doubt would have continued had it not been for the interruption of the Korean war and the loss of Iranian oil to the world markets. At that time, imports were running at 11, 12, or 13 percent. We know also that imports were then causing serious injury. Therefore, 10 percent is a reasonable beginning point. The history of the import problem shows that it is within the bounds of fairness and equity as an answer to a problem that must be met. If experience dictates that 10 percent is either too high or too low, we can, at a later date, make the necessary adjustment.

The 10-percent quota provided by my bill is an overall quota placing a limit on total imports of crude oil and all petroleum products. As I have previously mentioned, the two principal products that are being imported are crude oil and residual fuel oil. Residual fuel oil is a heavy burning oil used by large commercial and industrial consumers. Total imports have been made up roughly of 60 percent crude, and 40 percent residual fuel oil. My proposal affords a maximum of flexibility. The total quota could be brought in as crude oil or as any other product. If seasonal demand requires more imports of residual fuel oil, the overall 10-percent quota provided would permit the importing companies the fullest flexibility to meet seasonal variations in demand.

The Congress recently has heard a great deal about the adverse effects of imported residual fuel oil upon the coal-producing industry and related groups. A number of bills have been introduced proposing to restrict residual fuel oil imports so as to give relief. I am not familiar with the problem of the coal industry as I am with the problem of the domestic petroleum industry. As a result, my bill is designed to meet the problem of the domestic oil producer, but I believe it will also give relief to the coal industry.

Under my proposal, oil which is imported for supplies of vessels at United States ports would be treated and included as an import. The fueling and bunkering of vessels at domestic ports is a natural and substantial domestic market, and should be treated as a domestic market. On the other hand, under my proposal, oil which is imported for manufacture and reexport is not treated as an import, and would be excluded from the 10-percent quota.

The demand for oil fluctuates as between seasons of the year. I have, therefore, provided in my bill that a quota be established on a quarterly basis, equal to 10 percent of domestic demand for the same quarter of the previous year. The Bureau of Mines as a regular activity reports the demand for oil in the United States. The quota can, therefore, be established easily and readily based upon regular and recognized governmental statistics. In addition, I have provided in my bill that the quota may be suspended by the President during any period in which he finds that there is an inadequacy of oil supplies to meet national requirements. This is designed to protect the consuming public from any shortage situation should it arise.

In introducing this bill I have not been unmindful of the possible effects on the American consumer. There are some who will argue that greater imports mean lower prices to the consuming public. I have been unable to find any evidence to support this conclusion. To the contrary, the evidence I find demonstrates that increased imports do not have the effect of reducing prices to the consuming public. In fact, the evidence leans in the opposite direction.

The great bulk of imports into the United States enters on the eastern seaboard centering around the New York Harbor area. In 1948 the retail gasoline price, excluding tax, in the New York area was 19.5 cents per gallon. Since 1948 imports have doubled, increasing from about 500,000 barrels daily to over 1 million barrels daily. Today in New York the retail gasoline price is 21.5 cents per gallon. Increasing imports have had no beneficial effect upon the consumer price of gasoline in New York.

In contrast, the 1948 gasoline price in the St. Louis area was 20.9 cents per gallon and today it is 19.4 cents per gallon.

The lack of any beneficial effect from imports upon consumer prices is understandable upon analysis. First, as previously mentioned, a large portion, about 40 percent, of the total imports is made up of residual fuel oil, which is a heavy burning oil used only by large commercial and industrial consumers. This comes primarily from Venezuela and the West Indies, which have been unable to find an adequate market for this product elsewhere and are forced to dispose of it. As a result, it is being dumped into the United States. It is true that, as a result of this dumping, the price of this product to the relatively few large consumers has been substantially reduced. At the same time, however, the marketer of oil products has been forced to increase the prices of gasoline and home-heating oils to the thousands and thousands of domestic consumers in order that his overall return will be sufficient. Second, I do not believe it is reasonable to expect that imports will have a long-range beneficial effect upon consumer prices for the reason that imports are controlled by a few large companies. Five or six of these large companies dominate the production of foreign oil and also bring in the bulk of imports into the United States.

It is obvious that the consumer's long-range position would not be benefited by shifting his source of supply from the thousands and thousands of American producers and marketers to a foreign source that is controlled by 5 or 6 large companies. I am convinced that from the consumer's standpoint, increasing oil imports are highly dangerous in that, as imports increase, the consumer is more and more at the mercy of a closely integrated combine of a few large international oil companies.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress intends to give meaning to the billions we are appropriating to the defense effort, we must do something about the oil import problem. I believe the bill I have introduced provides a sound and fair solution. I urge every Member of the House to give it his consideration and his support for early passage.

RECKLESS AND INEFFECTUAL SPENDING WITHOUT THANKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last Friday May 8, was Black Friday for every taxpayer in the United States. From the executive department and congressional leaders, there were gloomy predictions that the budget cannot and will not be balanced in this or the next fiscal year; that taxes cannot be cut in view of that situation and that spending for the military establishment must continue in view of the crisis in international affairs.

Mr. Speaker, this country has been in a state of perpetual crisis since December 7, 1941, if we are to believe those who have been and are now responsible for foreign policy. It is an old, old record that has been played so long and so often that it is pretty thin. In no place in the world does a crisis exist but in the United States, except for Korea.

Mr. Speaker, there is no crisis in Britain, France, or Italy. There is positively no urgency to prepare for a military defense against communism. North Atlantic Treaty Organization plans approved and inaugurated 2 years ago are less than 50 percent completed today.

But the American taxpayer, Mr. Speaker, groans under a tax burden imposed on him by an unrealistic foreign policy that is forcing this country into national bankruptcy. It is destroying incentives that produce needed tax revenues in our global spending spree. Already tax receipts are greatly less than were anticipated before March 15.

Mr. Speaker, while our people are told that tax reductions, a balanced budget and less spending are not possible for them, Canada and Britain proudly announce to their people that taxes will be reduced this year.

Yet on last Friday, Mr. Speaker, Foreign Aid Administrator Harold Stassen announced a gift of $60 million in special aid to France. This he said was necessary to help France in its war against Communist-led forces in Indochina. This deal was cooked up at the last NATO Council meeting in Paris a few weeks ago, but this Congress, Mr. Speaker, had no knowledge of it until last week after it was an accomplished fact.

In addition to this grant of $60 million, the mutual security bill now before Congress carries $400 million for French Indochina aid, plus 100 millions more for France for defense materials. Then France will also share in a $2½ billion NATO military program. The exact amount has not as yet been fully spelled out. It is safe to say that American taxpayers will give to the French Government in excess of $600 million within the next year. And for what purpose? Mr. Stassen says it is to resist communism in southeast Asia. Some people, Mr. Speaker, doubt the purpose of that spending.

Recently a study mission of American businessmen was sent by the foreign aid Administrator to various countries to evaluate our spending programs. The group that went to Indochina reported significantly that military effort alone in that country will not break the present stalemate. They found that neither the French nor the Americans have the support of the native populations. There was no finding that these natives were Communists.

No, Mr. Speaker, the trouble in Indochina is not so much a threat of communism as it is a policy of French colonialism. It was said by a committee recently that the people in Indochina do not have the necessary confidence in their rulers, nor in the willingness of the French to grant independence, nor in ultimate victory over the Viet Minh under such circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the King of Cambodia, a State in Indochina, is now in the United States. On April 19 in an interview with a New York newsman he is reported to have said "that these 3 million people are so resentful of French rule and French refusal to grant independence that, although they despise communism, they will most certainly support the Communist forces if they must, to force France out."

Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances are we justified in giving to France millions of dollars for military purposes which will be used against the native people in their struggle against French colonialism. Certainly not, and the time has come to explode the crisis technique which is used to scare the Congress into appropriating more money at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. Speaker, to make matters worse the Honorable R. A. Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain, in a recent speech in Paris charged that the United States was responsible for the financial troubles that exist in Western Europe. He suggested that we take a new look at the dollar-gap problem and said:

Wherever you go in Europe you find the same problem of the gap between the dollar world and the nondollar world. We have done our best to suggest means of bridging that gap and hitherto the response we have had has not been sufficient to enable us to foresee a successful conclusion of our efforts. The fault is as much on that side as this, as I have freely and publicly stated, and without extreme frankness I do not think we shall get success in improving the financial position of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Butler refers to the fault being on the other side, he was referring to the United States. We, notwithstanding the good intentions of the Government of the United States which has poured 30 billions of taxpayers' money into European nations, are now blamed for all of its financial ills. But what more can we expect, Mr. Speaker? Recipients of gifts never thank the giver for his generosity.

Included as part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, is an article that appeared in the Washington Post of May 9:

UNITED STATES BLAMED BY BRITON FOR FINANCIAL ILLS

LONDON, May 8.—Chancellor of the Exchequer R. A. Butler today blamed the United States for much of Western Europe's financial troubles.

He suggested Washington take a new look at the dollar-gap problem.

Speaking at a luncheon of the French Chamber of Commerce in Britain, Butler did not mention the United States by name but his reference to the other side of the Atlantic was plain enough.

"Wherever you go in Europe you find the same problem of the gap between the dollar world and the nondollar world," the Cabinet minister said.

"We have done our best to suggest means of bridging that gap, and hitherto the response we have had has not been sufficient to enable us to foresee a successful conclusion of our efforts.

"In thinking of the dollar gap, it is the other side of the Atlantic that has to make advances by better creditor policies in enabling us to trade with them, as much as it is our duty to put our house in order • • •

"The fault is as much on that side as this—as I have freely and publicly stated—and without extreme frankness I do not think we shall get success in improving the financial position of the free world."

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PHILLIPS in two instances; to include in one a letter from Senator POTTER, and in the other the concluding portion of an insertion already made.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an article.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in four instances.

Mr. ABBITT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARY and to include a letter addressed to him.

Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. METCALF and to include an editorial from the Hungry Horse News.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania and to include editorials.

Mr. GAVIN and to include a statement delivered before the Committee on Ways and Means this morning.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH and to include an essay delivered by him before the New Jersey State Dental Society on voluntary pensions for professional people.

Mr. PERKINS in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHORT and to include an address delivered by the counselor of the Korean Embassy at the University of Kentucky, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $210.

Mr. BOW and to include an editorial.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include a letter on housing.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. BENNETT of Florida) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORDON and to include a resolution.

Mr. DOYLE in two instances and to include appropriate material.

Mr. FORAND and to include a resolution and an editorial.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. BOLAND) in three instances, in the first his statement on the Genocide Convention, in the second to include an editorial on the designation of David R. Daniel as new publisher of the Hartford Times, and in the third an editorial on Francis S. Murphy.

Mr. FOGARTY and to include an article.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include an article.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. BOSCH and to include a speech.

Mr. HORAN and to include an article.

Mr. BENDER in two instances.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 731. An act for the relief of James Renwick Moffett; and

H. R. 4465. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 13, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

690. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 215. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 2294) for the relief of the County of Riverside, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1528. An act to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1527. An act to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 35. An act to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1448. An act to amend the act of

June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present national emergency; with amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1530. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1546. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button; without amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1547. An act to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1550. An act to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom; with amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2226. A bill to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2319. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 193. Joint resolution to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MERROW: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 113, 83d Congress, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee. Report of the special study mission to Pakistan, India, Thailand, and Indochina; without amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5134. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 232. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4198. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf; without amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 233. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5134, a bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 415). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 685. A bill for the relief of Walter Carl Sander; with amendment (Rept. 375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 783. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung; with amendment (Rept. No. 376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1345. A bill for the relief of John Lampropoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3522. A bill for the relief of Arthur S. Rosichan; without amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4048. A bill for the relief of the Maxwell Hardware Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4432. A bill for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham; with amendment (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 166. An act for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir; without amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 167. An act for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo; without amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 193. An act for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki); without amendment (Rept. No. 395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 207. An act for the relief of Jimy Okuda; without amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 371. An act for the relief of Georgia Andrews; without amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 709. An act to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough; without amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 20. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 665. A bill for the relief of N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Krayenbrink Moerings, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings; without amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Porfirio Punciano Vila, Tatiana Abatooroff Vila, Porfirio P. Vila, Jr., Anne Marie Vila, and Josephine Anne Vila; with amendment (Rept. No. 401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 765. A bill for the relief of Tien Koo Chen; without amendment (Rept. No. 402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 847. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Rickards, Conception Sotelo Rickards, and Walter John Rickards; without amendment (Rept. No. 403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 869. A bill for the relief of Masuko Oshima; with amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1756. A bill to stay deportation proceedings on Eugene de Thassy; with amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Paul Myung Ha Chung; with amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1963. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Schillings; with amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Sam Rosenblat; without amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2652. A bill for the relief of Constance Brouwer Scheffer; without amendment (Rept. No. 409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2787. A bill for the relief of Josefine Hoorn (Dmytruk); without amendment (Rept. No. 410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3670. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Gamroth; with amendment (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 5134. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 5135. A bill relating to the repacking of fresh vegetables which have been, or are to be, transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5136. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 5137. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to establish the hours of work for rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 5138. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, so as to provide that in the absence of a designation of beneficiary thereunder by a person having national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance, the designated beneficiary of such insurance shall also be the designated beneficiary of any indemnity payable under such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE (by request):

H. R. 5139. A bill to incorporate Wounded Combat Veterans, now known as the Military Order of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 5140. A bill to provide that certain veterans who served during the Spanish-American War and who were erroneously discharged for fraudulent enlistment shall be credited with increased periods of active military or naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 5141. A bill to create the Small Business Administration and to preserve small business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 5142. A bill to provide that where the father of a family has died as a result of military service, the sole surviving son shall not be inducted for military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 5143. A bill to provide a method whereby wartime service can be established in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War whose records cannot be found; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5144. A bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 5145. A bill to establish a Commission on Tax Policy to study various methods for limiting the taxing, appropriating, spending, and borrowing powers of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5146. A bill to provide that newspapermen shall not be required to reveal the sources of their information in Federal courts or before committees of Congress, except where disclosure is found to be necessary in the interests of national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5147. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow, as a deduction from gross income under section 23 (l), the depreciation of property owned and occupied by the taxpayer as his residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 5148. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 5149. A bill to authorize the use in criminal proceedings in any court established by act of Congress of information intercepted in national security investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5150. A bill to assure the development of petroleum resources necessary to the national security by providing a limitation on the quantity of crude petroleum and petroleum products that may be imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5151. A bill to incorporate The Mothers of World War Number Two, to set forth and establish the purposes and aims of the organization, fixing its corporate powers and establishing the rights of membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution designating the week beginning June 14, 1953 as Theodore Roosevelt Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. NORBLAD: Memorial No. 4 of the 47th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress to consider the merits of the recently announced general policy of the United States Department of the Interior with regard to Indian affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, urging the President of the United States to place all needed facilities of the Federal Government at the service of the Isle Royale Study Commission, created by authority of Gov. G. Mennen Williams, and requesting the Congress to take the necessary and appropriate action to assist this agency in the conduct of a proposed development program for Isle Royale National Park, originally a part of the State of Michigan and the most unique of our national parks in the great national park system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 5152. A bill for the relief of Damiano Mario Carmine Palusci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5153. A bill for the relief of Pasqualina Iraci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5154. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLYLE:

H. R. 5155. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Katsoudas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG (by request):

H. R. 5156. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Kontelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5157. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Ganelin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 5158. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Welch Sanders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 5159. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nadezhda Pojidaeff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5160. A bill for the relief of Manuel Barrios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5161. A bill for the relief of Maksymilian and Yetta Feldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 5162. A bill for the relief of Zofia Nowosad (Mazurek); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5163. A bill for the relief of Solomon Wiesel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 5164. A bill for the relief of Denis Moussouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5165. A bill for the relief of Harry Koulouthros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5166. A bill for the relief of Shozo Ohsuga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 5167. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Paula Neureuther and son, Frank Timothy Neureuther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5168. A bill for the relief of Shamim Jonathan Ahmed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 5169. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lonna Louise Koch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 5170. A bill for the relief of Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5171. A bill for the relief of Nikola Barulic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 5172. A bill to authorize Col. John M. Welch, United States Army Reserve, to accept a decoration tendered by a foreign government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 1953

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, as we come in the reverential stillness of this moment, our spirits bowing at the altar of Thy greatness and goodness, be to us more than a name, more than a distant deity enthroned in heavenly glory; be to us a quickening presence, a sustaining power, a refuge from the confusion and tumult of our times. May we see life steadily, and see it whole, and discern in it Thy purpose for us and for our fellows.

Thou knowest how we are tempted. The drain of our daily work, the limitations of our strength frustrate so often our yearnings after a nobler life. We pray that there may be renewed within us a sense of joy at the high privilege of serving the present age. Let Thy spirit dwell in our hearts that we may carry about the infection of a good courage and gallantly greet the unseen with a cheer, knowing that whatever comes Thou art our rock and our salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 12, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller,

one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, May 13, 1953, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 365. An act for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson;

S. 720. An act for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 851. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall; and

S. 1041. An act to abolish the United States Commission for the Construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMATHERS was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] has the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield in order to permit discussion of a bill which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] desires to call up; also to permit the transaction of the usual business of the morning hour and the transaction of executive business; and that I may claim the floor at the end of that period without having lost my right to the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] asks unanimous consent that he may yield, without losing his right to the floor, to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], then for the purpose of allowing the transaction of routine business and executive business. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Utah is granted.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT ASSOCIATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 241, H. R. 2277, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment. I have asked for its present consideration because I have been advised that the Roosevelt Memorial Association desires to have this change of name made in order to avoid confusion. They are contemplating a meeting of importance in the near future, and desire to prepare their invitations bearing the new name.

The bill has been passed by the House and I see no reason why it should not be passed by the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has heard the request and the explanation as given by the Senator from New Jersey. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2277) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, recommending the enactment of legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide a small civil penalty for violation of the rules and regulations of the Commission applicable to all radio stations other than those in the broadcast services, and to further provide for collection or mitigation thereof by the Commission which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Society of the Cincinnati, at Philadelphia, Pa., endorsing the right and duty of Congress and the judiciary to investigate all Communists and subversive activities, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Missouri, memorializing Congress to appropriate funds recommended in the budget for the Missouri River Basin program, and to enact soil conservation legislation to be coordinated with such water conservation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President, on May 12, 1953, p. 4753, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS AT NEWPORT, R. I.—RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, at the January session, 1953, relating to Federal assistance in the construction of State piers in the city of Newport, R. I.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to Federal assistance in the construction of State piers in the city of Newport

Whereas, the United States Navy, and rightly, since War College, Training Station, and many other installations are a part of the structure of our maritime State, Rhode Island, has priority in approach to the sea in the matter of piers and dockage front area; and

Whereas in the economic and recreational development of this highly industrialized State, ready access to and from the salt water for the nonmilitary resident, navigator, tourist, and vacationist, many of them relatives and friends of the Navy, is increasingly essential for survival: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Congressmen in the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to give serious consideration to the feasibility and possibility of urging that Federal funds be allocated for the development of piers in the city of Newport, which will be available to the public generally and exclusively for Navy or other military purposes, at least that a survey be undertaken through correct official or special channels to consider the possibility and feasibility of establishment and construction of said State pier or piers, with funds allocated from the Federal Government for such purpose, and contribution to be made to match or otherwise from the State of Rhode Island as the State's share in this undertaking; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the Senators and Congressmen from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America duly certified copies of this resolution.

WORLD AFFAIRS—RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TEMPLE SISTERHOODS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk several resolutions adopted by the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods which held its 40th anniversary biennial assembly in New York between April 19 and April 23.

The Federation is composed of more than 480 units throughout the United States with a membership of 85,000 women.

The resolutions pertain to the great work of the United Nations, the importance of the United Nations Children's Fund, and the need for the point 4 program, on all issues of which I have personally cast my votes in emphatic and affirmative support.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TEMPLE SISTERHOODS 40TH BIENNIAL ASSEMBLY

WORLD AFFAIRS—UNITED NATIONS

We believe that all people are equal and united to one another in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God; and that the best interests of the world may be obtained through mutual deliberation and consideration; that more than two-thirds of the world's people live in underdeveloped countries where there is a low living standard; and that only through the elimination of want and starvation may all men become equal: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods in convention assembled, urge upon itself, its affiliated units and their members further support of the United Nations and study of its specialized agencies, in order that it may continue in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods in biennial assembly hopes the United Nations will continue its projects of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas of the world and that the United States will continue to make available to the U. N. its technical knowledge and teams of experts.

UNICEF

There is an agency of the U. N., namely the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, interested, as a mutual assistance agency, in the well-being of the world's children and since allocations for child welfare projects have greatly depleted the resources of this very essential agency of international assistance: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods in biennial assembly urges on behalf of its United States units, that the United States Government pass without delay the appropriation already authorized for UNICEF and assume responsibility for its share of the emergency needs.

POINT 4

Whereas point 4 under the Mutual Security Administration of the United States has given hope to millions of unfortunate people and set them on the road to better health and to self sufficiency; and

Whereas we believe that well-fed, healthy populations who can sustain themselves are the best insurance for a free world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this 19th biennial assembly of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods upon behalf of its United States members urges the President, the State Department, and the Congress of the United States to support the point 4 program and strengthen it as much as possible.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 105. Resolution authorizing the payment of certain expenses in connection with the preparation of a study entitled "Tensions in the Satellite Countries of the Soviet Union"; without amendment.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN MATTER RELATING TO SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 109, providing for the printing of certain matter relating to the Subversive Activities Control Board, submitted by me on May 12, 1953.

The cost involved is $1,177.04. The report is now on the press, and we can save quite a good deal of money if we can combine it with the report that is being printed.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to have printed for its use 3,000 copies of Senate Document No. 41, 83d Congress, entitled "Subversive Activities Control Board."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1884. A bill for the relief of Katherine Christine Blakewood (Junko Abe); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of Col. John R. Harris, Army of the United States, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1886. A bill for the relief of Michael Herlong Padget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

S. 1887. A bill to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1888. A bill for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1889. A bill for the relief of Margot Goldschmidt; and

S. 1890 (by request). A bill for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1891. A bill for the relief of Lee Jahn Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1892. A bill for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1893. A bill for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRISWOLD (for himself and Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska):

S. 1894. A bill relating to the reservation of mineral rights in land patented under the nonmineral land laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1895. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Lemoine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1896. A bill for the relief of Joubran A. Abou Joubran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of June 16, 1938, creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRICKER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1081, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FERGUSON submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1081, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUPPORT OF CREDIT OF THE UNITED STATES BY FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM—EDITORIAL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) which would require the Federal Reserve System to support United States Government securities at par, thereby enabling the Government to borrow at lower interest rates. This in turn would permit lower interest rates for farmers, businessmen, home buyers, local governments, and other borrowers.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the junior Senator from

West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] have joined me in support of the concurrent resolution.

During the first 4 months of 1953, Mr. President, the Federal Reserve System has refrained from buying any new Government securities—although it was obvious that interest rates would rise in the absence of Federal Reserve System support.

As a result increased rates on 90-day Treasury bills will cost the Treasury $38,900,000 a year.

The new and higher rates on the refinancing of 1-year Treasury certificates will cost an additional $30 million.

The recent rate increase on long-term bonds will cost $7,500,000.

The total additional cost to the Treasury on bills, certificates, and bonds will be about $76,800,000.

The refusal of the Federal Reserve System to support the credit of the United States would be bad enough if it resulted only in additional billions of dollars in Government expenditures and the national debt.

But it has also led to a dangerous spiral of interest-rate increases for private borrowers.

First there was an increase in the interest on support loans to farmers and on Export-Import loans for the purchase abroad of American cotton.

Then came an increase in the commercial bank rate on prime business loans.

This was followed by a rise in rates on consumer-installment loans.

Over the last weekend the interest rate on VA- and FHA-insured home mortgages was boosted.

All of this is happening at a time when there is a serious decline in agricultural prices and a growing danger that the agricultural price decline may spread to the rest of the economy.

The adoption of our concurrent resolution will help protect American farmers, veterans, home buyers, and small-business men against the harmful effects of further interest-rate boosts and of undue tightening in the supply of credit.

In this connection I would like to quote an editorial which appeared in the Havre (Mont.) News of March 15, 1953.

This editorial is based upon a special study which was made by Dr. Clark Warburton, an economist who works for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:

It is the contention of Dr. Warburton—

States the editorial—

that if the Federal Reserve banks operated so as to provide a rate of growth in the legal reserves of member banks for lending purposes corresponding to the rate of growth of money which is needed in the economy for business stability, there need be no fear of a major depression.

Our concurrent resolution, Mr. President, will help achieve the objective set forth so well by Dr. Warburton. By so doing, it will provide invaluable insurance against the threat of future depressions, foreclosures, bankruptcies, and unemployment.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the editorial from the Havre News from which I have just quoted.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF CAUSE AND CURE OF DEPRESSIONS

We have heard or read of 101 reasons why there are depressions, these opinions ranging from the position of the stars to the aftermath of wars. But we think we have strayed across an intelligent analyses which has considerable merit.

Dr. Clark Warburton, an economist who works for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in Washington, D. C., has pointed out that the basis of a depression is less spending for goods and services produced by business enterprise. A business feature in a report of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States states that "when people spend less, one of two things, or both, must have happened. Either people kept money in their banks or pocketbooks that they might have spent without going too far in the hole, or they had less money to spend."

Here is the reason:

Depressions are caused by a shrinkage in money spending in the market.

What the heck, you say. That's not an unusual observation. You had it figured out that way all of the time.

But did you? You have joined with the theory of modern economists who have been saying that depressions begin with a decline in spending, a reduced rate in the use of money, rather than a smaller supply of money.

The one thing you did not figure out was if reduced spending preceded or followed the shrinkage of the supply of money.

Dr. Warburton opened our eyes when he stated that as long ago as 100 years, economists said that the supply of money shrinks first and then the people begin to spend less. The doctor agrees and we're stringing along with him. His studies show that by the middle of 1929, which was the peak of the boom, the Nation's money supply had been getting smaller and smaller.

Dr. Warburton says that the Nation's money supply was contracting in 1937 in advance of the 1938 recession. Shrinkage in money supply preceded nearly all of the 40 recessions and depressions since the American Revolution. That's historical.

A remedy is offered by Dr. Warburton. He says that the Nation's money supply is largely controlled by the Federal Reserve banking system. It is the contention of Dr. Warburton that if the Federal Reserve banks operated so as to provide a rate of growth in the legal reserves of member banks for lending purposes corresponding to the rate of growth of money which is needed in the economy for business stability, there need be no fear of a major depression.

The question is not one of maintaining a constant supply of money but rather a question of increasing the money supply in proportion to the need.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has pointed out many times that the Federal Reserve System can encourage the increased money supply by (1) reducing the reserve requirement of banks thereby increasing their ability to loan money; (2) permitting banks to borrow from the Federal Reserve at less interest; and (3) purchase of Government securities which puts more money into the market.

Reasons for depression are better known than ever before but this does not mean that any administration has but to pull the solution out of a file of cures worked up by economists. Some economics are based on theories and there are pet theories which are weak. However, what Dr. Warburton outlines appears to be more factual than theoretical. It makes us feel good to learn that there is a pretty good answer for depressions available. If it is used when slippage occurs, we can continue to buy our apples from the grocers and not from unemployed men on street corners.—H. C. W.

CONSUMPTION OF DAIRY ITEMS—RELEASE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a press release which I have received from the National Dairy Council setting forth the record consumption of dairy foods in 1952. The release points out, for example, that the people of our country consumed around 455 pounds of dairy food per person during last year.

It is a fact that consumption of certain dairy items like butter, evaporated milk, condensed milk, and so forth, were down slightly last year as compared to previous years.

Moreover, it is a further fact that regardless of how high our consumption of all dairy items may appear to be in relation to previous years, still, consumption of specific items like cheese is nowhere near the vast amounts which foreign countries consume.

There should, therefore, be greater concentration by both public and private sources in encouraging greater consumption of dairy items. If such consumption did increase, it could practically overnight wipe out the so-called present surplus and replace it in effect with a shortage.

I ask unanimous consent that the National Dairy Council release be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD CONSUMPTION OF DAIRY FOODS

CHICAGO.—Americans consumed about 455 pounds of dairy foods per person during 1952, it has been announced here.

In terms of individual dairy food products, the per person consumption of whole milk and cream was up 18 percent over prewar years, the purchase of cheese hit an all-time high, ice cream held its own, and dry milk set a new record.

Butter and evaporated and condensed milk were down slightly in per person consumption from the previous year.

These facts were revealed this week in the 1953 issue of How Americans Use Their Dairy Foods, a special report issued annually by the National Dairy Council, Chicago, a nonprofit, research, and educational agency for the United States dairy industry.

The actual average per person consumption of cheese was 7.7 pounds, a rate of consumption 40 percent above prewar and more than 70 percent above 20 years ago. Twenty-five years ago little more than 5 percent of the Nation's milk supply was used in the production of cheese. In recent years cheese has used 10 percent of the total.

Ice cream consumption has stood at 14 quarts per person for the past 3 years, an amount 75 percent above prewar consumption. Present consumption of ice cream is more than twice the amount consumed per person in 1920, a fact attributed to an increasing awareness on the part of consumers that ice cream is a food in itself, not just a luxury.

Per person domestic consumption of dry whole milk and nonfat dry milk solids has increased spectacularly to a combined total of almost 5 pounds.

What did dairy foods, including butter, contribute to the nutritional value of the entire United States food supply during 1952?

Americans gained about 16 percent of their energy from dairy foods.

Milk and milk products also contributed to the total food supply: (1) More than one-fourth of the protein; (2) three-fourths of all the calcium; (3) almost half the riboflavin; (4) one-fourth the fat; and (5) over 18 percent of the vitamin A.

The following table tells the full story of the known nutritional contribution of dairy foods:

Contribution of dairy products, including butter, to the total nutrients in the United States food supply, 1952

Nutrients:	Percent
Food energy	16.6
Protein	26.0
Fat	24.7
Carbohydrates	8.1
Calcium	76.2
Iron	3.6
Vitamin A value	18.5
Thiamin	11.4
Riboflavin	48.3
Niacin	4.2
Ascorbic acid	5.9

Pricewise, dairy foods piled up a favorable record during 1952. While the all-foods price index rose to 232, the index for whole milk home-delivered, for example, advanced to only 198.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—LETTER FROM WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a letter which I have received from W. C. Foth, president of the Wisconsin Association Vocational Agriculture Instructors.

The Association has raised the very important issue of adequate funds for vocational education purposes, particularly vocational farm training.

Needless to say I am deeply concerned, as I know my colleagues are, with regard to the difficult budget problem facing our country and facing the Congress today. I hope however that every effort will be made to bear in mind the importance of vocational training in contributing to the national defense as well as to the national wealth, and contributing to the base for tax revenue.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTORS,
Cameron, Wis., May 7, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The 500 members of the Wisconsin Association Vocational Agriculture Instructors in a special meeting have instructed us to urge your support in restoring the cuts in Federal aid recently voted for the field of vocational agriculture through the appropriation bill of the Health, Welfare, and and Education Department.

This association has long stood and worked for the ideals developed in the fields of vocational agriculture. To discontinue or impede this program through a cut in financial aid would deprive many farm boys of much needed training, or at least reduce the standards to a point where the effectiveness of the training would be seriously impaired.

Further it would mean the eventual discontinuation of the National, State, and local organization, the Future Farmers of America which has done much to provide training in leadership, citizenship, and farming skills to the farm boy.

Thank you for the support we hope you give the bill.

Sincerely yours,

W. C. FOTH,
President.
M. S. MURRAY,
Secretary.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Address delivered on Monday, May 11, 1953, by Hon. Jacob M. Lashly, past president of the American Bar Association and a member of the St. Louis, Mo., bar.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address delivered on May 6, 1953, by George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., before the First Annual Conference on Business Problems, under the auspices of Morris Harvey College and WCHS, Charleston, W. Va.

By Mr. MORSE:

Address delivered by Mayor Bowron, of Los Angeles, Calif., over radio station KNXT on May 5, 1953; and two press releases issued by the Citizens Committee to Reelect Mayor Bowron.

Letter addressed to him by the Clackamas County Central Grange, No. 276, of Beavercreek, Oreg., on the subject of the submerged lands joint resolution.

Resolution on size of parcel post packages adopted by the Polk County (Oreg.) Farmers Union.

By Mr. PASTORE:

Statement on formation of the Government News Correspondents Association.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Editorial entitled "Do This for Freedom," published in the Arizona Republic of May 9, 1953.

Editorial entitled "They Demand Inflation," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 12, 1953.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Facts Forum results on certain public questions.

SMALL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, there is at present much discussion of the different functions performed by various units of government in the United States. Herman A. Lowe, a special writer for the Philadelphia Inquirer, has prepared an interesting study which enumerates the subdivisions of government in the United States. In days to come, when Congress considers the subject of a commission to consider the question of taxes and the functions of government, such information might be helpful. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Pennsylvania Still Has Too Many Small Units of Government," may be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA STILL HAS TOO MANY SMALL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, May 9.—Pennsylvania has no fewer than 5,156 operating local units of government which spend money. These include the counties, municipalities, school districts and special districts.

But this is fairly typical of what goes on in all States. It may be why the Federal Government in Washington has been able to gather more and more power unto itself—too many weak, local units.

Nationwide, there is a total of 116,743 units. Included in this great total are: 1 Federal Government and 48 State. All but these 49 are units of smaller than State size.

But, there's an encouraging note. The States have begun to merge their subsidiaries into fewer, stronger ones. Pennsylvania, it must be admitted, is not in the vanguard of this movement.

As against the present 116,743 units, there were 155,116 in 1952. The merging, strengthening, and streamlining has been in two categories—school districts and townships.

Nationally, the number of school districts declined from 108,549 to 61,346 during the decade. The number of townships went down from 18,919 to 17,202. On the other hand, there has been a small increase in the number of municipalities (villages, boroughs, towns, and cities) as population has grown. And there's been a relatively substantial jump in the number of special districts—from 8,299 to 12,319.

But there's still plenty of room for improvement, with Pennsylvania a good example of what could be done.

The statistics quoted, just gathered by the United States Census Bureau, list only 66 functioning counties for the Keystone State.

Philadelphia County is excluded because it is merely an area with no genuine separate functions of government.

Pennsylvania has 397 self-governing municipalities with fewer than 1,000 population, and another 231 with fewer than 2,500 population.

The State's townships are a potent political factor and there's little tampering with them. But the survey shows that 645 townships govern fewer than 1,000 people apiece and another 575 townships have fewer than 2,500 population each.

Pennsylvania, which would doubtless do the job better with fewer, has a total of 2,506 school districts. In 282 of them, there are fewer than 50 pupils apiece.

One of the new developments has been the so-called special district, to tackle limited functions, usually for more than one unit of local government. Pennsylvania is slow in this field. It has 27 special districts for housing and community redevelopment and 2 for urban water supply. In addition, Pennsylvania is part of 2 of the 15 interstate special districts—the Delaware River Port Authority and the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission—both with New Jersey as its partner.

In most States, small local communities have banded together to create special districts to provide the area with better fire departments, hospitals, sanitation, joint health facilities, highway lighting, drainage, soil conservation, irrigation, libraries, cemeteries, etc. Some have set up special joint districts to provide better gas and electricity.

This appears to be the new trend, which may even reach Pennsylvania.

THE FAR EAST AND THE COMMUNIST PEACE MANEUVER

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on May 1, in Chicago, Ill., a distinguished American citizen, Hon. William C. Bullitt, delivered a notable address at the Palmer House before the National Convention of Central Supply Association. The subject of Mr. Bullitt's address was The Far East and the Communist Peace Maneuver, which, of

course, is a matter giving us all extreme concern at the moment.

Mr. Bullitt, as we all know, has had the distinction of being Ambassador to Russia, then Ambassador to France, and then Ambassador at Large, besides serving in many other important posts. His observations on the pending crisis in the Far East are, therefore of first importance. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bullitt's address be published in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. BULLITT BEFORE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF CENTRAL SUPPLY ASSOCIATION, PALMER HOUSE HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 1, 1953

THE FAR EAST AND THE COMMUNIST PEACE MANEUVER

All Americans want peace. In consequence, the Communist peace maneuver in the Far East has released a flood of wishful thinking. Many entirely patriotic men and women have begun to hope, and even to believe, that at last the Soviet Government is making a genuine offer of peace. What they see, unhappily, is not a Communist change of heart but a projection of their own wishes.

When I was a child, I watched a revival meeting on the bank of a creek in South Carolina. Converts were being baptized. A nice old colored woman became very excited and hurried to the water shouting: "I see the Lord! I see the Lord!" Her husband, sitting on the bank, called out to her: "Shut up, Mandy! T'aint nothin' but a mud turtle." Unfortunately, the present Communist maneuver is not a holy dove of peace, but just another Soviet snapping turtle.

To understand this Communist maneuver, it is necessary only to remember that, so long as the Soviet Government exists, it will continue to try to impose Communist dictatorship throughout the world. The Communist creed dictates aggression as a duty. The Soviet Government signs nonaggression pacts and peace treaties when it believes that its vital interests demand their signature; but it signs with every intention of breaking such agreements when it feels strong enough to do so with impunity. When the Soviet Government offers "peace and friendship" to a non-Communist state, it always intends to end the "friendship" by driving a dagger into the back of its new "friend." The Soviet satellite governments are controlled absolutely by the Soviet Government. All Soviet satellite aggression is ordered by the Soviet Government and is, therefore, in essence Soviet aggression.

The Soviet Government never changes its long-range objective of world conquest; but frequently it changes its tactics. It does so in accordance with its estimate of the world military situation. When it feels sure it can conquer a victim with impunity, it attacks. When it estimates that the forces arrayed against it have become so strong and alert that persistence in its preferred policy of perpetual aggression might produce retaliation and the destruction of the central Russian bastion of communism, it camouflages itself in sheep's clothing and gently bleats "Peace, peace." By that tactic, which Lenin invented, it has bamboozled the free world four times since 1918. Each time it has used the period of bamboozlement feverishly to prepare a fresh attack.

Today the Soviet Government fears our intercontinental bombers, our atomic bombs, and our hydrogen bombs. Malenkov, Beria, and their associates, have learned thoroughly the teaching of Lenin, who said: "Political leaders of the revolutionary class who are unable to tack, to maneuver, to compromise, in order to avoid an obviously disadvantageous battle are good for nothing." The Soviet leaders know that today they would lose a war against us. They have no intercontinental bombers and no hydrogen bombs. They have atomic bombs, and bombers which could fly across our country but not return to the Soviet Union. They can damage us; but they cannot now knock us out by a sneak attack. They know that our retaliation might well knock out the Soviet Union. Until the Soviet Government possesses enough intercontinental bombers and hydrogen bombs to annihilate us by a surprise blow, it will not dare to provoke war with us. It needs time to construct those lethal weapons. Therefore, knowing how much we desire to live in peace, and the weakness and weariness of our allies, it is now attempting to lull us into a sleep of death by its fifth peace maneuver.

Although this maneuver does not offer us peace it is important as a Soviet admission of relative, temporary weakness. It throws a spotlight on the chance we now have to seize the initiative in our struggle against the Communist effort to conquer the world. For a brief period we shall be able to act with relative impunity.

This chance may be our last. When the Soviet Government possesses the weapons it needs to destroy us by a surprise attack, it will not hesitate to attack. If our Government should fail to employ the present period of our relative impunity to seize the initiative from the Soviet Government, we may incur the destruction of our country. Time is on the side of those who know how to use it. No war, hot or cold, was ever won by forces which feared to take the offensive.

What should we do?

The possession of military strength is not enough. No man ever held such absolute power to protect the vital interests of his country as President Truman held at the close of the Second World War. We alone had the atomic bomb. Our Air Force dominated the skies of the world. We had the power to act with absolute impunity. But our President did not know what to do.

He was bamboozled by Soviet psychological warfare into treating the Soviet Union as a peace-loving democracy, and the Chinese Communists as mere agrarian reformers who had no connection with Moscow. During the period of our irresistible power, Truman allowed Stalin to impose his rule on central and eastern Europe, and on China. Today our impunity is only relative, and the problems bequeathed to Eisenhower by Truman are more multitudinous and grave than any our Nation has faced since Washington stood in the snow at Valley Forge. We need in Eisenhower the qualities we found in Washington and did not find in Truman: the wisdom, the moral courage, and the will to lead us up the hard road to national survival.

In his major address of April 16, 1953, President Eisenhower started to lead us. He called on the Soviet Government to prove its desire for peace not by rhetoric but by acts. He said:

"We care only for sincerity of peaceful purpose—attested by deeds. The opportunities for such deeds are many. The performance of a great number of them waits upon no complex protocol but upon the simple will to do them. Even a few such clear and specific acts—such as the Soviet Union's signature upon an Austrian treaty, or its release of thousands of prisoners still held from World War II—would be impressive signs of sincere intent. * * *

"The first great step along this way must be the conclusion of an honorable armistice in Korea. This means the immediate cessation of hostilities and the prompt initiation of political discussions leading to the holding of free elections in a united Korea. It should mean—no less importantly—an end to the direct and indirect attacks upon the security of Indochina and Malaya. For any armistice in Korea that merely released aggressive armies to attack elsewhere would be a fraud."

The President called for a free and united Germany with a government based upon free and secret elections, then asked:

"What is the Soviet Union ready to do?

"The test of truth is simple. There can be no persuasion by deeds.

"Is the new leadership in the Soviet Union prepared to use its decisive influence in the Communist world—including control of the flow of arms—to bring not merely an expedient truce in Korea but genuine peace in Asia?

"Is it prepared to allow other nations, including those of Eastern Europe, the free choice of their own forms of government and the right to associate freely with other nations in a worldwide community of law?

"Is it prepared to act in concert with others upon serious disarmament proposals to be made firmly effective by stringent U. N. control and inspection?

"If not, where then is the concrete evidence of the Soviet Union's concern for peace?"

By this address, President Eisenhower cleared the deck for action to seize the initiative from Soviet Government. If the Soviet Government should order its Chinese and Korean satellite governments promptly to agree to hold free elections in a united Korea, and if it should order its Communist leaders to quit the soil of Indochina, and should sign the Austrian peace treaty—none of which acts are likely—we would have gained ground for the first time since the beginning of the cold war. If, on the other hand, the Soviet Government should reject the President's proposals, he would either be obliged to move from words to action at once or to forfeit the respect he has gained throughout the free world by his strong statements. Brave words, unsupported by brave acts, excite only contempt, as every schoolboy knows when he faces a fist fight, and every nation should know.

If, as is likely, the Soviet Government should try to delay action by minor agreements and long negotiations on vital points, a hard moment would come for the President and for all other Americans. To permit the President's proposals to degenerate into prolonged palaver, like the old Korean truce talks, would be to hand to the Soviet Government the time it needs to prepare the weapons for our annihilation. To avoid that trap, the President would be obliged to set a time limit when Communist talk must be replaced by acceptance of our proposals or American action.

For example, if our Government should agree to a cessation of hostilities in Korea before the Soviet satellites had agreed to the holding of free elections in a united Korea, and to honest arrangements for such elections, the Soviet Government might order its Chinese and Korean agents to keep us talking on those points endlessly. What then? Unless we wished to deprive ourselves entirely of friends in Korea, Formosa, and Indochina, we would have to recommence hostilities. Otherwise those Asiatics who trust us, and fight on our side, would feel betrayed; and Japan would conclude that to be a friend of the United States is too dangerous.

The peoples of the Far East respect our physical strength and our good intentions; but events of the past 10 years have made them doubt that our Government has either the intelligence or the will to counter the Soviet Government's skillful and relentless attack on Asia. They know that ever since the establishment of the Soviet Government in Russia, its strategy has been to seize control of Asia before attempting to conquer western Europe and the United States.

Lenin said: "In the last analysis the outcome of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, and China, etc., constitute the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe."

Stalin, as far back as 1918, published a pamphlet entitled: "Don't Forget the East,"

in which he asserted that the Communists could not achieve success unless they should succeed in controlling Asia. He described Asia as the imperialists, most reliable and truest rear and inexhaustible reserve, and declared that by seizing Asia the Communists could transform the encirclement of the Soviet Union into an encirclement of the imperialists.

A popular Communist expression of the idea runs:

"The way to Paris and London lies by way of Peking."

China is the key to Asia; and the first great step of the Soviet Government toward conquest of Asia came at the Yalta Conference in February 1945 when President Roosevelt, ill and close to death, was tricked into secretly handing control of Manchuria, the most productive and strategically important province of China, to Stalin—behind the back of the Chinese Government. The second great step came in 1946, when, at the height of the war between the Chinese Nationalist Government and Stalin's Chinese Communists, our Government, bamboozled into the idea that the Chinese Communists were mere agrarian reformers who had no connection with Moscow, demanded that President Chiang Kai-shek should take Communists into his government; and, when he rightly refused, broke all our agreements with him and cut off all munitions for the Chinese National Army. The third great step came in 1949 when Secretary of State Acheson issued a so-called White Book on China which by lying half truths at a time when the Chinese National Army was losing in battle against the Communists 7,000 dead a week, smeared our devoted allies. That document—the most dishonorable ever issued by the Government of the United States—convinced millions of Asiatics that we were such an unreliable friend that to save their skins they had better turn to the Communist side.

These acts not only prepared the way for Communist conquest of the mainland of China and for the Korean war but also made all Asiatics conclude that we had one standard of honor and ethics in dealing with Europeans and another in dealing with Asiatics.

In Japan, thanks to General MacArthur, our behavior was entirely honorable; but our Government, bamboozled into the idea that the Soviet Union was a "peace-loving democracy" which would help us keep the peace in the Far East, insisted on writing into the Japanese Constitution an article forbidding Japan to have an army or navy or an air force. Today we are doing our utmost to persuade the Japanese Government to take that article out of their constitution, because we want a Japanese army to assist us in the defense of Japan. But the article was taken seriously by most Japanese, and resistance to its cancellation is so great among Japanese women and young men that the Japanese Government does not even dare to try to eliminate it. In Japan it was not our morality but our foresight, our intelligence, which failed.

At the present time, Japan is an unhappy country. Everyone is working hard; but without faith in the future. We forced Japan to hand Southern Sakhalin to the Soviet Government and there, today, only a few miles from the large Japanese island of Hokkaido, the Soviet Government has built air fields and has based bombers. Japan's economy is kept from collapse only by the large expenditures of our Armed Forces—due to the Korean war. In order to live in time of peace Japan must expand greatly her overseas trade. Her sales of silk to us are threatened by synthetic fibers. Her trade with Southeast Asia is precarious because of Communist invasion. Her trade with the Communist-held Chinese mainland is reduced to small proportions by our justified objection to allowing her to supply the Chinese Communists with products useful in war. Moreover, the Japanese statesmen know that if they should become dependent on trade with the Communist-held mainland of China, Japan would soon be at the mercy of the Communists.

If the present war in Korea should end with the mainland of China, north Korea and a great part of Indochina in Communist hands, we would be obliged to give large annual doles to the Japanese Government in order to keep the Japanese people alive. Japan would be, in name, an independent nation; but, in reality, dependent on us. The Japanese are proud and they resent that prospect. Those who work without faith in a better future are easy to convert to communism. There is no way to insure that Japan will remain in our camp except the way of winning the Asiatic war.

Such an outcome of the present Communist peace maneuver may be closer than many Americans think. If Soviet talk and stalling should oblige President Eisenhower to decide that we must act, he could not in honor ask our men, as Truman did, to die in a war he did not even intend to try to win. He would have to fight for victory.

The Soviet attack on Asia is a carefully planned war on three fronts: 1. in Korea; 2. on the mainland of China; 3. in Indochina. Effective action to win the Asiatic war during the present period of our relative impunity would involve:

First. Stoppage of all seaborne supplies to Communist-held mainland of China.

About 60 percent of Red China's imports arrive by sea. The Communist armies in Korea and Indochina, as well as those that hold the coast against the raids of the Chinese Nationals from Formosa and the National guerrillas, are all supplied by way of the Chinese mainland. To stop all Red China's seaborne commerce would be to shrink to impotence the strength of the Communists on the Korean, Indo-Chinese, and mainland of China fronts.

Second. Rapid strengthening of the South Korean forces, the Chinese National forces in Formosa, and the anti-Communist forces in Indochina, where the Communists are now conducting a dangerous offensive, in a new aggression against the State of Laos while their Kremlin masters bleat their love of peace.

Third. Coordinated attack on the Korean front, the Indochina front, and the mainland of China front, under one command, in obedience to one strategic plan.

Such a plan should not call for use of American ground forces on the Asiatic mainland except where they are now involved in the Korean war or in pursuit across the Yalu River. Asiatic soldiers, well trained and led, fight as effectively as white soldiers and require less than one-fifth of the supplies needed by white soldiers. If we should be so foolish as to debark white troops on the coast of China, the Chinese Communists would be able to raise mass resistance and guerrilla warfare against the white imperialist invaders—which they could not raise against the Chinese National soldiers who would be returning to liberate their blood brothers.

There are 600,000 fighting men on Formosa who live with one hope—the hope that they will receive from the United States the arms which will enable them to fight their way back to their homes on the mainland as victors. Such promises as the Truman administration made to supply arms to them were all broken. By January 1953, our Government had delivered only 30 percent of the arms it promised to furnish by July 1, 1952; only 70 percent of the arms it promised to deliver by July 1, 1951; and none whatsoever of the arms it promised to deliver before July 1, 1953. The Eisenhower administration is now beginning to arm those Chinese National fighting men, whose morale is as high as the superb morale of the South Koreans.

All Americans now know that the forces of the Republic of Korea have been fighting for the liberation of their country—the total liberation—with a courage that is beyond praise. No one can destroy their morale except ourselves. If we should agree to cut their country in the middle and leave North Korea under Soviet rule, the army of the Republic of Korea would go on fighting—as President Syngman Rhee has warned us. If, in order to force the Republic of Korea to accept defeat, we should then stop all supplies of munitions to its army, as our Government stopped all supplies of munitions to the Chinese National Army in 1946, we would destroy their morale. But such foul play would render all Korea easy prey for the Communists, and thereafter no Asiatic would trust us.

Eisenhower was not elected to be a mere executor of the policies of Acheson, and he would find it difficult to descend to the ethical level of Truman. Nevertheless, he will be under great pressure to do so, especially from our British friends. They want us to leave all Korea north of the present battleline in the hands of the Communists, and to try to curry favor with the Chinese Communists by withdrawing our recognition of the Chinese National Government on Formosa and recognizing the Red regime in Peking, as Great Britain has—and finally by inviting the Chinese Communists to take the place of the Chinese National Government on the Security Council of the United Nations.

Necessitous men are rarely wise men. The British need money. They have made much, and are making much, out of the earnings of their merchant ships which carry about 70 percent of the seaborne commerce of Red China and out of sales to Red China, largely through the British colony of Hong Kong. But they think they could make more if they were relieved of the restrictions we now impose on their trade with our enemies. Cash is the dominant consideration in British Far Eastern policy. In Great Britain they do not have to worry about Soviet bombers based on Siberia and Manchuria as we do in the United States. Our most vital interest—the survival of our Nation—is involved in this war for Asia. We can not subordinate our survival to British profits. If the shoe were on the other foot and we were selling and carrying supplies to Red China and the British had suffered 133,000 casualties in Korea, we would hear from that superb defender of his country's interests, Winston Churchill, a noble utterance which would make our stomachs turn with shame. The British fleet would blockade the China coast whether we liked it or not—and we would like it.

If we should be obliged to defeat the Korean and Chinese Communist forces in the Far East, we would have the consolation that in the Asiatic war there is no real substitute for victory. For even if the Soviet Government should withdraw its satellite forces from Korea and Indochina, it would use a so-called peace, as it used the Korean truce talks, to build up Communist strength in Red China for a fresh attack. The Communist threat to Korea, Formosa, Indochina, and Japan will not be ended until the Communist regime on the Chinese mainland is destroyed.

Meanwhile, we should not be idle in Europe. As soon as practicable, we should help Albanian patriots to wipe out the anachronism of a miserable, Soviet-controlled Albania cut off from both the Soviet Union and Soviet satellite states. The repercussions of this act of liberation would electrify the enslaved peoples of Central and Eastern Europe.

If Soviet delaying tactics should oblige the President to set a time limit for action, all the Soviet agents and dupes in Europe and America, and all the frightened governments, and all the men and women who do not understand that this is the last chance of the free world to survive, would howl that he was issuing an ultimatum and provoking war.

If the President should face that hour, he would need the help of every patriotic American to resist the pressure of the Communists and their dupes, and the bewildered and the cowards. There are times in the life of a nation when, if it is to survive, its men and women, and even its children, must find in themselves the moral and physical courage to face what the Lord God may bestow—be it battle or death.

Unless we seize the initiative now, we may be blotted from the earth. This year, rather than face destruction by our bombs, the Soviet Government may prefer to permit the downfall of its Chinese, and Korean, and Indochinese satellite governments, and the liberation of some of the European peoples it has enslaved. The Soviet Government will not stop. It can only be stopped by keeping it constantly confronted by superior force. If we have the courage and will to face action, we may achieve such a shrinkage of Soviet power and dominion that we shall be able to keep the conspirators in the Kremlin constantly confronted by superior force and prevent a third world war. If we seize the initiative, we may acnieve peace. The road to salvation for Americans today is the same way that St. Paul pointed out to the Christians of Corinth: "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."

SALE OF GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I wrote this morning to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey.

In the letter, as a reading of it will show, I quoted the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in the colloquy which took place between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] yesterday on the floor of the Senate with regard to the sale of the so-called $1 billion issue of Government bonds.

In the letter I have respectfully requested the Secretary of the Treasury to advise me who bought the bonds. I understand they were sold below par. The Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Oklahoma indicate that much of the issue was bought by speculators. I specifically request, in my letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, that he advise me as to how large a block of these bonds was purchased by the Federal Reserve banks.

Mr. President, we are dealing here with a very dangerous issue so far as the fiscal policies of the Government are concerned, and in my judgment we are dealing with another example of the Eisenhower administration, doing the bidding of the big interests group in this country.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 13, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the course of his remarks in the Senate of the United States yesterday afternoon, Senator GORE, of Tennessee, stated as you will note on page 4798 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 12:

"The Senator referred earlier to the fact that the $1 billion bond issue sold below par before it was even fully offered on the market. Is the Senator aware that, even so, it was oversubscribed 5 or 6 times? That being so, there is but one explanation, namely, that the bonds went, not to permanent holders, but to speculators."

I would appreciate it if you would have someone on your staff prepare a memorandum for me setting forth the facts concerning the sale of the $1 billion bond issue referred to by Senator GORE. I want to know who bought the bonds and particularly want to know what proportion of the issue was taken by the Federal Reserve bank.

Any other information or point of view which you may wish to give me in regard to this bond issue will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

CONFIRMATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, for the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar under the head of "New Reports," beginning on page 2 of the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with the new reports.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Catherine B. Cleary to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Can the acting majority leader advise the Senate whether or not the report of the committee on this nomination was unanimous?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have reason to believe so, but I cannot speak with authority.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. In the absence of the chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. MILLIKIN], I will say that to the best of my knowledge all the nominations on the Executive Calendar reported from the Committee on Finance were reported unanimously.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Catherine B. Cleary to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States?

The nomination was confirmed.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert Cole to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carroll L. Meins to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Horace A. Hildreth to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Will the Senator provide the Senate with information with respect to this nomination? Was it unanimously reported?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I refer that question to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Hon. Horace A. Hildreth, former Republican Governor of Maine, appeared before the committee in person. He was cleared by the FBI, and cleared by all members of the committee who were present. The remaining members of the committee were canvassed, and I understand that no objection whatsoever was raised.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Horace A. Hildreth to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan?

The nomination was confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Julius J. Hoffman to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Win G. Knoch to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. John R. Hardin, colonel, Corps of Engineers, to be a member and President of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the new reports on the executive calendar.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the President will be notified forthwith.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE KOREAN PRISONER-OF-WAR ISSUE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] yield to me so that I may address the Senate for not more than 15 minutes?

Mr. BENNETT. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] yielding to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for not more than 15 minutes, with the understanding that the Senator from Utah will not lose his right to the floor?

The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois may proceed for 15 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the issue of the disposition of the prisoners of war now in the custody of the troops of the United States and of the United Nations.

On the decision of this point not only will peace in Korea be determined, but it will have a great effect upon the ultimate balance of power in Asia and in the world, as well as on our relationships with our allies.

I wish to start out by saying that I believe the past policy of the United States Government under both President Truman and President Eisenhower concerning the disposition of prisoners of war has been fundamentally just and proper.

We have taken approximately 123,000 prisoners. Approximately 74,000 of these have declared either their readiness to return to North Korea or Communist China, or have stated that they would not resist repatriation. Approximately 49,000 of these prisoners of war have stated that they would violently resist repatriation.

The attitude of the American Government has been that we would not force men to go back to North Korea or Communist China against their will. We stood ready to repatriate those who want to go back or are only lukewarm in their opposition, but we would not force men at the point of the bayonet to return against their will. The Communist negotiators in Korea and the Russian Government and the Soviet satellites in the United Nations have insisted that all prisoners of war, regardless of their desires, should be forced to return home.

It was upon that issue that the truce negotiations broke down last fall. It is that issue which is now before the truce negotiators in Korea.

I believe the American public does not understand very thoroughly the reasons which have impelled the American Government to take its position, and I am afraid the British public does not understand our position.

I believe that a little plain speaking in a friendly manner is in the interests of world peace.

In the first place, the American Government refuses to return prisoners of war against their will because we feel it would be a breach of faith with the prisoners who surrendered. We induced a great many of the prisoners to surrender by scattering over the lines leaflets which promised them security of life if they would desert. I have seen some of the leaflets, and I believe the translation which was given to me, namely, that we would guarantee "security of life" to the prisoners, was correct.

Mr. President, we guaranteed security of life at our hands, and we have tried religiously to live up to that pledge. I also believe that the pledge guaranteed the future security of the men as well. While a Philadelphia lawyer might be able to maintain that the pledge did not mean we would guarantee security for them after they were returned to their home country; nevertheless, the moral obligation on our Government seems to me to be compelling not to deliver them into the hands of governments where we know their security of life would be violated.

I believe, therefore, that if we were to turn back to the Communists the prisoners who have surrendered under the pledge which we gave them, to the effect that we would guarantee "security of life," it would be a breach of faith on our part and a betrayal of the promise which we made to those who surrendered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois desire to conclude his address before yielding for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should prefer to finish my remarks.

Mr. President, why have approximately 49,000 prisoners of war held by the United Nations forces refused to go back home? It is because they fear, if they do, that they will be marked men and will be tortured and killed.

We had some experience on this issue after World War II. At Potsdam we guaranteed to return all prisoners of war. I am sure that promise was made in good faith. We believed it was the natural desire of prisoners to go home. Then, after the promise had been made, we discovered that there were a great many Russian prisoners in the German prison camps who did not want to go back home and who resisted repatriation.

Nevertheless, sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly, we repatriated them. In many cases there were suicides before they reached the Russian border. In most other cases, after they crossed the Russian border, if my information is correct, those men were killed. Mr. President, we have done that once. Now, if we turn these people back a second time to certain punishment or revenge, after we have given them our pledge of security, it will be a great blow not only to the United States but to the cause of freedom everywhere. The Communists wish to punish and kill those who do not wish to return, because they want to deter future desertions. They want to prove that if any man leaves their country or deserts from their army they can compel or coerce the free nations to return him, and that when he does return he will be either killed or tortured. The plain purpose of the Communists is to impose such discipline upon their troops and their nationals that, no matter how dissatisfied they may be, they will refuse to desert.

So, Mr. President, we have adopted this policy not only in order to keep our pledged word, but also because we knew that if we yielded, we would discourage and really make impossible future desertions.

The second reason why we did not wish to return them against their will was because we knew that if we were to do so, it would not only discourage, but probably would make impossible, future desertions from behind the Iron Curtain and from behind the bamboo curtain; men would be afraid to desert if they knew we would return them.

Broad humanitarian considerations, of course, underlie and dictate the same decision against forcible repatriation.

So I believe it was a very courageous and correct position on the part of the Truman administration, which has been followed thus far, as I understand, by the Eisenhower administration, to refuse to compel men to return against their will. We refused to drive men at the point of a bayonet to return to a country to which they did not wish to return.

Until recently, the Communists have taken the position that there should be a direct return of unwilling prisoners. The past deadlock has been upon that issue.

In the last few days, beginning last Friday, the Communists have renewed their efforts in somewhat more subtle ways. They have devised a plan which constitutes a grave temptation to the leaders of our Government and the leaders of Great Britain to acquiesce, to salve their consciences, but nevertheless to commit a great wrong. We know the influences which are playing upon the Government of this country and the government of Great Britain to get a quick peace. The war in Korea has been costly and bloody. There is an earnest desire to end it—a desire to end it on terms that will advance the prospects of peace and justice, a desire to end it on terms which will permit the governments to face their public opinion at home, and in some cases the governments are handicapped by pledges which they gave during the period of the election campaigns, when the prime objective seemed to be to win votes.

Let me analyze in some detail the proposal of the Communists, as it was set forth in the New York Times for Friday, May 8.

First, it called for a neutral commission of five nations to exercise general supervision over repatriation, those nations to be Poland, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Sweden, and India. Apparently the proposal was designed ostensibly to include two Communist countries, two

non-Communist countries, and India, which openly states it is a neutralist country.

In passing, it should be noted that the Polish and Czechoslovakia governments are directly satellite governments which would do the will of Moscow; that Switzerland has never joined the United Nations, and therefore does not have the same obligation for collective security; that Sweden lies next door to Russia, across the Baltic Sea, in imminent danger of attack if a third world war should break out. Sweden has tried to maintain neutrality as between East and West, within the United Nations, by not joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I think the United States went rather far in its early proposals, when it said it would be willing to accept Switzerland and Sweden as members of a neutral commission. We certainly have evidenced that we were willing to have neutralists on the commission.

In the third paragraph the Communists proposed that each of the five nations furnish an equal number of armed forces as guards, who would be sent into South Korea and who would have custody of the prisoners during a 4-month period, which would mean that Poland and Czechoslovakia would be privileged to send armed guards into the territory of the United Nations. I have searched the document in vain to find any provision for the separation of prisoners, as between the 74,000 who are willing to go home and the approximately 49,000 who are not willing to go home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The Senator from Illinois has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it would be possible for the Commission to herd the pro-Communist prisoners and the anti-Communist prisoners indiscriminately together. We know what happened when this was done before. The Communists formed "goon squads" which beat, tortured, and killed the anti-Communists. It was further provided in the Communist proposal that North Korea and Communist China could send men to the prisoner camps, to try to explain to all these prisoners of war depending upon these nations, so as to eliminate their apprehension and to inform them of all matters relating to their return to their homelands.

In other words, under that provision it would be possible for the Communist prisoners to be herded in with the non-Communist prisoners, for Communist guards to supervise the prisoners, and for Communist agents from North Korea and from China to work upon the prisoners. The only protection the prisoners would have would be the guards from Sweden, Switzerland, and India. Switzerland does not belong to the United Nations, Sweden has disassociated itself from the most significant efforts of collective security, and India is a most decidedly neutralist country, living in mortal terror of Russia, and anxious to avoid at all costs a conflict in the East.

Under sections 5 and 6 of the Communist proposal, 4 months would be allowed for these explanations, and the disposition of prisoners still in the custody of the repatriation commission at the end of that time would be submitted to the political conference for settlement. In effect this means that no termination date at all would be set for the detention of the prisoners who refuse to return to Communist North Korea or Communist China. It would thus make them virtual hostages while political discussions were going on. With no fixed termination in sight, repatriation—however hateful—would appear to these poor prisoners to be the only alternative to continuing an indefinite detention and perhaps permanent captivity.

Obviously, this would violate all efforts to afford these prisoners a free and uncoerced choice and would afford those determined not to return to Communist countries only a prospect of indefinite detention.

It seems to me that if we were to permit such a commission as that to operate under the conditions set forth in the Communist offer, it would be a great blow to the cause of peace. There would be no real protection to the anti-Communists who would be forced home.

Mr. President, from the statements appearing this morning in the Washington Post and from the incomplete account which has just come in by teletype, I think that in the main the delegation attached to the United Nations command has been attempting to parry the Communists' attack, and I believe that delegation deserves our support. As I understand it, the delegation is insisting, first, that the North Korean prisoners who refuse to return to their former homes be freed immediately and be absorbed into the economy of South Korea. That would dispose of approximately 34,000, leaving for disposition approximately 15,000 Chinese. I understand that we are also insisting that Poland and Czechoslovakia not send armed guards, and therefore not have an opportunity to "work on" the prisoners and coerce them into returning.

What other provisions we include are still not certain. But I think we should stand fast on the points which I have already made, and that further we should shorten the period during which the screening of prisoners can take place, should fix a definite terminal date for detention, and should provide that those who, at the end of the period, still do not wish to go home should not be sent back against their will. On these points I think we should stand as a rock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted 10 minutes more, under the original conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, that is agreeable to the Senator from Utah, provided his rights to the floor are fully protected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 more minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, upon the ultimate and proper conclusion of this controversy, there will hinge not only the fate of nearly 50,000 innocent men, to whom we have given our pledged word, but also, in my judgment, in large degree the security of Asia and the peace of the world. If, by one method or another, the Communists, directly or indirectly, are able to coerce men to return to their countries against their will, they will have won a tremendous moral victory. Such a victory will strengthen their forces throughout Asia and throughout the world, and will correspondingly weaken the forces of the free world. People will say the democracies will not defend their own, and will not protect those who come over to them; and that in the long run the Communists always get their way. Therefore, I hope that the Congress of the United States, regardless of party, and regardless of all other considerations which may arise, will stand behind the administration in resisting these efforts.

I think we may already have gone too far. We may already have made concessions which will be very difficult to reconcile with the fundamental position we have taken. But certainly we should go no further, and we should insist that the detailed procedures shall carry out the basic principle, namely, that men are not to be driven or coerced against their will into repatriation. If we stand by that principle, I think our security and the security of the world will be safer.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to say a word, if I may, to our British friends across the water. In recent days we have become aware of speeches made by the Prime Minister of Great Britain and by the leader of the opposition, both able and fine men. In their speeches, they undertake, apparently, to nudge the United States into such a position that it will be forced to acquiesce in the main features of the Communist proposal. Thus, Prime Minister Churchill declared 2 days ago that the question of the conditions governing the exchange of prisoners has really been reduced to terms which no longer involve any difference in principle. It is probably true that both of the great political parties in England would like to have us agree with the Communists on this question, so that the Korean war can be washed out, and they may be able to think of other things.

Mr. President, I believe the British are adopting this position because they do not know what the issues really are which are at stake. The British people have historically been supporters of justice, have been defenders of the underdog, have wished to grant freedom of choice to people, have opposed coercion, and have stood for a free society. I cannot believe that Prime Minister Churchill and Clement Attlee really know what the issues are when they urge us to take the stand that they are now urging. How, otherwise, can the Prime Minister say there is no difference in principle between ourselves and the Communists on the question of prisoners of war?

We have borne the main burden of the Korean war, at least 90 percent of the United Nations' burden, and yet we have been most cooperative with the

British in the matter of the general policies which are to be followed. We have refused to carry the war beyond the Yalu River, despite great internal pressure in this country. We agreed to put the rearmament of Europe first. In our negotiations we have made many concessions. We have not insisted that the territorial border, to be established by military force, at least, must be the Yalu. We have not blockaded the Chinese coast and have allowed a large degree of British trade with Communist China from which some British firms have reaped considerable profit but which has hurt our military defense of the free world.

We have agreed to neutral commissions containing representatives of certain nations which would be in a very exposed position if they resisted Russia. We have tried in every way we could to keep the great alliance together; and of course the preservation of that alliance is essential for the freedom of the free world. But we appeal to our British friends not to try to force us to betray the eternal principles of justice upon which we stand; we appeal to them not to seek security at the expense of liberty; and we appeal to them to join us in preserving the freedom of the individual and the freedom of men to stand secure from coercion and terror.

So I hope that from all over the free world, from Great Britain and the dominions as well as from this country, there will come a determination not only to support the American attitude in the matter of the return of prisoners, but also a determination to strengthen it, if possible. There can be, in my judgment, no further compromise on this issue. We should have no Munich in 1953, anymore than there should have been in 1938. Let the free world stand together, but stand in the defense of free men and a free society, and not in acquiescence to the terror of the totalitarians.

Mr. President, as an appendix to my statement, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the recent Communist proposal for the Korean prisoners, as reported in the New York Times for May 9, 1953, and the first newspaper reports of the United Nations' counterproposals presented by General Harrison today, together with salient passages from Mr. Churchill's speech of August 11.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 9, 1953]

TEXT OF RED PLAN ON KOREA PRISONERS

I

Within 2 months after the armistice agreement becomes effective, both sides shall, without offering any hindrance, repatriate and hand over in groups all those prisoners of war who insist upon repatriation to the side to which the prisoners of war belong in accordance with the related provisions of paragraph 51, article 3, of the armistice agreement and in conformity with the final name lists exchanged and checked by both sides.

II

In order to facilitate the return to their homelands of the remaining prisoners of war who are not directly repatriated, both sides agree that a neutral nations repatriation commission shall be established, to be composed of an equal number of representatives appointed respectively by five nations; namely, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, and Sweden, the four nations provided for in paragraph 37, article 2, of the armistice agreement and India as agreed upon by both sides.

III

All prisoners of war of both sides, with the exception of those prisoners of war who shall be directly repatriated as provided for in paragraph 1 of this proposal, shall be released from the military control and custody of the detaining side at the original places of detention and be handed over to the neutral nations repatriation commission, provided for in paragraph 2 of this proposal, which shall receive them and take them into custody. The neutral repatriation commission shall have the authority to exercise its legitimate functions and responsibilities for the control of the prisoners of war under its temporary jurisdiction. In order to insure the effective execution of this authority, the member nations of the neutral nations repatriation commission shall each provide an equal number of armed forces.

IV

The neutral nations repatriation commission, after having received and taken into custody those prisoners of war who are not directly repatriated, shall immediately make arrangements so that within the time limit of 4 months after the neutral nations repatriation commission takes over the custody, the nations to which the prisoners of war belong shall have freedom and facilities to send personnel to the original places of detention of these prisoners of war to explain to all these prisoners of war depending upon these nations so as to eliminate their apprehension and to inform them of all matters relating to their return to their homelands, particularly of their full right to return home to lead a peaceful life.

V

Within 4 months after the neutral nations repatriation commission receives and takes into custody the prisoners of war and after the explanations made by the nations to which they belong, the speedy return to their fatherlands of those prisoners of war who request repatriation shall be facilitated by the neutral nations repatriation commission and the detaining side shall not offer any obstruction. The administrative details for the repatriation of such prisoners of war shall be settled through consultation between the neutral nations repatriation commission and the two sides.

VI

If, at the expiration of the time limit of 4 months as provided in paragraphs 4 and 5 of this proposal, there are still prisoners of war in the custody of the neutral nations repatriation commission, their disposition shall be submitted for settlement through consultation to the political conference as provided in paragraph 60, article 4, of the armistice agreement.

VII

All the expenditures of the prisoners of war during the period in the custody of the neutral nations repatriation commission, including their traveling expenses in returning to their fatherlands, shall be borne by the nations to which they belong.

VIII

The terms of this proposal and the arrangements arising therefrom shall be made known to all prisoners of war.

[From the Washington Post of May 13, 1953]

U. N. OFFERS PLAN TO END KOREAN WAR—PRISONER EXCHANGE IS SPELLED OUT TO RED NEGOTIATORS AT LENGTHY SESSION

PANMUNJOM, May 13.—The U. N. command today presented a sweeping and detailed proposal to break the deadlock on the crucial prisoner exchange issue—sole barrier to an armistice in Korea.

It would free immediately after a truce those Korean prisoners refusing to return to Communist control and would place balky Chinese prisoners in custody of a five-nation neutral repatriation commission.

The Allies flatly rejected a Communist proposal that a political conference settle the fate of prisoners persisting in their refusal to go home.

Lt. Gen. William K. Harrison, Jr., senior Allied truce delegate, presented the lengthy document to North Korean Gen. Nam Il, chief Red negotiator, at today's 1 a. m. session.

Harrison asked the Communists to study the plan "in the same spirit of constructive negotiations in which we have studied your eight proposals upon which it is based."

The Allies earlier had said some sections of the Communist plan—particularly that concerning a political conference handling of prisoners—would be "unworkable."

After Harrison had completed reading the lengthy counterproposals—at 12:40 p. m.—the Communists asked for a recess until 10 p. m., eastern daylight time, Wednesday.

The Allies accepted the Communists' proposal for a five-nation commission made up of India, Poland, Switzerland, Sweden, and Czechoslovakia, but said the commission's supervision must be limited to non-Korean prisoners of war.

The Allies hold 48,500 Communist prisoners who say they would resist being returned to Red rule. Thirty-four thousand are Koreans whom the Allies propose to release to civilian status immediately after an armistice. The other 14,500 are Chinese who said they have renounced communism.

The Allied proposal said there would be no objection to Communist representatives making "explanations" to the Chinese in custody of the neutral commission.

However, the U. N. command reserved the right to revert to its original proposal that one neutral nation take custody of prisoners reluctant to go home.

The Allied counterproposal was brought to Korea Tuesday by Gen. Mark W. Clark, United Nations Far East commander.

A South Korean government official, however, said some of the leading elements were:

1. Modification or rejection of the Communist nomination of Poland and Czechoslovakia among five "neutrals" to supervise 48,500 Chinese and North Korean prisoners who refuse to go home. Other nations nominated are Sweden, Switzerland, and India.

2. Rejection or modification of the Communist plan to bring in troops from the five neutral nations, including Red satellite Poland and Czechoslovakia, to take custody over the reluctant captives in Korea.

3. A reduction from 4 months to 60 days in the length of time the Reds would be allowed to make "explanations" to non-Communist prisoners in an effort to persuade them to return home.

Korean Gen. Nam Il, poker-faced head of the Red delegation, repeatedly has dodged answering questions of detail and urged speedy agreement on principle. He said the details could be ironed out later by consultations.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 13, 1953]

REDS ARE COLD TO U. N. PLAN FOR ARMISTICE—BROAD 11-POINT TERMS ARE GIVEN NAM IL; TALKS IN RECESS

PANMUNJOM, May 13.—The U. N. command today handed the Communists a new blueprint for an armistice in Korea. It was a sweeping 11-point plan for exchanging prisoners of war, last big roadblock to a truce.

The Allies would free 34,000 North Koreans who refuse to go home and, on certain conditions, give temporary custody of 14,500 balky Chinese to a 5-nation commission

made up of Sweden, Switzerland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and India.

The Communists called the proposal a step backward and said the Allied attitude "threatens the prospects of the whole armistice negotiations."

The broad plan, a counterproposal to one advanced by the Communists, is based on the long-standing Allied position that no prisoner will be sent home against his will.

After the lengthy document was read and the Communists commented acidly, the truce delegations recessed until 11 a. m. tomorrow (10 p. m. eastern daylight time, Wednesday).

PLAN GIVEN TO NAM IL

Lt. Gen. William K. Harrison, Jr., senior Allied delegate, presented the plan to his Communist counterpart, North Korean Gen. Nam Il, in a 1-hour 40-minute session.

Briefly, the Allies proposed:

1. Repatriation of prisoners immediately after an armistice, except those refusing to go home. Releasing to civilian status all prisoners of Korean nationality unwilling to return to Red rule. Releasing all non-Korean prisoners who persist in refusing to return to Communist control after 60 days in custody of a neutral commission.

2. Conditional acceptance of the Communist nomination of India, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, and Switzerland as members of the custodial commission, but only if India heads the body and provides any troops needed.

3. Rejection of the Reds' proposal that a political conference determine the fate of prisoners refusing to go home after being in neutral custody.

NO OBJECTION TO EXPLANATIONS

The Allied plan voiced no objection to the Red proposal that representatives of the Communist governments be permitted to explain things to reluctant prisoners. The Allies warned, however, against any effort to intimidate or force the prisoners.

"It is an excellent basis for an armistice," General Harrison told General Nam. He asked the Communists to study it "in the same spirit of constructive negotiations in which we have studied your eight-point proposal on which it is based."

General Nam observed coldly that the allies had not accepted the Communist proposal—the Reds had put it on an "all-or-none" basis—but was "a step backward from the three-point proposals put forward in the letter of April 16 by your side."

The allies had nominated Switzerland as a neutral to handle all reluctant prisoners.

PLAN WOULD BE CHARTER

General Harrison told newsmen the detailed allied plan "would constitute the charter" for the neutral nations duties.

He said the UN command found "a major portion" of the Communist plan acceptable but there were portions "we cannot accept in their present form."

The allied counterproposal rules out the post-armistice political conference as a final court to decide the fate of prisoners, sets a 60-day time limit during which prisoners may be given "explanations," and spells out the function of the five-nation repatriation commission.

Speaking of turning prisoners who refuse repatriation over to the neutral nations commission, General Harrison said:

"The United Nations command accepts this point for non-Korean prisoners of war. Prisoners of Korean nationality who have elected not to avail themselves of the right to be repatriated should be released to civilian status on the date the armistice becomes effective."

CHANGE OF MIND ALLOWED

He said any Korean who subsequently desired to be repatriated would be free to do so and would be given "all assistance in so returning."

"Your side followed this procedure throughout the course of the Korean war," General Harrison said, referring to Communist arguments that many prisoners they captured early in the war were freed at the front.

The Red plan called for each of the five neutral nations to furnish an equal number of troops to take custody of the prisoners.

General Harrison said the Red plan for five neutrals "would entail many problems so complex as to preclude effective execution of their (the neutrals') mission."

INDIA IS U. N. CHOICE

"In order to eliminate these problems," General Harrison added, "the United Nations command proposed draft terms of reference to provide that the armed forces and any other operating personnel required to assist the custodial organization in carrying out its functions and responsibilities shall be provided by India, whose representatives shall also be chairman and executive agent of the custodial organization.

"The United Nations command accedes to the viewpoint of your side that explanations be made to the prisoners provided it is clearly understood that the prisoner is not to be subjected to force or coercion of any kind to prevent or effect his repatriation."

General Harrison said allied acceptance of this point was clearly conditioned on "the mutual acceptance of terms which will insure that the explanations are not coercive in nature."

The allied counter-proposal was flown to Korea Tuesday by Gen. Mark Clark, UN commander, following its approval in Washington.

General Harrison spent an hour and a half reading the plan to the Reds.

EXCERPT FROM SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL'S SPEECH ON FOREIGN POLICY

KOREA

Our immediate aim, of course, is the conclusion of a truce in Korea. I doubt very much whether there could be any agreement at the present time on a united Korea. Terrible injuries have been done to each other by the North and South Koreans, but, even if both sides only stood still where they are now, ceased fire and tried to replace foreign troops in the country by Korean forces—even if only that happened, time might once more prove to be a healer, especially in ravaged countries, given a revival of prosperity and help in repairing the really fearful damage. Therefore I should be content with even a truce or a cease-fire at the moment.

We all desire a settlement of the prisoners of war dispute at Panmunjom. The wonder is that it has been kept alive so long. There is only one vital point, namely, that a prisoner of war cannot and should not be forcibly repatriated against his will. That issue has involved many months of wearisome discussion, but it is now no longer an obstacle. The question of the conditions governing the exchange of prisoners has really been reduced to terms which no longer involve any difference of principle. All that now remains is methods and procedure. Both sides have made numerous concessions, and the United Nations representatives have themselves suggested at least half a dozen alternatives.

It is obvious that, if at any time, there is is a wish among the Communists to reach an agreement as between rational human beings, the matter could be instantly, or almost instantly settled. It has also been made plain—abundantly plain—that, if there is no wish to settle, endless and inexhaustible variants can be proposed. So far as we are concerned, we readily accepted the idea that Switzerland or Sweden or India or Pakistan should take over the task of handling in an honorable manner the 40,000 or 50,000 prisoners who fear to go home.

Now a proposal has been made by the Communists that five powers—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Sweden, and India—shall all deal together with the problem. This involves much complication, but, at the same time, the claim that all prisoners concerned shall be moved from their present camps to other distant countries has been dropped. I must remind the House, as I have done several times, that the United States as mandatory for the United Nations has borne nineteen-twentieths of the burden in blood and treasure. The matter is not one which we have the right or duty to decide, but it is our duty, without separating ourselves from our great ally, to express our opinion frankly and plainly as the occasion offers. I certainly feel that this new proposal requires patient and sympathetic examination, and there is no reason known to me at present to assume that it may not be the basis of an agreement, provided always that it is put forward by the Communists in a spirit of sincerity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me for 2 minutes, with the understanding that he will not thereby lose his right to the floor?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah will be happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon for 2 minutes—if the Senator can count 2.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator would be quite surprised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request that the Senator from Utah may yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon, without losing his right to the floor? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I find myself in agreement with so much of what the Senator from Illinois has said that I do not like to offer a syllable of dissent; but, later this afternoon, I shall discuss the issues raised by the Senator from Illinois, because I think he has overlooked one very important principle; and it is that principle, I believe, that will determine the difference between peace and war in Asia.

Of course, we want no Munich in Asia, but I think it is perfectly clear that there are millions of people around the world who are also taking the position that they will not go along with the United States in a proposal of unconditional surrender on the prisoner issue. I want no part of the Russian proposal. My thinking on this question coincides with that of the Senator from Illinois. I think it is a cleverly disguised, vicious proposal to embarrass us so far as world conditions are concerned. But we might as well face the fact that we must draw the Russian position, which I consider to be a position of bad faith, out into the open. We ought also to recognize irrespective of the fact that we have carried the greater part of the burden of the Korean war, that our allies, nevertheless, are a part of that war, and we had better sit down to negotiate some understanding with our allies, rather than criticize them on the floor of the United States Senate as to the position they are taking on the prisoner-of-war issue. They are not going along with us on that issue as of now, because it is their position, it is their fear, that we are dictating the terms of the prisoner issue.

After all, Mr. President, it was unilateral action on the part of the United States.

So far as dropping leaflets is concerned, we are told, "You dropped the leaflets; you made the promises, and then you say you are going to back up the leaflets and threaten the peace in Asia."

I say, Mr. President, let us call the turn, first, with our allies, get an agreement with them, and then we can find out what the position is going to be by negotiation with reference to the prisoner issue. But, as for me, I think we had better settle the prisoner issue than to face the ugly reality that we must sacrifice the lives of American boys because we do not get together with our allies on that issue.

ATTACK ON UNITED STATES BY CLEMENT ATTLEE—NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ADDRESS THE SENATE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I was extremely shocked to read in a newspaper today an account of one of the most unusual performances I ever heard of taking place on the floor of the legislative body of an Allied nation. I was not shocked by what Mr. Atlee said. We can expect him to make a dastardly attack upon our President and our Nation. I was shocked because the majority party in the British House of Commons sat idly by and did not question what Mr. Attlee said.

Mr. President, I intend tomorrow to answer in some detail Mr. Attlee's attack upon the President and the American people. I had planned to do so today, but I understand that the floor today will be occupied. Therefore, I shall address the Senate tomorrow. I do not think that what Mr. Attlee said should go unchallenged by the American people. I hope the responsible majority party in England answers him today on the floor of the House of Commons.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of the morning business tomorrow, I may be recognized. I shall consume possibly 20 minutes, or a maximum of a half hour.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I do not believe I shall object at all, does the majority leader agree to the request?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Delaware that I am acting as majority leader at this time. I would have no objection to the Senator's request, with the limitation of time he has suggested.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] asks unanimous consent that he may be recognized tomorrow, immediately following the morning business, for not exceeding 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if possible, I should like not to fix a time limitation. My prepared remarks will require not longer than 20 or 30 minutes. I intend to discuss what Clement Attlee said on the floor of the House of Commons yesterday, so there may be some questions asked by other Senators. I would dislike to be stopped after a half hour if, as a result of questioning, my remarks should take 35 minutes. However, I assure the acting majority leader and the acting minority leader that my prepared remarks will take no longer than 20 or 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me for a moment, so that I may make an inquiry of the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield, if by so doing, I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

I understand that an amendment I submitted with respect to the so-called regulations X and W is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency and will be favorably reported as a committee amendment. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. The committee considered the Senator's amendment and revised it slightly. As so revised, it is now a part of the bill which is being considered. By virtue of the fact that the amendment was added to the bill by the Committee on Banking and Currency as a whole, it became a part of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, it will not be necessary to offer it as an amendment from the floor. Neither will it be necessary to offer an amendment to strike out the rent control feature of the bill, because such a proviso likewise is now a part of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely desired to have the RECORD show that that was so. I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Indiana, because I did not wish any misunderstanding to arise.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, in order to make certain, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to be certain of the statement I have just made, to the effect that the consumer control and rent control portions of the bill as reported by the committee contain committee amendments that are now a part of the bill, and that it will not be necessary to offer them as amendments from the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that they are a part of the committee substitute.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me to make a unanimous consent request?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield, under the same conditions.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1081, to provide authority for temporary economic controls and for other purposes, be reprinted showing the committee substitute as modified by additional amendments heretofore reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a part of the material which I shall cover in what I have to say today has already been developed in the debate which took place yesterday. I ask the indulgence of the Senate if I seem to repeat some of that material, because I should like to present what I have to say in an orderly fashion. I shall consume approximately 40 minutes, plus whatever time may be consumed in colloquy which my speech may engender.

Last Friday I occupied the floor to present my point of view with regard to the basic philosophy behind the proposed legislation. Today I should like to address myself to the problems which I think exist in connection with the idea that legislation should be enacted on a standby basis.

Those of us who oppose Senate bill 1081 will probably be accused of opposing all Government intervention in the economy in times of grave national emergency. That is not true. We recognize that at such a time we shall need a wise and courageous Government program, but we vigorously reject the idea that title 8 of this bill is such a program, or that we should try to produce a program now on a standby basis.

As I analyze the arguments made by the proponents of the standby idea, it seems to me that they are three in number, as follows:

First, they argue that it is necessary to adopt some program now and give the President the power to invoke and operate it because Congress cannot act fast enough in the face of adverse international developments, or because of the speedily destructive force of modern warfare.

Second, the proponents of the standby idea, it seems to me, apparently believe that the pattern of direct consumer controls, developed in World War II and repeated when the Korean war began, is the only proper pattern for all similar emergencies and can, therefore, safely be enacted now to be applied when needed. Of course, if we can accept that assumption, we can accept the idea that all emergencies are more or less alike, that the same problems repeat themselves. Therefore, you can agree that a use of direct consumer controls should be a permanent standard economic pattern—a part of our continuing law, to be dormant during times of peace on a standby basis and reactivated more or less automatically in times of economic stress or threats to our national security.

Third, they ask us to accept the idea that this pattern of consumer controls, even on a standby basis, is an effective weapon against inflation.

I completely reject these three assumptions. Today I propose to examine each critically in its turn.

The chief reason given for the idea of reposing standby powers in the President is that the Congress cannot act fast enough in time of need. I think this reasoning is fallacious from many points of view.

This is the part of my address which will probably go over some of the ground over which we went yesterday.

First, I doubt that so great a grant of power as that contained in title 8 of this bill is constitutional. Since I am not a lawyer, I shall not pursue this question further. I raise it in the hope that others better prepared than I will discuss it before this debate ends.

Second, I feel that this is a problem which is definitely the responsibility of Congress and of Congress alone. I agree with the statement of William Blake, president of the Cotton Council of America, made before the committee during the hearings on this bill. Mr. Blake said:

> The responsibility for deciding whether ceilings are in the national interest should not be transferred to the executive branch on any standby basis. The question involved is a very fundamental one of national policy. I hope we will keep in mind that, when business and agriculture and labor are forced to go under ceilings, the adjustments which they must make are terrifically difficult, wasteful, and demoralizing.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The 1950 Defense Production Act, certain features of which we are now considering extending, gave the President the power to control all prices, all wages, and all rents. It did not give him a mandate to do that; it simply gave him authority for a 12-months period to do so if, in his opinion, he though it was necessary.

So no principle is involved in the pending bill which was not involved when the original 1950 Defense Production Act was passed. In fact, less power is granted in the pending bill, because in this instance the power is limited to 90 days only, whereas the original 1950 Defense Production Act provided such power for 12 months.

Mr. BENNETT. I was not in the Senate when the 1950 Defense Production Act was passed. However, I voted against the 1951 and 1952 extensions. The passage of those bills led to the direct, current imposition of controls. The pending bill is offered to project that power into the unknown future. To me, there is a difference in the situations.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under this bill, authority is granted to freeze all prices, wages, and rents for only 90 days, if the President in his wisdom, as a result of a grave national emergency, wished to use it. It would be applicable for only 90 days, not indefinitely; and the legislation under which he could impose the 90-day freeze would run only for 2 years.

In the committee, we discussed the possibility of limiting the authority to the duration of hostilities in the Korean war. Then we decided that possibly that would not be a good way to handle the matter. So we provided for a 90-day freeze, and the proposed legislation permitting the imposition of such a freeze for 2 years. It might well be for the duration of the Korean war, because we are at war today. We are living under an emergency at the moment, because any time the Nation is at war, certainly it is living under an emergency. Whether or not one likes it, he has to face the fact that it is an emergency. It is not, of course, at this time a grave national emergency.

Mr. BENNETT. I am aware of the time limitation in the bill, but I suggest to the chairman of the committee that the 1950 act was extended in 1951 and again in 1952, and I am afraid that a pattern is being assumed, perhaps fallaciously, but I think rather accurately; and once the pattern becomes established, it will be continued.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree that the 1950 act has been extended twice. I suppose this will be the third time certain features of it have been extended. But I also call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that during the entire time, even to this very day, the United States has been at war. In other words, the 1950 Defense Production Act was enacted as a result of the beginning of the Korean war. The Korean war will have been in progress 3 years on June 25, next month. So while the act has been extended twice, that has been because it has not yet been possible to find a way to end the Korean war. We have not as yet been able to stop that war; it is still going on. I do not know of anybody who can give us assurance at the moment how that war is going to be stopped.

I believe the Senator from Utah will agree with me that so long as we are at war, we ought not completely abandon any idea that it might develop into a big war and that we might need to control prices because of that circumstance. So long as the Korean war is in progress, the American people ought to have some protection. That is my viewpoint. We must keep that thought in mind.

It was stated yesterday that we might well place in the bill a provision requiring that a declaration of war precede use of the 90-day freeze. We are now at war. There is no use placing a provision for a declaration of war in the bill because we are now at war. There is an emergency. We are at war. We do not like it, but I think we must be sufficiently realistic to realize that we are at war, and that some day unless there is a truce, or peace is brought about, we will have to win the war.

Mr. BENNETT. I realize that there is a difference of opinion between the committee chairman and me. It is my opinion that if Congress should adopt the kind of standby legislation that is proposed, it would be setting a more or less permanent pattern. However, the Senator from Indiana does not agree with that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I may say that it is a friendly misunderstanding.

Mr. BENNETT. It is a discussion of the problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. I return to my text. I was quoting from a statement by William Blake, president of the Cotton Council of America:

> I hope we will keep in mind that, when business and agriculture and labor are forced to go under ceilings, the adjustments which they must make are terrifically difficult, wasteful, and demoralizing, and that once they are under ceilings the process of getting extricated from them and returning to the normal price relationships is also a slow, painful, difficult matter of adjustment. The responsibility for deciding whether in any future situation this country should again go into the ordeal of ceilings should never be transferred from that branch of government which is closest to the people—the United States Congress.

The only reason offered for the opinion that this power should be transferred to the President is that Congress cannot act with the necessary speed. In the recent debate on the submerged land bill and in the discussion therein concerning freedom of debate, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] recognized the speed with which Congress could and does act when necessary. His statement in this regard is recorded in the Congressional RECORD of April 21, 1953, at page 3437. The Senator from Arkansas said:

> One may say that in the modern world it is necessary for legislatures to act quickly. I reply that when it is necessary we do act quickly. When the Nation feels itself in danger from war or depression, the Congress of the United States can do whatever is necessary in a day's time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, if Congress wished to do so, it could, in 20 minutes, by passing a freeze bill, give the President the right to freeze. While I have my serious doubts whether it would ever act so swiftly on a price-wage-rent freeze bill, it is a possibility. Unfortunately, that is the least part of what must be done in preparing the Nation to handle such a situation as would arise in the event of an all-out war. Endless days are required to set up an organization; endless days are required to write rules and regulations; endless days are required to recruit personnel; endless days are required to do the many things which must be done in connection with a matter of this kind, if it is to be done right.

My position is based upon my observations of what happened in World War I and World War II, and our endeavors to handle this problem in the Korean war, when we were unable to do the kind of job which ought to have been done, because we did not have the time. Of course, Congress could pass a simple 90-day freeze bill or resolution on the floor almost instantly, but that would be the least part of the problem.

Time is required to prepare regulations, to recruit an organization, and to get ready to do the job. It is in the inter-

val that the harm is done. If we do not have the proper laws, the proper rules and regulations, and the right kind of organization, great injury results. My position is that we ought now to decide what we are going to do and prepare to do it, thereby avoiding endless days, weeks, and months of preparation. In my opinion the harm is done during the first 2 or 3 weeks. I agree that if the Congress wished to do so it could this afternoon, within 10 minutes time, act in a hurry by virtue of a vote. Of course, one, two, or several Senators could delay such action for some time, as the Senator certainly is aware.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the Senator from Indiana has indicated a situation in which I believe, if we pass this proposed legislation, assuming that it is an effective freeze—which I am not ready to admit—we shall have taken one step, which is to freeze the economy, or give the President the right to freeze the economy. Then we would expect to use the time thus gained in developing permanent legislation. I think we should take the first freeze step by congressional action, and still give Congress time to write the permanent legislation. The only question between us at the moment is whether we should take the freeze step now or whether Congress should act to freeze at the time of an emergency. It is my feeling that Congress could act to freeze, if a freeze were desirable, and then could go on to the next step.

I now return to my text. I turn again to William Blake of the Cotton Council. In another part of his testimony before the committee, he said:

I am well aware of the argument that in the event of a truly great national emergency prompt action might be necessary and that action by the Congress might be too slow. I disagree with this point of view. Congress can act with great rapidity when the occasion demands. War was declared on Japan and Germany in less than 36 hours after Pearl Harbor. Actually, I believe an examination of our past will show that the speed with which Congress moves in an emergency varies directly in proportion to the seriousness of that emergency, and the point that needs to be made here is—that is precisely the speed at which we should move in imposing wage and price ceilings on the future American economy. If any emergency that might arise in the future is not serious enough to precipitate prompt action by the Congress, it is not serious enough to warrant any such drastic action as the imposition of ceilings.

The President recognizes both the responsibility of Congress and its power to act when needed. He has not requested the standby powers granted by this legislation. Turning now to his state of the Union message of February 2, 1953, I quote:

We are, of course, living in an international situation that is neither an emergency demanding full mobilization, nor is it peace. No one can know how long this condition will persist. Consequently, we are forced to learn many new things as we go along, clinging to what works, discarding what does not.

In all our current discussions on these and related facts, the weight of evidence is clearly against the use of controls in their present forms. They have proved largely unsatisfactory or unworkable. They have not prevented inflation. They have not kept down the cost of living. Dissatisfaction with them is wholly justified. I am convinced that now, as well as in the long run, free and competitive prices will best serve the interests of all people and best meet the change of growing needs of our economy.

May I go back and underline two statements in the preceding paragraphs from the President's state of the Union message. He said:

Consequently we are forced to learn many new things as we go along, clinging to what works, discarding what does not.

By rewriting price, wage, and rent controls into this bill—even on a standby basis—we are not "clinging to what works" and "discarding what does not"; we are clinging to what we know does not work. And again, in all the matter presented at the hearings, the weight of evidence was clearly against the use of controls in their present forms. They have proved largely unsatisfactory and unworkable; and yet, as the Senator from Utah understands the bill, it would reenact on a standby basis the same type of controls which the President has said have largely proved unsatisfactory or unworkable, and in the face of his statement that the weight of the evidence is clearly against the use of controls in their present form.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the President also stated that under the law Congress gave him the authority to eliminate controls, and that he was eliminating price and wage controls; but in the same paragraph he stated that if he found, as a result of removing controls, inflation occurred, and it should become necessary, he would not hesitate to come to Congress and ask that they be reenacted.

Mr. BENNETT. I expect to quote that paragraph in a moment.

The purpose of title VIII is to reimpose controls in their present form, in the hope of overcoming the obvious objection to them with the idea that they are to be on a "standby basis only."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think the Senator can say that it is the intention to reimpose them as they are. All title VIII does is to give the President the right, in case of a grave national emergency, to freeze prices, wages, and rents as they are for 90 days. During the 90-day period Congress can decide what it wishes to do. If there are new and better ways of handling the situation during a grave national emergency, then Congress will pass upon that subject.

Congress might not at all, under title VIII, continue direct controls. It might decide that other methods were better. All we are endeavoring to do by title VIII is to say that in a grave national emergency we shall hold the line until the Congress and the President can decide what ought to be done. The Congress would be free to do anything it cared to do within the 90-day period. If it wished to do so, it could rescind the 90-day order the first day. It could decide, during the 90-day period, that direct controls were not needed, that the situation could be handled entirely by indirect controls.

It could decide, if it wished to do so, to do nothing. The decision during the 90 days would be up to the President; and during the 90-day period the line would be held. We would not permit prices to get out of line. We would be stopping inflation in its tracks, until we could decide what to do.

That is all title VIII does. That is all it is intended to do. I think, particularly while we are at war in Korea, that the American people are entitled to that protection. Title VIII does not by any stretch of the imagination indicate that during the 90-day period the Congress would enact the same kind of legislation which was enacted in World War I, World War II, or the Korean war. It is simply an effort to hold the line until Congress can decide; and Congress has 90 days in which to decide what to do. That is all there is to title VIII. It does not continue controls. It does not say that controls shall be the same as they were at the beginning of the Korean war, or the same as they were in World War I or World War II. It leaves that decision 100 percent up to the Congress of the United States.

During the 90-day period the able Senator from Utah and other Senators would be able to introduce proposed legislation and make speeches and take any position they cared to take on the subject. We would have 90 days to do it in, knowing that during that 90-day period, while we were considering the subject very carefully, the line would be held and prices would not be skyrocketing and people would not be hoarding. My personal opinion is that the people would welcome the idea of knowing that our economy was not going to get out of balance.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah realizes that if we had price controls and if they were discontinued, this measure, if enacted, would make it possible to put them into effect for a 90-day period. However, they still would be price controls, and the same is true of wage controls and rent controls.

In making the statement the Senator from Utah reserves again for later discussion his opinion as to whether this proposed legislation would actually accomplish the desired purpose.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Section 802, at page 24, reads, in part:

SEC. 802. The President may make such rules, regulations, and orders as he deems necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

My question is, Does not that section give the President complete economic authority and power over the entire Nation, not only with respect to wages and prices, but in the operation of our ordinary economy? It seems to me that it is too far-reaching power to give to the President except during a war.

Personally it will be very difficult for me to go along with legislation which gives the present President or any future President—and, of course, I understand that the legislation could be used only

during a 2-year period—such broad powers.

It seems to me that such powers could be abused. They are powers which I have criticized in the past and which I doubt should be given to anyone in a democracy.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah would suggest to the Senator from Kansas that he reread all of sections 801, 802, 803, and 804. If he does so, he will find that the powers to which he has referred are only a small part of the grant of power which in the opinion of the the Senator from Utah is made under this proposed legislation. The Senator from Utah hopes to discuss that phase of the problem in detail at another time. If it should be wise to do so now he would be very glad to discuss it at this point.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield so that I may answer the question of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The language which the Senator from Kansas has read is the language which was included in the 1950 Defense Production Act, and in each revision of the act which was passed since that time. I am sure the able Senator from Kansas voted for such language in the past. It is the same language as is contained in prior legislation on this subject. There is no difference whatever in the language. The 1950 Defense Production Act contained the same language. It gave the President the right to write rules and regulations, and so forth, in order to put the act into effect.

In almost every piece of legislation which Congress passes, the President is given the right to prescribe the rules and regulations which put the act into effect. It is nothing more than a housekeeping clause which is included in this type of legislation. The exact words were included in the 1950 Defense Production Act.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to say in response to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that the junior Senator from Kansas will be very cautious in voting such powers in future legislation. I admit that I voted for some of these powers in the past. I am not certain that they rendered the great service we thought they would render when we voted for them. I have a great doubt in my mind that such authority should be granted to any individual.

I shall listen with great interest to the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Indiana discuss this particular point when it is reached.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope Senators will give the Senator from Utah an opportunity to maintain some coherence in his remarks. I shall return to my text. I should like to quote from the President's state of the Union message, in which he said:

> We shall have to watch trends closely. If the freer functioning of our economic system as well as the indirect controls which can be appropriately employed prove insufficient during this period of strain and tension, I shall promptly ask Congress to enact such legislation as may be required.

May I emphasize that last sentence? He said:

> I shall promptly ask Congress to enact such legislation as may be required.

He did not say he would promptly ask Congress to reenact the type of controls legislation if it were allowed to expire, the present renewal of which he wisely rejected.

Let us turn now to the testimony of two representatives of the administration, given before the committee during the hearings of the bill. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, said:

> Consistent with the President's desire to free the economy of controls, we hope that the Congress will decide that in the event of an emergency situation it could move rapidly enough in providing authority for a freeze to deal with the problem in an adequate manner.

He did not say he hoped Congress would provide the President with such power.

Mr. Flemming said:

> We hope that the Congress will decide that in the event of an emergency situation it could move rapidly enough.

Then again, the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, in testimony before the committee said:

> I am opposed to the continuation of price and wage controls on any basis. It is my opinion that such controls are both unnecessary and undesirable. We believe that this country is capable of taking prompt and effective action in the event of an emergency requiring such controls.

Under questioning, both of these witnesses and other Government witnesses indicated their belief that, if Congress chose to impose these controls on a standby basis and require the President to decide when they should be invoked, he, the President, would accept that responsibility. I can clearly understand that attitude of the President. It reflects his clear understanding of his responsibility in relation to the Congress. If Congress chooses to pass any law and impose responsibilities on the President, it is his duty to accept those responsibilities. You will note that Mr. Flemming said:

> It [Congress] could move rapidly enough in providing authority for a freeze to deal with the problem in an adequate manner.

But this bill goes very far beyond a freeze. As title VIII is written, it is a serious and almost complete delegation of power over the economy. It gives the President the power and the responsibility, first, to freeze the economy; second, to determine all ceiling prices—and may I note in passing that this power includes the power to roll back ceiling prices—third, to provide exemptions from, suspensions of, or adjustments to these ceilings; fourth, in section 802, as the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has indicated, to write all the regulations necessary; fifth, to inflict punishment; and sixth, to use the income-tax law as a means of punishment even before a person may have been proved guilty by the ordinary judicial process. At least that is the way the Senator from Utah reads the bill.

Knowing the man we have as President now, we can understand why he did not ask for these great powers and his reluctance to accept them.

Moreover, we cannot assume that, because such powers as these might be transferred to the President, he, whoever he may be, will act with wisdom and dispatch in the time of crisis, or with more wisdom than Congress might exercise.

Certainly in 1950, President Truman, who was given standby powers in September, did not choose to exercise them until January 1951, leaving the impression that he allowed the possible political effects on the elections of 1950 to have more weight than the possible value of direct consumer controls in fighting economic effects of the inflation.

That these vast powers must be transferred to the President now, in order to save a few days time is unthinkable to me. I am inclined to agree with the editorial in the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, March 26, which says in part:

> Writing a law now under which the Congress delegates to the President full powers to act in some future time is, we believe, unwise. The power to declare the existence of a national emergency must be vested in somebody by any law that attempts to provide the means of dealing with it. To place that authority exclusively in the executive branch of the Government goes against our deeply rooted political instinct. If not by the President, the decision to invoke the powers of the standby mobilization can only be made by the Congress. It is the real or assumed dilatoriness of Congress in meeting a state of emergency or outright war that the proponents of this bill seek to avoid. Our feeling is that they are ready to pay too high a price for the time that this plan might or might not save.

Yesterday, during the discussion, the able Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] suggested that the bill should be passed because in some tragic way Congress might be wiped out, and then there would be no one on hand to pass economic legislation. However, it seems to me there would be far more serious problems to be faced if Congress were to be wiped out; and if we felt that were a real possibility, I should think we would be more concerned with studying the question of other powers which should be transferred.

Of course, the fact is that Congress cannot be wiped out successfully, because the governors have the right to appoint our successors and to reconstitute this body itself very quickly.

Furthermore, what proof have we that the same catastrophe might not wipe out the President, to whom the powers are proposed to be given?

Thus, for all these reasons, I reject the first assumption that Congress cannot act quickly enough, as being unsound.

Let us turn now to the second assumption, which is that the pattern of direct consumer controls—in pattern, if not in detail—as developed in World War II and as repeated when the Korean war began, is the proper pattern for all similar emergencies and, therefore, can be safely enacted now, to be applied in any future emergency. Of course, if we can accept this assumption and if we accept

the idea that all emergencies are more or less alike, we might also be led to agree that such a system of direct consumer controls should be a permanent part of our standard economic pattern. These are assumptions I cannot accept. From this bill, we might get the impression that other possible programs for use in emergencies had been studied and rejected. This is not true. The only program the committee considered was this one to reenact direct consumer controls. The opportunity the members of the committee had was to adopt or reject the one program substantially represented by title VIII of this bill. But the most serious assumption implicit in this standby idea is the assumption that conditions never change in an emergency; that we can safely adopt a pattern now to fit all cases.

On the very face of it, this is not true. Conditions changed between 1940, when World War II threatened, and 1950, when the Korean war began. They have changed since June 1950 in many important respects. I think we should stop and consider some of these changes that might affect the possible pattern we would want to adopt if and when we face another emergency. First, let us consider some conditions in our civilian economy. Take employment. When World War II began in Europe in 1939, in this country we had about 11 million unemployed, and they represented 20.4 percent of the total labor force. When the Korean war began in 1950, we had a little more than 3 million unemployed, representing 5.5 percent of the labor force. Today we have less than 1.7 million unemployed, or 2.7 percent of the labor force. That is one very important and very significant change.

It is hard to calculate our productive capacity for civilian goods and services in the face of the present need for the production of military equipment, but the survey of current business for February, issued by the Department of Commerce, shows that while the purchases of the Federal Government for goods and services nearly doubled between 1949 and 1952—and note that this period includes the Korean war—the rise in production was great enough, nevertheless, to permit increases of nearly 7 percent in personal consumption, 14 percent in nondefense construction, and 19-percent increase in the output of producers' durable equipment, to say nothing of the increase in inventory which took place over the period. In other words, we have taken the increased production required by the Korean war in our stride and still have been able to increase production for civilian use. No serious shortages developed except those created by the application of controls and maladjustments created by OPS regulations, such as the meat shortage and the potato fiasco.

Another interesting measure of the tremendous change that has taken place in our economy since World War II began is the record of the remarkable increase in the civilian inventory of consumer goods. Between 1940 and January 1, 1953, for instance, the total number of electric washing machines rose from 14½ million to over 32 million. The total number of homes with radios increased from 28 million to 46 million, and the total number of radio sets in used increased from 45 million to 114 million. There were no television sets in 1940. There are 21 million today. In 1940 there were 27 million passenger cars; in 1952 there are 43 million. There is a refrigerator for 7 out of every 8 families; a vacuum cleaner for 5 out of every 8; a washing machine for 6 out of every 8; a television set for 4 out of every 8; and there are 3 million more passenger cars in the United States than there are families. I mention these figures to show that any plan to control the civilian economy of the consumer level for future emergency can be built with the knowledge there will not be a pent-up consumer need for durable goods such as existed either in 1939 or in 1950.

Let us turn now to our military preparedness. In 1940, with war already raging in Europe, we were able to devote only 2.2 percent of our gross national product to war production. In 1950 it was 6.4 percent. But in 1953, it is 14.2 percent. And today we are producing more than one-third as much as we produced in the peak year of 1944; but this is only about one-seventh of our total gross national product.

Another place in which there have been great changes, particularly in the last few months, is in the area of basic Government policy. I think every Member of the Senate will agree that pre-World War II fiscal policies were definitely inflationary. We had deficit financing, a pegged market for Government bonds, and easy credit. As Dr. Harold Degraff, professor of economics at Cornell University, pointed out to the committee:

> Extremely easy money policies characterized most of the depression and war years and were a major factor in the inflationary buildup. Prior to 1930, Federal Reserve discount rates were never below a 3-percent level and were at times even as high as 6 percent or more. But during the currency inflation of 1933 to 1948, the discount rates were pushed down to 1½ and 1 percent on borrowing secured by short-term Government security. A standard 1-percent rate was in effect from 1937 to 1948. It was a conscious policy of Government during this time, first, to inflate the currency as an antidepression device and, later, to keep money cheap as an aid to financing Government deficits and refinancing the public debt. The peace policies at the same time were a potent force contributing to an overexpansion of currency and bank deposits relative to available supplies of purchasable goods. Price inflation was an inevitable result of such policies.
>
> The record is all too clear that Government in recent years actually has favored inflationary fiscal and monetary policies and then has fostered the application of direct controls presumably as an offset to the inflation of the currency. Such a combination of policies is nothing short of economic quackery or economic dishonesty. The record of direct price controls is that they were much more effective in holding down the official price indexes than they were in holding down the real prices people had to pay.
>
> The indirect measures by which inflation really can be controlled, if we do mean that we want to control it, may require more political fortitude and more real leadership of the Nation; but, on the other hand, they can work, they can control inflation without a disruption of competitive enterprise, without an army of price policemen, without making criminals out of honest, useful, and constructive citizens.

Mr. President, the great change of the last few months is, of course, that we have seen displays of that political fortitude—that real leadership. It began 2 years ago when, under public pressure, the Federal Reserve Board was freed from domination by the Treasury. It was continued when the Federal Reserve Board ended its price-pegging policy. Additional and more courageous steps have been taken by the present Secretary of the Treasury as he has allowed interest rates on Government borrowing to rise and to reflect the more natural market level. The extent to which these actions have contributed to the dissipation of the inflationary pressure that occurred many months before the previous price controls were lifted is difficult to measure; but certainly they should convince us that indirect controls work, and we take heart from the changes in the Government policy; and we can realize that when the next serious emergency comes, if it comes, there is a chance that these controls may be effectively used.

Then, too, there has been an important change in the attitude of the people. No crisis can catch us as unprepared emotionally as we were caught in 1941 and 1950.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BENNETT. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. BUSH. On the question of indirect controls, I think I agree fully with the Senator from Utah; and we have previously agreed on the force of indirect controls.

In the pending bill, as originally drafted by the committee, there was a provision which would give the Federal Reserve Board power to exercise indirect controls, particularly with respect to consumer controls, such as those provided for in regulation X and regulation W, which once were in effect. At a meeting of our committee, which, unhappily, I did not attend, for some reason I do not now recall, though I hope the Senator was there, authority was removed from the bill to restore to the Federal Reserve Bank a continuing power to exercise control over consumer credit through such regulations as X and W. I should like to ask the Senator specifically whether he agrees that that was a good thing to do.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah would remind the Senator from Connecticut that the authority was not completely taken out of the bill, but it was transferred under title VIII, so that the authority could only be used concurrently with the imposition of price, wage, and rent controls.

Mr. BUSH. Would the Senator agree with me that, since it was transferred in that manner, the Federal Reserve Board is effectually left as it was, namely, without any control over consumer credit at the present time?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct. The position of the Senator from Utah is that the particular problem to which the Senator from Connecticut refers is a very serious one. It is a problem whose aspects are very much misunderstood by many parts of our American economy, in my opinion. The Senator from Utah hopes that before too long the Committee on Banking and Currency will itself begin a study of that particular problem, giving interested facets of our economy an opportunity to testify, and giving an opportunity for an educational program which might wipe out some of the misunderstanding upon which the Senator from Utah feels much of the opposition to the particular proposal now pending is based.

The Senator from Utah certainly hopes that, before too long, we can review that problem, study it carefully, and, if possible, develop public opinion behind it, so that in some proper form it can be added as a weapon to the arsenal of indirect controls the Federal Reserve Board has.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I return to my text. Then, too, there has been an important change in the attitude of the people. No crisis can catch us as unprepared as we were in 1941 and 1950. The cold war has had one virtue—it has adjusted us emotionally to its demands as it has adjusted our productive capacity. The fact that in the face of the cold war's threat we should determine as a people to reverse the trend of the past 20 years and support our President when he acted to remove controls, the fact that we as a people can trust in the free market again, is a sound evidence that no crisis in the next few years should be able to shake us so as to produce an insistent public demand for the reimposition of police-state methods. The fact that the Senate is now considering consumer-controls legislation—even on a standby basis—indicates to me how far we are behind the people we represent and how much we have been weakened by the defeatism from the bureaucratic regimentation of the past few years. I make that as a general statement, with no personal implications.

On September 13, 1858, in a debate with Stephen Douglas at Edwardsville, Ill., Abraham Lincoln said:

> Our reliance against tyranny is the love of liberty which God has planted in us.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator from Utah familiar with the Civil Defense Act of 1951?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah is not particularly familiar with it.

Mr. CAPEHART. It was passed by the Congress. It gives the President almost unlimited power in a grave national emergency. For example, it says "procure, by condemnation or otherwise, construct, lease, transport, store, maintain, renovate, or distribute materials and facilities for civil defense, with the right to take immediate possession thereof."

That was a delegation of power as broad and unlimited as it is possible to delegate power to anyone. When the bill was before the Congress, I know of no one who asserted, as a matter of principle, that the power was only to be used in case of grave national emergency. The same principle has been advanced now, in an endeavor to have Congress do exactly the same thing sought by those of us who support a 90-day freeze in case of grave national emergency which is tied in with the military, and tied in with war. In such circumstances we believe the President should have power to act, and to act quickly. Why does the Senator not take the position that in the matter of civil defense the Congress could meet, decide what ought to be done, and take action? I admit there is not quite the same analogy, but there is an analogy in principle.

We are at war today in Korea. If we were not at war in Korea, no one would be thinking of controls at all. But we are at war in Korea; and until that war is settled, we must protect every segment of our economy, including civil defense, the military, and all other segments. I do not think we dare leave it as a highway with an open end, not knowing what we would do in case of a grave emergency.

I have heard much about the principle involved, and have listened repeatedly to the statement that the Congress could meet and could act. Why did we not take that position in respect to civil defense? We gave the President quite broad powers, including the power, in a grave emergency, to condemn and to take over any property and any facility in the United States. It seems to me the principle is the same.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BENNETT. If I may, I should first like to reply to the Senator from Indiana.

The memory of the Senator from Utah may not be completely clear, but did not our committee, during the discussion of the pending bill consider a grant of powers with respect to the right of the President to seize industrial properties, similar to the power which existed in previous versions of the Defense Production Act?

Mr. CAPEHART. We eliminated that.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct. Therefore, in effect, the committee turned its back on the position represented by the Civil Defense Act. Is not that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. What we did had absolutely nothing to do with the Civil Defense Act, which is still in existence.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. It was passed in 1951. It empowered the President of the United States to take over any facility in the United States in a grave emergency and to do practically anything he wanted to do; and it rightfully so provided. It conferred upon him unlimited power. I think the President ought to have such power in a grave emergency. My question is, Why do we apply that reasoning in one direction, and then say the principle is not sound when it comes to controlling prices, wages, and rent? In case of a grave emergency, if there were not such controls the effect might be to wipe out millions of Americans because prices might get completely out of line. In case of a grave emergency why should anyone object to preserving the status for a period of 90 days? Why should we not, rather, hold the line for at least 90 days, until we can ascertain how great the emergency is likely to be, and determine what we ought to do? Why should we take the chance, particularly when we are at war today, a war which tomorrow may develop into a big war? Why should we take a chance?

Mr. President, if we were not at war I would not be standing here to talk about the matter at all. But we are at war today. It was suggested yesterday that a declaration of war should be included in the pending bill. I submit we do not need it. We are at war today. We shall shortly find that we have been at war for 3 years.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to inquire whether the Senator from Utah, at any time during the entire period of the hearings on this particular subject, ever heard a proper definition given of a grave national emergency.

Mr. BENNETT. I should prefer to withhold my answer to that question, because, as I replied to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], I have another presentation to make at some later time, when I would like to go into that question in detail.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should appreciate hearing it at any time.

Mr. BENNETT. We never had a specific definition of the phrase. I am willing to admit that it cannot be reduced to specific definitions. We can still use the phrase "grave national emergency," but it may be desirable to substitute other phraseology for it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it not correct that any undue incident could be termed a grave national emergency, inflicting upon the businessmen of the country the heavy weight and the dangers of controls?

Mr. BENNETT. I think it is true that if the President in his wisdom decides that any situation is a grave national emergency, he may so declare and proceed accordingly.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Other phraseology might have been written into the bill had we not been at war at the moment. The President would have been given the right to impose controls. But we were already at war. If we had not been at war at the moment we would have said that at the beginning of hostilities the President could do these things. We did give a great deal of thought to making the termination date of title VIII the date of the cessation of hostilities in Korea. I would still have no objec-

tion to doing that. We thought the words "grave national emergency" were better than definitely to state in the bill that only at the beginning of hostilities could the President do these things. But we found ourselves at war. Therefore, those words would have been meaningless. We used the words "grave national emergency" because we were at war. If the war should become more widespread we would find ourselves in a squeeze. By using the word "grave" we intended that the President would not use the authority except in a very serious emergency.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield further?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah one more question. In view of the fact that it is no longer popular in this country to declare war—it seems to me that any time anyone wants us to go forth and fight, we always do it—does the Senator feel that the argument of the chairman of the committee in defending his position in not having spelled out the situation in specific language is correct? I feel that his argument is correct—that we are in a grave national emergency now, but we seem to be getting along pretty well without controls in spite of what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle may feel about it.

Mr. BENNETT. I remind the Senator from Arizona that our distinguished colleague the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has an amendment pending which, if adopted, would define the phrase "grave national emergency" in terms of a declaration of war. So far as I am concerned, I should like to wait and debate the subject when the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is before us.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. From the discussion, I gather that this proposed legislation will determine how much power and authority we are going to give the President of the United States. As has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], we passed the Civil Defense Act, which seems to give unlimited power, but I remember the debate which took place on the floor at the time the President seized the steel industry, when he thought he had power to take such action. Had it not been for the Supreme Court of the United States, he would have assumed such power.

I think it is important that we keep in mind some of the past legislation as we begin to consider further delegation of authority and power to the Chief Executive.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to return to Abraham Lincoln.

On September 13, 1858, in a debate with Stephen A. Douglas at Edwardsville, Ill., Abraham Lincoln said:

> Our reliance against tyranny is the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men and all lands everywhere. Destroy the spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own door. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage, and you prepare your own limbs to wear them.

We need to face this problem in the light of Lincoln's warning. With this bill we acknowledge that we have so familiarized ourselves with the chains of economic bondage that we are hereby preparing our own limbs to wear them in every time of crisis.

To summarize my second point, obviously the economic pattern will be different in each future emergency that may arise. To deny this is to deny the vitality of our economy. We cannot possibly foretell conditions with accuracy; we cannot possibly provide in advance a program that will fit them. Certainly we cannot provide one program that we can guarantee will fit any and every emergency.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is exactly the reason for the 90-day freeze, in order to hold the economy in status quo so that during the 90-day period Congress can decide what to do and take into consideration every facet about which the Senator is speaking. That is the reason for it. That is exactly what it does. It holds the line while Congress is doing exactly what the able Senator has been describing, taking into consideration every conceivable aspect of the matter. During the 90-day period Congress can consider conditions as they exist and consider what ought to be done. Then, it will be able to do it without pressure, knowing that the line is being held, knowing that it is not fighting against time, fearing that every day Congress is debating and deciding what to do, prices are going up and someone is saying, "Hurry, hurry, hurry." The able Senator from Utah was never any more right in his life than when he said conditions may be different. But while we are considering changed conditions we should hold the line. The Senator is making a fine argument for the 90-day provision.

Mr. BENNETT. I take the position that in the event of a future emergency Congress can pass legislation rapidly enough to make it effective.

I go back to my text.

Certainly in the face of conditions which have changed so much even since Korea, we should not attempt to readopt the program which we all realize now did not work effectively between January 1951, when it was finally imposed, and January 1953, when our President had the courage to relieve us of its weight. If we should attempt to fasten this discredited program on the unknown future, it seems to me that thereby we admit our interest in the program for its own sake. Time and time again during the hearings, many proponents of this bill denied that they believed in controls for their own sake. They insisted that they did not want them as a permanent thing. Yet, this bill belies their protestations. Title 8 will fasten the idea of direct consumer controls permanently into the pattern of our economy, to be called up at the will of the President. To make the chains seem lighter, we talk about limiting the President's power to use it and point out that this bill is only supposed to last for 2 years and that we are only giving him one chance in those 2 years. But, make no mistake, once passed, this pattern is permanent. Its very standby provision assures permanence. We are persuaded to adopt for the future what we reject for the present because we half believe that the future will never come.

If we adopt this program as the permanent first recourse in an emergency, we may be prevented from finding the right one to fit the needs of the times. Any program we adopt now on a standby basis is bound to be wrong. Let us avoid that mistake before we make it. Let us not accept a dormant disease germ because it is presently harmless without counting the cost of the disease it can produce when aroused.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah further yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. How could we possibly be wrong in case of a grave emergency by simply holding the status quo? We can be wrong, possibly, if we consume the 90 days in debating what kind of legislation to pass, but we cannot possibly be wrong in a grave national emergency in saying that we are going to hold the line for a few days to see what shall be done. That is what is provided for in title VIII. We cannot possibly be wrong in that.

Mr. BENNETT. I cannot agree with that statement.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator cannot say we can be wrong in keeping down unnecessary price increases.

Mr. BENNETT. There might conceivably be a situation in which increased production might be more important than a temporary control of prices.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator was never any more correct in his life, but the purpose of this bill is to hold the line for a few days until that question can be decided. The Senator might well be 100 percent correct.

For example, as a result of the passage of the 1950 Defense Production Act, in which Congress provided for the appropriation of money to help increase production, and to do all the things for which that act provided, our production has been increased in the last 3 years to such a point that price controls are now not needed, because, although we are carrying on the Korean war, we are at the same time supplying our civilian needs. But that came about as a result of increased production because of what Congress did in the Defense Production Act, providing for 5-year amortization certificates, lending money, increasing production, and the doing of this, that, and the other thing.

Of course, the Senator is 100 percent right in saying that we might not want to do certain things. But let us hold the line until it is decided what we want to do.

Mr. BENNETT. I would hope that the Senator from Indiana could agree that there might conceivably be a situation in which we could move in an emergency without requiring the imposition of controls. The Senator from

Indiana is robbing me of the opportunity to present what I had hoped would be my "punch" line.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sorry; I apologize.

Mr. BENNETT. I shall reread the last sentence.

STANDBY CONTROLS MAY BE A TYPHOID MARY

The third assumption, that this pattern of consumer controls, even on a standby basis, is an effective weapon against inflation, is to me the strangest of the lot. Naturally, I admit that up to this point there has been little affirmative argument on that point of view, so, to a certain extent, I am presenting my point of view in a vacuum. I disagree with the basic assumption that direct consumer controls are an effective weapon against inflation. I presented this point of view in my remarks on May 8, 1953, and shall not repeat them now except to say that I am certain every member of the committee will admit the truth of this simple fact if it is stated independently of the language of this bill.

I think I can point out many ways in which the standby idea itself is highly inflationary and, therefore, will work directly against the purpose the proponents of this bill claim for it.

First, the standby idea creates a perpetual uncertainty that will hang over the economy like a sword of Damocles and have a dangerous influence. While this uncertainty may be quiescent much of the time, it will flare up into near-panic with every international incident, every scare headline, and everyone will say to himself, "Is this the time controls will be imposed? I'd better act now and beat the gun."

Secondly, there are many people in Government and outside who like the economic power that goes with controls. Whenever they think the President might be persuaded to invoke these powers, they will join to put pressure on him to do so. They remind me of the character Gabriel, in Marc Connolly's play The Green Pastures.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator believe that President Eisenhower, after the record that has been made in the committee and on the floor, and in a time of grave national emergency, knowing that his authority would last for only 90 days, knowing that Congress, if it wished to, could in 10 minutes, by concurrent resolution, rescind the authority, would permit some bureaucrat to talk him into invoking the 90-day freeze without its being obvious to most Americans that it was needed? The Senator really does not believe that, does he?

Mr. BENNETT. No, I do not believe it, but neither do I wish to put the President under that pressure. I think the pressure would exist.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to do so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator recall the President of the United States asking specifically for this power during the course of the hearings on the pending bill?

Mr. BENNETT. The President of the United States was not present at any hearings.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Did he ask for it through any of his representatives.

Mr. BENNETT. Those who came, purporting to speak for him, indicated, as I have quoted Mr. Flemming earlier, that the President would accept powers; but, so far as I know, no one asked specifically in his name that those powers be granted to him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. After having observed the President during the first 4 months of his administration, and in view of the fact that the President wishes to give back to Congress the powers which were taken from Congress by previous administrations, does the Senator from Utah feel that the President might be thinking of the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall regulate commerce between the States, when the President specifically did not ask for this propdsed legislation?

Mr. BENNETT. Obviously, I have no way of knowing what was in the mind of the President, but it is my feeling that, under the Constitution, the responsibility to act rests with Congress, and that when the President said he would accept the power if it were given to him, he was in true character as President of the United States.

I become disturbed whenever I have something I think I am going to enjoy. I should like to take Senators back to Marc Connolly's play, The Green Pastures, and to the character Gabriel. It will be remembered that Gabriel had a horn and was told that on the Judgment Day he could blow it. That delightful prospect produced a constant temptation. He liked to take his trumpet from the hatrack and shine it on his robe. He liked to wet his lips and try the mouthpiece out with his mouth until the Lord had to say, "Now, watch yourself, Gabriel." And Gabriel said, "I wasn't goin' to blow, Lawd. I just do that every now and then so I can keep the feel of it." I think there are many people in Government who would like to get back the feel of controls and literally live for the day when they can blow their horn like Gabriel.

Besides, there are still many people in this country who believe in controls for their own sake. We had some of them before our committee; particularly people who felt that rent control should become a permanent part of our economic pattern. People like this would welcome every opportunity to call for the imposition of the powers granted with this bill.

Moreover, the American people have a memory of price control in action. They will not soon forget the disturbances created by price controls in World War II when they realize that these may again be imposed without warning by the President and without congressional action. As I have suggested, every international incident will create its own wave of scare buying, and inflation will get another boost. For years now, the American people have looked in vain for typical up and down movement of our free market. Only lately have they been able to expect price reductions. After this bill is passed, it seems to me there will be a new force acting to resist price drops. With this threat hanging over their heads, businessmen and labor leaders will know that when the law is imposed it will penalize the man caught with his rents, prices, or wages down not only on the day the freeze is imposed but for a period of 30 days before. Remembering their past experience, they may strive always to keep prices and wages at the highest possible level, a pressure which is distinctly inflationary and which may increase with every sign of crisis.

In this and many other ways, standby controls legislation would hamper effective functioning of our free market as a control of our economy. It is a confession that the Government itself does not trust the free enterprise system. Businessmen, farmers, and labor leaders could not possibly make their plans very far in the future and operate on faith in a free market. They would have to try to outguess the Government as well as the market.

It seems to me direct consumer controls on a standby basis are definitely inflationary.

Yesterday during the debate there was a discussion about the relative rise in price levels of the Consumers' Price Index between the time the Korean incident began and September 8, 1950, when Congress passed a price-control law, and then between September 8, 1950 and the time in January when the President invoked it.

The enactment of the price-control law in September 1950 put this law on a standby basis until January 1951. Between June 25, when the Korean conflict began, and September 8, 1950, Consumers' Price Index rose to 2.6 points, using January 1950 as a base. That is to say, it rose about 1 point per month. From the date of passage of the act until controls were imposed by the President by means of the general ceiling price regulation on January 25, 1951, all items in the Consumers' Price Index advanced 5.5 additional index points. In other words, prices rose more than twice as much after the controls legislation was put on the books in standby form than they did even in the first flush of the scare buying that followed the beginning of the Korean conflict.

During that second period the consumer index rose twice as high as during the first.

Thus, for these and many other reasons given in my earlier talk, I consider this legislation, and particularly its standby feature, dangerously inflationary.

Mr. President, that we should ever consider such a bill as this is a serious indictment of ourselves. If we pass it, we will acknowledge that we have no faith in ourselves and that we are unworthy of the faith that the people have put in us. By so doing, we admit that in times of stress we cannot carry our constitutional responsibility and must impose it on an already overburdened Chief Executive.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have exactly the opposite impression. We shall be irresponsible if we do not now decide what we are going to do, and make plans for it. I know that the Senator from Utah is a businessman. He certainly makes plans for the future. Why does he say that we ought not to plan for the future? Why does he want the emergency to strike before we decide what we are going to do? What is wrong about planning for an emergency? Why does the Senator want to wait until the emergency strikes?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Indiana has made it clear during the afternoon that the bill is not a planned assault on problems of the emergency. It is simply a plan to freeze the situation so that during later consideration the problems may be faced.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is exactly what it is, but the able Senator persists in trying to convince the Senate that it is a standby control bill in all its details, when he knows that it is not.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah has not said that.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Utah has said a half dozen times that there are those in the Senate—and I presume he means to include me—who want to retain controls permanently. He knows that that is not true. In one breath he talks about this being permanent legislation, and in the next breath he talks about something else. What is wrong with planning for the future?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah will repeat what he said earlier. If we are in a situation in which a freeze is important, it seems to the Senator from Utah that it could be provided at the time by the Congress then sitting, just as effectively as Congress could provide it now.

Mr. CAPEHART. In a speech which the able Senator from Utah made a few days ago, and also, I believe, in direct reply to a question which I asked yesterday, he admitted that he was opposed to price, wage, and rent control, even during a serious emergency. At least, he says that they should be the last resort.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, if the emergency were to strike tomorrow, and if I were to introduce a resolution to freeze prices, wages, and rents, the Senator would vote against it.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah would vote on the basis of the conditions existing tomorrow. He might vote for the Senator's resolution. That is the point the Senator from Utah is trying to make. The Congress in session at the time can act with the necessary speed.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is opposed to price, wage, and rent controls at any time, and he has so stated. Therefore, even though an emergency were to strike tomorrow, and no such legislation were in existence, if I were to introduce a resolution to bring about a freeze for 90 days, the Senator from Utah would be opposed to it. He would debate it, argue against it, and insist on hearings, involving many days of delay.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we have gone over this ground three or four times. I think our previous colloquy clearly represents the point of view of the Senator from Indiana, as well as my own point of view.

Mr. President, I am very anxious to conclude this speech. I am within sight of the end. I now return to my text.

The Senator from Utah feels that by enacting the proposed legislation now we admit that in times of stress we cannot carry our constitutional responsibility and must impose it on an already overburdened Chief Executive. In time of great crisis the President has the problems of the crisis; and if it is a crisis of war, as Commander in Chief, he has all those problems to face. We also admit that we have no faith in the men of the future who may be in the Senate when a crisis comes, so we try to bind them now to use our discredited program. When we move to fasten direct consumer controls permanently on our economy on a standby basis——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator knows that that is not a true statement, because it is only for 90 days. Ninety days is not "permanently."

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator will be glad to amend that sentence.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should think the Senator would want to amend it, in order to be fair and factual.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems to the Senator from Utah——

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Utah has repeatedly made that statement. This is the first time I have called his attention to it. Ninety days is not "permanently."

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah has the feeling that if we enact the proposed legislation now, with the idea that whenever a crisis occurs in the future we are to have a freeze which will control prices, wages, and rents for 30, 60, or 90 days, that entire concept becomes a permanent part of our economy. Probably my use of words did not make that clear.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think such a program ought to be in effect so long as we are at war in Korea. So long as American boys are dying in battle, I think we ought to be interested in protecting their families back home against undue rises in prices and against inflation. That is one reason why I am for this proposed legislation. I think the lives of American boys are just as important as material prices.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Utah feel now, or has he ever felt, that title VIII of Senate bill 1081 would accomplish what the distinguished chairman just said it would accomplish namely, control inflation?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah made a speech last Friday more or less on that subject, and, as he has indicated, he hopes at a later time, when we reach the point of specific consideration of the language of the bill, to discuss it from still another point of view.

For the sake of my long-suffering colleagues in the Senate, I hope I can reach the end of the next page.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Utah feel that the Senate has ever approached the problem of inflation from the proper angle? Does he not feel that in attempting to enact title VIII of Senate bill 1081 we are only attemping to correct a result, and that we have never yet tried to determine the cause of inflation and attempted to do something about it?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Arizona made a very long, and I think effective, presentation of his point of view on that subject, with which the Senator from Utah is in practically complete agreement. But the Senator from Utah would not like to make the categorical statement that the Senate has never approached the problem of the solution for inflation. This is all a part of the process by which we educate ourselves with respect to the problem of inflation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senate probably has attacked the problem of inflation. In fact, the suggestion was made on the floor yesterday that we take steps to cause a little more inflation by having the Federal Reserve bolster the prices of Government bonds.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is in sight of the finish line. I hope my colleagues, for their own sakes, will allow me to reach it.

I return to my text.

The Senator from Utah feels that when we adopt the standby idea we admit that we have no faith in our free-enterprise system. When we adopt the standby idea we create a new inflationary force which nullifies the efforts of the new administration to move with courage against inflation and makes a mockery of our protestation of fiscal responsibility.

As I bring this argument to an end, may I close by quoting from a treatise titled "Standby Controls," written by F. A. Harper and published this spring by the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc. I recommend this treatise as "must" reading for every Senator before he votes on this bill. I think the meat of Mr. Harper's argument is contained in these paragraphs:

> The most kindly charge that can be made against one who favors standby controls for emergencies, it seems to me, is that he does not understand the workings of a free market and that he lacks confidence in the performance of free men working with private property in a voluntary exchange economy. And if that be his belief, why does he not propose Government controls of everything, all the time? Why not use the "strength" of controls all the time, not just in emergencies?
>
> Standby controls? For what? Not, to be sure, for the purpose of either productive efficiency or justice. Not to maximize trade, nor to balance distribution so that

shortages and surpluses will disappear. Not to further the freedom of men in this land which we claim will be the last bastion of freedom in the world struggle in which we are now engaged.

To enact standby controls would mean putting into the law of the land permanent endorsement of a basic tenet of socialism—the principle that control of the vital mainstreams of commerce and confiscation of the rights of private property are sound and just practices. A nation of freedom cannot enact even standby controls and remain basically free.

In an earlier speech, I challenged the whole validity of the concepts on which this bill for direct consumer controls rests. Today I have tried to point out the dangers inherent in the standby idea. In another presentation, if convenient, I shall try to show that title VIII of the bill is not the freeze that it is represented to be by its proponents, but is a transference to the President of greater economic powers than any other President has ever had. I hope you will share my alarm and will vote to reject title VIII of this bill and the whole concept of standby controls.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Utah has stated that the bill grants greater powers than the President has ever heretofore been given. I would respectfully say that the bill provides no greater powers than those which are now in existence. The Senator knows that to be the fact. They are exactly the same powers.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Senator from Indiana is referring to section 802, the Senator from Utah will agree with him that the language is the same.

Mr. CAPEHART. The 1950 Defense Production Act gave the President the standby right to control prices, wages, and rents, and to do other things as well. That power was given the President for 12 months, not for 90 days, as is provided in the pending bill. The Senator from Utah quoted a poem. The Senator knows that we are not talking about permanent standby controls. We are talking only about a 90-day freeze, with such a freeze to be put into effect only in a grave emergency, in which the Government would have to take the production of America for military use to such a large extent that there would not be sufficient material left for 160 million Americans, thus making it necessary to put into effect controls on prices and on wages and on rents, and on everything else. The Senator from Utah knows that is all we are talking about.

I have stated no less than 200 times during the hearings that all we are talking about is a grave national emergency, in which the military would need such a large percentage of various categories of goods and materials that in order to make it possible for them to get what they need there would not be sufficient left over for the civilian population.

When that sort of situation arises the law of supply and demand does not work, and the country is faced with a grave emergency. Under those conditions I do not believe anyone in America would argue that the Government would not have to allocate materials and control prices. For example, if we cut down a manufacturer of automobiles to one-half of his present production because the Government needs the materials which go into the manufacture of automobiles, he would have only half as many automobiles to sell as he has for sale today. The Senator from Utah is a businessman. Surely he will not tell me that the price on the remaining half of the automobiles would not skyrocket. The Senator from Utah knows that to be a fact, because he is a businessman. He knows that under those circumstances the Government would have to control the price of automobiles, and likewise probably would have to allocate the distribution of the automobiles.

Mr. President, let us not fool ourselves. Let us put our cards on the table and discuss the bill as it ought to be discussed. We are not talking about anything except a grave national emergency, in which the Government would have to take over vast quantities of materials. That is all we are referring to. Under any other circumstances I am 1,000 percent opposed to controls; I always will be and always have been.

Mr. President, let us not get off the subject, and try to make people believe we are talking about something that we are not talking about. We are talking only about a 90-day freeze under the conditions which I have described.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will yield for an observation, I should like to say that in my opinion the Senator from Utah has made an excellent presentation of some very fundamental approaches to the problem under discussion. I want him to know that the senior Senator from Kansas appreciates the viewpoint expressed by the Senator from Utah. I well recall, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the distinguished Senator who has just finished speaking is now a member, that we had on many occasions to listen to witnesses who pointed out, as the Senator from Utah has done, features of the bill which would be injurious to the economy of the country.

When the Senator from Utah suggests some of the pitfalls incident to such a solution of the problem as is proposed, I think he is rendering a great service, not only to the Members of the Senate, but to the people of the country. I wish to commend him for his speech.

I believe the Senator has spotlighted an important point. We found in the committee that when there was in effect a standby law which could be invoked, people invariably would readjust their activities—to what? They would readjust their activities so as to get themselves into the most advantageous position possible.

As I viewed it, such an approach was injurious to the entire economic situation, in circumstances such as those in which we now find ourselves, or in any emergency.

I commend the Senator from Utah for his excellent portrayal of what he believes, and in his views I concur.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah deeply appreciates the remarks of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to yield the floor, so that my colleague, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] may proceed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for one question?

Mr. BENNETT. Gladly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the 90-day freeze order were put into effect, does the Senator believe it would ever be removed from the books? Does the Senator recall the passage of rent control legislation, 11 years ago, I believe, as an emergency measure?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It was stated at the time that it would last only for a year or two years, or perhaps for the duration of the emergency. Does the Senator realize that the emergency still exists, and that we still have rent control with us, and that it was extended only a short time ago?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah also realizes—and I think this is a perfectly fair statement—that there are people in the United States who are disturbed by the fact that Federal rent control will soon expire and hope that the States will exercise the power to control rents, so that the rent control policy may be extended indefinitely into the future.

Mr. President, the Senator from Utah now yields the floor.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, before I speak I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that the Senator from Kansas joins in complimenting him very sincerely upon his very able presentation, made both previously and today, in connection with this general subject. I can very easily associate myself with most of what he said, in fact, with about 95 percent of it.

I also compliment him upon the fact that all through the long hearings in connection with the pending bill he developed points with great ability, to the great advantage of the committee.

Probably more than any other Senator he was responsible for getting out of the way another bill, also a standby control bill, which would have stockpiled bureaucrats, as I believe he himself stated it. He had a profound effect on the deliberations of the committee. I am therefore very happy, before proceeding with my remarks, to make this acknowledgement and to pay my compliments to him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] without losing my right to the floor so that the Senator from Michigan may ask some questions of the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUFF in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. The first question is, Does the pending bill provide for rollbacks?

Mr. CAPEHART. I assume the Senator from Michigan is referring to title VIII; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I assume that under title VIII there might be some instances in which the President could roll back prices. Of course that title gives the President the power to freeze prices, wages, and rents at the levels existing on the day preceding the day when he freezes them; or, if prices were not generally representative on that day, the President could select a day as far back as 30 days before the freeze, or if no price existed within that 30-day period, he could freeze them at the nearest representative date.

Mr. FERGUSON. If in some instances the President would be empowered to roll back prices, then let me state the matter this way: Section 801 (a) of the bill reported by the committee would grant the President three alternatives to establishing prices, wages, and rents, that is, at the levels prevailing as of the close of business on the day preceding the freeze "or those prevailing on the nearest date during the preceding 30 days on which, in the judgment of the President, they are generally representatives, or if none prevailed during such 30-day period, then those prevailing on the nearest date on which, in the judgment of the President, they are generally representative."

I have just read from line 25, on page 23, and lines 1 through 5, on page 24 of the bill as reported from committee.

The committee report, on page 28, makes it clear that the words "generally representative" mean that the prices must be also "fair and equitable."

Mr. CAPEHART. They should be fair and equitable to the seller.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I wanted to emphasize.

I do not believe the committee intended to grant to the President the power to roll back prices to those prevailing on any preceding date on which the President would find that prices, wages, rents, and so forth, were "generally representative," if by "generally representative" is mean "representative, fair, and equitable."

The committee report sets forth some cogent reasons why the President should be permitted to establish prices as of a date preceding the "business day next preceding the day on which the action is taken." The date selected should be "generally representative" of the price structure of the seller on whom the ceilings are to be imposed, and should not involve a collateral determination of their being "fair and equitable."

That would mean that the exercise of this power would involve a wide area of administrative discretion.

In its amendments of the Defense Production Act in 1951, the Congress sharply limited the power of the President to roll back prices.

The language of the bill reported by the committee should be amended, I believe, so as to eliminate—or at least the Senator from Indiana, as chairman of the committee, should make a statement which would eliminate—all ambiguity from the construction of the bill, in order to make it clear that the President's power to select a date other than the date preceding the executive order should be limited to a date on which, in the discretion of the President, the price structure was generally representative as to the seller and others on whom ceilings are to be imposed.

Is that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is right, yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. So it is not intended to give the President the power to roll back prices, wages, rents, and so forth; is that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. It is not intended to give that power. The President would not roll them back. He would select the business day before the day when the freeze occurred; or if there were no representative transaction on that day, he could select a previous day within 30 days, and could use the price the individual seller was using on that day; and that is all. If no price prevailed during the 30 day period, he could go back to the nearest date on which a representative price did prevail.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well. I think that makes it clear that the President would not be given the power to roll back.

Mr. CAPEHART. The bill never was intended to do other than to give the President the power to select a representative day.

Mr. FERGUSON. And that is intended to be a day that is representative for the seller; is that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is right.

Mr. FERGUSON. Section 801 (a) provides that ceilings on prices, wages, rents, and so forth, shall be established simultaneously by Executive order "at the levels prevailing as of the close of business."

Those words appear in lines 23 and 24, on page 23.

The word "levels" does not appear in the price-control provisions of the act now in existence. The word seems to me to be vague, indefinite, and subject to a variety of interpretations. It does not specify the basis of classification for the purpose of determing levels. It may suggest an averaging of prices between producers of the same commodities—between efficient and inefficient producers; between high-cost and low-cost producers. It could, therefore, suggest price, wage, and rent increases, as well as decreases.

It may even suggest the establishment of prices which would produce a "fair" rate of return on investment of all producers in any given class. As a matter of fact, the use of the word "levels" negates the concept of a freeze with respect to specific prices, wages, rents, and so forth. The exercise of this power would involve a wide area of administrative discretion which would not possibly be exercised within the 90-day freeze period contemplated by the bill.

So, Mr. President, would the Senator from Indiana accept an amendment to change the——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not think an amendment is needed, because we are referring to individual levels of individual sellers; that is all—period.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Instead of the word "levels," I wonder whether the Senator from Indiana would accept the word "those," so that the bill would read "those prevailing as of the close of business," and so forth. In that way the provision would be made clear.

Mr. CAPEHART. I would have no objection to such an amendment. Offhand I do not think it would change the meaning of the bill; but if it would improve the bill, I would have no objection to the amendment, because the reference in the bill now is meant to apply to the individual levels of the individual sellers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator from Indiana accept such an amendment?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would have no objection, when the time comes to offer amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have several other questions to ask, but I have been allowed only 10 minutes in which to proceed at this time, so I shall suspend now.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think such an amendment is necessary; but if the Senator from Michigan insists upon it, I have no objection. What is meant is the individual levels of the individual sellers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Chair. However, I have several other questions to ask, and I am afraid that I could not conclude them within 3 minutes. Therefore I shall suspend at this time, and later shall seek the floor in my own right.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a little while ago I referred to the 5 percent area of disagreement which I may have with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. Of course that has to do with title VIII of the pending bill.

The entire controversy over Senate bill 1081 appears to center upon title VIII. It is important that we recognize what that title of the bill would do, and it is equally important that we recognize clearly what it would not do.

It would not impose ceilings on prices, wages, and rents in peacetime, or in any period such as the present, when, in the words of President Eisenhower, we are "living in an international situation that is neither an emergency demanding full mobilization, nor is it peace."

It would not strip from the Congress the authority to determine what measures would be necessary to keep our economy stable, should we find ourselves plunged into world war III or into another "Korea" or into a comparable period of grave national emergency.

It would not create an elaborate organization of "standby" agencies, with large staffs—"a stockpile of bureaucrats," as one Senator put it.

It would not remain law indefinitely, but only for a period of 90 days at the very most.

It would not solve the problem by itself. It would only begin to deal with it. But it would force a beginning.

Mr. President, I say it is important that we recognize what title VIII would

not do, because I know that many other Members of the Senate, like myself, have a deep abhorrence of the use of direct economic controls, except in times when our national security is definitely threatened.

What, then, would title VIII do?

It would authorize the President to invoke a 90-day freeze on prices, wages, and rents, "whenever," in the language of the bill, "he shall find and declare that a grave national emergency exists, and that the exercise of such authority is necessary in the interest of national security and economic stability."

The whole philosophy of the Eisenhower administration guarantees that the President will not invoke these powers frivolously. We may be sure they will be used only when the national security is at stake.

It should be noted that the maximum period during which the freeze could be in effect would be 90 days; that the Congress may terminate the freeze at any earlier time it may decide; that the extraordinary powers granted to the President may be exercised once, and only once; and, finally, that a termination date requires reconsideration of this whole question by the next Congress.

This is stopgap legislation, Mr. President, if you will, intended to safeguard us through the coming months of world tension. Like our defense mobilization plans, it is insurance against disaster—insurance that we shall not be caught wholly unprepared.

The purpose of the title is to give to the President the minimum authority he will need to keep the economy as stable as possible until the Congress has an opportunity to act. We who support this proposal recognize full well that ceilings on prices, wages, and rents are ineffective in themselves. I agree with much that the Senator from Utah said in that connection. But, with ceilings in effect temporarily at the outbreak of a grave national emergency, inflationary forces may be held in check until a combination of controls, direct and indirect, may be developed by Congress, if needed.

In the scramble for goods which surely will accompany an emergency of the kind we have in mind, it is always the little fellow who gets hurt—the small-business man, the teacher, the public servant, the housewife, the average consumer. With inflation, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

It is to help guard against this unfairness—and to benefit all taxpayers by making sure that spiraling prices do not add heavily and unnecessarily to the cost of war—that we propose a 90-day freeze until Congress can strike against the root causes of inflation. The ultimate authority remains with Congress. We seek only to make certain that Congress shall have the best possible opportunity to act effectively.

I have referred to the proposed powers of the President as extraordinary. Why did the majority of the Banking and Currency Committee, by a vote of 12 to 3, after exhaustive hearings on the question, propose to give the President of the United States any such extraordinary powers?

Mr. President, to answer that question, we must face up to the kind of world in which we live. It is a world in which we yearn and strive for peace; yet no man among us can safely predict that we shall achieve it.

I have referred to President Eisenhower's description of the international situation as neither an emergency demanding full mobilization, nor yet peace. We are in a sort of twilight zone. We know not yet whether that twilight will be followed by a black night of storms—a night of the awful atomic destruction of the third world war we dread so much—or whether we shall pass through a long night of unrest, to see eventually the dawn of an era of real peace and real security for all the world.

We know the aspirations of the United States. As President Eisenhower so eloquently stated them in his inspiring address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors last April 16, we aspire to this:

> The lifting, from the backs and from the hearts of men, of their burdens of arms and of fears, so that they may find before them a golden age of freedom and of peace.

However noble our own aspirations, we and our allies alone cannot guarantee peace. In his address before the newspaper editors, President Eisenhower asked, "What is the Soviet Union ready to do?" We do not know the answer. We know, however, that the fighting continues in Korea. It continues to spread in southeast Asia. The Middle East is uneasy, unsettled. The Secretary of State, accompanied by Mr. Stassen, has gone to that area. It is the first time in the history of our country that a Secretary of State has visited the Middle East and the Far East.

We know that Soviet protestations of peaceful intentions must be scrutinized with wary skepticism. And we know that the evil successors of Stalin in the Kremlin have it within their power to unleash a new "Korea" on the world, or on us, or to trigger world war III, with all its terrible consequences.

In such a state of world affairs, we must continue to prepare for the worst, while hoping for the best. We are preparing in other fields. We are straining our economy to provide an adequate defense for ourselves and our allies in the free world. We have drafted—and are continuing to draft—the flower of our young manhood to fight in Korea, and to man our outposts elsewhere on the globe. As we are thus preparing, so should we prepare to begin promptly the fight on inflation and its damaging effects upon our economy, which would inevitably accompany the outbreak of a new, grave national emergency.

Mr. President, some of those who oppose title VIII contend that it is unnecessary, because, should such an emergency arise, Congress could act quickly enough to meet it.

That argument ignores the fact that Congress may not be able to meet quickly because of a paralysis of the Nation as the result of an atomic attack. It also ignores past history.

We have never had a greater national emergency than that which occurred in the period immediately following the attack upon Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. Yet, Congress moved at a snail's pace in authorizing ceilings and controls at that time. It was 6 months before a bill was adopted, and 9 months before effective regulations were in operation. In the meantime, the inflationary spiral had gained much momentum, and much damage was done.

The attack on Pearl Harbor occurred 12 years ago; Korea may be fresher in our memories. The invasion of Korea took place on June 24, 1950. It was not until September 8, 1950, that we had a law providing for ceilings—an elapse of 75 days. Congress, I assume, moved at that time as rapidly as it could, but the inevitable delay in the legislative process was followed by more—and less excusable—delays on the part of the former administration. It was not until January 26, 1951, 7 months after the invasion, that a price freeze was made effective.

What were the consequences? I quote from page 12 of our committee report:

> The cost of inflation during fiscal 1951 to the Department of Defense alone was estimated at $7 billion. The consumers of this country had to pay an estimated eighteen to twenty billion dollars more for the goods and services they bought because of the price increases which took place between the outbreak of hostilities in Korea and the date of the issuance of the general ceiling price regulation on January 26, 1951.

Mr. President, the lesson of history in this case is clear. We must not let ourselves get caught unprepared again.

There has been some discussion as to whether or not the administration wants the authority we would confer. To my mind, that is irrelevant, for we in the Congress bear the primary responsibility for writing legislation to safeguard our Nation against disaster.

Since the point has been raised, however, I will say that it is my firm belief that this legislation would be welcomed by the President and his principal advisers.

Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Acting Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, testified that the Eisenhower administration is keenly aware of the necessity of planning against inflation. He stated that title VIII would be acceptable to the administration. An examination of the testimony of Cabinet officers who appeared before our committee indicates clearly that while the administration would not in any way attempt to force this legislation upon the Congress, it would welcome this addition to its arsenal of weapons against inflation. In effect, the Eisenhower administration has told us that it is our responsibility.

Mr. President, I believe that it is our duty to accept that responsibility. We have no faith that price and wage ceilings can deal with inflation by themselves. I have no more faith in them than has my distinguished friend from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] or my distinguished friend from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

When inflation becomes a serious danger, we must have sound fiscal and monetary measures to take the pressure off—restrictions on consumer credit and real estate credit, a realistic tax policy, strong inducements to savings. In short, we must restrain civilian spending when we are forced, in an emergency situation, to

devote a lion's share of our production to war purposes.

Price and wage ceilings can serve a useful temporary purpose—only that. They can keep the lid on inflation until these other measures have had time to take the pressure off the lid.

For that reason, I think we will decide wisely if we grant to the President the limited and temporary authority proposed in title VIII. We will be giving the administration a small weapon, but, indeed, a weapon against inflation it will need, and need badly, should we find ourselves in another period of grave national emergency.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Connecticut made reference to the purchase of materials and their increased cost——

Mr. BUSH. I recall that a bill was introduced to give persons a chance to express their thoughts concerning a type of standby controll bill. I made reference to it only in connection with the statement of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], who is very strongly opposed to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute as modified by the committee.

EXTENSION OF MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM IN RELATION TO OUR REGIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly concerning a matter of imminent concern to every Senator and to the Nation.

Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House are both now engaged in examining the administration's proposals for extending the mutual security program and authorizing funds to carry out this extension in the several major regions of the earth deemed vital to our national defense. While these proposals will be the subject of prolonged study by the two committees and will be debated thoroughly on the floor of both Houses in the coming weeks, it is not too early to raise certain questions about them.

I shall confine my present remarks to the relation of this program with the regional security system erected under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The leading spokesmen of the administration have been taking great pains to assure our allies, our people, and the Congress that the Eisenhower administration is as determined as anyone could be, as determined as anyone has been in the past, to maintain and develop NATO. President Eisenhower's own role in bringing NATO to life as commander of SHAPE is repeatedly cited as proof positive of his administration's intent to go on building where he left off.

I would like to accept at face value these assurances and this evidence, Mr. President, but I find it somewhat difficult to do so. Actions are speaking with greater authority than words. The news reports emanating from the recent meeting of the NATO ministers in Paris have raised questions in my mind, and in the minds of many other Americans.

These questions can be expressed simply: Does the present administration really mean to press forward, building greater strength through NATO and exercising leadership in that direction, or has it decided to slacken and relax the Atlantic defense efforts, abandon the idea of a growing and flourishing Atlantic community, transfer its emphasis in foreign policy to some other part of the world—Asia, for example—and allow leadership in the western community to slip into the hands of some other nation or group of nations?

There are two main causes contributing to my doubts on this score: One is the decision reached in Paris by the North Atlantic Council, without strong objections on the part of the American delegation, to stretch out the defense efforts, slow down the rate of buildup, and stress "quality" in place of "quantity." The other is in the none-too-subtle threat made publicly and privately to our European allies by Secretary Dulles to reduce military assistance if the European Defense Community treaty is not speedily ratified.

First, let us look at the decision to stretchout the defense buildup. The Secretary of State has told us we can expect a 30-percent increase in actual strength in the coming year, that we will concentrate on the quality of NATO forces rather than their quantity, that we plan to strengthen the divisions already in the process of formation rather than form a large number of additional new ones.

When we recall that General Eisenhower as commander of SHAPE declared the Lisbon Conference goal of 100 divisions was too low and that we really needed 120 divisions, we have a reliable standard for judging the present lowering of goals to 56 or 60 divisions. I have not noticed that the Russians were reducing their divisions in Eastern Europe to any comparable degree.

Perhaps our allies are right in insisting that their economies cannot support a greater defense burden. Perhaps the President is right to believe that because we are in a permanent emergency we do not need to worry about 1954 or 1955 or any other particular "crisis year," but should simply prepare for a long-term defense effort that will go on indefinitely.

But I do recall, Mr. President, that the crisis-year estimate was based on a careful analysis of the Soviet atomic buildup. The Soviet Union was expected to have enough atomic bombs by 1954 to destroy the United States, and it was on that basis that we were striving for maximum strength by that year. If anything has occurred to change the estimate of probable Soviet atomic power a year from now, I have no knowledge of it.

General Bradley told us last week that—

> There is every indication that the Soviets continue vigorously to develop and modernize the forces that they could throw against the free world. We believe that their atomic capability is rapidly improving.

Is this another of those well-known calculated risks?

Testifying before the joint session of the House and Senate committees last week, the Secretary of State declared in reference to the North Atlantic Council's latest decisions:

> All agreed that it was vital not only to maintain NATO's strength, but to build it up. We faced a problem, however, because the NATO members have about reached the limit of their present ability to improve quality and at the same time to maintain the past rate of buildup in size of NATO forces. The situation obviously demanded a shift of emphasis. Rather than continuing to exhaust our resources in a precipitate military buildup, we have agreed to undertake a more gradual and more steady buildup which is consistent with United States and European economic capabilities. Greater emphasis will at this time be placed on the improved quality of NATO forces rather than upon immediate quantitative increases.

And the Secretary immediately added this assurance:

> I do not want anyone to receive the impression that NATO is cutting back its program. * * * The program upon which we agreed for the calendar year 1953 provides for a moderate increase in the size of NATO forces as well as a very substantial improvement in their quality. If these plans are carried out, it is the judgment of our military experts that the NATO forces in Europe, by the end of this year, will be nearly 30 percent stronger than they are now.

To obtain an idea of what this 30-percent improvement in quality represents, of course, we first have to know what is the strength of the forces now in being. The Secretary stated in his testimony:

> Today there are approximately 75 NATO divisions in existence across the Atlantic, plus sizable air and naval forces.

He added that many of these troops need more training and equipment before they can be fully effective.

Mr. President, I am not privy to any military secrets, and I do not wish to be. But any reader giving average attention to the newspapers is aware that the figure of approximately 75 divisions under NATO command is more a figure of speech than a meaningful statistic.

My own limited reading on the subject has left me with the impression that a considerable portion—at least a third—of these 75 divisions are standing guard in Turkey and Greece, and that when we talk of the defense of Western Europe we cannot count on borrowing strength from Turkey or Greece.

I may be completely wrong—and I hope that I am—but the number of NATO divisions in Western Europe I have seen most frequently mentioned is 50. And of those 50 divisions, only 20 or 25 are actually in a state of combat readiness, while the others are more in the nature of undermanned, underofficered, underequipped reserves. Even assuming that there are 25 combat-ready divisions, including, of course, the 6 American divisions stationed in Western Germany, we fall to a much lower and much more realistic figure than 75 divisions.

In the Washington Star of April 25 a dispatch from Paris by Mr. William H. Stoneman, foreign correspondent of the

Star and the Chicago Daily News, recorded his two principal conclusions about the council meeting. First:

The future of Europe's defense against Russia now lies at the mercy of France and Germany and the political parties which compose their parliaments.

Second:

The feeling of urgency and alarm which first drove the 14 members of NATO to join forces is petering out.

Referring to the feeling of relaxation at the Conference, Mr. Stoneman concludes:

This spread out comes at a time when NATO has a total of 25 ready divisions, plus 25 other divisions theoretically mobilizable within 30 days, to defend the whole area of western and northern Europe from the north cape to the Strait of Messina. Against them they have 90 Russian divisions in readiness, plus a vast number of reserve divisions and a considerable number of satellite divisions.

Hanson Baldwin, in the Sunday New York Times of Times of April 26, writes:

The long haul and the stretch out were substituted for the crash program. The year-of-crisis philosophy, which has dominated NATO thinking for the past 2 years, has been scrapped, and the new plans contemplate a steady but very slow buildup of Western Europe's military strength, with the ultimate goal still shrouded in uncertainty but plainly far lower than was originally contemplated. The basic factor in NATO's new approach * * * is negative and not positive.

Mr. Baldwin continues:

The "stretchout" and "slowdown" have resulted in the abandonment of any specific "date of readiness," and the force increases approved last week contemplate only a very modest ground buildup in present NATO strength, with somewhat more emphasis on airpower. The equivalent of about eight divisions is to be added to SHAPE's control, but some of these represent merely paper "transfers."

Mr. Baldwin then concludes:

Existing NATO strength is not adequate to defend Europe, much less to defeat Russia and win a war. The hope of NATO planners is that by the end of 1955 NATO may have built up enough air and land strength to defend the vital parts of Western Europe for 90 days, or until American, British, and Canadian reinforcements could arrive. But this remains just a hope. Today, NATO's problem is that all its strength is in the showcase; there are few reserves, and these are grossly inadequate.

Mr. Crosby S. Noyes, writing from Paris on April 25, in the Washington Star, says the determined show of unanimity and harmony at the NATO conference covered up several real splits among the delegations. One of these differences concerned the idea of Mr. Dulles that Western Europe rather than the United States should set the pace in NATO.

This reflects, says Mr. Noyes:

A growing fear that the United States is anxious to bow out of its role of leader in the western community once the objective of German rearmament has been achieved. Most Europeans are aware what withdrawal of American support would mean and they are willing to pay almost any price to avoid it. The present NATO council meeting, which is giving Western Europe its first real taste of the new administration's foreign policy, has not succeeded in calming these fears.

On the contrary, Mr. Dulles and his colleagues have suggested more than once that the possibility of a drastic revision of American policy is very real. While indorsing the objectives of NATO and the role that the United States should play in it, he has hinted broadly that the deciding factors are almost entirely a matter of domestic American politics. He has given the impression that the administration's foreign-policy programs are no longer to be worked out and fought through Congress but rather tailored ahead of time to the prevailing political sentiment. Considering what is at stake, it is an attitude which must be less than reassuring to Mr. Dulles' fellow ministers; in spite of the outward harmony the feeling will remain that NATO has survived its first encounter with the new administration with an exceedingly stiff upper lip.

Referring again to the estimated 30-percent increase in strength which the Secretary believes will result from the new shift in emphasis, I must say I do not know how that percentage has been calculated, but if it means that only 30 percent of 25 underequipped and undermanned divisions are going to be brought up to full strength and combat readiness by the end of the year, then we would obtain an additional force of only 7½ divisions, or a total of 32 or 33 divisions ready to meet an invading force. Mr. President, this is not a picture that comforts me, and it is not one to comfort the American people.

The cost of creating and maintaining a combat-ready division in the army of one of our European allies is far less than the cost of a similar division in the United States Army. As the Secretary of State testified the other day:

If these forces [under NATO] did not exist, we would need a much larger security establishment in the United States, with an immense increase in cost, and hundreds of thousands of more Americans in uniform.

This is so undeniably the case that I should think one of the prime objectives of any American administration seeking to economize on defense expenditures would be to strain every effort to aid and assist in the creation of larger and less expensive armed forces among our allies. If it is an objective of the administration, as the Secretary of the Treasury told our joint committees on Monday, May 4, to secure the maximum of security wherever it may be for the least possible expenditures of money, then in all logic it should follow that instead of seeking to reduce funds for foreign military assistance, we should be seeking to increase them, thereby obtaining more security for ourselves as well as for our allies at far less expenditures of money than we would have to spend for a comparable increase in security by augmenting our own forces.

If the argument is valid that it is less costly to arm our allies than to increase our own forces, then an administration bent on economy, on cutting expenditures to balance the budget, and on reducing taxes, should logically do all in its power to get maximum security for our Nation at the least possible cost by stepping up the forces of NATO, not just qualitatively but quantitatively.

Therefore, the decision of the administration as shown in the mutual security bill to slash funds for aid to our NATO allies is a further reason to cause doubt in my mind as to their intentions; it is further cause for my difficulty in accepting the assurances of administration spokesmen that they are continuing to strengthen the Atlantic community's defense forces.

I repeat if this administration seeks the maximum defense in the Atlantic area for the least cost, why does it not step up funds for NATO, instead of cutting back? Why does it not step up the creation of armed forces on the European continent where it can be done so much more cheaply, instead of slowing down? Why does it not step up the pace at which these forces are being built, instead of reducing it?

Whereas, in the past, the United States, as the leading member of the alliance, took a strong position against proposals to stretch out the defense program under NATO, now it seems definitely to have changed its mind. This meeting of NATO was characterized by a very different mood from the one that has prevailed in previous conferences. The main change, from all reports, stemmed from the new attitude of the American delegation. Formerly it was our representatives who strove to impart a feeling of urgency. This time we did little or nothing along this line.

Mr. President, when I read that the administration has told our allies to set the pace; when I read that thereby we are in effect turning over leadership in NATO to other countries; when I hear about slowdowns and stretchouts and the transforming spirit the administration has brought into NATO; when the Secretary of State says we are going to get a stronger defense in the Atlantic mainly "through greater economies, better planning, better organization of production," I stop still, and I ask, What does this so-called shift in emphasis really mean?

Where is the dynamic new spirit that was to infuse the whole free world with determination to meet the Soviet challenge? How does more strength come from less output of effort? How can Europe be defended better with smaller forces than with larger? How does one attain strength through weakness? What has become of the leadership the United States was going to exercise under the new dispensation?

But, Mr. President, it is not only this so-called shift in emphasis that makes it difficult for me to accept administration assurances about continued determination to build Atlantic defenses.

There is another basic obstacle to my acceptance: The Secretary of State has apparently made ratification of the European Defense Community Treaty the condition for continued American assistance. He implied both publicly and in private that if there were not speedy action on the EDC, Europe could expect Congress to slash foreign aid funds to the bone.

Here is what Mr. Dulles said during the question and answer period at his press conference in Paris, April 23, according to the text furnished me by the Department of State:

Secretary Dulles said the element now missing in developing West Europe's defense strength was the German forces. He said that German forces would contribute strength by adding quantity and depth to

defense setup. Secretary Dulles stressed that the main purpose of EDC was to make West Europe's defense complete by integrating the whole. He expressed hope that EDC would be brought into being within the next few months. Secretary Dulles was asked if he was satisfied with EDC progress. He said "No," but added that he felt very considerable progress had been made and this was marked by great vitality and that no alternative to EDC had been proposed. Replying to another question, Secretary Dulles said he opposed re-creation of the national German force unless integrated into international force.

Secretary Dulles said he felt that there was a good enough chance for EDC ratification for Congress to proceed on assumption that EDC is likely to be ratified. He recalled that he had said if there seems to be no prospect of creating effective European defense by bringing Germany in through EDC, then Congress will want to review the whole picture. Secretary Dulles said he did not believe Congress or anyone else would put enough strength in Europe to protect Europe, or send men to fight and die while Germans sit on the sidelines. He said perhaps French feel that way, but the United States does not.

Apparently, Mr. President, prodding for ratification of EDC is the chief—perhaps the only—effort at leadership our delegation made in Paris, and from the latter part of the above remarks it evidently was not the most subtle or the most helpful kind of prodding.

In view of the very great unlikelihood of speedy ratification of the EDC treaty, the implied threat to cut the aid program is interpreted by many of our Allies as meaning less a desire to have EDC created and more a desire to have Congress cut aid appropriations. It looks not so much like a threat meant seriously, as an invitation to Congress to slash the funds for NATO. If it was important to impress European statesmen with the danger of such a cut because of the situation in Congress, this could have been done privately with equal effect. But the declaration was issued publicly in speeches and press conferences, which, of course, were fully reported back here in the United States. Every Representative and Senator reads these reports. What conclusions could they draw?

One obvious conclusion was that an alibi was being prepared in advance for cuts in funds to NATO that were being planned anyway and that Congress was expected to make anyway. By demanding that Europe do something practically impossible, was not the way paved for administration forces in Congress to vote cuts in the aid program and then blame the Europeans for it? If this was not the purpose of the public pressure, I fear very much that will be its effect.

If its purpose was rather to threaten our allies with reprisals for their failure to carry out a basic goal of American policy, then we can expect self-respecting people in Europe to stiffen in anger at such heavy-handed tactics. For EDC is today American policy as much as it is European policy—indeed far more so, in the case of many European governments.

EDC is America's way of arming Germany. It is not the only way Germany might be armed; it is not the only way to defend Europe; it is just the way the administration insists that it be done.

According to Mr. Crosby Noyes, writing in the Washington Star from Paris, revival of the European army issue as a condition for continued American aid threw a chill over the NATO meeting. Mr. Noyes writes that Secretary Dulles made it clear the Eisenhower administration not only looks on ratification of the EDC treaty as the condition of further aid, but also considers the EDC as the condition of the very survival of NATO as a military alliance.

Mr. Noyes continues:

> The general feeling in Europe is that if NATO's future really depends on creation of an integrated European army—

Writes Mr. Noyes—

> it hangs on a very slender thread. Few politicians or military men have any real faith in the project as outlined by the treaty. Fewer believe with Secretary Dulles that it provides any long range guaranty of German tractability.

I shall read a paragraph or two more from the article by Mr. Noyes:

> From a military point of view, the difficulties involved in achieving an integrated fighting force are enormous. Even such relatively simple problems as working out standardization of pay scales and food for soldiers of different nationalities are enough to give military planners the shudders.
>
> Mr. Dulles, of course, is not thinking in these terms. He is dealing in the political field, and pressing for what will be accepted in the United States as a political victory for the administration.

Mr. Noyes goes on to suggest that many in Europe regard this pressure for EDC as merely creating a convenient excuse for an abrupt curtailment of foreign military assistance, while others see it as a willingness on the part of the administration to scrap the whole European rearmament program.

Another dispatch by Mr. Noyes, published April 25 in the Star, states flatly:

> American leadership in NATO has taken an awe-inspiring nosedive, instead of continuing in its role as the moving spirit of the alliance. The United States has emerged in the course of the conference as a reluctant member whose contribution in the future has been hedged by a number of formidable conditions.

In the same dispatch, he states:

> Mr. Dulles has made it clear that NATO and the whole system of collective security which it represents is in danger of losing its most essential support.

At the end of this article, Mr. Noyes asks a most pertinent question:

> Is NATO and the strength which has been laboriously created in Europe to go forward with American help and American leadership to greater strength and security or not? In framing their answer, Americans might do well to consider carefully the alternatives.

Where does this leave us, Mr. President? Have we placed all our Atlantic defense eggs in the single European Army basket? If the handle to that basket breaks because of the failure of the German or French Governments to muster enough parliamentary strength for ratification of the EDC treaty, are all our eggs to smash on the ground?

If the EDC is not ratified, have we no other alternative but to let the Russians swallow up the continent of Europe?

If opposition parties in the European parliaments represent such a very great proportion of people refusing to ratify this EDC treaty, can we expect that its ratification would secure us the kind of strong international army we are aiming for?

Has the time not come to speak out openly about this matter? Is it not conceivable that the United States Government, under both the present administration and the previous one, has been mistaken to place such total dependence on the European defense community? It is well known that 6 months before we plumped for this idea, our defense planners were dead set against it. Now they are for it. Some months hence they may be against it again.

The simple fact is that our policymakers decided in the summer of 1950 that the Communist attack on Korea was the beginning of World War III, or at any rate might very well be, and that if it happened in Korea it could happen in Germany. They determined to drive through as swift a rearmament of the West German Republic as possible, so as to make the Germans able to help defend themselves and the rest of Europe from an expected Soviet onslaught.

Secretary Acheson went to a North Atlantic Council meeting in New York with this surprise proposal in his briefcase. It exploded like a bombshell. Paris and London reacted violently to this sudden proposal which had not been mentioned to them prior to the conference. The French brought forth in haste a proposal for a European Army that would incorporate German units—not divisions as now contemplated, but regimental teams—in an army where they would be well counterbalanced by the armed forces of the other West European nations.

Out of this hastily conceived proposal, invented to check the unilateral American drive for German rearmament, came this complicated plan for a European Defense Community, which is not only supposed to be the structure within which a European army will be created, but has also been transformed into the platform on which will be erected a parliament of "Little Europe" and finally a federation of the six signatory nations.

That, Mr. President, is the origin of this EDC plan, which has been so refashioned and remodeled as to be almost unrecognizable to the original sponsors. That is the plan on which the United States Government has based and is still basing its hopes for an effective and adequate defense of Western Europe.

Moreover, it is said that any indication the United States is even dreaming of another alternative to EDC would bring all efforts at ratification to a halt, and that, therefore, we must keep silent and hope for the best. If this project has such feeble support abroad as this attitude suggests, then, Mr. President, we must certainly start looking for another solution. And I refuse to believe that with all the ingenuity and skill of the many able statesmen on both sides of the Atlantic no satisfactory alternative can be found.

The Washington Post on May 1 commented on this editorially in the following terms:

> What is distressing, in view of the extremely parlous status of the European Defense Community, is to have Secretary Dulles say inflexibly that "there is no other good solution." If the Europeans don't want EDC, the United States cannot force it on them and have it mean much. The time has come to think concretely of alternatives, including full German membership in NATO. The lack of recognition that such thinking is necessary was the greatest flaw in Mr. Dulles' report as well as, apparently, in the meeting in Paris.

While it is the responsibility of policymakers in the executive to find and examine possible alternatives if the EDC fails, there are a number of obvious courses open to us, some of them to be avoided like the pest, some of them conceivably far superior to the present policy. We must not close the doors of our minds and hang on grimly to a project that at best has a 50–50 chance of succeeding. The Washington Post and others suggest bringing Germany into NATO. If Western Europe feels itself too small to contain a revived, rearmed, and industrially powerful Germany, then it might be wiser to expand the framework within which the German Republic can be fitted, and integrate Germany into the Atlantic community instead of into merely the continental European community.

But my purpose today, Mr. President, is not to speculate on possible alternatives to EDC in the Atlantic defense structure. My purpose is rather to direct attention to signs of what may be an extremely significant change in our policy toward the Atlantic defense structure itself—a change in emphasis and direction, a change made evident by actions already taken by the administration but not explicitly stated in words, a change that appears to result not so much from a basic rethinking of our strategic requirements but more from purely domestic political considerations.

I am troubled and disturbed by these signs, but I am even more troubled and disturbed by the feeling that these signs represent politics rather than national necessity.

I should not like to think that the dominating factor in the new administration policy toward the Atlantic is its attempt to redeem exaggerated campaign promises of budget cutting instead of the need to build up the ramparts of our Atlantic defenses.

Yet I note, Mr. President, that the Republican chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, is reported in the New York Times as having said that the new authorization under the mutual security bill must be held to about $5 billion if there is to be any chance of balancing the Federal budget in the coming year. That would mean an additional reduction by the Congress of some $800 million below the figure recommended by the present administration, which, of course, has already reduced the amount recommended by the previous administration nearly $2 billion.

I note further, Mr. President, that the majority leader is reported to be demanding greater reductions in the foreign-aid program, on the ground that unless present military and foreign-aid spending plans are altered, the Eisenhower administration would spend more money in its first year than the Truman administration did in its last.

On the other hand, the Secretary of the Treasury told us in the Foreign Relations Committee on Friday that while he was distressed at not being able to balance the budget this year, he did not think it should be balanced this year. "The risks that would involve our security would simply be too great," he said.

But I would point out, Mr. President, that it has already been strongly suggested by the actions of our delegation at the North Atlantic Council meeting, that the administration is trimming NATO and is threatening more trimming if EDC is not ratified. If the administration's supporters in Congress now wish to slash even deeper, it cannot be said they were not invited to do so.

What are we to think of a policy which lays down a choice between ratification of EDC and a congressional cut in aid appropriations? If we cannot force the Europeans to accept EDC, is that a reason to reduce our defenses by cutting our military assistance to them?

Does this mean that the mutual-security program is a form of reward, to be handed out if the recipients comply with our demands, or to be withdrawn if they are recalcitrant? If so, this is indeed a changed approach to the military-assistance program. Up to now this program has been designed to increase the defenses of the United States by arming its allies; it has not been designed as a whip to compel governments to do our political bidding.

It will certainly be a great change, Mr. President, if aid to Europe, our defense frontier on the Atlantic, is going to suffer because of rash vote-getting pledges made last fall to balance the budget.

As my colleagues will recall, I was not an enthusiastic advocate of the Atlantic military alliance when it came before the Senate 4 years ago, but I voted to ratify the treaty, and I have loyally and stanchly supported it ever since. The North Atlantic regional-security system was the product of a broad bipartisan effort in the United States. We have now committed too great a share of our treasure, of our energies, of our manpower, and of our hopes and expectations, to establishing and maintaining the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for us to permit anyone, or any party, or any administration to take steps that might lead to its weakening, undermining, or collapse.

NATO has become too vital to our Nation's survival for us to countenance any attempt, direct or indirect, to enfeeble or wreck it. America cannot allow a slow erosion of this great alliance. We cannot sit by silently while this major defense project is put on the shelf.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to quote a few lines from the testimony of Gen. Alfred Gruenther, chief of staff to General Ridgway at SHAPE, given to the Foreign Relations Committee on April 1, this year. Of course, General Gruenther has just been announced as the successor to General Ridgway. General Gruenther warned the committee that if the aid program were cut care would have to be taken lest this action "indicate we are getting ready to pull out of Europe or lose interest in Europe's defense." That, he said, is what people in Europe keep watching, since many Europeans feel American policy, "to say the least, is a very flexible matter, and that it vacillates as the changes of the wind."

General Gruenther also said—and this point is one we must never forget:

> The major objective of Soviet foreign policy now is to separate the United States from its allies. That is their No. 1 project. If they are able to do that, they don't have to worry about whether they are able to attack on 6 hours' notice. * * * They will achieve their mission practically for the asking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles and editorials relating to the topic I have been discussing be printed in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks:

The text of the communique issued by the North Atlantic Treaty Council, as published in the New York Times of April 26, 1953.

A statement by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles at a press conference at NATO Headquarters on April 23, 1953.

An article by Anne O'Hare McCormick, in the New York Times of April 25, 1953.

A dispatch by Crosby Noyes, in the Washington Star of April 24, 1953, under the headline: "Dulles' Blunt Statement Puts Chill on Paris Conference; Warning That NATO Must Set Pace Expected To Lessen Chance for Solid Front."

Another dispatch by Crosby Noyes, from Paris, on April 25, under the headline: "United States Leadership Seen Waning, Casting Gloom Over NATO; System of Collective Security Feared Endangered by Reaction to Dulles' Stand."

A third dispatch by Crosby Noyes, in the Washington Star of April 26, under the headline: "Harmony on Surface May Hide Split in NATO Paris Meeting."

A dispatch by William Stoneman, in the Washington Star of April 25, headlined "Relaxing NATO Puts Defense Key in Hands of France, Germany."

An article from the New York Times' News of the Week of April 26, entitled "Stretchout for NATO."

An article by C. L. Sulzberger, from Paris, in the New York Times of April 25, headlined: "Ridgway Stresses Weakness in NATO but Sees Solution."

An editorial from the Washington Post of May 1, 1953, entitled "More Strength for NATO."

A column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, headed "Plaster Job at Paris," appearing in the Washington Post of May 1, 1953.

A column by Marquis Childs, in the Washington Post of May 7, headed: "Leadership Needed; Ike Should Imitate Role as NATO Commander."

An article from the New York Times of April 28, headlined: "Dulles, Back, Says NATO Will Give More Security More Economically."

An article by C. L. Sulzberger, in the Sunday New York Times of May 10, entitled "United States Leadership Faces Severe Test in Europe."

And the final article of the series by Crosby Noyes, summing up his answers to the question: Is NATO Worth It? published in the Sunday Star of May 10.

There being no objection, the articles and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 26, 1953]

TEXT OF NATO COUNCIL'S COMMUNIQUE

(PARIS, April 25.—Following is the text of the final communique of the North Atlantic Treaty Council's meeting, translated from French:)

I

The North Atlantic Council, meeting in Paris in ministerial session, with the participation of the ministers of foreign affairs, defense, economics, and finance present, and under the chairmanship of Lord Ismay, completed their work today.

II

The Council agreed on short- and long-term programs for NATO. They established a firm military program for 1953 and a provisional program for 1954. In addition to the forces which Greece and Turkey are contributing, there will be a notable increase in the size of the forces assigned to NATO supreme commanders and a considerable improvement in their effectiveness. Training is being greatly improved at all levels.

The series of large-scale maneuvers held during the last year has appreciably raised the standard of cooperation of the forces of the member countries; units are being better equipped and the organization of support forces is developing. The NATO military authorities consider that the attainment of the force goals in 1953, and the combined influence of these various factors, will add materially to the defensive strength of NATO during 1953.

III

Agreement was reached not only on the common financing of the second part ($187,600,000) of the fourth slice of the infrastructure program (the first part of the amount of about $224 million having been settled at a ministerial meeting in December), but also on a cost-sharing formula which would cover future programs to be submitted by the supreme commanders for the 3-year period beginning in 1954, involving expenditure of up to $700 million, subject to the approval of parliaments. These programs will include a wide range of projects such as airfields, telecommunications, naval bases and port facilities, pipelines and radar installations. The military authorities of NATO now have a financial planning figure to which they can work for over 3 years. In addition, an improved system is ready to be put into operation to insure closer financial supervision over the expenditure of common infrastructure funds.

* * * * *

VI

The Secretary General's progress report to the Council stressed the close collaboration between the civilian and military agencies of NATO, and outlined the current work of the international staff. It emphasized the importance of developing a better public understanding of the aims and achievements of NATO, a matter to which governments should give their constant attention. The report described the progress made in the many and varied technical studies by committes of the Council in a number of widely different fields, such as civil defense and other aspects of civil organization in time of war.

In the course of discussion on the report, the Council reemphasized their interest in the NATO countries' cooperation in the economic, cultural, and social fields. They noted with satisfaction the initiative taken by the President of the United States of America, recently announced, with a view to fostering the solution of overpopulation problems in certain countries.

VII

The Council continued their regular practice of exchanging views on political matters of common concern. In reviewing the international situation they were in full agreement. This agreement included their estimate of recent Soviet moves and gestures. To the extent that these moves and gestures are proved by events to be genuine efforts to reduce international tension, they will be welcomed by member governments, whose policy has always been to seek every opportunity for world peace.

VIII

Nevertheless, the Council found that there had not yet in fact been any change in the fundamental threat to the security of free peoples. The most striking evidence of this continuing threat is the huge and constantly strengthened military force maintained by those nations whose policies have been responsible for the present tension, and who are still promoting aggressive war in several parts of the world. The most recent example is the extension of hostilities in Laos. This serious development has increased the burden of France in the struggle against aggression and has given rise to deep concern on the part of other member governments.

IX

The Council, therefore, reaffirmed the policy of collective defense which has proved fully justified, and which has been responsible for the growing confidence of the free world in the future. The Council felt that there was every prospect that this policy, continued with firmness and patience, will create a basis for a just settlement of unresolved international problems.

X

The Council considered it essential that member governments should continue to develop the free Atlantic community which should include a European defense community to be established as soon as possible in an evermore closely united Europe.

XI

The Council reaffirmed their fundamental desire to build for peace. They looked forward to the day when a greater share of the resources of their countries would be devoted to national and international reconstruction and development. Convinced that in unity lies their greatest strength, they are resolved to broaden cooperation in every field, economic, political, and social, as well as military, and so to make the Atlantic community a lasting reality.

STATEMENT BY MR. J. F. DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AT A PRESS CONFERENCE AT THE PALAIS DE CHAILLOT, APRIL 23, 1953

This is the first time that President Eisenhower's administration has participated in any major international conference of this nature. We come to this NATO Council meeting, however, not as strangers by any means to the project because it has had bi-participation from the beginning. Of course, President Eisenhower's part in it as General Eisenhower is well known and lives still in the minds of all the European members of the NATO organization. I had some part in the original consummation of the North Atlantic Treaty and in the first mutual security bill, both of which I supported when I was in the United States Senate. We come here, therefore, with knowledge and familiarity with the project, and with great sympathy for it. At the same time, we do bring a somewhat fresh point of view. I took occasion to call the attention of the Council members to that fact at this afternoon's session. I pointed out that in particular we believed that it was important to operate NATO with the long pull rather than merely for a short-range pull, and that as that was the case it was important to keep a proper balance between the military and the economic factors. In order to make it perfectly clear that the present position of President Eisenhower and his administration is a basic position, and not in any sense due to the Soviet peace defensive, I read to the Council an extract from a statement which President Eisenhower himself made to the Council a year and a half ago when it met in Rome, in which he pointed out: "Now because, therefore, we are defending a way of life, we must be respectful of that way of life as we proceed in our purpose, not only so as not to violate its precepts and principles, but so as not to destroy from within what we are trying to defend from without. The economic life of a nation is equally valuable; possibly you can make cases for saying that it is more valuable than the arms it has produced, because without the economic support any amount of arms is futile and sterile, even in the emergency of war. So we should not coordinate our military purpose with our economic purpose so badly that we destroy both." That was the sentiment that President Eisenhower expressed to the Council a year and a half ago, and if today we reexpress that same sentiment it is not because of any intervening Soviet moves but because that is a basic philosophy with President Eisenhower and his Cabinet Ministers. Now, there was, what I think I can say without violating any confidences, unanimous agreement on the part of all of the Council members that we could not assume that there was any change at the present time in basic Soviet policy, and that we had to assume that what had taken place was tactics rather than any real basic change of policy—until, at least, there was more evidence to prove a change of basic policy.

Therefore, we all agree that the NATO organization and its program must proceed. There is a considerable reason to believe that the European members of the Council should, in a sense, be the pacemakers. They are here and appreciate the peril perhaps better than we do; but the United States is fully prepared to continue to take the major role in developing here the force in being which is needed to deter aggression. I gave the Council, and I give you, some significant figures: the shipment of military end items from the United States to the NATO countries in Europe amounted, in 1951—that is our fiscal year in 1951 which ends on June 30—to $900 million. In 1952 it was $1,100,000,000. During this present fiscal year, which will end next June 30, it will be $3 billion and, subject to congressional appropriations, it will in 1954 be $3,600,000,000. Then in terms of offshore procurement contracts let—that is, contracts which the United States places with factories and industries in Europe—to obtain the desired military equipment. The contracts let in our fiscal year 1952 were $640 millions, the fiscal year in 1953, that is the year that will end next June 30, we expect to amount to $1,300,000,000 and again, subject to congressional appropriations, to be for the year 1954 $1,500,000,000. These figures speak for themselves in terms of the actual hard goods which are involved. We believe that it is going to be possible, by proper planning and proper care, to get considerably more for *less* money. You notice that I have not spoken to you in terms of money, but in terms of actual things. I did speak to you in terms of the money value of the actual goods shipped but not in terms of overall monetary sums. The things that count are the actual end items, and we believe that it is going to be possible, through greater economies, better planning, better organization of production, to get considerably more in the way of defense for a lesser amount of dollars, and thereby to achieve the goal which President Eisenhower set for the NATO Council a year and a half ago—if possible to organize defense so that we can

have military strength without destroying the economic health of the nations. And of course another thing that we are thinking about is new tactical weapons of warfare which may make it possible to effect very considerable savings. Therefore, I think that you can sum it up by saying that we believe that nothing has happened to change the basic course upon which NATO is embarked. We do believe that that course must be one which can be carried on consistently for a good many years. We are not going to stop in that course and pick up the few crumbs that Soviet communism has dropped, perhaps merely to distract us, but we are going to proceed strongly, vigorously, efficiently, and economically to obtain the maximum of military strength with the minimum of money and thereby conserve the economic and military strength and stability of all the member nations.

[From the New York Times of April 25, 1953]

ABROAD

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

KEEPING STEP ON THE LONG, UNCERTAIN ROAD AHEAD

It is already evident that NATO meets in a different mood from that prevailing in previous conferences. The study of Soviet intentions made during the past few weeks has led to a unanimous conclusion that there is no change in basic policy and that the nations represented in the conference in Paris have no choice but to continue to strengthen their arms program. But the western timetable has definitely changed and to some extent the concept of defense. Big standing armies are not considered as important as a vastly increased and mobile modern air force, and it is at last accepted without argument that economic factors must be balanced with the military in building up a sound defense system.

But these are not the main reasons for the difference in temper between this conclave and preceding meetings of western statesmen. Neither is it the result of the less belligerent tone of Moscow under the new regime. The change stems mostly from the attitude of the American delegation. Heretofore the Americans have labored hard to impart a sense of their own urgency on the organization. We took the initiative in founding the alliance and in setting the targets it aimed for. At every meeting Mr. Acheson had to push the other members to exert themselves to reach these goals. Above all, he had to impress upon them the reality and probable nearness of their danger.

Despite substantial American aid some of them could not fulfill the military schedules set without serious damage to their fragile economic systems, still wobbly from the strains of two wars. Now we see that they could not even meet the reduced quotas the wise men worked out at Lisbon. But that NATO has come as far as it has in 4 years, actually it is hardly 2 years since the paper plans began to be translated into troops and bases and available arms, is due in large part to the tireless prodding of Mr. Acheson.

A change of emphasis

Whatever its shortcomings NATO is now a going concern. The organizing stage is over. Western Europe is no longer defenseless, and a faint confidence exudes from the meeting of ministers in Paris as a result. They feel for the first time in recent years that they have a little room to turn around in, a little time to mull things over. So far we do not know what are the fresh ideas Secretary of State Dulles says he takes to the conference, but it is quite apparent that, aside from spurring on the ratification of the European Defense Community Treaty, this time we are doing no prodding. In warning our allies to expect some cuts in the Mutual Security Program, Mr. Dulles is reported to have told his colleagues that henceforward the United States will let the governments of Europe set the pace of western defense.

This represents a change of emphasis, to say the least. The shift of responsibility may be another form of prodding. The object may be to scare the Europeans to greater efforts on their own. Or, as seems more likely, it is an attempt to speed up approval of the European army. So far the project to arm the Germans has been ratified only by the Bundestag at Bonn. And even as NATO, spurred by the United States, was passing a resolution urging the early ratification of the plan as extremely important, and while Chancellor Adenauer was insisting that West Germany would approve it, the Bonn upper house, the Bundesrath, voted to postpone decision until the high court acts on the constitutionality of German rearmament. The five other nations of the Defense Community (France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg) did not promise ratification at a specified date, but all agreed, including France, to take the necessary measures to that end in their respective parliaments.

The war in Indochina

Obviously, we are making the ratification of the European army plan the test for the amount of our aid to Europe. Not only did Mr. Dulles imply in his speeches and press conferences that Congress would be influenced by European action on this measure. He said openly, to the great annoyance of the French, that in case of war this country did not intend to send troops to fight and die in Germany while the Germans sat by.

At the same time the American Secretary of State warmly supported the appeal of the French Foreign Minister, M. Bidault, for continued help in Indochina. The invasion of Laos opens a new front in Indochina and poses a new problem for its hard-pressed defenders. The Chinese Communists are acting independently of the Russians or they planned this attack before the Kremlin softened its policy. In any case, the violent move to liberate people who do not wish to be liberated makes the French more skeptical of the Soviet peace gestures and is calculated to strengthen their ties with the West.

Certainly the necessity of bringing the far eastern issue into the NATO parleys shows how impossible it is to compartmentalize the war—or the peace. Most of the powers of the Atlantic Community either control territory on another continent or are involved as members of the United Nations in the fight in Korea. As such, the only strength of the so-called Western nations lies in their unity. They can act safely only in acting together. Perhaps Mr. Dulles is not making our aid in Indochina conditional on French ratification of the European army plan. On both fronts both the United States and France need all the help they can muster. But at the current NATO meeting we perceive that compromise, however reluctant, is the essence of a coalition. We are engaged in the difficult exercise of keeping step with our allies, and they with us.

[From the Washington Star of April 24, 1953]

DULLES' BLUNT STATEMENT PUTS CHILL ON PARIS CONFERENCE—WARNING THAT NATO MUST SET PACE EXPECTED TO LESSEN CHANCE FOR SOLID FRONT

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

PARIS, April 24.—Secretary of State Dulles' revival of the European army issue as a condition for continued American aid to Europe has thrown something of a chill over this conference of NATO ministers.

Before the conference began, there was hope that the matter would not be brought up, at least not in terms as blunt as those the Secretary used at his press conference yesterday. The feeling was that nothing would be gained by a return to the diplomatic line which developed during Mr. Dulles' tour of Europe earlier this spring.

It seemed that if the conference was to achieve its purpose of setting goals for the coming year and presenting a solid front to the Russian peace moves, the fewer contentious problems raised the better.

Mr. Dulles shattered these hopes in his first public statement. Before he was finished, he had made it clear that the Eisenhower administration still looks on early ratification of the EDC treaty not as only the condition of continued aid for the defense buildup, but as the condition for the very survival of NATO as a military alliance.

The Secretary led into his statement on EDC by pointing out that, from now on, Europe rather than the United States must be the pace setter in NATO. It would be impossible, he predicted, to sell Congress on a faster rate of buildup in the United States than was taking place in Europe.

So far as he was concerned, Mr. Dulles added, Europe would never be militarily defensible without German troops. And he could see no way of rearming Germany safely without integrating her forces completely within a general European force.

He himself, said the Secretary, was opposed to the recreation of a German national force, which might once again menace the peace of the world.

Mr. Dulles said he was not satisfied with the rate of progress that has been made toward ratification of the six-nation treaty. But he added that since his earlier visit the project, which was all but dead, now has vitality in it.

The Secretary refused to be pinned down to a specific date by which the treaty must be signed to satisfy the administration. But he predicted that any large unconditional aid program would be impossible, without assurances on EDC.

The statement, taken in connection with the inevitable stretchout of NATO goals for the coming year, has a sinister ring for many European observers here. It seems hard to square with the repeated assertions by Mr. Dulles and his fellow ministers that the time has not arrived to relax the rearmament pace.

The general feeling in Europe is that if NATO's future really depends on the early creation of an integrated European army, it hangs on a very slender thread. Few politicians or military men have any real faith in the project as outlined in the treaty. Fewer believe with Secretary Dulles that it provides any long-range guaranty of German tractability.

From a military point of view, the difficulties involved in achieving an integrated fighting force are enormous. Even such relatively simple problems as working out standardization of pay scales and food for soldiers of different nationalities are enough to give military planners the shudders.

Mr. Dulles, of course, is not thinking in these terms. He is dealing in the political field, and pressing for what will be accepted in the United States as a political victory for the administration.

It is possible, though at this point it seems highly improbable, that satisfactory progress will be made toward ratification of the EDC treaty by the time Congress gets around to debating the foreign aid bills. But observers here predict it will be an action of the most formal kind, aimed at satisfying the political requirements rather than solving the military problem.

UNFAVORABLE REACTION LIKELY

European reaction to Mr. Dulles' statement however will certainly be violent and unfavorable, if past experience is a reliable guide. Government leaders who favor ratification of the treaty will find their own political problems increased by renewed charges of American pressure. There will also be some who will look on Mr. Dulles' statement as an indication that the administration is willing to scrap the whole European rearmament program.

It will be argued that substantial progress toward ratification cannot be made quickly, and that the administration is merely creating a convenient excuse for an abrupt curtailment of foreign military aid.

At best the injection of the issue into the NATO council meeting is certain to stir up controversy and dissension at a time when most people are earnestly plugging the theme of Western harmony. At the worst it threatens the whole military buildup which Western Europe is trying to maintain.

[From the Washington Star of April 25, 1953]

UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP SEEN WANING, CASTING GLOOM OVER NATO—SYSTEM OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY FEARED ENDANGERED BY REACTION TO DULLES' STAND

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

PARIS, April 25.—Out of the maze of studied diplomatic language which the council of NATO ministers has produced, the following facts have emerged:

1. NATO as a military alliance is today no longer on an emergency basis. Whatever the reasons and justifications, the original sense of urgency has disappeared. Instead of a specific military program, with definite time limits on its completion, NATO's rearmament effort has now been geared to an indefinite formula based on economic and political factors within the western community.

2. In spite of official skepticism toward Russian peace moves there is an obvious feeling that war is not imminent. Economic and financial considerations have shoved the military into the background. Anticipation of curtailed American economic aid to Western Europe has stimulated the search for alternative means of keeping Europe's industrial machine working on a scale to support a minimum military establishment.

3. American leadership in NATO has taken an awe-inspiring nosedive instead of continuing in its role as the moving spirit of the alliance. The United States has emerged in the course of the conference as a reluctant member whose contribution in the future has been hedged by a number of formidable conditions.

The first two facts came as no surprise. Anyone who has looked in on the political scene in Europe during the last few months cannot have missed the decreasing sense of danger and the tendency to return to a more normal pattern of life.

Many observers have predicted that NATO as a defensive military alliance would face its most critical test when the fear began to subside.

It is hard on the basis of the council's final communique to figure out how this test has been met. The statement is most notable for its vagueness as to NATO's future program.

So far as the public is concerned, there have been no firm military goals for the coming year or conditional goals for 1954. But there has been no secret made of the fact that the old idea of target dates and times of greatest danger has been abandoned. It is no secret, either, that the tentative force goals set at Lisbon 2 years ago have been scrapped in favor of what is called a more realistic military program and the communique makes it clear that NATO's military effort from now on is to be geared strictly to what the member nations can afford on a long-range basis.

Despite the fact that the ministers appraising the Russian peace moves found that "there had not in fact been any change in the fundamental threat to the security of free peoples," there seemed to be a fundamental change in the character of the Western response to that threat.

It is not, however, in the language of the Council communique or in the immediate NATO program that the significance of this meeting is to be found. It is, rather, in the effort that everybody here has been making to determine where NATO stands in the light of the attitudes revealed by the American delegation led by Secretary of State Dulles.

To say the least, these attitudes have not been reassuring to most observers here. In the course of the conference, Mr. Dulles has made it clear that NATO and the whole system of collective security which it represents is in danger of losing its most essential support.

In laying down what appears to be the administration line of EDC or else, Mr. Dulles, has done more than strain the patience of his fellow ministers to the breaking point. Many experienced observers here feel that the Secretary, while acutely aware of his own political problems back home, has shown himself totally unsympathetic to the far more delicate problems of the European members of NATO.

ATMOSPHERE OF PESSIMISM

So far as administration policy can be determined, it seems to depend at this point on how good an impression western Europe is able to make on Congress in the coming months.

In spite of all the expresaions of confidence and good will, this policy has succeeded in casting an atmosphere of pessimism over the proceedings of the last 3 days.

It has fostered a rash of gloomy behind-the-scenes predictions of violent political reaction throughout the European community.

So far as the American people are concerned, the issue is simply this:

Is NATO and the strength which has been laboriously created in Europe to go forward with American help and American leadership to greater strength and security or not?

In framing their answer Americans might do well to consider carefully the alternatives.

[From the Washington Star of April 26, 1953]

HARMONY ON SURFACE MAY HIDE SPLIT IN NATO PARIS MEETING

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

PARIS, April 25.—Anyone who takes at face value the official statements at the current council meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty ministers must come to the conclusion that NATO was never in better shape than it is today.

In their published resolutions and press conferences, the 12 nations represented here have put on a determined show of unanimity and good fellowship.

The less harmonious aspects of the conference have been sidestepped or smoothed over in the best diplomatic tradition. Every potential bombshell has been quickly doused.

REAL SPLIT IS RUMORED

This outward show of harmony is being received with a good deal of skepticism. There are continuing rumors of a real split on several important matters, including the response of the Western World to the Russian peace offensive.

According to the reports, one school led by the United States favors a reserved statement reflecting a highly skeptical attitude toward the new Russian tack. The other group, led by the British, is said to be plugging for a less frosty resolution indicating that NATO still has an open mind toward the new Russian regime.

Another difference centers on the idea expressed by Secretary of State Dulles that Western Europe and not the United States should take over the role of pacemaker in NATO.

CONTINUANCE PLEDGED

In a press conference yesterday, the leader of the British delegation, Chancellor of the Exchequer R. A. Butler, suggested that the pace of NATO's effort must continue to be the common responsibility of all the participating countries.

Both of these differences reflect commonly expressed anxiety in Europe toward the new American administration.

The first difference springs from a feeling that the Republican leadership has shown itself somewhat less than astute in its foreign policy and unnecessarily stubborn in pursuing a set course. Russian peace moves in Europe bring a feeling that western policy should be flexible enough to take advantage of any diplomatic breaks that may occur.

The second difference reflects a growing fear that the United States is anxious to bow out of its role of leader in the Western community once the objective of German rearmament has been achieved. Most Europeans are aware what withdrawal of American support would mean and they are willing to pay almost any price to avoid it. The present NATO council meeting, which is giving Western Europe its first real taste of the new administration's foreign policy, has not succeeded in calming these fears. On the contrary, Mr. Dulles and his colleagues have suggested more than once that the possibility of a drastic revision of American policy is very real.

DULLES' VIEWS DISTURBING

While endorsing the objectives of NATO and the role that the United States should play in it, he has hinted broadly that the deciding factors are almost entirely a matter of domestic American policies. He has given many observers the impression that the administration's foreign policy programs are no longer to be worked out and fought through Congress but rather tailored ahead of time to the prevailing political sentiment.

Considering what is at stake, it is an attitude which must be less than reassuring to Mr. Dulles' fellow ministers.

This afternoon the council meeting winds up with a bright and optimistic final communique covering the unanimous decisions of the ministers on developments in Russia, the European Army Treaty, and the future rate of NATO's armament effort. But in spite of the outward harmony, the feeling will remain that NATO has survived its first encounter with the new administration with an exceedingly stiff upper lip.

[From the Washington Star of April 25, 1953]

RELAXING NATO PUTS DEFENSE KEY IN HANDS OF FRANCE, GERMANY

(By William H. Stoneman)

PARIS, April 25.—Two formidable facts stood out in bold relief today as the North Atlantic Council concluded its 2½-day meeting here in Paris.

1. The future of Europe's defense against Russia now lies at the mercy of France and Germany and the political parties which compose their parliaments.

2. The feeling of urgency and alarm which first drove the 14 members of NATO to join forces is petering out.

By suggesting that ratification of the European Defense Community Treaty may be a condition to future American aid to Europe, the new American administration has made it theoretically possible for the French National Assembly to create a situation in which the United States Government may be pledged to take financial reprisals against France.

DELEGATES ASKING QUESTIONS

"If that happens," delegates were asking themselves today, "what will happen to communication facilities and airdromes on French territory upon which the United States now depends for maintenance of the six divisions and Air Force units it now has in Western Germany?

"What would happen to those American forces in Germany?

"And if anything happened to those forces in Germany, would NATO still remain in being?

"If, finally, anything happened to NATO, what would happen to Western Europe and what would happen to the whole American defense system which is premised on the idea

of meeting and stopping the Russians before they could seize the resources and manpower of Western Europe?"

FRENCH MAY NOT REACT

While American impatience with the French National Assembly is fully understood, even by the French themselves, the question remains whether the United States will ever be able to implement the none too subtle threat which Secretary of State Dulles mentioned.

The French, who realize their own importance and who don't like to be pushed, may or may not react as Mr. Dulles obviously hopes they will.

Germany has equal power over the future of NATO.

The Americans and British both stated that the 12 German divisions provided for by the EDC treaty are essential to the effective defense of Western Europe. Thus the failure of Germany either to ratify or to implement the treaty would find the major western allies on record as feeling they are unable to defend Western Europe against Russian attack.

Because of the paramount importance which EDC now has assumed, it is anticipated that the Russians will redouble their attempts to sabotage it.

RELAXATION EVIDENT

Despite all of the talk to the contrary, there can be no doubt that this session of the NATO Council has been dominated by a feeling of relaxation. The fact that both the United States and Britain have acted in favor of spreading out defense preparations and against acceptance of a danger date means that the possibility of Russian attack is now regarded as remote.

This spreadout comes at a time when NATO has a total of 25 ready divisions, plus 25 other divisions theoretically mobilizable without 30 days, to defend the whole area of western and northern Europe from North Cape to the Straits of Messina.

Against them they have 90 Russian divisions in readiness, plus a vast number of reserve divisions and a considerable number of satellite divisions.

[From the New York Times of April 26, 1953]

THE WORLD—STRETCHOUT FOR NATO

In Paris' plush Palais de Chaillot yesterday the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—the defense league binding together 14 nations on both sides of the Atlantic—concluded its 11th meeting. The mood of the ministers was not one of bold decision. Even before the ministers convened, they were warning of the dangers of a letdown in the western defense effort. A week ago Sunday NATO Secretary General Lord Ismay said, "It would be folly to abandon the defense effort."

The warnings against a slump arose in response to two factors generating pressures for a defense cutback. First was the new United States administration—an administration thought to favor cuts in European aid which would throw a larger portion of the defense burden on the already hard-pressed European economies. Second was the Russian peace drive which has tended to cloud the urgency of western defense preparations.

In these circumstances, one of the principal aims of the meeting was to bring the European ministers into personal contact with the new United States team. "The conference," a New York Times correspondent cabled, "was accompanied by a host of private consultations, dinners, theater parties, lunches, teas, and convivial between-session drinks. The American visitors in particular were bombarded with a volley of social invitations, and they were able to accept a surprising number. As the ice was broken with the new United States leaders, NATO's mood, which appeared apprehensive as the meeting began, seemed to turn toward eager good fellowship."

NEW PHILOSOPHY

Meeting the challenge posed by the Russian peace drive, however, was a more formidable problem. The original NATO defense effort, charted at the Lisbon meeting of February 1952, was pitched on the concept of a direct Russian threat, reaching maximum intensity in 1954, the so-called critical year. Last week the NATO ministers adopted a new defense philosophy. It was the philosophy of the permanent emergency—the long, hard pull. In a final communique summarizing the 3-day meeting, the ministers pledged their countries "to broaden cooperation in every field * * * and so to make the Atlantic community a lasting reality."

The change in defense emphasis was accompanied by a change in defense targets. On the one hand, the military goals set at Lisbon, which were substantially met in 1952, were stretched out for 1953 and 1954. The following table compares the Lisbon estimates for NATO divisions and planes with the stretched-out estimates for the end of this year and next (present strength is approximately 4,000 planes and 50 divisions):

	Lisbon targets		Revised targets	
	Planes	Divisions	Planes	Divisions
1953	6,500	75	5,500	60
1954	9,000	90	7,000	70

On the other hand, the NATO powers consolidated their long-term commitments. The final communique stressed the need for improving the quality rather than the quantity of the NATO forces in being. The infrastructure program for mutual financing of permanent military installations, such as airbases and military camps which had previously been on a 1-year basis, was placed on a 4-year basis at an overall cost of $885 million.

On the whole the NATO planners seemed satisfied with their work. But it was plain that major problems still confronted the alliance. One of the biggest is the question of what impact the Russian peace drive will have on the European Defense Community Treaty—a treaty integrating a rearmed West Germany with the defense forces of five other West European nations under a unified command. The treaty was signed last May, but so far only the lower house of the West German Parliament has ratified it.

The NATO conference generated some pressure for ratification. At the instance of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the Council passed a resolution urging ratification of all the signatories.

But the basic political tide appeared to be running in the other direction. On Friday the West German upper house voted 20 to 18 against taking action on the treaty until the present world situation had been clarified. The upper house's action makes a court test of the treaty's constitutionality a near certainty in West Germany. It also is likely to increase pressures against ratification in France. Thus, despite the NATO resolution, the prospects for speedy EDC ratification looked dim.

[From the New York Times of April 25, 1953]

RIDGWAY STRESSES WEAKNESS IN NATO BUT SEES SOLUTION—COUNCIL ASKED TO SPEED STEPS TO MEET GRAVE DEFICIENCIES; URGES EUROPEAN ARMY

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, April 24.—Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, told the North Atlantic Council this afternoon that his existing armed forces were insufficient to face a possible Soviet attack.

Nevertheless, he expressed what he termed "sober optimism" in the hope that the Atlantic alliance defenses would be able to cope better with such a threat, within a relatively short period.

He declared that at the moment there were certain "grave deficiencies" and called for prompt consideration of these categories to stiffen the Allied position. Some auxiliary services and coastal naval units were specified among others.

SECRET ANALYSIS CIRCULATED

General Ridgway's laconic statement was made after a secret document had been circulated among the cabinet ministers representing 14 governments analyzing the strength of the Soviet Union's military potential and measuring possible war risks.

He explained with deep respect for his civilian bosses that since they had requested a statement from him he could report only his own opinion based on existing facts. A similar but less detailed view was expressed by Admiral Lynde D. McCormick, Supreme Allied Commander of the Atlantic.

Having listened to its principal officers, the council then continued on the swift, if somewhat inconclusive, course of its present session.

It agreed unanimously on a resolution that stresses that the Atlantic community continues to attach paramount importance to the rapid entry into force of the treaty establishing the European Defense Community and, consequently, to its ratification by all the signatories as well as to the ratification of the additional protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty.

The protocol referred to provides for relationships between West Germany and the Atlantic alliance once German troops are added to the alliance's forces through a European army.

BIDAULT BACKS RESOLUTION

Although Georges Bidault, French Foreign Minister, supported the resolution without a demurrer, this latest United States inspired effort to force a defense community on a somewhat reluctant Europe—which invented the idea—bore a certain similarity to whistling in the wind.

Mr. Bidault, who is not renowned as a fighting devotee of the plan, cannot guarantee its ratification by the French National Assembly. While Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Italy appear certain to ratify the defense community treaty, the key and absent country, West Germany, was moving in the other direction today. The Bundesrat or upper house of the West German Parliament, voted to postpone action and this, Atlantic alliance members privately conceded, constituted a real blow.

Nevertheless, particularly prompted by John Foster Dulles, United States Secretary of State, the Atlantic Pact ministers did their best to inject new life into the audacious but faltering project. The French noted with satisfaction that their recently drafted protocols to the defense community treaty had been accepted. Selwyn Lloyd, substituting here for Anthony Eden, Britain's ailing Foreign Secretary, said London and Paris had reached a very large measure of agreement on the extent of Britain's association with a supranational defense community.

WARNING BY DULLES RECALLED

Mr. Dulles has warned his colleagues in the Atlantic Alliance that the extent of the United States aid allocated by Congress for the defense of Europe will depend to a large degree on the immediate prospects of the defense community in June. At best the treaty cannot be ratified before autumn.

A good deal of the rest of the day's deliberations were involved with the Atlantic Alliance's new philosophy of a long-term stretch-out effort rather than a concentrated attempt to attain certain basic defense goals by any fixed critical year.

The ministers largely completed their analysis of a bulky annual review of each country's efforts that will provide the basis for this and next year's force goals. A small quantitative increase is foreseen for 1953 and, if all goes well, a somewhat better effort in 1954.

Underlying the discussions was an apparent emphasis on the need to avoid excessive strains on the national economies even if the military strength desired by General Ridgway did not yet exist. René Pleven, French Defense Minister, spoke of his country's difficulty in maintaining levels foreseen and M. Bidault once again called attention to the huge burden of the Indochina war.

PATIENCE URGED BY BUTLER

R. A. Butler, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, told the press afterward that the Atlantic Alliance must exhibit both patience and strength; patience to avail itself of any real opportunities to negotiate peace and strength to induce such occasions—or to meet an attack if things go wrong.

He thought the need for continued effort over a long period important and that paper goals must be set nearer to the level of possible achievement in terms of national economic potentials. The indications are that such goals are being reduced but, his colleague, Earl Alexander, British Minister of Defenses, said, "I think the NATO countries are doing their maximum within their economic abilities" even if "history shows no general is ever satisfied with the forces he has."

The British delegates promised that their country would continue to rearm for collective security but it is apparent to any observer at this Council session that a letdown, as well as a stretch-out is in the air at least at the moment.

Yesterday, Mr. Dulles said it was now up to Europe to set the pace. Today, Mr. Butler said it was up to all the Allies—obviously including the United States and Canada. Thus, in effect, the ball has been tossed back to the United States Congress upon whose budgetary allotments this year's program basically depends.

Mr. Lloyd in his public statement, seemed to differ slightly in emphasis from Mr. Dulles, when analyzing the current Soviet peace offensive the British official said: "It is too early to draw any firm conclusions; there is not enough evidence to be certain. We would welcome any chance of lessening the tension."

[From the Washington Post of May 1, 1953]

MORE STRENGTH FOR NATO

We hope Secretary Dulles is justified in holding out the hope of a 30-percent increase in NATO combat effectiveness as a result of the Paris meeting. There had been some indication in press dispatches that Mr. Dulles was again talking softly to the Europeans and boldly for American consumption. His radio-television report Wednesday night, however, was both circumspect and direct. At the same time, it would be quibbling to pretend that there has not been a stretch-out in NATC.

The essential job of the administration in the next few months is to remind the Europeans that stretch-out is not synonymous with slowdown. The stretch-out makes a good deal of sense economically and has some advantages militarily. Long-term budgetary commitments, along with some overdue changes in military planning, should promptly reduce the future dependence on American aid. This approach will work, however, only if the European NATO members are able to support themselves through trade and similar means. And this in turn goes back to Congress: reductions in direct foreign aid would be frustrated by new trade restrictions.

Certainly the abandonment by the NATO Council of the misleading target dates of maximum danger is a step forward. The 56-division, 5,500-plane goal set for 1953 is far more realistic than the amorphous program outlined last year at Lisbon. This recognizes the importance of concentrating on quality rather than mere quantity, especially as respects the weak reserve divisions.

By the same token, the 3-year program for infrastructure—that is, airfields, port facilities, pipelines, and the like—should be a stabilizing factor, and the allocation of fixed percentages to each country should aid advance budgeting. Likewise, the 3-year offshore procurement program for aircraft is sensible. It will eventually mean more dollars to Britain, France, Belgium, and Holland, and, since it represents a reprogramming of funds already appropriated by Congress, it will not be affected by future cuts in foreign aid.

These positive achievements must be balanced, however, against several important points on which no decision was reached. Although Mr. Dulles referred to more reliance on tactical—meaning atomic—weapons, the Europeans would have been better reassured by some more definite assurance that the United States is prepared to support a real change of emphasis. There must be enough ground troops to make an enemy concentrate his forces; but beyond this the maximum NATO strength lies in atomic weapons and air power. The NATO arrangements for coastal and air defense, though somewhat improved, still are inadequate. Similarly, the Council left hanging General Ridgway's proposals for centralizing the air command and placing control of all central European forces under General Juin.

The missing link in the whole chain, of course, is the German contribution, without which effective defense of the remainder of Western Europe would be difficult. Probably it was impossible to do anything definite at this stage about German rearmament. What is distressing, in view of the extremely parlous status of the European Defense Community, is to have Secretary Dulles say inflexibly that there is no other good solution. If the Europeans don't want EDC, the United States cannot force it on them and have it mean much. The time has come to think concretely of alternatives, including full German membership in NATO. The lack of recognition that such thinking is necessary was the greatest flaw in Mr. Dulles report as well as, apparently, in the meeting at Paris.

[From the Washington Post of May 1, 1953]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

PLASTER JOBS AT PARIS

The right background for the President's press conference on national defense is the story of what really happened at Paris. Judging by the reports now trickling back across the Atlantic, the NATO planning meeting was a fairly ominous rally.

Some pretty big cracks had begun to show in the walls of the house of the West. Trouble with the foundation was all too clearly indicated. But repairing foundations is always expensive and bothersome. Everyone wanted to avoid effort and expense.

So the assembled statesmen slapped some plaster into the cracks. They muttered a private prayer that the foundations would last for another little while. And they issued a public statement that construction was triumphantly progressing according to plans.

That is about the best figurative summary of what happened. To be more specific, the first offer that Messrs. Dulles, Humphrey, Wilson, and Stassen brought to Paris is now known to have spread something very close to consternation among the other NATO allies.

Perhaps the British, the French, and the rest have been foolish to suppose that President Eisenhower would wish to complete the great NATO structure that he himself designed, in his former incarnation as General Eisenhower. At any rate, they were surprised and shocked by the American delegation's original program. It virtually ignored the persistent European and British dollar gap. It almost wholly eliminated most of the supporting types of military aid. And it only provided for a reduced level of direct military aid.

When the British got the news they named Chancellor of the Exchequer R. A. Butler, chief planner, Sir Edwin Plowden and a representative of their chiefs of staff to tell their story to Messrs. Dulles, Humphrey, Wilson, and Stassen. What the British said—and what the French later said—was simple enough. In effect, they would be forced to renege on their most vital NATO commitments, if the United States reneged on its past policy.

Such a public failure would have been politically embarrassing for everyone, as well as affecting the Kremlin the way bad fish affects an excitable cat. Considering the circumstances, there was a surprising amount of good will around the Council table—Chancellor Butler and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, for instance, are said to have formed a close alliance. The threatened crisis was avoided by good will, by ingenuity, and by sacrificing the Eisenhower design for NATO.

Typical of the handling of the dollar gap problem was the solution found for the British. They are to be allowed to earn, or to save, or to receive about three hundred and ninety million extra dollars by an extraordinary combination of devices, ranging all the way from offshore purchasing to a donation of $100 million worth of lard, wheat, and other agricultural products.

Even these compromises in effect defeated the American delegation's primary intention, which was to cut aid to Europe sharply enough so that far-eastern aid could be substantially increased without interfering with a massive net saving. The overall foreign-aid figure will still be high. But the fact remains that the compromise made at Paris made it necessary to toss the Eisenhower design for NATO rather casually into the discard.

As it is perhaps carping to recall, NATO Supreme Commander Eisenhower initially asked no less than 120 divisions for Western Europe. This figure was cut, over the general's protest, to the 100 divisions agreed on at the Lisbon meeting. When the President was a general, this figure was a minimum; now, however, NATO is to have 56 divisions by the end of this year, and indefinite additional strength in a highly indefinite future.

Nor is this all. Our High Commissioner in Germany, Dr. James B. Conant, and our special negotiator in France, the immensely astute David K. E. Bruce, were called to report on the outlook for the European defense community. That meant the outlook for the 12 additional German divisions which are to be the keystone of the NATO arch. Conant was reasonably hopeful about the Germans' attitude toward the EDC, but Bruce, although a naturally sanguine man, was blackly pessimistic. He is authoritatively quoted as saying that only a miracle could induce the French Parliament to take the needed favorable action.

When Bruce reported, the French had merely been exposed to the Moscow peace offensive. They are now additionally reacting to the American peace offensive. They are now additionally reacting to the American retreat from NATO. Hence, a really big, economy-size miracle will now be needed. Meanwhile, Secretary Dulles has already told the Congress that favorable action on EDC is the final test of European sincerity. And the Congress is already longing for an excuse to cut the foreign-aid appropriations to ribbons.

In these circumstances, optimism is not justified. And an explanation is perhaps in order of the sudden transformation of General Eisenhower's NATO minimum into a visionary, redundant and impractical goal, which President Eisenhower's representatives at Paris joined to denounce.

[From the Washington Post of May 7, 1953]

LEADERSHIP NEEDED—IKE SHOULD IMITATE ROLE AS NATO COMMANDER

(By Marquis Childs)

The leadership General Eisenhower gave when he was commander of the North Atlantic treaty forces inspired the free world. He had more to do than perhaps any single individual in uniting diverse people behind the concept of a defense force able to stand up to Communist imperialism.

It is important to recall that leadership now that the NATO idea is endangered. On top of a cut of $1.8 billion in the foreign aid progam made by the administration the Congress is threatening much deeper reductions. As the congressional hearings may show, some of the NATO partners have defaulted on their obligations.

This reporter was in Rome in late November 1951, when the NATO council was meeting. Eisenhower was present at that meeting. It was felt it would be his last NATO appearance, since already the shadow of a political draft had begun to dog him.

In a closed meeting of NATO foreign ministers, Eisenhower made one of the inspiring extemporaneous talks that marked his leadership. This reporter obtained a transcript of that talk in Rome. It would seem the time has come to take it out of the confidential file. What he said then confirms the President's recent statement that he opposed specific target dates for NATO preparedness. As commander of the 14-nation force, Eisenhower said:

"We are producing, forging, and sharpening the instruments that we must use, and there has been talk of 1952 goals, 1953 goals, 1954 goals and so on, and I must say to you gentlemen it leaves me cold. While for the purposes of planning and putting these necessary sums in the national budgets in order to obtain what you need, we have to sort these out into annual allotments and accretions. The real thing we are trying to do is gain for our people at the earliest possible moment, the tranquillity of mind, the peace and confidence to which they are entitled."

Eisenhower also underwrote with strong emphasis the European army idea that now seems stalled on the old French-German suspicion. But most striking in view of the political obstacles in the way of progress both here and in Europe was his rallying cry for a stronger and a braver effort.

The general in that last appearance before the NATO foreign ministers talked about Rome and the majestic weight of history accumulated there through the centuries. Then in language that deeply impressed his listeners he said:

"Now in this city we meet for a brief moment and 50 years from now there is probably going to be some concern as to what we have done, what the organization has done, that you gentlemen direct and in which I and my staff labor. I believe that if we allow the burdens and influences of traditionalism, cautious approach, statements of what is politically feasible and all of the other deterrent influences that affect man—if we allow these to keep us from positive and direct action, there will be nothing in history about us. It will just be a little feeble effort washed away and forgotten.

"But if the problems that you men have taken upon your shoulders are met with courage and fortitude and confidence, if all of us, each in his own niche, can perform the leadership jobs that it has fallen to our lot to perform, then there can be no monument in history that can really typify the grandeur of your accomplishment * * *."

Those words might serve as a rebuke for the political expediency so transparent in the approach to NATO today. The cut of $1.8 billion may be logical and justifiable. The sum fixed in the Truman budget was not sacrosanct, although it should be added that top American military men who studied and restudied those figures believed that to trim them substantially would be to endanger the rearmament of Western Europe.

But if anything like the sum now sought is to be obtained from a Congress that has gone far to usurp prerogatives of foreign policy, some strong affirmative action by all concerned in the executive branch of the Government must be forthcoming. The outline of that action is not yet discernible. Perhaps in his new role Mr. Eisenhower will find the same inspiration, the same conviction to bring to what is an infinitely more difficult task. When he spoke at Rome a year and a half ago he summed up very well the dilemma he faces today:

"I submit again that if our hearts, if our determination, if our qualities of leadership are equal to the task, then the so-called economic limitation will not be nearly so important as we first judged it."

[From the New York Times of April 28, 1953]

DULLES, BACK, SAYS NATO WILL GIVE MORE SECURITY MORE ECONOMICALLY

WASHINGTON, April 27.—The Eisenhower Cabinet team returned today from its first meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to report to the President and the Congress its conviction that the western defense organization now would be run "with greater firmness, greater strength and greater economy."

This was the word given by John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, after an hour-long talk with President Eisenhower. He was accompanied by George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury; Harold E. Stassen, Director for Mutual Security, and Douglas MacArthur 2d, Counsel of the State Department. Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, still is in Europe.

Mr. Dulles will appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tomorrow to bring that group up to date on developments in Western Europe.

Secretary Dulles said the administration had not yet taken a final decision on the amount of foreign aid funds it would ask of Congress for the next fiscal year. He said it was possible a final decision might be made at tomorrow's session of the National Security Council with the President, but that, in any event, the estimates would not go to Congress before the first week in May.

Mr. Dulles and his party returned to Washington this morning in a military air transport plane after an overnight flight from Paris.

Talking with reporters at the airfield, the Secretary had this to say of the Paris session:

"We had, I think, a very successful meeting. We were very realistic. We accomplished some good hard practical results, which, I think, on the one hand fully protected the interests of the United States and on the other hand built up the strength of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in which we were all interested."

Later, at the White House, Mr. Dulles added:

"As a result of these meetings, we believe that NATO will be run with greater firmness, greater strength, and greater economy than ever before with greater security for the free world."

Mr. Dulles said that in addition to the general NATO sessions, the Paris conference also provided opportunity for bilateral conversations with French and British officials on problems of mutual interest.

THREE WESTERN POWERS AGREE

PARIS, April 27.—In long talks over the weekend among ministers of the United States, Britain and France it was agreed that the three powers would exchange views regarding any concrete Soviet proposal that might be made and it was expected they would act together in replying to it.

There was general agreement with the United States view that the Austrian treaty would form a test of Soviet intentions in Europe.

Great stress was laid by Secretary of States Dulles on European unity, the importance of which was considered underlined by Moscow's apparent effort to prevent it. Emphasis was put also on European army treaty. The Europeans were told the United States Congress would take a far more favorable view of Europe if this treaty were promptly ratified.

It was added that no conceivable concession by Moscow, such as an agreement to hold free elections in Eastern Germany, would lead the United States to drop its advocacy of a European army.

The point was made that by this and other treaties France and Germany must be united as a counterweight to Soviet power.

[From the New York Times of May 10, 1953]

UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP FACES SEVERE TEST IN EUROPE—ALLIES ARE CRITICAL OF FOREIGN POLICY WHICH THEY HOLD DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THEIR OWN DIFFICULTIES—TROUBLE FOR NATO AND EDC

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, May 9.—United States foreign policy, as applied in Europe, is entering a new and difficult phase. Divisive signs are commencing to appear like tiny cracks in the wall of Western harmony. There is ample time to mend them. But if they are not heeded, trouble can be foreseen.

Most of America's Western allies have accepted the leadership of President Eisenhower with enthusiasm after a preelection period during which an emotional pro-Stevenson wave prevailed. The President's April 16 speech set the tone for a truly unanimous approach by the democratic nations to the basic problems of the day. However, in Europe, where there is by no means complete understanding of the complexities of the United States constitutional system nor of the political forces which limit a President's efforts to formulate foreign policy, there is confusion concerning what appear abroad to be contradictions in Washington's iterated views.

There has been intermittent sniping in many European papers against Secretary of State Dulles. His name is generally associated with the theories of liberation and rollback which, many allied statesmen fear, risk an inevitable war with the Soviet Union if they are applied.

The amiable Mr. Dulles is often depicted by European journals as being more bellicose than General Eisenhower, and opponents of the United States seek to stress such differences whenever possible.

A stir was thus created over here when the White House denied views attributed to Mr. Dulles allegedly contemplating the possibility of partitioning Korea. This is unfortunate, and Pravda was keen to exploit the impression that there seemed a difference in tone and emphasis between the two. A reassertion of the complete unity in views of the President and his Secretary of State would surely be welcomed in Europe, needless as such might seem to be in the United States.

WEAKNESSES REMAIN

This is important because the urgency has seeped out of the Western effort to rearm for common defense, and no amount of glossing over this fact alters it. Despite the immense lead in atomic weapons and the ability to apply them which the democracies main-

tain, their generals are painfully aware that NATO is not yet strong enough to deter aggression or hold fast if an attack should come. A strong and united American leadership is required during the coming months to keep the stretch-out in defense preparations abroad from becoming a slowdown.

The struggle of that leadership with the United States Congress is being nervously observed on this side of the Atlantic. Europe's industrial production has been static for 15 months and will probably decline. The painful problem of the "dollar gap" has not yet been solved.

America's allies detect a growing political pressure to curtail still further their shrinking commerce with the Soviet bloc. Yet they feel they are unfairly excluded from United States markets. They want lower American tariffs, competition for American freight cargoes and larger American investments.

TRADE, NOT AID

They fear the trend is in the opposite direction. There is much resentment in England over the "tempest in a teapot" on the certificate of airworthiness required for the new Comet model. There was anger when a British construction bid on an American power project was rejected.

As the United States shifts the weight of its reduced foreign assistance program from Europe to Asia, this continent counts more and more heavily upon trade, not aid. But it does not see that trade developing.

While these patterns form, the United States seems to have predicated its current foreign and defense policies upon the success of a project to create a European Defense Community whose supranational army, under NATO command would include West German contingents.

It is known throughout the Continent that the President himself vigorously endorses this audacious European army plan. However, at present it is not advancing toward realization. No alternative solution has been presented publicly. The situation is a temporarily embarrassing political stalemate.

Often it is acknowledged that the energetic Germans must help to defend the West. But some observers, worried by the delay, ask why the United States and Britain cannot make a separate accord rearming Germany outside NATO the way Greece and Turkey signed a pact with Yugoslavia.

IF NO EDC

When United States spokesmen warn that if EDC is not enacted America may have to recast its basic program, it is resented. A great many Europeans simply do not believe Washington could curb all aid if its pet project does not succeed.

The United States has hundreds of thousands of men stationed over here and has spent billions of dollars on its own installations and the NATO "infrastructure." The realistic European calculates this is to sustain a first line of American defense. Therefore, it is reasoned, such a policy cannot be drastically altered—for reasons of United States self-interest.

Unfortunately at this moment EDC has commenced, politically, to resemble the albatross which hung around the ancient mariner's neck. Any French statesman will have a hard time forcing its ratification. The German Socialists, fighting it tooth and nail, contend its enactment would perpetuate Germany's division. If it should fail, America's friend Chancellor Konrad Adenauer may go down with it, since he faces a national election late next summer and has staked his political future on it.

BASIC PROBLEM

When all these factors—none of them yet crystallized irrevocably and some of them not in themselves important—are added together one can see the basic problem facing the United States in asserting its unquestioned western leadership during the coming months.

The Soviet Union's propaganda offensive, deliberately designed to divide Europe from America, is bound to continue. Furthermore, it has developed some effective subtleties during recent weeks and is seeking to exploit a political and economic situation inherently complex.

The United States, therefore, must be careful not only to keep reasserting the initiative calmly established by the President's April 16 speech, but also to emphasize again to its friends and enemies the unanimity of views in Washington's leadership.

It must recognize the distinct possibility that its pet project for unifying Europe might still not materialize. If such proves the case, the United States must respond with positive alternatives, not negative despair.

The legislative as well as the executive branch of our Government must recognize the urgent necessity of adjusting America's own internal industrial desires to the very real needs of a Europe whose economic life has not yet recovered from war and occupation. All this requires diplomacy, vision, wisdom, and patience.

[From the Washington Star of May 10, 1953]

IS NATO WORTH IT?—EUROPE NO LONGER A PUSHOVER FOR REDS, THANKS TO UNITED STATES AID—CONCERTED EFFORTS CAN BE ABANDONED ONLY AT PERIL OF ALL NATIONS OF FREE WORLD

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Western Europe, this spring, is playing host to a new kind of American tourist. In every NATO capital, the arrival of squads of American business experts, equipped with bulging briefcases and pointed questions, has aroused curiosity and stirred speculation.

The implication has not been lost on Europeans. Today, after 8 years of enthusiastic spending, Uncle Sam has put on his most conservative pinstripes. He is checking up on an investment of some $30 billion and turning a cool, businessman's eye on the dividends. He also is collecting evidence to guide his future policy.

From everybody's point of view, this is a good thing. To Europeans and American officials alike, it seems like an approach that promises to lift the subject of American aid out of the morass of emotionalism, prejudice and politics in which it has been immersed. It holds the hope that the American people may at last get a clear picture of what they are doing in Europe and why they are doing it.

It isn't surprising if at this point the whole subject inspires the average American with confusion and dismay. Since the end of the war, he has been trying to keep pace with a succession of programs whose purposes were lost in a meaningless jumble of alphabetical agencies and whose objectives were too often clouded in overoptimistic salesmanship.

THE TAXPAYER—IS HE SAINT OR SUCKER?

For the most part, his progress reports have been masterpieces in black or white. The taxpayer is painted as a saint or a sucker, either saving the world or being taken for the greatest ride of his long-suffering career. The confusion has spread with each new journalistic angle, catch-phrase, gimmick and punchline.

Europe is hopeful that a serious attempt will be made to take some of the distortion out of this picture. There is confidence that a more realistic appraisal of the aims and accomplishments of the American aid program will help to dispel doubts and focus attention on the real problems that the free world faces today.

In 1947, when the emphasis in our overseas aid shifted from direct, emergency relief to a planned program for reconstruction, the objectives were perfectly clear. They were:

1. To rebuild Europe's war-shattered economy by providing the essential money and material that Europe could not afford herself.

2. To halt inflation and relieve Europe's critical shortage of dollars.

3. To check the spread of communism and strengthen the development of friendly, democratic governments by raising employment and living standards.

At the time, no elaborate arguments were needed to show the need for such a program. In spite of the money that had been spent and the effort that had been made since the end of the war, much of Europe's industrial machine stood idle. It was predicted that at least a decade would pass before the damage could be repaired and Europe restored to a semblance of prosperity. Considering the general level of morale, and particularly the strength of communism in several strategic countries, there was every reason to believe that the Western World could not afford to wait out a normal recovery period.

Judged in terms of its original objectives and as a weapon against the "hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos" of the day, the Marshall plan must rate as one of the most successful international experiments ever undertaken.

THINGS LOOKING UP

From the economic standpoint, European recovery has proceeded faster during the 4-year life of the plan than the most optimistic could have predicted at the beginning. In every country where American aid programs were set up, overall production has long since passed the prewar level, averaging about 40 percent above the figures for 1938. With few exceptions, industries are expanding rapidly. Unemployment no longer represents a serious threat. The general atmosphere of economic well-being, judged by European standards is high.

Gains in the political field have been hardly less spectacular. Communism, to be sure, remains a powerful force in some countries, but there is wide agreement that the hard-core strength of the party is in steady decline. A large proportion of the Communist vote in France and Italy is considered today more as a routing protest against the existing governments than the expression of a subversive or revolutionary tendency.

In the course of the past year, Communist leaders have provided convincing proof of their own weakness. Every big show they have tried to stage, including the latest general strike in Italy, has fizzled pathetically. Communists in NATO countries still would represent a threat as potential saboteurs if it should come to a shooting war. But the Red menace that once loomed so large on the European horizon seems to have been brought under control.

The trouble is, of course, that the success of the American aid program cannot be measured today in terms of its original objectives. The pressure of historical events since 1947—notably the launching of NATO in 1949, the start of the Korean war the following year and the dramatic increase in the military threat to Western Europe—has demanded a drastic revision of the program's scope and purpose.

To the original Marshall Plan objectives, a fourth was added and given immediate priority; American resources were to be devoted directly to the task of creating military strength in Europe. A new Mutual Defense Assistance structure, set up under the Defense Department, began pumping military hardware into Europe as fast as there were men to handle it. Teams of military technicans and advisors were sent to each NATO country to oversee the distribution of this equipment. Training programs were set up to improve maintenance standards and the tactical employment of new weapons.

ECONOMICS OVERSHADOWED

In this setup, the more strictly economic aspects of the Marshall Plan tended to be pushed into the background. Under the new names of "defense support," the program became gradually geared to the urgent task of supplementing in one way or another the rearmament efforts of the individual NATO countries. At the same time, the drive went on to achieve a long-range solution of Europe's economic problems by broadening the industrial base, increasing productivity and breaking down destructive trade practices.

This program—which soon became the cornerstone of NATO's military effort and a decisive factor in setting NATO's force goals—has had certain practical disadvantages compared to the original Marshall plan. The objective, for one thing, has been clearer than it was in the first place. But the directions and pace of the program have been governed by a number of intangible factors.

They have depended, in the first place, on current estimates of Russian intentions and capabilities—a question on which there has been a notable lack of agreement between military men and politicians. Today, with the improvement of NATO's administrative machinery, these arguments have been successfully removed from the public forum. But in an atmosphere of relaxing tension and reemphasis of economic factors there is little reason to believe that military opinion has abandoned the idea that General Eisenhower expressed 2 short years ago: "If we stretch this job out, we fail."

A second difficulty has been the strategic need for strength in certain areas of Europe, regardless of the ability of the countries concerned to support that strength. Among the most striking impressions left by a tour of NATO countries today is that the poorest countries are making the greatest proportional military effort. This is an effort with which the West can ill afford to dispense at this point. But it can be sustained over the pull only if the principle of economic support continues as a feature of American foreign policy.

A third factor that has been hard to assess has been the willingness of individual countries to undertake the armament burdens imposed on them by their strategic position and by NATO's slide-rule experts. The effort to measure NATO's effort in terms of cold economical capabilities has in some cases failed to take into account historical and political favors of equal, if not greater, importance.

ONE DISADVANTAGE

Finally, from the point of view of the American taxpayer, the Mutual Security program which succeeded the Marshall plan has had the disadvantage of no fixed price tag and no firm time limit. Until recently some attempt has been made at least to provide measurable and definable goals. There was emphasis on critical years and on the number of divisions (however indefinite a measure of strength the term "division" might be) to meet the crisis. As a not-so-long-ago goal, the hope was held out that the West might be able to deal with Russia from "positions of strength." The promised era of relaxation and tension whetted the common resolve by carrying with it the connection of smaller sacrifices in the reasonably near future. As a temporary means of smoothing the way for the new program, the line undoubtedly served its purpose. But today, as both America and Europe awaken to the permanence of their mutual security commitments, the chickens of optimism are coming home to roost.

In spite of these difficulties, NATO has reached the point where Europe no longer amounts to a military pushover to Soviet forces. With the creation of a continental covering force of nearly 2.5 million men supported by 5,000 aircraft and powerful naval forces, the free world is stronger than it was at the beginning of World War II. In case anyone is inclined to feel cocky about this fact, of course, NATO's military leaders point out with fervor and unquestionable logic that the forces at their command are still hopelessly inadequate for the assignment of defending Europe against a Russian attack. But they can at least predict that with 2 years, given the political breaks and the same momentum as has existed in NATO up to this point, something like a reasonable balance may be won.

The grave danger is that this momentum will be lost. Within the last few months—or, to fix the date more precisely, since the installation of the new administration in Washington—there has been an unmistakable attempt to develop a new philosophy of Western European security.

LONG-RANGE SOLUTIONS

In general it has been put on the basis of finding long-range solutions to Europe's economic and military problems. The idea of NATO "shifting gears for the long pull" has been the dominant theme of each recent high-level NATO pronouncement. This laudable idea with its emphasis on striking a balance between economic and military factors, has, however, suffered from a certain lack of definition. It has encouraged a reaction of "do what you can provided it doesn't hurt much." It has given many observers the impression of a search for a comfortable political formula in exchange for the bothersome, expensive, and unpleasantly realistic program on which NATO had been launched.

There were abundant indications of this new trend in the course of the last NATO council meeting. The new policy of not announcing specific national force goals was inevitably interpreted as an effort to reduce the pressure of public interest and the weight of public disappointment in the rearmament effort. Vague statements on the role of atomic weapons and strategic warfare strengthened the impression that the politicians were looking earnestly for an easier and less expensive way out. Above all, American emphasis on the European defense community and the revival of German military power carried the implication that the United States is growing restive in its role as the leader and powerhouse of the common security effort.

To a large degree, the mood of NATO today reflects the growth of political opposition in the United States to the American-aid program. It is hard to overestimate the extent to which our attitude toward NATO determines the willingness of individual European countries to assume the burdens that rearmament places on them.

The opposition in this country seems to center its fire on the complaints that the United States has been extravagant, overambitious, and overindulgent in its foreign investments. Recently, there has been growing emphasis on a much tougher American policy—that continued aid should be made conditional on specific political and military commitments from other NATO members.

NO LONGER A BEGGAR

In this connection, one fact stands out clearly. Europe today is no longer in the position of a beggar receiving handouts from a generous rich relation. The weight of NATO's rearmament effort rests at least as heavily on the shoulders of the average European as it does on the average American. The idea that America's contribution to this effort is a gift that can be granted or withheld depending on good behavior lacks realism.

CEASE-FIRE NEGOTIATIONS IN KOREA—STATEMENTS OF BRITISH PRIME MINISTER AND MR. ATTLEE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, in view of the speeches in the British House of Commons by Prime Minister Churchill and the leader of the opposition, Clement Attlee, I believe it is necessary that the American people be fully informed of the implications of the cease-fire negotiations now going on in Korea.

While I recognize there is room for an honest difference of opinion, it is my own belief that the acceptance of the Communist proposal to have prisoners of war turned over to a commission representing India, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Sweden, and Switzerland is a great mistake, and one that may be hard to justify in the years to come.

All five of these nations have recognized Communist China.

Two of these nations, Poland and Czechoslovakia, are Communist satellites, and consistently follow Soviet policy.

The fifth nation, India, has more than 80 percent of the time, since the Korean war broke out, voted with the Communist side or abstained.

In addition, we are on notice that the leaders representing India have voiced sentiments which can only give aid and comfort to the Communist position, and indicate that they do not place the same moral values on standing against forced repatriation that we do. The statements to which I refer are as follows:

Prime Minister Nehru, at the conference of the All India Congress Party, at Hyderabad, on January 17, 1953, said regarding the Indian proposal:

> It did not recognize voluntary repatriation of prisoners, nor was there any question of prisoners being asked whether they wished to return or decline to do so. It did not recognize the right of asylum for prisoners of war, which applies to political refugees. There was to be no screening of prisoners. It insured that all prisoners would be released from the custody of the detaining side and in neutral territory. The presumption was that they would go back to their country of origin. In fact, repatriation would have begun as soon as these prisoners were released from detention.

From the closing speech of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon in the United Nations last December:

> In the procedure effecting return, there are no further processes of separating the wheat from the chaff, or what is usually called "screening." There are no interrogations; there are no questions to be asked. And there will be no restrictions from guards whom in the past the Chinese have called the guards of Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek. * * * There will be no offering of temptation to prevent returning. * * * There will equally be no question of groups of people who want to go and groups who "do not want to go"—I mean this in quotation marks—who will be kept separate so that they will be marked men. * * * The first act of release by the detaining side is the first act of repatriation.

Even though a unanimous vote rather than a majority vote should be finally accepted by the Communists, the facts of the matter are that the neutrals, like

the British, will feel that the Chinese Communists need appeasement, and that we do not; and, therefore, in view of the fact that they already recognize the Chinese Communist Government as the legal government of China, it will be relatively easy for them to decide that the repatriation of the prisoners of war is not of sufficient moment to warrant offending the Communists to the extent of risking further overt acts by them.

On May 1, I briefly called this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I included correspondence that I had had with the State Department. This information is to be found on pages 4275 and 4276 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

There are other implications to the cease-fire negotiations with which the American people need to be fully conversant.

Once there is a cease-fire without a unification of Korea or a binding pledge by the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists for free elections in North Korea, the hope of ever getting a united Korea is, in my judgment, nonexistent at worst, and very remote at best.

The American people need to understand that a divided Korea cannot survive as a free Korea unless it permanently has large-scale economic and military support from this Government. Certainly it cannot exist with a mere guaranty by the United Nations, for in the overt aggression which took place 2½ years ago, up until this present hour, only 17 members of the 60 nations comprising the United Nations have supplied any forces to the resistance of aggression in Korea, and all 17 of them have furnished less than 35,000. The United States of America alone has furnished over 350,000 of its Army, Navy, and Air Force to resist the aggression in that country.

What Mr. Churchill and Mr. Attlee were in effect saying to us by their speeches in Parliament was that we should accept the Communist eight-point proposal and should stop trying to clarify or modify the proposal to maintain the principles for which we have suffered 135,000 casualties in the past 2½ years.

In effect, what they have told us is that, if we do not accept their advice, and if the Chinese Communists persist in the war, we must be prepared to go it alone. So be it.

It is unfortunate that they did not take that position in June of 1950, if their intent was to give half-hearted support to the resistance of this first overt act of aggression, and to spend the remainder of the time in placing such restrictions upon our Armed Forces that we would be denied the opportunity for achieving the victory, which alone would have assured a united Korea, the carrying out of the United Nations policies pledging a united Korea, and which would have been a deterrent to further aggression elsewhere in the world.

We are now face to face with the problem that our chief ally has joined with certain other United Nations members in urging a Far Eastern Munich.

I repeat that, once the cease-fire is agreed to without assurances of a united Korea, the chance of achieving that objective is, in my judgment, gone.

Our chief allies in the United Nations are prepared to urge and to insist upon the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and a seat on the Security Council.

We will then be faced with the choice of consenting to this maneuver or again of facing the wrath of the Chinese Communists alone, with the implication that they will have the support of the Soviet Union, whereas we cannot be assured of the support of our allies or of the United Nations. Both Mr. Attlee and Mr. Churchill have made it perfectly plain that this is the next step in the inevitable tragic sequence of events now shaping up.

What position will we then be in, when the Chinese Communists, then being a member of the United Nations and presumably one of the negotiators of a peace agreement, take the position that they cannot maintain the truce until they get back all of the territory which they claim belongs to them. They may promise, as Hitler did at Munich, that once they have redeemed the Province of Taiwan—Formosa—they will have no further territorial claims in Asia.

Like Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, Messrs. Churchill, Attlee, and Bevan may believe that they will be "buying peace in our time." The tragic fact is that they will only be making inevitable world war III, for if our stout allies were so intimidated by international communism that they effectively used their influence to prevent this Nation's taking the only steps which could have been taken to win the Korean war during the past 2½ years, how can we expect them to stand up against this inevitable Chinese Communist demand?

When the tragic sequence of events shall have reached that stage we must be prepared to go it alone, or to permit the accomplishment of what is an obvious objective of a ruthless Communist China, supported by its stout allies, Kim Il Sung, Ho Chi-minh, and Malenkov. What a satisfaction it must be to know that when the going is tough one's allies will fully support him.

At some point in Asia now, a year from now, 5 years from now, or 10 years from now, someone must be prepared to draw the line. Before that day we had better review carefully the situation in Asia, in Europe, and in the Americas, to see who will stand with us when the chips are down.

All of Asia hangs in the balance at this very moment.

I hope and pray that the tragic course of events which I have outlined will not take place. I would not be discharging my obligation as a Senator of the United States were I now to remain silent in view of the speeches made in Commons by the British Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Since the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the minority leader in the British Parliament, in effect, have brought into the open clearly their present position, does not the Senator feel that our Government should, at an early date, speak out, for fear that we might mislead our allies in the Far East as to our intention, particularly in view of the fact that so many Chinese are in Indochina, Thailand, Burma, Malay, Indonesia, and that general area? If they come to the conclusion that they are about to be dumped to communism, we may have difficulty in holding them, may we not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Michigan is quite correct. I believe it extremely important that the Government of the United States speak out now relative to its position on the admission of Communist China to the United Nations, which the British Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition have clearly indicated the British are going to urge as soon as cease-fire arrangements have been worked out. If the Chinese Communists, who have been the aggressors in Korea, and have been so declared by the United Nations itself, by a U. N. resolution, should be permitted to shoot their way into the United Nations, it would in fact be an invitation to the town arsonist to head the fire department. It would make the remainder of Asia aware that Communist China, as a result of the prestige and position she would obtain as a result of recognition by this Government, or through membership in the United Nations, had developed a band-wagon psychology in Asia. Then our chances of withholding any of the rest of Asia from international communism would, in my judgment, be very difficult indeed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator feel that if we were to admit Red China into the United Nations, on the Security Council, with the right of veto and with full power, it would mean the removal of Nationalist China?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Obviously there cannot be two governments of China, both represented in the United Nations and on the Security Council. The very nature of the Churchill and Attlee proposal, that Red China be admitted to the United Nations, is in and of itself a clear indication, though they did not say so, of the removal of the Government of the Republic of China, which now sits on the Security Council. Once that is done, then the effect would be to put the Government of the Republic of China and the 8,000,000 free Chinese who have been our historic friends and are on their island citadel, in the position almost of international outlaws. With the recognition and support, presumably, of this great organization devoted to international law and order, Communist China would gain great prestige. What would they be doing in that case? The implications are very plain: They would be rewarding the aggressor, and, in fact, punishing the nation which has been our friend and our historic ally

for more than 50 years, and our ally in two great wars.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator feel that we would be in grave danger if we were to do as suggested by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Attlee, one of them suggesting that we do it immediately, the other that we do it after the shooting stops? In either case it would make very little difference where the truce line or the so-called peace line might be established, whether at the 38th parallel, or at the Yalu. Instead of buying peace in our time, does not the Senator feel that we would be selling peace in our time—the peace of all southeast Asia?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know whether the Senator had the opportunity of listening to all my remarks, but I have said that in my judgment, if what has been proposed should be done, and if the United Nations should go along with the program outlined by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Attlee, in my judgment it would ultimately lead to the domination of all Asia by international communism.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the Senator made that point on the Senate floor. As our allies, the British, have raised it in the House of Commons, I think it is well that we can now discuss it on the Senate floor and express our opinion on this very grave question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may also say to the Senator from Michigan that I pointed out that if the cease-fire is accepted without having a firm commitment for a united Korea, it is very naive to think that, once a cease-fire has been entered into, we shall ever get a united Korea again. I do not believe that a Korea divided at the 38th parallel, or at any other similar line, can be a free Korea. To the contrary, the country, by the very nature of its economy, could not exist, as the distinguished Senator knows. The Senator has also been in Korea, and he knows that, even if the country is united clear to the Yalu River, at best they are going to have a very modest or low standard of living. But at least there would be a possibility of their existing with the industrial north tied to the agricultural south. If the Republic of Korea remains divided it must maintain a large standing army, far larger than that little nation can economically maintain.

If they weaken their position, they will be subject to another aggression across the 38th parallel. If they do not weaken their position, they are faced with economic collapse, social disorders, ultimate revolution, and a completely Communist-dominated Korea. So, in either event, the Communists can afford to sit back for a little while and expect to pick up Asia, piece by piece. Any such Munich-type of appeasement in Asia will, in my opinion, result in all of Asia going down the drain. I do not exclude even India, where they are apparently so naive as to think they will be able to exist as an isolated island of freedom in a totalitarian world.

The hard fact of the matter is that international communism, by gaining 1,250,000,000 people of Asia, with the vast strategic resources of Asia, will be able to consolidate their position and turn with overwhelming power against the West. The choice of India being neutral will not be India's to make. It will be recalled that in World War I the Imperial Germany of Kaiser Wilhelm respected the neutrality of the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway, although they violated the neutrality of Belgium. But the Germany of Hitler did not give the Netherlands or Norway or Denmark the choice as to whether they wanted to be neutral.

I think it is utterly naive to think that the ruthless men in the Kremlin will ever give that choice to either Mr. Nehru or his successors when and if they become prepared for all-out aggression.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel from what was said on the floor of the House of Commons, that it will be more difficult for America and the United Nations to stand firmly on some of the principles for which we have been fighting in Korea?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The sad facts of the situation are that the real isolationists in this country and abroad are those who think they can isolate themselves from the tragic sequence of events which have already started rolling in Asia. If they believe they can maintain an isolated position, while the Soviet Union gathers and consolidates a billion and a quarter people of Asia and the vast strategic resources of Asia, and can remain unconcerned, I think they are living in a fool's paradise.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, the Senator does not believe that communism will satisfy its appetite by taking Asia, but that its purpose is to take Europe and the rest of the world?

Mr. KNOWLAND. All the writings of Lenin, of Stalin, and of Malenkov make that perfectly clear and plain.

The situation is that once we lose Asia—and up to the present time we have a chance of keeping hundreds of millions of people of Asia on our side—once we lose all Asia, the world balance of power will have become so upset that I do not believe there is a competent military, naval, or air person in any nation of the world who would not recognize that with such power it would be most menacing for what would then be left of the free world.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am going to propose two amendments at this time. I am sorry the chairman of the committee [Mr. CAPEHART] is not on the floor at the moment, because I was going to ask him to accept them.

One amendment is on page 10, line 23, to delete the word "or" and substitute the word "and."

The committee bill, section 101 (b), would prevent control of the general distribution of any materials in the civilian market unless the President finds "(1) that such material is a scarce and critical material essential to national defense, or (2) that the requirements of the national defense for such material cannot otherwise be met without creating a significant dislocation of the normal distribution of such material in the civilian market to such a degree as to create appreciable hardship."

"Or" was substituted for "and", line 23 on page 10, which appeared in an earlier draft of the bill. Under the committee bill it will be necessary for the President to find that only one of the two requirements be met—and not both. Thus if he finds that a material is scarce and that it is a critical material essential to the national defense, he would be empowered to control the general distribution in the civilian market even though there was not a significant dislocation in the civilian market to such a degree as to create appreciable hardship.

The change is incompatible with the expressed wish of the present administration and, I believe, the present intention of Congress, that general controls over civilian production not be reinstated unless both conditions be met. Under the committee bill the President would be permitted to reinstitute controls over steel, copper, and aluminum under conditions similar to those which presently obtain. It could be argued that steel, copper, and aluminum which are critical materials essential to the national defense are still scarce. Scarcity of materials, however, is and always has been relative. At the present time the supply of steel, copper, and aluminum certainly does not exceed demand. As a practical matter supply is never perfectly geared to demand in a free market. If raw materials are scarce the processes of the market place bring in additional capacity or result in importations of materials from abroad. Conversely, if there is an increase of supply over present and forecasted demand, production is contracted, facilities are abandoned and/or importations decline. Accordingly, it is believed advisable that both conditions be met before the President may reinstitute controls.

I see that the chairman of the committee is now on the floor and I would ask him whether he would accept the amendment on page 10, line 23, to delete the word "or" and substitute the word "and."

Mr. CAPEHART. Personally, I would be willing to accept it. However, the committee took a vote on the words "and" and "or," and the majority of the committee voted for the word "or" instead of for the word "and." In the absence of the author of the amendment in the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I would not like to agree to accept it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I shall offer it from the floor at the proper time.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator from Michigan is unduly alarmed over the possible consequences which prompted his proposal to substitute "and" for "or." In my personal opinion, I do not believe there is sufficient difference to warrant much debate or much fight over whether the word shall be "or" or "and." We debated the matter in committee, a vote was taken, and the majority of the committee decided to substitute the word "or" for "and." The original bill contained the word "and" instead of "or." Under those circum-

stances, I do not feel that I could accept the amendment without a vote of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that. I shall bring up the matter later for a vote on the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not believe the Senator need be alarmed about it. All that we are endeavoring to accomplish is that if the military should take such a high percentage of goods in a given category that it looked as though the remainder for the civilian economy would be so small that it would be in the best interests of the Nation to have the President allocate it, this provision would give him the right to do so. That is the purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall seek to have a vote on the amendment later.

Mr. CAPEHART. I would have no objection to that. It might be that the Senator from Michigan could speak to the Senator from New York and have the matter straightened out.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have another amendment I desire to speak to, as to which I should like to have the views of the Senator from Indiana. My suggestion is as follows:

Delete lines 5 through 10 on page 21, and substitute the following:

(d) The term "national defense" means programs for military and atomic energy production or construction, military assistance to any foreign nation, and stockpiling.

Section 101 (a) of the Defense Production Act, as revised by the committee bill, authorizes the President "to allocate materials and facilities in such manner, upon such conditions, and to such extent as he shall deem necessary or appropriate to promote the national defense."—Page 10, lines 16 through 18.

"National defense" is defined in section 702 (d) of the Defense Production Act as revised by the bill to mean not only the operations and activities of the Armed Forces and the Atomic Energy Commission and operations or activities in connection with foreign economic or military assistance programs, but also operations and activities of "any other Government department or agency directly or indirectly and substantially concerned with national defense."

Under the definition of "national defense" in the committee bill it would still be possible for the President to accord preferential treatment to programs sponsored by such agencies as the Defense Transport Administration, Petroleum Administration for Defense, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, and other Government agencies which sponsor interests which have no direct connection with the defense effort.

Since Korea many industries have been able to convince the administration that they were defense-related and, accordingly, were given a prior claim on materials before there was any distribution to other civilian users of the residue after direct defense requirements were met. During the last 2 years, power, transportation, and petroleum capacity has been substantially enlarged—in large part at the expense of other claimants. Many of these projects were imprudently deferred until after Korea—when materials were in short supply and when accelerated amortization made them most attractive. It is believed that a number of these projects were sharply accelerated for the same reason.

The President's power to accord preferential treatment to defense-related activities should be limited. Power, transportation, and petroleum, for example, should not enjoy preferential consideration unless the materials allocated to these industries are to be used in conjunction with programs for military and atomic energy production or construction, military assistance to any foreign nation, or stockpiling.

The opportunity in the present act to qualify under an interpretation of "defense related" has subjected the Administrator to most intense pressures from many claimants. The acceptance of a concept of "defense related" necessarily involves a determination of degrees of essentiality among various parts of the economy in relation to a master plan of national requirements. Determinations must be made as to the relative importance of rolling stock, trucks, radios, aluminum windows, automotive parts, safety pins, and a wide variety of capital and consumer goods. Needless to say, the administration has not been omniscient.

There can be no valid objection to according to a railroad or public utility preferential treatment in the allocation of materials as to specific projects which are part and parcel of military or atomic energy programs, such as a railroad facility or power plant directly related to a specific military or atomic energy project. However, there are no valid reasons why power, railroad transportation, oil drilling projects, and so forth, which are intended merely to add net to the Nation's capacity, should receive any consideration not accorded all other claimants in the economy.

I relate this because that is what has happened in the past and could happen in the future, because this bill would become permanent legislation.

The regulations already issued by the Administrator in contemplation of the renewal of the priority and allocation provisions of the Defense Production Act contemplate a sharp restriction on the right of these claimants to preferential consideration in the matter of priorities and allocations. I believe the statute should coincide with the stated policy of the administration.

There is a strong implication in the declaration of policy in the bill, lines 4 to 9, inclusive, on page 9, that productive facilities should receive preferential treatment. Any such implication should be dissipated by restricting preferential consideration to facilities which are an integral part of military and atomic energy programs, and to those which are for our foreign aid, which is part of our national defense.

I feel very keenly about this, because I know of the pressures which have been brought in the past, and administrators should not be subjected to such pressures. Congress should give such definitions and speak in such language that administrators will not be pressured into making grants to segments of our economy not connected with the war effort. I shall ask later whether or not the Senator from Indiana feels that he could accept this new definition.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I doubt it very much. I should like to make a brief statement, if I may.

The proposal to alter the definition of the term "national defense" in section 702 of the Defense Production Act is dangerous.

The entire act is expressly intended to provide for the national defense, and the various powers it gives the President must be used by him in the interests of the national defense. Thus, any change in the definition of the basic term "national defense" may limit or destroy the usefulness of virtually the entire statute.

Removal from the definition of the words "or any other Government department or agency directly or indirectly and substantially concerned with the national defense" might be construed as intending to limit the applicability of the act in many ways.

These are the points I wish to have considered very carefully:

First. It might prohibit giving priority to the performance of a contract for the delivery of supplies and equipment to plants and mines which produce the basic materials for weapons production, since the contracts for such supplies and equipment are not prime or subcontracts of the Defense Department.

I think we must take that into consideration. What the Senator is talking about, of course, is supporting agencies or businesses related to national defense. One of the chief agencies or businesses related to national defense deals with the mining of minerals, particularly the production of strategic minerals or scarce materials.

Second. It might be thought to prohibit limitations on the use of critical items essential for our defense which are in short supply, such as nickel, cobalt, and tungsten.

I know the able Senator does not want to do that.

Third. It might be thought to prohibit the relief of hardship on business, and particularly small business, caused by defense-created dislocations in the distribution of a scarce material.

Fourth. It might be taken to deny the availability of financial assistance, including loans and purchase commitments, for the development of critical and strategic materials or the production of machine tools or the expansion of other basic industrial capacity.

Essentially, the danger in limiting national defense to the production of weapons of war is the fact that the national defense depends on much more than weapons of war. It is a well supported rule of statutory draftsmanship that commonly used words, having well understood meanings, should not be artificially and narrowly defined. Such definitions serve only to distort the body of the statute. If the Congress does not want the President to use the priorities and allocation authority to avoid defense-created hardship in the civilian economy, for example, that limitation should appear in a substantive provision

of the act. It is not possible to be certain about the effects which a change in a basic definition may have, and some of those effects may be far from the intent of the Congress.

I understand exactly the concern of the Senator from Michigan. I am concerned about the same thing, and I am certain that the committee is. The Senator from Michigan does not want to see the administration use its powers under this particular title or section to support a number of industries which have absolutely no connection with the war effort or which have only a remote connection. That is what concerns the Senator from Michigan, as well as the Senator from Indiana. It is not the intention of the committee that that sort of thing should happen. We do not want anyone to misuse the authority given for the purpose of allocating materials to uses which are truly defense-supporting. That category should not be used loosely. However, it is our intention to give help in the way of allocation of scarce materials to any project, any company, or any industry which is absolutely essential, either directly or indirectly, to the war effort.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not the trouble with our use of words that when we say "directly or indirectly" we are opening up the field? We must all realize that because of the enormous size of our Government and the production capacity of our economy, the President is never personally concerned. When we speak about giving certain authority to the President, that is done really only in name. The authority is given to an administrator.

Mr. CAPEHART. The President certainly passes it on to someone else.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. The administrator must act. That is the point at which the pressure is exerted to have various sidelines considered as indirectly necessary for the war effort. Why cannot such language be used as will limit the authority to what the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Michigan really intend?

Mr. CAPEHART. We experimented with different language from that which we used. We found it rather difficult to phrase. We found that the language we used was about as good as we could find. We discussed the very thing which the able Senator has suggested. The intention of the committee, which reported the bill favorably, is that the authority shall be used only when it is absolutely necessary to support an industry, or categories of industries the processing, manufacturing, production, or mining of whose products is absolutely essential to the defense effort. It is not intended to support a great number of unrelated industries who might stretch the connotation of the words "defense-supporting" in order to obtain allocations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that statement of the Senator is a much better definition than the bill itself contains.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wonder if it is. The bill says:

> (d) The term "national defense" means the operations and activities of the Armed Forces, the Atomic Energy Commission, or any other Government department or agency directly or indirectly and substantially concerned with the national defense, or operations or activities in connection with foreign economic or military assistance programs.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill uses the words "substantially concerned."

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. An administrator might conclude that such language empowered him to go in any direction.

Mr. CAPEHART. He should not so conclude the requirement that the operations or activities must be substantially concerned with national defense should be a warning to the Administrator to make no allocation unless the particular activity for which an allocation is requested is substantially concerned with national defense. The Interior Department, for example, is substantially concerned with national defense, through the activity of mining, in certain of its operations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Certain mining may be essential.

Mr. CAPEHART. It may well be. The Petroleum Administration, of course, is substantially concerned with national defense, in some of its operations because it must see to it that gasoline is produced for defense purposes, particularly the gasoline needed for airplanes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The restrictive language which I have suggested would permit the authority to be used when it is necessary.

Mr. President, if I leave this amendment on the table, I wonder whether the Senator will think about it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, yes. I assure the Senator that we have no objection to improving the bill in every respect possible. We certainly have no pride of authorship. We shall be happy to improve if it we possibly can.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the committee permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. As the chairman of the committee knows, I am responsible for substituting the word "or" for the word "and" on page 10, line 23 of the bill. I had a good reason for doing so. I shall not take up the time of the Senate by discussing that question at this time, in view of the fact that the Senator from Michigan is willing to lay it aside.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am willing to let the amendment lie on the table.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to make certain that when these amendments are voted upon Members of the Senate will receive some notice.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the able Senator from New York did not happen to be present earlier when the proposed amendment was under discussion. What he has suggested is exactly what the chairman of the committee stated when the able Senator from Michigan submitted his amendment and started to discuss it. Under no circumstances would I consider taking it up in the absence of the distinguished Senator from New York, the author of the amendment in the committee. Originally at this place the bill used the word "and," but the Senator from New York offered an amendment to substitute the word "or" for the word "and." The majority of the committee agreed with him. Under no circumstances would the amendment of the Senator from Michigan be considered in the absence of the Senator from New York. I think the record will show that.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the Senator from New York will read what I have had to say on the subject.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to do so.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf.

The message also announced that the House agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) indefinitely postponing H. R. 1101, for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is not Friday. I am aware of the fact that it is Wednesday. However, the Independent Party was unable to give its report on its work as a member of the Committee of the Whole last week. It gave assurance, however, that it would give its report this week on Monday. The Senate did not meet on Monday, and therefore this is the first opportunity, although it is rather late in the day, that the Independent Party has had to give its report of last week. It will give its next report, dealing with the work of this week, on Friday of this week.

I desire to assure the increasing number of people in the country who are interested in my reports that I shall continue each week to give a report. If circumstances make it necessary to postpone a report from one week to the beginning of the next week, I shall always see to it that the report is made at the beginning of the next week, until such time, Mr. President, as more than a million and a half people in the State of Oregon are given equal representation in the Senate.

I do not know how many weeks it will take. It may take several years. I do not know. Of course, I will be here for several years to come, God willing. My political opposition need not worry about what the people of Oregon are going to do about it. I will take my chances with them.

I shall continue to make my reports based on the constitutional principle—and no Member of this body has yet risen to answer my contention—that under the Constitution of the United States each State is entitled to equal representation in this body. When, on January 13 of this year, this body kicked the junior Senator from Oregon off his

committees, without any basis or precedent in the Senate, except an unfortunate one in 1871, more than a million and a half people in the State of Oregon were denied equal representation in the Senate. I shall fight for those million and a half people.

Mr. President, let me tell you that there is an increasing interest in that fight. Some of my colleagues in the Senate are aware of that increasing interest. I am greatly encouraged by what is happening almost every day. Today, for instance, five Senators came to me and, in effect, said, "Wayne, we are beginning to see through this issue. We are beginning to understand that we did make a mistake on January 13 from the standpoint of sound procedure in the Senate."

So I am greatly encouraged.

It is not pleasant and it is not easy to put on the kind of fight I have been making for about 16 weeks. But I will not be deterred from making the fight, because I desire to do all I can to help the Senate correct the very unfortunate precedent of January 13.

On Friday of this week I shall discuss at some length a letter which I sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration a few days ago, in which I pointed out to the committee, in very dignified fashion, I think, the error in arithmetic which they made in their report on my resolution. The committee voted adversely on my proposal to add a Republican to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Their vote was based upon a typographical error which was contained in my amendment, but which was corrected on the floor of the Senate on the very day on which the amendment was offered. It is a typographical error which, if it had not been corrected, would have left the impression that I sought to reduce the Committee on Public Works from a committee of 11 to a committee of 8, thereby resulting in bumping a Democrat. That was not my intention, and the correction makes clear that it was not my intention, and I pointed out to the committee in my letter that such was not my intenion.

Nevertheless the committee submitted a report on my resolution based clearly upon an error in arithmetic. The resolution will come up for debate in a short time. The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], has assured me that it will come up for debate within the next few days, awaiting only some further conferences on the part of Senators who want to confer about it before the matter is brought to the floor of the Senate. I hope in the meantime the Committee on Rules and Administration will take back its report and at least submit a corrected report based upon what my amendment actually proposes to do. I do not want any Member on the other side of the aisle to assume for a moment that the rationalization which some of their members have been peddling to them, that MORSE proposes to kick some Democrats off committees, has any basis in fact, because it is utterly unfounded.

My resolution does not remove any Democrat from any committee. My resolution adds 2 Republicans to committees, 1 to the Committee on Armed Services and 1 to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They ought to be added to those committees, because the Republicans happen to be the majority party in the Senate, and Republicans should constitute the majority on the major committees. I said so on January 13. The majority leader, in his fairness, on January 13 was perfectly willing to accept my resolution. He said so, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show. That is why I am a little at a loss to understand why the Republican dominated Committee on Rules and Administration submitted a report which does not coincide with what the majority leader stated on January 13.

Mr. President, do you know what is the matter with the Democrats in this whole argument? They just do not want to face a reality. They do not want to give in. They want to go ahead assuming they are the only minority party in the Senate. They are wrong about that, Mr. President.

So what are they crying about? They are crying, "MORSE destroys the ratio." Certainly I do, but only to the extent that it ought to be reduced, because they no longer are the only minority party in the Senate. I destroy the Democratic ratio by less than one-half of 1 percent. That is what adding 2 Republicans, 1 to the Committee on Armed Services and 1 to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, does to the ratio. It leaves the Independent on the committees on which he is entitled to remain because of 8 years of seniority rights in the Senate. Those seniority rights were destroyed by the Democrats on January 13, when they refused to give unanimous consent to the request of the majority leader to add a Republican to each of two committees I have mentioned.

Mr. President, I do not want to be unkind to my friends on the Democratic side. I have about as many friends over there as on this side of the aisle. That does not mean zero either, Mr. President. I have a lot of friends over there, and they are troubled about this matter. They ought to be. They are a little bit troubled because I keep carrying it to them. I will keep on carrying it to them until this wrong is righted—this wrong to a million and a half people in Oregon.

Mr. President, I shall discuss the matter at some length next Friday, and at still greater length next week, when I am sure the subject will be debated at some length.

I have another item to take up before I proceed to my main remarks. I have before me a very sound statement, made last night, by Mr. Frank Edwards, over the Mutual Broadcasting System, dealing with the fiscal problem of our country, as it has been presented by the very interesting shifting of position on the part of the Eisenhower administration. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Today, the Secretary of the Treasury says he expects to balance the budget by next year. Yesterday, both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Defense said that it would be two or three years before a balanced budget could be expected. Last Friday, the Secretary of the Treasury told the Senate Foreign Relations committee that we could not balance the budget, and might have to raise the limit on the national debt.

What has brought about this sudden change in Mr. Humphrey's predictions? Overnight, he sees a balanced budget where none grew before—what happened?

I think you will find the answer in the fact that business interests from all over the Nation are aroused by the effects of Mr. Humphrey's tight money policy. Industry finds itself faced with higher costs of operation and selling. Retail merchants find themselves loaded with merchandise that isn't moving; inventories covered with loans that will cost more to maintain—thanks to Mr. Humphrey. This is a playback of the "hard dollar" policy of Harding and Hoover; a hard dollar that became hard to get.

As an example of the business distress that already exists, the Wall Street Journal reports that a group of top officials of a major automobile manufacturer met quietly last week with Federal Reserve officials, asking the Government to ease up on the money squeeze, or the automobile makers can't sell the cars they are making. More than half of all cars are sold on credit and the customers can't stand the hike.

I have a letter here from a listener who is irate because I have frequently mentioned the Treasury action which increased interest rates. He demands to know why I have turned to this subject on several broadcasts.

The answer is very simple. That Treasury action was nothing more than a move to enrich the bankers at the expense of the American people. Bundles for bankers. It will affect every family and every individual, through higher prices for the things you must have to live. It boosts the cost of your automobile, the home you are buying, the electricity you use, the food you eat. Just remember this one fact: the Treasury bonds Mr. Humphrey is selling are 30-year bonds, bearing 3¼ percent interest. That means that for every billion dollars' worth of bonds, the American public is pledged to pay an additional $975 millions in interest charges during the life of the bond. That is the money that must come out of your cash registers, your market checks and your salary envelopes—and out of your children's incomes during the next 30 years. It enriches the money lenders, at the expense of the rest of the Nation. You cannot avoid it; I just want to be certain that you understand it for what it is: Bundles for bankers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the statement of Mr. Edwards speaks for itself; but I shall supplement it by saying that not many months ago in the midst of the campaign I heard Republican spokesmen all over the country promise—for votes—a balancing of the budget, a reduction in taxes, and early action on the public debt.

The morning after the campaign was over I issued a statement for which I was roundly criticized by some persons. However, I do not believe in hypocrisy. I believe in telling the American people what they should be told on the basis of the facts. So on the morning after the election I said the American people allowed themselves to be fooled, and lost the election.

Then I went on to say—although this part of my statement was not published in many newspapers—that the time had come to close ranks in the public interest and to support the things proposed by President Eisenhower which are in the public interest, and to oppose the

things proposed by him which are not in the public interest. That has been my position ever since.

I shall continue on the floor of the Senate to support President Eisenhower whenever he is right. I only wish he were right more often on the facts. He certainly is not right in regard to the giveaway programs. In my judgment, he was not right on the submerged-lands issue. He was not right in giving to the Idaho Power Co. the great maximum power potential of the Snake River; and he is not right in passing on to future generations of American boys and girls hundreds of millions of dollars of increased debt as a result of the uncalled-for increases in the interest rate on Government bonds. He is playing havoc with the economy.

Not only will the Edwards broadcast show what I mean, but, Mr. President, I ask that you take a look at what I have referred to so often as the bible of the Republican Party, namely, the Wall Street Journal. In the May 13 issue of that newspaper we find, on page 1, an article entitled "Insurance Money—For-Hire Cash Supply of Big Life Insurance Firms Is Running Low—Some Borrowers Meet Flat Turndowns, Others Get Less Than They Seek."

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSURANCE MONEY—FOR-HIRE CASH SUPPLY OF BIG LIFE INSURANCE FIRMS IS RUNNING LOW—SOME BORROWERS MEET FLAT TURNDOWNS, OTHERS GET LESS THAN THEY SEEK—FACTOR: UNITED STATES BOND PRICE DIP

(By Lindley H. Clark, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—The biggest single source of long-term corporate cash shows signs of drying up.

The Nation's 700 life insurance companies own some $29 billion of bonds and debentures of American business. That's over 41 percent of total long-term debt of all United States corporations.

Holdings of the life companies jumped by over $3 billion in 1952 alone. There are growing indications that this push for funds is reaching the limits of the insurance firms' resources.

THE BIG FOUR

The biggest life insurance lending market is in the New York area where the largest companies have their home offices. Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., the Nation's biggest, has assets of $11.6 billion. Across the Hudson River in Newark is Prudential Insurance Co., the No. 2 company, with assets of $10.2 billion. Other major New York area companies are Equitable Life Assurance Society, $6.6 billion, and New York Life Insurance Co., $5.3 billion. These four companies control 46 percent of the $73 billion assets of all life concerns.

"We've never been so short of funds in the 20 years I've been with the company," says a vice president of one of the large insurance companies.

Other insurance officials come up with tales like these:

A Midwest steel concern had been a regular borrower from one life insurance company for more than 30 years. Late last month, the treasurer of the steel company tried to sell the insurance firm $20 million of debentures. The insurance company took $10 million, reluctantly told the borrower to place the remainder elsewhere.

"We don't like our good customers to get acquainted with other lenders," says an officer of the life insurance company. "They might like the way the other boys part their hair. But there's nothing else we can do."

SOME FLAT TURNDOWNS

In some cases, potential borrowers are meeting flat turndowns. A New England utility recently needed $25 million to finance property improvements. The company tried four insurance concerns before it finally found one which would make the loan.

Just last week, a moderate-sized Southwest pipeline company tried to place $10 million in notes with insurance companies. After two rejections, the company decided to put off its borrowing for a while.

Life insurance companies naturally turn down many borrowers they consider poor credit risks. But, complains the treasurer of one life concern, "we're turning away business now that we'd have turned handsprings to get a year ago."

GETTING HIGHER INTEREST

One result: Life insurance companies are asking, and getting, higher interest rates on loans they make. A major finance company, for example, recently borrowed $50 million from insurance companies. The interest rate: 4 percent. The company could have borrowed that amount 6 months ago for as little as 3½ percent.

CIT Financial Corp., one of the "Big Three" finance companies, in January sold $25 million of 5-year promissory notes at 3½ percent. Last month, the company had to offer 3½ percent on a block of $25 million of 6-year notes. This is one of the factors which is leading some finance companies to increase charges on consumer credit.

This money shortage doesn't apply to all life insurance companies. A few concerns, particularly in New England, are still out actively looking for investments. But many of the biggest say the loan demand is crowding them as never before.

KNOCKING ON MORE DOORS

One upshot: Potential borrowers who formerly were able to meet all their needs by knocking on 1 or 2 doors in New York, now must turn to smaller companies in other parts of the country. Often, a $10 million loan must be broken up into 20 or more pieces to fit the portfolios of the lenders concerned.

The pressure on the life insurance companies, oddly enough, comes at a time when they are raking in more money from policyholders than ever before. Life insurance sales in the first 3 months of this year were a hefty $8.3 billion, an increase of 24 percent over the like 1952 period.

The scarcity of dollars in part reflects loan commitments made by the companies many months ago, when they were relatively flush with cash. As other source of credit tightened up, business concerns rushed to take up these commitments. As a result, one big life-insurance company recently had to dig up $150 million in a 3-day period.

These advance commitments generally were made at the interest rates then prevailing. Some borrowers thus have been able to avoid rising rates by taking advantage of old commitments.

BOND SELLING SLOWED

Tightening the squeeze on life insurance company funds is the fact that they no longer can easily raise new cash by selling Government securities. In the period from 1946 to early 1951, the companies met much of the business demand for loans in this manner. In March 1951, however, the Federal Reserve System stopped supporting Government-bond prices at fixed levels. Bond prices fell, making it necessary for life-insurance companies and others to take losses if they sold United States securities.

This action hit harder at insurance companies than at commercial banks, since price declines have been the greatest in longer-term United States issues, where the life firms' holdings are concentrated. Commercial banks generally prefer shorter-term obligations.

One large life company, whose Government holdings run into the hundreds of millions, has sold only $5 million in Government bonds since March 1951—a period of 26 months. During 1949 and 1950, it sold United States securities at the rate of $10 million a month.

Life-insurance company holdings of Government issues totaled $21.6 billion at the end of 1946, nearly 45 percent of their assets. By the end of 1951, this figure had plunged to $11 billion, or only 16 percent of assets.

At the end of February of this year, the life companies still had $10.3 billion of Governments. A major part of this $700 million decline in the 14 months since the end of 1951 has been accounted for by maturities of existing issues.

"We just can't afford to sell Governments now," says the treasurer of one life-insurance company. "If we sold all of them, we'd take a loss that would practically wipe out our surplus."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize particularly the last paragraph of the article. It is a honey. I ask you, Mr. President, to contemplate for a moment its implications:

"We just can't afford to sell Governments, now," says the treasurer of one life insurance company. "If we sold all of them, we'd take a loss that would practically wipe out our surplus."

Mr. President, did you ever expect to live long enough to read a statement of that sort about Government bonds? Did you ever expect to live long enough to find Government bonds selling so far below par that the insurance companies do not dare to sell them now, or else they would wipe out their surpluses?

I say to the American people, "Wake up, before it is too late, and realize where the fiscal policies of the Eisenhower administration will lead you. Take a strong position against an administration that is playing into the hands of the big-interest boys. Keep in mind the fact that it is the little people of America who will pay the cost of this inexcusable economic policy of the Eisenhower administration."

Mr. President, take a look at Canada, the country to the north of us. Canada really did something about inflation control, at a time when a very small number of us on the floor of the Senate fought our hearts out for a Baruch anti-inflation program which really would have frozen wages and prices, and really would have done something about credit, and would have protected a sound dollar. My memory may be in error, but it is not far off when I say there was only a small group of 17 or 19 of us, who, about a year ago, when Mr. Baruch testified before our committee—and I think his program was absolutely right—voiced our support of his proposal. Of course, now the number would be much larger. At that time he testified that because we did not take the course of action that this little band fought for on the floor of the Senate, the people of the United States, because of inflation, lost approximately $24 billion that did not need to be lost.

So, Mr. President, consider the situation in Canada. It is a very interesting

one. In the same May 13 issue of the Wall Street Journal, there appears an article reading as follows:

OTTAWA.—The Canadian Finance Department announced the government had bought back $75 million of its bonds sold privately in the New York market in 1948.

The bonds were part of a $150 million issue bearing 3 percent interest and maturing August 1, 1963.

Mr. President, the Canadian Government is buying them back 10 years before they are due. That is the kind of sound fiscal policy followed in the country to the north of us.

I read further from the article:

The repurchased securities will be put in a government account that holds sinking funds for retirement of other funded debt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA BUYS BACK $75 MILLION OF BONDS SOLD IN UNITED STATES IN 1948

OTTAWA.—The Canadian Finance Department announced the government had bought back $75 million of its bonds sold privately in the New York market in 1948.

The bonds were part of a $150 million issue bearing 3 percent interest and maturing August 1, 1963.

The repurchased securities will be put in a government account that holds sinking funds for retirement of other funded debt.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is a sad day for our country when the bankers and the big financial institutions have been allowed to get by with a program which results in the selling of United States bonds below par. It is a sad day for our country when the Eisenhower fiscal program which is now being put into effect has played right into the hands of speculators in Government bonds.

That is why I sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, earlier today, the letter to which I previously referred on the floor of the Senate. I wish to know how large a share of the $1 billion bond issue has gone into the hands of member banks of the Federal Reserve System. I want to know who bought the bonds. The people are entitled to know that, because one of the most fallacious arguments being used today in connection with the discussion of the fiscal policy of our Government is that those bonds are going into the hands of little people. That is not my understanding. So I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare for me a memorandum giving the facts about that matter.

Mr. President, I am worried about the present fiscal policies of my Government. I have not forgotten the 1920's; I have not forgotten what the interest-rate policies did in the 1920's to the economy of the United States. I have not forgotten what happened when we let the speculators get control of the economy in the 1920's. I have not forgotten when, in the 1920's, we let big business control the fiscal policies of the Government, instead of having those fiscal policies controlled by the Government itself. And, Mr. President, as I said on the floor of the Senate yesterday, in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], I have not forgotten that it was a farm depression which preceded, by several years, the collapse of the economy.

I happen to be one who is fearful that if we do not stop the beginnings of an unsound fiscal policy under the Eisenhower administration, we may within the next few years discover that 1932 was a year of great prosperity.

Mr. President, we should talk to the farmers. I talk to them every weekend; I talk to dirt farmers in nearby Maryland. They are now beginning a retrenchment program. That is the situation on farms close to the city of Washington, farms within a stone's throw, figuratively speaking, of the Capitol Building and of the White House. It is impossible to sell those farmers any farm machinery today. That is the pattern. They are not going to take a chance. Let one go out and try to sell them some feeder cattle. They will not be interested. They are scared, Mr. President; and they have justification for being scared, because of the fiscal policy being put into operation by the Eisenhower administration, a policy which is obviously, in my judgment, being dictated by American big business and speculators. It does not augur well for the future of the American farmer.

The record of the Senate will show that it was the representative of the independent party in the Senate of the United States who, weeks ago, on the very day the Eisenhower administration announced the proposed increase in interest rates on Government bonds, took the floor of the Senate to make a speech against it; and all the developments bear out everything said by the representative of the Independent Party in that speech on the floor of the Senate not so long ago.

Now, Mr. President, I turn to the major subject of my remarks this afternoon. I am about to give, in my opinion, the most difficult speech I have ever given, because it is on a subject which is easily misinterpreted and misrepresented. It is on a subject colored by emotion in America today; it is on a subject about which our people have deep feelings, and, because of their deep feelings, I respectfully say the people are confused. In general, I could say it is on the subject of peace; but let a United States Senator talk about peace in America, and he will be smeared as being a Communist. I have been talking about peace across America, and I have been reading my mail, too. If anyone thinks he can talk about peace and not be smeared as being a Communist, let him come to my office and read my mail. Yet, Mr. President, the subject of peace is the all-important subject that ought to be discussed. It ought to be discussed with cold realism. The difficult realities which are involved in the subject of peace should be frankly faced.

So, as a preface to these remarks, I am first going to have to say what I do not believe, before I can say what I do believe. Is it not a strange commentary, that, in American political life today, we have reached such a state of hysteria that if one proposes to discuss the subject of peace, in order to be understood at all, he must first tell the American people what he does not believe, before he can tell them what he does believe—that is, if he wants to be constructive and to have the record contain an answer to the smear that warminded forces in this country will level at any man who talks about peace.

First, Mr. President, let the record be perfectly clear that I do not believe Russia is acting in good faith in her peace overtures. There is no reason for us to take her at her word; yet we can hope and pray. As I said—I think it was in a speech in Los Angeles the other night—surely I am for sitting down to negotiate with Russia; but, to use a Western phrase, I want the loaded pistols on top of the table. No, I do not believe that Russia is acting in good faith.

Second, Mr. President, I do not believe that we should recognize Red China. That has been my position always; yet one will pick up periodicals and newspapers and find the name of the junior Senator from Oregon, time and time again, listed with men who are supposed to favor the recognition of Red China. I have discussed it innumerable times. I have discussed the criteria we have always applied, with certain exceptions—and the exceptions are not in our favor—in recognizing de facto governments.

Briefly, there are three principal criteria. We ask ourselves, supposedly, first, Does the country that is seeking recognition actually control the territory over which it claims to govern? That is not always easy to determine, and so we, as our diplomatic history will show, have applied the rule of reasonableness. We have had to satisfy ourselves whether the country seeking recognition controlled the territory claimed. I suppose, if we were to employ that criterion and were to apply it to Red China, the conclusion would be that she undoubtedly controls—although we do not like the kind of control, for she controls, as a police state controls—the territory over which she claims jurisdiction.

Of course, Mr. President, we have not been too sensitive about that in our history. By that I mean we have not been too sensitive about it from the standpoint of whether we have liked the policies of control which have been applied; because, had we, in our history, been very sensitive about it, we would not have recognized certain Central American and South American countries following certain revolutions in times past. But, by and large, I think we have a pretty good record with respect to that criterion.

The second major criterion is, Is the Government seeking recognition accepted by the people under its jurisdiction? I suppose if we wanted to apply that criterion, keeping in mind the police-state methods used by Red China, we would have to conclude that she is accepted by the people under her police-state control; because they are given a very simple choice—either accept her jurisdiction, or die. The best information we have is that China is not wasting very much food these days on people in concentration camps who do not accept the jurisdiction of the Communists. We have a pretty good military intelligence agency—and it is proper for me to say this on the floor of the Senate

today, because I disclose no secret by saying it—and our information is that mass murder by the thousands has characterized the police-state methods of Red China in those areas in which there has been resistance to the acceptance of the jurisdiction of that Government.

Mr. President, if we were to consider only the two criteria which I have mentioned and which have generally been followed by our Government, I suppose Red China might be able to make a case for herself, in that she controls the territory and is accepted by the masses of the people within her jurisdiction.

But, ah, there is a third criterion. It has been the diplomatic policy of the United States not to recognize a claimed de facto government unless it can give evidence that it will keep its international commitments. In that regard the record of Red China reminds me of an unfertile goose egg, or, to use another figure of speech, a big cipher, a zero. We look in vain in the record of the Government of Red China for any evidence that we can rely upon her to keep her international agreements. That is why I have been consistent in my position that I do not favor the recognition of Red China until after the passage of time, it can be proved on the record that in taking a position in the family of nations she will live up to her international commitments. That is where I have disagreed—I have said this many times—with the British policy of recognition of Red China. I think the British made a tremendous mistake. I should like to say from the floor of the United States Senate today a word to our friends in the British Parliament. They are our friends: We can disagree with them all we want to on various issues, but do not count out the British as our friends, for they have the Anglo-Saxon traditions, thank God, of free speech, free argument, and the free expression of differences of opinion, and we should not, if we would, have it any other way. But I disagree with the British on the question of the recognition of Red China. I think they have greatly complicated the entire Asiatic situation by going along with the recognition of Red China without full consultation with the Allies in the common cause of saving freedom in Asia.

I am not saying, Mr. President, and I do not want any Britisher in the House of Commons to imply tomorrow that I did say, that we had any right to ask them to consult with us and try to work out an agreement with us before they recognized Red China. Of course, they had the sovereign right of a great and independent nation to recognize Red China if they wanted to, but in doing so they should have known that they let down a great ally—the United States—because they should have known and do know, and we can take judicial notice of that fact, that we would not retreat from our position of refusing to recognize an alleged de facto government until it had given some evidence that it could be counted upon to live up to its international commitments.

So I emphasize the point, Mr. President, that I do not believe we should recognize Red China. There is the probability—and this is what many persons in our country do not like to hear, but I do not walk away from reality—there is the probability that in due course of time, I do not know how many years, Red China will be recognized. I do not know what kind of a Red China it will be at that time. I pray to my Creator that it will be a different Red China from what it is now. In fact, I hope we can take out of the descriptive term of that China the word "Red."

The American people should recognize, Mr. President, that with the passage of time—maybe 10, 20, 30, 50 years; I do not know how many years—we will have to face whatever changes may occur in China, and that we cannot forever follow a closed-door diplomatic policy. For the present, however, I want to keep the door closed, and I shall defend keeping it closed; but I want to warn the people in my speech that, of course, eventually the door will have to be opened.

There is one other thing I do not believe; namely, that we can win a peace by means of war. That is one of the most difficult points of view to get an emotionally aroused people to understand. Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President; there is not a Member of the Senate who, in carrying out his duties in the Senate, will fight harder than I will to win if we should become involved in a third world war.

A part of the difficulty in the thinking of many persons today is that those who fail to think in terms of a war psychology are regarded as a little strange. If we think in terms of winning a peace short of a war, we are at least idealists. That is the kindest thing people will say about us—idealists or theorists. Otherwise they will say some unkind smear things about us.

I should like to ask the American people from this desk today a few hypothetical questions, because I think if they will ponder those questions they may have a little better understanding of why I say we are not going to win peace through a war.

Suppose we get into an all-out war, with or without allies—and I think, as of now, if we do not watch out we will get into it without very many allies. I believe we can win it militarily. We can knock out Russia. I desire to say to the American people, "I think you have the right to stop worrying, in spite of all the scare arguments being fed to you about our ability to knock out Russia, if what is meant by knocking her out is leveling her cities or destroying her ability to carry on for very long an aggressive war. We are not going to do it without some tremendous losses in the United States, in my judgment, but we are going to win that kind of a military victory. I am not so sure that we will not win it with relative speed."

Russia knows this, so I disclose no secret. The fact that we can stand on a great air base closer to Moscow than Mexico City is to Washington, D. C., affords some indication of what I mean when I say I am not greatly alarmed about the fear arguments as to whether we can knock out Russia, so far as leveling her major cities and destroying her war potential and production are concerned.

Mr. President, will that give us peace? Stop fooling yourself, if you think so. We can knock out the major cities of China, and relatively quickly, but will it give us peace? Let those who think so stop fooling themselves. Read history. How are we going to get the American people and their leaders to pause long enough in these hysterical times to reflect on the facts of history?

Have we in the United States really reached such a condition that we have dulled ourselves by the same old political opiate that dulled the sensitivities of other civilizations in centuries gone by, and that caused them to strew themselves on the pages of history as wrecked civilizations? What was the opiate? The opiate was a sense of national supremacy, through injections of which they developed illusions and delusions that they were greater than the rest of the world.

Mr. President, what is shocking to me is that there are in America today powerful forces and millions of people who obviously believe that we are bigger than the rest of the world, and that we ought to call the shots, lay down the rules, determine the policies, and that the rest of the world should salute us and fall in line. Whenever any civilization adopted such a complex of blind nationalism, it soon became a fallen civilization in the history of mankind.

What happened to them will not happen to us overnight if we follow that course of action, but we in this country had better begin thinking in terms of time. Too many of our leaders and too many of our people are thinking only in terms of the immediate present, forgetting that there is something about the great, immutable force of civilization that evolves throughout the generations and is unstoppable. On the walls of history we find scribbled the record of decay of civilizations that did not understand the import of the passage of time.

We Americans are "overnighters." We see something that ought to be done, and we say, "This is the way to do it. Let us go about doing it.

"What is the matter with you, Nehru? Why do you not see it that way, too, and do it?"

We stand on the floor of the Senate and criticize the head of the government of an oriental nation having a culture, a tradition, and a point of view so unlike ours that we are talking a different language, not only in language form, but in intellectual meaning.

A revolution is going on in the world. It is not a political revolution in every area. It is political in the Soviet part of the world, but in the free part of the world the revolution is not political. In this revolution, the masses, by and large, have not the slightest conception of the differences between communism and democracy, between freedom and enslavement.

There are differences of skin, color, culture, social, values, and religious faiths; but there is always the great common denominator of the same human instincts, because all peoples were created by the same Creator, in the same image. We have the same great divine purpose, too. We overlook that. When a spirit of nationalism takes over a

people, watch out, for that people is dulling its sensitivity to divine purposes.

There is also another common denominator we had better keep in mind, because the great social and human forces of mankind, which we see evolving ahead of us in our day, will come to a common understanding, not now, but through evolutionary processes in the passage of time. That is what we must face, but we Americans simply do not want to face that ugly reality, because we are overnighters. I think that is why we shall have to keep ourselves strong. That is why I have voted, and shall continue to vote, for every appropriation which can be shown to be needed to keep my country so strong in defense that the Soviet world cannot successfully attack.

I recognize that the function of the military in the great revolution of the century ahead is primarily a function of defense, not a function of policy making. I would get the military out of policy making. I would keep them in their true role, the role of defense. I would leave the question of policy making to the civilian heads of government, to students of government, to those who recognize that if we are to win the peace, we will not win it through military destruction. We will win it on the economic front.

So to return to my hypothetical question: Suppose all the major cities of Russia were leveled? I think we could level them. Suppose we leveled all the major cities of China, and I think we could do that in a relatively short time. It would be bloody, terribly bloody, for them, and no tea party for us; but what would happen then? Mr. President, do you think we would have peace?

Let us Americans look at our nature, at our culture, at our ethical values, at our preponderant devotion to Christian principles, or, in the case of other religious faiths, such as the Jewish faith, to a faith, nevertheless, in a great Divine Being, out of which faith stems the Christian faith. After all, from this faith in one God stem most of the ethical and humanitarian standards of the American people. We could no more walk away from those standards of ethical values after we had won the military victory than one could walk away from his own dying child begging for a glass of water. Of course we would not walk away. We could not if we would; but let us stay for a moment with the phase of the hypothetical which deals with the question, Would we? Of course we would not. With the chaos such a war would cause in China, Russia, and elsewhere in the world, we know what we would do. Our humanitarian impulses would cause us to do everything possible to relieve suffering, rebuild cities, and try to establish a world order of good will among men.

We could not do it for a dime. That is why I bleed from my heart, figuratively speaking, when I hear people say to me, as they too frequently say, "Let us get on with the business of this war and get it over with." I say to businessmen who talk to me like that, "What kind of business do you think you are going to operate when that war is over?"

Once before I said on the floor of the Senate—and I think it deserves repeating today—that I shall never forget what Jim Forrestal once said before the Armed Services Committee. He said:

> The paradox of another world war will be that we shall fight it to save freedom in the world, and we shall lose it here at home, not only for the duration of the war, but for a long time thereafter, in the sense that we shall fight it with a totally regimented economy for the first time in our history.

We have never fought a war with a totally regimented economy, but Jim Forrestal said we would have to fight that war in such a fashion. Moreover, we would not get away from that regimentation for a great many years after the close of that war, if ever. I think there is a great deal of truth in what Jim Forrestal said. I think that such a war, if it comes, will be so total in its nature that the entire American life will be regimented.

When we come—as we shall have to—to occupy great areas of China, Russia, and other parts of the world which will be in turmoil, considering what it has cost us already to occupy Germany, how do we like to contemplate that economic cost? We must think about it. It is easy to wave the flag until it is in tatters; it is not so difficult to stir up a people into a fighting mood; but if we live up to our challenge of statesmanship in the Senate, we must assume an obligation to think decades ahead.

Mr. President, I wish now to say a few words about what I believe. I believe that the peace can be won without a war. I believe that we should try to win it without a war. The first thing I think we ought to try to do is to reach a better understanding with the other free nations of the world, and not drive wedges among them, or between them and ourselves—wedges of misunderstanding, criticism, and charges. That is why, during the recent campaign, when there was so much talk about ending the Korean war, I ventured the suggestion that what we ought to be negotiating was, first, an understanding with our allies. I repeat that suggestion today. We ought at least, to narrow, if not eliminate, the area of disagreement which exists between and among the Allies. It is a large area. Let us not try to gloss it over. I do not think we could gloss it over. Let us not leave with the American people the impression that if we will only lead the other nations will follow. Let us not be so sure of that.

The problem is complicated; it is exceedingly complex. I do not think we are going to narrow or reduce the area of difference among our allies by having two great parliamentary bodies engaging in long-distance debate. The heads of states should get together. I said, in October as I recall, that I thought the place for such negotiations in the first instance would be by way of a trip to the United Nations Building in New York on the part of the foreign ministers of all the free nations, and, no matter how many days or weeks might be required, sitting down and, eliminating diplomatic double-talk, talking with dignity, in terms of stark reality.

In that broadcast speech I remember that I said I wanted to know how big a price England has on Hong Kong. I still want to know. I want to know, for example, how big a price England has on trade with Red China, by way of shipping economic goods into Red China. I care not what the nature of the goods may be, because to the extent they help the economy of Red China they hurt American boys in Korea—and British boys, too. We must come to some understanding about it. We are not going to do it, in my judgment, in any other way than by the heads of states stopping the long-distance debate and closeting themselves together to find out whether we can have real unity, rather than a token unity, with respect to Asiatic policy.

This would involve questions of trade, and questions of tariff. I am rather amused about the questions of tariff these days, and by the talk about "trade, not aid." There is a great deal of lip service to the principle that the greatest defense weapon America has in Europe is not the military forces of NATO at all, important as they are, but is the economic productive power of our allies.

Of course, one of the greatest instruments for promoting world peace revolves around the improvement of the economic productive power of our allies. Yet in American politics today let anyone make a proposal for improving the economic productive power of our allies and see what criticism he receives. The reason we are receiving so much of it, I say most respectfully, is that I think our political leaders are doing a mighty poor job of educating and informing the American people as to the direct relationship between the economic productive power of Italy, France, Germany, and England and the protection of American lives.

Mr. President, do not talk to me about spending defense dollars only at home. It is just as important to be spending some defense dollars in improving the economic productive power of Italy and France and Germany and England, if we want to stop the wave of communism in Europe, as it is to be spending defense dollars in the General Motors plant in Detroit, Mich., in the construction of weapons of war which we must ship overseas, supposedly to be sold to France and Italy and Germany and England, when every Senator knows those countries will never pay for any of it. There will be merely a lot of paper transactions.

It was not so many years ago, following World War I, that we were talking about selling all our surplus property in Europe to the nations of Europe, who were to pay us for it. It was all to be put down in the book of accounts. The check I made on it shows that it is still all in the book of accounts. It is always going to be there. No credits will be recorded.

Mr. President, I do not care to be a party to fooling the American people in that way. When I voted for the military implementation of NATO—and how well I remember what went on behind the scenes at the time we voted on that issue, in the old Supreme Court Chamber, where we were meeting in those days when the NATO treaty was before the Senate—I never had any doubt that

I was voting for an outright grant on the part of the American people of most of the cost of the goods we shipped abroad. Mr. President, history will prove I was right.

I still think it is a very good expenditure of the defense dollar. I think so because freedom is worth the price. I think the preservation of freedom here and the preservation of freedom in Europe is worth the price. I believe it is more important to have freedom for all than to have for some two Cadillacs in garages for the time being.

Mr. President, we should realize that we must win the peace on the economic front. We should realize also that history shows when a nation rises to a great pinnacle of military might and then seeks to follow a course of economic isolationism it falls. Do you know why it falls, Mr. President? Because sooner or later, as history discloses, a combination of the have-not nations defeat the have nation. When a country rises to a great pinnacle of military might and then follows a course of economic isolationism a lot of things happen to its national attitudes, to its national psychology. It makes a great many mistakes in the field of foreign policy. It becomes a little too big for its breeches. It does not have to make very many mistakes before it finds itself either without friends or with allies who start to weaken.

That is why the representative of the Independent Party in the Senate is never going to be afraid to take to the American people the issue of expanding the economics of a capitalistic economy hitched to political democracy for the backward areas of the world, because unless and until we do so there is no hope for permanent peace. There is no hope for world order or peace in our time, or in a hundred years from now, unless the freedom of economic choice for the individual is hitched to the freedom of political democracy, and those two freedoms are brought to the backward areas of the world.

The outlook today is a dark one on that score.

Consider South America, Mr. President. Conditions are not good in South America today. Anti-American feeling in South America is entirely too rampant. I do not know how the idea got abroad there; I do not know what the facts are to support it—and there are probably some facts—but I am satisfied that the people of South America feel we consider them our poor relations, and that we try to extend to them, in the too frequent American tradition, what too many people extend to poor relations.

We must do something about that situation.

Consider Africa, Mr. President. It is no bulwark of freedom. Nor is it a great reserve of allied support for the United States. Fear, suspicion, and distress characterize the thinking of the teeming masses of Africa.

Consider southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I do not think there need be any justification for the weakening of allied strength. We must take the initiative to correct it.

That is why I am making this plea, so far as I am concerned, for some negotiations on the part of our Government with the foreign ministers of the free states, to come to an understanding in the areas of disagreement which exist between and among us, because such disagreements are the greatest impediments to peace in the world today.

I have no doubt as to what Russia will do if she drives a wedge between us and our allies.

Vandenberg so many times warned us against such a thing. He stressed the importance of our maintaining allied unity and playing for time. One of the major doctrines of Vandenberg was we must play for time. He used to talk in terms of a quarter of a century. His thesis was that a police state such as Russia could not hold her dissident groups in subjugation for a quarter of a century.

Mr. President, with that as a general thesis I wish to turn to a specific issue, about which I think there is need for the exercise of great caution on the part of American leaders, and British leaders too, namely, the Korean prisoner of war issue.

I listened to a great speech today made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I agreed with much of it. I shall comment as I go along on a disagreement which I have with an emphasis in his speech, but only with an emphasis, because with so much of the speech I am in agreement. However, I think the emphasis in the speech may result in increasing misunderstanding instead of promoting understanding on the prisoner-of-war issue.

I also listened to the very able speech by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. With parts of it I agree; but I find myself in disagreement with an emphasis in that speech.

Because I am speaking for the record, Mr. President, I wish to review some of the major preliminaries to the Korean war which I think involve mistakes on the part of our Government.

The first mistake I wish to mention is that in 1945, when the United Nations Charter was before the Senate, the Senate rejected a proposal to recognize the provisional government of Korea, a proposal to place the provisional government of Korea under a United Nations mandate, a proposal to put into effect the principle of the self-determination of weaker peoples. That was a major mistake. History will record it as such. However, in 1945, it was not possible to obtain a corporal's guard in the Senate to agree to the recognition of the provisional government of Korea, although in the plea I made at that time—as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show—I argued in the following language:

> If we do not follow this course of action, there is a danger that Korea will fall, as a ripe plum, into Russia's lap.

Elsewhere in that plea on June 28, 1945, I said, in speaking on the floor of the Senate:

> If we do not follow the course of action I am recommending, there is a danger that Korea will become a threat to the peace of Asia.

I could have said, "a threat to the peace of the world," but I said "a threat to the peace of Asia."

Mr. President, I shall never forget that within the following year, Arthur Vandenberg came to me and said, "What did you know about Korea that the rest of us did not know?"

I said, "Absolutely nothing; I do not know much about Korea. But we all know the Russian pattern; and we know that when Russia takes over, she enslaves the satellite that comes under her jurisdiction."

Mr. President, not only did we not recognize the provisional Government of Korea, but we, the United States, joined with Russia in the partition of Korea. Do not ever forget that, Mr. President. That was not a United Nations action. That was not done in concert with our allies. Of course, we rationalized it on the basis of a military-necessity arrangement. But it was wrong in principle; and when we make a mistake in principle, we have to pay a price for it. I believe that is one of the greatest mistakes we have made in recent times—the partition of Korea, when we should have taken the position of recognizing the provisional Government of Korea and urging a United Nations trusteeship or mandate over Korea until free elections could have been held in all of that country.

One of the paradoxes of this situation is that one of the reasons why no support could be obtained in the Senate for recognition of the provisional Government of Korea was that some of my colleagues argued that the Syngman Rhee administration was not very stable. Yet that is the same group we have been supporting in South Korea ever since the partition. Talk about an unfortunate paradox in the diplomatic history of the United States.

With that background, I wish to read, from a United Press dispatch, certain statistics which constitute a major premise which I desire to lay down in discussing the prisoner-of-war issue.

A few hours ago the following came over the United Press ticker:

> American battle casualties in Korea now total 134,958, an increase of 153 over last week's summary, the Defense Department reported. It was the smallest weekly increase since the report of March 26, 1952, when the total increase was 123.
>
> The overall total now includes 24,010 deaths, 98,052 wounded, 9,019 missing, 2,335 captured, and 1,542 previously missing, but returned to military control.
>
> The casualties include those reported from the beginning of the Korean war, through last Friday. There is a 1- to 3-week time lag in making casualty reports, so it does not include all casualties through Friday. The 153 increase includes 109 Army, 5 Navy, 36 Marine Corps, and 3 Air Force.
>
> Broken down by services—Army: 104,585 casualties, out of which there are 19,558 deaths, 73,744 wounded, 7,500 missing, 2,331 captured, 1,452 previously missing, but returned to military control.
>
> Navy: 1,989 casualties, out of which there are 381 deaths, 1,508 wounded, 92 missing, 8 previously missing, but returned to military control.
>
> Marine Corps: 26,933 casualties, 3,568 deaths out of the total, 22,758 wounded, 572 missing, 35 previously missing but returned to military control.
>
> Air Force: 1,451 casualties, out of which there are 503 deaths, 42 wounded, 855 missing, 4 captured, 47 previously missing but returned to military control.

Mr. President, those statistics are the backdrop against which I wish to discuss the Korean-prisoner-of-war issue. I desire to discuss it from the standpoint of the 24,010 American boys who made the supreme sacrifice in Korea. I desire to discuss it from the standpoint of the 98,052 wounded, many of whom will be dismembered for life. I wish to talk about the Korean-prisoner-of-war issue from the standpoint of the background or the backdrop of the 9,019 missing, which you and I know, Mr. President, undoubtedly means for the most part dead and gone, and will eventually be added to the 24,010 already reported known deaths. I desire to discuss the prisoner issue from the standpoint of the 2,335 American boys who are within Red prison camps, undoubtedly suffering the tortures and atrocities about which we are reading every morning and every night in our newspapers, and which are so vividly described by the heroes who have recently been brought back to this country after months spent in prison camps.

I am greatly concerned, Mr. President, about North Korean and Chinese prisoners who read certain leaflets we dropped over the lines, which promised them various sorts of immunity if they would come behind our lines. I am concerned about them; but I am also concerned about a stalemated war in Korea that is resulting week by week in more loss of life among American boys. I say we cannot allow it to go on and expect to justify it on the ground that because we dropped certain leaflets over the Chinese lines, some North Koreans and Red Chinese came behind our lines, and we promised to give them certain protection. I am in favor of our keeping faith with the principle of that promise, Mr. President, but I do not recognize in that promise on the part of the American officials who dropped the leaflets the assumption of any moral obligation on our part to continue to sacrifice American boys in order to protect the Reds in prison camps behind our lines, if an honorable solution can be worked out on the basis of an international judicial process, such as I am going to suggest this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the very able Senator from Oregon believe that the Communist proposal of last Friday constitutes an honorable basis upon which the prisoner-of-war issue can be settled?

Mr. MORSE. I certainly do not; and if the Senator will hear me through, he is going to find that one of the things I am pleading against is the Communist proposal. I told the Senator from Illinois that I agreed with much that he said today. I agree with him that we cannot accept that solution of the prisoner problem. But I do not agree with what I interpreted to be a certain emphasis in the Senator's speech, which I do not believe will be promotive of a better understanding and solution of the problem.

Mr. President, I shall take up the points suggested in the Communist proposal now, since the Senator from Illinois has mentioned them. I said earlier in my speech that I did not think the Russians were acting in good faith; but we must demonstrate that to the world, because we must face the fact that Russia, with her vicious, lying propaganda has fooled millions of people in various parts of the world into thinking that she is carrying on the initiative in the peace offensive, and that it is the United States that is stalling the negotiations for peace. We must change that. We must take the peace offensive away from her. That is why I was so thrilled by the great speech on international policy by the President of the United States not very long ago. I welcomed it. It put us on the initiative—and we ought to remain on the initiative. Let us consider the President's recent speech. The trouble is that he is not implementing the speech. It does no good merely to announce the great principles of the President's speech, and then do nothing about them. In order to implement the principles of the President's speech, we ought to undertake some international negotiations with the foreign ministers of the free nations, as I said earlier this afternoon. I was thrilled at the principles which the President recognized in his speech. The fact that we had heard a good many of them previously—great pronouncements by Truman and by the late Brien McMahon here on the floor of the Senate—did not cause me to think any less of the President's speech, but rather, more of it.

I thought it was wonderful that the President of the United States would place the sanction of the greatest office in the world upon principles we had heard other great leaders of this country enunciate within recent years. I remember the afternoon, as I sat from this seat looking across the aisle at the great Senator from Connecticut, Brien McMahon, no longer with us on this earth, and listened to his thrilling pronouncement of a program for taking the initiative in the peace offensive. It was one of the greatest afternoons I ever experienced in the Senate. Much of the McMahon speech, in principle, was contained in the Eisenhower speech; and we ought to be proud of it.

But I am pleading this afternoon for an implementation of those principles. I am saying that it is necessary to demonstrate to the world that the prisoner proposal of the Soviets is not a good-faith proposal. The Senator from Illinois is correct—the composition of the group that would administer the program is stacked against us. All we ask for is impartiality. We must demonstrate that we are willing to act impartially, and that we ask for impartiality in return. We are not going to get it with the kind of group suggested. That is where the problem with the allies arises. It is not going to do any good to say they should agree with us. To scold them is not going to help the cause we are trying to win. It is not going to advance the cause of peace, Mr. President, to inflame the populations of two great free nations over the prisoner of war issue.

Let us start with a fact or two. Is it true, or is it not true, that the leaders of Great Britain feel that we are too tough, too uncompromising, too fixed in our attitude on the prisoner issue? I do not know. I do not know for a fact whether that is true or not. I would judge from what I hear and read that the British leaders have some rather serious differences with us on the prisoner of war issue.

What does one do in a controversy or dispute between friends, when a misunderstanding or a disagreement develops between them? He tries to talk it out—not fight it out. He tries to get together with the other fellow, to see whether there is common ground upon which it would be possible to modify the respective positions of the parties and still protect every principle that might be thought to be involved. I think we ought to do that.

I do not know whether it is true or not, Mr. President, but what I hear and read leads me to believe that some of our allies—not only the British but some others, and some of our Asiatic allies in particular, such as India—take the position, "Why should we be bound by any leaflets the United States dropped behind Communist lines, if insistence upon being bound by the representations of those leaflets might threaten an all-out war in Asia?" If they are asking that question, let us find out, first of all, whether that is what they believe; and then let us try to get them to see the great humanitarian principles for which the Senator from Illinois pleaded today, in which he referred to—I do not quote him exactly, but I am sure it was his meaning—as a moral commitment on the part of the United States in regard to those leaflets. Let us find out. I simply say it is necessary to sit down and to have some negotiations about the subject. In my judgment, it will do more harm than good if we say to England, no matter how politely, "This is the commitment we are going to insist upon being followed," or say it to India, either, because we are likely to be told, if we take that attitude, "We are not going along." What answer do we hear to the argument that they may not go along?

"All right, then; we will go it alone."

I do not think that is a very rational stand to take. We can go it alone, but it will not promote very much peace. I happen to think the objective on which we ought to have our eyes and from which we should never remove them is the objective of peace.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which standard does the Senator from Oregon regard as the more important, peace or justice?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think they are inconsistent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If there is a conflict between those two objectives?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think we should have peace without justice, or justice without peace. What is there inconsistent about those two concepts? We are talking about the same thing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Should we yield on a matter which we regard as essential to

justice, in spite of the fact that it may involve hostilities?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think we have to yield to have both peace and justice, but I do not take the proposal for implementation as the only procedure by which we can get both peace and justice. I want to talk about some other procedures this afternoon. I say, most respectfully and with endearment, to the Senator from Illinois that, in my judgment, there is great danger that his remarks today will be interpreted by many with the emphasis that we will go it alone if we do not have our way and have our principles interpreted for what we think they are. I believe the Senator does himself an injustice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly that was not my intention. I do not wish to give my remarks any importance they did not possess. What I was seeking to do was to make an appeal, insofar as one can talk across the Atlantic, to the people of Great Britain and to the statesmen of Great Britain, to understand why we regard the Communist's proposal as unfit, because 2 days ago Mr. Churchill said there was no longer any difference in principle between us on the subject of the return of prisoners. He obviously thought that the Communist proposal had removed all differences in principle, whereas I believe, and, apparently, the Senator from Oregon agrees, that the Communist proposal was a cleverly camouflaged set of conditions which, in effect, would have permitted Communist prisoners, Communist guards, and Communist representatives to put pressure upon the known Communists to go back to their respective countries when they really did not want to go.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is all I was trying to do.

Mr. MORSE. I thought that was all the Senator was trying to do, but let me say most respectfully that I think he went beyond that insofar as the interpretation of some of his hearers was concerned. I heard others make the same interpretation I am making, namely, that he left the impression that he was entirely too uncompromising in this matter, as though it were not a situation in which a compromising procedure can be worked out without in any way endangering principle. I say I hope we can work out some compromise in procedures without endangering the principle in which he and I are interested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So long as the principle is carried out that men shall not be coerced against their will to go back when they do not want to go back, I am ready to accept any procedure, but I do not want to be subject to procedures which permit Communists to wash their hands of responsibility while allowing terror to be exercised against prisoners.

Mr. MORSE. Nor do I; nor do I want to continue to sacrifice the lives of American boys because of any failure on the part of my Government to do everything reasonable in trying to work out by way of negotiation some procedure which will protect the principle to which the Senator has referred, a procedure in which there is give and take in conference with our allies and which will accomplish the end of settling the prisoner issue on an honorable basis.

The Senator from Illinois in his speech today pointed out that we have carried the burden of this war to the extent of 90 or 95 percent of its cost and 90 to 95 percent of its manpower, with the exception of South Korea. I have been critical of the failure of our allies to do their share, but I simply say that I do not think it is helpful, on the prisoner issue, to take the position that because we have carried this burden our allies should accept our procedure if they think our procedure is wrong and if they think, using the hypothetical I mentioned before, that we went ahead with unilateral action in connection with the prisoner problem without adequate consultation with them.

I do not believe Great Britain and France have done their share; but talk to Englishmen and to Frenchmen and listen to what they will tell us. They make two great points. I do not think their argument, Mr. President, makes their position any sounder as to the incidents to which they refer than I think we are sound on the attitude we take about our support of the Korean war. The average Englishman will say, "Where were you at the beginning of World War II? From the first day of it, it was your war as much as ours."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Prefatory to the point I have in mind let me say that I was always an interventionist prior to December 7, 1941. There is, however, a great difference between World Wars I and II and the Korean war. There was no world organization in either World War I or World War II which pronounced Germany as aggressor. In the case of Korea there was such a world organization, and Great Britain and other nations joined in declaring North Korea an aggressor. Great Britain, France, and other nations joined in asking all nations to make their contributions, and the united command in the field was established under a mandate from the United Nations. When any decisions were made those who participated in them certainly had a greater responsibility than we had at the outbreak of World War I or of World War II.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Illinois is not making that argument with the expectation that I am going to disagree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope not.

Mr. MORSE. Let me make it very clear that I am only pointing out what the British say. I prefaced my remarks by saying I did not think it was a very sound argument, but I think we ought to have on the record what they say. There now sits in the chair, presiding over this body, a man who has represented this country in a great many international conferences, and he knows as well as I do the attitude of some of our allies.

That attitude on the part of some of our allies happened to be with regard to what we did or did not do at the beginning of World War II. They simply think we came in too late. They are very glad we came in. They recognized that we came in and not only saved them but also saved ourselves. But that is their attitude.

The British and the French have another argument. They say:

> You are carrying a terrific burden in Korea, but we are carrying a terrific burden in Indochina, Malaya, and across north Africa, particularly in Egypt. In view of our weakened condition following the war, our debilitated manpower, our limited resources, we are not greatly moved by your argument that we have not been carrying a sufficient burden in the Korean war.

I am not making that argument for them; I am simply relating in the Senate this afternoon that that is a common British and French argument.

Of course, I think there is a little psychological attitude, too, which certainly I do not condone, but I believe it exists in the world picture. Some of our allies will not admit it publicly, but they take note of the fact that it is interesting to see the United States on the receiving end first, for once.

In my judgment, Mr. President, all these considerations indicate how important it is that leaders of this Government at the White House and State Department levels proceed with some international negotiations with our allies first, to try to reach common agreement and understanding of the procedures to be followed. Let us not continue the practice of shooting from the hip first, because we have been doing too much of that since January 20, and we have had to do some backtracking. Compare Secretary Dulles' testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations before and after he went to Europe. Consider the tenor and emphasis of his statements of policy. There is quite a difference between his testimony before he went and his testimony after he returned. Mr. President, do you know why I think so? He did not do a very good job of selling the foreign policy that was enunciated in the state of the Union message.

All I am saying is that now is the time, before it is too late, to iron out some differences with our allies. I said I would propose a procedure. I claim no great merit for it, except that I think it would work if some "ifs" could be met. I proposed it before. I do not wish to be misunderstood about this, but I am not so sure that the whole question of war prisoners should not be taken out of the hands of the military. I am not ready to say that it should be, but I am saying that some consideration had better be given to it. I think it is probably true that the war-prisoner issue is bound up with the whole question of peace in Asia, although I have always been suspicious that if Russia did not have this issue, she would find another one. However, I do not think we can give up hope, and we cannot afford to give up hope. If there is any basis for the hope that settling the prisoner issue would bring peace in Asia, then I think we had better look at the question from all possible angles of negotiation, and perhaps we ought to try to take it out of the hands of the military. I do not know anything about negotiating a settlement on the question of war prisoners, but I do not believe it is of such an innate nature that only mili-

tary men can negotiate it. As I understand, most international agreements on the handling of prisoner problems are negotiated by foreign ministers.

We have a new President, occupying a great civilian role; we have a Secretary of State, occupying a great civilian role. They can have all the advice they wish from their military advisers, but I wonder if we might not make a little more progress on the prisoner issue if we tried, in conjunction with our allied friends in the United Nations, who, at least theoretically, are parties with us in the Korean war, to settle the question through a conference of foreign ministers.

That is one procedure I think ought to be considered. I am not saying it is the one that should be adopted. The fact is that the military negotiations to date, after many, many months, do not seem to have brought us any nearer a solution than when they were started. There may be no cause-to-effect relationship, and I do not claim that there is, but I think that at least the situation ought to be examined, to determine whether or not there is a possibility that there might be a settlement.

I think it was Newton Baker, when he was Secretary of War, who said—I quote his meaning, not his words—that when it comes to the settlement of peace, policies are not determined by the military.

I have another suggested procedure, which I think I mentioned about a month ago. I mentioned it at the time when Russia went along with the idea of having a great Swedish statesman serve as Secretary General of the United Nations. What I believe we ought to be looking for all the time is the opportunity to take the initiative away from Russia. We should keep her back on her heels in the offensive for peace. Keep the play away from her all the time. Call her bluff; call her hand. That is why I suggested a month ago that we should consider, procedurewise, consulting with our allies in offering to select two negotiators in behalf of the Allies, let Russia and her satellites pick two, and then say to the Swedish Government, "You select the fifth, and we will submit the prisoner issue to this international tribunal and abide by its decision."

I can hear the arguments that may be used against that proposal. Perhaps it will be said, "It may get us into a position where the principle which we think is very important may not be sustained by the tribunal."

Or the suggestion may be subjected to the criticism: "This might be interpreted as a face-saving procedural device to get us out of a very difficult situation."

But I do not believe those are objections of substance.

I sat here in years gone by and listened to some great speeches by Vandenberg, Connally, Austin, and Barkley with respect to establishing a system of international justice through law. There is a principle the soundness of which, idealistic though it is, cannot be questioned. Let us start trying it. It might work. We might be dumfounded. We might discover that the world is so weary of war, and that the people of the world are so desirous in their hearts of peace, that a simple proposal for the settlement of some great international issue which is threatening the peace of the world, a proposal to do it by way of a procedure of international justice through law, might work. At least we ought to try it. That is all I am pleading for.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator given some consideration to the fact that it might serve some purpose to stop the shooting while we are trying to negotiate on the question of prisoner exchange?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I am coming to that point. I do not accept the notion that we must have an agreement before the shooting stops. I think that argument is unsound. I apreciate the Senator's question. I will come to that point. I am about through. That is the last point I wish to cover.

Mr. President, I happen to believe that ideals are great realities. I believe that some of the most dangerous unrealities are the so-called practicalities. One of the arguments is that it is not practical to settle great international problems with reason. We must rattle the sword. I do not believe it. We should keep ourselves strong enough so that we can use force if we are compelled to do so, but I still think that the divine gift of reason is a greater weapon for obtaining peace than the divine gift of muscle. Let me repeat that. I still think that the divine gift of reason is a more effective weapon for obtaining peace than the divine gift of muscle.

I am pleading this afternoon for a greater use of reason and less threatening of the use of muscle. I am pleading along the lines of the implications of the question of the Senator from Louisiana—that we stop the shooting of American boys because I do not accept the notion that we must have some agreement for the unification of Korea before the shooting is stopped. There are many people in many countries who say, "Why did you not think of that before you joined in partitioning Korea? You are in a rather paradoxical and inconsistent situation, are you not, Uncle Sam? It was you, along with Russia, who partitioned Korea in the first instance." That is one of the ugly realities of the world situation. We are going to have to negotiate about that.

The last point I wish to make is that we had better face the very serious danger that we may maneuver ourselves into such a position that we shall be compelled to go it alone in Asia. Then what? I can hear the speeches. Mr. President, you can almost sit there at the desk and write them out. You know what will be said. Of course, we shall mean it. There is nothing we would not do to win such a war. We shall say—and we shall mean it—"Fight we will, if fight we must," as great patriots before us have said. But I want to say this afternoon that I do not think we have too much time. I do not think we are going to remain on dead center very long. I do not think that it is in our interest to let Russia observe that serious differences are developing between and among the Allies. We may be going it alone sooner than we expect.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have been listening attentively to the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I do not agree with some of the things he has said, as the Senator knows. However, I have been particularly impressed with his statement about reason rather than muscle. When I was a member of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Oregon was appointed chairman of a subcommittee dealing with the exhibition of certain pictures which were being shown. Later he was appointed to be in charge of arrangements for the disposition of the famous Austrian horses. Of course, that subject is of infinitesimal importance as compared with what the Senator is discussing—the prisoner-of-war issue. The Senator understands that.

Mr. MORSE. I understand. I appreciate the Senator's question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator and I reasoned with one of the greatest military geniuses this country ever produced, Gen. Lucius Clay. The Senator and I talked over the radiophone with him when he was in Berlin. While the Senator and I differ on many issues, I wish to commend his statements on this question. I am particularly impressed by his statement with respect to reasoning being of greater value than muscle. I say that in all sincerity.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from South Carolina very much.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator well remembers the conversations we had. In the days to which I refer, we were applying the rule of reason in connection with minor matters. However, the rule proved to be correct.

Mr. MORSE. I well remember the shoulder-to-shoulder support we gave each other in connection with every major question which came before the Armed Services Committee. Never during my service with the Senator from South Carolina on the Armed Services Committee did he and I disagree on a major issue before that committee, involving the defense of our country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Together we visited Fort Knox, and many of the other camps.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am about to close, by emphasizing my last point.

I think there is great danger we may give the world the impression that we are going to lay down the program in Asia, and that either it must be complied with or we are going to go it alone. In my judgment we shall never win the peace in that way. I think the danger of that strategy is that our people may be thrown into a war which we do not need to fight.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. The great danger is that we shall be thrown into a war which we do not need to fight. I think we can lick Russian communism around the world on the economic front by following a strong defense policy militarily

and a very aggressive economic policy by using enlightened capitalism, to provide a better way of economic life for millions of people now in revolt.

I say to the American people today that it happens to be in our national self-interest, in my judgment, to follow that kind of policy. I intend to keep my mind open to the presentation of any facts which warrant modifications in any of the views I have expressed this afternoon. But I have been so deeply moved by the dangers of war as I see the war clouds gathering on the horizons of the world today that I think we who bear the responsibilities of statesmanship, ought to be talking and thinking and acting in terms of peace. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether it is not true that in the effort to get unity among the Allies, the Truman administration made great concessions to our allies, particularly Great Britain? For example, we did not permit any bombing beyond the Yalu River, although there was terrific pressure inside this country for such bombing; we have permitted a large degree of British trade with Red China when, as the Senator from Oregon has stated, such trade has been directly adverse to the war effort in Korea, and has resulted in the loss of American lives; and we have been willing to accept a neutral commission on the prisoner-of-war issue, which included countries that are in no practical position to resist pressure from Russia. Have we not done almost everything to preserve the unity of our allies?

I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether there is not also an obligation on the part of our allies to understand our position, and to realize that those of us who feel very strongly on the prisoner-of-war issue are not warmongers, but believe there is a great moral principle involved, and also that if we force prisoners, either directly or indirectly, to go back to their country against their will, we will never again get desertions from Communist-held countries in the future?

I ask my good friend from Oregon to consider those facts before he says the American policy has been inflexible.

Mr. MORSE. That is quite a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but the Senator from Oregon has been making quite a speech.

Mr. MORSE. I hope so. I shall take up the question point by point, as I remember the points.

Let us take the matter of concessions with respect to the Yalu River. It is news to me that it was ever the official policy of our Government to bomb beyond the Yalu River. I hope it was never our policy. That was not my understanding of the Truman policy. To the contrary, the President took the position that we should not follow that course of action, not as any concession to the British, but because he was advised, here in the Pentagon, that such a course of action would undoubtedly get us into what was called in those days an all-out war in Asia, when, first, we were not in a position to fight such a war, and, second, we should not follow such a policy even if we were in a position to fight such a war.

Therefore, I respectfully disagree with the observation of the Senator from Illinois that we made a concession to the British in regard to bombing beyond the Yalu River. I think what is confusing the Senator from Illinois is that at that time the British also took the position that there should not be any bombing beyond the Yalu River, but I do not think there was any concession involved.

Let us take the next point of the Senator's question, the one regarding trade.

I have stood shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Illinois on the floor of the Senate on that question, I do not know how many times since the Korean war broke out, deprecating British trade with China. I am still against it. I have made a little study of the subject and I do not agree with the Senator from Illinois, if he wishes to leave the impression by his question that we really have done a very good job of negotiating with the British on that broad issue, and I do not think they have done a good job of it, either. Oh, we have been doing a little talking about it, but I do not believe we have ever said to Great Britain, "Now, listen, top officials of the American State Department and other Government officials ask for some top level negotiations on this whole question of trade." I do not think we have done that. I have pleaded for it. I have taken it up with officials of the State Department, not once, but many times. On the basis of those conversations I make the statement this afternoon that I do not believe it follows from what the Senator from Illinois says that we have done, nor has Great Britain done, all that ought to have been done in connection with a thorough negotiation of that subject.

Let us consider the next suggestion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have refrained from imposing a naval blockade on the China coast, which would have had the effect of stopping British trade with Red China, and we have refused to do it largely, I suppose, not merely because of the technical difficulties involved but because we did not wish to endanger our alliance or friendship with Great Britain.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder whether we did not do it also, in part, because Admiral Sherman under oath testified that to do it would constitute an act of war. A blockade raises difficult questions. I remember cross-examining Admiral Sherman on the subject.

I asked him, "Admiral, how do you enforce a blockade?"

As the record will show—and we have the testimony—he said, "You enforce it with guns. You sink ships."

We were confronted with two very serious historical facts. One was that the British Union Jack has never been known to respect a blockade on the high seas when it thought a British ship was where it had a right to be. The other was that the history of Russia shows that Russia has always fought when there was an invasion of her territory. Admiral Sherman was of the opinion, as was the case with most of our top officers in the Pentagon, that Russia looked at Port Arthur and Dairen as so connected with Russian territorial rights that Russia would be in very much the same position we would be in if Russia spread a blockade outside San Francisco Harbor.

I desire to say to my friend from Illinois that I believe the reason we have not imposed a unilateral blockade of China is because the judgment of our leaders was that the chances were very great—in fact, all the odds were in favor of it—that such a course of action would assure an all-out war in Asia; and it was our policy not to get into an all-out war in Asia.

That is one of the things I am pleading against this afternoon.

There is still great danger of an all-out war in Asia. It may come; and, believe me, if it comes we will fight. However, I am saying that time is of precious value, and that these are days and weeks and months when we ought to be getting together with our allies in negotiating conferences, and not engaging in international debates. Does the Senator from Illinois wish to ask me another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that there must be accommodation on both sides?

Mr. MORSE. There can be no question about that. In speaking of negotiation and of applying the rules of reason through the application of the principle of international justice by law, I am speaking of give and take without the sacrifice of principle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that such process should not occur only between diplomats, but also between peoples, and that to the extent such discussions in the Senate and in the House of Parliament have any value, they are discussions between peoples?

Mr. MORSE. What kind of accommodation are we going to have between peoples unless the discussion results in enlightenment? If the discussion merely makes the British more pro-British and the Americans more pro-American, what have we done to help the cause of peace?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Oregon imply that the Senator from Illinois this afternoon spoke in a fashion to set back the cause of peace?

Mr. MORSE. I said to the Senator from Illinois that my chief difference with him was not so much with what he said, but how he said it, because I believe he left a false emphasis which I do not believe he intended to leave. He has made very clear that he had no such intention, but I wish to say that I think there is danger that his speech will be so interpreted.

The Senator from Illinois and I are such good friends that I think I can ask him if he knows what I think there is a danger of appearing tomorrow in the British newspapers? I think there is danger that tomorrow there will appear in the British newspapers a statement that "DOUGLAS attacks Great Britain on the floor of the United States Senate."

That is what I think there is danger of; and such a statement in the British newspapers will not help any.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is indulging in

suppositions as to what will appear in the British newspapers.

In the first place, I do not think the British newspapers will regard my speech as having the importance which the Senator from Oregon ascribes to it. In the second place, I think the British reporters are fair.

Mr. MORSE. But let us not forget that they are British newspaper reporters, and in their journalistic reportings they do not differ a great deal from American newspaper reporters.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not casting any reflection on American newspaper reporters. In referring to the British newspaper reporters, I simply say they are British reporters.

Mr. MORSE. Of course in making my point I meant no injustice to the Senator from Illinois. I simply think there is need for a different emphasis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course I want the free world to stand together; but we should stand together in defense of freedom, and we should stand together in defense of the individual. We should not move together in acquiescence to tyranny.

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. France and Britain stood together after Munich, but it was a rather inglorious company in which they were joined.

Mr. MORSE. I realize that. I have heard the Munich argument by analogy made today. It makes a good argument, but I do not think it is very applicable to this situation. I do not know of anyone who proposes a Munich. I think the Senator from Illinois is very unfair if he implies that the British leaders are proposing a Munich in Asia. I think the way to meet them on the position they took in the House of Commons—and I do not agree with the position they took there—is to say to them, "Very well; sit down with us; we have some proposals for procedure to work out with you. Let us see how far you will go in carrying out the four freedoms, to which you are a party, but which are only empty words unless they are based on a sound procedure for international justice through law."

As the Senator from Illinois has pointed out, the handling of prisoners involves a question of international justice.

But let me ask the Senator from Illinois to consider the problem we have in the case of the vicious Russian propaganda regarding the prisoner-of-war issue and the statements the Russians have made regarding the Geneva Convention. I think those statements are lies. But does the Senator from Illinois doubt for a moment that the Russians have made propaganda "hay" in India, Africa, and South America on the basis of their talk to the effect that we have not followed the Geneva Convention in the handling of the prisoner problem in Korea?

Of course there is nothing in the Geneva Convention that says leaflets cannot be dropped and that prisoners cannot elect not to return. The statements the Russians have made in that connection are simply Russian propaganda.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Geneva Convention deals with the handling of prisoners after they have been captured.

Mr. MORSE. I am talking about the Russian propaganda.

Mr. DOUGLAS. One of the first rules of civilized warfare is that pressure or terror should not be used upon prisoners.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; and in that connection we have to state the facts, in order to show that we have not used pressure or terror. That is what I am talking about when I speak of taking the initiative against Russia.

We also have to meet the vicious, lying propaganda the Russians have issued to the effect that we have used pressure on the prisoners in our prisoner-of-war camps to get them to say they do not wish to return to China. That is the kind of rot the Russians have been feeding out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are perfectly willing to have neutrals freely examine the prisoners, and we are willing to send back those who wish to go back. Indeed, we are willing to send back those who do not wish to go back, but who would not resist repatriation. We have refused to repatriate only those who have said they would use violence to resist repatriation. So the "lukewarm" would be returned, as well as those who wish to return.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I think we should get together with the British and should make crystal clear to them what our position is, and should offer them a specific procedural proposal for protecting the principles of justice to which the Senator from Illinois addressed himself. Then we should say to the leaders of Great Britain, "What is wrong with it? Why don't you support it?"

Mr. DOUGLAS. I heartily agree with the Senator from Oregon. That is what I was trying to do in my poor, feeble efforts on the floor of the Senate earlier today. But I think Mr. Churchill is greatly mistaken when he says there is no longer any difference in principle between the Communists and the United States, because of the Communist offer of last Friday, which would permit the Communist "goon" squads to exercise, within the prisoner-of-war camps, terror upon the non-Communists, and would put Czechoslovak and Polish guards inside the camps, and would permit north China, North Korea, and Communist China to send "explainers," who really would be terrorists. It would permit all those forces to play upon the groups of prisoners of war who do not wish to return; and, of course, there would be no surety that, at the end, those who refused to return would be freed, but they would merely face the prospect of almost indefinite confinement in the camps.

I do not regard that as an honest offer; and I do not think the Senator from Oregon regards it as an honest offer.

Therefore, I think Mr. Churchill could not have understood the offer, when he said it removed all differences in principle between the Communist position and the United States position.

Mr. MORSE. I do not disagree at all with the last remarks made by the Senator from Illinois.

At the beginning of my speech, I really said so. I do not disagree with the position of the Senator from Illinois on this Communist peace proposal. I think it is a vicious proposal, and we cannot go along with it. I think Mr. Churchill is wrong in saying there is no difference in principle.

What I have tried to say in my speech this afternoon—and I close with this remark, Mr. President—is that I am making some specific suggestions. I am suggesting that the way to meet the British situation is to offer a procedure that the British cannot reject on the basis of the laws of reason. I think we must show the British people that we offer a fair solution of the prisoner problem, and that we are not taking a position that "Either you accept our proposals, or we will go it alone," because I do not think we shall preserve peace in Asia by "going it alone."

Last of all, Mr. President, in my speech this afternoon, I have sought to suggest once again to the American people that we, too, have an obligation to substitute the use of the rules of reason for the use of muscle. We have an obligation to keep faith with our promise to the world that our goal is a goal of international justice through law.

That is why I again proposed this afternoon what many persons will say amounts to a form of international arbitration of the prisoner issue. However, Mr. President, I submit that, as I have outlined my suggestion, it amounts to one to submit the matter to a tribunal, and it gives every hope that a decision based on impartiality will be rendered, which is all we have a right to request or demand.

RECESS

Mr. WELKER. I move that the Senate now take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of May 12) 1953:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Robert E. McLaughlin, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1955, vice James H. Flanagan, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Albina R. Cermak, of Ohio, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Leonard G. Hagner, of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware, vice William Marvel, term expired.

Wendell A. Miles, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan, vice Joseph F. Deeb, resigned.

Leonard Page Moore, of New York, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York, vice Frank J. Parker, resigning.

James Major Baley, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina, vice Thomas A. Uzzell, Jr., resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of May 12), 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Horace A. Hildreth, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Catherine B. Cleary, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. John R. Hardin (colonel, Corps of Engineers) to be a member and President of the Mississippi River Commission.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Julius J. Hoffman to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois. (New position.)

Win G. Knock to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois. (New position.)

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Albert Cole, of Massachusetts, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Carroll L. Meins, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 1953

The House met at 11 a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in this brief moment of prayer and meditation, may we be refreshed and renewed in spirit and inspired to dedicate and devote ourselves more resolutely and wholeheartedly to the doing of Thy will.

Grant that, in these tense days, when nerves are taut and we are in danger of cracking up under the pressure of life, we may learn the secret of patience, poise, peace, and power in hearing and heeding Thy voice when Thou dost say, "Be still and know that I am God."

God forbid that we should ever yield to the devastating feeling that life is futile and not worthwhile but before we are at our own wits' end may we have the grace and the wisdom to follow and try the way of our blessed Lord.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] be granted an indefinite leave of absence because of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under prevailing trade laws, unlimited quantities of foreign residual oil may be imported into this country regardless of the adverse effects on domestic industry and American workers. As a consequence, thousands of miners and railroaders are unemployed, and whole communities are suffering severe economic depression.

The President has asked that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be extended in its present form for a full year. Apparently he is willing to retain the status quo for our coal areas, regardless of the widespread distress that becomes progressively worse with the rise in shipments of foreign residual oil into this country.

I therefore feel that the Congress must assume the responsibility of enacting equitable legislation for the protection of our labor groups and our industries. Regardless of the glowing promises in the administration's long-term plans, it is heartless to permit the suffering among our coal and railroad groups to be continued. To extend such conditions for as much as a year would be abhorrent. It is difficult for families in affected areas to obtain the proper food essential to good health. They are entirely unable, with their incomes restricted to unemployment compensation or relief, to purchase clothing and necessary household items. With each additional month that they are unemployed, the situation is aggravated.

To me it appears strange that a year's study is needed when we already have ample evidence of the damage wrought upon the coal industry by residual-oil imports. Committees of both Senate and House made studies of the situation after 75 million barrels of residual oil were shipped into the United States in 1949. At those hearings it was learned that upward of 25,000 miners lost their jobs or had their working time reduced as a result of the loss of coal markets to foreign oil. In 1952, residual-oil imports were 75 percent more than the amount of the 1949 imports.

Why must we permit our people to be the victims of a policy which, by the President's own statement, is so questionable that a long investigation is in order? Should not our own people receive the benefit of any doubt which the President may have about this policy?

I recommend that the Congress enact a law restricting residual-oil imports to 5 percent of domestic demand for the corresponding quarter of the previous calendar year—a provision that is included in the bill now before the House Ways and Means Committee. If another long study is necessary, as is claimed, our people should at least be given the opportunity to earn a living in the meanwhile.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ) was granted permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Angell	Hays, Ohio	Sieminski
Baker	Hull	Simpson, Pa.
Barrett	Johnson	Small
Bennett, Mich.	Kearns	Smith, Miss.
Boykin	Krueger	Smith, Va.
Brown, Ohio	McIntire	Sutton
Bush	Miller, Calif.	Taylor
Carlyle	O'Neill	Warburton
Dempsey	Poulson	Williams, Miss.
D'Ewart	Rabaut	Withrow
Feighan	Reece, Tenn.	Wolcott
Gubser	Roberts	
Hart	Shafer	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5174) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, which was read the first and second times, and with the accompanying report referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. GARY reserved all points of order on the bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday, May 19, 1953, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to address the House today for 20 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SUBMERGED LANDS ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up the House Resolution 233, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the consideration of this rule because it attempts to make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 5134, which is a bill to amend a nonexisting act.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the point of order that has been raised by the gentleman from Ohio is not one within the jurisdiction of the Chair, but is a question for the House to decide, whether it wants to consider such legislation.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already ruled.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who is opposed to this rule, although there may be two or three. I have no requests for time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I do not want to take any time at this point but I do not want the gentleman's remarks to remain unchallenged that there is no one opposed to the rule, because I expect to vote against the rule and I know of several others who will vote against the rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say I know of no other person.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we are asked to do something which is rather unprecedented this morning, most anomalous, in my humble opinion. You may recall that we passed the so-called offshore bill which contained three titles, three separate titles, I, II, and III. Title I involved definitions. Title II appertained to submerged minerals seaward to traditional State boundaries. Title III appertained to the minerals seaward from the State boundaries outward to the Continental Shelf. In the Senate title III was stricken from the bill.

I repeat, title III appertains to the mineral deposits in the lands seaward from the traditional State boundaries clear to the Continental Shelf. Ordinarily bills passed differently in the two bodies would go to conference and the conference would resolve or attempt to resolve the differences between the two Houses; instead, this rule, as a result of an agreement, would make in order the consideration by this body of the Senate bill which, as I said, contains only title I and title II which appertain to the offshore deposits from the low-water mark to the traditional State boundary.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I have only 5 minutes and have not yet expressed what I wanted to say to the House, but I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I just wanted to say to the gentleman that the Senate bill which contains title I and title II is not made in order by this rule; this rule makes in order the bill dealing with so-called title III, or lands on the Continental Shelf beyond the traditional State boundaries.

Mr. CELLER. I am referring to the second rule which also was passed by the Rules Committee and which we shall next consider. The first rule is for H. R. 5134—the Graham bill. We are confronted this morning with two rules, one referred to making in order the Senate bill, and the present or instant rule making in order consideration of a bill H. R. 5134 which refers to title III primarily but which was given scant attention by the Judiciary Committee to which it was referred.

It might be argued that title III was debated fore and aft when the general bill was before us, but I will say that the administration—and I turn my attention to those on my left—the administration officials who appeared before our committee indicated that they wanted a bundle bill; they wanted a bill containing all these titles. They stated that they did not want them to be considered separately—title I and title II as distinguished from title III.

The point was raised by the gentleman from Ohio that we are actually attempting in this bill to amend something that is nonexistent.

This bill, this H. R. 5434 would amend the so-called Submerged Lands Act, but there is presently no Submerged Lands Act in existence. In my long experience in the House I do not remember when we were called upon to do just that: namely amend an act not yet passed. There may have been some exceptions during the war because of the emergency, when we did that. We did unusual acts during the war in the interest of speed. But what is the need for hurrying now? I can conceive of no reason for rushing this bill, as was the case yesterday before the Judiciary Committee.

An announcement was made on the floor that there would be an executive meeting of the Judiciary Committee. Very few members were present. The matter was very cursorily considered before the Judiciary Committee yesterday morning. There was no debate. There was only the exhortation to hurry. There was opposition to the procedure. Eight members of the Judiciary Committee voted against the bill. All of them were not opposed in principle to the bill, but they registered thereby their protest against this rush proposition. Twelve members voted for the bill. That means there were 20 members present out of a membership of 30. A number of members said this morning they had not received the notice of meeting, which was by telephone. I only received the notice by chance. I happened to speak to one of the members and he asked: "Are you going to meeting?" I asked. "What meeting?" I was told what the meeting was. The meeting was not in an unusual meeting room but in the auxiliary room of the Ways and Means Committee, of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, for the reason stated I think it is wrong for us to be pushed into the acceptance of these two rules in this fashion. I shall oppose both, if only to register emphatically my protest against the highhanded procedure. There should have been the usual conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I need not remind my colleagues that this matter of submerged lands legislation has been before the Congress and the country for a long, long time. Pages and pages of debate, some of it relevant and some of it highly irrelevant, have been devoted to this subject. I do not know how others may feel about it, but, as far as I am concerned, I want to get this behind us. I want to be done with it, done with it in as good a fashion as we can work out, but once and for all let us decide it and have it behind us.

The gentleman from New York stated that this rule makes in order an amendment to legislation that has not yet been enacted. But let me point out that is completely procedural. It is a matter for the House to determine. Of course, if it should be that titles I and II as they will be sent to the White House are vetoed, then what we are seeking to do would be of no consequence, but I think we all understand that that result is

not going to come about. So what we are doing here, in my opinion, is getting at this proposition in a most orderly manner.

What the gentleman from New York stated as to the actions of the Judiciary Committee, I suppose, has a certain amount of merit, but, on the other hand, it was largely a formality of procedure because just a few short days ago the House of Representatives acted on this whole proposition after careful consideration by the great Committee on the Judiciary, which reported to the House after full and thorough debate here.

Titles I, II, and III were all open to amendment. Amendments were offered and arguments were made. Some favored titles I and II but not title III, and some favored title III but not titles I and II. But, in any event, we did debate it and we did act on it and the House of Representatives came to a conclusion.

All that we are here seeking to do so far as title III is concerned is to enact that title as it was previously adopted by the House of Representatives. One would hardly think that this was an earth shaking proposition requiring any excoriation of the great Committee on the Judiciary which after all, as I pointed out, is seeking only to cooperate with us in getting this matter decided once and for all.

Now, it is true that so far as our committee was concerned in the previous action it was determined to put the matter all in one package, to deal with the historic boundaries of the States and their rights within those historic boundaries—something I have supported throughout the years—and likewise to deal with the Continental Shelf which, as the gentleman from New York says, goes out beyond the traditional boundary. Putting this all in one package, I thought, was a good way to get at the problem, but it so happens that the other body did not see it that way. They elected to handle the matter in a two-package approach.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. This matter, it seems to me, is very much misunderstood. So far as title III is concerned, the bill under consideration now, it simply acknowledges that the Federal Government owns all the land in the so-called Continental Shelf, out from the historic boundary, and simply sets up the machinery whereby the Federal Government can administer the Continental Shelf.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman is correct, and I am glad he made that observation at this time. So far as I am concerned, my view is that the Federal Government should exercise that control and should have that domination beyond the historic boundaries.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman has stated that title III was contained in a bill as it passed the House. I would like to call his attention to the fact that the language is identical with that contained in a bill passed in the last Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. I have not checked that carefully, but if the gentleman says it is identical, then for me that is enough, because I admire his capacity and his knowledge of the matters that come before us.

Now what are we trying to do? We simply are seeking to adjust to a parliamentary situation that which has developed between the two bodies of the Congress. And let me say for the record that I have been assured, and many of us have been assured, by the leadership in the other body that they will act on this title III and bring it to passage as a separate measure. If that is accomplished, then what is the difference so far as the end result is concerned between proceeding as we are or, perchance, sending this whole matter to conference?

Now, there are some practical considerations in connection with that, having regard to our desire to finally wind this up and get on with the other business of the Congress that I think should weigh with us. I will not undertake to go into detail now. I know there are a few Members of this body who are in opposition to the provisions of the bill this rule makes in order, but I dare say that the overwhelming majority of the Membership on both sides of the aisle is supporting this title III which has to do with the rights of the Federal Government in the Continental Shelf beyond the traditional boundaries of the States. So if I am correct in that, and I think I am, I dare say when this bill comes on for passage, if the roll should be called, or if there is a division vote, you will find at least 90 percent of the Membership supporting this legislation presently before us.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I understand the gentleman from Louisiana is against this bill, and some of his colleagues from Louisiana are against it, and there may be a few Members in some other States who are very vitally interested in titles I and II that may be a little unhappy about this title III, but just let me say to the gentleman, recognizing the realities, that this is about the way it has got to be if we are going to have legislation.

Mr. BOGGS. I should simply like to correct the record to point out that the bill passed in the last session of the Congress by the House of Representatives was not identical with title III, the bill that is before the House today. It provided for 37.5 percent participation by the States in the royalties, and also provided for the taxing and police authority.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman may be correct about that. We have had this bill before us so many times and there have been so many changes here and there that I must confess that on occasion I have lost sight of the details. However, if I recall, going back into the record, at one point the gentleman from Louisiana was contending for the traditional boundary, but I do not recall that he was contending so very vigorously for the area beyond the traditional boundary.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LANTAFF. To clarify our proceeding here this morning, will the bill for which the rule is now sought in any way conflict with the provisions of the bill enacted by the Senate pertaining to titles?

Mr. HALLECK. No, not at all, because it deals with a different matter. The bill as passed by the Senate, which is in large measure like titles I and II of our bill—there are some slight differences, but it is largely titles I and II of the bill we recently passed—deals with the traditional areas of the States. This bill deals with the areas beyond the traditional boundaries and so certainly could not be in conflict with the other legislation for which a rule has been granted and which we hope to take up today upon the adoption of the pending legislation.

Mr. LANTAFF. This bill is merely further amplification and sets up the machinery under which the Continental Shelf beyond the historical State boundaries is to be administered?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I am sure the gentleman is not naive enough to believe that the Senate, which contains a great many so-called States righters, will accept this so-called Graham bill, title III. If that is the case, do we not then destroy our bargaining power? If, under the usual, ordinary procedural developments, we went into conference, we would have that bargaining power. Now we destroy that bargaining power as far as the House is concerned.

Mr. HALLECK. I recognize the great capacity of the gentleman from New York. I am sure he recognizes with me that in matters before the Congress we shall certainly not suspect the integrity of the statements that are made by people in the Congress.

Just let me say this, and I think the gentleman from New York will agree with me, certainly the people on the other side who were against titles I and II are going to support title III. I have been assured, as I said before, by the responsible leadership in the other body that title III will be brought up and will be brought to enactment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman stated that those who had opposed the original tidelands bill should support the pending bill. Does the gentleman mean by that that in the event the tidelands bill as passed by the other body is declared unconstitutional, then this bill will apply not only to the Continental Shelf beyond the so-called historical State boundaries but to the land within the historical State boundaries as well?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course the gentleman is astute enough to know that it undertakes to assert the Federal rights beyond the traditional boundaries. If

what the gentleman contemplates the Supreme Court will do, but which I think it will not do, should result, then I would take it that the matter would be up for further consideration. But that is neither here nor there so far as the attitude of the folks is concerned who assert the right of the Federal Government to everything including the territorial boundaries. By what consistency could you justify being against this bill, which recognizes the rights of the Federal Government in the Continental Shelf, when you insist on the rights of the Federal Government from the very edge of the land boundary of the State out beyond the Continental Shelf?

I do not care to unduly prolong the consideration of this rule. Next, I thought I should make the statement I did in the interest of clarification of the situation, in the hope that we can get on with the consideration of both of these measures and bring them to final enactment today.

Mr. BOGGS. Further in the interest of clarification, I recall when the original bill was before the House, we had a title III which we amended with the so-called Keating amendment. Is this bill, H. R. 5134, identical with the title III that passed the House of Representatives?

Mr. HALLECK. It is. I do not claim to be an expert on all the details, but it is represented to me that it is.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I would like to make just one observation. It is identical with one exception, and that is it provides the Federal Government shall get the severance tax, which would otherwise go to the States.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Referring to the statement that the gentleman made about not wishing to unduly prolong this matter, my understanding is that the bill was only introduced yesterday afternoon at 1:30 p. m. They had a meeting of the committee outside here and not in the committee room. They reported it out. I do not know whether all members of the committee were notified at all. They got a rule at 2 o'clock and it is up here this morning. I do not think that is unduly prolonging this measure. Is that correct or not? That is what I want to ask the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I have explained all of that to the gentleman from Louisiana and everyone else who was interested. I well recall when we had this matter before us, you had lots of time to talk about title III.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say to the gentleman that I simply asked him a question as to whether my statement was correct or not.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will wait just a moment, may I state I respect the gentleman and his ideas. I know what his idea is. I want the people of the State of Louisiana to know that he is violently opposed to title III.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to again go over what has transpired. I said at the outset that this matter has been before us for years and years and years, and that we ought at some time come to the end with respect to it. The matter which is contained in this legislation was before the House of Representatives and was thoroughly debated and open to amendment and was passed. I would not assume that the committee would undertake to make any different judgment or that the House would make any different determination from what we did before. Under those circumstances, certainly, the gentleman should not complain of the action we have taken to let this matter come up for our consideration and come to a conclusion with respect to it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, my request to the last speaker to yield was for the purpose of explaining that the only difference in title III in H. R. 5134, upon which we are considering the rule, is that there is added a provision that in addition to all payments required under a lease, the lessee pays an additional royalty to the Federal Government equal to the amount of the severance tax charged by the abutting State. This applies only to an exchange of lease from the State to the Federal Government. This title III was considered previously in the House. I took the floor and urged the retention of title III because it is, in my opinion, extremely necessary, even though I was opposed to title I and title II of the same bill, which gave away the mineral resources of the United States situated within the historic State boundaries. I am for inclusion of title III in any submerged lands act. The reason I made the point of order which was overruled is because of the question of procedure. H. R. 5134 amends a nonexistent act. The unusual hurried circumstances prompting the introduction of H. R. 5134 distress me. I hesitate to express the deep concern and feeling that is within me because of this unprecedented action. If the House concurs in the Senate amendments to H. R. 4198, the House will yield its bargaining power to include title 3 which is in H. R. 5134. I will vote to preserve title III. I will vote for H. R. 5134. I previously voted that title III apply within the historic boundaries of the States, that is, from the low-water mark seaward to the end of the Continental Shelf.

The important fact is when the amendment was made to strike out title 3, when we first considered this bill, the House by a vote of 103 to 12 voted to keep it in.

The House should insist on title III being included in any submerged-lands legislation. Our best assurance to that end would be to refuse to accept the Senate amendments to H. R. 4198, send it to conference and direct the conferees to insist on inclusion of title III. If we adopt title III in a separate bill, we will be giving the other body exactly what they want. We will lose any bargaining power that might be effective to persuade the other body to accept title III which was included in the original H. R. 4198 passed by the House.

Now we have this rule on H. R. 5134. It has come to us without title I and title II. I am against consideration at this time of this bill, H. R. 5134, because I want first to have this House consider the amendments in H. R. 4198 that were sent over from the Senate. I think they are an improvement, to some extent, over the House bill. However, they struck out entirely title III. Title III, as you know, gives the Federal Government complete control of the submerged lands seaward from the historic boundaries of the States. It is my opinion that we should not pass H. R. 5134 now, and we should refuse to accept the Senate amendments to H. R. 4198; send the latter bill to conference, then the Members of the House would have an opportunity to bargain with the Senate for the acceptance of title III.

I sincerely wish I could have the same feeling of assurance that the distinguished majority leader has, that the other body will accept H. R. 5134 when we pass it this afternoon. It is quite obvious that there are Members of this House who are strongly opposed to H. R. 5134. There is no question but that there are Members in the other body who are strongly opposed to H. R. 5134. It is quite obvious the reason is that they would like to give to the States adjoining these coastal waters a large and undeserved share of the royalties and revenues gained from the submerged land beyond the historic boundaries or the 3-mile limit; and in addition to that, to get for the States control of leasing, police powers, conservation powers and authority to assess severance taxes. So I feel that we should vote down this rule. Then reject the Senate amendments, and send the bill H. R. 4198 to conference and let this House work its will and try to get the Senate to agree to the contents of H. R. 5134 in its entirety. I am in favor of that. That is the reason why I think we should not put the cart before the horse. We are not giving the House an opportunity to bargain with the other body to put into effect H. R. 5134, which is the subject of this rule.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Assuming that your view should prevail, and you in effect kill title III, which apparently is what you are asking for, then the next rule is put on and we agree to the Senate bill on titles I and II. Then the gentleman has, in effect, brought about a situation by which he has denied Federal control of the Continental Shelf beyond the traditional boundary of the State; and, as I understand it, that is the last thing he wants.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That could be very well taken up again.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. It is of no essential importance that this bill be passed immediately. What you are trying to do is to give the other body an opportunity to reject entirely title III. If we yield, then we have got to start from scratch and

try to get title III, and we have no bargaining power with them.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is it the gentleman's idea that we had far better let the bill that we passed and the Senate bill go to conference so that the matter may be considered in its entirety?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Absolutely. It could be done in one fell swoop. I assure you that in my opinion the House and the Nation would fare better.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, somebody has made up their mind that the better way to handle it is the way we are handling it now. As a Member of the House from your great State, you would not want to bring about a situation, believing as you do, that would handicap or interfere with the enactment of title III, recognizing, as you must recognize, that titles I and II are going to be enacted?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is perfectly true, but assuming that this was turned down, it had its inception yesterday after 12 o'clock. If it were turned down it could again have its inception this afternoon and probably be brought up on the floor again tomorrow. I think the gentleman's argument is untenable.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. That just indicates, of course, the strength of what I argued earlier. Maybe the gentleman himself is not kind of tired of this whole matter, but I happen to be; and I just do not want to go into any kind of procedure that is going to keep this matter interminably before us. I sincerely hope that what we do today will mark the end of our action on this subject.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I do not believe the gentleman is so tired that he like myself and many other Members does not want to bring to fruition the the ability of the Federal Government to authorize explorations and drillings in the Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile limit or the historic boundaries, which are so necessary for our national defense, and the revenues which will inure to the Federal Government.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take any time on this rule because I thought it was quite apparent that the rule was going to be adopted and that we could get along with this legislation, but there has been so much fuss raised around here, confusion or attempted confusion, that I just want to make one or two observations.

First, I quite agree with the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], that the opposition to this bill H. R. 5134 by their efforts would seem to defeat the very end they really have in mind. They will all tell you that they favor H. R. 5134, but they want to do it a different way.

Let us just face the situation. What does H. R. 5134 do? It gives the United States Government the rights to the so-called Continental Shelf. What is the situation now with reference to that? That is all in confusion. You will not have the production of these so-called trillions of dollars worth of oil that supposedly lies out there. Nobody knows about that. You know we hear a lot about this big giveaway of trillions of dollars; nobody knows what there is there. But you cannot explore it and you cannot produce it now because the oil contractors, the producers, do not know where they are. They cannot risk their money by going in and dealing with the States because they do not know whether the States have title; and the same thing applies to the Federal Government. So you have an impasse with no leasing, no exploration, and no oil production.

The so-called States Righters—and I confess that I belong to that group, the old Jeffersonian group who believe in States' rights as opposed to the Hamiltonian group who believe in a strong central government with everything concentrated in the Federal Government—I am proud to belong to the Jeffersonian group, and sometimes I wonder about some of my so-called liberal friends who have deserted the Jeffersonian principles and gone over and embraced the Hamiltonian principles. Yet in spite of the fact that this legislation would give them what they want they oppose it. Why? Only to confuse the issue. If you will just bear with me for one minute I will tell you what this is all about. The real situation has been hinted at here this morning, but no one has just been frank enough to say it in plain language. It would be better, of course, to have this all in one package, to have one bill.

But why do we not have it in one bill? The answer is obvious. No one knows better than our so-called liberal friends, who are complaining here today about the manner in which this legislation is being handled, that if they could succeed in sending this legislation to conference, further action would be required on the conference report in the other Chamber as well as in this body. While the conference report would undoubtedly be speedily acted upon in this body, they also realize that when it got over to the Senate it would face an extended filibuster—I am sorry, filibuster is not the word. Our liberal friends do not use the word filibuster when they resort to that technique in the Senate. That is a reprehensible term which must be hurled at States' righters, and particularly, a stigma to be applied only to that group of Senators from the Deep South. It will be recalled that when this legislation was up for consideration in the other body, the so-called liberal opponents carried on a rather lengthy debate lasting several weeks. In that debate everything from the Ten Commandments to atomic energy was discussed. Of course, this was not a filibuster. It was just full and lengthy debate. But, may I remind my friends that had that full and lengthy debate been sponsored by the Southern Members of that body on, shall I say, the so-called civil-rights legislation, it would have been designated as a filibuster.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since that is the strategy of the opponents of this whole subject of tidelands legislation, that is what they set out to accomplish—send the bill to conference where it could be talked to death with another full and extended debate in the other body. That is obvious to every Member on this floor. So why not say it forthrightly and be through with it.

Mr. Speaker, as has been well pointed out here, somewhere along the line there has got to be an end to legislation. This matter has been kicking around here ever since I have been in Congress, and I have been here a pretty good while, some two decades. We have got to have a settlement of it, and this is the practical way to settle it. When the rule is adopted, title III will be passed eventually, as it is bound to be, because, certainly, my liberal friends cannot vote against it, my Hamiltonian friends cannot vote against it because it is what they want. Then if we pass the other resolution which is to follow this, adopting the Senate amendments and sending it down to the other end of the Avenue where no doubt it will be signed, that is the end. Then the question of whether the Hamiltonian principles so far as the right to the Continental Shelf is concerned, and I subscribe to that, will be up to the other body. But it is up to us to discharge our duty here today.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The question I have in mind is what assurance do we have that the Senate will now accept title III as embodied in H. R. 5134 which the Senate refused to accept in the bill that we adopted in the House and which it has turned down? I cannot reconcile that statement.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. When the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is read it will be found that a promise was made in the other body that if title III was knocked out of the bill there they would take this up in the Senate within 2 weeks.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That does not answer the question.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, this body cannot give assurances as to what the other body will do. But, we will have discharged our duty, as I said a moment ago.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman says that they will take it up in 2 weeks. But, they have turned it down in one bill. I have read the report, and it seems to me that they are complicating the process, and it seems to me the logical thing to do is refuse to accept the Senate amendments to the bill we passed first and then go to conference.

Mr. COLMER. If my good friend was listening to what I was saying a moment ago, I think he will understand why it is being handled this way.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was listening. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to make some reference to this States' rights matter. I want to tell the Members of this House that I believe in States rights, too. I voted against the tidelands bill because I felt

I would be surrendering some of my State's rights. I think the people who are talking about States' rights are criticizing some of us who are States' righters because of the position we have taken on it, but I still say that the best way to handle this matter would be to go to conference and not go through this unusual procedure of bringing a bill in here. I admit we would all like to see title III adopted, but this is an unusual way to do it. In spite of the fact that I have been listening, regardless of what the gentleman has said about that, I am still not convinced that this is being handled in the proper way or in an orderly way.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentlemen from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know whether the gentleman from Missouri heard my statement or not.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have been on the floor the entire time.

Mr. HALLECK. Well then, I do not know whether it would avail anything for me to again state the basis upon which I approach this matter. I will say, however, again, that I have had assurances from the responsible leadership in the other body that this matter will be brought on for action. So far as I am concerned, I accept those assurances. I would also certainly be very sure, although I have no assurances about it, that many of the people who were in opposition to titles 1 and 2 will, when this title 3 comes over there, support the measure. That would mean to me an overwhelming support of this legislation when it comes to the other body.

Let me say just one further thing. The gentleman says since they did not include title III in their bill, that that means there is some intimation that they will not consider title III. May I say to the gentleman, without disclosing confidences with respect to meetings where we discussed this whole matter, that from the beginning the leadership in the other body has felt that this ought to be handled in a two-package arrangement. That did not make any difference to me except I thought we might handle it in one package. But certainly the fact that the other body decided that they would handle it in two packages ought to be assurance that they will take up the second package rather than not take it up.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Would it not be far simpler to settle this matter in conference rather than to go through the procedure of passing a bill and the other side passing a bill?

Mr. HALLECK. I hope the gentleman will not press me too far on that, because I have the highest respect for the so-called upper body, and I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for making a few blunt statements that a lot of people recognize. I said at the outset and I say it again, this is as good a way to get at it as any. It will all come out all right. Let us go ahead and adopt these two rules and take this action, and let us all be consistent. If you are against titles I and II you will get a chance to vote against them again. If you are for title III, you can vote for it now.

Mr. COLMER. I want to add this statement: I certainly do not want my friend from Missouri to get the idea that he seems to have gotten that I thought he was not attentive to this business. He is always most attentive. He is always most alert and on the job. I merely wanted to know whether or not I was getting my idea across. I guess it was my failure to successfully explain the matter that caused his remarks. He is usually sound; I am sorry that he does not agree with me on this matter. But that is his right. I entertain a very high regard for him.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5134, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks, I would like to give a brief review of my part in this legislation over the last 8 years. My attention was first called to it by the attorney general of the State of Pennsylvania and the Governor of Pennsylvania writing to me in the year 1945 and asking me as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary to pay particular attention to the legislation which had been proposed. As I recall it, at that time 47 governors of States petitioned together with 44 attorneys general in the matter. Hardly any measure could have received more unanimous support than that, if I am correct in my recollection of the figures. Forty-seven governors of the great sovereign States of this Union joined in this matter along with 44 atorneys general. In the years that intervened the matter has been brought before us, and I, in my personal capacity, have served as a conferee, I believe, three times in conferences between the House of Representatives and the other body. The man, who in my judgment deserves the greatest credit in this matter, is the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER, a Member on the Democratic side. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] introduced this bill, followed it through, and has given it his close personal attention throughout the years. By the changes of political fortunes, I now occupy the place that he held during the years in which our Democratic friends were in control. A year ago, when we went to conference, the bill contained three titles. The only difference between our third title today is this—that then it provided for a 37½-percent tax and also, I think, that the State should have the severance tax. We sat with Members of the other body, if I am correct in my recollection, for 3 or 4 days trying to reach an adjustment in the matter. When we failed, we relinquished our contention for the 37½ percent and other matters and returned. If you will cudgel your minds by way of refreshing your memory, you will recall the House passed this bill, but it was not passed by the other body in the form that we submitted it. So much, Mr. Chairman, for the background of the bill.

Now as for the present bill, you will recall President Eisenhower made a campaign pledge that he would seek to see that the so-called tidelands, which is a misnomer, it really should be called the submerged oil lands, would release oil to the separate States. In fulfillment of that promise, I was called to the White House for a conference on this matter, and it was decided I would introduce the bill again. My original thought was to introduce it in the form in which we had it last year, that is, with two titles. Title I, giving the definitions; and title II, assuring to the States their rights and powers, particularly the inland States, having reference to the Great Lakes. We began a series of hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary. We called before us the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Brownell. We called before us Mr. McKay, the Secretary of the Interior, and a representative of the Navy Department. After those men, in their several capacities, had testified, they were in accord that the bill should contain 3 titles, and asked me to withdraw the original bill containing 2 titles, and submit a third bill containing 3 titles. In conformity with their wishes, we did that. The subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee, and after some discussion in the full committee it was reported favorably to the House. We began debate on the 30th day of March and continued throughout that day and the succeeding day, March 31. We could have voted on that day, but it so happened it was a Jewish holiday and a request was made that we carry the vote over until the morning of April 1. On that morning we voted by a vote of 285 to 158, the bill containing all three titles: Title I, title II, and title III, and the bill was sent to the other body. They began their debate on that day. They finished that debate, so-called, on the 7th day of May. In other words, what we had done in this House in 2½ days required nearly 7

weeks for them to accomplish. What they did is a matter of history.

As to the manner in which this is brought here, the Senate returned the bill, you might say disassociating title III. We have before us titles I and II in the bill.

Here again I want to digress for a moment and pay tribute to the leadership of this House, both on the Republican side and on the Democratic side. I am frank to say to you that I have consulted with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], our majority leader, and I consulted with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the minority leader. I have great respect, outstanding respect, for those two men. The mere fact that they are on different sides of the aisle means nothing to me. In my judgment, they are two of the outstanding Americans, and I pay tribute and homage to them at all times.

When those two gentlemen heard this story, they in turn got together in a conference of minds—and I make no disparaging reference to those who criticize and ask why these things are done—mine is to accept the responsibility given me by the leadership, and I follow that leadership. I followed the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and brought this bill before the House.

There was some rapid work done. There is no concealment about that. There were certain interests which had to be considered. I do not desire to disclose those private matters, but they who proposed these had good and sufficient reasons. There was no undue haste. Their desire was that this be done decently and in order and effectively, and for once and all put behind us, and get on to the other problems that confront this Nation in the days that lie ahead. We have spent too much time on it. We have wasted too much time on it. Every issue is distinctly understood. There is not a man in this House or in the other body or the great public press that does not know the background of this.

We decided, as you know, the territorial limits, the historic boundaries extending 3 miles out; and, due to the foresight and great judgment of those who created the Republic of Texas, they took care of themselves to 10½ miles. In that connection, after we had taken care of that we then decided in title 3 that the Continental Shelf that extends out from 90 to 120 miles should become the property of the Federal Government, and that comprises 90 percent of all the area in which oil can be drilled for. Ten percent remains within the confines of the original State historic boundaries.

You must realize that this outer Continental Shelf is the area where it is most costly to drill, some of the wells costing many millions of dollars. Regular little colonies are built up around these wells out to sea. The matter of police protection enters into it, and the whole thing becomes a matter of vital importance.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is to differentiate and divide between States rights and the rights of the Federal Government, and to the best of our ability we sought to do it. There has been no chicanery, no trickery, no quick action in this in the sense of putting anything over on anybody. We have attempted to deal justly and honestly with the States and with the Federal Government.

Now as to the outcome the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has assured you, and so has the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]—I repeat these honorable men have said they have assurances——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. What does this new bill do in contrast with the old? And I hope you will indulge me for a moment, because it is highly technical, and I would like to read from our report.

The first thing that we say is that this new bill is to amend the submerged lands act in the area of the outer Continental Shelf, beyond the boundaries of the shelf may be leased and developed by the Federal Government. That puts 90 percent of that land under the control and direction of the Federal Government. I know it is a great hardship to the States of Texas and Louisiana; they will suffer terribly in the matter of their taxation, but in the light of dealing with all the 48 States of the Union, in the light of dealing with Alaska, and if Hawaii should come in as a State, of dealing with Hawaii, we must take the whole composite picture and deal with it as an entirety and with the sovereignty of the whole United States.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to pay tribute to that group—no, I do not yield to the gentleman at all.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRAHAM. I refuse to yield; you may get it on your own time—and I do not know of a better illustration of an attempted filibuster than what we see here today.

Now, what is the next thing? Four changes are made in certain sections of the bill and here I would like to read from the report:

Section 1 of the bill, H. R. 5134, amends section 2 of the Submerged Lands Act by adding thereto four new paragraphs. Subsection (i) defines the term "outer Continental Shelf" as those submerged lands which lie outside of seaward of lands beneath navigable waters as defined in section 2 of that act, and of which the subsoil and natural resources appertain to the United States. The term "Secretary" is defined as the Secretary of the Interior. The term "lease" is also defined, as is also the term "Mineral Leasing Act."

The above terms are added to section 2 of the Submerged Lands Act since they refer exclusively to the area in the outer Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries.

Section 2 of the bill further amends the Submerged Lands Act by striking out therefrom sections 9, 10, and 11. Section 9 of the Submerged Lands Act constitutes a legislative confirmation of jurisdiction over the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf seaward of the original State boundaries, which was asserted in the Presidential proclamation of 1945. The need for this section is obviated by the addition of title III which deals specifically with the same area, particularly with regard to the new matter set forth in section 9 (a) of the bill, H. R. 5134. Section 10 of the Submerged Lands Act is also made unnecessary by the new matter being added to the act as specifically contained in section 19.

The provisions of section 11 which are stricken from the Submerged Lands Act by this bill are exactly the same as contained in section 21 of H. R. 5134. In this regard the bill merely transposes the section from one title to another title and is a clarifying amendment to that extent.

Title III relates solely to the outer Continental Shelf outside of State boundaries.

Section 9 (a) constitutes a legislative confirmation of the jurisdiction of the United States over the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf outside State boundaries. It makes applicable to that area Federal laws and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to administer the provisions of this title and to adopt such rules and regulations as are not inconsistent with Federal laws to apply therein.

Those are the changes from the original title III which passed the House on April 1 of this year. When the bill is being read for amendment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] will offer an amendment that will take care of several things that have developed in the interim. With that we feel that we are passing now an act that the whole public of the United States may understand. They may now learn who are the real friends of the State, they will know who is seeking to protect the interests of the United States and, to inject a little politics into this, they will realize that the President has complied with his word when we pass this bill, and if the other body will pass it, and if we adopt the other rule, a great campaign pledge will have been confirmed to the people of the United States.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, time will not permit a discussion of all the provisions of the bill now before us. I will limit my remarks to section 9.

This bill was introduced yesterday. Within a matter of minutes after its introduction a special meeting of the Judiciary Committee was called in the Capitol and not in the regular quarters of the committee. Only about two-thirds of the members were able to attend the meeting. The bill was not referred to a subcommittee in usual order of business, and of course no hearings of any kind were conducted.

The language in section 9 definitely was not contained in any bill previously introduced in the House or in the Senate. The language contained in this section was never considered by any committee of Congress. The language contained in this section was never before recommended by any committee of Congress. This language was adopted on the floor of the House recently when we considered the bill, H. R. 4198, and after exactly 20 minutes of debate. When that occurred I moved to strike out title III to the end that we might study the matter,

but my motion did not prevail. I was against the provisions of the section then, and I am unalterably opposed to them now.

Here is some of the new language appearing on page 3, line 1:

> Federal laws now in effect or hereafter adopted shall apply to the entire area of the Continental Shelf.

Here we find one of the bugs under the chip. This is a brand new approach to the problem. I repeat that this approach was never before contained in any bill introduced in Congress. It was never considered by any committee of Congress.

Heretofore the bills provided that to begin with, the laws and police power of the States would apply, until such time at least as Congress and committees of Congress studied the question of the adequacy and applicability of Federal laws to the Continental Shelf. We proceeded along that line because we realized that Federal laws as presently written are utterly inadequate to cover this field.

Of course, the succeeding paragraph of the section goes on to say:

> Except to the extent that they are inconsistent with applicable Federal laws now in effect or hereafter enacted, or such regulations as the Secretary may adopt, the laws of each coastal State which so provides shall be applicable—

And so forth. The quoted provision is also a new approach. What is the practical significance of this language?

First, the States probably would have to call their legislatures into special session to extend their laws to cover the Continental Shelf.

Second, after going through this trouble and expense, it could be argued that the Secretary of the Interior could whimsically by regulation modify or nullify such State laws.

Are you, and especially those of you who believe in States rights, willing to give the Secretary of the Interior the power to repeal your State laws?

We too frequently give a bureaucrat the power to adopt regulations to carry out the provisions of a law, but never before have we given him power to supercede a law. The unsoundness of this whole approach is exceeded only by its unconstitutionality.

It could be argued that you may as well forget about the application of State laws and police power. They apparently do not intend them to apply anyway, because the first premise is that—

> Federal laws now in effect or hereafter adopted shall apply to the entire area of the Continental Shelf.

The fundamental question before us is, are Federal laws as presently written adequate to cover the conduct of men and the development of the mineral resources underlying the subsoil of the Continental Shelf? I submit that the answer is no. Let me give you a few illustrations.

There are no Federal conservation laws on the books specifically applicable to the Continental Shelf. Some Members may contend that the Secretary of the Interior might devise appropriate regulations or might adopt applicable State conservation laws. The answer is that he might or might not, depending on how he feels about it. The principle of separation of powers is the bedrock of our republican form of government. We in this body represent the legislative branch of the Government, and we should never abdicate our functions with our eyes wide open. I simply will not vote to make a czar out of a bureaucrat.

Since human beings will be involved in the operations on the Continental Shelf, we must assume that crimes will be committed, torts will occur, disputes will arise between labor and management, workmen will be injured, and contracts will be made and will require enforcement.

When a tort is committed because of someone's negligence, in what forum will redress be available? As lawyers we know that every act whatever of man that causes damage to another obliges him by whose fault it happened to repair it. Where and how would such a fault occurring in operations on the Continental Shelf be repaired? I have heard it rumored since yesterday that the Jones Act might afford relief. I personally dispute that idea, because the Jones Act deals with seamen. Laborers on drilling rigs or platforms in the sea are not seamen or maritime workers.

When a workman is injured in the course and scope of his employment, how and in what court of the United States can he expect compensation for his injuries? We certainly cannot look to the Federal Employers' Liability Act, because this statute applies only to employees of the United States. The laborers with whom we are concerned will be on the payroll of private industry.

Nor can we find relief under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, because that law does not seem to have anything to do with the problem.

And what about the myriad situations which will arise under contractual arrangements? Suppose a contract which involves less than $3,000 entered into between citizens of the same State is violated. How and where will it be enforced? Certainly the aggrieved party could not file suit in the courts of the United States, because there would be no diversity of citizenship and the jurisdictional amount of $3,000 would be lacking.

No one can seriously deny that Federal courts have no general jurisdiction over common-law crimes and misdemeanors. The criminal jurisdiction of the Federal courts is limited to crimes defined by Federal law within a limited area.

Nor can anyone pretend that the body of maritime law, dealing, as it does, with vessels and seamen, is sufficient and adequate to cover the torts, crimes and misdemeanors, disputes, labor and management arrangements, injuries to workmen, contractual relationships, and other situations which will inevitably arise in connection with the geophysical explorations and mineral development of the submerged lands in the Continental Shelf outside of and beyond State boundaries.

Mr. Chairman, it must be recognized that this bill constitutes a radical departure from legislation heretofore adopted by this body and dealing specifically with the Continental Shelf. Under the provisions of the Walter bill, State laws and police power were made to apply in the area of the Continental Shelf. This feature seems to have been effectively removed. Under the Walter bill, the States received 37½ percent of the returns. This provision has been eliminated. Under the Walter bill, the States were given taxing powers. These powers are now completely denied to the States. The simple fact is the political and economic rights of the States have been almost completely ignored. It can be argued that the Federal Government gets everything. The States get nothing, period.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Those questions the gentleman has raised were propounded to the Committee on the Judiciary yesterday, and there was no argument whatsoever to it; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIS. Well, I did not get any answer to the argument I am now making.

As I have indicated, we lawyers know that every act whatever of man that causes damage to another obliges him by whose fault it happened to repair it. That is a substantial definition of a tort. Now, if a tort occurs in that area, how is it going to be repaired? Before what court are you going to proceed? What Federal law is there to cover the subject?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to answer the gentleman's question. I think it is abundantly clear that it is our intention that the laws of torts in the several States shall be applicable in this territory. I am sure we have done that through this language.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman read the language?

Mr. WALTER. It reads, "The laws of each coastal State which so provide shall be applicable to that portion of the outer Continental Shelf," and so on.

Mr. WILLIS. "The laws of each coastal State which so provide." Up to now the coastal States have not so provided.

Mr. WALTER. But the gentleman is overlooking this fact, that what this language does and the effect of this language is to make applicable to this territory beyond historical boundaries those rules of law in the several States which would be applicable if the boundaries of the States extended on out beyond the historical boundaries.

Mr. WILLIS. As the gentleman knows, I have every respect for his opinion, but I submit that I have read that sentence very carefully. It states, "The laws of the coastal States which so provide." Louisiana has never provided for an extraterritorial effect of its laws to the Continental Shelf. Texas has not, nor so far as I know has California or any other State. So for the time being the Federal laws are definitely going to apply.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. To clarify that point, is it not a fact that at the present time the Louisiana State line goes out 27 miles? In other words, in part of this Continental Shelf area do not the State laws now apply?

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman, of course, refers to the act of the Legislature of Louisiana extending our boundaries out 27 miles. Assuming that act to be valid, the point I make would still remain, because the Continental Shelf stretches out as far as 125 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I know it is going to be approved by an overwhelming majority of the Members of this body. I have no new matter I can add to the long and extensive debates which have taken place on this legislation. I feel that the committee is thoroughly familiar with the basic facts involved.

I merely wish to comment with reference to my distinguished chairman of the Judiciary subcommittee who has so skillfully handled this legislation not only this year but in previous years, and who is the author of the bill now before us, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]. It has been a distinct pleasure to serve under his chairmanship on this important subcommittee. I believe this committee and this body owe him a great debt of gratitude for the attention and devotion he has given to what is an extremely important piece of legislation. I also wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] for his excellent contribution to the preparation and passage of this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have become a little confused on this issue because of the statement made by the gentleman from Louisiana. He is opposed to section 9. Does the gentleman know if the opposition of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] to section 9 will prevent him from supporting the balance of the bill?

Mr. HILLINGS. It is my understanding from debate previously that the gentleman from Louisiana and his colleagues from that State will oppose the bill, but I think it would be more proper to direct the question to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] just stepped off the floor and will be back in a moment, and I shall not attempt to answer for him; but I can say that section 9 is the heart of the whole bill. When you take from the State the authority to make any reference to the taxation out there in the Continental Shelf for the purpose of paying the cost of the enforcement of the laws, you bring in an entirely new doctrine which to my mind is most unsavory. I just would not support it and I do not intend to. I do not know what may be the views of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. GRAHAM. Has the gentleman overlooked the case decided in the Supreme Court of *Toom* v. *Witzel* (334 U. S. 385) where concurrent jurisdiction is recognized?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have not overlooked it. I do not intend to argue the legality of the question, but I do intend to argue the advisability from a constitutional viewpoint of adopting this approach to the handling of these lands beyond the historic boundaries of the States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, unless this section is changed, the gentleman then would oppose the entire bill?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes, I will oppose the bill, I mean—the last bill which was introduced yesterday at 1:30 p. m. and reported to the Committee on Rules at 2 o'clock, and which has been brought here today. I will oppose that bill unless the provisions of section 9 are changed or modified very greatly. That is my intention.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am just seeking information, of course.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have profound respect for the gentleman and his ability as an agricultural leader, and I have followed him on many occasions. If the gentleman will accord me some little modicum of ability with reference to oil and gas matters, perhaps the gentleman would be encouraged to follow me in a case like this.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I might be willing, and I am seeking information. Since the State of Louisiana is one of the beneficiaries, and rightfully so of this act, I want to lift a little confusion from my mind about the opposition.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I rather think the State of Louisiana has more at stake than any other State in the Union with reference to the proper handling of this property and the determination of this matter. Naturally, we are keenly sensitive as to how these things are handled.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman intend to offer an amendment as to section 9?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I cannot go that far, but I can tell you this—that I would welcome an amendment, if the gentleman will offer amendments which are contained in the Walter bill, and I will support him on it and speak in behalf of them and vote with him on them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am very happy that the gentleman has supported me on so many agricultural questions, but I do not think I am in a position to draft an amendment which would satisfy the criticisms which have been raised by you and your colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS] has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this bill. I am going to vote against the next bill, and for the following reasons. I am not going to vote to help pay the political debt of the Republican Party and President Eisenhower to Governor Shivers of Texas. That is the nub of my real opposition. What is the situation now?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This issue was before the House prior to the election of last year. Did the gentleman take the same position at that time?

Mr. CELLER. I certainly did take the same position. My position is that the Federal Government has dominion and control over the offshore minerals. There is no deviation whatsoever from it. Let me please go on, and then I shall be glad to yield. It would be the height of naivete to think that the other body is going to accept this bill, which we undoubtedly will adopt today. The so-called States' righters from California, Texas, Louisiana, and other States will not accept this bill which says that the Federal Government shall have dominion, imperium, possession, and the right to lease all the lands seaward from the traditional State borders. They will be unalterably against this bill when it goes to the other chamber. Then what will you have? You will only have the adoption of the so-called title 1 and title 2, which is in the next bill which will be adopted by this House, and since it was adopted by the other body will become the law of the land. You will only have what? The States will have all the minerals offshore to the so-called traditional State boundaries. What about title III? The so-called States righters reason this way: By this maneuver, by this rather clever, rather skillful, and adroit maneuver, they will get half a loaf, and later on they will start a campaign all over for title III. They will have the lands seaward from low-water mark outward to State boundaries. Then the wheels of propaganda will be started to get the balance for the States, for example, the Continental Shelf beyond the State boundaries.

They get what they want. We are left holding the bag. The Federal Government has the cards stacked against it. The Federal Government will be euchred out of all interest. If the regular procedure had been followed and the bill had been referred to conference, this whole matter could have been ironed out. There could have been quid pro quo, consideration for consideration, and something could have been worked out. We who fight to retain as lessor the shelf for the Federal Government will have no bargaining power whatsoever. In whose fertile brain was this scheme hatched? I would like to know that. It has not been answered. This is very unusual procedure. Members of the Judiciary Committee were hastily summoned, with practically no notice, and asked to swallow this scheme, hook, line, and sinker. Well, I am against it. In principle I like this bill, but I am going to vote to indicate my emphatic unmitigated protest against the procedure that is being adopted here this afternoon.

I know, just as well as day follows night and night follows the day, that when we pass the next bill—which will

become the law of the land—this instant bill will not become the law of the land. Then the excitement will start all over again in Texas and Louisiana and California and elsewhere, to the end that the States may be permitted to grab all this black gold that may exist offshore, seaward from the traditional State boundaries to the edge of the Shelf. And then what? This is only the beginning.

This is the season for plunder. This is the season for easy pickings. All the public domain will be offered on the auction block. All of our wildlife reserves, all of our national parks will be put under the hammer. Efforts have already been inaugurated to do that very thing. Do you know, it has gone so far that in my own State of New York a legislator had the temerity to rise in his place and say that Government-owned West Point with its very valuable land on the Hudson, the site and all Military Academy buildings, should be sold to a prep school for $20 million. I can cite you other examples by enthusiastic, misguided State legislators and others who are seeking to sell, and as I said before, place on the auction block a great deal of our public domain and our public lands. I repeat, this is but the first step in transferring all of our entire nationally owned resources to the States. This is indeed the season for plunder. Our parks, our forests, our minerals—are these to follow in the wake of offshore oil? Is the much abused shibboleth of States rights to be utilized as a convenient device to take from the people of the United States their complete natural resources for private exploitation?

The sustained-yield capacity of the national forests alone is 10 million board-feet, according to the estimates of the Forest Service. According to the recent Paley Commission report:

> A large portion of the mineral deposits yet to be discovered in this country are located in lands in the Western States still belonging to the Federal Government.

Bills have geen introduced, Mr. Chairman, bills have been offered in the other body, to the effect that the mineral deposits under the federally owned lands in certain States belong to the States. In Wyoming the Federal Treasury has received out of the Federal-controlled mineral-deposit lands about $135 million in royalties. This has gone into the United States Treasury. Now one of the distinguished Senators from that State says that all future money belongs to Wyoming; or, rather, I would say that all future royalties that come from that submerged oil in the State of Wyoming shall belong to the State of Wyoming. And there is a mighty good reason behind what the distinguished Senator from Wyoming agitates for; for example, we say here without the quiver of an eyelash that the mineral deposits offshore, off the shores of California, Louisiana, and Texas belong to the States. It is a stronger argument to say that the deposits underneath the particular State shall belong to that State. If we pass this bill we open the door to a plethora of other bills to the same effect. Do not think I am talking a lot of "malarkey" here. Just see what the opening gun in this plunder campaign is: The opening gun, for example, to weaken our Forest Service; and that gun was fired by Lawrence F. Lee, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce in a speech before the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association. He said the following:

> A study be made by Congress, by departments, of the Federal real estate inventory to the end that all property which, in the public interest, is best adapted to private ownership be offered for sale as soon as possible and thus placed on the tax rolls and in the productive use of private enterprise."

There you have it. His plan is simple. Congress, after completion of the study, would prepare legislation to sell all of Uncle Sam's real estate, except that not adapted for private use.

As of the present time, the Federal Government owns from 35 to 45 percent of all lands in the States of Washington, Montana, Colorado, and New Mexico; 45 to 55 percent of all land in California, Oregon, and Wyoming; 65 to 75 percent of the land in Idaho, Utah, and Arizona, and 85 percent of all land in Nevada. Is the present bill to constitute precedent for the abdication of all Federal areas and their rich resources? Is all to go under the hammer?

This is not a mere figment of our imagination. Already, I repeat, rumblings can be heard. Proponents in the Senate have already suggested that along with submerged lands, other national areas belonging to the people be given away. Only last year, the report of the Paley Commission emphasized the need for conservation of our vital raw materials, our forests, and our mineral wealth. We do not believe that these resources presently owned and controlled by the national Government in trust for all of the people should be disposed of purely for the purpose of private exploitation. We feel that we must express this view vigorously for we do not feel that Members of this body were elected to preside at the disolution of the national domain.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. Is it not true that the argument the gentleman is advancing at this time does not actually apply to this bill? This bill actually establishes Federal ownership and does not do any of the things the gentleman is talking about. This bill would confirm and establish Federal ownership in the area of the Continental Shelf beyond the historical State boundaries.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman were listening or harkening unto what I said he would realize that I said this bill, and the passage of this bill, is only a gesture, as far as this House is concerned; it will not receive the approval of the other body; it cannot receive the approval of the other body. I am not a Cassandra; I do not read tea leaves, but I know that 2 and 2 make 4. I have read the debates in the other body on the main bill. The so-called States Righters themselves who were for title 1 and title 2 are not going to swallow title 3. We would be left holding the bag; the Federal Government would be euchred out of title 3; and then, as I said, the campaign will start all over again, and the agitation, the ceaseless agitation in certain States to have the States lay their hands upon the offshore oil deposits seaward of the traditional State boundaries would begin all over again.

Mr. HILLINGS. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question if he will yield.

Mr. CELLER. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. In his earlier remarks the gentleman stated that this legislation was brought before this committee primarily because of campaign pledges or promises made by the President. Is it not true that when the so-called tidelands legislation passed this body this year and in previous years a majority, Democrats as well as a majority of Republicans, supported the bill? Is it not true that in this instance the majority leadership, as well as the minority leadership, is currently supporting this legislation?

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman is a little bit disingenuous in that statement. He will forgive me for saying that. I have been here long enough to know that legislation just does not develop as the gentleman would wish to have it develop. It is just a little bit of wishful thinking on his part in that regard. Certain minds came together here and we have a situation such as this. I say it is a very dangerous situation to legislate this way. We should have gone to conference on the general bill. The minute you depart from the usual procedures you always have this difficulty. That is the gravamen of my complaint.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to elaborate a little bit upon my answers to some questions which were propounded of me a while ago by a colleague in the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] spoke in opposition to section 9 of this bill, which I think is the heart of the bill. If this section were modified in conformity with the provisions of the Walter bill, if it were modified in the direction of his bill, it would be far more palatable to the people of the State of Louisiana.

My objection is based on the background and the whole theory of this operation. It is proposed in this bill that was introduced yesterday afternoon at 1:30, adopted by the committee and a rule obtained by 2 o'clock, then brought up here today, that the Secretary shall reimburse the abutting States in the amount of the reasonable cost of administration of the laws. That means simply that the Secretary of the Interior will call in a State and say: "Now, we want your laws, we like them, we want them enforced here in the area off the coast of your State. What can you do the job for?"

Then there will be a proposition of bargaining back and forth. The State will want the revenue from the contract entered into to enforce the laws. They will bargain and finally arrive at some

arrangement whereby under a bargaining contract the State will be employed as an agency of the United States to enforce the laws in the offshore areas beyond State boundaries. Theoretically I think that is bad. I am one who believes in States rights, but I think the last vestige of States rights is apt to be forgotten when we begin to bargain that way with the sovereign States of our Nation. The States are going to want to get as much money as they can for the enforcement of the laws and the Federal Government is going to want to do it as cheaply as possible. The States will be employed as you would employ a gardener, bricklayer, or painter to do this job of enforcing the laws insofar as we want them enforced.

Now that is a very serious thing because the laws to be enforced will most probably be, first of all, the criminal laws. In the State of Louisiana, for instance, just a few miles out beyond the historic boundary line, they will be spending four or five million dollars to drill a deep oil well, maybe 10,000 feet down. There may be a criminal offense committed out there, perhaps murder or some other serious criminal offense. Then the State will step in to enforce its State laws against murder under the contract which it has negotiated with the Federal Government to handle that job. The Federal Government does not like the severity which the State government exercises in the enforcement of the laws and then at the end of the term of the contract the Government may say, "Well, we do not like the way in which you are applying these laws, they are not severe enough" or "they are too severe" and then the Government will say, "We will not employ you again on that job and we will not give you the money you are entitled to receive."

I think the theory behind the whole thing is bad. I think it has a direct tendency to undermine all vestige of States rights in the coastal States.

In addition to that I would say this, that our laws expressly provide in many instances that they will have no extraterritorial effect. We have a provision in the code of the State of Louisiana that laws do not have extraterritorial effect. What arrangements are we going to make, for instance, outside of a bargaining contract, to school these children of the workers who drill these wells off the coast of the State of Louisiana? The time may come when there might be as many as 10,000 workers with 30,000 children, or something of that sort, and we will have to provide schooling facilities for those people. The time may come when we will have to provide special laws covering torts, as my colleague has already indicated, for those things that are done in violation of a law beyond the 3-mile limit.

Of course, the conservation laws of the State of Louisiana could, by contract, be extended out 100 miles, or as far out as the Continental Shelf goes, as well as the fishing laws, and the laws covering compensation, and the laws covering contracts and all those things which now have no extraterritorial effect. Perhaps under the laws of the State of Louisiana provision would have to be made by the State Legislature to take care of that.

So, I say specifically I think the theory is wrong. If you want to do the job, if you want the States to enforce those laws beyond the area owned by the State, beyond the area over which they have dominion, I think the way to do it is by permitting some measure of taxation rights, and perhaps a certain percentage of the production of oil or gas or minerals or fishing rights, or whatever it may be, beyond the limits over land owned or claimed by the United States. Unless you do that, you go back to the fundamental threat of breaking down the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana, and I do not think that that is the best thing for the future of the United States of America. I am certain it is not going to be the most satisfactory way to handle the thing for a State like my own State, the State of Louisiana.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, like the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] I have had enough of this legislation.

The question of procedure has been raised on 2 or 3 occasions. The gentleman who just preceded me on 4 separate occasions mentioned the fact that this bill was introduced at 1:30 and at 2 o'clock the committee obtained a rule. Without an explanation, that does not sound like the usual procedure that we use. However, it is important to remember that the bill under consideration was thoroughly debated by this House. This language is not new. The proposal is as old as is the legislation. All the Committee on the Judiciary did on yesterday was report a bill which is identical, with but one exception, with the bill that has passed the House. I will point out that exception. During the course of the debate on the rule, I said it was identical. The one difference lies in this provision on page 10, lines 18 and 19, with respect to the severance tax. There is no such thing in the Federal law. Where the leases are transferred from the State to the Federal Government, then the additional cost which would be represented in the severance tax would be added to the lease, so that the company engaged in the development would not by virtue of the transfer of leases get an advantage over somebody who had bought originally. That is the only change in this section 3, which is now incorporated in H. R. 4156.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, than whom there is not a better lawyer in our great State, and not many better in this body, talked about the President's debt. I am not concerned with the debt of President Eisenhower, our great Chief Executive, nor was I concerned with the position taken by his predecessor. When the attorneys general of the United States, not 44, as was stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], but 47 of them, reached a unanimous agreement with respect to this proposition and it was then referred to the Judiciary Committee, and as a matter of course referred to the subcommittee of which at the moment I happen to be the chairman, I examined their position carefully. I was not only deeply impressed by what they said and by what they attempted to do, but I was so impressed by the position taken by Mr. Justice Frankfurter that no amount of argument here or advanced in the other chamber would change my views.

They add up to just this one simple proposition: How territory admittedly the property of the State became the property of the United States will always be a mystery to me. The United States never had any title to the territory under consideration in the bill that we recently passed and on which we will again be called to act in a few moments, but we have never declared our sovereignty in that land beyond the historical boundaries. All we are trying to do here today is for all time to dispose of this conflict. I do not contend that by this declaration of sovereignty the United States obtains title to the entire Continental Shelf. But I do contend that now at long last the people who are interested in the development of the resources lying beyond the historic boundaries know to whom they can turn in order to obtain a binding agreement so that the millions of dollars they invest will be protected to some extent.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Is that true with respect to land lying seaward 3 miles of the Louisiana coastline?

Mr. WALTER. I am thoroughly convinced that the State of Louisiana has control over the historic boundaries beyond the 3 miles. I am not contending about title. However, the Norwegian fishing case, recently decided by the International Court, perhaps decides that question.

Mr. Chairman, we heard much about the other body accepting this bill. Of course, as our distinguished majority leader said, we do not know what will be done in the other Chamber. But, I call your attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28 on page 4114. I am certain I am not violating the rules of the House by reading from that RECORD. It is as follows:

> Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that so far as the Continental Shelf is concerned, a bill is being prepared by the committee. I am sure it will be here within 2 weeks; and I can assure Senators that the whole subject will be dealt with comprehensively in that bill, and will have most careful study.

Mr. Chairman, I for one am willing to run the risk of assuming that the assurance extended to the Senators is also extended to the Members of this body.

We heard much about the giveaway legislation. Why do you know it would be to the financial advantage of these oil companies if the Federal Government had control of all of this territory? That is a fact.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this particular point?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Now that you have mentioned the word giveaway, I am sure with your legal talent, you will agree that if someone gives to another something that the Supreme Court says is

his and gives it without any consideration whatsoever, it must be pretty much of a gift, and a gift is a giveaway. I mean that is the law of the land.

The Supreme Court said that the States had no title to or interest in any of these submerged lands seaward from their low watermark——

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further because I would like to answer the gentleman's question. Of course, the Supreme Court did not pass on the question of title. It merely said that the United States had a paramount interest. That is what the Supreme Court said and it left the entire question up to the Congress. As a matter of fact in every announcement coming from the highest Court of the land, there was contained an open invitation to the Congress of the United States to dispose of this question. Now there is no giveaway and there never has been anything like a giveaway involved except in the minds of those people who are so committed to the philosophy of an all powerful Federal Government that they see in this an opportunity to carry out those principles.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes additional to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to thank the Republican leadership, the leadership of this House, for its sincerity and its honesty in carrying in its platform an honest, straightforward plank that at least a portion of these tidelands would be returned to the States, and then getting some action upon that promise.

Enough has been said about the tidelands bill to fill many volumes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or in the Congressional Library. I do not know of anything new that has been stated in the last two times the bill has been on the floor for debate. The same issues have been rehashed, carried over, and the same cry of "giveaway," "steal," and all that sort of thing has been carried on, especially in the other body by this talkathon and by the filibuster that was carried on, admittedly, but no new fact has been brought forth to show that the States have not owned this property at all times; have claimed it adversely and notoriously against all parties, including the Federal Government; and their rights were recognized repeatedly by the Supreme Court. I do not think there is anything to the claim that this bill was jumped up suddenly without hearings, because this very language stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], former chairman of the subcommittee, has been gone over and voted out of the committee at least twice before since I have been a member of the Judiciary Committee, and once before that. This is simply title III of the original Walter bill.

I have some objections to title III, and it is no secret, because I offered some amendments when the bill was before the House recently. I offered an amendment to put in the bill the right of the States to reasonable taxing power. This House turned that down flatly. Therefore, I am not belaboring the issue, because we made an honest attempt, and I believe that the contiguous States to this territory, whose roads, schools, and public service will be used by the people who develop and exploit this territory, whose roads will be wrecked and ruined, should have some power of the right of taxation. This bill does not contain it, but I am not going to vote against the bill because it does not contain it. I think, in all fairness, proration and State police powers should apply in that area, because we all know the Federal proration laws, and a serious situation could arise if these wells to be developed by Federal leaseholders should ever produce oil contiguous to the State's territory as opposing the State and Federal lands. But I say none of those things are serious enough to make me vote against this bill.

I think the only way we are going to get any legislation on this subject is to deal with both subjects and to get rid of them now. Oh, I know my distinguished former chairman says the demagogs claim that the President is paying off the Governor of Texas. That may go in New York, but it certainly does not sound very good in Texas. The President is paying off nobody; and I will say to you that if sincerity and honesty of purpose mean anything I think the President is going to make a great President, I think he is keeping a campaign pledge. This matter was voted on by the people last year and this was one of the material issues in my State, it so happened. We just do not believe in folks stealing, especially the Federal Government.

But with all those objections—and I think the bill could be improved by their adoption—I am going to vote for the bill because I think, frankly, if the other bill had gone to conference it would only have amounted to longer delay and another filibuster in the Senate if 1 comma or 1 period had been changed in this body. No wonder they wanted a conference; no wonder they wanted to take the bill back. They would have another great circus over there, but we would have no tidelands legislation.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is now talking about the Senate bill which we will take up a little later. I wonder if the gentleman will get back to the bill before the Committee?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I shall be glad to.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman himself is the author of a tidelands bill, is he not?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I am.

Mr. BOGGS. What does the gentleman's bill provide with regard to the Continental Shelf?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I just made my position very clear when I said I believed the States should have taxing power and police power. It is also provided that the States should receive 37½ percent royalty.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman's bill contained that provision?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Yes, it did.

Mr. BOGGS. Does this bill contain that provision?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. It does not.

Mr. BOGGS. Yet, the gentleman intends to vote for this bill?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I do.

Mr. BOGGS. On what theory?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. When we had the other bill before the House we tried to put those amendments in and we were defeated some 4 or 5 to 1, and I am taking this bill as a last resort and as the best bill possible to get from this House and the Congress as a whole. My position is clear and I am not hesitating about it at all.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman has now acceded to the position of complete Federal domination.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. No; I have not, because the bill that comes next on this floor gives the States absolute rights.

Mr. BOGGS. But I am talking about the bill now before us.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I refuse to yield further. I know the gentleman from Louisiana has to justify his position.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Texas is justifying his position; he has reversed himself.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I understand; I know something about that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I interpose at this point and say that no man contended more seriously and strenuously for his position than did the gentleman from Texas. The same may be said likewise about the gentleman from Louisiana. Both did everything within their power to advance their interests and they were defeated only because we had the greater votes.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Of course, we can continue for months and years talking about taxing power and police power and what the States would like to get out of the revenue, but when we do we get away from our theory—at least the Texas theory, and that is that our claim—and the only claim which we can really justify and which we think without doubt we have, our historical boundary of 10½ miles. Many of us, of course, have thought that inasmuch as the State services would be used we should have a reasonable taxing power; and I still think and still say that before too long unless an amendment is adopted to this bill applying State proration laws and reasonable police powers that this Congress will be called upon to enact Federal laws to set up a proration law and a law against waste, and it will also be called upon to pass a law providing criminal penalties in cases involving crime. I think that should have been done in this bill, and I think it could have been done and would have been done if certain amendments had been adopted when this bill was before the House some weeks ago. As I say, these amendments were turned down. I am supporting this bill because I believe

it is the only way we are going to get legislation to end this subject for all time.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time only to call the attention of the members of the committee to the very serious new problems being raised by this legislation regarding civil and criminal jurisdiction over structures erected in the outer Continental Shelf seaward from territorial waters. There is no precedent which tells us what body of law is applicable to structures in the outer Continental Shelf.

The bill we are passing today, H. R. 5134, expressly declares the waters above the Continental Shelf to be high seas, international waters.

The closest analogy to the problem of punishment for criminal offenses committed on structures on the high seas is, of course, the punishment for offenses on vessels on the high seas.

I wish to direct the attention of the Members to the law relating to criminal law jurisdiction on the Guano Islands. These islands are not declared to be territory of the United States but are said to appertain to the United States. I refer to title 48, United States Code, section 1417. It reads as follows:

All acts done, and offenses or crimes committed on any island, rock, or key mentioned in section 1411 of this title, by persons who may land thereon, or in the waters adjacent thereto, shall be deemed committed on the high seas, on board a merchant ship or vessel belonging to the United States; and shall be punished according to the laws of the United States relating to such ships or vessels and offenses on the high seas, which laws for the purpose aforesaid are extended over such islands, rocks, and keys.

I also direct attention to title 18, United States Code, section 451, paragraph 4, of which also relates to the Guano Islands. That section reads as follows:

The crimes and offenses defined in sections 451–468 of this title shall be punished as herein prescribed:

First. When committed upon the high seas, or on any other waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and out of the jurisdiction of any particular State, or when committed within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and out of the jurisdiction of any particular State on board any vessel belonging in whole or in part to the United States or any citizen thereof, or to any corporation created by or under the laws of the United States, or of any State, Territory, or district thereof.

Second. When committed upon any vessel registered, licensed, or enrolled under the laws of the United States, and being on a voyage upon the waters of any of the Great Lakes, namely: Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, Lake Saint Clair, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, or any of the waters connecting any of said lakes, or upon the River St. Lawrence where the same constitutes the international boundary line.

Third. When committed within or on any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States, and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof, or any place purchased or otherwise acquired by the United States by consent of the legislation of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of a fort, magazine, arsenal, dockyard, or other needful building.

Fourth. On any island, rock, or key, containing deposits of guano, which may, at the discretion of the President, be considered as appertaining to the United States.

Inserting language similar to title 48, section 1417, in the bill before us might solve the problem so far as criminal jurisdiction is concerned. However, we still would not have dealt with the civil law jurisdiction over these structures, nor with the problem of what legislation is applicable on these structures, such as workmen's compensation laws, wage and hour laws, and so forth. Actually the waters above the Continental Shelf are expressly recognized as international waters, not a part of the territory of the United States or of any State of the United States. The field of law with respect to structures in these international waters is almost completely uncharted. It deserved more concentrated attention than it has been given by the Judiciary Committee of the House.

I do not intend to offer an amendment because the speed with which the Judiciary Committee and the House are acting on this bill did not allow sufficient time for me to study the matter and propose language which in my opinion would constitute a satisfactory solution to this complex and difficult legal problem.

For that reason I have merely called attention to the existence of the problem and have offered a suggested solution to one phase of it in the hope that the other body, or perhaps the conference committee if there is a conference, will deal with the subject adequately and intelligently.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill as it stands with reference to the territory to which it extends I believe is an excellent bill, a bill that is very much needed. My contention is that Federal control should begin at the low-water mark and extend seaward. There are in the Gulf of Mexico beyond the Continental Shelf outside of the historic or 3-mile boundary of Texas and Louisiana oil-producing wells and there are also other areas which should be developed for our national defense and for our general welfare.

In other areas beyond the three-mile limit or historic boundary there are leases under which operations had started for drilling purposes but they have had to be stopped or curtailed under authorization of the Secretary of the Interior. He is permitted under his inherent right, only to continue drillings that had already started or to initiate new drillings when it would be for the protection of an adjoining area. The Secretary of Interior cannot authorize new and additional explorations unless congressional authorization is given him.

Mr. Chairman, I opposed the rule on this bill because I felt that this body would be in a much better position if we would reject the Senate amendments to H. R. 4198 and send the bill to conference where this body's conferees would then be able to present to the conference committee the argument and the will of this body and adopt in toto title III, in addition to title I and title II. It is quite obvious to me, in spite of glowing assurances, that the Members of the other body will not readily accept this bill, H. R. 5134 when we pass it. I am quite confident that they will endeavor to obtain for the coastal States a sizable proportionate share of the royalties derived from oil and any minerals that may be obtained in submerged lands beyond the 3-mile limit or the historic State boundaries. My reason for thinking in that direction, is that legislation has been introduced in the other body which would give the coastal States control of the leasing, control of the conservation, authority to assess severance taxes, and State police powers, and also demanding 37½ percent royalty. I think we in this House, out of an abundance of caution, should refuse to accept the Senate amendments. We should send H. R. 4198 to conference so that we can really make a fight to include in its entirety title III along with title I and title II.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take this time to answer any of the previous questions that were brought up with reference to the title of any of these submerged lands inside the historic boundaries, or the 3-mile limit, which the Supreme Court has decided belong to the Federal Government, as that is of no concern in this particular bill, because this bill gives lock, stock and barrel to the Federal Government jurisdiction and control in its own right to keep unto itself and all of the royalties or resources that might be taken from the submerged lands beyond the 3-mile limit or historic boundaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand how anyone can seriously find fault with the action the committee has taken in considering the areas inside of historic State boundaries and such boundaries in two separate bills because actually I think we all recognize that two different sets of principles are involved in these areas. Inside the historic boundary we are dealing with an area that always belonged to the States until the decision of the Supreme Court cast doubt upon the title, but when you go beyond the historic seaward boundaries of the States you are dealing with an area that is altogether different. It is not only outside of the States, it is outside of the United States. We are dealing with it only on the legal basis of a proclamation of the President of the United States claiming, not title to the lands outside of the historic State and national boundaries, but rather claiming only the right to extract the resources of the seabed and the subsoil and to the edge of the Continental Shelf. Historically, legally, and in every way you are dealing with an entirely different proposition when you deal with the area known as the Continental Shelf.

It is very difficult for me to understand some of the opposition to this bill. It gives everything to the Federal Government. Some of the people who opposed giving the States back that which has al-

ways been theirs are opposing this bill although it gives everything beyond State boundaries to the Federal Government.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was arguing here a few minutes ago that there is a trend toward giving the States more and the Federal Government less. Actually this bill represents a trend in the other direction. Bills previously passed here gave the States 37.5 percent of the royalties out in this area. This bill gives the States nothing, so the trend of this bill is toward greater Federal control of, and all the revenue derived from, the area involved, I should think the people who favor Federal ownership of all submerged lands would support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YORTY. So, I repeat, the trend evidenced by this bill is toward taking away from the States and not giving to the States.

Actually, I find myself in the same position as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON]. I introduced a bill similar to his. It would have given the States the right to do the leasing out in this area, and it would have given them a percentage of the royalties. I did that because I thought it would be better to have one administration for the entire area. I felt that since basically, the fight is not over administration of the area but over the division of the proceeds from it, so long as you gave the Federal Government the major part of the proceeds, I could see no harm but, rather, definite advantages from the standpoint of recovery and efficiency in letting the States administer the whole area, while keeping a reasonable percentage of the royalties as compensation for services performed.

After debate in the House that provision was taken out. I think, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] pointed out, it became obvious that you could not again at this time get a bill through the House with a provision giving the States 37.5 percent of the revenues. I am sorry this is true. I would rather see it that way. But since this appears impossible, and since there is no law under which this area can now be administered, and it ought to be developed, it seems to me we should support this legislation as the best we can pass by a majority vote of the House.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman says the area should be developed. Does this include the whole Continental Shelf, including that area which is given to the States by the bill?

Mr. YORTY. As the gentleman knows, this bill deals only with the area outside the historical State boundaries.

Mr. YATES. Suppose the Supreme Court of the United States should declare the other bill unconstitutional. Should not the area be developed by the Federal Government then?

Mr. YORTY. A law of the Congress is presumed to be constitutional until the Court rules otherwise. I do not know by what authority some people are already purporting to decide the constitutionality of the Submerged Lands Act in advance and to hold it invalid. Frankly, I think it is constitutional. We will have to leave that question to the courts anyway.

Mr. YATES. It is nevertheless possible that the Supreme Court of the United States might declare the bill unconstitutional; is it not?

Mr. YORTY. It is always possible that any law may be declared unconstitutional, but the presumptions, as the gentleman knows, are in favor of constitutionality. With the saving clause that has been put in the bill, if it turns out that we could not constitutionally grant full title to the States, they would retain the right to develop the area anyway. I do not see what anyone would have to gain by challenging the constitutionality of that act, if my views are correct.

Getting back to the proposition of this bill, it just seems to me that as a practical matter this is the kind of bill we should all approve since we cannot now get a majority to give the States greater rights in the area in question, the outer Continental Shelf. It is possible that experience will prove the advisability of letting the States administer the entire offshore area under one set of laws and regulations. In this event the State will be entitled to compensation for their services and I feel that limited taxing power or a share of the revenue will be the proper measure.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to ask a question on the bill. I do this because of my doubts concerning the constitutionality of the basic legislation giving title to the submerged lands to the States. I have no illusions concerning my ability as a great constitutional lawyer, and I make no claim of enjoying the prestige and dignity of being a great constitutional lawyer. But having read the debates on tidelands bills of previous years, I noted that a very able constitutional lawyer declared that in his opinion, such bills would be unconstitutional. I refer to our former distinguished colleague, the late Sam Hobbs, who stated that this bill would violate the Constitution. I now ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] what would be the jurisdiction of the Federal Government in the event that the other tidelands bill, the one previously pased by this House and recently passed by the other body, should be held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States? Would the Federal Government under the terms of this bill have any jurisdiction over the area covered by the other bill?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Do I understand your question to be that if the States' historical boundary bill is held to be unconstitutional, this bill gives the Federal Government the right to move in and develop the area within the historical boundaries?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. In my opinion, it certainly would not.

Mr. YATES. In other words, this bill deals only with the portion of the Continental Shelf outside that area?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Beginning at the outer edge of the historic boundary of the States, which is 3 miles only except for the States of Texas and Florida, and on out.

Mr. YATES. I see. But does not the gentleman concede that in the event the other bill was held unconstitutional that the Federal Government under existing decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States would have jurisdiction over that area?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. No, I do not think they would.

Mr. YATES. Then who would have jurisdiction over it?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Congress would have to deal with it again.

Mr. YATES. You mean that nobody would have any jurisdiction over it?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Do you mean inside of the State boundaries?

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. We would be in the same position as we were in before we passed the bill. We could change it.

Mr. YATES. And according to the Supreme Court of the United States does not the Federal Government have paramount interest in those lands?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Paramount rights, yes, that is all, but not ownership.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS], a member of the committee.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I will require 5 minutes to discuss briefly what I have in mind. I had been supporting the tidelands bill since its inception. I have been supporting it because I believe the legislation is needed and necessary; I have been supporting the bill in order to restore to the States what I believe has been unjustly taken away from them by the split decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. I have been supporting this measure because I think it is the right and honorable thing to do. That covers my first approach to this very, very important piece of legislation. But, I am not in favor of carrying on with the adoption of this legislation unless it carries with it the provisions that are noted in the Graham bill. I think our activities in connection with legislating on this important measure should be confined exclusively to that which we originally started out to accomplish, to wit, to establish the boundaries of the States over which we have this existing controversy which, I understand includes the 3-mile limit and a 10½-mile limit for the States of Texas and Florida. We should adopt a hands-off policy as it applies to submerged land referred to as the Continental Shelf—I mean by that, that the States should confine their control over submerged lands strictly to what we started out to do. For that reason, I see only one hope in sustaining this legislation ultimately in the United States Supreme Court, and that is to keep our faith with the people and our promises as we originally made them and return to the States what they have been divested of, and leave title exclusively

and unconditionally in the Federal Government to that submerged land area that has always been recognized as Government property.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is another of the days of the great betrayal. On another day of infamy this body voted to pay the price of the presidency with the surrender of the Nation's wealth and security to the powers of oil and of darkness. All that Abraham Lincoln represented in the history of this Nation, all that the defenders of the Union gave, even to the last supreme sacrifice, was made a mess for the mockery of Republicans from the North and East. Today there comes in the consideration of H. R. 5134 a proposition to powder-puff the face of Judas with perfumed beauty aids. I doubt the soundness of the proposition that by applying whitewash to the wings of a bat you come forth with an angel.

This body passed a bill covering the submerged lands to the Continental Shelf. The other body labored hard and long and came forth with a bill that went as far as the traditional boundary lines and stopped there. So it is proposed that we first vote upon the part of the bill that the other body left out—a part of the bill that no one seriously thinks will ever be taken up and acted upon favorably by the other body. Why are we asked in this weird parliamentary procedure to vote upon what in substance is an amendment to a nonexistent bill? The answer is, of course, that H. R. 5134 is a gesture in futility. It is as a device arranged for the convenience of indiscretion to proclaim virtue on the threshold of the door.

I shall vote against the passage both of H. R. 4198 and 5134 because I cannot in good conscience have any association with what to me appears the boldest conspiracy in history to sell out the security and the resources of a great Nation. The evil and intended work of today is to accept the other body's amendments to H. R. 4198, thus sidestepping a conference committee, and getting this colossal grab measure immediately to the White House.

The distinguished and able majority leader has forthrightly told us that he wants to have the matter over with as quickly as possible so that the House can proceed to other business. If the gentleman hopes that in the consideration of other business the country will forget what happened today he will wake up to wonder why he never placed more faith in the 13 superstition. May 13, 1953, is a date that patriotic indignation will burn indelibly in the minds of the men and women of America.

I have no doubt a sense of gratitude for past favors will again manifest itself on the other side of the aisle. My Republican colleagues, with few exceptions again will go down the line in the payment of the price of a presidency. The kiss that the Republican Members of this House will plant on the oily lips of the tidelands bill will prove to be the kiss of death for the Republican Party. Let them pursue their amorous flirtation with oil with the reckless abandon of a night of illicit romancing, but let them know that tomorrow will come as surely as the earth will continue to move in its orbit.

Mr. Chairman, it is significant that on the very eve of the consummation of the infamous tidelands oil deal announcement was made of the sensational growth of billion dollar business in the United States. There are now 29 businesses with assets of $1 billion and more.

The 13 top money makers—in terms of net profits—are General Motors, Standard of New Jersey, Bell, du Pont, Texas, Socony-Vacuum, Standard of California, General Electric, United States Steel, Gulf Oil, Standard of Indiana, Sears, Roebuck, and Ford.

The billion dollarists, which excludes insurance and finance companies and banks, follows:

Bell system	$10, 784, 848, 960
Standard Oil Co. (N. J.)	5, 049, 282, 672
General Motors Corp.	4, 001, 294, 708
Pennsylvania Railroad	3, 133, 518, 486
United States Steel Corp.	2, 988, 434, 756
New York Central	2, 613, 903, 655
Du Pont de Nemours & Co.	2, 371, 140, 879
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	2, 011, 336, 643
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	1, 963, 876, 666
Southern Pacific	1, 954, 415, 877
Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	1, 795, 337, 509
Consolidated Edison Co. (N. Y.)	1, 773, 317, 755
Texas Co.	1, 736, 081, 009
Gulf Oil Co.	1, 627, 279, 394
Bethlehem Steel Corp.	1, 610, 078, 107
Ford Motor Co. (1951)	1, 584, 172, 000
General Electric Co.	1, 579, 523, 878
Santa Fe	1, 462, 710, 435
Commonwealth Edison Co.	1, 434, 664, 667
Standard Oil Co. (Calif.)	1, 407, 198, 494
Sears, Roebuck & Co.	1, 362, 011, 465
Union Pacific	1, 308, 378, 450
Baltimore & Ohio	1, 295, 167, 047
Westinghouse Electric Corp.	1, 195, 232, 040
Humble Oil	1, 106, 228, 714
International Harvester	1, 090, 644, 236
Union Carbide & Carbon	1, 072, 178, 149
Cities Service Co.	1, 047, 080, 707
Sinclair Oil Co.	1, 035, 307, 940

The above list is the directory of the invisible government of the United States. The corporations on the list are closely bound together, and by far the largest group is that of oil. The power of billion-dollar corporations can be effective in campaigns when the people are not alerted to the real issues. When that power is used to divest them of their resources and to take from them their national security the story will be different.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Submerged Lands Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraphs:

"(i) The term 'outer Continental Shelf' means all submerged lands (1) which lie outside and seaward of lands beneath navigable waters as defined hereinabove in section 2, and (2) of which the subsoil and natural resources appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control;

"(j) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior;

"(k) The term 'lease' whenever used with reference to action by a State or its political subdivision or grantee shall be regarded as including any form of authorization for the use, development, or production from lands beneath navigable waters or lands of the outer Continental Shelf and the natural resources therein and thereunder, and the term 'lessee' whenever used in such connection shall be regarded as including any person having the right to develop or produce natural resources and any person having the right to use or develop lands beneath navigable waters or lands of the outer Continental Shelf under any such form of authorization;

"(l) The term 'Mineral Leasing Act' means the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), and all acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 1, line 6, after the words "submerged lands", strike out all of lines 6 and 7 and that part of line 8 preceding the word "of".

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, there are two masses of land involved in this legislation. There is the land given to the States by the bills that have passed this House and the other body, the so-called submerged-lands bills, and then there is the land that is seaward of the historical boundaries of the States. That is the land of the Continental Shelf which is proposed to be covered by this legislation.

My amendment is applicable to the land which is within the so-called historic boundaries of the States. The purpose of my amendment is to permit exploitation and development of that territory in the event that the submerged-lands bill is declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States.

As I stated a few moments ago, I make no claim of being an authoritative constitutional lawyer myself. I happen to believe the bill is unconstitutional. More than my opinion, however, is that of a man for whose legal ability on constitutional matters, many Members of this House had the highest respect. I refer to the gentleman from Alabama, the late Sam Hobbs, who stated time and again that a statute on this question without a constitutional amendment, would be inadequate to convey title to lands to the States. It would be unconstitutional. Therefore, in the event that the opinion of Mr. Hobbs is sustained, if the Supreme Court of the United States holds that bill to be unconstitutional, this legislation would permit exploitation of the area that has been given to the States under the other bill. That area would be a no-man's land, a territory under Federal control, but without power in the Federal Government to develop its resources, if additional legislation for that purpose is needed. I say it would belong to the Federal Government, because the Supreme Court of the United States has stated in its decisions that the submerged lands seaward of the low-water mark belong to the Federal Government. If that bill is held unconstitutional, there will be no legislative authority in the Federal Government to develop the oil resources.

I call attention to the language on page 2 of the report which states:

Representatives of the Federal departments, the States, and the offshore operators all urged the importance and necessity for the enactment of legislation enabling the Federal Government to lease for oil and

gas operations the vast areas of the Continental Shelf outside of State boundaries. They were unanimously of the opinion, in which this committee agrees, that no law now exists whereby the Federal Government can lease those submerged lands, the development and operation of which are vital to our national economy and security. It is, therefore, the duty of the Congress to enact promptly a leasing policy for the purpose of encouraging the discovery and development of the oil potential of the Continental Shelf.

My amendment would permit the Federal Government to undertake the exploitation of all lands to which it has paramount rights.

In the event the Supreme Court sustains the legislation and holds it constitutional the States will not be hurt. They will be able to continue to exploit the mineral and oil resources lying under the submerged lands within their boundaries. The amendment I have offered will fill the gap caused by unconstitutionality of the bill and permit development of the entire submerged area, pending the efforts of the coastal States to obtain a constitutional amendment to obtain title to the submerged lands bordering their shoreline.

I ask for a favorable vote on my amendment.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it should not take 5 minutes to dispose of this amendment because all this does is to surrender the entire area seaward from the coastline of the United States to the international domain; a domain wherein foreign vessels, warships, or other craft could sail up and down and do as they pleased without any control over them by the United States. If you will refer to the language on page 3, the second paragraph, you will find this provision:

> This act shall be construed in such manner that the character as high seas of the waters above the outer Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation and navigational servitude shall not be affected.

That means in dealing with the outer Continental Shelf the area outside of the United States the right of foreign nations to use the areas for shipping and so forth are not affected.

If we were to adopt this amendment, which does not fit in with the rest of the bill, but defines the whole offshore area as outer Continental Shelf, making the high seas above them international domain, it would be a very unwise action.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will consider the amendment he will note that the term "outer Continental Shelf" means all submerged lands and natural resources appertaining to the United States in accordance with the definition in the other bill. My amendment would not change the language in the other bill but would clarify it. If the other definition is followed, the sumberged land lying seaward of the historic State boundaries would belong to the Federal Government. There is nothing in my amendment which would deprive the States of any interest in the lands within their historic State boundaries if the Supreme Court holds that bill constitutional. My amendment gives rights to the Federal Government only if the bill is held unconstitutional.

Mr. YORTY. I think the gentleman is incorrect because this refers back to the definition in the submerged lands act which will become a law and changes that definition so that seaward of the coastline the whole area would be outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. YATES. On the contrary, all this definition does is state that it is applicable to the land which belongs to the United States.

Mr. YORTY. It does not say "belong," it says "appertains."

Mr. YATES. All right, appertains to the United States.

Mr. YORTY. If the gentleman will permit me, he is assuming as a fact that the submerged lands act has been declared unconstitutional.

Mr. YATES. I make no such assumption. I recognize it as a possibility, and in the event the bill is not declared unconstitutional the title of the States will not be impaired. In the event it is declared unconstitutional, then there would be this safeguard to permit the resources to be exploited.

Mr. YORTY. That is not correct, either. Even if the act were sustained as constitutional, what we have here would be inconsistent with the other act. You are setting up a conflict that would have to be resolved, because the gentleman's amendment refers to the submerged lands act, and it will become a law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Submerged Lands Act is further amended by striking out sections 9, 10, and 11 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III

"OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OUTSIDE STATE BOUNDARIES

"SEC. 9. Jurisdiction over outer Continental Shelf: (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction, control, and power of disposition as provided in this act. Federal laws now in effect or hereafter adopted shall apply to the entire area of the outer Continental Shelf. The Secretary is hereby empowered and authorized to administer the provisions of this title, and to adopt rules and regulations not inconsistent with Federal laws to apply to the area.

"Except to the extent that they are inconsistent with applicable Federal laws now in effect or hereafter enacted, or such regulations as the Secretary may adopt, the laws of each coastal State which so provide shall be applicable to that portion of the outer Continental Shelf which would be within the area of the State if its boundaries were extended seaward to the outer margin of the outer Continental Shelf, and the Secretary shall determine and publish lines defining each such area of State jurisdiction: *Provided, however,* That State taxation laws shall not apply in such areas of the outer Continental Shelf. The Secretary shall reimburse the abutting States in the amount of the reasonable costs of the administration of such laws.

"This act shall be construed in such manner that the character as high seas of the waters above the outer Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation and navigational servitude shall not be affected.

"(b) Oil and gas deposits in the outer Continental Shelf shall be subject to control and disposal only in accordance with the provisions of this act and no rights in or claims to such deposits, whether based upon applications filed or other action taken heretofore or hereafter, shall be recognized except in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 10. Provisions for leasing outer Continental Shelf: (a) When in the Secretary's opinion there is a demand for the purchase of such leases, the Secretary may in his discretion offer for sale on competitive sealed bidding, oil and gas leases on any area of the outer Continental Shelf. Subject to the other terms and provisions hereof, sales of leases shall be made to the responsible and qualified bidder bidding the highest cash bonus per leasing unit. Notice of sale of oil and gas leases shall be published at least 30 days before the date of sale in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary, which publication shall contain (i) a description of the tracts into which the area to be leased has been subdivided by the Secretary for leasing purposes, such tracts being herein called 'leasing units'; (ii) the minimum bonus per acre which will be accepted by the Secretary on each leasing unit; (iii) the amount of royalty as specified hereinafter in section 10 (d); (iv) the amount of rental per acre per annum on each leasing unit as specified hereinafter in section 10 (d); and (v) the time and place at which all bids shall be opened in public.

"(b) The leasing units shall be in reasonably compact form of such area and dimensions as may be determined by the Secretary, but shall not be more than 640 acres if within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field and shall not be more than 2,560 acres if not within any known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field.

"(c) Oil and gas leases sold under the provisions of this section shall be for the primary terms of 5 years and shall continue so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced therefrom in paying quantities. Each lease shall contain provisions requiring the exercise of reasonable diligence, skill, and care in the operation of the lease, and requiring the lessee to conduct his operations thereon in accordance with sound and efficient oilfield practices to prevent waste of oil or gas discovered under said lease or the entrance of water through wells drilled by him to the oil or gas sands or oil- and gas-bearing strata or the injury or destruction of the oil and gas deposits.

"(d) Each lease shall provide that, on or after the discovery of oil or gas, the lessee shall pay a royalty of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the leasing unit and, in any event, not less than $1 per acre per annum in lieu of rental for each lease year commencing after discovery in addition to any taxes imposed by Congress. If after discovery of oil or gas the production thereof should cease from any cause, the lease shall not terminate if the lessee commences additional drilling or reworking operations within 90 days thereafter or, if it be within the primary term, commences or resumes the payment or tender of rentals or commences operations for drilling or reworking on or before the rental paying date next ensuing after the expiration of 90 days from date of cessation of production. All leases issued hereunder shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a rental of $1 per acre per annum for the second and

every lease year thereafter during the primary terms and in lieu of drilling operations on or production from the leasing unit in addition to any taxes imposed by Congress, all such rentals to be payable on or before the beginning of each lease year.

"(e) If, at the expiration of the primary term of any lease, oil or gas is not being produced in paying quantities on a leasing unit, but drilling operations are commenced not less than 180 days prior to the end of the primary term and such drilling operations or other drilling operations have been and are being diligently prosecuted and the lessee has otherwise performed his obligations under the lease, the lease shall remain in force so long as drilling operations are prosecuted with reasonable diligence and in a good and workmanlike manner, and rental paid, and if they result in the production of oil or gas so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced therefrom in paying quantities.

"(f) Should a lessee in a lease issued under the provisions of title III of this act fail to comply with any of the provisions of this act or of the lease, such lease may be canceled by the Secretary because of such failure; but before such a cancellation the Secretary shall give the lessee 20 days' notice by registered mail at his last known address of the claimed defaults. If the defaults are not cured by the end of said period the Secretary may proceed to cancel the lease. Any person complaining of such cancellation may have such action reviewed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. If a lease or any interest therein is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, in violation of any of the provisions of this act, the lease may be canceled, or the interest so owned or controlled may be forfeited by the Secretary as provided in this paragraph, or the person so owning or controlling the interest may be compelled to dispose of the interest in an appropriate court proceeding.

"(g) The provisions of sections 17, 17 (b), 28, 30, 30 (a), 30 (b), 32, 36, and 39 of the Mineral Leasing Act to the extent that such provisions are not inconsistent with the terms of this act, are made applicable to lands leased or subject to lease by the Secretary under title III of this act.

"(h) In the interest of economy and of cooperation between Federal and State leasing agencies within their respective jurisdictions, the Secretary may, but only to the extent he deems feasible, make use of facilities available to him from the adjacent States and their leasing agencies. Each lease shall contain such other terms and provisions consistent with the provisions of this act as may be prescribed by the Secretary. The Secretary may delegate his authority under this act to officers or employees of the Department of the Interior and may authorize subdelegation to the extent that he may deem proper.

"(i) The Secretary may deny any application for a lease, as to which it appears that the lease, if issued, or any interest therein, would be owned or controlled, directly or by stock ownership, stockholding, stock control, trusteeship, or otherwise, by any citizen of another country, the laws, customs, or regulations of which deny similar or like privileges to citizens or corporations of this country. Where such ownership or control arises after a lease is granted, the Secretary may then cancel the lease because thereof. Any ownership or interest described in this section which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for 2 years and not longer after its acquisition. No lands leased under the provisons of this section shall be subleased, trusteed, possessed, or controlled by any device or in any manner whatsoever so that they form a part of or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust or form the subject in whole or in part of any contract, agreement, understanding, or conspiracy, to restrain trade or commerce in the production or sale of oil or gas or to control the price of oil or gas.

"(j) Any lease obtained through the exercise of fraud or misrepresentation, or which is not performed in accordance with its terms or with this law, may by the Secretary be invalidated subject to the right of review as otherwise provided for herein.

"SEC. 11. Exchange of existing State leases in outer Continental Shelf for Federal leases: (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to issue a lease to any person in exchange for a lease covering lands in the outer Continental Shelf which was issued by any State prior to December 21, 1948, and which would have been in force and effect on June 5, 1950, in accordance with its terms and provisions except as modified as to additional royalties provided later in this section and the laws of the State issuing such lease had the State issuing such lease had such paramount rights in and dominion over the outer Continental Shelf as it assumed it had when it issued the lease. Any lease issued pursuant to this section shall be for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the unexpired term of the old lease, or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, the same: *Provided, however,* That if oil or gas was not being produced from such old lease on and before December 11, 1950, or if the primary term of such lease has expired since December 11, 1950, then any such new lease shall be for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of the old lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing or whose grantee issued such lease, shall cover the same natural resources and the same portion of the Continental Shelf as the old lease, shall provide for payment to the United States of the same rentals, royalties, and other payments as are provided for in the old lease, together with a sum as additional royalty equal to any severance tax charged by an abutting State, in addition to any taxes imposed by Congress, and shall include such other terms and provisions, consistent with the provisions of this act, as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Operations under such old lease may be conducted as therein provided until the issuance of an exchange lease hereunder or until it is determined that no such exchange lease shall be issued. No lease which has been determined by the Secretary to have been obtained by fraud or misrepresentation shall be accepted for exchange under this section. Any persons complaining of a refusal by the Secretary so to exchange a lease as herein provided may have such action reviewed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

"(b) No such exchange lease shall be issued unless, (i) an application therefor, accompanied by a copy of the lease from the State or its political subdivision or grantee offered in exchange, is filed with the Secretary within 6 months from the effective date of this act, or within such further period as provided in section 18 hereof, or as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary; (ii) the applicant states in his application that the lease applied for shall be subject to the same overriding royalty obligations as the lease issued by the State or its political subdivision or grantee in addition to any taxes imposed by Congress; (iii) the applicant pays to the United States all rentals, royalties, and other sums due to the lessor under the old lease which have or may become payable after June 5, 1950, and which have not been paid to the lessor or to the Secretary under the old lease; (iv) the applicant furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other reasonable requirements as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States; and (v) the applicant files with the Secretary a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction showing that the old lease was in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing it on the applicable date provided for in subsection (a) of this section; or in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavit, receipts, canceled checks, and other documents showing such facts.

"(c) In the event any lease covers, as well as other lands, lands of the outer Continental Shelf, the provisions of this section shall apply to such lease insofar only as it covers lands of the outer Continental Shelf.

"SEC. 12. Income from outer Continental Shelf: All rentals, royalties, and other sums payable under any lease on the outer Continental Shelf for the period from June 5, 1950, to date, and thereafter shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

"SEC. 13. Actions involving outer Continental Shelf: Any court proceeding involving a lease or rights under a lease of a portion of the outer Continental Shelf may be instituted in the United States district court for the district in which any defendant may be found or for the district in which the leased property, or some part thereof, is located; or, if no part of the leased property is within any district, for the district nearest to the property involved.

"SEC. 14. Refunds: When it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary that any person has made a payment to the United States in connection with any lease under this act in excess of the amount he was lawfully required to pay, such excess shall be repaid to such person, his assignees, or his legal representative, if a request for repayment of such excess is filed with the Secretary within 2 years after the issuance of the lease or the making of the payment.

"SEC. 15. Waiver of liability for past operations: (a) No State, or political subdivision, grantee or lessee shall be liable to or required to account to the United States in any way for entering upon, using, exploring for, developing, producing, or disposing of natural resources from lands of the outer Continental Shelf prior to June 5, 1950.

"(b) If it shall be determined by appropriate court action that fraud has been practiced in the obtaining of any lease referred to herein or in the operations thereunder, the waivers provided in this section shall not be effective.

"SEC. 16. Powers reserved to the United States: The United States reserves and retains—

"(a) in time of war or when necessary for national defense, and when so prescribed by the Congress or the President, in addition to any and all other rights it may have under the law, the right (i) of first refusal to purchase all or any portion of the oil or gas that may be produced from the outer Continental Shelf; (ii) to terminate any lease issued or authorized pursuant to or validated by title III of this act, in which event the United States shall become the owner of wells, fixtures, and improvements located on the area of such lease and shall be liable to the lessee for just compensation for such leaseholds, wells, fixtures, and improvements, to be determined as in the case of condemnations; (iii) to suspend operations under any lease issued or authorized pursuant to or validated by title III of this act, in which event the United States shall be liable to the lessee for such compensation as is required to be paid under the Constitution of the United States; and payment of rentals, minimum royalty, and royalty prescribed by such lease shall likewise be suspended during any period of suspension of operations, and

the term of any suspended lease shall be extended by adding thereto any suspension period;

"(b) the right to designate by and through the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, as areas restricted from the exploration and operation that part of the Continental Shelf needed for national defense; and so long as such designation remains in effect no exploration or operations may be conducted on any part of the surface of such area except with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense; and if operations or production under any lease theretofore issued on lands within any such restricted area shall be suspended, any payment of rentals, minimum royalty, and royalty prescribed by such lease likewise shall be suspended during such period of suspension of operation and production, and the term of such lease shall be extended by adding thereto any such suspension period, and the United States shall be liable to the lessee for such compensation as is required to be paid under the Constitution of the United States; and

"(c) the ownership of and the right to extract helium from all gas produced from the outer Continental Shelf, subject to any lease issued pursuant to or validated by this act under such general rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, but in the extraction of helium from such gas it shall be so extracted as to cause no substantial delay in the delivery of gas produced to the purchaser of such gas.

"SEC. 17. Geological and geophysical explorations: The right of any person, subject to applicable provisions of law, and of any agency of the United States to conduct geological and geophysical explorations in the outer Continental Shelf, which do not interfere with or endanger actual operations under any lease issued pursuant to this act, is hereby recognized.

"SEC. 18. Interpleader and interim arrangements: (a) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this act, if any lessee under any lease of submerged lands granted by any State, its political subdivisions, or grantees, prior to the effective date of this act, shall file with the Secretary a certificate executed by such lessee under oath and stating that doubt exists (i) as to whether an area covered by such lease lies within the outer Continental Shelf, or (ii) as to whom the rentals, royalties, or other sums payable under such lease are lawfully payable, or (iii) as to the validity of the claims of the State which issued, or whose political subdivision or grantee issued, such lease to the area covered by the lease and that such claims have not been determined by a final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction—

"(1) the lessee may interplead the United States and, with their consent, the State or States concerned, in an action filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and, in the event of State consent to be interpleaded, deposit with the clerk of that court all rentals, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease after filing of such certificate, and such deposit shall be full performance of the lessee's obligation under such lease to make such payments; or

"(2) the lessee may continue to pay all rentals, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease to the State, its political subdivisions, or grantees, as in the lease provided, until it is determined by final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction that such rentals, royalties, and other sums should be paid otherwise, and thereafter such rentals, royalties, and other sums shall be paid by said lessee in accordance with the determination of such final judgment. In the event it shall be determined by such final judgment that the United States is entitled to any moneys theretofore paid to any State or political subdivision, or grantee thereof, such State, its political subdivision, or grantee, as the case may be, shall promptly account to the United States therefor; and

"(3) the lessee of any such lease may file application for an exchange lease under section 11 hereof at any time prior to the expiration of 6 months after it is determined by final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction that the claims of the State which issued, or whose political subdivision or grantee issued, such lease to the area covered by the lease are invalid as against the United States and that the lands covered by such lease are within the outer Continental Shelf.

"(b) If any area of the outer Continental Shelf or other lands covered by this act included in any lease issued by a State or its political subdivision or grantee is involved in litigation between the United States and such State, its political subdivision, or grantee, the lessee in such lease shall have the right to intervene in such action and deposit with the clerk of the court in which such case is pending any rentals, royalties, and other sums payable under the lease subsequent to the effective date of this act, and such deposit shall be full discharge and acquittance of the lessee for any payment so made.

"TITLE IV

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 19. Executive Order No. 10426, dated January 16, 1953, entitled 'Setting Aside Submerged Lands of the Continental Shelf as a Naval Petroleum Reserve,' is hereby revoked.

"SEC. 20. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 21. Separability: If any provision of this act, or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or individual word, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or individual word to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby; without limiting the generality of the foregoing, if subsection 3 (a) 1, 3 (a) 2, 3 (b) 1, 3 (b) 2, 3 (b) 3, or 3 (c) or any provision of any of those subsections is held invalid, such subsection or provision shall be held separable and the remaining subsections and provisions shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. GRAHAM (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 9, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"(k) Nothing contained in this act or any other act shall prevent the leasing of a particular area for oil and gas, and also, at the same time, and for the same area, for sulfur or other minerals, and no person having been granted a lease for any particular mineral shall have any preference right to a lease for any other mineral on account of a discovery of such mineral in the area covered by his lease. No lease shall be for more than one mineral except that 'oil and gas' for the purposes of this act shall be deemed to be one mineral. The Secretary is authorized and when requested by any responsible and qualified person interested in purchasing leases for any mineral other than oil and gas in any area of the outer Continental Shelf not then under lease for such requested mineral, shall offer for sale in a competitive sealed bidding, mineral leases for a mineral other than oil and gas in such area. The Secretary in his discretion shall fix all proposed terms of any such lease in his invitation to bid, as herein provided, as to royalty rates, area covered and otherwise as circumstances peculiar to development of the underseas area of the Continental Shelf may require: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary shall be and is hereby authorized to promulgate regulations of general application with respect thereto."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will accept the amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I am addressing myself to an additional aspect of the problem involving the outer Continental Shelf, with particular reference to leaseholds thereon. The language of the pending bill deals only with oil and gas deposits, and to deal with other mineral deposits in the outer Continental Shelf presents no problem. Every Member of this body will be properly concerned with the maximum appropriate utilization of the natural resources to be found in the outer Continental Shelf. We certainly do not wish to place ourselves in the position of seeming to offer protections to oil and gas leaseholds to the exclusion of all other minerals. The State of Texas long since, out of its experience, learned to deal with other possible minerals, for example sulfur; and under its laws, Texas has made possible the exploitation of the same, or substantially the same area for the coincidental development of recovery of oil and gas as well as sulfur.

Those experienced in the field tell me that sulfur occurs in domes which may be 700 to 1,000 feet below the surface. Sulfur may occur in a stratum on the very crest of the dome whereas oil and gas will be found in oil-bearing sands occurring on the flanks of the dome at depths of many thousands of feet below the sulfur-bearing stratum. Oil and gas will be recoverable from the flanges of the dome—not from its crest—and there is no reason whatever why the companies developing and recovering oil and gas resources should not go forward at the same time as those who are seeking to recover sulfur. Completely different processes are involved in the two operations.

What I wish to see Congress do will accomplish the maximum recovery of the natural resources over which we seek to exercise dominion. As the bill now stands there is no provision whatever for recovery of minerals other than oil and gas.

I do not think that this Congress should put itself in the position of legislating only for oil and gas development. Consequently, I feel it to be my duty to alert you to the fact that large and recoverable deposits of sulfur and other minerals are said to occur on the outer Continental Shelf, and while we are legislating on this subject, I think we ought to do a reasonably complete job to stimulate maximum recovery of much needed

minerals in whatever category. Sulfur, particularly, is a strategic and critical material in wartime. American citizens today are exploring for sulfur in various parts of the world, but of course it is sulfur here at home which we need in time of war.

Of course, there are some minerals, like sodium, which it may not be economically feasible to recover by undersea operations. I would not wish to see precluded, however, the possibility of some enterprising development of the recovery of sodium or any other mineral for failure on our part to provide the necessary legislative implementation.

I understand that to explore for and locate sulfur might require vast amounts of capital, perhaps as much as $10 million and upward, to locate and recover sulfur from a single sulfur dome. I am told that perhaps as many as 20 domes must be drilled in order to find one which is productive, from which it is apparent that this is a highly costly and speculative, exploratory operation.

It seems to me that when Congress is "writing the ticket," and making it possible for some concern to exploit these natural resources under our authority, the very least we should do is insure equal rights to each of various types of prospectors for each of various minerals.

Since the bill as reported by the committee deals simply with oil and gas and makes no provision for the recovery of other minerals, I think Congress should say that nothing contained in this act or any other act shall prevent leasing of a particular area to one person for recovery of oil and gas, and at the same time leasing to others for the recovery of sulfur or other minerals in the same area. I think we should say that no person, having been granted an oil and gas lease, should have any preference right to a lease for sulfur, for example, on account of a discovery of sulfur in an area covered by the oil and gas lease. I think that the Secretary should offer for sale, under separate, competitive, sealed bidding, leases for the recovery of sulfur, or any other mineral, notwithstanding the existence of an outstanding lease for the recovery of oil and gas in the same area. Conversely, I think that the holder of a lease, for the recovery of any particular mineral, should have no preference right to a lease for any other mineral simply because of a discovery of that other mineral in an area covered by his lease.

If the bidding is competitive, every person will have a right to bid. If the bidding is separate, an oil and gas company can bid, just as can a sulfur company. If the bids are sealed, each bidder can be the judge of his own willingness, and to what extent he is ready and able to back up that willingness to seek and recover whatever minerals may be recoverable.

The principle for which I contend is sound. To achieve it, various possible legislative steps are open to us. We can amend the existing bill by a series of amendments to expand the use of the terms "oil and gas" wherever they occur, and otherwise adapting the language to the peculiarities of each of the minerals which might be sought.

I do not recommend that approach for the simple reason that the language of the bill before us, dealing exclusively with oil and gas, has been carefully worked out and deals adequately with that subject. Let us keep it.

Rather, I think we should interpolate, by way of an amendment, a new section dealing with sulfur and other minerals in a fashion comparable to the way we have dealt with oil and gas.

The correct approach may be stated thus: Let us provide for leases for oil and gas. Let us provide for leases for other minerals, including sulfur. Let us prescribe the appropriate royalty rates which should inure as a result of the discovery and the recovery of one or the other type of mineral. Then let us write one section that applies equally to all which would read, in effect, that nothing contained in this act or any other act shall prevent the leasing to one party of the same area for oil and gas, and also, at the same time, leasing that area to another for sulfur and other minerals, and that no person, having been granted a lease for any particular mineral, shall have any preference right to a lease for any other mineral on account of a discovery of such mineral in the area covered by his lease. Rather, at that point, the Secretary should be required, upon application by any interested bidder, to offer for sale on separate competitive sealed bids, oil and gas leases, sulfur or other mineral leases, on any area or in the same area, of the outer Continental Shelf.

In that way, we will develop to the utmost the natural resources to be found in the outer Continental Shelf. In that way we will secure through competitive bidding an equal opportunity for all, yes, for each to bid for, and recover, any mineral, and avoid future difficulties.

I think we should draw on the experience of the past and deal with this present problem at the very outset.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to see oil and gas leases so drawn as to be exclusive. I wish to see the maximum possible development of our natural resources, and the principle for which I contend can readily be achieved by adopting this amendment. Let us act now, and get off on the right foot as we undertake to deal with the vast outer Continental Shelf.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY: Page 13, line 15, after "1950", insert *"Provided however,* That all moneys collected by any State through the leasing or disposal of lands or natural resources of the outer Continental Shelf after July 1, 1947, shall be paid to the United States Government except that portion of such moneys which the respective States are obligated to return to lessees."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the language of the amendment which I have offered to the bill now pending is very similar to language contained in section 2 of H. R. 4198 which I expect will be accepted this afternoon. H. R. 4198 provides that the Secretary of the Interior or the Treasurer of the United States shall be required to pay back to the States any money that the Federal Government has collected through the leasing or other disposal of lands or natural resources within the historic boundaries as defined in the act.

My amendment provides that the States shall reciprocate by paying to the Treasury of the United States any moneys they have collected through the leasing or disposal of natural resources or lands outside the historic boundaries. It seems to me that if the Federal Government is required to pay the States anything it has collected within the historic boundaries, that it is absolutely fair and equitable to provide that the States shall pay to the Federal Government anything they have collected through leasing or other development outside historic boundaries. As a matter of fact, the claim of the Federal Government is much better because its title outside the historic boundaries has not been disputed.

My amendment requires that the States shall return these moneys only if collected after July 1, 1947. That is a date subsequent to the first Supreme Court decision in the California case in which it was decided that the Federal Government had paramount rights not only outside the historic boundaries, now defined, but in the area between these newly defined historic boundaries and the low-water mark adjacent to the shores. It seems to me that the House, and particularly the proponents of titles I and II of this bill, should agree to accept my amendment without objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. It is perfect logic to give to the Federal Government money accruals from submerged lands, which lands, by this bill, we say belong to the Federal Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the gentleman. It is for that reason I have offered the amendment; that is, to give the House the opportunity to go on record, or at least to make a record of consistency.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman fom Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Did not the gentleman offer this very same amendment when the bill was being debated on the floor and discussed before?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; this is a different amendment to a different section of the bill. I offered an amendment to title 2 previously.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. But it had the same effect.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; it had a different effect.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I thought it had the same effect.

Mr. McCARTHY. No. The effect in the other case was to provide that the Federal Government should not have to pay what it had collected from the States; just as the States were not required to make repayment to the Federal Government. This requires the

States to make payments similar to those required of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act, pursuant to House Resolution 233, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 309, nays 91, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—309

Abbitt	Cole, Mo.	Goodwin
Abernethy	Cole, N. Y.	Graham
Adair	Colmer	Grant
Albert	Cooley	Gregory
Alexander	Coon	Gubser
Allen, Calif.	Cooper	Hagen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.	Cotton	Hagen, Minn.
Andresen, August H.	Coudert	Hale
Andrews	Cretella	Haley
Arends	Crumpacker	Halleck
Auchincloss	Cunningham	Hand
Ayres	Curtis, Mass.	Harden
Baker	Curtis, Mo.	Hardy
Barden	Curtis, Nebr.	Harris
Bates	Dague	Harrison, Nebr.
Battle	Davis, Ga.	Harrison, Va.
Beamer	Davis, Tenn.	Harrison, Wyo.
Becker	Davis, Wis.	Harvey
Belcher	Deane	Hays, Ark.
Bender	Derounian	Heriong
Bennett, Fla.	Devereux	Hess
Bennett, Mich.	Dies	Hiestand
Bentley	Dolliver	Hill
Bentsen	Dondero	Hillelson
Berry	Donohue	Hillings
Betts	Donovan	Hinshaw
Bishop	Dorn, N. Y.	Hoeven
Bolton, Frances P.	Dorn, S. C.	Hoffman, Ill.
	Dowdy	Holifield
Bolton, Oliver P.	Doyle	Holmes
	Durham	Holt
Bonin	Edmondson	Hope
Bonner	Elliott	Horan
Bosch	Ellsworth	Hosmer
Bow	Engle	Hruska
Bramblett	Evins	Hunter
Bray	Fallon	Hyde
Brooks, Tex.	Feighan	Ikard
Brown, Ga.	Fenton	Jackson
Brownson	Fernandez	James
Broyhill	Fino	Jarman
Budge	Fisher	Jenkins
Burleson	Ford	Jensen
Bushey	Forrester	Johnson
Byrnes, Wis.	Fountain	Jonas, Ill.
Camp	Frazier	Jonas, N. C.
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Jones, Mo.
Carrigg	Fulton	Jones, N. C.
Cederberg	Gamble	Judd
Chelf	Gary	Kean
Chenoweth	Gathings	Kearney
Chiperfield	Gavin	Kearns
Church	Gentry	Keating
Clardy	George	Karsten, Wis.
Clevenger	Golden	Kilburn
		Kilday
King, Calif.	Perkins	Smith, Kans.
King, Pa.	Pfost	Smith, Va.
Knox	Philbin	Smith, Wis.
Laird	Phillips	Springer
Landrum	Pilcher	Stauffer
Lanham	Pillion	Steed
Lantaff	Poff	Stringfellow
Latham	Polk	Taber
LeCompte	Preston	Talle
Lovre	Priest	Teague
Lucas	Prouty	Thomas
Lyle	Rains	Thompson, Mich.
McConnell	Ray	
McCulloch	Rayburn	Thompson, Tex.
McDonough	Reed, Ill.	Thornberry
McGregor	Reed, N. Y.	Tollefson
McVey	Rees, Kans.	Trimble
Mack, Wash.	Regan	Tuck
Magnuson	Rhodes, Ariz.	Utt
Mahon	Richards	Van Pelt
Mailliard	Riehlman	Van Zandt
Martin, Iowa	Riley	Velde
Matthews	Rivers	Vinson
Meader	Robeson, Va.	Vorys
Merrill	Robsion, Ky.	Vursell
Merrow	Rogers, Colo.	Wainwright
Metcalf	Rogers, Fla.	Walter
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	Wampler
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Tex.	Warburton
Miller, N. Y.	Sadlak	Watts
Mills	St. George	Weichel
Morano	Saylor	Westland
Moss	Schenck	Wharton
Moulder	Scherer	Wheeler
Mumma	Scott	Whitten
Murray	Scrivner	Wickersham
Neal	Scudder	Widnall
Nelson	Secrest	Wigglesworth
Nicholson	Seely-Brown	Williams, N. Y.
Norblad	Selden	Wilson, Calif.
Norrell	Sheehan	Wilson, Ind.
Oakman	Shelley	Wilson, Tex.
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sheppard	Winstead
O'Hara, Minn.	Short	Wolverton
Osmers	Shuford	Yorty
Ostertag	Sikes	Young
Patman	Simpson, Ill.	Younger
Patterson	Simpson, Pa.	
Pelly	Small	

NAYS—91

Addonizio	Forand	Miller, Kans.
Andersen, H. Carl	Friedel	Mollohan
	Garmatz	Morgan
Aspinall	Gordon	Morrison
Blatnik	Granahan	Multer
Boggs	Green	O'Brien, Ill.
Boland	Gross	O'Brien, Mich.
Bolling	Hébert	O'Hara, Ill.
Brooks, La.	Heller	O'Konski
Buchanan	Heselton	O'Neill
Buckley	Holtzman	Passman
Burdick	Howell	Patten
Byrd	Javits	Poage
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Powell
Canfield	Karsten, Mo.	Price
Cannon	Kee	Rabaut
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Radwan
Case	Kelly, N. Y.	Reams
Celler	Keogh	Rhodes, Pa.
Chatham	Kirwan	Rodino
Chudoff	Klein	Rooney
Corbett	Kluczynski	Roosevelt
Crosser	Lane	Spence
Dawson, Ill.	Lesinski	Sullivan
Dawson, Utah	Long	Thompson, La.
Delaney	McCarthy	Wier
Dingell	McCormack	Willis
Dollinger	Machrowicz	Withrow
Eberharter	Mack, Ill.	Yates
Fine	Madden	Zablocki
Fogarty	Marshall	

NOT VOTING—31

Angell	Hart	Roberts
Bailey	Hays, Ohio	Shafer
Barrett	Hoffman, Mich.	Sieminski
Boykin	Hull	Smith, Miss.
Brown, Ohio	Krueger	Staggers
Bush	McIntire	Sutton
Carlyle	McMillan	Taylor
Condon	Mason	Williams, Miss.
Dempsey	Miller, Calif.	Wolcott
D'Ewart	Poulson	
Gwinn	Reece, Tenn.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Hull against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Bush for, with Mr. Sieminski against.

Mr. Carlyle for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Sutton for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gwinn with Mr. Condon.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Dempsey.

Mr. Shafer with Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. Mason with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. Angell with Mr. Smith of Mississippi.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. PROUTY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. BYRD, CARNAHAN, and CROSSER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL ROBERT LEARY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 99 requesting the President of the United States to return a bill which passed both the House and Senate. The child involved in this bill has been taken care of under existing law.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House the enrolled bill (H. R. 1101) for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded, and the bill shall be postponed indefinitely.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]?

There was no objection.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER CAMPBELL BROWN

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINE. Admiration for Peter Campbell Brown's qualities as a man, his sagacity as a lawyer, and his fidelity to the public service, all exemplified throughout his chairmanship of the Subversive Activities Control Board, prompts me today, Mr. Speaker, to add my tribute to those already paid him for his achievement in that arduous work, from which he has now resigned.

By diligent inquiry, conducted under his direction, the Board, as we know, has conclusively established that the Communist Party is completely subservient to the evil influences of the Soviet Union, and has thus been able to order the party to submit to registration and control.

The finding as to the party's status, Mr. Speaker, is not, as many have supposed, a mere idle confirmation of the condition long before exposed. When the Board was established, Congress had, indeed, completely uncovered the party's

functions as a tool of Soviet Russia. For control of the danger to the national security inherent in that situation, however, it was necessary, under the Constitution, first, that a control method conforming to that basic law be devised by Congress; and secondly, that the law be administered with meticulous regard for the constitutional guaranties.

Failure on either count should have left the proceeding open to nullification by judicial decision and permitted the Communists to go on using the Constitution as a shelter, under cover of which to carry on their efforts to tear it down.

In order that my own high estimate of Peter Brown's services be understood and appreciated, I must relate what demands the conduct of the case made upon his patience, his fortitude, and his legal acumen. Only thus can the measure of his contribution be grasped.

Of the manifold functions of government relating to security, I know of none, Mr. Speaker, which confronts an administrator with quite the same severe tests of character and stamina as those involving communism.

In its effort to escape registration, the party ran the gamut of every legal trick, windy arguments, and contumacious actions, hoping to provoke the Chairman into unjudicious attitudes and reversible error; the party rasped Mr. Brown with its abrasive dialectics. A reading of the record would indicate that there is no instance in which the Chairman yielded to exasperation. Peter Brown handled the situation firmly and patiently and exhibited a profound knowledge of the law.

His duty in presiding over the hearing panel was to maintain impartiality. The record of the hearing and of the courts which, midway in the proceeding, reviewed it on the Communist Party's vain petition for an injunction to stop it, will show he did so.

But the prime test in the hearing was knowledge of the law, ability to unravel the skeins of specious arguments and motions spun out by the party, all in an effort to put the law, rather than the party, on trial. I am confident that when the Supreme Court reviews the proceeding, the rulings of Peter Brown will be upheld.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 235, Rept. No. 421), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5174) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for H. R. 5134, which, if passed, will confirm jurisdiction, control, and powers of disposition over the natural resources of the Continental Shelf which lies seaward of the 3-mile limit around our shores in the United States of America.

I do not approve of the mechanics by which this bill is before us. In the first place, when we pass H. R. 5134, we purport to amend a bill which is not yet law. As I understand the parliamentary situation, it is that after we pass H. R. 5134 we will then take up House Resolution 232, which, if passed—and I am sure it will be in the light of previous votes on the subject matter—will have the effect of an agreement on the part of the House to the Senate amendments to H. R. 4198, a bill to confirm and establish title in the States to those lands seaward of the low-water mark for a distance of 3 miles.

In the light of my previous votes on this subject matter, I shall vote for H. R. 5134 and shall then vote against House Resolution 232.

I have always felt that the Supreme Court decisions established title to the lands seaward of low-water mark for a distance of 3 miles, except in the case of Texas, where the distance is 10½ miles, in the United States. I have felt that the people of the Seventh Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent here, owned an interest in those lands under the decisions of the highest Court of the United States, and I never felt that it was my prerogative, by my vote, to give the interest of the people of the Seventh Congressional District to the States involved. I still feel that way and shall vote against House Resolution 232, which, if passed—and I am sure it will be—puts the House in the position of agreeing to the Senate amendments and takes from the United States the title which our Supreme Court says it has held and vests that title in our coastal States, and particularly in Louisiana, Texas, and California.

As stated above, I shall vote for H. R. 5134 and with the hope that when we pass it the Senate will adopt it and that it may go to the President and become a part of the law of the land. As I understand it, H. R. 5134 deals with the natural resources in and under the seabed of the outer Continental Shelf seaward and beyond State boundaries, as those State boundaries will be fixed and determined by H. R. 4198, after we have passed House Resolution 232, and recognizes that that area and the resources therein belong to the United States of America and are subject to its jurisdiction and control. The bill sets up the mechanics whereby the lands of the Continental Shelf may be leased, developed, and administered by the United States Government.

Every person interested in the subject matter of this legislation is in substantial agreement that we should set up a system whereby these lands may be leased and operated. Their development and operation, if not now vital to our economy and security, may well become so at any moment. This bill asserts for the United States, as against every other nation in the world, our claim to the natural resources of the Continental Shelf. It should be passed.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, British Machiavellian policy is highly dangerous in the modern world. Exploitation of the Irish or in India 100 years ago could be covered up from the general knowledge of mankind.

But hypocrisy or violation of moral principles by nations under modern conditions is a different matter.

British trade with Red China while British boys are being shot by the Red Chinese government involves a principle the violation of which by an individual is treason. Mankind is shocked by this perfidy.

Attlee's plea for a wider open door for British exports is a phony. The British have prohibited the Harley-Davidson Co. of Milwaukee, Wis., from selling one motorcycle in England since the end of the war. British firms have sold in the United States 57,448 machines made with cheap British labor during the same period. The Milwaukee firm is the sole surviving American manufacturer of standard cycles and the firm and its workers have been seriously damaged by this selfish British policy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, easily ranking among the greatest events in the history of this great country was the resolution of 1780 passed by the Continental Congress, which provided for the acceptance and management for the common benefit of all of such unappropriated lands as might be ceded by various States to the Central Government.

Between 1781 and 1802 7 States ceded 266 million acres which later constituted all or the major portion of 9 other States. In the absence of this epoch making event, there would have been a few superstates which would have destroyed the possibilities of a Federal Union.

It was this ingenious system that paved the way for the Louisiana Purchase, the purchase from Spain, the Oregon Compromise, the Mexican Cession, the purchase from Texas, the Gadsden Purchase, and the purchase of Alaska—adding more than one and a half billion more acres—1,571,335,640—to the great public domain.

Two basic principles have guided this country in the management of this vast joint holding. First, the creation of additional States and their admission to the Union on an equal footing with all other States, and second, the formulation of programs and policies for the ad-

ministration of great residual areas and resources for the common benefit of all the people.

Under the first, the number of States has grown to 48, and under the second have come such great programs as the national parks, the Forest Service, the mineral leasing program, the grazing and land management programs, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Reclamation program, and many multiple purpose projects to conserve and develop our great resources.

But now we are witnessing a reversal of all this. The Congress of the United States is proceeding to enlarge the boundaries of a few already large and powerful States, accentuating inequalities by allocation from the common public domain great resources in a process and under a system that only a few States can benefit from. Now that modern technology and great advancements in science, the tools of our great advancing civilization, have made possible the effective development of the great resources lying in and under the waters of the seas and oceans, Congress, in epoch-making legislation, is giving to a few States, the common heritage of all. The first act is for a limited distance, but this is only the beginning—they will probably be back later to extend their boundaries still further. Now that the basic policies that have guided America for 170 years have been breached, the second and third and many more steps will be easier to take in logical succession.

The offshore areas are only a part of the story. How else can it be explained that so many Members of both branches of Congress supported this expansion of the boundaries of a few States.

Enough has already happened to reveal a few of the successive steps to be taken.

An amendment to the measure to extend the boundaries of the coastal States that would have included the transfer to the States of all the minerals in all Federal lands was set aside with the promise that it would have special consideration as a separate segment of the program. Several bills are now before Congress to accomplish these purposes.

Other measures in the same pattern are before the committees to transfer to the States the rights to the vast grazing lands on the public domain. But this is to be only setting the stage for transfer to the cattlemen and sheepmen of these extensive areas.

Official administration policy has been announced of Federal withdrawal from the construction of a great multiple-purpose western project in favor of a restricted development by private power interests.

There has been unofficial talk, which probably could be ignored if it were not a logical part of the new policies and programs, of selling some of the great multiple-purpose projects to private interests.

If one great multiple-purpose project is to be stopped and turned over to private interests and other completed projects are to be sold, what becomes of the resource development program for the future? Under this new pattern there could be no future program.

One must be still further concerned with what is happening to the basic structure of the Government and political system on which this country has been built. Here we find the Congress of the United States undertaking by special legislation to destroy the functions and decisions of a coordinate branch—the Supreme Court. After prolonged and careful weighing of all the respective rights and the basic issues involved in three historic cases, the Supreme Court of the United States has clearly ruled against the action now being so lightly taken by Congress itself. Distinctly judicial functions appropriate only to the Supreme Court of the United States are being taken over by Congress itself—upsetting the judicial processes and starting this country on a new and strange course.

SUBMERGED LANDS ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 232 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf, with Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby, agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] and I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order H. R. 4198 which is the same bill pertaining to the submerged lands which was passed in the other body after extended debate. It is also the same bill as titles I and II of the bill which was passed in this body. I think it is perhaps sufficient for me to say that there has already been in this body extensive consideration not only in this session but of the general principles involved in past sessions as well. For that reason I will not take the time to launch into any lengthy discussion so far as I am concerned but will at this time yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I trust that 3 minutes will be sufficient for me to say all that I deem necessary about this resolution.

By its adoption, we concur in the Senate amendment to H. R. 4198 and this phase of the legislation is complete except for approval by the President. We all recall that earlier in the session we adopted and sent to the Senate H. R. 4198, and that that bill consisted of three titles. When it arrived at the Senate it was extensively debated for many weeks, and emerged with title III eliminated. About 15 minutes ago we again voted out title III in the bill H. R. 5134, and it now goes to the Senate for reconsideration.

Titles I and II of the original bill, H. R. 4198, are now before us. There have been no substantial changes made by the Senate in these titles. They are practically the same as when passed by the House except in a few instances where a few words and phrases here and there have been changed or deleted for clarification.

About the only thing that is substantially new in this bill is a reassertion by the Senate in section 9 which confirms the rights of the United States to the jurisdiction and control of the lands under the Continental Shelf outside of State boundaries.

I read as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be deemed to affect in any wise the rights of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf.

So that this is contained in the bill that will go immediately to the President upon its adoption.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Would the gentleman be good enough to explain right there on section 9 a matter that has disturbed some of us? Just what does that mean? Does that mean that this bill confirms in the United States title to that portion of the Continental Shelf which lies outside the 3-mile limit or the 9-mile limit, as the case may be?

Mr. REED of Illinois. It means there is nothing in this act, that is, the bill that is now before us, that shall be deemed to affect in any wise the rights, if we have any, of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters, as defined in section 2 hereof.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That means outside of the 3-mile limit or the 9-mile limit?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The 3-mile limit or the 3-league limit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What does this mean, "all of which natural resources appertain to the United States, and the jurisdiction and control of which by the United States is hereby confirmed"?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does not that confirm the title of the United States?

Mr. REED of Illinois. It does, in my opinion, but that does not provide the machinery.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not care about the machinery, but I want to know whether this act confirms the title of the United States in the land lying between the historic boundary and the Continental Shelf.

Mr. REED of Illinois. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to the adoption of this resolution for the reason that I believe we should send this legislation to conference to give the conferees on the side of the House an opportunity to try to

put into the bill title III, which we passed just a few moments ago, and which was included in the bill we sent to the Senate and which it has returned with title III deleted.

This bill, H. R. 4198, went to the Senate with three titles. Title I and title II are back with us with one particular improvement. The Senate adopted the amendment which I presented to the House and which was defeated, that is, the definition of the coastline. The definition that was in the bill as it left this body provided that the Santa Barbara Channel off the coast of California would be inland waters. That is one of the questions that the United States and California have been arguing before the Special Master, appointed by the Supreme Court, for the past 3 years.

They have retained title I and title II, giving, of course, jurisdiction and control of these submerged lands to the 3-mile limit or, in certain instances, in the Gulf of Mexico to Louisiana, Florida, and Texas, 10½ miles. Of course, I have been opposed to that. I believe the Federal Government should have the entire control. But that has been passed by the House.

My appeal to you now is that if we turn this rule down we will then have an opportunity to go to conference and insist that the other body accept title III in toto as we have just passed it.

We must make abundantly sure that the will of this House, as it has just been expressed by the passage of H. R. 5134 should obtain. We realize we have been given some assurances that the other body will take up for consideration the bill (H. R. 5134) which we just passed, but we have no assurance whatever that they will accept it either in toto or in part. I hesitate to make the prediction that it will not come back to this body in any form consistent with the way we passed it because there are persons both in this body and the other body who will claim that the States should have police powers and control of leasing, control of conservation powers, authority to assess severance taxes, and a sizable percentage of the royalties derived from these mineral deposits in these submerged lands beyond the 3-mile limit or the historic boundary, so I urge you not to abdicate or to capitulate. We should stand firm—send this bill to conference and see if the conferees cannot work out a title III which will be acceptable.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to ask a question of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]. Certain words were dropped out of the House bill which reached the other body with reference to water power. The words are "at any site where the United States now owns the water power." May I direct this question to the gentleman. The omission in sections 2 (e) and 3 (d) of H. R. 4198 as passed by the Senate of certain language contained in the corresponding sections, 2 (d) and 3 (d), of H. R. 4198 as passed by the House and the reference to "water power" and "use of water for the production of power" in section 2 (e) and similar references in section 3 (d) in the bill as passed by the Senate are not to be construed as acquiescence in any view that the United States has any proprietary right in water power by virtue or by reason of its being inherent in the navigable waters within the several States.

Mr. GRAHAM. Nor is it intended to interfere with the constitutional rights of the United States as to such areas anywhere in the United States where the United States now owns sites in such areas. The answer is, "No."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 116, not voting, 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—278

Abbitt	Curtis, Mo.	Hope
Abernethy	Curtis, Nebr.	Horan
Adair	Dague	Hosmer
Alexander	Davis, Ga.	Hruska
Allen, Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Hyde
Allen, Ill.	Derounian	Ikard
Andresen, August H.	Devereux	James
Andrews	Dies	Jarman
Arends	Dolliver	Jenkins
Auchincloss	Dondero	Jensen
Ayres	Donohue	Johnson
Baker	Donovan	Jonas, Ill.
Barden	Dorn, N. Y.	Jonas, N. C.
Bates	Dorn, S. C.	Jones, N. C.
Battle	Dowdy	Judd
Beamer	Doyle	Kean
Becker	Durham	Kearney
Belcher	Edmondson	Kearns
Bender	Ellsworth	Kersten, Wis.
Bennett, Fla.	Engle	Kilburn
Bennett, Mich.	Fallon	Kilday
Bentley	Fenton	King, Calif.
Bentsen	Fisher	King, Pa.
Berry	Ford	Knox
Betts	Forrester	Laird
Bishop	Frelinghuysen	Landrum
Boggs	Fulton	Lantaff
Bolton, Frances P.	Gamble	Latham
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gary	LeCompte
Bonin	Gathings	Long
Bosch	Gavin	Lovre
Bow	Gentry	Lucas
Bramblett	George	Lyle
Bray	Golden	McConnell
Brooks, La.	Goodwin	McCulloch
Brooks, Tex.	Graham	McDonough
Brown, Ga.	Grant	McGregor
Brownson	Gubser	McVey
Broyhill	Gwinn	Mack, Wash.
Budge	Hagen, Calif.	Mahon
Burleson	Hagen, Minn.	Mailliard
Busbey	Hale	Martin, Iowa
Byrnes, Wis.	Haley	Matthews
Camp	Halleck	Merrill
Campbell	Hand	Merrow
Carrigg	Harden	Miller, Md.
Cederberg	Hardy	Miller, Nebr.
Chenoweth	Harris	Morano
Chiperfield	Harrison, Nebr.	Morrison
Church	Harrison, Va.	Mumma
Clardy	Harrison, Wyo.	Murray
Clevenger	Harvey	Neal
Cole, Mo.	Hays, Ark.	Nelson
Cole, N. Y.	Hébert	Nicholson
Colmer	Hess	Norblad
Cooley	Hiestand	Norrell
Coon	Hill	Oakman
Cotton	Hillelson	O'Hara, Minn.
Coudert	Hillings	Osmers
Crumpacker	Hinshaw	Passman
Cunningham	Hoeven	Patman
Curtis, Mass.	Hoffman, Ill.	Patterson
	Holifield	Pelly
	Holmes	Philbin
	Holt	Phillips
Pilcher	Seely-Brown	Utt
Pillion	Seiden	Van Pelt
Poage	Sheehan	Van Zandt
Poff	Shelley	Velde
Preston	Sheppard	Vinson
Rains	Short	Vorys
Ray	Shuford	Vursell
Rayburn	Sikes	Wainwright
Reed, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.	Walter
Reed, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.	Wampler
Rees, Kans.	Small	Warburton
Regan	Smith, Kans.	Weichel
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Va.	Westland
Richards	Smith, Wis.	Wharton
Riehlman	Springer	Wheeler
Riley	Stauffer	Whitten
Rivers	Steed	Wickersham
Robeson, Va.	Stringfellow	Widnall
Rogers, Fla.	Taber	Wigglesworth
Rogers, Mass.	Talle	Williams, N. Y.
Rogers, Tex.	Teague	Willis
Sadlak	Thomas	Wilson, Calif.
St. George	Thompson, La.	Wilson, Ind.
Saylor	Thompson, Mich.	Wilson, Tex.
Schenck	Thompson, Tex.	Winstead
Scherer	Thornberry	Wolverton
Scott	Tollefson	Yorty
Scrivner	Tuck	Young
Scudder		Younger

NAYS—116

Addonizio	Fogarty	Miller, Kans.
Andersen, H. Carl	Forand	Mills
Aspinall	Fountain	Mollohan
Bailey	Frazier	Morgan
Blatnik	Friedel	Moss
Boland	Garmatz	Moulder
Bolling	Gordon	Multer
Bonner	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Buchanan	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Buckley	Gregory	O'Brien, N. Y.
Burdick	Gross	O'Hara, Ill.
Byrd	Heller	O'Konski
Byrne, Pa.	Heselton	O'Neill
Canfield	Holtzman	Patten
Carnahan	Howell	Perkins
Case	Javits	Pfost
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Polk
Chatham	Jones, Mo.	Powell
Chelf	Karsten, Mo.	Price
Chudoff	Keating	Priest
Cooper	Kee	Prouty
Corbett	Kelley, Pa.	Rabaut
Crosser	Kelly, N. Y.	Radwan
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Reams
Dawson, Ill.	Kirwan	Rhodes, Pa.
Dawson, Utah	Klein	Robsion, Ky.
Deane	Klucynski	Rodino
Delaney	Lane	Rogers, Colo.
Dingell	Lanham	Rooney
Dodd	Lesinski	Roosevelt
Dollinger	McCarthy	Secrest
Eberharter	McCormack	Spence
Elliott	Machrowicz	Sullivan
Evins	Mack, Ill.	Trimble
Feighan	Madden	Waits
Fernandez	Magnuson	Wier
Fine	Marshall	Withrow
Fino	Meader	Yates
	Metcalf	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—37

Albert	Hays, Ohio	Poulson
Angell	Herlong	Reece, Tenn.
Barrett	Hoffman, Mich.	Roberts
Boykin	Hull	Shafer
Brown, Ohio	Hunter	Sieminski
Bush	Jackson	Smith, Miss.
Cannon	Krueger	Staggers
Carlyle	McIntire	Sutton
Condon	McMillan	Taylor
Cretella	Mason	Williams, Miss.
Dempsey	Miller, Calif.	Wolcott
D'Ewart	Miller, N. Y.	
Hart	Ostertag	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Bush for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Sieminski against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Condon against.

Mr. Poulson for, with Mr. Albert against.

Mr. Carlyle for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi for, with Mr. Sutton against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shafer with Mr. Cannon.
Mr. Angell with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Cretella with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Hoffman of Michigan with Mr. Miller of California.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MEETING OF COMMITTEES DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all committees having hearings scheduled for tomorrow morning be permitted to sit during the session of the House tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE COMING ELECTIONS IN ITALY

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a momentous question will be placed before the voters of Italy within a few weeks—Is democracy to survive in their country? In early June the Italian people will go to the polls in the first general election since 1948. On that earlier occasion in May 1948, all Europe and America apprehensively watched and waited while Italy determined its fate at the polls. For the election had developed into a struggle between communism and democracy. It was a tremendous relief to the Western powers when the counting of the ballots revealed that the democratic parties had won. Now, after 5 years of democratic government by the center parties under the leadership of the Christian Democrats, the young republic again faces a national election. This election comes at a time when parliamentary democracy in Italy has entered a state verging on crisis. The threat to democracy comes from both right and left. However, by far the most imminent of the two dangers is communism. The center parties are facing a decisive battle to preserve democracy in Italy. Are they strong enough? Can they now join forces in preparation for this great electoral battle? Only the people of Italy can decide this.

A glance at the current trend of politics in Italy will serve to show how serious the situation has become. In the 1946 general elections for a Provisional Parliament, the Christian Democrats topped all other parties with 8 million votes; in 1948 with 12 million votes. However, the municipal and regional elections of 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952 point to a definite decline in the electoral strength of the Christian Democrats. In the 1952 municipal elections the extreme rightwing parties together polled 10 percent of the total vote and the Communists and their allies got over 30 percent. The democratic coalition led by the Christian Democrats lost heavily in the popular vote in these municipal elections. There was a definite trend toward the extremes of both the left and the right. Consequently, the political resources of the Christian Democratic Party appear to be dwindling and there is good reason to fear that it cannot duplicate this spring the success of 1948. Although these last elections were only for town and provincial councils, they were regarded everywhere as a trial run for the parliamentary election this spring. It would be virtually impossible to overstress the gravity of Italy's plight if the trend revealed in the recent elections should continue. If the parliamentary majority should shift to the right or to the left, the country might find itself split into two hostile camps, each directed by the extremists. Italy would then, indeed, face severe internal tension, if not open civil war—for the right has threatened to use the power of the state to outlaw all opposition parties, while the left threatens to resist by force. Another almost equally disastrous possibility is the development of three large blocs—left, right, and center—which would subject the government to grave uncertainties and probably would lead to a parliamentary deadlock.

Are the center parties slipping because they have failed the people? Indeed not. The core of Italy's problem is economic. Although progress has been made, the Italian economy has been unable to absorb the mass of surplus labor. The surplus labor presents a permanent crisis in Italy. Economic policies have been of an emergency nature and consequently have not fulfilled the fundamental requirements of the national economy, and so the peasants and workingmen are being wooed by the siren song of communism and allied leftist groups. If a free state and a representative government are to survive, the peasant and the workingman must know what conditions are necessary to constitute a stable economy and which groups in the political picture are striving toward these goals. Democratic leaders in Italy must bring home to the people that the foundations of real improvement—which rest on such factors as the modernization of industrial plants, the expansion of markets, a more public-spirited capitalist leadership, and the enlargement of an agricultural plan in which the peasant has a maximum of proprietary interest—cannot be laid by Communists. The welfare of the Italian people is directly related to such economic policies as those promoted by the Marshall and Schuman plans and by the integration of Italy in a free-world economy. These are the long-range goals of the Christian Democratic and other center parties. Are the people aware of the great sacrifices involved should democracy lose out—the benefits of mutual security, participation in NATO, participation in the Schuman plan, and Western European integration? There is no illusion about the price to be paid.

The Communist Party if it gains notably in the spring elections, may be able to block progress in many directions. It opposes any expansion of the national horizon for cooperation with other European countries, except of course, the Soviet Union or the satellite states. It seeks to perpetuate the country's lethargy and it blocks any forward steps. Moreover, the fundamental characteristic of the Communist Party in Italy is its role as an agent of the Kremlin. Should communism win out in Italy, the church would undoubtedly be persecuted, and possibly overthrown. This is almost a certain consequence since opposition to religion and the church is a basic tenet of Communist doctrine. Moreover, the spiritual force of the church in Italy has provided the Christian Democratic Party with the ideological means to acquire the vast political influence and popularity which it has enjoyed. And so it is evident that the struggle of democracy against communism in Italy is really a struggle for the survival of Italian culture and civilization.

What would be the consequences of a Communist victory in Italy for the rest of free Europe and the Mediterranean area? What would be the impact on us of a Communist victory in the Italian Parliament.

The cold war between the East and West has developed, at least in part, into a struggle for strategic positions. The Soviet Union is obviously reaching for a country which has been on "our side" of the Iron Curtain and would be for them an extremely valuable acquisition. If Italy were lost to communism, the present balance of power on the continent of Europe would be upset. The Mediterranean would be divided into halves. Russia would gain tremendous advantage in the use of Italy's warm-water ports. The Eastern Mediterranean would be closed to us—in case of war our position as allies of Greece and Turkey would be almost untenable. Our shortest route to the Middle East oil fields would be cut. Communist victory in Italy would spur the French Communists into intensified activity—and the Western European alliance would be greatly weakened. A Communist victory in Italy would usher in a dark hour for the whole free world.

Americans, I believe, are very conscious of the great issues at stake in Italy this spring. And Italian leaders know that we understand their problem—that we

have done much to help democracy in Italy and that we are planning to do more. We have shown over and over again our concern for the great problems of overpopulation in Italy, the Trieste question, and the constant economic crisis with which they are faced.

Can we do more to assist the Italians in this time of great crisis and imminent decision? Yes; I believe we can. I believe we can use our influence to help see that the people have the necessary freedom of action to vote as they believe. Democratic leaders in Italy are aware, I am sure, of the possibility that the Communists may use coercion as they have in other countries.

If the Communists should attempt to overthrow Italian democracy with the assistance of the Kremlin, the Italians can be sure that they will have the full support of the United States in defending their freedom. Article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty provides that the parties—and that includes both the United States and Italy—will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of any of the parties is threatened. The presence of strong United States naval forces in the Mediterranean is symbolic of the interest which the United States has in Italian freedom. Another action we can take is one which I would like to ask the American people to initiate now—as soon as possible—and that is the writing of letters to their relatives or friends in Italy, to impress upon them the great impact of these coming elections, not only on their own lives but on the whole world, and to ask them to go to the polls and vote for democracy. As you know, many Americans did exactly this at the time of the 1948 elections—and with tremendous success.

If democracy wins in Italy, if civil war is averted, if a Communist coup is prevented, a great victory will be won in Italy and in the Western World. Our strategic position in the Mediterranean will be safe, the survival of the Western European alliance will be assured, and the Communists will have been given another severe setback. However, only the Italian people can make the momentous decision. For the Italian people this must be a great crusade—a crusade for freedom. Time is running short.

If the democratic forces win, they will be able to achieve in time the material and idealistic objectives for which they stand. If they fail, democracy will be eclipsed in Italy. Such a defeat would be a mournful event in the history of the world. With steadfastness and perseverance on the part of the democratic leaders in Italy; with vision and the courage of their convictions on the part of the Italian people, democracy can and will win in Italy.

THE TIDELANDS BILL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this move on the part of the allied forces of the plunderbund and the administration to rob the people of the United States of the wealth of submerged minerals, more specifically oil in this instance, and labeled as a "tidelands bill" is the dirtiest most sinful move ever uncovered in this land. It dwarfs the Teapot Dome and Elk Hills attempt and there is nothing that could be referred to even remotely as comparable. It has been carefully worked out as to detail by the plunderbund with full cooperation of the administration and in its attempted perfection of execution it reminds me of the robbery of the Denver Mint and the more recent Brinks robbery in Boston. Of course, in total those were but petty larceny compared to this legalized robbery which may turn out in fact as a betrayal of the people of the United States. It not only involves the equity of each and every citizen, yes, even of those yet unborn, it also affects present and future educational advancement. None of this seems to make any difference to the conscienceless conspirators now in full control.

Three decisions of the Supreme Court and two Presidential vetoes mean nothing to the present-day manipulators who not only in themselves are mighty but are also certain of the support of the Chief Executive. There is no defense of the rights of the people today as there was in the Roosevelt-Truman administrations. There is no impediment in the path of these most powerful antipublic and conscienceless conspirators when the God-given natural resources, in this instance estimated to be worth anywhere from $35 billion to as high as $350 billion, are taken from all the people of the United States and given to the plundering interests of three oil-producing States, and one other State that does not even have that excuse or reason for the support of this alleged legislation.

Not even the people of those four favored States can personally gain anything in this battle. The loot will not go to them directly or indirectly. They will lose more than they would gain were all the people to share in the proper exploration and development of these mineral rights wherever they may be along our coastline. The plunderbund, the arch conspirators which are connected with a rapacious group within the oil industry, will reap the prime benefits and through them a political party supported by excessive outlays of ill-gotten gains will attempt to advance further over the prostrate body politic of the American people. All kinds of campaign advertising bought and paid for by these very same iniquitous interests are still to be found in California, Texas, and especially in Louisiana. Political advertising which led the people to believe that through the proposal which is now before this House would the schools and the people benefit when just the contrary is true. The Federal Government, as the Supreme Court decision sustained the position, would be permitted to develop and distribute the benefits from such development among the States. Especially under the proposals advocated by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and his equally effective and pro-public colleague, Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, would there be real and lasting advancement of our schools and other institutions would benefit and expand.

This attempt, Mr. Speaker, is the unprecedented low in brazen and contemptuous legislation against the sovereign rights of the people as expressed by the Supreme Court of the United States and is a dangerous evolution of power among industrial pirates who for their own self-aggrandizement will do anything even when it is generally recognized that it involves the very sovereignty and safety of our Nation. God grant that the test will be made in the Supreme Court and that the Almighty in His wisdom will grant the courage and the conviction to the great Court to intervene and decide once again and for all that the rights of the people are paramount and that polished and surreptitious banditry despite congressional weakness or cowardice shall not prevail against the Nation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE WEST INDIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1949, this Congress laid the basis for the successful Communist revolt in British Guiana over the past week-end. Right next door to the United States and the Panama Canal the Communists in British Guiana have just taken complete control of the Legislative Council by capturing 18 seats out of the 24. The new Prime Minister of British Guiana will be Dr. Cheddi Jagan, a self-proclaimed Communist and leader of the People's Progressive Party. There is absolutely nothing that the British Government can do about this except to dissolve the Legislative Council and deny suffrage to the people of British Guiana which in turn would play directly into the Communists hands and all of this is our fault.

British Guiana's No. 1 Communist and his wife campaigned throughout their country on one platform—Americans hate British Guiana and they used as proof the Judd bill which passed this House on March 1, 1949, with only 39 Members opposing it. I said then and I repeat now that the passage of that bill would "breed ill-will next door to ourselves, will do to ourselves immense harm and is an uncalled-for slap in the face." I tried unsuccessfully on March 1, 1949, to clean up the Judd bill. I was opposed by Congressman JUDD, Congressman WALTER, and others.

What was the Judd bill? The Judd bill was the foundation by which the nefarious McCarran-Walter Immigration Act is now predicated. The Judd bill aimed at giving equality to all orientals but tucked away in the heart of it was rank discrimination and prejudice against the loyal, efficient, trustworthy,

patriotic people who have been migrating to his country from the West Indies for the past quarter of a century. It was a deal made to admit 100 orientals per year from various sections of the Far East in return for stopping for migration to America of any Negro. It was hindsight of the worst type.

Today, we have a Communist government right next door to us, and it is directly the fault of the authors of the Judd-McCarran-Walter bills. I pleaded with you on the floor. I warned you that this would happen. I knew what I was talking about. I have been to the West Indies twice within the past few years. I know the people. But, because of your blind prejudices and your facetious arguments of equality by discrimination, you failed to listen. Not only do you have a Communist government strongly entrenched today in British Guiana but you have created ill will in every single West Indian island from Kingston in the north to Trinidad in the south. Every single West Indian legislative body passed a resolution condemning the United States of America for passing the McCarran-Walter bill.

Today, the separate colonies comprising the British West Indies are moving toward federation, it was recently agreed at a meeting in London. That means that within the next few months we will have not a crown colony but a new member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, governed and controlled by the natives and these natives do not like us.

We are the most disliked nation in the world today, not only among the darker peoples of Africa and Asia but among the Anglo-Saxons of Europe and now among the Caribbeans right in our own back yard.

In the eyes of the world we are the Western Hemisphere counterpart of the Union of South Africa. We have established a Capetown-Washington, D. C., axis. President Eisenhower did not cover the entire picture in his recommendations for amendments to the McCarran-Walter immigration bill. He omitted recommending the doing away with the equality by discrimination that we have forced upon our next-door neighbors. I am sure this was an oversight. I am this day dispatching a copy of this speech to the White House with the hope that he will include the recommendations that I fought for on March 1, 1949, in his new recommendations concerning the changing of the McCarran bill.

It is unfortunate that in times like these, when the world needs America and needs the idea of democracy, that our Nation is being governed by bigots. And so we have witnessed the best political idea that man has ever conceived—the idea of democracy—being defeated today by the worst political idea that man has ever conceived, the idea of communism.

How stupid of my colleagues 4 years ago to throw a sop to orientals 9,000 miles away and cut the throats of loyal Caribbeans 2 hours by plane from American cities. I close with the words I used April 25, 1952, when opposing the McCarran Act, "Do not think that what you do here is not going to be heard all over the world. It is going to be heard in the Caribbean, it is going to be heard where there are people of the darker races; we are going to need them sometime. We are not big enough to whip this world by ourselves and I hope to God we do not undertake to do it. You are sowing the seeds for the destruction of America."

We have squandered billions under the Marshall Plan. We are bleeding the prime of our American youth in a war that has no end and we are continually slapping the faces of those who have proven their loyalty. When are we going to stop legislation by prejudice, government by bigotry, lily-white foreign policy?

FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Under special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a certain appropriateness today that I should make brief, but nonetheless, very sincere reference to several bills which I introduced some time ago in the House in behalf of small business and small-business men, because it so happens that our Small Business Committee is currently giving attention to some of the very problems covered by these bills.

I should like to enumerate and discuss very briefly the bills in order and summarize them to some extent. There is no special significance to the order in which I consider them and I hope the House will indulge me if I seem to indicate somewhat unusual concern and no inconsiderable feelings and heat regarding the difficulties which in such a large number of instances confront the American small-business men.

Let us never deceive ourselves concerning the place which small business occupies in our great and dynamic economic system. I have had occasion to refer to the importance of small business in this House on several occasions, and frankly, I am always happy to do so, because it seems to me, in the light of the many attacks being leveled against our business structure and our political institutions by Socialists of varying degrees, by the Pinkos and the Marxist Reds, that it is quite fitting that we should acknowledge that small business is the true symbol of the independence, initiative, talent, resourcefulness, willingness to risk, and courage of the average American who chooses as he has a right to do, not in Moscow or Leningrad, or anywhere else behind the Iron Curtain, but which he has the right to do here in the United States, to seek out and pursue his own opportunities for advancement and achievement and reap the honest rewards of his endeavor.

I will not dispute the value, place, or importance of big business because I have no quarrel with big business so long as it is legitimate, honest, lawful, and motivated by the public interest. I am an incorrigible believer in free enterprise and the American system and way of life which has been responsible to a greater degree than ever before in history for building up the tremendous, powerful business and productive machine which presently makes this Nation outstanding among all the nations of the world and which is, incidentally, the greatest weapon which we have, if we but implement and guide it wisely and well against the surge of Communist ideology and aggression.

But the fact of the matter is that small business is the heart of our entire business structure, as well as the most representative part. Measured in terms of dollars and employment it constitutes the major portion of American business. It renders incredible and broad-gaged public service. It employs more than half of all the persons employed in the Nation. It deals in everything from peanuts to electronics. It is the mainspring which moves and directs the motion and scope of our entire business machine. It is the sacred repository of individual ambition and collective benefit. It harbors the adventurous and the enterprising regardless of creed, class, or station in life. It enthrones that great and most precious possession of America—equality of opportunity. It has been responsible for the rise of millions from poverty and lowly beginnings to comfort, self-sufficiency, success, and wealth. It has told the Horatio Alger story in every American community of the paper boy from the wrong side of the tracks who became president of the bank, of the homeless, penniless, immigrant from distant lands who rises from his small tobacco shop to head one of the Nation's largest industries.

Are we tending to change the climate of American economic life so that bigness becomes emphasized and smallness penalized? Are our current tax laws and regulatory measures, State, national, and local, militating against the soundness and health of small business? I believe strong evidence indicates an affirmative answer to these questions. I have given careful study to the multifold problems effecting small business, and I believe that the Congress not only can, but should, move at once to apply correct remedies which would offer necessary protection and encouragement to small business units throughout the country.

I would not assert for one moment that the measures I introduced of themselves are a complete panacea, but at least, they would have the virtue, in my humble opinion, of restoring a more wholesome and healthy climate than the one which excessive, discriminatory taxation and bureaucratic superregulation has been imposing upon our small businessmen.

The first of these bills, H. R. 5061, is designed to encourage expansion of business by allowing a deduction for income tax purposes of certain capital expenditures.

In substance, this bill amends section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to deductions of gross income, so that, at the election of the taxpayer, an allowance may be made for expenditures during the taxable year for construction, reconstruction, erection, or installation of any building, machinery, or equipment to be used in the trade or business of the taxpayer. But the deduction allowed under this bill for the taxable year shall

not be in excess of $50,000, or 50 percent of the net income for the year.

The second, H. R. 5062, would allow corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes and to limit the combined normal tax and surtax rate to 38 percent in the case of corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000 for the year.

H. R. 5058 would clarify the deduction for income-tax purposes of allowances for salaries or other compensation for personal services, provided such salaries are not unreasonable as measured by those of similar enterprises, this also by amendment of the Internal Revenue Code.

H. R. 5059, in general, allows an exemption of $25,000 corporate income taxes on corporations which has been expended by the corporation for capital expenditures.

The foregoing measures are designed to lighten the tax burden which in a special and discriminatory way are now pressing down so hard on small business. I believe they would promote initiative and make for greater expansion and thus develop and increase business activity, prosperity, and employment.

H. R. 5060 is in a somewhat different category in that it seeks to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 with respect to the procurement of supplies from small-business concerns.

A frequent criticism is that small business is not getting its share of defense procurement. At this point, I would not presume to place the blame for this situation, because the laws and requirements for competitive bidding and the specialized needs of the armed services enter into the picture over and above certain objectionable, hostile, anti-small-business attitudes. Yet I believe that, in general, in the understandable zeal for speed, and the unquestionable powerful influence of big business in the Government, that small business across the board has not been, and is not, receiving its fair proportionate share of that part of the national appropriations spent for defense procurement.

The proposal of this bill is in effect that in order to make or keep suppliers available for furnishing supplies in the event of a national emergency, or in the interest of industrial mobilization, active research and development, procurement officers may, when practicable, notwithstanding low bid statutes, distribute not exceeding 20 percent of the total procurement involved either by acceptance of bids or by negotiated purchase or by contract, where the price differential is less than 15 percent.

As I stated, the adoption of these measures should promote a better climate, greater equities and better opportunities for small business, and I hope that in due course they may be adopted in the interest of our free enterprise system, our small-business men and their faithful employees who are so vital to the American economy.

I am of the opinion and believe that the facts and the actuarial figures will disclose that in the end, both in the short run and in the long run, these measures will not reduce, but rather, will substantially increase the national taxable income. If adopted, they will surely prove a boon to a great many of our citizens and most enterprising businessmen and loyal workers. They will redound to the greater benefit of the Nation and to the definite strengthening for war, for defense production or for peacetime civilian and national prosperity of the great American business organism which to so great a degree holds in its continued sound health, vitality, and vigor, the destiny of social justice for all Americans and sure protection against the machinations and attacks of communism in war or peace.

CONFUSION

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, they are at it again. Maybe I should say they are still at it. There is feuding among the members of the team. Confusion and contradictions are the order of the day.

The budget—to be or not to be—balanced; that is the question.

Mr. Speaker, the answer is, the excess-profits tax must be extended beyond the next month, or does the Secretary of the Treasury propose to try to foist upon the people a general sales tax?

Let us be honest, let us meet the issue. Taxes on excess profits only means taking the cream from the top of the profits made because of the present unsettled world emergency.

What has become of the slogan "take the profits out of war"?

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER. Under special order, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my practice since I first became a Member of this body, I desire again today, to pay my heartfelt tribute to the great Polish nation and join in the commemoration of the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day.

The passing of this year has made no appreciable change in the status of the illustrious Polish nation and its noble people. Oppression and tyranny still exist in the Polish homeland. Freedom and democracy, so much beloved and so ardently practiced, and so militantly and unselfishly defended by the great Polish people throughout the centuries, no longer exist within the boundaries of the country whose beginnings we honor on this occasion. Instead, a cruel, barbarous and ruthless dictatorship, governing by force of arms and inhuman persecution, holds sway over the destinies of as gallant, as brave, as unselfish and as loyal a people as has ever shed its precious blood for the cause of liberty.

It is not necessary for me to recount the glories and the achievements of gallant Poland because they are legion, historic and irrefutable. No nation has sacrificed more, has suffered more, has given more of itself, its strength, its substance and its indomitable spirit for the cause of free institutions and for the cause of holy religion and justice and faith in the innate goodness of the people and the righteousness of the principle of self-determination. History is replete with the heroic struggles and the monumental sacrifices which the Polish people have made to protect their right to worship the God of their choice, to defend their nation against aggression and to preserve their inalienable rights and liberties as free men and women.

The tyrant of every generation has ruthlessly mowed them down by the millions, left their land a shambles, and stripped them of their right of self-government. He has visited upon them in this generation the unspeakable crimes of the Nazi and the Soviet alike. He has inflicted upon them every barbaric punishment, every inhuman indignity. He has destroyed their lives, he has laid waste to their fields, and scourged them with the outrages of the concentration camp. But neither Hitler nor Stalin has ever been able to break their determined spirit, their invincible undying resolve at all costs to live as free men and women and to hold to their firm faith in God and the right of every nation to order its own affairs. And no tyrant, whoever he may be, whether he be Molotov or Malenkov or Beria, or all the combined Nero-like tyrants of the world, will ever be able to extinguish the light of freedom in the hearts and minds of these pious, zealous, God-fearing and liberty-loving people. They will fight to the end of time if necessary, against the tyranny that would destroy their blessed heritage.

Has the passing of Stalin brought new hopes to the Polish people and their other companions in misery and oppression throughout the world for early liberation? If we are to judge by current reactions, that would seem to be the case. In any event, we have abundant evidence and conclusive testimony of their unyielding detemination to resist the evil of Soviet oppression and exert every possible effort to throw off the shackles that bind them. We can be sure of their tenacity, of their courage, of their invincible will to repossess their liberty.

There has never been any doubt in my mind that an overwhelming majority of the American people not only deeply sympathize with the tragic plight of Poland but are eager to hold out the hand of encouragement and assistance to the end that this afflicted people may again enjoy the blessings of freedom. Their yolk has not been lifted, it is true. But during the year, very significant events appear to be shaping a new destiny. Our own Government, speaking through our great Commander and Chief, has announced to the world the principle that all oppressed nations are entitled in morals and in law to their liberation from tyranny. I hail this announcement as a victory for the forces of right and freedom in the world and am sure that it has revitalized and rekindled the aspirations of the Polish people, in fact, of all oppressed people, for an end to domination and the renewal of their status as free citizens of free nations. I rejoice in common with all true Americans that we have so im-

pressively declared ourselves on the side of justice for the afflicted and oppressed of the world.

But let no one believe that the complete triumph of democratic ideals is at hand, or that dreadful and menacing world problems will soon or easily be settled. Let us never mistake the Marxist aims to conquer mankind and let us never underestimate the skill of this evil leadership, the strength of its purpose, the broad scope of its coverage and the shameful but substantial support which it has been able to secure, not only throughout the free world but here in our very own Nation.

In this struggle between godless Marxist communism and the democratic way of life, there is no room for compromise. Mankind will either rise to new heights of glory and ward off and dispel this great and ominous threat to its liberties, or it will succumb to, or be conquered by, an unprecedented dastardly tyranny which will cast the entire world into the throes of a horrible serfdom.

Let us not be fooled or deluded by the deceit and trickery of the Communists, by their peace proposals, or their peace propaganda, because we should be forewarned if we are wise, that in their hands they carry the olive branch of peace, yet, in their hearts and in their minds and in their overt acts, they are working desperately to forge the destruction of every precious possession of belief, of ideals, of principles, of freedom and democracy which the democratic world enjoys and which is the very nucleus and spirit of our culture and our matchless institutions.

Let us resolve that we will meet their despicable methods with strength and renewed determination never to surrender any part of our great heritage any more than we would be killing to jeopardize any part of our great Nation.

A strong, unflinching foreign policy backed up by mighty strength of arms and an unyielding purpose to preserve that heritage will be our best guaranty of security in this troubled world. Let us courageously face these issues and force decisions in favor of peace before the hourglass of time runs against us and permits the Soviet, fully implemented with our most modern inventions, fully harnessed for bloody warfare, to seize the initiative and catch us unawares. I urge upon the executive department earnest consideration of these views because I am firmly of the belief that peace can never be achieved through weakness, but it must be secured through strength, courage, and resolution to face up boldly to the dangers and the risks of this most crucial hour in the affairs of free people.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in saluting our Polish friends today, in sending them a message of encouragement, hope, and inspiration across the broad Atlantic which will fire them with the courage and the determination to continue the fight for their great cause, I hope and pray that our Government may be disposed to take strong, uncompromising affirmative action to continue to recognize the Polish Government in exile and to do everything which it can to cooperate with the efforts of that Government and other free governments to liberate Poland and the many other oppressed nations from the bondage of Soviet oppression.

Poland will never lose heart, Poland will never be untrue to its birthright, Poland will never surrender until it sees once again the blessed light of freedom. It is for us, true Americans that we are, to stand behind them and to help them in this fight which is not only theirs but ours, since it symbolizes the firm, heartfelt resolve of men everywhere for freedom and for justice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. REED of New York in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter notwithstanding that in one instance the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be $567.

Mr. CLARDY.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and to include an article.

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Illinois).

Mrs. KEE and to include a statement.

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANT and to include a report of the national security commission of the American Legion.

Mr. EBERHARTER and to include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an article.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HILL and to include a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. DEROUNIAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWNSON and to include an article from the Indianapolis News of May 11, 1953.

Mr. WOLVERTON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. ENGLE in three instances.

Mr. DOLLINGER in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BOW and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. MORANO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DELANEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include an article.

Mr. COOLEY and to include a statement made by him before the Ways and Means Committee in behalf of himself and certain of his colleagues.

Mr. YORTY in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NORRELL and to include an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. WILSON of California and to include a speech by Rear Adm. Leslie Gehres, one of our outstanding heroes, notwithstanding the fact that the estimated cost will be $224.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Providence Journal and one appearing in the Richmond News Leader, both relating to the same subject, the testimony of Secretary McKay before the Ways and Means Committee, where, in reading a statement, he was asked a question by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], and he frankly admitted, "I didn't write it, Mr. Congressman."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE in four instances and to include extraneous material.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEMPSEY (at the request of Mr. FERNANDEZ), for 3 days, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. BUSH (at the request of Mr. GAVIN), for an indefinite time, on account of illness.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 12, 1953, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 731. An act for the relief of James Renwick Moffett; and

H. R. 4465. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 14, 1953, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

691. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed

supplemental appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of $1,184,000 (H. Doc. No. 145); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

692. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, recommending the enactment of legislation amending the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, "to provide a small civil penalty for violation of the rules and regulations of the Commission applicable to all radio stations other than those in the broadcast services, and to further provide for collection or mitigation thereof by the Commission"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

693. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 23, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Tennessee River and tributaries, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky, with a view to determining the feasibility of providing flood protection along Big Brush Creek and its tributaries, Tennessee, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on September 29, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

694. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 23, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Edmonds Harbor, Wash., with a view to determining if improvement in the interest of navigation is advisable at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on February 1, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANFIELD: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5174. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4557. A bill to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to permits for construction of radio stations; without amendment (Rept. No. 417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4558. A bill to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOLLIVER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4559. A bill to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony; without amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2327. A bill to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 235. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 5174, a bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 5173. A bill to provide that the excess of collections from the Federal unemployment tax over unemployment compensation administrative expenses shall be used to establish and maintain a $200 million reserve in the Federal unemployment account which will be available for advances to the States, to provide that the remainder of such excess shall be returned to the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 5174. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5175. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 5176. A bill to amend section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain death benefits from Federal estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 5177. A bill to provide a method of voting and to facilitate voting by members of the land, air, and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 5178. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5179. A bill to provide that a loss upon the sale of a taxpayer's residence shall be taken into account for income tax purposes in the same manner as a loss from the sale of any other capital asset; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 5180. A bill to amend section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that $125 per month of retirement income shall be nontaxable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (by request):

H. R. 5181. A bill to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILLELSON:

H. R. 5182. A bill to authorize an emergency appropriation for the construction of a post office and building for Federal use in Independence, Mo., on a site which has been acquired by the United States for that purpose; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5183. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution permitting articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First International Instrument Congress and Exposition, Philadelphia, Pa., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. J. Res. 257. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the First International Instrument Congress and Exposition to be held in Philadelphia, Pa., from September 13 to September 25, 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating a day of national prayer of reparation for world peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Res. 234. Resolution providing for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to refrain from reducing appropriations for the FFA and FHA programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5184. A bill for the relief of the Ragheb family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 5185. A bill for the relief of Klyce Motors, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 5186. A bill for the relief of Anastasios C. Nicolachis and Helen Nicolachis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 5187. A bill for the relief of Shlomo Meyersdorf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 5188. A bill for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarte, Irene Grace Adiarte, and Patrick Robert Adiarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 5189. A bill for the relief of John Candela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5190. A bill for the relief of Simon Kahn and Eugene Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5191. A bill for the relief of Louis Anthony Barrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5192. A bill for the relief of Karl Schlochauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5193. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jalal Elahi and Batool Elahi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5194. A bill for the relief of Pauline Katsman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:
H. R. 5195. A bill for the relief of Max Kassner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:
H. R. 5196. A bill for the relief of Serban George Constandaky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 5197. A bill for the relief of Iskar Spas Schumanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 5198. A bill for the relief of Zanis Nicis and Lilija Nicis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 5199. A bill for the relief of Gunars Cukurs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 5200. A bill for the relief of Abraham Dembitzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 5201. A bill for the relief of Leizor and Aron Feldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 5202. A bill for the relief of Pavol Jozef Olas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LAIRD:
H. R. 5203. A bill providing that the title to certain lands within the Stockbridge-Munsee Indian Reservation, Wis., shall be held in trust for the use of the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
By Mr. METCALF:
H. R. 5204. A bill for the relief of Antonio Popp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MORANO:
H. R. 5205. A bill for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 5206. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cirillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:
H. R. 5207. A bill for the relief of Chin Buck Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. POULSON:
H. R. 5208. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giuseppina Mariniello Peluilo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 5209. A bill for the relief of Sante Martinoli, Mrs. Giuditta Martinoli, and Maurizio Martinoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. REED of Illinois:
H. R. 5210. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 5211. A bill for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. R. 5212. A bill for the relief of Jean Rudiano (also known as Ivan Rudenko); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SHELLEY:
H. R. 5213. A bill for the relief of Khalid Ahmad Rasheed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. YORTY:
H. R. 5214. A bill for the relief of Giulio Carone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions, and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

250. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of 19 persons regarding the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

251. Also, petition of 205 persons regarding the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

252. By Mr. MILLER of New York: Resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Polish-American citizens held at the Polish Home in Lackawanna, N. Y., on Sunday, May 3, 1953, commemorating the 162d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution refuting the diplomatic blunders at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam and appealing to Congress to take same determined stand in matters pertaining to Polish cause as did President Eisenhower in his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in April of 1953, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

253. Also, resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Polish-American citizens held at American Legion Post 1041, in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., on Sunday, May 3, 1953, to take immediate action to revoke the Yalta agreement and refer the case of Poland to the Assembly of the United Nations and to commend and praise President Dwight D. Eisenhower for the just stand he took in his speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors April 16, 1953, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

254. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary, Waldwick, N. J., requesting the appropriation of sufficient funds for the Veterans' Administration to reopen all hospital beds, closed during fiscal 1953, and to keep them open and in operation during fiscal 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

255. Also, petition of the Society of the Cincinnati, Washington, D. C., endorsing the right and duty of Congress and the judiciary to investigate all Communists and subversive activities and to use every legitimate and constitutional means to drive them out of the Federal, State, and other instrumentalities of Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

256. Also, petition of Hilda Grove and others, of Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447 social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1953

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, again we turn unfilled to Thee, whose mercies are new every morning and whose love knows no end nor change. Lift the light of Thy countenance upon us, pilgrims, as all our fathers were, and that remembering all the way by which Thou hast led us we may take heart and hope as we face the duties and demands of these days that try men's souls. Preserve us, we pray Thee, from fretfulness and impatience, from depression and anxiety. Increase our faith, strengthen our judgment, quicken our zeal for the things high and holy.

Hear our prayers for a confused and anxious world. Send Thy light into our darkness. Bestow upon the President of the United States and his coadjutors, the Vice President, the Congress, and upon all in every land, who bear rule, special gifts of wisdom and understanding that they may uphold what is right and follow what is true and do their full part toward establishing a world in which the grievous ills of this time may disappear and a glad day of brotherhood and peace may dawn. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 13, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF—HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 5134, relating to the Continental Shelf, which just came over from the House of Representatives, be retained at the desk and placed on the calendar without reference to committee. The Senate bill has not been actually reported, but it will be reported shortly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CLEMENTS was excused from attendance on the sessions

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the Senate today and tomorrow because of official business.

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMATHERS was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. WELKER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

DESIGNATION OF TOMORROW FOR MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE FORMER SENATOR WAGNER

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, unfortunately without adequate publicity, the intention was that today Senators would be permitted to make memorial addresses on the late former Senator Wagner, of New York. I regret very much that sufficient notice was not given. Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the conclusion of miscellaneous business, Senators may be permitted to make speeches on the life and public service of the late former Senator Wagner, and that no other matters shall be in order until those speeches have been completed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK AND CERTAIN MARINE LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, for the quarter ended March 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Resolution 20

"Resolution memorializing Congress to refrain from reducing appropriations for the FFA and FHA programs

"Whereas it has been reported in the public press that Congress is contemplating the reduction of proposed appropriations for the support of FFA and FHA programs throughout the Nation to effect a superficial 'economy' of approximately $5 million in the billions of the Federal budget; and

"Whereas the proposal, if adopted, would result in the discontinuance of every FFA and FHA chapter of less than 25 members; and

"Whereas these programs, training the rural youth of the country have, and will continue to have, the positive effect of adding many millions to the annual national income, and immeasurably to the national security, in improved food production; and

"Whereas any such relatively minor reduction in national expenditures, resulting in such damage to the advancement of agronomy, is a false economy induced only by a provincial lack of understanding of the agricultural problems of the Middle West and of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 24th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma:

"That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to refrain, in any manner, from reducing the already inadequate amount of funds requested to be assigned to promotion of FFA and FHA programs throughout agricultural sections of the country.

"That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress, and also to each member of the Oklahoma delegation to the Congress."

Two joint resolutions of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact H. R. 2842 to authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has constructed a highway which is a portion of the Honolulu-Pearl Harbor Road, Kalia section, Federal aid urban project No. FU 44 (9); and

"Whereas the construction of said highway was sponsored by the military forces of the United States of America; and

"Whereas it was necessary to take certain land and access rights which are owned by the United States of America in order to make the highway connect with existing highways in a congested area; and

"Whereas under the laws of the Territory, it is required that the land underlying highways be owned by the Territory in fee simple; and

"Whereas said land and access rights not subject to transfer under the provision of section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act authorizing the transfer of land to the Territory by Presidential Executive Order when it is necessary for public improvements of the Territory, because the land involved was acquired by the United States of America by purchase and not as government or crown lands of the government of Hawaii; and

"Whereas it is the intention of the Territory that the land and access rights be used only for highway purposes and that they be neither given up nor applied to any other use; and

"Whereas the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON has introduced in the House of Representatives legislation designated as H. R. 2842 which will authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer said land and access rights to the Territory: Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to enact into law H. R. 2842 for the reasons stated in this joint resolution.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 1st day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2840 for the transfer by the United States of America to the Territory of Hawaii of certain land in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H.

"Whereas the Leahi Hospital, situated in Honolulu, city and county of Honolulu, T. H., is the largest single plant in the Territory devoted to the care and rehabilitation of tuberculosis patients; and

"Whereas as such, it is a vital link in the chain of major hospitals in the Territory; and

"Whereas, in order to meet the growing needs of the Territory for such hospitalization as is provided by Leahi Hospital, it is desirable that the hospital be expanded; and

"Whereas, in order to accomplish the expansion, it will be necessary to acquire land contiguous to that already occupied by the present plant; and

"Whereas the only contiguous area available for such expansion is certain land owned by the United States of America and now incorporated in the Fort Ruger Military Reservation; and

"Whereas said land is now vacant; and

"Whereas said land is not required for military purposes; and

"Whereas the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON has introduced in the House of Representatives legislation designated as H. R. 2840 to provide for the transfer of said land to the Territory: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to enact into law H. R. 2840 for the reasons stated in this joint resolution.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 1st day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint resolution requesting Congress of the United States of America to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to public lands, to grant purchase options to certain lessees

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act substantially as set forth in the following form of bill:

"'A bill to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act

"'*Be it enacted, etc.:*—

"'SECTION 1. That section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, be further amended by adding a new proviso to the second sentence thereof to read as follows: *"Provided, however,* That the commissioner shall give to every lessee, sublessee or permittee under a revocable permit of public lands, being a citizen of the United States, or to any such person who has legally declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States and hereafter becomes such, who has, or whose predecessors in interest have, or the combination thereof, occupied said lands for an aggregate period of not less than 10 years, a right to purchase so much of said lands as shall be used for a houselot or for agricultural or business purposes, but not to exceed one-half acre and such adjoining lands as may reasonably be required for a right-of-way to a Government road, upon the payment of a fair and reasonable price, which price shall be determined by 1 or more but not more than 3 disinterested appraisers to be appointed by the Governor. The term 'predecessor in interest' as applied to a permittee under revocable permit shall be construed to include such permittee, his assignor, or his devisor occupying said lands under a lease or a sublease immediately prior to the issuance of the revocable permit. In the determination of such purchase price, the improvements thereon shall be valued at $1, if such improvements were made or purchased by the lessee, sublessee, or permittee. If the commissioner shall deem it to be of public interest, he may substiute in place of such parcel selected by the purchaser public lands of similar character, value, and area situated on the lands occupied under said lease or revocable permit and such purchaser shall pay for the relocation of any improvements thereto. No person shall be entitled to this right of purchase of public lands who has exercised said option under any other lease, sublease, or revocable permit or the combination of both."

"'SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.'

"SEC. 2. Upon its approval, certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 30th day of April, A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation permitting the sale of public lands at Waimanalo, city and county of Honolulu, without recourse to drawing or lot

"Whereas the Waimanalo Agricultural Development Co., Ltd., has subleased to about 350 tenants approximately 98 percent of the 2,805 acres presently under lease to it under General Lease No. 2543 at Waimanalo, city and county of Honolulu; and

"Whereas the sublessees have purchased the improvements on the land from the Waimanalo Agricultural Development Co., Ltd., and are using the land subleased as farm lots, pasture lots, and residential and business lots, until the expiration of the lease on November 21, 1953; and

"Whereas these sublessees have invested their life savings in these improvements and will have no place to relocate them if they have to move them off the lands now subleased; and

"Whereas the plight of said sublessees at Waimanalo is illustrative of the insecurity of the tenure of occupants of public lands throughout the Territory who have similarly invested their savings and their efforts in improvements on lands which they have not been able to purchase from the Territory; and

"Whereas the stable economic development of the Territory requires a widespread ownership of land; Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation permitting the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to give to any person, being a citizen of the United States, or to any person who has legally declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States and hereafter becomes such, (1) who holds public lands in the Territory of Hawaii by lease, sublease, or revocable permit on December 1, 1953, and (2) who has, or whose predecessors in interest have, or the combination of both, held such lands for not less than 5 years, a preference right to purchase so much of said lands used for houselot or business purposes, or both, as the case may be, but not to exceed one-fourth acre, upon the payment of a fair and reasonable price, which price shall be determined by three disinterested appraisers to be appointed by the governor; provided that the public lands immediately adjacent to any cemetery existent on the effective date of said legislation may be sold to the owner, or owners, of the said cemetery, but the parcel of such public land sold shall not exceed 3 acres. In the determination of said purchase price, the improvements thereon shall be valued at $1, if such improvements were made or purchased by such lessee, sublessee, or permittee. In the case of lands adjacent to and sold to a cemetery, or when the commissioner shall deem it to be in the public interest, he may substitute in place of such lands selected for purchase by the lessee, sublessee, or holder of a revocable permit, public lands of similar character, value, and area situated on other lands occupied under said lease, sublease, or permit and such purchaser shall pay for the relocation of any improvements thereto.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 30th day of April A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Joint resolution relating to harbor improvements, Island of Kauai

"Whereas the enlargement of the harbor and the deepening of the entrance channel of Nawiliwili Harbor, Kauai, is a great need of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers has studied the need for enlarging the harbor and deepening the entrance channel and are preparing a report thereon; and

"Whereas the construction of bulk sugar-handling facilities at Nawiliwili has caused a great increase in tonnage shipped; and

"Whereas wind and wave conditions make the requested improvements of great necessity to the safety of vessels using the harbor: Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested and urged to approve the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers concerning the improvement of Nawiliwili Harbor, Kauai, T. H.

"SEC. 2. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 1st day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint resolution relating to harbor improvements, Honolulu Harbor

"Whereas a second entrance to Honolulu Harbor is of vital importance to shipping entering the port of Honolulu; and

"Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers has approved provision for a second entrance to Honolulu Harbor at the Kapalama end of said harbor; and

"Whereas work on the project can commence without delay following approval of the work and appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress: Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to approve the project and urged to include in the current river and harbor development appropriation bill an item for providing a second entrance to Honolulu Harbor.

"SEC. 2. Duly certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 1st day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by Juniper Auxiliary to Post 3510, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Cedar City, Mich., protesting against any reduction in appropriations for veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the city of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to continue rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

FLOODS AT PEACE CROSS, BLADENSBURG, MD.—LETTER FROM RIVERDALE (MD.) CITIZENS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I am very much alarmed concerning the lack of any positive program leading to the solution of the periodic floods in the vicinity of Peace Cross near Bladensburg, Md., and this feeling reflects the attitude of many conscientious citizens residing in that area and elsewhere.

A study of the situation was initiated by the 54th Congress, and authority for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

remedial measures was extended by the 81st Congres, with approximately $25,000 for planning purposes being approved by the 82d Congress, 1st session. These are but preliminary motions, culminating many, many years of deplorable hazard, serious inconvenience and unnecessary damage to property, and there is still no evidence of action, except for the promise of perhaps further planning and study.

Many corrective measures have, at various times, been proposed, and I would assume that the merits of each of these have been fully evaluated as a part of the numerous investigations conducted by the Corps of Engineers and other agencies. From these years of experience, combined with recent developments surrounding comparable problems of flood control, it would also seem that a practical solution for Peace Cross should be near the point of crystallization.

The seriousness of this situation, as it relates to the defense of the Nation's Capital cannot be minimized, and in my opinion, these untenable and recurrent conditions cannot be permitted to continue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Riverdale Citizens Association, Riverdale, Md., relating to this serious problem be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIVERDALE CITIZENS ASSOCIATION,
Riverdale, Md., May 8, 1953.

Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: The Citizens Association of Riverdale, Md., requests that I urge you to convey as strongly as possible to the House Appropriations Committee the urgent need of including in the appropriations the $1 million necessary for the construction of the Anacostia Flood Control Work.

Their homes and properties are more and more threatened with the increasing flooded conditions now occurring with almost every rain. Flooded cellars, with resulting damage to heating and washing equipment, mildewing of clothes and furniture, breeding ill health conditions, are becoming more and more the common lot of many. Some must wade through water to get to their homes.

We do not believe that this is a new project. Federal funds have been appropriated for surveys, plans and investigations. Furthermore, actual Federal construction has been done on a portion of this project in the dredging and levee work on the lower Anacostia.

After the many years that have been spent in plans, and because the conditions are progressively becoming worse, the citizens are aroused to demanding that relief be now given. The State of Maryland has done its share in passing its State bill No. 583, which the Governor has signed, making it mandatory that $4,250,000 be spent on the project. But since the United States Army Engineers must supervise the work and furnish the engineering know-how, it is absolutely essential that the Federal Government appropriate construction funds to put the plan into action.

We feel we have a right to expect now of our representatives in the Congress favorable action on the Federal appropriation.

Very truly yours,
WALTER H. GARNER,
President.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1324. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees; without amendment (Rept. No. 270).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1897. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make unfair labor practices of acts and practices by labor unions or employers on grounds of race, religion, color, or national origin; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1898. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1899. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; and

S. 1900. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Trindler O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1901. A bill to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1902. A bill for the relief of Theresa Elizabeth Leventer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Taft-Hartley Act by providing that it shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry or for a labor union to engage in analogous practices.

I am a cosponsor, with my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], of a bill which seeks to achieve the same purpose. However, I feel that the bill I am now introducing would achieve this objective in a somewhat more constructive way from the point of view of labor-management relations.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with the bill and the text of the bill itself be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1897) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make unfair labor practices of acts and practices by labor unions or employers on grounds of race, religion, color, or national origin, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (a) of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a semicolon and a new subsection (6), to read as follows:

"(6) To refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a semicolon and a new subsection (7), to read as follows:

"(7) To discriminate against, limit, segregate, or classify any individual so as to affect adversely the employment opportunities or employment status of such individual, or his wages, hours, or conditions of employment, because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

The statement by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I have today introduced a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to make it an unfair labor practice for employers or unions to discriminate against individuals on the basis of "race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

As far as unions are concerned the bill would make it an unfair labor practice, subject to cease-and-desist orders and to all the penalties set forth in the Taft-Hartley Act for a union to engage in practices that discriminate, segregate, or classify individuals so as to affect adversely their employment opportunities, employment status, or their wages, hours, or other conditions of work on the basis of race, creed, color, or national ancestry.

My bill, as distinguished from the Ives bill of which I am a cosponsor, would place on employers and unions alike the obligation to refrain from discriminatory practices. My bill would not, however, permit the upsetting of established certification or existing collective bargaining agreement as might be the case under S. 1831.

The provisions of my bill are similar to and are based on the definitions of unfair employment practices which have been included in bills to provide for fair employment practices considered in recent sessions of Congress.

I would, of course, be happy to see enacted any fair and workable amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act to achieve the purpose of preventing discrimination, whether by employers or by unions. I have no special pride of authorship in this proposal. I just want to see the job done. It should be done. It must be done. Employers and unions alike must recognize not only the moral evil but the economic waste involved in discriminatory practices. As far as I am concerned, this is one of the most essential amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act.

DISSOLUTION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BYRD submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 892) to dissolve the Reconstruction

Finance Corporation and transfer certain of its functions relating to national defense to other agencies of the Government, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FREDERICK M. ALGER, JR., TO BE AMBASSADOR TO BELGIUM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of Frederick M. Alger, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador from the United States to Belgium. I give notice that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, in accordance with the committee rule.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Frederick M. Alger, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Belgium, which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Robert E. McLaughlin, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, vice James H. Flanagan, resigned.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

Radio address delivered by Senator MANSFIELD on the subject of farm prices and price-support legislation.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by Senator JACKSON at the New York State Democratic dinner, Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, on April 29, 1953.

By Mr. PURTELL:

Statement prepared by him relative to the visit of several hundred persons from Darmstadt, Germany, to Hartford and other Connecticut communities.

By Mr. GEORGE:

Several articles written by Crosby S. Noyes, staff correspondent of the Washington Star, under the general headline "Is NATO Worth It?" and published in the Washington Evening Star on May 7, May 8, and May 10, 1953.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Exchange of telegrams between himself and Robert C. Bassett, labor counsel, Hearst Corp., Chicago, Ill., regarding certain Communist activities.

By Mr. HOEY:

Editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway," published in the Boston Post of May 13, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorials entitled "A World of Difference," and "A Story of Oilmen," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of recent date.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Article entitled "Mr. Attlee's Speech," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 13, 1953.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Article entitled "Executive Department Should Take No Part in Constitutional Proposal," written by Raymond Moley and published in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of May 12, 1953.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

Statement issued by the American Legion entitled "Why the American Legion Supports the McCarran-Walter Act."

Editorial entitled "Labeling the Communists," published in the Washington Evening Star of April 24, 1953; and a reply to the editorial written by O. R. McGuire, entitled "Registering Communists."

Letter addressed to him by the chairman of the commissioners of Cabarrus County, N. C., dealing with the proposed reorganization of the Department of Agriculture.

SPEECH BY CLEMENT ATTLEE IN THE BRITISH HOUSE OF COMMONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order previously entered, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is recognized.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, yesterday I read an account of what I thought was a most unusual demonstration in the legislative body of a so-called allied nation. I should like briefly to quote from the Times-Herald of yesterday, referring to Clement Attlee's speech in the House of Commons:

> Attlee found fault with the American people, the American Constitution, the American system of government, and the American Government itself, past and present.

Let me quote Attlee, as quoted in the press. He says:

> One of the facts of the world situation is that the American Constitution was framed for an isolationist state. The Americans do not want to have anything to do with Europe.

Then he has this to say:

> Attlee said that he welcomed Churchill's proposal Monday for an immediate meeting of heads of state, but he doubted the wisdom of President Eisenhower's attendance.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capehart	Dworshak
Anderson	Carlson	Eastland
Barrett	Case	Ellender
Beall	Chavez	Ferguson
Bennett	Cooper	Flanders
Bricker	Cordon	Frear
Bridges	Daniel	Fulbright
Bush	Dirksen	George
Butler, Md.	Douglas	Gillette
Byrd	Duff	Goldwater
Gore	Kuchel	Potter
Green	Langer	Purtell
Griswold	Lehman	Robertson
Hayden	Long	Russell
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Hennings	Malone	Schoeppel
Hill	Mansfield	Smith, Maine
Hoey	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Holland	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Hunt	McCarthy	Sparkman
Ives	McClellan	Stennis
Jackson	Millikin	Symington
Jenner	Monroney	Taft
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Thye
Johnston, S. C.	Mundt	Watkins
Kefauver	Murray	Welker
Kennedy	Neely	Wiley
Kilgore	Pastore	Williams
Knowland	Payne	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official committee business of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. HENNINGS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, at the time of the quorum call I was reading a quotation from that most unusual speech made by Mr. Attlee, in the House of Commons the other day. I should like to read one more brief excerpt from the account of that speech:

> Attlee said he welcomed Churchill's proposal Monday for an immediate meeting of heads of state, but he doubted the wisdom of President Eisenhower's attendance. He hinted the presence of any American would only hinder talks.

Mr. President, I think we should keep in mind that Mr. Attlee no longer represents the British people. He has been repudiated about as thoroughly as Mr. Acheson was repudiated in this country.

I was not disturbed so much by what Mr. Attlee said. There is nothing surprising about his statement. It is in line with his whole career.

However, Mr. President, I was very greatly disturbed to find that the responsible majority in the British House of Commons sat idly by while this discredited and repudiated member of the Socialist Party deliberately insulted the President of the United States and insulted the American people.

Attlee may well have performed the first service for us which he has ever performed in his long and odious career, in that he may have unknowingly torn away the sham of all-out British support of American attempts to defeat communism. In so doing he may have performed some service to us.

When I talk about Mr. Attlee, it must be understood I am not directing any of my remarks against the British people. The British people are a great race. I

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

certainly applaud them for having repudiated Attlee. When they did so, they were voting, or, at least, they thought they were voting, for a man with a great heart and great courage. Perhaps they remembered that speech of Churchill's of June 4, 1940, when he said:

> We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender.

Mr. President, I could not help but think of that speech when I read the account of Attlee's statement that neither the President of this country nor any other American should be present at the peace talks, and when he urged a Communist type of peace, which, of course, would mean surrender by the United States. I could not help but think of those words of Churchill when I read the account of Churchill's sitting there and meekly nodding his head as Attlee made that fantastic speech.

I may say that it is extremely difficult, almost to the point of being impossible, for me to criticize Churchill, of whom I have thought rather highly for a long period of time. But I do think that Churchill, as the leader of the majority party of Britain, owes to the American people a frank statement of whether he and his majority party agree with what Attlee said the other day.

I can understand why Attlee would rise and insult the United States. I can understand why Attlee would hate Eisenhower. He was getting along right well before the 20th of January. The team of Attlee and Acheson was doing an excellent job of working with the Communists toward the expansion of Communist control throughout the world. I can well understand why he does not like the President of the United States, who refuses to compromise with treason, as did Attlee and Acheson.

Another reason why I assume Attlee must hate Eisenhower is that one of Eisenhower's first acts after he took office as President was to withdraw the United States 7th Fleet, which was protecting the long, exposed Communist coastline of China and also protecting the shipment of material into Communist China.

In that connection, I should like to read what the President said in his state of the Union message on February 2, 1953. He was referring to the previous use of our 7th Fleet under the Acheson-Attlee agreement. This is what Eisenhower said in speaking of the use of the 7th Fleet:

> This has meant, in effect, that the United States Navy was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China.

Mr. President, I should like to take a minute or two to discuss the importance of that act on the part of the President, and why it disturbed Mr. Attlee so much.

As we all know, during the entire Korean war up until the time President Eisenhower took office, our 7th Fleet had orders—and there is nothing secret about those orders—to shoot down any planes from Formosa which attempted to attack the Communist coastline of China, and to sink any ship and to kill any man if either tried to move from Formosa back to the Chinese mainland.

What did that mean, Mr. President? As General MacArthur pointed out before the Russell committee the result of the order to the 7th Fleet to ward off any attacks upon the Communist coastline of China was to release a vast number of Communist troops, with the end result that they were killing American young men in Korea.

Of course, Mr. President, Mr. Attlee had no objection to that. If he wishes to advise the American people, as he did the other day, I might suggest that he advise them, and that his friend Acheson advise them now, too, under what conceivable rule of warfare any nation has ever had its navy protect the enemy's coastline.

How does that affect the mothers of the 130,000 American soldiers who have become casualties? It is very simple. If Mrs. Jones has two sons, and if both are drafted, and if one went into the 7th Fleet during the old Acheson regime, and the other was sent into Korea, it meant that the son who was in the 7th Fleet was protecting the munitions and the arms which were being shipped to the Communists in Korea; it meant that Mrs. Jones' son in the 7th Fleet was protecting the weapons which would kill her other son who was fighting the Communists in Korea. The order to the 7th Fleet was the most fantastically unbelievable order ever issued either in war or in peace; it was a treasonable order if there ever was one. No wonder Attlee hates President Eisenhower for having revoked that order.

Again let me cite a statement made by Mr. Attlee about President Eisenhower, namely, that he welcomed Churchill's proposal for immediate meetings at a peace conference of the heads of states, but that he doubted the wisdom of President Eisenhower's attendance. He hinted that the presence of any American would only hinder peace talks.

Mr. President, I wonder whether Comrade Attlee does not know that we have suffered more than 130,000 casualties, as against 3,700 on the part of Britain. Yet he has the unmitigated effrontery to suggest that peace should be negotiated without having representatives of our Nation present. I wonder whether Comrade Attlee does not know that the American people repudiated his pals—the Achesons, the Lattimores, and the Vincents—by the most resounding vote by which they have ever repudiated any clique. Perhaps Comrade Attlee should review the facts.

I may say that I can understand such statements coming from Attlee, and I could understand them if they came from Mao Tse-tung; I could understand them if they came from Moscow; I could understand them if they came from the Communists at Panmunjom. But, Mr. President, I do not think any reasonable American can understand the attitude of the majority in the British Parliament when they sat idly by and meekly nodded their heads and apparently approved what Comrade Attlee had to say.

Mr. President, one of our great Senators—the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]—spoke yesterday. I should like to quote briefly from his speech. In referring to the Attlee and Churchill speeches, the Senator from California said:

> In effect, what they have told us is that, if we do not accept their advice, and if the Chinese Communists persist in the war, we must be prepared to go it alone. So be it.
>
> It is unfortunate that they did not take that position in June of 1950, if their intent was to give half-hearted support to the resistance of this first overt act of aggression, and to spend the remainder of the time in placing such restrictions upon our Armed Forces that we would be denied the opportunity for achieving the victory which alone would have assured a united Korea, the carrying out of the United Nations policies pledging a united Korea, and which would have been a deterrent to further aggression elsewhere in the world.

Mr. President, in view of this implied threat on the part of the British to withdraw if we do not accept a Communist peace, let us briefly examine the type of aid the British have been giving us.

I have before me a copy of Lord Beaverbrook's newspaper, the Sunday Express, dated April 19, 1953. Mr. President, from your seat on the rostrum you can see the bragging headline which appears in this copy of the Sunday Express. The article is entitled "Big Boost in Our Trade to China," and the subhead is: "Exports top a million in a month."

Let me read the first paragraph of the article, if I may:

> British exports to Red China are soaring. In January they reached a value of 1,200,000 British pounds, as against 74,000 pounds in the same month last year.

Mr. President, let me repeat those figures: In January of this year exports from Great Britain to Red China were valued at 1,200,000 British pounds; in January of a year ago, they were valued at 74,000 pounds. What a forceful way to fight the enemy, Mr. President.

Let me also, if I may, read briefly from the debate in the House of Commons when the subject of stopping British trade with China arose. I read now from the official record of the British House of Commons, dated April 1, 1953:

> 11. Mr. A. Henderson asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will give an assurance that, while Her Majesty's Government has taken steps to tighten the existing system of controls over shipments of strategic materials to China, they will not tolerate any stopping of, or interference with, British merchant ships trading with Chinese Communist ports.

Mr. Selwyn Lloyd the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, answered:

> Yes, sir. The position remains, as my right honorable friend made clear in the debate on February 5, that British ships on their lawful occasions will be protected.

Mr. President, I shall not read that entire debate into the RECORD; it is too lengthy. Instead, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from the debate which was referred to, which occurred on the 5th of February, and in which it was made clear that if we or our allies other than Britain attempted to stop the shipment of materials to Red China, the British Navy would protect the ships carrying those materials to Red China.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the debate on February 5, 1953,

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERBERT MORRISON (Labor Party opposition, formerly Foreign Secretary):

* * * * *

There is another possibility. Supposing the forces of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek conduct a blockade against the Chinese mainland and interfere with British merchant shipping peacefully going about its business. I am not sure that that has not already happened once or twice. Supposing it increases. Supposing it becomes systematic. After all, if one is going in for something in the nature of a war between Formosa and the mainland of China, a blockade is a not unexpected thing to happen, in the course of those military and naval operations.

I should like the Foreign Secretary to tell us what, in those circumstances, Her Majesty's Government will do? What will the Royal Navy do? I submit that we cannot tolerate Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek interfering with peaceful British shipping, and that that shipping would be entitled to the active protection of the Royal Navy. I should be grateful if the Foreign Secretary would be so good as to tell us what would be the line and attitude of the Government if that possibility, which is a real possibility, should eventuate? We see that the decision of President Eisenhower, whatever the motives may have been, is a decision which is full of unpleasant possibilities. Indeed, it contains great and considerable dangers, and we must say that we feel that a grave mistake has been committed.

* * * * *

MR. EDEN:

* * * * *

The right honorable gentleman asked me one specific question: What would happen if any of the ships of Chiang Kai-shek—I know he has some—sought to interfere with British shipping? There has already been one such incident to which we have reacted in the way the House knows. Compensation is being paid, or some arrangements are being made about it, and apologies are being made. I can tell the House at once that Her Majesty's ships on their lawful occasions will always be protected. That is the duty and policy of any government of this country and that is what we should do if our ships were interfered with—they would be protected as that ship was, in fact, protected.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in connection with this subject, I may say that on next Wednesday, our committee intends to give a rather clear picture of the type of shipping being protected by the British Navy. I may say that the evidence which will be produced next Wednesday will show that a sizable number of ships flying British flags are owned by the Chinese Communists, and are shipping materials to Red China; and those are the ships the British say they will protect with the British Navy.

Let us see what our Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, has to say about the shipment of material to Red China. We wrote him, requesting a statement with reference to the attitude of the Department of Defense toward the shipment of any material to China. In his letter dated March 28, of this year, he said:

The Department of Defense, including the three military services, has heartily supported this policy.

That is, the policy of cutting off all trade with Red China. He further says:

This position on the part of the Department of Defense is predicated on the realistic view that the shipment of goods or the provision of any services to the Communist Chinese, or to the North Koreans, contributes directly or indirectly to their economic and military potential. The Department of Defense believes that contributions to the "economic" potential alone often directly, and almost always indirectly, contribute to any country's military potential. Therefore, the Department is convinced that any goods, or any services, reaching or serving these areas increase the capabilities of the Communist forces in Asia not only to continue, but even to intensify and extend, the present areas of aggression.

But, Mr. President, in the face of that, our ally, who now says that our President should not attend any peace conference, boasts that its trade with the enemy has increased from 74,000 British pounds in January a year ago, to 1,200,000 pounds in January of this year. I might suggest that Mr. Attlee explain to the Britsh mothers and wives, who have also gone rather deeply into the valley of darkness and despair, why the British Government is willing to furnish the sinews of war to the enemy who is killing their young men.

Mr. President, as we read the debate in the House of Commons, in which it is stated that Britain will protect all British-flag vessels with the British Navy, even though such flag vessels are owned by Communists, and when we read this boast about their increased trade with Red China, I think we should perhaps keep in mind the American boys and the few British boys, too, who had their hands wired behind their backs and their faces shot off with machineguns—Communist machineguns, Mr. President, if you please—supplied by those flag vessels of our allies.

I know the answer will be, "Oh, but we have agreed not to ship any strategic material." Mr. President, we had the Assistant Secretary of Defense on the stand the other day, a very brilliant young man, Mr. Nash. We asked him about this British trade. He explained that "nonstrategic material," such as fertilizer, had exploded on the high seas. A rather explosive fertilizer, I may add.

Incidentally, Mr. President, in connection with the shipments, our committee has obtained a great number of charters, or copies of charters. Let me for the benefit of the Senate give a brief description of a typical charter in connection with the so-called nonstrategic material—the kind that is to be protected by our ally's navy. One particular charter called for the shipment of 10,000 tons of fertilizer. It provided, however, that the ship must under no circumstances pass through the Panama Canal, it must not stop at an American port, it must not stop at a Philippine port, and it must not stop at a Japanese port. Why, Mr. President? If that ship were actually carrying 10,000 tons of fertilizer to Red China, there would be no occasion for worry about the inspection to which it might be subjected in an American port. Obviously, the cargo consisted of some of the very explosive fertilizer about which we have heard.

Mr. President, I should like to quote again very briefly from Mr. Attlee's speech. He said:

One of the facts of the world situation is that the American Constitution was framed for an isolationist state. The Americans do not wish to have anything to do with Europe.

I may say that, if Mr. Attlee represents Europe, Americans certainly should not want to have anything to do with it. But luckily he does not. In connection with his statement that we are an isolationist state and do not wish to have anything to do with Europe, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to an article which appears in the latest issue of the U. S. News & World Report, the issue of May 15, in which there is set forth a careful review of the amount of foreign aid we have given since the end of the shooting period of World War II. The figure is $39 billion. Add that to the $6 billion which the President is asking this year and it makes a total of $45 billion. The figure is difficult for the human mind to comprehend; in fact it is almost impossible to adequately picture. Let me break the figure down. If we were to spread $45 billion of foreign aid over the past 2,000 years, from a time antedating the birth of Christ, how much, Mr. President, do you imagine it would amount to a year? It would amount to $22,500,000 a year. But our ally says, "Oh, you are isolationists; you are not helping us." The figure is staggering, Mr. President—$22,500,000 a year, over a period of 2,000 years.

If I may, let me break the figure down a little further so as to show what it would amount to a day, again starting from a time antedating the birth of Christ—going back 2,000 years. How much, Mr. President, do you think our foreign aid would amount to a day? It would amount to $61,643 for each and every day over the period of 2,000 years.

Let us break it down still further; let us break it down to show the rate per minute. It is more easily understood when thus broken down, than when we ponder the total figure of $45 billion. How much, Mr. President, do you think we have contributed a minute, computing the figures over the span of the past 2,000 years? On that basis, how much has been contributed a minute—if you please, Mr. President—by this isolationist country. It amounts to $42.80 a minute for all the minutes which have ticked away since long before the year A. D. 1.

Mr. President, I do not have the statement before me, but there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some time ago a statement by President Truman's adviser, General Lowe, a very competent general, who was sent to Korea to be Truman's eyes and ears. Strangely enough, his reports apparently never reached the President. Upon his return however his statement was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think it has a great deal of bearing upon the speech by Mr. Attlee the other day, particularly that portion of his speech evincing hatred of our President. General Lowe said:

General MacArthur was right in Korea, and if he'd been left alone he long since would have won in Korea. * * *

MacArthur was hamstrung and finally brought down by the interference of the State Department, which tried to wish a commissar war on him and by the collusion

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Secretary of Defense George Catlett Marshall, who had it in for him for various reasons, some directly personal, and some through little more than jealousy for his genius and his fame.

The net result has been a tremendous loss and tragic problem.

This appears in volume 98, part 8, page A220, Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I desire also to quote another brief passage from Attlee's speech. He says:

There are elements in the United States that do not want a truce in Korea, and it is just as well to face up to the fact.

Mr. President, Comrade Attlee knows that the people of this country want peace, he knows we want a victorious peace, and he knows that we do not want a Communist-dictated peace. He knows—or should know—that if we were to accept a Communist-dictated peace, it would result in infinitely more agony, blood, and tears than would have resulted, had we pushed on to victory, as General MacArthur suggested. I think it might be well to notify Mr. Attlee that the days of treason and appeasement in this country are past; that there is really a new day in America; that we do not want his advice; we do not need it, and we can assure him that we shall not accept it.

Mr. President, I think I should give a brief picture of Mr. Attlee for the RECORD, while we are about it. I have here a number of pictures of Mr. Attlee which appeared originally in the official publication of the Communist International Brigade in Spain. I have copies available for any Senators who would care to have them, and for members of the press. It is a picture of Attlee reviewing the Communist International Brigade, in Madrid, Spain, with his hand raised in the Communist salute. In the picture are Attlee, former General Miaja, commander of the Communist brigade, and Commissar Anton, head of the Communist Party in Spain. I showed the picture to one of my friends at one time, and he said, "Maybe Attlee's Communist salute was merely an act of courtesy to the Communists."

Lest anyone should think it was merely an act of courtesy, we have also reproduced from the Communist brigade official publication a letter in Mr. Attlee's handwriting. Let me read the last line of that letter, if I may, written by the man who says the United States should not participate in any peace talks. I read:

I shall try to tell our comrades at home of what I have seen.

"Our comrades at home," Mr. President. As the Senate well knows, in the Communist jargon the phrase "comrades" means only one thing; it means fellow Communists.

Listen to the closing line of his letter. As we know, the battle cry of international communism coined by Marx decades ago has always been: "Workers of the world, unite."

Mr. Attlee closed his letter with the words, "Workers of the world, unite."

Incidentally, in the letter he extols the Communist soldiers and tells of their "devotion to the cause of freedom and social justice."

That is the man who abuses us in the British House of Commons, while the majority party sits idly by and fails to repudiate him. I think it is time for them to stand up and say whether they agree or disagree with him.

Mr. President, one of our great Senators pointed out on the floor of the Senate, in effect, that Britain is trying to blackmail us into accepting the Communist plan on the ground that if we do not accept it Britain will withdraw from the Korean war.

Mr. President, I say to them that if that be true, if they are trying to blackmail us into accepting a Communist peace on the ground that if we do not they will withdraw, I say, "Withdraw and be damned." And then, Mr. President, let us sink every accursed ship carrying materials to the enemy and resulting in the death of American boys, regardless of what flag those ships may fly.

Mr. President, as I read the speech of Mr. Attlee I cannot help but be carried back to some of the less pleasant days we spent on Pacific islands. I was with a Marine dive-bombing squadron for a while, and one of my tasks at night after we lost pilots or gunners was to write home to the young wives or mothers in the hope that we could make the blow fall less heavily upon them. It was a difficult task. You might say, "He was a great Marine pilot," or "He was a great Marine gunner," but that would not mean much to the unfortunate women at home, because that great gunner or pilot was now dead. If, as was often the case, I had to explain why, his body having been lost at sea, his grave would remain forever unmarked, I might try to tell that unfortunate woman that the greatest headstone that any fighting man could desire would be the vast, moon-swept, wind-tossed Pacific Ocean. But I knew that would not mean much to a mother who could not even have the privilege of kneeling and praying at her son's grave.

I recall one evening particularly. It was after one of our roughest strikes. A great number of letters had to be written that night. As I sat in my dugout going over them, the chaplain came in. I said, "Chaplain, what can I tell these young women; what can I say to them that will be of some comfort to them, instead of digging and probing into a wound that would be better left to heal?"

He said, "MCCARTHY, let me suggest what you should write. Write and tell them that we, the American people, those of us who survive, make them the solemn promise that not one drop of blood will have been wasted; tell them that we make them the solemn promise that not a single one of those young men will have died in vain; tell them that we make them the solemn promise that when this gory, bloody mess is over, there will arise a new world that will be to some extent cleaner and finer and more decent."

I wrote a number of letters like that that night, and many more like it before I left the Pacific, but as I have witnessed the treason, if you please—and I use that word advisedly—the treason in this nation in which Mr. Attlee in Britain cooperated so long, when I see the complete sellout to international communism, the slow, steady retreat from victory, and when I see our allies and our alleged allies become so much disturbed when they realize we have an American in charge now and that the days of treason are over, I cannot help but think that maybe, after all, at long last, perhaps the promises which were made to those unfortunate women may be fulfilled—the promises which we so hopelessly failed to keep during the past 6 or 7 years.

I say to Mr. Attlee again that we do not want his advice, we do not need it, we shall not accept it. If, as one of the Senators indicated the other day, it is an attempt to blackmail us into accepting a Communist peace, which means defeat, and that otherwise Britain will withdraw, I again say that if that is their threat, Mr. President, then we can go it alone. This Nation is powerful enough. It has the guts and the strength to win its battles. While we welcome allies in this fight against international communism; while we would like to have them, let us serve notice on the world today that we shall never supinely kneel and beg for allies, nor shall we attempt to bribe them with dishonorable acts.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, normally, I suppose, one would not take cognizance of what is said in another deliberative body. It has been my privilege to visit the British Parliament on several occasions, and I have had a high regard for members of the British Parliament and for the British people as such. There is, however, much that might be criticized in the observations made by the former Prime Minister. We could probably disregard what he said if it were not for the fact that once he did speak officially for the United Kingdom, and the time may come again, through the suffrage of the British people, when he may be restored to power, and we may have to deal with his party.

Mr. President, I am not so sure this is not a time for pity rather than for passion, notwithstanding the fact that there is much that might be scolded. What disturbs me most is the note of pessimism which was sounded, because I know of no other word for a proposal that would accept an aggressor nation into the bosom of the United Nations, after the hope for peace in Korea had been consummated. We have denounced them as aggressors; they have been designated as aggressors by the United Nations. Now comes a proposal that they should be accepted in the United Nations on a par with the free nations of the world. I think that would be rather difficult to take, in view of the fact that such a great, wraithlike monument of 134,000 casualties stands as mute testimony to what the Korean war has cost the American people.

One might scold Mr. Attlee also for the rather gratuitous observation that was made with respect to the American Constitution and with respect to the power of the Senate under that Constitution. I mean not to speak in dero-

gation of Mr. Attlee, but I think candor would compel one to say that, compared with Gladstone and Lord Bryce, who wrote that great treatise on the American commonwealth, Attlee is something of an intellectual pygmy. Gladstone and Bryce had a quite different estimate of the American Constitution. They placed a quite different appraisal upon it. Their assessment of it was entirely different from that suggested in the statement made by Mr. Attlee on the floor of Parliament, for Gladstone was most profuse in his admiration of and his encomiums on the American Constitution, and likewise the work of Lord Bryce stands as a magnificent commentary upon that document. I prefer their evaluations to that of Mr. Attlee.

Of course, when it comes to Mr. Attlee's observation about the powers of the Senate and their delimiting effect upon our foreign relations, I can think of no better argument that might have been made in behalf of the so-called Bricker resolution, which is presently in the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. We have been laboring with it for a long time. I think that resolution is a monument to the fidelity and diligence of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], as in the Senate and throughout the country he has pointed out not only the dangers of the treaty-making power, but also the dangers of the effect of treaties upon the rights of the American people.

So when Mr. Attlee undertakes rather gratuitously to remark upon the powers of the Senate, I think he reinforces and fortifies the case that has been made for Senate Joint Resolution 1, introduced by the Senator from Ohio and cosponsored by 63 other Senators, because, as I view it, that resolution would be a great safeguard for the American people against any possibility that their rights might be bartered away now or in the future.

I have the highest regard for the President of the United States. I think that with dignity and with solemn silence he will meet the charges and allegations which have been made upon the floor of Parliament.

However, I think Mr. Attlee's statement is rather opportune, because it points the way for the United States Senate with respect to a proposal for a constitutional amendment which, in my judgment, is one of the most important matters with which we shall deal, if we do deal with it, in the first session of the 83d Congress.

One other matter disturbs me about this adventure on the floor of Parliament. It is the seeming acquiescence of a great statesman, Sir Winston Churchill. It bothered me somewhat, as I read the account. I do not know how accurate it was, but certainly he did not rise in his place and there rebut the allegations and charges which were made. I think of Sir Winston Churchill as a great character. I recall his sojourns in the United States on occasions. I think of his initial visit in those rather grim and depressing days early in World War II. I remember so well, in the joint session on the other side of the Capitol, when he made with his fingers the symbol "V" for victory, and the thrill that accompanied it. I remember how inspirational it seemed to us. I remember how it fortified, encouraged, and moved the faith and steadfastness of the American people when we were standing on the threshold of an adventure to which we finally had to commit nearly 18 million young men. What a great spectacle, what a great sight it was, to see that master of the English language, as his eloquent cadences somehow moved every Member of the Senate and the House, and the galaxy that graced the galleries of the Chamber of the House on that day.

But, according to reports, he sat quietly by in the House of Commons, and by his silence he may have given assent and acquiescence to what was said. That is a rather unhappy circumstance. I suppose there are other things one might scold, but I am inclined toward a great passion for pity, rather than toward a desire to dwell in excoriating language on an action of this kind. I read in all this an engulfing frustration on the part of men who have given direction to the affairs and the destiny of a country, and who have somehow failed to elevate it from its despair in its hour of difficulty. I think I see in it the embittered limitations of a country whose power is waning, and that we can think of as a kind of waning imperialism.

There was a time when it could be recited, not only romantically, but also as a fact, that the sun never set on the British Empire. I once had occasion to prove that for myself. I went all the way to the end of the line, to Ceylon, in India, and I followed spring back around the earth. I covered 21 or 22 countries. I remember seeing soldiers, statesmen, missionaries, and emissaries of the great British Empire in all corners of the earth. They could be seen at airports everywhere, whether at Baghdad or along the Suez Canal, whether at Bombay or Delhi or Calcutta or Karachi, or whether it be in other sections of the Middle East. There one found representatives of the Empire. So it could be said in truth and in fact that the sun never set upon the British Empire.

Today its course is marked by deterioration and disintegration, some of it voluntary, some of it forced. Israel is now a republic. It was not when I was there. India has developed for herself a free status. That was not the case when I was there in 1945.

I have expressed the hope that someday the little country of Ireland likewise might divest itself of British authority in the six northern counties, so that Eire might be an undivided republic. Even as the son of the majority leader of the Senate gives this country uncommonly fine representation in Dublin, I trust that Ireland may find full, unrestricted, and complete freedom.

So there has been disintegration of the British Empire. There has been a kind of erosion of the Empire. I suppose that at times it must bring a kind of embitterment, as those who are still identified with empire mark this fading glory, this waning imperialism. It is good for the world, but it must necessarily bring frustration and a sense of bitterness with it.

Mr. President, I think of this incident largely as the uttering of a plaintive cry in Parliament because of all the things that could not be achieved.

Of course, it seems to me that the thing that Attlee bespeaks, and on which he places approval, is, after all, in part, the result of Britain's own misdoing or nondoing, because the cancer of socialism has been at work in England. Who can deny it who has seen it, who has appraised it, who has read a history of it, and who has read official documents with regard to its effect upon the people? So we have seen in Parliament a former discredited statesman, who may return to power, giving vent to a complete feeling of frustration.

But words are so idle with which to scold the statesmen of another country. After all, words are so feeble and mean so little in placing an evaluation upon what was said there. I think we can better do it by action in this body at a not too distant date.

We have been a very patient body. It is not necessary for us to take it when some foreign statesman tells the world—and certainly the remarks in Parliament have been read in all parts of the world—that there is an element in this country that desires no truce, and that no American ought to sit at the proposed conference for fear that a discordant note might be struck. We do not have to take it. We have taken a great deal, particularly in the case of Great Britain. We have taken a little over $3 billion worth since 1948 in what we have done under the Marshall plan and under the Mutual Security Administration something in excess of $3 billion.

Under the circumstances, I think the time has come not only for the American people, but for Members of this body and Members of the body at the other end of the Capitol who represent our people, to bespeak their sentiments by way of action.

The question of foreign aid will be before us in this Chamber one of these days. I know precisely what I intend to do about it. I have some convictions of my own. I am not so sure that we have not been "played for a sucker" on some occasions. I think the time has come, as our people are asking for tax relief, as our people are asking for a richly merited reduction in expenditures and appropriations, to keep some of these American dollars at home for the benefit of our own people. Certainly they will not berate us and rail at us because of the policy we pursue.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say except to suggest to Mr. Attlee that, rather than an exchange of bitter words and lamentations, we shall have occasion to act on the matter, at a time not too far in the future. It will be interesting to observe whether any delegations will come in that good hour as mendicants, as suppliants, to say, "Please, Mr. and Mrs. America, a little more, a little while longer." At that time every Member of this body will have to charge his own conscience and his own judgment as to what he shall do. When the hour arrives for that decision, I know what the junior Senator from Illinois will do. The knife will go infinitely deeper

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

into those estimates than has been suggested by authoritative sources in Government.

The day has come to be thinking a little about what Mr. Hoover referred to some years ago as the citadel of this hemisphere. Those remarks were almost prophetic when they were made over the air waves to the American people. Sitting in New York, as he must be this very day, examining the language of Mr. Attlee in the British Parliament, Mr. Herbert Hoover, the former distinguished President of the United States, can indulge a little smile as he notes how prophetic his own words were.

There will be a time for action, and that will be the responsibility of every Member of this body and every Member of the other body as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I did not hear in their entirety the speeches which were made yesterday—the speech by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the speech by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the speech by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] commenting upon the remarks of Mr. Attlee in the House of Commons.

I rise to speak extemporaneously because of my concern over the serious issues involved—issues which I believe to be the most serious that face the Congress and the Nation today. I refer to the questions of whether or not there shall be an agreement for the exchange of prisoners of war, an armistice in Korea, and perhaps a new start toward the goal of peace.

The remarks of Mr. Attlee in the House of Commons, and the division and action which he suggested, are not helpful to the negotiations that are being carried forward in Korea. I likewise believe that rash or immoderate statements made in the Congress of the United States do not help and do not aid our cause.

Frankly, I was greatly disappointed when I picked up the newspaper yesterday morning and read the speech of Mr. Attlee. I think it was a particularly unfortunate speech, coming at a time when delicate negotiations for the exchange of prisoners-of-war were taking place, at a time when there existed hope that some agreement might be reached regarding terms for the transfer of prisoners-of-war—an agreement which if successful might give rise to the hope that actual armistice negotiations might then be effected. The speech was disturbing in that it affected the chances of success in those negotiations, and the relations between our countries.

Certainly, one of the most disturbing statements made in that speech was the statement that large elements of our people want and look for an extension of war. I do not think it is necessary to argue that that is not the fact. Every effort of the American people since the close of the war refutes that statement—the effort to assist Europe and Great Britain; our efforts in the United Nations; and our very entrance into the Korean war to prevent larger aggressions. Our conduct of the war in Korea also refutes the statement that our people—or at least large elements of our people—want an extension of the war. As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] said yesterday, our action in Korea is proof of our moderation and of the desire of our Government that the war should not be extended.

I am not arguing the merits now, but the decision that there should be no bombing past the Yalu and the decision not to press for a blockade show the moderation and care with which we have moved, in order that the war might not be extended.

While the background and the implications of these facts may not be understood by all the British people, they certainly are known to Mr. Attlee. For a long time, as Prime Minister, he was in negotiation and contact with the Government of the United States. I am sure that in his heart of hearts he knows that neither the Government nor the people of the United States want war or any extension of the war in Korea unless it is forced on us. Furthermore, it is disappointing if the great war leader, Sir Winston Churchill—it is very difficult to think of him as Sir Winston—knowing all these facts, seemingly acquiesced in the statements. By the same token, if we speak of those who, in the House of Commons, acquiesce by their silence in statements and implications, we have the same responsibility here not to sit and seemingly acquiesce in statements made by others, with which we do not agree.

Although these statements were made in the House of Commons by a British leader, I am thankful that no hasty responses have been made in our own country by the leaders of our administration. Beyond words, which will pass, it seems to me that the real importance of the incident is that it shows that there still exists a gap between the two greatest allies in the world, and it demonstrates the necessity of closing that gap by bringing greater information and understanding between the two Governments and peoples.

This must be done, not for any emotional reasons, but because of the great aims which must be pursued and the great effort which must be made jointly by the United States and Great Britain, and other allies, if we are to secure, and if there is to be any chance of real peace, as distinguished from a cessation of war. There is a lack of understanding on both sides by the people, between the Governments, as well as in the Congress. There is a responsibility upon the leadership of Great Britain to understand and to make clear to their people our position. It can be emphasized that we are concerned because several hundred thousands of our troops in Korea are making the fight, with some of their own sons, not alone for our own interest in the Pacific—and I admit it is a large interest—but also for the interests of all. It must be shown that our troops have borne those great sacrifices. Their leadership should also make clear, as they must know, that our Government and our people desperately want peace with freedom and justice.

On our own responsibility we must recognize the attitudes and emotions of the people of Great Britain who have lived through two great wars. During those two wars Europe was invaded, and Britain was physically invaded by air attack. They sustained tremendous losses of life in the two wars. They are proximate to danger, near the only possible aggressor, Russia, while we are thousands of miles away. They are in a much more difficult economic situation than we are. They have suffered and they remember war and its effect upon them. The fear their people face does not address itself daily to every one of our people.

It must also be admitted that because our executive and legislative branches of Government are separated, and not joined, as in the case of Great Britain, and, in consequence we speak often freely as individuals, but not for the administration, statements have been made which perhaps seems irresponsible to the people of Great Britain. I think those facts must be realized.

It is a bad situation. I do not think we can allow the immoderate statements which were made in the House of Commons to go unchallenged. The truth must be pointed out. Above all, we must not allow our attention to be diverted from what I conceive to be the things of chief importance and significance to us today. We must attempt to find some means of resolving misunderstandings without any loss of our own principles.

What is the answer? Evidently some place along the line we have failed. If fault is with our Government, with the State Department, the executive branch of the Government, then more and more there should be a determined effort made on their part to make our position clear to Great Britain and our other allies.

As the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] said yesterday, there must be no misunderstanding between the heads of our Governments, that our position is based on principles in which we believe.

Further, there is responsibility upon the Members of Congress.

I remember in 1948, as a Member of this body, listening to the debate on the European recovery plan. I shall never forget a statement by Senator Vandenberg. He had stepped away from his desk and walking to the rear of the Chamber, where he sat when a bitter speech against an ally was being made. He said to me, "I see the beginning of the kind of talk which will make very difficult our joint efforts toward peace."

Each of us uses his own judgment, and each has his own responsibility. As we chasten others for immoderate statements we must ourselves guard against reckless statements.

I wish to make it perfectly clear, in making these rather general remarks, that I do not deviate or back away one inch from the principle which has been announced by our Government, with respect to the prisoner-of-war issue. I adhere without reservations to the great argument made yesterday by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Whatever may be the attitude or whatever may be the modifications which may be urged by our allies, we can never deviate from the one principle which has held us and given us strength throughout the years, namely, the absolute insistence upon freedom, whether it be for the individual or ultimately for nations.

I have wanted to speak for a few minutes, to make my point. It is that after this flurry of unfortunate words shall have faded away—as all such things do fade away—we will still be faced with the same problems in Korea, and there is more chance for their solution, if the United States and Great Britain understand each other and hold together as allies. There is increased need for understanding by the people of our allies of our situation and position, and there is necessity for greater efforts on the part of our Government, without loss of principle, to make our position clear and to reach agreements.

Finally I must say I disagree with my good friend, whom I like very much, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who implied that what has been said should have something to do with the great decisions upon aid and other matters which are to be made by the Congress. As I see it, what has happened in the past 2 days does not have any bearing whatever on what we do for our own security and for freedom. Our progress toward security and freedom are inevitably bound up with our relationships and our friendship with our great allies and with Great Britain.

DANIEL ROBERT LEARY—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair) laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 99, which was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House the enrolled bill (H. R. 1101) for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded, and the bill shall be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution being a privileged matter, I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Anderson	Ferguson	Kefauver
Barrett	Flanders	Kennedy
Beall	Frear	Kilgore
Bennett	Fulbright	Knowland
Bricker	George	Kuchel
Bridges	Gillette	Langer
Bush	Goldwater	Lehman
Butler, Md.	Gore	Long
Byrd	Green	Magnuson
Capehart	Griswold	Malone
Carlson	Hayden	Mansfield
Case	Hendrickson	Martin
Chaves	Hennings	Maybank
Cooper	Hill	McCarthy
Cordon	Hoey	McClellan
Daniel	Holland	Millikin
Dirksen	Hunt	Monroney
Douglas	Ives	Morse
Duff	Jackson	Mundt
Dworshak	Jenner	Murray
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Pastore	Schoeppel	Taft
Payne	Smith, Maine	Thye
Potter	Smith, N. J.	Watkins
Purtell	Smith, N. C.	Welker
Robertson	Sparkman	Wiley
Russell	Stennis	Williams
Saltonstall	Symington	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning on Tuesday, May 19, at noon, the Senate proceed to vote on all amendments to the pending measure, and on the bill itself; that the time on each amendment be limited to not more than 1 hour, the time to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]; that the time for debate on the bill itself be not more than 2 hours, to be divided equally between the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]; and that after the adoption of this unanimous-consent agreement, no amendments be received which are not germane to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. President, I have inquired of all the Senators whom I could reach as to the best time for taking a vote on the pending bill. I think it would be wise to set a definite time. If we could do that, I would hope we might be able, either Saturday or Monday, perhaps, to take time in which to dispose of the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, it is my understanding from the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], that the agreement as propounded by the distinguished majority leader is satisfactory to the minority members of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Ohio is agreed to.

The committee amendment, as modified, is open to amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MAYBANK. I regret that I was absent when the present discussion started. Has a date been set for the consideration of the independent offices bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that no date has been set for the consideration of that bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Chair.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I inquire of my colleagues whether they have any other business to transact at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further business to come before the Senate at this time? The Chair hears no response.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely desired to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Idaho as to when he thought the independent offices bill would be taken up. Is it his thought that it will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. WELKER. It is my understanding that the independent offices bill will be taken up at noon tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may say that the time beginning at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow has been set aside by unanimous consent for those who wish to deliver addresses in memory of the late Senator Robert F. Wagner, of New York. Following that, we shall take up the appropriation bill, if it is in order at that time. I have not checked into the situation completely. If the appropriation bill is not taken up at that time, it will be taken up on Monday.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether there will be a Saturday session.

Mr. TAFT. No; there will be no Saturday session.

Mr. MAYBANK. So, Mr. President, I suppose the independent offices appropriation bill will be considered on Monday.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to start consideration of it tomorrow. I do not think many Senators will want to resume consideration of the controls bill. I am not going to insist on finishing the consideration of the appropriations bill tomorrow.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not intend to delay. I was only trying to find what the program was to be, because the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] had spoken to me about it. I had hoped he would not object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there a unanimous-consent request before the Senate at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, there is not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The rules of the Senate provide that there shall be a 3-day period between the time when the report and the appropriation bill are submitted to the Senate from the Committee on Appropriations, and the time when the Senate may take up the bill for consideration. That is provided in the Reorganization Act of 1947. From time to time the rule has been waived, but I think it is unfortunate when it is waived, because such a period of delay is necessary in order that Members of the Senate who are not members of the Appropriations Committee may have an opportunity to study the bill and scrutinize it effectively. While I do not wish to delay matters, I desire to make a point

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of order against the immediate consideration of the appropriation bill. I think that in the long run such a following of the rules will lead to a much more careful consideration of appropriation bills than if they are presented and immediately acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Illinois that there is no request at the present time to take up the appropriation bill immediately.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have been talking with the Senator from Illinois, and I hope he will agree to let the bill be considered tomorrow. The majority leader has stated that tomorrow has been set aside for eulogies on the late former Senator Wagner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly shall not object to making the appropriation bill the order of business, but I would be reluctantly compelled to object if we were to pass finally upon any items in the appropriation bill itself or if amendments were foreclosed, because to do so would defeat the purpose of the Reorganization Act. I would not object to a general discussion or explanation of the bill, but I do not want any possible amendments to be foreclosed. After all, Mr. President, there was a real purpose behind this provision of the Reorganization Act. This was to permit the Members of the Senate to study projected appropriations. Otherwise, if an appropriation bill is brought to the floor and immediately discussed, the rank and file of the membership do not have time to acquaint themselves with the proposed appropriations. The power of the Senate is lost and the decisions of the committee tend to become final.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has requested me to say in his behalf that we intend to follow the rules of the Senate in every aspect and to every degree. By way of a parliamentary inquiry I ask whether if a motion to adjourn is made following our little discourse, the Senate can take up the independent offices appropriation bill tomorrow following the tributes paid to the late former Senator Wagner. I ask the Presiding Officer whether it is permissible to call up that bill following the services in behalf of the departed former Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that if the Senate adjourns there will be a morning hour tomorrow and a motion can be made to take up the appropriation bill as soon as the memorial addresses are concluded.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understood that the majority leader had set tomorrow aside for eulogies on the late former Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then we cannot take up the independent offices appropriation bill until after the eulogies are completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to read from section 139 of the Reorganization Act:

> No general appropriation bill shall be considered in either House unless, prior to the consideration of such bill, printed committee hearings and reports on such bill have been available for at least 3 calendar days for the Members of the House in which such bill is to be considered.

Mr. President, I should like to inquire on what day the bill and the committee hearings and report were available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that must be ascertained from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understood they were filed day before yesterday. Under the rules of the Senate, I think we can bring up the independent offices appropriation bill today, but I also think, in view of the fact that the distinguished majority leader has set aside tomorrow for eulogies on the late former Senator Wagner——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that today is the third day.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my understanding that this bill was reported yesterday morning at 9 o'clock.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I only ask the Senator from Illinois to yield because I think he is misinformed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, section 139 of the Reorganization Act requires a delay of 3 calendar days after committee hearings and the report on the bill have been available. When is it maintained that Members of the Senate had the hearings and report available to them? I found them on my desk for the first time this morning. I tried to get them yesterday.

Mr. MAYBANK. The report was submitted at 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I am advised by the secretary to the majority that the report and bill have been available since yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to make two replies to that statement. First, I think we should get a definition of the word "available," so that it is clear that it means the time when the bill, the hearings, and the report actually became available to the Members of the Senate. How many posses must be sent out in order to capture a report?

I should also like to raise the question as to what is meant by "3 calendar days." Have I been under a misapprehension since infancy that a calendar day consists of 24 hours, beginning and ending at midnight? Do we have some parliamentary legerdemain whereby several calendar days can be crowded into one?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Anything in the Committee on Appropriations is available at any hour it is ready. I happened to have been with my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is chairman of the subcommittee, and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was also there. I may say, in all admiration and respect for the Senator from Illinois, that we submitted the report on Tuesday at noon.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. WELKER. I am advised that the reports were available to every Senator as of yesterday morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Three days from Wednesday, as I understand it, would be Saturday, not Friday.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELKER. I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 15, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of May 12), 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Frederick M. Alger, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1953

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we thank Thee for the priceless gift of a new day which we are called to make the most of and the best of.

May it not be just another routine day added to our years, but may we appraise it as a golden opportunity to contribute new meaning and worth to our own life and life of all mankind.

Grant that it may be a day filled with the best things; a day of faith and adventure, of vision and victory, of friendship and fraternity, of hope and helpfulness; a day when we shall move to higher levels of thought and action.

We pray that the legislation proposed and enacted here today may help lift the burdens which weigh so heavily on the backs and hearts of those whose lives are hard and full of hazards.

May our President, our Speaker, and all our chosen Representatives be blessed with insight and inspiration, with skill and sympathy, with wisdom and understanding as they seek peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2277. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN NATIONAL CELEBRATION OF 50TH ANNIVERSARY YEAR OF CONTROLLED-POWERED FLIGHT

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 193) to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled-powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas two Americans, Orville and Wilbur Wright, of Dayton, Ohio, made the world's first successful controlled-powered flight in a heavier-than-air craft at Kitty Hawk, N. C., on December 17, 1903; and

Whereas American inventiveness and competitive enterprise during the half century since December 17, 1903, has developed the airplane into one of mankind's most powerful economic tools, into a social force which has recast the earth, into the most decisive element in the armor of the free world; and

Whereas the epochal contribution of the Wright brothers is a historical milestone in world aviation leadership; and

Whereas the National Committee To Observe the Fiftieth Anniversary of Powered Flight desires and the President of the United States has directed the Federal Government to participate in a broad program of commemorative activities; and

Whereas it is the judgment of the Congress that a proper coordination of Government participation in this anniversary be achieved: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the period from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953, be, and it is hereby, declared the 50th anniversary year of controlled-powered flight.

The President of the Senate shall appoint six Members and the Speaker of the House shall appoint six Members to compose a Joint Committee on Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary Year of Controlled-Powered Flight, and may appoint additional Members of their respective Houses, from time to time, to represent the Congress at principal national events during the 50th anniversary year of controlled flight.

When requested thereto by the joint committee appointed pursuant to this resolution, the Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to arrange for the cooperation of and appropriate participation by the various armed services in the celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled-powered flight.

Necessary travel expenses of any Member of Congress incidental to the performance of duties and responsibilities pursuant to designation under this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of which such Member is a Member, upon vouchers approved by the chairman elected by the joint committee created hereunder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, there is a similar Senate bill lying on the Speaker's table; therefore I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 42, to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled-powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas two Americans, Orville and Wilbur Wright, of Dayton, Ohio, made the world's first successful controlled-powered flight in a heavier-than-air craft at Kitty Hawk, N. C., on December 17, 1903; and

Whereas American inventiveness and competitive enterprise during the half century since December 17, 1903, has developed the airplane into one of mankind's most powerful economic tools, into a social force which has recast the earth, into the most decisive element in the armor of the free world; and

Whereas the epochal contribution of the Wright brothers is an historical milestone in world aviation leadership; and

Whereas the National Committee To Observe the Fiftieth Anniversary of Powered Flight desires and the President of the United States has directed the Federal Government to participate in a broad program of commemorative activities; and

Whereas it is the judgment of the Congress that a proper coordination of Government participation in this anniversary be achieved: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the period from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953, be, and it is hereby, declared the fiftieth anniversary year of controlled-powered flight.

The President of the Senate shall appoint six Members and the Speaker of the House shall appoint six Members to compose a Joint Committee on Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary Year of Controlled Powered Flight, and may appoint additional Members of their respective Houses from time to time, to represent the Congress at principal national events during the fiftieth anniversary year of controlled flight.

When requested thereto by the joint committee appointed pursuant to this resolution, the Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to arrange for the cooperation of and appropriate participation by the various armed services in the celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled-powered flight.

Necessary travel expenses of any Member of Congress incidental to the performance of duties and responsibilities pursuant to designation under this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of which such member is a Member, upon vouchers approved by the chairman elected by the joint committee created hereunder.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby House Joint Resolution 193 was passed were vacated and the joint resolution laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee, I call up House Resolution 235 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5174) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of H. R. 5174, a bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes. It is an open rule providing for 3 hours of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee. The rule waives all points of order against the bill.

I do not know of anything controversial in the bill and I am not sure that points of order would have been made against the provisions of the bill. However, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] ranking minority member, appeared before the Rules Committee and requested this rule which waives all points of order.

There are two provisions contained in the bill which would probably be subject to points of order, and for this reason

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the rule was requested. The bill provides that not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation available to the Post Office Department for the current fiscal year may be transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other such appropriation or appropriations for the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, I understand this is a procedure which has been followed for some time. I do not know that there is anything new or unusual about this provision. However, this is one of the sections which the committee had in mind when requesting the Rules Committee to grant this rule waiving points of order.

The other provision relates to the Coast Guard and provides that this appropriation shall be available for expenses of primary and secondary schooling for dependents of Coast Guard personnel stationed outside the continental United States in amounts not exceeding an average of $250 per student, when it is determined by the Secretary that the schools, if any, available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents, and the Coast Guard may provide for the transportation of said dependents between such schools and their places of residence when the schools are not accessible to such dependents by regular means of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is the same privilege which is now granted to other branches of the armed services. All this provision does is to place the Coast Guard on an equality with the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, and give the children of members of this organization the same advantages now enjoyed by children of members serving in other branches of the armed services, so far as education outside of the United States is concerned. I understand only a few children of the Coast Guard are involved. I believe the chairman of the committee said something like 40 in all, so the number is very small. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there will be any objection to this provision of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill recommends an appropriation of $611,895,000 for the Treasury Department, which is $43,875,000 less than the amount of money appropriated for the Department in 1953 and is $53,433,000 less than the budget estimates for 1954, as previously submitted.

H. R. 5174 also recommends the appropriation of $2,832,250,000 for the Post Office Department, which represents an increase in the appropriation of $38,450,000 over the fiscal year of 1953, but a decrease in the previously submitted budget estimate of $74,550,000.

If H. R. 5174 is passed, the combined appropriations for both the Treasury and the Post Office Departments will be $127,983,000 less than the amount called for in the 1954 budget estimates for these two Departments. This bill recommends a reduction of $5,425,000 in the amount of regular annual appropriation as compared to the appropriation for the year 1953.

The recommended decrease in appropriations for the Treasury Department was made in the expectation of a reduction in the personnel of the Department. The Treasury Department will employ approximately 76,157 people, about 3,167 less than was contemplated, in the budget request on January 9, 1953. There would also be a reduction in the military personnel of the United States Coast Guard from 34,836 to 33,677 in the coming year.

This appropriation bill takes into consideration in its recommendation of $2,832,250,000 for the Post Office Department that this Department will employ approximately 520,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill and should receive the immediate consideration of this House. I, therefore, urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of May 11, 1953, carries a news story under this headline "Food-Cost Sag a Portent?"

May I again commend the Secretary of Agriculture upon his efforts to lower food costs to the consumer?

I am disappointed that Republican Members of Congress have been reluctant to support the policies of the Secretary of Agriculture. I suggest that they read the statement which I am including in the RECORD.

Farmers certainly realize that the coddling of the Democratic administrations of the past is at an end. Secretary Benson has raised the interest rate on loans on grain stored by the farmers. No doubt other steps will be taken to stop pampering the farmer and guaranteeing him protection against economic forces.

FOOD-COST SAG A PORTENT?

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—Food prices, which were the first to head upward in the postwar inflation race, are now the first to peel off in the other direction.

Evidence of this decline appears in a report from the Department of Agriculture of a 3.4 percent drop in retail food prices over the first 3 months of the year.

This brings the cost of the family market basket down to its lowest level since 1950. Not that the market basket of that day was any bargain by prewar standards, but the reduction represents a $25 saving over the period of a year.

The Department's price check on foods is kept on the basis of an average year's supply for a family of three.

The lower cost of this year's basket is due for the most part to the lower cost of beef.

The highest market basket price on record was that of 1952, when this average family of three had to foot a bill of $740.

Figured on the basis of prices over the first 3 months of this year, the price tag on the food basket would be $710. Last year at this time it was $735.

The price of that market basket has been going up ever since 1940, when it was only $319.

Even under price controls during the World War, food prices edged up slowly. By 1945, when the war ended, this same basket was up to $459.

It took a real leap in cost between 1950, when it was $645, and 1951 when it cost $722.

This new trend in food prices does not necessarily portend a substantial drop in the over-all cost of living, since other costs are still rising, according to the latest price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the reduction in this bill concerning the Post Office Department appropriation is poor economy. I want to call the attention of the Congress to the situation in industrial areas. The industrial Calumet region of Indiana is not any different than other industrial areas throughout the country. There should be provisions in this bill so the Post Office Department in these areas can hire added help for better postal service. There is a great concentration of industrial workers in these areas whose families came to these districts during the last 10 years. In the Calumet region of Indiana the postal employees are handling mail for thousands of additional patrons in spite of the fact that their budgets have been greatly reduced instead of increased.

I see in this bill where there has been a $127 million cut, or 3½ percent, for the Post Office Department. A year ago there was a very marked reduction in the Post Office operational budget. I have met with the postal employees and also with the postmasters in my area on several occasions. Their situation as far as employees is concerned and as far as the postal service is concerned is highly critical.

This does not apply in all areas in the country. I do not imagine that down in some of the rural areas that situation maintains, but in Hammond, Gary, and East Chicago, and other small localities adjacent to these industrial areas, the postal-employee situation is far from adequate and under the one-delivery-a-day system the carrier are overworked. By reason of this postal employees are resigning and sick absentees have tripled.

In the first place, any potential employee in the Post Office Department can go into the industries and secure wages greatly in excess from what they can get in the Post Office Department. In the cities of Hammond, Gary, and East Chicago, particularly in the wintertime and around the Christmas period, it is impossible to get sufficient help to operate the post offices.

About a month ago when I was home I met with the rural postmasters of northern Indiana. I do not know whether in other areas in the rural communities the same situation exists, but one of the rural postal carriers at Cedar Lake, Ind., which is a small town right adjacent to these industrial cities, and whose population has increased almost 5,000 in the last 2 years, told me that during the winter months he reports at the post office at 5:30 in the morning and it is after dark before he completes work at the post office. He is compelled to sort his own mail and then go out on these deliveries, and with the increased number of patrons and increased

number of boxes it is after dark before he completes his work. That situation exists with practically every carrier in the rural area in my district. It is brought about by reason of this great influx of population into this area on account of defense production.

I do not see where there is any economy whatsoever in cutting down the postal service of this country and especially in industrial areas where there is such a great concentration of extra work brought about by reason of this abnormal defense production situation.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I want to associate myself completely with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana. The situation in Detroit is just as bad or worse, due to the fact that the wages of the postal employees are so pitifully low that it is almost impossible for the postmaster to get appropriate help. Because of the cuts in the service the citizens of Detroit and the surrounding areas have been very much handicapped. I think, as the gentleman has so rightfully said, it is false economy to try to disturb the efficiency of the postal service.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think that if the gentleman will read the bill he will note there is contained therein $79,450,000 over and above the funds appropriated for the postal operations last year.

I think you will find that will take care of these industrial and rural demands.

Mr. MADDEN. Could the gentleman inform me as to what the reduction was in the budget last year for the Post Office Department?

Mr. CANFIELD. The reduction by the Congress was $127 million, but meanwhile there was an indicated saving in transportation of something approximating $50 million. The last-year cut, may I say to the gentleman from Indiana, was $28,300,000.

Mr. MADDEN. I might mention further that I was present at the town of Cedar Lake, Ind., at the post office there during the Christmas rush last year. Their quarters were so inadequate that hundreds of packages had to be parked outside the post office due to the fact that they did not have sufficient quarters to accommodate the daily mail and also the influx of Christmas packages. There has been a great deal of agitation about building or providing additional quarters at Cedar Lake, but, of course, the cry comes that on account of the cut in the budget and on account of economy, it is impossible to do that at this time. Possibly the situation in regard to industrial areas can be remedied by the administration of the postal service—I do not know—but I think there should be a different yardstick on the part of the Postmaster General or the heads of the various departments regarding the service of the post offices in industrial areas where there is a heavier concentration of postal work. There should be additional employees allowed in those areas considering the great increase in the mail and in the postal service for those industrial and defense areas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is my understanding that the Post Office Department is presently giving consideration to the subject matter the gentleman from Indiana is discussing at the present time. I believe in a comparatively short time, the Department will come up with some recommendations and suggestions which will at least partially take care of the situation which the gentleman has so well described to us today.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to thank the gentleman. In closing I want to state that I am in favor of economy, but I do not see where there can be any economy arrived at by cutting down the postal service in these industrial areas. I venture to say that 97 out of 100 families in my area want two mail deliveries a day. I do know that the administration and the party now in power in their platform said they would give more frequent mail deliveries. I think that was the statement that they made. Under this cut in the Post Office budget, you will never be able to resume the two mail deliveries a day, and if there is anything that I believe the American family is entitled to, it is to receive their mail as soon as possible after it arrives at the post office. The only way they can get adequate delivery of their mail is through two mail deliveries a day.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Do you not think this proposed cut is merely a gesture? The gentleman from Indiana will recall we have been running better than a half billion dollar deficit in the Post Office, and under the proposed cut here it just simply means a larger deficit for next year because the business of the Department is the largest business serving the American people and it will be carried on, and the result will be an increase in the deficit.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I believe he is absolutely correct. In closing, I repeat I cannot see any economy in cutting down the post service of the country. I do hope this Congress will restore the two deliveries of mail per day.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, my reason for taking the floor at this time on this rule is to direct the attention of the House to a practice on the part of the Appropriations Committee—and this is not new today or this year, but a practice that has been growing a little more and more as we go along. That is, to include legislation on an appropriation bill. I have no objection to this particular proposal. In fact, I hardly think a rule is required. In fact, I think the legislation is good. I call attention only to the manner in which these things are being done without what I believe to be proper consideration to legislative committees of the House. I want, as far as reasonable, to safeguard the prerogatives of the legislative committees of this House. Generally speaking, all legislation ought to go through the regular committees. Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee of the House and should at all times not be regarded as such with respect to the prerogatives of legislative committees.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado who yielded me this time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. One of the reasons I voted for this rule was because the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, who is now addressing the House, chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, appeared before the Rules Committee and indicated he had no objection to this rule waiving points of order against this bill. It had considerable influence with me in voting for this rule.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I believe the gentleman will recall that the gentleman from Kansas appeared because the program was already made up. Certainly I did not want to delay it. Furthermore, I did not think this particular item was of sufficient importance to make any difference. The item under consideration in this rule should be enacted into law. As I stated heretofore, I do not believe a rule is required in this case. The Postmaster General ought to have the right to transfer 5 percent of this fund from one department to the other. But, generally speaking, the proper thing when legislation is required it is better for the agencies to come before the regular legislative committees. Then it would be unnecessary to have the Rules Committee take any action such as is being required today.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Kansas is aware of the fact that the lady from New York, Mrs. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, has made a study and report wherein numerous recommendations are made. I quote from the report:

> This committee has refrained from making specific recommendations that would require legislation or the amendment of existing laws, preferring to leave to the present incumbent Postmaster General and his team a free hand to exercise initiative, judgment, and imagination in the hope that by so doing more and better improvements will result.

It was our position that that approach should be made in the legislative committee. Now, in connection with this specific item, it was my understanding that the Postmaster General had discussed this same language with the gentleman from Kansas, and he approved the flexible approach.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The Postmaster General did call this to the attention of the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the chairman of the subcommittee believe that this so-called inflexible sum of money under the authority of the Postmaster General could be diverted toward increasing the funds allowed to postmasters in industrial areas, so that they could put on added help in the rush seasons?

Mr. REES of Kansas. In all probability that could be done. I just want to make it clear I am not objecting to this particular section of the bill, not at all; I think it is a good provision. I am only talking about the general proposition of bringing in legislation on appropriation bills.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am sympathetic with the gentleman from Kansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. This question of legislation on appropriation bills is one that bothers the Rules Committee quite frequently, yet there are always practical considerations which make it desirable and feasible to make exceptions in these cases.

On yesterday when this rule came before the Rules Committee, both the Majority and Minority favored the rule; both thought it was a desirable thing to do these two things that are necessary in here. If I recall correctly the gentleman from Kansas agreed with them that it was a desirable thing to do, and the gentleman very kindly and I thought very considerately said he was not going to object to that yesterday, that he was just complaining about the system which has developed here over a long period of time. But from my experience on the Rules Committee every now and then we run into one of those situations where it is a practical and desirable thing to do in the interest of the country, to waive points of order to particular pieces of legislation attached to appropriation bills.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I just want to say that the gentleman has made a very fair statement.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Further reading from the report, here is what we say:

> Members of the committee were deeply impressed by the statement of the Postmaster General to the committee. He has highlighted therein many of the areas where changes looking to the betterment of the service can and should be made. To accomplish some of the changes and improvements will require legislation, either new or by amendment to existing law. The Committee on Appropriations is not, however, the proper committee to originate such legislation. The legislative committee, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is available to give consideration to proposed changes in existing law or to any new legislation that may be desirable.

That is the position of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word about the bill itself. Every time we have a postal bill up here there are a lot of folks who get up and say we ought to spend more money for this, that, and the other thing, we ought to increase salaries, and so forth; very seldom do we hear a Member say a kind word for the poor, old, bedraggled budget. The Post Office Department is running at a deficit of $600 million of the taxpayers' money. The gentleman to my right corrects me and says it is $700 million. Regardless of exact figures, it is somewhere in that range, and everybody will agree that it is more than it ought to be. I wonder when we are going to get around to the point where either through appropriations or through legislation we are going to do the thing that needs to be done. Of course, it is hard to do. If you undertake to raise the postal rates on books you get a letter from every library in the United States. If you undertake to cut out some surplus service you get a letter from everybody interested saying it is going to ruin the country and probably bring on a depression. But we know that the bald fact remains that while we are trying to balance the budget in other directions the Postal Department is costing the American people $700 million yearly, and it ought to be a self-sustaining service. What rates should be raised and what should not and what should be done about salaries and costs of transportation I do not know, but it seems to me that is a matter for the Committee on Appropriations and a matter for the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

We talk a lot about balancing the budget, but every time a bill comes up and the subject is raised we learn that it is a fine thing to balance the budget but do it on somebody else.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that during the past 3 years on at least three occasions the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service has held hearings on additional postal rates and has tried to bring in legislation. That has been repeatedly rejected by the House. The gentleman who is now chairman of the committee, and the gentleman who is the ranking Democratic member have fought vigorously to try to adjust these postal rates. But until the House is willing to accept its responsibility I do not think the committee can do very much.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I recognize what the gentleman from California says is correct. I know they have been trying to do something. The purpose of my remarks was simply to give a little more encouragment and a little more hope that some of us who have been a little weak kneed on this thing may hereafter stand up and do the thing that is so necessary for this country, cut the appropriations and get the budget in shape where the country is solvent.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House at this time. I would like to say to him that this deficit of $700 million, which is what I understand it is, is a direct charge on the taxpayers. It must be made up out of the general revenues of the Treasury. Some part of the $700 million involves subsidies that ought to be gotten out in the open and clarified so that we know what we are doing; but beyond that there is very definitely a huge deficit.

May I say to the gentleman that I have known the present Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, a long time. He is an able, conscientious, hard working, patriotic American citizen who is taking the responsibilities of his new assignment with the greatest seriousness that anyone can imagine. I am quite sure he wants to tackle this whole overall problem and if he can get the cooperation of the Congress of the United States many things will be accomplished and they will be accomplished in such manner as to render a public service at less cost and at the same time help cut down this deficit which, after all, stands directly in the way, at least in some measure, of our achieving a balanced budget and making a start on hauling taxes down.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sure that what the gentleman from Indiana says about Mr. Summerfield is true, but exactly the same thing was true about the previous Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson. When he came in here trying to save some money, the House almost wanted to lynch him.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree with what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] states in regard to balancing the budget in the Post Office Department; but after all, the Post Office Department is the one Department of our Government that gives service to every taxpayer in America. Every individual in America gets a service from the Post Office Department. I do not think we are going to see the time when the Post Office Department will balance its budget. It is a service the taxpayers are entitled to have, and considering the present postal situation there should be something done regarding the creation of some kind of a fund to take care of this deficit. Maybe we can go into some of these large post-office subsidies that are paid to the railroads and the airlines for carrying the mail, and cut those down. That may be one of the solutions. You should see some of these mail carriers on one delivery a day leaving the post offices in Hammond, Gary, East Chicago, and other cities and towns in these industrial centers. These postal carriers have mailbags and packages on their arms and on their backs that make them look like Chinese coolies working on the wharf over in Peking, China. It is unfortunate the way the mail carriers in these industrial areas shoulder that kind of a burden on account of a so-called lack of funds and the one delivery a day system. I think there should be two deliveries of mail

restored to the residential areas. In the campaign last year I heard administration candidates say in my district that there would be two mail deliveries restored if the party now in power was elected. So I trust Mr. Summerfield will carry out that promise.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. My good friend from Indiana has just emphasized and pointed up what I have been saying. He would like to have two mail deliveries in certain areas. That will cost $80 million a year and increase the deficit just that much.

Mr. Speaker, I did not have any impulse to make a speech this morning, and probably I made a mistake in getting up here, but as long as we got started, let us talk about it a little. You spent last year for the Post Office Department $3,449,000,000, and while the committee has struggled with it as best it could this year, you are only cutting the 1953 appropriation by $5 million.

Here is your great trouble in reducing that budget.

There are two things that the Postmaster General cannot do anything about: One is the cost of transportation of mail and the other is what Congress is going to do up here on the Hill about spending some more money.

I want you all to listen carefully this morning when the gentleman from Louisiana makes a speech on this subject and let us get down to cases. He is going to disclose some very startling figures about what kind of a subsidy you are paying the newspapers. Now, all the newspapers I know anything about are chock full of advertisements. They are just making more money than they ever made before in their lives, and I just do not understand why this Congress should sit up here and subsidize them some more.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In view of the observation made by my friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] about the two-mail delivery, I am sure he was not aware of the fact that Postmaster General Summerfield only yesterday made a statement to the national president of the Letter Carriers Association. I have a copy of it in my hands. He called them down because he knew there was going to be a fight, so I guess he talked them into refraining from further prosecution in trying to get the two deliveries a day back. Here is what the Postmaster General said:

> I would like to make it absolutely clear, however, that we have a completely open mind on the eventual restoration of two deliveries.

I know that will amaze my friend from Virginia in view of his position.

> It could well be that our studies will show that in some areas of the country, due to population shifts, two deliveries should be reinstated as quickly as possible.

Then he goes on. In other words, he does and he does not. That is the usual theme among the Republican members of the Cabinet.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does that indicate that the two-mail delivery is for the benefit of the public or for the benefit of the letter carriers?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will say from this that Postmaster General Summerfield has promised the restoration of a two-delivery system by inference. He does not say so. I am sure they are going to be disappointed, but I hope not.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I would like to read Mr. Summerfield's entire statement which Mr. Abrams, the Deputy Postmaster General, who has been in office 3 weeks in charge of postal operations, read yesterday before a group of letter carriers assembled here to support an amendment to restore two-a-day delivery service at a cost of $80 million. After this statement was read by Mr. Abrams before the group, I understand that Mr. Doherty gave his approval, calling it a very frank and forthright statement. I understand further that the so-called Rhodes amendment will not be presented on the floor this afternoon.

Now, this is the statement in its entirety. May I say before I read it that I have always been a two-a-day delivery man right from the very beginning, and the gentleman from Virginia will bear witness that when the thought was first projected in our committee I was the one dissenting Member, perhaps the first Member of this body to raise objection to cutting this service. But I believe in the traditional spirit of American fair play. I do not believe in grabbing the ball from this new team down here in the Post Office Department that is asking the Congress for a chance to show what it can do to improve the postal service in the Nation at less cost to the American taxpayers.

Now, this is the statement in its entirety:

> There is no easy solution to the problem of improving mail service. It involves better collection, distribution, transportation, and delivery of mail.
>
> Our objective is to get a letter from the sender to the receiver in the fastest possible time.
>
> Our studies so far clearly indicate that the problem is one of collection, distribution, and transportation and not primarily of additional deliveries. For example, by making later collections in Washington 56,000 pieces of mail a day are being delivered 24 hours earlier than they would have been. No amount of deliveries would have had that result.
>
> This being so, we think it would be downright dishonest to take the easy course and recommend restoration of two deliveries a day at a minimum cost of $80 million a year to the taxpayer.
>
> I would like to make it absolutely clear, however, that we have a completely open mind on the eventual restoration of two deliveries. It could well be that our studies will show that in some areas of the country, due to population shifts, two deliveries should be reinstituted as quickly as possible.
>
> I have stated from the beginning that this problem along with all the service problems of the Post Office Establishment will receive unprejudiced scrutiny and we will be guided by the facts. If our studies show that two deliveries are necessary, we will be the first to join with you in requesting the appropriation necessary for effecting the change.
>
> In the meantime, we will keep you advised of the progress and will be happy to receive any information you may have which bears on this problem.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If everybody is through, I want to drop this hot potato. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES]?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has not asked me for time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia has only 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania those 2 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield, apparently the statement of Postmaster General Summerfield is a hot potato, and he has made it more hot, because nobody knows what he means by it.

Mr. CANFIELD. The letter carriers seem to know what it means.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman tell what it means?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in reply to the statement by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] that I have made no definite statement or promise as to whether or not I would offer an amendment. I have not yet made up my mind as to whether or not I will do so, because I have not been quite satisfied in my own mind that the promise made for two-a-day deliveries is going to mean anything.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I was informed by one of the officers of the National Association of Letter Carriers, which has been behind the gentleman's proposed amendment, that the amendment would not be offered today.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I have made no definite statement to anyone. I did make a statement with reservations. May I say also that the letter carriers may be behind this, but it was my proposal in the first place.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5174) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resovled itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5174, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will permit me to complete my remarks

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

on the action taken by the Committee on Appropriations on this bill before asking questions.

Mr. Chairman, there is much talk in Washington these days about teams and team work, and properly so. I am very proud of the team which makes up the subcommittee on appropriations handling the Treasury Department and Post Office Department funds. In passing, I want to say a word about each member of that team. First, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] who in the 81st and 82d Congresses was chairman of this committee. He is a team man, and he has been extremely helpful to me as captain of the team in this Congress. VAUGHAN GARY distinguished himself as a member of the Virginia Legislature before coming to the Congress and he is known throughout the Nation as one of our country's leading tax authorities, a very good man indeed to have on this particular subcommittee. Through his leadership of the committee, we made important field studies, particularly in Coast Guard operations not only in this country but abroad. Those fact-finding studies have been extremely helpful in our considerations and actions.

I want, too, to salute the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] who is a top notch business executive, known in this Congress as one of our leading conservationists. He, too, has been dedicated to teamwork on this committee.

Also, on the minority side is my friend and colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SIKMINSKI], another successful man of business who was first elected to the Congress in 1950, when he was serving in our Armed Forces on the heartbreak ridges of Korea.

On the majority side there is the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], who yesteryear was a successful principal of a high school, a successful farmer back home; and currently, in addition to his service on this committee, is chairman of the committee in charge of funds for the District of Columbia.

Next comes the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES]. Mr. JAMES, too, formerly served in the legislature of his home State of Pennsylvania. He, too, is a successful businessman, being chairman of the board of the Franklin Printing Co., of Philadelphia; he, in fact, being the successor to the immortal Ben himself.

Then there is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], this year a new member on our subcommittee, who in yesteryear was a successful insurance executive, a successful man in the newspaper field, once sheriff of his county, and now doing a real job in this Congress.

I want also in passing to say a word about the executive clerk of our committee, Mr. Robert E. Lambert, whom I have known on Capitol Hill for the last 29 years. He antedated me 4 years in his service on the Hill. He has served as secretary to Members of the Congress, as clerk to the legislative Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and as clerk to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling military funds. We are particularly fortunate in having him with us in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us calls for a reduction of $53,433,000 in the original requests of the Treasury Department for $665,328,000. All but $2,550,000 was self-imposed.

Insofar as the Post Office Department is concerned, the cuts aggregate $74,550,000 from the original requests of $2,906,800,000. All but $2,450,000 of the cut was self-imposed.

Before discussing the major cuts in Treasury, I wish to say that every member of the subcommittee was deeply impressed with the stature and presentations of Secretary Humphrey and his team, all dedicated to improving the economic health and strength of our country and promoting the security of a free world.

The only Bureau in the Treasury Department untouched by any cuts is the Bureau of Narcotics which with a comparatively small number of men is doing an heroic job to stamp out the sources of illicit narcotics and prevent addiction in the United States. Our committee has been shocked to learn of the narcotics disclosures in our Nation's Capital; and we want to see better teamwork between the Federal and local authorities with more cooperation on the part of the courts of the District of Columbia which according to testimony are not handing out sentences as in other jurisdictions. If the Federal Bureau of Narcotics needs more men here, our committee will be the first to recommend any necessary funds.

The Coast Guard cut aggregates $34,350,000, $11,750,000 of which is applied to operating expenses and $22,500,000 to capital improvements.

Taking up the operating expenses cut, $6,475,000 represents a general tightening of the nonpersonnel costs for such items as maintenance of vessels, structure and buoy maintenance, electronics maintenance, and aircraft maintenance. In these areas, the Coast Guard anticipates that the reductions will be balanced by new economies in operations which the cut should stimulate. The balance of reductions in operating expenses of $5,275,000 will be applied against military personnel costs distributed about equally between the port security and the military readiness augmentation programs. The reduction in port security billets will be spread evenly so that no individual protective unit will be seriously affected. The Coast Guard gives assurances that the cuts will not lessen the essential safeguards thrown around the loading of explosives or munitions in our ports, loading docks, or the patrolling of our major port areas against suspicious vessels intent on doing damage.

The same situation is present in connection with the military readiness augmentation program. Full military manning of vessels on a war basis would be both unrealistic and economically indefensible. All that is now contemplated is a small lessening of complements and the method of effecting the reduction in all military personnel will be simply to let the attrition rate exceed the recruitment rate during the fiscal year 1954.

The other cuts in Coast Guard include $13,300,000 which is directed primarily toward the deferment of aircraft replacement, the Coast Guard holding that this will provide additional opportunity to review the matter for various types and models and to integrate more fully the replacement of Coast Guard planes with the procurement program of the military services. They insist that the deferment program will in no way endanger the lives of the pilots or crews.

The last item of $8,797,000 is a deferment of the final phase of a program for the establishment of a winterized loran chain for the use of the Armed Forces, the costs for which is now being explored with the military.

The cut in the Bureau of Internal Revenue is $6,500,000, and it should be emphasized that every cent requested for the investigation and audit of tax returns, assistance to taxpayers, and the necessary appellate service is being allowed. The reduction is attributable to changes initiated by Secretary Humphrey and Commissioner Andrews in operating methods which will have no substantial effect on the revenue. These changes are as follows:

Revision of procedures to eliminate unnecessary notices and reports and to avoid spending more in the collection of small deficiencies than is recovered from them.

Regulatory, control, and inspection work.

Avoidance of duplication of local liquor-law enforcement.

Processing returns, remittances, information documents, and claims:

(a) Effect a reduction in number of excise-tax returns to be received, assessed, processed, and filed by placing them on a quarterly rather than monthly basis.

(b) Revision of the methods employed in a comparison of information and other documents with tax returns, based on generally accepted practice of test checking and verification, which will not lessen the effectiveness of this phase of operations.

In commenting on these reductions, Commissioner Andrews said that a thorough analysis of all activities has demonstarted that the reductions listed above are the most which can be proposed at this time without materially affecting the amount of the revenue taken in. He further added that we think what we have proposed up to this time is workable, and we are sufficiently sure of it that we are willing to tell you that we can absorb this cut without interfering with our enforcement work.

The adequacy of the amount being recommended appears to be well summed up by Secretary Humphrey in his letter of April 15, addressed to me as chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee, a part of which has been reproduced in the hearings.

In this letter the Secretary stated, among other things:

The item in the bureau's budget where it can be strongly argued that increased expenditures will produce even greater increases in the amount of tax collections, is the item of investigation and audit of tax returns, and here our request is for the same amount provided in the Truman budget. We have not at this time requested an in-

crease in this figure, for Commissioner Andrews has not yet concluded studies in which he is now engaged to determine whether this is the right amount, or whether the figure should be increased. When studies have established a reasonable estimate of the amount by which increased enforcement activities would pay adequate dividends in increased tax collections, we shall not hesitate to ask the Congress for a supplemental appropriation, if this is the indicated conclusion.

Commissioner Andrews testified that he was committed to the policy of reducing overhead costs and applying all such savings to the employment of revenue-producing agents just as fast as he could effect savings in overhead and assure himself that added agents could be profitably employed.

Addressing myself to the cut in Customs of $1,500,000 from the requested amount of $42 million, I desire to read a portion of a letter addressed to me by Secretary Humphrey under date of April 15, 1953, as follows:

Here, also, we are reviewing various aspects of the work, as for example, to determine whether the examination of a higher percentage of mail matter than at present would increase the revenues by more than the increased cost of such additional examinations: to determine whether the increased customs workload can be properly handled by the projected force; to appraise the savings which could be realized from the projected customs simplification act; and to decide whether an adequate job is being done in other respects, including the surveillance of Communist propaganda material entering the country. If it appears necessary as a result of these studies, we shall request a supplemental appropriation.

When I asked for the comment of Mr. David Strubinger, Acting Commissioner of Customs, he spoke as follows:

I think the Secretary's letter pretty well covers our thinking on the way we are going to go about trying to work within the appropriation that is now being recommended. We have under consideration various projects which will simplify, we believe, methods and procedures and will enable us to operate properly and efficiently within the amount that is given us.

I might say that the projects are all under test, that we are not sure yet we are going to meet these objectives, but I think we have a reasonable chance of doing so. We have anticipated, as a matter of fact, some of the changes involved that will be included in the Customs Simplification Act to the extent that we can within the framework of the law. One procedural change under consideration is the process of obtaining information from importers with respect to value.

At the present time and for the past 15 years it is and has been the practice to require an importer if he wants information with respect to the value, to file what we call a submission sheet in advance of the appraisement of the merchandise. We are going to discontinue this requirement and in lieu of handling this extra paper and to eliminate the contacts with the importers that are necessary back and forth during the period the appraisement is under consideration we are simply going to go ahead and make our finding and then advise the importer if there is any difference between the entered and appraised value. So that will eliminate, we believe, a tremendous quantity of paperwork within the appraisers' stores.

In addition, we have issued instructions to our border ports not to issue touring permits except where they have reason to believe that a person coming into this country is going to stay past the 6-month period. We believe that in so doing, we can speed up the flow of traffic along the Canadian and Mexican borders and it will make unnecessary the cutting out of line of cars where the inspector knows that the driver is going to make a trip into the interior somewhere but, unless questioning reveals that fact that he is going to be there for an extended period, we will not issue a touring permit. It takes 5 or 10 minutes to issue a touring permit for a car.

We intend also to lessen the degree of the examination of passengers' baggage at seaports and airports. At the present time we have practically a 100-percent examination of all baggage that comes in at seaports and airports. That is not true along the Canadian border. A great portion of the baggage carried in cars or on the person, belonging to people coming across the border, is not examined so that, in effect, what we are going to do is to apply about the same procedure to the airports and seaports.

We also are going to try a system of determining in advance whether or not we should weigh, gage, or measure certain types of merchandise. We believe in this area there is greater room for the acceptance of the invoice or commercial weights.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 38]

Albert	Deane	Morrison
Angell	Dempsey	Moulder
Barrett	D'Ewart	Mumma
Belcher	Dingell	Neal
Betts	Dolliver	Pilcher
Boland	Dondero	Poulson
Bolling	Elliott	Powell
Boykin	Fenton	Prouty
Bray	Gamble	Rabaut
Brooks, Tex.	Hart	Rayburn
Brown, Ohio	Harvey	Reams
Brownson	Hays, Ohio	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Heller	Richlman
Burdick	Hull	Roberts
Bush	Jenkins	Scott
Carlyle	Knox	Scudder
Carnahan	Krueger	Secrest
Cederberg	Lyle	Shafer
Celler	McConnell	Short
Chudoff	McGregor	Sutton
Cole, Mo.	McMillan	Taylor
Colmer	McVey	Wheeler
Condon	Mason	Williams, Miss.
Coudert	Merrill	Young
Dawson, Ill.	Miller, N. Y.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5174) and finding itself without a quorum he had directed the roll to be called when 352 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I suppose right now I should thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. I understand that the motive behind his point of order was that he thought I was making a good speech and that more of my colleagues should hear it.

I am personally mindful of the ever-increasing demands being made on customs and I am urging the department to expedite its survey of the whole customs picture. Obviously our committee desires to promote the proper collection of revenue and do everything possible to prevent smuggling of narcotics, jewelry, and gold. I propose a series of conferences with the Treasury Department and possibly some inspections on the part of our committee.

The American people are to get better mail service, at less cost. That is why it is a real pleasure to inform the House that your subcommittee of the Post Office Committee on Appropriations has unanimously approved the statement made by the Postmaster General when presenting the Post Office Department's budget for the fiscal year 1954.

That is why I am also pleased to report that all members of our committee believe that the Postmaster General's report outlines the most challenging, progressive, and far-reaching program for improvement of the Post Office Department operations ever to come to our attention.

Let me briefly highlight the salient points of this new, intelligent approach which the present management of the Post Office Department is using to make the Postal Establishment as nearly financially self-supporting as practicable, while at the same time improving the postal service.

Being tough-minded realists, Mr. Summerfield and his able associates realize full well they have set themselves no easy task as they proceed to reduce the postal deficit and simultaneously improve the mail service. Historically, in the 115 years for which figures are available, the Post Office has reported a surplus only 18 times, and half of these profitable years were in times of war when much of the cost of transportation and distribution were absorbed by the military.

Few people realize that the business of the Post Office Department is increasing at a phenomenal rate—increasing even faster than our remarkable growth in population.

In 1940 the Postal Establishment handled 210 pieces of mail for every man, woman, and child in the United States. In 1954 it is estimated this figure will have jumped to 329 pieces of mail per capita per year, representing a 94-percent increase in total volume and a 51-percent increase in the use of the mail per person in 15 years. Our Postal Establishment, incidentally, now handles more than 50 billion pieces of mail annually, more mail than all the rest of the world combined.

While deploring the $596.7 millions deficit estimated for the Post Office Department in the fiscal year 1954, the Postmaster General properly noted, in his statement to our committee, that this deficit represents a reduction of $150 millions, or 20 percent, from the original estimate prepared by Postmaster General Summerfield's predecessors.

The $150-million slash in the current 1954 budget is by far the largest in the history of the Post Office Department. It is three times the estimated reduction in fiscal year 1953, and five times

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

greater than the 1952 reduction. The estimated deficit for 1953 is $642 millions—as shown in the budget document—and the deficit for 1952, you will recall, was $727 millions, an all-time record deficit.

As regards this estimated deficit for 1954, may I emphasize that the present management of the Post Office is forced to work largely within the straitjacket of the budget prepared by its predecessor and is unable, at this late date, to correct many inherent weaknesses in this budget.

As we all know, too, any reforms within the postal establishment can be made only with the help and support of the Congress and the public, since the Post Office Department itself has little or no control over such vital matters as rates, salaries, free services performed for other agencies, and subsidies.

Our committee was most favorably impressed with the abilities and the clearly defined responsibilities of the new management team recruited by the Postmaster General. The men he has chosen for the top positions are tested executives fully qualified to carry out a program for improving the organization, operation, and morale of the postal establishment. They are men who believe Government service to be a privilege; men willing to make the necessary sacrifices to meet this challenge; men whose efforts merit the support of Congress. They will, we are certain, give the post office the dynamic, determined leadership it needs.

The program now under way in the Post Office Department is concerned first with organization changes at headquarters which will simplify and tighten the top structure by eliminating duplication, overlapping, and excessive layers of supervision. No longer will a defeatist attitude, a resignation to ineffective management and mounting deficits, permeate the Post Office Department. Instead, there will be a new point of view—one that recognizes the Department's shortcomings and attacks them with commonsense and vigor. The Post Office Department is now undergoing a revitalizing experience—a stimulation of the birth of new ideas.

A study is in progress to determine the most effective way to delegate more authority and responsibility to the field and to overcome bottlenecks in headquarters in Washington.

Hand in hand with this delegation of authority to the field will go a widespread program of consolidation of outmoded post offices and routes, resulting in more efficient operation and better service to postal patrons at less cost.

On March 23, 1953, the Postmaster General announced the first step in a plan that, it is hoped, will be extended nationally to give the less populated areas of the United States far better service at reduced cost to the taxpayer.

The plan involved the discontinuance of 19 inadequate and outmoded fourth-class post offices in Wilkes County, N. C., and the simultaneous establishment and rearrangement of rural routes and star routes. Despite the fact that the plan will result in considerable savings to the taxpayer, many citizens are receiving better service because of it.

I wish the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] were here today to explain just what this change has done in his county, Wilkes County, N. C. Those, however, who may be interested in examining his position at some length can turn to the hearings. You will note that he appeared before us and made a statement on what this has done for his district, contending that the Wilkes County plan should be carried out throughout the United States.

Another example of the progress the present administration of the Post Office Department is making through intelligent planning can be seen right here in Washington. On April 27, improvements in the collection of mail, and the institution of longer hours of post-office window service were announced. This was undertaken as a pilot study, through which information could be gathered that would prove useful in improving the service nationally. Collections throughout Washington have been extended 2½ hours with a final collection at 11 p. m. Subsequent tests since April 27 have shown that an average of 60,000 letters a day are now picked up which otherwise would have remained idle in mail boxes. It is estimated that three-fourths of these 60,000 letters now arrive 24 hours earlier at their destination than they would have under the old schedule.

A most significant program is under way in New York City which will produce valuable experience that will be applied elsewhere in the country.

The post office of New York City is not only the largest in the world, but the enormous amount of mail emanating from Manhattan to the rest of the country makes the New York Post Office a vital cog in the industrial world. When mail is delayed in New York City its effects are felt throughout the Nation.

When Postmaster General Summerfield and his team took office, it was discovered that service in New York was far below acceptable standards. So, on April 1, a team of 20 inspectors was moved into the New York post office to make a thorough management study for the new Postmaster.

The results, in just 6 weeks' time, have been most encouraging. Many newspapers, magazines, large users, and individual citizens have commented on the fact that the service has been noticeably improved. With the permission of the House, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a few examples of this editorial response for the record.

Another important and promising program outlined by the Postmaster General includes development of modern personnel policies and practices, hitherto largely neglected by the Department.

Seventy-two percent of our expenditures are for wages and salaries—

Mr. Summerfield told us. Continuing, he noted:

Any program for major improvement in the Postal Establishment must include, near the top, a systematic plan for strengthening the morale and improving the efficiency of personnel.

He recommended creation of a Bureau of Personnel whose objective will be to develop a major constructive personnel program for the post office's 525,000 employees.

The new Postmaster General and his top associates paid high tribute to the dedicated men and women in the Postal Establishment and their loyalty to its finest traditions. They stated, too, they have received, during these early days in office, the wholehearted cooperation of the leaders of the great employee organizations.

The committee also unanimously endorses the request of the Postmaster General for changes in the appropriation language, which will give Mr. Summerfield the necessary management flexibility that he must have to reorganize the post office's operations.

As regards rates, the Postmaster General has indicated that equitable and realistic adjustments in rates are necessary if the postal deficit is to be materially reduced.

As far as the establishment of rates is concerned, I am personally willing to delegate this authority to the Postmaster General—Congress to have a veto—Certainly rates must be revised if the postal deficit is to be lowered.

As many of you will recall I disagreed with the previous Postmaster General when he curtailed service to one-a-day delivery in residential neighborhoods. I am gratified to know this matter is now under careful review by the new management of the post office and that in some localities where conditions warrant, additional deliveries will probably be made.

Your committee, irrespective of political affiliations, has been most critical of previous postal administrations for overlooking the possibilities of improving the mail service through mechanization and modernization of post office equipment. We are pleased that these important areas for improvement are now being carefully reviewed by the Post Office Department's top management.

Mr. Summerfield and his top associates tell us it is imperative that a better working relationship be established between Congress and the Post Office Department. They intend to make that relationship highly effective and cooperative.

Mr. Summerfield, Mr. Hook, the Deputy Postmaster General, and the other top men of the new management team also tell us they have no intention of abdicating their responsibility. In fact, they state they would welcome more responsibility, and I, for one, believe they will use that responsibility wisely and that Congress should give it to them.

Mr. Chairman, I have briefly summarized the main features of the Post Office Department's program—a program, which your committee believes will give the American people the kind of postal service they have the right to expect and reduce the overall postal deficit substantially through economies and modern management techniques.

Our committee believes all Members of Congress will agree that the Post Office Department should not continue, as

an expensive service operation, subsidized by taxes levied on our people.

Instead the Post Office Department should be developed effectively into a business-and-service operation that will be eventually as nearly financially self-sustaining as practicable. This is the mission and the basis for the program of our new vital and vigorous Post Office management.

The Post Office Establishment has demonstrated its willingness to do its part in accomplishing this mission but to reach the objective they must have the understanding and cooperation of this great body.

They cannot do it alone.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I was unwilling to interrupt the gentleman during the course of his excellent presentation of the bill.

Mr. CANFIELD. I have concluded my statement and am glad to yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have received a number of communications with reference to these two mail deliveries a day in the residential areas. The gentleman touched on that. I am wondering if the gentleman would elaborate a little, if he cares to, in such a way as we could give that as a reply to the inquiries we have been receiving.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I suggest to the gentleman from Louisiana that he examine the colloquy between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and myself earlier in the day. At that time there was read a statement by the Postmaster General, which yesterday afternoon was read by his deputy, Mr. Abrams, in charge of postal operations, before a large group of letter carriers, and approved by them. It explains why there was no provision in this bill for the return of this service at a cost of $80 million a year, but at the same time it emphasizes that the management of the Department has an open mind on the eventual restoration of that service. The whole matter is under intensive study.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman very much. I know that the gentleman would be glad to give us full information on this matter.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the national organization of letter carriers approved the statement and procedure as outlined by the Deputy Postmaster General?

Mr. CANFIELD. It is my understanding that the national president of that association called the statement a forthright, frank statement, and asked the men in his organization to approve it.

Mr. HARRIS. And as representing the national organization, that they would support that proposal and would not approve an increase in funds in the appropriation bill, under an amendment, to restore the service at this time?

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman it is also my understanding that the leadership of that organization, which as you know has been very strong for the return of this service, has requested that the projected amendment be withdrawn.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to say to the gentleman that I liked his talk about saving some money and improving the service, but there is one matter the gentleman overlooked, that is claiming a great deal of my attention now in the way of answering mail, and that is Public Law 669, that was passed under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. At that time, and for some years previously, the star-route carriers had been bidding on the routes. They would open the bids one year and A would get it. The next year B would bid under A and he would get it. And about the third or fourth time C or D would get it and go broke, and the bonding company would get it. Then, of course, the Congressman would get it in the neck, because we all inevitably become involved in that.

The whole Congress realized that that was a bad system. The Post Office Department realized it was a bad system and was not conducive to good service, so Public Law 669 was brought on the floor by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. There were some 7 or 8 pages of debate and it passed this House unanimously, and not one single person raised objection to that bill.

The other day I was astounded to receive a letter from the executive assistant or administrator, a man by the name of Guill. He announces that he is going to sample 8 percent of the people who hold those contracts to see what it proves, to see what it shows and discloses. It will not prove a thing in the world except the long period of time we tried this method and found that it was no improvement.

Those men in the New England States have made investments in trucks, equipment, and so forth. What kind of security do they have if he is going to start an 8 percent testing?

Let me say that in Public Law 669—and I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], will back me up in this—it was the intent of Congress—and I think the language of the bill backs me up—it gives to the Postmaster General the power and the authority to put good business methods into the handling of these star-route contracts. He has ample authority at this time, and I am in favor of his having the authority, to handle those contracts. Now, why does he want to stir up all this trouble again?

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman permit me to answer his question?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. I, too, have received those complaints and I think they are 3 or 4 in nature. One of them is as the gentleman has stressed, complaints that the Postmaster General is disregarding the intent of Congress as expressed in Public Law 669, which was approved June 19, 1948. To me the wording of this law is abundantly clear. With respect to the renewal of contracts the law states:

> The Postmaster General may in his discretion and in the interest of the postal service renew such contracts.

The law also states:

> Any such contract may be terminated at the end of any 4-year term at the option of the Postmaster General.

The overriding consideration obviously, is not the renewal of the star-route contract but is contingent upon such action being in the interest of the postal service.

The present program of the Department is designed purely and simply to provide an intelligent basis on which to base a finding as to whether or not such renewal would be in the best interest of the service; and in going over those contracts that have been let for a period of years they find that some have increased to the extent of 300 or 400 percent, one 1,800 percent. That is why it is necessary for them to provide this review.

Second, the complaint is made that it was necessary to advertise selective routes in order to determine whether or not renewal of the contracts is justified. Basically, star-route service is a contractual service; the normal way of awarding Government contracts is through competitive bidding; therefore, the most logical way of conducting an investigation relative to such contracts is to subject them to competitive bidding in order to see what the service is considered to be worth today over a sampling of the routes.

It must be remembered that it has been 8 years since bids have been solicited on most of these routes. During that period the cost of the service has almost doubled. Many of the routes bear little or no similarity to the service they ought to perform.

Certainly it is necessary that the present administration look into the increase in cost and determine whether or not it is justified.

It has been stated repeatedly that contractors have nothing to fear if their service has been satisfactory and the current contract rate is fair and reasonable to all concerned. That is the position of the Department and I think our committee believes it is sound.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. Just a minute. That is your contract theory, but in the absence of specific instructions from this House and a clear intent as to what the Congress intended and what it wanted done the fact that the gentleman recited one contract that increased 1,800 percent in cost does not prove anything, for there could be 1,800 times as much mail, or 1,800 times as much distance, or 1,800 times as much expense involved. But regardless of what that is, I heard the gentleman say a few minutes ago and I concurred with him in it, that he believed in putting responsibility onto the Postmaster General and giving him discretionary authority to deal with Post Office matters and put business management in control. Is that not approximately what the gentleman said?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. BARDEN. The Congress passed 669 and specifically gave him that authority. Now, why does he not exercise it and why is it that the gentleman wants to make an exception to that rule? This is a strange argument for me in the minority party to make, but I am constrained to believe it is good sense. It has worked satisfactorily. It was put in by a Republican House in the 80th Congress. I was for it then and I am for it now. I cannot understand why they want to dig in and take 8 percent now and stir up a situation that has been working. If it is not working, if there are bad contracts, if there is graft or collusion, the Postmaster General has and should have the authority to deal with it immediately and effectively.

Mr. CANFIELD. I have talked to star-route carriers in New Jersey and I have explained to them thoroughly and clearly the Department's position in this matter. They seem satisfied. I do not think the law is being distorted in any respect.

Mr. BARDEN. I am not disturbed too much about the star-route carriers. I have wrestled with this thing for 10 or 15 years in this House. I do not think the membership of the House should be subjected to that kind of thing again.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to refer to the question raised by the gentleman from North Carolina and say that I took this matter up with an administrative assistant in this Department to see what the exception was, what they had in mind. I also took it up because I was called upon by the head of the organization in Illinois, a man in whom I have a lot of confidence. I arranged for him to go down there. Mr. Allen was glad to have him come down so he could talk with him about it. Mr. Allen told me he intended to protect and to carry out the will of the Congress in every instance where the weight of the evidence showed the star-route carrier holding the contract for the route was doing a good job or where it was shown that he was not getting more than a reasonable or fair deal with the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. In talking with Mr. Allen, I am confident that he has no idea of doing violence to the intent of Congress but that he is going to use the discretionary power vested in him. I know that he is only making a sort of a spot check on those who will come around to contract dates earlier, that it is not general.

Mr. BARDEN. That is the best news I have received so far. But let me ask the gentleman, Why should we go back and employ a system that over a long period of years has proven to be no good and which this Congress definitely stated was not good and we did not want it? If he wants to find if a route is costing too much, they have years and millions of miles of figures to go by to determine the cost of the operation of a vehicle, for instance, they have their standards of civil service pay to determine the amount of salary the man should receive, they can determine every single item of cost involved; then let them arrive at it in that manner. If it is too much, let him say: All right, I have the discretionary power, we are going to put it into effect and if the man does not like it he can get out. But to start a row with 435 Members of Congress over a system which we thought we had buried, I am not looking forward to with much pleasure.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to get away from the country a minute and get back to the city and to this two-a-day mail delivery proposition. It is a fact that what the gentleman has said, what the Postmaster General and his assistants have said, and what the Postal Carriers Union has said, will undoubtedly deter Members from offering this amendment which was contemplated to put money in the bill in order to make two-a-day mail delivery in the cities. Therefore, I think in all fairness it ought to be clearly understood that nobody is waiving any rights. All we are doing is to give the Postmaster General an opportunity to work it out himself, and that opportunity we think he is entitled to because of the short time he has been in office, but if we do not think he has worked it out for the benefit of the city people, none of us have given up the right to seek more money for that purpose.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true, but I cannot see why anybody should now project an amendment under the circumstances.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. My question is directed to the portion of the bill appropriating $2,790,000 to the Bureau of Narcotics. I would like to know if the committee is wholly satisfied that that is an adequate amount to meet the ever-increasing narcotics menace we have in this country.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure the gentleman recalls that in my original presentation I pointed out in the so-called Eisenhower-Dodge revision of the so-called Truman budget, the Bureau of Narcotics is the only Bureau untouched. Not a cent was taken from its original request, and currently Dr. Harry J. Anslinger, head of that Bureau, and undoubtedly the world's greatest authority on the subject of narcotics, is not asking for additional manpower. We gave him additional manpower in the last Congress. What he is asking for is more cooperation from the States and the cities and towns of America, and above all, more cooperation from the courts of the land, particularly the courts of the District of Columbia. That is what he is asking for.

Mr. HOSMER. Is the committee well satisfied with the judgment of the Commissioner in not asking for increased personnel?

Mr. CANFIELD. We have the greatest faith in the Commissioner, and we know the Commissioner well enough to believe that if he needed more funds or more manpower, he would not hesitate to ask for more.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Directing attention to the question of two mail deliveries within the city, on page 23 of the report it says:

> Necessary extensions of service and new city delivery routes will require some 3,237 additional average positions.

Do you contemplate that within the purview of the understanding made by the representative of the Postmaster General and the members of the Postal Workers Union that this is part of the additional employees that could come in to carry out that service, and that you have provided sufficient moneys to carry out that plan in the event he adopts it?

Mr. CANFIELD. No. If the plan were to be carried out in toto it would require the addition of $80 million in this budget. However, if there is some partial restoration in certain urban areas there may be funds in this bill, because there is $79 million of additional funds here for postal operations over and above the amount allowed for the current year.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then I have the assurance of the gentleman that in the event the Postmaster General should determine on this program, that there are sufficient funds even in that $79 million to carry out the program?

Mr. CANFIELD. No. You see, $80 million of increased funds are necessary to carry out the two-a-day restoration taken away by the order of Mr. Donaldson in June, 1950.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If that is true, let me direct this question: In the event the present Postmaster General decides that this service is proper and that the public needs it, will it be necessary for him to come back here and thus make a new appropriation?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And we would have to wait until that appropriation was made?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes, indeed. I am sure the gentleman heard me say earlier in the day that the new Deputy Postmaster General in charge of postal operations has been in office just 3 weeks.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes. Then I understand it will be necessary to come back and get it?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true, if the department finds its studies warrant it.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I wish to say at the outset that I have a very high regard for my chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], and I want to commend him for the very fair, impartial, and efficient manner in which he conducted the hearings on the bill before you. My regard is equally as high for my former chairman, the very able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY],

and the same feeling prevails toward the other members of the committee and our very able clerk, Mr. Bob Lambert.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, there has never been an appropriation bill reported to the floor of the House that had any closer scrutiny or any more comprehensive and extensive hearings than the one before you.

In the bill before you the Congress is being asked to appropriate $2,832,250,000 to operate the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1954. It will cost almost as much to operate the Post Office Department in the fiscal year 1954 as it cost to operate the entire Federal Government in 1927. In fact, it cost only $2,974,000,000 to operate all branches of the Federal Government in 1927.

The annual operating deficit of the Post Office Department is almost as great as the cost of operating the entire Federal Government in 1916. In fact, it cost $734 million to operate all branches of the Federal Government in 1916. In 1952, the operating deficit in the Post Office Department amounted to $727 million. In 1953, the net operating deficit amounted to $642 million. The estimated deficit for fiscal year 1954 is $596 million.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, in my opinion the time has come for the Congress to give serious consideration to the advisability of putting the Post Office Department on a financially self-supporting basis. The very large subsidies to many classes of mail are primarily responsible for the tremendous annual deficit in the operation of the Postal Establishment.

In 1940, the postal establishment handled 27,700,000,000 pieces of mail, or an average of 210 pieces of mail for every man, woman, and child in the United States. In 1954, it is estimated that the Postal Establishment will handle approximately 58 billion pieces of mail, or an average of 329 pieces of mail for every man, woman, and child in the United States. This large increase in such a short period of time represents a 94-percent increase in total volume of mail handled and only a 51-percent increase in use of the mails per capita handled.

I would like to point out to the committee that the cost of handling the mails since 1945 has increased by $1,443,000,000. However, the revenue increase has amounted to only $390 million. In other words, the cost of handling the mail since 1945 has exceeded the increase in revenue by $1,053,000,000. Therefore, I hope that the Congress in its wisdom will take cognizance of this situation and remedy the condition by giving the Postmaster General authority to set postal rates or pass legislation authorizing increased postal rates.

Personally, I would support legislation giving the Postmaster General the authority to set postal rates, because certainly he possesses more knowledge of the problem than most Members of Congress, who have a multitude of other matters to consider. In many foreign countries the postmaster general is given the authority to set postal rates. If the Congress would extend that authority to our own Postmaster General, it could do so with veto power or maybe for a 2-year trial run.

I should like to point out to the committee where the greatest annual losses to the Post Office Department are occurring:

First. Fourth-class mail, which is, in the main, parcel post. In 1952, it cost the Post Office Department $638,264,000 to handle fourth-class mail. Revenues from fourth-class mail amounted to only $484,529,000. This left a net operating deficit of $153,735,000.

Second. In 1952, on third-class mail, which consists primarily of circulars, it cost the Post Office Department $362,439,000 to handle this class of mail. The revenue on third-class mail brought in only $170,526,000 leaving a net operating loss of $191,913,000.

Third. Now, here is one class of mail that is really alarming and that is second-class mail. This class covers newspapers, magazines, and periodicals. In 1952, it cost the Post Office Department $291,758,000 to handle second-class mail. The revenue from second-class mail brought in only $51,371,000, leaving a net operating loss in 1952 on second-class mail in the amount of $240,386,000.

Fourth. In 1952, there was an operating deficit of $32 million for domestic air mail; $21 million in foreign air mail; and $20 million in foreign-service mail.

Fifth. There are large deficits in special services such as registered mail, insured mail, collection-on-delivery mail, special-delivery mail, and money orders.

In 1952, the only two services of the Post Office Department to earn a net profit were first-class mail and postal savings. The revenue from first-class mail amounted to $842,695,000. The cost of handling first-class mail in 1952 amounted to only $790,287,000, giving the Department a net profit of $52,407,000 on first-class mail, and $6,717,000 on postal savings.

I can see no reason for the Federal Government to continue subsidizing tens of thousands of businesses which operate solely to earn a profit and who use the United States mails to enhance their profits.

I contend that newspaper publishers and magazine publishers are in business for the very same reason that I am in business and that is to make a profit on their investment. On that basis, why should not the Government remove this subsidy and permit them to operate their businesses like other business establishments which are not directly subsidized.

May we consider parcel post for a minute? A few years ago the Congress authorized certain adjustments in rates, weights, and size of packages, but even with the adjusted rate the Post Office Department is still losing $153 million annually on this class of mail and certainly the record is clear that the postal establishment is still having to compete with our great free competitive enterprise system. I do not believe that it was the intent of the Congress to pass legislation that would force the Post Office Department to compete with rail, freight, and express companies. Some of our friends believe that to adjust postal rates on second-class mail which, I repeat, covers newspapers, magazines, and periodicals, would put these operations out of business. Such would not be the case and the record is clear.

Let me cite an example of just how little annual postage it is costing the weekly newspapers in my district to use the postal service and just how little it would affect them financially to put this class of mail on a financially self-supporting basis. Of course, this same condition prevails in all congressional districts. Mr. Chairman, the figures that I shall cite cover the entire annual postage paid by these newspaper publishers for the calendar year 1950:

Newspaper No. 1	$11.84
Newspaper No. 2	14.78
Newspaper No. 3	27.71
Newspaper No. 4	35.37
Newspaper No. 5	39.85
Newspaper No. 6	48.72
Newspaper No. 7	60.90
Newspaper No. 8	70.51
Newspaper No. 9	70.65
Newspaper No. 10	71.50
Newspaper No. 11	73.01
Newspaper No. 12	74.62
Newspaper No. 13	79.05
Newspaper No. 14	82.62
Newspaper No. 15	117.25
Newspaper No. 16	177.82
Newspaper No. 17	179.13
Newspaper No. 18	239.30
Newspaper No. 19	244.16

I have a very high regard for all the editors, publishers, and personnel of the papers in my congressional district to which I have referred, but I sincerely believe that if these publishers would study the fact and figures of the Postal Establishment they, of their own accord, would endorse and recommend a program to remove these unnecessary and outmoded subsidies, because in the long run it would mean dollars in their own pockets. It may be considered politically dangerous to point out how little annual postage the newspaper publishers pay for their mailings. However, the newspapers, with few exceptions, have been clamoring loudly for economy in Government and the elimination of unwarranted and unneeded subsidies. On that basis I shall take my stand and let the chips fall where they may. My position on postal subsidies may hasten my involuntary retirement from the Congress but I have never been afraid to speak and act for what I thought was right. So far as my own personal views are concerned I am in favor of eliminating all subsidies and giving the Postmaster General the right to set postal rates either on a permanent, temporary, or veto basis.

If the Congress in its wisdom would pass legislation putting the Post Office Department in a financially self-supporting basis, I believe that each Member of Congress participating in this needed revision would later be highly commended by his constituents.

There has been a lot said about the restoration of two mail deliveries daily to residential sections. On that subject I should like to associate my views with those of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. In my congressional district there are some 119 post offices. It has been over 2 years since I have received a complaint due to the limitation of residential deliveries to 1 a day. At the time I was receiving complaints, it was rather amusing to observe that many

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the letters of protest came from citizens of towns that had no residential mail delivery at all. This is a clear indication that those letters of protest were inspired. To return to 2 mail deliveries daily in residential sections would cost the taxpayers $80 million annually and even with the service reinstated only 32 percent of the population would receive 2 mail deliveries a day.

We all understand that most people work for a living and a great majority of those receiving residential deliveries go to work in the morning and do not return home until in the afternoon. So it matters not to them whether they receive their mail in the morning or in the afternoon. I shall never support a resolution or amendment that would reimpose this luxury.

Mr. Chairman, according to the most recent estimate the population of the United States for the next fiscal year will reach 162,993,000 and on the basis of that population figure it will cost, if the present appropriation request is granted, every man, woman, and child, down to the 1-day-old baby, $17.39 for the postal service they will receive during fiscal 1954. If the rank and file knew it would cost them $17.39 per person for the mail service they will receive in fiscal 1954, I believe they would demand in large numbers that the Congress remove the many unneeded and outmoded subsidies and place the Post Office Department on a financially self-supporting basis. In my opinion this should be done in the quickest possible time.

I do not believe it possible for any business enterprise or any branch of the Government to accumulate a more efficient staff of businessmen and experts than are now handling the postal establishment. The new Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield, and his entire staff amazed your committee with the knowledge they had acquired of the postal operations in such a short period. Most of the members of the postal staff are outstanding business executives and experts who are making a great financial sacrifice to serve our Government. They are fair, experienced, and determined to overhaul the postal operation from top to bottom and with the cooperation of the Congress put the Post Office Department on a business basis. They need the support and encouragement of the Congress to do the job well and to accomplish their objective. I shall extend to them my full support. If given the opportunity I will support legislation giving the Postmaster General the authority to set postal rates, believing as I do that in the end my small part in helping to accomplish this much-needed reform would win me new friends and the approval of a great majority of my constituents.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I intend to propose an amendment to this appropriation bill which would permit the President of the United States to veto any single section or item of the bill without the necessity of vetoing the entire bill.

We have heard a great deal about economy in Government. Most of the Members on both sides of the aisle have expressed themselves in favor of governmental economy at one time or another. I am absolutely certain, however, that despite the able analysis of my distinguished colleagues on the committee, each and every appropriation bill which comes to the House for consideration leaves plenty of room for even greater economy.

One of the most wasteful practices in the appropriation process is the insertion in appropriation bills of individual items that cannot be justified as legitimately serving the national and the public interest. Sometimes this is done by legislative riders, sometimes as the result of the most objectionable forms of logrolling. No matter how it is done, it serves to squander priceless resources, increases the tax burden, and gives people the unjustifiable impression that Members of Congress are more interested in dipping their hands into the pork barrel for local projects, and for items of special and limited interest, than they are in serving the national interest as a whole.

The major reason for the enactment of these unnecessary items and the reason these items, while perhaps individually small, total such large sums of money is that the President is unable to veto individual items in an appropriation bill. He is faced with the choice of either doing nothing about individual items such as these or vetoing a total measure, thus holding up operations for many other projects and activities that are vitally necessary. He is invariably forced therefore to do nothing.

A number of years ago, the then senior Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, proposed that this problem be handled by giving item veto powers to the President. The Senator from Michigan stated:

> Now that we suddenly confront fabulous appropriation totals, it seems more than ever necessary that the Presidential veto should be afforded some degree of that same discretion and selectivity with respect to the component parts of an appropriation bill which the Congress itself enjoys when it formulates and passes these bills. * * * The governors of at least 40 out of 48 States have the privilege of the item veto, and I have yet to hear of a single instance in which its use has been contrary to the public interest. * * * I know of no reason why the President of the United States should not have similar opportunity to deal effectively with Federal appropriation bills. * * * Furthermore, an economy-minded President may easily be quite helpless in dealing with appropriations if he is confined to a blanket "yes" or "no" to the lump-sum appropriation totals in the gigantic annual supply bills which now confront the country, and if he is forbidden to send back specific items for congressional review.

When the late Senator from Michigan first proposed an item veto, he suggested that it be done through constitutional amendment.

President Roosevelt, however, pointed out that the same objective could be obtained by the insertion of a properly worded clause in every appropriation bill.

The late respected Senator from Michigan accepted President Roosevelt's recommendation and suggested the insertion of appropriate language in appropriation bills. However, nothing was done to carry out this proposal.

When I was first elected to Congress, I introduced a bill which, among other things, would have required that every appropriation bill reported to the floor of the House or the Senate contain the language necessary to give the President the item veto power. That same bill has now been pending before three successive Congresses. In the 83d Congress, proposals to grant the President this same item veto power have been introduced by 6 other Members of this body and by 4 Members of the Senate. I am pleased that a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee has already held hearings on some of these proposals, but despite the great speeches for economy which we have heard in Congress for many years, no definitive action has yet been taken.

Until legislation is enacted which would make it unnecessary to insert item veto authority in every appropriation bill, I hereby serve notice that starting with the appropriation bill we are to consider this afternoon I shall propose item veto authority for each and every appropriation bill before the Congress at the time it is considered. Perhaps I will be ruled out of order, perhaps my amendment will be defeated, but each and every Member of this body will have an opportunity to record himself on the question of economy. Each and every Member of this body will have an opportunity to make known his position on the important question of the item veto. Each and every Member of this body will thereby have an opportunity to inform his constituents whether he is in favor of continuing the obnoxious forms of logrolling and pork barrel legislation, or whether he is willing to permit the President—subject to being overridden by the Congress—to strike from an appropriation bill the wasteful, the extravagant, the unnecessary individual items which add so much to the Nation's tax burden.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the proposal just given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] were ever put into effect, it would simply mean the abolishment of the Committee on Appropriations. The President might as well take over the power of appropriations; he would approve those items in which we happen to agree with him, and then he could veto any items he does not approve of. This system would make the Congress subservient to the Executive. I think the whole idea is ridiculous and dangerous.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am considering the introduction of an amendment to this appropriation bill to restore two mail deliveries in the residential areas in the amount of $39,848,930. I appreciate the fact that this amount is far below what Postmaster General Summerfield stated would be necessary. Postmaster General Summerfield declared that it would

take $80 million to restore service. The former Postmaster General had varying estimates ranging from $20 million to $150 million. Evidently the figures varied to suit his purpose. I believe I can support my estimate with more sound reasoning than was offered by either Mr. Summerfield or Mr. Donaldson. In a recent statement, Postmaster General Summerfield admitted the difficulty in arriving at an accurate estimate of Post Office costs because of an outmoded accounting system. So I am not sure if Mr. Summerfield is any better on a guess than Mr. Donaldson was.

In fiscal 1950, the last year that we had two full deliveries, there were 90,189 regular letter carriers and 27,994 substitutes. In 1952, the number of regular carriers had declined to 85,848, but the number of substitutes had increased to 34,110, or a net increase of both regulars and substitutes of 775. The basis for my figures are the annual reports of the Postmaster General. The postal revenues in 1950 amounted to $1,677,486,967.30; in 1952 the revenues had increased to $1,848,753,685.13.

If we employed the same proportionate number of letter carriers with relation to revenue in 1952 that we had in 1950, we would require 99,401 regular carriers and 30,066 substitutes. This would result in an increase of 13,553 regular carriers and a decrease of 4,044 substitutes, or a net increase of 9,509 men. An average salary of $3,770 would require $35,848,930. We have also assumed that further increases in revenue will require an additional $4 milion, making our final total $39,848,930.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would just like to ask the gentleman if the figures he has cited were furnished by the Post Office Department.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. They come from a statement by the Post Office Department; yes.

Mr. GARY. The $39 million?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Oh, no, I am sorry.

Mr. GARY. They told us $80 million.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. That is right.

Mr. GARY. I just wanted to know whether they gave the gentleman one set of figures and gave us another set of figures.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. No; I think the gentleman misunderstood my statement. Those are the figures I am estimating. I am not accepting the Post Office estimate of $80 million.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is not accepting the Post Office figures? The gentleman does not think the gentlemen who run the Post Office know anything about it? I want to get it straight.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I cannot accept the $80 million estimate. The curtailment of delivery resulted in a decline in the number of letter carriers. However, poor service evidently resulted in an increase in the number of employees necessary to handle complaints. In 1950 there were 1,775 employees in the Department in Washington. In 1952 the number had increased to 2,941. Busily engaged in answering complaints.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that that is a nonpartisan effort on my part and that my only objective is to improve the postal service which has deteriorated since the unwise Donaldson curtailment order.

If I viewed this question simply from a partisan point of view, I would be inclined to be silent while administration forces continue to break promises made to the American people during the election campaign. Here is a chance for our Republican friends to help to live up to at least one of its campaign pledges. Here, also, is the chance to improve the mail service which would reflect to the credit of the administration.

I was in New York last year when General Eisenhower made his first promise to restore twice-a-day deliveries of mail and other postal services which were cut off by the former Postmaster General with the help of Congress.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Did the President make a direct promise of restoration of two mail deliveries a day, or did he just indicate they would improve the mail service?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. A reference was made to twice-a-day deliveries.

Mr. PASSMAN. I read his statements very carefully as a member of this subcommittee. I cannot find where the President ever stated he would reinstate two mail deliveries daily. If the gentleman has some quotation that escaped my attention, I should like to have a copy of it.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I do not have a direct quotation, but surely that inference was left. The Philadelphia Inquirer of the date following the remarks made in New York commended General Eisenhower in an editorial for his statement that the mess in the postal department would be cleaned up. I made a reply in a letter to the Inquirer that if there is a mess, certainly the responsibility belongs to the Congress, which appropriates the funds. The Inquirer apparently interpreted the President's statement to mean more frequent deliveries of mail and so did the people who read this editorial.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is making a very fine statement. I am just wondering if he would endorse a proposal to permit the Postmaster General to fix the rates, where he could advance the rates, remove subsidies, and get the revenue we are entitled to if we are to have all these super-duper services.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I certainly would, but I would oppose any increase in first-class rates. First-class mail now shows a profit of approximately $100 million. I mention that in my statement. I would like to complete that statement before I answer any more questions. Some of the questions may be covered in the statement I will make.

Let me remind our Republican friends of these words, and I quote:

> We pledge a more efficient and frequent mail-delivery service.

This was the most concise, direct, and exact statement in the Republican platform. Commenting on this statement, the New York Daily News of last July 11 stated editorially:

> One plank alone ought to touch off millions of cheers and attract numerous votes.

In accepting the nomination as Postmaster General, Mr. Arthur Summerfield declared:

> The improvement of all branches of the Department and the increase of its morale will be my paramount objectives in the public interest. We will operate the postal system as it should be operated—in the service of the people and as their most vital means of all-important communications. I, too, like you, am interested in two-a-day deliveries.

What has been done on the keeping of the positive promise of the Republican Party? Why is there no appropriation in this bill for this improved service? What has developed from Postmaster General Summerfield's keen interest in the return of two deliveries?

I want to remind the House that in August of 1950 a motion to restore the service was approved on a rollcall vote by 264 to 108.

I am interested in improving service not simply because it is desired by the Letter Carriers Association, but because I believe it is something to which the people of the country are entitled.

The Post Office Department profits to the tune of approximately $100 million a year in first-class mail. The big deficit in the Post Office Department is due largely to the handouts which this great public enterprise gives to many private enterprises.

I was interested in the remarks made by the gentleman from Virginia when he called attention to the big indirect subsidies which benefit the publishers of newspapers and magazines. I think it is entirely wrong to take away from the people, service to which they are entitled, so long as we are taxing the American public to subsidize immense salaries that some of these publishers are taking for themselves with the help of these indirect subsidies.

In a recent statement, Postmaster General Summerfield said that he would not ask for funds to restore twice-a-day deliveries. Within the last few days, the Postmaster General has reversed his position. Now we are told that he has an open mind on this question, and from what I can learn, he is now planning twice-a-day deliveries.

It is on again, off again with Mr. Summerfield and I wonder how much we can depend upon his last statement. But I hope his last promise will stick.

The restoration of the mail service includes more than twice-a-day deliveries. It means a more frequent pick-up of mail and that post offices be open for longer periods during the day to insure the kind of efficient service that the American people have a right to expect.

Now that Mr. Summerfield has agreed to restore the service, I may not introduce the amendment as I had planned. Although I have not yet definitely decided. I want to make it clear, however, that I have made no definite commitment not to introduce the amendment,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

although I did make a statement in this regard, with certain reservations.

I am glad if I, along with some of my Democratic colleagues, have helped in any way to force our Republican friends to keep, at least, one of their campaign promises.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, to me it is unthinkable that the House would consider favorably any amendment, if offered, to restore the two mail deliveries a day in residential section of our cities. Certainly with the tremendous deficit of nearly $700 million that now faces the Post Office Department and an ever-recurring deficit which is increasing year by year, we will not add $80 million to this deficit by providing for the restoration of 2 mail deliveries a day. What are the facts about the mail-delivery service? In our country today there are 41,000 post offices, and since carrier delivery service is only authorized in 4,675 offices, therefore, as of today there are more than 36,000 offices that have no city carrier delivery service at all in these towns. The combined population of these communities, not including the rural communities, is a little more than 35 million, and these people go to the post offices to get their mail and pay the rental on lockboxes or get service through general delivery.

In addition to this, there are 32,546 rural routes that serve approximately one-fourth of our population. The patrons of rural service get 1 delivery trip a day and in some instances get only 3 trips a week. So there is no cause for restoration of the two-delivery service a day. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] that I never heard our President during this campaign expressly promise to the people that he would restore two mail deliveries a day to the cities.

I have here a copy of the Gallup poll, April 1, 1953. It says:

SHOULD THE POSTMAN ONLY RING ONCE?—PUBLIC SATISFIED WITH ONE HOME MAIL DELIVERY A DAY

PRINCETON, N. J.—A coast-to-coast survey shows that one problem Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield does not need to worry about is whether to restore twice-a-day home mail deliveries.

The general public turns thumbs down on the idea by a vote of almost 2 to 1. More than 6 out of every 10 voters questioned—62 percent—today say 1 home delivery of mail a day is enough.

Even when you take the urban areas which had been generally accustomed to twice-a-day delivery—towns upward of 10,000 population—there is a 5-to-4 vote in favor of the present 1-a-day plan.

It goes on to say that in towns from 10,000 to 100,000 61 percent favor 1-a-day deliveries, and only 36 percent favor 2 deliveries a day.

In towns from 100,000 to 500,000, 53 percent favor 1-a-day deliveries and 43 percent 2-a-day deliveries.

In cities of over 500,000, 48 percent favor 1-a-day deliveries, and 50 percent 2-a-day deliveries.

I have a telegram here sent to our committee from the president of Branch 43 of the National Association of Letter Carriers, of Cincinnati, Ohio, dated May 13, 1953, which says in part:

Urge you support sufficient appropriation for Post Office Department for entire fiscal year. Vote scheduled Thursday, May 14. As the customary practice of depending on later deficiency appropriations plays havoc with the morale of the man and the service speedup and undelivered mail naturally stem from inadequate operating expenses. Cincinnati letter carriers covering one-trip routes were polled yesterday. They voted nearly 3 to 1 against channeling funds for the restoration of 2-trip delivery service.

I want to make some reference to an increase in postal rates. For 4 years I had the honor of being chairman of your Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I have been a member of that committee for 10 years. I do not believe there is any member of the committee or of this House who has worked harder and more unceasingly, day in and day out, during the past 10 years for an adequate increase in our mail rates, especially in second- and third-class mail. The only mail to pay its way today is first-class mail. There is a deficit of $255 million in the second-class mail, which consists of newspapers and magazines. There is a deficit of $173 million in the third class which is advertising and circular mail.

I have led fight after fight on the floor of this House for increasing the rates on second- and third-class mail. Unfortunately, I have been unsuccessful in my efforts to get what I thought was a fully adequate increase in the rates on those two classes of mail. I have carried the ball as best I could. I understand the Postmaster General is going to propose an increase in second- and third-class rates. The ball will now be carried by our friends on the left. I no longer have that responsibility, but I assure you I will give it the same vigorous and hearty support as I did when I was chairman of the committee.

My distinguished chairman of the committee at this time, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], has always supported legislation for a fair and adequate increase in our postal rates. It is high time that we quit subsidizing second- and third-class mail at such a tremendous loss to our Government.

Our course I am concerned about this great deficit in the Post Office Department. Something must be done to increase the rates. I, for one, have been fighting for years to establish a Bureau of Postal Rates in the Post Office Department. I think the Postmaster General should have the responsibility of fixing those rates. There is too much logrolling and too much trading when we come to the question of a proper increase in mail rates. I do not believe we will ever get our rates adjusted on a fair and equitable basis for all classes of mail until we establish a postal rate board in the Post Office Department, empowering the Postmaster General upon recommendation by this board to fix the proper and fair rates for all classes of mail. Then we can start reducing this budget. I am glad to see the Postmaster General is coming along with a bill for increased rates, especially for second- and third-class mail, and I am going to back him up to the limit.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to serve on this subcommittee and to note that we deal today with two departments as great as the Treasury and the Post Office, and to know that sitting at those hearings were perhaps two of the finest Cabinet officers one could obtain in the United States today, in terms of their private business experience. The record will show that they have reflected business thinking in the Government service, and I for one wish them well.

I would like to congratulate and thank our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], for his fairness in committee; and to my colleagues, sincere appreciation for their courtesy.

There are two points it seems to me that we could note. If we must continue the postal deficit, then we should openly explain it to our people. An open and frank explanation can do much to pull the deficit out of politics, so that it will not be a campaign issue 4 years from today.

I think that if American industry, especially that segment doing business with the Post Office, on Thanksgiving Day were to take out full-page ads and thank the taxpayers of the Nation for the help of all kinds that the Federal Government is giving it, it would do much to do away with the hypocrisy of whiplashing the Government for its deficit, especially at campaign time. American industry takes out full-page ads when there is a strike, to solicit the sympathy of the consumer and the tolerance of labor, but show me any American industry, be it airlines, ships, transportation, farming, or anyone else, that has ever come out on Thanksgiving Day to thank the people for what the Government has done for them.

As far as customs are concerned, if we are going to have a program of trade, not aid, how can you expect to handle a stepped-up trade program if you reduce the personnel of the customs service? How do you reconcile a cut in customs personnel with an anticipated increase in prosperity through greater trade?

This is a good bill. It should pass. The hearings substantiate the merit of our modest request.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note on page 19 of this report that:

Members of the committee were deeply impressed by the statement of the Postmaster General to the committee.

It further states:

He has highlighted therein many of the areas where changes looking to the betterment of the service can and should be made. To accomplish some of the changes and improvements will require legislation, either new or by amendment to existing law.

The reason I direct the Committee's attention to this statement is that I want to point out a condition that exists in my

own congressional district, the city and county of Denver, Colo. The 79th Congress provided that the General Services Agency could acquire certain buildings and sites for Government purposes. Pursuant to that authority the General Services Administration did condemn and acquire property in the city and county of Denver and expended approximately $750,000. They now have possession of that building and the site that they acquired for the purpose of maintaining new postal facilities at the Terminal Union Station in the city and county of Denver.

During the last session of the Congress we did pass legislation which would authorize the construction of facilities at that site under a lend-purchase agreement with private industry. Due to the fact that many amendments were tacked on it when it was in the House and in the Senate, President Truman vetoed this legislation. During this session of the Congress the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], introduced H. R. 570, and I introduced H. R. 1411, both of which have as their objective the enactment of the law that was vetoed by the President 2 years ago. If the Postmaster General desires to carry out and improve the service, I want to point out that the working conditions in the city and county of Denver post office at the present time are not good. Most of the assembling, sorting, and distribution is made at an abandoned warehouse which I had the privilege to examine last year. I would say that the working conditions were such that if it was private industry, operating the building, the State authorities would close it up as a fire trap. I hope the Postmaster General will, with all convenient speed, make a report to the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and act favorably on these bills.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to assure the distinguished gentleman from Colorado that we share his concern with respect to this legislation, H. R. 570 and H. R. 1411, and we do appreciate his interest in the problem. For his information I will say that both of these bills were sent to the Bureau of the Budget and the Post Office Department, and they have gone through the regular routine that bills usually pass through, and we have just recently received a report from the Post Office Department approving the legislation with some amendments that they are asking our committee to consider. I believe I can assure the gentleman that within a very short time we will be able to bring to this floor legislation that will be practically or almost similar to the bill he introduced. We appreciate, again, his support as we had it last year. As the gentleman just suggested, in the 82d Congress he and the gentleman from Kansas introduced similar legislation, but for some unfortunate reason the President saw fit to veto that measure. I think I can assure him that we will move this thing along as speedily as possible from here on.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am delighted to hear the chairman of the committee say that and to assure him of my full cooperation, and I trust we can get it on the floor of the House and pass it and remedy the situation that now exists.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], a member of the committee.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which held hearings on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bills, I would like to say that I was deeply impressed with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable George M. Humphrey, and the presentation he made to our committee. The committee was likewise impressed with the members of his staff, all of whom have excellent backgrounds, and at the same time have had close contacts with government operations in their private business, so that they are not operating entirely in new fields but are in a position to evaluate techniques of the business world and apply them to the large and difficult problems of government before us.

Throughout the hearings, which lasted several days, I was constantly impressed with the zeal and exceptional ability of the new men who had been brought into Government, and their willingness to cooperate fully with the committee to reduce the cost of every department. And at the same time, their confidence that with better management they could achieve greater efficiency in their departments and better service. Instead of wanting increased appropriations, as has been the practice, they came pointing out to the committee in almost every instance where appropriations could and should be reduced. With their cooperation, our committee has been able to bring to the floor of the House the largest reduction that has been made in the Treasury and Post Office Departments in many years.

May I point out that the total of regular annual appropriations carried in titles I and II of the bill before us amounts to $3,444,145,000, which is a reduction of $127,983,000 in the Truman budget estimates for direct appropriations. Recommended appropriations in this bill for the Treasury Department amount to $611,895,000, which provides for approximately 76,157 employees.

This cut resulted in a civil personnel reduction of 3,167 employees and will reduce the military personnel in the Coast Guard by 1,159 during the year. The recommended appropriation of $2,832,250,000 for the Post Office Department contemplates the employment of about 520,000 civilian personnel.

If you will turn to the tables on pages 30, 31, and 32 of the committee report, you will note we made substantial reductions in every department, with the exception of the Narcotics Bureau, and never an increase. Those in charge of the departments, through greater efficiency and better management, assured the committee that they believe they can absorb all of these savings.

For instance, for salaries and expenses in the Office of the Secretary there was a cut of $220,000; in the Bureau of Accounts, $1,265,000; in the Bureau managing and administering the public debt, a reduction of $5 million; Office of the Treasurer, $3,650,000; Bureau of Customs, $1,500,000; and in the Bureau of Internal Revenue there was a total cut of $6,500,000.

We reduced the United States Secret Service department by a total of $348,000; the Bureau of the Mint, $600,000; the Coast Guard, including operating expenses, acquisitions, construction and improvements, reserve training, the amount of $246,200,000 requested by the Truman budget was reduced by $34,350,000.

These reductions total up to the sizable sum of $53,433,000 covered under title I of the bill but does not include the reductions made in title II of the bill covering the Post Office Department.

I think the Members of Congress realize there has been a serious lack of progressive, up-to-date management in the Post Office Department. It has been a loose, badly mismanaged, constantly expanding organization generally doing the same things the same way they have been doing them since the beginning of the horse and buggy age, with failure to give proper attention to research, the installation of modern machinery methods, and a laxness of proper accounting with a general absence of dynamic business management from the top. This, I think, can be said without finding any fault whatsoever with the fine effort and loyalty to the service that has been carried on by the thousands of splendid employees who are to be complimented for keeping their morale as high as they have in spite of the lack of inspiring, efficient, top leadership.

I am sure every member of the committee was tremendously impressed when for an hour in the first session of our committee, the Honorable Mr. Summerfield, the new Postmaster General, outlined his policies, who in the time he has been at the head of this Department has shown an overall grasp of the problems of this tremendous Department that surprised and encouraged the members of our committee. May I say to the Members of the House that the men he has brought in at a considerable sacrifice to themselves from the business world who are willing to work with him on the team to rejuvenate the entire postal organization with the application of better business practices and new methods of modernization as rapidly as possible for greater efficiency, I am sure deeply impressed every member of the committee.

I feel certain that if this Congress will cooperate with the Postmaster General with the same zeal that he desires to cooperate with the Congress that all of the Members of this Congress will be proud of the results that will come from such cooperation in putting the Post Office Department on a business basis and ultimately, and I may say speedily, wiping out the postal deficit that has constantly become greater each year until it now approaches $700 million.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I wish every Member of Congress could have had the opportunity our committee had to appraise and evaluate the remarks of the Postmaster General—his ability, his enthusiasm, along with the members of his staff, to make a great contribution to our Government.

In closing, I would like to point out that the budget estimate requested by the outgoing President of $2,906,800,000 has been reduced by your committee down to $2,832,250,000, or a total reduction of $74,550,000. When you add the reduction of $53,433,000 in the Treasury Department, the total savings requested in this legislation is $127,983,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I wish first of all to thank the committee for giving me this opportunity to speak on this legislation. I shall address myself to the portion of the bill that is concerned with the Post Office Department, in which I have the very deepest interest and perhaps some knowledge.

First of all, I would like to say that I am also, like the chairman of this committee, one of those who deeply regretted the curtailment order when it went into effect; that I favored the two-a-day delivery of the mail, and that I think it will work to greater efficiency. But I think that we must all take this into consideration: The curtailment order has now been in effect for 3 years. Therefore, it is not a question of reactivating anything. It is a question of recreating. In so doing, it would mean a considerable expense. I believe some figures have been quoted; but it seems to me, after going through it carefully, that we can safely say it would cost at least an additional $80 million to give this service back to the country and to the people.

In the second place, the present Postmaster General, who has been extolled, and quite properly so, today on both sides of the aisle, seems to me like a man we can all trust. We know his ability. We know his business acumen. We know, because he has stated it repeatedly before committees, and also to Members of Congress personally, that he believes in efficient service; that he believes in economy; and that he intends to put both into operation. He must, however, be given a little time to do this. I have no doubt, from the performance we have already seen, that the Postmaster General is going to give two-a-day service where it is needed. I understand that already in some congested areas that is in effect. It will gradually grow until it is given wherever it is needed. I have implicit faith in the present heads of the departments, but I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman: During the past few weeks I have been working on a report on a reorganization of the Post Office Department, and it has been my pleasure and profit to work very closely with a great many of the employees. I would like to say I have found them most reasonable in their approach to these problems. I have talked with the lettercarriers. I have also talked to the star route carriers, and when we have been able to discuss these things quietly and across the table, they are the first ones who have agreed that they must give this new department, this new administration, a chance to find its way; a chance to get its feet on the ground; a chance to work with them and for them.

There is no group in the Government service more loyal, more honest, or more painstaking than the Post Office employees. They are not going to try to sabotage the work of the Department. On the contrary, we have faith and trust that they are going to do everything possible to help it along.

I also agree with those who have said on the floor of this House that if at some later date they are not satisfied with what has been done, either for the employees or for the service, they will again come before Congress and ask that certain services be restored. I think that is the proper attitude. I think it is an attitude that all wish to take and a right we will all reserve to ourselves. But I am sure that the House at the present time is in a mood to give this new administration a fair show, to let them try and improve the service—and there are many many improvements that should be made. To mention just one of them that I think is very important—I do not say that it can be done immediately, but I sincerely hope that the committee will take it into consideration—and I am sure the great committee on which I have the honor to serve, the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service will take it into consideration, some of the improvements that need to be made in the post offices throughout the country. If you stop to realize, hardly any of these offices have air conditioning. Now I ask you as Members of this House who work here every day, usually all through the summer, because it has been my good fortune to be in Washington 10 months out of the year ever since I was elected to Congress—how would you feel if you had to work in offices not air conditioned? Yet that is so in most of the postoffices all through the South and even here in Washington. Those are some of the problems that have got to be taken up to enhance efficiency because, after all, efficiency depends upon the morale, the good health, and the strength of the employees. I say that this administration has many many things to look into.

This new team is composed of fine, experienced businessmen, men who are used to personnel management, men who realize that in the final analysis it is the human being and the human equation that counts and that makes an organization valuable or not. I, for one, have the utmost confidence that they will build up the Post Office Department to be not only what we want but what the people of the country want and also what the employees and those serving want it to be.

We talk a great deal on the matter of rates; we also talk a great deal about the Post Office Department being a service department and therefore not paying its way. I would like to point out to you that after all, the one service that does pay its way in the Post Office Department is the first-class mail which gives the service and goes into the home of every taxpayer in the entire country. There is never any grumbling about what they pay, and I say that service pays its way. Yes, the subsidies should be marked out; they should be marked out carefully, they should be apportioned where they belong. That is the only way to do it intelligently. We scrutinize the Department's deficit, but even so, even after you have put all the penalty mail on one side, even after you have put away the subsidies to the airlines, to the railroads, you will still find that you have a very large deficit.

Ever since I have been in Congress I have said year by year that what we must determine once and for all, is whether the Post Office Department is to be a service department or whether it is to be a department paying its way on a business basis. Let me remind you that there is only one post office in the world that does not pay its way and is not organized along businesslike lines, and that is the Post Office of the United States. I am not quarreling with it, I am not saying that it is not better that it should be so, but I do think that for once and for all the Congress should determine what it wants the Post Office to be, whether it is to be a service organization, whether it is to run constantly at a rate of about $2 billion and nearly $3 billion a year to the taxpayers, or whether it is to pay its way. I believe that in time under the present administration, under this team of fine businessmen and fine patriotic citizens these things will be determined. But I do feel that we must have patience and we must give them a little more than a hundred days in which to reorganize this huge Department.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from New York yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to commend the gentlewoman from New York for her splendid statement and call attention especially to the report of the subcommittee of which she is chairman, reported to the floor of the House offering very fine constructive suggestions with respect to the improvement in the postal service and which is also recommended by the Post Office Department itself. I hope the Members of the House will read that very fine report.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman and may I say, that the cooperation of the present Post Office Department has been most gratifying and helpful, on the preliminary report of my subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, all other forms of communication are speeding up, but the Post Office Department has gone back to the one-horse shay.

The order of the Postmaster General, dated April 17, 1950, cut deliveries from 2 to 1 a day for the parents of a boy in service, or an older person who needs that social-security check without delay, or a businessman who knows the value of time.

As a result of this economy slowdown, a letter posted tonight will be delivered not on the following day but on the day following that, even though it is only sent across the river.

Economy? It is not even that. The Postmaster General himself is authority for the fact that it would only cost $80 million to restore the convenient and necessary service of two deliveries a day.

It seems to me that we could make up this sum by operating efficiencies, starting with administration. A good beginning could be made by snipping off a lot of the redtape, the reports on reports on reports that "merry-go-round" within the Department itself, constituting a separate and inside mail service that costs money, frustrates every postal employee and accomplishes next to nothing.

In the campaign of last fall, the Republican leaders were getting their vital analyses, battle communications, and speeches so late that they suspected the Democratic Postmaster General of doing this deliberately, as part of the political war of nerves. As the Democrats were having the same trouble, there were no grounds for suspecting political sabotage.

You see, we both suffered from the lagging mail service.

But you ought to hear some of the complaints I get from those who carry the mail and those who wait for it. It is a good thing they do not put their feelings in writing—sealed, stamped, and dropped into the nearest letterbox because I believe there is some penalty attached to mailing incendiary matter.

The mail service has become the snail service since this alleged economy move backfired.

Previously, foreign countries used to copy our system, but the "postman rings once" setback is beyond their understanding and ours.

Local and field surveys reveal that a big mistake was made in curtailing service, not only to householders, but to the little fellows of business and industry. Orders and inquiries arrive too late. Jobs and contracts are lost. These people cannot afford to close a deal by telephone, telegraph, or personal contact. When the mails fail them, they are stuck.

The United States is growing. The volume of communication is ahead of that pace, due to the increasing complexity of contacts, personal and economic, that accompany progress.

Way back in 1797, Congress decided that the United States Post Office Department should be run as a public service, rather than a profitmaking business.

I believe that we have allowed an order by a former Postmaster General to interfere with the prime responsibility of delivering the mail as swiftly as possible.

The public wants mail deliveries brought up to date by restoration of twice-a-day service.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES], a member of the committee, whom I would describe as a successor to the immortal Ben himself.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the many "plugs" that you give me, which have been of very great benefit both in my business and private life.

Earlier in the day the very distinguished and universally respected gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, prefaced some very valuable remarks with the statement that he had not been "impelled" to make a speech today on this bill. Up to this point I, too, have not felt any impulsion to speak. The very able members of the committee who have described the bill have done an excellent job and, so far as I can see, there is not much more to say. Each of the members of the committee has paid high tribute to the wonderful leadership that our committee has enjoyed, both in this session under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and in the last session when it was under the guidance of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. I confirm all of the fine statements that have been made about these gentlemen and also the stated fact that this committee operates in a spirit of harmony and devotes and dedicates itself to the business before the committee without heat and in a way that is bound to bring to the House the best results possible.

My impulsion to speak at this time is because the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] has just addressed the Committee. May I say to the Committee that during our deliberations and our hearings on the Post Office section of our bill, a report from the so-called St. George Subcommittee of the Committee on Civil Service and Post Office, was given to us for our information. We found in that report the basis for many very important interrogations of people who came before us from the Post Office Department.

I am going to recommend to the legislative committee, the Committee on Civil Service and Post Office, that they read carefully the hearings before our appropriations subcommittee. The problems of legislating and the problems of appropriating for this particular department of the Government are so closely allied that there is a temptation at times for the Appropriations Committee to step out of bounds and try, or at least think that it might contribute something, by writing legislation into an appropriation bill. The distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], has this day warned the Appropriations Subcommittee, or shall I say served notice upon it, that he does not care much about our efforts to get any hint of legislation into an appropriation bill. Certainly our own work is sufficient unto itself and we have no desire to add to our task.

However, there are a great many occasions when we find things that should be subjected to legislative scrutiny, and which are, we think, neglected to a point where exploration alone provides the temptation to step in and do something about them. For that reason I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and your very able and distinguished and highly respected committee, that you examine our hearings and the interrogations therein as carefully as we examined the St. George report that came to us during the time that we were hearing the Post Office Department witnesses.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that we appreciate his admonition and will be most careful in examining the hearings of his subcommittee. We know that his hearings contain a lot of constructive and valuable information as well as admonition, and we appreciate it.

Mr. JAMES. That is very kind.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, with the other members of my committee, I want to pay tribute to our chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. The gentleman and I have been seesawing back and forth on this committee for some time. He was chairman in the 80th Congress. I had the privilege of serving as chairman in the 81st and 82d Congresses. Now he is back in the saddle. I can say that he has never failed to give me his utmost cooperation, and I have tried to give him the same cooperation during his service as chairman of this committee. We seldom disagree, but we have found out that we can disagree without being disagreeable. Consequently we have had unusual harmony in our committee. Our chairman is a very able man. He has served long in this body, and previous to becoming a Member he served as secretary to the Congressman from his district. There are few men that know the operation of the House any better. He has contributed greatly to the study of the Treasury and Post Office Departments and to the improvements of those departments. I join with him in the tribute that he paid to each member of this committee, and I will not stop now, as the hour is getting late, to commend each one of them separately. I am proud of them. They have done a remarkable job.

I do want to say that I agree most heartily with the very excellent remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] with reference to subsidies in the Post Office Department. He has labored on that question very diligently and has spoken most intelligently on the subject before this House.

Mr. Chairman, I think each Member of this House should realize that this bill actually appropriates nearly $20 billion, which is approximately one-fourth of the entire Federal budget.

Comprising that amount is, first, the item of $9,605,990,000 of permanent and indefinite appropriations. Included in that large sum are two items which make up most of it, the item of interest on the public debt of $6,350,000,000 and the tax refunds of $2,593,000,000. Although a part of this bill, that nine-billion-odd dollars cannot be touched by our committee because those items are fixed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In addition, we have certain funds paid out of the trust funds of the Treasury, which total $6,382,338,504. They are comprised chiefly of the payments from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the payments from the unemployment trust fund. Those items cannot be touched by our committee, yet they are a part of this huge appropriation we are considering today.

The items over which we do have jurisdiction and in which we can make changes are in the operating expenditures of the Treasury and Post Office Departments.

The Treasury Department requested a total of $665 million originally. Those requests were subsequently reduced, and our committee approved the expenditure of $611,895,000, which is a decrease of $53,433,000 from the original request.

Several of the reductions are questionable. Thirty-one million dollars of the total cut comes from the Coast Guard appropriation. In my judgment, the Coast Guard is one of the most economically administered services in the entire Government of the United States, and I say that after having visited its installations practically all over the entire world. We have been assured by the Coast Guard that they can absorb this cut without seriously impairing its efficient operation.

One item to which I might call your attention, however, is that we are drastically cutting their airplane replacement program. As to that program, they came before us several years ago and asked for large sums. We suggested to them that they work out a definite program of replacement so that they would replace only a part of the planes each year and not have such a large appropriation in 1 year. They worked out a 5-year program. Their request this year was based on the 5-year program. Frankly, I think it would be better economy to make our appropriations on that basis. However, the new administration said they wanted some opportunity to resurvey that program and I think they should have it. Therefore, I am acquiescing in that cut, although frankly I do not think that in the long run it will result in any large saving of funds.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. On page 16 the report of the committee points out that there is a reduction of some $11,750,000 in the budget for the Coast Guard. Can you tell me if that will have any effect upon the Air Sea Rescue operations of the Coast Guard, particularly along the shores of the Great Lakes?

Mr. GARY. It will not affect the Great Lakes at all.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. Search and rescue programs will not be disturbed. The cut will only affect the port security program, and there will be no reduction in that program, but it will merely slow down the enlistments in the program from now on. There will be no reduction whatever in the program to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If I may ask one further question, sir, there was a question raised as to uniform allowances at the Coast Guard Academy over the past year. Was this matter considered by the committee?

Mr. GARY. It was not brought to our attention.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. In connection with the development of the final phase of the Loran projects, how long is it contemplated before they will be developed?

Mr. GARY. That is a matter for discussion between the Coast Guard and the Navy. The Coast Guard wanted an opportunity to discuss that program with the Navy, and they will work out a solution. I will say our committee, and I am certain the Congress, will go along with any reasonable agreement they may make with respect to the Loran program.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. SCHENCK. I wonder if this reduction with respect to the Coast Guard means any reduction in the allowance or pay of the men themselves?

Mr. GARY. No; there is no pay reduction whatever. The only reduction it will make will be a reduction in the number of those employed, and that will not require the separation of any men from the service, but will be taken care of in the recruiting program.

Mr. SCHENCK. Therefore, it will have no effect on their quarters or subsistence allowance?

Mr. GARY. None whatever.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In other words, the normal rate of attrition, if you will, will take care of the reduction in force?

Mr. GARY. The reduction will be taken care of entirely by the normal rate of attrition. The gentleman is correct. The only effect, as I say, is on this airplane program, which I would rather not see cut, yet I think the new administration should have an opportunity to review that program.

Mr. Chairman, we cut the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Let me say right here that is one Bureau I would hestitate to cut because this administration has seen fit to come to the city of Richmond, my hometown, and take one of our ablest citizens, a man who has made a name for himself in the local community and throughout the United States as well. He is a certified public accountant, Mr. T. Coleman Andrews. We grew up together. He is a man of absolute integrity. He is a man of great ability. He is the first certified public accountant to ever head the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I think he is going to do an excellent job, and I certainly for one would not want to cut his funds so as to hamper his activities. But, before we made that cut, we were assured that it could be taken care of without impairing the efficiency of that office. So it goes down the line.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. In connection with the $738 million for the item to investigate or audit tax returns, that is the same amount that the previous administration desired. It was an amount based on what we know to have been a notorious disinclination to pursue collections to a great extent. Is there any assurance that if the new Commissioner wants additional personnel now for auditing inspections, he will come in and get them?

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman, I would not agree that there had been any disinclination in the past. As a matter of fact, that appropriation was tremendously cut in the 80th Congress. We then found out that a mistake had been made and we have been gradually restoring the personnel necessary to take care of that office.

Mr. HOSMER. Is it not true, however, that where there are some 26,000 people working on this project which covers more than 60 million taxpayers, that it is a pretty low ratio of inspections and audits for the number of returns.

Mr. GARY. No, sir. I do not think so at all and the new Commissioner does not think so. He never complained to us. He said that if he found out that he would need additional personnel to do a proper job of enforcement, he would not hesitate to come back and ask for it.

Mr. HOSMER. In other words, the matter is still open.

Mr. GARY. The matter is still open, and it is always open before this Congress.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that the Commissioner told us that during the last year $2,700,000 was saved through simplification, and devoted to this very purpose, and they expect to apply further savings?

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely true. The reorganization plan which went through last year is contemplated to save substantial sums of money, which will be plowed back into that program; but if additional funds are needed for enforcement, our committee has made it plain to the Commissioner that we will see that those funds are granted, to the best of our ability, and I believe the Congress will back us up because, in the long run, that is economy.

Now, with references to the Post Office, there has been a great deal said about the Post Office. To me, this is the one important fact in connection with the Post Office. We have an annual deficit in the Post Office Department of $700 million. That is a tremendous deficit for any department to face. I am frank to say that included in the items which make up that deficit are two items which in my judgment should be eliminated and our committee has fought on this floor for their elimination for a long time.

The first is subsidies. We subsidize the airlines of the country. We have never been able to determine how much of the amount we pay to the air companies is for service and how much is for subsidy. But those rates are not fixed by the Post Office Department. Under the law that has been passed by this Congress, those

rates are fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and in determining those rates they do not consider the service rendered, but determine them according to the needs of the individual airlines. This means we are giving the airlines a subsidy. It may be necessary, and at this time I am not opposing the subsidy. What I am saying is that if we are going to give the airlines a subsidy it should be a separate item, and the people of the United States should know how much they are contributing to those companies.

In addition to the airline subsidies, the post office handles a lot of free mail. They handle all the Government mail. It is estimated that the subsidies and free service that the post office renders would account for $200 million of the deficit, but that leaves a deficit of $500 million a year, even if you eliminate those two items. How are you going to reduce that deficit? Ninety-five percent of the expenditures of the post office are not under the control of the post office at all. A large part of it, the greater part of it, is for salaries, and the salaries are fixed by the Congress of the United States and not by the Post Office Department.

Another large part of the expenditures is for the transportation of mail. The cost of transportation of mail by rail is fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Post Office Department cannot do a thing to change it. The transportation of mail by air is fixed by the Civil Aeranoutics Board, and there is nothing the Post Office Department can do to change it. Therefore, the post office actually controls only about 5 percent of its expenditures.

There are several ways in which the post-office deficit can be reduced.

First, we can have more modern management. Frankly, I do not think there is any question about the fact that the post office has been somewhat slow to adopt modern methods. Our committee has been urging them for a long time to bring in experts in the various fields: expert engineers to advise on mechanical devices to handle the mail, expert accountants to insure a proper accounting system, and other experts to work out other technical problems within the Department. A program of this kind was started a year or two ago, and I have every reason to believe that it is going to be continued. We have been assured of that by the Post Office Department, and I hope that by adopting modern methods we will be able to obtain better service at less cost.

Let me say right here that in any program of that kind the Post Office Department is going to have the wholehearted support of the minority members of our committee, and I am sure of the minority Members of the Congress.

Second, here on this stand is a picture exhibit. The pictures happen to be taken in North Carolina because that is where this particular problem arose, but they represent a situation that exists throughout the entire United States. The post offices in this country were laid out in the days of the horse and buggy, when a man wanted to be able to drive to the post office, get his mail and drive back home without losing too much time. We therefore had to have a great many post offices throughout the entire lengtn and breadth of the country. Today we have hard-surface roads, and our whole system of transportation has improved tremendously; yet as far as the post offices are concerned, we are still living in the horse-and-buggy age. The Post Office Department is trying to make an improvement here. This project, may I say, was started last year under Postmaster General Donaldson and has been continued under the new administration, so it is no partisan matter; we are simply setting forth facts on how and where we can save money in the Post Office Department.

Here you have 21 post offices in one county in North Carolina. If you look over this exhibit you will find that the receipts of those post offices are very low, in most instances less than a thousand dollars, although the expense of operating them runs many times that amount. Therefore, the Government is losing large sums of money on the operation of each one of these post offices. In addition, the fact is that the patrons of all those post offices can be better served by rural routes which are now running right along the highways. Instead of the mail being left at the post office to which the people would have to travel to get their mail, it would be left in the box at the entrance to his farm. All he has got to do is to put up his box to get the mail delivered to him, and he will have better service at less cost.

The Post Office Department has told us they intend to carry through this project of replacing uneconomical post offices with rural routes, and I have heard some grumblings from Members because the Department is going to abolish post offices in their districts. Let me say to you that they abolished a number in my own district last year and people wrote to me and asked if I could not save them. I replied that I had been telling the Post Office Department for many years to save money, and that I could not consistently attempt to block an effort to do so.

I believe this administration is going to try to do a good job in that respect and I hope they will have the full cooperation of the Members of Congress.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sure the gentleman realizes that in most parts of the United States these little fourth-class post offices are in small villages. If you take away from these particular little communities their post office you virtually take away the individuality of that particular community. Take the case of my own immediate locality.

My community, Tyler, is 7 miles distant from a small fourth-class post office at Florence. The Florence people believe in their little village, and are proud of this community but with the possible abolition of their post office that little community will go out of the picture. From then on the mail is addressed to them via Tyler, the neighboring village. The name of Florence would become unknown. This is just given as an example of what can occur.

I express this little note of caution feeling that perhaps we may overdo this because of economy, which we hope to achieve, but let me ask, Will some arrangement be made to reimburse the rural route appropriations for the additional funds needed to serve any former fourth class communities, which may be eliminated.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman that arrangement has been made. That is the arrangement that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] discussed and the arrangement for which we had a rule this morning. The Post Office Department asked us if we would not give it the right to transfer funds within the Department so that when they could save on one operation of this kind they could use those funds for other operations. That authorization is contained in this bill, and I think it is a very proper authorization.

Now, do not misunderstand me. I did not say that every fourth class post office in the United States should be abolished.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I realize that. I appreciate the gentleman's very fair viewpoint on this. He has always shown himself a friend of agriculture.

Mr. GARY. Post office closings should be done only after very careful investigation, and I believe it will be done only after very careful investigation. I may say to the gentleman that unless the Post Office Department could assure me, when about to abolish a post office in my district, that equally good service would be rendered the patrons of that office through another post office, I would oppose it; the point is that in most instances the service will be better.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to point out a further situation relative to these two small towns, I have previously referred to. We in Minnesota have blizzards during the winter. Sometimes out on my farm we are cooped up for 9 or 10 days without a delivery of mail. Now, if, for example, the Postmaster General should decide to go to the extreme and close the fourth class post office at Florence, it could mean that the rural route to Florence could be blocked and that small village, like others in similar situations, would be without mail, even though railroads go through their villages.

Mr. GARY. The Post Office Department will take those things into consideration.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to be satisfied they are going to conduct a very thorough investigation, especially up in my section where the winter conditions are as they are.

Mr. GARY. As a Democrat, I am willing to trust the administration to do that and I think the gentleman should be willing to trust them also.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I certainly am in agreement with the gentleman but do want to express this word of caution.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is it not true that the Post Office Department will notify a Congressman and tell him a survey is being made for the purpose of determining

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

whether a post office should be abolished or consolidated?

Mr. GARY. It has been the custom to notify them that a survey is being made.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one other question I want to discuss that I think is very important. The one mail daily delivery came about as a recommendation of our committee. At the time the recommendation was made I was chairman of that committee, and I stand here today to take all of the blame for any evil that has flowed from it. I think by the same token I might be entitled to some credit for the good it may have done.

In the first place, at the time the order went into effect curtailing mail deliveries in residential sections, only 32 percent of the citizens of the United States were getting more than one mail delivery a day. Sixty-eight percent of the people of this country have never received more than one delivery a day, and a large part of that 68 percent did not get even one delivery a day. Some of them received their mail every other day. Personally, I did not think it was proper to saddle the expense of $80 million on all of the taxpayers of the United States to give a special service to 32 percent of the people.

In the first place, we have never restricted deliveries to one a day. There is not a single section affected by this order that cannot get delivery every hour if they want it.

All a person has to do to get more than one delivery a day is to put a special delivery stamp on the letter. That is what special delivery is for. If anybody wants special service, then there is no reason why they should not be willing to pay for that service; and in my judgment, there is no reason for saddling that expense upon the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman talks about 32 percent and 68 percent. Of course, the problem of business delivery in a city and of delivery in a large city generally is an entirely different matter.

Mr. GARY. This order never affected the business section at all. Business sections get more than one delivery a day now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not all of them.

Mr. GARY. Well, then, they should.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to get into an argument, but the gentleman has stated his views frankly, and I respect them. There is no need of us getting into a discussion just because I am not in agreement with my friend, though I respect his views in disagreement. But when you take the figure of 32 percent, most of that is in the cities.

Mr. GARY. All of it is in the cities.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the gentleman will admit that the problem in connection with business and all of the other activities of the cities might justify different deliveries.

Mr. GARY. Yes; I admit business does, but not the residential sections. This order affected only the residential sections, and I see no difference between a residential section in a city and a residential section in a rural area.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not so sure that my friend is completely correct, but I suggest he look into it further.

Mr. GARY. There has never been any suggestion of reducing deliveries in business sections, and if it has been reduced in business sections, then it should be restored.

Mr. McCORMACK. In any event, my friend will admit that the ones who caused the change in the two deliveries a day that took place was the Congress itself.

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. It started in the gentleman's committee.

Mr. GARY. That is right, and I am from a city.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the Republican members voted for it as well as the Democratic members.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Except the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. GARY. The gentleman from New Jersey opposed it from the very beginning.

Mr. McCORMACK. All other Republicans voted for it; is that not true?

Mr. GARY. It has never been a partisan matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was a $25 million reduction, was it not?

Mr. GARY. Eighty million dollars.

Mr. McCORMACK. Eighty million dollars?

Mr. GARY. At the time the order was originally entered there was a $100 million reduction, which included other services, but it was estimated that $80 million of that was allocated to the one delivery.

Mr. McCORMACK. What did the gentleman's committee reduce it to?

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The cut of our committee that year was $28 million.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thought it was about that.

Mr. CANFIELD. Prior thereto there had been a cut of $42 million by the Bureau of the Budget. The contention of the Postmaster General was that he needed all those funds back for restoration, which was $70 million.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was my recollection. I wanted the record clear. That $28 million reduction really brought it about. As I remember, that was brought about as a result of a coalition vote in this body.

Mr. GARY. It was a coalition vote. I think one of the greatest problems this country faces today is that of balancing the budget. We have balanced the budget very seldom within the last few years. We are now facing a public debt of $265,500,000,000. We have been warned that the budget cannot be balanced within the next year or two, and there is talk of increasing our debt limit above $275 billion. Here is an opportunity to save some money, $80 million of the taxpayers' money, the estimated cost of restoring twice-a-day service. If we are going to balance the budget we must cut out all unnecessary services. I maintain that two mail deliveries a day in residential sections is unnecessary.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Postmaster General did not request funds to permit more frequent deliveries and pick-up of the mail.

It was my intention to introduce an amendment to provide additional funds for this improved service. However, I understand that yesterday the Postmaster General told representatives of the National Association of Letter Carriers that he has an open mind on this question and that two deliveries may be restored at an early date.

It will be interesting to know how Mr. Summerfield will accomplish this objective without additional funds and it will also be interesting to watch what he will do about this matter in the near future.

My objective is to bring about the improved postal service which was promised in the Republican platform and in campaign speeches by its candidates. It has been said today on the floor that General Eisenhower never made such a promise. I am sure that is not the feeling of millions of voters who were influenced by the statement made by the General at the Letter Carriers National Convention last fall.

I am not surprised that efforts are now being made to have it appear that this promise was not made. Apparently, it is considered a mandate of the people to give away the great oil resources through the States to the big monopolies. But the promises that the people were really interested in, such as expansion of social security, a fair tax program, public housing, and improved postal service, are not going to be accepted as such a mandate.

I am, however, satisfied to withhold the amendment I planned to introduce. Regardless of the opposition and statements on the floor today against twice-a-day deliveries, Mr. Summerfield now intends to take steps to restore this service.

I wish to conclude my remarks by reading statements of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield and William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers:

STATEMENT BY MR. SUMMERFIELD

There is no easy solution to the problem of improving mail service. It involves better collection, distribution, transportation, and delivery of mail.

Our objective is to get a letter from the sender to the receiver in the fastest possible time.

Our studies so far clearly indicate that the problem is one of collection, distribution, and transportation and not primarily of additional deliveries. For example, by making later collections in Washington, 56,000 pieces of mail a day are being delivered 24 hours earlier than they would have been. No amount of deliveries would have had that result.

This being so, we think it would be downright dishonest to take the easy course and recommend restoration of two deliveries a day at a minimum cost of $80 million a year to the taxpayer.

I would like to make it absolutely clear, however, that we have a completely open mind on the eventual restoration of two deliveries. It could well be that our studies will show that in some areas of the country, due to population shifts, two deliveries should be reinstituted as quickly as possible.

I have stated from the beginning that this problem along with all the service problems of the Post Office Establishment will receive unprejudiced scrutiny and we will be guided by the facts. If our studies show that two deliveries are necessary, we will be the first to join with you in requesting the appropriation necessary for effecting the change.

In the meantime, we will keep you advised of the progress and will be happy to receive any information you may have which bears on this problem.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. DOHERTY

Postmaster General Summerfield's policy statement on his immediate and long-range program for restoration of postal services has the complete support of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

Letter carriers have been organized for 64 years. During all that time one of their primary objectives has been "the constant improvement of the postal service, in conjunction with the Post Office Department." They have never forgotten that fundamental objective. They are not now going to lose sight of that aim.

We have never supported a policy of squandering public funds on nonessential Federal projects. It must be remembered that letter carriers are also taxpayers. And while we do not agree with the $60 million estimated cost of restoring two mail deliveries, at the same time we realize that Congress must appropriate whatever funds are required to reinstitute good postal service.

We feel very strongly that swift, dependable, and frequent mail service is an essential part of our American scene. A good postal system has been one of the most important contributing factors in the greatness of our Nation. Nothing should be done to halt postal progress. When you slow down mail service you also halt progress on every other front.

The Postmaster General's statement promises two things, both of which are extremely important to letter carriers: The promise is made to study the problem and reinstitute two mail deliveries wherever it can be done as quickly as possible.

The second is almost without precedent in recent postal history. It is Mr. Summerfield's determination to consult with employee representatives. The National Association of Letter Carriers welcomes the opportunity to discuss with the Postmaster General and his staff the improvement of mail service, and all other problems of the postal establishment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the chairman of the legislative Committee on Civil Service and Post Office.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee on their fine statements and forthright explanations of the legislation. I agree with both of them with respect to the compliments they pay to the Post Office Department, the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, and those who are associated with him in an effort to really render a businesslike administration to the people of this country. The Postmaster General together with his assistants and others associated with him are doing a real constructive job.

For just a few minutes I should like to direct your attention to section 301, which I submit again is legislation on an appropriation bill. I am not opposed to it because the purpose is a good one, to keep off the Federal payroll those who believe in the right to strike against the United States or overthrow our Government by violence. At the same time, I want the record to show clearly I am not one of these who think the end justifies the means—either in making appropriations or performing any other governmental function.

I am not going to object to this proviso, secondly, because I have introduced legislation which will write into permanent law everything that is in this bill plus additional provisions which will afford really adequate safeguards for the internal security of the United States so far as concerns the hiring of Government employees. My bill, for the first time, will provide by law for a comprehensive and reasonably uniform program for keeping disloyal persons off the public payroll.

I have stood by and watched piecemeal legislation—much of it in appropriation acts—and hit-or-miss administrative efforts to cope with this problem of the Government feeding some of its own worst enemies out of the Public Treasury. It would be charitable to describe the success of these efforts as merely indifferent. I have introduced my bill so that we can be done once and for all with halfway measures, and through decisive legislative action put forth a concerted, joint effort on a broad front to take care of this situation.

I am not going to object to this proviso in the post office appropriation bill, thirdly, because I fully expect that my bill will have been enacted into law before this appropriation bill comes out of the Senate, thus making the proviso unnecessary.

My bill will establish a vigorous, hard-hitting governmentwide program which will effectively close the entire Federal payroll—not merely this department or that agency or the other bureau, as has been the case heretofore—to those who are disloyal or who believe in strikes against the Government or overthrow of the Government by violence.

My bill will not set up any new and complicated investigative procedure. Existing law and Executive orders, or those enacted or issued in the future, will be used. However, at present there is no permanent, comprehensive procedure set forth in the law covering loyalty of Federal employees. The only provisions concerning overthrow of the Government by force or strikes against the Government appear in annual appropriation acts. In my judgment, these matters are the direct responsibility of Congress and should be acted on in the form of permanent legislation.

This legislation which I have introduced today will make it a crime punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, for any person to accept employment in the executive branch if he, first, knows or has been notified in writing by proper authority that there is reasonable doubt of his loyalty based on an investigation required by law or Executive order; second, engages in activities which under any law or Executive order reflect adversely on his loyalty or belongs to any organization which engaged in such activities; third, advocates overthrow of the Government by force or belongs to any organization which advocates overthrow of the Government by force; or, fourth, engages or has engaged in a strike against the United States or belongs to an organization which advocates the right to strike against the United States. No such person shall be paid for any service he might render. An affidavit will be accepted as prima facie evidence that he has not violated these prohibitions, but his loyalty will be investigated as required by law or Executive order.

Under this legislation which I have introduced, the appointment or paying of any person prohibited from Federal employment will be made a crime if it is done knowingly. Thus, it will penalize not only acceptance of Federal employment by persons who are disloyal or believe in the right to strike against the Government, but it will also penalize Government officials who wrongfully appoint such persons. This last point should be particularly emphasized, because now, for the first time, a duty will be imposed on appointing officers to do their part to protect the security of the United States in the employment of these persons who are prohibited from holding Government positions.

It is recognized that need will arise for the making of exceptions for individuals, agencies, or groups under proper supervision. Accordingly, the President will be authorized to provide for the exemption of specified persons from this legislation when he deems such exemption to be in the national interest.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LANTAFF. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether or not in connection with the so-called postal deficit the Postmaster General has indicated any intention of sending to the Congress and to the gentleman's committee a bill for the revision of the second- and third-class postal rates, which we had under consideration last year?

Mr. REES of Kansas. He has not officially given us such notice, but I may say to the gentleman he is deeply concerned with respect to the fact that there is so much of a deficit in those areas. It is my opinion that some suggestions will be offered in the near future by the Postmaster General. I cannot speak officially, but I know he is very much interested and is giving the matter very careful consideration at the present time. I want to say, too, that I very greatly appreciate the gentleman's inquiry, because he is a former member of our committee and was a distinguished member of our group. He was most helpful when he was a member of our committee.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to go back to the discussion which took place some time ago about the star route mail contracts. There has been a great deal of interest in that matter in my district. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is the committee satisfied with the procedure being adopted by the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

post office in making these so-called spot checks of these contracts? I understand it is their procedure, Mr. Chairman, that when they put these contracts up for rebidding, they advertise the amount that is being currently paid by the holder of the contract. It seems to me that is a great hardship on those people who now have these contracts. I know of the case of a man who has a contract at the present time. He applied fer a new contract and thought he was going to get it. There was no question of reopening it. The man bought new equipment, and now the contract is being advertised again, and the competitors are being told what he has been receiving on that contract. That, sir, is not the usual way of bidding on contracts; and this question of mine is also in the nature of a protest on such procedure.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts we posed this question when the men from the Department were before us:

Does the action of the Department mean a return to cutthroat bidding?

The answer was:

This is not the case. It has been stated repeatedly that present contractors have nothing to fear if their service has been satisfactory, and the current contract rate is fair and reasonable to all concerned.

If there is a difference of $100 or $200, the contractor obviously is not going to lose, but if there has been a 300-percent or a 400-percent increase and a case similar to the situation where there was an increase of 1,800 percent, it is going to be reviewed and undoubtedly the contractor will lose his contract.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his information.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I submit that any small economy achieved at the great price of disheartened employees and low public morale is indeed a false and impractical economy. I very deeply believe that such has been the case during the prevailing postal delivery curtailment practice.

Prompt postal delivery has been traditionally accepted by the American people as an essential public service. It is essential to good business relationships as well as family relationships. No one can guess how many satisfactory business deals have collapsed because an important letter arrived too late. The Lord only knows how many mothers' and fathers' hearts have endured prolonged suffering because of the delay in the delivery of a letter from their boy or girl in the military service. Let us be mindful, also, of the great many thousands of our fighting men who are still in foreign lands and whose major inspiration and comfort is derived from a letter from home. It is authoritatively admitted that the current reduction of mail service has promoted an unfortunately widespread loss of morale, not only among the general public here at home, but among our military personnel.

On top of this public morale loss is imposed the disheartenment existing among the postal employees from circumstances beyond their control. Not yet afforded a cost-of-living salary increase proportionate to private industry scales—which I hope will soon occur as a matter of justice—they are forced to carry on their work today under increasing hardships and burdens.

Under the 1 delivery order a day a great many of the employees must arise at 4 o'clock in the morning to get to the office in time to set up the extraordinarily heavy mail load they must carry throughout their route. As you know, they deliver this mail in all types of weather and to all kinds of out-of-the-way places, no matter how heavy it is. As faithful public servants, they exert every effort to carry out their orders. They must eat their lunches wherever they happen to be at noon. In residential and outlying areas, where there are no restaurants, they must hurriedly eat their sandwiches on the sidewalks or roadside, as the case may be. It is little wonder that, although they valiantly carry on, there is no song in their hearts as they fulfill a day of unnecessary physical and mental hardship, with all the sickness and accident possibilities accompanying that type of work.

Mr. Chairman, the postal employees are not and never have been surpassed in honorable and faithful duty performance by any other group of Government workers. They are certainly eminently deserving of humane treatment, and the American public is preeminently entitled to prompt mail deliveries. Certainly if we can afford charitable gestures to the tune of billions of dollars to aid foreign nations and peoples, we can and should take care of our own. Curtailed mail-delivery service has proved to be a most impractical, unwise, and uneconomical experiment; it is high time that we corrected that error by restoring the traditional custom of two mail deliveries a day to every American home and business.

TIME FOR A CHANGE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the clarion call for a change rang loud and often from Republican circles during the recent campaign.

The voters who answered that call, however, never expected the changes they are getting.

Eviscerating the civil-service system, economizing by bookkeeping legerdemain, stopping inflation by boosting costs, conserving our natural resources by giving them away, and bundles for billionaires by depressing the bond market are noteworthy changes that were not promised.

Now come the changes in the campaign promises.

The Republican Party platform carried this absolute direct pledge to the American people:

We pledge a more efficient and frequent mail-delivery service.

This pledge was repeated by President Eisenhower when he addressed the convention of the National Association of Letter Carriers in New York City on September 1, 1952, when he declared:

There is just one criterion here: The finest mail service we can get for the least economic cost. That is exactly the thing that will be applied, and that will mean that the Republican program will be carried out to the letter with the greater frequency of service and with the greatest possible efficiency.

In accepting the nomination as Postmaster General, Mr. Arthur E. Summerfield declared:

The improvement of all branches of the Department and the increase of its morale will be my paramount objectives in the public interest. We will operate the postal system at it should be operated—in the service of the people and as their most vital means of all-important communications. I, too, like you, am interested in two-a-day deliveries.

But let us not be naive. No one, but the gullible, has any right to expect performance of those promises.

The enactment of this appropriation bill without provisions for the funds with which to carry out those pledges, will sorely dissapoint the postal employees of the Nation, but more important, it will point up for American people what they can expect from the majority party, that is the majority for the present, but not for too long, I trust.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Customs, including examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase of 50 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; arms and ammunition; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and not to exceed $1,220,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia exclusive of 10 persons from the field force authorized to be detailed under law (19 U. S. C. 1525); $40,500,000.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question about this Bureau of Customs, and then would like to address myself to this two-a-day mail question. First on this subject of customs: Can the gentleman assure us, because I have been asked questions by some of the customs people in New York, that it is not the intention by the cut of approximately $1,500,000 in this item to reduce essential services with respect to customs inspections, customs receipts, and narcotics inspections, and so forth, but that the committee feels that the job that is being done can be done with full effectiveness, and that if the committee is shown any good reason why it is not being done with full effectiveness, the committee is perfectly prepared to look at that reason sympathetically?

Mr. CANFIELD. That statement is true.

Mr. JAVITS. On this two-a-day mail delivery, Mr. Chairman, I could not help but hear my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, compare the cities with the country and tell us that all was good in Richmond. Well, all is not good in New York about postal deliveries and the people do not like the present system.

New York has 8 million people, and it pays far more than its proportion populationwise of the revenues which go into the Federal Treasury. This is something which many of us here in the Congress, from time to time, forget.

Also, something which some are inclined to overlook, is the contribution of the proportion of 8 million to the Americans who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. New York is not alone a business and port center, but also a great educational, cultural, and research center of the United States. This is a pride to us all, and we should recognize it.

So I think it is only fair to say there is great dissatisfaction with this one-a-day mail delivery in New York. I see my friends from Boston, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, and all other big cities about to take the floor, and I might hasten to add that I feel the same way about the contribution to our country of the other big cities. There is a tendency on the floor sometimes to put the big cities aside and to forget their enormous contribution to the country.

The dissatisfaction about this one-a-day mail residential delivery is in one respect: That there are many business concerns in residential areas. Those business concerns are suffering seriously because they get only one-a-day mail delivery. There are many business concerns in my particular district, which is a residential district. Those are all small businesses; business concerns in residential areas are all small businesses.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I assume that those are the stations which the Postmaster General referred to in his letter, which he said he would attempt to clear up. Frankly, I have always maintained with Postmaster General Donaldson and with the present Postmaster General that wherever business enterprises are not getting adequate service they should have it, because there is all the difference in the world between business and residential. My remarks are limited to residential sections. I do not believe a residential section in a city is any different from a residential section anywhere in the country.

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly, we have one point already conceded, and that is that where there are business concerns mixed in residential areas, they should have improvement in mail service.

Second, in the residential areas in the city the people are in a very difficult position with respect to appointments for jobs, notifications of various kinds, and the difficulties city people have found are the uncertainty of when they are going to get this one mail delivery. Many people have missed important things in the way of jobs because their one delivery a day did not come at 8, 9, or 10 o'clock in the morning but it came late in the afternoon. Those are some of the things the Postmaster General should look into.

Now, in this question of money. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] said $80 million will be added to the cost to improve this residential delivery service, and it would come out of the taxpayers.

I have before me the record of hearings of the committee, and I find that the only class of mail that is making any money is first-class mail. That is making $52 million a year, which is almost enough to cover any deficit that might be created in giving the residential sections who get first-class mail the service which they have been getting for years and to which they are entitled.

Let us see what is losing money. Second-class mail—newspapers and periodicals. Third-class and fourth-class mail, and they are losing a great deal of money; just about the amount of this deficit. According to these figures, they are losing about $690 million. It is about a $700 million deficit. Therefore, what the city people, who are complaining about this one-delivery service, are suffering from, and what the post-office employees, who complain they are not getting paid enough—and they are not—is not to be repaired at the taxpayers' expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JAVITS was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. JAVITS. It is not the taxpayers they are complaining about. They are complaining about the second-, third-, and fourth-class mail free ride at their expense, at the expense of the residential deliveries, and at the expense of the post office employees. That is the nub of this discussion.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] put his finger on the question. When we get this rate schedule straightened out as it should be, so that second-, third-, and fourth-class mail bears the same part of the burden as the first-class mail, which is paying more than its share, then we will find these problems easy of correction, and it would not come out of the taxpayers' pocket, and, indeed, it need not come out of the taxpayers' pocket.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I have been fighting on this floor for a long time for an increase in rates to make these various classes self-sustaining, but there is a great deal of talk about first-class mail being self-sustaining. I seriously question whether at the present time it is self-sustaining.

The figures the gentleman has are Post Office figures, and they are accurate; but they are based on experiences prior, in my judgment, prior to the last increase in the salaries of the postal employees. The Post Office Department is now making another cost survey, and I think the gentleman is going to find before that survey is over, that even first-class mail is not completely paying its way.

Mr. JAVITS. All I can say to the gentleman is that if it is argued from these figures as a fact that second-, third-, and fourth-class mail is not paying its way it is as much to be argued from the same figures as a fact that first-class mail is more than paying its way.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. The record of the New York City post office is not good. I am sure the gentleman in the well of the House has read in the metropolitan press of the current effort being made by the new postmaster to remedy that situation.

Mr. JAVITS. My friend, Hon. Harold Riegelman, the new acting postmaster of New York, will remedy it if anyone can. He is a splendid and able man with a great record of achievement. But I think we are never going to get a real improvement in the deficit situation until we realistically face the fact that these very low rates on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail have got to be eliminated.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not get an agreement at this point that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I think we can agree on that. I now ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT: Section 302 at page 14, line 20, is hereby redesignated "Section 303"; after line 19, page 14, add the following new section:

"SEC. 302. When this bill shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and shall have been presented to the President for his approval, the President shall have power to disapprove any item or items contained in this bill, in the same manner and subject to the same limitations as he may, under article 1, section 7 of the Constitution of the United States, disapprove as a whole any bill which shall have been presented to him for his approval. The provisions of such section 7, which relate to the reconsideration, shall also apply to any item or items so disapproved to the same extent as they apply to a bill that has been disapproved by the President."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order until I can be heard on my amendment?

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, during general debate I explained the purposes of this amendment and its historical background. No lesser authority than the senior Senator from Illinois, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, has written an article which I have here.

Senator DOUGLAS has estimated that because we do not have a Presidential item veto about $4 billion a year of the taxpayers' money is wasted on various projects which are not in the national interest in an hour of emergency such as we now face.

This year we will probably be asked to cut over $5 billion from our military defense budget. We are being called upon to reduce very drastically our contributions to the military efforts of our

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

allies in Western Europe and other parts of the free world. We are being called upon to reduce very drastically our contribution to the military buildup of our allies in Western Europe, to the extent of a reduction of some $2 billion. Here we could save the same amount of money by eliminating some of the pork-barrel legislation that this Congress passes year in and year out.

I am not the first one to suggest this. The suggestion was first made by Senator Vandenberg several years ago who proposed it as a constitutional amendment. It was suggested by President Roosevelt that the same objective could be achieved by insertion of language such as I have offered, which was originally written by Senator Vandenberg, to be attached to each appropriation bill.

I know my rules, Mr. Chairman, and I recognize that it is quite probable the Chair will hold this is legislation on an appropriation bill, but, Mr. Chairman, when you wanted to legislate on an appropriation bill to eliminate public housing you did it. When it comes to legislation on an appropriation bill to save $4 billion of the American taxpayers' money through pork-barrel legislation, oh, no, you would like to squander it because you think that helps you come next election day.

If we are really interested in economy, if we are really interested in the national welfare of this country, if we are really interested in building up the military security of this country and cutting out the waste, let us see who will make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is a test and it is a test that I intend to offer on every single appropriation bill that comes before this House during the present session of Congress. I hope it will call the attention of the people through the slow process of being offered over and over again to who is for real economy and who is for pork-barrel legislation.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I happen to be new in the House and, therefore, not too fresh on the history of the Members here. May I inquire, has this provision been adopted in the method in which the gentleman suggests here by himself or any other Member of the House in the last 20 years?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, it has not. I have had pending for the last three Congresses legislation which would require the Appropriations Committee to put this language in every appropriation bill, but it has never been reported out of the committee. I might add for the gentleman's information this is a completely nonpartisan proposition. It was first suggested by Senator Vandenberg and supported by Members on both sides of the aisle. This has nothing to do with partisan politics. It is a question of who wants to save the taxpayers' money on projects which do not involve the national interest.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order, and may I add this: The gentleman from New York states: Let us see who makes the point of order. The gentleman from New Jersey, chairman of the committee, makes the point of order, and, incidentally, the gentleman from New Jersey has gone down the line, right straight down the line, for public housing. If I am not mistaken, when the gentleman from New York made his maiden speech on the floor of this House it was a speech in behalf of public housing and it was a very good one. I followed it, I commended the gentleman for that speech and he knows I am a friend of public housing.

Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The gentleman from New York says he has introduced bills which have been referred to appropriate legislative committees. His proposal is not for the consideration of this committee under long established rules of procedure. It is for the consideration of the proper legislative committees.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do, Mr. Chairman. May I say that I regret it had to be one of my closest friends, one of my colleagues I admire the most, who felt it his duty as chairman of the subcommittee to make the point of order. I must say that he has been a stanch advocate of public housing, so my remarks in no way apply to him.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the validity of the point of order, and I will not be surprised if the Chair rules me out of order, but in that case I propose to offer an alternate amendment to accomplish the same purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has carefully considered the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. He is constrained, after due thought and deliberation, to hold that it is a violation of rule XXI, section 2, of the rules of the House and is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT: Section 302 at page 14, line 20 is hereby redesignated "SEC. 303"; after line 19, page 14, add the following new section:

"SEC. 302. For all intents and purposes, each section or item of appropriation of this bill shall be deemed to be a separate bill, and shall be subject to approval or disapproval by the President as though contained in a separate bill."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I raise the same point of order, being legislation on an appropriation bill. It is a proposition to establish affirmative directions for an executive officer.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

In this instance, I have tried to effect the same net result as we do in other legislation where we provide for the separability of individual sections of an act where there is a possibility of court review and therefore the holding by the courts of a particular section as being invalid. I feel that this deals directly with each section, and therefore making that section a separate act we are not giving the President any more authority than he has if we consider this entire bill as one act. He has the right to veto or approve each separate appropriation bill or act, and if by this amendment we divide this act into separate bills, we are not adding to the President's authority thereby and therefore, his constitutional authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. Again, the Chair has carefully considered the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. The statement made in support of the amendment is that it applies to legislative bills. This is an appropriation bill and the matter of separability does not enter into it. Therefore, the Chair rules that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of this opportunity primarily for the purpose of accentuating two matters which I brought up at the full House Committee on Appropriations meeting on this bill yesterday morning and which have been previously discussed here today.

The first matter is the omission of funds in this bill for reinauguration of the two-a-day mail delivery. While I fully realize that my friend and distinguished colleague, the able chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] has been a foremost advocate of the reinauguration of the two-a-day mail-delivery service, I must again point out that the action of the majority in this instance is in violation of the direct pledge made in the Republican Party platform of 1952 to the American people in which it was said:

We pledge a more efficient and frequent mail-delivery service.

This pledge was repeated by President Eisenhower when he addressed the convention of the National Association of Letter Carriers in New York City on September 1, 1952, when he declared:

There is just one criterion here: The finest mail service we can get for the least economic cost. That is exactly the thing that will be applied, and that will mean that the Republican program will be carried out to the letter with the greater frequency of service and with the greatest possible efficiency.

In accepting the nomination as Postmaster General, Mr. Arthur E. Summerfield declared:

The improvement of all branches of the Department and the increase of its morale will be my paramount objectives in the public interest. We will operate the postal system as it should be operated—in the service of the people and as their most vital means of all-important communications. I, too, like you, am interested in two-a-day deliveries.

It is my understanding that the National Association of Letter Carriers have agreed to let this matter stand for the time being in the hands of the Re-

publican leadership and I trust that it will be in the not too far distant future that we in the Borough of Brooklyn have the much needed two-a-day mail delivery once again.

The other matter to which I wish to address myself concerns the deep slash in funds for the Bureau of Customs which will mean the layoff of 335 employees of that Bureau, 110 of whom are now working in the port of New York. This pennywise pound-foolish action is being taken in the face of the following statistics which have been prepared by the New York branch of the National Customs Service Association which show the tremendous increase in customs' receipts and activities over the years:

CUSTOMS STATISTICS ON VOLUME OF BUSINESS AND NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, PORT OF NEW YORK, COMPILED BY THE NEW YORK BRANCH, NATIONAL CUSTOMS SERVICE ASSOCIATION

The statistics compiled by the New York Branch National Customs Service Association, indicate a steady and sharp increase in the volume of customs business at the Port of New York ever since 1946. The figures also indicate a steady decrease in the number of employees used in collecting the revenues and performing various other duties involved in preventing smuggling and illegal importations of narcotics and other contraband, including harmful and dangerous drugs.

Between the fiscal years of 1946 and 1952, the customs receipts have increased approximately 43 percent, the number of formal entries approximately 128 percent, the number of mail entries 144 percent, the number of baggage entries approximately 227 percent, and the number of warehouse withdrawals 264 percent. The steady increase in the number of foreign aircraft arriving at the International Airport has made it necessary to detail a special group of employees to handle the increased amount of customs business at the airport occasioned by an increase of approximately 87 percent in the number of arrivals between the fiscal years of 1946 and 1952. In spite of the extremely high increase in the volume of customs business at the port of New York, the total number of employees was reduced by approximately 12 percent during the 7-year period.

A comparison of the first 9 months of the present fiscal year ending March 31, 1953, and the same period in the previous fiscal year indicates a steady increase in every phase of customs activities, with customs receipts showing an increase of 12 percent and the number of formal entries showing an increase of almost 20 percent. There has been a steady increase in the amount of customs business each month compared to the corresponding month of the previous year. This is graphically illustrated by the comparison of the figures for the last 2 months available, February 1953 and March 1953 with the corresponding months in 1952. The figures for the month of March are particularly interesting since they indicate an increase in general business of approximately 25 percent over the same period in the previous year. The fact that the number of employees has not been increased within the period of time indicated is an explanation for the ever-increasing backlog of work accumulating in the customs offices at the port of New York.

It should be pointed out that the amount of revenue collected is not in itself a true reflection of the greatly increased volume of imports because of the fact that during the past 7 years various trade agreements have greatly reduced rates of customs duties.

Although the work of the employees in the Customs Service has been increased from time to time by laws and regulations requiring the customs personnel to perform new duties in connection with imported merchandise, such as import fees, quotas, import licenses, foreign assets control licenses, general trade agreements, and the imposition of 1930 tariff rates on merchandise from Communist-dominated areas, in addition, customs employees are required to perform special functions for other departments and agencies of the Government. At the present time customs employees at this port are required to do work for various divisions and bureaus of the State Department, Treasury Department, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Department of Defense, Post Office Department, Department of the Interior, Federal Security Agency, Federal Communications Commission, Maritime Commission, Atomic Energy Commission, and others.

In spite of the new work imposed by new laws, Presidential proclamation, regulations, etc., additional funds, except for export control work, have not been provided.

TABLE I.—*Number of employees, annual workload, 1946–52*

	Number of employees	Customs receipts	Formal entries	Mail entries	Baggage entries	Other entries	Warehouse withdrawals	Vessels	Aircraft	Passengers
Fiscal year ending June 30—										
1946	3,166	201,906,152	142,003	70,508	159,859	198,198	49,188	5,587	8,460	891,796
1947	2,744	241,208,660	193,410	127,110	277,973	239,704	71,131	4,216	9,891	464,691
1948	2,908	232,795,090	196,868	142,348	379,742	297,435	98,866	4,666	12,269	588,779
1949	2,709	217,668,118	232,410	141,212	392,402	274,144	120,033	4,445	13,204	615,084
1950	2,755	224,686,250	270,654	148,492	445,004	307,931	149,435	4,462	13,311	734,807
1951	2,815	343,659,360	370,784	169,600	508,973	256,142	174,081	4,666	14,460	837,927
1952	2,772	290,209,060	323,063	193,644	522,362	253,745	179,163	5,211	15,853	916,881
Percentage increase or decrease, 1952 as compared with 1946	−12.44	+43.73	+127.8	+143.5	+226.7	5	+28	+264	−6.72	+8.7	+2.81

TABLE II.—*Comparison, first 9 months of fiscal years 1952–53*

	Number of employees	Customs receipts	Formal entries	Mail entries	Baggage entries	Other entries	Warehouse withdrawals	Vessels	Aircraft	Passengers
July 1–Mar. 31—										
1952	(1)	$222,124,143	241,289	144,990	393,156	190,092	138,458	3,758	11,668	686,474
1953	(1)	$249,866,745	287,473	159,343	423,002	201,306	139,102	4,076	12,411	701,227
Percentage increase		+12.12	+19.14	+9.9	+7.6	+6		+8.46	+6.36	+2.15

[1] Approximately same (2,772).

TABLE III.—*Comparison (1 month) February 1952 with February 1953*

	Number of employees	Customs receipts	Formal entries	Mail entries
February 1952	Approximately the same (2,772)	$21,055,699	25,442	14,832
February 1953	do	$23,613,966	28,817	15,485
Percentage increase		+11.2	+13.26	+4.4

TABLE IV.—*Comparison (1 month) March 1952 with March 1953*

	Number of employees	Customs receipts	Formal entries	Mail entries
March 1952	Approximately the same (2,772)	$22,314,767	29,339	17,091
March 1953	do	$28,800,564	36,632	20,357
Percentage increase		+29.06	+24.8	+19.11

In addition to the figures hereinbefore set forth, the New York Times within the past few days showed the comparison between figures for the month of April 1952 and the month of April 1953, wherein there is an increase as between those 2 months of over 30 percent.

The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] has always been a champion of the customs service and its employees. We have worked together over the years. I am willing to accept his statements made here today with regard to the Bureau of Customs appropriations and trust that it shall not be required that that service be affected and that these employees be eliminated. For if such were to be done, instead of each and every bag and trunk being inspected upon arrival in the port of New York, the Bureau would have to resort to spot checks and inspect merely 1 of every 10 pieces of baggage. The result of such a situation may easily be predicted. For one thing, it would result in unprecedented smuggling of narcotics and contraband into the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take any part of 5 minutes. I simply want to commend the committee for authorizing the expenditure of $500,000 for expansion and renovation of the mail equipment shop in Washington. The mail equipment shop, as Members of the House probably know, makes canvas mail bags, repairs all mail bags, pounches, and so forth, used in the transportation of mail in the United States. I was a member of a subcommittee which last winter inspected the mail equipment shop in Washington. It badly needs expansion, and we found working conditions in the shop deplorable, particularly

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

from the standpoint of dust and poor lighting. We suggested improvements and I hope that in the expansion and renovation program made possible by this appropriation due attention will be paid by the Post Office Department, especially to the elimination of dust so that the workers will have more healthy conditions under which to work.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I just want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Iowa who was chairman of the subcommittee which made that investigation and offered very constructive suggestions in respect to improvements. I think that he, as well as the members of his committee, did a good job.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] for his kind observation. I would point out, however, that Mr. REES, as chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, played a most important part in bringing this situation to the attention of the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I heard the splendid address of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. I agree with him 100 percent as to the necessity for this country's having an item veto. I hope the committee which is studying this matter, the Committee on the Judiciary, will bring forth either a constitutional amendment or a statutory provision which will correct present inadequacies in the application of the veto power.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman says he is in full agreement with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. Is he then in full agreement that the President should have complete control of the appropriations and thus give to the executive branch control which is not vested in it by the Constitution?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. The answer to that question is "No."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] suggests is part and parcel of the whole thing. The President, for example, could undo the work of my Appropriations Committee if he saw fit to do so, and throw out the whole triple-A program of the next year, in spite of the wishes of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Of course, the Congress does not give up its rights. The Congress would have the right to override such a stupid veto. The gentleman knows perfectly well the Congress would override that kind of a stupid veto.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It would become rule by the minority here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. This is not a partisan matter. It is a matter going back very deeply in the roots of the South. As far as I know, the first provision of this type was involved in a constitutional provision of the Confederate constitution. It was copied by a number of States immediately after that constitution was put into effect. At the present time only nine States of our Nation do not have an item veto. It is not a theoretical proposition, it is a very practical one. There has not been this abuse that has been spoken of.

We can look at what the States actually have done. Their governors have vetoed things and thus have saved a great deal of money for the various States. We could save a great deal of money for the United States if we had such a provision as this.

The first President who came out for this was Ulysses S. Grant. Presidents Rutherford B. Hayes, Chester A. Arthur, William Howard Taft, and Franklin D. Roosevelt were for it. In fact, practically all the great leaders who have given study to our Constitution and its provisions have been vigorously for it.

When our Constitution was drawn and our country was established, this concept was implied in the language they used. It was never contemplated when our country was founded that appropriations would be handled in the mass manner in which we are now appropriating money, covering infinite items in a single bill. It was contemplated we should appropriate so much money for each item, and that this item was to be the appropriation bill. Actually our practice lately has thwarted the Constitution. In having an item veto we would be returning to the very idea our forefathers had in drawing the Constitution.

I hope very much the Congress will seriously consider this matter, as I think it will save us a great deal of money and will be very beneficial for the financial safety of our Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5174) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 235, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 422) which was read a first and second time, and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHITTEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] be granted 2 days leave of absence in order to attend to official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the Treasury and Post Office Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to inquire of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. A bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency which has been on the whip notice will be called immediately after I conclude this announcement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I inquire if there is anything in contest about that bill, so that the Members may be advised now?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman I expect to oppose the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. I understood the gentleman would oppose the bill. I do not know how devastating that will be.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know either, but I hope the gentleman will not vote for the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. On Monday we will call the Consent Calendar and begin general debate on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are there any suspensions on Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. No. No suspensions.

On Tuesday we have primary elections in Pennsylvania, and I understand most of the Pennsylvania Members want to go home for that. So on Tuesday we shall continue general debate on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, if it is not concluded on Monday, and will begin the reading of the bill and will continue the reading of the bill in Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule until such time as we get into a controversial section of consequence, at which time we would suspend consideration of the bill, in view of the Pennsylvania situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. By that you mean until the first amendment is offered?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, I would say it might involve some discretion as to just the consequence of the amendment. It is my understanding that there may be 2 or 3 rather controversial amendments of consequence, and I would not want to say that we would quit immediately on the offering of the first amendment, because it might be some amendment that could be disposed of without prejudice to the interest of anyone. But I shall be glad to keep in touch with the minority leader as we progress, and with the members of the Appropriations Committee on that side, and members on our side, so that he will not have any difficulty about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday?

Mr. HALLECK. The Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday. Then, on Wednesday we will continue with the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill and hope to conclude it as quickly as we can.

Then following that will be the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, and we hope to conclude it Thursday or Friday.

I might say to the gentlemen I have been informed that a great many Members are expecting to go out next week to witness an atomic blast in Nevada, but at the moment I am not inclined to believe there is any such controversy about the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill as to prejudice them or embarrass them in connection with their trip out there.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If any rollcalls are necessary on the Labor and Federal Security bill, could they be put over in that event until Monday, because, after all, about 100 Members will want to make that trip.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand that, but we will have an appropriation bill to follow immediately after that. I think all I can say at this point is that if a situation develops that might seem to indicate desirability to have the matter go over until Monday, we can determine whether that should be done. I do not want to anticipate such a circumstance, but at this time I do not want to make a positive statement in that respect.

REVISION OF THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized and directed to revise, by bringing up to date, the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government" as set out in House Document 465, 79th Congress.

SEC. 2. Such revised pamphlet shall be printed as a Senate document, and there be printed 100,000 additional copies of which 24,750 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; 66,150 copies for the use of the House of Representatives; 3,100 for the Senate document room; and 6,000 for the House document room.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "one" and insert "five."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "24" and insert "30"; and in lines 8 and 9 strike out "750."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "66,150" and insert "460,900."

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I may state for the benefit of the Members that this is a reprint of the document known as "Our American Government" in question and answer form brought up to date. It provides for 500,000 copies for the use of the Members of the House and the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. LeCOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I just wanted to state that I am in complete accord with the objectives expressed in the resolution and shall be very glad to work on the revision of that document and get it ready as quickly as possible.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL TO THE MARINE CORPS DEAD

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. J. Res. 157) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the first section of the act authorizing the erection of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead, approved July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242), as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "District of Columbia" the words "or immediate vicinity."

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply amends the previous resolution which authorized the erection of a Marine Corps memorial, and it amends it to the extent of permitting the commission to erect a memorial outside of the District of Columbia but in the immediate vicinity. The need for this amendment is the fact that the commission feels that it might be appropriate to erect that memorial across the river in Virginia. I might say that this memorial is the Iwo Jima Marine Corps memorial that has attracted a great deal of attention.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL RESERVE BRANCH BANK BUILDINGS

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 230, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4605) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of the bill, H. R. 4605.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

NEW FEDERAL RESERVE BUILDINGS NOT NEEDED FOR FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I know this bill is looked upon lightly; in fact, our distinguished majority leader referred to it in a very facetious way a while ago and said that it did not mean much and suggested that my opposition would mean less. But I want to invite your attention to certain things that I doubt the Members of Congress know about or have given serious consideration to in reference to the Federal Reserve System. This brings it out in the open. Since no one has explained the purposes of this bill I will do so.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The object of the bill is to use $20 million of Federal Reserve funds to build 6 branch bank buildings in different places in the United States, costing, of course, three or four million dollars each. Right off, the question arises, Why should you object to that? Federal Reserve funds—spending their own money to build buildings to be used by the Federal Reserve System. Why is that not all right? May I invite your attention to the fact that the business done by the Federal Reserve System has grown up like Topsy. This system has been looked upon in such a sacred way, like the majority leader indicated a while ago, that anything which comes up about the Federal Reserve is all right, let it go, it is fine. No investigation, no study, no report—just let it go. It has been operating that way over the years—40 years, in fact. Why, it is difficult to get an economist to make any statement that would be in conflict with the views of the Federal Reserve System. It is seldom that any banker will ever say anything that conflicts with the views of the Federal Reserve System. They are afraid of it. Here in the Halls of Congress it has become almost a sacred institution.

PULL CURTAIN BACK

But I want to pull the curtain back today and show you some things that have been going on for the 40 years this Federal Reserve System has been in operation. It is an agency of Congress. If there is any Member within the sound of my voice who disputes that statement I wish he would rise now. I would like to yield to him. No Member will challenge it because that is the truth. It is an agency of the Congress of the United States, it is something that we have brought into being, it is our creature. Some people refer to it as the servant of the Congress. It is certainly an agency of Congress, no one disputes that. All right, it is our agency.

During that time you would think an agency that has the power to issue money like the Federal Reserve, which handles billions of dollars a year and trillions of dollars' worth of checks and transactions a year, would make some report to us in detail as to audits, and so forth. Under the law audits are to be made. Up until 2 years ago I must confess I was ignorant. I thought the Federal Reserve was filing audits of their 12 Federal Reserve banks and the Federal Reserve Board with the respective Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate every year. But not one during that time has ever been filed down to this good day—not one audit.

You know, any good audit always discloses before it is wound up certain conclusions, recommendations, findings, and criticisms. From that the people in power can get some good wholesome suggestions and advice. The congressional committees could have done that doubtlessly, but they have never seen one of these audits.

Up until I brought the question up in a joint meeting of the House and the Senate less than 2 years ago they had never had an outside independent audit made, but then they commenced to have one. They hired an outside concern and they had an independent audit. But, can you see that audit? No. Has it been filed with the Committees of Banking and Currency of either House? No. Where is it? The Federal Reserve has it. We have not seen it. I asked Mr. Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the other day this question. I said, "Do you not think you ought to file those audits here with the Committee on Banking and Currency?" He said, "If the committee wants to see them, they can come down to the Federal Reserve Building." I said, "Do you not think you should bring them up here?" He said, "No, some of it is confidential. We will not bring them up here; you have to come down there." Have you ever known such arrogance as that, your agent, your servant, a creature of this Congress, telling this Congress that if your committee wants to see the audits, that the committee must come to their house, down to their building, and then with a word of warning that some are confidential, with the indication that you will not see all of them after you got down there? Imagine such arrogance.

I can tell you some of the reasons for that. In the hearings I asked Mr. Martin a question about the earnings. I said, "No. 2: The earnings flow into the Treasury 90 percent if you do not intercept the earnings and use the earnings to build big buildings; that is correct, is it not?" Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve said, "Well, if we did not have any buildings we would not have any operations or earnings at all."

TRADE PAPER MONEY FOR INTEREST-BEARING BONDS TO GET THEIR EARNINGS

Now that sounds like a logical statement, but I want to prove to you that it is not correct at all. Where did the earnings from the Federal Reserve System come from? All right. I have a table here, table 6 in the report that we prepared in the joint committee last year from 1914 down to 1950. During the year 1950 the earnings of the 12 Federal Reserve banks were $275,838,994 plus. Where did they get that money? Interest on bonds, $272,915,591, from interest on Government bonds. That is where they got their earnings, practically every bit of it, interest on bonds. How did they get the Government bonds? Under the power that we gave them when we created the agency. We gave the Federal Reserve banks the power to go to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing over here and have Federal Reserve notes printed: This currency that you see, this folding money, greenbacks, some people call it. It is guaranteed by whom? By the Federal Reserve? No. Every bill—look at it yourself—is guaranteed by the United States Government. These 12 Federal Reserve banks have carted off $23 billion worth of those new bills, and they have traded those new bills, which are not interest bearing, they are just money—they have traded those new bills for Government bonds that draw interest, and there is where they get the $272,915,591 for 1950 interest on the bonds that they have traded money for. All right. There are the earnings. Therefore, if they do not have a single bank building in the United States, the Open Markets Committee, with its headquarters in New York, could continue to function and keep those bonds in a vault in New York and not have a building in America, and they would have practically the same earnings as they have today. So, Mr. Martin's statement that if they did not have the buildings they would not have the earnings is absolutely untrue.

Now then, what will these new bank buildings be used for? Mr. Martin, the chairman of the Federal Reserve bank—and he is correct in that—said that the greatest increases in volume of work have come in the handling of currency and coin and the collection of checks. Now, for whom are these checks collected? Are they collected for the Government? Some of them are, but about 2,000 million, or 2 billion, of them are collected each year for the private banks. You have these private banks using the Federal Reserve banks in this way for their own use and benefit and for their own profit.

When the Federal Reserve banks render a service for the Treasury or for a Government agency they allocate their expense and send them a bill. Last year it was about $20 million that the Treasury and other governmental agencies paid the Federal Reserve System for the work they had done for the Government agencies. But did they send a bill to the private banks? Not one, and it cost about $100 million. So there you find a bank building in every instance, the regional banks and the 24 branches, filled up with employees, working for the Government? No. They are working for the private commercial banks. Who pays them? The Federal Reserve System. Where does it get the money? From public funds, funds that would go into the United States Treasury were they not intercepted. There is where they get their money. Do you believe in that?

I wonder if the majority leader is going to endorse that, that here we have over 20,000 employees working on the Government payroll—to all intents and purposes it is the Government's payroll—receiving money that would go into the United States Treasury, working for private banks, clearing checks and counting coins, and things like that, absolutely a private function for private profit, and paid for by the taxpayers of this country to the extent that the Federal Reserve System has taken the money that you authorized them to take, that is non-interest-bearing, and traded that money for interest-bearing obligations, and now collect that interest every year; and they use that money, which is public money, for the purpose of paying these expenses. You cannot justify it.

Are you going to vote to spend twenty more millions of dollars to build buildings for that purpose, for more employees, for the Government to pay more hospital benefits and retirement benefits and everything else at Government expense? That is what it means. It is public funds.

I am not blaming the employees. They earn their money. I would like to see them get just the same or more, but they should get their pay from the commercial banks because they are the ones that they are working for. They are the ones who profit by reason of their work.

COULD SAVE $2,000 A DAY

If we could put this $20 million on the public debt instead of building these buildings with it, at 3¼ percent interest that would save the taxpayers $2,000 a day. Which is better, to pay it on the public debt and save $2,000 a day or build six more buildings, costing three or four million dollars apiece, to fill up with more employees to count more checks and more coins for private banks? That is the issue here.

All right. Now, you have no information in here about the cost of the facilities now in use, but, of course, they are being used for the private banks. There is nothing here about the rent that is now being paid. Even if you want a building, you want to know something about the economic feasibility of building the building, and the first thing you would inquire about is how much rent they are paying now, what kind of facilities they have now, and would it be cheaper to keep the rented facilities than to build more ivory towers. You want to ask questions like that. But there are no answers in this record—none anywhere to the effect that present buildings will include commercial space. To show you how something will just grow up like Topsy when there is no supervision, and Congress has not given the Federal Reserve any supervision, they have just passed it over as the majority leader says as if it was a sacred institution and we should not ask any questions about it. They are always right, we are told, and we are not supposed to ask any questions about the Federal Reserve. According to their opinion, anyone who dares to stand up against them is bound to be wrong from the beginning. As the majority leader said, I do not know how devastating the gentleman's position will be, indicating there is something ridiculous—ridiculous, mind you, to think of somebody opposing the Federal Reserve System. Well, I am opposing them and I believe you will in this kind of practice. I do not believe you understood this. I did not believe all of this 2 years ago. There is a great deal of criticism about the House of Representatives' restaurant costing a few thousand dollars to make up the deficit, and in the other body. The Federal Reserve Bank Board has a cafeteria. I have never been in the cafeteria, but they run cafeterias in all of these Federal Reserve bank buildings. I understand according to investigations made, but no searching investigation, that down here at this Federal Reserve Board in Washington, D. C., last year, it cost $115,000 to operate the cafeteria. I am just giving you this one little, simple illustration and there are just dozens of them, but actually, the receipts were only $73,000. The net expense absorbed by the Board came out of this fund which I have been telling you about—of $41,000. In other words, 36 percent of everything that they served in the cafeteria down there is paid for by the taxpayers. That amounted to $41,000. Let me tell you about the 12 regional banks. These 12 regional banks—you know the president and directors are wined and dined and they do a lot of wining and dining at the expense of the taxpayers—pay for it out of this fund I have been telling you about. They are just happy-go-lucky and carefree and spend money like drunken sailors.

I can tell you a dozen instances, but it does not make any difference as Uncle Sam pays for it. They just reach into Uncle Sam's pocket and get the money. That is the way they do it. All right, now these 12 Federal Reserve banks last year had cafeterias too, and had operating expenses of $2,342,329. But they only had receipts of $1,279,140. In other words, the 12 Federal Reserve banks spent $2,300,000 and collected back only $1,200,000, and then subsidized the people who patronized those cafeterias 45.4 percent by contributing over $1 million. Now do you believe in that? I wonder if the majority leader believes in it? I wonder if he is going to condone that kind of subsidy. Why that is a franking privilege and a subsidy at its worst. I have never heard of any subsidy like that before, have you? I do not think you have. I am just bringing this up and just hitting the highlights and the high places to let you know that this should be gone into. When I wanted to interrogate a witness, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] was very generous and let me go on asking questions. But one time a member of our committee questioned my right to ask so many questions, which he had the right to do, and our distinguished friend [Mr. WOLCOTT], for whom I have the highest regard, said, "I will let him go on for a little while longer." Well, he did. He was very generous with me on the time, and I went ahead, but I am not the one charged with the duty of making a record here. It is the duty of the committee chairman to make a record that will justify this expenditure. I ask you to read the hearings and see if you can find any justification for voting for this expenditure, which is tantamount to reaching into Uncle Sam's pocket and building six ivory-towered buildings for more employees to count more money and clear more checks for the private commercial banks of the country. I am just calling this to your attention. This bill should be sent back to the Committee on Banking and Currency for the purpose of making searching inquiry into the Federal Reserve System expenditures and see these audits for the past few years and see what has been going on.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is no more time on the other side. There is none here.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no further requests for time. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] can explain what this bill does much better than I can.

I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4605) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4605, with Mr. SHEEHAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is entitled to 1 hour and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is entitled to 1 hour.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is very simple, and surely is not as complicated as the Federal Reserve System appears to be.

The Federal Reserve has, on other occasions, asked for and received from the House committee authority to build branch banks. Just previous to Korea the Senate passed a bill almost identical in form with the present bill. It was at the close of the session and the House did not pass the bill because of the war situation, although it had been reported from our committee. The program at that time was postponed because of the shortage of building materials.

The House, on two occasions, has had this matter before it. It has, on those two occasions, reviewed the necessity for the building of these branch banks. I think we have made quite a complete record. On no other occasion, however, has the justification for the building of these branch banks turned upon the advisability of continuing the Federal Reserve System as a central banking system in the United States.

So far as I am concerned I do not think this bill should turn upon the amount of profits of the Federal Reserve System or the question of the interest rates which are paid or received on Government bonds.

This bill provides that in the aggregate branch-bank buildings may be constructed and major additions made so long as the total expended does not exceed this $30 million, which is an increase of $20 million over their present authorization.

The gentleman from Texas said that there were six buildings involved. I am sure the gentleman misspoke himself; there are 16 buildings involved; 6 new buildings, 1 each at Buffalo, Nashville, Louisville—and I am surprised to find 3 of them in Texas—El Paso, Houston, and San Antonio, and major additions to 10 buildings: at Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Charlotte, Birmingham, New Orleans, Denver, Oklahoma City, Omaha, Los Angeles, and Salt Lake City.

These additions and new buildings will cost the Federal Reserve out of its capital funds about $18,500,000. The Federal Reserve, of course, operates with a capital, and they have certain capital expenditures the same as every bank in the United States. The capital expenditures in this case are carried as assets of the Federal Reserve System. I hope the gentleman from Texas will not argue that the Federal Reserve System should

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

be dissolved and disbanded. The committee of which he is a member has filed a report—he has referred to it—the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has issued two reports on this, and as chairman of that committee I am now in the process of setting up subcommittees which again will deal with various phases of the credit and monetary policies of the United States.

In the reports of these two subcommittees, one headed by the Senator from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS, 2 years ago, and the other headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], last year, both came to the same conclusions. I was honored to be a member of both these committees. I shall put their whole recommendations in as part of my remarks. This Joint Committee on the Economic Report, according to my understanding and according to the manner in which I seek to have it function under my chairmanship, is that it make recommendations on monetary, fiscal, and economic policies for the guidance of the legislative committees of the House and Senate. It is a coordinating committee, a committee set up to coordinate economic and fiscal information and to make recommendations on these matters. Both of the subcommittees used the same language in making their recommendations, the one of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] was chairman, and the one of which Senator DOUGLAS was chairman. The reports say:

> We recommend that an appropriate, flexible, and vigorous monetary policy, employed in coordination with fiscal and other policies, should be one of the principal methods used to achieve the purposes of the Employment Act.

I might say parenthetically that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report was set up under the Employment Act of 1946.

> Timely flexibility toward easy credit at some times and credit restriction at other times is an essential characteristic of a monetary policy that will promote economic stability rather than instability.

I am rather amazed to find in a report sponsored by the gentleman from Texas that he is in favor of the Federal Reserve restricting credit.

Going on with the report:

> The vigorous use of a restrictive monetary policy as an anti-inflation measure has been inhibited since the war by considerations relating to holding down the yields and supporting the prices of United States Government securities. As a long run matter, we favor interest rates as low as they can be without inducing inflation, for low interest rates stimulate capital investment. But we believe that the advantages of avoiding inflation are so great and that a restrictive monetary policy can contribute so much to this end that the freedom of the Federal Reserve to restrict credit and raise interest rates for general stabilization purposes should be restored even if the cost should prove to be a significant increase in service charges on the Federal debt and a greater inconvenience to the Treasury in its sale of securities for new financing and refunding purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I quote that merely to show that as late as last year we recognized the suitability of the Federal Reserve System as the agent of Congress to stabilize our economy. If it is going to do the job which it was set up to do way back in 1913, and it has functioned continuously since 1913, it has to be housed and it has to be given the machinery to accomplish the purposes for which it was created.

Let us not fall into the error of contributing to the nationalization of credit as Great Britain did; let us not fall into the error of assuming that this Congress can administer satisfactorily and efficiently the provision of the Constitution that the Congress of the United States shall coin and regulate the value of our money. We set up an agency of the Congress, the Federal Reserve, to do that and there are certain judgments which we delegated along with it, certain restrictions, certain limitations upon the use of this power; but at any time this Congress can set up new standards. My point is, this is not the bill by which the Congress should set up any new rules for the guidance of the Federal Reserve System in administering this power which we have delegated it.

I remember years ago a movement here in America to bring the Federal Reserve within the executive establishment of the Government, turn it over to the President of the United States. Suggestions were made at that time that every bank would have to come into the Federal Reserve System in order to have its deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Then members of the Federal Reserve Board, being a part of the executive establishment, could be removed at will and the President of the United States could have written the loan policy of every bank in the United States, thereby effectuating socializing—nationalization, if you please, but I want to call it by its right name—socializing credit here in the United States. This Congress said, "No, we are going to maintain the independence of the Federal Reserve System" and it did maintain the independence of the Federal Reserve System, although during recent years it has been difficult for it to do so against the pressures brought to bear to destroy its independence. So, as of today, 40 years after it was set up, this Congress, being jealous of this independent agency which it set up to do the job we have the constitutional obligation to do, we find it still intact, still functioning, and so far as I am concerned the Federal Reserve is going to continue as an independent agency of this Government and it is going to be given the facilities to do the job that we in the Congress have given it authority to do.

I surely trust that no one will at this moment expect us in this Congress to reorganize the Federal Reserve System, especially under a bill as minor as this. This, to me, is the only controversy in this bill, and I hope I have explained the bill satisfactorily so that we all can conclude that the Federal Reserve needs this authority to build 10 additions to their branch buildings, and 6 new branch banks, having in mind that it comes out of their capital funds and it is treated as a capital asset. I think it all turns on the question whether we want to continue the Federal Reserve to do the job they were set up to do and whether we are willing to give it the proper facilities to do that job.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard for the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I know he is a deep student of our economy and financial matters, but I think that the questions that he has brought up today are irrelevant and immaterial to the consideration of this bill.

When I was chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, just before the Korean war, I introduced an identical bill because I thought it was essential for the proper functioning of the Federal Reserve to be properly equipped and adequately housed.

The Federal Reserve has made some mistakes, the Treasury has made some mistakes, but we cannot abolish these agencies or departments of the Government because we do not agree with them. There was a panic in 1907—I remember it—a panic when the sources of credit and money were dried up entirely. I saw script money used because there was no adequate circulation of money in the Nation. In 1913, under Woodrow Wilson's administration, the Federal Reserve System was created as a reservoir of credit for our banking system and for the stabilization of our economy. I think it was well conceived. If we abolish the Federal Reserve today, we certainly will have to establish some other agency to take its place. Before that time there was no coordination in the banking system. Banks collapsed like houses of cards, and they had recurrent money panics.

You cannot make a political issue out of this, because the Federal Reserve was created under a Democratic administration. William McChesney Martin was appointed by President Truman as Under Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and he was appointed by President Truman as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. President Eisenhower has reappointed him. Whether or not he has made any mistakes, I am sure he is an honest, conscientious, able, and modest gentleman, one for whom I have great respect, and is an excellent Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The other members of the Board, I am confident, are also men of ability and good character. What is the purpose of this bill? Merely to house properly the Federal Reserve banks. And it has no other purpose. The Federal Reserve System is a permanent institution and will be here probably after these buildings provided for in the bill will be no longer serviceable. It is certainly a proper thing to house the great agencies of our Government in buildings that will express the dignity of their functions and the dignity of the Government. I am always glad to see my people come from home and see the great buildings and the great beauty of this great city. I am glad to see those from foreign lands come here, because I know it impresses them with the importance and the dignity and the power of our country. I want to see all agencies of the Government housed properly, and that is the only issue here.

If we should abolish the Federal Reserve today, and we are not going to do it, but if we should, we would have to establish some other agency. It would need this housing that they ask for. Where is the loss? I know nothing better to buy at this time than real estate, and to carry it as reserves. So there is no loss.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This bill has just one purpose, that is, to give more room to the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. SPENCE. That is it

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They made out a good case for it. They pay for this room by the money they have made themselves. That is all that is involved in this.

Mr. SPENCE. That is all.

I do not want to make political issues out of things that are justified. We cannot make a political issue out of this. We may make a political issue out of policies that are pursued. But there is no politics in this bill. I would prostitute myself if I stood here and opposed it. I voted for the bill in committee, and a short time ago I introduced an identical bill. I ask that you vote for the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

FOR WHOM ARE THE BUILDINGS NEEDED?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do want to comment on what the distinguished gentlemen from Michigan and from Kentucky have said about the bill. The first is that I have no desire to destroy the Federal Reserve System. I have never worked in that direction in my life. I believe the Federal Reserve System, however, should be administered properly just like any other agency of our Government. I do not believe it should be allowed to be wasteful. I do not believe it should be allowed to have any more privileges than any other kind of agency. I believe it should be accountable to the Congress, the body that created it, and I insist the only thing involved here is not the dissolution of the Federal Reserve—that has not been suggested at all and there is no question about that—the question is of building more Federal buildings—more Federal Reserve bank buildings. For whom are these buildings being constructed? That is the issue. It has not been denied. I have said here that those buildings are being constructed to clear checks for private banks and to count money for private banks. I am not objecting to the buildings being built for the private banks if they are willing to pay for them and to pay the employees to man them and to do the work of the private banks. That is the only question involved here.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Will these buildings be exempt from local taxation?

Mr. PATMAN. They will pay what you might call an ad valorem tax. You see the Federal Reserve System is exempt from all taxes except real-estate taxes in the respective States. They are supposed to pay the local real-estate taxes.

Mr. DIES. Is there any consideration given to the idea of letting these banks rent such quarters as they may need?

Mr. PATMAN. That is the point. Right now, you see, if you read the hearings, they do not even attempt to tell you how much it costs in these various cities right now to rent quarters. It might cost half as much as the interest would be on this amount. I do not know. That is the reason I believe that this bill should be recommitted so that the committee will bring in a report here that shows in each case how much is proposed to be spent in that particular city and how much it will cost in this particular city to run the service and how much it would cost if the new building was built. That is what you do in private business, but you are not doing it here.

FUNDS SUBJECT TO THE WILL OF CONGRESS

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] suggested that these were capital funds belonging to the Federal Reserve banks. But remember this, they are funds subject to the will of this Congress. They are just keeping them there temporarily—they do not belong to the Federal Reserve banks. I can give you an illustration, and that illustration is that when we set up the FDIC—the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—we dipped into the Federal Reserve banks surplus funds and took out $139 million and put it over to the FDIC as part of their capital, and when the FDIC paid it back, they paid it back to the Treasury of the United States. That is where it belonged. So it is a capital fund subject to the will of the Congress. If we do not spend it on these fine buildings, we can pay it on the national debt or we can pay it on anything else. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is a very clever debater. I take my hat off to him for dodging—I will not say "dodging" as that is the wrong word, and I will strike that out of the RECORD—for not really discussing the issues of this debate. If I needed a good lawyer in a case, I think I would like to have the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. He is a good lawyer. He knows exactly how to keep the argument away from the main issue if he is on the wrong side. Now here he is on the wrong side. He will not argue the merits at all. He just gets up here and says, "The dissolution of the Federal Reserve should not be allowed." He talks about the capital funds and more room for them to do more business, but he does not tell you that business is for the private, commercial banks. He does not deny it. He would not deny it, because it is. Mr. Martin himself, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, testified before the committee that the reason they needed these buildings was to take care of more employees. Their business was increasing. What business? Private commercial banks'. Here we have a party that has just come into power. I am not trying to make political issues out of this at all, but this party is in power and General Eisenhower is a good, honest, sincere, and conscientious person, and is going to do his best to make a good President. I have been supporting him and I expect to continue to support him as long as I believe it is in the interest of the country. I do not believe President Eisenhower would be in favor of taking public funds and using them to clear checks for private banks and pay employees for that service.

Let us take these six buildings that the gentleman mentioned. He says they are more, but suppose next year we have these six buildings constructed. You will have to have new people to go into those new buildings. The people will be hired by the Federal Reserve Board, paid for with cash out of Uncle Sam's pocket, to do work for private commercial banks. Can you justify that? Can the administration, can the administration leaders justify it? Here is a hundred million dollars spent that way. That is not talking about the real performance of the Federal Reserve System. That is separate and apart. One is for private banks and the other is for the Federal Reserve. Leave the Federal Reserve alone. That is all right. I believe in the independence of the Federal Reserve, but not independent of the Government.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. In all of our big cities and large towns we have national banks and trust companies and other kinds of banks, and they are in buildings that the people in the cities are proud of. All this bill does is to allow the Federal Reserve to put up the same kind of buildings that the other banks have, and do the work that we have asked them to do. Even if they spent $15 million, it is an asset. They could be sold at any time it is desired.

Mr. PATMAN. Let us take it another way. Let us say 20 banks in the gentleman's area of that fine city of Boston: Suppose they wanted the Government to put up a building for them and hire a couple of thousand people to clear their checks and count their money for them every day, in that big fine building, the gentleman would not condone that, yet he is condoning it in this bill. That is exactly what this bill is. It has nothing to do with the real duties and obligations of the Federal Reserve System. It is performing a function that the private banks themselves should pay for.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. When we gave authorization in the first place for the Federal Reserve to build buildings, it was away back over 20 years ago?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Now it costs anywhere from four to five times as much to build the same kind of building.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not arguing about the cost. If it is small or large the principle remains the same. The principle is, will you use public funds—and that is what you will do if you vote for this bill—you are voting to take public funds and spend $20 million of it for fine ivory-towered buildings to count checks in and to count money in for the private banks of the country. Nobody

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

can deny that because that is what is happening.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I always figured that that is all any bank did—count money.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right, but they do not dip into Uncle Sam's pocket to get the money to pay the help to do it. Here you are dipping into Uncle Sam's pocket and bringing out money and paying for employees that are working for private banks.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The Federal Reserve has been a great asset to the Federal Government in buying up bonds under the 3½-percent plan.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. The Federal Reserve renders a great deal of service for the Federal Government, but do you know that the Federal Government and the United States Treasury pay in cash every month for that service? But the private banks, that get 90 percent of the service, do not pay anything. That is the point I am trying to make. You say they clear a lot of checks for the Government agencies, and that is true, but for that service the Federal agencies pay them, pay them in cash, pay them money. They paid them $20 million last year for it. But the private banks for which they rendered the greatest service and the principal paid nothing, and here you are authorizing them to have more buildings, to have more employees to do more work for private banks and get nothing for it. I think you ought to think that through, my dear sir. I do not believe you will condone it. I am just inviting this to your attention to think it over. I know it is too quick and too sudden to expect any action on it probably, but it is a serious question.

Do not think that the Federal Reserve System is so sacred that you cannot utter a word of criticism against it. I suspect that the law of averages applies to the thousands of employees of the Federal Reserve System, that you will find the rotten apples in the barrel just the same as you will find them in any large group of employees; but yet over a period of 40 years Congress has not received one notice, not one notice where the auditors have gone through a bank or system and made criticism or suggestions, not one; and we are told by our agent that if you want to see them you come down to the Federal Reserve Bank Building and look at them, that there are some of them that may be confidential, indicating that we might not get to see them. Think of your agents telling you that. That shows how arrogant they are and how over the years they have been built up to think nobody can criticize them and get by with it. And they have gotten by with it, and right here on the floor you see that Members are not very much appreciated who seem to want to criticize them. They think that they are just above any wrongdoing. But they are not; I tell you they are just human beings like the rest of us, and we should recommit this bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the committee should bring those audits up here. We want to see them; we want to see them not for 1952 but for the last 40 years. We want to see what has been going on, what auditors have been saying. We ought to have the General Accounting Office go down there and audit these banks. They have never been audited, not one of those audits have been made except by those selected by the bank officers themselves, and reports made to them and the reports put in a locked box and nobody connected with the Congress allowed to see them.

Do you want to condone that? You condone every bit of it if you vote for this bill. The truth is not only should the audit be filed with the Committees on Banking and Currency of the House and Senate, but the funds should go into the Public Treasury that they collected all these years and they should come to the Appropriations Committee and get their money just like dozens of other agencies do under similar and like circumstances. But if you vote for this bill you vote for that secrecy, you vote for that little "Kremlin" of their own down there looking after things like they want to. Oh, yes, they say, If you want to see them come down there and you can see them, but some of them are confidential—and that indicates that probably you will not get to see them at all. That is your agent, your servant, telling you that, and that shows how arrogant they get. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, the thing we ought to do is to recommit this bill and demand that the committee bring back here a report that you can vote for.

And remember, the charges I made have not been disputed by the chairman of this committee because he cannot dispute them; he cannot dispute them, they are the truth.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. What is the purpose of the motion to recommit? What does the gentleman expect to gain by that motion that he could not gain by an amendment on the floor now?

Mr. PATMAN. There is no amendment necessary except to recommit the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Is not that the effect of recommitting the bill, to kill the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. No. We will direct them to bring back a report. Mr. Martin testified——

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The record shows that every witness testified of the need for these buildings.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Martin testified——

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. You did not testify.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Martin testified that the greatest increase in volume of work they had was in the handling of currency and in the collection of checks. That is right. For whom? The private commercial banks—at the expense of Uncle Sam. Now you are proposing to build all these fine buildings where they can clear more checks and count more currency and have more employees to be paid by Uncle Sam. I say they ought to be paid by the private banks just the way they used to be paid.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. There is no difference between the banks they want to build now and the banks they have been building over the last 40 years.

What does the gentleman expect to gain by sending the bill back to the committee?

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman deny that these banks get all this service free? Understand the Government that put them into being, Uncle Sam, the United States Government, is charged for each and every check, it is charged for counting the money, it is charged for everything. A bill is sent to the Treasury every month and it is paid. The Government paid $20 million last year, but the private banks paid not a penny. Is the gentleman in favor of that?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman has made a very effective speech in the way of how they make money. But that is not the question here. They need the housing. The gentleman is not against the Federal Reserve System because he has stated in the committee hearing he is not.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right, I am not. I am for it properly administered.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They say they need more buildings.

Mr. PATMAN. But I say they have been doing the wrong thing by not charging the private banks like they charge the Treasury. Let every fellow pay his part.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They made $273 million last year.

Mr. PATMAN. That is interest on Government bonds.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes. Who gave them that authority?

Mr. PATMAN. We did, the Congress did. They are our agents.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I note here in the report three of these banks are in Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Sure.

Mr. GAVIN. At El Paso, Houston, and San Antonio.

Mr. PATMAN. That was called to my attention. Some Member probably thought that would influence me. It did not and will not influence me at all.

Mr. GAVIN. Now may I ask a question?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. Are the banking interests in Texas objecting to this legislation?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know whether they object or not.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman represents the State of Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. They get their benefits like anybody else. But here is a $100 million franking privilege or subsidy, I do not care what you call it, it is here, and the question is, when it has been brought to your attention, Do you want to stop, look, listen, and think, and see where you go from here or just keep on doing it? The point is you should send this bill back to the committee and have that committee look into it thoroughly and stop this practice.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Texas should bear in mind that the Federal Reserve banks are the depositories of the reserve funds of all of these independent banks he refers to, and they make no charge for keeping these reserves. As to whether they are reimbursed for this clearing house operation of theirs, this is the law:

> The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall by rule fix charges to be collected by the member banks from its patrons whose checks are cleared through the Federal Reserve bank and the charge which may be imposed for the service of clearing or collection rendered by the Federal Reserve bank.

I think that is an answer to the charge as to whether they do all of this for nothing or not and whether this system is set up for the benefit of these private banks.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman claim that the private banks pay anything? If so, I wish he would bring it to my attention.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I do. If the Federal Reserve is not requiring them to do it, surely the gentleman should then attack the policy of the Federal Reserve in not doing it because the law expressly says they shall fix it.

Mr. PATMAN. That is what I am doing here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Call it to their attention. I contend that they pay for these services.

Mr. PATMAN. It is absolutely not that way. They do not pay a penny for it. The Government pays for the service, but the private banks do not pay a penny.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is it because the Federal Reserve Board has not fixed the charge?

Mr. PATMAN. No, they did not fix the charge. They have sent no bills. They do send a bill to the Treasury.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They get it in other ways. Let me repeat to the gentleman the section:

> The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall by rule fix charges to be collected by the member banks from its patrons whose checks are cleared through the Federal Reserve Bank and the charge which may be imposed for the service of clearing or collection rendered by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Mr. PATMAN. Is that section 16?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is United States Code, title 12, section 360. That is a part of the Federal Reserve Act and has been since 1913.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take all the 10 minutes. I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and I think he has rendered an outstandingly valuable service to his country in his constructive criticism of the administration of the Federal Reserve System. No man in America is the equal of WRIGHT PATMAN in intimate, thorough, detailed knowledge and understanding of the money question. I am glad he has taken the opportunity of this debate to give us, and the country as well, the benefit of his views on the entire administrative structure of the Federal Reserve System. As to the bill now before us, however, I cannot stand in opposition to my chairman and the ranking member of my party on the committee. They are agreed that the new housing is necessary for the proper functioning of this agency of the Congress. Chairman Martin stated to our committee (a) that most of the Federal Reserve branch buildings were built or acquired over 25 years ago, (b) money in circulation, about $30 billion, flowing through the Federal Reserve banks and branches is more than three times what it was before World War II, and (c) since 1940, the number of coins received and counted by the Federal Reserve branches has more than tripled, the pieces of paper currency received and counted has more than doubled, and the number of checks has nearly tripled. It would seems that a good case has been presented as to the necessity of providing new and enlarged housing.

But, Mr. Chairman, in supporting this authorization because I do not wish to handicap an agency of the Congress or to embarrass the administration I am subjecting myself to some embarrassment in explaining how the 83d Congress could authorize expenditures for new homes for bankers when it could not find money for public housing. Yes, Mr. Chairman, this body even voted to cut down to the bone the appropriation for the Central Intelligence Agency. My constituents are going to ask me why this House is cutting down for everyone except the bankers and in cutting down the appropriation for the Central Intelligence Agency was it being sympathetic to the Communists. I will be forced to say to them that I am in as much confusion as they are to find a plausible explanation for the actions on the other side of the aisle.

On page 23 of the printed report of the public hearings on H. R. 4605 is a list of the directors brought in from the Federal Reserve Bank System to administrative agencies of the executive department in the Eisenhower administration. This list was furnished by Chairman Martin on the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. It is illuminating and it is revealing.

I am surprised to find on page 23 that the Secretary of the Navy is on the list, the man selected by this administration to be Secretary of the Army is also listed, the gentleman selected to be Assistant Secretary of Defense is another former director of a Federal Reserve bank. I wonder why it was done. This is a big bankers' administration—that we know. What are they fearing if at the head of the Army and the head of the Navy, and in the Defense high command they put gentlemen with past association in financial circles. Have we no other group in America except bankers? What training is there in the executive offices of Federal Reserve banks peculiarly to qualify for the job of running the Army and the Navy? I hope there is no ugly significance to this monopoly by the bankers of the key spots in the Armed Forces.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Certainly I yield to my beloved friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And that affection is reciprocated. The gentleman comes from the same county in my district. May I ask, has the gentleman forgotten those General Motors fellows? That is what I was inquiring about.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Have we any General Motors fellows?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. We do not have any in the Democratic Party. General welfare of all the people is our concern.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman was talking about bankers, and I wondered whether he was not going to stray off on the General Motors appointees. I want to be here if you do.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. If the gentleman will consult the list of 29 billion-dollar corporations just published he will find General Motors, the oil barons and the big bankers all in the same bed—the invisible government that has taken over.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You will admit they are doing a good job—wait a minute—they are trying to do a good job, will you not?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. For whom?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For the country. For you.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. In individual cases they have always done a mighty good job for themselves but when they took over the country in Mr. Hoover's administration, as they are doing now, the people went "bust."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you think they did any more than Phil Murray?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Phil Murray?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, for themselves, than Phil Murray did for himself?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. If the gentleman will bear with me, and this is merely a matter of what philosophy you wish to adopt, I think that a man who gives his life and his talents for working people, helping little people in their quest for some share of the sunlight, I think he is doing a bigger job for his country and for all mankind than the man who gives his life and his talents building up primarily for his own advantage.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, John L. Lewis did. He priced coal out of the market so that the boys over there have been yelling for a week about unemployment down in the coal fields.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Does the gentleman wish to debate with me the merits and the demerits of John Lewis?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I could get an audience anywhere that would listen, I would.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if no other Member wishes me to yield, I yield back the remainder of my time.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], and I know he was sincere about it, said that the private commercial banks must pay an interest charge or pay something for this service. He really believes that. I am not questioning his sincerity at all. However, I do not believe they are making such a payment.

The record to sustain my viewpoint is the Federal Reserve report, which is issued every year. I do not have the 1952 report here, and do not have it broken down, but the report I do have here, of 1950, compares favorably and proportionately with the reports of the years 1951, 1952, and other years.

The total expenses for the 12 banks for 1950 were $96 million. How were the reimbursements made? There were reimbursements of $15,797,000. Who made those reimbursements? The Treasury Department remitted $12,975,000, the other Government agencies $1,276,000, that is all, or a total of about $15 million.

The private banks, although the same service was rendered for them, or most of it was rendered for them, the buildings used for them, the employees used for them, this cafeteria subsidized in their behalf, to the amount of a million dollars a year, yet they did not pay a penny, they did not pay one penny in the world. You can rely on that. There is no way in the world to question it or disprove it because it is a record, that is why.

So I insist that the point involved here is so serious that has been brought to your attention that I think the committee should take the bill back and look into this for the purpose of determining whether or not they want to continue this enormous subsidy at Government expense, or should they make the private commercial banks that profit from it pay the expense of it. That is the issue involved here.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the gentleman mean to contend that the private banks of the country are performing no service for the Federal Government?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not say they are not, but the commercial banks cannot object in view of the benefit received from the Federal Government.

Mr. GEORGE. Who does the gentleman think have been handling the tremendous amount of paper work in the last 20 years that has been involved in carrying on this $260 million debt?

Mr. PATMAN. The bankers are civic minded and patriotic. I take my hat off to them for doing it. But they are being paid by the Government, too. During the war, just one instance, they were allowed to buy $108 billion worth of United States Government bonds, through a bookkeeping transaction, just put down on the books without any reserve whatsoever. They created the dollars. That is one thing they did. I can find a dozen other instances. So it is not a one-way street.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I wanted the gentleman to admit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso contained in the ninth paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 522), is hereby further amended by striking out "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$30,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHEEHAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4605) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 230, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PATMAN moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 4605, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a short announcement on behalf of our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CRETELLA].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that it may appear in the RECORD that our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CRETELLA] was necessarily absent yesterday at the time of the rollcall on the so-called tidelands-oil bill because of the necessity of receiving medical attention.

DAIRY FARMER IS BACKBONE OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the House on a subject which is most interesting to me and which should interest all of us at this time—the dairy industry and the programs affecting it.

Milk, butter, and cheese are all foods which provide better living at the family table. Our family never complains about the price we pay for dairy products, because we know that we are getting our full money's worth in relation to the cost of other foods we buy.

Butter has been in the news for the last month or so. Frankly, I am somewhat concerned about the tone of some of the official statements which have been made on butter. I have also been concerned about some of the news stories and editorial comments that have appeared in the press in the large consuming centers of the East.

It is difficult for us to understand some of these statements and press releases. The question we ask ourselves is why misleading statements continue to appear concerning the dairy industry. Oftentimes these statements are used in such a way as to imply that the farmers who produce dairy products are trying in some way to take advantage of consumers.

FALSEHOODS BOMBARD HOUSEWIFE

I am wondering what the housewife must think. She is told that butter is pricing itself out of the market because of the price-support program. She is bombarded with stories about the big surplus of butter. She hears talk about spoilage and waste.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it would almost seem that an effort is being made to make butter the horrible example of price-support programs.

I am reminded of what happened a few years ago to potatoes. Such a hue and cry was raised about potatoes, that instead of a better program being worked out for potato farmers, the program was discontinued.

The same thing could easily happen to the program for dairy farmers. I am

concerned about this. I come from one of the great dairy States. The economy of the district I represent is based largely on dairying. The livelihood of my friends and neighbors, both on the farms and in the business communities, depends to a great extent upon the production and sale of dairy products.

Now, I am certain that the Secretary of Agriculture would not deliberately lend himself to a campaign that might hurt the dairy farmer. But I am forced to state Mr. Speaker, that the tone of some of his statements has helped create a public feeling about butter that may very well make it harder to work out a proper and sensible solution to the dairy problem.

I do not believe there is a Member of this Congress, or a dairy farmer, who would not prefer to get a fair return on his dairy products on the free market, rather than depend at any time on a price-support program.

The butter problem is a serious one. I have said before, and I repeat now, that the dairy program can be improved. But I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that a solution could be worked out in a calmer atmosphere.

NEED FACTS, NOT FUSS

Up to now, I am afraid we have had too much of public complaint about the butter situation, and not enough of serious diagnosis of the reasons for this program. So far as public discussion is concerned, we have had an oversupply of fuss and a shortage of fact.

The butter industry has done a remarkable job over the years of narrowing the spread in price from the creamery where butter is manufactured to the consumer's table. For example, eggs that are selling on the market in Little Falls, Minn., for 43 cents a dozen cost us 65 cents a dozen in Washington. Butter, on the other hand, shows a spread of only about 8 cents a pound.

While the farmer has been receiving a fair share of the butter dollar, the same is not true of other dairy products. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics says that the farmer presently receives less than 50 cents of the consumer's food dollar spent for dairy products.

This would indicate that the marketing system needs improvement. Present milk regulations in some areas place unnecessary costs on farmers and add nothing to the quality of the product. While research can find better ways of producing good, wholesome milk, the regulations which have piled up over the years also should be brought up to date. Modern equipment makes many of them impractical and unnecessary.

Arbitrary barriers set up by both Government and private sources make it impossible to bring enough dairy products to the consumer at a price he is willing to pay and which guarantees the farmer a fair share of the food dollar.

DAIRYING IS VITAL

Dairymen want to produce the most wholesome, high quality product it is possible for them to produce. We need this production, and we need the kind of agriculture dairymen have helped to build in the United States.

An agriculture based on animals is the backbone of the American standard of living. Animal agriculture builds and conserves our precious soil. The health and wealth of our country lie in the top 6 inches of our soil. Conservation of this topsoil is the concern of both urban and rural people because it determines what we and our children shall eat.

In large part, an animal agriculture depends upon the dairy cow. If much of our topsoil is kept in grass, forage crops, and forests, the problem of conservation will pretty much take care of itself. And the dairy cow can convert grass into the most valuable and nutritious food know to man.

Not only does the dairy cow produce the milk we need, she also represents stored food on the hoof. Sale of these cows for meat represents at least a third of the dairy farmer's income.

Labor and business should be concerned with the maintenance of a healthy dairy industry. It has been estimated that at least 10 million persons depend upon dairying for their livelihood.

At the same time, 60 percent of our farms depend upon the dairy cow as the major source of income. Dairy products and meat from dairy animals provided about 30 percent of the cash farm income in 1951. This is 1½ times the cash received from hogs, 3 times that received from wheat, and 3 times that received from cotton.

WILL NEED PRODUCTION

Our dairy industry has a job to do for the future prosperity of our country, and to maintain and improve our diet. In 1942, the production on farms was 879 pounds of milk per capita. In 1951, it was 749 pounds per capita. Our estimated population in 1975 will be 190 million people. That means that if we are to provide these people with as much milk per person as we now have, annual production will have to be increased by 30 billion pounds more than now being produced.

There is an old saying that it takes three generations to make a farm but only one to tear it down. We all know of countries which are dependent mainly upon a direct grain economy, and where farms have been robbed of their fertility and famines have become an age-old problem. With adequate dairy herds this will not happen to our country.

All of this should help us to see our present problems in perspective. It is vital to our future that the dairy industry be made strong and kept strong. To permit a temporary problem to throw us into panic and abandon the gains we have made is a dangerous and foolish attitude for which we must all pay eventually. Let us face facts and advance to a sound, long-range solution that will strengthen, not weaken, the dairy industry.

FACTS ON BUTTER

The recent hearings of the subcommittee on agriculture of the House Committee on Appropriations brought out some of the facts on the present butter situation, and the butter price-support program, which I wish to call to the attention of the House:

First. We do not have an unparalleled situation today. In August of 1950, the Commodity Credit Corporation had 69 million pounds more butter in storage than it had in mid-April of this year. Most of this butter surplus in 1950 was sold back to the trade without loss in a period of a few months, as prices advanced.

The only loss was on butter donated to the school-lunch program, welfare agencies, and what was sold for export. Commodity Credit Corporation's estimate of a $48 million loss on butter in the 4 years from 1949 through 1952 amounted to less than 1 cent a pound on the butter produced in this period—far less than the loss farmers would have taken in a single year of heavy production had there been no support program.

Second. Never before in history has so much milk been produced during the winter months as during the December-March period of this last winter. Only once before has the winter-milk production exceeded the low point in summer production by as large a percentage as in the last season. That was in March of 1935, following the very severe drought of 1934.

Third. On March 31, 1952, cold storage stocks of butter totaled 6.5 million pounds. Of this total, 4.8 million pounds were in commercial storage; the remainder was held by the Government—probably the military, because Commodity Credit Corporation had no stocks at that time.

On March 31, 1953, cold-storage stocks of butter totaled 129.3 million pounds. Commercial holdings were estimated by the Department of Agriculture at no greater than a year earlier. The increase in total storage stocks over a year ago is represented by Government stocks.

The main reason for this increase in Government-held stocks is the unprecedented large production last winter. Another reason is Department of Agriculture hesitation in continuing the butter price-support program.

Fourth. Not a pound of butter held by the Commodity Credit Corporation is spoiling now, nor is it in any danger of spoiling so long as it is properly handled. Butter is stored at temperatures ranging from zero to 10 degrees below zero. It can be held at least a year and has been held as long as 2 years.

Fifth. A Department of Agriculture witness was asked how much butter taken under the price-support programs actually did spoil and was unfit for human consumption.

His answer: "None."

Sixth. When price-support butter is supplied to the school-lunch program it is packaged into 1-pound prints out of 60-pound cubes. There is a little waste resulting from this operation, due to cleaning equipment and the handling involved, just as you get a little sawdust when you saw a log.

During the period 1949–51, the Department printed and repackaged about 19.2 million pounds of butter for such purposes. About 5,400 pounds of butter had to be disposed of as salvage, or waste, butter as a result of this repackaging operation. This waste represented about one thirty-fifth of 1 percent of the total quantity repackaged.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

FIGURES TELL STORY

In a recent speech before the American Dairy Association in Chicago, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson spoke of a decline in the production of creamery butter of some 666 million pounds from 1941 through 1952. Then the Secretary said, and I am quoting:

In these 11 years population has increased by 23 million people, while the much smaller quantity of butter, 1,206 million pounds, has been depending on Government price supports. Excessive artificial aids are rapidly destroying the markets for which they were designed to protect.

Department of Agriculture figures, on the other hand, show that during the period when per capita consumption declined most, there was no price-support program in operation. Other factors had more to do with the decline in butter consumption than the price-support program itself.

Mr. Speaker, the following information obtained from Department of Agriculture releases bears out this fact:

Year	Butter purchases for price support purposes by USDA	Per capita butter consumption
	Pounds	*Pounds*
1938	142,000,000	16.4
1939	25,400,000	17.2
1940	10,600,000	16.7
1941	11,500,000	15.8
1942	None	15.7
1943	None	11.7
1944	None	11.8
1945	None	10.8
1946	None	10.4
1947	None	11.1
1948	None	9.9
1949	114,300,000	10.4
1950	127,900,000	10.6
1951	200,000	9.5
1952	16,100,000	8.8

The Department of Agriculture had announced a support program for butter during the entire war and postwar period. But no price-support purchases of butter were made from November 29, 1942, through December 31, 1948, "because of the strong commercial market demand for butter." This is a quotation from an official Department of Agriculture publication.

In 1942, the per capita consumption of butter was 15.7 pounds a person. In 1948 consumption had declined to 9.9 pounds a person—a loss of 5.8 pounds a person. During the entire period there were no butter price-support purchase operations. During 1949 and 1950 when there were large butter purchases, per capita consumption of butter increased one-half pound per person.

From 1950 through 1952 when only 16,285,494 pounds of butter were purchased, per capita consumption declined 1.8 pounds a person. Based on past experience, it is possible that per capita consumption of butter may increase again.

Mr. Speaker, I would not question the integrity or the sincerity of the Secretary of Agriculture. But I feel sure that if the Secretary had had all the facts before he prepared his Chicago speech his wording would have been more carefully phrased.

I am glad to see that the Department of Agriculture is working on a solution to this problem. I wish the Department every success in this effort. I hope the Department's solution will give the dairy farmer a fair price in the market, without the need for a price-support program.

Mr. Speaker, we can use facts from the Department of Agriculture. We have use for new and imaginative solutions to farm problems. But there is no market in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, for economic theories that went into discard 20 years ago.

Let us keep the farm programs we have now, until better ones are worked out and brought forward.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members of the House may be granted leave of absence for the remainder of the week because of their official attendance at the atomic tests in Nevada: Messrs. BELCHER, BETTS, BOLAND, BOLLING, BRAY, BROOKS of Texas, BROWNSON, CARNAHAN, CEDERBERG, COLE of Missouri, COLMER, DEANE, DOLLIVER, ELLIOTT, HAGEN of California, HELLER, JENKINS, Mrs. KEE, Messrs. KNOX, LYLE, McGREGOR, McVEY, MURRAY, O'NEILL, PROUTY, REAMS, RICHARDS, RIEHLMAN, RIVERS, SCOTT, SELDEN, WATTS, WHEELER, WICKERSHAM, and YOUNG.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was granted permission to include certain articles in the RECORD but failed to have them prepared in time. I ask unanimous consent that they may be placed in the RECORD today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE SPOILS SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, some days ago, I found it necessary to denounce the Republican political machine in West Virginia and certain top-level officials of the party, here in Washington, due to the arbitrary and unfair manner in which Mr. M. G. Burnside, a former Member of Congress, was summarily removed from his civil-service position. The appointment of Mr. Burnside to a highly technical and security place in the Department of Defense was purely on merit and due to his outstanding scholastic background.

These Republican politicians stated that Mr. Burnside was a discredited politician because of his recent defeat in the 1952 congressional election. I am now wondering what they mean by the term "discredited politician." A careful check of the appointments by the Eisenhower administration before and since the discharge of Mr. Burnside, discloses that to date 16 former Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives have been appointed to political positions without any regard whatsoever as to their qualifications under the civil service system.

In addition to this list, there are several other appointments including defeated candidates for governor of the various States.

For the information of my colleagues, and in order to keep the record straight, I desire to read into the RECORD, the names and positions now occupied by these "paragons of political purity":

Ben H. Guill, Representative, Texas, elected in special election in Texas in 1949, defeated next election. Appointed as Special Assistant to Postmaster General.

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Representative to the United Nations. Former Senator from Massachusetts. Defeated in 1952 elections.

Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Former House Member from North Dakota. Defeated in 1952 primaries.

Albert M. Cole, former Representative from Kansas. Defeated by HOWARD MILLER in 1952 election. Appointed head of Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Harry P. Cain, member of Subversive Activities Control Board. Former Senator from Washington. Defeated by HENRY M. JACKSON in 1952 election.

Harmar D. Denny, Civil Aeronautics Board. Former House Member from Pennsylvania. Defeated in 1952 election.

Ross Rizley, Solicitor, Post Office Department. Former Representative from Oklahoma. Defeated by Senator KERR.

Thomas J. Herbert, Chairman of Subversive Activities Control Board. Former Governor of Ohio.

Val Peterson, Civil Defense Administrator. Peterson is a former Governor of Nebraska. While never a Member of Congress, he ran against Senator BUTLER and was defeated in the Republican primaries.

Parke M. Banta, Chief Counsel, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Former Representative from Missouri. Defeated for reelection in 1948.

Forest M. Harness, Sergeant at Arms, United States Senate. Former Representative from Indiana. Defeated in 1948.

Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President. Former Representative from New Hampshire.

John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State. Former Senator from New York.

Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce. Former Senator from Massachusetts.

Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State. Former Representative from Kentucky.

Joseph E. Talbot, member Tariff Commission. Former Representative from Connecticut. Defeated in race for Governor in 1946.

Ivy Baker Priest, United States Treasurer. Ran for Congress from Utah in 1950 and was defeated.

Chan Gurney, Republican, South Dakota. Appointed by former President Truman but confirmed after President Eisenhower was elected. Member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, former chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee, has already condemned this raiding of our civil-service system. I quote:

The administration's new security program is the major link in a chain of events that are crippling civil service.

President Eisenhower couldn't possibly be aware of what his Cabinet officers and his assistants are doing to the merit system, the South Carolinian declared. He called on the President to keep close watch on what was going on.

Senator JOHNSTON said recent events in civil service would plague the Republican Party for years to come.

Senator JOHNSTON also chided the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Commission and the National Civil Service League for remaining strangely silent while the new administration returns the Government to the spoils system.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JAMES.

Mr. MACHROWICZ in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas and to include two letters.

Mr. ROONEY and to include extraneous matter at that point following the ruling of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT]; and in the Appendix of the RECORD to include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. HOLT.

Mr. HARVEY in two instances and to include some editorials.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $224.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. O'NEILL (at the request of Mr. LANE) and to include an editorial.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOSS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TABER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include a table.

Mr. WHARTON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include a table.

Mr. NEAL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. GROSS and to include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. DODD) in three instances.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. NEAL, for today, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2277. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4198. An act to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4198. An act to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 18, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

695. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities of war-risk insurance and certain marine-liability insurance for the quarter ended March 31, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

696. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

697. A letter from the Chairman, Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Committee on Appropriatons. H. R. 5227. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 24. Concurrent resolution to revise and reprint the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government"; with amendment (Rept. No. 423). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House administration. House Joint Resolution 157. Joint Resolution to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242), as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 424). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5069. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5215. A bill to exempt amounts paid for admissions to wildlife sanctuaries from the Federal tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 5216. A bill to provide for a heliport in the District of Columbia, for use in helicopter service between the Friendship International Airport and the downtown area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5217. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from gross income increases in the redemption value of series E United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 5218. A bill to provide that certain enlisted men who have been prisoners of war in Korea shall be promoted one grade for each year of internment upon their return to the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5219. A bill to increase the optional standard deduction from 10 percent to 15 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, with a maximum standard deduction of $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 5220. A bill to amend the penalty provisions of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5221. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Narcotics to require the production of books, papers, and records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5222. A bill to amend chapter 203 of title 18 of the United States Code, so as to extend certain powers, including the power of arrest, to narcotics officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 5223. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1955, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5224. A bill to facilitate civil-service appointment of persons who lost opportunity therefor because of service in the Armed Forces after June 30, 1950, and to provide

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

certain benefits upon appointment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5225. A bill to protect the security of the United States by preventing the employment by the United States of persons who are disloyal to, or believe in the right to strike against, the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 5226. A bill to authorize emergency appropriations for the purpose of erecting certain post office and Federal court buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 5227. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5228. A bill to amend section 303 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23); to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 5229. A bill to provide marital deduction in case of property subject to power of appointment in surviving spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5230. A bill to provide an increase in the rates and amounts of compensation which may be earned by certain retired commissioned officers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 5231. A bill to require United States Civil Service Commission to establish regional office for State of Michigan at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Subversive Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution exempting State clubs and fraternal organizations from filing form 990; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H. Res. 236. Resolution declaring that the House does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 25, 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. Res. 237. Resolution extending greetings to the Republic of Haiti on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the creation of its national flag; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Massachusetts Senate urging immediate action in constructing the Boston lifeboat station at Castle Island in Boston Harbor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Senate to cause a study to be made of the Taft-Hartley Act with a view to revising certain portions thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to harbor improvements, Honolulu Harbor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2840 for the transfer by the United States of America to the Territory of Hawaii of certain land in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2842 to authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to public lands, to grant purchase options to certain lessees; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation permitting the sale of public lands at Waimanalo, city and county of Honolulu, without recourse to drawing or lot; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to harbor improvements, island of Kauai; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 5232. A bill to prohibit the payment to John Carter Vincent of any annuity from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, and to provide for the return to the said John Carter Vincent of the amount to his credit in such fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 5233. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant certain easements and rights-of-way to the Anover Realty Corp., of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 5234. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Sadiq; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5235. A bill for the relief of Michele Fasullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 5236. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Jarecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5237. A bill to restore and continue in full force and effect patent No. 2,038,903, issued April 28, 1936, relating to a banana rack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 5238. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Jarecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5239. A bill for the relief of Arthur Alexander McFarlane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5240. A bill for the relief of Joaquin Rivademar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5241. A bill for the relief of Samuel Pilicer (also known as Szmul Pilicer and Mrs. Ann Pilicer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5242. A bill for the relief of Moshe Kuperstoch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 5243. A bill for the relief of Rosa Ehrlich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5244. A bill for the relief of Harry Vondas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5245. A bill for the relief of Harry Vondas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

257. By Mr. HIESTAND: Petition of 39 citizens of Sunland, San Fernando, LaCanada, and Tujunga, Calif., urging support of H. R. 1227 to ban advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and TV; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

258. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Roger W. Lent and others, Connecticut Lace Works, Inc., Norwalk, Conn., requesting the protection of their living standards and jobs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 15, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we beseech Thee that Thou wilt make this moment of devotion a pavilion of Thy peace as, trusting only in Thy mercy, we bring our soiled souls to Thy cleansing grace. We come with burdens on our minds and hearts for our Nation and the world. We come with haunting fears of a war won and a peace lost, with deep anxiety concerning the future our children will inherit from our hands; yet we live in the faith that Thy trust is marching on even in the perplexities of these terrific days.

Make us ministers of that good will which asks nothing for itself that it does not covet for the whole world, and which will not halt its growing sway until it joins all nations and kindreds and tongues and peoples into one great fraternity. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 14, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 14, 1953, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 100. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 142. An act for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee;

S. 248. An act for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter;

S. 811. An act for the relief of George Mauner; and

S. 846. An act for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint reso-

lution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4605. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5174. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242), as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) to revise and reprint the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government," with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2277) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, a primary election occurs next Tuesday in Pennsylvania. I believe it is the duty of every American to take part in both primary and general elections. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the sessions of the Senate next Monday and Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in cases granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens, together with a list of such aliens, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TELEVISION CHANNEL IN VERMONT—JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Vermont, relative to the securing of a television channel in the State of Vermont.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution relating to the securing of a television channel in the State

Whereas applications are now pending before the Federal Communications Commission seeking permission to construct and operate a television station in Vermont; and

Whereas Vermont is now the only State in these United States which has not received a television grant; and

Whereas the rugged terrain of Vermont makes it impossible for its citizens to receive a satisfactory television signal from any station located beyond the borders of Vermont: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Federal Communications Commission is hereby respectfully requested and urged to designate a time for an early hearing on the applications, aforementioned, and be it further resolved that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Federal Communications Commission, and to the members of the Vermont delegation in Congress.

CONSUELO N. BAILEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.
Approved May 6, 1953.
LEE E. EMERSON,
Governor.

SALARIES OF COUNTY EMPLOYEES ADMINISTERING SOCIAL SECURITY AIDS—JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from Thomas M. Donahue, chief clerk of the Wisconsin State Senate, Senate Joint Resolution No. 32, adopted by the Wisconsin Legislature.

The resolution memorializes the Congress on salaries of county employees administering social security aids. I present the joint resolution and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution relating to memorializing Congress on salaries of county employees administering social-security aids

Whereas the Federal Security Agency under its rulemaking powers requires that all employees administering Federal grant-in-aid programs be covered under the statewide merit system standards which include salary classifications for all such employees including clerical workers, stenographers, typists, and so forth; and

Whereas in Wisconsin these Federal grant-in-aid programs are administered at the county level of government by county employees under the supervision and control of the State department of public welfare; and

Whereas the Federal Security Agency fixing salary ranges for these county employees means that counties have lost the right to fix the salaries of clerks or stenographers in the various courthouses of our State because they must follow the Federal agency's wage standard because it is impossible to have two salary ranges for the same types of positions in the county service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact legislation which will prohibit the Federal Security Agency under its rulemaking powers from including any requirements on salary ranges in promulgating its merit standards; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Wisconsin Member of Congress.

FEDERAL SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF CAMBRIDGE (MASS.) SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Cambridge school committee, of Cambridge, Mass., protesting the reduction in appropriations for the Federal school-lunch program.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas President Eisenhower has announced that the Federal Government participation in the school-lunch program will be reduced by over 10 percent; and

Whereas the Federal school-lunch program has proven its worth to the health of the Nation's school children by providing a hot, nutritious meal at a low cost; and

Whereas a reduction in aid by the Federal Government will mean an increase in the cost per meal with a resultant reduction in the number of school children able to take advantage of the present program; and

Whereas Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, has publicly requested the President of the United States to reconsider his action: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Cambridge school committee heartily endorse the Federal lunch program and urge the President of the United States to reverse his decision to reduce the appropriation for this exceedingly important assistance to our school children; and be it further

Resolved, That Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY be commended by this committee for his consideration and action in behalf of the health and well-being of our children; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Eisenhower and Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

LITHUANIA'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Americans of Lithuanian descent, residing in Norwood, Mass., commemorating the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On March 1, 1953, American Lithuanians residing in Norwood, Mass., gathered together in the Norwood Lithuanian Club auditorium to commemorate the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, notwithstanding the fact that the Lithuanian democratic republic, regardless of all international agreements and rights, became victims of the Soviet war aggressions, and to the present time remain the Kremlin dictator's offering in mass killings and deportations; and in view of the above injustice

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to our country unanimously adopted and approved the following resolutions:

"NO. 1

"Voicing strict protest against the Soviet actions in Lithuania and other occupied countries in practicing genocide, request our Government officials to ratify Genocide Convention and to join Lithuania and other Baltic nations in quest of freedom to America's foreign-affairs program.

"NO. 2

"Red imperialism jeopardizing and endeavoring to enslave other free countries, we deem it a sacred duty to our Government to aid further in all ways and means and to uphold any and all efforts of the United States in combating the expansion of international communism and to liquidate results of their atrociousness."

JOHN M. PECHULIS,
Chairman.
JONAS MARTYSIUS,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 879. A bill to amend section 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," with amendments (Rept. No. 271).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1640. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts; with an amendment (Rept. No. 272); and

S. 1643. A bill to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 273).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1903. A bill for the relief of Liselotte Appel Sawyer; and

S. 1904. A bill for the relief of Ottilie Theresa Workmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1905. A bill to amend sections 1104 and 1105 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 1906. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 1907. A bill to establish corporations to assist financial institutions in making credit available to commercial and industrial enterprises and to provide capital for such enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1908. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Jarecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. FERGUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1909. A bill for the relief of Jacob Grynberg; and

S. 1910. A bill for the relief of Yonezawa Nobuko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself, Mr. GILLETTE, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1911. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1912. A bill to make credit more readily available for financing small business and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 1913. A bill to make capital more readily available for financing small business and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1914. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces who suffer disability or death while performing travel to and from specified types of active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1915. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to require that, for the purposes of such act, certain birth certificates issued by States shall be conclusive evidence of age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1916. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. LANGER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. IVES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 1917. A bill to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special-quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself and Mr. BUTLER of Maryland):

S. 1918. A bill to amend section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1919. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide a more effective method of dealing with labor disputes in vital industries which affect the national security; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution for the establishment of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend sections 1104 and 1105 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory memorandum prepared by me on the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1905) to amend sections 1104 and 1105 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The memorandum presented by Mr. BUTLER of Maryland is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER OF MARYLAND

The purpose of the bill is to strengthen and simplify the provisions contained in title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended relating to ship mortgage insurance.

Under existing provisions of title XI, vessels to be operated in the foreign trade of the United States must be operated between the United States and foreign countries in continental North America, and between the United States and all islands lying between the continent of South America and the United States in the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean Sea, or the Atlantic Ocean, in order to be eligible for ship mortgage insurance under the provisions of the title.

The bill amends section 1104 (a) so as to remove this requirement, and extends the provisions of title XI to vessels engaged in foreign trade between the United States and foreign countries.

Also under the present provisions of title XI, a mortgage under an insured mortgage must acquire title and possession of the vessel, by foreclosure or with the Maritime Administrator's consent, before he is entitled to have debentures issued to him by the Maritime Administration for the unpaid balance of his mortgage.

Many banks and other lending institutions are unwilling to advance funds under the provisions of the title if they are to be faced with the delays and red tape involved in foreclosure proceedings. Furthermore, they do not desire to accept debentures for the unpaid balances of their mortgages when they do acquire title and possession of the property.

The bill amends section 1105 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to (1) permit the mortgage in the event of default on the part of the owner to assign his mortgage to the Government, and (2) authorize the Administrator to pay to the mortgagee the full amount of the unpaid balance of the principal and interest in the form of cash. The bill gives the Administrator the right to foreclose the mortgage, or to take such other action against the mortgagor that in his discretion may be required, except that the sole recourse against the mortgagor of a passenger vessel having the tonnage, speed, passenger accommodations, and other characteristics set forth in section 503 of the act, as amended by Public Law 586, 82d Congress, is limited to repossession of the vessel, and the obligation of the mortgagor is satis-

fied and discharged by the surrender of the vessel as provided in such section.

The bill would implement the present Administration's desire to have shipowners use private lending agencies, rather than relying on the mortgage provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in that it would encourage private lending agencies to advance funds to shipowners for the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of vessels to be used in the trade of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, RELATING TO THE NURSING PROFESSION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 2 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

The bill (S. 1906) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is simply to remedy an unjust and inequitable situation created by a provision of the Taft-Hartley Act that effectively prevents members of the nursing profession from exercising the same rights of collective bargaining as are conferred upon other employees covered by the act. I refer to section 2 (2), which exempts from the act's coverage those corporations or associations operating nonprofit hospitals. The effect of this exemption is to encourage the managers of nonprofit hospitals to refuse to sit down and discuss wages and working conditions with the nurses employed by them. The sponsors of the measure therefore are offering this amendment to the act which will eliminate the aforesaid exemption and thus confer upon the nurses the same rights, privileges, and immunities enjoyed by other employees coming within the purview of the act.

There is substantial evidence that the efforts of members of the nursing profession to improve their economic conditions through collective bargaining have been seriously impeded. American nurses today comprise one of the lowest-paid economic groups in the country in relation to their education, skill, and experience. I am reliably informed that the average salary of the graduate registered nurse is from $215 to $220 a month, and that figure, Mr. President, is based upon a 44-hour workweek. Nursing salaries have not kept pace with either the increased cost of living or with general wage increases that have occurred in other occupations and professions. Since 1950 the salaries of registered professional nurses, and particularly those employed in hospitals and similar institutions, have increased only slightly. In order to attempt to deal with their economic problems, the nurses have sought to improve their working conditions by collective bargaining through the State nurses' associations. These State associations have been selected by the membership to act as exclusive spokesmen for all nurses in matters affecting their conditions of employment. However, because of the exemption of nonprofit hospitals from the procedures of the Labor-Management Relations Act, hospital management has taken the position that because of the exemption it is under no duty or obligation to bargain collectively with these representative associations.

Mr. President, the nurses of America have gone on record, through their State and National associations, as voluntarily relinquishing the right to strike and have affirmed time and again their conviction that a nurse's primary obligation is the care of her patients. What the nurses want is the removal of a provision in the Taft-Hartley Act which is being used by management as a means of avoiding its obligation to sit down and discuss with its employees matters affecting wages and conditions of employment.

In 1949 the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported a bill (S. 249) which removed the exemption about which the nurses are complaining. The Senate subsequently approved that bill, but no action was taken in the House. We who are offering this bill today do so in the hope that the Senate again will approve the removal of the present language of the Taft-Hartley Act which effectively operates to prevent nurses from exercising their valid and essentially American right to bargain collectively with their employers through representatives of their own choosing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on this subject prepared by the American Nurses' Association be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE BY THE AMERICAN NURSES' ASSOCIATION RELATIVE TO PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

The American Nurses' Association is the national professional organization of registered nurses, with a membership of more than 177,000. It has constituent associations in the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Panama Canal Zone.

Our association has for some time supported an amendment to the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to eliminate the unjustifiable exemption of nonprofit hospitals contained in section 2 (2) [1] of the present act, as amended.

The members of our association are most anxious that the exemption of nonprofit hospitals be eliminated in any new labor relations act which Congress may enact. This exemption, contained in the 1947 act, has seriously impeded the efforts of the nurses' professional organization to improve the economic conditions of its members.

Nurses today represent one of the lowest paid economic groups in relation to their education, skill, and experience. Not only have nurses' salaries been historically out of line with other employed groups with similar preparation, but, in addition to this, nursing salaries in recent years have not reflected the economic changes in cost of living and general wage levels. For example, since the early part of 1950 the salaries or wages of practically all groups of employed persons have increased greatly, in order to keep pace with the rise in the cost of living. Even various categories of so-called white-collar workers have enjoyed substantial increases in compensation. During this time, however, the salaries of registered professional nurses, particularly those employed in hospitals and similar institutions, have increased only slightly. At the same time, the educational and other requirements for registered professional nurses have been constantly increasing. As a result, the economic status of the registered professional nurse is at the lowest point, relative to comparable groups in our economy, in many years.

It is well known that the principal method which other groups have used to improve their wages or salaries has been the use of collective bargaining, supported by the sanctions of Federal and State labor relations laws. Professional groups which have not enjoyed the advantages obtained by other groups of employees have perceived the necessity of using the method of collective bargaining to obtain comparable gains. In September 1946 the house of delegates of the American Nurses' Association unanimously adopted a platform endorsing collective bargaining to improve employment conditions for nurses and encouraging State nurses' associations to act as the exclusive spokesmen for all nurses in all matters affecting their economic security.

Following the adoption of this platform, the existing programs of various State nurses' associations were expanded and new programs were instituted in many other State associations. The early efforts of State associations to represent their members in collective bargaining with their employers made some progress. However, following the passage of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, which exempted nonprofit hospitals from the obligation to bargain collectively with their employees, nurses found that large numbers of employers adamantly refused to meet with them and took the position that all conditions of employment were to be decided unilaterally by the employers. As a result, the program of the American Nurses' Association and of its constituent State nurses' associations has been seriously impeded. In 1951 there were 3,237 nonprofit hospitals in the United States registered by the American Medical Association. This represents 70.3 percent of all registered nongovernmental hospitals in the country.[2]

Despite the fact that more nurses are working today than ever before in the Nation's history, a critical shortage of nursing service exists in almost every city and rural area. This is seriously affecting defense efforts, as evidenced by the shortages reported by the armed services nurse corps.

The 1951 Inventory of Professional Registered Nurses showed that of the 556,617 registered nurses in the United States only 60 percent were actively engaged in nursing. It may be assumed that a considerable number of the inactive nurses can be drawn back into service if employment conditions are sufficiently improved.

Registered professional nurses urge that the present provision of section 2 (2) of the National Labor Relations Act be repealed.

[1] SEC. 2. (2) The term "employer" includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

[2] Source: Hospital Service in the United States—Hospitals Registered by the American Medical Association. Reprinted from the Journal of AMA, May 10, 1952.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The present exemption of nonprofit hospitals is highly inequitable for two reasons:

1. Professional nurses have voluntarily foregone the use of such methods as strikes and picketing, to which other groups of employees are able to resort when all other methods fail. Nurses are, therefore, peculiarly dependent upon the machinery which has been established by law to compel employers to recognize and deal with the duly accredited representatives of their employees. The policy adopted by the American Nurses' Association in 1950 reads:

"In recognition of the fact that the nursing profession and employers of nurses share responsibility for provision of adequate nursing service to the public, the American Nurses' Association, in condcting its economic security program, (1) reaffirms professional nurses' voluntary relinquishment of the exercise of the right to strike and of the use of any other measures wherever they may be inconsistent with the professional nurses' responsibilities to patients; and (2) reaffirms its conviction that this voluntary relinquishment of measures ordinarily available to employees in their efforts to improve working conditions imposes on employers an increased obligation to recognize and deal justly with nurses through their authorized representatives in all matters affecting their employment conditions."

2. No satisfactory reason has ever been suggested why nonprofit hospitals should be treated differently from all other employers, including other nonprofit organizations. Indeed, the modern tendency is to treat them like any other employer. Thus, for example, they are held liable for the torts of their employees, the courts holding that their establishment for the purpose of doing mercy does not exempt them from the obligation also to do justice.[3] Also, charitable hospitals have been held to come within the provisions of State labor relations acts in several States.[4]

The 177,000 members of the American Nurses' Association are eager to take part, in the approved democratic fashion, in the determination of nurses' compensation and working conditions. Nurses cannot understand why they alone should be compelled to accept whatever terms their employer may see fit to grant them without even the right to sit down at a table and discuss them. Nurses wish to conduct their affairs in a professional manner, without resort to weapons which, like the strike, might endanger the patient. Experience has demonstrated that many employers of registered professional nurses will not grant nurses their basic economic rights unless such rights are clearly prescribed by statute. For this reason, the nursing profession requests that the present discriminatory legislation be terminated, and that any new legislation extend to nurses, as it undoubtedly will to other groups of employees, the right to bargain collectively with their employers.

ENABLING FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS TO MAKE CREDIT AVAILABLE FOR SMALL, MEDIUM-SIZED, AND NEW-VENTURE ENTERPRISES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, because the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency will begin hearings on the abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation next week, I am introducing, for myself and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], a bill for appropriate reference in order that it may be considered at the same time.

The bill (S. 1907) to establish corporations to assist financial institutions in making credit available to commercial and industrial enterprises and to provide capital for such enterprises introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, having participated with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to investigate the RFC and to uncover some of the political influence which developed there, I am certainly aware of the problems which such an agency creates. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation difficulty was cleared up under the able leadership of a man who is now our colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. Nevertheless, there are always great dangers involved when a Government agency makes direct loans. It would be far preferable to have this done by private enterprise. Yet I have opposed efforts to eliminate that agency because of the "credit gap" which makes it difficult for small and medium-sized businesses to obtain loans and risk capital, particularly for long periods of time.

It is not really the fault of private enterprise which causes this credit gap. There are a great variety of logical reasons which make it difficult for such loans to come through normal channels. So I have, heretofore, opposed abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, even though I felt somewhat queazy about it.

Today we have introduced a bill which, if passed, would help to eliminate this credit gap and enable us ultimately to take the Reconstruction Finance Corporation out of this area of financial operation. I hope it will be considered by the Federal Reserve Board and others interested in the problem facing the Committee on Banking and Currency next week.

The bill we are introducing would provide a regional system of capital banks or investment companies so organized as to meet the needs of small, medium-sized, and new-venture businesses through the facilities of the private banking system. No direct Federal financial aid is involved.

These capital banks would receive capitalization by subscriptions from private banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System and also from other financial institutions as well. In addition, the capital banks could borrow further funds for the purpose of making advances. The banks could deal not only in loans but also in preferred and common stocks of the businesses concerned.

If this bill could be passed, we could then test the efficacy of closing the small business credit gap by private enterprise. If it works, and we believe it will, then the inherent flaws of closing the gap by direct loans administered by a governmental agency could be overcome.

Our proposal has been supported by the Committee for Economic Development—CED, Meeting the Special Problems of Small Business, June 1947—and by other groups such as the Smaller Business Association of New England.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a statement which I have prepared, to be followed by the text of the bill itself.

There being no objection, the statement submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS and the bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

A PLAN FOR AIDING PRIVATE CAPITAL TO FLOW INTO SMALL AND NEW-VENTURE BUSINESSES

The important role of small and new business in the American economy is so generally recognized as one of the dynamic forces for progress in our country that one hardly need argue the importance of a banking and investment system which assures small and new business the capital necessary to keep it thriving. When extension of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation lending power was considered in 1948, the Congress recognized this necessity and added a new preamble emphasizing that the RFC had a definite responsibility to encourage small business.

Whatever role Congress may assign to the RFC in the future, the expiration of its lending powers under existing legislation in June 1954 points up again the special problem of small and new-venture business financing.

On various occasions the Banking and Currency Committees and other committees of the Congress have gone into the special financing needs of small and new-venture business. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report, through a subcommittee on the volume and stability of private investment, heard similar evidence in 1949 and concluded then that one of the important questions facing the American people was to preserve an open door at all times for investment in little and new-venture businesses in terms of ownership as well as in terms of debt. That some credit or capital gap in our present institutions does exist has been amply demonstrated by all studies of the reasons why commercial banks so often decline small and new-venture business loans. The reasons which they commonly give—that the maturity called for is too long for commercial banks, or that the collateral is not acceptable by traditional banking standards, or that the loan requested is in excess of the bank's legal limit, or that the requirement is for equity rather than debt funds—all point to the existence of this institutional gap.

The Joint Economic Subcommittee recommended action on the part of the Government to provide aids or supplemental channels for capital loans and equity capital for small, new-venture businesses. It recognized that these measures might take any one of several forms, but it seemed clear that the present facilities for channeling this type of capital were inadequate. As possible plans it was suggested that (1) the RFC might be continued and made more effective in dealing with the special problems of small business, (2) a system of cooperatives might aid in supplying small-business capital needs, (3) the Government might sponsor a system for spreading risks through an insurance fund, or, finally, (4) the Government might encourage the creation of specialized private capital institutions within the present banking system empowered to make long-term loans or purchase the securities of small- and medium-sized firms.

The bill which I am introducing follows this last plan. Its basic concept is to provide for a regional system of capital banks or investment companies so organized as to meet the needs of small- and new-venture business through the facilities of the private-banking system. No Federal appropriation, guaranties, or other forms of direct Federal financial aid are involved. The role of the

[3] *Sheehan* v. *North Country Community Hospital* (273 N. Y. 163).

[4] *Northwest Hospital* v. *Public Building Service Employees* (208 Minn. 389, 294 Northwest 215); *SLRB* v. *Utah Valley Hospital* (235 P. (2d) 520); *Wisconsin ERB* v. *Evangelical Deaconess Society* (242 Wis. 78, 7NW (2d) 590); *WERB* v. *St. Joseph's Hospital* (Prentice-Hall Labor Service, sec. 48,699,394).

Federal Government would be limited to providing a statutory framework for the creation of such corporations and, thereafter, for giving, through the Federal Reserve System, the customary supervision usually exercised over banking institutions.

This bill takes the form of an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act and supplies a new section 13 (b) for the existing section that permits the Federal Reserve banks, under special circumstances, to make loans to business.

The new section provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall promulgate standards to determine the eligibility of small or independent business enterprises for the purposes of the section. In establishing such standards, consideration is to be given not only to the type of financing involved but to the relative size and position of the businesses in relation to the trade, industry, and area in which they are engaged and to the independence of their ownership and management.

The bill would permit the establishment of capital banking corporations not to exceed in number the total number of Federal Reserve banks and branches thereof. Thus 36 such corporations could be organized in the United States.

The articles of incorporation for such corporations would be subject to the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System who would give due regard, among other things, to the need for the financing of small and independent business and the general character of the proposed management of such corporations before giving approval. A board of directors, having wide discretion in directing the affairs of the corporation, would be elected annually by the shareholders.

No corporation organized under this section would commence business with paid-in capital and surplus of less than $5 million. Member banks of the Federal Reserve System would be permitted to invest up to 2 percent of their capital and surplus in the stock of the corporation. Federal Reserve banks themselves would be permitted to invest up to 2 percent of the aggregate capital and surplus of all member banks within the district. Other financial institutions,, corporations, or individuals may, under appropriate circumstanbes, acquire shares of stock but, other than a Federal Reserve bank, no institution or individual may own more than 10 percent of the stock of each corporation.

To provide additional capital for its financing operations, the capital banking corporation may issue its debentures or bonds up to the amount of its paid-in capital and surplus.

The financing powers of the new corporations would be:

1. The power to make loans or buy the obligations of any small or independent business from banks or other lending institutions (par. 7) or

2. The power to purchase and resell to the issuer or others equity securities of eligible enterprises (par. 8), provided that without the approval of the Board of Governors the aggregate amount of obligations or securities which exceed the sum of $300,000 for any single enterprise shall not exceed 33 percent of the combined capital, surplus, and indebtedness of the corporation established under the section.

In order to provide incentives for the establishment of such capital banking corporations, the corporation, its assets, its capital stock and income would be exempt for a period of 15 years from all taxation by the United States or by any State, county, municipality, or other taxing authority except that real estate of the corporation shall be subject to State and local taxation as other real estate is taxed.

It is recognized that such capital banking corporations must be in a position to provide not only money but also business guidance to small and independent business. It is contemplated, therefore, that the Federal Reserve Board and the Department of Commerce would collaborate to establish machinery within which the capital banking corporations will be able to provide such service.

The Board of Governors would be authorized to prescribe regulations, to subject the corporations to periodic examination, and to enjoin any acts or practices which conflict with any provisions of this section or regulation thereunder.

The framework of this proposal for a system of capital banks was originally worked out through the informal consultation of representatives of the Federal Reserve System with Dr. A. D. H. Kaplan, of the Brookings Institution, who had worked with the Committee for Economic Development in the search for a private enterprise approach to the special financing problems of small and new venture business. Former Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, who was chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, first introduced a bill in 1950 looking toward the establishment of such institutions. The bill which I am now introducing is an outgrowth of that plan, consideration of which was laid aside without hearings by the Committee on Banking and Currency upon the intervention of the Korean invasion, although it was touched upon in connection with the RFC Act amendments of 1951. While the problem of small-business financing was no less after the Korean invasion, the urgency of other problems served to push it into the background from which it must now emerge if we are to give consideration to the future of the RFC.

The bill providing for private institutions is in effect a challenge to private banking and financial institutions to come forward and resume the traditional role of the local bank in financing small and new venture enterprise. It would be hoped that such a system of channeling private savings into small and new private business would eventually reduce or eliminate the need for direct Government lending of the RFC type.

Reasons why banks decline small-business loans

REASONS EVIDENCING EXISTENCE OF A CREDIT GAP

	Percent of total
Maturity too long	40.7
Unacceptable collateral	10.6
Bank was extending short-term credit but would not make long-term loan	5.8
Applicant's business located outside of area serviced by bank	4.3
Loan requested exceeds bank's legal limit to one borrower	3.6
Bank loaned-up or low on lendable funds	2.2
Loan requested was a special type not made by bank	2.0
Policy not to lend to type of business in which applicant engaged	1.8
Miscellaneous reasons	1.8
	72.8

REASONS EVIDENCING CONCERN ABOUT THE RISK INVOLVED

	Percent of total
Bank felt applicant's financial condition did not warrant a loan	5.4
Collateral considered insufficient	2.0
Applicant's enterprise newly formed; credit and earnings records not established	1.6
Declined in general terms (brushoff)	16.4
Miscellaneous reasons	1.8
Total	27.2
Grand total	100.0

Source: Grouped by the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report from a study by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

S. 1907

A bill to establish corporations to assist financial institutions in making credit available to commercial and industrial enterprises and to provide capital for such enterprises

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13b. 1. PURPOSE: The general purpose of this section, as amended, in the light of which its provisions shall be construed and applied, is to provide a means for supplementing the existing financial activities of banks and other financial institutions by the establishment of one or more regional investing corporations, privately owned and managed, their formation to be facilitated by authorizing the purchase of their capital stock by the Federal Reserve banks with a view to the ultimate disposal of such capital stock by the Federal Reserve banks to member banks of the Federal Reserve System and to other private investors. Such corporations shall be authorized to invest in and make loans to both small and independent business enterprises organized upon sound business principles which supply an economically useful product or service, where the investment in or loans to such enterprises are in the interest of the national defense during periods of national emergency, or are desirable to promote the growth and expansion of such enterprises.

"2. National investment advisory council: (a) There is hereby established a National Investment Advisory Council, hereinafter called the 'Council,' which shall consist of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, who shall be Chairman of the Council, and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The Council shall advise and consult with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and make recommendations to that Board from time to time with respect to the operations of the corporations organized under this act, the lending and investment policies of such corporations, and the administration of the provisions of this section.

"3. Eligible enterprises: The Secretary of Commerce shall promulgate standards to determine the eligibility of small or independent business enterprises for the purposes of this section. In promulgating such standards, which may differ according to the types of financing or other relevant factors, there shall be considered the relative size and position of businesses in relation to the trade or industry in which they are engaged, the size and nature of the area of their operations, the size and independence of the group supplying capital or holding ownership or control of the business, and the independence of their management; and no enterprise shall be considered to be a small or an independent business enterprise which is affiliated through stock ownership or otherwise with any other enterprise which is determined to be dominant in the trade or industry or field of business in which it is engaged, unless such other enterprise otherwise qualifies as a small or independent business enterprise under this section.

"4. Organization of corporations: (a) Corporations, not exceeding in number the total number of Federal Reserve banks and branches thereof, organized for the purpose of operating under this section, may be organized by any number of persons not less than five, who shall subscribe to the articles of incorporation; except that any such corporation in whose stock one or more Federal Reserve banks invest shall be formed by a Federal Reserve bank, which alone shall subscribe to the articles of incorporation. The articles of incorporation of such corporation shall specify in general terms the objects for which the corporation is formed and may contain any other provisions not inconsistent with this section that the corporation may

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

see fit to adopt for the regulation of its business and the conduct of its affairs, including provision for cumulative voting in the election of directors. Such articles shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and with such approval may be amended from time to time. Articles of incorporation and amendments thereto shall be forwarded to the Board of Governors for consideration and approval or disapproval. Such articles shall specifically state—

"first, the name assumed by such corporation;

"second, the area or areas where its operations are to be carried on, which may be anywhere within the United States, its Territories and island possessions, but as long as any of its stock is owned by any Federal Reserve bank, the Board may restrict the geographical area of its operations;

"third, the place where its principal office is to be located, which shall be within the Federal Reserve district in which it is established; and

"fourth, the amount of its capital stock and the number and classes of shares into which the same shall be divided, with or without par value, and the respective participations of such shares in the profits of the corporation.

"(b) In determining whether to approve the establishment of such a corporation and its proposed articles of incorporation, the Board of Governors shall give due regard, among other things, to the need for the financing of small and independent business enterprises in the place or places where the proposed corporation is to commence operations, the general character of the proposed management of such corporation, the number of such corporations previously organized in the United States, and the volume of their operations. After consideration of all relevant factors, the Board of Governors may approve the articles of incorporation and issue a permit to begin business. Upon issuance of such a permit, the corporation shall thereafter become and be a body corporate and, as such, and in the name designated therein, shall have power to adopt and use a corporate seal; to have succession for a period of 30 years, unless extended as provided in this section, or unless sooner dissolved by the act of the shareholders owning two-thirds of the stock or by an act of Congress or unless its franchise becomes forfeited by some violation of law; to make contracts; to sue and be sued; complain, and defend in any court of law or equity; by its board of directors, to appoint such officers and employees as may be deemed proper, define their authority and duties, require bonds of them as it deems advisable, and fix the penalty thereof, dismiss such officers or employees, or any thereof, at pleasure and appoint others to fill their places; to adopt bylaws regulating the manner in which its stock shall be transferred, its officers and employees appointed, its property transferred, and the privileges granted to it by law exercised and enjoyed; to establish branch offices or agencies subject to the approval of the Board; to acquire, hold, operate, and dispose of any property (real, personal, or mixed) whenever necessary or appropriate to the carrying out of its lawful functions; to act as depository or fiscal agent of the United States when so designated by the Secretary of the Treasury; to operate in such Federal Reserve district or districts or Territories or possessions of the United States as may be specified in its articles of incorporation; and shall have the other powers set forth in this section and such incidental powers as may be reasonably necessary to carry on the business for which the corporation is established.

"(c) The board of directors of each corporation organized under this section shall consist of nine members, all of whom shall be elected annually by the holders of the shares of stock of the corporation authorized and issued under the provisions of this section. Subject to the provisions of this section the directors of any corporation organized under this section shall have wide discretion in directing the affairs of such corporation to carry out the purposes of this section.

"5. Capital stock provisions: Each corporation organized under this section shall have a paid-in capital and surplus equal to at least $5 million before it shall commence business. Each Federal Reserve Bank which organizes a corporation under this section shall invest in shares of stock of such corporation in an amount equal to at least $5 million, or an amount which, when added to the amounts, if any, of shares subscribed by other Federal Reserve banks, member banks, nonmember banks, financial institutions, corporations, partnerships, or other persons, shall equal the sum of $5 million; and each Federal Reserve bank is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to invest in the shares of stock of one or more corporations organized under this section: *Provided*, That in no event shall any Federal Reserve bank invest in shares of corporations organized under this act if as a result thereof it will hold an amount of such shares aggregating more than 2 percent of the aggregate amount of the combined capital and surplus of all its member banks, or $5 million, whichever is greater. The shares of stock in any corporations organized under this act shall be eligible for purchase by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and each such member bank is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, to acquire and hold an amount of such shares equal to not more than 2 percent of the capital and surplus of such member bank. Subject to the provisions of this section, any nonmember bank, financial institution, corporation, partnership, or other person may acquire shares of stock in any corporations organized under this act. Upon the demand of any member bank, a Federal Reserve bank which holds shares of stock in a corporation organized under this act shall, with the approval of the Board of Governors, sell to such member bank all or a portion of such shares up to the amount which such member bank is authorized to acquire and hold under the provisions of this paragraph; and a Federal Reserve bank holding such shares of stock may, with the approval of the Board of Governors, sell such shares to any nonmember bank, financial institution, corporation, partnership, or to any other person. The price at which such shares may be sold by a Federal Reserve bank under this paragraph shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Governors. The aggregate amount of shares in any such corporation or corporations which may be owned or controlled by any member bank, by any nonmember bank, financial institution, corporation, partnership, or by any other person, or by any group or class of persons, may be limited by the Board in accordance with its general policies; and no one stockholder, other than a Federal Reserve bank, shall at any time, without the approval of the Board in accordance with such policies, own or control more than 10 percent of the total outstanding shares of any such corporation.

"6. Borrowing power: Each corporation shall have authority to borrow money and to issue its debentures, bonds, promissory notes, or other obligations under such general conditions and subject to such limitations and regulations as the Board of Governors may prescribe, but in no event shall any such corporation issue obligations which would cause the amount outstanding at any one time to exceed the amount of its paid-in capital stock and surplus. Notwithstanding any limitation contained in section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, each member bank is authorized to purchase and hold obligations of corporations organized under this section in an aggregate amount not exceeding 10 percent of such bank's capital and surplus.

"7. Direct loans: Each corporation shall have authority to make or acquire loans with or without security to both small and independent business enterprises which are eligible therefor, or to purchase obligations of such enterprises. Such loans, purchases, or other acquisitions may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions, through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, commitments to purchase, or otherwise, as the corporation may determine.

"8. Equity financing: Each corporation shall have authority to purchase and to resell to the issuer or to others, the income debentures, common or preferred stocks, or other capital shares of small and independent business enterprises eligible under this section.

"9. Aggregate limitation: Without the approval of the Board of Governors, the aggregate amount of obligations or securities acquired or for which commitments may be issued by the corporation under the provisions of this section which exceed the sum of $300,000 for any single enterprise shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the combined capital and surplus and maximum indebtedness of the corporation authorized by this section.

"10. Extensions: (a) The loans of any national banking association for which a commitment to purchase is issued hereunder shall not be subject to the limitations on real-estate loans prescribed in section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act as amended.

"(b) Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end of such paragraph the following: 'or any security issued by or representing an interest in or a direct obligation of a corporation organized under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended;'. Paragraph (3) of subsection (c) of section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by changing the period at the end of such paragraph to a semicolon and adding the following: 'or any corporation organized under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended'. Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of section 304 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is hereby amended by changing the semicolon at the end of such paragraph to a comma and adding the following: 'or any security issued by or representing an interest in or a direct obligation of a corporation organized under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended;'.

"(c) The corporation, its franchise, loans, and other assets, its capital stock, its surplus, its reserves, and its income, shall be exempt for a period of 15 years from the date of its charter from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or other taxing authority; except that any real property of the corporation shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

"11. Miscellaneous: (a) Wherever practicable the financing operations of the corporation shall be undertaken in cooperation with member banks of the Federal Reserve System or with other banks or financial institutions, and any initial investigation and servicing required for loans or purchases of securities by the corporation under the provisions of this section may be handled through such banks or other financial institutions on a fee basis.

"(b) The corporation may make use, wherever practicable, of the advisory services of the Federal Reserve System and of the Department of Commerce which are available for and useful to industrial and

commercial businesses, and may provide consulting and advising services on a fee basis and have on its staff persons competent to provide such services. Subject to the supervision and direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System any Federal Reserve bank is authorized to act as a depository or fiscal agent for any corporation organized under this section. Such corporations may invest funds not reasonably needed for their current operations in direct obligations of, or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"(c) The Board of Governors is authorized to prescribe regulations, not inconsistent with general policies established by the council, governing the operations of national investment companies and to carry out the provisions of this section in accordance with its purposes.

"(d) Each corporation shall be subject to examinations made by direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or by a Federal Reserve bank designated by the Board of examiners selected or approved by the Board, the cost of such examinations, including the compensation of the examiners, to be fixed by the Board and to be paid by the corporation examined; and every such corporation shall make such reports to the Board of Governors at such times and in such form as the Board may require.

"(e) Should any corporation organized hereunder violate or fail to comply with any of the provisions of this section, all of its rights, privileges, and franchises derived herefrom may thereby be forfeited. Before any such corporation shall be declared dissolved, or its rights, privileges, and franchises forfeited, any noncompliance with, or violation of this section shall, however, be determined and adjudged by a court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, in a suit brought for that purpose in the district or Territory in which the principal office of such corporation is located, which suit shall be brought by the United States at the instance of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Attorney General.

"(f) Any corporation organized under this section may at any time within the 2 years next previous to the date of the expiration of its corporate existence, by a vote of the shareholders owning two-thirds of its stock, apply to the Board of Governors for its approval to extend the period of its corporate existence for a term of not more than 30 years, and upon certified approval of the Board of Governors such corporation shall have its corporate existence for such extended period unless sooner dissolved by the act of the shareholders owning two-thirds of its stock, or by an act of Congress or unless its franchise becomes forfeited as herein provided.

"(g) Whenever in the judgment of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this section or of any regulation thereunder, the Board may make application to the proper district court of the United States, or the United States courts of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and such courts shall have jurisdiction of such actions and upon a showing by the Board that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"(h) Section 1014 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting the phrase 'or a corporation organized under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act' after the words 'Federal Reserve bank.'

"(i) Notwithstanding this amendment to this section 13b, the Federal Reserve banks, for a period of 1 year following the effective date of this amendment, shall continue to possess and have the right to exercise all authority conferred upon them by the provisions of this section as it existed prior to the effective date of this amendment. Nothing herein shall affect the power of any Federal Reserve bank to carry out, or protect its interest under, any agreement or transaction heretofore or hereafter made or entered into in carrying on operations pursuant to such authority. All or part of the assets held by any Federal Reserve bank which have been or may hereafter be acquired by it pursuant to such authority may be purchased by any corporation organized under this section with the consent of such Reserve bank.

"(j) Within 60 days after the effective date of this amendment, each Federal Reserve bank shall pay to the United States the aggregate amount which the Secretary of the Treasury has heretofore paid to such bank under the provisions of this section as heretofore existing; and such payment shall constitute a full discharge of any obligation or liability of the Federal Reserve bank to the United States or to the Secretary of the Treasury arising out of subsection (e) of this section as heretofore existing or any agreement thereunder. The amounts repaid to the United States pursuant to this paragraph and any remaining balance of the funds set aside in the Treasury for payments under this section as heretofore existing shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts.

"(k) Neither the United States nor any Federal Reserve bank shall have any liability with respect to any obligations entered into, or stocks issued, or commitments made, by any corporation organized under this section."

FRANCISZEK JARECKI

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Franciszek Jarecki.

Mr. Jarecki is the young Polish flier who left Poland because of oppression by the Communists. He was flying a jet plane in what he thought was the direction of an American airfield, but instead landed in Denmark. Since then he has come to the United States.

I have discussed with him the attempt of the Polish Communists to indoctrinate him into the principles of communism. One of the reasons why he was permitted to fly in Poland was that it was believed he had accepted the indoctrination. When Jarecki was a boy of 9 years, his father was sent to Siberia, and died as a result of his imprisonment there.

Mr. Jarecki's mother is still living in Poland. He has come to the shores of America because he believes in the institutions of America and because of the slavery which exists in Poland, as he described it to us yesterday, in the presence of the Vice President. He understood what was going on, and what he might find in America.

I was delighted yesterday to hear him express to the Vice President the fact that the message of President Eisenhower had reached behind the Iron Curtain, that he had learned of it, and had learned of the hope that the people in Poland have of eventual freedom from Communist slavery. He wanted to be able to further that objective, if possible, in the hope that Poland may some day be free.

I have been joined by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in sponsoring the bill. I hope it may receive early consideration by the committee and by the Senate, so that Mr. Jarecki may be issued a permanent visa, and thus make it possible for him to become a citizen of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1908) for the relief of Franciszek Jarecki, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KENNEDY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CREDIT FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills relating to credit for small business. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the bills for not to exceed 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Alabama may proceed.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

S. 1912. A bill to make credit more readily available for financing small business and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 1913. A bill to make capital more readily available for financing small business and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the 3 years that I have served on the Senate Small Business Committee, one of our most perplexing problems has been the financing needs of small business. While we have sought means to better meet the credit requirements of independent business, we have had a strong desire to place greater reliance on the private banking system of this country.

The two bills I have introduced relate to credit for small business. One deals with operating capital, and the other relates to structure capital. One bill pertains to short-term loans; the other refers to long-term loans.

Instead of reading my full statement, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

A great many public and private reports over the past 10 years have cited the increasingly difficult financing problems of small business. One of the best surveys was a research report prepared by the Committee on Economic Development under the distinguished direction of Raymond Rubincan, chairman, and Chester Davis, vice chairman. That report pointed out:

"Small firms, including many with good commercial credit ratings, have been unable to obtain needed credit through their banks. Even on short-term borrowing, apparently sound firms have been cramped by inadequate bank credit except in generally prosperous years. * * * Sources of investment funds for small, private ventures, have been

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

drying up. * * * Floatation of the securities of small businesses through regular investment channels is practically impossible or prohibitively high in cost. Banks shy away from capital loans to small business. The traditional means of growth through plowing back of profits have been curtailed by tax rates that draw off earnings needed for consolidation and expansion of business."

To meet these financing needs, I am introducing 2 bills: 1 to provide short- and intermediate-term credit and 1 to provide for long-term equity capital.

The first bill provides for the establishlishment by the Federal Reserve Board of an FHA-type program for insuring short- and intermediate-term loans by private banks to small business. The Board would insure 90 percent of any loan or group of loans to a borrower up to a $250,000 ceiling. The maximum term would be for 5 years. A premium of 1½ percent would be charged to cover the risks involved and to make the program fully self-supporting. I want to emphasize that private banks would carry out the program and that it would be operated substantially without the expenditure of Government funds. The local bank's responsibility for 10 percent of any loss would guarantee that the bank would use sound judgment in making the loans. An important factor for small banks is that the insurance program would provide a spreading of risk which would approach the diversification achieved only by the largest banks. The highly successful experience of banks throughout the country in the smaller field of insurance against losses resulting from loans made for home improvements under title I of the Federal Housing Act is an indication of the soundness of this proposal.

The second bill that I am introducing follows a suggestion made by many business groups for the creation of regional capital banks. Sumner H. Slichter outlined the need in his book, What Is Ahead for American Business:

"Most of the present investment institutions, such as commercial banks, savings banks, or insurance companies, suffer from a serious handicap; they are not free to make a loan or an investment simply because it promises to be profitable. They must put the security of their depositors or their policyholders above the pursuit of profit. This limits their ability to put money into new enterprises, no matter how attractive the gamble. There is need for investment companies that are free to take any risk that seems worth taking without the necessity of protecting someone else's security."

Professor Slichter goes on to suggest that capital banks might be formed by commercial banks and insurance companies, aided initially by money from the Federal Reserve banks.

My bill would provide for the organization of national investment companies under the supervision of the Federal Reserve Board. In order to get the investment companies started, Reserve banks would be authorized to invest in stock of the companies but would be required to sell their stock just as soon as any bank or other purchaser could be found. I want to emphasize that the capital of the investment companies would be put up by the Federal Reserve. It would require no appropriation by the Congress. These investment companies would be authorized to provide credit and capital by making loans to or acquiring stocks or bonds of small-business enterprises. The maximum loan to any single company would be $1,000,000.

The investment company would work in close cooperation with banks and other financial institutions in the region it serves. It could often participate jointly with local banks in financing businesses with good earning prospects in cases where lending policies prohibit banks from providing all the funds required or where the business needs more equity capital which banks cannot legally provide.

This legislation has been drafted with a view toward maximum private participation and the minimum of Government participation. It is anticipated that the Reserve banks' equity in the regional capital banks would be sold to private investors. A primary provision of this bill is to have these private investment companies owned ultimately by private interests.

The former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Thomas B. McCabe, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee in 1950, stating the Board's support of a similar proposal. In addition, this proposal has had a practical test in the work of the J. H. Whitney Co. and the American Research & Development Corp. (McCabe, p. 135).

I know that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will give these two measures serious study in the forthcoming hearings on various small business financing proposals.

FIRST INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1954—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4663) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4663, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEVELOPMENT OF NIAGARA FALLS AND RIVER—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1851) to preserve the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, to promote the national defense, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, appropriately referred, and printed; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The amendments were referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

On page 2, line 9, beginning with ", prosecuted", strike out all through "Engineers," in line 11.

On page 2, line 19, after "advisable", insert "by the Niagara Development Corporation created by section 201 of title II of this act and."

On page 2, line 24, beginning with the period strike out all through "program" in line 3, page 3.

On page 11, strike out lines 1 through 22.

At the end of the bill add a new title as follows:

"TITLE II—NIAGARA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

"CREATION OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 201. There is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the Niagara Development Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation'). The Corporation shall be an instrumentality of the United States and shall have the powers and duties hereinafter set forth.

"BOARD OF DIRECTORS

"SEC. 202. (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors consisting of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members of the Board shall be members of the same political party. One of the members shall be designated by the President as chairman at the time of appointment.

"(b) The terms of office of members of the Board shall be 6 years except that (1) the terms of office of the members first appointed shall run from the date of enactment of this joint resolution and shall expire one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 4 years, and one at the end of 6 years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (2) a member appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member prior to the expiration of the term for which he shall have been appointed, shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

"(c) Each member of the Board shall be paid compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. Members of the Board shall devote full time to the business of the Corporation.

"(d) Two members shall constitute a quorum for transaction of the business of the Board, and vacancies in the Board, so long as there are two members in office, shall not impair the powers of the Board to execute the functions of the Corporation.

"FUNCTIONS OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 203. The Corporation is authorized and directed to adopt final plans and specifications for the works of improvement for redevelopment of the Niagara River, as defined and authorized in section 2 of this act, and to proceed with the construction of such works: *Provided*, That in accordance with the provisions of section 209 of this act and with the approval of the President the Corporation shall utilize, on a reimbursable basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of the Department of the Army and shall arrange for the prosecution of the construction of such works under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

"CORPORATE POWERS

"SEC. 204. (a) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this joint resolution the Corporation—

"(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

"(2) may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

"(3) may sue and be sued in its corporate name;

"(4) may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised;

"(5) may make and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary or advisable in the conduct of its business;

"(6) shall be held to be an inhabitant and resident of the western judicial district of New York within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to venue of civil suits;

"(7) may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of its business, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as the Board may determine, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums on such bonds; and

"(2) may acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation such real and personal property and any interest therein, and may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such

real and personal property, as the Board deems necessary for the conduct of its business.

"CAPITAL STOCK

"SEC. 205. (a) The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $5 million which shall be subscribed by the United States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury the sum of $5 million for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment for such capital stock when payment is called by the Board. Receipts for payment by the United States for or on account of such capital stock shall be issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be evidence of stock ownership by the United States.

"(b) The directors of the Corporation are authorized and directed to retire the capital stock to a minimum of $1 million over a period of not more than 50 years. The directors shall determine the time or times of such retirement and the amount or amounts to be retired from time to time, provided that any such determination shall not be effective until it shall have been approved by the President.

"OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 206. (a) In order to finance its activities, the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue, and to have outstanding at any one time in an amount not exceeding $385 million, its notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations or commitments. Such obligations shall mature not more than 50 years from the dates of their issue, shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations, shall bear interest at such rate or rates and shall be subject to such other terms and conditions, as may be determined by the Corporation after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury. Obligations of the Corporation shall not be purchased by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof.

"(b) All such obligations shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Corporation shall be unable to pay the principal of or interest on any such obligations when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, and thereupon to the extent of the amounts so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to the rights of the holders of such obligations.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prepare suitable forms for the notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations, and otherwise to make the facilities and services of the Department of the Treasury available to the Corporation in the issuance and sale of such obligations. The Corporation shall reimburse the Secretary of the Treasury for any expenses incurred by the Department of the Treasury under this subsection.

"DEPOSIT AND EXPENDITURE OF CORPORATE FUNDS

"SEC. 207. (a) All moneys of the Corporation not otherwise employed may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States subject to check by authority of the Corporation or in any Federal Reserve bank, or may, by authorization of the Board, be used in the purchase for redemption and retirement of any notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations issued by the Corporation, and the Corporation may reimburse such Federal Reserve bank for its services in such manner as may be agreed upon. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers.

"(b) All expenses incurred by the Corporation in carrying out its functions, including administrative expenses, shall be paid from funds obtained from the sale of its obligations under section 206 or from revenues derived from its corporate activities, except that until such time as funds from such sources are available amounts paid by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 205 may be used for such purposes.

"(c) Sections 105 and 106 of the Government Corporation Control Act, requiring annual audits by the General Accounting Office and reports thereof to the Congress, shall be applicable to the Corporation.

"EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION

"SEC. 208. The Corporation, its property, franchises, and income are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by the Federal Government or by any State, county, municipality, or any subdivision or district thereof.

"SERVICES AND FACILITIES OF OTHER AGENCIES

"SEC. 209. The Corporation may, with the approval of the President, accept and utilize, on a reimbursable basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, except that any such agency having custody of any engineering or other data relating to any of the matters within the jurisdiction of the Corporation shall, upon request of the Board, make such data available to the Corporation without reimbursement.

"MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

"SEC. 210. (a) All general penal statutes relating to the larceny, embezzlement, conversion, or to the improper handling, retention, use, or disposal of public moneys or property of the United States shall apply to the moneys and property of the Corporation and to moneys and properties of the United States entrusted to the Corporation.

"(b) Any person who, with intent to defraud the Corporation, or to deceive any director, officer, or employee of the Corporation or any officer or employee of the United States, (1) makes any false entry in any book of the Corporation, or (2) makes any false report or statement for the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) Any person who shall receive any compensation, rebate, or reward, or shall enter into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, with intent to defraud the Corporation or wrongfully and unlawfully to defeat its purposes, shall on conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 211. The Corporation shall transmit to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session an annual report of its operations under this joint resolution.

"AUTHORIZATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AS A SELF-LIQUIDATING PROJECT FOR THE PUBLIC USE AND BENEFIT

"SEC. 212. (a) It is hereby declared to be the purpose and intent of the Congress as expressed in this act to provide for the redevelopment, for the public use and benefit, of the United States share of the waters of the Niagara River, in accordance with the reservation to the treaty of February 27, 1950, between the United States and Canada, which reservation was adopted by the Senate of the United States in giving its advice and consent to the ratification of the treaty on August 9, 1950.

"(b) It is further hereby declared to be the purpose and intent of the Congress to authorize the development of power on the Niagara River as, in all respects, a self-liquidating project, and the Corporation is accordingly authorized and directed to take all steps necessary to accomplish this purpose in any arrangements it makes for the financing, construction, maintenance, and operation of the project, consistent with the provisions of this act.

"(c) When power is available from any generating unit of the project, if transfer of the power facilities of the project shall not have been consummated under the provisions of section 3 hereof, the project shall be maintained and operated and project power shall be disposed of by the Corporation, in accordance with the safeguards contained in section 3, pending the negotiation and approval of the agreement provided for in section 3, or pending further disposition by the Congress.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 213. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the joint resolution and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 214. This act may be cited as the 'Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1953.'

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, to promote the national defense, to provide for the creation of the Niagara Development Corporation, and for other purposes.' "

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4605. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5174. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242), as amended; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC USE AREAS AND IMPROVEMENT OF WILDLIFE HABITAT ON THE NATIONAL FORESTS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the bill (S. 1173) to facilitate the development, management, and use of public use areas and facilities and improvement of wildlife habitat on the national forests, and for other purposes, which was introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] on March 4, 1953, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The bill relates only to the use of funds for the Forest Service and is properly a bill to be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and he agrees with me that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD T. WAILES TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the White House sent to the Senate today the nomination of Edward T. Wailes, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State. Notice is hereby given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, under the committee rule.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WALTER S. DELANY TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the White House sent to the Senate today the nomination of Walter S. DeLany, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951. Notice is hereby given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, under the committee rule.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES MAJOR BALEY, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 21, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of James Major Baley, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina, vice Thomas A. Uzzel, Jr., resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LEONARD PAGE MOORE TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 21, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Leonard Page Moore, of New York, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York, vice Frank J. Parker, resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WENDELL A. MILES TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 21, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Wendell A. Miles, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan, vice Joseph F. Deeb, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LEONARD G. HAGNER TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 21, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Leonard G. Hagner, of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware, vice William Marvel, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Address by him on the subject Justice for Poland, broadcast from station WSPR in Springfield, Mass., April 5, 1953, together with an introductory address by Edward Lonczak.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by General of the Army Omar M. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the Women's National Press Club luncheon for Armed Forces Day, Washington, D. C., on May 15, 1953.

Editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Progress," published in the New York Times of May 14, 1953, and editorial entitled "Canadians Ready for Seaway Now," published in the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette of May 11, 1953.

Editorial relating to loopholes in espionage laws, published in the New York Daily News of May 10, 1953.

Resolution relating to espionage activities, adopted by the Society of Cincinnati on May 8, 1953.

By Mr. POTTER:

Editorial entitled "Communist Conspiracy," from the New York Times of April 22, 1953, and reply by Senator MUNDT published in the New York Times of May 6, 1953.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Editorial entitled "Tidelands Filibuster," published in the Washington Evening Star of April 22, 1953.

Article entitled "Bohlen Appointment Held Approval of Foreign Policies," written by Vardis Fisher and published in the Eastern Idaho Farmer of Thursday, April 16, 1953.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Article entitled "The Sure Road to Peace," published in the Michigan Tradesman of April 22, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial entitled "The Press Meets Senator MORSE," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 12, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "A Booby Trap," published in the New York Journal of Commerce of May 8, 1953.

HOW TO WIN FRIENDS AND INFLUENCE PEOPLE—ESSAY BY MRS. CAROL HEIDEMANN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, both here and abroad there is a tendency to fail to realize that a soft answer turneth away wrath. I have in my hand a very fine compilation entitled "How To Win Friends and Influence People," written by Mrs. Carol Heidemann, secretary to one of my friends in the little town of Thorp, Wis.

This is a subject of great importance on the world's stage today. It is for us to be calm and judicious in our approach. Oh, I can remember, when I was a boy, how important it was to twist the Lion's tail. There were persons in those days who wanted the United States to get into a scrap with Britain—hotheaded folks. But then the world was large, the ocean was a protection and there were thinking people who calmed the hotheads.

Mr. President, today the facts are different. The world has contracted. In yesteryear the Atlantic was a barrier against enemies. Today the Atlantic can be crossed by plane in 3 hours. Today the H-bomb and the A-bomb exist. Today our problem is how best to keep united the peoples who believe as we do in the same fundamental principles of liberty, freedom, and government.

The patience of freemen has been sorely tried by the Kremlin. But we must not lose the steadying force of patience with our allies even if some individual loses his head. Let us prove our adequacy mentally as well as militarily.

I ask that the essay entitled "How To Win Friends and Influence People" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WIN FRIENDS AND INFLUENCE PEOPLE

PART I. FUNDAMENTAL TECHNIQUES IN HANDLING PEOPLE

(Essay by Mrs. Carol Heidemann)

One of Lincoln's favorite quotations was, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Criticism is dangerous, as it usually puts a man on the defensive. Criticisms are also like homing pigeons; they always return home. It doesn't pay to criticize as one would probably do the same under the same circumstances.

People are not creatures of logic, they are creatures of emotion. Instead of condemn-

ing people, let's try to understand them and figure out why they do what they do.

The desire to be important is a human trait, so in order to make people do something you want them to do, it should be done by making them feel important. Another human trait is the craving to be appreciated. The way to develop the best in a man is by appreciation and encouragement, hearty in sincere approbation and lavish in praise. Flattery is cheap praise and seldom works as it is shallow, selfish, and insincere.

A way to influence the other fellow is to talk about what he wants and show him how to get it. Think in terms of the other person's point of view and from his angle as well as your own.

PART II. SIX WAYS TO MAKE PEOPLE LIKE YOU

Rule 1: Become genuinely interested in other people. We should put ourselves out to do things for other people—things that require time, energy, unselfishness, and thoughtfulness.

Rule 2: Smile. The expression a woman wears on her face is far more important than the clothes she wears on her back. A smile should come from within, not be an insincere grin. If you do not feel like smiling, force yourself to smile or if alone force yourself to whistle or hum. Act as if you are already happy and that will tend to make you happy. By controlling the thoughts one can have happiness, as happiness depends on inner conditions, not outward conditions. Lincoln said, "Most folks are about as happy as they make up their minds to be."

Rule 3: Remember a man's name is to him the sweetest and most important sound in the English language. Franklin D. Roosevelt's motto was, Remember people's names and make people feel important.

Rule 4: Be a good listener. Encourage others to talk about themselves. To become a good conversationalist is to listen intently and be genuinely interested. Big men have said they prefer good listeners to good talkers, but the ability to listen seems rarer than almost any other good trait.

Rule 5: Talk in terms of the other man's interest. The royal road to a man's heart is to talk to him about the things he treasures most.

Rule 6: Make the other person feel important and do it sincerely. Emerson said, "Every man I meet is in some way my superior and in that I can learn of him." Tell a person what you honestly admire about him to make him feel important. "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

PART III. TWELVE WAYS TO WIN PEOPLE TO YOUR WAY OF THINKING

Rule 1: The only way to get the best of an argument is to avoid it. "A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still."

Rule 2: Show respect for the other man's opinions. Never tell a man he is wrong. If you are going to prove anything, don't let anybody know it. Even if a man is wrong and you know it, agree with him, but ask questions in a friendly, cooperative spirit, and keep insisting he is right in order to show respect for his opinions and to save his face.

Rule 3: If you are wrong admit it quickly and emphatically. A person's eagerness to criticize oneself will take the fight out of the other person; and by admitting a wrong to others we may even take pride in our frankness and broadmindedness.

Rule 4: Begin in a friendly way. If someone has ill feeling toward you, you can possibly win them to your way of thinking by being ever so gentle, have a friendly approach and show sincere appreciation toward him.

Rule 5: Get the other person saying "yes, yes" immediately. Emphasize things on which you agree, and look at things from the other man's viewpoint and try to get him saying "yes, yes" by asking a gentle question or questions. "He who treads softly goes far," is a Chinese proverb, which can be applied here.

Rule 6: Let the other man do a great deal of the talking. If you disagree with him, do not interrupt, but listen with an open mind and be sincere about it. Encourage him to express his ideas fully. If you want friends, let your friends excel you.

Rule 7: Let the other man feel the idea is his. Consult another person and let them take the credit. What we are interested in is results, not credit.

Rule 8: Try honestly to see things from the other person's point of view. Success in dealing with people depends on a sympathic grasp of the other man's viewpoint.

Rule 9: Be sympathetic with the other person's ideas and desires by apologizing and sympathizing, and if the other person's idea is an insult one gets infinitely more satisfaction of returning kindness for an insult. The human craves sympathy.

Rule 10: Appeal to nobler motives. The individual who is inclined to chisel will in most cases react favorably if you make him feel you consider him honest, upright, and fair.

Rule 11: Dramatize your ideas. Merely stating a truth or fact isn't enough—it must be dramatized or displayed.

Rule 12: Throw down a challenge. The desire to excel is a human trait; the chance to prove his worth, and for self-expression.

PART IV. NINE WAYS TO CHANGE PEOPLE WITHOUT GIVING OFFENSE OR AROUSING RESENTMENT

Rule 1: Begin with praise and honest appreciation. It is always easier to listen to unpleasant things after we have heard some praise of our good points.

Rule 2: Call attention to people's mistakes indirectly.

Rule 3: Talk about your own mistakes before criticizing the other person. A few sentences humbling oneself and praising the other party and seeing one's own faults makes it much more difficult to criticize anyone else.

Rule 4: Ask questions instead of giving direct orders. To ask questions makes a man want to cooperate instead of rebel as it gives him an opportunity to voice his ideas.

Rule 5: Let the other man save his face.

Rule 6: Praise the slightest improvement and praise every improvement. Be hearty in your approbation and lavish in your praise. Praise and encouragement can actually change a person's future and also outlook on life. Be sincere about praising.

Rule 7: Give a man a fine reputation to live up to. The average man can be led readily if you have his respect and if you show him that you respect him for some kind of ability. Give a man a good name to live up to and he will do all he can to live up to it rather than see you disillusioned.

Rule 8: Use encouragement. Make the fault seem easy to correct.

Rule 9: Make the other person happy about doing the thing you suggest. Also make them feel important.

PART V. LETTERS THAT PRODUCED MIRACULOUS RESULTS

In order to get miraculous results in letters, ask them to do a favor, or ask for information, and show that you feel obligated for getting this information. Try to boost the other man's ego through genuine appreciation.

PART VI. SEVEN RULES FOR MAKING YOUR HOMELIFE HAPPIER

Rule 1: Don't nag. Constant nagging and wild outbursts of temper will not get a person anywhere.

Rule 2: Don't try to make your partner over. A good thing to learn is noninterference with their own peculiar ways of being happy. Success in marriage depends just as much on being the right person as finding the right person.

Rule 3: Don't criticize. Fifty percent of all marriages are failures because of heartbreaking criticism.

Rule 4: Give honest appreciation.

Rule 5: Pay little attentions. Judge Sabbath, of Chicago, said "Trivialities are at the bottom of most marital unhappiness." Marriage in the long run is a series of trivial incidents.

Rule 6: Be courteous. Courtesy is just as important to marriage as oil is to your motor.

Rule 7: Read a good book on the sexual side of marriage.

NEW YORK LONGSHOREMEN'S UNION ABOLISHES THE SHAPEUP

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, it was gratifying to note in the newspapers this morning that the New York longshoremen's union abolished their so-called shapeup system of hiring waterfront laborers.

I was particularly pleased that this action came as a result of their own volition and decision rather than as a result of appropriate legislative action. It clearly indicates that most of the longshoremen are good, honest, hard-working men, and as anxious to get rid of racketeers and grafters as are Members of Congress.

The shapeup system of hiring on the New York waterfront made it possible for racketeers to infiltrate and eventually to control the longshoremen's union, thereby placing them in positions of power and threatening the safety and security of our Nation's largest and busiest shipping center.

The action taken by the union, as I have said, was voluntary, and came in the midst of our subcommittee's investigation of waterfront activities. If the longshoremen will continue to clean house and rid their unions of parasites, gangsters, and corrupt officials, we can be better assured of the safety of this important port.

In any event, abolishment of the shapeup is a step in the right direction, and I wish to compliment the rank and file of union members, on the whole loyal and hard-working men, who were chiefly responsible for this action.

ANGLO-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes on the present international situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been one of those who have felt most keenly the failure of the free world's strategy in the Far East. I have deplored the lack of united policy within the United Nations. I have opposed a policy that would declare Communist China an aggressor on the one hand and maintain diplomatic and economic relations with her on the other hand. To try to maintain your representatives in the capital of a nation that is killing your sons seems to me more than a slight contradiction in terms. To provide any economic help to a world conspiracy that is avowedly bent on the subversion of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

your own nation seems to me a road to suicide.

It has been my conviction for some time that a lack of a common program with our allies, especially with our British friends, concerning the Far East is what has blocked a solution to the Korean problem.

We all want peace. There are no groups in America who do not want peace. But the history of the last 15 years is as clear as a lightning flash across a night sky. Peace is indivisible.

Our policy makers should know by this time that appeasement is no solution. Never in our history have we been in greater need of "firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

We need to be doubly on our guard lest peace in Korea be a tactic in a strategy of war—war of arms and war of ideas—which encompasses a far greater region. Peace in the Far East must include justice to Indochina, Malaya, Formosa, and to that whole vast area. It must consider the future in the free world of the people of Japan.

The military aspect of peace, obvious and moving as it is, is only a part of the creation of peace. This is an ideological age, and the free world must win the battle of justice and truth in the war of ideas if any peace is to have meaning.

We need to keep perspective at this critical time. I can imagine nothing more pleasing to the Kremlin than the present battle of words between Westminster and Washington. For a major aim of Communist strategy is to isolate America and turn our allies against us. It is all very well to say that we can "go it alone." We cannot go it alone. Ninety-four percent of the world's population comes from outside the borders of America. Most of that 94 percent is being steadily taught by Moscow to hate America. Let us be sure we do not aid the process. Let us be sure that the fighting words which naturally come to our lips when we think of Korea do not become weapons for Communist victories instead of our own.

Our allies can well understand the feelings of the American people in regard to Korea. The statistics to date are 24,010 American dead and 98,052 wounded.

France can understand such suffering and we should understand the suffering of France. France has lost a whole generation of her best officers in Indochina.

The British people can understand these feelings and we should understand the feelings of the British people. They have suffered in Malaya. They have also suffered in Korea. Let me read the words of a great general, James Van Fleet, who ought to know the truth about Korea:

On April 22—my 8th day in Korea—the attack came. Soon we were involved in what still ranks as the biggest battle of the Korean war. We took some heavy losses. The First Battalion of the Gloucestershire Regiment, with the 170th Heavy Mortar Battery attached, volunteered to try to hold a critical hill instead of withdraw, and lost all but 42 of its 500 men on line in perhaps the outstanding example of unit bravery in modern warfare. Farther to the east in the Kapyong area an Australian battalion and a battalion of the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry stopped a deep Red penetration. The courageous example of these three units was so inspiring that I immediately awarded the unit citation to them, and incidentally broke protocol by not getting a prior clearance from their Governments.

The peace of the world rests on the unity of its free people. The brotherhood of Britain and America is fundamental to that peace. We will have our differences. The British deserve from us an honest expression of our convictions. But holding in trust the strength which is ours in the world, we in America need to cherish as a great treasure, with the British people, our heritage of Anglo-Saxon freedom, and the common ideology which we must live as well as proclaim, for it is the hope of the future.

Mr. President, it is my purpose on a later day, based on my studies, to develop this subject further. At this time, with the recent exchanges that have been made between Westminster and Washington, I wish to strike this note, in urging that we seek to find a common ground with our British brothers.

A LINCOLN MUSEUM

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on May 13, 1953, there appeared in the Washington Times-Herald an excellent editorial in support of a joint resolution introduced by Representative DONDERO and myself, calling for restoration of Ford's Theater. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LINCOLN MUSEUM

Senator YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota, and Representative DONDERO, Republican, of Michigan, are sponsoring proposals to revive national interest in Abraham Lincoln and his ideals with a great national museum.

Senator YOUNG is pushing a resolution to improve Ford's Theater. It is his idea to dramatize the life of the Great Emancipator by restoring the boxes, stage, and settings in the theater as they were on the night Lincoln was assassinated. Representative DONDERO, while approving the idea, suggests that wider attention could be directed to Lincoln and his great love for his fellow man by the construction of a museum in which documents and other objects related to his life could be assembled. Many of them are now scattered in Washington. Others are in possession of private owners.

Both of the ideas are excellent. There is no reason why Ford's Theater should not be restored and an adequate first-class fireproofed building be constructed to house the many Lincoln relics.

We agree wholeheartedly with the statement of Senator YOUNG that:

"Never in the history of the world has it been more necessary that the attention of all men everywhere be directed to the great force of love of liberty, justice, tolerance, and brotherly love as exemplified in the life of the Great Emancipator.

"Communist hatemongers are everywhere spreading the poison of racial and religious hatreds, inflaming and confusing those who would be our friends in Asia, the Middle East, and elsewhere.

"No figure in American history is so beloved throughout Asia and the Middle East as Lincoln, and we would do well to remind our friends overseas that this Nation, with God's help, is dedicated and rededicated to the ideals for which Lincoln stood."

We urge immediate approval of the two ideas by the Republican leaders in both Houses of Congress.

POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 692, TO PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I announce that the hearings on Senate bill 692, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, nationality, or ancestry, which were scheduled to begin next Tuesday, May 19, have been postponed to begin on the second week of January, the week of January 10, 1954.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

CONFIRMATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, for the immediate consideration of certain nominations for appointment or promotion in the Army, in the Air Force, and in the Navy, which have been lying on the table for about a week, and which were not printed because they were so numerous.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, as in executive session.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I also ask that 3,443 junior nominations be ordered to lie on the table until the next session of the Senate, but not printed, because they are so numerous.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I also report from the Committee on Armed Services certain nominations of generals which I request to have printed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the nominations will be received and placed on the calendar.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the calendar under the head of new reports. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination of Robert E. McLaughlin to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia be now considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert E. McLaughlin to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOTICE BY SENATOR KENNEDY OF INTENTION TO ADDRESS THE SENATE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on Monday at the conclusion of the normal legislative business I shall seek recognition to speak on a program affecting the economy of New England.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF FIRST INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement, that Senators are now free to make remarks regarding the life and public service of the late former Senator Robert F. Wagner; and that other matters are not in order until that is completed.

I now ask unanimous consent that when the eulogies are completed, the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4663, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus and agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, with the understanding and on condition that controversial matters be passed over and that no votes be taken today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, let me say that of course I understand that the Senator from Ohio means that individual amendments will be offered on Monday, and only committee amendments will be considered today.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct, and only committee amendments which are noncontroversial in nature will be considered today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Does the Senator from Ohio desire to have that arrangement continued after the hour of 2 o'clock?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, being somewhat confused as to the importance of the hour of 2 o'clock, I intended to make another motion at 2 o'clock.

THE LATE ROBERT F. WAGNER, FORMER SENATOR FROM NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, I rise to pay tribute to a great American and a warm personal friend.

The life of Robert F. Wagner should be an inspiration to every American; his loyalty to his friends and to the causes in which he believed was a virtue admired by all and for all to emulate.

Since his death there has been repeated frequently, by editorial and other form of eulogy, the story of the young boy who came to our shores as a poor immigrant, and from a condition of dire poverty, by sheer courage and ability, rose step by step—first in the attainment of a good education, then as a leader in civic and political life, through election successively to the New York State Assembly, to the New York State Senate, where he became the leader of his party, to the New York State Supreme Court, and finally to the United States Senate.

Twice, in 1915 and 1938, he was elected as a delegate to the New York State constitutional conventions of those years, and in the latter instance he served as his party's leader throughout the convention.

Senator Wagner's record of legislative achievement in the field of legislation pertaining to health, education, labor, housing, and social welfare and security generally is without parallel in the history of the country.

He has been called a pioneer and innovator, rather than a perfectionist, in social legislation. But however one may term his extraordinary accomplishments, he was a true humanitarian. Whether or not one may agree with all his methods of approach, one must applaud his high purpose and lofty objectives.

Senator Wagner was fundamentally a party man; even as he was loyal to his friends, so he was equally loyal to his party.

He contributed much to the development and advancement of his party throughout the long period of his public service.

Robert F. Wagner was my senior when I first came to the Senate.

I have never been able adequately to express my deep appreciation for all he did for me during the early days of my service in the Senate.

He was kind, patient, helpful, generous; he proved himself to be a genuine friend.

In his passing, the country has lost a truly great American, and all who were privileged to know him have lost a good and true friend.

I extend deep sympathy to his son and to the other members of his family.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the majority leader for the opportunity he has accorded us to express our great affection and regard for the late former Senator Robert F. Wagner.

For more than 40 years Bob Wagner was my friend. I was associated with him in philanthropic, civic, and political undertakings beyond count. I esteemed him as a friend. I admired him as a public figure. Few men have served in so many different capacities and brought to each one of them so full a measure of strength, devotion, and wisdom. Bob Wagner was a great man, and a versatile one. He rose from humble and difficult beginnings. He never forgot that fact. He never lost touch with the people.

I first remember Bob Wagner as a member of the New York State Legislature, to which he was elected as an assemblyman in 1904. Four years later he was promoted to the State senate, where he served for 10 years, and became Democratic floor leader. He was one of the great liberal, farsighted group led by Alfred E. Smith, James A. Farley, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During his long service in the New York Assembly and Senate, Bob Wagner made a great legislative record which included sponsorship of the workmen's compensation law, laws regulating employment of women and children, widows' pensions, and many other similar measures. He was chairman of the committee which investigated the Triangle shirtwaist factory fire, one of the worst disasters in the history of New York, which helped shock New York into action in the field of social legislation. After the investigation of this fire, Bob Wagner helped to write a law safeguarding workers in factories—a law which was the most advanced legislation enacted up to that time. As leader of the State senate, he cooperated with Al Smith to secure the enactment of more than 50 bills in a great social-reform program that long served as a model for the Nation.

In 1918, Bob Wagner was elevated to a seat on the New York State Supreme Court. In that capacity he served with great devotion and distinction for 8 years. In 1926, Bob Wagner was elected to the United States Senate. Here he soon assumed leadership in liberal legislation and humanitarian measures.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President, Bob Wagner became a prime builder of the structure of the New Deal. He drafted the National Industrial Recovery Act and the National Labor Relations Act, which became labor's magna carta. He fathered and fought for social security legislation. Throughout his long career in the Senate, he battled for measures for the relief of unemployment, for aid to the States in meeting the tragic impact of the depression, for public housing, and for many other similar measures.

He was an indefatigable worker. He never spared himself. He gave to the work which was his responsibility the fullest measure of his devotion, industry, and wisdom. He had many battles in the New York Legislature and in the Senate of the United States, but he nevertheless won and held the respect and affection of all his associates, regardless of political point of view or affiliation.

I deem it a high honor to have been chosen by the people of New York to succeed this great man, whose political philosophy I long shared. "Bob" Wagner was a great public servant, who earned the undying gratitude of the people of his State and Nation. His name will be long remembered here in the Senate and by the great masses of the people whom he served so well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a number of editorials written in eulogy of our beloved friend and former associate, Senator Wagner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 6, 1953]

ROBERT F. WAGNER

Robert F. Wagner exemplified throughout his long career of public service the high qualities which so many immigrants have contributed like thank offerings to their adopted country.

What marked out the young man who later became senior United States Senator from New York was that from the beginning of his adult life he dedicated himself to legislative reforms on behalf of the common man. Many poor boys on the East Side of New York were as handicapped as he in struggling for an education. Few, if any, have added as many illustrious chapters to our social welfare history.

Fortunately for him, Robert Wagner's early career in the legislature at Albany was linked with the careers of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt, who fortified his own high resolves. Even without this association, however, he would have followed courageously on his chosen course, for he was imbued with the zeal of a born crusader.

A pioneer and innovator in social legislation rather than a perfectionist, the lawyer from Yorkville was not the man to insist that any law he advocated was the last one on the subject. It was his deep-seated humanitarianism, his sympathy for those handicapped in the race of life that led him to espouse many noteworthy statutes. These laws may well serve as his fitting monument.

[From the Washington Post of May 6, 1953]

ROBERT F. WAGNER

More than any other single person, perhaps, former Senator Wagner, now dead at the age of 75, exemplifies the genius of the earlier New Deal. It is to Franklin Roosevelt, of course, that the historical responsibility for the courses followed and the measures adopted during that revolutionary epoch belongs, and it is upon his memory that for good or bad ultimate judgment will be passed. Yet very few of the political and social innovations for which his first administration is historically conspicuous were of Roosevelt's own conception. He depended largely upon other men's ideas, adapting or modifying them to suit the necessities or exigencies of his situation; and high up among his fertile-minded advisers was Robert F. Wagner.

In this amenability to Senator Wagner's influence Mr. Roosevelt revealed his political astuteness; for unlike the much publicized brain trust, Mr. Wagner was first and above all a practical man who had fought his way upward through the legislature and the law courts into the high favor of Tammany Hall. Unlike many other luminaries of the epoch, and unlike Mr. Roosevelt himself, Senator Wagner had a first-hand, rather than an abstract and theoretical, acquaintance with the problems of poverty in an industrial and urbanized society. Probably better than anyone else in high office at the time he understood the thought and aspirations of the anonymous and inarticulate workers who were not then fully aware of how preponderant political power had passed into their hands.

Senator Wagner, in a lifetime of battles against sweatshops, loan sharks, landlords, greedy corporations, and other evils, had concluded that the chief hope of betterment in the lives of the urban poor lay with the labor unions and in their power to enforce their own terms on employers. What he wanted most of all, therefore, was to see the principle of collective bargaining made universal and obligatory. To achieve this he was prepared to abandon what remained of the Jeffersonian tradition of his party. Thus, in his authorship of the National Recovery Act, American industrial monopolism was recognised as a fait accompli in order to achieve a similar recognition for trades unionism.

This recognition stands as Senator Wagner's permanent and tremendous contribution to our economic and political life; for even though the NRA was subsequently repudiated by the Supreme Court, and the National Labor Relations Act subsequently modified by the Taft-Hartley Act, the general principle of the right of collective bargaining remains unimpaired. Thus it is to Robert F. Wagner, more than to anyone else, that the American labor leaders owe their present great power. And though some of these leaders may have sometimes seemed determined in their conduct to prove the axiom of Burckhardt, that "power is of its nature evil, whoever wields it," the power is unlikely to vanish.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 6, 1953]

ROBERT F. WAGNER

The death of Robert F. Wagner, Sr., symbolizes the end of a period of stirring fast-paced development of our collective social conscience. In New York it is hard to think of ex-Senator Wagner without recalling Gov. Alfred E. Smith. Both rose to eminence from boyhoods of poverty spent in this city's crowded lower East Side. They served in the State legislature together. Wagner as a State senator and Smith as an assemblyman led in the creation and the deliberations of the first New York State factory investigation commission charged with looking into the causes of the tragic Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire of March 25, 1911. One hundred and forty-five women workers lost their lives in that holocaust. But subsequently the techniques of investigation developed by the team of Wagner and Smith have been used repeatedly in the development of the many social laws now on the State and Federal statute books.

There has been no law to improve the working and living conditions of the workers which does not either bear Senator Wagner's name as a sponsor or in the passage of which he did not play an active role. Measures for the relief of unemployment, for aid to States in meeting the severe problems of the depression years, the National Industrial Recovery Act, the social-security bill for unemployment insurance and old-age pensions, measures for public housing, all represent his pioneering effort. The long record would be incomplete without reference to the National Labor Relations Act—which organized labor hailed as its Magna Carta. Its passage was marked by probably the most bitter and hard-fought battle in Senator Wagner's career. He believed passionately that the workers' right to organize as free men and women must be protected. The pendulum swung rapidly away from the conditions which in 1935 had made the successful fight for the NLRB virtually a crusade. When a later Congress felt it necessary to bring this law in balance and passed the Taft-Hartley Act, Senator Wagner was already too ill to take part in the momentous debate.

The social causes to which Senator Wagner's life was devoted are forever a basic part of the fabric of our national life, no matter what changes in form the years may bring. It is in the great democratic tradition of America that the German boy who came here when 8 years old, sold newspapers to help the family purse, worked his way through college and law school, was able through our political institutions to render these enduring services to his country.

[From the CIO News of May 11, 1953]

BOB WAGNER

Death has robbed America of another of the great figures of the New Deal era—75-year-old former Senator Robert F. Wagner, of New York.

An early associate in the New York Legislature of Franklin Roosevelt and Al Smith, Bob Wagner based his philosophy on the belief that government should help the people rather than the special interests. He was a strong right arm of F. D. R. all during the New Deal, and his name kept bobbing up on a series of bills to strengthen New Deal programs.

The national labor relations law—much better known as the Wagner Act—was the legislation that most popularized the Wagner name. But it was only one of many social laws sponsored by the New York Senator that have helped to improve America.

The Social Security Act was one; the first big Federal Slum Clearance Act was another; he fought for better health and better education for the children of the country.

Every worker whose union has won him better wages and working conditions; every family freed from the misery of slum living; every elder citizen to whom even modest pensions bring a measure of security—all of them owe a direct debt to Bob Wagner, of New York.

We mourn his loss; and we shall not soon forget his great humanitarian record.

[From the New York Post of May 7, 1953]

TO BE FRANK

(By Dr. Frank Kingdon)

The late Senator Robert F. Wagner was the legislative spokesman for the era of reform, correcting abuses growing out of the development of mass production in industry. Others will pay tribute to his record. I want to point out another aspect of his career.

He was born overseas. True, he was brought to this country early in life, and received his education here, but he was a product of the waves of immigration which contributed so many leaders to this country in times past. The significant fact about him is that he was almost the last of these leaders. Unless I am mistaken, no present Senator was born overseas, and Justice Frankfurter is the only man left in any comparable high office who was so born.

Forty years have passed since the last huge influx of immigration, 1914 being the last year with over a million immigrants. Thirty years have passed since the number went over a half-million in 1924. We must also recall that in 1914 our total population was less than a hundred million, and in 1924 about 110 million. With our present population of 150 million, immigration quotas for 1953 total only 154,657.

It is still possible that an occasional national leader will rise from among the few immigrants we admit, but these exceptions, when they occur, will only emphasize the truth that we have entered a new epoch of our social history—an epoch of integration of our own community and reliance of leadership born and bred among ourselves.

For us this has a peculiar meaning. In our origins we were unlike other nations, and those among the Founding Fathers who followed Jefferson believed they were creating a new kind of community, one unified not by a common birth but by a common faith. The Englishman, according to their thinking, was English because he was born in England, the Frenchman French because he was born in France, and so on.

But they were men who, for freedom's sake, discarded the loyalty to which they were born. They, accordingly, were willing to accept as members of the American community any who came seeking liberty. They did not ask of any where he was born or who was his former ruler. They said only: "If your heart be as our hearts in the love of freedom, give us your hand." Their definition of a true American was anyone who chose to come here to live with faith in the democratic way of life.

We cannot return to their uncomplicated ways because we cannot reproduce their vast

unsettled areas, their agrarian economy, and their simpler dealings with the outside world. But we shall lose the unique essence of their original vision for the United States if we ever substitute in their definition of an American the accident of birth for the love of liberty. An American is not so much one who is born in America as one in whom America is born.

Such thoughts as these come all the more readily when we think of Robert Wagner's associates. He was one of four men, different in background, contrasting in personality, who exemplified in their association how firm and productive a union of social ideals can be.

His first political partner was Alfred E. Smith, child of Irish parents and product of the East Side, great reformer of New York State government. His later activity was linked with Franklin Roosevelt, of long New York lineage and a country estate, who moved from his social circle to inaugurate domestic reforms and lead the country to world leadership. His successor, in place and boldness is HERBERT LEHMAN, unreconstructed liberal in a time of reaction.

In what other country could four men, starting from such distant origins, have come together to such a fruitful accomplishment? None of them was less or more an American because of his beginnings. All were Americans for what they had in common, their devotion to civil liberties, their determination to correct inequalities, their intention to secure the blessings of freedom for all in a highly industrialized society threatening to turn men into robots. What moved them all in their common task is that which defines an American.

[From the Machinist of May 14, 1953]

NO SENATOR DID MORE FOR THE PEOPLE

The newspapers said he died of a tired heart. In his time, no man had a bigger heart or worked it harder than Bob Wagner of New York.

Those of us who are newly come may not even remember the name. But the big heart of Bob Wagner worked overtime for almost half a century so that the common people of this country could live better and live more happily.

With the late Al Smith, Bob Wagner worked out the pattern in the New York Legislature in the first quarter of the century, the pattern that later in the United States Senate he helped Franklin Roosevelt apply to the entire Nation—the pattern that brought a New Deal to millions of homeless, jobless, underpaid Americans.

There are those among us who have never known a depression. There are those who can't believe that there ever have been times in these United States when capable workmen who want work couldn't find it at any wage.

Today all of us complain justifiably because pensions aren't big enough, because wages should be higher, because housing isn't being built fast enough. But our complaints today are minor compared with those of 20 and 25 years ago. They are small complaints because we have laws today, laws that Bob Wagner sponsored in Congress.

THE MANY WAGNER ACTS

Franklin D. Roosevelt summed it up well in a radio address during the 1938 senatorial campaign when he said:

"If you were to list some of the newly recognized major responsibilities of Government to meet the complexities of modern life-security in old age, unemployment insurance, protection of the rights of labor, low-cost housing, and slum clearance—you would have a virtual résumé of the acts of Congress that bear the name of Robert F. Wagner. So often since 1933 has new legislation been described as 'The Wagner Act' that the phrase has become confusing because there have been so many Wagner acts.

"For example, there is not only the Wagner Labor Relations Act; there are the Wagner Social Security Act and the Wagner Housing Act; and although you might feel uncertain as to which particular act is meant by the phrase, you can feel no uncertainty as to this—that any one of the Wagner Acts was an act intended for the benefit of those who need the help and support of Government against oppression and against intolerable conditions of living. His name stands in our history for courageous and intelligent leadership, constructive statecraft and steadfast devotion to the common man and the cause of civil liberties."

NOW IT'S UP TO US

Bob Wagner fought for us until his health failed 5 years ago. He died last week unsure of whether the great social reforms he helped to establish are to survive the attacks that are now being made upon them.

Bob Wagner's enemies, the greedy, the shortsighted, the selfish men who fought all of his reforms are out again in force. They think they can turn back the clock.

If all the Americans who have benefited from all the Wagner Acts will stand up and fight for Bob Wagner's reforms as he fought for us, we can protect the Wagner Acts. They're worth it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the things that have impressed me deeply ever since I have been a Member of the Senate is the value of our personal friendships here. In the matter of these friendships politics makes no difference. They are based on the respect that is developed between and among us because of integrity, conscientious purpose, and dedication to our individual ideals.

Our friend and former associate, Robert Wagner, has gone. To me it was a great privilege to know him. I had studied his early career, and I realize that the convictions which he held had come to him through the hard road of actual experience. Our backgrounds were different, our opportunities were different, and that may have accounted for the difference of our approach to political problems.

Robert Wagner, because of the sufferings he had gone through in his early life, had dedicated himself to the cause of bettering the conditions of his fellow men. His whole career reflected that dedication, and those of us who were here with him had the benefit of that wonderful spirit which he displayed in his life's work. It is of small importance whether we agree on the methods to accomplish honorable objectives for the good of our country and our fellow men. The important thing is that we really have these objectives in common, and that we can here work together for the true and inspiring interpretation of America to the world. To this ideal Robert Wagner was dedicated, and we are in his debt for the inspiration he left with us to carry on in this spirit during these difficult times.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as a former chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency—and there is also present another former chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who served as chairman during the 80th Congress—I desire at this time to pay my respects to the memory of a distinguished Senator who formerly served as chairman of that committee, the late Robert F. Wagner.

While I knew and respected Bob Wagner as a Senator of the United States long before it was my privilege to be a Member of this body, it was only after being assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which he was then the chairman, that I had the opportunity of becoming more intimately acquainted with him. The distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and myself remain in the Senate today of those who served on the Banking and Currency Committee under Bob Wagner when I became a member of that committee in 1941.

As chairman, he was eminently fair and impartial. Although a man of very deep and strong convictions, he was always most tolerant of the ideas and convictions of others. He took it for granted that other Senators were as much interested in man's welfare as he was. Thus, he never questioned another man's motives, but only the particular means of achieving the ends on which he assumed all would agree. It was this characteristic that made it possible for me and for so many others who differed with him, sometimes in a rather fundamental way, to become his ardent admirers.

Because he directed attention toward legislative means rather than encouraging lengthy discussion about the ends, he expedited the enormous work of his committee as few chairmen could. At the same time he took full advantage of the talents and ideas of every member of the committee, and had a unique way of harmonizing them.

A German by birth, he was characteristically thorough and orderly. He concentrated his efforts in a few important fields, and it was a rare occasion, indeed, when he would rise in the Senate to discuss anything which he felt he had not fully mastered, or for which he had not adequately prepared himself.

Bob Wagner, I came to learn, although never appearing to be pious, was basically a religious man. One day in talking about things in general, as it was my pleasure on so many occasions to do, I asked him what he thought was the most important thing he did in life. I had expected that he would refer to one of the more important laws that bore his name, or some far-reaching decision he wrote as a member of the supreme court of his State, or some crucial political decision in his life. After a little thought, he said, in complete seriousness, "ringing the church bell every morning as a little boy in Germany. In doing that I know I was calling and bringing people to God." It was this humility of spirit that explained the very high esteem in which he was held by all who really knew him. It demonstrates that a man can achieve great fame in political life without generating the envy to which such men are, unfortunately, subject.

Bob Wagner was "liberal" in the days when it was unnecessary to put quotations around the world. He was an old-fashioned liberal. Bob Wagner best

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

summed up his whole philosophy—simply and profoundly—when he wrote:

Every man had a soul—it was as simple as that—and that's why man had a dignity that had to be preserved and enhanced. Man imprinted his personality on that on which he labored, and to his work was lent his dignity and his personality. Work was, therefore, something honorable and the expression of God in man.

He was interested in giving every human being an opportunity for a decent and respectable life. He was a practical man, who knew that change in social progress was at best a slow process and that in order to achieve it in a democracy, it was necessary to make constructive compromises.

He had as fine a sense of timing as anyone I ever knew in political life. He would, so to speak, nurse along a bill in which he was vitally interested, until he thought the time was ripe and then he would concentrate every last ounce of energy on seeing that it was enacted.

He was able in an uncanny way to sense problems and issues long before their time. In 1927, when the country was preoccupied with the stock ticker and when even the economists were viewing the economy through leather spectacles, he foresaw the economic depression which was to come and introduced the Employment Stabilization Act, which became law in 1933. At about the same time he proposed the Employment Service Act, which became law in 1933, and is still operating; also the act which provided for the gathering of employment statistics which was enacted in 1930.

So much emphasis is put, and deservingly so, on his achievements in behalf of the wage earner, I think it is worth noting that Bob Wagner's interest in people, as might be expected, extended to all people, whether they were businessmen, bankers, farmers, or whatever they were. He was interested in seeing to it that they all could make their fair contribution to society and receive from it what was their just due. He participated actively in the creation of the RFC, which saved the life of some of the great railroad and business corporations of the land in the early thirties. He was one of the chief sponsors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which not only saved the homes of so many American families but kept our banks and savings institutions solvent. He worked hard, alongside the late and beloved Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg, for the enactment of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act. I recall very well how effectively Senator Vandenberg and Senator Wagner worked together.

Senator Wagner sponsored the law greatly expanding the authority of the Export-Import Bank; he was 1 of the 4 representatives of the United States at the Bretton Woods Conference, and he played a leading role in establishing the International Bank.

We are all familiar with his pioneering work in slum clearance and public housing and his sponsorship of the United States Housing Act of 1937. What is generally not remembered is his vital interest and continuous and successful efforts in extending private-home ownership and in the encouragement of private enterprise in housing. It was Bob Wagner who, as much as anyone, was responsible for the success of the FHA. He prophetically visualized its role almost 20 years ago, in 1934, when he stated:

The National Housing Act (Federal Housing Administration) will stimulate the flow of several billion dollars of private capital into the repair and improvement of existing homes. It will insure mortgage investments. It will stimulate the organization of private national associations to furnish liquidity to mortgage securities. It will bolster the building and loan associations that are the backbone of small-home financing. All this is to be accomplished through the medium of private business, aided by the Government if necessary, but encouraged above all to stand upon its own feet and contribute, as it has in the past, the largest aid to American prosperity.

In 1928 the sad plight of the farmers, which he observed and was so concerned about, was one of the signs he pointed to as foreshadowing the depression he predicted. He supported during his legislative career every measure to aid and assist the farmer. He was the author of the Farm Mortgage Relief Act of 1933, believed in and fought for farm parity and the soil-conservation program.

It was my privilege during his last years in the Senate, when he was ill, to take over much of his burdens as ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee during the 80th Congress. Although he was aware that we had strong differences on some issues, he never hesitated to delegate to me full discretion in making the important decisions I had to make as the ranking majority member of the committee in those days.

I shall always be proud of his confidence in me, when he asked me to assume the chairmanship of the committee instead of himself in the 81st Congress. It was my great satisfaction and the achievement of a goal that he long looked forward to, when, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I, with several other Senators, managed the Housing Act of 1949 successfully through the Senate and helped in enacting it into law. I hope it will serve as a lasting tribute to a truly great man.

The one thing Bob Wagner was more interested in than in his work, if anyone can imagine that, was his family, and for the last 34 years, since his wife died in 1918, his family consisted of his son, Bob, Jr.

In expressing my sympathy to you, Bob, Jr., and your lovely family, I can now say that of all the honors ever bestowed on your father, none were so precious to him as those which were bestowed upon you. May you, therefore, follow in his way and bring increasing honor and success to the great name of Robert Wagner.

Mr. President, I want to pay this tribute to Bob Wagner because of the close association I had with him in the 80th Congress when he was ill and left authority with me. As I said, when the 81st Congress was organized, Bob Wagner was to be the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. At that time he telephoned me to discuss the chairmanship of the committee and told me that he had decided not to assume the chairmanship because he had full confidence in me, and knew that I would operate it in the best interests of the American people.

Later in that session Senator Wagner resigned and Governor Dewey appointed to the Senate the gentleman who is now the distinguished Secretary of State. Before he resigned his son, Bob, called me and told me that the Senator wanted me to know that it was not so difficult to resign knowing that I was carrying on. For this confidence evidenced by a great man I shall forever be proud.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of former Senator Bob Wagner, who was an intimate friend of mine from the time I became a Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, when the history of the United States Senate during the 20th century is recorded, no name will rank higher than that of the Senator whose passing we mourn today, the courageous, conscientious and liberal-minded Senator from New York, Robert F. Wagner. During his 23 years in this body, Senator Wagner became the vigorous and successful champion of the underprivileged, the poverty stricken, and the exploited. As the sponsor of essential social and economic reforms in that period, he won recognition as an outstanding spokesman of enlightened and humanitarian government.

In 1927, when few were able to foresee the storm clouds on the horizon, it was Bob Wagner who pointed out the danger of a threatened depression and called for advance planning to prevent it. Finally, when the collapse came in 1929, followed by unemployment, hunger, and fear, it was Bob Wagner who led the fight for social reforms, relief, and public works. When his old friend and lifelong associate, Franklin D. Roosevelt, entered the White House in 1933, it was Bob Wagner who took the leadership in the major legislative programs of the New Deal, resulting in far-reaching reforms in our economic and social life.

Today everyone refers to the National Labor Relations Act of 1937 as the Wagner Act. But there are many Wagner acts. The Social Security Act was a Wagner act. The United States Housing Act was a Wagner act. The minimum-wage law was largely a Wagner act. The legislation setting up the Federal Housing Administration was a Wagner act.

I shall not undertake to name all the important acts for which he was responsible.

One of the greatest privileges of my life was to work closely with Senator Wagner during the trying period of the great depression. I was a member of the Labor Committee when he was advocating the passage of the National Labor Relations Act. Senator Wagner and I were cosponsors of the first health-insurance proposals, which were considered by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee during the period when I was chairman. Senator Wagner and I were

cosponsors, together with other Senators, of the full-employment bill, and I came before the Banking and Currency Committee, which he chaired, to advocate action upon the legislation which is known today as the Employment Act of 1946.

All of us associated with Bob Wagner during those stirring historic years were impressed by the courage and convincing eloquence with which he met the attacks of those who opposed his progressive legislative proposals. He never allowed himself to be dissuaded, discouraged, or deceived by the fog of propaganda resorted to so often by his adversaries. When he and the legislative programs he sponsored were subjected to misrepresentation, abuse, and vilification he declined to resort to personalities or invectives. Always he answered patiently, with sober and convincing argument on the issues as he saw them.

He never was discouraged by a losing fight. He stood his ground and looked forward to another day. He had a sublim faith that in the course of time right would triumph. Buttressed by this faith, he again and again saw measures which had for many years been opposed by overwhelming odds finally enacted into law. He tasted the ironic joy in his later years of hearing many of his legislative triumphs referred to as Wagner Acts—acts praised in glowing terms by some who had at first opposed them as radical.

A factual and moving description of Senator Wagner's approach to legislative problems has recently been written by his former executive assistant and associate, Leon H. Keyserling. Let me quote briefly from this article, which appears in the May 18 issue of the New Republic:

> Rarely has a man in public life rejected so vigorously all weapons except the truth as he saw it. But when armed with a just cause, he ignored the political risks and personal burdens of fighting for reforms before they became popular.
>
> Love of the ancient safeguards which a free society must hold fast to even while rushing to solve new problems; unwillingness to use distortion for political advantage; courage to foresake one's own political superiors on a vital party issue where one believes them to be mistaken; determination to fight for one's beliefs before they are accepted; a burning passion to help the underdog without wronging the more fortunate; lonely withdrawal from the material and social advantages open to a successful man, in order to concentrate upon his life's work—these were rare qualities, not in an idealist satisfied just to be right without being effectual, but in a practical man driven by an insatiable desire to get results.

Mr. President, many outstanding statesmen have served in this body during recent decades. I am proud of the achievements of my predecessor, Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, recognized as an outstanding champion and authority on constitutional law. I shall always treasure my associations with the great Senator from Nebraska, the man to whom credit belongs for the creation of the TVA, Senator George Norris. I shall always honor the memory of young Bob La Follette, who conducted the civil-liberties investigation for the Senate Labor Committee. I can never forget the effective work of David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, who led the fight for the Wagner Act in the committee.

But the name of Senator Wagner stands out as that of a people's Senator. He was a senator whose legislative achievements have made this country a better place in which to live. He was a Senator who did more than any other Member of Congress in this century to make our Government responsive to the needs of the people. His name will ever have a high place in the history of our democratic institutions.

I wish to extend to his distinguished son, Robert Wagner, of New York, and to all his relatives, my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the article entitled "Senator Wagner: Government for the People," by Leon H. Keyserling, which appeared in the New Republic of May 18, 1953, and from which I have quoted.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WAGNER: GOVERNMENT FOR THE PEOPLE

(By Leon H. Keyserling)

Robert F. Wagner, who died on May 4, was born in Germany in 1877. Brought to New York at the age of 8, he lived with his penniless parents in the basement where they labored, battled his way through the years to a law diploma, rose rapidly to high elective and judicial offices in the State, and served 23 successive years as a United States Senator. During a vital period, he introduced and guided to enactment a more varied and significant group of laws than any other Senator in our history.

To review briefly his 40 years of public service is impossible. During his 6 most active years, he sponsored the Social Security Act; Home Owners Loan legislation; Public Works Administration; United States Employment Service; National Labor Relations Act; Railroad Retirement Act; Civilian Conservation Corps; United States Housing Act (slum clearance and low-rent housing); National Industrial Recovery Act; National Housing legislation (FHA); various unemployment relief laws; and a host of other measures.

Proponent of so much legislation associated with the heyday of the New Deal, Wagner was far more than the legislative agent of a preordained program. When he introduced the National Industrial Recovery Act in early 1933, its great public-works features were a synthesis of public works and relief bills which he had been agitating since 1930. The effort to deal comprehensively with prices and wages, production and industrial relations, was attuned to his long search for a balanced program of recovery and reform rather than a panacea such as the bill for a 30-hour week to share unemployment instead of combating it. Despite shortcomings, the NRA laid foundations for improved economic conditions which still endure.

Years before introducing the social security bill in 1935, Senator Wagner sponsored the first resolution ever presented in the Congress to study unemployment insurance; between 1930 and 1933 he presented bills to measure unemployment, alleviate its hardships, spread its costs, and counter it affirmatively with industrial stabilization measures. In two of his later efforts—the National Labor Relations and the United States Housing Acts—he encountered not only powerful expected opposition, but also the more heart-breaking experience of apathy or dissent running to the highest levels of the executive structure.

Senator Wagner hated to indict individuals or groups; he saw many sufferers but few malefactors. He never tried to win a temporary—and in a democracy, dangerous—majority by pitting one interest against another. Seeking to improve society rather than to punish or reform individuals, he aimed his appeal at the reason of all fair-minded men by programs geared to the ultimate welfare of all.

While radical in his determination to get to the heart of matters, in certain fundamentals Wagner was a fundamentalist. He instinctively disliked the court-packing plan, not because he thought judges holier than other men, but because he thought the basic framework of our free institutions more sacrosanct than any man.

Rarely has a man in public life rejected so vigorously all weapons except the truth as he saw it. But when armed with a just cause, he ignored the political risks and personal burdens of fighting for reforms before they became popular.

Love of the ancient safeguards which a free society must hold fast to even while rushing to solve new problems; unwillingness to use distortion for political advantage; courage to foresake one's own political superiors on a vital party issue where one believes them to be mistaken; determination to fight for one's beliefs before they are accepted; a burning passion to help the underdog without wronging the more fortunate; lonely withdrawal from the material and social advantages open to a successful man, in order to concentrate upon his life's work—these were rare qualities, not in an idealist satisfied just to be right without being effectual, but in a practical man driven by an insatiable desire to get results.

Even now, there are millions of families living in decent homes which would not have been built but for his efforts. There are tens of millions of workers who enjoy an industrial democracy which but for him would not be so full. There are thousands of businesses and farms and banks alive and thriving, because of his numerous measures designed to afford them direct aid and stimuli. There is a throbbing $360 billion economy which, but for the many measures bearing his imprint, would not be so strong or stable or just.

How different countless American lives would be today, if some quota in 1885 had prevented this boy of 8 from coming to these shores. And how important for our future it is that later members of the greatest deliberative body in the world measure up to the standards which Robert F. Wagner set.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the political principles of Bob Wagner are eternal. They were based on a faith that man was created in the divine image. He believed in the unanswerable truth that the objective of free government by free men is to promote and protect human values. He belonged to the liberal tradition in American politics. Abuse, criticism, smear—and he was subject to such attacks almost constantly—did not deter him for standing for what he thought was right.

Bob Wagner believed that his primary duty in the United States Senate was to exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues and in accordance with the facts as he found them, irrespective of political pressure. He sat in the United States Senate as a free man. His monument is his record of liberalism in the Senate. We can best memorialize him by walking in his footprints.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

FIRST INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland obtained the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield for that purpose?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield for that purpose provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is the understanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the terms of the order previously entered, the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 4663, the first independent offices appropriation bill.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4663) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish me to yield to him for any purpose?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I understand, the independent offices appropriation bill is now the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is consideration of committee amendments next in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, only noncontroversial amendments are to be considered, and no vote is to be taken today.

THE PROBLEM OF POLICY-INFLUENCING PERSONNEL IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission recently outlined a proposal which would remove all policy-making and confidential governmental positions from the scope of the civil service system. This is a much needed and long overdue measure. It is by far the most significant plan of action in efforts to bring conformity and consistency in the policies and objectives of the new administration. The vital importance of these policy provoking and confidential positions can be readily emphasized by the following quotation from the book Witness by Whittaker Chambers:

> The simple fact is that when I took up my little sling and aimed at communism, I also hit something else. What I hit was the forces of that great socialist revolution, which in the name of liberalism, spasmodically, incompletely, somewhat formlessly, but always in the same direction, has been inching its ice cap over the Nation for two decades. * * * It was the forces of that revolution that I struck at the point of its struggle for power. And with that we come to the heart of the Hiss case and all its strange manifestations. No one could have been more dismayed than I at what I had hit, for though I knew it existed, I still had no adequate idea of its extent, the depth of its penetration, or the fierce vindictiveness of its revolutionary temper, which is a reflex of its struggle to keep and advance its political power.
>
> It was the forces of this revolution that had smothered the Hiss case (and much else) for a decade, and fought to smother it in 1948. These were the forces that made the phenomenon of Alger Hiss possible; had made it possible for him to rise steadily in Government and to reach the highest post after he was already under suspicion as a Communist in many quarters, including Congress, and under the scrutiny of the FBI. Alger Hiss is only one name that stands for the whole Communist penetration of Government. He could not be exposed without raising the question of the real political temper and purposes of those who had protected and advanced him, and with whom he was so closely identified that they could not tell his breed from their own.

I hold no brief for Chambers as an individual, nor do I presume to temporize the transgressions of his life. Nonetheless, his credibility as a witness before congressional committees and the courts stands unimpeached, and we can gain much from revelations, such as these, in our vigorous and continuous fight against the subtle and often obtuse forces of creeping socialism, subversion, and communism.

This observation by Chambers illuminates a pivotal problem of immediate importance to the new Republican administration. It is the problem of policy-influencing personnel. While the majority of Federal employees are not only loyal and reliable but void of any desire or intent to bring about the "great socialist revolution" of which Chambers writes, there does exist a significant minority of Federal employees who during the past two administrations have striven purposely and resolutely to effectuate such a transformation. Because of the strategic positions the members of this minority occupy and because of their skill and experience, gained by many years of practice, in subverting Federal authority to their own ends, it can fairly be said that as long as they constitute a force in the Government no legislation, no matter how wisely drafted to further Republican programs, can be expected to maintain its character or to attain its goals.

This minority is to be found, chiefly, in those departments and agencies of the Government whose actions and policies affect, directly or indirectly, the economic and social institutions of the Nation. The members of this group include, in particular, professional employees, such as lawyers, economists, information specialists, writers, personnel experts, public relations people, and political and social science analysts. What percentage of professional or policy-influencing employees in the Government are members of the forces of that great socialist revolution to which Chambers refers, it is impossible to say. But experience and observation suggest that the percentage is sufficiently large to warrant the immediate and thoughtful attention of the new Republican administration.

Some members of the Socialist forces mentioned by Chambers still hold top positions in the Government as Presidential appointees, and since they may be expected to be replaced as a result of the change in administrations, they are not of primary concern. Most of them, however, occupy positions below the top and out of the public eye, ranging from confidential assistants, division heads, and section chiefs to minor and obscure subordinates. These should be of the utmost concern to the new Republican administration. It is upon them, unless replaced or neutralized, that the Republican appointees, who are necessarily less expert and experienced in government, will depend to a great extent for information, advice, and assistance in the performance of the innumerable duties of their offices. Government today is a system of wheels within wheels, wherein the small and obscure wheels grind out in great part the vast bulk of the decisions and policies for which the major and known wheels are ultimately responsible. Hence, if the policies and decisions of the new Republican administration are not to be frustrated, it will be necessary to remove from the Government whomever among the small and obscure wheels may duly and fairly be shown to be Socialists in ideology and purpose, and replace them with personnel who are free of any anti-capitalist, procollectivist bias.

How does one identify the Socialists in the Government? At the outset it cannot be sufficiently emphasized that these people do not call themselves Socialists and that for the most part they do not belong to the Socialist Party. They are always liberals, as Chambers points out, and it is always in the name of liberalism that they speak and act. But that these people are Socialists, or more accurately crypto-Socialists, since they mask their socialism under another guise, is plainly revealed by certain basic assumptions which they fervidly profess and which have their origin in socialism. Among these assumptions are: Government is good and to be expanded; business is evil and to be regimented; labor unions are good, with the CIO better than the A. F. of L.; employers are wicked; the Federal Government, at least since 1932, is progressive, and should increasingly supplant the States which are regarded as reactionary and obsolete; public own-

ership is better than private enterprise which is looked upon as selfish and corrupt; wages are good, profits are sinful; public welfare measures should replace private charity; the executive branch of the Federal Government, and in particular the regulatory agencies thereof, should be given more power and wider discretion, the Congress and the courts should be subordinated and curtailed.

From these basic and related assumptions flow many corollaries which manifest themselves in all the areas of economic, social, and political action—race, religion, foreign affairs, disloyalty and subversion, civil liberties, industrial relations, public education, social welfare, and so on. On each of these problems the crypto-Socialists in the Government adopt attitudes and courses of action which, it must be stressed, are designed not to effect a peaceful and equitable solution of the problems but to promote differences and antagonisms in order to render our traditional institutions unworkable, thereby making it easier to replace them with the centralized organs of a socialistic or collectivist state.

Thus, the crypto-Socialists or collectivists are readily distinguishable from those who hold soundly progressive and truly liberal views in the areas of economic, social, and political action. The latter employees recognize both the desirability and the necessity, under appropriate circumstances, of social legislation and of governmental action in the socioeconomic sphere, but unlike the socialist liberals they view such legislation and action as desirable and necessary only if designed to solve specific and immediate problems, and if consonant with and in furtherance of the fundamental traditions and institutions of the Nation. The socialist liberals in the Government, on the other hand, regard legislation and governmental action in the socioeconomic sphere principally as steps toward attaining the goal of a socialized state, as entering wedges which are to be steadily expanded rather than discarded even when the necessity for them has disappeared. This ultimate objective of a socialized state is, of course, always carefully concealed. Each step toward socialization is defended as liberalism, and all opposition thereto is fought with a vicious skill designed to convict the opponents before the Nation as barbarous reactionaries motivated by greed and bent on oppression, exploitation, and fascism. It requires but little insight to realize how well this so-called liberal approach correlates with the goals and tactics of the Communists, and why the infiltration of the Government by the Communists has been so successful and so penetrating.

The socialist liberals in the Government, however, should not be confused with Communists, nor with Communist sympathizers, nor with the other subversives against whom the loyalty program is directed. The crypto-Socialists are not disloyal or subversive in the sense that they are under the direction of a foreign power or that they subscribe to the violent overthrow of the American Government. But they are disloyal in the sense that they, whether from good or bad motives, seek to subvert the American system of limited government, free enterprise, and democratic society and replace it with a system hostile and alien to our traditions as a nation. Because the socialist liberals operate under the camouflage of respectability, they may fairly be deemed a danger to the national interest, independent of the effective cover they provide for the Communist infiltration.

In the field of labor, which next to foreign affairs is the most sensitive and fertile field for Socialist infiltration, collectivist attitudes, as previously indicated, manifest themselves primarily in a prounion, antimanagement bias. This prounion bias for labor does not spring, it must be stressed, from any real concern for wage earners or for the great free American labor movement as such. Labor unions are regarded by the crypto-Socialists not as integral and wholesome factors in the national economy nor as legitimate voluntary organizations seeking the social and economic welfare of their members within the framework of the American system of private capitalism, but rather as instruments for attaining a Socialist state. While the leadership of the Republican Party consists of skilled politicians and capable administrators, it apparently is not fully conversant with the strength and the strategic location of the collectivist bureaucrats in the Government. The latter even now are seeking to hold on to their policy-influencing positions with an eye to future effectiveness and present subtle political sabotage. Toward this objective they are using any and all means that promise success. They assume the guise of Republicans; they ceaselessly reiterate the virtues of the merit system, the sanctity of civil-service status, and the public need for a trained, impersonal, nonpolitical body of Federal career servants; and label any effort to replace them as a vicious exercise of the spoils system. Any willingness to rely upon these people is fraught with great danger to the new Republican administration and, indeed, to the safety and welfare of the Nation. These people will never be Republicans, any more than they ever were Democrats of the traditional organizational type. Like the Communists their objective is a monopoly of power. Their technique is infiltration followed by elimination of their allies, and failing this, the destruction of the infiltrated organization. The Socialist liberals are fundamentally indifferent to party labels, but because of the favorable conditions which the New Deal and the Fair Deal created for their infiltration of the Government they have during the past 20 years adhered to the leftwing of the Democrat Party. There is no question then that if the Socialist liberals are permitted to function within the new Republican administration, they will do so with an eye to a future victory by the leftwing of the Democrat Party.

To meet the grave threat posed by the significantly large number of socialist liberals who now hold policy-influencing positions, techniques must be evolved and measures taken to prevent them from continuing to be a force in the Government. Above all, their appointive superiors as well as their replacements must learn to guard against subsequent reinfiltration by those who share the same basic philosophies and views. In this connection effective aid can be rendered by the reliable and ideologically sophisticated, anticollectivist employees who have managed to survive the long years of the New Deal-Fair Deal and with many of whom I have consulted in the preparation of these remarks.

The people of America await conclusive and incontestible evidence of the change for which they overwhelmingly expressed themselves last November. There are already clear indications of impatience. In the formulation of policy and the translation of policy to positive action, it is essential that these sensitive positions be occupied by reliable and competent persons who are immutably sympathetic to the platform and objectives of the new administration. The success or failure of the Republican administration hinges upon the effective utilization of this fundamental of good organization.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the presentation by the distinguished Senator from Maryland of a very important subject, as it relates to America. Does not the Senator believe that Federal ownership, at the present time, of almost $30 billion worth of property indicates a serious trend toward socialism in our country?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It most certainly does. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Has not much of that trend been the result of having what is called career people in various important positions in the Federal Government?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I observe no attempt to discontinue that trend on the part of so-called career officials. On the contrary, they would take more and more of the people's rights, more and more of their land and property, and would centralize everything they could in Washington. Until we get rid of those who have such a tendency and who hold such views the new administration cannot possibly succeed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Is not one of the reasons for the trend toward a highly centralized Government in Washington to the detriment of local government, which

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

is our basic form of self-rule, the result of policies being established by men and women in Washington who occupy secondary roles and who are not generally observed personally by the public?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is perfectly true. I have talked to several Cabinet members and to several heads of Government agencies. They find themselves utterly incapable of getting rid of employees who are not only making policy with which the heads of departments do not agree, but who are sabotaging the policies which such heads are trying to establish.

Mr. MARTIN. Is there any great organization in our country whose head does not have the opportunity to select all of his policymaking subordinates?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In any organization the head of the organization must have control over the policymaking subordinates and those who occupy a confidential relationship with him in conducting his business. Otherwise, the situation is similar to that of a ship without a rudder. In other words, whenever an attempt is made to establish a policy, it fails because down the line the attempt is sabotage, or, coming up the line, there is a strong trend of thought exerted surreptitiously with which it is unable to cope.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation, and then ask a question.

The Army of the United States is a great organization. Many Socialists have stated that the Army is a socialistic organization because the members have equal rights and equal privileges, and have the same clothing, the same food, and so forth. However, is it not true that in the Army of the United States an officer is not permitted to be assigned indefinitely to troops, but occasionally is given administrative assignments? He may be kept a while in the United States, and then is assigned to a post in a foreign country; the officers are continually being moved. If that is not done, they become stale, and do not have new ideas.

Does not the same situation obtain among many of the persons in the service of the Federal Government?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I believe it does; and I also believe that if a good and workmanlike job is to be done the heads of departments and agencies must control policymaking and must have in confidential positions in the Federal Government employees on whom they can implicitly rely.

Mr. MARTIN. Will not it be most difficult for the Federal Government to dispose of the almost $30 billion worth of factories, loan agencies, land, and so forth, until all those in policying-making positions in the Federal Departments and agencies are truly in sympathy with the free-enterprise system?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think that is true. That is a part of the problem.

I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that the persons to whom I am directing my remarks do not amount to more than 1 percent of all the employees of the Government, but they wield vast power and formulate policies against the will of the head, with the result that he is unable to stem such formulations of policy and is unable to put into effect the things he wishes to put into effect. Certainly we cannot survive as a new Republican administration under such conditions. We must have some way of getting our own team on the field.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to join the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania in his remarks concerning the speech of the Senator from Maryland, in which I wholeheartedly concur; and I congratulate the Senator from Maryland upon it.

I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland if he does not sense, among the people in his own State and among the people in the other States he has occasion to visit, a feeling of division on the question of Federal domination of everything, as against State domination and private domination of various matters. Does the Senator notice such a feeling, as he travels among the people?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I certainly do; I see it everywhere I go. I speak on that subject probably as much as, and perhaps more than does the Senator from Arizona, who, I know, is devoted to our system of government, and speaks on it quite extensively.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to ask another question, if the Senator from Maryland will yield further to me.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does not the Senator from Maryland feel that the great source of this division has been the repeated utterances during the past 20 years in favor of gigantic strength on the part of the Federal Government, as opposed to the sovereignty and power of the several States; and does not the Senator from Maryland also feel that the recent tidelands debate brought that issue into focus, with the result that the issue is now before the people of the United States?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes. In my opinion the tidelands debate embraced but one issue, and that was whether the States shall survive as independent units, or whether they shall be submerged under an all-powerful Federal Government, and whether control of all property shall be lodged in Washington, D. C., for administration by the Federal Government. I think that was the basic issue in the tidelands debate, and that is why I voted to return the tidelands to the States.

FIRST INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4663) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, House bill 4663, now being considered by the Senate, is the first independent offices appropriation bill for 1954, providing funds for the Executive Office of the President and for 23 of the independent agencies. The estimates for these agencies total $1,172,444,190.

Deferred to a second bill are budget estimates totaling $6,455,758,664 for the Atomic Energy Commission, Selective Service System, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Veterans' Administration.

The bill as reported to the Senate is under the estimates for 1954 by $715,031,311.

The largest item of reductions below the estimates is for payments to the civil-service retirement and disability fund. The estimates included $176,139,000 for normal cost or payments required in 1954 from the fund, also $192,015,000 estimated as an indefinite appropriation to pay interest to the fund, as well as $27,590,000 to repay to the fund the amount used in 1953 for the increased annuities authorized by Public Law 555 of July 16, 1952. These estimates, totaling $395,744,000, are not provided for in this bill, but are deferred, as stated in the committee report, until the study now being made of the overall retirement program of the Government has been completed and until the proper amount of such payments may be determined. The results of that study are expected by the end of the present calendar year. Meantime, the committee is informed that there is sufficient in the fund to pay for required disbursements in fiscal year 1954.

The second largest item of reductions below the estimates is for the stockpiling program in the procuring of strategic and critical materials. For this purpose the estimates included $188 million for additional funds and $37 million for liquidation of contract authorization. No additional funds are provided in the bill for these estimates of $225 million. As stated in the committee report, due to diversion to industry of materials contracted for from stockpile funds, to price decreases, to short deliveries, and to changes in authorized purchase programs and objectives, there is presently an unobligated balance of some $459 million, and the amount available as of July 1 is estimated at $376 million. For liquidation of contract authorization, there is provision in the bill for $30 million from these unobligated funds.

The balance of the reductions below the estimates—of $94,287,311—for the most part are deductions in the operating programs of the agencies, and amount to an overall percentage cut of 17 percent.

The amendments proposed provide increases totaling $16,718,766 and reductions totaling $10,326,380, for a net increase over the House bill of $6,392,386 or 1.4 percent.

Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, as I understand it, the bill will be read at this time for committee amendments; and if amendments are to be offered to the committee amendments, or if amendments are to be offered independently, they will be considered on Monday.

Therefore, I hope the bill may now be read and completed so far as noncontroversial committee amendments are concerned, so that on Monday we can take up controversial committee amend-

ments or other amendments which Senators may desire to offer and debate.

I now ask that the committee amendments be considered, with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that if objection is raised to any committee amendment, it will go over until Monday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding, too. I have the further understanding that even if committee amendments are not objected to today, they may be brought up again on Monday, without the necessity of obtaining unanimous consent or the necessity of making a motion to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an arrangement will require a further unanimous-consent agreement, because the Chair's understanding of the present unanimous-consent agreement is that at this time noncontroversial committee amendments may be considered and agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to have the unanimous-consent agreement amended in the way I have suggested, because in fairness to the membership of the Senate, some of whom are not present at this time, I think it is better to proceed in the other way. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have adopted the amendment I have suggested to the original unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to such an addition to the unanimous-consent agreement presently in force? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the committee amendments will now be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President—Emergency Fund for the President—National Defense," on page 3, line 3, after the word "year", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices—American Battle Monuments Commission—Salaries and Expenses," on page 4, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$8,000" and insert "$12,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction of Memorials and Cemeteries," on page 5, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$27,520" and insert "$41,276"; in line 15, after the word "travel" to strike out "$9,500,000" and insert "$4,500,000", and in line 16, after the word "expended", to insert "and, in addition the Commission is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation, foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States in an amount not exceeding $4,000,000, and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to make such foreign currencies or credits available to the Commission in the amount stated, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That foreign currencies available to the credit of the Treasury shall be used to defray expenses incurred for this purpose wherever practicable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 6, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$383,335" and insert "$570,000"; on page 7, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$16,064,323" and insert "$17,000,000", and in the same line, after the amendment last above stated, to strike out "Provided."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Communications Commission," on page 10, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$13,000"; and in line 15, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to insert "purchase of not to exceed sixteen passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$73,335" and insert "$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 17, after the figures "$7,100,000", to strike out the comma and "of which not less than $935,000 shall be available for personal services necessary for application processing and hearings in connection with the issuance and renewal of television licenses, and not less than $809,271 shall be available for personal services necessary for application processing and hearings in connection with the issuance of licenses in the safety and special radio services."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to advise the Senate that I have an amendment to propose to the amount stated in line 17, namely, $7,100,000. I propose to amend by striking out that numeral and inserting "$7,718,440." I send forward my amendment, which I ask to have lie on the table, to be brought up at an appropriate time on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, and will lie on the table, for consideration on Monday.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, beginning in line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission," on page 11, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$173,335" and insert "$240,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Trade Commission," on page 11, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$163,035" and insert "$196,435", and at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "$4,178,800" and insert "$4,053,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Services Administration," on page 12, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$161,200" and insert "$208,300", and in the same line, after the word "travel", to strike out "$98,826,070" and insert "$104,750,000."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the change from $98,826,070 to $104,750,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona to turn to the bottom of page 4 of the committee report. He will observe that the addition "is for space previously reimbursed for management from funds appropriated to other agencies." In other words, we are gradually trying to place within the General Services Administration jurisdiction over the management and renting of property. Three million three hundred and ninety-four thousand four hundred and fifty dollars of the addition is for property which has been placed under General Services Administration, which sum was formerly carried for other properties, and $1,120,000 is for costs resulting from advances in rental and utility rates. These are the principal items intended to be provided for by the restored amount.

At the time the General Services Administration Act was passed, the theory was that in the long run it would be more efficient and economical to place under one agency the handling of real estate and rental property, occupied by Government offices. It was for that reason that the General Services Administration was established.

The explanation of the additions is that the General Services Administration takes care of the rents for various departments. More than $3 million of the increase is represented by this item. The House, in reducing the appropriation, did not take this into consideration. I believe the evidence on this subject came to our committee after the matter had been before the House, though I am not sure of that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then is it correct to say that the amount of $3,394,450 would be reflected in a saving by some other department?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the understanding. It is to be expected, and it is to be insisted upon. It is removed from the other budgets.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Has that been done?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That has been done by the Director of the Budget to the best of my knowledge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$22,865" and insert "$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "$22,668,250" and insert "$20,000,000."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with reference to that item I should like to say that information has come to me since the committee voted which may indicate that this cut is a little too great. However, that can be taken up in conference with the House. I do not object to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$133,400" and insert "$160,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$800" and insert "$1,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$79,865" and insert "$81,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$140,700" and insert "$174,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$24,600" and insert "$36,900"; in line 2, after the word "travel", to strike out "$5,625,000" and insert "$5,525,000"; and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$100,000."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Massachusetts explain what is meant by "nitrate film conversion"?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, that refers to the preservation of historic films. The process has been in use for a number of years. I understand there are about 6 or 7 regional buildings in which the films are stored. The nitrate film conversion is for the purpose of preserving the films, some of which relate to World War II, some of which are historic commercial films which are to be preserved for posterity. It is to implement an effort, through the film process, to preserve such films for the future.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$88,600" and insert "$98,200", and in line 12, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$4,140,750" and insert "$4,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 3, to strike the numeral "$143,000" and insert "$209,550."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "Federal government, State governments", and insert "Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 20, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$175,800" and insert "$211,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 20, in line 14, after the numerals "1949", to strike out "$2,587,100" and insert "$3,330,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts explain the increase over the House figure?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I respectfully call my colleague's attention to the bottom of page 5 of the committee report. I read:

> The increase recommended by the committee is to provide a total of $3,330,000, which is $1,200,000 below the budget estimate of $4,550,000.

The reasons for providing this fund are set forth in the committee report on page 5. The report includes a detailed account. The appropriation is to be used in the administration of certain services, which are listed on page 5, in the total amount of $3,330,000.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, is the Senator able to give me a list of all the services involved?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I understand, this represents a breakdown by the Administrators' office, for the purposes of administering the various amounts. For slum clearance, if my memory is correct, there are grants in the bill in the sum of $20 million. That is for the payment of contracts up to date. Altogether there are capital grants of $500 million, authorized to pay for two-thirds of the net project cost of slum clearance. There is $20 million in the bill to complete grants for 8 projects and partial payments on 17 other projects. This is for the administration of those sums in the Administrator's office. That is my understanding.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The reason why I asked the question is that on page 23, line 14, the amount recommended by the House has been increased to $9 million. That is for the Public Housing Administration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would respectfully say to my colleague from Arizona that the other figure on page 23 is for the administration of public housing as opposed to slum clearance.

Mr. GOLDWATER. How much housing will $3,330,000 administer?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That I cannot answer in accurate figures. There is a $20 million grant this year, and $500 million in capital grants are authorized for two-thirds of the project. There are 25 projects, of which 8 will be completed with the $20 million, and there will be partial payments on 17 others.

Mr. GOLDWATER. By virtue of the $20 million appropriation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, including 25 projects, outside the Corporation operation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the commitee on page 20, line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 21, line 5, after the figures "$500,000", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further*, That not to exceed $40,000 of this appropriation shall be available for a reorganization survey of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in cooperation with the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization", and in line 19, after the word "agency", to strike out the colon and the following additional provisos:

> *Provided further*, That the Administrator's general supervision and coordination responsibilities under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 shall carry full authority to assign and reassign functions, to reorganize and to make whatever changes, including the reallocation and transfer of administrative expense funds and authority where applicable, necessary to promote economy and efficiency in the operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall not expend more than $21 million during the fiscal year 1954 on loans to educational institutions not committed as of June 30, 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$112,500" and insert "$115,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 16, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and the following provisos:

> *Provided*, That before approving any local slum-clearance program under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, the Administrator shall give consideration to the efforts of the locality to enforce local codes and regulations relating to adequate standards of health, sanitation, and safety for dwellings and to the feasibility of achieving slum-clearance objectives through rehabilitation of existing dwellings and areas: *Provided further*, That the authority under title I of the National Housing Act shall be used to the utmost in connection with slum rehabilitation needs: *Provided further*, That section 110, subsection (e) of the Housing Act of 1949 is hereby amended to read: "Gross project cost" shall comprise (1) the amount of the expenditures by the local public agency with respect to any and all undertakings necessary to carry out the project (including the payment of carrying charges, but not beyond the point where the project is completed, and excluding expenditures for parks, playgrounds, public buildings, or similar facilities), and (2) the amount of such locals grants-in-aid as are described in clause (2) of section 110 (d) hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Housing Administration," on page 23, line 14, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$4,948,000" and insert "$9,000,000."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. This is the item to which I previously referred. The House recommended approximately $4,500,000, and the Senate committee's recommendation is $9 million. I am not arguing about the amount, but is the $9 million for administration of the expenditure of $32,500,000?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator will permit me, this $9 million covers the new public housing. That is a debatable item, and I presume it will be debated on Monday. If the Senate votes to eliminate all housing activities, then another question is presented. If the housing work is to proceed, this additional amount is necessary to cover the expenses.

Mr. GOLDWATER. My question is brought about by the fact that it is for administrative expenses, and the sum is $9 million. It seems to me to be a very, very high administrative cost.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The $32,500,000 is for contracts already entered into,

and it has no relation to the administrative expense. The Public Housing Administration will administer Treasury borrowings outstanding of $625 million. They will administer the various projects which are already constructed and on which loans are outstanding. If there are 35,000 more units built this year, this additional amount is necessary to work out those new units.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then the $9 million is for the overall administration of the entire public housing program?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The way it is written makes it very confusing. I think the Senator can understand my concern with reference to spending $9 million to administer $32 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would respectfully say to my good friend that it is very difficult to understand.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are 5 or 6 different types of housing, and to keep them apart and to understand them is a problem in itself.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator will also agree that the Senate could stand a new system of reporting these items.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think that is beyond the province of the Senator reporting the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the same methods of preparing budgets and stating budgets were applied to normal business operations, they would not last 30 days.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall not disagree with my colleague.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by the Public Housing Administration, showing administrative expense requirements.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public Housing Administration—Statement of administrative expense requirements

Program	Actions to date			Estimate for varying levels of construction starts				
	Printed budget (75,000 units, all stages)	Revised budget (35,000 units, all stages)	House bill	35,000 units, all stages	25,000 units, all stages	15,000 units, all stages	35,000 construction starts (no preconstruction)	No new construction nor preconstruction (to complete units under construction)
United States Housing Act:								
Development activity	$6,820,000	$5,120,000	$1,364,000	$5,120,000	$4,620,000	$3,920,000	$4,120,000	$2,995,000
Management activity	4,480,000	4,480,000	3,584,000	4,480,000	4,480,000	4,480,000	4,480,000	4,480,000
	11,300,000	9,600,000	4,948,000	9,600,000	9,100,000	8,400,000	8,600,000	7,475,000
Subsistence, homesteads, and greentowns	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500
Public war housing:								
Management activity	2,298,000	2,048,000	2,048,000	2,048,000	2,048,000	2,048,000	2,048,000	2,048,000
Disposition activity	1,716,500	1,716,500	1,716,500	1,716,500	1,716,500	1,716,500	1,716,500	1,716,500
Defense housing	100,000	350,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Veterans' reuse housing	180,000	180,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
Total	15,600,000	13,900,000	8,973,000	13,625,000	13,125,000	12,425,000	12,625,000	11,500,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 23, line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 12, after the word "amended", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no housing shall be authorized by the Public Housing Administration, or, if under construction, continue to be constructed, in any community where the people of that community, by their duly elected representatives, or by referendum, or by any other legal method, have indicated they do not want it, and such community shall negotiate with the Federal Government the repayment to the Government, only such money expended prior to the vote or other formal action whereby the community rejected such housing project.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Provided further, That in any case where the Public Housing Administration (after the approvals on the part of the governing body of the community required by law) has entered into a financial assistance contract with a local housing authority covering a low-rent housing project to be constructed in such community and the people of that community, by vote of their duly elected representatives, or by referendum, have thereafter indicated that they do not want such low-rent housing projects constructed, then, in such case the Public Housing Administration, for a period (which shall not again be granted in connection with such low-rent housing project) of 180 days after the date of such vote or referendum, or the effective date of this act, whichever is the later date, or such longer period as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, in his discretion, may grant, shall not (unless requested by the governing body of the locality to do so) authorize the award of any contract for the construction of such low-rent housing project, or advance any further funds for such low-rent housing project, and, during such period, the local community shall negotiate with the Public Housing Administration for the liquidation of such financial assistance contract and, if during such period the local community enters into a valid and binding contract with the Public Housing Administration for the repayment to it by the community of a stated amount representing moneys advanced or guaranteed by it under such financial assistance contract, and for the payment of any additional sums which the local housing authority or the Public Housing Administration would be obligated or liable to pay to secure releases from obligations theretofore incurred under such financial assistance contract the Public Housing Administration shall cancel its financial assistance contract in respect to such low-rent housing project.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 22, after the word "amended", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the limitation in clause (2) of the third proviso under this head in title I of the independent offices appropriation act, 1953, is amended to read as follows: "(2) after the date of approval of this act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for any dwelling units or projects."

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Provided further, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, (1) authorized during the fiscal year 1954 the commencement of construction of in excess of 35,000 dwelling units or (2) after the date of approval of this act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 35,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1954, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Indian Claims Commission," on page 28, line 18, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$111,020" and insert "$117,020", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,845" and insert "$4,270."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission," on page 29, line 3, after "(not to exceed $200)", to insert "purchase of not to exceed nine passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only;"; in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$212,645" and insert "$290,650", and at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "$9,466,176" and insert "$9,665,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 31, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$216,700" and insert "$325,000", and in line 5, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$52,988,050" and insert "$51,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Planning Commission," on page 32, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$4,260" and insert "$7,000", and in line 14, after the word "compensation", to strike out "$97,915" and insert "$155,000."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Massachusetts explain the rather large increase?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arizona will notice on lines 20 to 24 an amendment appropriating $365,000, and there is also an increase from $97,915 to $155,000. The increase is to make it possible for the National Capital Planning Commission to purchase two pieces of property, one in Virginia and the other in Maryland. The purchase of the property in Virginia has been approved by the Virginia Legislature. There is an appropriation outstanding which will pay for two-thirds of the necessary land acquisition to help to complete a road just across the Potomac River by the Chain Bridge, which is a fundamental part of the project.

The other part of the appropriation is to purchase land in Maryland for which the Maryland Legislature has a bond issue outstanding to pay for two-thirds of the cost. It is only common sense, in my opinion, to buy these two pieces of property now. They will have to be bought ultimately if the parkway system is to be completed. On the Maryland side a bond issue is outstanding, and the area is being built up rapidly, so that the property is becoming more valuable. The appropriation for the Virginia property expires this year. In both instances the States of Virginia and Maryland will pay for two-thirds of the acquisition costs.

I have here a map which indicates the two pieces of property involved, and I shall be glad to show it to the Senator, if he desires to see it. I personally believe, the committee believes with me, and the Senators from Maryland and Virginia are very emphatic in their belief, that it is common sense to buy this land now. If the land is to be bought, then there will be involved the additional cost of surveying and all that goes with it, which will call for the additional amount, the difference between $97,000 and $150,000.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would $60,000 be required for surveying?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For surveying, searching titles, and making it possible to obtain the property and start putting it to a useful purpose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 1081, to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes.

FIRST INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate continue the consideration of the Executive Office and sundry independent offices appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4663) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 16, after the word "system", to strike out "Of unexpended funds available for land acquisition purposes a total of not exceeding $19,680 may be used during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses of the Commission (other than payments for land) in connection with land acquisition" and insert "For necessary expenses for the National Capital Planning Commission in connection with the acquisition of land for the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital, as authorized by the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended, $365,000, to remain available until expended, $100,000 of said sum to be used for carrying out the provisions of section 1 (a) of said act and $265,000 for carrying out the provisions of section 1 (b) of said act: *Provided*, That not exceeding $24,940 of the funds available for land acquisition purposes shall be used during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses of the Commission (other than payments for land) in connection with land acquisition."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Science Foundation", on page 33, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$78,000" and insert "$101,000", and in line 18, after the word "services", to strike out "$5,724,400" and insert "$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Renegotiation Board—Salaries and Expenses", on page 33, line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$238,700" and insert "$305,600."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, is there sufficient renegotiation in progress today to warrant an increase in the amount of this item?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is the travel appropriation that is being raised. What happened was that the House reduced the amount available for travel by 33⅓ percent. That did not entail less money; it simply meant restricting further administrative costs. In some instances the reduction of 33⅓ percent will enormously interfere with the activities of the agency. What the Senate committee has voted to do is to restore the amount to the revised budget figures, so that the whole travel question can be taken to conference and adjusted among the agencies. Every agency that came before the committee objected to the greater restrictions imposed by the House upon travel. The Senate committee adopted a uniform procedure of restoring the revised budget amount, in order to take the matter to conference, where it can be adjusted in the proper manner.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That will be done in conference?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We hope so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission," on page 34, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$104,170" and insert "$150,000", and in line 9, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$5,245,080" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Smithsonian Institution", on page 35, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,825" and insert "$10,225", and in line 12, after the word "publications", to strike out "$2,897,500" and insert "$3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,600" and insert "$1,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Subversive Activities Control Board", on page 36, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariff Commission", on page 36, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$11,335" and insert "$14,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Tax Court of the United States", on page 37, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$45,000."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, did the committee discuss or consider the new system proposed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the determination of the amount carried in the amendment, which seems to be quite a jump?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It did not. As I understand, the Tax Court has all the work it can take care of, and the question is whether the amount proposed to be appropriated is sufficient. We have granted it the full revised budget figures. The House did not change those figures.

I believe the general feeling is that the Tax Court should be able to operate as quickly and as efficiently as it can, and that that Court tends to be overloaded rather than underloaded. I hope that if there is a new system of working out differences of opinion on tax matters, it will be reflected next year. However, I think it would be a great mistake to try to change the amount this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Claims Commission—Administrative Expenses," on page 38, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$7,520", and insert in line 16, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Corporations—Housing and Home Finance Agency," on page 41, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,300,000" and insert "$4,200,000", and on page 42, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$95,750" and insert "$120,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$411,250" and insert "$640,000", and on page 43, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$26,330" and insert "$27,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 17, after the word "of", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for expenses of travel."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$4,370" and insert "$6,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,045,590" and insert "$5,600,000"; in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$131,000" and insert "$184,500"; in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$500" and insert "$1,500"; on page 47, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$27,500,000" and insert "$25,000,000."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Massachusetts, who is in charge of the bill, a question about this item.

I note that the amount of $27,500,000 has been reduced to $25 million. I understand that the number of public housing units has been increased, or will be increased, to about 35,000. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts indicate why there is proposed a reduction of $2,500,000 in the amount of expenditures for nonadministrative expenses. I understand that probably there will be more nonadministrative expenses in connection with the public housing units than will be met by the reduced figure. Will the Senator give me some enlightenment as to why that amount was cut?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The figure at the top of page 47 has nothing to do with public housing; it has to do with the Federal Housing Administration. The feeling in the committee was that some of the regional offices were overstaffed, so we reduced the figure by $2,500,000. The matter will be taken to conference. Since the committee made the cut I have been informed by the agency that we have cut them pretty much to the quick, and that there is a question as to whether we should not restore some of the reduction. We can consider that question in conference.

Federal housing has to do with eight different funds: Repair and improvement and mortgage, title I; insuring individual dwelling mortgages, title I; mutual mortgage insurance—on 1- to 4-family dwellings, title II; insuring multifamily and cooperative housing, title II; emergency and special incentive mortgage and insurance, title VI; investment insurance operating fund, title VII; military housing operating fund, title VIII; and defense housing mortgage fund, title IX.

Insurance of $15 billion is outstanding.

Net income in 1952 was $60 million; it is estimated that in 1953 it will be $75 million; and in 1954, it is estimated it will be $88 million.

This is the fund which is used to administer the various agencies. It has nothing to do with public housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 3, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That the position of Assistant Commissioner, established pursuant to section 213 (f) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is no longer authorized.."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$8,973,000" and insert "$13,025,000"; in line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$685,300" and insert "$916,000", and on page 48, line 11, after "(Public Law 65)", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That during the fiscal year 1954 the Commissioner shall make every effort to refund all local bonds held by the Public Housing Administration under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the committee amendments have now been adopted, and that unless a committee amendment is reopened for debate on Monday, under the agreement, or unless individual amendments are offered to committee amendments, the bill as reported by the committee has been approved. I ask if that is a correct understanding of the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All committee amendments have been agreed to. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I have an amendment to offer. It is in my office——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the agreement, that amendment could not be offered at the present time. It could be submitted and lie on the table. It may be offered on Monday. I suggest that the Senator submit his amendment so that it may be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

THE NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, it is my intention to associate myself with the group of distinguished Senators who are in opposition to article VII of the NATO Status of Forces Treaty.

The provision of article VII to which I object is as follows:

(a) the military authorities of the sending State shall have the right to exercise within the receiving State all criminal and disciplinary jurisdiction conferred on them by the law of the sending State over all persons subject to the military law of that State;

(b) the authorities of the receiving State shall have jurisdiction over the members of a force or civilian component and their dependents with respect to offenses committed within the territory of the receiving State and punishable by the law of that State—

And so forth. A review of the testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, as well as the report issued by the Foreign Relations Committee in submitting this treaty to the Senate, reflects that this unprecedented transfer of the rights of American Armed Forces personnel is predicated upon certain interpretations of international law and assumptions of fact; namely, first, that members of the armed services of our country do not have sovereign immunity when stationed in foreign lands; second, that the failure to adopt this provision will deprive the separate States of the United States of jurisdiction over foreign personnel; third, that the adoption of this section of the treaty would place our relations with foreign nations on a quid pro quo basis; fourth, that failure to adopt this provision of the treaty would jeopardize friendly foreign relations; and fifth, that the adoption of this section of the treaty would confer more rights on American military personnel than obtained under the executive agreements made by the preceding administration.

I do not propose at this time to explore in detail what I consider to be the erroneous nature of the interpretations and assumptions which have been made by our State Department. Neither do I propose to affix responsibility or imply motives as to why this section was incorporated in the treaty.

The comments thus far made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

other Senators, seem to me to be adequate in pointing out the inaccurate, specious, and illogical assumptions upon which this section is founded.

Bluntly speaking, in my opinion this section of the treaty would deprive Americans of their constitutional liberty. Let me trace the effect which this section would have on an American GI.

This Nation drafts into the armed services a Kansas farm boy, or a boy from any other State. He is involuntarily sent across the seas to a foreign country. In the event he should become involved in difficulties he would be subjected to the jurisdiction of the criminal courts which exist in the country wherein he is stationed.

We know at this time that under the jurisprudence of France and Italy he would be deprived of certain constitutional guaranties which are his birthright as an American citizen. He might possibly be brought before a Communist judge for trial.

For the life of me, I cannot understand how anyone can seriously propose that the United States Senate ratify any treaty which would deprive an American boy of his constitutional guaranties after we have forced him into the Army and compelled him to go overseas as a part of a force which has been sent for the purpose of resisting possible Communist aggression.

It is absurd to state that we are merely giving to the NATO countries the same rights which we expect to receive from them, and that this is the establishment of a quid pro quo relationship. At the most, there are several thousand NATO military personnel in the United States. We have hundreds of thousands of American servicemen in Europe.

The few NATO personnel who come to the United States come to receive training and other benefits from this Nation. Our servicemen are stationed in the respective NATO countries for the very defense and security of those countries.

If we grant criminal jurisdiction to foreign nations over our Armed Forces in return for our jurisdiction over theirs, we are trading an elephant for a mouse, and I will not be a party to such a trade.

No Member of the Senate is a prophet, and no one can foresee the future. We do know, however, that there are large Communist elements in some of the NATO countries, and we must assume that percentagewise there has been some infiltration into their court systems. What the future holds no one knows, but it is dangerous for us to establish a mechanism whereby possibly at present or in the future our American service personnel may be subjected to propaganda trials by Communist judges.

To claim that by retaining criminal jurisdiction over our military personnel we are practicing extraterritoriality, is, in my opinion, fanciful. I do not believe that any person who voluntarily goes to another country should have rights and privileges which exceed those of the inhabitants of that country. I do maintain, however, that American military personnel stationed abroad are a special, privileged class. They did not go there of their own volition; they went there at the request of the receiving nation. The least we can do for those boys, who have been separated from their homes and loved ones, and who may be subjected to trial by battle, is to preserve and protect for them the rights guaranteed under our Constitution.

It is fashionable these days to make things so complicated and technical that only experts are supposed to be qualified to reach decisions. Many people see things not as black and white but as gray. All the legal verbiage, all the long-winded explanations cannot change the basic issues involved in this question. Simply stated, the questions are: Does this section of the NATO Status of Forces Treaty deprive American servicemen of their constitutional guaranties, subject them to possible trial and punishment by Communist judges; and establish a mechanism which may adversely affect the operation of our Military Establishment? The answer on all three counts is "Yes." Therefore, I shall oppose this section of the treaty.

Let me add that I believe the other provisions of the treaty should be approved; and in addition, the two companion treaties relating to the status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and NATO military headquarters should be approved.

Accordingly, I shall vote for the passage of those, and support the reservation to section VII submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] as follows:

> The military authorities of the United States as a sending state shall have exclusive jurisdiction over the members of its force or civilian component and their dependents with respect to all offenses committed within the territory of the receiving state, and the United States as a receiving state shall, at the request of a sending state, waive any jurisdiction which it might possess over the members of a force or civilian component of a sending state and their dependents with respect to all offenses committed within the territory of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Kansas for associating himself with those of us who are in favor of the reservation.

When the matter came before the Committee on Foreign Relations I first detected the situation in which American boys might be tried, for example, in a court in Yugoslavia, in which the constitutional right of being presumed innocent until proved guilty does not exist, but, instead, the American boy would have to prove his own innocence. It may very well be, too, that a soldier could be denied bail.

In other words an American boy, who had been drafted and sent to a foreign country, even a Communist country, as my distinguished friend just stated, would be subject to the laws of that country.

I might add that when I raised the point in the Committee on Foreign Relations I was joined by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. Later the point was raised in a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, at a time when various members of the American Bar Association, including Mr. Frank Holman, former president of the American Bar Association, met with the committee. The subject was thoroughly discussed, and the feeling was unanimous on the part of the subcommittee that the reservation referred to, and so well described by the Senator from Kansas, was a good reservation, and that if the treaty is to be adopted it should contain the reservation.

I am delighted to know that my distinguished friend from Kansas is associating himself with those of us who feel the way we do.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

SPECIAL IMMIGRATION QUOTA VISAS FOR CERTAIN ESCAPEES AND EXPELLEES IN EUROPE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, President Eisenhower has recommended the enactment of emergency immigration legislation, within the framework of the immigration laws, which would demonstrate in a concrete fashion this country's concern for and support of escapees from communism, expellees from communism, and the distressed nationals of certain European nations within the community of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The President emphasized that the plight of those made homeless by tyranny and the population pressures caused by forced migration constitute a political and moral problem of constantly growing magnitude. He also made it clear that it is imperative, in our own interests, that we join with the other nations of the free world in helping to find a solution to these grave, human problems.

Mr. President, before I proceed further I wish to state that I am introducing a bill on this subject on behalf of myself and of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], my colleague, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The bill I am introducing proposes—

First. To provide 110,000 special-quota visas to escapees and expellees residing in the western zones of Germany, the western sectors of Berlin, and in Austria.

Second. To provide 15,000 special-quota visas for escapees from communism residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in Turkey, and in the Free Territory of Trieste.

Third. Provision for 75,000 special-quota visas to nationals of Italy and persons of Italian ethnic origin residing in Italy or the Free Territory of Trieste.

Fourth. Provision for 20,000 special-quota visas to nationals of Greece and

persons of Greek ethnic origin residing in Greece.

Fifth. Provision for 20,000 special-quota visas to nationals of the Netherlands and persons of Dutch ethnic origin residing in metropolitan Netherlands.

I should like to emphasize that this is an emergency and temporary program which will be carried out within the requirements of our established immigration laws. It is an emergency program because it clearly deals with an unusual situation caused by Communist tyranny and threats to the security of the free world. It is a temporary program extending over a period of 2 years during which time every effort will be made to bring about concerted action by all the nations of the free world to reduce these grave, human problems to manageable proportions.

All the necessary protections with respect to security are provided for in this bill. In no manner do the requirements differ from those of the Internal Security Act or the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The selection of immigrants within the classes provided for in the bill is to be carried out exclusively by officials of the United States Government. Without exception, all determinations of eligibility and admissibility will be made by officials of this Government.

The bill also provides protection against the displacement of an American from employment or housing by the immigrants to be resettled in the United States. This protection also serves the best interests of the immigrants because it assures them that adequate plans have been made for them and their families before their departure from Europe.

With the proper selection of immigrants provided for in this emergency bill, much can be done to satisfy some of our domestic manpower needs. I have particularly in mind the continuing need for skilled and unskilled agricultural workers as well as for skilled and unskilled workers in certain industrial fields.

In this connection I may interpolate that in the West and in the South difficulty is being experienced in getting a sufficient number of agricultural laborers, and each year it is necessary, by contract, to bring in many thousands of workers from the Republic of Mexico on temporary visas. A difficult problem has been brought about because of the unlawful entry of many Mexican laborers, known as wetbacks, who come into this country to live.

Here again this bill serves the best interests of the immigrant as well as the American sponsor.

Members of Congress are well acquainted with the problems of the escapees from communism. For some years committees of the Congress have carried on continuous studies of this matter. The uniform findings of these studies show that severe political and religious persecution, together with the slave labor tactics being carried out in the nations and areas under Communist domination, has caused the flight of great numbers of people to the free world. These escapees have been afforded asylum by those countries bordering on the Soviet empire. None of the countries affording first asylum are in a position to give a permanent haven to all the escapees from Communist tyranny. With the help of the other nations of the free world the doors to asylum in the West can be kept open.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it the implication that we are in a position to give them all a haven?

Mr. WATKINS. No; we are not in a position to give them all a haven. As I understand, there are in Europe and in other places in the world approximately 30 million refugees, under a liberal interpretation of that term. Of course, this would be only a gesture in the direction of providing relief. It is not intended as a program, and we cannot carry out a program which would even go largely in the direction of giving them all a haven.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In other words, the Senator admits that it is not a problem that can be solved by immigration.

Mr. WATKINS. Not by immigration into this country; no. There are other sections of the world which are not developed as fully as our country is developed, and such areas could absorb many millions of these people. It is felt by the President and others in the executive department that if we were to lead off by showing our goodwill in this direction, we would, with good grace and good faith encourage the other nations to accept many millions of these unfortunate people. It is a very serious problem. For that reason I am introducing the bill. The President made the request, and the introduction of this bill is in furtherance of his request.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Have we any assurance or indication that other nations will do as we are doing?

Mr. WATKINS. I do not know the exact details or facts about the negotiations which have occurred with other countries, but I am informed in a general way that there are prospects for the relief of a large number of these persons if we will lead the way and if we will urge an active program on other nations which have room for these persons.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator from Utah tell me whether under the provisions of his bill, the members of the family of a person who is granted a visa will be admitted on the same visa, or will the members of his family have to have their own visas and visa numbers?

Mr. WATKINS. The purpose of this bill is to cover all persons who would seek admittance. If a man seeking admittance has a wife and 10 children, and if all of them seek admittance with him, the result will be to charge 12 numbers against the quota.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That has not been true in the case of past legislation in this field.

Mr. WATKINS. However, the bill now being introduced is a good, honest piece of proposed legislation, carefully drawn to protect the United States, and it is drawn in such a way as to make clear what it is intended to be.

Mr. President, the German expellees have long been a concern of many Members of Congress. Their mass expulsion from the areas overrun by the Red armies will long remain as a black chapter in the history of civilized mankind. The Western German Federal Republic has made remarkable progress in the orderly and permanent integration of the expellees. The leadership of Chancellor Adenauer, who, a short time ago was a most welcome visitor to the United States, in very large measure accounts for this progress. However, it is impossible for the German Federal Republic to absorb all the expellees in the foreseeable future. It will be necessary for the other countries of the free world to assist by providing a new homeland for a number of these people.

With regard to the provisions of the bill applying to nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, I am sure the people of the United States want to help the people of those countries solve one of the most vital problems of the free world to our mutual benefit. It is a problem created by strains and stresses of the postwar period which have caused economic and population pressures of dangerous proportions.

In Italy, Prime Minister de Gasperi has continuously warned the people of the free world of the grave problems resulting from unemployment and underemployment in his country. He has appealed to friendly nations for assistance in his efforts to preserve freedom and to develop a reasonably prosperous life for the Italian people. To reach this goal, Italy must find settlement opportunities for those who cannot be satisfactorily employed in the Italian economy. We can make a timely contribution to the realization of this goal by admitting not to exceed 75,000 qualified Italian nationals into the United States during the next 2 years.

Similarly, the people of Greece have been confronted with difficult social and economic problems in the postwar period. The recovery of Greece, following World War II, was given a severe setback by the widespread destruction caused by Communist inspired and supported guerrilla warfare in that country. Greece must find settlement opportunities for qualified workers who cannot be satisfactorily employed in the Greek economy. We can make a significant contribution to the stengthening of this valiant partner in the case of freedom by admitting 20,000 Greek nationals into the United States during the next 2 years.

Queen Juliana of the Netherlands has, on several occasions, called the attention of the people of the free world to the human problem of refugees and the dangers of population pressures on the European Continent. Her deep concern for and awareness of these problems results

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

from her personal experiences. While her interest encompasses all the homeless victims of tyranny and postwar population pressures in Europe, the Netherlands itself must find settlement opportunities for some of its nationals. We can assist the Netherlands in maintaining its traditional position in defense of freedom by admitting 20,000 Dutch nationals into the United States during the next 2 years.

The President has given his assurance that the request for this kind of legislation will not be repeated on the theory of repeated emergencies requiring similar legislation.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that, as my colleagues know, the President of the United States addressed to me, as chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, a letter in which he pointed out that there are 10 broad fields in which he thinks the Senate and the House of Representatives should make studies of the present Immigration Act. The President did not suggest any amendments to the act, but he suggested that we make studies.

For the information of the Senate, let me say now that, in accordance with the act itself, the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy has been organized under the auspices of that law, and is now in operation. It has held several meetings; and, by means of the loan of several staff members of the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary, we are making studies of the Immigration Act, as required by the act itself.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1917) to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WATKINS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Migration Act of 1953."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this act the term—

(a) "Escapee" means any person who, during or after World War II has left the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or other Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area of Europe, including those parts of Germany under military occupation by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and who because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion refuses to return thereto and who has not been firmly resettled.

(b) "German expellee" means any person of German ethnic origin residing in the area of the German Federal Republic, Western sector of Berlin, or in Austria, who was born in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, or areas provisionally under the administration or control of any such countries, except the Soviet zone of military occupation of Germany, and who has not been firmly resettled.

(c) "National" as used in this act shall mean a person owing permanent allegiance to and having full rights of citizenship in a state as of the effective date of this act.

SPECIAL QUOTA VISAS; NUMBERS

SEC. 3. There is hereby established a special quota of 240,000 which may be used as provided by section 4 of this act, during the 2 years beginning 120 days after the enactment of this act, for the issuance of immigrant visas to aliens seeking to enter the United States as immigrants and to their spouses and their unmarried children under 21 years of age, including adopted children and stepchildren, if accompanying them: *Provided*, That sections 201, 202, and 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175–178), shall not be held to be applicable to any alien to whom an immigrant visa shall be issued under this act: *And provided further*, That no alien shall be issued a visa under this act and no such alien shall be admitted into the United States unless he is eligible under the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163), except as specifically provided in this act.

ALLOCATION OF SPECIAL QUOTA VISAS

SEC. 4. (a) Special quota immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 3 of this act shall be allotted as follows:

(1) Not to exceed 110,000 visas to escapees and German expellees residing in the area of the German Federal Republic or in the Western sectors of Berlin or in Austria: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

(2) Not to exceed 15,000 visas to escapees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or in Turkey or in the Free Territory of Trieste and who are not nationals of the area in which they reside: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

(3) Not to exceed 75,000 visas to nationals of Italy or persons of Italian ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this act in Italy or in the Free Territory of Trieste: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

(4) Not to exceed 20,000 visas to nationals of Greece or persons of Greek ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this act in Greece: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in Greece.

(5) Not to exceed 20,000 visas to nationals of the Netherlands or persons of Dutch ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this act in metropolitan Netherlands: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in metropolitan Netherlands.

(b) The allotments provided in subsection (a) of this section shall be available for the issuance of immigrant visas to the spouses and children, referred to in section 3 of this act, of persons defined in subsection (a) of this section.

EMERGENCY MIGRATION COORDINATOR

SEC. 5. In order to carry out the purposes of this act—

(a) The Emergency Migration Coordinator, hereinafter referred to as the "Coordinator," shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a rate of compensation not in excess of $17,500.

(b) The Coordinator may exercise any power, function, or authority conferred upon him by this act through such agencies, officers, or employees of the United States as he shall designate, appoint, or employ, utilizing to the maximum extent practicable the services of existing agencies, officers, or employees of the United States.

(c) Any funds authorized to be appropriated hereunder may be allocated by the Coordinator to any agency and such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with authority granted hereunder or under the authority governing the activities of the agency to which such funds are allocated.

(d) The Coordinator is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out the provisions of this act.

(e) The Coordinator shall report to the President and the Congress on the operations of the program established under this act at the end of each of the 2 years of such program. Such reports shall include full and complete details respecting the administration of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes provided for in section 14 of the act including the names of the persons and organizations to whom loans shall be made and the amount of such loans.

ASSURANCES; GOOD FAITH DATA

SEC. 6. (a) In accordance with regulations promulgated pursuant to section 5 (d) of this act assurances shall be executed by a citizen or citizens of the United States and submitted to the coordinator. Such assurances shall state that persons who qualify under section 4 of this act, but not their spouses and children, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment, and that any such person and his spouse and children who propose to live with him will not become public charges, and will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing.

(b) No visa shall be issued to any alien whose admission under this act is based on the submission of an assurance made under subsection (a) of this section, unless he shall first execute a signed statement under oath or affirmation that he accepts and agrees in good faith to abide by the terms of employment provided for him in the assurance upon which his application for a visa under this act is based. The responsible consular officer is hereby authorized and empowered to administer such oath or take such affirmation for this purpose and to designate employees who shall have power to administer such oath or affirmation: *Provided*, That upon a finding by the Attorney General that such statement was falsely made it shall be deemed to be a misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as provided for in section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 183): *Provided further*, That in determining whether or not the person accepted and agreed in good faith to abide by the said terms of employment the Attorney General shall consider the manner, conditions, extent, and duration of the person's employment after admission into the United States. Such alien and any alien found to have been inadmissible under the provisions of this act at the time of entry shall, irrespective of the date of his entry, be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided by sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 208–214).

(c) Neither subsection (a) nor (b) of this section shall have applicability if the alien provides satisfactory evidence under the Immigration and Nationality Act that he will not become a public charge.

(d) Assistance rendered an alien in connection with his transportation to and resettlement in the United States shall not be regarded as a cause for excludability as an alien likely to become a public charge.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL ARRANGEMENTS

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of State may, for the purposes of this act, make such arrangements with foreign governments as are necessary and appropriate for the purpose of financing and insuring the voluntary movement of migrants, such arrangements to be mutually beneficial to the economies of the United States and the countries concerned, as well as to the individual migrants and their families. Such arrangements, where appropriate, may seek to enable immigrants under this act to transfer into dollar cur-

rency personal assets necessary for defraying the cost of transportation and for use in the United States. Arrangements between the United States and the other governments concerned should also provide for such cooperation and assistance as may be required in the administration of the program authorized under this act in the territory of the intending immigrant's residence.

(b) The Secretary of State may also make such arrangements with the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration as are necessary and appropriate for the purpose of facilitating the transportation of aliens receiving visas under this act to the port of entry in the United States.

SELECTION WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION

SEC. 8. (a) Within the categories established in section 4 of this act the determination of the eligibility of persons to receive visas and of the admissibility of such persons into the United States under this act shall be made without discrimination in favor of or against race, religion, or national origin of such persons.

EXEMPTIONS FROM VISA FEES

SEC. 9. Persons receiving visas under this act shall be exempt from paying the fees prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230–231).

SECURITY AND OTHER INVESTIGATION; EFFECT OF MISREPRESENTATION

SEC. 10. No alien shall be issued a visa under this act, or be admitted into the United States, unless there shall have been first a thorough investigation by such agency or agencies of the Government of the United States as may be designated by the President regarding such person's character, history, and eligibility under this act. Any person who shall willfully make a material misrepresentation to any agency of the Government entrusted directly or indirectly with the administration, investigation, enforcement, or any other function relating to the implementation of this act, for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as an alien eligible hereunder, shall be excluded from admission into the United States under section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 183); and no person shall be issued an immigrant visa or be admitted into the United States under this act, if the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State or the consular officer or immigrant officer knows or has reason to believe that the alien is subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws or is not eligible under the terms of this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall remove the right of review and appeal available to aliens under the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163).

PRIORITIES

SEC. 11. Priorities in the consideration of visa applications under this act, without priority in time of issuance of visas as between such priorities or as between priority and nonpriority cases under this act, shall be given to—

(1) persons who are farm workers and persons whose services or skills are needed in the United States, if such need has been certified to the Coordinator, by the United States Department of Labor; and

(2) persons who are the blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted alien residents of the United States, such relationship in either case being within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the common law.

PERSONS INELIGIBLE; OATH ON ADMISSION; PENALTIES

SEC. 12. (a) No visa shall be issued under this act to any person who personally advocated or assisted in the persecution of any person or group of persons because of race, religion, or national origin.

(b) Before being issued a visa every alien 18 years of age or older, authorized to be admitted under this act, shall take and subscribe an oath or affirmation that he is not and never has been a person specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), or (H) of section 212 (a) (28) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 184–186), except as provided in subparagraph (I) of such sections, and shall be liable to prosecution for perjury if such oath or affirmation is willfully false. If any alien not entitled to be issued a visa under this act and not entitled to be admitted into the United States shall nevertheless gain admission, such alien shall, regardless of the date of his entry, be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided in sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 208–214).

(c) Any person or persons who knowingly violate or conspire to violate any provision of this act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000 or shall be imprisoned not less than 2 or more than 10 years, or both.

APPLICABILITY OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

SEC. 13. Except as otherwise provided by this act all of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be applicable under this act.

LOANS

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Coordinator is authorized and directed to make loans not to exceed $10 million in the aggregate, to public or private agencies for the purpose of financing the ocean transportation and the reception and transportation from ports of entry within the United States to the places of their resettlement, of persons receiving immigrant visas under this act, and who lack resources to finance the expenses involved. Such loans, which shall mature not later than June 30, 1960, shall be made under rules and regulations approved by the Coordinator.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Coordinator such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

HELLS CANYON AND THE IDAHO POWER CO.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter dated May 8, from Mr. Albert C. Ullman, of Baker, Oreg. Mr. Ullman is chairman of the Idaho-Oregon Hells Canyon Association, and president of the Hells Canyon Development Association. He writes:

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: You must have been as jolted as we were by the boldness of the McKay decision to discard Hells Canyon and abandon the river to the Idaho Power Co.

We have known that this is exactly in line with the administration's resource policy. We doubted that it would be done so openly and boldly.

Mr. Ullman, an Oregonian, is speaking in his letter of another Oregonian. Interior Secretary McKay, to whom he refers, is a former governor of that State.

The river that he speaks of having been given to the Idaho Power Co. is the Snake River.

The Idaho Power Co., so that no one may be misled, is not an Idaho company at all. It is a Maine corporation. In other words, it was incorporated about as far from Idaho and Oregon as a corporation can get without incorporating in the Atlantic Ocean, which, of course, would not be permissible.

Maine and Idaho, I must admit, have one great industry in common, that of growing potatoes. But the private utility that calls itself the Idaho Power Co. is not engaged in growing potatoes, at least of the agricultural variety. It is interested in power; and Secretary McKay, to all effects, has just given it the juiciest power plum in the United States, Hells Canyon of the Snake River.

DARK HOUR IN WESTERN DEVELOPMENT

I return to Mr. Ullman's letter. As I stated before, Mr. Ullman is chairman of the Idaho-Oregon Hells Canyon Association. He writes:

This is the darkest hour in the history of American resource development. Hells Canyon is but the first step in the boldest giveaway program of all time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to finish this portion of my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield. I am sure the Senator from Oregon will be interested in the letter.

Under its articles of incorporation, as a Maine corporation, the Idaho Power Co. is presumed to hold its annual meeting in Augusta, Maine, the State capital of Maine, on the first Wednesday of May each year.

Notices of this year's meeting were mailed on April 13, 1953, to stockholders of the company. They read in part:

To the Stockholders of Idaho Power Co.:

You are cordially invited to attend the annual meeting of Idaho Power Co. to be held at the company's office at 128 State Street, Augusta, Maine, May 6, 1953, at 10 a. m.

The invitation also noted that Mr. Ernest L. McLean, nominee for the office of clerk of the company, is "an attorney and member of the law firm of McLean, Southard & Hunt, Augusta, Maine," and adds that Mr. McLean has been clerk of the company since it was incorporated in 1915, in the State of Maine, of course. Again let me say that that is a long, long way from Idaho and Oregon.

Secretary McKay made his momentous announcement in behalf of the Idaho Power Co. of Maine on May 5, on the very eve of the power company's scheduled annual meeting in Augusta. I would call that close timing.

In this connection, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an article titled "A Happy Day in Augusta, Maine," by Lowell Mellett, published in the Washington Star of Thursday, May 7.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HAPPY DAY IN AUGUSTA, MAINE—ANNUAL MEETING OF IDAHO POWER CO. HELD THERE FOLLOWS ANNOUNCEMENT OF GIFT FROM SECRETARY MCKAY

(By Lowell Mellett)

The annual meeting of the Idaho Power Co. held yesterday must have been a joyous occasion. The company had just been assured that the Government is prepared to turn over to it the immense power potential of the Snake River along the Idaho-Oregon

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

border; that this administration is abandoning plans of the previous administration for a great power, flood control, and irrigation project at Hells Canyon. Secretary of the Interior McKay had announced that his Department had withdrawn its intervention in the company's application to the Federal Power Commission for a license to dam the river at a place called Oxbow. Former Secretary Oscar Chapman had intervened to protect the Hells Canyon project, which cannot be carried out if the Oxbow installation goes through.

Whether the joy of the Idaho Power Co. was shared by the people of Idaho is not so certain. For the Idaho Power Co. is not, as you might think, a local enterprise, an association of Idaho citizens. Its principal stockholders are residents of New York and Boston. It is a State of Maine corporation. This week's happy gathering occurred in Augusta, Maine, as required by the corporation charter.

To the degree that the Government's decision is a case of cooperating with a State, in line with the President's expressed purpose, the cooperation would seem to be with Maine, New York, and Massachusetts, rather than Idaho.

His action, Secretary McKay said, had been cleared with the President. So the latter perhaps had forgotten his promise to the people of the Northwest. In a speech in Seattle during the campaign, he said, "Power development in the Northwest must and will go forward. In this continuing program, the Federal Government will play its full part."

The full part of the Government, it now appears, will be to allow private interests to exploit as much of the public domain as they may find profitable, regardless of any larger considerations. A larger consideration in this instance is the amount of power to be developed on the Snake River. The Northwest needs all the power that can be produced. Hells Canyon, it is estimated, would deliver three times as much power as Oxbow. Another consideration is flood control. As a principal tributary of the Columbia, the Snake has been a principal contributor to the floods that ravage the Columbia Valley from time to time. Hells Canyon could provide a storage basin of such magnitude as to virtually eliminate future floods. It was expected to do for the Columbia Basin what the dams on the upper Tennessee have done for that region.

The Government has some interest in flood control—or it has had in the past—but a State of Maine corporation cannot be expected to take a similar interest, not in any such faraway neighborhood. The same applies to irrigation. These things pay for themselves in the course of time, of course, but hardly fast enough to attract New York and Boston investors.

Final decision on the Oxbow application by the Power Commission is to be made in July, but in the light of the Commission's present makeup and of the administration's attitude, the likelihood of its rejection is small. Other intervenors in opposition, however, are not following Mr. McKay's example. They include the American Public Power Association and the National Association of REA Cooperatives. These organizations have indicated their intention to make sure the full story of the administration's latest giveaway in the field of natural resources is made a matter of public record.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it will be observed that the headline of the article is "A Happy Day in Augusta, Maine." The subhead is, "Annual Meeting of Idaho Power Co. Held There Follows Announcement of Gift From Secretary McKay."

Mr. President, one is always happy when he receives a gift. I suppose that is true of all of us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington agree with me that both the infamous Seattle speech and the infamous Boise speech of the present President of the United States, made during the late campaign, bear out the warning which some of us issued during the campaign, that when one reads between the lines, what the Republican candidate was proposing was a giveaway of the natural resources of the rivers of the Pacific Northwest to private monopoly?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would say to my friend from Oregon, I did not use those adjectives during the campaign in my own speeches.

Mr. MORSE. But the Senator heard me use them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I heard the Senator use them.

Mr. MORSE. I repeat them today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did say, however, that I thought if the so-called Boise declaration were carried out, in my opinion, it would mean, at the minimum, not only a slow-up of power development for all the people of the Pacific Northwest, but would also probably mean the end of the so-called multiple-purpose projects.

I remember that during the campaign, when we dedicated Hungry Horse Dam, the then President of the United States, Harry Truman, attended the dedication. There we were, standing at the bottom of the huge structure which was rising to impound billions of acre-feet of water, firming up the power downstream, making possible cheap power to people, particularly those engaged in private industry. I remember the then President said to the people there assembled in that beautiful country in Glacier Park, "Ladies and gentlemen, take a good look at this structure. Take a second look and a third look, because if the policy announced by the Republican Party at Boise, Idaho, is carried out, this will be the last Federal multiple-purpose dam you will ever see." Apparently he was correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I preface my question by adding that Harry Truman was completely correct. The rationalizing of the Eisenhower administration is going to become crystal clear to the American people before very long.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The administration leaders could change their minds. It would make me very happy, indeed, were they to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Public opinion is changing very rapidly in my section of the country, I assure the Senator. The new proposal for the development of the Snake River is still being recognized for exactly what it is—another exploitation of the Nation's natural resources, which belong to all the people, for the benefit of private monopolies, in this instance a corporation owned lock, stock, and barrel by easterners, who for too long a time have looked upon the great Pacific Northwest as an economic asset of Wall Street and eastern investors.

I desire to ask the Senator whether he is aware of the fact that the rationalization and political baloney being peddled by the Secretary of the Interior in regard to this particular project show that all the Department of the Interior is doing is to remove itself as a special pleader in this case. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I could use the colloquialism, "however thin one slices it"—I do not know what it would be called, but I think I shall proceed to point that out.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question? After that, I shall let the Senator proceed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington agree with me that it happens to be the public duty of the Secretary of the Interior, occupying a position of great trust, to represent the interests of the American people in respect to their heritage in the Nation's natural resources, rather than to try to avoid his responsibility by saying he is not a special pleader in a case which raises the issue as to how the potential electric power of the Snake River should be developed, and under what procedure it should be developed, whether it should be fully developed by the Government, or whether less than the full potential should be developed by a private monopoly? Does the Senator agree with me that that is the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I agree with the Senator from Oregon. When the Secretary made his momentous announcement, I said just that. A certain newspaperman asked me what it meant. I said, "Well, it means that the people now have no one at all to represent them."

Mr. MORSE. I say advisedly that, if the newspaper accounts are accurate, the speech of the Secretary of the Interior at Boston last night is but a continuation of the big-lie technique of the Eisenhower administration, and I propose to answer it on the floor of the Senate next week.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Mr. Mellett will be interested to know, I am sure, that the good citizens of Idaho and Oregon who are concerned with the orderly development of their resources for public benefit instead of for the private profit of a Maine corporation, are meeting also.

REAL WESTERNERS TO MEET

They are not meeting in Augusta, 3,000 miles away, but right in the heart of the Hells Canyon country, the flourishing city of Lewiston, Idaho. I hope to report on the results of this meeting, which, unlike the meetings of the Idaho Power Co. in Augusta, Maine, I am sure will be well publicized.

Mr. President, I am aware of the generalities employed by the Secretary of the Interior in announcing his decision at a press conference held at the Interior Department.

As I read a transcript of his comments he sought to leave an impression that he is both for and against public power.

While divorcing his Department from the great multipurpose dam proposed for Hells Canyon, he was declaring that the Federal Government has primary responsibilities in multipurpose dams on the main stems of our rivers.

At the same time he acknowledged his action might be taken to mean the same thing as recommending a license for the Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation, he was contending, and I quote him: "Each project will be judged on its merits."

Mr. President, I am a firm believer in the old adage that actions speak louder than words, and in this instance the actions of the Secretary of the Interior really shouted. And the actions were well understood and interpreted by able newspapermen.

Let us go back to Boston, Mr. President, where the Secretary of the Interior made a speech along the same line of "off again and on again."

THE NEW POWER POLICY

The Boston Globe, for example, on May 7, carried an extremely illuminating article by John Harriman, who was quick to grasp the national significance of Mr. McKay's decision.

Mr. President, the article is headed "Hells Canyon Decision Reveals Power Policy," and was given good double-column display.

Remember, this is a Boston newspaper. Boston today is much different from what it was in the days of Daniel Webster, when he said, "Not one dime for anything west of the Allegheny Mountains."

I am sure Members of the Senate, such as my friend from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and my friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who led the courageous fight for 5 weeks on the floor of the Senate on the tidelands oil issue, and my friend from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], will be interested to hear what this Boston Globe reporter says. I read:

> The tidelands oil issue now belongs to history and in all likelihood to the 1956 Presidential campaign.

I think he is right about that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It may belong to the 1954 campaign.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am quoting the writer directly. I read further:

> California, Louisiana, and Texas may now make such deals with private oil companies as they find advantageous for the billions in oil lying off their beaches.
>
> But this is not the only news of progress in the current program of taking the Federal Government out of the West.

This is close timing, Mr. President. I read further:

> On the same day the Senate passed the tideland oil bill, Interior Secretary Douglas McKay announced that plans for a Federal dam at Hells Canyon on the Idaho-Oregon border would not be carried out.

They time all this very well, Mr. President—or it may have been a coincidence.

So far Mr. Harriman has only been winding up. Now he lets go with what I consider a perfect pitch right down the groove in this power controversy. He says:

> This decision on Hells Canyon is important, probably more important than tidelands oil. It has been waited as a test case or showdown in administration policy on developing the power and water resources of the West.

Mr. President, I note that Mr. Harriman used the word "probably" in his statement that the Hells Canyon decision is probably more important than tidelands oil.

I think it is in some respects definitely more important than tidelands oil. As I recall, we sat in the United States Senate for 5 weeks participating in or listening to the debate on the oil bill. Some of us were for the Holland measure and some of us, including myself, were not in favor of the bill as it was presented. Many of us offered amendments, and when the time came to vote we voted, with victory going to the proponents of the Holland measure.

That is the democratic way. That is the legislative way. The House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States considered and passed on the merits of that issue, not a secretary sitting in his office as head of an executive department.

If the policy of the administration, as Mr. Harriman suggests, is, and again I quote: "Taking the Federal Government out of the West," it is something that the Congress, not one executive department or its head, should pass on.

If the policy is to take the Government out of the South, or the Southwest, or the Mountain States, or the Missouri River Valley, or any great region of the United States, it is a matter that properly should be considered in the Congress of the United States, not one that should be determined by administrative fiat.

The water resources of the United States and their utilization and development for the benefit of the people are even more vital than the question of who will have jurisdiction over that portion of our oil resources that lie off-shore our Gulf and sea coasts.

WASTING OUR RESOURCES

For one thing, whether under Federal jurisdiction, or under State jurisdiction, we may be sure these off-shore resources will be developed. The oil will ultimately reach the consumer in any event and will be used.

The Hells Canyon decision, presaging a new Government power policy developed in some office, means incontrovertibly that great portions of our natural water resources and power potential will not be used.

More than that, it means these power resources will never be used to any degree approaching their potential.

It means that the people of our area and the people of the United States will be forever foreclosed from maximum utilization of their own water resources.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not a fact that this McKay-Eisenhower pronouncement means that they are going to allow the Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation, to skim the cream, so to speak, off the Snake River, so far as its electric power potential is concerned, and deny future generations of American boys and girls the maximum potential power of the Snake River?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is exactly what it means.

Their river—the Snake River—will be locked from them. Its power resources will be held captive, with administration blessing, by the Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation.

The Idaho Power Co., at its annual meeting held each year in Augusta on the first Wednesday in May, will presumably determine the river's destiny, and, in great measure, that of the area through which the river flows, because that is the great natural resource of the area.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not wish the Senator to yield if it will at all interrupt his train of thought.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is all right.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Washington is making an important speech, and I compliment him for coming to the Senate floor today and calling the shots on this latest of steals, because the time has come in America for outspoken language to be addressed to the people of the country, to put them on warning, before it is too late, that they are living under an administration that is out to raid their interest in a great heritage belonging to the American people, the natural resources of the United States.

I say to the liberals in the United States Senate that the hour has come to fight as they have never fought before, in honor of the great man from New York, Bob Wagner, who was eulogized here today; in honor of Norris, the great conservationist from Nebraska; in honor of the La Follettes, those great liberals who fought on the floor of the Senate in years gone by to protect the natural resources of the United States for the American people.

In my judgment, never before in our history has the danger to the American interest in the Nation's natural resources been so great as it is now, under the Eisenhower administration, which is out to raid our natural resources. That is why this speech by the Senator from Washington is important. It is another warning as to what this gang is out to do to the natural resources of the United States, and is a call to the American people to wake up before it is too late.

We have no right to stand by in silence and see this administration deny to future generations of American boys and girls the maximum potential power of the Snake River, as this steal will deny to them. That is why I wish to ask the Senator from Washington this question: Is it not also true that the Eisenhower program, so far as the Snake River is concerned, will not begin to provide the people of the Northwest with the flood-control protection which the Army engineers and the reclamation engineers

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

have told us Hells Canyon Dam will provide, and which can, if there should be a repetition of the great floods on the Columbia, save lives and millions of dollars worth of property? Is it not true that the program of the Idaho Power Co. in the Northwest would give no protection, so far as flood control is concerned, in comparison with what Hells Canyon Dam would provide?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is not only the opinion of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Washington and of hundreds of thousands of people in our area, but it is good engineering sense.

Mr. MORSE. That is what the Government engineers say. We are saying this on the basis of facts presented by Government engineers in reports they have made in recent years as to the advantages of Hells Canyon Dam in connection with flood control. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. One more question. Is it not also true that the senior Senator from Washington, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the other Senators who are cosponsors with me of the Hells Canyon Dam bill, are also fighting to preserve for future generations of America the right to the maximum development of irrigated lands in the Pacific Northwest, which 100 or 200 years from now American boys and girls may sorely need as a source of food supply?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator has well stated our motives. He has portrayed exactly what I think the situation is.

I again revert to Mr. Harriman's able article in the Boston Globe. He states:

Hells Canyon, it should be noted, is a giant gorge in the Snake River. Through this gorge pour the waters of the Snake, dropping even faster than the waters of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado—to be specific, about 12 feet to the mile.

In this gorge—

Mr. Harriman continues—

the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior has wanted to build a dam with an installed capacity of 900,000 kilowatts. But this is not all.

When we speak of the Snake River, I do not believe most people realize, topographically speaking, the type of river it is.

The Hells Canyon Dam would harness the Snake's spring runoff in a reservoir and could thus release the stored water in a dry season. Thus, all in all, the Hells Canyon Dam would have provided 1,632,000 kilowatts, a generating capacity the equal of even the Grand Coulee. Much of this power would be fed to the Bonneville grid, and thus spread throughout the Northwest.

Cost was put at $375 million. Government engineers have insisted that the dam would pay for itself and amortize its construction costs over 50 years at 3 percent.

I think that is a generous estimate, because we have found, in connection with similar projects, that we are not only well ahead of our repayment schedule, but it appears that we may pay for them ahead of time with interest. That does not include all the other benefits; that refers only to power.

DOG-IN-THE-MANGER DAMS

Then follows an interesting subhead to the article. It reads: "Five Dams With Half the Generating Capacity."

Following the subhead Mr. Harriman had this to say, and no truer words were ever spoken. I quote:

This plan for a dam at Hells Canyon has been bitterly fought by the private utilities, particularly the Idaho Power Co. Instead of the Federal project, Idaho Power has wanted itself to erect 1 small dam now at a cost of $23 million and 4 additional small dams later.

These 5 dams when completed would produce in all about 700,000 kilowatts of generating capacity as against the total of 1,632,000 which would result from the Federal project.

I have quoted Mr. Harriman at some length to demonstrate that the effects of Secretary McKay's decision are known well outside his own area, and also almost as far away from Hells Canyon as the corporate seat of the Idaho Power Co. in Augusta, Maine.

I could, of course, quote many other able articles on the subject by informed and syndicated writers.

I think that Mr. Harriman might like to know, when he refers to 1 small dam and 4 additional small dams later, that the 4 additional dams are in the talk stage only.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield; and I might say, as a preface to the Senator's question, that I have had many years of experience in connection with power development in the State of Washington, during which time I noted that private utilities, in opposition to Grand Coulee and Bonneville, always came forward with great plans of what they were going to do. It was always "mañana." That word should be used when the four dams now proposed are mentioned.

Mr. MORSE. My question deals with pointing up the very significant observation just made by the Senator from Washington, because I want to have the point he makes emphasized on the record. It needs to be emphasized for the enlightenment of the American people.

My question deals with what will happen when the Idaho Power Co. gets permission to build the Oxbow Dam, which I think they are going to get, since the Power Commission knows the signals being given now. Is it not true that once the Idaho Power Co. gets the permission there will be no obligation on the Idaho Power Co. to build a single other dam?

All they are saying is, "In future, we may build these dams." But they are asking in their petition for permission to build simply this one small, low-head dam, and no others.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and it would take the cream of the river.

Mr. MORSE. It would give them what they know will be the maximum profit; and as a private monopoly—and this is what I would have the American people remember—it would give them the selfish chance they are looking for to collect tribute from the consumers of the power they will generate out of the low-head dam. As the Senator from Washington has said, it would really give them the cream of the river.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no assurance whatsoever that they will ever build more than the first dam. As the Senator from Oregon has said, they will have fulfilled one obligation, and one only; namely, to build a dam in Hells Canyon. I might say that, by way of comparison, that will be a very small project. For instance, the one dam at Oxbow which they have applied for a license to build would be 117 feet high, a small dam, as western dams go; and the installed capacity for electric power would be from 140,000 to 151,000 kilowatts, 140,000 kilowatts being not much greater than the capacity of one generator at Grand Coulee.

There is no assurance whatever that the Idaho Power Co., incorporated under the laws of Maine, will ever build more than the first small dam.

It has filed one application and one application only to build a dam in Hells Canyon. That application is for a license to build one dam, and one dam only, and, I should say, a puny little dam.

By comparison, the one dam that Idaho Power has applied for a license to build is at Oxbow. It would be 117 feet high, a small dam as western dams go, and installed capacity for electric power would be 140,000 to 151,000 kilowatts, or not much greater than just one generator at Grand Coulee. And Grand Coulee has 18 generators. That may be all that the Snake River may be able to produce if this project goes through—the equivalent of not more than one generator at Grand Coulee.

Should Oxbow Dam be constructed, as Secretary McKay seems to wish, I think the name should be changed from Oxbow to "Dog-in-the-Manger" Dam, because that is just what it would be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. My suggestion would be to name it the Eisenhower Dam. I want the monument left for all to see what can happen when a free people goes to sleep upon its rights.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

THE BLOW TO FARMERS

To illustrate what I mean let me quote from a telegram I have just received from Mr. Charles Baker, general manager of the Pacific Supply Cooperative, with headquarters in Walla Walla, Wash., and branches in Oregon, Idaho, and California.

Pacific Supply Cooperative has no offices in Augusta, Maine. It is strictly a western operation, as its name indicates. The Pacific Supply Cooperative supplies literally thousands of farmers in that area who belong to it.

I wish to read from Mr. Baker's telegram. This is the blow to the farmers. This is an additional thing which has happened. The Oxbow, "Dog-in-the Manger," or Eisenhower Dam, or whatever it may be called, would not begin to approach in importance the Hells Canyon Dam. Even the five dams would not do so.

Mr. Baker's telegram states:

Failure to build Hells Canyon Dam serious blow to water resources development Columbia and Snake River systems. Its elimination appears to make unfeasible four dams

already authorized on lower reaches of Snake River and will cause heavy power losses at lower dams on the Columbia through failure to store floodwaters.

Let me interrupt Mr. Baker's telegram at this point. The four proposed Federal dams that Mr. McKay's decision would appear to make unfeasible are in the State of Washington. I am in my own territory now, not far away in Augusta, Maine.

They are: Ice Harbor Dam, for which my good Republican friends and good Democratic friends in Walla Walla and neighboring counties of Washington have been crusading for years, and which would produce supplemental power needed by our atomic works at Hanford. I have received letters in which the immediate construction of Ice Harbor Dam is urged. This decision would knock out that dam, as well as the other dams on the Snake River in Hells Canyon. An uninterrupted supply of power is needed for the atomic energy plant. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] appeared before the Appropriations Committee with documents from the Atomic Energy Commission urging the construction of Ice Harbor Dam. The Ice Harbor Dam was in the budget this year, but it, too, has been cut out.

Ice Harbor alone would produce 260,000 kilowatts of power, or far more than the "Dog-in-the-Manger Dam" the Maine corporation wants to build at Oxbow.

Then there is Lower Monumental Dam, which would produce 240,000 kilowatts; Little Goose, 260,000 kilowatts; and Lower Granite, 220,000 kilowatts; none of which in my opinion will ever be built if the corporation favored by Mr. McKay is licensed to build its low, run-of-the-river "Dog-in-the-Manger" or Eisenhower Dam.

What the farm families and the producers of the area want and need is, first, Hells Canyon Dam, which would provide ample power and water storage; and Ice Harbor Dam, also needed for our atomic works; later as the area builds, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite.

To get back to Mr. Baker's telegram, this additional damage is done.

New processes presently being developed makes it very important that low-cost power be brought to the phosphate rock deposits of Idaho which contain more than 50 percent of our phosphate rock resources.

Soda Springs, Idaho, area presently served by Utah Power & Light, who have no surplus power and would have to build steam plants to care for our needs.

The Soda Springs area is in the center of the phosphate rock workings.

Quoting further from the telegram:

Their price quoted an associate group is seven mills which makes electric furnace process prohibitive. It is our belief that within next 10 years one-quarter million kilowatts prime power will be required for phosphate fertilizer processing alone in that area.

If low-cost hydropower is available western fertilizer representing 8 wholesale farm cooperatives in 4 Northwestern States serving 200,000 farmers have developed an 1,800-acre phosphate deposit under lease from the Department of the Interior estimated to contain seventy-five to one hundred million tons of phosphate rock.

We are ready to start processing as soon as power is available.

Midwest cooperatives likewise have very substantial holdings in the same general area.

For a moment let me again lay Mr. Baker's telegram aside to state that however technical this may seem, the good farmers of our great Northwest, who have had to import fertilizer by the boatload from Japan since the war or pay still heavier shipping costs for domestic fertilizer, will understand it.

I think a great many farmers throughout America will understand it also.

I now resume reading Mr. Baker's telegram:

With low-cost power and new process being developed savings to farmers tilling more than 300 million acres of our 530 total plow land in America will run from 25 to 35 percent.

That means something. According to these farmers, the decision in the present case would destroy that saving.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is aware, is he not, of the fact that there have been no finer experiments, so far as the development of phosphate fertilizer is concerned, than those conducted by the TVA?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. The TVA has been able to carry on experiments and to make wonderful progress in the development of phosphatic fertilizers, because of cheap TVA power. If cheap power were available in Idaho by reason of the building of the Hells Canyon Dam, there would be no reason why phosphatic fertilizers could not be made there, just as they are made in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. The only difference is that the phosphate rock out of which phosphatic fertilizer is made in the Tennessee Valley must be brought in from Florida. However, in Idaho the phosphate beds are near the place where the Hells Canyon Dam could be built. They are right at the power, so to speak. So if cleap power were available at Hells Canyon, untold benefits could be brought to the farmers of that region, the farmers in other areas of the West, and farmers all over the country, by reason of the development and processing of phosphatic fertilizer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Alabama. The point we are trying to make is that if this giveaway to the Idaho Power Co. goes through, we might as well say goodby to that phosphate. That is what these farmers understand.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator says he would have to say goodbye to phosphatic fertilizer. There is nothing more important today to the farmers than phosphatic fertilizer. The people of the Senator's area would be saying goodbye to phosphatic fertilizer. They would be saying goodbye so far as any cheap power for REA cooperatives is concerned. They would be saying goodby so far as flood control is concerned. They would be saying goodby so far as great industrial developments in that area are concerned, developments which would provide a better balance between industry and agriculture. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Alabama is absolutely correct. I thank him.

Continuing with Mr. Baker's telegram:

Dollar savings conservatively estimated at not less than $50 million annually based on present consumption. With the use of phosphate fertilizer growing by leaps and bounds these savings will increase substantially as volume of distribution grows.

In our opinion—

Mr. Baker concludes—

it would be a grave mistake to disrupt the whole program of water resources as set forth in the 308 report of the Army engineers of which Hells Canyon Dam is an integral part, and from the standpoint of western and midwest agriculture it will be a serious blow to our future economy.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Inasmuch as the Baker telegram mentioned the Army engineers' report, does not the Senator from Washington agree we ought to make clear in the RECORD that the recommendation of Mr. McKay and Mr. Eisenhower of turning over the Snake River to the Idaho Power Co. cannot be reconciled with the previous reports of both the Army engineers and the Reclamation engineers?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, it cannot be reconciled. When the Senator from Oregon and I speak of the 308 report, the people in our section of the country know to what we are referring. It is the comprehensive, well-planned, well-gone-over, and well-screened development of the great river systems of that area.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Are not the Reclamation engineers engineers of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Therefore, what Secretary McKay has done has been to override the recommendation and the facts presented by his own Reclamation engineers?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is true. The engineers are not only the engineers of one administration but they have been the engineers of many administrations. Those engineers have come to the same conclusion.

In this connection, Mr. President, so the RECORD will be clear, I should like to have printed at this point a letter written by Mr. G. W. Bunting, manager of the Central Farmers Fertilizer Co., of Chicago, to Mr. W. A. Dittner, of the Bonneville Power Administration, nearly a year ago, or before Secretary McKay's decision.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In reply to your inquiry of May 21 we wish to make it clear that if Federal power can be delivered from Hells Canyon Dam at a cost of between 2.5 and 3 mills per kilowatt-hour

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

this corporation intends to construct an electric furnace adjacent to phosphate deposits owned by this corporation in southeastern Idaho and that such furnace operation is to produce concentrated phosphate fertilizer. The initial operation is planned to produce annually 75,000 tons of calcium metaphosphate (0–65–0) and 75,000 tons of triple superphosphate (0–48–0). To produce this quantity of fertilizer it will require 369,750,000 kilowatt-hours per year. With the operation at a 90 percent load factor our demand load would be 46,000 kilowatts. For this plant the total investment in Idaho will amount to $16 million to $18 million. Total employment in the mine and processing plant would be about 560 men. The fertilizer produced in this plant would be marketed to 1,460,000 farmers in the States of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Oklahoma, Kansas, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Nebraska. The product from one plant alone will in no way meet the demand of the farmers who are members of this organization. At least nine additional plants of a like capacity will be required to meet the requirements of the Midwest. Based upon the present prevailing prices for low-analysis phosphate fertilizer the annual savings to the farmer from this one proposed plant would be in excess of $3,400,000 annually.

We are sure that anyone making an honest evaluation of the problem of meeting the farmer's phosphate problem by utilizing the phosphate resources of the West will concur with the opinion set forth herein. Should you desire any further information regarding our proposed operations in the West and our reason for desiring low-cost hydroelectric power, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the letter Mr. Bunting points out the importance of cheap electric power and what it would accomplish, and how many people would be employed in the development, and so forth.

WHO IS ADMINISTRATION WORKING FOR?

Mr. President, it is my suspicion that the interests of these 200,000 farmers served by Pacific Supply Cooperative, and that of the other hundreds of thousands of farm families throughout the United States who want to buy low-cost fertilizer for their acres will not weigh greatly with the new administration or its Secretary of the Interior.

The latter's concern from the very outset of the last presidential campaign was primarily in the interest of private utilities such as the Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation. In fact the President himself, then a candidate, took a very dim view of Federal power developments. In a statement made at Boise, Idaho, on August 20 of last year, he said:

> Now we have for a long time a government that applies the philosophy of the left to government. The Government will build the power dams; the Government will tell you how to distribute your power; the Government will do this and that; the Government does everything but come in and wash the dishes for the housewife.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I first yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wonder whether the President of the United States does not realize that perhaps the greatest thing which cheap power has brought to the farm homes of America is the electric washing machine. I recall visiting the Tennessee Valley some years ago with the late Senator George Norris. We went into a humble farm home and the good farm wife in that home told us what it meant to her to have electricity in the home and to have an electric washing machine, which made it possible for her not to be forced to bend her poor aching back to wash the clothes of the household. As we listened to that good housewife's story, there was so much pathos and so much truth in it, I saw tears running down the cheeks of the great Senator Norris, and it was not long before I joined him in his feelings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We can all agree with the Senator from Alabama as to what electric power has meant to the farm homes and that it has been a great boon to the country. When the President made the statement in Boise, Idaho, that we would soon be washing the housewives' dishes, he was exactly right because that is what we have done in the Pacific Northwest.

Of course, the area where Mr. Eisenhower was speaking is virtually the private domain, powerwise, of the Idaho Power Co., of Maine. He should have been advised of that when he went to Boise, but apparently was not.

Most of the power resources of the Snake River already are being exploited by the Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation, through a series of small dams built for power purposes only and not by the Federal Government.

The rural areas of the States of Oregon and Washington are more than 95 percent electrified, and only because of the Federal Government's program of building dams and because that program has gone ahead. I defy anyone, regardless of whether he is in favor of making such broad statements about power development, to show me that it was done or could ever be done as well other than through the Federal program of the development of electric power in the great riverbeds of the country.

In the area so ably represented by the Senator from Alabama the rural electrification program was practically dead until this program started.

I think we can be thankful that we have gone so far as we have with the development, because had the McKay type of reversal of policy been put into effect 10 or 12 years ago, or prior to World War II, our farms would still be back literally in the Dark Ages.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that when Candidate Eisenhower, now President Eisenhower, was in Boise, it would have been a good thing for someone to have taken him by the hand and to have led him into some dairy barns in the Pacific Northwest, which are supplied with electric milking machines, but which would not have been supplied with electric milking machines if we had depended upon the private electric-power monopolies to provide cheap electric power? Does the Senator agree that someone ought to have taken him by the hand and led him into a farm kitchen in the Pacific Northwest and let him watch a farm wife operate her dishwashing machine with electric power, a process which would not have been possible if we had left the development of electric power to the private electric power monopolies?

Does the Senator from Washington agree with me that then someone should have taken the candidate by the hand and led him into the backwoods areas, where we are trying to get cheap power from Hells Canyon Dam, and let him see with his own eyes why we are fighting on this issue for human values, rather than for the profiteering private monopolies?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there is no question about it. I do not stand here and say that we would have been without power development in this country under a different Federal power policy. Of course we would have had power development, but the development would not have gone so far as it has, because the cost would have been too great. I know of a farm home by which ran a great hydroelectric powerline but the farmer could not afford to tap that line in order to get electricity. REA did it. But only because the Federal Government brought the development into the valleys in Alabama and in the States represented by the Senator from Oregon and by myself.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will make it clear in the RECORD, that when he spoke about building a multipurpose dam, as he did in referring to the wonderful dam that could be built in Hells Canyon, that he was speaking about a field in which private enterprise cannot be expected to enter. A multipurpose dam involves not only the generation of power, but also the development of water for irrigation, flood control, and navigation. No one may expect private enterprise to enter such a field, and private enterprise, of course, does not go into such a field. It cannot provide for flood control, reclamation, or navigation. Therefore we are dealing with a field which is entirely different from perhaps any other field in the national economy. Is that not true?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is true. The general statement is made—and I am in agreement with it—that there is a place for Federal power, but private industry should do the job if it can do it. We all agree with that general statement. There is no disagreement on that point. However the experience has been that private enterprise cannot do the work in some cases. In other cases it would not do it. In this case, the Secretary of the Interior is making a complete reversal of our Federal power policy. That policy has been followed not only under Democratic administrations, but actually was started back in 1902, under Theodore Roosevelt, and continued since then. Even Mr. Hoover built a Federal dam, and we named it for him in the 80th Congress. That dam has been a great boon to the people in the southwest cor-

ner of the United States. However, he stated that private enterprise should undertake such work when it can do it. Of course we are all in agreement with it.

Mr. McKay has stated that the present Congress is in no mood to appropriate any sums of money for dams such as Hells Canyon Dam, and therefore, since Congress is of that feeling, it should be turned over to a private concern.

What Mr. McKay is forgetting is that that is only one Congress. I would recommend his reading the article published in the Boston Globe, written by Mr. Harriman. In other words, merely because this Congress is not sufficiently farsighted to go ahead with such a development is no reason for the Secretary of the Interior to give it all away to a private power company.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. On that particular point, it is very important that we stop and think about it for a while. Does not the Senator from Washington believe that the statement of the Secretary of the Interior is a sad confession of lack of political leadership on the part of the Eisenhower administration? Although what Mr. McKay says may be true of this Congress, do we not have a right to look to the administration for leadership? Should it not come before Congress, tell us why private utilities should do the work, and what the facts are which support it, and such a proposal take its plea to the American people and sell the program to the American people, and then see what Congress would do?

I thought that was one of the silliest, phoniest rationalizations I ever heard come from the lips of a politician; I refer to the statement that "I am advocating that we turn it over to a private monopoly because I do not think the Congress"——

Mr. MAGNUSON. In fact, the reference was to this Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Yes—"because I do not think this Congress will provide for it."

Mr. President, where was President Eisenhower? If the implications of the McKay statement are true, President Eisenhower should have spoken over the radio and television, to inform the American people why they should support such a giveaway of a large part of the national heritage.

I believe that it was merely a rather cheap run-out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, I was amazed at the statement, because we have been fighting for these things for years. The fact that one Congress does not take care of the situation does not mean that we should throw up our hands and give away these extremely valuable assets.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is not the history of all these projects that of a long, hard struggle before the battle was won and the funds were made available for construction?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course; and no one knows that better than the Senator from Alabama, who has gone through this fight for many years.

I recall my experience when, as a young member of the Washington State Legislature, I had the temerity to introduce a bill providing that the Seattle Light Co. be allowed to sell its cheap power outside the city limits. What a storm of criticism descended upon me then. I was said to be a Socialist and a radical, for proposing that the Seattle municipal plant be allowed to sell power outside the city limits. That was 21 years ago.

The Senator from Alabama and I have gone through the fight since then, but we have not given up because in one Congress there was a different shade of opinion in the case of a certain issue. We have not given up, because, thank goodness, Congress changes at times.

So Mr. Eisenhower, before making his statement at Boise, should have been advised, as might have been pointed out here, that the place where he was speaking was virtually in the private domain, powerwise, of the Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation. He spoke in Idaho, but apparently the dictates were coming from somewhere else, in regard to the question of whether the Idaho Power Co. should have the Snake River.

The recent action of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, in effect merely increases the Idaho Power Co.'s domain, giving to it the parts of the Snake River it does not have already.

A good many people in the area devoutly wish that what Mr. Eisenhower said in Boise was true: that the Federal Government would build the dams and would do what it does for other areas of the country. In that case, in that area electricity certainly would be cheaper than it is now.

According to the Public Utilities Fortnightly, which always expounds the private utilities' point of view, there are 15 plants located on the Snake River, of which 2 small ones are owned by Utah Power & Light Co., and 13 are owned by the Idaho Power Co. More are planned, the Utilities Fortnightly adds.

THE LITTLE DAMS

To continue the Fortnightly article:

Idaho Power's plants, starting at the farthest upstream and working down, are the following—

Then appears the following list of dams:

American Falls, present capacity 27,000 kilowatts, completed in 1927, although predecessor companies had installations dating back to 1902.

Twin Falls, capacity 9,600 kilowatts, installed in 1935.

Shoshone Falls, capacity 12,500 kilowatts, completed in 1921, although a predecessor company started it in 1907.

Clear Lake, capacity 2,200 kilowatts, built in 1937.

Thousand Springs, capacity 7,800 kilowatts, completed in 1920, started by a predecessor company in 1910. This plant is located on canyon wall of the Snake River and is fed by springs.

SCENIC WATERS IMPAIRED

I might interject at this point that I am told that Thousand Springs was one of the great scenic wonders of the West, like Shoshone Falls, a natural wonder of national-monument quality; that is, until its beauty was virtually destroyed by a little 7,800-kilowatt power project being operated for a corporation of the State of Maine.

I continue the Fortnightly's list:

Also Upper Salmon, capacity 37,000 kilowatts. Idaho Power installed the first 2 units of 20,000-kilowatt total capacity in 1937 and added 2 additional units in a separate plant amounting to 17,000 total capacity in 1947.

Lower Salmon, capacity 68,000 kilowatts, was completed in 1949.

Lower Malad and Upper Malad, total capacity 22,000 kilowatts, completed in 1948. These are not located on the Snake proper, but are immediately adjoining it.

Bliss, capacity 80,000 kilowatts, completed in 1950. Last year there was completed the C. J. Strike development, with a capacity of 90,000 kilowatts, and named after the late and widely known president of this company.

Swan Falls, capacity 12,000 kilowatts, completed in 1919, although the first units were installed by a predecessor company in 1901.

Oxbow, capacity 600 kilowatts, was built by a predecessor company in 1914.

This completes the list of Idaho Power Co. plants now in operation, as listed in the Fortnightly. The company's 1952 annual report adds several more:

Salmon, with 657 kilowatts of hydroelectric power; Horseshoe Bend, 1,600 kilowatts; Barber, 1,050 kilowatts; and Cascade, the smallest, 275 kilowatts.

Not 1 of them, I must emphasize, generates an amount of power equivalent to that developed by 1 generator at Grand Coulee Dam. That shows the difference between a series of small dams and 1 large multipurpose dam; and I suppose the total cost of the smaller dams is much greater than that of 1 large multipurpose dam. The small dams generate only small amounts of power, which means that the electricity generated at them has to be sold at relatively high rates, which must be paid by the housewife who may wish to "use electric power to wash her dishes," to quote President Eisenhower.

As we realize, the Idaho Power Co. is a private power company incorporated under the laws of Maine. It builds the powerplants, and has a virtual stranglehold on the Snake River for all its length below two small dams owned by the Utah Power & Light Co. on the upper reaches of the river, at St. Anthony and Ashton, near the Wyoming border.

So I think Mr. Eisenhower was grievously misadvised when he made his Boise statement.

THE REAL WHOLE HOG

I think he also was misadvised when he declared at Seattle, on October 6 of last year, that the Department of the Interior is seeking a monopoly over hydropower production and distribution. He said:

It seeks this monopoly not just in the West, but throughout the Nation. Here we have the real whole hog.

Mr. President, if President Eisenhower will just look up the facts, as

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

stated by the private power industry's own principal organ, he will find that the real whole hog in the Snake River Valley is the Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation. It is not the Federal Government. On the Snake River the Federal Government is not even the tail of the hog, and Mr. McKay is making certain that it will not be.

Even the company boasts in its prospectus, filed with the Securities Exchange Commission, on February 6:

> The company is not in competition with any privately owned public utility company or with any municipality or other governmental agency in the company's service area.

Mr. McKay, by his action in the Hells Canyon case, has not even lived up to his own pronouncements.

On January 22 of this year, the Sacramento Bee reported Mr. McKay as stating that he believes the private utilities should have equal treatment with public agencies.

Of course, all of us agree on that point, but I wonder whether Secretary McKay would consider a ratio of 17 private dams to one Federal project as equal treatment. Apparently not, because he now seeks to give the Idaho Power Co., of Maine, another dam on the Snake River, to the exclusion of a federal dam to benefit the people.

Secretary McKay, at hearings held before the Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate on his nomination, contended:

> I believe that private enterprise can work with the production and distribution of power, and I think they should be allowed to. I don't think they should be throttled, and there has been a tendency in the past to give breaks to all the public deals.

I might inquire of Secretary McKay at this point: Who got the breaks on the Snake River, and who is still getting them?

At the same hearing Secretary McKay also expressed his view that there should be greater local participation in the operation and control, and eventually local ownership, of federally sponsored, reimbursable water projects.

That, of course, is the expressed policy of the corporation part of the Republican Party. It was so expressed in the Republican platform. Local participation and local ownership is the great shibboleth of the Republican Party, inspired no doubt by the urgings of the private power trust. It sounds fine, and it would be fine, except that the private power trust often does not practice it. The Idaho Power Co. does not practice it.

The Idaho Power Co., which almost has the role of whole-hog on the Snake River, is, as I have said before, a Maine corporation. It is not local, never has been, and never will be.

WHAT THE REPUBLICANS MEAN BY "LOCAL"

None of the 10 most powerful men of this Maine corporation, as votes represent power, is a resident of Idaho. Only one is located anywhere in the West.

I do not presume to know how the shares of this Maine corporation are broken down; but I do know who, as last reported, had the most votes. The corporation has a peculiar arrangement that disguises the number of shares. The holder of one share of preferred stock is entitled to 5 votes, and the holder of a share of common stock is entitled to only 1 vote.

So let us see who holds the greatest voting power. The list begins with a Philadelphia company. Then follows a Hartford, Conn., insurance company; and, after that 2 Boston concerns, a Milwaukee company, another Boston enterprise, a Chicago firm, 2 more Boston companies, and—10th, and last on my list—the Occidental Life Insurance Co., of Los Angeles, which alone of all this power hierarchy has headquarters in the West.

Of course, if the Idaho Power Co. were to seek to obtain from the Federal Power Commission a license to build a dam on, let us say, the Androscoggin River, or the Kennebec River or the Saco River, in Maine, such a plan would be subject to local participation and control, such as the administration talks so much about. They are beautiful rivers, and a Maine corporation should have not too much difficulty in building a dam somewhere on them. But the corporation would not have a monopoly, or virtual monopoly, on the rivers of Maine, such as it enjoys on the Snake River, and which Secretary McKay has taken steps to strengthen.

There are the Central Maine Power Co., the Androscoggin Water Power Co., and several others with their dams on the rivers of Maine, and I strongly doubt that any of these companies is incorporated under the laws of Idaho or has its corporate seat in Boise.

Thus it seems indisputable to me that when Mr. McKay speaks of local participation and local control he is referring to the great State of Maine, whether the power site lies in Oregon or Idaho.

The Census Bureau informs me that as of the last census, there are 90 former Idahoans now making their home in Maine, which may give the Secretary some claim to recognizing the principle of local participation in his Hells Canyon decision.

On the other hand, the Bureau reports that 450 former natives of Maine now reside in Idaho. Unfortunately it does not advise us if any of the Idaho migrants to Maine, or Maine migrants to Idaho, have any connection with the Maine corporation known as the Idaho Power Co.

When Secretary McKay speaks of local participation, he also may be referring to the locality known as Wall Street.

Recently Idaho Power Co. of Maine offered 225,000 shares of common stock to supplement the 900,000 shares that already were outstanding.

On February 6 this year it informed the Securities Exchange Commission that for underwriting purposes the following had taken shares as indicated:

> Kidder, Peabody & Co., 17 Wall Street, 35,650 shares; Bear, Stearns' Co., 1 Wall Street, 30,000 shares; Eastman & Dillon Co., 15 Broad Street, 30,000 shares; Hallgarten & Co., 44 Wall Street, 25,000 shares; White, Weld & Co., 40 Wall Street, 20,000 shares; A. G. Becker & Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill., 17,000 shares; W. R. Pressprich & Co., 48 Wall Street, 15,000 shares; American Securities Corp., 25 Broad Street, 11,000 shares; Schoellkopf, Hutton & Pomeroy, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y., 11,000 shares; and Laurence M. Marke & Co., 49 Wall Street, 10,000 shares.

Then follows a Chicago company with 5,500 shares, J. A. Hoyle & Co., of Salt Lake City, the only one in the intermountain area, 3,300 shares; 5 Chicago firms, 2 with 2,200 shares each and 3 with 1,650 shares each; and 2 San Francisco companies, J. Barth & Wilson, Johnson & Higgins, each with 1,100 shares.

WESTERN UNDERWRITERS GET 2.4 PERCENT OF SHARES

Thus, of the 225,000 shares of common stock acquired by underwriters, Wall Street and its environs took 176,500 or more than 75 percent; Buffalo, 11,000 shares; Chicago, 31,850 shares, and Western underwriters, a grand total of 5,500 shares, less than 2½ percent.

Local participation, apparently, does not extend to financing.

Of course, the contention will be raised that the Maine corporation known as the Idaho Power Co. does have officers who reside in Idaho. That is correct.

According to Idaho Power's own report, as of July 25, 1952, these officers and directors owned 390 shares of the 181,000 shares of preferred stock then outstanding. Of the then 900,000 shares of common stock they owned exactly 5,950. That, apparently, is Mr. McKay's idea of local participation.

Seven hundred five thousand seven hundred and eighty-eight of the one million one hundred and twenty-five thousand shares of common stock, were owned in New England and the Mid-Atlantic States, 175,133 in the North Central States, 27,331 in the South Central and southeastern areas of the country, and 5,868 shares abroad.

The West had 123,085 shares in the coastal States; 87,795 in the intermountain area, a total of 210,880 shares for the West as against 908,252 for the rest of the country, the great bulk in the East, and the 5,868 shares owned outside the United States.

Mr. President, Mr. Harriman, in his article in the Boston Globe, spoke of the administration program as "Taking the Federal Government out of the West." I call the program "Selling the West down the river and then blocking the river behind us."

DO NOT GIVE OUR SCALPS TO WALL STREET

Hells Canyon Dam, and the obstacles Secretary McKay has put in its way, is but one phase of the gigantic scheme—some might call it a conspiracy—to make the resources of the West a grab-bag for eastern corporations and Wall Street underwriters.

We westerners are a pretty hardy people. For the next 4 years I suppose we shall have to take it. We will not like it, but we shall have to take it. We know what is coming, that is sure; and from the flood of letters and telegrams pouring into my office protesting the grabs, giveaways, and cutbacks, I think we westerners are beginning to get a little bit angry.

Mr. President, the administration still has time to reverse its open grab-bag policy. It can reverse that policy and let the orderly development of water resources, our mineral resources, and our industrial resources proceed for the good of the Nation.

It can make friends instead of enemies by going ahead on the great program which has brought production and prosperity to the West in the past 20

years and enhanced our national security.

It can do that, or it can scalp us, as it is doing now, giving our scalps to Wall Street.

Mr. President, when the Senator from Oregon says we should sound a warning, I submit we did so during the debate on the submerged lands. Much was said to the effect that it might merely be the beginning of an attack upon our national natural resources. On the day the vote was taken on the so-called tidelands measure, when everyone knew what the vote would be, and when we, of the opposition, knew we were going to lose—on that very day the Secretary of the Interior announced another give-away program in connection with hydroelectric power. I hope it will not come to pass, but I wish to sound a warning to my people of the West, and to the people of the South, who are also vitally interested in this matter. If the present policy is adhered to, I think it will not be long before our national forests will be dealt with according to that policy. It would be the third step in the so-called program. During the past 20 or 25 years, under the Federal program, we have done very well in the development of the West. Private enterprise has been able to make progress particularly because of the availability of cheap power. We have constructed numerous reclamation, flood-control, and navigational projects. I, for one, would look askance at any reversal of the policy we have been following in the West. We do not want the Federal Government to take over any of the programs which I have mentioned, or to take over any other program, unless it be for the good of all the people.

Much is said about private enterprise. A great many private enterprises came into being because of the development of hydroelectric power on the Columbia River, in fact, 20 times the number of such enterprises as would have been possible had the multiple-purpose dams not been constructed. In connection with Bonneville Dam, there is a local law which contains a preference clause. If the preference clause is found objectionable, a recommendation should be made for its repeal. We of the West believe that any reversal of our present policy would be a serious detriment to the happiness and welfare of our people. I hope the Republican Party will not proceed to such a point that the people of America will say, "Your new slogan should be, 'Stick with us; we give away something every day.'"

COMMITTEE REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is Friday afternoon. The representative of the Independent Party in the Senate will now give his weekly report to the Nation as a member of the only committee to which he belongs in the Senate of the United States, the Committee of the Whole.

I do not know how many more weeks it will be before the representative of the Independent Party can function in the Senate of the United States as a part of the committee system of the Senate, over and beyond the Committee of the Whole. But, as I indicated day before yesterday, I am pleased to report today that there is growing optimism as more and more of my colleagues in the Senate tell me that they are changing their view as to the position they took on January 13 of this year. I do not think they are "kidding" me, Mr. President. I think they are very sincere and that they mean it when they say, as so many of them have said, that if they had it to do over they would not vote to establish the very unfortunate precedent in the Senate of denying to a Senator, simply because he insists on keeping faith with his conscience, his committee rights in the Senate of the United States.

I am advised that next week there is a good possibility that my resolution may be brought up on the floor for debate and for a vote. The resolution, of course, proposes to add one Republican to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and to restore the junior Senator from Oregon as a representative of a million and a half people to his seniority rights which were taken away from him on January 13, and to place him once again on the committees on which he has asserted for 17 weeks he is entitled to serve.

It has been a very interesting experience, Mr. President. Some weeks ago, in my weekly committee report, I urged my colleagues to relax their neck muscles for a while. I thought if they would do that the impulses of reason would go up into the cortex and they would reflect more rationally on the problem of protecting the committee system of the Senate, which was, in my judgment, so unfortunately abused on January 13.

That is about all I want to say concerning the committee matter this afternoon, other than to invite the attention of some of my friends of the press that things are looking better. We are waiting, of course, for the minority leader to return. I understand that a number of his colleagues wish to confer with him. The majority leader has been wonderful about it ever since January 13, when on the floor of the Senate he said he was perfectly willing to accept the proposal of the junior Senator from Oregon which was blocked, as the RECORD shows, by the minority leader on that day, because, had he been willing to give consent on January 13 I would not have had to make all these committee reports during the weeks which have passed. I do not know how much longer they will continue, but I still have 3½ years' service in the Senate, and it means a good many more committee reports on the floor of the Senate on Friday afternoons, because, so help me, Mr. President, so long as I am a Member of this body and so long as the Senate permits this injustice to stand against more than a million and a half people in the State of Oregon whom I represent, I shall rise every Friday afternoon and fight for their rights.

I repeat this afternoon, Mr. President, that there is involved the principle of equal representation under the Constitution. I also repeat that we cannot justify accepting a procedure applicable to 1 Member of the Senate and not applicable to the other 95 Members.

The great fallacy in the argument of the Democrats who are opposed to the adoption of my resolution is their failure to recognize a fact, because, Mr. President, the only thing they have left by way of rationalization now is that my proposal changes the ratio. Certainly it changes the ratio, by a little less than one-half of 1 percent; but that ratio was automatically changed when 2 minority parties came into being in the Senate of the United States. What the Democrats do not like to recognize, at least, a few of them who still insist that they should stand by the mistake in judgment they made on January 13, is that they are not the only minority party in the Senate. With 2 minority parties, the second minority party has its rights also.

The second great fallacy of my Democratic colleagues is their false assumption that it is up to the majority party to do something about a minority party. They mean, of course, a minority party other than their own. They would not want the majority party to assign committee seats to the members of the Democratic minority party, but they think it is all right to have the Republican Party assign seats to an independent minority party. The Independent Party does not think so. The Independent Party was very fair and decent about it, I thought, by notifying both the majority and minority parties, the Republicans and the Democrats, several days before January 13, that it did not want any handouts from the Republicans. I do not want to be under any obligations to a Republican caucus or to a Democratic caucus.

I am glad my friend from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has come into the Chamber, Mr. President. I have wanted for a long time to talk to him intimately. He would be surprised to know how many people in Montana are interested in the position of the Independent Party on this committee question. I shall be delighted to show the Senator from Montana some of the mail I have received from people living in Montana. They are good Democrats, too.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I think the Senator from Oregon is mistaken if he thinks I do not appreciate the importance of his reports.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think so at all. I think the Senator from Montana is growing in his appreciation of my reports. I believe my mail from Montana indicates that and I believe it is true of some of his Democratic colleagues, too, who have heard from their constituents, not only through me, but directly.

Getting back to my argument, Mr. President, let me say that I have tried to be very fair. Days before January 13 I told the Senate I did not want to be under any obligations to the Republican caucus or to the Democratic caucus; I only wanted my rights under the Reorganization Act.

That involves another stumbling block to the Democrats, because, when they made the argument that in times gone by some of the minorities in the Senate have let the majority party assign them to committees, they forgot that was before the Reorganization Act. Now they

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

are beginning to recognize that this is a novel case; this is the only case that has arisen under the Reorganization Act where one not a member of either of the two major parties in the Senate simply says, "I want my rights under the Reorganization Act." It is just that simple, Mr. President.

So it is misleading for the Democrats to argue that I should look to the Republicans for committee assignments. It is misleading on two grounds: First, because that is not what the Reorganization Act says, and I stand on that act; second, because the Democrats have no right to ask me, a member of the minority party, to follow a procedure different from the procedure they themselves follow in regard to assignments of Democrats to committees.

So, by way of brief review this afternoon, I am only calling the attention of my Democratic friends to the two great fallacies the Democrats have perpetuated throughout the whole committee assignment fight: First, their false assumption that a minority party should look to the majority Republican Party for committee assignments, because I say they have no more right to expect me to look to the Republican Party for committee assignments than they as Democrats should be expected to look to the Republican Party for assignments.

Their second fallacy is their argument that there is something untouchable about the preexisting ratio of committee assignments between Republicans and Democrats. But they overlook the fact that that ratio has been developed on the basis of Republicans versus Democrats? However, it is now necessary to face the new fact that the situation involves Republicans, Democrats, and one Independent—and do not be too sure that I am not going to have some colleagues in my party in the Senate before long.

So the Independent Party also is entitled to its ratio allotment which reduces the Democrats a half of 1 percent in their ratio, but it respects and protects an interest vital to them and to all other Senators. It protects and preserves the seniority rights of each Senator, rights which Democrats are undermining when they treat the junior Senator from Oregon as they have treated him, because it protects the 8 years of seniority I have in the Senate, which was taken away from me on January 13. There is no language that can be used that will cover up that fact. It was done, and I respectfully submit that the responsibility is now upon the Senate to do something about it.

So, Mr. President, I am encouraged when I call attention to the increasing number of Senators on both sides of the aisle who have come to me in recent days to tell me that when my resolution is considered next week, if it shall be, or the week after, I will find them voting differently from the way they voted on January 1?

Mr. President, for years I engaged in difficult negotiations and mediations, and I wish to say to my friends on both sides of the aisle that they ought to get together prior to the time this question is taken up for consideration, and participate in some good-faith negotiations, and then come forward with a solution which will protect my rights, and restore to a million and a half people their equal representation in the United States Senate. I think that would be the best way to handle the matter.

In my opinion that could be done very simply, if there were a will to do it, because I believe I have demonstrated at least one thing in 16 or 17 weeks, namely, that any hope of silencing me on this issue ought to be abandoned, for I shall continue to fight for what I know is right, and continue to point out to the American people that my colleagues in the Senate cannot find any precedent for what they did on January 13, save a disgraceful one in 1871, when Sumner, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, who was opposed to a military administration of his time, the administration of General Grant, as I am opposed to the one of our time, was kicked off his committee. That is the only precedent that can be cited. All the other precedents are on my side. Listen to the names of some of those whose cases can be cited: Norris, the La Follettes, Ladd, Couzens, Cummins, Shipstead, Wheeler, Taylor. There are others, but those are some of the leading ones.

It does not make any difference what adjectives are used to describe these men. Some may call them individualists. I believe some of them called themselves free soilers, progressives, or independents. But they all made one pattern. In the midst of a political campaign they dared to stand for what they thought was right. They refused to put party regularity above their consciences, and they were not disciplined.

I have said before, and I repeat the statement so that no one will charge me with immodesty on this point, that I cannot fill their shoes; but I can try to walk in their footprints in the Senate. If I did not stand here every Friday afternoon until this wrong is righted and fight to protect the principle of seniority rights in the United States Senate in regard to committee assignments, I would feel that I had let these men down, because I have read the cases involving all of them. I have read everything I can find about these cases, both from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and from information the Library of Congress has been able to supply of public discussions in the press of the time.

Mr. President, what runs through all those discussions is the very point I have made time after time in the Senate, and which I argued on January 13. No discipline was meted out to those men, but the Senate respected their seniority rights growing out of service in the Senate. That is what the newspapers of their day said. When La Follette, when Wheeler, when all the others returned after they had followed a very independent course of action in presidential campaigns, there was much newspaper conjecture as to what would happen to them. Were they going to be disciplined? Would any attempt be made to deny them their committee rights in the Senate? Without exception, other than the Sumner case of 1871, the comments were to the effect that the Senate would not take any adverse course of action against them, because it would respect the seniority rights of its members. Those men had had long tenure in the Senate, as I had served 8 years before January 13 last. The record will show that in some instances they were removed from the chairmanships of committees, as I think they should have been, as a matter of policy. It did not happen in the case of the great Norris, because he was recognized for the giant statesman he was. He was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and he was not removed from the Judiciary chairmanship. But there were some other cases. Ladd was removed from a chairmanship. I think one or two others were also. Of course, they were all required—and it was right that they should be, and I expected to be—to sit at the foot of the committee table so far as seniority within the committee was concerned. I have no objection to that.

La Follette, as a Progressive, after one of his bolts was treated as a junior member of the committee so far as committee seniority was concerned. That was quite proper. But the inappropriate thing about all this is the failure on the part of the Senate, during these 16 or 17 weeks, to recognize what I pointed out on January 13, namely, that we are dealing with two types of seniority. When a Senator sits here for 8 years he has Senate seniority.

Of course, regardless of what language may be used, what has been done is an affront, but not to me, because affronts do not bother me. Of course, it was an insult, but not to me, because I do not let insults bother me. However, it was an affront and an insult to the people of my State, for whom I am a vehicle of sovereignty representation so long as I sit here representing them in the Senate, to deny to them on January 13 the full measure of the seniority rights of their Senator representing them in the Senate of the United States, so far as concerns his membership on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There is no answer to it. That is why I am pleased and encouraged to find, after 16 or 17 weeks of battling here every Friday afternoon before empty desks, that a change is taking place in the thinking of many Senators. I have said that I have been speaking to empty desks. But, Mr. President, many of the American people are listening. What many of my colleagues are just beginning to realize is that what I say here on Friday afternoon on this subject is being listened to by increasing thousands of American citizens who do not like what the Senate did on January 13. They are making their displeasure known is a variety of ways. One of the ways is by direct representation to some of my colleagues in the Senate.

The American people believe in the fundamental rule of the American playground—the rule of fair play. They believe in another rule of the playground, and that is that if we are to have fair play, the same rules should apply to all teams. No one team should be given an advantage. The American people understand that language.

One can go before any cross-section audience of the American people today and lay before them what the Senate did on January 13, and the reaction will be a reaction of resentment. I know whereof I speak. The American people know that the Senate violated the rules of the playground. The action of the Senate cannot be reconciled with fair play.

That is true of a great many who disagree—yes, violently—with the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon on a great many issues. I wish I could parade before the Senate this afternoon the hundreds of people across America who have said to me, as I have gone about America since January 13, "Senator, I completely disagree with your position in American politics on many points, but I do not like a dirty deal." They interpret the discriminatory practice of January 13 as a dirty deal. I am telling the Senate what they say.

So I hope that when we come to debate this subject sometime next week or the week following, if the majority leader brings up my resolution at that time, my colleagues will have thought through the fairness of the position I have taken. I ask Senators to forget about me as a person and think, as they should have thought on January 13, about the best interests of the Senate, so far as the uniform treatment of all its Members is concerned, irrespective of disagreements with an individual member. When that is done I think there is no doubt that if consciences prevail the resolution will be adopted.

Senators certainly cannot go along with the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is based in large measure on a typographical error in an amendment to the resolution, because of which the false assumption was drawn that I proposed to reduce the membership of the Public Works Committee from 11 to 8, thereby bumping some Democrats off the committee, when the proposal was to reduce the membership of the Public Works Committee from 11 to 10, simply eliminating me from the committee.

I made the correction on the floor of the Senate, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show. The Parliamentarian advises me that I did all I needed to do to correct the RECORD, although I wish now that I had submitted a new amendment.

In addition, the clerk of the Committee on Rules and Administration was notified, and he informs my office that he so advised the committee. But in spite of all that correcting, we have a report from the Committee on Rules and Administration based upon the false assumption that I was proposing to reduce the membership of the Public Works Committee from 11 to 8.

As I have said on two previous occasions, the Committee on Rules and Administration did not extend to me the courtesy of calling me before the committee for testimony on my resolution. No member of the committee ever stopped at my desk at any time and asked a simple question which, if it had been asked, would have resulted in an answer which could not possibly have supported the report finally made. All they had to do, if they had not read the RECORD, or if they failed to realize that their staff was aware of the correction, was to ask me, "Wayne, did you mean to reduce the membership of the Public Works Committee from 11 to 8?" I think they ought to have taken judicial notice of what my answer would have been. The answer would have been, "Of course not." There is nothing in my argument which could possibly support the conclusion that I was proposing to reduce the membership of the Committee on Public Works from 11 to 8. What would be the purpose of that?

What happened was that in the typing of the amendment the Committee on Public Works was confused with the Committee on the District of Columbia. The Committee on the District of Columbia happened to be a committee of 9, and the Committee on Public Works happened to be a committee of 11. My proposal was to reduce each committee by 1. That would have reduced the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia to 8, and the membership of the Public Works Committee to 10, by eliminating the representative of the Independent Party. As I have said, it was designed, by the garbage-can-disposal principle, to leave assignments on those two committees for the Independent Party, instead of assignments to the major committees on which he has served for 8 years. He was clearly entitled to retain his membership upon those committees.

So much for that point. Before I proceed further I wish to commend the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for what I think was an exceptionally able speech, in support of the Hells Canyon Dam bill, of which I am the author, and of which he is one of the cosponsors, along with my good friend from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], whom I see in the Chamber. It was a very able speech in opposition to the giveaway program of the Eisenhower administration. I believe a proper appraisal of the speech of the Senator from Washington could be made by me by saying:

What has happened with regard to the whole program of protecting the natural resources of the country is that the political locusts have landed and the looters are at work. That is my summary of the Eisenhower program for exploiting and raiding the Nation's natural resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a series of editorials, which I consider to be great editorials, published in recent weeks in the Milwaukee Journal, under the following headings: "Security and Liberty, 'One and Inseparable' "; "This Precious Freedom"; "Vigilance, the Price of Liberty"; "The Peril to Free Thought"; "Problem of Loyalty Programs"; "How Loyalty System Fails"; "Who Needs Security Checks?"; "Unwise and Injurious to Nation"; "The Unworkable McCarran Act"; "Revise Internal Security Act"; "Security Act Loses Friends"; "Abuse of Congressional Probes"; "Invading Executive Functions"; "The Abuse of Immunity"; "The Tradition of Fair Play"; "Keep Due Process of Law"; "How To Ruin a Good Man"; "Your Freedom To Judge Art"; and "Rights, Privileges Under Law."

So that no colleague of mine will have the slightest concern about the introduction of these editorials, dealing with the general subject of basic American freedom, let me assure my colleagues that any reference in any of the editorials which even slightly could be interpreted as derogatory to any Member of Congress has been stricken.

I am placing the editorials into the RECORD without reading them, although I would be delighted to read them into the RECORD.

I think whenever a great newspaper does what the Milwaukee Journal has done, namely, write a series of analytical editorials on the heritage of freedom in America, recognition ought to be given to that newspaper. I am proud as an American liberal to stand on the floor of the Senate and pay tribute to the editors of the Milwaukee Journal for writing the editorials at a time when the American people ought to have their attention called to the growing threats to the basic freedoms in this country under the Bill of Rights.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 22, 1953]

SECURITY AND LIBERTY, "ONE AND INSEPARABLE"

There are two things most Americans can agree upon—that the United States is the world's best hope of freedom and that Russian communism is the world's greatest threat to freedom. The threat of communism is real, and it has stirred Americans deeply. Our emotions are natural. Abroad communism threatens to engulf large areas of the world. At home communism seeks to undermine our strength and our institutions. Its methods and its dangers need no spelling out, for Americans are well aware of them.

The danger of communism heightens for us the eternal and basic problem of democracy: How can national security be maintained while maintaining at the same time the individual liberty that is the essence of democracy?

This is not a new problem. Men seeking freedom have always had to struggle with it. It is the same problem that faced the men who wrote our Constitution 166 years ago. It is the constant problem of our courts. It is the deep concern of freemen who give serious thought to what history has spelled out as the American way. It should be the great concern of every American.

There is a parallel danger to communism, a danger that creates a paradox. It is the danger that in trying to make ourselves and our liberties secure against communism we may follow procedures and policies that destroy the very things we seek to protect. If we ignore that danger, we may end up elaborately protecting something we no longer possess.

This latter danger comes chiefly from two sources. The first has to do with the laws, administrative procedures, and official policies that have grown out of the need to fight communism. In a very real sense these are weapons, and they must be designed and handled carefully to keep them from being turned on ourselves and our institutions. They include such things as security and loyalty programs, travel restrictions, new immigration policies, loyalty oaths, security measures, and congressional investigations.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Some are sound and useful. Some work well in the hands of careful, judicious men and badly in the hands of irresponsible men. Some are dangerous to our way of life.

The second source of danger is those who, out of panic or for personal, political, or financial advantage or undemocratic purposes, use the fear of communism to destroy liberty or to gain power. These people make reckless use of political power, congressional immunity, and the opportunity for political advantage by indiscriminate attacks on fellow citizens.

This involves assignment of personal guilt for inevitable events and the use of hindsight to imply subversion in legitimate errors in judgment. It demands orthodoxy and conformity. It uses guilt by association, half truths, deception, and hatred to indict Americans without due process of law.

This country needs a careful assessment of the methods by which it is fighting communism—both to determine whether those methods are effective and whether they show proper concern for our institutions and liberties. There is evidence that much of our tub thumping and elaborate security measures helps the Kremlin by weakening our confidence, breeding suspicion, and sapping our unity and strength.

Former President Truman attempted a study of our security system when he appointed the Nimitz Commission. Senator McCarran, Democrat, Nevada, blocked it. The Tydings committee and former Senator Lodge, Republican, Massachusetts, suggested a nonpolitical commission to deal with charges of communism in government. Congress ignored them. Warnings have come from all sides. But, while much has been done to sow fear in the Nation, little has been done to give it the calm confidence it needs.

The Journal believes that calm studies of the methods by which we are fighting communism are needed. It believes that the new administration and all Americans have a deep responsibility for seeing that the American way of life is not sacrificed in reckless, panicky efforts to protect it. In forthcoming editorials the Journal will discuss what it is we are trying to make secure, what our problems of security are and why some of our methods dangerously threaten liberties without adding anything at all to security.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 25, 1953]

THIS PRECIOUS FREEDOM

To achieve national security we must first know what we must make secure. It is easy to understand the need for physical safety of individuals and the Nation. We are building that kind of security, backed by our tremendous industrial capacity and the quality and genius of our people. When we differ about it, it is usually on procedure or in degree and not on the goal of physical strength itself. But there is more to national security than that. We have a heritage that makes us completely different from totalitarian nations. It is our concept of individual freedom. If we lost that concept and lost freedom, we would lose the source of our greatness.

In order to secure freedom we must understand what we mean by it. We must understand, first, because we can't intelligently protect something without knowing what it is. And we must understand so that we won't be fooled by Communists and homegrown demagogs who use words like "freedom" as false fronts behind which to hide while they try to destroy freedom.

What does freedom mean to us It means an atmosphere in which the integrity and dignity of the individual is all-important.

The men who wrote our Declaration of Independence, who fought for freedom and set up a Constitution and a Government to protect it, believed that the individual was the most important value in a democracy.

The theme of their declaration of freedom was the "unalienable rights" of individuals—chief among them "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." But our Founding Fathers knew that freedom by itself is anarchy. They added to their declaration that "to secure these rights," men create governments to give freedom protection and a foundation in law.

What we must make safe, then, are both the rights of the individual and the Government created "to secure these rights."

Where most of our differences about security come these days is in the failure of some people to understand that the test of freedom is in its use. We can't treat freedom like the paper on which our Constitution is written and lock it away in a guarded case, properly humidified and dustproofed, but inert. We have to protect freedom while we use it.

Freedom is hard to use. It requires a brave, intelligent, and dedicated people. The democratic faith, as Francis Biddle, former Attorney General, says, "is the hardest faith there is, for it is necessarily skeptical, opposed to fanaticism, based on compromise, turned toward tolerance, welcoming variety and diversity. Its nature is scientific rather than dogmatic."

Our faith is opposed to enforcing conformity because it denies, as Justice Jackson put it, that any "official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion or matters of opinion."

In our faith, and in our body of law, it is basic that the individual has the right to think and believe as he pleases. He has the right to advocate what he pleases, limited only by the Constitution.

It is basic that every individual has the right to his good name and the right not to be robbed of it by lies and insinuation.

It is basic, as the Supreme Court has held, that guilt is personal. As Judge Medina said in the trial of the 11 top Communists, guilt is assessable only for definite acts. It must be established by due process of law and not by legislatures, politicians, or partisans.

These basic rights are part of national security. If we lose them—either to communism or in unintelligent and unrealistic efforts to find security—we lose the very essence of America.

The goal of defeating communism all Americans can agree upon. Some liberty inevitably goes by the board in any time of crisis. But liberty must never be given up unnecessarily nor permanently. And when it is given up, it must be by law and not by intimidation.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 27, 1953]

VIGILANCE, THE PRICE OF LIBERTY

Besides understanding and practicing the American way of life, there is something else Americans can do to strengthen our security. They can learn to see through people who use words like "liberty" and "freedom" as cloaks behind which to plot the destruction of democracy. The average American would be wise to take the advice of J. Edgar Hoover and leave the business of hunting spies and subversives to the FBI and other law enforcement agencies. But he does have the duty not to allow himself to be used to aid Communist and other un-American causes.

Thousands of Americans aided the Communists by signing the Stockholm peace petitions. The Communists rounded up the signatures by playing on the universal desire for peace and by using American slogans. When it turned out that the petition was for peace on Communist terms and was used as a tribute to one of the bloodiest tyrants in history, Joseph Stalin, many an American was red-faced.

The Communists are masters of this sort of deception. They twist and pervert our patriotic symbols, our democratic philosophy, and our institutions into false fronts for subversion. Americans cannot afford to be misled.

An excellent example of Communist dissembling is the case of the Rosenbergs. Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were convicted by due process of law, on the basis of absolute evidence, as atomic spies in the employ of Russia.

Using the big lie technique, the Communists claim there was no fair trial, no evidence. They claim that the Rosenbergs were convicted because they "fought for peace," because they are Jews, because they opposed Jim Crow and were in the trade-union movement.

None of these things is true. The Rosenbergs took part in no social crusades whatever—they spent 9 years underground working against this country for their Soviet masters.

Typical of the Communist propaganda is Rosenberg's own letter to the Communist Daily Worker, in which he said he would continue "to fight for freedom and democracy"—two things he risked his life to destroy.

Many Americans have pleaded for leniency or freedom for the Rosenbergs. A few, from honest conviction or religious principle, oppose capital punishment. Some believe that mercy would be useful propaganda as a contrast to Russian purges. Others are those who snap incessantly at the bait of catchwords—who rise automatically in protest at such words as "Jim Crow," "peace," or "justice" without bothering to check facts or look behind the hubbub at Communists leading the shouting. Americans who find their causes parallel Communist causes need not give them up, of course—but they should make clear that their motives are different than Communist motives.

In the last several decades many Americans have been lured into organizations by patriotic, high-sounding names without troubling to look twice at the organizers. Still others have refused to recognize proof when legitimate organizations they joined were infiltrated and taken over by Communists.

In most cases Americans were innocent victims, too trusting to question their associates. But the day is past when that is much of an excuse. Communist trickery has been exposed too often to fool any intelligent American for long.

By and large, Americans have become alert to Communist deception and have cleaned Communists out of their organizations—or forced the organization into disintegration or disrepute.

The Communists will keep trying, of course. And others will keep trying to deceive us, too. Like Communists, there are extremists of other kinds who pervert the American traditions for their own ends—neo-Fascists, demagogic politicians and others who use patriotism as a cloak for political or selfish personal ends.

Americans who are alert to the real meaning of individual liberty will see through them all—and oppose them all in the knowledge that they would destroy the very things vital to our way of life.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 29, 1953]

THE PERIL TO FREE THOUGHT

Just as dangerous to the American way as being tricked into supporting Communist causes is to see Communists where none exist. It manifests itself in the common failing of mistaking differences of opinion or belief for subversion. This danger to democracy is nothing new. During the Civil War the word "Copperhead" was used to describe traitors in the North. Irresponsible people soon found it a convenient smear

word. Soon anyone who hated war was a Copperhead. It was a simple step for politicians to call all Democrats Copperheads—and a final step to imply that all Democrats were disloyal.

In 1863, Governor Seymour, of New York, was branded a traitor when he seemed to sympathize with draft rioters and denied the right of the Federal Government to draft men for military service. Many a governor felt the same way in the War of 1812. President Lincoln, a wise man, recognized that Seymour's stand was based on honest personal interpretation of the Constitution. He wrote Seymour:

"As to maintaining the Nation's life and integrity, I assume and believe there cannot be a difference of purpose between you and me. If we should differ as to the means, it is important that the difference should be as small as possible; that it should not be enhanced by unjust suspicions."

Today unjust suspicions form the basis of too many personal judgments. Unlike Lincoln, too many people are almost eager to brand all honest opposition subversive or Communist. It can reach the ridiculous lengths of the opponent of fluoridation of Milwaukee water who called it a Communist plot to destroy Lake Michigan.

"Some of us," Raymond B. Fosdick has pointed out, "believe that * * * anyone who advocates new ideas is probably a fellow traveler who should be watched." There is danger, as the President's Commission on Civil Rights, headed by Charles E. Wilson, said in 1947, that suspicion will "inhibit the freedom of genuine Democrats."

America was not made by people who walked afraid, who refused to accept freedom, who feared ideas. Business Week, a leading business publication, pointed out the other day that there is a valuable "case for unorthodoxy." Discussing private foundations, it agreed that foundation money should not go to Communists "because the preconceived dogma to which every loyal party member must subscribe makes it impossible for them to do their own thinking." But, it added, "free enterprise in thought" is essential to progress—and "nonconformists are given the greatest measure of freedom precisely because they have the capacity for independent thought."

One may hold views that coincide with current Communist views from different motives than Communists and without being Communist in the slightest. Robert Hutchins, then chancellor of the University of Chicago, said in 1949:

"One who criticizes the foreign-aid policy of the United States, or the draft, or the Atlantic pact, or who believes that our Military Establishment is too expensive, can be called a fellow traveler, for the Russians are of the same opinion. One who thinks there are too many slums * * * can be called a fellow traveler, for the Russians say the same. * * Anybody who wants change of any kind in this country can be called a fellow traveler, because the Russians want change in this country, too."

The unfortunate fact is that many people have been called fellow travelers for just such reasons. * * * A Loyalty Board member told a Government employee menacingly "there is suspicion in the record that you are in sympathy with the underprivileged."

What too many Americans do is to confuse motives—to fail to realize that the Communists say things to ruin the country that sound similar to things others say to improve the country.

The history of this Nation is part and parcel of honest differences of opinion, of an atmosphere in which new ideas are welcomed and eagerly debated, in which men's motives are not impugned, in which people are not afraid of new frontiers. Our history will remain great only if we keep that atmosphere.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 31, 1953]

PROBLEM OF LOYALTY PROGRAMS

Nowhere has there been more confusion, more damage to morale, more loss of faith in Government, and more abuse of individual liberty than in the matter of the loyalty and security of Federal employees. Nowhere has there been a more teeming hunting ground for irresponsible Congressmen. Nowhere is there more need for careful study of present procedures and the development of new and fairer procedures. Former President Truman asked an impartial study of the loyalty and security program he set up in 1947. Congress refused. President Eisenhower announced a new approach to the problem. Two months have passed since then and the program is still to be outlined and put into effect. The delay is proof of the complexity of the problem.

No American would argue against the need to make sure that Government employees are loyal and are not risks to national security. No one could deny that there have been disloyal employees, and that there may still be some. At the same time, every American should be concerned with having fair loyalty and security tests which preserve the guaranties of liberty under the Constitution.

There is a vast difference between loyalty and security risks. A loyalty risk is a person who puts the cause of another government before his own government. He might be a Communist, a spy, a saboteur.

A security risk is one who, through carelessness, bad habits, or incompetence, might compromise security. He might, as former Secretary of Defense Lovett said, be a "blabbermouth." He might be a drunkard, a user of dope, or a person with habits for which he could be blackmailed. He is, in essence, one who is untrustworthy.

Under the 6-year-old Truman program, attempts are made to bar these types from Government. Attempts are made to rid Government of all loyalty risks and, in sensitive areas, of security risks. Some such program is necessary, of course.

The present program is a giant dragnet. It covers everyone, regardless of what kind of job he holds. The experience with the program raises doubts about whether it is so all-inclusive as to waste time and effort and whether it is effective. Hiss, Copion, and Remington, after all, slipped through the loyalty net. Experience also raises doubts about whether the program adequately protects basic rights and innocent employees.

It should be understood that where acts of disloyalty or violations of security occur there are ample and strict laws to deal with them and ample power to get rid of employees. The Hatch Act makes it illegal for anyone who belongs to an organization which advocates overthrow of the Government by force to hold a Government job. The law bars Communists from Government jobs and provides adequate punishment.

The purpose of the present loyalty program is to provide means of determining tomorrow's spies and loyalty risks. To a large extent the program poses an impossible job. It's something like asking police to discover and control men who are apt someday to rob, murder, or shoot out street lights.

Loyalty boards are concerned with how people think, what they believe, and how they are liable to act in the future. Their job is prediction. Injustice is inevitable. The only judges of thoughts and beliefs are members of the boards, who naturally have no standards but their own thoughts and beliefs. The boards are under the additional pressure of some Congressmen who are disappointed when an employee is found innocent and loyal, and who cry "whitewash" when their unproved charges against a special victim are not substantiated by investigation.

Further the boards are not required to find proof but only "reasonable doubt" of loyalty. This is a philosophical and legal monstrosity. Attorney John Lord O'Brian says:

"By this [standard] * * * the Anglo-Saxon presumption of innocence is shifted, and for all practical purposes the burden is placed on an individual to prove beyond a reasonable doubt his loyalty and integrity. When it is remembered that the employees or applicants are being judged not on their actions but on their supposed ideas or mental attitudes, and that the charges against them may be based on secret evidence, the extreme nature of this final action is apparent."

Surely some better way can be found to protect the rights of individuals while at the same time providing adequate security.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 2, 1953]

HOW LOYALTY SYSTEM FAILS

The hunt for tomorrow's subversives and the labeling of security risks under present procedures are open to abuses. There have been abuses. Obviously there are no definite standards on which judgment can be made about what a given individual is apt to do next week or next year. Each Government loyalty board must make its own rules and set its own standards. Some have operated very fairly, within the limits of the program. Many have improved with experience. But some have been careless and unfair. The basic trouble is with the system itself, however.

Much that boards do is, under present procedure, done on hearsay and anonymous evidence. Information and opinions given secretly to the FBI are admissible in loyalty cases. Loyalty boards often have no way of assessing the evidence or of determining its reliability. Information the boards receive may be the considered, verifiable evidence of a trustworthy citizen, or the invention of a warped troublemaker. The boards aren't always sure.

There have been cases in which an employee was brought before a board for questioning on matters which the board was forced to state were too secret to reveal. Leonard A. Nikoloric, attorney associated with the Washington firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter, described in the American Scholar, Phi Beta Kappa magazine, the case of an employee who had been dismissed by the State Department for security reasons. He went before a security board to ask the reasons for his dismissal. He was told that the board did not know the reasons but would listen to an appeal.

"We realize," said the board spokesman, "the difficulty you are in in this position; on the other hand, I'd suggest that you might think back over your own career and perhaps in your own mind delve into some of the factors that have gone into your career which you think might have been subject to questions and see what they are and see whether you'd like to explain them or make any statement with regard to any of them."

Employees such as this one had the impossible job of defending themselves against not only anonymous accusers but unrevealed accusations. They may have been guilty of something, but they were not told what it was. They were asked for an answer to an unstated question.

One loyalty board member asked an employee at a hearing: "If you are, as you say, a loyal American, why do you persist in denying that you were a member of the Communist Party?"

One employee was dismissed for contributing money for the defense of a friend who was tried on a charge involving communism, in spite of the fact that the friend was acquitted fully. Fortunately, a superior board reversed the dismissal. But it is indicative of the kind of thing that can happen.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

What is lacking is a standard. There are basic standards for court trials, as the Supreme Court has pointed out. They include the right to an impartial judge, clear and definite charges, confrontation of accusers and the right to cross-examine, no double jeopardy, and no cruel or unusual punishment.

Obviously a loyalty hearing is not a court trial. There must be more latitude than courts can or should allow. But certainly the spirit of legal safeguards should be adhered to when a citizen is accused of anything—even of tomorrow's crimes. And certainly a man's job should not be taken from him with no safeguards at all—and the man dismissed with the taint of disloyalty with no recourse.

It is here that the present system is most unjust. It tests loyalty, not acts, but the supposition that acts might sometime be committed. It is one thing to get rid of an employee whose associations or attitudes or competence create doubt as to his security. It is quite another to dismiss him and label him potentially disloyal, a label that can wreck his career, ruin his livelihood and taint him for life. That amounts to conviction as a traitor.

Yet that has happened numerous times. Undoubtedly, it has happened to some guilty people. But it has happened, too, to innocents. Plain American fair play and justice demand reasonable opportunities for accused people to defend themselves. To the extent that it has denied that right, and the extent to which it punishes not for definite acts but for alleged opinions and beliefs, the present program is dangerous to the American way. A better way must be found.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 5, 1953]

WHO NEEDS SECURITY CHECKS?

The argument used to support the Government's "dragnet" loyalty and security program is that dismissals do not involve individual liberty because a Federal job is a privilege, not a right. That, of course, is true, as far as it goes. But the courts have pointed out that because a Federal job is a privilege does not justify taking it away improperly. There is more involved here than a job, there is involved the taint of disloyalty. Federal employees, like all Americans, deserve protection of the basic constitutional guaranties in any circumstance.

Against that is the undoubted right of Government to be painstakingly careful about its security, to place its own basic safety against the rights of individuals and to attempt to exercise some judgment on the reliability of its employees.

Where should such judgment be exercised? In the case of loyalty, it now applies to all Government employees. Assuming that employees are carefully screened when they enter Government service, overall, constant loyalty and security tests are a waste of time for most of them.

It makes no difference to basic security if the man who spears paper in a Federal park in Washington thinks that Chinese Communists are agrarian reformers. But it would make a world of difference if the man who empties wastebaskets or checks files of the Atomic Energy Commission were a fellow traveler or had a Communist roommate.

The question is whether it is worthwhile to impose intensive loyalty and security checks on people who are not in sensitive agencies. The principle involved is the same as that governing the bonding of a bank employee after initial proof of reliability upon hiring. The doorman and stenographer who are never near money need no bonds. The cashier who handles money does.

At least 90 percent of our Government employees have no access or proximity to security secrets and never will have. They are liable to laws barring Communists from Government and can be fired for unsuitability. If laws are properly enforced when information is found to prove them subversive, they can be fired and punished.

The remaining 10 percent or so need tests of reliability. They have had them. They need to be checked whenever new information is obtained reflecting on their trustworthiness. In cases of doubt they should be removed—a power that administrators in sensitive areas have—or placed in jobs where security is not involved. (The latter method is employed generally by the British Government.)

In departments handling security matters, doubt must be resolved in favor of the Government. But doubt is not enough to justify wide publicity labeling an employee disloyal without proof, wrecking a career and perhaps a life. Guilt is one thing. Doubt another. The two must not be confused.

Tentative outlines of the new administration's program for handling security indicate that loyalty will no longer be the basic test. That makes sense. Acts of disloyalty can be handled by existing laws.

The new test will be security—which, after all, is the thing the Government is interested in. Security standards can eliminate potential disloyalty without the risk of tainting innocents.

Unfortunately, the new plan as outlined would apply the security test to all present employees. It will involve millions whose jobs do not affect security at all, who were screened before and after getting jobs. It will waste time that might better be spent on sensitive security areas.

The quick promise of the new administration to change the loyalty-security program has not materialized. The men who plan the change find that it is not a simple but a complex problem. They have found, for instance, that their plan for security boards composed of members outside the department to be checked is not practical. The Defense, Atomic Energy, and other departments in sensitive areas could not allow outside boards to have access to their secrets. These and other problems have delayed action.

It is better to delay than to rush in with an unworkable program to replace an unworkable program. We hope that it means that the problem is getting careful study and will get a workable solution.

President Eisenhower has an opportunity to restore confidence in Government, improve the morale of public employees and to end witch hunts—while still guaranteeing security. American traditions and the guaranties of individual liberty are at stake here as in no other area. It's the place to prove that our democracy can work and still be safe.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 6, 1953]

UNWISE AND INJURIOUS TO NATIONS

A major assault on American traditions of freedom and the rights of individuals is the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. It was passed over the veto of former President Truman, who said in a memorable message that the "price is too high" for the security the act allegedly provided. He repeatedly asked for revision. President Eisenhower has done the same. In his state of the Union address he said that the act contains "injustices" and "does, in fact, discriminate." A President's commission has called the law "unwise and injurious to the Nation." Religious and nationality groups have called for its repeal.

The act was the first complete redrafting and recodification of immigration laws since 1798. But it perpetuates the faults of the old mass of laws and enacts many new and unnecessary restrictions and faults. It does not improve or simplify policy, as its authors claim. It impairs and complicates policy.

Biggest bone of contention is the national origins quota system perpetuated by the law. It bases quotas on the number of Americans of various national origins in the 1920 census.

That system grants the bulk of entry permits to Northern Europe and discriminates against Southern and Eastern Europe and the Far East. Great Britain, for instance, has quotas of 65,361 a year, Germany 25,814, Ireland 17,736. But only 6,488 Poles, 5,648 Italians, 3,069 Frenchmen, 308 Greeks, and 100 of most other nations can gain entry.

Much is made of the fact that the law removes racial, color, religious, and other restrictions. It does in words, but not in effect. The national-origins quotas discriminate in themselves, particularly against Asians.

More than that, the law creates a serious racial ban. It provides that a man born, say, in Great Britain does not come under the British quota if he is "attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry" to the Asian-Pacific people.

Thus an Englishman or German of Japanese or Chinese descent is treated not as an Englishman or German but as a Japanese or Chinese. He comes under the limited quotas of far-eastern nations rather than the quota of his own nation. Is that easing racial bars?

These are just a few of the injustices in the McCarran-Walter Act. They are injustices that [one of] the authors meet with charges that the only opponents are "professional Jews" or Communists.

The list of critics includes such men as our former and current Presidents, heads of our great churches, students of our immigration and naturalization policies. They fear the damage the act does to American traditions of freedom. Their voices should be heeded.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 7, 1953]

THE UNWORKABLE MCCARRAN ACT

The most highly publicized feature of the restrictive McCarran-Walter Immigration Act is the requirement that all foreign sailors get security clearance before being allowed American shore leave. This provision has brought sharp and bitter protests from a number of foreign governments and seamen's organizations. It has proved costly, confusing and workable only at the expense of hurting trade and insulting nationals of friendly nations. It is a direct contradiction of our traditions of freedom, and democracy.

The theory behind the regulation is that we must keep all Communists and subversives from our shores. As a theory it sounds good. As a practical matter it is stupid. Real spies and subversives slip across the border almost at will—just as hundreds of thousands of wetbacks do at the Mexican border each year. Our new policy alienates thousands of friends in order to give us questionable protection from a handful of potential enemies.

As it isn't possible for us to have a card index file on the background of every sailor in the world, we couldn't unearth all the subversives anyway. All the clearance procedure can do is to depend upon Communists to admit they're Communists or to pick up an occasional Communist our officials abroad happened to get information about.

The thing that makes the new program particularly unworkable is that it requires clearance examination every time a sailor visits our shores. There is no such thing as an annual or permanent permit to go ashore. Sailors on transatlantic liners, which visit here every 2 weeks or so, are up in arms. Their traditional right to shore

leave is frequently revoked. They are subject to continual prying by American officials.

So are sailors on tramp steamers up in arms. They frequently leave their ships to await a job on a ship headed back for their home port. If they don't make a connection within a month they are picked up like criminals, taken into custody and sent packing—sometimes around the world from the homes they haven't seen for a year or more. They, their governments and their friends and relatives back home are commenting that America as well as Russia has an Iron Curtain. Our protests of freedom sound hollow to them.

A surprising feature of the new immigration act became apparent only after it became law. It bars members or former members of totalitarian parties which want totalitarian government in the United States. That closes the door to Communists. But not to present or former Nazis or Fascists. They can claim with justification that they wanted totalitarian government at home, not in the United States.

The law gives American consuls unusual and completely arbitrary power to bar immigrants. They can do it on the mere hunch that the applicant may someday become dependent or turn Communist. They can regulate by prediction.

The Attorney General is given equally arbitrary power. He can deport aliens who have a purpose to engage in activities prejudicial to the public interest. There are no standards or guides set up. As the Presidential veto said, "To punish undefined 'activities' departs from the traditional American insistence on established standards of guilt" and "to punish 'purpose' is thought control."

Many of the regulations are based on the un-American philosophy of fear, suspicion, and distrust of aliens who seek entry, of aliens already with us, and of naturalized citizens who have become one of us.

There are, for instance, 20 new grounds for deportation. An alien who has been here for 20 to 30 years can be deported for even minor criminal offense. Anyone confined to a mental hospital within 5 years of entry can be deported, even if he contracted his illness because of something that happened here. Citizenship, a valuable prize that is hard to win, can be canceled for capricious reasons.

The law puts our newly acquired citizens on perpetual probation. It wouldn't stretch the philosophy back of the law much to apply its provisions to second-generation citizens.

The McCarran-Walter Act is no proper law for a nation which, as President Eisenhower says, is made up of immigrants and the children of immigrants. Congress can do no less than follow the President's request that it "enact a statute that will at one and the same time guard our legitimate national interests and be faithful to our basic ideas of freedom and fairness to all."

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 8, 1953]

REVISE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Senator MCCARRAN is the author of another law, in addition to the Immigration Act, which dangerously invades the American tradition of freedom and individual liberty. It is the Internal Security Act of 1950. It was passed over a Presidential veto in a rush to do something to cope with Communists. But little regard was given to whether the methods adopted were workable or beneficial and little thought to whether those methods were in the American tradition or conflicted with our claim to be the land of the free.

The law is a hodgepodge and catchall. It duplicates and complicates some of the adequate laws and machinery we have for dealing with subversion. It makes some desirable corrections of deficiencies in old laws. It strengthens the Government's hand in dealing with potential saboteurs in time of war, invasion, or insurrection.

But it sets up dangerous and complicated restrictions that invade individual liberties and create a "redtape curtain" around America.

One of the strong talking points for the act was its requirement that all Communists and Communist-front organizations register and provide the Government with lists of members and sources of funds. It's a simple and attractive idea, as former President Truman said. But it has the drawback of being both unworkable and undesirable. One might as well order all bank robbers to register and outline future robberies to the police.

The registration provision is undesirable because it is a sure way of eventually driving Communists underground where it's harder to keep an eye on them. The really dangerous Communists are underground and not registerable anyway. The registration plan was opposed by the Departments of Justice, Defense, and State, the Central Intelligence Agency, and intelligence experts. Congress ignored its experts.

The provision is unworkable, as time is slowly proving. What is provided for is an endless, fruitless game of tag. The law went on the books in 1950. To date not even the Communist Party is registered, to say nothing of Communist fronts.

When the Communists failed to register, the Attorney General went to the Subversives Control Board to demand party compliance. The Board, as provided by law, ordered a hearing. After many preliminaries, a Board panel sat for 14 long months listening to testimony aimed at proving the obvious fact that the Communist Party was subversive. Last October that's what the panel found.

The full Board is charged by law to review the panel recommendation. It must review a couple of million words of testimony before it, too, can find what everybody knows—that the Communists are subversive. Attorney General Brownell said the other day that when the Board rules, the Justice Department will order the Communists to register.

The Communists, of course, won't register. They're waiting for the Board ruling, too—to appeal to the United States court of appeals. That will mean more long months to get on the calendar and to get a decision. If the Communists lose there and the McCarran Act is sustained, they will appeal to the Supreme Court. If they lose there, they can disband, reorganize under another name, and start the whole process over again. The procedure ties down the Government in a cumbersome, wasteful, useless process with no hope of any results at all.

The law's definitions open the way to capricious and arbitrary smearing of individuals and groups. One test it applies to a Communist front is the extent to which its policies coincide with Communist policies. An antilynch organization's policies coincide with phony Communist policies. So do policies of public housing, slum clearance, anti-foreign-aid groups. Backers of the law say it is not the intent to label such groups Communist fronts. Yet such labels have been applied, and such labeling is possible under the law.

Another weakness in this kind of process is that the law attempts to judge how men think. Basic American law is concerned not with thoughts but with what men do, with concrete acts.

The possibilities of violating the law are endless. It is posible to send a man to prison for 10 years for giving unimportant information to a friendly government. It is possible to deport an alien who works in a bookstore which sells such books as Marx's Das Capital, or Hitler's Mein Kampf—both legal volumes.

The law is too loose, too capricious. It should be revised.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 9, 1953]

SECURITY ACT LOSES FRIENDS

Perhaps the most unfortunate provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 are those that place a redtape curtain around the United States. They have made a mockery of the claim before the world that we are a free, liberty-loving, friendly nation. Through the law we have made it impossible for many eminent scientists and scholars to visit the United States. We have made it so difficult for many others that few of them any longer try. An example of how drastic the law is: The International Red Cross convention was to have been held in this country last year. Instead it was held in Canada because the Red Cross officials feared the security law would create too many difficulties for its delegates. Russia bars International Red Cross directly; we do it indirectly.

The act originally barred all former members of totalitarian parties from entering the United States. It applied to persons who had belonged to Nazi or Fascist groups at the age of 10 as well as to adults who joined voluntarily. An amendment last March changed the law to permit entry for those who joined totalitarian organizations when they were under 16 years of age or when they were forced to join by law or in order to obtain work or food.

This is an improvement, but not improvement enough. We still bar many honest persons who have repudiated former associations. And the process of proving involuntary membership in totalitarian organizations or repudiation of former membership has worked to bar even short visits by many eminent foreigners.

Applicants for a visitor's permit or visa are questioned first by consuls abroad. Where there is the slightest question, the application is forwarded to Washington. Consuls are reluctant to make up their own minds, for they are well aware that under present conditions their heads would roll if they made the slightest mistake. At the very least they would be attacked or "investigated" by some Congressman.

If there is the slightest derogatory information uncovered in the check made in Washington a visa is denied. An appeal may be made to the Attorney General. But the process of review takes so long that in most cases the occasion for the visit passes and the visa is no longer desired.

The very hunt for derogatory information has, time and again, consumed so much time that a scientist or scholar seeking entry to attend a conclave or convention or to fill a lecture date finds the festivities are over before he can get clearance.

Prof. Marcus Oliphant, for instance, a noted Austrian scientist, wanted to attend a parley on nuclear physics in Chicago. He applied for a visa. A long investigation ensued. He withdrew his application. The investigation went on. It was finally determined that Professor Oliphant was entitled to a visa. He didn't want one—the conference had met weeks before.

The case has been duplicated time and again for scientists, writers, educators, lecturers from friendly countries. They can't understand the sudden unfriendliness which bars them from the free association with American colleagues they had always visited. They resent it; so do their countrymen. Their friends here resent it, too, for it is a reflection on their own loyalties.

Some of our own scientists and students have stopped going abroad, for they find it difficult to obtain passports, often because they once belonged to a group that some Congressman called but never proved a "front" organization.

The free exchange of ideas is being hampered. The American Association for the Advancement of Science has several times warned strongly that the "redtape curtain"

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

works to the detriment of scholarship and progress in this country.

There's no doubt that it does.

The Internal Security Act badly needs revision. It is one thing to pass laws to insure security where real security is involved. It is another to pass laws to insure security where little danger to security exists—especially when such laws cost us friends and alienate people we need on our side.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 10, 1953]

ABUSE OF CONGRESSIONAL PROBES

An area in which there is danger to American traditions and individual liberties is the field of congressional investigations. The current Congress promises to be the "investigatingest" in history. In January alone there were 105 proposals for investigations in Congress. Congressmen with inquiring minds are preparing to dig into everything—but, most particularly, in the business of hunting Communists and subversives, for there is where the headlines lie. The danger to be feared is not in the fact of investigations, but in the methods used. Congress has a recognized right to investigate almost anything it wishes. It even has a duty to do so for the purpose of obtaining information on which to base legislation.

It is when Congress forgets its major concern—the making of laws—and becomes prosecutor, judge, jury, indicter, and bulletin board for unproved accusations that the danger appears; it is when Congress takes upon itself the duty of the courts—the enforcement of law.

The Journal of the American Judicature Society pointed out recently that investigations properly conducted have the double value of providing information for sound legislation and of educating the public. But, it added, "when they are investigating the commission of crimes, they ought to have no more power than any other criminal investigating body, and they should be subject to the rules that have governed those investigations throughout Anglo-American history."

Few congressional committees do follow any rules. Most go far beyond their objective of establishing patterns to show the need for legislation, or to show the need for departmental reorganization or administrative improvements.

The last few years the pattern of some congressional investigations has been particularly dangerous. Investigating Congressmen with preconceived opinions have repeatedly called witnesses before them, not to obtain facts but to intimidate. They have not sought to find truth but to substantiate by unbalanced testimony, wild charges, and character smears of their own.

They have loaded questions, not to obtain a complete picture but the kind of picture they wanted to produce. They have inspired and accepted half truths, outright lies, and hearsay, and have published it all without giving persons concerned a chance to answer, explain, or repudiate.

There has been some incredible examples of the misuse of congressional authority. But the danger is inherent in even the best committees. The King committee, for instance, which investigated the Internal Revenue Department, did an excellent job in part. It buttressed previous efforts which led to reorganization of the Department. But it also succumbed to the lure of headlines, the heady opportunity for indictment and the exciting role of prosecutor, judge, and jury.

William H. Berman and Walter F. Hoffman, two attorneys for the committee, discussed the inherent faults of investigation procedure in a recent issue of Reporter magazine. They point out that, good as it was, the King committee considered its legislative work to be incidental to its prosecuting work—a job it shouldn't have been doing. It accepted hearsay, it prosecuted and it judged—ignoring legal authorities whose duties it usurped. It did not bother, when it was through, to propose a body of laws that would overcome conditions it found. It indicted many people without giving them a chance to be heard, and did it often on flimsy or partial evidence. It worked mainly for news releases.

Example: Denis W. Delaney, former collector of internal revenue for Massachusetts, was removed from office by the President and indicted by a grand jury on criminal charges. After that he was called before the committee. The Justice Department, pointing out that Delaney was due to be tried in court, asked that the hearings be secret. The committee refused and spread the Delaney case on the record.

Delaney was later convicted in court. He appealed. The United States court of appeals set aside the conviction, saying that because of the congressional hearing Delaney had had to "stand trial in the hostile atmosphere engendered by extracourtroom publicity."

The committee could have learned what it wanted to know by waiting for a court record. It didn't. Like so many worse committees before it, the King committee insisted on getting publicity for a case that law enforcement authorities had already broken—and insisted at the risk of letting the accused go free.

It preferred prosecution to its own proper job of lawmaking.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 13, 1953]

INVADING EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS

Another danger inherent in unrestrained congressional investigation is the invasion of the executive department by the legislative branch of Government. Congress outlines policies, creates departments, approves budgets, and supplies funds. It is called upon continually to renew these authorizations. Congress, therefore, has the right to know whether its policies are being carried out, whether departments are operating properly and efficiently, and whether the money it provides is being spent economically and wisely.

To the extent that Congress must know these things, it has the right and duty to investigate.

But Congress increasingly extends its proper function into actual administration. By calling administrators before it in the guise of seeking broad policy information but with the threat of causing trouble, some Congressmen have been able actually to hire or fire individual employees. They have been able to change policies outlined by the whole Congress, to determine contracts and regulatory decisions, and almost to completely usurp an administrator's duties.

The late Representative Cox, Democrat, of Georgia, for instance, once was able to immobilize the Federal Communications Commission and make it defend at length its most minor decisions out of pure pique over FCC disclosure that Cox had accepted $2,500 to help grease the way for the license of a Georgia radio station.

* * * * *

Executive departments cannot operate under constant heckling, constant interference, and constant prying by legislators who extend their control of the purse strings to minor areas of administration. No administrator can work if his policies are continually being pulled up by the roots to see whether they are growing and healthy.

This invasion of the executive department is part of the inevitable struggle between the President and the Congress which has traditionally threatened the balance between our branches of Government. That balance, so vital to our system of government, can be destroyed unless Congress exerts self-discipline and restraint.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 18, 1953]

THE ABUSE OF IMMUNITY

A further danger to American tradition an individual liberty is the abuse of congressional immunity. It is the constitutional privilege of Congressmen not to be held legally liable for what they say on the floors of Congress or insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under that privilege Congressmen have been able to destroy and smear reputations and to make unproved and unfounded charges. Victims are seldom able to adequately answer for lack of a forum equal to that of a Congressman, and because truth seldom catches up with a lie.

* * * * *

These outrageous statements were made in the complete confidence that congressional immunity protected the Senators from any libel or other actions.

* * * * *

It has become instinctive reaction for congressional smear artists to answer protests with more smears. In the words Communist or Communist thinkers, Congressmen have, under immunity, terrible and destructive weapons with which to attack their enemies.

It is not congressional immunity that is at fault, but its irresponsible misuse for political and demagogic purpose. Legislators need reasonable immunity in order to act without harassment or fear. It is to the ultimate interests of the people that legislators can act fearlessly.

But there is a responsibility in Congress to make sure that its Members do use immunity properly. The Constitution gives Congress not only privileges but the power to discipline its Members. It is here that Congress falls down. It allows its own dignity and the rights of citizens to be violated by Members who misuse privilege.

Congress seldom exerts discipline. It shows anger only when its own membership is criticized or attacked. Congress is, in a very real sense, a club. It has traditionally acted on the assumption that each Member is his own master and is the sole judge of his own actions.

Congress investigates and castigates officials and citizens with wild fervor but it only rarely disciplines or exposes wrongdoers among its own membership. Congressmen whose names come up in investigations are never harried or pilloried by committees. If they are called as witnesses at all, they testify in secret, little or nothing is revealed and the whole thing is usually quickly forgotten. * * *

* * * * *

The answer to the threat of congressional activities to American traditions and individual liberty lies in Congress itself. It has the constitutional power to set its own rules and discipline its own Members. In the interests of the Nation, it also has the duty to do so.

That duty President Eisenhower pointed up at his February 25 press conference. The primary responsibility for policing * * * rests on Congress. And he added this statement, paraphrased because direct quotes of presidential press conferences are not allowed:

"We must never think we are protecting the country if at the same time we destroy the values that make democracy strong—such as the right of a citizen to be presumed innocent until proved guilty."

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 21, 1953]

THE TRADITION OF FAIR PLAY

Congress weakens American traditions of individual liberty when it allows congressional immunity and investigations unjustly to destroy reputations and to supplant due process of law. Only Congress itself can remedy this. Some Congressmen, like Senators MORSE, Independent, Oregon, and KE-

KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, have proposed remedies. One need is for definite rules of procedure for investigating committees. There are no general rules. Some committees establish their own rules—good and bad. Many committees have no rules other than the chairman's whim.

Senator KEFAUVER has suggested that witnesses be notified of derogatory information in committee hands to enable them to prepare answers. He would allow witnesses to have counsel and to file questions to be asked their accusers. He would allow witnesses to make full statements in their own defense at the end of testimony. Further, he would allow individuals and organizations to file answers in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to charges made on the floors of Congress.

Senator MORSE has proposed stricter rules. He would follow Federal court procedure as far as possible to insure relevance and reliability of evidence and testimony. Witnesses would be given prior notice of derogatory testimony, the right to object to questions and procedure, the right to confront and cross-examine accusers—all with the help of counsel.

This would help overcome the damage done by hit and run witnesses. Witnesses would have the right to make complete answers to questions and to make full statements at the end of testimony. Where necessary they would be allowed to produce rebuttal evidence and witnesses.

Finally, no committee report adversely affecting anyone would be released without simultaneous release of rebuttal testimony.

These suggestions deserve serious study and should serve as at least the basis for drawing up rules for the conduct of investigations. The rules should provide means of getting every bit of information necessary while insuring individual rights and promoting fair play.

Fair rules would speed and assist investigations. For proof of that read the record of many a congressional committee and find it full of thousands of words devoted to arguments and harangues over the rights of a witness, the appearance of counsel, the admissibility of evidence. These wrangles destroy congressional dignity.

Obviously congressional investigations like grand juries, must run down many blind alleys and consider much that is only hearsay or flimsy evidence to get at truth. But, unlike grand juries, much of what the Congressmen turn up is immediately made public. Half truths, downright untruths and irrelevant smear material become privileged and are spread over the land.

Congress can't be expected to forego the privilege of "digging." But it should be willing to forego the privilege of serving as a sounding board for deception—and, in the cases of some committee chairmen, as a self-appointed sounding board.

Congressmen point out that congressional hearings are not courts and so have wider latitude than court rules allow. True. But some rules are desirable. The tradition of fair play, the right of an individual to be heard and to defend himself, the tradition of due process of law by themselves should require rules of relevancy, reliability and basic protection for the rights of individuals.

The same thing should be true of congressional immunity. If a congressman libels a citizen with an untruth, that citizen should have the right to answer. And, if the Congressman is proved wrong he should be expected to withdraw his statement. If he doesn't, Congress should itself see to it that the record is set straight.

Unless Congress does act to discipline and restrain the activities of its members, Congress will suffer. It will be hampered by suspicion of irresponsibility, recklessness, and even oppression. The people will lose faith in their lawmakers. Democracy will suffer.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 24, 1953]

KEEP DUE PROCESS OF LAW

Congressional irresponsibility, abuse of immunity and shooting from the hip investigations are dangers to democracy. They fail to justify on the record the argument by which some Congressmen defend them—that they are necessary to prosecute Reds. Reckless charges that some Congressmen make on their own or as a result of inadequate investigation are seldom put to the proof and are seldom substantiated by subsequent legal action. Take the case of Owen Lattimore. He was branded by Senator MCCARTHY as the "top Russian espionage agent in the United States." Senator MCCARRAN spent days saying pretty much the same thing. Louis Budenz, former Communist, has branded Lattimore a Communist.

It is easy to prove that Lattimore said some pretty silly things. But that's not enough to convict a man in a court of law. Yet the charges made against Lattimore are the most serious that can be made in this day in these United States.

If they are true, Lattimore deserves conviction for treason.

Yet there has been no attempt to prove that the charges are true. Lattimore has been indicted by a grand jury on charges of perjury—but not on the essential contention that he is a Communist or the "chief espionage agent" of Russia in the United States.

Lattimore has argued that either he or Budenz is a liar. He has asked for a court test to determine the truth—lead where it may. But Budenz has not been called upon to prove his statement, made under the privileged sanction of congressional committees. MCCARTHY has not been called upon to prove his charge. Lattimore has not been called upon to prove that he isn't head of the espionage conspiracy which MCCARTHY claims he is trying to clean up.

What Lattimore has been called upon to prove is that he did not perjure himself in testimony about his associations and his professional performance as an editor and an adviser—testimony on matters that are piddling compared to the main issue. And testimony given in endless days of congressional inquisition. The trial will in no way settle what would seem to be the all-important issue—the issue of whether Lattimore is the greatest traitor of our time.

What it amounts to is that Lattimore is being denied the opportunity to answer the chief allegation against him. He is being given no opportunity to confront his accusers in a court of law.

The same thing is true of John Carter Vincent, discharged State Department official. He was called a Communist, by Budenz among others. A loyalty review board recommended his discharge as a loyalty risk, but skipped over the Budenz charge. Secretary of State Dulles found that Vincent was not a loyalty risk—but fired him on the vague charge that Vincent did not come up to Department standards of capability.

Vincent—after being charged with what amounted to treason—has no way to remove the blot from his name. The Budenz charge stands in the record. There is no way for Vincent to get a court test of the main issue of whether he was a foreign agent or a loyal American. He has no way to force proof from the men who made against him the most serious charge it is possible to make these days.

These facts have nothing to do with Lattimore's or Vincent's guilt or innocence! They merely show that these men are not being given the opportunity for a trial and a chance to defend themselves in court against the basic charges.

The extralegal indictment of treason in these cases has come out of congressional investigations and statements made under congressional immunity. These men have been prosecuted and, in a real sense, convicted by legislators. But privileges granted Congressmen under the Constitution serve to deny these defendants their own constitutional right not to be convicted without due process of law.

Common thieves and murderers are guaranteed and get fair trials. Failure to give them fair trials would create national scandal overnight. Yet few persons these days react to the embargo put on due process of law by some Congressmen. And even fewer persons seem to realize that their failure so to react is eating away at their own constitutional guarantees of individual liberty.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 27, 1953]

HOW TO RUIN A GOOD MAN

One thing that shooting from the hip investigations have accomplished is to destroy the careers, morale, and effectiveness of many public servants who have survived probing. A good example is John Paton Davies, recently sidetracked from his post as deputy political adviser of the United States high commissioner to Germany and sent to the obscure job of counselor to the embassy at Lima, Peru. Davies has repeatedly been branded "disloyal," partly on the basis of his service in China but mainly on the charge that he recommended that the central intelligence agency employ Communists. It took testimony of such men as Gen. Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, and George Kennan, former Ambassador to Russia and distinguished career man, to keep Davies from being fired as a loyalty risk.

* * * * *

In 1949, Davies, testifying before the McCarran committee on China and other matters, admitted that he had suggested that the CIA "utilize" some alleged Communists. He refused to reveal what he said were "secret" details. The committee recommended that he be indicted for perjury and blasted Davies unmercifully. The Justice Department could find no grounds for action.

General Smith has since given the details. Davies proposed that a group of six Communists, crypto-Communists, and fellow travelers be gathered together in a CIA project under the guidance of a "cutout." A "cutout," in cloak-and-dagger language, is a man of unquestionable trustworthiness who works secretly for the Government. His job would have been to "guide" the group into revelations and contacts the Government wanted to uncover.

Smith, testifying recently, said that Davies' plan could have been productive of valuable information "if carefully and adroitly handled by a skillful officer and a skillful cutout." The trouble, he said, was that Davies' superiors were "relatively inexperienced" and the suggestion shocked them.

"I did not think then, and I do not think now, that Mr. Davies was disloyal in that action," General Smith said.

What General Smith was saying was that Davies was not a risk but a man of more imagination and ability than his superiors. Investigation after investigation has not disclosed anything to warrant Davies' dismissal. Yet he is still attacked, still accused.

* * * Congressional probes have proved nothing, but they have put a cloud over a career official and have all but immobilized him. His career is probably ended, at least, as far as productive work is concerned.

This kind of baiting, this insistence that diplomatic officials justify every judgment, report, or action, or be suspected of treason, has deeply damaged the diplomatic service and the State Department.

Probing Congressmen make two assumptions—that errors in judgment or reports which contain unpalatable facts are—5, 10, or more years after the fact—indications of disloyalty or treason; that when something happens in a foreign country that we don't

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

like our own career officials are somehow responsible and probably worked with Communists to achieve it.

Not Russia, but our own State Department, is blamed for the state of the world—thinking similar to blaming the weatherman for cyclones. Such thinking results in the preposterous contention that China and Eastern Europe were "sold out" by American officials.

Russia, Red armies, Nationalist revolts, war, failures of foreign governments are set aside and the blame placed on a handful of Americans who somehow should have made the world over to suit present congressional tastes. The fact that they didn't is uncritically taken as proof that they worked "hand in glove" with Reds.

This attitude has created an atmosphere in which diplomats fear to make honest reports lest their judgments be questioned or later proved wrong and open them to charges of treason. No diplomat can work efficiently under such fear. No government can depend upon diplomats if those diplomats feel compelled to report what congressional investigators want to hear rather than what the facts are. No department can function under constant baiting and attack.

Not only is the diplomatic service damaged, but the faith of Americans in the State Department has been weakened by irresponsible Congressmen. At a time when good diplomacy is vital, our diplomats are smeared and immobilized. The Nation as a whole is the true sufferer.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 23, 1953]

YOUR FREEDOM TO JUDGE ART

A marked danger not only to individual liberty but to American art and culture is the tendency to judge artistic production not on its merits but on the alleged political beliefs of the artist. It is a muted example of Hitler's burning of books. We are not without our own book burners. Representative VELDE, Republican, of Illinois, currently talking about Communists in churches and schools, once proposed that the Library of Congress label all subversive books among the 9 million or more on its shelves. Groups over the country are trying to remove many excellent textbooks from schools on the ground that they are subversive.

The Voice of America, under pressure of Senator MCCARTHY, is clearing its library of the works of suspected authors and promising not to broadcast the works of any suspected persons.

This, as a State Department official points out, prevents the Voice from using commendatory statements about the United States by Stalin and many others—statements which might lend credence to our propaganda and contradict enemies from their own mouths or pens.

Many a novel, poem, painting, or musical composition by suspected men is true art and has contributed to the wealth of our democratic tradition.

We rob ourselves when we ban works of art because we don't like the artist. Wagner and Chopin were violently anti-Semitic, yet their greatest interpreters are Rubinstein and Horowitz, both Jewish. Beethoven was a radical in his day—a rabid republican in a conservative, monarchist Vienna. Yet Vienna honored him and enjoyed his music. Verdi was an anticlerical adulterer in a clerical state, yet he was honored and enjoyed even by the state for his art.

Aaron Copland has been called the greatest living American composer. His composition, A Lincoln Portrait, in which excerpts of Lincoln's writings are set to music, was to have been presented in the recent inauguration concert in Washington. Representative BUSBEY, Republican, of Illinois, had it banned at the last minute because, he said, Copland had an affinity for questionable affiliations.

Copland, apparently, has made Lincoln's words subversive, if we take BUSBEY's view of it. The inauguration committee made a decision not on Copland's art but on BUSBEY's political judgment of Copland. And the Congressman is currently stirred by the discovery that the United States Marine Band has been playing Copland music—patriotic music, at that. Copland hasn't been wise in his political associations, but should that keep us from hearing his unquestionably great music? That's a Russian attitude, not American.

Charlie Chaplin's picture, Limelight, is being boycotted by the American Legion and withdrawn from a number of theaters. Chaplin isn't a sterling character personally. Some of his statements and his failure to apply for citizenship during his long years in the United States are highly distasteful. He has been checked to find out whether his affiliations with some so-called front groups should bar him from reentering the country. He has announced that he doesn't intend to return.

But Chaplin as a comedian and artist is superb. His Great Dictator and other pictures have delighted Americans for years and are part of our artistic treasure.

When we make political judgments of art based not on the art but on the real or alleged beliefs of the artist, we do exactly what the Communists do. And we rob the Nation of the art itself and create an atmosphere in which creative people are immobilized by fear. We limit an individual's right to make personal judgments of art.

Strangely, the guardians of our political morals haven't been consistent. If they are out to ban books, music, and other art because the producers are allegedly subversive, why not other things?

Shall we remove from Congress all copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing speeches by formar Representative Vito Marcantonio? How about the hybrid corn developed by Henry Wallace because of his former Progressive Party activities?

* * * * *

The list is endless. We're in for a pretty time if we carry this confusion between products—and the personalities of their producers—to its logical conclusion in a misdirected hunt for security.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 1, 1953]

RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES UNDER LAW

The problem of insuring both national security and the American tradition of civil liberties has been the continuous concern of our country. The Civil War era was not unlike that of the present day—a period in which real dangers were heightened by irresponsible accusations and character assassinations in a hue and cry against spies and traitors. An example similar to our experiences: An anonymous letter came into the hands of Secretary of State Seward. It was full of wild allusions and contained the lines: "President P—— in his passage had drawn many brave and influential men into the league."

Seward, a ready hunter of subversives, immediately assumed that former President Pierce and the Knights of the Golden Circle, a pro-Southern secret society, were involved. He wrote Pierce asking for an explanation and calling the letter an injurious aspersion on your fair fame and loyalty.

Pierce was furious at the slanderous inference. He wrote: "Nothing but the gravity of the insinuation, the high official source whence it emanates, and the distracted condition of our recently united, prosperous, and happy country could possibly lift this matter above ridicule and contempt."

The letter proved a forgery by a Michigan man who wrote it to prove to treason-shrieking people how baseless charges could be turned into major scandals. Coldly brushing off Seward's excuse that he had signed the letter in a hurry after a careless clerk had written it, the former President wrote these impressive words:

"It is proper, perhaps it is my duty, to add that my loyalty will never be successfully impugned so long as I enjoy the constitutional rights which pertain to every citizen of the Republic, and especially the inestimable right to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation and to be confronted face to face with my accusers."

There, in the words of a long dead President, is the crux of the great American problem of individual rights today—and the answer to witch hunting, false accusations, and character assassinations that mark our era.

Two other Presidents have spoken recently. Former President Truman said to Congress in January:

"Already the danger signals have gone up. Already the corrosive process has begun. And every diminution of our tolerance, each new act of enforced conformity, each idle accusation, each demonstration of hysteria—each new restrictive law—is one more sign that we can lose the battle against fear."

President Eisenhower told students as he left Columbia University for the White House: "If there is one thing for which I am trying to live, it is the rights and freedom of the individual and his right to express his honest conviction, no matter what it may be."

And, paraphrased, President Eisenhower said in his February 25 press conference: "* * * we must never think we are protecting the United States while at the same time destroying or attacking those values which have made it great, and one of those values is the right of the individual to be [considered] innocent until [it is] proven that he is guilty."

We need changes in restrictive laws. We need a better security program than either the old Truman or new Eisenhower programs. We need orderly procedures for congressional investigations and a Congress that disciplines irresponsible Members who abuse the privileges of Congress. We need careful studies to determine whether our efforts to defeat communism are so misguided as to endanger our civil liberties—a study for which Ford Foundation has just allotted $15 million.

But we need much more. We need to live the words of the President quoted above. We need a renewed understanding by all of our people of the great strengths of this Nation—our rights and privileges based in the Constitution and law, our tradition of individual liberty.

Given that understanding, that greatest of all influences—public opinion—will keep us on the track of democracy. It will strengthen and continue our traditions. It will end hysteria and the atmosphere in which demagogs can thrive.

It will provide us with our greatest need: security against our enemies and security in our way of life.

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR SETTLEMENT OF EMERGENCY DISPUTES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the next item in my committee report which I should like to take up deals with a bill I am introducing. It is a labor bill. It is a bill which deals with emergency disputes. It is a bill, the major principles of which I have discussed in the Senate since 1950. It is a bill which recognizes that we should have legislation on the books to handle emergency disputes which threaten the health, safety, and security of the United States.

I introduce the bill, Mr. President, because I repeat today, as I have stated on the floor of the Senate, I do not know how many times in recent years, but al-

ways without successful contradiction, that there is not a line in the Taft-Hartley law which is effective in the handling of emergency disputes. Not a line, Mr. President. It is all discretionary.

Mr. President, you will recall last spring when the steel strike was in effect I walked onto the floor of the Senate and read line by line, paragraph by paragraph, section by section, the emergency dispute section of the Taft-Hartley law. After each paragraph I paused and asked if any colleague would like to stand up and tell me whether or not that paragraph would be effective in handling the steel strike. Every Senator knew it would not be. There was not a Senator who did not know that the Taft-Hartley law emergency dispute section is not worth the paper it is written on, so far as being an effective instrument in dealing with the steel strike was concerned. We all knew that.

However, there was a presidential election in the offing. It was good Republican politics to kick the steel strikers around. It was good Republican politics to abuse a Democratic President who had exercised his rights under the Taft-Hartley law by entering into an agreement with the union, to the effect that if they would postpone the strike the Government would try to get the case settled.

Mr. President, you can criticize his wisdom in entering into such an understanding, but you cannot criticize his right to enter into it. There is not a word in the Taft-Hartley law which made it mandatory upon the President of the United States to use the emergency dispute section of the Taft-Hartley law in that dispute. A grand job was done in befogging the American people into thinking the President was guilty of a serious dereliction of duty, a failure to abide by the law, because he did not invoke the emergency dispute section of the Taft-Hartley law. He did not have to do it.

We in Congress passed a law in 1947, known now as the Taft-Hartley law, in which we said we were going to leave it up to the discretion of the President. Mr. President, go back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I stood on the floor of the Senate in 1947 in opposition to the law, and said then what I say today, that the discretionary features of the law were of little use, because they could not be effective in settling disputes in many types of cases.

The steel case was made to order to prove my statement. As I said so many times during the debate on the steel strike, when Congress was on strike against passing effective legislation, once the steel furnaces were allowed to grow cold they could not be started again for 2 or 3 weeks, on the average, and there was nothing in the Taft-Hartley law that would start them.

Mr. President, the record is that the President of the United States, through his intervention at the time, and as a result of his conversations with leaders of the union—and he also had conversations with leaders of the industry—not only postponed that strike for 80 days, but postponed it for well over 100 days. In fact, I think the final postponement was in the neighborhood of 150 days. However, that strike need not have occurred at all, if the Congress had done its duty at the time and if the steel industry had not insisted on holding up the American people for a price increase of several times what the industry was entitled to receive under the wage stabilization program existing at the time.

So that was the second strike. The first strike was when the Congress refused to pass the legislation of a mandatory nature that it should have passed. The second strike was that of the steel companies, when they refused to agree to a reasonable settlement of the dispute unless they could obtain a price increase far in excess of any that they were entitled to receive under the price-stabilization program. Finally they bludgeoned the country into a price increase of a little more than twice what they were entitled to, under the price-stabilization program.

The final strike was that of the workers themselves. At the end of the period, after the President had been successful in prolonging the time during which he prevented the strike, there was the strike of the steelworkers themselves.

That is a sad case in American industrial history; in fact, I believe it is a disgraceful case. When we get further away from that case, I believe it will be found to reflect most adversely upon the times, the attitudes, and the statesmanship that prevailed last spring.

Without enumerating all the arguments I then made in opposition to those who felt we should not do anything to regularize the President's seizure of the steel mills, I shall incorporate them here, by way of reference. Some of these days there will be another crisis of that sort. Mr. President, with a presidential election campaign now behind us, I believe this is the time to introduce and pass some legislation which will be effective in handling emergency labor disputes, when they arise.

So, Mr. President, when at Chicago, a week ago today, I spoke at the Industrial Institute which was sponsored by De Paul University and the American Arbitration Association, I said I would introduce in the next few days my bill for the handling of emergency disputes, with a few slight changes, but not in any way affecting the objectives of the bill; and I said I hoped that in calmer days—such as now, as compared with last spring—there might be enlightened consideration of the bill by Congress. That is why I am introducing the bill today.

I wish to say several other things about the situation which existed last spring. A few of us took Bob Lovett seriously. He was Secretary of Defense, and last spring he was greatly concerned about the production of munitions for defense purposes. He was very much concerned about the production of ammunition. He was very much concerned about the building up of a stockpile of effective weapons of war, which would be available for use in case we should suddenly find ourselves involved in an all-out war with Russia. I know what he said. First, I know what he said to the President, because both he and the President told me what he said. I also know what Bob Lovett said before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, because I was then a member of the committee, and I cross-examined him at some length, as the record will show.

What he said can be summarized as follows: He warned the President and he warned the Congress and he warned the Nation that if the steel furnaces were permitted to grow cold and, as a result, the production of steel was stopped, the loss of steel production would be translated into the loss of American lives, in case the international situation became more difficult. That is what Bob Lovett testified, and that is what he told the President; and that is why Bob Lovett thought it was so important that we do whatever it was necessary to do in order to maintain the production of steel.

I remember that one day the Armed Services Committee went to the Pentagon Building, for a briefing. I got there a little early, and Bob Lovett sat down with me. If I ever saw a man deeply concerned and deeply worried, it was he. He was very much worried about what was happening in the steel case. The strike stage had not then been reached, but he was fearful that it would be. I betray no confidence when I say now that on that occasion he told me that from the standpoint of the ammunition problem, we should not let the steel mills close. He referred also to other needed weapons of war.

So when I was fighting as hard as I could on the floor of the Senate in those days, I was speaking on the basis of my knowledge of Bob Lovett's fears of what would happen if a steel strike should occur.

Not so long ago the Armed Services Committee had General Van Fleet before it. He gave to the committee a great deal of interesting testimony. He testified regarding one point I would have my colleagues keep in mind when we come to consider emergency legislation for handling labor disputes which threaten the security, health, and welfare of the Nation. He was testifying on the ammunition shortage in Korea and the need for certain types of ammunition which the troops were not receiving. I believe his testimony is entitled to the clear interpretation that the lack of the needed ammunition was a great loss to our troops in Korea. I do not pretend to quote him verbatim, but I believe the transcript of the record of the hearings will show that I quote him accurately when I say that at the hearing General Van Fleet said he was advised by superiors in Washington that for a time the steel strike cost the troops 37 percent of the supply of a certain type of ammunition which was very much needed in Korea.

Mr. President, that record is not a very pleasant one. It is a record upon which we should reflect when we come to grips with the question of emergency disputes legislation, for which one of us can say how soon the country may face another such crisis? At this time there is nothing on the statute books that would be effective in handling such a labor dispute.

One more word, and then I shall proceed with a description of the bill. Let me refer to the only words I need eat, among all the words I used in the course of my discussion of the steel case. Mr.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

President, when I make a mistake, I happen to be willing to admit it; I am not the kind of politician who believes he must never permit anyone to know he recognizes he made a mistake. I make many mistakes, as do all my colleagues. When I make a mistake, I am willing to admit it. In all the arguments I made on the steel case, I made only one that I have to eat, and even that one was rather rhetorical. However, I will eat it. That was when I said, one afternoon, that I did not think any Member of the Senate would live long enough to see the United States Supreme Court hand down a decision to the effect that the President of the United States did not have power to handle an emergency situation of that sort. I was wrong about that, although such a case had never been decided before in our history. It was the first time that we had had a direct decision on the question by the Supreme Court. But I know of few Supreme Court decisions that have been so misinterpreted and misapplied in political speeches as has been the Supreme Court decision in the steel case. In fact, it is rather humorous and amusing to read of, or listen to, some of the interpretations of the decision. Of course, it took 6 Justices, in 6 separate concurring opinions, to write for the majority in the steel case. The 6-man majority in the steel case simply could not get together. They all had slightly different views as to what the rules of law ought to be. So there were 6 separate concurring opinions. Those opinions make interesting reading as an illustration of judicial inconsistency.

I wish I were back teaching a course in jurisprudence, Mr. President. I could almost teach it around those 6 concurring opinions, so far as using inconsistent theories to arrive at a common result is concerned. That is a trait exhibited by some judges at times. But, be that as it may, they at least finally reached a conclusion.

I submit that the future judicial history of the Supreme Court will bear me out when I say—and I do not expect ever to have to eat these words—that the only thing those 6 Justices really agreed upon, so far as lasting judicial effect is concerned, was that in their opinion the facts in the steel case did not convince them that the President had a right to exercise the power he sought to use. I think that is the essence of the decision.

The decision is binding upon us. I stand by it. I think what the decision in essence shows is that the court found, on the basis of the operative facts involved in the steel case, that the President's act was beyond his authority. But I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that one will employ a considerable amount of mental elasticity if he stretches the decision into meaning that under no set of facts does the President of the United States in an hour of great crisis, have the power to protect the security of the Nation without prior Congressional act. That is all I am saying. I am using these words advisedly, Mr. President. That is all I am saying, but I am saying that much.

As I have been reading the law-review articles on this historic decision, I have thought that many of the writers were missing the point of what the minority saw as a set of facts which so endangered the security of the Nation that the President of the United States had the right to act summarily, subject to authorization and approval by the Congress of the United States. As Senators heard me last spring argue so many times on the floor of the Senate, that is the Corwin theory.

I walked on to the floor of the Senate last spring, on the very morning after the President had issued his order for a token seizure of the steel mills, and, at the very first session of the Senate, offered my bill and my argument for a congressional regularization of the action of the President. I discussed the very mooted question of constitutional law as to how much power the President had. But I asserted then, as I assert today, that if the situation is sufficiently serious it happens to be the duty of the President to protect the security of the Nation, and then he should get congressional approval at the first opportunity. If he cannot obtain approval—now, Mr. President, mark what I say—if he cannot get the approval of Congress, in light of the Supreme Court decision of last spring in the steel case, then I think he is placed under the duty of withdrawing his action. But he has, I think, the right and duty to act immediately, provided he immediately requests the approval of Congress.

Mr. President, on April 9 last year, I think it was, Senators heard me say I thought we ought to proceed at once by congressional mandate to regularize the action of the President in the steel strike, and to provide congressionally for the kind of procedure which should prevail during such a crisis. I offered my suggestion of a solution in 1950 after the coal strike. I offer it again. I offer a bill that labor does not like. I offer a bill which large segments of management do not like. I offer a bill on which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare conducted lengthy hearings last year, a bill which a majority of the committee approved, and reported, notwithstanding the fact that witnesses both for labor and for employers testified against it. Why? Because they apparently think the jungle law of the economic forest ought to be available to them in an hour of great crisis. I do not think so.

Mr. President, they argued that it would result eventually in compulsory arbitration. They are wrong, unless the Government is forced into a position in which it says, "All right, boys; we have given you ample opportunity for applying the procedures of voluntarism. You have let your country down, but in the interest of protecting the security of the Nation, your Government is going to keep production flowing." If they want to call that compulsory arbitration, Mr. President, it is all right with me; but it is a strange kind of compulsory arbitration.

Let me say something else about the witnesses against the bill last year on the part of management and labor. Many of them would say to me, privately, "We hate to testify against the bill. We think we should be able to devise some procedure short of some of the drastic provisions of the bill, although"—and this is an important thing, Mr. President—"we have to admit your bill would work and it would be fair to the country and to the parties immediately concerned."

I think that is a pretty good recommendation from adverse witnesses. I only wish they would say it publicly.

Mr. President, we must have on the statute books emergency legislation which will work and be effective in the handling of emergency disputes. We have no such emergency legislation on the books at this time. Not one single thing in the field of labor legislation has been recommended.

I am interested in the alibi—I understand it is an alibi—for the fact that this administration does not have a program of legislation before the Congress, not only in the field of labor, but in many other fields. It does not want to interfere with the congressional prerogative. I agree that it is the responsibility of Congress to pass legislation, but I also agree with the historical precedents that it is the responsibility of the Executive to exercise some leadership in the field of legislation, in forwarding the legislative program on which he was supposedly elected.

I know how difficult it is for this administration to draft a legislative program based upon the various types of representations it made during the campaign, and I am probably asking for too much when I suggest that the President of the United States, ought, at least, to come forward now and recommend to his leaders in the Congress a legislative program in various fields, with some suggested bills, or, at least, with the suggestion that Congress draft some bills carrying out his suggestions. But we have had none.

We have a Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which I once served, presenting the amusing spectacle of conducting extensive labor hearings on no proposed legislation. It is what we might call a negative approach. There have been some bills dropped into the hopper, such as a proposal to take away the protection, if it is protection, or the liability, if it is liability, or the obligations of the Taft-Hartley law in connection with some industries. There have been a few very minor bills as to which it may be said, "It is these bills that justify these extensive labor hearings." But the fact is that the hearings are covering the whole field, including the kitchen sink, but they are not directed to any official administration program in the field of labor legislation.

I desire to help the administration. I want to suggest this afternoon a program for it in the field of emergency disputes. It is the same bill on which there was a favorable report by a majority of the committee last year. I introduced it in 1950 and again last year. Last year it was Senate bill 2999. Some of the procedures are discretionary, but the one in connection with handling emergency disputes has some teeth in it.

It provides, first, the issuance of a Presidential proclamation when conditions in the labor field create a national emergency; second, for recommendations by the President for continuance

of production during the settlement of disputes.

Let me pause here to say that I am still of the opinion that if properly handled, we can settle 95 percent of the so-called emergency disputes at those two steps. The issuance of the Presidential proclamation and the recommendation of the President for continuance of production in most instances will be sufficient if the facts are of the type about which I have been talking, if they involve a case so critical that the security, the health, and the welfare of the Nation are at stake.

We make the mistake, Mr. President, because some particularly unfortunate, yes, atrocious case, stands out when we are dealing in the field of emergency disputes, of thinking that the pattern in that particular case is the pattern for all cases. That is not true. We do not hear about the hundreds and thousands of cases which are settled at the level of voluntarism. I think that in most instances the Presidential proclamation and the recommendations of the President would suffice. But suppose they should not suffice. Then my third step calls for the appointment by the President of emergency boards to hear the disputes and to recommend terms of settlement. That is discretionary. My bill does not provide that he must appoint them. I am proposing a bill which I think can be described in part as a bill which provides procedures by way of alternatives.

We must stop assuming that in the handling of labor disputes some pat formula, some rule of thumb, some straitjacket procedure can be used which will guarantee the settlement of all disputes in accordance with a common mold. It cannot be done that way, because the problem of human relations is involved and, also, because human factors and human frailties are involved.

Labor cases have great individual differences, just as people have great individual differences, and there are many intangibles which the public does not see but which have a great deal to do with whether or not efforts to settle the case can be successful, such as the intangible of personal likes and dislikes, on a human level, existing between and among the negotiators and the parties to the dispute. Many a time I have seen a case apparently completely lost because the parties to the case did not like the negotiator who had been assigned to the case, and later, another negotiator made practically the identical proposals, maybe changing the order in which he presented them, and everybody accepted them in one night's meeting.

Human factors such as that are lost sight of by many in the handling of labor disputes.

It will be seen that I keep wide open the doors of voluntarism. But I finally say to the parties, All right, we have given you every chance to live up to your public responsibility, and you have got to be told, in terms of acts of your Government that you will understand, that your Government is going to protect the public interest. We are going to keep production going, whether you want to keep it going or not, because all of your rights, precious and important as they are, are subordinate and relative to the overpowering right of a people to be protected by their government in their health, safety, security, and welfare.

Whenever a government fails to do that or cannot do it, it is breaching the trust it owes to its people.

I want such disputes settled voluntarily, but I am not going to kid myself, or the American people, about the ugly reality that sometimes voluntarism breaks down. I also wish to emphasize, as I describe this bill again today, that I am satisfied that the gun behind the door of final procedure provided for in my bill is about all that is going to be needed, because once it is known that the power exists, then the parties will do everything they can to follow a course of action which will make it unnecessary to exercise the power.

Mr. President, mandatory legislation should be written on the books. If the permissive sections of the emergency disputes provisions of the Taft-Hartley law were changed into mandatory sections, we would be surprised at the difference in attitude among many of the parties when they came to settle emergency disputes. It would make a great difference.

So, in the fourth place, I provide for seizure by Executive order, subject to congressional veto by concurrent resolution within 10 days of such seizure. What kind of seizure? A token seizure, a seizure that does not move a single management officer from behind a desk, a seizure that says, "This situation is so critical that the security of our country is in danger; we are going to put up the flag here, and for the time being you are going to produce for that flag."

I become sick and tired of listening to the phony argument of superpatriots who tell me that such a procedure is some kind of socialism or nationalism or totalitarianism, when all it says is that for the period of an emergency the workers are going to produce for the flag, just as at the same time American boys are dying in Korea under that flag, but for it.

It is just about time in this country that we stopped placing property rights above the lives of our boys in uniform. It is about time that we say to American employers and American workers, "You have no right to strike"—and employers, as well as workers, strike in these cases—"you have no right to strike against that flag while boys are dying for it in Korea."

That is the only patriotism I am willing to recognize in this issue, Mr. President, but that is patriotism. That is the patriotism I was taught as a boy and throughout my life. We had simply better pierce through some of the phony political soap arguments that are being used by selfish interests in order to profiteer out of the blood of American boys.

Do not tell me we are endangering the foundations of freedom when we say to American workers and American employers, "Now, listen. You have some responsibilities to supply the economic goods that our boys need during this period of crisis. If you do not supply them, the Government is going to take over their production and see that they are supplied, but we will make a return to you."

That leads me to the next point in my bill. We say, "We will return to you full compensation. You will not suffer any loss of property rights. What you will suffer is any claimed right on your part by way of a false assumption, that you are bigger than the Government; that you have some property right that is bigger than the right of the Government to protect the security of the Nation and to see to it that the economy of the country is used to produce in a manner that will protect life."

When we bring this matter down to basic political values, the air becomes a little clearer. The interesting point is that it is the usual "out" of either a labor leader or an employer, in connection with the point I am now enunciating, to say, "But, Senator, we ought to be able to do it without going that far."

I say, "I think you should, too. My bill makes it possible for you to do so, if you have a will to do it. If you want to live up to your responsibilities of voluntarism, you can do it under my bill. But if you think we are simply going to stand by and let you shut down the steel industry or any other strategic industry, and endanger the security of the Nation, get that idea out of your heads. Get it out of your heads if you think we are going to stand by and have any repetition of the testimony of a great general subsequently coming before the Senate Committee on Armed Services and saying that it was his understanding, on the basis of advice given him by his superiors, that one of the reasons why he lost 37 percent of the ammunition he needed of a certain strategic and vital type was the steel strike."

So long as I am in the Senate I will try to make a record that will prevent a repetition of that tragedy. I am introducing a bill this afternoon which will prevent it. I am presenting a bill, Mr. President, which will not endanger a single precious American liberty. In my judgment, I am submitting a bill which is consonant with the Constitution of the United States; a bill in support of which I would welcome an argument before the Supreme Court of the United States; a bill—and mark you well these words, Mr. President—which, in my judgment, would leave no doubt about its consistency with the six majority opinions in the Steel case.

The fifth provision of my bill is for termination of seizure within 60 days of an order, unless continued by concurrent resolution.

Mr. President, I provide for automatic termination of token seizure. That is how anxious I am to protect employers and labor from any of the claims that this kind of legislation will lead in some way to the destruction of inherent constitutional rights. My bill would work automatically to bring about a termination within 60 days—unless what happens? Unless the Congress of the United States renews the seizure. I believe in constant review by the Congress of executive power. That was my argument, repeated time and time again, during the Steel case last spring.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

My bill would keep the responsibility on Congress to review the President's conduct, and also to work with the President. When the security of the Nation is in danger, I think we have a great responsibility in the Senate to work cooperatively with the President in connection with every possible thing on which we can work cooperatively. That is the time for parking partisanship in the cloakrooms and never bringing it to the floor of the Senate. I pleaded for such a course last spring. I knew what the play was. I knew that it was a big political play. I knew that there were politicians who could not resist the temptation to make political capital out of the Steel case, but I thought we should have kept the partisan weapons out in the cloakrooms.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, is the bill the Senator is discusing substantially the same as the Morse amendment which was offered last year at the time of the strike in the steel mills?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is corect. It is the Morse bill, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and on which there were several weeks of hearings. I shall place the report of the committee following those hearings in the RECORD when I finish my speech this afternoon.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator proposing to offer that bill as an amendment to the pending bil, on which we have agreed to vote on Tuesday?

Mr. MORSE. No. My good friend from Louisiana was not present when I started my speech this afternoon. This is my weekly report of the Independent Party as a member of the Committee of the Whole. I am taking the opportunity this afternoon to present my bill as a part of that committee report. It has nothing to do with the unanimous-consent agreement to vote next Tuesday on the measure before the Senate. If the Senator will look around him he will see that there is no particular interest in the Senate with respect to the pending measure. I judge that most of my colleagues have gone away for a long weekend. Therefore in order to discommode them the least I take this opportunity to present a bill which I think is of vital importance to the security of my country.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. I am curious to know whether the Senator is one of those who share the view of the junior Senator from Louisiana that it does not really make much difference whether we pass the pending bill or not.

Mr. MORSE. I would not go that far. I am open to conviction with respect to the pending bill. I have a very open mind on the subject. I will reserve judgment and my final vote on the pending bill until I hear all the arguments. The other day I listened to the distinguished Senator who now presides over this body [Mr. BENNETT] make a very able speech on the pending bill. It made quite an impression on me. I shall be here Monday and Tuesday, and I shall make up my mind on the pending bill after I have heard all the arguments.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. Before yielding further I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that it is always a great compliment to me to have him present during my Friday afternoon committee reports. I think the Senator from Louisiana has about the best attendance record in the Senate at my Friday afternoon committee reports. It is really very flattering to me. I have always enjoyed his questions, as I am enjoying the ones he is now asking me, although I say respectfully that some of his past questions have been more relevant to the subject I have been discussing. Nevertheless, I shall listen to the next question.

Mr. LONG. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that if the Morse amendment were offered to the pending proposal, and if that amendment were adopted, we would then have some legislation which would be vitally needed by the Nation in the event of another emergency affected by a strike which might cut off the ammunition needed by our men to fight a war. The President would be able to take steps to protect the Nation from perhaps a more serious emergency than merely a temporary rise in prices.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. There is no doubt about it. However, the Senator's suggestion puts the junior Senator from Oregon in a rather difficult position, because the Senator from Oregon has never approved of the idea of adding amendments to bills as riders or for parliamentary strategical purposes. I am afraid that if I were to offer my bill as an amendment to the pending measure, there would be a great deal of misunderstanding in the Senate as to my motivation.

I am extremely anxious to have the bill considered by the Senate on its merits. I do not wish to handicap it in any way by attaching it to the pending legislation as a rider. I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that I think it is perfectly clear that such a course would cause some of our colleagues to become a trifle irritated. It will be easier to do that as the summer weather comes on. It will be more and more difficult in the hot days ahead to obtain thorough consideration for such legisaltion as this. I do not wish to do anything to handicap it. So I am offering it today with the hope that on July 1 I can have it considered on the floor of the Senate, after a favorable report on its merits, and we can pass it. At least I shall have done my best. I shall be free, then, of the criticism to which I think I would be subjected if I were to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana and offer my amendment as a rider to the pending measure.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. LONG. Under the Taft-Hartley law the answer to a work stoppage involving the health and safety of the Nation was that Congress would pass on what should be done after the 90-day period had expired. That would be the answer to the $64 question. We were to wait and see what would happen. During the steel strike, which certainly affected national survival, we found what the answer was. It was nothing. Congress does nothing.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I brought out in my speech. We walked out on our responsibilities as a Congress. We struck. That is why I have been heard to say that there were three strikes.

Mr. LONG. We told the President to do something which everyone knew he was not going to do.

Mr. MORSE. Management struck for an unconscionable price increase. Labor struck when it should not have struck; and the Congress struck. It pulled a strike on passing legislation it should have passed. The difficulty about the whole thing is that the people lost the game.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his contribution. It is always helpful to me whenever he cross-examines me during the midst of a speech.

The sixth major provision of my bill is that changes in wages, hours, and working conditions during seizure, within the limits of recommendations of the Emergency Board, can be granted.

That is the provision which management and labor say they do not like. Why? Because it keeps both parties in doubt. It puts both parties in such a position that they cannot figure out in advance whether they can use the procedure to their advantage. There is one principle in settling labor disputes which must never be overlooked. That is to keep the parties in doubt as to what will happen to them if they walk out on voluntarism. Never adopt a procedure which they can use by way of figuring out that it will be to their advantage to force the Government into the position of following a certain procedure. Keep them in doubt.

So under the bill the employers would not have the slightest idea of what an emergency board might decide as to what should be the wages and hours and conditions of employment for the duration of the seizure, knowing only that the board was empowered to render a judgment on the basis of the facts presented in the record made before the board.

Labor is kept in doubt too. I wish to say that the sixth provision of my bill is about as effective as anything in the bill to guarantee the maximum use of voluntarism to party disputes in labor cases in the country.

We did it during the war. Oh, what a battle we had to get that principle adopted as a part of the procedure. I can well remember how I fought for that principle. It is a principle which I applied for years as an arbitrator in major labor disputes on the west coast.

I used to say to the parties: "We do not touch a case with any economic action being used by either party. We work first and we settle second."

So when I was called in, with San Francisco or Portland or Seattle or San Pedro harbors tied up as tight as a drum,

without a ship moving—and sometimes no ship had moved for days and days—and was asked to arbitrate a case I asked: "What do you mean, arbitrate the case? How can you have a judicial process of arbitration carried on in the midst of a strike or a lockout? What makes you think that I would disparage the process of arbitration as a judicial process by sitting on that bench and conducting hearings on the merits of this case with employers locking men out or men striking? I will arbitrate it on one condition, and that is you go back to work, or you open up the port, as an employer. When you are back at work we will then have a quick preliminary hearing for the issuance of a temporary order as to the conditions under which you will work while the case is being heard on its merits."

I know it works, Mr. President, and I know if I had not insisted on such procedure I would not have lasted 10 days as an arbitrator on the Pacific coast, because that was the greatest weapon I had so far as public support was concerned.

I had the public behind me, because the public knew it was a fair rule of procedure to demand. I had another rule of procedure. I would not sit in a private arbitration, because, Mr. President, when a port is tied up, the public interest is involved, and the public has a right to know what is going on. That is why my arbitrations had to be public arbitrations, with access to them by the public and the press.

My bill contains the same principle in a little different form. It was adopted in the War Labor Board procedure. We had a little trouble sometimes. Some Government officials, particularly in the Navy, did not always like it. At one time during the war we had to take over a shipyard to keep it going. The Navy at first thought they would operate it as they operate a naval shipyard. We said, "No. You will operate it in accordance with the decision of the Board." We finally had to take that issue all the way up to the White House.

I remember that the late Bob Patterson sat in on one occasion, listening to the dispute with the Secretary of the Navy. I was making the argument on behalf of the Board. It was my argument that it was the duty of the Secretary of the Navy, under the Presidential order, to carry out the decision of the Board, not to seek to substitute his judgment as to what wages, hours, and conditions of employment should be, for that of the Board. Bob Patterson said, Mr. President, the dean is right; you and I are just a couple of United States marshals in these cases, carrying out the court's orders."

Mr. President, that is a very important section of my bill. The language of that section is one of the best guaranties, because of the fact that it keeps them in doubt, that the parties will use the principle of voluntarism before they feel the full force of the law.

Mr. President, they are protected, as will be seen in subsequent sections of the bill, in all their legal rights, because they have the right of appeal. They also have the duty to comply, subject to the right of appeal.

Seventh. No change in union security that exceeds maintenance of membership without the consent of the parties during Government operation.

I am as much opposed as I was during the war to letting a union walk in before an employer—an employer who never had had a closed shop in his plant—and take advantage of the emergency and say to the employer, "Sign, or else."

I am proud of the decisions I wrote on the War Labor Board against what I termed an "unfair labor practice." Those decisions made it the policy of the Board that for the duration of the war such a practice could not be employed by labor.

On the other hand, I was adamant in my position that no employer had the right to take advantage of an emergency to destroy a union. So we worked it out in the famous Norma Hoffman case, which was based on the dissenting opinion in the International Harvester case.

The seventh provision means that while the Government is in control, the Government will maintain the membership of the union as it exists. That is all. It is perfectly fair.

Eighth. Continued production during Government operation.

Ninth. Just compensation to owners of enterprises of which possession is taken.

Tenth. A compensation board to determine just compensation for which some standards are prescribed; its award would be appealable to the Court of Claims.

As a lawyer, I am so devoted to the judicial process that I could not think of supporting a piece of legislation which would make an administrative board, a compensation board, final in its determination of the question of fact as to just compensation. I insist upon an appeal to the Court of Claims.

It should be emphasized that this enumeration does not set forth a static procedure or time table. The various provisions can be used singly or in conjunction with variations in timing as the particular occasion demands and the operative facts of individual cases require.

That is why I stated earlier in my remarks that the bill can be described as a bill providing for alternatives in the handling of emergency disputes. But it is a mandatory bill.

There is nothing permissive about the bill. It will work. It has been analyzed by the best experts in the country. I am willing to let the transcript of record speak for itself, as made last year before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Therefore, Mr. President, in closing I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill, and request that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1919) to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide a more effective method of dealing with labor disputes in vital industries which affect the national security, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 206, 207, 208, 209, and 210 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. Whenever the head of an appropriate department or independent agency reports to the President, and the President finds, that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a stoppage of work or operations has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry or plant which seriously affects the security of the United States, and the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service advises the President that all possibilities of mediation and conciliation have been exhausted without success, the President shall issue a proclamation to that effect and call upon the parties to the dispute to refrain from a stoppage of work or operations, or, if such stoppage has occurred, to resume work and operations in the public interest.

"PROCEDURE FOLLOWING PROCLAMATION

"SEC. 207. (a) Immediately after issuing a proclamation pursuant to section 206, the President shall submit to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case based upon such information as has been made available to him through the appropriate agencies of the Government together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make as to procedures for effecting final settlement of the dispute and, pending settlement, for maintaining operation of the enterprise or enterprises involved.

"(b) The President may include a recommendation that the United States take possession of and operate the business enterprise or enterprises involved in the dispute. The President may make such additional reports and recommendations as he deems advisable. If the President recommends that the United States shall take possession of and operate such enterprise or enterprises, the President shall have authority to take such action forthwith. If the Congress by concurrent resolution within 10 days after the submission of such recommendation to it determines that such action should not have been or should not be taken any property seized shall be returned to its owners and no future seizure shall take place during that dispute without congressional authorization by concurrent resolution: *Provided*, That during the period in which the United States shall have taken possession, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the parties concerned, and the agency or department of the United States designated to operate such enterprise or enterprises shall have no authority to enter into negotiations with the employer or with the labor organization for a collective-bargaining contract or to alter the wages, hours, or the conditions of employment existing in such industry or plant prior to the dispute, except in conformity (in whole or in part) with the recommendations of the emergency board: *Provided*, That in case an emergency board assumes jurisdiction over any form of union security which requires an employee to join a union as a condition of continued employment, the putting into effect of its union-security recommendations, during a period of Government possession shall require the acceptance of the labor organization and the employer concerned in the dispute. If the Congress or either House thereof shall have adjourned sine die or for a period longer than 3 days, the President shall convene the Congress, or such House forthwith for the purpose of consideration of an

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

appropriate action pursuant to such statement and recommendations.

"(c) After the issuance of a seizure order it shall be the duty of any labor organization of which any employees who have been employed in the operation of such enterprise are members, and of the officers of such labor organization, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to refrain from a stoppage of work and not to engage in any strike, slowdown, or other concerted refusal to work, or stoppage of work, and if such stoppage of work has occurred, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to return to work and not to engage in any strike, slowdown, or other concerted refusal to work or stoppage of work until the dispute is settled or until possession of such enterprise is relinquished by the United States, whichever occurs sooner.

"(d) After the issuance of a seizure order, or any time thereafter the President may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court, having jurisdiction of the parties, to enjoin such stoppage of work or operations, and if the court finds that the President has reasonable cause to believe that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a threatened or actual stoppage of work or operations may result or has resulted from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective agreement) in a vital industry or plant which seriously affects the security of the Nation, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin such stoppage of work or operations, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate. In granting such injunction or relief, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes, approved March 23, 1932' (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 29, secs. 101–115). Such injunction or order shall be dissolved when the dispute is settled or the property of which possession has been taken is relinquished by the United States, whichever occurs sooner.

"EMERGENCY BOARDS

"SEC. 208. (a) After issuing such a proclamation, the President may appoint a board to be known as an 'emergency board.'

"(b) Any emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President but not more than 30 days after the appointment of the board, make a written report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The recommendations shall be consistent with all laws and regulations otherwise applicable to compensation, hours, and other terms and conditions and incidents of employment. The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"(c) An emergency board shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"(d) Members of an emergency board shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(e) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 5 (f), 9, and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 45 (f), 49, and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

"(f) When a board appointed under this section has been dissolved, its records shall be transferred to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"(g) No member of an emergency board shall be an officer or employee of the organization of employees or any employer involved in the dispute."

"SEC. 209. (a) In the event that the Government shall take possession of and operate any business enterprise or enterprises involved in a given dispute, the President shall designate the agency or department of Government which shall take possession of any business enterprise or enterprises including the properties thereof involved in the dispute and all other assets of the enterprise or enterprises necessary to such continued operation thereof as will protect the national security.

"(b) Any enterprise or properties of which possession has been taken under this title shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as (1) such owners have reached an agreement with the representatives of the employees in such enterprise settling the issues in dispute between them, or (2) the President finds that the continued possession and operation of such enterprise by the United States is no longer necessary under the terms of the proclamation provided for in section 206: *Provided*, That possession by the United States shall be terminated not later than 60 days after the issuance of a seizure order unless the period of possession is extended by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

"(c) Beginning not later than 30 days after issuance of a seizure order, the United States shall impound and hold all income received from the operation thereof in trust for the payment of general operating expenses, just compensation to the owners as hereinafter provided in this subsection, and reimbursement to the United States for expenses incurred by the United States in the operation of the enterprise. Any income remaining shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. In determining just compensation to the owners of the enterprise, due consideration shall be given to the fact that the United States took or continued possession of such enterprise when its operation had been interrupted by a stoppage of work or operations or that a stoppage of work or operations was imminent; to the fact that the United States would have returned such enterprise to its owners at any time when an agreement was reached settling the issues involved in such stoppage of work or operations; and to the value the use of such enterprise would have had to its owners in the light of the labor dispute prevailing, had they remained in possession during the period of Government operation: *Provided*, That any increase in wages or other compensation or any increase resulting from a change in the method of computing wages or other compensation which are agreed to retroactively for the period of Government operation or any portion of that period shall be deemed costs or expenses for such period.

"(d) During the period in which possession of any enterprise has been taken by the United States under this section, the employer or employers or their duly designated representatives and the representatives of the employees in such enterprise shall be obligated to continue collective bargaining for the purpose of settling the issues in the dispute between them.

"(e) (1) The President may appoint a compensation board to determine the amount to be paid as just compensation under this title to the owner of any enterprise of which possession is taken. For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any such board the provisions relating to the conduct of hearings or inquiries by emergency boards as provided in section 208 of this title are hereby made applicable to any such hearing or inquiry. The members of compensation boards shall be appointed and compensated in accordance with the provisions of section 208 of this title.

"(2) Upon appointing such compensation board the President shall make provision as may be necessary for stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the compensation board to perform its functions.

"(3) The award of the compensation board shall be final and binding, unless within 30 days after the issuance of said award, a party moves to have the said award set aside or modified in the United States Court of Claims in accordance with the rules of said court.

"SEC. 210. When a dispute arising under this title has been finally settled, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of all the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make."

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective upon its enactment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the text of the report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the bill, as that report was submitted at the last session of Congress.

There being no objection, the report (No. 2073, 82d Cong., 2d sess.) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2999) to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments, and recommends that the bill, as reported, do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill is designed to provide the Government with a comprehensive and flexible plan for averting stoppages of work and operations resulting from labor disputes which may shut off supplies or services essential to the national security and for contributing to their settlement. This bill would supplement not supplant the present provisions of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act.[1]

As reported, this bill is the outgrowth of extensive hearings in which testimony was sought and procured from outstanding Government, labor, and business leaders and others with rich experience in industrial relations. Four separate and comprehensive revisions of the bill were made before the committee was satisfied that it was ready for reporting.

It provides for—

(1) The issuance of a Presidential proclamation when a labor dispute threatens to create a national emergency;

(2) Recommendations by the President for continuance of production and settlement of the dispute;

(3) Emergency boards to hear the disputants and recommend terms of settlement;

(4) Seizure by Executive order subject to congressional veto by concurrent resolution within 10 days of a seizure order;

[1] As introduced in the 83d Cong. by Senator MORSE, the bill would eliminate the present emergency dispute provisions and substitute a new and different plan.

(5) Termination of seizure within 60 days of an order unless continued by concurrent resolution;

(6) Changes in wages, hours, and working conditions during seizure within the limits of recommendations of the emergency board;

(7) No change in union security that exceeds maintenance-of-membership without consent of parties during Government operation;

(8) Continued production during Government operation;

(9) Just compensation to owners of enterprises of which possession is taken; and

(10) A compensation board to determine just compensation for which some standards are prescribed; its award would be appealable to the Court of Claims.

It should be emphasized at this point that this enumeration does not set forth a static procedure or timetable. As more fully described under "Analysis of the bill," the various provisions can be used singly or in conjunction with variations in timing as the particular occasion demands.

A POLICY FOR NATIONAL EMERGENCY DISPUTES

Under the Wagner Act the keystone of national labor policy was the encouragement of collective bargaining. The process of collective bargining serves to substitute the exchange of ideas and propositions for outright contests of economic strength over inflexible alternatives. The presentation of grievances, ideas, and arguments by both unions and managements help create an area of understanding. Within the area of remaining disagreement, trading, and partial concessions, agreements to reopen questions and the like have made possible contracts acceptable to the parties.

An integral part of the collective-bargaining process is the right to disagree. In the normal case, each side has an ultimate sanction to enforce its will or to exact concessions. For labor, it is the right to strike. For management, it is the right to refuse improvements, to insist upon the status quo until agreement is reached.[1]

Labor and management alike have endorsed these principles and the Wagner Act embodied them.

These factors are the purported basic principles of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, which states, in part:

"Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest, by encouraging practices fundamental to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees.

* * * * *

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining * * *."

In the normal situation, labor disputes and the right to strike fulfill a healthy purpose. They lead to agreements upon terms which the parties are willing to accept after the exhaustion, if necessary, of all legal means of compelling acceptance or concession from the other side.

In our resilient economy most such disputes, even when they interrupt production and services, do not unduly inconvenience the public at large. The very availability of the right to strike and the right to withhold improvements tends to minimize such disruptions.

In peacetime, absent severe economic dislocations such as a depression, there are practically no work stoppages which would create hardships so extreme as to constitute a national emergency. As an example, a widespread stoppage of some substantial duration on the railroads would create critical shortages of civilian goods sufficient to result in such an emergency. A short strike would usually not be of emergency proportions because most communities have some reserve supplies of food, fuel, and other necessary consumer and industrial commodities. Stoppages confined to a few cities or a region would not reach serious proportions, particularly if only of short duration. Where only a limited area is affected, alternate methods of transportation can counteract the results of a brief railroad tieup and alleviate those of a moderately extended one.

Few industrial stoppages, even if in basic industries and of substantial length, have a profound effect upon national stability or well-being. For example, a coal strike usually does not have an immediate effect upon industrial production or home-fuel supplies. In this industry, there is usually a substantial stockpile above ground, and strikes have amost always been settled when reserves dwindle to the near-danger point. Recent coal strikes which evoked substantial public reaction have all occurred in a crisis period.

Stoppages in local public utilities may have a sharper effect upon a given locality and may more quickly jeopardize vital community services and activities. However threatening such situations may become, and they usually have been settled before serious damage results, they do not have an impact beyond a relatively small area and hence cannot be regarded as national emergencies.

1. THE NATURE OF EMERGENCY DISPUTES

It is recognized, however, that war, the threat of war, and conversion from a war economy create national and international emergencies.

In such periods, there are some few major or critical disputes which can cripple or seriously endanger the economy and security of the Nation. It has not been sufficiently recognized that it is the existence of an "emergency" that has converted such labor disputes into national-emergency disputes. The threat of stoppage cannot of itself result in an emergency but can only give rise to apprehension of one.

Even a major labor dispute in a time of emergency will not necessarily create critical national hardship if it erupts into a stoppage of work or production. Other factors, such as the stockpile of materials and alternative supplies and services, may mitigate the effects of an actual strike so as to enable the Nation to endure it without serious consequences. Most stoppages do not have the immediate effect of sharpening an existing emergency to the point at which the national security is imperiled.

A comparatively rare combination of circumstances operates to produce a situation in which a work stoppage imperils the national security. Section 211 of the bill was rewritten so as to make clear that it would be applicable only in cases of extreme emergency and critical danger. Only a very few labor disputes have the potential effect of rendering the Nation helpless or seriously weakened in combating some external threat or internal crisis.

One of the principal procedures made available by the bill, Government possession and operation of private enterprises, is an extreme remedy. The committee was reluctant to recommend its use and recognizes that it has serious potentialities for abuse. However, there are situations of such gravity and urgency that seizure must be available for the preservation of the national security. Only under such circumstances would we sanction its use, and then only with the safeguards provided by this bill.

The frequency and ease with which injunctions have been issued in recent years has tended to insensitize many to the inappropriateness of injunctions in labor relations. They engender resentment and disrupt relationships as they become more common. Their prohibitions are expanded. Unions have bitter experience that injunctions are antiunion weapons which have been used oppressively. With great reluctance, however, we included a provision for preventing stoppages during Government operation in the interest of national security.

When national security is imperiled by a stoppage in a critical enterprise or plant, it is obvious that the usual prerogatives of labor and management must yield to overriding public needs. In such circumstances, a stoppage must be averted or terminated without recourse to the normal means of resolution.

It must be recognized that in such situations the parties to a dispute do not operate under the same pressures which are conducive to collective bargaining. On the other hand, public opinion is averse to a strike. This severely limits a union's bargaining power and thereby strengthens management's ability to resist union demands. Complete implacability on the part of management may also result in adverse public reaction, but its translation into pressure upon employers is more difficult to achieve.

It takes two, at least, to make a strike. Both union and management must disagree before a labor dispute will, or threaten to, erupt into a stoppage. At such a time, some set of forces must serve as a substitute for the stresses which foster collective bargaining. Both sets of parties must be subject to pressures which impel them to bargain and to settle. Whatever device or set of devices is to be used, it must operate upon both parties with equal force. Neither side can be given an advantage or possibility of preferred position which will encourage action designed to precipitate Government intervention rather than to avoid it. The procedure must be capable of immediate and effective application and also provide safeguards against abuse.

S. 2999 is designed to meet this problem of national emergency disputes (1) with expedition, (2) with a minimum of interference with the parties, (3) by making Government intervention onerous and yet maintaining a maximum of fairness to all disputants, and (4) with the double aim of maintaining critical production and services and the resolution of disputes through collective bargaining.

2. THE METHOD OF S. 2999; A COMPARISON WITH TAFT-HARTLEY PROVISIONS

The present provisions of title II of the Taft-Hartley Act have two basic shortcomings: one-sidedness and inflexibility. An injunction against strikes operates only against the union disputant. This device weakens the collective-bargaining position of a labor organization only. The net effect of this is to encourage an employer not to bargain to the same extent that he would if he were faced with the normal sanction of the strike. Nothing in the act now replaces the strike so as to insure employer bargaining.

It is contended that the 80-day injunction period is a cooling-off period. But, the 60-day notice provision of section 8 (d) is supposedly designed to operate as a cooling-off period during which the parties must bargain without resort to strike. Supposedly this is balanced off by a prohibition against lockouts for the 60 days. However, the lockout is not a practical economic weapon in a nondeflationary period, for an employer can obtain continued production on the terms and conditions existing when demands for a new or modified contract are made. In a

[1] The employer has the additional right to hire permanent replacements for economic strikers.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

time of increased living costs, an employer needs no more than this ability to continue production under existing wage rates. A ban on lockouts would only be significant in a deflationary period when there is need for and some feasibility of reducing labor rates. Such a period cannot be expected to exist during a time of emergency, which has always been characterized by inflationary tendencies.

Apparently the injunction is considered by some to be a sure means of averting a work stoppage. That certainty is illusory. The present Taft-Hartley procedure is cumbersome and slow.

It begins with the appointment of a board of inquiry which reports the facts and contentions of the parties. Not until the report is issued can the President instruct the Attorney General to apply for an injunction. And then a district court must make independent findings that the injunction should issue. This procedure is totally inappropriate to situations in which uninterrupted work is imperative. For example, any stoppage in the basic steel industry is expanded into the loss of several days' or weeks' production because of the length of time required to reheat furnaces and reestablish full operation.[3]

In comparison, S. 2999 permits seizure and injunction, if necessary, practically simultaneously with a Presidential proclamation of emergency. If such speed is not required the President can begin with the proclamation and follow with seizure and injunction at any moment when the urgency of the situation dictates.

On the record of Taft-Hartley in operation it is clear that the injunctions delay and discourage bargaining.

In the 1948 report of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service it was observed that—

"Provision for an 80-day period of continued operations, under injunctive order of a court, tends to delay rather than facilitate settlement of a dispute. Parties unable to resolve the issues facing them before a deadline date, when subject to an injunction order, tend to lose a sense of urgency and to relax their efforts. In most instances efforts of the Service to encourage the parties to bargain during the injunction period, with a view to early settlement, fall on deaf ears."

As a matter of experience bargaining usually resumes toward the end of the injunction period.

The fixity of the present emergency procedure makes Government action so predictable as to enable a party to gage the advantages of precipitating the statutory procedure. Moreover, the end point of the Taft-Hartley injunction procedure is the employee ballot on the employer last offer. It has been observed that employers tend to make that offer lower than the real offer which it would finally make to procure settlement. The procedure encourages an employer to keep some improvement in reserve.

Bargaining is certainly not encouraged by the present law and probably is discouraged by it.

Nor is public opinion brought to bear upon the disputants. The Taft-Hartley board of inquiry makes no recommendations which might become the focus of public opinion. That board only reports the problems and positions of the parties. Those reports have received little publicity and are not an effective means of mobilizing public opinion.

S. 2999 provides for an emergency board which investigates and makes recommendations. In this respect, the measures proposed by Senators MAYBANK,[4] MONRONEY,[5] and CASE[6] are the same.

The procedure provided by S. 2999 is initiated by a Presidential proclamation which describes the emergency and the dispute and calls upon the parties to continue work and operations. At this stage the President by informal means may persuade the parties to settle or at least continue operations while negotiating.

This might be an effective means of procuring continued production, which would only be possible if both parties are satisfied that the other is bargaining. When the proclamation is issued, the President need only report to Congress. No other formal action is necessary. He can appoint a board or hold off. He might seize and procure an injunction if a stoppage is imminent. The parties could not be sure. At each step they would probably be desirous of averting additional Government action.

Under present provisions, the President, once he starts, cannot stop. The law provides a timetable for the parties to read and count upon. To a lesser extent the other proposals under consideration by the committee share this defect of inflexibility.[7]

The present law requires employees to labor under conditions which cannot be altered for the period of the injunction. Other proposals have essentially the same feature.

It would be unjust to compel workers to continue at work solely for the public good and at the same time visit upon them the sole burden of continuation. The bill provides for limited adjustment of wages and working conditions. As pointed out under the later analysis, even such changes would not be possible absent recommendations from an emergency board, whose appointment is not mandatory. It is to be expected that any increase granted would be calculated to maintain pressure upon the union disputant to bargain and settle. These factors of uncertainty would encourage a union to avoid Government intervention. But, at the same time, employers would have similar causes to seek voluntary resolution of the dispute rather than surrender to the uncertainties of Government action.

The prospect of Board recommendations would lead both parties to attempt to agree on terms before the Board recommends a settlement which might interfere with the realization of their aims.

Employers for their part would be faced with the loss of control of their enterprise if seizure is decided upon. This pressure is slight, for seizure alone is normally nominal and does not affect revenue or profits. Indeed, it insures continued operations. But, the bill provides a formula for ascertaining just compensation for any seizure which lasts longer than 30 days. These criteria might very well reduce profits. To what extent that would happen could only be known after seizure is ended. This feature would operate as a strong inducement to bargaining and discouragement of inviting Government intervention.

The bill guarantees active participation by both Congress and the Executive.

Other measures proposed either omit this type of provision or are not sufficiently strong in so providing. In a true national emergency the full prestige and powers of the Presidency and Congress should be brought to bear. This focuses the attention of the public and the parties upon the gravity of the situation. Public scrutiny will tend to insure responsible action by both management and labor. The fact that the principal agencies of Government take an immediate concern in the dispute will stimulate public interest in the conduct of the parties and in any recommendations issued by an emergency board.

Both the President and Congress will share responsibility for the role Government plays in the dispute. This will stimulate cooperation, minimize mere partisan debate, and lend prestige to any official action taken. By insuring the mobilization of both executive and legislature, the parties will labor under additional uncertainties as to what form Government intervention will take. Uncertainty as to what action will eventuate and whether it will be favorable or unfavorable to either party will create additional incentives to both parties to settle. Irresponsible action by a party will be inhibited by the fear that the governmental and public reaction will be translated into measures unfavorable to that disputant.

This flexibility and adaptability of official process is in sharp contrast to currently available procedures under which the parties can anticipate what the Government will do and how their interests will be affected.

The bill combines expedition, flexibility, fairness, and safeguards against abuse. It provides that the full prestige and authority of both the President and Congress will be brought to bear so as to assure necessary production and resolution of the dispute. S. 2999 is designed to secure settlements by making Government intervention undesirable without being oppressive. Emphasis is placed upon reinvigorating collective bargaining rather than authoritarian compulsion. These factors, we believe, represent a balanced policy for national emergency disputes.

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS

In the last few decades, whenever public attention has focused upon labor problems, there has been a revival of three basic proposals, each with innumerable variations. They are: (1) compulsory arbitration; (2) a ban on so-called industrywide bargaining; and (3) subjecting unions to the antitrust laws. The latest manifestations of these proposals have been considered by the committee.

1. Compulsory arbitration

When parties to a labor dispute fail to agree, it is proposed, "agreement" should be imposed upon them by a third party, the Government. Such a plan implies a total lack of faith in any alternative method of stimulating the parties to agreement.

As indicated earlier in this report, collective bargaining is believed to be efficacious because it tends to create understanding between labor and management and satisfies the parties that they have done as well as their economic position enabled them to do. In emergency situations the normal sanctions available to labor and management are not so readily available or are delimited in some way by law. Normal inducements to bargain are absent or diminished.

To the extent that it is possible, it seems desirable to encourage bargaining by the substitution of some new set of pressures for those normally brought to bear.

Under a scheme of compulsory arbitration, and more specifically S. 3322, the primary substitute is an imposed settlement. This specific proposal would begin with a board which investigates and makes recommendation within 30 days. When the board reaches a decision, its formula is to be observed by the parties for 120 days.

This plan is not susceptible of any variation to meet the needs of different situations. It is a blueprint of such certainty and definiteness that the parties will know what to expect. Actually the principal incentive for agreement is the uncertainty

[3] In 9 cases under these provisions 7 injunctions were issued. The time elapsed from appointment of the board of inquiry to issuance of an injunction was 14, 11, 11, 4, 5, and 6 days. The average elapsed time was 8 days.

[4] S. 2594, 82d Cong., amendment June 4, 1952–C; S. 3233 has the same substantive provisions.

[5] S. 2594, 82d Cong., amendment June 4, 1952–D.

[6] S. 2594, 82d Cong., amendment June 5, 1952–A; S. 3322 has the same substantive provisions.

[7] The comments on "other proposals" do not apply to the other bill applicable only to the current steel dispute which the committee is reporting at this time.

which precedes the board's report. However, both sides may tend to feel that it can do better or strengthen its position by getting a report than by agreeing in advance.

Once the report is issued there are two principal alternatives. The parties may be so impressed with the fairness and advantageousness of the Board's report as to accept it. It would be unduly cynical to rule out this possibility entirely. But, it would be exceptionally naive to expect this to occur with any frequency.

More often than not the recommendations will be viewed by the parties as more favorable to one than the other. Under the circumstances the party favored will settle for only the recommendations or a formula substantially like it. The alternative is the imposition of the entire package. Little effective bargaining can be expected.

The apparent choice between agreement or the imposition of the "suggestions" is close to nonexistent.

The period of mandatory "acceptance" is circumscribed. While the prescribed conditions are in force the parties may find them less distasteful than they thought. This is more likely in the case of noneconomic issues, e. g., form of grievance procedure or the check-off. Acquaintanceship will not breed affection on economic issues, the effects of which the parties can anticipate with fair accuracy.

The committee believes that this proposal, and others like it for labor courts and permanent Government arbitral bodies, would be totally inconsistent with our industrial institutions and would fail in their purpose.

Even less area for choice and bargaining would be left the parties under this measure than it indicates. That itself is too little. It is true that in the area of negotiations whose disruption may develop into what is regarded as a national emergency dispute there is bound to be some governmental interference.

We earnestly believe that governmental interference should be at a minimum so that the terms on which a dispute is settled approximates what the parties would have done for themselves under normal conditions. This maximizes the acceptability of the outcome, thereby providing a measure of stability to the relationship.

S. 3322 places reliance on the one factor of compulsion. If it fails to achieve agreement by that single force—the procedure is at an end and the dispute and potential disruption remain.

The history of industrial relations in this country is in total opposition to compulsory arbitration. Few if any principles evoke the same unity and degree of opposition from both labor and management. It can hardly flourish in such hostile soil.

A lesson is to be learned from countries, such as Australia, which have used compulsory arbitration in labor disputes. Initial use of this procedure shows a tendency to expand so that what is initially used for a limited class of cases is gradually applied to all. Not only does the Government set wages, hours, and working conditions for a few key plants or industries, it proceeds with mandatory measures in all labor relations. This has led to price fixing and minute supervision of business. What has been described has become the standard operational procedure even in peacetime. The extent and subjects of control far exceed what this country has tolerated in the midst of war.

Government regulation, the setting of standards of conduct, as this country has known it for several decades has been confined to limiting excesses of conduct. This is a far different thing from Government control which is plenary and intimate. Any measures which have been proven to contribute to such a climax must be rejected as incompatible with our free system.

S. 3222 provides that the plan it embodies will come into operation only after the present provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have been exhausted. It thereby is susceptible to the same objections as the Taft-Hartley prescription.

2. Ban on industrywide bargaining

A ban on industrywide bargaining is a chimerical cure for a fictional condition.

This recommended proscription was suggested, without the specification of details, by the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and a vice president of the United States Steel Corp.

Legislative proposals allegedly designed to accomplish this end now and in the past are directed not to industrywide bargaining but multiemployer bargaining.

Industrywide bargaining is susceptible of two meaningful definitions. It may mean bargaining by all of the employers simultaneously or by a common representative with a labor organization. (In our economy this concept has never been extended to bargaining by such a group with the union representatives of all of their employees.) Even this limited "industrywide" bargaining does not exist.

It may be stated categorically that in no industry do all of the employers, or even the overwhelming majority, bargain as a group. In the coal industry there is the division among anthracite and bituminous and northern and southern operators. The automobile, packinghouse, rubber, oil, and steel producers bargain either individually or in groups which are far less comprehensive than the whole industry involved.

Another possible definition is bargaining by a dominant individual company or group with the results accepted or followed in substantially the same form by the smaller companies in an industry. Apparently this is the conception many have of what takes place in the steel industry. As a vice president of United States Steel observed, the 1950 steel "settlement" had unequal effect on various companies. It is a matter of record that the steel strike over pensions in 1949 was settled, company by company, on different terms. And the first to settle were not the mammoth "leaders," but a few medium-size concerns.

There are certain patterns of wage setting tending toward uniformity which cannot be reached by legislation of this sort. Just as there is price "leadership" there is wage leadership. This phenomenon may occur within an industry. Quite commonly it is prevalent in communities in which there is one or a few dominant enterprises, which set wage standards even in businesses which are totally dissimilar. These economic patterns have developed and continue without regard to whether the leaders or followers are unionized.

It may be true that a national union or locals are unwilling to accept substantially less from one company than a competitor of that company agreed to. Similarly, employers are loath to exceed what has been granted by competitors. In practice any equivalence which does result is approximate only and may take different forms, with shift differentials substituting for paid holidays and the like.

The argument in favor of this legislation is cast in the following terms: If there is no industrywide bargaining there cannot be industrywide strikes. The absence of industrywide bargaining demonstrates that this argument is incorrect. A recent occurrence points the error. The petroleum industry has resisted even multiemployer bargaining so that at least 200 major companies bargain individually. Yet, within the past few months there was a group of simultaneous strikes which shut down almost all of these operators. Interestingly, after the Wage Stabilization Board announced the limits for a settlement for one employer, all of the remaining employers settled on essentially the same terms.

Under existing law the individual employer has the sole option of bargaining alone or in combination with other employers. He may enter or leave such a group at any time that a new contract can be negotiated. Section 8 (b) (1) (B) of the National Labor Relations Act makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to restrain or coerce an employer in his choice of a bargaining agent. Section 8 (b) (4) (A) makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to strike or to engage in a secondary boycott to force an employer to join an association.

It is quite clear that multiemployer bargaining frequently is the choice of employers particularly among smaller enterprises. Understandably so. Such bargaining provides protection against strikes while competitors are in operation which would subject employers to "whipsawing." Obviously a nonstruck employer can achieve important business advantages while competitors are shut down.

Of course, multiemployer bargaining is often desirable to unions because it tends to establish uniform standards. The economy has a legitimate interest in this result also. Usually it is highly desirable. In most cases, even where there is group bargaining there is some individual bargaining to resolve special problems peculiar to an individual employer. Indeed, most multiemployer agreements provide for such additional terms.

Multiemployer bargaining is often desirable to unions because it tends to set uniform standards, with respect to wages, hours, and working conditions. But this is desirable as well to the employer who pays decent wages and who feels he should not suffer competitively because he does not exploit his employees. The principle of uniform minimum standards has been recognized in public policy too through the enactment of minimum wage and hours laws. In effect this public policy says: Competition is fine but it ought not to extend to the point where workers are paid below what is required to maintain a minimum standard of health and decency.

In point of fact there is abundant evidence to prove that even where multiemployer bargaining prevails, there are wide variations in earnings. These variations are due to differences in workers output in managerial efficiency none of which are seriously affected by multiemployer bargaining.

Yet, the sole legislative proposals made today (H. R. 7697 and 7698) which were introduced in May 1952 would set stringent limits upon permissible bargaining. They would limit bargaining to single employers and local unions except that two or more employers could bargain together if their installations were within a metropolitan area, and the employees involved would be fewer than 500.*

Proposals of this sort normally include a ban upon direction of or participation in negotiations by parent unions or cooperation among locals. Funds of one union, even with the same international could not be used to assist another striking local.

Those who proposed this legislation strangely do not urge concomitant action to cure the curse of bigness in industry.

---

*Needless to say serious complications could arise in administering such a provision. For instance, 3 employers in the proper area execute a 2-year contract. At the time of execution they have a total of 350 employees. One's operations expand so as to bring the total of all to 550 after about 6 months under the agreement. The contract contains an exclusive recognition clause and also a union-security clause. The validity of each clause depends upon the appropriateness of the unit covered by the contract. Do employers and unions become guilty of unfair labor practices as the 501st employee is hired and/or do the contracts become unenforceable?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

For if big unions cause large conflicts, doesn't it follow that big enterprises also contain the roots of large and serious industrial upheavals? The statement of the proposition demonstrates the mere formalism of schemes of this sort. Large-scale industrial enterprise is one of the bastions of American strength. So also is well-developed free unionism an integral and healthy part of our industrial and economic democracy.

We can only deduce that when put forward as a solution for emergency disputes a ban upon industrywide bargaining is a meaningless slogan. Apparently it is designed by some to have popular appeal because it superficially seems to contain a plausible solution. This scheme can only result in the atomization of unions and the isolation of locals to the detriment of labor's bargaining power and to the extinction of many unions.

The proposals to ban industrywide bargaining in the present context suffer from several serious defects. First of all the effect of these proposals on minimizing emergency disputes is remote and highly speculative. Second, the only concrete result of such a ban would be to weaken the bargaining power of unions. Third, the proposals would substitute a Government dictum for collective bargaining. Under Government intervention is unjustifiable because no showing has been made that multiemployer bargaining is generally harmful to the public interest. The weight of the evidence suggests on the contrary that it has frequently stabilized labor-management relations in what would otherwise be chaotic situations.

3. Application of the antitrust laws to labor organizations

Proposals to subject unions to the antitrust laws take many forms. They vary from a simple statement that the antitrust laws shall apply to comprehensive definitions of what combinations and objectives of unions shall be unlawful. The antitrust statutes provide for injunctions and treble damage suits.

The stated basis for proposals of this type is the contention that unions have grown too large and are monopolizing the labor supply. What then could be more reasonable, it is argued, than to restrict union monopolies in the same fashion as business combinations?

Whatever cogency this argument has is on the surface. It ignores entirely the basic and important differences between business and union organizations and the economic purposes and results of their activities.

First, it should be observed that that is no evidence that big unionism is responsible for difficult labor disputes. There is an implicit assumption, without proof of any kind, that small unions tend to act more responsibly than large unions. There is no doubt that some business interests find it advantageous to deal with small and weak unions.

Apparently there is an attempt to analogize business competition to union competition, despite the fact that present labor legislation seeks to minimize union competition, e. g., section 8 (b) (4) (D) of the Taft-Hartley Act which supposedly controls jurisdictional disputes. The proponents of this plan do not stress the desirability of union competition despite the fact that the preservation of competition is the keystone of the antitrust laws.

In passing, we would note that the antitrust laws are generally considered to be a very incomplete answer to the problem of business combination in restraint of trade. At best, they operate to discourage blatant price fixing, market sharing, and other obvious practices. No claim is made that these statutes effectively preserve competition or impede its elimination.

Even with these shortcomings, the courts have held that the Sherman Act was declaratory of common law on restraints of trade so that its general terms were given content and meaning. At that, the administration of the act and those which amended it, has been marked by litigation and uncertainty.

How much more complicated it will be to seek to apply these measures to unions when there is an almost complete lack of precedent to give significance to the very general language of the Sherman Act in this new context.

The courts have been able to impose the sanctions of those laws to unions when it is found that they are not acting for union objectives, but combine with employers for the purpose of excluding sellers from a market and price fixing, e. g., *Allen-Bradley Co. v. Local Union No. 3, IBEW* (325 U. S. 797 (1945)). This demonstrates that when unions go beyond their legitimate functions in the opinion of the courts, legal sanctions will be inflicted. This is not to imply that the holding of the cited case was precisely correct in the opinion of the committee. We only point out that the courts will act against what they deem union action that exceeds normal trade-union purposes.

What is the nature of the alleged labor monopoly? Unions do not control the labor supply. They do not agree to provide given numbers of employees on definite terms. Even under the closed shop this was so. The outlawing of the closed shop made it all the more clear that unions do not manipulate pools of labor—withholding or granting units of labor in an effort to exploit the laws of supply and demand.

Nor are the characteristics of prices and wages the same or similar. Most prices fluctuate with cost and market conditions. This variability is totally inappropriate to wages and is not to be found. Workers must have some idea of their income. And, indeed, employers must have certainty about their labor costs.

And of course unions cannot set wages unilaterally in the way that an enterprise or group of enterprises in a monopolistic position sets prices. A union must bargain on wages. A business enterprise if it is in a sufficiently strong position can simply announce prices.

It may be argued that a ban on cooperation among locals and their international unions would tend to eliminate uniformity of wage rates in industries or local areas. As any student of wages knows, infinite variations in rates and methods of computing wages is typical of American industry. This is all the more true because of the relative lack of standardization of job content.

Within a few industries there may be some uniformity of jobs and rates. This uniformity, it may be contended, penalizes the efficient producer and bolsters the laggard. A significant segment of American labor believes that competition in wage rates is undesirable as it tends to depress wages in bad times or is disruptive in inflationary periods as employers bid against one another for scarce labor. It is urged that the more efficient producers must rely upon their superior utilization of workers and other nonwage factors to gain competitive advantage. The committee finds merit in this view.

We have no alternative but to look upon the arguments in favor of applying antitrust laws as spurious. The necessary effect of such legislation would be to create doubt and uncertainty. In the field of labor-management relations such a condition leads to strife as parties attempt to exploit that uncertainty. They tend to construe ambiguous unclear laws so as to be most advantageous to themselves and press for their interpretation until some authoritative body rules against them. Until that happens the process of collective bargaining is wrecked or seriously impaired.

The application of the "antitrust" provisions of S. 3158 or H. R. 9697 or 9698, particularly the latter, would plunge the labor movement of the United States into a total war of law suits. These measures clearly favor employers and would encourage employer resistance to union demands whenever the law seemed to offer a means of defeating them. Such predictions are not fanciful. The 5 years of the Taft-Hartley Act, which is replete with ambiguities, has demonstrated that employers tend to litigate first and bargain later, if it is still necessary to do so.

If labor legislation is designed to eliminate strife by eliminating or at least subjugating unions, H. R. 9697 and 9698 are admirable means.

This committee believes that employers, employees, and the public at large will be benefited by a calmer attempt to encourage collective bargaining. We do not counsel forging new weapons for one side or the other. To do so is to encourage tests of strength and weapons.

THE CURRENT STEEL DISPUTE—A CASE IN POINT

At this moment most of the basic steel industry is shut down by a strike. The controversy which gave rise to the strike first began in November 1951, almost 8 months ago. The length of this labor dispute, its severity and potentially grave consequences point to the necessity of a plan to deal with dislocations of this type, which, though rare, are formidable and dangerous.

The history of this dispute demonstrates the difficulty of considering legislation of general application in the broil of a current dispute. At the same time, it is fairly clear that the basic problems involved will not be given serious attention in the absence of compelling need.

In December 1950, the principal producers of steel and the United Steelworkers of American (CIO) agreed upon a wage increase of about 16 cents an hour pursuant to a wage reopening clause of then current contracts.[9]

At the end of January 1951 the newly constituted Economic Stabilization Agency and its Wage Stabilization Board "froze" wage rates as of January 25, 1951, and thereafter issued a series of regulations which modified the freeze in limited fashion. The regulations consisted of formulas beyond which wages and other compensation could not be adjusted.

On December 31, 1951, the collective-bargaining agreements in the basic steel industry were to expire. In conformity with the 60-day notice provisions of section 8 (d) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the USW (CIO) gave notice at the end of October 1951 of a desire to negotiate a new agreement.

Negotiations were slow in getting under way. The union, after informal approaches to the companies, presented its demands for new rates and conditions to the United States Steel Co. in early December. That company indicated a desire to study the demands, but made no counteroffer.

The union voted to strike at midnight December 31, 1951, when the contract was to end. On December 22, the President of the United States referred the dispute to the Wage Stabilization Board pursuant to Executive Orders 10161 and 10233. This was not the first dispute referred to the Board by the President. In addition to cases certified by the President the Board had accepted dispute cases voluntarily submitted by the parties. The latter type involved a commitment that the parties would be bound by the Board's decision. Cases certified by the President result in recommendations only. There was widespread public confusion on this point, due, in large part, to steel company literature and advertisements protesting the possible imposition of the union shop by the WSB.

In response to the President's request to defer the strike during the period of WSB consideration of the case, the union post-

[9] The actual increase varied from company to company—16 cents was the approximate average increase.

poned it for a fixed time. It also put off the strike deadline twice thereafter to permit the Board to conclude its hearings and deliberations.

As dozens of companies were involved in the dispute, they combined for purposes of presenting their case to the Board. They established common headquarters in New York.

The Board appointed a 6-man tripartite panel to hear the parties present their case. Some 20 subjects were in dispute which could be further subdivided so that a total of about 100 issues was before the Board. Chief among these were a general wage increase, holiday pay, shift differential pay, Sunday pay, and union security.

The parties were heard over a period of many weeks. Some issues were withdrawn by agreement of the parties during the hearing. The panel summarized the contentions of the parties and the factual material submitted. This report was submitted to the WSB without recommendations.

The Board after considering the report and the record issued its recommendations on March 20, 1952.

Of the twenty-odd major issues involved, the Board's recommendations rejected 3 union demands in toto, suggested that the parties attempt to negotiate on 10, and contained affirmative proposals on those remaining. In no instance did the Board recommend the granting of a union demand in full.

The merits of the various emergency disputes bills have been considered against the background of the steel dispute. In fact, during 6 days of hearings, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee heard from authoritative spokesmen of all of the parties at interest in that dispute.

To the extent that the steel dispute provides us with a case history of an emergency dispute, it is important that the committee appraise some of the controversial aspects of that dispute.

One finding which the committee will not make, nor do we deem it necessary that it be made at all, is whether the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board in the steel dispute were the best recommendations which could have been appropriately made. This committee will not constitute itself as a tribunal to re-assess the facts and to remake recommendations. We do believe, however, from the extensive record before us that procedures followed in this dispute and the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board were not unreasonable. The reasons for this judgment we set forth in summary form below:

(1) The allegedly unstabilizing effect of the Board's recommendations: There was not a single fact brought to our attention in the course of these extensive hearings which demonstrated in a convincing manner that the Board's recommendations, if put into effect, would be unstabilizing. There were, to be sure, sharp differences of opinions on the methods of making wage comparisons. This is no more than should be expected from an aggrieved party. The argument that the Board's recommendations would be unstabilizing was based principally upon the contention that they exceeded what was permissible under existing regulations. This contention was not substantiated and we feel that the Board, after hearing proof and argument from all parties in interest, is in the best position to determine what its own regulations allow.

(2) Price and wage controls: A settlement of this dispute was made infinitely more difficult by the existence of price and wage controls. If price and wage controls had not been in operation, a settlement by the parties on their own power would have come forth more easily. In this case even if the parties had been able to conclude a bargain they would have had no certainty that their agreement was permissible under stabilization policies. More than that, the bargaining process was complicated by the differing contentions of the parties as to whether various demands made by the union were allowable under stabilization regulations. The record before the Board shows that this was a potent force operating against private bargaining. But these controls had been established by Congress on the conviction that they were essential to maintain economic stability and conformity to them was indispensable to a final agreement.

(3) Price bargaining: Ostensibly the union and managements were bargaining over wages. Actually the outcome of the bargaining between union and managements had to wait on the outcome of a more crucial bargain—the bargain between the Government and the industry with respect to the price of steel. Here again, an element of stabilization policy complicated bargaining. It is clear as this report is being written that no bargain can be concluded until the price bargain is finally determined.

(4) The disputes functions of the Wage Stabilization Board: There is nothing in the record which effectively contradicts the conclusion that the Wage Stabilization Board has been able generally to discharge the disputes authority granted it in a capable manner. If the test of effective administration of the disputes function is the avoidance of strikes, then the Wage Stabilization Board must be accounted successful in every case which it handled except the steel dispute. And even in the steel case the President of the United States was successful in holding back a strike through the voluntary acquiescence of the union for 100 days, or 20 days more than the statutory Taft-Hartley period, on the inducement that there existed a Government tribunal with authority to recommend a settlement.

(5) The union-shop recommendation: There is no question that the union shop is a proper subject of collective bargaining between union and management and is consistent with public policy. The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as later amended to make the union shop easier to negotiate by eliminating the requirement for a union-shop-authorization election, the amendment to the Railway Labor Act legalizing the union shop in railroad union-management agreements, all suggest that the union shop is proper if the parties want it.

The issue in the steel dispute is much narrower than this, however. It is whether it is appropriate for a Government agency to recommend the union shop.

The majority of the committee felt that (a) the union-shop issue was within the framework of the dispute as submitted to it by the President of the United States under Executive Order No. 10233; (b) the public members initially proposed to the Board that the union shop should be referred back to the parties with the Board retaining jurisdiction if agreement were not reached. Industry members of the Board insisted that the Board recommend against the union-shop demand. The labor members insisted that the union shop be granted. Faced with these alternatives the public members accepted the labor members' alternative as the less unreasonable of the two.

Senator MORSE, however, feels that under no circumstances should the Government put its force behind a recommendation which he feels would have the effect of compelling union membership.

Much has been said to the effect that recommendations of the WSB in a dispute are tantamount to a compulsory arbitration. The successful rejection of the WSB's steel recommendations is concrete evidence of the difference between recommendations and compulsory arbitration.

(6) Tripartitism: It is difficult to see why this should have been an issue in the Wage Stabilization Board's handling of the steel dispute. There is nothing in the record to suggest that the recommendations would have been any better or any worse or that the recommendations would have been more acceptable if there had been an all-public board or a tripartite board weighted in favor of the public members. The plain fact is that the party to the dispute which feels it is aggrieved will always set up a clamor whether the recommendations emanate from a tripartite board or an all-public board.

(7) Alleged bias of public members: There is not a shred of credible evidence in this record which can be used to substantiate a bias on the part of the public members in favor of labor. Indeed, the most reprehensible aspect of this dispute has been the reflection which it was found necessary to cast upon the integrity of the public members in order to justify disagreement with the Board's recommendations. The malicious half-truth or half-lie that several of the public members had been on the payroll of a union cannot be sufficiently condemned. This allegation was based solely on the fact that some of the public members had been arbitrators in labor-management cases. One member is the impartial chairman of a board which decides jurisdictional disputes. Employers contribute to defraying the expenses of that board which performs a function of value to both unions and management in the industry concerned. Of course, an arbitrator who renders a decision in a voluntary arbitration case upon the voluntary request of the union and management involved is paid by the union, but he is also paid by management. It would be just as accurate or inaccurate to say that these same public members were on the payroll of industry, and, indeed, the president of a corporation who echoed this charge must know that his own corporation has participated in such arbitration arrangements.

The record before us compels the conclusion that the outpouring of propaganda and scare advertisements before, during, and after the Wage Stabilization Board's deliberations was not calculated to create an atmosphere in which the union and management could come to a settlement on their own. This propaganda, much of which was patently untrue, converted a labor-management dispute into a major social struggle. The processes of collective bargaining are difficult enough without the accompaniment of a hysterical chorus egging one of the parties on to battle.

The steel dispute has many meaningful implications for the handling of emergency disputes. The efficacy of any governmental plan for emergency disputes depends on the devoted service of people in public life. The barrage of invective which descended upon the public members of the Wage Stabilization Board has reduced the reservoir of people who will be willing to subject themselves to this sort of service. Those who do serve may be so cowed and intimidated that their usefulness is seriously impaired in any future dispute.

From the point of view of the unions the aftermath of the WSB recommendation has depreciated the value of public intervention. The conclusion can be drawn that any finding construed as favorable to a union can be discredited by an aggrieved party which has sufficient resources and persistence.

These are imponderables which no legislation can deal with. The best intentioned legislation will break down if one side or another feels that it can manipulate the results of Government intervention by tactics and stratagems which have nothing to do with the merits of the case.

We believe that S. 2999 as reported out of committee is an intelligent piece of legislation. It will be nullified, however, if the climate of opinion converts the disputes between unions and managements into titanic class conflicts.

This consideration imposes a responsibility on the opinion makers, which includes

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Congressmen and Senators, not to contribute to the creation of an environment which makes settlement on the merits impossible.

SUMMARY

Few problems which face the United States present greater challenges than that of national-emergency labor disputes. They must be treated so as to maximize the use of free institutions and the exercise of the rights of free men. To the extent that Government acts to ameliorate their consequences, that action should be designed to exploit and encourage the methods of a free society, not limit or extinguish them.

As in all matters, the Government must act in the interest of all with due respect and protection for the rights and well-being of minorities and individuals. It would be both indefensible and foolhardy to favor one class over another. The suppression of one dispute would then but breed others.

In the normal case free collective bargaining provides the healthiest and surest adjustments in labor-management relations. Overriding public-interest demands some limitation of the rights of unions and management to precipitate stoppages when serious impairment of the national security would result. We deem it the function of such limiting legislation to provide alternative pressures upon the parties to stimulate bargaining not inhibit it. Any legislative proposal must be so flexible that the parties to a dispute will not be able to anticipate the form and timing of Government intervention and turn it to partisan advantage. Pressure to bargain must operate equally upon the parties and not place the power or prestige of Government on either side. Expeditious action should be possible, coupled with safeguards against abuse.

We conscientiously feel that S. 2999 combines these desirable features.

As an alternative, compulsory arbitration is too greatly at odds with our free institutions to be feasible or desirable. Resort to compulsion is an index of exasperation and lack of faith in our traditional means of reaching social and economic adjustments. Such measures tend to overflow into related areas now free from regulation or in which only a minimum of control is now tolerated. There is no showing that such compulsion will contribute to the settlement of disputes after the Government steps out of the case, as the bill before us provides that it shall.

The second alternative of a ban upon industry-wide bargaining is unrealistic to the extent that the phenomenon does not exist. Current proposals would all but obliterate multi-employer bargaining which is the outgrowth, where it exists, of the economic needs of both business and unions. Most often it performs a useful function. No evidence has been offered to show a casual relationship between multiemployer bargaining and work stoppages which, because of the unsettled times in which they occur and the critical nature of the industry or plants affected, may adversely affect the national security.

Such a ban and application of the antitrust laws to unions seem primarily designed to weaken the bargaining power of labor organizations. Measures of this sort can hardly be expected to improve labor-management relations. Punitive legislation will only sharpen disagreement and create dangerous resentment. We find no merit in proposals which can only be construed as attempts to eliminate fights by tying a hand of one party behind his back.

The committee does not claim that this bill would solve all of the problems presented. We sought a means of strengthening the role of mediation and conciliation. This is a voluntary and informal process not susceptible of improvement by adding mandatory or formal features. We did not arrive at a method of improving mediation facilities or procedures. In any controversy mediation should be attempted and exhausted if possible before recourse to more formal procedures. The bill so provides. Beyond that we did not receive nor can we make further recommendations. This subject merits further consideration.

The committee earnestly believes that this measure represents the best compromise formula for permanent legislation that has been produced from bitter experience and widespread inquiry.

We recommend it as a fair measure for a free society.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1: Provides for the amendment of title II, the national emergency portion, of the Taft-Hartley Act, by inserting additional provisions as follows: [10]

Section 211: When the President finds that an actual or threatened strike or lockout in a vital industry or plant would create a national emergency by endangering the national security he shall issue a proclamation and call upon the parties to continue or resume work and operations.

Section 206 of the present Taft-Hartley Act applies to strikes and lockouts affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof so as to imperil the national health and safety. This new section would permit application of the new procedures to a unit smaller than a substantial part of an industry. This would meet the potential need of insuring production in one or a few plants producing critical items. On the other hand, it was intended that the provisions of the bill would not be readily available but should only be used in the most extreme and urgent situations. For this reason the terms "which affects the public interest" was replaced with "which seriously affects the security of the United States."

Section 212: [11] (a) Immediately upon issuing the proclamation, the President must inform Congress about the dispute. At that time or at any subsequent time he may make any recommendations for continuation of production and settlement of the dispute.

This provision was made mandatory rather than permissive as it was originally. The bill is designed to keep Congress informed at every step of the procedure and to have Congress share the responsibility for and authority to deal with the dispute.

(b) At any stage of the dispute, the President may recommend seizure of any enterprise or enterprises involved in the dispute. Originally, such a recommendation would be made only if there were an actual strike or lockout. It was deemed advisable to give the President sufficient authority to forestall any stoppage. This may be necessary in industries, such as steel, in which a slight interruption in production results in the loss of the production of many days or weeks because of technological factors. In addition, the President is not limited to a particular time or set of circumstances. He may seize before, immediately following, or a substantial time after a cessation of operations. The parties would not be able to count on any surely predictable action. If governmental action is predictable, parties will jockey to force action thought to be favorable to them. The removal or reduction of predictability is designed to remove or reduce such maneuvering. The uncertainty would tend to encourage settlements as the parties would not know in advance when or if they would be helped or hindered by Government action.

When the President recommends seizure he would have immediate authority to seize. But Congress would have 10 days from the submission of such a recommendation to it to veto or undo seizure. In its original form, the President could not seize until 5 days after making such a recommendation. Within that period Congress could have disapproved of the recommended seizure.

The committee feels that a congressional check upon seizure is desirable. However, it feels the amended version combines the desirable factors of speed of operation and congressional safeguard against what it believes improper seizure. Particularly in an industry such as steel, uninterrupted production is vital for the cooling of the furnaces results in the loss of weeks of full production.

If the Congress disapproves of the initial recommendation of seizure any later seizure in the same dispute would have to be authorized by concurrent resolution beforehand.

Although it can be expected that mediation and conciliation will be attempted throughout the dispute, the bill specifies that the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall continue to encourage settlement. At the suggestion of the Service's Director• provision making the "Emergency Board" available as a mediator was eliminated.

The Government operating agency would be empowered to change wages, hours, and working conditions only within the limits set by the Emergency Board's recommendations. Such changes could be partial and made at various stages of the dispute. Flexibility and uncertainty here would contribute to bargaining. A union would not know what to expect in such interim changes in terms and working conditions, which could vary from zero to 100 percent of the Board's recommendations. Note, however, that a Board need not be appointed in which case there would be a freeze for the period of seizure or until a Board was appointed and made recommendations. Employer parties to the dispute would not know what would be done at this juncture either. On both sides, pressure to settle would be generated.

The bill limits the extent to which changes in union security could be made during Government possession. No change in union security which goes beyond maintenance of membership [12] could be made during Government operation without the parties' consent (i. e., each employer and union affected—not all parties need agree in order to effect changes in some facilities). The language of this proviso is intended to make clear that in cases in which union security is an

---

[10] Existing provisions of title II would remain in effect. The additions provide a series of alternatives to such existing provisions. Present secs. 211 and 212 are merely renumbered as secs. 216 and 217, respectively. (NOTE.—The bill as introduced by Senator MORSE in the 83d Cong. would supplant existing provisions.)

[11] The change in sequence of sections within the bill has no substantive effect but was designed to put the steps provided by the bill in chronological order.

[12] Under this form of union security employees who are members of the union at the beginning of a contract period or who voluntarily join thereafter must maintain membership for the remainder of the contract term as a condition of continued employment. There are many variations on this basic theme. Many contracts provide for an escape period at the beginning or at some time during the contract term. Employees who resign during the specified escape period under no obligation to rejoin. This form is to be distinguished from union-shop contract provisions which require that all employees must be members of the union on or after a certain number of days following execution of the contract or the inception of employment as a condition of continued employment. Under present provisions of section 8 (a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act membership cannot be required of new employees until 30 days after they begin work. Loss of membership for any reason other than failure or refusal to tender initiation fees and dues uniformly required of all members may not be the basis for discharge under such agreements.

issue, other Board recommendations may be effectuated in whole or in part whether or not the conditions for a change in union-security terms are satisfied or not.

The original bill would have permitted changes in wages, hours, and conditions of employment in accordance with a concurrent resolution of Congress. It was concluded that the Congress would not be equipped for this type of task, which is close to adjudication, and the provision was eliminated.

Specific provision is made for the convening of the Congress or either House if adjourned sine die or for more than 3 days. In a sense, this is not necessary, because at the very outset of this procedure the President must submit a report to the Congress. In the original bill a report immediately after issuance of the proclamation was not mandatory. However, so as to leave no doubt that Congress must be in session during the threatened or actual emergency, this language was retained.

In the original bill it was provided that the Norris-LaGuardia Act was to apply to the United States while using the procedures outlined unless Congress by concurrent resolution provided otherwise in each case. In case of seizure this would have meant affirmative congressional action would be required as a prerequisite to procuring an injunction against a strike during Government possession, or after the issuance of a proclamation.

After experimenting with several different versions of this language and various injunction provisions, the committee decided that pressure should be exercised simultaneously on both sides of the dispute. To achieve that end, the committee concluded that an injunction should not precede seizure. It was felt that the sole purpose of abridging the right to strike would be overriding national interest. Under the circumstances, it would be most inequitable to enjoin a strike in favor of a private employer. For the limited emergency period, workers deprived of the right to strike should toil for the Nation as a whole.

Subsections (c) and (d) are consonant with this principle. The affirmative legal duty of a union not to strike or to call off a strike arises only after seizure is decided upon. This duty is to arise at the issuance of the seizure order rather than at the time of seizure because the former is easier to identify and isolate.

The duty not to strike, the availability of an injunction, and an injunction endures only so long as the Government is in possession. Government possession can terminate in the following ways:

(1) If Congress overrules initial Presidential recommendation by concurrent resolution; (2) the original 60-day seizure runs out without renewal by concurrent resolution; (3) the dispute is settled; or (4) the President determines Government operation is no longer necessary (e. g., dispute not ended, but emergency abates).

Section 213, emergency boards. After the issuance of a proclamation the President may appoint an "emergency board." Originally prompt appointment of the board was mandatory. It was felt that flexibility and the element of uncertainty would be enhanced if appointment and timing of designation were discretionary. As indicated above, the existence of such a board and the issuance of recommendations by it are prerequisites to changes in wages, hours, and the like during Government operation. Depending, primarily, upon whether the economy was in an inflationary or deflationary phase, one side or the other would desire changes from preseizure conditions. Uncertainty here would operate against the side which desired a change. Now and in the foreseeable future, this would be the union party.

As under the present Taft-Hartley Act (sec. 207) the Board is empowered to conduct its operations throughout the United States. It is given the subpena power by making applicable sections 9 and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Those sections prescribe the scope of the subpena power, but do not provide for other than personal service. It is an open question whether the power given in section 5 (f) of that act is imported by reference so as to permit service by registered mail and telegraph. Rather than leave that question unresolved as it currently is, the bill specifies that section 5 (f) also applies to subpenas and other papers.

As explained above, it was decided not to vest the emergency board with authority to mediate. It seemed unnecessary to specify its duration. This should be within the discretion of the President.

Provision is made for preserving board records with the Mediation and Conciliation Service.

Originally, it was provided that a separate board should be appointed for each dispute. In some instances it might be wise to have a new board composed of men with special experience in a given technology (e. g., mining) or a special industrial problem (e. g., health funds). Other circumstances might make desirable the use of the same board for a series of disputes to achieve uniformity and to capitalize upon accumulated experience. It was decided that Congress lacks prescience sufficient to determine in advance the nature of the board required at any given time. The only limitation was to exclude as members of a board those who are officers or employees of the disputants. This test was substituted for interest in the dispute which was deemed too vague.

Section 214: (a) President to designate Government agency to operate facilities.

(b) As noted above, Government possession is to terminate (1) on settlement of dispute; (2) when President finds continued possession not necessary; (3) 60 days after issuance of a seizure order unless Congress extends by concurrent resolution.

(c) Just as other sections are designed to create an incentive to a union disputant to bargain and settle, this subsection would generate pressure upon employer disputants. During the first 30 days following the issuance of a seizure order income would be the same as if the Government were not in possession. After the first 30 days the Government would impound and hold all revenue and would be reimbursed for its operating expenses. The owners of the enterprises would be entitled to just compensation. Certain standards for computing just compensation are defined. Consideration is to be given to the fact that possession was taken or continued when operations were disrupted or about to be disrupted by a stoppage of work or operations; to the fact that Government possession would have been terminated whenever the dispute was settled; to the value the enterprise would have had if the Government had not taken possession. Absent such standards compensation would be all income less actual operating expenses without figuring in the expenses of the Government. Without the factors prescribed, a company whose property is operated by the Government would experience no financial hardship and, indeed, seizure would insure it against any loss it otherwise might suffer. This feature was not contained in any other seizure proposal. The committee considers it an essential ingredient of this type of legislation.

In the bill as introduced the holding of funds and the application of the compensation factors was to date from the beginning of Government operation. It was suggested that a period be allowed in which the anticipation of these provisions would create the desired incentive to settle. The actual application of these provisions, it is felt, will tend to make continued Government possession undesirable to management.

In the bill as introduced a factor to be weighed in determining just compensation was which party rejected an emergency board's recommendations. If the company did, its compensation would be diminished accordingly. If the union did, the fact that possession was taken or continued because of a threatened strike would not weigh as heavily, if at all, against the company. The effect upon the other factors would be similar. This provision was eliminated because it was considered tantamount to compulsory arbitration. Rather than encourage bargaining, it would encourage one party or the other to insist upon the precise recommendations of a board.

While the recommendations would serve as an excellent point of departure for bargaining, it is not intended to have this bill erect a scheme for imposing conditions for the settlement of emergency disputes.

Any increase or change in computation of compensation which results in an increase may be agreed to retroactively for all or part of the period of Government possession. This proviso makes clear that the increase for all or part of the period of possession could be treated as costs or expenses for that time.

In computing just compensation the increase would be allocated as costs or expenses for the period for which they are to be retroactive. The owners could pay the prorated retroactive increase from the funds held by the Government for that period rather than from income received before or after Government possession. Of course, if an increase is to be retroactive to a time before seizure or the date of impounding, that increase for the earlier period could not be charged off as a cost or expense for the period during which funds were impounded. This provision is for the protection of the owners and to remove doubts that might preclude or discourage retroactive increases which otherwise would be negotiated.

(d) The duty of all parties to bargain collectively is to continue during Government possession. This merely emphasizes existing law. The one change which appears rectified a typographical error.

(e) (1) The President is authorized to appoint a compensation board which would determine just compensation under the standards prescribed in section 214 (c). Appointment of a board is not required. If a board were not appointed, the standards would govern negotiations between the Government and owners and any subsequent court test.

(2) Provides for clerical and other facilities for compensation boards.

(3) The award of the compensation board would be binding upon the parties unless a party to the award proceeding moves to have it set aside or modified in the United States Court of Claims.

Section 215: After a dispute is settled the President is to submit a comprehensive report and any recommendations he may have to Congress. Experience may indicate the advisability of amendments. The reports would constitute a rich source of material on industrial disputes.

Section 2 of the bill provides that the act would become effective immediately upon enactment.

Section 3: At the time of its introduction the bill provided that the emergency board provisions would not apply to existing disputes and that a board of inquiry already appointed under section 206 of the LMRA, 1947, would be deemed to be an emergency board for the purposes of this bill. These provisions were designed to cover a contingency which has not materialized, i. e., invocation of Taft-Hartley emergency dispute procedures, and were eliminated as unnecessary.

Section 4: This section of the bill as introduced provided that the bill would not apply to any matter subject to the Railway Labor Act. Present section 212 of the Taft-Hartley Act which would be retained as renumbered section 217 so provides. Section 4 is therefore unnecessary.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In accordance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law are as follows:

1. Present sections 211 and 212 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, are renumbered as sections 216 and 217.

2. The bill inserts new sections 211 through 215.

THE POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE OF WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, without my taking the time to read it, a statement composed for the most part of excerpts from the book Mr. Churchill, a Portrait, by Philip Guedella. I had intended to discuss this matter today, but I believe it can be covered adequately by having the excerpts printed in the RECORD. They bear out an observation I made a week ago when I pointed out that Mr. Churchill has been a great source of inspiration to me—as has been another great Englishman in past decades of English history, namely, Edmund Burke—in that Mr. Churchill has a record of standing for independence of judgment. As the excerpts will show, he never placed party regularity above his conscience. As his political history shows, he did not hesitate to walk from one side of the House of Commons to the other, to join the other party, when he became convinced that his party was following a course of action he could not square with his conscience.

That is a great lesson in political independence, and I believe it particularly apropos today that the tribute I pay to Churchill be paid to him on the floor of the Senate, and that I say that we, as American office holders, could well learn, I believe, from the lessons Churchill's great career in English politics has taught. Although he is a Conservative—and I have great admiration for sincere Conservatives—my admiration for Churchill and for the notable contributions he has made in the preservation of important values in civilization, is such that I wish to say now that I do not join in the point of view of those who feel that Churchill and other leaders of the British Government should be subject to attack because on some questions of foreign policy they hold views different from ours.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHILL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

1899: Defeated for Parliament as a Conservative at age of 24.

"So Winston Churchill had endured his first defeat, while Mr. Walter Runciman and Mr. Emmott went to Westminster. But the young knight had scarcely won his spurs. For in the heat of battle he had thrown over the government's tithes bill to loud nonconformist cheers in Oldham and grave Tory frowns in London. This maneuver came of thinking for himself on complicated subjects, upon which the party much preferred to think for candidates. At headquarters it left a sad impression of independence. Randolph Churchill had always been unorthodox; and it looked as if his son were going to be much the same."

1900: Elected to Parliament as a Conservative.

Writing of his first speech in Parliament:

"His father's memory was strong upon him; and at one instant he recalled his father's gift of making his own leaders jump by saying, 'If I were a Boer fighting in the field—and if I were a Boer I hope I should be fighting in the field * * *.' That was not the way to talk about the Boers; and Chamberlain turned sharply to his neighbor on the front bench with an unappreciative comment. Although he managed to be loyal to the Government, the new member's tone about the Boers was a shade unusual."

And in that term he roundly attacked the policies of the Conservative Secretary of State for War.

And in 1903 he opposed his party's position on the budget and protection—he was a freetrader (p. 83).

And in 1904:

"Now his free-trade heresy brought him into conflict with party leaders of his own.

"His method was uncompromising. A published letter soon expressed his view that 'freetraders of all parties should form one line of battle against the common foe.' This came dangerously near coalition with the Liberals; and when he gratified a Yorkshire audience with the doxology, 'Thank God for the Liberal Party,' Oldham Conservatives disowned their member. He still sat among the Tories in the House of Commons. But they made no effort to retain him. One evening in March 1904, when he got up to speak, his party with Mr. Balfour at its head and something less than its customary courtesy, left the chamber. Years later Mr. Chamberlain told someone that Winston Churchill was 'the cleverest of all the young men, and the mistake Arthur made was letting him go.' The Liberals of northwest Manchester invited him to be their candidate; and he was soon following John Morley at a meeting in the Free Trade Hall with a loud aspiration for 'a government that will think a little more about the boiler at the bottom of the mine and a little less about the fluctuations of the share market in London * * * a government and a policy which will think the condition of a slum in an English city is not less worthy of attention of statesmen and of Parliament than the jungle of Somaliland.' The lesson of his father's life was that a man who did not follow his opinions into the party which believed in them was a tragic failure. Winston Churchill's views in 1904 were obviously Liberal; and a fortnight later he crossed the House to sit beside Lloyd George" (with the Liberals).

Note that he left the majority party. It is true that it was waning.

In 1905 he was in Liberal cabinet as Under Secretary for the Colonies.

In 1906 he was elected to Parliament as a Liberal.

Thereafter he held a variety of cabinet positions under Liberal governments and rose to his famous position of First Lord of the Admiralty during World War I. He almost became Prime Minister instead of Lloyd George.

During the war he drew unfavorable publicity for his presence at Antwerp where the British Army, under his urgings, remained and sustained what looked like a defeat. Later commentators credited the action with saving France from defeat in 1914. An unsuccessful naval action in the Dardanelles brought additional unfavorable comment, although the poor results may have been caused by half-hearted prosecution on the part of others.

He was dropped from the cabinet during the war, under pressure from his former party, went to France and saw action. He returned to the subcabinet as Minister of Munitions.

In 1921 became Colonial Secretary.

In 1922 defeated for Parliament as a Liberal.

"Where, then, did he belong? The kaleidoscope of party politics was strangely disarranged in 1923. Reading from left to right, it ranged from Labor, which professed its faith in socialism, by way of Mr. Asquith's Independent Liberals, who were receptive of all forms of progress except any advocated by Mr. Lloyd George, to Mr. Lloyd George's slightly ambiguous Coalition Liberals, and the solid mass of the Conservatives. As Mr. Churchill was a little apt to view socialism as halfway to Moscow, he was plainly excluded from communion with Labor; and a pillar of the Coalition Government was obviously ineligible for reunion with Mr. Asquith. He was, in actual fact, a Coalition Liberal. But was he likely to remain so? His leading interest appeared to be the preservation of his country from a revolution, though he diverted Mr. Asquith, who was seated next to him at a royal wedding, with a progressive housing policy—'Build the house round the wife and mother: let her always have water on the boil; make her the central factor, the dominating condition, of the situation. (He was building one himself just then at Westerham on the magnificent proceeds of the World Crisis.) Close friendship and long association united him to Mr. Lloyd George; but there was manifestly some divergence in their views. For Mr. Churchill's antirevolutionary bias inclined him towards association with Conservatives, and Mr. Lloyd George has escaped from the Coalition with evident relief. He had never shared Mr. Churchill's misgivings about Russia, and Mr. Churchill had not succumbed to the Gladstonian glamour of the Greeks. Differing to some extent on foreign policy, their views were no less incompatible at home. It had been one thing for them to campaign together on social causes in the relative stability of Edwardian society. But it was quite another matter to toy lightly with established institutions in an epoch which had witnessed the disintegration of entire communities; and if Mr. Lloyd George was blind to the increasing gravity of the situation, that could only mean that Mr. Churchill was unlikely to remain a Liberal for long.

"But he was hardly a Conservative in 1923. Conservative at heart by virtue of his general antipathy to world revolution and to anything that might lead in that direction, he was by no means Conservative in party allegiance. For the party was controlled by the same stolid elements which had consistently obstructed his career, to say nothing of his father's."

In 1924, defeated as a "Coalition Liberal."

He was growing away from the Liberals and the Conservatives were much the same as when he left.

Churchill ran in a by-election in 1924 as an "Independent Anti-Socialist."

But in the general election later that year he was elected as a "Constitutionalist."

And he went into the Conservative cabinet.

In 1929, he was out when Labor came in.

1931: "When Mr. Baldwin seemed to lend his countenance to these unfortunate proceedings Mr. Churchill could only speak his mind on the subject as an independent member—'I do not speak for the official opposition nor for my right honorable friend the leader of the opposition. I speak solely as a member of Parliament, of some service in this house, who holds views upon this matter which ought not to go unrepresented in this discussion.'

"That was in January, 1931. By the next month he had withdrawn from the inner counsels of the Conservative Party by resigning from Mr. Baldwin's business committee. It was the practice of parties in opposition to entrust the direction of their policy to a 'shadow cabinet,' largely composed of the last administration and broadly foreshadowing the next; and by his resignation Mr. Churchill frankly sacrificed his further chance of holding office under Mr. Baldwin.

"The controversy was exacting. But its practical significance closed for the moment with the passage of the Government of India bill against his unrelenting protests. Yet one consequence remained. For he had opened his campaign with a blunt announcement that 'nothing will turn me from it, and I have cheerfully and gladly put out of my mind all idea of public office.' He could not expect it now from Mr. Baldwin and still less from Mr. MacDonald, when his (MacDonald's) strange gyrations brought him to power with Mr. Baldwin at his elbow and a large Conservative majority in the latter part of 1931. So Mr. Churchill has retraced his footsteps towards the wilderness again. He was still a Conservative, too good a Conservative, perhaps for party managers and the strange hybrid of the national government. But he remained Conservative, hanging on the party's flank and equally prepared to charge its enemies or to correct its leaders' line of march."

And in the 1930's he made perhaps his most notable fights—those against appeasement, the abandonment of Abyssinia, Austria, and Czechoslovakia, and unpreparedness.

"He had no doubts of Mr. Baldwin's supreme responsibility. [Baldwin was, he said] 'decided only to be undecided, resolved to be irresolute, adamant for drift, solid for fluidity, all-powerful to be impotent'; and when he stigmatized it in the House of Commons one November day, the Prime Minister replied with startling confession that if he had gone so far as to announce the need for rearmament at any earlier stage, he could not have won the general election of 1935—'Supposing I had gone to the country and said that Germany was rearming and that we must rearm, does anybody think that this pacific democracy would have rallied to that cry at that moment? I cannot think of anything that would have made the loss of the election from my point of view more certain.'

"Already a diminished figure, whose public reputation had been seriously damaged by the dubious maneuvers of the Abyssinian affairs, Mr. Baldwin was left almost in eclipse by this astonishing admission of elaborate duplicity upon the gravest question of the day; and as he dwindled, his unwearied critic gained proportionately in popular and Parliamentary esteem. Was Mr. Churchill coming into his own at last? It looked very like it in November 1936."

His rising stock was devalued by his opposition to Baldwin's handling of King Edward's tangled affairs. Perhaps Baldwin's sole decisive act was forcing Edward into abdication.

"As 1937 opened and the dust subsided, the outlook from his watchtower was no more inviting than before. But by this time Mr. Churchill's warnings had achieved a certain regularity which somehow diminished their effect, and the return of public confidence in Mr. Baldwin blunted their edge."

But, the day that war came Churchill once again became First Lord of the Admiralty. And, after Chamberlain's forced resignation, Prime Minister of a Coalition Cabinet.

At last report, he was still a member of the Conservative Party.

THE KOREAN PRISONER-OF-WAR ISSUE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said day before yesterday, if the leaders of our Government at the Executive and State Department levels would only recognize that nothing but great harm can flow from the development of misunderstandings and antagonisms between the Parliament and the Congress, the Government of England and the Government of the United States, the heads of state of England and the heads of state of the United States, I believe they will then follow the course of action which I recommended day before yesterday, namely, to call for negotiations, to closet themselves together, and to try to work out an undersanding and agreement on Asiatic policy.

I believe it will require some give and take on both sides, but I believe it can be done without our compromising any principle. Today I repeat that the way to handle the Korean prisoner-of-war issue is not by way of beating tom toms of threat, not by shouting across the Atlantic, "Come with us, or we will go alone," but it is by way of substituting the use of the rule of reason in direct negotiations with our allies, because it is possible that the hour is late; it is possible that we are seeing the beginning of what the Kremlin would like, namely, division among the Allies. I think it is possible to substitute use of the rule of reason in direct negotiations with our allies, and thus subject the prisoner-of-war issue to a procedure of international justice through law.

That is why once again I suggest that we had better ponder the question of whether we should take this problem away from the military, and should place it on the desks of the heads of state—the President of the United States and the Secretary of State—with a suggestion that we offer to submit it to a tribunal of international justice composed of two representatives of the United Nations and two representatives of the Communists, with Sweden to select the fifth member of the tribunal, and then let the matter be decided—away from the smell and smoke of battle—in the judicial atmosphere of an international tribunal.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 18, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Edward T. Wailes, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Walter S. DeLany, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, pursuant to section 406 (e) of Public Law 329, 81st Congress, and as authorized by section 501 (d) of Public Law 165, 82d Congress.

DEFENSE MATERIALS PROCUREMENT ADMINISTRATION

Edmund F. Mansure, of Illinois, to be Defense Materials Procurement Administrator.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Col. Harvey R. Fraser, O21747, for appointment as professor of mechanics, United States Military Academy, effective June 23, 1953, under the provisions of Public Law 449, 79th Congress, and section 520 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Frank O. Evans, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Georgia, vice John P. Cowart, resigned.

Frank D. McSherry, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

Clinton G. Richards, of South Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota.

Lester Shields Parsons, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia, vice A. Carter Whitehead, resigning.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Albert Pierson, O11838, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Howell Collier, O12388, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, O15004, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Carter Bowie Magruder, O15155, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Frishe Dean, O15453, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Howard Arnold, O15558, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Winfered Smythe, O15816, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Jacob Nold, O6888, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Lillard Barriger, O11220, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Howard Louis Peckham, O12058, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Wayne Cliffton Zimmerman, O12436, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Francis Henry Lanahan, O12735, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. John Ray Hardin, O12283, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Eugene McGinley, O12318, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Windle Read, Jr., O12603, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Clare Partridge, O12630, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward John McGaw, O12631, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Malcolm Lewis, O12650, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Kenon Galley, Jr., O12782, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Francis William Farrell, O12784, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Thomas Williams, O12818, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Lemuel Mitchell, O12832, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Edmund Waters, O14700, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Charles McConnell, O14873, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Stevens Lawton, O14924, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Numa Augustin Watson, O14968, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Robinson Pierce, O14979, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Oliver Perry Newman, O15016, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harry McKenzie Roper, O15176, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Eugene Ware Ridings, O15230, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Elwyn Donald Post, O15243, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Craig Stewart, O15349, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Leroy Dulaney, O15351, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, O15513, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Trueman Lanham, O15568, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15, 1953:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Robert E. McLaughlin, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1955.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Aaron E. Harms, O19712, et al., for reappointment or appointment in the Regular Army, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 23, 1953, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Aaron E. Harris, which appears on page 3688, and ending with name of Forrest V. Zimmermann, which is shown on page 3691.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be first lieutenants

AIR FORCE

Ryland, Russell Steger, 24758A.
Lawry, Raymond Gordon, 24757A.
Bouchard, Francis Paul, 24759A.
Moorman, Alvin Robert, 24760A.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

The nominations of Franklin Roland Greenspan, 24756A, et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 23, 1953, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Franklin Roland Greenspan, 24756A, which appears on page 3691, and ending with the name of Barbara Louise Northrup, 21183W, which is shown on page 3693.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named line ensigns of the Navy for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy with the grade of ensign:

John A. Davis
John W. Pancoast, Jr.

The following-named lieutenant of the Supply Corps of the Navy for appointment in the line with the grade of lieutenant:

Richard J. Kessler

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 18, 1953

(Legislative day of Friday, May 15, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as at the beginning of another week we pause at this wayside shrine of prayer, may we find the altar within us. Thou hast created us to be Thy temples. Grant that the holy places of our inner lives may harbor nothing unworthy of our high calling as ministers of the public trust. The din of words assails our ears from an agitated world. Grant us an inner calm, undisturbed by any outer commotion, and courage to seek the truth honestly and to follow humbly the kindly light that leads us on. And in these times that try our souls and test our character, may Thy strength sustain us, Thy grace preserve us, Thy wisdom instruct us, Thy might protect us, and may Thy hand direct us this day and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 15, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CLEMENTS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow because of official business.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MURRAY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate through Thursday of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MILLIKIN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of certain aliens from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL SEED ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting proposed amendments to the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT ON TRINITY RIVER DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the views and recommendations of the State of California, as a supplement to the report of the Department of the Interior on the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, transmitted to the Senate on January 2, 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROCLAMATION ON RESULTS OF REFERENDUM IN VIRGIN ISLANDS ON CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO ORGANIC ACT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Governor of the Virgin Islands, transmitting, pursuant to an act of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, a copy of a proclamation dated May 11, 1953, recording the results of the 1953 referendum on certain basic amendments to the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 37

"Joint resolution relative to requesting the United States to construct a portion of a highway in substitution for the highway closed by the establishment of the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range

"Whereas in 1949 when the United States Navy sought to establish the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range as a target area for jet planes, the Board of Supervisors of Imperial County in the interest of patriotism gave its consent thereto insofar as the establishment of the range required the

closing of the only direct traversable road between Niland, Imperial County, and Blythe, Riverside County; and

"Whereas the Board of Supervisors of Imperial County took this action freely and without the requirement that the United States condemn the interest the county had in this road, thus permitting the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range to be established immediately at the time when it was needed and without the necessity for lengthy and costly litigation; and

"Whereas the county road through the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range was the only road of any economic value connecting the populous west portion of Imperial County with the less-developed eastern portion of Imperial County, and also served as the only short diagonal for interstate traffic connecting United States Highways 60 and 66 with the populous portion of Imperial County and the metropolitan area of San Diego County; and

"Whereas at the time of the establishment of the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range the Government of the United States, through the Department of the Navy, gave assurances to the Board of Supervisors of Imperial County that the United States would build a replacement road on account of closing of the existing road, the cost thereof to be viewed as the cost to acquire the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Public Roads has authority under existing law to replace existing highways and highway connections that are shut off from general public use by necessary and required restrictions at military and naval reservations; and

"Whereas there is a practicable route from Imperial County to Blythe along the southerly end of the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, which route commences from a county road running easterly from Brawley at a point approximately 3 miles west of the Highline Canal, and then proceeds east across the Coachella branch of the All-American Canal, across the Southern Pacific Railway near Glamis, along the southern boundary of the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, and thence along an existing county road to Palo Verde, and from there to Blythe; and

"Whereas such a road would make the distance between Brawley and Blythe 90 miles as compared to the distance of 85 miles by the way of the road across the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, now closed, 152 miles by the existing road by way of Mecca and Box Canyon, and 129 miles by the existing road by the way of Holtville, Ogilby, and Palo Verde; and

"Whereas the Board of Supervisors of Imperial County is willing to give assurances that it will construct to accepted local standards the road from Brawley to Blythe along the southern boundary of the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, except the portion from the point of beginning to Glamis, and that it will maintain the entire road, including such excepted portion, if the United States constructs such excepted portion in accordance with the recommendations of the report of road replacement from Imperial Valley to Palo Verde Valley in California, prepared by E. Q. Sullivan (formerly State highway division engineer), consulting engineer, for the Imperial County Board of Supervisors in April 1953: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the legislature on behalf of the State of California approves the proposed assurances of the Board of Supervisors of Imperial County as herein set forth, or as subsequently amended, for the purpose of obtaining a direct county road between Imperial County and Blythe; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the legislature finds that there is an urgent need for the reestablishment of this road in order to assure the development of the eastern portion of Imperial County and to provide a connecting highway between United States Highway Routes 60 and 66 and San Diego; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the legislature memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide funds for the construction of that portion of the road between Imperial County and Blythe which is a condition of Imperial County constructing the remainder of the road and maintaining the entire road, and that such construction be carried out for the United States by its Bureau of Public Roads; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chief of Bureau of Public Roads, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to permit the taking, killing, and possessing of wild ducks and other migratory birds in the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the hunting of wild ducks and other migratory birds is not authorized in the Territory of Hawaii by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended, or any other acts of the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended, provides for the hunting of migratory birds in the various States and also in the Territories of Alaska and Puerto Rico: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to further amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended, to provide for the taking, killing, and possessing of wild ducks and other migratory birds in the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 7th day of May A. D. 1953.

"FARRANT L. TURNER,
"Acting Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Joint resolution approving the plan recommended by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for the protection of the existing shore facilities, preventing further erosion, and of restoring and increasing usable recreational beach areas

"Whereas at the expense jointly of the United States of America and the Territory of Hawaii, and certain contributors, there was made an exhaustive study 'to determine the most suitable method of providing needed protection of the existing shore facilities, preventing further erosion, and of restoring and increasing the usable recreational beach area,' and to determine the extent of Federal aid in effecting the desired improvement; and

"Whereas the report of that study has now received the approval and the endorsement of the Office of the Chief of Army Engineers and the Federal Beach Erosion Board; and

"Whereas the report and endorsements are currently being forwarded to the Congress of the United States of America; and

"Whereas it is proposed by that report that the Federal Government contribute approximately $227,000 to the completion of the project; and

"Whereas it is a requirement of the contribution that the plan of improvement contained therein be adopted: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The plan of improvement recommended by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and generally concurred in by the Federal Beach Erosion Board, as outlined in the report of the district engineer, San Francisco district, Corps of Engineers, dated December 15, 1950, and further concurred in by the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii, be, and it hereby is, adopted.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Army, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 9th day of May A. D. 1953.

"FARRANT L. TURNER,
"Acting Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to make a survey of the Kahului Harbor in the County of Maui and to appropriate funds for enlarging the turning basin therein, and requesting the assistance of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in connection therewith

"Whereas Kahului Harbor in the County of Maui is indispensable as a port of entry and debarkation for the numerous vessels which serve the County of Maui; and

"Whereas the turning basin in the harbor is inadequate for the safe turnaround of large vessels and has been the cause of accidents or near accidents to such vessels on recent occasions; and

"Whereas in addition to the inadequacy of the turnaround space, the shallow waters surrounding the entrance render the harbor hazardous for all types of shipping; Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby earnestly and respectfully requested to provide for the making of a survey of the Kahului Harbor in the County of Maui and to appropriate funds for dredging the harbor so as to accommodate the large vessels which are now using said harbor, including the enlarging of the turning basin therein, and dredging of the harbor entrance, if found necessary, to provide safe passage for such vessels.

"SEC. 2. The Corps of Engineers, United States Army, is hereby earnestly and respectfully requested to take appropriate action to assist in securing such appropriation, and to perform such work as may be found necessary to make said harbor safe for all types of merchant shipping.

"SEC. 3. Upon its enactment, copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Interior, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the commanding officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 1st day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to authorize and direct the restoration of crosses at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific

"Whereas the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Punchbowl Crater, Honolulu, T. H., was once symbolically marked by crosses row on row; and

"Whereas such crosses no longer mark the graves of the many veterans who have been put to rest at this beautiful and peaceful cemetery in the middle of the Pacific; and

"Whereas a display of crosses and other religious monuments appropriate to the religious faiths of those who are interred in the cemetery will tend to enhance the religious significance of this national memorial, more solemnly symbolize the deep respect with which each veteran so interred is honored, and will more effectively convey to the thousands of visitors who come to pay homage from the world over the message of 'peace on earth, good will toward men' for which these sacrifices have been made: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to appropriate adequate funds for and to authorize and direct the appropriate Federal agency to restore and maintain crosses and other suitable religious monuments over the graves of those who are interred at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Punchbowl Crater, Honolulu, T. H.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 7th day of May A. D. 1953.

"FARRANT L. TURNER,
"Acting Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate moneys for the removal of certain abandoned military installations

"Whereas certain land in Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., which forms a part of the public lands ceded and transferred to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation of July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), and reserved for military purposes as a part of the Fort Ruger Military Reservation, was returned to the jurisdiction and control of the Territory by Executive Order 10268 of July 5, 1951, of the President of the United States as being no longer required in the interests of national defense; and

"Whereas there is situated upon such land certain abandoned military installations of no salvageable value, the removal of which has been estimated at $75,000; and

"Whereas though said land is in the heart of the residential district of Honolulu and its immediate conversion to such use to alleviate the existing housing shortage is most urgent, the existence of such abandoned military installations is a strong deterrent to the proper and orderly development of such area; that such installations are unsightly, and will greatly detract from the desirability of such land for homesites; and

"Whereas the cost of removal of such installations initially erected not only for the protection of the peoples of the Territory of Hawaii but for the protection of all of the peoples of the United States, should in all equity and justice be shared by all of the peoples to whom such protection was afforded: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to appropriate to the government of the Territory of Hawaii the sum of $75,000 for expenditure by the commissioner of public lands in the removal of certain abandoned military installations situate on tract No. 4 of Presidential Executive Order 10268 of July 5, 1951.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 9th day of May A. D. 1953.

"FARRANT L. TURNER,
"Acting Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbor at Minneapolis; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the delegates of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, at Chicago, Ill., relating to a revision of the social-security law; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the delegates of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, at Chicago, Ill., relating to prohibiting, by constitutional amendment, the Federal Government to engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Two resolutions adopted by the delegates of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, at Chicago, Ill., relating to care of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, and the report of the Truman Commission on the health needs of the Nation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, four joint resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, relating to marine craft safety, educational television, the Connecticut beach erosion program, and to restore the taxing power to the States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress on marine craft safety

"Resolved by this assembly:

"Whereas His Excellency, John Lodge, Governor of Connecticut, requested the State Legislative Council to make a study of marine craft safety regulations following the tragic sinking of the motor passenger boat *Jack* on June 10, 1951, in Long Island Sound with resulting loss of 11 lives; and

"Whereas the motor passenger boat *Jack* had been employed as an open party fishing boat and was operated out of Niantic, Conn.; and

"Whereas it was the expressed opinion of the marine board of investigation, which investigated the subject casualty, that all evidence pointed to a serious failure of the retentive power of the wooden skeletal structure of the boat due to dry rot; and

"Whereas the said board of investigation concluded that with the hull of the said passenger boat *Jack* in poor condition the force of the seas further weakened the vessel sufficiently to cause a portion of the planking to let go and water to enter the vessel, thereby causing the boat to break apart and sink rapidly; and

"Whereas the legislative council's inquiry disclosed that there is no agency—Federal, State, or local—charged with the duty of examining the seaworthiness of the hulls of small craft used for fishing parties or otherwise for passage by the public; and

"Whereas although legislation was introduced in the second session of the 82d Congress to require the inspection of motor vessels carrying passengers, no such legislation was enacted at said session of said Congress; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by this assembly, That we petition and memorialize the 83d Congress of the United States to take proper and immediate action to provide for the annual inspection and certification by the United States Coast Guard of all motor vessels, regardless of size, which carry passengers for hire; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded to each Senator and Representative from Connecticut in the Congress of the United States."

"House Joint Resolution 79

"Joint resolution concerning educational television

"Resolved by this assembly:

"Whereas certain proposals for educational television have been submitted to the General Assembly of Connecticut; and

"Whereas this body is of the opinion that a decision should be made only after thorough consideration; and

"Whereas a bill has been prepared for a commission to make a continuing study of the values and benefits at stake and to recommend proper action; and

"Whereas experimental work in programing is regarded as of particular importance and is well under way by State agencies and with State funds; and

"Whereas a special session of the general assembly can be called should speedy action be required: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to protest any assignment to commercial stations of the three channels now allocated to Connecticut for educational television and to ask an extension for 2 years of the period for acceptance of them; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Governor Lodge, to the said Senators and Representatives, and to the Federal Communications Commission."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Resolution 47

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress concerning our beach-erosion program

"Resolved by this assembly:

"Whereas the prevention of further erosion of our Connecticut shores and beaches is a matter of grave concern to all our citizens; and

"Whereas the cost of such a program should be borne in part by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the State of Connecticut has heretofore appropriated the sum of $75,000 to aid and assist the Federal Government, and the latter has also allocated a like amount for said program; and

"Whereas the Federal Beach Erosion Board has had said matter under consideration for several years: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by this assembly*, That the members of this assembly memorialize the 83d Congress of the United States to take action to expedite completion of the reports of the Federal Beach Erosion Board; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the State be and she hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress and to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

To the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"House Joint Resolution 60

"Joint resolution relative to the need for congressional action to restore the taxing power to the States

"*Resolved by this assembly:*

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has provided statutory exemption from State taxation of activities of the Atomic Energy Commission (60 Stat. 765, 42 U. S. C., sec. 1809b); and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the activities of a private contractor performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission come within the meaning of activities of the Atomic Energy Commission for the purpose of tax immunity (*Carson* v. *Roane-Anderson Co.* and *Carson* v. *Carbide and Carbon Corporation* (96 Law Ed. Adv. Sheet 198, decided Jan. 7, 1952)); and

"Whereas the published congressional hearings on the bills which matured into the Atomic Energy Act furnish no indication that the Congress intended to provide for such an all-inclusive exemption from the normal incidence of State and local taxation as indicated by the above decision; and

"Whereas it has not been the policy of the United States to extend immunity from State taxation to the vendors of private contractors with governmental agencies or to such contractors but, on the contrary, the Congress has repeatedly rejected any and all such suggestions; and

"Whereas by the interpretation placed upon the Atomic Energy Act, the court has extended the scope of intergovernmental tax immunity far beyond that heretofore permitted; and

"Whereas this results in a serious interference with State and local tax powers and strikes directly at the rights of the States to support the essentials of government by nondiscriminatory taxation; and

"Whereas it is apparent that the section of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 upon which this decision was based should be amended so that independent contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission and their vendors are subject to the same State and local taxes as are other Federal contractors: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the general assembly memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Atomic Energy Act so as to eliminate therefrom any language which may be interpreted as providing for the extension of tax exemption to private contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission or to the vendors of such contractors, contrary to the well-established principles of intergovernmental relations which have assured to the States and their political subdivisions full power to impose nondiscriminatory taxation upon private persons who deal with the Government; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from Connecticut in the Congress of the United States."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.)

EXTENSION OF TRANSMISSION LINE THROUGH WESTERN MINNESOTA—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MINNESOTA VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, JORDAN, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative, Jordan, Minn., relating to the extension of a transmission line through western Minnesota.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in 1952 20 Minnesota REA cooperatives and 3 private-utility companies presented a proposal to Congress for the Bureau of Reclamation to extend a 230-kilovolt transmission line through western Minnesota; and

Whereas Congress failed to make the required appropriation of funds in 1952, to begin construction of this transmission line: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative, Jordan, Minn., deems it necessary that this transmission line be built by the Bureau of Reclamation and by this resolution requests of its United States Senators and Congressmen that they all support the project in question and urge all Members of Congress to vote the required appropriations so construction of this 230-kilovolt transmission line can be built at an early date; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all of Minnesota's United States Senators and the Members of Congress.

FEDERAL ECONOMY—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA AMPUTATION POST 1539, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Minnesota Amputation Post No. 1539, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Minneapolis, Minn., relating to Federal economy, in its relation to veteran amputees.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
MINNESOTA AMPUTATION POST, NO. 1539,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 9, 1953.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

DEAR SIR: A special meeting was held by the Minnesota Amputation Post, No. 1539, VFW.

"Whereas we were informed that Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, of California, is presenting a new so-called economy drive; and

"Whereas any economy in the case of battle casuals that have made the supreme sacrifice of losing an arm or leg, would be most unfair and would place great suffering on such veterans by closing thousands of hospital beds, as veterans with such a handicap and at their age would suffer greatly, and few are now in a position to provide hospital care at their present income; and

"Whereas all amputation veterans have been greatly handicapped in employment and earning power: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this committee on Veterans' Affairs give consideration to this economy drive at once."

Respectfully yours,

FRANK PATZWALD,
Commander.
T. E. O'CONNELL,
Adjutant.

USE OF WORDS "IN GOD WE TRUST" ON POSTAGE STAMPS—RESOLUTION OF AERIE 703, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, AUSTIN, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Aerie 703, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Austin, Minn., May 6, 1953, relating to the use of the words "In God We Trust" on postage stamps.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our postage stamps do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust," while our coinage does; and

Whereas our postage stamps reach into millions of foreign homes and offices in which our coinage is never seen; and

Whereas postage stamps, on which the inscription "In God We Trust" will be printed, can be an effective means of describing the fundamentally spiritual nature of this country to all nations of the world; and

Whereas in our current struggle against the irreligious philosophy of communism, it is important that we pray to God for help; and

Whereas many foreign nations do not consider Americans basically religious; and

Whereas such postage stamps would serve to remind our own people of their debt to God; and

Whereas Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Senator from Montana, who is a member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, has introduced a bill into the Senate instructing the Post Office Department to place the inscription "In God We Trust" on all of our postage stamps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the officers and members of Lookout Aerie No. 703 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in Austin, Minn., hereby express their endorsement of this legislation with the recommendation that it be given speedy attention and prompt passage; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers and members of Austin Aerie No. 703 FOE invite other civic, religious, patriotic, and fraternal organizations to join with them in the support of this project.

MEDICAL CARE FOR CERTAIN SEAMEN—RESOLUTION OF GRAND LODGE, INTERNATIONAL SHIP MASTERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE GREAT LAKES, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the grand lodge of the International Ship Masters' Association of the Great Lakes, Cleveland, Ohio, relating to medical care for certain seamen.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION No. 3, PRESENTED BY DETROIT LODGE No. 7, AND RATIFIED BY THE GRAND LODGE, INTERNATIONAL SHIP MASTERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE GREAT LAKES, JANUARY 30, 1953

Whereas under the Public Service Act, Public Law 410, 78th Congress, as amended, seamen employed on board documented vessels of the United States may receive medical care without charge at medical facilities of the Public Health Service only if they have had 60 days of continuous sea service and make application for treatment within 90 days following such period of service. A man who makes a career of sailing the Great Lakes seldom has need for health insurance or medical facilities during his younger and most active years. But this same individual (although he may have sailed all of his adult years) may be incapacitated or reach retirement age and then find that he is denied the services of the marine hospital, this at a time in his life when he is unable to secure other hospitalization coverage because of physical conditions of prohibitive cost due to age; and

Whereas licensed officers after long years of service on vessels who are not eligible for medical care by the Public Health Service should be afforded medical attention on the basis of their service rather than current activity status; and

Whereas several bills have been introduced in Congress which would provide medical benefits to retired licensed officers none of which were enacted into law: Be it

Resolved, That the grand lodge take positive action, by the appointment of a committee, or other appropriate means, to acquaint the 83rd Congress with the injustice of the present law and make every effort possible to see that said Congress enacts a law that will include retired licensed officers under the Public Service Act.

Capt. RAYMOND E. HAYWARD,
Secretary, Detroit Lodge No. 7.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1870. A bill to extend the time for filing a report by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel established by the act of July 16, 1952; without amendment (Rept. No. 274).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 351. A bill for the relief of Catherine Nina Cole; without amendment (Rept. No. 276);

S. 1176. A bill for the relief of Peter Hoskins; without amendment (Rept. No. 277);

S. 1387. A bill for the relief of Beth Barbara Burpee (Fujiko Maezawa); without amendment (Rept. No. 278);

S. 1416. A bill for the relief of Vito Rizzi; without amendment (Rept. No. 279);

S. 1521. A bill for the relief of Richard Robert Kabisch; without amendment (Rept. No. 280);

H. R. 782. A bill for the relief of Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge; without amendment (Rept. No. 281);

H. R. 870. A bill for the relief of Harry Block; without amendment (Rept. No. 282);

H. R. 2023. A bill for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk; without amendment (Rept. No. 283);

H. R. 2363. A bill for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 284);

H. R. 2420. A bill for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk; without amendment (Rept. No. 285);

H. R. 2667. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom; without amendment (Rept. No. 286);

H. R. 3389. A bill for the relief of Pio Valensin; without amendment (Rept. No. 287);

S. 67. A bill for the relief of Anastasia John Tsamisis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 288);

H. R. 2366. A bill for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger; with an amendment (Rept. No. 289);

S. 143. A bill for the relief of Hanni Marie Matuschke; with amendments (Rept. No. 290); and

S. 1857. A bill to amend certain statutes providing expeditious judicial proceedings for the condemnation of lands for public purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 291).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution for the establishment of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy; without amendment (Rept. No. 292).

ANNIE COBB AND CARRIE COBB

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to pay a gratuity to Annie Cobb and Carrie Cobb, sisters of Ettie Cobb, late an employee of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 111), was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Annie Cobb and Carrie Cobb, sisters of Ettie Cobb, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 5 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 18, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE—CORRECTION OF BILL AND REPORT (S. REPT NO. 275)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent that the bill and report submitted by the Judiciary Committee on May 12 on the bill (S. 1349) to amend title 28, United States Code, may be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for the purpose of making certain corrections, and that after such corrections have been made the bill and report may be resubmitted and take the same place on the Senate Calendar it now occupies. The bill deals with the United States Court of Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was recommitted Senate bill 1349, supra, subsequently reported it with amendments, and submitted a corrected report No. 275 thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1920. A bill for the relief of Ashley G. Ogden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1921. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special stamp in commemoration of the memory of Christopher "Kit" Carson; and

S. 1922. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special stamp in commemoration of the organization of the Kansas Territory; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 1923. A bill for the relief of Tokuichi Nagaki and Hideo Nagaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 1924. A bill providing for the conveyance of the lands and buildings of the former Fort Philip Kearny Military Reservation to the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1925. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Carl E. Welchner, USAF; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (by request):

S. 1926. A bill to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1927. A bill for the relief of Akiko Hatano (Linda Joan Lepe); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1928. A bill to extend for 1 year the wage credits for certain military service under the Federal old-age and survivors-insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, and to provide for lump-sum death payments on behalf of any individual whose death occurred while in military service and who is reinterred;

S. 1929. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors-insurance provisions of the Social Security Act to increase from $75 to $100 per month the amount which may be earned without loss of insurance benefits;

S. 1930. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the insurance benefit of a wife or husband of an individual entitled to an old-age insurance benefit from one-half to three-fourths of the old-age benefit of such individual, and to increase the insurance benefit of the widow or widower of such individual from three-fourths to a whole old-age insurance benefit of such individual;

S. 1931. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code to permit the coverage under old age and survivors insurance of services performed by ministers in the employ of organizations exempt from income tax under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes;

S. 1932. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of Federal old age and survivors insurance to employees of institutions of higher educa-

tion who are covered by State or local government retirement systems; and

S. 1933. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act by extending for 2 years the increased Federal financial participation for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO TERMINATION OF RAILROAD REORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 978) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—AMENDMENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us jointly, to the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

The amendment is what is commonly known as the oil-for-education amendment which we are now submitting to the bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon on last Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and will be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Two addresses by Senator HENDRICKSON, one before New Jersey Civil Service Association at Asbury Park, N. J., on May 16; the second at National Hospital Day ceremonies at Veterans' Administration Hospital at Lyons, N. J., on May 17, 1953, on the subject of military and veterans' problems.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address entitled "Our Defense Policy," delivered by Senator SYMINGTON at Enid, Okla., on May 16, 1953.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Statements by Senators KERR and MURRAY in broadcasts over Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association radio network, relating to farm prices and farm programs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Statement prepared by him relating to the 162d anniversary of the Constitution of Poland.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Address delivered by Mr. George F. Kennan at the University of Notre Dame on May 15, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

"Narrative of Thomas Hodges and Family," written by Mr. O. Ray Brown, county supervisor, Farmers' Home Administration, Wise County, Tex.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Comments by Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of the Harvard Law School; Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York; and Hon. John W. Davis, on the subject of proposed immunity legislation.

By Mr. GORE:

Open letter to the President of the United States, signed by Edward J. Meeman, editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar, and Loye W. Miller, editor, Knoxville News-Sentinel, and published in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of May 15, 1953, dealing with the needs of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

By Mr. HILL:

Telegram from T. C. Carroll, president, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Detroit, Mich., to President Eisenhower.

By Mr. IVES:

Abridgement of article entitled "Taft-Hartley and the Test of Time," written by Benjamin Rathbun and published in the March 1953 issue of Harper's Magazine.

By Mr. WILEY:

News releases by American Heritage Foundation.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Article entitled "Salt Marsh Lands Can Be Reclaimed," written by T. Wilbur Thornhill, and published in the Charlestonian of January 1953.

By Mr. LANGER:

Editorial entitled "Better Pay for Congress," published in the New York Times of May 13, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Poem entitled "The ABC of Security," written by E. B. White, and published in the New Yorker magazine of May 9, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Government Employees," published in the New York Times of May 13, 1953.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Article entitled "Federal Credit Unions," written by Peter Edson, and published in the Washington Daily News of April 24, 1953.

SUSPENDED EMPLOYEES OF OFFICE OF RENT STABILIZATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a letter addressed to the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming of the Economic Stabilization Agency on March 25.

The letter contains a report to Mr. Flemming on the appeals filed by three employees of the Office of Rent Stabilization who were suspended by Mr. William G. Barr, Acting Director of Rent Stabilization, on February 25. The statement should be incorporated in the RECORD in justice to the employees involved, since their cases have been discussed on several occasions on the Senate floor.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Mr. Flemming appointed a special board to hear the appeals of the Rent Stabilization employees, to examine all pertinent documents, and to obtain any additional information which might enable the board to make a recommendation to the Administrator.

Members of the appeal board named by Mr. Flemming were retired civil-service employees who made distinguished records in the Government service. Mr. E. Ray Ballinger, the board chairman, was Assistant to the Comptroller General prior to his retirement; Mr. Kenneth Vipond formerly was Assistant Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission; and Mr. Edward Kemp formerly served as General Counsel of the Bureau of the Budget.

It is very significant, I think, to observe that the board in effect cleared the three employees, and indicated that their actions had been in good faith and did not warrant serious disciplinary action. The lump sum leave payment plan in which the employees participated had been cleared on two different occasions by the General Accounting Office.

I regret to say that Mr. Flemming arbitrarily overruled the board which he himself appointed to consider the evidence in these cases.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1953.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Acting Economic Stabilization Administrator, Economic Stabilization Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Separate appeals having been filed with you as Acting Economic Stabilization Administrator by 3 employees of the Office of Rent Stabilization, Edwin D. Dupree, Jr., John J. Madigan, and Linda A. Matteo, requesting a review of the action taken against them on February 25, 1953, by William G. Barr, Acting Director of the said Agency, in which he suspended them for a period of 30 days without pay on account of certain activities which occurred in the month of June 1950 in the Office of the Housing Expediter, the undersigned were designated and appointed, pursuant to your

direction, as members of a board, with Mr. Ballinger as chairman, to hear the said appeals, examine all pertinent documents, and obtain any appropriate additional information so that we might, as a board, make a recommendation to you as early as possible concerning the action that you ought to take with respect to the appeals.

Following a brief preliminary meeting of the board on February 27, and notification to the persons concerned, hearings were commenced on Wednesday, March 4, and continued through Saturday, March 7, at which time they were suspended until March 13 owing to the absence of a material witness. The hearings were concluded on March 14 with brief arguments by counsel representing the appellants and Mr. Barr.

At these hearings Mr. Dupree was represented by Mr. William C. Burt as counsel, Mr. Madigan and Mrs. Matteo were represented by Mr. Byron N. Scott, and Mr. Barr was represented by Mr. William S. Kaplan. Also present at the hearings as observers were Mr. Charles W. Hanger and Mr. Earl J. Roach, Jr., members of the staff of the General Accounting Office, and Mr. Harris Houston, member of the staff of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

Having given the matter careful study and due consideration, we herewith submit to you a report on our findings and recommendations, together with a transcript of the testimony presented and the various documents and memoranda that were brought to the attention of the board, except printed decisions and laws.

The record in the case is quite lengthy. Our report simply summarizes very briefly the facts and evidence which we believe to be essential to an understanding thereof. The board regrets that time does not permit complete indexing and annotation of the record and the report. The board members are, of course, at your service severally or collectively if we can be of any possible further assistance.

The board has enjoyed the full cooperation of the responsible officials of the administration and takes this opportunity to express our special appreciation of the valuable assistance rendered by Mr. Parmely C. Daniels, executive secretary, and by the members of his staff.

Yours respectfully,

ADVISORY BOARD ON SUSPENSION APPEALS,
E. RAY BALLINGER, *Chairman.*
KENNETH VIPOND, *Member.*
EDWARD KEMP, *Member.*

REPORT OF SPECIAL BOARD APPOINTED BY DIRECTION OF THE ACTING ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ADMINISTRATOR TO HEAR THE APPEALS FROM SUSPENSIONS WITHOUT PAY OF MR. JOHN J. MADIGAN, MRS. LINDA A. MATTEO, AND MR. EDWIN D. DUPREE, JR.

AUTHORITY OF THE SPECIAL BOARD

1. Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Acting Economic Stabilization Administrator, on February 25, 1953, directed the establishment of a special board "to hear the appeal of the employees, to examine all pertinent documents, and to obtain any appropriate additional information so that this board may make a recommendation to me as early as possible concerning the action that I ought to take with respect to the appeals."

2. The members of the special board are E. Ray Ballinger, chairman, and Edward Kemp and Kenneth Vipond, members.

3. The appellants are Mr. John J. Madigan, Deputy Director (Administration); Mr. Edwin D. Dupree, Jr., General Counsel; and Mrs. Linda A. Matteo, Director of Personnel.

4. The appeals are from suspensions without pay for 30 days, effective February 25, 1953, effected in each case by letter of February 25 signed by William G. Barr, Acting Director of Rent Stabilization.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE

5. In the spring of 1950, the Office of the Housing Expediter faced serious operating and financial problems. There had been monthly reductions in force (reducing force progressively from 5,436 employees in July 1949 to 2,642 in June 1950, and to 2,493 in July 1950), and also operating funds were deemed by the responsible officers of the agency to be insufficient to carry the agency through to June 30, 1950. In addition to the balance of the regular operating funds, there was at the end of May a balance of approximately $1,800,000 in an appropriation earmarked by Congress for terminal-leave purposes.

6. Under the terms of its governing statute, the Office of Housing Expediter would have come to an end on June 30, 1950. There were indications, however, that Congress would take some action to continue the agency beyond that date, and by the end of May the prospect of such an extension had become so favorable that the Housing Expediter and his staff began to consider ways and means of holding the staff together as a working organization so the agency would be able to carry on through the fiscal year as a going concern if that became necessary, and be prepared to continue to function effectively during any extension of life granted to it by the Congress. This, it appears from the testimony, had been a recurring annual problem for several years.

7. On May 26, reduction-in-force notices had been sent to all officers and employees, effective June 30.

8. At the end of May, two plans were under consideration to aid in solving the budget and personnel problems: one, the drastic plan (which was not adopted by the Housing Expediter) of dropping approximately 1,640 employees by reduction in force, and the other plan, to have all the officers and employees take a week's leave without pay. This latter plan had been discussed informally by the Housing Expediter with members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and had their tacit approval. The Housing Expediter, the afternoon of May 13, had decided to put this plan into effect when in a meeting that day with him, attended among others by Mr. Barr, Mr. Madigan, and Mr. Dupree, Mr. Madigan stated that possibly there was a third alternative.

9. Mr. Madigan outlined the plan (which for some reason became known as "Plan X") in a memorandum dated May 31 to the Housing Expediter.

10. This plan X is difficult to explain, but it involved principally:

(a) The maximum use of 1950 funds, including the terminal leave appropriation.

(b) No leaves without pay during June.

(c) The maximum number of employees possible to be put on annual leave during June 7 to 23.

(d) Modification of the outstanding reduction-in-force notices to make them effective June 25 for the large number of employees who would come under plan X. This would mean that probably a majority of the employees would be changed from permanent to temporary appointment effective June 26, such temporary appointment to continue into fiscal year 1951, and to the extent made possible by appropriated funds, be changed back to permanent after the expiration of the leave period for which they had been paid. Such employees would be paid from the special 1950 terminal leave appropriation in a lump sum for the leave accumulated during the temporary appointment upon conversion back to a permanent status.

11. At a top staff meeting on June 1, not attended by the Housing Expediter (who usually did not attend staff meetings because of other duties), the plan proposed by Mr. Madigan was thoroughly discussed. The general manager, Mr. Barr, objected to the plan and gave his reasons in a report of the meeting, dated June 1, to the Housing Expediter. The wisdom of Mr. Barr's objection has been confirmed by subsequent events.

12. The Housing Expediter decided not to adopt this plan generally on the ground that it was too complicated and there was insufficient time to explain it for general adoption. He adopted the plan whereby all the employees took a week's leave without pay and whereby the final week of the fiscal year 1950 was charged to the 1951 appropriation as permitted by law. Nevertheless, a number of employees who had heard of plan X expressed to the personnel office a desire to avail themselves of it. Although there is some conflict in the testimony of Mr. Woods and Mrs. Matteo, it would appear that the Housing Expediter was consulted about this by the director of personnel, Mrs. Matteo, and he approved its special application to those employees who desired it, provided it was legal, on the ground that they had earned the leave and would be paid for it ultimately on separation from the service. In any event, Mr. Woods states unequivocally that the 49 cases here involved were approved by him.

13. When Mr. Barr learned of these special cases, apparently shortly before June 25, he went to the Housing Expediter and protested against their approval, and was told, in effect, that these individual cases had been approved and it was now the job of all of them "to get busy and administer rent control."

14. It resulted, therefore, that plan X was availed of by 49 employees at that time, and that subsequently the cases of four additional employees were processed under circumstances which gave to them the same benefits that were accorded to employees processed under plan X, 1 each in the months of September, October, and December 1950, and 1 in January of 1951. This makes a total of 53 cases. Of these, 51 were ultimately restored to permanent status, 1 was terminated, and 1 resigned.

15. It should be borne in mind that legislation extending the life of the Agency for 1 year was enacted June 23, 1950. At that time it would not have been too late to cancel the actions then being processed under plan X on the reasonable assumption that, having extended the life of the Agency, the Congress would provide funds to operate it. While the board believes, and has so stated in its conclusions, that plan X was originally conceived in good faith and for the primary benefit of the Agency as a whole, it is also of the opinion that at the point in the chronology of events when the plan was made available only to a few the welfare of the Agency was inadvertently subordinated to the welfare of the individual. Here occurs the second error in judgment mentioned in our conclusions.

16. The certifying officer at the time the payments in question were made to the 49 employees was, and still is, Miss Sophie Donine. She has testified that she made several official, but oral, inquiries concerning the legality of the payments. Her first inquiry, Miss Donine testifies, was made on or about May 29, 1950, of a Miss Ganaway, a site auditor for the General Accounting Office. According to Miss Donine, Miss Ganaway stated that in the circumstances (that is, plan X) she could see no reason why any exception could be taken. Miss Ganaway, however, told Miss Donine that she was not authorized to give an opinion for the General Accounting Office and suggested that Miss Donine inquire of higher authority if she wanted a definite decision. Miss Donine states that a week or 10 days later, when it became evident that the plan was to be put into effect, she did call Miss Ganaway's chief of section at the GAO and was told that the proposed action was not one that the GAO would take exception to. About a year later representatives of the GAO made another

Approved For Release 2005/11/16 : CIA-RDP57B00303R000100010001-6

audit, and at this time Miss Donine explained in detail to Auditor J. E. McManus the whole series of transactions. Immediately thereafter Miss Donine spoke with Mr. McManus' supervisor, Mr. L. C. Tredway, and he also was given full details concerning the payments. No payment was disallowed by the GAO. That Office did, however, take an informal exception to the payment made to Mr. Dupree, requesting a signed statement of the circumstances. While preparing her statement in reply to the request of the GAO, Miss Donine learned that legislation was in process which would, if enacted into law, make similar payment impossible in the future. She thereupon again called Mr. Tredway and alleges that she was told, "Since the necessity for it is no longer present, I see no reason why you should even bother to reply." The legislation in question was enacted into law as the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

17. It will thus be seen that the Agency, through its certifying officer, made diligent inquiry of the highest authority in matters involving the disbursement of Federal funds, namely, the General Accounting Office. That Office, having complete knowledge of the essential facts both before and after the payments were made, took no adverse action. The board is satisfied, therefore, that the Office of the Housing Expediter had sufficient reason to believe that its proposed and subsequently consummated actions were legal.

18. A few weeks ago all 53 cases were brought to the attention of certain members of Congress, resulting in inquiries and also in public statement on the floor of the Senate. Thereupon, Mr. Barr, the Acting Director of Rent Stabilization, successor agency to the Office of Housing Expediter, took steps which culminated on February 25 in suspensions without pay for a period of 30 days of Mr. Madigan, Mr. Dupree, and Mrs. Matteo, the appellants in this proceeding.

NATURE OF CHARGES

19. There accompany this report, a copy in each case of a letter of charges dated February 12, 1953, of the employee's reply, and of a letter of February 25 notifying each employee of his suspension.

20. With some variation as to the specific nature of the participation of each employee, Mr. Barr's letter of charges of February 12 state that "During the months of, on or about May or June in the year of 1950," Mr. Madigan "introduced, proposed, executed, participated, and gave sanction," Mrs. Matteo "aided in the introduction, proposal, and execution and personally participated in and gave sanction," and Mr. Dupree "personally participated in and gave sanction," "to the use of a plan or device the purpose and design of which was to enable some of the employees of the Office of the Housing Expediter, the predecessor agency of this agency, to secure cash payment of the accumulated annual leave to their credit without there being any real termination in their continuity of service as employees of the agency. The method as contemplated and effected by this plan or device to bring about this highly improper, irregular, and unethical result was to permit such employees to be separated from their employment pursuant to the then existing reduction-in-force notices, allow them to be paid their annual leave credit in cash (which in some cases, as you knew or should have known, amounted to considerable sums of money), and then immediately and in fact on the very next working day following the aforesaid separation, such employees were rehired on temporary limited appointments in the same position and grade, and then at a subsequent date were converted to permanent employees, again in the same position and grade. This plan recognized and contemplated that such employees would receive further and additional cash payments of accumulated annual leave when such employees were converted to permanent status from their temporary limited employment status."

21. "Further, as it developed, when many of such employees were reinstated to permanent position, all pursuant to the plan, there was then in full force and effect, section 1302, of chapter 13, of Public Law 843, 81st Congress, approved September 27, 1950, more commonly known as the Whitten amendment, which prohibited the reinstatement of employees to other than temporary positions. Nevertheless, many of the employees were permitted to be reinstated to permanent positions, contrary to the terms and provisions of said Whitten amendment."

WHITTEN AMENDMENT

22. The second charge, as quoted above, in Mr. Barr's letters of February 12 to the 3 appellants is that when the temporary appointments of the 49 persons were "converted to reinstatements," in most instances after September 1, 1950, there was a violation of the Whitten amendment. The pertinent part of this amendment (sec. 1302 of ch. 13 of Public Law 843, 81st Cong., approved September 27, 1950) reads:

23. "Sec. 1302. After September 1, 1950, and during the fiscal year 1951:

"(a) In making appointments in the Government service the Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to make temporary appointments in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel and no employee in the Federal civil service promoted, transferred, or appointed to a position of higher grade shall be eligible, in the event of separation from the service through reduction in force, to reinstatement at a grade above the grade held by such employee on September 1, 1950; and all reinstatements, transfers, or promotions to positions in the Federal civil service shall be temporary and for positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to the individual reinstated, transferred, or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to postaudit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission."

24. The amendment provided for certain enforcement authority by the Civil Service Commission.

25. Documentary evidence was submitted at the hearings showing that the Commission's instructions of September 8 and October 2, 1950, indicated that reinstatements which were in the nature of reemployments of former employees were covered by the Whitten amendment, but not conversions to reinstatement as in these 49 cases. Later, the Commission's instruction were amplified so that after December 1, 1950, such conversions to reinstatement could not be made on a permanent basis. All the conversions to reinstatement that were made in the 49 cases were completed prior to December 1, 1950.

26. The second charge against these appellants, therefore, is without legal or factual foundation.

DECISIONS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL AND ACTIONS OF THE STAFF OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

27. We are aware that in the report of the Acting Comptroller General, dated February 20, 1953, the statement is made that "the payments for accrued leave as a result of the transactions were not proper." The Comptroller General also states in his letter of March 4, 1953, to Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, that in his judgment "the payments made by the Office of Rent Stabilization were in bad faith, being the result of a contrived series of personnel actions and for that reason were illegal."

28. These two statements, however, are as of February and March 1953, whereas in our judgment the situation must fairly be judged on conditions existing in May and June 1950. The following, therefore, is deemed important in reaching a full understanding of this phase of the matter.

29. Under current leave law (Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951) and the Comptroller General's decision of March 4, 1953 (which revokes his decision of December 14, 1951, 31 C. G. 215), the actions taken in June 1950 in the then Office of the Housing Expediter are not now possible. Neither, it is especially pointed out, could they have been taken in June 1950 had not the Comptroller General by decision of October 24, 1946 (26 C. G. 259) specifically overruled the decision of April 17, 1945 (24 C. G. 726).

30. The decision of April 7, 1945 (24 C. G. 726) was in reply to a letter from the National Housing Administration inquiring whether under the Lump-Sum Leave Act of December 21, 1944 (38 Stat. 845), commonly termed the Lane Act, a lump-sum payment was required upon transfer from a permanent position in one agency to a temporary position in another agency. The decision of the Comptroller General was that although different amounts of annual leave were granted to temporary employees and to permanent employees, the Annual Leave Act of March 14, 1936 (49 Stat. 1161), provided for one leave system and, therefore, no lump-sum payment was authorized.

31. The syllabus of the April 7, 1945, decision reads:

"Under section 3 of the act of December 21, 1944, providing for lump-sum payments for employees' leave upon transfer between different leave systems, an employee who transfers from a permanent to a temporary position in another agency—both positions falling within the purview of the annual-leave statute of March 14, 1936, providing for one leave system—is not entitled to payment for the annual leave to his credit at the date of transfer, even though, under section 4.9 (b) of the annual and sick-leave regulations, it is not mandatory that his leave credit be transferred."

32. In the following year, the Secretary of War presented two cases to the Comptroller General for decision involving two employees who were separated from war service positions by reduction in force on August 9, 1946, and were reappointed by the War Assets Administration on August 12, 1946, in temporary positions. After a discussion of the issues involved, the Comptroller General on October 24, 1946 (26 C. G. 259), ruled as follows, quoting from the syllabus:

"On the basis that annual leave is granted to permanent and temporary employees according to separate systems, although the grant of leave to both classes of employees is provided for by the same statute, the appointment, reappointment, or transfer of an employee from a permanent to a temporary position without break in service may be regarded as a transfer to position under a "different leave system" within the meaning of section 3 of the act of December 21, 1944, entitling the employee to a lump-sum payment for the leave to his credit in the permanent position, computed as of the last day of service in such position (24 Comp. Gen. 726, overruled). (Amplified by 26 Comp. Gen. 604)."

33. The following paragraph is also quoted from this decision:

"While the grant of annual leave both to permanent employees and to temporary employees is contained in the same statute, it will be noted that those temporary employees who are entitled to leave are entitled to 2½ days' leave for each month of service, whereas other employees covered by the section are entitled to 26 calendar days' leave a year, or at the rate of approximately 2⅛ days per calendar month. Also, it will be noted that temporary employees are entitled to leave on a monthly service basis whereas permanent employees are entitled to leave

on the basis of the calendar year. Hence, while, as stated above, these two formulas for crediting leave are contained in the same act, it clearly appears that each forms the basis of a separate leave system, 1 system for temporary employees and 1 system for permanent employees. Accordingly, in that view, an employee appointed, reappointed, or transferred without break in service from a permanent position to a temporary position may be regarded as transferring to a position under a 'different leave system', within the meaning of that phrase as used in section 3 of the Lump-Sum Leave Payment Act of 1944, and as entitled to a lump-sum payment computed as of the last day of his service in the permanent position."

34. A further decision appears in volume 27, Comptroller General's Decisions, pages 41 and 42, to the Librarian of Congress on July 30, 1947. The first question asked by the Librarian was that "since the language of this decision in 26 Comptroller General 259 [referred to above] relates only to the distinction between a permanent and temporary position, is it intended that the action required should apply in the same manner to temporary and permanent appointments? For example,' should a transfer from a permanent appointment to a temporary appointment (or vice versa) in the same position be treated as coming within the meaning and intent of this decision?"

35. In reply to this question, the Comptroller General said:

"It is settled that the permanent or temporary character of a position for leave purposes under the annual and sick leave acts of March 14, 1936 (49 Stat. 1161, 1162), is determined by the terms of the appointment of the occupant of such position. See 22 Comp. Gen. 429, and decisions cited therein. Hence, while a position may be 'permanent' for budgetary purposes yet, if the terms of the appointment of the occupant of such position are such as to bring him within the definition of "temporary employees' as contained in the leave regulations, the position is a temporary one for leave purposes. Conversely, even though a position administratively be considered as 'temporary' if the terms of the appointment of the proposed incumbent thereof be such as to bring him within the definition of 'permanent employees' as defined in the leave regulations, the position is a 'permanent' position for leave purposes. Consequently, upon a change in the appointment of an employee from that of permanent to temporary, or vice versa—notwithstanding that such appointments were made to the same position—the employee, under the rule stated in the decision of October 24, 1946, supra, would be entitled to a lump-sum payment for accrued and unused annual leave to his credit at the time of such change in the tenure of his appointment. Accordingly, question 1 is answered in the affirmative."

36. Question 2 of the Librarian of Congress reads:

"It is stated that in those cases where an employee is transferred from a permanent position to a temporary position, he is 'entitled to a lump-sum payment computed as of the last day of service in the permanent position.' Is it intended that the term entitled as here used should rule out any discretion on the part of the employee concerned? If, for example, an employee should formally request that he be not paid a lump-sum payment, is it mandatory upon the agency to make the payment? If the answer is in the affirmative, does the employee have any discretion in the case of a transfer from a temporary to a permanent position?"

37. In reply to this question, the Comptroller General said:

"With respect to question 2, it may be stated that since, as held in the said decision of October 24, 1946, the transfer of an employee from a permanent to a temporary position is a transfer to a position under a 'different leave system' within the meaning of that phrase as used in section 3 of the lump-sum leave payment act of December 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 845, 846), the specific requirement contained in that section that 'all accumulated and current accrued leave be liquidated by a lump-sum payment—in cases involving transfer to agencies under different leave systems,' makes it mandatory that, in such instances, a lump-sum payment be made. For the purposes of the lump-sum payment requirement of section 3 of the said act of December 21, 1944, it is immaterial whether the transfer is from a permanent position to a temporary position or from a temporary position to a permanent position. (See decision of April 15, 1946, B-64710, 26 Comp. Gen. 786.)"

38. The printed decisions of the Comptroller General are a controlling guide to certifying and disbursing officers of the Government wherever they may be located.

39. When Mr. Madigan proposed his plan on June 1, 1950, the decisions quoted above, and somewhat similar decisions in other cases, were current and they appeared to give legal authority for his proposed plan insofar as the lump sum leave payments on transfer from a permanent position to a temporary one, or vice versa, are concerned. While we have found no ruling by the Comptroller General involving a technical separation as the result of a reduction in force proceeding, followed without a break in service by employment of the persons so "separated" in temporary identical positions, it seems to the Board that the then current decisions gave at least a strong color of legality to the whole transaction. That this was so considered by the Staff of the General Accounting Office is attested by the "report of February 20, 1953 of the Acting Comptroller General concerning action of the General Accounting Office with respect to lump-sum leave payments to employees of the Office of Rent Stabilization in 1950 and 1951 and employees of the Department of the Army in 1947." The following paragraphs are quoted from such report:

"In August 1951 General Accounting Office auditors made an on-the-site audit of the payrolls of the Office of Rent Stabilization (then Office of the Housing Expediter). This audit was conducted by Mr. J. E. McManus (not presently employed by the General Accounting Office). During the course of the audit, it was discovered by Mr. McManus that in June 1950 a number of employees of the Office who held permanent appointments were terminated and immediately given temporary appointments in the same position. By reason of the termination of the permanent appointments the employees were paid for all annual leave accrued to their credit as of the date of termination. The employees were allowed to remain as temporary employees until such time as the period covered by the leave payment expired and then were given permanent appointments and paid for all leave accrued to their credit during the period of temporary appointments.

"Mr. McManus prepared a memorandum of the facts addressed to Mr. H. H. Sasscer, auditor-in-charge, dated August 29, 1951. This memorandum was prepared for the signature of Mr. L. C. Tredway who was the immediate supervisor of Mr. McManus. Mr. Tredway (not presently employed by the General Accounting Office) was interviewed in the past week. He believes, to the best of his knowledge, that the memorandum was taken to the office of Mr. H. H. Sasscer and discussed with him and Mr. Wineberg, Zone Audit Chief, on September 3, 1951. Mr. Tredway believes it was decided at the conference that in view of the 1946 and 1949 decisions of the Comptroller General no report would be made to the Comptroller General's office at that time, but an 'informal exception' would issue to see what explanation the administrative office could offer. On September 12, 1951, Mr. McManus issued an 'informal exception,' which is used by the General Accounting Office to raise a question with an agency under audit and request an explanation of a particular payment made. The informal exception was taken against the lump-sum leave payment made to Mr. Edwin Dupree, Jr. Mr. Tredway further stated that before any reply was made the 1951 Annual and Sick Leave Act was approved and since the practice to which exception was taken could no longer occur he advised Miss Sophie Donine, payroll supervisor of the Office of Rent Stabilization, in response to a telephone call from her, that no reply to the informal exception was necessary.

"With reference to the decision made by the audit personnel not to report the payments made by the Office of Rent Stabilization to the Comptroller General, I can see the reasoning for such a decision but I emphatically disagree with it. This was a matter involving 53 employees receiving payments aggregating in excess of $100,000, and a transaction that was highly questionable both from a legal and moral standpoint. Notwithstanding the action directed in the Army case, which had no general application and was not intended as a precedent, the case of the Office of Rent Stabilization should have been promptly brought to the attention of the Comptroller General."

40. The matter was not brought to the Comptroller General's personal attention, however, nor was an earlier clearance by representatives of the General Accounting Office which was given to Miss Donine before she made the original certification for the lump-sum payments in the 49 cases.

41. So far as legality is concerned, therefore, the Office of the Housing Expediter had warrant for believing that the transactions were legal, since the authorized representatives of the General Accounting Office did not disapprove any of them when in accordance with the usual and regular procedure the specific instances were brought to their attention by the certifying officer.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In order to judge fairly the actions of the three appellants and determine whether they warrant or require the severe disciplinary action which the Acting Director of Rent Stabilization has taken against them, it is necessary to examine them in the light of the circumstances in which they occurred, including the interpretations which the Comptroller General had placed upon the act of December 21, 1944, commonly known as the Lump-Sum Leave Act or the Lane Act.

In proposing his plan to Mr. Woods, the Housing Expediter, in his memorandum of May 31, 1950, Mr. Madigan presumably had in mind certain rulings of the Comptroller General in which that official had approved the cash payment of accumulated leave upon a mere transfer from permanent to temporary status, and vice versa, without a break in service. (See vol. 26, Comptroller General Opinions, pp. 259, 786, and vol. 27, p. 41). This was done on the theory that such a change in status constituted a transfer to a different leave system. In such cases the Comptroller General has ruled that payment of accrued leave in lump sum without obligation to make refund was required by the Lump-Sum Leave Act of December 21, 1944. Mr. Madigan cited two instances in which employees of the Rent Stabilization Office had previously received cash payments for accrued leave in such circumstances.

In a letter to Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, dated March 4, 1953, and in the earlier report of February 20, 1953, the Comptroller General expressed the view that the transfers and payments involved in the present case were made in bad faith, in the sole interest of the employees concerned, and were therefore illegal. It would seem, however, that the most serious flow in Mr. Madigan's proposal is that it contemplated the use of an

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

appropriation that was earmarked "for terminal leave only," whereas the payments involved in the previous rulings of the Comptroller General may have been, and probably were, made from operating funds. As the term is commonly understood, and as we believe the Congress intended, "terminal leave" is paid not upon a transfer from one agency or appointment status to another, but only when Government employment is definitely terminated and the employee leaves the service, either permanently or for a temporary period.

However this may be, it appears that before any payments were actually made in pursuance of the plan devised by Mr. Madigan, they were specifically cleared with the General Accounting Office by Miss Sophie Bonine, the certifying officer. This clearance coupled with the previous rulings of the Comptroller General, seemed at least to give the transactions the color of legality. And there is the additional circumstance that after an informal exception had been issued by the auditors for the General Accounting Office in August 1951 in connection with a post audit of the agency payrolls, the agency was subsequently told to disregard it because future payments of this kind were now precluded by the Leave Act of 1951.

In considering whether Mr. Madigan advanced his proposal in good faith, it is important to remember that it was done in an atmosphere of tension and uncertainty. At the end of May 1950, the agency was running short of operating funds and there was no assurance that it would be continued beyond June 30. It was charged with important responsibilities under the law. Its operations were conducted on a countrywide basis. Because of the probability of an extension being granted by Congress, it was important to hold the organization together as a going concern, but it seemed to be approaching the end of its life and the extension might be granted for some period less than 1 year. The agency at that time was encumbered with heavy leave accumulations, a matter about which Members of Congress had been expressing general concern.

It was evidently Mr. Madigan's belief, based on rulings of the Comptroller General and the actual cases cited in his memorandum, that under the plan outlined by him the balance of the 1950 appropriation for terminal leave could lawfully be used to pay the leave accumulations of employees who might be given temporary appointments—that this would help to get the agency over the hump and "would lessen the terrific impact of our huge volume of accumulated and accrued annual leave in connection with the 1951 requirements which, conceivably, could include actual liquidation activities during the final months of the fiscal year 1951."

We do not say this was sound or wise or legally correct, but we believe the proposal was conceived and submitted by Mr. Madigan in good faith. There was no attempt to conceal the fact that the plan could also be advantageous to the employees concerned. And there is no evidence that after the plan was rejected by Mr. Woods, the Housing Expediter, for general use and adoption, Mr. Madigan made any further efforts in its behalf, except possibly by way of participation along with others after this was sanctioned as hereinafter related.

When Mrs. Matteo reported to Mr. Woods, after he had rejected the plan for general adoption, that a number of employees had expressed a desire to avail themselves of it, Mr. Woods approved the idea. He did this, as he testified, because it was his understanding that the employees had earned the leave and were therefore entitled to it as a legal right. When Mr. Dupree spoke to him about taking advantage of the plan, he agreed, provided it was legal. Mr. Dupree said he thought it was. Beyond this, there is no evidence that anyone of the appellants did or said anything to influence Mr. Wood's decision except possibly by way of participation in the program. It is apparent from Mr. Woods' testimony that he gave little, if any, attention to matters of this kind but left them as far as possible to his aides so that he could devote his time to the basic problems of rent control and legislation.

We believe it was a serious mistake on Mr. Madigan's part to suggest or advise use of the 1950 terminal leave funds in the manner proposed in his original plan. It was also a mistake for Mr. Woods to allow individual employees to take advantage of the plan after it had been rejected for general adoption, and as head of the agency he must bear chief responsibility for the error. It is our view, however, that some responsibility for the error must be charged to Mr. Madigan, and that the General Accounting Office is likewise chargeable with a share of the responsibility as a consequence of granting an informal clearance to the certifying officer and its subsequent action in connection with the post audit.

It could be argued with some force in Mr. Madigan's behalf that he was not consulted in connection with Mr. Woods' decision and took no part in it, that Mr. Barr's criticism of the decision was disregarded by Mr. Woods, that these circumstances plus the fact that the transaction was cleared by the General Accounting Office relieved and exonerated him (Mr. Madigan) from any responsibility in the matter.

While there is merit in this, there are some other circumstances to be considered. Mr. Wood's action involved a matter that lay within Mr. Madigan's special area of responsibility as Deputy Director for Administration. It grew out of a faulty plan which had been proposed by him. After the plan had been rejected for general use, it should have been apparent to Mr. Madigan that little benefit would accrue to the agency from allowing a relatively small number of employees to take advantage of it. In view of his position, his greater experience in such matters, and Mr. Woods' general preoccupation with other agency problems, was it not Mr. Madigan's duty to raise a question about this? We feel that in the particular circumstances Mr. Madigan could be justly criticized and possibly reprimanded for not raising a question with Mr. Woods about the wisdom and propriety of his decision, and that he should bear a portion of the responsibility for the error which occurred. We do not believe, however, that this was such a gross breach of duty as to warrant the penalty of suspension without pay or other serious disciplinary action at this late date.

Mr. Dupree was suspended because of his participation in the plan, although he had obtained prior express permission from Mr. Woods to participate. This was on the theory that because of his position as General Counsel of the agency, his mere participation gave the plan a special aura of respectability and legality and supplied it with an element of legal, moral, and ethical approbation. It should be borne in mind, however, that this entire transaction was in a specialized field of law and administration that was wholly outside Mr. Dupree's particular field of responsibility, which was litigation and legislation concerning rent control. It appears that he gave little attention to such matters and was seldom consulted about them. It is not believed, therefore, that his mere participation in the benefits of the plan would necessarily carry the implications set forth in the letter of charges and notice of suspension.

It was testified at the hearing, however, that when Mr. Dupree talked to Mr. Woods about taking advantage of the plan, and was told that there was no objection if he thought it was legal, he expressed the opinion that it was. This offhand opinion was apparently not based on independent study, was not in the nature of an office ruling, and was probably not a determining factor in Mr. Woods' decision. Coming from the General Counsel, however, its natural effect would be to influence and confirm Mr. Woods' judgment about the propriety of allowing individual employees to take down their accumulated leave in this manner. It may be, therefore, that Mr. Dupree unintentionally assumed a share of the responsibility for Mr. Woods' action, without looking into the question and without considering the propriety of using the terminal leave appropriation for this purpose. We are convinced, however, that Mr. Dupree acted in good faith, in the belief that Mr. Woods' action was legally and morally proper, and that he ought not to be disciplined and his professional standing jeopardized for a mistake of this nature.

We find no reason in the evidence to think that Mrs. Matteo acted in bad faith when she informed Mr. Woods that a number of employees had inquired about taking advantage of the plan, and asked him for instructions. According to her understanding, the plan had been rejected only for practical reasons, not on legal or ethical grounds. The idea of individual participation had not been ruled out therefore, but it did involve a question of agency policy which Mrs. Matteo deemed it advisable to present to the head of the agency. In doing this, as well as in her participation in the preparation of the plan and in its benefits, Mrs. Matteo was involved in the same mistake that led Mr. Madigan to propose it as a solution of the agency's problems, but to a lesser degree than Mr. Madigan, inasmuch as he was the chief of the Administrative Division and was responsible for the presentation of the plan in the first instance. For reasons already indicated, we do not feel that Mrs. Mateo's actions call for the severe action that has been imposed upon her and the other appellants.

In the absence of circumstances which indicate that the appellants or either of them were actually aware of legal or other deficiencies in the plan or entertained serious doubts about it, it is our view that their connection with the plan and their failure to advise Mr. Woods against it was neither an intentional wrong nor a gross breach of duty nor otherwise so culpable as to warrant the penalty of suspension without pay or other more serious disciplinary action, especially after a lapse of nearly 3 years and two clearances by the General Accounting Office.

Full credit is due Mr. Barr for sensing that there was something wrong with the Madigan plan, and for opposing it as he did. It was most unfortunate that he was obliged, as the temporary head of the agency, to bear the brunt of the criticism that was recently voiced in the Congress. It is quite possible that another person, one with greater experience as a Federal administrator, might have found an acceptable solution to the problem without taking such action against the appellants as Mr. Barr felt required to do. The unfavorable publicity, however, and the adverse criticism which attended public disclosure of the matter, placed Mr. Barr as well as the agency in a difficult position. It came at a time when he was hoping to be appointed head of the agency, and he stated with utmost candor on the hearing that he acted in his own interest as well as in the interest of the agency.

While the testimony disclosed evidence of friction between Mr. Barr and some of the appellants, it should be possible for them to compose their differences and work together for the good of the agency. If Mr. Barr feels that he cannot rely on their judgment and loyalty or that retention of any of the appellants is inadvisable in present circumstances, he is free to take proper steps in accordance with the regular procedure on the basis of current conditions and circumstances.

In view of all the foregoing the Board recommends for your consideration:

1. That Mr. Barr be commended for his good judgment in objecting to the so-called plan X at the time it was proposed in June 1950, and for his concern in maintaining the good name of the Office of Rent Stabilization.

2. That the suspensions without pay, based on actions taken nearly 3 years ago, which actions were approved by the then head of the agency, be revoked, and that the employees be restored to duty.

3. That Mr. Madigan be admonished for his failure as Deputy Administrator to advise the Housing Expediter of the impropriety of applying plan X to a limited number of individual employees.

4. That Mr. Barr, the present Acting Director of Rent Stabilization, be advised that if he has reasons to doubt the full loyalty and support of any of his subordinates and has any substantial evidence justifying such a doubt, there is ample authority within regular procedure for displacing such employees.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL FLAG OF HAITI

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 5 minutes in tribute to Haiti on the 150th anniversary of the adoption of her national flag.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today marks an important occasion in the history of one of our sister republics of this hemisphere, for it is the 150th anniversary of the adoption of the national flag of Haiti. The celebration of this important occasion and the historic events related to it will be climaxed next January 1st by the observance of the 150th anniversary of the proclamation of Haiti's independence. Today I should like to pay tribute, sincere and well-deserved, to our sister republic in a few brief remarks. I know that my colleagues in the Senate join with me in conveying our warmest fraternal congratulations to Haiti, to her government, and to her people.

We of the United States are now keenly aware of how closely intertwined with our own fate is the destiny of each and every one of the republics of this hemisphere. The prosperity and the security of our good neighbor nations are matters of deepest significance to us.

PREOCCUPATION WITH EUROPE, ASIA, CAN BE HARMFUL IF HEMISPHERE IS IGNORED

For far too long, in a preoccupation with events in Europe and Asia, many of us tended to ignore what was going on in our own backyard. That indifference was extremely unfortunate. From every possible standpoint, certain ominous developments there are of crucial interest to us.

I refer in particular to the extremely disturbing development in the recent election in British Guiana. I refer to the Guatemalan ferment, and to other problems elsewhere in the hemisphere. But wholly aside from the Communist menace as such, there is every reason why we should further cement our relations with the Pan-American nations.

As we turn to our friends in Haiti today, we view a brave, industrious, and friendly people, dwelling in an agricultural land blessed with deep natural beauty. We see a people which has slowly, painstakingly, but always with a fervent faith, built and built well upon her republican foundations.

THE "MIRACLE" OF HAITI'S PROGRESS

To the stalwart, heroic Jean Jacques Dessalines and the other patriots who forged Haiti's independence, and who in 1803 first hoisted the Haitian flag to inspire the desperate, isolated, revolutionary troops, the progress which has been made in the last 15 decades would seem miraculous indeed.

Even those great patriots gifted with vision and courage could hardly have conceived how one day that flag would fly not only above the Haitian nation itself, but at the council table of the Organization of American States and of the United Nations—as the well-respected emblem of a free and independent people, contributing constructively to sound decisions in the dynamic world of the 20th century.

WAR OF INDEPENDENCE AFFECTED UNITED STATES HISTORY

I wish that time were available for me to present in detail even a brief synopsis of the epic struggle which culminated in Haiti's freedom.

I should like to point out in detail, for example, the extremely interesting fact that the victory of the Haitian armies over the French forces played an important role in what was ultimately to become our Louisiana Purchase.

Napoleon Bonaparte had hoped to make the vast American mid-continent region the foundation for a colonial empire, but the army which was needed to hold it, had been destroyed in the insurrection in San Domingo. That fact contributed to Napoleon's offer to our envoys of Paris to sell the vast region of the Louisiana Purchase in April 1803 for the paltry sum of $15 million.

Amazing as it seems, therefore, the bold determination, the indomitable courage, and the military ability of the ex-slaves of Haiti helped to save our own beloved America from the entry into our country of a powerful army of French veterans, an army whose presence on our midcontinent could have completely changed the entire course of American history.

Thus it is that the echoes of a struggle for freedom reverberate throughout the world. Just as the American War of Independence so magnificently contributed to the inspiration of foreign peoples, so the great battle for independence which was waged in Haiti, and in other lands to the south, helped directly and indirectly in far more ways than the average American appreciates to shape for the better our own history and the history of the world. An understanding of that historical interrelationship is all to the good.

For that matter, I think that all of us could profit a great deal from a better understanding of the background and the culture of all of our sister Republics to the south and our good neighbor to the north. Such understanding is essential in order to make more fruitful pan-American cooperation.

THE ARTIBONITE PROJECT

Cooperation itself is a feature of Haitian progress. Haitian cooperation takes many forms. An outstanding example is the long-cherished national dream—land reclamation in the Artibonite Valley through which runs Haiti's largest river. That valley, once a garden spot of wealth and plenty, had through the generations become a wasteland of erosion and barrenness.

A model farm or pilot project started there last year under joint Haitian-United States auspices, utilizing technical experts of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, has pointed the way toward solving the problem by demonstrating how varied food crops can be profitably grown with irrigation water from the river in an area where thousands of small farmers have for generations been eking out a scanty living from the dry saline soil.

With the assistance of a $14 million credit from the Export-Import Bank, the Haitian Government is now commencing a large construction and agricultural development program in the Artibonite Valley. The project involves the building of a dam and irrigation and drainage ditches and the clearing and resettlement of upward of 70,000 acres of land.

Thus, in time, Haiti proposes to do for the whole valley, with the assistance of United States financing and technical know-how, what the pilot project has already demonstrated to be feasible on an experimental scale.

OTHER AREAS UTILIZING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Artibonite project is only one of several areas in which Haiti is enthusiastically utilizing United States technical assistance.

Among them are agricultural extension, livestock improvement, rubber development, irrigation, municipal water supply, and the treatment of disease.

Haiti is paying a fair share of the cost of these technical cooperation programs. The ratio of Haiti's contributions to joint servicio funds for carrying out technical assistance programs in agriculture and health has risen from $2 for each United States dollar in 1951 to $3 for each United States dollar now.

THE GOVERNMENT'S ENTERPRISING PROGRAM

Mindful of the needs of its people, the Haitian Government is utilizing its $26 million national budget wisely to improve the Haitian economy and the health and education of its people.

It has earmarked $40 million over a period of 5 years to provide for public works, public health, general agricultural development, and education. An unexpected drop in revenues, occasioned partly by a smaller coffee crop and a fall in the prices of certain agricultural exports, such as sisal and sugar, may make it necessary to curtail or postpone a part of this ambitious program.

But the will of the Haitian Government and people to make sacrifices in order to develop their country should do much to overcome these financial obstacles.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

I should like to stress one of the particularly important factors in Haiti's progressive development. That is the encouragement which she has given to private enterprise, both Haitian and foreign.

On several occasions I have commented on the Senate floor that unfortunately, a continued recognition of the contribution of private enterprise, both native and of foreign nationality, has not characterized certain countries.

What they choose to do in their internal affairs is of course their own responsibility. But the consequences of their arbitrary acts are a matter of deep concern to other peoples as well as to their own.

Fortunately, I can report that a favorable climate for private investment exists in Haiti and is a factor of the deepest significance for attracting new industries and expanding on old ones. Haiti has, for example, enacted legislation, liberalizing import duties and income taxes, to help bring in new companies.

A recent listing, drawn up by the Haitian Government, of 23 industries for which Haitian raw materials are available includes leather and shoes, glass, salt, tropical fruit processing, dairy products, paper, fish, cotton textiles, rubber products, metals, transport, soap, chemicals, limestone, grain, chocolate, fiber products, vegetable oils, talc, lumber, and beverages.

Less than 1 month ago, on April 20, at the opening of the 36th session of the national legislative body, the President of the Haitian senate emphasized the importance for his country's economic development of establishing new industries and encouraging private foreign investment.

He said in his address:

> Haitian and foreign capitalists recognize that they need no longer fear to invest their funds in Haiti, because they know the time is past when laws governing such investments were likely to be modified according to * * * whims and caprices * * * They also know that they can count * * * upon the courts * * * If in the past insecurity was the most serious obstacle to the development of industry, it has been replaced by a climate of security.

A similar confidence, and a similar cordial attitude toward foreign investors, was expressed in the annual message of the President of Haiti, who said that one of the striking evidences of Haiti's climate of security is the ceaseless flow of foreign capital into the country.

GUARANTY OF INVESTMENT

Last month, also, in an exchange of notes between Assistant Secretary of State John M. Cabot and Haitian Ambassador Jacques Leger, a United States Government investment guaranty agreement was concluded with Haiti. Thus, Haiti became the first American Republic, although the 16th nation, to enter into such an agreement, which makes possible Mutual Security Agency guaranties protecting new American investors in the country against currency incontrovertibility and loss by expropriation.

As Mutual Security Director Harold Stassen pointed out when announcing the signing of the agreement, United States private investment in a friendly country is doubly advantageous. It can be of major economic benefit to the country wherein invested, and can contribute to the Eisenhower program of peace, progress, and prosperity for the free world.

Peace, progress, and prosperity are the goals which the Haitian people have set for themselves. They are good goals for us all.

CONCLUSION

I should like to conclude these remarks by renewing my warmest fraternal greetings to the officials and citizens of Haiti.

I believe that in the decades to come, they will equal and surpass the splendid progress which they have made to date.

I know that the fraternal sentiments which we of the United States feel are reflected by similar feelings throughout Latin America and in Canada.

It is my earnest hope that we of this hemisphere will remain united in the face of the great challenge of world communism which now confronts us and all other peoples.

It is a challenge to the basic concept of human dignity. It is a challenge to Christianity and to all other spiritual faiths to which man adheres. It is a challenge to human progress.

There are, of course, differences of opinion within the hemisphere today. But there are no differences among anti-Communist nations which cannot equitably be solved, peacefully and amicably, particularly in the face of the common danger.

It is up to us to reason together around the conference table—in the Organization of American States, in the Organization of Central American States, in the United Nations, and in every other instrumentality which men have devised for a peaceful, fair solution to their difficulties.

The people of the United States respect as equals their fellow peoples of the hemisphere and of the world.

There is no country so small, no country lacking in material strength or wealth, which does not have our respect and which we do not consider as being entitled to be treated as an equal.

This is in striking contrast to the brutal, tyrannical attitude of the bullies and enslavers in the Kremlin.

And so, in peace and freedom, congratulations to the people of Haiti and good luck in all their future undertakings.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate on the anniversary of the creation of the national flag of the Republic of Haiti.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, May 18, 1953, is a memorable date in the history of the Western Hemisphere. This day marks the anniversary celebrations in honor of the creation of the national flag of the Republic of Haiti.

The events leading up to this event are worthy of record. On May 16, 1803, Alexandre Pétion, who subsequently served as founder and first President of the Haitian Republic, had the happiness of seeing his companion in arms, Jean Jacques Dessalines, commander in chief of patriotic Haitian forces, convoke a meeting of his principal generals at Arcahaie, a modest-sized village adjacent to the capital, Port-au-Prince. The idea of General Dessalines, influenced greatly by Alexandre Pétion, was to bring about a unified command of the local armies. This gathering, inspired by the hope of unity in the campaign against Napoleon Bonaparte, first consul of France, was to be known in history as the Congress of Archahaie.

Present in the minds of Haitian leaders at Arcahaie was the memory of the noble-hearted forerunner of Haitian independence, Toussaint Louverture, a figure immortalized in English and American literature. Seized by Napoleon's officers as the result of treachery, Toussaint Louverture had been dispatched to a dungeon in France. Therefore it was the heritage of Jean Jacques Dessalines, in the words of a famous Haitian historian to "have understood that it was his responsibility to lift up in honor the flag that had fallen from the hands of the deathless Toussaint Louverture."

What was the genesis of the Haitian national flag? Up to the time of the Congress of Arcahaie, the banner most familiar to the people of the island had been the French tricolor: blue, white, and red. It was an important part of the destiny of Dessalines to remove the white band in the center and to bring together, as a symbol of the union of Negroes and mulattoes, the blue and the red. This explains the motto inscribed on the flag of the Republic of Haiti: "Union constitutes strength." Rising up through the heart of the Haitian national standard is the tree of freedom, the green-leafed tropical palm, surmounted by a cap of liberty. Rallying round this flag, the people of Haiti recognized in the creator of their national standard, Jean Jacques Dessalines, their natural chieftain. With vision and determination they vowed that they would work for one indisputable goal: an independent, free Republic as a substitute for the status of French colony.

The Haitians remember this glorious act, because it produced the intended effect: unity. Step by step, the French armies of Napoleon, veterans of some of the most strenuous campaigns of Europe, were obliged to retreat. Provinces were restored to the Haitian people; cities were recaptured by the regiments organized and fired by General Dessalines. Everywhere, the blue-and-red national standard of Haiti moved forward, victoriously. The legions of Napoleon were pushed into the sea. The stage had been set for the proclamation of the independence of Haiti. This declaration of independence was signed on January 1, 1804. The French had been driven out of the island on November 29, 1803. Consequently, the 1953 celebrations in honor of the creation of the national flag of Haiti extend from May 18, 1953, to January 1, 1954.

It may be added that, on January 14, 1804, a decree was passed in virtue of which the new state welcomed back to the homeland "those natives of the country, both Negroes and people of color"

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

whom the military campaigns had forced out of their country. In this decree, every American captain of any ship bringing home Haitian people was promised a reward of 40 gourds. A copy of this decree was addressed to the Congress of the United States of America.

A direct result of the establishment of the national standard of Haiti was the creation of the independent, free Republic of Haiti. This nation, therefore, became the second republic in the Western Hemisphere, preceded only by the United States of America.

Moreover, it is no accident that the anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase takes place in the same year as the creation of the national standard of Haiti. It was because the people of Haiti repulsed the legions of Napoleon that Bonaparte was forced to relinquish his dreams of an empire in the New World. The defeat of the French in Haiti paved the way to the Louisiana Purchase. Although a wealth of historical documentation can be offered on this interesting phase, it should suffice to quote the words of Robert Livingston, United States Resident Minister in Paris in 1803, who wrote on December 30 to Rufus King:

I know that the expedition, which has its first object Hispaniola, will proceed against Louisiana if Toussaint Louverture does not oppose it.

Henry Adams, philosophical as always, added this reflection:

As yet President Thomas Jefferson had no inkling of the meaning of these plans. The British Government was somewhat better informed, and perhaps Godoy, of Spain, knew more than all the rest; but none of them grasped the whole truth, or felt their own dependence on Toussaint's courage. If he and his blacks should succumb easily to their fate, the wave of French empire would roll on to Louisiana and sweep far up the Mississippi; if Saint-Domingue should resist, and succeed in resistance, the recoil would spend its force on Europe, while America would be left to pursue her democratic destiny in peace.

As we know, Napoleon Bonaparte never pursued his ambitious plans in the New World. Instead, he negotiated the Louisiana Purchase with Thomas Jefferson. And one result is that, while the people of the United States of America, rejoice in the uninterrupted expanse of territory they now hold from the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean, the people and the Government of Haiti can be remembered with deep and sincere appreciation for the role which their republic enacted in maintaining the flag of freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared relating to the 150th anniversary of the heroes of Haitian independence and the creation of the national flag of Haiti.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS ON MAY 18, 1953, THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HEROES OF HAITIAN INDEPENDENCE AND THE CREATION OF THE NATIONAL FLAG OF HAITI

Today, throughout the Western Hemisphere, many national legislatures are commemorating an important anniversary. I refer, of course, to the 150th birthday of the national standard of the Republic of Haiti. Directly in the center of the Haitian flag there rises the celebrated "tree of freedom" capped by the familiar French liberty bonnet. Underneath the tree of freedom there are inscribed the words which fired the people of Haiti in their struggle for independence: "Union makes for power." The colors of this flag are blue and red: an indication of the complexion of the two groups whose unification paved the highway to victory. Thanks to an understanding between the blacks and the mulattoes on the island of Saint-Domingue, an alliance effected on May 18, 1803, the people of Haiti consolidated their military resources and launched the campaign that drove the legions of Napoleon Bonaparte into the sea.

In this connection, it must be remembered that, some months previous to the attainment of spiritual unity, the talented Toussaint Louverture had vanished from the scene. A victim of treachery, he passed away in a dungeon of Napoleon in the Jura Mountains. But the precursor of independence, Toussaint Louverture, had opened the doors of liberty for his people. He found a faithful exponent of freedom in Gen. Jean Jacques Dessalines. This patriot, acting on the suggestion of Alexandre Pétion, summoned his companions-in-arms to a Congress at Arcahaie, a tiny village not far from Port-au-Prince, now the capital of Haiti. It was agreed in this Congress that the spiritual unity of the Haitian groups working for freedom should be effected. In a moment of inspiration, General Dessalines eliminated the white center stripe of the French tricolor and united the two colors, blue and red. This symbolized for the people of the island of Saint-Domingue a new understanding between blacks and mulattoes. As a result, a dynamic spirit electrified the whole independence movement. Little by little, the armies of Napoleon were pushed toward the sea. Within 6 months, on November 29, the last French officers and soldiers were evacuated from Môle St.-Nicolas. In order to complete the work the Haitian Declaration of Independence was signed by Jean Jacques Dessalines on January 1, 1804. That climax of the battle for freedom explains why the people celebrate their national holiday on the first day of every New Year.

The President of the Republic of Haiti, His Excellency Paul E. Magloire, has decreed that the anniversary celebrations in honor of the national flag are to extend from May 18, 1953, to January 1, 1954. A number of events, scientific, artistic, literary, and historical, will mark this period.

It may interest my colleagues to know that His Excellency, Ambassador Jacques Léger, of Haiti, whom I have the pleasure to know personally, made his debut in the field of scholarship by writing the first article of his career on the subject, The Acquisition of Louisiana. In this interesting piece, M. Léger, who comes from a family of historians, pointed out that early in 1802 there was grave alarm in the United States of America that Napoleon Bonaparte would take advantage of the French foothold in Saint-Domingue to launch an attack on the mainland. In order to document this assertion I would like to quote the exact words of President Thomas Jefferson. On April 18, 1802, this farsighted statesman wrote to the American Minister in Paris:

"The day that France takes possession of New Orleans * * * we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation. We must turn all our attentions to a maritime force (and) make the first cannon which shall be fired in Europe the signal for * * * holding the two continents of America in sequestration for the common purposes of the united British and American nations. This is not a state of things we seek or desire. It is one which this measure, if adopted by France, forces on us."

In the meantime Toussaint Louverture and the heroic people of Haiti stopped the legions of Napoleon. "Without Santo Domingo," wrote the American historians, Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager, "Louisiana lost half its value to France. * * * Why not sell it to the United States while there was yet time?"

This explains the historical link between the independence of Haiti, achieved under the colors of the national flag of that Republic, and the Louisiana Purchase. Naturally enough, we celebrate both anniversaries in 1953.

Another footnote to history was written when the founder and first President of Haiti, Alexandre Pétion, befriended the Great Liberator, Simón Bolívar. At a time when the latter, routed upon the mainland of South America, sought refuge in Haiti, he was given food, money, and ammunition. As a result Bolívar returned to his native land, Venezuela, and reorganized the patriot hosts for the campaigns which he inspired and led to glorious victory. Can we, in 1953, forget the generous attitude of a noble-hearted Haitian President, or will we recall, with sentiments of admiration and respect, that Haiti furnished a springboard for liberation to the people of the other American Republics? Free peoples everywhere can rejoice in the good example of President Pétion and the initiative of General Dessalines in achieving unity by the creation of the national standard of the Republic of Haiti.

IMMIGRATION OF EUROPEANS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Friday last the distinguished senior Senator from Utah introduced a bill carrying out the recommendations recently made by the President of the United States, suggesting the immigration of 240,000 Europeans to our country for the next 2 years. This is to be done under a special-quota system which takes into account the plight of escapees and expellees, and also of those nations which are being vexed by the serious problem of overpopulation.

In presenting this bill, the distinguished Senator enumerated a number of cosponsors of his bill. It was refreshing to me to observe that there were so many. I can understand quite well why all of them are adherents of the same political party as the senior Senator from Utah. In this observation I am not being critical in the least. I mention it only because I want the senior Senator from Utah to understand that there are many on this side of the aisle who support this legislation and who congratulate him in its introduction.

Speaking for myself, I assure the senior Senator from Utah that he has my wholehearted support in this legislation. It is my fervent hope that hearings will be held on this measure as soon as possible so that some definite action in reporting the bill out of committee might be taken before the impending elections in Italy. Naturally, we in this country cannot afford to absorb all of the expellees and all of the overpopulation of the various countries of Europe. We can only afford to take in as many as can be conveniently and comfortably

absorbed into our economy without displacement, without discomfort and without dislocation of our own Americans. We cannot, however, overlook the fact that America is the leading nation of the world. She is the remaining beacon-light of man's hope for his future destiny in an atmosphere of peace.

While we cannot, through the process of our immigration law, relieve entirely the vexing problems of immigration which afflict other countries of the world, we can nevertheless show the way by setting an example of our willingness to cooperate in this problem, so that other countries may follow our example. In this respect, I think that the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Utah—S. 1917—will go very far. It will show the rest of the democratic world that we are willing to assume our responsibility in the hope that they will follow our lead.

As long as the world is beset with the horrible situation of expellees roaming about in strange lands without rest or without a home, and as long as we have men and women who are willing to work and cannot find jobs, the peace of the world cannot be assured. More than anything else, to promote peace in our lifetime depends upon our ability to establish an atmosphere wherein man can live with the reasonable assurance of making his livelihood for the support of his family.

I congratulate the President of the United States and the senior Senator from Utah for their awareness of this problem, and it is my sincere hope that the Congress of the United States will awaken its own responsibility and support the President in his desire to meet and solve this serious problem.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, for the present consideration and confirmation of approximately 3,300 nominations in the military service, many of them from the graduating classes at Annapolis and West Point. The nominations have been on the clerk's desk over the weekend. This is in accordance with the usual practice. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be now confirmed, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frederick W. Kaess, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Philip Allen Hart, resigned;

Roy L. Stephenson, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa, vice William R. Hart;

Francis Everett Van Alstine, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Iowa, vice Tobias E. Diamond, resigned;

Clement W. Crahan, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa, vice Frederick Elliott Biermann;

Roland A. Walter, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa, vice Daniel N. McEniry;

William E. Smith, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York, vice Eugene J. Smith;

William B. Somers, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina, vice William D. Kizziah, term expired;

Albert W. Saegert, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas, vice Kehoe C. Shannon;

Darrell O. Holmes, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington, vice Wayne Bezona;

William Budd Parsons, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the western district of Washington, vice John S. Denise, Sr.; and

Noah W. Riley, of Wyoming, to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming, vice Earl R. Burns.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph Holmes Lesh, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana, vice Gilmore S. Haynie.

By Mr. WELKER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Saul Hale Clark, of Idaho, to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho, vice Everett M. Evans.

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Howard Call, of Utah, to be United States marshal for the district of Utah, vice William Q. Treseder.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Albina R. Cermak, of Ohio, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. MERLIN HULL, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled-powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarthy
Anderson	Gore	McClellan
Barrett	Green	Millikin
Beall	Griswold	Monroney
Bennett	Hayden	Morse
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hennings	Neely
Bush	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Hill	Payne
Byrd	Hoey	Potter
Capehart	Holland	Purtell
Carlson	Humphrey	Robertson
Case	Hunt	Russell
Chavez	Ives	Saltonstall
Cooper	Jenner	Smathers
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Douglas	Kennedy	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworshak	Knowland	Taft
Eastland	Kuchel	Thye
Ellender	Langer	Watkins
Ferguson	Lehman	Welker
Flanders	Long	Wiley
Frear	Magnuson	Williams,
Fulbright	Malone	Young
George	Mansfield	
Gillette	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

FIRST INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays the unfinished business before the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4663) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I correct in my understanding that all committee amendments to the independent offices appropriation bill were adopted on Friday, subject to being reopened today, without requiring a motion to reconsider, in the case of any amendment which any

Member of the Senate wishes to debate or amend?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The understanding of the Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I hope we shall proceed with such amendments at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment on page 11, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, it is proposed to strike out the proviso beginning on line 20 and extending down to and including line 23, as follows:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for a statistical analysis of the consumer's dollar.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the independent executive offices appropriation bill, which is now under consideration, contains on page 10 an appropriation item of $4,053,800 for the necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission. At the very end of the section of the bill appropriating these moneys to the Federal Trade Commission we find an innocent looking "sleeper" provision which reads as follows—lines 20–23, page 11:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for a statistical analysis of the consumer's dollar.

How that provision ever found its way into this appropriation bill is very mysterious. But the meaning of the provision is quite obvious. It is a bold attempt to restrict the historic and basic jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, as provided in the original Federal Trade Commission Act of September 26, 1914—38th United States Statutes at Large 717, 63d Congress, 2d session.

This statute has been in force for almost 40 years, in defining the powers and duties of the Federal Trade Commission.

Section 6 of this act provides—38th United States Statutes at Large 721; title 15, United States Code, Annotated, section 46:

The Commission shall also have power (a) To gather and compile information concerning, and to investigate from time to time the organization, business, conduct, practices, and management of any corporation engaged in commerce, excepting banks and common carriers subject to the act to regulate commerce, and its relation to other corporations and to individuals, associations, and partnerships.

The Federal Trade Commission Act was passed to supplement and implement the Sherman Antitrust Act of July 2, 1890, which may be rightfully termed the "Consumer's Magna Carta," designed to free interstate trade and commerce from the blighting and baneful effects of illegal restraints of trade and monopolies.

Although the Federal Trade Commission has been carrying on, unchallenged, studies and investigations under this statute for a period of almost 40 years, such investigations being designed to help the ultimate consumer from monopoly practices, yet the proviso to which I have called attention and which is attached to the pending appropriation bill, would most seriously circumscribe the historic jurisdiction of the Commission, by limiting its heretofore lawful authority under the basic provisions of the 1914 act. I do not believe that such a far-reaching attempt to interfere with, circumvent, and circumscribe the time-honored jurisdiction of the Commission should be undertaken under the guise of a rider to an appropriation bill. Nor do I believe that the Members of this body have heretofore had brought to their attention directly the real nature of this subtle legislative attempt, by piecemeal approach and attack, to delimit the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. That is why I have moved to delete this proviso from the bill, in order that the attention of Senators may be directly focused upon its inherently dangerous implications.

Nor can this interference with the normal functions of the Federal Trade Commission be justified as an economy measure. A study of what happens to the consumer's dollar would not involve an expenditure of 1 cent beyond the appropriation of $4,053,800 provided in the bill for the necessary expenses of the Commission, even though it might require a simple reallocation of expendable amounts within the budgetary limitation.

What is the need for a breakdown of the buyer's dollar?

Although the Federal Government has provided for the assembling of much statistical data in various fields, there is one type of information which has been completely neglected; namely, a breakdown of the buyer's dollar into its various cost elements.

We need, for example, specific information as to how much of the consumer's dollar spent for food and farm products goes to manufacturers, processors, and distributors, as compared with what goes back to the farmers.

Not so many months ago it was asserted by powerful special interests that it was the farmer who was responsible for the high cost of living. Today, as everyone knows, the farmer, particularly the cattle raiser and the wheatgrower, has suffered so greviously from a steady decline in the prices of what he sells, in marked contrast to what he buys, that he is presently in a most precarious and distressed economic position. I am informed that the same is true of the cotton farmer and other special groups of farm producers.

For months, the daily bulletins of the Department of Agriculture have emphasized the farmer's economic predicament. I wish to quote from the Department of Agriculture's daily summary, under the dates indicated:

May 1, 1953:

The farm real-estate market: Farm real-estate values showed some decline in most parts of the country during the 4 months ending March 1.

April 29, 1953:

Agricultural prices: The index of prices received by farmers declined 5 points (2 percent) during the month ending April 15. The index of prices paid by farmers, including interest, taxes, and wage rates also declined during the same period, but only by two points (less than 1 percent).

April 27, 1953:

Grain market news and statistical report: Cash grain markets continued unsettled during the week ended April 23. Contributing to weakness in markets were inactive export demand, more favorable Korean developments, and large impending deliveries to CCC under the 1952 support programs.

April 23, 1953:

The farm income situation: With prices received by farmers at a lower level than in 1952, farmers' cash receipts from marketings in 1953, and their total gross income, are likely to be somewhat below a year ago. Farm production costs, however, continued high and relatively inflexible. Farm operator's realized net income in 1953 will probably be down about a billion dollars from last year's total of fourteen and three-tenths billion. * * *

April 22, 1953:

Livestock market review: At Chicago the Monday run was largest for April in 27 years. * * * Prices on Monday declined 50 cents to $1.50.

April 15, 1953:

Livestock market review: Cattle receipts were largest since January and prices weakened in spite of some improvement in the wholesale beef trade. Fed steers predominated and supplies were slightly burdensome even for the currently good demand, closing prices being steady to 50 cents lower than a week ago, instances $1 off. Stocker and feeder trade was very dull and late prices were weak to $2 or more lower.

April 10, 1953:

The farm-cost situation: Prices received by farmers in the first 3 months of 1953 averaged 9 percent below the comparable quarter in 1952 and 10 percent above the pre-Korean level (first half of 1950). Prices paid for commodities and services used in farm production, including interest, taxes, and wage rates in the first quarter of 1953 averaged about 3 percent below the same quarter a year ago but were still about 14 percent above the average for the first half of 1950.

I may say, Mr. President, these prices are very, very alarming.

April 6, 1953:

Grain market news: Cash grain markets continued to weaken during the week ended April 2.

March 18, 1953:

Livestock market review: Fed cattle sold at weak to lower prices early in the week when receipts were fairly liberal.

March 11, 1953:

The livestock and meat situation: Prices for medium and top quality cattle declined sharply beginning early January following similar reductions for cows and feeder cattle last summer and fall. Prices for all classes of cattle are now considerably below a year ago and most are at their lowest point since 1949. * * * Fed steers and heifers made up a large share of the run, and with a general decline in wholesale beef, fed cattle sold weak to $1 lower, instances $1.50 lower, upper grades off most.

March 9, 1953:

Action to halt drop in livestock prices reviewed: With the removal of price controls, retail markets began to reflect the lower farm price and beef prices dropped in the butcher shops.

March 5, 1953:

Farmers in general are not concerned so much about the drop in farm prices as they are about increased cost of things they have to buy.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. President, at the end of World War I, as every Senator knows, the price of grain dropped from nearly $3 a bushel to approximately 20 cents. The price of everything the farmer had to buy, of course, increased.

The net value of farmers' output was down 6 percent.

February 5, 1953:

The demand and price situation: Prices received by farmers dropped an average of 9 percent from August last year to mid-January 1953, and are 11 percent below a year ago. Most of the decline was due to lower prices for meat animals and cotton. The index of prices paid by farmers, including interest, taxes, and farm wage rates, has dropped much more slowly than prices received and in mid-January was down only 2 percent from a year earlier.

February 4, 1953:

Livestock market review: Cattle prices dropped sharply for the third successive week as wholesale beef continued a general decline.

February 3, 1953:

Cattle people disturbed by the decline of fed cattle prices at central markets.

January 28, 1953:

Livestock market review: Smaller receipts of cattle failed to stem the downward price trend and fed offerings sold unevenly 50 cents to $2 lower. Slow trade and lower prices for beef resulted in reduced demand for cattle and trading was extremely dull with sizable carryovers from day to day. Stockers and feeders showed progressive weakness, closing weak to $2 lower.

Mr. President, here is a statement by Secretary Benson on the price situation:

Prices received by farmers have been moving downward slowly and irregularly for almost 2 years. The decline is about 12 percent from a year ago and 18 percent from the peak reached in February 1951. Prices paid by farmers, as measured by the parity index, have been substantially unchanged during this period, with the result that the net income of farmers have experienced a severe squeeze. These changes have been under way for some time.

October 20, 1952:

Farm cost situation: Cost rates for most commodities used in farm production and also wage rates are likely to increase slightly in 1953 while prices received by farmers for commodities probably will average slightly lower than in 1952. This means that the cost-price squeeze on producers will be intensified in 1953.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary to review the conditions such as drought and inadequate feed stocks which caused distress marketing of cattle during the fall months of 1952 which contributed to a constantly declining price of both range and feeder cattle.

This matter of the severe cost-price squeeze on the farmer was graphically pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] who sent timely communications on the subject to the chairmen of the respective Subcommittees on Appropriations which conducted hearings on this bill. These letters are of such importance that I shall read them:

FEBRUARY 27, 1953.

Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILLIPS: I would like to call to your attention one small item on the budget for the Federal Trade Commission for fiscal year 1954 which your Subcommittee on Independent Offices will be considering. This is a request for $186,000 to enable the Commission to begin a study of the breakdown of the consumer's dollar.

As you may recall, during the 81st Congress I was chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee which studied the problem of price spreads in a number of fields including bread and cereals, meat, milk and dairy products, coffee, eggs, and others. This subcommittee has not been in existence since the end of the 81st Congress, and, to my knowledge, no other committee in Congress has undertaken or is prepared to undertake this type of study on the comprehensive basis necessary to provide Members of Congress with the essential facts relative to this exceedingly significant subject.

It is my understanding that if funds are provided for the Federal Trade Commission as requested in the budget, the needed information will be gathered and made available to Congress and the public on a continuing and systematic basis.

In my opinion the need for this type of information is now particularly acute. On the one hand farm prices have been declining for several months. On the other hand we hear many complaints to the effect that these declines in farm prices have not been fully translated into lower consumer prices.

I particularly invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to that statement.

I continue to read from the letter of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]:

The figures of the Department of Agriculture show that the overall spread between the farmer and the consumer has in fact been rapidly increasing. But what we do not know is what changes have taken place in the various components that make up the overall spread between the farmer and the consumer. For example, we have no information which would indicate how much of the increase in the spread has been due to higher labor costs, higher processing costs, higher wholesale margins, higher retail margins, etc. The proposed study of the FTC would provide us with this badly needed information.

I hope that the Independent Offices Subcommittee of which you are chairman will approve this program. I am sure the benefit to Congress and to the public will repay the cost many times over.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

Mr. President, on April 20, 1953, the distinguished Senator from Iowa wrote to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], as follows:

APRIL 20, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: It is my understanding that your Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Senate Appropriation Committee will in the very near future be considering the budget for the Federal Trade Commission.

I am taking the liberty of sending you herewith a copy of a letter which I addressed on February 27 to the House Independent Offices Subcommittee members concerning an item in the FTC budget which provides $186,000 to enable the Commission to undertake a sudy of the breakdown of the consumer's dollar.

I hope this letter may be of value to your subcommittee in its consideration of this matter.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

As the Senator from Iowa has tersely expressed it, the decline in farm prices has not been fully translated into lower consumer prices. On the contrary, the figures of the Department of Agriculture show that the overall spread between the farmer and the consumer price has been gradually increasing and lengthening. Who is getting this gravy? How much of this increase in spread has been due to higher processing costs, higher wholesale margins, higher retail costs, or higher labor costs?

A study by the Federal Trade Commission should provide the answers to these pertinent questions. The ensuing benefit to the consuming public will indeed repay the cost many times over.

Who can object to such a study? The Federal Trade Commission is ideally fitted, both by experience and statutory mandate, to undertake this type of research. Who can oppose it except those special interests who have been capturing an improper proportion of the consumer's dollar?

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, tells us that in 1952 the average family of three paid $740 for its year's market basket of farm food products as against a figure of $722 in 1951; $18 more than in 1951. However, the farmer, who filled this market basket, received only $353 in 1952 as against $360 in 1951; that is, $7 less than in 1951. Who was the middleman who received this increased fee of $25 in 1952?

For every $1 the consumer paid for farm products in 1952 the farmer received only 48 cents, 2 cents less than in 1951.

Cotton farmers received a smaller share of the consumer's dollar in 1952 than in 1951—14.5 percent in 1951 to 14 percent in 1952.

Reports compiled by the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission reflect that net earnings after taxes of food and tobacco processing corporations have been steadily rising; whereas, the farmer's share of the consumer dollar has been steadily decreasing. Food processors' net earnings were up 11 percent, from $405 million to $450 million, between the last half of 1951 and the last half of 1952. Tobacco manufacturers' net earnings went up over 6 percent, from $63 million to $67 million, between the last half of 1951 and the last half of 1952.

Not only would such a study and breakdown of the consumer's dollar be useful in analyzing the true proportion of the farmer's share in the consumer dollar as compared with those who handle or process his products, but it would also furnish dependable statistical data of prime utility in other economic fields such as, first, the individual or small-business man could compare his costs with his industry's costs to arrive at his relative efficiency; this is a major economic problem as yet not adequately explored; to wit, the relationship between size and efficiency; second, investors and lending institutions would be furnished a standard upon which to compare the efficiency of companies seeking their aid; and, third, it would tend to aid the settlement of labor disputes by providing irrebuttable cost figures which would

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

eliminate hours of argument over which side's estimates thereof were more accurate.

The Federal Trade Commission is the ideal body to conduct such a study. It is bipartisan, having a long and praiseworthy record of objective fact finding. The Commission has both the power and the experience to conduct such a research. The cost is inconsequential measured by the benefits to be received.

In 1919 the House Appropriations Committee requested the Federal Trade Commission to suggest what might be done to reduce the high cost of living. The Commission recommended a study similar to this. As a result, Congress appropriated $150,000 specifically for this purpose.

The consumer is entitled to know who is sharing his dollar and in what proportions it is being shared. When he buys at the retail store, how much does the retailer get? How much does the wholesaler or processor or middleman get? What is the manufacturing and transportation cost? How much of the price went to materials, labor, overhead, and so forth? These are pertinent questions that should be answered. Are the proponents of this particular clause in bill afraid of getting the answer to these questions? Are they fearful of having the spotlight of publicity thrown on excessive and unjustified price increases which have captured a disproportionate part of the consumer's dollar?

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report, in its report on current gaps in our statistical knowledge, stated:

> There has been a long-standing need in both Government and private industry for objective data on unit costs. * * * Better information would be of value to the Government in the appraisal of economic conditions. It would provide individual firms with a yardstick with which to compare their own costs and operations with those of the industry as a whole. It would aid both industry and labor in the settling of labor disputes.

However, the basic need for this consumer-dollar study, which this bill would outlaw as if it were the plague, was strikingly and forcefully put by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] at the Senate subcommittee's hearing on this particular phraseology in the bill. The following colloquy occurred between the Senator from West Virginia and Mr. Howrey, the new Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission:

> Senator KILGORE. Would this permit you to go ahead with the investigation of the consumer's dollar?
>
> Mr. HOWREY. No. It would not. The House committee particularly directed us not to do that. * * *
>
> Senator KILGORE. Is it not rather puzzling to you that there was such a wide divergence between the cost of living to the consumer and what the farmer or producer gets for his raw material?
>
> Mr. HOWREY. Yes.
>
> Senator KILGORE. It has always puzzled me why apples in my State sell for $2 a bushel and here in Washington the same identical basket of apples sells for $6.50.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that about a year ago I stood upon the floor of the Senate and read letter after letter from farmers in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, who stated that they were getting 23, 24, and 25 cents a dozen for their eggs, at a time when the same eggs were selling in Washington for as high as $1 a dozen.

I continue with the statement of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]:

> I wonder what part of the consumer's budget comes out of that little bit of transportation cost because it is only 100 miles to bring them here. I am very much interested in that consumer-dollar investigation. I wanted to get that into the record here because I think it works against the farmer and against the consumer.

Competition is the underlying principle which governs the American economy. Competition has been likened to a race "in which all may enter, but in which there must be no unfair jostling or hampering of others. Each one is free to exert all his powers, and distance, if he can, all competitors, and win all the prizes; but he must run fairly and accord to others a like freedom"—*United States* v. *Motion Picture Patents Co.* (225 Fed. 800).

Unless there is a free play of competitive forces, the public interest will languish, and the consumer will be unprotected against high and extortionate prices. It is thus the function of the Federal Trade Commission to buttress and protect free competition against those unlawful forces and practices which, if permitted to go unbridled, would destroy it. The Commission's economic reporting functions are designed to provide for the Congress, the Executive, and the public alike, information on matters vitally affecting the competitive economy.

The clause which I have moved to strike and delete from this bill, as it relates to the Federal Trade Commission is thus fundamentally objectionable because it is deliberately designed to curtail the historic authority and economic reporting function of the Commission as it has existed for almost 40 years.

What is the principle involved? It is literally whether Congress intends to tie the hands of the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission in allocating the general appropriation for such work as may from time to time be found necessary in the proper performance of the Commission's statutory functions and duties.

The Reorganization Act of 1949, under Reorganization Plan No. 8, which became effective May 24, 1950, transferred to the Chairman of the Commission certain executive and administrative functions formerly exercised by the Commission as a whole. The language I am attacking in this appropriation bill can only be a deliberate and bold attempt improperly to delimit and circumscribe these powers formerly granted to the Chairman by broad congressional mandate.

These powers are derived from the original Federal Trade Commission Act of September 26, 1914 (38 Stat. 717, 15 U. S. C. secs. 41–58) as contained in the first paragraph of section 2, which reads in part:

> The Commission * * * shall have authority to employ and fix the compensation of such attorneys, special experts, examiners, clerks, and other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties and as may from time to time be appropriated for by Congress.

There is nothing in this basic language which indicates any intent or purpose on the part of Congress to lay down kindergarten rules for the administrative procedure and executive functions of the Commission, as the language under attack in this present appropriation bill undertakes to do. Nor is there any provision in Reorganization Plan No. 8 which would support or justify such language.

That the Commission is inherently trustworthy and competent to make such statistical studies is apparent from the language of section 6, subdivisions (a) and (h) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which confer upon it the power, and the implicit duty, if you please, of gathering and compiling information relating to conduct and practices in both interstate and foreign commerce which injuriously affect the competitive economy and the public interest.

Can any Member of Congress deny that we need, and can use profitably right now, a study of what has happened and is now happening to the consumer's dollar?

Do we wish to go on record, in this appropriation bill, as not being interested in the consumer's dollar? Does a single Member of the Senate wish to do so?

For all the reasons to which I have alluded, the objectionable language in this appropriation bill, namely, the last restrictive clause relating to the Federal Trade Commission appropriation, should be stricken from the bill, and I so move.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly. I will withhold it entirely if the Senator wishes to speak first.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully ask the Senator to withhold it at the present time, because there has been no debate. I understand that there will be further discussion of this subject.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Were the yeas and nays ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was not put.

Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak very briefly in support of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. In the first place, I think it is very poor government to try, in an appropriation bill, to direct the manner in which an independent Federal executive agency shall proceed.

That is, of course, exactly what is intended by the proviso in the bill reported by the committee, and what would develop in the event the amendment of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota should not prevail.

I think there is nothing more important than to permit the American public—after all, everyone in the American economy is a consumer—to know exactly what happens to the consumer's dollar. The people of this country, including the Members of this body, have no idea today what is happening to the consumer's dollar. They do not know the breakdown of the consumer's dollar.

We know, for example, that the prices of agricultural products, whether livestock, milk, cabbage, or any one of a number of commodities which go to form the agricultural economy of the Nation, have dropped drastically. There has been no equivalent decrease in the price of those products to the consumer, and no commensurate drop in the prices of the commodities which the farmers and the consuming public generally must pay for the goods which they buy.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has submitted a resolution proposing the establishment of a separate select Senate committee to investigate and study the many problems which affect the consumer and to make recommendations and reports to the Senate and to the appropriate standing committees of the Senate. That resolution does not in any way assume to take over any of the legislative functions or responsibilities of the standing committees. However, it emphasizes the need for bringing to the attention of all the people of the country the problems and the difficulties of the consumer, and to make clear the relationship between the cost of production of many commodities, notably agricultural products, and the prices which the consumer must pay.

The resolution of the Senator from Iowa is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. PAYNE] and myself, as well as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and other Senators are members. We held a meeting this morning, as the distinguished occupant of the chair will recall. It was an executive session, so, of course, the junior Senator from New York cannot disclose the matters which were discussed and debated at that meeting. Suffice it to say that no action was taken. Today there is no agency of the Government that can possibly concern itself with the problems of the consumer. We have no agency, either within Congress or elsewhere, that does or can concern itself with the problems of the consumer.

Those problems are numerous. Perhaps many of them are imaginary or susceptible to explanation and analysis; but certainly such explanation and analysis is not apparent at the present time.

Very few people in this country understand why, in the face of a rapidly declining market for agricultural and other products the price which the consumer must pay remains substantially unchanged. I think we need an investigation of this kind by the Federal Trade Commission. I hope we shall go further and establish a special or select committee of the Senate to investigate and study all the problems of the consumer. It is the small consumers who are affected by the continued high prices of what they buy, notwithstanding the fact that the primary producer, the farmer, is compelled to take far lower prices for his products.

So I very much hope that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] will prevail. I may add that I am proud to have had this opportunity to speak in support of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to speak on the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I withhold my request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] wishes to speak on the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I merely wish to say that the committee sustained the action of the House in leaving in the bill the proviso, according to which no money appropriated to the Federal Trade Commission shall be spent on further statistical study of the consumer's dollar. The committee took the action for the following reasons:

The study was started by Executive order signed by President Truman sometime last year. In the present budget, as revised by the new administration, no money was provided for a continuation of the study. I assume—although no evidence has been presented to the committee—that the language which the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] would strike out was inserted to make certain that the revised figures submitted by the Bureau of the Budget were adopted. I have inquired of the Bureau of the Budget to find out why they took that position. I am informed they took the position because of the uncertainty as to which agency should conduct these consumer studies.

I am in sympathy with consumer studies. Certainly in my section of the country we are very vitally interested in such studies. I was one of the sponsors of the bill which the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] just mentioned, as having been discussed by the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning.

At the present time the Department of Agriculture contains a division or commission which is conducting a continuing study of agricultural prices. Most of the price problems referred to by the Senator from North Dakota relate to food and agricultural items. Such studies may properly be made by the Department of Agriculture.

Furthermore, there is within the Department of Labor a Bureau of Labor Statistics, which, of course, studies consumer prices.

As the Senator from New York has stated, the Committee on Banking and Currency discussed this morning, in executive session, the question of whether a special committee should be constituted for the purpose of studying consumer interests, and, if so, how it should be done.

I am informed that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is also considering the same subject.

So, in addition to 2 agencies of the Government, namely, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor, which are now equipped to prepare such statistical data, 2 committees of the Senate are discussing how best to protect the consumers' interests, if they should be protected.

So, the Bureau of the Budget, in its revised budget figures, quite correctly, in my humble judgment, eliminated the appropriation for the time being so far as the Federal Trade Commission is concerned, in view of the uncertainty as to which agency of Government should conduct such a study and how best it could be conducted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. President, I hope that the committee's action in not striking the provision from the House bill, as it came to the Senate, will be sustained, and that the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] will not be adopted. I yield for a question to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, is it not true that the Federal Trade Commission has done this job for 40 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question factually. I assume it is the function of the Federal Trade Commission to study matters which affect trade and business in their various aspects.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator know that time after time the Federal Trade Commission has published pamphlets, with graphs, showing how much the farmer gets and how much the middleman gets out of the consumer's dollar, and that the Federal Trade Commission has done that work for 40 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the Federal Trade Commission will go forward with performing the duties which it has always performed in the past. The proviso ban was placed in the bill so as to eliminate a study which was begun last year by an Executive order signed by President Truman.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts know that if the proviso is permitted to remain in the bill the Federal Trade Commission cannot go ahead with the study?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the language is stricken out it will not be able to go ahead, because there will be no money available.

Mr. LANGER. They are asking for only $86,000 for this work. Does not the Senator understand that even though no money is provided for this purpose the study will be made nevertheless?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission to determine how it

will carry on its work. I say that a breakdown of the Federal Trade Commission's funds does not provide for the special study, which was begun under an Executive order signed by President Truman a year ago.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not obvious that the main purpose of the Federal Trade Commission has nothing to do with this study at all? The main function of the Federal Trade Commission is to prevent unfair competition in business. It was set up under the Clayton Act and under the Robinson-Patman amendment. In other words, it has had nothing to do with such studies. Is not what I have stated the Senator's understanding of the function of the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. TAFT. That is, until President Truman chose to impose a consumer study upon it. It that not correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Do not the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Department of Agriculture furnish every bit of information anyone could possibly want to have? I believe so. Of course, someone could coordinate the information.

I have seen the economic reports issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The reports are prepared directly from their figures. They determine what the cost of living is. In order to determine the cost of living they have to determine how the consumer's dollar is divided, and they have to determine how much the consumer spends for food and how much he spends for clothing. They determine how much the average American family spends. Those studies are conducted completely and very satisfactorily.

When it comes to determining how much finally goes to the farmer, the Department of Agriculture is constantly publishing statistics showing how much the farmer gets. He received nearly 53 percent of the consumer's dollar about 2 years ago. As prices went down his share of the consumer's dollar has gone down to about 46 or 47 percent.

It is not the ascertainment of the facts that is involved. The question is, What do we do with the facts that are ascertained? It seems to me we are duplicating statistical surveys throughout the Government. Certainly I would welcome the adoption of a provision which would eliminate an additional statistical survey.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Ohio for stating the subject so clearly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, after hearing the arguments which have been made on the subject, particularly the explanation by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as to what is to be done with the results of the surveys, it should be stated that the committee agreed with the House to eliminate this item from the appropriation bill because there are now before the Senate numerous requests for appropriations for studies of the same subject. Such requests are before the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Banking and Currency.

For example, a resolution has been submitted by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], providing $50,000 for such purpose, and the resolution is sponsored by several other Senators.

I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts—and I ask him whether he agrees with me—that I believe if the study should be made it should be made in the form of a congressional inquiry, to find out what should be done, rather than through statistics gathered by the Department of Agriculture and various other departments of the Government.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina. The reason we supported the action of the House was because of the uncertainty which exists at the present time and because of the duplication of effort which would result if the study were continued.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is a fact, I may say, that Congress has requests before it for congressional committees to undertake the same kind of study, and such requests have been filed with the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot say that of my own knowledge; but if the Senator from South Carolina tells me that is a fact, I am sure it is.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that the Banking and Currency Committee held a hearing on that matter this morning.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, I know of that hearing.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Previously I agreed to yield next to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to whom I shall yield now, if the Senator from South Carolina has concluded—unless the Senator from New York wishes to ask a question of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, I do.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Unfortunately, Mr. President, the very distinguished and very able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] was not present at the meeting this morning of the Banking and Currency Committee——

Mr. MAYBANK. I was present this morning at the meeting of the Appropriations Committee, in connection with certain mutual-aid appropriations.

Mr. LEHMAN. I know that, and I realize that the Senator from South Carolina cannot be at two places at any one time, although we would like him to be, and it would be very useful if he could be.

Let me inform the Senator from South Carolina that at the meeting this morning of the Banking and Currency Committee, there was no indication that the committee favored the Gillette resolution and would report it; and I point out that a failure to report and act favorably on that resolution would leave us without assurance that the Government would study the subject of the consumer's dollar.

I hope the Banking and Currency Committee will report the resolution, and I hope the Senator from South Carolina will support it. However, there is no indication that the resolution will be reported.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, I cannot speak for the Banking and Currency Committee. I merely say that this morning I was not present at the meeting of that committee because I was in attendance at a meeting of the Appropriations Committee, in connection with certain mutual-aid appropriations.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize that. My purpose was merely to inform the Senator from South Carolina what happened to the resolution of the Senator from Iowa, and I do so only because the Senator from South Carolina referred to that resolution.

Mr. MAYBANK. I referred to the resolution because, let me say frankly, when we wrote up the independent offices appropriation bill, various resolutions of that sort were pending. There were more of them in the House of Representatives.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in connection with food products, is not the difficulty that although we can, from the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, measure the amount the average family spends for food, and we can also measure from the figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics the amount the farmer receives for that composite market basket, let us say, and therefore we can determine the amount of the gross spread, there are no figures to show the amounts which go to the retailers, the wholesalers, and the jobbers, when they are involved, and the amounts which go for transportation and the amounts which go to the processors?

Therefore, whenever question is raised as to whether possibly the processors are receiving the added markup, they will reply, "No, it is the retailer or the wholesaler who is receiving it."

So a study of this type, showing the distribution of the spread, would enable us, so to speak, to put the finger on the places and the functions where the mark-ups really go.

I think that is the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the resolution of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In reply, let me say that of course the Department of Labor gathers the statistics of various costs——

Mr. DOUGLAS. It does so in the case of costs for the consumers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the Department of Agriculture does the same.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It does so in the case of the various costs for the farmers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if there is to be a new Senate committee, it seems to me it will be much more advisable to have this work handled by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

such a group—as, for instance, a committee to investigate and study problems affecting the consumers, as proposed to be created by the resolution of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. I believe it will be more appropriate to have such a group study this question, rather than to assign the study to the Federal Trade Commission, which has many functions of a different character to perform. Furthermore, the cost of having the work done by that agency would probably be much greater than the cost of having it done elsewhere in the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for another question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to preface the question by making a statement of fact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I jotted down the figures the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] stated during the course of his address. He said that in 1951 the average family of 3 spent $723 for food, and the farmers received $363 of that amount. If my subtraction is correct, that left $360 for the intermediate stages. Thus, the split was approximately 50–50.

Then, in 1952, as I understood the Senator from North Dakota, the Bureau of Labor Statistics showed that the consumers spent $740 for food, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics showed that the farmers received, for the same quantity of food, $353. Again, if my subtraction is correct, that meant that the groups in between received $387; in short, that although the farmers received $10 less, the middlemen received $27 more, or an increase of approximately 7 percent.

The problem is to locate where the difference goes. Does the retailer receive it or does the wholesaler receive it, or do the railroads or the processors receive it?

Charges have been made that there are agreements between the processors and that there is not perfect competition between them. I do not know the degree to which the charges may be correct, but certainly that would seem to be one of the very functions of the Federal Trade Commission as it was established. So it seems to me the Federal Trade Commission would be a very admirable body to determine whether the competitive system is working.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully reply to my friend the Senator from Illinois, who is a distinguished professor of economics in his own right, that it seems to me he has answered his own question to a great degree. He shows that the ultimate question is how much the farmers receive and how much the other groups receive. Obviously, the processors are receiving the difference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts does not wish to be unfair to the processors, and I wish to hasten to their defense, because there are retail markups and wholesale markups and transportation costs, and it is not possible to allocate the responsibility to any one of the various stages.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; I meant to refer to all the stages.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I repeat that at the present time the important matter is to have the proper agency do the work. Perhaps 6 months or a year from now we shall get the right agency to do it, with the help of Congress, and with a clearer understanding of the various corelated functions of the agencies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts feel that at the present time we are in a sort of "button, button, who has the button?" game, and it is impossible to determine who has it? If we place our finger on one agency, it replies, "The responsibility is somewhere else."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think Congress should determine who should do that work.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Should not we delegate the Federal Trade Commission to do it for us?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let us consider the matter further when the Banking and Currency Committee has considered the matter and when the Joint Committee on the Economic Report also has done so.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe I am correct in stating that a committee amendment to the appropriation bill carries an item of $4,053,800 for the Federal Trade Commission. Is it not a fact that that Commission is making, and has been making, a great number of surveys, studies, and investigations regarding the matters coming within its jurisdiction?

I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts will state whether to his knowledge there has ever been a legislative prohibition—certainly there is none in this bill, other than that contained in the last three lines on page 11—similar to the following:

> No part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for a statistical analysis of the consumer's dollar.

I wonder why, in view of the fact that there is no other agency that could make the investigation or study, the Senator from Massachusetts feels that it is sound procedure to include a prohibition against one particular study or investigation, whereas the Federal Trade Commission, as we know, makes hundreds and hundreds of studies, investigations, and surveys.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to my colleague, the Senator from New York, I shall not attempt to break down all the figures, because it would take too much time; but in the Bureau of Antimonopoly there are 168 positions, and the Bureau spent a total of $1,130,835. The Bureau of Antideceptive Practices has 150 positions, and had an allotment for personal services for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $999,400. The Bureau of Industrial Economics has 82 employees, and had an allotment in 1953 for personal services in the sum of $514,730. The other items are printing and binding, general operating expenses, stenographic pool, legal records, and so forth. But those are the three breakdowns of the costs of the various studies pursued by the Federal Trade Commission for the objectives indicated. The provision here in question, as I understand, was inserted because it had to do with a special study, outside the scope of the ordinary duties of the Commission, which was requested by an Executive order of President Truman.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator would agree with me that the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota would not increase the appropriation by a red cent; that the Commission would still receive $4,054,800, as provided in the bill—assuming, of course, that the Senate and House agree to the appropriation—regardless of whether the language contained in the proviso on page 11, beginning at line 20, is stricken out as a result of the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota. I ask again whether the Senator will not agree with me that the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota would not affect, even to the extent of 1 cent, the appropriation which has been recommended by the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Oh, of course, I agree with that statement. There is an overall fund which can be spent; but, as I have said, the breakdown submitted by the Bureau of the Budget eliminated the proposed study, and, presumably, the House determined that since the Bureau of the Budget did not specifically include the provision, the language now in question was advisable. The Senate committee did not see fit to change it. That is the present situation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Fulbright	McCarthy
Barrett	Gillette	McClellan
Beall	Goldwater	Millikin
Bennett	Gore	Monroney
Bricker	Griswold	Morse
Bridges	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bush	Hickenlooper	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hill	Pastore
Byrd	Hoey	Payne
Capehart	Holland	Potter
Carlson	Humphrey	Purtell
Case	Hunt	Robertson
Chavez	Ives	Russell
Cooper	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Kuchel	Stennis
Duff	Langer	Symington
Dworshak	Lehman	Taft
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Flanders	Mansfield	Williams
Frear	Maybank	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota. On this question the yeas and nays are requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say that the amendment would strike out lines 21 to 23, inclusive, on page 11 of the bill. I hope the amendment will not be adopted. There is no provision in the bill for the continuation of such a statistical study. The proviso is in accord with the revised budget. At the present time the work is being done, in part, at least, by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor, and there is a resolution pending now before the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to this very subject. There would be a duplication of work, and it is much easier to leave the proviso in the bill in order to determine how the work can best be done.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as the proponent of this amendment, I desire to make it clear that the Federal Trade Commission has done this work for the past 40 years. Ever since the Federal Trade Commission was created one of its functions has been to do this work. It has done a good job. For the life of me, Mr. President, I cannot understand why, all of a sudden, the Federal Trade Commission is no longer to do the work. There is talk about its being done piecemeal, through an investigation by the Congress. I respectfully submit that the Federal Trade Commission, under its new Chairman, is very able to handle it and to do a good, competent job out of its appropriation of approximately $4 million, even though no funds are specifically set apart for this particular study. The consumer and the farmer are entitled to know where their dollar goes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the issue is a very simple one, as to whether the study shall be continued now or whether it shall be postponed to the indefinite and indeterminate future.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the proponents of the amendment to the fact that the information involved has always been available from various private sources. The Harvard School of Business has provided it for years, as have the American Institute and other private institutions. Any consumer can readily see where his dollar goes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business at the White House.

On this vote the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea." The Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay" and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. If present and voting the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

I announce further that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is necessarily absent, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent on official business at the White House.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

I announce further that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—30

Anderson	Fulbright	Humphrey
Chavez	Gillette	Hunt
Douglas	Gore	Johnson, Colo.
Eastland	Hill	Johnston, S. C.
Kilgore	Mansfield	Smathers
Langer	Monroney	Sparkman
Lehman	Morse	Stennis
Long	Neely	Symington
Magnuson	Pastore	Welker
Malone	Russell	Young

NAYS—45

Barrett	Duff	Maybank
Beall	Dworshak	McCarthy
Bennett	Ellender	McClellan
Bricker	Ferguson	Millikin
Bridges	Flanders	Mundt
Bush	Frear	Payne
Butler, Md.	Goldwater	Potter
Byrd	Griswold	Purtell
Capehart	Hendrickson	Robertson
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Case	Hoey	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Holland	Taft
Cordon	Ives	Thye
Daniel	Jenner	Watkins
Dirksen	Kuchel	Williams

NOT VOTING—21

Aiken	Jackson	McCarran
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
George	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Green	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	Knowland	Tobey
Hennings	Martin	Wiley

So Mr. LANGER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on page 47, lines 2 and 3, appears a reduction of $2,500,000 in the authorization for the Federal Housing Administration——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wished to suggest that it is not a reduction in the sense of a saving of money to the taxpayer. It is merely a limitation on the amount the FHA can spend on the work it is doing, which amount comes out of what the FHA earns. I ask the Senator from New York if that is not correct.

Mr. IVES. I will not disagree with what the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has to say. The reduction to which I refer is a reduction of the House figure. The House figure is $27,500,000. The Senate committee figure is $25 million.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make clear to the distinguished Senator from New York, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, that it is not a reduction to the taxpayer. It is a limitation on expenditures.

Mr. IVES. That is correct. I used the term "authorization" in my statement initially.

Mr. MAYBANK. In substance the taxpayers do not save anything.

Mr. IVES. The taxpayers do not save anything one way or the other by this operation.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. IVES. It has nothing to do with the taxpayers.

While I do not wish to take issue with the Committee on Appropriations, I am wondering if it is not possible to substitute some other figure. I have in my hand a memorandum which I believe to be accurate, and which I desire to present at this point in my remarks, because I think it is rather important and should be considered.

The bill as reported by the committee cuts the Federal Housing Administration's authorization for nonadministra-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tive expenses from $27,500,000 to $25 million.

FHA is entirely self-supporting. These funds come out of FHA's insurance income and not out of the Treasury. FHA collects $4 for every dollar it spends for operating expenses.

The cut of $2,500,000 would not save money. The cut would mean just this—that FHA would be unable to process about 100,000 unit applications for mortgage insurance. The fees and initial premiums alone on these applications would total more than $6 million. This would not be true economy.

The cut would not be a true economy for another important reason. It would prevent FHA from doing an adequate job of risk analysis and inspection of properties.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. Let me complete this statement, and then I should be glad to yield.

This would seriously increase the risk of future insurance losses—losses which could be far in excess of the $2,500,000 cut. FHA is an insurance company. If any insurance company is prevented from analyzing its risks, it is put in a dangerous position. The expenditure of this $2,500,000 now is insurance for solvency in the future.

FHA's business has increased. The volume of applications has been running 20 percent above last year. In the month of April, new construction home mortgage insurance applications were 36 percent above the corresponding period last year. In the face of this increased workload, FHA should not be required—as it would be by this budget reduction—to cut 600 employees out of its field staff totaling less than 4,100.

The cut should be restored also because it would deprive thousands of prospective homeowners of the benefits of FHA mortgage insurance. It would deprive members of the public of the service they are entitled to receive from FHA for the fees and premiums they pay.

FHA has an excellent reputation for economy, efficiency, and service. It has served directly more than 3 million homeowners with mortgage insurance. In addition, it has helped to repair and maintain 15 million American homes. It has improved housing standards throughout the country and its constructive influence has been felt not only in the mortgages it has insured but also in better lending practices on uninsured loans. One out of every four new homes in this country is started under FHA. It has benefited homeowners, builders, workers, and lenders alike. FHA has written about $30 billion of insurance and it has not cost the taxpayer 1 cent.

In the fiscal year 1954 alone it is estimated that FHA will insure 2,200,000 home repair and improvement loans and receive mortgage insurance applications covering about 572,000 dwelling units. It is estimated that it will collect fees and premiums of $138,300,000 out of which it will pay operating expenses of $33,100,000. This is an expense to income ratio of less than 25 percent—a much more favorable ratio than that of any of the leading nonlife stock insurance companies.

This is a fine record. I cannot urge too strongly that FHA's nonadministrative expense authorization be restored to $27,500,000.

The figures which I have just read show an anticipated profit of more than $100 million for the coming year.

Mr. YOUNG and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. IVES. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, this cut was made pursuant to a motion which I made in the full Committee on Appropriations. It was based largely on many letters which I had received from several States, stating that the State offices of the Housing Administration were staffed by politicians of long standing who did not know their work. The offices are said to be overstaffed. My thought was that even though this is not money which comes out of the Federal Treasury, nevertheless it is money paid in by the people all over the United States, and therefore there is no need of wasting money, even though it is not Government money.

I think the cut was possibly a little too deep. I wonder if the Senator would accept an amendment restoring all but $1 million; in other words, restoring the amount to $26,500,000?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I wish to be reasonable. Heaven knows, I am not trying to do something which is out of order. I am just as much for economy as is any other Member of the Senate. However, I am inclined to think that in this instance we are being penny-wise and pound-foolish. If there are 600 inefficient employees, for heaven's sake get rid of the 600 inefficient employees and replace them by 600 who are efficient, if there is any way of doing it. That is the way to solve that problem.

It now takes 8 weeks to process an application. Such delay is holding up the construction industry to a great extent. It is anticipated that the proposed reduction, which would cut the field force from 4,100 to 3,500, would cause the processing time to be extended to 10 weeks. That would not be desirable. It would only hurt the building industry.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The reduction referred to is similar to that which we are imposing upon every other agency of the Federal Government. Is that not correct?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, what does the Senator mean by every other agency? Does he mean every other agency which earns money, or all agencies of the Federal Government?

Mr. YOUNG. I think almost every other agency is being cut very heavily on administrative expenses.

Mr. IVES. I am all in favor of cutting expenses. However, we are dealing with an agency which is not able to do promptly what it is supposed to do. The proposal is to cut the appropriation by about 20 percent, in order to try to save some money.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. In a moment. If the purpose of the reduction is to eliminate six or seven hundred inefficient employees, I say by all means we should eliminate them and replace them with six or seven hundred efficient employees.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe the only way we can get rid of inefficiency is to cut out some of the deadwood.

Mr. IVES. I am not opposed to that.

Mr. YOUNG. The only way we in Congress can get results is by cutting down the appropriations for administration costs.

Mr. IVES. I am not opposed to that at all. However, there are other ways of assuring efficiency than by cutting people out of jobs.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New York. I wish to make the record crystal clear that the housing law which was originally passed gave the FHA the right to spend 35 percent of its collections, including fees, which it earns. If that provision were in effect, they could spend nearly $40 million.

Mr. IVES. Much more than $40 million.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am speaking in round figures.

Mr. IVES. It would be more than $50 million.

Mr. MAYBANK. It would not be any saving in money to limit the FHA in the manner proposed by the Senator from South Dakota. The amount has been cut down from the amount which the House provided and from the amounts proposed by the subcommittee and the full committee. Now it is proposed to cut the amount further by $2 million. As the Senator from New York has so ably stated, the FHA is far behind in its work. They are not taking care of the mortgages in the way they should take care of them, from the standpoint of administration.

As the Senator from New York has stated, FHA is doing a very good job, but I know that the processing of mortgages in my State is far behind. In some cases the FHA is as much as 6 and 7 months behind in its work. It should be noted that the taxpayers do not pay for this service. Under the original housing law a definite limitation is in effect as to what the FHA may spend from its fees and premiums. All of us want to be fair to public housing and fair to slum clearance.

I think we would go too far if we were to cut the amount from $40 million to $12½ million. It should be borne in mind that this is not taxpayers' money.

I thank the Senator from New York for his explanation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator from New York that I agree with what the Senator from South Carolina has stated.

On Friday last, when the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] was not in the Chamber I stated it was my feeling, from information which I had later received, that the committee had cut the item too much. If the Senator from New York will accept the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] I assure him the committee will give the matter very careful consideration in conference.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I understand, is willing to make the figure $26½ million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from New York will accept the amendment and let us take it to conference, we shall try to work it out, so the FHA will be able to perform its work efficiently and at the same time permit us to save some money.

Mr. IVES. I am very agreeable to it. If it is to be $26½ million, it is satisfactory to me.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate what the Senator from New York has stated. Instead of saving money, if we do away with the premiums and fees and hold back the mortgages, the Federal Government in the end, and those who hold the mortgages, will lose money.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out that we are still a million dollars short of what should be the amount, and that will probably mean the dismissal of more than 200 employees, which will cripple the work of the agency to some extent.

I ask the committee, in conference, to seek the restoration of the amount of $27,500,000 because the $27,500,000 is really necessary to carry on the work properly.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. What was the amount of the appropriation last year, for the Housing Administrator?

Mr. IVES. I do not have that before me.

Mr. WATKINS. It was substantially the same, as I understand. Without this cut, it was substantially the same, was it not?

Mr. IVES. I assume it was.

Mr. WATKINS. How did the agency get so far behind?

Mr. IVES. They have been far behind for a long time and because of the time it takes to process applications and the constantly increasing number of applications. If the Senator had been here when I read a memorandum, he would have noticed how much the number of applications has increased. In April alone the number of applications had increased more than 36 percent over the corresponding period last year. The volume of applications this year is running more than 20 percent above last year. That is why they are constantly getting behind in their work. I do not argue on behalf of inefficient employees. I have no more use for them than anyone else. If the delay is due to inefficiency, let us get rid of the whole 4,100 employees and replace them with efficient employees. However, we are not accomplishing anything by cutting down on the work and by having the agency inadequately staffed, regardless of the qualifications of the employees.

Mr. WATKINS. I may say to the Senator that I am in favor of appropriating for the agency sufficient money to enable it to do business efficiently. However, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has pointed out that charges of inefficiency have been made, as well as charges of wasting money. I wonder whether the Senator from New York can point out how, under Civil Service, we can get rid of the inefficient employees.

Mr. IVES. We can always take care of civil service by passing a law applicable to this agency. I know that the builders who deal with this agency are satisfied with the work it is doing.

Mr. WATKINS. But they do not have to pay the employees. They are paid by the people who buy the homes.

Mr. IVES. But it is important to expedite the processing of the applications, and the number of applications has been steadily mounting. It is also true that the cost of the homes built has been steadily mounting.

Mr. WATKINS. I am not objecting to giving the agency sufficient money with which to do its work. However, I think there should be efficiency in the agency, and I am pointing out to the Senator from New York that we ought to find some constructive way of getting rid of inefficient employees.

Mr. IVES. I am in favor of it.

Mr. WATKINS. Since the new administration came into power we have not been able to get rid of inefficiency.

The Democratic administrations froze political appointees into the civil service, which has had the effect of making their spoils system permanent.

Mr. IVES. Of course, I am not in favor of inefficiency; but we should not proceed by penalizing the construction industry itself.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not in favor of penalizing anyone. I think there should be found a way of getting rid of incompetent employees and of the politicians who appointed them under the spoils system, and froze them into positions in the civil service which apparently have been made permanent.

Mr. IVES. I am in favor of doing that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Utah speaks about the spoils system. The President has appointed a new Director of FHA, and the distinguished Senator from New York is aware of his qualifications. If there is any spoils system in that agency, the present administration should do away with it. On this side of the aisle we do not want any spoils system in housing, which has been a bipartisan undertaking ever since I have been in the Senate, and I have been here for a long time.

Mr. IVES. I want to assure the Senator from South Carolina that every Senator on this side of the aisle will never have any part of any spoils system, either.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Friday last, the vote by which the committee amendment on page 47, line 2, was agreed to is reconsidered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the committee amendment on page 47, line 2, to strike out the figure "$27,500,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "$26,500,000."

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to be recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has the question been put?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been agreed to, without objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask that the question be put.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the committee amendment, on page 47, line 2, to strike out the figure "$27,500,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "$26,500,000." [Putting the question.]

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, to the committee amendment on page 20, in line 14, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated; and I request immediate consideration of the amendment I offer to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 20, in line 14, it is proposed to strike out "$3,330,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "$4,130,000."

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I was not present when the Appropriations Committee acted on this matter; at the time, I was presiding as chairman of another committee. Normally I would be inclined to go along with the Appropriations Committee. However, I think a very important item was deleted from the bill because of lack of information about it.

In 1948, during the most acute part of the housing shortage, our joint committee on housing traveled approximately 30,000 miles and held hearings throughout the United States. One of the things that we found was preventing a young man from receiving a dollar's worth of housing for every dollar he spent for housing was the complete lack of uniformity among the various building codes, including the plumbing codes, and even in respect to the measurement of equipment going into homes. At that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

time our committee unanimously—including every Democratic member and every Republican member of the committee, as I recall—agreed that there should be established within the Housing and Home Finance Agency a research department which would work toward reducing the cost of the average home and toward unification of the building codes throughout the United States. That department has done an excellent job. However, I know the results of its work have not been fully felt as yet because there is a wide gap between successful research and the savings which can be accomplished thereby.

I also know that there was not presented to the Appropriations Committee a complete picture of some of the results obtained; and I think I must plead guilty for failing to ask that the hearing be held up until I could be present and could submit to the committee the material in my possession.

I may say that President Eisenhower has requested $800,000 for this research department. The amount he has requested is considerably less than the amount Mr. Truman requested.

Mr. President, let me list a few of the accomplishments of the research department since it has been in existence. Its research has showed how the cost of the roof of a medium-priced home could be cut by $180, or roughly 34 percent of the cost. The research department has demonstrated a way to build a frame wall in a medium-cost home at a saving of approximately $210. It has showed builders how they could save from $40 to $50 on each house by proper planning of the arrangement of the plumbing fixtures and pipes. It has worked toward the establishment of a national plumbing code, which if adopted, would save approximately $150 in the case of each house built. If all these methods or even if any single one of them were used for one-fifth of the houses built in any one year, there would be a total saving ranging from a minimum of $8 million to a maximum of $108 million.

I think it is false economy to delete this item of $800,000, which, as I say, is the item President Eisenhower has requested, and is much less than Mr. Truman requested. This research department has done an extremely good job.

Let me say in closing, without taking too much of the time of the Senate, that as of today, anyone who knows the first thing about housing must be aware that a young man who wishes to build or to buy a home is still paying more than $1 for every dollar's worth of housing he receives.

I most strongly urge the Senate to vote to restore the item of $800,000, which President Eisenhower has requested; and on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask the Senate, as a courtesy—for I think this matter is extremely important—to grant my request for the yeas and nays. It will take only 10 minutes to call the roll, and this matter is most important.

So, Mr. President, again I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say that $800,000 was proposed for housing research in the revised budget. The House voted to eliminate the entire item. The full Appropriations Committee of the Senate voted against the subcommittee's recommendation of $600,000, and joined the House of Representatives in voting to delete the entire item.

Since the committee made its report representatives of the Housing and Home Finance Agency have been to see me; and they say they need approximately $125,000 in order properly to liquidate the housing research program not later than April 30, 1954.

Our full committee voted against this research for the reason that we felt that today there are competing architects and various types of houses under construction in various sections of the country, in respect to which there is much competition among building contractors and private architects; and we felt that by reason of such competition in private industry the best possible housing research would be done.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency has a certain number of skilled employees; and if the research work is stopped, those employees will go to other services within the Agency. They will not necessarily be discharged if the housihg-research item is eliminated from the bill.

In closing let me say that the full House Appropriations Committee and the House itself and the full Senate Appropriations Committee decided that housing research is no longer needed in view of the accelerated pace of housing construction and the efforts of the housing industry to build the best possible houses.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think I have spent more time on housing than has almost any other Member of the Congress. I spent 8 months on it in 1948. I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts is aware of the fact that one of the causes for the increased cost of the average house—and every Member of Congress agreed wholeheartedly on this point—was the great divergence in building codes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. For instance, one city requires a certain type of roof and another city requires a certain type of wall, and another city requires that the plumbing work be done in a certain way. There is no uniformity whatever. The result is that a contractor who is building houses in one city has almost completely to change his plans if he is to build houses in another city; and that increases the cost of construction.

Is the Senator from Massachusetts aware of the fact that there is no way by which private industry can work toward a uniform building code? I believe the Senator from Massachusetts knows that I am perhaps the last Senator who would urge an increase in appropriations, for ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have been voting for reduced appropriations.

So it is most unusual for me to request the Senate to increase an appropriation item. I do so only because I feel so very, very strongly that each one of the dollars spent upon research work—work which cannot be done by private agencies—will ultimately result in saving tens of thousands of dollars.

I understand the Senator from Massachusetts was chairman of the subcommittee. The subcommittee voted for the figure of $600,000, instead of $800,000, I believe. In order to avoid the necessity of any member of the subcommittee voting against the majority of the subcommittee at this time, very resultantly, I propose to modify my amendment to provide the identical figure which was provided by the subcommittee, namely, the figure of $600,000, instead of $800,000. I do not do this because I think $600,000 is the more ideal figure. I think President Eisenhower was correct when he requested $800,000. But I have talked with certain members of the subcommittee, as a result of which I have found that some of them are reluctant to vote for a figure other than the figure for which they voted in the subcommittee. So, Mr. President, I ask permission to modify my amendment so that it will strike out "$3,300,000" and insert "$3,930,000". This means that I am asking for an additional $600,000 for the housing research program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I oppose the Senator's amendment to increase the amount by $600,000, because as chairman of the subcommittee, I am bound by the report of the full committee, as well as by the report of the subcommittee. I may say to the Senator I would accept an amendment increasing the amount by $125,000 or $150,000, having in mind that it would lead to a liquidation of the program on April 30, 1954. If the Senator from Wisconsin would accept that suggestion, I believe it would be fair. But I cannot accept his proposal to increase the amount by $600,000.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly would not accept the Senator's suggestion. That would provide for the elimination of the research program, a program which I think is all important. If the Senator will permit me to ask one question, is it correct—and I may say I do not have the vote of the subcommittee—is it correct that the Senator from Massachusetts voted for the item of $600,000 in the subcommittee?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may state to the Senator from Wisconsin that, as chairman of the subcommittee, I recommended that this matter be stricken out in its entirety. On that I was overruled by the subcommittee to the extent of $600,000.

Mr. McCARTHY. Could the Senator tell us the vote by which the subcommittee accepted the $600,000?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was a voice vote, following a discussion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I view this item and certain other items, I may say I believe that last November, the people of the United States were determined to curtail bureaucracy in

Washington. Here we have a typical example of a bureaucracy which I think evidences a desire to compete with the architects and construction companies as well as with individuals who desire to build homes. The item is for what is called research development. Mr. President, I find no reason for saying that the Government should be operating within this particular field. The Senator from Wisconsin advocates an increase because, as he pointed out, as a result of this research work two or three suggestions or plans have been developed at a cost of more than $5 million.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not yield at the moment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would like to correct the figure, if I may.

Mr. FERGUSON. What has been the entire cost of the program?

Mr. McCARTHY. The research program has not cost $5 million.

Mr. FERGUSON. What has been the cost of it during the entire period?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator will wait a moment, let us get the exact figure. I do not want to guess about it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have the exact figure, which is $4.3 million. I should like to inquire which, if any, of the so-called plans has been adopted by private industry? We hear pleas for economy, but the attitude seems to be, "We want everybody else to economize, except when it happens to be at the expense of a project in which we personally are interested."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senate and House at this session of the Congress are not going to reduce the budget, then there will not be a balancing of the budget, and there will be no reduction of taxes in the United States. There will not be one item of the budget as to which Members of the House or of the Senate will not be importuned by people within the various departments to apply the heat, so to speak, in order to get an increase in the amount of the appropriation. I have served on the Appropriations Committee for approximately 11 years. I know the pressures which are exerted. Pleas are always made on behalf of the departments that their appropriations be not reduced.

If there ever was anything we could eliminate, it is the provision regarding the research program. I had understood that it was generally desired that this program be returned to private enterprise, in the belief that it would result in a reduction of building costs because of the competition in the building industry. This matter affects items that are in the municipal building codes, yet I am unable to find wherein the codes have been changed as the result of the research program. Why do not the people of the cities assume the burden of changing their building codes?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield in a moment. Why does the agency in Washington want to hire bureaucrats for the purpose of trying to tell the people throughout the 48 States the kind of buildings they should have and the kind of building codes they should have in the thousands of cities throughout the United States? I submit we should not be meddling with the business of the people back home in that manner. We can be spending $800,000, or we can accept the mandate of the people given last year by cutting the budget. I hope we may soon begin cutting it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Michigan is genuinely sincere. I know that over the years he has been doing a great job in trying to cut the fat out of budgets. I am sure, however, that when the Senator says this program is competing with private industry, it simply is not a correct statement. Representatives of private industry from coast to coast appeared before our committee, saying to us, "Gentlemen, if you can help us get a uniform code, we can cut the cost of building." City officials from coast to coast appeared before us, who said, "Gentlemen, we cannot hire the necessary legal talent, we cannot hire the necessary expert talent for the purpose of drafting a code which would cut the cost of building." They said, "That must be done by the Federal Government."

So I would say to the Senator from Michigan, this does not contemplate competition with private industry. It is what every builder from coast to coast wants. It is what every responsible city official wants. It is what is desired by every young man who wants a dollar's worth in return for every dollar he spends.

I may call the Senator's attention to the fact that within the very short period of time the housing research program has been in effect, it has been possible to have 41 cities adopt a model plumbing code, which was badly needed, and which was drafted under the housing research program. In addition to the 41 cities that have adopted the model plumbing code, 150 other cities, though not adopting it in toto, have in effect adopted it. I point out that this is not a proposal which would create competition with private industry. It is, on the contrary, a proposal to give to private industry the greatest assistance the Government can give to assure the building of good, reasonably priced homes.

I desire to call attention to what I consider to be not a completely accurate statement. In doing so, I wish to make it clear that I have great admiration for the Senator from Michigan who, I think, has done a great job in cutting fat from the budget, year after year. But in this matter he is not assisting in cutting out the fat. He is proposing that we cut out a very important muscle—a thing which should not be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there is not a corporation counsel in any city who does not have legal talent, who does not understand the building code in his city, who will not be working constantly to improve that code, and who will not cooperate to the end that we may have good building codes all over the United States. I do not know why it should be thought that every problem, no matter what, must be brought to Washington, and that we must spend millions of dollars on it.

I do not know why the people back home are not interested in the changing of their building codes. We are told on the Senate floor that there is not a common council that does not want it and there is not a builder that does not want it. Why do not the common councils in the various cities change their own building codes? Why do they ask us to endeavor to draw a uniform building code?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to answer the Senator's argument.

This is another instance of "economy, but—." It does not apply if we want a certain particular item. I want to try to keep appropriations down, and here is a place where we can save almost a million dollars.

I would go along with the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] that we liquidate this agency, but it will have enough money under its present budget to continue to approximately June 1. As indicated by the House vote, by the House committee, and by the Committee of the Whole of the Senate, here is a place where we can apply the knife and cut out this item.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Michigan asked the question why, if it is an ideal thing to have a better building code, the common councils of the various cities do not adopt a model code?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; why?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I started out feeling exactly as the Senator from Michigan feels, but as I listened to witnesses for the builders and to witnesses from various branches of city governments, I think we received a very simple answer to the question.

Let us take one of the relatively small or moderate sized cities in Michigan; let us take a city of 50,000 population. Let us assume it has a building code which is a conglomeration which has grown up over a hundred years. It has never been planned, but, like little Topsy, it just "growed." That is what obtains in most of our cities. If the common council wants to adopt a model code prior to the operation of our research program, it will have to hire lawyers and engineers, and the average city will find it impossible to find a lawyer who is an expert on coding. If it does find one, the next thing would be to find an engineer. It will have to convince the labor leaders and leaders in industry that a new code would not adversely affect them.

We heard witnesses representing labor and industry, and witnesses from many city councils, and they all agreed that there is only one way to get a uniform code. They agreed that unless we have a uniform code, we will always pay too much for houses, and the only way to bring about a uniform code is to have a central body work with them.

This research division has worked out a model plumbing code which has been accepted by labor and industry in 41

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

cities, and, in essence, it has been adopted in 150 cities.

A city council cannot work out a model building code. The Senator from Michigan suggests that if they have developed a model plumbing code, why not let the research division go out of existence. They are working on a model building code, and, if it is accepted, every young man who purchases a home will pay less money for it than he has to pay at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I never understood the philosophy of the Federal Government in Washington to be that it should undertake to tell the respective cities what their city ordinances should be. I never understood that the province of the Federal Government was to tell the State legislatures what kind of laws they were to pass in relation to State matters or city matters.

We are now told that the proper thing to do is to form in Washington a bureaucracy with a corps of lawyers, to teach the people back home what kind of laws they should have in their cities and in their States. I cannot understand why we should be advocating on the floor of the Senate that the province of the Federal Government is to try to tell the people back home what kind of ordinances they need or what kind of laws they need. We have a big enough job in Washington to legislate on Federal matters without undertaking to tell the people of the respective cities and towns what they should do.

I hope that we shall close out this particular activity. We could keep 10,000 lawyers busy telling the people in Michigan and all the other States what kind of legislation they should put on their books. But that is not the province of the Federal Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that experience has shown that for each dollar of Federal money which has been spent on this service, the benefits received have been far beyond $800,000, which is the appropriation sought. The agency has been working with practically all branches of the building trades; it has been working with labor and industry, and it has done an excellent job. It is now in the middle of it, and we should not cut it off. If we do, it will be the most false economy we have ever practiced, and the result will be that every young man who wants to buy a home will have to pay an increased price.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator mean to say that the General Electric Co., among the users of the service, needs the taxpayers' money in order that it may engage in research on electrical equipment? Does the Minneapolis-Honeywell Co. need the services of the United States in making research?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know what the General Electric Co. needs. Perhaps it can survive, regardless of whether wiring a home costs a thousand dollars or $900. But the young man who buys a home needs it. To him it makes a great difference whether he pays $1,000 or $900 for the wiring of his home. If we knock out this program, although the General Electric Co. can survive, every young man who wants to buy a home is going to have to pay more money.

Mr. FERGUSON. Where is the evidence that by reason of this research it has cost less to build a home?

Mr. McCARTHY. This research agency has already sent out the results of its experiments, which, according to industry, can mean a saving of $150 in the cost of a home.

Mr. FERGUSON. Where is the evidence that the code has been adopted?

Mr. McCARTHY. Forty-one cities have adopted the model plumbing code.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much has been saved?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot give the Senator the figures. The estimate I have is that the model plumbing code will save, roughly, $150 on an ordinary home. Obviously, the figures can vary from Flint, Mich., to Appleton, Wis. The point is that there is a saving.

I have stood with the Senator from Michigan for years in trying to cut expenditures. I think that at times I may have voted unwisely to cut some figures. This is the first time I have ever risen on the Senate floor and asked for more money in an appropriation bill. I do so because I have been following this problem closely for 5 years, and I have heard industry, labor, and homeowners begging for something along this line.

Mr. FERGUSON. It appears to me that we are confronted with the question, Is the Federal Government going into every conceivable industry and every conceivable business and try to tell the people how they ought to conduct the industry or business as the case may be?

If we indicate that we aim to save something for the young man who desires to build a home, naturally that will appeal to the heart of every American. But the same reasoning would apply to the manufacture of automobiles. Shall we have a bureau in Washington to tell manufacturers how automobiles can be made at a lower cost? Are we to have a bureau in Washington to tell how electric washers can be manufactured less expensively? Are we to have an agency in Washington to tell how to make dolls for children more cheaply? Shall we say that because we have the power to tell the people, from Washington, how they can save a dollar, that is the province of the Federal Government?

If the Senator's argument applies to the building trade, it applies to everything a young man and his wife can place in their home. Why do we not begin to conduct research as to furniture? Why not begin research into everything that is used in the home? It might be that we would come to the point of telling people that if they bought a standard article, they could buy it for less money.

Is it the duty of the Federal Government to mold the lives of the American people? Is it the province of the Federal Government to spread its wings all over the United States and tell the people what kind of ordinances and what kind of laws they ought to have in their States? I believe that would be a misconception of the proper function of the Federal Government. Now is the time for a change.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may answer him briefly?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Michigan asks, why do we not have research as to automobiles and furniture? I call attention to the fact that the Government does not insure the purchase price of an automobile, and the Government does not insure the purchase price of furniture. However, it was found that it was impossible for a young man returning from the war to get a home within his income, so the Federal Government has invested billions of dollars in the insuring of home loans. That being so, I believe the Government does have the obligation to try to help young men to obtain homes for less money.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to speak briefly in support of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. I served on the House Committee on Banking and Currency for 12 years. I perhaps am as familiar with the need for research in the field covered by the amendment as are the members of the Committee on Appropriations. I beg leave to differ with them in the conclusions which they have reached on this important subject.

This year we shall build perhaps 1,300,000 homes, more than half of which will be insured by the Federal Government to the extent of from 90 percent to 100 percent. We are interested in getting the highest possible value for the dollar and the building of the most modern homes, but we do not wish to pyramid the costs because of obsolete or antiquated building codes or antiquated, obsolete construction codes.

If the senior Senator from Michigan were correct in his assumption that the building of houses was comparable to the manufacture of automobiles, there would be a "General Motors of Housing," which we do not have.

The housing industry is composed of thousands upon thousands of small-business men, most of whom were very small-business men before the housing program enacted by previous Congresses came into being to make possible home ownership for the mass of Americans. This housing program resulted in the building of homes in one section of the country without knowledge of what was happening in another section. Savings that might be developed in the building of a home for $8,000 might not be available to a housing contractor in Massachusetts, who might have to charge $10,000, $12,000, or $15,000 for the homes he erected. Obviously, an agency in the nature of a clearinghouse is needed through which can be channeled to other sections of the country information as to savings that have been made in one section by small-business men, who can tabulate them and give performance results through laboratory tests.

By and large, housing purchases represent indebtedness which will continue

for 30 years. Very few builders, can insure loans when innovations in construction have been made and certainly the FHA and the housing agency of the Veterans' Administration cannot, unless those innovations have been thoroughly tested and studied by a research and development branch of the Government.

Let me give a brief history of the bureaucratic institution about which the senior Senator from Michigan was speaking. When it was proposed several years ago, immediately after the war, that there should be a Research Division, private industry almost unanimously fought the provision. They did not want to see established an agency of bureaucrats who would do what the senior Senator from Michigan has said will be done. Certainly that is an established fact. But such an institution has been a going organization for more than 7 years. After the Research Department was created, instead of the fighting opposition continuing to fight, the home-builders association, architects, and others came to Congress and asked unanimously that the funds be continued, in order to help them produce better houses for less money for Americans to own.

It would be pennywise and pound-foolish to chop off $600,000 from the appropriation having to do with the improvement of values in property behind perhaps $1½ billion of Government insured mortgages in the coming year. It would be pennywise and pound-foolish, with the Government having more than $20 billion tied up in insurance of home loans, to say that the Government is blind or ignorant, or that the Government does not care what quality of construction or improvements goes into these homes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I am very much impressed with the argument the Senator from Oklahoma is making, but during the 7 years of this program, why has there not been compiled information with respect to building codes, or other cost-reducing proposals? Why has it not been put together and made available?

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, for whose judgment I have great respect, that building codes have grown up over a period of from 50 to 75 years. Vested interests concerned in preserving the status quo of certain types of construction, such as plumbing and wiring and the other features of housing, are slow to change them. As a Government, we cannot go to the Senator's home city or to my home city and say, "Wipe out the obsolete codes." However, if information is channeled to private industry about what is being done in different sections of the country, and if it is demonstrated that new methods of plumbing and new wiring systems can be obtained at much lower cost, eventually the codes will be improved, and eventually the buyer will get more home for his money.

I should say we would be making a very bad change if we eliminated this $600,000. We would be endangering and jeopardizing more than $1 billion of home mortgages, on which Uncle Sam has written his endorsement.

I plead with Senators not to cut out funds which have been demonstrated in the past to be needed. It has been demonstrated that the expenditure of these funds will tend to provide much better housing for purchasers. If we allow this agency to exist, it will continue to serve, not bureaucrats, but private industry, which desires to give the very greatest value. That cannot be accomplished with vast combines of housing companies, such as General Motors or General Electric or the other tremendous giants of our industrial complex, because the housing industry has not been developed and does not operate in that way. The housing industry, as it should be, is made up of small businesses. By cutting the appropriation we would be removing, not only from the veteran, but also from small business, far more than the $600,000 which this appropriation will entail.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, last year this agency had an appropriation of $528,000. What is being urged is an example of what bureaucracy wants to do. When we are supposed to be cutting down on the number of bureaus, we are being asked for $950,000. Last year the appropriation was $528,000. In other words, this year the amount sought is almost double. The agency has had 7 years in which to try to develop a model for all the various building codes. If they have not been able to perfect such codes and draw them up in 7 years, I do not know why we should grant any more time or increase the size of the bureaucracy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as Senators know, the subject of housing and housing research is handled by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. No one has said anything to me about this appropriation, one way or the other. I have not heard from the homeowners, the builders, or anyone else, as to whether this program is a good thing or a bad thing. I think I can say without fear of successful contradiction that the committee has received no information whatsoever on the subject. No one has appeared before the committee advocating that the research program be continued, or that it be discontinued. I do not know what the record is. I do not know whether the agency has made a good record in this respect or a bad record. I should like to make a suggestion. First of all, no one came to me, as chairman of the committee which handles housing, asking that the committee do anything about it. I do not know where the able Senator from Wisconsin obtained his information. It certainly did not come to me as chairman of the committee handling this activity.

I should like to suggest that this amendment be passed over for a few hours—perhaps until tomorrow, if we are not going to be able to vote on the bill today. I should like to obtain a little information as to what has been done. My best judgment is that the item might well be eliminated. However, I am not prepared at the moment to vote intelligently one way or the other. I do know that no one in the building industry or in the financial world, and no one connected with the administration, has said a word to me about the appropriation. In fact, no one at all has said a word to me about continuing or discontinuing this program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator wishes information, under the heading of Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of Administrator, there is a 14-page justification for this item. The agency has undoubtedly done some good work. It has undoubtedly made some progress in connection with codes. However, the question arises, How are we going to reduce expenditures? In 1950 there was an appropriation of $2,050,000 for this purpose; in 1951, $1,404,000; in 1952, $495,000; 1953, $528,000. This year, in the original budget, $950,000 was requested.

Mr. CAPEHART. And the item was eliminated?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We eliminated it.

There is no question that the agency has done some good work. The question is, When are we going to stop or slow down some of these governmental activities?

As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has so well said, much of the research involved must be local. It involves local conditions. Conditions differ in various sections of the country. Uniform building codes have been adopted in a number of the States. The research effort of some of the colleges has been helpful. The real question involved is how much we want to reduce expenditures. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I believe we should provide some money to liquidate this activity in the coming year. But if we want to continue it, all I can say, as the chairman of the subcommittee, is that the subcommittee and the full committee voted against any further funds.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which handles housing legislation, I think I can say without fear of successful contradiction that neither builders, homeowners, nor members of any other group have said a word to me on this subject. I believe that is true not only with respect to the membership of the committee as a whole, but also with respect to the staff of the committee.

My best judgment is that we might well eliminate the item. If it is desired to have the amendment passed over for 3 or 4 hours, or until tomorrow, I shall be very happy to see if I can obtain some factual information from Mr. Cole, the Housing Administrator, which will show how important this item is. It makes no difference to me. If Senators wish to vote at this time, I am perfectly willing to do so. I am also willing to allow the amendment to be passed over so that I may have an opportunity to obtain a little information.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The authorization for the establishment and development of research in this field was through legislation considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is the appropriate committee to consider the housing program.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. If we are to discontinue the program, would not the proper procedure be to go to the legislative committee, have a hearing, and at least give the program a decent burial, instead of giving authority to the Appropriations Committee to pronounce the sentence of death without hearings, and without consideration by the committee charged with the conduct of the housing program?

Mr. CAPEHART. That was partially my thought. No one has said a word to me on the subject. Other members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency are in the Chamber. Whether anything has been said to them or not I do not know; but certainly nothing was said to me about continuing this appropriation. I was a member of the committee when the program was started. At the time I thought it was a good thing. It has been in existence for 7 years. The purpose primarily was to standardize codes. Also I believe the agency was supposed to do some research work on housing. That was 6 or 7 years ago. It might well be that the work in that field is completed, so far as codification is concerned. Frankly, I do not believe that it is necessary to keep the program in operation in order to draw plans for houses. I do not believe that any money would be saved by following such a course. The research department might well serve a purpose in trying to bring about some standardization of codes. But I doubt very much if it can serve much purpose in so-called research, or in drawing plans for housing.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of the fact that neither the Appropriations Committee nor anyone else discussed this subject with the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and in view of the fact that the housing agency has submitted a 14-page detailed justification for this item, which material apparently has not been brought to the attention of the Senator from Indiana as of this moment, I should have no objection whatsoever to postponing the vote on this amendment, so that any Senators who desire to do so may acquaint themselves with the housing agency's justification for this item, check into the facts, and get in contact with representatives of the building industry, as well as of labor, so as to obtain a picture of just how important this item is.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this long dissertation was drawn up by the Truman budget officials. They are the ones who wanted $900,000. They wanted practically to double the previous appropriation. We would not expect them to want to cut out this particular agency.

Mr. McCARTHY. This agency was created by a Republican Congress. It was created in 1948.

Mr. Truman asked for $950,000. President Eisenhower asked for $800,000. I have taken the figure adopted by the subcommittee of $600,000. That is $200,000 less than what Mr. Eisenhower asked for. I asked for $600,000 rather than $800,000, not because I thought the $800,000 was not justified but because I did not wish to embarrass the members of the subcommittee. I think it would be better to have an appropriation of $800,000. However, I discussed the subject with certain members of the subcommittee. Some of them feel that, in view of the fact that the subcommittee voted for an appropriation of $600,000, the subcommittee would be bound by that figure. I do not wish to embarrass them. For that reason, my amendment calls for $350,000 less than President Truman asked for and $200,000 less than President Eisenhower asked for.

I ask the Senator from Indiana if he would prefer to have the amendment passed over for several hours, if unanimous consent can be obtained.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not in charge of the appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. But the Senator is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is true. I said what I did only because I thought it might be helpful to Senators who were undecided. Certainly no one has approached the Committee on Banking and Currency. So far as I am personally concerned, we might as well go ahead and vote on the amendment. I might be inclined to vote for a small amount of money for the study of codes, but I doubt very much if I would vote for money for so-called housing research, so as to find out how to build a house. If it were desired to provide a couple of hundred thousand dollars for code study, I think I would vote for it, but I would not vote for money for research.

Mr. McCARTHY. In addition to the study of codes, there is the matter of adopting uniform measurements in the building industry. If I may take a moment to discuss that subject, the testimony by both labor and industry was that if uniform measurements could be provided for in the housing industry from coast to coast the savings would be tremendous. So in addition to the unification of codes, the study of uniform measurements in the housing industry constitutes the principal function of the research division.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator realize that there are 60 people working in this agency and that at one time the appropriation was as high as $2 million? If we cannot get a code in 7 years——

Mr. McCARTHY. Five years.

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, 5 years. It has been stated on the floor that it has been 7 years. If we cannot get a code in 5 or 7 years, when are we ever going to get around to drawing up a code?

Mr. McCARTHY. May I answer the Senator?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is a great deal to the Senator's argument. Industry for 20 or 30 years has been attempting to get a uniform plumbing code. The research agency has drafted one which has been accepted now by 41 cities, I believe. The agency is now working on a model building code.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish, please. It is a difficult job. Even in the Senator's home city it is almost impossible to adopt a streamlined building code and to get industry and labor to accept it. We are discussing a service agency which serves every city in Michigan and every city in Wisconsin and every city throughout the United States. It cannot do the job in 5 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is this a lobbying organization? Do they go to the cities and lobby to get the code adopted in the first instance?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is a service organization.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is it? Is it a service-lobbying organization?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me answer the Senator from Michigan. Let us assume the Senator is an alderman in his city and that the other aldermen agree with him that the city's building code is out of date, as many such codes are out of date. The Senator could contact this agency and get the benefit of what has been done in every city of the United States. That information has been brought together in a model code. The agency does not lobby.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could not that information be obtained from the cities themselves?

Mr. McCARTHY. One of the reasons for the appropriation being eliminated from the bill is because the organization has not been indulging in publicity work. They have been spending the money for actual research. If they had been spending half of the money in publicity, as so many bureaus might be inclined to do, there would have been a great uproar and the full amount would have been accepted in the first place.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the only matter that concerns me this afternoon, after listening to the debate, is that my good friend the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] seems to be against research.

I hope the Senate and the Congress will never forget that if it had not been for research in every line of endeavor which affects everyday American life, we would not today occupy the position we do throughout the world.

In this instance, of course, it is fair to ask why there is a lack of a uniform building code. There are many reasons. Building construction in this country is a progressive business. It does not arrive at a conclusion about construction in 2 years and say, "We have reached the ultimate, and are now stopping." Research must continue. That is the situation in the present instance.

What appealed to me in the argument of the Senator from Oklahoma was the fact that it was in line with the philosophy, as I understand, of the senior Senator from Michigan. The research is not being done for the Federal Government. The information which is gathered is channeled to private industry, to the builders who erect houses and who must use labor to construct the buildings. In other lines of endeavor the same situation holds true.

Does the Department of Agriculture stop its research work because a certain type of corn has been developed and is being raised in Iowa? Would Senators want it to stop all further research?

It is research which has made it possible for the farmers to produce perhaps three times as much corn as was produced, say, 30 years ago.

It was research which has made it possible to produce better sheep and better cattle in Wyoming, New Mexico, and throughout the West, as well as in the Carolinas and throughout the South, than it was possible to produce 30 or 40 years ago.

It is research which has placed us in the position of power in matters of war. That is it, pure and simple. It is research which makes it possible for the housewife to get a clean pound of butter. It is research which makes it possible to get better grades of oleomargarine. It is research which has made possible the production of oil. It is research which has made it possible to give a little relief to people suffering from cancer and heart disease and mental illnesses.

I for one do not believe that the American people are going to say that in the United States, both Government and private industry, are now at a standstill. Even in law we have research. We have bar associations, and we have courts. All of them are trying to get information as to how they can better apply to the moment the noble concepts of the Constitution of our country.

In every line one can think of, even in carrying out the duties of this body—and the Senator from Oklahoma was partly responsible for it—it was research into legislative procedures which brought about the Reorganization Act, under which we are now operating.

I am not arguing with the Senator from Michigan from the standpoint that he could not be correct in this particular instance. I think he is. But the point I am trying to make is that we should not stop research work.

Mr. FERGUSON. Neither do I want to stop it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Once we stop it, it will be too bad. The Senator from Michigan was speaking about the automobile industry. It is research in the Bureau of Standards, affecting a bolt or a screw or a piece of metal, which is channeled to the automobile industry, as it should be. It is research being done by the Department of Agriculture at Madison, Wis., which makes it possible to produce some plastics.

I hope that this body, in considering the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], will pay some heed to the implications and results of research. We must not stand still. We must continue to progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the vote by which the committee amendment on page 20, line 14, was agreed to is reconsidered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], as modified, on page 20, line 14, to strike out the figure "$3,330,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "$3,930,000."

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it in order for me to ask that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings in connection with the call of the roll be dispensed with? I am inclined to make such a request because I understand that certain Senators who will come to the floor for the vote will not come to the floor for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a request is in order.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that the further proceedings in connection with the call of the roll be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] to the committee amendment on page 20, in line 14.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—19

Aiken	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Chavez	Kilgore	Neely
Green	Langer	Smathers
Hayden	Lehman	Sparkman
Hennings	Long	Symington
Humphrey	McCarthy	
Hunt	Monroney	

NAYS—62

Anderson	Flanders	Malone
Barrett	Frear	Mansfield
Beall	Fulbright	Maybank
Bennett	George	McClellan
Bricker	Gillette	Millikin
Bridges	Goldwater	Mundt
Bush	Gore	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Griswold	Payne
Byrd	Hendrickson	Potter
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Carlson	Hill	Robertson
Case	Hoey	Saltonstall
Cordon	Holland	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Jenner	Stennis
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	Watkins
Dworshak	Kennedy	Welker
Eastland	Knowland	Williams
Ellender	Kuchel	Young
Ferguson	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—15

Butler, Nebr.	Kerr	Schoeppel
Clements	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Jackson	Murray	Tobey
Kefauver	Russell	Wiley

So Mr. McCARTHY's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have another amendment to offer, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to argue for it. It is along the same line as the last amendment.

As the Senate knows, President Truman asked for $950,000 for the program under consideration. My first amendment called for $800,000. My next amendment reduced the figure to $600,000. I now present a final amendment to appropriate $300,000 for the research program. I believe this to be very important, but I shall not burden the Senate with further argument. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the same arguments may be urged against the amendment just offered by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, that applied to the one previously offered. The House voted to cut out any money for housing research and the Senate committee followed suit, and by a vote of 19 yeas to 62 nays, the Senate has confirmed the action of the committee in its vote on the amendment calling for an appropriation of $600,000. I ask that the pending amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, there might be some justification for what is asked by the Senator from Wisconsin. It might well be that the office has finished its work of revising and making available codes to the cities and States, the subdivisions of Government which must, of course, eventually pass the laws putting the codes into effect, but if they have not finished their work, there might be some justification for such an amendment as is offered. There is no question that standardization of building codes in the United States is very badly needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment of the committee on page 20, line 14, in lieu of "$3,-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

330,000", to insert "$3,630,000." [Putting the question.]

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I asked for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The amendment is rejected.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had already announced the result.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the Chair to announce that the committee amendment had been agreed to prior to my addressing the Chair.

I understood the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts who is handling the bill to say he thought some amendment was necessary to the committee amendment, and I now ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment in connection with the question which I have discussed with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I ask that my amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 14, it is proposed to strike out the figure "$3,330,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,455,000", of which not to exceed $125,000 shall be available for liquidation of the housing research program not later than April 30, 1954.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I think this is a proper amendment. I accept it, and will take it to conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, $125,000 will save the research program assets which are worth much more money. I offer the amendment only in the interest of the taxpayers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the chairman of the subcommittee or the author of the amendment advise me whether the wording is such that terminal leave pay will be provided for without requiring an additional appropriation?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the amendment was drawn by the Housing Administration and checked by the legislative counsel. It is designed only to save the assets of the present organization in connection with the liquidation of the research agency of the Housing Authority.

Mr. CASE. I merely wish to be assured that the organization will be terminated and closed out without any terminal obligations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the $125,000 is to liquidate the program, pay the terminal leave of the staff, and also include funds for printing and distributing the results of its work in 40 to 50 research reports which will cost approximately $1,000 apiece. So the money will provide for liquidation, terminal leave, and printing reports.

Mr. MAYBANK. The only money for terminal leave is that which is provided for under the law which is on the books.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what I understand.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to assure the Senator from South Dakota that only those who are legally entitled to it under the decisions of the courts will receive such pay.

Mr. CASE. That is satisfactory, Mr. President. I wanted to determine that we were going to get rid of the obligation, and would not receive another bill for terminal leave.

Mr. MAYBANK. My only wish is to liquidate the agency. When that is done, we must pay what is provided for on the statute books.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any further amendments to the committee amendment? If there are no further amendments, without objection, the committee amendment as amended is agreed to.

The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "5-15-53-B," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$7,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,718,440."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it sounds like doubletalk when a Senator asks to have an appropriation increased in amount and, at the same time, says it does not impose an increased burden upon the Treasury or upon the taxpayers. But that is the case in this instance, and this is the reason:

A part of the item which I wish to amend is to be used to remove the freeze on television which was imposed by the Federal Communications Commission some years ago. That freeze was very effective. It stopped all applications for television licenses for several years. On July 1, 1952, the freeze was lifted and applications were accepted. Prior to that time there were 108 television stations in the United States. On July 1, 1952, the Commission had allocated more than 1,800 television stations for commercial use and 242 stations for educational use.

Under the Administrative Procedure Act, whenever there is more than one applicant for a station license, hearings have to be held. Such hearings, in some instances, last for many months. Examiners have to hold the hearings. Today the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had a meeting with the Federal Communications Commission. Six of the seven Commissioners were present. We received information from them which I do not believe the Committee on Appropriations had at the time it acted upon the item of $7,100,000, which appears on page 10, line 17, of the bill.

I wish to invite the attention of the Appropriations Committee to the information which our hearing today developed in connection with our examination of the situation.

As I have told the Senate, there are allocated to communities of the United States more than 1,800 commercial stations and 242 educational or noncommercial stations. Since July of last year, when the freeze was lifted, there have been added and placed in operation 3 VHF stations and 30 or 31 ultrahigh frequency stations, or UHF stations, making a total of 168.

I invite attention to the allocation of more than 2,000 stations. The Federal Communications Commission told us today that there are 65 large cities which do not have any television stations whatever. There are large cities, such as St. Louis and Kansas City, which have only one station apiece. The situation is very difficult. The additional amount of money requested this year will not add to the burden of the Treasury because, sooner or later, we are going to make appropriations to hire hearing examiners to take care adequately of the situation.

The only question before the Senate today in this connection is, Shall it be done in 1953 or shall we string along these appropriations over a great many years and cause delay to those who want the stations, who desire to have them licensed, and who have applied for licenses? Are we going to compel them to wait for perhaps 5 years before they receive their licenses? Congress must decide whether the cities will have to wait 5 years before they get television service. The problem is one of time. It is not a question of dollars; it is a question of when the communities of the United States are going to get television service. I am certain that no one will dispute the fact that hearings must be held; and when hearings are held, they cost money.

Mr. Rosel H. Hyde, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, told the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce today that it was the Commission's experience that the dragging out of hearings results in higher costs, and I am certain that he is correct. So instead of costing less, it will cost more, if we drag out this matter over a 5-year period.

During the delay a tremendous hardship will be imposed upon those who desire television stations. It costs a large sum of money to set up a television station, equip it, build transmitters, and install all the machinery that is required.

It costs from $300,000 to $500,000 to construct a television station. One who applies for a license to operate one must keep his money liquid. He must be ready to invest it whenever he receives his license. So an immense amount of capital is tied up in that way.

But that is not the whole problem. First, I should say that at present the Federal Communications Commission has 12 examiner teams. Mr. Bartley, speaking to the House Committee on Appropriations, said that the Commission could clear up all the backlog of applications which were pressing upon them if they were given 40 examiners.

I am taking the word of the Federal Communications Commission with respect to this matter. I believe that unless we do take their word for it, we shall be shifting responsibility from the Commission to Congress. Congress has passed the Administrative Procedure Act. Congress has said what must be done in the hearings. It has said what must be done before licenses shall be approved or granted. Congress has set up the whole procedure. The Federal Communications Commission must proceed under the standards which Congress has provided. It cannot be done otherwise. That is the law of the land. The standards Congress has provided are correct, good, and equitable, provided they are carried out in full. But time is required.

Television stations are valuable property. Some licenses are estimated to be worth tremendous sums of money. One license in the city of Chicago is estimated today to be worth $6 million. There is a great deal of competition for such licenses. There are many applicants for a license for a station having such great value. Therefore, several applications are made for a license for one station. The Federal Government cannot merely say, "Eeny, meeny, miney, mo," put its finger down, and say, "We will give the license to this applicant." No. It is necessary to hold hearings. The Commission has to sift out from the hearings the applicant who will best serve the public interest, because there is tremendous public interest in a television station and a television application.

As I have said, hearings take a great amount of time. They must follow a regular course, just as a trial in a Federal Court. Both sides must be given an opportunity to state their cases and make their pleas that the license be granted to one or the other applicant.

Congress has laid down the rule for such procedure. It is the law. Hearings must be held. If Congress did not provide for hearings and for the hearing personnel, hearings could not be held. What would happen? Television licenses could not be granted, and communities throughout the United States would be denied television stations and television service.

As I have previously said, 65 large cities in the United States do not have television, and perhaps they will not have it for 5 years unless Congress does something about the situation. The Federal Communications Commission, through Mr. Bartley, has said that if Congress will provide funds to enable the Commission to have 40 examiner teams, the Commission can clean up the whole backlog in 1 year. Congress must take the word of the Commission about that. We have to accept their appraisal of conditions. If we do not, if we deny them the funds, Congress will have to accept the responsibility of not providing for television stations throughout the United States. The matter is as simple as that. I believe the Committee on Appropriations has been misinformed, because I read the following in its report:

> It is not the intention of the committee, however, to delay the TV allocations in any manner, and if the Commission can adjust procedures or in any other way demonstrate their ability to process the applications to a decision in shorter time, the committee is agreeable to the consideration of an additional amount in a supplemental bill.

The committee is willing to have the hearings held, it is willing to have the licenses granted; but money is required to get the job done. There is nothing mystical about it. No sleight-of-hand performance will provide the licenses for the stations. Hard work is required to sift the facts, to insure that mistakes are not made, and that licenses are granted to the groups applying which are best fitted to operate the stations.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Did not the Senator say that there were 61 large cities, including cities such as Kansas City and St. Louis, having not more than one television station in operation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Kansas City and St. Louis have one television station each, but representatives of the Commission testified today that there are 65 large cities in the United States that have no television service whatsoever.

Mr. STENNIS. There are 65 large cities without television service of any kind?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. Kansas City and St. Louis are very large cities, and they have only one station apiece. I might say that there are a great many applications for stations in those cities. I think there are four applications for stations in Kansas City, and five for stations in St. Louis. It is not fair to the people that one station should have a monopoly of television in St. Louis. Large cities like St. Louis and others desire that television applications be processed, so that licenses for additional television stations can be granted.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is most correct. Is it not also true that while the people of Kansas City and St. Louis have at least one station each, many other large cities included in the number which the Senator has mentioned do not have the benefit of any television service or television programs whatsoever?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator estimate that it will take 5 years to clear the logjam of television applications unless a special fund is made available immediately to provide for extra examiners?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the length of time the Federal Communications Commission estimated it would take. They have 650 applications as of now. Each examining team can handle from 12 to 15. Their estimate was given to us today.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the law require that the examinations be held, testimony be taken, and the cases be heard in more or less the manner followed in an elaborate case in court?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Exactly.

Mr. STENNIS. That is mandatory; the Commission cannot decide otherwise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Congress has passed a law which requires the Commission to do those things. Twelve examiner teams, multiplied by 12, means 144 cases in a year. At the present time there are 650 cases pending, and, of course, there will be more applications.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for bringing the situation to the attention of the Senate. I knew that the situation in my State was bad, but I was very much surprised to learn that the situation is so general throughout the United States. I certainly shall support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HILL. A great deal is involved in these applications. Whoever gets a license may have a very valuable grant. A great deal of evidence and testimony is required in determining who shall receive the license, and careful consideration must be given to the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course.

Mr. HILL. Such an application is not something which can be disposed of overnight. We must have men who are capable and qualified to go into the applications, hear the testimony, and render a wise judgment, if the licenses are to be granted according to the rules laid down by the Congress. Is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. This is not a penny-ante operation at all. It is a big-money operation. Some television stations are valued at as much as $6 million at the present time. When that much money is involved, it means that it is an important concession which the Federal Communications Commission is giving to citizens of the United States. When a concession as valuable as that is granted, the Commission must be very careful that it is doing a good job. Congress has laid down certain standards, through the examiner system, so that a good job will be done, and so that the public interest will be well served.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the public interest is best served if the Commission can proceed in due, expeditious, and orderly fashion; is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. It must be enabled to proceed with all the speed possible. We do not want the Commission to act hastily. However, it is a pretty tough thing for a good-sized city not to have television service when cities all around it have

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

television service. We are asked, "Senator, why do we not have television service in our town? Is it not just as good as some other town?" What answer can we make? We may say, "Well, you will have television service when the Federal Communications Commission gets around to holding hearings in your town and deciding who is to receive the television license."

Mr. President, as has already been stated, the freeze on television was lifted in July of 1952. Hearings have been held or are in the course of being held on 65 contested cases. They are in one stage or another of hearings. Only two have already been decided by the examiners and are in the hands of the Commission at the present time.

I understand that the Appropriations Committee was informed that the bottleneck was not in the hearings, but was in getting the license to a station after the examiners had finished. According to the Federal Communications Commission, that is not the case at all. The bottleneck is in the hearings, absolutely and completely. The evidence shows that only two stations have been approved by the examiners. That is all that is before the Commission at the present time. Members of the Commission are not overworked in granting licenses. Their problem is to hold hearings, which must be held according to law. They cannot be held quickly. They cannot be shortened in any way. Applicants have certain rights under the law; and if they are turned down or disappointed in what they receive at the hands of the examiners or at the hands of the Commission, they can take their cases to the Federal courts and obtain justice. That requires a great deal more time than the time which might be saved by curtailment of an applicant's rights by reason of having a quick hearing instead of taking the full time and doing the job as it should be done. It must be done right. It must be done according to law. If it is not done according to law, the applicant has his recourse in law, and, of course, he can take full advantage of it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield for an observation if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am very happy to join with the Senator from Colorado in his amendment. As the Senator knows, I have been one of the severest critics of the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of granting television applications. It seemed to me for quite a long time that the Commission delayed interminably. It talked about extraneous matters. The procedure became so expensive that a reasonably poor applicant could not even afford to make an application for a television license.

We have learned from the Federal Communications Commission, which appeared in a body before our committee, that the Commission has undertaken to remedy the situation. The members of the Commission have undertaken to remedy it themselves. They have adopted rules of procedure, similar to the judicial pretrial conference, under which it will decide in advance what issues are in dispute, and eliminate all extraneous subjects, such as for example, what the religion of an applicant is, how many elevators there will be in his new building, or what programs he will broadcast on Thursday afternoon at 5 oclock.

In the past such subjects have taken up the most of the time in the hearings.

The Commission has now been able to get down to the meat of the situation, and has taken steps to remedy the prior situation which caused long delays in hearings.

Furthermore, we have learned that the Commission has agreed to what amounts to practically a cut-off date. In the past, when two applicants file applications—as, for example, when applicant A and applicant B got together and decided they would file an application for a certain channel—the Commission threw that application back on the open market, so to speak, and persons who actually had no interest in getting a station, but who wanted to effect a compromise, would file on top of the original applicants who had joined together.

That procedure has been eliminated. It is now possible for applicants to get together, and the Commission gives them protection and examines their applications jointly, as though they were making one application.

We have learned that the Commission has only 12 examiners. The examiners are doing a good job, but they do not have sufficient help. The members of the Commission testified that if the examiners worked the clock around for 6 days they still could not hear more than approximately 10 cases a year.

We have learned that there are today approximately 15,000 applications of all kinds pending before the Federal Communications Commission, which these 12 examiners must handle by themselves. The 15,000 are not all television applications. They are made up of FM applications, and AM applications, for two-way radios, and other applications.

Since the freeze was lifted last year there have been 1,090 television applications filed.

In the last year the Commission has been able to grant licenses in 345 cases, but there are roughly 650 contested cases which they have not been able to hear. As a matter of fact they have not been able to render a decision in any of the contested cases. They are about to render some decisions in the next 30 days, for the first time.

The members of the Commission testified that if they were granted the additional appropriation they would be able to hire a greater number of competent examiners and, with the new procedures which they have adopted, they would be able to clean up the backlog of 650 applications in the space of 1 year.

If Congress does not grant the appropriation, both Mr. Walker, who is the ex-chairman of the Commission, and Mr. Hood, the new Chairman, testified it would take anywhere from 3 to 5 years to clean up the backlog.

Mr. President, this is not in the nature of an extra expenditure. It seems to me it is in the nature of a wise investment. If we can get applications approved and get television stations in operation, the general public will be served. Moreover, the Internal Revenue Bureau will be much happier, because they will receive vast sums of money in taxes. In the first instance, television stations have been very profitable, and the money which the Federal Government will receive will more than make up for the money which would be appropirated for the Commission in this instance.

I am happy to join the distinguished Senator from Colorado, the former chairman of the committee, in asking that his amendment be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, no matter how sympathetic the Commission may be, no matter how desirous Congress may be, no matter how irate the long-suffering public may become, one fact stands out crystal clear; namely, that the present personnel of the Commission is unable and will continue to be unable to process the hundreds of applications now awaiting action until Congress votes an appropriation to finance hearings. Television belongs to the people and is for their welfare. The happiness of the FCC is not at stake. It does not make any difference to the Federal Communications. They can go along for years and years. But what about the Members of Congress? What are they going to tell their constituents who ask why they do not receive television service in their home towns?

By this additional appropriation which I am requesting Congress can set in motion a chain reaction which in 2 years' time will create billions of dollars in business. Applicants for TV stations stand ready to invest billions of dollars in building and equipping stations. There are approximately 23 million TV sets in use today. This figure can be doubled in the relatively near future, and the investment in these sets will amount to $8 billion of new business.

Thousands of people will be employed in their manufacture and hundreds of television jobbers, wholesalers, and retailers will enjoy a profitable business. The advertising campaigns over television will stimulate the sale daily of trainloads of manufactured products of every description.

The country has suffered for a long time because of the television freeze, which was put into effect by the Federal Communications Commission. I think it was a very unwise act. The Commission had reasons for doing it, which, perhaps, were satisfactory to the Commission, but which, nevertheless, the freeze has brought about a terrible injustice to a great many people. Last July the Federal Communications Commission lifted the freeze. But Senators and Members of the other House will be continuing the freeze unless they make it possible for the hearings to be held and the licenses to be issued. Otherwise it will be a continuing freeze for 65 large cities in the United States—and I mean large cities of 75,000 people and more. They will be without television for 2 or 3 years more unless we act.

Who is continuing that freeze? It is the Congress of the United States. We would be continuing that freeze unless we were to provide money. We have set up standards, and we have laid down the

terms upon which licenses can be issued. Now we want to put up the money, so the law may be complied with and to make it possible to license those stations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am sure every member of the committee is in complete sympathy with what the Senator from Colorado has stated. The facts which were given to us make the situation, as a practical matter, a little different from what he has stated. The processing of television applications is accomplished in the first instance by teams of seven men headed by an examiner. The teams go into the field. Then they return and bring their results to the Commission, and the Commission must pass upon the license applications. That is the way I understand it is done.

Last year there were 10 teams. The original Truman budget called for 17 teams. The Eisenhower budget followed up with 17 teams. The House, by shifting around the work of the Commission without increasing the appropriation, but discriminating against the radio work and some of the other work, called for 21 teams.

Our committee has put the number back to 17.

It is my information, from the Budget Director, that the Commission cannot handle the claims or recommendations of these examining teams faster than the 17 teams can bring back their findings.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to finish my statement. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado would add 15 teams to the 17 teams for which the committee has provided, or a total of 32 teams, as I understand his amendment. If our information is correct, there would be a bottleneck created in the Commission as these terms brought in their reports.

At the present time there are 1,189 requests pending. As of next July 1 the Commission expects to have 675 applications pending. A team will work at the rate of approximately 15 applications a year. So if there are 17 teams, they will process approximately 255 applications. If the information we have received is correct—and we received it from the Bureau of the Budget and, I understand, also from the Federal Communications Commission itself, although I cannot be certain about that—namely, that with 17 teams, it is not possible to process the applications any faster than that 255 a year, then we have provided all the funds the Commission can use for this purpose.

I agree that if it is possible to process the applications faster, that should be done. On the other hand, if it is not possible to process the applications any more rapidly, there is no use in providing more funds for this purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know where the Bureau of the Budget got its information. Members of the Federal Communications Commission testified before our committee today, just before the Senate met. I wish we had available the transcript of the proceedings of that meeting, so that I might read it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, the transcript is not yet available to us.

Let me summarize the statement by saying that just a few hours ago, 6 of the 7 members of the Federal Communications Commission told the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the bottleneck is not in the Commission, and will not be in the Commission; but the bottleneck will be in the hearings. They said only two cases have come to them from the hearings up to the present time. Sixty-five cases are in process of being handled by the examiners, but only two have reached the Commissioners. They said there is no question at all but that the Commission can keep up with the number of cases the 40 examiners bring to them. That is what they told us, and it makes sense, too.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I may ask a question of the Senator from Colorado, let me ask whether I correctly understand that the Federal Communications Commission has appeared before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and has testified that it has adopted revised procedures which speed up the handling of television applications.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to suggest that the same testimony was received last year. My judgment is that the fault does not lie in the number of teams, as Mr. Dodge, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has said, as is shown by the testimony which was submitted to the committee, and as the Senator from Massachusetts was told later—and the Senator from Massachusetts conveyed that information to me—but the trouble lies with the Commission itself, I believe.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what I understand.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think Congress should investigate the Commission, and should not provide for more teams to do nothing. I believe the Commission has been slow in its work. Am I correct about that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to answer the question asked by the Senator from South Carolina, I reply that I do not think the Commission has been at fault. I think the Commission has done a remarkably good job up to the present time. I think Congress placed upon the Commission a workload which Congress has not made it possible for the Commission to handle. I believe the fault lies with Congress.

When the Senator's constituents complain about not being able to obtain television licenses, there is only one place where they can lay the blame, and that is with the Congress of the United States.

I believe the Commission has done a remarkably good job. It has approved 340 cases for building permits, when no hearing was required. Up to the present time, only two cases from hearing examiners have come before the Commission.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood. Last year in the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee we had the pleasure of hearing from the Senator from Colorado and from others of the members of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We went along with his suggestions and also with the suggestions of the Commission, and we voted to increase the funds for the hearings on television applications. Am I correct about that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have nothing but the highest regard for the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of course. My present thought is that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget said he did not believe the Federal Communications Commission could keep up with the actual hearings to be conducted by the various teams if more teams were assigned to that work.

I should like to have the Senator from Massachusetts correct me if I am in error on that point.

If more teams can be of real assistance in this matter, I shall vote for funds for more teams.

Of course, I am familiar with what the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has done not only in this matter but also in railroad matters and other interstate and foreign commerce matters. However, I was told that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget did not think the assignment of more teams to work with the Federal Communications Commission would make it possible for the Commission to handle its work any more rapidly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina is eminently correct. We provided for funds sufficient for the work of 17 teams, and that was all the Commission could process. That is the basis upon which we acted.

If the information which came to us from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget was incorrect, then, personally, I would be open to making a change, because I do not believe these applications should be left 3 or 4 years behind. We provided for sufficient funds for 17 teams, at $40,000 a team, to process the applications as rapidly as the Commission could act upon them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not a fact that the Senate Appropriations Committee voted to revise the language of the House version of the bill in conformity with the request of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not also a fact that since it was not too clear to us where the bottleneck was, we discussed informally, in the subcommittee, the possibility that if we could find out for certain what would expedite the granting of television licenses—which all of us wish to see expedited—possibly we would consider a supplemental request, next year; but that this year we should stand by the provision now contained in the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. We felt that if more funds were needed and if they could properly be used, we would be very receptive to a supplemental appropriation request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield further to me, I wish to contradict the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina. I am not questioning his veracity at all, but I do question the judgment of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget when he makes such a statement, in view of what the Federal Communications Commission has told us and has testified to. Certainly someone is mistaken.

I also wish to reply to the proposal made by the Senator from Virginia. If we wait for a supplemental appropriation next year, we shall have lost an entire year's time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this afternoon we are arguing on the basis of conflicting testimony given in regard to the same set of facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Testimony has been received from two different groups.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sure the Senator from Colorado is telling us the facts as he knows them, and I am trying to state the facts as they were stated to me. In any event, we cannot conclude our action tonight on the independent offices appropriation bill.

I am perfectly willing to let this matter go over, without a vote, until Wednesday, when we will take it up again. In the meantime, I assure the Senator that I shall try to get the information from the Federal Communications Commission in such form that we can determine whether the bottleneck is in Washington or whether it is in the field.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In a moment. Let me reply to the suggestion just made.

If we are given that much time, we will have the record of the hearings which we held this morning, at which members of the Federal Communications Commission testified, and we will place that in the hands of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor. The Senator yielded to me for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I respectfully submit I have the floor. I promised to yield next to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I do not believe that, for the past 2 months, anybody has been any more critical of the delay of the Federal Communications Commission than has the junior Senator from Florida. Today we had the entire Commission before our committee, to examine into the reasons why there has been what appeared to be a great delay. At the time the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, I believe it was, made his recommendations, he was undoubtedly correct. But since then, the Federal Communications Commission, under its new chairman, has revised its rules of procedure, so that no longer do they have lengthy hearings, hearings which sometimes continued for even 4, 5, or 6 months consecutively, during the course of which witnesses were asked to testify as to what church they belonged, to what social clubs they belonged, who had the most money, and how many janitors they would have.

Under the present Administrative Procedure Act the Federal Communications Commission does not even have a right to consider any of the applications until after, first of all, the examiner has gone out into the field with a team, has conducted hearings, and has sent the transcripts to the Commission.

As the Senator from Colorado has so well said, rather than there being a bottleneck in the Commission, there are but two cases which have thus far worked their way up to the Commission, for final decisions by the Commission. Why? Because all the examiners are so busy. They have but seven cases now on which there can be hearings. So that, so far as the bottleneck being with the Commission is concerned, that cannot possibly be true. The bottleneck has resulted from a lack of examiners to go into the field to develop the facts.

Mr. STENNIS and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If my colleague on the committee, the Senator from South Carolina, has a word he wishes to say, I yield first to him.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to say I do not believe a better man could have been chosen as Chairman of the Commission than the present incumbent. I have great respect for him. That is not where the trouble lies. It is further down the line. What I am endeavoring to do is to straighten out the trouble that exists down the line. The Commissioners have come before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is chairman. They could have come before that committee when the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] was chairman.

While I am glad to express my admiration and respect for the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Walker, whom the President of the United States appointed, whom I have the pleasure of knowing, and who appeared before the committee for the purpose of testifying, I submit that we shall get nowhere until we eliminate the trouble that exists down the line. Let me inquire of the Senator from Colorado about the investigating conditions. Who was the examiner away down the line at Denver, or at Poughkeepsie, or at Birmingham, Ala., or at Miami, Fla.? The trouble is outside of Washington. That is where matters have been held up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield so that I may reply to the Senator from South Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have been endeavoring to yield to the Senator from Mississippi. But if the Senator from Colorado wishes to reply to the Senator from South Carolina, I yield first to him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator. I agree that the trouble exists down the line. But so far as Washington itself is concerned, I do not think the trouble lies with the Federal Communications Commission, but with the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is called for. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if this matter is to go over, I should like to ask whether the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Colorado, and other Senators who might be interested will ascertain definitely whether the Commission is able to handle the cases, which now appear to be rising more rapidly, and will consider the advisability of setting up a temporary special group similar to what is done in our courts when the dockets become too heavy. As Senators know, under such circumstances, extra judges are assigned for the purpose of relieving the congestion of the docket; if extra deputies are needed in connection with the service of the process of the court, extra deputies are provided. Regardless of where the trouble lies, those who suffer are the people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I know the Senator is interested in finding a remedy. But let us not stop until we shall have provided whatever is found to be necessary in order to get results.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Mississippi that I shall make it a point to get in touch with the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission tomorrow, in order that I may be informed as fully as possible regarding the facts. We can then proceed to vote the amount of money we deem necessary. But discussion seems rather futile when the testimony seems to be completely conflicting.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am very happy to hear the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee make the statement he has made, because I think it is absolutely necessary to enlarge and quicken the hearing procedures that are presently

employed, if we are to leave the Congress in a supportable position. The Federal Communications Commission is not a branch of the executive arm of the Government. By direction of the Congress it is performing quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial duties, in an effort to carry through a part of the detailed legislative function which we have assigned to them. My feeling is that we, the Congress, are properly getting the criticism, and we are going to continue to get the criticism. This criticism and public concern is going to continue to engage a great deal of the time of the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives who come from the areas referred to, areas that have no adequate television facilities and, in many instances, who have none at all; as, for instance, in the Tampa-St. Petersburg area where television should serve about three-quarters of a million people, there is no television station at all. The hearings started sometime last fall and they are still underway. It would seem to me that there must be speedier conclusion of action on the applications. In the Orlando-Daytona Beach area, which will serve a half million or more people, there is neither a station nor any adequate service. The hearings have not yet gotten underway. Insofar as the Jacksonville and Miami areas are concerned, they each have one station. They have a coaxial cable serving both areas. Hearings have not yet been held on the question of additional applications.

I cite these cases merely by way of a partial showing of the fact that there must be a speeding-up process, and in order to say if that speeding-up process is not attained, it is going to be the Congress which will suffer, not only from justifiable criticism, but also from diminution of our work time, because we must see the many anxious people who come here about this matter. We should see them, and we are trying to see them.

I thoroughly support the position of junior colleague, who thus far for several months has shouldered a goodly part of the difficulties in this field, so far as our State is concerned. I support him and I also support the distinguished former chairman, now the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the senior Senator from Colorado. I believe that we should and can speed up the hearings and the decisions.

Before I conclude, I want to say that I do not believe that the Commission is itself without fault in the matter because certainly I know of my own knowledge of its having permitted an additional applicant, who had very little closeness to the area, to file, after two well-qualified competing groups of applicants had gotten together in the city of Miami, in the effort to bring earlier service to the community; and then, within the next day or two, the Commission allowed the new applicant to come in to take advantage of their procedure and force a long delay. I understand that perhaps the procedure has been straightened out through a recent change in the regulations of the Communications Commission, and I sincerely hope that such is the case. I understand that in connection with the hearings they have speeded up the time of hearings and are getting away from much of the possibility of endless immaterial questions being asked and a great expense bill being saddled upon all applicants. I am glad that is the case. But I do not want us to forget the fact that the Commission itself has been slow to reach the time when it had an efficient procedure, and if the Commission is controllable by the Congress, and in a sense it is an arm of the Congress set-up to relieve us of the details of handling a field of service which otherwise we would have to handle, I want this Congress to make sure that they do speed up this procedure. For that reason, I certainly stand back of the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the junior Senator from Florida in their insistence that something be done in the passage of the pending appropriation bill that will take some of the difficulties off us, and will, I am sure, assure our constituents that we are living up to our responsibilities to give them adequate service at an early date.

This means something to the Nation in terms of taxation and in terms of great business enlargement, in the giving of markets for hundreds of thousands of additional television sets, and all the electrical equipment and other activity which goes with them.

I certainly hope the distinguished Senator will reach a solution which will settle this matter because, if he does not do so, the Congress of the United States will be in large part to blame.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I believe I still have the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make one additional statement?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to remind the Senator from Massachusetts that I have voted with him and his committee all day long, in support of economy, both on record votes and on voice votes. Here is an issue as to which I think he is about to practice some very false economy, and unless it is settled so as to greatly speed the award of television channels, the Congress of the United States is going to stand as the blameworthy branch of our Government.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I promised to yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], but I will yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to add a word to what the distinguished Senator from Florida has said. Following the action of the Subcommittee on Appropriations and the full Committee on Appropriations with reference to the independent offices appropriation bill, the Federal Communications Commission was before the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] today. I understand that the Commission has changed certain rules of procedure. I am happy that the Senator from Massachusetts may have an opportunity to take such action as will make it more likely that our constituents will receive good television service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has been quoted several times in the debate. We have looked all through the hearings before the Senate subcommittee and cannot find any statement by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to this matter. Is there any oral statement or any written statement from him?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would reply to the Senator by saying that we talked with the Director of the Budget after the hearing to find out about it, and the statement of the Director came to us after the hearings were concluded and the statement is not included in the hearings.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That, of course, may account for the misunderstanding. As I now understand, the matter is going over until Wednesday, and by that time we shall have typewritten copies of the committee's hearing this morning.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope that the entire independent offices bill will go over until next Wednesday. I make that statement in pursuance of the suggestion of the majority leader, who talked with me before he had to leave the Chamber. Tomorrow it is the intention to take up the controls bill, and the first thing on Wednesday it is planned to resume the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill.

I believe my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has some remarks he wants to make at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to make the statement that, without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Colorado and House bill 4663 will go over until Wednesday.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) to revise and reprint the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government," which were, in line 7, strike out "one" and insert "five"; in line 8, strike out "twenty-four" and insert "thirty"; in lines 8 and 9, strike out "seven hundred and fifty", and in line 10, strike out "sixty-six thousand one hundred and fifty" and insert "four hundred sixty thousand nine hundred."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ORGANIZATION OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to be present while I read for the RECORD two letters and make a very brief comment on them. They involve affairs of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Under date of May 7, 1953, I sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration, over my signature, the following letter:

MAY 7, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: In view of the fact that Senate Resolution 32, which I introduced, is now pending on the calendar and will be considered by the Senate in the near future, I respectfully wish to call your attention to an error of fact upon which a substantial portion of the report on that measure (No. 142, April 14, 1953) is predicated.

The report recites that under amendments to Senate Resolution 32, which I submitted on March 6, it was proposed to reduce the Committee on Public Works from the present authorized membership of 11 to 8 places with the consequence that 2 present incumbents (1 Republican and 1 Democrat) would lose membership.

By a typographical error, the amendments proposed to the original resolution stated that each committee was proposed to be reduced to eight members. The responsibility for the typographical error is mine, but due notice of the error was given, as I shall show presently.

What was proposed and intended was a reduction of those two committees by one member each from the number adopted in early January pursuant to the Case resolution. The effect would be a reduction of the Public Works Committee from 11 to 10 members, and of the District of Columbia Committee from 9 to 8 members. In each case the odd seat was and remains unfilled.

On March 6, I stated on the floor, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1680:

"What I propose in my amendment to Senate Resolution 32 is to increase the number of committee posts by two. That would be accomplished by adding two members to the Committee on Armed Services and two members to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and by reducing the membership of he Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works by one member each. The total change in overall committee posts would be from 209 seats to 211 seats. At present the Committee on the District of Columbia is supposed to have 9 members and the Committee on Public Works is supposed to have 11 members. Until now each has operated with 1 vacancy."

Moreover, the amendments provided that the number of members of the majority party who would be permitted to serve on minor committees and 2 major committees would be increased from 14—as provided by the Case resolution—to 16. Had the proposal been to remove the vacant seat and 2 incumbents—a Republican and a Democrat—from the Public Works Committee, it would have been necessary only to increase this authorization to 15.

Thirdly, a day or two after I announced my intention to submit a discharge resolution a member of the staff of the Rules Committee telephoned my office and spoke to an assistant who was familiar with the measure. The Rules staff member inquired whether the amendments were intended to reduce the Public Works Committee by 3 and he asked why the authorization for majority-party members to serve on more than 2 committees was to be increased from 14 to 16.

It was explained that the increase of 1 member on both the Armed Services Committee and the Labor Committee required that increase. It was further explained that 3 members of the Committees on District of Columbia, Government Operations, and Post Office and Civil Service would be eligible; and that the amendment contained an error, to wit, the Public Works Committee was to be reduced from 11 to 10 members, not to 8, as the amendment, through a typographical error, stated.

On April 15 my assistant, upon seeing the committee's report, called that staff member and each confirmed the earlier conversation, the staff member explaining that the committee was informed of the conversation by memorandum.

I respectfully suggest that the committee may wish to issue an amended report based upon the amendments as explained and corrected in the RECORD. The committee may also wish to consult my remarks on this subject which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 6, March 27, and April 16, tearsheets of which I enclose.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

I may say again, as I have said before, that I could call as my witness in regard to my intent the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who on March 6, when I was making my speech on this matter, came to my desk and in a whisper pointed out the fact that the Committee on Public Works under my resolution should be a committee of 10 and not 8. It was his correction which is what brought forth the remarks properly showing my intent which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

Under date of May 14, 1953, a letter was written to me by the chairman of the Rules Committee, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], in which he said:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,
May 14, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I appreciated having your letter of May 7, 1953, commenting upon the report submitted by this committee in connection with its adverse action on Senate Resolution 32.

I do not feel that a committee should be impelled to consider anything save what is officially before it. The error in your amendments was first called to the attention of your office by the committee staff on April 3. On that date, the committee staff was assured a correction would be forthcoming. Meanwhile, from their introduction on March 6, until April 3, the amendments had been left uncorrected by star print costing, I am told, no more than $25.

When the committee finally took up the amendments on April 13, an additional 10 days had elapsed in which there had been no further move on your part officially to make such a correction. Faced with that, the committee decided to consider the amendments as printed.

If you desire to present a new or amended resolution to the Senate, which will include your amendments in corrected form, I am sure the committee will be glad to consider same.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman.

I desire to have both these letters in the RECORD, together with this brief statement in regard to my position, so that the Senate may have before it the full history of this matter.

I cleared with the Parliamentarian after March 6 as to what further correction of my amendment, if any, I needed to make, and I was advised that the statement I had made in the RECORD was ample.

Mr. President, I say today that the Rules Committee staff had actual notice of my intent, clearly expressed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is an elementary principle of law that actual notice suffices, so there can be no doubt about the fact that, on the RECORD, the committee had actual notice of my position. The reply of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] itself makes clear that the committee was aware of the intent of the Senator from Oregon that the Committee on Public Works was to be reduced to a committee of 10 members instead of 8.

So, Mr. President, we come down to the very fine technical question as to whether I was under some obligation officially to ask for a star print of the amendment correcting the error. The Parliamentarian says that I was not. I could have asked for a star print, and, in view of what has happened, I wish now that I had asked for one, although I did not think it was necessary.

But the point I am trying to make clear is that the Committee on Rules and Administration had actual notice of my true intent. Its staff member said to my legislative assistant that a memorandum was prepared for the committee, showing my intent. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 6 is perfectly clear as to what my intent was.

No member of the Rules Committee at any time stopped at my desk for as much as an inquiry about the matter, let alone calling me before the committee. I shall simply let the record stand on this basis, as to whether I acted in complete good faith throughout the entire controversy.

But if it is a star print that is needed, a star print I shall ask for. I shall ask to have my amendment, which, because of a typographical error, contained the figure 8 instead of the figure 10, corrected now by way of a star print, and it can be referred to the Rules Committee. The Parliamentarian says it can lie on the desk and be taken up when the resolution is called up or it can be referred to the committee.

But it is the resolution which is now the important consideration, together with my amendment which I offered on March 6, as an amendment to the resolution already on the desk. The resolution is now on the calendar, and I do not think, Mr. President, that when it is considered we ought to strain at gnats in the United States Senate.

Frankly, it does not make any difference what the personal feelings of Senators toward me may be. Matters of principle are involved in this whole committee fight. I think the time has come when we ought to relax and decide what disposition will be made of the committee positions of a representative in the United States Senate of a million and a half people. It is time for Senators to decide whether they are going to turn their faces away from all the precedents of the Senate, with the one unfortunate exception of 1871; whether they are going to keep in mind the Reorganization Act of 1946 and following what it provides; or whether they are going to take the position that a Member of a minority party must look to the majority party for assignments to committees. That is

not what the Reorganization Act provides.

I have been very fair with the Senate about this matter. Several days before January 13, I told the Senate I would stand on the Reorganization Act; and the fact that the issue came to a vote on January 13 without the policy committees of the two major parties working out a satisfactory solution is no responsibility of mine. Indeed, if the policy committees of the two great parties in the Senate had desired to work out the situation, they could have done so before ballots on committee assignments were cast on January 13.

The fact simply is that the action of the Senate to date seeks to put a member of a minority party in the Senate into a position where he must look to the majority party for his committee assignments, although the Reorganization Act does not so provide.

The second result of the action taken by the Senate to date seeks to put the junior Senator from Oregon into a position where he is denied, in the face of all the precedents of the Senate, save and except the precedent of 1871, the same treatment that throughout the history of the Senate every other so-called liberal, or free soiler, or progressive, or independent in the Senate has received at the hands of the Senate.

As I said today to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and to some other colleagues in the Senate, "You will have to decide now whether or not in 1953 you want to establish a precedent the like of which you cannot turn to in the history of the Senate, except the Sumner precedent of 1871, which has been roundly criticized by American historians and writers of the history of the United States Senate as a precedent based upon an angry partisanship that prevailed in 1871."

To my Democratic friends I say that this is the last time I expect to discuss this question until the resolution comes before the Senate, which I think now will be some time next week. I wish to say to my Democratic friends that there is one fact which they do not like to face. For the most part those of them who are not supporting me in my position are relying on a fallacious argument involving a false ratio. The fact they do not like to face is that, whether they like it or not, there are two minority parties in the Senate. The Democrats have taken the position that one of those minority parties should look to the majority party for assignments to committees. If anyone suggested that Democrats should look to the majority party for assignments to committees, what a shouting protest there would be in the Senate.

I have the right, on principle, to stand here as Norris did when he followed the identical course of action which I have followed, when in the midst of a campaign he, too, left the Republican Party. But did the Senate kick him off his committees? It did not even remove him from the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee. It permitted him to keep his chairmanship as an Independent in the Senate, and he subsequently ran for reelection as an Independent, as I shall do in 1956. We cannot erase that precedent; nor can we erase similar and analogous precedents involving the La Follettes, Ladd, Shipstead, Couzens, Brookhart, Wheeler, and Glenn Taylor. In 1948, Taylor was not kicked off any committees.

Senators are also overlooking the fact that they are dealing with a novel case, in that it is the first case of this type which has arisen under the Reorganization Act of 1946. I have asked for assignment under that act, not by a caucus. The act does not provide for assignments by caucuses if a Senator does not want to be assigned in that way.

As I said to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] this afternoon, I have no personal feeling about this matter. I appreciate the point of view he expresses in his letter in behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I simply think the Committee on Rules and Administration is dead wrong in its observation, because it had actual notice of my true intent as to my amendment to the resolution. I cannot raise my right hand and say that each and every member of the Committee on Rules and Administration had actual notice. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] tells me that he did not receive notice. But how is a Senator supposed to get actual notice to the members of the committee? If in a conversation between his legislative assistant and a member of the staff of the committee which is handling the resolution, the subject is thoroughly discussed and a memorandum is prepared by the staff of the Committee on Rules and Administration for the committee showing my intent, I say there is actual notice. From that point on any member of the Committee on Rules and Administration is in a pretty weak position if he wishes to argue that he did not receive notice.

In the second place, I say that it is fair to presume that when a committee takes up for consideration a resolution submitted by a Senator, it takes it up in the light of what the Senator said was his intention when the amendment was submitted. Some member of the staff would certainly check the resolution. If that was done, one could not escape the conclusion that the committee had actual notice of my intent.

Lastly, I think that after all the old rule of fairness ought to apply. I am satisfied that most of my colleagues in the Senate, even though they have voted against me, know that this case has not been fairly handled. I should think the Senate would want to do equity. But, Mr. President, I wish to accommodate the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Parliamentarian tells me that I do not need a star print, in view of the record which has been made.

Nevertheless, because the Senator from Indiana has suggested a star print, and because I wish to cooperate with the committee; also because this resolution will not come before the Senate until next week, so that the Committee on Rules and Administration will have plenty of time to reconsider the case if it wishes to do so, I now ask unanimous consent to have my amendment of March 6 to Senate Resolution 32 reprinted as a star print, with the correction on page 2, line 2, striking the word "eight" and inserting, as was originally intended, the word "ten", and that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFINITION OF "CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREA" UNDER THE HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, since I have submitted an amendment dealing with the definition of "critical defense housing area" in connection with the controls bill, since that bill will come up tomorrow I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement relative to my amendment, so that Senators may read it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DOUGLAS IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT TO S. 1081 TO CHANGE DEFINITION OF "CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREA" UNDER THE HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

Section 204 (e) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, pertains to the certification of critical defense housing areas and the establishment of Federal rent control in such areas. Three conditions or criteria have to be met before the area may be certified as critical. The exact language is as follows:

"No area shall be certified as a critical defense housing area under the authority granted in this subsection unless all the following conditions exist in such area (except that clause (2) of this sentence shall not apply in any area in which is located an Atomic Energy Commission installation and the housing accommodations in such area are owned by the Federal Government; however, maximum rents under this title shall not apply to any such housing accommodations when sold by the Federal Government);

"(1) A new plant or installation of the Department of Defense or the Atomic Energy Commission has been or is being provided, or an existing plant of installation of either of such agencies has been or is being reactivated or its operation substantially expanded;

"(2) Substantial in-migration of defense workers or military personnel is required to carry out activities at such plant or installation; and

"(3) A substantial shortage of housing required for such defense workers or military personnel exists which has resulted or threatens to result in excessive rent increases and which impedes or threatens to impede activities of such plant or installation."

Substantial housing shortages exist in some of our larger metropolitan areas which are engaged in various defense activities. At the present time, before such metropolitan areas may be declared critical, the facts must disclose that a defense department or atomic-energy plant or installation has been built or reactivated, and that there has been a substantial inmigration of defense workers or military personnel. In spite of the fact that defense activities are present and rental housing is short, the area cannot be declared critical without a substantial inmigration of defense workers or military personnel, and without a Defense Department or Atomic Energy Commission plant or installation being involved. Housing

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

shortages in areas where large private plants are doing defense work could not be dealt with.

Under the present criteria, such large cities as Boston, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Newark, Philadelphia, Camden, Baltimore, Cleveland, St. Louis, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Kansas City, Mo., and San Francisco, probably cannot be certified as critical defense-housing areas, regardless of the extremity of their housing shortages.

This condition would be changed if the present section 204 (1) were amended to eliminate the requirement regarding substantial inmigration of defense workers or military personnel, and the words limiting its application to areas in which there are defense department or atomic-energy plants or installations. If the last sentence of the present section were thus changed some of our large metropolitan areas could be declared critical if the Secretary of Defense and Director of Defense Mobilization found such a serious housing shortage to exist. This change is accomplished in the proposed amendment by making the last sentence of section 204 (1) read as follows:

"No area shall be certified as a critical defense-housing area under the authority granted in this subsection unless both the following conditions exist in such area:

"(1) a defense plant or installation has been or is to be provided, or an existing defense plant or installation has been or is to be reactivated or its operation substantially expanded; and

"(2) a substantial shortage of housing exists or impends which has resulted or threatens to result in excessive rent increases."

If this change is made in the law, then as a result of our recent continuation of general rent controls for 3 months beyond April 30, 1953, the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Defense Mobilization or the President will have an opportunity to determine which of these metropolitan areas, if any, are critical, and take any action they believe essential under this act prior to July 31, 1953.

Obviously, this will broaden the authority of the President to utilize rent controls where he is duly advised that they are essential in critical defense areas. I hope it may not be necessary to use such controls widely. Where it is necessary, however, I hope we will not leave the President without authority.

In further support of this amendment, I would merely point out that—

(a) Local option to terminate even these controls is retained in State and local authorities (sec. 204 (j) (3)).

(b) The amendment will permit the President to prevent the worst rent gouging that might otherwise occur after July 31 in critical defense areas—an authority that may well assist the national defense effort over a difficult period.

(c) There is some evidence of continuing serious housing shortages in many industrial areas (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 25, 1953, pp. 3878–3879).

(d) The feared inadequacy of State legislative action to which I referred on April 25, 1953, has been demonstrated in the case of my own State of Illinois:

A State statute of April 27, 1953, provides for eviction court stay of 9 months—with power to fix rents 10 percent higher. It doesn't apply to leases entered into after May 30, 1953. It will benefit only those who are willing to let themselves be taken to the renters' court.

The State legislature refused to pass an enabling act to allow Chicago or any other city in Illinois to control rents, as requested in a resolution of the city council adopted on April 22, 1953. The text of the resolution follows:

"Whereas the Federal rent-control law expires on April 30, 1953, and unless such law be renewed and rent control continued under Federal regulation a serious public emergency in housing may exist in Chicago; and

"Whereas in order to alleviate such emergency, it is necessary and desirable that the city of Chicago shall have appropriate legal power to control rents: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the United States Congress be memorialized to continue Federal rent controls until at least December 1, 1953; and be it

"*Resolved*, That the Illinois General Assembly be and it is hereby memorialized to enact into law appropriate legislation to enable the city of Chicago to regulate and effectually control rents on residential property with the same effect as presently prevails under the Federal controls, such legislation to be in a form as will meet the constitutional or other legal objections raised in the case of *Ambassador East Hotel* v. *City of Chicago*, decided by the Illinois Supreme Court; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the foregoing legislation shall be enacted into law so as to enable the city to act prior to the incidence of such emergency."

NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday many Americans celebrated Norwegian Independence Day, paying their respects to one of the most democratic nations of Europe.

At a time when so much of the world is beset by tensions and crisis, it is reassuring for us to know that the Norwegian people are among the true champions of freedom. Their spirit is undaunted. Their belief in freedom and democracy remains steadfast and militant.

The Norwegians are widely known for their honesty, simplicity, and kindliness. In no other European country is society more democratic. There are no privileged classes and no orders of nobility. They are a religious people, Norway being one of the most Christian countries in the world. While the Evangelical Lutheran Church is the established religious body, all denominations enjoy complete freedom of worship.

From the rugged Viking stock of Norway has come a great contribution to our own Nation, in the form of democratic-minded, freedom-loving immigrants who have settled in the United States and become sturdy, hard working, and talented patriotic citizens.

They have meant much to the progress and development of the great State of Minnesota that I have the honor of representing. From out of their ranks have come some of our greatest leaders. Their inheritance of rural background has contributed greatly to Minnesota's stature as an outstanding agricultural State.

I am proud to say that they are among the most loyal of Americans, devoted to the principles of freedom and liberty in this country and fiercely opposed to the insidious poison of communism seeping into so many areas of the world. I can speak with feeling and conviction about them and their ideals, for from such roots has come the inspiration of my own life. My mother was born in Christiansend, Norway.

I feel it appropriate, in observance of Norway's Independence Day, to voice these few words of tribute to that great Scandinavian country and the many Americans of Norwegian ancestry and heritage.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

WHAT IS "NORMAL" FOR WHEAT RESERVE?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement on the subject of What Is "Normal" for Wheat Reserve? This statement deals with the carryover stocks of wheat and the ratio of reserves or surplus which the Government of the United States should maintain during these very critical years. In substance, it calls for a re-evaluation of our reserve stocks or surplus of wheat. The present reserve is about 15 percent of our estimated requirements. I am suggesting in this statement that we increase that reserve to 30 percent, in view of the uncertainties of present world conditions.

I suggest also that the administration's agricultural leaders might well be best protecting the Nation's interests and best serving the farmers if they would give serious thought to the question of the proper normal level of supplies before automatically invoking acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the basis of past standards of normal which are now considerably out of date.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS "NORMAL" FOR WHEAT RESERVE?

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Mr. President, recent estimates of the Department of Agriculture indicate that the carryover stocks of wheat, as of July 1, 1953, will be approximately 575 million bushels.

I am concerned with what our attitude is going to be toward that reserve.

There was a time, of course, when such a carryover would have been thought of only as a surplus problem. There are some still inclined to that attitude today. I think there is more to be considered, however, in the Nation's total interest.

We have reason to be thankful, not worried, over having such an abundant reserve of basic food grains.

It is time we quit thinking about our food carryovers in storage simply as unwanted surpluses and start thinking about them as our margin of safety against any possible food shortages, not only here but anywhere in the world. It is time we recognized adequate stored reserves as insurance for our security.

Experience has proved my point is well taken. We have been worried about surpluses in the past, only to suddenly become very thankful we had such abundance available when emergency conditions confronted us.

We are again in uncertain times of world tensions that make it highly advisable to take no chances of food shortages. It appears sound wisdom to have abundant reserves, ready for any emergency.

In the past we have thought of reserves primarily as protection for our own requirements, in event of drought or crop failure from other natural hazards. Now, we must think beyond our own food needs. We must

think about our food supplies in relation to the united defense efforts of the free world.

I need not remind you of the practice in recent years of wheat stocks backing up our country's foreign policy.

Because we had adequate reserve, we were able to come to the aid of India when that country was in dire distress, greatly strengthening bonds of friendship for our country in that keystone of Asia.

Because we had adequate reserves, we were able to come to Yugoslavia's aid when its own crops failed, and, as a result, food rather than bullets was primarily responsible for bringing that country into the Western World's camp as it broke from its ties with Moscow.

Because we have adequate reserves, we are now studying the likelihood of extending a helping hand of assistance to Pakistan to avoid threatened famine in that country, and to prevent it having to turn to Russia for wheat.

I mention these just briefly to show that we have new calls upon our food supplies, as instruments of foreign policy—calls that were not contemplated when earlier standards were established for what we regard as normal wheat reserves.

We would do well to think seriously about what really should be the normal for safe wheat reserves—in the light of conditions today, instead of conditions in years gone by.

Under present legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to establish acreage allotments and proclaim marketing quotas when our supply exceeds by a certain percentage the amount now fixed by law as the "normal" supply.

The Secretary of Agriculture is now confronted with an early decision that may require him to invoke acreage allotments and marketing quotas for the 1954 crop year. He has indicated he is reluctant to do it, understandably so, but required to under the present formula of what is a "normal" wheat supply.

I respectfully suggest that new consideration be given to what is "normal" for wheat reserves, under present conditions. Is a 15 percent reserve above our estimated requirements any longer adequate as a safe reserve, or is a 30 percent reserve a sounder policy of protection against the uncertainties of world conditions today?

I would suggest that the administration's agricultural leaders might well be best protecting the Nation's interest, and best serving farmers, if they would give serious thought to the question of proper "normal" level of supplies, before automatically invoking acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the basis of past standards of "normal" that are now considerably out of date.

I hope the administration's leadership will initiate such action itself, through the proper committees. I hope they will give consideration to increasing the reserve level on wheat from 15 to 30 percent, before requiring production curbs, as a greater margin of national safety. I hope at the same time they will consider a similar increase of from 10 to 20 percent in the reserve level of corn, on the same grounds of a more realistic safe reserve.

For as far as I can foresee, the Nation's interests would be best protected by higher reserve levels of these basic commodities, not lower levels. They are insurance policies, and while the risk is greatest appears a good time to increase the amount of protection.

World food needs, not just domestic markets, will eventually be the controlling factor in American farm production. We would be shortsighted indeed to tailor our production to restricted markets when there exists a tremendous need in the world. Many of us have proposed creation of an International Food Reserve with just such ideas in mind as making full use of our ability to produce, rather than shut off the spigot of our agricultural knowledge and technological ability.

I am offering these comments in a spirit of constructive cooperation toward the administration's farm leaders, hopeful they may suggest to them a sounder alternative to invoking production curbs. I am sure they will find considerable support, if they propose legislation changing the formula for what we regard as "normal" in our wheat and corn supplies.

If they do not take such initiative, in fact, I would feel compelled to offer some such legislation myself so that the Senate will have an opportunity to consider this important decision, rather than let it "just happen" on the basis of an outmoded formula as now appears likely.

THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF NEW ENGLAND—A PROGRAM FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate today in the first of a series of speeches concerning the economic problems of New England and the role of the Federal Government in the solution of such problems. I want to make it clear from the outset, however, that neither the problems which I shall discuss nor the congressional measures which I shall propose are peculiar in their application to the New England economy. They apply in some measure to the Middle Atlantic States and to the East North Central States, and to a lesser degree to all other regions of the United States.

As a Senator's responsibility is not only to his State but to his Nation, I think that it is proper to point out that even though many of the recommendations I have made are of special importance to New England, nevertheless, none is contrary to the national interest, but rather would, if enacted, be of benefit to all of the people wherever they may live. Serious areas of labor surplus exist not only in such New England communities as Lawrence and Lowell, Mass.; they also impair the prosperity of dozens of other areas, including Tacoma, Wash.; West Frankfort, Ill.; Durham, N. C.; Atlantic City, N. J.; Terre Haute, Ind.; and Scranton, Pa. Unfair competition from depressed wage areas is a problem to the textile industry in New Jersey and in North Carolina as well as in Massachusetts. Modernization of equipment and managerial techniques are needed by small-business men in all sections of the country, not merely in New England. A declining textile industry has affected the manufacturers of Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee, as well as New England and the Middle Atlantic States, to say nothing of the cotton and wool producers of the South and West. Likewise, each Senator can point to examples in his own State of communities overly dependent upon 1 or 2 industries, just as so many New England towns found economic existence hanging upon the survival of the textile and shoe industries. The South and the West, as well as New England, are concerned about fair and equal transportation rates. New York, as well as Rhode Island, is interested in safeguarding its State unemployment-compensation fund. Similar examples could be pointed out for each of the problems and proposals which I shall discuss in this series of three talks.

In short, although I shall use the needs of the New England economy to point up the needs of the economies of our Nation and other great regions and States, these are not matters of interest to New England alone. As the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has pointed out with respect to the economy of New England:

> Its problems are those of the oldest economic region in the country. They deserve attention on their own merits, but have the additional value of serving as prototypes of problems facing regional economies as they grow older.

As Secretary of Labor Durkin recently said in a Lawrence address:

> These islands of surplus labor in an otherwise prosperous Nation pose a national problem. * * * Unless corrected, they act like a brake on the growth and expansion of our entire national economy.

Thus, of the three dozen or more legislative measures which I shall propose or discuss in this series, none concerns or applies to New England alone, with the possible exception of those problems of resource development and area transportation rates which necessarily involve the attributes of a particular region.

Moreover, I need not labor the point that even if such a program were concerned with and applied to only the New England region, its importance to the rest of the Nation could not be overstated. We know too well in this country that a serious economic recession in one part of the Nation will eventually take its toll in other sections. This Nation's challenge to meet the needs of defense mobilization and to achieve national and international economic stability and development cannot be fully met if any part of the country is unproductive and unstable economically. Other areas depend upon New England as a market for their raw materials and as a source of manufactured products. New England accounts for over 20 percent of the Nation's textile manufacturing, well over 50 percent of the Nation's textile machinery, and approximately 50 percent of this country's nails and spikes, typewriters, handsaws, lathes, and ball and roller bearings. It provides a very substantial part of our electrical machinery and appliances, aircraft and aircraft engines, machine tools, shoes and rubber products, hardware, wiring supplies, and other important goods. War supply prime contracts of nearly $18 billion, or 9 percent of the national total, were fulfilled in New England in World War II.

New England does not seek regional advantages which are contrary to the national interests. It does not call for special attention or favors which disregard or discriminate against the needs of other areas, but this Nation cannot afford to ignore the economic problems of an area so vital to our national prosperity and well-being.

Finally, with respect to the question as to whether this is a national or regional problem, I want to say this to my friends in the South. There is no question, and I shall not attempt to conceal the fact, that much of New England's loss of industry has been to the South.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

But it is not my intention to attempt to penalize the South for this or to give to New England or the North any unfair advantages in the normal competition and commerce between the States. On the contrary, I firmly believe that the proposals which I shall offer will be of tremendous benefit to the South, to raise its standard of living and level of wages, to stimulate industrialization, to improve its markets, to prevent unjust discrimination and unfair competition against its industries, and in many other ways to help the economy of that region. This also helps New England, which needs to sell to the South. I shall stress many times in this series the theme of fair competition; and fair competition is just as important to the South and its industries as it is to any other section of the United States. On the basis of the recent New England address by the Governor of Mississippi, the Honorable Hugh White, I am certain that unfair practices encouraging the abandonment of existing plants are not a necessary part of the South's industrialization program; that their aim is rather one of new industrial development. "Our industrial concept," said Governor White, "is not that of robbing Peter to pay Paul."

Moreover, the South, which more than any other region has benefited from assistance by the Federal Government as well as by the free market, has recognized by its own experience that the role of the Federal Government in developing the resources of a region is great; and I am sure the South will not object to having similar aids extended to other regions.

Secondly, I wish to stress that my constant reference to the problems of New England is not intended to convey a pessimistic exaggeration of those problems, or to echo the prophets of doom who have been talking about the decline of New England for the past 30 years, or, indeed, if we examine the statements of some of our earliest citizens, ever since the establishment of the New England community.

New England has much to be proud of and much for which to be grateful. With only slightly over 2 percent of the Nation's land area, it has 6.3 percent of the population, 6.7 percent of the individual money-income payments, and about 10 percent of the Nation's manufacturing employment. In terms of per capita income and standard of living, New England is one of the more prosperous areas of the country. It has an energetic climate and an intelligent and independent citizenry. It is highly industrialized and highly productive. In absolute terms, its economy has continued to expand throughout the years, despite the problems I shall outline. In terms of 1952 price levels, the buying power of the region has increased steadily since 1940, except for the 1947–49 period which I shall discuss shortly. Population, income, and employment have similarly increased, and the present number of manufacturing employees is little less than at the wartime peak in 1943. Commercial bank deposits have shown a large rise since 1933, except for a slight hitch in 1937 and a serious decline once again in the 1947–48 period. Personal liquid savings have held fairly steady, while retail sales have risen markedly. Investments in equipment, machinery, and new construction are better than generally assumed.

At present, defense activity has stimulated economic progress in New England and has given the regional economy an opportunity to make long-term adjustments for future years. Since 1939, the number of manufacturing establishments and employees in New England has increased by better than 50 percent; the value of our manufactured products has nearly tripled. Employment in December 1952 was the highest in the region's history, with a gain of approximately 1 million jobs since 1939. Our financial institutions had a higher proportion of assets, and our workers a higher take-home pay and standard of living, than those in other regions throughout the Nation. In terms of savings accounts, purchases, life insurance, home ownership, and telephones, radios, and television sets, New Englanders as a whole are in a most fortunate position. For nearly 20 years, New England has shown the lowest annual total of man-days lost because of strikes. Our educational institutions and industrial research laboratories are famous throughout the Nation and the world. Our New England Council, chambers of commerce, and local industrial development groups have actively championed new industries and aided old ones. In short, the economy of New England on the whole is neither depressed nor undeveloped. All in all, we have every reason to be optimistic, and few to be pessimistic; we have little reason to complain, and many blessings for which to be thankful.

But, Mr. President, I believe we must speak frankly with respect to the very real problems which threaten the prosperity I have already discussed, and which already, in particular communities, have damaged the economic welfare of our citizens. We speak frankly in order to realize what the problems of the region are, and in order to determine what solutions for such problems are needed. Regionwide statistics do not reveal the suffering of individual communities. Defense prosperity conceals long-range declines.

These problems have been analyzed in intensive studies. I doubt that the economic problems of any region have been so thoroughly and so frequently studied as have those of New England. The number of such studies began to rise as far back as 1920. Their intensity has increased in the past 5 years. Studies have been made by regional and State groups, on both a private and public level. The President's Council of Economic Advisors initiated a study which was published in July 1951. The Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report is currently sponsoring a study, through the National Planning Association. The New England Governors, the New England Council, and various economists have all made studies. And the studies have been studied. But no definite, comprehensive legislative program has been submitted to Congress. The time has come now to act positively and decisively.

In addition to these analyses, in the past 2 years I have traveled up and down the State of Massachusetts, and, to a lesser extent, other parts of New England. I have discussed these problems with workers in the plants, fishermen on the piers, bankers, businessmen, and others. I am convinced that the problems which I shall discuss in this series of addresses are very real problems indeed. They deserve our immediate and serious attention as a matter of national interest.

It is not my contention, Mr. President, nor is it the contention of the great mass of New Englanders, that the sole answer to all these problems lies in the Federal Government. The recommendations I intend to propose fall within the legitimate functions of the Federal Government because they involve problems national in scope and character. Although I shall deal primarily with legislative matter, an equally large area of work on these problems is dependent largely upon administrative action by the executive branch. I limit myself to recommendations of action on the Federal level only because that is the limit of my jurisdiction as a United States Senator.

No Federal program can solve problems of the New England economy without action on the State and local level. Indeed, no governmental program can do the job without assistance from private agencies, organizations, and industries. The primary responsibility for the economic development of any area rests with the people of that area, acting both through their State and local governments and through the utilization of their own private initiative. As the New England Council has often pointed out, and as experience has shown, community leadership and community spirit are of the utmost importance in maintaining the economic prosperity of an area. The structure of State and local taxes is one of the most important factors affecting economic growth in New England and elsewhere. State and local programs for manufacturing, community public works projects, State and local surveys, and public and private education all play a large part. Labor and management can, by their wise conduct and concern for the problems of the community and the individual, contribute much to the solution of such problems.

Above all, it has often been said that New Englanders must have faith in New England. They must modernize and expand their manufacturing plants in the expectation of, and as a contribution toward, a region whose prosperity will continue to grow. In the important textile industry, for example, new investments, intelligent handling of labor relations, merchandising techniques, new product development, and new engineering methods are several important fields in which, according to the Report on the New England Economy, a considerable segment of management in New England has room for improvement. New investment per textile worker lags in New England, as compared to other regions. Yet the New England mills which have developed and made new products and have modernized their machinery and have accepted new ideas have continued to prosper.

Such matters are of concern to others than textile owners. An abandoned textile mill means lost skills, welfare payments, and a loss of income not only to the worker, but to his grocer, his doctor, and all others in the community. It is thus the business of all citizens in a community to consider the problems and means of assisting not only new industries, but also those now providing their economic lifeblood. Ingenious and alert industrialists, with the aid of responsible labor and understanding government, can do much to solve economic problems of New England, without Federal assistance.

However, the proper role of the Federal Government cannot be denied. By this I do not mean, nor will I call for, the expenditures of large Federal grants or the establishment of new, large bureaucracies to handle these problems. As I shall discuss later, New England has a very vital stake in economy in the National Government. New England does not ask for unjustified grants for itself or for any other region. The overall effectiveness of the three dozen or more proposals I shall make will not depend upon the public expenditure of large sums of money. But I firmly believe that New England can no longer attempt to solve its national problems on a local level. It can no longer pour tax funds into the economic development of other regions, without receiving from the Congress fair consideration of its own problems. In recent years New England has contributed to the Federal Government far more funds than those which have been returned to it in Government services or expenditures. It is not my thought that New England's interest is best served by opposing Federal programs which contribute to the well-being of the country, particularly when those programs increase the purchasing power of New England's customers. Where Federal action is necessary and appropriate, it is my firm belief that New England must fight for those national policies. Besides aiding the national interest, such policies are of importance to New England's prosperity, and particularly if it acts to obtain its fair share of the services and programs for which its tax funds are expended.

What are the problems of the New England economy? Why is it necessary that the Federal Government devote attention to that area? What are the economic ills which in the past have hampered the economic growth of that area, and are equally dangerous to other areas all over the Nation? In the first place, New England is the oldest regional civilization and economy in the United States. It has not yet reached its limit, as some would have us believe; nor is it without new industries, new developments, and new ideas. But as an older industrial community with long-established industries and traditions, too much of New England is still dependent upon outmoded methods and customs of the past. Its principal natural resources, such as fisheries and forests, are being depleted. The center of population is moving away. The fast-growing basic industries of the country are located elsewhere, for reasons of economic geography and resource development. Many communities have relied entirely upon 1 or 2 industries, whose decline in the world or national market could not be prevented. Machinery is old; management is old; methods are old. Too often government, management, and labor have resisted new ideas and local initiative. Products of New England's outstanding universities and research laboratories—Massachusetts alone has 32 institutions of higher learning—have frequently been rejected unwisely by New England business. What Professor Seymour Harris calls economic arteriosclerosis has set in, in too many communities and industries.

These are, of course, generalizations, which are equally as dangerous as the overall regional statistics which conceal the problems of particular communities. There are in the region many firms and many areas which are realizing the needs and opportunities before them. There are government officials who realize that an older economy must be revitalized if it is to compete successfully with other regions and if it is to continue its economic growth. Various parts of New England are far more prosperous, or face far different problems, than other sectors. But, for the most part, the general description I have given is at the root of New England's troubles, just as it is at the root of the troubles of many industrial communities elswhere in the United States. Unless important basic adjustments in the economic structure of the area are undertaken, the end of our present defense-inspired prosperity will accentuate what has been called the decline of New England. Its economic growth, industrialization, population, per capita income, manufacturing employment, and share in particular industries have not kept pace with the rest of the country. From 1919 to 1950 the Nation gained 46 percent in manufacturing jobs, while New England lost 6 percent, although much of this was prior to 1939. Today defense contracts in the aircraft and electrical machinery industries and the inflated Government payrolls and other activities resulting from mobilization cover up the static position of the private civilian economy of the region. Without the aircraft and electrical machinery industries employment, New England hard goods showed a decline in 1952. Soft-goods employment increased only nominally, with serious decreases in particular industries, such as textiles. The problems of the textile industry, employing some 250,000 workers in New England, are not primarily regional problems, but their effect is felt heavily in New England because of that industry's importance to the region.

Although at present levels of activity the labor-force requirements are higher than ever, experts agree that New England industry is operating below capacity. Even now soft spots in the economy are developing, defense plants are completing orders and are laying off workers, and large-scale unemployment continues in particular communities. A disproportionately large percentage of the group IV areas of substantial labor surplus were in the six-State New England region, according to the latest classification by the Department of Labor.

Such problems have plagued our region since the close of World War II, and to a lesser extent since World War I. Between 1929 and 1950, New England textiles lost 149,000 jobs; and the leather industry, 44,000. In Lawrence, for example, so dependent upon textiles, approximately one-fifth of all workers have been without jobs continually since 1947—this during the greatest prosperity in American history. Even after the Korean boom, nearly 40 percent of Massachusetts' 100,000 textile workers were jobless, and yet they constituted less than one-half of the State's unemployed. Instead of declining during the heavy mobilization year of 1951, unemployment increased 150 percent in Fall River, 103 percent in Lawrence, and far more in Nashua, N. H., and in the Rhode Island textile mills. These unemployed workers are the concern of their communities who suffer a double economic loss in the incomes of the workers and those who serve them. They are of concern to the State and to the region, where the impact of such unemployment is felt and they are of concern to the entire United States, whose economic welfare and mobilization productivity is harmed by such misfortunes in its midst.

The 1948–49 recession hit New England much more severely than the rest of the country. The decline in manufacturing employment was earlier and greater in each of the six New England States and in the region as a whole than for any other State or region or the Nation as a whole. Throughout 1949 and during the recovery in 1950, between one-fourth and one-half of the Nation's areas of critical unemployment—measured only by those covered by unemployment insurance—were located in the New England region. In September 1949, 16 of the 30 critical areas surveyed were in New England. The workers of New Bedford, Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, Worcester, and North Adams, Mass.; Danielson, Conn.; and Providence and Woonsocket, R. I., for example, cannot yet fully forget the meaning of long-term unemployment, when benefits have been exhausted and governmental action is sporadic and superficial. New responsibilities and new opportunities were presented by the current defense program, but unemployment in many of these areas continue just as it has continued in areas outside of New England, such as Scranton, Pa. A 1951–52 textile slump hit New England particularly hard, with a loss in jobs of over 50,000. A large share of those who kept their jobs worked less than 4 days a week. Although the business outlook seemed generally improved in 1953, textile employment continued to decline. As a result of these trends, my own State of Massachusetts has consistently since World War II exceeded the national average in unemployment rates. According to Department of Labor classifications, in March 1953, of the 11 Massachusetts labor markets, 9 were in group III or IV areas of labor surplus; as were Portland, Maine, Providence, R. I., and Manchester, N. H.

The proportion of official unemployment in Lawrence, Mass., in January of 1953, well over 20 percent, was practically equivalent to the proportion

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

reached in that city in January of 1934 at the height of the great depression, and more than twice as great as the figure for 1930.

Moreover, another disturbing factor has entered the New England scene—that of industrial dislocation. I shall discuss this matter in more detail subsequently; but suffice it to say at this time that New England is not opposed to the industrial development of any other area of the country, nor do New England industries shrink from competition with their competitors in other areas. But we believe that such competition should be fair; and we cannot approve the abandonment of plants and thousands of workers for what we consider to be the exploitation of unfair methods of competition. Nor can we sit idly by and not take whatever legitimate paths are open to prevent such improper dislocation and migration and its ill effects. Since 1946, in Massachusetts alone, 70 textile mills have been liquidated, generally for migration or disposition of their assets to plants in other sections of the country, in the following communities: New Bedford, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Fitchburg, Taunton, Lowell, Worcester, Brockton, Haverhill, Peabody, Norwood, Walpole, Waltham, Canton, Wollaston, Maynard, Hudson, Andover, Newton Lower Falls, Clinton, Easthampton, Fisherville, Lynnwood, Turner Falls, Millbury, North Adams, Rochdale, Gardner, Manchaug, Auburn, Webster, West Medway, Gleasondale, Graniteville, North Oxford, North Dighton, Bondsville and West Warren.

Within these past few weeks, we have heard rumors of further liquidations and migrations on the part of the American Woolen Co., the biggest woolen manufacturer in the country, with 18 mills and many thousands of workers in New England. The migration in woolens is more recent; in cotton manufacturing it has been under way for 25 years. Then New England had 80 percent of the industry; now it has 20 percent.

The impact of such industrial dislocation cannot be underestimated. When the Kilburn Cotton Mill in New Bedford was partially liquidated and moved to Tryon, N. C., 1,000 workers lost their jobs. The American Woolen Co. has already shut down its Assabet mill in Maynard, Mass., in preference to its new mill in Tifton, Ga., at a cost of 1,500 jobs. The liquidation of the Arlington mills in Lawrence of William Whitman, Inc., added 4,000 to the unemployment rolls. In all, liquidations and migrations in the textile industry alone since 1946 have removed from one State—Massachusetts—over 28,000 jobs. Plants stand idle, nearly 5 million square feet of industrial plant being empty in Lawrence alone. Officials of one Massachusetts town have stated that 50 percent of that community's jobs have been moved elsewhere.

Such dislocation is not only taking place in Massachusetts, but all over New England; and indeed throughout the Middle Atlantic and other regions. It is not only taking place in textiles, but also in shoes, electrical goods and numerous other industries. I am certain that nearly every other Senator can point to similar situations in his own State. I ask, therefore, that before our mobilization economy has terminated and a more serious recession is upon us, and before spot unemployment and industrial dislocation and migration undermine the orderly maintenance of our prosperity, we give special attention to these problems.

It is my intention to outline in this series of addresses a comprehensive legislative program to meet these problems. After long and serious study, I have concluded that action by the Federal Government in the following areas and in the following ways is both necessary and desirable.

First, we must lend our efforts toward the diversification and expansion of commercial and industrial activity in these problem areas. This may be done through assistance to State and local community organizations engaged in stimulating activity; through tax incentives to industries expanding in labor surplus areas or replacing and modernizing equipment; through establishment of a job retaining program; through assistance to small business; through the fullest utilization of natural resources; and through assistance to industries which are specially depressed, such as our fishing industry.

Secondly, we must lend our efforts toward the prevention of further business decline and dislocation. We can do this by taking measures to equalize the cost of labor, through equalizing unionization, wage rates and non-wage-payroll costs; by equalizing the distribution of Federal business incentives such as defense contracts and tax amortization privileges; by eliminating the competitive abuses of tax privileges which have contributed to such industrial decline and dislocation; by giving attention to the need for eliminating discrimination in transportation costs; and by preventing harmful speculation in certain commodities.

Third, we must lend our efforts toward the reduction of those hardships caused by unemployment, dislocation or recession. This would include improvement of our unemployment compensation program; provision for a more adequate program for our older citizens; and establishment of a genuine middle-income housing program.

Finally, I shall set forth other overall legislative objectives affecting these problems, including economy in the National Government; cautious wisdom in international trade policies; effective anti-inflation, antideflation, and antitrust programs; and a review of our present agricultural programs.

I want to stress that the presentation of these problems and proposed solutions is only a foundation—a beginning in outline form. My approach is, of course, only one approach. I shall offer it as a basis for further consideration and further suggestions and legislation by the Congress, the Federal agencies involved, and the people of New England and the United States. I have no doubt that there will be many in New England who will not agree with one or more of the solutions offered to these problems. Indeed there are many who are unwilling to admit that such problems and such needs even exist. But I am hoping that this program will contribute to the present consideration New England, the Nation, and Congress are giving these problems, and facilitate appropriate action to meet these needs.

I know, of course, that there is a long road between the presentation of a program and its final enactment, and that we cannot expect favorable or immediate action upon all of these proposals. Nor would even the enactment of such a program provide a panacea for all of the economic ills of New England and the Nation. But I believe it to be a start in alleviating the present and long-term situations which I have outlined to you.

ORGANIZATION OF NEW ENGLAND DELEGATION

The implementation of any effective program for the benefit of New England will require, of course, the united efforts of the entire New England delegation for the purpose of promoting these and other bills for the benefit of New England, for reviewing general legislation affecting beneficially or adversely the New England economy, and for coordinating information on Federal administrative action affecting New England, including a check on funds expended and derived by the Federal Government in that area.

This delegation has always in the past worked harmoniously for the best interests of our region. I believe, however, that it is of the utmost importance that this cooperation be placed on a more formal basis and that we should meet periodically to discuss these and other proposals, to consider in fact all governmental matters affecting the New England economy. Other State and regional delegations have similar meetings with considerable effectiveness, and I congratulate them. Despite differences in the type and intensity of problems affecting the various sectors and States of New England, I am confident that we can unite in order to cooperate in the interest of the Nation and our region.

In summary, Mr. President, I wish to say only this: Our national prosperity and the present overall advantages of New England are in themselves evidence of those assets, both human and material, which can overcome the problems which I have previously discussed. The role of the Federal Government is only a limited role in the solution of these problems, but it is an important one. To many in New England, a Federal program for even a partial alleviation of their problems will require an adjustment in attitudes. But we in New England have too long sat on the sidelines while our tax funds solved the problems of other areas. Now we are beginning to act. By facing facts, by uniting our efforts, by contributing our utmost on all levels of government and in all walks of life, our regional and national prosperity will continue to grow, our employment levels will increase, and our industries and workers will prosper. The time for such action is now.

II. INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION AND DIVERSIFICATION

Mr. President, the most important step which can be taken to alleviate the economic stagnation which mars the otherwise healthy economy of our Nation, in particular areas of New England

and elsewhere, is to bring about the diversification and expansion of commercial and industrial activity in those areas. New industries, new products, new firms, and new markets will remove labor surpluses, invigorate the economy, and stimulate economic growth. Similarly, new plants, new machines, new technical developments and new techniques of management and marketing are needed to cure the ills of an economy suffering from old age. In textiles particularly, such new approaches are available but need to be put into effect.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS

As the first and basic step in enabling local communities and industries to bring about such changes through their own efforts, I am introducing proposed legislation which would enable the establishment of regional industrial development corporations. Such corporations would have the following functions:

A. To provide technical assistance to, and otherwise encourage the formation and growth of, State, and community industrial or credit development agencies, foundations, corporations, or similar organizations formed for the purpose of stimulation and expansion of new and diversified commercial and industrial activity and productivity;

B. To provide technical assistance and informational and consultative services to such organizations or agencies, and to educational or other appropriate public agencies, to aid in the initiation or development of—

First. Industry advisory committees and technical conferences;

Second. Community and area surveys of—

(a) Private industrial production and distribution potential, market analyses, and plant space surveys, and

(b) The need and possibilities of Federal public works projects;

Third. Labor mobility and retraining;

Fourth. Business adaptability to new lines of production, and productivity generally; and

Fifth. Liaison between various Federal agencies and those interested in, or in need of, the contracts or services of such agencies, including RFC loans and certificates for rapid tax amortization;

(c) To provide particular assistance and analyses to the appropriate State and local organizations, and make recommendations to the appropriate Federal agencies, with respect to any area within the region which has been designated as a labor surplus or distressed area.

Congress should also consider the possibility of enabling such regional bodies to make loans, and in some instances grants, to the local groups, and insure or guarantee the industrial development loans of such groups and possibly commercial banks. Moreover, if present RFC and SDPA direct-loan authorizations are not expanded, as I shall discuss shortly, or if the Douglas-Flanders or Sparkman bills for small-business financing are not accepted, Congress should further consider the addition of that function to the powers of the Regional Development Corporation. Such legislation would authorize the establishment of such corporation with a Federal charter under the auspices of the Federal Reserve bank in the region in question whenever two or more State or local industrial development corporations join in establishing such a regional body under the conditions to be set forth in this legislation. The initial purchase of stock in such a corporation could be made in whole or in part by the Federal Reserve bank of the district, with the provision that the stock would be sold to the organizations for, with, and through which the regional corporation works. State industrial development agencies would similarly be eligible to purchase stock in, or make annual contributions to, such regional agency. The regional agency, in turn, would be empowered to purchase a specified minimum proportion of the stock in any community industrial development corporation in that region.

Such a corporation shall have a board of directors, all of whom are selected from the region in question and a full-time technical staff. In general, the philosophy of such a program will be neither the establishment of a new supernational or regional bureaucracy duplicating the present industrial development programs and bringing large Federal grants or Federal intervention; but instead shall be to help, encourage, and prod such State and local organizations to help themselves in their own manner by providing to them the technical assistance and other resources mentioned above which will enable them to perform their functions more adequately. Such a regional corporation should not be a promotional agency advertising the benefits of such region or particular States or communities therein, or exercise direct efforts to attract specific firms to such regions or States. Interstate cooperation, not rivalry, would be its objective. Federal enabling legislation is necessary primarily only to define the role of the Federal Reserve banks and to establish conditions for tax exemption; in all other respects, such a project would be local in its entirety.

Such a corporation would be granted exemption from Federal, State, and local taxes, although it would be established on a basis making possible a small profit to those State and local industrial development groups who hold stock therein. The efforts of such regional agency on behalf of State and community industrial development organizations will not be exercised on behalf of those organizations who are engaged in the extension of public credit, tax privilege, tax loopholes, or other outright public subsidy to new industries, who will still be expected to pay their fair share of State and Federal taxes on all sites and buildings involved, nor will its efforts be exercised on behalf of those individuals and firms whose objective is primarily one of profit making rather than the community interest, although those community industrial development corporations which have a possibility of earning profits will not be excluded. To the extent possible, considerations in the extending of such efforts by the regional group will be toward stimulating new industries, not enticing old ones, and giving fair consideration to the competitive position of industries presently established in the area.

Ideally, the initiative for industrial development and most of the funds and effort should come from the local communities. There are at present three State development corporations in New England, in Maine, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island. Vermont and Connecticut are working toward such corporations and there have been several proposals, including that of Governor Herter, for establishment of a similar organization in Massachusetts. There are more than three dozen local industrial foundations in cities and towns throughout New England whose work, which I shall describe shortly, has recently been praised by the National Planning Association's Report on the Financial Resources of New England. Many other communities have other types of development organizations. Practically all of these have limitations in scope or financing. To provide further assistance of the type I have mentioned to these local groups would be the chief function of the regional bodies I am proposing.

Such an organization would also provide an invaluable function in coordinating on a regional and local level, and providing local interests with liaison, the present activities related to those problems now conducted by the Departments of Commerce, Labor, Defense, the RFC, SDPA, and other Federal agencies. Perhaps more important, it could coordinate the activities of the various State and local groups, the desirability of which was recently pointed out by the National Planning Association's Committee of New England.

The fact is, I believe, self-evident that New England and certain areas therein, with their economic growth retarded and certain of their industries being lost to other regions, are in need of new expanded and diversified commercial and industrial activities and products. It is likewise self-evident that important in the attainment of such objectives are the utilization of technical assistance, community surveys, job retraining, labor mobility, business adaptability, liaison with the Federal Government, and the other factors envisioned in the program proposed.

According to Department of Labor estimates last year, a total of $11 million of investment from local industrial development corporations would provide the nearly 14,000 jobs in manufacturing necessary at that time to balance the labor force in Massachusetts. This amount may be compared with the annual cost of unemployment insurance benefits in the State of nearly $30 million. In the city of Lawrence, where well over one-quarter of the labor force was unemployed in July 1952, a total of some $5 million in capital investment, initially utilized in the bonds of a local industrial development corporation at a per capita investment of $41, when supplemented with capital investment raisable from insurance companies and the investment provided by a new industry for its machinery, would provide the number of manufacturing jobs required to balance the labor force in that area. In this same area, over $11 million annually was being paid out in unemployment insurance benefits.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In August of 1952, the Arthur D. Little Report on Industrial Opportunities in New England was published. The objective of this report was to discover new markets for products now made by New England companies, opportunities for introducing newly developed products, and opportunities for establishing new industries suitable for New England, with emphasis principally on growth industries and technological advance. The report emphasized the many products in which New England's share of the market is underdeveloped, the possibilities of diversifying New England industry through new products and new firms, and the basis for establishing industries new to the region or new in a technologic sense. The establishment of a nonintegrated steel mill, an oil refinery, or a cement plant have long been considered desirable objectives for the New England economy. To these, the Little report added many others. It emphasized, however, as so many other reports on the New England economy have emphasized, that further efforts and investigation were necessary with respect to the establishment of each such industry or product. Such a task might well be undertaken by the organization I am proposing.

The most recent report of the Massachusetts Industrial and Development Commission, the report of the Massachusetts Special Commission on the Textile Industry, the testimony of labor and other representatives before that commission, the report of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry, the report of the Council of Economic Advisers' Committee on the New England Economy, and others have all emphasized the effect upon New England industries of technological and managerial changes. The need for consultative services and technical assistance in the area has been restated many times by such reports. The emphasis here is not only upon new industries, but is likewise upon showing the same enthusiasm and consideration to existing industries in an effort to retain and expand the status of those industries.

In general, the functions suggested for the Regional Industrial Development Corp. are those which have time and time again been recommended as necessities for the New England economy. They emphasize the need for using New England agencies, New England facilities and sites, New England investment capital, and New England personnel. The Federal Government cannot and should not attempt to take over all of the functions necessary to maintain the economic prosperity of New England or any other region. But, through enabling legislation for regional agencies of the type described above, it may provide assistance to the State and local organizations to enable and encourage them to help themselves. That is to say, help themselves with respect to those functions not strictly a matter of Federal legislation—promotional organizations, industry censuses, industrial research and development, technical and managerial services to small business, analyses of regional economic needs and capacities, encouragement of diversification of industry and products, promotion of the retraining and mobility of labor, analysis of labor force and unemployment statistics, encouragement of venture capital, establishment of steel and other required industries, and similar functions—all of the foregoing being listed as important steps for New England in the report on the New England economy, which has high praise for the work of the State and local industrial development organizations.

The praises of State and local industrial and credit development foundations, corporations, and agencies have been sung many times. The results of their efforts on a statewide basis, as in New Hampshire, or on a local basis, as in Lawrence, Lowell, and New Bedford, have often been cited as examples of what could be done if proper funds and assistance were available. The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, through its Monthly Review, has commended the establishment and activities of industrial foundations. The definition provided by a Monthly Review article is an excellent summary of the work of such foundations:

> Industrial foundations are privately sponsored community agencies which make investments out of their own funds, bring enterprises in need of capital to sources of funds seeking investment, or otherwise aid business in obtaining money. For the most part, they are nonprofit organizations * * * set up to carry on and extend the services customarily provided by chambers of commerce in the industrial development of their communities. The primary purpose of the industrial foundation is to bring new industrial enterprises into the community, although it may also be interested in assisting local manufacturing firms. It achieves its purpose primarily by financing requirements for factory space * * * (or) buying and building plants for lease or sale * * * It may also furnish other aid by leasing or selling industrial sites at or below cost, by loans or other financial aid, and by providing managerial assistance * * * (including) engineering and other counseling services to small business * * * subsidies such as free rent or land, and exemption from property taxation. The fundamental objective of an industrial foundation, therefore, is to increase the payrolls of the community by developing the community industrially.

New England foundations have not utilized outright subsidies and tax exemption. Funds are usually raised on a broad base of solicitation; the average foundation is a nonprofit corporation. Such organizations have neither conflicted with other community groups such as the chamber of commerce, nor competed with private enterprise such as local banks, but have worked in cooperation with both. According to a Tulsa study quoted in Monthly Review, there were 72 industrial foundations operating in the United States in 1948 while another 32 cities had similar but less formal community industrial financing plans. In the past 5 years, this type of financing program has grown tremendously, partly due to their amazing success in attracting new industries and financing the expansion of enterprises already located in the community. Their work has been compared to "the practical neighborly interest in a local venture that used to develop spontaneously in a more simple structure of an earlier period," while at the same time recognizing the fact that technical expertness and respected judgment, as well as sources of capital, are necessary to supplement community enthusiasm and goodwill.

A particular booster of such organizations is the New England Council. The council's publication New England Newsletter in January 1953 stated that 37 relatively new community agencies in New England had attracted at least 300 firms, 27,000 new jobs and a total annual payroll of around $75 million. The Report of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry also praised the efforts of State and community organizations to attract new industry, without use of tax funds and subsidies. The Third District Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia is similarly a great supporter of community industrial development organizations as a means of improving and diversifying the local economy in Pennsylvania's many labor surplus areas.

The Department of Labor has also publicized and boosted the efforts of community industrial development organizations, and states in a recent release that far more promising in the long run than Government contracts, "particularly in one-industry towns, is helping small businesses expand and bringing in new industries."

Particularly successful community industrial development organizations which have received justified public commendation include Pittsfield, Mass., Industrial Development Co.; Holyoke Industries, Inc., Massachusetts; Northampton, Mass., Industrial Realty Development Corp.; Lowell, Mass., Industrial Corp.; Danbury, Conn.; Industrial Corp.; Pottsville, Pa., Development Fund; Lebanon, N. H., Industrial Development Association; Laconia, N. H., Industrial Development Corp.; Ware, Mass., Industries, Inc.; Knox Industries, Inc., of Rockland, Maine; Belfast, Maine, Industrial Building Association; Louisville, Ky., Industrial Foundation; Scranton, Pa., Planning Corp. and Industrial Development Co.; Amoskeag Industries, Inc., of Manchester, N. H.; Greater Lawrence, Mass., Industrial Corp.; Nashua, N. H., Foundation; Portland, Maine, Industrial Program; and many others. The structure and functions of the above vary, but they have been uniform in their success.

It has been pointed out, however, that such local initiative is to no avail if it attempts to raise funds and enthusiasm after the disaster has struck and the area has become distressed. Thus, the measures taken by the New England groups during the 1948–49 recession were called a hopeful sign of community interest, but not proportionate to the industrial decline during that period. Again, the value of a regional organization with more adequate and more permanent resources is seen.

In summary, it is submitted that a regional industrial development corporation, with the functions suggested, could make an invaluable contribution to the battle for the expansion and diversification of the economies of New England and other regions through providing technical assistance, coordination, and

other services to those properly qualified State and community industrial and credit development organizations who are in the forefront in this battle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this place in the RECORD a memorandum setting forth the precedents for such a regional agency as I am here proposing.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRECEDENTS FOR REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LEGISLATION

A. PRECEDENTS FOR SIMILAR REGIONAL BODIES IN FEDERAL LEGISLATION OR PROPOSALS

Although a program of the exact nature described above has not previously been proposed to my knowledge, similar programs, containing parts of the above outline, have previously been incorporated into bills or suggested by various studies as appropriate for Federal action.

A recent article in the Harvard Business Review gives a full discussion of the growth and value of industrial foundations in New England and concludes with a discussion of the need of such funds for outside assistance:

"What communities need from the outside is neither leadership nor funds, but know-how. While the United States Government is currently furnishing significant technical and scientific aid overseas under its point 4 program, let us not overlook our own 'underdeveloped' communities. They also deserve something akin to point 4—when their business leaders have organized in a manner to profit from such aid."

In 1950, Senator O'Mahoney introduced S. 2975 establishing regional corporations within the Federal Reserve System subject to the supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with authority, among other things, "to encourage the growth of local industrial development corporations formed for the purpose of supplying venture capital for the development of new and useful products, services, or techniques by providing for limited financial participation in such corporation," by purchasing the capital shares of any such corporation up to 5 percent of its capital and surplus.

Such corporations were to be formed by private individuals acting under the auspices of the Federal Reserve System, with shares of stock in the corporation being eligible for purchase by member banks of the Federal Reserve System and initially by the Federal Reserve banks themselves. Provision was also made for technical assistance, coordination with other agencies and tax exemption, etc.

In the first session of the 81st Congress a comprehensive bill intended as a furtherance of or a substitute for the Employment Act of 1946 was introduced in the Senate by 17 Democrats and 2 Republicans. Shortly thereafter I introduced the same measure in the House. This bill, although not intended to operate primarily on a regional level, provided through the utilization and expansion of existing facilities and agencies for a large number of the items discussed above and others generally included in our New England program. It specifically provided that "the President, through the Tennessee Valley Authority and any other such regional agencies as may be established and, for those regions of the country for which no such agencies exist through such administrative mechanisms as he may designate or create, shall provide for continuing regional surveys of * * * developmental needs and opportunities for private business enterprise, particularly new, small, and competitive business enterprises, including market analyses and distribution potentials * * * needs for resources development and public works projects: *And provided further,* That in making such surveys the facilities of State, local, and regional planning and development agencies and of universities and colleges shall be utilized to the fullest practicable extent. The results of such surveys shall be made promptly available to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies."

It also provided for loans to State agencies and subdivisions for surveys, economic investigations and analyses, and advance planning of resources development and public works projects. Special assistance to distressed areas, provisions for labor restraining and mobility, and industrial advisory committees were all included. Apparently no hearings were held on this legislation.

The report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the Economy of the South stated that if some form of Federal aid is needed to provide capital funds for full development and employment in the South, then "such aid might take the form of a Regional Industrial Investment Fund set up by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or some other similar agency."

The report of the Committee on the New England Economy prepared for the Council of Economic Advisors was even more specific in its recommendation:

"It is desirable that the Congress take action to provide for the establishment of regional privately owned investment corporations which shall have the support of regional Federal Reserve banks. Such a proposal was before the last Congress in the form of Senate bill 2975. Adoption of such a proposal would greatly expand the total of funds available for equity financing. It would bolster the operations and funds of private and State-sponsored development corporations. It would continue to use the personal contacts, information, and advice of local banks, which could assume ownership and control as soon as they wished. It would greatly stimulate the formation of new enterprises and the modernization and growth of small established firms. * * * It is recommended that the regional investment banks, suggested above, have on their staff full-time personnel to guide and assist community groups that are interested in the establishment of industrial foundations."

The report also recommended that the Department of Commerce use some of its research and development funds to work through educational and community groups to provide technical and managerial assistance to small-business men.

The Committee for Economic Development has proposed, and the Smaller Business Association of New England is interested in, the establishment of capital banks on a regional basis, with a private, profit-making status (although at least related to the functions of the Federal Reserve banks) for the purpose of providing for the long-term financial and equity capital needs of small business. The committee states that a form of this type of bank is successfully operating in Canada. A similar proposal was made in 1945 by the Committee on Small Business of the Investment Bankers Association. In 1943, representatives of the private New England Industrial Development Corp. recommended to the Senate Small Business Committee the establishment of a holding company for investments and small firms backed by Government guaranties. The recent report of the NPA committee of New England made a similar recommendation.

All are, of course, aware of the existing agencies such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Federal Reserve bank, Small Defense Plants Corporation, Council of Economic Advisers, and others. Most of these have regional offices. A more regionalized approach has been used in the power and water resources field, where a separate body (TVA, SEPA, SWPA, BPA, etc.) has been established for a particular region.

B. PRECEDENTS FOR SIMILIAR REGIONAL BODIES IN REGIONAL COMPACTS OR PROPOSALS

There have been previous proposals in New England for uniting the region on problems of industrial development. In March 1949, the six New England Governors, under the chairmanship of Governor Pastore of Rhode Island, drafted a plan calling for an organization "to plan and develop for 10 years common economic interests for a greater New England." This was to be in the form of an interstate compact for a New England Development Authority to survey the natural and economic resources of New England, together with the resources of adjacent areas which affect the economy and development of New England. The emphasis appears to have been primarily upon development of water and other natural resources; but the survey was also to include, but not be limited to, an investigation, study and comprehensive report upon the importation of natural gas by pipeline, the establishment of a steel industry, the promotion and development of the textile, the electrical, the brass and the shoe industries, and the conservation and expansion of marine fisheries, agriculture, and timber and mineral production. The Authority was directed to determine the availability of Federal grants-in-aid for developing such projects as it might recommend; and take steps to procure such funds.

The President of the New England Council, in calling attention to the significance of the proposed compact, stated:

"To a much greater degree than we have been able to bring about, it proposes to bring to bear upon some of the problems with which we are and have been concerned, the powers and resources of the States. It would unite the States much more firmly in support of regional development, and reinforce their commitments to joint endeavors. Presumably the proposed authority could and would require greater cooperation of agencies of State government on a regional basis than the council's persuasions have been able to achieve.

"In addition to the above, the compact expresses an intention to secure larger allocations of Federal funds to New England, and to bring about greater activity of Federal agencies in the region than has characterized the Council's policies and objectives."

Although the Rhode Island Legislature promptly and unanimously ratified the compact, rejection by one State under its terms nullified the entire undertaking, and Vermont, by a fairly close vote, rejected it shortly thereafter. A resolution adopted by the Ninth Eastern States Conservation Conference proposed later in 1949 that an effort be made to redraft the terms of the compact.

As has previously been mentioned, all six New England States have State government-sponsored industrial development agencies of varying types. Not empowered to provide financing, they work both independently and with private and community development corporations, and carry on research, surveys, and promotion. Maine in 1951 and New Hampshire in 1952 also put statewide development corporations into operation to provide financial assistance in the form of venture capital or long-term credit to new and small manufacturers on a statewide basis. Proposals to establish somewhat similar agencies under State government auspices in Massachusetts and Rhode Island were defeated in their respective State legislatures in 1952. This year, a privately financed industrial development corporation is certain to be established in Rhode Island under bipartisan support in the State legislature, and a revitalized State department of commerce is being studied by the Massachusetts Legislature, as well as the Governor's recent recommendation for a State-sponsored credit development corporation.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in passage of a bill enabling the establishment of regional industrial development corporations may be the most important step we can take to maintain and improve the growth and vitality of our national and regional economies.

TAX AMORTIZATION INCENTIVES

Mr. President, there is a second important way by which the Congress can take action to stimulate the expansion of commercial and industrial activity in the declining companies, industries, and communities in New England and the United States. This is through the enactment of Federal income-tax legislation which would provide incentives for new activity, expansion, and modernization. All of us recognize that the high-tax levels under which we now exist are not the most desirable for small business, investments, or new enterprises; and I shall discuss the desirability and means of effectuating general tax reductions, when possible, in a subsequent part of this series. I wish to speak now of a particular part of our tax laws which can be used with a most beneficial effect upon these problems of which I speak. That is the part relating to the depreciation or amortization of new plants and equipment.

The Revenue Act of 1950 permits the portion of the cost of facilities attributable to the defense program, after allowing for postemergency usefulness and other factors, to be written off for tax purposes over 5 years instead of the normal depreciation period. This provides a great incentive for the construction of such facilities because of the high deductions permitted during these times of high tax levels. The effect of this 5-year amortization is to allow a quick tax-free recovery of capital to those engaged in defense production who may otherwise face the possibility of a postwar loss in the value of plants and equipment currently deemed necessary to the defense effort. As of December 1952, a total of 15,000 applications for facilities valued at $25 billion had been certified for rapid amortization, of which $14.5 billion was permitted a fast write-off. A large portion of such expansions is for the purchase and installation of new machinery and equipment, which is so badly needed in the textile mills of New England and in other industries and areas. Similar programs have been used during World Wars I and II. During World War I, an estimated $650 million worth of facilities were granted these privileges and during World War II, certificates of necessity were issued for a total of $7.3 billion of which about $5.7 billion were reported for tax purposes.

As a means of further stimulating for civilian purposes new investment and modernization of plant, a necessary prerequisite for continued economic growth in all parts of the country and particularly in New England, it is my intention to introduce legislation to provide similar tax amortization incentives to industries expanding in labor surplus areas and to older industries seeking to replace and modernize equipment. Permit me to discuss briefly each of these proposals:

With respect to the proposal that such incentives be given to those business concerns expanding existing facilities or locating new facilities in labor-surplus areas, a proposal which Secretary Durkin and the Office of Defense Mobilization are initiating on a limited scale, one must first think of the vicious circle of fear and inertia which strikes down the investment opportunities in an area hard hit by recession and unemployment. Psychologically, a town with large empty plants with broken windows and rusty padlocks, and with large numbers of idle men roaming the streets, is not looked upon as the ideal location for new business expansion. Such scenes raise fears, not only of the present, but also of the future. Some special inducement is needed to provide new investment or new industries or new machinery in such a community. Our experience during World War II and at the present time with the 5-year amortization program shows that a powerful stimulus is provided by accelerated amortization. The investor or prosperous businessman sees a chance of getting his investment back over a short period of time and is willing to take a chance he might otherwise be loathe to take. The businessman whose own concern is in a slump has no income against which to write off the extra depreciation, and finds it better to defer depreciation deductions. However, where his slump is only temporary, as is frequently true in the seasonal fluctuations of the textile and other industries, the deficit created by such large depreciation allowances for expanding his productive capacity would create a net loss for income-tax purposes which, under our present tax laws, may be set off against the income of the previous year and tax refund obtained, or carried forward and set off against the income of the 5 succeeding years. Thus, new firms and new commercial operations would be attracted to distressed areas.

To direct such incentives toward the needs for new or expanded industrial activity in labor-surplus areas would confine their use, and the subsequent loss of revenue to the Federal Government, to those areas where the need is greatest and where the Federal and State governments are losing revenues or otherwise being harmed by lack of employment opportunities. Clearly, such a law would need to be most carefully drafted. The primary purpose of such incentives, which are actually a form of Federal assistance, should be to stimulate industrial activities in labor-surplus areas; and not to prop up industries whose decline is inevitable because of technical obsolescence or other reasons; to bail out failing industries who have negligently failed to keep pace with developments in their own field; or to encourage local industries to postpone investments until their area becomes one of labor surplus.

With respect to the second recommendation that the Internal Revenue Code be amended to provide tax amortization incentives to older industries or concerns seeking to replace or modernize equipment, much of what is said above, likewise is applicable. A method by which this may be accomplished, provided adequate safeguards are established, and which I commend to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for consideration, is to permit a business to set aside during prosperous times tax-free depreciation reserves which could be used during depressed times for expansion or replacement of old equipment.

Because of the serious need for technological improvement and modernization in the textile and other industries in New England, the Committee on the New England Economy recommended in its report that the Congress, along with the Bureau of Internal Revenue, "review the problem of asset depreciation for the purpose of making tax revisions that would stimulate industrial plant and machinery modernization by older concerns, whether or not they are directly engaged in defense work." The textile committee report recommended more specifically that some such tax incentives be provided as a stimulus to the construction of new plants and machinery, which would be "especially helpful for an older region which tends to have excessive numbers of outmoded plants and equipment." The textile industry is being completely changed by new machines and new products. New England's woolen and worsted industry in particular faces competition from new fibers and processes. Cotton, too, is being pushed aside by the so-called miracle blends. New precision machinery, automatic winding, quality testing, electronic controls and new plants generally are needed if the individual company is to stay economically healthy. But such million-dollar investments require the encouragement of a tax program such as this. The cost of replacement may be several times the value of existing machinery. Present Treasury depreciation allowances of 25 years for spinning and weaving machinery, for example, do not provide any encouragement. With such a program as I have outlined, it would be necessary to devise methods to prevent investment from being accentuated in times of prosperity, but abnormally decreased during hard times.

I have long believed that tax amortization or depreciation incentives for private enterprise were a beneficial means of bringing economic expansion through private investment, production, and employment. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and many other Senators have been pressing for similar action. Nearly 4 years ago, I introduced a bill providing for such incentives with respect to the development of facilities which added to or improved the efficiency of this Nation's productive capacity. Since World War II, Canada has had particularly favorable results from its policies of granting special depreciation allowances for new investment. Proposals of this nature have been suggested and under study for a great many years, as the Treasury rulings became more complex, less realistic, and the cause of unnecessary redtape and litigation which plagues small-business men in particular.

I am hopeful that on the limited basis respecting labor-surplus areas and the outmoded equipment of older industries, a program of tax-amortization incentives may be begun shortly.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

JOB RETRAINING

The next step, Mr. President, in aiding the diversification and expansion of industry in the problem areas of New England and elsewhere is the establishment of an adequate program of job retraining.

On March 24, of this year, the Massachusetts State Division of Employment Security announced that it had 8,000 job opportunities open, but could find few qualified takers among the 40,000 persons drawing unemployment-compensation checks.

The Department of Labor has recently pointed out in a memorandum to my office that among the many measures that should be taken to rehabilitate areas of unemployment, training and retraining of the work force are of prominent importance. The skills available in an available work force may be a deciding factor, and certainly should be a major inducement in an industry's decision to expand or establish in the area. Most areas of unemployment have a skilled work force, however, that is not automatically adaptable to the activities that can be expanded in the area. There is urgent need for assistance in these areas for a job training or retraining program to convert or adapt the skills of the work force to the requirements of the new activity. To initiate a program of this nature requires funds and facilities not readily available in areas hard-hit by unemployment. Present Federal programs do not directly meet this problem, and the need for their improvement was pointed out by President Eisenhower in his opening message to Congress.

Although job training programs would be facilitated by the work of regional industrial development corporations, as already mentioned, the best legislative approach for provision of such a program would be through amendment of the present basic vocational education laws, primarily the George-Barden Act. The funds appropriated under this law are presently allocated on the basis of State population. It is my intention to introduce legislation expanding the authority of such programs, and providing for special allocations to job retraining programs in labor surplus areas. Provisions should also be included for establishing training facilities and equipment where such training resources are not available. Financing would continue to be on a matching basis with the State, in order to insure local responsibility, and whenever possible the particular industry involved should be encouraged to underwrite at least partially some of the cost of training if facilities are made available. Such special training programs would be geared to the needs of a particular industry after a firm commitment by the industry is made to establish a plant in that area when a specified number of skilled employees are available. Such training would start with the breaking of ground so that the work force would be ready upon completion of the plant. All available trained personnel, including older workers, women and handicapped workers, and minority groups would have their skills utilized by a realistic training program tailored to actual needs. The funds necessary for such a program, now being encouraged under Defense Manpower Policy No. 5, would be more than repaid by the resulting decrease in unemployment and relief payments and increase in purchasing power and taxable revenues.

Such a job retraining program, which would provide specific authority and facilities for this important work, is essential to the fullest utilization of our manpower.

AIDS TO SMALL BUSINESS

The next step, Mr. President, in aiding a diversified and expanding economy is, I believe, aiding small business. New England, which has a higher proportion of independent business enterprises employing less than 500 persons than any other region in the United States, is particularly dependent for its economic growth upon such small-business men. They are the lifeline of our free competitive economy and our total national product. During World War II, 32 percent of this Nation's defense production came from small business. During the first 3 months of this year, loans to New England firms through SDPA-RFC facilities enabled small business production of such items as weapon parts, jet engine parts, military snowshoes and bomb parts; and certificates of competency enabled defense procurement contracts to go to small New England firms making raincoats, metal parts, webbing, cable, and cotton overcoats. Only through full and free competition can free markets, free entry into business and opportunities for the expression and growth of personal initiative and individual judgment be assured. It is proper that the resources of the entire United States acting through the Congress and the Federal Government be utilized to encourage and develop our small business enterprises and preserve and expand the competition which is so basic to our economic well-being.

In a growing economy, it is the small-business man who so frequently leads the way with new products, new enterprises, and new job opportunities. We should neither give unfair advantages to small business nor condemn big business. But small-business men, in an economy which has become not only tremendous in its size but dominated by giants in particular industries, are in need of help simply to obtain equal opportunity to exist and compete. They need long-term loans and equity investment, technical assistance, consultative managerial services, availability to new research techniques and a fair share of Government contracts.

Specifically, experience has demonstrated that an expanding competitive economy is in need of two types of different Federal functions or agencies aiding small business: First, a source of long-term loans; and secondly, a source of technical assistance, both in production and in utilizing the opportunities presented by Federal contracts and facilities. Such functions could be combined in a single independent agency along the lines of the Small Business Administration proposed by the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business [Mr. THYE] and recently endorsed by the New England Smaller Business Association; or they could be carried out by two separate, independent agencies working along lines similar to the tasks now performed by the RFC and the SDPA. I would like to discuss the work of each of these agencies very briefly.

Since its initiation under Herbert Hoover over 20 years ago the RFC has made 126,835 loans for a total of about $13 billion. More than 90 percent of RFC loans are small-business loans, amounting to less than $100,000 each. By making credit available through the RFC on sound credit terms we have been able to assist our small and independent businessmen to put their concerns on a sounder financial basis, to expand their developments, or to convert their plants to urgently needed defense activities. These needs of small business are not being met by any other Government agency or any private source. I have been in touch recently with a large number of Massachusetts firms whose valuable contribution to our economy and defense effort was made possible by RFC loans after they could not obtain financing elsewhere, particularly in their formative or temporarily distressed years prior to their establishment of an earning record attractive to private financing. According to the National Planning Association report, between January 1948 and March 1952 business loans in excess of $164 million were authorized by the RFC for New England, 5.2 percent of the national total. The same study indicated that it was long-term loans for small firms for which the greatest need existed unfulfilled by private sources; that "capital investment in New England must be larger if the region is to maintain or increase its competitive strength"; and that the RFC was making an important contribution to the financing of many middle-sized New England companies.

Of course, corruption and abuses in such an agency must be curbed; and, of course, its functions which are no longer necessary should not continue. But it is absolutely essential to the vitality of our national and regional economies that the Federal Government continue to make possible a source of capital to our small-business men. The RFC lends money only to those who could not get the funds from private sources, and its impressive record of repayment is due to the caution with which application for such loans is accepted. To replace this independent agency by a unit in some other department of the Government, as has been proposed, would be to turn the problems of small business over to an insignificant and unsympathetic bureau more concerned with other duties. Instead of being abolished, the RFC needs a liberalization of its lending facilities to enable more long-term loans to new and growing enterprises, not merely rescue-type loans.

Surely it is not economy to liquidate an earning organization. In the two decades of its existence, the RFC has paid a billion dollars into the Federal Treasury, including its initial capital of $100 million and its earnings on loans and liquidations of assets. It pays interest on the money it borrows from the Treasury and gets no appropriation from the Congress to pay its employees or other of its operating expenses. It is

an entirely self-sufficient Government corporation which pays a net return back to the United States Treasury. Whether it be in the form of a reorganized RFC or a program of regional banks, an independent agency for loans which small business cannot obtain elsewhere is an absolute necessity for a strong and growing economy.

For the same reasons, this country needs an independent agency—and I stress the word "independent"—to handle the problems of small business with respect to Government contracts and technical assistance. The experience of the Small War Plants Administration when placed under the Department of Commerce, and the lack of accomplishment of the so-called Small Business Unit of that Department may be contrasted with the operations of the Small Defense Plants Administration during its first full year as ample demonstration of the need for such independence. In proposing a permanent, independent small-business agency to be known as the Small Business Administration, which would broaden the scope of the Small Defense Plants Administration to include other than strictly defense activities, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] stated:

> Our experience with the Small Defense Plants Administration has taught us how effectively a small agency organized efficiently can be in seeing that small business gets serious consideration in the formulation of Government policies.

The record of the Small Defense Plants Administration is more than paying for itself through the savings to the Government on defense bids, and aiding on the meager scale permitted by its appropriation the fair distribution of defense contracts to small-business men is ample evidence of the continued need for such an agency. The Smaller Business Association of New England during its January 1953 monthly meeting discussed this record, determined that the SDPA had accomplished a great deal of real help for small business in the New England area, and that these accomplishments far outweighed the small cost to the Government. The association unanimously adopted a resolution that "in view of the consistent, dynamic, effective record of the aid to small business of the Small Defense Plants Administration, the Smaller Business Association of New England feels strongly that this agency should be continued."

During 1952 the Small Defense Plants Administration helped 300 smaller firms secure defense expansion financing; aided in the establishment of critical materials hardship reserves which aided 1,000 firms; assisted in the formulation of 21 small-business production pools covering 500 firms; issued hundreds of technical and managerial assistance materials; certified the competency of 45 smaller firms to work on defense contracts; and secured the earmarking of $218 million of defense contracts for individual firms. In my own State of Massachusetts, it has recommended 19 loans totaling close to $3 million and granted 5 certificates of competency enabling the awarding of contracts worth nearly $1.7 million. Eighty-three percent of the loans it has recommended have gone to companies employing fewer than 100 persons. The agency has the overwhelming support of the small-business community in this country, from whom it has been estimated have come over 110,000 various requests for assistance. It needs more support from Congress and a strengthening of its authority. Small business needs an independent advocate in the executive branch of the Government. Unless the vital importance of small business in our economy is fully recognized in Government policies and operations, we will be unable to prevent the deterioration of small business and competitive enterprise in our national economic structure.

At this time, I would like to congratulate the members of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business and urge that they continue their active and vigorous work along these lines. Only by protecting and aiding the small and independent enterprises of this Nation, and this is particularly important in New England, can we expect to strengthen our economy for years of either mobilization or recession.

I am hopeful that the Congress will not permit the small business functions of either the RFC or the SDPA to expire, but will instead strengthen and expand those activities in either one or two independent agencies protecting the interest of small business.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The next important step in the expansion of commercial and industrial activity in New England is the fullest utilization of our natural resources, including the development of hydroelectric power and flood control and prevention of water pollution. The importation of natural gas, the wise management of our forests and other items which are of importance to the New England economy come within the heading of natural resources development, but they are not at this time, in my opinion, questions for congressional consideration.

Proper utilization of our water resources, on the other hand, necessarily and properly requires at least some participation by the Federal Government. This is true for several reasons. A part of New England falls within the St. Lawrence watershed and another part faces Passamaquoddy, which are international in their effects. Part of New England is in the watershed of rivers lying entirely outside New England, such as the Hudson, of New York. Our great rivers, such as the Connecticut and Merrimack, are interstate, on which neither the individual States nor a regional compact can act with the same flexibility or authority as Congress. State laws, such as the Fernald law of Maine, restrict interstate development by those other than the Federal Government. Such a law may seem desirable where power development is on a catch-as-catch-can basis; but with a comprehensive plan for development of the region's natural resources, the necessity for such a law as the Fernald law will cease to exist. State actions are almost inevitably hamstrung by the veto power of one or more men temporarily in office in a single State. Indeed, various State commissions and interstate conferences have tried unsuccessfully for over 25 years through legislative resolutions to have action taken. Navigation and interstate commerce, which are part of any major river basin development, are constitutionally within Federal jurisdiction. The long-term billion dollar capital necessary to replace our obsolete installations and the authority necessary to construct multipurpose projects are not available to private or even State groups, nor do they make good business risks. Finally, the Federal Government has a role in the water-resources development in New England because such development is a Federal problem; because the pollution of our streams affects the health of the Nation; because the destruction caused by our floods impairs the productivity and safety of our Nation; because the lack of an adequate supply of low-cost power in one region affects the products it buys and sells to others.

The Federal Government has made tremendous expenditures for the development of the water resources of other areas of this country and indeed of other countries. Its expenditures for such purposes in New England, whence a large share of the tax funds supporting such projects have come, have been almost nil. For example, of the 156 hydroelectric-power developments in the United States, not a single one is located in any of the six New England States. I fail to see any basis for disagreeing with the conclusion of the Report of the Committee on the New England Economy, which, I believe, has stated a principle upon which all New England should unite:

> In those cases where multipurpose projects will provide for the development of our resources, including waterpower, at a lesser cost than would a series of alternative single-purpose projects, the multipurpose projects should be developed. * * * Since the social costs and social gains of multipurpose water-control development are beyond the immediate commercial interest of private enterprise, and especially since waterpower projects, not otherwise feasible, may be provided through multipurpose projects, we think it likely that community welfare in the long run will be found to require cooperative efforts between Federal and State governments, on the one hand, and private enterprises, on the other.

Federal projects are not, and cannot be, an adequate solution to New England's power problems in themselves; but I believe that the principles stated by the Committee on the New England Economy amply demonstrate that the development of hydroelectric power may properly include participation by the Federal Government. It is simply a matter of interest for New England communities and New England industries, of reducing the drudgery of the New England housewife and farmer, of saving consumers and businesses millions of dollars in electric bills which could go for higher wages and better living. It is simply a matter of the Federal Government taking action where, as stated earlier, the States are not equipped to take such action either alone or jointly. Waterpower, decades ago, made New England great; but I know of no study of the New England economy, including those conducted by private business

groups or which interviewed industry leaders, which has not indicated that the high cost of power is at least one factor which today hampers the economic growth of our region, encourages at least some industries to move to other areas, and discourages others from locating in New England.

The recent report of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry pointed out that the higher power costs and relatively small development of hydroelectric power were among the many factors causing the decline of the textile industry in New England and in the lack of new industry. According to the Arthur D. Little Survey of Industrial Opportunities in New England, this region's higher power costs are a factor in the selection of industrial opportunities. Specific industries pointed out by the report which normally require large amounts of power include groundwood pulp, newsprint, electrochemical products, electrolytic products such as tin, aluminum, and magnesium, and materials made in electric furnaces such as alloys and abrasives. Consumption of power in New England is less for the housewife as well as the manufacturer, and the Little report points out that lower cost power, by stimulating domestic consumption, would also have secondary effects on the demand for electric appliances. The Committee on the New England Economy also discussed the effect of high-cost power on New England's inability to attract certain industries. Some members of the Senate will recall the evidence presented in the investigation of the abandonment of the Textron Mills of Nashua, N. H., in which the Textron representative emphasized the large difference in power costs, which, among other things, motivated his move from New England. To locate the cotton mills of the South in New England, he stated, would cost an additional $27 million in power costs.

Census figures show costs of power per unit to be 52 percent higher in New England than in the country, 80 percent higher than in North Carolina, and 246 percent higher than in Tennessee; and if the proposed limitation on the importation of residual oil, which I have vigorously opposed, is enacted, the cost will be even higher. Thus, in woolens and worsteds, the weighted average cost of purchased electric power in Massachusetts and Rhode Island was 75 percent in excess of the weighted average in the Carolinas and Georgia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am asking my question only for information. First, however, I wish to compliment the Senator from Massachusetts for delivering what I believe, from the standpoint of careful analysis and penetrating content, is one of the most able speeches I have listened to during this session of Congress, and I congratulate Massachusetts for the able presentation of the New England problem as set forth in the Senator's very enlightening treatise.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator's discussion of the power problem and the figure which he has cited, if I understood him correctly, namely, that the cost of electric power is 52 percent higher in New England than in other areas of the Nation, causes me to ask for information.

Are there not in New England sites where substantial multipurpose hydroelectric dams could be built, which would produce not only power but which would be of assistance, as the Senator has suggested, in the matter of flood control and possibly with respect to agriculture, too, somewhat comparable to some of the multipurpose dams which have been built by the Federal Government elsewhere in the country?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question, I would say, yes; I believe there are such sites available. Obviously, our water resources are not comparable to those of the Southeast or the Northwest.

Moreover, we have the problem of a comparatively small land area and flooding the land, as well as other problems and difficulties.

I believe that our waterpower resources could be developed to a far greater extent than they are at the present time. We have also other potential resources. I intend to speak briefly about Passamaquoddy and about the desirability of New England sharing in the development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence.

In 1950 there was created by Executive order an interagency survey of the waterpower resources and other natural resources of New England. That survey should be completed before we embark on any major program for the development of our waterpower resources.

It is a source of regret to me that the program, which should have come to fruition in 1952, because of lack of funds has been stretched out to 1954. I understand that under the proposals set forth by the new administration, the program will be further stretched out until 1955. So there will be a further postponement of the development of our resources. However, I would say that while certainly we do have such resources, they are not on a scale comparable with those in other sections of the country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would I be correct in concluding that the maximum electric power potential of the hydroelectric resources of New England has not been developed, and that with some Federal assistance, in the building of structures, which would develop the resources, New England would be strengthened as a great potential defense area in case we should become involved in a war?

Mr. KENNEDY. I certainly believe that to be true.

The Senator from Oregon can understand that our problem involves an attempt to help not only industry but also the consumer of electricity. The fact that our cost of power per unit is 52 percent higher in New England than elsewhere in the country, 80 percent higher than in North Carolina, and 246 percent higher than in Tennessee places us at a great disadvantage with respect to industries which have a substantial part of their cost represented by power.

I wish to emphasize two points. First, we do not have, and we can never have, the great waterpower resources which are found in the State so ably represented by the Senator from Oregon. I believe New England itself is partly to blame for the situation, because consistently groups in New England, which have exerted great influence, have blocked the legitimate interests of people who are genuinely interested in power development. To some degree, therefore, we have only ourselves to blame. But we are moving forward. The interagency survey will give us the best evidence of what can be done. So I hope the survey will be completed as soon as possible, so we may begin to do something about the power problem, which is of such tremendous importance.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me to make a brief observation, I wish to say that I happen to be one who believes the development of the electric power potential of our country is essential, not only from the standpoint of our domestic economy, in providing cheap power in every region of our country for the development of our domestic economy, but also from the standpoint of the national defense.

I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts, as I have said to other Senators in the past, that it does not make a bit of difference to me where the power project is located. As the Senator from Massachusetts has indicated, we are dealing not only with a regional problem but also with a national problem. The development of the maximum electric power of New England helps not only New England but the Nation as well. I shall vote for any project for the development of the maximum electric-power potential of any stream in America, wherever it may be located, whether in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Florida, Arizona, or any other State, provided it is sound from an economic and engineering standpoint, because I happen to be one who feels that providing the American people with the greatest amount of cheap electric power is vital to the expansion of our economy.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator very much for the interest he has shown.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I believe he is rendering a fine service not only to his region but also to the Nation, for I am one of those who feel that the Nation is no stronger than all its regions, and that difficulties which affect any region to the same degree impair the strength of the Nation.

I desire to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I particularly approve of what he has said with reference to his desire that New England share more generously and more actively in the program of Federal public works.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I have served now for approximately 6 years on the Senate Committee on Public Works. I believe there has been no New England Senator upon that committee until recently, when one of the new and able Senators from New England did go upon the committee. We repeatedly have had before us the subject of waterpower.

I have always felt there was a missing value there that New England needed to realize; and I have been somewhat nonplussed by the very factor the Senator from Massachusetts has just mentioned, namely, that in New England itself there has been diversity of opinion as to the need for the development of its waterpower. I believe I am correct in saying that the State in New England which has the largest potential amount of waterpower has State laws preventing the development of waterpower for use beyond the borders of that State.

I believe that our Public Works Committee has great potentialities of serving every State and every region and the Nation as a whole; and I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will assiduously pursue that particular part of his suggestion, because I believe there is great merit in his contention that New England had not adequately insisted upon its full part, and has not received its full part, of betterment in connection with the program of resource improvement in the field of the production of hydroelectric energy.

The most heartening thing I have seen in this field in recent years is the recent compact between the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, relative to control of the flood problems of the Connecticut River, which indicates that those States have gone a long way toward doing their full part not only in cooperating with each other, but also in making it possible for the Federal Government very properly to help solve that problem in a much fuller way than it has done heretofore.

I want my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, to know that the problems of which he speaks affect the prosperity of every part of the Nation. For instance, many of the fine people who now live all the year around in our State of Florida formerly lived in New England; and they are among our very best citizens. Every year we are honored by having tens of thousands of persons come to our State from New England. When prosperity in New England is great, a greater number can come; when prosperity is less, a smaller number can come. So we are affected in a very direct way by the prosperity of New England.

Moreover, we love to go to New England, and we love to find New England prosperous when we go there. We regard New England as one of the fountain sources of freedom in our country.

Certainly every section of the Nation, as represented in Congress, will be delighted to do everything within its power in collaborating in the public-works program the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement the Senator from Florida has made. In that connection let me say, for instance, that I believe the expenditure of funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority has perhaps been objected to by some persons in New England. Yet that development has helped contribute to the prosperity of New England, as well as to the prosperity of other parts of the Nation. So it is important that there be adequate development of all our regions.

I hope some of the statements we are making today will stimulate some unanimity of agreement on the point the Senator from Florida has made. I certainly appreciate his statement.

Mr. President, when I examine the chart published by the Federal Power Commission, showing typical electric bills in 1952 in cities of 50,000 population and more, I am dismayed to compare the low bills of the communities at the top of the list—in areas competing with New England, and for which New England tax funds in many instances have built hydroelectric projects—with the bills, more than twice as high, paid by the housewife and the businessman living in the communities at the bottom of the list, which consist almost entirely of Massachusetts and Rhode Island cities. Development of hydroelectric capacity in Maine, on the St. Lawrence, and in other New England areas would lower our cost, without damaging the rights of private utilities. On the contrary, private utilities have much to gain from such development. Both the supply of power and the stimulation offered by its distribution have given to private power companies in areas aided by Federal hydroelectric developments higher profits than those now enjoyed by New England utilities. Massachusetts is not Montana; we cannot flood huge acres of valuable and scarce land for water-development purposes; nor can the Federal Government replace the farmer, the housewife, the industrialist, the municipality, or the private power company in their important roles in the development of our water resources. But where the people find it necessary to act through their national representatives in order to provide for the most efficient utilization of such resources, I am hopeful that the interests in New England who have long opposed any such activity on the part of the Federal Government will realize the wisdom of such Federal Government activity. We have many studies of New England's need for power development. The completion of the present New York-New England Survey should provide us with a comprehensive program to meet those needs.

There may be disagreement as to the importance of the cost of power to New England industries, partly because the high cost has necessarily resulted in the establishment in New England of industries which do not require as much power. There may be disagreement as to the importance of hydroelectric power, although steam generating plants suffer from the high cost of fuel and its transportation to New England. And there may be disagreement as to the amount of undeveloped water power in New England. Nevertheless, as stated by the Committee on the New England Economy—

> To the extent that cheap hydroelectric capacity can be developed and properly marketed * * * it will serve to hold down the level of rates and help to keep the spread between New England and national power costs from widening further.

Practically every New England Senator has endorsed one or more Federal projects or otherwise has recognized New England's needs for more adequate lower-cost hydroelectric power. Several items, not exclusively dealing with power, need our immediate attention.

INTERAGENCY SURVEY

As the first step, I urge the continuation of adequate appropriations for the Interagency New York-New England River Basin Committee surveying the land and water resources of New England. I think it would be ill advised for me or others to recommend any program for comprehensive resources development in New England until this intensive survey is completed. I think it would be equally ill advised for the administration or Congress to deny to this study committee the funds necessary for the full and prompt completion of its survey.

In order to give the people of New England and New York at the earliest possible date the most comprehensive view possible of their resources and how they can serve them, every effort should be exerted to make certain that the administration and the Congress provide the necessary appropriations for the New York-New England Interagency study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this place in my remarks, my statement before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, on appropriations for the Interagency Survey.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NEW ENGLAND-NEW YORK INTERAGENCY SURVEY, MAY 15, 1953

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak before your committee in behalf of the restoration of funds for the New England-New York Interagency Survey, in particular those allocated to the Army Corps of Engineers. This survey is to enable the first comprehensive understanding of the potential development, utilization, and conservation of the land and water resources of New England and New York. The subjects under study include agriculture, drainage, fish and wildlife, flood control, mineral resources, navigation, beach erosion, pollution control, power, public health insect control, recreation and water supply.

The fullest utilization of our natural resources is an important step in the expansion of commercial and industrial activity in New England—an expansion that is sorely needed to offset problems resulting from industry dislocation and migration. For several reasons well known to this committee, proper utilization of our water resources necessarily and properly requires at least some participation by the Federal Government. Although the Federal Government has made tremendous expenditures for the development of the water resources of other areas of this country and indeed of other countries, its expenditures for such purposes in New England, whence a large share of the tax funds supporting such projects have come, have been almost nil. For example, of the 156 hydroelectric power developments in the United States, not a single one is located in any of the six New England States. Yet higher power costs and relatively small development of hydroelectric power are

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

among the many factors causing the decline of the textile industry in New England and the lack of new industry.

We have many studies of New England's need for resource development. The purpose of the New England-New York Interagency Survey is to provide us with a comprehensive program to meet those needs. In the past, there have been a number of piecemeal studies of our New England river basins, but they have been limited to particular problems or particular rivers.

I think it would be ill-advised for me or others to recommend any program for comprehensive resources development in New England until this intensive survey is completed. And I think it would be equally ill-advised to deny to this Survey the funds necessary for the full and prompt completion of its study. As you know, this committee consists of representatives of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Federal Security Agency, and each of the seven States involved. In addition, the cooperation and contributions of local agencies, civic organizations, and private individuals interested in resource development have been encouraged. The committee was established by Presidential directive of October 9, 1950, and was based on provisions of section 205 of the Flood Control Act of that year. The single comprehensive report to be prepared of the coordinated findings of the committee's various report groups and subcommittees is now scheduled to be submitted to the President at the end of the 1954 fiscal year—a lack of funds having postponed this completion date 2 years.

The 1954 budget now under consideration contains requests for funds for the completion of this study in the various department and agency budgets. The appropriation for fiscal 1954 to the Corps of Engineers for their work in the interagency survey, which was anticipated to be $1,200,000, has been reduced in the revised budget to $710,000. In comparison, the total amount in the printed 1954 budget for the entire survey (Army, Department of Commerce, Federal Security Agency, Federal Power Commission, Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture) of $1,762,309 has been reduced in the revised budget to $1,107,463. It is evident from these figures that most of the reduction has been made in the proposed appropriation for the Corps of Engineers, the agency carrying out a specific directive of Congress. The Assistant Chief of Engineers for Army Civil Works informed me this morning that this cut in funds will delay completion of the study still another year until 1955.

What sort of economy is it that refuses to permit a completion of a limited task and requires all personnel involved to keep on this job for an unnecessarily long time. A reduction in an appropriation of this type is not an economy, for although the annual appropriation will be reduced, the total cost of the job will in all likelihood be increased. This situation results from the fact that inadequate funds force delaying completion of the project without actually reducing the overhead. Key personnel, who have been assigned a specific job and will finish it if it takes 10 more years, are continued throughout the whole survey. If an adequate amount were made available promptly, the whole survey could be rapidly completed and the results would be made available not only to the Federal agencies involved, but to the seven States that are vitally concerned with the sound development of their resources. This drag-out procedure of the Federal Government forces the States also to delay and prevents them from effecting economies which could be made through rapid completion of the study. I am convinced that such a study is not a luxury at a time when our mobilization economy requires the fullest utilization of our resources. It is not a matter which should be returned to State and local or private interests, if an effective and comprehensive study is to result.

PASSAMAQUODDY STUDY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a second and more specialized study is likewise of great importance to the New England power picture. Senate Joint Resolution 12, introduced by both of my colleagues from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. PAYNE], calls for a survey by the International Joint American and Canadian Commission to determine the cost of construction of the Passamaquoddy tidal power project in Maine and New Brunswick; to determine whether or not such cost would allow hydroelectric power to be produced at a price that would be economically feasible; and to determine what contribution such a project would make to the national economy and the national defense. This joint resolution is the latest in a series of joint resolutions, bills, reports, petitions, messages, International Commission studies, and Federal Power Commission actions which, since 1924, have been concerned with the power utilization of the tides of Passamaquoddy Bay. Senators and Presidents of both parties have been interested in the development of the Passamaquoddy. It has been more than 10 years since the Federal Power Commission made its report questioning the efficiency and the marketability of power produced from an American project, but leaving open for further study the feasibility of an international project, with the words:

The events seem certain; the only uncertainty is in point of time.

In 1950, the International Passamaquoddy Engineering Board reported to the International Joint Commission that the project could be physically engineered, constructed, and operated, but that the information available was not adequate to determine its economic feasibility. In May of last year, the Army Corps of Engineers made a supplemental report reducing the estimated costs of necessary investigations, due to new equipment which is now available.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has stated in her bills that such a project is desirable for the purposes "of preventing future power shortages in the State of Maine and all of New England; for the development of large quantities of dependable low-cost electrical energy and for the stimulation of industrial growth and development in the area and throughout New England. The strategic importance of this section of the country to our national defense makes imperative ample quantities of low-cost power. Power shortages such as developed in this section during the winter of 1947–48 have seriously interfered with the productive capacity in the area and tend to discourage the establishment and growth of industries."

I cannot, of course, offer any technical judgment as to the feasibility of this project; but I cannot help but agree with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] as to the need for such power if it could be economically developed. The most recent Federal Power Commission report on additional hydroelectric power which is possible of economical development at New England sites lists 400,000 kilowatts from the International Passamaquoddy project. If such a project is or will become practicable, Congress cannot afford to say that it was unable to support a timely study of the project.

Legislation calling for an intensive study of the Passamaquoddy project is essential to our resources development.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER

One other item of importance in the New England power picture is not dependent upon completion of the interagency study. I refer to the contemplated hydroelectric power development on the St. Lawrence River. Although Congress has before it measures which propose the inclusion of provision for such a project in Federal legislation in connection with proposals for the St. Lawrence seaway, the matter is also before the Federal Power Commission, upon application by the State of New York. At this time, the latter appears to be the most likely basis for approval of such a project. Nevertheless, I do not feel that Congress can abdicate its interest in this matter. It is important that the Congress as a whole and individual Senators and Representatives from the States concerned make certain that the project is developed in accordance with national policies and to serve best the national interest.

I have set forth my views concerning the St. Lawrence power project, including a general summary of New England's power needs, in a statement filed with the Federal Power Commission on February 19 of this year. At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this statement be inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, SUBMITTED FEBRUARY 19, 1953

I wish to record with the Commission my views relating to the pending application of the New York State Power Authority for a license under the Federal Power Act to construct and operate project No. 2000, a project for the development of hydroelectric power on the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. It is my understanding that interested persons may file briefs and comments on the case at any time prior to February 20. My interest stems from the interest and concern of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in plentiful and low-cost power for their homes, offices, and plants. If this project is to be constructed, the plan for utilization of the power to be made available therefrom must protect the legitimate interests of New England and Massachusetts.

I wish to stress the importance of including in any license granted a condition effectuating an absolute guaranty allocating to New England and Massachusetts a share of the power to be produced, such share to be based equitably upon the needs of that area; and a requirement that definite interstate machinery be established to give each State proper representation in all decisions affecting the distribution of such power. Only a vague assurance of interstate distribution was given by the applicant during the most recent hearings; and I understand that there are no plans at present for providing in the license for a

definite method of determining each State's share. A mere hope or prediction of agreement, with intervention by the Federal Power Commission if agreement is not reached, is not sufficient to satisfy our concern; nor is an applicant's unenforceable pledge. The Governor of Massachusetts on October 30, 1952, filed a formal protest with the Commission on grounds that our Commonwealth's interests would not be protected by the issuance of this license. If such license is to be issued, and is not governed by presently pending legislation, I strongly request that it contain, in connection with and in addition to a condition for fair distribution based upon need, provisions for formal interstate machinery whereby the States concerned will be properly represented in all decisions respecting the allocation of this power. Such decisions include, if not the construction of the project, defining the market area, making arrangements for power transmission, and allocating power to industries, localities, and public and private utilities. Provision should also be made for assuring the availability of a fair share of the power for the municipally owned utilities in the region, of which there are 40 in Massachusetts, in a manner consistent with traditional American policies for marketing publicly developed hydroelectric power. Such assurance thus far has not been given by the New York Power Authority in testimony presented to the examiner in this hearing.

The particular needs of Massachusetts and the New England area for low-cost power have not, to my knowledge, been fully presented to your Commission with respect to the present proceedings. It was stated in the engineering report of your Bureau of Power (1952, p. 30) that New England alone—without Maine—could, in the 5-year period from 1956 to 1960, readily absorb the entire output of the proposed St. Lawrence plant. Beyond the statistical summary upon which this conclusion is based are facts of vital importance to the businessmen, workers, housewives and other citizens of this region.

Electric rate surveys of your Commission since 1935 have uniformly revealed that New England has one of the highest overall rates in the United States. FPC charts consistently show Massachusetts cities at the top of the list in terms of amount of typical monthly electric bills. The President's Water Resources Policy Commission found residential consumption of electricity in New England to be comparatively low because families were paying more per kilowatt hour than the rest of the Nation. This means increased drudgery for the housewife and a decreased standard of living for her family. A new supply of low-cost power is of considerable importance to our Massachusetts homes.

Industrial power rates are also much higher than those for the Nation as a whole, according to the Boston Federal Reserve Bank; and as a result consumption is lower in this category as well. The lack of sufficient low-cost hydroelectric power has been cited as at least one of the reasons for New England's economic difficulties—i. e., primarily the movement southward in textiles and other industries, the lack of new industries as a substitute, and a comparative lag in overall economic expansion—by the report of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry, the report of the Council of Economic Advisers' Committee on the New England Economy, the report of the Special Massachusetts Legislative Commission on the Textile Industry, and a poll of textile and other manufacturers by the Boston Federal Reserve Bank, among others. It has been mentioned as one cause of industrial loss by the Secretary of the Interior in a statement quoted before your Commission by Mr. Gatchell in an earlier proceeding, and by industrialists themselves in surveys or before congressional committees.

As long as industrial power rates continue to be substantially higher in New England than in the Southeastern States or other areas, so long will those New England industries—particularly those such as textiles where power is a more important cost—suffer competitively. And these high power costs directly affect the ability of Massachusetts and other New England States to compete on an equal footing with other areas in the attraction of new industry—so vital to us if we would end our dependence on industries which are now almost permanently distressed. Thus the people of New England, the thousands of unemployed in the mill cities like Lawrence, as well as business and community leaders, are directly affected by the distribution of any low-cost power to be produced on the St. Lawrence.

It is not enough to respond that the power to be available from the proposed St. Lawrence project will only fill a small part of our area's needs; that is but further evidence of the importance of making provision for specific allocation of a sizable portion of such power output to New England, and for definite machinery giving New England its proper voice in all determinations affecting the distribution of such power.

In summary, may I reemphasize that the cost of power is one of several cost differentials between New England and other parts of the United States competing with New England in the attraction of industry. This difference in power costs must be reduced if New England is to expand its commercial development and standard of living on a basis comparable with other areas. If your Commission is concerned, as any Federal agency should be, with the discrimination against New England in the public development of hydroelectic power in the United States—a discrimination due in part to limited potential, but also to our own negative attitude in the past to the development of our natural resources—it is of great importance that you act to safeguard our region's interests in any license granted for the St. Lawrence power project. Such interests can be secured only if our industries and citizens can be assured of an adequate supply of low-cost power, through the inclusion of appropriate conditions in such license providing protection to the rights of the municipalities, a guaranty of a sizable proportion of such power for New England, and definite machinery for equitable participation by the New England States in the determination of questions relating to the distribution of such power.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this St. Lawrence project has been under consideration by both United States and Canada for over 30 years, and Canada is ready to proceed immediately with construction of the Canadian half of the project. No longer should this project be tossed back and forth by the Congress and the Federal Power Commission, at the cost of sorely needed, economical hydroelectric power to the people of New England, New York, and elsewhere.

I am very hopeful that the St. Lawrence power project can immediately be constructed, in view of the needs of defense and civilian industry for power, and that the rights of New England will be amply protected in the manner set forth in my statement.

CONNECTICUT RIVER FLOOD CONTROL

It must be emphasized that the comprehensive development of our water resources is not limited to matters of hydroelectric power. Comprehensive development of our rivers necessarily includes flood control; and there is now pending before Congress Senate bill 261, introduced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], for the 8 Senators of the 4 States concerned. That bill would grant the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River Flood Control Compact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this place in my remarks my statement on this compact given before the Senate Public Works Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY BEFORE THE SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, APRIL 23, 1953

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to appear today to testify on behalf of the Connecticut River Flood Control Compact of which I am one of the sponsors. This compact was authorized by Connecticut in 1949 and by Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts in 1951. It provides a formula for contributions in lieu of taxes to be made by downstream States receiving the benefit of flood-control reservoirs as reimbursement to the State in which the reservoir is located for loss of taxes due to Federal ownership of reservoir lands, and for other economic loss to political subdivisions where flood-control reservoirs are built on the Connecticut River or its tributaries by the Federal Government. It is believed that such a compact will facilitate the construction of urgently needed projects. The bill itself, of course, involves no expenditure of Federal funds. Unfortunately, I might add, the compact does not show on its face that it has been ratified in the usual sense of having been signed and confirmed by representatives of the four States.

For over 5,000 years, man has harnessed rivers and controlled floods. The Connecticut River is the great river of New England embracing parts of 4 of the 6 New England States within its basin. It includes the greatest area and it has the largest population of any drainage area in the region. The valley contains all or part of 355 towns and cities, of which 20 have a population of over 10,000. It contains farms with more than 4 million acres of land worth over one-half billion dollars and its manufactured products are over a billion dollars annually. I think that you can see the importance to the Nation of harnessing the serious floods which are capable of great damage to this important area. The enormous waste of property and water which results from these floods concerns all of us. Since 1927, flood damages in the entire Connecticut Basin have amounted to over $80 million. A few weeks ago, another flood added to this toll. The United States Corps of Engineers has been building a series of reservoir projects which have thus far emphasized only this single purpose; and further projects are under study. The completion of the New York-New England interagency study, in which I am most interested, will lead to further projects, including those for multipurpose development of the Connecticut River. It is imperative that action be taken before flood control projects hre so far along that there will be no possibility of adequate multipurpose development.

As a sponsor of the Connecticut River flood control compact, I wish to stress the importance of such compact in the development of flood control projects in New England. It is only proper that southern New England should compensate northern New England for losses of farmlands, recreational facilities and tax capacity. But I also wish

to stress my understanding that it in addition permits consideration of all the rich advantages of a comprehensive water regulation program. If I am correct in my understanding, I assume that the compact upon enactment will be so carried out. If other sponsors of the compact differ on this interpretation, I would appreciate their comments now in order that the legislative history of this bill may be clear.

The compact recognizes the role and responsibility of the Federal Government in the prevention of floods and in, it states, "other utilization of water resources." The compact enables the signatory States to cooperate more effectively in accomplishing the object of flood-control and water-resources utilization in the basin of the Connecticut River and its tributaries. Unlike the compact submitted in 1937, it neither limits the authority of the United States Government to take further action with respect to such developments nor with respect to the provisions of the compact itself. I have, therefore, assumed that such a compact does not intend to stress single-purpose river-development projects—such purpose being that of flood control only—to the exclusion of multipurpose projects which could produce badly needed power, aid navigation, regulate pollution, or take other action. It is instead, I am confident, a proposal typical of New England wherein our States, recognizing the need for Federal action with respect to one of the many phases of river development, are cooperating to see that the local costs as well as the local advantages of such Federal activity are equitably allocated among the four Connecticut River States.

As I believe that the Connecticut River flood-control compact is an aid to such comprehensive development, a contribution toward that end by solving problems arising from a particular phase thereof, the controlling of destructive floods, I urge that you give it your full support.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am hopeful that this compact will be approved by the Congress for the purposes set forth in this statement.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

There is one other important item where the Federal Government may act with respect to the fullest utilization of New England and the Nation's water resources. I refer now to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This law, introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the former vice-president, then Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Barkley, in the 80th Congress, was originally passed with a 5-year authorization. The 82d Congress extended the duration of the act for 3 more years until June 30, 1956. I am convinced that this Congress should make this act a permanent piece of legislation, in order to permit long-range planning and definite commitments. It is also necessary that Congress provide for its administration appropriations more nearly in line with the ceiling contained in the act, which funds are necessary in order to achieve the objectives of that act, including grants and loans to the State and local agencies for their water pollution control programs. Congress should also include in the tax amortization program heretofore discussed an acceleration incentive to encourage the construction of industrial waste-treatment works, as recently recommended by the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission and the advisory committee of the Massachusetts Department of Health on Water Pollution Control.

The availability of clean water is of importance, not only as a matter of health and living standards, but as a question of industrial development. The most recent report of the Massachusetts Development and Industrial Commission pointed out the importance of water to the location of new industry. A basic factor in the long-discussed possibilities of locating a non-integrated steel mill, cement plant, or other industry in New England is the availability of such water. The early growth of New England was possible because there was plenty of good water available. Today it is used for the public water supply, industrial water supply, agricultural water supply, bathing, fish and wildlife, commercial fishing, and other uses where clean water is necessary.

The Water Pollution Control Act recognizes the primary responsibility and rights of the States and municipalities in controlling water pollution. The United States Public Health Service has developed comprehensive water-pollution control programs in cooperation with the States, municipalities, industries, and others in New England. The New England States have also established an Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission to control and coordinate the abatement of pollution of interstate, inland, and tidal water.

But New England has a long way to go. Pollution is today the largest single destroyer of New England water resources, hindering the economy, health and prosperity of the region. In 1952, available data showed that nearly 800 separate communities in New England discharged the sewerage from more than 6½ million people into our waterways. More than 1,000 industrial plants discharged their process waste directly into streams, in addition to those hundreds who add their pollution to the load of human waste contained in the municipal sewers. Only 152 communities provide satisfactory treatment plants for water pollution. Less than 80 treatment plants control the sources of industrial pollution. Based on 1950 cost levels, it is estimated that the municipal sewers and sewerage treatment facilities known to be needed in New England will cost $200 million. Industry will need to spend an estimated $50 million to control present pollution. Over a period of 30 years, this will only cost each individual 90 cents a year for construction and a few more cents for operation. Given the technical services and Federal credit and grants provided by the Water Pollution Control Act, if this is made permanent, individual towns and industries can assume their responsibility as neighbors in a democracy to make sure that their carelessness does not infringe upon their neighbors' rights. The only way to test thoroughly the workability of this emphasis upon State and local control is to provide adequate grants and loans for such purposes.

The progress in pollution abatement in New England has been seriously handicapped because the majority of States lack adequate surveys and investigations. According to the report of the Public Health Service on this area, "Unless increased funds and additional technical personnel are made available to the State water pollution control agencies, a significant delay in carrying out pollution abatement programs is in prospect." Appropriations by the Congress have totaled only a small fraction of the amount provided by the act. I cannot stress too strongly the importance of the Federal Government's assuming its full share of the responsibility of supporting these regional and State programs with funds and technical assistance and setting the example itself by providing adequate sewerage treatment facilities for Government installations in the area.

Although I have used New England as my example for the need and effectiveness of the water pollution control program, an equal need exists in all parts of the United States. In 1952 State expenditures for water pollution control amounted to approximately $4.50 for each dollar of Federal grant. Industries all over the United States have made decisions respecting the location of their plants based upon the availability of clean water and the cost and necessity of treating it before use. The United States Public Health Service has cooperated with the States in the conduct of surveys, the development of comprehensive basin plans, providing funds and assistance for State and local studies such as the study now being conducted in the Lowell Textile Institute regarding the disposal of wool scouring wastes, the encouragement of uniform State laws, and the provision of technical aid to State, interstate, and local agencies and other agencies of the Federal Government. The Environmental Health Center of the United States Public Health Service established in Cincinnati, the only one of its kind, is a leader in the development of new techniques to meet these problems.

It is, I think, apparent that the fullest development of this program now requires that positive action be taken by the Congress. We must provide adequate appropriations for the Public Health Service in carrying out the purposes of this act and for making grants and loans to State and local programs, and, by making permanent the Water Pollution Control Act, demonstrate our confidence in its desirability and clear the way for long-range planning in this area. Tax amortization incentives for industrial waste treatment plants would also be helpful.

In conclusion, Mr. President, may I say that the water resources of New England and the United States are a most precious treasure, much of which we have failed to use properly. Whenever the problems they present or the uses which they offer require action on a national or interstate level, I am hopeful that the Congress will not underestimate the importance of water resources development to the economic well-being of our citizens and to the fullest utilization of our productive capacity in the mobilization period.

AID TO FISHING INDUSTRY

Finally, a very specific problem industry affecting the economic growth of New England and particularly other coastal areas, is the fishing industry, an

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

industry valuable to all coastal States and those bordering on the Great Lakes. The value of fisheries to New England can be estimated in many ways. The 1950 earnings from catching, processing, wholesaling, and retailing New England fishery products totaled some $75 million; 15,000 are employed in processing plants, freezers and cold-storage warehouses, and well over 30,000 are directly engaged in fishing. The total income of New England from its fisheries, not including retailing fish, was $153 million in 1951, and the total value of manufactured fishery products in that year was estimated at $87 million. In Boston alone, the yearly payroll to employees in the fishing and fish processing industries totals $15 million, and the value of fishing boats and vessels, plant investment, and real estate added another $24 million.

Unfortunately, the once preeminent position enjoyed by New England's fishing industry, America's oldest, is in danger. Several of the most important food fish in the New England catch have become increasingly difficult to secure in recent years. Landings at Boston, Gloucester, New Bedford, and on Cape Cod during 1952 declined 43 million pounds or almost $2 million worth from landings of 1951. The decrease in landings of key species of fish and the resulting lesser production of fillets have increased production costs and caused an actual drop in the domestic production of ground fish and ocean perch fillets of 19 million pounds. The lower production has increased production costs per unit of vessel and per unit of package product. The Boston fleet in 1950 was only about 60 percent as great in number as in 1939 and only 55 percent of the tonnage. Decline was very sharp, particularly in the large trawlers available. Under the competitive pressure of increased imports, domestic ground fishing operations have begun to be curtailed. In 1952, imports of ground fish and ocean perch fillets totaled 108 million pounds, equivalent to 85 percent of the domestic production. In the past few years, the duty paid prices of imported fillets in the United States have generally been lower than corresponding prices of domestic fillets, causing an increase of 50 percent in the cold storage holdings of ground-fish fillets between January 1, 1952, and January 1, 1953, and a drop in average wholesale prices ranging up to 33 percent.

There are several logical steps which Congress should take to prevent this decline of one of our basic food industries. The fishery industry, made up of hard-working, independent men, has never received direct or indirect subsidies other than a few Government relief purchases in the late thirties, nor any shipbuilding assistance or other bounties such as those given to other industries or given in other countries. This Nation cannot afford to let the fishing industry go down the drain; and there is no reason why it should. We can compete with imports and expand our domestic fishing industry if its development is assisted as other industries are, not by subsidies or relief but by technical assistance, market development, and other aids. Yet the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior has had available only 82 cents per ton of fish caught per year, whereas the Department of Agriculture has about $7 per ton for other foods. In 1949, the Secretaries of State and Commerce, after making a comprehensive study of the problems of the fishing industry as affected by the imports of large quantities of fish from abroad, recommended that the most appropriate method of meeting the industry's problem of competition would be a positive course of action directed toward expanding consumption and reducing domestic production costs.

It would seem constructive—

The report concluded—

for the Congress to provide funds for the appropriate governmental agencies to cooperate with and aid industry in developing and expanding programs for the further improvement of techniques and facilities for catching, storing, processing, transporting, and marketing of fish.

I thus feel that Congress, in addition to providing adequate funds for the Commercial Fisheries Division of the Fish and Wildlife Service, should also look with favor upon a bill which I shall soon introduce, and similar to one which I have introduced previously, providing not for the expenditure of new funds but for the transfer of an equitable share—amounting to $1 million—of those funds now allocated from import duties for such purposes generally, under Department of Agriculture jurisdiction, for use by the Department of the Interior in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture in the encouragement and development of domestic consumption of our fishery products, further exportation of such products and effective education, research, and quality control. Purchase of surplus fishery products is not included at this time in this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture already being authorized to expend $1.5 million for such purposes.

Such technological and marketing studies are fundamental to the future prosperity of our fishing industry if it is to continue to form the economic foundation for a significant portion of New England's population. Technological studies will help to land top quality fish despite longer trips to new fishing grounds, help discover such grounds, and will improve handling and processing techniques after landing so that these products will come into the hands of the consumer unsurpassed by competing foods, whether imported fish or domestic agricultural products. Studies are already underway to evaluate the effectiveness of freezing fish on the high seas for later thawing, filleting, packaging, and refreezing ashore. It is hoped that this procedure will be sufficiently practical, economical, and otherwise successful to assure the fishing industry of New England many years of prosperity. Marketing studies are necessary to find those areas in which an unsatisfied demand for frozen fillets, the main New England product, exists, particularly those in which consumption is not at the national average. The housewife, the TV viewer, and the schoolchild can be educated about fish products. Transportation studies have to be initiated to determine the most inexpensive ways of moving fishery products and the best methods for maintaining quality while they are stored or en route. All parts of the fishing industry would benefit from some extension services in the techniques of their trade. Quality control must be applied from the moment fish are landed on board ship to the moment they are put on the consumer's table. Such quality control, including the adoption and use of standards by the fishing industry, would, more than anything else, assist in the development and maintenance of markets for our fishery products.

Like those quoted in a recent editorial in the Maine Coast Fisherman, I believe that "quality products, efficient operation, aggressive sales policies—these are the avenues that lead in a constructive direction." A recent series of articles in the Gloucester Daily Times demonstrated that improved technical processes is the best answer to foreign competition. New filleting machines, bigger trawlers, electronic dragging devices, freezing fish at sea, precooked frozen foods—all of these can revitalize the fishing industry if we will only give it the attention it deserves. A fishery educational service is needed to carry to the industry techniques and information now available but unknown or unused.

The type of legislation which I have here proposed has received widespread support from various segments of the fishing industry, not only in New England but all over the country, particularly with respect to the educational services and technological research. Such support includes the resolutions of the National Fisheries Institute, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, and the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. Representatives of labor, management, and public agencies concerned with the fishing industry have united in their support.

It is only just that fishery products receive their proper share of the funds set aside each year from duties collected under the customs laws for such purposes. Actually, the amount provided in this bill in addition to the 1939 funds for purchase of surplus fish are less than the 30 percent of import duties Congress intended to be allocated for such purposes. No additional appropriations or increase in budget would be necessary under such a program and the benefits would result not only to those directly engaged in the fishing industry, but to our consumers and businessmen in general.

Such a research program, of course, is one of long-range benefit. In the meantime, the Congress must decide whether the fishing industry is also in need of and entitled to other means of assistance which are provided to similar or competing industries. These would include study by the Tariff Commission of the necessity of the imposition of a temporary flexible import or tariff quota on ground fish fillets, and by the Congress of the establishment of a price support program for fish, or other subsidy. It is my intention to present to the Congress

from time to time further information and proposals relating to these problems.

As a first step, Congress should provide for the transfer of a fair share of import duty revenues to utilization in the type of fishery research, market development and other studies I have outlined, to enable that industry to contribute to our economic expansion.

Mr. President, this is one of a series of three speeches to be devoted to the economic problems of New England. The second will be given on Wednesday of this week, May 20, and the third on Monday, May 25.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for the very splendid study, research, and program which he has presented to the Senate this afternoon. I make particular note of the fact, Mr. President, that the Senator from Massachusetts, in bringing to our attention the problems of the New England States, and, in particular, of his own great State of Massachusetts, has not in any way criticized other areas of the Nation for the fine programs which may have benefited them, but, rather, he has pointed to other areas of America only to show what might be done to alleviate some of the problems in his own particular region. His forthright language and what I consider to be his very fine analysis of the economic problems involved in his area should command the attention of the appropriate committees of the Congress.

I desire to assure the Senator from Massachusetts that I, for one, will do all I can as a Member of this body to be of help, particularly in those areas needing the development of the great natural resources of New England and the solution of problems which deal with the fishing industry which is so basic to the economy of the New England States, together with all the many social and economic problems which the Senator from Massachusetts has outlined.

The Senator has performed a valuable service, not only for his own people, but I think he has set a pattern for the rest of us showing how we can discuss the problems which we face and relate them to the total problem of the United States.

I wish to assure the Senator that I shall stand with him in whatever his endeavors may be for the constructive good of his region and of the Nation.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am extremely grateful to the Senator for his kind words.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the financial plight of our older people today is most difficult.

There are in the United States more than 13 million men and women past 65 years of age. Less than one-third of them are able to find employment, despite the fact that we are in a period of relatively high employment opportunity. As for the rest, a fortunate minority have savings and individual incomes; some, also fortunate, still own their own homes and can rent rooms; some are partially supported by their adult children and other relatives. Most older men and women, however, must look to social-security insurance or public old-age assistance as their chief sources of dependable income.

The number of persons age 65 and over has increased between 1900 and 1950, and is still growing. The net increase is about 325,000 a year—an increase of about 1,000 every single day.

Not only is the number of our aged increasing, but the proportion of old persons in our population is also increasing. In 1900 the aged were only 4 percent of the total population. Today they are 8 percent. In about 20 years the proportion will have increased to about 10 percent and will still be climbing.

Nevertheless, and in spite of the high level of employment of the past few years, relatively few aged persons are working. Around 1900, out of every 10 aged men, 6 were still working. Today only 4 out of 10 are still working. It is estimated that the number of aged persons at work is remaining constant at a figure of about 3 million.

Social-security benefits, therefore, are vitally important to the welfare of an increasing number of Americans. The number of aged persons drawing insurance benefits today is 4 million. This is about 1½ million more aged persons on insurance than on assistance.

Yet in the face of the highest cost of living in our Nation's history, benefits under social-security insurance average only about $50 per month. Assistance payments average about the same. Not counting luxuries, not counting doctor and hospital bills, not counting even shoes and clothing, can anyone say that $50 is enough to live on today?

The Congress has a responsibility to reexamine this problem and act intelligently and expeditiously to improve our social-security program.

Mr. President, as a step in that direction, it is my intention to introduce six bills to amend and modernize the Social Security Act. They provide as follows:

First. Extending social-security credit for periods of military service: Our social-security laws today provide that men and women who enter the military service of our Nation are to receive a social-security credit of $160 a month during their period of service. This is the least we can provide those young men and women who are sacrificing and disrupting their lives to protect the security of our Nation. Under the present law the provision expires this year. It is essential that we extend the provision protecting the wife and children of the men in military service. My bill would extend those benefits for 1 year. This will enable the Congress to give further consideration to a long-term program for protecting the rights of servicemen under the social-security program.

Second. Increase from $75 to $100 the monthly amount which may be earned in covered employment without loss of social-security benefits: It is wrong to discourage persons over 65 from working at whatever part-time jobs they can find. There may have been merit at one time for such a provision, but it does not exist today.

Our social-security payments are inadequate to meet the needs of our senior citizens when they reach the age of 65. To prohibit them from earning more than $75 a month at the penalty of losing their social-security benefits is both unwise and inhumane. There is reason to prefer, in fact, the complete elimination of earning ceilings. I recognize, however, that the Congress is not prepared to go that far at this time, and that it may also perhaps be wiser at this time to use the limited funds we have available for extending our social-security benefits and coverage, rather than completely eliminate the work clause.

In view of these considerations, I feel the Congress would do well, and can do no less than, to increase the work clause amount to a more reasonable figure, so that when it is added to the meager social-security benefits our aged are in a position to sustain themselves without being a burden on the rest of the community. The establishment of a $100 work clause is a step in that direction.

Our laws do not discriminate against a recipient of old-age benefits if he receives additional funds through investments, annuities, or employment in a job not covered by social security. It does, however, discriminate against an individual attempting to earn additional funds by part- or full-time employment in a job covered by social security. This works to the disadvantage of the individuals in the lower income bracket, who are thus most in need of social-security benefits today.

Third. Increase social-security insurance benefits by increasing the benefit of a wife from 50 to 75 percent of the husband's benefit and increase the widow's benefit from 75 to 100 percent: This bill increases the benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program. At the present time if a retired man receives $60 a month, his wife receives an additional 50 percent, or $30, for a total of $90. If the man dies, his widow receives 75 percent of his benefit, or $45 a month.

Under the bill which I am introducing the insurance benefits for the wife in the illustration I have just given would be increased from $30 to $45 a month and her widow's benefit would be increased from $45 to $60 a month.

These modest increases will greatly help to make our insurance program more adequate. They will help millions of families and widows whose benefits are now not sufficient for them to live on.

Fourth. Providing an opportunity for ministers to be covered under social-security laws: I have received many letters from ministers and active church laymen from our State, urging that the Social Security System be extended to include an opportunty for ministers to be covered under the social-security laws. It is important that this entire subject be examined by the Senate Finance Committee. Ministers should be given an opportunity to come into the social security program if they wish to do so, and if their churches are willing to cooperate in the program. The 1950 social security amendments made it

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

possible for lay employees of religious organizations to elect to be covered under the social-security programs. Ministers, whether they are actively performing services for a religious organization, or whether they are teachers or administrators in nonprofit organizations, should be given a similar opportunity. I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted at the general convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Church pertaining to social security for pastors, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point. My bill would carry out this provision.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR MINISTERS

Whereas the Federal Government has greatly broadened its policies regarding old-age Federal security; and

Whereas an earlier position which ruled out benefits for all employees of all church organizations has now been reversed so as to include all unordained workers on a voluntary basis, providing at least two-thirds volunteer in any given organization; and

Whereas it has been finally and officially decided that all ordained workers are excluded from coverage unless they are definitely empolyed in such work as janitorial service; and

Whereas even ordained men who do services on our college faculties comparable to that given as laymen in the same areas of service are ruled out from benefit coverages; and

Whereas many church denominations are at this time reversing earlier positions by memorializing Congress to extend coverage to all ordained ministers and others serving the church in various positions so as to allow them to be covered on a voluntary basis; and

Whereas the Federal Government has made such exclusions at the request of the churches and would be willing to extend the coverage if it should prove to be the wish and will of the various church denominations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Evangelical Lutheran Church, assembled in its 20th biennial convention, does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend said social security coverage so as to include all ordained ministers on a voluntary basis and that action be taken at the earliest possible moment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be dispatched at once to the proper Federal officials as well as to all Senators and Congressmen in the United States Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my fifth bill would make employees of institutions of higher education eligible for participation in social-security benefits.

This is a bill which would make it possible for employees of institutions of higher education to be covered under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance assistance, under the terms of Federal-State agreements, regardless of the fact that these employees may be covered by an existing retirement system.

In a poll of public education institutions conducted by the American Council of Education in March 1950, 80 percent of the institutions expressing an opinion favored giving college and university teachers who are members of public retirement systems an opportunity to be covered under the Federal OASI program. More than 63 percent favored making coverage available to nonteaching personnel covered by a public plan.

There is in my files a letter from Dr. J. L. Morrill, president of the University of Minnesota, informing me, as a spokesman of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, that the presidents of the member institutions of that association, and the members of the National Association of State Universities, have adopted a position by an overwhelming majority in favor of their institutions being accorded the opportunity of coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program.

Employees of colleges and universities today are excluded from the social-security system because they are apparently covered by State retirement plans. It is clear, however, that few of the State plans are adequate to the need and they wish to build a more adequate program by coverage under the social-security system and supplementation by their own private plan. This is the same principle now being used by 14,000 employers in private industry. We should play our part in making that possible.

My sixth bill would extend for another 2 years the increases provided to States in 1952 for payment to old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the disabled, and aid to dependent children.

Under the original 1935 Social Security law, Congress offered to pay each State one-half the cost of providing old-age assistance to needy persons, providing the Federal cost did not exceed $15 per needy aged. Congress increased this $15 to $20 in 1939. Further increases took place in 1946, 1948, and 1952, so that the Federal share is today four-fifths of the first $25 and one-half of the next $30, and the Federal maximum payment is $35. This provision was enacted for a 2-year period which expires at the end of September next. Unless Congress takes further action, the law reverts to the previous offer of three-fourths of the first $20 and one-half of the next $30, up to a maximum Federal payment of $30 per month.

At the present time about 2,600,000 needy aged persons are drawing assistance payments. The average payment for the Nation as a whole is $49 per month. This is equivalent to only about $26 at the 1935–39 price level, which is about $4 less than the $30 a month which was assumed to be the average payment at the time the law was enacted.

It is encouraging that the number of persons receiving old-age assistance has been steadily but slowly decreasing every month for the past 2½ years. At the present time the needy aged are less than 20 percent of the total aged population.

During the 82d Congress an increase of approximately $5 per month was provided to the States for payment to old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and $3 for aid to dependent children. This provision, as I have explained, expires in 1954. The same considerations which led the Congress to enact this improvement in 1952 are present today, and should in all humaneness lead Congress to renew the increase for another 2 years while further studies are under way to improve the entire social-security program.

The cost of living is still high. The need is still great. These considerations should lead us to increase assistance benefits, and not decrease them. I do hope that the Congress will act favorably on this measure in the very near future. All of us prefer to have the American people protected by insurance rather than assistance, but until the insurance program is improved and extended and so long as people are on assistance, those benefits must be humane and adequate.

In conclusion, the six bills I submit are, by no means, meant to be inclusive. It is my hope to introduce and cosponsor other legislative proposals to further meet the need for improving our social-security system. I believe the social-security program should be extended to cover everyone, and that its benefits should be made more adequate. I shall continue to strive to support proposals designed to improve social security benefits for all the American people.

The sum total of these bills would only define the minimum goals for social security in the United States. They would make our social-security system not a perfect system, but a better system, a sounder, more just, and more comprehensive system. They do not provide coverage for everybody, as a perfect social-security system would, nor do they provide for every hazard as many believe desirable. They provide merely for broader coverage than now exists, and for benefits more nearly approaching the standards required. They ask only the very least. They are neither complicated nor involved. Each bill lends itself to immediate action by the Senate committee and by the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference the six bills which I have discussed.

There being no objection, the bills introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 1928. A bill to extend for 1 year the wage credits for certain military service under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, and to provide for lump-sum death payments on behalf of any individual whose death occurred while in military service and who is reinterred;

S. 1929. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act to increase from $75 to $100 per month the amount which may be earned without loss of insurance benefits;

S. 1930. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the insurance benefit of a wife or husband of an individual entitled to an old-age insurance benefit from one-half to three-fourths of the old-age benefit of such individual, and to increase the insurance benefit of the widow or widower of such individual from three-fourths to a whole old-age insurance benefit of such individual;

S. 1931. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code to permit the coverage under old-age and survivors insurance of services performed by ministers in the employ of organizations exempt from income tax under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes;

S. 1932. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to employees of institutions of higher education who are covered by State or local government retirement systems; and

S. 1933. A bill to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act by extending for 2 years the increased Federal financial participation for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE MERLIN HULL, OF WISCONSIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 18, 1953.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MERLIN HULL, a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That a committee of 11 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 110) was read, and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. MERLIN HULL, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the presiding officer of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, all the members of the Wisconsin delegation have heard with deep sadness the news of the passing of one of our colleagues, the Honorable MERLIN HULL.

The resolution now before the Senate conveys the sympathy of the Senate on the passing of our dear friend.

I have known Merlin for many years. He was a personal neighbor of mine, representing the Ninth District, including my own home county of Chippewa.

Merlin had a long and distinguished career in the public service, beginning away back in 1909 in the Wisconsin State assembly.

He was speaker of the assembly in 1913, and secretary of state for the Badger State from 1917 to 1921.

He was elected to the 71st Congress, and has served continuously ever since in the House of Representatives.

MERLIN HULL was to the last a deeply conscientious servant of the people of his district and of his State. He was a fair-minded, friendly man, and yet a man of strong convictions. He expressed himself frankly, whether it was on domestic or foreign affairs.

He was a member of the Wisconsin Progressive Party and then of the Republican Party, but he was a man whose friendships were not limited to any one party.

He was a friend of Wisconsin's farmers, but there was no group in his district or in his State to which he would not give a fair hearing, and whose cause, if he felt it right, he woud not espouse.

As we say, hail and farewell to this fine Badger. We know that he has but gone ahead in the great journey which all of us must eventually take.

I ask unanimous consent that the biographical summary which appeared in the New York Times of May 18, 1953, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERLIN HULL DEAD; REPRESENTATIVE, 82—WISCONSIN REPUBLICAN, OLDEST MEMBER OF CONGRESS, WAS SERVING 11TH TERM

LA CROSSE, WIS., May 17.—Representative MERLIN HULL, oldest Member of Congress, died in Lutheran Hospital here today, at the age of 82, of bronchial pneumonia complicated by conditions of advanced age. He had undergone an operation on April 15.

Mr. HULL represented Wisconsin's Ninth District as a Republican. His home was in Black River Falls, where he had published a weekly newspaper since 1904.

A LA FOLLETTE PROGRESSIVE

Mr. HULL rose to political prominence as a member of the La Follette Progressive Party during its revolt in Wisconsin, and rugged independence remained one of his traits. When wearing the Republican label, he often broke away to vote with Democrats on domestic issues; on the other hand, on foreign policy he frequently voted with the isolationist Republican wing.

Born in Warsaw, Ind., December 18, 1870, Mr. HULL attended Gale College, Galesville, Wis., and received a law degree from Depauw University, Greencastle, Ind., in 1890. Besides law and farming interests at home in Black River Falls, he became publisher of the Jackson County Journal in 1904. Since 1926 he also had operated the Banner-Journal.

He entered politics in 1907 as district attorney of Jackson County. From 1909 to 1915 he served in the Wisconsin Assembly, being speaker in 1913, and from 1917 to 1921 he was secretary of state, following the leadership of United States Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr.

First elected to the House of Representatives as a Republican in 1928, Mr. HULL was defeated for renomination on the dry versus wet issue—he had favored national prohibition.

RETURNED TO HOUSE IN 1934

In 1934, the La Follette Republicans adopted the name of the Progressive Party, and under that banner elected a Governor, Senator, and seven Representatives, including Mr. HULL. Mr. HULL was reelected as a Progressive until the party returned to the Republican fold in 1946 and then kept winning reelection as a Republican. He was reelected last year by 38,000 votes.

Seeking neutrality in World War II, Mr. HULL voted for a mandatory arms embargo before the European war broke out, opposed the Selective Service Act of 1940 and its extension in August 1941, and voted against the Lend-Lease Act. Nevertheless, he voted in 1940 for a loan to Finland, and sought vainly to allow that nation, then under Soviet attack, to buy arms here.

In 1944, he voted for American participation in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. But on December 18, 1945, he was 1 of only 15 Representatives to vote against a bill for American representation at the United Nations.

OPPOSED FOREIGN-AID BILLS

He fought against the $3,750,000,000 loan to Great Britain in 1946, demanding that "our veterans and old folks should be adequately taken care of" first. He went on to vote against Greek-Turkish aid, in 1947; the European recovery program, in 1948, and the foreign-aid bills that followed.

Domestically, he battled on behalf of dairy farmers, and for price supports and import controls; supported anti-poll-tax legislation; opposed measures to restrict labor unions; espoused public housing. He voted against the peacetime draft law in 1948.

A member of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. HULL broke from Republican ranks to oppose tax cuts in 1945 and 1947. With President Eisenhower leading a Republican return to power, Mr. HULL still kept voting his own way. On April 1 he was 1 of 18 Republicans in the House to vote unsuccessfully against a bill to give States title to offshore oil lands.

Mr. HULL married Miss Jessie Matchette Robbins in 1896. They had three children, Perry Miller Hull, Lois Margaret Hull, and Mrs. Marion Bernice Lamb. A sister, Miss Effie Hull, also survives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WILEY and Mr. MCCARTHY as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 19, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 18 (legislative day of May 15), 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Arthur Gardner, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Cuba.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named licensed officers of the United States Merchant Marine to the grades indicated in the United States Coast Guard:

To be a lieutenant commander

Jewel Olney Strickland

To be lieutenants

George Frank Millard
Donald Franklin Hall
John Stanley Lipuscek
Alfred Edward Hampton

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Myron Eugene Welsh
Frank Madison Sperry
Cletus Joseph Wals
Robert Frank Ewels
Walter Russell Stark

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Paul Tregenza Anderson
Paul Laurence Arnold
Darrell Leroy Babcock
Kenneth Edward Barrett
Laurence Oliver Bates
Murray Withers Boggs, Jr.
Paul Hobart Breed
Dan Henry Briganti
Roger Alan Britt
William Bruce Clark
Dan Alfred Colussy, Jr.
James Hilary Conrad
Edmund Lee Cope
Charles Lincoln Crane, Jr.
Calvin Ellis Crouch
Richard Paul Cueroni
Edwin Hassel Daniels
Ted Orville DeYoung
Richard Anthony Donnelly, Jr.
Vaughan Wendell Driggers, Jr.
James Richard Erwin
George Everett
Edward Clayton Farmer, Jr.
Rolland Aime Faucher
Henry Curt Fisher
Jerome Vincent Flanagan
Thomas Joseph Flood
Galloway Buttram Foster, Jr.
Walter Dennis Fox
Frank Adolph Frauenfelder
Donald Dale Garnett
Gregory Carl Gaski
James Edward Grabb
George Kirk Greiner, Jr.
Donald Grim
Ralph Connaway Hill
Donald Claude Hintze
Roger Arnold Holmes
David Gidley Howland
Bernard Arnold Hoyland
Robert Eugene Iden
James Clarence Irwin
James Aloysious Kearney, Jr.
Joseph Morrow Kelly
Marinus Fred Keyzer
William Louis King
Walter William Kohl, Jr.
William Edward Lehr, Jr.
Charles William Linn
Herbert Gerry Lipsett
Richard Vinal Littlefield
Roger Lee Madson
Max Stanley Maire
Graeme Mann
William David Markle, Jr.
Charles Walter Matherly
Charles Edward Mathieu
George Fayette Merritt
Roger William Mowell
Edward Nelson, Jr.
Harry James Oldford, Jr.
Hal Floyd Olson
Walter Eugene Paulsen
Harris Albert Pledger, Jr.
William Peter Reilly
Dean Albert Ridyard
Arthur Paul Roberts
Ernest Edward Rowland, Jr.
William John Russell
Robert Schmidt
Keith Byron Schumacher
Thomas Major Sing
Donald Wade Smith
William Edward Smith
Nathaniel Chris Spadafora
Fredric Christian Sponholz, Jr.
Charles Gilbert Stadtlander
Raymond Lowe Stevens
Albert Glenn Stirling
David Earl Stryffeler
Eugene Frederick Trainor
Robert E. Lee West
Lloyd Otto Westphal
Theodore Joseph Wojnar
Glenn Franklin Young
David Thomas Zurzuski, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 18 (legislative day of May 15), 1953:

REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nomination of Thomas Eugene Anderson et al., for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 29, 1953, and appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Thomas Eugene Anderson, which is shown on page 4198, and ending with the name of Harry E. Mottley, Jr., which appears on page 4200.

IN THE NAVY

PERMANENT APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

The following-named ensign of the line of the Navy for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy with the grade of ensign:

James A. Whelan

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Henry F. Abele et al., for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, and the nominations of Paul M. Crum et al., for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 5, 1953, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Henry F. Abele, the first name of the first group mentioned, and which appears on page 4495, and ending with the name of Robert M. Krippner, the last name of the second group mentioned, which is shown on page 4501.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 18, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast entrusted us with the high vocation of leadership in the business of statecraft, Thou alone art the source of the wisdom and strength which we need so urgently and supremely.

Give us the tranquillity of an unconquerable hope and the quietness of a patience that knows how to endure and never loses faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness and justice.

Show us how we may bring courage and cheer to all who are staggering under the heavy burdens of fear and foreboding.

We thank Thee for the character and life of our colleague whose spirit has entered into the eternal blessedness of Thy nearer presence. Grant unto the members of his family the assurance that Thy grace is sufficient for all their needs.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 14, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution indefinitely postponing H. R. 1101, for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 53–8.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for the week of May 18 to 22, on account of official business.

Mr. HILLELSON, for a period of 5 days, beginning May 18, on account of official business to attend committee hearings in Los Angeles.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. COOPER and to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. RADWAN and to include a resolution adopted by the western division of the Polish-American Congress.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. PRICE) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE in four instances.

Mr. METCALF and to include an editorial.

Mr. BAILEY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POLK and to include extraneous matter and statistical tables.

Mr. ENGLE (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an address by Archbishop Cushing.

Mr. HORAN and to include an article appearing in This Week.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JONAS of Illinois).

Mr. CLARDY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARRINGTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAILLIARD.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. WILSON of California.
Mr. BENDER in four instances.
Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. KEAN.
Mr. LUCAS and to include a statement entitled "The Public Speaks on Taft-Hartley Amendments."
Mr. PATTEN in five instances and to include extraneous matter.
Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include a letter.
Mr. WILSON of California and to include an editorial.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 5173.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last at my request the House granted leave of absence for a number of Members of the House to attend the atomic test. In view of the fact that test was necessarily postponed, I renew the request that official leave of absence may be granted to those Members of the House who remained to see the test.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow and Wednesday, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, also to revise and extend those remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the special order I had for today and place it on tomorrow's calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 20 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for tomorrow may be vacated because I expect to be absent from the city on official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to call the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE LATE MERLIN HULL

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad responsibility to announce to the Members of the House the passing of our friend and colleague MERLIN HULL. Several weeks ago he submitted to surgery from which he never recovered. MERLIN HULL was born in Warsaw, Ind. At an early age his parents moved to Wisconsin. As a boy he worked as a farm hand. He also taught country school for a time. He learned the printing trade in the office of the Wisconsin Independent in his home town of Black River Falls. Later he attended the old Columbian University in this city as a law student and in 1894 he was admitted to the Wisconsin bar. In 1904 he purchased the Jackson County Journal and later he combined it with the Badger State Banner under the name of Banner-Journal. At the time of his death he was the owner and publisher of this paper. Here we have the typical success story—farm hand, country school teacher, printer, lawyer, publisher, public servant, and statesman.

Our colleague represented the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin. He was elected to the 71st Congress in 1928 and reelected again in the 74th and succeeding Congresses since that time. He was the dean of the Wisconsin delegation in this body.

Mr. Speaker, MERLIN HULL had a record of distinguished public service. As a young man he served his county as clerk of the district court and as district attorney. Later he was elected to the Assembly in the State Legislature of Wisconsin, where he served one term as speaker. In 1917 he was elected secretary of state which office he held for two terms.

For many years he was a leader in the Progressive movement in the Middle West and at one time was nominated by the Wisconsin Progressive Members in Congress to be the Speaker of the House. When the Progressive Party in Wisconsin ceased to be a political force Mr. HULL cast his lot with the Republican Party and he was elected on that ticket in 1946. So strong was he in his district that no Democratic opponent has ever opposed him since being elected as a Republican.

MERLIN HULL was a conscientious Member of this House. His first interest was to serve the people of his district, which is chiefly agriculture. The farmers of Wisconsin and the Nation never had a better friend and advocate of their cause than MERLIN HULL. His fight against the "butter trust," as he called it will never be forgotten. He was seldom absent from the floor when the House was in session.

MERLIN HULL was not a "party man" as we understand that term. He was truly independent in thought and action; he was a man of deep conviction and in private conversation he was concerned about this country becoming involved in "foreign wars." The man who served his country in war was always his friend.

MERLIN HULL was a friendly gentleman of the old school. He could disagree violently with others but in doing so respected the views of others.

Wisconsin and the Nation has lost a devoted public servant. His family has lost a loving father and statesman and the House of Representatives a distinguished Member. My sincere sympathy goes out to the members of his family.

Dear Lord and Father of mankind,
Forgive our feverish ways;
Reclothe us in our rightful mind,
In purer lives Thy service find,
In deeper reverence praise,
Take from our souls the strain and stress,
And let our ordered lives confess,
The beauty of Thy peace.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, my colleague [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the 10th Congressional District, the friends and neighbors of MERLIN HULL, I wish to express the greatest sympathy to the members of his family. MERLIN HULL was an unusual man. Most of us who are elected to the Halls of Congress, either in this body or the other, are usually elected on the basis of party affiliation. MERLIN HULL was never elected on that basis. MERLIN HULL had such great respect and admiration of the people of his district that he could have run on any ticket and always be elected. He was never elected as a Republican or a Democrat or a Progressive. He was elected with increasing majorities, with outstanding majorities each time he ran because he was MERLIN HULL. The majority of the people of his district remember him as a figure who was entirely independent in thought, one who always had the utmost welfare of the people of his district, State, and the Nation at heart. It is seldom that we have in the Halls of Congress a man of such independent thought and action as was MERLIN HULL. It is always seldom that a man is sent to the Halls of Congress on a personal basis as was MERLIN HULL. The way the people of his home district respected and admired him, I think is the way the people of this Congress, the people of the State and the Nation respect and admire him.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of our departed colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, MERLIN HULL was a good friend of mine. We served on the Banking and Currency Committee together for several years. While we did not always agree on issues and votes, I always admired his courage and enjoyed his company and association. He was a fine American and one of the nicest colleagues that I have ever known. His family can be as proud of his memory as we are. He was an honorable, able, quiet, and effective public servant. He will be greatly missed by his friends. My deepest sympathy goes to his family.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the passing of MERLIN HULL closes the living book on an era. He was part of the virile Wisconsin that changed the political thought of a nation. He stood at Armageddon with Teddy Roosevelt. No one more dynamic, no one more sincere than he in the great uprising of a people under the banners of the old Progressive Party. The Progressive Party of the early decades of the century which established itself as a tremendous political force now belongs only in history. One by one those who stood at Armageddon with Teddy Roosevelt have walked far over the western slope to meet the setting sun. If it be given to man when mortal limitations are lifted to meet again in recognition dear friends on earth, what a joyous reunion there is now of MERLIN HULL with Bob La Follette and Theodore Roosevelt and Hiram Johnson, and all the other stalwarts of that era, the living book of which was closed with the death of our dear colleague.

I came within the warmth of his glorious personality late in his career. I am the richer for having known him. To me it was one of the great honors of my life to have served in two Congresses on a committee of which MERLIN HULL was a member. To the end he lived true to the ideals of his youth. To his last day of public service he lived up to everything that he believed in and fought for in the earlier years of an outstanding career.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, although I was aware of the serious illness of our colleague and my friend, the Honorable MERLIN HULL, I was nevertheless shocked this morning to learn of his death.

Upon entering Congress, he was one of the first of the older Members with whom I became acquainted. This was because I quickly learned that he was a man of independence, integrity, and deep conviction. His mission in the House of Representatives was to support legislation which he deemed to be for the greatest good of the greatest number of people. He was an unrelenting foe of any proposal which he believed was not in the best interests of the people of this Nation.

The death of Mr. HULL removes a faithful servant of the district which he represented in Wisconsin and an outstanding servant of all the American people.

To members of his family, I tender sincere condolences in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Hon. MERLIN HULL brings grief to all of us and deprives the House of a useful and deeply respected Member. His long service was characterized by a conscientious approach to the issues confronting the Congress and an earnest desire to maintain the highest standards of statesmanship. He was a good man as we have long been accustomed to use that phrase. His influence will continue to live.

I recall vividly my last talk with him. We were walking to the Capitol together, and because of his illness his movements were slow. Knowing that I had an engagement, he thoughtfully said, "You go ahead." I thought of that expression when the news of his death reached me. "Going ahead" was something our friend did so well himself in the field of public service. His was a forward-looking philosophy that produced a sound and practical leadership. Now he goes ahead in the great experience that awaits us all. It suggests the familiar lines:

> To all eternity he binds us,
> He links the planet and the star;
> He goes ahead, the trail he finds us,
> And where he is and where we are
> Will never seem again so far.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our distinguished Member from Wisconsin. It has been my privilege to know Mr. HULL since I became a Member of Congress in 1945. We were neighbors, having our offices in the same corridor during all of these years. Because of this, naturally, I had frequent contact with Mr. HULL, meeting him often in the hall and walking to and from the floor with him many, many times. This gave me an excellent opportunity to get well acquainted with him.

His was a most affable and lovable disposition. He was kind and considerate at all times and his outgoing personality was heartwarming and endearing to all who came in contact with him. As a green freshman Member, I found him to be most helpful. He was truly a Chesterfield of the old school.

In addition to these admirable characteristics of personality and disposition, he possessed and exercised an independence of judgment which set him apart as a rugged individualist, as one whose penetrating insight and political acumen compelled him to seek out the truth and underlying fundamentals of any issue. Upon that basis, he formed his own sagacious opinion, to which he held firmly and without compromise. Over the years, I noticed that he unfailingly voted for what he considered to be the best interests of those whom he represented, irrespective of party lines.

Not only the constituents of his district in Wisconsin, but also the citizens of his State and of the Nation have lost a public servant of integrity, wisdom and devotion to the public good. We, here in Congress, have lost a true friend and colleague. I wish to extend to his widow and to the other members of his family my heartfelt sympathy, with the fervent wish and prayer that they may take comfort in the thought of Mr. HULL's outstanding contribution to the public service of his country and his many years of happiness with a devoted family and his host of admiring friends.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness we pause in our work today to do honor to the memory of a beloved colleague who has passed the Great Divide.

It was my privilege to know MERLIN HULL for over 25 years. I admired his rugged patriotism, his broad humanitarianism, his devotion to his work, and his desire to benefit the poor people of our country as well as those living in other lands.

As a fellow newspaperman, he liked to talk with me concerning the problems of the profession he had followed all his life. He loved the newspaper profession for the wide opportunities it opened for public service.

MERLIN HULL was a kindly man. He was a tolerant man. He never bore grudges nor strove to tear down any other individual. He practiced the rule of "Live and let live," and he went his own quiet way, serving the community and the country he loved.

We shall miss MERLIN HULL, but there is consolation in the fact that he lived a full and useful life. The State of Wisconsin has lost a fine Congressman; we have all lost a good friend. My sincere regrets are extended to his family in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened by the death of our colleague, the Honorable MERLIN HULL, of Wisconsin.

He was a gentleman in the true sense of the term.

His passing is of particular interest and regret to the people of my area, since he was a native Hoosier, having been born in Warsaw, Ind., a city in the Second Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing.

MERLIN HULL's was a long and useful career during which he served the people of his home community, his adopted State, and the Nation not only in varied capacities as a public servant but as a newspaper publisher as well.

We who knew him as a friend and colleague down through the years learned to appreciate MERLIN HULL's intellectual honesty and his extreme diligence as a Member of the Congress.

He went about his committee assignments with great seriousness of purpose and I have no doubt he adhered to the same high standard of service in day-to-day relations with his constituents. Certainly the many years he has served here attest to the esteem and confidence in which he has been held by the people of his district.

In the death of MERLIN HULL it can be said that America has lost a loyal and most faithful servant. Beyond that, my own State of Indiana has lost a native son, and we here in the Congress have lost a good and kind friend.

Our deepest sympathies go out to the bereaved family and we express the hope that the burden of sadness is lightened

in some measure by the knowledge that their beloved husband and father has served his country well.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, during the over 6 years I have been in the House of Representatives I have met many fine men but no finer character than that of Mr. HULL, of Wisconsin. He lived in the tradition of the elder La Follette, and he graced that tradition. He was gentle, yet firm, patient and wise, stubborn in conviction, yet reasonable in debate. The members of his committee praised him, and to us all he was a gracious and distinguished gentleman in the greatest American tradition because he coupled with it a fighting instinct for the moral and spiritual values epitomized in our pioneer stock. It will be a personal loss to miss MERLIN HULL's "How are you today, JAVITS?" on the floor of the House, a loss to our Nation in his integrity and statesmanship, and I know a great loss to the people of his district. To his family I am sure he was very dear, and to them my sincere condolences.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised but I was greatly saddened to hear of the death of MERLIN HULL. All of us who knew him real well knew that he was approaching the end of his life on this earth. He declined during the last 6 months, very much physically, but not mentally.

Mr. HULL was a very friendly and likable man. When I first came to Congress, I had the pleasure of meeting him, and had a special interest in knowing him because of the fact that he represented a district in my native State of Wisconsin.

He was a very active man in the politics of Wisconsin. As a young man, he was speaker of the Wisconsin Assembly. Later he was secretary of state of Wisconsin. From his earliest manhood he adopted a progressive attitude toward the political questions of the day. He was trained in the school of Robert La Follette and continued to have the forward outlook to the end of his life which he had in his days as a young man. The La Follettes, both Robert La Follette and Robert La Follette, Jr., left a great impress, not only on the political life of the State of Wisconsin but also strongly affected the political life of the Nation: badly needed political reforms, such as a primary law, which took the control of our parties away from the political bosses, a good public utilities act, and other reforms.

On the national scene, the La Follette influence was felt in uprooting corruption, and helping give to the common citizen protection against predatory interests, who looked upon government as a vehicle for the development of their selfish ideas and interests.

Mr. HULL came to Congress as a Progressive. When the party was merged with the Republican Party in Wisconsin, he became a Republican, but his old Progressive ideas never deserted him. He had an independent, courageous mind, and, in many ways, typified the true Representative, which is one who votes his convictions, rather than voting for measures as a political expedient. For over 20 years, he served the people of Wisconsin faithfully in the National Legislature.

MERLIN HULL was a kind and gentle individual. He was friendly and anxious to help new Members, as well as his older colleagues. He truly reflected the attitude of his people and did what he could to promote their welfare and to protect their interest.

Mr. HULL has a son in the city of Stockton, Calif., where I have resided for 35 years. MERLIN HULL was a good example for younger men in the House of Representatives to follow. He was the soul of honor and in every way typified the Christian spirit in his conduct with his colleagues.

We will miss him, but we will gather inspiration from Mr. HULL's life to courageously do our work as well as we are able to, irrespective of the political consequences which might follow our determination to do what is right as we see it. I extend to his wife and his son my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the news of the passing of Hon. MERLIN HULL, of Wisconsin, last weekend came as a shock to me. I had had the idea that he had been making great and determined progress in his convalescence from his long illness.

There are few men in public life who have been held in such high esteem as MERLIN HULL. For many, many years he enjoyed the warm affection and devotion of the people of the Ninth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin, which he so ably represented here for 11 terms.

It was my great privilege to know MERLIN HULL ever since I became a Member of Congress. We used to eat lunch together in the House Restaurant, always at Bob Baker's table, day after day, and month after month, over these last many years. I enjoyed a warm friendship with him and admired him for his sincerity of purpose and independent thought. He and I often discussed the problems affecting our respective constituencies and I always found him to be an outstanding and effective foe of any legislative proposals which he deemed not in the best interests of his Nation.

It is hardly necessary for me to review MERLIN HULL's long and illustrious public career. His record speaks for itself. With his great wisdom and understanding he was a courageous advocate of progressive legislation. As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee his service was characterized by a conscientious and intelligent approach to the many important issues of our time. He was a true statesman and his devotion to his work was an example and inspiration to all of us who served with him.

I shall miss this affable and lovable friend. I shall never forget his courtly manner and his simplicity of character. His years of distinguished service in this body have left an imprint which shall not be soon forgotten. The people of his district as well as the State of Wisconsin and the Nation have lost a great public servant.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his widow and family in their hour of bereavement.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, all of Wisconsin is saddened by the death of the Honorable MERLIN HULL. We have lost one of our pioneers. We have lost a man who dedicated practically his entire lifetime to public service. Starting with the turn of the century, he served his people first as clerk of the circuit court in his county and then as the county district attorney, then as State legislator, following that as secretary of state. Finally, he served his people as a Member of the Congress. He served 11 terms in this House. During that period—in fact, during the entire period of his public service—he served his people conscientiously and faithfully. Mr. Speaker, we are all going to miss him deeply. To his wife and his family, I express my deepest and sincerest sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, it was with a heavy heart that I had word of the death of my dear friend and colleague, MERLIN HULL. We have not the right to challenge the acts of the Almighty, nor the wisdom of that great power which removes from our midst a dear friend and a cherished comrade.

MERLIN HULL had a long period of service in public life: as speaker of the Wisconsin Assembly, as a member of the assembly itself, as secretary of State of Wisconsin, and as a Member of the United States House of Representatives for a long period of time. During the last several years of his service in this august body, he was not enjoying the best of health. I watched him many times during late years in sessions of the House, when it required considerable effort and physical endurance to stand square to his duty and vote at the proper times without fail. I always admired his excellent judgment and courage.

MERLIN HULL's voting and his approach to legislative matters indicated that he had been trained in the public service, and was acutely responsive to the needs of the people of his district on various legislation which affected them. He was a very able member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and rendered to his district and the Nation excellent service on this important committee. He was a fine gentleman and a devoted and patriotic American.

In the course of his service here, I came to know him well and to appreciate his fine qualities of heart and mind.

With his passing the American farmers lost a true friend, for their welfare was always uppermost in his thoughts and actions.

MERLIN HULL was one of those rare individuals who was independent in his thoughts and actions. His decisions were based on two factors: Is it right? Is it for the best interests of our country?

Merlin, as we fondly addressed him, was a Christian gentleman in every way.

To his bereaved family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to find one word that properly describes our friend and colleague, MERLIN HULL, who died on Sunday. But if that word can be found, it probably would be that MERLIN HULL was a gentleman. He was a gentleman of the old school, a man of integrity, of courage in his beliefs, and one with a courtly politeness. In nearly 50 years of public life, he was untouched by scandal and never once charged with a selfish, petty, or ulterior motive in the steadfast course of action which he followed.

MERLIN HULL was one of the last sturdy links between our Wisconsin of the present and our Wisconsin of the past. To many of us, the rise to prominence of Robert M. La Follette, Sr., in 1900 is known only through history. But MERLIN HULL lived in those days, actively participated in the birth of the "Wisconsin idea" in government, and remained through the years to assist and advise those of another generation who passed his way.

Our State, and especially the people of his home section, had honored MERLIN HULL repeatedly with high office—district attorney, member of the State legislature, speaker of our State assembly, secretary of State, and Member of Congress. He narrowly missed the governorship, and frequently had been mentioned for the United States senatorship. But statesmanship was not his only forte; in early life he engaged in agricultural pursuits, since 1894 he had been a member of the Wisconsin bar, and since 1904 he had been publisher of a newspaper in his home city of Black River Falls.

I know what a blow it was to Congressman HULL less than 6 months ago when death took his entire office staff. Two of them had been with him for many years; the third was the daughter of his newspaper manager. They had seemed like members of his family, and he grieved for them accordingly.

MERLIN HULL had a fierce pride. Through his life, he never met defeat in any battle until he faced failing health. He recently had been forced to use a wheelchair between his office and the Capitol. He disliked it bitterly, but he yielded to it, to maintain his record of attendance to congressional and committee sessions—a record of faithfulness that few younger men equal. But I recall that on the last time he came to my office, to attend a meeting of the Wisconsin delegation with a group of residents of western Wisconsin, he walked every step of the way and took pride in that accomplishment for the oldest man serving in Congress.

In the Ninth Congressional District, MERLIN HULL was above political lines. He had a following that searched for his name whether it appeared on the Republican or the La Follette Progressive ticket. It was a personal following, people who knew and respected him, who believed in his honesty, and sincerity, and who, in the sunset years of his life when he could no longer campaign actively, went to the polls and reelected him by ever-large majorities because he was MERLIN HULL.

To them, just as it is to those of us here in the Halls of Congress, his death is a personal loss All of us appreciate that.

To his immediate family and to the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin those of us who have served as his colleagues here in the House join in expressing a sense of personal loss in the passing of MERLIN HULL.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT].

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues and the citizens of Wisconsin in extending my deep, heartfelt sympathy to the Hull family in their bereavement. While Congressman HULL's name was known by many in the State of Wisconsin because of his long career in public service, I did not come to know him personally until my election to the 82d Congress. Congressman HULL was known as the dean of our delegation and on many occasions it was my privilege to seek his counsel. Congressman HULL will be greatly missed not only by his host of friends in Wisconsin but also by his colleagues here in the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, MERLIN HULL has passed from among us, and our sorrow is real. He was an innately friendly man; he was a man of genuine dignity. He had the utmost respect for the trust placed in him by the good people of the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin.

MERLIN HULL spent his boyhood in a farming community at Sechlerville, in Jackson County, Wis. Here he attended school and worked as a farmhand and schoolteacher so that he might earn funds with which to continue his education. He also learned the printing trade. Representative HULL attended Gale College, at Galesville, and DePauw and Columbian Universities. He practiced law in Black River Falls, Wis., and in 1904 he bought the Jackson County Journal. In 1926 he consolidated this paper with the Badger State Banner, and, under the name Banner-Journal, Mr. HULL continued to publish this newspaper until the time of his death.

MERLIN HULL has had a distinguished record of public service. He has served as a district attorney, a member of the Wisconsin Assembly from 1905 to 1915, speaker of the Wisconsin Assembly in 1913, secretary of state for Wisconsin from 1917 to 1921, and a Member of the Wisconsin congressional delegation for 20 years.

MERLIN HULL has made a real contribution, not only to our State in the various public offices which he has held but as a Member of the Wisconsin congressional delegation he has also made a real contribution to the welfare of our Nation. MERLIN HULL indeed led a rich, full, American life. I shall long remember his kindness, understanding, and his help to me as I reported to Congress this year as a freshman Member.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like the privilege, Mr. Speaker, of joining with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and the other Members who have expressed such splendid sentiments relative to Mr. HULL. He was a fine gentleman. I extend my sincere sympathy to his family.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to share also in the respects that are being paid to our colleague, Mr. MERLIN HULL. I think all of us try to be truly representative of the districts from which we come and join in this body as representatives of the people of the United States. Mr. HULL was truly representative of the basic principles on which we meet here. He lived for a while in my district, and it has often given me pleasure to sit down in the cloakroom and visit with MERLIN HULL. All of us have lost a true friend.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of our late colleague and friend, MERLIN HULL, takes from us one of our most beloved as well as one of our most valuable Members. His death also takes from us one of our outstanding independent and progressive Members in both thought and action.

During our years of service there developed between MERLIN HULL and myself a close friendship, one that I greatly appreciated. I respected MERLIN HULL as strongly as I could respect anyone. I did so for a number of reasons: MERLIN HULL typified everything that was noble and uplifting in a human being; he was kind, considerate, understanding; he was possessed of a beautiful outlook on life; he symbolized nobility of character in his expressions and actions, and in the performance of his duties as well as in his associations with his fellowman. MERLIN HULL was a man of great ability, which he utilized effectively during his years of service in the Congress of the United States. He was serious, devoted to his duties, reliable, and dependable.

His private and his public life was honorable and trustworthy. MERLIN HULL was a legislator of courage, evidenced on so many occasions, particularly years ago when it took courage to vote for progressive legislation beneficial to the best interests of our people.

MERLIN HULL led a productive life. He has made marked contributions toward the progress of our country. As a result of years of service in this body he has left his imprint on the legislative history of our country.

He symbolized a type of public service that is an inspiration for others to follow.

To Mrs. Hull and to her son and daughter, I extend my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members in paying respect to this distinguished Congressman. MERLIN HULL was one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives. I had the pleasure of serving with him for the past several

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

years and I found him to be one of the most conscientious men I have ever known. He always did what he thought was right.

In the passing of Congressman HULL, the farmers of America have lost one of their most useful champions.

He will be greatly missed by his family, by the Members of this body, by the constituents whom he served so faithfully throughout the years, and by all who knew him.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with my colleagues from Wisconsin to express in a personal way that Wisconsin and the people of Minnesota likewise have suffered a tremendous loss in the death of Congressman HULL. His district was not too far from the district which I happen to represent, just across the St. Croix River.

I first became acquainted with Mr. HULL during the days when I was serving in the Minnesota State Legislature. I came to respect him, and I also found in him a champion of the interests and for service to the great mass of little people in this Nation. I feel as all working people will feel that the labor movement of this country, organized and unorganized, has lost a true champion of their cause and of their interest.

To me Congressman HULL was an ideal American, a great American. He devoted his entire life to the cause of the little people—the workers, farmers, and those who have passed beyond their employable age and had moved into their days of retirement. He championed their cause at all times and in all places.

I join with the Members of the House from the State of Wisconsin, and I am sure the State of Minnesota joins with all of us here, in regretting this loss that has occurred within the past 24 hours.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, when Mrs. Short drove me to the Capitol this morning I observed the flags over the Capitol, the Senate and House Office Buildings flying at half-mast. I remarked to her, "Another Member of Congress has left us." She asked me, "Who do you think it could be?" I said, "With all of the uncertainties of life hanging over us and having seen strong men fall just in their heyday, it could be any one of the 531 Members. But I rather think it is MERLIN HULL."

His death came as no surprise to me, and I dare say to any of you. Because of his advanced years and infirmities, and particularly because of the serious operation he underwent recently, we could reasonably expect the end at any moment. However much we might anticipate death, we are never quite prepared for the shock that it brings. There are few men in public life who have experienced a longer tenure of office, who have had a wider knowledge of Federal, State, and local Governments, who had a more varied career in statescraft than MERLIN HULL.

Mr. Speaker, I observed only a moment ago the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] in the Chamber. He, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS], MERLIN HULL, and I came to Congress at the same time following the 1928 election before the passage of the lame-duck amendment. We entered this Chamber in 1929. MERLIN HULL and I were out for a short time, but we returned to the 74th Congress and have served continuously since, the same length of time in this body. I should say that at least half of the time, though he was nominally called a Republican, we disagreed, because MERLIN HULL was one of the most independent men that I have ever known, and however much you might disagree with him at times and on various issues, he was a man of rugged honesty, of unimpeachable integrity, of unsullied honor, and he had a capacity for friendship that bound his friends to him with hoops of steel. No Republican and no Democrat could defeat him. He enjoyed the confidence and respect of all. Many, many times have I visited with him and discussed not only affairs of state, but the humble, plain, and simple things of life that, after all, perhaps, are the greatest things in life. I shall always remember him because of his quietude, sweet serenity, and the deep dignity that surrounded him, because of his willingness to listen to every side of an argument and because, after his adversary presented his case, he was big enough to say, "Well, I do not agree with a lot that he said, but he did an excellent job." It is that spirit of forbearance, of tolerance, of patience, and understanding that endears Members of this body to one another.

Mr. Speaker, I shall miss MERLIN HULL. I shall remember him because of his modesty, because of his simplicity, his earnestness, and his sincerity, and if you younger Members of the House could have known him 15 or 20 years ago when he was in his heyday, you would have realized that he possessed a keen and alert mind, quick on the trigger, with a powerful and resonant voice: a very able and most effective speaker. In the declining years of his life he could not participate in public debate on this floor, but we all know that he remained true and steadfast to his convictions to the bitter end. It would take him about three times as long as one of us to come from his office in the Old House Office Building over to this Chamber to answer a rollcall but he got here, and he was such a proud man he insisted on navigating under his own steam with the help of his cane. It was but a comparatively few times that he allowed himself to be brought over in a wheelchair.

Mr. HULL was a warrior, an old warhorse. He loved his country and because of his honesty, humility, integrity, and simplicity will forever be remembered by the Members of this body.

Not so much do I extend my sympathy to his bereaved family, because after all, MERLIN HULL lived to a ripe old age, a rich and full life, and we would be selfish to want to keep such as he, even though we love them, in their infirmities and pain with us always. So I extend not so much my sympathy as I thank God at this moment for having known and having been associated with MERLIN HULL. I hope and pray that the world may have more of his kind, because if it does it will be a better place in which to live.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our good friend MERLIN HULL. We served adjoining districts, he on one side of the Mississippi River in Wisconsin and I on the other. I served in this body with him during his entire period of service. He was my friend. I respected his judgment and his convictions.

One thing I can say for MERLIN HULL, he served his constituency with integrity and honor. Whenever he gave his word to me, I considered his word to be as good as his bond.

He was a great American, a man who has served his country well. We will miss him here and he will be missed in Wisconsin. I join my colleagues in paying this tribute to him, and also in sadness express my sorrow to his family.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was not my good fortune to know MERLIN HULL well, but I had the privilege of knowing the radiations of his spirit. He was proof to me that older people who have lived well, who have done their best, who have held true to their principles and the deep principles of living here on earth, have a very real role to play.

Yes, it took him three times as long as it took most of us to come over here, but he was always here. If you stopped along the way and walked with him, as I had the joy of doing a number of times just recently, you felt the sweetness of the man, you felt the tenderness of his whole being. He came because it was his duty, and his duty was his life, it was his joy, it was his contribution to the evolution of man here. It was also his contribution to the building of an America which would not only reflect the right and the left, the conservative, the reactionary, and the radical, but reflect the thinking and feeling of men who had the courage to reach out beyond their own beginnings into the newer life they saw being built.

It has been a great privilege to serve in the Congress with MERLIN HULL. I would say even as my colleague from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has so well said, that I convey my deep sympathy to his family for the separation that has come, but I join with them in what must be gratitude to the Almighty that such a man has lived, and now has gone just across the threshold of another room to continue his faithful services to his God.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on an occasion like this all of us are well aware that words are woefully weak and inadequate to express the feelings that may be in our hearts. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], in quoting a hymn, gave a line that is the key to the whole mind, life, and spirit

of MERLIN HULL. That was the line from the great hymn that reads, "Forgive our feverish ways." I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I had lunch with MERLIN HULL perhaps more times than I have had lunch with any other Member of this House. That came about, I think, largely because of the practice that was his, and a practice that has been mine for some time, to get to the dining room and eat lunch before time for the House to convene at noon. And so many, many times during the past 4 years we have sat together in the dining room prior to the convening of the House, and have had our lunch together. That association leads me again to comment on the line that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] quoted: "Forgive our feverish ways." That was a primary trait and quality of character, I think, in MERLIN HULL. So many times in these hectic years I have had that blessed privilege of talking with him when I have been inclined to be tense and greatly disturbed over some pending issue before the Congress. On such occasions a quiet conversation with MERLIN HULL, and I somehow was able to sense the serenity of his soul and the mellow maturity of his mind and invariably the result was a slackening of my own tensions. I shall remember him always and cherish that memory.

The gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] in a very moving and beautiful tribute mentioned the fact that often she had walked with him. That happened to be my lot so many times because we both came to lunch at the same time. Walking much faster than he I frequently overtook him in the subway. I always had the feeling that I would gain something if I slowed down and accommodated my step with that of MERLIN HULL, even after he had to depend somewhat on a walking cane for support. My life has been greatly enriched by the fact that I have had that association with him.

I shall think always of that serenity of his soul, that mellow maturity and understanding of a very great mind, in my opinion a mind that grasped to a very marked degree the fundamental problems which confront our Nation and confront a very tense and feverish world.

I join, of course, with all others in expressing my deepest and sincerest sympathy to all members of his family. As I think back over those walks through the subway with MERLIN HULL, I can do no better than to use some words from Longfellow in closing these very brief and inadequate but sincere remarks about our late colleague:

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time;
Footprints, that perhaps another,
Sailing o'er life's solemn main,
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
Seeing, shall take heart again.
Let us, then, be up and doing,
With a heart for any fate;
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labor and to wait.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is at a time such as this that I wish I had the vocabulary and the eloquence to express what is in my heart and my mind. I considered MERLIN HULL one of my very dear and intimate friends in this House of Representatives. I wish to concur in every loving tribute that has been paid Mr. HULL by my colleagues who have preceded me.

You would not have to know MERLIN HULL as intimately as I knew him to respect and love him. All you would have to do would be to look at his long years of service, not only to the people of Wisconsin, but the entire United States. His record speaks for itself. Show me another man in the Congress who had won the confidence and the faith that his constituents had in him as evidenced by the way they worshiped and idolized him and stood by him. That was a tribute of which any Member of Congress could justly be proud. MERLIN HULL had many, many qualities that I admired, but I think if I had to choose only one or two, I would say it was the ideals and the high principles that he not only subscribed to, but for which he fought so steadfastly. I admire anyone who will fight for the principles and ideals in which he believes, even though they may not concur with my own.

This is the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and as a Representative, MERLIN HULL truly represented the people of Wisconsin and the United States. He was a gentleman through and through, a man of noble character, a fine and upright Christian.

We will all miss MERLIN HULL. I will particularly miss not only those little walks in the subway between the Capitol and the Old House Office Building that were referred to by Members that preceded me, but the many, many chats outside the doors of his office and my office. Our offices were across the hall from each other.

With all sincerity and sympathy, I wish him God's divine blessing and the everlasting and eternal peace he so richly deserves.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the death of the late Honorable MERLIN HULL, the dean of the Wisconsin congressional delegation, our country and our State have suffered a deep loss.

I know that it is not necessary for me to review, before the Members of this body, the long and distinguished public career of our late colleague. From a farm hand, and a printer, he rose to become one of the outstanding leaders in his community, a speaker of the Wisconsin State Assembly, the secretary of state, and, finally, the dean of our State delegation in Congress.

Through his many years of public service, Congressman HULL earned the respect and deep affection of those with whom he came in contact. Until illness overtook him, he was known in these Halls as one of the most diligent Representatives, one who combined refreshing vigor with the wisdom and understanding drawn from his long experience as a public servant.

In his death, the people of his district, and the people of the State of Wisconsin, have lost a faithful, able, and vigorous champion. Their loss is shared by the many Members of this House, who have benefited on many an occasion from his sage advice, and from his penetrating analysis of the vital problems which have faced our Nation. I have often benefited from his counsel.

It is with deep sadness that I join the Members of this body in paying tribute to the memory of this great and humble man, and in extending my sincere sympathy to his widow and his family in their bereavement.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, today we feel deeply the loss of a useful Member of this body.

We form friendships here on the floor of the House and in and around our offices. MERLIN HULL was one of the most sincere men I have known here in the past 15 years.

He came to see me about a matter that concerned him in my early days here as a Member of this body. From that day on I have appreciated his friendly way and manner that he approached each problem. We will miss him, and personally I have lost a valued friend.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 238).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard, with profound sorrow, of the death of Hon. MERLIN HULL, a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That a committee of 11 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee Messrs. SMITH of Wisconsin, O'KONSKI, BYRNES of Wisconsin, DAVIS of Wisconsin, WITHROW, WIER, ZABLOCKI, KERSTEN of Wisconsin, VAN PELT, O'HARA of Illinois, and LAIRD.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 19, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

698. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a list of changes and specific recommendations to the Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1275); to the Committee on Agriculture.

699. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the recovery, care and disposition of the remains of members of the uniformed services and certain other personnel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

700. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

701. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a list of cases involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 14, 1953, the following bill was reported on May 15, 1953:

Mr. BUSBEY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5246. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 18, 1953]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5173. A bill to provide that the excess of collections from the Federal unemployment tax over unemployment compensation administrative expenses shall be used to establish and maintain a $200 million reserve in the Federal unemployment account which will be available for advances to the States, to provide that the remainder of such excess shall be returned to the States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 14, 1953, the following bill was introduced on May 15, 1953:

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 5246. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[Introduced and referred May 18, 1953]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5247. A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Alaska applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territory; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 5248. A bill to alleviate the Arab-refugee problem in the Near East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 5249. A bill to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 5250. A bill to provide that the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to lands in the Heart division of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 5251. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct housing loans to veterans who have not exhausted their guaranty entitlement; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5252. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to guarantee loans made to certain veterans for the purpose of trailers to be used as homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 5253. A bill to amend the act of June 17, 1902, to remove the prohibition against the employment of Mongolian labor in the construction of irrigation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 5254. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuity for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to 50 percent of the average monthly salaries or wages based on the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 5255. A bill to amend section 3672 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to requirement of filing notice of lien for taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 5256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the retirement of judges of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5257. A bill to extend to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 5258. A bill to authorize the sale of Army, Navy, and Air Force stores at military establishments to civilian employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 5259. A bill to permit the continued exercise under section 6 (8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, of certain powers relating to preference and precedence in the transportation of military traffic; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution requiring the preparation of an estimate of the cost of reconstructing Ford's Theater in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the United States to construct a portion of a highway in substitution for the highway closed by the establishment of the Chocolate Mountain aerial gunnery range; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorials of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the need for congressional action to restore the taxing power to the States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning our beach-erosion program; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the passage of an act authorizing the return of property acquired by the Territory of Hawaii and by the government of the several counties including the city and county of Honolulu from local residents during World War II; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the establishment and construction of a new post office building in the Palama-Kalihi District, Honolulu, Oahu; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make a survey of the Kahului Harbor in the county of Maui; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing for a referendum on certain amendments to the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 5260. A bill for the relief of Gonzalo Sergoviano-Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5261. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fanautahi Terorotua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 5262. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Mao Pollak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5263. A bill for the relief of Eugene Herskovitz and Mrs. Elly Herskovitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:
H. R. 5264. A bill for the relief of Carlo Panno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:
H. R. 5265. A bill for the relief of Margarete Hohmann Springer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:
H. R. 5266. A bill for the relief of Crescenzo Di Donna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:
H. R. 5267. A bill for the relief of Isidoro Heredia Ruiz; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (by request):
H. R. 5268. A bill for the relief of Selim (Robert) Salloum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

259. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of the Black Forest Conservation Association, Coudersport, Pa., protesting the passage of the land-grab bill, H. R. 4023 and S. 1491, and requesting that this protest be made part of the official record of the hearings on H. R. 4023 scheduled by the House Subcommittee on Public Lands; and urging favorable action on H. R. 4268 and S. 1509, or any similar bills that would improve the supervision and use of public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

260. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Southern Bipartisan Citizens' Housing Committee, Atlanta, Ga., relative to H. R. 4663, and requesting restoration of the public-housing program as recommended by President Eisenhower and Senator TAFT; to the Committee on Appropriations.

261. Also, petition of Florence Schmidt and others, Chicago, Ill., protesting continued membership in the United Nations and requesting Congress to enact legislation that will take the United States out of the United Nations and the United Nations out of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

262. Also, petition of Eastern Arizona Association of Indian Affairs, Safford, Ariz., requesting the removal of all Federal laws which are discriminatory toward Arizona Indians, with special emphasis on laws prohibiting the sale and consumption of liquor by Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

263. Also, petition of Mrs. Mamie E. Hart and others, of Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

264. Also, petition of B. D. Mathis and others, of Wauchula, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

265. Also, petition of Mrs. Henrietta Hall and others, of Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

266. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, of Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

267. Also, petition of Olaf Theodor Carlson and others, of Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1953

(Legislative day of Friday, May 15, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our spirits are restless until they find the rest of Thy presence; our hearts are empty and our lives barren until Thou dost possess our very souls. Apart from Thee these feverish days are but tangled tragedy, sound and fury signifying nothing, devoid of meaning, dignity, and beauty. In Thy radiance trivial rounds become sacraments, common days are glorified and even bitterness, disappointment, and failure are transfigured and redeemed.

Make us great enough for these great days. Deliver us from pride and prejudice. Join us to those who labor to bring sense and system to this disordered globe, and grant that our eyes may yet look upon a world that has found the pathway leading onward to the plains of universal peace. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 18, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 18, 1953, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 306) for the relief of Waltraut Mies van der Rohe.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Ammunition Shortages of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD as in the morning hour, under the usual limitations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, and to the Federal Security Administrator:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas Federal legislation and regulations limit the participation in any aid program to States, making such aid payments strictly on the basis of need and thereby prevent States from recognizing the principle of incentive earnings without jeopardizing their rights to Federal funds; and

"Whereas the inability of States under any circumstances to recognize the earnings of any persons which commence or are increased after a grant is made to such person without the deduction in full thereof from the amount of their grants, has in many cases prevented persons from eventually becoming self-supporting or partially self-supporting thereby causing an actual loss in the long run to both the State and Federal relief funds; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has recognized this situation to the extent of making a special provision that the first $50 of earnings by the blind is exempt from the operation of the above rule, and has further made it possible for children to participate in the FFA or 4-H educational programs even though the same may bring about earnings or profit on their part through their participation without a reduction in the grants made to or in respect to such children, and that the number of persons affected thereby is very small and in the case of children limited entirely to those in rural districts; and

"Whereas it is unreasonable to expect recipients of relief funds to make any effort to earn money or increase their earnings when the same will be of no advantage to them; and

"Whereas the bringing up of children under a system by which they are penalized instead of rewarded for working and earning money is an injury to them and to the future citizenry of our country;

"Now, therefore, we your memorialists respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to pass the necessary legislation, and the Federal Security Administrator to make the necessary regulations, to exempt a certain percentage of the earnings of any dependent children in respect to whom aid is being paid, under such safeguards as may be necessary to see that said earnings are applied to the present or future benefit of said children, and that they further consider the advisability of legislation and regulations similarly exempting a percentage of earnings or increase of earnings subsequent to the making of a grant by the recipients of other classes of relief, particularly the blind and the physically disabled, such percentage exemption if possible to be made on a sliding scale and to cease when the amount of earnings equal or exceed the original grant; and that if it shall appear impossible to make

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

such exemption on a percentage basis then at least that grants in behalf of dependent children and to the physically disabled be given a similar minimum exemption as is now given to the blind or that the exemption to the blind be increased and a similar exemption be given to the other classes; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives from the State of Washington, to the Vice President and chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to the Speaker and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the House of Representatives, and to the Federal Security Administrator."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 33d Legislature of the State of Washington, convened in regular session, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas there exists in the State of Washington a partially constructed coastal highway which begins at the city of Hoquiam in Grays Harbor County, skirts the north shores of Grays Harbor and North Bay, and then turns northerly to follow the shore of the Pacific Ocean to a junction with the Olympic Loop Highway in the vicinity of Queets; and

"Whereas this highway is of major importance to the Nation from the standpoint of coastal defense and of great importance to the economic development of the State; and

"Whereas there is a 14-mile section of this highway between Taholah, on the left bank of the Quinault River, and the aforesaid junction with the Olympic Loop Highway not yet constructed; said unconstructed section being entirely within the boundaries of the Quinault Indian Reservation; and

"Whereas State and Federal funds for the construction of this part of the highway, which, with necessary bridges, is estimated to cost $2,810,000, will not be available in the foreseeable future;

"Now, therefore your memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States speedily take such legislative action as may be necessary to bring about the completion of the highway described hereinbefore; and be it

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington."

"Senate Joint Memorial 14

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas there exists in the State of Washington a primary State highway on the north side of the Columbia River from Vancouver to Maryhill; and

"Whereas it is essential to the economy of the State and the orderly development of lines of transportation leading to and from the Columbia Basin that this highway be continued easterly on a water grade along the north bank of the river for a distance of 37 miles; and

"Whereas the location of this new highway and its height above the existing high-water level in the Columbia River must be related to the height of the new water level to be established by the proposed John Day Dam in the Columbia River;

"Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States speedily take such action as may be necessary to make known to the public the elevation of the theoretical maximum high-water level of the pool behind the proposed John Day Dam and the probable year in which the construction of this dam be started: Be it

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to pass an act authorizing the return of property acquired by the Territory of Hawaii and by the government of the several counties including the city and county of Honolulu from local residents during World War II

"Whereas during World War II, several eleemosynary organizations whose members were persons of Japanese extraction, many of whom were citizens of the United States, owned real property; and

"Whereas such persons were made to feel that their loyalty was under grave suspicion, notwithstanding there was no basis for any suspicion; and

"Whereas it was made known to such persons that the suspicion, baseless though it was, might be somewhat allayed by the conveyance of the property aforesaid to the government of the Territory of Hawaii and to the government of the several counties including the city and county of Honolulu without monetary consideration; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii speaking through their legislators, feel that all such lands should be returned: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to enact the following law:

"'A bill to provide for the return of certain lands acquired by the Territory of Hawaii and by the several counties including the city and county of Honolulu by gift

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*—

"'SECTION 1. That any provision of any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii, with the approval of the governor of the Territory of Hawaii, is hereby authorized and directed, for the sole consideration of the provisions of this act, to reconvey to the persons and organizations who, during World War II, without monetary consideration conveyed to the government of the Territory of Hawaii and to the government of the several counties including the city and county of Honolulu, land and property theretofore acquired by them for eleemosynary purposes.

"'SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon its approval.'

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the mayor, chairman, and executive officer of the board of supervisors of the several counties including the city and county of Honolulu.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect 10 days after promulgation as required by section 2 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945.

"Approved this 12th day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution 30

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation providing for the establishment and construction of a new post-office building in the Palama-Kalihi district, Honolulu, Oahu

"Whereas it is essential that the people residing in the districts of Kalihi and Palama have an adequate, modern post-office building in their districts to service their postal needs; and

"Whereas the United States post office at Honolulu, Oahu, does not now have the necessary facilities to adequate satisfy the postal needs of the people in these areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation providing for the establishment and construction of a new post-office building in the Palama and Kalihi districts, Honolulu, Oahu, and appropriating sufficient funds therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Postmaster General, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Georgia Association of B'nai B'rith Lodges, at Columbus, Ga., favoring a revision of the so-called McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, so as to remove from it the discriminatory national origins quota system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Georgia Association of B'nai B'rith Lodges, at Columbus, Ga., protesting against the persecution of religious and national minorities in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A memorandum in the nature of a petition, issued by the 33d Congress of the Slovak League of America, Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the policy of offering asylum and material and moral aid to the peoples of all nations persecuted for their political or religious convictions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE PRESENT AGRICULTURAL SITUATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, a resolution recently adopted by a group of farmers and businessmen from New Rockford, N. Dak., and vicinity, relating to the present agricultural situation. The resolution sets forth very clearly the thinking of a great majority of farmers in North Dakota.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

"Here and now, without any ifs or buts, I say to you that I stand behind, and the Re-

publican Party stands behind, the amendment to the basic farm act to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

"I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income.

"A fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity, but full parity."

We firmly believe we have not only a right, but a duty to demand a fulfillment of the above promise made by our President at Kasson, Minn.

As the economy of the Nation revolves around a prosperous agriculture, we demand the resignation of Secretary Benson so that the promise of President Eisenhower can be fulfilled.

We firmly believe in price supports of 100 percent of parity and if a burdensome surplus is on hand that acreage control be invoked, handled by democratically elected farmer committees.

We resent the statement that this is regimentation or interference with our freedom. We well remember when wheat sold for 25 cents per bushel and cattle for $20 per head. We don't want that kind of freedom with farm failures, business bankruptcy, and thousands of closed banks.

Whereas the price of cattle has gone down 50 percent, mostly in the last 6 months, and whereas the income of beef is second only to grain, we, therefore, petition the Secretary of Agriculture to use the authority he now has to bring the price of beef to 90 percent of parity.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 971. A bill to authorize films, and related material, for educational use to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books; without amendment (Rept. No. 293); and

H. R. 4654. A bill to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 294).

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 833. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 295).

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION UPON RANK OF LEADER OF MILITARY ACADEMY BAND—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1644) to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended, to remove the limitation upon the rank of the director of music, the leader of the Military Academy Band, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 296) thereon.

The bill was introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on April 15, at the request of the Department of Defense. In view of the amendments made to the original text of the bill as the result of hearings by a special subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent that my name, and that of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], be added as cosponsors of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the name of the Senator from New Jersey and the name of the Senator from Wyoming will be added as cosponsors of the bill.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1934. A bill to provide rates of postage on third-class matter mailed by organizations and associations of volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1935. A bill to prohibit the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1936. A bill for the relief of Helmut Hopton and Herta Hopton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1937. A bill for the relief of Rev. Francis T. Dwyer and Rev. Thomas Morrissey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1938. A bill for the relief of Mario Fernandes Mano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1939. A bill for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 1940. A bill for the relief of Michela Aurucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1941. A bill to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats project for irrigation in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENT TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES FOR ACCUMULATED OR ACCRUED ANNUAL LEAVE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which I wish to have referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

Much has been said in recent days, both on and off the Senate floor, about the annual leave benefits for Government employees. Much of this discussion has been brought about by the disclosure by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that several employees of the Rent Stabilization Agency collected large lump-sum leave payments by taking advantage of a loophole in the law.

I am not prepared to say these employees acted in an illegal manner. However, I do say the action taken was wrong, and that it should never have occurred.

I am, therefore, proposing today legislation, which, if enacted, will preclude once and for all the recurrence of a case such as cited by the Senator from Delaware.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1935) to prohibit the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISTURBING INFLUENCES IN OUR SOCIETY—ADDRESS BY GEORGE F. KENNAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I had intended to ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD today an article entitled "Kennan Examines Some Disturbing Forces in Our Society," which appeared in the Washington Post of May 17, 1953, containing a transcript of an address by Mr. Kennan at Notre Dame University on May 15. However, the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] had the address printed in the RECORD yesterday, and I shall therefore not ask to have it duplicated.

Mr. George F. Kennan has long been one of our most distinguished and able diplomats, serving with courage and wisdom as United States Ambassador to Russia and in other diplomatic posts. This address, which was delivered recently at a University of Notre Dame convocation, analyzes in an extraordinarily clear and thoughtful way the dangers to this country of certain forces in our society. I commend it to the careful reading by Members of the Senate and by the people of the Nation generally.

REQUEST TO PASS OVER THE NOMINATION OF UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I may not be able to be present at a late hour this afternoon if the Executive Calendar should be called. Therefore, I desire to serve notice at this time that I wish to ask, most respectfully, that the nomination of Darrell O. Holmes, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington, be passed over. I have spoken about this matter to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and to the majority leader and to the minority leader.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

APPENDIX

By Mr. KILGORE:

Editorial entitled "GOP Giveaways," published in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of May 1, 1953.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address delivered by Senator HENNINGS before the 22d annual meeting of the National Housing Conference, held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 12, 1953.

Editorial on the subject Understanding America, written by Ben F. Ray, chairman of the Alabama Democratic Executive Committee, and published in the Montgomery (Ala.) Examiner.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "You Can't Order a Young Man To Be a Pilot," written by Max Conrad; an article entitled "Winona Experiment," published in a recent issue of the Minneapolis Star; an editorial entitled "Tides and Men," published in the June 1953 issue of Flying.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Address entitled "Mass Air Transportation in the Public Interest," delivered by Col. Joseph P. Adams, of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Editorial entitled "Fisheries: Ugly Duckling?" published in the Gloucester Daily Times of May 11, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Airline Subsidies Again," published in the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram of April 18, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Twenty-three at Valley Forge," published in the Boston Daily Globe of May 4, 1953.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 166. An act for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki);

S. 207. An act for the relief of Jimy Okuda;

S. 371. An act for the relief of Georgia Andrews;

S. 709. An act to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Zimbrough;

S. 837. An act for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky;

S. 1524. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes;

S. 1525. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex.;

S. 1527. An act to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units;

S. 1528. An act to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force;

S. 1530. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy;

S. 1546. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button;

S. 1547. An act to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel;

S. 1549. An act to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va.; and

S. 1641. An act to retrocede to the State of Oklahoma concurrent jurisdiction over the right-of-way for United States Highways 62 and 277 within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That beginning on Tuesday, May 19, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, debate upon any amendment proposed thereto shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of such amendment and Mr. CAPEHART: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate upon the question of the final passage of the bill shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. BRICKER.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarthy
Anderson	Griswold	McClellan
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bennett	Hennings	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Bush	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Hunt	Purtell
Carlson	Ives	Robertson
Case	Jackson	Russell
Chavez	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kennedy	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Symington
Ellender	Kuchel	Taft
Ferguson	Langer	Thye
Flanders	Lehman	Tobey
Frear	Long	Watkins
Fulbright	Magnuson	Welker
George	Malone	Wiley
Gillette	Mansfield	Williams
Goldwater	Martin	Young
Gore	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

There are 2 prints of the bill being considered by the Senate, 1 of April 10 and 1 of May 13. The print of May 13 contains the committee amendment as modified. However, the print used at the desk, which will be the subject of modification, will be the one which was made on April 10.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia to the committee substitute as modified will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 13 in the committee substitute as modified, it is proposed to strike out "whenever he" and insert in lieu thereof "whenever the United States has declared war against a foreign nation, or whenever the Congress, by concurrent resolution."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The amendment which I have offered is a very simple one. It provides that title 8, which contains authority for temporary emergency price, wage, and rent ceilings, shall not become effective except under 1 of 2 conditions: First, whenever the United States has declared war against a foreign nation, or second, whenever Congress, by concurrent resolution, finds that a grave national emergency exists and that the exercise of such authority is necessary in the interest of national security and economic stability.

My objection to title VIII is the fact that the President is authorized and directed, whenever he shall find and declare that a grave national emergency exists, to invoke the great powers of emergency price, wage, and rent ceilings, decreed by his own determination.

I submit that there is no definition of a grave national emergency, and I do not think any such definition could be written into a bill. I believe the Congress should have an equal voice in saying when this great authority shall be vested in the President, whereby all prices are frozen for a 90-day period.

Mr. President, of course I hope and pray that we will never have to fight another war, but if war should come, I certainly trust it will be a declared war, a war in which we are engaging after a declaration of war has been made by Congress. I hope that never again will we be called upon to wage war under such circumstances as surround the Korean war, which was called a police action by President Truman. That war has lasted now for nearly 3 years, and our Nation has been engaged in that bloody conflict for that length of time without a declaration of war on the part of Congress. I hope that will never happen again.

I believe one of the reasons people have been confused so badly about the Korean war is that the constitutional authority of Congress was not invoked to conduct the war.

The second part of my amendment provides that the control powers can come into existence whenever the Congress, by concurrent resolution, declares that they shall be invoked.

Mr. President, I submit that Congress, in case of an emergency, can convene very promptly. I believe that in 24 hours we can have a quorum in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, should a great emergency occur.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Virginia, as it is the opinion of the Senator from Oregon, that one of the clear responsibilities of Congress, in living up to the obligation of checks and balances under the Constitution, is to exercise the authority of which the Senator from Virginia is now speaking? Do we, the Congress, not have the duty of checking the President in the exercise of discretionary power?

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator from Oregon. The point I wish to make clear is that there would be no delay with reference to the control powers immediately coming into effect. They would come into effect in the same minute with the declaration of war, or whenever Congress by concurrent resolution invoked the powers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I interrupt the Senator briefly and ask him a question with reference to his statement about there not being any delay?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I remember the attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor on the 7th of December. On that day I was in the West. Many other Senators were away from Washington. Nevertheless, we were here on the following day.

Mr. BYRD. The very next day, at 12 o'clock we can be here; every Senator and every Member of the House can be here within 24 hours. Therefore, I see no reason for Congress to abdicate its authority and responsibility. There is absolutely no reason why such tremendous power should be given to the Chief Executive under any other circumstances.

Under the pending bill every price in the country could be frozen by the Chief Executive. He could freeze the price of cattle in the West or in Virginia, even though conditions in Virginia are entirely different from what they are in the West.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BYRD. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

All prices would be frozen. Under the conditions which might exist prices could be frozen at less than the cost of production, and by invoking the freeze every contract made between businessmen would be invalidated, if the price in the contract was in excess of the price or ceiling fixed by the freeze order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Virginia has referred to the ability of Congress to convene within a day after an attack. In that connection was he not speaking primarily of wars of the past? When attacks occurred outside our borders? In the future, wars may well be atomic in nature, and if an atomic bomb were to fall on Washington while Congress was in session it might well wipe out all of Congress. I do not believe that the Constitution is clear with respect to filling vacancies in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that if Congress were to be wiped out in that way I am sure the administrative branch of the Government would be wiped out as well, and consequently no one would be left to enforce any law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope I am not giving away any secrets, but at least I am under the impression that the President has a bombproof shelter available to him at the White House, although such a shelter is not available to Members of Congress. I think the President would have some sort of protection, which Senators and Representatives would not have.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as I said, if an atomic bomb were to explode over Washington and if all the Senators and Representatives in Congress were killed, then the administrative officials of the Government would be killed also. I do not think that an atomic bomb would show any preference to certain members of the Government. In other words, we would all go down together.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to delay the Senator, but I should like to point out, with his permission, that the Presidential line of succession is much clearer than it is with reference to filling the vacancies in the House of Representatives. There would be an inevitable delay in filling the House of Representatives, because Members cannot be appointed by the governors of the various States, and there would have to be, consequently, special elections held in accordance with the laws of the various States. This would involve great delay.

In the event of the unfortunate loss of the President the Vice President would take over, to be followed by the other 11 successors in line, namely, the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of State, and so on. It would be highly improbable that all of these men would disappear, but it is a strong possibility that we would not be able to get a quorum in the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to complete my statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. I am sorry.

Mr. BYRD. If the theory that everyone in Washington is going to be destroyed is to be carried to its logical conclusion, then perhaps there should be passed a great many other laws giving the President supreme power to do everything he pleases.

I shall not take up any more time in connection with my amendment, because other Senators wish to speak on it, and I have only half an hour available.

I wish to emphasize the fact that the pending legislation would freeze the price of everything in the country, except stocks on the New York Stock Exchange. I do not know why they were exempted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that in its decision in the Steel case of last spring that the Supreme Court made it clear that Congress has the responsibility to act in times of great emergency in conjunction with the President, but with Congress exercising its power of check?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BYRD. How much time does the Senator from Ohio desire?

Mr. TAFT. Ten minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the first place, price and wage controls, in my opinion, are absolutely contrary to the whole theory of a free economy. I feel very strongly on the subject of putting them into a Republican bill.

I believe that if in the past there had been price and wage controls we would never have had a free economy or the free competition which has brought about the tremendous increase in production, in productivity, and in the standard of living in the United States.

Such controls may at times be necessary. If so, Congress should decide whether they are necessary. They should not be made a part of the economic system of the United States, written into the statutes. They have no part in our economic system.

Price and wage controls may be necessary in a war, and they may not be necessary in a war.

Personally I do not think they are necessary in the war in which we are engaged today, the Korean war. Price and wage controls are obviously unnecessary, and they have been removed.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that to make them a part of our system would be to accept the philosophy of the Truman administration and the philosophy of socialism, that price and wage controls are an essential part, from time to time, of the economy of the United States. I am unwilling to admit any such proposition.

I had a good deal to do with price and wage controls during the First World War, in writing regulations with respect to price and wage controls. I helped to write the law in the Second World War.

I say there may be times when such controls are necessary, but the more I have observed them the more have I wondered whether, if they could be all avoided, we would not be just as well off without having price and wage controls, even in a war.

Certainly in an all-out war, when we get to the point where we have a tremendous deficit, of perhaps $50 billion, as happened in the Second World War, during 3 or 4 years, then probably price and wage controls will at least deter inflation. They will not prevent inflation. Inflation occurs finally anyway. However, they will slow up inflation, probably delay it, and probably help maintain greater stability for the time being. But,

Mr. President, that is for Congress to decide. If, when an emergency arises, a freeze is imposed, its effect is to freeze inequities and to freeze many prices at levels below where they should be. During a war prices rise because people think certain articles will be in demand; but after a while, the higher prices bring about increased production of those articles.

Frankly, I think it would be wise, when a war starts, to let prices adjust themselves for a few months while Congress considers the wisdom of imposing wage and price controls, the extent and nature of the emergency, and the connection between the two.

It has been said that if at the start of the Korean war, controls had been imposed, there would not have been a 15-percent increase in prices. Of course, the increase was primarily due to policies pursued by the administration for 2 years before the Korean war began, whereby credit was greatly expanded and an inflationary spiral was developed. Paper money was being issued, in the form of currency, to almost anyone who applied to a bank for a loan, by the support of Government bonds. The Government was essentially encouraging the banks to loan all the money they wished to loan. Up to the beginning of the Korean war a policy of inflation was steadily being pursued.

Then, of course, that situation got out of hand, because so much inflation had already occurred that it was impossible to prevent the 10- or 15-percent increase in prices which occurred at that time. The price increases could have been held down if the Government had not been already involved in inflation. However, the price increases were due primarily to the world situation, rather than solely the situation in the United States. Nothing we can do to prices in the United States will prevent an increase in the prices of materials throughout the world, in the event of a major war.

The Eisenhower administration has stated clearly that it wants to get rid of the present controls; it does not want standby controls. The President only said, "I do not ask for it, but if Congress passes a freeze law, I will take it."

Is the present proposal a freeze proposal? Certainly it is not. The present proposal is for standby controls, because a freeze is an impossibility. Prices cannot be frozen overnight and maintained in that status for 60 days; that simply can not be done. The result would be, for instance, to close every grain market in the United States, because no one would sell grain at the price at which it was frozen, under those circumstances, with the economic price perhaps 10 cents a bushel higher.

Under any price freeze, it is necessary to make adjustments, and a whole system of price controls has to be imposed, and, of course, finally that was provided for in the bill. The committee finally recognized that it could not approve a freeze bill.

On page 24 of the committee amendment we find the following:

(b) The President may provide exemptions from, suspensions of, or adjustments to ceilings in the case of any materials or services or transactions therein, or types of employment—

And so forth. In other words, this measure is an ordinary price-and-wage-control measure, which would be put into effect by the fiat of the President, simply because the President might say there was a national emergency. So what we have here is a measure proposing standby controls, and that is opposed to the policy of the Eisenhower administration. It is opposed to what President Eisenhower has told us he wants and what he does not want. This measure does not provide for the freeze President Eisenhower said he would accept.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield on that point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. If that be the case, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio why there is any need to be disturbed about having the controls ever exercised under the present administration.

Mr. TAFT. Once the President is given the power, he may be urged to use it.

Mr. IVES. But if the President is opposed to controls, is there any danger of his imposing them?

Mr. TAFT. If there is no likelihood that he would impose them, why give him the power at all? That is an equally good answer.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The only reason for giving the President the power, in my opinion, is that Congress might be unable to act.

The Senator from Virginia has said Congress would be in session within 24 hours, but how do we know that would be the case?

Mr. TAFT. Of course, Congress could be in session within 24 hours.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Virginia says the President should have this power if the Congress is unable to act. I agree with the Senator from New York that the President is most unlikely to use the power if the Congress can act and will act.

Mr. TAFT. Once the President is given the power to say, "I see an emergency, and therefore I can do this and that," we cannot tell what the President may do. In the first place, the President is subjected to tremendous pressures by various interests who feel they want price controls or a freeze imposed. The President may be subjected to all sorts of pressures from various interests and may act because of various considerations to which Congress should be giving full consideration.

On the other hand, once the President is given the power, there is a general tendency on the part of the public and newspapers to say to him, "Mr. President, you have the power. If you do not exercise it, you will be to blame for everything that happens." Congress itself is inclined to pass the buck when it ought to be considering the emergency reasons for action.

It seems to me that Congress cannot delegate its constitutional power to make fundamental changes in the entire economy of the United States, in connection with the maintenance of freedom in our country, under the provisions of the Constitution.

So, Mr. President, I believe very strongly that we cannot and we should not renew the practice we protested against for 20 years—namely, the practice of giving the President the power to declare an emergency, and thereby the power to grant to himself the right to put into effect such controls.

Furthermore, how could the President decide about such things without having the benefit of the advice of an OPA organization? How could the President possibly determine what exemptions should be made, unless he had an organization to tell him? How could the President decide to suspend ceilings or to make adjustments in ceilings unless he had a whole OPA organization to advise him about what should be done?

Mr. President, this measure is an OPA measure, which the President could put into effect by simply saying, "I declare the existence of a national emergency."

This measure is contrary to everything I have supported ever since I have been a Member of Congress, and it seems to be contrary to everything we urged during the campaign.

I would prefer to vote for the Bricker amendment, which would strike out the entire section.

The Byrd amendment, however, in effect returns the power to Congress, because only Congress can put this system into effect; and when Congress does so, Congress will have an opportunity to rewrite the entire law, after determining what kind of price and wage controls there should be and what exemptions there should be and how they should be carried out.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for another question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is it not a fact that Congress can still rewrite the law or can write any law it wishes to write, as soon as it convenes, if it is not already in session?

Mr. TAFT. Oh, yes; but I do not see that that is an objection. Why should we give the President the power to write the law?

Mr. IVES. What, then, is the danger in allowing the President to take the initial action in this matter, if Congress can correct it immediately afterward, if Congress wishes to do so?

Mr. TAFT. Under that argument, the President perhaps should be granted every power Congress has, in the event the United States became involved in war; under such circumstances, perhaps Congress would grant the President other powers which would be necessary to be exercised in the event of an emergency.

But Congress does not do that. Congress decides, at the time, what kind of law is necessary to meet the particular kind of emergency then existing; and that is the kind of law Congress should write.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry that my time has expired, so I cannot yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana desire recognition?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall speak for perhaps 5 minutes, and then I shall yield the remainder of the time to the Senator from Maine.

Let me say that the able Senator from Ohio and the able Senator from Virginia both voted for the 1950 Defense Production Act which gave the President the right for 12 months to control all prices, all wages, and all rents. Under that act the President was not mandated to do so, but he was given the right to impose standby controls; he was given the right to freeze prices, wages, and rents, and to control them for 12 months, not 90 days. Both the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Virginia voted for that measure, which gave the President authority to do something in the future, although he did not have to do it if he did not wish to do it; and Congress relinquished all rights in the matter, once that bill was enacted into law.

Mr. President, to me, this matter is very simple. Certainly I cannot quarrel with the able Senator from Virginia in what he said about the obligation of Congress to retain its power to declare war and various other powers it has. Certainly, I do not quarrel with the statement made by the able Senator from Ohio, except that we seem to be like ostriches, in that we put our heads in the sand, and forget the fact that we are now at war in Korea, and that there is danger of an intensification of that war, and that all the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, or at least a majority of the 15 members of that committee, are doing is asking the Congress at the moment to take the minimum steps to make it possible, in case of a grave emergency, for the President to hold the line for at least 90 days, until Congress itself can decide exactly what it wishes to do. That is all that would be done by title VIII. That is all that we are asking to have done. We have given the President of the United States a standby manpower law, authorizing him to call up a maximum of three and one-half million men, with authority to call as many or as few each month as he may deem appropriate.

On the previous occasion, to which reference has been made, I did not at that time hear the objection made that we were granting too much authority to the President. The civil-defense bill was passed. Senators should refresh their recollections regarding the provisions of that law. They should recall the unlimited power which was vested in the President of the United States under the civil defense law. That is a standby law which, in case the Nation is attacked, or in case a great emergency arises, authorizes the President to protect the civilian population of America. The responsibility lies with the Congress, not with the President of the United States; and we ought to accept our responsibility.

I have no particular objection to a provision requiring a declaration of war. In fact, in the committee we gave much thought to the making of such a provision. I submit that we might well have written into the bill a declaration-of-war provisions, except for the fact that we are already at war. Would it not be inconsistent for us to provide that the grant of authority to the President in regard to controls should become effective only in the event of a declaration of war, or the beginning of an undeclared war, when the fact is that we are already at war?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true, however, that in connection with the so-called military manpower law we have laid down very definite standards and very clear restrictions on the power of the President? We have set a ceiling within the law. We have set the age limits. We have specified the terms for which the men may be called into service. In other words, in connection with that law, we have exercised a check upon the exercise of power by the President of the United States by saying, in effect, that only within the prescribed framework, and within the prescribed restrictions imposed by Congress may the President exercise the authority contained in the law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

I may say in reply to the Senator from Oregon we have similarly imposed a limitation by restricting the President's power to a 90-day period. During that 90-day period, Congress, if it so desired, could repeal the act. We vest in the President the right to make certain suspensions or extensions, if in his opinion they should be made.

I should again like to call the attention of Senators to a chart which was prepared by a committee of the 80th Congress and which I hope all Senators will study. In the 80th Congress, a Republican committee, Mr. President, studied the entire question of controls, and on the basis of its study, recommended standby controls. That was as far back as the 80th Congress. I hope that Senators who concurred in the action at that time will let it be known at this time that they meant exactly what they said.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Oregon, for a question.

Mr. MORSE. I am open-minded on the present issue. I am prepared to vote for the bill, provided there are sufficient restrictions imposed upon the President in the use of the powers to be conferred upon him. I think it is our duty to do that. So I ask the Senator from Indiana whether it is not true that the particular power which is proposed to be granted to the President for the 90-day period is a complete and blanket power? Is it not true that it would place no restriction upon the President's exercise of the discretion conferred upon him for the period of 90 days? The Senator says that the President may declare whatever exemptions he may see fit, and that he may impose any restrictions he may care to impose, with the limitation, as pointed out by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Connecticut, that it shall be subject to the power of the Congress to act within the 90-day period. That, I think, must be admitted.

But the point I am thinking of at this time in connection with the Senator's proposal is that in the field of price and wage control it would confer an unchecked and wide-open discretionary power upon the President to do whatever he may want to do, within the period of 90 days, without any requirement that he shall first submit his recommendations to the Congress for approval. If congressional approval were required, the Senator's proposal would be in line with the constitutional theory of checks upon the Executive, which the Senator knows I follow, in regard to this particular point of constitutional law. But the present proposal is to delegate an unchecked discretionary power upon the President.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Is not the answer to the Senator from Oregon that it is not proposed to give unlimited power to the President, but only to confer authority upon the President to do certain things within a period of 90 days, during which time it is clearly presumed that the Congress would convene and would deal with the situation? We are discussing the granting of authority for a period of 90 days to a man who has spent his life in the service of his country, and who is not going to exercise the power in a manner which would be at variance with his whole record in the matter of exercising power.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. My reply to the Senator from Connecticut is that it is impossible to escape the fact that during the 90-day period the President could perform a great many acts which could become binding, in the sense of becoming vested. Let us face this political reality. Once certain interests became vested, it would be found that the Congress had made it very difficult to deal with the situation itself, in view of the existence of what might be considered to be vested rights.

Economic groups and interests would claim that they had come to rely upon the President's policies and decisions and that for Congress to change them after the 90-day period would constitute changing the rules in the middle of the game.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. In the final analysis, Mr. President, does not this matter resolve itself into a question of whether we have confidence in the present President of the United States, and confidence also, in the present Vice President of the

United States? It might be that it would require a few days before the Congress could act. It took the Congress all summer, it took the Congress 2 months, July and August, in 1950, to act. Certainly I think we should have sufficient confidence in the Chief Executive and in the Vice President of the United States to permit them to receive this authority. The chances are about 1,000,000 to 1 that one or the other of them would be free to exercise the authority, and we know they would use common sense in exercising it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I may say our committee debated this question.

Mr. MORSE. I submit that we should be guided by the principle involved, rather than upon the basis of whether we have confidence in the President of the United States. On the latter basis, some of us most certainly could not vote to give the President any power because we do not have confidence in him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must advise the Senator from Indiana that his 5 minutes' time has expired. Does the Senator desire to yield himself 5 more minutes?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

The committee spent many weeks on this matter. Some of the members of the committee have been on the committee for a number of years. We felt it was our responsibility to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that price, wage, and rent controls would expire.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the whole purpose of the bill is to place wide open discretion in the President of the United States, but only in the event the Congress has been rendered impotent by the force of conditions and circumstances which we cannot foresee and over which we shall have no control? If the Congress is in session, or if it can be rapidly convened, is it not a fact that the Congress, under this bill, would have a complete right to cancel the discretionary powers given to the President, and that therefore no risk is involved? We are not yielding any principle, but we are recognizing, in view of the uncertainties and dangers of the present situation, which nobody can deny, that there should be placed in the hands of the Chief Executive of the United States the power to act, and to act promptly, not after a week, 2 weeks, or a month, but to act immediately to freeze prices and to prevent inflation?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from New York, of course, is correct. Let us lay the cards on the table. So far as the matter of principle is concerned Congress has violated it on a number of occasions. The question is, Does one believe that in time of grave emergency we need price, wage, and rent controls? If he does not think we need them in times of grave emergency, then he will vote against the committee proposal and for the Byrd amendment. If he feels that in time of grave emergency, when the United States Government is taking a huge percentage of our national production, that we must have price, rent, and wage controls, then he will vote for so-called title VIII.

I think that is the question, and every Senator has the right to make up his own mind. If a grave emergency should arise next October, and Congress, called into special session, would vote within 10 hours for a 90-day freeze, which I understand the opponents of the bill say they would do, what, then, is the difference in principle, whether it be done now or whether we wait until the emergency strikes? Personally, I shall not take the responsibility, as a United States Senator, so long as the Korean war is going on, of having no legislation on the statute books to protect the 160 million American people by price, wage, and rent controls in case of a grave emergency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, Congress has a right to pass a law, and Congress by a concurrent resolution can abolish any controls the President may have established. So, with me, it is a question of principle. It has been said that if there is a threat of war, Congress can meet within 24 hours. But it usually takes a much longer time to pass a law. Congress can act by concurrent resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The Chair must advise the Senator from Indiana that his additional 5 minutes' time has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield myself 1 more minute. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana has made very clear what the issue is and what are the differences among us. I would point out that the difference between giving a blanket directionary power to the President and retaining in the Congress in a time of emergency the right to prescribe what the restrictions shall be is the difference between Congress at that time approving or modifying proposed presidential restrictions when it has the facts before it, and giving now, far in advance of an emergency, blanket power without the facts before it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand the Senator would be more interested in detailed standby control than in a 90-day freeze.

Mr. MORSE. I am interested in requiring the President to come before the Congress and setting forth his program and obtaining approval from the Congress at that time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator realize that it would take days and possibly weeks to do it?

Mr. MORSE. Not if the basic assumption is correct that a grave emergency is existing. Congress will act very quickly under such circumstances.

Mr. CAPEHART. But it takes time to work out detailed legislation. It takes time to do these things. If we wait until the emergency hits, we do not have the time to frame proper legislation. In the meantime, we would be accelerating the very thing we want to control.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator missed my point. I shall vote for some kind of a bill for emergency controls, but in this bill there is no requirement that procedurally the President, before he issues an order, must obtain the approval of the Congress for it. He can have standby machinery in the meantime and get his recommendations ready, and he should have them ready when the emergency arises, and then get the approval of Congress for specific controls.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is a detail.

Mr. MORSE. It is a principle of great importance. It is the principle of exercising a constitutional check upon the danger of arbitrary discretionary, capricious power exercised by any President.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, it seems to me that we are losing sight of the fact that this is only a standby measure. It is primarily and basically proposed legislation which would place in the hands of the President, in the event of a grave national emergency, the power to freeze across the board the economy of the Nation. Why there should be so much concern about the provisions of the bill enabling the President to have such power is far beyond my comprehension.

I should like to invite the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that in the 81st Congress an emergency provision was enacted into law in the Civil Defense Act, which certainly provides broader powers than those which are specified by the terms of title VIII of this particular bill.

Let me read, if I may, the provisions which were enacted into law, without one dissenting voice being raised on the floor of the Senate, so far as I have been able to determine from the RECORD:

> The provisions of this title shall be operative only during the existence of a state of civil-defense emergency (referred to hereinafter in this title as "emergency"). The existence of such emergency may be proclaimed by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress if the President in such proclamation, or the Congress in such resolution, finds that an attack upon the United States has occurred or is anticipated and that the national safety therefor requires an invocation of the provisions of this title. Such emergency also shall exist with respect to any designated geographic area or areas of the United States when the President determines that any such attack has been made upon or is anticipated within such area or areas, and directs the Administrator to proceed pursuant to the provisions of this title with respect to such area or areas.

Mr. President, that is a pretty broad provision. Why was it enacted? Because, at the outbreak of the Korean conflict, we knew that an aggressor nation possessed atomic bombs and planes with which to carry them to strategic points. I am sure the distinguished

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Members of this body will recognize that we are not facing the situation which confronted us in World War I or World War II, when we could stand by and wait for conflicts to take place on other soil, and we could use our productive might and the might of our manpower in sending aid and help to those oppressed nations to meet the aggressor.

Today we are faced with a situation in which I am sure no aggressor nation will make the same mistake which was made twice, of permitting the productive power and the manpower of this Nation to be mobilized in sufficient force to put down an act of aggression elsewhere, but rather the strike will be made here at home to demoralize the people of this Nation suddenly and without warning.

That is the reason, Mr. President, for the broad powers granted by the Civil Defense Act. That is the only reason why the members of a Banking and Currency Committee, who, to a person, stood in defiance of the continuation of wage and price controls at the present time, believe that the economic welfare and safety of the United States can best be preserved in the grave situation which exists today, by placing the authority in the man who serves as the Chief Executive so that he may act rapidly and not delay in the event our economic well-being should suddenly be upset and there should be created a vicious spiral of inflation, bringing disaster to the economy of America.

I trust the Members of the Senate will give full credence to the importance of this proposed legislation and see to it that no further restrictions other than those embodied in Senate bill 1081 shall receive the approval of this body.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, certainly it is not for me to say what is good Republican doctrine, but it is very interesting to listen to the conflicting Republican doctrines being enunciated on the Senate floor today.

I thought the Republican Party stood against giving to any President unchecked discretionary power, even for an hour. I thought it was sound Republican philosophy to hold that Congress should exercise its power under the check and balance system of the Constitution, on the President of the United States, and, under the Corwin theory, require that he submit to Congress for confirmation and approval in advance his proposals for the exercise of extraordinary executive power.

My position on the bill is consistent with the position I have taken on the question of executive power for 8 years in the United States Senate. Time and time again I have pleaded that Congress keep a check on the President of the United States. That is why, in the Steel case, I took the position that on the day after the seizure the President ought to have come to Congress and obtained congressional approval of his action. In fact, I favored the President seeking congressional approval even before seizure. I take the position that we need some standby machinery for the preparation of this country for emergencies, but the President ought to get the approval of Congress before he put the machinery into operation at the time of an emergency.

It would be a very simple matter for the President of the United States to lay before Congress, on a day's notice, if he were properly prepared for the emergency, his proposals as to what restrictions on wages, prices, and credits he desired to impose. Let him present those proposals, and if the emergency is a serious one, he can count upon the Congress to act, and act quickly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not until I have finished.

Mr. President, the danger in this proposal is that we would give the President of the United States 90 days in which to act. If we give the President that authority, the argument on the floor of the Senate will be, "Let us see how things work out. Let us give the President a chance."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not at the moment. In that 90-day period, the President will by his decisions create such vested rights on the part of economic interests that, in my judgment, Congress will be handcuffed, so far as changing the action of the President is concerned.

If the Senate wishes to vote unchecked discretionary power to the President, let it do so but it is my position that he should be required to obtain congressional approval in advance of putting into operation any specific program of controls even for 90 days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. May I have 1 more minute, in order that I may answer a question which the Senator from Illinois desires to ask me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Let the program be worked out before the President is given the power. Let him get the machinery set up; then let him come to Congress with his recommendations, and Congress can act quickly.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to make it clear that I have yielded only 1 additional minute.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon if he has ever considered the possibility that there may not be a legally constituted Congress after a smash atomic attack which might wipe out the majority of the Members of the House and Senate?

Mr. MORSE. There may not be a legally elected President, or successor to the President, if we are to engage in that kind of speculative argument. We have to proceed on the assumption that our Government still will be standing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in answer to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], let me say that during my very short term in this very august body it has been my observation that an atomic bomb could be dropped on the Capitol at any time, and still a quorum could be gathered. [Laughter.]

I am glad the Senator from New York has brought up the question of principle, because I have contended, along with other Members of the minority, that that point has been entirely missed during the discussion in the committee and the debate on the floor. We are talking about a principle. We are talking about the principle of whether or not our free-enterprise system will work. Yes, it works beautifully, we say, in times of peace. It has given us the greatest economic strength in the history of the world. But let a little emergency arise, or let a war come, and repeatedly the Government begins to tamper with the machinery that has made us strong.

I think the principle involved is whether or not we, as a legislative body, should tamper with the free economy that has made this country great. Senators might ask me, In what way are we tampering? My answer is that if we enact section 801, we will hang over the head of the economy of the Nation a weight in the form of controls.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who is a businessman, knows that businessmen who anticipate trouble take steps to protect themselves against such a prospect.

What, I ask, is going to be the inception of an emergency? Is it going to be caused by the next man who inadvertently walks across the Russian line in East Germany? Will it be the next plane that wanders off its course and is shot down? No businessman in this country is going to know what will constitute an emergency.

Repeated testimony has been offered in the attempt to show that Congress can stop inflation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. BYRD. I yield another minute to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Congress can stop inflation. Let us stop mincing words about controlling prices, wages, and rents. Inflation is only the result.

If Congress has the courage to do so, it can stop inflation. I was almost dumbfounded the other day when 20 Members of the House and Senate asked the Government to give an impetus to inflation by requesting the Federal Reserve Board to peg prices up. It is that kind of activity in the Halls of Congress that has repeatedly increased the velocity of inflation. When we realize the symptoms, when we recognize that inflation can be controlled, then, Mr. President, we can stop inflation, and prevent the terrible things it does to the economy of our country. But let us not for political purposes say we are going to protect the people of the Nation by regulating wages, prices, and the other orderly processes of the economic system.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CAPEHART. Much has been said about giving the President unlimited

power, so that he can do the things indicated. The Senator from Arizona referred to the shooting down of an airplane. Let me read the language of the bill:

> The President is authorized and directed, whenever he shall find and declare that a grave national emergency exists and that the exercise of such authority is necessary in the interest of national security and economic stability.

If Senators have any confidence in the President of the United States, then they will vote, in my opinion, to give him this authority. If they do not have confidence in him, if they think he is the kind of man who will declare a grave emergency because a plane is shot down somewhere, they will vote against the bill.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is it not true that this power will exist for only 2 years?

Mr. CAPEHART. It is true that this power will exist for only 2 years, and the authority will be for only 90 days, if the President declares a grave national emergency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 3 minutes to the able Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN.]

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the remarks made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I think he misses the point. We are not trying to enact a bill which will affect the normal economy of the country. Of course, the Senator is right with regard to the procedure under a normal economy. This bill, however, would be applied only in time of threat of the gravest emergency man can conceive. If we did not believe there was a grave emergency, we would not be appropriating $45 billion, $50 billion, or $55 billion a year for defense purposes. The idea is to provide for action in a grave emergency, at a time when it is perfectly conceivable that Congress would not only be rendered impotent, but actually might not exist or when it might not be possible to call Congress together, because one well-placed bomb might wipe out the greater part of the Congress. Let me point out that Members of the other House cannot be replaced by appointment, as Members of the Senate can by appointment of the governors. In my own State of New York it takes a minimum of 30 days before a special election can be held. I was surprised to hear the distinguished majority leader give as one of the reasons why he is opposed to the bill the fact that the President of the United States would be placed under great pressures. That would imply that the distinguished majority leader would fear that the President would yield to pressures. If that is his fear, I do not share it. I voted against the present President of the United States, and I campaigned against him. But he is the President of the United States, and I have full confidence that in the event of an emergency, he will do his duty as President of the United States.

It seems strange and unusual that I should be defending the good faith, the strength, and the courage of the present President of the United States, while Senators who are members of his own party, including the majority leader, should be impugning those attributes. It is an astonishing and arresting situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think we are finished, if the able Senator from Virginia is. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	McCarthy
Barrett	Hayden	McClellan
Beall	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Bush	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Capehart	Hunt	Potter
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Case	Jackson	Robertson
Chavez	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kennedy	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Symington
Ferguson	Kuchel	Taft
Flanders	Langer	Thye
Frear	Lehman	Tobey
Fulbright	Long	Watkins
George	Magnuson	Welker
Gillette	Malone	Wiley
Goldwater	Mansfield	Williams
Gore	Martin	Young
Green	Maybank	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, No. 5–8–53–B, offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the committee substitute, as modified.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business. The Senator from Kentucky is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

I announce also that on this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Ferguson	McCarthy
Barrett	Frear	McClellan
Bennett	George	Millikin
Bricker	Goldwater	Morse
Bridges	Griswold	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	Potter
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Carlson	Hoey	Schoeppel
Case	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Cordon	Knowland	Taft
Daniel	Kuchel	Thye
Dirksen	Long	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Welker
Eastland	Martin	Williams

NAYS—41

Beall	Humphrey	Monroney
Bush	Hunt	Neely
Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Douglas	Jackson	Payne
Duff	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Flanders	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Kefauver	Smathers
Gillette	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Gore	Kilgore	Sparkman
Green	Langer	Symington
Hayden	Lehman	Tobey
Hennings	Magnuson	Wiley
Hill	Mansfield	Young
Holland	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—10

Anderson	Ellender	Russell
Butler, Nebr.	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Clements	McCarran	
Cooper	Murray	

So Mr. BYRD's amendment to the committee substitute, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer and ask to have stated a perfecting amendment which is made necessary by the amendment the Senate has just adopted. The amendment is offered to the committee substitute as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia to the committee substitute as amended will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee substitute as amended, at the bottom of page 24, in section 606, after the word "President" in the fourth line of that section, it is proposed to strike out "has found and declared under section 801 of this act that a grave national emergency exists and"; and before the semicolon in the seventh line of that section, to strike out the words "such section," and insert in lieu thereof "section 801 of this act."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in explanation of the amendment I now offer to the committee substitute as amended, let me say that section 801 as reported

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

provided that the temporary freeze should come into operation when the President finds and declares that a grave national emergency exists and that the exercise of the authority is necessary in the interest of national security and economic stability. My amendment to section 801 provides in effect that before the authority may be exercised under title VIII, the Congress must make such finding and declaration or the United States must have declared war against a foreign nation. My amendments to the new section 606 reported from the committee eliminate the reference to a finding and declaration by the President. That will make section 606 consistent with section 801. This is a perfecting and technical amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, we have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia to the committee substitute as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia to the committee substitute as amended.

The amendment to the committee substitute as amended was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, to the committee substitute as amended, I call up my amendment identified as "5-13-53-E."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee substitute as amended will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21 of the committee substitute as amended, it is proposed to strike out lines 5 to 10, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

(d) The term "national defense" means programs for military and atomic-energy production or construction, military assistance to any foreign nation and stockpiling.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as reported to the Senate, the committee amendment on page 21, in section 10, reads as follows:

(d) The term "national defense" means the operations and activities of the Armed Forces, the Atomic Energy Commission, or any other Government department or agency directly or indirectly and substantially concerned with the national defense, or operations or activities in connection with foreign economic or military assistance programs.

It is the purpose of my amendment to the committee substitute as amended to amend that provision, so as to define the term "national defense" to mean "programs for military and atomic-energy production or construction, military assistance to any foreign nation, and stockpiling."

Mr. President, at the time when I submitted the amendment, I presented some facts which are already in the RECORD, so I shall not repeat them at this time.

I wish to say, further, that the priorities and allocation powers in Senate bill 1081 are substantially the same as those of World War II. We have debated at considerable length standby powers for prices and wages. At the same time, we are currently granting much broader allocation and priorities powers than are necessary. These powers are not standby powers, but are a present grant of very broad powers to the Executive. If it is unsound to grant standby powers today, by the same token it is even more unsound to make a current grant of powers that are unnecessary today.

That the allocation and priority powers contained in Senate bill 1081 are substantially the same as those of World War II is evidenced by the following quotations:

World War II powers were granted as follows:

Whenever the President is satisfied that the fulfillment of requirements for the defense of the United States will result in a shortage in the supply of any material for defense or for private account or for export, the President may allocate such material in such manner and to such extent as he shall deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest and to promote the national defense.

Section 101 (b) of Senate bill 1081 reads in part:

The powers granted in this section shall not be used to control the general distribution of any material in the civilian market unless the President finds (1) that such material is a scarce and critical material essential to the national defense, or—

In effect, it was provided in both instances that where there is a shortage of a material, it may be allocated. While subsection (b) of section 101 in Senate bill 1081 may have been intended to impose a far greater limitation on the allocation powers, in fact it does not do so, but merely adds the requirement that the material be "scarce," which is similar to short supply.

It has always been contrary to the American concept of government for the legislature to grant powers to the Executive in excess of those actually required. It has always been contrary to the American way of life to impose controls of any kind where they are not needed. The President in his inaugural address expressed this concept very distinctly and clearly when he said:

But we are concerned with the encouragement of competitive enterprise and individual initiative precisely because we know them to be our Nation's abiding sources of strength.

Conditions have changed very markedly since June of 1950, and since the days of World War II. We are not in an all-out war, nor do we have the speculative psychology today that prevailed in 1950. In fact, we have stemmed the tide of inflation. A tremendous increase in the capacity of certain industries has occurred since 1950. At the same time military demands have, at least, reached a plateau, if they have not diminished. Today we only need give the military and AEC priority in their orders, so they are assured that their orders will be promptly filled. General control through complete allocation of materials is limited to a handful of materials, like nickel. Should the tail wag the dog? Should the shortage of nickel and a few other materials prompt us to make this very broad grant of life and death powers over our entire production?

The answer seems clearly to be "No." The amendment limiting the definition of "national defense" in a clear, concise, and simple manner limits the scope of the act to its proper proportions and those that are required today. This limited definition makes it clear beyond dispute or misinterpretation that no controls over our entire industry are intended. Allocations in the civilian economy are clearly limited to those very rare cases, like nickel. The administration receives the assistance for military and AEC procurement that it desires. We live up to our best American tradition and do not leave on our statute books a framework for socialism.

We also take care of one of the greatest weaknesses of any priorities system. Whenever we stop short of complete controls on any material, there are always groups who feel that they should receive a top priority. In 1951 it was these pressure groups that broke down the priorities system, and finally resulted in the adoption of the controlled materials plan. This was pointed out on the floor of the Senate on May 13. The limited definition would clearly prevent such an occurrence again.

Mr. President, the only purpose of the amendment is to define the term "national defense." The amendment proposes to define it as meaning the "programs for military and atomic energy production or construction, military assistance to any foreign nation, and stockpiling." That, of course, would include directly related activities. Therefore, it would clearly mean programs for military and atomic energy production or construction, military assistance to any foreign nation, and stockpiling, and directly related activities. I hope the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the able Senator from Michigan discussed this amendment with me yesterday, and we talked it over with the General Counsel for the Office of Defense Mobilization. The committee considered the language contained in the bill very carefully, and, if my memory serves me correctly, it was accepted by unanimous consent. Therefore I am not in a position to accept the amendment of the Senator from Michigan without a vote.

The language written into the bill by the committee gives the President of the United States the right to see that all Military Establishments receive all the material they need. If, in the opinion of the President, after they shall have received all they need, there is not sufficient to meet all civilian needs, he may allocate the remainder. We are met by the question which was raised by the able Senator from Michigan, as to whether we should provide for allocations to certain categories of industry not related to the military.

Under the amendment of the able Senator from Michigan, the President might be denied the right, for example, to allocate materials for the building of machinery with which to mine certain critical materials, or he might be denied the right to allocate materials for certain petroleum or oil production, or to allocate materials to any other indirect industry that might be deemed necessary

to the support of the Military Establishment.

There is not too much difference between what the able Senator from Michigan proposes and the language reported by the committee. But in talking with the general counsel of the Office of Defense Mobilization, I learn that he much prefers that we retain the language as it is.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator referred to the allocation of materials for the building of machinery with which to mine certain critical metals. That certainly would be directly related to the activities of the military. I should be glad to modify my amendment by adding to it the words, "and directly related activities." There could then be no question. The difficulty in employing the word "indirect" is that it would be opening the door to pressures for priorities, on the part of groups from every known and conceivable industry. What I think we should do is to limit the definition contained in the bill so that it may be perfectly clear to those administering the act, and so that they would not be subject to pressures. The purpose is to give priority in the matter of the national defense; and the bill clearly so indicates.

Mr. President, I ask that I be permitted to amend my amendment E, in line 3, by changing the period to a comma, and adding, after the word "stockpiling," the words "and directly related activities." I have always considered that to be within the meaning of the language of the amendment as drafted, but, in order to make it abundantly clear, I ask permission to modify my amendment in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan may modify his amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have a question which I should like to address both to the Senator from Michigan and to the Senator from Indiana, if I might have the courtesy of an answer from each of the Senators on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom is the time to be charged?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest that the time be divided equally.

Mr. FERGUSON. That will be satisfactory to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Both the committee provision and the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan include within their verbiage language relating to atomic production. I should like assurances from the Senator from Michigan as to whether there is anything in his amendment which could in the slightest degree be interpreted as authorizing the President, or any other authority, under any circumstances, to allocate or deliver atomic or fissionable materials, or equipment for their use, to any foreign government, or into the charge of any foreign government, at any time, under circumstances opposed to the present restrictions and provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

Mr. FERGUSON. I answer that question by saying it is neither the intent nor is it within the scope of the language to in any way whatever modify the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to permit the President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Or anybody else.

Mr. FERGUSON. Or anybody else, to deliver any of the material mentioned in the Senator's question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Or to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to do so?

Mr. FERGUSON. Or to authorize the Commission or anyone else to do so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would inquire of the Senator from Indiana what the amendment of the committee includes along that line.

Mr. CAPEHART. It certainly does not give the President authority, or more authority than he now has, with respect to atomic materials. It was not the intention of the committee to violate any law, or to give the President authority that he does not presently have, or in any way to broaden the scope of his authority. That was not the intention, under the wording of the bill. In the discussions in the committee no thought was given to that idea.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The burden of my inquiry is whether, either in the committee proposal or in the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, there is any thought or intention of modifying the existing prohibitions contained within the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, or to enlarge the power or authority of the President, or of any other public official, to make available to other nations any atomic materials, fissionable or otherwise, for the use of those nations.

Mr. CAPEHART. I assure the Senator there is no such intention.

Mr. FERGUSON. I repeat, it was neither the intent nor was it the meaning of the language employed in my amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] as amended. The clerk will state the amendment, as amended.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, it is proposed to strike out lines 5 to 10, inclusive, and in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

(d) The term "national defense" means programs for military and atomic energy production or construction, military assistance to any foreign nation and stockpiling, and directly related activities.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Indiana would allow me to ask him some questions, in order that we may clear up certain matters connected with the pending bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I call up an amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and myself, which is designated "5-12-53-C," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 24, line 5, after the period, to insert the following:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, (A) the ceiling level for any agricultural commodity shall be the higher of (i) the level specified in the foregoing provision, or (ii) the parity price for the commodity determined and adjusted for grade, location, and seasonal differentials by the Secretary of Agriculture, and (B) the ceiling level for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity shall be the higher of (i) the level specified in the foregoing provision, or (ii) such level as will reflect to producers of such agricultural commodity a price for such agricultural commodity equal to the ceiling level specified therefor in this sentence.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is chairman of the committee. Subsection (c) of section 701 provides for allocation of materials for "newly acquired operations." I should like to find out, for purposes of interpretation, because there is some doubt or ambiguity, the interpretation on the floor aids in the construction of the words, whether this means that the operation must be completely foreign to the normal course of business of an established manufacturer?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. It means any newly acquired operation in its broadest sense.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator mean, then, that a manufacturer who has been in the habit of purchasing certain component parts might elect to manufacture such component parts and be entitled to a fair and reasonable share of total authorized production with respect to such parts?

Mr. CAPEHART. That was the intention of the committee, and I think the language so states.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the term "newly acquired operations" apply to a new product?

Mr. CAPEHART. It certainly does.

Mr. FERGUSON. To constitute a new product, is it necessary that the product be of a completely new type to the manufacturer thereof?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would not think so. I should think any new operation or new product acquired either from the outside or within the plant would be included.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would a new series of automobiles produced by an automobile manufacturer in addition to and not in substitution for other series produced by the same manufacturer qualify as a "new product"?

Mr. CAPEHART. It certainly would.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would a deluxe or stripped-down line of automobiles introduced by a manufacturer which are basically the same in design, wheelbase,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

or performance, as other automobiles of the same manufacturer, constitute a "new product"?

Mr. CAPEHART. It might not. I question that very much.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator mean, then, for instance, that an automobile of substantially different wheelbase than other series manufactured by an automobile manufacturer would classify as a "new product"?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. Under the language and the intention of the committee such a line would so qualify.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would an automobile which represents merely a model change which historically and customarily takes place in the automobile industry constitute a "new product"?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think it is intended that a model change, without being a new model, would be included.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Indiana, and I wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota for yelding to me.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, it will take only a few minutes to explain the intent of the amendment Senator SCHOEPPEL and I have offered.

As I understand the pending bill, it would permit the President of the United States, or whoever he may designate, to freeze prices, at the time he issues his order, at whatever level prices happen to be at that time. If the provisions of this bill were put into effect at the present time, they would impose an injustice on producers of farm products. For example, at the present time the prices of industrial goods are at an all-time high. Wages, too, are at an all-time high, but the prices of agricultural commodities have been declining for approximately 5 years. At the present time they are considerably below what is deemed by the Federal Government to be fair prices.

I should like to quote the average prices of some of our major agricultural commodities as of April 15, 1953. The source of my figures is the United States Department of Agriculture. I read:

	Average farm price	Percent of parity
Wheat	$2.08 per bushel	85
Corn	$1.46 per bushel	82
Cotton	$0.31.45/100 per pound	92
Butterfat	$0.65.1/10 per pound	89
Beef cattle	$17.30 per hundredweight	82
Hogs	$20.70 per hundredweight	102
Chickens	$0.27½ per pound	89
Eggs	$0.45½ per dozen	110
Soybeans	$2.81 per bushel	101
Oats	$0.76.1/10 per bushel	86
Barley	$1.30 per bushel	96
Rye	$1.49 per bushel	88
Flaxseed	$2.57 per bushel	79
Apples	$3.29 per bushel	118
Oranges	$1.34 per box	41
Potatoes	$1.34 per bushel	82

Mr. President, it will be noted from those figures that agricultural prices are rather uneven at the present time, as is often the case. If, for example, prices were frozen at their present level, it would be up to the President of the United States, I suppose, to appoint a commission to establish prices, and it would probably take a long time to secure any adjustments. I think it would be most unfair to agriculture, and certainly detrimental to production in time of emergency, to freeze farm prices at the lowest level at which they have been in 5 years, and to freeze the prices of industrial goods and the wages of labor at the highest point at which they have been in their history.

I am wondering if the distinguished Senator from Indiana, who is a very good friend of agriculture, would accept this amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from North Dakota understands that under the 90-day freeze the President has a right to make extensions, and he certainly would not freeze agricultural products below parity when there is a law at the present time directing him to guarantee parity. I do not have any particular objection to the amendment. I may suggest, however, that we now seem to be facing the same kind of a situation we are likely to confront in the event of a national emergency. We are having a little example of how much time it takes to pass a control bill. It is very complex. The Senator is asking that we now write his amendment into the 90-day freeze provision. I have no objection, but I cannot accept the amendment because 12 of the 15 members of the committee directed me as chairman of the committee to report the bill as it is, which I did. I do not feel that I can accept the Senator's amendment. I am certainly in sympathy with it. I am just as certain as I am that I am standing here that if the bill becomes law and the President should, as a result of a grave national emergency, invoke the 90-day freeze, he will not freeze agricultural products below parity, because there is a parity law in existence at the present time providing for the Government's loading up to 90 percent. Furthermore, this measure is only for a 90-day period.

I am a great believer in 90 percent parity for the farmers, as the Senator knows. I think the prosperity of the Nation depends upon farm prosperity. I have always been a supporter of parity, and I shall continue to be a supporter of it.

The question now arises, in connection with all the amendments which are to be offered, Do we wish to write a detailed bill on the floor of the Senate, or are we interested, as I thought we were, and as I think we ought to be, in giving the President the right, in case of a grave national emergency, to freeze wages and prices for a short period of time, until Congress itself can decide what ought to be done? That is what our 90-day freeze feature does. That is exactly what title VIII does. It enables the President, in case of a grave national emergency, to hold the line until Congress can write detailed legislation if, in the opinion of Congress, it is advisable to do so. Congress might decide that no controls were needed. If they should so decide, the 90-day freeze would be off. It is simply a question whether the Senate wishes to begin writing detailed legislation into the 90-day freeze provision.

For all practical purposes, since the Byrd amendment has been agreed to, a declaration of war or a concurrent resolution by Congress would now be required to put the freeze into effect. At that time Congress, if it wished to do so, could declare a 90-day freeze. Or it could put it into effect by a concurrent resolution, which would be debatable, and likewise Congress could act upon what the able Senator from North Dakota is recommending.

I do not think the amendment would add much to the bill one way or the other. Personally I have no objection, but, as chairman of the committee, I cannot accept the amendment in the light of my instructions from the committee.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish I had as much faith in the Government as has my good friend, the Senator from Indiana. I am afraid that if the provisions of the pending bill were put into effect, notwithstanding that both political parties have promised farmers 100 percent of parity in the market place or otherwise, it might be many months before the farmers' ceiling prices were permitted to go up even to 100 percent of parity. I think this is a provision very similar to that which was in the previous act.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel very strongly that the administration and Congress, jointly, should decide exactly what should be done and should spell out what they intend shall be done in case of great national emergency in the future. We ought not to wait until an emergency strikes us and then argue afterward, and hold hearings for many weeks on literally thousands of thousands of subjects, while in the meantime, prices are going up, up, and up, and we are getting more and more inflation.

The problem is very complex. The Senate voted this afternoon that the 90-day freeze cannot become effective unless there shall be a declaration of war or a concurrent resolution of both Houses. It seems to me that, under those circumstances, when Congress is voting upon the concurrent resolution, or when it is voting upon a declaration of war, it can protect farm prices as they should be protected.

I agree with the able Senator from North Dakota that farm prices should be protected. The question is simply whether we wish to make such provision in this bill. I have no objection to having a vote upon the question. I think that in many respects the amendment is meaningless, now that the Senate has denied the President the right to pull the trigger, and has provided that Congress will take action either by concurrent resolution or by a declaration of war.

I do not see that much can be gained by amending title VIII one way or the other; in fact I do not see how anything can be gained, because, in my opinion, the amendment is largely ineffective and meaningless as it now stands.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I think I agree with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] with respect to the delays which will come about in trying to adjust prices or make decisions on prices, such as farm prices. Farm prices now are going down, as the Senator from Indiana knows. In many instances, they are below the cost of production, and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

farmers are in distress. There is no doubt about that. So it would seem to me to be unfair to farmers to have a freeze in prices come about, even after a declaration of war, without having in the law a provision which would give them immediate relief, or place them in a position whereby relief could be had immediately.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under the proposed act, the President would have a right and would have broad powers to adjust or exempt, and I am sure that he would act with careful discretion. Certainly he would not at the moment freeze farm prices below parity, when the law requires that he maintain parity by loans to the farmers on many of their products—not all of them, but many of them.

Mr. WATKINS. There is always a way to consume time in making adjustments. What we are complaining about is the adjusting period. There is always a way to delay that matter to a point where great damage could be done.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand the subject to which the Senator is now alluding. Let us pray that such a time will never come. But if a grave emergency shall arise, it will take many days of debate and hearings to provide proper controls, because it is a complex problem. I have been through such a situation twice. I know of the long hours and the many days and night that I worked on the problem. The matter of controlling prices and wages is not an easy one. The committee was very conscientious and sincere in their efforts. We have presented the whole problem to the Senate and to the people, giving them what we thought was our best judgment, based upon experience.

I suggest that it might be a better plan if the Senate were to vote upon the question whether or not Senators wish to place in the bill a provision directing the President that, should he freeze prices on agricultural products, he could not freeze them below parity.

Mr. WATKINS. I think that ought to be done, because such a provision would take the pressure off the President, and would put the policymaking power in the hands of Congress, where it should be. I think that is what should be done.

Mr. CAPEHART. I call attention to the fact that if we do that, engineers, barbers, beauticians, those of every other calling will come before Congress seeking exactly the same treatment. When they achieve that objective, we will end up with a detailed bill. I am certain that there is proper protection in the language of the bill, because I am sure the President would not, under any circumstances, freeze farm prices below parity, when he is required and mandated under the law to maintain parity. I simply cannot conceive of any President not having that much common horsesense. At least, he would have good business sense, and good business sense would dictate that he could not freeze prices below parity when the law mandates that he maintain prices at parity. I do not see how he could possibly act contrary to the law. That is why we should give the right to the President to make exemptions and adjustments. There is no question that flexibility is always needed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr YOUNG. I agree that the President is strong for the policy of having the farmer receive 100 percent of parity. That being his position, I see no objection to having the bill contain a provision that prices cannot be frozen below parity, or below what is deemed to be a fair price.

The Senator from Indiana referred to beauticians and barbers. I think that the prices of their services are at an all-time high, as are the wages of almost everyone else.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] to the committee substitute as amended.

The amendment to the substitute as amended was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "5–13–53–G," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 23, it is proposed to strike out the words "the levels" and in lieu thereof insert "those."

Mr. FERGUSON. This subject was debated on a previous occasion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have discussed this subject with other members of the committee, and we have no objection to accepting the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee substitute as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 11 of the committee substitute as amended, to strike out lines 5 through 6, inclusive.

This amendment has been discussed with other members of the committee. As we wrote the bill, section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, relating to the control of imports of fats and oils, was to be repealed when the bill became law. I do not think we intended to do that. What we intended to do was to permit it to expire on June 30. I am sure there is no objection to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, after line 4, in the committee substitute, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 4. Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana to the committee substitute as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee substitute as amended will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee substitute as amended, on page 8, it is proposed to strike out lines 23 through 25, inclusive, and on page 9 to strike out lines 1, 2, 3, and 4, as follows:

In spite of substantial increases which have occurred since the outbreak of the conflict in Korea prices are now generally in normal relationship and the economy as a whole is relatively stable. It is the sense of the Congress that this stability can be maintained by the full and effective use of indirect controls barring adverse international developments.

However, defense production now requires a limited.

And in lieu of line 4 to substitute "Defense production requires some."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, we have no objection to that amendment. We will accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the committee substitute as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designed "5–13–53–A" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the committee substitute as amended will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, beginning with line 9, it is proposed to strike out through line 4 on page 10.

On page 22, it is proposed to strike out lines 9 to 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) (1) Titles I, III, VI, and VII of this act, and all authority conferred thereunder, shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1955.

On page 23, beginning with line 7, it is proposed to strike out through line 2 on page 27.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, this amendment would strike out title VIII of the controls bill as reported by the committee and as now amended. Title VIII, of course, is the so-called freeze section of the bill. As amended in the committee and on the floor, it is no longer a freeze bill, but is in the position where it is about to be placed on the statute books as an unenforceable law. The President cannot exercise the authority granted until such time as the Congress adopts a concurrent joint resolution authorizing him to do so, or enacts a joint resolution declaring war.

Of course, Congress could pass title VIII as it is now written just as quickly as it could pass a resolution authorizing the President to put it into effect. It could likewise pass such a resolution just as rapidly as it could declare war. So the title as it is now amended is practically meaningless. It is a gesture. It is an assumption of something which does not exist. It is not a freeze. It is not a control. It is not an authorization to the President, and it is not an act of the Con-

gress putting into effect any freeze or any regulation of prices or wages.

Let us look at it in the light of our past experience. In the beginning the proponents of this provision seemed to think that if the Congress were to pass a freeze bill everything would be accomplished, prices would stop rising, and everyone would comply. The truth is that such a freeze bill would immediately close down all trading and throw our entire economy into utter chaos. As the majority leader [Mr. TAFT] stated a moment ago, such a law would freeze a great many inequities into our economy for the duration of the freeze, assuming that the law could be enforced. But unless we are in war, or unless there is a great surge of patriotism, or unless there is a fundamental reason and cause beyond the declaration of an emergency by the President of the United States the American people will not comply with a rule, regulation, or mandate from Washington without proper enforcement machinery.

Such a law would require more enforcement agents than we have ever had in the history of the country. It would require police in every community of the United States. In fact, I think we would pretty nearly have to call home the Army in order to enforce a freeze on the economy of the people of the United States, unless there were an underlying sentiment supporting it, which there is not at the present time, and which there will not be unless a dire emergency is recognized by the Congress, and the country is practically in an all-out war. So in the first place this provision would be unenforceable. It would raise many problems, legal and otherwise, which would be absolutely unnecessary and uncalled for. It would create confusion and be an encumbrance upon the administration of the law.

I have stated that at this time the American people are opposed to wage and price controls. That was perfectly apparent last fall in the campaign. It was one of the underlying causes for the tremendous support given to the Republican candidate for President. He appreciates that fully. When this subject was under consideration in the committee, the President sent word to the committee through administration witnesses that he did not desire this authority, that he did not ask for it, but that if the bill were passed, he would not veto it. That is consistent with his principle that the Congress is the policymaking body, and that if it enacts a law as a matter of principle he should not veto it in the absence of very fundamental reasons.

It has been said that machinery ought to be set up so that we shall be ready when the time comes to put into effect a control law. This provision would not do it. The bill does not set up the machinery for studying the price and wage situation. We shall be no more ready when Congress reconvenes than we are at the present time, and certainly not as ready as we shall be when these economic problems are really before us.

The testimony of Mr. Flemming, acting director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, was to the effect that that agency is constantly at work on this problem, planning and arranging to meet the crisis when and if it comes. That is the responsibility of the administration at the present time. This bill does not in any way add to or change that responsibility or relationship.

Something has been said to the effect that those who have confidence in the President will support title VIII and those who do not have confidence in the President will oppose it. That is not an issue in connection with the bill, in any way, shape, or form. I have confidence in the President. He has not asked for this authority. I have confidence that the principles of the Constitution are abiding principles in our jurisprudence. We have taken an oath to abide by the Constitution of the United States. Likewise, I have confidence in the ability of the Congress, when a crisis arises, to meet it. I do not believe in anticipating things. That is not the intent and purpose of the system of checks and balances. It is not the responsibility of Congress to try to guess what will happen in the years ahead. I know that in recent years there has been an attitude on the part of Congress—and perhaps also the courts—indicating a tendency to waver from the constitutional concepts as they have been established.

Mr. President, the constitutional question has not been raised in regard to this point. It seems to me that the Senate has passed it over without giving adequate consideration to it. Each one of us has the responsibility, as have our courts, in the first instance, to pass upon the question of whether a measure is constitutional. I admit there has been a change in attitude of the courts of the country within the past few years toward what is and what is not constitutional. We note that three judges of the Supreme Court in the steel seizure case varied widely with respect to what have been constitutional concepts of our jurisprudence, and in the interpretation of constitutional principles.

However, let me refer to a case which the Supreme Court decided a few years ago, in 1935. It is the case which is remembered popularly as the "sick chicken" case, the Schechter case. I wish to read from the opinion of the Supreme Court, as follows:

> To summarize and conclude upon this point: Section 3 of the Recovery Act is without precedent. It supplies no standards for any trade, industry, or activity. It does not undertake to prescribe rules of conduct to be applied to particular states of fact determined by appropriate administrative procedure. Instead of prescribing rules of conduct, it authorizes the making of codes to prescribe them. For that legislative undertaking, section 3 sets up no standards, aside from the statement of the general aims of rehabilitation, correction and expansion described in section 1. In view of the scope of that broad declaration, and of the nature of the few restrictions that are imposed, the discretion of the President in approving or prescribing codes, and thus enacting laws for the government of trade and industry throughout the country, is virtually unfettered. We think that the code-making authority thus conferred is an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power.

Yet, the rules and regulations and prescriptions for putting into effect those codes were explicit. There is no such prescription in the pending measure. It represents absolutely an uncontrolled delegation of power to the President, and is an abdication of power on the part of Congress to meet a situation when it arises. We are saying to the President in effect, "This is your responsibility."

We are the policymaking body, yet we refuse to take the responsibility, and are trying to shift it to someone else, in violation of the Constitution and of the principle of separation of powers, which have been so effective up to this time.

Many other cases could be cited, but I wish to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate because it is our primary responsibility, if we believe an act to be unconstitutional, to vote against it when it comes to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The Senator from Ohio has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRICKER. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; I first yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have listened to the Senator from Ohio with careful interest. The one unanswered question in my mind with respect to the constitutional point is this: In view of the adoption of the Byrd amendment, which the Senator from Ohio and I supported earlier today, is it not true that we have provided in the bill a congressional check on the discretionary power of the President, in that the President will have to submit to Congress any proposal which he may have for the imposition of restrictions on wages, prices, and credit, before he may put it into effect? Does not the Byrd amendment in and of itself supply us with the constitutional check which we need upon Presidential power?

Mr. BRICKER. My understanding of the Byrd amendment is not that it gives Congress power to check on the prescribed rules and regulations put into effect by the President, but provides only that the President cannot put such rules and regulations into effect until Congress, by joint resolution or concurrent resolution, brings the law into being.

Mr. MORSE. Is not that, in fact, however, the check on the imposition of any restrictions by the President regarding which the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Oregon are in complete agreement? So far as the Presidential powers are concerned, and so far as he can take action, we have a check on the discretionary power of the President. That is what I believe to be very important, as I have stated so many times, in line with the Corwin theory. In fact, it is the Corwin theory.

Mr. BRICKER. Any check which the Byrd amendment gives to Congress is as to the date and the time when the law shall become effective. I am speaking of a constitutional principle, namely, whether the bill as drafted is constitutional under the decision of the Supreme

Court in the Schechter case, because of its indefiniteness and because of the extreme grant of power to the President to determine policy.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, I do not wish to take the Senator's time, and I am still making up my mind on that point, but for the purpose of further discussion, as of this moment, in my judgment, the Byrd amendment answers the constitutional problem so far as checking the arbitrary power of the President is concerned.

Mr. BRICKER. It is effective only as to the date. It does not affect the principle.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as I begin my presentation, I may remind the Senator from Oregon that the Byrd amendment is in two parts. The first part refers to a declaration of war, and the second part relates to a concurrent resolution adopted by Congress. That is how I understand the Byrd amendment. The requirement that Congress must concur is involved only in case where there is no declaration of war, but if a war is declared the power is transferred automatically to the President. The important word is "or." The word is not "and." The provision reads: "Whenever the United States has declared war against a foreign nation, or whenever the Congress, by concurrent resolution."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the question of a declaration of war, of course, we get into many other fields with respect to the constitutional powers of the President, as, for example, what powers the President exercises as Commander in Chief. There we enter an entirely different field, which I could not possibly discuss in the short time now available. However, I am satisfied that the Byrd amendment solves the major problem which confronts us insofar as preventing the President from exercising arbitrary power without an adequate congressional check. Therefore, I feel that this Bricker amendment goes too far. It is, in fact, a proposal to destroy the bill itself.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, my objection to title VIII rests on the principle that it is presented to the Senate as a freeze. I am sure that many of my colleagues believe that if the title were in effect, all prices, wages, and rents would be frozen under the limitations provided in the title.

I suggest that Senators look carefully at the language on page 23, beginning on line 18. They will not find the words "all prices, wages, and commission," or the words "by or to all persons." Instead, they will find the words:

> The price, rental, commission, margin, rate, fee, charge, or allowance paid or received on the sale or delivery, or the purchase or receipt by or to any person—

And so forth. It reads "by or to any person."

Another interesting fact is developed by a careful reading of page 23. The only extent to which the freeze applies to rent is in the rental "for the use or occupancy of housing accommodations." There is no freeze for the rental of business properties. There is no power contained in the bill to freeze the rental of equipment.

I am in the automobile business. A pattern is developing in the retail automobile business to rent automobiles instead of selling them. Under the provisions of the pending bill, as I read them, the President could not prevent the rental of automobiles at any price a dealer wished to charge.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why does not the able Senator from Utah offer an amendment to provide what he has in mind instead of complaining about it?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah is opposed to the whole freeze principle and he is pointing out weaknesses in the pending measure, not trying to correct them.

Of course, the exception does not mean anything, because when we turn to section 801 (b) we find that the President has unlimited powers to make exemptions from, suspensions of, or adjustments to ceilings.

Therefore whatever he freezes on page 23 he has the power to unfreeze on page 24. He can maintain price ceilings on commodities and exempt all wages from ceilings, and he can maintain price ceilings on some commodities and exempt all others. To justify the use of the selective power all he has to do is to show that the maintenance of such ceilings would be impracticable "in order to effectuate the purposes of this title."

I am sure that there is not a businessman in the United States who could not make a pretty good case that it would be impracticable to impose ceilings on his line of merchandise.

Also, at the bottom of page 23 and at the top of page 24 we find spelled out the basis on which the President should set the ceilings.

Of course, under subsection (b) of section 801, again the President would have complete power to make any changes in ceilings he wished to make. Although under subsection (a) of section 801 it is suggested that the President would be limited to the prices which existed within the 30 days preceding the setting of the ceiling, under subsection (b) of section 801 the President would not be limited; he could set prices as high or as low as he wished to.

It may be said that the President would not do that, and I agree that certainly our President would not do it. It may be said that our President is different, and that he would not succumb to the pressures which inevitably would fall on him when those engaged in business realized he had the power to free them from the freeze.

But I say those who are concerned with and who wish to support and wish to express their love and respect for the President should not subject him to such pressures, because under this measure we would transfer to the President complete and arbitrary power to set ceilings on the prices of any articles and the wages of any person at his own pleasure, and to exempt any article and any wage he pleased to exempt, and to set the ceilings at any level at which he pleased to set them. On that basis, Mr. President, I do not think this measure is truly a freeze.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Utah has said the President could set the levels at any point he might wish to set them. Certainly, the Senator from Utah must know that is not accurate. The price determined upon by the President must correspond with the price during the representative period for 30 days before the freeze.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well. The President could set the price at such a point; but on the next day, under the provisions of the bill, the President could provide exemptions from suspensions of or adjustments to the ceilings. Under the words "adjustments to," I think it is fair to say the President could set the price at any level he pleased, regardless of the price he set on the day of the freeze.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Certainly if the President is limited in placing the order in the first place, there is no limit upon his authority under subsection (b), in respect to the making of exemptions.

Mr. BENNETT. Undoubtedly, that is so. The President would have complete power to make any exemptions he might wish to make, on the basis of his own determination, regardless of the careful language which was included in order to limit him to the prices existing 30 days before the freeze went into effect.

Mr. President, if this measure had been written as an airtight freeze, so there could be no adjustments, no exemptions, and no suspensions, it might command more respect. However, in my opinion this measure is merely a broad transfer of power and a broad transfer of trouble to the President of the United States.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to strike out title VIII.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, how much time remains to our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). The Senator from Ohio has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRICKER. I wonder whether the opposition cares to use any time at this point.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad to have the Senator from Ohio proceed now, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. BRICKER. Then, Mr. President, I yield the time remaining to me to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in the course of the debate frequent reference has been made to worry about the President. I am not worried about the President, but I am worried about the precedent we would establish by means of this measure.

The first precedent would be in connection with transferring some of the powers reposed by the Constitution in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Congress, and delegating them to the President of the United States, such as the power to inflict price, wage, and rent controls during a period which, before adoption of the Byrd amendment, was referred to in the bill as "a grave national emergency," with that term very loosely applied.

I should like to discuss very briefly some of the difficulties the President of the United States would encounter, were this measure to become the law of the land.

How could the President within 90 days accumulate the force necessary to attempt to establish price-, wage-, and rent-control ceilings? In that connection, I should like to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the remarks I made last week about the size of the force which would even approach the one which would be necessary in an effort to control prices. I submit to the Senate that neither of the forces I mentioned ever controlled either prices or wages, and very few rents, during the period when the controls were applied. In fact, we find that some of the greatest increases in the cost of living occurred during the time of controls and some of the greatest increases in wages occurred during the time when wages were supposed to be controlled.

The President would be confronted with a practically impossible task on the day when he said, "War is declared by the Congress, and I now invoke title VIII of Senate bill 1081, which freezes all wages, prices, and rents at a predetermined level." I may say that we have now, by adoption of the Young amendment, made certain exemptions in the case of livestock and agriculture, and I call that point to the attention of the Senator from Utah.

I quote now from the remarks I made in the Senate the other day:

> Early OPA planners envisioned a paid staff of 90,000. While it never reached this figure, it did approach a level of 64,000 persons in 1945, and of this total 4,000 were employed in the Washington office. Most of OPA employees were found in 9 regional offices, 94 district office, 4 Territorial offices, 288 defense rental area offices, and 5,556 war, price, and rationing boards.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me at this point?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Arizona agree that even with that tremendous bureaucracy, which was built upon a political basis, essentially, and was used for political purposes, the enforcement was lax, and the favoritism which existed was a disgrace to the country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I heartily agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

I may point out also the tremendous dollar cost to the Nation of a program of this sort. It cost $758 million merely to operate the OPA, and I may call attention to the fact that we have no idea of and no way of ascertaining the billions and billions of dollars which were put into the inflationary streams by the black market which was caused by the OPA.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. I believe the Senator from Arizona means the OPS, instead of the OPA.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I mean both of them. Seven hundred and fifty-eight million dollars was only the cost of the OPA.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Arizona have the figures in regard to the OPS? I know that in my State alone, the annual payroll for the OPS was $2,500,000.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is hard to believe, in the case of a State the size of Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Nevertheless, that is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to learn those figures.

Mr. President, I continue reading from the remarks I made last Tuesday in addressing the Senate:

> The figures do not take into account the many thousands of volunteers who assisted during this program. Likewise, the Office of Price Stabilization mushroomed into a gigantic bureaucracy. By October of 1951 the number of OPS employees had passed 11,000. Of this total, 2,410 were in Washington, and 8,839 in 14 regional offices, and 91 district offices. The administration's price-control plans included 19,000 permanent positions in the OPS for the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. President, how can anyone conceive that the President of the United States would start from scratch and in 90 days would build a bureaucracy of 90,000 persons?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. On the same point, can the Senator from Arizona conceive that it would be possible for the President to obtain the basic lists of prices on which he would make decisions as to whether the price which would be frozen would be the price existing on the day before the freeze or the price existing at an earlier time? Can the Senator from Arizona believe it would be possible for the President to obtain such lists within the 90-day period?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, the President could not do so. I have only to call on the memory of the distinguished Senator from Utah as a businessman and my own memory, having lived through an insufferable period of OPS, to point out that in my particular small business I have 18,000 separate items. There are literally hundreds and hundreds of thousands of items in the various businesses of the country, for which the President within 90 days would have to get the basic price structures.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Furthermore, how could the President within 90 days suddenly control the supply? He could not control the demand, because he could not stop it.

We have not yet discussed, as I said earlier today, the basic problem which we should be discussing, which is the control of inflation, for when we can control inflation and can control the money people have in their pockets, then we are making an approach to the ultimate solution of this problem.

I would also call attention to the fact that the eminent Mr. Baruch in his remarks before the committee admitted that without a complete and solid freeze clear across the board, with no exemptions, we would be faced with the problem of rationing. But at no point in section 801 do we find provision for the President to have the power to ration. Under the provisions of section 801, as it is written, to begin with it could not work with the exemption provisions included. To imagine that it could work without rationing, would constitute a wild type of dreaming.

Mr. President, I do not feel that we should criticize the pending measure without making suggestions, and I am going to repeat a suggestion which has been made by the minority group time and time again, namely, that we act on the original thoughts presented by Secretary of Commerce Weeks during his presentation before the committee, when he said that the Department of Commerce was ready, willing, and able to undertake a continuing study of the questions involved, so that, should the time ever come when, in the judgment of the Congress, the Nation needed price and wage controls, it could call upon the Secretary of Commerce and say, "Mr. Secretary, what is your latest study on this subject?" Whereupon he would reach up on the bookshelf, and would pull out the latest book his staff had completed, with everything set forth in it that needed to be done by the Congress which could then proceed to enact an appropriate law. I feel that if we followed that course, we would have come to a time when, as a practical matter, we admitted that our great economic system was so weak that there would have to be dependence upon Government intervention again. The Lord knows I hope that time never comes, but I feel in that way the situation could be met without infringing upon the Constitution, and without impairing the great economic strength of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. I shall then yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, my interest in the pending measure and in the particular amendment now pending results from my experience as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee during the period which preceded the outbreak of the Korean war.

First let me say a word with regard to the control of prices by mandatory means, of which, like the junior Senator from Arizona, I am a convinced supporter. However, in regard to its application to such a wartime buying surge as we had in July of 1950, let me say that it can only operate by practically

stopping production; and what was needed at that time was not a decrease of production, but an expansion. Mandatory control is not adapted to emergency periods. It is the proper reliance for day-to-day price control. What we did was to spend some months conducting hearings and determining the method of price control. It is my recollection that we finally passed the bill in October 1950. That law remained unattended to, unused, neglected, for 3 long months, and during that time our economy went wild.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Vermont remember that for 4 years previous to that the President of the United States had asked for a series of controls—price, wage, and rent controls?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Then, when the Korean war broke out, he sent Keyserling to Congress to say that price, wage, and rent controls were not wanted, and were not needed. Congress gave authority for such controls, but the administration would not put them into effect. Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. FLANDERS. That, I believe, is in the record. So the President allowed our economy to run wild for at least 3 months. Then, when he applied controls, he applied them to prices only, allowing wages to run wild. That was most unwise and most disastrous.

My interest in the pending measure has been the possibility of putting a freeze into effect on short notice when an emergency arises, and continuing it long enough to give the Congress time to pass necessary legislation. My interest in that has resulted from the experience we had during the period in 1950 to which I have referred. I have been sorry to see included in the bill paragraph (b) of title VIII, which gives so much latitude to the President, whoever he may be, to have a practically uncontrolled power over prices, instead of what I had hoped for, namely, a simple freeze.

Because of my interest in the proper kind of freeze, I shall vote against the first amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I shall vote for his second amendment, which eliminates paragraph (b) of title VIII. I may also say that I was sorry to see my good friend, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], succeed in obtaining the adoption of his amendment, which really requires that Congress be convened to declare war. It is a limitation upon what I conceive to be the necessity for the sudden, complete application of a freeze before the existing moving balance of prices, wages, and production has been disturbed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the able Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. First, Mr. President, addressing myself to the particular amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, I precede my remarks by paying a tribute, which I believe is rightfully deserved, to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the senior Senator from the State of Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. Certainly, as we sat through the committee hearings, no person could have been a greater champion of the free-enterprise system or more zealous in his efforts to protect that system and to assure its operation under all normal conditions than was the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana. Day after day, as he sat with other members of the committee, listening patiently to literally hundreds of witnesses from all over the country, who set forth their views on the matter which is now under consideration, he opposed, down the line, any standby control authority, but recognized that, in the event of a grave national emergency, when a great amount of our production might be taken for defense needs, then, and only then, should there be some type of freeze upon our economy for the purpose of affording relief to the average citizen against an inflationary spiral which such conditions always create.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator from Maine is very glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. The determination of what may constitute a grave national emergency is wholly in the hands of the President. There is no appeal from his decision. The Congress has no check on it. The President may make this provision effective at any time when he believes an emergency requires it.

Mr. PAYNE. If that be true, I wonder whether the junior Senator from Ohio would state whether similar authority was not granted under the Civil Defense Act, which was enacted by the 81st Congress, and which gave broader powers to the President than those which are under discussion at this time.

Mr. BRICKER. It did not give broader powers. There were restrictions and limitations, and the rules were laid down much more explicitly than in the pending bill. This represents an absolute grant of power to the President to determine the time when the power shall become effective. The Senator realizes we are living in an emergency, created by the former President, and that the declaration of an emergency has not been revoked during the present administration. I do not know that this very provision could not be put into effect tomorrow, if the President should decide to do so, with or without declaring the existence of an emergency, because we are already in an Executive-declared emergency situation.

Furthermore, the bill grants unlimited authority to the President to place into effect a freeze and make any exceptions, restrictions, or exemptions he may care to make. This bill has been sold as a freeze bill, when it is not anything of the kind. It simply gives the President authority, without setting up any machinery to carry out its provisions.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I think it can be agreed that title VIII of this measure would, in effect, be null and void, anyway, as to any real effect in the event of any great national emergency happening suddenly.

I should like to read for the benefit of the Members of the Senate a statement which was made by M. K. M. Murphy, of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I am sure everyone will recognize that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is a rather conservative organization which has been rather restrictive in support of measures of the type which we are discussing:

> The chamber of commerce is unalterably opposed to wage, price, and rent controls, as well as standby controls. However, we do recognize that the present state of world conditions is such that there exists the possibility of serious and rapid adverse international developments which might threaten the national security of the United States. In the case of such international emergency or catastrophe, and remembering the wave of fear and psychological reaction that swept the country in the summer and fall of 1950, rapid action to prevent a cumulative spiraling of wages, prices, and rents may be necessary. It is recognized that the Congress must have time to consider, draft, and enact legislation in case of such an emergency.
>
> In view of this situation, the board of directors of the chamber of commerce adopted the following emergency policy declaration at its meeting last week:
>
> "The chamber reaffirms its position that wage, price, and rent controls are unnecessary and harmful except in case of imminent threat to the national security from a foreign source. Because of the desirability of restraining a rapid cumulative wage-price-rent spiral in such cases, the chamber favors the enactment of legislation authorizing a simultaneous freeze of wages, prices, and rents which may be invoked for a period of not more than 90 days by the President when Congress declares a state of war or the President or Congress declares a national emergency arising from a foreign source. Such legislation should expire no later than April 30, 1955."

Mr. President, let me read a few remarks from a gentleman who probably does not have too many more years to live on this earth, a man who is devoted to America, to the cause of the free-enterprise system, and to the welfare of our people. I read from the statement of a great American, Bernard Baruch:

> We face a simple issue. Are we to take the elementary precaution of writing into law now what we know would have to be done in event of emergency?
>
> The pattern of any mobilization is set by the very first decision. When war breaks or seems imminent, the normal workings of supply and demand suddenly go haywire. Speculators and hoarders rush in to corner materials they believe will be scarce. Prices skyrocket. It is not long before the economy is out of control.
>
> One of two general courses of action is possible. The wise course is to act promptly before the economy is out of hand, to preserve as far as possible the equilibrium that existed prior to the emergency.
>
> That is the sound course of action. The other course is to wait and fiddle until the economy is out of control. Only then do you act. Your whole mobilization then becomes a wild chase of a dog after his own tail. You then have to chase the disruptions caused by the Government's failure to act in time in a frantic effort to recover the equilibrium which should never have been lost.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The choice, in short, is between acting before serious harm is done and waiting until you are deep in trouble before acting. One course locks the stable door promptly. The other deliberately keeps the stable door open until the horse is stolen.

To wait and fiddle is wrong morally as well as economically. When you invoke an across-the-economy ceiling at the outset of the emergency, your mobilization is set up on a sound moral base. Your very first action obviously treats all segments of the economy alike. None can claim that special favoritism is being shown to business or to labor or to agriculture or to any special interest.

In contrast, under the wait-and-fiddle approach, you begin your mobilization by destroying your moral base. In letting the economy get out of hand before acting, you unavoidably permit some groups special advantage over others. Each segment of the economy is given a grievance with which to justify its own inflationary demands.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. PAYNE. If the Senator will wait a moment I shall be glad to yield, but I wish first to read two additional paragraphs:

The overall ceiling, being based upon the economic relationships that prevailed before the emergency, enables you to establish the principle that none shall profiteer from the emergency. If you allow that balance to be disrupted, you lose the moral ground for enforcing this principle. You are left with no standard but expediency with which to resist the clamorous demands of pressure groups.

In brief, the policy of wait and fiddle has the effect of inviting every group to exploit the national peril for its own selfish advantage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maine has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield more time. I yield 3 more minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. I shall be glad, then, to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I share the regard for Bernard Baruch expressed by the Senator from Maine, and I should like to quote a further statement of Mr. Baruch:

Put a freeze on, a solid across-the-board freeze.

Paragraph (b) of section 801 provides:

The President may provide exemptions from, suspensions of, or adjustments to ceilings—

And so forth. Does the Senator feel that that is an across-the-board freeze, a solid freeze, such as the eminent Mr. Bernard Baruch asked us to provide?

Mr. PAYNE. I am definitely for a freeze across the board. I do not maintain that that particular provision does establish, necessarily, a freeze across the board, because it leaves a loophole open. There will be an amendment before the Senate which would eliminate that provision, and I can assure the Senator that I, as the junior Senator from Maine, will support that amendment if it comes before us.

The meat of title VIII has been destroyed with regard to placing any effective freeze on the American economy in the event of a national emergency occurring, so that the measure, as it presently stands, is nothing but a few idle words holding out hope to the American people who look for guidance and support in controlling prices and for action against spiraling inflation which will take place in the event of a grave emergency which all of us hope will never occur.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the junior Senator from Maine.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, this is one debate or one proposal as to which I hope it will never be proved that I was right, because I hope there will never be a grave national emergency making it necessary for us to have controls.

We who support the pending bill are just as patriotic as those who oppose it. We believe in the private-enterprise system just as much as do those who are opposed to the bill. We are not Socialists. I will tell the Senate what we are. We are a group of men who believe that so long as a war is in progress in Korea; so long as Congress is asking the American people to submit to taxation to such a point that we are spending about $60 billion a year for national defense; so long as 500,000 American boys are serving in Korea—and possibly some of them have been killed or wounded since I began speaking 3 minutes ago—there ought to be some legislation on this subject.

Mr. President, I do not mind stating that I am disappointed in the Republican Party, because we are not accepting the responsibility that is ours. The responsibility of conducting the Government is our responsibility now, because we have a Republican President, and we control both Houses of Congress.

We are saying to the American people, "If a grave national emergency strikes next month or next October, we do not have the good, common horsesense and judgment now to decide what should be done in the event of that emergency."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would rather not yield, because I am limited as to time.

I have heard so much misrepresentation on the floor of the Senate today in respect to this bill that I thought possibly I would not become aroused by any amendment that might be offered. All we are trying to do in this instance is to get Congress to recognize its responsibility. I am disappointed in the Republican Party. We seem to take the attitude, and the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] also takes the attitude, that a war is not in progress. We are at war today, and either we are going to win that war, or we shall have to get some kind of truce. It will have to be one or the other.

The Congress, through its Republican leadership, tells the American people that we must spend billions upon billions of dollars for war and for defense, and must maintain 500,000 men in Korea, some of them will be killed every day; yet we seem to take the position that we are more interested in material goods, if you please, than we are in the fight in Korea.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. That is positively an unfair statement. There is no one more interested in ending the war and in saving lives than is the junior Senator from Ohio, who has presented this amendment. I am interested in keeping our economy strong. Why have we become a great Nation? It is because we have been freer than any other nation in the history of the world. That is the reason why we have strengthened our economy. That is the reason why we have been able to send $40 billion to Europe since the end of World War II. Our controls over wages and prices are inconsistent with our present economy. Prices are today falling. The Senator from Indiana knows that to be so. No one is trying to keep an Army in Korea indefinitely. The Senator knows that to be true.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that our economy has been free because of our private-enterprise system, but the Senator from Ohio again wants to stick his head into the sand and completely ignore the fact that we have been at war for many years, and that we have had controls. During the time we have had those controls, we have had the greatest production, the highest incomes, and the largest profits in the history of the Nation.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think I wish to yield any further. In a moment I will yield some of my time to the able Senator from Ohio.

My point is that we are not accepting our responsibility. I am perfectly willing to accept the decision. I might say we may as well vote for the amendment of the able Senator from Ohio to strike out title VIII, because since we have agreed to the Byrd amendment, which requires a declaration of war or a concurrent resolution, Congress can, when it takes such action, just as well pass a 90-day freeze law, if it wishes to do so, as it can today. There is no question about that.

I apologize if my remarks have become a little heated, but I do not believe the Republican Party is accepting its responsibility. I do not believe that we have as yet realized that we are in control of the Government. It is our responsibility. Again I say, how anyone can push his head into the sand completely, 100 percent, and ignore the fact that we are at war in Korea, is something I simply cannot understand. We are at war in Korea.

All the committee has tried to do in this instance has been to say that so long as we are at war in Korea, with the danger of a grave national emergency, meaning stepped-up war or perhaps all-out war, we ought to give some thought to the subject of control; we ought to pass some legislation; we ought to know what we will do in any emergency that may arise, and how we will do it.

If the country gets into a big war, in which the military will take a larger percentage of our national production, leaving a smaller percentage for civilian consumption or civilian use, how will we handle that situation?

A moment ago I listened to an able Senator on my side of the aisle ask how the President would be able to control 90,000 prices, how he would be able to recruit 90,000 people, how he would be

able to do all these things in 90 days. In the first place, the Senator knows that the bill does not require the President to do those things, but the Senator was making the best argument in the world for the contention that we ought to decide what we will do and how we will do it and should provide some sort of small organization to proceed immediately in case such an emergency occurs.

There is not a Senator who will not admit that if we got into world war III, into a big, all-out war, in which the Government would take the great percentage of many strategic and critical materials, we would have to have price, wage, and rent controls. Senators know that such controls would be necessary. We know we would have to have them. We know there is that possibility. If there is not that possibility, then let us quit kidding the American people by taxing them to death and sending their boys all around the world and preparing for war. We are wrong on either one point or the other.

Why is there a desire anywhere to leave unsettled the matter of price and rent controls, inflation, if you please? Why should we not be anxious to protect the American people in case of an inflationary spiral? Why not protect 160 million Americans? Why not prepare now for an emergency? Why should we not set up some kind of organization, when we know that if an emergency strikes, we shall have to have some such an instrument?

I do not particularly blame Senators on the other side of the aisle. They had the responsibility of running the Government for 20 years. We have that responsibility today. It is the responsibility of President Eisenhower and of the Republicans of both Houses of Congress. It is not the responsibility of Senators on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. President, I say that we are not living up to our responsibility. I say we are sticking our heads into the sand. Some Senators are not willing even to admit that the country is at war in Korea. They are not willing even to admit that an emergency exists today. When we are at war, as we have been at war for almost 3 years; when we have lost 140,000 men in casualties; when we are spending between $50 and $60 billion we are at war. Why does anyone attempt to deny that fact? Why should anyone tell us that we are not at war? Why do we refuse to handle this end of our economy? Why do we act as we are acting?

I am discussing the problem only because, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which handles legislation like that now proposed, I feel it is my responsibility to do so. I feel it is my duty to call it to the attention of my own party, to the attention of the Senate, of Congress, and of the American people. I will not hide my head in the sand. I will not stand on the floor of the Senate and take the position that we are not at war today when we are.

The able majority leader [Mr. TAFT] said today that we who are advocating this measure are Socialists, leaving the impression that we have some ulterior motive. I will place my Americanism, my patriotism, my anticommunism, my antisocialism, against his or that of any other American. I will place my love for the private enterprise system against that of any other American. But I am interested in the welfare of all the people of America, not merely the 40,000 business units. I am interested in housewives. I am interested in soldiers. I am interested in everyone.

We Republicans who have the responsibility have everything to gain and nothing to lose by reaching a decision now, and establishing a small organization to cope with an emergency if and when it arises. Then we can get down on our knees every night and pray that the emergency will never arise. If it never occurs, nothing will ever happen under the terms of the bill. If some great crisis arises, we shall know what to do and when to do it.

I was hopeful that we would be able to say to the American people that we who are operating the Government and have the responsibility at the moment would not do what the opposition did during the last three wars. They sat around and fiddled until inflation got away from them and prices went up and up. I was hopeful that we could say to the American people that we know how to handle these problems, that we intend to control the situation from the very first hour of the national emergency, and that we will not allow prices to go up and up and up, resulting in additional expense of many billions of dollars to the American taxpayer because of purchases made by the Government.

I had hoped that we could say to the American people that we intend to benefit from the mistakes and the experience in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, and that we will do this job as it ought to be done. I cannot understand how anyone can be opposed to planning for the future. I cannot understand why we hesitate to give certain necessary powers to the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to the committee substitute as amended.

Mr. BRICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—26

Bennett	Ellender	McCarthy
Bricker	Ferguson	Millikin
Bridges	Goldwater	Potter
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Carlson	Jenner	Taft
Cordon	Knowland	Watkins
Dirksen	Kuchel	Welker
Dworshak	Malone	Williams
Eastland	Martin	

NAYS—61

Aiken	Hendrickson	Monroney
Anderson	Hennings	Morse
Barrett	Hill	Mundt
Beall	Hoey	Neely
Bush	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Capehart	Hunt	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kefauver	Sparkman
Flanders	Kennedy	Stennis
Frear	Langer	Symington
Fulbright	Lehman	Thye
George	Long	Tobey
Gillette	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Mansfield	Young
Griswold	Maybank	
Hayden	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—9

Butler, Nebr.	Kerr	Murray
Clements	Kilgore	Russell
Gore	McCarran	Smith, N. C.

So Mr. BRICKER's amendment to the committee substitute, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 5-13-53-B.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 24, it is proposed to strike out lines 11 through 19, inclusive.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment is to make it a real freeze bill, not a standby-control bill. Paragraph (b), on page 24, reads:

> (b) The President may provide exemptions from, suspensions of, or adjustments to, ceilings in the case of any materials or services or transactions therein, or types of employment, or housing accommodations of any class or in any area, if he finds that (1) such exemption, suspension, or adjustment is necessary for national defense, or (2) the imposition or maintenance of such ceilings would be impracticable or unnecessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this title.

Mr. President, the bill was sold to the committee, and, insofar as it has been sold to Congress, on the basis that it was a freeze bill which would hold the status quo if war should come or if a dire emergency should strike this country.

It was not contended in any way, shape, or form that the President is more qualified to pass upon exemptions or setup price controls than is the Congress.

No organization is created by the bill to give the President the machinery with

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

which to carry out either the original purpose of the bill, which is a freeze, or to determine whether exemptions or qualifications or restrictions are essential or necessary, or how they shall be given force and effect.

No organization, power, or appropriation is provided to carry out the purpose of the bill.

Mr. President, we sat for many weeks in the Committee on Banking and Currency, listening to group from agriculture. We considered the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], which was adopted, under which amendment the power of the President, even under the term of the pending bill, over the prices of livestock and agricultural products would be restricted in relation to parity prices. We listened to the farmers, to the cattle growers, to the cattle buyers, and to the cattle sellers for many weeks, as to whether there should be a rollback, whether they should be exempted, and whether the parity price ceiling should be taken off.

We listened to the barbers and to the beauticians, to the retail grocers on the Herlong amendment, and to the manufacturers on the Capehart amendment to the original act. It took us many weeks to determine whether the bill could be practically applied and honestly and fairly administered as between various groups in our economy.

We spent many weeks considering regulation X and regulation W. We listended to the automobile dealers, and we listened to merchants who had radios and television sets piling up in their warehouses, which they could not sell because of certain restrictions.

We even sent a representative of our committee to the Federal Reserve Board to discuss with them the question of whether there ought to be a loosening up of regulation W so far as radio and television was concerned. We got no action from them.

The protests became so loud and so strong that our committee responded to them in behalf of the economy of this segment of industry by taking off regulation X. We modified it insofar as automobiles, radios, and televisions were concerned. That is policy making. That is a part of the responsibility of the Congress. It is not a power which should be given to the President, without any control, limitation, or restriction, as would be the case under this bill.

So the bill was sold as a "freeze" to the people of the United States—if it has been sold; actually, I doubt that it has been. In any event, it has been supported by the membership of the committee and by the Congress because it was spoken of as a "freeze" bill, as a bill to give the President the power to stop the economy in its tracks, to prevent inflation, to prevent price spirals, and to provide the necessary regulation of the economy.

However, the bill does nothing of the kind, Mr. President. It is a complete control bill, with absolutely unlimited, unrestricted, and untrammeled power on the part of the President, not to freeze prices, but to make all sorts of exemptions, rules, and regulations for the control of the entire economy of the United States—prices, wages, and everything else concerned—from the manufacturer, clear down to the consumer.

Under the bill we would not give to the President any instrumentality by which he could proceed to act; we would not give him any employees to put such an arrangement into effect. We would not provide any machinery by which the President could exercise that vast power—the greatest over our economy ever given to a President of our country in time of peace or in time of war.

So, Mr. President, if we intend to make the bill mean what it was intended to mean from the beginning, in connection with what Mr. Baruch testified before our committee that we need, and what I voted some 4 years ago to put into effect, until Congress can determine the kind of controls that should be had, then we must strike out subsection (b) of section 801 of title VIII, which gives the President unlimited power to impose rules and regulations and to modify the freeze at any time he wishes within the 90 days. Under that subsection the President can make any exemptions he desires to make or can impose any kind of rules and regulations he may wish to impose.

As I said at the beginning, with such control, administration, regulation, and power exercised over the American people, it would take more public employees than we have at the present time for the national and local governments, and also including the membership of the Armed Forces, in order to provide the necessary enforcement personnel. We know that similar experience was had under OPA and OPS, when complete machinery was set up throughout the Nation.

There would be no chance to impose controls of that sort. There might be a semblance of a chance to hew to the line if there were a freeze throughout the country and if we were to make it possible for a freeze to be imposed straight across the board until the Congress could look into the equities of the matter, as we have already tried to provide in the case of livestock and agricultural products, until Congress could see whether prices, wages, and rents could be controlled, and, if so, what kind of machinery would be proper for that purpose.

Mr. President, I do not know whether any other Senator wishes to speak at this time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Assuming that Congress passes the bill without including the amendment the Senator from Ohio now proposes, would not the bill then place the President in an extremely embarrassing position and under tremendous pressures from various groups? Would not that be the case if the language the Senator from Ohio now proposes to strike from the bill were left in it?

In other words, would not the President's problem be very much simplified if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio were adopted? In that event, the President would not use this power, except under the gravest circumstances. So would it not simplify the President's responsibility, if the amendment of the Senator from Ohio were adopted?

Mr. BRICKER. There is no question of that.

Mr. BUSH. Would not the Senator from Ohio agree that adoption of his amendment would save the President from tremendous embarrassment within the 90-day period?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes. If the President were to be given this extraordinary power, certainly he should not be confused and harassed by having to make qualifications regarding the exercise of the power.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Ohio believes there should be no exemptions, does he?

Mr. BRICKER. There should be no exemptions or exceptions of any kind or character. If exemptions are to be made, it is the duty of the Congress to establish the policy in the case of such exemptions.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President——

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and then I shall yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a few moments ago I referred to our experience with controls following the invasion of South Korea by the North Koreans. My own views of that experience led me to oppose the first amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. However, the same considerations lead me to suport his proposal to eliminate subsection (b) of section 801 of title VIII.

The only thing we can properly propose by means of this control bill is a sudden and complete freeze of prices, wages, and rents. We have already diminished the efficacy of the proposal, in that the bill has been made worse by means of the adoption of amendments proposed by some of the best Members of the Senate. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has made it necessary to wait until Congress is in session, in the case of an emergency; and he has thereby made it difficult to have the necessary sudden imposition of the freeze.

The junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has introduced various complications with regard to the prices of agricultural commodities, which again has removed from the application of a sudden freeze a very large variety of agricultural products indeed.

Now there is inherent in the bill itself, in subsection (b) of section 801 of title VIII, something which falsifies the notion of a sudden and tight freeze.

Mr. President, the only procedure that is useful in connection with proposed legislation of the kind now before us is a sudden freeze—bang. Whether we shall get from the bill anything that is useful for an emergency depends on whether we eliminate subsection (b) of section 801 of title VIII.

I support this amendment wholeheartedly, in the hope that there will still remain in the bill sufficient authority to impose a sudden freeze. Without such authority, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to concur wholeheartedly in the remarks just made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] in respect to the way in which wage, price, and rent controls should be applied, namely, straight across the board, on every segment of our economy.

I also echo an admonition of Bernard Baruch, who said that no portion of our economy can be favored in connection with such a procedure. His exact words were:

> All segments of the economy should be treated alike, with special favors for none.

However, Mr. President, as the bill now stands, we would give the President the power to favor. It may be asked, "Has it ever happened before?"

Mr. President, in that connection let us examine history. In the 4,000 years of history in which price controls have been tried, whenever an attempt has been made to control inflation by means of imposing price, wage, and rent controls—which I contend constitute the wrong approach—the effort has failed because of flexibility.

I should like to enumerate for the Senate the things which became exempt during the life of the Defense Production Act of 1950. They included the fees charged for professional services by such persons as doctors, lawyers, professional engineers, architects, certified public accountants; the charges made by press associations; the charges made for books, magazines, motion pictures, newspapers or radio programs; and the charges made by newspapers, magazines, radio stations, and theaters. They include the rates charged by insurance salesmen and underwriters; the prices and wages of barbers and beauticians; the wages and salaries of employees of small businesses; the prices charged and the wages paid by bowling alleys; and others too numerous to mention.

Mr. President, to hark back to my own State of Arizona, because I am more acquainted with the economy of that State, let me say those exemptions allowed 11.9 cents of the consumer's dollar to be uncontrolled. That is the basic reason why we cannot control prices, wages, and rents if we grant to the President the power to make exemptions, and that a particular segment of the economy need not be placed under price control, and that no attention need be paid to the wages in certain segments of the economy.

As the result of the failure adequately to control wages, they rose 12.7 percent, I believe, during the early portion of the time when the OPS was in effect.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to present a unanimous consent request. The reason for the request is that the Secretary of Defense is now present at a hearing before the Committee on Appropriations, and he is waiting until I can return to the hearing. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the junior Senator from Ohio may be laid aside in order that the Senate may take up another amendment, in which I am interested.

Mr. BRICKER. I should like to have the Senator from Michigan present to vote on my amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall return for the vote.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, how much time remains to us?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to have the amendment laid aside, provided it is understood that we shall resume its consideration at the place where we left off. We shall have 16 minutes remaining. The other side has 30 minutes remaining. If that is satisfactory, I shall be very glad to accommodate the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. I certainly appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know that other Senators are desirous of returning to the hearing, also.

Mr. President, on page 10, line 23, I proposed to strike out the word "or" and insert "and", so that subparagraph (b) will read as follows:

> (b) The powers granted in this section shall not be used to control the general distribution of any material in the civilian market unless the President finds (1) that such material is a scarce and critical material essential to the national defense, and (2) that the requirements of the national defense for such material cannot otherwise be met without creating a significant dislocation of the normal distribution of such material in the civilian market to such a degree as to create appreciable hardship.

As the bill is now drafted, the President could find that either one of the conditions referred to existed. I believe that we should change it so that both requirements are made essential. Scarcity of material, however, is now and always has been a relative matter. At the present time, the supplies of steel, copper, and aluminum, certainly do not exceed the demand. As a practical matter, supply is never perfectly geared to the demand in a free market. If raw materials are scarce, under the processes of the market place, either an additional capacity for their production is created, or such materials are imported from abroad. Conversely, if there is an increase in supply above the present or forecast demand, production is reduced, facilities are abandoned, and our importations decline. Accordingly it is believed feasible to provide that both conditions shall be determined to exist before the President may reinstate controls. In other words, there must be both a scarcity of the material and a requirement by the national defense for such material, a requirement which cannot be met otherwise without creating a significant dislocation of the normal distribution of such material in the civilian market to such a degree as to create appreciable hardship.

As I understand, when the bill was originally drafted, the word "and" was used in subparagraph (b), line 23; but, by a vote of the committee, "and" was changed to "or." I discussed this matter at the time I submitted the amendment, and I shall not debate it longer, because I believe it is perfectly clear that mere scarcity alone should not be sufficient to authorize the President to act. However, when the scarcity is such as to interfere with defense production, then the President should be authorized to act. My amendment merely involves the substitution of the word "and" for the word "or," to require the existence of both conditions, as originally proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee substitute as amended.

Mr. BUSH and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be happy to allocate 5 minutes to the able Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. The bill, as now written, provides:

> (b) The powers granted in this section shall not be used to control the general distribution of any material in the civilian market unless the President finds (1) that such material is a scarce and critical material essential to the national defense, or (2) that the requirements of the national defense for such material cannot otherwise be met without creating a significant dislocation of the normal distribution of such material in the civilian market to such a degree as to create appreciable hardship.

The Senator from Michigan wishes to change the word "or" to "and"—in other words, to require the existence of both conditions, before the President may decide to allocate goods in the civilian market. My objection to the change is that it would work a tremendous hardship to small civilian manufacturers, a class of business which I believe it is our duty as Members of the Senate to protect so far as lies within our power. There is no question whatever that under any reasonable circumstances there will be a sufficient quantity of raw materials to take care of the defense needs of the country. But if the defense needs of the country should consume 50, 60, 70, or 80 percent of a commodity in scarce

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

supply—and I suggest copper as an example—it will leave only a very small amount of copper for civilian production. If that happens, and it can very easily happen, and it has happened, as a matter of fact, at times in the past, the large manufacturer, the large consumer of raw materials, is always going to have a tremendous advantage over the small producer of civilian goods.

The great companies which manufacture automobiles, television sets, or household appliances are not very much worried about whether they pay 30 cents for their copper or 50 cents. The increase on the small quantity they use in relation to the price of the product they sell is so negligible that ordinarily it would not raise the cost of a particular article by more than a fraction of 1 percent. But the small manufacturer of civilian goods, the man who produces typesetting machinery, small electrical appliances, cable, and things of that sort, of course must have even the small supply that he needs in order to carry on his production. Otherwise he is going to be frozen out, because the large manufacturer, who does not care whether the price of copper is 30, 35, 40, or even 45 or 50 cents a pound, can buy the small remaining supply at the expense of the small manufacturer.

In the hearing before the Committee on Banking and Currency, I interrogated Secretary McKay, and I read the testimony:

Senator LEHMAN. What I had in mind is this. I feel that if full mobilization or a similar emergency arises, the larger percentage of the productive capacity of this country would be employed in defense activities, leaving a lesser amount for civilians. The share that was left for civilian use would be proportionally cut down.

It is my feeling that if you are confronted with that situation, you have got to allocate generally the defense production. Otherwise, you are going to have a mad scramble, and the little fellow, producing civilian goods, is likely to suffer very severely.

I was wondering how you felt about that.

Secretary MCKAY. I feel that is true, Senator. However, at the present moment I think we are in pretty good balance, and I do not want to anticipate any difficulty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield 2 more minutes to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I continue reading from the hearing:

Senator LEHMAN. I realize that today we are pretty closely in balance, but I am concerned about any emergency that may arise, which would very seriously disturb that balance, and the situation in regard to civilian production might be serious.

That is why I agree with your statement that you feel the continuation of full authority to grant priorities and make materials allocations should be continued.

I assume you mean that it should be extended for civilian users, as well as producers of defense material.

Secretary MCKAY. My position is based on Mr. Flemming's proposal before the committee. I should like to quote it for the record:

"The powers granted in section 101 shall not be used to control the general distribution of any material in a civilian market, unless the President finds that such material is a scarce critical material essential to the national defense; that the requirements of national defense—

And so forth.

Mr. President, I have no objection to requiring the President to find that a material is a scarce material. I applaud that, but I do not want to join a scarce material with an article needed exclusively in the manufacture of defense material.

I am convinced that the changing of "or" to "and" would seriously affect and jeopardize the interest of the small producer of civilian goods. That person has at least an equal right to protection as have the great companies manufacturing automobiles, household appliances, and articles of a similar nature.

Therefore I urge that the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan be not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, just one more word. This amendment will not harm small business. I think the way in which the provision is now stated borders on absurdity. There should be more than simply the word "scarce" in order to meet the definition. I believe the amendment meets another requirement which I think is necessary, namely, "that the requirements of the national defense for such material cannot otherwise be met without creating a significant dislocation of the normal distribution of such material in the civilian market to such a degree as to create appreciable hardship."

What is wrong about that, rather than the mere expression of a scarcity?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, as a member of the committee who voted in favor of reporting the bill, I was opposed to having the word "or" in the section of the bill which we have been discussing, and I agree with the Senator from Michigan that the word should be changed to "and." I also agree that there is no threat to small business or to anyone else by reason of the amendment. I think it makes the requirement a little more severe, and, therefore, that the amendment should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee substitute as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Am I correct in assuming that I still have the floor? I yielded to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to the committee amendment, as modified. The Senator from Arizona still has the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio if I may have 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, how much time do we have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 16 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. I yield 5 minutes more to the Senator from Arizona, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, before I yielded to the Senator from Michigan I was discussing the impossibility of price, wage, and rent controls working when we allow any flexibility or allow any individual or any bureau the right to determine the flexibility and to whom it shall apply.

Mr. President, because this will probably be the last opportunity to discuss this question, I should like to answer the charge which has been made against the Republican Party, that we have not accepted our responsibility in this instance. I should like to invite the Senate's attention to the fact that the Republican Party campaigned last fall and in that campaign one of the issues was that of getting the Federal Government off the neck of American business. I think the vote on November 4 showed that the American people were heartily in accord with the provision of our platform and the part of our argument which called for that result.

I have heard charges made today that the minority group of the committee have their heads placed in the economic sand. As I have traveled over the country and listened to businessmen, I have rather imagined, as I said in the committee, that perhaps the sand from the bleak desert of Federal control of our free economy is getting into the eyes of some members of the committee and into the eyes of too many American businessmen. I refer to the bleak desert on which we have lived for the past 20 years, during which time the economy of the Nation has been throttled at every turn and with which the Republican Party said it would do away. That is the desert whose sands now seem to be resting uncomfortably in the eyes of too many Americans.

I repeat, Mr. President, we cannot tamper with the free economy of this Nation forever. We have done it far too long, and it is time that the Republican Party assumed its responsibility and removed completely from the necks of American businessmen the unhealthy burden of Federal interference.

In 1924 the now deceased Josef Stalin said that the way to defeat the free world was to defeat the economic system which provided its strength. Mr. President, if we are to continue to pursue the idea that we can meddle with our free economy, I care not whether the meddling comes from the other side of the aisle or from this side of the aisle, we are playing into the hands of that dead pirate now gone to the resting place which he so long ago deserved. I hate to

think that he is sitting in that hell of his and laughing at the American Congress for even thinking of passing such a bill as the one which is now pending, providing for something which ancient history and modern history have shown will not work.

Mr. President, I should like to read from the minority views which express my feeling wholeheartedly:

> With a majority of our fellow citizens, we believe this administration has committed itself to strike from the American citizen the shackles of 20 years of a bureaucratically dominated economy. We believe in the vitality and efficiency of American free enterprise and are anxious to pay more than lip service to this concept. During this period, when even the proponents of title VIII admit direct controls are not necessary, we are in favor of affording free enterprise an opportunity to function unburdened by the heavy hand of ever-present threats of Government control.

Mr. President, for that reason, and for the reasons which I have previously stated, I shall vote, and shall urge my colleagues to vote, for the pending Bricker amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRICKER. Would it be in order at this time to ask for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order.

Mr. BRICKER. I join with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and request the yeas and nays on the approaching vote on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio yields 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah, and the Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to return to paragraph (b), section 801, and to point out again that it grants power not only to exempt whole areas of our economy from the freeze, but, as I understand, if the freeze is imposed it can be taken off 5 minutes later by the President. It also permits the President to set price ceilings at any point he pleases.

It seems to me that if we leave paragraph (b) in the bill, one of the things we will be doing will be automatically to create tremendous pressure on the President. In the first place, as soon as the bill is signed, all of the factors of our economy that were given exemption under OPS and OPA will immediately settle down on the President and begin to put pressure on him to recover some privileged position they had under the previous legislation.

Naturally they will be joined by another group of citizens who will feel that they have the right or power to obtain special privilege. Then, when the President invokes the freeze, if he should, he will be immediately subject to another kind of pressure, the pressure from businesses and persons who will feel that the price ruling on the last day before the freeze went into effect was not a fair one. They will start pressuring for at least the right to have a change made from the ceiling price to a representative price within the preceding 30 days. That is an obvious conclusion to be drawn from the language of the bill. However, it will not take such persons very long to realize that the President has full power under the bill to set the ceiling at any point, and those who have no hope of getting out from under the ceilings completely will attempt to put pressure on the President to have their ceilings set at a more advantageous level.

I am concerned about the possible implications of the statement that the provisions of the bill will go into effect only in time of dire emergency. That would be the time when the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and as head of State, undoubtedly would be completely engrossed with the emergency problems of defense and problems of the use of the military forces. In that time of need he would have to stop and face the problem of requests for exemptions, adjustments, and suspensions.

If the amendment is agreed to, I hope that I may then suggest to the senior Senator from Indiana that we return to section 801 and correct the language so that what is provided may be truly an overall freeze, which will apply to every price and every person, and eliminate the loophole exempting rents other than rents on housing. That is another matter which I must approach after this amendment is disposed of.

I hope the other Members of the Senate will realize that if paragraph (b) stays in the bill, not only will it be a freeze, but it will offer a tremendous temptation to many forces in America to begin immediately to use whatever power they can exert to put pressure on the President to grant favors, exemptions, suspensions, or adjustments to them. For that reason, if the bill is to be passed finally, I hope it will be without paragraph (b) of section 801.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, no one has greater respect than I have for the able junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the able junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the able junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I hope that nothing I have said here today, or ever may say, will in any way offend them, because I do not intend to do so. We have disagreements on some of these matters at the moment.

I merely wish to say that the full committee, after weeks of testimony and hearings, reported title VIII containing the provision which the able junior Senator from Ohio now proposes to eliminate.

I wish to say, in all good humor, that it is most interesting to me that those who talk the most about knocking out section (b) are the ones who are 100 percent opposed to any kind of price, rent, or wage control. I believe I can make that assertion without fear of successful contradiction.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. CAPEHART. In a moment. Those who are opposed to any kind of wage, price, or rent control desire to tighten up that on which the committee has spent a great amount of time and consideration, and rejected by a vote of 12 to 3. In other words, there is no question that the able Senator from Utah and the able Senator from Arizona, who have favored striking out section (b), are opposed to any kind of price, wage, or rent control, and now they want to knock out this provision.

Let us not fool ourselves. This is a part of a plan possibly to kill the whole bill, as I see it. We have already, by action of the Senate this afternoon, exempted agricultural products, at least up to the point of parity. I understand an amendment will be offered a little later to exempt newspapers.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I am sure the Senator from Indiana will admit that what he has stated does not reflect the position of the Senator from Ohio, the author of the amendment, because in 1950, when we were considering a control bill, I voted with the Senator. We were the only two on the committee who voted for a freeze bill. I then voted, in connection with the extension of controls on wages and prices, against giving power to the President to make exceptions, exemptions, and regulations, such as are proposed in paragraph (b). So certainly I have been consistent all the way through in this matter.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not wish to leave the impression that anyone has not been consistent or is insincere in the position he takes.

Let me state why I think we ought to leave this paragraph in the bill. As I view the whole matter, I hope the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the National Security Board, and other agencies of the Government which have some authority—and I am sure they have sufficient staffs—will immediately proceed, if this bill shall be passed, to study what the President ought to do if a grave emergency should occur; that they will write certain proposed legislation; that they will make certain rules and regulations, in conjunction with the advice of representatives of business; and that they will prepare themselves and be ready to put into effect the so-called 90-day freeze.

I also hope they will be prepared to come before Congress at that time with proposed detailed legislation, and be able to say to Congress, "Here is exactly how we think the matter ought to be handled. We would like to have the committees of Congress hold hearings and look into the situation, and then pass the kind of legislation we suggest."

In order to work up to that point, there must be some flexibility, and I believe there ought to be some exemptions. If a grave emergency should occur next October, and if we have passed this bill and the President puts it into effect, then we ought to get down to the business of writing a detailed bill and holding hearings. There are many things we might well exempt from price, wage, and rent controls. There might be many items in our production which would be in such plentiful supply that controls would

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

not be necessary. We certainly do not want to control newspapers and magazines. We never have done so in the history of this Nation. Congress has written 3 or 4 so-called price, wage, and rent control laws. We have always exempted newspapers on the basis of freedom of the press.

So I have an entirely different viewpoint from that of some others. The facts from which I am working may be different from the facts from which others are working. The facts from which I am working indicate to me that if we pass this 90-day freeze with the flexibility in it which I think ought to be in it, the President will not need to exempt anything he does not wish to exempt. He will not need to make any exemptions if he does not wish to do so. He will not be compelled to make any exceptions if he does not wish to do so. My opinion is that he would be showing good, common horse sense if he did make certain exceptions in the case of articles which have no bearing whatever on the emergency at the time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no particular reason to be against the pending proposal, but I do not think it is what we wish to do. Again I come back to the fact that some of those who are advocating this course are the very ones who are absolutely 100 percent opposed to any price, wage, or rent controls. I know that that statement does not apply to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I do not believe that supporting this amendment is at all inconsistent with the bill. In fact, I think it is entirely consistent with the bill. The purpose of the bill is to establish a freeze for a short period during which it is conceded by both sides that Congress should meet and consider legislation to deal with the entire situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. How in the world could the President exercise the discretion proposed to be given him in the bill? I have never felt that it was proper, but how in the world would he deal with that discretion within a short period of 90 days? He cannot pick and choose. He must have an organization to act for him. The bill hardly provides for that. We might as well leave the whole thing to Congress as to give the President power to make exemptions.

Mr. CAPEHART. As I stated a moment ago, if the bill becomes law the President certainly will call upon the Department of Commerce and other agencies of the Government to get ready and to inform him as to what he should do if and when the emergency should arise. I am very hopeful that the President and the various agencies of the Government will go so far as to agree upon a permanent policy to be followed, and that they will be ready to come before Congress and say, "We propose to place in effect a 90-day freeze, and we want you to do this, that, or the other." We hope that they will be ready to make recommendations to Congress, at which time hearings will be held, and we shall decide what we wish to do.

The Senator from Connecticut is a member of the committee. I do not believe that we want to eliminate this particular paragraph from the bill. Perhaps we do. If the Senate wishes to eliminate it, it is perfectly agreeable to me, but I do not believe that is what we wish to do.

Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 2 minutes, or as much time as the Senator desires.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the able chairman a question. First, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to pay my respects to the able chairman of the committee for the very excellent job he did throughout the long and tedious hearings on this subject; also for the very fine and fair manner in which he has managed the legislation on the floor of the Senate.

I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana a question. I believe the report on the bill sets out the fact that, so far as allowable exemptions are concerned, they are simply in accord with what we have done every time we have passed a control measure in the past. In every instance in which we have enacted a control measure, instead of requiring exemptions, we simply made it optional with the President to make exemptions.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. I am sure we would expect the President to exempt newspapers, because Congress has always done so in every piece of control legislation which has ever been enacted. I am sure that neither the Congress nor the President would freeze the prices of agricultural products at a level below parity, when the President is required by law to lend money up to 90 percent of parity. We must remember that the President has good common horsesense. He will not do foolish things.

I do not believe that we wish to eliminate this paragraph. Perhaps the Senate wishes to do so, but I do not believe so.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. We are talking about an emergency. Are we to believe that the exemption of a certain article would represent a greater emergency than the main emergency itself?

Mr. CAPEHART. It might not. It might. I do not know.

Mr. BUSH. I cannot believe it. We are discussing a proposal to impose a freeze on everything, at the time the freeze is put into effect, until Congress can act.

Mr. CAPEHART. All I know is that when we get ready to write a control bill—and I hope we shall never have to do so as the result of an emergency—many exemptions will be proposed. Senators who are advocating that we allow no flexibility to the President are the very ones who will be voting to exempt newspapers. They will be the ones who will be voting to exempt agricultural products until the prices of such products reach parity. Then the engineers, the beauticians, the barbers, and others will be seeking exemption. Exemptions will be sought on behalf of utilities. I have been all through the process. Legislation on this subject is possibly the meanest thing Congress has to deal with. Members of the committee do not derive any more enjoyment from dealing with it than other Senators do from discussing it. But the responsibility rests with our committee. I am chairman of the committee. Other members of the committee do not enjoy this job any more than do Senators who are not members of the committee. It is not easy. It is a tough job. We are dealing with a very controversial subject. It seems to have a tendency to inflame tempers and bring on all sorts of things.

Mr. BUSH. I assure the Senator that my temper is not aroused at all.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know that.

Mr. BUSH. Let me ask the Senator another question. Does not the Senator agree that if the President is to make exceptions he will have to hold hearings, or hearings will have to be held in his behalf?

Mr. CAPEHART. He will do that through his administrative staff.

Mr. BUSH. Then we shall be in the ridiculous situation of having the President holding hearings downtown while we are holding hearings uptown, to write definitive legislation.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator is going to extremes.

Mr. BUSH. What is extreme about that statement?

Mr. CAPEHART. The President will study the problem through the Department of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Office of Defense Mobilization. That is why we have an Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to take my seat and let the Senate vote. I simply wish to say that, in my opinion, the motive behind this amendment is to kill the entire bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Two years ago, I believe, on the floor of the Senate we debated the original Defense Production Act. If I had been a betting man—and occasionally I am—I would have given odds of 100 to 1 that I never would enthusiastically support the position of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, because I was in complete disagreement with him. But I have been sitting on the Committee on Banking and Currency with the Senator from Indiana. We have held hearings for 5, 6, or 7 weeks. I wish to say that I have never known any man in legislative life, whether a Democrat or a Republican, who has been more fair and more conscientious in the discharge of his duty than has been the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I sat in the hearings and heard the testimony, and I supported the chairman. I am glad and proud to support him today.

I have very little interest now in whether the bill is passed. In my opinion it has been completely emasculated, to the point of its being useless, by the adoption of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and other amendments. I do not think the bill will do a bit of good. I shall probably vote for it because I am a member of the committee. However, I have no illusions. It is a fraud on the people of the United States. It may lead them to believe that we are protecting them, when we are not protecting them. We have completely retreated and yielded on powers that might have been exerted by the President of the United States to protect all the people.

I cannot help but say again, as I have stated so often, that to me it is a little strange that I, a Democrat, should time and time again speak in defense of the good faith and high principles and integrity and patriotism of the President of the United States, in whom I am willing to vest such powers—and they are very great powers—while Members of the Republican Party, from the majority leader on down—and he is a leader whom many Senators on the other side of the aisle, although I am glad to say not all of the Senators on the other side of the aisle, are inclined to follow more or less blindly—question the good faith of the President, which I am willing to acknowledge.

I again wish to say that what has happened today has rendered the pending bill entirely impotent to save the country in case of a great emergency and attack. I ask Senators not to kid themselves. I hope and pray that the attack will not come, but if it does, we in the Senate may not be here at the time. It may be entirely impossible for us to be here.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether he does not agree with me—and I voted with him to favorably report the bill—that the pending Bricker amendment will strengthen rather than weaken the bill in its present form? Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I do not believe it will strengthen the bill. I believe quite the opposite.

When the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] offered his amendment requiring two standards to be met before an allocation of materials could be made, I believed there were a sufficient number of votes on the floor of the Senate to defeat it, but I did not ask for a division because I thought, What is the use? The bill is rendered pretty much useless at the present time because of the emasculations which have taken place on the floor of the Senate.

I do not think for a moment that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] helps at all.

However, I did not rise for that purpose. I rose to express my appreciation and my gratitude and my admiration of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for what he has done or sought to do in the bill. The fact that the Senate has not approved the bill in the form in which it was reported to the Senate is not the fault of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator very much. We have worked hard on the bill, as has the entire committee. We have had some misunderstandings, of course.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana a question. I am looking at subdivision (1) in subsection (b) which is proposed to be omitted from the bill. If I read this provision correctly, it would mean that the President would not have the power, in the event the bill were enacted and a freeze later went into force under the act, to increase the price of a given commodity needed for national defense, in order to stimulate the production of that commodity, which would be badly needed at the time for national defense. Am I right or wrong.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us read subsection (b) which is being sought to be stricken out. It reads:

(b) The President may provide exemptions from, suspensions of, or adjustments to ceilings in the case of any materials or services or transactions therein, or types of employment, or housing accommodations of any class or in any area, if he finds that (1) such exemption, suspension, or adjustment is necessary for national defense, or (2) the imposition or maintenance of such ceilings would be impracticable or unnecessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this title.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to say that the President cannot arbitrarily do these things. He must do them if it is in the interest of national defense. Let me say that the freeze would never be used—and I hope we will never have wage, price, and rent controls—unless it is in the interest of the national defense. We are not talking about peacetime.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that it is my understanding of the bill, as the ranking minority member of the committee—and I hope that the chairman of the committee will tell me if I am wrong—when we adopted the so-called Byrd amendment it gave Congress the right to declare the emergency, and from that we would naturally presume that Congress would write the law. Is that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Therefore, for all practical purposes, the President has no authority to exempt newspapers, for example, or anything else. Although I shall reluctantly vote for the bill, in view of the adoption of the Byrd amendment the President has practically no authority whatever in that connection. Am I correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. Since the Senate adopted the Byrd amendment there must be a declaration of war before the act can go into effect, or it must be done by concurrent resolution adopted by both Houses of Congress. Therefore, I do not know why Senators are taking the time to discuss the Bricker amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further? I am trying to assist him.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to me, in the event the pending amendment is adopted, the President would be left without power to increase the price in order to enlarge the production of a commodity which was badly needed in vastly increased quantities, because of the fact that we were in the emergency which had brought on the freeze. For example, suppose it were necessary for national defense to multiply by many times the commercial production of penicillin. If the provision referred to in the bill is eliminated, the President would be left powerless to exempt the production of penicillin by commercial laboratories, or to exempt the price of penicillin from the price freeze.

It is that particular part of paragraph (b) which is sought to be stricken, which the Senate ought to be aware of. Surely, when we get into a serious emergency, or if a war is declared, there will be many commodities of which we will need a vastly increased production. To bring that about we may have to force the production in such a way as to greatly increase the price of the unit produced. Surely, Senators do not want, by the adoption of this amendment, to strike from the bill the power of the President to stimulate the production of such needed articles.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], it limits the period of time within which the powers of the President would become effective.

Of course, I intend to vote in favor of the bill, along with the distinguished chairman of the committee and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Since it would be necessary to have first of all a declaration of war—and I hope and pray that we will not have another war—it was the judgment of those who supported the Byrd amendment that Congress would be able to act within 48 hours after such a declaration of war. Does the Senator from Indiana believe that 48 hours after such a declaration we would be able to determine all the questions which would arise in connection with a control measure?

Mr. CAPEHART. Well, we have been in session since 12 o'clock noon today, and we cannot even agree on a few things. So I do not know what we would do in the case of a national emergency. I assume we would work a little faster.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like the Senator to answer my question. Is it not true that if subsection (b) of section 801 is stricken from the bill, the President would be precluded from exempting from the operation of any freeze which was ordered the production of articles which would be badly needed for a war effort and which, because of the great need, would have

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to be increased in price in order to have such articles produced quickly and in adequate quantity?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. One of the things the President said he hoped would happen if Congress gave him a standby control bill was that the bill would provide for flexibility of operation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. In answer to the Senator from Florida, certainly it would seem that if there were a shortage of a certain commodity, such as penicillin, it would be impossible to take care of that situation within the period of 90 days; and hearings would have to be held in order to determine whether relief should be accorded anyone.

So Congress would have to determine whether an exception should be made, and that determination would have to be made by Congress while it was in session, following the time when the emergency had been declared.

If there are to be exceptions, Congress should provide for them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senator from Indiana will insist at least on the inclusion of subdivision (1) of subsection (b). The second subdivision is not so necessary, because it relates to a relatively unimportant matter. Subdivision (2) reads:

> The imposition or maintenance of such ceilings would be impracticable or unnecessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this title.

The omission of that provision would not be a matter of grave importance.

But if subdivision (1), which I have already read into the record, were deleted from the bill, certainly the President would not have power to exempt from a freeze order the many articles which would have to be immediately forced into greatly increased production. I have in mind medical supplies of many kinds. Suppose the emergency came upon us like a blast in the night, and suppose we then needed an increased production of bandages and an increased production of various kinds of necessary medicines, which would have to be obtained from every available commercial source. Should the President in that case be without power immediately to exempt all those articles from the price freeze, and should he be without power to offer such attractive prices on those articles that the production of them would be immediately increased?

I think to ask the question is to answer it. None of us would wish to have the President left in that position.

So I hope that the Senate will at least give the President the power to stimulate the production of commodities which would be needed in the event of such an emergency.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Florida recommend that subdivision (2), of subsection (b), be deleted?

Mr. HOLLAND. If anything has to be deleted, let subdivision (2) be deleted. However, I am not suggesting that any part of the subsection be deleted.

Mr. CAPEHART. I would rather have subdivision (1) deleted; but, as a matter of fact, I do not think any part of subsection (b) should be deleted.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I may say that the making of exemptions and exceptions is, under the theory of the bill, a responsibility of the Congress, in connection with the writing of the complete controls legislation.

I cannot emphasize any more strongly than did the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] that if this exemption provision is not stricken from the bill, the President or an administrative force will hold hearings downtown, and might decide to exempt certain commodities which Congress might feel should not be exempted. Then Congress would have to hold hearings, and thus there would be a most complicated procedure, unless this particular provision is deleted from the bill.

I think the character of the freeze bill must be carefully preserved if we are to enact the bill into law.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think the time has come to vote. I repeat that in my best judgment—and the committee so decided by a vote of 12 to 3—we should leave this subsection just as it is.

I again say—and I do so in the best possible humor—that Senators who are trying to delete the subsection are Senators who are opposed to price, wage, and rent control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, it has been stated several times that the President would hold hearings downtown. Let me inquire whether the bill contains any provision to the effect that the President will be required to hold hearings for the purpose of making such findings of fact?

Mr. BRICKER. The bill does not contain a provision which would require the President to hold hearings before putting the law into effect. Undoubtedly the President of the United States would not—and I trust him not to do this—put into effect an arbitrary exemption or qualification or restriction unless he did hold hearings. I know of no other way by which the President could ascertain the facts of the matter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My point is that no formal hearing plan is provided by the bill; is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; the bill does not contain provision for machinery of any kind in that respect.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The President would have to take whatever steps he might desire to take, in order to determine the facts applying to such a situation; is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes. That is one of the weaknesses of the bill; it does not contain definite provision for the President to have available to him machinery by which he would be able to determine the nature of the freeze.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarthy
Anderson	Griswold	McClellan
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bennett	Hennings	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Bush	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Hunt	Purtell
Carlson	Ives	Robertson
Case	Jackson	Saltonstall
Cooper	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kefauver	Sparkman
Duff	Kennedy	Stennis
Dworshak	Kilgore	Symington
Eastland	Knowland	Taft
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Tobey
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Long	Welker
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young
Goldwater	Martin	
Gore	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on amendment B of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], to the committee substitute, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—48

Barrett	Flanders	Millikin
Beall	George	Morse
Bennett	Goldwater	Mundt
Bricker	Griswold	Payne
Bridges	Hendrickson	Potter
Bush	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Ives	Saltonstall
Byrd	Jenner	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Case	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Taft
Dirksen	Kuchel	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Eastland	Martin	Welker
Ellender	McCarthy	Wiley
Ferguson	McClellan	Williams

NAYS—40

Aiken	Hill	Mansfield
Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Capehart	Holland	Monroney
Cooper	Humphrey	Neely
Daniel	Hunt	Pastore
Douglas	Jackson	Robertson
Duff	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Frear	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Fulbright	Kefauver	Stennis
Gillette	Kilgore	Symington
Gore	Langer	Tobey
Green	Lehman	Young
Hayden	Long	
Hennings	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—8

Butler, Nebr.	Kerr	Russell
Chavez	McCarran	Smith, N. C.
Clements	Murray	

So Mr. BRICKER's amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 24, line 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) The authority conferred by this title shall not be exercised with respect to the following: prices, or rentals for materials furnished for publication by any press association or feature service, or books, magazines, motion pictures, periodicals or newspapers, other than as waste or scrap; or rates charged by any person in the business of operating or publishing a newspaper, periodical, or magazine, or operating a radio-broadcasting or television station, a motion-picture or other theater enterprise, or outdoor advertising facilities.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is simply to place in the bill exactly the same exemption which has always been in defense production acts with reference to newspapers, television, radio, and other means of communication.

The Senate has just eliminated a section which would have authorized the President to make exemptions. It might not have been necessary to offer my amendment had the authority been left with the President to make such exemptions. However, since that authority has been eliminated, I believe it is necessary, if we are going to follow the historical practice which Congress has followed in exempting newspapers, radio, television, and other communication facilities from the provisions of the controls acts, for us to so provide in this bill. The committee realized this. It said in its report:

Your committee is aware that it is impractical to freeze some categories of our economy. Historically, certain categories such as newspapers and other informational media and public utilities regulated by Federal, State, or local authority have been exempted from controls.

The committee continued by saying that it was giving the President power to make such exemptions. Of course, that part of the bill has now been eliminated, so I hope the Senate will agree to this amendment, worded exactly as the exemption for newspapers, radio, and television was worded in the present Defense Production Act.

Congress has always realized that this is a category of the economy that should not be under controls, even for a 90-day period. Here we have involved the exercise of freedom of the press and freedom of speech. In my opinion, it is not a wise thing in our country to have the press, radio, television, and moving pictures under economic controls, because they have been mediums used in support of our national defense from the very beginning of every emergency, and it is entirely possible that controls would harm the work that they could contribute to our national defense effort, even during a 90-day period.

So I urge the Senate to agree to this amendment and write into the bill what has always been a part of our defense production acts in the past, and exempt these important mediums of communication from this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] to the committee substitute as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "5–13–53–C," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "control the general distribution of" and insert in lieu thereof "allocate".

On page 20, line 20, it is proposed to insert "allocation" before "controls."

On page 20, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "on the general distribution."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, this is purely a technical amendment. I think the language of the bill will be improved from the viewpoint of what is intended. I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the committee substitute as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated. This is purely a technical amendment for clarification, and is necessary since we have amended section 104.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "Titles I," and insert in lieu thereof "Title I (except section 104), and titles."

On page 22, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "Title" and insert in lieu thereof "Section 104 of title I and title."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the committee substitute, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have one other technical amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 22, after the word "on", it is proposed to strike out "June 30" and insert "July 1."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the committee substitute, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 5–12–53–B, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. . The last sentence of subsection (1) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "No area shall be certified as a critical defense housing area under the authority granted in this subsection unless both of the following conditions exist in such area:

"(1) A defense plant or installation has been or is to be provided, or an existing defense plant or installation has been or is to be reactivated or its operation substantially expanded; and

"(2) A substantial shortage of housing exists or impends which has resulted or threatens to result in excessive rent increases."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to begin by paying a tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the very able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I have hitherto refrained from paying him tribute during this debate, lest it lower his standing among his colleagues on his side of the aisle. Now, since I think no further damage can be done to him, since all the injury which mortal flesh can receive and endure has already been inflicted, I think perhaps it would not be inappropriate to express what is in my heart, namely, that, not as a Democrat, but as an American, I pay tribute to him for his courtesy, his courage, his intelligence, and his fine public service.

I do not suppose that the Senate is in any mood for an amendment which will strengthen controls. Nevertheless I feel duty bound to rise and make this proposal.

When critical defense areas were first defined in the Housing and Rent Control Act, there were three qualifications that had to be met to justify imposition of rent controls, namely, that there must be: first, new, reactivated or expanded governmental defense installations or

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

private installations working on defense contracts; second, a substantial in-migration of defense labor or military personnel; and third, a substantial housing shortage. Now when this law was amended by the act of April 30, 1953, extending general rent controls for only 3 months, the definition of "critical defense housing area" was further narrowed to apply only to areas with a Department of Defense or Atomic Energy Commission plant or installation.

The result has been that a number of big cities now under general rent controls that expire July 31, which have plants with a large volume of defense contracts, will not be able to qualify under the critical defense area provision, even though there is a marked housing shortage. This may be because there is no military installation or atomic energy plant there or because there has not been an in-migration of labor; and there has not been any in-migration of labor in some cases because there has been a housing shortage, and people have not been able to find housing accommodations in those cities.

The amendment which I am proposing strikes out the requirement that there must be substantial in-migration. It likewise restores the application of the definition to areas with private defense plants. It provides simply that for an area to be classified as a critical defense housing area there shall be a substantial shortage of housing, and there must be new or expanded defense work that is being conducted either by public agencies or by private agencies.

This is of great importance to such cities as Boston, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Newark, Philadelphia, Camden, Baltimore, Cleveland, St. Louis, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Kansas City, San Francisco, and many other cities in the United States which otherwise will be without needed protections.

I point out that this would not be mandatory; it would merely permit the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Defense Mobilization, if they find that there is a substantial shortage, and if they find that new or expanded defense work is being conducted in large degree, to define a city as being in a critical defense housing area and thus permit the President to institute the necessary protections for tenants against the effects of this severe housing shortage.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the compliment the able Senator from Illinois has paid me. However, I am reluctantly inclined to be opposed to his amendment. I believe the Senator is attempting in effect, to amend the Rent Control Act which was passed 3 weeks ago by both the Senate and the House and is now law. For that reason, I do not believe the Senate should consider the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee substitute, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee substitute as amended.

The committee substitute as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, much has been said in discussion of public affairs about UNESCO. Before many days or weeks, the Senate will have before it as an item in an appropriation bill the question of providing funds for UNESCO.

To the end that Members of Congress may familiarize themselves with some of the work which has been undertaken by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and so that they will not have to engage in blind flying when the discussion ensues with respect to the appropriation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter directed to me under date of May 11, 1953, by Mr. Walter H. C. Laves, Chairman of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, which gives a brief but effective review of some of the good things being done by that organization.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
THE UNITED STATES
NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO,
Washington, D. C. May 11, 1953.

The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: On behalf of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, it is my pleasant privilege to recall to your mind an historic event which took place 8 years ago and in which you played a major part. At that time steps were taken to assure international action in support of principles basically identical with those found in the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

On May 22, 1945, the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 215, which you had introduced, in which the House urged * * * the participation by the Government of the United States in the creation of an international educational and cultural organization * * * Two days later the Senate adopted a similar resolution introduced by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT. Pursuant to these resolutions, the United States helped to establish the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Two Members of Congress, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY and Representative CHESTER E. MERROW, were members of the United States delegation to the Conference at which the constitution of UNESCO was drawn up. Subsequently Congress authorized the acceptance of membership in UNESCO by the United States and the establishment of a National Commission to advise the Government, and to serve as an agency of liaison on UNESCO matters.

In view of the personal initiative and interest which you thus showed in the establishment of UNESCO, together with these colleagues in Congress, I should like to take this occasion to give each of you a brief report—a progress report—about the Organization and the National Commission.

UNESCO is rendering to its member states the services which you envisaged for the organization in H. R. 215: "* * * * for the purpose of advising together and to consider problems of international education and cultural relations throughout the world and more particularly to organize a permanent international agency to promote educational and cultural relations, the exchange of students, scholars, and other educational and cultural leaders and materials, and the encouragement with each country of friendly relations among nations, peoples, and cultural groups."

You will be pleased to know how far UNESCO has gone in living up to these expectations.

UNESCO SERVICES

UNESCO has responded to the urgent requests of more than 20 of the less developed nations for help in raising their levels of education.

It has pioneered a system of fundamental education which helps improve health, nutrition, and literacy, and thus promises to raise the standard of living of the more than half of the world's population which can neither read nor write.

It has brought together teachers from many countries and in many separate conferences for the study of common educational problems.

It has demonstrated to countries without public libraries how they can establish these and use them for democratic educational purposes.

It is helping member states undertake scientific research to improve living conditions. Notably it promotes study of ways in which semidesert regions can be brought into cultivation.

It has made possible the renewal of contacts between scientists, educators, and creative artists in the postwar world, thus upholding the free exchange of knowledge and ideas.

Schools and libraries in soft currency countries have found a way to obtain books, laboratory equipment and other necessary supplies from hard currency countries through the UNESCO coupon plans. In 1952 this made possible purchases from the United States to an amount of over half a million dollars.

Fellowships and travel grants awarded by UNESCO have helped educators, scientists, youth leaders, and trade union members from over 40 countries to study in other countries.

The international interchange of students and teachers is greatly helped, too, by UNESCO's publications, Study Abroad and Teaching Abroad which list annually the fellowships and teaching opportunities in many countries that are open to candidates from other lands.

UNESCO has helped people in the free world understand the principle of collective security, as defended by the United Nations in Korea.

Most important of all, UNESCO is demonstrating to the people of the free world how they can secure social and economic advancement through free institutions and through peaceful international cooperation.

May I mention a few typical pieces of UNESCO work that have come to my personal attention recently.

RAISING EDUCATIONAL LEVELS

In 1952 alone, UNESCO was asked by member governments to send out 22 educational missions. The purpose of these was to provide expert help in planning public educational reforms, to recommend methods of financing such reforms, and to propose ways of improving school administration. These teams of international composition

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and character would have been impossible without UNESCO.

This large number of advisory services was requested because previous missions sent out under UNESCO auspices had been singularly successful. I talked about this at the Paris General Conference of UNESCO last November with an official of the Ministry of Education of Thailand. He told me about the changes that have been undertaken in the Siamese educational system as the result of the educational mission which his government had requested UNESCO to send 2 years ago. A 10-year plan for educational development has been approved and a supplemental scheme is already in operation in one area where all types and grades of educational activities are being reorganized.

The delegate from Burma told me that his government had doubled its budget for public education and was in the midst of building 1,000 new primary schools, 240 secondary schools, and a teacher training center. This was the direct result of the recommendations of a UNESCO educational mission which had been adopted by the Burmese Government. Important progress has been made in Afghanistan and many other countries.

A few months ago I was in Cairo when the final plans were made for the establishment of a fundamental education center for the Arab states. Illiteracy rates in this region range from 50 to 70 percent. This center has now opened and the first class has teams of 5 trainees from each of the 6 cooperating countries. Within a year there should be 200 trainees enrolled. The center is modeled on the Fundamental Education Center in Mexico, which is supported by UNESCO, the Mexican Government, and the Organization of the American States. Fifty teachers were graduated this year from the Mexican center. They have returned to their countries in Latin America to establish similar national schools run by their own governments.

METHODS BY WHICH UNESCO HAS WORKED

These services, like all else that is done by the organizations, are undertaken by UNESCO only on the request of the member states. I can assure you, from personal experience as Deputy Director General of UNESCO for nearly 4 years, and from subsequent observation, that UNESCO carries out in the letter and the spirit the provision of its constitution that, "with a view to preserving the independence, integrity, and fruitful diversity of the states members of this organization, the organization is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their jurisdiction."

UNESCO's work throughout its program rests on and supports and promotes the free exchange of knowledge and ideas. It is a continuous attack, by practical action, against the Iron Curtain philosophy. Fellowships for study abroad, international seminars for scientists, scholars, and teachers, expert advice given on request, publications bringing the concentrate of free scholarly inquiry or divergent opinions—these are its chief methods of action.

INCREASING UNESCO MEMBERSHIP

As you know, this agency unites the American people in the cause of freedom, understanding, and friendship with the people of over 60 other countries.

Six years ago, when UNESCO's first conference was held, there were 34 member states. The number has increased steadily each year. At its last meeting, UNESCO accepted the application of Spain, Libya, and Nepal. Countries which have gained their independence have at once applied for membership in UNESCO—countries such as Indonesia, Cambodia, Viet Nam, Burma, Ceylon, and Pakistan. Germany and Japan have sought and received admission; thus UNESCO brings former enemy peoples back into the family of nations.

I am sure that you will regret with me that the peoples of some countries are kept outside UNESCO by the will of their governments, but it is easy to understand why Soviet Russia has refused to subscribe to the principles of UNESCO, and why the Governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary have withdrawn from UNESCO, since they have become satellites of the U. S. S. R., and since UNESCO has begun to be effective.

The Polish Government, in its letter of withdrawal, last December, alleged that UNESCO is turning itself into an obedient instrument of the cold war launched by American imperialism; that UNESCO has supported Anglo-American aggression in Korea.

These distortions and falsehoods were rejected by the General Conference of UNESCO, which declared "that the allegations contained in the aforesaid communication are completely unfounded."

SOME UNITED STATES MISUNDERSTANDINGS ABOUT UNESCO

I should like to remark briefly on two points about which some misunderstanding exists in the United States.

First, all who sincerely wish that international cooperation through organization may succeed are concerned lest Americans who are disloyal or are engaged in subversive activities should find employment in international agencies. The Executive Committee of the United States National Commission at one of its first meetings in 1947 declared that persons employed by UNESCO should be truly and fully representative of their countries, and the National Commission assisted UNESCO to find Americans who meet this standard. About 60 Americans are employed by UNESCO headquarters in Paris, which has a total staff of about 800, and some 50 other Americans are employed by UNESCO in other parts of the world. I am confident that the great majority of these Americans employed by UNESCO are completely loyal citizens, and I believe that measures now being taken will assure that no American will be employed by UNESCO except those known to be loyal.

I wish also to touch on another point which may have come to your notice—the allegation that UNESCO is trying to impose some doctrine on our schools, designated as one-world government. This false charge was first aired in a newsletter issued by a certain organization and has been widely repeated, although frequently refuted. The truth is that in several pamphlets for teachers (not for pupils) some opinions expressed in international conferences of teachers invited from various countries are reported, and that an occasional sentence among these opinions indicates a belief that a world organization should have stronger powers than those given to the United Nations. UNESCO has never advocated any policy with respect to world government. The Director General of UNESCO has spoken explicitly on this point. "It has never been the purpose of UNESCO to turn citizens from their national loyalties * * * whoever, out of alleged devotion to some international order, repudiates his loyalty to his own country, does not really love his own country nor the international order he claims to admire."

UNITED STATES NATIONAL COMMISSION ACTIVE

I should like to take this opportunity, too, of reporting to you that the United States National Commission has carried out in the past 6 years many of the functions assigned to it by Congress. You were one of those who labored to insure that the Commission should be a body widely representative of the voluntary citizen groups of this country. It consists of 100 American citizens, of whom 60 are selected and nominated by national organizations. These voluntary organizations comprise millions of members, and are widely representative of the educational, cultural, social, economic, and religious life of this country. Through active membership in the National Commission they have linked their members in UNESCO's work for international friendship.

The Commission has been continuously consulted by the Department of State on many matters relating to United States participation in UNESCO. It has been represented on delegations to all sessions of the General Conference of UNESCO, at which the program and budget of this organization are approved.

Through several committees and panels of experts, parts of UNESCO's program are submitted to citizen groups and competent specialists for consideration and advice. More than this, hundreds of American citizens have volunteered to assist in the task of carrying out within the United States those portions of the UNESCO program that can be carried out in this country, such as contributing to the educational needs of the less developed countries and the study of the United Nations.

A special feature of the National Commission's program has been the organization every 2 years of a national conference for the purpose of considering ways to improve our understanding of and participation in world affairs, particularly through the kinds of international cooperation represented by UNESCO. Provision for such conferences was wisely made by Congress when it authorized the establishment of the National Commission. All interested organizations are invited to send representatives.

You will recall the First National Conference held in Philadelphia in 1947 at which you gave a keynote address. Subsequent conferences were held in April 1949 and January 1952. We are now making plans for the Fourth National Conference to be held in Minneapolis in September at which the main theme will be "America's Stake in International Cooperation."

This letter already too long by ordinary standards—yet it barely touches upon the wide variety of important activities made possible through the existence of UNESCO.

I want to close by extending you the thanks, appreciation, and congratulations of the United States National Commission for UNESCO for the great public service you performed in helping assure the establishment of UNESCO which has been so essential to the achievement of an understanding among peoples and of peace itself. Even at this early date the wisdom of that decision has been demonstrated by the enthusiastic support given UNESCO throughout the peace-loving world. The record of this phase of postwar cooperation has already shown its practicability and necessity.

Sincerely,

WALTER H. C. LAVES,
Chairman.

COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 78, a joint resolution for the establishment of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) for the establishment of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the President of the United States has asked the Congress to establish a Commission

on Foreign Economic Policy, to be composed of Members of both Houses and a certain number of members to be appointed by the President. Under this plan the Senate would appoint 3 members, the House 3 members, and the President 5 members. In the case of the House and Senate not more than 2 members of the 3 shall belong to the same party. So far as the Presidential appointees are concerned, not more than 3 of the 5 shall belong to the same party.

The purpose is to make a thorough study of our international trade. Let me read some of the duties of the Commission, so that the scope of the project may be judged. I read from the joint resolution, under the heading "Duties of the Commission":

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. The Commission is directed to examine, study, and report on the subject of international trade and to recommend policies, measures, and practices for stimulating its sound enlargement.

Without limiting the general scope of this direction, the work of the Commission shall include consideration of, and report on, the following matters:

(1) (a) Applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States;

(b) Laws, regulations, and practices of the United States relating to international trade, including such matters as tariffs, customs, customs administration, trade agreements, peril point and escape procedures, opinions and decisions thereon of the United States Tariff Commission and the President, import and export quotas, monetary licenses, countervailing duties, and procurement preferences;

(c) Departments, agencies, boards, commissions, bureaus, and other instrumentalities of the United States having jurisdiction over, or dealing with, these matters;

(d) Laws, regulations, and practices and official instrumentalities of other nations concerned with similar subject matters;

(e) Pertinent statistics on international trade;

(f) Balance of payments, nation by nation, excessive imbalances, causes, effects, proposed remedies.

(2) Relationship of our foreign economic policies to, and their influences on, our total foreign policy, proper relationship of each to the other.

(3) Effect of our foreign aid and military defense programs on international trade and international balance of payments.

(4) Foreign markets of trading nations—extent and nature—effect thereon of wars, other emergencies, technological advances, international relations, and other pertinent factors.

(5) International instrumentalities, organizations, agreements, and practices affecting trade such as General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Customs Unions, Organization for European Economic Cooperation, International Wheat Agreement, cartels, European Payments Union, European Coal and Steel Community, International Monetary Fund.

(6) Foreign investment capital, flow of investment capital between nations—need thereof—restrictions thereon—inducements necessary to encourage, role of Export-Import Bank and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(7) Effects on international trade of factors such as costs of production and pricing, labor practices and standards, general living standards, currency manipulation, inconvertible currencies, official inflationary policies, currency devaluations, exchange controls and licenses, quotas, embargoes, dumping and pricing practices, multiple currencies, bilateral trade agreements, barter arrangements, customs procedures, marking and transit problems, concealed regulation of exports and imports, preferential tariff systems, most-favored nation treatment, government monopolies, State-controlled economies, State trading, State-subsidized trading.

(8) Effect of existing and proposed trade policies on promotion of peace and security and betterment of political, social, and economic life.

It can be seen that the purpose of the Commission is a very broad one. The joint resolution provides that a report shall be made not later than 60 days after the commencement of the second session of the present Congress. The reason I am asking for immediate consideration of the joint resolution is to allow the Commission to get to work on this very important subject.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Colorado that the establishment of the Commission would facilitate the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 1 year, as requested?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The two things are not necessarily tied together. The President has asked for both. He has asked for this Commission, and he has also asked for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. One member of the committee has stated that in voting for the joint resolution he was not necessarily binding himself to vote for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. That question was raised by one member of the committee. If the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act were not extended, there would be perhaps more reason for the Commission than there would be if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act were extended.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. It seems to the junior Senator from Tennessee that the establishment of a commission to make a study of the scope indicated by the Senator from Colorado would make it necessary to extend the program now in existence pending the establishment of a policy by the administration. The Senator from Tennessee was hoping that the distinguished chairman of the committee would express the opinion that the establishment of this commission for the purpose of making a study would facilitate the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Most respectfully, let me say that I think there is a relation between the two, but I do not think there is a necessary relationship. I do not want to overplead my case. One member of the committee voted for the joint resolution, but stated that that did not necessarily mean that he would vote for what the President requests with respect to extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. If we did not follow the President's request with respect to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that would probably enhance the need for this kind of commission.

Mr. GORE. I am willing to follow the recommendations of the President in both instances. I was hoping that the passage of the one measure would facilitate early passage of the other.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I could not in good faith say that, although I am hopeful that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be extended for 1 year.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Has the joint resolution yet been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not yet been acted upon.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise to urge the passage of the joint resolution. It was considered by the Finance Committee, and the committee recommended its passage.

This measure involves a study which must be conducted by a competent staff. The study is very comprehensive, and involves a survey of wide scope. In order to obtain a competent staff of sufficient size to do this work, it is necessary to have early action on the joint resolution. I therefore hope that it will be passed speedily, and that the House may act on it expeditiously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) was passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 11 members as follows:

(1) Five appointed by the President of the United States, of whom no more than three shall be appointed from the executive branch of the Government;

(2) Three appointed from the Senate by the Vice President of the United States;

(3) Three appointed from the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(b) Political affiliation: Of the first class of members mentioned in subsection (a), no more than three members shall be from the same political party. Of the second and third classes of members mentioned in subsection (a), no more than two members from each class shall be from the same political party.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 4. Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their

services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall receive not to exceed $75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. The Commission shall have power to appoint such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the civil-service laws, and to fix the compensation of such personnel in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission is further authorized to employ experts and consultants for temporary and intermittent personal services, but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals. The Commission is authorized to reimburse employees, experts, and consultants for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties and to make reasonable advances to such persons for such purposes.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

REPORT—EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. (a) Report: Within 60 days after the 2d session of the 83d Congress is convened, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress.

(b) Expiration of the Commission: 90 days after the submission to the Congress of the report provided for in subsection (a) of this section 8, the Commission shall cease to exist.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. The Commission is directed to examine, study, and report on the subject of international trade and to recommend policies, measures, and practices for stimulating its sound enlargement.

Without limiting the general scope of this direction, the work of the Commission shall include consideration of, and report on, the following matters:

(1) (a) Applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States;

(b) Laws, regulations, and practices of the United States relating to international trade, including such matters as tariffs, customs, customs administration, trade agreements, peril-point and escape procedures, opinions and decisions thereon of the United States Tariff Commission and the President, import and export quotas, monetary licenses, countervailing duties, and procurement preferences;

(c) Departments, agencies, boards, commissions, bureaus, and other instrumentalities of the United States having jurisdiction over, or dealing with, these matters;

(d) Laws, regulations, and practices, and official instrumentalities of other nations concerned with similar subject matters;

(e) Pertinent statistics on international trade;

(f) Balance of payments, nation by nation, excessive imbalances, causes, effects, proposed remedies.

(2) Relationship of our foreign economic policies to, and their influences on, our total foreign policy, proper relationship of each to the other.

(3) Effect of our foreign-aid and military-defense programs on international trade and international balance of payments.

(4) Foreign markets of trading nations—extent and nature—effect thereon of wars, other emergencies, technological advances, international relations, and other pertinent factors.

(5) International instrumentalities, organizations, agreements, and practices affecting trade, such as General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Customs Unions, Organization for European Economic Cooperation, International Wheat Agreement, cartels, European Payments Union, European Coal and Steel Community, International Monetary Fund.

(6) Foreign investment capital, flow of investment capital between nations—need thereof—restrictions thereon—inducements necessary to encourage, role of Export-Import Bank and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(7) Effects on international trade of factors such as costs of production and pricing, labor practices and standards, general living standards, currency manipulation, inconvertible currencies, official inflationary policies, currency devaluations, exchange controls and licenses, quotas, embargoes, dumping and pricing practices, multiple currencies, bilateral trade agreements, barter arrangements, customs procedures, marking and transit problems, concealed regulation of exports and imports, preferential tariff systems, most-favored-nation treatment, government monopolies, State-controlled economies, State trading, State-subsidized trading.

(8) Effect of existing and proposed trade policies on promotion of peace and security and betterment of political, social, and economic life.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such lawful expenditures, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission and shall be served by any person designated by him.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or by the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending business of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H. R. 4663, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is my understanding that the appropriation bill is the pending business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Consideration of it was laid over until tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, is a vote on the bill to be had tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No unanimous-consent agreement was entered into with respect to a vote on the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But the agreement was that the bill would go over until tomorrow, and it is now the pending business of the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the majority leader has asked me to make an announcement.

The appropriation bill for the independent offices will be considered tomorrow. We do not know whether consideration of the bill will be completed tomorrow. Assuming that it will take most of the session of the Senate tomorrow, it will then be our purpose, with the approval of the Senate, to take up the Legislative Calendar on Thursday. Of course, if consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill is not completed tomorrow the bill will go over until Thursday, and the Senate will keep working on it until its consideration is completed.

A MATTER OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, an article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, of the Christian Science Monitor. This article analyzes what I consider to be a serious matter in the procedure of the Congress. Mr. Drummond has reviewed the committee sessions of the Congress and advises that from January 3 to March 31, congressional committees and subcommittees have held about 860 meetings, 417 of them have been completely secret and 22 partly secret.

He also makes appropriate note of the fact as he puts it "that the majority of the members of the Cabinet have been silent, uncommunicative, unusually inaccessible to the press—certainly as secretive, if not more secretive, than their predecessors whom the Republicans criticized so sharply in the campaign."

I regret to say that this policy of closed committee meeting still continues. I have protested against this policy on several occasions and shall continue to do so until we can arrive at a policy decision in Congress, where public business is done in the public view.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETIVE GOP CABINET, CONGRESS RUINING CAMPAIGN PROMISE NOT TO BE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

One of the most frequent criticisms leveled at the Truman administration by Republican campaigners last fall was that it did not take the people into its confidence, that it kept information bottled up, that important agencies of the Government oper-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ated behind a screen of totally unnecessary secrecy and censorship.

These criticisms undoubtedly were exaggerated. Campaign oratory is an occupational hazard of all politicians. But there was substantial truth in the complaint that too much of the Government was overshielded from the press, that the President was often uncommunicative and evasive, and that the State Department was run almost as though it were a private club and foreign policy too precious for the public to be allowed to have the facts.

The Republicans promised that things would be different if they were elected.

ANY DIFFERENT?

Are these things different today? That is a valid and pertinent question now that the new administration has been in power in both the executive and legislative branches for more than 3 months. And if different, how different?

A fair and faithful answer to these questions cannot fail to concern the press and the voters, because at stake is not just the freedom of the press but also the right of the people to know what is going on when it is going on—not at some time in a future expediently selected by some Government official.

The facts on this important point, as objectively as I can get at them, are these:

1. President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles personally have opened wide the windows of the White House and State Department to let the information out and to encourage full discussion to play upon what they are doing and thinking. The President's press conferences have been consistently meaty and outgiving, and not once has Mr. Eisenhower backed away from pointed questioning by hiding behind the overused "no comment." Mr. Dulles has been exceedingly informative.

2. The majority of the members of the Cabinet, each responsible for operations and decisions which affect the whole country, has been silent, uncommunicative, unusually inaccessible to the press—certainly as secretive, if not more secretive, than their predecessors whom the Republican orators criticized so sharply in the campaign.

3. The new Republican Congress is now in the act of building a record of closed sessions and secret testimony which makes previous Democratic Congresses look like goldfish bowls. The trend thus far on Capitol Hill, consciously or unconsciously, has been toward secrecy and away from open decisions openly arrived at.

The evidence, then, is that despite the vigorous lead given by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles and their own resplendent examples, the Republican record toward fulfilling its pledge of open government openly visible to the people is very uneven and that, on balance, there are as many, if not more, closed doors in Washington than there were previously.

Here are the particular facts which show what has been happening—or not happening—on this critical ffont of the Government:

FACTS

In Congress: From January 3 to March 31 congressional committees and subcommittees have held about 860 meetings and 417 of them have been completely secret, 22 partly secret.

Many of these committees have good and sound reasons for secret sessions, such as the appropriations subcommittee sessions and hearings involving military security. But many are not validly secret—such as the hearings on several presidential nominations—and when the total of secret sessions mounts to nearly 50 percent of all congressional committee work, secrecy is becoming habitual, is becoming dangerous, is becoming a vice.

In the executive: Five members, or a majority of the Cabinet have not had a single press conference during the past 6 weeks. They are the Attorney General, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. These failures to meet the press tend to block off from public scrutiny large areas of Government operations. Two other members of the Cabinet—Secretary of Defense and the MSA Administrator—have held only two press conferences during this long period. It is true that the new officials have been busy getting acquainted with their jobs and it is quite possible that their record of disclosure will improve.

VIOLATE OWN PROMISE

It needs to improve if the Republican practice in office is not to be allowed to violate the Republicans' promise of what they would do when they got into office.

And when nearly 50 percent of congressional hearings are secret, this foreshadows a trend which, if it is not reversed, can do grave disservice to the functioning of democratic government and to the prestige of Congress itself.

President Eisenhower's own instinct and concept of government are strongly on the side of disclosure. He is faithfully practicing his precepts. If the Cabinet as a whole and if the Congress do not follow suit soon, the Republicans certainly will be leaving themselves open to the very charges which they so eagerly brought against their predecessors.

COMMUNISM IN UNIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is with a sense of humility and increasing conviction that I believe my position on foreign affairs is a correct one. The nature of the opposition to my views adds further confirmation, in my opinion, as to their validity.

I bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial critical of my views appearing in the Daily Worker for April 14, 1953. This is not the first attack leveled against me by the Communist Party. I welcome the hostility and the opposition of the Communist Party.

Members of the Senate will recall that during the time that I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations in the 82d Congress, the Communist Party bitterly attacked our investigation of Communist trade unionism. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] brought the attention of the Senate to those attacks in the course of a very fine speech during the 82d Congress. That investigation was a constructive effort to eliminate Communist influence from the American labor movement. For our efforts we received the thanks and appreciation of many democratically minded Americans all over the country.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of February 11, 1953, commenting favorably on our subcommittee work and an editorial written by Father Benjamin Masse and appearing in the April 25, 1953, issue of the America be printed in the body of the record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 11, 1953]

COMMUNISM IN UNIONS

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, chairman of the 82d Congress Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, has released a report on public policy and Communist domination of certain unions. This comparatively brief statement of 32 pages is the last of a series of reports focusing attention on the difficult problem of how to deal with Communist-controlled unions whose members are overwhelmingly non-Communist but who are victimized by astute Communists who use the trade-union paraphernalia, collective bargaining, and Government agencies as a legitimate cover for their party-line activities.

Certainly there is no easy way to remove Communist leaders from their entrenched official positions in some unions. Several years ago the Congress of Industrial Organizations ousted a group of Red-controlled unions for following the Communist Party line. Although by this action the CIO cleaned its own house, these unions still exist as independent entities under the same leadership. They had been officially certified by the National Labor Relations Board because at one time or another their members chose them as bargaining agents and because under the Taft-Hartley Act their leaders had signed non-Communist affidavits.

Unfortunately, some of these unions have contracts with employers in sensitive defense plants or industries. And yet the agents of these unions, while disbarred from setting foot inside the plants, may meet members at the gates or confer with their own planted accomplices at other places. The implication is too plain to need elaboration.

While there is legal authority for the Department of Defense to protect classified information, the Industrial Employment Review Board, under criteria established by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, finds that "the denial of access program, efficacious as it may be from the point of view of protecting classified information, does not in itself substantially reduce the threat of possible sabotage which might be carried out at the instigation of Communist-dominated unions. * * * We do not believe that we have the legal authority to go in and remove or summarily exclude potential saboteurs from national-defense facilities."

It should not be concluded, however, that the Government has done nothing to protect itself. The report states that effective steps have been taken against threats to national security, but also points out that additional steps can and should be taken. Among these are (1) the Munitions Board as well as other agencies concerned with security problems should develop specialized competence in dealing with the security implications of Communist-dominated unions; (2) the Bureau of the Budget should study how the various Federal responsibilities in this field can be sensibly coordinated and, through the Budget Bureau, the President should consider the development of in-service training programs for these various agencies on the goals and purposes of Communists in unions and how to distinguish the bona fide militant unionist from the Communist agent; (3) the Department of Justice should establish a special unit to deal with cases arising out of alleged violations of the non-Communist oath, with effectual liaison relationships to the NLRB and legislative committees engaged in Communist inquiries.

The Humphrey subcommittee deserves commendation for a creditable job. Its work, still uncompleted, should be continued by the present Senate Labor Committee, headed by H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

[From America of April 25, 1953]

PUBLIC POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST UNIONS

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

Just about every school of thought—liberal, conservative, and all the ideological shades in between—is dissatisfied with the anti-Communist section of the Taft-Hartley Act. Though the dissatisfaction stems from a variety of reasons, on one score all hands are agreed: Section 9 (h), which requires

non-Communist affidavits as a condition for enjoying the services of the National Labor Relations Board, has lost whatever force it may once have had.

The basis of this general persuasion need only be indicated. After nearly 6 years of operation under a law which was supposed to make their position untenable, the Communists remain a lively and potent factor in the labor movement. Though not so strong as they used to be, they continue to represent about a half million workers in such key defense industries as electrical manufacturing, longshoring, and copper mining and smelting. They have pockets of strength in other essential industries, too.

How oust the comrades from these places of power and potential sabotage? Should section 9 (h) be firmed up; and, if so, how? Or should it be quietly junked as a well-meaning but unrealistic approach to the problem? If it is to be junked, what, if anything, ought Congress put in its place?

Last year a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare set out to find the answers. For the business at hand, it was just about as knowledgeable a group as could be found in the 82d Congress. Senator TAFT, coauthor of Taft-Hartley, was a member. So were the three most highly regarded labor experts in the Senate: Senators IVES, of New York, MORSE, of Oregan, and DOUGLAS of Illinois. The chairman was Senator HUMPHREY, who brought to the probe an intelligent interest in the problem and a gift for energetic direction.

The subcommittee did a thorough job of picking the brains of a large and highly informed group of people. It levied on labor and management, on the professions, and the universities. The testimony turned out to be so revealing and authoritative that the subcommittee's publications—four volumes of hearings, plus a 32-page summary report to Congress—are now the richest available source of information on Communists in United States labor and what the Government ought to do about them.

Before giving the subcommittee's policy recommendations, which this Congress may decide to follow, I propose to hit the highlights of the various suggestions offered by the witnesses. They fall under four heads.

I

The National Labor Relations Board should be given authority to find that a union is Communist-dominated: This finding would be subject to due constitutional process, that is, the unions so characterized would enjoy the right to appeal to the courts. If they did not appeal, or if their appeal was denied, the unions would be refused access to the services of the Board. Furthermore, if the unions had the status of recognized bargaining agents, the Board would order them disestablished and compel employers to cease dealing with them.

Although the Canadian Labor Board has successfully used this approach to eliminate Communist-controlled unions above the border, our own Board is loath to accept the responsibility. NLRB Chairman Paul Herzog testified that the Board was expert in collective bargaining, not in detecting subversive activities, and that to become expert would require special investigative techniques inconsistent with the open-court procedures of a quasi-judicial agency. He added that the burden of investigating charges of Communist domination would delay and otherwise interfere with the purposes for which the Board was established.

Such informed witnesses as David Saposs, former chief economist of NLRB, Meryln Pitzele, chairman of the New York State Board of Mediation, and Senator MORSE did not share Mr. Herzog's doubts. Neither did several AFL leaders who favored this proposal.

II

Some Government agency other than NLRB should be empowered to declare a union Communist-dominated. Upon such a declaration, which would also be subject to due constitutional process, the Communist-dominated union would be liable to the penalties mentioned above.

Some of the witnesses limited this plan to defense industries. Others wanted it extended to all industries. The Government agency most frequently nominated for the job was the Munitions Board within the Department of Defense. This Board is already charged with the responsibility of formulating and policing security regulations in defense work.

One important precedent was cited for this proposal. In 1948 the Atomic Energy Commission ordered General Electric not to recognize the United Electric Workers (Independent) as collective-bargaining agent at the Government-owned atomic installation in Schenectady, N. Y.

Although a few union witnesses supported this approach, labor spokesmen were generally opposed to any procedure—whether it involved the Defense Department, NLRB or any other Federal agency—that would permit the Government to determine what unions can represent workers in this country. As the late Allan Haywood, then executive vice president of the CIO, told the subcommittee:

"This amounts, whether or not it is so labeled, to Government licensing of trade unions. It means that the Government determines which unions are legitimate and may continue to function, and which shall be proscribed. Government licensing of unions would, in our opinion, be justified, if ever, only in a desperate situation and as a last resort * * * and would inevitably involve thought control, since it would turn not on acts but on beliefs and loyalties."

A spokesman for the Defense Department expressed doubt that this agency had authority under existing law to disestablish a union, as the Atomic Energy Commission did in the General Electric case. And Mr. Herzog of NLRB said that there was serious question whether his agency could legally commit itself in advance to recognise any such order by the Defense Department, or by any other Government agency. It seemed clear from the testimony that if the Defense Department was to police unions in defense work, Congress would have to give it new authority.

Pending before Congress is a bill sponsored by Arizona's freshman Republicans, Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER and Representative JOHN J. RHODES, which would give to the Subversive Activities Control Board the job of fingering Communist unions. This bill has a chance of becoming law.

III

Communist-dominated unions should be eliminated by a Government guaranty of democratic processes in trade unions.

The assumption underlying this proposal is that Communists gain and maintain their hold over unions, as H. W. Story, vice president of Allis-Chalmers, testified, through stifling of democratic processes in the election of officers and in other administrative union activities. This position received some support from the liberal and labor side when J. B. S. Hardman, editor of Labor and Nation, agreed that protection of union civil rights was at least a partial answer to Communist control of unions. He told the subcommittee that trade unions cannot, by their very nature, duly protect the civil and democratic rights and duties of union members.

Other witnesses were of the opinion that Mr. Story was overly optimistic about the willingness and ability of all anti-Communist union members to oust Communist leaders. They were inclined to agree with an industrialist who testified that the unions have not really demonstrated their capacity to rid their organizations of Communist leadership. The trade-union witnesses who favored invoking the aid of NLRB or the Defense Department to break the Communist grip on certain unions apparently agreed with that estimate.

IV

Communist-controlled unions can be adequately handled by strengthening section 9 (h) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

As it now stands, section 9 (h) can be easily circumvented because the non-Communist affidavit requirement is couched in the present tense. To convict a union leader of making a false affidavit, the Justice Department must prove that the affiant was a member of the Communist Party on the very day he executed the affidavit. According to the Justice Department, that is virtually impossible, and the record bears the Department out. Out of a total of 68 cases which NLRB has referred to it since 1947, the Department has presented no more than 14 cases to a grand jury, and obtained a conviction in only one instance.

To close this verbal loophole, the former Attorney General, Howard McGrath, suggested that labor leaders be required to swear that they are not now, and for the preceding 12-month period have not been, members of the Communist Party.

Other witnesses doubted whether this change in wording would be really effective. They pointed out that if the law were amended in this way Communists would go through the farce of resigning from the party, wait a year, and then resume their union activities with impunity. The critics suggested, too, that the proposed change would not catch the Communists who, over the past 3 years, have resorted to the quickie resignation dodge and are now functioning as labor officials.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Confronted with these conflicting proposals, all supported by expert testimony, the subcommittee finally decided that, barring a worsening of the international situation, the country should continue to rely on section 9 (h). Persuaded by Mr. Herzog's analysis, its members agreed that NLRB was not geared to investigate the truth or falsity of the 232,000 affidavits now on file, and could not be so geared without a serious loss of efficiency. The subcommittee thought, however, that NLRB could help put teeth into section 9 (h) by stronger efforts "to protect its own processes from abuse." This it could do by denying its services to unions under three sets of circumstances:

1. Where individuals refuse to testify under oath before a grand jury or legislative committee that they have signed a non-Communist affidavit, or where they refuse to swear that they were not Communists at the time of signing.

2. Where individuals refuse in similar circumstances to testify whether or not they are members of the Communist Party.

3. Where individuals are convicted of executing a false non-Communist affidavit.

To encourage unions to rid themselves of officials involved in such cases, NLRB would give them 30 days to purge themselves before declaring them not in compliance with section 9 (h).

The subcommittee was aware of the objection that its recommendations conflicted with the constitutional protection against self-incrimination. This is the subcommittee's answer:

"It seems to us that the constitutional protection against self-incrimination ought not to become an immunity for Communist union officers from the consequences of bad faith in filing non-Communist affidavits.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

And in any case the loss suffered by such officers is a disqualification from serving as officers of a union which wishes to utilize the procedures of the law. That the unavailability of the Board's processes is something less than catastrophic is attested to by the fact that 2 large and powerful unions (and anti-Communist unions, by the way) have been able to exist for 5 years without access to NLRB procedures."

The subcommittee also had some recommendations for other Government agencies. It suggested that the Justice Department set up a special unit to handle section 9 (h) cases, and that this unit maintain close relations with NLRB and the various congressional committees concerned with Communist infiltration. It thought also that the Munitions Board, the Atomic Energy Commission, the FBI, and other security agencies should develop special competence in the security implications of Communist-controlled unions, and that the Budget Bureau should coordinate all Government activities in this field.

Finally the subcommittee recommended that Congress exempt from the affidavit provision of Taft-Hartley the officials of all unions which ban Communists from holding office and enforce the ban. Such a provision would encourage unions to dump Communist officials and would lighten the load on NLRB and the Justice Department.

Perhaps this program, which represents a compromise, is the best that can be had at the present time. It seems to me, however, that the forthright way to handle the problem, as Senator MORSE has said, is to declare that Communist-dominated unions are not trade unions within the meaning of the Taft-Hartley Act. If that were done, NLRB would be the logical agency to do the declaring.

Mr. Herzog, I think, exaggerates the difficulty of determining whether or not a union is Communist-dominated. To make such a determination is certainly much easier than to prove that an individual union leader is a member of the Communist Party. Actually, a difficulty would arise only in the case of scattered local unions affiliated with non-Communist internationals. So far as Communist-controlled international unions are concerned, they are so well known that the Board could easily identify them.

It was clear from the hearings that official labor opinion does not like this approach, but then official labor opinion does not like any governmental approach to the Communist issue. Against the background of AFL and CIO opposition to communism here and abroad, one can agree that ideally the best answer to Communist-controlled unions is counteraction on the part of workers and unions themselves. As the subcommittee found, however, the unions are not able to do the job alone. Since this is so, they should not resent Government aid in a matter which seriously concerns not trade unions alone but national defense, the whole general welfare of this country and, indeed, the defense of the free world itself.

AN EDITORIAL IN THE DAILY WORKER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published in the Daily Worker of April 14, 1953.

It is an indication to me that the Communist Party will again campaign against me in my State and throughout the Nation. The Communists opposed my election to the Senate in 1948, and I expect and welcome their opposition again. They play a destructive role in a democratic society. Their influence ought to be completely eliminated from every phase of American life. I pledge to continue my efforts in behalf of building and maintaining a free and prosperous economy, in which those of totalitarian faith will find no following.

I shall do my utmost to eradicate all traces of Communist influence wherever it may be found, at home or abroad.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMPHREY CONCURS

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, if we may speak figuratively, wears a big button reading: "I am a friend of labor." By feverishly pointing to that button he got himself elected once as president of the Americans for Democratic Action. Now he has got into the act with the Hearst press, John Foster Dulles, Syngman Rhee, Chiang Kai-shek, and a motley crowd known for their hatred of labor and democracy, to issue a warning against peaceful settlement of our differences with the Soviet Union, China, and Korea.

HUMPHREY issued on Sunday what is described as a "concurring statement" saying that the United States should beware of Soviet peace gestures. The gentleman with whom he was concurring was none other than Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, who has an unbroken record of voting for every antilabor bill that ever came down the pike.

To see the full import of HUMPHREY'S statement, it should be read against this background:

1. Newspaper correspondents, public figures, and others predict that if a truce and cease-fire are reached in Korea, the way will be open for relaxing many of the tensions between the United States and the U. S. S. R.

2. Many such figures believe—and some deplore—that one of the results of such a lessening of tensions will be that Congress will reduce the present enormous expenditures for armaments.

3. Chairman STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire, of the Senate Appropriations Committee declared Sunday that the national budget can be slashed by $8 billion and that a tax cut by January 1 is probable.

4. The CIO called on Congress Sunday to increase the Federal income tax exemption for each individual from $600 to $800, thus providing a tax cut for the neediest section of the population.

WILEY'S statement is obviously aimed at preventing any reduction in the armament program and therefore any cut in taxes. HUMPHREY, by concurring with WILEY, thus lends aid and support to those who exploit and bleed labor and takes a stand in opposition to labor's demand for a tax cut.

This is a strange position for a Senator who likes to advertise himself as a "friend of labor."

OPPOSITION TO ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA INTO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in the past few weeks there has been apparently a growing pressure on the United Nations, at New York and elsewhere, to admit Communist China as a member of the United Nations, either before or after a cease fire in Korea.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the resolution of June 27, 1950, which was passed by the Security Council of the United Nations shortly after the aggression took place in Korea.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECOND UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION—JUNE 27, 1950

(Resolution concerning the complaint of aggression upon the Republic of Korea, adopted at the 474th meeting of the Security Council, on June 27, 1950:)

The Security Council—

Having determined that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace;

Having called for an immediate cessation of hostilities; and

Having called upon the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces to the 38th parallel; and

Having noted from the report of the United Nations Commission for Korea that the authorities in North Korea having neither ceased hostilities nor withdrawn their armed forces to the 38th parallel and that urgent military measures are required to restore international peace and security; and

Having noted the appeal from the Republic of Korea to the United Nations for immediate and effective steps to secure peace and security,

Recommends that the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repeal the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area.

(Voting for the resolution: United States, United Kingdom, France, China, Norway, Ecuador, and Cuba. Voting against: Yugoslavia. Abstention: Egypt, India (2 days later India accepted the resolution). Absent: Soviet Union.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the text of a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on October 7, 1950, in which that body of the United Nations called for the unification of Korea.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Document 9 (U. N. Document A/1435)]

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, OCTOBER 7, 1950

The General Assembly;

Having regard to its resolutions of November 14, 1947, of December 12, 1948 and of October 21, 1949;

Having received and considered the report of the United Nations Commission on Korea;

Mindful of the fact that the objectives set forth in the resolutions referred to above have not been fully accomplished and, in particular, that the unification of Korea has not yet been achieved, and that an attempt has been made by an armed attack from North Korea to extinguish by force the Government of the Republic of Korea;

Recalling the General Assembly declaration of December 12, 1948, that there has been established a lawful government (the Government of the Republic of Korea) having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea was able to observe and consult and in which the great majority of the people of Korea reside, that this Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which were observed by the Temporary Commission; and that this is the only such Government in Korea;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Having in mind that United Nations armed forces are at present operating in Korea in accordance with the recommendations of the Security Council of June 27, 1950, subsequent to its resolution of June 25, 1950, that members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area;

Recalling that the essential objective of the resolutions of the General Assembly referred to above was the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government of Korea.

1. Recommends that—

(a) All appropriate steps be taken to insure conditions of stability throughout Korea;

(b) All constituent acts be taken, including the holding of elections, under the auspices of the United Nations for the establishment of a unified independent and democratic government in the sovereign state of Korea;

(c) All sections and representative bodies of the population of Korea, South and North, be invited to cooperate with the organs of the United Nations in the restoration of peace, in the holding of elections and in the establishment of a unified government;

(d) United Nations forces should not remain in any part of Korea otherwise than so far as necessary for achieving the objectives specified in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above;

(e) All necessary measures be taken to accomplish the economic rehabilitation of Korea.

2. Resolves that—

(a) A Commission consisting of Australia, Chile, Netherlands, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, and Turkey, to be known as the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, be established to (i) assume the functions hitherto exercised by the present United Nations Commission in Korea; (ii) represent the United Nations in bringing about the establishment of a unified, independent, and democratic government of all Korea; (iii) exercise such responsibilities in connection with relief and rehabilitation in Korea as may be determined by the General Assembly after receiving the recommendations of the Economic and Social Council. The United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea should proceed to Korea and begin to carry out its functions as soon as possible.

(b) Pending the arrival in Korea of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, the governments of the states represented on the Commission should form an interim committee composed of representatives meeting at the seat of the United Nations to consult with and advise the United Nations United Command in the light of the above recommendations; the interim committee should begin to function immediately upon the approval of the present resolution by the General Assembly.

(c) The Commission shall render a report to the next regular session of the General Assembly and to any prior special session which might be called to consider the subject matter of the present resolution, and shall render such interim reports as it may deem appropriate to the Secretary General for transmission to members.

The General Assembly furthermore—

Mindful of the fact that at the end of the present hostilities the task of rehabilitating the Korean economy will be of great magnitude.

3. Requests the Economic and Social Council, in consultation with the specialized agencies, to develop plans for relief and rehabilitation on the termination of hostilities and to report to the General Assembly within 3 weeks of the adoption of the present resolution by the General Assembly;

4. Also recommends the Economic and Social Council to expedite the study of long-term measures to promote the economic development and social progress of Korea, and meanwhile to draw the attention of the authorities which decide requests for technical assistance to the urgent and special necessity of affording such assistance to Korea;

5. Expresses its appreciation of the services rendered by the members of the United Nations Commission on Korea in the performance of their important and difficult task;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Commission with adequate staff and facilities, including technical advisers as required; and authorizes the Secretary-General to pay the expenses and per diem of a representative and alternate from each of the states members of the Commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also wish to have printed at this point in my remarks the resolution of the General Assembly of February 1, 1951, in which the General Assembly designated Communist China as an aggressor in Korea.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NAMING THE PEIPING REGIME AS AN AGGRESSOR IN KOREA, ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, FEBRUARY 1, 1951

The General Assembly—

Noting that the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, has failed to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in regard to Chinese Communist intervention in Korea.

Noting that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China has not accepted United Nations proposals to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea with a view to peaceful settlement, and that its armed forces continue their invasion of Korea and their large-scale attacks upon United Nations forces there,

1. Finds that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, by giving direct aid and assistance to those who were already committing aggression in Korea and by engaging in hostilities against the United Nations forces there, has itself engaged in aggression in Korea;

2. Calls upon the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to cause its forces and nationals in Korea to cease hostilities against the United Nations forces and to withdraw from Korea;

3. Affirms the determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression;

4. Calls upon all states and authorities to continue to lend every assistance to the United Nations action in Korea;

5. Calls upon all states and authorities to refrain from giving any assistance to the aggressors in Korea;

6. Requests a Committee composed of the members of the Collective Measures Committee as a matter of urgency to consider additional measures to be employed to meet this aggression and to report thereon to the General Assembly, it being understood that the Committee is authorized to defer its report if the Good Offices Committee referred to in the following paragraph reports satisfactory progress in its efforts;

7. Affirms that it continues to be the policy of the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea and the achievement of United Nations objectives in Korea by peaceful means, and requests the President of the General Assembly to designate forthwith two persons who would meet with him at any suitable opportunity to use their good offices to this end.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the United States Congress on January 19, 1951, reading as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations should immediately act and declare the Chinese Communist authorities aggressor in Korea.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks two Senate resolutions adopted on January 23, 1951. The first one reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

The second resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

My recollection is that those resolutions were unanimously adopted. I believe one of them was adopted by a yea-and-nay vote of the Senate at that time.

Mr. President, in the not too distant future we may be faced with an effort by the Chinese Communists to "shoot their way" into the United Nations organization. It seems to me that should our associates in the United Nations consent to any such membership by the Communist regime of China, it would be a betrayal of the moral foundation upon which the United Nations rests and would be a betrayal of the 135,000 American casualties, including more than 20,000 killed, that have occurred in Korea up to this time.

I have prepared two resolutions which I desire to ask unanimous consent to submit at this time, and I ask that both resolutions be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks. However, I shall read only one of the resolutions at this time. It is in the nature of a Senate resolution, whereas the other one is in the nature of a concurrent resolution, which would require action by both Houses of Congress.

The Senate resolution (S. Res. 112) reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that (1) if Communist China is admitted to membership in the United Nations or (2) if representatives of the Communist regime in China are recognized as the representatives of the Republic of China in the United Nations, the President should recall the representatives of the United States in the United Nations and should take such steps as may be necessary to effect the withdrawal of the United States from membership in the United Nations and all organs and agencies thereof.

Mr. President, I now ask that the concurrent resolution, which I ask unanimous consent to submit, also be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) was or-

dered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that (1) if Communist China is admitted to membership in the United Nations or (2) if representatives of the Communist regime in China are recognized as the representatives of the Republic of China in the United Nations, the President should recall the representatives of the United States in the United Nations and should take such steps as may be necessary to effect the withdrawal of the United States from membership in the United Nations and all organs and agencies thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the Senator from California that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, or that they lie on the table?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to have the resolutions referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolutions (S. Res. 112 and S. Con. Res. 29) were received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Owen Clarke, of Washington, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, vice William J. Patterson, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the Senator from California that the Executive Calendar be called at this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not at this time, Mr. President.

RECESS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 19 (legislative day of May 15), 1953:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Owen Clarke, of Washington, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1959, vice William J. Patterson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Frank Ray Wilson, St. John's Church, Lafayette Square, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Gracious Father, worthy is it and right for us to offer Thee praise and our humble petition, Thou who art truly God.

Look favorably, we beseech Thee, O Lord, upon the people of this land whom we have been appointed to serve.

Grant unto us in this House, especially, that whereas in many things we may be divided, we may be united in heart and mind to bear the burdens laid upon us.

Help us to respond to the call of our country and the hopes of all men everywhere according to our several powers. Put far from us all selfish indifference to the needs of others. Pour upon us Thy grace to fulfill our daily duties with sober diligence. Keep us from all uncharitableness in word or deed, and enable us by the patient prodding of Thy holy spirit to do all things well, while protecting us from every evil to which we may be exposed.

And may we also ask that when the day is done we may be able to say with an honest and good heart we have sought to do Thy will, O God, and glorified Thy holy name. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 11, 1953:

H. R. 720. An act for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery.

On May 13, 1953:

H. R. 1936. An act authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2936. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California for use as a fairground by the 10–A District Agricultural Association, California.

On May 14, 1953:

H. R. 686. An act for the relief of Takako Niina;

H. R. 684. An act for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi;

H. R. 955. An act for the relief of Paula Akiyama;

H. R. 1186. An act for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marques;

H. R. 1193. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. James M. Tuten, Jr.;

H. R. 1704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki;

H. R. 1895. An act for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter; and

H. R. 2624. An act for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford.

On May 18, 1953:

H. R. 731. An act for the relief of James Renwick Moffett;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann); and

H. R. 4004. An act to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 110):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. MERLIN HULL, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution to revise and reprint the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government."

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 239) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM M. TUCK, of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Post Office and Civil Service.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business may have permission to sit during general debate in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

EDWARD KEATING

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an event of unusual significance which occurred in Washington recently when a former colleague was honored for outstanding service in the newspaper field. I refer to the retirement of Edward Keating as editor and manager of Labor, a national weekly newspaper owned and edited by the railroad workers of America, at which time Mr. Keating was elected manager emeritus of this publication for life.

Mr. Keating was elected to Congress while a resident of Pueblo, Colo. I have the honor to represent the congressional district in Colorado that he so ably served for three terms, during the period from 1913 to 1919. Before coming to Congress Mr. Keating was engaged in newspaper work in Colorado.

Soon after his retirement from Congress, Ed Keating was employed as the first editor and manager of the new national weekly to be known as Labor. From the fall of 1919 until his retirement in March of this year he directed the editorial policies of this publication, which each Member of Congress receives and enjoys each week.

On the occasion of his retirement several prominent railroad labor leaders paid highly deserved tributes to Mr. Keating for his long, efficient, and valuable service. Mr. Thomas C. Carroll, president of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, had this to say in presenting the resolution which bestowed upon him the title of manager and editor emeritus for life:

To say that Ed Keating has done a magnificent job with our paper, Labor, is understating the facts. I don't think there is a man living who could have done a more splendid job.

It would be impossible to place a monetary value on the good will our paper has brought to the railway workers of this country. As a matter of fact, it may be truthfully said that the work of our newspaper, Labor, has profited all the workers of the North American Continent.

Ed Keating and our paper, Labor, have contributed tremendously to many, many campaigns of importance to our boys—the Railway Labor Act, the Railroad Retirement Act, the union-shop amendment, to mention only three.

The following tribute to Mr. Keating was paid by Mr. George M. Harrison, grand president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, who said:

I appreciate this occasion when I can pay tribute to you, Ed Keating, for a long and valuable period of great service to your fellowmen, and particularly to the railroad workers as the editor of our great newspaper, Labor.

As I look back over the more than 30 years you have spent with Labor and endeavor to recount the blessings which have come to the members of these organizations which own Labor, I feel it is almost impossible to put in words the progress the workers in the railroad industry have made.

A large measure of that progress is indirectly traceable to the influence our newspaper has had on public thinking, and particularly its influence on Members of the Federal Congress, who on many occasions had the power of decision on legislation which sometimes amounted to life and death for these organizations.

And I think you, Ed Keating, must look back with great satisfaction over this long period of service. You have given of your time and your talents to improve the lot of the average man.

You have helped countless millions of men and women and children whom you have never seen. Through their labor unions they enjoy a better standard of living and thus enjoy a fuller measure of those things they participated in creating.

Mr. D. B. Robertson, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, paid the following tribute to Mr. Keating:

I have known Ed Keating through all the years he has piloted Labor. We have been intimate friends and comrades in arms. All of the members of our brotherhood have received Labor for many years.

Through all that time Ed Keating has been a tower of strength for all of us in the ranks of railroad labor. He has built up Labor to a position of unrivaled prestige and influence. Under his guidance Labor has been a strong right arm for our brotherhood and all rail unions in their many hard battles for higher wages, better conditions, protective legislation, and innumerable other vital objectives.

Labor stands as an imperishable monument to the genius and devotion of Ed Keating. We all owe a great debt to him.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of this House joins me in congratulating our former colleague, Ed Keating, of Colorado, on his brilliant record in the newspaper field, and for the contribution he has made not only to the railroad brotherhoods but to the cause of organized labor. It gives me great pleasure to extend our very best wishes to Mr. Keating, and to his devoted wife, on the occasion of his retirement. We wish both of them good health and much happiness for many years to come.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TRANSPORTATION TO VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1730) to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has prepared an amendment setting a termination date on this proposed legislation. In accordance with that understanding I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, whenever he finds such action to be necessary for the efficient conduct of the affairs of the Veterans' Administration, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to utilize automotive equipment of the Veterans' Administration, to transport its employees between field stations and nearest adequate public transportation at such reasonable rates of fare for the service furnished as he may establish. All moneys collected as fares from such employees shall be accounted for and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. The authority herein granted the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be exercised with respect to any station only after determination by the Administrator that existing private and other facilities are not and cannot be rendered adequate by other means, and that its exercise will result in the most efficient method of supplying transportation to the personnel concerned and a proper utilization of transportation facilities.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the present authority for the furnishing of this type of transportation expired on June 30, 1953, and by unanimous direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: On page 1, line 3, after the word "That", insert "until July 1, 1955."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUE VETERANS' OFFICE IN PHILIPPINES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3884) to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation involves an expenditure of $1,640,000 annually and thus violates the resolution of the objectors' committee relating to the consideration on the Consent Calendar of bills involving the expenditure of more than $1 million. It is a good piece of legislation, but I think it should be considered under suspension of the rules or under a rule. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that that is what is being paid now for the rental of these buildings and facilities in the Philippines. This involves no additional cost to the Federal Government. Some facilities will have to be provided by the State Department if the Veterans' Administration does not do that. I wonder if, in order to facilitate the passage of this bill in the House and get it over to the Senate so it can be passed before

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Congress adjourns, the gentleman will not reconsider his request.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I see the point the gentlewoman from Massachusetts makes. However, the objectors' committee has a rule that if the bill involves an amount in excess of $1 million we shall ask that it be passed over without prejudice. This violates that rule. I think the bill should come up under a suspension of the rules or under a rule.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I shall have to object to the gentleman's request that the bill be passed over without prejudice, in order to get the bill off the calendar and see if we cannot get it considered more quickly by rule or suspension. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PORT CHICAGO, CALIF., CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2696) to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of effecting the settlement of those claims against the United States resulting from the explosions which occurred at the naval ammunition depot at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, which have not been settled by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full settlement of all such claims, the respective sums found to be due in the report of the Secretary of the Navy to Congress dated November 26, 1951, of claims which have been investigated and recommended to be paid by a Board of Investigation of the 12th Naval District subsequent to Public Law 637, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 389): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "report" and insert "reports."

Line 3, strike out "of claims which have been investigated and recommended to be paid by a Board of Investigation of the 12th Naval District subsequent to" and insert "and November 12, 1952, submitted pursuant to."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPOSITION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS COMMISSIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4364) to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," relative to the composition of claims commissions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act of Congress of January 2, 1942 (ch. 645, 55 Stat. 880), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "In time of war" and by capitalizing the next following word "any."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE CHARTER OF THE AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1434) to amend the act of February 24, 1925, incorporating the American War Mothers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 7 and 8 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American War Mothers," approved February 24, 1925, as amended (36 U. S. C., secs. 97 and 98), are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. That the membership of American War Mothers is limited to women, and no woman shall be and become a member of this corporation unless she is a citizen of the United States and unless her son or sons or daughter or daughters of her blood served in the Armed Forces of the United States or of its allies in World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or any subsequent war or conflict involving the United States, having an honorable discharge from such service, or being still in the service.

"SEC. 8. That this organization shall be nonpolitical, nonsectarian, nonpartisan, and nonprofit, and as an organization shall not promote the candidacy of any person seeking public office."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COPYRIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2747) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyright" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 17, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section 216 to read as follows:

"§ 216. When the day for taking action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday

"When the last day for making any deposit or application, or for paying any fee, or for delivering any other material to the Copyright Office falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday within the District of Columbia, such action may be taken on the next succeeding business day."

SEC. 2. The table of contents of chapter 3 of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof "216. When the day for taking action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILING OF CERTAIN CLAIMS UNDER CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2566) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to establish a time limitation upon the filing of certain claims thereunder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 is hereby amended by adding at the end of subsection (d) thereof the following: "No person shall be entitled to recover compensation, to receive a settlement of any alleged obligation, or to obtain the benefit of any amendment, confirmation, ratification, or formalization of any alleged contract or commitment under the provisions of subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of this section, unless such person shall, on or before 90 days after the date of enactment of this sentence, have filed a claim therefor with the contracting agency."

SEC. 2. No liability shall accrue by reason of the enactment of the first section of this act which would not otherwise have accrued.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "90 days" and insert "180 days."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMITTING THE STATE OF OHIO INTO THE UNION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 121) for admitting the State of Ohio into the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. LYLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I have an explanation of this joint resolution? If Ohio is not a member of the Union and we have some illegal Members of the Senate and the House here, I should like to know it. I would like to have an explanation, actually, as to what this joint resolution does.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am no authority on this piece of legislation, but I might advise the gentleman that it is my understanding that the only purpose of this joint resolution is to make fixed and exact the date on which Ohio entered the Union. There is no question that Ohio is in the Union.

Mr. LYLE. I see.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There is some little confusion as to the exact date. This makes the date March 1, 1803.

Mr. LYLE. That clears it up some, because, in view of some of the things that have been said by the gentleman from Ohio, I am sure if they were not in the Union they would not want to subject themselves to many of the things they have been talking about.

I withdraw my reservation of the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas, in pursuance of an act of Congress, passed on the 30th day of April, 1802, entitled "An act to enable the people of the eastern division of the territory northwest of the river Ohio to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, and for other purposes," the people of the said territory did, on the 29th day of November, 1802, by a convention called for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution and State government, which constitution and State government, so formed is republican, and in conformity to the principles of the articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in the territory northwest of the river Ohio, passed on the 13th day of July, 1787: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the State of Ohio, shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and is admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever.

SEC. 2. This joint resolution shall take effect as of March 1, 1803.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR PURCHASE OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR HOME AND OTHER SITES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2512) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the Delegate from Alaska answer a question please with regard to this bill? I note there are not up-to-date reports before the committee on this bill. However, similar bills passed the House in both the 80th and 81st Congresses. I wish to inquire of the gentleman whether or not there were complete reports in the 80th and 81st Congresses on the similar measure which passed the House.

Mr. BARTLETT. There were at that time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended by the act approved July 14, 1945 (59 Stat. 467; 43 U. S. C., sec. 682a), is amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, is authorized to sell or lease to any person or organization described in section 3 of this act a tract of not exceeding 5 acres of any vacant, unreserved public lands, public lands withdrawn by Executive Orders Nos. 6910 of November 26, 1934, and 6964 of February 5, 1935, for classification, or public lands withdrawn or reserved by the Secretary of the Interior for any purposes, which the Secretary may classify as chiefly valuable for residence, recreation, business, or community site purposes, if he finds that such sale or lease of the lands would not unreasonably interfere with the use of water for grazing purposes nor unduly impair the protection of watershed areas, in reasonably compact form and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, at a price to be determined by him, for such use: *Provided*, That no land may be sold hereunder unless it has been surveyed. No person or organization shall be permitted to purchase or lease more than one tract under the provision of this act, except upon a showing of good faith and reasons satisfactory to the Secretary.

"SEC. 2. No tract shall be sold for less than the cost of making any survey necessary to describe properly the land sold. Patents for all tracts purchased under the provisions of this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of the oil, gas, and all other mineral deposits, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable law and such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

"SEC. 3. A lease may be issued or a sale made under this act to any of the following: (a) An individual who is a citizen of the United States, or who has filed his declaration of intention to become a citizen as required by the naturalization laws: (b) a partnership or an association, each of the members of which is a citizen of the United States or has filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen; (c) a corporation, including nonprofit corporations, organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, and authorized to do business in the State or Territory in which the land is located; (d) a State, Territory, municipality, or other governmental subdivision.

"SEC. 4. Any employee of the Department of the Interior, stationed in Alaska, notwithstanding such employment, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, purchase or lease under this act one tract for residence or recreation purposes in the Territory of Alaska.

"SEC. 5. The authority to lease lands under this act shall extend to the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands situated in the State of Oregon and under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 17, following the word "residence", add the following words: "or recreation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURCHASE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2312) to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on June 30, 1953.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this measure about to be repealed is one which I sponsored in the House of Representatives and is one which has worked well. It is heartening to watch the course of this type of legislation and realize that much can be done for American agriculture without the cost of one single penny.

When we had hearings on this matter we found that Europe and parts of Asia were in real need of new materials such as cotton from the United States. We had available this material but we did not feel that we should present it to these conquered countries as a present from the American taxpayer. As a result, we worked out this revolving fund idea. Under the operation of this fund, raw cotton was shipped to occupied areas and was processed by local people, using local labor and mill equipment. It was then sold locally to needy people; and they using current moneys available paid the manufacturer and he in turn paid our people for the cotton used. In this manner, every one benefited from the arrangement.

Under the terms of this bill, millions of bales of southern cotton was thus sold to foreign consumers who otherwise would never have been able to obtain the products needed by them. It has been a successful operation.

TARRANT COUNTY WATER CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2314) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, an identical bill has already been passed by the other body. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1525) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex., an identical bill to H. R. 2314 in lieu of said House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in consideration of the conveyance to the United States of America by the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1, of fee simple title to two certain parcels of land and avigation easement rights in other lands described in section 2 hereof, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convey to the said Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to three parcels of land at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex., comprising an aggregate of two hundred twenty-five and five one-hundredths acres, more or less, and indicated as sections 1, 2, and 3 of area D on Public Works Drawing No. 4847 approved February 10, 1950, a copy of which is on file in the Navy Department, reserving however, to the United States of America, avigation easement rights and such other rights in, to, and over said lands as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to accept the conveyance to the United States of America by the said Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 of fee simple title to two parcels of land at the said former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex., containing an aggregate area of two hundred forty-four and thirty one-hundredths acres, more or less, and indicated as areas A and B on said Public Works drawing No. 4847, together with perpetual avigation easement rights acceptable to the Secretary of the Navy over other lands of the said district lying in the flight clearance zone of the east-west runway of the said air station.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar bill, H. R. 2314, was laid on the table.

FORT BELVOIR, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2315) to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a similar situation exists with regard to this bill. A Senate bill, S. 1549, which is identical to the House bill, has already been passed by the other body. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1549) to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va., in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of Virginia a retrocession of jurisdiction over portions of highways described below within the Fort Belvoir Military Reservation to the extent that all laws of the State and all laws of the United States shall be applicable thereon and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover: United States Highway No. 1 between the easterly and westerly boundaries of the reservation, Virginia Highway No. 617 from Accotink to the northwesterly boundary of the reservation, Virginia Highway No. 618 between United States Highway No. 1 and Virginia Highway No. 613, Virginia Highway No. 613 from its intersection with Virginia Highway No. 611 (also known as Telegraph Road) to its intersection with Virginia Highway No. 618, and over the following area: Beginning at the intersection of the center lines of Virginia Highway Nos. 613 and 617; thence westerly at right angles to the center line of Highway No. 617, four feet; thence north forty degrees west two hundred thirty-two and forty-seven one-hundredths feet to center of bridge; thence north fifty degrees east forty-four feet to a point in stream; thence south forty degrees east one hundred eighty-eight and forty-seven one-hundredths feet to a point in Highway No. 613; thence south five degrees west sixty-two and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to point of beginning. This legislation is to be effective only as to those portions of the highways and area indicated herein over which the United States has heretofore acquired exclusive jurisdiction and shall not affect portions of such highways and area, if any, over which exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction is now vested in the State of Virginia. The general location of the numbered highways and the bounded area are shown on a map designated: War Department, O. C. E., Construction Division, Real Estate, Fort Belvoir Layout Map, approved September 22, 1944, Drawing No. MAD 37, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction provided for in section 1 of this act shall take effect upon the acceptance thereof by the Legislature of the State of Virginia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 2315, was laid on the table.

SUPPLIES AND SERVICES TO FOREIGN NAVAL VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2317) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill, S. 1524, which has been already passed by the other body is identical to H. R. 2317. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1524) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes, in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to furnish foreign naval vessels at United States ports and naval bases—

(1) routine port services such as pilotage, tugs, garbage removal, line handling, and utilities on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds when such routine port services are furnished on a like basis to United States naval vessels at ports and naval bases of the country concerned;

(2) miscellaneous supplies such as fuel, provisions, spare parts, and general stores on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds when a prior agreement conferring reciprocal rights on the United States and covering the reimbursement therefor has been negotiated with the country concerned; and

(3) supplies and services such as overhauling, repairs, and alterations, including the installation of equipment, when funds to cover the estimated cost thereof have been made available in advance.

SEC. 2. Payments for the supplies and services furnished pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of the first section of this act may be credited to current appropriations so as to be available for the same purposes as the appropriation initially charged.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 2317, was laid on the table.

JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN HIGHWAYS IN FORT SILL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4554) to retrocede to the State of Oklahoma concurrent jurisdiction over the right-of-way for United States Highways 62 and 277 within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill (S. 1641) which has already passed the Senate, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of Oklahoma a retrocession of jurisdiction over that part of the Fort Sill Military Reservation for which permission to use as a highway right-of-way for United States Highways 62 and 277, 80 feet in width, with necessary borrow pits, was granted to the State of Oklahoma by the Assistant Secretary of War by permit dated October 13, 1932. This retrocession of jurisdiction is granted to the extent that all laws of the State and all laws of the United States shall be applicable within the entire area included within the said permit and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction granted shall be effective upon the acceptance thereof by the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 4554, was laid on the table.

TO AMEND RECREATION ACT OF JUNE 14, 1926

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1815) to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869), entitled "An act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) The Secretary of the Interior upon application filed by a duly qualified applicant under section 2 of this act may, in the manner prescribed by this act, dispose of any public lands to a State, Territory, county, municipality, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision for any public purposes, or to a nonprofit corporation or nonprofit association for any recreational or any public purpose consistent with its articles of incorporation or other creating authority. Before the land may be disposed of under this act for a purpose other than a recreational purpose, it must be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the land is to be used for an established or definitely proposed project.

"(b) No more than 640 acres may be conveyed to any one grantee in any one calendar year.

"(c) Where the lands have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior, or of a State, Territory, county, municipality, water district, or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary of the Interior may make disposals under this act only with the consent of such Federal department or agency, or of such State, Territory, or local governmental unit. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national forest, national park, or national monument, or to any Indian lands, or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians. Nor shall any disposition be made under this act for any use authorized under any other law, except for a use authorized under the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609; 43 U. S. C., sec. 682a), as amended.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may after due consideration as to the power value of the land, whether or not withdrawn therefor, (a) sell such land to the State, Territory, county, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision in which the lands are situated, or to a nearby municipal corporation in the same State or Territory, for the purpose for which the land has been classified, and conveyances of such land for historic-monument purposes under this subsection shall be made without monetary consideration, while conveyances for any other purpose under this subsection shall be made at 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the Secretary; (b) lease such land to the State, Territory, county, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision in which the lands are situated, or to a nearby municipal corporation in the same State or Territory, for the purpose for which the land has been classified, at a reasonable annual rental, for a period up to 20 years, and, at the discretion of the Secretary, with a privilege of renewal for a like period, or (c) lease such land to a nonprofit corporation or nonprofit association at a reasonable annual rental, for a period up to 20 years, and, at the discretion of the Secretary, with a privilege of renewal for a like period. Each patent or lease so issued shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in the lands conveyed or leased and of the right to mine and remove the same, under applicable laws and regulations to be established by the Secretary. Each lease shall contain a provision for its termination upon a finding by the Secretary that the land has not been used by the lessee for the purpose specified in the lease for such period, not over 5 years, as may be specified in the lease, or that such land or any part thereof is being devoted to another use.

"SEC. 3. Title to lands conveyed by the Government under this act may not be transferred by the grantee or its successor except, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, to a transferee which would be a qualified grantee under section 2 (a) and subject to the acreage limitation contained in section 1 (b) of this act. A grantee or its successor may not change the use specified in the conveyance to another or additional use except, with the consent of the Secretary, to a use for which such grantee or its successor could obtain a conveyance under this act. If at any time after the lands are conveyed by the Government, the grantee or its successor attempts to transfer title to or control over these lands to another or the lands are devoted to a use other than that for which the lands were conveyed, without the consent of the Secretary, title to the lands shall revert to the United States.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary may authorize transfers of title or changes in use in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of this act with respect to any patent heretofore issued under any act upon application by a patentee qualified to obtain a conveyance under section 2 (a) of this act.

"SEC. 5. The act of September 30, 1890, entitled 'An act to authorize entry of the public lands by incorporated cities and towns for cemetery and park purposes,' and the act of October 17, 1940, entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease for park or recreational purposes, and to sell for cemetery purposes, certain public lands in Alaska,' are hereby repealed."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, insert "The Secretary may classify public lands in Alaska for disposition under this act. Lands so classified may not be appropriated under any other public land law unless the Secretary revises such classification or authorizes the disposition of an interest in the lands under other applicable law. If, within 18 months following such classification, no application has been filed for the purpose for which the lands have been so classified, then the Secretary shall restore such lands to appropriation under the applicable public land laws."

Page 3, line 24, strike out "at 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the Secretary," and insert "at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior through appraisal or otherwise, after taking into consideration the purpose for which the lands are to be used."

Page 5, line 15, insert "The provisions of this section, however, shall cease to be in effect as to any lands patented under this act 25 years after the issuance of patent for such lands."

Page 5, line 22, insert "If the Secretary, pursuant to such an application, authorizes such transfer or use, all reverter provisions and other limitations on transfer or use under this or any other act affecting the lands involved, shall cease to be in effect 25 years after the Secretary authorizes the transfer or use for a changed or additional purpose under the provisions of this section."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN JOHNSON CITY, TENN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1561) authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration in Johnson City, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill, and also calendar No. 72, which involves the transfer of Federally owned property to communities, without purchase by the communities, seems to be a new policy. I wonder if somebody from the committee might advise us as to what the policy of the committee is in recommending that Federal land be given to communities for specific purposes rather than having the communities purchase the property from the Government.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The policy of the committee is that where there is no objection to it we do. In this instance, as I remember, the land from Ohio was given over to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is Calendar No. 52.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In the case of the Johnson City property it is my understanding this will transfer 30 acres of land that the Veterans' Administration has control over, to the State of Tennessee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct. It is to be used for an amusement park and the veterans would receive a great deal of benefit from that. It would be right next door.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. This matter, I may say to the gentleman has had the full consideration of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The Veterans' Administration offers no objection to the approval of this measure and the transferring of title to this land. The tract sought to be transferred is to be used for a recreation park and also for the site of an armory. Therefore, public purposes would be utilized. In the event the tract is not de-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

veloped or used for this purpose, then it would be returned to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The only thing, I understand in other communities they will find need for a National Guard building, for instance, and they will go out and buy the property on which to construct it. Here we have a couple of instances at least where, instead of going out and buying the property, Federal property is given to them.

Mr. EVINS. My State of Tennessee gave to the Federal Government a few years ago some 33,000 acres of land for use for an Air Force base. So there is constant interchange of lands for public purposes between the Federal Government and the States. This bill is sponsored by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], who represents the First District of Tennessee in which Johnson City is situated. It is my information that a similar bill was previously passed in the House in another session of Congress and, as I have indicated, there is no objection by the Veterans' Administration. This land is to be used for park and recreation purposes and the veterans at that facility would gain the advantage of its use.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman believes that in the case of these transfers it should be the policy that where the transfer is for the benefit, in this case, of the Veterans' Administration that it should be made?

Mr. EVINS. I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Veterans' Administration's interests are protected by a provision that it may be ceded back to the Federal Government if it is not used for the purposes indicated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Board of Managers who had been managing the Soldiers' Home transferred it to the Veterans' Administration. It was a transfer from one Government agency to another. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] was helpful in securing the passage of the bill. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs was unanimous in voting for this measure—as was the Budget and the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer to the State of Tennessee certain property of the Veterans' Administration situated in Johnson City, Tenn., and described as follows:

Commencing at a point located on the northwest corner of the property which will be known as corner numbered 1; thence running south two degrees no minutes west one thousand eight hundred fifty and eight-tenths feet to corner numbered 2; thence running south seventy-four degrees fifty-two minutes east six hundred and sixty-nine feet to corner numbered 3; thence running north two degrees no minutes east two thousand two hundred forty and three-tenths feet to corner numbered 4; thence running south seventy-three degrees twenty-five minutes west two hundred fifty-two and three-tenths feet to corner numbered 5; thence running south sixteen degrees thirty-five minutes east twenty feet to corner numbered 6; thence running south seventy-three degrees twenty-five minutes west four hundred and thirty-four feet back to corner numbered 1, the origin point of this survey. This land includes approximately thirty and fifty-eight one-hundredths acres, and shall be conveyed together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall execute and deliver in the name of the United States in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments as may be necessary to effectuate the said transfer: *Provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized for conveyance of this section.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain a provision that said property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Tennessee shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Tennessee during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency to exist, and upon the determination by the Secretary of National Defense that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made by the State of Tennessee for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency and upon the cessation thereof plus 6 months said property is to revert to the State of Tennessee: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall have no obligation to restore the property in any way.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning on line 7, strike out down to and including line 13, on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Approximately 30 acres of land comprising the westerly portion of the Veterans' Administration Center, the exact courses and distances of the perimeter of which shall be determined and approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The State of Tennessee shall pay the cost of surveys as may be required by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in determining the required legal description. The land."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the tible.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO CINCINNATI, OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4730) to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, of certain lands formerly owned by that city.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described lots which were conveyed by the city of Cincinnati to the Government of the United States without monetary consideration by deed dated March 14, 1949: Situate in section 14, township 3, fractional range 2, State of Ohio, county of Hamilton, city of Cincinnati, and being all of lots numbered 159 and 178 of the Erkenbrecker Improvement Co.'s third subdivision as recorded in plat book 13, page 42, of the Hamilton County recorder's office.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 3, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain a provision that said property shall be used primarily for the purpose of providing a vehicular entrance to a playground area on a contiguous tract of land, and that, if the city of Cincinnati, Ohio shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and, in addition, all improvements made by the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor: *Provided*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized for conveyance by section 1."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREVENTION OF COLLISIONS AT SEA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2456) to amend the act of October 11, 1951, authorizing the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That rule 9 (e) of section 6 of the act of October 11, 1951 (65 Stat. 406), is amended by striking out the word "traveling" in the first line and inserting in lieu thereof the word "trawling."

SEC. 2. Rule 11 (c) of section 6 of the act of October 11, 1951 (65 Stat. 406), is amended by striking out the word "been" in the second line and inserting in lieu thereof the word "be."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSPECTION OF PLANTS, BOOKS, AND RECORDS OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2313) to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 185, 186, ch. 199, secs. 1301–1304), as extended by subsection 1 (a) (2) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82d Cong.), shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction granted shall be effective upon the acceptance thereof by the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 4554, was laid on the table.

TO AMEND RECREATION ACT OF JUNE 14, 1926

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1815) to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869), entitled "An act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) The Secretary of the Interior upon application filed by a duly qualified applicant under section 2 of this act may, in the manner prescribed by this act, dispose of any public lands to a State, Territory, county, municipality, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision for any public purposes, or to a nonprofit corporation or nonprofit association for any recreational or any public purpose consistent with its articles of incorporation or other creating authority. Before the land may be disposed of under this act for a purpose other than a recreational purpose, it must be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the land is to be used for an established or definitely proposed project.

"(b) No more than 640 acres may be conveyed to any one grantee in any one calendar year.

"(c) Where the lands have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior, or of a State, Territory, county, municipality, water district, or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary of the Interior may make disposals under this act only with the consent of such Federal department or agency, or of such State, Territory, or local governmental unit. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national forest, national park, or national monument, or to any Indian lands, or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians. Nor shall any disposition be made under this act for any use authorized under any other law, except for a use authorized under the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609; 43 U. S. C., sec. 682a), as amended.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may after due consideration as to the power value of the land, whether or not withdrawn therefor, (a) sell such land to the State, Territory, county, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision in which the lands are situated, or to a nearby municipal corporation in the same State or Territory, for the purpose for which the land has been classified, and conveyances of such land for historic-monument purposes under this subsection shall be made without monetary consideration, while conveyances for any other purpose under this subsection shall be made at 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the Secretary; (b) lease such land to the State, Territory, county, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision in which the lands are situated, or to a nearby municipal corporation in the same State or Territory, for the purpose for which the land has been classified, at a reasonable annual rental, for a period up to 20 years, and, at the discretion of the Secretary, with a privilege of renewal for a like period, or (c) lease such land to a nonprofit corporation or nonprofit association at a reasonable annual rental, for a period up to 20 years, and, at the discretion of the Secretary, with a privilege of renewal for a like period. Each patent or lease so issued shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in the lands conveyed or leased and of the right to mine and remove the same, under applicable laws and regulations to be established by the Secretary. Each lease shall contain a provision for its termination upon a finding by the Secretary that the land has not been used by the lessee for the purpose specified in the lease for such period, not over 5 years, as may be specified in the lease, or that such land or any part thereof is being devoted to another use.

"SEC. 3. Title to lands conveyed by the Government under this act may not be transferred by the grantee or its successor except, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, to a transferee which would be a qualified grantee under section 2 (a) and subject to the acreage limitation contained in section 1 (b) of this act. A grantee or its successor may not change the use specified in the conveyance to another or additional use except, with the consent of the Secretary, to a use for which such grantee or its successor could obtain a conveyance under this act. If at any time after the lands are conveyed by the Government, the grantee or its successor attempts to transfer title to or control over these lands to another or the lands are devoted to a use other than that for which the lands were conveyed, without the consent of the Secretary, title to the lands shall revert to the United States.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary may authorize transfers of title or changes in use in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of this act with respect to any patent heretofore issued under any act upon application by a patentee qualified to obtain a conveyance under section 2 (a) of this act.

"SEC. 5. The act of September 30, 1890, entitled 'An act to authorize entry of the public lands by incorporated cities and towns for cemetery and park purposes,' and the act of October 17, 1940, entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease for park or recreational purposes, and to sell for cemetery purposes, certain public lands in Alaska,' are hereby repealed."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, insert "The Secretary may classify public lands in Alaska for disposition under this act. Lands so classified may not be appropriated under any other public land law unless the Secretary revises such classification or authorizes the disposition of an interest in the lands under other applicable law. If, within 18 months following such classification, no application has been filed for the purpose for which the lands have been so classified, then the Secretary shall restore such lands to appropriation under the applicable public land laws."

Page 3, line 24, strike out "at 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the Secretary," and insert "at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior through appraisal or otherwise, after taking into consideration the purpose for which the lands are to be used."

Page 5, line 15, insert "The provisions of this section, however, shall cease to be in effect as to any lands patented under this act 25 years after the issuance of patent for such lands."

Page 5, line 22, insert "If the Secretary, pursuant to such an application, authorizes such transfer or use, all reverter provisions and other limitations on transfer or use under this or any other act affecting the lands involved, shall cease to be in effect 25 years after the Secretary authorizes the transfer or use for a changed or additional purpose under the provisions of this section."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN JOHNSON CITY, TENN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1561) authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration in Johnson City, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill, and also calendar No. 72, which involves the transfer of Federally owned property to communities, without purchase by the communities, seems to be a new policy. I wonder if somebody from the committee might advise us as to what the policy of the committee is in recommending that Federal land be given to communities for specific purposes rather than having the communities purchase the property from the Government.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The policy of the committee is that where there is no objection to it we do. In this instance, as I remember, the land from Ohio was given over to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is Calendar No. 52.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In the case of the Johnson City property it is my understanding this will transfer 30 acres of land that the Veterans' Administration has control over, to the State of Tennessee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct. It is to be used for an amusement park and the veterans would receive a great deal of benefit from that. It would be right next door.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. This matter, I may say to the gentleman has had the full consideration of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The Veterans' Administration offers no objection to the approval of this measure and the transferring of title to this land. The tract sought to be transferred is to be used for a recreation park and also for the site of an armory. Therefore, public purposes would be utilized. In the event the tract is not de-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

veloped or used for this purpose, then it would be returned to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The only thing, I understand in other communities they will find need for a National Guard building, for instance, and they will go out and buy the property on which to construct it. Here we have a couple of instances at least where, instead of going out and buying the property, Federal property is given to them.

Mr. EVINS. My State of Tennessee gave to the Federal Government a few years ago some 33,000 acres of land for use for an Air Force base. So there is constant interchange of lands for public purposes between the Federal Government and the States. This bill is sponsored by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], who represents the First District of Tennessee in which Johnson City is situated. It is my information that a similar bill was previously passed in the House in another session of Congress and, as I have indicated, there is no objection by the Veterans' Administration. This land is to be used for park and recreation purposes and the veterans at that facility would gain the advantage of its use.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman believes that in the case of these transfers it should be the policy that where the transfer is for the benefit, in this case, of the Veterans' Administration that it should be made?

Mr. EVINS. I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Veterans' Administration's interests are protected by a provision that it may be ceded back to the Federal Government if it is not used for the purposes indicated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Board of Managers who had been managing the Soldiers' Home transferred it to the Veterans' Administration. It was a transfer from one Government agency to another. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] was helpful in securing the passage of the bill. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs was unanimous in voting for this measure—as was the Budget and the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer to the State of Tennessee certain property of the Veterans' Administration situated in Johnson City, Tenn., and described as follows:

Commencing at a point located on the northwest corner of the property which will be known as corner numbered 1; thence running south two degrees no minutes west one thousand eight hundred fifty and eight-tenths feet to corner numbered 2; thence running south seventy-four degrees fifty-two minutes east six hundred and sixty-nine feet to corner numbered 3; thence running north two degrees no minutes east two thousand two hundred forty and three-tenths feet to corner numbered 4; thence running south seventy-three degrees twenty-five minutes west two hundred fifty-two and three-tenths feet to corner numbered 5; thence running south sixteen degrees thirty-five minutes east twenty feet to corner numbered 6; thence running south seventy-three degrees twenty-five minutes west four hundred and thirty-four feet back to corner numbered 1, the origin point of this survey. This land includes approximately thirty and fifty-eight one-hundredths acres, and shall be conveyed together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall execute and deliver in the name of the United States in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments as may be necessary to effectuate the said transfer: *Provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized for conveyance of this section.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain a provision that said property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Tennessee shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Tennessee during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency to exist, and upon the determination by the Secretary of National Defense that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made by the State of Tennessee for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency and upon the cessation thereof plus 6 months said property is to revert to the State of Tennessee: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall have no obligation to restore the property in any way.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning on line 7, strike out down to and including line 13, on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Approximately 30 acres of land comprising the westerly portion of the Veterans' Administration Center, the exact courses and distances of the perimeter of which shall be determined and approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The State of Tennessee shall pay the cost of surveys as may be required by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in determining the required legal description. The land."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the tible.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO CINCINNATI, OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4730) to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, of certain lands formerly owned by that city.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described lots which were conveyed by the city of Cincinnati to the Government of the United States without monetary consideration by deed dated March 14, 1949: Situate in section 14 township 3, fractional range 2, State of Ohio, county of Hamilton, city of Cincinnati, and being all of lots numbered 159 and 178 of the Erkenbrecker Improvement Co.'s third subdivision as recorded in plat book 13, page 42, of the Hamilton County recorder's office.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 3, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain a provision that said property shall be used primarily for the purpose of providing a vehicular entrance to a playground area on a contiguous tract of land, and that, if the city of Cincinnati, Ohio shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and, in addition, all improvements made by the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor: *Provided*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized for conveyance by section 1."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREVENTION OF COLLISIONS AT SEA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2456) to amend the act of October 11, 1951, authorizing the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That rule 9 (e) of section 6 of the act of October 11, 1951 (65 Stat. 406), is amended by striking out the word "traveling" in the first line and inserting in lieu thereof the word "trawling."

SEC. 2. Rule 11 (c) of section 6 of the act of October 11, 1951 (65 Stat. 406), is amended by striking out the word "been" in the second line and inserting in lieu thereof the word "be."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSPECTION OF PLANTS, BOOKS, AND RECORDS OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2313) to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 185, 186, ch. 199, secs. 1301–1304), as extended by subsection 1 (a) (2) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82d Cong.), shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the

termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 C. F. R., 71), notwithstanding any limitation by reference to war of the time during which the powers and authorizations therein granted may be exercised.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 6, following the second comma, insert "as amended."

On page 2, line 4, substitute a comma for the period and add "or until such earlier date as may be provided by the Congress by concurrent resolution or by the President."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE PAID FROM SPECIAL FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4091) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to make the exclusion from such act of temporary employees of Congress inapplicable to such employees who are appointed at an annual rate of salary.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 3 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, as precedes the colon therein is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The provisions of this act shall not apply to employees of the Senate or the House of Representatives whose employment is temporary or of uncertain duration unless such employees are appointed at an annual rate of salary."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MENOMINEE INDIAN TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2828) to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended, is hereby further amended to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the payment from trust funds credited to the Menominee Tribe of Indians pursuant to the determination provided by the act of September 3, 1935, of $1,500 to each individual member of the Menominee Tribe of Indians on the Menominee tribal rolls as of December 31, 1952: *Provided*, That payments to minors and such members as are receiving welfare assistance through the social-security program or from the Menominee Tribe shall be made pursuant to regulations to be adopted by the Menominee General Council and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, change the period to a colon and add the words "*Provided further*, That such payments shall be made first from any funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Menominee Indian Tribe drawing interest at the rate of 5 percent, and thereafter from the Menominee judgment fund, symbol 14X7142."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AT OGDENSBURG, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (S. R. 307) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved August 19, 1950, authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Lawrence River, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the city of Ogdensburg, be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS RIO GRANDE AT HIDALGO, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1219) authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge and originally designed approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation, at or near Hidalgo, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject further to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and also subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge: *Provided*, That the construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be undertaken until after an agreement regarding such construction shall have been effected between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Mexican States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its originally designed approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State of Texas.

SEC. 3. The said Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of the State of Texas applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, is hereby granted to the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, or legal representatives; and any such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "provide for military and."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "originally designed."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "*Provided*, That the construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be undertaken until after an agreement regarding such construction shall have been effected between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Mexican States."

Page 3, line 6, after the word "Texas", insert "or the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4689) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENTS OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1528) to continue in effect certain appointments

as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if the appointment as a commissioned officer or warrant officer of any person who is determined, as provided in the Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to have been in a status of missing, missing in action, interned, captured, beleaguered, or besieged at any time after June 25, 1950, and before the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 CFR 71), would normally terminate before the person holding that appointment is released from active duty, the President is authorized to continue that appointment in effect until that person is released from active duty. On or before the date of his release from active duty, any such person who agrees in writing to have his appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer or a Reserve warrant officer continued in effect for an indefinite term shall be given an indefinite term appointment in lieu of the appointment which he holds at that time.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT CONCERNING DETAILING OF OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1527) to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 40b of the National Defense Act (41 Stat. 759, 777), as amended, is further amended by striking out so much of the second sentence as reads, "and no officer on the active list shall be detailed for recruiting service or for duty at a school or college, not including schools of the service, where officers on the retired list can be secured who are competent for such duty."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REHABILITATION AND REPAIRING OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS DAMAGED BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 35) to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in the past the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having jurisdiction over the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill in its various reports and in the bill recently submitted has made violent objection to this particular problem. I see the gentleman from Georgia present, a member of that subcommittee, and I would like to ask him whether or not that subcommittee would concur in approval of this legislation?

Mr. PRESTON. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that this matter has been up for discussion in our committee on two occasions this year, first when we were considering the first supplemental appropriation bill and later on when the regular bill was up for consideration. The only reason the committee did not put this language in the appropriation bill at that time was that we were not sure how many projects would be in the status of reimbursability. We thought that near the end of the year we could tell more accurately how many local communities that had expended their funds in making repairs but had not been reimbursed under the provisions of the Federal Airport Claims Act would be involved. Certainly this language should be written into law because less than half of the money already appropriated by the Congress has been expended to the local communities that are in the process of doing the work. I discussed this matter with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] recently and he made the statement to me that rather than offer an amendment to the regular appropriation bill when it was up for consideration—the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill—he would at a later date refer the matter to our subcommittee for study in order to determine just what language should be written into the bill. Of course, that would be legislation on an appropriation bill, something I do not favor personally. This is the proper way to do it, that is, by an act brought before the House from a legislative committee. I think it is inevitable that we must adopt this language, either in an appropriation bill or in a bill of this character. This one has already passed the Senate.

Mr. FORD. Would this legislation conform to the policy of the subcommittee of which the gentleman is a member?

Mr. PRESTON. I hesitate to speak for the entire subcommittee because, first of all, I am in the minority. I am sure it reflects the minority views. I am not positive that I would be making an accurate statement if I said it reflected the majority views.

Mr. FORD. Has it been a question that has been almost unanimously approved by the subcommittee in the past, and I suspect probably at the present time? I know the subcommittee has been greatly worried about this situation. In the past they have strong language in their reports and I think they put a cut-off date on the time that these applications could be filed. Because of the subcommittee's interest I could not let this bill go through until I knew what the subcommittee's point of view might be because they deal with funds that come before the Congress so far as these claims are concerned.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. As I understand this legislation, which came out of the Commerce Committee, it is merely an authorization for these funds to be appropriated to avoid the often embarrassing situation when a point of order is raised against a legislative provision in an appropriation bill. The hearings before our committee disclosed no opposition to this legislation, and I believe that it was introduced at the request of the interested parties to forestall and avoid difficulty at the time the Committee on Appropriations had the opportunity to act. Now that is my understanding of the situation.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman from Michigan is correct in saying that the committee did establish that date to prevent any future filings. This was a doubtful bill to begin with. I really think it should not have passed the Congress, but since the Congress enacted it, it was left up to the Committee on Appropriations to provide funds. The Senate bill undertook to extend the whole thing so that new applications could be filed, but what the House has done is this: they have stricken the Senate language and simply put a paragraph in the bill saying that the funds shall remain available until expended. This does not provide any future authorization at all. It simply means that the money heretofore appropriated remains available until expended so that the communities currently doing the work can be reimbursed, something that we must do, in fairness, if we are going to treat the communities fairly.

Mr. FORD. It is my understanding then that we are not contemplating at this time approving the Senate bill, which does extend the date. All we are doing is passing the House version. I would object to any approval of the Senate language based on the experience that the gentleman from Georgia and his subcommittee have had which indicated that there was some very loose handling of the approval of these claims. I will withdraw my reservation but I do want to go on record that I will certainly disapprove of any attempt to approve the Senate language.

Mr. DOLLIVER. You will note on page 3 of the report that sections 1, 2, and 3 of the bill as passed by the Senate have been eliminated from the House bill.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield further, I would like to thank him for withdrawing his reservation. I am very much interested in this bill as I have a project in my district which is affected. The city of Colorado Springs is now engaged in the construction of a new administration building to serve the municipal airport. The Federal contribution under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act has been made and the funds allocated to this project. Construction is proceeding as rapidly as possible, but the building cannot be completed by June 30. Assurance has been given that the Federal funds will be available until construction is completed, which will require several additional months. I understand there are other projects over the country in the same situation.

I consider the passage of this bill highly important, so we can keep faith with those who have commenced construction of local airport projects on the assumption that the Federal appropriation would be available until expended. No further appropriation of Federal funds is involved. It is merely a question of giving local communities necessary time to take advantage of appropriations heretofore made for their benefit.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) By deleting the last sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Appropriations made pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended."

(b) By amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

"TIME LIMITATIONS ON FILING OF REQUESTS

"(d) No request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport submitted pursuant to this section shall be considered by the Secretary unless such request was submitted to him within 6 months after the occurrence of the damage upon which the request is based, except that in the case of a request relating to damage occurring while the airport was under the control and management of the United States, such request may be submitted to the Secretary within 6 months after the transfer of such control and management of the report to the public agency involved."

(c) By adding thereto a new subsection (e) as follows:

"TIME LIMITATIONS ON MAKING OF CERTIFICATIONS

"(e) No certification pursuant to this section with respect to a request submitted to the Secretary after the date of enactment of this subsection (except a supplemental certification of the amount by which the actual cost of accomplished rehabilitation or repair exceeds the amount of a prior certification which was based on the estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair) shall be made to the Congress after a date 1 year from the expiration of the period prescribed by law for the submittal of such request."

SEC. 2. There is hereby repealed the proviso contained in the appropriation to the Department of Commerce, Civil Aeronautics Administration, headed "Claims, Federal Airport Act" in chapter III of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 45, 82d Cong.), reading as follows: "*Provided*, That no request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport filed under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act shall be considered by the Secretary unless filed prior to July 1, 1951, and the Secretary shall make no certification to Congress after July 1, 1952, of the actual or estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair."

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the proviso of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, cited in section 2 and the provisions of subsection (d) of section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to consider, pursuant to the said section 17, any request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport, which is submitted to him within 6 months following the effective date of this act, if such request would have met the time requirements of the said subsection (d) had it been filed on some date subsequent to June 30, 1951, and prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding provisions of existing law to the contrary, all appropriations heretofore made to the Department of Commerce, pursuant to certifications made by that Department to the Congress under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, for reimbursement of public agencies for the cost of rehabilitating or repairing public airports damaged by Federal agencies, shall remain available until expended.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding section 17 (c) of the Federal Airport Act or any other provision of existing law, all appropriations heretofore made to the Department of Commerce pursuant to certifications made by that Department to the Congress under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, for reimbursement of public agencies for the cost of rehabilitating or repairing public airports damaged by Federal agencies, shall remain available until expended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to extend the authority to expend certain funds for the reimbursement of public agencies for the cost of rehabilitating or repairing public airports damaged by Federal agencies."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUE IN EFFECT CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1448) to amend the act of June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present national emergency.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act of June 25, 1942 (56 Stat. 390), as extended by section 1 (a) (11) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82d Cong.) is amended by deleting the words "for the duration of the present war as determined by proclamation of the President" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 CFR 1950 Supp., p. 71)."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the parentheses, insert "and as further extended by section 1, Public Law 12, 83d Congress, approved March 31, 1953,"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT OF 1947

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1530) to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (jg.) of nurses in the Regular Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (c) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 42) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Commissioned officers of the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps, and commissioned officers of the Regular Air Force appointed with a view to designation as Air Force nurses, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. To be eligible for appointment under this subsection a person must be a graduate of a hospital or university training school and a registered nurse and must have the physical and other qualifications prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force for the appropriate armed force. A person appointed under this subsection shall be appointed in the grade of—

"(1) second lieutenant, if she is not more than 27 years of age on the date of nomination by the President and is not qualified for appointment as a first lieutenant under clause (2); or

"(2) first lieutenant, if she is qualified under regulations issued by the appropriate Secretary and is not more than 30 years of age on the date of nomination by the President.

The maximum ages specified in clauses (1) and (2) are increased by the period of active Federal commissioned service performed after December 31, 1947. However, such an age may not be so increased by more than 5 years."

SEC. 2. Section 102 (c) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 42) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Commissioned officers of the Regular Army in the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, and commissioned officers of the Regular Air Force appointed with a view to designation as women medical specialists, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. To be eligible for appointment under this subsection, a person must have the physical and other qualifications prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force for the appropriate armed force. A person appointed under this subsection shall be appointed in the grade of—

"(1) second lieutenant, if she is not more than 27 years of age on the date of nomination by the President and is not qualified for appointment as a first lieutenant under clause (2); or

"(2) first lieutenant, if she is qualified under regulations issued by the appropriate Secretary and is not more than 30 years of age on the date of nomination by the President.

The maximum ages specified in clauses (1) and (2) are increased by the period of active Federal commissioned service performed after December 31, 1947. However, such an age may not be so increased by more than 5 years."

SEC. 3. Section 204 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 48) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Except as provided in sections 203 and 211 of this title, appointment to the grade of nurse in the Regular Navy shall be with the rank of ensign or lieutenant (junior grade), and each such appointment shall be subject to revocation by the Secretary of the Navy until such time as the appointee has served under such appointment for 3 years from the date of appointment. Officers whose appointments are so revoked shall be discharged from the service

without advanced pay. Appointees shall be female citizens of the United States who shall have reached the age of 21 years on July 1 of the calendar year in which appointed. No person shall be appointed pursuant to this section until she shall have established her mental, moral, educational, professional, and physical qualifications to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy. A person appointed under this section shall be appointed with the rank of—

"(1) ensign, if she is not more than 27 years of age on the date of nomination by the President and is not qualified for appointment as a lieutenant (junior grade) under clause (2); or

"(2) lieutenant (junior grade), if she is qualified under regulations issued by the Secretary of the Navy and is not more than 30 years of age on the date of nomination by the President.

The maximum ages specified in clauses (1) and (2) are increased by the period of active Federal commissioned service performed after December 31, 1947. However, such an age may not be so increased by more than 5 years."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICE FLAGS AND SERVICE LAPEL BUTTONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1546) to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if someone could tell me whether this flag is to be used in combination with the service lapel buttons and what design this flag will bear. I will say to the gentlemen of the committee that I am very much interested as to whether or not this is to be an American flag used in connection with the service lapel button or whether it is a combination representing some of these hybrid international organizations we have.

Mr. JOHNSON. This is only a flag to be hung in the home. The gentleman is old enough to remember that we had service flags in the First World War as well as in World War II.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is speaking of service buttons in connection with these service flags?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. It is a distinctive button and it is a distinctive flag, also devised by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. GROSS. Will there be a flag on the button?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not know what will be on the button, but I know it will be appropriate.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to be sure of that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I hope that will assure the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of October 17, 1942 (ch. 615; 56 Stat. 796), is hereby amended by striking the words "Secretary of War" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of Defense" and striking the words "the current war" appearing at the end of the first and second sections of the act and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any period of war or hostilities in which the Armed Forces of the United States may be engaged."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1547) to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That payment of the cost of transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, and unpacking) of household effects of members of the naval forces, upon release from active duty, from their homes of record to places selected by such members is hereby authorized to be made from current appropriations as may be available for such services and any payments representing the cost of such transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, and unpacking) heretofore made, are ratified and approved: *Provided*, That such transportation shall have been authorized prior to June 13, 1947, pursuant to duly promulgated regulations of the Navy Department: *Provided further*, That the transportation costs authorized to be paid hereunder are limited to the constructive costs of transportation from the last duty stations to the homes of record.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESCRIBING OCCASIONS UPON WHICH THE UNIFORM OF THE ARMED FORCES MAY BE WORN BY PERSONS HONORABLY DISCHARGED THEREFROM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1550) to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 125 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "of ceremony" wherever they appear therein and substituting therefor the words "authorized by regulations of the President."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 793), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "of ceremony" and substituting therefor the words "authorized by regulations of the President."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the period and insert "issued after prior consultation with the Armed Services Committees of Congress."

At the end of the bill strike out the period and add "issued after prior consultation with the Armed Services Committees of Congress."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAY OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2226) to repeal the provision of the Act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph under the heading "Emergency Fund, Navy Department" of the Act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended (54 Stat. 383), which reads:

"The Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, is authorized to pay all civilian employees appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, and in Alaska, from the date of their sailing from the United States until they report for duty to the officer under whom they are to serve, and while returning to the United States by the most direct route and with due expedition, compensation of a rate corresponding to their rate of pay while actually employed." is repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPRODUCTION AND SALE OF COPIES OF OFFICIAL RECORDS OF ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2319) to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are authorized to make and to rent or sell to interested persons, concerns, or institutions, reproductions of the official current records of their respective Departments, including but not limited to, papers, manuscripts, documents, books, photographs, lantern slides, motion picture films, and sound reproductions, consistent with national security as determined under regulations promulgated with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and at such prices and fees (not less than the estimated cost of furnishing such reproductions) as may be prescribed pursuant to such regulations. All proceeds of such sales or rentals shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The term "current records" as used herein means records that are required for use in the current operation and administration of the Department concerned.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "current", insert "public."

Page 2, line 4, after "of", insert "preparation and."

Page 2, line 5, after "reproductions", insert "including reasonable administrative overhead."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 215) providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 2294) for the relief of the county of Riverside, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2294), entitled "A bill for the relief of the county of Riverside, Calif.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF RADIO STATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4557) to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to permits for construction of radio stations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That subsection (b) of section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof; and such section 319 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) A permit for construction shall not be required for Government stations, amateur stations, or mobile stations. With respect to stations or classes of stations other than Government stations, amateur stations, mobile stations, and broadcasting stations, the Commission may waive the requirement of a permit for construction if it finds that the public interest, convenience, or necessity would be served thereby: *Provided, however*, That such waiver shall apply only to stations whose construction is begun subsequent to the effective date of the waiver."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4558) to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth sentence of section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by striking out "fifteen days" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirty days."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4559) to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"GENERAL PENALTY

"SEC. 501. Any person who willfully and knowingly does or causes or suffers to be done any act, matter, or thing, in this act prohibited or declared to be unlawful, or who willfully and knowingly omits or fails to do any act, matter, or thing in this act required to be done, or willfully and knowingly causes or suffers such omission or failure, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for such offense, for which no penalty (other than a forfeiture) is provided in this act, by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both; except that any person, having been once convicted of an offense punishable under this section, who is subsequently convicted of violating any provision of this act punishable under this section, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 2 years, or both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2327) to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That enlisted personnel of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Air Force of the United States, the United States Marine Corps, and the United States Coast Guard, and the reserve components thereof, may, upon selection by the Secretaries of the departments concerned, be designated by the Post Office Department as Army postal clerks and assistant Army postal clerks, Navy postal clerks, and assistant Navy postal clerks, Air Force postal clerks and assistant Air Force postal clerks, Marine Corps postal clerks and assistant Marine Corps postal clerks, and Coast Guard postal clerks and assistant Coast Guard postal clerks, as appropriate, who shall be authorized to receive and open all pouches and sacks of mail addressed to Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard post offices, stations, vessels, and installations, to make proper deliveries of such mail, to receive matter for transmission in the mails, to receipt for registered matter (keeping an accurate record thereof), to keep and have for sale an adequate supply of postage stamps, to make up and dispatch mails and to perform any other postal duties as may be authorized by the Postmaster General, and in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the appropriate Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard authority. Each postal clerk or assistant postal clerk mentioned herein shall take the oath of office prescribed for members of the postal service, and shall give bond to the United States in such penal sum as the Postmaster General may deem sufficient for the faithful performance of his duties as such postal clerk or assistant postal clerk: *Provided*, That the Secretary concerned may waive the giving of bond in the case of such postal clerks and assistant postal clerks.

SEC. 2. The Post Office Department shall be reimbursed annually by the department concerned, in an amount of money equal to the funds and the value of other accountable postal stock embezzled by, or lost through the negligence, errors, or defalcations on the part of unbonded postal clerks, unbonded assistant postal clerks, persons acting in those capacities, or commissioned or warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who have been designated custodians of postal effects by the appropriate commanding officer, and funds expended by the Post Office Department in payment of claims arising from negligence, errors, losses, or defalcations by such unbonded postal clerks, assistant postal clerks, persons acting in those capacities, or commissioned or warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who have been designated custodians of postal effects by the appropriate commanding officer.

SEC. 3. Postal clerks and assistant postal clerks appointed under this act, shall be amenable in all respects to the discipline of their respective services, except that, as to their duties as such clerks, the commanding officer having jurisdiction over the post office, station, vessel, or installation at or on which they are stationed, and who exercises jurisdiction over such clerks, shall require them to be governed by the postal laws and regulations of the United States and such supplemental postal directives and regulations as may be prescribed by appropriate authorities. Whenever necessity arises therefor, any assistant postal clerk may be required by the appropriate commanding officer to perform the duties of a postal clerk.

SEC. 4. Any bond given by Army, Navy, or Coast Guard mail clerks or assistant mail clerks or by Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard postal clerks or assistant postal clerks, may be terminated by the Secretary of the department concerned, but such termination shall not affect the liability of any person or surety thereunder for losses or shortages occurring prior to such termination.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Treasury shall take such action as may be available to them to effect recovery of amounts paid under the provisions of this act from the persons responsible for the losses or shortages.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. The act of August 21, 1941 (ch. 392, 55 Stat. 656), as amended by the act of June 30, 1947 (ch. 170, 61 Stat. 211; 39 U. S. C. 138); paragraph 23 of the heading, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, of the act of May 27, 1908 (ch. 206, 35 Stat. 417-418), as amended (39 U. S. C. 134); section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 389, 37 Stat. 554), as amended (39 U. S. C. 135), and all other laws or parts of laws to the extent that they may be inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following statement in the RECORD at this point.

On April 28 the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, moved to recommit H. R. 4828, the Interior appropriation bill, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 2, strike out all of lines 22, 23, and 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Not to exceed $3,736,000 shall be available during the current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and for the payment of rentals for the use of transmission facilities."

And on page 3, line 19, strike out "$38,300,000" and insert "$42,728,000: *Provided*, That such sum shall include for the following items the respective amounts as follows:

"For Snohomish-Kitsap project, $2,605,000;

"For McNary substation, $1,538,000;

"For Ilwoco-Long Beach area service, $109,000;

"For Valley Way substation addition, $56,000; and

"For Idaho Panhandle, $120,000."

The Rayburn motion provided a true test of sentiment on the public-power program. It was supported by those who advocated continued development of low-cost public power for all the people. It was generally opposed by those who favored giving the benefits of public power to the private utilities.

The Rayburn motion was defeated by a vote of 167 to 212. Eighty-six percent of the Democrats voted in favor of low-cost public power, while almost 95 percent of the Republicans voted against the motion and in favor of the private utilities.

It is interesting to note that more than half of the Republican votes in favor of restoring the funds came from Members whose districts were directly affected.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

GRONISLAV VYDAEVICH AND LEONID ZANKOWSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1141) for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

JOHN W. McBRIDE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 140) for the relief of John W. McBride.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, S. 140, be passed over without prejudice, and insert at this point in the RECORD the following remarks:

It is my information that when H. R. 834, of which I am the author, was under consideration by the Senate Judiciary Committee, some members thereof stated that they could not approve the bill because they saw no reason for the delay upon the part of the claimant in filing his claim.

I would like to direct the attention of the House to the bill just called, S. 140, which is identical in content with my bill, H. R. 834, as well as S. 365, which the House passed May 5, 1953. The injury sustained by the claimant in S. 140 was in 1943, the injury sustained by the claimant in S. 365 was in 1940. Both of those bills were approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and passed the Senate. The injury sustained by the claimant in my bill, H. R. 834, was in 1944.

Such inconsistency makes it imperative that I ask that the bill, S. 140, be passed over without prejudice, and I do want the House to understand my reason in so doing.

HARUE FUKUSHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 978) for the relief of Harue Fukushi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Harue Fukushi, the Japanese fiance of Robert A. Matza, a citizen of the United States who is serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, and that the said Harue Fukushi shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Harue Fukushi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Robert A. Matza, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after entry of the said Harue Fukushi, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Harue Fukushi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Harue Fukushi as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harue Fukushi, the fiance of Robert A. Matza, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Harue Fukushi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Robert A. Matza and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Harue Fukushi, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Harue Fukushi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Harue Fukushi as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of Illinois: On page 3, line 4, strike out "241 and 242" and substitute in lieu thereof "242 and 243."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY FRANCINA MARCONI, FERNANDA GUZZI, ANNA FERRARO, MARY LAUDANO, AND JULIA PISANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1143) for the relief of Mary Francina Marconi, Fernanda Guzzi, Anna Ferraro, Mary Laudano, and Julia Pisano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mary Francina Marconi, Fernanda Guzzi, Anna Ferraro, Mary Laudano, and Julia Pisano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct five numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "and head taxes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LIANE LIEU AND HER SON, PETER LIEU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1330) for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son Peter Lieu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws" and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On line 9, strike out the words "and head tax."

On line 9, strike out the word "alien" and substitute "aliens."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEMINTINA FERRARA ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2160) for the relief of Clemintina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gazzarrini.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Clemintina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gazzarrini, nuns who are at the Malvern Preparatory School, Malvern, Pa., who were admitted into the United States on temporary visas from Rome, Italy, on November 22, 1951, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by them of the required head taxes and visa fees.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota or quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Clemintina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gazzarrini, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct six numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEE KWANG NONG (GEORGE CLIFFORD ROEDER)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2392) for the relief of Lee Kwang Nong (George Clifford Roeder).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lee Kwang Nong (also known as George Clifford Roeder), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Clifford Roeder, citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIE WEIR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4110) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Weir.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Mrs. Marie Weir shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On line 7, strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENE RIVOCHE AND MARIE BARSKY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 837) for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barksy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IDA BAGHDASSARIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 779) for the relief of Ida Baghdassarian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ida Baghdassarian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHANNA C. WILLEMSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 781) for the relief of Johanna C. Willemsen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Johanna C. Willemsen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER CARL SANDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 685) for the relief of Walter Carl Sander.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,557.18 to Walter Carl Sander of 2506 Beaumont Street, Green Bay, Wis., in full settlement of any claims against the United States for property loss sustained as a result of a fire on April 14, 1952, while said property was in the custody of the Army and being transported from Fort Lawton, Wash., to Camp McCoy, Wis.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated," strike out the balance of line 5, all of lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, down to and

including the word "Wisconsin" and insert "to Warrant Officer (junior grade) Walter Carl Sander, of 2506 Beaumont Street, Green Bay, Wis., the sum of $3,557.18, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages sustained by him on account of damage to and destruction of his household goods by fire, which occurred on April 14, 1952, in a United States Army van, at Camp McCoy, Wis., while said household goods were loaded on such van, for which he has not heretofore been compensated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORE J. HARTUNG AND MRS. ELIZABETH HARTUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 783) for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung, of 187 Colvin Street, Rochester, N. Y., in the amount of $1,200, which was paid Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung as family allowance after the discharge of the said Theodore J. Hartung from the Army of the United States from December 1945 to November 1947, inclusive.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN LAMPROPOULOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1345) for the relief of John Lampropoulos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to John Lampropoulos, of 4228 Archer Avenue, Chicago, Ill., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for bond posted for Tassia Kyriazis (nee Papadopoulos) on November 14, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR S. ROSICHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3522) for the relief of Arthur S. Rosichan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Arthur S. Rosichan, Buffalo, N. Y., is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of $1,935.85, said amount representing sums disbursed by him while he was employed from September 1, 1933, through December 31, 1934, as disbursing agent for the District of Columbia Transient Service of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. In the settlement of the accounts of any officer of the United States or the District of Columbia, full credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 39]

Addonizio	Dorn, N. Y.	Morgan
Albert	Dorn, S. C.	Morrison
Angell	Eberharter	Moulder
Bailey	Fenton	Mumma
Barden	Fine	Murray
Barrett	Fulton	Norblad
Belcher	Gavin	O'Neill
Bentsen	Gordon	Osmers
Blatnik	Graham	Patman
Boland	Granahan	Patten
Bolling	Grant	Pilcher
Bolton, Frances P.	Green	Poulson
	Hagen, Calif.	Powell
Bonin	Harden	Rayburn
Bow	Hébert	Reams
Bray	Heller	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brown, Ohio	Hillelson	Rhodes, Pa.
Brownson	Hoffman, Mich.	Richards
Buchanan	James	Rivers
Bush	Javits	Roberts
Byrne, Pa.	Kearns	Rodino
Canfield	Kee	Roosevelt
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	St. George
Carrigg	Kersten, Wis.	Saylor
Case	Kilburn	Scott
Chatham	Kilday	Shafer
Chudoff	King, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Mo.	Kirwan	Smith, Wis.
Colmer	Klein	Taylor
Corbett	Knox	Teague
Dague	Landrum	Wainwright
Dawson, Ill.	Lanham	Walter
Deane	LeCompte	Wheeler
Dingell	McConnell	Wickersham
Dodd	McVey	Wier
Dollinger	Martin, Iowa	Young
Donovan	Miller, Kans.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 319 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

MAXWELL HARDWARE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4048) for the relief of the Maxwell Hardware Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Maxwell Hardware Co., Oakland, Calif., the sum of $5,015.17, together with interest compounded at the rate of 6 percent per annum from February 1, 1946. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Maxwell Hardware Co. against the United States arising out of the inadvertent overpayment by such company of excess profits taxes for the fiscal year ending January 31, 1946. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, page 1, after the figures, strike out: "together with interest compounded at the rate of 6 percent from February 1, 1946."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRINGTON & GRAHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4432) for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the law firm of Harrington & Graham, Washington, D. C., the sum of $10,600. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of the claim of such firm against the United States for legal services rendered from September 1947 to June 1950 by such firm in connection with the defense of Toneo Shirakura and Osamu Watanabe, certain Japanese sergeants wrongfully accused, convicted, and sentenced to be hanged as violators of the laws and customs of war by the United States of America: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER LOUISE MARIE JOSEPHINE BELLOIR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 166) for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER JEANNE MARIA HENNETH LANGLO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 167) for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TONI ANNE SIMMONS (HITOMI URASAKI)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 193) for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Max L. Simmons, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JIMY OKUDA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 207) for the relief of Jimy Okuda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jimy Okuda, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sergeant and Mrs. Melvin C. Nietzel, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGIA ANDREWS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 371) for the relief of Georgia Andrews.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Georgia Andrews, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Gust Andrews, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIVING RECOGNITION TO THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE OF COL. J. CLAUDE KIMBROUGH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 709) to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the outstanding service and contribution made to the science of medicine and surgery by Col. J. Claude Kimbrough, Medical Corps, United States Army, retired, and to provide that his mature professional judgment and long experience may continue to remain available to the public service, the President is hereby authorized to designate the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough, upon his retirement from the active list, as consultant in urology at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C. Such designation shall be subject to the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough's acceptance and shall be terminable at his pleasure, or at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Army. During the time he serves under such designation, the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough shall be entitled to receive, in lieu of his retired pay, the full active-duty pay and allowances to which he was entitled immediately prior to his retirement.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN CASES IN WHICH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL HAS SUSPENDED DEPORTATION

The Clerk called the resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-6471827, Angelaras, James George.
A-7476562, Astwood, Carl Henry alias Carl Brown, Clifford Astwood, Clifford Astford.
A-6854483, Baarle, Jan Van.
A-7921576, Babkirk, Cecil Leonard.
A-9767669, Bari, Abdul.
A-6451068, Baruela, Carmen Verzola alias Carmen Verzola Benales (nee Carmen Tsucano Verzola).
A-7445007, Beck, Moises (Mozes).
A-7903408, Blyden, Ida Louise.
A-8106368, Boni, Rocco.
A-6904780, Bose, Peter alias Peter Kaltenberger.
A-6981483, Botello-Antura, Manuel or Ascension Botello-Antona, or Concepcion Botella-Antona.
A-5970209, Bouquet, Jean Pierre Edouard alias Jean Pierre Edouard Chautemps.
A-7863124, Bourguignon, Paul Henri Joseph.
A-6379324, Braudo, Abram.
A-3424978, Bruni, Giuseppe.
A-5969316, Callwood, Agnes Enez.
A-7983111, Chang, Kuo Chang.
A-3474752, Chen, Dora Tseng Fong.
A-5508435, Chiappane, Rose Margaret (nee O'Neill).
A-9562048, Chong, Wong or Chong Wong alias Tom Kin or Tam Ken.
A-3541386, Chruszczyk, Jerry or George Chruszczyk.
A-7145949, Coleman, Sophie Emma.
A-8021893, Connor, Zabrina Bethelda.
A-7390835, Costanzo, Francesco alias James Scotto.
A-7828206, Crawford, Cristina M. (nee Meily).
A-4502362, Cruz, Pomposo.
A-7395423, Csicsery-Ronay, Istvan.
A-5241207, Daly, Elsie May.
A-7962046, De Anda-Contreras, Ramon Ramiro.
A-2875289, De Bandala, Adelina Herrera nee Adelina Herrera-Orvera or Despart or Covarrubias.
A-3122673, De Frausto, Josefa Gonzalez or Josefa Gonzalez-De La O.
A-7978997, De Gonzalas, Maria Ana Montoya.
A-7978918, De Montoya, Maria Ramirez vda.
A-7980331, Montoya, Victoria.
A-7873807, Denkins, Constance Carmela.
A-5673755, Denniston, Carlton Sylvanus or Carlton Sylvanios Denniston, alias "Frenchy".
A-6425349, De Ramirez, Julia Ortiz or Julia Ortiz-Rodriguez of Julia R. Ortiz.
A-7139138, De Sousa, Jose Esteves.
A-7927613, Di Lieto, Joseph.
A-5567326, Douglas, Miriam Adelia Constantia (nee West).
A-9567551, Drumo, John.
A-7539105, Du, Darfoon.
A-4553438, Dutchak, Semen Nicol alias Sam Nicol Dutchak and Frank Hoffman.
A-7249128, Eerenberg, Grietje (nee Huizenga).
A-7203900, Eerenberg, Johannes.
A-5860280, Ehlert, Antone Frederick.
A-6626042, Eleazarian, Anahide Boudjikanian.
A-8039483, Felix-Avila, Pedro or Juan Sanchez.
A-7023558, Fernandez-Parada, Consuelo Armida.
A-7457597, Fleischner, Kurt.
A-6989467, Flores-Limon, Macario.
A-7983045, Forbes, Verna Herodia.
A-4657800, Frazer, Luther Daniel or Luther Daniel Fraser or Luther Fraser or Louis Frazer.
A-4717221, Furnari, Mary Frances.
A-4539679, Caputo, Antonia Frances Helen.
A-8106620, Gallo, Antonio or Antonio Domenico Mario Gallo.
A-3745514, Garcia, Manuel.
A-7962512, Garcia-Jaime, Secundino.
A-7130995, Garza, Francisco Benavides.

A-6819099, Ghazi, Ibraham Moses or Abraham Moses Ghazi.
A-3591839, Graf, Ludwig or Louis Graf.
A-6938849, Gravitsky, Catherine alias Catherine Ulrich.
A-6097876, Gushi, Chiru Gushiken.
A-5981991, Gushi, Koshin.
A-5966555, Guth, Dora Kathleen.
A-4132492, Gutierrez-Lavorico, Rosa.
A-9757521, Haw, Tek King.
A-3456258, Hayashi, Toshiko or Toshiko Tani Hayashi.
A-1660305, Heinzie, William Eleasar.
A-8106367, Hernandez-Borja, Carlos.
A-7849795, Heron, Victor Joseph.
A-6315638, Holtzman, Andree Francoise (nee Le Mentec).
A-7390566, Il-Begi, Taji Motamedi.
A-1339705, Jacques, Gerardus.
A-7677448, Jankowska, Maria or Maria Stawska.
A-7356278, Jankowski, Sylwim.
A-7055678, Kaainoni, Leopoldine Maria Forjan.
A-4544710, Katz, Samuel alias (first names): David, Samuel D., Samuel Samuel David, David Samuel; (last names): Goldcheker, Goldseker, Goldchecker, Goldsecker, Golsecker.
A-7802020, Klapp, Margarete Karolina Suzanne Magdalene alias Greti Klapp.
A-4773382, Kovalink, Mary (nee Tkachuk).
A-2636329, Kyriacatos, Christ N.
A-8091971, Lavie, Laetitia Afivor Hiamabe.
A-9069826, Lee Fai.
A-3401031, Leuci, Josephine (nee Salvemini alias Angela Basso).
A-7821878, Liddell, David Francis.
A-7707784, Limon, Maria Fernandez y.
A-7759995, Lin, Kuo-Yung.
A-6703347, Lin, Florence Shen or Pung-Hwa Shen.
A-6989301, Liu, Wei Kung.
A-9686023, Look, Pong alias Pang Jung.
A-5849282, Lumbantobing, Muara.
A-7247958, Macias-Hernandez, Zenon.
A-4627136, Martinoff, Sophie Vladimir formerly (Kovalevsky, formerly Blagoy formerly Golikova (nee Dafergoff).
A-7050100, Mata, Reyes.
A-9532398, Mathiesen, Wolifert.
A-4011396, McLaughlin, Margaret Jane (nee O'Shea).
A-5487436, Meier, Constance Mary alias Mrs. F. W. Meier.
A-2101785, Miyagishima, Katsugoro.
A-4502949, Miyashita, Nobuichi or Jim Miyashita.
A-2595310, Modl, Richard.
A-3890186, Monteiro, Jose Maria.
A-8106350, Moreno, Raquel Cordova.
A-8091152, Morgan, Mildred Lillian (nee Lewis).
A-6149807, Munsie, Margaret Alice.
A-7945035, Musella, Pasquale.
A-5155465, Nakayama, Tomojiro.
A-4525627, Nakayama, Masako.
A-7903015, Navarro-Ornelas, Jose.
A-6961608, Ngun, Kong Tsao or Katherine Kong formerly Tsao Ngun Woolridge.
A-5461589, O'Connor, Marie.
A-8106496, Orlove, Gregor Boris.
A-8106491, Palma, Francisco De Sousa Romeiras alias Frank Santas.
A-8091736, Panela, Jose Senoa.
A-3564917, Pesole, Nicola.
A-7941829, Pimentel-Palacios, Lorenzo.
A-7927525, Ramirez Sebastion.
A-7197620, Ricciardella, Felice alias Philip Ricciardella.
A-3080844, Robinson, Lawrence Robert.
A-8301630, Robledo-Guajardo, Pedro.
A-5571122, Runge, Frederick Wilhelm Arthur or Friedrich Runge or Friedrich W. Runge of Friedrich Wilhelm Arthur Runge.
A-6423124, Sabbah, Edgard Moussa.
A-6685257, Sanchez, Salvador or Salvador Gopar-Sanchez.
A-1091331, Sandoval-Barrientos, Eulalio.
A-6816890, Sekros, Sofia or Sekropoulos.
A-6817370, Sekros, Efterpi.
A-6590225, Serbeniades, Vasilios Dimitrois.
A-1282934, Shirae, Shinzo.
A-6377708, Siegel, Hazel Keitha Ashley.
A-2956945, Simpson, John MacLaurin alias John MacLaurin.
A-6723494, Spotorno, Giuseppe.
A-5946348, Sun, Wong (Sang).
A-6147036, Sutter, Doris Lucille.
A-6147037, Sutter, Harry John.
A-9776880, Szwec, Teodor.
A-7000271, Taylor, Herbert Robert or Herbert Robert Gillespie.
A-5998831, Torres, Rodolfo Valencia.
A-5443687, Touma, Nahima (Norma).
A-6628906, Vafiadis, Konstantine Daniel.
A-6628909, Vafiadis, Ekaterina Ellena.
A-9624272, Valk, Cornelius William or William Valk.
A-5818944, Vernice, Vito.
A-8091058, Waage, Solveig, Johannessen.
A-2536887, Wang, Joseph En-Pao.
A-5871669, Weber, Heinrich Ignatz alias Henry Weber.
A-7910008, Wenckheim, Beatrice Mary or Beata Wenckheim.
A-7353077, Wexler, Jeanette or Jeanette Moser.
A-1331075, William, Goerge Kapa.
A-5741883, Williamson, Robert or Robert T. Williamson.
A-5281604, Willison, Margaret Rose.
A-6924621, Wood, Valerie Laverne (nee Hamilton).
A-4354547, Yglesias, Remedios Vasquez (nee Perez).
A-4715237, Yruegas-Bueno, Raymundo, or Raymundo Yruegas, or Raymundo Iruegas-Bueno.
A-3894324, Zinnamosca, Joseph Anthony.
A-6355233, Zulueta, Enrique Costa.
A-2858251, Amzqua, Donato.
A-2384429, Andrade, Aniba, or Hanibal De Andrade.
A-9767603, Andresen, Ragnar.
A-6984215, Andruchow, Peter, or Peter Andy.
A-7131569, Asymkos, Johanna, nee Frentzos, or Ioanna George Frentzos.
A-6613791, Baillie, Sophie Margarethe.
A-5447673, Baptista, Manuel Gomes, or Manuel Gomes Batista.
A-5540288, Barbulescu, Arghir Juan, or Bob Barbulescu.
A-7828698, Baublis, Mary, nee Vizaimiskiute.
A-6172608, Bautista, Antonio Marquez.
A-6172609, Bautista, Antonio Molin.
A-6604116, Belmonte, Fidencia Alvarado.
A-9836641, Bergersen, Else Berit.
A-1716162, Bliber, Hugo.
A-6390963, Bochner, Moses.
A-2834288, Bosher, Laura Annie.
A-7131924, Capua, Dioscoro.
A-7756316, Cardenas-Lalinde, Luis Eduardo, or Lusi E. Cardenas.
A-6522838, Chen, Chi Hsin, or Chi Hsin Chow.
A-6451980, Chen, Fu Liem Franklin, or Fu Liem Chen.
A-8010634, Chinnery, Harold Henrique.
A-7971824, Choo, Sa Sik, or Sa Sik Eun Bong Lee Choo.
A-7879888, Choo-Chew, Chang, or Chu-Chiu Chang.
A-7879887, Ling, Chang Loo (nee Hang Loo Ling).
A-7858998, Chu, Ming, or Chu Ming.
A-5263138, Chu, Yong Chen, or Chu-Yong-Chen or Joseph Paul Chu.
A-7035759, Cortez, Miguel Jose Juan.
A-3590687, Cottakis, Nicholas Leonidas.
A-7127831, Coussis, Theodore John.
A-7394774, Currie, Olga May Campbell, or Olga May Currie (nee Campbell).
A-7356548, D'Alfonso, Yolanda, or Yolanda Zanfrisco, or Iolanda Zanfrisco, or Yolando Mazzela.
A-6554691, De Banuchi, Esperanza Cruz.
A-5816898, De Cortez, Juana Anica Aragon.
A-2924399, Dedousis, Anthony, or Papadoupulis.
A-1955451, De Florio, Angelina Macias.
A-2732596, De Hernandez, Florentina Cardenas Murillo or Flora Murrillo de Hernandez.
A-9698428, Delen, Borje Kuno.
A-6044903, De Leon, Rosa Prudencia.
A-6877285, De Lopez, Carmen Lopez or Carmen Lopez vda de Chavez or Juana Lopez or Carmela Lopez.
A-6877277, Chavez-Lopez, Maria Rita or Maria Rita Chavez-Lopez.
A-7188338, De Salazar, Lorenza Guzman or Lorenza Guzman S.
A-4724593, De Self, Mary Louise Nava or Maria Luisa Avelar.
A-6295509, De Vito, Stella Marie.
A-3998273, De Yanez, Josefa Avelar.
A-8082378, Diakostamatis, Michael or Michael Thomas.
A-9620397, Diakoyanis, Stamatios Georgios.
A-3064690, Dilullo, Dominic Antonio.
A-2859923, Dong, Ruby Lee (nee Ruby Lee Joe or Shew Guey Jew).
A-7890880, Duarte, Rafael Argentino.
A-7119155, Dudley, Ella (nee Stopard).
A-2830750, Edwards, Reginald Stanley.
A-7054530, Eskildsen, Edward Carl.
A-2365566, Evans, Edra Varona.
A-6515700, Farrant, Laurence Geoffrey.
A-7983049, Filoteo, Gennaro.
A-4845245, Fleischer, Martin Andreas.
A-4007904, Frangakis, Ioannis or John or James Andre Frangakis or John Andre Frages.
A-1000369, Franz-Josef of Austria, Archduke or Prince Don Francisco-Jose De Habsburgo Y Borbon or Francisco-Jose De Habsburgo Borbon.
A-1410440, Borbon, Princess Martha De Habsburgo or Marta De Habsburgo Borbon nee Marta Beumer Locatelli.
A-5101358, Friedman, David.
A-3625157, Fujino, Chuji (Chester).
A-6644479, Gagliardi, Giuseppina Gasdia.
A-7188303, Garcia-Larios, Juan Angel.
A-7140534, Gawel, Wladyslaw Jan or John Gavel or Walter Gawel.
A-2263835, Giacalone, Ignazio or Joseph Giacalone or Joe Giacalone.
A-6819623, Giordano, Vincenzo.
A-9025886, Glavan, Mijo Mate.
A-9715436, Gonzalez, Hermino Castillo.
A-7423227, Gonzalez, Josefina Garcia de.
A-6063722, Gonzalez-Hernandez, Galdino.
A-6200611, Goseco, Francisco Navarro.
A-6207837, Goseco, Nenita Bradley.
A-6207839, Goseco, Elizabeth Bradley.
A-6207838, Goseco, Margarita Bradley.
A-7284919, Gotsis, Theoni Athanasiou or Theoni Athanasiou Barlos.
A-7137743, Gradillas-Calsada, Jesus.
A-7290364, Gradillas-Gradillas, Jesus.
A-7290365, Gradillas-Gradillas, Domingo.
A-7290366, Gradillas-Gradillas, Eduardo.
A-6920657, Grant, Frederick William alias Lenord Grant.
A-4684021, Grimmesey, Satoye alias Satoye Itagaki alias Kay Grimmesey.
A-8021475, Hachisuka, Masako.
A-6345097, Hansen, Vivienne Kathleen (nee Smith).
A-1478191, Hattori, Tadashi or Frank Hattori.
A-7079560, Henriksen, Corina Kyllingmark or Corina Kyllingmark.
A-3436032, Heron, Edward Peter.
A-7981944, Hjort, Paul Konrad Thorvold or Paul Hoyt to Paul Thorvold Konrad Hjort or Paul Konrad Thorvald Hjort or P. Hoyt or Paul Konrad T. Hjort or Paul Konrad Thorvold Tjorst or Paul Hjort.
A-7197027, Holguin, Gregoria or Gregoria Holgium De Godfrey or Georgia H. Godfrey.
A-4963380, Horshan, Bruno Hugo.
A-6847799, Huang, Pao Chyuan or Pao-Chyuan Huang.
A-6958638, Huang, Shao Chen (nee Shao Chen Wu or Shao-Shen Wu).
A-2470946, Iman, James or Mohammed Bin Abdullah.
A-6670228, Ingdal, John Andreas.
A-7423243, Jarrett, Adriel.

A-5605706, Johnson, Eveline Mary formerly Larr (nee Lauria).
A-5602270, Kalafatich, Gregory or George or Grgo Kalafatich.
A-1823997, Kanakakos, Panagiotis alias Peter Kanakos or Panos Kanakakos.
A-3196587, Karanas, John or Ioannis Teodoro.
A-1719629, Karavidas, Petros or Peter Nicholas Papas or Petros Pappos or Pete Pappas.
A-6581692, Kasparian, Minas or Arnak Minas Kasparian.
A-1883332, Kennedy, John.
A-1381848, Kershaw, Frederick.
A-5792320, Kershaw, Ann.
A-6680602, Kettler, Geoula Rachel.
A-7284987, Krause, Luciana Ansaldo (nee Ansaldo).
A-9769909, Kristoffersen, Osvald Meier or Osvald Kristoffersen or Osvald M. Kristoffersen, Oswald Kristoffersen.
A-6811608, Kulikov, Laura (nee Samoyloff).
A-8031133, Kim, Young Ja (nee Kwon).
A-5575162, Langlais, Mary Frances or Mary F. Langlais.
A-5464805, Langlais, Pascaline Maud.
A-7130594, Lassince, George.
A-7115976, Lattyak, Ellen Marianne formerly Ellen Marianne Herdan.
A-8117167, Lekic, Maria (nee Humer).
1600-99344, Levine, Dianne Lee.
0300-344955, Lewis, John or Babun.
A-5901797, Lung, Vincent Leslie or Eng Hong Doon.
A-7858241, Maiorano, Francesco or Frank Maiorano.
A-3761454, Malik, Abdul.
A-7862064, Maloberti, Irma.
A-7280460, Margules, Esther or Esyera Frydman or Esther Frydman Ackerman.
A-7445691, Martinez, Domingo (Sunny).
A-7390663, Martinez, Martin.
A-3010001, Mastrantoni, Ignazio.
A-1988773, Matsuo, Shigeru.
A-6721172, May, Mon Tin alias Mon Tin.
A-6097030, Melendez, Elsie Egea.
A-6525483, Mendoza-Trujillo, Jose.
A-6802547, Miguel, Francisco San.
A-3356136, Mistretta, Vito.
A-7058329, Mitchell, Marie.
Maggia.
A-5173117, Moggia, Arideo alias Arideo.
A-6918512, Molocea, Eugene.
A-6918513, Molocea, George or Gheorghe.
A-7019900, Moulas, Elaine Gust formerly Helen Moulas.
A-6888048, Moustafa, Hussein Kamel.
A-7366691, Murray, Helen alias Helen Clanin.
A-4706795, Mustafa, Mohamed.
A-4706775, Mustafa, Dina Merita.
A-7828672, Mustafa, Lillian.
A-6492414, Naboa, Patrocinio P. Navidad.
A-4518091, Naboa, Roy.
A-7290839, Nenna, Vito.
O-5977617, Noguni, Kame.
A-6240780, Neely, Antoinette.
A-7203934, Ocaranza, Aurelia.
A-7203935, Cortez, Angelina.
A-70920168, Ortegon, Pablo or Pablo Ortegon-Dominguez.
A-2509077, Ozdemir, Orham Sakir.
A-4968317, Pagan, Virginia Felix or Virginia Felix.
A-7145867, Parrilla, Josefa.
A-5444738, Peel, Ampara or Amparo Perez.
A-3818102, Pesce, Paul Anthony alias Antonio Pesce alias Paul Pesce.
A-6811855, Pestic, Prospero.
A-4988608, Pettersson, Allgot.
A-5943396, Pisarski, Joseph.
A-7116336, Ponitkoff, George V.
A-7116337, Ponitkoff, Vadim V.
A-7044542, Posen, Ibolya (nee Endzweig).
A-9831052, Primavera, Tommaso or Tommasso Primavera.
A-7145943, Prisciandaro, Damano.
A-7387859, Procaccio, Michele.
A-3498519, Pullai, Armand or Armugam Pullai.
A-7955664, Pyman, Ada Gertrude (nee Terry).
A-8091703, Rainey, Margaret Amy formerly Sudbury (nee Wittingham).
A-5295100, Ramirez, Jose.
A-5988032, Ramirez, Manuel or Manuel Ramirez Canuta Sicon.
A-7717576, Reel, Virginia Pauline (nee Huisman).
A-7927929, Reimer, Mary or Mary Fowler or Mary Farrelly.
A-4513345, Revello, Antelo Arthur or Anbelo Revello.
A-1131359, Rose, Christian, Heinrich or Carl Rose.
A-2572993, Rossi, Marie Anna.
A-3743323, Russomanno, Nicola.
A-3205205, Sabo, Samuel Ivon, Jr.
A-6371788, Salinas-Martinez, Jose Emigdio.
A-6881658, Sarian, Jirair Nerse.
A-7082564, Sasso, Flora Erma or Flora Erma Rizzi or Erminia Domenica Bonini.
A-8021832, Saunders, Mabel (nee Mabel Benjamin alias Eugenie Prince).
A-7280051, Schauflinger, Klaus Dieter or Bobby Bishop.
A-6178370, Schermerhorn, Paulina Maligos.
A-2491132, Schlei, Peter.
A-2491126, Schlei, Suzan (nee Suzan Muller).
A-1219097, Sciancalepore, Giammaria alias John Sciancalepore.
A-2592388, Sciciuna, Anna.
A-6985470, Shahan, Nevart (nee Asiroglu or Ashroglu).
A-2727483, Shimizu, Hideaki.
A-4404619, Sikora, Mary alias Mary Shmura.
A-5600476, Singh, Jawala.
0502-6163, Sipsis, George alias George Callins.
A-6848763, Smith, Maria Carmen.
A-9825453, Socolich, John Anthony.
A-5127063, Steel, Joseph William.
A-3520552, Steinlauf, Eduard Elieser.
A-6791514, Strahammer, Josef Vincent.
A-5552117, Takizawa, Kichiro or Kenny Takizawa.
A-4116938, Tana, Antonio or Anthony Tarrio or Julio Tarrio or Julian Farrio.
A-4209592, Tana, Lucia Molino.
A-6609640, Taviarides, Cortesis Vassilios.
A-7388957, Torres, Joaquin.
A-7388958, Torres, Jesus Manuel.
A-7388959, Torres, Socorro.
A-7388960, Torres, Ruben Narciso.
A-8091254, Towles, Katherine.
A-7491336, Ulrich, Patricia.
A-7995810, Vaca-Reyes, Miguel.
A-6487513, Vartanyan, Hayik or Haig Vartanyan.
A-5832901, Vela-Garza, Rufino.
A-4235815, Vela-Garza, Jesusa.
A-4235816, Vela-Garza, Santos.
A-9732674, Visser, Adolph.
A-9579878, Vrolyk, Jan Zier.
A-6524277, Weinberger, Chaim Hersh.
A5582983, Weiss, Arnold or Irving Weiss or Weist alias User.
A-8021437, Willard, Cherie Eugenie formerly Kemp.
A-8117016, Wilmot, Noel Eaton alias Samuel Lowe.
A-4528159, Wollion, John or John Walian.
A-5951210, You Chen Tuck or Chang Tuch You or Chenk Tuck You.
A-4794527, Young, Chee Dick alias Clarence Chee Dick Young.
A-4120628, Young, Frank alias Tien Fu Yang.
A-6291236, Zahawi, Faizi Khalid.
A-6374953, Zahawi, Sevim Miral.
A-7034695, Zeid, Larry.
A-2353697, Zemmel, Leon or Leon Semel or Leon Semi Leibisch or Leon Semmel.
A-6738148, Zielinski, Claudia (nee Dombrovski).
A-7469542, Balaba, Daniel.
A-1472027, Berndt, Heinz Werner.
A-7898442, Blagrove, Archibald Nathan or Nathan Blagrove.
A-7073695, Bollino, Savino or Babino or Bollino or Bellino Savino or Savaino or Sabino Bellino.
A-2752500, Boncich, Sam.
A-2411018, Calderon, Jesus Alejandre.
0300/394666, Calero, Gladys or Gladya Milagra Negrin-Rodriguez.
0300/394667, Calero, Isabel or Isabel Negrin-Rodriguez.
A-3377743, Camia, Bonfiglio or Phil Camia or Giacomo-Cavana.
A-7132987, Chu, Edith Ju-Hwa or Edith Tseng-Chun Chu or Edith Ju-Hwa.
A-7457602, Chu, Tseng-Chun.
A-7025727, Chung, Jack.
V-1240753, Dadaian, Serabi Adour (nee Kabakian).
A-2555368, De Ramirez, Ernestina Escobar or Ernestina Ramirez or Ernestina Escobar Ad Echevarria.
A-9692102, De (or Do) Rosario, Joaquim Francisco Lopes or Joaquim Rosario or Rosario; Joaquim Francisco Lopes Rosario; Joaquim Maria Francisco; Joaquim Maria Francisco Rosario; Joaquim Francisco De Rosario or Derosario; Joackim Rosario; Joaquin Rosario; Joaquim or Joaguim Francisco Rosario; Joaquin F. Rosario; Joaquim De Rosario.
1700-5241, Dolor, Rosalia Ea (Estefania Ea).
A-7975641, Donovan, Ione Orilda.
A-3449690, Dwyer, Michael Francis.
A-7351273, Eng, Frank Gee or Ng Fong.
A-5394243, Enlow, Julia Irene.
A-6912654, Fiore, Marie Louise (nee Williams formerly Horton).
A-5960623, Flanagan, Ursel Renate Meyer (nee Ursel Renate Meyer).
A-7070741, Flores, Maria Teresa.
0300-311750, Fong, Eng Lun or Hoy Yin.
A-2582238, Garcia, Amancia or Amancia Hernandez.
A-6574522, Garcia, Andrew Winant.
A-2469265, Garcia, Eduardo or Eduardo Garcia Ris or Viriato Guttierrez.
A-4705880, Gardella, Giuseppe alias Carlos Alonso.
A-6825202, Gergits, Hannelore Stefanie.
A-6825203, Gergits, Karl Alois.
A-3535341, Giannicchini, Gino or Gino Giannecchini or Gino Giannichini or Gino Giannechini.
A-6498461, Gonzalez, Hector Manuel Modesto-Lopez or Hector Frazer.
A-9836695, Hansen, Niels Thuroe.
A-6920912, Hassab, Antoine Antoun.
A-6329559, Henryk, Jan or John Henry Stillbach.
A-6872523, Huff, Lucille May Plummer.
A-3112979, Kaltenmaier, Eugen.
A-5883854, Kenyeres, Andras or Andras Kanczuga.
A-5883855, Kenyeres, Krisztina formerly Krisztina Deak (nee Molnar).
A-4685154, Knuth, Herman Ernst.
A-9659166, Kondiles, Gabriel.
A-9671075, Koolhoven, Herman.
A-7983079, Lanuez, Luis Alfredo or Luis Alfredo Laneuz Mendive.
A-6730666, Liao, Tien Ren.
A-6886839, Liao, Wei Ping Wu.
A-8064339, Macias-Hague, Edna Antonio Aileen.
A-5566403, Maruyama, Masamori or Paul Masamori Maruyama.
A-5960624, Meyer, Irmgard Emma Martha.
A-5673350, Muller, Joseph or Joe Muller.
A-5531956, Nagel, Charles Bernhard.
A-5970800, Neugebauer, Erich.
A-5970801, Neugebauer, Gwenyth Audrey.
A-5970802, Neugebauer, Audrey Moonyeen.
A-5886923, Nibbs, Phyllis Geneva.
A-6965247, Nordmark, Dalton Everett.
A-4360220, Ogle, William.
A-1690705, O'Leary, Elizabeth.
A-7192474, Osio, Antonio De Guerrero.
A-7192475, Osio, Angelina Villasenor De.
V-192353, Pedota, Guiseppi Nicola.
A-5995217, Pena-Flores, Salvador.
1407-20647, Pena, Maria Lopez De.
A-7176011, Pereira, Francisca Josefa.

A-7457684, Perez, Rafael Santiago Sanchez Y.
A-7457685, Perez, Miriam Rogelia Sanchez Y.
A-6332084, Pires, Donald George.
A-2523066, Ransom, Alexandra Serjanko formerly Alexandra Zrum.
A-5976847, Richards, Robert Vincent or Robert Vincent Soso.
A-4763940, Robinson, Hilda Amy Jane nee Hilda Soso.
A-2927242, Romano, Francesco or Frank Romano.
A-8091008, Rosberg, Nechama or Nechama Farber.
A-4871200, Royce, Dorothy Beryl (nee Fleming).
A-4272778, Santiago, Joseph.
A-2414442, Schaffer, Ludwig or Louis John Schaffer.
A-5693325, Shaw, Gilbert Henry.
A-5693329, Shaw, Edward Meredith.
A-7197890, Shuster, David Abram.
A-7197892, Shuster, Ida (nee Rubin).
A-9765543, Springvloed, Arnold or Arnoldus Springvloed or Springbloed.
A-4024200, Steinbrecher, Eduard Georg or George Edward Steinbrecher or Edward or Eduard Steinbrecher.
A-6449231, Stephanidis, Dean Constantine John.
A-5015878, Ticehurst, Katherine Elizabeth (nee McLellan).
A-3161661, Tsarnas, Stephanos Emanuel.
A-6275119, Valdovino-Navarro, Francisco.
A-5320950, Welch, Cecil Carlisle.
A-7445720, Wen, Shao Lien or Shao Haiung.
A-1560215, Wong, Shi Ching or Wong Shi Ching.
A-4491534, Yee, Cora Sue Moy (nee Moy or Moy Su Wah or Su Wah Moy or Cora Sue Moy).
A-9836629, Zvans, Carl or Karlis Zvans or Karl Zvans.
A-7140102, Acosta, Gregorio or Gregorio Acosta Rodriguez.
A-7140088, Carreon, Maria Mercedes or Maria Mercedes Carreon De Acosta.
A-5804142, Afentakis, Konstantinos D.
A-3444860, Antonoff, Spass or Spass Anthony or Stanley Anthony.
A-5444895, Avramides, Clearchos Hercules.
A-7962226, Ayo-Guanilo, Gabriel or Gabriel Ayo or Lucio Gabriel Ayo-Guanilo.
A-3798195, Balsamo, Raffaele or Ralph Balsano.
A-5930326, Barry, Violet Marie.
A-6062967, Bateman, Florence Liliam formerly Florence Lilian Cunningham.
V-941386, Bertucci, Primo.
A-1743346, Borina, Nadina Grigorieva or Nadina Roman Grigorieva Borina or Nadina Roman Bakaleinikoff.
A-5693328, Bradley, Edith May (nee Shaw).
A-7049692, Brewster, Adella Keturah.
A7841167, Castillo, Ana Alvia nee Leon-Martinez.
A-8014959, Christian, Ethel Virginia.
A-6399522, Cooper, Josefa Artiles or Josefa Artiles or Josefa Artiles Vasquez.
A-7251660, Crivello, Anna (nee San Filippo).
V-934834, Cutino, Caterina Sansone.
A-4025239, De Castro, Eriida Agatha.
A-6476416, de Hoyos-Torres, Enrique or Henry de Hoyos.
A-7702320, de Mederios, Agnelo Clementino.
A-6937351, Dertien, Maartje (nee Sleutel).
A-6660658, De Soto, Maria Salazar.
A-1162399, De Velasquez, Natividad Lopez (nee Natividad Lopez).
A-5101863, Di Giorgio, Domenico or Ciagio Bennardo.
A-7057985, Diorio, Mary Carmela.
A-9535114, Do Nascimento, Joaquim or Joaquin Do Nacimento or Joaquin De Nascimento.
A-7178251, Dounias, Garifalitas or Garifalitea, or Garifalia (nee Trango).
A-8001797, Erkus, Ali Orhan.
A-8001796, Erkus, Guzide Nesrian.
A-5948745, Fleming, Ina.
A-7049155, Florio-Macias, Armando.
A-9825449, Fong, Eng Gum.
A-5966266, Foy, Rachel Ann.
A-8017203, Freeman, Samuel Frederick.
A-7122091, Freshour, Raimund Haring.
A-7197981, Gagliarducci, Pacifico.
A-2346359, Garcia, Felix P.
A-7978757, Garcia-Hurtardo, Alfonso.
A-7903421, Gibbs, Samuel James.
A-8021949, Glass, Anya formerly Chana Singer.
A-7995664, Gomez, Jorge.
A-4827036, Gon, Mary Tom or Mary Quon Yee or Fung Kum or Gow Sheung or Fong Dai Muey.
A-6846919, Gonzalez, Genaro.
A-6846916, Gonzalez, Manuela Herlinda.
A-6846917, Gonzalez, Alicia.
A-6846918, Gonzalez, Roman Alfredo.
A-5233140, Gonzalez-Vela, Manuel.
A-5352453, Grasso, Joseph.
A-4359194, Grenier, Marie Jeanne (nee Beauchemin).
A-6482237, Griffiths, Ada Agnes.
A-6482236, Griffiths, Thomas Littleton, Jr.
A-6482235, Griffiths, John Scott Randolph.
A-7435313, Grossholz, Iris.
A-7435314, Grossholz, Heidemarie.
A-7189146, Guccione, Matteo.
A-4066587, Gugliotta, Michael Guiseppe or Michele Guiseppe Gugliotta.
A-5967979, Gumbs, Joseph Nathaniel.
A-6549358, Hallas, Mary Lillian.
A-1577231, Harlan, Doris May.
A-7043770, Harrigan, Cecil Cleve.
A-4347545, Haskakis, William or Basilios Haskakis.
V-661046, Heong, Kwai Ting alias May Kwai or Ting Heung Kwai.
V-1078972, Hiatt, Clemintina Bedoy.
A-7999538, Hoover, George Melvin.
A-3683690, Hoskinson, Bertha Rosalie or Berta Tiant de Munoz or Bertha Rosalie Tiant Y Rodriguez or Bertha Nonoz or Bertha Tyndall.
A-6896031, Hyder, Yvonne G. (nee Haddad).
A-8014950, Industrious, Valentine.
A-5782508, Industrious, May Louise.
A-5438893, Itzkovitz, Evelyn Eve (nee Schnaier).
A-4889195, Jakush, Alexander.
56263/630, Karavasilis, Michalis or Ghatzimichalis or Hajimihalis or Hatsimihalis alias Demetrius or James Hajimihalis or Hatsimihalis.
A-4133211, Kellman, John Reuben or Oscar Herbert.
A-7983188, King, Albertha.
A-1719615, King, Ordenia Gwyndhor (nee Garrold).
A-7849694, Lay, Joachim Ellery.
A-7356719, Lee, Yue Chang or Yue Lee.
A-5971755, Leonard, Alice Olivia.
A-5921673, Lettsome, Anita (nee Venzen).
A-7802509, Lettsome, Norris Alexander.
A-3565855, Lewis, Rene Rose.
A-6450121, Liang, Daisy Yu Ching Liu formerly Yu Ching Liu.
A-6271439, Liang, Ta.
A-7415647, Lois, Ramon Novas.
A-4482881, Lucchino, Antonio.
A-6982455, Magas, Venetia Andre (nee Fragoyiannopoulou).
A-4937264, Malandruccolo, Michele L. or Mike Malandruccolo.
A-4276678, Marohnich, Anton.
A-2578212, Mazzilli, Giuseppe.
A-6205358, McIlvain, Pilar Tobias.
A-5067380, Mirbach, Wilhelm Joseph or William Joseph Mirbach.
A-1631832, Nash, Frank Jesse alias Frank Jesse Naish.
A-8117351, Navarro-Lozano, Rafael.
A-3851086, Neave, Dorothy Kathleen (nee Smith).
A-6492284, Nicolas, Jolita Quimangan alias Felipa Salbosa Laforga.
A-3432011, Nilsen, Alfred Edwart Martin.
A-9607259, Penn, Gibson Alonzo.
A-5852635, Penn, Ophelia Perlina.
A-5988740, Petersen, Ellen Rebecca.
A-6295510, Picciottoli, Josephine Lucy (nee Cuomo).
A-2522320, Radoontsoff, John E.
A-8102958, Ranck, Gladys Karolyn formerly Kanther formerly Halliday (nee Madill).
A-6860161, Rodriguez, Otilia Planas Punceles (nee Otilia Planas Punceles) or Otilia Punceles-Planas.
A-8065865, Ronan, Alexander Wallace.
A-5987803, Ronan, Christina.
A-3458654, Ronzakolski, Wladyslaw or Walter Rolland.
A-7967458, Salto, Isaac or Issac.
A-6178372, Schermerhorn, Esperanza Bangui.
A-4847082, Schnaier, Liba.
A-4907048, Schnaier, Louis.
A-7980292, Seller, Madeleine Antoinette.
A-6002?00, Smith, Conrad Arthur.
A-8010661, Smith, Inez Beatrice.
A-6631947, Soroko, Haim.
A-6544316, Standaart, Johanna Margaretha.
A-6611877, Steffen, Marie Elizabeth (nee Weber), formerly Czekalla or Elsie Steffah.
A-7111334, Stiers, Dorothy (nee Bok Ye Pak).
A-6816811, Stout, Maria Grazia Russo (nee Maria Grazia Russo).
A-6245757, Strat, Athena.
A-7065645, Sun, Lee Wing.
A-7065635, Quong, Lee Wing.
A-3092016, Tachibana, Iku.
A-4641933, Takakuwa, Yayoi.
A-7606771, Tiber, Erwin or Ervin Tiber.
A-7178010, Torielli, Giovanni Francesco or Jeames Franklin Hibes.
A-6250841, Torrez, Andrew or Andres Torres.
A-6887100, Triantafillis, Spero or Spiros Triantafilliou.
A-3848578, Tsi, Tsu Sih.
A-5889279, Tutcher, Margaretta May (nee Kline).
A-7616390, Vinyets, Antonio Rojas or Antonio Vinyets.
A-6770010, Vinyets, Virginia (nee Moran) or Virginia Maria Del Pilar Moran Sierra Vinyets.
A-5170833, Webber, Katherine Rose (nee Kehoe).
A-8078910, Williams, George Ashbourne or George Ashbourn Williams or Ashburn Williams or George Williams or George A. Williams.
A-6624332, Williams, Jack James.
A-5971748, Williams, Vernon George.
A-6541785, Williams, Inez.
A-7863864, Woo, Sun Nam.
A-5149798, Wundt, Mirdza Agnesa (nee Zirnis or Jackel or Gackel).
A-3570617, Yee, June or John Yee.
A-4827305, Zimmerman, Hazel Johanna (nee Ryan).
A-6630018, Agnello, Elda Naomi (nee Pedrazzoli).
A-1269810, Ala'i, Hershmat or Hechmat Alai or Heshmat Husain-Ali'i or Hesmat Alai.
A-6465786, Alexander, Neville Garfield alias Neville Wilson.
A-5886885, Alexay, Mary Krizsan or Mary Krizsan.
A-6650760, Alquizola, Pia C. (nee Pia Caballero).
A-8091720, Amey, George Wallace.
A-6609666, Anastopoulos, Vasilios Panagiotis alias Basil P. Anastopoulos.
A-3765515, Anderson, Frank Ezediel.
A-6043095, Anderson, George Ruthven or Boysie (Nickname) or Monte Cristo (State name).
A-4381407, Andrichik, John or John Andrichick.
A-5456402, Arpe, Carl Johannes Adolf Wilhelm or Carl William Arpe.
A-4933624, Barbieri, Leonardo Antonio or Leon Barber.
A-7809752, Bastian, Gladys Elaine.
A-7019831, Gegin, Joseph Real Gaeton.

A-5970035, Belanger, Joseph Raymond Napoleon or Raymond Napoleon Belanger or Mattias Bizier.
A-7140098, Belmontes, Luz or Luz Belmontes De Rodriguez or Luz Belmontes De Cruz.
A-6997918, Berindei, George.
A-6997919, Berindei, Madeleine Jeanne.
A-2418775, Bismann, Georg.
A-7863967, Boivin, Patrick.
A-7991520, Boots, Habbe or Habbe Dorenbusch.
A-4809720, Burre, Karl Ferdinand.
0608-7520, Cabanzo, Jose Lanza alias Jose Cabanzo or Jose Lanzas.
A-7520764, Caldwell, Ivan Edwin Lindsay.
A-5374313, Campana, Francisco.
A-7599823, Campos, Juana Ampiro.
A-5786864, Carcich, Luca.
A-5402298, Challis, Elizabeth Lesley (nee Judd).
A-7264168, Champe, Olga Tapavichky alias Olga Petrovna Tapavichky.
A-9709799, Chen, Chin alias Jen Chin alias Chun Chan.
A-2481534, Cheng, Amber Lieng-Shan.
A-7879889, Chiu, Chung Chi alias Franklin Chiu.
A-8056959, Chiu, Shang Chun (nee Shang Chun Shu).
A-4641184, Chwalibog, Szyje Zaime now known as Joe Burg.
A-7712792, Clarke, Israel Edward.
A-6148907, Coster Felix.
A-2372178, Cruz-Herrera, Tomas Jose.
A-1469907, Cruz, Rosalina Reyes De.
A-5059353, Dainoff, Clara or Kraina Dainoff or Rose Draina Dainoff.
A-6860782, Di Maria, Annunziata.
0900-56713, De Vitis, Filippo or Di Vitis.
A-5055163, Del Vescovo, Cosmo.
A-7427042, Djakonova, Alexej.
A-4507723, Economopoulos, Nicholas.
A-4684507, Eilenbogen, Mark or Mike Allen.
A-6921739, Esposito, Anthony.
A-4988318, Falvo, Sebastiano or Sam
A-5952820, Galea, Giovanni Baittista.
A-5439085, Garcia, Reynaldo or Jose Reynaldo Garcia.
A-9669427, Georgandis, Adamantios.
A-7858118, Gilbert, Rosa Elvira Salas.
A-4744989, Gonsalves, Joseph alias Joseph Alexander Gonsalves.
A-7445900, Gonzalez, Gertrudis Mireles alias Gregorio Garza.
A-5977709, Gonzalez y Soto, Francisca or Francisca Gonzales or Francisca G. Patino or Francisca Vargas.
A-2320697, Gratsos, Helene.
A-7389931, Granziani, Cipriano.
A-7457706, Grevas, Efstathia or Afstathia Grivas.
A-3800537, Groz, Herman.
A-4958770, Hale-Rodriguez, Carlos.
A-4809648, Hamada, Harumatsu.
A-4312231, Heimerman, Marjorie (nee Labliberte).
A-7210378, Hellmann, Ilse Anna Adolfine.
V-12484, Henriques, Jose Maria, Junior alias Joseph or Joe Costa.
A-6498411, Hernandez de Trejo, Ana Maria.
A-6498445, Trejo-Bravo, Antonio.
A-6498444, Hernandez, Maria Graciela or Graciela Trejo-Hernandez.
A-6498443, Trejo-Hernandez, Ana Maria Christina.
A-6883852, Herrera-Fidela, Fermin.
A-8015884, Hines, Roy Fitzgerals or Aston Thomson.
A-3309720, Howes, Jorge Eugenio.
A-6271457, Hsien, Che Cheng.
A-7419845, Hua, Margaret Pai-Ya alias Margaret Zia.
A-5189047, Irvin, George.
A-5903725, James, Elecia Constancia.
A-7379701, Jung, Norbert Hermann, known as Norbert Hermann Kanyer.
A-1595698, Kawamoto, Yui.
A-7084211, Keller, Lieselotte Charlotte.
A-6848648, King, Sing.
V-369350, King, Cissie (aka Ng Fung Tsang King) (nee Ng Fung Tsang).
1000-19778, Kipper, Henry John.
A-4059204, Klimanoff, Vladimir alias Adolph Piedro or Adolf Piedro.
A-6072051, Korbia, Paul Charles alias Pal Karoly Korbai.
A-6756670, Kostis, Vasilikie alias Vassiliki Kostis (nee Razis).
A-1789925, Krendle, Lily (Lilly) or Lillian Crandell.
A-9825376, Larino, Manuel Lamela.
A-7424881, Lawrence, Dale.
A-7558790, Lawrence, Sandra Jill.
A-3020548, Lazaroff, Zaharia (nee Pop Thanas).
A-7903004, Lee, Hing Jeung alias Lee Hing or Hing Lee.
A-6165966, Linares, Bruno.
A-6474925, Lopez, Salvadaro Calvillo.
A-4065628, Lucin, Bozo or Bob Lucin or Bozo Nicholas Lucin.
A-7283445, MacLeod, Phillipa Beatrice Collins.
A-7483284, Madrell, Robert Scott.
A-7483285, Madrell, Evelyn Maud.
A-5900738, Maduro, Lillian Agatha.
A-6576006, Maiorano, Enrico.
A-7457248, Maiorano, Barbara.
A-7225043, Man, Fung.
A-6365490, Mandamadiotis, Sperios Demetriou.
0301-18521, Manetas, Anthony Demetrios.
A-7025022, Mark, Wee Git also known as Fred Mark, Jr.
A-8106254, Markes, Christ Harry formerly Christos Markos.
1100-25000, Martinez-Flores, Jose known as Joseph Florez Martinez.
A-1060161, Matancias-Morales, Candelario.
A-8080689, McDonald, Albertina (nee Fanfani).
A-1771384, McLeod, Pearl formerly Venner (nee Churchill).
A-6011826, Mefford, Florence Vivian formerly Bryan (nee Alexandra).
A-7886788, Meijer, Manfred.
A-5825318, Mendolia, Margarete Sofie or Margarete Jensen.
A-6057677, Meyers, Blanche.
A-5932933, Meyers, Clemencia Dawson.
A-3285696, Miyashita, Katsuyoshi alias K. Hirayama.
A-6178929, Morch, Milan (William) or Edward William Sadig-Alved or Edward William Cecil.
A-5645201, Morquecho-Hernandez, Jose.
A-5690083, Morquecho, Angela Ramirez de.
A-4531719, Morris, Stafford Clinton.
A-2566504, Muentes, Ignacio Rogoberto.
A-7222175, Nilssan, Egil Martin.
0807-4942, Olmoz-Andaverde, Amelia alias Maria Ulda Gonzalez.
A-7117819, Papa, Domenico.
A-6989658, Papazidis, Christos or Chris Papazidis.
A-6988915, Pardo, Roman Becerra or Roman Becerra.
1600-95282, Pena-Ceja, Alfonso.
T-1774508, Perera y Suarez, Armando Elpidio alias Armando Elpidio Perera.
A-8057558, Piazzi, Giuseppe Celestino alias Joe Turri.
A-5265022, Poriles, Jennie (nee Bazar).
A-7821700, Portelli, Giuseppe or Joseph.
A-3380724, Prentiss, Annie Catherine (nee Delves).
V-1465729, Prevots, Georgette Marie Louise (nee Cierhout).
A-7903801, Quiogue, Francis.
0616-1568, Rabsatt, Vaneta.
A-7383689, Rathbun, Margaret Annie formerly Howerd (nee Sedgman).
A-4721933, Reimann, Emma Augustie.
A-7978828, Richards, Helen Ruth.
A-8001777, Richardson, Reuben Johnson.
A-5393445, Ringwall, Emil or Konrad Emil Ringwall.
A-3641414, Ross, Angus Nicholson.
A-8010610, Roza, Socorro Dela (nee Buraga).
A-7941746, Rubin, Mihaly.
A-7189842, Rumfeld, Heinz Albert.
A-3607555, Sam, Chu Buck or Buck-Sam Chu.
A-6336122, Shar, Tom Tze or (Mrs.) Buck-Sam Chu.
A-9748289, Santalla, Carlos or Carlos Santalla Lojo.
A-4980723, Sardo, Manuel Ferreira.
1300-110059, Scopazzi, Albino.
A-6743297, Sedilo, Evelyn May formerly Evelyn May Hollingum.
A-3483335, Seinberg, Heinrich.
A-4750637, Seinberg, Emma.
A-5967454, Shirado, Seishu.
A-7818429, Skouson, Peter James.
A-66770579, Smith, Henry Hallam.
A-6621142, Spira, Pinchas (nee Pinhas Shapiro).
A-3598815, Steiner, Elizabeth Bessie.
A-5964203, Stenzel, William.
A-7279651, Stern, Eva Stepanek.
A-7141224, Stoppani, Caridad (nee Trevejo also known as Caridad Fernandez Trevjo Rodriguez).
A-7978816, Storrs, Margaret (nee Rush).
A-7978815, Storrs, Timothy John.
A-7980305, Storrs, Peter Kip, Jr.
A-5949820, Stramm, George Carl Bruno.
A-6610968, Suavage-Gonzalez, Carlos or Carlos G. Suavage.
0502-6546, Sup, Chong or Chang.
A-6216393, Sylvestrowicz, Stefania formerly Bielawa (nee Wolinska).
A-4368963, Takakuwa, Shujiro.
A-4433609, Tanaka, Hiraku or Henry Tanaka.
V-155193, Tebele, Linda (nee Cohen).
A-1101889, Theodorakis, John.
A-6963152, Threlfall, Eila Maarit Hyyrylainen.
0803-2303, Torres, Felix.
A-8117373, Torres, Severa Valencia.
A-9634774, Tramontano, Francesco or Franco or Frank.
A-5948749, Turnbull, Esme Viola.
A-2682458, Ullah, Walter or Walter Ali.
V-6423, Uyehara, Marianna Teiko.
A-5784790, Valdes, Joaquin Munoz or Joaquin Munoz.
A-7387449, Valentino, Ernesto.
A-3193878, Valeriano, Francesco or Francesco or Frank Vallarino.
A-6245147, Venetis, Koula.
A-7222547, Verze, Antonio or Anthony Verze.
A-7130589, Villarreal, Margarito Leal.
A-7046255, Wiazemsky, Pauline Princess (nee Pauline Cumbo).
A-7046241, Obolensky, Lydia Princess (nee Lydia Cumbo).
0616-2461, Williams, Melanie Olivia.
A-4004798, Wong, Beatrice or Yuen Choy Kee.
A-6317860, Wong, Gordon Patrick or Youe Han Wong.
A-6497638, Wong, Sun Chong or Wang.
A-6497641, Lee, Tse Seng.
A-4053840, Wu, Pai Tuan.
A-3401043, Yow, Jung known as You Jung known as Yow Jung.
A-7984804, Zamorano-Garcia, Segundo or Ramon Miramontes or Ramiro Miramontes.
A-6989249, Zani, Cesare or Chester Zani.
A-9726397, Zawadzki, Witold.
V-1462278, Zuder, Jacqueline Ivy (nee Cairns).
A-2622696, Zumbo, Paul.
A-5225187, Alexandridi, Alexandrina Maria or Sandra Alexandridi.
A-5305385, Allaer, Alfons Albert.
A-4902610, Allaer, Helena Charlloette (nee Van Der Haegen).
A-4808389, Araujo, Francisco Alexandre or Francisco Alexandre or Francisco Araujo.
A-4797132, Bonifacic, Gaspar.
A-6845710, Brooks, Newton Alvin or Rudolph Crossdale.
A-8015494, Carboni, Ciro Carlo.
A-4792487, Cassidy, James Joseph.
V-939068, Chelini, Giuliano.
A-7748712, Choy, Alfred Hernando.
A-7983490, De Miranda, Socorro Cardenas or Maria De Socorro Cardenas or Socorro Cardenas.

A-5060317, Dona, Mario Antonio or Mario Antonio Nandino Dona or Mario Dona or Dona Mario Antonio.
A-5856811, Engel, Eira Deryn.
A-7112023, Estrada, Jose Luis.
A-6881287, Franco, Gonzalo or Gonzalo Franco-Acosta.
A-6828807, Gettas, Gus Peter or Constantinos Gkitzias.
A-6817855, Haddad, Alfred or Fred Haddad.
A-4463290, Herrera-Hernandez, Pablo.
A-6709361, Hodge, Henrietta Rose (nee Brown).
A-2626026, Holter, Anna Josephine.
A-4678190, Krute, Fritz Heinrich.
A-5237120, Krute, Anna Sophie.
A-3449747, Lahikainen, Otto or Henry Johnson.
A-7941123, Lew, Suey Sen or Robert Lew or Lew Wo Ching or Lew Suey Sen.
A-3361379, Lopez, Serafim or Rafael Serafin Lopez Rajo.
A-6597443, McIlrath, Elena Dolores (nee Ortiz-Milord).
A-4160485, Moreno-Sanchez, Refugio.
A-6923176, Nguyen, Nguyen Thanh.
A-6849421, Nguyen, Li Thi or Thi Ly Phan.
A-7858019, Novella, Daniel Palma.
1600-99778, Ochoa-Ochoa, Robert or Roberto Ochoa-Ochoa.
A-7740671, Ozamis-Ormaechea, Domingo.
A-7079629, Papayannacos, Stylianos.
A-4864916, Pelayo, Soledad Garcia (nee Soledad Garcia Albarracin).
A-1732177, Petok, Irma or Emma.
A-6268920, Preen, Brian Norman.
A-6288190, Prenn, Harold Norman.
A-6268921, Preen, Kate Helen or Kate Ellen Haferkorn.
A-2308244, Raimo, Gennaro.
A-7984830, Ramirez, Victoria Orozco or Victoria Orozco.
A-5582943, Roblejo-Rober, Jose Celedonio or Charlie Molina or Joseph Roblejo.
A-6833430, Rodriguez, Miguel Flores or Miguel Flores or Miguel Angel Flores.
A-7298526, Rumi, Amalia Julianna (nee Mezei).
A-7019158, Saunders, Joan.
A-4456942, Schillaci, Angelina.
A-4456944, Schillaci, Philip.
A-4946941, Schintu, Guiseppe Salvatore or Joseph Schintu or Joseph or Guiseppe Salvatore Pinna or Joseph S. Pinna.
A-4585065, Schultz, Senior, Martin.
A-1718311, Sergei, Jacob or Jack Sergei or Jacob or Jack Shergei.
A-5166619, Shuell, Michael Elmer.
A-7991978, Sitaras, Byron John or Viron Sitaras.
A-9509086, Tarkowski, Franciszek or Frank Tarkowski.
A-4553895, Thompson, Susannah (nee Wylie).
A-6989243, Trotman, Vivian Estelle or Vivian Estella Webbe-Mary Estella Meade-Mary.
V-38960, Valenti, Giuseppina or Giuseppa Valenti (nee Pagano).
1209-9337, Walter, Frank Edy or Frank E. Ruhl or Frank Edy Foster.
A-4625481, Wechsler, Irene (nee Fischer or Rosalia (Rosa) Perlstein).
A-6755973, Wein, Wu Big or Wu Big Woon or Mrs. Mark Chong.
A-4083830, Westphal, Frank or Franz Theodore August Westphal.
A-5359781, Vergottis, George C.
A-4674944, Vergottis, Mary G.
0300-260344, Dehkan, Afsar.
A-6381363, Dehkan, Abdul or Abdul Hussain Dehkan.
A-5975666, Loukatos, Evangelos Kosmas.
A-2320696, Gratsos, Constantin George.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out the matter as it appears on: Page 6, line 10; page 8, line 22; page 17, line 9; page 20, line 6; page 32, line 25; page 39, line 18; and on page 45, after line 12, add the following:

"A-9532298, Mathisen, Wollert.
"A-1331075, Williams, George Kapa.
"A-7145943, Prisciandaro, Damiano.
"A-4193296, Zaganas, Leonidas, alias Leo Z. Gray.
"A-7019831, Begin, Joseph Real Gaeton.
"A-6670579, Smith, Henry Hallam."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

N. A. G. L. MOERINGS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 665) for the relief of N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Krayenbrink Moerings, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Krayenbrink Moerings, his wife, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings, their minor child, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PORFIRIO PUNCIANO VILA ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of Porfirio Punciano Vila, Tatiana Abatooroff Vila, Porfirio P. Vila, Jr., Anne Marie Vila, and Josephine Anne Vila.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Porfirio Punciano Vila; Tatiana Abatooroff Vila, his wife; and Porfirio P. Vila, Jr., Anne Marie Vila, and Josephine Anne Vila, his children, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct five numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws" and substitute the words "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "and head taxes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIEN KOO CHEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 765) for the relief of Tien Koo Chen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tien Koo Chen (also known as Chen Tien Koo) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT J. RICKARDS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 847) for the relief of Robert J. Rickards, Conception Sotelo Rickards, and Walter John Rickards.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Robert J. Rickards, Conception Sotelo Rickards, and Walter John Rickards shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASUKO OSHIMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 869) for the relief of Masuko Oshima.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens, inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Masuko Oshima, the Japanese fiance of Lt. Col. Carl H. Cundiff, a citizen of the United States and a member of the staff in the Adjutant General's Office, and that Masuko Oshima may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Masuko Oshima is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Carl H. Cundiff, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Masuko Oshima, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after entry of said Masuko Oshima, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful

admission for permanent residence of said Masuko Oshima, as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head taxes.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Masuko Oshima, the fiance of Lt. Col. Carl H. Cundiff, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Masuko Oshima is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Lt. Col. Carl H. Cundiff and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Masuko Oshima, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Masuko Oshima, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Masuko Oshima as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAY OF DEPORTATION PROCEEDINGS ON EUGENE DE THASSY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1756) to stay deportation proceedings on Eugene de Thassy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of immigration and naturalization laws, Eugene de Thassy shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 3, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws," and substitute in lieu thereof "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On line 7, strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Eugene de Thassy."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL MYUNG HA CHUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1886) for the relief of Paul Myung Ha Chung.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Paul Myung Ha Chung shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On lines 3 and 4 strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws", and substitute the words "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On line 7, strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNELIESE SCHILLINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1963) for the relief of Anneliese Schillings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anneliese Schillings, the German fiance of Cpl. Giovannibattista Tudisca, a citizen of the United States and member of the Armed Forces of the United States, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Anneliese Schillings is married to the said Cpl. Giovannibattista Tudisca, within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anneliese Schillings, the fiance of Cpl. Giovannibattista Tudisca, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Anneliese Schillings is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Cpl. Giovannibattista Tudisca and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, other than the provisions of section 212 (2) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anneliese Schillings, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anneliese Schillings, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Anneliese Schillings as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM ROSENBLAT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Sam Rosenblat.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sam Rosenblat may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTANCE BROUWER SCHEFFER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2652) for the relief of Constance Brouwer Scheffer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Constance Brouwer Scheffer, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. George W. Williams, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEFINE HOORN (DMYTRUK)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2787) for the relief of Josefine Hoorn (Dmytruk).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Josefine Hoorn (Dmytruk), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius P. Hoorn, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JULIA GAMROTH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3670) for the relief of Mrs. Julia Gamroth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Julia Gamroth, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oath prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Mrs. Julia Gamroth shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Julia Gamroth shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Private Calendar.

DANIEL ROBERT LEARY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES RETURNING BILL PURSUANT TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 99

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H. R. 1101, entitled "An act for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 1953.*

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House on May 25 for 30 minutes, instead of the 20 already granted.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE NATIONAL FLAG OF HAITI

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 237.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas 150 years ago, on May 18, 1803, Gen. Jean Jacques Dessalines created the national flag of Haiti and thereby established national unity among the forces working for Haitian independence; and

Whereas through the years the Republic of Haiti has played an important part in the historical and cultural development of the United States and the other American nations; and

Whereas the House of Representatives recognizes the significant contributions which have been made by the Republic of Haiti to the achievement of closer ties between the nations of the Western Hemisphere: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its cordial greetings to the Republic of Haiti on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the creation of the national flag of Haiti, and expresses the deep friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Haiti, recognizing the historical and cultural contributions which have been made by the Republic of Haiti to the nations of the Western Hemisphere and reaffirming its profound desire for the continuance of the warm and mutually beneficial relationship presently existing between the Republic of Haiti and the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, today throughout the Western Hemisphere we are commemorating a historical event. Just 150 years ago Gen. Jean Jacques Dessalines, commander in chief of the Haitian armies, saw fit to create the national flag of the Republic of Haiti. Some days previous, at what was called the Congress of Arcahaie, the principal leaders of the Haitian independence movement, gathered together in order to concert measures of national unity. One of the illustrious sons of Haiti who inspired this unification movement, was Alexandre Pétion, founder and first President of the Republic of Haiti. Up to this month of May in 1803, the forces working for Haitian independence had been somewhat scattered and disorganized. It was the destiny of Commander in Chief Dessalines to establish a formula of unity in order to give his people a symbol of their new understanding of each other. He decided to create a national flag. Until May 18, 1803, the flag that was most familiar to the people of the island was the French tricolor—blue, white, and red. General Dessalines, realized that the blacks and the mulattos would have to join forces in order to achieve freedom, removed the white band from the center of the French tricolor. In this way the blue and the red were placed side by side as a symbol of the Negroes and mulattos who were to stand shoulder to shoulder in their quest for independence.

The establishment of the national flag had an electrifying effect upon the majority of the people of Haiti. Rallying around their leaders they began to defend themselves against the powerful armies of Napoleon Bonaparte, First Counsel of France. Little by little the foreign legions were pushed back until late in November they were forced to flee from the island itself. This victory of the Haitians under their national flag, terminated the dream of Napoleon to establish a French Empire in the New World. Indeed, he was intimidated to such an extent that he immediately sought to sell Louisiana to the United States of America. And that is why, by a happy historical incident, the anniversary of the creation of the flag of Haiti and the acquisition of the State of Louisiana by the United States are being commemorated in the same year. And it is an equally felicitous conjuncture that the first article written for publication by His Excellency Ambassador Jacques Leger of Haiti was on the subject The Acquisition of Louisiana. In this article M. Leger pointed out a historical fact of the first magnitude, namely, that the triumph of the forerunner of Haitian independence, Toussaint L'Ouverture, paved the way for the extension of United States territory from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean.

It is likewise a historical fact of a most interesting character that the Haitian patriot, Alexandre Pétion, gave hospitality of a most valuable character to the great liberator of South America, Simón Bolivar, at a time when the latter had been routed on the mainland and had no other place of refuge. President Pétion, with a generosity characteristic of the Haitian people, not only preserved the life of Bolivar, but also gave him, freely, the money, the arms and the provisions which enabled the great liberator to return to his country and complete the work to which he had set his hand. There was only one request that President Pétion made to Bolivar on the occasion. The Haitian leader simply asked that slavery, as a result of liberation, would be abolished on the free soil of America. This was a promise, Mr. Speaker, that I am happy to report was fulfilled loyally by the noblehearted son of Venezuela.

From this recital of history it must be clearly apparent to the Congress and the United States of America how much all of us in the Western Hemisphere owe to the magnanimous initiative and splendid loyalty of the President of Haiti. Consequently all of us can join in the celebration with the utmost sincerity and enthusiasm. The ceremonies in connection with this event are to continue from the 18th of May 1953 to the 1st of January 1954. The commemoration marks a glorious chapter in the history of inter-American friendship.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as we join in observing the 150th anniversary of the creation of the Haitian national emblem several thoughts occur to me that may be worthy of consideration.

First, it is evident from the event we are commemorating here today that the genius for freedom and independence is not limited to the people of any one race, creed or color.

Second, the history of Haiti demonstrates, as does our own, that while liberty may be gained by one generation responding to inspired leadership, freedom can be preserved only if succeeding generations demonstrate their worthiness and determination to remain free.

Third, here in the relationship between Haiti and the United States of America we see the small independent nation existing peacefully in the shadow of a giant among world powers—without the slightest fear of aggression from our direction.

We have proved, down through the years, that we do not covet the territory of our neighbors. Instead, we respect their integrity, cherish their friendship and value the reciprocal customer relations we have built up in the trade lanes down through the years.

Mindful of the contributions made by Haiti to the cause of human liberty in the Western Hemisphere, our Nation has always stood ready to lend a helping hand when it was needed.

Let it be pointed out that there has never been an occasion for the people of Haiti to doubt our intentions. Not by words, but by deeds, we have demonstrated the honor of our motives in helping Haiti to preserve its atmosphere of freedom and peace.

As one neighbor to another, then, we are happy to pause here today to acknowledge Haiti's contribution to mankind's struggle against tyranny; to reaffirm the traditional spirit of friendship between our countries; and finally, to extend sincere congratulations to Haiti for having reached a significant milestone in what we are confident will be a long and honorable history of achievement among nations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago Gen. Jean Jacques Dessalines, commander in chief of the Haitian armies striving for their independence against Napoleon Bonaparte, summoned his leading generals to a meeting at Arcahaie, a town near the capital, Port-au-Prince. The idea for this gathering had come to General Dessalines from Alexandre Pétion, who, in subsequent years, was to gain fame as the founder and first President of the Republic of Haiti. It was felt that a dramatic gesture was needed to unite the people of the island in their struggle for freedom.

This drama was provided by General Dessalines. On May 18, 1803, 150 years ago today, the Haitian patriot, taking the French tricolor in his hand, removed the white band in the center and drew together the blue and red colors: a symbol of the spiritual union of the blacks and the mulattoes. Instantly, the scattered hosts of Haitian independence realized that they had found a natural leader. From that day forward, the people knew that they would have in Jean Jacques Dessalines an intelligent, brave commander in chief. The Haitian objective became clear to all: An independent, free Republic. Within 6 months, the Napoleonic armies were in full retreat. On November 29, 1803, while the people of Haiti took possession of Cap Haitien, the last regiments of Bonaparte embarked at Môle St.-Nicolas to return to their homeland, France. The national flag of Haiti had played its role in the emancipation of the island.

At a time when the Congress of the United States of America is extending to the people and the Government of Haiti warm congratulations upon a happy anniversary, it may be appropriate to add a few words about the outstanding heroes of Haitian independence. One of the champions of freedom, whose names have resounded in history, was the son of a slave, Toussaint L'Ouverture. Thanks to a wealth of natural talent, Toussaint learned the uses of many medicinal herbs. This knowledge was utilized for the benefit of his fellow men. It also gave him a place of leadership among his fellow slaves. Toussiant, it can be noted, was a devout believer in God. His deep religious convictions freed him of racial animosity. His one dream was to secure fair treatment for his people on the island. Although this gifted man never received any formal military training, he developed remarkable facilities for discovering almost everything planned by Napoleon's generals. Consequently, in the words of a contemporaneous historian, Toussaint L'Ouverture emerged as "a top-flight military leader with an unusual humanitarian record."

In one of his orders to generals in the field, Toussaint wrote as follows:

> I have given instructions to my commanders to treat all prisoners with humanity.

In order to crush Toussaint and to reestablish slavery in Saint-Domingue, the French First Consul, Bonaparte, sent to the Caribbean the largest fleet and most powerful expeditionary force that had ever crossed the Atlantic. Although Toussaint L'Ouvérture suffered reverses and died in prison, a victim of treachery, the noblehearted Haitian leader handed on the torch of liberty to his compatriots, Alexandre Pétion, Henry Christophe, and Jean Jacques Dessalines. Toussaint was the forerunner of liberty in the Caribbean. It was the destiny of his brothers-in-arms to complete the work of victory.

One of the most notable results of Haitian independence, a movement which derived inspiration from the national flag of the republic, was the definitive repulse of Napoleon in the New World and the termination of the French dream of an empire in the Mississippi Valley. When the French armies evacuated Saint-Domingue, Bonaparte, reading the handwriting on the wall, began negotiations which led to the acquisition of the Lousiana Territory for the United States of America. This important achievement by President Thomas Jefferson was due, in part, to the triumph of the people of Haiti. The intelligent courage of General Dessalines and the vision of President Jefferson paved the way for the Louisiana Purchase. Consequently, we in the Western Hemisphere are commemorating the creation of the national standard of the Republic of Haiti in the same year that we recall, with sentiments of loyal gratitude, the epochal decision of one of our great Presidents. The simultaneous celebration is no accident; it represents the union of hearts and of minds that is characteristic of America.

I congratulate the Government and the people of Haiti on this celebration, and in particular on the great progress their country has made during this period. The people of Haiti of this generation have received a great heritage from their forebears.

Maintaining their faith in and love of God they will not only preserve but improve upon the Government they inherited and that they now possess.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 5 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5227, with Mr. McCULLOCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture. As chairman of that subcommittee, I would be remiss if I were not to express my sincere appreciation for the splendid cooperation given to me during the hearings and markup of this bill by the other members of this subcommittee. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has an intimate knowledge of forestry problems, of conservation and of research in every field. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], two new members of our subcommittee on the Republican side, have aided immeasurably by their clear and succinct questioning of the witnesses and

their developing of the various questions called to the attention of the committee. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], minority member of the committee and former chairman, brings to the subcommittee his store of knowledge in relation to agriculture, gained from his 10 years upon this committee. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] have cooperated in every way possible and all of us have maintained in our subcommittee a bipartisan approach to all of the financial problems facing agriculture. I feel that I am extremely fortunate in having gentlemen of the caliber of these six men sitting with me and advising with me as to what we should bring out on the floor of the House for consideration by the Congress. I also feel fortunate in having as our executive clerk Mr. Ross Pope, who is fast gaining a reputation for ability second to none on our Appropriations Committee staff.

The deliberations of our committee as to the financial needs of the Department of Agriculture, together with its related activities, have been centered around the basic need for preserving a prosperous agriculture. Anyone who has made a study of the economic progress of our Nation will admit that we cannot have a prosperous United States of America unless we are willing to grant the same degree of prosperity to each separate segment which makes up our economy. We in agriculture are not requesting that the farmer be given special privilege in any way. We do ask and we do demand that he be given a fair and equal opportunity with labor, with industry, and with all other groups to share in the bountiful resources of these great United States of America.

During my 15 years in Congress, I have fought for one principal objective—parity prices for all farm commodities. The farmer does not want an unreasonable price for what he produces but inasmuch as his expenses have skyrocketed just as much as they have in all other industries, he must receive prices for what he produces which will maintain his position in our national picture—which is to say, he must receive parity prices for every farm commodity.

The No. 1 duty of Members of Congress now is to see to it that the money and machinery necessary to cushion the shock of any possible drop in farm prices shall be available if the need shall arise. A small suplus is sufficient excuse for the speculators to break the market. Farm prices are barometers of national welfare. Let us, therefore, make certain that no economic storm be foretold by the farm-price barometer. Let us insure that farm prices shall not fall below a reasonable level. We must have the necessary gross national income if we are to continue to meet the huge drains on our Treasury, which will be with us for years to come.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, a fair price for farm products is the first essential of a prosperous nation. A drop of only 10 cents in the value of a bushel of corn means a loss of $300 to the average farmer in my seventh district. Twenty cents reduction per bushel for barley will cost him another $200, while a fall of a dime per pound of butterfat will create an extra deficit of $150. Our farmers must have the income if we are to be able to pay current prices for labor and everything we buy. Give the farmers of the Nation at least 30 billions in income and we need not fear any economic crisis in our country. The farm dollar exchanges hands 7 times creating an income for the Nation of 7 times whatever the farmer receives gross for his products.

Our ceiling programs, bolstered by the Commodity Credit Corporation are the most important part of our farm program. We must preserve this program. If a severe drop in prices hits agriculture, it may cost the farmers of the Nation $8 billion in 1 year and will result in creating unemployment in every community of our Nation.

We must have and must keep machinery available in each and every township and county ready to start the wheels rolling for placing loans under grain, if they are needed.

It is because of my personal experience as a farmer that I am convinced of the great need for keeping the framework of this committee structure intact and available for possible future needs and I have spent many hours trying to convince other Members of Congress of the value of our triple-A committees. Without them, or a similar group, we cannot have a successful farm program, nor would we have any machinery to throw into action if a tailspin in farm prices developed. God help our Nation if any such catastrophe should happen again. A severe fall in farm-commodity values is so absolutely unnecessary that it is almost criminal to permit its recurrence. All we need do is keep farm income at a reasonable level and the gross income for the rest of the Nation will, as a matter of course, keep its own relative position.

May I respectfully suggest that too many Members on the floor of the House have imbedded in their minds that the farmers, that agriculture as such in America, are the recipients of huge subsidies, paid for by the other taxpayers of this Nation. Nothing can be further from the truth. Please let us orient our line of thinking here before we proceed. May I ask you to turn to part 1 of our hearings, page 42, and study carefully that table as given there.

During World War II there was paid out of the Treasury of the United States $4.2 billion for the sole purpose of bringing to the consuming public cheaper food. This is the reverse of the expenditures to support the price of farm commodities. Since 1933 through January 1, 1953, the cost to the Treasury of the United States in what might be classified as farm price supports was $1,064,000,000. In other words, since 1933 up to this date, about one quarter as much money has been expended in behalf of keeping up the price for the farmer in America as there has been expended for holding down the price of food to the consumer. Let us remember also that if OPA rollbacks on pork, beef, veal, lamb, and mutton, let alone butter and milk products, had not been put into effect during World War II, farmers of America would have during that time received at least $10 billion more for their products than they did. Furthermore, through expenditure of $1,070,000,000 during the last 20 years for price supports, at least 10 times that amount has been paid as additional income taxes by farmers because of their having that degree of protection and as a result a degree of prosperity approaching that of other portions of our economy.

Business as such was subsidized by the taxpayers to the extent of $40,787,864,000, following the end of World War II in what was known as business reconversion payments—including tax amortization. Yet the Chamber of Commerce of the United States this past week has seen fit to protest, in a special edition of its publication Spending Facts against what it terms "an unneeded farm subsidy program." They have not to my knowledge protested in the past 6 years against the giving to business of at least 55 times as much of the taxpayers money as contained in this one bill for the operation of the entire Department for 1 year.

I have noticed, Mr. Chairman, protests in the press against what is termed undue liberality to our one basic industry, agriculture. This same press has not protested against the out-and-out subsidy given them in second- and third-class postal rates, amounting to more over the same period than the entire cost of our price-support program.

Much will be said during this debate relative to so-called subsidies due to farmers along the line of soil-conservation payments. Ladies and gentlemen of this Congress, if there is any one possession or physical asset of this Nation that is important, outside of the human element, that physical asset is our soil. Remember that our population is increasing at the rate of 2,700,000 persons a year. This requires in turn an increase in our food production of an estimated 7½ million acres of good farm land. You will note Dr. Shaw's statement page 266, part 2 of the hearings, to the effect that if our population continues to increase at the present rate of growth, we will have 190 million people here in the United States to feed by 1965, only 12 years from now. To feed these additional people will require 115 million acres of additional production. Through research we may be able to secure the equivalent of 45 million acres, by increasing production on the nearly 400 million acres now in cropland. But where will we obtain the other 70 million acres?

Yes, some small amount from reclamation. Where can we turn except to more and more increase in production. That means better and better soils. Is it not of the paramount importance that we continue the incentives of soil conservation? Cannot we afford to spend on our soils, in payments in part for good soil-conservation practices, an amount equal to two-fifths of the cost of keeping one combat division in operation. Do you not think we must keep our food production going upward to prevent a lowering of our diet level, which in turn would mean an America on the way down as a decaying Nation? I am sure that you do.

Upon the quality and beneficence of our soils rests the future of America. Plainly speaking, it makes me sick and tired to hear some of our colleagues unthinkingly, I am sure, object to the spending upon the soils of America for the good of future generations to come of a sum annually equal to that which, during the last 2 years, they have appropriated with very little debate for an aircraft carrier. Surely even though we are today at war this great Nation of ours can find $169 million, the net available of the $195 million in the bill for distribution to farmers, to use as incentive payments and part reimbursement of conservation costs to farmers of this Nation so that our soils can be passed on to the coming generations better than we as farmers today have them. To me that is only good, common sense. When peace comes, which all of us hope will not be too far distant, we will not have the necessity of spending the billions we do upon armaments and such, we should then seriously evaluate this soil conservation program and add to this investment of $169 million at least another $100 million annually for the preservation of our soils. Let us remember that while the average farmer may recognize the need for carrying out soil conservation practices, he is naturally influenced by the fact that his interest in the land may be for a relatively short period of time. This applies especially to the tenant farmers of America. Let us remember, on the other hand, that the interest of the Nation as a whole in the land is for an indefinite period of time in the future. The strength of our Nation and its welfare depends upon the continued productivity of the soil and its water resources. When we forget these fundamental truths, ladies and gentlemen, our great United States of America will cease to be the great Nation that it has been in the past.

Gentlemen, the list of various activities of the Department are before you in this report that we have brought to you. I will not enumerate them. You can see for yourself what we have done for research in every field. You can see what we have done for our experiment stations, our Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, the Bureau of Animal Industries, the Bureau of Dairy Industry, the Bureau of Agricultural Industrial Chemistry, the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.

You can examine into our actions relative to the Forest Service and Flood Prevention, and our new program as initiated here in relation to watershed protection. It is my sincere hope that this program as described on page 9 of the report will be the beginning of a great program of watershed protection throughout America. You will note that here we are providing for 50 small pilot plant watershed areas scattered throughout the United States in areas selected because of the problems which they represent. We have provided an appropriation of $5 million for fiscal 1954 and are limiting the total expenditures upon these 50 projects from now to the period of the conclusion of their construction to $29 million. In no case is the cost of any one project to exceed $3 million.

We are attempting to find out the answer to the age-old question, Mr. Chairman, as to how and where can we best stop floods and hold back our soils and keep these soils from drifting down into the sea or filling up the vast reservoirs behind dams. The Congress of the United States has made available through the Army Engineers nearly $4 billion of actual appropriations for the purpose of constructing huge dams and control works along the main stems of our rivers. By this pilot plant operation at a total cost of $29 million, if we can prove the needless construction for even one or two of these dams, this money will have been returned to the taxpayers 10 times over.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, may I emphasize this fact. The amount recommended in direct appropriations for this coming fiscal year for the regular activities of the Department is $24,301,505 less than the funds available for 1953. Furthermore, because of the expected acreage controls for the 1954 crop year on wheat and cotton, we have been compelled to include here $27,500,000 for that purpose. Were it not for this new activity our direct appropriations in this bill would have been $53,801,505 less than in 1953.

We have decreased the size of the announced soil conservation payment program for 1954 by $55 million. Soil Conservation Service, however, is kept at the present scale of operations.

We have insisted on keeping the loan programs, Rural Electrification, Rural Telephone, and the Farmers Home at a sufficiently high level to continue the operation of those splendid programs to the best possible advantage of agriculture in America.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attention given to this short summation on my part and I am sure whatever action is finally taken by the Congress will be to the best interest of the farmers of this great United States of America.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. I would like to inquire of the gentleman when he would contemplate doing away with such loans as the Farmers' Home Administration issues. If we are ever going to discontinue socializing our economy, why would that not be a good place to start now?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I might say that there is a little fundamental difference between the gentleman and myself. I do not consider that program in any way as socialistic. I have seen that program take care of the farmers in my district who could not otherwise get credit. It makes loans to those who cannot get credit elsewhere. In addition, it makes loans to young veterans and it starts them along the road to a successful farming career. When these people get on their feet, they become good, worthwhile clients of the local banks and cease to obtain loans from the Farmers' Home Administration.

Please keep in mind that, regardless of what may have been said by people who do not understand this program, it deals with people who have no other source of credit. If we were not to help out these people we would have a huge relief program upon our rolls instead. Here on the other hand we are giving these people an opportunity to help themselves. I am proud of the fact that 93 percent of the loans which have matured have been repaid by this group of people. I think it is a very worthwhile program and, as far as I am personally concerned, next to the price supports it is the most essential program in this bill.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I think it is wise at this time to point out that not only do we take people off the welfare lists through the wise administration and application of Farmers' Home Administration loans, but if we were to stop this program they would go back on the welfare lists in many cases.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is no question about it, and we would have no way in which we could help our returning veterans. I think it is good, sound business.

Mr. HORAN. We not only try to work through this subcommittee as closely as possible with the administrator of these funds but we do insist that when they have proven their ability to handle these loans and have become successful they be taken off the Farmers' Home Administration rolls and seek credit elsewhere.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. In order to secure one of these loans the applicant must show that he does not have credit available from other sources. You are dealing with that class of people. Certainly the situation we found when we started this agency was not something to be proud of. I do not think this is socialism. I like to think I am against that. But if that be what this is, though I am sure it is not, it is good for the individuals and good for the country.

MR. GWINN. I have heard that argument so long that we are virtually socializing our whole economy because it is the American variety of socialism and therefore it is good socialism.

My original question to the gentleman from Minnesota was, when is this type of crutch or the taking from one group and redistributing to others according to their needs going to be discontinued?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. First, let me disagree with that part of the gentleman's question as to redistribution. I will specifically answer the question as to when this crutch, as the gentleman calls it, will be done away with as far as the Congress of the United States is concerned. My answer would be never.

Mr. GWINN. Never? How much do we loan per year now under this administration?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We put $162,500,000 for new loan money into this category, and it will not be many years before we have the same amount of money coming back as repayments on loans. This includes the $35 million

program of loans for aid in buying farms. Most of that money goes to the veterans.

Mr. GWINN. Is not this administration the one that has the power to adjust or modify or even cancel these loans? Is it not a fact that in the election year something like 80,000 of these loans were modified or canceled?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman had examined into that he would have found that that had to do with the hundreds of thousands of loans that were made during the drought years back through the Midwest in 1934 to 1936. Those loans were made to various farmers. I remember in my community that hay worth $6 a ton was brought in there and farmers were charged $24 to $30 a ton. Those loans have been considered direct charges against the farmer, whereas in the villages and the cities it was known as direct relief.

As time has gone by, it has been found necessary, where certain people who had moved off the farm, most of them getting up into their 60's—and after all, this is 20 years from that period—to give to the Farmers' Home Administrator the right to come in and compromise or cancel those loans. There was no possibility of collecting a good many of them.

In a good many instances, those laws were made during the drought period when all the farmers through that entire great area from Texas up to Minnesota practically went broke. Those loans should have been considered as direct relief, as was done in the villages and cities. But in this particular case they were made a direct charge against the farmers of America.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to point out that these were the old seed and feed loans of relief days, and the Farmers' Home Administration happened to be the agency which was saddled with the responsibility of handling it. It is not a part of the Farmers' Home Administration program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. As has been so well pointed out in this instance, they did have notes signed by the farmers, but the same thing done at the same time in the cities and municipalities was called direct relief. No payments were asked and none made. On the other hand, from the farmers they did take these notes. The other side of the picture is—after representatives of the Farmers' Home Administration collected all the money they felt they could without spending more money collecting it than they were receiving, after they had squeezed it down to the level where there was no reasonable return for the amount of money spent in trying to collect further, that is the point they reached when they finally decided to clear the books.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I know my former chairman would agree that in many, many cases more money was spent in attempting to collect the loans than the amount of money involved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from Minnesota think that the Farmers' Home Administration program is any more socialistic in principle than the creation of a $100 million fund by the House of Representatives a few days ago to indemnify bankers on loans made to exporters whose property is shipped overseas and has been confiscated or expropriated by some foreign dictator or some foreign government? Is that any more socialism than this sort of deal?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Of course, I would agree fully with the gentleman.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Gladly.

Mr. GWINN. Being a farmer myself, I have a high regard for the morals of farmers because I know something of them. It has been something of a sentimental notion of mine that perhaps because of that we could appeal to the farmers to get off the gravy train first as an example to the rest of the country, like the bankers in the city and those receiving public houses and loans and rent control. When are we going to start getting off the gravy train, if we do not start with the farmers?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not consider these great farm programs which have done so much for the good of the farm people of America as anything approaching socialism. My definition of such socialism is where you have any degree of compulsion. If the farmer is told that he must do certain things in order to do certain things, then you have something approaching socialism, which is in my mind the first cousin of communism, and from there it is only a step to a dictatorship; but there is no out-and-out compulsion in any of these programs having to do with agriculture, Mr. GWINN, and if there were, I would be the first one to get up here and fight against it. From that viewpoint, I cannot agree that there is anything that you might term socialism connected with what we have in this bill. I thank you.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, immediately after returning to Washington, and before inauguration of the new Eisenhower administration, I requested, from the Department of Agriculture, figures showing what agriculture prices in January 1952 were in relation to the last figures available, which was January 15, 1953.

The reason I requested these figures is that it had become obvious that the purchasing power of agriculture had steadily declined for a period of the past 2 years. In fact, the records show that from January 15, 1950, to January 15, 1953, agriculture prices had dropped, while the price of nearly all commodities had advanced until the purchasing power of the farmers have been reduced a total of 22 percent. I have found all Members of Congress vitally concerned about this economic problem. The Congress must find a solution to this problem.

Here is the price picture for the major American crops, comparing the January 15, 1953, price to the farmer with the January 15, 1952, price:

Crop	1953	1952
Wheat.....bushel..	$2.10	$2.20
Corn.....do....	1.48	1.68
Cotton.....hundredweight..	29.79	38.45
Potatoes.....bushel..	2.06	2.07
Apples.....do....	3.21	2.32
Beef.....hundredweight..	19.70	27.20
Hogs.....do....	17.80	17.40
Veal calf.....do....	23.40	31.50
Lambs.....do....	20.30	28.20
Chickens.....pound..	.265	.274
Wool.....do....	.51	.613
Milk.....hundredweight..	4.80	5.14
Butterfat.....pound..	.683	.798
Eggs.....dozen..	.458	.405

The decline results from a number of fluctuations in the market. The farmer's real income has dropped steadily since World War II because retail prices have inched up and middleman costs have gone up. In the past year, a 30-percent drop in export of farm goods has increased the surplus, and cut into the rural income. This decline in exports was caused by increased production in other countries.

Individual commodities also have run into trouble. Beef is in a long cycle of increased production. Consequently, beef prices have fallen from 129 percent of parity to 92 percent in the year 1952.

The subnormal rainfall in the last 2 years has contributed greatly to the beef problem being serious in the southwestern States of our country. Shortage of feed and a declining market has forced many sales that otherwise would not have been made.

Mr. Chairman, in order to help maintain farm income on a parity with other segments of our economy, it is absolutely necessary that this administration and the Members of Congress give this problem their most careful and considered thought. Without a prosperous agriculture, we cannot have a prosperous country, and for that reason I intend to support the recommendations made by the Agriculture Committee and the Appropriations Committee dealing with that subject.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, the work of the subcommittee on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture now before you has been long and arduous. I have had the privilege of working with a fine group of colleagues, whose integrity and sincerity I honor and whose opinions I respect. I do not always agree with them, but I know that the opinions they hold and express, while some of them may be different from my own, are sincerely and conscientiously arrived at. The friendship and courtesy they have extended to me leaves nothing to be desired.

The members of the subcommittee have made a sincere attempt to make a distribution of funds in this bill that will do the utmost toward helping solve some

of the important problems of agriculture. We have greatly benefited from the counsel of four members of the subcommittee with years of experience, broad knowledge, and a deep interest in agriculture—our chairman, H. CARL ANDERSEN, WALTER HORAN, CLARENCE CANNON, and JAMIE WHITTEN. Two new members of the subcommittee—OAKLEY HUNTER, of California, and MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin—have contributed much. The patient and untiring work of Ross Pope was invaluable to the subcommittee. It has been a pleasure to serve with these gentlemen. To have had the opportunity to work on problems so close to me as farming and farm families has given me great personal satisfaction.

It is with mixed feelings that I speak to the House today. It should not be necessary at this time to review in detail that part of our agricultural history which still lives vividly in the memory of every farmer who went through it. I am speaking of that period in the twenties when falling farm prices, forced sales, farm foreclosures, dark depression, dust storms, and bank failures brought a mighty nation to its knees.

It should not be necessary to review the tremendous comeback of agriculture and the onward push of farmers to the greatest productive effort the world has known. It should not be necessary to review the many basic agricultural laws which helped to make this great recovery possible—credit and conservation, research, and education, improved health and better diets for children, electric power and telephones, crop insurance and price supports. All of these have been provided for in the bill before you today. All of them have resulted in programs of established and proven benefit.

Mr. Chairman, this bill concerns the food on our table and the clothes on our backs. National security and human need have been our guide in drafting this bill. These are the only sound criteria that can be used for things so basic.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a curious change seems to have come over the Department of Agriculture in recent months. This was apparent throughout the hearings on this bill. It has been apparent in the speeches and pronouncements that have come from this great institution. It recalls to us the discarded and discredited policies of unhappier days which we thought were gathering dust in the files of failures. It is the philosophy that guided us into the last great depression.

It is the philosophy that there is something more important than national security and human need.

To paraphrase a well-known remark, we are told to lift our eyes beyond the dollar sign. That, Mr. Chairman, is exactly what your committee tried to do. Yet it is apparent that some in the Department of Agriculture have their eyes so closely fixed on the dollar that they have forgotten or ignored the national need. And this is precisely what the committee has attempted to correct in this bill.

Some responsible body, Mr. Chairman, must keep watch over the economic health and well-being of the country and its people. If it is not the appointed officials, then it must be the elected officials.

I have said that it should not be necessary to review the history of agricultural decline, depression, and recovery. Perhaps I am wrong. There seem to be a number of responsible people who have learned nothing from having gone through this experience. Or, perhaps they are like the 17-year locust which spends most of its life buried and hidden away, then emerges to live for only a brief moment in the sunlight of reality.

On April 28, one of the appointed officials of the Department of Agriculture made a speech in Chicago. He started off this speech by saying, and I quote:

> Last November the citizens of the United States by an overwhelming vote decided to redirect the course of the Nation.

Now I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman is as honest and sincere in this belief as he is wrong in his analysis. So far as the farmers of this country are concerned, the letters I have received from my friends and neighbors since November lead me to believe that the farmers intended that the progress would be forward, not backward. And the farmers seem to have a notion that the President shared their belief.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported out last Thursday. The following day, the same appointed official in the Department of Agriculture expressed the hope in a remark to a reporter that the Congress would disapprove this bill and be guided instead by the amounts submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

Now it is perfectly proper for an official of the Department to express this hope. I mention it only because it is indicative of an attitude that seems to persist over there.

It is the attitude that the duty of Congress is to support the Department of Agriculture. I hasten to say that Department officials have given repeated assurances that their only intention is to carry out the will of Congress. Yet, the opposite attitude continues to manifest itself in various ways. Appointed Department officials seem to have fixed notions as to the general type of programs that are best for the farmers. These officials seem to be very impatient with some of us who express disagreement with some of their ideas.

This was apparent in the hearings. As the hearings proceeded, it became quite clear that many of the responsible officials were in fundamental disagreement with many of the programs which the Congress has provided, and with many of the methods which Congress has authorized. The question naturally arises, Mr. Chairman, how can an administrative official do a good job in carrying out a program he does not believe in—no matter how sincere his intent or how earnest his effort?

Perhaps some of our fears are not justified, Mr. Chairman; I would hope so.

I would not like to see the time come when the question at issue is whether the Congress supports the Department of Agriculture, or the Department of Agriculture supports the Congress. I would not like to see the time come when the Congress is putty in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, to be molded to fit the whim and fancy of passing appointed officials.

I am ever grateful, Mr. Chairman, that our Founding Fathers had the foresight to provide for elected representatives through whom the people of this country can express their wishes. The voice of the people is being expressed, and it has been heeded by your committee.

There is another matter that came up during the hearings, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to dwell on briefly. It is this business of getting down to specific cases as to where we are going in agriculture; getting down to the point of whether we are going to change direction or not.

Many times during the hearings the subcommittee members have asked department officials specifically what they had in mind. What do you intend to do about conservation? What do you intend to do about price support? What do you intend to do about generation and transmission loans for REA? And so on down the line.

And in practically every instance we received the same reply. We have a committee working on that, Mr. Congressman, would be the answer. Or, we are going to get a committee to work on that. Or, we have that under study. Or, we have not had time to get into that; we need time for more study of that problem.

Now I am fully aware that it takes some time to work out new approaches to farm problems, and this is especially true if your intent is to change direction. But, bless my soul, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture is becoming one of the most profound study clubs in the land. I would like to recommend that while the Department is studying out the new kinds of farm programs, it also read up on the established and proven programs we have now, which the Congress, in its wisdom, has already provided.

While all this study is going on farm prices are going down, the export market is declining, and some surpluses are beginning to accumulate. Nero fiddled while Rome burned. Now we are asked to attend study seminars when we ought to be putting out the fire.

The President said at St. Cloud, Minn., on October 4, 1953:

> Every kind of program adopted for the future would be farmer run, locally run.

This would seem to be a wise policy to follow. It is good to consult farmers on farm problems. But what has happened? We have agricultural advisory committees—one for nearly every important commodity and agricultural problem. The trouble is that on these committees the processors and the professors outnumber the farmers 2 to 1. I am afraid that the hand that is now guiding our great Department of Agriculture is not the hand of the farmer, but the hand of those who have traditionally farmed the farmer.

It is clear to me that if positive action is to be taken in behalf of agriculture,

that action must come from the Congress itself. And I wish to state, Mr. Chairman, that you could come to no better place than this Chamber to find men of good will, high courage, and sound judgment in the affairs of agriculture—and they sit on both sides of the aisle. There are men of both parties on this floor today who have been through this before. They are men who are close to the people, who have intimate knowledge of the problems of agriculture, and who are alert to reality. These men have forgotten more about farm problems, farm legislation, and farm programs than many can learn in a lifetime. It is to these men that agriculture must look today for constructive leadership.

Since being in Congress, I hope and feel that I have made friends among many of the Republican Members. I know that in many respects their beliefs are similar to mine. Mr. Chairman, my heart goes out to these Republican Members. I can well understand the concern and frustration they must feel at the curious behavior of some of the people they worked so hard to put in office. It gives me no pleasure as a Democrat to observe the unhappy predicament of my Republican friends. All I can say to these friends of mine is: Keep your chin up—we Democrats will see you through.

I think we should keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that in this bill we are dealing with the only civilian department of Government that has had a succession of budget reductions over the last 12 years. This bill has been brought in for a Department that is facing some very serious problems which are the concern of city people as well as of farm people.

The great flow of production from our farms can be hindered or helped by the action this Congress takes.

Farming today is not an isolated business involving farmers alone. It is one involving close ties with business, industry, and jobs for workers. Nearly 2 out of every 5 people working in this country are either working on farms or in businesses and industries related to agriculture. Three great streams of employment flow from the soil. Ten million people in this country are working on farms. Six million more people are producing things and servicing the farmer. Nine million more people are processing and distributing farm products. These 25 million jobs are dependent in one way or another upon the health and wealth of our soil and the people on it.

This great industry is not to be approached in a small way. Too much is at stake in human values, in jobs for workers, and in the continued prosperity of our Nation.

Do you know of any place in the world where workers can buy as much food for each hour of labor as in the United States? Because of the progress farmers have made, an hour of factory work today will buy you more meat, more milk, more eggs, and more bread than the same hour of work would have purchased 13 years ago, or even 23 years ago.

We have no assurance that this present favorable situation will continue. It is an unpleasant fact to be faced that danger signals are lighting up across the country.

Farm prices are going down, while farm costs are staying high. Net farm income for this year is estimated at a billion or more dollars below that of 1952. The buying power of this income, which helps to keep the machines humming and the men and women working in the towns and cities, is the lowest since 1941.

Farmers are spending $4 for production today for every dollar they had to spend during World War II. A farmer starting today needs at least $3 for every dollar he had to have 15 years ago. The volume of industrial goods used in farm production today is 2¼ times that of the average before the last great war. Farmers are using 3½ times the tonnage of fertilizers. Farmers are using 4 times the tonnage of liming materials. Farmers are now spending $3⅓ billion a year for all kinds of farm machinery and equipment to keep production high. All of this means jobs in the towns and cities and money in the pay envelopes, and food and education for the children, and maybe a little something to put away for a time of sickness or retirement from active work.

Agriculture reminds me of the fable about the goose that laid the golden eggs. It spreads prosperity throughout the land every year. It is not a critically sick goose yet, but it is ailing. The proper treatment is not to cut off its head or starve it to death—or even to worry it into a state of collapse.

One of the very important items in this bill, Mr. Chairman, is the one dealing with conservation. I should like to point out that as the Benson budget came over to us, more than three-fourths of the total cut in regular annual appropriations had been taken out of conservation activities. There are some on this floor who feel that the funds proposed for the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service are too much. I do not question their sincerity, Mr. Chairman, but I deplore their judgment.

I do not wish to belabor the point, but I want to express the firm belief that $195 million for vital conservation work is small enough. In fact, last year the taxpayers of this country paid $192 million in subsidies to receive third-class circular mail.

Every authority appearing before our subcommittee testified to the decline in productivity of much of our richest farming land. This has been going on for 30 years. It is still going on. It will continue to go on until adequate corrective measures are taken.

We are dealing with a program that involves our future food production. Other members have very ably pointed out the increased food requirements we will be facing in a comparatively short time. The cost of shortage is far greater than the cost of providing abundance. An increase of only 1 cent a pound in the cost of all the domestically produced food we eat in a year would cost the taxpayers $2½ billion—more than 10 times the cost of this program.

We are nowhere near meeting our yearly conservation needs. At the rate we are now going it will take 30 years to do a once-over conservation job on the farms of this country. With all of the progress that has been made, we are still taking out of the soil each year twice the volume of plant nutrients we are putting back. At the rate we are going now it will be 10 to 12 years before the gains from conservation are equal to the annual losses from soil deterioration.

One of the soil authorities testifying before our subcommittee made a remark worth remembering.

"When we get a little hungry," he said, "we will pay more attention to this job."

I would hate to feel, and I do not feel, Mr. Chairman, that the decision of this Congress will be to wait until we get a little hungry. I do not believe that the farmers of this country put us in office to provide a stretchout program for conservation such as proposed by the Department of Agriculture.

In the conservation sign-up campaign for this year, farmers indicated, as brought out in the hearings, that they would like to carry out practices totaling more than three times the amount that can be provided in this bill. In actual conservation assistance on the land, this program will provide only $112 million in 1954. As the able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has said, "This is not a payment to a man to stick into his pocket. It is a contribution as a part of what he actually put back into the land." The $112 million in actual work represents only one-third of the total cost. The farmers will more than double this amount in cash costs and labor.

If we were attempting to provide for a total conservation job, based on annual needs as determined by the States, it would take an appropriation seven and one-half times the amount provided in this bill. No one is advocating such an expenditure.

During the period in which farm production climbed highest we had the incentive of a rising price level and high net income for agriculture. What assurances do farmers have today that the price structure will remain favorable? Any slackening in our effort now—any stretchout of this much needed work—means falling further behind.

Conservation is not something that can be set aside to be taken up at a more convenient time. Erosion and soil loss go on day in and day out, year after year. The rate of gain in conservation should, in the national interest, at least keep pace with the rate of soil decline.

When it comes to a matter as important as food, it is the need which should be our guide. This is a case, Mr. Chairman, where the national interest demands that we lift our eyes beyond the dollar sign. This is a case where we can afford to subordinate the dollar to human need.

In another part of this bill, your committee has restored $2½ million in production and subistence loans for the Farmers' Home Administration. The record of the Farmers' Home Administration is outstanding. But with the funds available, it has been unable to help more than 35 percent of the applicants for loans. It should be remembered

that families who apply for loans from this agency cannot obtain credit from any other source. This program has the support of bankers and businessmen.

On the average, participants turn to other credit agencies after they have had Farmers' Home Administration loans for about 3½ years even though mortgages are drawn for 7 years.

Since it has been indicated that it will not be necessary to use as much money for subsequent loans to present borrowers, it would be possible to help about 800 more families in the next fiscal year. The repayment record of borrowers of this agency shows that less than 4 percent of the total amount loaned will be written off as a loss to the taxpayer. Production and subsistence loans are the first steps toward strengthening family-type farms.

Mr. Chairman, your committee recommends $135 million for REA loans and a modest expansion of $15 million in rural telephone loans in this bill. The $50 million for telephone loans is the amount requested by the Department of Agriculture. There are approximately $100 million in telephone loan applications now pending in REA. This is an important program. According to the 1950 census, less than 2 out of 5 American farms had telephone service of any kind. From the evidence brought out at the hearings, your committee feels that this bill will provide for an orderly development of this work.

Your committee did not feel that it would be wise to approve a stretch-out program for rural power. The loan funds for REA represent an investment in national growth and national security. This money will be returned to the Treasury with interest. Loan repayments are well ahead of schedule.

Approximately 11 percent of American farms are still without electric service. More than 1,000 REA borrowers serve nearly 4 million farm people and operate over 1,200,000 miles of line. Over half of these lines are more than 5 years old. The point has been reached where it is essential that adequate maintenance programs are carried out to assure continued and reliable service to farmers, and to protect the Government's investment. There are about $2 billion in loans outstanding. Heavy repayments will be coming due in the next few years.

Power requirements are increasing. Power shortages still exist in some areas. Farmers last year used more than 17 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy. This is more power than is used by four of our large industrial centers in a year.

The power requirements of REA borrowers alone last year were 13½ billion kilowatt-hours. And it is estimated that REA borrowers alone will need about 20 billion kilowatt-hours by 1955—an increase of nearly 50 percent in 3 years.

Every dollar invested in bringing electricity to a farm multiplies itself 3 or 4 times in additional business to the local communities and towns. This program has created at least $8 billion worth of initial new business, strictly as a by-product of bringing farmers central station service.

Most of the power now purchased by rural families is used in the home, for this is the first place it is needed. Great additional benefits can be realized in the future from an expansion in the use of electricity for increased farm production.

Mr. Chairman, it has been the policy of REA to make sufficient loan funds available to electric cooperatives that they can meet the needs for expansion of systems so long as they show satisfactory evidence of being able to repay.

It has also been the policy to make loans for generation and transmission of electric power. This is an important point. It is one of the main reasons that the average cost of power to REA borrowers has come down one-fifth since 1941.

I am sure that the Congress desires to take no action which would weaken the ability of REA cooperatives to meet the expanding requirements for rural power, or to obtain favorable rates for farm families.

Mr. Chairman, your committee has restored the drastic cut recommended in the Benson budget for the school-lunch program. This program is helping to provide better diets for our school children. It encourages the use of dairy products, meats, and other good wholesome foods.

This program is operating in 55,700 schools. There are only about 3,000 schools in the country which have lunch programs of their own. Ten million school children are receiving the benefit of this program—nearly a third of the total enrollment in elementary and high schools. Enrollment in schools is now increasing at the rate of about 1½ million children a year, compared with a rate of 800,000 in 1951.

The funds appropriated for this program all go for the purchase of food. Between 80 and 90 percent of the food used by the schools is purchased locally. When the purchases of more than 55,000 schools are added together, they represent a large market. This year schools will spend about $270 million for local purchases of food.

To reduce the funds for this program, as proposed in the Benson budget, might well increase the price of the lunch to many school children and limit participation in this important program. The States are now putting $3 into this program for every $1 the Federal Government contributes.

Mr. Chairman, your subcommittee on agricultural appropriations has worked long hours to bring you a bill that meets the needs of the Nation. We have been ever mindful of the state of the Nation's finances. We have tried to make every penny do a job of utmost importance. We recognize the need for bare-bone economy, as well as the need for wise economy which makes every dollar work for us. We have tried to provide the means by which programs for the growth and development of agriculture can be carried forward. Let me remind you that a balanced budget over a period of years will depend largely upon a thriving agriculture from which flows the raw materials of production and the sources of employment.

In a world of enduring peace, the goods of a productive agriculture are weapons in the continuing fight on poverty, hunger, and disease. In peace and war, agriculture has served the Nation well. It remains the backbone of our might and seeks only to serve us with the food and materials we need to build strength against enemies, and to raise even higher a standard of living already unbelievable to millions in great areas of the world.

The productive capacity of American agriculture did not just happen. It was built by men of faith and foresight. It was built by the ceaseless labor of farm families striving always to improve the resources and methods of production. Government to them is not an autocratic landlord doling out undeserved relief; it is a working partner paid out of their taxes and serving them in honest return. The farmer is a citizen first and shares fully in the common fate of the Nation; he is not separate from Government but a part of it.

George Washington knew this when he said:

> I know of no pursuit in which more real and important service can be rendered to any country than the improvement of its agriculture.

This has been the sole and overriding desire of your subcommittee—to serve our country by helping to improve our agriculture. We present this bill to you with pride in our work and with the humble hope that you too will appreciate its importance to the future of these United States.

I now yield to my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. I asked the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota to yield for the purpose of complimenting him, not only as an individual but also the members of the subcommittee, for the restoration of the proposed cut in the school-lunch program. I think it was an excellent job, and I hope the committee and the Congress will approve the subcommittee's action.

Mr. MARSHALL. I appreciate the gentleman's compliments, and I assure him that if I had known he was asking me to yield for that purpose I would most willingly have yielded.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Is there anything in this bill in reference to the appropriation for funds for land-utilization projects which were begun a number of years ago by the Government and which are being maintained as land-utilization projects?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the answer to that would be $1,248,000.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to this fact: There are a great many of these projects which are more than self-sustaining. For instance, in my district we have two of these projects which pay a very liberal return to the Government of the United States. I do not think there is anything in the report—at least, there is nothing that I see—which shows the Government is getting the money back or that money is being placed in the Treasury and shown as a credit offset on the amount of money that is paid.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The chairman of this subcommittee will inform the gentleman that in a good many places throughout this bill there are offsetting receipts. For example, in the Forest Service there are considerable receipts from timber sales. Were we to take credit for all such receipts as offsets, the size of the bill would be considerably less.

Furthermore, in reference to the school-lunch program, that $83,350,000 should properly not be charged against agriculture. That appropriation is for the benefit of the schoolchildren of America. The members of this subcommittee have thought more about the welfare of the schoolchildren of America than trying to make a record as far as this particular bill is concerned.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think, however, it could well be taken into consideration in estimating the cost of the farm program when some of the money is being returned as in the case of the land-utilization projects. One more question, if I may inquire further of the gentleman: Is there any study being made now which the gentleman knows of by the Department of Agriculture in reference to the dust storms we are having now throughout the Middle West? I recently experienced the discomfort of flying through one of those duststorms. The dust was being blown out of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and other States in that area. The entire air was just laden with this dust moving from these areas. I know it is doing a great deal of harm to those areas. Is any study or any effort being made to offset that?

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman, I am sure, is aware that over the years the soil-conservation work being done attacks that problem. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is raising the question.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think it is extremely important.

Mr. MARSHALL. Many times people feel when we talk about soil conservation, we are only dealing with the water problem. The conservation of our land from the standpoint of wind erosion is as important, if not more so than other types of erosion.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The time has come when this country has to do something about wind erosion.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do know that many of the practices carried out, that protect the soil from wind erosion, are also those same practices that assist in times of flood dangers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] raises a very valid point. On page 464 of the hearings you will find a chart which I had inserted in the RECORD. In fact, I compiled it myself from information supplied by several departments. It shows the amount of work and the amount of money that is being spent on range revegetation, where a lot of your dust comes from. This bill also carries $5 million with which we propose to set up pilot plants to study watershed flood prevention, which will work in that direction. If you have studied soil conservation work, you will know that where you have a good district, the wind can pass over those farms with a minimum of erosion from the wind. I would say that permeating this bill we have a great many programs, which this bill supplies, which work in the direction of stopping that which you complain about.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman. Let me say to the gentleman our problem in Louisiana is not one of wind erosion. We often have too much water in my State; but I flew over areas at least a thousand miles away from those wind-eroded areas, and I found the sky 5 miles up laden with dust. I know it is blown up there from the whole countryside in some areas. It is a serious question. I am making a serious study of this most important problem.

Mr. HORAN. I wish the gentleman would study this chart which I mention, because in addition to the Department of Agriculture we have the biggest of these landholdings in the Department of the Interior. We also have landholdings owned by the armed services. As far as the clouds and skies and study of the jet streams are concerned, which we discovered in 1944, experiments are now going on in the State of Washington, conducted by the weather bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my two friends from Minnesota in the things they have said about the rest of this subcommittee and our clerk, Ross Pope.

I want to talk today generally, in this general debate, about the place of American agriculture, and perhaps to relate it to world peace and what we may be able to do in that direction. I think I shall have some interesting statistics for you and will try to prove to you why it is so essential that we maintain a healthy agriculture here in this good earth of ours, which is the last best hope of men for peace, I think.

Every weekend or so my colleagues have been going out to Las Vegas, Nev., where continuing billion-dollar atomic experiments are on display. There is drama in it. It defies all conscience, and we are left bewildered, stunned, impressed.

Today, our subcommittee brings before you a simple bill. In direct appropriations it is less than last year's budget. It deals with bread—common, real—no more dramatic than the old shoes you threw away last week—much less dramatic than atom bombs. And yet, humble though it may be, food is also a definite factor in a lasting peace. And because we are a nation seeking a lasting peace, I am thankful for the opportunity, along with my colleagues on this subcommittee, to talk with you about the work of a great Department of this Government of ours. I speak of the Department of Agriculture.

We are not Greeks bearing gifts for the world. We are simple Americans going about our free way of life—productive, well meaning, and neighborly. We bring to you today a supply bill to enable our Department of Agriculture to continue on through fiscal 1954. These are necessary funds. How necessary and how cheap is the investment we here propose to make.

We live in a world of some 2,400,000,000 persons. Our best available statistics indicate that since the end of World War II our ability to produce food in this world has increased only some 9 percent—our population is increasing at the rate of 12 percent, leaving a deficit of caloric intake around the globe. This world skates on thin ice in the matter of food. Today the National Research Council reports that the average calories daily consumed by various peoples in certain areas around the globe border dangerously on the slow-starvation side.

Figures of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Service, which include staples such as wheat, rice, and the principal crops, as well as supplemental food items such as vegetables and fruits, are:

	Calories	Remarks
Southeast Asia	1,800–2,200	Serious.
North Asia	1,900–2,300	Do.
Near East	2,200–2,400	Do.
North Africa	2,000–2,300	Do.
South Africa	2,420	Borderline of need.
South America	2,250–3,090	Ample.
Northern Europe [1]	2,400–3,200	Do.
North America	3,130	Do.
U. S. S. R.	2,800	Do.

[1] Deficiencies exist in Danube Valley.

Living, as we do, in a world of bombs and bread, I feel that it is particularly timely and important as we today consider our appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, to once more refresh our memories with relation to the work this Department is doing—and also to envisage the work this bill will enable it to accomplish during fiscal 1954.

To me, I feel that it is well for us to realize the entire import of what our Nation and our neighbor to the North—Canada—mean in terms of hunger wherever you may find it.

Hunger knows no law, sacred or civil. In Starvation, Truths, Half-Truths, and Untruths, written by Frank Pearson and Don Paarlberg in 1946—Mr. Paarlberg is now an Assistant to Secretary Benson—they say:

> Throughout history, hunger has known no law. The pressure of population on the food supply caused the more powerful groups of men to raid or seize the fertile valleys, plains or countries from their better fed, though weaker, neighbors. History records that many different races raided the fertile valleys of the Euphrates, the Nile, the Danube, the Rhine, the Volga, and the Yangtze. The natives of the Scotch highlands raided the lowlands to the south. The Pilgrims, driven by hunger, raided the food supplies of the Indians. Sometimes these raiders were small groups of men and sometimes they were armies of millions. They sought more meat, more grain, or more living space.

In the known history of man, famines, whether caused by weather, war, or greeds to which man is heir, have caused

widespread suffering, migrations, political upheavals and death. Our earliest record of a famine is some 2,000 years before the time of Abraham. And still with all our vaunted progress, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations estimates that half of the world's 2.4 billion inhabitants are today on seriously insufficient diets. Perhaps the worst areas of famine are those which depend upon the seasonal rains, the monsoons, and so forth, where failure of the weather can bring widespread suffering to thickly populated areas which depend upon such weather for the production of their food.

No exact chronology of all the world's famines in the last 4,000 years is at hand, but of the great famines of history undoubtedly somewhere between 600 and 700 can be authenticated from the beginning of our records until the present day. It is estimated that 50 percent of Chinese mortality is directly or indirectly caused by chronic malnutrition, and the University of Nanking lists 1,829 famines in the last 2,000 years for China alone. We know that famines are frequently mentioned in the Old Testament. We know that famines occurred in Rome during the height of her so-called prosperity. We know that Europe all through the years has had her famines with the consequent effects.

As late as the early Middle Ages, cannibalism was not uncommon even in Western Europe. In Scotland, after 4 years of famine in A. D. 936, we are told that people began to devour one another. During the Irish famine of 963 and 964, parents sold their children for food. We are told that severe and extended famines of the years preceding 1095 were a contributive cause of the First Crusade and that Pope Urban II, in a speech at Clermont, referred to the land of France as "too narrow for its dense population; nor does it abound in wealth; and it furnishes scarcely food enough for its cultivators. Hence it is that you murder and devour one another, that you wage war." The Crusades made a potent economic appeal to the peasantry of Europe, especially of France.

The first 400 years of the second millennium since Christ saw many famines throughout Europe and throughout the world. They followed the trail of the Tartars of Genghis Kahn and the armies of other conquerors and would-be conquerors in the world.

Of all the great famines in India and in Asia, the famine in Bengal, India, in 1770 ranks among the most destructive. A third of the population, 10 million people, perished, and entire communities were wiped out. When new crops came forth, they often had no owners. Again in India, even after the industrial revolution, a great famine occurred in 1876–78 and 5 million persons perished from famine in Bombay, Madras, and Mysore. At the same time, there was a severe famine in North China where 9½ million people are said to have perished. That's only some 75 years ago.

With the coming of the industrial revolution, of course, and the rapid growth of railroads, steamships, and other means of transportation in the 19th century, outright famine in time of peace has been more generally avoided in the highly developed industrial areas of the world.

The great famine in Ireland in 1846–47 caused a death toll of over a million persons and resulted in tremendous migrations to the United States. All told, Ireland's population was reduced as a result of this famine by 2½ million. This gives us a new concept of the effect of famine when migration is possible. It also brings clearly to us our responsibility as producers and the need to facilitate more speedily the transportation of food from areas of production to areas of want.

However, the industrial revolution has presented some interesting paradoxes. It has been reported that in the Indian famine of 1876–78, which has been mentioned earlier, while 5 million people were dying of hunger, the exports of cereals through the port of Calcutta never stopped.

The cures of famine, of course, are obvious. We must reclaim more land, we must drain our swamps in order to increase the land available for cultivation, and, further we must take advantage of new and improved means of agriculture production. We must have new crops, new hybrids, improved breeds of animals, etc. In many parts of the world, improvement in land holding regulations and in methods of taxation will result in increased production. We must take care of the soil, conserve it, fertilize it and improve its consistency.

According to the FAO, in its second world food supply survey published last November, the following is true:

Many of the present significant patterns of food production, trade, and consumption, if they did not altogether originate from the Second World War, have at any rate taken clearer shape as a result. The low level of food production in the underdeveloped areas of the world, and the wide disparities between food consumption in these areas and in the more advanced countries have long been recognized as outstandingly serious aspects of the world's food and agricultural situation. The effect of the Second World War was to aggravate these problems acutely. Territories were laid waste not only in Europe, but also in the Far East. Destruction of livestock, farm machinery, and farm buildings, storage and processing facilities was on an immense scale; soil reserves and sometimes agricultural manpower were seriously reduced. Most of the prolific fishing grounds were closed and the best craft were converted to war purposes. Important sources of supply and markets were cut off from each other. The immense burden of supplying the Allied Powers with food and other requisites for the war effort fell upon the few areas in which supplies were accessible, especially those in which output could be expanded rapidly. In this way, the main features of the postwar dependence of large areas of the world on the surpluses of North America and Oceania emerged. The history of the world food situation during the postwar years is essentially that of an arduous struggle to increase agricultural and other output all over the world, and to restore some balance in the patterns of production and international trade. The struggle is still continuing, its successful issue obstructed by political disturbances, by repeated foreign exchange crises and by recurrent shortages of raw materials and other means of production.

The world continues to be in a precarious balance as far as the adequacy of its food supply is concerned.

The following conclusion from the May 1952 issue of Fortune magazine may, however, be as sound a one as can be found at the present juncture of world history:

> The world faces, as it always has, an endless struggle to feed itself, today and tomorrow. It would be disastrous for man to assume that a solution is inevitable, that he can sit back and wait for science to supply it. But there is no reason for energetic and ingenious men to despair.

As my colleague from Minnesota has pointed out, we do not propose in this bill to weaken, in any way, our American agriculture.

The measure also indicates some new accents that, to me, are truly sources of hope.

First, we propose a new direction for a wiser use of funds for flood prevention. This, to those areas of the United States which suffer from excessive spring runoffs of water or from flash floods, is truly an important program. Moreover, it holds some promise of watershed and water conservation that can, in the future, be of immense importance.

In periods of drought, the retention of these waters held on the watersheds in the spring can be a source of real salvation. The floods which we have experienced in Kansas, Texas, California, and elsewhere in the Nation make an active consideration of this principle of conservation no longer avoidable.

The second accent which this bill carries is that of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Service. One of the first acts of Secretary Benson was to make this into one of the major divisions of the Department of Agriculture and change its name from the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations to that of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Service. A trade promotion program is being set up and at long last we in the United States are going out to reassert our historical place in world agriculture markets. The importance of this is at once apparent, for we are a productive nation. We must remain productive, and rather than worry about the existence of surplus, we should rejoice that we do have surpluses and go energetically about the business of getting these surpluses into the stomachs of hungry people everywhere.

I trust that the Congress and the committee will appreciate our responsibilities in this matter of food, and thus make it possible to promote the movement of our surplus agriculture stocks into every land.

Perhaps one of the most illustrative programs that today exists is that of the international wheat agreement which

was recently reentered into on a 3-year basis. It illustrates the picture which we have in the world today. Some 45 nations of the free world are party to it. Four of those nations are classed as exporters of wheat. Forty-one are listed as importers and, yet, of the 4 exporters, only 2 are important—Canada and the United States. Australia is listed as an exporter but the present favorable world price of wool has led her producers to go into wool production rather than grain growing. France is listed as an exporter but her contribution is so small as to be almost insignificant.

In this program we loom large. We contribute some 275 million bushels of wheat each year. The new agreement carries a higher ceiling price than the one first entered into in 1948. When we talk of people, let us not forget that bread is far more important than bombs.

It was my pleasure about a year ago to attend the international wheat agreements and when I saw people from Asia, rice-eating nations, actively represented in the international wheat agreements and wanting our wheat, I knew then that there was a place for the United States in any arena where we work for a lasting peace. This is one of the programs that is today of such immense importance.

We must remain productive, for even in our own country, as has been so graphically pointed out, our population is likewise increasing.

It is now estimated that there will be 195 million people in the United States by 1975. Last year's estimate was 190 million people by 1975. That is just 22 years away.

The 195 million figure is equal to our present population, plus the present populations of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey.

To feed these 195 million folks, the 28.4 billion pounds of meat necessary to supply today's menu will require:

Pork: Today's production, plus the present production from Nebraska and Iowa;

Beef: Today's production, plus the present production from Oklahoma, Texas, and Minnesota;

Lamb and mutton: Today's production, plus the present production from Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, and Montana.

In terms of milk and eggs, the figures are astounding:

Milk: Today's production, plus the present production of Wisconsin, Michigan, Vermont, and Illinois;

Eggs: Today's production, plus the present production from California, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Vermont.

Some way we must find and wheel into our production line, 115 million acres. That is more than the combined productive fertile fields of today's States of Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio.

Some way we are going to feed those people. We do not agree with the Malthusian premise that famine, war, and pestilence bring about an inevitable leveling of population in terms of available food production.

Today we have some 462 million productive acres. From these acres we feed our present population amply and have 40 million acres for export. We need 115 million more, for it is estimated that we will need 577 million acres to feed our own population in 1975.

From irrigation and drainage, we can see an additional 45 million acres. Conservation and other types of reclamation, including more and wiser use of chemicals and fertilizers must supply the rest.

Our Nation needs to save what we have and to bring into full production everything that can be reclaimed. Our Nation needs it and since the world's population is increasing at the rate of 12 percent, while world food production is increasing at only 9 percent, the world needs it also.

Hunger knows no law and history records that hunger means invasions, war, and death.

It could happen here if we lose vision.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his very constructive talk. I think it was a real contribution on the subject under discussion today. The gentleman has evidently given this much study.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I would like to add my compliments on the splendid statement of the gentleman. I think he has given much thought to these important problems. He mentioned in the course of his fine speech the famines throughout history and our growing population. In view of these facts, may I ask the gentleman for his comments upon the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service?

In view of the fact that there is need for the production of more and more food, and we do not have the land, is not the best means of assuring such greater production, the conservation of our soil?

Mr. HORAN. I want the gentleman to know that we gave a great deal of thought to that. The additional $5 million which we have put in the bill under flood prevention work will also be administered by the Soil Conservation Service. I can envisage, as the gentleman can, that this division of the Department of Agriculture still has a big job ahead of it. That is conservation on water sheds, but that is also an important form of conservation, as was brought out by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. I think as far as soil conservation appropriations are concerned, they are not forming new districts as fast as they anticipated, and that is the reason for the amount in the bill.

Mr. EVINS. It is the gentleman's view then that the reductions that have been made will be offset by increases in conservation in the watershed field?

Mr. HORAN. I think so, and we hope so. At least our subcommittee are in agreement on that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may make further reply to the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Washington is entirely correct when he says that the new districts have not come in as anticipated. In fact, for fiscal 1953 we made sufficient money available for 2,642 districts, as of March 1, 2,502 had been organized. Forty more are expected by June 30. Consequently, the 100 or more anticipated for this coming fiscal year will be more than taken care of in what we made available last year. Hence, you will see no increase for the first time in many years on this particular program, but all districts will be well taken care of.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I congratulate the gentleman on the very fine and graphic presentation he has made of the problems of agriculture, as he has stated them today. I am only sorry that more Members of the House are not present to hear the gentleman because I think what he has said is very much worthwhile, and something we need to know more about, and something that we need to try to look into in the future in an effort to solve these problems. I think the gentleman has done a very fine job.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in bringing you this appropriation bill as so frequently happens, it does not represent in its entirety my own personal views, nor, I am sure, does it represent the views of any individual member of the committee in its entirety. But I do feel that we have brought a bill here which represents a composite of the views of the entire membership of the committee. It is a bill which I expect to support because I think it is a good bill. I served, as you know, for 4 years as chairman of this subcommittee, and during that time I had the wholehearted cooperation of the two fine Republican members of that committee, the present chairman, Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN, and Hon. WALTER HORAN. They are informed, able Members of Congress. We brought out a joint bill during those 4 years. We have now had added to the committee the gentleman from California, Hon. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD. On the Democratic side, we have had added

to our subcommittee Hon. FRED MARSHALL from Minnesota. All are outstanding Members of Congress. I want to say to you I do not know how you could have selected men with more interest in agriculture, and who have made a greater contribution to the hearings and the handling of this matter within the subcommittee. I wish to join in the statements about our executive clerk, Ross Pope. There is no finer.

There are a number of items in this bill, which I think perhaps I should mention here. First, and I think I should answer it—we are reading in the press or at least I have and I have had a number of telephone calls where they point out that a news story carried the report that this bill was $100 million above the budget recommended by Secretary Benson. First, that is not true. Secondly, in their news story they counted loan authorizations as part of the operating expenses of the Department. Whoever heard of counting the loans made by a bank as part of the operating expenses?

If you have heard of that, whoever heard of reporting loan authorizations as a part of the annual operating costs? And if you were going to count those loan authorizations as an annual cost in this bill, why not give the Department credit then for the money collected from selling timber, which amounts to something more than $40 million? Why not give the Department credit for the millions of dollars which it collects annually on loans heretofore made, and from fees? Such funds go into the general receipts of the Treasury. If you are going to list loan authorizations as an annual charge, why not delete from this bill the amount of money that we spent in Mexico on the foot-and-mouth disease? Why do you not delete from the charge against appropriations for this Department the $83,300,000 which is furnished for the school-lunch program? I do not mean to do away with the school-lunch program, but why charge it to this appropriation?

I mention these things because those of us who have a sincere regard for agriculture have tried to do a good job in holding down expenses in this Department to these bare essentials.

THE FACTS

The facts are these: The appropriation for the Department of Agriculture in this bill is $24,301,505 less than the appropriation last year. The appropriations for the Department of Agriculture are 30.7 percent less than in 1940. Personnel in the Department of Agriculture, under the terms of this bill, are 38.1 percent less than in 1940. I would like to point out that so far as the rest of the Government is concerned, for the present fiscal year appropriations for all activities of the Government, exclusive of national defense and atomic energy, are 139 percent above 1940; and the number of Federal employees engaged in the operations of the Government, exclusive of national-defense items, are 126 percent above 1940.

BELIEF IN BALANCING THE BUDGET

I believe in balancing the budget, but feel it should be balanced where it has become unbalanced; and that is largely with regard to the activities of the Government where the great increases have been made.

RECORD FOR ECONOMY

Mr. Chairman, since I have made a real fight for adequate attention to American agriculture and expect to support this bill to the limit of my ability, I think I have a right to say that I will compare my record for economy in Government with anyone in Congress. Unlike some who have gotten lots of credit by talking about how large the Federal Government is and how many employees it has, but who stop there, I know I have done something about it and feel justified in pointing out some of my affirmative actions for economy which have been incorporated into law since I have been a Member of this Congress.

ELK HILLS

In the first full term served in the Congress raised the question of legality of the lease of oil reserves by the Navy, got an appropriation held up, preventing the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars. The Secretary of Navy insisted I was wrong. However, my actions were approved by the Department of Justice. Later Secretary Knox came in to say he had pulled a "boner."

NAVY USE OF VACANT ARMY BASES

When the Navy attempted to secure over $300 million for new facilities, managed to get Army witnesses before our Navy subcommittee and found that during the 4 years of the war there has been no meeting of the joint committee on use of facilities. The Army had said it had no facilities to make available to the Navy because the Navy asked for abandoned facilities, and the Army called them vacated. We used more than 169 vacated Army facilities by the Navy, saving more than $300 million. For this I received the commendation of Secretary Forrestal.

FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING

When it developed that the Federal Public Housing Authority had twice as many of its people in salary brackets above $5,000 a year as other agencies of Government, wrote the language limiting the agency to not more than 20 percent of their force in that category.

INLAND WATERWAYS

When it developed that the employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation were absolutely strangling the Corporation by their "featherbedding" and other practices, gave them the benefit of civil service and when they attempted to follow their former activities they found that under civil service they could not strike against the Government. Such provision saved that activity and much money besides, and is still carried in the act.

AMERICAN SPRUCE CORPORATION

Was the acting head of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Government Corporations which discovered the American Spruce Corporation had existed since World War I at an annual cost of thousands of dollars to the Government, but had done nothing and actually no one even had a record of it. We abolished it.

INVESTIGATIONS AND CORRECTIONS

In 1950 was author of provision of law requiring regular departments of Government to meet wartime needs with regular personnel and funds.

RESOLUTION 10

Mr. Chairman, I was the author of Resolution 10, of the Appropriations Committee, passed last year, as follows:

Resolved, That it shall be the policy of the Appropriations Committee that the programs and budget estimates of each department or agency shall be inspected and checked by investigators of the Appropriations Committee each year; and

The appropriate subcommittee may direct the particular phases to which special attention shall be given.

The present administration is proceeding under that resolution now.

LIMITATIONS ON PERSONNEL

Mr. Chairman, it was my amendment, Public Law 253, section 1310, and Public Law 375, section 1302, which limited the total number of permanent Federal employees to that of September 1, 1950; provides for orderly promotions; requires a report annually to the Congress as to the annual grade and salary in each bureau and agency. We did not have such provision in World War II and ended up with an extra expenditure of $2 billion a year as a result. By reason of this law, which the Congress adopted, experts estimate that the Government is saved an amount exceeding one-half billion dollars a year.

When we had the Joint Committee on the Budget—made up of members of Appropriations and Tax Committees of the House and Senate—I offered the resolution to set aside a percentage of our annual income for application on the principal of the national debt. When the Democrats were in the majority on that special committee, I got the vote of all the Republicans. When the Republicans were in the majority, I got the votes of the Democratic minority. Both recognized the soundness of the approach. However, I failed to get the resolution adopted.

OTHER ACTS FOR ECONOMY

A few years ago led the fight in the Appropriations Committee to reduce foreign economic aid programs by 15 percent. This was adopted.

Wrote a provision requiring that before nitrogenous fertilizer could be shipped overseas, the Department of Agriculture had to make a survey and certify there were sufficient quantities left for the American users.

Last year, when it developed that through the foreign-aid programs, in many instances, we were providing the money through grants to foreign countries and they selling our own commodities below cost to us in exchange for our own money, wrote the provision of law which prohibits continuation of such program. This saves us much money

and in addition will have the effect of firming up prices for American commodities, as against using our own money through foreign aid to drag down prices for American producers.

All this in addition to individual votes for reductions in appropriations.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

You may say, "How about agriculture?" Let us see the record:

Comparison of appropriations and employment of Department of Agriculture with other civilian departments and agencies (regular annual appropriations)

Department	Fiscal year 1940		Fiscal year 1953		Percentage increase or decrease	
	Appropriations	Employment	Appropriations	Employment	Appropriations	Employment
Agriculture	[1] $1,054.9	91,370	$733.8	57,935	−$30.4	−38.7
Commerce	54.2	26,690	797.2	65,172	+1,370.8	+144.1
Interior	191.2	46,547	545.5	60,677	+185.3	+30.3
Justice	[1] 52.6	[1] 14,720	184.4	32,194	+250.6	+118.7
Labor	34.6	3,484	222.5	7,815	+543.0	+124.3
Post Office	704.0	303,654	2,798.8	523,779	+251.8	+72.4
State	21.0	6,302	261.7	31,302	+1,146.1	+396.7
Treasury	215.9	59,256	655.5	89,460	+203.6	+50.9
Independent offices	3,301.9	77,160	[2] 5,100.9	273,760	+54.4	+254.8
Other offices and agencies [3]	1,469.1	120,269	4,126.8	357,919	+180.9	+197.6
Total (excluding Agriculture)	6,134.5	658,091	14,688.3	1,422,078	+139.4	+116.1
Total civilian activities	$7,189.4		$15,422.1			
Agriculture to total percentage	14.7		4.7			

[1] Appropriations and employment for judiciary included in 1940. Carried under "Other offices and agencies" in 1953 column.
[2] Excludes Atomic Energy Commission and stockpiling.
[3] Includes remainder of Federal establishment, excluding Defense Department, military assistance under Mutual Security, interest on public debt, permanent and indefinite appropriations, working funds, and other special funds.

Mr. Chairman, for the 4 years I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and served on such committee, we brought about a complete reorganization in the Department on its means of using property, saving in excess of a million and a half dollars a year; caused the Department to use cold-storage facilities belonging to the military instead of building their own; asked that an investigation be made of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and all subsequent investigations by the Senate, by the Comptroller General, and others were based upon the reports which we gave them. Our recommendations were followed to correct bad practices. In this connection we pointed out to the Committee on the Judiciary in their investigation of the Department of Justice that a big part of the problem in Government was that various departments had an arrangement with the Department of Justice to do their own law enforcement. This, I am glad to say, was corrected.

Mr. Chairman, you can vote for the bill before you and be for economy too, for it is real economy to save our own country, its timber, its lands, harness its streams, protect its ability to provide food and clothing for us and generations to come.

WHY HAVE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS?

In this bill before us today we deal with a great number of things. I know you hear people say, "Why should the Federal Government do this, that, or the other?" There is only one reason we should, because it is to our national and individual interest to do it. We are all depending upon the ability of this Nation to feed and clothe us. Every one of us believes in individual freedom. I do not know of any group that is more individual in its thinking than the American farmer, but we learned earlier that there are many things we can do together better than we can do by each one going his individual way, such as schools and roads.

Why do we have an army? Does anybody like to be inducted and regimented? It is for the national interest for us to bind together, to meet the needs of national defense.

SOIL CONSERVATION IS FARMER'S PRIMARY OBLIGATION

I know it is primarily the problem of the American farmer to look after his land. It is his property. It is to his interest to do it; but for 150 years we let the farmer alone look after the land. We said, "You solely, out of your own share of the national-income dollar, shall be responsible for the maintenance of the soil." For 150 years we let him sell on practically an unprotected market at the market place. In that period we built up protective tariffs. In that period we built up minimum wage laws, but the farmer continued dependent upon what he could get on the open market at the market place. It was understood in that period of time that the average farmer was not expected to furnish his house like other people, or even have the normal or ordinary facilities enjoyed by the rest of the population. It was understood he was to work much longer hours, save his suit for Sunday wear, not because he was not as good an American as the rest but because, under the laws as they were written, his share of the national-income dollar was too small to meet other needs.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I am wondering whether it is not a fact that the American farmer had a protective tariff on his farm and on his wheat during all that time, but he was producing such a surplus that the tariff was not worth anything to him, and he sold on the open market the same as if he had no protection. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my understanding; that the only tariffs that you had did not protect; and insofar as the farmers' security is concerned it did not exist. I think, as I have said, it is the primary duty of the farmer to meet his needs, but in that period of time it was understood that the farm boy or girl was expected to work his way through college, and I do not know that that hurt them, but that was not generally true with regard to other segments of your population. In saying that I am not making any appeal to you that the Government should look after the farmer other than on an equal and fair basis, but there has been competition in this Congress over how the laws have been written, and for that period of time there was that difference, and one of the reasons for that difference was that we had unlimited, almost unlimited, acres of fertile soil, and billions of feet of timber, and they could afford to do it because as you wore out one farm you moved on to the next hillside. That situation no longer exists. We do not have the land. In that period the farmer, some farmers, wasted 40 percent of all our fertile soil; he was in an emergency, or thought he was, continuously, where he thought he never could afford to put back into the soil a fair share of what he took out of the soil. Of course some farmers did, but the ones who wore out this land did not.

1975—WHAT THEN?

According to the testimony before our committee by Doctor Shaw, borne out by others and from the best informational sources I know of, by 1975 it is estimated that the population of this country will be in excess of 190 million people. By that time we will need the production of 115 million more acres of land than we now have unless by science and research we are able to increase the yield per acre. We all are interested in it. We must band together here and provide for the future and take protective steps in the national interest. What is so wrong with all of us, through the instrument of the Government, contributing a little bit to protect ourselves and future generations in our ability to eat? What is so wrong with it? Oh, you say it is the farmer's primary job. It is, but he has not done it.

MR. BENSON'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The present administration made certain recommendations which we did not follow. I have come to think lots of the present Secretary. He is a most estimable gentleman. I think he has been finding out a good bit about life in a short period, as much as most anybody; but I want to say this, in some respects, he needed to. One of the first official press releases of the Department after he took over was this:

> The United States Department of Agriculture, largest of all the Nation's civilian agencies, swollen into a huge bureaucracy of 20 agencies and bureaus in the last 20 years, is getting a major overhauling.

Again that is not true. This Department, I repeat, is operating with 38 percent less people than in 1940. All other civilian activities average an increase of 126 percent.

Secretary Benson did not issue that statement. He testified to our committee that after he learned of the statement that he was unhappy about it and retracted it. But that statement does represent the atmosphere that permeated the Department during the time Mr. Benson's budget was being prepared. The head of every agency and every department was called in; and while nobody testified to it in so many words, it is quite apparent that they understood, this statement having been in the paper and not having been corrected at the time when they appeared before the Secretary's committee, that they had to cut down even though what they cut out was highly important. Now, there is one of the reasons we have not followed the Secretary in many of his recommendations.

Recently we had Secretary Benson before the committee about the reorganization plan a long time after his recommendations on the budget were made. Last week, I believe, he was before a Senate committee. He told us he had not had time to know what he wants to do in the Department. From the press, he told the Senate committee he had not had time to make up his mind. Now, if he has not had time now to know how to reorganize or run his Department what could he have known 2 or 3 weeks after he took over the Department what these appropriations should be?

There are many other things that justify this committee in writing the kind of bill that this committee jointly has written for the last 4 years and prior to that time through joint efforts of our side with the help of our Republican colleagues.

COMMITTEES' OBLIGATION

Our primary obligation is to the people and to the Nation and we have tried to discharge that obligation. We feel we have for we have had the Department investigated every year for 4 years and we have tried to correct everything we have seen that was not correct. We therefore believe we are in a little bit better position to recommend funds for this Department to this Congress than any individual who might come in following a round of campaign oratory in an atmosphere which produced such an incorrect statement as that which was released to the press, which, I think, was the first official press release of the new administration. At least it was issued before the chairs had gotten warm.

What have we done to this bill about major items? I know from my own correspondence what most of your interest will be.

RESEARCH

Four years ago we had three divisions of research in the Department of Agriculture—the Secretary's fund, the regular research fund and research under the Research and Marketing Act. It was hard for us to distinguish one project from another. We also learned that if the Congress cut down the appropriation for almost any agency they would go over to the Research and Marketing Division, get an allocation of funds and to a large extent keep the same folks working at the same stand. We tried to correct that by putting all of this research fund in the same pot, so to speak, and having an advisory committee in industry throughout the country meet with the research people twice a year to go over with them the projects that they thought needed attention and the work that was to be done.

In the period of the last 4 years we think we have gotten to the point where it is working and we can move ahead. Practically every item of research in the Department now is subjected to the scrutiny and the competition of folks in the trade who want somebody to give attention to this, that, or the other problem. Having reached that point and having reached the period when we are putting millions of dollars into various commodities, at a time when we are losing the cotton markets and other markets for agricultural products through competition and other reasons, it is highly important from a monetary standpoint that we increase our efforts to meet those problems. We have made substantial increases in the research fund in this bill.

CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The next item that so many people have talked to me about is the soil and conservation program. I think the gentlemen on my left have pretty much covered the action of the committee with regard to the Soil Conservation Service. There is one item on which I certainly differ with the Benson approach. That is the one providing that all of the nurseries be closed that were under the operation of the Soil Conservation Service.

Some years ago we spent millions of dollars selling the American people on the need for reforestation. But, then, we discovered we had no trees for them to set out. Our committee corrected that. When we created the Soil Conservation Service we had no grass seed, we had no young trees, we had no material things for them to use. That is the way your nurseries came into being. It is said that in many instances the States can take them over. I do not know. But this committee would not go along with the Secretary's recommendation to abolish them and we have recommended about half the amount they have this year "to carry such nurseries until some satisfactory solution can be worked out."

We refused to follow Mr. Benson's recommendations to end abruptly quarantine and other work on sweetpotato weevil, phony peach disease, and Japanese beetle. Here we provided about half the amount they had this year on the same basis as with the Soil Conservation Service nurseries.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

In that connection, in this bill we have taken another action which I think is one of the most forward steps that a Congress could take. For this action I must claim a fair share of the credit for myself and my party. I refer to this watershed flood prevention program. I went out to the Democratic Convention in Chicago last year and urged the Democratic Party to include as a part of its farm plank an assurance of special and additional attention to watershed flood prevention. I succeeded and that was incorporated in the Democratic farm plank. Not because it was there, but because they, too, recognized the need, I am glad to say that our friends on the subcommittee on the Republican side with our support have added in this bill what I believe is a start in the right direction. We have provided $5 million for about 50 small watershed pilot plants, 1 in most of the watersheds of this Nation. These will be constructed on a cooperative basis with local interests to see if we cannot help meet this flood problem to a large extent by stopping the water before it reaches the size of floods.

SOIL EROSION AND FLOOD DAMAGE

As I told this Congress many times, one of the hardest tasks I ever had to perform was to sit on a committee and deal with the Kansas-Nebraska flood and see the untold damage that was done; with $2 billion worth of property damage and from $60 to $80 million of expense to the Federal Government. Is it not cheaper in advance to try to do something about it? According to the measurements made at the city of Memphis, Tenn., every day in the year on the average there flows down the Mississippi River the topsoil of fifty 40-acre farms. At least that soil used to spread over the Mississippi and the Louisiana deltas where it did some good, but now those fifty 40-acre farms flow on out to sea each day. Is it common sense to let that condition continue so that we will eventually get into the position of India, Greece, Palestine, or China, or many other countries which we are aiding today? You may say it cannot happen here. I repeat we have already wasted 40 percent of our natural land resources. Shall we sit idly by saying, "Let us practice rugged individualism." If the farmers, or 40 percent of them, cannot or will not take care of the land, why should we worry? Shall we continue to allow our country to continue to go down the road to a need for a Marshall plan? Those wornout countries are the beneficiaries today of your dollars and mine. If we wear out our country, who would help us? Who could help us? If any there are it would be the country which has taken care of its natural resources. You may argue with me as to how best to meet this problem, but I do not think there can be any argument about the need to meet it. We are trying to do it in this bill under the agencies as they are now constituted. Somebody says we should abolish all the Federal programs. I say we had better not. You might improve on its operations, but with the Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service, the PMA, and the individual efforts of everybody concerned in this field, you have not been doing too good a job. They say we owe more than $265 billion; we are in an emergency; let us cut down on the attention to our farm plant. Do you know why most of this land was worn out? Because the farmer himself always thought he was in an emergency. He never could see how he could afford to put back a fair share of what he took out. In our committee hearings, I thought it ironical that a Mississippi lawyer like me had to argue with the heads of farm organizations

who said, "We are in an emergency; therefore, we feel that we should give less attention to preserving our country." It is bad enough to overdraw at the Treasury, it is bad to have an unbalanced budget and certainly I do not wish that condition to continue, and we have to correct it, but is it not much worse to overdraw on your natural resources, your real wealth, of your own country? You could wipe out every dollar, as bad as that would be, but you could set up another financial system. However, destroy your soil and there is nothing on which to build.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has brought out with great clarity this new proposed program for pilot plant demonstrations on various watersheds throughout the country. Now the gentleman knows, as I do, that had it not been for the fact that we have seen fit to override the revised budget to the extent of this $5 million, the direct appropriation in this bill would have been $1,057,914,000 below that requested by Mr. Benson, the present Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have not checked the figures, and I know the gentleman is usually correct, and I trust he figured this correctly. I have not had the opportunity to check that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHITTEN. One point where the committee has substantially differed with Secretary Benson is in the flood prevention work, to some extent on research and on the loan authorization for the Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, as well as abolishing quarantine work, ending Soil Conservation Service nurseries and letting out the home agents of the Farmers' Home Administration.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS—FHA, REA

Mr. WHITTEN. Loan authorizations are not necessarily appropriations and certainly do not represent annual operating costs. I may say the Department is going to run the FHA and REA. Those programs are going to be under the Secretary and his Department. Why should he ask us to put a ceiling down below what the need might be? Below what we believe it will be? The REA Act itself says you cannot borrow money to build lines except where the people do not get central station current. It says you cannot make such a loan unless the applicant proves it is a sound loan and can and will be repaid. Why should he object to a raised ceiling?

If the need should be proven, even to him, should he not want a ceiling high enough to meet the need? But the Secretary, 40 days in office, says the need is not there. If it is not, doubtless he will not make the loans. What harm is the higher authorization to him? He has charge of passing on the applications. As to the Farmers Home Administration, I think there is going to be a real need for the authorization in this bill, because the testimony showed that within a few months after last year's appropriations were made all the funds were committed. I think there is a real need, but there, too, the law says that with regard to tenant purchases the applicant has to meet the requirements of the law, the loan must be sound and it has to provide for repayment.

PRODUCTION AND SUBSISTENCE LOANS

With regard to the subsistence loans, the applicant has to show he cannot get credit any other place. Whether it is right or wrong, we do have relief in this country. We have so many ways that one way or another these people are going to be taken care of. I think it is a much sounder, a much more sensible, and a much cheaper way to lend a man money which he will repay and let him reestablish himself. The record is wonderful. You would hardly believe you could operate a program such as this on as sound a basis as you do, when you limit yourself in the first instance to applicants who cannot get the money anywhere else.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not admit that the Farmers Home Administration is essentially a relief program?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. I say in the absence of these programs people would be on relief one way or another. I say it is a case of our joining together in this system of private enterprise to make self-supporting a group which was not before. We have to recognize that if we do not do something along this line and give them an opportunity to repay these loans with interest and establish themselves, we are missing the boat, and are probably leading ourselves into some of the difficulties foreign countries have.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. How can the gentleman brand it as a sound program when in the lending of $160,000,000 a year it costs $27,000,000 just to administer the program?

Mr. WHITTEN. If you were putting it on the basis of what it should cost to operate a program the situation would be different. Take the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The relative administrative cost is very, very small. In the Farm Credit Administration the cost of handling a given volume is very, very small. In the Farmers Home Administration it is not a case of just handling the loan, it is a case of supervising the man and helping him to rehabilitate or reestablish himself. It is the kind of program where you do not just count the number of loans and balance the books. A major part of the program is supervision, and that is as it should be. In that connection, I should like to say we have directed that they keep the women home supervisors in those areas where they are needed because, in my judgment, they do as fine a job and are as much responsible for the success of this program as any other group. The committee felt that way, and has directed that this agency keep those fine people in that job.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In regard to the remarks that have been made here this afternoon about the Farmers Home Administration, that is, as to whether or not it is a sensible or a sound or a proper program, I think the appropriate place for that to be taken up would be on some measure other than an appropriation bill, because the Appropriations Committee is simply carrying out an order which has previously been given it by the Congress. In truth and in fact, it is incumbent upon the Appropriations Committee to bring in an adequate amount of money to implement and put that program into effect. Certainly the Appropriations Committee should not be criticized for doing what the Congress has heretofore directed it to do.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my colleague. He certainly is correct. While appropriations are not compulsory, the committee should do as my colleague suggests. There is a whole lot of legislation to which some are opposed. If certain individuals do not like it, the place to correct it is in the legislative committee. It so happens that I believe in this program, as I know my colleague from Mississippi does, but the place to raise the question is in the legislative committee which would have to do with changing the law if it were desired to do so.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is one of the true champions of American agriculture. He has always done a splendid job on this floor with respect to appropriations for the farmer.

I am not entirely satisfied with the explanation that has been given with respect to the $5 million cut for the Soil Conservation Service.

I understand from the gentleman's remarks that he certainly is in favor of the watershed conservation program, but does he think that such effort will suffice or be sufficient to justify the substantial cut of $5 million or more for soil conservation work?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will tell the gentleman frankly that there are a good many items here which do not reflect my individual opinion, but I think the figures here are so much better than they might have been in the overall, I feel I should sustain the committee. When I say that, I am sure every individual member of this committee could make the same statement for himself, except that we would differ as to where the items were. But the reduction here in the Soil Conservation Service is not from the present year. The reductions, which you mentioned, had to do with the Truman budget. My colleagues were correct in their statements when they say they did not organize anything like the number of new districts for which we made provision last year. The answer of those in the soil conservation district associations is that since the people knew the

money was not available, and new districts could be serviced only by making the service of other districts a little more thin where it is already too thin—that is the reason your districts were not organized. Nevertheless they were not, and the only reduction as against the present year was about a 50 percent reduction in this nursery tree item. The committee did not go along with a proposed increase, which was in the Truman budget, neither did it reduce it from the present year except for a reduction of 50 percent in the nursery item.

Mr. EVINS. Knowing the gentleman's views, and he being the champion of agriculture, as I know he is, I feel that the gentleman believes as I do that it certainly is false economy to continue to cut down on soil-conservation work when it is so very vital.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my feeling. In this bill we announce a $195 million ceiling for the ACP, for the coming year, a reduction of $55,000,000. I would like to answer here misleading statements which always bob up in this debate. Heretofore practices under the soil-conservation program were built up from the community level to the top. The community farmers met and selected the community committee. They selected or elected the county committee. The community recommended to the county and the county to the State and the State to the National Government as to what practices were thought to be best and most needed in a particular area. The Department down here went over all that and selected those practices and put them in a catalog. Sixty-eight percent of those practices in that catalog are permanent-type practices. Then that catalog was sent back and selections were made by the State, county, and community. Then, I want to point out first that the Federal Government contributed approximately 50 percent of the monetary cost and the farmer put up on the average an equal amount of money and an equal amount of labor to start that. This is something that all Members might think about. Any community that used up this money on sorry or trifling practices, selected such practices themselves and ignored 68 percent of this catalog in so doing. Any individual who got a check for his contribution on the part of the Federal Government either asked for it himself or had somebody do it for him. Anybody who got such a contribution not only asked for it, but claimed that he had done something for it. And if he had just let it alone, perhaps it would have been made available to somebody who could have made better use of it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. In addition to what the gentleman has said, in my State and I presume it has been done in other States in the United States, these practices that are carried out for soil-conservation purposes are checked with the experiement stations to meet the requirements in the individual States.

Mr. WHITTEN. And all States could well follow your example.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. To put it another way, the fact is that that farmer who received that check for certain practices either had to show by some direct proof that he had actually performed the practices or else he received the money through some fraudulent representation that he had performed it.

Mr. WHITTEN. He did. Many times, perhaps some agent or some manager or someone else may have done it in his name. I know cases where perhaps that happened, and I do agree that some folks have selected such trifling practices. But I want the finger to be put where it should be put, and that is right in the county or in the community which was a party to it, or else the individual would not have collected.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Is it not possible that putting this in the management of local committees just makes it easy for them to devise practices to take Government money?

Mr. WHITTEN. It depends on the type of people. Some people fall for that kind of thing quicker than others. I have seen some otherwise good people fall for it. But it is a waste of Government money. It is not right, and they should be ashamed of themselves for doing it.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. How far are you apart with Secretary Benson on this ACP payment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Benson recommended $140 million. Here is the way this is handled: We announce the limit that the Federal Government will contribute for the following year. This is a ceiling. None of it will be paid unless somebody earns it. The present administration says it is going to tighten down on the practices. They are going to send out a list of what they can do and what they cannot do to get contributions, but if no farmer performs, we do not pay any of it. It is a ceiling. Now, if there be a need, why should he want us to have a low ceiling? You know farming is hard. We should make a special effort to get them to do more, now with so many men in the service and it being so difficult to get help. We announced a $250 million program last year, and the farmers earned only $211 million. This is nothing but a ceiling that we are establishing. If Mr. Benson is going to do, as he testified he was going to, limit this practice to permanent-type practices, he is running the Department, and if they are going to do that and if the farmer cannot get any Federal contribution except for permanent-type practices, if the farmer is going to swear that he did do it, and do something extra for it, and if we have wasted all this land needed to do something, why have such a low limit? Why hold it down there, unless, as some folks think, they are trying to kill the program gradually? I am not talking about the Secretary, but I know some of his advisers who have been against this program for years.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. You also mentioned or insinuated your approval of the permanent-type practices as against the purely temporary practice.

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly do.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. If it is logical for us to confine this to permanent-type practices, not simply contribute dollars to the farmer's annual expenses, then the cut that he suggests is quite logical, because, according to the figures that I have, something like $50 million was spent purely for chemicals on annual-type practices, not permanent-type practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Last year we urged the committee in the county to try to get lands in this program that needed it most. It was unfortunate that it happened to come in a political year, because many folks gave political implications to it. Certainly there was no such intent on my part or on the part of the committee, but by having called on the landowner who had land that needed this kind of work most, the increase in those who said they would go into the program was about 80 percent. In many sections of the country, after they had announced the maximum that the Federal Government would contribute, they had to come back and say, "We cannot go but half that far, because so many folks have signed up that we cannot go that far." In every announcement they made they said, "Within the funds available." So when they got to the point where the funds were not sufficient, they had a right to go back and scale it down.

I have urged time and again in the committee that we give more attention to permanent-type practices, by every means short of telling them from Washington what they had to do.

I had some fun in these hearings by pointing out to the Assistant Secretary the position he had gotten himself into. They ran on the basis that they were going to stop dictation from Washington. The first thing he had to do here was to tell the communities what practices they had to follow. There is, of course, inconsistency, but I am glad I am not in that one.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. When the Committee on Agriculture looked into this problem, they authorized that annual expenditures be made up to $500 million. The Appropriations Committee of the House has never anywhere near approached that. I would like at this time to call attention to the innumerable witnesses who appeared before our committee—and their testimony is scattered all through the hearings. It will show the need for carrying on soil-conservation work, and I think it would be well for Members of the House in the spare time that few of us have to review in the hearings what these programs have brought

out actually. Actually we have a pretty dismal picture in connection with the wasting of the national resources of this country. I think it is well for all of us to read and think about the inscription that appears on the wall of this Chamber above the Speaker's dais:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for this statement. That challenge could well be repeated every day in the year.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi for one of the finest explanations it has been my privilege to listen to on any bill; I think he has done a great piece of work giving us the reasoning behind this bill and the reasoning behind the compromises the committee has necessarily worked out, and I realize that we have to have compromises to get legislation. But before the gentleman yields the floor, I wonder if he would discuss with us a little the loan authorizations for the rural electrification programs? Of course, I read the bill and find that you provide $135 million for electrical services and $50 million for telephone services, and then I note that you provide $30 million, but I am frank to say that I do not fully understand it, and I wonder if the gentleman would explain to us just how that $30 million can be spent, under what circumstances, whether it can be spent without restriction as to the present limitation that is in the basic law or whether it is simply an extension of the appropriation, and whether it is something that can be spent, or whether it is something that is going to be frozen and that we are not going to have more rural electrification?

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as the committee's intentions—and I started that practice 4 years ago the first year I was chairman of this subcommittee—the law says that these loans can be made only under certain conditions: One is, as I stated earlier and as the gentleman himself knows, having worked with the program in his own committee and elsewhere—they must show that they do not get central station current, that it is economically feasible, and that the loan will be repaid.

We feel that if those conditions are met, since the loans will be paid back with interest and on which we have not as much as two-tenths of one percent of loans 30 days in arrears, we feel that if those conditions arise the loans should be made because they would be sound loans and a good investment in the United States of America.

We wanted to be sure that if applications reached that level they would be met. If that $130 million is used up, it is the intention of this committee that if in any State their pro rata share of the $130 million is used up, that so much of the $30 million as may be necessary to meet the bona fide sound applications shall be made available.

In addition to that $30 million there is a carry-over of $35 million which is not tied down by the same formula as is this. There again I cannot see why the Department should raise a whole lot of sand about what the ceiling is. They are going to pass on whether there will be any loans at all or not, and they are doing some things that make you think they are going to be rather hard on some of these matters—I do not know—I hope not; but I want them to know that the ceiling is high enough where they cannot lay it in the lap of Congress if they do not meet the needs of the American people for this sound program.

Mr. POAGE. That means there is $190 million that will be available for loans for the rural electrification program next year.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. If there are applications that meet all of the qualifications.

RURAL TELEPHONE

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. Let me say this about the telephone program before I forget it: The committee agreed on $65 million for the telephone program for the remainder of this year and all next year; but $15 million is now pending in a supplemental appropriation bill in conference between the House and the Senate. It was agreed by the subcommittee that unless that is forthcoming the committee will offer an amendment increasing this to $65 million where it is now $50 million.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree fully with the gentleman that we intend to make the full $65 million available if possible. If the supplemental fails to carry we will then urge the other body to put in the $65 million; then we will uphold that in conference. It is our intention to see to it that $65 million total is made available for that particular program.

Mr. POAGE. If we may get it perfectly clear, let me ask this: If this bill passes, we can expect $190 million of money to be available for use for electrical purposes, $65 million of which to be handled, as the chairman of the subcommittee has explained, for rural telephone services. There is no supplemental fund and no carryover, as I understand it, for rural telephones. I understand about the carryover for rural electrification, but there is none for rural telephones, as I understand it? Is that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. So that the $65 million will be the absolute limit for rural telephones. Right now there are applications for $99 million pending for rural telephones and about $216 million for electrical extensions?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my understanding. Let me explain for those who hear these figures bandied around and get the authorization mixed up with the appropriation. This is the authorization. This is how far they could go if all the requirements of law were met by the applicants and they approved the applications, but not a dollar is spent nor appropriated nor taken out of the Treasury and no interest paid until after the loan is approved, and not then until the money is spent on the construction of the line. Let us not get that mixed up as being a part of the annual cost of the Department of Agriculture as some folks seem to wish to do.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. This program has already cost the Government quite a lot of money, a great deal of money has been appropriated throughout the years. Can the gentleman from Mississippi tell me how much we have put into this proposition?

Mr. WHITTEN. The total amount of money that has been put into the rural-electrification programs through the years and the total amount of loans that have been made I do not have at hand.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I am interested in that because I come from a kind of a rural part of the country—New England. It is mostly rural. Ninety-eight percent of the farmers in Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Massachusetts have electricity, and we have never asked the Government for a nickel in any one of those three States. The families get along pretty good up there. Apparently this money has been spent in other States than those of New England.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is spent in other States than New England, and part of the interest that the folks pay back, I hope, is helping New England and the rest of us to support the Government, because they do repay it with interest. But in New England you have some problems we do not have. You also have some things that make it so easy for you to meet many of your needs that we do not find exists in other sections. For instance, the matter of distance. With all due deference to New England, you like to pride yourselves on keeping the feel of the ground, and agriculture is expressed endearingly, but the size of New England is such that you do not have the same type of problem in extending electrical lines that we have in the State of Texas, which I recall is about the size of New England. We have tried to meet this in those areas where the law says they must show that otherwise they cannot get central station current.

They have to show ability to repay it and they must repay it with interest. The records over there show that less than two-tenths of 1 percent have been as much as 30 days behind in their repayment. Now, only about 15 percent of the American people are feeding all the rest of us, with all the boys in the service. The REA has saved the day, and it is a sound, money-making program, and I think the gentleman, knowing his record here, is 100 percent for it. I do not want to expand unless there is a real need.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Of course, I am also interested in all this money we get back on projects that are self-supporting, and everything, but it seems to me that every year when appropriation bills come up there is at least as much appropriated this year as there was the year before. I cannot understand how we are saving money by spending, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, or being in a position to spend, $190 million this year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Many of your private power companies never thought that the farmers would buy electricity for use on even a small scale in some sections, but it is interesting to note that the number of farmers on REA lines is almost twice as many as was contemplated, and the consumption of electricity by the farmers now that they have electrical appliances and labor-saving devices and live like the rest of the folks do, their demand for electricity is about twice what anybody thought it would be. As a result, many of these lines are in need of rephasing, that is, they must be increased in size to take care of the larger load.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Mississippi was asked about the total amount of funds made available to the Rural Electrification Administration. I think the total is $2¾ billion. As to the program that we have authorized here, I just want to make it clear for the record that it is $135 million in electrification loans plus a contingent fund of $30 million in electrification loans plus $25 million free fund, which is a carryover which was not estimated in the Truman budget which was sent up to the committee originally. That $25 million can be used. It does not have to be used in accordance with the regular formula which provides that no more than 10 percent of the total loan authorization can go to any one State. In addition to that, there is the $65 million program of the Rural Telephone Administration, which is in addition to the total $190 million possible program in electrification.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I want to repeat again that this is a ceiling; this is an authorization, and I am sure that my friends on the left would not think for a minute that the administration would abuse its discretion in too free handily approving these applications. This is the maximum. Of course, whether they approve any or not is up to them.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I think it might well be pointed out that not only has REA been a profit-making program but that many of the payments of loans have been made far in advance of the scheduled time for repayment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly. They talk about this, that, and the other, but throughout history we have learned many things we can do better by joining them together, and this is one of them. Up until we joined through the instrument of the Government, we know that the American farmer was in a bad way.

In this bill we direct the Department to measure acreage planted to cotton and wheat in an effort to keep at a minimum the problem of controls. We provide additional funds for studying the method of crop estimating. We maintain this years' figure on the school lunch program, provide for the Forestry Department, for extension to the limit of the authorization. We have tried to meet the many problems facing us.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have consumed as much time as I should. I hope to meet other questions that arise as we go into the reading of the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to speak briefly on the subject of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1954.

This session marks my first year of service on the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations. It has been a most interesting and informative experience. It has also been a pleasure to work with the other members of the subcommittee. I have great respect for their ability, industry, and devotion to the interests and well-being of American agriculture. I have learned much from my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. Although we have differed in our ideas with respect to some of the items in the bill under consideration, we nevertheless find ourselves in general agreement with respect to the bill as a whole. Concerning the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], I can say most advisedly that the Seventh District of Minnesota has in him a shrewd and forceful Representative, and the American farmer a considerate and loyal friend. While stanchly defending and looking out for the welfare of his own constituents, his general outlook and attitude have been in no sense provincial. He is acutely aware of the problems and importance of American agriculture in its entirety.

The Department of Agriculture is a tremendous and fascinating agency. The hearings of the subcommittee were a revelation to me. I had never realized how vast were the Department's responsibilities or how complex its problems. It is fortunate, indeed, that we have in charge of its activities a man of the capabilities of Ezra Taft Benson. Mr. Benson brings to the Department a rare combination of intelligence, integrity, training and experience which will serve it well. He has surrounded himself with able assistants—Mr. True Morse, Mr. John Davis, Mr. Earl Coke, Mr. Romeo Short, Mr. Howard Gordon, Mr. Daiken Broadhead, just to name a few. All of these men are serving in Washington at a financial sacrifice. They have given up secure positions in a spirit of dedication to Federal public service. They all know American agriculture. They all have in common a desire to serve their country in that field.

The bill in its broad outlines has been well covered by the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. Like him, and like the other members of the committee, I think it is a good bill. It will serve our country well—not just those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits, but all of America.

As pointed out, the amount recommended for regular activities is less than the funds available for the current fiscal year. Actually, a substantial increase over this year's appropriations would be justified. However, in the interest of the overriding necessity of seeking by every means possible to bring the overall Federal budget into balance, a cut in expenditures is mandatory.

As far as my own opinion is concerned, there are within the total amount recommended some items which should be increased and others decreased. However, any appropriation bill will contain compromises. Complete accord on every item even among members of the seven-man subcommittee is a practical impossibility, let alone such accord among all Members of Congress.

Nevertheless, I am constrained to point out a few instances where my thinking differs from that as reflected in the bill as reported out.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

An advance authorization for the 1954 crop year of $195 million is recommended for the agricultural-conservation program, which has as its purposes restoring and improving soil fertility, reducing erosion caused by wind and water, and conserving water on land. This compares with an authorization of $250 million for the 1953 crop year and $140 million recommended by the Department of Agriculture in its revised budget. I personally favor the Department's request of $140 million. That amount is also recommended by the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation. The reduction would be affected by confining program assistance to the more lasting or permanent type conservation practices; for example:

First. Enduring—permanent type—mechanical and vegetative practices whose benefits will continue through a period of several years when they are (a) properly applied where needed to attain the conservation objective and (b) adequately maintained.

Second. Practices needed for conservation purposes but which would not likely be initiated in an area by farmers without financial assistance.

Third. Practices which, although essential to the public welfare, will not return sufficient short-term economic benefits to the farmer to provide the necessary encouragement for him to install them.

There is a reasonable association between the more lasting conservation practices and those for which farmers generally need assistance most. The more permanent type practices often require rather heavy outlays, and the benefits from them are realized over many years rather than in a short time. The more often repeated practices by their very nature are likely to be ones

which pay off through increased production within a fairly short time.

Although the committee has recommended an advance authorization for the 1954 crop year in excess of the Department's request, it is important to note that the committee report accompanying the bill contains the statement that increased attention should be given to those practices which have more than annual benefits to the soil. In that statement, I wholeheartedly concur.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Seventy-five million eight hundred sixty-nine thousand one hundred forty-five dollars has been recommended for the constituent agencies of the Agricultural Research Administration. This is $262,423 more than the 1953 appropriations but $1,288,663 less than that recommended by the Department in its revised estimates. Many persons and organizations, including the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange, have recommended an increase over the current year's appropriations of $17 million. There is no question but what such an additional amount could be well and profitably spent. Research is definitely the kind of activity which the Government can do far better than the farmer can do for himself. And, the benefits which result are shared by all—not just the farmer. Eradication of animal diseases, mechanization of farm production, increased utilization of milk nonfat solids, improvement of quality of products and savings in handling and transportation of foods mean a better life for all of us.

Of the small additional amount recommended, it is important to note that, first, $69,445 is earmarked for use by the Bureau of Dairy Industry to increase research designed to help the dairy industry meet surplus butter problems; second, $115,000 for research on cotton; and third, $10,000 for studies on food preservation. Evidence presented to the committee demonstrates clearly that lack of research on cotton has contributed to the loss of large markets to synthetic fibers. In view of existing cotton surpluses and impending acreage controls, all possible action should be taken to enable this commodity to maintain its competitive position in the markets. The increase of $10,000 for research on food preservation will enable the Bureau to speed up its work on dehydrating fruits and vegetables. The ultimate savings to the consumer in handling, transportation and refrigeration of foods makes this a very promising line of research. Remarkable progress has been made in the development of an orange-juice powder, which, with water added and chilled, makes an exceedingly appetizing drink.

It is unfortunate that these increases are so meager. As I previously stated, an additional $17 million could well be utilized. Let us hope then that the Agricultural Research Administration makes the most of what it has. In this regard, it would be well to observe the recommendation of the committee in its report that the research programs of the Department be reexamined to make certain that they are directed primarily to problems of farmers on the land. Furthermore, it is felt by many informed observers that considerable duplication throughout the constituent agencies could be eliminated and the savings thereby realized used in solving some of the pressing problems which are suffering from lack of funds.

FOREST SERVICE—RECREATIONAL AREAS

Another matter which I would like to call to the attention of the House is that of sanitation and care of recreational areas in the national forests.

The committee has recommended an increase of $250,000 to improve serious sanitary conditions in the recreational areas and campgrounds of the national forests. The current fiscal year appropriation is $690,000. A total of $940,000, therefore, is recommended for 1954. An additional amount of $570,000 out of funds for protection and management of the national forests is available this year for improvement maintenance. No increase in this item has been recommended for 1954. These proposed appropriations are entirely inadequate.

During the calendar year 1951, public use of the national forests, exclusive of highway travel, amounted to 30 million visits, totaling 44 million man-days' use. This is an increase of 9 percent over the 27 million visits reported for 1950.

Overcrowding at many large public-use areas and the fact that practically no new areas have been developed since World War II, plus the deteriorated condition of many areas, are making the care, policing, and maintenance of the existing facilities more difficult and costly. Sanitation is a serious problem throughout the national forests and is aggravated by overcrowding. Inspections made by the United States Public Health Service and State and local sanitary officers show that many national-forest, public-use areas, especially the larger areas, are not satisfactory and should have better toilets, water systems, and garbage disposal.

Continuing efforts are being made to obtain greater participation by local communities in the management of local public-use areas, and in increasing the number of concessioner-operated installations, in order to reduce the burden of maintenance on the Federal Government. Although these efforts continue, progress is limited in relation to the total job involved. It appears quite certain that this approach will not answer the real problem of urgently needed improved sanitation and care of public campgrounds.

Existing facilities are completely inadequate. They are geared to take care of about half of the 33 million annual visits now being made. I asked the Forest Service what it would take to do the job right. This is the answer I received, and it sounds reasonable to me.

One million and seventy-one thousand dollars is needed annually for sanitation, cleanup, garbage disposal, fire prevention and supervision at existing recreation areas. One million one hundred and ninety-seven thousand dollars is needed annually for maintenance of improvements and facilities at existing recreation areas. These figures total $2,268,000, which are to be compared with the 1954 proposed figures of $940,000 and $570,000, totaling $1,510,000.

Additional capital investments needed for recreation area improvements and facilities are not even considered in the 1954 budget. Seven million one hundred and sixty-nine thousand dollars are needed to provide satisfactory facilities for sanitation, fire prevention, and public safety and to put all essential existing public-use areas and facilities in safe and sanitary condition. Seventeen million one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars are needed to expand the capacity of existing areas and to construct new areas necessary to accommodate present use in a safe and satisfactory manner. This program is proposed for 5 years; however, it could be extended to 8 or 10 years, thus decreasing the funds needed for capital investment each year.

It is estimated that when the program is completed, the total annual cost of the whole recreation job will be $3,200,000. The exact amount, of course, will depend upon the volume of public use and the purchasing power of the dollar at the time.

The forest recreation problem is one which merits the attention of Congress. It is not being satisfactorily met at the present time. The situation is serious.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

One of the most important changes to take place in the Department of Agriculture since Secretary Benson has taken office has been the creation of the Foreign Agricultural Service, which is charged with performing the duties formerly undertaken by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. It is most earnestly hoped that this will be a real change and not a mere juggling of squares on an organization chart.

It has long been felt that the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations could be revitalized and reorganized so as to better serve its original and primary purpose, that of providing information regarding supplies and prices of agricultural products in foreign markets and smoothing the economic and diplomatic paths over which export products move. It is particularly important that this be done at this time in view of the increasing difficulties experienced in maintaining foreign markets for American farm products.

The importance of agricultural exports to our American economy cannot be underestimated. In the 1951–52 marketing year, over $4 billion worth of our agricultural commodities were exported. These exports were 5½ times in value and double in volume those of the 5 prewar years, 1935–39.

American exports have been substantially facilitated by economic aid. With shifts in the nature of economic aid, it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain foreign markets for American farm products. United States cotton, tobacco, grains, fruits, lard, soybeans, dairy and other products have to compete for scarce dollars with the requirements of our foreign customers for industrial and military items. In addition to the problem of competing for available dollar

exchange, there is the problem of restored and increased agricultural production abroad. Thus, American agriculture must compete for sales, as well as dollars.

During the 1952–53 marketing year, the latest estimate on the value of agricultural exports is $2.9 billion, only a small percentage of which is being paid for by our military and MSA programs. That marks a sharp decline over 1951–52. It accounts in large measure for the mounting agricultural supplies in the United States.

It is no wonder, therefore, that under the reorganization, emphasis will be reoriented toward developing offshore markets for our agricultural production, including the sending abroad of highly competent agricultural commodity specialists who are thoroughly acquainted with the production and trade problems involving these commodities in the United States and who are capable of analyzing the complex foreign market situations for the guidance of the United States Department of Agriculture and the producers and exporters of these commodities.

To accomplish this purpose, a new branch is being set up, called Foreign Trade Development, and within this branch, a division called Foreign Marketing Services, which will include the foreign commodity marketing specialists. In this connection, it is amazing to note that at the present time the Department has only 3 full-time and 5 part-time such specialists. This is particularly ironic at a time when, faced as we are with agricultural surpluses at home and a falling off of exports, our Government has on the payroll literally hundreds of agricultural experts who are roaming about the globe showing others how to increase their own agricultural production. Granted that there be merit in this foreign assistance program, still there is such a thing as balance.

It is also understood that under the reorganization, the new Foreign Agricultural Service will participate more actively than its predecessor in negotiations in connection with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—to assure more adequate representation and stronger defense of the basic interests of American agriculture under this agreement and the various trade arrangements with the participating countries.

There is ample evidence that agriculture has not been adequately represented in international trade-agreement conferences. In 20 years of so-called reciprocal trade, tariffs on American agricultural products have been cut by more than half. Compare that with the record of the automobile industry. The ad valorem on foreign autos has never changed. It was 10 percent in 1930; it is still 10 percent.

The committee recommends $673,000 for this activity for 1954, which represents an increase of $59,876 over 1953. Other funds totaling approximately $6 million will be available, as heretofore, from other agencies. The committee feels that this office can become an extremely important part of the Department and a highly effective part of our international program if this proposed change in emphasis is carried out effectively.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. The public use of the national forests is one program in which the people get to exercise their right and interest in our great national forests. This is part of our great recreational program and I want to compliment the gentleman on what he said with regard to it. I wonder if the gentleman would care to tell us some of the things that have taken place in his own area where certain lakes and recreational facilities have had to be closed down because there were not sufficient sanitary facilities which constituted a health menace.

Mr. HUNTER. That is absolutely correct. I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks. I did not wish to make this in any sense provincial, because the national forests extend throughout the length and breadth of our country. The incident the gentleman mentions in California is applicable to the Bass Lake area which is in the Sierra National Forest. The public camp ground operated there by the Forest Service was developed to accommodate 1,500 people at one time, yet the use on weekends and holidays reaches as high as 10,000 per day.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that it was only through the effective urging of the gentleman from California that the subcommittee decided to take the action concerning the problem about which the gentleman from California has just been speaking. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], of course, is more conversant with the situation in these recreational areas than are the other members of the subcommittee as he is close to our large national forests. He has aided us considerably in arriving at the decision we have made.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my distinguished chairman. I would like to say that there is no disagreement amongst members of the subcommittee on the problem involved; it is a question of trying to keep the overall budget within reasonable limits. We do hope that in time we can expand and improve this program to meet current need.

But getting back to the Bass Lake area in California, it was only recently that the public-health officer of Madera County closed the area down for sanitary reasons.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I agree with the gentleman that this should not be a provincial matter, because it is one that affects the people of the entire United States. These national forests are scattered all over the United States and provide recreational areas for all of the people who care to use them. But it is only as we speak about these individual places we are familiar with that we can actually point up the problem before the Congress.

Mr. HUNTER. I certainly agree with the gentleman. These areas are not used by the people in the immediate vicinity. The national forests and park areas are visited and used by people from all over the entire United States; so this is a national problem.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 19 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to state that this is the first experience I have had on the agricultural subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. I have enjoyed that experience very much. I have enjoyed working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and I think we have come up with a report which will receive the support of a majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee began its hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill on Wednesday, February 25, 1953. Our committee was in session each day up to and including Tuesday, May 5, 1953. During these hearings we took over 3,000 pages of testimony, which is included in parts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the hearing records which are before you as you consider this agriculture appropriations bill today. Each witness was given every courtesy by our subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. This bill was very carefully reviewed by the subcommittee and by the entire House Appropriations Committee.

The bill includes direct annual appropriations for regular activities of the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1954, totaling $712,308,328; loan authorizations for the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers' Home Administration of $402,500,000; administrative expense authorizations for the corporations of the Department in the amount of $21,005,000; and an appropriation of $439,500 for the special activities of the Department. The amount recommended in this bill for the 1954 fiscal year for the activities of the Department of Agriculture is $24,301,505 less than the funds available for 1953 and $37,101,014 less than the budget estimates submitted to this Congress by former President Truman for fiscal 1954. These savings are made notwithstanding the fact that the addition of an entirely new item of $29,250,000 for acreage controls on wheat and cotton was not carried in the 1953 budget, nor was this item carried in the original budget estimates for fiscal year 1954. At the time the budget for 1954 was originally drawn, no provision was made for acreage controls on wheat and cotton but it is now necessary under the law for the Department of Agriculture to have these funds so that it is possible for them to make necessary provisions for acreage controls on wheat and cotton in the next crop year.

Our committee was not unanimous on every item in this appropriations bill. As a matter of fact, there are several items which were included at a higher

figure in this budget bill than I thought was absolutely necessary. I do feel, however, that it is an outstanding committee report and one which will certainly provide for all services which the Federal Government should provide. I support this committee report.

There is no question in my mind that agriculture, occupying the important place that it does in our Nation's economy, is concerned about the fact that our Federal budget has not been balanced, with the exception of one year, over the past 20 years. The farmers making up this great agricultural economy of ours have a widespread feeling in my section of the country that our Federal budget must be balanced.

Back some 15 years ago, the Department of Agriculture spent more money than our Defense Department. For 2 years prior to World War II and since Pearl Harbor, the Department of Defense, of course, has greatly exceeded the spending of the Department of Agriculture because the functions of this Department became more important to our immediate national security. In the past fiscal year we have obligated in foreign aid funds six times as much in dollars and cents than the Federal Government has obligated through the Department of Agriculture. The appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1954 are considerably below those appropriations made to the Department of Agriculture on a functional basis for fiscal year 1940. The number of employees of the Department of Agriculture is well below the 1940 employment figure for the Department of Agriculture. This is true for no other major department in our Government, but this fact in itself cannot be used as a justification of the present budget.

In drawing up a budget for the Department of Agriculture, it was necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture and for the Appropriations Committee to take into account the following considerations:

First. Mandatory requirements of the law must be fully and faithfully executed and activities essential to a sound agricultural economy should be maintained.

Second. Research programs should be strengthened and redirected to make maximum contribution to current problems, with full recognition of State, local, and private participation in research and scientific development work.

Third. Savings should be made by finding more economic and efficient methods of operation.

Fourth. Every effort should be made to withdraw or curtail Federal expenditures for activities where State and local governments and private enterprise can and should assume more responsibility.

The task of reducing expenditures in the Department of Agriculture is not an easy one. It is a task, however, which is not impossible and one which must be faced up to in all departments of the Federal Government if this country is to remain strong as a nation. The present administration has inherited a $267 billion national debt. In addition to this, the Eisenhower administration inherited $90 billion in unspent authorizations which had been approved by previous sessions of Congress, but were not reflected in the national debt figure.

The financial position of our country as the new administration takes over is indeed not good. A policy of deficit financing has been built up here in Washington to the point where it has become an accepted philosophy to pass on to our children and grandchildren the debts which we accumulate today in the form of a huge Federal mortgage levied against their future. Many individuals seem to think that we should keep on spending and spending today so that we can have a good living. The idea seems to be that we should let future generations pay the bills for our good living today. My primary concern in carrying out my duties and responsibilities as a representative of the Seventh Wisconsin Congressional District is to do my part to restore a sound economy to our country. We must balance our Federal budget. We must work to reduce our Federal indebtedness. We must reinstate the principle of good common sense in meeting the problems which confront us as a nation. We must stop running to Washington with our hands outstretched every time a local problem confronts us. There is no pot of gold in Washington, D. C. There are only debts and mortgages which have been piled up by the State and local governments running to Washington with their problems, by military and foreign-aid spending, and by corruption, dishonesty, inefficiency, and waste during the past 20 years.

In my work on the Appropriations Committee, I have kept foremost in my mind the pledges which I made as a candidate for Congress last summer and fall in each of the 10 counties in my congressional district. I pledged to the people of my district that I would do all in my power to do away with the principle of deficit financing in our Federal Government. This can and must be done during the next 2 years. It can be done by everyone's realizing that one of our greatest dangers during this period is not the threat of war, but the even greater danger of spending ourselves into bankruptcy, which would lead us to complete chaos. We could deliver ourselves to international communism without having a shot fired upon us. We can balance our budget by: First, cutting those sections of our budget which have become out of balance since 1940. Second, present and past spending authorizations of all departments must be continually reviewed and curtailed by the executive department.

The budget of the Department of Agriculture in 1940, as approved by Congress, authorized a total expenditure of $1,653,000,000. The budget of the Department of Agriculture in 1953 provided for a total spending authorization of $1,519,000,000. The Department of Agriculture is the only major department of Government which does not reflect a considerable increase over funds authorized in 1940, but, in fact, shows a decrease. This is true despite the fact that in 1953 the Department of Agriculture was charged with losses of $182 million, due to the International Wheat Agreement, and $83.4 million as a result of direct appropriations to the national school-lunch program—this figure exclusive of agricultural surpluses transferred to the school-lunch program by use of section 32 funds in the amount of $50 million in 1953.

The deliberations of our committee as to the financial needs of the Department of Agriculture, together with its related activities, have been centered around the basic need for preserving a prosperous agriculture. This is not limited solely to those engaged in agriculture, but is one of the basic economic problems facing our entire Nation. In this bill we have given consideration to the pressing problems of agriculture, including the need for research in the dairy industry, the need for increased attention to conserving soil of the Nation, the need for basic agricultural research, and the need for a continued high production of agricultural commodities to meet the food requirements of a constantly increasing population.

CONSERVATION OF SOIL

In my work on the committee, I continually was aware of the fine work of the Soil Conservation Service, and the technical and professional help which the Soil Conservation Service has provided the farmers throughout our Nation. The work of the Soil Conservation Service has helped to conserve and protect our soil, which is the greatest physical asset we as a nation possess.

All members of our committee agreed that increased attention should be given to soil-conservation practices of a more permanent nature which add to the value of our soil over a long period of time. Too much emphasis has been placed, particularly in some of our Southern and Western States, on agricultural conservation practices which have only a temporary influence upon a long-range conservation program. The committee recognized that a national program should be encouraged which would place more emphasis on permanent-type practices. The committee recognized, however, that the application of such a national policy at the local level would not be entirely uniform, since the permanent value of certain practices will vary in different areas of the country.

All commitments made for the agricultural-conservation program for crop year 1953 will be fully met by the Department of Agriculture, and the committee has arrived at a compromise figure which will authorize a maximum of $195 million for the agricultural-conservation program for the 1954 crop year. This is $55 million below the recommendation of the former Secretary of Agriculture, but $55 million above the recommendations of Secretary Benson. Under the new program there is some question as to how much of the maximum authorization of $195 million will be actually used. County committees throughout the country are giving consideration to the program for crop year 1954 and will be making their recommendations to the Department. It is impossible to estimate exactly what the total program will cost for 1954.

The budget authorizations for the Soil Conservation Service for 1954 take into

account the fact that the new soil-conservation districts have not been organized as rapidly as originally estimated. The appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service is in contemplation of the development of a plan for the transfer of Soil Conservation Service nurseries, now maintained for the distribution of seeds and tree-planting stock, to soil-conservation districts or other State or local associations or groups who may be ready and willing to take them over.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Perhaps the most important work of the Department of Agriculture is in the field of research. Research has played an important role in the development of agriculture. The contribution of research in solving many of the immediate and long-range problems facing agriculture cannot be minimized. Our committee has attempted to avoid any substantial reductions in this essential work. While the research items have been reduced somewhat below the original budget, our committee's recommendations represent an increase over the 1953 budget for research activities of approximately $2½ million. The Secretary of Agriculture will reexamine the work of the Department of Agriculture in the field of research in relation to the work now being done by the States and by private industry. Secretary Benson has assured us that he will see that these funds are expended in the most effective way possible. In this bill there is a total of $58,177,000 provided for agricultural research activities. Increased emphasis is placed on the Department's research activities in cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations, and with other research agencies, both public and private. Increased emphasis is also placed on the research work now being carried out on dairy products and the important problems facing the dairy industry.

Research work in the Bureau of Dairy Industry has been stepped up by an increase of $69,445 over the 1953 budget. This will enable the Bureau to step up its research program in nonfat-milk solids, cheese, and new milk products. The Bureau brought out in testimony before our committee that this work would be carried on in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin's new Babcock Laboratory.

The committee has attempted to make provisions for all urgent research projects presented to it and expects the Department to use the authority granted to it by Congress to transfer funds from other activities to meet any additional acute problems which may arise during fiscal year 1954 in this most important work.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Those funds necessary to carry out the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in fiscal year 1954 have been provided in this bill. The price-support program, which continues in effect throughout fiscal year 1954, will be administered by the Department in accordance with the intent of Congress. This law provides for the support of basic agricultural products at 90 percent parity, and of dairy products at from 75 to 90 percent of parity. The Secretary of Agriculture announced soon after taking office that dairy products would be supported at 90 percent of parity from April 1, 1953, to April 1, 1954.

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

Adequate funds are provided in this bill for the Rural Electrification Administration and for the Farmers Home Administration. The total maximum loan funds provided in this bill for these two agencies amounts to $402,500,000. One hundred and ninety million dollars is available for electrification loans and $50 million is made available for telephone loans by the Rural Electrification Administration. The Farmers' Home Administration in fiscal year 1954 will have available for farm ownership and housing loans, a total of $35,500,000; for product and subsistence loans, $120 million; and for water facility loans, $7 million.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

The bill provides for a total direct appropriation of $83,365,000 for the school-lunch program. This is the same amount as was available in fiscal year 1953. In addition to this direct appropriation, there will be made available approximately $65 million in surplus commodities to the school-lunch program. The Commodity Credit Corporation will be reimbursed for these commodities from section 32 funds. It is interesting to note that, as far as the school-lunch program is concerned, the Federal Government's contribution has greatly increased during the past 2 years to the cost of this program. In fiscal year 1952, the total Federal contribution to this program was $100 million; in fiscal year 1953 the Federal contribution to this program was in excess of $133,400,000; in 1954, the estimated total contribution on the part of the Federal Government to the program will be approximately $147,000,000.

It is my personal feeling that if the Federal Government is ever to reduce our Federal tax burden and return to the States tax sources for their exclusive use, the individual States will soon be required to bear more of the cost of this program. In 1952, the total contribution by State and local government to this program was $54.4 million; in 1953, the total contribution by State and local government will be approximately $60 million; and, in fiscal year 1954, the estimate of the contribution by State and local government to the cost of this program is approximately $65 million. Almost one-third of our school children are covered by this program. State and local government will be required to make more of a contribution to this popular program in the future if we are to carry out the recommendations made by the Council of State Governments and governors of the various States.

FOREST SERVICE

In this budget there is included an increase in the amount of funds made available for fiscal year 1954 to the Forest Service. Five million dollars were provided in the third supplemental appropriation bill for the Forest Service to construct access roads. Additional funds are made available for access roads in this appropriation bill because of the seriousness of the infestation of Engelmann spruce-bark beetle now spreading very rapidly in spruce timber in national forests in Idaho and Montana; and of Douglas-fir beetle, which is causing widespread damage to Douglas-fir in Oregon and Washington.

The Forest Service engages in three main lines of work: First, management, protection, and development of national forests; second, cooperation with States and private forest landowners in connection with fire protection, forest tree planting, forest management, and extension; and third, forest and range research. Several years ago the Congress inserted language authorizing the institution of cooperative arrangements with States and local organizations relative to research stations and experimental forests. The committee feels that the Forest Service should continue to expand this means of meeting the research needs in those areas not now covered by existing appropriations.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

The Production and Marketing Administration has been provided with adequate funds to carry out the agricultural adjustment programs, Sugar Act, School Lunch Act, removal of surplus commodities, and marketing services, which have been previously authorized by Congress. Funds have been provided as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out that authority delegated to the Production and Marketing Administration to administer price support and related programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The responsibility for the major policy in carrying out the agricultural conservation program has been recently transferred to the Assistant Secretary in charge of research, extension, and land use activities of the Department.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations will be revitalized and reorganized so as to serve the original and primary purpose of this agency. That original purpose was to provide information regarding supplies and prices of agricultural products in foreign markets and smoothing the economic and diplomatic paths over which export products go. It is particularly important that this be done at this time in view of the difficulties experienced in maintaining foreign markets for American farm products. In the past few years, this service has been very ineffective and it is hoped that the reorganization by the present Secretary of Agriculture will restore the effectiveness of this agency.

It is my sincere hope that the House will act favorably upon the report of our committee on the Agricultural Appropriations bill for 1954. This report is supported by each member of our subcommittee, realizing full well the importance of agriculture and its related activities to our whole economy.

In seven separate instances, we have given notice in our report that specific control activities of the Department of Agriculture must revert to the States and become the responsibility of the States. We have given notice so that the States can assume the responsibility in the

future for several of these control programs.

As a member of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, I assure you, my colleagues here in the House, that I have worked diligently to eliminate unnecessary expenditures of Federal funds by the Department of Agriculture.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, has impressed me in his appearances before our committee. He seems to me to be one of the most able, conscientious, and outstanding members of President Eisenhower's new Cabinet. He has a thorough understanding and interest in the problems of agriculture because of his long background and experience as a farmer. His patriotic and religious devotion to his country is something that I admire and respect. I have great confidence in his administrative ability and the leadership he will give this important Department of our Government. I say this not because I represent a dairy district and we at last have a Secretary of Agriculture who recognizes the importance of the dairy industry, but because of the impression that he left with all members of our committee of his awareness and knowledge of our entire agricultural economy. His task is indeed a difficult one. The problems he has inherited are not of his own making. He has solicited the help of all of us regardless of political label, and it is our duty to help him in every way possible.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has made a splendid address, and in connection with it I should like to call attention to a fact that has not been expressed here today, and that is that the bill before us has a net decrease in personnel below 1953 of 1,469 positions.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for including that important information.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I also would like to say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] will, in my opinion, become a worthy successor to his predecessor, the late Reid Murray, who was held in high esteem by the Members of this House.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. I wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin on his very forthright and very informative statement. Like myself, he is a new member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture. I have enjoyed my association with him tremendously and I feel the gentleman has made a very concrete and very valuable contribution to the work of our subcommittee.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, the vigorous progress in agriculture in this country during the last half century is a monument to agricultural research. It has been a continuous battle to keep ahead of ravages of insects and diseases and the depletion of soil fertility. Unfortunately, research frequently does not receive the support to put an army on the field until the battalions of diseases and pests have virtually won the battle.

The history of the sugarcane crop in Louisiana provides a good example of such a situation. During the early twenties, Louisiana was producing good crops of cane, providing about 300,000 tons of sugar a year. Even then a few people recognized that serious diseases were threatening. These enemies in the form of sugarcane mosaic, red rot, and root rots struck rather suddenly and viciously. By 1926 sugar production in Louisiana had dwindled to a mere 48,000 tons. An entire industry faced liquidation. Vigorous cooperative research efforts by the United States Department of Agriculture, the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station, and the American Sugar Cane League resulted in the importation of several disease-tolerant varieties that saved the day and the initiation of research toward breeding disease-resistant varieties. Louisiana is now producing about 400,000 tons of sugar annually from varieties of cane developed at the United States Sugar Plant Field Station in Canal Point, Fla.

New and ominous warnings are on the horizon, however. Two previously unreported diseases of sugarcane were found in Louisiana last year. Should we wait and see whether or not these diseases ravish a productive agricultural crop, or should we protect Louisiana farmers by supporting the necessary research to combat these diseases?

It is granted that there have been tremendous increases in appropriations for agriculture during the past two decades. Let us consider how production research on sugarcane has been affected: In 1933, the Bureau of Plant Industry had funds to support 18 scientists working on this crop; by 1941, the number was down to 14; and by 1952 funds were available to carry only 7 scientists. The pending bill would not only result in a further reduction in force but would make other drastic cuts in our research program.

NEED FOR WORK

During the past 25 years the per capita consumption of sugar in the United States has averaged about 100 pounds, and the estimated consumption for 1953 is 8,200,000 tons.

During the 4-year period from 1948 to 1951, the average annual production of sugar in the continental United States and its possessions has been approximately 4,380,000 tons or about 55 percent of the total consumption within the United States. During the same period the annual production of beet and cane sugar within the continental United States was 2,070,000 tons or only one-fourth of the current annual rate of consumption in the United States.

Every time this country has become involved in a war, sugar is the first item of food to become rationed. The serious stresses of national emergency provide indisputable evidence of the importance of maintaining a vigorous and economically sound domestic sugar industry.

Since our native sugar crops are produced in direct competition with foreign countries where wages and living standards are comparatively low, it is mandatory that the American farmer be able to produce sugar with maximum efficiency, particularly in view of the relatively high capital investment and high wage rates that he has to face. It is, therefore, highly essential to continue efforts to breed superior varieties of sugarcane having hybrid vigor, resistance to disease, high sucrose content, outstanding keeping qualities in storage and adaptable to mechanical field operations.

The Sugar Advisory Committee on Production, Marketing, and Research at each meeting for the past 4 years has emphasized and reemphasized the need for an expanding research breeding program on sugarcane and sugar beets. The Committee stated unqualifiedly that it gave that recommendation the highest priority in the entire field of sugar research.

MAINLAND CANE PRODUCTION

The State of Louisiana produces about 270,000 acres of sugarcane annually and Florida about 36,000. The sugar produced in those 2 States has an average annual value of about $58 million. In addition to sugar, these 2 States produce about 45 million gallons of molasses annually, with a present value of about 10½ cents to 11 cents per gallon; also about 750,000 tons of bagasse which is used in the manufacture of wallboard, poultry litter, and will be used for the manufacture of paper and dissolving pulp within another year upon completion of a plant which is now being constructed for that purpose in Louisiana.

In order for Louisiana and Florida cane growers to successfully compete with offshore areas having low standards of living, it is essential that production be maintained at the highest possible level of efficiency.

Varieties of cane that produce well in Louisiana and Florida must be somewhat different from those grown in other sugarcane areas in the world. They must mature early, having resistance to cold, and be adaptable to mechanical harvesting in addition to resistance to numerous diseases, such as mosaic, chlorotic streak, red rot, root rot, and so forth. Thus, major emphasis should be given to the breeding program and to isolating and characterizing the strains and varieties of sugarcane that are especially valuable as superior parents.

BREEDING IS COMPLICATED AND EXPENSIVE

Sugarcane breeding is expensive work. For instance, it has been shown that only 1 out of about 250,000 sugarcane seedlings becomes a promising variety. At the present rate of variety yield, deterioration and the ominous threat of diseases, there is an urgent demand by sugarcane growers for the development of several

potentially superior varieties of sugarcane per year.

By using present personnel and facilities to the utmost during 1952, the combined efforts of Louisiana, Florida, and the United States Department of Agriculture permitted the production and testing of only 75,000 new seedlings which is less than one-third of the number that should be tested in order to meet the varietal needs of the industry.

The primary obstacle to sugarcane breeding is that only a very few existing varieties will bloom in the United States. Consequently, research is urgently needed to ascertain the physiological basis for flower production in sugarcane and to initiate research to find out how to artificially stimulate bloom.

URGENT DEMAND FOR NEW VARIETIES

Existing varieties of sugarcane are continually degenerating and the demand is urgent for new varieties. A variety that is outstanding today will probably be worthless 10 years from now. Research is needed to ascertain why varieties degenerate and whether or not it can be prevented. If a way could be found to prevent degeneration of varieties it would relieve to a certain extent the demand for such a large sugarcane-breeding program.

Varieties of sugarcane being developed must be rigorously tested for sugarcane diseases now present in the United States and also for those that may possibly be introduced and become disastrous to the domestic industry. During recent months two previously unreported diseases of sugarcane have been discovered in Louisiana. One is a virus causing a stunted growth and is regarded as the most serious disease of cane in Australia. The other is a mildew disease that is serious in the canefields of Peru.

IMPORTANT ITEMS

One of the most important items in the budget is a $50,000 fund for building additional greenhouse facilities at field stations in Florida and Louisiana. These additional greenhouse facilities will eliminate one of the main bottlenecks in the present breeding program which is greatly hampered by the inadequacies of such facilities.

Another most important item is the establishment of a secondary quarantine station in Florida where imported canes can be kept under strict observation until all possibility of infection has been eliminated. Although canes imported for breeding purposes are subjected to strict quarantine regulations before they are sent to the Government experiment station at Canal Point, Fla., for use in the breeding program, there have been instances where the first quarantine was not adequate to prevent introduction of disease. The growth-stunting virus from Australian cane undoubtedly would have been discovered and eliminated in a secondary quarantine station like the one proposed.

ADEQUATE FUNDS ESSENTIAL

What I have said about the importance of agricultural research to our sugarcane industry applies with equal force in connection with all other agricultural crops. For instance, the present bill carries an item of $119,000 for sweetpotato weevil control and research, as compared to $238,000 carried in last year's appropriation bill. This is a cut of exactly 50 percent. I appeared before the subcommittee and vigorously protested this wholly unjustified reduction.

The work done by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine Laboratory at Southwestern Louisiana Institute in Lafayette, in charge of Mr. C. H. Gaddis, has been of immense value to the sweetpotato growers in my district. At present experiments are being conducted to determine possibilities of field control of the weevil, and considerable testing and evaluation must be done before a definite program can be placed in operation for effective and economic field control. I do not consider it to be sound economy to render practically useless much of the groundwork that has been laid by curtailing the program at this time and not carrying to a successful conclusion a project in which so much has already been accomplished, but in which the possibilities for still greater service are so evident.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to be penny wise and pound foolish. I believe that the present economy move is being carried on too far too fast when we are asked to cut the budget so severely for agricultural research. I commend the Committee on Appropriations for its efforts to economize and to try to bring the budget in balance, but I suggest that to cripple our agricultural program at its very foundation in the field of research is the wrong approach.

In this instance the committee has recommended an amount wholly inadequate to sustain life in the goose which has laid so many precious golden eggs for the farmers and the taxpayers of the United States. The amount recommended by the committee is not only far below the figure suggested by the so-called Truman budget, but is also out of line with the recommendations of President Eisenhower. I submit that these severe cuts should be restored on the floor of the House. Specifically, at least $150,000 should be allocated for sugar plant research and at least $238,000, the amount we appropriated last year, should be set aside for sweetpotato weevil control and research.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

There are a few things in this bill that I wish to call attention to, and I shall not be very long.

In order that we may have some idea of what the so-called ACP picture is, which is called by some a soil conservation program, I would like at this point to read a letter which went out to all of the major representatives of the Limestone Trust on April 20, 1953. It was signed by Robert M. Koch, executive secretary of the trust.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1953.

MEMBERSHIP LETTER No. 14

The ACP situation has reached a critical point. Both pro and anti groups are making all-out supreme efforts to either save it or drastically curtail it.

The Benson administration has finally reduced its policy on ACP to writing. ACP Memorandum 5 has been issued to State offices with instructions to send it to county offices by April 30. We will have it in your hands before then.

Briefly it puts an end to our National ACP limestone program. From now on you would be on your own to sell your product. Limestone could be used in a few cases but in my opinion the total purchased would not exceed 2 million tons and probably would only be half this amount. You would have to market the other 26 or 27 million tons without any financial assistance.

Some of you may want to buy earth moving equipment as the Benson administration proposes to put a great deal more money into that type of practice.

The Farm Bureau is spending a great deal of money to bring key farmers to Washington to testify, interview their Congressmen and have friendly banquets with their State Congressional delegations. This is very potent and extremely difficult to combat.

Members recently received a letter dated April 3 and April 16 addressed "To Persons Interested in the ACP." These were sent to you for your information but were primarily for the 3,000 county PMA offices, State offices, etc. We have been asked for hundreds of additional copies. Some of you, no doubt, think parts of the letters were too strong. Gentlemen, in my opinion you must fight fire with fire. We are in a last-ditch fight and only Congress can save this program now. To offset the tremendously well-planned tactics of the farm bureau we need extensive grass roots support.

It is coming. Only time will determine the results. We are definitely gaining, although TABER is wielding a big club on his full committee—he has a 10-man majority with a large part of it his own handpicked men. His battle cry upon entering the hearing room the other day was "not 1 cent more than Secretary Benson wants." So the bill may get cut to $140 million in his full Appropriations Committee, even though the Subcommittee on Agriculture passes a larger amount. If it gets cut to $140 million there will be a floor fight to restore it to $200 million. In my opinion we will win this by a very close vote if supporters of the program continue their efforts right up to the moment of the vote, which now is scheduled the week of May 11.

In addition to fighting for a substantial appropriation, I am trying to get directives written into the report of the committee to block the Benson policy of having no lime program. Be sure and keep this letter confidential.

Enclosed is a reprint of Senator MORSE's address at our banquet last January. Every limestone producer ought to be familiar with the basic tenets of Senator MORSE's philosophy on soil conservation. Additional copies are available at $2 per hundred.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. KOCH,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to ask the gentleman in regard to the letter he was reading if he did not think that the reference to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was what you might call the climax of the letter?

Mr. TABER. No; I think that perhaps the climax might be——

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I insist with my good friend, that is one of the high points; I want to insist that that is one of the high points.

Mr. TABER. No; the high point was when he wanted to protect the Lime-

stone Trust and be sure that the Limestone people would not have any work to do amongst the farmers to sell it. That was really the climax of it, and that was his chief objective.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I understand that the gentleman from Minnesota in control of the time on the other side has used all of his time. We have not used all of our time and I would be glad to have the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] taken out of our time. We are very fond of the gentleman from New York even though we had a tough job to get some provisions in this bill reported out over his opposition. But we would be glad to share our time with him.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have allotted 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it is highly significant that in his letter Mr. Koch says to his people that if the Government cannot be forced to assume limestone sales costs then "you would have to market the other twenty-six or twenty-seven million tons without any financial assistance."

It indicates that the authorization contracts with farmers for payments in fiscal year 1955, which appears in the sum of $195 million on page 31, line 14, of the agriculture appropriation bill, is for about 27 million tons of limestone at a cost to the Government of at least $40 million. The Limestone Trust is the chief beneficiary of this appropriation alleged to be for the benefit of the farmers. That alone should be enough to indicate how thinking Members of the House who had a sense of responsibility to the people should vote.

Let us analyze the picture a little further. Of the farmers who now get Federal checks out of this setup, 392,774 receive checks of $20 or less. The number in this category has dropped from 789,000 since 1948. There are 538,552 receiving checks of from between $20.01 to $40; this figure has dropped from 748,000 since 1948. The number receiving from $40 to $60 is 412,085, and this has dropped since 1949 from 478,000, indicating a rapidly lessening interest in the program on the part of the small farmers. In fact, 1,343,411 of the 2,563,956 recipient farmers, or 52 percent of the total number, received less than $60, indicating that it means practically nothing to the farmers who receive the checks. The big beneficiary is not the farmer but the Limestone Trust.

It is very doubtful that the farmer who receives less than $60 would ever go into the central county office and fill out all of the papers and go through all of the redtape that is required to qualify him for this program. But the members of the PMA and the local farm county committee have been receiving per diem and travel allowance from Federal funds for going out and soliciting farmers to sign these applications. If these members of the county committees and the local committees were not allowed to go out and so solicit farmers, the applications would never be made and the administrative expenses which are charged up against this appropriation for operating this program would be cut by at least $10 million. There is a certain amount of "velvet" in this for the members of the committees but the major beneficiary is still the Limestone Trust. This is established beyond dispute by their own statements quoted above from their lobbyist letter to their membership; $140 million with only $16 million out for expenses would leave $124 million for the farmers if they did not have to take care of the Limestone Trust.

Agriculture is a major industry and it should have every possible consideration and I am willing to give it every possible consideration but the budget of the United States is so far behind that we need to catch up. I am sure that the farmers of this Nation are aware of the financial stress of the Government and are willing to cooperate and try to solve the problem.

It is thus apparent that there is really very little actual benefit to the farmers involved. I believe these farmers who receive these small checks are ashamed to take the money and this is not a genuine soil-conservation program but a limestone selling scheme program. The Farm Bureau, the National Grange, and many other local farm units have indicated that they favor a reduction in this item. I believe that 90 percent of the farmers in America would feel that way. Not more than one-third of the farmers in America get a check above $60 and only a very few get a check as high as $150—you can count them very easily in any community.

Why should we continue this enormous complicated operation on such an elaborate basis at a time when the financial credit of our Government is at stake? I am in hopes that when we get to reading this bill for amendment that the membership of the House will follow what I believe to be the desire of the farmers and not allow themselves to be influenced by pressure on the part of the limestone trust, or by those who are more interested in selfish considerations than they are in the welfare of the farmers and their country.

Every other department of the Government has taken a budget reduction in a cooperative spirit. Secretary Benson tried to effect a reduction on what he believed to be a fair and workable basis. Why shouldn't we permit this reduction to go into effect and restore the revised budget estimate of $140 million at this point?

I know that the farmers will probably continue to use limestone if they need it on their land even if there is a reduction in the amount of Federal assistance—most of them always have used it where it was desired.

Frankly, I am in favor of the soil-conservation program where the Department lays out a program to protect the soil. But why we should go on with this program is something that it is very difficult for me to see, especially when you take into consideration the crisis we are in at the present time. It is altogether different from the price-support program, it is altogether different from anything that is involved in the acreage-control proposition.

We must consider also that notwithstanding that there was an authorization of $250 million in contracts left, the use of it and the followup of it has dropped so steadily in the last 3 or 4 years that I can see no possible reason with the declining interest in it on the part of the farmer for our going above the $140 million. It will not stand a real analysis.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, of course, I cannot agree with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has just said in his address to the Committee. There is a complete disagreement between my good chairman and myself as to what is needed for the preservation of our soils. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is entitled to his opinion and he is never backward about expressing his viewpoint. He is courageous, but in this instance, and in my personal opinion, he is mistaken. There has been no indication that I know of that the so-called Limestone Trust has had any effect whatsoever upon the deliberations of my subcommittee or upon any individual member thereof. I repeat, what I said previously today, that if it is not worthwhile to expend one-third of what it costs annually to keep one combat division in operation for the preservation of our soils in these United States of America, then it is time that we reorient our line of thinking. We, on our subcommittee, are trying to prevent the coming of the time when there may not be sufficient food to feed this great Nation of ours, including the constituents of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. We are looking for a solution of how we can produce food for an additional 35 million people in 12 or 15 years' time. We know that means securing the production from an additional 115 million acres by 1965, 12 years from now. It is my opinion that we should leave to the determination of the various States, individually, as to whether or not they wish to have limestone application as one of their practices. We know that many States do want that right given to them. Personally, we do not use much limestone in Minnesota, but at the same time I see no reason whatsoever to say to the Northeastern States, who depend upon the application of limestone to put their soil in shape so that they can produce legumes, that they cannot use limestone if they so decide.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not we like what we call the ACP program, I think it is time for this Congress of the United States to think this thing out clearly to the end and not be drawn down the wrong highway, on a tangent, simply because of some letter that somebody has written. Let us keep in mind the basic problem, and that is, to keep our soil in such shape so that the people of this Nation, your children and grandchildren and mine will have as good food and as much food 50 years from now as we are blessed with today. No program is perfect. We do hope to improve, from year to year, our soil-conservation programs.

Our report, accompanying this bill, says:

> The committee believes that the soil is our greatest physical asset and that everything possible must be done to protect and conserve it.

Our committee further states, page 10 of the report:

> The committee has felt for many years that increased attention should be given to those practices which have more than annual benefits to the soil. It is recognized, however, that application of such a national policy at the local level will not be entirely uniform since the permanent value of certain practices will vary in different areas of the country.

May I, in conclusion, call to your attention that the full Appropriations Committee defeated the motion to reduce the agricultural conservation program for 1954 from $195 million to $40 million. I hope and feel sure that the House will sustain this action for the good of the future of our Nation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to get into the general debate on this bill, but I was interested and prompted to do so by the remarks of my valued friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] when he referred to a Limestone Trust. We have heard the same kind of remarks on previous occasions during past years when the agricultural appropriation bill was up for consideration in the House. As a result of remarks made in the past, and which I anticipated would again be made on this occasion, and they were, I took occasion to find out for myself just what kind of a Limestone Trust there was in this country.

There is a Limestone Association, but there is a National Association of Manufacturers. There are various chambers of commerce, locally and nationally. There are various trade organizations in business and associations in other spheres of human activity in the United States. I do not consider them to be trusts.

My investigation of the limestone industry shows that there are about 1,100 producers of agricultural limestone in the country. That certainly would not indicate a trust. I also found, for example, that during the period 1935 to 1939, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the average price was $4.09 per ton delivered to the farmer. On the basis of figures available for the 1952 period, the comparative price was $3.22 per ton, in spite of the increased cost. Freight rates during that period increased 78 percent. Other increases have taken place. When there is a trust usually it is a monopoly, there is close control, and prices usually are raised. Certainly the evidence in the case of the limestone industry does not impress me with the fact that there is any trust existing.

It is very easy to make the charge, but the facts certainly do not support the charge. With 1,100 producers of agricultural limestone, there is a very highly competitive situation existing throughout the country. That certainly is reflected in the lower price the farmer pays for limestone, at least based on the 1952 figures, as compared with what the farmer paid in prior years.

It is true they have an association. There is nothing wrong with that. Whether or not every limestone producer belongs to the association is something I cannot say. But we have associations of businessmen, various kinds of associations, which are perfectly proper and desirable. Simply because thousands of business concerns might belong to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States does not take away their competitive standing, their competitive ability. The fact they are members of associations like that or any other association does not make that association a trust.

With all due regard to the views of my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. TABER], I think that in this case he is seriously wrong, that his charges of a trust are not supported by the facts. If he argues that an association constitutes a trust, then that is a different situation, but I doubt very much if anybody would pay much attention to a charge that an association of businessmen, properly formed, as this one is, constitutes a trust. I doubt that such a charge could carry much weight in the minds of the Members of this House or anyone else.

So my few remarks, for whatever value they may have, are to convey to the Members of the House the information which to me clearly shows there is a limestone industry in the United States. I am glad there is. But by no means is it a limestone trust.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Assuming that it is just an innocent association, does the gentleman condone the letter that was read?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing wrong with the letter I heard read. If I were writing the letter I probably would write it differently. Knowing my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I would certainly not make any reference to him as "TABER." But if I did not know him and was writing a letter, I see where I might, and without intending to reflect upon him.

So far as the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, there is no one in this House of Representatives or in this country who has a higher respect for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] than the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. I may disagree with the gentleman, but in my disagreement I shall never be disagreeable. But in this respect, I think the facts do not justify the charge that there is a limestone trust in the United States.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I believe in soil conservation, and having worked on this committee and having studied the subject for many years—as I see it, we have not taken care of our country as we should. I welcome the efforts of any and all in the direction that I think that we all should look, and I think that is toward taking better care of our land and toward restoring our land. I trust the people of no community in this country and of no county and/or State would select limestone use as a practice unless there was a need in that area for limestone. Certainly nobody wishes it on any community. Certainly it is a waste of time for the farmer to spend his money and his effort and his labor because the Government pays only about a third of the total cost of application unless he is convinced it is needed on his own farm. The testimony is that the benefits of limestone last from 7 to 8 years depending upon the use that is made of it. What kind of crop is grown on the land and what part of it they take out. It is surprising how great a part of the United States has a need for some basic element in the soil. I happen to know the individual who wrote that letter. He works for his association. I do not blame him for working for them, but sometimes I question whether his efforts, as in this letter, are as effective as they might be. I believe I could have written a whole lot better letter personally if I had the same interest that he has. I do not have that same interest, but I do have the interest of the American people and the Nation at heart when I say we should give more attention to the soil.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, when I asked for time to speak this afternoon, I had no idea I would get into the middle of a controversy with reference to the National Limestone Association. May I say that in the district I have the honor to represent, there are a number of limestone producers. Whether they all belong to the National Limestone Association, I do not know. I do know that many of these limestone producers in the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio are farmers who as a side line have opened limestone quarries and are supplying their neighbors with agricultural lime. May I say that to my knowledge, the limestone interests in the State of Ohio have rendered an outstanding service to the farmers. They have carried on a very comprehensive campaign to encourage farmers to put more land in permanent pasture. Of course, to do that requires a considerable amount of lime. They have carried on this educational campaign for a number of years and have been very beneficial. I am sure the National Limestone Association has participated in this program, and like former Chairman WHITTEN, I have met Mr. Robert A. Koch, the executive secretary of the National Limestone Association, and I have always found him to be a very courteous, capable young man. He has never so far as I know brought any pressure upon me as far as any legislation is concerned.

I want to say that my observation of his activities before the Congress have shown him to be a very fine gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that the gentleman from Massachusetts does

not have a farm in his district. There are no limestone interests in my district. I think there is some limestone in Massachusetts, up in the vicinity of Lee, probably 75 or 125 miles from my district. Like the gentleman from Ohio, I have absolutely no interest other than an objective interest, and certainly I would not accuse a chamber of commerce of being a trust. I may disagree with their resolutions, but I thoroughly respect them as a business association. Certainly I feel the same way toward the National Limestone Association. An association is one thing; a trust is another.

Mr. POLK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

There is another benefit that has come to the farmers through the activities of the National Limestone Association. I can remember a few years ago it was impossible for farmers to secure ground limestone that was fine enough to do the job on the farm. They were trying to sell ground limestone that was too coarse. To my personal knowledge I know that through the activities of the National Limestone Association they have carried on a program whereby ground limestone that is produced and placed on the market today is of sufficient fineness to meet the requirements of the agricultural colleges and State universities.

As I said, I did not plan to speak with reference to that particular item. Having served on the legislative Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives for more than 14 years, I am vitally concerned with the soil-conservation program. On yesterday I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which appears on page A2700, in which I endeavored to show that the funds for the agricultural conservation program should be increased. I am somewhat concerned about the soil-conservation program that was announced by the United States Department of Agriculture on April 10, 1953. This proposed program for 1954 is included in what is entitled "ACP Memo No. 5, Development No. 1," a copy of which I hold in my hand. It was issued by the chief of the agricultural-conservation program and sets forth a guide for tentative developments of State and county programs for 1954.

Memorandum No. 5 is a 23-page bulletin and has been included in part IV of the hearings beginning at the bottom of page 1797 and continuing to the top of page 1808. It is 11 pages of fine print. Memorandum No. 5 spelled out the soil-conservation practices that will be approved for 1954. I do not criticize the practices that are included in memorandum 5. No doubt many are desirable practices for certain areas of the Nation. Only a few of them are applicable to the district and State I represent. I doubt if any Member representing a district east of Kansas and north of the Gulf States will find in Memorandum 5 many soil-conservation practices that will meet with the approval of the farmers he represents.

Naturally, I am most vitally interested in the Federal soil-conservation programs in the State of Ohio and especially those approved practices which will aid soil conservation in the sixth district of Ohio.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] so ably pointed out this afternoon in his very comprehensive report to the House on this appropriation bill, the former procedure, one that was followed for many years by the Department of Agriculture, was to submit the problem of determining suitable soil-conservation practices to the people, first to the committees out in the various States, and after the committeemen in the States had had an opportunity to study this program the plans were sent to Washington and were approved here; in other words, we started at the ground and worked up. But in Memorandum 5 we have a reversal of that proposition, namely, an order from Washington telling farmers what they may do. Under the old program in Ohio in 1951—and that is the latest year for which all figures are available—there were 22 practices carried out by the farmers of my State. And may I say that liming was only 1 of the 22 practices. There were in this list of practices 12 that are included in Memorandum 5, but there are 10 that were carried out in Ohio in 1951 which are eliminated from Memorandum 5. I would like to read you the practices that are eliminated—and it happens that these practices that are eliminated are the ones that were most popular in Ohio.

The first practice that was eliminated is applying liming materials. Fifty-eight thousand nine hundred and fifty farms used that practice in Ohio in 1951; and may I say I am not going to read all of them, but you will find the figures I used in my testimony when I appeared before the Appropriations Committee on this item. You will find the information at page 556 of part 5 of the hearings.

The second practice that has been eliminated was applying phosphate. There were 51,710 farms on which that practice was carried out in 1951.

The third practice was applying potash and it was used on 43,493 farms.

Turning under green manure crops, 23,998 farms.

Seeding increased acreage of legumes and grass, 3,643 farms.

Contour farming, intertilled crops, 553 farms.

Contour farming, close-sown crops, 553 farms.

Clearing land, 605 farms.

Mulching orchards, and so forth, 1,052 farms.

Fencing for protection of woodlands, and so forth, 198 farms.

All of those items have been taken out of the program being approved for this year. So I repeat that I am deeply concerned about the present attitude of the administration with reference to these soil conservation programs. I think that this is one of the most important programs of the Government. In this program we do not give the farmer anything; we merely tell him that if he will spend $2 or $3 of his own money to protect the soil and its fertility, the Government will spend $1 to help him out.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Even though certain practices have been eliminated in the gentleman's district and State, still this program will be of vital interest to the farmers of his State and will be very helpful even without the practices he spoke of. Is not that true?

Mr. POLK. May I say to the former chairman of the legislative Committee on Agriculture of the House, whom I hold in very high esteem, that from the figures I have been able to assemble it would appear that about 90 percent of the total practices that were carried out in Ohio in 1951 are eliminated—that is, taking the total number of farms under each practice—only about 10 percent of the practices that were carried out in 1951 can be carried out under this program. In other words, approximately 90 percent are being eliminated.

Mr. COOLEY. While that is entirely true, the fact remains the farmers who carried out these other practices in former years might carry out new practices under the program that is now being offered.

Mr. POLK. It is possible that they may, but as I tried to point out a minute ago the program that was carried out in 1951 was a program that the farmers worked out themselves. They picked out these practices which they wished to carry out on their farms. They wanted to do these certain things on their land. As a result of the farm committee program they picked out the items that I mention, the applying of lime, phosphate and potash and turning under green manure. Those are the major ones. They also had some of these other projects, especially waterways construction and diversion and spreader ditches, the construction of permanent open ditches, and so forth, but only a very small number of the farmers were able or willing, may I say, to engage in that type of practice. So I contend the present administration is forcing the farmers to take a program that they do not want.

Mr. COOLEY. May I suggest to the gentleman, I come from the State of North Carolina, a State that uses more commercial fertilizer than any other State in the Union. Naturally, North Carolina farmers know something about the value of using commercial fertilizer, whereas in other sections of the country fertilizer has not been used so extensively. I want to suggest that this reliming program and the phosphate program have brought considerable criticism to the overall ACP program for the reason it has been felt that the farmer was imposing upon the Government because he was doing the same thing over and over each year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, may I say in answer to the gentleman from North Carolina that I have not heard the criticism he mentions from farmers in the State of Ohio. We have had much unanimity of opinion in approval of the program in Ohio. However, there is no doubt but what in some parts of the country it may not have worked satisfactorily.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. Of course, the farmers have used the practice over and over again, but they have not used it over and over again in the same field and the same spot. I think that is the thing which has created a lot of confusion. A lot of malicious gossip has been spread about a fact that these practices have been used over and over again by the farmer, giving the impression that he is putting that fertilizer on the fields over and over again, which he is not doing. He goes to his field, he puts lime on that field this year, he seeds it down to grass and legumes, then he moves over to another portion of that field or to another field the next year. I see nothing absolutely wrong with that practice.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to make it perfectly clear that I did not suggest that there had been any abuse, but I do suggest there has been a lot of criticism on the floor of the House. Whether that criticism was warranted or not, I do not know. It certainly has not been warranted so far as my own State is concerned.

Mr. POLK. I would like to say that the justification for the advanced authorizations for the 1954 agricultural conservation program by the last administration seem to me to point up this problem very well.

The budget estimates propose an authorization for the 1954 agricultural conservation program amounting to $250 million, the same amount authorized by the Congress for the 1953 program.

May I say that at the proper time tomorrow I shall seek recognition to offer an amendment on page 31, line 14, to increase the amount of ACP authorization to $250 million, the amount of money available this year. I would like to point out in that particular as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] said a little while ago, that is a ceiling; that does not mean that that much money will be spent unless the farmers ask for it, but it does mean that the money is available for them if they can work out a cooperative soil conservation program fitting into the Federal scheme. I certainly hope that the membership of this House will see fit to increase this appropriation to $250 million, the amount that was available this year.

I would like in that connection to point out that the amounts appropriated for the agricultural conservation program for 5 of the last 6 years have averaged slightly more than $264 million annually.

In 1947 the appropriation was $300 million.

In 1948 it was reduced to $150 million.

In 1949 it was increased to $262 million.

In 1950, to $285 million

In 1951 to $225 million.

Last year we raised it to $250 million.

I believe in the interest of a sound soil-conservation program throughout the Nation we should have at least the amount that was available this year.

For more than 100 years this Nation used up its land faster than any other nation in history. Nearly 50 million acres of land which once had been cultivated—more than 1 in every 11 acres of land once capable of growing crops—had become unsuitable for cultivation. Only about 100 million acres of land, representing about 10 percent of the land in the farms, was free from erosion. Attention became focused upon conservation as a national problem and definite steps were taken to provide for the preservation and conservation of the Nation's agricultural resources.

Under the agricultural conservation program and the soil- and water-conservation activities of local, State, and other Federal agencies, extensive progress has been made in reducing erosion and rebuilding soil fertility. However, the Nation is not yet close to balancing its conservation with needs. The Nation has become aware that the concept of inexhaustible resources is false and that the amount of land available for production is very definitely limited. Agricultural resources must be protected and fertility must be built up to safeguard the future ability of the Nation's farms to produce enough to meet the growing requirements of an increasing population.

Over the past 10 years the average increase in population has been more than 2 million persons a year. On the basis of maintaining the 1950 level of diet, farm production, by 1975, would have to be increased by at least 25 percent to meet the normal needs. Most of this increase must come from present acres of cropland and pasture by increasing yields per acre. To get the needed increase, present acres must be built up and losses of productive acres must be checked. Improved varieties of seed, more and better fertilizers, and mechanization will all help to increase yields, but, most important, the basic agricultural resources must be used according to their capabilities and treated according to their needs.

Financial assistance is especially important for the permanent type practices such as erosion control, drainage and forestry which require a substantial outlay of cash and which do not result in immediate cash returns. Although a farmer may recognize the need for carrying out this type of practice, he is influenced by the fact that his interest in the land is for a comparatively short period of time. The interest of the Nation, on the other hand, is for an indefinite period of time, since its strength and welfare depend upon the continued productivity of the soil and water resources.

Soil conservation practices carried out on Ohio farms under the agricultural conservation program in 1951

PRACTICES WHICH BENSON ADMINISTRATION HAS ELIMINATED FROM 1954 ACP

Practice	Farms on which carried out	Extent of practice		
		Acres	Units	
			Unit of quantity	Quantity
1. Applying liming material	58,950	947,651	Tons	1,188,184
2. Applying phosphate (20 percent P_2O_5)	51,710	738,020	do	80,603
3. Applying potash (50 percent K_2O)	43,493	715,227	do	19,929
4. Turning under green manure crops	23,998	380,690		
5. Seeding increased acreage of legumes and grasses	3,643	35,010		
6. Contour farming intertilled crops	553	9,271		
7. Contour farming close sown crops	553	9,518		
8. Clearing land	605	4,122		
9. Mulching orchards, etc	1,052		Tons	8,767
10. Fencing for protection of woodland, etc	198		Rods	16,673

PRACTICES WHICH BENSON ADMINISTRATION HAS RETAINED IN 1954 ACP

1. Establishing sod waterways	1,780		Square feet	296,937
2. Constructing diversion and spreader ditches, dikes, and terraces	139		Rods	8,778
3. Constructing permanent open drainage ditches	593	[1] 13,177	Cubic yards	308,864
4. Installing enclosed drains (tile)	8,931	[1] 72,502	Rods	1,718,889
5. Seeding pasture and rangeland	3,239	29,460		
6. Dams for livestock water	404	[2] 404	Cubic yards earth moved	489,000
7. Developing springs and seeps	42	[2] 42		
8. Tree planting	1,085	5,397		
9. Improving stand of forest trees	7	99		
10. Contour stripcropping	1,415	18,548		
11. Stripcropping not on contour	185	3,734		
12. Constructing terraces	61	1,137	Linear feet	176,000

[1] Drained.
[2] Structures.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time at the moment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, according to the statements made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK] there seems to be some confusion about the duties and responsibilities of the present PMA county committees. I should like to read a statement by the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to the responsibilities and duties of the county committees in the agricultural-conservation program and the use he presently intends to make of them in his administration of the program. I quote the statement of Secre-

tary Benson, appearing in our hearings at page 901:

You may be assured that I am aware of the splendid contribution PMA county and community committees have made to agriculture and that we intend to make the best possible use of these farmer-elected committees in administering farm programs.

I have recently revised the regulations governing PMA county and community committees. In the revised regulations we made it abundantly clear that these committees will have local responsibility for the agricultural-conservation program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak about that branch of the soil conservation program that builds up the land by keeping the rain drops where they fall, which increases the fertility and productivity of the land.

In my State of Iowa each year many plowing contests or plowing matches are held. Some are county matches, some State matches. A number of times we have had the national plowing contests held in the State, where the national level-land-plowing champion was selected, as well as the national contour-plowing champion.

I should like to take you with me in your minds to a farm in Iowa where one of these plowing contests is held. In the first place, the committee in charge selects the farm and arranges with its owner for the use of it for 1 day. All the owner supplies is the use of the land and permission for the people to roam over it. He also furnishes some of the machinery necessary to do the work.

During that 1 day the entire face of the farm is lifted. As one of our best editors, Mr. Don Berry, of Indianola, Iowa, who has spent almost a lifetime in the study of soil conservation, told me a few years ago, when the face of a 120-acre farm is lifted in one day's time at one of these plowing contests it adds 40 acres in value to the farm, or 33⅓ percent. I am sure that the future will bear out those figures.

Just what happens in one day of these contests? In the first place, the farmers are taught by demonstration how to plow around a hill, contour plowing. Do you realize that many of our best farmers have prided themselves for many years on their ability to plow a straight furrow, that if they start plowing around a hill or a slope they will end up going straight up and down it, and each furrow becomes a conduit to carry the soil down to the creeks, and then to the rivers, and then to the oceans? Therefore, they teach them to plow around by marking out with limestone markers lines around the hill. But first they show them the advisability of not plowing the top of a hill but leaving it to sod. About a third or half way down the hill they leave another strip of sod; and if it is a long slope, still another one before they get to the foot of a hill.

About every 10 rods in the plowed part they will throw 2 or 3 furrows together to make a breaker for the purpose of holding the water. The farmers see that. They learn the advantage of it. Next year they have the privilege of coming back and seeing the results in increased productivity on those hills that have been put under the contour plan. Next, they fill up the gullies and the ditches and seed them over. Also, they fill them up in such a manner with straw and trees that they will not wash out again. Sometimes tubes are put in underneath to drain off the water. Then with bulldozers and shovels they dig out a pond or a place for a pond or a lake, and when that fills up the farmer stocks it with fish. In 2 years after one of those ponds has been stocked with the right kind of fish, they can get 1½- and 2-pound crappies and bass in addition to holding all that water on the land and preventing it being washed into the streams and eventually into the ocean. Also at these plowing matches, the farmer is taught the use of fertilizers of all kinds, including limestone and how best to apply it to the soil. In addition, he is taught the value of the rotation of crops as well as many other things.

Mr. Chairman, in the time left to me I want to compare the value of that and what it does for the building up of our soil and preserving it with some of the things that have been proposed and are going on in certain parts of the land that take valuable soil out of production. I mean the building of dams in those parts of our country where dams are not necessary for reclamation purposes as they are in the Western States where they have deserts and they build a dam to provide water for irrigation purposes, which actually brings to the American people more land to produce more for their benefit. But to build a dam in the Mississippi Valley basin where irrigation is not necessary is only to take out of production and off of the tax rolls hundreds of thousands of acres of the most valuable land in the United States. I am not opposed to the building of dams for the prevention of floods and protection against floods, but I do say the building of dams without first doing everything we can to preserve the soil by keeping the raindrops where they fall is putting the cart before the horse. You know on the Mississippi River between Keokuk and St. Paul, there are more than 14 sets of dams and locks. They have been there for years.

A year ago last month in coming back to Washington from Iowa, I had to cross the Mississippi River. I could not cross at Davenport. I drove down to Muscatine and I got across, but 2 hours later on that day I would not have been able to cross there because of the floods. Do dams prevent the floods? No; they do not. Once the water gets off the soil into the stream and into the rivers, we have floods just the same. A few years ago I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Public Works, and at one of its sessions one day, many of the Army engineers came up. I questioned one of them. Finally, he admitted that if every farm that drains into the Mississippi River or into the Missouri River was put under the soil-conservation program, as I have demonstrated here, and as it is demonstrated at the plowing contests, 50 percent of the water which now goes into the rivers would remain on the soil where the raindrops fall. My next question was how often then would we have a devastating flood such as we had in 1947 if every farm were put under this plan? He said not more than once in every 75 years. First, we should do everything to build up and increase and even appropriate more money for the kind of soil conservation that increases the fertility of the soil and preserves it for the future, and also prevents the taking of valuable land out of production and putting it under water instead of taking it out from under water and putting it under production. In those States of our Nation where it is necessary to build the dams to get the water for irrigation purposes, let us build them—build for the future. I greatly appreciated the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], when he said two things were necessary, namely, to preserve valuable soil that we have by building it up and also to reclaim the nonproductive soil we now have and make it productive.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if, in his opinion, this appropriation bill in any way decreases the amount of money appropriated for the building up of our soil such as is practiced at our plowing contests.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My answer to the gentleman on that specific question would be that if this bill goes through, as proposed, we will have as good a program for the preservation of our soil as it is possible to get through the Congress today.

In addition, I might state to the gentleman that the pilot-plant operation we have proposed in this bill for the upper watersheds is a distinct step forward, and along the line that the gentleman advocates.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Do I understand from the gentleman's statement, for which I thank him, that this upper watershed proposal in this bill, for which there is $5 million set aside, will tend to keep the water in the tributaries and streams up on the farms, and keep it from going down to the rivers where it washes the soil away?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We hope that the suggested pilot-plant program will prove the advisability of doing just what you propose.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman, and I congratulate him, as well as the members of his committee, for bringing out this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to congratulate the gentleman from the State of Iowa for the fine speech he has just made, explaining how the plowing contest was carried on, and in helping the farmers learn and see what value there is in contouring and all the practices which the Soil Conservation Service recommends. The gentleman has made a very fine presentation. Of course, we in Iowa are

very proud of the fact that the farmers in Iowa have done a wonderful job in the preservation of the soil, but still there is a great deal to be done.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to thank my colleague from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who has taken a great interest in the preservation of our valuable soil at home, and emphasizes the old saying, "There is no substitute for knowledge." The demonstrations put on at these plowing contests give knowledge to the farmer that he needs to preserve his own soil.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I am wondering why there seems to be so much difference between the statement of the Army engineers with regard to what effect upstream soil conservation practices have with regard to flood prevention. I believe you say they told you it might result in a 50-percent increase.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes. That was the testimony of the witness before the Public Works Committee several years ago when I personally interrogated him. It was like pulling teeth to get him to admit it because he was favoring the building of dams for power purposes more than for flood control. But after some discussion he did finally admit to me that if every farm in the Mississippi Valley Basin was put under the soil-conservation contour system, as is provided by Congress—an educational program—that 50 percent of the water that is going into the streams will be held on the land where the raindrops fall. My next question after that was if we did that how often would we have a devastating flood like we had in 1947, and he said not more than once in 75 years. I do not see any conflict in his testimony at all. It was a question of building up the land and then, after that is accomplished, building what dams are necessary. If the soil is not built up and is permitted to wash into the streams, it is gone just as much as if it was washed into the Gulf of Mexico. The thing to do is do the first thing first and the next thing next.

Mr. WHITTEN. I join in the statement made by my colleagues on that side of the aisle. Friends of America and American agriculture know no dividing line when it comes to soil conservation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do want to say that I want it clearly understood that what is in this bill on flood prevention does not attempt to resolve this major difference that exists between the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Engineers and between the Agriculture Committee and the Committee on Public Works. I have my own views about that, but this is merely an effort to use the authority of the Department to do a very necessary work on a pilot-scale basis and thereby prove the value of this approach to it. I want it understood because we do not want to lose a very major effort, as I see it, which has great potentialities for the future benefit of the country. Let us hope it is understood because it might be taken that we were trying through this means to resolve a difficulty that we all know does exist.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman, and my position is exactly the same as his. I am not against the building of dams to prevent floods and devastation to save our people, but I do say that the most important thing is to keep the raindrops where they fall; then we will know better what can be accomplished.

Mr. WHITTEN. I did not mean to get the gentleman into that side of the question, but we do not want to lose this effort here because someone might misunderstand and think that in trying to deal with this question we are trying to settle something else.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No; we do not want to lose sight of the value of limestone. It is very valuable.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I speak about this bill as a farmer, and I would like to state in a few words, in the short time I have, what I think the basic farmer-interest is in this matter.

In my honest opinion the reason that the farmers have been comparatively poor in our economy over all these years is that the farmers, by reason of overproduction, have necessarily had a poor bargaining position in a free economy. In this country agriculture is rapidly approaching the stage where it is outside of a free economy. A great many people are free enterprisers until it comes to farming, and then they think the Government should take a hand and furnish aid from tax money to promote production, when as a matter of fact the farmer is looking forward to that day when profits will be the incentive for production. He will always produce just as much with that incentive as this country can possibly eat.

We have learned from the previous speakers about the great hunger of the world and the impending growth of our own population requiring millions of extra acres, yet there are thousands of farmers back in the country hoping for the quick arrival of the day when demand will equal the supply they produce.

We certainly must recognize today that we have overproduction; in fact, this country is almost choking with food, and the Government does not know what to do with all it holds, all of which hangs over the free market like a weight waiting to cut off the head of any speculator who might offer a little more money for it.

This program of the Government encouraging overpromotion of agriculture has gone on in this country for 50 to 75 years on a nonpartisan basis, all because this Government, mainly here in Washington, felt that it was either good policy or good politics to give the farmer more and more. Today we are discussing an appropriation bill which gives him in an item or two more than he wants, more than he is entitled to in the interest of the consumers, the taxpayers, or even himself, and I think I can speak in behalf of a host of farmers who by their own ingenuity and hard work have established themselves as efficient operators in the production of food.

The whole theory of the Government has been one of protective charity but actually the result has been overproduction, so that the market prices never seem to quite cover the farmers' expenses without all of this Government aid. The sooner the population increases in this country so that supplies are a little short, the better it will be for the farmer because then he will be in a position where he can get higher prices.

I believe in real conservation. We have a longtime interest in the future, and, as I said, I believe in real conservation, but there is a lot in this so-called conservation program that is phony when it comes to real conservation. First you must remember that nothing uses up our soil reserves quite so fast as use in the growing of crops. Less use in crop production is real conservation. Then on top of that, the Government supplies free chemicals to put into the soil for growing more and more crops. Some of these practices are perhaps in the interest of the longtime future, but a great many of them are strictly in the interest of current year's operation.

We find the Government spending some $69 million for lime and other materials. Incidentally, I think as a farm operator I use perhaps more lime than any other individual farm operator in the East. The Government has helped me to pay for a lot of it in the past. When it is applied to annual practices it is an absolute travesty upon justice, an absolute detriment to the farmer in the long run in that it pays him a part of current operating expenses and thereby increases the surplus. There is no more reason for doing that than to pay the rent for the corner grocery storekeeper.

Mr. Benson came to this committee and said he could get along with $140 million instead of $195 million, which was projected for 1954. Of course, he can. It will be very easy because in 1953 we propose to spend $82 million for lime, phosphate, and other minerals, whereas he proposes only $24 million, a reduction reasonably accomplished by simply stopping the free gift of materials which contribute nothing to conservation.

Where does he get it? Nineteen million dollars is currently being supplied to farmers for the growing of cover crops on an annual basis. I plant a lot of rye in the winter-time and cover crops in the summer, all using lime, then I plow them down and use the humus in the production of other crops. That just becomes a current part of my operation. Nineteen million dollars is being given away this year just for lime and fertilizers for green manure and annual cover crops. Eleven million dollars more is being given away strictly for pastures.

What are pastures? Pastures are not necessarily soil conservation. It depends on how they are grazed. Certainly the purpose of fertilizing and liming pastures is mainly for the production of food for beef.

In my estimation, the whole reduction of $55 million could be made by stopping these heavy payments for practices

which have no real relation to permanent conservation.

I want to point out a few other ridiculous practices that exist over the country. There is the protecting of summer fallow, which takes $5 million. Summer fallow, as you know, is that practice which denudes the land of all its summertime growth and holds it so that it will catch more rain so as to build up the soil moisture and improve the later crop. But, under summer fallowing land is fully exposed to erosion, so they list furrows in it at Government expense.

Subsoiling, that means digging the soil deep, $1,200,000.

Deep plowing sandy soil, $900,000. There is not one of those practices which is in line with soil conservation.

Estimated portion of reseeding pastures that have previously been seeded, $16 million.

Fencing to protect wood lots, $1 million.

Building stock trails, $61,000.

Weed control by tillage, $1 million.

Weed control by chemicals, $1 million.

Seeding hay crops, $500,000.

We pay one farmer under this program for clearing land for putting in crops; then we pay another farmer for reforestation. Clearing land is not conservation. In fact, the best way to save our land for the next generation is stop farming it until it is needed. There is nothing better than weeds and natural cover to conserve the land.

Overproduction is the worst form of waste of soil resources.

This agriculture conservation program could be logically cut by 100 million. Surely we can get along on the 140 million asked by the Department.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle for the fine work they have done in providing us with this, shall I say, straightforward and forthright approach to the problems of agriculture. I have always felt that this committee is more than a committee on appropriations, because in many ways it lays the groundwork for the agricultural programs that will be really and truly promoted to help the farmers in the coming year.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to use the remaining portion of my time to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business I wish to discuss this afternoon the tragic and desperate plight now presently existing in the mining industry, and I especially wish to direct attention to the conditions that now exist in the lead and zinc operations. Our committee held hearings in four different localities in the West, where more than 60 percent of the lead and zinc mine operators are engaged in producing these ores. There were many mine operators representing small, middle-sized, and large operations who appeared before our committee. And in these hearings we covered the mining areas in the States of Colorado, California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Utah, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Arizona, and the tri-State district of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri.

The tragic story of the destruction of our metal mines was told by these lead and zinc producers, and I repeat again the small producers, the large producers, and the miners themselves fresh from the work stoops, labor-union representatives, and mine owners employing 10 to 30 men and up to as many as 600. We collected the opinions and the suggestions of a cross section of the mineral producers of the entire West.

Top executives of large mining organizations—union executives—appeared before us and told us that something had to be done if production was to continue. Chamber of commerce representatives and industrial leaders came before us and added their advice and suggestions.

Mr. Chairman, I shall include in my remarks excerpts from the testimony taken from these hearings and I know it will shock the Members of this House to learn of the tragic plight and the certain destruction of our lead-zinc domestic mining industry. Small-business operators, every one of them, now are standing on the very brink of total eclipse. Mr. Chairman, I became firmly convinced after hearing the statements of these actual miners and operators that only through quick and affirmative action by this Congress passing legislation, such as proposed by the sections 324, 325, and 326 of the Simpson bill, can we in my opinion save the lead and zinc industry. Otherwise, it will be eliminated from our economy.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time for political quibbling or political wrestling for advantage. No, I am certain we should lay aside every political aspect or approach to this question and approach it through and on a nonpartisan basis, and pass whatever legislation which in our judgment and our considered opinion seems necessary to stem this certain movement toward the crisis and the end of the domestic mining industry.

What if this legislation now before us does not immediately solve all our troubles? It does make an attempt in the right direction and should prevent the complete closing down of the lead and zinc industry. We may be able later to propose and pass legislation more to our liking than the particular bill we are now considering, but in my own mind I am certain we cannot delay longer. Action on the sections of the Simpson bill proposing a sliding scale tax on imported lead and zinc up to and including a price of 15½ cents per pound should be enacted into law with the greatest dispatch possible.

Let me quote from the testimony given by Robert S. Palmer, of Denver, Colo., executive vice president of the Colorado Mining Association at the Denver hearings. Mr. Palmer had this to say about the Simpson bill, and I quote:

> The Simpson bill is designed in substance to save the industry from destruction in providing for a sliding-scale stabilization import tax on lead and zinc. It proposes to maintain the American standard of living within the mining regions of the Nation. A base price on lead and zinc upon which the tax is to be determined is fixed at 15½ cents, adjusted periodically by the Bureau of Labor Statistics index on primary market prices for other than farm and food. It amounts to 1 cent plus 1 cent per pound for each 1 cent the market price is below the base price. For ores and concentrates imported into the country the tax would apply in a similar manner but in an amount of seven-tenths of a cent per pound for lead content and six-tenths of a cent for zinc content.

Continuing to quote Mr. Palmer:

> The preservation of our domestic mining industry is purely that of self-interest. It involves the economy of our people here in the West, and in the various mining regions of the Nation. Mining is a basic industry. The operators of mines produce new wealth. They maintain the economies of many sections of the Nation. The railroads, the trucking lines, the power companies, and other utilities depend largely upon the mining industry for revenue. The retail merchants, the farmers, the ranchers, and all those who supply the miners, including the manufacturers, are affected when mines go down. Professional men, schoolteachers, and others all have a genuine interest in the welfare of the mining industry. It therefore seems proper that those who represent the mining industry should present a case to the Small Business Committee purely on the basis of self-interest.

The idea that a mine can be reopened overnight is absolutely beyond the realm of reason. There are those who have been proposing that we store our minerals in the ground, or just leave them where they are so we can get them immediately if needed. But this is impractical, for in the first place it is a well-known fact that in a great many areas underground pressure and movement takes place which destroys the tunnels, the shafts, and the working places. It would be very expensive to maintain the runways keep the machinery in shape, and underground waterflows would have to be kept pumped out and away from the machinery. Flooding and caving would take place and this would involve tremendous, continuous expenses.

An active, healthy, going mining industry is the best conservation of American mineral resources. This provides for the recovery—yes—a more efficient recovery of the natural resources of our country. It prevents losses of the reserves which otherwise would occur, and makes them available for quick usage when they are stockpiled on the surface, usage which can be taken advantage of if America should be attacked or war should threaten. This is a sensible and a sane approach to this question and I am sure is worth more than any theory that can be developed about what we should do with our natural resources.

Is it wise to place the safety and security of our Nation on the mere possibility of acquiring strategic minerals from foreign nations? No, my friends, there is a first-class hazard involved here. This is a chance, in my opinion, which we cannot afford to take. We should not jeopardize the safety and security of our Nation by relying on the possibility of securing strategic materials when war begins. Recently the Bolivian Government was overthrown and the tin mines were seized. Now that could happen to any

foreign country where we might be procuring lead or zinc, and within a few days we might find it impossible to obtain any ore. In addition, the fact remains that in a real hot war submarines would undoubtedly sink any ships that tried to bring ore across the ocean. And further, with airplanes as thick as they would be, it would not be safe to try to transport ore from one nation to another, or even the metal itself in a refined form. No, my friends, we just dare not place our whole country in jeopardy by depending on foreign sources for strategic minerals.

To give you an illustration of what has been going on in New Mexico, the testimony showed that in one small community 1,200 men were employed in 1952 and by the first of May in 1943 only 300 men were employed in mining. Mining payrolls have been reduced in the first 4 months of 1953 by at least 25 percent. In normal times the western part of the United States produces two-thirds of all the zinc and lead used in our country. From December 1951 to October 1952 the imports of lead and zinc increased 70 percent. You can understand what I am talking about when I tell you that the small-mine operators of the West are certain that imports are causing the decline in lead and zinc prices.

And from other testimony given to our committee I learned that if present conditions force the closing of the major portion of the domestic lead-zinc mines, then it is but logical to assume that the smelters and refiners will also be forced to close.

With the smelters and the refineries closed, the miners will be unable to sell the ore, to market the ore in its proper form. Consequently every mine will be shut down, and along with them many of the mills which have been milling the ore for small independent mines. With the larger mills closing down there is no possibility of the small miners being able to continue operation.

Foreign producing nations do not have the smelting and refining capacity to treat the additional ores that would be necessary if our zinc and lead mines were closed. They may have the facilities to smelt and refine the production that they have now for their own markets at home, but with the great increase in the ore that we would need they would not have the mill nor the smelter capacity to handle it. This means that we, the American taxpayers, would be paying, after our mines were closed down, much higher prices for our lead and zinc to enable foreign producers to expand their operations and build extensions to their plants to supply the necessary metals for our requirements. Again I say that this would bring about a most disastrous condition which would jeopardize our very life should war arise.

Mr. Chairman, another interesting matter was brought to our attention and that was the wages which are paid to the men who are mining in foreign countries. We were told by competent authorities that the quantity of ore mined per man in many of these countries is just about as high per man per hour or per day as it is in this country, especially if the mine is properly equipped.

Here are some of the daily wages: In this country, for example, Utah pays an average wage of $15.92 per day. The testimony showed that the average for the United States was from $12 to $15 per day.

Canada also pays high wages of from $12 to $15 per day. Other countries: Morocco pays $1.50 per day; Peru, $0.50 to $2 per day; Guatemala, $1.50 per day; Germany, $1.35 per day.

I shall include in the RECORD the United States mine production on lead and zinc imports from 1930 until 1952. Let me just give you a few of the figures and then place the charts in the RECORD. In 1939 the average price of lead was 5.05 cents. That is the price per pound. The United States mine production was 414,000 short tons. The imports were 86,800 short tons. The production percentage of imports was 21 percent, and dropped in 1933 to 2.8 percent of our average domestic consumption. By 1940, and during the war, the imports increased. We find that in 1952 lead had reached a price of 16.47 cents per pound. That is the average domestic price. And we produced in the United States 375,000 short tons. But the imports were 637,000 short tons or 169 percent of our domestic production. In 1949, domestic production and foreign imports balanced. Zinc production paralleled that of lead. In 1939, zinc was worth 5.11 cents and we mined 583,000 short tons, but we imported 67,000, or about 11½ percent of our consumption. The price of lead was 8½ cents per pound. We produced 614,000 short tons, and imported 479,000, or 77.94 percent. Then in 1952 the imports of lead were 85 percent or only 15 percent less than our total domestic production.

If you study these tables you will realize what we mean when we say that something must be done to prevent the dumping of lead and zinc on our domestic market when prices are favorable.

This is the first time in the history of the lead and zinc industry that both the large and small producers of lead and zinc have unanimously agreed on legislation they think should be passed to save the industry from ruin.

Let me quote again from testimony given to our committee by the manager of a lead-producing firm in the State of Utah, he said:

> During a few months of 1952 the price of lead and zinc fell 33 percent, which means over a 60 percent drop in our net returns. We are told that this enormous drop was brought about in this way. We gave England millions of dollars in order to help her economy; we gave other foreign countries many millions in order to help develop their mines through direct grants and long-term loans. England buys lead and zinc for her stockpile until she has a huge supply on hand. Then suddenly England needs dollars so she sells her lead-zinc stockpile to us which knocks the bottom out of prices. We really got this metal cheap. We paid to have it produced, we gave England money to buy it, and then we bought it back from England. We paid for it three times.
>
> At the present time zinc is quoted at 11 cents per pound. It costs us 8 cents per pound to market zinc which leaves 3 cents per pound to pay for the mining and milling costs of zinc ore. For example if crude ore runs 10 cents per 10 percent zinc you would have 200 pounds of zinc in a ton of ore. Milling will lose 20 pounds of this so that a ton of this ore is worth $5.40 after it is mined and milled. It costs around $6 a ton to mill this ore and $10 per ton to mine it. In other words, we would lose money on this ore if it were already mined and all we had to do was to mill it.

And so the testimony goes, Mr. Chairman. The meeting at Spokane, Wash., followed the same pattern as the other meetings. Testimony in Spokane showed that our Nation consumes about half the world's lead supply, but our production is only one-third of that requirement. The balance of the need must be supplied from scrap and foreign imports.

Our country consumes 45 percent of the world's supply of zinc and produces two-thirds of our consumption. This testimony was given to us by Henry L. Day, of the Idaho Mining Association.

I think the testimony given by the representatives from the Coeur d'Alene district of northern Idaho was the most striking and impressive of any testimony we received. From this section of the country we received a petition signed by more than 5,000. Employment in this area declined by 600 men in the past 6 months. This was directly attributable to falling lead and zinc prices. In the case of his own company, the Day Mines Co., he said their organization was typical of what was going on in small and medium sized operations. He stated that lead output was the best it had been in recent years. His employment has varied in the last 10 or 12 years from 400 to 600. Today, his testimony showed, he was employing about 270 men and had difficulty preserving even that many men's positions in the company. Since last fall his lead output is off one-tenth and the zinc output is down one-half.

I would like to quote directly from the testimony given by one of the Idaho mine witnesses:

> How many are aware that the Federal Government during World War II was forced to furlough nearly 10,000 soldiers to the nonferrous metal mines? Yet this was the case. The importance of operating mines, large and small, even on a part-time basis, cannot be overestimated. The great majority of local mines must operate continuously or not at all. They are not like a water faucet, to be turned off or on at will. Mines must be maintained continuously, as they cannot be placed in mothballs like a battleship for use in an emergency. Trained workers, or more exactly, an experienced nucleus, must be available in time of national emergency even to expand the output of known ore bodies.

Mr. Chairman, this is real testimony. This is information directly from men who are in the front lines who know what the mining industry is suffering. They know how it operates and they know what the effects are going to be if we allow this industry to pass out of our economic picture, which personally I am convinced is going to happen unless this Congress takes immediate and direct action on this problem.

The chief sources from where our lead and zinc are being imported are: Australia, Bolivia, Peru, Spain, Yugoslavia,

Union of South Africa, Mexico, and Canada.

Each country importing lead and zinc may require a special kind of reciprocal-trade agreement. Time and great care should be used in arriving at a plan suitable and acceptable to the various countries. But while this attempt is being made we should pass the Simpson bill to stem this tide of certain destruction of our lead and zinc production.

Let me give you testimony from a witness to show you some of the foolish contracts we have entered into in the last few years. I read from a witness' testimony at Spokane:

Defense Materials Procurement Agency has contracted for lead from Guatemala over a 7½-year period at prices from 17 to 20 cents.

Mark you, I am reading from the record.

They contracted for zinc from Mexico and Peru over a 5-year period for a price of 16½ cents up to 17½ cents.

This same witness continued:

Canada favors its mining economy with a very attractive tax structure and prudent climate for investors in mining adventures.

I frankly confess that as far as I am concerned I have always felt that our mining industry has been neglected by those who were trying to develop great industries in other countries.

From Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma we had the same testimony. It followed the same line as the testimony we received from other sections, including: Idaho, California, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to place in the RECORD, as part of my address, excerpts from a paper prepared for me by the Library of Congress on the economic problems confronting small mines, and I would like to call to your attention some tables, or charts, in this report:

Over the last few years, an increased number of electrolytic zinc refineries and improvements in metallurgy have brought zinc more and more into the position of an important source of income for small mines. In fact, many small mines, formerly abandoned, can, under a stable and modern price for zinc, be rehabilitated as zinc-silver mines long after they have lost their value as lead-silver mines. But even with these effectively cared for, the miners are still confronted with technical problems of great difficulty since the amount of zinc must be several percent higher in an ore than would make it economical to handle as a lead ore.

The lead-zinc-silver ores, because of their generally small volume and widely variable richness are usually outside the category of big business.

Provisions have been made in the Federal program for gathering of statistics on mineral production, monthly prices, imports, stocks of metals on hand, and other data which are all assembled and reported by the Statistics and Economics Branch of the United States Bureau of Mine, the official data-gathering agency in the mineral field for the Federal Government. Such data assembled by the Bureau of Mines are generally accepted by the industry and Government agencies as being reliable.

From the point of view of the small-mine operator, these data are only the beginning point for the type of complicated analysis and appraisal he would like to have to explain what is affecting the prices and supplies of the metals he produces and all the various forces affecting his operations. Appropriate policies and programs to remedy difficulties should be founded on facts and thorough studies but these are not made.

No agency in the Federal Government has been designated as being responsible for taking these basic statistical data collected by the Bureau of Mines and making economic studies and interpretations in understandable terms that would be available to the small-mine operator. A clear-cut explanation of the various economic and other forces affecting their industry would be generally acceptable.

Maximum benefit that can be gained by the most favorable outcome of action under the escape clause

	Present duty	Maximum possible—New duty	Gain over existing duty
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*
Lead ores, etc.	0.75 (3/4)	1.8	1.05
Lead bullion, etc.	1.0625 (1¼(a))	2.55	1.4875
Zinc ores, etc.	0.6 (3/5)	1.8	1.2
Zinc slabs, stocks, etc.	0.7 (7/10)	2.1	1.4

Zinc: United States mine production and imports

[In short tons]

Year	Average domestic price	United States mine production	Total imports	Imports in percent of production
	Cents per pound			
Section 1:				
1930	4.56	395,425	2,612	0.44
1931	3.64	410,318	1,054	.26
1932	2.88	285,231	2,214	.78
1933	4.03	384,280	3,979	1.04
1934	4.16	438,726	16,002	3.65
1935	4.33	517,903	14,964	2.89
1936	4.90	575,574	11,832	2.03
1937	6.52	626,362	46,020	7.35
1938	4.61	516,703	25,813	5.00
1939	5.11	583,807	66,998	11.48
Section 2:				
1940	6.34	665,698	196,788	29.59
1941	7.47	749,125	194,808	26.00
1942	8.25	768,025	319,519	41.60
1943	8.25	744,196	570,726	76.69
1944	8.25	718,642	486,325	67.67
1945	8.25	614,358	478,835	77.94
Section 3:				
1946	8.73	574,833	376,809	65.55
1947	10.50	637,608	370,271	58.07
1948	13.59	629,977	357,501	56.75
1949	12.14	593,203	367,803	62.01
Section 4:				
1950	13.87	623,375	427,881	68.64
1951	18.00	672,320	390,449	58.06
1952	16.22	661,023	563,029	85.48

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Mines and American Bureau of Metal Statistics.

Lead: United States mine production and imports

[In short tons]

Year	Average domestic price	United States mine production	Total imports	Imports in percent of production
	Cents per pound			
Sec. 1:				
1930	5.52	558,300	78,200	14.0
1931	4.24	404,600	53,200	13.1
1932	3.18	265,000	34,500	11.8
1933	3.87	272,700	7,700	2.8
1934	3.86	287,300	13,300	4.6
1935	4.06	331,100	24,000	7.2
1936	4.71	372,900	23,600	6.3
1937	6.01	464,900	40,900	8.8
1938	4.74	369,700	63,900	17.3
1939	5.05	414,000	86,800	21.0
Sec. 2:				
1940	5.18	457,400	282,500	61.8
1941	5.79	461,400	381,200	82.6
1942	6.48	496,200	492,500	99.3
1943	6.50	453,300	319,100	70.4
1944	6.50	416,900	319,700	76.7
1945	6.50	390,800	300,300	76.8
Sec. 3:				
1946	8.11	335,500	159,300	47.5
1947	14.67	384,200	227,800	59.3
1948	18.04	386,900	347,100	89.7
1949	15.36	404,000	399,500	98.9
Sec. 4:				
1950	13.30	430,800	541,900	123.7
1951	17.49	390,400	257,900	65.5
1952	16.47	375,000	637,000	169.9

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. WHITTEN. We have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read down to and including line 6, page 1, of the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCCULLOCH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State

of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDING RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] be given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House resolution which would amend the rules of the House, so that three members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—to be appointed by the Speaker—would sit as ex officio members of the House Committee on Appropriations at times when atomic energy appropriation bills are under consideration.

If this resolution is adopted, it will make the practice in the House conform with the practice in the Senate. A little more than 2 years ago the rules of the Senate were altered so as to permit 3 members from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to sit as ex officio members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations when atomic energy matters are being considered.

I suggest to the House that this Senate practice is sound and responsible and that it contributes to wise decisions—since atomic energy matters are so complex that joint committee members, who alone have the opportunity of studying such matters the year around, are able to bring added perspective as a supplement to the able judgments of the Appropriations Committee members.

There is another unusual factor here which I should like to stress. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does not have what might be called authorizing jurisdiction. In other words, the joint committee does not under present law have the duty and the authority to report out enabling legislation for each major new atomic project which is to be undertaken.

I stress this point because the Armed Services Committees do have such authority in their field. They do have the duty and the authority to report out enabling legislation for each new military project. Thus, the position of the joint committee in this respect differs markedly from the position of the Armed Services Committees.

Accordingly, on April 15, 1953, I wrote the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, in part, as follows:

> It was the thought of my colleagues on the House side [of the joint committee] that you might see fit to arrange informally for three of us to sit with your committee and Mr. PHILLIPS' subcommittee when atomic energy appropriations are up for discussion.
>
> Since the joint committee does not report out enabling legislation for the various new atomic projects as to which funds are requested, the members have long questioned whether our contact with the fiscal side of the atomic program is now as close as our responsibilities require. An arrangement such as the one I have described might go far in remedying this situation.
>
> However, other standing committees of the House, of course, do normally report out enabling legislation to authorize new programs before the necessary appropriation requests come before your committee. Hence, an invitation to have joint committee members join in your deliberations would not set a precedent which other committees might seek to follow.

On April 21 the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee replied to my letter, saying that he could not extend to joint committee members an invitation to sit in and indicating that, if such an invitation were to be extended, it would set a precedent for other committees. However, as I emphasized, this is not the case—since the joint committee is unique in its lack of authority to report out enabling bills, and hence unique in its need to sit in on appropriation hearings.

For these reasons, I very much hope that the House may see fit to adopt the resolution which I am today introducing. Such approval will, I think, avoid the setting of a precedent and at the same time assist the work of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, because of the lateness of the hour, I will not use the special ordered granted me for this evening but I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, as well as on the following day, after the disposition of all legislative matters on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

OUR ECONOMY AS STRONG AS A PUPPY?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. W. Randolph Burgess, Treasury deputy in charge of debt management, has placed a very low evaluation on the strength of our national economy. He told the New Jersey bankers, May 8:

> The economy is as strong as a bull pup.

It would be more reassuring, if he is compelled to compare our national economy to an animal, if he would at least refer to it as "bull strong" or as "strong as an elephant." Dr. Burgess is a great economist. Possibly he believes other economists understand that kind of a comparison better. I would not know. I do have a very high regard for our economists, both in and out of Government service.

The truth is, the economy at the time Dr. Burgess came in was stronger than it has ever been before, but by reason of Dr. Burgess' activities our economy has become weakened—not so much weakened that it cannot be restored—but something must be done soon in that direction or we are headed for serious trouble.

Dr. Burgess has been the outstanding spearhead for the eastern bankers for a number of years in the drive for high interest rates. It is unfortunate that the administration has selected such a biased, partisan, selfishly interested person to have charge of debt management.

If the hard-money, high-interest policy is not changed, much of the expansion program that has been projected for the last half of 1953 will not materialize. Every day mention is made in the press about different concerns taking another look at the cost increase that is being caused by high interest and tight money.

Dr. Burgess is making an unfair illustration concerning my own views about money, inflation, and high interest.

I do not believe any Member of Congress has a better record in support of anti-inflationary measures—including the very unpopular price and wage controls and tax measures—than I have. Yet, because I agreed that higher interest would be preferable to ruinous inflation, Dr. Burgess seizes upon that as a commitment from me that I favor the present high-interest, tight-money policy. I would only favor higher interest to prevent inflation as the very last resort if it would be effective for that purpose. Several effective weapons can be used before we reach that point. One is the reserve requirements of banks—the ones doing the most business—can still be raised. It would be interesting to know the excuse the Board gives for not increasing these reserves on the big city banks—New York and Chicago—where the law allows it. The Board increased the reserve requirements on the country banks to 100 percent of the amount allowed but not on these big city banks where a very high percentage of the inflation is caused. There are other ways but this one should come first. Furthermore, I am not convinced that higher interest is not itself inflationary, which should be determined before using it as a proposed remedy for inflation.

I am not sure that the threat of inflation is sufficient now to use any one of the many methods that could be used that are anti-inflationary. In fact, the Federal Reserve Board must believe that we went over the hump of inflation a

couple of months ago or the Board would not have reduced the margin requirements on stock exchange transactions. By doing this, it is great encouragement to speculation, which no one will contend is anything except inflationary and causes more bank-created money which the Board claims to be against.

HIGH INTEREST—TIGHT MONEY—CITY BURDENS

In the Washington Herald, May 17, 1953, there is an interesting article by Walter S. J. Swanson about the plight of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission. He discloses the information that on the $4,700,000 bond issue, which is to be sold May 28, there will be an interest charge of 3½ percent, which is considerably higher than the sanitary district has been compelled to pay in the past. This will, of course, increase sewer and water bills.

There are a lot of people in that particular district, who enjoy high salaries and large personal incomes. These 3½ percent bonds are tax exempt, as all State, county, city, and political subdivision bonds are. A person in the $20,000-a-year income bracket, who purchases a 3½-percent tax-exempt bond has what is equivalent to an 8½-percent rate as compared with securities and stocks that are not tax exempt. As Mr. Swanson brings out, a person with an $80,000-a-year income—and there are certainly a lot of them in that area—the yield from these bonds would be equivalent to a 23.33-percent yield from something else. It can also be pointed out that the return for one in the $100,000-a-year income bracket would be the equivalent of 35 percent.

This same thing is going on all over the country. As interest rates increase, all utilities—gas, water, telephone, electricity, buses, and railroads—are compelled to pay more interest. This compels the utilities to ask for and get higher rates, which falls right back on the consumer. In addition to that, all public improvement bonds of cities, counties, and States must carry a much higher rate of interest because of the administration's hard money, high interest rate of money policy, and that falls right back on the taxpayer, who must pay higher taxes to pay higher interest. The farmers and wage earners are particularly hard hit on higher interest rates.

ACTION BY EXECUTIVE NEEDED NOW

It should be recalled that this policy started under Chairman McCabe, of the Federal Reserve Board, who seemed to be more persuaded by the arguments of his reactionary, eastern-banker, Republican friends, than his consideration for the public good. The policy had not gone so far when the new administration came in that it could not have been stopped in its tracks without causing the chain reactions that are now setting in, but instead of the policy being stopped, it seems to have received encouragement and support.

It is my sincere hope that President Eisenhower will take this matter in hand and do something about it. It is too serious to go unnoticed by the Executive. It is giving our entire economy a devastating shake, and if something is not done soon will probably cause a serious depression.

"THE LID IS ON"

Sylvia F. Porter, often referred to as one of America's most outstanding financial experts, had an article in her column that appeared in the papers May 13, 1953, on the subject of The Lid Is On. It has been called to my attention by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, who is also very much concerned about the administration's high-interest, tight-money policy and who made a good speech on this subject February 5, 1951, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 1, page 1010.

It is as follows:

THE LID IS ON

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

In March 1951, the great inflation that had cursed America for a full decade came to a perceptible halt.

Since then—right into today—you and I have enjoyed virtually the economic ideal of roaring production, full employment, record paychecks and relatively stable prices.

In March 1951, the bitter fiscal-monetary policy battle between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board ended in a smashing victory for the Federal Reserve and its anti-inflation plans.

Since then—right into today—as a result of deliberate Federal Reserve policy, interest rates have surged to the stiffest levels in 20 years, the cost of borrowing money has climbed to the highest point since the panic year of 1933, all bond prices have crashed and United States Government bonds have slumped to historic lows.

Is there a connection between the two events of March 1951—the definite interruption in the inflation spiral and the Federal Reserve's start of a determined effort to clamp down on the supply of money and put the lid on credit?

Of course there's a connection although other factors also have played a part in bringing inflation under control.

But now it's May 1953. Now the Reserve's money squeeze is really beginning to hurt all owners of bonds, all borrowers of money.

So now the lines are forming for the first major policy fight of the Eisenhower administration—a fight over whether the Reserve is not moving so far and so fast that it is undermining our strength and sending us straight for a deflation.

Take your seats at the arena, Mr. and Mrs. America. This one will be a honey and already is transcending all party lines.

Here is what has happened since the Federal Reserve withdrew its support from the United States bond market, stopped creating new money and let interest rates and bond prices respond to demand-supply laws.

The United States bond market has had the worst collapse in decades. Billions of dollars in values have been wiped out. Every bank, savings institution, insurance company has terrific losses on its books. If some smaller institutions had to liquidate tomorrow, they'd be in a bad, if not intolerable, spot.

Borrowing money is more expensive and tougher than at any time since the depression 1930's.

The Treasury itself is having a hard time borrowing money and is paying twice, three times the rate of interest it paid only a short while ago. Business borrowers—from the top down—farmers, veterans, home buyers, builders are in a similar pinch.

The Wall Street bond and money markets are shaking with fear.

I hear that the Reserve and Treasury are being deluged with letters and calls from smaller bankers through the country who have been locked in by the bond price break and who are getting scared.

Elliott Bell, a top Republican spokesman and publisher of Business Week, a couple of days ago wrote a major editorial in this conservative magazine calling for an easing of the Reserve policy and declaring we are glad to know the brakes work but we don't want to go through the windshield.

On Monday a group of 20 Democratic Congressmen submitted a resolution also demanding that the Reserve let up on its rapid and reckless credit-tightening program.

So far the Reserve is standing firm. It says it won't ease up until signs of deflation appear and it doesn't yet see the signs. So far, despite the spot it's in, the Treasury is backing the Reserve.

It'll be a long, fierce fight climaxing when deflation hits. In preparation, the Reserve had better buy some storm windows for its beautiful building in Washington. It'll sure need them.

February 21, 1953, I gave out the following statement concerning the Board's action in reducing the margin on stock-market transactions:

The morning papers carried the announcement that the Federal Reserve Board has just reduced the margin on stock-market transactions from 75 percent to 50 percent, effective Tuesday, February 24. This means that the speculator will need to put only 50 cents on the $1; he can speculate on credit to the extent of one-half of his purchases of stock.

It should be noted that the Board of Governors actions over the last 2 years has been in the direction of contracting credit in the interest of economic stabilization and as protection against further price rises. The most recent action in line with this policy was taken only a few days ago when the Federal Reserve raised the rediscount rate from 1¾ percent to 2 percent on commercial bank borrowings at the Federal Reserve. The effect of this contraction of credit has been for interest rates to rise, making it more costly for the Government to borrow and refund its debt, and for small-business men and homeowners to operate their business and finance their homes.

But yesterday's action by the Federal Reserve to make it easier for people to speculate on the stock market appears to me to be a reversal of the policy of credit restraint. I hope that it has not been dictated by Wall Street, but recent happenings in the economy since the election suggest that we are following the same pattern of the late 1920's. Now, as then, farm prices are spiraling downward. Now, as then, Wall Street is being encouraged to speculate. We can only hope that these actions will not lead to a similar terrible depression as that which followed so nearly the inauguration of the last Republican President.

In a reply by the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. Martin, to the question propounded to him by a subcomittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, of which I was chairman, regarding the role of selective regulation of stock market credit in restraining inflation, he stated:

When stock market credit is expanding it tends to increase the demand for stocks or, more specifically, for stocks that are publicly offered or traded. Hence, expansion in stock market credit tends to raise the price of stocks, although such effect may be partly offset by new flotations that increase the supply.

A second major fact about stock market credit is that in the financial organization of this country changes in this credit are financed largely through the banking system, either through loans to brokers or through loans directly to customers for the purchase and carrying of listed securities. As these loans go up, the deposits of commercial banks also rise, thus increasing the money supply. An increase in the money supply from this source is fundamentally unstable for it tends to be dependent on stock prices and stock market expectations, which are highly volatile.

* * * * *

To the extent that the increased stock market credit is financed by bank credit, it is a factor working to expand the total money supply.

Please notice that Mr. Martin says that if these loans go up, the deposits of commercial banks rise. This is due to created money in the banking system and is very inflationary, everyone agrees.

Mr. Martin further stated:

An increase in stock market credit can sometimes represent a diversion of the flow of funds away from bonds, mortgages, short-term loans, or Government securities. To the extent that it does represent such a diversion, it increases the advantage of those users of capital that can finance by floating stock as against those that cannot. Prominent among the latter are home builders, farmers, small businesses, and the Government (since it issues interest-paying obligations and not stocks).

* * * * *

In summary, it can be said that—except when manpower, facilities, and materials are available to increase physical production—a significant particularized effect of an increase in stock market credit is to divert the flow of funds toward publicly traded stocks and away from other investments such as bonds, mortgages, short-term loans, and Government securities.

In the last paragraph, it will be noticed that Mr. Martin admits that an increase in stock market credit diverts the flow of funds away from Government securities. It should also be considered that this order reducing the margin requirements in February 1953, which makes it harder to sell Government securities, was issued at the very time the Treasury was planning a program for the sale of an issue of long-term securities.

It should be recalled that these answers were made by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin, the latter part of 1951.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND LAND GRANT COLLEGES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill will be considered on the floor tomorrow. In the time allotted to me I wish to discuss two items in the bill. One, vocational education, has been reduced considerably, and the other, land grant colleges, has been cut out entirely. I shall attempt to show you the need for sufficient funds to carry on both of these programs, and I hope a sufficient amount will be voted for both.

It is a well known fact that the economic and social well-being of a community, State, or nation is dependent upon the skill, knowledge, and productive capacity of its people. People are not born with skills and knowledge. They must be trained. Education for work is a never-ending process. It must be repeated with each new generation.

Vocational education has played a major role in increasing American production. Skilled workers produce more goods in less time. Other factors have also helped increase production, such as better human relations on the part of management, labor-saving machines, improved quality of raw materials and better management.

Yes, vocational education has helped develop a generation of farmers, business and industrial workers, and homemakers who are more literate than ever before, equipped with better work habits and possessed with more skills and knowledge essential to efficient production and the developing of better homes. America would not be in its present strong position in productive capacity, high living standards, and military preparedness had it not been for our magnificent system of vocational education.

This being true, I hold that a part of the wealth growing out of increased productivity should be plowed back into our public vocational system. This is our surest way to continue progress and keep America strong.

In light of these facts, I have for years supported those measures designed to help with the further development of vocational education as a part of the public school system of this country. As some of you know, I took a leading part in urging the passage of the George-Deen Vocational Education Act, which was passed in 1936. Then in 1947, I supported the George-Barden Act which provides for the further promotion and development of vocational education.

I was not in Congress when the George-Reed Vocational Education Act was passed. We are grateful to Senator GEORGE and other distinguished Georgians who played such an important part in the passage of vocational education legislation. I am also proud of the important role played by my friend and colleague, DANIEL A. REED, of New York, in the passage of this measure.

These measures, together with the original Smith-Hughes Act, which was passed in 1917, have stimulated beyond the dreams of many the development of a system of vocational education which is vital to the security and well-being of this country.

Great progress has been made, but there are still thousands of schools with no programs or inadequate programs of vocational education. We should not be content until every individual who needs it, and can profit by it, has opportunity for vocational training of his choice.

Good education must develop citizens who work as well as play, produce as well as consume, create as well as appreciate. Vocational education for youth and adults helps people to attain these objectives.

The first half of this century witnessed the greatest advance in technology in all history. The second half must see an equal advance in getting the world's work done through people. This is a terrific challenge to vocational education. It is also a challenge to Congress to see that the program is not hampered in such a way as to prevent it from getting the world's work done through people.

The George-Barden Act, which authorizes an appropriation of $29,300,000 annually, provides for the development of programs of vocational education of less than college grade. It is designed primarily to help those who need assistance most—youth who cannot or do not go to college where opportunities exist for preparing for a profession or vocation at the college level. It is designed to assist the masses who need help most.

I cannot understand why the Appropriations Committee has recommended a cut of $2,624,391, or about 11 percent, in the appropriation for vocational education. This is the first step in an effort to eventually destroy a program of education that is meaning so much to the youth and adults of our land. This drastic cut certainly would result in eliminating the program in many communities of the Nation and crippling the program everywhere.

I am sure it is not in keeping with the thinking of President Eisenhower to cut vocational education funds or to wipe out funds for land-grant colleges. As evidence of this, I would like to quote from a letter the President wrote last September in which he indicated his keen interest in this phase of education and the need for maintaining and strengthening the program:

OFFICE OF DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
New York, N. Y., September 27, 1952.

Mr. C. M. MILLER,
State Board for Vocational Education,
Topeka, Kans.

DEAR MR. MILLER: I understand you would like to have from me a brief statement which you might use in the October issue of several publications dealing with vocational education. You are free to use the following:

"One of the greatest things about the United States is the fact that it has achieved the highest level of mass education in history. This American system has many unique and valuable phases, among the most important of which are the land grant colleges, the experiment stations, the vocational education program in high schools, the county agent system, and the future farmers and 4–H programs.

"The wealth of the world is created by the work of skilled hands on raw materials. Our magnificent system of vocational education is constantly developing increased understanding of raw materials, and is helping to develop the skilled hands and the clear minds essential to turning those raw materials into useful wealth.

"One thing I like especially about the program is that it calls for genuine understanding and cooperation on the part of Federal, State, and local agencies. Here, the Federal Government is a helpful partner, not an officious boss. That is how it should be."

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

It is my understanding that Russia has greatly expanded its program of vocational education in recent years, and that this, at least in part, accounts for

Russia's increased and improved production. Malenkov in his speech last fall indicated that Russia and her communistic satellites would continue to increase production and try to win the cold war by outproducing America and underselling us in the markets of the world. They are using vocational education to step up their productive capacity, and, from the most reliable information we can obtain, they are certainly succeeding in their efforts. It has been reported in the press that the rate of increase of Russian production at the present time is almost twice the rate of increase of production in this country.

To do anything to weaken America's vocational program would be playing into the very hands of Russia. This we must not do.

It would be an act of wisdom to increase aid to vocational education instead of decreasing it. America's strength lies in its people and their ability to produce efficiently goods and services.

Our hope of winning a cold or a hot war is dependent in a large measure on the productive capacity of our people. Vocational education as presently carried on in the public schools of the Nation certainly plays a major role in helping people to acquire skills, technical and scientific knowledge that result in increasing their productive capacity. A cut in these programs is a cut at the very heart of the Nation.

Vocational education has been a great aid to training those in industry and agriculture alike. In my home town of Elberton, Ga., which is often spoken of as the granite center of the United States, we have a full-time granite apprenticeship coordinator who teaches our granite apprentices two nights per week and daily coordinates and correlates their classwork to their training processes on the job.

Livestock is an ideal project for vocational agriculture students and future farmers. They have produced swine, dairy cattle, beef cattle, and poultry in sufficient quantity and high quality to improve greatly the livestock industry of my State and I think all over the country. William Higginbotham, a young boy of Washington, Ga., has a national reputation with his dairy cattle; Bill Williams, of Buena Vista, with his hogs; and Tommy Rainey, of Ellaville, with his beef cattle. I could mention many more, but this is sufficient to illustrate the good results of the training these boys have had.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended no appropriation for land-grant colleges. This is indeed a tragic mistake. The land-grant colleges of the Nation have done much for many. They were started as a result of the Morrell Act which was passed during Abraham Lincoln's administration in 1862. Why withdraw aid from these great institutions of our land? They have done a marvelous job of providing vocational training of college grade and should have the continued support of the Federal Government. The Federal support means more than just the amount of money made available for the land-grant colleges. The same is true for vocational education of less than college grade. We must see to it that vocational education at the college level and at the level of less than college grade continues to receive financial and moral support from the Federal Government.

We want vocational education to be provided for college students and for the more than 75 percent of our people who cannot or do not attend college. The masses must have vocational training if we are to remain strong. And we must never forget that only the strong can hope to remain free.

Hospital construction is another item which has been drastically cut. If this cut is not restored, hospital construction in my State and throughout the Nation will be severely crippled, and urgently needed hospital projects already approved cannot be built and other projects already started but not completed will be imperiled.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman for his fine message in support of the vocational education program, and to state that I feel sure his conclusions about the unhappy effects of such a cut at this stage and the development of that program are sound. I would like to commend the gentleman for his fight in behalf of continued support of this very worthwhile program.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

THE PLIGHT OF THE ARAB REFUGEES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Near East and Africa, I yesterday introduced H. R. 5248. This is a bill which seeks to move forward toward solution one of the most pressing problems of the world, that of the Arab refugees. The plight of these now nearly a million people hangs like a pall over every country in the area and beclouds the whole world. Their condition grows more and more intolerable and the general deterioration is draining them of hope, even of desire. Such an attitude, or should I say lack of attitude and the consequent void it creates, is fertile soil indeed for the subtle inculcation of Communist ideas. The latest reports given this committee are that some 80 percent of these tragic people are in a mood to take part in any uprising which holds possibilities of change. Can one blame them?

Such conditions, Mr. Speaker, are of vital importance to the whole free world, including the United States. Indeed, our position of leadership among the free nations places upon us the responsibility of never ceasing effort to do something to get the situation off dead center.

Extensive as have been the efforts of the United Nations to solve this problem, they have been of no avail. But the ultimate return to normal living of these hundreds of thousands of human beings is crucial.

In pursuing its study of the situation, the subcommittee has become convinced that there are practical steps that can be taken to give hope to these people and to begin to ameliorate the present conditions—conditions which have brought about a disintegration more and more recognized to be a direct danger to this country and the free world.

The committee is well aware that there are unsolved political problems which appear to be insurmountable hazards to all constructive action. But, Mr. Speaker, we refuse to believe that any problem, however difficult, does not have some solution if a right approach can be found. It is in an effort to find an acceptable approach that the committee is asking the Congress to consider charging the Director of the Mutual Security Agency with the immediate duty of making a short, intensive study of current conditions and possibilities, reporting back within 90 days with recommendations.

In agreeing to the principle of compensatory payments, Israel has made a gesture which may well become the first step toward action, particularly if it is followed by actual payments in the near future. Some of the other countries in the area have long since opened their doors to many thousands in spite of their own economic difficulties. Others are attempting to find ways to absorb thousands more. But there are many obstacles to overcome—some economic, some political. Eventual solution, Mr. Speaker, can and must be found. In the meantime, there are steps that can be taken.

President Eisenhower has sounded a positive note giving direction and leadership to us all. He has made it clear that the United States intends to pay more attention to the Arab States during his administration. After talking with Saudi Arabia's Foreign Minister, the President was quoted as expressing concern over recent "deterioration of relations between the Arab nations and the United States," promising that it would be his "firm purpose to restore confidence and trust." One news article put it this way:

> President Eisenhower was outlining a new approach for the Middle East which involves strict fairness and impartiality toward all countries, including Israel.

Evidence of this new approach has been reflected in the regional approach adopted in the Mutual Security Agency bill submitted by the State Department, which is now under scrutiny by the Senate and House committees.

So, Mr. Speaker, in response to the President's declared position, the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Near East and Africa desires to be certain of current situations and conditions in the Near East, hoping that ways of cooperation may be found which will start a constructive program giving new hope to the refugees, allaying the fears of all the countries of this critical area and setting us on the road to better understanding and ultimate peace.

A PROGRAM OF TRADE, NOT AID

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have sent letters to the President of the United States today, also to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of Commerce, and to the Secretary of Labor. I will read the letter I sent to the President of the United States:

MAY 15, 1953.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have given deep consideration to the question, "Trade or aid to the free nations of the world," currently being considered by the Congress of the United States. I know, Mr. President, that you have an interest, a deep personal interest, in every phase of this program, a deep human interest which I believe motivates your every action, I am, therefore, submitting to you herewith copy of my letters sent to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor asking them to use their good offices to call a conference jointly of representatives of their respective departments, together with representatives of industry and labor, to consider jointly the best possible immediate approach. I am a great believer in the traditional New England system of having selectmen meet, consider a problem and present it then to the town meeting. I believe that such a conference as I here propose would bring together the selectmen most intimately concerned. Whatever help you may give to a broad consideration of the many aspects of this question will, I assure you, be deeply appreciated.

Yours very sincerely,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
Mrs. John Jacob Rogers.

Trade, not aid, is a currently popular approach to an important phase of our international relations. There are a number of sound and easily understandable reasons for the widespread acceptance of this term. Basically, we want to help other nations and people. Particularly do we want to help them help themselves. That is sound, especially in light of American tradition and in recognition of the history and sensibilities of the people of many of the nations with whom we share our material and spirtual values.

Actually, most of them do not like to have to accept material aid from us. They are proud, freemen. They point to their capacity to produce. They have a production potential which indicates that they could produce by far enough to enable them to develop and maintain a sound national economy, if they had markets for their goods. That "if" is the essence of the problem; their's and ours.

The two most potentially extensive immediate world markets are the United States and Russia. To be sure, as each free nation reestablishes its own sound economy, it in turn becomes a potential merchant and a potential market for its own goods and for the goods of other nations. But at the moment the major markets in which all these countries could sell are Russia and—if we let them—the United States. That "if," as I have said, is the crux of the problem.

If we do not buy the goods of other nations, where else can they sell them except to Russia? Yet, if we do admit their goods to our markets, to be sold at a market level based on their production costs, we are placing our own workers' wages and production standards in serious jeopardy. We are placing goods produced by well-paid labor incompetition with goods produced by lowly paid labor. The textile industry in my State well illustrates this point. Our textile workers are paid real wages above those paid textile workers in any other country and above those paid even in our own United States. This standard is obtained through a combination of a negotiated wage over and above essential statutory bases. We set a floor for their wages. And I by my vote, helped set that floor. I voted for the Walsh-Healey Act; I voted for the original Wages and Hours Act; I voted for the Bacon Act. I believe in the maintenance of adequate wages and good working conditions. I believe a national floor for wages helps maintain a free competitive industry in which free trade unions could bargain with employers for wages above the statutory base.

Today I want to direct careful consideration to the dilemma the international trade problem poses for us. If foreign textiles are imported into our country to be sold in competition with our textiles, at a lower rate than the actual cost of production is in the United States, then our textile industry cannot survive. Some will view this grave problem entirely in terms of international repercussions. World economic stabilization, I realize, is essential to world peace. World economic stabilization requires an outlet for national production above domestic needs.

However, I am not resigned to a philosophy which accepts defeat and destruction for some as a byproduct of social change and world development. I do not believe that we can morally permit the destruction of the New England textile industry or the New England shoe industry or any other industry in any other State, by the importation of foreign goods produced at low wages and long working hours, without planning to do something to protect the economic, the social, the human interests of the men and women in these industries and their families. Do those who propose what would in effect wipe out certain domestic industries, to build up world trade, at the same time propose a Government subsidy for the industry they are destroying by placing it in competition with the goods produced by poorly paid foreign workers? Do they also propose a new sort of WPA to supplement the workers' pay if the manufacturers cut wages to reduce prices to meet this competition from abroad?

There is another point even more serious to me than the economic losses this program would impose on our workers and our manufacturers. The devastating blow to the dignity and morale of the workers, the psychological effect on employer and employee of removing his sense of security is far more important even than the economic problem, important as that may be.

And yet, even as I say this, I realize that the dignity and morale of the workers in other countries is involved in this problem, too.

I do not here propose a solution. I do, however, suggest an approach.

First. There cannot properly at this time be a question of trade or aid. There is a very complex question of how, where, and when to aid or to trade.

Second. A superficial, sporadic, localized approach to one aspect of the problem at one time cannot have the constructive approach which is vitally essential today.

Third. We cannot morally, as a nation, permit the dislocation or destruction of industry in any field, in any area in our country, lest the grievous harm done thereby to any group of persons may not only expose certain areas to economic and social waste, but may even begin a wave of chaotic events which may endanger our whole national economic security.

A chain reaction to misfortune in one area or one field of enterprise may start a trend toward a serious recession, leading—heaven forbid—to a depression.

Fourth. We cannot ignore the needs of freemen anywhere; especially today, when communism waits with yawning jaws to suck in and devour the least fortunate of men. Our appreciation for sound economic enterprise coupled with our sense of moral responsibility must help us plan for the well-being of all freemen here and afar. However, in our zeal to help freemen and to make men free all over the world, we cannot fail in our duty to our own people, first of all. Actually our ability to help freemen anywhere must be predicated upon keeping our own people free and strong so that they have not only the will, but the capacity to serve their fellow men wherever the need arises.

Fifth. We must not permit the need of freemen anywhere to compel them to look to Russia for temporary relief—and thereby for permanent enslavement. Russia's offer to buy the wares of freemen entices them in their great need, and endangers them—and us.

I propose, therefore, that, as quickly as possible, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor jointly convene a small working conference of representatives of industry and labor to find a way of protecting the interest of our people now, and for the future, while we serve and develop the well-being of all freemen through trade and/or aid, whichever, whenever it is best.

WILL TITO GO BACK TO THE KREMLIN?

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KIRSTEN] be given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Tito, of Yugoslavia, is likely to make his peace with the Kremlin in the very near future.

The recent meetings of the envoys of Tito with Soviet agents indicate that a rapprochement is imminent. If Tito is

back in the counsels of the Kremlin, how great will have been the hoax perpetrated by the pro-Tito apologists. The millions of dollars of American aid sent to Tito will redound to the benefit of the Soviets.

This means that the guns and tanks and planes that we have sent to Tito would be turned against us and would have to be matched by further guns and tanks and planes in Western Europe.

It is becoming increasingly clear that aid to the Yugoslav Communist dictator never had a reasonable chance of changing his black heart and all the while the people of Yugoslavia have continued to suffer under the heel of the Tito type of communism and they will be brought back again under the police state tyranny of the Kremlin. How naive are those American policymakers who would shape our foreign policy on the Tito pattern—Tito, of Yugoslavia, or Mao Tse-tung, of China, or any other Communist dictator in the Soviet sphere.

Incidentally, the same people that have been lately promoting Tito were the ones who favored sending arms to the "agrarian reformer" Mao Tse-tung who is now murdering American boys.

It is possible, of course, that Malenkov and Tito would not let their real alliance be fully known to the Western World in order that Tito might still seek to get aid from the United States. But the mere willingness on the part of Tito now to negotiate with the Kremlin should be enough to convince American policymakers that no trust can be put in a Communist dictator of any nationality.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WAINWRIGHT.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a letter for Admiral Boone regarding an exhibition of prosthetic appliances.

Mr. ARENDS and to include four short editorials.

Mr. JACKSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON and to include an article which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $196.

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include a statement she made before the Library Subcommittee and an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances: to include in one a letter from the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in the other an article by James Morgan appearing in last Sunday's Globe.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. BAKER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a statement by the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers before the Committee on Ways and Means, at an estimated cost of $399.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VELDE.

Mr. D'EWART and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DURHAM.

Mr. EVINS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California.)

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a resolution of the Laundry Workers' International Union, AFL.

Mr. O'KONSKI in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLT.

Mr. WILSON of California.

Mr. MULTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. WHITTEN) in three instances and to include extraneous mater.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. WHITTEN) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POLK to include in his remarks in Committee of the Whole two short statistical tables on soil-conservation practices carried out on Ohio farms under the agricultural program in 1951.

Mr. HILL to include some tables in his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CRETELLA and to include resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. PATTEN, for the rest of the week, on account of atom test.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2277. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

702. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize and finance a program of public works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

703. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to expedite the payment by the Comptroller General of judgments rendered by the district courts and the Court of Claims against the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

704. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,' approved March 5, 1953"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

705. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Department of the Interior on the lower Nueces River project, Texas, prepared under authority of the Federal reclamation laws, pursuant to the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

706. A letter from the secretary, the American Society of International Law, transmitting the annual audit by a certified public accountant of the financial transactions of the said society for the year ended December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 9 of the act of September 20, 1950, 64 Stat. 869; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

707. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

708. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

709. A letter from the Federal Security Administrator, transmitting the 13th Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to section 201 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 237. Resolution extending greetings to the Republic of Haiti on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the creation of its national flag; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4485. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to publication of partnerships; without amendment (Rept. No. 432). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2969. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls; without amendment (Rept. No. 433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4484. A bill to amend section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of assets of a decedent's estate for funeral expenses; without amendment (Rept. No. 434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4486. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer; without amendment (Rept. No. 435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4487. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as further amended by an act of April 19, 1920 (title 20, ch. 1, sec. 116, D. C. Code, 1951), relating to continuing decedent's business; without amendment (Rept. No. 436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4550. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property; without amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4939. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees; with amendment (Rept. No. 438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4940. A bill to provide for the redemption of District of Columbia tax stamps; without amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3087. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3796. A bill relating to the incorporation of the Columbus University of Washington, D. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4229. A bill to change the name of the Polycultural Institution of America to Polycultural University of America, to grant a congressional charter to such university, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 5269. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 5270. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be an ex officio member of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 5271. A bill to permit payment of certain cost-of-living allowances outside the continental United States at rates in excess of 25 percent of the rate of basic compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 5272. A bill to provide for a review by the Court of Military Appeals in certain cases in which relief pursuant to section 12 of the act of May 5, 1950 (64 Stat. 147) was denied by The Judge Advocate General of any of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 5273. A bill to repeal the act of July 27, 1950, so as to terminate the President's authority to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5274. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by the addition of a new section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5275. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 5276. A bill relating to the deduction for depreciation in the case of land containing peat, muck, and other organic soils which wear out or is subject to exhaustion due to oxidation, while being used for agricultural or horticultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 5277. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall investigate and report upon the advisability of establishing a national monument and national cemetery on the site of the old Fort Wallace Post Cemetery, Kans.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 240. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the subsidies paid by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 241. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 240; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Res. 242. Resolution to amend Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting legislative action necessary to complete a partially completed highway from the city of Hoquiam in Grays Harbor County and following the shore of the Pacific Ocean to a junction with the Olympic Loop Highway in the vicinity of Queets; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting action as may be necessary to make known to the public the elevation of the theoretical maximum high-water level of the pool behind the proposed John Day Dam and the probable year of starting construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting passage of necessary legislation, and the Federal Security Administrator to make the necessary regulations, to exempt a certain percentage of the earnings of any dependent children in respect to whom aid is being paid, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 5278. A bill for the relief of Arturo Tarzia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5279. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Paniccioli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5280. A bill for the relief of Ciro Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5281. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 5282. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sebastiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 5283. A bill for the relief of Charles Sacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5284. A bill for the relief of Agosto Giampoali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5285. A bill for the relief of Edward Gordon, Morton Gordon, John J. Dahill, Esteban Melendez, Jean Garcia, Marie Flynn, Carmen Rodriques, and 62 Lenox Ave. Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 5286. A bill for the relief of Wajih Kassees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 5287. A bill for the relief of Maximilian Paschkus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5288. A bill for the relief of Jacob Helman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5289. A bill for the relief of Herman Landau, Mrs. Seerens Landau, and Erwin Landau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5290. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Etil Yahoubian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5291. A bill for the relief of Dicran Yahoubian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (by request):

H. R. 5292. A bill for the relief of Alexander and Victoria Lashkareff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5293. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 5294. A bill for the relief of Amante Rongetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

268. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of Miss Mary L. Rector, of Pawtucket, R. I., and 76 others relative to the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

269. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 35 residents of Spokane County, Wash., for favorable consideration and enactment of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

270. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the Ecorse Aerie, No. 2812, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Ecorse, Mich., endorsing H. R. 4308, authorizing the Postmaster General to provide for the use of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies bearing the words "In God We Trust" for use in first- and second-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

271. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Earl V. Cates, president, Business Men's League of United States, Chicago, Ill., relative to no further delay in appropriating money for the Calumet Harbor and Sag Channel project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

272. Also, petition of Office of United States Government Agency's Employee and President-in-exile of the San Juan, P. R., post office, relative to the claims of approximately 26 persons of the Post Office Custodial Service Employees Association, concerning charges preferred before the United States Civil Service Commission against the majority of the San Juan, P. R., Post Office-Custodial Service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 1953

(Legislative day of Friday, May 15, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Joseph Francis Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, Carrollton Manor, Frederick, Md., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Creator of the Universe, look down with favor upon the Presiding Officer of this Senate and let the light of Thy countenance shine brightly upon all the Members of the Congress.

Grant to Thy children, in an hour of crisis, Thy most powerful graces so that, with enlightened minds and firm wills, they may achieve Thy gracious purposes for the salvation and progress of this troubled world.

On this day, sacred in the history of a sister republic, Cuba, and in this year, dedicated to the memory of a noble-hearted apostle of freedom, José Martí, vouchsafe to the peoples of all the American Republics as well as to their leaders and legislators the special blessings that are needed to preserve and advance human dignity throughout the hemisphere.

Rekindle the fires of liberty everywhere, dear Saviour, with the torch of Thy divine love.

We pray for these gifts in the name of our Redeemer, who is Christ, the Son of God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 19, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1448) to amend the act of June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present national emergency, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 35. An act to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 1550. An act to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 307. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.";

H. R. 665. An act for the relief of N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Krayenbrink Moerings, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings;

H. R. 685. An act for the relief of Walter Carl Sander;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Porfirio Punciano Vila, Tatiana Abatooroff Vila, Porfirio P. Vila, Jr., Anne Marie Vila, and Josephine Anne Vila;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Tien Koo Chen;

H. R. 779. An act for the relief of Ida Baghdassarian;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of Johanna C. Willemsen;

H. R. 783. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung;

H. R. 847. An act for the relief of Robert J. Rickards, Conception Sotelo Rickards, and Walter John Rickards;

H. R. 869. An act for the relief of Masuko Oshima;

H. R. 978. An act for the relief of Harue Fukushi;

H. R. 1143. An act for the relief of Mary Francina Marconi, Fernanda Guzzi, Anna Ferraro, Mary Laudano, and Julia Pisano;

H. R. 1219. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 1330. An act for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu;

H. R. 1345. An act for the relief of John Lampropoulos;

H. R. 1434. An act to amend the act of February 24, 1925, incorporating the American War Mothers;

H. R. 1561. An act authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration (in Johnson City, Tenn.) to the State of Tennessee;

H. R. 1730. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation;

H. R. 1756. An act for the relief of Eugene de Thassy;

H. R. 1815. An act to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Paul Myung Ha Chung;

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Anneliese Schillings;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of Clemintina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gazzarrini;

H. R. 2226. An act to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska;

H. R. 2312. An act to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold";

H. R. 2313. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter;

H. R. 2319. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2327. An act to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Sam Rosenblat;

H. R. 2392. An act for the relief of Lee Kwang Nong (George Clifford Roeder);

H. R. 2456. An act to amend the act of October 11, 1951, authorizing the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2512. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended;

H. R. 2566. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to establish a time limitation upon the filing of certain claims thereunder;

H. R. 2652. An act for the relief of Constance Brouwer Scheffer;

H. R. 2696. An act to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy;

H. R. 2747. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday;

H. R. 2787. An act for the relief of Josefine Hoorn (Dmytruk);

H. R. 2828. An act to amend the act of Congress on September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended;

H. R. 3522. An act for the relief of Arthur S. Rosichan;

H. R. 3670. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Gamroth;

H. R. 4048. An act for the relief of the Maxwell Hardware Co.;

H. R. 4091. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to make the exclusion from such act of temporary employees of Congress inapplicable to such employees who are appointed at an annual rate of salary;

H. R. 4110. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Weir;

H. R. 4364. An act to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," relative to the composition of claims commissions;

H. R. 4432. An act for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham;

H. R. 4557. An act to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to permits for construction of radio stations;

H. R. 4558. An act to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder;

H. R. 4559. An act to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934 so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony;

H. R. 4730. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, of certain lands formerly owned by that city; and

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution for admitting the State of Ohio into the Union.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WELKER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BRIDGES was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and Friday, on official business.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WELKER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Monday next, on official business.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GOLDWATER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate, for the purpose of attending to official business, from tomorrow noon until June 1.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD the address delivered last night by the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, tonight, as you sit in your homes all across this broad land, I want to talk with you about an issue affecting all our lives. It is the defense of our country.

If we ponder this a moment, we all know that this really means the defense of those spiritual values and moral ideals cherished by generations of Americans—the true treasure of our people. This treasure of the spirit must be defended, above all, with weapons of the spirit: our will, our devotion, our readiness to sacrifice.

If we think further, we also know that this defense of America demands still other weapons. We must, of course, want to be free. But this is not enough.

To be free and to stay free, we must be strong—and we must stay strong.

Our national security is affected by almost everything that your government does—things far removed from the building of planes or the training of troops.

National security involves, for example, the plain honesty and competence of government itself—for no nation is secure whose government does not command respect at home and honor abroad.

Our strength demands, also, healthy two-way trade with our allies—for this Nation could not for long enjoy either freedom or prosperity alone in a hostile world.

And, national security requires an industrious and productive America, for here is the vital source of all our military strength.

These truths make clear, I think, how every act of your government is—and must be—a part of the whole great effort to make America secure in a world in which freedom itself is under mortal fire.

We all know something of the long record of deliberately planned Communist aggression. There has been, to this moment, no reason to believe that Soviet policy has changed its frequently announced hope and purpose—the destruction of freedom everywhere.

There is, therefore, no reason for the free nations to alter their course: to hope and work for the best, to arm and be ready for the worst.

We must see—clearly and steadily—just exactly what is the danger before us.

It is more than merely a military threat.

It has been coldly calculated by the Soviet leaders—for by their military threat, they have hoped to force upon America and the free world an unbearable security burden leading to economic disaster. They have believed—and, in fact, plainly said—that free people cannot preserve their way of life and at the same time provide enormous military establishments. Communist guns, in this sense, have been aiming at an economic target no less than a military target.

I believe firmly—and I think the Soviets realize—that the United States, if forced to total mobilization today, could meet and win any military challenge.

I believe no less firmly that we must see and meet the full nature of the danger immediately before us. For the nature of this danger dictates the nature of the defense we summon.

This defense must, first of all, be one which we can bear for a long—an indefinite—period of time. It cannot consist of sudden, blind responses to a series of fire-alarm emergencies, summoning us to amass forces and materiel with a speed that is heedless of cost, order and efficiency. It cannot be based solely on the theory that we can point to a D-day of desperate danger, somewhere in the near future, to which all plans can be geared.

The truth is that our danger cannot be fixed or confined to one specific instant.

We live in an age of peril.

We must think and plan and provide so as to live through this age in freedom—in ways that do not undermine our freedom even as we strive to defend it.

To watch vigilantly on the military front must never mean to be blind on the domestic front. In our present world—in this kind of prolonged tension and struggle—a crippled industry or a demoralized working force could be the equivalent of a lost battle. Prolonged inflation could be as destructive of a truly free economy as could a chemical attack against an army in the field. And if, in today's continuing danger, we ever were to strain our capacity until rigid governmental controls, indefinitely or permanently continued, became mandatory—where then would be the freedom we defend?

Our defense, I repeat, must be carefully planned and steadfastly sustained.

Such planning brings us to that bewildering realm of budgets and expenditures and appropriations and deficits and taxes. This, as we all know, is no easy area to explore or to explain. But these rude facts-and-figures of our national economy are—to our body-politic—as vital as pulse-rates or blood-counts.

As you all know, Government deficits of past years have been a main cause of the cheapening of our dollar by half its value.

The budget inherited by this administration, for the year beginning this July 1, called for expenditures of $78.6 billion, and signified another red-ink entry in our national books of $9.9 billion—on top of other big deficits for last year and this year.

Beyond this, when this administration took office, we faced two stubborn financial facts. The first fact was this: under the former administration expenditures for the future were so scheduled as to reach their peak during 1954 and 1955. The second fact was this: these are precisely the years when—under existing laws—Federal revenues from taxes, under scheduled reductions, will fall sharply downward.

If we do nothing about this, the results of these facts could only be bigger deficits, greater Government borrowing, ever increasing cost of living, depreciated savings, higher and higher cost of the Nation's security.

These figures are but a small part of the story.

Let me give you a few more facts:

First. The past administration overestimated tax collections for the next fiscal year by some $1.2 billion. Even the most conscientious men must be allowed some leeway in forecasting tax receipts more than a year ahead. Nevertheless it is unfortunately true that this overestimate of income would bring the red-ink entry for the coming year up to more than $11 billion.

Second. The military budget proposed by the previous administration for the fiscal year 1954 did not fully plan for one item that could scarcely be called obscure. That item was the Korean war. No specific budgetary provision was made for continuance of this conflict. No provision was made for the building up of Republic of Korea divisions beyond those currently in being. Our task, then, is not only one of dealing with the planned deficit, but also one of providing for the costs of the Korean war so long as it may continue.

Third. Largely aside from the budget and deficit, there will be, as of June 30 of this year, $81 billion of authorizations to spend money for which cash must be found in the tax revenues of the next several years. Since a large part of this enormous sum is already under contract, mostly for defense purposes, there is little room in which to turn around to make any immediate economies in this area.

This whole matter is rather like buying c. o. d. When you order goods c. o. d. you do not need any money until the items come to your front doors—and then it is cash on delivery. This administration faces payment on just such an $81 million c. o. d. over the next several years.

I come now to the critical question: How can we make more bearable, for every family in our land, the burden of this inheritance, and at the same time make our Nation's security more sound and sure?

To begin with the military front: There must be—far from any slackening of effort—a speeding, a sharpening, a concentration that will extract the last cent of value from every dollar spent. Our Defense Establishment has yet to reach the level of performance we want. Until it has, we shall not rest.

I want here to state a few critical facts plainly. They are critical. They are facts. And they should be beyond the reach of any partisan debate.

It is military fact that there is no such thing as maximum security short of total mobilization of all our national resources. Such security would compel us to imitate the methods of the dictator. It would compel us to put every able-bodied young man in uniform—to regiment the worker, the farmer, the businessman, to allocate materials and to control prices and wages; in short, to devote our whole Nation to the grim purposes of the garrison state.

This, I firmly believe, is not the way to defend America.

It is also a fact that when we seek anything less than this vision of military perfection—total mobilization—we are debating in a realm of speculation—sometimes informed, more often uninformed.

Words like "essential" and "indispensable" and "absolute minimum" become the common coin of this realm—and they are spent with wild abandon. One military man will argue hotly for a given number of aircraft as the absolute minimum. Another, even from the same military service, will answer just as passionately that less aircraft of a different kind is imperative. And others will earnestly advocate the indispensable needs for ships or tanks or rockets or guided missiles or artillery—all totaled in numbers that are always called minimum. All such views are argued with vigor and tenacity. But obviously all cannot be right.

Now it is a fact—and this I most deeply believe—that it is foolish and dangerous for any of us to be hypnotized by magic numbers in this type of analysis. There is no given number of ships, no given number of divisions, no given number of air wings in the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, no given number of billions of dollars, that will automatically guarantee security.

I have given to this phase of our national planning careful, personal study and analysis. I have, as you know, lived with it for many years. I have also sought, of course, advice from the most competent people I could find.

Let me tell you how we approached this analysis. We did not set any fixed sum of money to which our defense plans had to be fitted. We first determined what is truly vital to our security. We next planned ways to eliminate every useless expenditure and duplication. And we finally decided upon the amount of money needed to meet this program.

Such an analysis rejects the extreme arguments of enthusiasts and of all groups of special pleaders both in and out of the military services.

But this I do assure you: what has been so carefully, so painstakingly evolved is a sound program. It contemplates in each of the Armed Forces calculated risks which have been prudently reasoned. And it represents, in my judgment, what is best for our Nation's permanent security.

There is, I believe, only one honest, workable formula. It is not magical, but it is the best that competent men can define. It is this: A defense strong enough both to discourage aggression and beyond this to protect the Nation—in the event of any aggression—as it moves swiftly to full mobilization.

The more swiftly and smoothly we can mobilize, the less our dependence upon standing armies, navies, and air forces.

The more vigorously we eliminate the nonessential, the more effectively we can concentrate on what is vital.

With all this in mind, we are putting major emphasis on airpower, which daily becomes a more important factor in modern war. Our revised budget will provide the Air Force with more than 40 percent of all defense funds programed for 1954. As of this June 30, the Air Force will have available a sum totaling more than $40 billion. Buttressing this strength are those additional funds allocated to naval airpower for 1954—totaling more than half of the Navy budget. This means that almost 60 cents out of every dollar to be available for national defense in the next year will be devoted to airpower and air defense.

These investments in airpower represent and will continue to represent the heaviest single annual outlay of our Government. It is my conviction that our developing program—under constant review and study—will result in a steady growth in the size and efficiency of the air defense, until we have attained an adequate level of security.

I repeat: This security cannot arbitrarily be defined as the simple equivalent of a specific number of aircraft or air wings. For example: Today three aircraft with modern weapons can practically duplicate the destructive power of all the 2,700 planes we unleashed in the great break-out attack from the Normandy beachhead. Clearly every technological advance profoundly affects this problem of airpower—including the development of missiles now in production. Similar advances in civil defense will help shape the nature and size of our air forces.

The plain truth is this: Security is planned, not blindly bought. It is the product of thought, and work, and our ability and readiness to bear our military burden for however long the threat to freedom persists.

The course we must set for ourselves is a difficult one. It must avoid, on the one hand, the indefinite continuance of a needlessly high rate of Federal spending in excess of Federal income at a time of heavy taxation. It must avoid, on the other hand, any penny-wise, pound-foolish policy that could, through lack of needed strength, cripple the cause of freedom everywhere.

This middle way may lack drama and sensation. But it has sense and strength—lasting strength.

It may not scream with shrill crisis and emergency. But it speaks with conviction and realism.

Because of the necessary costs of national security your Government is not just preaching economy but practicing it. Every department of this Government has cut its requests for funds for the next fiscal year. As a result, we have been able to reduce the previous administration's request for appropriations of new money by some $8½ billion. This prodigious sum means more than $50 for every man, woman, and child in our country. This is the first step in cutting expenditures. Next year we shall spend at least $4½ billion less than was planned by the former administration.

Here let me add this word. Government cannot do this job—any more than any other job—utterly alone. You and your fellow-citizens who want your Government to spend less must yourselves practice self-restraint in the demands you make upon Government. You as citizens cannot help the common cause by merely favoring economy for every group except the one to which you belong.

All that we have done to date is an encouraging start. But it is no more than a start. During every day of the coming year we must and shall continue striving to find, in every department of the Government, new ways to achieve economies. I need scarcely remind you that the saving of $4½ billion is less than half the deficit planned by the previous administration for the next fiscal year.

It is in the light of these facts that all of us must honestly face the matter of taxes. It must be apparent that to accept a great revenue loss at this time would be to insure longer life to bigger Federal deficits and greater eventual danger to our country.

The convictions of this administration on these grave subjects are clear and simple.

We believe that—for the long term—present taxes are too high. We think they are becoming a real threat to individual initiative.

We believe, at the same time, that no citizen—once satisfied that his Government is operating with honesty and economy, and planning with foresight—wants any tax saving at the price of essential national security.

We believe—finally—that our truly urgent need is to make our Nation secure, our economy strong, and our dollar sound.

For every American family today, this matter of the sound dollar is crucial. Without a sound dollar, every American family would face a renewal of inflation, an ever-increasing cost of living, the withering away of savings and life insurance policies. An immediate tax reduction which in turn inflated the dollar still more would cheat every family in America. It would strike most cruelly at the poorest among us.

The balancing of the budget of the United States is, therefore, vital—not merely as some abstract, statistical feat to be performed by Government accountants—but to help give each citizen the kind of dollar with which each family in the Nation can begin balancing its own budget.

With this in mind, I am recommending the following measures to the Congress for tax legislation:

First. The excess-profits tax on corporations as now drawn should be extended for 6 months beyond its present expiration date of June 30—an extension that will produce a gain of revenue of $800 million.

Second. The 5 percent reduction in the regular income tax on corporations, now scheduled to go into effect April 1, 1954, should be repealed. The continuation of this additional 5 percent will bring in approximately $2 billion a year.

Third. The reduction in excise taxes, which would take place next April 1 under present law, should not be put into effect pending the development of a sounder system of excise taxation, for which I shall make specific recommendations to the Congress next January.

Fourth. There is now scheduled an increase in the old-age security tax from 1½ percent to 2 percent on both employees and employers, to go into effect next January 1. It can and should be postponed, for the old age and survivors trust fund has now reached $18 billion and receipts at present tax rates are in excess of current expenditures. This will be a worthwhile saving to wage earners and, in my judgment, is simple justice to them.

Finally: Another relief for the taxpayers will be the reduction in personal income taxes that will go into effect next January 1.

While this is in accordance with the letter of the existing law, it would not have been possible but for the economies in Government that have been and are being made by this administration. At the same time, I do not believe that the American people think that earlier reduction would be prudent. Your many communications to me show that, first of all, you want our Nation secure and our dollar sound. This administration agrees. To advance by 6 months the date of this scheduled reduction would take away $1.5 billion and, to that extent, would risk both of the objectives we seek.

No effort will be spared in the coming months to achieve additional vital economies. To do this in significant amounts will depend on some gradual improvement in the world situation. If we should be disappointed in this, I shall, of course, be compelled to make recommendations for alternative sources of revenue. But if these efforts prove successful, a balanced budget will come within sight.

Next January, I shall recommend a completely revised program of taxation. Already appropriate studies are underway in the House Ways and Means Committee and in the Treasury Department. Our system of taxation must not only provide our Government with the resources to be strong for freedom's sake—but also enable our people to apply their initiative and industry fruitfully in an economy that is itself free and strong. This means taxes so adjusted as to fall where payment is least harmful—and so planned as to create jobs and expand the income of the mass of our people.

I have spoken to you tonight not only as your President but as one whose life has been devoted to the military defense of our country.

I have outlined my convictions as to the way to defend America.

This is the way to work for national security—in the full, true sense.

It is with the greatest confidence that I say to you:

We possess, as a people, all the qualities, all the talents, and all the resources necessary to resolve the problems inherited from the past or inherent in the present.

We live, as I have said, not in an instant of danger but in an age of danger.

We will meet it, as Americans, boldly, vigorously—and successfully.

We will make of it an age of productive freedom, unmatched in all man's history.

This is what I ask all of you to help to do.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarthy
Barrett	Griswold	McClellan
Beall	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bricker	Hennings	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Byrd	Holland	Payne
Capehart	Humphrey	Potter
Carlson	Hunt	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Saltonstall
Clements	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Kennedy	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Symington
Ferguson	Langer	Thye
Flanders	Lehman	Tobey
Frear	Long	Watkins
Fulbright	Magnuson	Welker
George	Malone	Wiley
Gillette	Mansfield	Williams
Goldwater	Martin	Young
Gore	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business in accordance with the usual procedure, provided that the remarks of Senators be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND (S. DOC. NO. 48)

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Commissioner for Social Security, members of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 13th annual report of that Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF LOWER NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TEXAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the survey of the lower Nueces River project, Texas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXPEDITIOUS PAYMENT OF CERTAIN JUDGMENTS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to expedite the payment by the Comptroller General of judgments rendered by the District Courts and the Court of Claims against the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the year ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, WASHINGTON, D. C.

A letter from the Secretary, the American Society of International Law, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the financial transactions of that society, for the year ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the withdrawal of Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes

"Whereas the Federal gasoline tax is levied upon the users of American highways; and

"Whereas the highway system of this country and the highway systems of the several States are rapidly deteriorating because the funds needed to develop and maintain a

modern-highway network are not available; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is now distributing to the States only about two-thirds of the revenue which it is deriving from the Federal gasoline tax and is diverting the remainder to its other purposes; and

"Whereas if the Federal Government would withdraw from the field of gasoline taxes and the several States would increase the taxes imposed by them on gasoline and motor vehicle fuels in an amount equal to the Federal tax on gasoline, a much larger amount of revenue would be available to the several States for the purpose of developing and maintaining a modern system of highways therein; and

"Whereas the 11th General Assembly of the States which was held in Chicago, Ill., in the month of December 1952, at which practically all of the States of the United States were represented, went on record as favoring the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the gasoline-tax field; and

"Whereas the National Conference of Governors has declared by appropriate resolution that the Federal Government should withdraw from the gasoline-tax field: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the 117th General Assembly of the State of Delaware hereby respectfully urges and requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this joint resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each member of the Delaware congressional delegation, and to the respective houses of the legislatures of the several States of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"*To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the senate and the house of representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas peace compacts and treaties heretofore had with Japan have been productive of great controversy as respects safeguarding the fishing interests of this State and Nation in the ocean waters of Alaska, Pacific coast, and Washington; and

"Whereas it is in the national interest that the development and preservation of our fishing industry be borne in mind in the drafting and enforcement of any treaty or pact or agreement between the United States and Japan;

"Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully petition the President and the Congress of the United States to make all possible provision in any treaty, pact, or agreement with Japan for the preservation and the safeguarding of the fishing interests of this State and Nation in the ocean waters off the Territory of Alaska, Pacific coast, and of the State of Washington; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Washington congressional delegation."

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"*To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the International Wheat Agreement has been of great benefit to the wheat growers of the United States; and

"Whereas the International Wheat Agreement will soon expire; and

"Whereas the production of wheat in the United States is beginning to pile up surpluses, which can only be disposed of if the agreement is renewed;

"Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully petition the President and the Congress of the United States to renew the International Wheat Agreement as soon as such action may be feasible: And be it

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Washington congressional delegation."

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Ponce (P. R.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring continued appropriations for slum clearance and low-cost housing in the city of Ponce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Miss Alpha Williams, of Beaverton, Oreg., submitting a proposed resolution favoring the assignment of Senator MORSE to the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare, without loss of seniority; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS IN CERTAIN CASES—RESOLUTION OF OTIS HENRY POST 2549, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, TEXARKANA, TEX.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at the request of the commander of the Otis Henry Post 2549, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Texarkana, Tex., I ask unanimous consent that a resolution, recently adopted by the post, protesting against any reduction in veterans' benefits for service-connected or non-service-connected disability or the reduction of the number of hospital beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America is considering a measure which would deprive veterans of hospital beds, hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities where the veteran has limited means; and

Whereas the veterans of the United States have served their country in peace and war, on land and sea and in the air, and on many distant shores, to the detriment of their personal business, homes and private lives for the benefit of all citizens and some aliens of the United States of America who never served in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas the denial of hospitalization, hospital beds and medical service to non-service-connected veterans as well as service-connected veterans would materially affect the health and welfare of numberless veterans in all categories, should the Veterans' Administration's hospitalization benefits to veterans be materially reduced: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Otis Henry Post, No. 2549, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, That it go on record as opposing any reduction in veteran benefits for service-connected or non-service-connected disability or the reduction of the number of hospital beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded without delay to the Congressmen from Texas and Arkansas in our respective districts.

Passed and approved this 13th day of May A. D. 1953.

SIDNEY METCALF,
Commander, Otis Henry Post, No. 2549, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Attest:

JOHN PRICE,
Adjutant.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1942. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Kurth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1943. A bill for the relief of Genara Hernandez Martins; and

S. 1944. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ivan Kerno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 1945. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved March 5, 1952; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. CASE, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 1946. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 1947. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and to repeal such provisions of the Ship Act of 1910 as remain in effect; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1948. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for flood control on the Big Sioux River at Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1949. A bill to amend the act of September 8, 1916 (10 U. S. C. 388); to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1950. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt home workers in rural areas from the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of that act in certain cases; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON):

S. 1951. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1952. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system to employees performing services in the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, or other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. WELKER, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. LANGER):

S. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to increase allowances for carry-over and acreage allotments for the 1954 crops of corn and wheat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SUSPENSION FOR 1 YEAR OF CERTAIN DUTIES ON IMPORTATION OF ALUMINUM AND ALUMINUM ALLOYS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys.

It has become clearly evident that the current import tariff of 1½ cents a pound on aluminum has prevented the importation of much needed aluminum, particularly from a strategic and important source of supply, namely, Canada. This tariff should be removed during the present shortage of the metal. I believe the effect will be wholesome, just as it was in the case of such metals as copper and zinc.

Furthermore, many leaders of small businesses have testified that the suspension or removal of the present tariff on aluminum not only meets with their approval, but is urgently needed if they are to survive and grow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1951) to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ALLOWANCES FOR CARRYOVER AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR 1954 CROPS OF CORN AND WHEAT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a great many people in the farming areas of America are disturbed about the possibility of allocations and allotments for corn and wheat in the next crop year, and a number of us have introduced legislation to meet that problem. On behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with a short statement in explanation of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 79) to increase allowances for carryover and acreage allotments for the 1954 crops of corn and wheat, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas adequate supplies of grains have been of great assistance in carrying out United States foreign policies in recent years by enabling the United States to render aid to friendly foreign countries; and

Whereas supplies provided for by the present allowances for carryover in marketing quota legislation do not furnish adequate protection against potential needs in view of the present troubled state of world affairs; and

Whereas it appears likely that marketing quotas will be proclaimed for corn and wheat to be harvested in 1954 at levels which will unduly restrict the United States supply of these grains: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) the second sentence of section 301 (b) (10) (A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (relating to allowances for carryover) is amended (1) by striking out "10 percent in the case of corn" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 percent in the case of corn"; and (2) by striking out "15 percent in the case of wheat" and inserting in lieu thereof "30 percent in the case of wheat."

(b) The first sentence of section 328 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows: "The acreage allotment of corn for any calendar year shall be that acreage in the commercial corn-producing area which, on the basis of the average yield for corn in such area during the 10 calendar years immediately preceding such calendar year, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and trends in yield, will produce an amount of corn in such area which the Secretary determines will, together with corn produced in the United States outside the commercial corn-producing area or imported, make available a supply for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year, equal to 120 percent of the normal supply."

(c) The first sentence of section 333 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows: "The national acreage allotment for any crop of wheat shall be that acreage which the Secretary determines will, on the basis of the national average yield for wheat, produce an amount thereof adequate, together with the estimated carryover at the beginning of the marketing year for such crop and imports, to make available a supply for such marketing year equal to 120 percent of the normal supply."

(d) The amendment made by this section shall be effective only with respect to the crops of corn and wheat harvested during the calendar year 1954.

SEC. 2. The second sentence of paragraph (2) of Public Law 74, 77th Congress, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The rate of the penalty shall be 50 percent of the parity price per bushel of the commodity as of August 1, in the case of corn, and as of May 1, in the case of wheat, of the calendar year in which such crop is produced."

The statement by Mr. MUNDT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

The proposed joint resolution to increase allowances for carryover and acreage allotments for the 1954 crops of corn and wheat, and for other purposes, would—

(1) Increase the allowance for carryover used in computing the normal supply for corn from 10 percent of domestic consumption and exports to 20 percent.

(2) Increase the allowance for carryover used in computing the normal supply for wheat from 15 percent of domestic consumption and exports to 30 percent.

(3) Increase the acreage allotment for corn from an acreage designed to produce a normal supply to an acreage designed to produce 120 percent of a normal supply (computed with the increased carryover allowance).

(4) Increase the acreage allotment for wheat from an acreage designed to produce a quantity equal to a normal year's domestic consumption and exports, plus 30 percent thereof, to an acreage designed to produce 120 percent of a normal supply (computed with the increased carryover allowance).

(5) Provide marketing penalties for corn and wheat. In this respect, the draft is the same as S. 3510, which passed the Senate on June 8, 1950, but which did not pass the House of Representatives. A copy of S. 3510 and the report on it, explaining the situation, are attached.

The provisions described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of this memorandum would be made applicable only to the 1954 crops. The provision described in paragraph (5) would be permanent legislation.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN ACTS RELATING TO COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK—AMENDMENT

Mr. FERGUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1679) to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States, Territories, and possessions receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 307. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y."; and

H. R. 1219. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 665. An act for the relief of N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Krayenbrink Moerings, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings;

H. R. 695. An act for the relief of Walter Carl Sander;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Porfirio Punciano Vila, Tatiana Abatooroff Vila, Porfirio P. Vila, Jr., Anne Marie Vila, and Josephine Anne Vila;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Tien Koo Chen;

H. R. 779. An act for the relief of Ida Baghdassarian;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of Johanna C. Willemsen;

H. R. 783. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung;

H. R. 847. An act for the relief of Robert J. Rickards, Conception Sotelo Rickards, and Walter John Rickards;

H. R. 869. An act for the relief of Masuko Oshima;

H. R. 978. An act for the relief of Haruo Fukushi;

H. R. 1143. An act for the relief of Mary Francina Marconi, Fernanda Guzzi, Anna Ferraro, Mary Laudano, and Julia Pisano;

H. R. 1330. An act for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu;

H. R. 1345. An act for the relief of John Lampropoulos;

H. R. 1434. An act to amend the act of February 24, 1925, incorporating the American War Mothers;

H. R. 1756. An act for the relief of Eugene de Thassy;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Paul Myung Ha Chung;

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Anneliese Schillings;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of Clemintina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Garzarrini;

H. R. 2313. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and six months thereafter;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Sam Rosenblat;

H. R. 2392. An act for the relief of Lee Kwang Nong (George Clifford Roeder);

H. R. 2566. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to establish a time limitation upon the filing of certain claims thereunder;

H. R. 2652. An act for the relief of Constance Brouwer Scheffer;

H. R. 2696. An act to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy;

H. R. 2747. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday;

H. R. 2787. An act for the relief of Josefine Hoorn (Dmytruk);

H. R. 3522. An act for the relief of Arthur S. Rosichan;

H. R. 3670. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Gamroth;

H. R. 4048. An act for the relief of the Maxwell Hardware Co.;

H. R. 4110. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Weir;

H. R. 4364. An act to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," relative to the composition of claims commissions; and

H. R. 4432. An act for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1561. An act authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration (in Johnson City, Tenn.) to the State of Tennessee;

H. R. 1730. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; and

H. R. 4730. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, of certain lands formerly owned by that city; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1815. An act to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes;

H. R. 2512. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended;

H. R. 2826. An act to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended; and

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution for admitting the State of Ohio into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2319. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2312. An act to repeal Public Law 620, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2456. An act to amend the act of October 11, 1951, authorizing the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4557. An act to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to permits for construction of radio stations;

H. R. 4558. An act to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder; and

H. R. 4559. An act to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2226. An act to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska; and

H. R. 4091. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to make the exclusion from such act of temporary employees of Congress inapplicable to such employees who are appointed at an annual rate of salary; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2327. An act to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK O. EVANS TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 28, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Frank O. Evans of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Georgia, vice John P. Cowart, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK D. McSHERRY TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 28, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Frank D. McSherry, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CLINTON G. RICHARDS TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 28, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Clinton G. Richards, of South Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LESTER SHIELDS PARSONS, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 28, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Lester Shields Parsons, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia, vice A. Carter Whitehead, resigning. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New

Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address delivered by him at Cumberland University assembly, Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., on April 30, 1953.

Letter written by Watson Rogers, president of the National Food Brokers Association, to the Journal of Commerce, of New York, relating to the Robinson-Patman Act.

By Mr. NEELY:

Address relative to employment of the physically handicapped, delivered by Okey L. Patteson, former Governor of West Virginia, at the presentation of a plaque to Adm. Ross T McIntire, in Washington, D. C., on April 23, 1953.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Proclamation issued by the Governor of New Hampshire in support of Port of Boston Month.

Article entitled "Britain Torpedoes Truce Talks," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Post of May 15, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Record of the Kremlin's Broken Pledges," published in the Washington Daily News of May 4, 1953.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Report by Ernesto Galarza and Gardner Jackson on the present situation in Bolivia.

By Mr. LANGER:

Article entitled "20th Anniversary of AAA Recalls Faith in Democracy," published in the Farmer's Union Herald of May 11, 1953.

Article entitled "If We Cut Acreage," published in the Farmer's Union Herald of May 11, 1953.

By Mr. FREAR:

Editorial entitled "Grievous Words," published in the Wilmington Morning News of Friday, May 14, 1953, relating to the controversy between Great Britain and the United States over the shipment of goods to Communist China.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Editorial entitled "Let the Generals Win," published in the Indianapolis Star, relating to the winning of the war in Korea.

Article entitled "Early Days on the Salt River Project," written by Oliver T. Reedy.

By Mr. WILEY:

Program of All-American Conference to Combat Communism, and an article by Jerome L. Mueller, published in the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Tablet, relating to antiespionage laws.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Editorial entitled "Now Too Much?" published in the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram of May 8, 1953, dealing with policies of the Department of Agriculture.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Building Seaway Piecemeal Still Doesn't Justify It," published in a recent issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Prize essay written by Miss Virginia Boyle, entitled "The Physically Handicapped: A National Asset."

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Address entitled "Washington and Manifest Destiny," delivered by Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas at ceremonies in the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., May 14, 1953, commemorating the centennial of the Territory of Washington.

Address entitled "Accelerated Amortization: Biggest Bonanza That Ever Came Down the Government Pike," delivered by Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, at the annual convention of the American Public Power Association in Boston, Mass., on May 14, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Break the Bunk about Hells Canyon Dam," published in the May issue of the Pacific Northwest Cooperator at Walla Walla, Wash.

Editorial entitled "Crime of the Century," published in the Wenatchee (Wash.) World of April 28, 1953, dealing with Hells Canyon Dam.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Article entitled "The United States Negro, 1953," published in Time magazine of May 11, 1953.

TWENTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF TRANSATLANTIC FLIGHT OF CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, today marks an anniversary in the life of a great American, Michigan born, who by his courage, enterprise, and resourcefulness, lifted aviation into the prominent place it now occupies.

Twenty-six years ago today, on May 20, 1927, Charles A. Lindbergh succeeded in getting his heavily loaded Spirit of St. Louis off the runway at Roosevelt Field, Long Island, and began his flight across the Atlantic, which had the people of the world in a great state of excitement for 33 hours.

Lindbergh was born in Detroit on February 4, 1902. His father, a native of Sweden, brought to this country when he was a boy, was a graduate in law of the University of Michigan, at Ann Arbor. His mother also graduated from the same university.

Young Lindbergh might well have followed in the footsteps of many who have performed great feats and capitalized on his exploit to his personal gain. But from the time he landed at Le Bourget Airfield in Paris he demonstrated qualities that have made him, as I have intimated, one of the great figures in American life. Even then, as a young man of 25 years, he demonstrated qualities that marked him as an ambassador of good will, and he did much to endear his country to the people of Europe.

His life since has been one of accomplishment in science and good citizenship. As a civilian with the Air Force in the Pacific in World War II, instructing young aviators in many particulars of flying of which he was a master, he held the unique distinction of having participated in encounters with the enemy in the air, though not at the time a member of the military forces. Many have forgotten that Lindbergh was commissioned an officer in the Air Reserve after completing his course of training in Texas in the early twenties.

With his gracious wife, Charles Lindbergh has presented a picture of the best in American family life, and on this day I am glad to refresh the memory of his countrymen about the great exploit he engineered in 1927.

MARCUS WHITMAN

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for not more than a minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Idaho may proceed.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on May 22, which is Friday of this week, a statue of the great American missionary and physician, Dr. Marcus Whitman, will be unveiled in the Capitol rotunda. I regret that my absence from the Senate on official business on that day will prevent my attendance at the ceremony, but I should like to pay a brief tribute at this time to the memory of this great American, who played such a prominent and important part in the founding and settlement of the Northwest.

It was Marcus Whitman who in the year 1836 opened the way to the tide of immigration into the Territory which is now the State of Oregon. It was this courageous missionary who first recognized the value of the Oregon Territory to the United States, and who almost singlehandedly frustrated British plans for colonization of the area. Marcus Whitman can truly be called the father of the State of Oregon, for it was because of his leadership that thousands of settlers made the long trek into the valley of the Columbia. His untimely death, along with that of his wife and two adopted children, came at the hands of hostile Indians who did not understand that Whitman was both their friend and benefactor.

There are descendants of Marcus Whitman living in my own State of Idaho today, and I congratulate them upon the well deserved recognition and honor which have finally come to their great ancestor. They are Mrs. Frank A. Campbell, of Deary, Idaho; Winnifred Wann, of Arco, and Robert Barnett, of Lewiston.

They, and all other descendants of Marcus Whitman, can take satisfaction from the ceremony to be held in the National Capitol on Friday.

PROPOSED ADMISSION OF CHINESE REDS TO UNITED NATIONS—ARTICLE BY GEORGE MINOT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 17, there appeared in the Boston Herald an article entitled "Britain Wants Us To Give In," authored by its extremely capable managing editor, George Minot.

It is a clear and forceful presentation of the role of the United Nations in the Korean conflict, and paints a vivid word picture of how Great Britain would have us give in to the Chinese Reds.

This article is particularly pertinent at this time, and worthy of the attention of all thinking Americans. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLIES WOULD ADMIT CHINESE REDS TO U. N.—BRITAIN WANTS US TO GIVE IN

(By George Minot)

A House Foreign Affairs subcommittee, which has been over there, wants the whole southeast Asia conflagration, including Indochina, put before the United Nations for action. This is a terrifying suggestion. We already are mixed up in one United Nations

action over there. It has cost us more than 130,000 casualties. We find ourselves stuck with the entire responsibility. We don't know how to get out decently.

Just as we were fooled in Europe, where the politicians told us if we would invest $30 billion the countries over there would match it and raise armies for their own defense, so a great many have been fooled by the Korean war. It was sold to us as a United Nations action. Our soldiers found it wasn't.

UNITED STATES BECOMING ISOLATED

Forty-three of the 60 member states never joined in the fight to drive the Reds out of South Korea. Of the 17 that did, most gave only token assistance. Our soldiers in Korea found there were no United Nations uniforms or funds or camp shows or decorations—or anything at all. When they returned—including these recent prisoners of war—they heard or saw nothing of the organization that had voted them into the war.

Americans now know that the United Nations has no more to do with the conduct of the war than any individual taxpayer in this country. Decisive events like the firing of General MacArthur, the decision to move the fleet out of Formosan waters, the extended training and use of South Korean troops—such things as that don't even go before the organization they are supposed to be fighting for.

The truth of the matter is that America is becoming more and more isolated in the entire Korean adventure. The British are openly advising us to give in to the Chinese Reds. On the basic issue that is behind all these talks at Panmunjom, the big majority in the United Nations will side with the Communists.

That issue, of course, is Red China's membership in the United Nations, which automatically will give her the dominant role in all Asia. It will install her as 1 of the 5 great powers sitting in judgment on the massive probems that come up all over the world.

WOULD WRECK WHOLE BUSINESS

Should that happen, we will have lost not only the Korean war, but the entire cold war. There would be no more Allied defense against world domination by the Communists. It would wreck the American-British alliance and the whole United Nations organization with it.

If the Red Chinese should be admitted to the councils of decent nations as a reward for their aggression and brutalities, this country never again could raise its voice in defense of the oppressed. It would be a national disgrace.

Yet pressure for a deal with the monsters who invaded South Korea is increasing daily among nations sponsoring the war yet bearing little if any responsibility for it. Gradually all of that—supplying the outside troops, all the money and all the munitions—has been shifted on to us. And still there are politicians urging United Nations action in the case of Indochina. How big a load do they think they can pile on the camel's back?

The British don't like the Chinese Reds any better than we do, but they like their trade. They like it so much and they consider it so important that American words about honor and decency make no impression on their politicians.

UNASHAMED FRANKNESS

"Gradually and with unashamed frankness," David Lawrence said in his Traveler column the other day, "the British are conceding that they think it is more important for them to continue their trade with Communist countries than to help the United States put economic pressure on the Soviet Union even as the latter supplies to Red China guns and munitions with which to kill American boys in Korea."

The British are not sending strategic supplies directly to Red China any longer, but continue to send them to Russia. Our cousins with straight faces hide behind the fiction that the Soviet Union is not legally an aggressor. It must be hard for the parents of those 130,000 American soldiers killed or wounded in Korea to swallow nonsense like that.

And on top of that is the ship scandal dug up here—the story of the ships under Allied flags that are still carrying cargoes to Red China and other Red ports. This is a double action because these ships collect in two ways—from the Reds for delivering supplies that aid them in Korea and from the United States for delivering goods designed to build up Europe against attack by the Communists.

More than 2 years ago the General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution naming the Chinese Communists as aggressors in Korea. Despite that, not one of the 17 member states which at that time had recognized the Communists as the government of China saw fit to withdraw its recognition of the Peiping regime. Those included Britain, Denmark, the Netherlands and Norway, which are associated with us in the North Atlantic Pact.

The United Nations also has adopted a resolution calling on all members to refrain from aiding the aggressors. That great liberal Premier Nehru of India announced his country does not and will not accept the U. N. embargo on strategic materials.

It's about time the fiction that this is a United Nations action in Korea is straightened out. It's time the British stopped needling us for not surrendering to the Reds and cocked an eye toward southeast Asia. There's plenty of hot water for the empire.

CEASE-FIRE OR PEACE?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, last week members of the British Parliament and of this body became engaged in a crossfire of recriminations. This was understandable. But it was also unfortunate, particularly because the debate was unilluminating. We and our British friends should be able to do better than to allow statesmanship to descend to the level of angry housewives exchanging left-handed compliments over the backyard fence.

There are some things that our English friends should understand and we should endeavor to explain to them in a calm and reasoned manner. When Mr. Attlee said, referring to Korea, "There are elements in the United States that do not want a settlement," he was probably doing what so many of us on this side of the Atlantic are prone to do, which is to confuse a cease-fire or truce with peace. The people of this country earnestly long for peace. Some of us tend to think that a truce is a peace. Of that dangerous notion we must disabuse ourselves.

During the practical cease-fire of many months of the early negotiations, the Communists, who as we now know had suffered defeat, used the occasion to rebuild their strength in men, munitions, and airfields. That is what has happened under a simple truce.

The least we can accept is an armistice whose terms preclude the strengthening of either side, and provide means to make sure that neither side is cheating on those terms. A truce only would be a serious misfortune, permitting again the building up of Communist strength as during those months of hopeless palaver.

But after all, even such an armistice is not peace. We cannot be satisfied with it. What we long for in Korea as elsewhere is some negotiated end to the conflict that gives reasonable assurance of a period of peaceful prosperity for both North and South Korea.

But Clement Attlee was not the only critical voice that we heard. Prime Minister Nehru indicated that he favored the Communist stand as compared with that of the United Nations, saying that it was a "very close approximation" of the Indian plan endorsed by the General Assembly last fall.

There are many points on this matter of the exchange of prisoners on which the two sides have come to an agreement. These points of agreement include a period suggested by the Communists in which "explanations" will be made to those unwilling to be repatriated. The Communists want this explanation period to last 4 months. All we have agreed to is a 2-month period. We cannot look upon our agreement for a 2-month period with easy consciences when we know, as we do know, what the Communists mean by "explanation." Are these men who have suffered under communism, who hate it, who wish to be free from it, to be subjected not to friendly and gentlemanly explanations but to that psychological torture known as "brain washing." Nothing that has appeared in print indicates any restrictions on these explanations. Nothing indicates that the victims will have the help, advice, and moral support of those of us who are as hostile to communism as they are. From anything that has been said publicly, these men are to be turned over to the unrestrained and skillful psychological manipulation of the sort which has broken down the spirit of so many of their victims in the past.

The Western World had come to have a growing appreciation of the spiritual values which are inherent in eastern philosophies and religions, even though such institutions as the caste system were as incomprehensible to us as are our much milder color-line problems to them. That spiritual strength seemed to us to find its highest expression in the life and achievements of Mahatma Gandhi. Has the clear mountain flood of that spiritual influence flowed down to the plains and now lost itself in the desert sands of Nehru's day?

What the Communists asked for and what we may have reluctantly—and for your speaker at least with shame—agreed to is that every psychological pressure, every device of moral bullying which has been so skillfully developed by the Communists in the past years shall be applied to men who have made up their minds rationally, freely, and without duress.

To permit such a thing at all is shameful. To have the Premier of India, the home of great spiritual philosophies, ask that the time be extended over a period of 4 months is incredible. What ground there may be for it in his religion and philosophy I do not know. It seems incompatible with all we know about his background. I do know that it violates the dignity and worth of the individual soul of man, which is an essential part of the teachings of Christ. I do know that

it is the antithesis of the principles of the Founding Fathers who built this Nation. I do believe that we cannot and must not stand on other ground than the Bible and the Declaration of Independence if we are not to shame our history, our ancestors, and our descendants.

Believing all this, we still cannot crusade for these beliefs at all times on all occasions and in all places, but we must be guided by them where a clear responsibility exists, as in Korea.

As I said earlier, the great longing of our people is not for a cease-fire, not for a truce, not even for a controlled armistice, but for peace in Korea as, indeed, for the whole world. We can offer peace on terms which match the dignity of the human soul. We can offer it in terms which lead to the utmost of practically attainable well-being for the individual man, woman, and child of North and South Korea. Nothing short of this is worth offering. I have mentioned these terms on this floor before. Let me do so once more. Here is what we should propose to do:

First. Set up a neutral zone along the Yalu River covering also the Siberian frontier. This offers assurance that so long as neutrality is maintained there will be no military action against the Manchurian border. Conversely there can be none against Korea. This meets the only interest in the Korean conflict which the government of Communist China has admitted.

Second. Set up a commission composed entirely of Asiatic nationals to inspect and administer neutrality in this zone. This does two things. First, it removes from consideration the idea that we are seeking military advantage in the Korean peninsula. Second, it puts a serious responsibility for the maintenance of peace on the Asiatics themselves.

Third. Proceed with the political unification of North and South Korea. The political jurisdiction of the government should extend to the Yalu but military operations would be forbidden within the neutral zone.

Fourth. Rebuild in usable form, though not elaborately, the housing, transportation, and industry of the united country. The two halves belong together—the industrial north cannot exist without other sources of food. The agricultural south needs manufactures from the outside. Together they will support each other in a standard of living that is high for Asiatic nations.

Fifth. After political integration and economic reconstruction, carry out the original United Nations purpose of free elections throughout the entire peninsula to determine the form of government under which the Korean people desire to live.

Some of the advantages of this plan are mentioned in the above five points. In addition, it has the characteristic of being to the greatest possible advantage of the peoples concerned whether they are soldiers in the two armies, civilians of North Korea, or civilians of South Korea. It would be difficult to change the terms except to the disadvantage of people.

Rejection of such terms cannot be made without rejecting the well-being of people. The act of acceptance or rejection will put on those with whom we negotiate the stamp of those who seek to advance or seek to destroy the well-being of some millions of men, women, and children.

The maximum advantage to people must be the cornerstone of a new diplomacy adapted to the world in which we live.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks a statement I made this morning before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the subject of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 45 ON ST. LAWRENCE LEGISLATION, INCLUDING LEHMAN RESOLUTION, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 45, BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 20, 1953

Mr. Chairman, the several measures now before the subcommittee have in common many sound provisions for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

This is the fifth time since 1941 that I have appeared at congressional hearings to urge the dual-purpose development of the St. Lawrence River as an integral part of the seaway and power project.

I know that the members of this subcommittee are just as eager as I am to speed the completion of this project in the national interest and to safeguard its benefits to the people of every section of our country. I know that your chairman has fought as hard for these objectives in Wisconsin as I have fought for them in New York.

The joint resolution I have offered on behalf of myself and other Senators, Senate Joint Resolution 45, is intended to strengthen the provisions of the chairmen's bill, S. 589, of which I am also among the cosponsors.

Senate Joint Resolution 45 would apply to the St. Lawrence power development in my State safeguards well established by Federal law, vital to the interests of millions of power consumers in New York and New England, and directly in line with the safeguards for producers and consumers in the Midwest provided by S. 589.

In extending the navigation safeguards of S. 589 to include safeguards for the power development in the Northeast, Senate Joint Resolution 45 is quite similar in principle to the bill S. 1065 offered by the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY. That bill very properly would add a new title to S. 589, to authorize the deepening of the connecting channels of the upper lakes, thereby completing the seaway to project depth throughout its full extent so that it will efficiently serve Duluth-Superior and other great ports of the Northwest.

It will be seen at a glance that the measures before the subcommittee do not differ so much in substance as in the scope given to their underlying provisions.

So far as the development of the International Rapids section in my State is concerned, each of these measures provides: (1) For the improvement of this section as a self-liquidating project; (2) for a Government corporation to build all the works in this section which may be authorized by the Congress; and, (3) for bond issues supported by revenues from the use of the new facilities, sufficient to cover all costs of construction, operation, and maintenance, without burden upon the taxpayers.

In view of the common provisions of S. 589, Senate Joint Resolution 45, and S. 1065, I hope that this subcommittee will incorporate their essential features in a perfected bill—a bill that will preserve their sound principles in all their vigor and command united support for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Similar as these bills are in substance and principle, any limitation on their provisions to exclude the power development from authorization by the Congress will, in my judgment, have serious and highly regrettable consequences.

Senate Joint Resolution 45 deals with the development of the International Rapids section for what it actually is—a dual-purpose project to harness the rapids both for power and navigation. The engineering boards of the United States and Canada and the Committee on Foreign Relations, in repeatedly recommending this dual-purpose project, have never dealt with it in any different manner.

Senate Joint Resolution 45 takes into account the fact that, by estimated costs, over three-fourths of the works required to complete the United States share of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project must be built in the International Rapids section. It is these works—the key to the entire project—that will open the Great Lakes to deep-water navigation and develop 940,000 kilowatts of low-cost hydroelectric power from the United States half of the flow of the St. Lawrence through this section.

Accordingly, Senate Joint Resolution 45 would exercise the jurisdiction of the Congress, under the Constitution, to provide for the development of these boundary waters for the dual purpose of navigation and power.

It would authorize the Government corporation to install the United States share of the works and facilities primarily for power, and the joint works common to navigation and power—including the main Long Sault Dam—as well as the associated locks and canals solely for navigation.

It would authorize the Government corporation to issue its bonds to finance the construction of the dual-purpose project and to support those bonds with assured revenues from the power facilities, as well as from the navigation facilities.

In contrast with these provisions, S. 589 on the other hand would authorize the Government corporation to issue bonds only for works on the St. Lawrence River solely for navigation, and to support those bonds with navigation tolls. Even if its provisions were extended to authorize the navigation works on the Upper Lakes, as proposed by S. 1065, the bill would remove all the power works and all the common works in the International Rapids section from any measure of direct authorization and control by the Congress. Such works, comprising the major part of the development in this section, would be left by S. 589 for construction under a 50-year license from the Federal Power Commission, without the enactment of any specific safeguards by the Congress.

I am sure this subcommittee will wish to consider the practical results of such a severance of the navigation project from the power project.

By narrowing the jurisdiction of the Congress to apply only to navigation, millions of consumers in New York and New England—domestic and rural consumers, municipalities, rural-electric cooperatives and even national-defense agencies of the Government itself in this area—would be deprived of the safeguards which the Congress has been careful to prescribe in authorizing all other major river-development projects over the past 30 years.

The establishment of such a policy in dealing with the boundary waters of the St. Law-

rence would create a dangerous precedent that would surely rise up to plague us in the future. Such a precedent would immediately be seized upon by private utilities to support their demand that the Congress approve the licensing of all the undeveloped power left at Niagara Falls, 1,250,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric capacity. The licensing of such projects as these, on the St. Lawrence and the Niagara, without adequate safeguards prescribed by the Congress, would lead inevitably to undermining the basic policy of conservation and multipurpose development of our water resources, consistently approved by the Congress over the last half century.

Moreover, speaking from the viewpoint of my own State of New York, the severance of the power project from the seaway would load onto the consumers of the power, in New York State, in New England and elsewhere, a disproportionate share of the cost of the dual-purpose project. By this severance, the power development in New York and Ontario would be required to bear an additional capital cost of almost $100 million in excess of the amount heretofore allocated to the cost of the power.

This would certainly not be fair to power consumers of New York State and New England. I think those officials of my own State who, by failure last year to support wholeheartedly the dual-purpose legislation when it might have been approved, should have real reason for regret in the present situation. As for myself, I continue unqualifiedly to support the dual-purpose legislation.

I ask to insert for printing in the record a brief statement on the need for allocation of the costs of this project by Mr. Roger B. McWhorter, a United States member of the International Joint Commission and chief engineer of the Federal Power Commission.

The saving for consumers in the equitable allocation of the cost of the common works such as would be achieved under a dual purpose project, is not, of course, the chief reason for my advocating Senate Joint Resolution 45. My chief reason is the absence, in the pending legislation providing for the seaway alone, of adequate public interest safeguards for the power phase of the project. In S. 589, acquiescence is given the separation of the power project from the seaway project. It is contemplated that the New York State Power Authority will obtain from the Federal Power Commission a license for the development of the power project.

It is pertinent to observe, I am sure, that I have asked the Federal Power Commission, if it decides to grant a license to the New York power authority to insert the necessary safeguards in the license. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a copy of the letter I addressed to the Federal Power Commission on this subject on February 5, 1953.

I should add that there is serious doubt concerning the Federal Power Commission's legal authority under its present act to include such safeguards in the grant of a license to the New York Power Authority or to any other licensee. In view of that doubt, I introduced a bill some weeks ago, S. 1010, in the form of an amendment to the Federal Power Act, requiring the Commission to include such safeguards in any license granted the New York Power Authority. That bill is now pending before the Committee on Public Works.

I am sure it is no secret to the members of this committee that the New York Power Authority does not favor the safeguards I have referred to, although those safeguards constituted a basic part of the philosophy of the New York Power Authority, as that body was originally conceived in 1930, and as it remained until 1950. The present New York Power Authority no longer favors preferences to municipal and other public bodies, and to rural electric cooperatives. It has frankly stated its plan to sell the power to the private utilities for transmission over the utility lines, without those preferences which the Congress has prescribed in authorizing similar projects.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I will not labor the point. It is part of a pattern—a dangerous pattern in my judgment, and one which will be costly to the people of our country.

I would like at this point, Mr. Chairman, to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of my bill to amend the Federal Power Act by requiring the Federal Power Commission to include the safeguards of public interest in any license granted to the New York Power Authority for the development of the power in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence.

Also at this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD the text of the Federal-State Accord negotiated in 1946 between the United States Corps of Engineers on behalf of the Federal Government, and the New York Power Authority on behalf of the State of New York. This agreement was arrived at on the basis of the Federal-State Accord of 1933, negotiated between the same two parties when I was Governor of the State of New York. The 1933 agreement has been referred to in all the joint resolutions of the St. Lawrence considered in the past years by this committee, including the Vandenberg resolution of 1947 and the Green resolution considered last year. It was included by reference in what was formerly designated as section 5.

The 1946 agreement, negotiated during the incumbency of the present Governor of New York, provides, among other things, for all the safeguards to which I have referred, and which the present New York Power Authority now opposes for reasons which, in my judgment, are highly unsound and even dangerous.

As the subcommittee is aware, the Parliament at Ottawa has already taken definite and positive action to protect the interests of Canada and her people in every phase of this project for development of the boundary waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

By legislation approved December 21, 1951, the Canadian Parliament has vigorously exercised its jurisdiction over the Canadian share of these boundary waters both for navigation and power.

It has created a St. Lawrence Seaway Authority with power to issue up to $300 million in bonds guaranteed by the Canadian Government. It has authorized this agency to build all or a part of the works needed to complete the seaway to project depth of 27 feet through the channels and 30 feet over the sills of canals and locks, from the Atlantic to Lake Erie.

The Canadian legislation is exceedingly flexible in its terms. It leaves the door open for reciprocal action by the Congress, as contemplated by the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, and as provided by Senate Joint Resolution 45. The treaty of 1909 authorized the United States and Canada to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system by mutual arrangements "expressed by concurrent or reciprocal legislation on the part of Congress and the Parliament of Canada."

Thus the Canadian legislation of 1951 provides for the construction by Canada of the navigation works in the wholly Canadian sections of the waterway. In addition—in the event that the Congress fails to act—it provides also for the construction by Canada of the vitally important locks and canals in the International Rapids section.

These locks and canals will command the approach of all ships, whether cargo or naval vessels, to the Great Lakes. They are to be built in waters forming a part of the original boundary of the United States. This boundary was won in the American Revolution and fixed by Franklin, Adams, and Jay in the treaty of 1783 on a line starting at the intersection of the 45th parallel with the St. Lawrence River and running west through the International Rapids section and through the Great Lakes and their connecting rivers to a point near the headwaters of the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River.

Up to now, for 170 years, the United States has never failed to assert the sovereign rights of this Nation in all our boundary waters. In every treaty and agreement negotiated with Canada to provide for the development of the St. Lawrence River, the United States has always reserved the right to build, own, and operate the proposed locks and canals in the International Rapids section on the United States side of the river. This would be accomplished by Senate Joint Resolution 45 and the other measures before the subcommittee.

Under the Canadian legislation of 1951—if the Congress fails to act—the Canadian side of the river where they would be built, would be owned and operated by Canada. This would mean an all-Canadian seaway, without a canal or lock under the American flag from the Atlantic to the MacArthur Lock at the Soo. Under the legislation of 1951, if Canada builds all the navigation works needed to complete an all-Canadian seaway, the Canadian Seaway Authority is directed to levy tolls, by unilateral action at Ottawa, on all ships, passengers, and cargo passing through these new facilities. The great bulk of this traffic, as our own Government agencies have reported to the Congress, will be American commerce, bound to or from our ports on the Great Lakes.

We are therefore no longer confronted with the question whether or not the seaway is to be built. It will be built by Canada, subject to tolls fixed by unilateral action, or it will be built jointly by the United States and Canada, subject to tolls fixed by mutual agreement.

The Parliament of Canada has by no means confined its jurisdiction to the navigation phase of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

In Canada—unlike the practice in the United States—major river projects for the public development of hydroelectric power have for many years been built by the Provinces rather than by the Dominion Government. In the acts of 1951, Parliament designated the Province of Ontario through its Hydro-Electric Power Commission to build the Candian share of all the works in the International Rapids section, except the works solely for navigation.

The acts provided in substance that Ontario would build the Canadian share of the common works and the power works "in conjunction with works undertaken by an appropriate authority in the United States."

Parliament thus limited the commitment of the Canadian Government to the cost of the works solely for navigation. By specifically assigning the common works and the power works for construction by agencies of Ontario and the United States, it allocated the cost of the common works—including dams and channel excavation—to the power development. It thus made an allocation of costs not only for the Ontario agency but also for the United States agency, each of which will develop one half of the power in the International Rapids section.

Under the acts to which I have referred, Parliament has provided fully for the development of the Candian share of St. Lawrence power, with every possible safeguard to protect the interests of power consumers on the Canadian side of this boundary. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario is today operating great projects on the Niagara, the Ottawa, and other rivers to produce virtually all the power contributing to the public supply in that Province. Under its own act and under the legislation approved by Parliament in 1951, the Commission will publicly develop and transmit the Canadian share of St. Lawrence power

over its own system, serving municipalities, rural electric cooperatives, and public agencies throughout the Province, extending from the head of the Great Lakes to the Quebec border on the St. Lawrence River.

There is no question that St. Lawrence energy, mingled with other available sources of low-cost energy in Ontario, will reach consumers at low rates.

The cost of electric energy to domestic and rural consumers in Ontario averages about one-half the cost to consumers in New York and New England. This differential against residential customers, dairy farmers, and consumers generally in this area would be increased further if we fail to safeguard the development of our share of St. Lawrence power.

In the light of the action taken by the Canadian Parliament to protect Canadian interests in all phases of this project, it is inconceivable to me that the Congress should waive or delegate its responsibility to deal with the power development in the interest of our own consumers.

The International Joint Commission by its order of October 29, 1952, gave general approval to the project for construction of the power works and the common works in the International Rapids Section, to be undertaken jointly by agencies of the United States and Ontario, each agency to bear one-half of the cost.

The application filed by Canada in this proceeding was authorized in advance by the act of Parliament designating Ontario to construct and operate the Canadian half of these works.

The application filed by our State Department made no designation of the agency which would build the United States half of the works. On the contrary, our application expressly set forth the jurisdiction of the Congress over the development of the International Rapids section for power as well as navigation, and left open the matter of designating the agency to build any of the works undertaken on behalf of the United States. Accordingly, the International Joint Commission itself, in its order of approval, made no designation of the United States agency that was to participate in building the project.

Separate applications to construct the United States share of the power works and the common works under a 50-year license were filed with the Federal Power Commission in 1952 by the Power Authority of the State of New York, and by a private corporation, the Public Power and Water Corporation. The Federal Power Commission, which recommended to Congress in 1950 that our Government develop the International Rapids section in a dual purpose project, has not yet acted upon these applications. If one of the numerous intervenors in this proceeding should exercise the statutory right to a review in the court of appeals, it would require about 2 years before a final decision could be reached on the validity of any order issued by the Commission.

S. 589 makes no definite designation of the agency which is to construct and operate the United States share of the power works and the common works. It provides only that the Government corporation set up in the bill shall not proceed to build the navigation works unless and until it has satisfactory assurances that "the State of New York, or an entity duly designated by it, or other licensee of the Federal Power Commission, in conjunction with an appropriate agency in Canada, will construct and complete, as nearly as possible concurrently with the navigation works authorized herein, the dams and power works approved by the International Joint Commission in its order of October 29, 1952" (sec. 3, S. 589).

In contrast with this provision, Senate Joint Resolution 45 definitely designates the Government corporation set up by both measures to build not only the navigation works authorized by S. 589, but also the United States share of the power works and the common works.

In this respect, Senate Joint Resolution 45 authorizes works in the International Rapids section well within the scope of the Green resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 27, of the last Congress. It closely follows the terms of the proposed Aiken amendment to that resolution, an amendment sponsored by the chairman, Senator TAFT, Senator DOUGLAS, myself, and other supporters of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

As a matter of fact, the United States would have assumed the cost of more of the works in the International Rapids section under Senate Joint Resolution 27 and the Aiken amendment than is proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 45. All the works to be built in this section are listed with estimates of cost submitted by the Corps of Engineers on page 529 of the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 27, 82d Congress, 1st session.

The United States was to assume the cost of all the works in this section—except the cost of power equipment and machinery, land acquisition, and rehabilitation on the Canadian side—under the 1941 United States Canadian agreement which has now lapsed.

The Aiken amendment accordingly authorized bond issues by the proposed St. Lawrence Development Commission in the amount of $485 million. Since the Province of Ontario has now assumed the cost of one-half the power works and one-half the common works under the project approved by the International Joint Commission, Senate Joint Resolution 45 reduces the bond limit to $385 million. This allows for an increase of about 15 percent in the costs above the estimates last submitted by the Corps of Engineers. While it reduces the limit on the issuance of bonds by $100 million, Senate Joint Resolution 45, nevertheless, makes available to support the bonds the full volume of power revenues and navigation tolls contemplated by the Aiken amendment.

The principal difference between S. 589 and Senate Joint Resolution 45 is in the matter of provision of congressional safeguards for power consumers.

Since it excludes the power works and the common works from authorization by the Congress, S. 589 contains no safeguards on the power phase of the development.

Senate Joint Resolution 45, on the other hand, includes safeguards which the Congress has uniformly provided in dealing with dual-purpose developments of such magnitude as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The safeguards contained in Senate Joint Resolution 45 conform to St. Lawrence resolutions heretofore approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations, in reporting the Vandenberg resolution of the 80th Congress, and many previous enactments by the Congress. They are designed—

1. To make possible very substantial savings and economies in the actual construction of the project as a dual-purpose development, by continuing congressional review and control of the authorized works, and by providing for an equitable allocation of the cost of the common works as between navigation and power.

2. To accord to power consumers in New York and New England and to rural-electric cooperatives, municipalities, and other preference customers, the same benefits from this project as Congress has provided by law in authorizing similar projects in other areas throughout the country.

The safeguards to which I refer are set forth in section 16 of Senate Joint Resolution 45.

That section authorizes the St. Lawrence Development Corporation, with such assistance as the President may direct and designate, to negotiate an arrangement with the government of the State of New York for the transfer to the appropriate agency of that State of the power facilities to be installed on the United States side of the International Rapids section.

Senate Joint Resolution 45 maintains the jurisdiction of the Congress over the development of the power by providing, in the first instance, for construction of the United States share of the power works and the common works, as well as the navigation works, by the St. Lawrence Development Corporation. It provides further for the specific approval by the Congress of any agreement negotiated for the transfer of the power facilities before it shall become effective.

Section 16 specifies that any such arrangement shall contain provisions for making available a fair share of the power to New England States within economic transmission distance of the project.

It provides for the marketing of the power in accordance with the safeguards for preference customers and rural and domestic consumers contained in the Federal-State joint recommendations on this project submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations on March 6, 1946.

It provides for the reimbursement to the United States Treasury of the full cost of the project facilities useful for power, under a formula heretofore approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations, providing for an equitable allocation of the cost of the common works as between navigation and power.

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone in expressing the viewpoints I have expressed in my presentation today. Many organizations and individuals representing a virtual cross-section of my State have written to me or addressed to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee directly, urging approval of Senate Joint Resolution 45 and strongly advocating the inclusion of power safeguards in whatever legislation is reported out by this committee. These organizations include labor unions, rural groups, and individual public officials of New York State. I have selected a number of these statements from individuals and organizations and shall ask that they be included in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. The organizations and individuals whose statements I offer for the record are as follows: International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Senator Francis J. Mahoney, minority leader, New York State Senate; Assemblyman Eugene F. Bannigan, minority leader, New York State Assembly; Robert F. Wagner, Jr., president, Borough of Manhattan; Mr. Richard H. Balch, chairman, Democratic State Committee of New York; Mr. Rudolph Halley, president, New York City Council; Women's Trade Union League.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELKER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WATKINS, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. EASTLAND managers on the part of the Senate at the conference.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I propose to move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to take up the new reports and new nominations on the Executive Calendar. I have discussed this procedure with the minority leader, and it is agreeable to him. Among the new reports on the Executive Calendar there is only one nomination—that of a United States marshal—which the minority leader has asked, on behalf of an absent Senator, to have passed over. So far as the minority leader knows, no request has been made to have the other nominations among the new reports passed over.

So, Mr. President, if all routine matters for submission for the RECORD have been presented, and after consultation with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is handling the independent offices appropriations bill, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Jewel Olney Strickland, and sundry other offices of the United States merchant marine for appointment in the United States Coast Guard;

Gordon P. McGowan, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the United States Coast Guard; and

Paul Tregenza Anderson, and sundry other cadets to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar, beginning with the new reports.

RESERVE COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, these nominations, beginning with the new reports, are confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albina R. Cermak, of Ohio, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Holmes Leah, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick W. Kaess, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis Everett Van Alstine to be United States attorney for the northern district of Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roy L. Stephenson, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard Call, to be United States marshal for the district of Utah.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Saul Hale Clark to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William B. Somers to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clement W. Crahan to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Darrell O. Holmes to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Smith to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert W. Saegert to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Darrel O. Holmes to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that this nomination go over, at the request of the minority leader, who was acting on behalf of an absent Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomiation will be passed over.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Budd Parsons, to be United States marshal for the western district of Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Noah W. Riley, to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

FIRST INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4663) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which will appear in the May issue of the American Journal of Public Health on the subject of slums and the need for a reasonable public housing program.

In view of the fact that the Senate today will debate and probably vote upon H. R. 4663, a bill which contains appropriations for the public housing program, I feel that this editorial is especially pertinent. It points out that there are costs other than monetary expenses which result from slum areas. In fact, after reading this editorial I am inclined to ask, not whether we can afford public housing, but whether we can afford to be without a good housing program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHAME OF THE SLUMS

"Domestic garbage and filth of every kind is thrown into the streets, covering their surfaces, filling the gutters, obstructing the sewer culverts, and sending forth perennial emanations which must generate pestiferous

diseases. In winter the filth and garbage, etc., accumulate in the streets to the depth sometimes of 2 or 3 feet." "The streets are generally in a filthy and unwholesome condition; especially in front of the tenant houses, from which garbage and slops are, to a great extent, thrown into the streets where they putrefy, rendering the air offensive to the smell and deleterious to health. The refuse of the bedrooms of those sick with typhoid and scarlet fevers and smallpox is frequently thrown into the streets, there to contaminate the air, and, no doubt, aid in the spread of those pestilential diseases." "The privies form one of the chief features of insalubrity. Nearly all of them are too small in size and too few in number, and are without ventilation or seatcovers. About 12 were found full to the floor timbers or within 1 foot of them. In some cases the doors were found to be locked securely, and on procuring the key and inspecting the privy, such masses of human excrements were found on the seats and floors as would justify the locking of the doors to protect unwary persons from injury." "At high tide the water often wells up through the floors, submerging them to a considerable depth" (this condition refers to cellar dwellings). "In very many cases the vaults of privies are situated on the same or higher level, and their contents frequently ooze through the walls into the occupied apartments beside them."[1]

This was the city of New York; but the conditions described were observed in 1865; and we have assumed that during the past century the grosser forms of insanitation have been eliminated.

"I stepped into one of the dimly lit, narrow hallways off Madison Avenue and knocked at the door. * * * At first glance, the place looked like a jumbled storeroom for second-hand beds. Squeezed into a 15- by 18-foot area were a three-quarter bed for the father and mother, with a bath curtain to close it from view; a crib for the 7-year-old; a wooden double-decker where 2 small girls share the lower section, leaving a teen-age sister the upper; a roll-away for a boy 18; a bathtub; and a toilet set up in a small clothes closet. Mrs. Cruz cooks on a tiny gas ring. At mealtime, 3 of the family draw up to a small table—they have only 3 chairs—while the other 4 sit on the beds, plates on laps, or eat standing up. Dishes dry on a board laid across the end of the bathtub. And this is typical."[2] "In one cellar dwelling the air was stifling, the odor of urine and unburned gas, with a distinct sooty smell superimposed, permeated the rooms. The first room was called a living room; actually both of the two rooms in this so-called apartment were bedrooms. Couches and beds of many descriptions were placed in every available bit of floor space. One room measured 9 by 13 feet; the other 9 by 10 feet. The cold cement flooring was cracked and broken, and encrusted with black soot and filth. The crudely plastered walls and ceilings were also cracked; the ancient paint was peeling and blistering throughout and was covered with soot. The gas range, crowded into a corner of the smaller room, was burning continuously to provide heat, as the only other fixture was a steam riser running along the ceiling which was totally inadequate. The windows were sealed tightly to keep out the cold, thereby eliminating any ventilation to the outside air. In the dim light of several electric bulbs, hooked by means of crude wiring, the expressionless faces of six children moved with us as we picked our way through the crowded rooms. They were dirty little children, definitely not robust, and the only noise was a constant series of deep coughs emitted by each one. In the passageway just outside the door we had to use flashlights to avoid stumbling over refuse littered everywhere on the cellar floor. In addition there were pools of water from leaking soil lines, the stench of sewage was nauseating. Near the furnace we discovered human feces on the cellar floor. In one particularly dank, dark, wet corner was a toilet bowl and slop sink. There was no sign of a bathtub anywhere. To get back to the door of the cellar we had to walk on boards to prevent soaking our feet in sewage."

These conditions were also observed in New York City; but in the year 1952. In a recent inspection drive in the Borough of Manhattan, about 1 in 8 was a cellar dwelling. There are today worse slums in certain of the Puerto Rican areas of Harlem than can be found in any city of northwestern Europe—conditions far worse than those from which our Puerto Rican immigrants have come; for the slums of San Juan have at least sunlight and fresh air. Harlem presents New York's most serious problem, but a recent grand jury study in Brooklyn has revealed conditions almost as grave in that borough; and it is doubtful if any city of considerable size in the United States does not offer comparable situations. Here is one instance reported in New Haven, Conn., perhaps one of our best-housed New England cities. A doctor was called to an emergency delivery in a tenement during a winter month; he found a woman living without any source of heat or light except a candle and no source of water within the apartment. He succeeded in delivering the baby and tried to dispose of the cord in the dark toilet in the hall only to find that the flush had been out of order for 6 months.

What should be done about such conditions as these which disgrace the cities of the most prosperous country in the world?

The first obvious answer is to enforce our housing laws; remodel or vacate such substandard dwellings as those which have been described; and both in Brooklyn and Manhattan active movements are now in progress for the condemnation of unsafe and unsanitary dwellings and for rehabilitation based on comprehensive block-by-block inspections. It would be a great mistake, however, if the city were lulled with the hope that such procedures alone will solve the problem. If the city were to purchase 100,000 quonset huts and were to set them up in Central Park, it would be possible to clean up the most menacing slum and to move evicted families into temporary quarters; but this is perhaps too radical a procedure to hope for.

The slum dweller is the real problem, not the slum. The basic inescapable fact is that a substantial part of our urban population cannot pay for decent housing. In an Atlantic seaboard city like New York, private capital cannot possibly build and maintain decent housing for rent at less than $30 per room per month. No family of a size requiring a 3-room apartment can afford to pay such a rent on a family income of less than $5,000 a year. It is true that gouging landlords are, in some instances, obtaining huge incomes from subdivided tenements and cellar dwellings. To expect, however, the private landlord to be able to meet the housing needs of the $2,000-income families with children is a fantastic dream. The submerged one-tenth of the population of New York and of other large cities, who have incomes of $2,000 or less, can pay only $30 per month for the whole dwelling unit.

It was for this very reason that our federally subsidized low-rent housing program was initiated; it can provide a most economical type of basically decent housing and provide it to the needy tenant for a price of $30 per month for an average household. The far more extensive development of this program is an essential precedent to the elimination of the slum dwelling; yet the entire basis of our low-rent housing program is now under attack. Last year only 35,000 units were authorized by Congress; and the House of Representatives desired to place the limit at 5,000 units for the entire United States. Such a figure does not do justice to the common sense of the American people.

The American Public Health Association is in full sympathy with the enforcement of basic legal standards for healthful housing. It has prepared a model for housing ordinances, which is now being considered for adoption by several cities. We hope that public-health workers all over the country will bear in mind that provision of decent low-rent housing must parallel legal condemnation of dangerous and insanitary housing and will use their full influence to see that the 83d Congress takes adequate steps to continue the public-housing program. In this way—and only in this way—can the dark shadow of the slum be eliminated from the American scene.

[1] Report of the Council of Hygiene and Public Health of the Citizens Association of New York Upon the Sanitary Condition of the City. New York, 1865.

[2] Clarke, Blake. The Puerto Rican Problem in New York. Reader's Digest, February 1953, pp. 61–65.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$7,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,718,440."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment relative to appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission. The bill provides for $7,100,000 for the Federal Communications Commission; and to that item the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has offered an amendment to increase the amount of the appropriation from $7,100,000 to $7,718,440.

I have talked with the Senator from Colorado, and it is agreeable to him and it is also agreeable to the members of the committee with whom I have talked to accept an amendment in the amount of $7,400,000.

Therefore, I ask that the amendment, as modified, be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, in line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$7,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,400,000."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It will be recalled that there was a difference of opinion regarding the facts as given to the Appropriations Committee and as given to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have discussed the matter with the Chairman of the Federal Communication Commission, and I have received from him a letter which may be summarized by stating that at the present time the Commission has on file 600 applications for television stations, and during the next year the Commission expects to receive approximately 250 more applications, which would mean a total of 850 applications.

Under the present law, 10 teams are working on the television applications. The committee voted to increase the 10 teams to 17 teams. A team will take care of approximately 15 applications in the course of a year. If there are 17 teams, they will take care of approximately 255 applications.

I have talked with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]; and it is agreeable to him and it is agreeable to the members of the committee to increase the 17 teams to 24 teams, or an increase of 140 percent over the present arrangement; and that will take care, presumably, of almost half, if not more than half, of the applications now pending and those which will be pending during the coming fiscal year.

The committee report also contains a statement indicating that the Commission could return to Congress and request an additional appropriation, if the Commission could recruit the men required.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment, which I understand is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado, will be adopted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned the report.

I should like to state, so there may be no misunderstanding about it, that so far as I am concerned, and I think the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts feels the same way—the modified amendment will enable television applications to be processed and new television stations to be installed, and the Government will be able to collect the taxes which will thereby be made possible.

Furthermore, I wish to state that in conference we shall do our very best regarding this matter. I assure the Senator from Colorado that we shall do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The amendment is acceptable, but it is far from being agreeable. I think the total amount provided by my amendment should be appropriated. I believe it would be wise for the Senate to allow the entire amount.

However, I have such great respect for those who are serving the Nation on the Appropriations Committee and for the efforts they have to make to hold down expenses that I am not going to throw any rocks at them. They have an almost impossible job to perform. They have to resist requests they do not like to resist; nevertheless, they have to do so.

I have such great respect for the chairman of the subcommittee and for the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee and for the members of the committee that I wish to be agreeable, even though I still think a mistake is being made in not appropriating for sufficient hearing teams to permit the backlog of television applications to be disposed of on an equitable basis for every community in the United States.

Aside from that, I wish to say only that I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to the fact that last year I appeared before the Appropriations Committee and tried to have additional teams provided for at that time. I tried to have 20 additional teams provided for, and the committee voted to provide for 15 additional teams, and the Senate also voted for 15 additional teams.

However, in the conference the 15 additional teams were reduced to 5, with the result that the bottleneck in the Commission continues, because the hearings which are required by law have not been held.

I sincerely hope the Senate Appropriations Committee members will be able to succeed in having final provision made for the 7 additional teams, or for a total of 24. Of course, I am not asking them to give any assurance on that point, but 24 teams are the minimum we are able to accept, and a very determined effort should be made in the conference to have the additional 7 teams, or a total of 24, provided for.

Mr. President, I also wish to say that this matter does not involve a recurring appropriation. This big job must be done; the hearings must be held. However, once the hearings are held, the matter is ended; once the job is done, it will not recur year after year. Mr. Hyde testified before our committee that to drag out the hearings—those were his words—would cost more money.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I believe there should be early action on this matter because all the people of the United States are entitled to have television facilities as the able Senator from Colorado has said. More than 1,800 commercial television stations have been allocated to various communities, but it is going to cost an uncertain amount of money to process each of the licenses. Whether the work is done within 5 years, or 2 years, the cost to the Government will be the same. But let us consider the amount of tax revenue that would be lost and the opportunities for employment that would be missed if there were undue delay. Let us consider the enjoyment all Americans will receive as a result of the installation and operation of television stations.

Mr. President, we will not save the Federal Government anything by delaying the program. In fact, the result would be just the reverse. I congratulate the Senator from Colorado upon having brought this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield me 1 minute more?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, when this amendment was before the Senate on Monday I stated that Mr. Hyde and five other Commissioners from the Federal Communications Commission appeared before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, at which time our committee asked them many questions. The Senator from Indiana was acting as chairman of our committee at the time, and the committee investigated this whole matter. We received much information, and we thought the position of the Commission was completely clarified.

The hearing was reported stenographically, but the notes had not been transcribed, so I may say the matter was taken up in the Senate when I did not have the exact language of the testimony before me. Since then I have received a transcript of the committee hearings. I have gone through the testimony, and have taken excerpts from the statements by Commissioner Hyde in answer to questions propounded by various Senators as members of the committee. I ask unanimous consent to have those answers printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, so that the RECORD may be complete.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DATE OF HEARING, MAY 18, 1953

PAGE 12

Senator PASTORE. Could you answer that question? About how long would it take from your persons to get the issues resolved in this 650 cases? I am not being critical.

Mr. HYDE. I want to be sure I understood the question. I think it would take 3 to 4 years with our present staff, and I would be expecting that applicants would abandon their interest in it, that people would be forced into settlements which would not be desirable.

I just do not believe they will wait that long, Senator. If we may assume they would stay in the hearing process, to be heard out in regular course, which I think would be the desirable thing, it might well be 4 or 5 years.

PAGE 13

Mr. HYDE. I would like to mention some efforts the Commission has made to expedite the hearing itself. These procedures are designed to improve the efficiency with which we can operate with our present staff. It certainly would not permit 12 hearing officers or 17 of them to do the whole job within the year.

PAGE 17

Senator CAPEHART. Do you have sufficient staff at the moment to do this job?

Mr. HYDE. We do not have a sufficient staff to hear these cases as rapidly as they ought to be heard.

Senator CAPEHART. Do you have a sufficient appropriation to do that?

Mr. HYDE. For the present year we do not have. The new appropriation, as approved by the Senate Committee, would give us 7 additional hearing officers.

PAGE 19

Senator CAPEHART. If you had all the examiners that, let's say, three times as many as you do now have, and three times as much money, how much quicker could you expedite the granting of these?

Mr. HYDE. If we had three times the number of examiners we now have, that would be 36. I think that within a year and a half after we got those people working, have them recruited, have them oriented in their work, we could handle the backlog.

PAGE 46

Senator CAPEHART. Mr. Hyde, how many applications at the moment have been passed upon—I say recommended—by the examiners who are before the Commission, itself?

Mr. HYDE. There are two that I can think of at the moment. You would think with that low number you would think I could name them.

Senator CAPEHART. In other words, the Commission is within two of having finished its job, as far as the allocations of permits is concerned?

Mr. HYDE. Senator CAPEHART, you oversimplify it, if you will permit me to say so. There has been a considerable lagtime in getting it under way.

Senator CAPEHART. I am trying to be helpful, now. There are just two cases before the Commission at the moment, which means, then, the bottleneck is with the examiners?

Mr. HYDE. Yes, the bottleneck is with the hearing process, the taking of the testimony.

PAGE 47

Senator CAPEHART. The examiners are working on 65 cases at the moment, which are in varying stages?

Mr. HYDE. That is right.

Senator CAPEHART. And the Commission has two before it, ready to act upon?

Mr. HYDE. That is the general situation.

PAGE 62

Senator CAPEHART. Don't be modest. We want to know. You ought to know better than we, because you are dealing with it each and every day. What is your recommendation to speed it up now?

Mr. HYDE. I hope this committee will recognize the fact that 12 hearing officers, or 17, is the bottleneck which this bulk of hearing cases has to pass through; that the hearing process, even when it is made efficient, as it possibly can be, is still a time-consuming operation.

PAGE 66

Mr. HYDE. We have taken what I think are very significant actions looking toward that.

Senator CAPEHART. That lies within your province.

Mr. HYDE. Yes, sir.

Senator CAPEHART. No. 2, it could be speeded up by more examiners?

Mr. HYDE. That is right.

Senator CAPEHART. That requires more appropriations, does it not?

Mr. HYDE. Yes.

PAGE 81

Senator CAPEHART. Suppose you had 40 good examiners over there at the moment, examiner teams, processing them, doing an efficient job in the best interest of the people and everybody concerned, could you Commissioners handle the cases as fast as they could process them? Would you have a bottleneck within the Commission?

Mr. HYDE. I would say, yes, for this reason, because Senator JOHNSON's proposal for examiner teams included other related talent which would help us in the handling of the exceptions and the writing of opinions, and what not.

PAGES 82 AND 38

Mr. HYDE. Senator, we are handling the uncontested applications on a 30-day basis in any city. Originally, we followed the order of priorities and have taken them up. But since we have gone through it now we are in a position to act on an application within 30 days wherever that application may come from.

PAGES 86 AND 87

Senator SMATHERS. Do you have any idea if you've got, for example, these 40 examining terms when you get these B—I think you classify them as B-4 areas, which are the large population areas with only one channel?

Mr. HYDE. I can't give you a statement in terms of months. It would take us a little while; you get these cases scheduled for hearings, the notices out, and to get the hearing officers oriented, and all; but I do believe that after the 6 or 7 months necessary to get the operation under way, they would go along fairly rapid. I think the importance of priorities would disappear.

No one is going to complain about being third, fourth, or fifth, or one-hundredth on the list if he knows he is going to get his hearing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, our failure to make adequate provision to process television applications will come back to haunt us. Citizens throughout the Nation to whom television is not available are not going to take delay very good naturedly. They are going to make representations to the Congress, with a chip on the shoulder. They have been severally dealt with, and they will complain about it. I want the RECORD to be as complete as we can possibly make it.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Colorado has concluded, I yield first to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, day before yesterday I requested certain information from the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who is the author of the pending amendment, particularly with respect to the number of cities which do not have television, and the number of States, if any, that do not have television. I find that all the States, with the exception of two, have television, in some form or other. The Senator has furnished me this morning with a statement showing that in the State of North Dakota 17 cities have received allocations for television, and that, up to the present time, the Federal Communications Commission has only granted licenses to 3 cities. I might add that it took us more than 4 years, with numerous hearings, to get the first permit for an installation, which has just begun operation in my State. I regret that more money was not appropriated. I would have been willing to vote for the entire amount asked by the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I do not believe we shall be saving any money by the reduction of $200,000 or $300,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, whom I compliment on having made the adjustment he has made, whether we are given assurance that the entire number of the new teams to be provided for by the increased appropriation, will be devoted to the hearing of applications for TV stations. The Federal Communications Commission has other fields of jurisdiction, and I should like the Senate to have definite assurance that the increased staff will be used entirely within this particular field.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, that certainly is the understanding of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. There is one further question I should like to ask. Is there any hope of further amelioration of the regulations of the Commission which would tend to make the hearings more prompt and more economical?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Florida that I talked to the Chairman of the Commission this morning. He states that, as the applications are received from the examining teams, there will be no delays on the part of the Commission, but they will be processed promptly by the Commission.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my question was not addressed so much to the expedition of the applications after they reach the Commission, but to the expedition of the hearings in the field. Most of the criticism insofar as my State is concerned has been directed at the failure to expedite the hearings in the field. The hearings have lasted for months and months. All kinds of inconsequential and irrelevant matters have been inquired into. The hearings have then adjourned, to be reconvened at Washington. The constant attendance of interested persons has been required over a period of weeks, sometimes of months, at very heavy expense. There has been very great complaint and, I think, justified criticism because of the undue length of the hearings. I wonder whether the Senator has any reassurance to give us on that point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Florida that I have no assurance to offer on that point. It would seem to me to be a question of procedure peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and having acted as chairman on Monday, at which time the entire Commission was before the committee, I should like to say that there is no question in the minds of the members of the committee that the procedure is being streamlined by the Commission, and that the Commission is going to do everything possible to expedite the granting of licenses. The Commission is going to do many things which have not been done in the past, some at the suggestion of members of our committee, some at their own suggestion.

We expect to have another meeting with the members of the Commission possibly next week, at which time we shall hope that certain technical changes will be proposed in the existing laws, in order to expedite the hearings of the Commission. If such changes prove to be necessary, we shall introduce the technical legislation that may be re-

quired in order to get the work done. Members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are going to stay on the job until it is finished. The Senator may be assured of that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator from Massachusetts, and also the Senators from Colorado and Indiana. I want particularly to voice my approval of the statement just made by the Senator from Indiana, to the effect that there is much more involved in this matter than the question of fairness in the rendering of service, which, in itself, if of great importance. This matter means a great deal to business in general. It means a great deal in the way of tax revenues for the Government, and in the payrolls of tens of thousands of people. I think it is wholly unconscionable that the matter has been held up the way it has been, with the resulting bottleneck that now exists. I hope that the activities of the three distinguished Senators will do much to relieve this very bad situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate floor this morning I had fully made up my mind that I was going to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. But I am most happy that he has seen fit to accept the suggestion made by the chairman of the subcommittee.

Following up what the Senator from North Dakota stated a little while ago, I should like to give a clear picture of how this matter affects my State, which is only a cross section of the manner in which it affects the entire Nation, allowing for differences in the populations of the respective States. This morning I received information from the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], as follows:

> Television channels have been allocated to 25 cities in the State of New Mexico. Up to the present time, the FCC has granted permits to only 4 cities, leaving 21 cities to be acted upon. At the present rate, it probably will require many years before all parts of the United States are granted TV licenses. This can be done with less cost to the taxpayer while dragging it out will cost more.

So I am most happy that the Senator from Colorado, notwithstanding the fact that he would have preferred the amount set forth in his original amendment, has accepted the suggestion of the chairman of the subcommittee.

We are encouraged by the statements which have been made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. Television channels have been allocated to 25 cities in my State. Compared to population, I imagine that we are in the lower group. But the people who live in those 25 cities want television as much as do the people in perhaps 100 cities in some other State.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts is willing to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As amended.

Mr. WATKINS. I greatly appreciate that, because my State is in a situation similar to that which has been described by other Senators. There is only one city which has television service. Ten others have made application for service and cannot get action because of lack of means to make the investigations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Would the distinguished Senator mind telling the Senate what the objection was to allowing the full amount? If these cities are to get television service, the money will have to be spent. Why compel the people to wait, in some instances, 3 or 4 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The committee originally gave the full amount of the revised estimate. That would increase the number of teams from 10 to 17, or 70 percent. The committee has now agreed to accept an amendment to increase by 140 percent the present number of teams. A problem arises when it comes to finding suitable persons for the teams and getting them into the field as quickly as possible.

The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission this morning stated that the Commission could get along with the number the committee has suggested. In addition to that, there is in the report of the committee a suggestion that if the Commission can process more teams and get suitable persons to carry on the work, it can come before the committee and discuss the subject further. So we felt we went the whole way.

Mr. LANGER. What possible objection can there be? Why can there not be more than 24 teams, if necessary, so as to get the work done in a hurry?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that after talking with the representatives of the Federal Communications Commission, I believe that if provision is made for 24 teams we will be making as much haste as is possible.

Mr. LANGER. Does the distinguished Senator know how long it will take to finish up the work in North Dakota, Utah, and New Mexico?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Half of the applications now pending will be processed within the year.

Mr. LANGER. It will take approximately 2 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It will take 2 years or less, depending on how rapidly the applications are acted upon and the new ones that come in. We hope the work will be up to date within 2 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no amendment pending at the moment. I desire to discuss the housing question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought my colleague was probably going to make a very important speech, with which I may disagree, but which I think Senators should have the benefit of hearing. So I thought I would suggest the absence of a quorum in order that the Senator might deliver his speech to a larger audience.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleague, but my desire was merely to make the record more complete so that there may be some clarification of the situation for the House and Senate conferees. Being a person of very modest attributes, it does not make too much difference to me whether there is a large and enthusiastic audience to hear what I have to say.

I have noticed some confusion in the Senate committee with respect to the public-housing question. I examined the House hearings very carefully, and also the Senate hearings, and it does seem to me that some clarification is necessary. When the House had the subject under consideration it made a change, so that the language carried in the 1953 Appropriation Act would prohibit the Public Housing Administration from making any commitments which would bind the administration to any new units for 1954. So that the 35,000 units now carried in the Senate bill would not be permitted under the House language.

A motion was made in the Senate to strike out all the housing units, and the motion was defeated. A motion was made to reduce the number to 25,000 units. That motion likewise failed.

I had originally intended to offer an amendment in line with the position taken by the House of Representatives, but since it deleted the units and the Senate has restored them, the matter will go to conference, and I prefer that the conferees fight it out in conference. But I believe that some clarification is necessary.

First, I noticed that there was no clear distinction between the two forms of housing covered by the bill. The first one, of course, is slum clearance, on the basis of loans and grants, in cases where localities with Federal funds buy property, clear off the old construction, and then rely on private enterprise to develop them. The testimony shows that there are 91 such projects, and there are 129 more which are not in the planning stage. That is one type of housing program.

The type with which I am now dealing is the low-rent public housing. I was at the other end of the Capitol, a Member of the House of Representatives, when Congress passed the act in 1937. It provided for low-rent housing with

contributions from the Federal Treasury. As of today, 190,511 units have been developed, built, and occupied under that program. But in 1949 Congress saw fit to modify the 1937 act, and in the 1949 act it authorized up to 135,000 units a year. As a matter of fact, the maximum number recommended by the President was 75,000. Last year, however, 35,000 public housing units were provided for in the 1953 Appropriation Act, and this year the President has suggested 35,000, although the House has not embraced that view.

After looking at the program, Mr. President, I want to state for the RECORD how it works. First of all, under the enabling legislation which has been passed by various States, local housing authorities have been created which have the power of eminent domain. They operate usually through a board of directors and an executive director. As a matter of fact, there is a public housing authority in the city in which I live in Illinois. Normally, that housing authority will make what is called a program reservation. That is simply a request to set aside a given number of units for allocation to that particular authority or locality. That is followed by a preliminary loan request, and if it is granted, the money can be used for planning, for architectural fees, and for everything that goes into the general plan of the housing authority.

After that the localities usually enter into a cooperative agreement with the Federal authorities under which they waive their right to tax the property, and the city is then willing, under such an agreement, to accept payment in lieu of taxes. I suppose there are cases in which cities get back an amount equal to the taxes which are lost. More often, however, the amount is far below the estimate of taxes which would accrue.

Finally, there comes the loan made to the local housing authority. Bonds, which are instrumentalities of the Federal Government, are issued, and then, of course, the local housing authorities are entitled to contributions from the Public Housing Authority. Those contributions take the form of a percentage of the capital cost, namely, 2 percent, plus the going Federal rate of interest, which will guarantee redemption of the bonds over a period of 40 years. I do not know to what extent Senators have spelled that out, but if the subsidy program is used to its maximum, there could be taken out of the Federal Treasury an amount equal to 180 percent of the capital cost of the whole program.

How far have we gone under this program? As of April 17, 1953, the total number of units which have been completed was 290,000. That is a cumulative figure, going back to 1937. There are presently under construction 89,917 units. For the RECORD, I should say that nothing in the language of the House bill will impair or in any way slow down the operations which are now in progress for the completion of those units. Incidentally, as testified before the House committee, the unit cost is $10,783.

It would be possible, Mr. President, to pay a maximum subsidy on what we have already constructed of $6.6 billion, although that amount has by no means been committed in the form of subsidies. There are these 90,000 units with which we can proceed; and if the maximum subsidy were paid on them, it could amount to $1,600,000,000. I wish to emphasize to the Senate that I do not believe that it will be paid. The likelihood is that the maximum amount will not be paid. But let no one be fooled or deceived as to whether or not this money is coming out of the Federal Treasury, because it is.

If for any reason, because of adverse conditions, there should be at some time an impairment in the value of these properties, and it were necessary to make good on our commitments under the subsidy, it would take a larger amount than one may foresee at the present time.

Construction costs on the 90,000 units that are already committed and are now under way will be roughly $1 billion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Do the Senator's figures include Alaska and Puerto Rico?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand, they include the whole program, for all purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Certainly, then, they include Puerto Rico?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. However, the amount there has been rather small.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think there is some argument in favor of the House position, although I do not intend to offer an amendment on the floor to embrace it. The reason why I believe the House is on sound ground is simply that there are now 70,000 units under loan and contribution contracts, and it will take several years to complete them. If Senators have any doubt about that, they may examine the testimony which was adduced by the authorities who testified before the Senate committee.

They have a problem with reference to reducing costs. There is a question of value. There is a question of arrangements with individual localities. They themselves testified that it will be several years before the 70,000 units which are now committed can be completed.

The second reason I advance for a little slowdown in this program is that there is a committee, namely, the House Committee on Government Operations, that has been studying the entire low-rent public-housing program. As a matter of fact, they had carried their research and exploration so far that on May 15 they were to have begun public hearings in Los Angeles, Calif. It would seem to me to be a very proper restraint and a reasonable step on the part of Congress simply to slow down on this matter until the testimony which will be developed by that committee, which is making a special study of the program, can become available to Congress and everyone else who may be an interested party.

There is a third reason. The testimony shows that the President has asked the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and also the Public Housing Commissioner to make a survey. Why hurry about this? With so many units still incompleted, it seems to me that proper restraint on our part would argue that we wait until the survey has been prepared and made available.

There is a fourth reason for abiding this program and assuming the position of the House, namely, that there is now on the calendar, reported by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, a bill which gives authority to a special committee to make an investigation in the whole field of intergovernmental relationships. I am a member of the subcommittee that reported it. The authority is rather broad.

I know that some feeling of friction has developed in this field. Some of it centers around the nucleus of public housing. I see it in my own State. Only this week the Illinois Senate passed a bill which would require that a referendum be held by all citizens within an area of 1 square mile where any public housing was proposed. I think it is evident that that viewpoint will commend itself to many localities. Why can we not delay the 35,000 additional units until we see what the sentiment is, and what the relationship between the Federal agencies and the local authorities will be?

There is a fifth reason I would adduce. When the bonds are issued for public housing they will finally have to be sold in the public market. Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on February 6, 1952. I was then a member of that committee, and heard his testimony. In his statement he noted the fact that $328 million in housing bonds had been floated in the latter part of 1951, and it was expected that $750 million would be issued and put on the market in 1952. To the committee he made what I thought was a rather significant statement. He said:

> Not only do such issues absorb some of the funds that would otherwise supply a market for Government bonds or for mortgages generated by new private construction, but they afford an opportunity for wealthy individuals and corporations to reduce legally their income-tax payments in a period when it is essential that tax revenues be as large as possible.

In that connection, there came to my attention a very interesting folder issued by Smith, Barney & Co., which I take to be a bond house, with offices in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Albany, Allentown, Boston, and Hartford. The caption is "Housing Progress Through Modern Financing." I notice on the inside cover this recital:

> New housing authority bonds of local public agencies. By act of Congress, both principal and interest are "exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States."

Then there is a very intriguing table under the title "What Tax Exemption Means to You." I shall not explore it, but it says:

> If you are in the 40 percent tax bracket, a 2 percent tax free yield is equal to 3.33 percent on taxable income.

If you are in the 75 percent tax bracket, a 2 percent tax free yield is equal to 8 percent on taxable income.

So there was some substance to the allegation made by the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to the Committee on Banking and Currency in February 1952.

There is another reason I would assign why I believe the House is on solid ground in this matter. I think the intent of the Housing Act is being gradually violated. The idea of the act was to provide housing for needy people. I think it is getting to be anything but that. I have here a very interesting folder, issued by the Wilmington Housing Authority, of Wilmington, Del. I call the attention of my good friend, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], to what I am about to say. I am referring to a brochure published by the Wilmington Housing Authority, 903 Washington Street, Wilmington, Del. It has a very large, interesting question mark on the front page, with this legend:

Does your child—

Then, when the page is turned, the following appears—

live in a clean, comfortable home with indoor toilet and bath, hot and cold running water, electricity, adequate heating?

The Wilmington Housing Authority operates housing projects for families of low income who cannot find decent housing at a price they can afford to pay.

These houses (from 1 to 4 bedroom units) are equipped with a refrigerator, gas range, electricity, space heater, and hot and cold running water. Rent is based on income, size of family—

And so forth. So in Wilmington, in the great Commonwealth of Delaware, if one is a citizen of the United States, and a resident of Wilmington, if his income is small, if his present housing has no indoor plumbing—if it has a Chick Sale type of plumbing—no electricity, no gas, no hot or cold running water, or is dilapidated and unfit to live in, he and his family are eligible for a house.

The housing authorities advertise for tenants. That is rather interesting. The testimony shows that of the last 54,000 units, there are 2,500 which are not occupied. The interesting thing is that the housing officials who appeared before the committee said that that was due to mismanagement, or the fact that the units were small, or the fact that they were in a local community. However, the fact of the matter is that there are more than 2,500 new units built with Federal funds, really, that are presently unoccupied. I think it is a rather interesting thing that housing authorities advertise for tenants.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As soon as I yield to my distinguished and esteemed friend from Delaware, I wish to read from a folder issued by the housing authority in Denver, Colo., the home of a great public servant and an outstanding Member of the Senate, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I merely wished to ask the Senator from Illinois if he does not agree with me that the fact that the housing authority in Wilmington has advertised for tenants is a compliment to the people of the State of Delaware, because of their willingness to build their own homes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Now let us go to the great city of Denver, known as the mile-high city. It is a wonderful place. It has salubrious, invigorating air, and a fine climate. I like to go there and fill my lungs with that good Denver air. I do not know of any climate which energizes human beings and provides them with an incentive to the extent of that of the city of Denver in the State of Colorado. I have before me a folder issued by the Denver Housing Authority. I like this line. This is an all-out invitation.

You may rent a beautiful home if your family has: 2 to 12 persons; 1 adult member who is a United States citizen; assets less than $2,000; present occupancy in substandard housing—

And so forth. They are now advertising for tenants. The Senate committee may have its way, notwithstanding my objections. Our distinguished friend, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has been very gracious, and I compliment him. I promised him that I would not offer an amendment. However, I want to be sure that the record is abundantly clear when this measure goes to conference.

It seems to me that the procedure now being followed violates the basic intent of the law which Congress originally passed in 1937, when I was a humble Member of the House of Representatives and on the Appropriations Committee in that very distinguished body. I was led to believe that this program was for the benefit of the ill-housed group, the needy. Today difficult problems arise because the incomes of certain families who are in public-housing units are increased, and there is the problem of inducing them, persuading them, or compelling them, if necessary, to get out, because their income is above the prescribed maximum.

In view of all this, why should we not wait with the additional 35,000 units which will be committed? There is nothing in the bill to prevent the housing authorities from going ahead with the 89,000 units now under construction.

Several years will be required to complete them. Why not wait on the House Committee on Government Operations, on the special request of the President for a survey, and on the Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, which is to be established? Why should we not wait for its report before we make deeper commitments, put more bonds into a sagging market, and commit administrative costs out of the Federal Treasury for this purpose?

There are other things that could be said. I might talk about what we said in the Republican platform, but I shall not do so. I simply wish to say that I think the reasonable thing to do is to see where we are, examine the alleged abuses that have crept into the program, reexamine the original intent of Congress, survey the need, resurvey the slum-clearance program, which is also in this bill, and redefine the objectives of public housing. Forty years is a long time. If we vote the 35,000 units, we shall have committed our Government for a period of 40 years, because that is the length of the maturities involved.

Mr. President, since I have the floor—and I am frank to say that I had great difficulty in finding a little time, although I suppose the fault was mainly mine—I wish to cover one item in the bill, and in connection therewith, to offer an amendment.

(At this point Mr. DIRKSEN yielded to Mr. SALTONSTALL for the purpose of inserting certain matter in the RECORD; also to answer a question propounded by Mr. FERGUSON. The colloquy, together with the statement inserted in the RECORD, was ordered to be placed at the conclusion of Mr. DIRKSEN's speech.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to address a few modest observations to the rather delicate subject of economy in Government. Then I shall offer an amendment. First, I shall read the amendment:

On page 1, after line 2, strike out the remainder of the page and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, agencies, and offices under this title, in not to exceed the amounts set out, respectively, in each of the appropriation paragraphs therefor (except that the amount set out for the compensation of the President is appropriated in full and may not be reduced)—

This is the punchline; this is the gimmick—

there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed 95 percent of the gross total of such several amounts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, namely"—

Mr. President, that is a rather glossy way of proposing a 5-percent cut on every agency in the bill. That is what it amounts to, by merely appropriating 95 percent of the totals which are set out for each one of the appropriation paragraphs in the bill.

Mr. President, I listened to President Eisenhower last night. I listened to him in a very solemn mood, as a matter of fact. I believe the country should sympathize with the job he has inherited. It was a bitter inheritance. Over the years there have been left on the books commitments, made by the predecessor administration, which, like the proverbial chickens, are now coming home to roost upon the threshold of the Eisenhower administration and the Republican Party. President Eisenhower did not put the country in the hole. He inherited the condition. He is deserving of every support on the part of our people, on the part of the Federal agencies, and on the part of Congress. That is one reason for submitting the amendment.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the fact that the Budget Bureau cut the original figures before it submitted its

proposed appropriations to the committee. I am not insensible to the fact that in the main the House of Representatives did a pretty good job. I salute the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, for the good job he has done.

But, Mr. President, when we are confronted with this situation it is necessary to approach it with resolution and with a certain amount of robustness of spirit. We are in the hole, and we are in the hole plenty.

So we have a grave responsibility which more than matches that of the President of the United States, because the constitutional power to take money from the Federal Treasury for appropriations is lodged exclusively in the Congress. I, for one, will not shirk my duty in that respect.

There is real justification for an amendment of this kind. All of us have said to the country that we would squeeze out waste, we would reduce expenditures, we would balance the budget, and we would reduce taxes.

I would be less than candid, Mr. President, as a member of a great public instrumentality, the Republican Party, if I stood on the floor of the Senate and said we have made an impressive economy record thus far. I cannot say it in good conscience. I wish the record were an infinitely more impressive and better one. Therefore, because it has not been too impressive I believe we should cut where we can.

I do not believe in cheese paring. I went through a sad and dismal experience of that kind during the 12 years I spent on the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives. It was a cut of $100,000 here and a cut of $200,000 there. I am not unmindful that a penny saved, as Franklin said, is a penny earned, but it is a long and torturous course toward a balanced budget to do it that way.

People have said to me, "Your theory is all wrong. Your idea of a meat ax or sharp knife for the necessary excisions of appropriations and expenditures is not the selective way to do it."

But, Mr. President, if we are going to do it with a scalpel, we will be here for a long, long time before we ever get within hailing distance of a balanced budget and a tax reduction, for which the people are clamoring in almost every expressive and articulate letter they are sending to the Members of the House and of the Senate.

In our platform we gave them that assurance, and I want to retrieve that pledge and I want to redeem the promise we made in good faith. It was one of the promises which crowned our arms with victory in November 1952.

I am fully sensible of the public debt. One day recently the Secretary of the Treasury stated it may be necessary to increase the debt limit. I hope fervently that it will not be necessary to do so. As of the 1st of May 1953, the public debt was $264,589,000,000. That is not hay, even in the town of 21,000 people where I live. There now comes the suggestion that the debt limit must be increased to $275 billion.

What will people say about it? It is not that I am afraid of my political skin. That has never bothered me in my lifetime. It does not and it will never inhibit me from saying what is in my heart and in expressing whatever condition I may have upon public problems. But I say the people of the country have a right to depend upon some of the assertions and averments we made to them.

I stood on platforms in 25 States of the Union and expressed the belief that if they would turn the old administration out of power and give those with a fresh viewpoint an opportunity, we would do infinitely better. I want to do better. This is one way to do it. Let us take 5 percent from these agencies. It ought to be 10 percent. Let us keep that much money in the Treasury. There today is a great clamor for retrenchment.

Mr. President, there is no royal road to a balanced budget. If there is, I have never discovered it in all the time I have been dealing with the millions of little figures that come to us in what looks like an unexpurgated mail-order catalog but what we call the budget of the United States, which contains some 1,100 pages.

It will take some heroic work in every field of civil spending and military spending and in all the other kinds of spending. There dare not be a sacred cow if we are to discharge what I regard as a very deep and abiding obligation to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, it is the fiscal rock upon which nations founder. Let us consider France. One cabinet after another has fallen over a period of time. Why? Because of some particular civil policy? Always it has foundered upon the fiscal rock, the problem of getting revenues and cutting down expenditures so they could balance their budget. There is a very shaky and unstable condition in the Republic of France for that reason.

There is also the situation in Britain today. Does she face up to it? Not to the point where I think she should. So today as never before she is concerned about sterling balances and about protecting the gold reserve. Always and always fiscal problems haunt the solidarity and the stability of a country.

Mr. President, as I listened to President Eisenhower last night talk about these inheritances, he spoke very graciously and very kindly. I thought he presented the matter in a very understandable package to the American people. I suppose that if I had been doing it and if I had commanded a great audience on the radio and television networks, I probably would not have been quite so dignified, and would have talked about the mess we are in.

I have seen a good many messes in my life. My good friend, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], whom I first met when he was one of the able representatives of this country overseas in Germany, will bear me out when I say there was something most depressing and distressing about the great piles of rubble in certain German cities resulting from the bombing by American and British planes during the dark hours of the war. Oh, how agonizing it was to view such cities as Cologne, Dusseldorf, Regensburg, Munich, and others, and to see those great cities of ancient culture, with all the architectural beauty that had been lavished upon them for so many years, suddenly pounded into rubble. Such scenes make a person shudder.

When I saw those cities for the first time, I wondered how human hands and human ingenuity could ever bring order out of that chaos, so that normal life could be resumed, so that automobiles could move in the streets, so that telephone and electric lines could be restored to service. What amazing progress in that undertaking was made in a very short time, Mr. President? The day when I followed the American Army into Regensburg, where the great General Patton had his headquarters, I saw thousands of American soldiers, aided by the German people, begin to clear the streets. After a while, traffic began to move and a semblance of civilization began to appear, and the stores began to open. Someone invented a device to throw the rubble into a great crushing machine, from which the rubble came out in the form of aggregate, which was used for the construction of new buildings. So rehabilitation became an accomplished thing. The people in those cities were not worried about their future; there were no faint hearts. Difficult and repugnant though the problem was, little by little, by brain and by brawn, those people cleaned up the mess that existed there.

Today, we have a mess in our country, namely, the billions of dollars of commitments and the large deficit, both requiring us to draw heavily upon the supply of red ink, in order to total the budget of the Nation. It is a mess at this time, in the month of May 1953, long after V–E Day.

How are we to clean up the mess and how are we to return to sound and orderly channels in the interest of fiscal solvency and the stability of our country? We shall do so by accepting the President's challenge. He invited everyone in the Nation to help him. He said, "I hope you will exercise restraint and will not put demands upon your Government, unless they are absolutely necessary."

The same injunction should be addressed to the agencies of the Federal Government; and, at least by inference, the Congress also was invited to help hold up the President's hands in this difficult fiscal hour.

How are we to do it? Not by quailing, not by recoiling from the distasteful job; but we hold up the President's hands by letting the knife go in, no matter how desirable the things excised may be.

I am afraid I relented a little today, because the proposal was to make a reduction of 10 percent. However, after the appropriations for some agencies were cut 15 percent, the milk of human kindness began to assert itself, and I became a little softhearted. So I agreed to propose a 5-percent overall reduction in the appropriations, instead of a 10-percent overall reduction.

Therefore, Mr. President, in order to hold up the hands of our great Chief and to do my small bit in the interest of economy, I submit this amendment for a 5-percent reduction in appropriations, a 5-percent cut across the board,

to apply to all items in the bill with the exception of the salary of the President, which under the Constitution cannot be diminished during his tenure of office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, after line 2, it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the page, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, agencies, and offices under this title, in not to exceed the amounts set out, respectively, in each of the appropriation paragraphs therefor (except that the amount set out for the compensation of the President is appropriated in full and may not be reduced), there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed 95 percent of the gross total of such several amounts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, namely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

During the delivery of Mr. DIRKSEN's speech,

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Illinois is through with his discussion of housing, I should like to ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a page-and-a-half statement concerning housing. This statement is the result of a question asked by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. It concerns future moral obligations in connection with housing, and should be considered a part of the committee report on housing. If there is no objection, I should like to have it placed in the RECORD at this point.

The statement also includes a provision which is now in 54,000 of the 62,600 housing contracts. In my opinion, it should be included in every future contract. The statement deals with the responsibility of Congress and of the committees on appropriations before any moral or legal commitments are made with respect to housing.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As of June 30, 1953, there will be approximately 62,600 housing units with approved annual contribution contracts on which construction will not have started. Fifty-four thousand of this number have included in their new or amended contracts the following provision:

"(B) The local authority shall not award any main construction contract unless (1) the development cost budget referred to in subsection (B) of section 404 has been submitted to the PHA, (2) the PHA, taking into account the level of construction costs prevailing in the locality where the project is to be located, shall have specifically approved the amount of such main construction contract, and (3) the PHA, taking into account all applicable provisions of the act, *of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953*, and of this contract, shall have authorized the award of such main construction contract." (Italic designates new requirement.)

This provision means that the parties to the contract have been put on notice that the construction contract cannot go ahead unless it is authorized in an appropriation act of the Congress. In other words, this means this: The Congress is not under an obligation to approve any more construction contracts than it desires at any given time; in fact, the whole construction is based upon present and future authorizations by the Congress in the appropriation acts. I think it would be well also for the PHA, in addition to the above paragraph, to issue a directive to all of its people who in any way negotiate annual contribution contracts to state in all conversations and in all correspondence emphatically that this contract is approved, but it cannot go ahead for construction until it is authorized in an appropriation act of the Congress. The PHA shall take every possible step to see that there is no misunderstanding on this score.

The Housing and Home Finance Commissioner, Mr. Cole, stated that if a program was continued at 35,000 starts in 1954 and subsequent years, the carryover of approved annual contribution contracts would probably gradually fall to a level of perhaps 50,000 units to be authorized for commencement later by the Congress, but would never go down to 35,000 since it would never consist entirely of units ready to start construction in the following year.

It is clear that it might take in many cases several years to negotiate a contract, as land would have to be approved, program reservation made, loan contract authorized before the annual contribution contract could be approved. Therefore, it is clear that if you do not continue getting annual contribution contracts to the point of approval, you would simply kill the program within a period of 3 years and waste the administrative expenses involved in bringing the contracts to the annual contribution stage.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me in order that I may answer a question with respect to housing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield if I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELKER in the chair). Without objection, the Senator from Illinois may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts to answer a question to be propounded by the Senator from Michigan without losing the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me say preliminarily that I do not know what is in the statement which the Senator from Massachusetts has placed in the RECORD.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to read it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it a statement by the committee, or by someone in the Housing Authority?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Subcommittee on Independent Offices included as a part of its report a paragraph concerning moral obligations with respect to future housing arrangements.

Mr. FERGUSON. I heard the question of moral obligations discussed in the committee. I wonder whether this is a contention that when there is a statutory obligation or an existing statute, over and beyond the statute there is a moral obligation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is a difficult question to answer. We considered whether we could make this statement an amendment to the act. We decided, after consideration, that we could not.

This is an effort to make it clear that if the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby's new Department, should determine that the housing program should be abandoned, there would be no moral obligation on the part of Congress because of any agreement which might be made in getting houses ready to go through the public-housing process. In other words, it is an effort to prevent any feeling on the part of an individual who makes an application that he has any moral or legal understanding with the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is the proper answer to the entire question. A statutory obligation is one thing. However, if the Congress does not desire to appropriate under the statute, it has not broken any moral obligation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is an effort to pin down that principle.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that, because there was some discussion of the question of moral obligation. Some people seemed to think that once we enact a statute we have a moral obligation to continue appropriations under the statute, or, if a department of the Government which studies the situation determines that a certain program is no longer necessary, that there is a moral obligation merely because an individual has filed application or followed some procedure before a common council or some other agency, to let him proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator states the question much better than I could state it. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it is well that the statement has been incorporated in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts listen to a suggestion from the occupant of the chair? Will it be agreeable to the Senator from Massachusetts for the colloquy to be printed at the end of the speech of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], so it will not interrupt the continuity of his speech?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is entirely satisfactory. I thought the Senator from Illinois had finished on the subject of housing. Whatever is agreeable to the Senator from Illinois is agreeable to me. This applies to housing, not to another subject.

THE FORTHCOMING ELECTIONS IN THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under an agreement previously made, the Chair now recognizes the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, a dispatch of several days ago from the Philippine Islands states that that nation's Liberal Party—the incumbent party—has scheduled its convention for the nomination of its presidential and vice-presidential candidates for May 24. As we all know, the election is scheduled for November of this year; and the Nacionalista Party—the opposition party—nominated its candidates some weeks ago. The Liberal candidate for President, it seems, will most likely be President Elpidio Quirino, who has declared his intention to seek renomination or Carlos P. Romulo. The Nacionalistas' nominees were

Ramon Magsaysay for President and Senator Carlos Garcia for Vice President. All of these are names prominent in Philippine political affairs and are well known to many of us here in Washington.

I call attention to the candidates in the coming election in the Philippines because of an unfortunate situation involving our own country which has arisen in this connection.

It is not my purpose here to advocate the candidacy of any man or to support either of the competing parties. Indeed, my purpose is to do just the opposite—to stress the fact that our Government must maintain a neutral position in this election. One might ask why it is necessary to affirm this policy of neutrality at this time, in view of the fact that our foreign policy, as stated repeatedly, has been one of noninterference in the internal affairs of other nations.

Mr. President, I am sure that many of my distinguished colleagues are unaware of the fact that our diplomatic representatives in the Philippines recently have been criticized vigorously and repeatedly for allegedly taking sides in this forthcoming election campaign. I do not know whether these charges are true, but I do know that they have received such wide currency as to assume an important aspect in their effect on United States-Philippine relations.

It is charged that our Ambassador in Manila and members of his staff there, as well as certain American private citizens, have advocated privately and by deed the candidacy of Ramon Magsaysay and his colleagues. As a matter of fact, the Philippine newspapers have published repeated stories terming Magsaysay a political candidate "made in America." The incumbent Philippine administration has expressed keen resentment at the alleged pro-Magsaysay actions on the part of our officials and private citizens. Regardless of whether the suspicions of the Quirino government are well founded in this connection, real friction does exist; and this is quite dangerous for our relations not only with the Philippines, but in all of the democratic Far East and, for that matter, in the entire world.

It is significant that our Government has considered the Philippines such an important factor in the Far Eastern political, economic, and military picture that we have sent them some $2 billion in economic aid since the end of World War II. It would seem patently improper as well as unwise for us now to jeopardize our good will in that part of the world by interfering in the internal affairs of a friendly nation, especially in view of the fact that that nation has cooperated with us in our foreign policy in the United Nations, in the Korean conflict and in every other respect.

One of our most telling criticisms of the Soviet Union has been the exposure of their meddling in the internal affairs of smaller and weaker nations. We cannot afford to take this same course ourselves, nor can we afford even to appear to take such a course whether or not in fact we are doing so.

Mr. President, I am aware that our Ambassador to the Philippines has denied the charges of interference in a routine way, but I have seen no vehement denial commensurate with the vigor of the charges either from him or from the State Department. In view of the magnitude this matter has assumed in the press and in public opinion in the Philippines, it would seem that nothing short of a vehement denial, backed by concrete action, can remedy the situation.

Again, Mr. President, let me repeat that I am not charging our officials or our private citizens in the Philippines with improper action. I am merely taking cognizance of the fact that charges have been made and have not been refuted sufficiently to allay the fears of our oriental friends in the Philippines and elsewhere. These people may be oversensitive, and may be too quick to distrust the Western world whenever there is the slightest suspicion of colonial or imperialist attitudes, but this makes it even more important that we act impeccably and that we exert every effort to right any real wrongs or eradicate any false impressions.

We all know the splendid record of our country in its historic colonial administration of the Philippines, our voluntary grant of independence to that nation, and of our very real assistance to the fledgling Republic in its first years, up to now. It would be a great shame to jeopardize American prestige and good will, earned by our fine record, by permitting real or imagined misdeeds on the part of a few Americans to go unanswered or unexplained. The friendship of all the Philippine people is certainly worth the effort of proving that our democratic foreign policy is not just a tissue of words.

Mr. President, the Philippines many times has been termed the "democratic showcase of Asia." In other words, the Philippines has been an example of democracy in the American tradition in action in the Far East. The very essence of democracy is the self-determination of people.

There may be much to criticize in the Quirino administration. Indeed, no administration anywhere in the world can be free of criticism. However, Mr. President, the question at hand is: What right have we to judge or dictate or even influence—if indeed we are so doing—the policies and procedures of a sister nation which has been our friend? We are in the anomalous position, if we support an opposition candidate against the incumbent, of repudiating an administration which we have been supporting in every way, economically and militarily. In other words, if we back the candidacy of this Magsaysay, no matter what his virtues may be, a fortiori we indict our own judgment and actions in aiding the Quirino administration and its predecessors in the Philippine Liberal Party. Our policy must be that of aiding or refusing to aid the government chosen by the Philippine electorate, but not to meddle in the process of election.

This is not a question of taking sides in a struggle between a left wing ideology and a democratic ideology. No one has accused either party or any of the candidates of being even remotely communistic.

Mr. President, I am introducing at this point in my remarks newspaper clippings from American and Philippine newspapers which bear out my thesis that a serious problem exists. I will not take the time of my colleagues by reading all of these clippings, but I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The items are from Wall Street Journal, the Christian Science Monitor, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Manila Herald.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 10, 1953]

PHILIPPINE POLITICS

There is an election coming up in the Philippines next November, and a United States aid agency is just where it ought not to be—right in the middle of it.

We got there by way of a little report on land reform issued by the Mutual Security Agency. It may be that the Philippines Government is going about land reform slowly and perhaps too slowly to suit the agrarian reformers. It may be that the farm rentals are oppressive, that interest rates are exorbitant, and that the land tenure system is a feudal one. But when an election may hinge on the haste or the slowness with which these things come about, is it our place to tell another government what to do and how to do it?

President Quirino, who says these things cannot come about as fast as many would like, took particular objection to a little phrase hidden in the report written by Mr. Robert Hardy. This special little phrase warned that the United States might have to take direct, expensive, drastic action to save the Philippines from communism unless poverty and unrest among tenant farmers were alleviated. How? By land reform, of course; by the Philippines Government buying land and divvying it up among the farmers.

President Quirino says that Mr. Hardy, who was a land-reform expert under General MacArthur, might know a lot about Japan but he doesn't realize that the Philippines is different. Mr. Quirino points out that in Japan all that had to be done was to seize the Emperor's lands and split them up—but that in his islands they must be bought and paid for first.

And the Philippines Government just hasn't got that kind of money. Doubtless here is where Mr. Magsaysay, the leading agrarian reformer and recently defense minister in the Government, hopes that we will come in.

Mr. Magsaysay seeks the nomination of the Nacionalista Party in opposition next November to Mr. Quirino, who heads the Liberal Party, and he will make great use of the MSA report on land reform in all the hundreds of islands that make up the Philippine archipelago if he should get the nomination. If he doesn't get it, whoever does will make the same use of the document.

Compounding the misadventure of the report, Admiral Spruance, our Ambassador to Mr. Quirino's country, is reported by Mr. Homer Bigart, of the New York Herald Tribune, to be foursquare behind the MSA study. Doubtless neither Mr. Hardy nor Ambassador Spruance mean to be kingmakers even on a small scale, but that is what they may be thoroughly charged with in Communist propaganda.

Meddling in other people's affairs is never a pretty business. When it lends ammunition to the enemy, it is dangerous, for they make of it not just a report by economic

planners but the course of an imperialist government powerful enough to tell a smaller ally what it must do and how it must be done.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 11, 1953]

FRICTION WITH UNITED STATES EMERGES IN MANILA

(By David Sternberg)

MANILA.—Submerged frictions between the Quirino administration and the American Embassy in Manila have surfaced explosively to produce the most strained official Philippine-American relations of the past decade.

The word "official" is necessary, for animus has been manifested only by President Quirino and several other members of the Liberal Party. From all other sources, including the Manila press, reaction to the attacks on Ambassador Raymond A. Spruance and members of his staff has been one of shocked protest.

Whether deliberately timed or no longer containable is not clear, but the upheaval coincided with the recent visit of Adlai E. Stevenson and his party.

Following a luncheon in Baguio, at which Governor Stevenson was a guest of honor (with Miss Armi Kuusela, holder of the beauty contest title of Miss Universe), and the President's house guest, the President called a press conference.

During a lull in the questioning, the President suddenly called attention to Ambassador Spruance's "banquet" for Governor Stevenson, the proceeding Thursday, charging that discrimination had been displayed in the presence of many Nacionalistas—including Senators Laurel, Recto, Puyat, and former Defense Minister Ramon Magsaysay—and only one Liberal, Foreign Secretary Joachim Elizalde.

POLITICAL INTERVENTION

He charged that this constituted political intervention and demanded an explanation.

Subsequent disclosure of the guest list and seating plan by an Embassy spokesman indicated that the "banquet" had been a small dinner for 22, that there had been only three Nacionalistas—Laurel, Puyat, and Magsaysay—and that three Liberals had been invited and had accepted, but that two had changed plans late that day, leaving only Secretary Elizalde to represent his party and the administration.

Meanwhile, however, Liberal House Speaker Perez had sparked three congressional resolutions for presentation to that body following the Easter recess. Authors of the resolutions are top House Liberals Macapagal, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; Alias, chairman of the Ways and Means Comittee, and Tizon, of the Committee on Un-Filipino Activities. It was the last named who led the attack on the United States Mutual Security Agency's land reform report as a Communist-inspired document last December.

The attack on the United States Embassy was actually begun by Mr. Macapagal's release to the press of two questions which he called upon Ambassador Spruance to confirm or deny.

SECRET DOCUMENTS

The first had to do with rumors that Embassy vaults harbored the secret document in which Mr. Magsaysay had agreed to cast his lot with Nacionalistas. The second called for comment on Mr. Magsaysay's charge that the United States Government had lost confidence in the Quirino administration.

Nacionalista sources promptly denied the existence of any such secret documents, while Ambassador Spruance issued a terse statement indicating that, for the duration of the political campaign, he would refrain from comment on all charges of this nature, since comment would be tantamount to intervention.

That these developments are part of broad political strategy to deglamorize Mr. Magsaysay as a presidential aspirant is suggested by this coincidental appearance in Manila, officially released for reprint through the President's Office of Information, of an article which appeared in Bataan, a Washington publication close to the Philippine Embassy there.

FRIEND AND FOE

This article purported to expose the efforts of unnamed United States Army personnel to advance the political fortunes of a Filipino official, also unnamed, but obviously Mr. Magsaysay. The article bore a Manila dateline but paralleled accusations that were being circulated verbally in Washington as early as last November, when intraparty pressures against Mr. Maysaysay, then Secretary of Defense, had begun to intensify.

It has been a characteristic of Philippine election campaigns since the Nation achieved independence in 1946 for one side to court American endorsement, while the other charged interference. Aside from the fact that the current campaign promises to be the longest and bitterest yet experienced, Philippine American relations inevitably will be involved because of the role that will be assigned in campaign material to the joint economic development program under MSA.

Whether the administration takes credit, or the opposition criticizes performance, the position of United States officialdom will be the uncomfortable one of resisting distortion of the facts.

Tensions that exist today between Malacanan and American representatives here could probably be traced directly to the day-to-day irritations of maintaining control, direction, and pace of the far-reaching American aid program, which takes as its guiding principles the recommendations of the Bell Mission of 1951 and the subsequent Foster-Quirino agreement on social and economic reforms on which the aid program would be predicated.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 31, 1953]

EMBASSY INCIDENT UNFORTUNATE

President Quirino last night said it was unfortunate that the American Embassy in the Philippines was being dragged into the local political picture after it had announced its strict neutrality.

The President at the same time castigated "people who, for local political effect, assume to be spokesmen of the United States Government."

Mr. Quirino was obviously referring to certain leaders of the opposition party whom he had previously charged with enticing former Defense Secretary Ramon Magsaysay into joining their party to create the impression that the Nacionalistas are not anti-Americans.

The President made the statement in the course of a press conference late last night in his Malacañan study.

Asked to comment on the attitude of several Congressmen who are initiating a recall of Ambassador Spruance, the President issued the following statement:

"It is unnecessary for me to comment on the remarks and attitudes on the alleged interference of the United States Embassy in Philippine politics. Each one is free to react on what he sees and observes.

"It is unfortunate that the Embassy is being dragged into the local political picture after it has announced its strict neutrality.

"The trouble is there are people who, for local political effect, assume to be spokesmen of the United States Government and this is what is disturbing the mind of our people who have no recourse to the direct and genuine source of information on the matter."

The President's refusal to add his comment on the "remarks and attitudes on the alleged interference of the United States Embassy in Philippine politics" was, however, interpreted to mean that he was awaiting whatever official action Washington might make on the matter.

It was hinted that the President was awaiting this development in order to be able to act accordingly.

It was also understood the President was not giving any importance to the heated discussions now raging over the seating arrangement in the March 26 dinner Ambassador Spruance gave in honor of Mr. Stevenson at the Embassy.

Liberal party leaders were vehement in their charge that this seating arrangement during which top NP leaders were present and only Foreign Secretary Joaquin M. Elizalde represented the administration showed the alleged partiality of certain Embassy officials toward the Nacionalistas.

The seating arrangement question was mentioned in the course of a press conference the President gave last Sunday in Baguio and this precipitated the move for the recall of Ambassador Spruance.

[From the Manila Herald of March 13, 1953]

NACIONALISTAS LET MAGSAYSAY BEAR STANDARD—BOSS SAYS IT'S TIME FOR A CHANGE, HOPES UNITED STATES KEEPS EYE ON QUIRINO, ARMY

(By Homer Bigart)

MANILA, March 9.—Ramon Magsaysay, plugged by Americans as the plumed knight of Philippines politics, was formally accepted into the Nacionalista Party tonight by party boss Jose Laurel, who said the country needed Mr. Magsaysay because he was clean as a hound's tooth, if not overly brilliant.

Mr. Laurel told this correspondent there is absolutely no doubt Mr. Magsaysay would win the Nacionalista presidential nomination at the party convention April 12. Mr. Magsaysay resigned 2 weeks ago as Defense Minister in the government of President Elpidio Quirino, who is seeking renomination as the Liberal Party candidate in the November elections.

Mr. Laurel, celebrating his 64th birthday, said he backs Mr. Magsaysay, who is 46, because it is time for a change. He said he would refuse the Nacionalista nomination even if drafted.

"CAN'T TURN MY BACK"

"I said I'd support Magsaysay, and I can't turn my back on him," said Mr. Laurel.

"I haven't known him very long," said Mr. Laurel of Mr. Magsaysay, "but he strikes me as honest and courageous. I wasn't looking for a wise man or a sage. I was looking for an honest man with guts. Perhaps Magsaysay hasn't much cultural background, but the country needs his moral character."

Mr. Laurel said he hopes the United States would intervene tactfully in the election to make sure Mr. Quirino would not use the army to coerce the voters. "In the last Presidential election (1949) the United States Embassy shut its eyes when Quirino stole the election from me," he said. "This time you can't afford another dirty election. You have invested lives and money in the Philippines, and you have a legitimate interest in seeing we don't go to the dogs.

DOUBTS NEW CONTRIBUTIONS

"Four years ago I was presented as anti-American because I collaborated with the Japanese. But you can't make out Magsaysay as anti-American. Four years ago American businessmen in Manila contributed to Quirino's campaign fund. But I don't think they'll do it this time."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on the basis of the facts which I have brought to the attention of the Senate, I call upon the executive branch of the Government to make a full and complete study of the charges and countercharges that have been made in this matter and ask that

at an early date a report be made to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that that body consider the advisability, based on its evaluation of the report, of acting further in the premises.

Mr. President, I ask further that the executive department take appropriate action at once to allay the fears of the Filipinos and others in this important matter by issuing a vigorous statement of American neutrality, and by warning publicly all American officials having to do with the Philippines that any violation of our traditional policy of strict neutrality in these matters will result in recall or other punitive measures.

I suggest that we should go even further. I think it is time, Mr. President, that the executive branch of our Government tender some token of confidence to the Philippine Government, which has been so cooperative with us in the execution of our own foreign policy in the Far East, and which feels, rightly or wrongly, that it has been affronted by our officials.

In other words, Mr. President, this matter should be investigated thoroughly; but even pending investigation, in view of the fact that there is a wide belief that we have been guilty of interference, we should state unequivocally our position, and go beyond that to affirm our friendship with President Quirino and his government. Of course, this should be done in a way that does not amount to endorsement of his candidacy, but merely recognition of his accomplishments, and affirmation of our good will toward him and his administration in view of the fact that our good will is suspect in some quarters.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, like the junior Senator from Illinois, I, too, listened last night to the address by the President of the United States. I thought he pleaded well for an extension of the excess-profits tax. His discussion of our stringent budgetary problem was challenging. For one, the junior Senator from Tennessee expects to support—if he has an opportunity to do so—an extension of the excess-profits tax, as recommended by the President. The budgetary problems of our Nation constitute one of the supreme challenges of self-government in our time. I must say I thought President Eisenhower was something less than generous in emphasizing the budgetary problems left by the previous administration. It is as a result of the orders which have been placed, it is as a result of the appropriations that have been made, that the strength in being of our military forces will be greatly augmented during the ensuing months. If blame for these appropriations and this defense build-up is to be assigned then in fairness credit should likewise be given.

This is not meant to indicate, Mr. President, that I am unsympathetic toward or unmindful of the tremendous responsibilities and the stupendous task of trying to bring about proper reductions in the budget. It seemed to me that the President made a strong defense of his recommendations for reduction in military appropriations—a strong defense when listened to. I doubt, however, if the defense will appear as strong when analyzed in detail.

Having served for 10 years on the Appropriations Committee of the other body and for a while on the particular subcommittee dealing with Air Force appropriations, it is my firm belief that very material reductions can be made without reducing the procurement of planes. Indeed, last year the subcommittee of which I was a member made a recommendation, and supported it on the House floor, for a heavy reduction, without reducing the procurement of one plane and without reducing the procurement of weapons.

I do not mean by this statement to indicate that large reductions cannot now be made in the military budget. I think it is possible, but I do not believe we should make as heavy a reduction in the flying force of the defenses of this country as has been recommended in connection with the number of planes.

Mr. President, it is not within the province of the junior Senator from Tennessee to partake of the executive functions in the affairs of his sovereign State or of the political subdivisions thereof. Even so, a sense of responsibility to the people who have given me the great privilege and honor of serving them and my country in the United States Senate prompts me to advise them of current and prospective developments which they may want to take into consideration in reaching decisions vitally affecting local and State welfare. I particularly have in mind the comparatively large public improvement undertaking of the State of Tennessee and of several counties and municipalities thereof which must be financed by the sale of State, county, and municipal bonds.

I am advised from several sources, including the Tennessee Municipal League, of various Tennessee municipalities and counties issuing this year more than $15 million in bonds for public-school improvement.

The municipalities of Tennessee report an anticipated utility bond issue of from $8 to $10 million. Approximately $6 million of bonds is expected to be issued for street improvements. Other anticipated Tennessee municipal bond issues total $30 million. County bonds for purposes other than schools are expected to approximate $10 million. On top of these county and municipal issues, the State of Tennessee has recently authorized the issuance of $52 million in State bonds.

This means a total of $121 million to $123 million in bonds will be issued by government subdivisions in Tennessee during this year under present plans.

Mr. President, in view of this, I feel constrained to call to the attention of the people of my State that the interest rate on municipal, county, and State bonds is rapidly rising.

The Bond Buyers Index indicates that the effective interest on municipal bonds has risen 37 points since January. State and county bonds have followed a similar trend.

If all of the anticipated bond issues to which I have referred materialize, the increase in interest rates since January will cost the people of Tennessee approximately $500,000 a year.

This is not all of the story, though, Mr. President. There are numerous and frightening signs that the Eisenhower administration has decided upon a course of action deliberately calculated to push interest rates even higher.

Only last evening, President Eisenhower saw fit personally to endorse the tight-money policy of his Secretary of the Treasury. Currently the Treasury is offering to exchange 2⅝ percent interest short-term bonds for oustanding short-term issues bearing only 1⅞ percent.

This is not only the highest short-term interest rate since an issue during the bank holiday more than 20 years ago, but it represents a 40-percent jump in going Government interest rate.

This was made inevitable, Mr. President, by the recent unfortunate and ineptly handled $1 billion sale of long-term bonds at 3¼-percent interest—a 30-percent jump in long-term rate.

Another ominous sign for the future can be seen in the current exchange of 1-year 2⅝-percent bonds for 10-year 2-percent bonds. This, of course, is in a direction directly contrary to the recently announced Treasury policy of moving toward long-term financing of the public debt.

By public admission of United States Treasury officials, it can be fairly said that their laboriously conceived policy of long-term financing has already sputtered to a halt with the refinancing of only $1 billion of our huge public debt.

It is not my purpose today, though, Mr. President, to discuss the problem and dangers of public debt management. This I shall do on another day. My purpose in rising today is briefly to advise the people of my State, and those of any other State who might be interested, of how seriously and adversely their welfare has already been affected by the monetary policies of the United States Treasury Department and the Government's central banking system, and also to point out to them that there are many signs which indicate that those who are now in control of our Government fully intend to push the interest rate higher and higher on State, county, and municipal bonds, and on all other types of interest-bearing securities.

It is my feeling that the people of Tennessee and their public officials may want to take these facts into consideration in reaching a decision as to when and in what amount they will undertake to sell their bonds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Tennessee upon his exposition of the effects of the increase in interest rates, particularly the rates on State, and municipal securities and bonds. I believe that it can be verified that what the Senator has said in reference to his own State is true as to all States. The municipal bond market today is showing an increase in interest rates at a pace which

it has not known for 20 or 25 years. The refinancing of municipal debt, which is a normal practice, is now costing municipalities a higher interest rate than at any time within the last 20 years.

Recently I have been in conversation and consultation with advisers in the municipal bond market, and I have been told that municipalities will face the highest interest rate for their securities they have faced since the depression. Is that the general conclusion of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GORE. Not only is it my conclusion, but it is a fact revealed by all the statistics of recent months, and also by the market as of today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When we talk about having money receive its price in the open and normal market, which is a statement of the economic theory of freedom of competition within the market place, is it not fair to say under present circumstances, that that is sheer theory, since the Government of the United States is such a large borrower that it exercises a controlling influence in the money market? Is it not true, therefore, when the Government steps in with a bond issue or with any type of refinancing, it sets the pattern not only for State, municipal, and Federal bonds, but also for all private financing costs? In other words, to rephrase my question for the Senator, is not the Government of the United States such a powerful factor in the money market that its influence is greater than that of any other competitor; that it exercises such a predominent influence that it does not compete freely for money, but competes almost in a monopolistic sense, it establishes a pattern, and it establishes an overall rate of interest because of its great importance in the financial picture?

Mr. GORE. I had not intended to discuss that particular phase of the problem, but since the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota has raised two pertinent inquiries, I think I must, in fairness, respond.

It is indisputable that the policies of the Federal Reserve bank and the policies of the United States Treasury affect the pattern of and exercise a very direct bearing not only on the interest rate on publicly issued securities, but also upon the interest rate of of commercial banks and upon our whole economic structure.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I will yield as soon as I have replied to the other phase of the question asked by the Senator from Minnesota.

The Senator has also raised the question of the advisability, the feasibility, and the possibility of depending safely upon the free money market under present conditions to determine the rate of interest upon United States Government bonds. Not only do the budgetary affairs of the Government have an overpowering effect on the country, but the huge public debt has an overpowering and impelling effect upon the Government itself, as well as upon our entire economy. The law of supply and demand cannot operate normally when there is in the stream $265 billion of public debt. The Government of the United States must determine the interest rate on Government bonds. That determination must be made in Washington, not in Wall Street.

Does that answer the inquiry of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield to me again, I will say to him that his observations as to the controlling power of the Federal Government in establishing interest rates can be well documented, I believe, by fact and by example.

The point which the junior Senator from Minnesota was trying to bring to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee was simply that the so-called free-money market, which is always alluded to in speeches about the free market simply is not free. The market is obviously conditioned by the example, the efforts, and the direction of the Government. When the Government sets an interest rate of 3¼ percent on 30-year bonds, and a rate of 2⅝ on 1-year short-term bonds, then indeed the Federal Government is taking a controlling interest in the market for the financing of the country's goods and services. It has a direct effect upon private financing efforts.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I hope shortly to try to help to develop this subject with my friends on the other side of the aisle. In the meantime I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee on the question of interest rates if he does not agree with me that they have been going up since February or March of 1951.

Mr. GORE. There has been some rise during that period, that is true. However, the very rapid rise has occurred since January. I have before me figures from the Bond Buyers Index which show that as of November 6, the rate was 2.38. It rose only two points until January 8. From January 8 to May 14 it jumped 37 points. The answer to the Senator's question is a conditioned "yes." It rose slowly before January. It has been leaping upward since January.

Mr. BUSH. No doubt the Senator will also agree with me, however, that during this period our economy has been operating at an almost unequaled high rate. Loans are at an all-time high. The demands upon the bond market have never been so high. Therefore, it is perfectly natural that money rates should advance under those circumstances. Is not that so?

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator that under the policies now in effect it is not only a natural but an inevitable consequence that interest rates should rise to the high point they have reached, but if those policies are continued, disaster may follow. Interest rates will continue to rise.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator agree with me that it would help us to consider his argument if he would say what policies he thinks are responsible for this condition? I also hope that he may agree with me that most of the cause of the rise, if not the entire cause, has to do with the condition which I have just described, namely, the very high rate of business activity, and the very heavy demands upon lenders of every kind for money.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has just advised us that ere long he will undertake to bring enlightenment on the policies with respect to which he now asks me. I shall look forward with great interest to the enlightenment, which I know he will bring, but surely if he has given the subject sufficient study to be prepared to bring such enlightenment, he recognizes the policies which he asks the junior Senator from Tennessee to describe.

Further in answer to the question——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. Let me answer further.

The great business activity to which the Senator refers is real, and I applaud it. However, it is not business activity alone which has created the tight money situation which we now experience. It is the policy of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, the policy of the Eisenhower administration, for tight money which has brought it about. Throughout World War II there was great business activity. I am sure the Senator would not say that we have more activity now than we had during World War II. Then interest rates did not leap upward. Interest rates were managed in Washington.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. To what policy does the Senator refer?

Mr. GORE. I refer to the policy of the Treasury of the United States. I refer to the policy or policies of the Federal Reserve System, as well as to the overall policy of the administration.

Mr. BUSH. To what policy of the Federal Reserve System does the Senator refer?

Mr. GORE. Tight money. Does the Senator not understand that term?

Mr. BUSH. I understand it.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps the Senator had rather refer to it as sound money or hard money. It means that the supply of money is restricted. It means that interest rates go up. It means that loans are more difficult to obtain. It means that the Federal Reserve System is tightening up on the flow of money into the economic stream. It means that the Treasury of the United States has arbitrarily and unjustifiably issued a $1 billion refinancing issue at 3¼ percent, which may, I advise my colleague, have so demoralized the monetary market that a few weeks later, when we must refinance $5,600,000,000, according to the public

admission of Treasury Department officials themselves, they cannot refinance it on a long-term basis. If that does not answer the Senator——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation on his comment?

Mr. GORE. I yield for an observation. I had promised to yield to the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BUSH. I shall not detain the Senator very long.

The Senator speaks of the policy of the administration as a definite policy to create tight money. I submit to the Senator that that is not the policy of the administration. I defy him to prove that such is the policy. As I understand, the policy has been to let the market seek its level; and in the light of the inflationary forces which have been built up by the policies of recent years it was inevitable under such circumstances that money rates should increase somewhat. I submit that those are the facts, and that the administration has not had a policy of tight money. Tighter money has been the inevitable result of allowing a free market in Government bonds and other bonds.

Mr. GORE. It comes as a distinct surprise to the junior Senator from Tennessee that the administration is without a monetary policy. Surely this situation cannot come about by accident. I am well aware that we are drifting in many respects, but it was my impression that in the field of money the administration at least had a policy.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am not speaking for the administration, but I will say to the Senator that I am stating what I think is the policy, which was to allow the market to seek its proper level after the suppressing measures which had been in effect for many years in an effort to hold interest rates down to the disadvantage of savers of every kind—holders of life-insurance policies, holders of savings bonds, owners of savings accounts, and all kinds of savers. Their interest was subordinated to that of the borrower.

In my humble opinion the administration should recognize once and for all that the saver, the thrifty man, is entitled to some consideration. The country should not be run entirely in the interest of the borrower.

I submit also, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield one more minute to me, that while he talks about money rates being too high, if he will go back to the post-war period after the first World War he will find that the Government was then selling bonds, the Victory bonds, at 4¼ percent. In my experience, and I think in the experience of most Senators, the present rates are not high. The situation is adjusting itself from a condition which has been going on for years, in which the Government has deliberately suppressed money lenders.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the gentleman from Connecticut has referred to the period following World War I. That same reference was made only yesterday by the head of a very large bank in this country. There is a very distinct difference. True, bonds went down after World War I to 80 percent of par. True, the interest rate soared skyward.

I may say to the Senator that I hope he, the Senator, will pardon me for referring to him as a gentleman. That form of reference is a habit in the House of Representatives. I recognize him not only as a gentleman, but as a Senator of very great ability.

Not only were bonds selling at 80 percent of par, not only were interest rates high, but we were in the midst of the worst depression the country has ever known.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator to designate the time he is referring to?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. BUSH. I merely ask the Senator to indicate the time he is referring to so we may be clear about it.

Mr. GORE. I shall proceed to reply to the Senator's first interrogation.

The difference between that time and now is that then we had, compared with the present time, a relatively small public debt. Now we have the overpowering and tremendous public debt of $265 billion.

If Government bonds were to go down to 80 percent of par—and they are already down to 91—and, if interest rates should go up to 4½ percent on Government bonds—I would not want to say that the Senator from Connecticut seems to be looking forward to it, because I do not think he does, and certainly I hope he does not—the cost to the taxpayers of the country in carrying such a huge public debt would become almost unbearable.

Banks all over the country would shore up their interest rates and start calling loans, as some are already doing now. Municipal issues would leap upward still further, and projects in my State for public improvement, for school buildings, and for street construction would have to be canceled or postponed.

That is the fruit, that is the consequence, of the policy to which I refer.

One difference between the Senator from Connecticut and the junior Senator from Tennessee seems to be the question of whether it is a policy. I say it is the result of and the consequence of a policy. The Senator from Connecticut seems to be saying that it is the result of haphazard conduct, not a policy.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I said a little while ago that it was not the policy of the administration to put interest rates up. I contended, if the Senator will recall, that that was not the policy, but that the rise in interest rate was the reversal of a policy which for many years the administration under his party held to; namely, suppressing interest rates and holding them down, at great expense to the taxpayers, particularly through the forces of inflation. That is what I have tried to point out to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I should like to respond to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. Then I shall be happy to yield. The Senator from Connecticut stated that the previous administration had a policy of holding interest rates down. He has described in beautiful language a program by which interest rates have been increased. Yet, how he can deny that it is policy, I do not quite understand. I thought it was spelled out by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, before he came to Washington.

In magazine articles and in the financial pages of our leading daily newspapers I read articles predicting the policy, and I have read statements about it since then. I may also advise the Senator from Connecticut, without trying to quote anyone, that I have talked with high officials of the Treasury and of the Federal Reserve Board, and they have confirmed to the junior Senator from Tennessee the fact that there is a policy of tightening up on credit and there exists a policy of monetary deflation, which will absolutely and inevitably raise the interest rates on money in the country.

I am surprised that the Senator from Connecticut does not recognize it as a policy. I realized that we were operating in the field of agriculture without a policy. I realized that in many fields we did not have proper leadership. However, I thought here we had firm and determined—although I think improper—leadership.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I believe the able Senator from Tennessee should consider certain facts and should contemplate what would be the end result of the policy.

First, I believe everyone agrees that we should convert the big public debt into a long-term debt, because it is very dangerous—to a government, to an individual, and to a company—to have too much money coming due too soon. Most of the $265 billion comes due in a comparatively short time.

That will be one result of the policy.

The second result, which to my mind is even more important than the first, is this: If we are to stop inflation and if we are to have a gradual reduction in prices, it may be that the taxpayer will have to pay more in interest rates, perhaps as much as $300 million more. However, if by gradually reducing prices the Government saves perhaps $10 billion on what it buys, we will save $10 billion to the American people.

The same thing is true of projects which will be built in the State of the Senator from Tennessee. While it might be true that the interest rate would cost a little more, the fact remains, if the projects could be built for 10 or 15 percent less money than they cost now, there would be a saving of literally millions of dollars. Combining such savings over the country the result might well be a total saving of billions of dollars.

Therefore the reason is twofold. First, it is to convert the unsafe, tremendous debt into a long-term debt. Second, it is to check inflation and gradually reduce prices. Therefore, while we might be paying more in interest rates we would save many times that amount of money in the purchase of things we bought.

For example, if a housewife could save $300 or $400 a year on her food and

clothing expenditures it would be a very great advantage.

That is the purpose of it.

I am not unmindful of the fact that, just as it is possible to have inflation and let prices go up and up, this policy could likewise be carried too far, and push prices too low. We do not like to have prices too low, either.

However, at the moment I believe we ought to get the enormous public debt refunded into a long-term issue, with maturities of 10, 20, and 30 years.

I think we should check inflation and get a gradual reduction in prices.

I believe that will be the end result, and that is all that the Treasury of the United States is trying to do. In my opinion, it is a sound policy.

The policy to which the Senator refers, of supporting Government bonds, was put into effect by the Democratic Party. I believe it was put into effect 2 years ago this March, when the Federal Reserve Board, at the suggestion of President Truman and Secretary Snyder and others, got out of the so-called market, and the present administration is continuing the policy.

I think those are the facts from which we should work, and I think what I have suggested will be the end result. I hope it will be, because we cannot go on and on having billions and billions of dollars' worth of bonds come due every month or every 2 months or every 6 months. That is not good management, and I think the able Senator from Tennessee will agree with me on that point.

Likewise, I am sure he will agree that we would like to have, and should have, some decline in the inflationary situation, as we find it today.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the contributions the distinguished Senator from Indiana, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, has made. Before replying to his questions and statement, I should like to pay tribute to him. One of the encouraging things in recent months has been to see him rise to the responsibility of leadership. Second only, I think, to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I believe the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] stands as a stalwart in his party, with a willingness to shoulder the responsibility that goes with the power and privilege of leadership in this country.

Yesterday I voted with him. I think he was eminently correct, and I am only sorry that he was so alone on his side of the aisle. However, that should be considered, not in deprecation of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, but, in my humble opinion and according to my lights, a compliment.

Now the Senator from Indiana has raised some very broad questions, which I am sorry to say have led me, along with other Senators, into an impromptu discussion of perhaps the most important question today facing the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Nation. However, I am willing to proceed upon that basis.

The Senator from Indiana has referred to the dangers of inflation. That subject is not new to me. Perhaps the Senator from Indiana will recall that in 1941, I was the author, in the House of Representatives, of what then was called the Baruch plan—a plan for the overall control of prices, wages, credit, profits, and salaries in an endeavor to prevent an enormous public debt from developing as a result of World War II inflation.

So I have been fighting inflation fully as long as has my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Indiana. I recognize the dangers of inflation.

However, Mr. President, we have not paid the price of inflation. Instead, we have piled it up as a huge, towering, overpowering public debt. I am sorry that, through inflation, we have cut the purchasing power of the dollar to approximately 53 cents.

But what are we going to do about the situation? We have to start where we are.

The Senator from Indiana now speaks of going down the steps of deflation. If, whenever we were to take a step downward, we could throw into the ocean a large piece of the public debt, then we could safely take another step downward, and could then throw into the ocean another large chunk of the public debt. However, Mr. President, we cannot do that. The public debt is an existing fact of life; and if we go down the steps of deflation, the public debt will crush us.

I recognize the dangers of inflation, and I also recognize the dangers of deflation. The situation must be managed wisely, or it will devour us.

Now that we have gone up the steps of inflation—and when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, I was fighting inflation at every step—I do not think it is possible safely to retreat from the level at which we have arrived. I do not believe we can pay with 100-cent dollars the debt incurred with 53-cent dollars. That goes for private as well as public debt.

The Senator from Indiana has spoken of the hope that prices will be reduced. Let me remind him that the farmers are already experiencing a reduction in the prices of the commodities they produce. During the inflationary period, I advocated moderate policies similar to the ones now being placed into effect. However, it seems that in our country we have a remarkable penchant for doing the right thing at the wrong time. I believe we have passed the peak of inflation, and I believe that the policies now being enforced are dangerously turning us on the downward trend, to the point where communities in my State are now considering cancellation of the public improvements program upon which they have embarked.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, I am well aware of the record in respect to combatting inflation which the able Senator from Tennessee made while he was a Member of the House of Representatives, and I also am familiar with the legislative proposals he sponsored there. In no way do I wish to appear to be indulging in criticism. I rose only to explain the purpose and the reason for the policy the Treasury Department has followed.

As the Senator from Tennessee knows, over many years we have heard so much about the so-called 53-cent dollar or the "baloney dollar" and the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, that now we are trying to strike a balance, so that, I repeat, we can handle the national debt by means of long-term bond issues, or at least bonds of longer terms than those now outstanding; and at the same time we certainly wish to make sure that higher prices will not generally prevail. We wish to have some reduction made, and we wish to have a better balance established in the Nation.

I believe that every Member of the Senate, including the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], has been fighting inflation, and is opposed to it, and is aware of its dangers and the harm it causes.

I believe the Senator from Tennessee is equally aware, as I am, of the deflated dollar. I think all of us are trying to do what is right, and I believe that is what the able Senator from Tennessee has in mind and what everyone else has in mind. I do not think the people of the Nation want either inflation or deflation. On the contrary, I believe that all of us want a dollar that is a little sounder than the dollar we have at the moment, and I believe all of us want a dollar that will buy a little more than can be bought by the dollar we have at the moment. That desire is entertained particularly by those who are on pensions and those who have fixed incomes.

So, I believe these debates are most encouraging and excellent, and I hope they will continue.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself fully with the desire of the distinguished Senator from Indiana to achieve and to maintain a balance. Stability is what we need.

However, let me ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana if a 40-percent increase in the wage of money would be an achievement of balance? Suppose the working people of the country were to demand a 40-percent increase in their wages, and suppose the farmers were to demand a 40-percent increase in the prices paid for the commodities they produce? We would think those were horrible demands.

Yet the financial advisers have urged upon the administration, and the administration has acceded to that urging, a 40-percent increase in the interest rate on short-term borrowing. That is not balance. That is not stability.

(At this point Mr. GORE yielded to Mr. KNOWLAND for a statement as to the legislative program and the nomination of Darrell O. Holmes. Mr. KNOWLAND's remarks appear in the RECORD following Mr. GORE's speech.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, before yielding to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, who some moments ago asked me to yield, I should like to advert to a phrase used by the

distinguished Senator from Indiana. He referred to the demand debt, as I recall. Let me remind him that there is on demand this year approximately $60 billion in bonds. Let us suppose that the confidence of the people were shaken. Let us suppose that the demand were to become real. What would be the result? The answer to that question illustrates how serious the problem is.

I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, in the hope that I shall not very much longer hold the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee whether he does not agree with me that, in the discussion which has taken place this afternoon, it is very obvious that no one seems to know what the policy of the administration is in fiscal matters, or whether there is a policy? Say what we may, the policy of keeping interest rates down, which was referred to by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, was a policy; and the financial institutions of America knew that it was a policy.

Only 2 days ago I was privileged to have come to my office the head of the trust division of the largest bank in my State, a great banking institution, who asked me, "What is the policy of the administration in reference to fiscal matters? What is its interest policy? What is its financial policy?"

I submit there is nothing more dangerous than an administration without a declared policy. If there is a declared policy of high-interest rates, with no bond support by the Federal Reserve System, clearly defined and clearly stated, then every banking house in America knows how to govern itself. But, apparently, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, the long-term, 30-year-maturity bonds were placed on the market, they were sold betimes, and they were then subsequently sold under par at a discount.

There has now been announced a 2⅝-percent bond issue, and there has also been an alteration of the interest rate on other issues. There is no continuity, there is no stability of policy whatever. Would the Senator agree that it dangerous, to have no declared policy in fiscal matters?

Mr. GORE. I may say I cannot quite agree that somebody does not understand that this is a policy, that there are not people who have determined it and have fixed it. I am not sure how many people know that it is a policy and understand it, but I certainly cannot be quite so naive as to accept the view that it is not a policy of the administration and of the money market of the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Tennessee happens to hold the same position the junior Senator from Minnesota holds on the matter of what is the policy of the present administration regarding interest rates. All I am saying is that the argument which has been brought forth in this debate, and the argument which we have heard throughout the country, is that nobody quite knows whether the present administration intends to adhere to this policy or not. They seem to jump in and to jump out. They seem to attract the money market with high-interest rates, and then they draw back. I may say that, at least, when we had an administration which had the declared policy of low-interest rates, with support of the bond market, no one had any doubt about what the policy was.

Furthermore, I may say to the Senator that in 1951 the Federal Reserve System and the Department of the Treasury came to an agreement on fiscal matters, and the bond market was no longer supported. To be sure, the interest rate rose a bit. My criticism of the recent rise in interest rates is not that the interest rates ought never to rise or ought never to be lowered. I have never asked that there be a static situation; but I submit that the sudden increase in the interest rate, the percentage rate of the increase, was uncalled for. I further submit that it is shown it was uncalled for by the fact that the 30-year bond issue was oversubscribed 5 times, practically before the bonds reached the market, which only indicates that a rate of 3¼ percent was unnecessary in order to attract money for Government financing and that a rate of 3¼ percent is not needed in order to obtain money for Government financing.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Everyone is talking about policy, but I am sure——

Mr. GORE. Except the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I shall speak about it, too, in a moment.

The Senator from Minnesota has commented that this administration has no fiscal policy, but that the previous administration did have a fiscal policy. I submit that the policy which the previous administration had was definitely to hold interest rates down, and the result was inflation. I submit that no one can deny that inflation was the result of that policy.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from Connecticut agree that the policy of the present administration is to raise interest rates?

Mr. BUSH. I shall not admit that. Without being able to speak for the administration, which has not taken me into its confidence, I think the Senator will agree with me that the policy of this administration is not to put rates either up or down, but to stop inflation, to check it in the interest of the thrifty people of the country; and the fact that money rates have gone up somewhat is almost inevitable because of the policies of the previous administration.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am greatly surprised that such an illustrious star, newly risen on the horizon, as is the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, whose success in the business world is so marked and whose brilliance in debate is so evident, has not been taken into the confidence of the administration. I am disappointed. I think the administration has made a grievous error. Perhaps if it would take the Senator into its confidence there would be a policy.

However, I think the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has discussed this question in a way which makes it clear that it is a difference of words of which he speaks. He does not like to call it a policy to increase interest rates. He does like to call it a policy of giving, for the first time in many years, he said earlier, a fair wage and return for money.

Is not that the difference between Tweedledee and Tweedledum?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When the distinguished Senator from Connecticut discusses what he considers to be the new management, or the new policy, which is the only word one can use, to control inflation, he fails to take into account that there are ways of controlling inflation other than letting the money market run wild. The Federal Reserve System can raise its credit ratio and thereby help to control inflation. There are all sorts of ways, including direct and indirect controls. But the bankers want to get as much interest as the market will bear, plus a little extra. This hard-money policy, Mr. President, leads to but one thing, and that is hard-to-get money. It leads to tightening the market with reference to those who need credit in order to survive. I think it is about time we faced up to that fact.

I have never said that interest rates ought to be static. I have never said there is no time when there is not need for increases in interest rates. All I say is that the fact that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and other Senators have never been consulted as to a 30- to 40-percent increase in the rate on money indicates that no one was taken into the confidence of this administration except those who were loaners of money.

When representatives of the administration talk about agriculture they do not talk to farmers; they talk to processors. When they talk about fiscal policies they talk to lenders of money.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee if a policy which is always predicated on talking to the lenders instead of to the borrowers, to the processors instead of to the producers, can lead to but one thing, namely, an unbalanced economy in which a great many of the small people find themselves hard up with hard money and completely out of the market themselves, so far as being able to obtain credit is concerned.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in answer to the junior Senator from Minnesota I wish to express the view that if the monetary and fiscal policies of our Government were now wisely managed, we might very well be free of serious danger of either inflation or deflation. But a precipitate rise in interest rates may disturb that balance. In fact, it is already disturbing it. What I am pleading for today is that the administration will stop, look, and think before it plunges us further down the road of a policy which may bring disaster.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Federal Government can pursue policies to protect its own interest in managing the public debt. For example, the Secretary of the Treasury could work with the Federal Reserve Board on an open-market policy, if he chooses to do so, and agree to pay a fair interest rate on the national debt. That policy has been pursued in the past, has it not?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. LONG. For the Government to stand idly aside and let the interest rates go up while talking about economy means that if we undertake to refinance the national debt, we would have to pay about $2 billion more.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana eloquently makes the point that the monetary policy and the fiscal policy with reference to interest rates on Government bonds must be and should be fixed by the Government in Washington and not alone in the money markets of the country.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, if the Government decides that it will pay an extra 1 percent on the national debt, does it not stand to reason that thereby borrowers of money will have to pay at least an extra 1 percent when they borrow money?

Mr. GORE. There can be no question about that. The interest rate on Government bonds, affecting, as it does, the huge public debt, is the bellwether of all interest rates in the country.

Mr. LONG. Assuming the public debt runs approximately $300 billion, with an extra 1 percent interest, would it not mean that, on a private debt of $300 billion, the people who owe money would have to pay an extra $3 billion a year?

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana is not only a logician, but a mathematician.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will my colleague from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I compliment my distinguished colleague upon his address. He has brought about a great deal of worthwhile thinking on this very important subject.

Some days ago I had occasion to talk with a county judge in the State of Tennessee who mentioned the fact that the new bonds being issued by his county in order to be sold had to carry an interest rate considerably larger than the increased Federal interest rate. Is it not true that if the Federal Government makes a 1-percent increase in the interest rate on United States Government loans, not only is that increase reflected in loans of municipalities, counties, and private organizations, but they have to pay a larger percentage increase than does the Federal Government?

Mr. GORE. I do not believe that is always the case, but undoubtedly it is true in many cases.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a short question? I promise him it will be a short question.

Mr. GORE. I have had handed to me a note saying that the Senator from Illinois desires to have his amendment acted upon soon.

Mr. BUSH. I ask the Senator if I may ask a very short question.

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. BUSH. Before I ask it, I simply wish to say to the Senator that I appreciate very much his courtesy this afternoon in yielding so freely to allow me to discuss these matters with him. Should the Senator from Tennessee be interested in pursuing the matter further when I take the floor to discuss the matter, I shall certainly hope to reciprocate his courtesy.

Perhaps the Senator would rather defer his answer, but there is a question I should like to have him answer specifically. He said that money rates should be fixed in Washington. By whom should they be fixed? By the Treasury?

Mr. GORE. After careful analysis of the economic situation in the country and after careful examination of the money stream, the rates should be determined by the President, by the Federal Reserve Board, and by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BUSH. By all three?

Mr. GORE. By all three; indeed so; cooperating together with duly delegated authority.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator admit that that is a very novel philosophy in the fiscal policies of the United States?

Mr. GORE. I do not wish to make any such admission. On the contrary, I think it rather strange that the Senator from Connecticut should suggest that consultation between the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on the monetary policy is novel.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the question asked by the Senator from Connecticut is one of the finest, one of the most direct questions that has ever been asked in the discussion of monetary policy.

Would the Senator from Tennessee agree with me that whether we have the money market fixed in Washington, whether we believe the Government ought to be directing, totally and completely, the free economic market, the fact is that so long as the Government of the United States has a debt of $265 billion, so long as the Government of the United States must refinance that debt, so long as it must put into the money market $2 billion of additional money, the rate of interest, both public and private, will be set by what the Government does? Whether we like it or not, it will be set by the Federal Government.

When the Government of the United States issues 3¼ percent bonds, as compared to 2 percent or 2½ percent bonds, the whole money market goes up.

When the Government of the United States, with a $265 billion debt that must be refinanced, offers 2⅞ percent, 1-year certificates of indebtedness, that formerly bore 1⅞ percent, the whole money market goes up.

This is proved by the fact that the interest rates on car financing, consumer credit, housing credit, farm credit, and small business credit immediately reflected an increase when the Federal Government raised its interest rate on public issues.

This is why we have raised the interest rate on GI loans. We cannot have 4 percent money for GI houses when we have 2⅞ short-term certificates of indebtedness. We cannot have 4 percent money for GI homes when we have 3¼ percent 30-year maturity bonds.

So let us quit "kidding." When the Government of the United States steps into the money market as the major user of credit, as the major factor in the economic market place, the Federal Government is controlling, all the textbooks to the contrary notwithstanding. The Government of the United States is the biggest borrower and the biggest financier in the world.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the contribution of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

I should have added, and now wish to add, the Congress of the United States to the list of consultants to which I alluded a moment ago. I will be glad to explore the question further with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GORE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch from New York, dated May 19, 1953, and to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States To Refund Two Maturing Issues With New 1-Year Certificates," published in the New York Times of May 19, 1953. I ask unanimous consent that these matters be included as a part of and at the conclusion of the remarks I made earlier.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. The Associated Press dispatch to which I have referred is entitled "Government Bonds," and reads as follows:

GOVERNMENT BONDS

NEW YORK, May 19.—Many United States Government bonds drifted to their lowest levels today and several established new depths in meager over the counter trading.

Declines in the Treasury bond list extended to a quarter of a point. The new long-term 3¼s lost 3/32 at 99 3/32 bid. Victory 2½s slipped 9/32 at 91 11/32 bid. The 2½s of 1958 set a record low with a 9/32 drop at 98 19/32 bid.

Financial circles were inclined to blame the Treasury's latest refinancing venture for the losses. The Government offered to exchange nearly $5 billion of 1⅞ percent certificates for 2⅝ percent 1-year notes.

Market observers had anticipated a 2½ percent coupon attached to the new certificates. Some said that the higher interest rates for such a short term investment automatically encouraged downward adjustments in longer term obligations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Not only will this activity interfere with interest rates on long-term securities, but it will also tend

to interfere with every private-interest loan made in America. Is not that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is true, indeed.

The New York Times article referred to by Mr. GORE, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

UNITED STATES TO REFUND 2 MATURING ISSUES WITH NEW 1-YEAR CERTIFICATES—INTEREST RATE OF 2⅝ PERCENT IS HIGHEST SINCE 1933 WHEN 4¼ PERCENT WAS PAID DURING BANK HOLIDAY—BOOKS TO OPEN TOMORROW, CLOSE FRIDAY

WASHINGTON, May 18.—The Treasury proposed today to refund $5,688,000,000 of maturing obligations with a new issue of 1-year certificates bearing an interest rate of 2⅝ percent. It was the highest short-term rate since the bank holiday in 1933, when a 9-month certificate was offered at 4¼ percent.

The new issue will be offered in exchange to holders of $4,963,000,000 of 17.9-percent certificates of indebtedness maturing June 1 and $725 million of Treasury 2-percent bonds maturing in 1953–55, which were called for redemption on June 15. The new certificates will be dated June 1.

In explanation of the short-term refunding, a Treasury spokesman said no serious consideration had been given to a long-term or intermediate issue because the money market was still in the process of digesting the recent issue of a 3¼-percent 30-year bond, which now are quoted fractionally above par after selling below their face value for more than a week.

"We didn't want to do anything that might interfere with the adjustment of the market to that issue," an official said. He added that it had been only a question of what type of short-term issue investors would prefer and what the market could handle.

It was made clear at the same time that the new high rate of 2⅝ percent represented the Treasury's judgment as to the lowest figure at which the refunding certificates would be accepted on the exchange basis.

The March 1933 issue of 9-month certificates that provided the basis of comparison with today's announcement was part of a split issue that included $473 million of 6-month certificates bearing 4-percent interest. At the same time $469 million of the 4¼-percent 9-month certificates were disposed of.

The last previous 1-year certificate bearing a rate comparable with that announced today was in March 1932, when the Treasury disposed of $661 million of certificates at 3¼ percent. The total included an exchange of $414 million for maturing certificates and $247 million in cash.

By offering the 2⅝-percent issue announced today the Treasury would avoid having to pay cash to redeem the maturing certificates and bonds. The new certificates for old will be exchanged as of June 1 while the called bonds will be exchanged as of June 15, with an interest adjustment back to June 1, the date of issue of the new certificates.

Announcement of the short-term refunding came in the middle of heated congressional debate over the Treasury's debt management policy and demands for a less restrictive credit policy by the Federal Reserve Board.

COMPETITION FOR MONEY

W. Randolph Burgess, Deputy to the Treasury Secretary, explained recently that far from paying more for its money than necessary, the Federal Government is confronted in its borrowing with an unprecedented competitive demand for funds from corporate, municipal, and other borrowers.

Corporations plan to raise another $7,500,000,000 this year through new issues, according to Treasury estimates. Municipal issues are expected greatly to exceed last year's $4,100,000,000. Continuation of the January-February level actually would double the 1952 volume of municipal issues, but this is not expected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND NOMINATION OF DARRELL O. HOLMES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me, to permit me to make an announcement of the legislative program, inasmuch as a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle have asked about it?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to announce that when the Senate completes action on the independent offices appropriation bill—assuming that the action on that bill is completed this afternoon—it is the proposal of the leadership to have Senate Resolution 32, Calendar 141, made the unfinished business; and then to have the Senate adjourn from this evening until tomorrow noon, at which time there will be a morning hour, followed by a call of the calendar.

The proposal also is that after the business of the Senate tomorrow is completed, following the call of the calendar, the Senate shall take a recess until Monday, because the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has requested that Senate Resolution 32 not be debated this week.

For the further information of the Senate, let me say that Senators will recall that Senate Resolution 32 is the one proposing an increase in the membership of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and the resolution has been reported, with an adverse report, by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Under that program, that resolution will be the unfinished business to be debated on Monday.

I desire to have the Senate advised of the contemplated program, because a number of Senators have asked what would be the general program for the remainder of this week and the beginning of next week.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I should like merely to say one more thing for the RECORD. When the Executive Calendar was called at the request of the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas, who was acting on behalf of one of the Senators on the other side of the aisle, caused the nomination of Darrell O. Holmes to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington to be passed over.

I desire to make it perfectly clear that there is no commitment on the part of the leadership on this side of the aisle to continue to postpone the consideration of that nomination. It is not our purpose to move today to confirm it; nor would I propose to move to confirm it tomorrow. But I want the distinguished leadership on the other side of the aisle to know that we do not intend continually to postpone the nomination, and that we may be prepared to ask for its consideration and confirmation sometime next week. I thought, in fairness to the distinguished minority leader and to those who requested him to have the nomination go over temporarily, I should make that explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas will confer with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in regard to the nomination. Certainly it is not the purpose of the minority leader to request an indefinite postponement of action. However, as the Senator from California knows, when the Democrats were in the majority, we were very considerate of requests coming from the other side of the aisle; and I do want the senior Senator from Washington to be present when the nomination is considered. I would therefore ask that we be given sufficient advance notice of the intention to call up the nomination, in order that the senior Senator from Washington may have an opportunity to be present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, my reason for making the statement at this time is this: I am fully cognizant of the splendid cooperation shown by Senators on the other side of the aisle when they were in the majority; but I had been informed that the distinguished senior Senator from Washington was to make a rather extended trip, beginning I think, sometime in the middle of next week. For that reason, I did not even want to imply a commitment that we would delay the nomination for another 2 weeks, until the Senator from Washington returned. I shall be glad to consult further with the majority leader; and, if there are any extenuating circumstances which would justify the leadership on this side in holding up the nomination for a further period of time, certainly I would want them to be presented. But, in fairness to all concerned, I did not want any implication that we were going to postpone the nomination indefinitely.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will contact the senior Senator from Washington, and we will confer about the matter later. I am sure we can make some progress.

Could the distinguished acting majority leader tell us what is planned after Monday of next week?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; but on Monday of next week, we shall be prepared to announce the program for the remainder of the week.

ILLEGAL AND UNEARNED PROMOTIONS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I wish to call attention to the manner in which several thousand Government employees were illegally promoted during the closing days of the Truman regime.

On November 1, 1951, Congress passed section 1310 of Public Law 253, 82d Congress, 1st session, better known as the Whitten amendment, which I shall read:

[Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 253; approved November 1, 1951, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)]

SEC. 1310. * * * (c) The Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its au-

thority to prevent excessively rapid promotions in the competitive civil service and to require correction of improper allocations to higher grades of positions subject to the Classification Act in 1949, as amended. No person in any executive department or agency whose position is subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be promoted or transferred to a higher grade subject to such act without having served at least 1 year in the next lower grade.

On October 17, 1952, the Civil Service Commission, under the chairmanship of Mr. Robert Ramspeck, recognizing the days of the New Deal administration were numbered, issued Departmental Circular No. 671, Supplement No. 11, in which was outlined a program whereby all Government agencies were told how they could circumvent the law—section 1310, enacted November 1, 1951—and thus give unearned promotions to their friends.

I quote from that civil service bulletin—Departmental Circular 671, supplement 11, October 17, 1952:

I. BASIC POLICY

The Commission has advised agencies of approval of the following policy:

"When an employee is not eligible for promotion of two grades because of the provisions of section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended, it does not mean that an agency may not assign the higher grade duties and responsibilities to such employee. For example, an occupant of a grade GS–11 position who is otherwise eligible may be assigned GS–13 duties and responsibilities even though he is not eligible under section 1310 for a grade higher than GS–12. In this case the agency may promote the employee to GS–12 only and state the reasons for this action in the 'remarks' column of form 50."

These promotions which were being made on a wholesale scale were called to the attention of the Comptroller General. He reviewed the authorization—under Departmental Circular 671, Supplement 11—of the Civil Service Commission and on March 2, 1953, Mr. Warren rendered his decision.

In this decision the Comptroller General ruled that all promotions or upgradings by the various Government agencies under the authority of the above referred to departmental circular were not only improper but also illegal.

I quote from the decision—No. B-112656, March 2, 1953, of the Comptroller General as submitted to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission:

The attention of this office has been called to Departmental Circular No. 671, Supplement No. 11, of October 17, 1952, issued by the United States Civil Service Commission authorizing the assignment to higher grade duties of employees who do not meet the service requirements of section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1952, as amended (65 Stat. 757, 66 Stat. 122), commonly known as the Whitten amendment.

The matter has been given careful consideration but, for the foregoing reasons, I am required to conclude that the action authorized by Circular No. 671, Supplement No. 11, is improper and illegal.

In rendering his decision declaring these promotions illegal the Comptroller General instructed the Civil Service Commission to inform all Government agencies to begin a rollback of the promotions made under the order referred to above.

No estimate is available as to the actual number of employees who were given these illegal promotions; however, both the Civil Service Commission and the General Accounting Office have estimated that the number will run into many thousands.

Over 200 of the appointments or promotions made under the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of the Treasury Department are adversely affected by this ruling of the Comptroller General.

In a speech in the United States Senate on April 2, 1953, I charged that the former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder; the former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Dunlap; and the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Ramspeck; had in carrying out the Reorganization Plan No. 1 at least violated the intent of Congress if not actually the law.

Following my statement all three of these individuals vehemently denied my accusations; however, I now call attention to the fact that the decision of the Comptroller General not only upholds my charge that they violated the intent of Congress but goes even further by declaring that over 200 of these appointments were actually made in an illegal manner.

This report has been called to the attention of both the chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and assurances have been received that prompt action is being taken to correct this situation.

Prompt action is very essential because many of the employees involved will, if allowed to serve 1 year in their advanced positions without challenge, gain permanent status.

I compliment the Comptroller General upon the prompt and effective manner in which he has put a stop to another last-minute attempt by the Truman administration to raid the Federal Treasury.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks Circular 671, Supplement No. 11, issued by the Civil Service Commission under date of October 17, 1952, which circular authorized these promotions.

There being no objection, the circular was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., October 17, 1952.

DEPARTMENTAL CIRCULAR NO. 671, SUPPLEMENT NO. 11

To heads of departments and independent establishments.

Subject: Assignment to higher-grade duties of employee who does not meet service requirements of section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended.

I. BASIC POLICY

The Commission has advised agencies of approval of the following policy:

"When an employee is not eligible for promotion of two grades because of the provisions of section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended, it does not mean that an agency may not assign the higher-grade duties and responsibilities to such employee. For example, an occupant of a grade GS–11 position who is otherwise eligible may be assigned GS–13 duties and responsibilities even though he is not eligible under section 1310 for a grade higher than GS–12. In this case the agency may promote the employee to GS–12 only and state the reasons for this action in the "Remarks" column of form 50."

II. PURPOSE OF THIS CIRCULAR

This circular is being issued to set forth more precisely the limitations of the above policy and to give instructions relating to the corollary effects when the policy is applied in any case.

III. LIMITATIONS

The basic policy is applicable, at the option of an agency, where all four of the following conditions are met:

A. The employee must meet the qualifications standards of the Commission for the position to whose duties and responsibilities he is to be assigned.

B. The employee must meet the requirements of subsection 8.109 (a) of the Civil Service Regulations.

C. The employee must meet the service requirements of subsections 8.109 (c), 8.109 (d) (2), 8.109 (e), or 8.109 (h), whichever is applicable for the grade to which he will be promoted and paid.

D. It must be found that the employee will within not more than 1 year, meet the service requirements of subsections 8.109 (c), 8.109 (d), or 8.109 (e), whichever is applicable, for the position to whose duties and responsibilities he is to be assigned. For this purpose such service will be considered as rendered at the grade to which promoted and paid rather than at the grade of the position whose duties he performs.

IV. EXAMPLES

There follow two typical examples of situations in which the above policy may be used:

A. An employee who served at grade GS–11 for 1 year is proposed for promotion to a vacancy at grade GS–13. He does not meet the service requirement of the Whitten amendment for that grade. However, he meets the Commission's qualifications standards for the GS–13 position. The employee may be officially assigned to the duties of the GS–13 position and promoted to and paid at grade GS–12. No position at GS–12 need be created.

B. An employee has served in a grade GS–11 position for just 6 months. He is proposed for a GS–12 vacancy. He meets the Commisison's qualifications standards for the GS–12 position. The agency desires to have the employee's GS–11 position vacated. The employee may be officially assigned to the duties of the GS–12 position and paid at a GS–11 rate. His former GS–11 position will be considered as having been vacated.

V. REPORTING

Where this policy is applied by an agency in any particular case the reasons for the action shall be specifically stated in the "Remarks" column on standard form 50. In example A, above, the action would be reported as "Promotion" under authority of Civil Service Regulation 8.108 (a) (1) or 7.106, as applicable. The "To" column would show the title of the GS–13 position, but the grade shown would be GS–12 and the salary would be that for grade GS–12. The following statement would be entered under "Remarks":

"Incumbent ineligible under section 1310, Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended, for grade and salary of GS–13 in this position until ——" (enter date when incumbent will meet service requirement for GS–13). "Action accords with DC 671 Suppl. 11."

In example B, above, the action would be reported as a "Reassignment" under authority of Civil Service Regulation 8.108 (a)

(1) or 7.106, as applicable. The "To" column would show the title of the GS–12 position, but the grade shown would be GS–11 and the salary would be for grade GS–11. The indented statement above would be adapted to the case and entered under "Remarks."

In either case, another standard form 50 must be executed to report the "Promotion" when the employee meets the service requirement.

VI. COROLLARY INSTRUCTIONS

In any case where the above policy is followed, the following instructions are applicable:

A. The higher-grade position may not be filled by another employee as long as the employee is assigned to the duties of that position.

B. As soon as the employee meets the service requirements for the higher position (see par. III–D, above) he is to be officially promoted to that position.

C. The employee's rights in the event of a reduction in force during the period of his official assignment to the duties of the higher-grade position will be those applicable to the grade at which he is being paid. The position title and other identification, aside from grade, will be that of the position to whose duties he is assigned.

VII. RESTRICTION

The above personnel policy is to be confined to cases meeting the four specific conditions. It is not to be used in cases where the employee's promotion is blocked for reasons other than the service requirements of section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended.

C. L. EDWARDS,
Executive Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, following that I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the decision of the Comptroller General of March 2, 1953, Decision B–112656, in which he declared the action taken under the previous supplement as being both improper and illegal.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 2, 1953.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN,
The United States Civil Service Commission.

MY DEAR MR. EDWARDS: The attention of this office has been called to Departmental Circular No. 671, Supplement No. 11, of October 17, 1952, issued by the United States Civil Service Commission authorizing the assignment to higher grade duties of employees who do not meet the service requirements of section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1953, as amended (65 Stat. 757, 758; 66 Stat. 122), commonly known as the Whitten amendment.

Paragraph I of the circular sets forth the basic policy of the Commission as follows:

"When an employee is not eligible for promotion of two grades because of the provisions of section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended, it does not mean that an agency may not assign the higher grade duties and responsibilities to such employee. For example, an occupant of a grade GS–11 position who is otherwise eligible may be assigned GS–13 duties and responsibilities even though he is not eligible under section 1310 for a grade higher than GS–12. In this case the agency may promote the employee to GS–12 only and state the reasons for this action in the 'remarks' column of Form 50."

Paragraph IV gives two typical examples of situations in which the stated policy may be used as follows:

"A. An employee who served at grade GS–11 for 1 year is proposed for promotion to a vacancy at grade GS–13. He does not meet the service requirement of the Whitten amendment for that grade. However, he meets the Commission's qualifications standards for the GS–13 position. The employee may be officially assigned to the duties of the GS–13 position and promoted to and paid at grade GS–12. No position at GS–12 need be created.

"B. An employee has served in a grade GS–11 position for just 6 months. He is proposed for a GS–12 vacancy. He meets the Commission's qualifications standards for the GS–12 position. The agency desires to have the employee's GS–11 position vacated. The employee may be officially assigned to the duties of the GS–12 position and paid at a GS–11 rate. His former GS–11 position will be considered as having been vacated."

It appears from the foregoing that the circular purports to authorize the official assignment of an employee to occupy and perform the duties of a position which legally is classified in one grade while he is to receive the salary of a position which is classified in a lower grade. In such respect, paragraph V of the circular provides:

"In example A, above, the action would be reported as 'Promotion' under authority of 'C S Reg 8.106 (a) (1)' or '7.106', as applicable. The 'To' column would show the title of the GS–13 position, but the grade shown would be GS–12 and the salary would be that for grade GS–12. * * *

* * * * *

"In example B, above, the action would be reported as a 'Reassignment' under authority of 'C S Reg 8.106 (a) (1)' or '7.106', as applicable. The 'To' column would show the title of the GS–12 position, but the grade shown would be GS–11 and the salary would be for grade GS–11.

The restriction of the Whitten amendment is not solely upon the use of appropriated funds but is upon "excessively rapid promotions" and provides expressly that "No person in any executive department or agency whose position is subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be promoted or transferred to a higher grade" except subject to the conditions stated therein.

While the circular indicates that an employee is not to be "officially promoted" to the higher grade position until he meets the service requirements of the Whitten amendment, the action authorized by the circular to all intents and purposes has the effect of promoting or transferring an employee into the higher position—except for the payment of the salary thereof—prior to the time he meets the necessary service requirements. Such action, in my opinion, is contrary to the applicable provisions of the Whitten amendment and is not authorized.

Furthermore, the assignment of an employee to occupy and perform the duties of a position classified in one grade while his salary is fixed in that of a position classified in a lower grade, appears to be contrary to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 954, which contemplates that employees shall receive the salary provided for the grade in which the position they occupy and perform the duties of has been classified.

Moreover, this office knows of no legal authority under the Classification Act of 1949, or otherwise, for paying an employee the salary applicable to a specified grade in which no position has been established, as in example A above, or in which the position has been vacated, as in example B. Also, the action authorized by the circular appears to constitute the indefinite assignment of an employee to the work of a higher classified grade contrary to the provision of Title 5 United States Code, Section 38.

The matter has been given careful consideration but, for the foregoing reasons, I am required to conclude that the action authorized by Circular No. 671, Supplement No. 11, is improper and illegal. Accordingly, this office will not approve payments of compensation for personnel changes hereafter made on such basis or otherwise recognize the validity of such changes.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks another decision of the Comptroller General, under date of April 20, 1953, B–114017, which refers to the same subject. While this is only one specific example it does establish a precedent which must be followed by all other agencies. The Comptroller General here rules that the employees so affected must, in those cases in which they have received the advance pay, repay the money back to the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 20, 1953.

The ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Veterans' Administration.

MY DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: Reference is made to your letter dated February 27, 1953, requesting consideration and decision on certain questions involving the application of section 1310 (c) of the act of November 1, 1951 (65 Stat. 756), as amended by the act of June 5, 1952 (66 Stat. 122); which section is referred to as the Whitten amendment.

It is reported that, through a misunderstanding, action was taken by your Administration to appoint and promote an employee from a grade GS–3 position in the Department of the Army to a grade GS–7 position, $4,205 per annum, in the Veterans' Administration but that, upon review thereof by the Civil Service Commission, it was determined that, since the promotion of four grades was prohibited under the restriction on promotions contained in the above act and the Commission's regulations issued pursuant thereto, the employee should be separated or placed in a position not higher than GS–5. In view thereof, the employee was demoted to a GS–5 position at the top of the grade, or $4,160 per annum, effective January 18, 1953.

Your letter refers to the provision added by the amendment of June 5, 1952, to section 1310 (c) of the act of November 1, 1951, supra, which states that the Civil Service Commission may authorize promotions (without regard to number) in order to avoid undue hardship or inequity in individual cases of meritorious nature. By reason of that provision you desire answers to certain questions which depend on whether the Civil Service Commission may or may not approve a promotion to GS–7 for the employee here involved—such as the date the Commission would be authorized to make the promotion retroactive, the amount to be refunded by the employee in the event the promotion could not be retroactive, etc.

You may be advised that the portion of the questions regarding the authority of the Civil Service Commission to make the promotion retroactive under the related circumstances would appear to be a matter for submission to that agency in the first instance rather than to this office. In other words until the Civil Service Commission decides that it has authority to act favorably respecting the retroactive promotion of the

employee, there properly is no question for decision by the General Accounting Office. The only matters contained in your letter which may be considered at this time relate to the proper salary rate of the employee upon being placed in grade GS–5 together with the effective date thereof, and the amount proper for refund assuming that the Civil Service Commission will refuse to take cognisance of the situation as a "hardship case" under section 1310 (c), supra. In the absence of the employee having attained a salary rate of $4,160 or higher in some other position as defined in section 25.101 of the Commission's regulations, there would be no authority for using the salary rate paid to the employee in the GS–7 position—a position to which he was not legally entitled—in fixing his salary rate in grade GS–5 above the minimum of that grade. With respect to the effective date of the appointment to GS–5 it may be stated that this office would not object to making such appointment or demotion effective as of the date the employee otherwise is determined to have become eligible for promotion from GS–3 to GS–5 under the Commission's regulations (sec. 8.109). The basis for that view is that it may be assumed that the employee would have been appointed to GS–5 on the date of transfer to your Administration or as soon thereafter as he became eligible for a two-grade advance. The difference between the amounts actually paid to the employee in GS–7 as well as GS–5, and the proper salary rate of GS–5 from the effective date thereof, as fixed and determined in accordance with the foregoing is required to be refunded.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

FIRST INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4663) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL obtained the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For what purpose?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I was about to ask the Senator to yield in order that I might suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the Senator will not do so now.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withhold my suggestion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] providing for a 5 percent overall cut, except for the President's salary, in the pending independent offices appropriation bill.

I respectfully call attention to the fact that the bill now under consideration represents a reduction of $715 million in round figures, under the estimates for 1954, as contained in the so-called Truman budget, and $536 million under the appropriations for 1953.

The revised budget, the so-called Eisenhower budget, provided for appropriations of $888 million.

As I stated in my opening remarks on Friday, May 15, this bill represents a cut in the appropriations for the active agencies covered by the bill, aside from items for contracts and retirement funds of approximately 17 percent below the estimates.

Of the $457 million appropriated by the bill, $200 million is provided for contract payments, or definite obligations, for the following: annuity payments under civil service, rents and utilities, renegotiation refunds, slum clearance grants; annual contributions on housing units previously constructed; and contract liquidations. In other words, approximately $200 million is for obligations of the Government. Another $40 million in the bill is for regulatory bodies, most of which have already been drastically cut, including the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Renegotiation Board, the Tariff Commission, and the Tax Court. So I believe that a 5-percent cut on those figures is illogical, and I hope it will not prevail.

I should like to make one further remark to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], with whom it is always pleasant to debate because he constantly wears a smile. We have a different situation this year from that which existed last year and the year before. Last year and the year before, when I served on the Appropriations Committee with my friend from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and other Senators, the administration then in power did not help us to cut. It did not show us where to cut. This year we have an administration which has already made substantial cuts. The House and the Senate committee have cut underneath the reductions suggested by it. So I hope there will not be a further 5 percent reduction.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want the RECORD to show that the committee cut below the administration figures, below the so-called Dodge budget. How much did the cut amount to? I have been asked that question. I think the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee deserve commendation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In answer to the Senator from South Carolina I will say that the revised budget, the so-called Dodge budget, was $888,000,000; and the bill provides $457,000,000, almost a 50 percent reduction.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have reduced the appropriations requested by the President and the Dodge budget, both in the subcommittee and in the full Committee on Appropriations, have we not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. By how much, in dollars and cents?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In round figures, $431,000,000 is cut from the so-called Eisenhower budget, and $750,000,000 from the Truman budget.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope we may soon have a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, although I have several amendments of my own which call for reductions in appropriations, I should like to discuss the amendment of my colleague in connection with the budget as a whole. I should also like to make some comments with respect to the statements just made by the very able and beloved chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is in charge of the bill.

I am somewhat startled by his claim of economy in which he states that the appropriations requested are $536 million under those made last year and $715 million under the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1953–54.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator says he is startled. I made the statement on Friday last. The distinguished Senator, I think, realizes that some of these cuts are deferrals. I do not mean to say for one moment that they are permanent, final cuts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is just the point I wish to discuss. We love the Senator from Massachusetts. He is a genuine individual. He would no more make a misstatement than he would pass a spurious coin. However, unfortunately, the House committee led the country into a misapprehension as to the nature of the economies proposed, and I am sorry to see my good friend from Massachusetts continuing to perpetuate the misapprehension.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me finish, if I may.

The point is that, while the Senator from Massachusetts is not a "phony" in any respect, but is one of the most genuine men ever to serve in this body, this budget is a "phony," so far as economies in expenditures are concerned; and I think I can prove that statement very simply.

For example, where do these economies come from? An examination of the tabulation on page 16 of the report, discloses that the committee is claiming credit for a reduction of $321,450,000 which is not being appropriated this year, but which was appropriated last year—for what purpose? For the payment to the civil-service retirement and disability fund. This failure to appropriate does not diminish the expenditures of the Government by 1 red cent.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield later. The expenditures of the Government are determined by the statute prescribing the benefits to be paid to retired civil-service employees. If we do not appropriate this year we will be forced to appropriate next year or in succeeding years. Therefore this is purely a bookkeeping item, not a saving of a single penny to the taxpayers of the United States. I know it looks well to claim economies of $321,450,000, but on that item there are no economies whatsoever.

It is a pure piece of bookkeeping legerdemain.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Illinois to page 4974 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15. I believe he will agree with me that the deferral to which he is referring was clearly set forth in the RECORD. I make the statement in appreciation of the kind statement he has made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Massachusetts makes the same statement on page 3 of the report in fine print. But in big type on page 1 a decrease in appropriations is stressed. In the House of Representatives and on the political hustings of the country the claim will be made that the administration has saved $321,450,000 on this item. I am very glad the Senator from Massachusetts goes back to the fine print of last Friday, to point out that it is not a saving at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not seek to delay the argument of the Senator from Illinois, but I know he is a distinguished author in his own right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Please do not condemn me for that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He knows that the titles of books are printed in rather large type on the first page, and small print is used inside the book. Sometimes the argument inside a book may not measure up to the title of the book, and sometimes it may.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was distressed to hear the able Senator from Massachusetts talk this afternoon in terms of large type, and not once mention the small type. The point is that the $321,450,000 item, which is claimed as a saving, is not a saving at all. The money will have to be spent sometime. If we do not appropriate the money this year, we will have to appropriate it in some future year. In fact, the administration may have to resort to unsound financial procedures in postponing until tomorrow what it should provide today.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the point I was trying to make was that the appropriations contained in the bill are below those recommended by the President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the reductions are not real. They are "paper" savings only.

Mr. MAYBANK. They are also below the authorizations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. But that does not mean that the expenditures will be reduced.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not suggest it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want any mistake to be made. I would say to the Senator that, aside from the amendment which was adopted this morning, namely, to add seven more television teams, in order to expedite television applications throughout the United States, I do not believe the Senator from Illinois will find any place in the bill where we raised the so-called false budget. Am I correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We will go into that point later. There are in fact numerous increases.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am asking the Senator whether I am correct in my statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not accusing the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from South Carolina of telling an untruth. They would not do it. I merely say they are not telling all the truth, because they talked in terms of appropriations, not in terms of actual expenditures.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, we did not do that at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On page 1 of the report it is done. Furthermore, in the statement of the very able Senator from Massachusetts this afternoon he talked in terms of appropriations. The real question is how much is saved in expenditures for the Government.

Mr. MAYBANK. But we never stop with page 1.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The orators stop on page 1.

Mr. MAYBANK. Not the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On the hustings they will say what a great thing the Republican administration has done. They will say, "We have cut appropriations by $536 million."

Three hundred and twenty million dollars of that amount is a complete "phony."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the Senator will not use the words "complete phony." Rather, it is a deferral. It is a proper deferral, because the Civil Service Commission states that the whole retirement system is being reexamined. We hope, when it is reexamined, a substantial amount of this money will not have to be appropriated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the liabilities to the Government have been created by organic acts which prescribe the benefits of the Federal retirement system. The bill of which the Senator from Massachusetts is in charge is not decreasing that liability by one penny. It fails to appropriate what sooner or later will have to be appropriated. The day of reckoning will come.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The word "phony" in academic circles is considered to be a rather derogatory word, and I hope the Senator from Illinois will use a different appellation. Whatever the Federal Government may have to appropriate, I hope it will not have to put up all of that money. I hope the Senator will use a different word.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will cease trying to give the impression to the country that this is an economy. It is a decrease in the appropriations, but it is not by one penny a decrease in expenditures.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, oh, no. "By one penny," the Senator says.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe the Senator from Illinois went a little too far.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not a decrease by one penny in the case of this item.

Mr. MAYBANK. Oh, the Senator from Illinois did not say "in the case of this item" before.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will ask the Senator from Illinois if, in his opinion, any proposals have been before this Congress or before any of the Congresses of which we have been a part, starting with the 81st Congress, which have in any way indicated that the Government's liability or contributions to the civil-service retirement fund would be any less.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; not at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield further.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that there are a number of bills presently before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service dealing with that subject?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say, in digression, that as chairman of a subcommittee in the 81st Congress I recall holding hearings on proposals for retirement benefits which would have greatly increased the Government's liability, rather than decreased the amount of money which the Government would have to pay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to point out that so far as this item is concerned, the liabilities have not been diminished by one cent. What the committee has done and what the majority has done is to fail to appropriate to meet unchanged liabilities. Hereafter the day of reckoning will come. It may be that some Senators are waiting for the day of reckoning to come in another administration. In any event the burden will fall on the taxpayers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Illinois suggesting that the temporary majority now is waiting for the Democratic majority of the 84th Congress to pick up the tab?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, I would not put it so badly, but I will say that they are transferring to the future the responsibility for their failure to appropriate today.

Therefore it is a piece of phony economy. There is not a bit of saving in this item.

Let us take another item of alleged saving. There are two items listed on page 17 of the report, at the bottom of the page, dealing with strategic and critical materials. For fiscal 1953 Congress appropriated just a little short of $204 million for this purpose. The present administration fails to recommend an appropriation for this purpose.

Therefore the item shows up on page 1 of the report as a $204 million saving in appropriations.

Why have they cut out the appropriation? Because, they say, there is a carry-over in funds which will be sufficient to enable the strategic and critical materials to be purchased. Apparently there is no contemplation that the rate of accumulation of these strategic and critical materials is to be diminished. I hope it will not be, because we need to stockpile copper, tin, rubber, uranium, manganese, and so forth, on which we are dependent on overseas sources in the event war breaks out.

So there is no saving so far as expenditures on this item are concerned. If we add the $321½ million and the $204 million we get a total of $525 million, which is claimed as an economy in expenditures. It is not an economy at all in expenditures. They may be reductions in appropriations, but they are not economies in expenditures.

That would apparently leave the committee with savings of approximately only $10 million, or 1 percent of the budget.

But let us analyze even that claim a little more fully. I now invite attention to the item regarding hospital facilities in the District of Columbia. Again it is to be found on page 17 of the report. We find that $11,400,000 was provided for this purpose in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953; and we find that no appropriation is proposed at this time. Therefore, that is said to be an economy in appropriations, in the amount of $11,400,000. However, if we examine the extra fine print at the bottom of page 17, we find that the appropriation was made in a Supplemental Appropriation Act passed by Congress, and therefore is not a real economy to be effected. It is an item which was appropriated heretofore by the Congress. It is not a real saving, since it is not a recurring item, and, in fact, no request has been made for further appropriations for this item. So, as a matter of fact, that item is not an economy.

Thus, the situation boils down to one in which we find that, instead of making an actual reduction in appropriations, the committee has in fact provided for an actual increase of $1 million over the appropriations of last year.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Illinois would not wish to be interpreted as suggesting that the appropriation for that purpose should be made in this bill, after the appropriation has already been made in the supplemental bill, would he?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I am simply saying that unless we read the footnote which appears in very fine type, we would think that the $11,400,000 was an actual saving. I think the appropriation was a necessary one, but it should not be claimed as an economy on the part of the present Congress, simply because the present Congress failed to renew it or failed to double the amount at once. That item is a nonrecurring one, which the Senator from South Dakota succeeded in having provided for, a few weeks ago—and I am glad he did. On the other hand, the Republican Party should not claim credit for not doubling the item immediately.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I desire to call attention—for I know the Senator from Illinois does not wish to misrepresent the situation——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course I do not wish to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Therefore, I wish to call attention to the fact that the hospital item about which the Senator from Illinois was speaking, was contained in the appropriation bill for 1953 which is the bill the Congress passed last July; and that item is not included in the present estimates.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The footnote on page 17 of the report reads "contained in Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1953." Was that act passed in 1953?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was passed in the fiscal year 1953.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When was that act passed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was passed last July.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, to that degree I am very glad to amend the statement I have made.

Mr. President, I am simply pointing out that no Member of Congress would think of appropriating another $11,400,000 for hospitals in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; that item was not even in Mr. Truman's budget for this year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, it is not an economy which this administration has put into effect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No, and it is not included in the estimated savings.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is included as a saving below the amount appropriated last year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, because that item was previously appropriated.

I hope the discussion will not be prolonged, but I should like to say that the $225 million of estimates for strategic materials is an appropriations estimate. I do not think the Senator from Illinois means to confuse estimates and appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have merely been trying to separate appropriations from expenditures; that is the entire purpose at the moment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well. That amount may be a fundamental and final saving in the appropriations. The money is available, and will be expended; but an additional appropriation is not necessary.

In this body we speak in terms of appropriations. The Finance Committee speaks in terms of expenditures and taxes; but in this body we always speak, when dealing with an appropriation bill, in terms of appropriations.

The $225 million item may never recur. We hope it will not. We hope the expenditure of that amount of money will result in the building up of sufficient strategic materials, so that to the extent of that amount, or a substantial part of it, there will be a real saving in the 1955 appropriation bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out that what matters to the taxpayers is expenditures.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We should not confuse the taxpayers by bookkeeping economies in appropriations, which are not economies in expenditures in the slightest degree.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In every appropriation bill we speak in terms of appropriations.

An explanation may be made as to the results in terms of expenditures this year. However, for instance, in connection with the Department of Defense, let me say that—to state the matter conservatively—approximately $40 billion, of Defense Department funds constitute carryovers that will be spent this year. So there is $89 billion in the Defense Department funds. I mention that to show that, in addition to the appropriations now being made, there is the money left over from the previous appropriations which has not yet been expended. That money must be added to the appropriations made this year, in order to find the new figure.

However, in the appropriation bill we talk in terms of appropriations, so far as I know.

I hope a great part of the $225 million will be an ultimate saving, and will never appear as an appropriation item.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is highly problematical. However, certainly the ultimate responsibilities of the government are not diminished in this way.

I am pointing out that the Appropriations Committee has been preening itself on the alleged great economies which are claimed to have been effected, whereas I point out that the reductions are made by drawing on past expenditures and postponing future obligations; and at the moment all the Appropriations Committee can claim as an economy is $10 million. If we include the $11,400,000 of appropriations for hospitals in the District of Columbia, we find that, instead of a decrease, in reality there is an increase of approximately $1,500,000 in appropriations, over the amounts appropriated last year, which I submit is not a good showing of economy.

If we are going to cut the budget, we had better do it, so that we can actually reduce expenditures, and not merely have paper cuts in appropriations.

Mr. President, after making that statement, I was about to submit the proposals I wish to present to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois has pointed out the difference on

the basis of the $11,400,000 that was appropriated by means of the bill passed last July, I believe.

I desire to call attention to page 18 of the report, where there is a $50 million item under the heading "Defense Housing." That item likewise was provided in a previous appropriation bill, but it does not represent a true saving, any more than does the $11,400,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank the Senator from Delaware. That means that, in reality, approximately $51 million more is being asked for than was appropriated last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reality, I agree with the Senator from Illinois that if this bill is passed as it now stands we shall be appropriating more money for all the agencies, on a comparable basis, than was appropriated during the previous administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Delaware. I wish to say that by means of this measure the progress of the majority toward economy is like that of the crab; namely, when it tries to go forward, it really moves backward.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the interest of accuracy, I hope both the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Illinois will listen for a moment.

On page 27 of the appropriation bill, under the item "Defense Housing," not only is the $50 million—to which the Senator has referred—which was appropriated last year, not appropriated—and that is what we are discussing—but this appropriation bill rescinds $17,500,000 of the previous appropriation, and that amount cannot be spent, because we are rescinding it, and we are not appropriating any additional funds for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then let me say that the committee has increased the expenditures by only $35 million, instead of by $52,500,000.

Mr. President, let us examine some of the other claimed economies.

There is eliminated an item of $4 million for Alaska housing, which is an exotic item; and then there is a reduction of approximately $1,700,000 in the administrative expenses of the Civil Service Commission. Whether the latter is caused by the fact that our good friends of the majority believe that the work of the Civil Service Commission will be reduced, now that a large part of the personnel work has been transferred to the Republican National Committee, I do not know. At least, that is a possibility, namely, that out of private funds amounts will be provided for clerical help and for the checking of personnel in the Republican National Committee, which will permit of a reduction in the expenditure of public funds. In any event, I do not wish to make such a charge, but I refer to it as an interesting possibility.

However, Mr. President, the committee and the administration have not cut the expenditures of the Government, so far as these items are concerned, by one penny. The expenditures may actually be increased by approximately $35 million.

Mr. President, I think it is about time that we made some real economies.

The proposal of my colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who sits on the other side of the aisle, is for a 5-percent reduction, or cut across the board, which would save approximately $23 million.

I think we should try to reduce the budget by about as much as is proposed; but I dislike the meat-ax cuts, because they fall on the just as well as on the unjust. They fall upon the services which are already down to a minimum, as well as upon those that have a surplus of fat. I am not a skilled budget surgeon, but I much prefer to use the scalpel to cut out the fat than to take a meat ax and to hack down through the bone and sinew of the services.

What I should like to do would be to propose a series of six amendments, which would save, in all, approximately $16,800,000, and $15,800,000 of this would be applied to General Services Administration, which is actually getting about $2 million more out of this budget than was appropriated last year, and which is the agency performing purely overhead operations.

Mr. President, I am not quite certain what the parliamentary situation is. What I am disposed to do is to allow the Dirksen amendment to come to a vote, and, if it carries, to propose further cuts to the degree to which my proposed reductions would be in excess of the Dirksen cut; and if it shall not be agreed to, to offer my proposals de novo, as it were.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Maybank
Barrett	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Beall	Hennings	McClellan
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Monroney
Bush	Hoey	Morse
Butler, Md.	Holland	Mundt
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Carlson	Hunt	Pastore
Case	Ives	Payne
Chaves	Jackson	Potter
Clements	Jenner	Purtell
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Dworshak	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Flanders	Kuchel	Sparkman
Frear	Langer	Stennis
Fulbright	Lehman	Symington
George	Long	Thye
Goldwater	Magnuson	Watkins
Gore	Malone	Wiley
Green	Mansfield	Williams
Griswold	Martin	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for a request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is an amendment pending before the Senate for a 5 percent cut in the appropriation bill. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois has asked for an overall 5 percent cut in the independent offices appropriation bill. I should like to point out that of the $457 million appropriated in the bill $200 million is provided for contract payments on definite obligations, for annuity payments, renegotiation payments, and other things of that kind, and another $40 million is for a regulative body which we have already cut approximately 17 percent.

In the past year we had an administration which perhaps did not help us to cut appropriations. This year we have an administration which sent in a budget which is much reduced from the original budget.

The House has cut the revised estimates much more. I believe the cuts are substantial. I will not say they are the utmost that can be done, but to make an overall cut of 5 percent when almost half of the appropriation is for contract payments I think is unwise.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. How does the total amount for the items contained in this bill compare with the total appropriations in the comparable bill for last year?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I call the Senator's attention to the first page of the committee report, which states that the amount of appropriations for fiscal 1953 were $993,536,843. The amount reported in the bill this year is $457 million.

I do not wish any misinterpretation to arise. In round figures, approximately $350 million, perhaps as much as $400 million, is a deferral for the Civil Service Commission to make payments to the retirement fund. Two hundred and twenty-five million dollars of the cut is in the amount for strategic materials, for which there is sufficient money this year.

What is important to remember is that the cut in funds for operating agencies is 17 percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, after line 2, it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the page and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, agencies and offices under this title, in not to exceed the amounts set out, respectively, in each of the appropriation paragraphs therefor (except that the amount set out for the compensation of the President is appropriated in full and may not be reduced), there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed 95 percent of the gross total of such several amounts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, namely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr.

BRIDGES], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official committee business. On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—35

Barrett	Goldwater	McCarthy
Beall	Griswold	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Pastore
Byrd	Jackson	Potter
Dirksen	Jenner	Smathers
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kuchel	Smith, N. C.
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
George	Martin	

NAYS—43

Aiken	Ellender	Hill
Bush	Flanders	Hoey
Carlson	Fulbright	Holland
Case	Gore	Humphrey
Chavez	Green	Ives
Clements	Hayden	Johnson, Colo.
Cordon	Hennings	Johnson, Tex.
Johnston, S. C.	McClellan	Sparkman
Kefauver	Monroney	Stennis
Knowland	Neely	Symington
Langer	Payne	Thye
Lehman	Purtell	Wiley
Long	Robertson	Young
Magnuson	Saltonstall	
Maybank	Smith, N. J.	

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson	Duff	Murray
Bridges	Eastland	Russell
Butler, Nebr.	Gillette	Schoeppel
Capehart	Kerr	Taft
Cooper	Kilgore	Tobey
Daniel	McCarran	Welker

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in accordance with the agreement made last Friday I ask to reopen for consideration the committee amendment on page 12, lines 22 and 23.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to reject the committee amendment on page 12, lines 22 and 23, the result of which motion would be to restore the House figure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of line 22 and the beginning of line 23 it is proposed to strike out "$98,826,070" and insert "$104,750,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I move to strike out the figure "$104,750,000" and hold to the House figure of "$98,826,070."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question will be put on agreeing to the committee amendment. A negative vote will obtain the result the Senator from Illinois desires.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the committee amendment, and ask the privilege of making a brief statement before the first name is called.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have just rejected the amendment of my colleague [Mr. DIRKSEN], which would have saved approximately $23 million. I voted for that amendment, although I do not believe in meat-ax cuts. I voted for it because it was the pending question.

Now we have an opportunity for selective cuts. I should like to emphasize the need for further cuts in this appropriation bill. Earlier in the afternoon I analyzed——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I finish?

Mr. MAYBANK. I was about to ask the Senator to enlighten us on the particular amendment. I have been asked to what it pertains.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the committee has brought forward an appropriation bill which really does not save any money whatsoever for the taxpayers of the United States. It contains bookkeeping items which indicate reductions in appropriations of some $536 million below the amounts appropriated last year. But if we analyze the bill we find that $525 million represents pure bookkeeping items, not involving any reduction in expenditures. Furthermore, the $11,400,000 item which is claimed as a saving on hospitals in the District of Columbia is a nonrecurring item, which could not have been expected to be included in this bill. There is an item of $50 million in connection with defense housing which appears as a saving. Actually it represents a phoney bookkeeping item amounting to $32,500,000.

So this budget is around $34 million greater than last year as far as authorized expenditures are concerned.

The pending amendment is the first of several which I intend to propose, which, if adopted, will save in all $16,800,000.

We turned down the meat-ax way of making economies. Now we come to the selective method.

The cuts which I am proposing are not on fixed items or on obligations of the Government, to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred in connection with the Dirksen amendment, but are merely overhead items.

I wish to discuss the General Services Administration. I am proposing to cut the appropriation by $5,900,000, thereby reverting to the House figure. This is purely an overhead item. The Senate committee recommends the increases because of a loss in building management reimbursements by other agencies and because of an alleged increase in utility and rental rates.

I submit that there is at least $5,900,000 worth of fat in the previous budget of the General Services Administration, out of which it can meet the increased charges which have allegedly come about.

This is a real chance to save money on a selective basis.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish I could go along with the Senator from Illinois. I should like to explain what funds are proposed to be stricken.

The first item consists of 2,196,000 square feet of space previously managed on a basis of reimbursement from funds appropriated to other agencies, $3,394,450.

The next item represents increases in cost due to advances in rental and utility rates, $1,120,000.

The third item represents 223,000 square feet of converted Government-owned space, $130,000.

Therefore the Senator from Illinois would cut out 2,196,000 square feet of space taken over by the General Services which was previously managed on a basis of reimbursement from funds appropriated to other agencies; the advances in rental and utility rates, and 223,000 square feet of converted Government-owned space.

If the appropriation is stricken from this bill there will be no way of paying for this space used by the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts believe that there is a degree of slack in the General Services Administration which that agency could eliminate and thereby absorb these increased costs? Why is the Senator from Massachusetts assuming that the increased costs of approximately $5 million will have to be met from increased appropriations? Why can we not put the squeeze on the General Services Administration to absorb these increases in costs?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say that the amount has already been cut from $121 million to $105 million. The amount in the Truman budget was $121 million, and the amount recommended by the committee is $105 million. These items are for utility services, office space, cleaning of offices, washing windows, and paying for electric light.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we make our comparisons in terms of the appropriations of last year, the appropriations were not $121 million, but only slightly more than $101 million. There is proposed by the bill an increase in appropriations over last year of $3.6 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that the General Services Administration is gradually taking over space from other agencies and paying for it. The reason the appropriation last year was smaller than this year is that the additional space had not then been taken over by the General Services Administration, but was provided for by appropriations for other agencies.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. For the moment, instead of arguing from the premise of the Senator from Massachusetts, namely, that all of these services must be continued, what does the Senator have to say about this hypothetical assumption? What would the General Services Administration, in the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts, do if we should adopt the amendment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we should adopt the amendment, then, according to the information given to us, there would be no money with which to provide services for 2,196,000 square feet of space or to pay for utilities or to pay for the rentals involved.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Massachusetts deny the fact that if the Senate adopts the amendment we would thereby force the General Services Administration to bring about some economies, even with the possibility of dropping some functions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that we have already cut $16 million from the estimate for carrying on the services. According to the information before the committee, there are involved such questions as how many times a week a building should be cleaned, how much cleaning of offices should be done, how often the windows should be washed, and how the electric light should be paid for.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator disagree that the only way to economize to the bone is to start to cut to the bone?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree perfectly; but I think the Senator from Oregon would not want elevator service to be eliminated, forcing persons to walk upstairs in the buildings, or the cleaning of windows eliminated.

Mr. MORSE. I take the position that that would not follow at all.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have had the opportunity to observe some of the buildings managed by the General Services Administration, over which it has custody. I visited such buildings, not only post office buildings, but also Federal courthouses. I noticed the unkempt condition of the buildings. I spoke to the custodians in charge of those buildings, and I also spoke to the janitorial staff about it. I was informed on each occasion that the only reason for it was the reduction in force and their inability to employ additional help, because they did not have the funds with which to do it.

No Federal buildings should be permitted to get into the bad state of custodial care in which I found some buildings.

I found instances where the employment of some senior employees had been terminated, and after a period of time the same employees were hired at the minimum wage. I said it was an abuse of the rights of the senior personnel in the custodial service.

Therefore, in viewing this appropriation I came to the conclusion, as a committee member, that the members of the committee had a responsibility, so far as the custodial services of the Federal buildings was concerned, to give the General Services Administration sufficient funds with which to keep the buildings in a condition which would conform to what the condition of a Federal building should be.

That is why I supported this amount of money for the General Services Administration.

Therefore I will oppose the amendment, because of the conditions which I found in some of the Federal buildings.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was merely going to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether it would not be possible to comply with the desires of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon by having the custodians of the public buildings wash only the lower half of the buildings, because no one ever looks in the upper half anyway, and very few people up there look out. Perhaps in that way we could make a substantial saving.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would leave the Senator's question to speak for itself.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is perfectly evident that it is proposed to make serious cuts in our health services and in our welfare services, to which I am very much opposed. We learned last night from the President of the United States that it is proposed to make very great cuts in our defense services which are designed to protect the security of the Nation. It seems to me that so long as we are considering making cuts in the health, welfare, and security services, it is not asking very much to make a cut of $4 million or $5 million in connection with the washing of windows, the elevator service, and the cleaning of the halls of the Government buildings.

The health, welfare, and security services are vitally necessary, and cuts in those services will seriously injure the people of the Nation.

So, Mr. President, I do not believe that a cut in the funds for the washing of windows and the funds for elevator services and the funds for the cleaning of the halls of the Government buildings, and a cut in the funds for the various other functions of the General Services Administration, will be of very serious moment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Will the chairman of the subcommittee detail for us where the savings in the other departments will come as a result of having the General Services Administration take over the management of buildings which heretofore were in charge of other agencies?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot do that now. This estimate has come to us from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I have to take the word of the Bureau of the Budget that the cuts in the appropriations for the other agencies were made; they are never detailed to us.

Mr. BRICKER. The cuts represent buildings and services taken over by the General Services Administration from various administrative departments; is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. A few years ago, by law, we assigned these services to the General Services Administration; and gradually, as the leases to the various administrative departments expire, new leases are made with the General Services Administration.

Mr. BRICKER. Was that presentation made to the committee?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was, on the basis of an overall figure. I can give the breakdown of the estimate; I have the breakdown of the $105 million, from which we have proposed a cut of approximately $7 million, so the amounts I shall now state should be reduced, in total, by the $7 million: Operation and maintenance of Government-owned space, $45,700,000; rental—operation—in other words, rental and operation to prepare leased space—$40 million.

I have the detailed breakdown of that figure, in the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, the Department of State, the Federal Security Agency, the General Accounting Office, the Renegotiation Board, and the Treasury Department. Those areas amount to 2,195,000 square feet, in total.

Mr. BRICKER. The reductions will be apparent in the appropriations for the various departments, when they come to us; is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the committee's understanding.

Mr. BRICKER. Will the chairman of the subcommittee designate those items,

at the time when those appropriation bills are presented to the Senate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be very glad to try to do so.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, unless the chairman of the subcommittee wishes to retain the floor, I desire to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly.

Mr. CASE. First, Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE. Is the pending question on agreeing to the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. In other words, do I correctly understand that a vote for a reduction or a vote to restore the amount voted by the House of Representatives will be a vote "no"—namely, a vote to reject the increase proposed by the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I find myself in a position which I never relish, namely, in opposition to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the chairman of the subcommittee, who is handling the appropriation bill, and who is also Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

I particularly do not cherish the situation in which I find myself, because my position in opposition to the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee in this instance grows out of an assignment which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], as Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, gave me. He assigned me to be chairman of a subcommittee on real estate and military construction; that is a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. In that connection it has been our responsibility, among other things, for the past several weeks to review the requests for the approval of leases, as submitted by the General Services Administration or as negotiated by that Administration or as proposed by various branches of the armed services for their own use.

My opposition to the proposed increase in the appropriation for the General Services Administration grows out of the fact that in those hearings I have become convinced that the only way we can "put the squeeze" on the agencies, in order to keep them from expanding and asking for more rentals, is to deny these funds to the General Services Administration. I say that because recently we had a hearing at which a representative of the General Services Administration was present, and we asked him how he determined the need of the various agencies for space. He said they certify the need to the General Services Administration, and asked the General Services Administration to provide space for them.

I asked him, "Do you pay the rent for them?"

He replied, "We do, to the extent that we have funds. If we do not have sufficient funds, they have to pay the rent themselves."

Mr. President, the situation is simply that if the General Services Administration has available funds with which to pay the rent, that Administration acts on the requests of the prospective using agency, and the General Services Administration does not itself determine whether there is need for the additional space. In other words, the agencies which wish to have the space say to the General Service Administration: "We want more space." Then, so long as the General Services Administration has available funds with which to pay the rent, that Administration seeks the space, without making a further review as to whether the space is needed. The using agency makes its own determination as to whether the space is needed.

In the committee report the following statement appears:

> The committee is advised that $3,394,450 of the increase over 1953 is for space previously reimbursed for management from funds appropriated to other agencies, which funds have been deducted from the 1954 estimates for such other agencies.

In other words, at least that amount of the increase is for the purpose of taking up the rent bill for other agencies.

The only way we can cause those agencies to exercise sharper judgment as to whether they need more space is by making them pay the rent out of their own budgets. So long as we give them free access to the purse of the General Services Administration and so long as the General Services Administration acts on the requests of the agencies, without making any investigation, such requests for funds will be made.

The only cure is for us to require that the rent be paid out of the budget of the using agency itself, in which case it will not ask for the additional space unless it is actually needed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I must reluctantly oppose the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, and must ask for rejection of the committee amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few moments ago I voted against a 5 percent cut. I desire to say to some of the Senators who have been elected more recently than I was that it would pay them to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the past 10, 12, 14, or 16 years.

Mr. President, one of the Senators described the present condition as "a mess," and he blamed the previous administration for it. It is most illuminating to go back over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering the period of the so-called bipartisan policy, and note the Senators on this side of the aisle who voted for what they now call "a mess." It would be time well spent for each of the Senators elected at the recent election to do that.

We have heard Senators on this side of the aisle talk about Alger Hiss. Who got him into office? Get the list of Republicans who voted for him, as they did when they voted for Mr. Acheson. The very Senators who most severely criticize Dean Acheson are those on this side of the aisle who voted to confirm his nomination.

They now come forward with a proposal to discharge a few stenographers, or to get rid of some girl whose brother is a veteran who fought in the war and who offered his life for America. They say, "We have too many Federal employees; let us get rid of a few of them." They vote to reduce the amount appropriated for the benefit of men lying ill in hospitals. They do not want them to have 24-hour service, although among the men in the hospitals are many who are paralyzed. They believe the service should be cut down to 16 hours a day. To the farmers of the country they say, "We will not cancel your seed and feed loans, as Canada did." They do not say to the girls who work in the Federal service, as every other civilized country in the world has said, that the girls shall receive pay for maternity leave.

Mr. President, some of those who argue the loudest and strongest for making a 5- or 10-percent cut in some small bill that comes before the Senate—a cut perhaps involving two, three, or four million dollars—are the very ones who stood on this floor shouting at the top of their voices to send 10 million men across the water. I think every Member of the Senate knows what my position was as to the wars in which we have been involved. I have said time and again, and I now repeat, that we had no reason for being in World War I, we had even less reason for being in World War II, and we have no reason for being in Korea. I am proud of the fact that the senior Senator from North Dakota has never voted for 1 penny of any giveaway program or loan to a single foreign country, without exception.

I remember that, though it was a very unpopular thing to do at the time, I was one of two Senators who voted against ratification of the United Nations Charter. I mention this, Mr. President, because, within a few days, we are to be asked to send six or seven billion dollars across the water for mutual aid. We are now arguing about a few hundred thousand dollars and wondering whether we ought to provide for the washing of the windows of some of our buildings.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I desire merely to say that so far as the senior Senator from North Dakota is concerned, I would very much rather spend the money in the United States than spend six or seven billion dollars more across the water.

I remember a distinguished Senator, who was not upon this floor at the time the Senate voted the $3.75 billion loan to England, and who, during his campaign, was asked, "Had you been in the Senate at the time, would you have voted for that gift loan to England?" He said, "No." He later came to the Senate, where he voted for the entire giveaway program.

Mr. President, I have no criticism to make of a man who honestly believes that we should make all these gifts and giveaway loans. I do not question the patriotism of a single Senator upon this floor. But to me it seems strange that when we are going to give away six or

seven billion more, we should be spending our time going into a little detail.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator referring to $6 million as "a little detail"?

Mr. LANGER. Let us say that, added together, it is $60 million—let us even say it is $160 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is only $6 million.

Mr. LANGER. Let us say it is 10 times $160 million. What is that compared to six or seven billion dollars? I remember that the distinguished Senator from Illinois, in a speech delivered before the DAR a year ago, recommended sending 10 million men across the water. That speech is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Well, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is going to be here for some time yet, I hope, as I hope I will be, and we shall see what we get from some of the countries who have received from us billions and billions and billions of dollars.

Mr. President, I mention this purely to explain the vote I cast a few moments ago.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that straight across-the-board percentage cuts are undesirable if it is possible to have selective cutting. But, as the Senator has pointed out, we have not been very successful with selective cutting. I voted for the straight across-the-board cut because I thought that in most instances it was justified, although there were 1 or 2 appropriations as to which I felt that such a cut would work a hardship. But I thought that, by and large, the economies could be made.

We have an opportunity now to do some selective cutting by means of the amendment presently before the Senate. I am satisfied that the General Services Administration can take this cut. It seems to me that, in the argument of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], there is a failure to recognize what I think any investigation will show, namely, that a good many of its functions can be reduced.

One of the great wastes I found in the Military Establishment when I was a member of the Armed Services Committee, and a member of its Subcommittee on Military Installations, was, for example, in the matter of the rental of floor space. There is a tendency to overstock in regard to floor space and office facilities. Great savings can be effected on that item alone.

I am satisfied that we can make selective cuts and in that way economize. I know of no way of economizing except to say to the various departments, "This is all you are going to have, and you are going to have to adjust your program accordingly." I believe that the amount provided in the House figure is adequate for the efficient administration of General Services.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall take but a moment more.

The General Services Administration was established under Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1950. Gradually it is proposed to have that agency perform all the functions of a certain kind for all the departments. It takes on new subjects from time to time. We have cut its appropriation from $124 million to $104 million this year. From information given to the committee, any further cut would simply mean that they would not be able to keep the buildings clean or pay the rent. I do not say that any of those services would be entirely eliminated, but I say it is good business to keep the buildings in good condition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With the economies which the Senator claims, there will still be an increase in the appropriation of approximately $3,700,000 over last year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct, as I have previously stated to the Senator; but it also represents over 2 million more square feet of space.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Chair state the meaning of an affirmative vote and the meaning of a negative vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An affirmative vote will be in favor of the committee amendment. A negative vote will be against the committee amendment and for the restoration of the amount approved by the House.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask the Chair to state the question, and I do so because at least five times I have been asked by Senators how they should vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 12, lines 22 and 23. A vote "yea" will be a vote for the committee amendment, that is, the amount recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. A vote "nay" will be a vote for the amount appropriated by the House of Representatives. A vote "nay" is a vote to reduce the amount approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I inquire how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. FERGUSON. Since this is a vote on a cut of the amount recommended by the committee, I wish to change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Wisconsin would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—19

Aiken	Hennings	Neely
Chavez	Hill	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Knowland	Thye
Flanders	Langer	Young
Green	McClellan	
Hayden	Millikin	

NAYS—56

Barrett	Hendrickson	Martin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Bricker	Hoey	Monroney
Bush	Holland	Morse
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Pastore
Carlson	Ives	Payne
Case	Jackson	Potter
Clements	Jenner	Purtell
Daniel	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Dworshak	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Frear	Kuchel	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Stennis
George	Long	Symington
Goldwater	Magnuson	Watkins
Gore	Malone	Williams
Griswold	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Duff	Murray
Beall	Eastland	Russell
Bridges	Gillette	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Kerr	Taft
Capehart	Kilgore	Tobey
Cooper	McCarran	Welker
Dirksen	McCarthy	Wiley

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "$18,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$12,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. By the defeat of the committee amendment and reversion to the House figure in the previous amendment, we have just saved nearly $6 million.

The amendment which I have now submitted would result in a further saving of $6 million on the item of "Repair, improvement, and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Coloumbia."

If we consider the testimony on this item before the Senate and House committees—that is, if we go behind the reports—we find that the proposed increase is apparently primarily to be made in order to improve the lighting facilities in certain post offices. Therefore, it seems to me that this is an overhead item on which we should be able to make a saving.

I am proposing a total reduction of $6 million from the amount provided in the bill, which would be a cut of $2 million below the amount available last year.

Mr. President, instead of having more electric lights in post offices, I suggest that we should let the light of our economy so shine before men that they may see our good works and glorify our Father who is in heaven.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I realize that the reduction just voted in the operating expenses of the General Services Administration appropriation, having the effect of cutting down on space, may have had a great and proper appeal. However, I hope very seriously that Senators will listen to the brief remarks I shall make, because if this amendment prevails, then, in my humble judgment, we simply shall have cut off our own noses.

This item provides for minor and major repairs to all Government buildings. Repairs are divided into minor repairs, costing under $25,000, and major repairs, costing more than $25,000. The amount allowed and appropriated last year for minor repairs was $9,250,000. This year the House reduced the amount to $9 million, a cut of $250,000.

Last year $5 million was allowed for major repairs to all Government buildings—that is, repairs costing more than $25,000. The House reduced that figure by $50,000, to $4,950,000.

In addition to these two items in the bill last year, there was included $10 million for improving post-office space, the purpose being to try to make post offices more efficient. The pilot experiment is to be at Richmond, Va. Experiments or improvements are contemplated in 12 million square feet of space, of which it is proposed to work on 4 million square feet of space this year.

The House reduced the proposed amount of $10 million for improving post office space to $5 million. If we make a cut of $6 million in this $18 million item, as the Senator from Illinois has proposed, we will eliminate all opportunity for post office improvement. The Post Office Department is running a deficit of about $600 million a year, so the reduction proposed by the Senator from Illinois would prevent all opportunity for greater efficiency through the pilot experiment to be conducted in Richmond, Va., and would reduce by an additional $1 million the appropriation for major and minor improvements to Federal buildings.

I submit that if we are to have Federal buildings, it is necessary to maintain them. This item is for the repair, improvement, and equipment of Federal buildings outside the District of Columbia.

I agree that the last amendment had a great appeal, because it is always possible to reduce the amount of space. But when we begin to cut down on minor and major repairs to buildings, and allow the rain to come through the roof and let boilers get rusty, we are simply cutting off our own noses. If we are to try to improve the efficiency of our post offices, let us make a beginning. The pilot experiment is to be made at Richmond, Va. If the amendment of the Senator from Illinois prevails, and funds for repairs are cut below the amount proposed by the committee—and the amount is lower this year than it was last year—we will eliminate all opportunity for post office improvements.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has drawn a very doleful picture of conditions in Federal buildings, with the wind and the rain coming it. I think he has stretched the bow too far.

Would the Senator from Massachusetts be willing to agree to a figure which would be the same as that of last year, namely, $14 million? That would not be a reduction from last year's figure, but would be $4 million below the committee's figures.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I could not agree to that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, is the Senator saying that we must increase expenditures by $4 million?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; I do not say that at all. I say to the Senator from Illinois that included in this item this year is a new matter, the purpose of which is to try to make our post offices and our post-office service more efficient.

We have already reduced the figure from $10 million to $5 million, so instead of being able to work in 4 million square feet of space, we shall have to work in 2 million square feet. If the Senator's amendment should prevail, we shall not only have to forego all chance to improve post offices, but we shall have to give up all hope of keeping our buildings in repair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask permission to modify my amendment, so that it will call for a reduction to $14 million, which would be the same figure as the figure for last year, thus making a saving of $4 million, instead of a saving of $6 million, as I originally proposed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois as modified.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois as modified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I undersand correctly that a vote of "aye" is a vote for the committee amendment, and a vote of "no" is a vote against the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is not a vote on a committee amendment; it is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. A vote in the affirmative is a vote for a cut.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And a vote for the committee is a negative vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A vote for the committee is a negative vote, and a vote in the affirmative is a vote in favor of the cut proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is in doubt. Will Senators in favor of the amendment stand and remain standing until the count is completed?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG. Is it in order to ask for the yeas and nays again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It may be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. LONG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Chair please state the question? Is not a vote for the committee a negative vote, just the opposite of the situation in connection with the previous vote? A vote for the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is an affirmative vote, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The understanding of the Senator from Massachusetts is correct. Senators desiring to support the committee will vote in the negative. Senators who desire to support the Senator from Illinois in making a cut of the amount recommended by him will vote in the affirmative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be better to state the question in a more impersonal form? The controversy is not a personal one between the committee and the Senator from Illinois. I am sure

that I would never win any popularity contest on that basis. Is not the issue this: An affirmative vote is a vote for a cut of $4 million, and a negative vote is a vote to maintain the figure of $18 million.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is another way of stating the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And a more accurate and impersonal way.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I state the question in an equally impersonal way? Is not a vote in favor of a reduction of $4 million a vote to cut down the improvement and repairs to buildings?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the statements have now gone beyond the point of parliamentary inquiries. The roll call will proceed.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official committee business of the Senate. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are all necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—39

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Barrett	Griswold	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Pastore
Byrd	Jackson	Payne
Case	Jenner	Potter
Daniel	Kennedy	Robertson
Douglas	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Frear	Malone	Watkins
George	Mansfield	Williams

NAYS—36

Bush	Hill	Maybank
Carlson	Hoey	McClellan
Chaves	Holland	Neely
Clements	Humphrey	Purtell
Cordon	Ives	Saltonstall
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Flanders	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Gore	Kefauver	Sparkman
Green	Knowland	Symington
Hayden	Langer	Wiley
Hennings	Magnuson	Young

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Duff	Monroney
Beall	Eastland	Murray
Bridges	Gillette	Russell
Butler, Nebr.	Kerr	Schoeppel
Capehart	Kilgore	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Tobey
Dirksen	McCarthy	Welker

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 17, strike out "$3,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this amendment would save $3 million. The item represents an amount set up for the establishment of a revolving fund to facilitate operations in connection with building management conducted by the General Services Administration, namely, restaurants and cafeterias.

I believe all of us have serious doubts about the value of revolving funds, which represent a method of eliminating congressional review of agency expenditures.

Even if such a revolving fund should be established I would suggest the money come from other amounts which the agency may have or from the profits of the restaurant and cafeteria operations themselves. It would seem to me that at least the item could be postponed, and thereby we could save an additional $3 million in the appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on July 12, 1952, Congress passed a law, which is known as Public Law 522, to authorize a building-management fund of $10 million, as working capital or revolving fund.

On January 13 of this year President Truman requested $3 million for this revolving fund. The revised estimate of the Eisenhower Administration was for $6 million. The House appropriated $3 million. The committee agreed with the action of the House.

These funds are provided for the purpose of achieving economy and efficiency. No money is gained or lost. I believe money will be gained if we provide this fund, because its purpose is to put building-management money in one fund.

If a door or wall is changed in a building, or a new curtain is put up, the cost is charged to the fund and then charged to the department involved. It is a method of simplified bookkeeping. Congress thought well enough of it last year to make provision for it. We are trying to create a $3 million revolving fund to permit the General Services Administration to operate more efficiently in an ordinary building management operation. We all know that if there are, let us say, 50 offices in a building and each office operates itself, we will not have as efficient an operation as if we have 1 building management to operate all the offices and take care of all expenses and minor changes and alterations.

There would be no saving by cutting out the item. By doing so we would be merely postponing putting into effect a law which was passed by Congress in July of last year to make the operations more efficient.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the House made this statement:

> It is emphasized that the appropriation of this fund does not result in any expenditures to the Government that adversely affect efforts to balance the budget.

Therefore, I shall vote against striking out the amount of money referred to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$100" and to insert in lieu thereof "$500."

Mr. WATKINS. I may say that the amendment would not increase the expenditures by one dime for the Subversive Activities Control Board. It would merely permit them to spend out of funds authorized in the appropriation bill $500 for newspapers, instead of $100. It would bring the Board in line with what was granted to the Securities and Exchange Commission. I hope the chairman will accept the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to accept the amendment and take it to conference. The original estimate was $500. The revised budget estimate was $300. This is the only item on which we have accepted an amendment without debate increasing the revised budget figure. I am willing to take the amendment to conference and shall try to work it out, so the board may buy the newspapers it needs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "$9,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$8,000,000."

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the object of the amendment is to eliminate $1 million, which is the excess over the amount appropriated for this purpose for the present fiscal year. There are no additional duties of any kind required under the Public Housing Administration program, and I see no reason for adding $1 million for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration at this time.

Therefore, the agency should be able to carry on its functions in an efficient manner with $8 million which was the amount appropriated for that purpose during the current fiscal year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I respectfully call the attention of the Senate to these facts:

This item is in relation to the public-housing program. Last year the development activity called for $4,500,000. This year the development activity calls for $4,520,000, or almost the same amount. The difference relates to the management activity. Last year $3,500,000 was provided. This year the amount recommended by the Senate committee is $4,480,000. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the reason for the increase is that there are 35,000 more houses to manage. If we reduce the amount allowed for management, there will be no way to manage the houses which already have been built or the houses which are to be built.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not true that only 35,000 units were authorized to be constructed during the current year, and that at the present time the bill provides for an appropriation for the construction of 35,000 units this year?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct; but it is also necessary to manage the 35,000 units which were built last year.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts think it would be possible to do that with the amount of money which was appropriated for the current year?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We already have cut the amount $600,000 under what the public building management, through Mr. Cole, states is the correct amount; and the amendment of the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment would reduce that amount by an additional $1 million, and would make it impossible to manage the houses

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What percentage of the rent does the amount for management represent?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me reply by saying that the units under management at the end of 1952 were 230,000-plus; and in the fiscal year 1953, they were 312,000-plus; and in the fiscal year 1954, it is estimated they will be 390,000-plus.

As I understand, management includes adjustments of rent, collection of rent, and upkeep of the buildings and all that goes with their upkeep.

Mr. FERGUSON. My question is what percentage of the rent does the management fee represent?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer the question, because the rents are in different amounts, and I do not think we have that figure.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much is the amount a year for each unit in the case of the units we are proposing to add? I understand that under the present administration the management was to be more efficient and better. In this case an additional amount is proposed, and I wish to find out how much it will be per unit.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One way of answering the question, although it may not be a direct answer, is to say that if the amendment to the committee amendment is adopted, it will allow nothing at all for management of the new units; in fact, less than nothing will be allowed for their management.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, in order that I may ask the distinguished author of the amendment whether he knows the amount?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me ask the Senator from Idaho whether he knows how much should be allowed per unit for management of the new houses; or does the Senator claim that the efficiency of the new administration's management will make it possible for the additional 35,000 units to be managed for the same amount as was provided last year?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I certainly think that under the new program for greater efficiency and economy, it should be possible for the Public Housing Administration, through its administrative expenses, to accomplish during the coming year additional work, as compared with the current year.

The same number of units of public housing—namely, 35,000—are requested for the coming year. I admit that a slight additional load may be placed upon the Public Housing Administration, but certainly we can ask that Administration to cooperate by reducing its personnel and by obtaining greater efficiency in the administration of this program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I said in a statement issued earlier this week, I had intended to offer the amendment the Senator from Idaho has offered to the committee amendment. Now that he has offered it instead, of course, I am very glad to support it.

I think my colleagues know that I have always been, and still am, a very strong advocate of public housing, because I think it is very much needed in the cities, as the slums are cleared. Poor people displaced by slum clearance and superhighways need public housing if they are not Ishmaels or by overcrowding create slums elsewhere.

However, the substantive features of the public-housing program are very different from the administrative overhead of the bureaucracy which administers the system. We shall not be sacrificing the principle of public housing if we insist upon economies in its administration.

Therefore, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Illinois, and also perhaps in reply to the Senator from Michigan, I simply wish to say that the amendment will cut down the development of the activity. In this bill, funds for 35,000 additional housing units are provided. If the appropriation is reduced by adopting the amendment of the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment the result will be that funds sufficient to develop less than 15,000 of the 35,000 units will be provided. If Senators favor the development of only 15,000 units, then such Senators should vote for the amendment of the Senator from Idaho to the Committee amendment. But if Senators favor the development of 35,000 housing units and if they believe that provision for funds for 35,000 housing units should be taken to conference, then Senators should vote for the necessary development funds.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. My difficulty is that the House version of the bill provides for approximately $10 a year a unit, whereas the Senate committee's figure, as now proposed, would allow almost $20 a unit a year, or almost double the amount a unit voted by the House of Representatives. I cannot understand why, in the name of economy and efficiency, we should vote to double the amount.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Because the House of Representatives allowed for no units whatsoever, and the Senate is allowing funds for 35,000 units.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not true that the House version of the bill provides for no additional housing units during the coming year, whereas the Senate version of the bill provides funds for 35,000 housing units, and the Senate provision will go to conference, and it is likely that at the conference a reduction will be decided upon?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree that funds for 35,000 units are provided by the Senate version of the bill, and no housing units are provided by the House version of the bill. The House version of the bill does not provide any funds for development activity. In the Senate version of the bill there is provision of funds for the development of 35,000 houses, based on the figures of the Public Housing Administration.

If the amendment of the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment is

adopted, the Senate version of the bill will provide funds sufficient for the development of less than 15,000 houses.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Massachusetts agree that there will be less need for administrative funds if in conference it is decided that less than 35,000 houses will be provided?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. However, I think the figures should be in proportion to one another. If in conference, provision is made for 15,000 houses, instead of 35,000 houses, then the funds needed for development purposes should be sufficient for 15,000 houses. On the other hand, the Senate should not vote for funds sufficient to provide 35,000 houses and also vote for funds sufficient for the development of only 15,000 houses. Such a procedure would be hypocritical.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays, on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment on page 23, in line 14. On this question the yeas have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that a vote "nay" will be a vote to support the committee? Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A vote "nay" will be a vote in favor of the amount recommended by the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. A vote "nay" will be a vote to support the committee and will be a vote in favor of 35,000 houses, because the money cannot be separated from the houses. [Laughter.]

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Idaho to wait 1 second, please. I am on the committee, and I am asking the Senator from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. President, I demand order. I am speaking to the chairman of the subcommittee.

We went all through this matter, and we figured that it would cost so much money to have 35,000 additional houses, so much money to have 25,000 additional houses, and so much money to have 15,000 additional houses.

In the case of the housing project, I am perfectly willing to vote on the question of whether 25,000 houses shall be provided for or whether 10,000 houses shall be allowed for.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I rise to the point of order that the call of the roll has been ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair informs the Senator from Idaho that debate is still in order, because no Senator has yet voted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement by the Chair, because I know the rules of the Senate.

Again I ask the Senator from Massachusetts this question: The cut of $1 million, as proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment, will not be a cut in funds, but will be a cut in housing projects; is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Again I say that if the Senate votes funds for the construction of 35,000 houses, the Senate should also appropriate sufficient funds for their development.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, Senators who do not want 35,000 houses developed should vote for the amendment of the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment.

On the other hand, Senators who wish to have 35,000 houses developed should vote for the committee amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I must protest against what my good friend from South Carolina has said. What he is saying is that every house must bear on its back a corresponding share of the Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, he well knows that I supported the housing program purely on the basis of States' rights—or cities' rights. Under city ordinances no public housing can be built; it must be built under the Public Housing Administration, unless it be in the city of Los Angeles, about which the distinguished Vice President knows, or unless it be in the city of Chicago. The Public Housing Administration determines in the case of each housing unit whether it is to be built. This does not represent Federal bureaucracy. The distinguished Senator once referred to Chicago, by mistake, when the matter of public housing was before the Senate. I speak facetiously. But the Senator well knows that no public housing development can be had, unless it be in Chicago or in some other city or town in Illinois, such as Springfield, where the city or town approves it, asks for it, and appropriates money for it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I should like to finish this discussion, if I may, since I feel myself compassed about with irritants. Mr. President, I am for the maintenance of the 35,000 units of public housing, and I hope the conference committee will stand like a rock against any reduction in that number. But the idea that we must provide $9 million for the Federal Government with which to administer the public-housing program is something else again, because the administration, as a matter of fact, should be conducted locally, and the Federal Government should have a minimum of auditing and supervising work to do.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What my good friend from South Carolina is trying to do—and we all love him dearly—is to whipsaw me into a place where, if I vote for this reduction in an appropriation for the administrative bureaucracy, it will be said to be a vote for a reduction in public housing; and I am not going to let him do that, because I think there is a million dollars worth of slack in the administration.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is exactly what my distinguished friend, who had so much to do with public housing, is going to do if he votes for this.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I do not think that is correct. I do not think that is true. If the conferees will stand firm and if the administration will help, we can save the 35,000 units.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further, that if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—38

Barrett	Daniel	Goldwater
Bennett	Douglas	Gore
Bricker	Dworshak	Griswold
Butler, Md.	Ferguson	Hendrickson
Case	George	Hickenlooper

Hoey	Martin	Smathers
Hunt	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Jenner	Millikin	Smith, N. C.
Kennedy	Morse	Stennis
Kuchel	Mundt	Watkins
Langer	Payne	Williams
Long	Potter	Young
Malone	Purtell	

NAYS—34

Aiken	Hill	Mansfield
Bush	Holland	Maybank
Carlson	Humphrey	Neely
Clements	Ives	Pastore
Cordon	Jackson	Saltonstall
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Frear	Johnston, S. C.	Symington
Fulbright	Kefauver	Thye
Green	Knowland	Wiley
Hayden	Lehman	
Hennings	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson	Dirksen	Monroney
Beall	Duff	Murray
Bridges	Eastland	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Gillette	Russell
Byrd	Kerr	Schoeppel
Capehart	Kilgore	Taft
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Cooper	McCarthy	Welker

So Mr. DWORSHAK's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I had hoped that an amendment might be offered on pages 26 and 27 of the bill. I do not propose to offer one, but I should like to address a question to the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill and also to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the acting majority leader.

I refer particularly to the committee amendment which seeks to deal with the situation which we considered on the Senate floor 2 or 3 times in the past. I had hoped that last year we had arrived at a satisfactory solution, but, apparently, it was not satisfactory. I am speaking of the difficult problem which has arisen in the city of Los Angeles with reference to the public-housing project there.

The House provision on page 26, beginning in line 22, was stricken out, and new language was put in by the Senate committee, commencing on page 27, at line 5.

Mr. President, I have examined the proviso, and while it may clear up the Los Angeles situation in a satisfactory manner, it seems to me it is very far reaching in its effects, far beyond the Los Angeles situation, and, in fact, it may very well slow down the entire public-housing program and make it much more costly, because it is provided that if action is taken to reject a project, no funds may be obtainable for 180 days, which would mean that if a contractor is on the ground, he will be held up for 6 months. I suppose he is bound to include in his figures a sufficient amount to protect him adequately against such a situation.

I am not offering any criticism of the amendment. My understanding is that the language was requested of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and this language was supplied by that agency.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that when that language was added in the House, apparently the representatives of the agency had testified before the House committee and had also testified before the Senate committee, pointing out that they felt the House language was a little too restrictive. Personally, I had prepared other language, but they felt that was also more restrictive than they would like to see it. So my office requested, under those circumstances, that the agency prepare language which it felt was workable. By that I do not mean that the agency is enthusiastically for it—I do not want to convey that impression—but they did prepare this language and forwarded it to me on the basis that if, as a matter of policy, language was to be added to the bill in conference, they felt they would be able to work under this language, whereas they felt that both the House language and the language I had personally prepared might handicap them to too great an extent.

So, with that as a basis—and I certainly do not want to do anything which would needlessly handicap them—I agreed to take this language, and it was put into the bill by the committee.

Of course, Mr. President, the matter will be in conference, but what we were trying to reach was the situation which was discussed on the floor of the House and of the Senate this year and last year, that where a local community, by the votes of the people and by the votes of their own representatives, had determined that they did not want to proceed with a public-housing project, under our democratic process, local home rule, and States' rights, they would have an opportunity so to express themselves and could discontinue, providing the Federal Government had returned to it the costs so there would be no burden upon the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from California has made that statement. Of course, I am not a member of the subcommittee, but it has been my understanding that the Senator from California has been most cooperative in trying to work out the program. Previously, when the subject has been considered on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from California has always been very cooperative. We want to work it out so that the result will be fair in this particular instance to the city of Los Angeles, and also fair to the Public Housing Administration and to the people of the United States.

It is my understanding that, after studying the bill further, the housing administration has come to the conclusion that the language would impede and impair the housing program, and I understand they are willing to suggest other language in lieu of this language, simply looking toward a solution of the particular problem, without impeding or impairing the program as a whole and building up costs, as I am afraid this language would do.

As I stated in the beginning, I shall not offer an amendment, because, as I understand the rules of both the House and the Senate, the question will be wide open when the conferees meet, because the Senate has stricken out the language of the House bill and has written new language. Therefore it is certainly left wide open for whatever language may be substituted.

Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD a memorandum which was submitted to the clerk of the Appropriations Committee on May 15, 1953, signed by Mr. B. T. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Administrator and General Counsel. In his statement he says he consulted with the Administrator, and this memorandum is submitted in keeping with the wishes of the Administrator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the distinguished Senator inserting the memorandum in the RECORD with the suggested language by the Administrator, but I would not want any implication to be drawn therefrom that either the Senator from California, or the Senate, for that matter, is approving the language of the Administrator, because I think this is a legislative policy matter which, after all, is in the hands of the Congress. Of course, we are entitled to have the judgment of the Administrator, but this job is not the Administrator's job.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree completely with the Senator from California. My purpose is not so much to have the language in the RECORD, except as a suggestion, as it is to have in the RECORD a statement which points out the difficulty of the amendment as it is worded at present. It is my hope that when the members of the conference committee sit down together, they may consider what the Administrator has said in this memorandum and may be able to write new language, which will do the job that all of us wish to have done, without crippling the program as a whole.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I would merely add one word, because I do not have before me the language the Senator is submitting. I might say that, without crippling the program, we were trying to provide that when a local community, by democratic process or through its own representative government, has made a declaration of policy, its views and wishes should not be completely ignored.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be included as a part of my statement.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A question has been raised as to whether the Administrator has recommended the language of the proviso beginning on line 22 of page 24 and ending on line 6 of page 26 of H. R. 4663, as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

While this office drafted the language of the proviso as a service to an interested Senator after ascertaining the type of amendment which the Senator desired to offer, and the language as drafted was discussed with the Administrator, the Administrator did not feel that he could recommend its adoption and did not do so, primarily because he felt that it would materially increase the costs of all projects constructed in the future. Under the language of the proviso, after a city council approves a low-rent housing project and the local housing authority, in reliance on that approval, has awarded

to a private company a contract for the construction of a project, the city council would be permitted to reverse its previous approval, and, for a period of not less than 180 days make it impossible for the local housing authority to obtain the funds which it would be required to pay its contractor. Under such circumstances, no contractor would enter a bid for the construction of any low-rent public-housing project without including in his bid a sum which he believes sufficient to compensate him for any expenses or losses he may sustain as a result of action which can be taken under this particular proviso. This would greatly increase the costs of all projects.

The Administrator recommended against including a similar proviso contained in the House bill, stating:

"I want to state very plainly about this proposed language that this proviso appears on its face to be a legislative instruction to the Agency to stop any local program in its tracks in the event there is at any time an adverse local vote through some formal procedure, whether by referendum or action of a local governing body, without any regard to any other provision of law or of contracts that may be in force.

"In the case of a project actually under construction, pursuant to an annual contributions contract, we would be directed to cease advancing funds and breach the contract, leaving to the courts adjudication of such matters as damages and the requirements of performance on the contract. I do not agree with that course of action on the part of the Government. However, that is what the language plainly says, and that is what we will do if it is enacted into law and invoked by circumstances." (Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate, p. 465.)

Since the question as to the official position of the Agency was raised, I discussed the matter by telephone with the Administrator this morning and he has authorized me to say that he is still of the opinion, as indicated in his testimony before the subcommittee, that no such language should be included, but that if some language is to be included he feels the fair and proper thing to do is to require provision for full reimbursement of funds previously advanced under a valid contract before contractual commitments are stopped, and that the following language would accomplish that purpose:

"Provided further, That, in any case where the Public Housing Administration (after the approvals on the part of the governing body of the locality required by law) has entered into a financial assistance contract with a local housing authority covering a low-rent housing project to be constructed in such locality, and (1) the people of that locality, by vote of the governing body of the locality, or by official referendum or other official public vote, have thereafter indicated that they do not want such low-rent housing project constructed in such locality, and (2) the governing body of such locality has either repaid, or has negotiated and entered into valid and binding contracts to repay, the moneys advanced or guaranteed by the Public Housing Administration under such financial assistance contract, together with any additional sums which the local housing authority or the Public Housing Administration would be obligated or liable to pay to secure releases from obligations incurred in connection with such project by the local housing authority or the Public Housing Administration pursuant to such financial assistance contract, then, in such case, the Public Housing Administration shall cancel such financial assistance contract in respect to such low-rent housing project."

B. T. FITZPATRICK,
Deputy Administrator and General Counsel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4663) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. HILL, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASED MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 141, Senate Resolution 32.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 32) temporarily increasing the membership of the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare, reported adversely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make an explanation to the Members of the Senate.

If the Senate agrees to the motion of the acting majority leader that the resolution be the unfinished business, it is then proposed, following the speech to be made by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and following any insertions Senators may wish to make in the RECORD, to adjourn until tomorrow, when we shall have a morning hour, followed by a call of the calendar. At the conclusion of the calendar call tomorrow, it is the purpose of the leadership to recess until Monday. On Monday the resolution to which I have just referred would be the unfinished business of the Senate.

I might say that a number of important committees are meeting at present, and Senators are finding it very difficult to be in 2 or 3 different places at the same time. The Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and a number of other committees are holding important sessions, so it was thought that by allowing committees to meet on Friday without a conflict of business on the Senate floor, committee work might be expedited.

The call of the calendar will begin where it was concluded at the last call of the calendar.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it had been my hope that Senate Resolution 32 would be called up a week from today, but I feel I have no right to request that its consideration be postponed further, especially in view of the fact that for many weeks I have been asking for action on it. It happens that Monday will be a somewhat inconvenient day for some of the supporters of the resolution. Nevertheless, the majority leader has been very cooperative with me in regard to the matter and apparently feels that next Monday is the day on which he, as majority leader, should ask for action on the resolution.

The majority leader has accommodated me this week in regard to the matter because he, too, is aware of the fact that certain conferences are being held among different Senators in an endeavor to see if an equitable and fair solution of the problem can be worked out. So I do not believe it would be proper for me to object, as I might otherwise be inclined to do, since I should have preferred a later date.

I simply wish to say to my friends in the Senate who have pledged me their assistance on the resolution that I hope they will be present next Monday.

To Senators who have not given very much study to the matter, I simply say that I believe a study of the record on the resolution will result in its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported adversely by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

TAX RECOMMENDATIONS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 146)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States making certain tax recommendations. As the message was read in the House of Representatives today, it will be printed in the Senate proceedings of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The message was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE — ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 166. An act for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki);

S. 207. An act for the relief of Jimy Okuda;

S. 371. An act for the relief of Georgia Andrews;

S. 709. An act to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough;

S. 837. An act for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky;

S. 1524. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes;

S. 1525. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex.;

S. 1527. An act to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units;

S. 1528. An act to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force;

S. 1530. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy;

S. 1546. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button;

S. 1547. An act to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel;

S. 1549. An act to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va.; and

S. 1641. An act to retrocede to the State of Oklahoma concurrent jurisdiction over the right-of-way for United States Highways 62 and 277 within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla.

WILLIAM MALONE BASKERVILL

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, with the death of my very dear friend, William Malone Baskervill, editor and publisher of the Baltimore News-Post and the Sunday American, the great American free press has lost one of its most outstanding leaders.

Long associated with the Hearst Enterprises, and one of Mr. William Randolph Hearst's business and personal advisers, Mr. Baskervill was a man of great acumen and sincere honesty. His career as a newspaperman has been truly significant by reason of his keen ability to interpret the news with great clarity and impact.

His career and his accomplishments will always serve as a model of effective journalism in the finest tradition of the profession. The people of the State of Maryland will feel his passing deeply.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "William Malone Baskervill" and published in the Baltimore Sun of May 20, 1953.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAM MALONE BASKERVILL

The "Hearst Empire," as it was customary to call the elaborate structure of newspapers, magazines, and other enterprises dominated by the late William Randolph Hearst, provided opportunities for power, wealth, and influence to a selected few out of two or three generations of aspiring young men. The pace was swift and grueling, the competition keen, and the mortality rate high. William Malone Baskervill entered into that competition at an early age. His natural capacity was large and his endurance was far above the average. His loyalty to Mr. Hearst and the Hearst causes was absolute. Thus fortified, he mounted the ladder steadily, becoming finally not only editor and publisher of the Baltimore News-Post and the Sunday American, but also one of the small group of trusted counselors who guided the empire during Mr. Hearst's declining years and since.

Many of the Hearst executives moved from place to place, but Mr. Baskervill liked Baltimore from his first assignment here in 1926 and remained in this city until his death. He established his residence here and took part, directly or indirectly, in many civic undertakings. In all of them, as well as in the organization which he did so much to create, he will be missed.

OUR FISCAL PROBLEMS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks today on the subject of our fiscal problems.

President Eisenhower has made a very clear and lucid explanation of our fiscal problems in his address of last night. We in Congress should make the full facts of this situation clear in our record, and this is particularly appropriate now, just after we have closed debate on the first regular appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1954.

We find ourselves in a financial trap, and one which is not of the making of President Eisenhower's administration. We find a tremendous demand on the Government for expenditures and appropriations for domestic needs and for defense. This demand has been built up over the past years.

Let us first consider the deficit spending of the past. The actual deficit of the 1952 fiscal year, which ran from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, was $4 billion. The budgets and estimates of the previous administration planned for a deficit of $5.9 billion in the 1953 fiscal year, which runs from July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, and a deficit of $9.9 billion in the fiscal year from July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954, fiscal year 1954.

These actual or estimated deficits established and published by the previous administration thus total $19.8 billion for the last two and the present fiscal years. The present administration finds itself in the position of having inherited a deficit of $19,800,000,000 in these 3 years.

Government expenditures arise from legislation. Because of the legislation of the past administration and the appropriations to cover that legislation, in the 5 years from 1950 through 1954 appropriations authorizing expenditures of Government funds exceeded the actual or estimated revenues for the same 5 years by about $96 billion. This is where the legislative branch actually lost control of the purse strings.

Much of this was brought about as a result of the crash buildup of defense after the beginning of the Korean war. Because of the lead time required to obtain certain complicated weapons, the expenditures in connection with the authorized program, which were largely committed by the previous administration, would reach their peak during the fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

We, therefore, find ourselves in this position. That the Truman budget proposed for the fiscal year 1954—that is from June 30, 1953, to July 1, 1954—an expenditure of $78,600,000,000. This would create a deficit, when we consider the anticipated income from that period, of $9,900,000,000. The Truman budget estimated that on July 30 of this year, just at the beginning of the 1954 fiscal year, there will be $81 billion authorized by Congress which can be spent by the Government.

This means that the United States Treasury must obtain from the taxpayers the sum of $81 billion to cover what the legislative branch of the Government authorized to be spent in actions of previous years.

The President described this as a crazy quilt of commitments, contracts, and obligations. He was justified in calling this a crazy quilt because a large part of this enormous amount of money is already under contract or committed for the delivery of defense materials, supplies and services and over which the present administration has very little, if any, control.

In some cases, it is like ordering a special article which is practically constructed, and one decides it is no longer necessary to have it. But he is committed to pay for it without receiving a dollar value in return.

The Congress was not entirely unmindful as to what they were doing. They appreciated that they were losing control of the purse strings and they knew, and some foresaw, what was going to happen when these deficits pyramided and what it was doing to inflation in this country. The people back home realized what was happening, and they demanded a change last November. They obtained it.

Congress attempted to hedge against this enormous tax load on the people, and, therefore, wrote into the tax laws certain expiration dates. But, there is one thing the Democratic Congress did not hedge against: that while expenditures would go along and increase, this reduction in the tax revenue would only create a further deficit and increase the pressures for inflation.

In other words, we were telling the taxpayers, when we were fixing the dates upon which certain tax legislation would expire, that they might expect a tax reduction. That action would indicate to the average person that expenditures were to be reduced. But such was not the fact.

So we find ourselves with reductions written into the tax law which will cut revenue about $8 billion. Of this amount, about $2.1 billion will fall into the fiscal year 1954 and the full loss will be taken in the fiscal year 1955.

The past administration estimated the Government revenue to be more than is reasonably expected to be received, and, therefore, we find that in the fiscal year 1953 they overestimated the income from the taxpayers by about $1.5 billion and it is safe to say that they overestimated what they would get in 1954 by about $1.2 billion.

Between January 20, and the present time, all of these factors have come into

focus—the peak of expenditures, expected revenue losses as a result of the tax reduction already in the law, and the overestimate of tax receipts in the current fiscal year and the next fiscal year. If left unchecked these factors would require Congress to increase the statutory debt limit of $275 billion by the end of fiscal year 1954.

The previous administration estimated its deficit for the 1953 fiscal year to be $5.9 billion. With the overestimated revenue for 1953, this deficit for 1953 will be increased to about $7.5 billion. As we recall, there was a $4 billion deficit in the fiscal year 1952. Now, as I mentioned before, the Truman budget for the fiscal year 1954 indicated a deficit of $9.9 billion and, when we allow for the overestimated receipts for that year, this brings the Truman budget deficit to about $11.1 billion for that year. Thus, there is a $9.9 billion deficit projected by the previous administration for the fiscal year 1954, without any reduction in expenditures initiated by the present administration, and it could be about $11 billion. When we put that deficit on top of the deficit for the 2 previous years, totaling probably $11.5 billion, the accrued deficit for the fiscal years 1952 through 1954 would really be $22.5 billion.

Mr. President, I realize that these figures must be beyond the imagination of our taxpayers; but they are the figures we are dealing with and these are the deficits. They indicate that our people are going into debt and that this amount of money will have to be made up in the future in the form of taxes, either by the people or by their children or by their children's children.

So, if the tax reduction put into the law were really to take effect, and the full impact felt in 1955, the 1955 budget deficit would be substantially greater than the deficit projected by the Truman budget for the fiscal year 1954, and it could reach a figure of between $15 and $16 billion for the year 1955. We would find ourselves in the position of being unable to balance the budget under the philosophy of the previous administration until 1958.

As I said before, Mr. President, the people realize it, and they demanded a change, and they obtained a change.

The significant point is that if the tax cut went into effect, as written in the present law, the Government would receive about $8 billion less in revenue. Under these conditions, no administration could allow such a paper tax reduction if it had any sincere concern about the accumulated effect on the economy of the past deficits.

Now, what is the present administration trying to do? It is vigorously trying to balance the budget and reduce collections from the taxpayers and it is determined to work to this end. The present administration, with its determined and effective efforts, has already begun to curtail governmental expenditures since taking office in the fiscal year 1954, and, in the years to come, will continue its attempts to balance the budget and to bring about a reduction in taxes. This will be done with the help of Congress for, without that help and without action taken by the present administration, this deficit, if allowed to continue in the magnitude authorized by the previous administration, would contribute to the inflation which has already depreciated the purchasing power of the consumer's dollar.

The present administration is determined to do something about the situation, and the facts are that it has protected the consumer's dollars, in the few months in which it has been in power, by stabilizing prices while, at the same time, eliminating controls. The march toward a controlled economy and a garrison state has been stopped.

The requests for new authorizations by the present administration have been sharply reduced, and actual governmental expenditures are being reduced and as they are surveyed from month to month and from year to year, they will be further reduced. Of course, the Government must, if it is going to keep its financial house in order during the time when these substantial reductions are developed, maintain the stabilization already achieved in the last few months.

The proposed tax program includes two reductions in the demands upon the individual taxpayers. One is a reduction of individual income tax to take effect on January 1, and the other is a postponement of the increase in the social security withholding tax. It will mean that the money will remain in the pockets of the small-income group, made up of working men and women and others who are hard pressed to pay their taxes.

The reduction in the individual income tax would not have been possible except for the action of the present administration and, if this Congress will go along with the Administration in its proposal to cut the budget and in curtailing new requests for funds and reducing expenditures, these two reductions will be of substantial benefit to the low-income group.

It means we will not build up the deficit which the people will have to pay in the future, or which their children or children's children will have to pay. Let me give some figures. The figures should be of interest to a person who earns from $3,000 to $5,000 a year. Let us talk about the people who are paying an enormous proportion of their small salaries for the support of the Government.

For a married man who has two dependents and earns $3,000 a year, the actions recommended by President Eisenhower will reduce the drain on his pocketbook by $22 in 1954, $15 of which will come from the social-security item and $7 from reduced income taxes. A married man with two dependents who earns $3,600 a year will take home $36 more in 1954 because of this action; his social security withholding will be reduced $18; and his income tax reduced $18. If that man earns $4,000 a year, his take-home pay will be $44 greater; and if he earns $5,000, his take-home pay will be $64 greater in 1954.

If, at the same time, the excess-profits tax is extended 6 months, and if the corporation tax increase of 5 percent is maintained, and if a reduction is made in expenditures, this direct reduction in the individual income taxes will be possible without any risk of inflation or greater deficits.

This administration finds that when it has taken over in 1953, which is really the beginning of the fiscal year 1954 and 1955, it is being penalized by a reduction in tax revenue, under existing laws, of about $8 billion. This makes the 1955 fiscal year the critical year. It is the year in which the tax and expenditure program established by previous administrations will bring the greatest difference between revenue and expenditures if no counteraction were taken by the present administration.

Let me say that the present administration is determined to reduce, and I feel satisfied it will be able to reduce the cost of Government, so that at the beginning of next year there will be a reduction of taxes and a balanced budget.

If no counteraction were taken by the present administration a larger deficit in 1955 and a continuing substantial deficit for several years thereafter would be forecast. This the present administration is determined to prevent.

An analysis of the budget shows that about 70 percent, or $55 billion out of the $73,600,000,000 of the proposed expenditures in the Truman 1954 budget, is for military, foreign aid, and atomic energy costs. Some cuts must be made in these items if we are to aid the taxpayers and balance the budget. We are not unmindful that the future budget situation and the final tax situation must depend on the international situation—whether we have peace in Korea, or whether we have trouble elsewhere in the world which requires arms and what is an appropriate defense establishment for this country under the prevailing conditions and costs. Of course, that factor must be taken into consideration. When I said before that the administration is determined to balance the budget and to cut taxes, I believe the administration will proceed next year to do so. But if unforeseen developments occur, we shall have to proceed on a different basis.

What we must do is to keep in mind what President Eisenhower said about the defense of this country—that is, it consists of three phases: spiritual, military and economic. There can be no doubt as to the spiritual beliefs in liberty of the people of this country. Therefore, we go to the other two items. We must have a military system so coordinated with the economic system that we can provide for the defense of America and for the free world. The answer to the question whether communism will prevail depends, to a large extent, on whether we crack up economically in trying to defend the principles of liberty.

I believe we now have in the White House and at the heads of our various departments men who appreciate that arms alone will not protect our freedom, and that the dollars appropriated will not alone create a defense. We must have a sound economy and a regard for the principles of liberty and freedom and the will, as Americans, to keep them.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY obtained the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF NEW ENGLAND—A PROGRAM FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

III. PREVENTION OF FURTHER INDUSTRIAL DISLOCATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the second major task facing those of us who are interested in alleviating the economic problems of New England and the Nation is to prevent the further decline and dislocation of business. I have previously pointed out the intensity of such industrial dislocation, migration, and decline and the serious economic and social consequences they have caused in so many communities in New England and elsewhere. Whenever they are due to congressional policy, unfair methods of competition, discrimination, or other action contrary to the national interest, it is proper that the Congress take remedial action. There are several areas of this nature in which Congress should act to prevent or at least to restrict further such problems.

LABOR COSTS

The first item under this heading involves the cost of labor. I realize that Congress cannot and should not make labor costs North, South, East, and West exactly equal. But Congress does have a duty to see that the laws of the United States are not preventing the equalization of labor costs; and a further duty, which has long been recognized, to see that labor is not exploited at an unreasonably low cost.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

The first and most important step which must be taken to equalize more nearly the cost of labor in this country, on the basis of minimum standards of decency and fairness, is to amend the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act so as to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents an hour to at least $1 an hour. I realize that there are other inadequacies in our minimum wage and hours law, particularly the large number of exemptions and exceptions to the coverage of that law which in 1949 were increased by the Congress. But, if nothing else, it is incumbent upon Congress at this session to raise the minimum wage to $1 an hour.

Seventy-five cents an hour, or $30 a week, is not a living wage in any part of the country today. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average four-person family in Mobile needed more than twice that amount in order to maintain a modest standard of living—to pay $51 monthly rent, for example. But $30 a week, or 75 cents an hour, is the minimum wage now set by the Fair Labor Standards Act; and, thus, that is the incredible sum, for example, that thousands of cotton-textile-mill workers in the southeast region of the United States are paid. What sort of homes, food, clothing, and medical care can these workers obtain for themselves and their families? Yet, a proposed increase to $1 an hour is protested. An increase in the minimum was recommended by the report of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry.

Since 1840, when Martin Van Buren established a 10-hour day for workers in Government Navy yards, labor-standards legislation has been an increasingly important part of America's social legislation. It is legislation which has been enthusiastically endorsed by citizens and Senators from every part of the country because it benefits every part of the country. Hugo Black, of Alabama, was one of the first sponsors of the Fair Labor Standards Act because he foresaw the steady economic progress and betterment of living standards which the South would enjoy under the stimulation of labor-standards legislation and similar economic improvements. He and his colleagues realized that the industrialization of the South would not be handicapped by its inability to offer sweatshop wage labor as an attraction to new business. They did not want runaway industries to desert their northern employees to come South in an attempt to exploit, at low wages, the labor supplies of the South. Nor did they want the industries of their own areas, that were paying legitimate wage scales, to face competition from those paying wages below a decent minimum. Their position has been borne out, as demonstrated by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in its 1949 report on the Impact of Federal Policies on the Economy of the South. Thus, my appeal for a higher minimum wage in 1953 is directed at every Senator and every citizen in every part of the country who believe in maintaining and improving our economy and our labor standards.

A doctor of philosophy in economics is not required to realize that today a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour is a nearly meaningless and obsolete yardstick, wholly inadequate even as a wage floor. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the consumer's price index, the best measure of living costs for which wages go, shot up from 169.7 to 190.7 from October 1949 when the 75 cents figure was enacted, to December 1952. In any event, 40 cents an hour was admitted by its sponsors to be inadequate pay in 1938; 75 cents an hour was admitted by its sponsors to be inadequate pay in 1949, and $1 an hour would not be excessive pay in 1953.

The average wage of New England factory workers in October 1952 was nearly $1.60 an hour, and similar wages are reported elsewhere. It is unthinkable that such workers should be forced to compete with the labor of those receiving less than one-half that amount, particularly since, according to a Bureau of Labor Statistics survey of 1951, there was little difference in the urban cost of living between North and South. Wages in the United States are over 40 percent of the value added by manufacturers for all industries, with figures ranging up to nearly 50 percent in the case of textile and other industries. The report of the Committee on the New England Economy stated that minimum wages should be high enough to stop the exodus of industry from older areas when this is not justified by underlying economic conditions.

The report pointed out that, thus far, the minimum-wage rates have been at levels that affect a relatively small part of the total labor force, including the South, because of the general rise in demand and in industrialization throughout the country. A higher and more effective minimum wage, the committee pointed out, would by no means eliminate wage differentials, but would tend to reduce the advantages of low-wage areas. There are many who maintain that a minimum wage of $1.25 would be more realistic and more effective, but I am convinced that Congress might more easily and quickly take the step of raising the minimum wage to $1 because of the obvious need for such step.

A $1 minimum wage would provide a standard which would prevent employers who now are paying less than that figure from continuing to exploit the helplessness of their employees. Further, it would be a stabilizing factor in these days when economists talk darkly of a mild recession. More money means more purchasing power and decent-living standards. Of particular importance to legitimate manufacturers in New England and elsewhere, who now are paying wage scales well above $1 an hour, is the effect such a minimum would have in preventing unfair undercutting by sweatshop-work employers.

President Eisenhower's campaign pledge to workers of "a high level of wages with steady purchasing power" cannot be realized so long as some workers in interstate commerce still receive less than $40 a week. Generally, such workers are being victimized at such a low wage, not because of their lack of skill or productivity, but because their age, color, lack of organization, or similar factors prevent them from being in a position to bargain for the wages paid by decent employers in the same industry. Events since the 1938 act and the 1949 amendments amply disprove the usual claims and clichés that such legislation would "cause mass unemployment," "interfere with free enterprise and collective bargaining," and "discriminate against small business." The most recent nationwide data on wage rates issued by the Department of Labor demonstrate that such an increase could be easily absorbed by all employers affected. Moreover, productivity continues to increase under the stimulation of decent wages and working conditions.

Although my main concern is with the minimum wage itself, I wish to add one word concerning the coverage of the act and the exemptions therefrom. When Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed wages-and-hours legislation in 1937, its constitutionality and the full scope of the commerce clause were still in doubt. Accordingly, Congress acted cautiously

with respect to coverage. In 1949, instead of extending the coverage, such doubts having been resolved, opponents of the increase to 75 cents exempted from the protection of the act an estimated half million workers—those in the lumber, telephone, newspaper, laundry, and other industries and those in retail establishments. This trend must now be reversed. The benefits of such legislation must be distributed over as broad an area as the Constitution and practicality permit. I am concerned, I may add, about the pressures that seek to exempt still more persons and occupations from the coverage of the act.

In summary, Mr. President, the strengthening of our basic fair-labor-standards legislation is an immediate necessity. If we are to maintain a healthy, vital, confident, and strong economy, vigorously pursuing a foreign policy designed to strengthen the democratic forces and living standards abroad and stability and security at home, we must follow the principle stated in the declared policy of the Fair Labor Standards Act:

> To correct and, as rapidly as practicable, to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers.

A $1 minimum is a modest goal; it would go virtually unnoticed by practically every industry and every legitimate employer in the country; but it would be a step forward in eliminating the worst forms of underpayment and in setting a realistic floor beneath the Nation's economy.

An increase in the minimum wage to $1 an hour would take into consideration the minimum standards of living necessary in this country, the increase in the cost of consumer goods purchased by the wage earner, the prevailing minimum rates in most American industries today, and the general rise in wage levels and productivity throughout the Nation; and it would help prevent undesirable industrial migration and dislocation.

WALSH-HEALEY ACT

The next step in more nearly equaling wage rates and the cost of labor in order to prevent further decline and dislocation of business is the improvement of the Walsh-Healey Act. This law, originally enacted in 1936, provides in general for a determination by the Secretary of Labor of the prevailing wage rates in an industry with which the Federal Government is contracting, and requires such contractors to observe minimum wages based on these more current and more adequate rates. Hours, working conditions, child labor, and other labor standards are similarly regulated. The object of the act, as stated by the United States Supreme Court, was to "obviate the possibility that any part of our tremendous national expenditures would go to forces tending to depress wages and purchasing power and offending fair social standards of employment."

Although an administrative lag frequently diminished its importance in the wage picture, the Walsh-Healey Act worked well without far-reaching amendments until 1952. Near the close of the 82d Congress, when preparation for the national conventions was reaching its peak, several extensive amendments to this permanent labor legislation were introduced as amendments to the Defense Production Act. One such amendment was enacted in the last few days of Congress which provided, among other things, for judicial review of the Secretary's determination under the act.

It is difficult politically to oppose judicial review. But not logically. The amendment introduces the confusing uncertainties of court decisions to matters for administrative finding of fact. It thus serves only to cripple unnecessarily the effective operation of the act. Its encumbering effect was recognized by the report of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry.

The real basis of the amendment was demonstrated as soon as the Secretary of Labor issued a finding of prevailing wages in the textile industry. Certain textile manufacturers immediately brought suit to review the action, claiming that separate rates should have been set for southern mills, that the procedure followed was improper in a number of ways, that the finding was unsubstantiated and that such finding should be held up indefinitely while all these matters were litigated in the courts. In February, a temporary injunction was issued suspending the textile increase for the employees of the plaintiffs. Thus, the whole intent of the Act was frustrated as the southern mills continued to undercut the industry with low wages. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] has introduced a bill to repeal the Fulbright amendment. If this cannot be done, surely the provisions for judicial review can be drastically modified.

Provisions for determinations of areas and goods to which an order applies should be clarified to spell out existing and I believe proper, administrative interpretation into law. The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and Representative ROGERS of Massachusetts have each introduced bills in order to make clear beyond question that minimum wage rates under the act may be determined on a nationwide basis, and that the Secretary is not required to fix different wage rates for different areas of the country. Such an amendment is clearly in keeping with the purpose of the Walsh-Healey Act by preventing the use of expenditures of the Federal Government to encourage and perpetuate substandard labor conditions in low-wage areas. Such an amendment is desirable in order to substantiate the present administrative interpretation which prevents unscrupulous contractors in higher wage areas from peddling their bids to have the contract work performed by manufacturers in low-paying areas. This interpretation has been confirmed by the continued appropriations for and review of the enforcement of the Walsh-Healey Act by Congress and a specific rejection of a contrary amendment during the last session. A determination of minimum wages on a locality basis would in effect prevent the Walsh-Healey Act from achieving the purposes for which it was enacted.

Consideration should also be given to means of expediting changes in the various industry rates as proposed by the New England Governors' Committee. I realize the importance and desirability of the present procedures which call for informal consultations with employers and employees, careful studies of wage rates, and quasi-judicial proceedings adhering to the basic elements of due process; however, I am hopeful that some machinery may be provided whereby such wage determinations may be kept more nearly up to date. I am likewise concerned that no further weakening amendments be introduced to destroy the effectiveness of the act by excluding particular commodities or industries or by insisting that wage rates be set on a local basis.

As in the case with the Fair Labor Standards Act, the fundamental objectives of this law are generally accepted by employers, employees and the public, who agree that healthy competitive conditions cannot be maintained at the expense of decent labor conditions. Because of the increased Government demand for thousands of items, the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act has become of increasing importance in maintaining our labor standards, protecting an increasing number of employers and their employees from the unfair competition of bid brokers and speculators and that minority of firms that will not maintain the fair labor standards generally observed in their industries. Fiscal 1952 contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act for the products of the woolen and worsted industry alone, for example, were valued at $236 million. The congressional purpose in enacting this law was to prevent this tremendous spending power of the Government from being used to perpetuate intolerable working conditions and unfair competition. The Government is protected from dealing with undependable and irresponsible suppliers and need not award defense contracts as subsidies to those who weaken our workers' morale and productivity through substandard conditions of employment. A strong and effective Walsh-Healey Act, free from the entanglements of the Fulbright amendment, is an important step in the achievement of a stronger national economy without undesirable industry dislocation.

ADMINISTRATION

There is one more problem with respect to the Fair Labor Standards, Walsh-Healey, and other acts, which affects the general problems which I have been discussing. I refer to the effective and equitable enforcement of these laws rather than substantive amendments to them. Here too, however, Congress has an important role to play; first, by providing adequate appropriations for the administration and enforcement of such laws; and, secondly, by maintaining a watchful attitude to see that the intent of Congress is not frustrated or misused. These laws, including the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the National Labor Relations Act, require able administrative personnel in adequate number to accomplish their purposes. They also need constant sur-

vellance by the Congress to determine when the law is not accomplishing those objectives and is in need of further legislative action. For example, with respect to the Taft-Hartley law, which I shall subsequently discuss, Congress should be concerned about reports that National Labor Relations Board field examiners and employees are intimidated in certain areas, and, further, that there is an unreasonable and unnecessary delay in processing of cases. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has introduced an amendment to provide for an advisory committee on procedure which may be helpful along these lines. As another example, we find the Wage and Hour Administration, on its present budget, faces far more violations of the Walsh-Healey Act in need of detection in the textile areas outside of New England than within that region.

It is with respect to the Fair Labor Standards Act in particular that Congress must give its attention to matters of enforcement and accomplishment of objectives; and I will mention here three specific problem areas where this is true.

CHILD LABOR

The first relates to the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Bureau of Labor Standards has done an excellent job of educating the public to cooperate with respect to the provisions of the act and checking on its compliance, but it cannot do so without adequate appropriations and personnel. Particularly in agricultural occupations, and here especially for children of migrant families, are violations of the law likely to occur without adequate informational and compliance services.

If we are concerned about the health and education of our children in every part of the country, then we shall be concerned about the adequate enforcement of our child-labor laws. A surprisingly large number of children found employed in violation of the law are only 9 years old or younger. This is not a question of one area of the country being pitted against another. The basic minimum age for employment under State laws in July 1952 was the same for all of the States of the Southeast as it was for most of New England and the Middle Atlantic States. But, unless full and accurate information about the child-labor laws reach employment agencies, labor contractors, schools, and other employers, this most shocking of all violations of decency will continue. Adequate enforcement of the Federal law, moreover, helps to equalize the cost of social legislation to employers in various parts of the country, and prevents exploitation of children at unreasonable wages.

LEARNER PERMITS

A second important problem area under the Fair Labor Standards Act concerns the use of learner permits. The original intention of that section of the law permitting employers under certain circumstances to be granted learner permits by the Secretary of Labor while training employees at a wage less than the minimum wage was to make the transitional period that much easier following the establishment in 1949 of a minimum wage of 75 cents. But, the transition period for a minimum wage of 75 cents, if such period ever existed, has been long past. Today, there is no justification for paying a learner less than 75 cents an hour; and there is particularly no justification for the wholesale issuance of learner permits to established industries which have moved to southern or rural areas to take advantage of low-cost labor. Complaint has been made that more learner permits have been issued to 1 such company in at least 1 instance than such company had employees in a particular year.

I hope that Congress will give serious attention to this problem and determine if the exemption for learners continues to be necessary and useful; whether this exemption has been inadequately administered by the Wage and Hour Division due to a lack of funds or personnel; or whether such exemption has been abused by either administrators or employers and is in need of corrective action by the Congress. Certainly we have a right to be concerned about a provision of the law which permits, for example, a wage of 60 cents an hour to be paid to certain employees in the apparel industry.

PUERTO RICO

Finally, an important problem area under the Fair Labor Standards Act to which Congress should make certain that the law is being effectively and equitably enforced is the special exemption for Puerto Rico. I am most sympathetic to the problems faced by the employers and employees of Puerto Rico, where substandard labor conditions, miserable living standards, and unemployment are far more prevalent than in the United States. But I am not sympathetic with those American manufacturers and other employers who establish sweatshops in Puerto Rico to which they can ship their goods to be processed and thus avoid the higher-wage levels here on the mainland. The present minimum-wage rates in Puerto Rico under the Fair Labor Standards Act are low enough to cause concern to manufacturers in any part of the United States regardless of what wage they may be paying. Such wages as 17½ cents an hour for certain textile workers, 23 cents an hour for certain leather workers, and 30 cents an hour for certain button, buckle, and jewelry workers shock the conscience of most American citizens, particularly those who must compete with the products of such labor. And yet the Puerto Rican Government has embarked upon a program to entice American employers to abandon their mainland plants and employees and migrate to the cheap labor of Puerto Rico, promising in one letter I have seen that wages will be only one-third or lower of those the employer now pays. Again, I do not believe that the exemption provided for Puerto Rico in the Fair Labor Standards Act under which minimum wages are determined by special industry committees was intended to encourage industry dislocation and bid shipping. Nor do such low-minimum wages alleviate the lack of purchasing power, standard of living and unemployment in Puerto Rico. I think it apparent that the present system of industry committees who meet every few years to grant slight increases industry by industry is not effective; and that Congress must take action to accelerate the upward revision of the Puerto Rican minimum wages not only that they may bear a proper relationship to our own wages, particularly in the case of those concerns migrating or bid-shipping from, or competing with, American industry; but also that they may alleviate the low-wage structure presently afflicting that economy. Exemptions may be granted, as for handwork; for a period of transition permitted. But action should be taken now.

Congress should immediately review the administration of the child labor, learners' permits, and Puerto Rican exemption provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to make certain that the objective of that act are being carried out.

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

The next important step which needs to be taken with respect to the equalization of the cost of labor is to provide at least a free opportunity for an equalization of the degree of unionization in various sectors of the country. This requires, of course, revisions of the Taft-Hartley law. As stated by the Committee on the New England Economy:

> In still another field Federal policies may injure New England's interest. * * * The Wagner Act tended to advance unionization much more rapidly in the northeast than in the south, and the Taft-Hartley Act tends to freeze that situation. * * * The Taft-Hartley Act * * * has had one unfortunate effect; namely, a freezing of an advantage for the South which has a much lower proportion of unionized workers. * * * It affected adversely the labor-cost position of the New England manufacturers in their competition with the South by retarding the equalization of labor conditions.

Similarly, the report of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry, prepared for the New England Governors' Conference of which Sherman Adams, now Assistant to the President, was chairman, and of which the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] was a member, stated that abuses of the Taft-Hartley law had helped to "freeze a situation which finds unionization retarded in the South to the disadvantage of New England. Unless southern trade unionism advances substantially in the near future, New England will continue to suffer a serious handicap."

The figures bear out these conclusions. In 1946, 32 percent of our nonagricultural labor force was unionized; but in 1952, 6 years after Taft-Hartley, the figure was only 31 percent. During the 5½ years before Taft-Hartley, the percentage of southern elections, of which there were 260, lost by the Textile Workers Union of America was 42 percent; but despite increased union activity during the 5½ years after Taft-Hartley, it had risen to 63 percent of only 150 elections. More important, the number of new members dropped about 75 percent; and where elections were successful, the percentage of successful collective bargaining relationships established dropped from 77 to 43 percent.

Unionization affects the cost of wages, working conditions, and workloads, and is frequently a cause of plant migration. Prof. Seymour Harris in his book on The Economics of New England sums it up this way:

> The Taft-Hartley Act has had the effect of freezing New England in its current relatively unfavorable unionization position. By guaranteeing employers freedom of speech, by changing rules of evidence, by outlawing the closed shop, and by introducing numerous other changes, the authors of the Taft-Hartley Act have substantially retarded unionization in the South where the largest advances remain to be made. The companies frequently intimidate workers, use their freedom of speech to threaten workers who wish to join a union, fire organizers, refuse to abide by National Labor Relations Board decisions, introduce all kinds of delays as a means of flouting collective bargaining—in fact, frequently do not bargain collectively. In some cases, by the time an employer has finally yielded, the union has disappeared.

Wage cuts imposed by arbitration in the North have upon occasion been frankly ascribed to failure by the unions in the South to organize sufficiently and keep pace with wages in the North. The largest woolen employer has recently demanded a substantial wage cut for similar reasons.

There are many amendments needed in the Taft-Hartley law, just as it has many provisions which should be retained or strengthened. However, I wish at this time to discuss only a few provisions in the law which have seriously retarded unionization in southern and other sections of the country to the disadvantage of New England and other areas which were industrialized and unionized earlier.

The first section in need of amendment is the so-called employer "free speech" section. Section 8 (c) of the Taft-Hartley law states that:

> The expressing of any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this act, if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit.

The effect of this provision, as pointed out by the Committee on the New England Economy, and the Senate subcommittee studying labor-management relations in the southern textile industry, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], has been to prevent the National Labor Relations Board from considering the antiunion statements of an employer as evidence of motivation of subsequent hostile conduct which would otherwise constitute an unfair labor practice so long as the statement in question did not explicitly threaten punishment or promise reward.

I am completely opposed to any attempt by this Government to restrain the free speech of employers or employees which is protected by the Constitution; but I think it cannot be disputed that speech itself is frequently and properly considered as evidence of motivation and may thus carry some penalty with it. This is clear in every other field of law, whether it be homicide, defamation, family relations, or anything else. I think it is equally clear that a statement may have a coercive effect without explicitly threatening punishment or promising rewards. A well-established union may be able to protect itself from hostile statements; but a weaker union, attempting to get on its feet in an antagonistic community, is seriously hurt by antiunion statements whether they are explicitly coercive or not. Thus the Senate Labor Subcommittee found that this section has been responsible, as much as any single provision of the Taft-Hartley law, for frustrating the efforts of textile workers to organize in the South.

Demagogic and violent themes are used by some employers with such an inflection and in the midst of such circumstances and conduct that the workers dare not organize into unions of their own choosing. Yet, under the Taft-Hartley law, such statements do not constitute coercion; they are privileged.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a memorandum be included at this point in my remarks, which memorandum sets forth examples of such speech which have been permitted under the Taft-Hartley law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON SPEECH PERMITTED UNDER THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

American Thread Co. plant at Tallapoosa:

"We have a nice mill here, but someone or something is fixing to come in and tear up your playhouse. This outside influence is just a bunch of potbellied Yankees with big cigars in their mouths, and the dues they collect will just go up North, and you should want to keep your money in Tallapoosa. If they come in you will share the same restrooms with Negroes and work side by side with them. It comes right out of Russia and is pure communism and nothing else. In one place the people who went out on strike had to eat raw cabbage."

Dacotah Cotton Mills, Lexington, N. C.:

"Who are the men who run this union anyway? I will name some of its chief officers to you. Baldanzi, Rieve, Chupka, Genis, Jabor, Knapik, and Rosenburg. Where do you think these men come from and where do they live? Are their background, upbringing, viewpoints, beliefs, and principles anything like yours and mine?"

Johnson Manufacturing Co., Charlotte, N. C.:

"Everybody knows that where unions are is where strikes generally occur, and everybody knows that strikes mean trouble, dissension, strife, hunger and misery, lost work and lost pay. A union often costs people more than just the dues it collects from them; it often costs them their entire earnings."

Pacific Mills, N. C.:

"Your common sense is bound to tell you that the union organizers are not here because they have suddenly felt an affection for you. They are here, and were sent here, to get some of your money. So long as they think there is any chance of getting it, they will stay here. If and when they find out they are not going to get it, they will leave as suddenly as they came."

Union Screw Products:

"The CIO was a bunch of Communists; veterans had nothing to gain by engaging in union activities; the IAM was no longer a good outfit."

Tennessee Valley Broadcasting Co.:

"Telling an employee he was silly, stupid, and unwise in remaining in a union."

Matthews Lumber Co. case:

"Statements by the employer that he was opposed to the union, it causes trouble, did no good, and existed only to get dues."

Vinton Coil Co.:

"Preelection letters to employees urging a 'no' vote to protect their jobs and families."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, under the cloak of this so-called free-speech amendment, certain employers have revealed with immunity their intimidation and coercion upon the rights of their employees in a manner alien to American standards of fair play and justice. For example, in the first case cited in the above memorandum, where the plant superintendent allegedly told employees that the union involved pot-bellied Yankees, sharing rest rooms with Negroes, strikes, and pure communism, the trial examiner was upheld by the Board when he found that these remarks "although antiunion, are not violative of the act. Under the act mere words ascribed to an employer do not constitute unlawful interference with the legal rights of the employees unless the words amount to an actual threat of economic punishment for engaging in collective bargaining.

As proposed in 1949 by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. TAFT], the act should at least be amended to permit such statements in their full context to be used as evidence of an unfair labor practice.

The second provision in the Taft-Hartley law which discriminates against those sections of the country, such as New England, which were more quickly organized is section 14 (b) which permits State laws prohibiting the union shop or other union security agreement to take precedence over the Taft-Hartley Act which permits a limited form of union shop. This section applies regardless of whether the plants are in interstate commerce and regardless of whether the union security arrangement is agreed upon by an employer and a union each of whom have units in several States. It is my understanding that 16 States, mostly in the South, prohibit even the limited union shop that the Taft-Hartley law permits. Indeed, the institution of this provision of the Taft-Hartley law was an invitation to such States to be more restrictive. This is not a question of States rights. There are several States, such as Massachusetts, whose State labor-relations laws are less restrictive in this field than the Taft-Hartley law, but they are not permitted to take precedence as is the case in the antiunion States. This has resulted in a hodgepodge of national policy and a lack of uniform treatment of a single industry or even a simple company with plants in many States.

Perhaps the best statement in favor of eliminating such State priority is found in the unanimous bipartisan report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the 82d Congress concerning the bill to permit in effect a closed shop in the building and construction industry. The bill provided that such agreements were to be permitted "despite any other provision of the Act

or any other Federal, State or territorial law." The reasons for this were clearly stated in the report, and are clearly applicable to all industries:

As the problems of this industry are indivisible and national in scope, it is provided that such agreements are permissible despite the provisions of any other section of the Act or any State or territorial law. • • • Approximately 16 States have constitutional or statutory limitations on union security more stringent than those of section 8 (a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act or those contemplated by this bill. Section 14 (b) of the act provides that such limitations are controlling. Congress can preempt the field of labor-management relations to the exclusion of State and Territorial action by legislation and it has done so to an appreciable extent. The needs of contractors, labor organizations, and employees in this industry are the same throughout the country. Failure to meet these needs has resulted in problems which are nationwide. • • • Their impact upon the national economy, and especially upon defense activities, does not vary from State to State. In providing the remedies which would be afforded by this bill, the committee is convinced that the provisions of this bill should take precedence over all local regulations.

The Taft-Hartley law is a national labor-management relations act. It should not provide for national problems of labor-management relations to be governed by 48 separate acts. Such a federal preemption amendment must be added for all industries and all parts of the act if we are to have uniformity in the governing of labor relations in this country.

A third provision of the Taft-Hartley law which has unfairly restricted the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively in those areas not now organized is section 9 (c) 3 which prohibits economic strikers from voting in a representation election. The statement in that section that "employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote" is combined with the longstanding rule that economic strikers—those who strike for reasons other than their employers' unfair labor practices—are not entitled to reinstatement if their jobs have been filled by permanent replacements. The effect of these two rules means that an economic striker who is replaced loses his eligibility to vote in a National Labor Relations Board election. When an economic strike is called, accordingly, all an employer has to do to throw the union out of the plant for good is to bring in replacements and, either himself or through the replacements, petition for an election by the board for the selection of a bargaining representative. Under such circumstances, only the replacements are allowed to vote while the employees whom they replace are not. This provision introduces the novel doctrine that an employee who is out on strike for higher wages is no longer entitled to state who shall represent the workers at that plant.

President Eisenhower referred to this provision of the Taft-Hartley law as "licensing union busting." The subcommittee of the Senate Labor Committee studying labor-management relations in the southern textile industry explored the impact of this provision on the union at the American Enka Co. in Morristown, Tenn. In this case it concluded:

The effect of that doctrine on the American Enka case is obviously that, since the back-to-work movement had replaced the strikers, the old union would be ousted, and the competing union which had no valid interest in the plant prior to the dispute, would emerge victorious from any election. Under such circumstances as these, the doctrine would convert the ultimate exercise of economic strength by the union, the strike, into a suicidal weapon.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has introduced a bill to eliminate this provision of the law. Elimination of the ban on economic strikers voting should have the support of every Senator and citizen who believes in fair labor-management relations.

The next very serious problem affecting the unionization and rights of employees in previously unorganized areas is the unreasonable delay which the many entangled requirements of the Taft-Hartley law have caused. Delay causes discontent and injustice and frequently aggravates differences for employer, employee, and the public alike. The National Labor Relations Board and its General Counsel's office have been striving to improve their procedures; and my criticism is directed not at those officials but at the various provisions in the Taft-Hartley law which prevent the most expeditious handling of cases under the act.

For example, in the cases of the American Thread Co. in Tallapoosa, Ga., and the Anchor Rome Mills in Rome, Ga., delays of nearly 2 years after filing charges of unfair labor practices broke the struggling textile unions completely. The Aldora Mills, Barnesville, Ga., case, begun in 1946, is unsettled today.

Naturally, this delay works the greatest hardship on the weaker unions attempting to gain a foothold in hostile and previously unorganized areas. After 2 years, an antiunion campaign can have successfully shattered employee morale and scattered the members of the union to jobs elsewhere. An enforcement order by then serves little purpose.

Mr. President, this unconscionable delay in part is due to the staggering load of 78,000 different cases docketed under the Taft-Hartley Act. In part it is due to the lack of adequate appropriations for sufficient National Labor Relations Board personnel, particularly in the regional offices, to handle such load. In part, it is due to the natural difficulties of attempting to interpret and apply an act so complicated as the Taft-Hartley. But it is also due to the presence or lack of particular provisions in the act itself, a few of which I might discuss.

The Taft-Hartley law prohibits prehearing elections, bans methods of determining a majority other than an election, and prevents hearing officers from making recommendations in representation cases. These prohibited practices had previously worked well and fairly to expedite representation cases, without loss of full rights and safeguards. They should not be required; but neither should they be prohibited. In the year prior to the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, 626 prehearing elections were held and only 172 required later hearings.

The act also provides for many complex and detailed filings, with penalties for the slightest defect in compliance with such requirements. Senator TAFT has already introduced an amendment to eliminate the necessity of filing certain information relating to union constitutions and bylaws which are practically always a matter of public record in any case, and I am hopeful that the Congress will consider further amendments along these lines.

The abolition of the central review section of the National Labor Relations Board, and the prohibition of assistants to trial examiners are other examples of legislative interference with internal administration which has made agreement more difficult, processing more inefficient and each case more costly.

Other suggestions which have come from the study of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations with respect to the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act include an amendment to permit a regional director to exercise final authority on all issues in representation cases, most of which are routine, subject to a limited right of appeal to the Board; to permit the Board to issue a decision in an unfair-labor-practice case where the parties waive the right to a hearing and agree to a stipulation of the facts; and finally to establish a court of labor appeals, with the same jurisdiction as the courts of appeal now exercise in review and enforcement cases, similar to the Emergency Court of Appeals established with respect to orders of the Office of Price Stabilization. In addition, penalties and enforcement of the law should be made more effective.

I am convinced that the enactment of these and other amendments would reduce the unnecessary delay and expenditures which are so harmful to the attainment of justice in labor-management relations in this country.

The next problem under the Taft-Hartley Act which affects the unionization of southern and other unorganized areas is the matter of injunctions. I speak here primarily of State court injunctions, which are not specifically mentioned in the Taft-Hartley law, but the use of which has been stimulated by the passage of that act. As a result, there has been a tremendous increase in State court injunctions since 1947. Moreover, by failing specifically to preempt the field of labor-management relations in what was supposed to be a National Labor-Management Relations Act, the Taft-Hartley law enabled these State courts to issue injunctions denying to the workers the right to conduct activities which the Taft-Hartley Act itself permitted and protected. Strikes conducted by the Textile Workers Union of America against Exposition Cotton Mills, Athens Manufacturing Co., and Crompton Highland Mills in Georgia, Brewton Weaving, Bonita Ribbon Mills, Gurney Manufacturing Co., and Jewel Fabrics in Alabama; and against Pee Dee Cotton Mills, Safie Manufacturing Co., and Amazon Cotton Mills in North Carolina, all were restrained by court orders arbitrarily issued without a hearing soon after the workers left their jobs.

These arbitrary denials of the right to strike and picket place the power of Government on one side of a collective-bargaining dispute; make agreement with the employer almost impossible; marshal the forces of law and order against the employees; justify the presence of unusually large number of police officers, State highway patrolmen, and sometimes national guardsmen; and excuse the use of brutal violence against the employees. I do not mean to suggest that a State should be powerless to deal with violence arising out of a labor dispute, but the cloak of violence should not be used to cover types of concerted action which were not violent and which were protected by Federal statute. Most of the New England States and many other States have statutes similar to the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act.

Although I realize that the solution to this problem is a difficult question of legislative draftsmanship and constitutional law, I am confident that Congress can enact appropriate legislation to enable its will to be carried out and to prevent the widespread abuses of the labor injunction which presently prevents the orderly conduct of industrial relations.

May I also add that it is most important that not only should liberalizing amendments including those mentioned above be adopted by the Congress, but that further restrictive amendments be defeated. To extend to representation elections the present license an employer is given in making intimidating statements would be to stop union organization in unorganized and hostile areas almost completely. To ban industrywide bargaining, even where agreed upon by employer and employee, would bring chaos and increased wage differentials in the garment and other industries which are located in more than one region.

I am hopeful that a fair and workable labor-management relations act will be passed by the Congress, fully protecting the public interest, our standard of living and the rights of employers and employees, with a minimum of government interference in the collective-bargaining process.

MINORITY EXPLOITATION

The next step, Mr. President, in attempting to put the cost of labor in this country, which is an important factor in industrial dislocation, on a fair and equal basis, is the prevention of exploitation of minority labor. Although Negro employment is very low in the textile industry, the presence of such a large group of workers subject to unequal wages depresses wages for all. In 1950, the Negro wage and salary worker earned an average of about $1,300, or 52 percent of the average for white workers, according to census figures. Such discrimination is one of the worst types of labor exploitation. Frequently it means that men doing the same job at the same level of skill and under the same conditions are paid unequal wages. The accumulated experience of many States and dozens of municipalities, as pointed out by the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the last session of Congress, proves that discrimination in employment can be minimized. Such discrimination also has, of course, other very serious adverse effects upon our international relations, our society and the individual which are not pertinent to this present discussion.

This country does not believe in discrimination or the exploitation of minority labor or in paying unequal wages for equal work. We do not believe that any manufacturers should gain a competitive advantage through discrimination. I think it is important for purposes of fair labor standards and fair competition throughout the country that such discrimination in employment be discontinued.

A second step in regard to this same problem concerns the enforcement of nondiscrimination provisions in Federal contracts. The recent report of the President's Committee on Government Contract Compliance stated that the nondiscrimination provision was "almost forgotten, dead and buried under thousands of words of standard, legal and technical language in Government procurement contracts." The nondiscrimination clause is the means by which Federal contracting agencies direct that the millions of American workers in private industries whose skills are paid for in whole or in part by Federal funds be recruited, hired, trained, paid, and promoted in accordance with their merit, in all parts of the country. The need for action on this provision, said the report, is an important responsibility of the Nation, particularly in times of defense mobilization when the fullest utilization of manpower is imperative.

The committee recommended that when conciliation and persuasion failed in enforcement of the nondiscrimination provision, "contracting agencies enforce the provision where practical through termination of contract, injunction, or disqualification from future contracting" and that if these remedies prove ineffective, legislation be enacted supporting the use of arbitration to obtain conformance.

I am hopeful that the Congress will review this situation and enact such legislation to prevent minority discrimination on Government contracts in the near future.

Finally, in dealing with the overall cost of labor which affects the location and migration of industry, we must not forget those nonwage payroll costs which today form a substantial percentage of total labor costs. Naturally, a large percentage of such costs involve private matters for collective bargaining or industrial policy, and others are confined to matters of State law. But I should like to mention briefly two items which are within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and which do affect the differential in labor costs between various areas of the United States.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE AND PENSIONS

The first of these relates to our Federal old-age and survivors insurance legislation. I think there is nearly unanimous agreement in the Senate and throughout the country that these laws do not provide real social security today. And yet in too many plants, in too many industries, in too many parts of the country, the $50 or so a month received by the retired worker under the Federal program is the extent of his benefits. Not enough New England textile mills have pension and insurance programs, but the amounts paid by those who do are, I am sure, enough to more than offset the slightly higher proportion of pension plans, though not survivors' insurance plans, in the southern mills; and the report to the President by the Committee on the New England Economy urged higher social-security benefits all over the Nation to include those concessions now privately granted by New England's textile mills.

Subsequently, I shall go into more detail as to specific means of improving our old-age and survivors insurance program. But I wish to stress at this time, with respect to the matter of labor costs, that the present low level of benefits paid under the social-security law acts as a subsidy to that employer who refuses to supplement this annuity with a private pension in his competition with those more enlightened employers who make financial contributions to employee pension programs. A large percentage of such private industrial pension plans are based on what is known as the offset or deductible method. Under this method, the retiring employees or their survivors are assured of a monthly annuity of a fixed sum, such as $125 a month, to consist of their social-security annuity and the difference paid by the employer's pension fund. There are merits for and against this particular type of pension plan which I do not now intend to discuss; but it is obvious that the present low level of social-security benefits increases the amount which such an employer must contribute for the old age of his employees or their survivors, while requiring the less-enlightened employers who have no such fund to pay only the 1½-percent payroll tax required under the social-security law.

I know of no reason why the policy of the United States should result in certain employers paying large sums in order to provide their retired employees or their survivors with an adequate standard of living while their competitors make disproportionately smaller contributions to a Federal program which does not provide that adequate standard. As mentioned earlier, I shall subsequently discuss the particular provisions in our social-security program which are in need of improvement and which will call for a higher level of benefits.

But as a matter of equality in nonwage payroll costs, as pointed out by the Committee on the New England Economy, increased social-security benefits narrow this labor cost differential still further.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION STANDARDS

The second item of nonwage payroll costs which is within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government is our unemployment compensation program. Although this is administered primarily on a State level, the basic law is a Federal statute. Here again, unless minimum standards are provided for each State, employers in various parts of the country

will suffer or gain unfair advantages because of the degree to which they themselves or their State legislators are concerned over the problems of unemployment. As stated by the report of the Committee on the New England Economy, with respect to benefits under unemployment compensation as well as minimum wages and hours, "We strongly recommend that wherever possible the Federal Government should adopt minimum standards of working conditions and social services. In this way, the competition among States to improve their competitive position by retarding the growth of their service would be met."

As pointed out by the committee, to the extent that the cost of these various programs is not borne by labor, but by the consumer in higher prices or by business in lower profits, the competitive position of New England and other advanced areas is injured. We are not ashamed of our high social legislation standards in New England, just as we are not ashamed of our high wages. Nor am I persuaded that they are yet high enough. Well-designed and administered social programs are not drains but investments which will pay large dividends and which are important to our democracy and our economy. But we see no reason for being penalized for being in the vanguard of social legislation by incurring competitive business disadvantages, even though they may be temporary.

The unemployment compensation programs of the New England States are on the whole somewhat more adequate than the country at large in terms of the amount of qualifying earnings, weekly benefit amounts, maximum weekly benefits, total benefits allowable in the benefit year and duration of benefits. In 1949 the average cost of unemployment insurance in the Nation as a whole was 2.2 percent of taxable wages. The cost was 3.7 percent for New England, and a maximum of 6.3 percent for Rhode Island, 3.9 percent for New Hampshire, and 3.6 percent for Massachusetts. On January 1, 1952, Massachusetts provided for a weekly unemployment benefit from $7 to $25 and up to $51 where dependents were involved, for a total of from 21 to 23 weeks; this may now be increased to 26 weeks. In Rhode Island, there was a maximum of $25 a week for 26 weeks; and similar figures prevail for most other New England and Middle Atlantic States. But in Mississippi, the weekly benefit amount ranged from $3 to $20 in the case of total unemployment for a maximum of 16 weeks; in South Carolina, from $5 to $20 for 18 weeks, and in Virginia from $5 to $20 for 16 weeks. Thus, the average weekly payment in the spring of 1952 was nearly $25 in Massachusetts, nearly $22 in Vermont and Rhode Island, and nearly $21 in Connecticut and New Hampshire; but it was less than $17 in Mississippi, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, and Texas; and little more in Kentucky, South Carolina, Alabama, Arkansas, Virginia, and Florida. Similar examples of standards below what is now generally considered to be an adequate minimum level and duration of payments may be cited. Such standards frequently have not been raised for years despite the increased cost of living. They create discriminatory advantages in the nonwage payroll cost to be borne by employers and the public in particular States.

Of course, a large part of New England's problems with respect to the unemployment-compensation program has been the high incidence of unemployment in the past few years, particularly in certain industries and communities, as already noted. However, a principle I have previously stated with respect to old-age and survivors insurance is equally applicable here: That employers in particular States should not be penalized competitively because their State has adopted adequate minimum standards for unemployment compensation program under Federal law. For several years, many of us have called attention to the inadequacies of unemployment benefits in various parts of the country, including New England, and have recommended Federal minimum standards as the long-range solution to this and other shortcomings of the unemployment-insurance program. Minimum standards of this nature were recently recommended by the New England Governors' Textile Committee. This amendment would in no way involve Federal control any more than Federal control is involved in other labor standards legislation or in other State-grant programs. Such a law should provide for a minimum—probably of 26 weeks, one-half of a year—for the duration of unemployment benefits, and an adequate minimum and permissible maximum of amounts of benefits to be granted, as well as improving present standards of coverage. Naturally, an adequate period of time would be given to each State to amend their laws to meet such standards.

I am hopeful that Congress will see fit to enact minimum standards for the amount and duration of payment of unemployment benefits in order to prevent the continuance of inadequate programs in any part of the country, a situation which adversely affects those regions with adequate programs.

In summarizing the issues of depressed labor costs and their effect on industrial decline and dislocation, I would simply say: The exploitation of labor or lack of adequate standards should not be a factor in fair competition. Whether such workers are nonunion, in sweatshops, children, learners, or Puerto Ricans, or whether they are denied adequate wages, pensions, or unemployment benefits, the effect is to damage the well-being of not only those workers, but employers, employees, and the public everywhere.

TAX ABUSES

Next, Mr. President—and this is a long overdue matter—we must eliminate those competitive abuses of Federal income-tax privileges which have contributed to unnecessary and undesirable industrial migration and dislocation.

MUNICIPAL SECURITIES

Under this category, there are five particular abuses which I wish to discuss. First, we must eliminate the Federal income-tax exemption given to municipal securities which are used for commercial, nonmunicipal purposes such as the acquisition of sites or plants for use in new industry.

There appears to be a growing tendency of States, counties, and municipalities to use their credit to issue tax-exempt bonds for the construction of factories which are subsequently leased, loaned, or given to private profit-making enterprises. This is a problem which has been particularly harmful to the textile industry and attention has been called to it on more than one occasion by the New England governors.

Such tactics have been employed recently in Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, California, and Illinois; other States, including Arkansas and Louisiana, appear on the point of following suit. A short time ago, a community in Tennessee completely financed a modern textile plant for the purpose of luring a New England textile mill to the locale. Very recently the city of Florence, Ala., issued 5-percent convertible revenue bonds to finance the construction of a building to be used by a private corporation for the manufacture of ceramic tile, and offered a Massachusetts textile firm a low-rent 30-year lease to its municipally financed industrial building. Walton County, Ga., according to a Boston Herald column, offered free building sites as 1 of 40 attractions. According to a recent edition of the Springfield Free Press, the American Bosch Co., a permanent fixture in the industrial life in the city of Springfield, is leaving its location in that city for a free plant, free taxes for 10 years, and low-wage labor in Columbus, Miss. In Mississippi, communities can authorize bond issues to build plants for new industries certified by a State industrial board as acceptable, the bonds to be retired over a 20-year period by the rent the industry pays on the tax-free plant. The mayor of Woodsville, Miss., offered both site and building to a Connecticut manufacturer. Another southern community has recently voted $26 million worth of bonds to build industrial plants and lease them to private manufacturers, among them a well-known textile manufacturer.

As municipal property these buildings escape local property taxes, and the companies operating them pay only the lower rent made possible by this means of financing. Moreover, since interest on these municipal and county bonds is exempt from Federal income taxes, they can be financed at lower interest rates. Such methods induce bargain-seeking manufacturers in other areas to abandon their plants and workers to accept the gains of such a tax dodge; and constitute unfair competition to a private company which would have to pay higher interest rates to finance taxable bonds for a new plant. I am told that because of reduced overhead costs, this type of financing within the textile industry may result in new mills being established only in those States offering such tax dodgea. One tax expert concluded that a municipally financed $8 million cotton mill needed only 2.4 percent profit on sales to stay in business, compared to a 4.36 percent return needed by a privately financed cotton mill.

These bonds are not issued for a public purpose, as Congress originally intended that term. There is no reason why they should be permitted to escape the Federal taxation which applies to all other commercial bonds. As a recent editorial in the Boston Record stated:

We have always been highly ethical in our treatment of municipal bonds. We issued them in the approved and proper manner for the construction of schools, water systems, streets, and hospitals. Since these securities are tax-exempt, we felt that their use should be prudently restricted and their value never impaired.

Instead of utilizing their municipal bonding privileges for public works and the protection of the people from disaster and disease, the southerners put up streamlined mills which various cities and towns rented for almost unbelievably small amounts to bargain-hunting individuals and corporations from the North. This naturally enabled the fugitives to pare down their tax bills and to slash their operating costs so drastically that they could undersell their northern competitors in the domestic and foreign markets.

This is not in keeping with our tax policies, nor is it free enterprise. As pointed out by an editorial in the Textile World for February 1952, "such practices are a gross inequity; a sly, unfair, and potentially vicious financing scheme; a tax dodge" and a conspiracy to give such plants a competitive advantage in their market over businesses established on the basic American principles of private ownership. In the words of the Southeastern States Tax Officials Association, speaking in conference at Atlanta, Ga., in September 1951, this practice is "inequitable and unfair to industry in the State and detrimental to the taxpayers of the State because what is given away must be paid for by other businesses and individuals, ultimately, thereby creating an unhealthy social and economic condition." The Investment Bankers Association of America recently requested its members to refrain from purchasing such securities.

Moreover, the industries thus attracted are migrants, not new enterprises. Obviously not devoted to the public interest or high ethical standards, they leave behind them stranded workers and sometimes stranded communities. Once having accepted such benefits and a few years of heavy profits, they may again move leaving the community with empty buildings and a heavy bond issue. As such use of public credit spreads, no community can be sure of the stability of the enterprises on which its citizens depend for their livelihood. In one town of only 10,000 people, municipal bonds for private industrial plants were proposed to the extent of $51 million, or an additional debt load of more than $5,000 plus interest for every man, woman, and child in the town. What happens when their new-found benefactors leave for another bargain elsewhere?

Congress should take action to eliminate the Federal tax exemption on municipal securities used for purely commercial, nonmunicipal purposes in order to prevent further such abuses and unfair methods of competition.

CAPITAL GAINS

Secondly, Congress should eliminate the opportunity for repeated abuses of the capital-gains preferential treatment on income received by financial speculators from the liquidation of going concerns purchased for financial manipulation rather than operation. The capital-gains provision has been increasingly used by such persons, rather than legitimate commercial operators, to exploit and destroy established and profitable businesses for personal gain, regardless of economic dislocations and human waste. The misuse of the lower tax rate on capital gains has been a factor in many textile mill sales and liquidations since World War II, I am told, and apparently in liquidations in other fields, including leather, tobacco, and retail establishments.

Such speculators make a business of acquiring going concerns and shortly thereafter liquidating them in order to receive the income therefrom under a preferred tax treatment. Surely this is not the purpose for which the capital-gains-tax privilege was intended. When used in this way, the lower rate does not induce new capital investment in productive enterprises as was the aim of this legislation, but on the contrary drains it off. In one example which has been cited to me, a single group of speculators, through a series of financial manipulations over a period of 8 years involving about a dozen allegedly different corporations, has been able to list most of the taxable income from the textile mills involved as capital gains, thereby paying a maximum tax of 25 percent—now 26 percent—instead of the higher rates intended by the tax laws. As a part of these maneuvers, the capital assets of one textile mill in New Bedford, Mass., were so impaired that it was liquidated in 1949, destroying 1,000 jobs; other mills met a similar fate. The fact that the enterprise may be a successful one makes no difference under these circumstances. For example, one mill which had reported earnings of $395,000 in the previous year was liquidated with dire consequences to the community simply because such liquidation was more profitable under these tax-avoidance schemes. Such manipulators are intent on bleeding the productive enterprises in which they have gained control without regard to the welfare of their workers or the communities in which their plants are located.

I am not proposing that the preferential treatment of capital gains be ended; and I realize that any limitation is difficult to draft and administer. But I am proposing that the repeated abuse of the capital gains privilege for the purposes of liquidating going concerns be prohibited under the Internal Revenue Code.

CHARITABLE TRUSTS

Third, Congress must take further action to make effective the elimination of the abusive use of charitable trusts and tax-free institutions to acquire business concerns. Such abuses have contributed to the decline of New England textiles, as pointed out in the Report of the New England Governors' Committee; and the same report points out that apparently the 1950 Revenue Act has not yet solved these problems.

I am sure that no one who was in the Senate in 1949 has forgotten the investigation of the closing of the Nashua, N. H., mills by the Textron Co. as a part of a manipulation of mill properties through the use of a charitable trust. Such hearings demonstrated that such charitable trusts and similar tax-exempt organizations were being used to avoid Federal income taxes, often with serious effects upon a particular industry, plant, or community. Title 3 of the Revenue Act of 1950 was intended to close this loophole; but experience has shown that it did not do so completely.

The outstanding example of the apparent need to tighten this loophole, as reported by the Governors' Committee, is again a recent action of Textron, who sold a mill to a southern university; the latter could pay a relatively high price because of its tax-exempt status, and then "permitted" Textron to manage the mill and pay only a fixed sum each year.

In general, the Internal Revenue Code now provides with respect to charitable, educational, and certain other tax-exempt organizations that, first, such organizations are taxable upon income derived from unrelated business activities and from long-term leases of property acquired with borrowed funds; second, upon engaging in specified types of prohibited transactions with the donors, or upon accumulating income under certain specified circumstances exemption will be totally or partially denied, subject to certain limitations; third, annual information returns available to the public indicating the nature of the operating activities are required to be filed; and, fourth, feeder organizations, enterprises all of the income of which is distributable to an exempt organization, are taxable in the same manner as other corporations. These provisions are modifications, however, of the original proposals to prevent such modifications and were, of course, made in good faith; but a further review is now needed in the light of subsequent experience with these provisions.

I recommend that the tax-exempt charitable trust loophole which permits discrimination and unfair competition be tightened to prevent further abuse.

PUERTO RICO

The fourth item of competitive abuse of tax privileges is the total tax exemption which is offered by the Puerto Rican government to industries which come to that island. Although closely related to the first abuse mentioned dealing with the use of community bonds, this raises many more difficult questions. At the present time, certain new industries are granted a complete exemption from income taxes, insular and municipal property taxes, and certain license fees, excise taxes and other levies imposed by the insular and municipal governments of Puerto Rico for the period from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1959; a 75-percent exemption from such taxes for the fiscal year 1959–60; a 50-percent exemption for the fiscal year 1960–61; and a 25-percent exemption for the fiscal year

1961–62. Recently, the Governor has requested a still more far-reaching program of tax exemption. In addition to permitting the payment of unbelievably low wages, not being covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act minimum as previously discussed, Puerto Rico further offers direct subsidies to attract continental industries. United States corporations in Puerto Rico and Puerto Rican corporations, as well as citizens of Puerto Rico, do not, except under special circumstances, pay Federal income taxes to the United States.

I fully sympathize with the need of Puerto Rico for further industrializing its economy; and I am opposed to undue interference by the Congress in Puerto Rico's affairs since the granting of its constitution. But, I cannot believe that Congress is powerless to act upon the type of unfair competition and industry dislocation which such tax exemptions create. This situation is exemplified by the following letter to the president of a textile mill, in a Massachusetts community already hard hit by dislocation and unemployment, from a Puerto Rican government official, attempting to induce that mill to migrate to Puerto Rico. The letter stated:

> In brief, we can offer complete tax exemption for a period of years, an abundance of good help at approximately one-third of the going rate in the continental United States, a help-training program which is to a large extent free, plus liberal terms for financing both machinery and buildings.
>
> Puerto Rico is able to offer complete tax exemption as it is an unincorporated possession of the United States without voting representation in Congress. Accordingly it is not subject to the usual Federal tax and writes all of its own tax legislation. There are no duties on goods of Puerto Rican manufacture imported into the continental United States as Puerto Rico is within the United States customs boundary.

The Textron hearing in 1949 also revealed a similar situation. As stated by the Report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at that time, the workers and manufacturers in both New England and the South who must sell in the same market with Puerto Rican products find their economic livelihood threatened by the activities of a government heavily subsidized by the United States Government, but paying nothing into the United States Treasury.

As stated by the committee investigating the Textron case:

> The subcommittee recognizes that when our Government acquired Puerto Rico it assumed an obligation to take reasonable steps to help this impoverished Territory to improve its economic condition, with the hope that eventually it could arrive at an economic parity with the continental United States. However, any program conducted or tolerated by our Government should not be at the undue expense of our continental wage earners and our continental industries.

It is my intention to introduce a resolution to determine what appropriate action can be taken by the Congress to prevent the abuse of Puerto Rico's tax privileges which are employed to lure going industries and thus result in industrial dislocation and unemployment in this country. From a strictly legal point of view, the constitutional relationship of Puerto Rico to the United States remains unchanged. The statute which authorized the Puerto Rican constitution continued in force those Federal statutes which provided the authority to the Puerto Rican Legislature to levy certain forms of taxes and fees for the support of insular and municipal government. Such sections, therefore, could be amended without infringing upon or repudiating the compact by which the people of Puerto Rico were authorized to organize their own government. Such amendments should be enacted if we are to save both the people of Puerto Rico and the United States mainland from exploitation by those unscrupulous manufacturers abusing such tax privileges.

Congress must give careful study and enact appropriate legislation to prevent the abuse of Puerto Rican tax privileges.

CERTIFICATES OF NECESSITY

Fifth and finally, Congress should take action to eliminate the abuse of awarding certificates for rapid tax amortization which result in undesirable industry dislocation, or which are awarded without regard to available sites or facilities in labor surplus areas. Moreover, such grants should be reviewed and revoked whenever the facilities are not used for the emergency defense purposes upon which the grants are based. The enactment of such conditions would, I believe, dovetail with the previous proposals I have put forward regarding our tax amortization or rapid depreciation program; namely, the use of such tax privileges as incentives to industries expanding in labor surplus areas as well as to older industries seeking to replace and modernize equipment; and the prevention of a disproportionate distribution of such incentives. Even should those other proposals fail of enactment, it is most important to prevent the further use of such certificates under our present defense program from contributing to undesirable industry dislocations and widespread unemployment.

My concern over the abuse of this tax privilege is not aroused by purely theoretical possibilities. For example in examining the list of certificates of necessity issued to companies in the textile industry, I find that the J. P. Stevens Co., Inc., applied for such a certificate for facilities to be located in Stanley, N. C., on March 28, 1951. Only a few days later, the same company announced the liquidation of its Haverhill mills, throwing over 400 employees out of work.

According to James B. Carey, president of the IUE-CIO, there are these further examples in the electrical industry:

General Electric secured a certificate of necessity for $20 million to build and equip an immense plant at Louisville, Ky., supposedly to make jet engines. But the company then discovered that only a small area was needed for jet engines, and is proceeding to shut down GE plants at Trenton, N. J.; White Plains, N. Y.; South Scranton, Pa.; and Bridgeport, Conn., and move 19,000 refrigerators, washing machines, and other appliances jobs to the new Louisville plant.

Westinghouse received a $20 million certificate of necessity for a jet engine plant at Columbus, Ohio, discovered it was not needed, and now plans, says Mr. Carey, to move the refrigerator division from Springfield, Mass., and Mansfield, Ohio, to Columbus.

Westinghouse has received $10.5 million in tax amortization to build a new meter plant at Raleigh, N. C., which may involve the loss of jobs of hundreds of workers in Newark.

Hundreds of workers may suffer loss of jobs and wage cuts because Westinghouse secured $12 million tax amortization at Horseheads, N. Y., and another $6.8 million at Bath, N. Y., for electronic tubes which had been produced at Bloomfield, N. J.

These moves, as already pointed out, leave in their wake thousands of unemployed, loss of seniority, and pension rights, and serious community problems. All too frequently such moves are made in order to exploit the cheap, unorganized labor of the new rural or southern locations. What made all the more tragic the awarding of the tax-amortization privilege of $25 million to the General Electric Co. for a new transformer plant in Rome, Ga., was the fact that this threatened further curtailment of General Electric's activities in Pittsfield, Mass., which at the very time such certificate was awarded was classified as a group III labor surplus area.

I protested this action to the Defense Production Administration at this time; but was told that such a move was justifiable under the statute as it is now worded. I was happy to read a recent address by a Pittsfield General Electric executive reasserting that corporation's belief in and practice of community responsibility, and its plans to expand further at Pittsfield; but I am nevertheless convinced that those communities with corporations less responsible or mistaken in their intentions need to be protected from Government incentives to unnecessary and undesirable migrations. I believe, therefore, that administrative action or legislation is necessary first to prevent rapid amortization certificates now being given for emergency defense facilities from being used where undesirable industrial dislocation accompanies such expansion; that is to say, where the recipient while building these facilities is simultaneously closing down or curtailing activities in similar facilities in other parts of the country; and second to condition the awarding of such rapid amortization certificates upon the recipient's first using—or justifying his not using—existing facilities in labor surplus areas, and upon the recipient being required to give priority in the selection of the site for such emergency facilities to labor surplus areas. No tax amortization certificates should be issued by the Government to replace existing production, nor should such certificates be issued for plants which would have been constructed in the absence of such tax amortization certificates. Finally, it is fundamental that such tax privileges should be revoked whenever the facilities are not used for the purposes stated in the certificate of necessity. To my

astonishment, I have learned that practically no check or review for possible revocation is provided under the present program, regardless of the use to which such facilities may be put once the tax privileges are given. Such conditions would not and should not make mandatory the location of industries in such areas, nor even the utilization of the obsolete facilities which at present plague New England.

Such legislation will be of particular importance if our defense expansion goals are increased. Presumably, the present regulations of the Office of Defense Mobilization deny certificates to a facility or part of a facility which is or will be used in lieu of existing facilities, with certain exceptions; presumably such regulations further provide that the adequacy of existing facilities for the production of the goods to be manufactured by such new facilities must also be considered. The investigation of the Hardy subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations 2 years ago, however, indicated that such regulations were not being strictly enforced, particularly on a nationwide basis. Such statute as I propose would not, therefore, impair the effective administration of such a program, but would provide specific authority for such regulations and carry their intent another step to meet more adequately the situation I have described.

The Federal Government should not positively aid the shifting of industry from one section of the country to another with disastrous consequences such as I have previously discussed. Nor can I see why the Federal Government, which has talked so long about aiding labor surplus areas without offering more than token assistance, should fail to give preferential treatment to such areas in the awarding of such certificates.

A prosperous, growing economy in every section of the country is an important pre-requisite for a strong Nation. I am hopeful that Congress will condition the granting of tax amortization certificates for defense facilities in this manner in order to prevent their abuse and undesirable consequences of industrial dislocation.

FEDERAL INCENTIVES

There is a third important step, in addition to its role in equalizing the cost of labor and preventing tax abuses, which the Federal Government can take to prevent further industrial migration and dislocation and a general business decline in those problem areas such as I have pointed out exist in many parts of New England; I speak now of an equitable distribution of Federal business incentives. Of course, the Federal Government assists business in many ways, most of which I shall not attempt to discuss here. Moreover, in many of these items considerations of areas are practically irrelevant. However, I feel very strongly about the need for an equitable distribution of Federal business incentives of at least three types in particular—first, the allocation of defense contracts; second, Federal projects; and third, certificates of necessity for rapid tax amortization of defense facilities.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Although I realize that Government contracts even during emergency times are not only a temporary but a wholly inadequate solution to the problems of distressed industries and areas, it is obvious that they are a helpful step in enabling a community or industry to get back on its feet. It is my intention to introduce legislation specifically providing for the awarding of certain public contracts to bidders from areas of very substantial labor surplus where their bids do not exceed by more than a fixed percentage the lowest bids submitted from other areas. I emphasize the word "specific" because New England has had earlier experience with both legislative and administrative action which were aimed at the allocation of defense contracts to so-called distressed areas, but which, because of some loophole or legalistic sophistry, have failed to be of any assistance whatever.

Such a bill as I propose would provide more specific authority for Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 than is now provided by the "public interest" provision of the Armed Services Procurement Act and the opinions of the Comptroller General. More important, such legislation would close the loopholes of that policy which have prevented it, despite the fact that it was inspired by the conditions of New England's textile towns, from being of any real help in alleviating the unemployment situation in those communities. Such a bill would make certain that the allocation of such contracts to companies with plants in labor-surplus areas would result in additional employment in those areas, and not merely in such contracts replacing present work which is either put aside or placed in other plants of the same company in other areas. Only areas of very substantial labor surplus and only responsible bidders who are in the lowest range of bids would be covered by such a bill in order to prevent wholesale abuses of such a privilege. Moreover, such allocation of contracts to areas of unemployment must not result in unemployment in other areas.

The report of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry recommended that defense contracts need not and should not be awarded exclusively according to price bid, particularly since Government procurement agencies already depart from the principles of sales to the lowest bidder. "In awarding contracts," the committee stated, "the Government should consider the amount of unemployment in definite regions, States, and local areas since the diversion of contracts to distressed areas will help to lower the cost of unemployment."

These are matters of immediate administrative, as well as legislative, concern. Speaking now with particular reference to the problems of the textile industry, I am hopeful that either through Congressional mandates or administrative action the Defense Department will be more alert to the problems of the industry and the unemployment which is continuing. If defense orders could anticipate the fluctuations of the industry, and the Department could accelerate its orders and stockpile its textile goods accordingly the situation would be at least somewhat improved. At the present time, despite the recommendation made by the textile panel of the Surplus Manpower Committee, mills operating 80 hours or less per week are rarely, if ever, given preference over mills operating more than that. There is general agreement among leaders in both labor and the industry, as well as impartial observers, that the surplus manpower contract allocation program has been a failure as far as textiles, and particularly woolen and worsted mills, are concerned. For example, the workers of Asheville, N. C., can understand the disdain which the workers of Lowell, Mass., have for Defense Manpower Policy No. 4, inasmuch as its so-called preference has been no preference at all. New England textile and apparel contracts in the first 2 months of 1953 amounted only to about $13 million.

I realize that the policies which I am now discussing are fraught with serious problems with respect to both the economic principles involved and their administration. I realize that some may say that such policies are inefficient and uneconomical. But surely 10,000 or more unemployed textile workers in Lawrence, Mass., drawing unemployment or assistance payments are not contributing to our efforts to economize. Surely the idle mills and machines, as well as idle men, in textile areas both North and South are not contributing to the efficiency of our mobilization production. Surely it is more inefficient and more uneconomical to waste the skills and facilities and human and material resources which could otherwise be utilized in our national production if only some slight preference were given to them.

Moreover, there are other considerations besides economy and efficiency. In Lawrence, Mass., in April of this year, the Communists distributed leaflets attempting to exploit the acute distress in that city for propaganda purposes. That attempt was wholly unsuccessful in terms of winning converts in Lawrence; but it serves to illustrate the advantage we are handing to communism, both locally and internationally, when we fail to take action in areas which have suffered several years of serious unemployment and poverty.

Widespread unemployment in any area should be of concern to all the Nation; and so should adequate methods of contract allocation to alleviate that unemployment. It is better to bring defense work to the workers, who are in need of jobs in their own communities, rather than move those workers to already tight areas with overloaded schools, housing, and other facilities. If they are not moved and do not migrate, unemployment continues to increase and, as pointed out, the national interest is further harmed through the loss of their contribution and the welfare funds necessary for their support. Moreover, the conversion from civilian to military production has been the cause of much of our dislocation and unemployment.

Those other areas of the country who have in the past objected to such a policy should remember that these distressed areas are not confined wholly to one section of the country; and that regions which have received so much assistance of other kinds from the Federal Government should not object to a temporary relief measure of that type. Although Government contracts are one method of at least easing extensive transitions, such a policy is not going to prevent the overall operations of the forces of free and fair competition. The allocation of defense contracts to labor surplus areas and the granting of preference to such areas, as well as giving special consideration to distressed industries, are founded on those principles which have been applied to aid every industry in every section of the country, and which are particularly important now in the light of the problems I have discussed. I am not proposing that we abandon the principles of awarding contracts at the lowest cost to the Government, but merely that the Government recognize the necessity of placing contracts in the areas that most need them. The Federal Government at present attempts to meet the problems of surplus agricultural commodities in a manner which its most enthusiastic supporter could not call wholly efficient and economical; surely the same consideration may be given to our surplus human resources. Nor is the principle a new one in the specific field of awarding defense contracts. During World War II, it was a common procedure to award such contracts to those other than the lowest competitive bidder and this had the approval of Congress and the Comptroller General. Thus, I am asking only that our present policy be made more effective and more specific in order to achieve a greater utilization of the manpower skills and facilities now wasting in areas of substantial labor surplus.

Specific legislation giving priority in the awarding of defense contracts to areas of substantial labor surplus is needed if the distribution of these Federal business incentives is to be equitable, and undesirable dislocation halted.

GOVERNMENT PROJECTS

As a matter of long-range legislative objective, rather than specific legislative or administrative directive, it is important that we strive for a fair allocation of Federal projects, installations and grants. Such expenditures by the Federal Government are no insignificant contribution to the economic life of an area, and it is important that all parts of the country receive equal consideration in the distribution of such benefits. New England has not received its fair share of such projects and, as a result, its economy lacks that additional aid which such Federal projects and grants might otherwise have provided. I have long believed, for example, that a major operation of the Atomic Energy Commission might well be located in Massachusetts whose facilities for research and traditions of scientific development are unequaled. Lawrence, with 47 acres of available land on the Merrimack River, could be the ideal spot for some installation.

Massachusetts received only 1 percent of the value of Federal contracts for various facilities, projects and other Federal construction in 1952; yet this was far more than any other New England State. Not one of the 8 Southeastern States—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia—had as small a share. Indeed, the share of any one of 4 of these States, Alabama, Kentucky, South Carolina, or Tennessee, was greater than that awarded all 6 New England States combined.

Those of us who represent New England in the Congress must continue to be alert to the needs and opportunities of our region in the awarding of Federal projects, installations and grants.

TAX AMORTIZATION CERTIFICATES

Finally, in order to prevent widespread and unnecessary industrial dislocation and decline through inequitable distribution of Federal business incentives, I propose that Congress enact legislation to prevent grossly unequal geographic distribution of certificates of necessity for rapid tax amortization of defense facilities. The present program of accelerated amortization, and it may well be that the program has already passed its peak, has had the effect of a discriminatory action on the part of the Federal Government against New England and other areas; and if, because of world conditions, the program continues to be of importance in the defense production picture, such regional discrimination must be ended.

As I have previously discussed, such certificates have frequently been used as an incentive for particular instances of plant migration with resultant unemployment. But I shall talk now about the effect of providing one area of the country—and speaking frankly I refer to the South—with a disproportionate share of such incentives while not providing the same opportunities to New England and other areas. New England's participation in these programs, which foster new productive capacity with the privilege of accelerated amortization and tax concessions, has been disproportionately small in terms of its population, income, manufacturing employment, defense contribution and willingness to expand. During World War II, although New England received over 9 percent of the contracts for military goods, she received only about 4.5 percent of the contracts for expanding plants and equipment. A similar disproportion exists in the certificates awarded during the Korean emergency. By the end of 1952, New England firms had been granted little more than 1,000 certificates for $612 million in new plants and equipment, approximately 2.5 percent of the comparable total for the United States, and this figure fell further during the first 10 weeks of 1953. The percentage is even lower if transportation and electrical utilities are excluded. According to the latest release of the Defense Production Administration, the 4 West South Central States, with far less defense participation, had certificates of necessity for projects worth 5 times the amount awarded the 6 New England States. Similar comparisons may be made with the South Atlantic and East South Central States. One of the most frequently cited bases for comparing certificates issued is the "value added by manufacture" in each region.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this place in my remarks a table comparing the percent of the cost of facilities receiving certificates of necessity as of September 30, 1952, by region and the percent of value added by manufacture in such region in 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Certified facilities	Value added
	Percent	*Percent*
New England	2.88	8.27
Middle Atlantic	20.92	26.20
East North Central	26.12	33.24
West North Central	7.44	5.72
South Atlantic	8.27	9.42
East South Central	5.44	3.84
West South Central	18.97	4.29
Mountain	2.86	1.16
Pacific	7.09	7.85
Total	100.00	100.00

Excluded from the total cost figure of $23,007,800,000 are $8,000,500,000 for transportation storage and public utilities which are not allocated by States, and $347,500,000 of other certificates in continental United States not allocated by States or which are outside the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, from the foregoing table, it will be seen that proportionately New England has obtained certificates for about one-third of the percentage it has had of value added by manufacture. This is much the lowest proportion of any section of the country. The Middle Atlantic and East North Central States, and South Atlantic and Pacific have also obtained proportionately less in certificates than they have had in value added. Great gains have been concentrated in the West South Central area—Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas—whose percentage of certificates is 4¼ times its percentage of value added by manufacture in 1950.

One of the major consequences of a disproportionate award of certificates to one section of the country, is that after the emergency there may be surplus plants in some industries. If there is such a surplus and an industry has both efficient plant and inefficient plant, it will naturally close the inefficient plant. If the old, obsolete, wornout and inefficient plant is concentrated in one section of the country because it failed to get certificates of necessity, then that area will be the one to suffer. Each area should be entitled to its share of government aid in expanding production, or those discriminated against will suffer in the years to come. That area is certainly justified in pointing out any discrimination against it and may well argue that it is entitled to legislation protecting it in the future. As pointed out earlier, our Nation as a whole cannot prosper to the degree it should, if one of its major regions is economically sick.

According to a recent study by the chairman of the New England Governors' Committee on Textiles, New England received one-fourth as many certificates as might be expected on the basis of its manufacturing employment, and about one-third of its share on the basis of total employment. Last year, information was supplied that of 58 certificates of necessity granted to the textile industry, an excessive number in view of the over-capacity in the industry, 6 were granted to New England plants; and of a total amount of $171.3 million in certificates awarded to the textile industry, only $1.9 million or about 1.1 percent went to New England. Even in textiles exclusive of synthetics, New England received but 3 percent of the tax amortizations although it accounts for 25 percent of the industry. In other words Federal subsidies went against New England 8–1. Although New England has five times the South's capacity in woolens and worsted, it received one-fifth as much aid for expansion as the South, or in short, one-twenty-fifth as much as might be expected. As of June 30, 1952, none of Massachusetts' four major textile towns had received any, and Rhode Island had 0.1 percent. Similar comparisons may be made for the chemical and metal industries.

When it is realized that these facilities can be written off in a 5-year period instead of the usual 20–25-year period, thus providing increased deductions for tax-return purposes at a time when normal and excess-profits-tax rates are particularly high, then the effect such discriminatory treatment is having upon industrial decline in New England may be fully understood. These certificates also gave priorities in allocations of scarce materials. I am certain that the Senators and business leaders of other areas on the short end of such discrimination are equally concerned. Surely it is not in the interest of national defense to provide lavishly critical materials and financial aid for the construction of new plants in the South, particularly in industries not suffering from lack of capacity, while New England plants remain idle; or to train apprentice workers for new mills while our own skilled workers are unemployed. I might add that the so-called industrial dispersal program is in no way responsible for this maldistribution; while that is a factor in the granting of tax-amortization certificates, it is confined to the location of plants on sites other than those immediately adjacent to the existing plants.

If some equilibrium is not maintained, we shall end the emergency period with some sections of the country having most of the new plants and equipment while others will have most of the old plants. Those of us in New England and other areas who are faced on the one hand with increasing need for modernization and expansion of our manufacturing facilities, and on the other hand with our tax funds being drained to help develop other areas, cannot sit idly by. I am not opposed to the industrialization of other areas and Federal incentives to stimulate such industrialization. But the welfare of the Nation is not well served by using the forces of the Federal Government to stimulate the industrial growth of one region at the expense of others. Again, equal competition and equal treatment should be our standard.

I realize that a large part of the blame for this unequal distribution lies with the manufacturing and business community of New England and its own lack of enterprise in seeking more of such certificates or seeking to expand further its facilities. And I can assure you that if those New England businessmen who have not yet acted continue to sit tight, undergo no expansion and refuse this opportunity to modernize their obsolete factories and machinery, then I will seek neither to blame the Federal Government nor the South, or require that such incentives be handed to New England on a silver platter.

But these are problems upon which all of us must cooperate. I am asking that legislation be enacted which would result in a more equitable distribution of rapid tax amortization certificates in order to give New England business the opportunity to take this step in preventing its own decline.

TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Fourth, the Federal Government is charged with the responsibility of providing for equal treatment in all parts of the country in the matter of transportation rates. Such rates cannot, of course, be equalized in the true sense of the word. Nor can it be denied that New England has some geographic advantage in its proximity to the world's richest marketing area, as well as disadvantage in its location to the Nation as a whole in matters of transportation costs. In textiles, transportation costs are not a comparatively large item. Nevertheless, it is of concern to all parts of the country that our transportation rates—by rail, truck and water—be fair and nondiscriminatory.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has announced that his Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is concerned with problems of the New England economy. I know that the Senator from New Hampshire has been long concerned with these problems.

I can think of no more logical field of investigation for this committee, and I shall introduce a resolution to this effect, than to investigate the charges of discrimination in trucking rates for commodities being shipped into New England, in freight rates both within New England and on commodities being shipped to or from locations outside of that region, and in water shipping rates on commodities leaving the port of Boston. Such a committee investigation would, of course, be made with the cooperation of private transportation interests, industrial groups, State and local governments and appropriate agencies of the Federal Government. New England's proximity to domestic markets is of no advantage if the service and rates for importing and exporting raw materials and manufactured products discriminate against that advantage. Moreover, New England's disadvantage from its location on the northeast corner of the Nation with respect to the cost of importing raw materials is aggravated by any discriminatory practices. The heavy reliance of New England industry upon raw materials and natural resources from other parts of the United States makes fairness in transportation costs of great importance.

TRUCKING

Charges of discrimination are frequently made with respect to trucking rates on commodities shipped in and out of New England. Trucking rates generally are confused and apparently discriminatory. For example, it is cheaper to ship from Boston to Philadelphia by truck than from Boston to New York. Moreover, a large differential prevails on trucking rates between North and South. In the case of New England textiles, which are in intense competition with the South and ship primarily by truck, this differential amounts to about one-third. For example, to ship a quantity less than a truckload of cotton or cotton and rayon from Lowell, Mass., to Detroit, Mich., costs $2.15 per 100 pounds; but from Greensboro, N. C., to Detroit, approximately the same distance, it costs only $1.60 per 100 pounds, according to one recent study. Trucks are handling great and increasing quantities of general freight between points within the region and between New England and points throughout the country, particularly in the period since World War II. Seventy percent of New England's interregional shipments of finished textile products are by truck. The committee on the textile industry of the New England Governors' Conference recommended:

> An equalization of trucking rates for shipments of raw materials to New England and for finished textiles out of New England with rates equal for equal distances to those rates for shipping to and from the South.

RAILROADS

Similar questions have been raised with respect to railroad freight rates. Since 1946 a rapid series of successive freight-rate increases have made New England's situation with respect to these costs more difficult. The Interstate Commerce Commission now operates under a regulation equalizing freight rates in all territories east of the Rockies. New England shippers do not ask for privileged rates or freight charges which discriminate against the South. But such a regulation must be wisely administered if New England, with its more difficult terrain, more dense population, and general short-haul characteristics, is not to be harmed. Charges of general discrimination in the matter of railroad freight rates on the part of New England business interests have lessened since the institution of the Interstate Commerce Commission regulation; but the Senate committee should investigate the administration of these rates to make certain that they are being applied with fairness and flexibility, and to lay to rest the charges that the national rate structure discriminates against New England. Such a study was recommended by the Committee on the New England Economy in its report to the Council of Economic Advisers. Only by a thorough study of commodity rates under which the greater part of the freight in and out of

New England is shipped can it be determined to what extent, if any, the existing structure of commodity freight rates is adverse to New England or other regions. Such a study might well be extended to include other factors in the New England rail transportation picture, including the discontinuance of facilities and service and the desirability of improving access to the natural resources and alternate routes of Canada.

A primary problem of discrimination in railroad-transportation rates, with respect to which the charges of discrimination have not diminished, relates to commodities shipped to the port of Boston. As stated by the Committee on the New England Economy—

> There is no reason why inland cities sending materials to Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore should have favorable rates relative to the charges for commodities shipped to Boston.

But this is precisely the case, although it now appears that, with respect to grain for export shipped from Buffalo, Boston is to be given the same rail rates as the two southerly ports. This change took 5½ years of litigation, and may not yet be definite. These difficulties began back in 1877, when four trunkline railroads under the guiding hand of W. K. Vanderbilt signed an agreement which established rail rates between the tidewater ports on the east coast and the area north of the Ohio River, east of the Mississippi, and west of New York State. This agreement gave Baltimore a preference under New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. Early in the 20th century the Interstate Commerce Commission permitted the railroads to reduce their export rail rates to favor shipments to the ports of Baltimore and Philadelphia. Other competing ports received similar advantages until exporters from the Middle West saved 3 cents per hundredweight by using the southern ports.

OCEAN CARRIERS

This problem is closely related to the third facet of the Senate committee study which I believe could profitably be made, namely, discrimination in water shipping rates. The apparent purpose behind the rail-rate discrimination which I have just mentioned was the lower ocean shipping rates that Boston would be able to offer shippers because of its location nearer to important world ports; but this intention was defeated, both by the shipping lines themselves and by the United States Shipping Board, back in World War I. Under the stress of the war-imposed dislocation in shipping, the Shipping Board allowed identical rates to be established for all North and South Atlantic and, eventually, gulf ports. This may have been a necessary measure in war, but it put Boston under a crippling competitive handicap, a handicap under which it still suffers, as the practice has been continued ever since.

In other words, with the probable exception of grain, which is admittedly the most important item, rival ports enjoy a lower rail rate on goods going into export, in order to compensate for a lower ocean rate which Boston once had—but has no longer. When the iron ore of Labrador begins to move in quantity, Boston's obvious suitability as port of call will be defeated by this rail differential imposed on equal water-carrier costs. These rail differentials on iron ore are presently under litigation. Not only iron ore and grain but all such differentials should be abolished, particularly in view of further discrimination in ocean-carrier rates.

Thus, although Boston is 1,926 miles closer to Bordeaux, France, for instance, than New Orleans, and some 200 miles closer than the nearest major competitive eastern seaport; 1,740 miles nearer Calcutta, and even 500 miles closer to Buenos Aires and 100 miles nearer Rio de Janeiro than is New Orleans; it is forbidden the competitive advantage that such a geographical position should afford.

In view of these and other handicaps, it is small wonder that the port of Boston, despite its locational advantages, more than 30 miles of berthing space and constant improvement and modernization by the Port of Boston Authority, has suffered competitively in recent years. At one time, New England had, in Boston and New Bedford, 2 of the 4 largest ports in the United States. But no longer. Although in 1900, Boston was second only to New York in total volume of foreign trade, in 1948, it was fifth in imports and forty-eighth in exports. Between 1935 and 1951, despite recent increases in total tonnage, the percent of all foreign trade cargo handled by the port of Boston decreased from 8.7 percent to 4.7 percent, while the percentage handled by Philadelphia and Baltimore was nearly doubled.

I am hopeful that the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will find that the regulatory activities of the Maritime Commission, the enforcement of the Federal antitrust laws, the calculation of operating subsidies for oceangoing carriers or other Federal action may be utilized to prevent such discrimination. The port of Boston, described in a recent proclamation by Governor Gregg, of New Hampshire, as the foundation stone of our New England economy, cannot continue to suffer on even some commodities both a differential rail export-freight rate favoring Baltimore, Philadelphia, and gulf ports and the equalization of ocean freight rates irrespective of distance to foreign ports. Attention should also be paid to other important New England ports, including Providence, Portsmouth, Portland, and New Haven.

Such a study by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of discrimination in New England trucking, rail, and ocean carrier freight rates could go a long way toward eliminating all discrimination and inequalities in the cost of transportation to New England industry, and thus prevent further decline and dislocation of such industry in that area.

SPECULATION—WOOL FUTURES

The final specific problem area which holds potential, if not actual, threats to industrial stability in New England and the United States, Mr. President, is speculation on the commodity exchanges and specifically in the wool futures contracts market. My office has received several complaints relating to the wool futures market and alleged price manipulations on that market which have adversely affected the woolen-textile industry. If such allegations are true, or if the futures exchange in wool is misused at some future time, the effect on the wool-textile industry would be very severe. No Senator is equipped with the means to investigate the validity of such complaints; nor should individual cases be dealt with by legislation. We all know, however, that similar allegations and actual instances of unlawful manipulation and speculation in the various commodity exchanges led to the Grain Futures Act of 1922, which was strengthened and broadened by the Commodity Exchange Act of 1936. Purely on the basis of historical accident, the wool futures market was never included within the scope of such act. In 1938, when the act was amended to include the market in wool-top futures, and 1940, when still other commodities were added, the wool futures market had not yet begun to operate on a substantial basis. Subsequent bills which would have included wool, along with other basic commodities not yet under the act, included certain controversial amendments which prevented their enactment. Thus, the wool futures market has inadvertently been excluded from the coverage of the Commodity Exchange Act and the jurisdiction of the Commodity Exchange Authority.

In order to lay to rest the allegations which have been made concerning the abuses of the wool futures market, the Commodity Exchange Act should be amended to include wool along with the other basic commodities now covered by that act. This would be a basic first step in preventing those unscrupulous speculative practices which can adversely affect the woolen-manufacturing industry and, I might say, the wool-producing industry of the West. The authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Commodity Exchange Act is limited, and the importation of foreign wool is an important cause of fluctuations in the market which can in no way be prevented by the Wool Futures Contracts Exchange. But regulation by the Commodity Exchange Authority is a logical and necessary safeguard to protect the wool producing and manufacturing industries from such undesirable practices and transactions as manipulating prices, speculating on a large scale, cornering wool, cheating or defrauding customers, making false reports to customers, disseminating false crop or market information, engaging in fictitious transactions, misusing customers' funds, and conducting improper operations on the Wool Exchange.

The unethical or illegal speculator is no friend of either the wool farmer or the wool manufacturer. It is generally agreed that speculation in wool as well as cotton has harmed European manufacturers. This should not be allowed to happen here. If wool futures are brought under the Commodity Exchange Authority, transactions or practices which appear to be in violation of the act are checked, brought to light, and penalized. Violations are criminal offenses under section 9 of the act and may

also result in denial of trading privileges on all contract markets under the administrative procedures provided in section 6 (b). Basically, the statute and the Commodity Exchange Authority operate through the governing bodies of the various futures exchanges themselves, through the exchange rules and self-enforcement. Futures commission merchants and floor brokers must register each year with the Authority, which must approve each exchange as an acceptable contract market, audit futures merchants books, investigate alleged manipulations, supervise daily trading, and take other necessary administrative action.

Such regulation may involve a minimum amount of additional paper work for those who utilize the services of such a market; but regulation of the wool futures market under the Commodity Exchange Act is an important step, not only to protect the industry from undue fluctuations and unscrupulous practices, but also to protect the reputation of those engaged in trading on the market.

The third and last speech on the New England program will be delivered on the floor of the Senate on Monday, May 25.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). Pursuant to the order entered previously, the Senate now stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 21, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20 (legislative day of May 15), 1953:

IN THE ARMY

RESERVE COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Leo Martin Boyle, O266202.
Maj. Gen. Harold Gould Maison, O141515.
Maj. Gen. Hal Lowndes Muldrow, Jr., O250319.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Claude Thomas Bowers, O183291.
Brig. Gen. James Francis Cantwell, O396657.
Brig. Gen. George Samuel Cook, O251434.
Brig. Gen. Frederick Alvin Daugherty, O337212.
Brig. Gen. Frank Dunkley, O240437.
Brig. Gen. Frank Edwin Fraser, O222901.
Brig. Gen. Edward Foster Griffin, O198652.
Brig. Gen. Orland Gerrard Hunt, O280504.
Brig. Gen. Otto Kerner, Jr., O358530.
Brig. Gen. Reginald Alfred Maurer, O180740.
Brig. Gen. Henry William McMillan, Jr., O323208.
Brig. Gen. Charles Coudert Nast, O298840.
Brig. Gen. Brainard Edwin Prescott, O294210.
Brig. Gen. Maxwell Cook Snyder, O242582.
Brig. Gen. George Weaks Trousdale, O189048.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Albina R. Cermak to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Joseph Holmes Lesh to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

Frederick W. Kaess to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan.

Francis Everett Van Alstine to be United States attorney for the northern district of Iowa.

Roy L. Stephenson to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Howard Call to be United States marshal for the district of Utah.

Saul Hale Clark to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho.

William B. Somers to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina.

Clement W. Crahan to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

Roland A. Walter to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa.

William E. Smith to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York.

Albert W. Saegert to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

William Budd Parsons to be United States marshal for the western district of Washington.

Noah W. Riley to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast made us for Thyself and for one another, unquiet and restless are our minds and hearts until we are right with Thee and all mankind.

Grant that the spirit of our relationship to Thee may always be one of reverence and fear, of faith and humility, of trust and obedience, of loyalty and devotion and love.

We pray that in all of life's human relationships we may help to cultivate an attitude of sympathy and respect, of appreciation and understanding, of fraternity and good will.

May the words of our mouth, the meditations of our heart, and the work of our hands be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1061. An act to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution for the establishment of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WATKINS, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. EASTLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 40]

Angell	Dingell	Mollohan
Barden	Dorn, S. C.	Moulder
Bentsen	Gamble	Pilcher
Blatnik	Granahan	Poulson
Bonner	Grant	Powell
Bush	Green	Rabaut
Canfield	Hébert	Roosevelt
Case	Heller	St. George
Celler	Hillelson	Shafer
Chudoff	Hoffman, Mich.	Sieminski
Cretella	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Wis.
Crumpacker	Landrum	Sullivan
Curtis, Nebr.	Martin	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Mason	Wier

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5227, with Mr. MCCULLOCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments to the paragraph which has been read, the Clerk will proceed with the further reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, golden nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, Hall scale, and gypsy and brown-tail moths, and

grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and chinch bugs in accordance with the act of May 9, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), including the enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation with States in the compensation of growers for losses resulting from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the golden nematode for the purpose authorized by the Golden Nematode Act (7 U. S. C. 150–150g), $5,187,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question at this point. What does the committee recommend for the continuation of the Japanese beetle quarantine?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The answer to that is $325,000, a decrease from the $482,702 available for 1953.

I might say in this connection that the revised budget proposed a discontinuance of the Federal quarantine on Japanese beetles. The committee felt that insufficient notice had been given to the various States to allow them to get into condition to assume the burden of this quarantine themselves. Consequently, while we have reduced the money available to some extent, the committee has provided sufficient funds to allow the Department of Agriculture to continue this quarantine until such time as the various States concerned can assume the obligation. In my opinion, that will be a minimum of 2 years' time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: It is the understanding that at least for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, this program will be continued as it has been in the past?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The quarantine will be continued. Of course, they will have to reduce operations to a certain extent. But it is the intent of the committee—and I will ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] whether he does not agree—that the Department continue practically the same sort of program as previously until Congress is satisfied that the States involved are able to take care of the situation. Is that not correct, Mr. WHITTEN?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say that is substantially correct. The same thing applies to the sweetpotato weevil, phony peach, and peach mosaic, diseases which are in the same category. The revised budget recommended that they be abolished.

The committee felt that to suddenly end these programs when they said some other program could be worked out to meet the need through the State, we felt perhaps that might be true and perhaps it might not. So the committee has carried it along on a somewhat reduced scale until they work out some satisfactory way to meet this need. Unless they do work that out, I think the committee is inclined to continue the program.

Mr. JENSEN. Then it is fair to state that the Japanese beetle quarantine will be carried on by the Federal Government until July 1, 1954?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is partially a statement. In all probability the committee will find that the program must be kept in effect during fiscal 1955.

Mr. WHITTEN. In other words, we do not want to turn this loose unless some satisfactory means of meeting the need is worked out.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate the action of the committee, and the statements that have been made by both the chairman and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], because this Japanese beetle scourge is really something to contend with in many areas of the country; a very destructive pest.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to add one comment on this matter. What makes this situation difficult is the fact that many legislatures have just adjourned their biennial meeting. The Legislature in the State of Minnesota, for example, has adjourned just this past month. It will not meet again until January 1955.

We feel that it is only fair to give these various States the opportunity to get themselves ready to take over this quarantine not later than July 1, 1955.

The Clerk read as follows:

White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant to the act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), $3 million, of which $460,000 shall be available to the Department of the Interior for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States; $1,590,000 to the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and $950,000 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including but not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman whether this particular provision of the bill includes the fund for research on the golden nematode.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will answer that by saying that we have left that control and research work at the same level it was for fiscal 1953.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Thank you. No further questions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service administration, including lands under contract for purchase or in process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purpose, $6 million, of which $2,500,000 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions.

Acquisition of lands for national forests

Weeks Act

PURCHASE OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, purchase of lands for national forests was first authorized by the Weeks law, approved March 1, 1911. This law resulted from widespread concern over extensive logging in the eastern forest regions, especially in the headwaters of major streams, and the adverse effect on streamflow. The Weeks law authorized purchase of land in the headwaters of navigable streams to promote streamflow regulation. The Clarke-McNary Act of June 7, 1924, broadened the provisions of the Weeks law by authorizing purchase of land in watersheds of navigable streams to promote streamflow regulation and timber production. The act of March 3, 1925, authorized the exchange of purchased land or timber for other lands valuable for national forest purposes.

The Weeks law established the National Forest Reservation Commission, to consider and pass upon purchases recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture. This Commission is composed of 4 Members of Congress, 2 each from the House and Senate, and the Secretaries of the Departments of the Army, Interior, and Agriculture.

Consent of the legislature of the State is required before lands can be acquired therein under the Weeks law. Forty States have so far consented, some subject to stipulations as to specific areas or approvals by State or local agencies.

In the Weeks law program, the Department of Agriculture, through the Forest Service, studies and recommends certain areas or units within which purchase of lands to accomplish the purposes of the Weeks law, as amended, appear needed and justified. These are presented to the National Forest Reservation Commission and if approved become purchase units. Designation of a purchase unit authorizes the Forest Service to undertake an acquisition program within it. Thereafter each tract, after appraisal, negotiation, and option, is passed upon by the Commission prior to acceptance of the option or exchange offer.

Since the enactment of the Weeks law in 1911, funds for land purchase have been made available for every fiscal year except those of 1916, 1918, 1919, 1921, and 1946. Appropriations and allotments have totaled about $96,543,000—to June 30, 1952—which after deductions, fund lapses, and so forth, has provided about

$90 million of available funds for purchase of lands, including costs incident to purchase. Thus there has been continued financial support of the Weeks law program by the Congress and the executive branch for over 42 years, with the exception of the 5 years mentioned above.

After changes, eliminations, and many combinations there are now 71 purchase units which have been approved by the Commission. Fifty-six of these are active, of which 52 are east of the Great Plains.

To June 30, 1952, 18,657,193 acres of land have been purchased or approved for purchase under the Weeks law. An additional net acreage of 548,643 acres has been approved under exchange procedure.

Through the Weeks law and amendments, there has been gradually built up a system of national forests in the great forested regions of the eastern United States of high present and potential value for public service and for conservation of forests and water. Most of these national forests are situated in the drainage of major streams where restoration, protection, and conservative use of land and vegetative cover is an essential part of good watershed management and flood control. All are in the forested regions of the country largely cutover in the past. In fact, much of the land acquired had been heavily logged and often burned over prior to purchase.

The national forests east of the Great Plains now contain 22,086,345 acres of national forest lands of which about 85 percent was acquired under the Weeks law, about 4 percent was acquired in other programs of the Federal Government and added to the national forests, and about 11 percent is made up of remnants of the original public domain reserved for national forest purposes.

In fiscal year 1952, over 870 million board feet of timber was cut from these national forests, largely by or for wood-using industries in or near the national forests; many communities, industries, power projects and navigable streams obtained part or all of essential water from them, and over 9½ million visits were made to these national forests for recreational purposes, as hunting, fishing, camping, picnicking, hiking, and other forms of outdoor recreation.

During fiscal year 1952 the national forest east of the Great Plains produced over $13,million in receipts from the sale of timber and other resources and use of land. This is roughly one-seventh of the funds expended for purchase of land under the Weeks law. The less tangible returns from better watersheds, from increasing amounts of timber for local industries, and from recreational use are not readily convertible to dollars but are none the less real.

The timber cut in 1952 from these national forests is estimated to be less than half of the current annual growth. The remaining growth was left uncut and added to the forest capital. Over a period of years, during which additional improvement and salvage cuts can be made, more fully stocked stands will result with consequent increased productivity. These forests can ultimately be expected to yield, on a sustained basis, several times the present harvest.

From a conservation standpoint, all of these 22 million acres—plus intermingled private and State lands—have been placed under effective fire protection, denuded lands are restocking, over a million acres of successful forest plantations have been established, the growth and stocking of desirable species are being increased through improvement and salvage cuts via timber sales, thinning, pruning, and weeding, and destructive use of acquired submarginal farmland has been stopped. Timber production has been promoted and the watershed functions of the lands have been protected and enhanced. Fish and game have been actively propagated in many areas in cooperation with the States, and necessary roads, trails, and recreation improvements are being constructed. The feasibility of large-scale forestry is being demonstrated, and the national forests have no doubt stimulated both State and private forestry programs in many of the timbered regions of which they are a part.

These Weeks law national forests, however, need to be consolidated to make them more effective for conservation of soil and timber and to promote more economical management. In many of the administrative units the national-forest acreage of forest-type land is in the minority. In practically all of them a large number of privately owned tracts of the same general character as the national forest are intermingled with the public lands. Many of these are subject to overcutting of timber, destructive cultivation, or other abuses, or have been denuded and require restoration and management.

Of the 56 active-purchase units, 26 are less than 50 percent consolidated; that is, less than half of the land which reasonably should be national forest has been acquired. An additional 19 units are more than half but less than three-fourths consolidated. Lands in farms, towns, recreational and industrial developments, or other types of permanent and economic private uses, are not considered as lands to be acquired.

In recognition of the need to consolidate areas, the policy of the National Forest Reservation Commission for several years has been that available funds will be used only for purchases that block in national-forest lands in previously approved and active-purchase units.

Lack of consolidation and the intermixed ownership pattern minimize results of conservation practices on public lands—the non-national forest areas are often clear-cut, burned, unwisely cultivated, or often just neglected. In some cases adjacent valuable national-forest resources are endangered or destroyed. Such situation also makes protection and management of the public lands more complicated and expensive. To protect the national forest lands from fire requires protection of the intermingled lands. The intermixed ownership requires much surveying to mark boundary lines, often leads to trespasses with consequent loss of timber and resources and expense of recovering damages, sometimes results in forest fires, necessitates surveys and purchase of rights-of-way for roads, and causes many other diversions of time and effort. Surveying and marking a mile of line—as for a 40-acre holding—can cost as much as $200 in rough topography and heavy cover.

Reasonable consolidation of these areas on a programed annual basis, therefore, is a sound investment, good forest and watershed conservation, and long-run economy from protection and management standpoints.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of making an inquiry as to the action of the committee regarding forest experimental stations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The answer to that is that we have left them at the same level they were in 1953.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, for the fiscal year 1954 it is anticipated by the action of the committee these experimental stations under the forest program will be carried on in the same manner as in 1953.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is my assumption, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. The effective work carried on by experimental forest stations is well-known and recognized. One of the most outstanding and successful stations is in my district, the Crossett branch. I would like to call to your attention a natural development at the station which should be corrected if we are to obtain the maximum result from its operation.

Because of 2 cost-of-living increases in salaries over the last 3 years and due to outright cuts in appropriations salary obligations have in effect increased 24 percent without any increase in funds. Costs of all other items have increased in like proportions. In addition Ramspeck promotions, for which Congress makes no provision, costs the Crossett branch $35 per permanent employee per year. We, in effect, have lost nearly 50 percent of our purchasing power for research in the last 5 years.

These cuts have resulted in the loss of 1 technical man and 2 forestry aids. Total amount of money now available for the operation of automotive equipment used on research, hire of common labor, gas, lights, heat, travel, and so forth, is $2,000 per year for the Crossett branch.

No doubt other stations are suffering from the same conditions. It is unfortunate that this important service is reduced in this manner. I hope it will yet receive the attention it deserves and appropriate action will be taken.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), title III of the act of July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the act of August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011 note), including research and investigations into irrigation, drainage, and watershed hydrology (including the construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations); classification and mapping of soils; preparing conservation plans and establishing measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures as may

be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs); establishment and operation of conservation nurseries; development and management of land utilization project lands and facilities; dissemination of information; purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings; operation and maintenance of aircraft; and furnishing of subsistence to employees; $60,844,014: *Provided*, That the cost of any permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same to any such building and with the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed $2,500, except for eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building and except that alterations or improvements to other existing permanent buildings costing $2,500 or more may be made in any fiscal year in an amount not to exceed $500 per building: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri, where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the service: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may sell at market value any property located in Yalobusha County, Miss., administered under title III of the act of July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and suitable for return to private ownership under such terms and conditions as would not conflict with the purposes of said act.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations about the item of grass nurseries. It has been brought to my attention that this falls under the Soil Conservation Service. Could the gentleman give me the reasons for the committee action on that subject?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I may say that the committee cut from the level of $1,700,000 for 1953 to $700,000 for the coming fiscal year. The revised budget requested a further decrease down to the point of $425,000. We refused to agree to the entire decrease.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The reduction, I may say, had to do with nurseries which were operated by the Soil Conservation Service. The revised budget provided for eliminating the nurseries under the Soil Conservation Service. Here again the committee felt that until they worked out some means or some sound basis for somebody else to take over and run these nurseries it would be a mistake to abolish them. We thought it might be true that a review of the total might be in order. But we remembered a few years ago that we spent millions of dollars selling the Nation on the need for reforestation but, then, we had no young trees. The committee corrected that situation. We thought it would be a mistake to abolish these nurseries under the Soil Conservation Service until we are sure somebody will run them or that there will be trees, grass seed, and so forth, made available. For that reason we have gone along about halfway so that they can work out some objective.

Mr. HOLMES. I understand from what the gentleman from Mississippi says that the revised budget recommended more of a cut than what the committee granted?

Mr. WHITTEN. We have gone along with $700,000. We added about $275,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The revised budget, I may say, had a decrease from $1,275,000 down to the figure of $425,000.

Mr. HOLMES. In what way does this affect the program? It has been brought to my attention it is going to have a very adverse effect on it.

Mr. WHITTEN. As I recall it, the funds in this bill for the general operation of the Soil Conservation Service are on the same level as they have been for the present year. The reduction has to do only with the nursery item.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I add, we have approximately 24 of these nurseries in existence today. The effect of the action of the committee will be to reduce these nurseries to about 8 or 10, which will be used more for research than for production. Is that not correct, Mr. WHITTEN?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. HOLMES. Why did the committee see fit to take such action as that?

Mr. WHITTEN. Much less was recommended by the Budget and we are trying our best to hold on to this much. There is some indication that there may be duplication in certain cases. But we feel that some nurseries should be made available for supplying the necessary tools for the Soil Conservation Service. Whether you need all of them or not I do not know. But we refused to go along with the President's budget to cut these items out. We are trying to hold them until they see fit to adopt a plan to turn them over to the States, so that the States can work it out.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say that within the past year arrangements have been made between the State agricultural service and the department of agriculture in my State of West Virginia. The State is operating the nursery in the Monongahela forest now. I think they have developed a program to shift some of those programs to State operations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That was the consensus of the subcommittee. We felt that here was a work that could gradually be shifted over to the States to take this burden off the Federal Government.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, the funds provided in this appropriation bill are not sufficient to carry on the Soil Conservation Service work, the water conservation and utilization projects, and watershed protection programs that are required to save the soil of this country. If the House fails to increase the amounts, I hope that the Senate will adopt amendments to increase the appropriations to provide adequate funds to carry on this vital work.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 28, line 23, strike out the word "County", insert a comma, and add "Chickasaw and Pontotoc Counties."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have discussed this proposed amendment with the gentleman, and both the ranking minority member of the committee and I are in full agreement with it. We will accept the amendment if it is consistent with the viewpoint of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $211,982,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, carried out during the period July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, of which amount $2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out agricultural conservation practices and $1 million shall be available for conservation practices related directly to flood prevention work in approved watersheds: *Provided*, That not to exceed $26,178,700 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $4,500,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments

and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supply of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1954 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $195 million, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 percent from the distribution for the next preceding program year, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500); but the payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program in the participating counties, and the funds so allotted may be placed in a single account for each State, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 1½ percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any State may be utilized in determining the most needed conservation practices on individual farms for which Federal assistance shall be given: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming material, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is the bone of contention of this bill. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and I can agree on a limitation of time for debate on whatever amendments may be offered, if that is agreeable to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would hesitate to agree at this time to limiting the time for debate. This is of great interest to the Members, and if they wish to speak on it I hope we can give them sufficient time. Let us let it ride a while and see.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Pennsylvania: On page 31, lines 14 and 15, strike out "$195,000,000" and insert "$140,000,000"; and in the same paragraph, line 20, strike out "15" and insert "40."

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides for a reduction in the ACP payments in line with the suggestion of the administration which is principally responsible for making this an effective program. It, furthermore, contributes to the general cause of reducing Federal expenditures by $55 million during 1954. The change in line 20 from 15 percent to 40 percent is obviously necessary to make the $55 million reduction effective.

The action of the committee in ignoring the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture only perpetuates that part of this program which has no relation to real conservation. They do not seem to understand that payments for the annual practices do not commit a farmer to any real conservation program. These payments merely become reimbursement for current expenses in doing what any good farmer would do in producing crops for market.

It is obviously impossible to cover in 5 minutes the philosophy of this whole program, but it should be apparent to all that it is largely a phony giveaway program.

At least $100 million provided in this bill will go to farmers for doing what any sensible farmer would do for himself in producing the current year's crop and not one dime of this $100 million will conserve any soil for the next generation if the farmer wishes to stick it in his pocket.

One hundred million dollars could be cut, but this amendment provides for a cut of only $55 million to put it in line with the Secretary's request.

Secretary Benson quite correctly suggested the elimination of payments for chemicals used on annual green manure crops, sod crops, and livestock pasture totaling $71 million. At the same time Mr. Benson suggested an increase from $11 million to $24 million in support of permanent cover crops and erosion control. This is a logical attempt to use the money in long-term conservation rather than give it away to meet current expenses of normal operation.

Our soil resources for the future are depleted mainly by use in the production of crops, so it should be apparent to both taxpayers and consumers that constant production of foodstuffs in excess of demand is the most wasteful dissipation of our future soil resources. Any program which subsidizes surplus production wastes our soil resources and, even worse than that, the excess production forces our Government into purchase programs which cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions more.

In the meantime farmers wonder why they have such a poor bargaining position in a free economy, yet anybody who understands economics should know that they will always have a poor bargaining position in any kind of economy as long as they produce more than the people can possibly eat.

As a matter of fact, agriculture is no longer operating in a free economy and farmers cannot expect the proper rewards of a free enterprise system until they stop the Federal Government from being the dominant factor in the market. A misguided Federal program in aid of agriculture has carried the industry to the gates of socialism which means that taxpayers and consumers will pay more, and farmers get less, while a Federal bureaucracy in control will grow fat.

There are many incidental practices for which the Government gives away money. I know it varies in the various States. But in most States, they pay one farmer for clearing the land, and then they pay other farmers for reforestation. They pay them for removing rock fences, and they pay them for building swimming pools in the guise of stopping up a ditch somewhere.

A great part of this program is paid to farmers for doing nothing that has any serious consequence upon our soil resources for the future. I hope you will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I am very glad that the gentleman from Pennsylvania introduced this amendment. This is a test of whether or not the Congress means what it says—that it wants economy. It seems particularly appropriate that it should be in the bill for the Department of Agriculture appropriation. Of all the groups in the United States, of all the economic groups, the farmers in their granges, and in their farm centers, and in meetings of various organizations and individuals, have continually said that they wanted economy and that they wanted a balanced budget. This item is one concerning which, I think, a great many of us from rural areas have had telegrams and letters. I find that the farmers where I live are in support of the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. In a moment I will yield to my friend from West Virginia.

I find that this was true in the 80th Congress, that the farmers who have considered this carefully, who mean what they say—and I believe all farmers mean what they say, that they want economy—

would support this amendment. This amendment is not cutting out those practices which have to do with the preservation of the soil, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING] pointed out. It is taking out of the budget money which was not requested by the Secretary of Agriculture. It should be pointed out that the Secretary himself increased the amount for actual soil preservation.

As a Member of this House who has spent 20 years working with farmers and for farmers, I ask for an affirmative vote upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman stated that the organized farm groups——

Mr. PHILLIPS. No. I said the farmers of my district.

Mr. BAILEY. Do you find that the small farmer, with the 40-, 60-, or 80-acre tract, who is trying to improve the fertility of his soil, is in favor of cutting down the appropriation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, I do.

Mr. BAILEY. It is coming from the large farmers who have been feeding at the Government trough for many years.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer is, "Yes, I do." I find the small farmer more interested than the larger farmer, because the larger farmer has something to fall back upon and the small farmer does not. He is most seriously concerned about taxes and about an unbalanced budget.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to say to the gentleman that most of the landowners in the district I represent are in favor of the gentleman's amendment. I shall vote for it. I find that, from actual surveys and questionnaires, from 75 to 85 percent of the recipients of these payments feel that it should be substantially reduced and confined to soil-conserving practices of a permanent character.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. The situation is the same in my district, and I am sure it is in other districts.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my colleague from California, who is himself a farmer.

Mr. GUBSER. I thought the gentleman might be interested in hearing a telegram which I received from the Santa Cruz Farm Bureau in Santa Cruz, Calif., a very difficult farming county:

> Want you to know we approve AC payments per Benson's request for $140 million and no more.

I have also received from George H. Wilson, president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, a telegram along the same line.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman what the difference is between spending hundreds of millions of dollars putting water on worthless land in his State, for instance, as against spending a few million dollars to put fertilizer on land to make and keep it productive?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Willingly. I am not in favor of putting hundreds of millions of dollars on worthless land.

Mr. JENSEN. But we have done it for your State and many other Western States.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It becomes land that is then worth something, and the money is repaid by the people who get the benefit from it. This $140 million is not repaid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think probably the best defense to this amendment and the best argument against it is to describe what is involved here. This amendment reduces the announced program for next year. It does not cut a dollar out of the bill so far as this year's appropriations are concerned. In this bill we announced the limit or the maximum that the Federal Government would put up in contribution toward soil-conservation payments or soil-conservation work. The figure that would be reduced from $195 million to $140 million is the announcement of the limit to which the Government would go in the coming year. On what? On practices that may be approved by the Department of Agriculture. Whose Department? Secretary Benson's and the administration's Department. They say down there that they are going to limit practices to permanent-type practices. If they are, are they afraid that the farmers will earn more than $140 million? Think of the situation as it has been down there with regard to the selection of practices. Now they are going to be subjected to the rule of the Department under a man who says it is going to be limited to permanent-type practices.

The Federal Government does not put up a dollar, according to their statement, unless the farmer himself has put up his own money dollar for dollar, his own labor, and swears that he has performed his share of it and requests the Federal contribution. That means, then, that you here are either not trusting Mr. Benson's statement as to how he is going to run the program, or you are afraid that the demands in the future will be such and their efforts in the soil-conservation program will be greater than the $140 million.

I had these gentlemen before our committee and they refused to say whether they were for more Federal contribution, if the people would do their part, than the $140 million. We know that some of the advocates of striking this program down from $195 million to $140 million are against the program anyway. When you look over this country and see how much of our land is wasted—40 percent—when you realize that for 150 years we have told the farmers that it was up to them to restore the land—and I believe it should be his effort to do that, but we also have an obligation to help him, especially when we see this soil going by the city of Memphis, as I said the other day, at the rate of fifty 40-acre farms a day, going down that river each day of the year; when we realize that we are taking our dollars now and using them in these foreign countries who were so shortsighted as to let their land run down—countries all over the world—I think the time has come when we should spend some of our money on our own land, because it is not going to be spent unless the farmer himself spends his money too, as required by the present Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think it should be pointed out that at least some of those who are against the program are citing Mr. Benson as their authority as to what the program should be; whereas the situation insofar as Mr. Benson is concerned is the very reverse: He approves of the program, and he approves of it at least to the extent of requesting $150 million himself to operate it.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington, a member of my committee.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to have the Committee know that there were various viewpoints on our subcommittee, and we discussed this fully. The figure we have arrived at—and we are in reasonable agreement on it—is the one that was a compromise in our own subcommittee where we did have various viewpoints on what the size of these payments should be; and that is the figure we have brought to the floor.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes in view of the many questions being asked me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I think Mr. Benson believes in sound conservation, and so do many of us who are opposed to many of the practices used to give away Federal money without in any way contributing. I would like to ask——

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman, however, is against the whole program, is he not?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. WHITTEN. Just answer my question: The gentleman is against the whole program, is he not?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. What will $100 million in liming do for the future conservation of the soil?

Mr. WHITTEN. It would depend upon the nature of the land. My land happens to be of a nature that does not require lime, but some folks have land that does need lime. The Nation needs land that will produce.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned the viewpoint of Mr. Benson. The gentleman will recall that in our subcommittee we asked Mr. Benson this question: Do you, Mr. Benson, feel that the Congress of the United States should establish a policy in relation to our great farm program? His answer was: Decidedly, yes, sir. We asked him this question: Do you, Mr. Benson, intend to carry out whatever decision the Congress might arrive at in relation to REA, RTA, the Farmers' Home Administration and the soil conservation program? His answer was that he definitely would do his best toward backing up the Congress of the United States.

I want to say there are many men in this Congress of the United States today who know more about this program than any man could possibly know who had only been in office for 5 months.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we as a nation have devoted near the attention to the saving, restoration, and protection of our land resources that we should. As a nation we have been wasting more in a short period of time than any nation in history. I think we will have to agree that is true. The only place that we may argue about it is as to how we should do it. I say that the Extension Service, the Conservation Service together with the efforts of the farmers have not been doing too good a job at it. All in the world we are doing is announcing the minimum and maximum that the Federal Government will go, whereby all of us are contributing a little something toward protecting our very means of existence. We will not pay out a dollar even unless the farmer puts up a substantially equal amount in money, unless he puts up his own labor, unless he meets the rules and regulations of Mr. Benson and the Department of Agriculture. I say to you that if the farmers will do these things and will help us in this thing, why set a ceiling so low you cannot meet the maximum? I know what the farmers are saying. Some of the farmers are saying that you can cut this out. But that attitude is the reason we are in the fix we are in today. Some farmers say, "Let us put off until next year doing what the land needs." Now the boys are in the service, now that we have been producing for the world, now the farmer, like he has always been saying, says let us put it off. He wants to get around in many instances doing what he should do. When we are running our production overtime 20 percent, at a time when for nearly 15 years we have had more and more production, more and more acres under cultivation, now that we do have a big national debt, now that balancing the budget is one of our major problems, it is time to give more attention to protecting the country in which we live, not less. Now that the farmers do want to let down, now that they want some excuse not to put back, that is the time when we collectively should put on a drive and when we should surround it with all the protection that there is in this program. The farmers have to ask for it, they have got to prove they did it, they have to meet the requirements of a Republican Secretary of Agriculture under rules which he says will require that there shall be permanent benefit from it. Why put the ceiling down too low?

We could go much further, but, as the chairman has said, this figure represents a compromise within our committee. We thought we could spend more in time and attention for this; other members of the committee thought less. We have agreed on this figure. I am going to stand by it with that in mind. I say to you once again, do not put the ceiling down too low on something that is so highly important. The ceiling is not the all-controlling factor.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest industries of southwest Louisiana is the sweetpotato industry. The legislation we are considering practically eliminates the program which virtually saved the industry in southwest Louisiana and is today serving as a bulwark to protect that salvation by cutting the sweetpotato weevil control program allocation from $238,000 to $119,000.

We in Louisiana remember the time when southwest Louisiana faced the loss of the sweetpotato industry, which last year brought $22 million to the farmers of that area. Weevil infestation had reached 25 percent. Several neighboring States had declared embargoes and refused to let Louisiana yams cross their borders, and others were studying similar action. Not only were losses to farmers mounting annually, but it would not be long before the south Louisiana Yam Belt, the Nation's chief supplier of yams, would be out of the business. At that point, the United States Department of Agriculture, cooperating with State agricultural authorities in Louisiana, set up the sweetpotato weevil-eradication program. They established control and eradication areas. They bombarded farmers, shippers, and storers with weevil-control information, by direct mail, by talks at community meetings, by movies, by highway signs, and even distributed weevil-control methods by passing out coloring books on the subject to grammar-school students and asking that they take them home. Best of all, they went into the yam grower's farms and dusted his seed potatoes and demonstrated control methods.

These efforts paid off. The weevil was stopped, pushed back, and today the average rate of infestation is less than 2 percent and is decreasing yearly. The weevil-control program continues to be pushed actively, as must be done else the prolific weevil will come back, and we cannot afford to let this happen.

To stop this sweetpotato weevil-eradication program now would mean that at today's high cost of labor, shippers could hardly afford the cost of separating weevily potatoes; with the return of the weevil, Louisiana would again face embargoes by neighboring States and ultimate strangulation; today's growers have a broader market because the once destroyed undersized yams now go to canneries. Weevily potatoes cannot be canned, hence the loss of this new outlet would multiply the State's financial losses. It would be a serious blow.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I would like to ask a question of my distinguished chairman, and also ask the question of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] whether or not you both believe that increased attention should be given in the future to those practices which have more than annual benefits to the soil? I bring that up because in the committee report there is a statement that it is the opinion of the committee that that should be done, and I believe that should be made clear.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is no question but what that is correct, may I say to the gentleman. This subcommittee has for several years been urging the Department of Agriculture and the people interested to use permanent practices. Of course, we should keep in mind that there is a difference of opinion as to what does constitute a permanent practice. Up in the New England States, for example, a semipermanent practice is the application of limestone in order to be able to produce legumes which mean so much to that area. So, the subcommittee has recognized in this report that we cannot expect to lay down a rigid regulation which will cover each and every State of the Union on this particular question.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman from Minnesota is talking about New England. What do we get in New England with this kind of a proposition?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Whatever is allocated to your State.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Roughly, nothing.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring this out. If it were not for the fact that this subcommittee has placed in this bill $5 million for what we call watershed protection in the upper reaches, this bill in direct appropriations

would be $1,057,000 below what Mr. Benson himself requested of the committee. In other words, we have brought this bill in here below Mr. Benson's figures as far as personnel and direct appropriations are concerned. But this subcommittee, frankly, is not accepting Mr. Benson's theory that this major farm program which means so much to each and every farm family in America should be cut down. We do not agree with that. You gentlemen must realize that the soils of America upon which your children and grandchildren are dependent for food in the future are certainly worth the price of one aircraft carrier a year. Also, you have to keep in mind here that $26 million out of the $195 million is for necessary expenses of the township, county, and State committee. So actually we are talking here about $169 million which can be distributed to the farmers of America. Yes, it may be a paltry $70 apiece on the average. Yet, there are some people who think it is poor business to give to the farmers of America an incentive to keep up the production of their soils so that the people throughout the country can have enough food to eat in the future.

I believe the line of thinking that is expressed by the proponents of this amendment is not for the good of the country. I repeat, if we cannot put into the soils of America, which is our most precious possession, beyond our children, as far as I am concerned, if we cannot put up incentives to the extent of one-third of what it costs to put a combat division in operation for 1 year, then there is something wrong with our line of thinking.

Remember this: We have brought in a decrease of $55 million below the original budget in this request. We are economizing. We have done our share to the extent of about 22 percent in asking that this be dropped down to $195 million.

Yesterday I pointed out that we will have 35 million additional mouths in this country to feed in 12 years. Where are you going to get the 115,000,000 acres of production necessary to feed those 35 million people? Think that over.

Yes, we have been very fortunate with great crops the last 10 or 12 years. We have been blessed with them. But drought can knock the bottom out of this so-called surplus. I believe that people who quibble about having too much food should consider it a blessing.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that this House in its wisdom will see fit to defeat this amendment and agree to the compromise of $195 million which your subcommittee has seen fit to bring to the floor of the House.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Speaking of my district, as the gentleman did, the State of Pennsylvania last year paid $59,000 for the removal of stone walls and hedgerows. Does the gentleman know anything that will hold the soil any better than stone walls and hedgerows?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is up to the State of Pennsylvania to correct such abuses. There is where the gentleman ought to take his complaint.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. They devise all kinds of schemes just to get the money.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is up to the various States to decide where this allocation can be best used for the specific purpose of improving their soils. These little red herrings you are trying to draw across the trail of this great program do not impress me in the least.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. $195 million is not a red herring; that is a lot of money.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this is in the interest of having sufficient to eat in the future.

Mr. GAVIN. They have done pretty well for the past 165 years, anyway.

The point I am trying to make is this. Let us get this thing clear.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly. That is what we are here for.

Mr. GAVIN. What all does this cover? Payments for lime seem to be the objective. Will the gentleman explain to me what else this program takes in?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This takes in whatever practices the various States decide are best for their soils. They are allocated a certain portion of whatever amount the Congress makes available. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] as I said to his colleague [Mr. KING], if you have any complaints to bring as to the practices being paid for, take them to the conservation people in your State, and in the final analysis they and the Department of Agriculture can get together and set up the catalog of these practices.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to express my personal appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee for his statement, which I believe is a splendid bipartisan statement of the approach to this problem which will best serve the interests of agriculture. It happens that I succeeded to the seat of the late Hon. W. G. Stigler, who served on the same committee with the gentleman from Minnesota, and I heard Mr. Stigler remark on more than one occasion that one of the great pleasures of service on that particular subcommittee was the fact that partisan differences were set to one side when that committee met to discuss the problems of the farmers. I think the gentleman from Minnesota who has been addressing us is entitled to a great deal of credit for the position which that subcommittee has taken in the past. I am very pleased, Mr. Chairman, to be in the position to support the report of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do want to reply first to the kind remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma. I do not think there was a finer man ever to sit on that subcommittee on appropriations for agriculture than Bill Stigler, and his loss was an irreparable loss as far as agriculture is concerned.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I also would like to join in that statement, Mr. Chairman. I loved Bill Stigler and worked closely with him for several years. I want the committee to understand that this is not a local bill. We here in this bill are trying to propose a Federal program. We are trying to serve those areas in the United States where farms are, and we are trying to do it on a Federal basis. We have to look at it that way, and I trust the debate will be on a Federal basis. I trust that we will try to be charitable with those places and areas in the United States other than where we live, and that we will try to see their problems in this Union of States, in this brotherhood, as our problems also.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman well knows that we never let sectional differences come into our subcommittee. I believe each and every one of the seven members has in mind constantly the welfare of all of agriculture in the United States of America.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman please permit me to continue?

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield? We have no objection to the gentleman having additional time. The gentleman has had considerable time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Thank you, sir; go ahead.

Mr. GAVIN. I just want to observe, too, and state that my good friend here, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is right, this is not a local issue. If there ever was a bipartisan issue where both sides really benefit by this program, this is it. This, indeed, is not a local issue.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. GAVIN. This is a bipartisan issue.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. And generally speaking, the gentleman from Pennsylvania always supports what is good for agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize again that if it is not good business to spend the price of one aircraft carrier or even less upon the soils of America, and if it is not good business to spend one-half or one-third of what it costs to keep one combat division in operation for 1 year, then I have no business standing up here and pleading with you to kill this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I might call to the attention of the Congress with reference to this problem that last year we spent more than $200 million, your country did, in paying the bills of foreign nations so that they might take their own money and do soil conservation work. They, too, were shortsighted years ago and did not give this problem the proper attention. But that was your money, and it was used to pay their bills so that they, in turn, could use their money to restore their lands which they had permitted to deteriorate over the years.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that booklets being put out by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States seem to indicate that they think this is an unneeded subsidy. Here is a 4-page booklet, a special edition which was put on the desk of each and every Congressman at a very propitious moment from their point of view. But have you ever seen the Chamber of Commerce come to the Congress of the United States and protest against giving to big business and industry by the Congress of the United States since World War II a subsidy of $40,787,000,000 in so-called business reconversion payments? That is 55 times the amount of money in direct appropriations contained in the bill before you today.

I repeat, that is 55 times the amount in direct appropriation contained in this bill before you today; yet they have the unmitigated gall to come in and tell you Members in this four-page Federal Spending Funds, which should be termed "Federal Spending Misinformation"—they have the unmitigated gall to come in here and try to get you to turn down this little measly appropriation of $195 million, comparatively speaking—compared with the $40 billion which they received—for the preservation of the soil of the United States to keep our children from starving in the future.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to elicit a little information from the chairman of the subcommittee, if I may. Of the $195 million provided for in the bill, could you roughly break it down as to how many millions go for administrative expenses, how many millions for limestone, how many millions for fertilizer, and how many millions for anything else?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), the gentleman's time was extended 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HALLECK. As far as I have observed, it has not been broken down.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Administrative expense amounts to approximately $26 million, with reference to both the program of $195 million or the $140 million proposed by Mr. Benson. Mr. Benson's request will cut the net receipts to the farmers by 50 percent. That is too drastic a cut.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. In answer to the gentleman's request, this is the announcement of next year's program. If Mr. Benson and the Department is sufficiently tight, you will not spend a dollar. They could write regulations whereby you could not earn anything. I say to you this is the announcement of the limit of how far the Federal Government will go, but any dollar spent will be on practices approved by the present administration, in which the applicant or the participant would have to show that he carried them out. So there is no way for us to say what part will be used for any particular purpose. There will be no way until the Department itself sets up the conditions on which payments are made.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. With all respect, I think we ought to have an answer to the question. Perhaps you cannot project it into the future, but can you give us the figures as to what happened to the money in past years? Certainly that is a matter of information that should be available.

Mr. WHITTEN. There is nothing secretive about it. The practices heretofore were as follows: The communities, counties, and States arrived at what they thought were the most necessary practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. WHITTEN) the gentleman's time was extended 2 minutes.)

Mr. WHITTEN. They set up a catalog, 68 percent of which are for permanent practices. They went back to the State, county, and communities and locally the farmers selected the practices they wanted. Whatever Congress spent up to this time, those communities selected them themselves and the farmers themselves selected the practices in which they have participated.

Mr. HALLECK. If I may pursue the inquiry further, I understand that. I know how it operates in my area, and I am not quarreling with that. I know that in my area part of it goes for limestone, part of it goes for fertilizer, and other parts for other things. Certainly, in passing on this matter we ought to have information out of past experience, as it means something for the future, as to how much money is spent in these different categories.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is a rather lengthy question to answer.

Mr. HALLECK. We have all the time we need.

Mr. WHITTEN. The table I have before me, which was prepared by the ACP of the Department of Agriculture, provided limestone $8 million in 1954, estimated; $32 million in 1953; phosphate $9 million estimated in 1954; other minerals estimated at $7 million. There are other figures here which I do not have the time to take up. I am glad to let the gentleman have this if he wishes to see it.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on April 15 of this year a group of some seventy-odd very practical farmers in my area had a meeting in Washington with their congressional delegation, and they said at that time that the meeting was for the purpose of advising us of their views. They emphasized that when they said they were for economy, they meant just that; they were for economy in the Department of Agriculture as well as everywhere else, and that they were for the reduction of the soil-conservation program.

I thought at that time that that was a little bit unusual; and, frankly, I was just a little bit skeptical as to whether they would really stick to that viewpoint when the heat was on, because that was before the consideration of this bill had been concluded. To my great pleasure, may I say, because this is a healthy sign in our economy program—to my great pleasure I have today from the New Jersey Farm Bureau, I think the largest and one of the more substantial organizations of farmers in my area, a letter from the president of that bureau, Herbert Voorhees. He reminds me of that meeting which took place on April 15. He says:

> You will recall at our dinner-conference on April 15 the subject of the appropriations in connection with the agricultural conservation program was given much discussion. It was brought out at that time that the New Jersey Farm Bureau members were opposed to a large appropriation for lime payments, cover crop plantings, and other soil building practices which they would be doing without expecting to be paid for it. The House Appropriations Committee has seen fit to increase the amount for ACP from $140 million as proposed in the budget to $195 million. Our membership is in favor of maintaining the budget figure at $140 million.

They enclose in their letter a copy of an extract of the minutes of that meeting and they remind me again of what went on at that meeting of April 15. The extract indicates that the farmers present at the conference realized that reducing governmental expenses included reducing the program of the Department of Agriculture as well as other departments. One suggestion was that the agricultural conservation program financing the use of lime and other standard soil improvement practices could be reduced at this time because the farmers should do these things without being paid for it, and would.

Mr. Chairman, I come here speaking, if I may, for this segment of agriculture. My district is not predominantly an agricultural district, but agriculture is significant and important in that district, and this letter ought in my judgment go in the record before this Committee because it represents the view of substantial, self-supporting, self-reliant farmers who are not opposed to this whole program, but who are in favor of economy even though it has some effect on them. I applaud their patriotic approach.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand the gentleman is a member of the committee and can perhaps answer this fundamental question: I find from a questionnaire sent out by our colleague from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], who represents a farm district, that his farmers voted 67 percent to 32 percent for agricultural conservation program payments only on permanent soil conservation practices, and voted exactly the same way against agricultural conservation program payments as at the present time, which bears out the gentleman's argument. I would like to ask the gentleman how much we should allow instead of the $195 million, how much we should allow for agricultural conservation program payments on permanent conservation practices.

Mr. HAND. I do not know that I am in a position to give the exact figure, but I can say to the gentleman that what he has read from that questionnaire would be entirely consistent with the results I have had by taking the trouble of writing to county committeemen and others interested in this very program throughout my district, and the answers I get from them would substantiate the gentleman's questionnaire results, and would substantiate the view that the New Jersey Farm Bureau takes in connection with this matter.

Mr. JAVITS. Would $140 million cover the word "necessary" whereas $195 million would include more than the word "necessary"?

Mr. HAND. It would amply cover the requirements, in my opinion, if reasonably administered, understand me, this is a good program, but like many other good things, it is easy to spend too much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words. I have an identical amendment on the desk to that offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. Chairman, although I do not come from a predominantly agricultural district, throughout the years I have always supported the farm program and especially the item under discussion at this time. But certainly there is some confusion on the floor today when we find the committee handling this bill in direct conflict with the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture. When the Secretary of Agriculture arrived at the figure of $140 million for this item certainly he must have had good reason and good evidence why that amount was sufficient to carry the program for the coming year.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] has just given the committee the opinion of the Farm Bureau of his State in reference to this particular item. Like him, I also attended a meeting of the Farm Bureau representatives when they came to Washington last month. I happen to have been raised on a farm and I know something about farming. My district has few farms in it today, but they are good farms and run by good farmers. Michigan being an agricultural State, and having a Farm Bureau that bureau has taken a position on this item.

I cannot understand why the committee handling this bill should be in direct conflict with the opinion expressed by the Farm Bureau of New Jersey and by the Farm Bureau of Michigan. I received a telegram this morning from the director of the Farm Bureau of my State in which I was asked to do everything possible to keep this figure down to $140 million, whether in the interest of economy or not. They take that position, and they are good farmers, they represent good farmers in my State. I want you to listen to what the Farm Bureau of Michigan has to say. This telegram is dated yesterday:

> Michigan Farm Bureau board of directors strongly approves Secretary Benson's request for reduction of ACP payments to $140 million. Also urge funds be limited to nonrepeating agricultural practices. Michigan Farm Bureau will appreciate your efforts to reduce the $195 million in bill reported out.
>
> C. L. BRODY,
> *Michigan Farm Bureau.*

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Every Member from Illinois received practically an identical telegram from our Farm Bureau in Illinois.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUMMA. I wish to corroborate the information given to the House by the two previous speakers. Several months ago there was a meeting of our organized farmers. They invited the Pennsylvania delegation down to the Raleigh Hotel for dinner and they said that all they wanted was to be let alone; they did not want any of this subsidy; they desired to be let alone, which is the point that is being brought out now.

Mr. DONDERO. It would seem to me that when the farmers themselves take a position on an item that takes money out of their program, that position must be based upon sound reasoning. Economy, yes, but their ox is the one that is being gored, still they are here asking this House to cut this item from $195 million down to $140 million.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The group that can afford to make these trips to Washington and put pressure on you are the big, rich farmers. This Committee and the House are interested in the little farmer who is trying to improve the fertility of his soil. This group you are talking about have been living at the trough for the past 20 years and enjoying all of these benefits that they now want to deny somebody else.

Mr. DONDERO. I answer the gentleman from West Virginia by saying that those men who represent the Michigan Farm Bureau and came here to Washington are farmers themselves. They are good farmers, they know the problems of the soil, and they would not take this position unless they were on solid ground.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania be supported and that it be adopted. Here is a chance to economize and support the administration.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, I gladly yield to the gentleman from Minnesota who has made an eloquent plea here today for more money than the farmers themselves want.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I regret that this is one time that we are on different sides of the fence. We are usually together. I would like to just say this, as a member of the Farm Bureau for 34 years, I do not agree with the present leadership of the bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to echo the words which have been spoken by the wise gentleman from Michigan. I consider it my good fortune, or perhaps you will let me say, excellent judgment, to have married into an old farm family in Illinois 35 years ago—a family still engaged in farming in Vermillion County—and I feel that I know something about the efforts of farming in Illinois, the necessity for good farm practices and for soil conservation. I happen to have one great farm county in my district of which I am very proud. I would say to my good friend from West Virginia, with whom as regards the interests of children I am always in complete agreement, that I certainly know the value of conserving the soil and I have no intention of giving away the bread of my grandchildren or great grandchildren. But I also know this. I, too, attended a meeting, not just with farm leaders of Illinois, but with individual farmers of Illinois who know their soil and know the problems. This was several months ago. These earnest men came to my office the next day and we discussed this problem, and I think perhaps they were a bit surprised to find out, first, that I knew so much about it. But, before they left we had a complete agreement; that the farmer was not only a farmer, but first of all an American citizen, and as far as the Illinois farmers were concerned, they wanted nothing for which they could not admit a full need. Now today, as happened to the gentleman from New Jersey, they backed up their words with a suggestion for definite action. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], has told you of the telegram that he received, and I would like to end my brief remarks in support of this amendment to give the farmers what they say that they need, to give the Secretary of Agriculture what he says that he needs, by including this telegram.

Perhaps you will let me add this, I was a bit depressed to have anyone say that perhaps the Secretary of Agriculture was not in an excellent position to judge this problem because he had been in office only 5 months. Secretary Benson

has had a long and distinguished record not only as a farmer, but as a friend of every sound farm program. He is in addition a skilled administrator, and a man of unimpeachable integrity. His heart is with the American farmer.

I would like just to read a telegram in support of the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairmain, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. Of course, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman, whom I regret to disagree with.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not know of anybody in the Congress that I have more respect for than I do the gentlewoman from Illinois. However, I want to point out that the gentlewoman mentioned only half of my remarks relative to Mr. Benson. But, I repeat this, that there are a good many men in this House of Representatives who, through experience, are better qualified to know what is best for agriculture than a new official who has been in office only 5 months. I repeat that, and I hold by that. I do not think Mr. Benson, even though the splendid gentleman that he is, has, through living in the Far West, become inculcated with what we in the great Midwest food-producing area in America think is essential for the farmer.

Mrs. CHURCH. The gentleman, of course, knows more about farming than I can ever begin to learn, but may I say in speaking for another State of the Midwest that the farmers of that State through their organization and individually do stand back of this amendment. I should like, if I may, to read the telegram:

> Respectfully urge you to support amendment on floor Wednesday to reduce 1954 authorization for agricultural conservation payments to $140 million. Subsidy payments for lime and phosphate not needed. We support Benson's request for $140 million for permanent conservation work but oppose committee recommendation of $195 million.

That, I would say to the Chairman and to the Committee, represents my viewpoint and the viewpoint of the gentleman who signed it, Charles B. Shuman, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I happen to have the same telegram, but, besides that, I have one more, which I should like to read for the gentlewoman's information.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would be glad to have it read.

Mr. ARENDS. It is from my own local Farm Bureau in my own county. I know all of these members. They said that last night at a meeting of the Farm Bureau they voted 11 to 1 to urge me to support the reduction of the 1954 ACP authorization. These are dirt farmers who kick around in the dirt every day of the year and know as much about farming as anybody in the House does.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

May I state in the beginning that I have the privilege of representing the district in the Southeast with the largest number of individual farms, running in 1950 to a total of 34,500 farms. I happen to be a sort of one-gallus farmer myself. I was reared on a small farm. I feel that I know and understand the problems, the hopes, the aspirations, and the dreams of the farmers in the area of north and northwest Alabama that I am privileged to represent here.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the adoption of the amendment before the Committee of the Whole will be directly opposed to the best interests of those farmers and to millions of others throughout the United States.

I think we do not only the farmers but ourselves a great disservice when we cut these funds from $195 million to $140 million, as is proposed by the amendment now before us.

Instead, Mr. Chairman, I feel we should be adding to the amount of $195 million to bring it back at least to the $250 million we have been expending these past few years. That amount, Mr. Chairman, would still be only 50 percent as I understand, of the amount that was authorized when this act was originally passed. For every dollar we spend in this program at least an additional dollar will be spent by the farmer himself to reconstitute, rebuild, and keep rich and fertile this land of ours, not for ourselves but for those who follow us.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Since the Farm Bureau has been mentioned, since my good friend from Illinois mentioned that his local Farm Bureau voted 11 to 1 in favor of this cut, I should like to bring to the attention of the House and this committee that every one of the 16 counties which I am honored to represent in the agricultural section, and I have heard from every Farm Bureau organization in those 16 counties, is in favor of increasing this appropriation instead of decreasing it. I say this if you want to bring the Farm Bureau into the argument.

As far as Secretary Benson is concerned, we are talking about his being a wonderful gentleman, and I have no doubt about it, but some of us are beginning to wonder if he got his agricultural education in the 5 months he has been in Washington.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I am glad to hear the gentleman is a one-gallus farmer, but may I ask this question: If these assistance payments are for the farmer who is hard-up, then is not an amendment in order to provide that any farmer whose net income is over $10,000 a year after the payment of all expenses and taxes shall not be entitled to these assistance payments? In my opinion, he does not need such payments. And generally, the people should not give them to him. What do you think of that?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would like to say first to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there might possibly be some merit in his amendment, and if he proposes that amendment, I want to give it full consideration. However, he should bear in mind that this program is not a relief program but is for the benefit of the land. Its purpose is to preserve and protect America's land. In doing that we benefit the Nation and all its people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GROSS.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if there is any provision in the mutual-assistance bill or in any of your foreign-aid bills which provide hardship as a condition for receiving fertilizer and payments of money from the United States.

Mr. FULTON. May I answer the gentleman by saying that I have always opposed this last year any economic aid, and have reduced my aid program solely to military aid. So when it comes to economic aid, yes, I would cut it all out of the program. That is my position.

Mr. GROSS. That has not been the situation in the past. I do not think the gentleman voted that way in the past.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Let us defeat this amendment which would cripple the Nation's effort to build its soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, from what has been said here, one might go away with the impression that the people in Utah do not know how to farm and that we do not run farms in my State. I want to tell my friends from the Middle West and from the East that we do the same type of farming out there as you do in the rest of the country. I have known Secretary Benson all my life, and I have seen him farm. I know he is a genuine farmer.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I certainly will withdraw those particular parts of my remarks from the RECORD. I would not want to reflect on the gentleman's region in any way whatsoever because it is a splendid region.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Did the gentleman mean to say he was a gentleman farmer or a genuine farmer?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. He is a gentleman and a genuine farmer.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said here about the Farm Bureau. Before coming to Washington I conferred with representatives of the Farm Bureau, and I found their sentiments to be the same as those expressed by the Illinois Farm Bureau. My constituents in Utah are determined that something be done to reduce Federal expenditures, and the farmers are willing to do their part. The Farm Bureau is not the only great farm organization that favors this cut. I would like to read to you a few words of testimony that was given by the legislative representatives of the Grange and the Grange also goes along with the Farm Bureau and recommends that this cut be made. Let me read to you from the statement of J. D. Saunders, who is legislative counsel for the National

Grange, before the committee. Here is what he had to say:

Therefore, we believe that the Secretary has done a commendable thing in undertaking to separate out the nonpermanent types of agricultural conservation practices, and in recommending a discontinuance of those types. We trust that this committee will give serious consideration to making this full cut of $110 million which the Secretary has recommended and we urge that the funds for permanent types of soil-conservation measures be transferred and be consolidated in the work of the Soil Conservation Service.

That ties up the Grange with the Farm Bureau. I cannot see why we would stand here and go against the advice of our two principal farm organizations and insist on giving the farmers something they are not asking for.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. A little while ago I inquired as to how much of this money was going for limestone or minerals. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] handed me a sheet showing the estimated assistance. The estimated assistance for lime, phosphate, and other minerals for 1953 was $82 million.

If the program is $140 million, as advocated by Secretary Benson, the estimated amount for 1954 would be $24 million. Whether there is any significance in the fact that the difference there is $58 million, whether that just happens to be coincidental with the $55 million increase over the Secretary's estimate, I do not know. Perhaps members of the committee could say to us whether or not the $55 million is to replace all but $3 million of the indicated cutback to $58 million that is indicated by this breakdown.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would say that it had nothing in the world to do with it. The practices which were used and which have been selected by the communities from the catalogue, in which two-thirds of the total practices were permanent type. Many of us feel that we could well afford to spend $250 million if the farmers would spend their part on permanent practices. Others thought $140 million, as the Secretary recommended, would be sufficient. We first agreed on $200 million, and then it was agreed that $5 million go into this watershed expansion. So the figure that is agreed on is actually arrived at as being a split between $250 million this year and $140 million.

Mr. HALLECK. May I ask one further question: If the committee recommendation for $195 million stands, as against $140 million, which means that the amount of money available is $55 million more, would it be the gentleman's expectation that it would be applied for lime, phosphate, and other minerals?

Mr. WHITTEN. Again this is a limit on next year's program. I anticipate that the Secretary and the Department are going to draw strings around this whole program and limit it to permanent practices. If so, I do not know how much would be earned, if they go into what they call permanent practices. I believe in obtaining real benefits. But, after all, this is a ceiling as to how far the Federal Government will go in doing its part. I anticipate that Secretary Benson and the Department will see to it that it is limited. If they do limit it, why get into a row trying to beat down the ceiling so low that it might not cover the need? I cannot see it.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I have a suspicion that there may be someone else who is more interested in this increased appropriation than the farmers. Let me relate an experience I had in 1947 while serving as a member of this distinguished body. I received a letter from some lime association, I believe it was——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. DAWSON of Utah was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I received notice from some fertilizer association that they had sent out a questionnaire to my district to inquire of the farmers whether they approved my action opposing the soil-conservation program. The fact of the matter was that I had never opposed the soil conservation so I called this gentleman on the telephone for an explanation and he said, "Yes it is true you did not vote against the soil-conservation program, but you did vote against an amendment to an appropriation bill that would increase funds for lime fertilizer, and we represent the fertilizer association." Therefore, they had gone out into my district and led the farmers to believe I was against the farm program. Now I do not believe in that kind of deception and those who engage in it should certainly be exposed to the public view.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman has had experience with farm practices, and he believes that this limestone represents a permanent soil conservation, or does he?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I think it might represent permanent soil conservation over a long period of time. It is a practice which the farmers themselves believe in, and they are going to continue this practice. My farmer constituents in Utah are intelligent individuals and they do not expect the Government to do for them something which they can and will do for themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said on both sides of this amendment, and a great deal of information and enlightenment has been afforded to the committee. This is a question on which there can be differences of opinion, very sincere differences of opinion; it is a question which perhaps is influenced somewhat by the locality from which the individual who speaks may come. But I am sure that everyone here is interested as a consumer and as a citizen in conserving our soil. I do not think this is a question so much of whether farmers want these payments; it is a question of whether or not these incentive payments—that is what they are—will be used by the farmers to increase the fertility of their soil and to conserve the soil for future generations.

Our population is increasing at the rate of 1½ percent per year. We have every acre of farm land in this country today that we will ever have. We will add some by reclamation, but we are going to take some out through the normal growth of our cities, for recreational areas, expanding our highways, building dams and reservoirs; so for every acre we reclaim we are going to lose an acre. If we are to take care of an increase of 1½ percent in our population per annum we must also increase the productivity and fertility of our soil by at least 1½ percent; otherwise we are not going to be able to maintain the standard of living we have in this country, a standard of living which is the greatest of any nation in the world.

I do not think anyone ought to be influenced too much by what any farmer or the leaders of any farm organization thinks about this particular proposition, because that is not the question; the question is whether or not we are going to maintain an incentive program to improve the soil of this country and save it for future generations.

I think every Member of Congress who comes from an agricultural district knows as much about what the farmers of his district are thinking as any State board of directors of a farm organization, or any State president of a farm organization—and I am not criticizing any farm organization or any man who has sent a telegram here, because I know they are sincere. But I am sure that I know what the farmers of my district want a great deal better than the president of the Kansas Farm Bureau who wired me what he thought they wanted—and he is a very estimable gentleman, too, and a very good friend of mine. I am sure that in the long run the people of this country are going to be better off if we do adopt this program calling for $195 million. After all, that is a 20 percent reduction—let us not forget that, a 20-percent reduction in 1 year. We are economizing, we are reducing substantially when we adopt this figure of $195 million, and I do not believe we ought to reduce the program any more rapidly than that if it is going to be reduced.

I hope the time will come when the farmers and the people of this country realize fully and completely the need for soil conservation; I hope the time will come when farm prices are at a level where farmers can proceed without any incentive or inducement whatever to conserve their soil; but until that time comes, as long as we are facing in this country the necessity of increasing our production by 1½ percent per year, then I am for this program on a reasonable basis, and I think $195 million is a reasonable basis.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman referred to the opinion of the average farmer in the State of Kansas. To my personal knowledge at least two-thirds of the farmers of Minnesota are against reducing this particular incentive payment. I am fully satisfied that a good many of them, on the other hand, would vote to increase it. We think we have here a very fine compromise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone down the line against all appropriations that, in my opinion, are not absolutely necessary. Let me say that this is not the soil-conservation program. The soil-conservation program is taken care of by the preceding item and involves $61,-250,000. This is not the soil-conservation program and has not been.

This is a program whereby a certain amount of moneys is paid out to different farmers year by year. Out of the 5,520,000 farms in the United States there were 2,350,000 that participated. The percentage that participated has decreased year by year to the extent of several thousand farms. Take the State of Kansas, for instance, 33 percent of the farms participated in 1950; in 1951 24 percent particapted.

There were 392,000 farmers who received less than $20; there were 586,000 who received between $20 and $40 and there were 412,000 who received under $60. Can you say that with better than 52 percent of all the farmers who received checks amounting to less than $60 this is a program in which the farmers take a great interest? The number that received over $60 would represent less than 25 percent of the total number of farmers.

That this increase is largely for the benefit of the limestone trust is demonstarted pretty fully by the letter I put in the RECORD yesterday from Mr. Kochs, the lobbyist for the limestone trust, who said that if the Government did not sell for them 27,000,000 tons they would have to get out and sell it themselves. Would that not be a terrible hardship?

Is it not time for us to wake up and to realize that the $140 million that is left is going to be more than sufficient to take care of all promotion of permanent practices which the Secretary hopes to confine us to?

Let me say to you that with an authorization to enter into contracts and with the privilege of going about and sending out the county committeemen to solicit the farmers to sign these applications, Secretary Brannan, who certainly was anxious to promote everything of that kind that he could, was able to get rid of only $211 million out of an authroziation of $250 million.

Mr. Chairman, is it not about time to cut this down to where it belongs?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest here today to this debate. It looked, when we started to debate, that the committee was going to ask for $195 million, a blank check, without any explanation whatsoever as to how the money was to be expended except the committee assures us it was all right and we are to go along with it and take it as presented and like it. Well, it was finally brought out that there was some $26 million for administrative expenses, this appears high for the amount to be expended and then, after another half to three-quarters of an hour of debate, the majority leader finally got some information as to how much was to be spent for lime and various other parts of the program. We then discussed several other phases of the program, and the discussion reached the local and bipartisan stage. I want to say right now, my friends, that this is about the finest piece of bipartisan legislation that has been presented for a long time, and I hold no criticism for either side of the House. They are all in it together. Iowa, corn; Kansas, wheat; Minnesota, butter, eggs, and cheese; Nebraska, wool; California, citrus fruit; Texas, Albama, Mississippi, Louisiana, cotton; Georgia, cotton and peanuts; North Carolina, South Carolina, and Kentucky, tobacco. Believe me, when any programs come up that affect any particular agricultural commodity, there certainly is a fine spirit of cooperation on both sides so the full appropriation is granted.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this time.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will the gentleman please include Florida citrus fruit, because he drinks it every day in the cloakroom.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes I will be glad to; I enjoy it, and I am willing to pay for it, too.

The Pennsylvania farmers who came to Washington were brought into the discussion. Now I did not yield to my distinguished friend from Florida whom I greatly admire and in the future I wish he would refrain from interrupting me and talk on his own time.

Now we also discussed the foreign agricultural conservation programs. I just want you to know that any of these foreign programs for soil conservation and farm practices carried on were not with my vote; just so we keep the record straight. And, let me tell you, the greatest farmers in the world come from Germany, and it seems ridiculous to send our so-called agricultural experts to Germany to show them how to farm when they came over here 250 years ago and settled in the Pennsylvania Dutch section and developed the greatest agricultural area east of the Mississippi and are considered the outstanding farmers of today. They do not want the restrictions, regulations or strangulations or subsidy programs or payments. They want to be left alone. Some gentlemen talked about our Pennsylvania farmers coming down here to talk to their Representatives. I believe it was my good and able friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUMMA], a great friend of the farmers. I might say that I note this limestone association certainly puts on a big show every year, if I am not mistaken. What is wrong with the farmers of Pennsylvania coming down here and talking with their Representatives on matters in which they are interested and concerned? I see nothing wrong with that. But, again getting around to this debate here today, I got to thinking about Bob Rich and his famous quote, "Where are you going to get the money?"

You know, and this goes for the membership on both sides of the aisle, when it comes to reduction of taxes and balancing the budget, ah, great. But the minute any appropriation is suggested to be cut, believe me, you are certainly ready to rise and go into action to restore it.

The Secretary of Agriculture said he wants only $140 million for this program. The committee states they know better, for they have been here for years, and he has been Secretary for only 5 months. Certainly, we have every confidence in him, let us give him an opportunity. I am satisfied he knows what he is doing. I want to call to the attention of the House that we are in debt $267 billion. A million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars, and a billion dollars is a thousand million dollars. We owe two hundred and sixty-seven thousand million dollars, and I would not be a bit surprised that there will be legislation introduced to increase the debt limit, because we are shortly going to hit $275 billion, or two hundred and seventy-five thousand millions. But the minute anybody talks about effecting economy, and it is, as they say, local, and it hurts conditions in anybody's backyard, immediately you rise up and stampede and go into action to restore any proposed cuts.

Now, if we mean what we say about balancing the budget and reducing taxes and giving some relief to the American taxpayer, certainly we will support this amendment.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the lady from Illinois, the capable lady from Illinois, gave this committee the gist of the speech I wanted to make and expected to make on this subject. She gave it much more effectively than I could give it. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall extend my remarks on the subject of taxes.

WHAT ABOUT UNTAPPED SOURCES OF REVENUE, MR. PRESIDENT?

Mr. Chairman, in his address to the Nation last evening, President Eisenhower presented cogent and convincing reasons for the maintenance of our Federal revenues at their present high level. He said, and we cannot but agree, that "no citizen, once satisfied that his Government is operating with honesty and economy, and planning with foresight, wants any tax saving at the price of essential national security."

Mr. Chairman, I fear there is a bit of exaggeration in that noble statement—for it is well known to the Members of this Congress that there are some citizens, some organizations, some corporations that are unwilling to pay their share of Federal income taxes, although they still expect to be fully protected and fully secure at the expense of other individuals and other businesses.

Specifically, the President asked that the Congress retain the present exorbitantly high level of income taxes on individuals for another 6 months, to gain $1½ billion of revenue; that we extend the excess-profits tax until the first of another year, to increase revenues by $800 million; and that we make other changes after January 1, 1954, to add perhaps still another $600 million or $700 million.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another and far more equitable way to accomplish the same revenue end, under which the overburdened individual income taxpayer would be given some small measure of relief. I regretted, as I listened to the President's report to the Nation, that he failed to mention new sources of revenue, not now being tapped, that could and would bring in $3 billion of new tax money to replace the $3 billion loss from the iniquitous, unfair, unsound excess-profits tax and also the 11-percent reduction in the individual income tax rates.

He might have urged the passage of H. R. 1559 to bring about tax equality which, according to the experts of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, would bring in at least $800 million of new tax money from sources not now being tapped—but sources that today are in direct competition with present-day taxpaying businesses.

He might also have suggested the liquidation of all Government-owned business enterprises that today are operating in direct competition with privately owned taxpaying businesses, such as TVA, Bonneville, the Mississippi Barge Line, the RFC, and the many other banking enterprises that are run on taxpayers' money. These Government-owned business enterprises are conservatively estimated to be worth over $30 billion. If sold to private owners, the money realized could be applied on the national debt, reducing the same by $30 billion, saving three-fourths billion dollars a year now being paid out in interest on that debt, and collecting each year at least $1½ billion in taxes from Government-owned business enterprises not now paying taxes, but which in private hands would be taxpaying enterprises.

From these two sources alone the Federal Treasury would make up the loss sustained if the excess-profits tax receipts and the 11-percent reduction in the individual income-tax rates were cut off as of June 30 this year.

Then, before next April, the cutoff date established in the 1951 revenue bill for the 5-percent increase in the regular corporation-tax rate and the increases in the excise-tax rates that were provided in that bill, before that additional loss in revenue can take place, the Ways and Means Committee will have the job done of revising the entire Internal Revenue Code. This should mean the readjustment of our tax load on an equitable basis over our entire national economy. It could mean the relief of some of our presently overburdened tax sources by substituting a national manufacturers sales tax. It should mean making sure that our total Federal revenue receipts would not be reduced below our expenditures, and that a balanced budget would be maintained.

Personally I am disappointed that our President and his financial advisers did not give some thought to these new sources of revenue instead of insisting upon the continuation of our present inequitable, unsound, unjust Federal tax program.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are various Members here who have read wires and letters from members of the National Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange to the effect that they favor cutting this program. If they really mean what they say and if they really want economy, I recommend that those who are complaining abstain from participating in the program, regardless of whether we reduce the authorization or appropriate the full amount. For your information, the Mississippi Farm Bureau does not recommend this reduction.

I am a member of the Farm Bureau Federation myself. It is my information that a great number of those farmers who are asking for a reduction in this program have been the heaviest participants since the beginning of the program. They have doubtless received the maximum benefits and their farms are in first-class condition. If they mean business, they will not request this help and the money which they normally receive will automatically be saved. If we appropriate the full amount, the same farmers who are advocating this reduction can merely stay out of the program and thereby practice economy. If this is done, we will not, in my humble opinion, even spend $100 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment.

After all this is only an announcement of the limit to which the Federal Government will help. Next year the Department will not do any of this nor spend any of this money, according to Secretary Benson, unless the farmer does twice as much on permanent-type practices.

We need more soil conservation; not less. We certainly do not wish the program to fail because we had the ceiling too low.

After all, we have been spending more than this on foreign countries. Agriculture is already reduced.

I do want to compliment this committee for its effort to provide for the REA, for rural telephone, Farmers' Home Administration, Forestry, Extension, and the many programs so essential to the welfare of our country. We need that. After all, in 1940 we were spending 14 percent of our civilian effort on our country. Now, exclusive of military, we are spending only a little more than 3 percent. We do not need to reduce that further. I say put first things first; cut down on other things which are up 139 percent; not on this Department which has already been reduced by more than 30 percent since 1940.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I shall vote for the pending amendment to reduce this item down to $140 million and thereby save the American taxpayers $55 million. I realize that is not much money to some people but it represents a lot of tax money down in the country I come from. The issue of whether you are for or against soil conservation is not involved here. I am wondering if there is any Member of this House who is opposed to the conservation of the soil. Some people are for soil conservation because they believe in it and some are for it because it is popular and some are for it because they think it is good politics. I am for it because I believe in it, and because I believe in it is one of the reasons why I am for this amendment.

I repeat that the issue of whether you are for or against soil conservation is not involved here. That talk is made purely as a smokescreen by some. Everyone that I know of wants to conserve the good earth. Everyone that I know of knows that civilizations have gone up and down with the fertility of the soil, with productive soil and nonproductive soil. So the argument by some that this amendment should be defeated and the amount left at $195 million in order to conserve the soil of America is utterly absurd. They could just as well say that if we do not vote for $300 million or $500 million we would be against soil conservation in this country.

The real issue in this vote is whether you are willing to provide Federal assistance in a reasonable amount for the progress of an orderly program. There was a good editorial in the Washington Post this morning on this subject. It contained this language:

> It has always seemed ridiculous to this newspaper for the Government to pay farmers for established conservation practices that would follow anyhow. This absurdity will be put to a vote in the House today in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill. Secretary Benson asked $140 million for the agricultural conservation program for 1954, some $110 million less than was in the Truman budget. But the House Appropriations Committee insisted on restoring $55 million. Thus there is the peculiar spectacle of the Secretary of Agriculture attempting to reduce expenses and a committee of Congress refusing to let him.
>
> The proposed reduction has nothing to do with the longer-lasting program of technical assistance conducted by the Soil Conservation Service or the educational activities of the Extension Service. The ACP pays farmers not only for permanent improvements such as erosion dams and terracing but also for such temporary measures as the sowing of green crops and the liming of fields. Whatever utility there may have been initially in paying farmers for protecting their soil fertility through temporary aids on a demonstration basis, these payments have now become nothing but gifts. • • •
>
> Interestingly enough, some of the strongest opponents of the cut have been the limestone producers. A letter from the National Agricultural Limestone Institute urges members to "fight fire with fire."

Mr. Chairman, I am sure every Member has been flooded, as I have been, with propaganda from the fertilizer and lime producers. We all know of the pressure they have attempted to exert in behalf of bigger appropriations for this purpose. The reason is obvious. The facts are that $44 million in ACP payments last year went for liming. That makes Uncle Sam their biggest and most lucrative customer. The Government has, in turn, furnished this

lime to farmers at a nominal charge—thus providing a very appetizing subsidy. As the Washington Post points out, it is certainly not the job of the agricultural conservation program to shield the lime industry from the need to solicit individual customers among farmers.

Let us face the facts and not let them be concealed behind the popular appeal for soil conservation. No one has a monopoly on devotion to the conservation of the soil. I yield to no one in that regard. But what are the facts here, facts that the opponents of this amendment dare not discuss? During the present fiscal year a total of $82 million was spent for lime, phosphate, and other minerals, to be applied as temporary stimulants to the soil. An additional $26 million was spent for green manure and cover crops—making a total of $108 million spent during the present fiscal year for this very useful but very temporary sort of assistance.

So, the real issue is not whether you are for or against soil conservation. The issue is whether you are for real soil conservation, practices which are permanent in their nature and which do not have to be repeated every year or so. If they have to be repeated every year or so, they are not basic conservation measures but are more in the nature of handouts, subsidies, gifts, which Uncle Sam sends out from year to year. Now, I am not for these temporary, makeshift outlays because they do not add to the permanent enrichment of the soil. They are the sort of practices that any progressive farmer would do anyhow. They are a part of any normal operation on a farm. They are about as essential as the planting of seed, the plowing of the sod. By fertilizing the yield is doubled in some instances. And the good farmer knows that. He is going to do it on his own just as he will buy his seed on his own. It is a part of his normal operations. It helps him from year to year. It does not help him permanently no more than planting his seed each year helps him permanently. It is a year-to-year operation, and those who think the average American farmer is not going to fertilize his soil where it is necessary simply underestimates the alertness and intelligence of the American farmer.

Yet, as I have pointed out, more than one-half of all ACP payments during the current fiscal year has been for these temporary, year-to-year practices which the average farmer would do without Government help or direction. Why not spend less on these temporary measures and spend more on the permanent sort of practices, the sort of practices which will preserve the soil, prevent its waste and erosion, and add to the permanent wealth of this Nation?

I sometimes wonder how a person sincerely interested in the soil of this country and its preservation, which I consider so vital to the future of this Nation, is willing to fritter so much away on temporary practices which are so far removed from permanent, established practices which should be employed in conservation of the soil.

I do want to compliment the committee which brought this bill in here. They did a good job. They reduced the total sum for this purpose substantially. And they arrived at what they call a compromise figure. That is well and good. But it is obvious that even more can be done without retarding in one small degree our great soil-conservation program. If the pending amendment is adopted, we should have more money for the proven, permanent practices, and less for the year-to-year, temporary, makeshift practices. So if you are sincerely for soil conservation, here is a good chance to vote against measures which do not actually add to the permanent retention and conservation of the soil.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I am old-fashioned enough to still believe that we should not spend money just because it will help some people who are on the receiving end. I represent a district that is agricultural. It is nonindustrial. Practically every landowner out there is a recipient of the ACP payments. They help pay the taxes and they accept these payments whether they are used for temporary or permanent improvements. Most of them apply the money for permanent practices. But they do not subscribe to the proposition that money should be spent for transitory, year-to-year purposes just because it may seem popular to do so. They think we should think of what is for the permanent good. And they are concerned, just as I am, about the size of the public debt and about the solvency of this Nation. Here is a chance to save the American taxpayers $55 million and everyone here knows down in his heart that it will not detract one small bit from the sound soil conservation practices, practices which we should encourage if we want to preserve and enrich the permanent top soil of this country.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I will put my economy record up against the record of any man or woman in this House, but I am going to support the committee because the committee has recommended the amount which I think is right and proper. It was a compromise between the $250 million originally requested and the $140 million in the revised budget and I think it was a very reasonable compromise. The members of that committee are men for whom I have the highest regard. They sat in hearing for weeks and weeks not only this year but for many past years. This bill year after year has been cut on an average to a greater percent over many past years than has any other departmental bill that has been brought to this floor and passed by this Congress.

I remember well in 1948 when the leaders of the Farm Bureau came out strong for the Aiken section of the Hope-Aiken farm bill, the sliding scale section. I remember in the election of 1948 what that Aiken section of the Hope-Aiken farm bill did to my party. Now we are being asked to step into the same trap by these same Farm Bureau leaders, who are now asking us to make the same mistake here today. A few years ago I voted for a $75 million amendment to reduce soil conservation payments. But that was when this program was not handled as it will be handled under the provisions of this bill because of the very fact that the committee has nailed down the payments for purely permanent practices or at least to semipermanent practices.

This is a bill for the benefit of all the American people. We have had 10 years of bumper crops, and the surpluses which we have of food and fiber are scarcely worthy of the name. One or two years of drought could cause food prices to increase 50 or even 100 percent, depending on the severity of the drought, unless we keep our land at a very high productive level, which commercial fertilizer will help do. And another thing, my colleagues, we cannot balance the budget without a high farm income which generates the national income. Make no mistake about that. The national income since we have mechanized the farm about 30 years ago has been almost exactly seven times the farm income.

Now I will read a letter and a statement from Mr. J. C. Holbert, president Iowa Meat Producers Association, which clearly explains the reason for the present condition of a segment of our farmers, and his recommendations for a solution of the problem, which make good sense to my way of thinking.

IOWA BEEF PRODUCER'S ASSOCIATION,
Washington, Iowa, May 14, 1953.

The Honorable BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am humbly submitting to you a paper expressing my opinions on the beef cattle industry and the causes which have brought about severe losses especially to the Corn Belt feeders.

There are a few points which are crystal clear:

1. Beef is cheaper in comparison to hourly wages than it has been in the last 50 years.

2. The operating expense of cattle feeders is as high today as it has ever been.

3. The bankers have become very strict on renewing loans as well as making new loans on cattle.

4. Beef cattle fit into soil-conservation programs better than any class of livestock.

5. The beef cattle industry has never cost the Government any subsidies. But the acts of the Government have cost your constituents, the Corn Belt feeders, thousands of dollars.

I have made a few suggestions in the enclosed paper with the approval of the officers and directors of the Iowa Beef Producer's Association. The association has waited, hoping that the Department of Agriculture would take some action of cooperation to help stabilize the market and to bring influence to narrow the great spread that has existed between live cattle and retail beef.

Now we are turning to you and asking for immediate cooperation. The facts still remain that Iowa markets more pounds of beef than any State in the Union. Livestock is the backbone of Iowa agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. HOLBERT,
President, Iowa Beef Producer's Association.

LEST WE FORGET

The average price of cattle sold for slaughter has suffered the severest drop in price the last 6 months ever recorded in the beef-cattle industry and the largest percentage drop of any major commodity either agricultural or manufactured. These are sweeping statements that can be substan-

tisted. The impact of the price break in cattle prices can best be understood if one thinks of the steel industry or labor taking 40-percent to 50-percent drop in less than 12 months.

WHY?

The reason for this drop in prices has been explained from many angles by commentators who live in New York City to swivel-chair experts. Recently I read an article in one of the leading business magazines with a national circulation and it claimed that the bust in the cattle industry is due mainly to a wild boom that came out of the southwest and spread across the country without any cause or reason. Little explanation was made as to why prices went down or the real cause of the upturn and downward trend in the cattle business. The main causes of the erratic swing in the beef business were not discussed.

Here are the causes for losses suffered by beef cattlemen, especially the cornbelt feeders, who have carried the brunt of the losses:

1. The Office of Price Stabilization.
2. The increased cattle population.
3. The drop in price of hides and tallow.
4. The drought.
5. Lower prices for pork, chickens, and turkeys.

LIVE CATTLE DOWN—RETAIL MEAT UP

Let us look first at the effect of the Office of Price Stabilization. Someone would say, "Let sleeping dogs lie," but let us put the blame where it belongs, lest we forget. The cattlemen fought controls from the beginning but controls were clamped on the cattle industry more severely than any other industry in the country. There has never been a parallel to it. The rollback order on live cattle from $3.50 to $4 a hundred pounds in May 1951 was the rankest infringment on private liberty and private property ever enacted in the history of the country and that loss was suffered by Corn Belt feeders and Corn Belt feeders alone. Two weeks later the Office of Price Stabilization set the price of retail beef and at least 9 out of every 10 retail stores in this country charged the consumer more for beef than they were charging before the price of cattle was rolled back to the farmer. Who got the difference? The Office of Price Stabilization never explained. Not the producer, not the consumer. There is no argument here. This is not an opinion. This is history spelled out in print and in figures.

MOVEMENT OF FEEDER CATTLE DISRUPTED

Along with the beef cattle rollback order in May came a threat from the Office of Price Stabilization to rollback the price of slaughter cattle again August 1, 1951, and again October 1, 1951. The last two rollbacks were defeated by Congress but look what happened to the shipments of cattle from the West into the Corn Belt from April until August. They dropped to an alltime low. Corn Belt feeders naturally could not buy while looking into a threat from the Government of a rollback of prices in August and again in October. A strong demand for feeders was built up and when Congress defeated the rollbacks there was a great rush to buy replacement cattle. Prices of feeder cattle leaped to an alltime high. Again the Corn Belt feeder was caught in the squeeze and paid at least three to four dollars a hundred more for feeder cattle than he would have paid if the Government had left controls out of the picture. The western cattleman gained at this point and the Corn Belt feeder took the shellacking.

GOVERNMENT FAILS TO LOWER WHOLESALE AND RETAIL CEILING

In January 1952, less than 9 months after controls were put on, the price of many grades of slaughter cattle broke below ceiling and continued below ceiling. In the fall of 1952 slaughter cattle broke all the way from 4 to 10 dollars below ceiling but according to the regulations the packers were still entitled to sell at ceiling prices as well as the retailers. Then in November and December 1952, packers began to drop wholesale prices to quite a degree but retail prices stayed up because the meat dealers were entitled to get OPS ceiling and when the housewife said beef was high all they had to do was point to the chart. The retail dealers were selling at ceiling or a cent or two below. This is not criticizing the retail dealer. This is criticizing the system of price control and the harmful effect which it has on the producer and the consumer. If wholesale and retail prices had dropped in comparison with live-cattle prices the consumption of beef would have been increased in the fall of 1952 which would have helped cut down the supply in the spring of 1953. It has been estimated that retail prices up to January 1, 1952, dropped 3 to 5 percent while live-cattle prices dropped 20 to 30 percent.

PROTEIN FEED

Let us look at another effect the regulations from the Office of Price Stabilization had upon cattle feeders. They placed a ceiling on protein supplements such as cottonseed meal, linseed oil meal, and soybean meal. Prices raised overnight from $8 to $10 a ton and the cattle feeders were practically closed out of the market. They couldn't buy a ton of straight protein supplement unless they had a particulary good stand-in with their feed dealer. The large commercial mixed-feed dealers bought up the supply because there was no ceiling on mixed feed and they could mix other ingredients with the protein supplement and resell it to farmers without control of prices. Again, I do not blame the commercial feed manufacturers, but I blame the regulations which create such conditions. The cattle feeder was forced to buy commercial feeds whether he wanted to or not in order to get protein supplement. This certainly ran up the price of protein feed to the cattlemen everywhere and again the Corn Belt feeder paid the biggest penalty because he was the largest user.

FEDERAL GRADING

Another act of the Office of Price Stabilization which was very harmful to the slaughter-cattle industry was compulsory grading by Federal graders. This was especially harmful from October 1, 1952, until the controls were discontinued. The grading of beef was so poorly done that one wonders whether it was lack of knowledge or what? When experts could hardly tell the difference between carcasses, and definitely no consumers could with their eyes on the platter, yet by dropping the grade from prime to choice or from choice to good it made a difference in price of an individual carcass of thirty to fifty dollars. I say let's repeat, lest we forget, the direct effect of these controls upon the men who feed cattle.

CATTLE NUMBERS

The second largest factor in the drop of cattle prices is due to the increase in cattle population. The increase of cattle numbers was stimulated by Government regulation and also by the Government demand for greater production. Furthermore, it is definitely true that cattlemen increase their numbers when prices are high. Cattle were showing a profit and there was a tendency for new people, even people not directly connected with farming, to become interested and engage in the cattle business. Also there was tendency on the part of the permanent cattlemen to increase their herds. The country as a whole from 1940 to 1952 enjoyed good crops and pastures, the weather was favorable, there was no major drought and no major setback in prices. The price trend was upward. Income taxes were high and there was a tendency on the part of many, especially the western ranchers, to hold back their heifers and as long as a cow was producing a calf that would bring $100 to $200 per head there was no point in selling old cows. Therefore, we faced a steady rise which culminated in 1951 and 1952. The cattle increase is not unsound in itself. It is fundamentally sound because our population is increasing and cattlemen want to produce an abundance because in this system and in this system alone is a permanent market for any food product. But products manufactured, yes even labor, must come under the same standards if this abundance is to be had by all.

HIDES AND TALLOW

The third factor which has affected the beef cattle market is the severe drop in the price of hides and tallow. It is estimated that if the price of tallow and hides was at the same level as it was in May 1951 when the Government put cattle under price control, the packer could pay $1.25 to $1.50 per hundred more for live cattle. The price of hides is a beautiful example of how the producer is suffering a severe drop, a drop of 50 percent, while the price of shoes to the consumer is as high today as ever.

DROUGHT

The drought, especially in the Southwest, in the opinion of many, has been a factor affecting the cattle market. It is the opinion of the writer that this has been overemphasized. The drought affected individuals and even sections, and increased the carrying cost of many cattle but it did not have a marked effect upon the overall price level. It has caused a shifting of cattle from one locality to another but it has not decreased the cattle population to any marked degree.

COMPETITION

The last major factor affecting the price of cattle was the continued pressure of other meats. The great increase of poultry, both chickens and turkeys, and the large surplus of hogs forced beef down from an all-time high to meet the competition. Restaurant, hotel, and night-club trade, recognizing the fact that the public was being told by Government officials, newspapers, radio commentators, even radio comedians and politicians, that beef was high, took advantage of the fact and quoted beef high in most cases served it a la carte. For example, in the Stockyards Inn, the hotel connected with the Union Stockyards, during the International Livestock Show in 1952, roast beef was quoted at $4.50 a serving and a steak at $5 when cattle were selling in the yards a hundred yards away for 20 to 30 percent less than the year before. Of course, such prices prevailed in other hotels, restaurants, and dining cars wherever one went.

In conclusion, we repeat, that the cattleman, especially the Corn-Belt feeder, has paid a costly price because of Government regulations. Cattlemen have never had Government subsidies and even in our severe loss at the present time, we are not asking for and we do not want the Government in our business. But since the Government, through the Office of Price Stabilization and through other Government programs has created an abnormal condition in the beef industry, the Iowa Beef Producer's Association recommends that the following steps should be taken for the benefit of the cattle industry:

1. The Department of Agriculture should do whatever it can to publicize the use of beef and collect data giving wide publicity to the price of live cattle as compared with the price of retail beef.

2. The Government should establish long-term credit at a reasonable rate of interest to cattle producers and feeders or lend influence to such a measure. Not loose credit but long-term credit. This is recommended especially for the purchase of breeding cattle and light calves.

3. The Government should restrict the importation of live cattle as well as dressed beef from both Mexico and Canada for a period of at least 12 months. Some will say this

cannot be done. But why can't it? The Government restricts other imports.

4. The Government should buy domestic beef for our Armed Forces both at home and abroad, not for a short period but permanently. This includes canned beef. The Department of Agriculture should not talk about this, it should insist that it be done.

5. The Iowa Beef Producer's Association would like to encourage the American meat packers to discontinue the feeding of cattle. We recognize that it is within their right and we would be against any Government regulation to restrict this right. But we are asking it from the standpoint of cooperation as a member of the meat team, because large numbers of cattle fed by the processor can, on a given day or a given week, be a bearish factor upon the market.

The above suggestions could be enough to stabilize the market so that cattle feeders would have time to adjust their program. We are ready to take our chances, if the Government will give us no more regulations in the future, to meet competition from other food products. But this break has been so fast and so severe that cattlemen need cooperation now, not 6 months or a year from now. Let it be emphasized—we are asking for cooperation from the Government, from the packer, the retail dealer, and the banker, but not for a handout.

J. C. HOLBERT,
President, Iowa Beef Producer's Association, Washington, Iowa.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not come to some agreement on the limitation of time. We have been running for an hour and a half and, I believe, we should be able to come to an agreement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Could we agree on 50 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state that 17 Members are on their feet who evidently would want time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, some Members have suggested that we go on a little while longer.

Mr. TABER. It would seem like we should conclude this in 1 hour.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto——

Mr. WHITTEN. There may be some other amendments.

Mr. TABER. In this amendment and all amendments thereto—I did not say the paragraph—just this amendment and all amendments thereto, close in 1 hour.

Mr. POLK. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment that I wish to offer.

Mr. TABER. Is it an amendment to the pending amendment?

Mr. POLK. No.

Mr. TABER. Then this would not affect that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time yielded to me may be yielded to the gentleman from North Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time that I have disagreed with the orthodox Republican organization of this House.

I was charged in the last campaign with voting with the Democrats 50 percent of the time. I answered that charge in one of our biggest cities. I hoped that they did not see fit to lie about me. In a campaign such as we had there was no use lying about candidates. I said, "The thing they said about me is wrong. I never voted with the Democrats 50 percent of the time. I voted with them 60 percent of the time." I always dislike to vote with the Democrats, but whenever they are right I have got to do it.

I was a good friend of the late President Roosevelt long before he was President of the United States, long before he was Governor of New York. The third time he ran for the Presidency I was down there to see him on some irrigation matter, and he said to me, "What do you think of my chances of winning a third time?" I said, "What makes you think you could win?" He said, "I will tell you. I can always depend upon the stupidity of the Republican Party."

Now, if you want to legislate yourselves right out of control of this House, you get in here and oppose soil conservation. I would not be alarmed about the Farm Bureau Federation, because I know all about them. I was there when they were first organized. They were organized by the banks, the insurance companies, the railroads, and the chambers of commerce to keep the farmers quiet. I ought to know, because I was the first president of the Farm Bureau Federation in North Dakota, and remained so until I found out what it was and until the membership found out what I was.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Did the gentleman get into that office through the banks?

Mr. BURDICK. At that time I could not qualify at the banks.

(By unanimous consent Mr. COOLEY and Mr. EDMONDSON yielded their time to Mr. BURDICK.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. That is more time than I usually get. I had 2 minutes one time and Knutson, of Minnesota, took a minute and a half, and I had half a minute left. That was when I made the remark:

Gentlemen, if you do not see me down here in the well of the House in the next 12 months I take this occasion to wish you a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

But I will say in fairness to the Farm Bureau of North Dakota that I do not see any telegrams here expressing their opposition to this matter, and we do not need soil conservation nearly as much as you do in the South and the East, because ours is a new country. When I see farmers coming on the floor of the House giving their opinion, scientific opinion about what the farmer should have, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who could not tell a combine from an airplane—I do not feel any resentment against the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] because I think he is to be congratulated for scanning all these items of expense. But if you were here a year ago and heard the Speaker of the House at that time [Mr. RAYBURN] tell us something about conservation of the soil and what it means to this great Nation, you would have a different opinion than you have expressed here in the last few minutes, especially with the kind of world disturbance now prevailing, when everybody ought to know that the last loaf of bread won every war in the history of the world; not a single war has escaped. We speak about overcoming the South in the War Between the States; we did nothing of the kind, they starved out.

I think the greatest defense any country can have—and God knows I want to defend this country—our greatest defense is in our soil and our ability to cultivate it. Do not get excited about surpluses in wheat, in cotton, or any other product; it is a healthy sign that we have surpluses. Maybe next year we will not have as much, and here at this particular time we are spending $135 million every day in our war effort, or a billion a month. Now, you figure that up and by just taking 10 hours of that time to build up this soil to the extent that we think it ought to be built up we are preserving our wealth. We have no asset in this country that can be compared to the soil because we live from that soil. Why is discontent in Europe so prevalent? It is because the people are fighting for soil, because they know that on soil they can live. I think it is a short-sighted policy for anyone in this House to object to liberal funds, insignificant in comparison with other expenditures, to preserve the soil of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Mr. POLK was given to Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, the item now before us affects every man, woman, and child in these United States. If we preserve our soil, if we maintain the fertility of our soil, it means that we will have good living for our men, women, and children in this generation and in generations to come. If we use a short-sighted policy of failing to take care of our soil it means that we will put our country in an impoverished position similar to that which caused great civilizations to fall by the wayside in the past. It is important that we conserve our soil.

There is one point that should be made very clear this afternoon, and that is that every cent appropriated in this bill will still not be sufficient to maintain the fertility of our soil at the rate we ought to maintain it and that we need to maintain it. It seems strange to me that when we have an organization, such as our Department of Agriculture, that has so much to do with the living of the people of this country, that has so much to do with whether we balance the budget and pay our bills.

We are going to need to maintain this country strong. If we maintain this country strong it means we must have

jobs for our workers. We must have raw materials for our industry. It means that we must have food in order to live. The amount in this bill is far too little as to what we ought to be spending and what we ought to be doing to keep our country in a strong, solvent position.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In times of adversity, does not the gentleman agree that is a poor time to throw the burden of conservation on the farmers?

Mr. MARSHALL. Certainly. We can look at the country and see what has happened in times of adversity. We know one of the first things the farmers do is to cut down expenses, which is one of the very things that gets us into trouble. I saw a field during the last depression which was improperly farmed, where the wind took off every bit of the dirt on that field down to the furrow bottom. Why? Because the farmer who farmed that land was unable to carry out on that land the conservation practices that ought to be carried out and need to be carried out. It is important that we do these things.

We do not have to leave the city of Washington to appreciate this. We can just cross the Potomac River. We have read in history of the beautiful Potomac River. I crossed that river this morning, I looked down there, and it was as muddy as I have ever seen the Missouri River. Where did that soil come from? It came from fields that have been exposed. How are you going to correct that situation? You are going to correct that situation by putting on to those fields the crop that prevents the soil from eroding. How are you going to do that? You are going to plant grass and legumes. To get grass and legumes to protect that land you are going to have to put on that land some lime. We live in a little house in Alexandria, Va. We could not get clover started on our lawn. Mrs. Marshall persisted that I get some lime and put some lime on that lot. Now we have a beautiful stand of clover. That is what conservation of soil does.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I do not come from Missouri; I come from Kansas, but I have come to present to you in a very vivid way what the Missourians always demand, and that is that you show them.

I have before you here a demonstration of exactly what is happening over the great Middle West that is producing the food for this Nation. I have here prepared for me a profile of soil that was taken from two adjoining fields only a few rods apart. The one was taken from a field of grass that had never been broken. It shows the amount of the original top fertile soil that was on this field when this State was first settled. The other shows a sample of soil that was taken from an adjoining field that had been continuously cropped and neglected. It is a vivid picture of what is happening.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity of appearing before you to present my views upon what I consider one of the most important problems that confronts the people of this Nation, that of soil and water conservation. By the term "conservation," as I shall here use it, I shall refer to the practical use of rainfall that is needed and the minimizing of any damage that may result from excessive amounts. As applied to the land, I shall refer to any practical measure to save the soil, such as terraces, waterways, and drop inlets.

I should like to make some fundamental statements upon which I am sure we can all agree and from which we may arrive at conclusions of unquestionable certainty.

The few inches of topsoil on about one-eighth of the surface of the earth, aside from the limited amount of seafood available, is the sole source of plant and animal life. This fertile soil was thousands of years in formation through the agencies of air, sunlight, and water upon plant life. This soil is held upon the earth, resisting wind and water erosion, only by vegetation, mostly trees and grasses. Following the destruction of forests and grass, the soil will shortly be washed into the sea unless measures are taken to prevent it.

The invention of modern tools and machinery has made possible the turning of the sod and cutting of the forests at a rate and to an extent never before possible in the history of the human race.

The American people have taken advantage of this situation to such a degree that our soil has been exposed and eroded to a serious extent, so serious that had it not been that this continent had never before been exploited by any race capable of turning the soil, we would even now be in a serious situation as regards supply of food, shelter, and raiment. In other words, had it not been for its superabundance, there would even now be little soil left in this country.

I used the word destruction of the soil for the reason that once the soil particles, exposed to the impact of raindrops falling at the speed of four meters per second, have been torn apart and floated off the fields into the ditches skirting the streams, they are practically lost, not only to that field but to all the earth so far as mankind is concerned. They may float out upon overflow land where they are often more a nuisance than a benefit, but, in the main, wherever they may lodge they are useless.

The great problem then is how to conduct necessary farming operations, which entails exposing the soil to the dangers of erosion with the least possible risk.

It has now been narrowed down to the question of the best method of controlling the rain as it falls upon the earth. It would seem to be sensible to begin the solution of the problem where the danger begins, namely where the rain falls. In trying to solve this problem, we must bear in mind that the power behind the raindrops is the pull of gravity toward the center of the earth. We have no control until the rain strikes the soil and begins its journey by the steepest route and consequently the swiftest pace toward the sea whence it came. Here is where the wisdom and ingenuity of man must come into play. We long since learned that the carrying capacity of running water is in direct proportion to the speed of its flow. Our problem then is to slow down the speed. We must make it walk around the hill instead of run down the hill. With modern machinery this can be swiftly and effectively accomplished by terracing the land. This the farmers, with some government aid, are doing at a rapidly increasing rate.

These terraces lead into prepared waterways which carry the water to a lower level. These, too, the farmer has prepared with some Government assistance. In most cases there comes a situation when the water must be conducted to a still lower level. Here it must be conducted through a tube or prepared channel. This is an added expense but absolutely essential to prevent forming a ditch in the waterway. In this also there has been some Government assistance.

You will observe, members of the committee, that I have made mention of the fact of governmental assistance in soil conservation practices on privately owned land. This practice, in my mind, has been fully justified on two different grounds. First, the general public, under the prodding of leading agriculturists and conservationists for several decades, was finally made aware of the danger confronting the country and insisted that something be done. Secondly, the operators on the land were, and still are, to a great extent, either renters or land owners carrying a burden of debt. In either case, they are not in a position to put out money for soil conservation practices. In many instances it is a matter of governmental participation or no soil conservation practices. There can be no doubt that Federal assistance has greatly accelerated soil conservation practices. I can conceive of no circumstances under which such contribution would be more justified.

We now have the excess of water, that the field upon which it fell could not absorb, in its natural channel and, after much delay, on its way to the sea; again by the shortest, swiftest route. We have prevented the first and greatest damage resulting from excessive rainfall, the carrying away of the soil.

Up to this point we have not averted that other damage incident to heavy rainfall, the danger of flooding of the river plains below. Fortunately modern earth-moving machinery has made this quickly and easily possible. It is necessary only for competent engineers to determine suitable situations for detention dams, to figure the amount of water that can be temporarily impounded with a given height and the size of the outlet to control the flow so that there can be no overflow of the natural channel below. Nothing could be simpler. It is purely a problem in arithmetic in the hands of men trained to do the work. It is doing on the upland, and before the water has accumulated unlimited power in the river channel,

what, through the years, has been attempted on the river channel. It is meeting the enemy when his forces are dispersed rather than when they are concentrated, just as any good general would do. It is meeting danger at its source. It is putting first things first. Metaphorically speaking, it is carrying the war to Carthage—Carthage being the source of danger.

This system, I submit to you, is mathematically sound. Excepting in cases of such unusual conditions as not to be foreseen or guarded against, it must be effective. It is not designed to control floods. It is designed to prevent floods. It has been tried out on a small watershed in Oklahoma where it proved 100 percent effective. If it will work on one watershed, it will work on all watersheds. With variations in detail, the problems are identical and the results must be the same. If the small streams are not permitted to overflow, the larger ones cannot overflow. If tributaries do not overflow, the rivers cannot overflow. This plan is in fact an application of an old plan applied in a new and more effective way in a different locale.

This solution of man's greatest problems, the saving of the soil and prevention of floods by one integrated program, is so simple as to be almost incredible. We are tempted to ask ourselves why it was not thought of before so much damage was done. The answer is that it is only in the last few years that machinery has been developed that makes such a gigantic undertaking possible. We now have the know-how and the means. It is only a matter of application of up-to-date knowledge and methods. We do not travel as we did 50 years ago. We do not farm as we did 50 years ago. We do not conduct wars as we did 50 or even 10 years ago. Why should we endeavor to prevent floods in the manner of 50 or even 25 years ago?

Our Nation prides itself on being up to date. Then why use antiquated methods in control of water? Big dams on river channels, in mountain regions, or in areas of waste or desert land, if needed have their place; but in rich agricultural areas where they unnecessarily flood thousands of acres of the best land in the Nation, they are outdated and out of place.

Honorable members of the Committee, I am sure you realize the seriousness of the problem under discussion and that it would be unwise to cut appropriations to a degree to impair progress in a sound soil-conservation and flood-prevention program. Money spent to prevent the irreparable loss of our soil will be returned in annual dividends to our children and grandchildren as long as this Nation may endure. The better the land we leave to our children, the longer this Nation will endure.

There is one further consideration: Sometime, may we hope not too far off, peace will return to the world. When that time comes, hundreds of thousands of young men will be leaving defense plants, hundreds of thousands of soldiers will be donning civilian clothes. All will be looking for jobs. If we will get this soil-conservation program away to a good start, and this year 1953 is none too soon, will not an enlarged program of soil conservation and flood prevention be a great shock absorber against unemployment and depression?

In conclusion, I am sure you will realize that the incontrovertible argument that I have set forth in opposition to big dams on river channels for the sole purpose of flood control applies with particular force to the proposed Tuttle Creek Dam on the Blue River in Kansas. This dam will cause the periodic inundation of more than 50,000 acres of the most productive land in the United States. Its construction became the major issue in the First District. I was the first Democrat ever to be elected from that district, which is normally nearly 2 to 1 Republican. The fact that both branches of the Kansas Legislature memorialized Congress not to appropriate funds for the construction of this dam shows where the people of Kansas stand on this issue. The further fact that the Bureau of the Budget has denied funds for its construction shows where this administration stands.

I shall be glad to endeavor to answer any questions relative to this subject, which I still believe to be the most serious problem confronting the Nation—that of soil and water conservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Rather than having a reduction, we should be here asking for an increase of this money for this soil-conservation program. In my opinion it would not be economy at all to reduce the amount; in fact, it would be the most reckless kind of waste not to support this program for soil conservation work in this country. It would not be economy to permit this program to go backwards instead of forward. Most of the farmers in my district in Minnesota, both large and small, support the soil-conservation program. They want to see it continued and expanded and developed more efficiently and more effectively. We have some of the finest soil in the world in the great Red River of the North Valley of Minnesota and North Dakota. We want to keep our soil good; we want to conserve it and improve it. Individual farmers come and go, but the soil continues on and on. As a national asset its fertility is important to the whole country, the people of all the cities, towns, villages, and rural areas of our country. These payments assist in a long-range permanent farm-soil conservation program. These conservation payments are not a subsidy, but payments for soil conservation for the benefit of all the country. It is a good, sound investment in our national welfare, and so it is recognized by our great leaders. One of these is our President in the White House, the leader of the Republican Party, you might say, who also is a supporter of a full soil-conservation program.

For the benefit of the membership I would like to read what President Eisenhower directly and straightforwardly said about the subject of soil conservation:

> I am a zealous believer in conservation, both as a national policy and a personal creed.
>
> To build a strong, secure United States, we must save our soil and improve our soil. We aren't now doing the job fast enough or well enough.
>
> I strongly favor farmer-managed soil-conservation districts, with the Soil Conservation Service and other public agencies giving such help as farmers request.
>
> I firmly believe that farmers should receive aid from the Nation in maintaining our basic resources. But, as soon as it can be done, such aid should be used to promote permanent and effective practices.

So there we see our leader in the White House, the leader of our country, and a great leader he is, supporting this program for a sound, permanent, more effective and more expanded soil-conservation program.

I urge you to defeat the amendment and go along with the committee on the amount originally requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BURDICK] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] had the perspicacity to put their finger on the political implications of this thing. I would just like to quiet the fears of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] about taxes. I listened to the President's speech last night. I also listened to the general last fall when he promised to reduce taxes. Now he says he cannot do so. But for the fears of those who are worrying about taxes, may I say that the taxes of the farmer have been reduced, although the President forgot to take any credit for it last night. Farm income is down since 1951 over 15 percent and farm costs are up over 1.5 percent, making a net loss of 16.5 percent in farm income; and with less income the farmer is going to pay less taxes. If the present policies are continued the farmer may not even have to pay any taxes as his income continues to go down.

I am for soil conservation. I think it is imperative to the welfare of the country, as has been said many times here this afternoon, that we protect our soil not for the present generation but for those who are to come in the years afterward.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the House that I am not going to talk on the farm problem, because I do not feel that I am qualified to discuss the farm situation. However, I do want to say that I consider the farmers of this country as patriotic as any other group of citizens. I am convinced they want to do their part in efforts to balance the budget and to bring about tax relief to all the people, including themselves.

I do know this: This country has a patient that is very, very sick. That patient is Uncle Sam. This illness affects every segment of our society—farmers, laborers, and everyone else. We must do something to make Uncle Sam a healthy man.

Do you want to know how sick he is? About 30 days ago the Treasury Department sold an issue of $1 billion worth of 3¼-percent bonds. That issue was oversubscribed 7 times. In 30 days' time those bonds had dropped 10 percent, to almost 90. They are quoted at 90 and a fraction today.

If we increase these appropriations as they come to the floor of the House there is not a Member of this body that can stand up and say someone else is responsible for not balancing the budget. The responsibility will be ours in this House. If we keep increasing appropriations over the revised budget and the requests of the President and the department heads, then Congress will be responsible for not balancing the budget and not giving the taxpayers relief.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING] to reduce the amount requested from $195 million to $140 million should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my good friend who just left the well of the House, and who came to the Congress at the same time I did in 1943, that I, too, appreciate the fact that there is a sick man in the world and that man is Uncle Sam. His illness may largely be attributed to his indebtedness. But I would like to remind him and some of my other friends, who are really not friends of this program, that this committee has already reduced this particular item under the authorization of last year by 22 percent. Is that not a substantial reduction? Is it not a reasonable cut? Why reduce it more? Without voting for the pending amendment you can truthfully tell your people that you voted for economy and by supporting the position of the committee you favored a 22 percent cut. If you want to take the responsibility of reducing it 44 percent, as the amendment does, then I do not think we will be seeing many of you who so vote back in the next Congress.

I am speaking with some knowledge and memory of what happened in 1947 and 1948. Now far be it from me to hand out any political advice to my Republican friends. Our Republican colleagues the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] have already done that. I remember what happened in the 80th Congress when the agricultural appropriation bill was brought here. You Republicans reduced rural electrification most unreasonably. You attempted to cut the heart out of the PMA program just as you are trying to do today. You applied the same meat ax to other farm programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, after that appropriation bill passed and the word leaked back to the Middle West and the Far West, what happened? How many of you remember? When election time came around, they left many Republicans at home. Now do you want to go back again and tell them that you cut agricultural conservation practices by 44 percent? Will you not be satisfied to go back and stand on the cut of 22 percent made by the committee? Certainly no one could contend that that is not a substantial cut. I think such a cut is fair and, in view of the economic strain in which we find ourselves, that it will be gladly accepted by farm people everywhere.

How many other items have been cut 22 percent? In this and other appropriation bills? Why, if all other items were so reduced, we would end the year with a surplus in the Federal Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Did they cut the United Nations appropriation?

Mr. ABERNETHY. The United Nations? No; not to such an extent. It is primarily for somebody else on the other side of the world. We could not afford to cut that item that much. Oh, no. We just cut ourselves. Sometimes we are so foolish.

Some of you are using the Farm Bureau as your authority to reduce this item. Let me tell you something. The Farm Bureau is all right. I am for it. I am a member of it. But its national officers who send you these telegrams are not speaking for the majority of its members. The average member of the Farm Bureau will not support the position of those of you who support the King amendment today. They will not support it or you. Allen Kline, president of American Farm Bureau, might, and perhaps some of the others who make up the official board of the Farm Bureau. Yes, they might; but the man who actually lives on the farm, the man who actually digs his living out of the soil, and who actually produces your food will not go along with you. You will be repeating what happened in the 80th Congress if you go along with this King amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I would like to verify what the gentleman is saying. I am a member of the Farm Bureau, and what the gentleman is saying is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman and again urge you to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. LYLE and Mr. LONG was granted to Mr. RAYBURN.)

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, since my devoted friend from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] has so generously referred to my remarks of a year ago, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege of inserting those remarks with the remarks that I intend to make today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I think we are touching the most important subject and the greatest problem that faces the people of the United States today. In my opinion, the major domestic problem that we have to face, as I said a year ago, is what are we going to do with this soil? What are we going to do for and with this good earth upon which we live and which has sustained us so long? Soil waste is world-wide, and there has never been a nation upon the face of the earth that passed out of existence but what could have been saved had it not been for the depletion and waste of its soil.

Take some of the countries of the old world, where they had lavish and productive lands. Today they have to buy what they eat and wear from other sections of the earth. It might not be amiss to review a little history about this farm question.

I repeat, 1932 the total net income of all farmers of the United States was $1,800,000,000. Programs began to work. Soil was conserved. It was made more productive. Of course prices rose. Nineteen years after that the net income of the farmers of the United States was $17 billion instead of $1,800,000,000. Do you think that they paid some taxes on that $17 billion? Do you think $195 million would cover anything like the taxes they paid on the net income of $17 billion? Yet some people stood on this floor and fought every program, as they fight this soil-conservation program today. If we keep on, even in the next 25 years we will see our soil blow away, wash into the rivers and into the seas, and we will be looking forward to recovering some land that is now in weeds and willows; building dams, in order that we may retrieve these fertile valleys and make the things that clothe and feed not only us but many people throughout the length and breadth of the earth. We must have a surplus. Money does not cross the ocean to balance trade between country and country. You have no trade with any country where you do not trade goods for goods. We need surpluses. We need big surpluses of everything, because this earth goes on its back and its belly. That is true in peacetime, and it is especially true in times of great emergency, and you cannot defeat a country that has a surplus of food and raiment; certainly not by a country that does not have a plentiful supply of food and raiment.

Some of these places where they have these big ranches, where they have already dug their ponds, where they have dug out the trees, of course do not need soil conservation, because they already have it. But in the region of the country of the small farmers, the man with 100 acres or 150 acres, where they are trying to build up their soil, where if he farms 150 acres he is putting 50 acres

each year to soil building, grasses, and clovers, where he can make more, with less labor, he must have this assistance.

Wages on the farm have not gone down; they have gone up. They will not go down this year, so the man has got to make more on the same on fewer acres if he is going to stay in the farming business.

I live in the rich alluvial black land belt of north Texas, part of which was rolling alluvial sand. I can remember when there was not a beef cow in the county in which I live, only a few milk cows. Today east Texas has more cattle than west Texas. Why? The soil has eroded until it could not be farmed, it had to go back to grass. That today is a great problem.

Mr. Chairman, if I know anything I know the land. I have lived on it all my life. I have lived on a farm all of my life. I live in what was at one time probably as fertile a part of the United States as exists. That is the black-land belt of north Texas.

For hundreds of years grasses grew on those prairies. They fell back and built it up into rich vegetable-fed soil. It is alluvial. It is underlaid with white rock. In the early days the white rock came to the top of the ground in only a few places, and in other places it is 40 feet deep. The soil is the same color all the way down. It is a level country, slightly rolling. We thought for many years that it could not be worn or starved or destroyed, but now you drive along, and you see that fertile land gutted with ditches. In many places it has been plowed and plowed and wasted into the creeks and the rivers, until that white rock is on top now with little or no soil in many fields that once were fertile.

To me, these amendments to reduce the Government's effort to save our soil are amazing. I thought we had argued this question of soil conservation long enough. I thought a vast majority of the people who constitute this House and a great majority of the people of the United States had come to the conclusion, as I have, that the major domestic problem we have in America today is what we are going to do with this soil. Are we going to preserve it? Are we going to transmit it to the generations that are to come?

Within a few years there will be 250 million eaters and wearers in the United States of America. If we are the same kind of vandals in destroying the fertility of our soil for even the next 25 years that we have been during the last 50, we will not be looking for places in other lands to sell a farm surplus. We will be looking for some fertile valley which is now in weeds, in willows, and elms, and under water, to retrieve, to make the things that even the people of the United States must have for a decent living.

And I want to say to you gentlemen from the cities, I know you feel like you have been a little roughly treated about housing and other things, but one mistake does not justify another.

Wages and salaries: $28,800,000,000 in 1933; $169,400,000,000 in 1951.

This thing of preventing soil erosion—soil waste—is worth while. Soil waste and soil erosion is the reason why governments throughout the length and breadth of the earth are not stable because their people do not have enough to eat, enough to wear, and their factories amount to practically nothing.

Let me repeat, if we waste this dirt, if we let it go into the creeks, into the rivers, and to the sea, if we let it wash away and blow away, the economy of this country will be wrecked, and it will not recover from that wreck, because the fundamental, the basic wealth of this country is in the soil, and when it is wasted then our prosperity and our national wealth and national income—our whole economy—goes down and it will not rise again. Should we not, therefore, encourage the people who own the land to terrace it—to keep it from washing away; encourage them to put back into the soil that vegetable matter that had been fed to it for thousands of years while it was being built up?

Some people say that the farmers do not want this. That is not so 100 percent in my section of the country. If a farmer does not want to use this there is nothing to force him to. Let him be responsible if his soil does not have fertility reestablished where it has been allowed to blow and wash away. Let him take that responsibility.

My brothers and I own some acres of pastureland and farmland that are becoming richer every year. We do not overgraze because that brings weeds instead of grass. Every acre that we have is well terraced at our own expense. Some of our neighbors cannot do that. We set aside at least one-third of our cropland each year to put vegetable matter back into it. We feel that we are only tenants for a short time on that dirt, that we owe it to this generation and those who come after us to leave that soil as fertile as we found it, not to deny the people of the next generation or generations for a hundred years in the future the right to have soil that will feed and clothe the millions of people that will inhabit this country in those years to come.

You better think of that. We are all in this thing together, including the defense of our country from every angle. One of the greatest defense measures that we can have is to have a sufficient supply of raw material at hand so that we will not be dependent if submarines sweep the ships from the seas and we have to draw from within ourselves as far as the seas are concerned.

Let us not make this terrible mistake of cutting down this appropriation to save our soil. Let us do the things that will preserve our greatest wealth, which is the good earth upon which we live.

If our soil is not fertile enough, if the 30 million people who live upon the farms of the country today do not have dirt on which they can raise a crop and a price to sell it at to give them a buying power, your people will be walking the streets, because your factories will be closed.

When you deny to the thirty-odd-million people in the United States of America the right to farm fertile dirt and make an income, you deny prosperity to all sections of the people of the United States of America.

I think every one of these amendments should be voted down.

What do we mean?

If it were not for this dirt there would be no Washington City, there would be no New York or Boston or Chicago, there would be no great factories with smoke rising from their chimneys, factories employing at good wages millions of American citizens; we would not have a national income of more than $276 billion a year.

Consider the time when the farmer was selling the product of his labor at a price far below the cost of production. There were 14 million unemployed people in the United States. And if the breadwinner of the family had a wife and only one child, that means 42 million people in the United States had no buying power at all because they had nothing with which to buy. Add to that the thirty-odd million people on the farms who were selling the product of their labor at a price so far below the cost of production that their buying power had vanished, and we had 75 million people in the United States who had no buying power, or whose buying power had been reduced to the very vanishing point. Is it any wonder, then, that factories closed, that banks broke, and turned other people out without employment, without buying power?

I ask those who want to cut down this program if they have forgotten those dark days of 1932 when the total net income of all farms in the United States was only $1,800,000,000?

Do you need to be reminded that under our farm program, fashioned through the last 20 years, our farmers' net income has reached $17 billion? And the gross farm income jumped from $6,400,000,000 in the dark depression days to $37,400,000,000 last year?

While the farmer's prosperity grew, look what happened to the rest of the economy:

Total production of all goods and services: $55,760,000,000 in 1933; $327,800,000,000 in 1951.

National income: $39,600,000,000 in 1933; $276 billion in 1951.

All bank deposits, $51 billion in 1935; $171,900,000,000 in 1951.

Corporate profits—after taxes: Minus $3,400,000,000 in 1932, but $18 billion in black ink in 1951.

I do plead with you today in the interest of our national economy, in the interest of our defense, in the interest of the good feeling of the 30 million people on the farms of the country: Do not do this thing to them today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the opponents of this amend-

ment seem to forget that the main reason for limiting this money is that at least $100 million under the name of conservation is being spent without accomplishing the least good in conservation. This has become in great measure just a phony giveaway program headed with the laudable title of soil conservation. Of course, we all want to conserve our soil. Most farmers are doing a good job of it. And, of course, you must not forget that the greatest depleter of our soil is use; and, to the extent that we overproduce and create these great surpluses by use of the soil, to that extent we are involved in a very wasteful practice.

About $82 million of this program this current year is to go for the purchase of lime and chemicals. Now, will someone please tell how lime and chemicals hold the soil?

I note also that we spent $26 million for green manure and cover crops. I grow them and we turn them down and use them right up again in the production of other crops.

In protecting summer fallow $2,500,000. Now, summer fallow denudes the ground completely and exposes it to all sorts of erosion.

Subsoiling loosens up the soil; it does not help hold the soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KRUEGER].

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Chairman, I represent a truly agricultural State; about 85 percent of my State is agricultural, dependent entirely upon agriculture. My colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] and I happen to divide the State between us; there are no districts in the State and we represent the State as a whole together. I have heard remarks made and telegrams read that certain farm organizations have wired to support Mr. Benson's program in the amount of $140 million for soil conservation. I heard there were two telegrams received to that effect, and they were read here. But I have on my desk at the present time 335 telegrams, and I know they are not from any particular farm organization group. They are from farmers. And every one of the telegrams asks me to support and vote for at least $250 million for the soil-conservation program. Of course, this will not be possible because the committee has reported $195 million, and I intend to go along with the committee on that amount.

Mr. Chairman, a lot of the Members have pointed out here that most of the money will be spent for fertilizer; at least a great deal of it will be. I want to make it known right here that we do not buy fertilizer. Our program will consist of preserving the soil and keeping it from blowing away and washing away. I am opposing the amendment to reduce the appropriation below $195 million and hope it will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment for the cogent reasons developed during the debate and because it gives the substance of such soil-conservation program as is in the interests of all our people, farmers and city consumers alike. I refer especially to the effort being made in the debate on this amendment to impress a good many Members with the fact that in their own districts they will face retribution if they support the amendment. I think that is unfair to consumers in the cities.

For, what is very important as we look at the overall picture of the country, and I think many people will agree with me, is that what the American people wanted from the administration they put in power was that the administration "call them as they see them," to use a baseball term. The American people wanted the administration to be evenhanded.

The farmers have very high fixed price supports for their principal commodities now. There are over $3 billion of Federal Government money tied up right now in an enormous amount of farm commodities, including 150 million pounds of spoilable butter. One hundred and forty million dollars seems right to the administration as a figure for the soil-conservation program. It is a fair balance, says the administration, as between what the farmers ought to have and what the city dwellers ought to pay taxes to support. The sum of $140 million will, I believe, cover the soil-conservation program adequately. I cannot conceive of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, wanting to see the soil of this country washed away, one of the fears expressed here.

I hope my colleagues will realize that what the American people are looking to from them and looking to from this administration is that which is in the interest of the whole of the United States, not currying favor with some particular group in some particular district. If the administration is supported by the Congress in sticking to the fact that it is serving the whole country, it will repeat in 1954 what it did in 1952, I believe, and not otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I represent a district with many family-sized farms. I hope that the voice of these small farmers will be heard here today.

As we have been so forcefully told, the No. 1 problem confronting us as a Nation today is the conserving and intelligent use of our land. Rather than being here attempting to further reduce this figure for soil conservation, we should be increasing it. Some of those who have spoken here today for a further reduction, remind me of the farmer who was not very good on taking suggestions. He said, "You cannot tell me anything about farming. I have done wore out three farms already."

We now have the problem of not only conserving our soil at its present level but we have the job of rebuilding the soil that has been mined unnecessarily in the past. The farmers of my district will find it more difficult this year and perhaps in the years ahead to continue their soil-building practices with reductions in farm incomes, even with incentive payments from the Government. We should encourage our farmers and help them to rebuild the soil because soil is the basis of our national strength. This amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion an overwhelming majority of Vermont farmers approve of the agricultural conservation program as it has been administered in that State. The Vermont State Farm Bureau, the Vermont State Grange, and the Vermont Legislature have by appropriate resolutions advocated a continuation of the program. None of these resolutions made reference to a specific amount which should be appropriated, but I am sure they implied that the program should be maintained at a reasonable level.

The $195 million recommended by the committee for ACP is a reduction of about $55 million from the budget request and represents a fair compromise between those who believe that more should be spent and those who think the program can function effectively for less. I would remind you, too, that $251 million was appropriated for this purpose for 1953 so that if the committee's recommendation is followed a substantial saving will be realized in 1954. But to reduce the appropriation to the extent proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would just about eliminate the ACP as far as the northeast is concerned.

There are those who suggest that greater attention should be paid to practices which have more than annual benefits to the soil, and with this contention few will disagree. But I hasten to add that through the application of lime and other minerals to our Vermont soil we are in a very real sense doing just that. We grow a lot of clover in Vermont and my farm friends tell me that that depletes the soil of lime very materially. So if we are to maintain good permanent sod under our conditions of farming a liberal use of minerals is necessary.

The educational value of the ACP and the incentives provided by it have contributed much to my State's agricultural economy. Prior to the program we were using only 3,500 tons a year in the entire State. This has now been increased to 70,000 tons but agricultural experts tell us that 300,000 tons annually is needed. At any rate we have made substantial gains in the use of minerals to maintain soil fertility and we desire to maintain and expand these gains.

I wish every American, farmer and nonfarmer alike, could read the statement which has just been made by our

distinguished former Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas, and also the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. HOPE, of Kansas, earlier in the debate. It seems to me that these gentlemen very effectively directed attention to one of the world's most pressing problems—food, or rather the lack of it, in many areas. To meet the needs of an expanding population we must give increasingly serious thought to the maintenance of soil fertility, for this is the key to life itself.

The approval of this amendment would, in my judgment, constitute a serious blow to conservation programs which are so vital to our future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, someone is going to have to take the responsibility if this amendment is adopted reducing this amount for agricultural conservation payments. I think the people generally recognize what soil conservation is. I know that of all the polls that I have seen taken on this particular question, the people, irrespective of whether they are farmers or not, are for soil conservation and they are for Government participation in this program. In my particular district a poll showed something like 76 percent for a continuation of the present program with the Government participating in the program.

Much has been said about what the Secretary of Agriculture has done and about how his actions have been approved by the Farm Bureaus. I was interested in reading in the Appendix of the RECORD yesterday of a Farm Bureau opinion poll taken in the State of Ohio and inserted in the RECORD by a Member from that State, in which it shows that 99 percent of the people participating in this poll were members of the Farm Bureau. Yet, when they get down to the question "Do you think Ezra T. Benson is doing a good job as Secretary of Agriculture?" and mind you, this is in a Republican State and 99 percent of the people participating in the poll were Farm Bureau members, and yet according to the statistics on this poll only 46 percent of them felt justified in saying that they did approve of the Secretary's action. I think that the recommendation of the Secretary in reducing the appropriation for agricultural conservation programs might have been reflected in this poll and the reluctance of even the Farm Bureau members in a Republican State to agree that Secretary Benson is doing a good job in his present position.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, in my work on the committee, I continually was aware of the fine work of the Soil Conservation Service, and the technical and professional help which the Soil Conservation Service has provided the farmers throughout our Nation. The work of the Soil Conservation Service has helped to conserve and protect our soil, which is the greatest physical asset we as a Nation possess.

All members of our committee agreed that increased attention should be given to soil-conservation practices of a more permanent nature which add to the value of our soil over a long period of time. Too much emphasis has been placed, particularly in some of our Southern and Western States, on agricultural conservation practices which have only a temporary influence upon a long-range conservation program. The committee recognized that a national program should be encouraged which would place more emphasis on permanent-type practices. The committee recognized, however, that the application of such a national policy at the local level would not be entirely uniform, since the permanent value of certain practices will vary in different areas of the country.

All commitments made for the agricultural-conservation program for crop year 1953 will be fully met by the Department of Agriculture, and the committee has arrived at a compromise figure which will authorize a maximum of $195 million for the agricultural-conservation program for the 1954 crop year. This is $55 million below the recommendation of the former Secretary of Agriculture, but $55 million above the recommendations of Secretary Benson. Under the new program there is some question as to how much of the maximum authorization of $195 million will be actually used. County committees throughout the country are giving consideration to the program for crop year 1954 and will be making their recommendations to the Department. It is impossible to estimate exactly what the total program will cost for 1954.

For fiscal year 1953 the Congress authorized an ACP program of $250 million; of this amount $211 million will actually be spent. It is impossible to give an absolute estimate of what will actually be spent on this program as approved by the Department for crop year 1954. Today we are merely establishing the maximum limit on expenditures for the next crop year.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. May I ask my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. JONES], who was speaking about Secretary Benson, what he thought of Secretary Wallace when he was Secretary of Agriculture, and his program when he converted the young hogs into fertilizer and then distributed the fertilizer to the farmers to increase the yield and production, and then plowed it under? Did the gentleman have anything to say at that time as to that program?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may answer for my friend, may I say that I opposed that, but that is better than plowing under these marginal farmers which some of you folks have been representing lately.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE].

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to this amendment because it is not in the interest of agriculture and the conservation of our soil and, therefore, not in the interest of our general welfare.

Although I have known for a long time that our soil has taken a terrific beating from erosion, I was amazed to learn from the committee report that, since the founding of this Nation, 40 percent of our cropland has been damaged or put out of production by erosion and that erosion is now underway on an additional 20 percent. Serious as this problem is today, the situation is further aggravated by our rapid growth in population. It is estimated that if our population continues to increase by the present average of 2½ million persons per year, by the year 1975 we will require the output of 115 million additional acres of land to maintain our present level of diet, and experts tell us that not over 45 million acres can be made available through land reclamation. Soil once gone cannot be replaced—there is no substitute.

One hundred and ninety-five million dollars recommended by this committee is small indeed for restoring and improving soil fertility and reducing erosion caused by wind and water. A reduction of $50 million, as proposed by this amendment, is ridiculous and penny wise and pound foolish. The committee is to be commended for including $195 million for this purpose and I earnestly urge my colleagues to vote down this amendment in the interest of conservation and for the benefit of generations not yet born.

One hundred and ninety-five million dollars is less than the cost of one of our large bombers and certainly this country can well afford to invest that much in preserving the fertility of our soil, which cannot be replaced and which is daily being carried into the sea by erosion.

Mr. Chairman, the amount recommended in this bill by this committee certainly should be upheld in its entirety. This committee has given this bill its serious and careful consideration and I, for one, am willing to be bound by its provisions. I sincerely hope that the bill will be passed as recommended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out 2 or 3 things we are mistakenly doing here that are right in line with what has caused our present predicament.

It is not all farmers who have and are now wasting the 40 percent of our land that is worn out, but the fertility of the land is nevertheless gone. In 1975, according to our best information, we will have more than 190 million people in this country and we will be short 115 million acres of land that we will need to main-

tain our present standard of living. But I say the farmers who wasted the land that is gone have been those who were or always felt they were in an emergency and could not afford to put back a fair share of what they took out.

What have we as a Congress done along the same line? Since 1940 we have reduced the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture by 30 percent and personnel by 38 percent. In the same period of time we have raised all the other civilian activities of the Government by 139 percent and personnel by 116 percent. We, too, mistakenly I think, are cutting down on our attention to agriculture, because we say we are in an emergency.

Much mention has been made here of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Mr. Allan Kline is president of that organization. I think it is ironical that those of us who are lawyers and farmers on this subcommittee have for 4 years had Mr. Kline coming before our committee and, with certain minor exceptions, have heard him say, "We are in an emergency." "We are spending on these other things," he said, "but let us cut down on pactically all agricultural programs because we are in an emergency." He recommended that we reduce REA, rural telephones, forestry, and nearly everything else. He is sincere. He is entitled to his view, but he does not speak for the Farm Bureau in Mississippi nor the South. I do not believe he speaks for his membership.

It is tragic to me for this leader of this great farm organization to recommend the same short-sighted policy those farmers showed when they wasted our soil. He too in effect says we can't afford, in this emergency, as a Nation, to put back a fair share of what is taken out of the soil. He believes we should leave it up to the farmer. We did for 150 years and we know where we are today.

I would like again to point to what I said numerous times before.

Did you know we spend twice as much each year on the handling and delivery of our mail as we do on all the activities of the Department of Agriculture?

We must put first things first.

There may be no Marshall plan when our country is as worn out as are Greece, India, China, Palestine, and practically all the countries we have reduced our natural resources to help.

We must not let our country get in the shape those countries are in. We must see that more of what we take out of our soil is put back so that we may maintain our high standard of living and generations after us may have a decent chance to do likewise. The strength and greatness of our country today is built solidly upon the fact that the United States is both a great farming Nation as well as a great industrial Nation.

I know it is popular to be for economy. I am for it. But let us save real wealth. I am telling you that there is a compelling reason not to reduce this bill on agriculture because it is 32 percent below that of 1940. We have a 53-cent dollar today. We have raised salaries 70 percent. As a result, you are paying one-third the attention to agriculture that you did in 1940, at a time when you are taking 20 percent more out of it.

Exclusive of national defense you have increased everything else. That is where you should reduce expenditures. You say emergency. We do have an emergency but because of it we should put basic things first. We need to give more attention to United States agriculture, not less.

But they say there is duplication. The remedy is to change the law. Let us use the programs we have until improved laws are passed.

Here is something I think we ought to remember. The reason these individual farms have gone down so that there is a total of 200 million acres of wasted farmland is that the man who owned the farm was always in an emergency. He never could afford to put back into the land a proper share of what he took out or so he thought. Should we as a Nation be guilty of the same mistake? Now that we are taking out 20 percent more, should we put back less? I leave the question with you.

If we are to feed our expected population by 1975—190 million—we will have to add to our present supply the milk that is being produced, today, in these States: Wisconsin, Michigan, and New York. In pork, if we are to feed the population in 1975, we will have to add the pork production of Nebraska and Iowa. In beef we are going to have to add the production today that exists in Minnesota, Texas, and Oklahoma. For their lamb and mutton, we are going to have to add the production that today exists in Utah, Nevada, Montana, and Wyoming. Eggs: we are going to have to add the production of California, Kansas, Missouri, Pennsylvania, and Illinois. It can be done, but we will have to pay serious attention to the things that need to be done to make 1 acre produce more than it does now; at least a third more. It can be done, and, in the meantime, we must save the land we have. I am for the United States first, and the first thing in the United States is the ability of the soil to feed and clothe us all. All the people need your help. I urge your support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be read again for the information of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Pennsylvania: On page 31, lines 14 and 15, strike out "$195,000,000" and insert "$140,000,000", and in the same paragraph on line 20, strike "15" and insert "40."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 110, noes 108.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN and Mr. KING of Pennsylvania.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 139, noes 137.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: Page 31, line 22, strike out the figure "$2,500" and insert "$1,000, nor qualify as a participant for payments of grants of assistance under such program if his net individual income for Federal income-tax purposes is in excess of $10,000 in 1952."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi will state his point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. This amendment would require affirmative action by the Secretary of Agriculture or someone acting for him. It would require the disclosure of income of individual citizens, which information is prohibited by law from being made public. It would require affirmative and special action by someone in the Government, which would make it legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FULTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not legislation, because it is simply putting a limitation on who shall be a participant in these programs. The amendment simply outlines the requisite characteristics of the participants.

The amendment says first, that the limit is $1,000 to any one individual in grants and payments under these programs. Second, it states that no individual who in the year 1952 received more than $10,000 in net personal income for Federal income tax purposes shall be entitled to participate.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the point of order should be sustained for the reason that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It places further duties on the Secretary of Agriculture, and certainly there is nothing in basic law giving him authority to determine the income of any individual in our economy.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, in order to make sure that there is no legislation in the amendment, in view of the point of order, I ask unanimous consent that everything in the amendment after the words "one thousand" be stricken.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Only on the point of order may the gentleman be heard.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment on the income tax question as that which I offered last year, so that it is not a new question and has been submitted previously on this particular bill. However, the $1,000 limitation to any one participant is the new part.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is legislative in character for it would require a determination of the individual income of all the farmers of the Nation whose income is not available but the release of such information is prohibited by law. Not only that, but it would entail an expense which would far exceed any proposed savings that could come from such limitation. I do not see how the amendment could be held necessarily to save money. Not only that, but as has been pointed out it would require affirmative action and to put on the Secretary special duties which he does not now have clearly would be legislation and subject to point of order.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, it is an administrative problem in determining who the participants shall be. That procedure can be by regulation that the applicants certify that they have not received a taxable personal income in excess of $10,000 in the year 1952, so that the applicants do not have to make a disclosure of income. That would simply be a certification by the individual who claims he is a participant, so that there is nothing that need be performed in addition by the Department of Agriculture other than receive the application as, of course, it must do now.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to ask if now the Secretary of Agriculture has the legal authority to see the income tax returns of all individual American farmers and if under the amendment he be given that right which he does not now have, would that not be legislation giving him authority and rights which he does not have now?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. As has been indicated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], the amendment imposes a qualification upon participants in this program. Therefore, the Chair is of the opinion that the offered amendment proposes legislation on an appropriation bill and is, therefore, subject to a point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 31, line 22, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the maximum payments to any individual under the ACP program to $1,000. It is presently $2,500. Those of you who are familiar with this program recall that several years ago there was no limitation in respect to the amount an individual or corporation might receive. A few years ago there was a limitation of $10,000. Then later and for a short period it was reduced, I believe, to $1,000, then increased to $2,500. In any event, $2,500 is the limit that any individual is permitted to receive under the ACP program.

Right here I would like to call attention to the fact that although this program is intended to help soil conservation, we do have a different and separate and additional program for soil conservation, for which $60,844,014 is appropriated in this bill. I respect this soil-conservation program. It is rendering fine service to the farmers and to the country.

This proposal is a different one, as the Members well know. I think it might be well to once more call attention to the manner in which expenditures have been made under this program in the last few years. Let us take the program of 2 years ago, for which we have some rather definite figures. The following 2 years, I understand, are quite similar. It should be remembered, of course, that in order for one to participate in receiving the funds, he must be included in the program and comply with its terms. That is the way it should be.

Now let us see what we have been doing with the money appropriated from the Federal Treasury for this particular service. Two years ago the appropriation was $255 million, and as I said before, the limit anyone could receive was $2,500. I have a table before me showing the manner in which this total of $255 million was divided. The statement comes from the Department of Agriculture. I am informed the allocations for last year are approximately the same as indicated in this statement.

According to this statement, 2,536,956 farm people participated in the program. Approximately 1 million farm units did not participate in the program. Now let us see how the funds were divided among those who did comply and participate in the program. First, cost of administration is deducted. Here is what the statement shows. Of the 2,536,956 farmers in the program, 392,774, or more than 10 percent got less than $20 each. Nine hundred and thirty-one thousand three hundred and twenty-six participants, which is approximately 40 percent of all farmers in the program, got less than $40 each for soil practices, lime and other fertilizer materials. In fact you dispose of 1,343,411 farmers by allowing them from $1 to $60 each. That is more than half of the farmers in the entire program. Those of you who talk so much about the one-man farm unit might want to give a little consideration in assisting the farmer at the lower end of the totem pole. Take one more look at the table: 73 percent of all farmers got less than $100. So, less than $100, takes care of 1,890,000 farmers under this schedule.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will affect less than 2 percent of those under the program. It will only reduce their payments to the sum of $1,000. I just do not see how they could object, especially when they should want to take care of their soil—and further considering the regular soil-conservation program is available to them. My amendment will save several million dollars for the taxpayers of this country without injury to anyone.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have a similar amendment at the desk to cut the payment down from $2,500 to $1,000. I have worked with the gentleman from Kansas on this matter over a period of years. I am for his amendment. It should be adopted, and its adoption will help the smaller farmers and it will also save money as far as the program is concerned.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is most helpful, and I thank him.

But, let me call your attention again, if I may, to this. Two years ago, according to the figures submitted by the Department of Agriculture, there were 2,563,956 participants in the program and out of that group 1,886,397, or 73 percent of them, got less than $100. That is the way your money was spent. So, this will help a little bit to equalize these payments to the folks to whom they ought to be paid.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I was not clear about one thing the gentleman said. He said those that wanted above $1,000 would be on their own. What the gentleman means is that every farmer would be eligible up to $1,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. JUDD. But if he wanted more than that, he would be on his own.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. I appreciate the gentleman's correction. My amendment just says in substance that nobody will receive more than $1,000.

The schedule above mentioned is as follows:

TABLE 13.—*Estimated number and cumulative percentage distribution of payees receiving payments under the agricultural conservation program by size-of-payment groups, 1947–51* [1]

Size-of-payment group	1947	1948 [2]	1949 [3]	1950 [4]	1951 [5]
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
$1.00 to $20.00	555,138	789,839	516,827	478,476	392,774
$20.01 to $40.00	631,850	758,408	651,486	612,928	538,552
$40.01 to $60.00	514,704	388,555	478,666	469,759	412,085
$60.01 to $100.00	649,369	310,902	579,095	580,303	542,986
$100.01 to $150.00	338,217	120,111	279,289	305,847	302,449
$150.01 to $200.00	157,882	60,596	136,927	155,554	158,839
$200.01 to $300.00	87,708	37,325	84,402	96,814	99,438
$300.01 to $400.00	36,252	16,429	37,317	42,078	43,151
$400.01 to $500.00	20,134	[6] 20,231	20,949	23,294	24,031
$500.01 to $1,000.00	27,197		[7] 40,499	35,886	37,041
$1,000.01 to $2,000.00	7,965			9,350	10,055
$2,000.01 to $3,000.00	1,548			[8] 2,429	[8] 2,555
$3,000.01 to $4,000.00	390				
$4,000.01 to $5,000.00	186				
$5,000.01 to $10,000.00	269				
Total	3,028,800	2,502,486	2,825,457	2,812,718	2,563,956
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Less than $20.01	18.32	31.56	18.29	17.01	15.32
Less than $40.01	39.19	61.86	41.35	38.80	36.32
Less than $60.01	56.18	77.39	58.29	55.50	52.39
Less than $100.01	77.62	89.82	78.79	76.14	73.57
Less than $150.01	88.79	94.62	88.67	87.01	85.37
Less than $200.01	94.00	97.04	93.52	92.54	91.87
Less than $300.01	96.90	98.53	96.50	95.98	95.45
Less than $400.01	98.09	99.19	97.83	97.48	97.13
Less than $500.01	98.76	[6] 100.00	98.57	98.31	98.07
Less than $1,000.01	99.66		[7] 100.00	99.58	99.51
Less than $2,000.01	99.92			99.91	99.90
Less than $3,000.01	99.97			[8] 100.00	[8] 100.00
Less than $4,000.01	99.985				
Less than $5,000.01	99.991				
Less than $10,000.01	100.000				

[1] Excludes naval stores.
[2] Excludes 150 payees operating under manager-type pooling agreements.
[3] Excludes 302 payees operating under manager-type pooling agreements.
[4] Excludes 449 payees operating under manager-type pooling agreements.
[5] Excludes 408 payees operating under manager-type pooling agreements.
[6] Payment to payee limited to $500.
[7] Payment to payee limited to $750.
[8] Payment to payee limited to $2,500.

Data for 1936 through 1945 available in table 13 of the 1948 statistical summary; data for 1946 available in table 13 of the 1950 statistical summary.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a problem that has been before the House before. It is a problem that has been debated several times on the floor of the House. I think there are two viewpoints here, and I think this amendment clearly defines what those two viewpoints are.

If you believe in soil conservation, then you do not need to consider the payment angle whatsoever, because every time anybody does anything in the line of soil conservation and earns payments, he must have put into effect soil conservation, often costly to him, to qualify to do that sort of thing.

This program has suffered over the years because it has had an implication of relief put upon it. It is not a problem that involves relief in any way whatever. We are talking about conserving our soil. We want to go in the direction of those practices which are more permanent practices, which often are the more costly practices. That means you must spend more money than the small amount, the piddling amount, that is indicated by some of the remarks on the floor today.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman agree that it is just as necessary to conserve the soil on large farms as on small farms?

Mr. MARSHALL. From my knowledge it is even more important to conserve the soil on the large farms, since the large farms have been those that have neglected their land to a greater extent than the small farms.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman also not agree that this is not an agricultural relief bill but is actually a soil conservation bill?

Mr. MARSHALL. Entirely so. That is why I am taking a stand in opposition to putting a limitation of $1,000 on the payment that may be received. It is a matter of making up your mind as to whether you are talking about a relief program or about conservation. I am one of the Members of this House who are firmly convinced that we must do more and more and more than we have done in the light of conservation. I reiterate that no one gets any money out of any of these practices for doing nothing. It means that, generally speaking, of the money earned by these soil conservation practices, the farmers contribute two-thirds and the Federal Government contributes one-third. Therefore, it is a cooperative program. This is a program we are working on to bring about conservation of the soil.

I hope the House sustains the action of the committee and votes down the amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague on the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, for a very excellent speech. He has very vividly pointed out that this is not an agricultural-relief program but a soil-conservation program. The committee unanimously agreed that more encouragement should be given to permanent-type practices. If we are going to limit payments to $1,000, we are going to eliminate to a great extent the possibility of putting into effect permanent-type practices. Therefore, I am against the amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], in sponsoring this amendment and believe that the amendment should be adopted.

We in the United States must get a balanced program with our Treasury, and the overall amount of the program has been reduced to the figure recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture and the various farm organizations. For that reason we should not be giving a very small percentage of the farmers of this country a large proportion of these funds.

On the figures that have been submitted on the agricultural conservation program for 1951, 99.51 percent of the payments have been under $1,000 to each individual farmer. Therefore, on this amendment of Mr. REES of Kansas, which is a part of the one I submitted previously, we are only talking about the 0.49 percent of the farmers of this country. In addition to that point, there are 2,563,956 farmers who have received payments. Of those who have received over $1,000 in this group, there are only 12,610 farmers who have received up to $2,500.

The men and women here who are representatives of the farming districts, and want to take care of the average farmer and do it in a way that the conservation program should be handled, can accomplish this purpose if you vote for this amendment, because this amendment is going to take care of 99.51 percent of the farmers in each of your districts.

On the other hand, we should remember that this is not a give-away program from the Treasury of the United States, but is part of a conservation program. You would think it very ill of me if as a farmer I were taking free grants and payments of this kind because I should be doing that myself on my farm, and if I do not I would not be protecting my own assets. On the other hand, the ones who really need it are the people who have rundown farms and do not have the capital to build their farms up through proper conservation programs of their own, and they should have adequate Government help just the way the lower economic groups of the cities occasionally come here and say, "Protect us

in our basic livelihoods and in our basic lives." As a Member, I thoroughly believe in soil conservation programs for the benefit of the whole country. I cannot see why anybody earning over $10,000 a year net personal income for Federal taxing purposes should be given a grant or a handout by this Government from the Treasury to help him run his own business or farm. Can anybody on the floor tell me why it is necessary for that person to ask the Government to give him a free grant to assist him in protecting his own livelihood and his own personal farm? And if it comes to some of the big corporations who are running these farms, I think it is all the less true that they should indiscriminately be given these free aids.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Am I correct in assuming from the gentleman's argument that he is against the entire appropriation?

Mr. FULTON. I favor the soil-conservation program, and I will vote for the appropriation.

Mr. COOLEY. If it is an unwarranted handout and an unjustifiable subsidy, and if it is something that is evil inherently, why is not the gentleman against the whole thing?

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman himself, with his outside income, were here asking for these free payments and these grants from the United States Treasury, it would be an evil, and if I were doing it, it would be evil. But to help the average dirt farmer, it is a real public benefit because you and I have the capital and they do not. The Federal Government must assist the average dirt farmer to help improve his soil and his farm for the benefit of the whole economy.

Mr. COOLEY. I have not expressed any views concerning the proposed limitation. At one time the limitation was $500.

Mr. FULTON. And then it went up, as you know.

Mr. COOLEY. I gained the impression that the gentleman is not only addressing himself to the pending amendment, but in his remarks is attacking the entire appropriation as being an unwarranted handout.

Mr. FULTON. No, not at all. I said that when there is a high income level, and yet these fortunate people are given grants and aid from the Treasury of the United States, it is unwarranted. But for 99.51 percent of the farmers who receive benefits and grants under $1,000 apiece, I have said I think the soil-conservation program is worthwhile, and I will vote for the program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FULTON. Why do you not consent to this amendment?

Mr. COOLEY. I have no right to consent to the amendment. I am not in charge of the bill. I would say this, since the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING] has been adopted, there is certainly far more justification for the adoption of the pending amendment than there would have been otherwise because now the overall appropriation is restricted and by having a limitation placed upon it, it might spread the benefits further among small farmers throughout the Nation.

Mr. FULTON. I think the gentleman has a good point. If we adopt this amendment, it will spread the benefits of the soil-conservation program among the smaller farmers and the lower groups who should have it. We will be helping these smaller farmers by reducing to $1,000 apiece the limit on the top 0.49 percent of the larger and more affluent farmers.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I think this issue is quite clear to the Committee. I wonder if it would not be possible to limit the time for debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WHITTEN. Reserving the right to object, let us see how many Members desire to speak.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 30 minutes. We should be able to settle this issue in that time.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and the type of argument made in its behalf by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] makes me wonder if it would not be appropriate in the Defense Department appropriation bill, which will come to this floor shortly, to put in a clause that no one shall be entitled to a defense contract who indicates that he has a net income of more than $10,000. When this income-tax bill comes out, and I understand it is on the Clerk's desk for signature, would it not be appropriate to add an amendment there, saying that no individual in the United States can have an income of more than $25,000? If we want to get this money leveled off, let us put in an income limitation for all citizens, no matter what their status is. Let us put a ceiling on what people can make, and let us have some good old distribution of the wealth on the part of the Republican Party.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. No. You have already talked for 15 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. But you mentioned my name.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Your name is well known and any person in the United States has a right to mention it and talk about it.

In regard to this amendment as expressed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], if you want to get this money voted around to all the people in the country, the thing to do is to put a limitation of $50 on it, and make sure that every farmer gets a part of it. It might be necessary to go down as low as $5 or $2.49 to be sure that every farmer gets some of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in behalf of the amendment.

A few moments ago I sat on this floor and searched my conscience as to how I should vote on the previous amendment which would have reduced the funds recommended by the committee. I heard reference after reference after reference by members of farm groups, by farmers, and by men who knew a great deal more about the program than I, that the reason this amount had been increased by the committee was to benefit the small farmer; and thinking back of my district and the situation on the farms there, I deserted by colleagues and voted with the members of the minority.

Now we are faced with an amendment which would back up the fact that these payements should be limited to the small farmer; they should be limited at 93½ percent—I believe one gentleman made the statement—as they have been in practice in the past. And yet I hear a member of the minority who is against this amendment get up and say that the very people who need these payments the most, that the very people who take care of their farms the least, in many instances are the big farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I voted in favor of the previous amendment to raise the appropriation under this program because I know that when income goes down, as farmers' income has for the last 4 years, the first thing that goes is maintenance; the first thing that someone cuts out of his budget is the money he should put back into taking care of his property and his land. Therefore, because I am fully aware of the need for soil conservation, particularly on small farms, I voted for a program which would permit the small farmer, who has had his income decreased, to maintain his soil as it should be maintained. That is why, Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment—so that these payments will be restricted to the small farmer who needs assistance and not to the big farmer who can afford to maintain his property himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think it is vitally necessary that this or a similar amendment be adopted. I offered an amendment last year in this amount. The year before that one reduced it to $500.

The only issue before us, as one distinguished gentleman said a while ago, is whether or not these incentive payments, these soil building practices incentive payments shall be limited to $1,000 a participant or $2,500. In my opinion,

there is nothing sacred about the figure $2,500.

I agree with the distinguished minority leader, who made a splendid address a few months ago speaking against the amendment that was recently adopted. He said the basis of this program was to build up the small farms, the 100-acre and the 150-acre farms. I subscribe to that, and I support him in his position. Then I heard what my former chairman said about the need for these funds. The committee fixed it at $195 million; this group has reduced it to $140 million. If that figure is to remain, then it is all the more necessary that the amount be limited. These payments were intended to take care of soil-building practices; they are used, and have been very successfully used, as an incentive for our farmers to improve their soils, to build up their farms for the benefit of all the people of our country. It is therefore necessary that we distribute the payments around as far as we can that all the farmers may have an incentive to continue soil-building practices. To do this we should by all means limit payments to any one participant to not more than $1,000, as provided in this amendment. Personally, I would be glad to see the limit set at $500.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I hope there is no one here who is going to vote for the amendment with the idea it will give any small farmer more money than he will otherwise get because he will not get one penny more whether we pass the amendment or not. He will get whatever he earns through the practice he follows. It does not make any difference how much we appropriate or how much we do not appropriate, he will get just what he earns.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program for conserving the soil. If it is going to accomplish its purpose it must be made applicable to all land and to all landowners and operators irrespective of the size of their holdings. Land on large farms is just as much subject to erosion as is land on small farms, and many times just as much incentive is needed in one case as in the other.

Of course if you consider this just a relief bill you should vote against the whole thing. But it is not a relief bill, it is a conservation bill and should be considered accordingly. This amendment should be defeated.

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Messrs. GATHINGS, HAGEN of California, and LONG was given to Mr. WHITTEN.)

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Mr. BENDER was given to Mr. REES of Kansas.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, there is a growing belief on the part of some students of government that the American people are in danger of being overwhelmed by the antics of propagandists who might best be described as political soap salesmen. The motives of these gentlemen are not the highest and their services are not appreciated by the great majority of the common people of this country who refuse to accept as a substitute for thought and substance some glib generalization which is designed to clothe programs dear to the heart of the salesman with political "BO."

A favorite device of these soapy gentlemen is to categorize worthwhile programs as "socialistic." Anything to which they are opposed is socialistic. On the other hand any activity which they favor for the special benefit of a few is described in the language of advertisements for perfume regardless of whether or not it is for the benefit of the overwhelming majority of our people. As a matter of fact if I judge them correctly a program is not a giveaway if it benefits a few corporate tycoons but is always a giveaway if it benefits the farmers or some other large class of people.

Agricultural conservation program payments have been described here as a "giveaway" program. No grosser misstatement could be made.

Such payments are made for the benefit of all of the people of the United States who are presumed to have a stake in the basic resources of soil and water.

The agricultural depression which preceded 1929 and which was a major cause of the crash of that year demonstrated that farmers had special problems which required special answers and, further, that the welfare of all of us hinged on the welfare of the farmer. The phenomenon of the Dust Bowl highlighted one of those special problems and directed the interest of a wise President and Congress to the fact that small farmers confronted with the fact of falling prices and income would inevitably mine their lands by producing and selling more bushels, tons, and bales of produce without wisdom in order to provide their families with the necessities of life. The Democratic agricultural program was the special answer to this and other problems. It attacked the problem of falling prices. Through the medium of ACP payments it encouraged the farmer to engage in good soil and water practices which he would have been unable to undertake without such monetary encouragement.

In the 1930's all farmers supported these programs. It would appear now that there are some farmers who regard their smaller neighbors as competitors and would bite the hand that fed them by depriving new and relatively unsuccessful farmers of the privileges which they enjoyed and appreciated.

I say we will never have an oversupply of farmers and that these programs should be continued. The fact is that our farm population is constantly declining and our food and fiber needs increasing. May we never see the day that the family farm has been replaced by the corporation or the coupon-clipping gentleman farmer. Our action here, which I opposed, in reducing the amount of money available for soil conservation payments was a meek surrender to those who would make farming the business of huge aggregations of capital.

I oppose the amendment to restrict the maximum amount of conservation payment of $1,000. In my opinion there should be a ceiling on such payments for the reason that large operators need no encouragement to engage in good farming practice. Their incomes are such that the employment of good farming practices yielding a smaller annual return does not deprive their families or stockholders of the necessities of life. They are not tempted to ignore the wisdom of long-range farm programing by the necessities of the immediate situation, but the present $2,500 restriction on payments virtually eliminates such free riders without eliminating any farmer who needs the program.

The $1,000 limitation would eliminate many worthwhile benefits, particularly in my home State of California. Farming in California is a high-cost operation. Water is difficult and costly to secure. Soil conservation payments assist in the most economical water development. I can think of many needy farmers who could not secure such development with a $1,000 limit on ACP payments. On the other hand, a $2,500 payment would take care of their needs and be of small value and incidence in the case of farmers able to provide for themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to urge the Members to vote for restoration of the full ACP payments when we have a rollcall. There has been too much talk of this as a relief program for the farmers. It is not.

It is in the interest of all of us who need to be assured of an adequate food supply at all times. The national income of this country is always 7 times that of the farmers. If those who eat the food would stop to realize that during the next 200 years we know our soil will be depleted, they would think differently on this question. There are only 3 inches of soil remaining in this country. I represent more than 400,000 farm people in 23 counties in western Oklahoma. I have received many letters from dirt-farmer members of the Farmers' Union, the Farm Bureau, and the Grange who are for the full ACP program.

I hope there will be a rollcall vote on this proposition and that you will vote to restore the full amount needed to carry on this worthwhile program. Also, the funds for the agricultural conservation program, Production and Marketing Administration, agricultural adjustment programs, and the Extension Service are not sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return temporarily to page 23 of the bill in order that I might extend my remarks at that point in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 minutes of the time allotted to me to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, as you know, I serve as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture. This is my ninth year on that committee. I represent a section of this country which is inhabited by small farmers. It is a very large congressional district and has a very large number of small farms. I mention these things to emphasize the fact that I know something about the farmer and his problems, particularly of the small farmer. If I came from a section of the country where farmers were generally large operators, I probably would not be for this amendment. But coming from an area which is largely inhabited by small people who farm small farms, and knowing something about their problems, and knowing of many who have told me that when they reached the PMA offices they found all of the money gone, and knowing that we then had a $250-million program, not $145 million or at most $195 million as we will have for next year, and knowing that they were not able to get any of the money or at most only a small part of that which they actually needed under the larger program, I am wondering where they will be next year under a smaller program. With the King amendment their situation is made even worse. Under it we will have much less money next year than was authorized for this or previous years. Under the bill itself we will have less.

Last year and this year we had a limitation of $2,500. If the King amendment stays in the bill, we will have only $145 million, 44 percent less money. Therefore, in order to do the most good for the most people, the ceiling, in my honest judgment, ought to be lowered. When it is, it definitely will in my judgment guarantee that the funds be spread further and among more people. Thus the small farmer will have a better chance to get the funds he needs.

Mr. Chairman, I have always argued as a strong supporter of this program that it provided the incentive required to persuade the farmers to do and perform the practices needed to preserve our land. The Government matched dollar for dollar, the amount of dollars that the farmers themselves expended in terracing and performing other soil-building practices. I also argued, and so has every other Member who has supported this program, including the former Speaker today, that it was particularly needed for the benefit of little people. Generally speaking, those who had larger farms and who had been able to acquire more of the good things of life such as good large farms did not need the incentive that the small farmer needed to perform these practices.

It is my sincere conviction that this amendment will spread the funds to more people and more farms. If it does, we will get more conservation. We will rebuild and preserve more land. The ceiling is not too low. After all, a thousand-dollars-per-year assistance from the Government is quite a sum of money. I know there is good argument on the other side of this issue. But we must remember that the funds are limited. The committee itself has recommended a reduction of about 22 percent in last year's authorization. With less money, how can we operate with the same ceiling? Of course, it should be lowered.

I shall vote for the amendment with the conviction that it is in the best interest of not only the most people but also of the most land.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I am a farmer, and I can further say that until January 3 of this year I was a dirt farmer.

I should like to point out that, in my humble estimation a big point has been missed here, that in all the debate this afternoon not one person has mentioned the fact that a true, honest-to-goodness farmer loves his soil and loves it dearly, and wants to do everything he possibly can to conserve it. The reason we perform conservation practices on our farms is not for the check we get from the Government but because we love the land.

There are only two reasons why conservation practices are not performed on any one farm. The first is ignorance or lack of knowledge regarding such practices, and I am glad to say that the agricultural conservation program has educated the farmer to the need for conservation. Ignorance can no longer be cited as justification for high individual payments.

The second reason is that a farmer sometimes cannot afford it. There is no one in this House who can bring to me a specific instance of a man who qualifies for $1,000 in agricultural conservation program payment who cannot afford to pay for the program himself. If there is such a person I would most definitely like to hear of it.

So it gets back to the point that the man who cannot afford conservation is the only man who should be helped. I appeal to those of you on the Democratic side who are forever talking about helping the "little man" to come through and give him the real break he deserves. Stop subsidizing the rich man, and let us help the poor man. I ask an aye vote on the Reese amendment limiting payments to $1,000 for any one participant.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I should like to invite the gentleman down to Mississippi or a lot of other places and introduce him to some of these people who have drawn these payments and perform these conservation practices who would not be able to carry them on without these payments.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman for the invitation. I will be happy to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

(Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. WHITTEN.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this problem many times through the years. If, as some of my friends on the left seem to think, this is a case of dividing out money to the American farmer, we should end it today once and for all. If this is a relief program, and you are just dividing out and distributing to the American farmers, no matter how many they are, if you are going to do it at all, divide it and give it to them.

The only justification you have at all is that this is a soil-conservation program. I should like to describe to you the mechanics of it. I have worked with it, and I feel I can discuss it so that you will see the fallacy of this approach. I hope I can.

If this is a soil-conservation program, where the Government has said, "If you will do certain things yourself, if you will spend money and devote your time to them, the Government up to certain limits will contribute its part, and the limit we will go to is $2,500"—and that was arrived at some years ago by a process of settlement—then this is the thing I would like to point out to you: There is a formula by which the funds made available in this bill are distributed to the States for that formula will be operating whether or not you adopt this amendment. Each State will get its pro rata share irrespective of this amendment. In Virginia, Maryland, and some others of these States perhaps all they need would be practices where the contribution should be no more than $50 or this $1,000. If that be true, why should I say to Wyoming, "No, you must have the same limitation we have for it is high enough for us. You cannot set up an irrigation project which would have some real value. We are going to limit you to a series of minor projects where $1,000 is the maximum."

Each State gets its share under the formula. Why should we States' righters suggest to a State that has flood problems, "You cannot go in here and put up a real project and drain this land. We are going to make you divide it up into driblets and do something not nearly so beneficial."

If you adopt this amendment, you are going right directly contrary to what was said by Secretary Benson and others. I do not agree with their approach but I agree with their objective, that is, that the things we spend this money for should have some permanent value.

I would like to get the farmers to so use this program. I would hate to have to tell them from Washington that they had to. But I do agree with what they are driving at when they say they want

some permanent value. If this is a soil-conservation program, and if it be true that the formulas are going to give each State its pro rata share of money, and if, as now is the fact, your State has the right to limit the payments itself, if it wants to by its own action, why not let those States that want to reduce it and hold it down because they have that class and kind of problem, as I say, why not let those States do that? Why should we here in Washington, because my own State or your State does not need the major things, go out to those places where you do need the projects to be on a large enough scale and tell them that they cannot have them? Once again I want to say that the money here is to try to get something done on land, and the more land the more we are willing to help. It is not a relief program. If it is, stop it—cut it out—but do not kid yourselves that you are helping any real soil conservation when you require the money to be spent in dribbles on minor problems.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Is it not true that in some counties the committees in charge of this program have established limits for certain types of practices?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true, and it is the right of any other States and counties to do the same thing, if they so desire.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman knows, of course, as well as the rest of us, that there is a soil-conservation program in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is named as such and is carried on as such, and it would carry out the propositions or proposals the gentleman has suggested.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true. I know that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And we are all for that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further because I think we all know that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I just do not want the Members of the committee to be confused about that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I would like to finish my statement. The gentleman who has just asked me to yield, since he has been in Congress has offered this or a similar type of amendment every year. I have the highest regard for him, but I cannot help but believe that he still thinks that this is a relief program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, no, no, no.

Mr. WHITTEN. One of the saddest experiences I have had in the Congress was to sit on a subcommittee on appropriations when the Governor from the gentleman's State of Kansas and the elected officials of his State were there asking the Congress to go along on President Truman's request for us to check for damage which was done out in Kansas by one of those terrible floods. That is a shining example of the need this country has to put real soil conservation practices into effect. It happened unfortunately in the gentleman's State. I say I will not be a party because I happen to come from a district made up largely of small farms, as I do, where $1,000 or so might meet the need when other sections have different problems and large land holdings. I am not going to say to a State that has bigger problems and major problems such as irrigation and flood control that they have to divide it up piecemeal. If the people in those States want to do that in any of those States, you can do it now. You can do it now if that is what will meet your needs, but let us not restrict those who have real problems from meeting them as they see it. Let us support Secretary Benson in his stated objective of trying to see that this money goes for substantial projects that have some real benefits.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes 98, noes 72.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. REES of Kansas and Mr. WHITTEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 122, noes 104.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sugar Act program

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101–1160), $59,645,000, to remain available until June 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided*, That expenditures (including transfers) from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,445,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the past 20 years have seen great changes in American agriculture and rural life.

We have seen the powers of government used in a way for the best interests of our country to enable agriculture to survive in a great industrial nation—with tariff protection for industry in an economic era, that without such legislative considerations would have destroyed the agricultural life and activity of our country.

Soil conservation, reforestation, rural electricity, rural telephones, better roads, flood control, parity payments, tenant-farmer legislation, are some of the measures enacted to enable American agriculture in this intense economic period to survive and to prosper.

During recent years we have seen the mechanization and modernization of farm production proceed with great rapidity, not always with favorable results.

Productivity per man-hour has also rapidly increased on the farm.

Research, experimentation, education are vitally important in the field of agriculture, for farming is a mighty technical operation in production and distribution.

We must keep in mind a strong agriculture is also important as an element of our national defense.

Like no other fields of our national economy, agriculture has benefited from the improvements and advance of the past 20 years, but such progress has also brought about problems.

I think the American people, whether or not they live on the farm, recognize the importance and necessity of conserving our soil, our forests, and our water resources.

There is no question but what great progress has been made during the past 20 years.

In addition to agriculture as a whole being strengthened, the poverty-stricken marginal farmer has in so many instances been able to improve his holdings; and yet, too many farm families, and also in the cities, receive unduly low incomes. We should not allow the progress of the past 20 years to be wiped out.

It is estimated there are 6,000,000 American families whose total family income is $1,200 or less each year, and a good percentage of those families live on the soil.

The problems of all of our people require constant consideration and legislative attention.

In view of the disadvantageous position of agriculture in a highly industrialized nation such as ours, such constant consideration and legislative consideration is essential in the case of agriculture and our millions of fine Americans who live on the farm.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

For operating and administrative expenses, $7,350,000.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GWINN: Page 37, line 11, after the comma in line 11 strike out "$7,350,000" and insert "$1,350,000."

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, it would seem perfectly obvious if we are going to balance the budget and reduce taxes—in fact, it would seem that if we are ever going to discontinue the give-away program, if we are ever going to quit taking by compulsion from one group and redistributing it to other groups as has been mentioned here boldly and openly as the process that we are in, we have got to begin in the alphabetic list with A. Unfortunately agriculture begins with A. We have 1,300 other agencies, corporations, and departments to go through. Here is a typical one, the Crop Insurance Corporation. I doubt if more than a hundred Members on this floor know what in the world the Crop Insurance Corporation is.

The Crop Insurance Corporation was organized on February 16, 1938, "to promote the national welfare by alleviating the economic distress caused by crop failures due to drought and other causes,

by maintaining the purchasing power of the farmers, and by providing stable supplies of commodities for domestic consumption and the orderly flow thereof in interstate commerce," and so forth. This is the high-sounding preamble common to socialistic legislation. Later the enabling act was amended so that the Corporation now writes crop insurance against drought, flood, hail, wind, frost, winter kill, lightning, fire, excessive rain, snow, wildlife, hurricane, tornado, insect infestation, plant diseases, and such other unavoidable causes as may be determined by the Board. From 1939 to 1952, the overhead cost of this insurance business—covered by taxes, not premiums—amounted to $80,838,391.49.

The Crop Insurance Corporation pays to its county agents a fee of $1.50 per policy written, plus a percentage of the premium, whether it is paid or not. To get his remuneration all the agent needs is the farmer's signature.

In 1 year, this Corporation paid out over $24 million more than it collected in premiums. Since it began operations, its outgo exceeded its income by $14 million, which the general taxpayer had to make up. And it should be remembered that these bounties were passed out to only 556,000 farmers in 834 of the Nation's 3,000 counties. It now proposes to extend these services. The counties selected were those in which the late administration was in need of votes. During the presidential campaign, the agents of the Corporation reminded the farmers that they could collect insurance for the loss of grains eaten by pheasants, geese, and ducks and could then shoot and eat the fowl free gratis. The immorality of this argument must have appalled the farmers, for despite the allurement, they voted against the bountiful administration, and for Eisenhower.

By this amendment I simply cut down the administration of that from $7,350,000 to $1,350,000. This insurance corporation is so sloppy in the administration of its insurance business that it has on the books today, according to the manager's report, uncollected premiums of $7,605,812. Often they do not even collect from the farmers the premiums when they are signed up. If $1,350,000 of taxpayers money is not enough to pay salaries and expenses let the agency collect these back premiums to pay expenses.

Here is a place where we can liquidate, discontinue such business, and start right in a Republican administration that intends to do what it promises, namely, to cut out socialism, and its waste even where it affects agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment be limited to 5 minutes and that this time be given either to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] or to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that our sound finance friend from New York, and there is no sounder American in the House on many things, stated that very few knew what this is. I believe he put himself in the latter category because we have these outstanding contracts, several hundred thousand, more than 100,000 I know of. The Government is committed on them for millions and millions of dollars. If you wish to abolish the Federal Crop Insurance Agency that is one thing, but you had better get out from under the liability on these contracts before you do. Since you have the contracts outstanding, how in the world are you going to get out, unless you owe the money and do not collect the revenue, I do not know.

The issue here is whether you want to run it or not. May I remind you that President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have been all over the country saying an extension of this program is what they are going to offer the farmers as a fact. But you are hooked for a whole lot of money unless you properly run this program until you determine whether you are going to enlarge it or kill it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to inform the House that since the reorganization of this program we have shown a profit of $2,100,000, not, of course, taking into account the administrative expenses. But let us remember that we protected through this program last year alone $412 million in crop production. It seems to me it would be foolhardy to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. After all, no insurance company will protect this kind of risk, and the farmers have no other place to turn. It would be foolhardy to practically do away with the Federal crop insurance program through the acceptance of this amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL. Of course, it is very obvious that this amendment should be voted down.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I just want to remind the committee that this has been a reorganized attempt to have an experimental crop insurance program. It has been the experience and the justifications have pointed out that since the reorganization and since it has been put upon an experimental basis, that it has been very successful.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank my colleague from Washington. The program has been operating quite successfully. This committee has impressed upon the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation that they must take steps to bring it into a more businesslike operation. This they have done. It is a program which has meant that the farmer has a way to protect himself against disaster, which will relieve the Treasury of the United States, when he carries and sets aside a certain amount of premiums. There is no other organization or company that writes this type of insurance.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. This amendment, as I see it, would seriously cripple this very important activity which is a healthy one not only for the farmer but for the country. I call attention to the fact that only the other day we passed a $100 million authorization with the power to issue bonds to the Export-Import Bank to take care of certain exports abroad and to protect them and to allow insurance where there is an expropriation of property. The other day we did it for business, but now we do not want to take this valuable asset away from the farmer today.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely correct, and I have no doubt that the Members of this House will vote down the amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. It is true, as the gentleman says, that there is no other place where the farmers can turn to get insurance. It is also true, is it not, that the commercial insurance companies of this country are watching the experiment, and if it turns out to be successful, I think in time we can expect there will be commercial crop insurance. But, if we drop the thing now as we will if we accept this amendment, then there will be no possibility of the farmer getting crop insurance.

Mr. MARSHALL. There are two commodities. I understand that wheat and tobacco are crop insurance that the commercial insurance companies are looking at this program for with a great deal of interest. Several have expressed themselves upon this valuable experimental work carried on by the Government. There is a good, strong possibility that they may enter into that field.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Loan authorizations

For loans in accordance with said act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act as follows: Rural electrification program, $135 million; and rural telephone program, $50 million; and additional amounts, not to exceed $30 million for the rural electrification program, may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1954, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 38, line 2, after the comma strike out the balance of the line and all of line 3 and insert "and may be distributed in any State or Territory in addition to any sum which such State may otherwise receive."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is legislation on an appropriation bill and contrary to existing law.

Mr. POAGE. I wonder if the gentleman would withhold the point of order until I have made a statement?

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman might get time by striking out the last word if he wanted to, but I think we ought to go through with this at the moment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. May not the gentleman from Texas be heard briefly on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I will have to concede the point of order because I know it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, that the Members may know just what has happened, I want everyone to understand that the present law for the allocation of Rural Electrification Administration funds provides that not more than 10 percent of the moneys authorized to be loaned in any 1 year may be loaned in any 1 State. That worked very well when we first started this program, and it was a fair provision when originally adopted because all the States were seeking to establish new electric distribution facilities.

Since many of the States have completed or very largely completed their rural electrification program, they find they do not need a large share of this money, whereas other States have continuing needs for an ever larger share of this money. Consequently, the 10-percent limitation works a grievous hardship upon certain States.

Particularly does this 10-percent limitation destroy the opportunity to establish what are known as generation and transmission facilities in a large number of States. I recognize that there is a general disposition to give lip service to generation and transmission facilities. Likewise I recognize that a great many Members in this House do not believe in generation and transmission facilities and would like to see them killed but do not want to administer the lethal blow in public. Personally, I believe they are essential.

I think that if we do not have the ability to provide the needed facilities; that is, the electrical power, to serve these rural customers we have definitely taken the shell out of the shotgun. To tell these people that they still have the right to make a generation and transmission loan is a cruel joke when you deny them the opportunity to make that loan by so restricting the funds that they cannot receive it.

Under the terms of this bill $135 million is made available for electric loans subject to all of the restrictions of the basic law. This means that in no State can more than $13,500,000 be loaned for all purposes. In a State where there is still an active distribution program, you will find there is a need for a large part of that money to carry on the normal work of improving the local systems that are now distributing power to the people.

When you establish one of these generation and transmission facilities it runs into a substantial amount of money, often five to ten million dollars. The result is that so long as all the money is restricted as is the $135 million authorized in this bill, it is impossible to make any appreciable number of generation and transmission loans unless you are to authorize a great deal more money.

I had thought yesterday we had an explanation here on the floor which I understood meant that we could use the $30 million item contained in this bill without limitation. I understood today the committee really did not mean that, they meant that the $30 million could be used simply upon the same terms that the rest of the money could be used. This means that you could not get enough money to carry on the generation and transmission loan program under this bill. It means that this House has this afternoon by the use of the rules—and I agree that it is the rule—made it impossible for the Members of this House to keep our pledge to the rural people of America that they would have the opportunity to borrow the funds needed for generation and transmission facilities. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee had a perfect right to make the point of order. I don't criticize him but I want everyone to understand the effect of his action.

I hope none of you will go home and tell your people that you voted for generation and transmission facilities. You have not had any opportunity to do so. There has been no opportunity in this House for you to provide the funds whereby there could really be generation and transmission facilities in all the States of the Union.

I call your attention to that because I know some of you honestly believe that you are providing for generation and transmission facilities. I have no criticism of those who do not believe in the generation and transmission program. You have a right not to believe in it. But I would like to see those who do not want such a program to stand up here and fight it in the open and come out and say "We do not believe in it," rather than tell the people, "Oh, yes, we are for generation and transmission," and then give the people a bill which makes the REA say "We would like to approve your generation and transmission loan applications but we cannot do so and at the same time approve the smaller loans which your State's local distribution cooperatives have submitted."

We could have avoided this reception by adopting language similar to that which I proposed in the suggested amendment. This would have made it possible to apportion the $135 million and to have then used the $30 million wherever it might be needed. This is the simple and effective way of making it possible for REA to make generation and transmission loans without increasing the total of this bill by one red cent. Obviously, no one would object to this method, or raise a point of order against it, unless he wanted to hamper these loans.

I do not believe in telling the people, "I am going to put a gun in your hands whereby you can protect yourself from the private power companies," and then before I give them the gun to remove the shells and fix it so that the gun will not fire. That is exactly what we have done this afternoon. Make no mistake about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred to Farmers' Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, the extension of financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and the administration of assets transferred under subsection 2 (f) of the act of May 3, 1950, $27,600,000, together with a transfer to this appropriation item of not to exceed $325,000 of the fees and administrative expense charges made available by subsections (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GWINN: On page 40, line 12, strike out "$27,600,000" and insert "$12,600,000."

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members should know and be at least conscious when we vote on these sums what 15 years of the giveaway program has done, and what we are in for if the Republicans are going to jump out of their free pastures over the fence with the goats. We get mixed up so that we cannot tell whether we are Republicans for free economy or goats full of the same tears the administration had before us. Are we to continue the socializing program of taking money from some and redistributing it to others wherever we find the opportunity to do good in return for votes? I do not believe we Republicans can possibly outbid the New Deal in this. This amendment simply cuts down the cost of administration of the $165 million that we proposed to loan not to exceed $1,000 to each farmer in certain areas of the country.

The administration of this Department costs 17 percent of all the loans that are given to farmers. I say "given" because this Department has the power to adjust or to modify or to even cancel the loans. In that kind of business, during the last 15 years, the taxpayers of

the country have been forced to loan $648 million only to have them adjusted, or canceled, or done away with. Banks would make loans to farmers at an administrative cost not to exceed 2 percent, whereas this Federal agency cost 17 percent to administer. The agency admits a loss of $118 million, not including interest, plus $555 million in administrative salaries and expenses, a total of $669 million of costs of administration as against a total lending of $641 million. That is one reason why we ought to stop this immoral socializing of our economy. In the last analysis, there is no such thing as a give-away program. It costs more in administration than the people get back in gifts or loans.

This amendment reduces the appropriation by $15 million, but still leaves $12,600,000 for administrative expense. That's a lot of administration. The agency should ultimately be liquidated entirely.

Like so many, it is a kind of political bonanza. In 1952, an election year, the Bureau adjusted or canceled the loans made to 82,873 farmers. To do all this requires an annual payroll of over 6,000 people, occupying well-equipped offices. The Bureau last year spent $29.5 million, or roughly 17 percent, of the amount of the loans to make them and to cancel part of them. Private lending and collecting costs less than 2 percent. Now the total number of beneficiaries in this welfare-state bureau lending business, including Government employees and borrowers and their families, add up to at least 300,000 votes, and this covers just 1 year in 1 bureau.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Would not the gentleman say that some of this legislation that is proposed is based on political expediency and action taken?

Mr. GWINN. I know of very little of it that starts from A and goes to Z that is not.

Mr. GAVIN. And what votes it will mean?

Mr. GWINN. Why, certainly. It is obvious. I doubt if the Congress has the power, a majority of us, to stop these things, but I think we ought to be thinking about them.

Mr. GAVIN. I was not quite clear as to what the gentleman was inquiring about. I am glad I understand the query now.

Mr. GWINN. I take it the gentleman agrees.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman complains about cost of administration. Is the gentleman not willing to trust the Administration now in power to achieve a degree of efficiency and economy which the gentleman thinks it should achieve?

Mr. GWINN. I have just indicated to the gentleman I have been trusting the party in power to dissolve and discontinue this sort of socialism. I still hope, when we are in power long enough, to understand the mortgage that has been placed upon us. My amendment simply provides that the administrative costs be scaled down from 17 percent to about 7 or 8 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. COOLEY), the gentleman's time was extended 2 minutes.)

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman one further question. Assuming that the administrative cost is excessive, may I suggest to the gentleman that great economy has already been accomplished in the Department of Agriculture, as has been indicated in this debate? But is the gentleman not willing to trust Mr. Benson and his associates to achieve the highest degree of efficiency possible?

Mr. GWINN. I think our experience indicates that we ought to set limits. We have no way otherwise of discharging unnecessary employees. We may get sued for discharging them. They claim a civil-service status.

Mr. COOLEY. If we are going to have suits against the Government every time an employee is fired, there will be a lot of Democrats suing; but on behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture, I suggest that Mr. Benson should be given an opportunity to see whether or not he can reduce these administrative costs during the current year, and perhaps next year.

Mr. GWINN. I think the Congress ought to indicate to him that we are conscious of the fact that reductions should be made.

Mr. COOLEY. I suggest this, rather than going at it in meat-ax fashion.

Mr. GWINN. The figures are $27,600,000 for administrative loaning of $162,000,000. That is 17 percent. My amendment simply cuts it down to $12,600,000, or about 7 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. This administrative cost is a little something more than the administration that is usually given by a banking corporation or other private lending agency. It is close supervision of the income of the farmers in the low-income brackets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. HOPE), the gentleman's time was extended 2 minutes.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to suggest that this is in the nature of a rural rehabilitation program and does embrace very close supervision of the income of farmers in the low-income bracket. It is not simply the ordinary administrative cost.

Mr. GWINN. Does the gentleman remember that this is the great-great-grandson of Henry Wallace's AAA program, which was a rehabilitation program 15 years ago? Its ancestry is clearly socialistic and clearly communistic.

Mr. COOLEY. To clear up the ancestry a little, this is a direct descendant of Henry A. Wallace's farm-security program, but it is a great improvement over the farm-security program as it was operated then.

Mr. GWINN. In an election year, when this Department cancels the loans or adjusts them for 82,873 farmers, that takes on some more of the elements of political expediency to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] referred. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has been talking about giveaway programs and socialistic programs. I would like to ask him if a Republican administration presided over by Abraham Lincoln did not originate one of the greatest give-away programs of all time by the passage of the Homestead Act? I wonder if the gentleman would like to comment on that.

Mr. GWINN. I would like to comment on that, and I would like 2 more minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN. Abraham Lincoln turned loose the public lands that the people might settle and build up. He was in favor of returning the public domain to the people. The administration for the last 20 years has been taking it all back until now we have 20 percent of the land in the hands of the Government. I would like to imitate Abe Lincoln and turn it back to the individuals again. He never thought of taking money or land from some citizens and giving it to others as this bill proposes. He gave them land from the public domain, wild lands. After that he made them no loans, gifts, crop insurance, subsidies, grants-in-aid, support prices, and so forth, out of the Treasury in Washington.

Mr. HOPE. Is there any difference between that type of giveaway program and the giveaway program of today?

Mr. GWINN. There is no analogy, because he was just giving back to the people what was theirs in the first place.

Mr. HOPE. His was a program to give land to the people?

Mr. GWINN. This land belonged to the States and to the people, not to the Federal Government. That is all Abe Lincoln recognized. It was like giving back the oil lands to the people they belonged to.

Mr. HOPE. Well, he gave it to the people; it was a giveaway program.

Mr. GWINN. This is different; this socialist program is one of taking money from one group of citizens and redistributing it to another under compulsion. Abe Lincoln never did that.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the Homestead Act was one of those early acts that has been followed by many in the encouragement of overproduction so that the farmers have always been kept poor and have had no bargaining position because of it?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment

and all amendments thereto be limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a little time on this side.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, with 5 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a few minutes to bring a few facts before the House. In the first place, if you accept this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York—I am sure it is an amendment which has not been thought through very clearly—you will place in danger the Government's equity in a total of $648 million in outstanding loans for which there will be no proper supervising. The gentleman mentioned taking care of $117 million in new loans. In addition, this agency must be responsible for $648,006,722 of outstanding loans as of this date. Remember that if you accept the gentleman's amendment it will have a direct affect upon farm ownership loans to veterans. Are you going to shut the gate entirely in their faces? I do not think you are. Remember also that this new program of the Farmers Home Administration, which has only been in effect 6 years, replaced the old defunct Farm Security Credit Administration. Of the production and subsistence loans of approximately $559 million advanced to farmers who could not get credit elsewhere, $376 million has been repaid. The repayment record shows a 92½-percent repayment to date on maturities due. I think that is a splendid record in connection with the farmers and veterans who have no other place to go for credit.

Also, in relation to direct farm loans of the $419 million made available for such purposes, these people have paid 123 percent to date on the maturities due.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I point out that repayment is good. This agency took over the work that used to be done for those who could not command credit from other sources, they used to be served by emergency crop and seed loans, from RACC and from the Farm Security Administration. This program has been well administered. We have reduced it in the present bill one and three-quarters million below what it was last year.

This is a program that allows young people, veterans included, to go on the land, who cannot go to the banks or to the Federal Farm Credit Administration services and get credit. I trust that the pending amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. The gentleman from Washington does not deny, does he, that the total cost of administering this business in Washington exceeds the total amount of the loans to date?

Mr. HORAN. I wish the gentleman would be charitable enough to realize that when you have men who cannot command credit from other sources, that they require supervision and then servicing, it costs money to run this institution, and our subcommittee has always demanded of that administration that when these folks become successful the Farmers Home Administration will cut them off from this kind of credit and ask them to go to the private banks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to observe that the Farmers' Home Administration is actually one of the best operated agencies of the present Government. It has rendered and is rendering a worthwhile service. I am definitely of the opinion that adoption of this amendment would completely destroy the effectiveness of the Farmers Home Administration program, and, further than that, it will jeopardize tens of millions of dollars that the Government already has invested. As has been indicated by the chairman of the subcommittee, the collections now are about 126 percent of the amount due on loans.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is in connection with the farm ownership loans.

Mr. COOLEY. As I understand it, this money is used not only for the purpose of servicing current loans but it is used also for supervising borrowers to whom loans have been made running up to many millions of dollars.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. If you handicap this administration, as the administration will be handicapped by the adoption of this amendment, you will jeopardize those loans which are now currently being collected at the rate of 126 percent.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to join with the gentleman in commending the present Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, Mr. Dillard Lasseter. In the opinion of our subcommittee he is one of the best administrators in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. I know he will appreciate that, and I know the majority of the Members of this House will also agree that Mr. Lasseter has done a fine job.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there is much additional light that I can shed on this subject or any phase of it that others have not made available, but we on this subcommittee are the instruments and agents of the Congress and we try as best we can to look at the country in its entirety and the people of the country with reference to their particular problems. We, too, believe in private enterprise, but there is no question but that this is one of the finest programs that you can conceive of and is under a very splendid Administrator, Mr. Dillard Lassiter. But this program is limited to those who have to show that they cannot get credit elsewhere before they can qualify. Having shown that and having shown that they have a reasonable right to believe that they could pay back loans that were made to them or pay for the farm and home which they may buy through the help of this agency, then they are approved and set out to farm themselves. First, this is the low income group, many times share workers, that, to start with, cannot get credit anywhere, and yet when you restrict this program to that class of borrowers, to that class of individuals who cannot get credit anywhere, they have shown the finest kind of repayment record. Why? Because they have had this $27 million of supervision which is so highly essential in teaching these folks who have not up to that time been able to meet the problems that arise, or get themselves on their feet. We, in this country, have had laws written throughout the years and there has been a lot of competition as to how these laws were written, and I might point out that the way they were written may have determined the way the national-income dollar has been distributed in years past. If we can make self-sustaining, honorable, solid citizens out of these folks without expense to the Government, it is a good investment.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The adoption of this amendment would be costly since there is no provision for servicing the outstanding loans which are under the control of the Government.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, my colleague is correct. It would be bad business to adopt this amendment if you were even going to abolish the program. Everybody knows that the gentleman from New York would scuttle this program just like his other amendment would scuttle the crop-insurance program.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. A Republican colleague from the Midwest told me the other day, "Do not pay any attention to these so-called farmers from New York State." He said, "They come from an area that has been highly developed for 150 years with the greatest market in the world in hollering distance. We

cannot get them west of Maryland nor can we get them to look west of Maryland. They think the rest of the country is still Indian country."

That, I think, is the best explanation for the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I hope you will send it back from whence it came.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GWINN) there were—ayes 30, noes 131.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is not clear as to whether or not the amount of $11,586,000 under the section of the bill entitled Bureau of Plant Industry, soils, and agricultural engineering, includes the sum of $40,000 or any other sum for barley research.

It is my understanding that the 1952 production of barley was the smallest barley crop since 1937 and that it is vital that this crop be increased.

Presently, the barley crop is being jeopardized by a new barley disease called false stripe disease which is damaging the malting barley crop.

My district in Wisconsin contains both outstanding malting companies and the great brewing companies of our Nation. We all know that beer is the common man's drink in America.

Therefore, it is vital to the malting and the brewing industry that this barley research be carried on. I think it should be clear at this point, Mr. Chairman, that included in this sum is the sum of at least $40,000 to carry on the barley research. I wish to include in my remarks communications that I have received on this subject from highly reputable firms from the Milwaukee area:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *April 30, 1953.*

The Honorable C. J. KERSTEN,
Congressman from Wisconsin,
House Office Building:

Referring to the bill soon to be introduced covering the appropriation for the United States Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953, we strongly urge that you vigorously support the proposed increase of $2,400,000 for the Agricultural Research Administration and the increase of $534,000 for the Bureau of Plant Industry. At present there is no increase provided for the Division of Cereal Crops and Diseases, although there is dire need for more adequate appropriations for grain research. The recently discovered false stripe disease of barley focuses particular attention to the need for more research on control measures for this serious virus disease now present in many important barley-producing States. Additional funds for barley research are therefore most urgently required and we respectfully request that you vote for a specific increase of at least $40,000 in appropriation for barley research over and above the present allotment of $159,000. Your kind consideration will be greatly appreciated.

LADISH MALTING CO.

Hon. CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We wish to impress upon you the necessity of further research study on barley. There has been a new disease found in barley known as the false stripe which is affecting the growth and yields of barley in the central Northern States to the extent of approximately 31 percent.

This new disease has been investigated and we believe it is highly necessary at this time for further study of the possibilities of its correction. To do this we feel that the United States Department of Agriculture's Research Department should be allotted an additional forty to fifty thousand dollars, properly earmarked for this particular purpose.

You no doubt are aware that the production of barley has been declining considerably in this country and last year we had one of the smallest crops in many years. In order to correct this we feel that any research that is necessary should be done.

Anything that you may do to help carry on toward the alloting of this necessary additional money to the United States Department of Agriculture for research will be very much appreciated by me.

Yours very truly,

C. KURTH, *Jr.,*
Chairman of the Board,
the Kurth Malting Co.

The Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inasmuch as we are consumers of farm products and in particular barley, we wish to urge you to vote in favor of the bill authorizing the general increase in funds for research in the United States Department of Agriculture and in particular for the earmarked funds for barley research.

We understand that a considerable portion of these funds is to be used for the study of a virus disease in barley which is still further reducing the yields of quality barley from the already dwindling supplies available on the market.

It is reasonable to point out to you that the end consumer products of barley bring to the Government over one-hundred-fold more tax return than the amounts requested for research and this is very little to invest to insure continued and possibly better returns through this industry.

We should further point out to you that the activities of this industry provide employment for a large number of people beyond the farming level and their interests are involved in such work. You should consider in supporting this expenditure that a large portion of our population enjoys pleasure with moderation from the end product consumed and it is to all of our interests to produce this end product, beer, as economically as possible.

We urge you to support agricultural research and in particular research (that is aimed at higher yields through control of plant diseases) on barley grown by our farmers.

Yours very truly,

WISCONSIN MALTING CO.,
R. B. OESTING,
Director of Research.

Hon. CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KERSTEN: I understand that the Truman budget for 1954 provided $79,505,708 for Agricultural Research Administration, and that this was reduced in the Eisenhower budget by $2,347,000, but that there still remains a million dollars for payments to the State agricultural experiment stations. Of this amount $40,000 is earmarked for barley research.

Dr. Wiebe of the United States Department of Agriculture has done excellent work on barley research, and it would be a shame to have to discontinue his work, particularly in view of a new barley disease called false stripe disease which is making inroads in more and more of the malting barley territory.

I earnestly appeal to you to use your influence and vote for the general increase in funds for research.

If you do not agree with this program I would appreciate hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

ZINN MALTING CO.,
WALTER G. ZINN,
Vice President.

The Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: It is our understanding that the President's budget recently submitted to Congress calls for an increase of $2,400,000 for agricultural research.

The 1952 production of barley showed a crop of 227,008,000 bushels, which is the smallest crop on record since 1937. The 10-year average from 1941 to 1951 was 306,127 bushels. This year's Government report giving the intentions to plant shows another decrease in acreage. In addition to this, the subsoil moisture in the principal barley-producing areas of the Middle West is definitely deficient. On even a partial crop failure, industry would be jeopardized by a lack of supplies.

We, therefore, strongly urge you to recommend the increase in appropriations, and particularly to earmark a minimum of $40,000 for barley research, not only to combat presently known diseases, but to further the development of new types of barley which are so urgently needed.

Very truly yours,

PROEDTERT GRAIN & MALTING CO., INC.,
ALVIN R. CORD, *President.*

MIDWEST BARLEY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Milwaukee, Wis., May 17, 1953.

Congressman CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KERSTEN: Please find enclosed an article on agricultural research from today's Milwaukee Journal. I think this article will be of interest to you in connection with the United States Department of Agriculture appropriations bill when it is considered by the House.

Very sincerely,

JOHN H. PARKER, *Director.*

I hope you will speak and vote for a modest increase in the appropriation for cereal research, including an item of $40,000 for barley, when the United States Department of Agriculture bill is up for action in the House.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 17, 1953]

RESEARCH PAYS OFF THOUSANDFOLD TO KEEP STATE FARMERS PROSPEROUS—THANKS TO IMPROVEMENTS MADE BY SCIENCE AND THEIR QUICK ACCEPTANCE, WISCONSIN HOLDS ITS POSITION AS A BILLION-DOLLAR FARM STATE

(By Lewis C. French)

The times have changed in agricultural research. No longer can the men of farm science work from a window ledge. The test tube and laboratory retort today are not sufficient, although there was a day when relatively simple tools led to resounding developments.

Before the turn of the century, Dr. S. M. Babcock developed his butterfat tester. He had an idea, a jackknife to whittle out many of the parts, and the help of a handy-andy smithy and his forge. It took him 2 years to iron out the defects. He worked in a humble basement room on the University of Wisconsin campus.

The cost was less than $300. But look at the results—a new era in dairy development. And the fame of Wisconsin and its university spread around the globe.

Now agricultural research is pretty complicated. It costs what seems a lot of money until you measure the results.

The records show that a dollar spent in farm research pays a thousandfold.

RESEARCH PUT STATE IN BILLION-DOLLAR CLASS

The 20 years before 1910 at the University of Wisconsin witnessed the development of the Babcock test, focusing attention on scientific dairying. The same era saw the start of plant breeding, development of the cold cure for cheese, development of certified seed, new methods of soil analysis with a statewide program for lime and enriching the soils, work to improve corn, tobacco, the small grains, and alfalfas, the forage crops.

And some of the greatest gains in animal nutrition were also made, with their subsequent widespread application to human diets.

It was this research work that put Wisconsin into the billion-dollar-a-year farm-income class. The original work on vegetables made Wisconsin the top canning State in the Nation.

The work never stops. In fact, agricultural progress is the story of changes, never standing still.

DR. FRED SPEAKS UP

"Research workers have to keep ahead of changing conditions," says Dr. E. B. Fred, president of the University of Wisconsin and former dean of the college of agriculture, trained in bacteriology. "Farm people have to be ready to shift their farming pattern and practices as new things come along."

In case you still have doubts about the men of agricultural science earning their pay or the way in which farm research is translated into practical results, consider golden corn.

In one swift jump the acceptance of hybrid corn increased yields 20 percent to boost Wisconsin farm income a whopping $73 million a year. It was not an accident; rather, it resulted from planned and tedious research. There were months of germinating seed under chilling refrigeration, of selecting seed that thrived in the colder Wisconsin climate and in heavy clay soils.

Having developed seed tailored to Wisconsin conditions, a battery of specialists teamed up to write soil and growing prescriptions to prove that Wisconsin farmers should average at least 120 bushels an acre rather than the 50 to 55 bushels previously recorded in better corn years.

WHAT PROFITS MEANS

The increased yield on corn alone represents a sum almost equal to the entire appropriations for the State's experiment stations since 1883, according to President Fred.

Or scan the records on oats. When rusts and funguses kicked up by dust storms in the wheatlands threatened Wisconsin's oat crop, skilled plant breeders worked more than 8 years to breed resistance into the sensational Vicland and Forvic oats. And when these varieties fell victim to new threats, the scientists came up with the Bonda and Clinton varieties.

From 1924 through 1942 there were only 4 years in which Wisconsin farms produced oats that averaged more than 40 bushels an acre. But, through research, the State average from 1944 through 1952 never dropped below 40 bushels. The average used to be 33 to 35 bushels; it is now 43 to 45. The increase is worth at least $15 million a year.

This variety improvement never stops. Today there is the new Branch variety of oats and still another improvement, the Sauk, being developed.

HANDFUL OF SEEDS RESULTS IN NEW ALFALFA

Few people, even farmers, really appreciate the work that goes into developing seed supplies. It took 8 years of intensive selection and trials to develop Vernal, the new alfalfa which is expected to give Wisconsin farmers greater security against forage crop failures, the wilt and winter killing. Here the hardiest varieties of domestic alfalfa were crossed with yellow flowered wild alfalfa from northern Europe. A handful of seed was nursed into a supply big enough for general distribution in 1955.

And remember Wisconsin has 2,500,000 dairy cows that must be well fed to make those milk checks read $500 million a year. With milk prices going down, it is more important than ever to use more farm-produced grains and forages. Over at the Wisconsin College of Agriculture the research staff is teamed up to produce 4 tons of good forage per acre rather than 2½ tons an acre. The goal is to cut the $100 million commercial feed bills of dairymen in half through better grassland farming.

With the stress in dairy markets away from butterfat and more to nonfat solids in milk, there is also emphasis on higher milk production. Rather than an average of 7,010 pounds, the dairymen need cows that will average at least 10,000 pounds of milk with perhaps a more moderate amount of fat.

ARTIFICIAL BREEDING EXPANDS

One of the greatest impacts on dairying has been the growth of artificial breeding. Wisconsin tops the Nation in the use of sires with an inheritance of high production to spread the blood among many cows and on many average farms.

The average dairyman cannot afford a top-notch pedigreed bull costing $5,000 to $25,000 or more. But he can belong to one of the artificial breeding associations which are rapidly acquiring the best proven bulls of the different breeds.

More than 900,000 cows, roughly a third in the State, are to be bred artificially this year.

Success of artificial breeding has been proved. Now research work is going on to improve the methods.

Normally semen is good for about a week if kept properly. The technician would rather use it within 3 days.

The British have developed one method of freezing the semen, and a team of genetic and other research experts at the University of Wisconsin is testing buffers which protect the live semen in the quick freeze, a tricky process of slow chilling and then quick freeze.

CHECK ON OFFSPRING

Working with the artificial breeding rings, the technicians have successfully impregnated cows with weeks old frozen semen. The calves are due to be dropped this summer. Before the results of the buffer and freezing research are made public the research staff first wants to be sure of the end results, thrifty offspring. But all present indications are that the semen can be preserved for more than half a year, even up to 9 months.

Now think what this means. One great sire, perhaps the son of a production champion, can be used on thousands of cattle rather than hundreds. Distance around the world is no bar to a better breeding program.

There are also spectacular new methods in marketing Wisconsin milk just around the research corner.

Having built up its annual milk production to 15½ billion pounds a year, Wisconsin must have big interstate outlets. Now with butter slipping in sales demand, attention is shifting more to fluid (bottle) milk and cream, the dried and canned milks and cheese.

Wisconsin has long been the victim of sharp ups and downs in the sale of its fresh milk and cream. When Atlantic seaboard cities or the South are short of milk, dealers almost batter down the doors of Wisconsin to get fresh milk shipped long distances. But the minute the eastern or southern milksheds think they have enough local milk, the barrier lid is slapped down.

Milk may be $3.50 a hundredweight in Wisconsin and $6.50 in Boston or $7 in Texas, but in times of plenty, such as now, the health authorities and local milk pools do their utmost to stop Wisconsin milk from going to those markets.

METHODS TO BEAT STATE, LOCAL BARRIERS

What's the answer?

In gleaming Babcock Hall on the university "ag" campus, scientists are working full tilt to overcome the barriers of State lines and local markets.

They have developed methods of sterilizing fresh milk and cream so that it can be put into containers, even tin cans, and kept fresh much longer.

They have developed a new freezing process that overcomes the old-market objections of the fat and milk proteins separating and coagulating when frozen.

They have perfected a new process of drying milk which removes any burned flavor. This dried milk is easily soluble, a nonperishable powder that can be reconstituted with little effort.

Also they have developed a better system of concentrating milk, pulling out more of the water to save on shipping costs.

With such research results, the wide world is a Wisconsin market. Sterile Wisconsin milk in cans is already going to Alaska and the State is reaching for a position that will permit it to sell milk direct to the consumer—and thumb its nose at the choosy interstate dealers.

FARMS, FORESTS, FACTORIES BENEFIT

The research that is now going on envelops all of Wisconsin, the farms and forests and factories.

For the canners there is a new sweet corn. It is a big-eared hybrid with that Golden Bantam taste but without the scales between the kernels—the glumes that snarl up in your teeth when you feast on sweet corn. Canners objected to the glumes because they were difficult to remove and prevented deep cutting from the cob. So the farm scientists have bred out the scales, just as they earlier bred out the bothersome barbs of barley.

In the interests of the new forests the genetic experts have developed a white pine resistant to blister rust, aspen that will overcome the deadly canker, and even maple trees that will yield more sugar sap.

For the Wisconsin tobacco grower, correction of soil defects was found to yield more of the desirable thin leaf product for a good burning cigar. And for the fruit grower there is one chemical compound to thin out spring blossoms to get bigger and more fruit and another compound to cement the ripened apples to the tree, thus cutting loss from windfalls.

And down the list to the apiarist. The bee experts through artificial breeding have upset the love life of the queen, but have come up with strains of bees that stay busier than ever, avoid swarming, and, believe it or not, don't have a tendency to sting.

TODAY'S BUSY HENS

For the poultry men hens have been developed that average 185 eggs a year rather than 60 as in 1910. The broiler producer now grows a 3-pound bird in 10 weeks. It used to take 12 to 14 weeks. He saves on feed, too.

"We are just around the corner from the better flocks with hens averaging 300 eggs a year," says J. P. Halpin, of the Wisconsin College of Agriculture poultry department. "Feed costs on meat poultry have been cut almost in half."

One of the most amazing facts about agricultural research—and one that indicates how much there is still to be explored—is that out of some 3,000 plants known to be valuable as food only about 150 have been extensively cultivated. And of these, only about 3 dozen are of major importance. Rice feeds about half the world, wheat and potatoes a high percentage of the other half.

To fully appreciate the importance of this fact, remember that corn was originally a wild South American grass with seed pods and the potato was a wild plant with scrubby tubers the size of golf balls. Look at what

research development has accomplished with these two plants that are native to the Americas.

"Science is man's restless seeking for new and better crops and of doing things to the end that man secure wider control of the forces of nature," says Noble Clark, assistant director of the University of Wisconsin experiment stations. "The prime purpose is to give humanity a constantly higher standard of living and greater security."

"It is a tragic fact that two-thirds of the world's people go to bed hungry nearly every night," adds Director Clark, who has had a close look at land problems and famine abroad as a member of a U. N. mission. "Proper research and application of the 'know-how' is the only answer to acute food needs. And where there is food and fiber enough, there is peace and progress."

RESEARCH MAKES UP FOR OUR POORER SOIL

No State has applied research to its farms better than Wisconsin. The State had to, not being blessed with such good land as its Corn Belt neighbors.

Look at the facts: Wisconsin, with 168,500 farms and 10,112,000 acres of cropland, had a 1951 farm income of $1,186,000,000.

Illinois, with 195,268 farms and 20,365,000 acres of land, had a farm-market income that year of $3,028,000,000. And Iowa, with 203,159 farms and 22,547,000 acres of cropland, reached $2,361,000,000. But that's not the whole story.

Wisconsin has only 2,820,000 acres out of the 10 million in farms which rate as "excellent." In sharp contrast, Illinois has 14,777,000 "excellent" acres, and Iowa is blessed with close to 26 million.

Wisconsin had to do a better job by keeping up with the new to be able to keep in that billion-dollar bracket.

That the Wisconsin farmer has received his money's worth and then some out of research is evident from the fact that the legislative appropriation spent on agricultural research in 1951 was $1,450,000, or 0.122 percent of the total farm cash income that year. The combined Federal and State appropriation was $1,780,000, or 0.15 percent of the total Wisconsin cash farm income.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there do not appear to be further amendments to the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCULLOCH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called ACP amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Rees of Kansas amendment, in regard to the limitation of ACP payments.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on the other amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 31, lines 14 and 15, strike out "$195,000,000" and insert "$140,000,000"; and in the same paragraph, line 20, strike out "15" and insert "40."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 201, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—196

Addonizio	Dolliver	Kearney
Allen, Calif.	Dondero	Kearns
Allen, Ill.	Donovan	Keating
Arends	Dorn, N. Y.	Kelly, N. Y.
Auchincloss	Eberharter	Keogh
Ayres	Ellsworth	Kilburn
Barrett	Engle	King, Pa.
Bates	Fallon	Kirwan
Beamer	Feighan	Klein
Becker	Fine	Kluczynski
Belcher	Fino	Knox
Bender	Fisher	Laird
Bennett, Fla.	Fogarty	Lantaff
Betts	Ford	Latham
Bishop	Frelinghuysen	McConnell
Bolton, Frances P.	Friedel	McCulloch
	Fulton	McDonough
Boech	Gamble	McGregor
Bow	Garmatz	McIntire
Bramblett	Gary	McVey
Brown, Ohio	Gavin	Mack, Wash.
Brownson	Golden	Mailliard
Broyhill	Goodwin	Mason
Buchanan	Gordon	Meader
Budge	Graham	Merrill
Busbey	Granahan	Miller, Nebr.
Byrne, Pa.	Gubser	Morano
Byrnes, Wis.	Gwinn	Multer
Campbell	Hale	Mumma
Case	Haley	Neal
Cederberg	Halleck	Nelson
Chiperfield	Hand	Nicholson
Chudoff	Harden	Norblad
Church	Harrison, Nebr.	Oakman
Clardy	Hart	O'Brien, Ill.
Clevenger	Herlong	O'Hara, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Heselton	Osmers
Coon	Hess	Ostertag
Corbett	Hiestand	Patten
Cotton	Hillings	Patterson
Coudert	Hinshaw	Pelly
Cretella	Hoffman, Ill.	Phillips
Crumpacker	Holmes	Poff
Curtis, Mass.	Holt	Powell
Curtis, Mo.	Holtzman	Rabaut
Curtis, Nebr.	Hosmer	Radwan
Davis, Wis.	Hruska	Ray
Dawson, Utah	Hunter	Reed, Ill.
Delaney	Hyde	Reed, N. Y.
Derounian	Jackson	Rees, Kans.
Devereux	Javits	Regan
Dodd	Johnson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dollinger	Kean	Richlman
Robsion, Ky.	Springer	Wainwright
Rodino	Stauffer	Warburton
Rogers, Mass.	Stringfellow	Weichel
Rooney	Taber	Westland
Sadlak	Taylor	Wharton
Saylor	Thomas	Widnall
Schenck	Thompson, Mich.	Wigglesworth
Scherer		Wilson, Calif.
Scott	Tollefson	Wolcott
Scudder	Utt	Wolverton
Sheehan	Velde	Yates
Simpson, Pa.	Vorys	Young
Small	Vursell	Younger

NAYS—201

Abbitt	Gentry	O'Konski
Abernethy	George	O'Neill
Adair	Gregory	Passman
Albert	Gross	Patman
Alexander	Hagen, Calif.	Perkins
Andersen, H. Carl	Hagen, Minn.	Pfost
	Hardy	Philbin
Andresen, August H.	Harris	Pillion
	Harrison, Va.	Poage
Andrews	Harrison, Wyo.	Polk
Aspinall	Harvey	Preston
Bailey	Hays, Ark.	Price
Baker	Hays, Ohio	Priest
Battle	Hill	Prouty
Bennett, Mich.	Hoeven	Rains
Bentley	Holifield	Rayburn
Berry	Hope	Reams
Blatnik	Horan	Reece, Tenn.
Boggs	Howell	Rhodes, Pa.
Boland	Ikard	Richards
Bolling	Jarman	Riley
Bolton, Oliver P.	Jenkins	Rivers
	Jensen	Roberts
Bonin	Jonas, N. C.	Robeson, Va.
Boykin	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Bray	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Brooks, La.	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Tex.
Brooks, Tex.	Judd	Scrivner
Brown, Ga.	Karsten, Mo.	Secrest
Burdick	Kee	Seely-Brown
Burleson	Kelley, Pa.	Selden
Byrd	Kersten, Wis.	Shelley
Camp	Kilday	Sheppard
Cannon	King, Calif.	Short
Carlyle	Krueger	Shuford
Carnahan	Landrum	Sieminski
Carrigg	Lane	Sikes
Chatham	Lanham	Simpson, Ill.
Chelf	LeCompte	Smith, Kans.
Chenoweth	Lesinski	Smith, Miss.
Cole, Mo.	Long	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Lovre	Spence
Condon	Lucas	Staggers
Cooley	Lyle	Steed
Cooper	McCarthy	Sutton
Crosser	McCormack	Talle
Cunningham	Machrowicz	Teague
Dague	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Davis, Ga.	Magnuson	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Mahon	Thornberry
Deane	Marshall	Trimble
Dempsey	Matthews	Tuck
D'Ewart	Merrow	Van Zandt
Dies	Metcalf	Vinson
Donohue	Miller, Calif.	Wampler
Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Kans.	Watts
Dowdy	Miller, Md.	Wheeler
Doyle	Miller, N. Y.	Whitten
Durham	Mills	Wickersham
Edmondson	Mollohan	Williams, Miss.
Elliott	Morgan	Williams, N. Y.
Evins	Morrison	Willis
Fenton	Moss	Wilson, Ind.
Fernandez	Murray	Wilson, Tex.
Forand	Norrell	Winstead
Forrester	O'Brien, Mich.	Withrow
Fountain	O'Brien, N. Y.	Yorty
Gathings	O'Hara, Minn.	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—33

Angell	Grant	Moulder
Barden	Green	Pilcher
Bentsen	Hébert	Poulson
Bonner	Heller	Roosevelt
Buckley	Hillelson	St. George
Bush	Hoffman, Mich.	Shafer
Canfield	James	Smith, Wis.
Celler	Jonas, Ill.	Sullivan
Dawson, Ill.	McMillan	Van Pelt
Dingell	Madden	Walter
Frazier	Martin, Iowa	Wier

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Green for, with Mr. Barden against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mr. Bush for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Bonner against.
Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Grant against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Moulder against.
Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Frazier against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Bentsen.
Mrs. St. George with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Hillelson with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Angell with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Wier.

Mr. BECKER, Mr. WOLVERTON, and Mr. OAKMAN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MACHROWICZ, Mr. SIEMINSKI, and Mr. FERNANDEZ changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 31, line 22, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 195, noes 110.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 384, nays 12, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—384

Abbitt	Bolton,	Clevenger
Abernethy	Oliver P.	Cole, Mo.
Adair	Bonin	Cole, N. Y.
Addonizio	Bosch	Colmer
Albert	Bow	Condon
Alexander	Boykin	Cooley
Allen, Calif.	Bramblett	Coon
Allen, Ill.	Bray	Cooper
Andersen,	Brooks, La.	Corbett
H. Carl	Brooks, Tex.	Cotton
Andresen,	Brown, Ga.	Cretella
August H.	Brown, Ohio	Crosser
Andrews	Brownson	Crumpacker
Arends	Broyhill	Cunningham
Aspinall	Buchanan	Curtis, Mass.
Auchincloss	Budge	Curtis, Mo.
Ayres	Burdick	Curtis, Nebr.
Bailey	Burleson	Dague
Baker	Busbey	Davis, Ga.
Barrett	Byrd	Davis, Tenn.
Battle	Byrne, Pa.	Dawson, Utah
Beamer	Byrnes, Wis.	Deane
Becker	Camp	Delaney
Belcher	Campbell	Dempsey
Bender	Cannon	Derounian
Bennett, Fla.	Carlyle	Devereux
Bennett, Mich.	Carnahan	D'Ewart
Bentley	Carrigg	Dies
Berry	Case	Dodd
Betts	Cederberg	Dollinger
Bishop	Chatham	Dolliver
Blatnik	Chelf	Dondero
Boggs	Chenoweth	Donohue
Boland	Chiperfield	Dorn, N. Y.
Bolling	Chudoff	Dorn, S. C.
Bolton,	Church	Dowdy
Frances P.	Clardy	Doyle
Durham	Kilburn	Reed, Ill.
Eberharter	Kilday	Reed, N. Y.
Edmondson	King, Calif.	Rees, Kans.
Elliott	King, Pa.	Regan
Ellsworth	Kirwan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Engle	Klein	Rhodes, Pa.
Evins	Kluczynski	Richards
Fallon	Knox	Riehlman
Feighan	Krueger	Riley
Fenton	Laird	Rivers
Fernandez	Landrum	Roberts
Fine	Lane	Robeson, Va.
Pino	Lanham	Robsion, Ky.
Fisher	Lantaff	Rodino
Fogarty	Latham	Rogers, Colo.
Forand	LeCompte	Rogers, Fla.
Forrester	Lesinski	Rogers, Mass.
Fountain	Long	Rogers, Tex.
Frazier	Lovre	Rooney
Prelinghuysen	Lyle	Sadlak
Friedel	McCarthy	Saylor
Fulton	McConnell	Schenck
Garmatz	McCormack	Scott
Gary	McCulloch	Scrivner
Gathings	McDonough	Scudder
Gavin	McGregor	Secrest
Gentry	McIntire	Seely-Brown
George	McVey	Selden
Golden	Machrowicz	Sheehan
Goodwin	Mack, Ill.	Shelley
Gordon	Mack, Wash.	Sheppard
Graham	Magnuson	Short
Granahan	Mahon	Shuford
Gregory	Mailliard	Sieminski
Gross	Marshall	Sikes
Gubser	Matthews	Simpson, Ill.
Hagen, Calif.	Meader	Small
Hagen, Minn.	Merrill	Smith, Kans.
Hale	Merrow	Smith, Va.
Haley	Metcalf	Spence
Halleck	Miller, Calif.	Springer
Hand	Miller, Kans.	Staggers
Harden	Miller, Md.	Stauffer
Hardy	Miller, Nebr.	Steed
Harris	Miller, N. Y.	Stringfellow
Harrison, Nebr.	Mills	Sutton
Harrison, Va.	Mollohan	Taber
Harrison, Wyo.	Morano	Talle
Hart	Morgan	Taylor
Harvey	Morrison	Teague
Hays, Ark.	Moss	Thomas
Hays, Ohio	Multer	Thompson, La.
Herlong	Mumma	Thompson,
Heselton	Murray	Mich.
Hiestand	Neal	Thompson, Tex.
Hill	Nelson	Thornberry
Hillings	Nicholson	Tollefson
Hinshaw	Norblad	Trimble
Hoeven	Norrell	Tuck
Hoffman, Ill.	Oakman	Utt
Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.	Van Zandt
Holmes	O'Brien, Mich.	Velde
Holt	O'Brien, N. Y.	Vinson
Holtzman	O'Hara, Ill.	Vorys
Hope	O'Hara, Minn.	Vursell
Horan	O'Konski	Wainwright
Hosmer	O'Neill	Wampler
Howell	Ostertag	Warburton
Hruska	Passman	Watts
Hunter	Patman	Weichel
Hyde	Patten	Westland
Ikard	Patterson	Wharton
Jackson	Pelly	Wheeler
James	Perkins	Whitten
Jarman	Pfost	Wickersham
Javits	Philbin	Widnall
Jenkins	Phillips	Wigglesworth
Jensen	Pillion	Williams, Miss.
Johnson	Poage	Williams, N. Y.
Jonas, N. C.	Poff	Willis
Jones, Ala.	Polk	Wilson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.	Powell	Wilson, Ind.
Jones, N. C.	Preston	Wilson, Tex.
Judd	Price	Winstead
Karsten, Mo.	Priest	Withrow
Kearney	Prouty	Wolcott
Kearns	Rabaut	Wolverton
Keating	Radwan	Yates
Kee	Rains	Yorty
Kelley, Pa.	Ray	Young
Kelly, N. Y.	Rayburn	Younger
Keogh	Reams	Zablocki
Kersten, Wis.	Reece, Tenn.	

NAYS—12

Bates	Ford	Kean
Coudert	Gamble	Osmers
Davis, Wis.	Gwinn	Scherer
Donovan	Hess	Smith, Miss.

NOT VOTING—34

Angell	Buckley	Dawson, Ill.
Barden	Bush	Dingell
Bentsen	Canfield	Grant
Bonner	Celler	Green
Hébert	Martin, Iowa	Simpson, Pa.
Heller	Mason	Smith, Wis.
Hillelson	Moulder	Sullivan
Hoffman, Mich.	Pilcher	Van Pelt
Jonas, Ill.	Poulson	Walter
Lucas	Roosevelt	Wier
McMillan	St. George	
Madden	Shafer	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Canfield with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Hillelson with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Van Pelt with Mr. Bentsen.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Grant.
Mr. Bush with Mr. Roosevelt.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Heller.
Mrs. St. George with Mrs. Sullivan.
Mr. Smith of Wisconsin with Mr. Moulder.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Green.
Mr. Jonas of Illinois with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Hoffman of Michigan with Mr. Walter.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks made in Committee on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 146)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

When this administration took office 4 months ago, it inherited a critically unsound state of financial affairs. The Federal budget was unbalanced by $4 billion in the fiscal year 1952; the estimates of the outgoing administration indicated a further deficit of $5.9 billion in the current fiscal year, and a still larger deficit of $9.9 billion in the fiscal year 1954. Moreover, the estimate of the former administration left on hand for the end of this fiscal year $81 billion of unspent appropriations; in effect $81 billion of bills which would fall due and

have to be paid by the new administration.

In addition, revenues appear to have been overestimated by the former administration to the extent of at least $1.5 billion in the fiscal year 1953 and about $1.2 billion in the fiscal year 1954. These overestimates will have the effect of increasing the deficits already indicated for both of these years.

In addition to that, the present tax laws contain certain provisions which will soon begin sharply to reduce Government revenues. These tax reductions will reduce annual revenues by an estimated $8 billion. Only $2.1 billion of this loss falls in the fiscal year 1954. But the full effect falls in 1955—the latter being the first year for which the budget will be prepared by the incoming administration. The fact is that in 1954 and 1955 we reach the peak of expenditures caused by earlier appropriations and programed and contracted for expenditure at the same time Government revenues are sharply reduced. These simple facts highlight the problems we have faced in trying to bring prudence and foresight into our budgetary planning.

Despite these problems we have made real progress in attempting to straighten out our financial affairs. Our first effort was a prompt review of the outgoing administration's budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1954. We have thus far succeeded in reducing those recommended requests for new appropriations by about $8½ billion, an amount equivalent to over $50 for each man, woman, and child in the Nation.

Expenditures in the fiscal year 1954 cannot immediately be reduced by the full amount of this $8½ billion, because a large part of the 1954 expenditures will be for the payment of obligations incurred by the Government in previous years. However, the reductions made in requested appropriations will eventually lead to a saving of the full amount. Some of this saving will be reflected in lower expenditures in 1955 and later years as well as in 1954.

Expenditures by the previous administration in 1954 were estimated at $78.6 billion. They now are estimated at $74.1 billion, $4.5 billion less than had been planned. We intend to continue our efforts to reduce Government spending and to put the Nation's financial affairs on a sound basis. These objectives will be pursued in our everyday operations and will chart our course in every budget this administration transmits to the Congress.

Almost 73 percent of our spending in 1954 will be for national security purposes, mostly for our own military services, international programs, and atomic energy. Another 15 percent will be for interest and veterans' programs, largely fixed costs brought about by past wars. The remaining 12 percent has already been substantially trimmed, and further reductions are under study.

To reduce expenditures enough to balance the 1954 budget would require more drastic curtailment of our national security programs than we can safely afford in today's troubled world. These programs will be continually reviewed in light of the world situation, our international commitments, and the need for economy and prudence in all Government operations. Substantial reductions have been made already. We are working hard to increase them within the framework of the administration program.

Against the foregoing revised expenditure estimate of $74.1 billion, net revenues for the next fiscal year are now estimated at $67.5 billion, if all of the reductions in taxes authorized under present laws take place. This would leave a deficit of $6.6 billion.

Receipts for the current fiscal year ending on June 30 will be at an all-time high level. Nevertheless, they will probably fall short of the estimate made in the January budget message of the prior administration by $1.5 billion, perhaps even more. With the large collections at the end of June, a margin of error of several hundred million dollars must be allowed for even at this late date, but it is clear now that the earlier estimate was too high.

In view of recent experience with collections, the estimate of receipts for the next fiscal year, made early last January by the past administration, is now revised downward by $1.2 billion. The new estimate is made on the assumption that employment and business will continue at a high level, but in the interest of prudence some relaxation of the extremely high rates of activity now existing is allowed for.

Because of the reduced estimates of receipts, the deficit for the next fiscal year, which the past administration projected at $9.9 billion, would rise to $11.1 billion if expenditures were not curtailed. With the economies in expenditures which I have recommended, the projected deficit would be brought down to $6.6 billion in the conventional or administrative budget. The deficit on a cash basis, that is, after adjusting for the retirement reserves and other special accounts, would then be $3.3 billion.

The above estimates are based on the assumption that the reductions in tax rates will take effect as now scheduled under the law. Those reductions would involve a loss in revenue of $2.1 billion in the fiscal year 1954, as follows:

Estimated revenue loss from scheduled tax reductions

[In billions of dollars]

	Effective date of reduction	Fiscal year 1954	Full year loss
Corporation:			
Excess-profits tax	July 1, 1953	0.8	2
Income tax	Apr. 1, 1954	----	2
Individual income tax	Jan. 1, 1954	1.1	3
Excise taxes	Apr. 1, 1954	.2	1
Total	----	2.1	8

The discrepancies between the immediate fiscal-year and eventual full-year effects are explained by the date of the scheduled reductions and by lags in collections.

If no reductions were made in present tax rates, estimated receipts would be $69.6 billion in the next fiscal year, which would exceed those of the current year by $2.4 billion. Even if the scheduled reductions in tax rates go into effect, total receipts are estimated to reach an all-time high, exceeding those of the current year by $300 million.

Nevertheless, tax receipts will apparently fall considerably short of our necessary expenditures during the next fiscal year. In view of this fact I have come to the conclusion that no reductions in tax rates should become effective during this calendar year. I regret this conclusion, because I share the widespread feeling that our taxes are generally too high and that some of our tax laws are inherently defective. But facts are facts and I propose that we face them. It seems to me that under the conditions stated here and regardless of the origination of the tax reductions now written in the law, no administration could acquiesce in their taking place as scheduled unless it was willing to take vigorous action to reduce expenditures sufficiently to bring outlays within available revenues.

The problem of fiscal readjustment is one of timing. Under present conditions of high business activity, coupled with a budget deficit, a tax reduction would not be consistent with attaining the vital financial objective of a sound dollar. I want to see a tax reduction carried out; I want it very much. But I want even more to stop the deterioration of the currency which has been going on for so many years under the unsound fiscal and monetary policies of the past administration.

As a matter of basic long-term policy, we must look forward to reducing tax revenues as Government expenditures are curtailed. But it is also wise under existing conditions not to reduce receipts any faster than we can cut back on expenditures.

Since an immediate tax reduction would be financially unsound, I submit the following six recommendations for tax legislation by the Congress:

First. The excess profits tax should be extended as now drawn for 6 months beyond its present expiration date of June 30. This action seems necessary in spite of the fact that this is an undesirable way of taxing corporate profits.

Though the name suggests that only excessive profits are taxed, the tax actually penalizes thrift and efficiency and hampers business expansion. Its impact is especially hard on successful small businesses which must depend on retained earnings for growth. These disadvantages of the tax are now widely recognized. I would not advocate its extension for more than a matter of months. However, under existing circumstances the extension of the present law is preferable to the increased deficit caused by its immediate expiration or to any short-term substitute tax.

The scheduled expiration of the tax in June would be misleading in its consequences. It would simply mean that the tax would be applied at half the full rate, 15 percent, to all of this year's business income. Therefore its bad effects in penalizing efficiency and encouraging waste will continue through this year in any event. The extension of the tax through December 1953 would maintain the full 30-percent rate for the entire year and would produce a gain in revenue of $800 million in the fiscal year 1954.

Second. The reduction in the regular corporate tax rate from 52 percent to 47 percent, now scheduled to go into effect on April 1, 1954, should be rescinded. A continuation of these extra 5 percentage points on the corporate tax will bring in about $2 billion a year, about the same amount as will be lost annually by the expiration of the excess-profits tax at the end of this calendar year.

Though a 52-percent corporate tax rate is too high for the long run, the budget will not now permit a reduction in both individual and regular corporate tax rates. A reduction in individual taxes must come first, for the benefit of the entire economy.

Third. The increase in the old-age insurance tax from 1½ to 2 percent on both employees and employers, now scheduled to go into effect next January 1, should be postponed until January 1, 1955.

The old-age and survivors trust fund has now reached almost $18 billion. Receipts at present tax rates are currently well in excess of expenditures. The further addition to the fund which would flow from the projected tax increase is not required.

From now on, the old-age tax and trust accounts, while maintaining the contributory principle, should be handled more nearly on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The postponement of the tax increase will reduce the impending tax burden on every covered employee and employer. It will not influence the administrative budget, but it will involve an increase in the cash deficit.

Fourth. The wide variety of existing excise rates makes little economic sense and leads to improper discrimination between industries and among consumers. Specific proposals for a modified system of excise taxation will be included in the recommendations for tax revisions that will be submitted to the Congress next January.

The reductions in excise taxes, which would take place next April 1 under present law, should be rescinded pending the development of a better system of excise taxation.

Fifth. I believe that a reduction in personal income taxes can and should be made effective next January 1. This reduction will amount to about 10 percent on the lower and middle incomes, graduating down to between 1 and 2 percent on the highest brackets. While this reduction is in accordance with existing law, it would have been impossible to accomplish on the basis of the previous Administration's budget without additional deficit financing with its resultant inflationary pressures. A reduction will be justified next January only because of reductions in proposed expenditures which the present Administration has already been able to make and because of additional economies we expect to achieve in the future.

While this administration will spare no effort to effect further economies, large-scale success in that effort will depend on some easing of the tension that besets the world today. Should this improvement fail to come about and thereby prevent significant further economies, I shall find it necessary to make recommendations for alternative sources of revenue. However, if we are able to follow without interruption the course we have marked out, a balanced budget will be in sight and the much-needed tax relief will be a sound financial measure.

Sixth. As you know, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is currently engaged in a comprehensive reexamination of the existing tax structure. To help achieve this objective, I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury to present by the end of the year recommendations to remove existing inequities of our tax structure, simplify the needless complications which have developed over the years in tax laws, and generally secure a better balance of tax revenues. The analysis in the Treasury is being made in close cooperation with the appropriate committees of the Congress and their staffs.

The Treasury must be assured of adequate revenues to finance necessary expenditures for national security and other essential purposes. At the same time, we must develop a system of taxation which, to the greatest extent possible, will not discourage work, savings, and investment, but will permit and encourage initiative and the sound growth of our free economy.

A recapitulation of the budget position for the next fiscal year is given below, showing the effects of the revisions and recommendations which I have made in this message:

Budget outlook fiscal year 1954

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget expenditures	Budget receipts	Deficit administrative	Deficit cash
January budget, past administration	78.6	68.7	9.9	6.6
Revisions in estimates	−4.5	−1.2	−3.3	−3.3
Revised budget, with scheduled tax reductions	74.1	67.5	6.6	3.3
Effect of recommended changes in taxes from rates now scheduled to become effective	.....	+1.0	−1.0	[1] −.5
Revised budget	74.1	68.5	5.6	2.8

[1] Difference between effects on administrative and cash budgets is explained by a reduction of $500 million in old-age insurance tax receipts.

The administration has begun the heavy task of putting the Federal Government's fiscal house in order. It is moving vigorously to reduce expenditures with due regard for the needs of national security. I am making the above tax recommendations in the conviction that they are prudent and sound. I commend them to the earnest attention of the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 20, 1953.*

THE LOUISVILLE POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I noticed a story this morning in the Louisville Courier-Journal entitled "Louisville Postmaster and Three Aides Facing Charges by Inspectors."

Joseph Scholtz was appointed postmaster of the Louisville Post Office in June 1947. He was president of the Louisville Water Co. from 1935 to 1937, and mayor of that great city from 1937 through 1941. This story states:

> During World War II he served as a lieutenant colonel in Italy and was military governor in Trieste after the German surrender. * * * He was at the top of the civil-service eligibility list of 14 applicants when he was appointed postmaster.

Rumors have been prevailing throughout Kentucky for several months that postal inspectors would come along with trivial charges in order that postmasters may be ousted from their present positions. These rumors are quite prevalent in the district which I am privileged to represent.

A regular inspection was made on March 19 in this post office, which was one of the periodical inspections made every year, and at that time the Louisville post office got an efficiency rating of 99 percent. Thereafter, two postal inspectors returned to Louisville about April 27 and remained 3 weeks. As I understand, Mr. Scholtz is not charged with fraud.

I am hopeful that the Postal Department will reverse its stand and refrain from trying to ambush outstanding, competent, and efficient postmasters in Kentucky, or elsewhere. The people of this country do not intend to see our civil-service laws scrapped and held for naught by this administration or any other administration.

Only a few days ago the House of Representatives voted to strike out certain sections of the appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice which would have destroyed the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act. The House killed the rider to give the Secretaries of State, Justice, and Commerce absolute discretion to fire employees. That rider was defeated by 13 votes. That vote in all probability prevented the House Appropriations Committee from adding similar riders to other budget bills.

I feel confident that the overwhelming majority of the people in Kentucky and this Nation will disapprove of this cowardly and ruthless method of accomplishing a poliitcal purpose. I also feel confident that the reputation of Joseph Scholtz will survive any partisan storm.

In the circumstances, there is only one recourse which any highly efficient and competent postmaster can follow, and that is to fight back. Let the people throughout this Nation know who is involved in trying to sabotage our civil-service system.

TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION PROVIDED FUNDS FOR INCREASE IN AIRPOWER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, attempts of the new administration to take credit for the expansion of the Air Force combat wings in recent months cannot go unchallenged.

The new planes which have come into being since the first of the year are products of the lead time resulting from airpower buildup under the administration of President Truman. They were planes ordered 2 and 3 years ago.

Instead of proudly patting themselves on the back and taking credit for this increase in the number of our combat wings, the spokesmen for the present administration should give credit where credit is due and should take a lesson in the importance of lead time in restoring the United States to the No. 1 position in air power. The slashing they are doing on Air Force procurement now will be reflected 2 and 3 years from now when new planes will not be forthcoming.

The Eisenhower administration up to date has not appropriated one dime for the buildup of our Air Force, consequently their efforts to take credit for the increase in number of combat wings is ridiculous on its face. It is the kind of "malarky" that has the American people worried and concerned over the cuts in our national defense.

Two years ago the National Security Council decided the United States should have an Air Force of 143 wings by 1954. President Eisenhower, himself, said last night:

> There has been, to this moment, no reason to believe that Soviet policy has changed its frequently announced hope and purpose—the destruction of freedom everywhere. There is, therefore, no reason for the free nations to alter their course: to hope and work for the best, to arm and be ready for the worst.

Yet, if the Eisenhower administration's plans prevail, in 1956, 2 years after the National Security Council's target date for 143 wings, the United States would have only 120 wings.

Such cuts in our air power are not safe—it is a dangerously high price to pay for so-called economy—an economy we may not be here to enjoy if we continue to issue these invitations to attack.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I congratulate the gentleman on his remarks, because it brings to the attention of the American people a truth that the facts support. The inference from the statements made would indicate that overnight we have increased our air group units by 50 or 100 percent, when of course, that was going on for the last 2 or 3 years. I am very much concerned by statements made by responsible men in the administration. I refer particularly to Secretary Wilson, who has made the statement that $19 billion is available to the Air Force. The ordinary American is being led to believe—I do not say it is intentional, but that is the inference—that the $19 billion is floating around; that it has been appropriated and it is just in the Air Force. Of course, that is not so, because practically all of that money is obligated under contracts. It is money which is already committed.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. That is the type of money that made possible the buildup of these combat units during the last few months, but if we go on the theory that we do not have to appropriate any further, because that money has been made available, then this type of expansion of combat wings will not be forthcoming in the future.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course the gentleman is correct. We know that when we appropriate money we appropriate it to complete a contract, and there is no $19 billion floating around or lying idle, held by the Air Force. While it is true the money is there, probably as high as $36,500,000,000, it is practically all committed. Eighty-five percent of it is committed. The information I have is that at the end of the fiscal year, out of funds appropriated to the Air Force by this and past Congresses up to fiscal 1953, there will be about $1,300,000,000 unobligated at the end of 1955.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman is absolutely right. There is no question that if these cuts go through for the Air Force, the build-up of the Air Force will be delayed several years. There will be no chance to reach this target day of the National Security Council. There seems to be a slogan going around today in official defense circles, "Talk tough, and cut the budget."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GRAHAM and to include an address delivered by Representative DORN of South Carolina.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MARSHALL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS and to include an article from the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Mr. BAILEY and to include an editorial.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include an editorial.

Mr. WHARTON and to include an editorial.

Mr. BATTLE.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

Mr. FINE and to include an editorial.

Mr. YATES and to include copy of a letter written by a Member of the other body to Thomas Buchanan, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. YORTY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POLK and to include a short article by Lowell Mellett in last Evening's Star.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include 5 letters.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER in three instances and to include some editorials.

Mr. SHORT and to include an address delivered by the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Mr. Mitchell, and also to include some editorials.

Mr. HOLT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN (at the request of Mr. HORAN) to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. REES of Kansas to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include tables.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. PHILBIN) in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. BATTLE) in two instances; to include in one an editorial, and in the other a speech by Senator SPARKMAN.

Mr. BATTLE and to include an editorial.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include an editorial appearing in the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. BAILEY) and to include an address by Hon. James Farley before the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRANT (at the request of Mr. ROBERTS), on account of illness.

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 3 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1081. An act to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 166. An act for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki);

S. 207. An act for the relief of Jimy Okuda;

S. 371. An act for the relief of Georgia Andrews;

S. 709. An act to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough;

S. 837. An act for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky;

S. 1524. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes;

S. 1525. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex.;

S. 1527. An act to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units;

S. 1528. An act to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force;

S. 1530. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize appointment in the grade of 1st lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy;

S. 1546. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button;

S. 1547. An act to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel;

S. 1549. An act to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va.; and

S. 1641. An act to retrocede to the State of Oklahoma concurrent jurisdiction over the right-of-way for United States Highways 62 and 277 within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 21, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

710. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 40th annual report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for 1952, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 8 of an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4976. A bill to repeal the act of September 30, 1950, authorizing the transfer to the State of Iowa of Fort Des Moines, Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1292. An act providing for the reconveyance to the town of Morristown of certain land included within the Morristown National Historical Park, in the State of New Jersey; without amendment (Rept. No. 442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 380. An act to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans.; without amendment (Rept. No. 441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 2954. A bill to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 183. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River flood-control compact; with amendment (Rept. No. 445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1545. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington Parish Burial Ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots; without amendment (Rept. No. 443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (by request):

H. R. 5295. A bill to amend section 22 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (by request):

H. R. 5296. A bill to amend section 22 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 5297. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to insure conformance with plans and specifications in the construction of housing initially sold with the assistance of financing guaranteed or insured by the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 5298. A bill to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 5299. A bill to prohibit the payment to Alger Hiss of any annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and to provide for the return to the said Alger Hiss of the amount to his credit in such fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5300. A bill to provide that the declaration of attorney or agent executed by a person who prepares an estate-tax return need not state that it is executed under penalties of perjury and need not imply any expression of opinion as to the value of items listed in the return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5301. A bill to amend and supplement the reclamation laws to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5302. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Postmaster General in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 5303. A bill to amend sections 1606 and 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code in order to permit unemployment insurance coverage under State unemployment compensation laws for seamen employed on certain vessels operated for the account of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5304. A bill to permit members of the Armed Forces to elect certain contingency options, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 5305. A bill to amend the Hours of Service Act approved March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1415); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5306. A bill to aid navigation and protect the fishing industry in the waters adjacent to New York City by prohibiting the dumping of certain materials in such waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5307. A bill to aid navigation and protect the fishing industry by prohibiting the dumping of certain materials in the coastal navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 5308. A bill to repeal the Federal taxes on gasoline, lubricating oils, and diesel fuel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 5309. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Red River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 5310. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5311. A bill to increase the rates of pension for veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 5312. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 5313. A bill to provide that each year an amount equal to the year's Federal receipts from the tax on tobacco and tobacco products shall be paid over to the States to be used for educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 5314. A bill to extend the coverage of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act to members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps when ordered to active training duty for periods in excess of 14 days; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the withdrawal of Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to renew the International Wheat Agreement as soon as such action may be

feasible; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make provision in any treaty, pact, or agreement with Japan for the preservation and the safeguarding of the fishing interests of this State and Nation in the ocean waters off the Territory of Alaska, Pacific coast, and of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Atomic Energy Act, etc.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 5315. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jalal Elahi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5316. A bill for the relief of Cornelius Koll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5317. A bill for the relief of Ciro Amore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5318. A bill for the relief of Szlama Blimbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5319. A bill for the relief of Henry (also known as Heinrich) Schor, Sally (also known as Sali) Schor, and Gita (also known as Gitta Aviva) Schor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 5320. A bill for the relief of the Kennedy Deaconess Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 5321. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Chiodo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5322. A bill for the relief of Maria Crocitto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5323. A bill for the relief of Anakaleto Maria de Oliveira or Joseph Oliveira or Anacleto Oliver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 5324. A bill for the relief of Menachem Herss Kalisz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 5325. A bill for the relief of Robert Brown and Morna Doris Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 5326. A bill for the relief of Peter Zywko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5327. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Almira Gilbreath Ramser; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

273. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of 12 names supporting agricultural conservation program payments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

274. Also, petition of 26 names supporting agricultural conservation program payments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

275. Also, petition of 12 names in support of agricultural conservation program payments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

276. Also, resolution of Fraternal Order of Eagles, Portland, Ind.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

277. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frederick W. Phoenix and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447 social security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

278. Also, petition of A. E. Riddell and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, who hast cast our lot in pleasant places, we praise Thee for our goodly heritage in this land of the free and the home of the brave. In this forum of the people's will we remember with gratitude those gifts of heart and mind and spirit that have fashioned this Republic, the wisdom of the fathers who founded a society conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, the consecration of good men and women who established this Nation upon the enduring foundation of religion. By Thy grace Thou hast led us from perilous beginnings to this day of testing and destiny.

Give wisdom, we pray Thee, to those who plan the Nation's program, clarity of thought to those who fashion the ideals of the people, and strength of purpose to those who seek to lift the spiritual levels of the Republic. Divinely guide our President and all those into whose hands have been entrusted the affairs of state. And facing a world in commotion, where so many are groping in the darkness of tyranny, may our America united in spirit do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly before Thee. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 20, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, having been appointed a delegate to the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, I ask the consent of the Senate to be excused from attendance at sessions of the Senate commencing at 3 p. m. on Friday, May 22, 1953, and continuing until my return to Washington sometime in early July 1953.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the usual proceedings of the morning hour, the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning at the end of the last call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX, AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Croix, St. Thomas and St. John, and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRESENTMENT OF ADDITIONAL GRAND JURY, HUDSON COUNTY, N. J.

A letter from the deputy attorney general, Department of Law and Public Safety, State of New Jersey, transmitting, pursuant to the order of the assignment judge of the Superior Court of Hudson County, N. J., a copy of the presentment of the additional grand jury of that county (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GASOLINE TAXATION—JOINT RESOLUTION OF DELAWARE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present House Joint Resolution No. 5, adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Delaware, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation.

I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance for consideration.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See joint resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on May 20, 1953, p. 5182, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION VISAS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from Father Aloysius J. Wycislo, assistant executive

director for war relief services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, a very gracious letter with regard to the introduction of S. 1917, to carry out President Eisenhower's program for emergency immigration visas.

The letter transmitted a resolution signed by representatives of various organizations deeply interested in that matter.

It is my earnest hope that the hearings which are to be conducted on this legislation will be carried through and, although it is rather late in the session, that definitive action will be taken.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR RELIEF SERVICES, NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE,
New York, N. Y., May 20, 1953.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In the name of the members of the American Committee on Special Migration and the National Catholic Resettlement Council, I want to take this opportunity to convey their sincere appreciation and gratitude for your joining with 17 other Senators in the introduction of S. 1917, to provide special immigration quota visas for certain escapees and expellees in Europe.

Our agencies have been deeply concerned with the problems created in certain areas due to the plight of many thousands of persons who have been made homeless by Communist persecution and special economic conditions. We want to commend you at this time for this demonstration of your concern about the problem and the desire to find a solution to it, together with the other nations of the free world.

At a meeting of the national, regional, and State representatives of the American Committee on Special Migration and the National Catholic Resettlement Council, held in New York on May 19, 1953, a resolution supporting President Eisenhower's recommendation to Congress and S. 1917 was unanimously adopted. A copy of this resolution is enclosed for your information.

With sincere appreciation and with the assurance of our wholehearted support in bringing about passage of this important bill and its successful implementation, I am,

Respectfully yours,

Rev. ALOYSIUS J. WYCISLO,
Assistant Executive Director.

RESOLUTION

The members of the National Catholic Resettlement Council and the American Committee on Special Migration at a joint meeting unanimously passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the severe religious and political persecution engaged in by the Communists in all the nations and areas under their cruel control and domination has caused the flight of great numbers of escapees to the free world; and

"Whereas the nations of the free world affording first asylum to these innocent victims of Red tyranny are not able to assimilate or otherwise care for all these victims of tyranny; and

"Whereas the problems caused by mass expulsions, escape and special economic conditions relate directly to the ability of the member nations of NATO, individually and collectively, to prevent further aggression by the forces of Red tyranny; and

"Whereas President Eisenhower, in his role as leader of the forces of freedom and peace has recommended to the Congress that emergency legislation be enacted which will permit our Nation to play a vigorous and vital role in reducing these grave human problems to manageable proportions: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the undersigned organizations express their gratitude for the initiative and leadership taken by Senator ARTHUR WATKINS in introducing S. 1917 and to Senators WILEY, HENDRICKSON, DIRKSEN, TAFT, BRIDGES, LANGER, AIKEN, FERGUSON, IVES, SALTONSTALL, FLANDERS, CARLSON, BENNETT, BUSH, PAYNE, YOUNG, and SMITH of New Jersey, for their support of this bill and pledge their constructive support for the passage of this law in the present session of Congress; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Eisenhower, Senator WATKINS, and his colleagues who have indicated support of S. 1917.

"American Aid Society; American Banater Relief Society of Chicago; American Relief for Poland; American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association; American Committee on Italian Migration; Bishop's Resettlement Committee of Chicago; Diocesan Resettlement Council of Brooklyn; Catholic Committee for Refugees; Croatian Refugee Committee; Estonian Aid, Inc.; Gottscheer Relief Association; Hungarian Catholic League of America; Hungarian National Council; Iuliu Manui American Rumania Relief Foundation, Inc.; League of Catholic Slovenians of America; Missionaries of St. Charles for Immigration; National Alliance of Czech Catholics; National Catholic Rural Life Conference; National Catholic Welfare Conference; National Council of Catholic Men; New York Diocesan Resettlement Committee; Polish Immigration Committee; United Friends of Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia; United Lithuanian Relief; American Federation of International Institutes; Byelorussian Congress; National Council of Catholic Women; Evangelical Reform Church, Hungarian Synod; War Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference."

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 21, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 166. An act for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki);

S. 207. An act for the relief of Jimy Okuda;

S. 371. An act for the relief of Georgia Andrews;

S. 709. An act to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough;

S. 837. An act for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky;

S. 1524. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes;

S. 1525. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex.;

S. 1527. An act to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units;

S. 1528. An act to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force;

S. 1530. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy;

S. 1546. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button;

S. 1547. An act to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel;

S. 1549. An act to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va.; and

S. 1641. An act to retrocede to the State of Oklahoma concurrent jurisdiction over the right-of-way for United States Highways 62 and 277 within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1953. A bill for the relief of Menga Meretey; and

S. 1954. A bill for the relief of Anthony N. Goraieb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 1955. A bill for the relief of Giorgio Salvini Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 1956. A bill for the relief of Maria Louise C. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1957. A bill to repeal the act of September 30, 1950, authorizing the transfer to the State of Iowa of Fort Des Moines, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1958. A bill for the relief of Alberto Ralph Sotto; and

S. 1959. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annemarie Namias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1960. A bill for the relief of Thomas Edward Lloyd (Masaaki Tamura); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 1961. A bill to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1962. A bill to require the marking of the containers of American goods exported with the words "United States of America," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENNINGS (by request):

S. 1963. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MARKING CONTAINERS OF GOODS EXPORTED WITH THE WORDS "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA"

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill requiring that the containers of all American goods exported be clearly labeled with the words: "United States of America."

There is no statute which requires exporters of American goods to stamp, stencil, or otherwise mark all containers in which such goods are exported to foreign lands. We do mark some containers "Made in U. S. A." because import regulations in some foreign countries compel it, but usually this is a small and insignificant marking that can be made to read "Made in U. S. S. R." with a stencil and two strokes of a brush.

For more than a decade we have given away or sold billions of dollars in food and material to Europe and the Orient and in most cases we have not marked in large, bold letters that its origin is the United States of America. We do not ship inferior goods; on the contrary, almost without exception, our merchandise is the finest in the world. Why, then, should we not label all containers with the words: "United States of America"?

In addition to advertising and good will, it would assure the recipients of the origin of these goods. We have every reason to be proud of our achievements in this field and it would be appropriate for this Congress to enact the necessary legislation as contained in this bill requiring this designation on our export goods.

It can be accomplished with little cost by the simple expedient of exporters and Governmental agencies requesting the inclusion of the words "United States of America" on containers of all goods procured for overseas shipment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1962) to require the marking of the containers of American goods exported with the words "United States of America," and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Commitee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRINTING OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR YEARBOOK NO. II, ENTITLED "THE WORKERS' STORY, 1913–1953"

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of Labor, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for the printing of the Department of Labor Yearbook No. II, entitled "The Workers' Story, 1913–1953."

The resolution (S. Res. 113) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Department of Labor Yearbook No. II, entitled "The Workers' Story, 1913–1953," be printed as a Senate document.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON IMMIGRATION BILL, S. 1917

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary, I announce that public hearings will be held on the bill (S. 1917) to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes, beginning at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, May 26, 1953, in the Old Supreme Court room, Capitol Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the public hearings are requested to register as soon as possible with the staff of the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee, room 449 B, Senate Office Building, phone NAtional 8–3120, extension 32.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nominations of R. Douglas Stuart, of Illinois, to be Ambassador of the United States to Canada; Michael J. McDermott, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador of the United States to El Salvador; and William T. Pheiffer, of New York, to be Ambassador of the United States to the Dominican Republic, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I give notice that the nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, under the committee rule.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG:

Personal report by him to the people of North Dakota, dated May 20, 1953.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Article entitled "Customer Loses Another Round," written by Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 20, 1953.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Statement on Pan American Day, including reference to Dr. Joseph Francis Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, who delivered the prayer in the Senate on Wednesday, May 20, 1953.

By Mr. JACKSON (for Mr. MAGNUSON):

Address entitled "Washington and Manifest Destiny," delivered by Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas at ceremonies in the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., May 14, 1953, commemorating the centennial of the Territory of Washington.

Address entitled "Accelerated Amortization: Biggest Bonanza That Ever Came Down the Government Pike," delivered by Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, at the annual convention of the American Public Power Association in Boston, Mass., on May 14, 1953.

COLD WAR OR HOT WAR IN THE FAR EAST—LECTURE BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM J. DONOVAN

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on May 7, 1953, at the Naval War College, Newport, R. I., Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan delivered a lecture which covered some of the most pressing problems before the world today. I have read his address with a great deal of interest, and I feel that it is a very important document which it would be well for us all to read. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of the pending debate on foreign affairs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the most ruthless despots in the history of the world has been dead for several weeks. The debate continues to rage as to whether the "cold war" which he initiated will slow down or turn into a "hot war." "Hot" or "cold," everyone agrees that it is a war. Whether it is fought on the battlefield of Korea or in the ballot boxes of Italy, it remains a war which involves the survival of the kind of life we want to live.

We are now confronted by a new tactic in this struggle—a new offensive called a "peace offensive." I can only pray that we shall not be deluded by our own hopes. To avoid such a delusion, there are three things we should remember:

One is that the goal of the Communists has not changed. Have they disavowed their aim of violent revolution? Have they withdrawn their political paratroops from behind our lines? They have not. If there is one constant in Communist dogma it is that the ultimate goal must always be world domination.

A second thing to remember is that while tactics may change, Communist methods do not disappear. Conspiracy, subversion, and lies remain the weapons in their arsenal and they will continue to be used wherever they can be most effectively employed.

And thirdly, let us not fool ourselves into thinking that Malenkov stands ready to throw out 30 years of Communist education so as to embrace the West in sympathetic understanding. If he is anything, he is a trained and loyal disciple of Stalin. Malenkov did not accept control of the Soviet regime to destroy it.

Let us also remember this: Whatever the Soviet motives, their peace offensive is well timed not only to jeopardize the whole fabric of our European defense but also to upset our efforts in the Far East. Our own Government is under severe pressure to reduce military and foreign spending, and, if this happens, our material and mental preparedness will be reduced accordingly. The power struggle continues and this new offensive can be even more dangerous to our goals than a full-fledged military campaign.

The terms that President Eisenhower has set down as the only basis on which he would conclude a political settlement are terms which it is unlikely the Communists will accept. They are terms dictated from a position of strength. Terms demanding that the Soviet octopus draw back its arms on all sides—in Asia, and in Europe. The President has made it plain that the peace he seeks is not the peace of weakness, appeasement, or surrender.

Let us look first at the problem of Asia. The seizure of China was for communism a major victory. The full consequences of that triumph have yet to unfold, not alone in China but throughout Asia and the rest of the world.

In China we see an economic and social revolution of those who sought to escape from their wretchedness. The Kremlin through the Chinese Communist Army has exploited this upsurge.

Even at the time of the Bolshevik revolution in 1917, the Soviets had their eye on China. Stalin nurtured and increased the Chinese Red Army from 25,000 in 1937 to a force of 300,000 in 1945. In the conquest of China that was the heart of his strategy.

Once China is consolidated, Stalin's conquest will be extended throughout southeast Asia, down the same path the Japanese followed through Indochina, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Siam, Malaya, Indonesia, and Burma—all the way to India.

India is a country of great economic potential. It has a reservoir of high-class military manpower. With Ceylon it dominates the Indian Ocean and the vital sea lanes between Europe, Asia, and the Far East. Once Asia is secured, the Communist forces can be turned against Europe and the United States.

How can we prevent the Kremlin from consolidating its gains in the Far East?

Let us try to answer this question in terms of a cold war: the war we are already in, and let us appraise the weapons we have—apart from those of a conventional shooting war. The manpower can come from those countries whose leaders recognize the common interest we share with them. We ask in Asia the same questions that we asked in Europe: "Are you prepared to fight for your own liberties? Are you ready to resist your conqueror?"

Propaganda properly used can be a very important stimulus in arousing resistance movements on the mainland—whether by radios, pamphlets, or leaflets.

The world should know that while much must still be done, a well-conducted economic and military aid program has been set up to improve conditions in Formosa and reorganize the Chinese Nationalist forces.

It should be stressed also that under direction of American officers the Chinese troops on Formosa are being supplied with modern arms and equipment and that Chinese guerrilla forces are active on the mainland of China.

Operational nuclei can be organized, small well-trained, well-screened cadres of men to train and activate a resistance force which in turn could organize the countryside. The active support of the people is the first aim. Also, as was done by General Chennault in the last war in setting up the Flying Tigers, a volunteer international air force could be established in Formosa.

There are many regions in China which offer ideal areas for resistance organization due to their topography, tradition, and the independence of their people.

China will not fall into our hands like a ripe pear. Were we to make public evidence of our belief that this could happen it would be viewed by the Chinese Communists as weakness on our part.

With Communist China as with the Soviet Union, we should harbor no hopes as to the chance of winning it as a friend or ally—our aim should be to halt and prevent Mao's expansionism.

Unconventional methods alone cannot overcome Communist China. We, as a people, are inclined to rely upon some single gadget for victory. Some think guerrilla warfare alone could do it, others think propaganda is the one effective device. No single measure is enough. But if we make a fist of all our resources, propaganda, deception, ideology, sabotage, guerrilla tactics, and the threat of military support—then every blow would carry a real impact. Such a program would at least delay the consolidation of Communist power; slow up the advance of Communists in southeast Asia; provide safe areas in the interior for Nationalist units; bring constant headaches to Red authority; and breed chaos and confusion.

With that our objective, our immediate job is to bolster the countries on China's rim, to reveal the Kremlin's aims for what they are, and to show them that their real and present danger is Soviet imperialism. Our task is not only to provide the weapons of war where that can be done, but also the constructive, humanitarian aid that no one else in the world—certainly not Mao—can give them: medicines for example, and education in the cure of tropical diseases.

The villages of Asia cannot be defended or liberated by military means alone.

Chiang Kai-shek's failure to carry out the land reform which Sun Yat-sen considered imperative was a decisive factor in swinging peasant sympathy to the Communists. When the Communists conquered China, they immediately distributed the land. The Communists implemented a land reform in North Korea as early as March 1946, while in South Korea the reform of 1948 affected only former Japanese property. The more comprehensive general reform of June 1949, passed after considerable American prodding of a prolandlord government, was not yet put into force when the war began.

A policy of radical agrarian change need be no monopoly of the Kremlin-dominated world. We can do as much; indeed we can do better! In postwar Japan, a comprehensive land reform which satisfied the peasants was carried in October 1946 almost as early as the North Korean reform. Such a program, extended to other lands and implemented by technical assistance, is point 4, not in lofty aspirations for the future, but in terms of the present practical need for a pair of pants, a bowl of rice, and a chance for a healthy body. As an example, read the reports of the effect of newfound drugs in arresting tuberculosis in Korea, where there has always been a high incidence of that disease.

And while we instruct them in the cure of their ills, we can teach them to defend themselves. We can bring them tough guerrilla fighters to teach them tough guerrilla fighting. We can provide the equipment, the arms, the radios, the printing presses, the teachers of new methods in industry, farming and schooling. Without these, plans and blueprints will be wasted.

You don't measure the success of irregular warfare in terms of battles won and cities destroyed. You don't hope to meet and defeat a powerful enemy in the field. In irregular war the object is delay, the tactic hit-and-run again and again, the targets the small enemy forces, the weak convoy—to breed in the mind of the individual enemy the sense of isolation and the fear of capture. It was that kind of war that defeated Napoleon in Spain and knocked him out in Russia.

Let me give you a few examples of what I have in mind. During World War II in every trouble spot the details of our problem were different. The Japanese, for instance, had overrun Siam. Because of Siam's central strategic position in Southeast Asia, it was essential for us to establish information sources there. At the request of the Siamese Government we had trained 40 Siamese in America in the various techniques of guerrilla warfare, dropped them with 40 Americans behind the Japanese lines into Siam and from them gathered priceless information of enemy intentions. The Siamese Prime Minister was skilled in this kind of warfare. In his own palace he gave shelter and protection for OSS men and set up a radio transmitter by which daily reports were sent to Washington by way of Ceylon.

In China, at the request of Chiang Kai-shek, we trained commando units based on the operations of Lawrence of Arabia. But where Lawrence used horses and camels, we used jeeps and parachutes.

We armed and equipped Kachine and Karen tribes in North Burma to fight, harass, and delay Japanese troops of occupation. These tribes were trained by Americans skilled in communications, sabotage and secret intelligence. In that area a volunteer native force of 12,000 fighting men were loyal to us throughout the war.

We also were in contact with Chinese pirates and guerrillas in the mountainous coastal regions on each side of the Fukien Kwangtung border north of Swatow and south of Foochow. These pirates had been operating for years in defiance of local, provincial, and national Chinese authorities. They were eager and willing to carry out attacks on the Japanese with our help. As a result we were able to post radios aboard their junks. We gave them limpets which were used to blow up Japanese ships in their ports. With imaginative leadership, they would be as willing to help us now as they were then.

Asia is one strategic theater of which Korea, Indochina, Malaya, and the Philippines are as integral a part as are Siam, Indonesia, Burma, and India.

A Pacific pact is as essential in our overall defense as is a NATO pact in the Atlantic. Urgency requires we take the initiative in obtaining the cooperation of other nations to make such a pact effective.

Asia is one problem, pressing and immediate, but Asia is not all. The unorthodox war must be fought simultaneously in Europe in three distinct areas:

1. Inside the Soviet Union itself;

2. In the satellite countries already enslaved; and

3. In the countries of Western Europe which stand in the Kremlin's path of expansion.

In each area, though the methods vary, the goal is the same; to prevent Soviet expansion and consolidation; to give moral and physical support to our allies and to keep the enemy off balance until the free nations are strong.

This kind of war is a brave man's war and a poor man's war. It doesn't cost billions and it doesn't fill large cemeteries, but its results can be incalculable. We can put our people into countries behind the Iron Curtain, not to arouse the population to premature and futile revolt when they have no weapons, but to foment unrest and discontent, and sustain hope.

Within the area of the Soviet Union, the Soviet's concern as to their peoples' unity discloses a weakness ripe for exploitation.

The jugular vein in this war is the Russian people. For the past few years disaffected elements within the population of the Soviet Union and its satellites have run great risks to escape into the American zone. They have taken these risks even though they were uncertain as to their reception by Americans or that they would be turned back by them to the Soviet authorities.

At the end of the war, the United States had discouraged and largely dissipated the potential of the Soviet emigration. As a result of the exchange agreement concluded at Yalta, the great mass of Soviet PW's and forced laborers in Western Europe, numbering more than 2 million, were sent back to the U. S. S. R., in many cases over their violent objections. It is only within the past 2 years that the principle of political asylum has gradually reasserted itself, at first clandestinely and recently more openly. But let us not forget that if political asylum is to be meaningful, it must be accompanied by the food, the clothing, and medical supplies necessary to enable the escapees to undertake the reconstruction of shattered

lives. Let me tell you what a group of Americans are doing in this respect:

The American friends of Russian freedom is a voluntary nongovernmental American committee working on behalf of postwar Soviet escapees in Germany. No other agency could do this job because no other agency has the political, psychological and moral assets accruing to the independent operation of a private American committee concerned exclusively with Russians seeking their freedom. Their confidence in the ability and good faith of American citizens is of great importance. Especially so, after the rejection and indifference which has marked our policy toward the Russian people.

Apart from the humanitarian aspect, it is a psychological weapon in our hands to be able to establish housing projects, employment opportunities, agricultural training schools, and permanent resettlements on individual farms.

The French Government has already encouraged refugee resettlement projects. France is said to have thousands of abandoned farms, a large percentage of which were given up only because there were no male children left in the remaining family to work the farm. About 50 percent of the postwar Russian escapees are of peasant origin, born and brought up in agricultural areas, usually on collective farms. Most of these men have escaped from the Soviet Army where they had been taken into military service with no training other than farming.

And more than this—the Moslems of south central Asia differ from the Russians in religion, family history, language, customs, and way of life, and have a long tradition of open opposition to their Russian conquerors.

After 30 years of pressure the Soviets have failed to remodel these peoples of central Asia. The Soviets still encounter opposition there which can be used against them.

This program of inducement organized in depth in the countries of the West, propagandized in truth, could be a heavy blow to the Soviets. It would intensify their continuing fear of their own people, a fear of revolt, a fear inherent in all power that is founded on force.

In the satellite area the same effort should be made to encourage escapees. It is easier to reach and help people in an occupied country when they have been conscripted into the enemy army than it is to reach those who have gone underground. If a patriot is drafted into the army of an invader he is a patriot still. He is, therefore, not only a source of information but also a means of carrying word of hope to those in the underground. The possibilities are exemplified in the instance of the young Polish flyer who recently escaped in a jet plane to Denmark.

Also, on the Continent of Europe, we can help those who have escaped imprisonment and who are prepared to build up in the free West an international volunteer legion.

The final area of the unorthodox war in Europe embraces the western European nations. Western Europe is second only to the United States among the world centers of industrial production. There we must continue to support the newly created and ever growing united Europe movement. This is the bastion across the path of Soviet expansion. Its security is of major importance in strategic planning, both for what it gives to western strength, and what it could give to the strength of any hostile power which made it captive. Were this bastion to fall it would enable the Soviets to come to the Atlantic, and the Atlantic to the Soviet Air Force would be port of entry to the United States.

The unification of Europe has proceeded along two lines. Beginning in early 1948 close cooperation in economic, political, and military matters has developed among the majority of the western European nations through intergovernmental organizations. Help was given by the European movement—a volunteer organization of citizens of the various countries of Europe concerned—and by the encouragement and support of the American committee on united Europe—a group of American citizens.

In addition, since 1950, a smaller "hard core" of European states—Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands have advanced beyond cooperation and are establishing federal institutions having the power to make decisions for the common membership in specific economic, military, and political fields.

The Schuman plan is now a going concern, and provides for a rapid expansion of coal and steel production necessary to meet defense needs and an increasing standard of living.

In August 1950, 2 months after the assault on Korea, the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe responded to a motion by Winston Churchill and endorsed a resolution calling for: "* * * the immediate creation under the authority of a European minister of defense of a European army * * *." And on October 24, 1950, France came forward with the Pleven plan, which became the basis for negotiations that led to the signing of the European Defense Community Treaty in May 1952.

On last March 10 after 6 months of work by the Assembly and its constitutional committee, the finished draft of a constitution was submitted to the six governments—France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg. If approved by the foreign ministers of these countries, it will be placed before the national parliaments for ratification.

With every concrete step toward the union of Europe, the opposition from left- and right-wing extremes becomes more intense and more determined. We must recognize for instance that the French-German dispute over the Saar and the strength of the Social Democrats in Western Germany can block the completion of the six-nation European army project and the peace contract between the Federal Government and the Big Three Western Powers. France had made it plain that the Saar dispute must be settled before the National Assembly can be asked to ratify the EDC.

Were the parliaments of these two countries to refuse ratification, it would seriously delay the realization of a United Europe and greatly impair the prestige, the influence, and the leadership of our own country.

Across the Atlantic the European movement is seeking to rally public opinion. Now more than ever European leaders in this fight need the encouragement and support of free citizens everywhere.

On our part, we Americans must recognize that the center of gravity in the world has moved to the United States. Thus, history has forced upon us a position of leadership—a responsibility we are reluctant to accept.

We are a people that want to be liked. We forget that the search for popularity has led other men and other nations down many bitter paths. As we move deeper into this great struggle, our friendship will be questioned, our sincerity challenged, our integrity traduced, and our power despised.

Our aim must be to abide by the truth as we know it, by our principles as we hold them, so that we shall deserve the confidence of other nations in the wisdom and dependability of our leadership.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Under the unanimous-consent order, the clerk will proceed to call the calendar, beginning at the point where the last call of the calendar was concluded.

HELMUTH WOLF GRUHL

The bill (H. R. 1334) for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl was announced as first in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hendrickson	McClellan
Barrett	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bush	Hoey	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Payne
Capehart	Humphrey	Potter
Carlson	Hunt	Purtell
Chavez	Ives	Robertson
Clements	Jackson	Russell
Cooper	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Knowland	Sparkman
Ferguson	Kuchel	Stennis
Frear	Langer	Symington
Fulbright	Lehman	Thye
George	Long	Watkins
Gillette	Magnuson	Wiley
Gore	Malone	Williams
Green	Mansfield	Young
Griswold	Martin	
Hayden	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 1334, for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to offer an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Colorado

[Mr. MILLIKIN] I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,300."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, this amendment is the standard limitation on attorney's fees in connection with private bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] for the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 10 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask a question of the acting minority leader [Mr. GORE] with regard to Calendar No. 227, Senate bill 1631, to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes. This is the bill immediately preceding Calendar 228, House bill 1334, which was announced as first in order on today's call of the calendar. I think objection was made last week to Senate bill 1631, and I wonder if the objection has been withdrawn.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Tennessee raised the objection. The only reason for the objection was that the calendar on which the minority Members were working was the calendar of the previous day, and this particular bill had not been printed on the calendar on which we were working.

I have already discussed the subject with the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. After completion of the call of the calendar today, which begins with order No. 228, I shall ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider Calendar 227, Senate bill 1631. There will be no objection from this side of the aisle.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 227, Senate bill 1631, may be reverted to at this time, if there is no objection. If there were objection, I would not make the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am not minded to object. However, I would prefer first to complete the call of the calendar. There may be additional requests of a similar nature. We have agreed with the calendar committee upon a certain procedure.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I am compelled to leave the Chamber shortly. The House has already passed a companion bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The majority calendar committee has no objection to reverting to the consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that neither the majority calendar committee nor the minority calendar committee objects, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1631) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I ask whether the Morse formula has been complied with in connection with the bill? If it has been complied with I do not object.

Mr. GORE. The Morse formula does not apply to the pending bill. It proposes an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the House has passed House bill 4605, a bill identical to Senate bill 1631. The House bill is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 4605, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4605) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 1631 is indefinitely postponed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

The bill (S. 1151) authorizing the transfer to the State of Tennessee of certain lands in the Veterans' Administration Center, Mountain Home, Tenn., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, there is a House bill on the calendar, H. R. 1561, which is a counterpart of Senate bill 1151.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1561) authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration in Johnson City, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee, and that its consideration be proceeded with at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire whether the Morse formula has been applied to this bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Will the Senator from North Dakota explain what he means by the Morse formula?

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from New Jersey is familiar with it, I am sure.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No; I am not particularly familiar with it. I have heard it applied many times to many situations.

Mr. LANGER. Does the State make any payments?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I can assure the Senator that in this instance there would be no payments by the State.

Mr. LANGER. The land is being used entirely for State purposes?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1561) authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration in Johnson City, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 1151 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate passed House bill 1561, authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration in Johnson City, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, in order that I may offer an amendment to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote is reconsidered and the Senator from New Jersey may offer his amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, may I ask the calendar number of the bill to which the Senator from New Jersey is referring?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Calendar No. 229.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a House bill which corresponds to Calendar No. 229; Senate bill 1151.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the language in the amendment which I now send to the desk be incorporated in the bill at the appropriate place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That the State of Tennessee shall perpetuate and provide for the maintenance of the cemetery located on the property."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 1561) was read the third time and passed.

PAYMENT OF UNNEGOTIATED CHECKS AS ACCRUED BENEFITS

The bill (H. R. 1563) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary payee, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND AT CHERRY POINT, N. C.

The bill (S. 731) to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer to the jurisdiction and control of the Department of the Navy, without exchange of funds and for such period as it shall be used for military purposes, a parcel of land at Cherry Point, N. C., consisting of 37⅘ acres, more or less, a metes-and-bounds description of which is on file in the Department of the Navy, for use in connection with the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.

PAYMENT OF SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF OFFICIALS OF THE KLAMATH TRIBE

The bill (H. R. 3406) to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPROVAL OF CONNECTICUT RIVER FLOOD CONTROL COMPACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 261) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River Flood Control Compact, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 2, line 22, after the word "East", to strike out "Hartfort" and insert "Hartford"; on page 3, line 20, after "twenty-five", to insert "(25)"; and on page 10, line 20, after the word "At", to strike out "Swift Water" and insert "Swiftwater", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent and approval of Congress is given to the Connecticut River Flood Control Compact between the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Such compact reads as follows:

"CONNECTICUT RIVER FLOOD CONTROL COMPACT

"Whereas the Federal Government exercises jurisdiction over the Nation's navigable rivers and their tributaries through passage of the Flood Control Act of 1936 and various other acts amendatory thereto; and

"Whereas these acts provide for construction by the United States of dams for flood control and, where feasible, in addition to flood control for storage of water to be used for irrigation, recreation, or hydroelectric power or for any of these purposes; and

"Whereas the Connecticut is an interstate river and control of major floods on it can be obtained only by the construction of dams by the United States under authorization of the above mentioned acts; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the States of Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Vermont recognize that it is in the interest of their general welfare that the United States construct in the Connecticut River Valley a comprehensive system of local protection works and dams and reservoirs to control floods and prevent loss of life and property, the disruption of orderly processes and the impairment of commerce between the aforesaid States; and

"Whereas the United States has constructed dikes, flood walls, and other local protection works at Hartford and East Hartford in the State of Connecticut, and at Springfield, Riverdale, West Springfield, Chicopee, Northampton, Holyoke, and Springdale, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and dams and reservoirs for the storage of flood waters at Knightville, Birch Hill, and Tully in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at Surry Mountain in the State of New Hampshire, and at Union Village in the State of Vermont and has reached agreements with the State wherein located for construction of dams and reservoirs for the storage of flood waters at Barre Falls in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and at Ball Mountain and at Townshend in the State of Vermont; and

"Whereas the Congress has at various times authorized construction by the United States of other dams and reservoirs for the storage of flood waters in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and in the States of New Hampshire and Vermont and has more recently instructed the Corps of Engineers to determine what additional local protection works and dams and reservoirs are required for a comprehensive system to control floods in the Connecticut River and its tributaries; and

"Whereas it is believed that such a comprehensive flood-control system should include dams and reservoirs controlling flood run-off from approximately twenty-five (25) percent of the total drainage area of the Connecticut River above Hartford, Conn., and strategically located in reference to characteristics of tributaries and to damage centers; and

"Whereas construction by the United States of additional dams and reservoirs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and in the States of New Hampshire and Vermont, to complete such a comprehensive flood-control system, will remove from the tax rolls of local governments of those States such property as is acquired by the United States and may work other hardships against the people of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont; and

"Whereas it is highly desirable that any flood-control dam and reservoir constructed by the United States in the Connecticut River Valley have the approval of the State wherein it is located and that States benefiting from construction of such dam and reservoir make reimbursement for such loss of taxes and for such hardships; and

"Whereas a comprehensive system for the prevention of destructive floods and for water-resources utilization in the Connecticut River Valley can best be accomplished by cooperation between the several States in the valley and by and through a common and joint agency of said several States;

"Now, therefore, the said Commonwealth of Massachusetts and States of Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Vermont do hereby enter into the following compact, to wit:

"ARTICLE I

"The principal purposes of this compact are: (a) to promote interstate comity among and between the signatory States; (b) to assure adequate storage capacity for impounding the waters of the Connecticut River and its tributaries for the protection of life and property from floods; (c) to provide a joint or common agency through which the signatory States, while promoting, protecting, and preserving to each the local interest and sovereignty of the respective signatory States, may more effectively cooperate in accomplishing the object of flood control and water-resources utilization in the basin of the Connecticut River and its tributaries.

"ARTICLE II

"There is hereby created 'the Connecticut River Valley Flood Control Commission,' hereinafter referred to as the 'commission,' which shall consist of 12 members, 3 of whom shall be residents of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; 3 of whom shall be residents of the State of Connecticut; 3 of whom shall be residents of the State of New Hampshire; and 3 of whom shall be residents of the State of Vermont.

"The members of the commission shall be chosen by their respective States in such manner and for such term as may be fixed and determined from time to time by the law of each of said States, respectively, by which they are appointed. A member of the commission may be removed or suspended from office as provided by the law of the State for which he shall be appointed, and any vacancy occurring in the commission shall be filled in accordance with the laws of the State wherein such vacancy exists.

"A majority of the members from each State shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, the exercise of any of its powers or the performance of any of its duties, but no action of the commission shall be binding unless at least two of the members from each State shall vote in favor thereof.

"The compensation of members of the commission shall be fixed, determined, and paid by the State which they respectively represent. All necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties shall be paid from the funds of the commission.

"The commission shall elect from its members a chairman, vice chairman, clerk, and treasurer. Such treasurer shall furnish to the commission, at its expense, a bond with corporate surety, to be approved by the commission, in such amount as the commission may determine, conditioned for the faithful performance of his duties.

"The commission shall adopt suitable by-laws and shall make such rules and regulations as it may deem advisable not inconsistent with laws of the United States, of the signatory States or with any rules or regulations lawfully promulgated thereunder.

"The commission shall make an annual report to the governor and legislature of each of the signatory States, setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this compact.

"The commission shall keep a record of all its meetings and proceedings, contracts and accounts, and shall maintain a suitable office, where its maps, plans, documents, records and accounts shall be kept, subject to public inspection at such times and under such regulations as the commission shall determine.

"ARTICLE III

"The commission shall constitute a body, both corporate and politic, with full power and authority: (1) to sue and be sued; (2) to have a seal and alter the same at pleasure; (3) to appoint and employ such agents and employees as may be required in the proper performance of the duties hereby committed to it and to fix and determine their qualifications, duties, and compensation; (4) to enter into such contracts and agreements and to do and perform any and all other acts, matters and things as may be necessary and essential to the full and complete performance of the powers and duties hereby committed to and imposed upon it and as may be incidental thereto; (5) to have such additional power and duties as may hereafter be delegated to or imposed upon it from time to time by the action of the legislature of any of said States, concurred in by the legislatures of the other States and by the Congress of the United States.

"The commission shall make, or cause to be made, such studies as it may deem necessary, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies, for the development of a comprehensive plan for flood control and for utilization of the water resources of the Connecticut River Valley.

"The commission shall not pledge the credit of the signatory States or any of them.

"ARTICLE IV

"The signatory State wherein is located the site of each of the following dams and reservoirs agrees to the construction by the United States of each such dam and reservoir in accordance with authorization by the Congress:

"In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, (1) At Barre Falls on the Ware River controlling a drainage area of approximately fifty-seven (57) square miles and providing flood storage of approximately eight (8) inches of run-off from said drainage area.

"In the State of Vermont, (1) At West Townshend on the West River controlling a net drainage area of approximately one hundred six (106) square miles and providing flood control storage of approximately six (6) inches of run-off from said drainage area.

"(2) At Ball Mountain on the West River controlling a net drainage area of approximately one hundred thirty-two (132) square miles and providing flood control storage of approximately six (6) inches of run-off from said drainage area.

"(3) At North Hartland on the Ottauquechee River controlling a drainage area of approximately two hundred twenty-two (222) square miles and providing flood control storage for approximately six (6) inches of run-off from said drainage area.

"(4) At Groton Pond on the Wells River controlling a drainage area of approximately seventeen and three-tenths (17.3) square miles and providing flood control storage for approximately eight (8) inches of run-off from said drainage area.

"(5) At Victory on the Moose River controlling a drainage area of approximately sixty-six (66) square miles and providing flood control storage for approximately seven (7) inches of run-off from said drainage area.

"(6) In Bloomfield on the Nulhegan River controlling a drainage area of approximately seventy (70) square miles and providing flood-control storage for approximately nine (9) inches of runoff from said drainage area.

"In the State of New Hampshire, (1) At South Keene on the Otter Brook, tributary of the Ashuelot River, controlling a drainage area of approximately forty-seven (47) square miles and providing flood-control storage for approximately seven (7) inches of runoff from said drainage area.

"(2) At Walpole on the Cold River controlling a drainage area of approximately one hundred one (101) square miles and providing flood-control storage for approximately eight (8) inches of runoff from said drainage area.

"(3) At Bethlehem Junction on the Ammonoosuc River controlling a drainage area of approximately ninety (90) square miles and providing flood-control storage for approximately six (6) inches of runoff from said drainage area.

"(4) At Franconia on the Ammonoosuc River controlling a drainage area of approximately thirty (30) square miles and providing flood-control storage for approximately eight (8) inches of runoff from said drainage area.

"(5) At Swiftwater on the Wild Ammonoosuc River controlling a drainage area of approximately fifty-seven (57) square miles and providing flood-control storage for approximately ten (10) inches of runoff from said drainage area.

"ARTICLE V

"The Commonwealth of Massachusetts agrees to reimburse the State of New Hampshire fifty (50) percent of the amount of Vermont fifty (50) percent of the amount of taxes lost to their political subdivisions by reason of ownership by the United States of lands, rights or other property therein for the flood-control dams and reservoirs at Surry Mountain in New Hampshire and at Union Village in Vermont.

"The State of Connecticut agrees to reimburse the Commonwealth of Massachusetts forty (40) percent, the State of New Hampshire forty (40) percent, and the State of Vermont forty (40) percent of the amount of taxes lost to their political subdivisions by reason of ownership by the United States of lands, rights, or other property therein for the flood-control dams and reservoirs at Tully, at Knightville, and at Birch Hill in Massachusetts, at Surry Mountain in New Hampshire, and at Union Village in Vermont.

"The Commonwealth of Massachusetts agrees to reimburse the State of New Hampshire fifty (50) percent and the State of Vermont fifty (50) percent of the amount of taxes lost to their political subdivisions by reason of acquisition and ownership by the United States of lands, rights, or other property therein for construction in the future of any flood-control dam and reservoir specified in article IV and also for any other flood-control dam and reservoir hereafter constructed by the United States in the Connecticut River Valley.

"The State of Connecticut agrees to reimburse the Commonwealth of Massachusetts forty (40) percent, the State of New Hampshire forty (40) percent, and the State of Vermont forty (40) percent of the amount of taxes lost to their political subdivisions by reason of acquisition and ownership by the United States of lands, rights, or other property therein for construction in the future of any flood-control dam and reservoir specified in article IV and also for any other flood-control dam and reservoir hereafter constructed by the United States in the Connecticut River Valley.

"Annually, not later than November 1 of each year, the commission shall determine the loss of taxes resulting to political subdivisions of each signatory State by reason of acquisition and ownership therein by the United States of lands, rights, or other property in connection with each flood-control dam and reservoir for which provision for tax reimbursement has been made in the four paragraphs next above. Such losses of taxes as determined by the commission shall be based on the tax rate then current in each such political subdivision and on the average assessed valuation for a period of 5 years prior to the acquisition by the United States of such property, provided that whenever a political subdivision wherein a flood-control dam and reservoir or portion thereof is located shall have made a general revaluation of property subject to the annual municipal taxes of such subdivision, the commission may use such revaluation for the purpose of determining the amount of taxes for which reimbursement shall be made. Using the percentage of payment agreed to in said four paragraphs, the commission shall then compute the sum, if any, due from each signatory State to each other signatory State and shall send a notice to the treasurer of each signatory State setting forth in detail the sums, if any, each is to pay to and to receive from each other signatory State in reimbursement of tax losses.

"Each signatory State on receipt of formal notification from the commission of the sum which it is to pay in reimbursement for tax losses, shall, not later than July 1 of the following year, make its payment for such tax losses to the signatory State wherein such loss or losses occur, except that in case of the first annual payment for tax losses at any dam or reservoir such payment shall be made by payor States not later than July 1 of the year in which the next regular session of its legislature is held.

"Payment by a signatory State of its share of reimbursement for taxes in accordance with formal notification received from the commission shall be a complete and final discharge of all liability by the payor State to the payee State for each flood-control dam and reservoir within the payee State for the time specified in such formal notification. Each payee signatory State shall have full responsibility for distributing or expending all such sums received, and no agency or political subdivision shall have any claim against any signatory State other than the payee State, nor against the commission relative to tax losses covered by such payments.

"Whenever a State which makes reimbursement for tax losses and a State which receives such reimbursement from it shall agree, through the commission, on a lump-sum payment in lieu of annual payments and such lump-sum payment has been made and received, the requirement that the commission annually shall determine the tax losses, compute sums due from each State and send notice thereof to the treasurer of each State shall no longer apply to the aforesaid States with respect to any flood-control dam and reservoir for which lump-sum payment has been made and received.

"The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the State of Connecticut each agrees to pay its respective share in reimbursement, as determined by the commission under the procedure following, for economic losses and damages occurring by reason of ownership of property by the United States for construction and operation of a flood-control dam and reservoir at any site specified in article IV, and for any other flood-control dam and reservoir constructed hereafter by the United States in the Connecticut River Valley: *Provided, however,* That no reimbursement shall be made for speculative losses and damages or losses or damages for which the United States is liable.

"On receipt of information from the Chief of Engineers that request is to be made for funds for the purpose of preparing detailed plans and specifications for any flood-control dam and reservoir proposed to be constructed in the Connecticut River Valley, including those specified in article IV, the commission shall make an estimate of the amount of taxes which would be lost to and of economic losses and damages which would occur in political subdivisions of the signatory State wherein such dam and reservoir would be located, wholly or in part, by reason of acquisition and ownership by the United States of lands, rights, or other property for the construction and operation of such flood-control dam and reservoir and shall decide whether the flood-control benefits to be derived in the signatory States from such flood-control dam and reservoir, both by itself and as a unit of a comprehensive flood-control plan, justifies, in the opinion of the commission, the assumption by signatory States of the obligation to make reimbursement for loss of taxes and for economic losses and damages. Such estimate and decision shall thereafter be reviewed by the commission at 5-year intervals until such time as the United States shall have acquired title to the site of such flood-control dam or plans for its construction are abandoned. The commission shall notify the governor, the Members of the United States Senate and the Members of the United States House of Representatives from each signatory State and the Chief of Engineers as to the commission's decision and as to any change in such decision.

"On receipt of information from the Chief of Engineers that any flood-control dam and reservoir is to be constructed, reconstructed, altered, or used for any purpose in addition to flood control, including those flood-control dams and reservoirs heretofore constructed and those specified in article IV, the commission shall make a separate estimate of the amount of taxes which would

be lost to and of economic losses and damages which would occur in political subdivisions of the signatory State wherein such dam and reservoir would be located, wholly or in part, by reason of acquisition and ownership by the United States of lands, rights, or other property for the construction and operation of such dam and reservoir in excess of the estimated amount of taxes which would be lost and of the economic losses and damages which would occur if the dam were constructed and operated for flood control only and the commission shall decide the extent to which, in its opinion, the signatory States would be justified in making reimbursement for loss of taxes and for economic losses and damages in addition to reimbursement for such dam and reservoir if constructed and used for flood control only. Such estimate and decision shall thereafter be reviewed by the commission at 5-year intervals until such time as such dam and reservoir shall be so constructed, reconstructed, altered or used, or plans for such construction, reconstruction, alteration, or use are abandoned. The commission shall notify the governor, the Members of the United States Senate and the Members of the United States House of Representatives from each signatory State as to the commission's decision and as to any change in such decision.

"Within 30 days after the acquisition by the United States of the site of any flood-control dam the commission shall proceed to make a final determination of economic losses and damages occasioned by such dam and reservoir. The commission shall not include in such determination either speculative losses and damages or losses and damages for which the United States is liable.

"The commission shall compute the share the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the State of Connecticut shall each pay to the State wherein such dam and reservoir is located by multiplying the sum of such losses and damages, as previously determined, by the percentage of flood-control benefits which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the State of Connecticut each receives, in the allocation by States, of the flood-control benefits resulting from the dam and reservoir.

"The commission shall send a notice to the treasurer of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and to the treasurer of the State of Connecticut setting forth in detail the sum, if any, each is to pay to the State wherein such dam and reservoir is located in reimbursement for economic losses and damages and shall also send such notice to the treasurer of the State wherein such dam and reservoir is located.

"The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the State of Connecticut on receipt of such formal notification by the commission shall each pay its share of such economic losses or damages to the signatory States wherein such losses or damages occur. Full payment by either State of the sum specified in such formal notification from the commission as to the amount of economic losses and damages for which such State is to make reimbursement shall be a complete and final discharge of all liability by the payor State to the payee State for economic losses and damages for each flood-control dam and reservoir within the payee State designated in such formal notification. Each payee signatory State shall have full responsibility for distributing or expending all such sums received and no agency, political subdivision, private person, partnership, firm, association, or corporation shall have any claim against any signatory State other than the payee State, nor against the commission relative to such economic losses and damages.

"A signatory State may, in agreement with the commission and the Chief of Engineers, acquire title or option to acquire title to any or all lands, rights, or other property required for any flood-control dam and reservoir within its boundaries and transfer such titles or options to the United States. Whenever the fair cost to said signatory State for such titles or options, as determined by the commission, is greater than the amount received therefor from the United States, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the State of Connecticut shall each pay its share of such excess cost to said signatory State, such share to be determined by the commission in accordance with procedure herein contained for determining reimbursement for economic losses and damages.

"Whenever the commission shall not agree, within a reasonable time or within 60 days after a formal request from the governor of any signatory State, concerning reimbursement for loss of taxes or for economic losses and damages at any flood-control dam and reservoir heretofore or hereafter constructed by the United States in the Connecticut River Valley, or concerning the extent, if any, to which reimbursement shall be made for additional loss of taxes and for additional economic losses and damages caused by construction, reconstruction, alteration, or use of any such dam for purposes other than flood control, the governor of each signatory State shall designate a person from his State as a member of a board of arbitration, hereinafter called the board, and the members so designated shall choose one additional member who shall be chairman of such board. Whenever the members appointed by the governors to such board shall not agree within 60 days on such additional member of the board, the governors of such signatory States shall jointly designate the additional member. The board shall by majority vote decide the question referred to it and shall do so in accordance with the provisions of this compact concerning such reimbursement. The decision of the board on each question referred to it concerning reimbursement for loss of taxes and for economic losses and damages shall be binding on the commission and on each signatory State, notwithstanding any other provision of this compact.

"ARTICLE VI

"Nothing contained in this compact shall be construed as a limitation upon the authority of the United States.

"ARTICLE VII

"The signatory States agree to appropriate for compensation of agents and employees of the commission and for office, administrative, travel, and other expenses on recommendation of the commission subject to limitations as follows: The Commonwealth of Massachusetts obligates itself to not more than seventy-five hundred (7500) dollars in any one year, the State of New Hampshire obligates itself to not more than one thousand (1000) dollars in any one year, the State of Vermont obligates itself to not more than one thousand (1000) dollars in any one year, and the State of Connecticut obligates itself to not more than sixty-five hundred (6500) dollars in any one year.

"ARTICLE VIII

"Should any part of this compact be held to be contrary to the constitution of any signatory State or of the United States, all other parts thereof shall continue to be in full force and effect.

"ARTICLE IX

"This compact shall become operative and effective when ratified by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, and Connecticut and approved by the Congress of the United States. Notice of ratification shall be given by the Governor of each State to the governors of the other States and to the President of the United States, and the President of the United States is requested to give notice to the governors of each of the signatory States of approval by the Congress of the United States.

"SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOMESTEAD ALLOTMENT ON BLACKFEET INDIAN RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the act of June 30, 1949 (41 Stat. 16), was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, Calendar No. 234, House bill 1243, was reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bill gives authority to the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to issue patents in fee to members of the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians on their allotted lands held in trust when he believes that the Indians are competent to handle their own affairs without any further supervision of the Government.

It would give the Secretary of the Interior the same authority with respect to the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians which he now has for substantially all the other tribes of Indians, with some exceptions. The Blackfeet Tribe is now deemed to be sufficiently advanced that such authority might well be given to the Secretary of the Interior. The bill has no other purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLOTMENT OF LANDS OF THE CROW TRIBE FOR DISTRIBUTION OF TRIBAL FUNDS

The bill (H. R. 1244) to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I do not rise to object, but I desire to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORDON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 6, after the word "sold", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "or patents in fee may be issued therefor."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to give to the Secretary of the Interior power, in the case of the Crow Tribe of Indians, either to grant patents in fee or to provide for the sale of the allotted tracts. Thus, there will be provided additional authority for immediate sale.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WATKINS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following the passage of House bill 1244, Calendar 235, a report from the Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1953.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: Reference is made to the oral request from your committee for a report on H. R. 1244, a bill "To amend section 13 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and other purposes,'" as passed by the House of Representatives on April 20, 1953.

I recommend that H. R. 1244 be enacted, with the amendment hereinafter set forth

Section 13 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751, 756), provides:

"That every member of the Crow Tribe shall designate as a homestead 640 acres, already allotted or to be allotted hereunder, which homestead shall remain inalienable for a period of 25 years from the date of issuance of patent therefor, or until the death of the allottee: *Provided*, That the trust period on such homestead allotments of incompetent Indians may be extended in accordance with the provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any Crow Indian allottee may sell not to exceed 320 acres of his homestead, upon his application in writing and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe: *And provided further*, That said land to be sold by said Indian allottee shall not exceed more than one-half of his irrigable nor more than one-half of his agricultural land and shall not include the improvements consisting of his home."

The restrictions in this section have prevented many Crow Indians from disposing of land of which they were not making use and of which disposition would have been made for the benefit of the Indians if the above-quoted restrictions had not prevented such disposition.

The act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 3, 16), imposes a somewhat similar limitation on the disposition by sale, or through the issuance of a patent in fee, of certain homestead lands on the Blackfeet Reservation. With minor exceptions, the Crow and the Blackfeet Tribes are the only Indian tribes subject to this type of restrictive legislation. We believe that the Crow Indians should be released from these restraints, thereby placing them in this respect in the same status as the other Indian tribes. For like reasons we are also recommending the enactment of H. R. 1243, a bill designed to accomplish a similar purpose with reference to the homestead allotments on the Blackfeet Reservation.

Numerous requests for the sale of lands or the issuance of patents in fee have been made by competent Crow Indians who are either unable to use their land or have moved away from the reservation. As a result, in the past large numbers of bills have been introduced in each Congress to authorize individual sales or the issuance of individual patents in fee. For example, during the 82d Congress, 75 such bills were introduced with respect to lands on the Crow Reservation, and in this Congress several such bills have already been introduced.

The provisions of H. R. 1244, as passed by the House of Representatives, would permit a Crow Indian, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to sell any of his homestead, irrigable or agricultural land on the Crow Reservation, notwithstanding the restrictions quoted above. The bill, however, fails to include any provision whereby a competent Indian could obtain, when appropriate, a patent in fee for lands subject to these restrictions which he does not desire to sell. In order to remedy this omission it is recommended that H. R. 1244 be amended as follows:

At page 1, line 6, after the word "sold", insert a comma and the words "or patents in fee may be issued therefor,".

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

P. E. WORMSER,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

ISSUANCE OF PATENTS IN FEE TO WILLIAM LYNN ENGLES AND MAUREEN EDNA ENGLES

The bill (H. R. 2364) to terminate restrictions against alienation on land owned by William Lynn Engles and Maureen Edna Engles, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN SCHOOL PROPERTIES TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS — BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 1242) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether the objection the Senator from New Mexico originally had to the bill has been satisfied.

Mr. CORDON. I cannot answer the question because I do not know the answer.

As I recall, the Senator from New Mexico had in mind that there should be a limitation with respect to whether the bill would provide for exclusion of boarding schools, as I recall; but he was not certain what action he would take.

Certainly I have no objection to having the bill go over until that matter is determined.

Mr. SMATHERS. Then, Mr. President, I ask that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, in the hope that the situation may be cleared up by the time the bill is reached.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

INCORPORATION OF NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CITIZENSHIP

The bill (S. 677) to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons: Robert N. Anderson, Arlington, Va.; Emma Mae Brotze, Marshall, Tex.; Leo M. Cadison, Asheville, N. C.; Thomas F. Clear, Stamford, Conn.; Earle T. Hawkins, Towson, Md.; Carl B. Hyatt, Rockville, Md.; Richard B. Kennan, Chevy Chase, Md.; and Justin Miller, Pacific Palisades, Calif., are created a body corporate by the name of the National Conference on Citizenship (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation") and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers and limitations contained in this act.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of regulations and bylaws, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The object and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(1) to hold annually a national conference on citizenship on or about "Citizenship Day," September 17;

(2) to assist in the development of more dynamic procedures for making citizenship more effective, including the promotion and encouragement of local, State, and regional citizenship conferences; and

(3) to indicate the ways and means by which various organizations may contribute concretely to the development of a more active, alert, enlightened, conscientious, and progressive citizenry in our country.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal;

(3) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

(4) to adopt, amend, and alter bylaws and regulations, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which such corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs, including the establishment and maintenance of local and State conferences on citizenship;

(5) to contract and be contracted with;

(6) to take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and accomplishing the purposes of the corporation, subject to applicable provisions of law of any State (a) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (b) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by a corporation operating in such State;

(7) to transfer and convey real or personal property;

(8) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law;

(9) to use the corporate funds to give prizes, or awards, to citizens for outstanding

contributions toward the achievement of the purposes of the corporation;

(10) to publish a magazine or other publication consistent with its corporate purposes;

(11) to use and display such emblems and badges as it may adopt; and

(12) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

HEADQUARTERS AND PRINCIPAL OFFICES; STATES AND TERRITORIAL SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 5. (a) The headquarters and principal offices of the corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, or in the States of Maryland or Virginia, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to these places but may be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation, such designation to be filed in the office of the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed sufficient notice or service upon the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP; VOTING RIGHTS

SEC. 6. Membership in the corporation shall be confined to agencies and organizations and the rights and privileges of membership shall, except as otherwise provided in this act, be prescribed by the bylaws of the corporation. In the conduct of the business of the annual national conference on citizenship each agency or organization sending delegates to, and participating in such conference shall have one vote.

NATIONAL OFFICERS; ELECTION OF OFFICERS

SEC. 7. (a) The national officers shall be a president, who shall serve as chairman of the board of directors and of the executive committee, a first vice president, a second vice president, a third vice president, a secretary, and a treasurer, to be selected from the officers and members of the member agencies or organizations participating in the conference.

(b) For the purposes of initiating the corporation, the national officers shall be elected within 10 days of the date of enactment of this act by the persons named in the first section of this act, to serve until the final session of the next following annual conference. Thereafter, the national officers of the corporation shall be elected biennially by a majority vote of the agencies and organizations sending delegates to, and participating in the annual conference, one vote to each such agency and to each such organization.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; MEETINGS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE; EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SEC. 8. (a) From the date of enactment of this act until the final session of the next following annual conference, the governing body of the corporation, which shall exercise the powers herein granted to the corporation, shall be the persons named in the first section of this act and such additional persons as shall be named by them. Thereafter, the governing body of the corporation shall be a board of directors consisting of such number (not less than 10 including ex officio members) as the bylaws may prescribe. The Board of Directors shall be selected from the officers or members of the member agencies or organizations participating in the conference.

(b) The members of the board of directors shall be elected for such term as the bylaws shall prescribe by a majority vote of the agencies and organizations sending delegates to, and participating in the annual conference, one vote to each such agency and to each such organization.

(c) The board shall meet at least once each year at such time and place as may be prescribed by the bylaws. The annual report of the board shall be presented at such meeting. Special meetings of the board may be called as prescribed by the bylaws.

(d) The board shall designate 3 of its own members, who together with the president and the 3 vice presidents shall constitute the executive committee which, when the board is not in session, shall have and exercise the powers of the board subject to its direction and have the power to authorize the seal of the corporation to be affixed to all papers which may require it.

(e) An executive director for the corporation shall be selected by the executive committee in keeping with qualifications and terms of employment adopted by such committee. Other professional staff members shall be nominated by the executive director and approved by the executive committee.

USE OF INCOME OR ASSETS; LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director, or be distributable to any such person, agency, or organization except upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation as provided in section 15 of this act. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the executive committee from adopting terms of employment of the executive director as prescribed by section 8 (e) of this act.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of a loan to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. The corporation, and its members, officers, and directors, as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office, nor advocate, sponsor, or promote legislation in the Congress of the United States or in the legislatures of the several States.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, nor to declare or pay any dividends, its objects and purposes being solely patriotic and educational.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of the annual conference, the board of directors, and committees having any authority under the board of directors; and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote or his agent or attorney at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS; REPORT TO COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 14. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually for the fiscal year ending June 30 of each year by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be filed annually with the Comptroller General in accordance with such regulations and upon such form as he shall prescribe verified by the certified public accountant by whom the audit is made.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 15. Upon final dissolution or liquidation of the corporation, and after the discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation shall be transferred by the board of directors to some recognized agency or agencies engaged in the furtherance and advancement of citizenship.

EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME, EMBLEMS, SEALS, AND BADGES

SEC. 16. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name, the National Conference on Citizenship, and such emblems, seals, and badges as the corporation may lawfully adopt.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

INCORPORATION OF NATIONAL SERVICE STAR LEGION

The bill (S. 360) to incorporate the National Service Star Legion was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, I wish to state that I desire to submit amendments to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 360), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 11, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 17. The financial transactions of the corporation may be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositors, fiscal agents, and custodians.

The corporation shall reimburse the General Accounting Office for the full cost of

any such audit of the financial transactions of such corporation as billed therefor by the Comptroller General, and the General Accounting Office shall deposit the sums so reimbursed into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 17. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositors, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than January 15 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I submit the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12 of the committee amendment, at the end of line 19, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "Such report shall not be printed as a public document."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I now submit amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, it is proposed to strike out lines 3 and 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "(2)" and to insert "SEC. 5 (1)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out "3" and insert "2."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, in line 16, it is proposed to strike out "4" and insert "3."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no other amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 360) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons, to wit: Mrs. John H. Butler, Mrs. Roy O. Shay, 301 Indiana Avenue, St. Joseph, Mo.; Mrs. Ethel Dickason, 626 East 130th Street, Cleveland, Ohio; Mrs. Clyde Jonagan, 2629 Sacramento Street, St. Joseph, Mo.; Mrs. Olla B. McDowell, 2346 Talbot Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.; Mrs. Mary Perkins Jones, 621 Douglas Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa; Mrs. W. L. Olds, Woodwards Grove, route 1, Madison, Wis.; Mrs. A. A. Pearson, 72 Baker Street, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. Lucy W. Caldwell, 7316 Church Street, Swissdale 18, Pa.; Mrs. Nancy M. Hitch, 506 East Riverside Avenue, Evansville, Ind.; Mrs. J. G. Palck, 1181 24th Street, Ogden, Utah; Mrs. Luella Koller, 1527 Shenandoah Avenue, Cincinnati 16, Ohio; Mrs. Foster B. Davis, 513 Walker Avenue, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Lola E. Siney, 1109 West Klingerman, Del Monte, Calif.; Mrs. Lillian Schulte, Elkader, Iowa; Mrs. J. F. Matthews, Weirton, W. Va.; Mrs. Winifred Finkbeiner, 305 West Second Street, Perrysburg, Ohio; Mrs. Emma B. Teckemeyer, 143 East Gorham Street, Madison 3, Wis.; Mrs. Henry Fenimore Baker, Maywood Avenue, Ruxton 4, Md.; Mrs. Frank Nessler, 3152 Central Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.; Mrs. Ida M. Suber, 409 Bell Avenue, New Castle, Pa.; Mrs. Marie Lane, 4900 Haddon Avenue, Baltimore 7, Md.; Mrs. James Montgomery, 1919 West A Street, Belleville, Ill.; Mrs. George W. Weber, 1816 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.; Mrs. A. M. Fleming, 627 Fourth Avenue, Salt Lake City 3, Utah; Mrs. Rhoda Woodruff, 116 First Avenue East, Oskaloosa, Iowa; Mrs. J. A. Shulte, 205 West Madison Street, Jefferson, Iowa; Mrs. W. C. Harllee, 1753 Lamont Street NW, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Irene Polito, 1397 East 82d Street, Cleveland, Ohio; Mrs. Charles R. Sharretts, 15 Seminole Avenue, Catonsville 28, Md.; Mrs. Olive B. Henderson, 83 Kingston Avenue, Crafton 5, Pa.; Mrs. Alma Cheesman, 5502 West Burnham Street, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Fred Edson, 2971 Jackson Avenue, Ogden, Utah; Mrs. W. W. Baldwin, 2908 Manhattan Avenue, Baltimore 15, Md.; Mrs. J. Barry Mahool, 305 West 19th Street, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Ada H. Auen, 1312 Seventh Avenue, Altoona, Pa.; Mrs. C. K. Lewis, 372 West Kennedy Street, Syracuse 5, N. Y.; Mrs. Harry Chapman, Chewelah, Wash.; Mrs. Frank Knapp, 3261 Altamont Avenue, Cleveland Heights 18, Ohio; Mrs. Anna E. Ward, 905 Clay Street, La Porte, Ind.; Mrs. Harriet S. Noble, 2401 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Esther M. Irving, route 3, box 499, Media, Pa.; Mrs. Emma R. Mason, 1604 West College Avenue, Spokane, Wash.; Mrs. Elise A. Kroening, 1309 West Orchard Street, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. J. C. Mellichamp, 699 Piedmont Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. Lillian Milewsky, 428 South Street, Steubenville, Ohio; Mrs. Lydia M. Collins, 340 Croft Avenue, Main Building, Pittsburgh 13, Pa.; Mrs. Louis Manegold, Cooper Road, route 2, Kenosha, Wis.; Margaret Louise O'Brien, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Vina Saunders, 1313 East Palm Street, Altadena, Calif.; Mrs. Laura Moenning, 405 South Kentucky Avenue, Evansville 14, Ind.; Mrs. Cecilia Hines, 515 Grandview Avenue, Steubenville, Ohio; Mrs. R. C. Newman, 552 Nivelle Street, Pittsburgh 13, Pa.; Mrs. Robert Carlton Morris, 2648 Kirkwood Lane, Toledo, Ohio; Mrs. Frank Braun, 7200 North River Road, Milwaukee 9, Wis.; and such persons who are members of Service Star Legion, Inc., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Maryland, and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name National Service Star Legion and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession of the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

SEC. 2. That the persons above named and other persons selected from among the membership of Service Star Legion, Inc., a corporation duly organized and existing under the State of Maryland as set forth in section 1 hereof, met in national convention in Evansville, Ind., on October 9, 1946, and then and there, by and through duly elected delegates representing 125 chapters throughout the United States, adopted pursuant to a former resolution a national constitution and bylaws, and duly elected national officers for said organization and authorized the duly elected president thereof to make application for this charter.

SEC. 3. That the purposes of this corporation shall be as follows:

(1) Service to God, country, and humanity, and the promotion of peace and brotherhood among men and nations.

(2) To guard the welfare of all persons engaged in the military and naval service of the United States of America, including those so engaged as soldiers, sailors, and marines and as members of the several women's auxiliaries, during the two great World Wars, and to lend aid and comfort to their families.

(3) To preserve and cherish the memory of the men and women who served in the military and naval service of the United States of America during either or both of said wars and who sacrificed their lives for their country and the liberty of the world.

(4) To foster a spirit of sisterhood, comradeship, and democracy among women.

(5) To promote, erect, and maintain local, State, and national memorials to the members of the Armed Forces engaged in either or both of said wars and to other persons who rendered conspicuous service to the Nation during either or both of said conflicts.

(6) To preserve and protect American ideals and traditions.

(7) To operate as a corporation not for profit and that no part of the income or assets shall inure to the benefit of any of its members, directors, or officers, nor be distributable thereto otherwise than upon dissolution or final liquidation; and that such corporation is organized and shall be operated exclusively for charitable, educational, patriotic, and civic improvement purposes.

SEC. 4. That the corporation hereby created shall have the following powers: To have perpetual succession with power to sue and be sued in any court of competent jurisdiction; take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by, a corporation operating in such State; to ordain and establish bylaws and regulations, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State thereof, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs; to use in carrying out its purposes such seals, emblems, and badges as it may lawfully adopt; to establish State and regional organizations and local chapters; to publish magazines, newspapers, or any other publications consistent with the purposes of the corporation, and to do any and all such acts and things as may be necessary and proper to carry into effect the purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 5. (1) The corporation and its officers and the members of its board of directors or board of governors as such shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office.

(2) The first board of governors of the corporation shall consist of 14 members, namely, Mrs. R. O. Shay, Mrs. Alma Cheesman, Mrs. Fred Edson, Mrs. Rosa Lewis, Mrs.

Ada Auen, Mrs. Cecilia Hines, Mrs. Frank Braun, Mrs. Lucy Caldwell, Mrs. Laura Moenning, Mrs. W. W. Baldwin, Mrs. Olive Henderson, Mrs. J. C. Mellichamp, Mrs. Emma Teckemeyer, and Mrs. A. M. Fleming.

(3) The headquarters office and principal place of business of said corporation shall be located in Baltimore, Md., care of John M. Butler, Esq., 1409 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore 2, Md., but the activities of said organization, as set out herein, shall not be confined to Maryland, but shall be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

SEC. 6. Membership in National Service Star Legion shall be mothers, wives, daughters, sisters, grandmothers, stepmothers, foster-mothers, and women blood relatives of the first generation only, of men and women who served with the Armed Forces of the United States of America and her allies, during hostilities, after April 6, 1917; Army and Navy nurses and all women who served with the Armed Forces of the United States of America and her allies, during hostilities, after April 6, 1917: *Provided, however,* That the original members shall consist of the present members of Service Star Legion, Inc., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Maryland.

SEC. 7. (1) Each member of the said corporation shall have the right to one vote in the conduct of official business at the chapter level. Each chapter shall have the right to elect delegates to national conventions of the corporation, which delegates shall each exercise one vote in the conduct of business of the respective convention to which she is elected.

(2) The board of governors of the said corporation shall consist of one member duly elected to represent each department, and, in addition, all elective officers shall be members of the board of governors ex officio.

SEC. 8. The said corporation may and shall acquire all of the assets of the existing corporation known as Service Star Legion, Inc., upon discharge or satisfactory provisions for the discharge of all its liabilities.

SEC. 9. In the event of a final dissolution or liquidation of such corporation, and after the discharge or satisfactory provisions for the discharge of all its liabilities, the remaining assets of the said corporation shall be transferred in equal shares to the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, to be by them applied as an endowment or otherwise used for the homes for children now being operated by them.

SEC. 10. The corporation shall have power to—

(1) have succession by its corporate name;

(2) choose such officers, representatives, and agents as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the corporation;

(3) contract and be contracted with;

(4) transfer and convey all real or personal property;

(5) borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure same by mortgage subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal or State laws.

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officials, representatives, and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

SEC. 12. The corporation shall maintain in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for such corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent, or mail to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice or service upon the corporation.

SEC. 13. The following national officers of the said corporation shall be elected by the chosen delegates thereof in annual national conventions, each official delegate casting one vote, to wit: A national president, a first and second vice president, a treasurer, a historian, a chaplain, a chairman of the Gold Star Division of Honor, and five regional directors, one from each of the five grand sections.

SEC. 14. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of governors, and committees having any of the authority of the board of governors; and shall keep at its registered office or principal office a record giving the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote; and permit all books and records of the corporation to be inspected by any member or her agent or her attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

SEC. 15. The corporation shall not have or issue shares of stock, nor declare or pay dividends.

SEC. 16. No loan shall be made by the corporation to its officers or governors, or any of them, and any governor of the corporation who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or governor of the corporation, and any officer or officers participating in the making of any such loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

SEC. 17. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositors, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than January 15 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

SEC. 18. The corporation and its State, regional, and local subdivisions shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and use in carrying out its purposes the name National Service Star Legion, and such seals, emblems, and badges as the corporation may lawfully adopt.

SEC. 19. As a condition precedent to the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred, National Service Star Legion shall serve notice on the secretary of state, in each State, the name and address of an authorized agent in such State upon whom legal process or demands against this corporation may be served.

SEC. 20. Such provisions, privileges, and prerogatives, as have been granted heretofore to organizations similar to National Service Star Legion by virtue of their being incorporated by Congress, shall also be granted and accrue to National Service Star Legion.

SEC. 21. The right to repeal, alter, or amend this act at any time is hereby expressly reserved.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF INCORPORATION OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 2990) to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The bill (S. 28) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to discourage the exploitation of appellate procedures in the Federal courts by appellants in certain alien property suits who, by virtue of an interpretation of section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act now prevailing, are permitted to maintain appeals without supersedeas bonds. Because of the lack of the requirement, large sums of money are tied up for long periods, with no risk to the appellant, other than court costs, while he negotiates with the owner of the property for a settlement out of court as the price of withdrawing his claim.

In other words, the Judiciary Committee found that certain claimants in alien property suits would appeal and would file petitions, and it would take a long time to get them decided. Then sometimes the claimants would go to the other side and would say, "If you pay me a little money, I will withdraw the appeal." That is a form of blackmail. By providing for supersedeas bonds, we eliminate that situation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is the bill favored by the entire committee?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; it is.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 28) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled "Trading With the Enemy Act," approved October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C., Appendix, 1946 ed., sec. 9 (a)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That when the property in issue is money, as distinguished from stocks, bonds, or tangible property, if the President, or the officer or agency designated by him under section 32 of this act, shall have determined that a person other than said claimant is entitled to the interest, right, or title claimed by said claimant and sued for under this section as hereinbefore provided, or to any part of said interest, right, or title, and if the judgment of the district court is against the claimant, then the Alien Property Custodian or the Treasurer of the United States may pay, convey, transfer, assign, or deliver such money, or such part thereof, to such other person in accordance with this section or in accordance with section 32 of this act unless said claimant shall file a bond with sufficient surety approved by the court conditioned for payment to the Alien Property Custodian or the Treasurer of the United States, as the case may be, for the use of such other person, of damages for delay if an appeal is taken and dismissed, or if the judgment is affirmed. In the case of actions not pending on appeal on or prior to the date of the approval of this proviso, such bond shall be

filed with the circuit court of appeals within the time permitted for filing appeals; in the case of actions now pending on appeal, such bond shall be filed within 30 days after the date of approval of this proviso. In its discretion, the court may modify or waive the requirements of the foregoing proviso, if it finds that such requirements would result in undue hardship to an appellant desiring to appeal in good faith and not for frivolous or nuisance purposes. The court's finding and ruling in this respect shall be final and shall not be subject to review.

"(1) Any payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or deliverance by the Alien Property Custodian or by the Treasurer of the United States made pursuant to this section or section 32 of this act shall discharge the said Custodian or Treasurer from all further responsibility for the money so paid, conveyed, transferred, assigned, or delivered, and no suits or actions shall thereafter be instituted or maintained against the said Custodian or Treasurer in relation to any such money. This subsection shall not preclude appeals from decisions of lower courts, but no judgments shall be entered requiring the said Custodian or Treasurer to pay, convey, transfer, assign, or deliver the same money more than once."

TEODORO EGUES MUNAGORRI

The bill (S. 64) for the relief of Teodoro Egues Munagorri was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Teodoro Egues Munagorri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ISAAC D. NEHAMA

The bill (S. 313) for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Isaac D. Nehama shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GREGORY LEON BARANOWSKI

The bill (S. 324) for the relief of Gregory Leon Baranowski was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Gregory Leon Baranowski, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Maj. and Mrs. Leo F. Baranowski, citizens of the United States.

MAY LING NG

The bill (S. 349) for the relief of May Ling Ng was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, May Ling Ng, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lun Foo Ng, a citizen of the United States.

ANGELO GURISETTI PODESTA

The bill (S. 458) for the relief of Angelo Gurisetti Podesta was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Angelo Gurisetti Podesta, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John Podesta, citizens of the United States.

STEVEN M. PIVNICKI

The bill (S. 815) for the relief of Steven M. Pivnicki was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Steven M. Pivnicki shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

BRUNO LANIER

The bill (S. 816) for the relief of Bruno Lanier was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Bruno Lanier, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Quinton C. Lanier, citizens of the United States.

AKEMI TERADA

The bill (S. 1516) for the relief of Akemi Terada was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Akemi Terada, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Samuel P. Jackson, a citizen of the United States.

DR. ARTHUR TYE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 297) for the relief of Dr. Arthur Tye, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Arthur Tye shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MIEKO KRISTINE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1579) for the relief of Mieko Kristine, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "Sergeant" and insert "Mr.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mieko Kristine, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. James W. Pulver, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OWEN LOWERY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 315) for the relief of Owen Lowery, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments in line 5, after the name "Owen", to strike out "Lowery" and insert "Lowrey", and in line 6, after the name "Edna", to strike out "Lowery" and insert "Lowrey", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Owen Lowrey, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Edna Lowrey, a citizen of the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Owen Lowrey."

MARIA NEGLIA, ANGELO NEGLIA, AND GUISEPPE NEGLIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 604) for the relief of Maria Neglia, Angelo Neglia, and Guiseppe Neglia, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the name "Maria", to strike out "Neglia," and insert "Neglia and", and in the same line, after the name "Angelo Neglia", to strike out "and Guiseppe Neglia", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act,

Maria Neglia and Angelo Naglia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maria Neglia and Angelo Neglia."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 694) to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over. I should like to make it quite clear that I ask that the bill go over, by request, because I favor the bill wholeheartedly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

STEFANOS A. SPILIOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1262) for the relief of Stefanos A. Spilios, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 4, after the name "Spilios" to insert "also known as Stephen A. Harrison", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stefanos A. Spilios, also known as Stephen A. Harrison, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secertary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Stefanos A. Spilios, also known as Stephen A. Harrison."

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1349) to amend title 28, United States Code, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, under the case of Williams against United States, the Supreme Court ruled that Congress created the Court of Claims under the power granted by article I of the Constitution. The fact that the Court of Claims is not a constitutional court raises many complications. Every case filed in the Court of Claims is a case wherein the United States is a party defendant. There appears no doubt that the Court of Claims could, therefore, have been created under article III.

The committee is of the opinion that Congress intended the Court of Claims to have been so created, and that this bill will accomplish that end. The change contemplated would permit the assignment by the Chief Justice of the United States of circuit and district judges to serve as judges of the Court of Claims, when called upon to do so. Of course, at the present time they cannot do so.

This measure would bring about what is believed to be the original intent of Congress when the Court of Claims was created.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

INCREASE OF CONGRESSIONAL AND JUDICIAL SALARIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1663) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this bill is obviously a controversial measure, and one which deserves more extended consideration. I therefore ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

TIBOR KALMAN JALSOVICZKY

The bill (H. R. 746) for the relief of Tibor Kalman Jalsoviczky was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. SUZANNE VAN AMERONGEN

The bill (H. R. 880) for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. MORAD MALEK-ASLANI

The bill (H. R. 974) for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA BOSCO LOMONACO

The bill (H. R. 3042) for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMPLOYMENT OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS — BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder whether we might have an explanation of this bill for the RECORD. It is a very important bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think this is a measure which probably should not be passed on the Consent Calendar, and I therefore suggest that it go over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to have the recommendation of the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DISTRIBUTION OF TRUST FUNDS HELD BY SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES OF THE WIND RIVER RESERVATION — BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 444) to amend the act of May 19, 1947, so as to increase the percentage of certain trust funds held by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation, which is to be distributed per capita to individual members of such tribes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, for the reason that when the committee considered this particular bill it was under the erroneous impression that there was a favorable report from the Department of the Interior. There was a report from the Department of the Interior which carried certain recommendations. I think further attention should be given to the bill, and I ask that it go over for that reason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

PATENT IN FEE TO LOUIS W. MILLIKEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 714) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I think there is an amendment which was proposed. It should be acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, at the beginning of line 6, it is proposed to insert "Northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 23."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Louis W. Milliken a patent in fee to the following-described lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: Northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 23; east half, and the east half of the west half of section 29, township 4 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, comprising approximately 520 acres.

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT — BILL PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) providing for a Consolidated General Appropriation Act was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Arizona desires to make a comment regarding this resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to advise the Senate that I have filed my individual views in opposition to this resolution and copies of them have been supplied to Senators. In this connection, I communicated with Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS, a Member of the House of Representatives and a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, requesting his comments on the concurrent resolution. I ask unanimous consent that, as a part of my remarks, what Mr. PHILLIPS has to say to me in a letter addressed to me be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1953.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CARL: The resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) is a restatement of the academic desire to consolidate all appropriation bills in one. I return your copy and have marked several spots, with red pencil, to which I will now refer by number.

(1) Page 6, line 9. Even if it were possible to combine all appropriations in one bill, there would be objections to the idea from a practical standpoint, as I shall indicate. However, not even this bill contemplates a single appropriation bill, as lines 16 to 19, inclusive, exclude deficiency and supplemental appropriations; all rescissions, and all appropriations under private acts. When the House tried a single bill for fiscal 1951, the idea not only resulted in less knowledge on the part of the Members (including the committee) than any preceding budget in the history of the Congress, but it was necessary to pass three continuing resolutions, to keep the Government in operation, and we had the usual number of supplemental and deficiency bills.

The reason for this is largely one of size, and all academic arguments fall down before it. The statement has been made that this works very satisfactorily on the State level, or in industry. I agree with both statements. We are discussing the Federal level and that is where it does not work. The budget of the State of California, which must be the second largest in the Nation, is seven times as large as the requests before the one subcommittee of which I am presently the chairman; in fact, the amount we took off the requested appropriations, in this one subcommittee, in the 80th Congress, was a larger sum than the California budget for the present session, which is the largest in the State's history.

My senatorial friends would like to discuss the subject on a high level of academic theory. I am compelled to discuss it on the practical level of whether or not it will work for the Federal Government. One answer, at least, is indicated by the fact that after a year's trial the House Appropriations Committee in January 1951 met in executive session to decide whether or not it would continue the package budget for another year, and on motion of a Democratic member, voted 31 to 18 not to continue the package budget experiment. My record shows that the 31 votes were made up of 18 Republicans and 13 Democrats. I have a strong feeling that the attitude is unchanged in the House committee; if anything, it is stronger after our experiences of the last few days when the system of separate budgets has given the House a chance to discuss and understand the several bills already before us with resulting cuts far beyond anything that could be made in a packaged edition.

(2) If I understand that part of the Senate resolution beginning on page 6 at line 20, and carrying over to page 7, what the authors propose is to do away with our restrictions on the spending of money in any one calendar year. If so, I am surely opposed to the idea. If the resolution proposes nothing more than that the carryover from the previous year, and the probable carryover into the succeeding year or years shall be indicated in the budget message, that can be done without further legislative action. The resolution apparently contemplates contract authorization, and while I am not so firmly opposed to this method as other members of the House committee, it should be limited rather than extended, and again the idea needs no legislation. I suggest that this section could have a destructive effect on any move toward economy.

(3) On page 7, at line 13, I call attention again to exemptions from the package budget, for these lines indicate that claims and the national debt are not to be part of it.

(4) Page 7, line 13, et seq.: Generally speaking, I favor the ideas indicated in subsection (3) of the resolution, but I again feel that the adoption of the idea would need no legislative authorization. This is merely a statement that we would like to have certain things shown in the annual budget. These have been shown for years in the California budget, and are of value, and they represent the sort of information which I have felt for a long time could be secured by a joint staff operating upon this phase of budget making, but not attempting to hold hearings which was feared by the opponents of the McClellan and Colmer resolutions last year.

(5) Page 9, paragraph 7: I think there is some merit to the idea of simultaneous hearings, although not as a general provision and I doubt if legislation is necessary. In other words, the chairmen of subcommittees on the House and Senate side, could very well arrange for such meetings at the present time. The danger is that the House and Senate might feel that this was a legislative mandate to hold them.

After experience with seven budgets, here in the House, I have come to the conclusion that the present system is a very practical one. The House subcommittee holds closed hearings and is able to get statements out of agency and department representatives which could never be secured in an open hearing. We work hard, both the committee members and the staff. We are able to gather comments from the hearings and run down additional information. When the bill gets to the Senate side of the Capitol, open hearings are held and people who might feel they had not been given a chance to be heard, have their opportunities there. I feel it works out very well.

One of the principal objections to the idea of the package budget, and the one which would cause me to oppose it on principle, is that it is the obvious intent of some members of both Senate and House, who support the idea, to try and get a percentage cut, or rather to send the bill back to the executive arm of the Government, and instruct the President to make a percentage cut. I am irrevocably opposed to the idea. I have been making budgets, city, State, and Federal, for about 22 years, and I know from experience that any government can make greater reductions, and sounder appropriations, by a process of taking the requested items separately and deciding on the amounts needed. To begin with, a percentage cut method simply invites the agency or the department to add that much or more, to cushion itself against a percentage cut. Second, the psychological reaction of an agency which finds it is being treated fairly and intelligently, results in reductions and in a better relationship than would otherwise be possible. Third, the most cherished right of a representative body, under our form of Government, is the control of the purse, and the records of the constitutional conventions indicate that this was uppermost in the minds of the writers of the Constitution.

As a further practical matter, the larger budget makes it possible to hide small items, which the Congress does not have the opportunity to identify and discuss. This prevents economy. Actually the discussion on the experimental package budget in the 80th Congress, resulted in a bill with 192 pages, and a House report of 337 pages and, as I remarked above, the House Members knew less about the budget that year than in any other year in the history of the Congress. The best system is the present system, which brings each subject bill to the floor, with time to discuss it; time to get information about it; time to propose amendments if they are desired. The result is indicated in greater reductions under this system. I think I should add that the key to good budget making is not some gadget like a package budget, but hard work on the part of accountants, investigators, staff members, and committee members. I have been in public life for 23 years, and I have never found any substitute for hard work, although I am still open to suggestions.

I thank you for your interest and your confidence and I hope that something can be done to bring the opposing facts clearly before the Members of the Senate. I am very much afraid that, even with such a distinguished list of Senators as those whose names appear on the resolution, any idea of imposing upon the House of Representatives another package budget idea like the one we so happily got rid of in January 1951, will rest unhonored, unmourned, and unsung in the files of the House Committee on Appropriations.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN PHILLIPS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate the concluding paragraph of this letter, in which Mr. PHILLIPS says:

I thank you for your interest and your confidence and I hope that something can be done to bring the opposing facts clearly before the Members of the Senate. I am very much afraid that, even with such a distinguished list of Senators as those whose names appear on the resolution, any idea of imposing upon the House of Representatives another package budget idea like the one we so happily got rid of in January 1951, will rest unhonored, unmourned, and unsung in the files of the House Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona object to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. I object. I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the concurrent resolution will go over.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 20) amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN ACTS RELATING TO COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

The bill (S. 1679) to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at the request of a Senator who is not now on the floor, I ask that this bill go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will withhold his request, I should like to inquire as to when he would propose that the bill be taken up.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold my request.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I inquire whether it is intended that the bill shall go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, before I heard the Senator's voice in the rear of the Senate Chamber, I asked, at the request of a Senator who was not on the floor, that this bill go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] would like to make a statement in connection with the bill. My only reason for rising was that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] told me he would be necessarily absent today, and asked me to give some attention to this particular bill, and to make an explanation of it, if necessary. That was the reason for my inquiry. If the bill is to go to the foot of the calendar, I feel sure that the Senator from Michigan will be back when it is reached again, and that we can discuss it at that time.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I may say that it was on behalf of the Senator from Michigan that I requested that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may return to Calendar 269, Senate bill 1679, to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914.

My reason for asking for its consideration at this time is that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is now on the floor, having adjourned a session of his committee in order that he might be present.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the majority calendar committee has no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I had asked that there be an amendment on page 2, line 24, of the bill to strike out the words "and home economics" and in lieu thereof to insert a comma and the words, "home economics, 4-H Club work."

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill whether such an amendment might be made unnecessary by a statement as to what is intended by the phraseology of the bill. Is it the Senator's construction of the wording of Senate bill 1679, "the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics and subjects relating thereto," that it includes 4-H Club work?

I am informed that at a stage of the drafting of this bill the definition of cooperative agricultural extension work included 4-H Club work as an expressed part of the definition.

It is my understanding that the omission of this phrase in the bill was solely for the purpose of avoiding any implication that phases of extension work not expressly mentioned would thereby be excluded and that there is no intention to narrow the present concept of agricultural extension work or to imply in any way that the work of the 4-H Clubs is not to continue. I am sure that all of the Senators will concur in my view that the work with our rural youth is of prime importance in the conduct of extension work, and deserves to receive and to continue to receive the fullest attention. Therefore, with the understanding and assurance that the 4-H Club work will be regarded as fully covered by this consolidated legislation I am ready to approve this bill.

Can the Senator so state?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the situation is as stated by the Senator from Michigan, and that is my interpretation of the language.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Is there any question at all as to the continuance of 4-H Club work?

Mr. THYE. There is absolutely none, I can assure the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Then, why has the question been raised?

Mr. FERGUSON. Because the 4-H Clubs, having in mind the working in the bill, feared that there was an intention to eliminate 4-H Club work. I wanted to make sure that was not the case.

Mr. COOPER. Is there any reason why it should not be so stated?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was not desired to name all such organizations. I was perfectly satisfied with the explanation that the bill does include 4-H Club work, and that it would be better not to change the language.

Mr. THYE. The statement of the Senator from Michigan is correct, because if we named one, we would have to enumerate all of them, and to avoid the enumeration of all, the language in the bill was adopted.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator state that 4-H Club work will be continued indefinitely?

Mr. THYE. Oh, yes. I would not even be a party to putting so much as a straw in the way of the 4-H Club movement, because of its excellent achievements.

Mr. COOPER. I wanted the Senator to make that statement so it would appear in the RECORD.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment and ask that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1679) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 8, 1914 (38 Stat. 372), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. In order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same, there may be continued or inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State, Territory, or possession, now receiving, or which may hereafter receive, the benefits of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, entitled 'An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanics arts' (12 Stat. 503), and of the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 417, ch. 841), agricultural extension work which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That in any State, Territory, or possession in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established, the appropriations hereinafter made to such State, Territory, or possession shall be administered by such college or colleges as the legislature of such State, Territory, or possession may direct.

"SEC. 2. Cooperative agricultural extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agri-

culture and home economics and subjects relating thereto to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in the several communities, and imparting information on said subjects through demonstrations, publications, and otherwise and for the necessary printing and distribution of information in connection with the foregoing; and this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State agricultural college or colleges receiving the benefits of this act.

"SEC. 3. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

"(b) Out of such sums, each State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Federal Extension Service shall be entitled to receive annually a sum of money equal to the sums received from Federal cooperative extension funds for the fiscal year 1953, and such sums shall be subject to the same requirements as to furnishing of equivalent sums by the State, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico as existed immediately prior to the passage of this act, except that amounts heretofore made available to the Secretary for allotment on the basis of special needs shall continue available for use on the same basis: *Provided*, That, in addition Puerto Rico shall be authorized to receive the total initial amount set by the provisions of the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 926), and this amount shall be increased each succeeding fiscal year in accordance with such provisions until the total sum shall include the maximum amount set by the provisions of the act of October 26, 1949, and Puerto Rico shall be entitled to receive such amount annually thereafter.

"(c) Any sums made available by the Congress for further development of cooperative extension work in addition to those referred to in subsection (b) hereof shall be distributed as follows:

"1. Four percent of the sum so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be allotted among the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico by the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of special needs as determined by the Secretary.

"2. Fifty percent of the remainder of the sum so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be paid to the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in the proportion that the rural population of each bears to the total rural population of the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, as determined by the census, and the remainder shall be paid to the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in the proportion that the farm population of each bears to the total farm population of the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, as determined by the census: *Provided*, That payments out of the additional appropriations for further development of extension work authorized herein may be made subject to the making available of such sums of public funds by the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico from non-Federal funds for the maintenance of cooperative agricultural-extension work provided for in this act, as may be provided by the Congress at the time such additional appropriations are made: *Provided further*, That any appropriation made hereunder shall be allotted in the first and succeeding years on the basis of the decennial census current at the time such appropriation is first made, and as to any increase, on the basis of decennial census current at the time such increase is first appropriated.

"(d) The Federal Extension Service shall receive such amounts as Congress shall determine for administration, technical, and other services and for coordinating the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and possessions.

"SEC. 4. On or about the 1st day of July in each year after the passage of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain as to each State, Territory, or possession whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation for cooperative agricultural extension work under this act and the amount which it is entitled to receive. Before the funds herein provided shall become available to any college for any fiscal year, plans for the work to be carried on under this act shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such sums shall be paid in equal semiannual payments on the 1st day of January and July of each year to the treasurer or other officer of the State, Territory, or possession duly authorized by the laws of the State, Territory, or possession to receive the same, and such officer shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture on or about the 1st day of January of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year and its disbursement, on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 5. If any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of any State, Territory, or possession, for the support and maintenance of cooperative agricultural extension work, as provided in this act, shall by any action or contingency be diminished or lost or be misapplied, it shall be replaced by said State, Territory, or possession, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to said State, Territory, or possession. No portion of said moneys shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or the purchase or rental of land, or in college-course teaching, lectures in college, or any other purpose not specified in this act. It shall be the duty of said colleges, annually, on or about the 1st day of January, to make to the governor of the State, Territory, or possession in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations in extension work as defined in this act, including a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures from all sources for this purpose, a copy of which report shall be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 6. If the Secretary of Agriculture finds that a State, Territory, or possession is not entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation, the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President, and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the expiration of the Congress next succeeding a session of the legislature of the State, Territory, or possession from which funds have been withheld in order that the State, Territory, or possession may, if it should so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make an annual report to Congress of the receipts, expenditures, and results of the cooperative agricultural extension work in all of the States, Territories, or possessions receiving the benefits of this act, and also whether the appropriation of any State, Territory, or possession has been withheld; and if so, the reason therefor.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act."

SEC. 2. The acts or parts thereof enumerated below are hereby repealed:

The Capper-Ketcham Act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 711), as amended by the act of March 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 83).

Section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 438), as amended by section 2 of the act of June 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 233).

Section 23 of the Bankhead-Jones Act as added by the act of June 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 231), and as amended by the act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 406, 81st Cong.).

The act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 881).

The act of April 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 599), as amended by section 707 of the act of September 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 742).

The act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 417, 81st Cong.).

The act of May 16, 1928 (45 Stat. 571), insofar as it relates to extension work.

The act of February 23, 1929 (45 Stat. 1256), insofar as it relates to extension work.

The act of March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1520), insofar as it relates to extension work.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 25) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, clearly this bill is not the sort of legislation which should be passed on a call of the Consent Calendar. It should become the unfinished business of the Senate and be fully considered. I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

TENSIONS IN THE SATELLITE COUNTRIES OF THE SOVIET UNION

The resolution (S. Res. 105) authorizing the payment of certain expenses in connection with the preparation of a study entitled "Tension in the Satellite Countries of the Soviet Union" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate a sum not to exceed $1,200 for the purpose of reimbursing the Library of Congress for certain expenses incurred in connection with preparation, for such committee, of a study entitled "Tensions in the Satellite Countries of the Soviet Union."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LICENSING AND REGISTRATION FEES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1324) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to fix from time to time, in accordance with section 2 of this act, the fees authorized to be charged by the following acts:

(1) The act entitled "An act to regulate steam engineering in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1867 (ch. 272,

24 Stat. 427 as amended; title 2, ch. 15, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(2) The act entitled "An act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia," approved June 18, 1898 (ch. 467, 30 Stat. 477, as amended; title 2, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(3) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906 (ch. 2084, 34 Stat. 175, as amended; title 2, ch. 6 D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(4) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907 (ch. 442, 34 Stat. 870; title 2, ch. 8, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(5) The act entitled "An act to define the term of 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," approved February 9, 1907 (ch. 913, 34 Stat. 887, as amended; title 2, ch. 4, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(6) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918 (ch. 82, 40 Stat. 560, as amended; title 2, ch. 7, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(7) The act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923 (ch. 94, 42 Stat. 1261, as amended; title 2, ch. 9, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(8) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia," approved May 28, 1924 (ch. 202, 43 Stat. 177; title 2, ch. 5, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(9) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia," approved December 13, 1924 (ch. 9, 43 Stat. 713, as amended; title 2, ch. 10, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(10) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929 (ch. 353, 45 Stat. 1326, as amended; title 2, ch. 1, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(11) The act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937 (ch. 760, 50 Stat. 787, as amended; title 45, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(12) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and licensing of those engaging in the practice of cosmetology in the District of Columbia," approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 321, 52 Stat. 611; title 2, ch. 13, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(13) The act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 322, 52 Stat. 620, as amended; title 2, ch. 11, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(14) The act entitled "An act to amend the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof," approved July 2, 1940 (ch. 513, 54 Stat. 716; title 2, ch. 3, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(15) The act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944 (ch. 612, 58 Stat. 823, as amended; title 2, ch. 12, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.)

(16) The act entitled "An act defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia," approved September 19, 1950 (ch. 953, 64 Stat. 854; title 2, ch. 18, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

SEC. 2. The Commissioners may increase or decrease the fees authorized to be charged by each of the acts listed in the first section of this act to such amounts as may, in the judgment of the Commissioners, be reasonably necessary to defray the approximate cost of administering each of said acts.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 879) to amend section 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT OF PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN COAST GUARD CONTRACTS

The bill (S. 1640) to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes, indeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, this bill has a rather lengthy legislative history. It passed the House in the 2d session of the 81st Congress in a form very similar to its present form, and it also passed the House in the 1st session of the 82d Congress, this time in the identical form in which it is now before the Senate.

I believe that the best short explanation of the bill which I have seen appears in the letter from the Comptroller General of the United States endorsing the bill. This letter appears in the committee report along with the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury recommending enactment of the bill, and I would quote the closing paragraphs of Mr. Warren's letter:

> The act of August 24, 1935, requires that before any contract exceeding $2,000 in amount for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work of the United States is awarded, the contractor must furnish a performance bond for the protection of the United States and a payment bond for the protection of persons furnishing material and labor to the contractor for use in connection with such contract.
>
> The act of April 29, 1941, amended the act of August 24, 1935, by authorizing the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to waive such bond requirements with respect to contracts for the manufacturing, producing, furnishing, construction, alteration, repair, processing, or assembling of vessels, aircraft, munitions, materiel, or supplies of any kind or nature for the Army or the Navy.
>
> The instant bill would grant the same authority to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Secretary of the Treasury, insofar as Coast Guard contracts are considered and, in addition, would authorize the heads of all five of the agencies named in the bill to waive the bond requirements with respect to cost-type contracts for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work.
>
> The cost-type system of contracting is such that performance bonds can serve little, if any, purpose under contracts of that type and the usual basis for requiring payment bonds is eliminated to a large extent thereby. Consequently, and since uniformity in the contracting procedure for defense materiel and supplies by the major procurement agencies named in the bill appears to be desirable, this Office recommends that the bill be favorably considered.

Mr. President, I believe that that explanation sets forth the main purposes of the bill.

The committee heard witnesses representing the executive branch of the Government, all in support of the bill.

The letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury requesting the enactment of this legislation appears in the committee report and indicates that the bill has the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget and that it would involve no additional expenditure of Federal funds.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1640) to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of April 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 147; 40 U. S. C. 270e), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Atomic Energy Commission, be waived with respect to cost-plus-a-fixed-fee and other cost-type contracts for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work of the United States and with respect to all contracts, including cost-plus-a-fixed-fee and other cost-type contracts, for the manufacturing, producing, furnishing, construction, alteration, repair, processing, or assembling of vessels, aircraft, munitions, materiel, or supplies of any kind or nature for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, or Atomic Energy Commission, regardless of the terms of such contracts as to payment or title."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Air Force, Coast Guard, and Atomic Energy Commission contracts."

DESIGNATION OF SERVICE PERSONNEL AS POSTAL CLERKS AND ASSISTANT POSTAL CLERKS

The bill (S. 1643) to authorize the Post Office Department to designate en-

listed personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like an explanation of this bill by its author.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, speaking for the the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I gladly offer an explanation.

This bill seeks to set up for the Army and the Air Force a procedure for assigning enlisted personnel for duty as mail clerks in the same manner as is now in effect in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

The Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard operate under a provision of law which provides, among other things, that the Secretaries may waive the giving of bond by Navy mail clerks.

The Army and the Air Force do not have this authority, and experience has shown that lack of such authority not only retards the expeditious handling of the mails, but also increases administrative costs.

The bill proposes simply to repeal existing law as it applies to the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and rewrite it so as to make it apply uniformly to all five of the services.

This bill was recommended by the Department of Defense and has the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget.

Cost estimates indicate that it will involve about $35,000 per year for the Army and the Air Force, but that this amount will be considerably offset by savings which should be brought about by the greater efficiency and economy which should result from the passage of this bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Is there involved in this bill the assignment of military personnel to an essentially civilian function—namely, post-office clerkships—which is not now being done?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Not at all. The bill has no such purpose at all. The purpose is to assign military personnel, in military areas, to handle mail for the military.

Mr. GORE. Are military personnel now performing these tasks or duties, or are civilian personnel performing them?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I have said, in the case of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, military personnel are performing these duties; in the case of the Army and the Air Force, they are not. The purpose of the bill is to make the practice uniform in all the services. It is another effort toward unification.

Mr. GORE. Then the answer must be that passage of the bill will entail assignment of military personnel to the performance of post office duties.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I misunderstood the Senator from Tennessee. I now understand what he means. Yes, in certain instances it will result as the Senator suggests, but it will be in connection with and for the benefit of the military.

Mr. GORE. I have been so much disturbed by the number of young men being drafted into military service and then finding themselves assigned to functions which could just as well be performed by civilian personnel, perhaps in some cases better, that I am constrained to ask that the bill go over until I personally can examine it further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

REPORT ON RETIREMENT POLICY FOR FEDERAL PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 1870) to extend the time for filing a report by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel established by the act of July 16, 1952, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I observe that the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is on the floor. I wish he would explain the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. When Public Law 555, 82d Congress, was approved on July 16, 1952, it created a body to be known as the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel. When the act was approved on that date, it was assumed that 18 months would be allowed in which to do the work.

Because of the change in administration, the committee did not begin functioning until February 1953. Thus, only about 11 months were left, and a request has been made to extend the deadline in Public Law 555 to June 30, 1954. The additional 6 months would give the committee about 17 months in which to perform its duties, which would be in accordance with the original plan when the act was passed by Congress.

Mr. SMATHERS. Are the appropriations for the civil-service retirement fund, which I notice Congress is not now making, awaiting recommendations by that committee? Is it the purpose of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to recommend that all future appropriations for the retirement fund be held in abeyance until the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel has finally made its report?

Mr. CARLSON. I should say that that is not the recommendation of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but I understand the Committee on Appropriations has recommended that no action be taken until a later date, which I assume means a postponement until the work of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal personnel is completed.

Mr. SMATHERS. So far as the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service knows, under the present law there will be no diminution in the amount of retirement pay which retired Federal workers are now receiving, by virtue of the extension of the time in which the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel can report. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. I think I can definitely assure the Senator from Florida of that fact, since it has been estimated that the 13 staff retirement systems are accruing obligations at the rate of more than $2 billion a year, but that disbursements of benefits are running only about one-third of this amount, although they are rising sharply. In other words, I believe there are sufficient funds for any withdrawals and disbursements, but the matter is one that should be studied very carefully in the future.

Mr. SMATHERS. As the chairman may remember, the original basic law, which will expire at the end of 1954, increased the amount of the annuities.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe the law will expire in 1955.

Mr. SMATHERS. The point I am trying to make is that I hope there will be no change in the payment which retired Federal workers are now receiving until after the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel has had an opportunity to make its recommendations.

Mr. CARLSON. I assure the distinguished Senator from Florida that my views on this matter are in thorough accord with his views.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1870) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended," approved July 16, 1952 (66 Stat. 723), is amended by striking out "December 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1954."

CATHERINE NINA COLE

The bill (S. 351) for the relief of Catherine Nina Cole was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Catherine Nina Cole, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Edwin H. Milligan, a citizen of the United States.

PETER HOSKINS

The bill (S. 1176) for the relief of Peter Hoskins was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Peter Hoskins, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Paul R. Hoskins, citizens of the United States.

RICHARD ROBERT KABISCH

The bill (S. 1521) for the relief of Richard Robert Kabisch was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor

child, Richard Robert Kabisch, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Julius Charles Kabisch, citizens of the United States.

ANASTASIA JOHN TSAMISIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 67) for the relief of Anastasia John Tsamisis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Anastasia John Tsamisis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BETH BARBARA BURPEE (FUJIKO MAEZAWA)

The bill (S. 1387) for the relief of Beth Barbara Burpee (Fujiko Maezawa) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Beth Barbara Burpee (Fujiko Maezawa), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. Gerald N. Burpee, citizens of the United States.

VITO RIZZI

The bill (S. 1416) for the relief of Vito Rizzi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Vito Rizzi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HANNI MARIE MATUSCHKE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 143) for the relief of Hanni Marie Matuschke, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments. The first amendment of the committee was on page 1, line 3, after the words "of the", to strike out "immigration laws" and insert "Immigration and Nationality Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, after line 5, to strike out "deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hanni Marie Matuschke, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Hanni Marie Matuschke, as of the date of the payment of the required visa fee and head tax," and insert "deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hanni Marie Matuschke, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Hanni Marie Matuschke as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 2, line 15, to strike out "241 and 242" and insert in lieu thereof "242 and 243." The latter are the appropriate sections of the Immigration Act to which the bill refers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the alien, Hanni Marie Matuschke, fiance of Capt. Arthur Charles Rapske, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Hanni Marie Matuschke is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Cpl. Arthur Charlie Rapske, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hanni Marie Matuschke, she will be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hanni Marie Matuschke, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Hanni Marie Matuschke as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

KURT J. HAIN AND ARTHUR KARGE

The bill (H. R. 782) for the relief of Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third, time, and passed.

HARRY BLOCK

The bill (H. R. 870) for the relief of Harry Block was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GORE subsequently said: Mr. President, my attention was temporarily diverted when action was taken on Calendar 286, H. R. 870, an act for the relief of Harry Block.

The files of the minority calendar committee are incomplete with respect to this bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the procedure by which the bill was passed be vacated, and that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The bill will go over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2023) for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DAVID H. ANDREWS AND JOSEPH T. FETSCH

The bill (H. R. 2363) for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I note that there are two beneficiaries named in the bill. In view of the fact that the title does not disclose that fact, I think the RECORD should show that there is more than $157.53 to be paid out. There is to be paid to Joseph T. Fetsch the sum of $278.60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRED B. NISWONGER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2366) for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$966.64" and insert "$666.64."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RUTH D. CRUNK

The bill (H. R. 2420) for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LENNIE P. RIGGS, JAMES A. CARSON, AND VERNON L. RANSOM

The bill (H. R. 2667) for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PIO VALENSIN

The bill (H. R. 3389) for the relief of Pio Valensin was considered, ordered to a

third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1857) to amend certain statutes providing expeditious judicial proceedings for the condemnation of lands for public purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill involves various matters which make the bill not a proper one to be passed on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

GRATUITY TO ANNIE COBB AND CARRIE COBB

The resolution (S. Res. 111) to pay a gratuity to Annie Cobb and Carrie Cobb was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Annie Cobb and Carrie Cobb, sisters of Ettie Cobb, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 5 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4654) to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSMISSION OF FILMS AND RELATED MATERIAL THROUGH THE MAILS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 971) to authorize films, and related material, for educational use to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and certainly I shall not object—I wonder if the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would furnish us with an explanation of the bill, for the purpose of the record.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend the same mailing privileges and rates to educational and informational film and related materials as are now applicable to books. This does not apply to commercial theaters.

There has been a tremendous increase in the use of educational films during the past 15 years, and the use of such films and other audio-visual materials has now become a major means of public communication and an important part of the educational programs of schools, colleges, universities, and public libraries.

I wish to state for the benefit of the Senate that I firmly believe, after holding hearings, that had films been in as extensive use at the time the book rate was adopted as they are at the present time, there would have been no question that they would have been included. However, films represent one of the newer developments.

For these reasons, the committee reported the bill unanimously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 204 (d) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (39 U. S. C., sec. 292a (d)) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(d)" and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) The rate provided in paragraph (1) for books may apply to 16-millimeter films and 16-millimeter film catalogs when sent through the mails except when sent to commercial theaters."

SEC. 2. Section 204 (e) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (39 U. S. C., sec. 292a (e)) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(e)" and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) The rate provided in paragraph (1) for books may apply to 16-millimeter films, film strips, projected transparencies and slides, microfilms, sound recordings, and catalogs of such materials when sent to or from (A) schools, colleges, universities, or public libraries, and (B) religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual."

EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 833) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments on page 8, after line 14, to insert:

(k) The Comptroller General of the United States shall, at the request of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget, make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable such joint committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to such agency which are contained in the budget as submitted by the President, and the justifications submitted in support thereof; and, for this purpose, the Comptroller General is authorized to employ technical and professional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, or regulations, and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

On page 9, line 3, to change the subsection letter from "(k)" to "(l)", and in line 12, to change the subsection letter from "(l)" to "(m)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the 'joint committee') and to be composed of 14 members as follows:

"(1) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(2) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than 2 weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the members of such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however*, That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"(d) A majority of the Members of each House who are members of the joint committee shall together constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a lesser number, as determined by a joint committee, may constitute a subcommittee and be authorized to conduct hearings and make investigations. Any member of a subcommittee so designated shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of any hearing or investigation, but the concurrence of a majority of the members of such subcommittee shall be necessary before any report or findings may be submitted to the joint committee.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies; (B) to provide the Committee

on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; (C) to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, to consider all information relating to estimated revenues, including revenue estimates of the Department of the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider essential programs, and to consider changing economic conditions; and (D) to report to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

"(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

"(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cut-backs in previously authorized programs which require appropriations, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof;

"(4) to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the fiscal year under way, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

"(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary to carry out its functions within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the opposition party. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

"(h) The joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

"(i) Professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President.

"(j) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommitte thereof, be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

"(k) The Comptroller General of the United States shall, at the request of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget, make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable such joint committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to such agency which are contained in the budget as submitted by the President, and the justifications submitted in support thereof; and, for this purpose, the Comptroller General is authorized to employ technical and professional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, or regulations, and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

"(l) When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term includes the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"(m) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

SEC. 2. Effective at the beginning of the second regular session of the 83d Congress, section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years.

"(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included in the reports or accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"(3) The Appropriations Committees of both Houses shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and semiannually shall print those compilations (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) for the information of the Congress."

SEC. 3. Section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Joint Committee on the Budget is authorized to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and of subcommittees thereof; but such joint hearings shall not affect the power of the respective committees, and of subcommittees thereof, to conduct separate additional committee hearings and shall not affect the independence of committee deliberations and decision. The chairman of each such joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of the hearing, and the vice chairman shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the other House, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION UPON RANK OF DIRECTOR OF MUSIC, LEADER OF MILITARY ACADEMY BAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1644) to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 233), as amended, to remove the limitation upon the rank of the director of music, the leader of the Military Academy Band, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, after line 18, to insert:

SEC. 2. The act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1111), is amended to read as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Academy Band shall hereafter consist of one leader with the pay and allowances of such grade as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy; one second leader with the pay and allowances of a warrant officer; and of such enlisted men and in such ratings as may be assigned to that band by the Navy Department: *Provided,* That the ratings and the proportionate distribution among the ratings of the enlisted men shall be substantially the same as in the Navy Band: *Provided further,* That the leader, second leader, and the enlisted men of the Naval Academy Band shall be entitled to the same benefits in respect to pay, emoluments, and retirement arising from longevity, reenlistment, and length of service as are or hereafter may become applicable to other officers and enlisted men of the Navy."

SEC. 3. The President is authorized to appoint Lt. Comdr. Charles Brendler, United States Navy, to the permanent commissioned grade of commander in the Navy. Such appointment pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be not in the line of the Navy or in any staff corps of the Navy.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended (10 U. S. C. 1086), is amended to read as follows: "That from and after the date of approval of this act the director of music, the leader of the Military Academy Band, shall have such rank as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army and shall be entitled to receive the pay and allowances of an officer of such grade: *Provided*, That in the computation of the pay and allowances of such director of music all active service in the Army, including service as teacher or director of music shall be counted as if it were commissioned service: *Provided further*, That the said leader of the Military Academy Band shall, at such time as the President in his discretion may direct, be retired as director of music with the highest rank in which he satisfactorily served for not less than 6 months while on active duty, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and when so retired, shall be entitled to receive the same retirement pay as is now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for an officer in the Army of the same grade with length of service computed as above: *And provided further*, That the dependents of said director of music shall be entitled to the same pensions, death gratuity, and other benefits as are now or may hereafter be provided for an officer of the Regular Army of corresponding grade with corresponding length of service."

SEC. 2. The Act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1111), is amended to read as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Academy Band shall hereafter consist of one leader with the pay and allowances of such grade as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy; one second leader with the pay and allowances of a warrant officer; and of such enlisted men and in such ratings as may be assigned to that band by the Navy Department: *Provided*, That the ratings and the proportionate distribution among the ratings of the enlisted men shall be substantially the same as in the Navy band: *Provided further*, That the leader, second leader, and the enlisted men of the Naval Academy Band shall be entitled to the same benefits in respect to pay, emoluments, and retirement arising from longevity, reenlistment, and length of service as are or hereafter may become applicable to other officers and enlisted men of the Navy."

SEC. 3. The President is authorized to appoint Lt. Comdr. Charles Brendler, United States Navy, to the permanent commissioned grade of commander in the Navy. Such appointment pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be not in the line of the Navy or in any staff corps of the Navy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended, and the act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1111), to remove the limitation upon the rank of the Director of Music, the leader of the Military Academy Band, and to remove the limitation upon the pay of the leader of the United States Naval Academy Band, and to authorize the appointment of Lt. Comdr. Charles Brendler, United States Navy, to the permanent grade of commander in the Navy."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an explanation of the bill just passed, for the purpose of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON WITH RESPECT TO S. 1644

The bill S. 1644 concerns itself with three of the statutory military service bands.

This bill was introduced as a Department of Defense legislative item. As introduced it would remove a statutory limitation with respect to the Military Academy Band. The statute now provides that the leader of the Military Academy Band is entitled to receive the pay and allowances of the grade of captain. This bill would amend that statute by permitting the leader of the Military Academy Band to have such rank as might be perscribed by the Secretary of the Army.

The present statutory limitation against the rank of the leader of the Military Academy Band is discriminatory against the present incumbent. The present leader was appointed to that position in 1934. He has held the rank of captain since May 27, 1940, which is the effective date of the statute prescribing the limitation in rank. Even though the officer is qualified and deserving of promotion, the statutory limitation prevents any consideration of his advancement. The bill, by permitting the leader of the Academy Band to have a rank prescribed by the service Secretary, would justifiably remove the statutory limitation.

Section 2 of the bill is a committee amendment. What it does is to remove a similar statutory limitation on the rank of the leader of the Naval Academy Band. The present statute provides that the Naval Academy Band shall have a leader with the pay and allowances of lieutenant (senior grade), United States Navy. Section 2 of the bill would permit the leader of the Naval Academy Band to have such grade as might be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

The present leader of the Naval Academy Band has more than 40 years' service, yet the statute operates to prevent giving him recognition for his past service as a band leader.

Section 3 of the bill authorizes the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Charles Brendler, the present leader of the United States Navy Band, to the permanent grade of commander. This officer has been in the Navy Band since its inception in 1925. Under the present rules regarding promotion, however, legislation is the only means by which the Navy could now promote Commander Brendler in recognition of his leadership of the United States Navy Band.

The bill in its present form is supported by the Department of Defense.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2327) to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this appears to be an erroneous listing. House bill 2327 is identical with calendar 276, Senate bill 1643, with respect to which action has been postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the bill came over from the House, and is properly on the calendar.

Mr. GORE. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a cross reference to the Senate bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, it was the intention of the junior Senator from New Jersey to ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill, in the event there had been no objection to the consideration of the Senate bill.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN SCHOOL PROPERTIES TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there is one bill which was passed to the foot of the calendar, and is to be considered at this time. Reference is made to Calendar No. 237, House bill 1242, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1242) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I had previously asked that the bill be passed over. I am advised by the Senator from New Mexico, who originally objected to it, that he now has no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the word "tribe", to insert a colon and *"Provided further*, That no more than 20 acres of land shall be transferred under the terms of this act in connection with any single school property conveyed to State or local governmental agencies or to local school authorities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Clarence Arthur Beutel, Sr., of Illinois, to be Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first nomination under the head of new reports.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is the purpose of the acting majority leader to move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday at 12 o'clock noon. Before doing so, I wish to announce again to the Senate that on Monday the pending business will be Senate Resolution 32, Calendar 141.

We also plan to take up next week, if it is ready for Senate action, the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriation bill. We shall also consider next week, under our present plans, both calendar No. 267, Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, providing for a Consolidated General Appropriation Act, and Calendar 296, House bill 4654, a bill to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

I wish the minority leader to be advised of our general plan. I believe that on Monday we can make an announcement with respect to certain other bills.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, a short time ago I made an announcement with respect to the legislative program of the Senate during next week.

I should also like to advise the Senate, in the event the agricultural reorganization resolution is reported by the committee—and I understand it will be reported—that of course, it being a privileged matter, inasmuch as there is a deadline and a time limit for its consideration, we may have to take it up on Monday or on Tuesday, and perhaps Monday may be the deadline on it.

Therefore I want the Senate to be advised of that fact, in the event the resolution is before the Senate.

ATTEMPTS TO CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, during the past couple of days there appeared in the Washington newspapers an article to the effect that a 21-year-old boy was sentenced to 18 months in prison for an attempt to bribe his associates on a football team. I am not defending the conduct of the boy nor am I criticizing the decision of the courts. However, it is rather significant that this 21-year-old boy was sentenced merely for an attempt to bribe his classmates while other cases of more importance go unpunished.

I call attention to the fact that there has been evidence before the Department of Justice for the past several months along the same line involving Government officials and influence peddlers which, in my opinion, goes beyond the attempt feature. This evidence was reported to the Attorney General under the old administration last July.

In the early part of 1952 it came to my attention that the chief counsel of the Treasury Department, Charles Oliphant, had received a car from one Henry Grunewald. In checking I found that this car has been purchased from Lenox Hill Motors, Inc., New York. Under date of March 7, 1952, I directed a letter to Mr. John R. Hughes, vice president of Lenox Hill Motors, Inc., asking for information regarding this sale. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1952.

Mr. JOHN R. HUGHES,
Vice President, Lenox Hill Motors, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: I understand that on May 21, 1951, the Lenox Hill Motors, Inc., transferred to Charles Oliphant, 3247 Quesada Street NW., Washington, D. C., a 1950 Chrysler, title No. X514318, serial No. 70840255.

Will you please furnish me with the following information in reference to this sale:

1. What was the sales price of the car?
2. Was the car sold direct to Mr. Oliphant? If not, who was the third party?
3. What were the terms of the sale?
4. Was delivery accepted for the car, or was it delivered to Washington?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On March 14, 1952, I received a letter from the Lenox Hill Motors Co. in which they stated that the car in question was sold to one Edward A. Martin, of Princeton, N. J., for which he paid in cash the sum of $2,763.35. It was a new 1950 Chrysler. I ask unanimous consent that their reply be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LENOX HILL MOTORS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 14, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have your letter of March 7 and can advise you as follows:

1. The total sales price of the automobile in question was $2,763.35.

2. The car was not sold direct to Mr. Oliphant. The arrangements for the purchase of this car were made by Mr. Edward A. Martin, Carter Road, Princeton, N. J. At his later request, the actual bill of sale and other papers establishing ownership were made out in the name of Charles Oliphant, 3247 Quesada Street NW., Washington, D. C. These papers were forwarded to Mr. Edward A. Martin on May 21, 1951.

3. The terms of sale were cash.

4. Delivery of this car was made in New Jersey.

We trust this is the information which you seek.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. HUGHES,
Vice President, Lenox Hill Motors, Inc.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on March 18, 1952, I directed a letter to Mr. Edward A. Martin, Carter Road, Princeton, N. J., asking him for particulars about this transaction. On April 14, 1952, following his visit to my office, I received a reply from Mr. Martin, together with a memorandum, in which he outlined the procedure followed in connection with the sale of the car, and said, in effect, that he was acting only as the agent of Mr. Grunewald, with the title of the car having been made directly to Mr. Oliphant in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 18, 1952.

Mr. EDWARD A. MARTIN,
Princeton, N. J.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I understand that on May 21, 1951, you transferred to Charles Oliphant, 3247 Quesada Street NW., Washington, D. C., a 1950 Chrysler, title No. X514318, serial No. 70840255.

Would you please advise me whether or not this car was a gift, and if not, the sales price along with the terms of contract.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
April 14, 1953.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The enclosed memorandum is furnished in accordance with our conversation, of April 8 relative to your letters of March 18 and April 2, in re Grunewald 1950 Chrysler title No. X514318, serial No. 70840255.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD A. MARTIN.

MEMORANDUM, SENATOR WILLIAMS' LETTERS, MARCH 18, 1952, AND APRIL 2, 1952, IN RE GRUNEWALD 1950 CHRYSLER, TITLE NO. X514,318, SERIAL NO. 70840255, AND CONFERENCE, SENATOR WILLIAMS, APRIL 8, 1952

This date Edward A. Martin called on Senator WILLIAMS to discuss his letters of March 18, 1952, and April 2, 1952. The following information was conveyed to Senator WILLIAMS:

That late in September 1950 arrangements were made by Edward A. Martin to purchase car in question from Mr. Grunewald. After transfer of title, instructions had been issued to the dealer (Lenox Hill Motors) but before delivery of the car to Mr. Martin the sale arrangement was canceled by the parties and the title to the said vehicle was returned to Mr. Grunewald.

That Mr. Grunewald in May of 1951 consulted Edward A. Martin in connection with the registration of the title to this vehicle. Apparently he had not arranged to have the title reissued in his own name and requested that Edward A. Martin register the title to permit Mr. Grunewald to effect a sale of this vehicle. In view of the fact that Edward A. Martin at no time owned this vehicle, it was suggested to Mr. Grunewald that the title be returned to the dealer who sold him the car and reissued to the pro-

spective purchaser. This suggested procedure was followed by Mr. Grunewald in arranging the sale of the car in question.

That Edward A. Martin was not consulted further in connection with the details of the sale of the vehicle in question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on July 5, 1952, I directed a letter to the Honorable James P. McGranery, then the Attorney General of the United States, and sent him a copy of this correspondence. I asked him to check whether or not there was any connection between the delivery of the automobile and the settlement on any particular tax case as between Mr. Oliphant and Mr. Grunewald.

On July 15 I received a reply from Mr. McGranery, in which he stated that the transactions had already been under investigation by his Department and that the information which I had furnished him was in substantial agreement with the results of their investigation. He further stated that the Department was proceeding to explore the case.

I ask unanimous consent that this correspondence be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 5, 1952.

Hon. JAMES P. MCGRANERY,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Several months ago considerable discussion appeared in the press regarding the close association between Henry Grunewald and Charles Oliphant, former Chief Counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Involved in that discussion was the alleged delivery of an automobile to Mr. Oliphant by Mr. Grunewald.

I have traced this Chrysler automobile, and find that it was originally sold by the Lenox Hill Motors, Inc., of New York City, to a Mr. Edward A. Martin, Carter Road, Princeton, N. J., who paid for the car, but at a later date requested the actual bill of sale be made out in the name of Charles Oliphant. This latter transaction was carried out on May 21, 1951.

Further inquiry developed that Mr. Martin was associated with William Power Maloney, former Justice official, who represented Mr. Henry Grunewald before the Senate District Committee in 1950, at which time Mr. Grunewald was charged with wiretapping. Mr. Maloney is the attorney who, during this same period, according to testimony before the King subcommittee, took an unusual interest in the Hyman Harvey Klein (Baltimore liquor dealer) tax case.

It is my understanding that Mr. Oliphant admits having been approached by this same group in reference to this tax case, and, in view of the fact that it now appears that a car was delivered to him and paid for by them, I think the entire case should be thoroughly explored by the Justice Department.

I am enclosing copies of my correspondence with the Lenox Hill Motors, Inc., as well as my correspondence with Commissioner Dunlap relative to this case. Also enclosed is a memorandum dated April 8, 1952, which was prepared by Mr. Martin, in which he explains his interest in this case.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

JULY 15, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated July 5, 1952, with enclosures, addressed to the Attorney General, regarding the transfer of a Chrysler automobile originally purchased by Henry Grunewald to Charles Oliphant, former Chief Counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Your letter apparently in error was mailed to the General Accounting Office, and was only received in this office today.

These transactions have been under investigation by the Department of Justice for some time, and the information furnished by you is in substantial agreement with the results of our investigation.

Your interest in furnishing the Department of Justice this information is deeply appreciated, and we wish to assure you that the matter is being fully explored.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. MCINERNEY,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have another letter, dated April 3, 1953, addressed to Mr. Charles Oliphant, of Washington, in which I asked him to explain his version of the transaction. On April 8, 1953, I received a reply from Mr. Oliphant. I ask unanimous consent that this correspondence be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 3, 1953.

Mr. CHARLES OLIPHANT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OLIPHANT: It has come to my attention that a 1950 Chrysler, title No. X514318, serial No. 70840255, was delivered to you in May 1951. The inference has been given that perhaps this car was a gift to you under what might be described as improper circumstances.

I had expected to serve as chairman of a subcommittee which could have discussed this allegation with you in an official manner; however, this did not materialize.

Recognizing that there might readily be a complete explanation of this inference I am requesting that you furnish me either a confirmation or a denial of receipt of the car, and if the car was a routine purchase, please furnish a complete report as to from whom it was purchased and a record of the payments. If the car was either a full or partial gift indicate from whom it was received.

I recognize that these questions are somewhat personal; however, since the allegation covers a period in which you were Chief Counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, I am sure you appreciate the importance of clearing up the rumor.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

APRIL 8, 1953.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Your letter of April 3, 1953, requested a report with respect to my acquisition of a 1950 automobile.

Late in May 1951, after Mr. Henry Grunewald and I had called retail dealers as to fair market value, I offered to pay him $2,000—the highest figure furnished—for a 1950 Chrysler six. I then sold my 1947 Buick to a used-car dealer for $700. A week or so later I paid $700 in cash to Mr. Grunewald as down payment. In November 1951 I delivered the title certificate to him as security for the balance due and a check for $70 as first installment on such balance. I made a like payment in December; and a payment by check early in March for $140, for the January and February payments. Later in March 1952 I paid the balance due of $1,020 by check, asking for and receiving both a receipt for payment in full and return of the title certificate.

As you probably know, this transaction has been not only previously reported in the press, but has also been the subject of complete inquiry by the House Ways and Means Subcommittee, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and a Federal grand jury.

Should you wish any further information as to your question, let me know.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES OLIPHANT.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call attention to the significant fact that this was a new 1950 Chrysler, for which they paid $2,763.35, and that it was purchased and transferred to Mr. Oliphant at a time when cars were not in surplus, but rather in short supply. Therefore, I see no reason why they would have to discount the car. Nevertheless, the car was delivered, apparently from the showroom in New York direct to Mr. Oliphant in Washington, without its ever having been used by any of the men involved.

Likewise, although the title was transferred to Mr. Oliphant in May 1951, it was not until November 1951, after the tax scandal began to break, that security was given by Mr. Oliphant for the car, according to his own statement. At that time Mr. Oliphant says he did assign the title to Mr. Grunewald as collateral for the balance due.

Likewise I call attention to the fact that the major claimed payments were made in March 1952. It may be coincidental that March 1952 was also the date of the letters of inquiry which I sent to the Lenox Hill Motor Co. and to Mr. Edward A. Martin asking for an explanation.

Notwithstanding the fact that all of this evidence has been on record along with the testimony before the House showing that Mr. Grunewald had this rather peculiar habit of subsidizing top officials of the Treasury Department, no indictments have been obtained against him for this conduct.

Mr. Grunewald has testified that he gave television sets to many high officials of the Internal Revenue Bureau, including Mr. Oliphant. It has also been testified that he subsidized an apartment for an Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue. How many others, we do not know.

It was also shown, according to their own testimony, that Mr. Oliphant was discussing tax cases with Mr. Grunewald.

Mr. President, we have heard a lot about section 55, and that it is a violation of the law to give even a Member of the Senate any information regarding anyone's tax returns. Yet here we see a man who is Chief Counsel of the Treasury Department, and sometimes others, discussing these cases with prominent influence peddlers—men of questionable character. They discussed these cases by their own admission. It is rather strange that no effort is being made to prosecute them for violation of section 55.

I also call attention to the fact that on October 16, 1952, 3 months after these facts were reported to the Attorney General, the Treasury Department authorized and approved Charles Oliphant as being qualified to practice before the Treasury Department, and gave him a card restoring him to good standing.

I think it is time that we prove to the American people that justice works across the board whenever a violation of the law is involved. If it is a violation of the law for a college student who otherwise has a good background to "attempt" to bribe one of his classmates, it is certainly a violation of some law on our statute books for an influence peddler to make, or for top officials in the Treasury Department to accept, such lavish gifts and entertainment.

It is hard to impress upon the youth of America the importance of high moral standards when they read of how low the moral standards of some of our public officials had deteriorated during the past 5 years.

I sincerely hope and believe that the new Attorney General and the House committee under the chairmanship of Congressman KEAN will continue to explore this case until all the facts have been developed and appropriate action taken.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 25, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 21, 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

R. Douglas Stuart, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

William T. Pheiffer, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

Michael J. McDermott, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Adm. Arthur William Radford, United States Navy, to have the grade and rank of an admiral while serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Adm. Robert Bostwick Carney, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for a term of 2 years.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

William D. Mitchell, of Colorado, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Joseph E. Talbot, of Connecticut, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1959. (Reappointment.)

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Chester R. MacPhee, of California, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.

Charles F. Brown, Jr., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky.

Cleta M. Smith, of Missouri, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 45, with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo.

Frank D. Yturria, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Lt. Col. Charles Peter West, O29964, United States Army.

Maj. Arthur Robert Barry, O23160, United States Army.

Capt. Ira Burdette Coldren, Jr., O27249, United States Army.

Capt. Thomas Henry McBryde, O28188, United States Army.

Capt. Edward Leo Flaherty, Jr., O28467, United States Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be colonels

Bernd Gustav Baetcke, O29497.
William Edwin Barksdale, O29478.
Chester Thomas Barton, O29529.
Benjamin DeWitt Beach, O29505.
Jesse Donald Bell, O29441.
Joseph Caccavajo Boyer, O29461.
Carl Sharral Brandner, O29442.
×Elmer Melvin Burns, O29499.
×Steven Stanley Cerwin, O29526.
Robert Hugh Christie, O29514.
Richard Harriman Comstock, O51206.
Derrill McCollough Daniel, O29500.
×Fred Joseph Delmore, O29440.
William Elam Eckles, O29450.
John Embry, O41798.
×Robert Carlisle Gray, O29531.
Stanley Howerton Hankins, O51100.
×Hiram Dudley Ives, O29509.
Louis Williford Jackson, O29474.
Shaffer Floyd Jarrell, O51112.
Robert Joseph Karrer, O51195.
×George Nelson Kibler, O29490.
×Eldon Hunter Larecy, O29523.
Lynwood David Lott, O41796.
Harold Clifford Lyon, O41832.
Lloyd Robert MacAdam, O29513.
×Richard Samuel McConnell, O41838.
×Charles Dudley McDaniel, O39696.
Francis Nicholas Miller, O41791.
Lillard Parker Miller, O29511.
Merton Edward Munson, O29519.
Daniel Aloysius O'Connor, O29454.
Donald Roy Patterson, O39624.
×Lindley Ames Pennypacker, O41851.
Alfred Arthur Pursall, O29491.
Robert Carlisle Rodgers, O29540.
George Reynolds Russell, O41827.
×Herbert Lucian Scofield, O29462.
Maurice Patterson Shaver, O29465.
Septimus Bonham Sightler, Jr., O41824.
Stephen D. Slaughter, Jr., O29530.
Lyman Francis Stangel, O29449.
×George Brice Sumner, O39689.
Kenneth Elwood Tilton, O29487.
Morton Elmer Townes, O18255.
Israel Brent Washburn, O29493.
Paul Russell Weyrauch, O18252.
Donald Boyd Wilson, O51198.
Hoke Smith Wofford, O29480.
×Walter Bernard Yeager, O29464.
Richard Cox Zalesky, O38682.

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Albert Alfred Biederman, O20501.
Warner Fremont Bowers, O29197.
Angel Antonio Cardona, O24299.
Edward Morris DeYoung, O20076.
Robert Tuthill Gants, O19636.
William Donald Graham, O20067.
Harold Everus Harrison O20078.
Eugene Coryell Jacobs, O20499.
Thomas William Mattingly, O20068.
Byron Glen McKibben, O19633.
George Foster Peer, O19638.
Thair Cozzens Rich, O19631.
Albert Marion Richmond, O19678.
William Warren Roe, Jr., O19675.
Lewis Calvin Shellenberger, O20506.
James Leslie Snyder, O19627.
Angvald Vickoren, O19680.

To be colonels, Dental Corps

Joseph Leroy Bernier, O20093.
Roy L. Bodine, Jr., O20484.
Bernice Julius Cehrs, O29220.
Gerald J. Collins, O29221.
George Farrer Jeffcott, O20077.
×George Thomas Perkins, O20468.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels

×Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., O20296.
×Charles MacKinnon Ackley, O39997.
×Marcus Webb Adams, O40025.
×Rellie Weldon Adams, O42663
×Henry Benson Alexander, O30565.
×Truman Alford, O30765
×Orvie Palmer Anderson, O42727.
×Sture Alexander Ansel, O30554.
×John Fred Arfman, O42802:
×Leslie Adam Arnold, O30815.
×William Franklin Ashenfelder, O40008.
×Theodore Fox Astrella, O42656.
×Edwin Lawrence Atkins, O30809.
×James Edgar Baker, O42714.
×George Armington Baldry, O30615.
×John Thomas Bankus, O42799.
×George MacElwain Barker, O30708.
×John Earl Barlow, O20224.
×John Merton Barnum, O51780.
×Douglas Chesley Barton, O38829.
×William Nott Beard, O20154.
×Edwin Gregory Beggs, O20297.
×Fred Deakyne Bendler, Jr., O30681.
×Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., O20331.
×Walter Bernard Bess, O20151.
×Leon Bieri, O42682.
×Arland Eugene Bigelow, O51687.
×Eugene Deering Billings, O30816.
×Charles Billingslea, O20367.
×Roberts Homer Billingsley, O30608.
×Wilson Harold Birch, O42816.
×Donald Read Bodine, O20238.
×Otto Max Boerner, O30747.
×Lowell Traxler Bondshu, O51670.
×John Herman Bosbyshell, O30596.
×Richard William Bowden, O42642.
×Millard G. Bowen, Jr., O30536.
×Harvey Bower, O19912.
×James Whitwell Bowman, O38813.
×Robert Walter Breaks, O20273.
×John Willard Britten, O38828.
×Frank Knight Britton, O30532.
×Harold Marvin Brown, O30777.
×Ned Butler Broyles, O20289.
×Donald Garton Buck, O30745.
×Harry William Bues, Jr., O42772.
×Raymond Walter Burkett, O30603.
×Robert Matthew Burnett, O20187.
×Robert Berkeley Bush, O30692.
×Winston Butscher, O30599.
×Adam Stephen Buynoski, O20169.
×William Leslie Calhoun, O42664.
×Fay Edward Joseph Carey, O38814.
×Norman Donald Carnes, O30666.
×Raymond Lemuel Cato, O20195.
×Andrew Davis Chaffin, Jr., O20153.
×James Archie Cheatham, O30427.
×George Weldon Childs, O20294.
×John Henry Chiles, O20295.

×Donald Paul Christensen, O20257.
×Robert Arthur Claffee, O30610.
×John Clapper, Jr., O42835.
×Ernest Church Clark, Jr., O42834.
×Maurice Neal Clark, O42690.
×Chester Victor Clifton, Jr., O20246.
×Roy Wheaton Cole, Jr., O20277.
×James Clifton Conine, O30203.
×William Henry Connerat, Jr., O30730.
×William Mellard Connor, O20137.
×Eugene Cook, O30736.
×Thomas Worthington Cooke, O20307.
×Harry W. Cooper, O42261.
×Stafford Ashley Cooper, O42730.
×Louis Wenzel Correll, O30582.
×Clarence Albert Cozart, O20152.
×Claude Lee Crawford, O20266.
×Albert Raymond Cupello, O38822.
×Robert Francis Curran, O20338.
×Donald McBurney Curtis, O38837.
×John Harold Daly, O20284.
×Herman William Dammer, O30363.
×Richard Percy Davidson, O42785.
×Robert Clifton Davie, O40050.
×Charles Ivy Davis, O42658.
×William Aldrich Davis, O20198.
×Kenneth Francis Dawalt, O20226.
×Charles Albert Deason, O30601.
×Bert de Meiker, O30679.
×Patrick Howard Devine, O31975.
×Randolph Charles Dickens, O20290.
×John Harrison Dixon, O42733.
×Thomas William Donnell, O30663.
×Gilbert Meding Dorland, O20132.
×Ramon Carl Dougan, O30566.
×Harry Vincent Douglas, O42786.
×Jesse Cyrus Drain, Jr., O20318.
×Maurice Loring Driscoll, O30525.
×Edward Clare Dunn, O20245.
×James Elbert Dupree, O40044.
×William Fredrick Durbin, O51748.
×Clifford Earl Dykes, O51781.
×Theodore Larned Eastmond, O40013.
×James Douglas Edgar, O30635.
×John Devitt Edmunds, O30323.
×David Lincoln Edwards, O20359.
×Ralph Harvey Elliott, O30744.
×Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368.
×Graham Roy Evans, O30656.
×Robert French Evans, O42662.
×Ernest Wyttenbach Ewbank, Jr., O30474.
×William John Fabritius, O40021.
×Walter Alexander Falks, O20129.
×William Crawford Farmer, O30691.
×Charles William Farnum, O42743.
×Carl Yates Farrell, O30628.
×Robert George Fergusson, O20267.
×Raymond Frederick Field, O42784.
×Irving William Finberg, O42716.
×John Georg Wilhelm Finke, O40037.
×Joshua Asher Finkel, O20253.
×Harrison Hines Finlayson, O42697.
×George Alexander Finley, O20136.
×Austin Glenwood Fisher, O20324.
×Edward William Fitzgerald, O30495.
×Andrew Paul Flanagan, O30609.
×Franklin Morris Fliniau, O30263.
×Robert Brown Franks, O40041.
×LeRoy Ernest Frazier, O30678.
×Harold Lee Freshwater, O51739.
×Russell Oliver Fudge, O30652.
×Myron Abraham Funk, O30796.
×Foster LeRoy Furphy, O20163.
×Philip Joseph Galanti, O30684.
×James Byrd Gall, O30563.
×Ralph Richard Ganns, O20184.
×Peter Woods Garland, Jr., O20288.
×Henry Merle Garretson, O38809.
×Ritchie Garrison, O30696.
×Frederick Harold Gaston, Jr., O20276.
×Giles Henry Gere, O51707.
×Joseph Otto Gerot, O30818.
×Floyd Edward Gidens, O30543.
×James Russell Gilbert, O51689.
×Shelby Linwood Gillette, O30727.
×Bob Haynes Glover, O30680.
×Clarence Edward Gooding, O20258.
×Guinn Burch Goodrich, O42680.
×James Bennett Goodwin, O30573.
×James Emmett Goodwin, O20158.
×John Gottfried Gramzow, O30735.
×John Ewell Grant, O42778.
×Russell Porter Grant, O42646.
×Philip Sheffield Greene, O20314.
×James Bryson Gregory, O51737.
×Wilbur Maben Griffith, O20250.
×Donald Gilbert Grothaus, O20221.
×Edward Alexander Grove, O20200.
×Elmer Williford Grubbs, O20291.
×Raymond Richard Guehring, O51723.
×Maurice Benjamin Gullion, O42826.
×Paul Garland Guthrie, O30050.
×Harry Edward Hagerty, O30685.
×Everett George Hahney, O20185.
×Samuel Lindsay Hall, O51584.
×William Alph Hamberg, O30741.
×William Charles Haneke, O20263.
×Robert Chesley Harris, O30529.
×Charles Dudley Hartman, Jr., O20192.
×Raymond John Harvey, O20116.
×Harold Gerson Haskell, O30588.
×Earl Henry Hauschultz, O42789.
×Thomas Jay Hayes 3d, O20134.
×Morgan Barnes Heasley, O30175.
×John Robert Hector, O30717.
×John Arnold Heintges, O20281.
×George Josephi Helms, O30694.
×Jacob Richard Hershey, O30286.
×Glenn Carroll Hess, O51753.
×Herbert Bernard Heyer, O40042.
×Wright Hiatt, O20139.
×David Woodrow Hiester, O20191.
×Howard Cogswell Higley, O38821.
×James Fella Hill, O38835.
×B. J. Leon Hirshorn, O51762.
×Melvin Adolf Hoherz, O42819.
×Stephen Walsh Holderness, O20157.
×Robert Everett Holman, O38815.
×Gordon Henry Holterman, O20135.
×Earl Franklin Holton, O20241.
×Roy Warren Horton, O30626.
×George Edward Hughes, O30733.
×James Renwick Hughes, O20343.
×George Melvin Hunt, O30782.
×Milburn Neil Huston, O30612.
×James Michael Ilig, O20330.
×Langdon Andrew Jackson, Jr., O20251.
×Arthur Milton Jacoby, O20125.
×John Joseph Jakle, O20270.
×Theodore Janof, O20382.
×Jack Cassels Jeffrey, O30763.
×Harry Waldemar Johnson, O42821.
×Jesse Mellette Johnson, O51797.
×Luther Elman Johnson, O30535.
×Wilbur Morgan Johnson, O30577.
×Paul LeGrand Jolley, O30764.
×John Price Jones, Jr., O30607.
×Maxwell Morrison Kallman, O20182.
×Henry Jacob Katz, O20138.
×Arthur Ernest Kahkee, O42797.
×Benjamin Franklin Keist, O38843.
×John Edward Kelly, O20156.
×Bruce Edward Kendall, O30623.
×John Herbert Kerkering, O20120.
×Robert Henry Kessler, O20178.
×Pierre Victor Kieffer, Jr., O20122.
×William Henry Kinard, Jr., O20180.
×Edward Warwick King, O30646.
×Laurence Terry King, O30713.
×Ralph Dickson King, O20115.
×Miles Albert Kinley, O51718.
×Karl Theodore Klock, Jr., O20123.
×Royden Arnold Konopaska O30787.
×Arthur Kramer, O20140.
×Walter Wulfe Kuehler, O30731.
×Howard Frederick Kuenning, O42739.
×Fredolin William Kuhn, O51734.
×James Benjamin Lampert, O20147.
×James Dillard Land, O30650.
×James Edward Landrum, Jr., O20216.
×Wilmer Charles Landry, O20208.
×Erdie Otis Lansford, O30569.
×Roy Lassetter, Jr., O51714.
×George Thomas Laughlin, O30723.
×Lawrence Edward Laurion, O20150.
×Thomas James Lawlor, O20361.
×Clyde Lafayette Layne, O20317.
×Charles Bruce Layton, O30729.
×Frank Edwin Lee, O42775.
×James Billy Leer, O20370.
×Gus Edward Lehmann, O40001.
×John Lawrence Leidenheimer, O30795.
×McPherson LeMoyne, O20309.
×Henry David Lind, O20256.
×Thea Lewis Lipscomb, O20174.
×James Poats Littlejohn, O42837.
×William Edward Lobit, O30699.
×Eugene Everett Lockhart, O20181.
×Neal Wallace Lovsnes, O30540.
×Harold Roy Low, O20234.
×Robert Richard Lutz, O30767.
×John Matthew Lynch, O20377.
×Arthur Lawrence MacKusick, O42695.
×Edward Francis Maguire, O30332.
×Steven Malevich, O30660.
×Roland Hull Mapes, O30538.
×Lawrence Bernard Markey, O38826.
×Harrison Schermerhorn Markham, O20073.
×Thomas Joseph Matkovcik, O30641.
×Robert Edward McCabe, O20269.
×Roy Dean McCarty, O20119.
×Donald Maxwell McClain, O42693.
×David McCoach 3d, O20177.
×Weston Arthur McCormac, O30716.
×Aloysius Elliott McCormick, Jr., O20363.
×Harold Donovan McCormick, O42765.
×John Daniel McElheny, O20170.
×Horace Fenton McFeely, O38812.
×Ambrose Thomas McGuckian, O42725.
×Henry Hora McLauchlin, Jr., O51752.
×Howard Franklin McManus, O20346.
×Carroll Barton McMath, Jr., O42678.
×Thomas Donald McPhail, O30613.
×William Francis Meany, O20287.
×Henry William Meinecke, O42722.
×William Herbert Melhorn, O51557.
×Philip Buckley Melody, O38782.
×Leo Vasserot Merle, Jr., O51778.
×Wheeler Godfrey Merriam, O30759.
×Harry Schnee Messec, O51682.
×John Hersey Michaelis, O20328.
×Marter Denton Middleton, O51767.
×Harry Edgar Mikkelsen, O20179.
×Alexander Hamilton Miller, O39992.
×Allen Clinton Miller 2d, O20342.
×James Allen Miller, O40018.
×Luther Russell Miller, O30737.
×Charles Burnham Milliken, O20340.
×William David Milne, O20144.
×Wilton Briggs Moats, O30336.
×Edward Daniel Mohlere, O20286.
×Richard Harold Moore, O30721.
×Howard Allen Morris, O20141.
×Thurman Wesley Morris, O20315.
×James McCauslin Moynahan, O42848.
×Thomas Vernon Munson, O42654.
×Harry Murphy Murray, O30610.
×Edwin Aloysius Muth, O30670.
×George Emil Myers, O51765.
×Jack Nicholas Nahas, O39990.
×William Henry Nicolson, O30804.
×Donald Wallace Noake, O20357.
×Ned Taylor Norris, O20222.
×Edmund Robert O'Brien, O40032.
×Robert Emmett O'Brien, Jr., O20313.
×Herbert Joseph O'Connor, O51654.
×Walter Blair O'Connor, O51740.
×Robert James O'Donnell, O51786.
×Charles Lindley Ogden, O30689.
×John Mayo Ogilvie, Jr., O30773.
×Keith Thomas O'Keefe, O30669.
×Clarence Oliver Olson, O30734.
×Lester Keith Olson, O30640.
×Paul Francis Oswald, O20160.
×Thomas Wilbur Otto, O30799.
×George Alvin Pace, O30552.
×Charles Manly Pack, O20378.
×Gordon Benjamin Page, O40046.
×Reginald Joseph Beauregard Page, O20149.
×Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117.
×Edwin Stanton Palmer, O30606.
×Norman Welbec Parsons, O30793.
×Robert Bruce Partridge, O20204.
×Gerald Alexander Paterick, O42853.
×Allen Leeds Peck, A20327.
×James Clifton Pennington, O42749.
×Howard Pinkney Persons, Jr., O20167.
×Wythe Munford Peyton, Jr., O42830.
×Preston Vincent Phelps, O40026.

×Ernest Wesley Philpot, O30627.
×Ray Allen Pillivant, O19761.
×Rolla Darby Pollock, O38832.
×Philip Eugene Pons, O30621.
×Theodore Law Poole, Jr., O30606.
×Beverley Evans Powell, O20237.
×Josef Albert Prall, O51772.
×William Raymond Prince, O20219.
×Colie A. Quinn, O30571.
×Thomas Joseph Raber, O30614.
×David Radam, O51736.
×Roger Allen Rawley, O30648.
×Robert Sidney Redfield, O30704.
×Philip Waters Regar, O40053.
×Hamilton Reger, O30700.
×Raymond Wilhelm Reisner, O51656.
×Burkitt Ameral Reynolds, O30814.
×James Halsell Reynolds, O42721.
×Walter Brown Richardson, O30597.
×Harold Robert Richmond, O30265.
×Carl LaVerne Rickenbaugh, O20259.
×Richard Wilkins Ripple, O20312.
×Paul James Ritchie, O38808.
×John Edward Robb, O42790.
×Eldred George Robbins, Jr., O20211.
×Walter Donald Rogers, O30676.
×John Walter Romlein, O20197.
×William Thomas Ryder, O20296.
×Frank Joseph Sackton, O30553.
×Robert Hall Safford, O20244.
×Eugene Albert Salet, O30790.
×Henry Rensselaer Sanford, O38827.
×John Lewis Schaefer, O39999.
×John Warren Schroder, O30637.
×Heinrich Gary Schumann, O39991.
×William John Scott, O42718.
×Thomas Jennings Seigler, Jr., O30789.
×Henry Carrol Settle, O30665.
×Irwin Thomas Shaw, O42679.
×Leonard Copeland Shea, O20231.
×Clarence Earl Sheen, O40015.
×William Reeves Shuler, O20118.
×Franklin Rogers Sibert, O20329.
×William Edward Sievers, O20299.
×Glenn Austin Sikes, O20353.
×Lawrence Spencer Simcox, O30602.
×Charles Lee Simpson, O20325.
×William Marshall Slayden, O30754.
×Eugene Smith O30559.
×James Pickett Smith, O30772.
×Ridgway Pancoast Smith, Jr., O20243.
×Selwyn Dyson Smith, Jr., O20194.
×Stephen Elliott Smith, O20142.
×Vernon Merriweather Smith, O39993.
×Howard McCrum Snyder, Jr., O20213.
×Lennard Charles Sorensen, O42710.
×Cecil Eldon Spann, Jr., O20162.
×Allen Thomas Stanwix-Hay, O51759.
×Douglas Stevens, O38816.
×Marsh Patrick Stockton, O51769.
×Orville Newton Stokes, O20215.
×Robert Russell Summers, O42841.
×Edwin Van Valkenburg Sutherland, O20173.
×John Franklin Sutherland, O30779.
×Oren Swain, O20176.
×John Wendell Swanson, O30788.
×Eugene S. Tarr, O42827.
×James Cornelius Taylor, O30616.
×Edgar Hall Thompson, Jr., O20143.
×Orval Calvin Thompson, O30539.
×John Massie Throckmorton, O42711.
×Raymond Horace Tiffany, O20348.
×Ralph Arthur Tolve, O40027.
×John David Torrey, Jr., O20217.
×Horace Entricen Townsend, O30578.
×George Adolph Traeger, O30746.
×Robert John Trout, O20347.
×Merlin Oscar Tryon, O38810.
×Benjamin Otto Turnage, Jr., O20360.
×Alexander Shedrick Turner, O51632.
×John Gilbert Turner, O31414.
×Raymond Van Fleet, O51801.
×Adrianus Johannus Van Oosten, O40028.
×Howard Elbert Von Kaenel, O30527.
×George Abraham Walk, O42796.
×Fred Livingood Walker, Jr., O20293.
×Frederick Nason Walker, Jr., O51655.
×Benjamin Merritt Warfield, O20229.
×Charles Lamoreaux Warfield, O30590.
×Charles Henry Waters, O20114.
×James Kaighin Watts, O30752.
×James Rainier Weaver, O20278.
×James Franklin Wells, O30654.
×William Childs Westmoreland, O20223.
×John Clinton Whicher, O39986.
×Clyde Ehannon White, O42700.
×George Ervan White, Jr., O20130.
×Webster Wilder, Jr., O51784.
×Carroll James Williams, O30811.
×Edward Worthington Williams, O20305.
×Jack Lloyd Williams, O42800.
×John Marvin Williams, O20319.
×Myron Lawrence Williams, O30622.
×Jack Edgar Willis, O30313.
×James Tillman Willis, O20264.
×William Edward Wilson, O30542.
×LeRoy Beatty Woodbury, Jr., O30598.
×Clifford LeRoy Woodliff, O30796.
×William Otis Wyatt, O40020.
×William Pelham Yarborough, O20362.
×Joseph Barry Yost, O20201.
×Carl Louis Ziegler, O30707.

To be lieutenant colonels, Judge Advocate General's Corps

×George Neal Anderson, O51379.
Benjamin Major Ayars, O42173.
Oscar Melville Bisant, Jr., O51387.
Arnold Gerhard Eger, O29842.
Harry Jarvis Engel, O39840.
Thomas Johnson Henderson, O42203.
×Edward Temple Johnson, O29856.
×Ralph Kenneth Johnson, O42213.
William Humphrey Johnson, Jr., O29906.
Jackson Knight Judy, O39825.
Howard Sidney Levie, O38735.
Floyd Melvin Lundberg, O42136.
John Gordon O'Brien, O42171.
Paul Ashworth Robblee, O42198.
John Reed Turman, O42217.
×Curtis Lee Williams, O30062.
×Seymour Walter Wurfel, O29835.

To be lieutenant colonels, Chaplains

×Alford Vernon Bradley, O29259.
×Edward Wilbur Eanes, O29249.
×Benedict Arthur Henderson, O38653.
×Robert Mansfield Homiston, O29242.
×Brannon Jonathan Hopson, O29223.
×John Joseph Jedlowski, O22754.
×Charles Edmund McGee, O29241.
×Frederick Eugene Morse, O29260.
×LeRoy Washington Raley, O41733.
×Ralph Mark Reed, O22760.
×John Roland Strevig, O39656.
×Herschel Raymond Weedon, O41741.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

×Willard Ferguson Angen, O23596.
×Warren Jackson Barker, O23638.
×Thomas Taylor Beeler, Jr., O23635.
×Abram Salmon Benenson, O24295.
×Philip Alexander Bergman, O22772.
×Hubert Lynn Binkley, O23594.
×William Charles Burry, O23569.
Glenn Jesse Collins, O22687.
Edward James Dehne, O51965.
×Robert Brooks Dickerson, O40103.
×Ivan Charles Dimmick, Jr., O24308.
×Stuart Irvin Draper, O23599.
×Claude Milton Eberhart, O51967.
×Richard Stanton Fraser, O23595.
×Sanford Williams French 3d, O23603.
×John Gardiner, O23600.
×Joseph Brown Gordon, O22774.
×Harold Buffinton Graves, O22790.
×Harry James Grossman, O22786.
×Owen Allen Groves, O43133.
×Robert Morris Hardaway 3d, O24301.
×George Woody Harwood, O30920.
×Nelson Sumner Irey, O30928.
×Edward Ross Marshall, O22692.
John Thomas Martin, O22694.
×Oscar Peyton Moffitt, Jr., O22764.
×Walter Henrik Moursund, Jr., O24305.
Cannon Armstrong Owen, O22688.
×Murble Henry Pearson, O23661.
William Nelson Piper, O22690.
×Robert Christian Rauscher, O23573.
×John Ward Regan, O22783.
×Sterling James Ritchey, O22771.
×Jack Thomas Rush, O23591.
×James Edward Sams, O22776.
Frank James Shaffer, O22695.
×Harold Eugene Shuey, O23640.
×Phillip Benjamin Smith, O30952.
Otis Whittier Snyder, O22702.
×John Henry Spiliane, O30932.
×Benjamin Hardy Sullivan, Jr., O22770.
×David Edward Thomas, O22700.
×Robert Glenn Thompson, O23568.
×Weldon Joseph Walker, O24307.
×James Arista Wier, O26416.

To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps

×Douglas Monroe Beebe, O21697.
×Garnet Paul Francis, Jr., O30876.
×Eugene Wilmeth Gray, Jr., O51183.
×Herbert Lester Gullickson, O21694.
×Calvin George Hagerman, O22252.
×William Jasper Hurt, O56811.
×Leon Guin McConnell, O21464.
×Gerald Arthur McCracken, O21695.
×Winlaw Archiebald Priebe, O21465.
×Lawrence Carlton Radford, O21462.
×Jerome Travis Smith, O30874.
×Arthur Hastings Vollertsen, O38851.
×Virgil Gordon Walker, O21700.

To be lieutenant colonels, Veterinary Corps

×Thomas Carlyle Jones, O20065.
×George Miller Kerr, O29319.
×Edward Thomas Marsh, O29325.
×Fred Dry Maurer, O29324.
×Wayne Devere Shipley, O20491.
×Lloyd Christopher Tekse, O20062.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps

×Bertrand Nelson Beaudet, O40119.
×Walter Leslie Beeson, O31143.
×Floyd Lacewell Berry, O38866.
×Elwood Wilbur Camp, O43173.
×Thomas Anthony Carilia, O40115.
×James Frank Clark, O43161.
×Gerald Edward Geise, O43167.
×John Martin Hunt, Jr., O31089.
×Tomas Carter Jefferis, O31137.
×Edwin Donovan McMeen, O31109.
×George Terence O'Reilly, O40120.
×Frank Almond Partlow, O31099.
×Glenn Keith Smith, O20563.
×Fenner Harvey Whitley, Jr., O31106.
×Roland Howard Wingo, O31098.
×Anthony John Zolenas, Jr., O31127.

To be majors

×Duane Wright Ackerson, O45068.
×John Nathaniel Acuff, Jr., O40637.
×Jonathan Edwards Adams, Jr., O23833.
×Willis Jones Adams, O34197.
×Charles Warren Adcock, O24287.
×George Roopen Adjemian, O23806.
×Robert Hugh Agnew, O45102.
×John Richard Aguglia, O33477.
×Joseph Patrick Ahern, O23881.
×Frederic Francis Ahlgren, O33566.
×Arnold William Alexander, O45089.
×George Whitaker Alexander, O34143.
×Joseph Paul Alexander, Jr., O34481.
×Michael Frank Aliotta, O23895.
×Carl Morrison Allen, Jr., O24550.
×Fred Cary Allen, O34104.
×Elmer Hugo Almquist, Jr., O24223.
×James Daniel Anders, O33475.
×Arthur Jerome Anderson, O33741.
Ben Lamar Anderson, O24616.
×David Leonard Anderson, O25223.
×Jose Antonio Andino, O24575.
×Carroll Wayne Andresen, O34388.
×George Sidney Andrew, Jr., O34235.
×Theodore Henderson Andrews, O33688.
×Walter John Angers, Jr., O34677.
×Harold Forbes Antrim, O33793.
×Marshall Hawthorne Armor, Jr., O45590.
×Clare Hibbs Armstrong, Jr., O24098.
×Ambrose Claiborn Arthur, O52904.
×John Elliott Arthur, Jr., O24457.
×William B. Askren, O45507.
×Robert Madison Atkins, O52916.
×Roy Leighton Atteberry, Jr., O23899.
×Will Gillespie Atwood, Jr., O25067.
×Charles Wood Audet, O52899.
×Charles Francis Austin, O45239.
×James Collins Bagg, O24132.
×Claude Esmond Bailey, Jr., O24420.
×Frederick James Bailey, Jr., O33982.
×John Alexander Bailey, Jr., O40602.
×Phillip Haines Baker, O24442.

×John Paul Balkman, O33766.
×Frank Elihue Ball, O33944.
×James Lester Ballard, Jr., O24215.
×Marion Karl Bandley, O45222.
×Athel Bangert, O25202.
×Ernest Terrill Barco, Jr., O33938.
×Dean Warren Barnes, O40745.
×William Waldorf Barnes, O24425.
×John Coles Barney, Jr., O23963.
×Norvel Harold Barnhart, O34105.
×Sam Hardy Barrow, O24055.
×James Potvin Barry, O25283.
×Olinto Mark Barsanti, O34037.
×Robert Charles Barthle, O24246.
×Claude Darrell Barton, O33663.
×George Samuel Beatty, Jr., O25208.
×Harry Vaughn Beck, O24210.
×Marshall Owen Becker, O24473.
×William Albert Becker, O24267.
×John Alexander Bell, O33577.
×Emery Ellis Bellonby, O24441.
×Lawrence Woods Bengel, O34423.
×John Arthur Benner, O24203.
×Verde Weaver Bennett, O34157.
×John Sidney Benson, O33954.
×Robert Leslie Bereuter, O24451.
×Walter Paul Berger, O33579.
×Ralph William Bergman, O45174.
×John Thomas Berry, O25284.
×Harry Charles Besancon, O23725.
×George Wilbur Best, Jr., O25074.
×Richard Judson Bestor, O33972.
×Benjamin Reese Bierer, O33722.
×Chester Henry Bigger, O24212.
×Richard Chester Biggs, O45688.
×Clayton Arthur Bird, O25048.
×Viron Edward Bird, O24568.
×Mortimer Buell Birdseye, Jr., O23807.
×William Herbert Birdsong, Jr., O33945.
×Donald Dunwody Blackburn, O33734.
×William Henry Blakefield, O33927.
×Ashley Anthony Blinn, O35322.
×Arnold Mandigo Bloss, O45424.
×Charles Cohee Blossom, Jr., O45451.
×Charles Edward Blount, O45217.
×Linton Sinclair Boatwright, O23963.
×Henry Richard Bodson, O23788.
×Adelbert Dale Boggs, O34569.
×William Miller Boggs, O34087.
×Charles Bogner, O33892.
×Dwight David Bonham, O33949.
×Arsene Peter Bonifas, O45437.
×Robert Channing Borman, O23922.
×Charles Robert Borns, O34245.
×Henry Boswell, Jr., O23913.
×Raymond Victor Bottomly, Jr., O34071.
×Jeff William Boucher, O24173.
×Jack Aloysius Boulger, O33935.
×Ralph Harry Bowen, O25069.
×Wilbur Craig Boyce, Jr., O24460.
×Donald Palmer Boyer, Jr., O24563.
×James Hodo Boykin, O45838.
×Herman Beverly Boyle, Jr., O34090.
×Richard Eli Bozeman, O45339.
×James Henry Brakebill, Jr., O33840.
×William FitzGerald Brand, Jr., O25323.
×Boyd Lee Branson, O25254.
×Johnnie Clites Brink, O34658.
×Delbert Leroy Bristol, O34340.
×William David Brodbeck, O34565.
×Wythe Parks Brookes, O45447.
×Harold Broudy, O24134.
×Earl Vincent Brown, O24044.
×Ernest Louis Brown, O33987.
×Harry Carlton Brown, O33556.
×Horace Maynard Brown, Jr., O23886.
×James Herbert Brown, O25024.
×Joseph Tuck Brown, O23969.
×LeRoy Charles Brown, O33782.
×Robert Duncan Brown, Jr., O23832.
×James Marvin Browning, O35220.
×Hunter Marion Brumfield, O24413.
×LeRoy David Brummitt, O44087.
×Rudolph Kermit Brunsvold, O24201.
×William Charles Bryan, O34150.
×Earl K. Buchanan, O24060.
×Richard Boyd Bullock, O24198.
×Donald William Bunte, O39122.
×James Tobias Burke, O34575.
×James Richard Burkhart, O25018.
×Richard Clement Burn, O34426.
×Charles Edward Burner, O33434.
×Kenneth Paul Burns, O25194.
×Robert Walrath Burns, O52887.
×Walter Eugene Burrell, O24493.
×John William Burtchaell, O23764.
×Charles Manly Busbee, Jr., O23950.
×Harry Robert Bush, O53342.
×Edwin Boynton Buttery, O23966.
×Donald Marvin Callahan, O34055.
×John Wilson Callaway, O24081.
×Donald Norman Cameron, O24408.
×John Holmes Camp, O23758.
×Thomas James Camp, Jr., O24603.
×Victor Woodrow Campana, O23975.
×Raymond Potter Campbell, Jr., O23861.
×Charles Joseph Canella, O23865.
×Preston Baldwin Cannady, O34101.
×Charles Arthur Cannon, Jr., O23835.
×Fred Hilton Cantrell, O25295.
×Charles Thomas Caprino, O33808.
×Vincent Paul Carlson, O23694.
×Daniel Joseph Carney, O34672.
×Earl Marine Carpenter, O34098.
×Charles William Carr, O25222.
×Frank Fairfield Carr, O24504.
×Charles Allen Carroll, O25250.
×James Henry Carroll, O23722.
×John James Carroll, O52996.
×Donald Gifford Carson, O53255.
×George William Carter, O24556.
×Victor Lee Cary, O24600.
×Duane Seaman Cason, O25334.
×William Fredrick Cathrae, O24220.
×Gordon B. Cauble, O24239.
×Theodore Bernarr Celmer, O24066.
×Clifton Henry Chamberlain, Jr., O56907.
×Burton Bryant Chandler, O24250.
×Curtis Wheaton Chapman, Jr., O23696.
×Daniel Thornton Chapman, O34086.
×Ernest Wilbur Chapman, O40704.
×James Riley Chapman, O40711.
×George Franklin Charlton, O25107.
×Jesse Melvin Charlton, Jr., O24543.
×James Kenneth Chenault, O45678.
×John William Chesley, Jr., O53264.
×Raymond Grant Chesley, O53265.
×Fred Dennis Chesnut, O45795.
×John Moore Christensen, Jr., O23856.
×Ancher Emil Christensen, Jr., O45271.
×Richard George Ciccolella, O34117.
×Charles Parsons Clark, Jr., O24423.
×Harry Ainsworth Clark, Jr., O33937.
×Howard Warren Clark, O23698.
×Robert Evarts Clark, O23911.
×Fred DeMasse Clarke, Jr., O45673.
×Ritchie Herbert Clarke, O35173.
×George Alexander Clayton, O24196.
×Thomas James Cleary, Jr., O23998.
×Herbert Campbell Clendening O23721.
×William Eugene Clifford, O23853.
×Roy J. Clinton, O23774.
×Robert John Coakley, O23919.
×Harrington Willson Cochran, Jr., O23731.
×James William Cocke, O35168.
×Merton Smith Coe, O52876.
×Alfred Edwin Coffey, O53220.
×Charles Franklin Coffey, Jr., O44998.
×Robert Edmondston Coffin, O25234.
×Cornelius Wesley Coghill, Jr., O33928.
×Sears Yates Coker, O23697.
×Joseph Louie Coleman, O24527.
×Walter Raleigh Evans Coleman, O52823.
×Thompson McCrea Colkitt, O33690.
×Fred Wilbur Collins, O33425.
×Leroy Pierce Collins, Jr., O24031.
×Matthew Rankin Collins, Jr., O33550.
×Tom Depher Collison, O23868.
×Rawlins Murrell Colquitt, Jr., O24189.
×William Condy, O25220.
×Robert Ernest Conine, O24393.
×John Edward Connor, Jr., O33933.
×Robert Edward Connor, O33960.
×Charles Maxwell Conover, O33685.
×Philip Wendell Constance, O24118.
×Thomas Joseph Cooke, O45043.
×Charles Gibeon Cooper, O33430.
×David Cooper, O23860.
×Earl McQuillis Cooper, O34191.
×George William Cooper, O23905.
×Thomas Hamlet Cooper, O45075.
×Robert Rudolph Corey, O34006.
×Howard LaVerne Cornutt, O45992.
×James John Cortez, O53277.
×Richard Waggener Couch, O23855.
×John Alfred Coulter, O33541.
×Ralph Hermanson Courtney, O35196.
×Alvin Ethelbert Cowan, O24171.
×William Ellis Cox, O25105.
×William Hubert Cox, O33751.
×Frederick Walter Coykendall, O33694.
×William Woodrow Cozad, O24552.
×Clayton Charles Craig, O25262.
×Luther Seale Crawford, O34297.
×Robert Burns Crayton, O34032.
×Herbert Frederick Crecelius, O25187.
×Roy Ernest Creek, O39099.
×Carl Peden Croninger, O24507.
×Ralph Dozier Crosby, O33981.
×James Calvin Cross, O39092.
×Thomas Raymond Cross, O24610.
×Roger Jerald Culhane, O25083.
×George Benedict Cullison, O25193.
×James Lewis Culp, O45508.
×Charles Stuart Cumings, O25120.
×George Marcel Cummins, O24418.
×Worthy Millard Cunningham, O45258.
×Thomas Winston Curley, O23904.
×Clifford Alvin Curtis, O33462.
×Elmer Pershing Curtis, O25028.
×Worth Marlow Curtiss, O53005.
×Niels Marius Dahl, O24466.
×Gerald Michael Dailey, O25249.
×Albert Samuel Dalby, O24036.
×Peter Louis DalPonte, O34486.
×Robert William Dalrymple, O25329.
×Ralph Lynton Dalton, O34488.
×William Joseph Daly, O25061.
×Carroll Freemont Danforth, O23997.
×Richard James Darnell, O24159.
×George Hiram Darwin, O33779.
×James Eugene Davidoff, O33460.
×Walter James Davies, O53328.
×Art Harvey Davis, O34693.
×Charles Willis Davis, O34046.
×Clarence Edward Davis, Jr., O53041.
×Dan Ralph Davis, O40629.
×Don Davis, O45687.
×Edward Lowndes Davis, Jr., O34079.
×Franklin Milton Davis, Jr., O24491.
×Gerald Wayne Davis, O33888.
×Harry Jones Davis, Jr., O34154.
×Oscar Esko Davis, O39136.
×Ottis Audrey Davis, Sr., O40553.
×Paul Clendenen Davis, O25218.
×Robert John Davis, O33886.
×Willis Howard Davis, O34325.
×Paul Chester Day, O23866.
×William Archey Dean, O46007.
×John Breed Deane, O24040.
×Robert Henry Deason, O35323.
×Richard Paul de Camara, O34399.
×George Herbert De Chow, O24553.
×Louis Cornelius DeGooyer, O45562.
×Richard Delaney, O23711.
×Arthur James DeLuca, O24400.
×Roland Edward Denby, O34192.
×Martin Luther Denlinger, O33519.
×Robert Milton Denny, O33406.
×Louis Leonard DeNoya, O53352.
×Edward Harleston deSaussure, Jr., O23790.
×Peer de Silva, O24000.
×William Robertson Desobry, O24262.
×John Vincent D'Esposito, O24095.
×Edward Brian Detchemendy, O45117.
×Robert Putnam Detwiler, O23892.
×Robert Balis Dexter, O33838.
×Truman Eugene Deyo, O24037.
×Guy O'Neil De Young, Jr., O33925.
×George William Dickerson, O34189.
×Ned Royal Dickson, O34091.
×Peter Kirkbride Dilts, O23955.
×Gedrge Lindsay Disharoon, Jr., O24277.
×Robert Edwin Divine, O45523.
×Robert Toombs Dixon, O24035.
×Leslie Otis Doane, O33493.
×Paul Edward Doherty, O25212.
×Richard Leo Dooley, O24456.
×Thomas Edward Dougherty, O53037.
×Francis Loring Douglass, O24254.
×Arden Wirth Dow, O24591.
×Edward Patrick Downing, O33917.
×Carl Erwin Drewes, O24122.
×Donald Lyons Drisoll, O24018.
×Edmund Louis DuBois, O24265.
×Jules Maurice DuPare, O24193.

×William Randolph Dudley, O45497.
×Warren George Duemmel, O45004.
×Johnnie Derrick Duffie, O33474.
×Jack Wayne Duke, O33662.
×Dan Kistler Dukes, Jr., O34283.
×Jack Miller Duncan, O34647.
×Donald Dean Dunlop, O24284.
×George Raymond Dunn, O34084.
×Jerry French Dunn, O34342.
×Joseph Francis Dunn, O24482.
×William John Durrenberger, O25099.
×John Edmund Dwan 2d, O25354.
×William Burg Dyer, O53095.
×James Henry Dyson, O33799.
×Robert Raymond Ebbs, O45116.
×Dayton Willis Eddy, O24565.
×Robert Huff Edger, O23921.
Emil Victor Benard Edmond, O34234.
×Bob Eugene Edwards, O33844.
×Richard Augustus Edwards, Jr., O34116.
×Spencer Penrose Edwards, Jr., O33990.
×Sam Efnor, Jr., O34054.
×Richard Edward Eggleton, Jr., O52844.
×Roger Allen Eicher, O40665.
×Sterling Kenwood Eisminger, O40651.
×Lowell Reginald Eklund, O25123.
×Edwin Willard Elder, Jr., O34033.
×John Weamer Elder, O25068.
×Dale Taylor Elliott, O25022.
×Glenn Pierce Elliott, O40658.
×Harold Bernard Ellis, O25338.
×Harry Howard Ellis, O23958.
×Harry Van Horn Ellis, Jr., O23724.
×Robert Vaughan Elsberry, O23783.
×Kary Cadmus Emerson, O33991.
×John William Engi, O44278.
×James Lee Erickson, O33597.
×Kenneth Walter Erickson, O24474.
×Keith Philip Fabianich, O24151.
×Jack Bansley Falks, O25266.
×John Madison Farnell, O34108.
×Richard Farr, O33737.
×William Lee Farrar, O34053.
×Wilfred Francis Farrell, O33950.
×Lyman Saunders Faulkner, O23870.
×Louis Regnault Fausett, O34421.
×Robert John Faust, O40641.
×Howard Harvey Featherston, O34339.
×William E. Feeman, O24243.
×Howard Lawrence Felchlin, O24041.
×Joseph Harold Felter, O53216.
×Donald Charles Felton, O39058.
×Thomas Glen Ferguson, O24464.
×Harry Ira Fernandes, O53128.
×Paul Alfred Feyereisen, O39069.
×Frederick Pauly Field, O45196.
×Glenn Smith Finley, Jr., O24117.
×Frank Otto Fischer, O45412.
×Robert Rorbach Fisk, O24614.
×Terrance Charles Fitzgerald, O45700.
×Francis Cornelius Fitzpatrick, O23927.
×Charles Llewellyn Flanders, Jr., O24006.
×Elmer Pearce Fleming, Jr., O33975.
×Charles William Fletcher, O23839.
×Brilsford Pease Flint, Jr., O34146.
×Marvin William Flora, O34083.
×Charles William Flynn, Jr., O25122.
×Ralph Martin Flynn, O39133.
×Robert Charles Forbes, O24511.
×John Arthur Ford, O24497.
×John Henry Ford, Jr., O33411.
×James Paul Forsyth, O24038.
×George I. Forsythe, O24510.
×Hugh Franklin Foster, Jr., O23837.
×James Daniel Fowler, O24003.
×Wesley Charles Franklin, O45565.
×Paul Oscar Franson, Jr., O39065.
×John Matthias Frassrand, O40621.
×Richard Grant Freeman, O33450.
×William Friedman, O24540.
×Alexis Michael Gagarine, O24153.
×Robert Berry Galbreaith, O33549.
×Neal Charles Galloway, O34158.
×Stephen Louis Garay, O45416.
×William Douglas Gardiner, O45175.
×Glenn Harris Gardner, O33665.
×Leonard Edwin Garrett, O35307.
×Robert Willoughby Garrett, O23971.
×Herbert Lundy Garris, O33872.
×Floyd Dewitt Gattis, O34269.
×David Gabriel Gauvreau, O23789.
×Robert Joseph Gavin, O33807.
×Donald Leon Geer, O34675.
×Jack Philip Geise, O25131.
×Edward Joseph Geldermann, O23803.
×Thomas Joseph Gendron, O45776.
×Ernest Thornton George, Jr. O25319.
×John George Georgelas, O33978.
×Felix John Gerace, O23954.
×Frederick Henry Gerfen, O53165.
×Frank Austin Gerig, Jr., O23701.
×James Joseph Gibbons, O25355.
×David Albert Gile, O24477.
×Eugene Pierce Gillespie, O25320.
×Hubert Walter Gillespie, Jr., O24264.
×Charles Jack Girard, O34110.
×Chester Elwood Glassen, O33932.
×William Thomas Gleason, O23956.
×Donald White Glenn, O33931.
×William Charles Glover, O34122.
×Melville Armand Goers, O25265.
×Howard Overton Golladay, O25062.
×Kenneth Mace Gonseth, O24417.
×Leonard James Goodsell, O24472.
×Vincent Farnsworth Goodsell, O33483.
×Richard Oliver Gordon, O24440.
×William Thurmond Gordon, O34397.
×Harold Elmer Gould, O25174.
×Gerald Elbert Gowell, O24174.
×Denis Blundell Grace, O23760.
×John Willis Grady, O33940.
×Charles Raymond Graham, O24605.
×James Wetherby Graham, O24064.
×Asa Parker Gray, Jr., O34096.
×Gordon Dare Gray, O40956.
×Paul Gray, Jr., O23935.
×James Oscar Green, 3d, O23850.
×Robert Walter Green, O34332.
×Lawrence Vivians Greene, O23872.
×Michael Joseph Lenihan Greene, O23887.
×Frank Butler Greer, O33447.
×Monsey Thomas Gresham, Jr., O45076.
×William Charles Gribble, Jr., O23695.
×James Snow Griffin, O53096.
×Richard Austin Grinnell, O53260.
×Robert Neil Grove, O25104.
×Joseph Stanley Grygiel, O23737.
×Vincent Charles Guerin, O34052.
James Willard Guest, O24133.
×Arthur Wendell Gunn, O24241.
×Joseph Ingram Gurfein, O23734.
×William Harold Gurnee, Jr., O23974.
×James William Haley, O24244.
×James Malone Hall, O40692.
×Maurice Jacob Halper, O39072.
×James Paul Hamill, O25324.
×Robert Kirk Hamilton, O45425.
×Robert Mayer Hamilton, O24621.
×James Edward Hammer, O24599.
×Homer Humphrey Hammond, O33507.
×William Franklin Hancock, O45013.
×Robert Edmund Hand, O24395.
×Lloyd LeRoy Hanes, O24191.
×Curtis Leland Hankins, O35190.
×Paul V. Hannah, O24539.
×Frederic Emile Hansard, O45303.
×John Christian Hansen, O34333.
×Adellon Franck Hanson, O25301.
×Earl Lloyd Harper, O35272.
×James Harold Harper, O40735.
×Charles Knighton Harris, O23848.
×Frederick Vivian Harris, O33595.
×Herbert Kent Harris, O40600.
×James Freeman Harris, Jr., O34242.
×Moyer Delos Harris, O25129.
×Thomas Albert Harris, O53117.
×Wesley Dalton Harris, O45371.
×William Nelson Harris, O40659.
×Matthew Clarence Harrison, O23875.
×William Walter Harvey, Jr., O24598.
×Chester Thomas Harvie, O25138.
×James Thro Haslam, O33079.
×James Jefferson Hatch, O45096.
×Merrill Grover Hatch, O33918.
×Mills Carson Hatfield, O23741.
×Edward Norton Hathaway, O25366.
×Gaynor William Hathaway, O25124.
×Auburon Paul Hauser, O23908.
×Frank Lawrence Havel, O53180.
×James Jackson Hawkins, Jr., O45759.
×John Hancock Hay, Jr., O25290.
×Frank Clifford Healy, O24412.
×James Gerard Healy, O23816.
×Richard Wyman Healy, O25275.
×Clovis Dee Heard, O34680.
×Calvin Aldrich Heath, O24431.
×James Walter Heatwole, O35215.
×James Arthur Hebbeler, O24518.
×Donald Heck, O24157.
×George James Heil, Jr., O39109.
×John Joseph Hejna, O45033.
×George Z. Helber, O45094.
×Cecil Caryl Helena, O53271.
×Roy George Hendrickson, O24093.
×Clair Gillespie Henline, O45087.
×Leo Charles Henzl, O23885.
×John Atwood Herod, O52859.
×Jay William Herrington, O34121.
×Merritt Lambert Hewitt, O23934.
×Irving Heymont, O25040.
×Herbert Cleveland Hicks, Jr., O40598.
×Thomas Arthur Hicks, Jr., O53246.
×Maurice Dowling Hiers, O33715.
×Walter Alfred Higgins, O25112.
×Garrett Leroy Hill, O33941.
×Elon Lee Hiller, O45059.
×Corson Landrum Hilton, Jr., O24438.
×Sidney Dodds Hilton, O33413.
×Jack G. Hines, O46117.
×Paul Parlier Hinkley, O40675.
×John Merwin Hinman, O33822.
×Albert Henry Hislop, O34034.
×Arthur Webster Hodges, O24437.
×Arnold Jacob Hoebeke, O23930.
×Raymond Laverne Hoff, O25140.
×Donald Evans Hoffmeister, O33942.
×William Morris Hoge, Jr., O23894.
×Dale Douglas Hogeboom, Jr., O34085.
×John Dean Holle, O33580.
×Charles Chilton Holbrook, O33501.
×Frank Seldon Holcombe, O24218.
×James Hallowell Holcombe, O45349.
×Maurice Clavelle Holden, O24534.
×Charles Michael Holland, O45157.
×James Grover Holland, Jr., O24573.
×Joshua LeRoy Holley, Jr., O40612.
×Earl Jay Holliman, O25298.
×James Francis Hollingsworth, O34155.
×Otho Eugene Holmes, O24252.
×Sammie Newell Homan, O34279.
×Walter Garrison Hopkins, Jr., O33551.
×James Henry Horton, O33609.
×Parkhurst Cloud Hough, O33836.
×Walter Scott Housman, O53308.
×Hugh Emert Howard, O45529.
×Thomas Jacob Howard, O33508.
×Charles Phillip Howe, O45555.
×Harry Reeves Howell, Jr., O46248.
×James Ragsdale Howton, O40613.
×William Hayward Hubbard, O34111.
×Burnside Elijah Huffman, Jr., O23759.
×Donald Charles Hughes, O25114.
×Fredrick Kenneth Hughes, O24471.
×James Francis Hughes, Jr., O33956.
×John Scarborough Hughes, O34271.
×Almon Louis Hugins, Jr., O24428.
×David Dorsey Hulsey, O24411.
×Thomas Abbott Hume, O23931.
×Cecil Floyd Hunnicutt, O33442.
×James Miller Hustead, 2d, O24175.
×Stanton Claude Hutson, O24042.
×Roy Lester Inman, O34102.
×Vernon Cline Irby, O25251.
×John William Irving, O53276.
×Wilburt James Irwin, O24179.
×Albin Felix Irsyk, O24158.
×Joseph Donald Iseman, O33798.
×Robert Bright Jaccard, O45195.
×Donald Henry Janz, O24217.
×Charles Cole Jeffries, O34093.
×James Curtis Jeffries, Jr., O25020.
×Donald Leverne Jenkins, O45935.
×Edward Newell Jenkins, O40561.
×Edward Bernard Jennings, O24251.
×Gregg Newhall Jennings, O45454.
×John William Jennings, Jr., O24522.
×Allen Jensen, O23692.
×Allan George Woodrow Johnson, O23769.
×Dan William Johnson, O33426.
×Floyd Lester Johnson, O25336.
×Gerald Johnson, Jr., O25035.
×Lynnwood Murat Johnson, Jr., O35199.
×Malcolm Corwin Johnson, O23794.
×Robert Maurice Johnson, O24498.
×Mont Sandels Johnston, Jr., O53169.
×Myron Thorne Johnston, O24525.

×Albert William Jones, O33488.
×Bruce Barton Jones, O34239.
×Bruce DesBrisay Jones, O34238.
Grant Ellsworth Jones, O40649.
×James Blanding Jones, O34152.
×James Owen Jones, O34059.
×Leo Bond Jones, O24255.
×Luther Griffin Jones, Jr., O40575.
×Morton McDonald Jones, Jr., O23879.
×George Bernie Jordan, O34644.
×John Thomas Joseph, O33756.
×Vern Louis Joseph, O53375.
×James Lawrence Kaiser, O24085.
×Leo Martin Kane, O24569.
×Robert Whitson Kane, O33492.
×Roy Alexander Kane, Jr., O34140.
×Carl William Kappel, O33833.
×Warren Herbert Karstedt, O33849.
×Elliott Taylor Katherman, O53023.
×Robert Bernard Keagy, O24072.
×Eugene Lawrence Keeth, O34687.
×Jim Dan Keirsey, O34681.
×Reynolds Robert Keleher, O23941.
×Lucien Fairfax Keller, O24399.
×Roy Skiles Kelley, O23703.
×Francis Stephen Kelly, O45513.
×James Beal Kelly, O24490.
×Chester Elwood Kennedy, O24242.
×Kenneth Wade Kennedy, O23716.
×Harold Ray Kent, O34103.
×James Robertson Kent, O34678.
×Ferris Adam Kercher, O33456.
×Benjamin Berry Kercheval, O23933.
×William Freese Kernan, O25023.
×Billy Harland Kerr, O34655.
×Harry Donald Kight, O56904.
×John Joseph Killian, O33502.
×Walter Kililiae, O25017.
×Robert Elwood Kimball, O24586.
×Robert Guice Kimball, O52599.
×James Henry King, O23884.
×Max Verlyn Kirkbride, O33485.
×Byron Mark Kirkpatrick, O24257.
×Edwin Charles Kisiel, O23984.
×Donald Elmer Kjeldsen, O34326.
×Joseph Dominick Klunder, O52947.
×Orville Kenneth Knight, O25043.
×Owen Beall Knight, O24231.
×Wendell Pollitt Knowles, O23953.
×Joseph Lippincott Knowlton, O23869.
×Jack Caldwell Knox, O45402.
×Henry Koepcke, Jr., O24581.
×Roland Leo Kolb, O25184.
×Ralph Edward Konkol, O52868.
×William Lindsay Koob, Jr., O25132.
×Stephen Thaddeus Kosiorek, O23772.
×Leon Francis Kosmacki, O24194.
×Vitaly Kovalevsky, O24488.
×Robert Sealey Kramer, O23729.
×John Theodore Kramers, O33890.
×Charles Thomas Krampitz, O33630.
×Raymond Frederick Kreager, O33919.
×Richard Brittain Kreutzer, O25037.
×Jack Joseph Kron, O45822.
×William Rhodes Kugler, O34663.
×Ralph Edward Kusell, O23766.
×Peter Joseph Lacey, Jr., O33668.
×William Franklin LaHatte, O24206.
×Wilbur John Lage, O33911.
×Elmer Booth Lagerman, O52980.
×Weldon Emanual Laiche, O34295.
×John Barton Lamond, O25309.
×William Stanley Lancey, O33997.
×Leroy Crosby Land, O25084.
×James Raine Laney, Jr., O23942.
×Clarence Joseph Lang, O40705.
×Francis Elliott Lang, O45628.
×William Henry Langendorf, O45551.
×Joe Vandiver Langston, O24182.
×Robert Edward Lanigan, O23896.
×John Van Scoten Lanterman, O33983.
×Robert Thomas Larson, O24506.
×Robert William Larson, O45964.
×Frederick F. Lash, O40574.
×Angelo Augustine Laudani, O24033.
×Wallace Michael Lauterbach, O23810.
×John Joseph Lavin, O45613.
×Leon Smith Lawrence, O34286.
×Melvin Martin Lawson, O45475.
×Paul Frederick Lawson, O24529.
×Roger Longstreet Lawson, O23852.
×Moody Elmo Layfield, Jr., O23939.
×Francis Xavier Leary, O24427.
×Walter Philip Leber, O25130.
×Lee Bradley Ledford, Jr., O23775.
×John Clifford Hodges Lee, Jr., O23688.
×Lynn Cyrus Lee, O23717.
×Wayne Harold Lee, O24469.
×Lewis William Leeney, O25206.
×Morris Allen Lent, O33469.
×Theodore Leonard, O34124.
×Robert Ellis LeRoy, O33835.
×Richard Mar Levy, Jr., O23980.
×Emmett McKay Lewis, O32866.
×French Greig Lewis, O33676.
×Edward Robert Lewitz, O45325.
×Jerome Ferris Lieblich, O33409.
×John Charles Liggett, O24410.
×Paul von Santen Liles, O23876.
×William Julius Lind, O45230.
×Haakon Lindjord, O25340.
×Harold Clinton Lindley, O45614.
×Marvin Leo Lindmark, O34393.
×Kenneth Robert Lindner, O34650.
×James Worth Linn, O34653.
×Frank Holroyd Linnell, O24089.
×William Miles Linton, O23728.
×Samuel Meyer Lipton, O24398.
×Frank Roy Little, O53090.
×Gerald Bethune Little, O40554.
×Norval Milner Locke, O33601.
×Norman Murchison Grusky Locksley, O25111.
×William Joshua Logan, O24470.
×Glen Carl Long, O24170.
×Joseph William Long, O34180.
×Mercer Presley Longino, O24024.
×Paul Allen Loop, O45735.
×James Warren Love, O34026.
×Peyton Royston Lucas, O33445.
×George Abbott Lucey, O24446.
×William Numsen Lucke, O24430.
×Morris James Lucree, O33401.
×John Paul Ludwikosky, O34228.
×James Norman Lunsford, Jr., O33518.
×Clare Norton Lyke, O24601.
×William Ray Lynch, Jr., O34268.
×George Lafayette Mabry, Jr., O34047.
×Donald Wright MacFeeters, O25300.
×Max Richard Machnicke, O33465.
×Stuart Arthur MacKenzie, O40618.
×Harold Vernon Mackey, O25046.
×Latimer Whittle MacMillan, Jr., O25100.
×Albert Scott Madding, O33680.
×Archie Tom Madsen, O45806.
×Samuel Bertron Magruder, O23874.
×Harold Vincent Maixner, O24439.
×Jack Carl Maldonado, O24447.
×Clinton Earl Male, O24078.
×Paul Julian Maline, O24402.
×Eugene David Manary, O33216.
×Raymond Oscar Manasco, O33608.
×John Benjamin Manley, Jr., O23847.
×William McKinney Mantz, O33403.
Herron Nichols Maples, O45920.
×Jack LeRoy Marinelli, O34331.
×William Grover Marks, Jr., O45395.
×Woodrow Wilson Marriott, O33486.
×Harley Truman Marsh, Jr., O23901.
×William Nathan Martasin, O44997.
×Brice James Martin, O33620.
×John Arthur Martin, O24453.
×Robert Arnold Martin, O24180.
×Martin Frank Massoglia, O52831.
×Theodore Christopher Mataxis, O34035.
×Charles Woodburn Matheny, Jr., O24619.
Walter Edward Mather, O23749.
×Harry George Mathos, O45077.
×Clinton Fort Matthews, O24503.
×James Snedecor Maxwell, O53163.
×Thomas Ward Maxwell, O23988.
×Charles Dorsey Maynard, O23754.
×Joseph Britton Mayo, O46024.
×Donald Eugene McArthur, O52892.
×Edward Earl McBride, Jr., O34347.
×Francis Gerard McBride, O33539.
×William Edward McBride, O24587.
×William Yates McCachern, O25190.
×Benjamin McCaffery, Jr., O23912.
×George William McCaffrey, O25256.
×Clark Richard McCauley, O40623.
×Philip Hunter McCorkle, O45867.
×Joseph Andrew McCulloch, Jr., O23786.
×Chris McCullough, O40611.
×William Thomas McDaniel, O34088.
×Austin Joseph McDermott, Jr., O40754.
×James Edwin McDowell, O40674.
×William Delaney McDowell, O35204.
×James Edward McElroy, O23917.
×Edward Joseph McGrane, Jr., O24027.
×Robert Emmett McGraw, O39107.
×Edward Wilson McGregor, O39096.
×Joseph Ruane McGuire, O24138.
×Thomas Charles McGuire, O33296.
×Ernest Charles McInnis, Jr., O24516.
×George William McIntyre, O23841.
×John Carl McIntyre, O23976.
×Gregg LaRoix McKee, O23811.
×James Fuller McKinley, Jr., O23893.
×Joseph Edward McKinney, O39090.
×James Donald McLanachan, O46037.
×Edwin Clayton McLaughlin, O44423.
×Donald Leroy McMillan, O23791.
×Donald George McNamara, O39085.
×Joseph Theodore McQuaide, O24247.
×John Alexander McWatters, O34336.
×Rocco Francis Meconi, O33516.
×Henry Edwards Mecredy, Jr., O45091.
×Wilbert Denning Meeks, O45109.
×Jack Rawson Melton, O33470.
×Ralph Hain Mengel 2d, O33504.
×Robert Levens Metcalf, Jr., O53179.
×Arthur Lloyd Meyer, O23871.
×John Field Michel, O23710.
×Rolf Erling Mickelson, O45184.
×Henry Van Middleworth, O24226.
×Crosby Park Miller, O34151.
×Donald Joseph Miller, O45642.
×Harley Neivell Miller, O53155.
×Joseph Gorrell Kearfott Miller, Jr. O24285.
×Leonard Charles Miller, O24623.
×Maurice Guthrie Miller, O23914.
×Robert James Miller, O33542.
×Verle Douglas Miller, O24396.
×Walter Leroy Miller, Jr., O24495.
×John Millikin, Jr., O23781.
×Warren Arthur Minton, O45199.
×Burt Lunney Mitchell, Jr., O24219.
×John Farwell Mitchell, O24405.
×Joseph Douglas Mitchell, O24286.
×Floyd Bayless Mitman, Jr., O25330.
×Sidney Thomas Mixon, O34281.
×James Harry Mobley, O25053.
×Alfred Franklin Moffitt, Jr., O40630.
×Walter Francis Molesky, O23857.
×Nelson Paul Monson, O23996.
×John George Montgomery, O33788.
×Alfred Judson Force Moody, O23685.
×Gordon Ames Moon 2d, O25214.
×George Bissland Moore, O23804.
×Harley Lester Moore, Jr., O40729.
×Robert Simeon Moore, O25253.
×Richard Clement Moran, O25027.
×Charles Allison Morgan, Jr., O45520.
×William Ovid Morgan, O34049.
×Paul Millman Morrill, O24528.
×Harry Gordon Morris, O45665.
×Willard Webster Morris, O25297.
×Woodrow Wilson Morse, O53048.
×Miroslav Frank Moucha, O23877.
×Jay Byron Mowbray, O24450.
×Maynard George Moyer, O23991.
×Edmund Louis Mueller, O34292.
×Glenn Edward Muggelberg, O33812.
×John Edward Muir, Jr., O33754.
×Robert Pershing Muir, O39105.
×James Penquite Mulcahy, O24227.
×Walter Raleigh Mullane, O23987.
×Henry John Muller, Jr., O24508.
×John Kearns Muller, O24570.
×Robert Joseph Munch, O45546.
×Reuben Wallis Mundy, O25063.
×Daniel Francis Munster, O24467.
×Arthur McMurrough Murphy, O24156.
×Edward Robert Murphy, O52847.
×James Owen Murphy, O34193.
×Manford Ray Murphy, O45403.
×Robert Elwood Murphy, O34080.
×John Francis Thomas Murray, O23768.
×Alexander Frank Musyk, O24010.
×Francis Joseph Myers, Jr., O24073.
×Winfred Clayton Naselroad, O35259.
×Albert Mayse Nash, O33727.
×Aubrey Parkerson Nathan, O34270.
×Leo Joseph Nawn, O53200.
×Rafael Negron, O34115.
×Alex Noble Nelson, O33528.
×Harold Easton Nelson, O24487.
×Joseph William Nelson, O34692.

×Alvin Thorwald Netterblad, Jr., O33971.
×Roger Stevens Neumeister, O23815.
×Jess Edward Newland, O45793.
×John Taylor Newman, O24281.
×Albert Newton, O40742.
×Edward LeRoy Nicely, O53251.
×Edwin Allison Nichols, O25192.
×Gibson Niles, O23938.
×Paul Arthur Nilsson, O25274.
×Hubert Lester Nolan, O39111.
×John Norton, O23858.
×Warren Edgar Nossaman, O25079.
×John Copeland O'Byrne, O52910.
×Thomas Courtenay O'Connell, O23994.
×Joseph Alva Ogle, O24500.
×William Charles Ohl, O34078.
×Leonard Frederick Olliver, O40586.
×Gust Edwin Olson, O46079.
×Richard James O'Neill, O33536.
×Charles Frederick Ostner, O24271.
×Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom, Jr., O25331.
×John Roy Oswalt, Jr., O23690.
×Maurice Jean Palizza, O33934.
×Robert Harlan Palmatary, O45026.
×Robert Edward Panke, O23831.
×James Coleman Parker, O34123.
×Charles McDonald Parkin, Jr., O24150.
×Albro Lefils Parson, Jr., O24259.
×Marcus Lindley Parsons, O45699.
×Charles Joseph Parziale, O33829.
×Lester Robert Patrick, O45212.
×George Douglas Patterson, O32702.
×William Presbury Patterson, O33687.
×Gordon Buford Patton, O24469.
×John William Paxton, O24199.
×Herbert Gale Peabody, O39008.
×Douglas Davis Peairs, O33479.
×Raymond Donald Pearsall, O33548.
×Edward Thielens Peeples, O24537.
×David Penson, O33787.
×Donn Royce Pepke, O25188.
×Ernest LeRoy Perry, O53324.
×George Thomas Petersen, O33771.
×James Wallace Peyton, Jr., O45138.
×Robert Eldon Phelps, O24165.
Tobias Raphael Philbin, Jr., O34406.
×John Francis Philip, O53061.
×Andrew Dee Pickard, O34639.
×Ellis Earl Pickering, O53113.
×George Bibb Pickett, Jr., O23932.
×Fred Allan Pierce, Jr., O24172.
×Henry Jones Pierce, O33989.
×Paul Edgar Pigue, O23990.
×Glenn Thomson Pillsburg, O34125.
George Edwin Pinard, O25172.
×Robert Martin Piper, O34674.
×George Thomas Pitts, Jr., O34036.
×Allan Gardner Pixton, O24137.
×Ottis Mazel Plant, O40714.
×Ernest Franklin Poff, O24020.
×John Tate Poffenberger, O45197.
×William Bernard Pohlman, Jr., O24193.
×Jurgen George Pohly, O52934.
×John Scott Pollard, Jr., O25291.
×Francis Fred Poppenburg, O25090.
×Howard Eugene Porter, O34480.
×Edwin Lloyd Powell, Jr., O23689.
×Ross Franklin Powell, O33980.
×John Barton Pratt, O34186.
×William Doyle Pratt, O24079.
×Carleton Preer, Jr., O45567.
×John Donald Prendergast, O40599.
×Joseph Thomas Prendergast, O45327.
×Andy Walter Pribnow, O25292.
×Julian Caldwell Propst, O45943.
×Joseph John Prusaitis, Jr., O34402.
×Lloyd Joseph Ptak, O25216.
×William Augustus Purdy, O23978.
×Emro Joseph Quashnock, O34321.
×John Temple Quick, O53006.
×William Oxley Quirey, O39102.
×Raymond Joseph Raffaelli, O53170.
×Lloyd Louis Rall, O40632.
×Paul Wyman Ramee, O23704.
×Stanley Meriwether Ramey, O23726.
×David Leroy Ramsey, O25072.
×Heinz Peter Rand, O33490.
×Maynard Clayton Raney, O24517.
×Walter John Rankin, O24455.
×Alexander Lawson Ransone, O34142.
×Vincent White Rasper, O40615.
×Richard John Rastetter, O23770.
×Roy Edgar Rayle, Jr., O25113.
×Donald Robert Redden, O33657.
×Thomas Carlton Reddington, O24401.
×Ira Cornelius Redfern, Jr., O34109.
×John Gabriel Redmon, O23802.
×Kenneth Otto Reed, O53102.
×Wilson Russell Reed, O23824.
×John Edward Reid, O25106.
×Robert Stanley Reilly, O23813.
×Jack Helm Remele, O24585.
×Charles Gilliland Renfro, O24567.
×George Irving Resseguie, O53240.
×George Albert Reynolds, O52852.
×Arnold Edward Rice, O45730.
×Edward Stephen Rice, O25119.
×Irvin Marshall Rice, O24414.
×Johnny Mac Rice, O34094.
×Donald Joseph Richardson, O25019.
×Herbert Richardson, Jr., O23748.
×James Richardson, O23993.
×Willard Donald Richardson, O45380.
×John Ralph Richmond, O46217.
×Willis Smith Riddick, Jr., O40570.
×Reinhold Carl Riede, O45810.
×Jacob Lewis Riley, Jr., O53161.
×Thomas Wise Riley, Jr., O33658.
×Harry Niles Rising, Jr., O24002.
×Frank Noel Ritter, O33558.
×Nathan Anderson Roane, Jr., O34156.
×Cecil Edward Roberts, O35232.
×Paul Franklin Roberts, O33825.
×Allen William Rodeheffer, O24602.
×Jack Alan Rogers, O34572.
×Maurice Albert Rogers, O40555.
×Andrew Peach Rollins, Jr., O24237.
×Paul Crawford Root, Jr., O23979.
×Willard Roper, O33605.
×Hezekia Jacob Ross, Jr., O34112.
×Samuel Rocky Ross, O34278.
×John Ellis Rossell, Jr., O24011.
×Robert Carl Roth, O39095.
×William Faye Roton, O23961.
×Denton Carl Rountree, O33797.
×Edward Leon Rowny, O23744.
×James William Roy, O23762.
×Donald Clark Rubottom, O35286.
×Donald Leo Rush, O39076.
×Vincent Louis Ruwet, O24524.
×Phillip Walter Ryan, O33328.
×Rex Russel Sage, O34061.
×Harold Jack St. Clair, O25369.
×Julius Albert Sakas, O33709.
×Daniel Salinas, O24012.
×Lloyd Robert Salisbury, O23797.
×Donald Lamar Sallee, O33951.
×Ernest Samuson, Jr., O24260.
×Robert Walter Sams, O23750.
×James Victor Sanden, O24213.
×Allen Wightman Sanders, Jr., O25305.
×Cecil Marcus Sanders, O33923.
×John Herbert Savage, O24186.
×Roland Savilla, O40563.
×Carl William Schaad O25087.
×Paul Bernard Schaefer, O40562.
×Frank Louis Schaf, Jr., O45860.
×Charles Henry Schilling, O23707.
×Eldon Woerner Schmid, O33627.
×Graham Edward Schmidt, O34348.
×Elmer Schmierer, O24531.
×Raymond Ira Schnittke, O23693.
×Carl Howard Schofield, O24505.
×Albert Theodore Schrader, O33747.
×William Leo Schreiber, O34043.
×John Edward Schremp, O23709.
×Edwin George Schuck, O33606.
×Richard Hamilton Schuler, O33414.
×Robert H. Schulz, O25303.
×Albert Dulaney Schutz, O25054.
×John Logan Schutz, O24229.
×Leo Henry Schweiter, O34334.
×Theodore Frederick Schweitzer, O52875.
×Gordon Lowell Chambers Scott, O24161.
×Richard Pressly Scott, O23787.
×Herbert Hollister Scott-Smith, Jr., O33817.
×Robert Burton Seeley, O33436.
×Richard Joe Seitz, O33979.
×George Philip Seneff, Jr., O23738.
×Truman Holt Setliffe, O24350.
×Harry Brown Sewell, O45491.
×Morrell Ray Sexton, O34057.
×Martin Andrews Shadday, O24043.
×William Kent Shaffer, O40639.
×Robert McDonald Shannon, Jr., O24486.
×Thomas Wilson Sharkey, O23981.
×Thomas John Sharpe, O24181.
×Wiley Freeman Shaver, Jr., O24459.
×Robert Champlain Shaw, O33626.
×Victor Boyd Shemwell, O44395.
×William McKinley Shepard, O25110.
×Charles Gloyd Shettle, O40706.
×Dale Howard Shick, O33412.
×Alden Peverley Shipley, O33699.
×Jackson Evert Shirley, O33977.
×Winant Sidle, O33651.
×Wilson Sifford, O33920.
×Clarence Frank Sills, O24463.
×Robert Maxey Silvey, O33887.
×James Elmer Simmons, O24521.
×Vernon Nelson Simmons, Jr., O39063.
×Robert Earl Simons, O25136.
×Paul Alexander Simpson, O25369.
×Beverly Norton Skardon, O33939.
×William George Skinner, Jr., O53044.
×Paul George Skowronek, O.
×Nicholas Edward Sloan, O33117.
×William Neville Sloan, Jr., O24235.
×Albert Hamman Smith, Jr., O34044.
×Allen Thomas Smith, O34320.
×Bradford Lee Smith, O25086.
×Bradish Johnson Smith, O24049.
×Carroll Brice Smith, O45178.
×Cecil Leo Smith, O23751.
×Edwin Kennedy Smith, Jr., O45463.
×Fletcher Smith, O44638.
×Harry Marvin Smith, O34041.
×Herbert Anderson Smith, Jr., O34081.
×Herman Roscoe Smith, Jr., O33922.
×Jack Lewis Smith, O33515.
×Walter Sayle Smith, O33424.
Willard Adelbert Smith, O34637.
×Stanley Michael Smolensky, O25333.
×J. T. Smyrl, O33732.
×Elbridge Lee Snapp, O24622.
×Robert Ellis Snetzer, O35458.
×Cecil Calvert Snoddy, Jr., O34690.
×James Max Snyder, O25036.
×Llewellyn Sobke, O33529.
×Charles William Spann, O34695.
×John Carl Sparrow, O24155.
×Robert John Speaks, O34196.
×Joachim Joseph Speciale, O45946.
×Houck Spencer, O34719.
×Thomas Furman Spencer, O24559.
×Roger Willard Spigelmoyer, O52903.
×Benjamin Alvord Spiller, O24023.
×James Ray Spurrier, O25273.
×Albert Clark Standish, O39066.
×Frederick Clinton Stanford, O23812.
×Marvin Nagel Stanford, O35182.
×Arthur Wilson Starkey, O25126.
×William Frank Starr, O23843.
×Woodrow John Steichen, O34392.
×William Henry Stein, O33837.
×Herbert Irving Stern, O23957.
×Claude Hathaway Stewart, O33441.
×Lee L. Stewart, O34184.
×Neil Geiger Stewart, O33670.
×Thomas Hill Stewart, 3d, O35205.
×James William Stigers, O23767.
×Richard Joseph Stillman, O25038.
×Frank Henry Stone, O24397.
×Robert Clark Storey, O24433.
×Morris Cowan Stout, O24166.
×James William Strain, O23719.
×Jack Bowden Street, O34272.
×Zebulon LaFayette Strickland, Jr., O24176.
×Michael Joseph Strok, O52838.
×John Levant Strong, O34088.
×Tom Billie Strother, O24429.
×Robert Wesley Strunk, O40581.
×Parker Osborne Stuart, O25055.
×Hugh Porter Stubbs, Jr., O24530.
×John Lawrence Sullivan, Jr., O25299.
×Martin Fannon Sullivan, O25332.
×William Gerald Sullivan, O39097.
×James William Sutherland, Jr., O24202.
×Francis Patrick Sweeney, O34485.
×Robert Louis Sweeney, Jr., O24494.
×James Rayford Sykes, O24046.
×Darrel Leon Syron, O25034.
×Joseph Szabo O24480.
×Jack Shannon Tabb, O33721.
×Robert Clinton Taber, O25270.
Orwin Clark Talbott, O24617.
×Peter Schuyler Tanous, O24067.
×Patrick Henry Tansey, Jr., O23915.

×Robert Mack Tarbox, O23715.
×Claude Edwin Taylor, O45316.
×George Ira Taylor, O24209.
×Lewis Clark Taynton, O34007.
×William Teir, O40701.
×Charles Edward Tennesson, Jr., O24190.
×Cader Cothren Terrell, O34555.
×Joseph Stuart Terrell, Jr. O53118.
×Leo Victor Thieme, O33561.
×Arnold Ray Thomas, O23947.
×Frederic Calvin Thompson, O35255.
×John Rhodes Thompson, O25047.
×Lowell Edgar Thompson, O25252.
×Harry Kelly Thompson, O24207.
×Walton Orville Threadgill, O25215.
×James Hubert Tirey, O33464.
×Nelson Whitney Tobey, O33778.
×Albert Alexander Todd, O33878.
×Ralph Leon Todd, O33696.
×Walter Blakely Todd, O25051.
×Edward Madison Tolliver, O33856.
×Oscar Charles Tonetti, O23864.
×Jacob Heffner Towers, O23883.
×Floyd Wayne Townsley, O33953.
×John Pershing Traylor, O25060.
×Lewis Lee Treadwell, O53121.
×Austin Triplett, Jr., O34030.
×Malcolm Graham Troup, O23862.
×William Robert Tuck, O24444.
×Henry Price Tucker, O24232.
×Leonard Carlton Turner, O33952.
×Max Campbell Tyler, O23809.
×Layton Carlos Tyner, O33640.
×Gordon Francis Tyrrell, Jr., O25102.
×Conrad Rudolph Underdahl, O33523.
×James Francis Unger, O34056.
×Jess Paul Unger, O23706.
×Ralph Reed Upton, O24063.
×Peter Leon Urban, O24163.
×Joy Kaufman Vallery, O34241.
×John Webb VanHoy, Jr., O23739.
×Ronald William Van Orne, O40725.
×Leo Donnell Van de Voort, O39071.
×Jay Dee Vanderpool, O34570.
×Ralph Emerson Vandervort, Jr., O25337.
×William John Dooley Vaughan, O23978.
×Richard Hull Verheul, O25039.
×Harold Frederick Via, O34635.
×James Bernard Via, O25121.
×Dale Leon Vincent, O33948.
×Anthony Joseph Vinci, O45029.
×George Brent Vivian, O25272.
×John Francis Vogel, O33585.
×Herman Martin Volheim, O24593.
×Robert Emmett Vollendorff, O34398.
×Dick Stanley Von Schrilitz, O23944.
×Guysbert Bogart Vroom, Jr., O46019.
×Archie Stanley Walker, O52915.
×Lawrence Harland Walker, Jr., O34243.
×Norvell McVeigh Walker, O34375.
×Thomas Gaspard Wall, O33023.
×Victor Manson Wallace, O53124.
×Edward Eugene Walters, O33710.
×Warren Earl Walters, O24200.
×Hugh Everett Wandel, O45160.
×Donald Robertson Ward, O33646.
×Linus Patrick Ward, O53191.
×William Donald Ward, O24208
×Stanley Arthur Warren, O45337.
×William Rhinehart Washington, O34042.
×Edwin Joseph Waszak, O35415.
×Thomas Eugene Watson, Jr., O24283.
×Edgar Sleadd Waugh, O33439.
×Charles Allen Webb, Jr., O40585.
×Charles Copenhaver Webb, O40620.
×William Edwin Webb, O34092.
×Milton Jacob Weber, Jr., O53319.
×William Thomas Webster, O33858.
×Gene Richard Welch, O24409.
×Lamar Asbury Welch, O24391.
×Edward Nicholas Wellems, O24484.
×George Hollenback Welles, O24086.
×Robert Blaine Wells, O24275.
×William Lewis Wells, O33641.
×Robert James Welsh, O25096.
×Hugh Merton Wendle, O33764.
×Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., O25269.
×George Cowles West, Jr., O45153.
×Roland Paul West, O34208.
×Henry Dale Weston, O25186.
×Lewis Gillette Wetherell, O45147.
×Frederick Carlton Weyand, O33736.
×Reuben Eugene Wheelis, O24184.
×Russell Earl Whetstone, O53212.
×Ernest Jeunet Whitaker, O23793.
×Hoyt Edward White, O33889.
×Stanley Wilbert White, O35250.
×Theodore Knox White,O24102.
×Joseph William Albert Whitehorne, 3d, O25277.
×Menon Walker Whitsitt, O31384.
×Thomas Coke Whitworth, Jr., O35231.
×Edward Woodrow Wild, O39142.
×Albert Cropper Williams O33974.
×Floyd David Williams, O39139.
×John Worth Williams, O34107.
×Trevett Williams, O52845.
×William Jones Williams, O24394.
×Ellis Warner Williamson, O34484.
×Joseph Michael Williamson, O24476.
×Eugene Allen Wilson, O33818.
×Leroy Buckman Wilson, O25106.
×Jerry Marion Wimberley, O25049.
×Wayne Moser Winder, O34420.
×Henry Wallace Witcover, O45522.
×Emitt Cleveland Witt, Jr., O34027.
×Richard Casper Wittmann, O25195.
×Walter Kazmir Wojcik, O33802.
×Edgar Charles Wood, O34051.
×Harland Glen Wood, O24154.
×Jean Lindley Wood, O34660.
×Robert Lawrence Woodard, O34031.
×David Hall Woods, O25101.
×Paul Marshall Woods, O25071.
×William Hunter Woodward, O23900.
×Walter James Woolwine, O23795.
×William Barker Wootton, Jr., O24261.
×James Franklin Wright, Jr., O40580.
×William John Yamber, O40656.
×Elmer Parker Yates, O23686.
×Dorin Warrington Yoder, O34664.
×Dantes Alto York, O45549.
×Jerome Bailey York, O25327.
×John Pearce Youens, O40605.
×Melvin Zais, O33471.
×Edward Benedict Zarembo, O24094.
×Glenn Walburn Zarger, O45568.
×Robert Harrison Zimmerman, O24481.
×Karl Heinrich Zornig, O25089.
×John Henry Zott, Jr., O24048.

To be majors, Judge Advocate General's Corps

William George Barry, O40452.
Thomas Henry Birch, O32696.
×Hayden John Price, O39013.
John Frank Taylor, O44143.

To be majors, Chaplains

×Herman Dicker, O43154.
×Ned Ralston Graves, O43164.
×Maurice Leo Sullivan, O43165.
×George Washington Williams, O52004.
×Aloysius Clarence Zielinski, O43162.

To be majors, Medical Corps

×Theodore Lawrence Bartelmez, O52051.
×John Lindsey Bradley, O56869.
×Louis Eugene Browning, O56875.
×Ralph Rymal Chapman, O43217.
×Shepard Jerome, O31241.
×Arthur Jerome Levens, O31283.
×George William Martin, O43210.
×Robert Vincent McAllister, O52044.
×Eddy Davis Palmer, O43224.
×Alton Ben Peyton, O52038.
×Adolphe Joseph Schoepflin, O43207.
×Gilbert Bradshaw Stansell, O43215.
×David Kuykendall Worgan, O52043.

To be majors, Dental Corps

×George Blanchard, O31269.
×Louis Emory, O31274.
×John Raleigh Frost, O56870.
×Martin Lester Segal, O31273.
×Richard William Tiecke, O43214.

To be majors, Veterinary Corps

×Ralph Owen Anslow, O31093.
×Clinton Leslie Gould, O40116.
×Wiley Henry Horn, O31078.
×Robert Loomis Jimison, O31097.
×Joseph David Manges, O31055.
×Harry John Robertson, O23683.
×Harvey Louis Rubin, O52006.
×Edwin Joseph Sunderville, O23335.
×Charles William Tate, O31050.

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

×William Lee Austin, O37403.
×Roy Irving Barham, O37396.
×Donald Harry Behrens, O37400.
×Eugene Tulie Brown, O37398.
×Layton Ogan Burris, O37413.
×Raymond Joseph Caldbeck, O41130.
×Francis Oberlin Chapelle, O37399.
×Wilford Paulard Helsel, O37391.
×Thomas Laughlin, Jr., O37414.
×Albert Leibovitz, O37407.
×Edgar William Leonard, O37390.
×Paul Maurice Levesque, O37415.
×Thomas Richard MacMillan, O37411.
×Anthony Charles Mastrolia, O43244.
×John Darval Medwed, O37410.
×John Valentine Mendenhall, O37416.
×Richard Lee Offutt, O40140.
×Morris Vincent Olson, O39327.
×Herbert George Richek, O40139.
×William Herbert Thornton, O37394.
×Glen Branch Wagnon, O56201.
×Arthur Leonard Wilkins, O37438.
×Martin Zachar, Jr., O37388.

To be captains

×Joseph John Addison, O50704.
Richard Herman Allen, O50603.
×Merlin Willard Anderson, O50584.
Walter Thomas Austin, O50572.
×Robert Jacob Baer, O50684.
×James Chadwick Bales, O56989.
Harry Polk Ball, O50672.
×Hugh James Bartley, O50621.
Calvin Leland Bass, O50761.
×Roger Redmond Bate, O50583.
Arthur Andrew Becker, O50591.
×Thomas Edward Benson, O50691.
×Thedore Chester Bielicki, O50625.
×Shelton Brant Biles, Jr., O50598.
George Earl Bland, O50821.
Junius Jay Bleiman, O50581.
Frank Coulter Boerger, O50579.
×Philip Thomas Boerger, O50618.
Otis Evan Brannon, Jr., O50783.
William Donald Brown, O50828.
×Jean Prosper Burner, O50722.
×Donovan Finley Burton, O50622.
James Lee Bushnell, O50697.
×Paul Charles Callan, O50833.
×William Albert Carpenter, Jr., O50818.
×Willis Howell Clark, O50686.
×William Fortune Coghill, O50753.
×Clarence Grady Collins, Jr., O56988.
William Edmond Conger, Jr., O50858.
William Lamble Cooper, O50866.
×James Christopher Cosgrove, O50763.
×William Bernard Cronin, O50787.
Bruce Utiger Crozier, O50885.
×John Edward Culin, O50654.
Robert Thornton Curtis, O50634.
×Kenneth Eugene Davidson, O50569.
Bernard Figueredo de Gil, Jr., O50794.
×John Delistraty, O50706.
Donald Marvin Dexter, Jr., O50834.
×Jack Van Dunham, O50668.
Richard Earl Dunlap, O50719.
×Gordon James Duquemin, O50784.
×James Eugene Edington, O50734.
×James Betts Egger, O50595.
×Henry Everett Emerson, O50868.
Robert Bruce Fahs, O50824.
×John Carter Faith, O50590.
×John Raymond Fitzpatrick, Jr., O50883.
×Stuart Gregory Force, O50769.
James Franklin Fraser, O50589.
John Griffin Gaddie, O50710.
×Edward Charles Ganz, Jr., O50570.
×Bernard Jay Gardner, O50679.
Albert John Geraci, O50786.
×John Love Gerrity, O50648.
×William Milton Glasgow, Jr., O56771.
×Warren Robert Gossett, O50676.
×William Douglas Grant, O50716.
Bernard Michael Greenberg, O50602.
Harold Walter Grossman, O50677.
×Alexander Meigs Haig, Jr., O50790.
×Raymond Richard Hails, Jr., O50641.
×Robert Haldane, O50742.
Milton Leland Haskin, O50637.
×Kenneth Martin Hatch, O50640.
×Wayne Otis Hauck, Jr., O50807.

George LeRoy Haugen, O50643.
Thomas Francis Hayes, O50800.
×Rolland Valentine Heiser, O50738.
×George Duane Heisser, O50805.
William Sylvester Henry, Jr., O50814.
×Dandridge Featherston Hering, O50696.
×Henry William Hill, O50755.
Ray Roselle Hoke, O50886.
×Thomas Dixon Holladay, Jr., O50571.
×Bennet Norman Hollander, O50693.
John Elwood Hoover, O50620.
Richard Motley Hutchinson, Jr., O50622.
Julius Frederick Ickler, O50667.
Carroll Christian Jacobson, Jr., O50612.
×James Allen Johnson, O50638.
×Wilbur Glenn Jones, Jr., O50863.
×Peter Karter, O50592.
×James Byron Kennedy, O50607.
×Robert James Kennedy, O50610.
Graham Gunther Kent, O50850.
Robert Adair King, O50797.
×Willis Hickam Knipe, O50829.
Robert Joshua Koch, O50874.
×Donald Warren Krause, O50872.
×Robert Peter Lane, O50705.
×Wells Brendel Lange, O50767.
John William Lauterbach, Jr., O50727.
Melvin Vernon LeBlanc, O50690.
×Alexander Lemberes, O50754.
×George Levenback, O50689.
Selby Francis Little, Jr., O50860.
Richard Alan Littlestone, O50653.
×Walter Patrick Lukens, O50801.
George Anthony Lynn, O50593.
×Henry Tomlinson MacGill, O50808.
Arnold William Mahlum, O50751.
×Robert Anthony Mahowald, O50796.
×Charles Stuart Todd Mallett, O50819.
×George Aloysius Maloney, O50862.
×John Wayne Mastin, O50582.
James Philip Mattern, O50713.
Richard Freeman McAdoo, O50609.
×Marshall Dickerson McClure, O50767.
Robert Ewing McCord, O50803.
×John Warwick McCullough, Jr., O50867.
×William Gabriel McGee, O50855.
×Robert James McNeil, O50756.
Harrison Franklyn Meadows, 3d, O50639.
×John More Miller, O50692.
Robert Miller Montague, Jr., O50578.
×James Lunsford Morrison, Jr., O50881.
×Charles Augustus Munford, Jr., O50838.
John DuBose Naill, Jr., O50818.
×William Wallace Nairn 3d, O50720.
Wallace Eugene Nickel, O50695.
×Robert Lynn Ozier, O50768.
×Henry Cantzon Paul O50725.
John Guilford Paules O50681.
×Robert DeWayne Peckham, O50740.
×Tom Judson Perkins, O50781.
×Milum Davis Perry, Jr., O50594.
×Louis Rachmeler, O50666.
Edward Lewis Ramsey, O37688.
John Richard Rantz, O50836.
Kermit Dean Reel, O50682.
×Hal Clyde Richardson, Jr., O50662.
James Russell Robinson, Jr., O50598.
Thomas Edmund Rogers, O50785.
Melvin Alfred Rosen, O50580.
×Norman Robert Rosen, O50600.
×Carl Kamp Russell, O50777.
Norman Junior Salisbury, O50802.
Howard Leroy Sargent, Jr., O50586.
×Donald Verner Schnepf, O50698.
×William Jackson Schuder, O50611.
Richard Henry Sforzini, O50624.
Robert Warren Short, O50871.
×Clarke Lewis Shumaker, Jr., O50568.
James Emerson Smith, Jr., O50798.
×William Smith, O50717.
Ira Warren Snyder, Jr., O50759.
Theodore Solomon Spiker, O50774.
×Sam David Starobin, O50601.
Richard Joseph Steinborn, O50616.
×Donald Harry Steininger, O50599.
×Marvin Henry Stock, O50633.
×John Joseph Sullivan, O50627.
William Michael Sullivan, O50750.
Allan Thorndyke Sylvester 3d, O50682.
×James Bernard Tatum, O50646.
Harold Stan Tavzel, O50780.
×Frank Leonard Taylor, O50730.
Jack Mathew Thompson, O50608.
×Gerald Ross Toomer, O50707.
×Albert Archer Van Petten, O50674.
Wallace Francis Veaudry, O50820.
×William Loyd Webb, Jr., O50652.
×Carlton Juan Wellborn, Jr., O50665.
×William Irvine West, O50732.
×Meade David Wildrick, Jr., O50827.
VanCourt Wilkins, O56766.
Joseph John Williams, O50810.
×William Dawes Williams, Jr., O50877.
Planter Madden Wilson, O50884.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Warren Coleman Casey, O63233.
Cecil LeRoy Cutler, Jr., O67913.
Dwan Vincent Kerig, O66172.
×John Charles Kinney, O63277.
John Allen Lighthall, O63739.
Carl Robert Nolte, Jr., O63278.
×George Robert Robinson, O65542.
×Robert Miller Thornley, O63802.
Sidney Joseph Walker, O63484.
×Kenneth Leslie Youngblood, O65543.

To be captains, Chaplains

James Murray Bragan, O66610.
Allen Cleveland Edens, Jr., O67567.
Frank Carroll Riley, O66196.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Asdrubal Arzola, O67785.
Robert John Ayella, O63799.
John Littler Babb, O64964.
Timothy George Barila, O64939.
Anthony Albert Boraki, O65443.
William Albert Boyson, O64967.
Otis Eugene Bridgeford, O65450.
Paul Woodrow Brown, O64946.
Robert Jean Carson, O62988.
Edwin Theodore Cooke, O63674.
Michael Paul Dacquisto, O63789.
John Raymond Daniels, O65460.
Claude William Delia, O64952.
×Francis Christopher Dimond, Jr., O65683.
Charles Curry Eaves, O65577.
Eugene William Eberlin, O67813.
Thomas Stoneham Edwards, O64979.
James Ardric Ewart, O65449.
Murray Eugene Finn, O65578.
Arthur Eugene Grant, O64960.
Norman Leslie Grant, O64943.
Rufus Roberts Harnbright, O64953.
Richard Daniel Hamilton, O65681.
Boaz Harris, O63791.
Robert Haviland Holzworth, O66636.
Alan Roswell Hopeman, O65455.
Heber Scott Hudson, O65446.
Francis Homer Hughes, Jr., O64937.
Robert Edward Kellenberger, O64962.
Lloyd Kitchen, O65466.
Mortimer Valentine Kleinmann, Jr., O64975.
Per Harold Langsjoen, O64949.
Donald Gray McLeod, Jr., O65445.
Edwin Allen Meeks, O64963.
Joseph Francis Metzger, O64940.
×Harold William Mueller, O65451.
×Jack R. Muth, O64944.
Matthew Denwood Parrish, O65447.
James Kenneth Pope, O64941.
×Jack Donnidson Reedy, O65456.
×Arnold Michael Reeve, O65453.
Stephan Norbert Schanzer, O65465.
Halbert Herman Schwamb, O67954.
James Luhn Sheehy, O64977.
×Paul Winston Sheffler, O65459.
Henry Kurt Silberman, O66099.
John Rogers Simmons, O64972.
Daniel Easton Stalker, O64959.
Grant Duane Stelter, O68052.
Michael Huntingdon Sulak, O64951.
Walter Edwin Switzer, O65442.
James Clark Syner, O65462.
Clarence Lee Tunberg, O65680.
Lewis Allan Van Osdel, O65467.
William Roy Vineyard, O64954.
Frederick Edward Vultee, Jr., O64973.
×Lloyd Thomas Wright, O65457.
Henry Thomas Zelechosky, O65444.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Cecil Raymond Albright, O63726.
Benjamin Kenneth Ammenwerth, O61963.
Joseph John Barone, O63732.
Joe Dudley Bell, O63458.
Russell William Bickley, O65474.
James Edward Cassidy, O67555.
×John Clarkson, O61962.
Robert Ivey Cochran, O64984.
James Claude Conway, O63795.
Robert Michael Coyne, O63483.
Richard Ernest Dierking, O63728.
Harold Seymour Elliott, O64983.
Willard Grenlee Fischer, O65583.
Darwin Forbes Fuller, Jr., O64982.
George Edward Fuller, Jr., O63839.
Glen Stanley Gamble, O62994.
Eugene Anthony Garcia, O65473.
×Richard Milton Hall, O63838.
×John Jewell Hamrick, O63792.
Carlos Bruce Harmon, O60782.
Ross Hawthorne Hill, O63797.
Billy Clasby Hopkins, O63480.
Ernest Luther Hunter, O67583.
Algene George Jordan, O63790.
Harold Herman Kelsey, O63837.
William Thomas Lee, O61079.
Robert Warren Little, O65471.
Ralph Burdette Lydic, O65469.
Robert Boris Mattes, O61080.
×John Joseph Mayer, O68028.
Robert Paul Moss, Jr., O67596.
Joseph Patrick O'Leary, O63675.
Thomas O'Sullivan, O65470.
Thomas Edwin Perry, O63224.
Harry Bruce Philp, O64978.
James Jarratt Pryor, Jr., O64981.
Harry Quint, Jr., O63481.
×John Lawson Robertson, O66086.
Corliss James Roll, O66087.
Leon Carter Rudy, O63729.
Earl Edward Schoeppner, O62800.
Andrew Fidre Serio, O62799.
×Willard Fred Spiller, Jr., O63459.
Robert Christley Sproull, O66104.
Robert Bruce Steiner, O64980.
Richard Eugene Swisher, O62995.
Charles Carson Trommer, O65582.
Charles Edward Turner, O67629.
Nathan Ellis Vanaman, O62996.
Robert Fallis Van Dyk, O63796.
Herluf Wanggaard, O63482.
Brente Leslie Ward, O63794.
Warren Ned Wheeler, O63176.
Virgil Woods, O63730.
Richard McConnell Wray, O66127.
×Henry Larkin Wright, O63798.
Robert Dale Youmans, O65581.

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

William Ashton Bridenstine, O63225.
×Charles Vleman Lyday, O65534.
Walter Wayne Miller, O65541.
Gabriel Nossov, O63223.
Bruce Steward Ott, O66064.
Gus Antonio Vaninetti, O65535.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Earl Joseph Janda, O66027.
Walter Joseph Limbacher, O67934.
George Edward Rowland, O66637.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

Peter Anthony Abbruzzese, O62553.
×Paul Smith Ache, Jr., O62425.
Dwight Lyman Adams, O62649.
×Walter Edwin Adams, O62528.
Irving Jackson Aden, Jr., O67635.
×John Terry Alexander, O61609.
×Abraham Noble Allan, O62440.
×John Wesley Allen, Jr., O62698.
Bernard Joseph Alley, O61916.
×Charles Norman Allgood, O61488.
Bernard John Ambrose, O61273.
Charles Henry Anderson, Jr., O61616.
×Charles Leroy Anderson, O63011.
×James Russell Anderson, O67638.
Charles Robert Armstrong, O61601.

George Henry Arnold, O61283.
Ned Ramon Ash, O62072.
×Orazio John Astarita, O61368.
×John David Attaway, O61872.
×Luther Bachman Auil 3d, O62428.
×Thomas Adam Austin 3d O62548.
Walter Otis Bachus, O61582.
×James Edward Bagley, O61619.
Charles Francis Baish, Jr., O62411.
×Joaquin Balaguer-Rivera, O61367.
×George Lawson Ball, O62485.
×Thomas Henry Ball, O62737.
×Grady Huger Banister, Jr., O62420.
×Phillip George Bardos, O62686.
×Cyrus Phillip Barger, O62635.
×Arthur Carlton Barker, Jr., O62513.
×James Cross Barnes, Jr., O62704.
John Anton Barnet, Jr., O62597.
×Raymond Ney Barry, O62617.
×Thomas Martin Barry, Jr., O62364.
×Boyd Truman Bashore, O62552.
Richard George Bastar, Jr., O62431.
William Joshua Baxley, Jr., O62583.
×Cecil Roy Edward Baxter, O63076.
Gilbert Merchant Beatty, O61844.
Raymond Hugh Beaty, O63079.
×Robert Bryce Beaumont, O61464.
×Jack Midford Becker, O65317.
×David Allen Beckner, O61634.
×John Leo Begley, O62777.
×Robert Eugene Belford, O61411.
×Charles Edward Bell, Jr., O62708.
×Charles Hoey Bell, O62689.
×Donald Joseph Benson, O63077.
Esai Berenbaum, O61442.
Richard Hale Bergstrom, O67645.
×Lyle Clarence Berner, O61379.
Elbert Devore Holland Berry, O62361.
×Howard Conway Berry, O62858.
William Thomas Berry, O61537.
×William Stanley Bice, O63025.
×Donald Gerald Bickmore, O61571.
Jack Daris Billingsley, O61591.
×Harry Souder Bingham, O61771.
Elmer Lawrence Birk, O62305.
×Lorne Summers Black, O61562.
×William Conant Black 3d, O61700.
×Arthur Hadfield Blair, O62349.
×Howard Byron Blanchard, Jr., O62764.
Harold Louis Blank, O62472.
×William Herbert Bloss, Jr., O62767.
×John Bruce Blount, O61705.
×Howard Jerome Blumhardt, O61838.
Donald Lee Bohn, O62611.
×Donald Earl Bohnett, O61672.
×Lucien Eugene Bolduc, Jr., O62359.
Carl David Bolson, O61587.
×Philip Lawrence Bolte, O62407.
James Franklin Boylan, O62331.
William McRae Bradley, O63026.
×Egbert Leo Brady, Jr., O62716.
×William Frederick Brandes, O62290.
×Thomas Oliver Brandon 2d, O62560.
×William Francis Branigan, O61381.
×Albert Gustav Breitwieser, O62544.
×Walter Ivan Brent, O61446.
×David Cullen Briggs, O62297.
John Richmond Brinkerhoff, O62287.
×Harry James Brockman, O61640.
John Philip Broderick, O67649.
×James Logan Brown, O61886.
Robert Liudahl Brown, O61272.
Vance Saunders Brown, Jr., O62429.
×Joseph Peter Buccolo, O62648.
×Charles John Buchanan, O63197.
×William Jack Buchanan, O61439.
×Garrett Davis Buckner, Jr., O62679.
×Wiley Lamar Bullard, O61638.
×Robert Emmett Bundy, O61630.
Dudley Taylor Bunn, O61902.
Emanuel Burack, O61905.
×Elwood Walter Burkhardt, O61418.
George Thompson Burnop, O63010.
Robert Frank Burt, O61530.
×Howard Dell Burtchett, O62055.
×Charles Clement Bush 3d, O62103.
Charles Lewis Butler, O62568.
×Lawrence Elbert Butler, O67650.
×Andy Joe Byers, O62436.
×James Webster Byrd, O61913.
×David Herdman Cameron, O62296.
Stephen Francis Cameron, O62328.
×Edward William Cannon, O67651.
Louis Sam Caras, O61827.
David Kay Carlisle, O62321.
Leonard Julius Carlson, Jr., O61821.
×Thomas West Carr, O61918.
×Joe Trujillo Carrejo, O61481.
×Edd McLendon Carter, O63132.
×Richard Lewis Cary, O61389.
×Robert Griffin Chamberlain, O61354.
Robert Middleton Chambers, O62660.
Malcolm Wright Chandler, Jr., O62618.
Herschel Eugene Chapman, O62471.
×Lee Joseph Chegin, O61890.
×Robert Arnold Cheney, O62692.
×Charles Norvall Childers, O61646.
×Grover Cleveland Childers, O67654.
×John Chalton Childers, Jr., O67655.
×Donald Chirafisi, O61409.
×James John Clark, Jr., O61766.
Ralph Tracy Clark, O61541.
Raymond Gordon Clarke, Jr., O67657.
×Paul George Clarke, Jr., O61750.
×Paul Edwin Coakley, O62863.
×Jimmy Coffey, O67658.
×Jacque Dexter Cohen, O61780.
×Joseph Edward Collins, O61909.
×Roland Hildreth Collins, O63122.
×Thomas Joseph Collins, Jr., O63135.
×Lester Leon Collis, O61523.
Keith Gale Comstock, O61376.
×Edward Robert Conway, O67659.
Claude Wesley Cooper, O61542.
×William Thomas Cooper, O63144.
×Florian Octave Cornay, O62493.
Leonard John Corsentino, O61461.
×Rudolph Vincent Cosentino, O62636.
×John Covach, O61893.
×John Ellwood Cowden, O61606.
×Carlisle Barksdale Cox, Jr., O67661.
×Charles Percy Cox, O62877.
×Joice Oren Cox, Jr., O67662.
×Malcolm Robert Cox, Jr., O62690.
×Harry Michael Coyle, O62309.
×Clayton Craft, O61394.
×John Marshall Cragin, O62412.
×Raymond Alphonso Cramer, Jr., O63138.
×Albert Benjamin Crawford, Jr., O62295.
×Donald Phillip Creuziger, O62386.
Harry Clinton Crews, Jr., O61871.
×William Earl Crist, Jr., O62444.
×Dale Jackson Crittenberger, O62432.
Edward Painter Crockett, O62497.
Clifford Earl Cross, O67663.
×Edward Lloyd Culbertson, O62886.
Victor Nicholas Cuneo, Jr., O62674.
×Charles Carroll Cunningham, O62599.
×James Alvin Curtis, O62624.
×James Washington Curtis, Jr., O67665.
×John Norman Dale, O61501.
William Michael Daly, O61825.
Lloyd Eugene Darland, O62474.
×Kenneth Ray Darrington, O62876.
×William Edward Dasch, O63027.
×John Cofer Dashiell, O63093.
×William Lester Daugherty, O62546.
×Carroll Clifford Davis, O63080.
David Hiram Davis, O61765.
L. Conrad Davis, O61848.
Reed Ellsworth Davis, Jr., O62623.
William Daniel Davis, O62621.
×Harvey Carter Day, Jr., O61433.
William Bradford DeGraf, O62282.
×Alfred Jean deLorimier, O63183.
×Ralph Hoyt Detherow, O62666.
×William Lester deVane, O61887.
Charles Frederick Dickerson, Jr., O62589.
×August John Dielens, Jr., O62563.
×Daniel Harvey Dietrich, Jr., O67669.
John Emilio DiGrazia, Jr., O62602.
×Louis Frederick Dixon, O62473.
Harry Eugene Dodge, O62653.
Pierre John Dolan, O61814.
×Philbert Cosmas Dolenc, O61304.
Thomas Riley Dolenz, O63120.
×Phillip Henry Donahue, O62441.
×James Clayburn Donovan, O62401.
×J. T. Dotson, O61678.
×Mark Histand Doty, Jr., O61519.
×Claude Holt Doughtie, Jr., O62535.
John Julian Douglas, O62080.
Robert James Douglas, O61990.
×Robert Wilkins Douglass, 3d, O62507.
×Ray Michael Dowe, Jr., O62650.
Thomas Watson Downes, Jr., O61432.
Neil Bertrand Downey, O61717.
×Thomas Francis Dreisonstok, O62682.
×James Curtis Drewry, Jr., O62447.
×Carl Walter Dreyer, O61366.
×Grover Adolphe DuBose, O61812.
×Samuel Scarborough Dugan, O63196.
Frank Hall Duggins, Jr., O62629.
×John Louis Dumas, O67670.
James Edward Dunley, O61503.
×James Frank Dunn, O62771.
Jay Bernard Durst, O62311.
×Roy Woodson Easley, Jr., O62631.
Robert Wayne Eastman, O62413.
×Kenneth Rohn Ebner, O62505.
Robert Charles Edwards, O62613.
Lauris Martin Eek, Jr., O62482.
×Edward Henry Effertz, O61413.
×Ira Robert Ehrlich, O62352.
×William Newsome Eichorn, 2d, O62702.
×Charles William Elliot, O62727.
×Jack Elliot, Jr., O61919.
×Joe Flint Elliott, O62454.
×Robert Wayne Elliott, O65318.
×David Maxwell Ellis, O67672.
×Earl Emmons, O67673.
George Houston Ensley, O61667.
×Angel Escribano-Aponte, O67674.
×Charles Ozro Eshelman, O62283.
×Thomas Bruce Eustis, O61597.
×Richard Cooper Ewan, Jr., O62342.
Donal Aloysius Fahey, O62427.
×John Leonard Fahs, Jr., O62422.
×John William Fahy, O62754.
×Raymond Leroy Farmer, O61668.
×Peter Buck Farrell, O62580.
×Salvatore Edward Fastuca, O62699.
×Victor Reinhold Fejcht, O61686.
×Robert Bruce Ferguson, O62366.
Albert John Fern, Jr., O62525.
×James Hoover Fette, O62715.
Darrel Rex Fields, O62862.
Thomas Wilfred Fife, Jr., O62388.
×George Clark Fifield, O62667.
×Herbert Alcus Fincher, O61353.
×Philip Dudley Fischer, O62683.
Emil Fisher, Jr., O61759.
×William Thrower Fitts 3d, O62652.
×Tyler Herrick Fletcher, O61884.
Allan Sarsfield Flynn, O62576.
×John Charles Fogarty, O62662.
James Frank Fooshe 3d, O62688.
×Dennis Luther Forbes, O67677.
×Charles Dewey Ford, Jr., O61760.
×George Everett Foster, O62353.
×Daniel O'Guynn Fox, O63205.
Douglas Ellwood Fox, O67678.
Edward Jay Fox, O62675.
John Edmond Fox, O62392.
×Herbert Louis Frandsen, O62083.
×Joseph Ross Franklin, O62893.
×John Aaron Fray, Jr., O62322.
×Lee Vernon Frazier, O63195.
×Edward Paul Freedman, O62384.
×Daniel William French, O67679.
×Harry Wallace French, O67680.
×Charles Douglas Friedlander, O62651.
×Edward Leonard Fronczak, O61833.
×George Rae Fullerton, O62329.
×Richard Stanley Fye, O62446.
John Robert Gaffney, O62467.
×Frank E. Gaillard, O62755.
Leonce Edward Gaiter, O61447.
Arnold Anthony Galiffa, O62741.
William George Gallivan, O61832.
×Richard Eugene Galvan, O61275.
×Joseph Anthony Gappa, Jr., O62520.
×Robert Gibbins Gard, Jr., O62355.
Leonard Joseph Garrett, O62408.
Charles Theodore Garrison, O63246.
×James Millard Garrison, Jr., O61635.
×Paul Lawrence Gaurnier, O61337.
William Keaveny Gearan, O62434.
Louis Vincent Genuario, O62696.
×Horace William George, Jr., O67681.
×Nicholas George, O63194.
×Richard Edward George, O61316.
Martin Gerber, O62859.
×Jerry Rodgers Germaine, O61641.
×Ross John Gibson, O61398.
George Asbury Gilbert, Jr., O61489.
×Henry Alfred Gilbert, O62656.
×William Shirley Gilliland, O67682.
Russell Alger Glenn, O62375.

×Joseph Glickel, O61900.
×William David Glover, O61673.
×Theo Harold Golding, O61466.
×John Walsh Goldsmith, O62709.
×Oved Gonzales, O62076.
×Paul Francis Gorman, O62379.
×Daniel Jerome Gormley, Jr., O61406.
×Arthur Joseph Gow, O67684.
×Edward John Gradoville, O62416.
×Charles Passmore Graham, O62354.
Willis Bascum Graham, O61873.
Robert William Green, O62371.
×William Andrew Green, Jr., O61456.
×Robert Allen Greenberg, O61458.
×James Francis Greer, O61922.
×Thomas Upton Greer, O62299.
×Kenneth Randolph Greider, O61677.
Alfred Lee Griebling, O62360.
Joseph Trundle Griffin, Jr., O62711.
×Samuel Ernest Griffiths, O61813.
×Frederick Hall Griswold, O61985.
Melvin Gussie Gross, O62044.
×Robert Marshall Grow, O62570.
×James Louis Guion, Jr., O62726.
×Robert Harold Gulley, O61435.
Paul Lawrence Gurnee, O62668.
Carrol Walter Guth, O67689.
×Frederic William Haberman, O62550.
John Richard Hall, Jr., O62452.
×Kenneth Walter Hall, O62680.
×John Samuel Hamel, O62509.
×Frederick Joseph Hamlin, Jr., O62301.
Lyman Hutchinson Hammond, Jr., O62489.
×Charles Wood Hanlon, O61349.
×Mark James Hanna, O62760.
Marcus Whitney Hansen, O61377.
×Ray Samuel Hansen, O62318.
×Louis Bernard Hansotte, O62664.
×Philip Harlan Harper, O62750.
×Norris Eugene Harrell, O62705.
×Rodney Parker Harrington, O63186.
×Brady Ray Harris, O61563.
×John Franklin Harris, O63184.
Leonard Henry Harris, O63127.
×Louis Alvin Harris, O61556.
×Richard Wright Harris, O62866.
John Sherman Harrold, O62759.
×Warren Edward Hatcher, O61356.
×Ernest Thomas Hayes, Jr., O62892.
×John Denison Hayes, O67694.
×John Grier Hayes, O66160.
Joseph William Hayes, Jr., O66012.
×Robert Thomas Hayes, O61338.
×Andrew Logan Haynes, O61644.
Charles Winthrop Hayward, O62495.
Franklin Karl Hazen, Jr., O61494.
×Falkner Heard, Jr., O62672.
×Je Mickey Helt, O61849.
×Billy Joye Henderson, O61819.
×Dwight Odin Henderson, O67697.
×James Michael Henderson, O61860.
×John Kiess Henderson, O61625.
×LeRoy Walter Henderson, O62292.
×John Raymond Hendry, O62317.
×Ralph George Henley, O61407.
×Raymon Duncan Henley, O63490.
William Ritter Henn, O62367.
Frank Andrew Henning 3d, O62582.
×Morris Joseph Herbert, Jr., O62424.
×Louis George Hergert, Jr., O62460.
×Robert Andrew Hetz, Jr., O62443.
×David Allan Hicks, O61868.
×James Edward Higgins, O62659.
×Sidney Rae Hinds, Jr., O62772.
×William Mullock Hinds, 3d, O62409.
×Irvin Stafford Hirsch, O62642.
Robert Criner Hodges, O62878.
×Clifford William Hodgkins, O61850.
×Wilford Joseph Hoff, Jr., O61794.
×Richard Gurney Hoffman, O62298.
×Frederick Dixon Hoham, 3d, O62530.
×Robert Henry Hoisington, O62587.
×Leslie Page Holcomb, Jr., O62761.
×Louis Laird Holder, O61558.
×John Michael Holko, Jr., O61284.
×Alfred Holston, O63240.
Hugh Carter Holt, O62554.
×Robert Bernard Hoppe, O61497.
×Clifton Andrew Horn, Jr., O61579.
×Bruce Kelly Houston, O61308.
×Francis Elliot Howard, Jr., O62745.
×John Darby Howard, O62639.
James Alfred Howden, O61471.
×William Smith Howe, Jr., O62330.
×James Grant Howell, O62565.
George Hale Hubbard, 2d, O62547.
×Norman Pailor Hubbard, O62763.
×Halvor Edward Hude, O68120.
×John Edward Hudson, O61350.
James Raymond Hufnagel, O62319.
×David Ralph Hughes, O62721.
Robert Burnett Hughes, O62307.
×Thomas Watkins L. Hughes, Jr., O62577.
Charles William Hulburt, O61331.
×Samuel Welters Hull, O61509.
×Richard Lee Hunt, O62357.
×Robert Griffith Hunt, O61340.
John Emory Hurst, Jr., O62310.
×Donald Ellsworth Hutcherson, Jr., O63241.
×Philo Allan Hutcheson, Jr., O62459.
×Robert Edward Ingalls, O61803.
×James Virgil Irons, O62644.
×Gordon Robert Irwin, O67700.
×John Francis Irwin, O62732.
×George Howard Isley, Jr., O61505.
Lawrence Winfield Jackley, O62568.
Marvin LaRue Jackson, O67701.
×Richard Harrison Jacobs, O63201.
×Gerhard Leonard Jacobson, O62456.
×John Rupert Jefferson, O67703.
×Allen Burke Jennings, O62365.
×John Rex Jennings, O62697.
×Richard Warren Jensen, O61675.
×Lorus Dall Jewkes, O61534.
×Elvind Herbert Johansen, O61615.
×Howard Oliver Johns, O62619.
Edward Lee Johnson, O61491.
×James Harry Johnson, O61923.
Malcolm Dayton Johnson, O62303.
Norman George Johnson, O63239.
×Ralph Russell Johnson, O68018.
×Richard Lee Johnson, O62487.
×William Elmer Johnson, Jr., O61473.
×Melvin Henry Johnsrud, O62426.
×James Albert Jolley, O61373.
×Briggs Howard Jones, O62693.
×Clarence Quentin Jones, Jr., O62746.
Clinton Donald Jones, O61352.
×John Griffin Jones, O62417.
×Mark Ellis Jones, O62681.
×William Robert Daniel Jones, O62596.
Kirk Abbott Jordan, O61622.
×Paul Melvin Jordan, O63125.
David Duncan Joy, O62685.
Arthur Ray Keeley, O61526.
×Morris John Keller, O61368.
×Robert Stevenson Keller, O61665.
×Gerald Patrick Kelley, O62383.
×Johnny Wilburn Kelley, O61904.
×William Harold Kellum, O62736.
×James Laflin Kelly, O62289.
Edwin Lyle Kennedy, O62590.
×James Edward Kennedy, Jr., O67708.
×Howard Everett Kessinger, Jr., O62541.
×Robert Frederick Kessler, O61807.
×Neal Bert Kindig, O62293.
Armand Mansfield King, O61767.
×David Bryant King 2d, O62633.
×Francis King, O62539.
×Ludie Elbert Kinney, Jr., O61628.
×Vincent Joseph Klaus, O67710.
Frank Smith Klein, O63130.
×George Denys Klie, O62527.
William Leonard Knapp, O62627.
×Glenn Warren Knauer, O62464.
×John Jacob Koehler, Jr., O62756.
×James Henry Koelling, O61758.
×Fred Kornet, Jr., O62854.
×Richard Louis Kramer, O62890.
×Roger Alderman Krause, O61692.
×Robert Stanley Kubby, O62325.
×Robert David Kubeja, O61559.
×Karl Otto Kuckhahn, O62634.
Donald McKay Laffoon, O61478.
×Clifford Vandarel Lambert, O62857.
William Ridgely Lamdin, O62529.
Lowell Henry Landre, O66035.
Philo Brendel Lange, Jr., O62562.
×Donald Richard Langren, O62484.
×William Melvin Larrabee, O61561.
×Donald William Larson, O61361.
×Stuart Hays Lassetter, O61521.
×Thomas Reigle Laube, O61297.
×Osborne Lawes, O62068.
×James Michael Leahy, O61278.
×George Emory Lear, O62374.
×Robert Paul Leary, O62406.
Burke Whitehurst Lee, O62294.
×Emmett Chambers Lee, Jr., O62341.
James Madison Lee, O62578.
×Richard English Lee, O68126.
×Stanton Klipper Lee, O65719.
Harvey Augustus Legate, Jr., O61642.
Robert Evan Legate, O61457.
Ralph McDonald Leighty, O61412.
Bruce Jean Leiser, O62770.
×Carl A. Leishman, O61599.
×Merrill Martin Lemke, O61396.
Robert Joseph Levitt, O61455.
×Richard Henry Lewandowski, O62594.
×Leonard Lamarr Lewane, O61744.
×Bennett Leonard Lewis, O62314.
John Lee Lillibridge, O61405.
James Henry Lilly, O61636.
×Roger Charles Lind, O62470.
William John Lindberg, O61855.
Samuel McCune Lindsay 2d, O61682.
Paul Costanzo Listro, O62526.
×Walter Edward Little, O67715.
×Charles Harvey Lively, O61403.
Gale Clare Livengood, O61659.
×Thomas James Lobe, O62747.
×Kilbert Emile Lockwood, O62430.
Lawrence Sherman Lodewick, O62339.
×George Stanley Lokken, O62087.
×Reginald Thomas Lombard, Jr., O62437.
William Eugene Long, O61748.
Robert William Looby, O61586.
Thomas Cameron Loper, O62395.
Keith Wilson Loucks, O62340.
×Melville John Lougheed, O62743.
×Roy Elton Lounsbury, O62438.
×Joseph Bland Love, O62492.
Lonnie Harrison Lumsden 3d, O62350.
James Thomas Lundy, O67719.
×Raymond Richard Lunger, O62469.
×Robert Joseph Lunn, O62475.
×James Edward Lynch, O62362.
×Jack Vincent Mackmull, O62677.
×Thomas Hershal Maddox, O61715.
Edward Stanley Maj, O61360.
×Raymond Maladowitz, O62586.
Ben Studdard Malcom, O63033.
×Peter Mallett, O62512.
Cloyce Leland Mangas, O62343.
×Wiley Mark Mangum, Jr., O62645.
Gardner Hammond Marchant, Jr., O61707.
×Charles Bradley Marion, O61756.
×Patrick Graham Markham, Jr., O61892.
×Martin Aldridge Markley, O63245.
×Jack Robert Marsh, O61422.
×Clark Charles Martin, O62663.
×Elmer Clark Martin, O61474.
George Mason, O61862.
Edward Francis James Mastaglio, O62604.
William Mastoris, Jr., O62521.
×Linwood Bertram Mather, O62449.
×Bernard Paul Matthey, Jr., O62723.
×Clarence James Matthiessen, O62523.
×John Christopher Maxwell, Jr., O62361.
×Ross Freeman Mayfield, Jr., O62575.
×John Milford Mays, O62005.
×Robert Dana McBride, O62735.
Thomas Elliott McBride, Jr., O62510.
×Robert Hays McCandlish, O62442.
×Alfred Bernard McCarthy, O67722.
John Edward McCleary, O62514.
×George A. McClellan, Jr., O63191.
×Robert Lewis McClure, O63200.
×Joe Edward McConnell, O67723.
×Joseph Matthew McCrane, Jr., O62654.
×Edmund McCullough, O61660.
×Dan Robert McDaniel, O62461.
×Paul Blaine McDaniel, O62463.
William Robert McDowell, O62391.
Andrew Jackson Briggs McFarland, Jr., O62776.
×Edgar Boyd McGee, O65319.
×Mark McGuire, O62593.
×Robert Clinton McKeen, O62864.
×John Tierney McKinney, O62655.
×James Edward McNiff, O61793.
Walter Clinton McSherry, O62404.
×William Herron Meanor, O61588.
×Charles Franklin Means, O62632.
Charles Robert Means, O61618.
×Billy Joe Mendheim, O61460.
×David Sutton Meredith 3d, O62591.

David Warren Mernan, O62414.
×Charles Robert Mesnier, O67725.
×Edward Harold Metzger, Jr., O61498.
×George Ralston Middleton, Jr., O62457.
William Henry Miehe, O62338.
Lloyd Ernst Mielenz, Jr., O62581.
×Paul Gordon Milbes, O61425.
Carmelo Placido Milia, O62462.
×George Alvin Millener, Jr., O61600.
×James Irwin Miller, O61426.
×John Elbridge Miller, O62671.
×Robert Lee Miller, Jr., O62502.
Wilfred Donald Miller, O62448.
×Glenn Wagers Million, O61307.
×James Reagan Mitcham, Jr., O62728.
×Howard Savage Mitchell, O62518.
Charles Berwin Modisett, O61448.
×David Maxwell Monihan, O62707.
×Henry Lee Montgomery, O67729
×Walter Hugh Moon, O63424.
John Joseph Morgan, Jr., O61912.
×George Thomas Morris, Jr., O62665.
×Robert Charles Morrison, O62555.
Billy Mack Morrow, O61387.
×Paul Joseph Motiska, Jr., O61300.
×Paul John Mueller, Jr., O62288.
×Clark Cameron Munroe, O61493.
John Michael Murphy, O62610.
×Kenneth Erwin Murphy, O62757.
×Harold George Nabhan, O62684.
×Pasquale Navarro, O62382.
×Nicholas Robinson Nave, Jr., O61907.
×William Henry Naylor, Jr., O63133.
Barney King Neal, Jr., O61735.
William Bert Neal, O61989.
×William Frederick Nelson, O62768.
Charles William Newcomb, O62405.
×Henry Carl Newell, O61564.
×Robert Norman Nicholson, O61414.
Fred Emmord Nickerson, O62453.
Phillip Elmer Nicolay, O62549.
×Leo Wesley Nielsen, O61551.
×James Miller Nold, O62626.
Wallace Hall Nutting, O62468.
Emmett James O'Brien, O61629.
×John Edward O'Brien, O62423.
×Robert Kevin O'Connell, O62327.
×Billy Lee Odneal, O62065.
Jose Emilio Olivares, Jr., O61620.
×George Sanders Oliver, O62336.
James Scott Oliver, O61416.
×William George O'Quinn, O62551.
×Michael Joseph O'Rourke, Jr., O61496.
×Stanley David Osborne, O62545.
×Charles Junior Osterndorf, O62358.
×Merrill Reisel Owen, O61499.
×Max F. Pachl, Jr., O62064.
×Paul Ramsden Palmer, O67734.
×William David Palmer, Jr., O61648.
×William White Palmer, O62494.
×Jean Charles Paquin, O67735.
×John Victor Parish, Jr., O62334.
×Patrick Ernest Parkes, O62061.
Howard Nixon Parks, O62607.
×Oliver Wolcott Parmly, O62501.
Tarlton Fleming Parsons 2d, O62516.
×Hunter William Passmore, O62519.
×Sam Glass Pate, O61901.
Albert McLees Paulger, O62488.
×Jack Hans Pedersen, O62881.
Duane Melvin Pederson, O62542.
×Robert Benjamin Peltz, O62561.
×Thomas Clifton Penn, O61866.
×Philip Julian Pennington, O62496.
×Paul John Perecko, O61317.
×Vincent Jerome Perricelli, Jr., O61399.
×Daniel Albert Peterson, O61785.
×George Wallace Peterson, O66190.
×Monte Irwin Peterson, O67737.
×Bruce Edward Petree, O62559.
×David Page Pettit, O62477.
Raymond Elwell Phares, O61270.
×Wendell Edward Phillips, O62511.
×Lewis Andrew Pick, Jr., O62571.
John Max Pickarts, O62057.
×Edward Martin Pierce, O62373.
James Martin Pierce, O62050.
×William Franklin Pierce, O62748.
Frank Augustus Pierson, Jr., O62687.
×John Herbert Pigman, O62306.
Ralph Donald Pinto, O62616.
Douglas West Poage, Jr., O62476.
William Alexander Pogue, O62393.
Norman George Pohler, O61428.
×Stephen Popadich, O63242.
Arthur Gignilliat Porcher, O62738.
×Vernon Robert Porter, O61804.
×Richard Johnson Potter, O61549.
×Robert Arthur Powers, O62869.
×Louis Watkins Prentiss, Jr., O62592.
×Russell Bates Preuit, Jr., O62312.
George Lynwood Price, Jr., O62385.
James Elmer Price, Jr., O63188.
×Walter Edwin Price, O62670.
Clifton Augustine Pritchett, Jr., O62615.
×Stanley Marshall Prouty, Jr., O62724.
×Jip Manring Pruden 2d, O62070.
Anthony Lawrence Pullano, O62047.
×Robert Arthur Pulsifer, O68152.
Vernon Alfred Quarstein, O62483.
×Edward Barney Quinn, O62377.
×Loren Eugene Radford, O61798.
×John Russell Randolph, O62109.
×Alfred Jay Raskin, O61817.
×Chester Eugene Raun, O63243.
William Franklin Rawley, Sr., O67742.
Henry Weatherly Rawlings, O61393.
Morton Ray, O62739.
×Lynn Richard Raybould, O61709.
William Edgar Read, O62308.
Robert Duncan Reed, O62769.
Walter Warren Reed, O61312.
×George Cornelius Rees, O62669.
Marvin Wade Rees, O62490.
×Thomas Walter Reese, O61882.
×Rodney Rex Rehfeld, O61724.
Frank Aloysius Reilly, O67743.
Neil Allen Reilly, O62091.
Wallace Lawrence Reimold Jr., O61808.
×Richard Arthur Rein, O62534.
×Gough Cooper Reinhardt, O61754.
Stanley Eric Reinhart, Jr., O62286.
×Louis Arthur Reinken, Jr. O62678.
×Robert Edward Rennebaum, O61382.
Richard Tillery Replinger, O61277.
Johnny Reus-Froylan, O63805.
×Philip Curtis Reybold, O62718.
×Mark Charles Rhoads, O62540.
×Nolan Clyde Rhodes, O61430.
×Nehemiah Edward Richardson, O61790.
×Lucien Edward Rising, O62481.
×Nelson Fred Ritter, O62719.
Radames Rivera-Vazquez, O61533.
×Paul Adams Roach, Jr., O62605.
×Lilbern Beryl Roberts, O62573.
×Frank Dawson Robie, O61369.
×Bernard Leo Robinson, O65325.
×Carlton James Robinson, O62860.
×John Francis Roehm, Jr., O62410.
×Walter Richard Roemer, O61593.
×Manley Eaton Rogers, O62333.
Albert Leo Romaneski, O62291.
×Aubrey Leighton Romine, O61402.
×Jean Roger Rondepierre, O61633.
Robert Alexander Roseberry, O62078.
×Al Stewart Rosin, O61645.
×Blair Arthur Ross, Jr., O62419.
×Harry Robert Ross, O61391.
×James Allan Ross, Jr., O62491.
×John Edward Ross, O61321.
John James Ross, O62595.
Roswell Emory Round, Jr., O62480.
Maurice Denman Roush, O62348.
×Ronald Rovenger, O62694.
×Milo David Rowell, O62729.
×Brunn Wall Roysden, O62867.
×Richard Williams Ruehe, O61594.
Lindsay Craig Rupple, O62647.
Benjamin Rush 3d, O67749.
Robert Owens Rushing, O61286.
×Daniel Francis Ruskin, O67347.
×Andrew Madison Rutherford, O62608.
×John Rutledge, Jr., O62806.
×John Jacob Saalberg, O62418.
Henry Steele Sachers, O62643.
Francis Alois Sailer, O62765.
×John Martin Sakowski, O61483.
×Donald Earl Sampson, O62630.
Philip Bruce Samsey, O62397.
×Ben Leavell Sanders, O63008.
×Alfred Lang Sanderson, O62479.
×John Patrick Santry, O61310.
×Wayne Bryan Sargent, O61671.
×Richard Donald Scamehorn, O61520.
×John David Scandling, O62661.
×Norman Dean Schanche, O67751.
×Vernon Gail Schieffer, O67752.
×Pedro Ivan Schira, O62722.
×Howard Edgar Schneider, O61654.
Dean Frederick Schnoor, O62673.
×Allan Peter Scholl, O62637.
×Jared Bruce Schopper, O62315.
Homer Edward Schott, Jr., O61626.
×Lawrence Lee Schrank, O62861.
George Harry Scithers, O62363.
×Joseph Jackson Scott, Jr., O67754.
×Theodore Anderson Seely, Jr., O62458.
×Robert Allan Seelye, O61805.
×James David Sehorne, Jr., O61889.
×Robert Jordan Seitz, O62612.
×Sherman Martin Seltzer, O61666.
×Roy Reese Severin, O61390.
Robert Ambrose Shade, O62421.
×George Bernard Shaffer, O62370.
John Robert Shaffer, O62762.
×William Edward Shambora, Jr., O62450.
×Joseph Fay Shankle, O62399.
×Donald James Shannon, O61714.
Jere Worth Sharp, O62316.
×Thomas Carter Sharp, Jr., O62558.
×Robert James Sharpless, O63140.
Harold Winfoeld Shear, O61513.
×Allan Merritt Sheets, O63193.
×Fred Clifton Sheffey, O63139.
×John Richard Shelley, O62564.
Arthur Luther Shemwell, Jr., O62714.
×Stewart Shirey, O67755.
×Don Franklin Shreve, O62691.
×Graham McLeod Sibbles, O62531.
Nathan Clelland Sibley, O61628.
Jack Raymond Siewert, O61372.
×Frank Robert Simmons, O67757.
×John William Simmons, O61305.
×Raymond Philip Singer, O62313.
Millard Henry Singleton, O62433.
×Winfred George Skelton, Jr., O62598.
×Clarence Engerman Skoien, O61752.
William Edgar Slavins, O62758.
×Martin Joseph Small, O62701.
Charles Rufus Smith, Jr., O62891.
×Clark Smith, O62543.
×Herbert Hugh Smith, O67758.
×John Harvey Smith, O62387.
×Samuel Wayne Smithers, Jr., O62579.
×Myron Dow Snoke, O62320.
×Robert Edward Soden, O61378.
×Clayton Ollis Spann, O62113.
Claude Stewart Sparks, Jr., O67759.
×Clyde Wadsworth Spence, Jr., O62504.
×David Roy Spencer, O61330.
×Milton Thomas Spencer, O67760.
×Richard Arland Spencer, O61815.
×Henry Donald Spielman, O62478.
×Robert Ernest Spiller, O61854.
×John Lester Squires, Jr., O61539.
×Mebane Graves Stafford, O67761.
×Kenneth Leonard Stahl, O61451.
Charles Dunbar Stampley, O61662.
×Walter Clement Stanton, Jr., O62734.
×Samuel Leroy Stapleton, O62368.
×Joseph Benedeck Starker, O63034.
×Richard Ward Statham, O61313.
Sidney Robert Steele, O62466.
×Edward Peter Stefanik, O62332.
×Irwin Ira Steinberg, O62380.
William Andrew Steinberg, O62641.
×Richard George Steuart, O62712.
×Wayne Manning Stevens, O62090.
×James Beeman Stewart, O63190.
×Warren Francis Stewart, O61453.
×Ivan Max Storer, O61592.
×Henry Ewell Strickland, Jr., O62569.
Carroll Davis Strider, O61363.
Thomas Prall Strider, O62435.
×Charles Chester Stringfellow, O63203.
×Hans William Strohm, O61612.
×Richard Maynard Strohm, O62323.
×Samuel David Stroman, O61415.
×John Patrick Sullivan, Jr., O63206.
×Kenneth Arnold Tackus, O62625.
×Marshall Dillon Talbott, Jr., O62574.
Rudolph Martin Tamez, O67766.
Will Hill Tankersley, O62744.
×Robert Winslow Tart, Jr., O67767.
×Grayson Dee Tate, Jr., O62566.
×Lester Keith Tate, O61574.
×Franklin Ray Taylor, O61753.
×George Ottway Taylor, Jr., O67769.

×Francois Xavier Therrien, Jr., O32658.
×Constantine Thomas, O67770.
×Grace Gray Thomas, Jr., O62503.
×Myron Morgan Thomason, O61610.
×James Mason Thompson, O62284.
×Nelson Loren Thompson, O62345.
×George Ervan Thurmond, O61585.
George Purefoy Tilson, O62403.
×Patrick David Tisdale, O62347.
×William Russell Todd, O61712.
×Hugh Pat Tomlinson, O61429.
×Charles Frederick Tonningsen, O62740.
James Henderson Tormey, O62351.
×Thomas Edward Tracy, O61573.
×James Leo Trayers, Jr., O62381.
×Richard Greenleaf Trefry, O62572.
×Paul Donald Triem, O62326.
×Rice Terrill Trolan, O67772.
John Hunt Truesdale, O62603.
Thomas Hogshead Tullidge, O62524.
William DeWitt Turley, O61479.
×William Henry Tuttle, Jr., O62455.
×Gramount Darwin Twitty, O62053.
John Ufner, O62601.
×Herbert Patton Underwood, O62522.
×Joseph William Urbanek, O61271.
James William Vance, O61454.
×Karl Herbert Van D'Elden, O67773.
×Jack Vanderbleek, O61685.
×Robert Douglas Vanderslice, O61841.
×Howard John Vandersluis, Jr., O62638.
×Walter Monroe Vannoy, Jr., O62324.
×John Horace Vanston, Jr., O62372.
×Paul Schuyler Vanture, O62731.
×Austin Kinzey Veatch, Jr., O62506.
×Salvatore James Vento, O61697.
Willard Mac Vickers, O61544.
Ralph Hadley Viskochil, O62515.
×David Eugene Wade, O61506.
×William Cooper Waddell, O62585.
John Edward Wagner, O62390.
×John Stanley Wagoner, O62584.
×Charles Gerard Frederic Wahle, O61269.
×James Benson Walker, O67775.
×Luther Garold Walker, O61440.
×James Joseph Walsh, O61386.
×Robert Frank Wanek, O61424.
×Ira John Ward, O62302.
×James West Ward, O61299.
William Francis Ward, Jr., O62451.
Volney Frank Warner, O62620.
James Forrest Warnock, Jr., O61524.
John William Warren, O61452.
×Wilbur Moore Warren 2d, O62557.
John Fabian Wassenberg, O62537.
James Richard Watson, O61581.
×John William Watson, Jr., O62720.
×Clarence Murphy Watters, O62567.
×James Francis Weaver, O67777.
×John Ernest Weaver, O61341.
John Valdimir Webb, O61595.
Karl Boromaeus Weber 3d, O62346.
×Warren James Weber, O61420.
×Leonard William Wegner, Jr., O62402.
Earle Melvin Welch, Jr., O61298.
×William Anderson Wells, O61395.
×Rex Gordon Welty, Jr., O61280.
×Robert Rehm Werner, O62337.
×Edward Charles West, O62356.
×Vorin Edwin Wham, Jr., O61786.
Jack Robert Wheatley, O62389.
×James Russell Wheaton, Jr., O62773.
×Warde Franklin Wheaton, O62300.
×Francis Wilford White, Jr., O62752.
×Robert Richard White, O62622.
×William Emerson White, O61465.
×Landon Page Whitelaw, O61362.
×Robert Ellis Whitelaw, O67779.
John Adams Wickham, Jr., O62394.
Wayne Rentchler Wiedman, O62883.
×Allen Warren Wiegand, O63762.
×Stuart Fuller Wilder, O67780.
×Don James Williams, O61294.
×Edwin Scott Williams, O61334.
×Francis Locey Williams, O61427.
×Kenneth Jack Williams, O63014.
Chester Morse Willingham, Jr., O62508.
×Durward Saunders Wilson, Jr., O62725.
×Gail Francis Wilson, O62614.
×Louis Wilson, O61384.
Patrick Wayne Wilson, O62600.
×Robert Maris Wilson, O62385.
×Wallace Lynn Wilson, O61899.
×William Crawford Winlock, O61375.
Selwin DeRoy Wisdom, O62856.
×Cecil Edwin Wise, O61527.
×Rene Arthur Wolf, O62304.
×Francis Rudolph Wondolowski, O62335.
George Eugene Wood, O67782.
Marion Timmons Wood, O61820.
×Stuart Wood, Jr., O62486.
Walter Alexander Wood 3d O62742.
×James Raymond Woodall, Jr., O63199.
×Richard Tolford Woodman, O61779.
×Ronald Woodrow, O61371.
×James Frederick Workman, O62378.
×Richard Lee Worley, O62766.
Robert Edward Wright, O61404.
×Sidney Thomas Wright, O62730.
Richard Robert Wyrough, O62415.
×William Frank Yeoman, O62439.
×Bruce Calvin Young, Jr., O61279.
×Harold Dean Yow, O61831.
×Patrick Henry Zabel, O62400.
×Paul Ray Zavitz, O62749.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

×Eugene Baxter Blair, O67553.
×Earle Willard Brown, O65956.
×Dan Chris Cavanaugh, O63187.
×Paul Michael Foley, O67573.
Willis Dabney Holland, O66021.
James Henry Lovett, Jr., O66040.
×John Kain Read, O67858.
×Robert Lee Taylor, O67622.
×Benjamin James Veltri, O66113.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

×Clarissa Linahau Burkert, L358.
×Ellen de Beruff, L350.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, approved May 16, 1950. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Zita Josephine Ierino, N1190.
Roberta Whitehouse Smith, N1526.
×Therese Daley Willett, N1527.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

×Joan Dabney Archer, N1843.
×Margaret Mary Brosmer, N1849.
×Jane Ellen Jacoby, N1854.
×Mary Helen Koenig, N1850.
×Claire Victoria LeBlanc, N1851.
×Ethel Liebowitz, N1852.
×Katherine Mary Marta, N1853.
Margaret Catherine McDonough, N1842.
×Jane Ruth Wiley, N1841.

To be majors, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

×Genevieve Stella Beard, M10073.
×Margaret Pauline Bettinger, J36.
×Elizabeth Stackhouse Carloss, R10065.
×Louis Dorothy Christman, M10007.
×Olena Margaret Cole, M10039.
×Helen Burns Gearin, R10000.
×Alice Theodocia Adelaide Knox, A10062.
×Erma G. Lord, R10069.
×Donna Sue Lowe, R10037.
×Kathryn Maurice, J38.
×Myra Louis McDaniel, J13.
×Winifred Grace Riley, R10071.
×Barbara Mills Robertson, M10006.
×Lydia Lucille Romersa, R10007.
×Mary Elizabeth Stack, R10072.
×Dorothy Grace Tipton, M10020.
×Eleanor Jane Westfall, M10074.
×Beatrice Whitcomb, M10076.

To be captains, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

Helen Ruth Barefoot, R10107.
Dolores Lavone Evanson, M10120.
Dorothy Louise Kemske, M10052.
Virginia Elizabeth McGary, R10128.
Agnes Juanita Ratcliff, R10106.
Vivian Louise Weller, J3.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

×Martha Jane Eason, M10094.
×Irma Lilliam Jaakkola, M10095.
Catherine Marjorie Owen, M10091.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Midshipman John Bellows Sturges, Jr., United States Naval Academy, class of 1953, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 2, 1953, upon his graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Philip G. Charest (Naval Academy) to be ensign in the Navy.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated:

Robert McB. Schucker
Stanley B. Waid

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Bernard J. Kravitz
James L. Youngblood

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, as previously nominated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John E. Arnold
Donald M. Bohrer
Miles M. Shatzer
Eugene W. Stuart, Jr.
Richard R. Tarrant

Thaddeus P. Fleischman (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated to correct name, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Baruch Rosenberg (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Richard R. McConnell (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Stephen W. Bartlett
James T. Gillespie
John J. Hogan
Jerry E. Kehrle
Robert R. Leisy
Buford L. Toney

Dempsey G. Salter, officer, to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy.

The following-named officers to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps in the Navy:

Kirk C. Hoerman
Jay D. Shaw

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line (aviation) in the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

James "G" Hayes
Clarence O. Robins
Burton H. Shepherd

ENSIGN

William F. Span

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line in the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Eugene B. Ackerman
Ellison Capers
Steve C. Charnas
Theodore Dorsa, Jr.
Edward P. Farr
Harold Feeney
Joseph P. Fleming
Joseph W. Golden
William K. Lally, Jr.
Edward A. Lipchak

James H. Lowe — Samuel J. Rose, Jr.
Gerald McNulty — Ralph W. Sensel
John A. Miesner, Jr. — Bertrand T. Sperling
Frank "D" Rogers, Jr. — James R. Switzer

ENSIGNS

Thomas R. Averett, Jr. — Theodore Miguel, Jr.
Charles W. Barrett — Everett L. Morris, Jr.
James W. David — William E. O'Leary
Ralph O. Davis — William B. Regan
Claud B. Fallis, Jr. — Robert W. Ritz
William A. Fitzpatrick — James G. Simcox
Donald P. Frei

The following-named women officers to the grades indicated in the line in the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Betty B. Garland
Mary A. Gore
Margaret J. Gravatt

ENSIGNS

Joan F. Adams — Bonnie J. Schuler
Eva W. Schekorra — Helen I. Spiegel

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Ernie F. Johnson — Emmett J. Wild
Robert M. Morlan — Dorsey V. Wilson

ENSIGN

Richard F. Reynolds

Lois E. Harden, woman officer, to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps in the Navy.

The following-named officers to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy:

Richard E. Anderson
Jack R. Wagoner

Milton T. VanMetre, officer, to be ensign in the Medical Service Corps in the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Helen J. deMariano

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Mary J. Knepper

ENSIGNS

Elizabeth T. McDonald
Shirley M. Parent

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 21, 1953:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named licensed officers of the United States merchant marine to the grades indicated in the United States Coast Guard:

To be lieutenant commander

Jewel Olney Strickland

To be lieutenants

George Frank Millard
Donald Franklin Hall
John Stanley Lipuscek
Alfred Edward Hampton

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Myron Eugene Welsh
Frank Madison Sperry
Cletus Joseph Walz
Robert Frank Ewels
Walter Russell Stark

To be captains

Gordon P. McGowan
Kenneth S. Davis
George A. Knudsen

To be commanders

John E. D. Hudgens — George E. Howarth
James E. Davidson — Benjamin F. Engel
James P. Brady — John W. Schmoker
Arthur Pfeiffer — Robert Waldron
John F. Kettler — Meyer Stockman
Horatio G. Thompson

To be lieutenant commanders

John R. MacLeod — James E. Van Valkenburg
Hubert McGee
Charles F. Overstreet — Ralph D. Fisher
Ray M. Marshall — Thomas M. MacWhinney
James F. Carr
Robert E. Rountree — Lemuel C. Sansbury

To be lieutenants

Lloyd L. Kent — William D. Ball, Jr.
Andrew B. Christensen — James A. Dillian
William C. Brown
Ralph W. Niesz — Robert I. Price
Mark F. Mitchell — Frank C. Anderson
Donald E. Ullery — Robert J. Healy
Robert N. Rea — Robert L. Kallin
Robert B. Long, Jr. — John P. Obarski
Robert G. Schwing — Gerald G. Brown
Alvin N. Ward — Winford W. Barrow
Risto A. Mattila

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Michael J. Holland — Ralph R. Pruett
Arthur E. Lawrence, Jr. — Dale J. Henderson
Thomas P. Connors

To be ensign

Edgar P. Bainbridge

The following-named persons to be commissioned warrant officers in the specialties indicated in the United States Coast Guard:

To be chief machinists

Abner W. Lee — Aubrey L. Smith
Gunnar E. Hansen — Russell D. Erickson

To be chief pay clerk

Daniel H. Griffin, Jr.

To be chief boatswains

Robert J. Earnest — George P. Lewis
Stanley N. Megos — Harold A. Glynn
Alvin E. Newcomb — Franklin L. Skidmore
Ludwig Wedemeyer

To be chief ship's clerk

Arva S. Alexander

To be ensigns

Paul Tregenza Anderson
Paul Laurence Arnold
Darrell Leroy Babcock
Kenneth Edward Barrett
Laurence Oliver Bates
Murray Withers Boggs, Jr.
Paul Hobart Breed
Dan Henry Briganti
Roger Alan Britt
William Bruce Clark
Don Alfred Colussy, Jr.
James Hilary Conrad
Edmund Lee Cope
Charles Lincoln Crane, Jr.
Calvin Ellis Crouch
Richard Paul Cueroni
Edwin Hassel Daniels
Ted Orville DeYoung
Richard Anthony Donnelly, Jr.
Vaughan Wendell Driggers, Jr.
James Richard Erwin
George Everett
Edward Clayton Farmer, Jr.
Rolland Aime Faucher
Henry Curt Fisher
Jerome Vincent Flanagan
Thomas Joseph Flood
Galloway Buttram Foster, Jr.
Walter Dennis Fox
Frank Adolph Frauenfelder
Donald Dale Garnett
Gregory Carl Gaski
James Edward Grabb
George Kirk Greiner, Jr.
Donald Grim
Ralph Connaway Hill
Donald Claude Hintze
Roger Arnold Holmes
David Gidley Howland
Bernard Arnold Hoyland
Robert Eugene Iden
James Clarence Irwin
James Aloysious Kearney, Jr.
Joseph Morrow Kelly
Marinus Fred Keyser
William Louis King
Walter William Kohl, Jr.
William Edward Lehr, Jr.
Charles William Linn
Herbert Gerry Lipsett
Richard Vinal Littlefield
Roger Lee Madson
Max Stanley Maire
Graeme Mann
William David Markle, Jr.
Charles Walter Matherly
Charles Edward Mathieu
George Fayette Merritt
Roger William Mowell
Edward Nelson, Jr.
Harry James Oldford, Jr.
Hal Floyd Olson
Walter Eugene Paulsen
Harris Albert Pledger, Jr.
William Peter Reilly
Dean Albert Ridyard
Arthur Paul Roberts
Ernest Edward Rowland, Jr.
William John Russell
Robert Schmidt
Keith Byron Schumacher
Thomas Major Sing
Donald Wade Smith
William Edward Smith
Nathaniel Chris Spadafora
Fredric Christian Sponholz, Jr.
Charles Gilbert Stadtlander
Raymond Lowe Stevens
Albert Glenn Stirling
David Earl Stryffeler
Eugene Frederick Trainor
Robert E. Lee West
Lloyd Otto Westphal
Theodore Joseph Wojnar
Glenn Franklin Young
David Thomas Zurzuski, Jr.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 21, 1953:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Clarence Arthur Beutel, Sr., of Illinois, Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was sent to the Senate on January 9, 1953.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we rejoice that in the revelation of Thy divine sovereignty and beneficent purposes we may find the genesis and fulfillment of our noblest impulses, our deepest longings, and our loftiest aspirations.

We pray that daily our minds and hearts may strike the notes of a larger faith and a more resolute courage as we encounter problems for which our own finite wisdom has no satisfactory solution.

Grant that we may have a clearer vision of the victorious power of Thy love and the triumph of righteousness and may we never allow our faith to become eclipsed by fear and our doubts to harden into despair.

Kindle within our souls a greater reverence for human personality and a sincere desire to help all mankind find in life a richer meaning and a fuller joy.

In the name of our blessed Lord we bring our prayers of praise and supplication. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4663. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. HILL, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK, to act as Speaker pro tempore tomorrow, May 22, 1953.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], to the effect that the bill H. R. 1613 was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The bill provides for the conveyance to the city of San Diego, Calif., of certain lands and should have been referred to the Committee on Public Works.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Public Works.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

POLISH JET PILOTS POINT THE WAY TO PEACE

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the flight from behind the Iron Curtain of two Polish jet pilots, as reported by the Associated Press, are just straws in the wind of what could be a great exodus of escapees from the Communist armed forces.

When Americans fully discover this weak link of the Communist conspiracy, it will be the end of Red power.

The United States is acquiescing in the enslavement of the Communist world by continuing to recognize and deal with the Red regimes.

Eventually we are going to withdraw recognition of the Communist gangster governments as enemies of the people they enslave and of the world. Why not now? Then we can go all out in our efforts to make contact with the peoples of the enslaved nations who are our abandoned friends.

Let us have done with this silly peace talk with the war-minded Communist regime in Korea and everywhere else.

The only persons in the world who really want war are the Communists—a small but highly organized group of diabolically intelligent fanatics bent on world domination and who have been built up by the softheaded so-called liberals of the Western World.

The Communists are determined to have war and are waiting only for the opportune time and hope desperately in the meantime that we will not discover the tremendous latent anti-Communist force among the 800 millions of peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

It is utterly imbecilic for us to attempt to negotiate with confirmed criminals or to place any faith in agreements we might make with them. Anyone who reads the speeches or who has studied the lives of Malenkov, Mao Tse-tung, or any other of the Communist dictators, including Tito of Yugoslavia, would know that it is fruitless and a dangerous waste of precious time to negotiate with, appease, or attempt to bargain in any manner with these human reprobates who have the crimes of millions of victims on their souls.

Let us direct our good will and efforts toward the hundreds of millions of the enslaved peoples and assist them wherever practical to gain their liberation. This is the only sound policy to peace.

Every effort has been made and will continue to be made to smear the policy of liberation with such Kremlin-coined slogans as "Liberation means war."

When President Eisenhower gave his great speech before the American Legion last fall advocating a policy of liberation, the machinery of the worldwide Communist apparatus went into high gear to smear him. Unfortunately, fainthearted and uninformed Americans opposed him too.

But with clear-eyed perception the President's vision penetrated the outward material aspects of the cold war and into the core of the issue which is philosophical, moral, and spiritual. I believe that Eisenhower saw that we could win men's minds behind the Iron Curtain by demonstrating with tangible deeds our desire for their liberation. I believe also he clearly sees that there is only one way to shatter the enslaving conspiracy and that is through the enslaved.

I urge the President to proceed on the policy of liberation, to place his faith, as I am certain that he will, in the victim peoples rather than in the promises of any Communist dictators. Actually a true liberation policy is the one policy that will prevent world war III because it will paralyze the Soviet war potential. A paralysis of the will of the Soviet and satellite peoples to fight for the Reds is the most effective block to Soviet aggression.

Col. Kenneth K. Hansen, chief of the psychological warfare section at allied headquarters, said of the members of the Communist forces recently:

You can start at one end of the map of Europe and run clear from Estonia through Bulgaria and find that those people are just as fed up with communism as the Chinese are.

If we prove that they can come over to us and will not be sent back to be killed, the Russians cannot even start a war in Europe.

I wish to include in my remarks the Associated Press story from the Washington Sunday Star for May 17, 1953, the article entitled "Private Wong, Who Would Rather Die Than Return to Reds, Is Typical of 48,500 POW's"; the Associated Press story in the Evening Star for May 20, 1953, entitled "Another Polish Pilot Lands New MIG–15 on Danish Island"; the story from the Milwaukee Journal for May 19, 1953, entitled "On Jet Wings to Freedom"; and the story for May 15, 1953, in the Washington Times-Herald entitled "Polish Pilot Tells of Escape From Iron Curtain in MIG":

[From the Washington Sunday Star of May 17, 1953]

PRIVATE WONG, WHO WOULD RATHER DIE THAN RETURN TO REDS, IS TYPICAL OF 48,500 POW'S—AFTER 11 YEARS SPENT IN ARMY, HE IS FED UP WITH COMMUNISM

(By Robert Eunson)

TOKYO, May 16.—Private Wong was impressed into the Chinese Red Army 11 years ago. Today he is in an allied prison camp in South Korea. He vows that he will commit suicide rather than return to Communist rule.

Private Wong, and the thousands like him, are not merely the unwilling pawns of Panmunjom, whose disposition blocks a Korean armistice. What happens to them may also determine the future of the world: Peace or world war III.

All the unwilling Communist subjects in the world are waiting to see what happens to Wong.

How did Wong, this nondescript little fellow of no great attributes, arrive in his present situation of such grave importance?

Here is his case history. The Geneva Convention forbids correspondents to interview any of the 14,500 Chinese and 34,000 North Koreans who forsook communism when the prison camps were screened a year ago.

Rules also forbid use of the names of American officers who interviewed them, but this composite of Wong is an accurate reconstruction from the notes of those officers.

WAS ARMY ORDERLY AT 12

Wong was a 12-year-old lad in a north China village when he was impressed into the Chinese "liberation army" in 1942. He began as orderly to a section chief.

During the next 8 years he climbed from flunky to squad leader, fighting against the Chinese Nationalists until they were beaten, then training recruits in the ever-expanding Red Army.

He liked the military life, but there were some things he did not like about communism. As a Chinese peasant, he had been reared in a close family relationship; as a Red Army man, he was isolated from his family. He had been taught a smattering of Buddhism and philosophy based on ethics; the Communists laughed at ethics and religion.

Over the years, young Wong forgot about these things, but there still was one thing he hated:

He never could get used to Communist insistence on self-criticism. When any little thing went wrong, he had to stand up in front of his squad and blame himself. The loss of "face" was almost unbearable.

Still, when the day's drill was over, there were dances to attend and pretty girls to meet. Wong remained a good and obedient soldier.

SENT TO KOREA IN 1950

One day in 1950 Wong, then 20, was put aboard a troop train. He had no idea where he was going until he reached North Korea. There he and his squad were given enough rice for 10 days and started marching south by night. By day they hid from allied planes.

Put into a frontline position on the western front, Wong and his men were told by a political officer:

"Here you will fight. If you retreat, you will be shot; and remember that we Communists never forgive a man who surrenders."

There followed intervals of hard fighting and periods of dull, dangerous waiting. In the daytime, Wong spent most of his time crouched in a rude hillside air shelter, hiding from American planes.

One day a plane dropped a small bomb that burst in air and showered the hillside with bits of white paper.

Wong picked up one of these leaflets and read in Chinese:

"This is a safe-conduct pass. If you will place this pamphlet on a stick and walk toward United Nations lines, you will not be fired on. You will be conducted safely to a rear area where you will be well treated."

It made no other promises. Wong idly tucked it away for safekeeping.

DEATH ON ALL SIDES

That night artillery fire hit Wong's bunker and killed two men. Wong thought hard about the death that lurked behind him if he retreated; death that struck from the front; and death that ruled the skies.

An American tank appeared up ahead and began firing at the bunker. Wong knew the enemy had found him. To stay where he was meant death; to retreat meant death.

He found a stick, stuck the paper to it, and led his squad out, waving the stick. The tank quit firing, and Wong's squad walked safely into Allied lines.

In a compound on Koje Island, he was made a deputy section chief among his fellow prisoners. One day a friend told him:

"The others are suspicious of you. You are one who surrendered. They are planning to kill you. Maybe tonight."

Now, Wong had seen one man disemboweled by Communist fellow prisoners who thought he was an informer. He had seen others hanged, and he knew that when Communist prisoners said these men were "suicides" they lied.

ESCAPES FROM COMPOUND

That night Wong escaped over the wire. South Korean guards caught him.

"Don't put me back inside," Wong pleaded. "They are going to kill me. I'd rather you killed me here, cleanly, with a gun."

Wong was not taken back. After long and careful questioning, he was transferred to a camp for anti-Communist prisoners. He had a good diet of rice, fish or meat, and vegetables which he helped to grow.

He settled into the routine.

Up at 6 a. m., work in the fields from 8 to 12 and from 1 to 5, dinner at 6, then a light musical program or prisoner-produced play over the public-address system.

He could listen to four hours of daily broadcasts containing news and entertainment but no propaganda. If he liked, Wong also could play soccer or volleyball. Some of his companions took courses in reading, writing, blacksmithing, or tailoring.

PREFERS DEATH TO REDS

One day a Chinese-speaking American officer asked Wong if he would like to go home.

"Not while the Communists are there," he replied. "They are my enemies and I am theirs."

"Suppose we made you go home?" the officer persisted.

"If you put me on a ship, I would jump overboard," Wong replied. "If you put me on a train I would jump beneath the wheels."

There are about 49,000 Chinese and North Koreans who feel as Wong does.

"Those are the ones who refuse to go home—the ones who had communism forced on them and want no more of it," said Col. Kenneth K. Hansen, chief of the psychological warfare section at allied headquarters.

"We believe that winning our point at Panmunjom will prevent world war III."

FED UP WITH COMMUNISM

"You can start at one end of the map of Europe and run clear from Estonia through Bulgaria and find that those people are just as fed up with communism as the Chinese are.

"If we prove that they can come over to us and will not be sent back to be killed, the Russians cannot even start a war in Europe."

Colonel Hansen of Tallahassee, Fla., has been in charge of the psychological warfare section since August 1952. The best-known function of his section is preparing the safe-conduct leaflets which persuaded such men as Private Wong.

"We promise safe conduct," Colonel Hansen said, "but we have never promised protection under the principle of voluntary repatriation. If we did, we'd probably have more prisoners than we'd know what to do with."

Even so, without promises, the thousands of Private Wongs who refuse to go home have staked their lives on a principle that stretches far beyond the bleak horizons of Korea.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 20, 1953]

ANOTHER POLISH PILOT LANDS NEW MIG–15 ON DANISH ISLAND—RED-MADE JET CRASH-LANDS; DAMAGE SLIGHT—YOUNG FLIER REPORTS HE LEFT FORMATION TO FLEE TO WEST

ROENNE, BORNHOLM, DENMARK, May 20.—Another Polish pilot crashed through the Iron Curtain today to land a Soviet-built MIG–15 jet fighter on this Danish island 100 miles southwest of Copenhagen.

Roenne police, who immediately took the young pilot into custody, said he had asked for political asylum. The plane was surrounded immediately by military guards with strict orders to keep reporters and press photographers away.

An unconfirmed report said the plane was of a type newer than the one landed on this Baltic island in March by Lt. Franciszek Jarecki, the first Polish Air Force escapee to Bornholm.

Lieutenant Jarecki's plane was later returned to Poland after a thorough examination by Western air experts. Lieutenant Jarecki was granted asylum and since has gone to the United States. He is in Washington now.

BROKE AWAY FROM FORMATION

An official announcement said the pilot today told police he broke away from a formation of MIG fighters flying over Polish territory.

Bornholm is 60 miles north—only a few minutes, jet time—from the Baltic Sea coast of Poland.

According to eyewitnesses, the plane circled over Roenne for 75 minutes before landing on a training field at Almegaard army camp, a few miles north of the city.

The camp has no airfield, and military personnel there held their breaths as the plane roared down onto the rough field. It swayed and bucked across the grass, then halted in a small group of trees in one corner of the training ground. One of its wings collided with a tree branch, but the damage was reported slight.

PILOT CLIMBS OUT UNHURT

The young pilot, apparently unhurt, climed out of the cockpit and greeted the camp commander with a smile.

The commander immediately notified Danish defense and air force headquarters in Copenhagen. Air force jet fighter experts rushed immediately from the capital to examine the plane.

Western military experts generally consider a MIG–15 a prize catch. About 3 weeks ago, the United Nations command in the Far East offered $100,000 to any Communist pilot in Korea who brought his MIG–15 undamaged to the Allied side. Thus far, there has been no announcement of any takers.

At the time of the offer by Gen. Mark Clark, a United States Air Force spokesman in Washington said it applied only to fliers of Russian-type jets operating in the Korean war area, not to those in Europe.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 19, 1953]

POLISH PILOT TELLS WHY HE FLED REDS IN A MIG—LIEUTENANT JARECKI, A TRUSTED RED, DECIDED IT WAS EASIER TO FLEE THAN TO STAY IN POLAND

(By Zygmunt Nagorski, Jr.)

This is the story behind the story of Franciszek (Frank) Jarecki.

You have probably read the bare facts of Frank's daredevil exploit. He flew a Russian jet MIG–15 at 700 miles an hour from Poland to Denmark, turned it over to the free world forces, refused to take a dime as a reward.

Frank Jarecki was a trusted Communist up to a few weeks ago. He was a lieutenant in the Polish Air Force. He was living off the fat of the land. He had been an active member of the Communist youth movement in Poland. He had known nothing but life under the Red dictatorship since the Russian invasion of Poland in 1939 when he was 9 years old.

So, when he landed in America a few days ago, I had a long talk with him in our native language. I asked him:

"Why did you take such a long-shot chance to escape?" (I put the emphasis on "why.")

Frank's answer was sharp and to the point:

"It was easier to escape than to stay there."

What risk did he take? Suppose he had been caught?

"Nothing much. Hanging; in front of my comrades."

Now, that's the kind of answer that forces a newspaperman to ask more questions. Frank answered them fully and freely.

I can't condense into a sentence or a paragraph or even in a thousand words the reasons Frank Jarecki became sick and tired and—though a brave man—fearful of communism. But I can write down his words. You can be your own judge as to whether his reasons are logical.

Frank is dark and short and stocky, just turned 21. When he grins, his whole face lights up like the eastern sky at sunrise. His proper name is Lt. Franciszek Jarecki. It's pronounced as though it were spelled Francheesheck Yaretsky.

I was puzzled by this grinning young fellow. As a fellow countryman, speaking his native language, I was curious. My curiosity brought such questions as these:

"Just when did you decide to escape? What started you thinking about escape?"

ORDERED TO REPORT TO HIS COMMANDER

Frank started to talk. It was in Polish, of course. I'm giving his answers in a rather free but authentic translation of his story.

"It all started in June a year ago. That was 1952. I got a call to report to my commanding officer. I was stationed, then, in Warsaw.

"'You are wanted at once,' I was told.

"I started to dress. What was wrong? Had I done anything? Or maybe it was a promotion? Or the political police? A special assignment? I would soon find out, so why worry? Why be afraid? Wasn't I a model pilot whose pictures decorated every clubhouse in the country? Wasn't I considered the perfect young Communist. Sure I was. Why then be afraid?

"' Lieutenant Jarecki, at your service sir.' I reported to the officer at headquarters."

SOFT, PLEASANT MANNER

"An unfamiliar figure rose from behind the desk. I wondered who he was.

"The stranger introduced himself as Captain Zavada.

"His voice was soft, his manner pleasant. But my fear was now almost out of hand.

"The officer talked about duties and obligations, about the western capitalists trying to start another war and about the necessity of being vigilant even among one's friends. Did Lieutenant Jarecki agree?

"Sure, I agreed.

"Zavada told me he didn't want anything special from me. Being vigilant, however, means being alert, he said. Alert to danger and alert to subversion.

"I was waiting. He told me he wanted full cooperation from me.

"A piece of paper was pushed under my nose. It was a pledge to cooperate with the political police. Instinctively I drew back.

NO ESCAPE, NO EXCUSE

"'Don't you have a pen?' the captain asked.

"Yes, I had a pen. I signed the pledge. My fear momentarily disappeared. There was no immediate danger. I merely had to spy on my comrades in the unit.

"Others had been approached earlier and I had known that one day my turn would come. I was shocked, but I knew that there was no way out of it. I had to do it.

"There was no escape, no excuse, no half truth in that business. But the doubts which occasionally cropped up suddenly sprang forward with unexpected force.

"What kind of a society is it in which a man is compelled to spy on his friends? What kind of life is it from which a man cannot escape fear?"

DOUBTS SET HIM ON ESCAPE ROUTE

Frank Jarecki, without knowing it, started his trip to freedom the moment these doubts appeared. A good Communist never asks questions, never knows why he fears life. He must accept fear as an inevitable part of his fate. Frank did not. He was a rebel.

The pilot left the room and walked straight back to his quarters. He was forbidden to divulge his duties to anyone. But would he not be discovered by his comrades the same way he discovered his other fellow officers were agents of the secret police? Would they not notice a change in his behavior, in his mood, and his manner?

Young Frank was liked by everybody. Not only because liking him was the right thing to do at that time, but also because he was a likable man. He was known for his wit and for his laughs. He laughed readily and loudly.

"Without that laugh," he told me, "I would have been lost forever in the Communist world."

In that world, very few laugh.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 15, 1953]

POLISH PILOT TELLS OF ESCAPE FROM IRON CURTAIN IN MIG

(By Julian Goraki)

"W szesc minut zamieniliem tyranie na wolnosc."

The words of the Polish pilot were simple and from the heart. They also were a massive understatement of one lonely man's courageous defiance of a vast and frightening tyranny.

Translated into English for his congressional hosts Thursday, the words of Lt. Francis Jarecki, 22, lose none of their eloquence. They mean simply, "In 6 minutes I exchanged tyranny for freedom."

OLD IN EXPERIENCE

This was the manner in which Jarecki, a Polish Air Force officer, summed up his flight out of the Communist-dominated country in a MIG jet fighter plane March 5 at the speed of sound.

When the handsome young pilot landed his swift jet on the Danish Island of Bornholm, the repercussions rocked both the Communist and non-Communist world. United Nations technicians had their first close look at a Russian jet. The Russians grounded all airplanes manned by Poles for an entire month.

Jarecki is very young, but he is old in experience. And he said many things to me Thursday that Americans should know. Here are some of them:

SOME ATTEMPTS FAIL

Russian pilots, veterans of the Korean war, are instructing Polish and other satellite nation pilots, how to fly in combat against American Sabre jets and bombers.

The Russian-built MIG now fighting against us in Korea is just as good, despite the American Air Force's statement to the contrary, as any jet in the sky. It has a good engine, and is sturdy and well balanced. However, it has an inferior gunsight.

The MIG, Jarecki said, does not have any fatal flaw of design such as our Air Force has described in explaining why we have offered $100,000 to any Chinese jet pilot who surrenders with his plane.

It had been explained that we needed a MIG for flight and study purposes so that our pilots can learn how to take advantage of this flaw and force the enemy ships into spins.

Jarecki said his escape from Poland was not the first attempt that had been made. In one effort several officers tried to get away in a bomber. But a wheel collapsed on takeoff, and they were captured and shot.

A similar fate met another Polish pilot who got off his field but had to make a forced landing in Austria. He was arrested by the Russians when he landed.

But the biggest thing on Jarecki's mind was a plan which would result in mass escape attempts by Polish pilots.

"All, everyone of the men in my group, without exception, would like to get out," Jarecki said. "It doesn't matter that the pilots have been ordered by their Russian superiors to be 'szpicle'—stool pigeons—and inform on any indiscreet conversations of their comrades.

WANTS FIGHTING FORCE

"The only thing that is needed is to provide a place in the West where Poles could go and join in a common effort to fight this tyranny. In other words, a Polish national force. Its commander should be Gen. Ladislas Anders."

General Anders, commander of the Polish Second Corps in World War II, captured Mount Cassino, in Italy. He now is with the Polish Government-in-Exile in London.

Jarecki said all officers above the rank of major in the Polish Communist Army are Russians in Polish uniform. There are few, if any, natives Poles who would not fight to free themselves of Soviet domination, the airman declared.

To understand Jarecki's escape from Poland you must know something of his life. He was only 8 years old when the Russians rolled into Poland with the Nazis to rip the helpless nation in two.

His family was deported to Siberia, where all died. Only he remained in Poland, a country that hoped for better days but found that none were to come when half of Poland was formally proclaimed a Russian satellite in 1945.

"It was then that I decided to escape," Jarecki said, "I joined a technical school and became a model Communist."

His abilities as a technician and apparent loyalty to the Communists won commendation from his superiors. He was sent to officers' pilot training school, from which he was graduated as its top student last September.

"From then on, it was just a question of time," Jarecki said. "As the years rolled by, my initial desire to get out of the country became coupled with another—to show the Western World that Poles will not fight for the Russians.

"I wanted to show the free world that even somebody like myself, who was brought up by the Communists, would not be loyal to the Russians."

Jarecki emphasized that he was not offered any money to escape with a MIG.

DECIDES ON DATE

"I decided it all myself, and shortly before Christmas I set March 5 as the day of my flight to freedom. It helped when I was assigned to the Siubek fighter base on the Baltic coast.

"On the morning of March 4, I went into the briefing room and stole a map which showed the island of Bornholm—my goal. As the day wore on, I became increasingly nervous.

"The next day I was to lead a training flight of four MIG's. What if the weather was bad? I checked and rechecked, but weather forecasts were poor.

"You can imagine my relief when, after spending a sleepless night, I opened the window and found the day was clear. I burned my private papers, including a diary with my friends' names, and walked out to the runway. Shortly after 9 a. m., I was airborne.

"I was in command of the group, and soon we began climbing higher and higher over the Baltic, where, in the mist, was the sanctuary of Bornholm.

"At 18,000 feet, I jettisoned my reserve gas tanks for extra speed. Even as they were falling I heard over the radio the voice of one of the other pilots in the group shout, '731 is escaping.' That was the number of my plane.

"ORDERED TO SHOOT

"On impulse, I shouted back into the mike, 'Yes, I'm going to fetch medicine for Stalin.' Then I put the nose over and dived. Before my craft began to shake and wobble as it approached the sonic barrier, I switched on the combat wave length and heard the base order the pilots, 'Krest!'

"'Krest' was the code word for 'shoot him down.'

"One of the pursuing MIG's fired at me, but without effect. Six minutes later, as long as eternity, I was landing on a Bornholm runway. I was free."

Even as Jarecki was telling this story, bills were being introduced in the Senate and House to permit him to remain in this country indefinitely. The Senate measure was sponsored by Senators FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan and KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts. The House bill was drafted by Representative O'KONSKI, Republican, of Wisconsin.

Interpreter for Jarecki during the latter's tour of Capitol Hill Thursday, was Representative MACHROWICZ, Democrat, of Michigan. After luncheon, Jarecki talked with Vice President NIXON, Majority Leader TAFT, of Ohio, and Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a significant article by Mr. David Sentner, chief, Milwaukee Sentinel Washington Bureau. Mr. Sentner's article points up the dilemma that is presently facing the President. In my opinion it would be tragic if we followed the Tito policy supposedly advocated by General Smith. There is only one safe policy and that is the one advocated by Mr. Dulles. Mr. Sentner's article follows:

IKE'S AIDS SPLIT ON SOVIET POLICY—DULLES AND SMITH DIFFER ON IRON-CURTAIN PENETRATION

(By David Sentner, chief, Milwaukee Sentinel Washington Bureau)

DEAR PUBLIC: Do you know there is a big and far-reaching split in the Ike setup over the program behind the Iron Curtain?

It concerns mainly a battle in policy between Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, former head of Central Intelligence Agency.

Dulles stands for a dynamic liberation campaign. General Smith believes in the Titoism school whereby the Soviet stooge regions are to be encouraged to break away from the Moscow brand of communism.

To make the distinction a bit clearer:

The Dulles blueprint calls for fighting directly against the Communist ideology through aid to resistance and underground groups back of the Iron Curtain.

Backers of the Smith agenda argue that the Communist form of government in each Russian satellite state can be ignored as long as it can be worked upon to break its ties with Moscow, a la the Red regime of Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia.

The current major objective is to Titoize Mao Tse-tung, Chinese Red leader.

A tricky aspect of the situation is that Allen Dulles, brother of the Secretary of State, is now the hushimo of CIA, where Smith wields considerable influence.

President Eisenhower, to date, has not given the nod to either camp.

Laos might seem to you like the name of a soap. In the same way, Sarajevo, where the Austrian Archduke Francis Ferdinand was assassinated to start World War I, must have sounded to Americans like the name of a patent medicine.

So today you may wonder why there is so much grim trading and quibbling and fighting over whether a few thousand captured Chinese Communists or North Koreans are to be turned over in any armistice deal.

The big gimmick is that in the event we go to war with Russia we expect to do a wholesale business in attracting deserters from the Soviet fighting forces.

If the United States now returns those enemy POW's in Korea to totalitarian enslavement against their wishes, it is feared that Ivan, the Russian GI in the next war, will remember and fight to the last ditch regardless of his hatred of the Red regime.

The twist in our psychological war, illustrated by the offer of a reward by General Clark of $100,000 for the first Russian MIG–15 flown over to our lines by a Chinese Red or Russian pilot, is just the beginning.

Get ready for a series of big surprises along this line.

Incidentally, the Clark $100,000 reward offer was borrowed from a similar suggestion by Prime Minister Churchill to be applied in the European field and was O. K.'d by the White House.

The White House also knew what General MacArthur had written Senator BYRD. MacArthur suggested that the threat of atom bombing Red China be used to button up the Korean truce negotiations and perhaps the entire cold war with the U. S. S. R.

This was another good psychological warfare touch and Ike had no objection to Mac's letter being widely publicized.

The romanesque shadow of MacArthur still hovers importantly over Washington events. He had much to do, indirectly, with the Eisenhower proposal to reorganize the Defense Department, putting control in civilian hands and lessening the power of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Ike was purportedly shocked on learning the political "yes men" records of the majority of the Chiefs of Staff during the Truman administration.

There was the sorry history of General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, going down the line in the Acheson-Truman persecution of MacArthur.

General Vandenberg, as Air Force Chief, had a special strike against him for insisting we could not go all-out bombing in the Korean war, as MacArthur recommended, because we needed the Air Force at home—in case.

Vandenberg, who has just recently resigned his post, is not at all happy at being replaced by General Twining, a forthright MacArthur man.

Vandenberg may therefore heed the pleas of certain Democratic Senators that he testify before the Armed Services Committees on the Hill that Ike is hamstringing the Air Force with his economy cuts.

Army Chief of Staff J. Lawton Collins shares the blame with Bradley for yesterday's ammunition shortage in Korea.

Only the late Adm. Forest P. Sherman of the Joint Chiefs gave a supporting word for MacArthur.

The Navy is expected to get the chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs after Bradley retires in August.

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, who is guarding Formosa and, along with Twining, thinks mighty like MacArthur, is the probable new Joint Chief Chairman. Ike calls him Raddy.

You can forget all the guff about the military running things today like the old clique in Prussia.

You have to admit this country is George when we elect a general who starts putting the Armed Forces pretty much in the hands of civilian topside.

THE ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, in the continuing struggle against subversion and Communist efforts to destroy the essence of constitutional government in this Nation as elsewhere, the forces striving to preserve human dignity and human freedom have no stronger ally than the All-American Conference To Combat Communism. The organization, representing a score of American veteran, patriotic, civic, fraternal, and service groups, was formed in New York City on January 28–29, 1950. The American Legion took the initiative in obtaining the cooperation of the many organizations, and since the first sessions, the All-American Conference To Combat Communism has made material progress.

If there is one thing the Communist conspiracy fears it is organized and intelligent counteraction. The weakness of free people has long been the failure to appreciate the extent, nature, and goals of the conspiracy. Into the area of apathy, inertia, and confusion has moved the All-American Conference.

More than 50 million Americans are represented in the organizations which comprise the conference. There are no racial, religious, or other bars to group or individual participation. A few of the organizations participating in the vital work of the organization are listed below. There are many others:

Veterans of Foreign Wars and its auxiliary; American Legion and its auxiliary; AMVETS; Disabled American Veterans; Catholic War Veterans and its auxiliary; Jewish War Veterans; General Federation of Women's Clubs; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; National Council of Catholic Men; American Jewish Committee; Freedom's Foundation; National Panhellenic Conference; American Medical Association; Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.; American Hotel Association; Lions International; Elks; Moose; Eagles; Improved Order of Red Men; Allied Youth; International Order of Christian Endeavor; American-Hungarian Federation; Ukrainian Congress Committee.

In addition, there are other organizations cooperating with the conference, such as United States Chamber of Commerce, Junior Chamber of Commerce, Optimists.

The conference will hold a plenary session in Washington on Friday and Saturday, May 22–23, 1953. The program is as follows, and all Members of Congress are cordially invited to attend one or more of the sessions:

PROGRAM

FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1953

8:30 p. m., Old Interior (General Services Administration) Auditorium, 18th and F Streets NW., Mrs. Oscar A. Ahlgren, presiding.

Dr. Daniel A. Poling, "Don't Talk America Into Slavery."

Gen. Frank L. Howley, "What Is Russia Up To in Her 'Peace' Offensive?"

SATURDAY, MAY 23, 1953

9:30 a. m., congressional room, Willard Hotel, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, presiding: Business session (for official representatives only).

12:30 p. m., luncheon, crystal room, Willard Hotel, Mr. W. C. "Tom" Sawyer, presiding.

Dr. Robert L. Johnson, "The Faith of Free Men."

Hon. Karl E. Mundt, United States Senate, "The Continuing Danger of Communist Subversion."

2:30 p. m., crystal room, Willard Hotel, Rev. John F. Cronin, SS, presiding:

Mrs. Robert A. Vogeler, "Voluntary Organizations Combat the Menace of Communism."

Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, "Voluntary Organizations Promote American Freedom."

7:30 p. m., banquet, ballroom, National Press Club, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, presiding:

Mr. Shane MacCarthy, "Horse Sense in Humans."

The Honorable George N. Craig, "Ideals of the All-American Conference."

The Honorable Herbert A. Brownell, "The Federal Employee Security Program."

The first session will be held in the old Interior Auditorium on Friday, May 22, at 8:30 p. m. Dr. Poling, who has just returned from a mission to the Far East and India, will speak on the subject, Don't Talk America Into Slavery. Gen. Frank L. Howley, vice chancellor of New York University, who was senior officer in Berlin during the airlift, will talk on What Is Russia Up to In Her "Peace" Offensive?

Following a busines session for participating organizations in the congressional room of the Willard Hotel on Saturday morning, Dr. Robert L. Johnson, Administrator of the United States International Information Administration, and Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, an associate member, will be principal speakers at a luncheon. Dr. Johnson will discuss the Faith of Freemen, and Senator MUNDT the Continuing Danger of Communist Subversion.

Mrs. Lucille Vogeler, wife of Robert Vogeler, a former prisoner in Hungary, and Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president of Freedoms Foundation, will share the platform at the afternoon session on the respective subjects of Voluntary Organizations Combat the Menace of Communism and Voluntary Organizations Promote American Freedom.

The highlight of the meeting will be the talk of Herbert A. Brownell, Jr., United States Attorney General at the annual banquet at 7:30 p. m. at the National Press Club. He will be introduced by Dr. Poling and will discuss the Federal employee security program.

Dr. Poling stated that all of the more than 50 national organizations which make up the conference, and whose combined memberships total more than 50 million, will send delegates to the meeting. Dr. Poling, who is also president and editor of the Christian Herald, recently returned from a 7-week round-the-world mission during which he spent 2 weeks with United Nations troops in Korea and Japan, and visited Formosa. He also spent some time visiting children's homes and orphanages in Hong Kong, India, Pakistan, the Middle and Near East, and Europe. In an address to a special meeting of the Christian Herald Association immediately upon his return, he stated that—

If Moscow and Red China can keep us talking a little longer, they will take Indochina, Thailand, Burma, and Malaya, and move directly into India.

He said:

Right now any peace or armistice that agrees to the partition of Korea or accepts present frontiers in Asia and Europe, would be a second and infinitely worse Munich. Gen. James A. Van Fleet's statement recently, "In the present peace talks with the Chinese Reds I am absolutely convinced that we run the risk of throwing away the future of our Nation." I agree with that.

Dr. Poling further stated there was absolutely no justification for the charge made of drug addiction among servicemen. He met with nearly 400 chaplains, numerous commanding officers, and spoke to, or with, thousands of enlisted men during his trip.

POLISH EMBASSY IS RED PROPAGANDA MILL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, at 2640 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., is the Polish Embassy, which represents the Polish People's Republic in the United States.

It is operating under false pretenses because it is merely a puppet of the Soviet Union.

Its main job is to spew Red propaganda throughout our country—slick words on slick paper that constantly insult the millions of Americans of Polish descent who know that this is not the true voice of Poland, its people, or its institutions.

It is part of the Communist conspiracy which ordered the North Koreans to attack the South Koreans, and, when this failed, ordered the Chinese Reds to come to their support. Aggression added to aggression.

Now Russian satellites are using their embassies in the United States, not for the purpose of representing their governments in matters involving the Government of the United States, but as headquarters for the dissemination of lies about the "liberty" and "progress" of the captive nations.

I maintain that this constitutes an abuse of the diplomatic privilege. These activities should be curtailed. There is no equal exchange of diplomatic representatives when our staffs are holed up in Warsaw or Moscow, while Red representatives here engage in espionage and psychological warfare.

Here is a sample:

They have been distributing a draft constitution of the Polish People's Republic. Article 70 reads:

The Polish People's Republic guarantees freedom of conscience and religion to its citizens. The church and other religious bodies may freely exercise their religious functions.

Can you swallow that? Here is another. Article 71. It says:

1. The Polish People's Republic guarantees its citizens freedom of speech, of print, of meetings and assemblies, of processions and demonstrations.

Sounds something like our Constitution, but that is where all resemblance ceases. Just criticize the Communist one, and that is the end.

Another handout is the Polish Bulletin. On page 9 of its March 15, 1952, issue it reports:

The priests' section of the Union of Fighters for Freedom and Democracy met in Warsaw on February 20 and 21, and adopted a resolution, which said: "The draft constitution of the Polish People's Republic guarantees the unity, the strengthening of the economic and defense power of the nation, social justice, full rights for citizens, freedom of religious beliefs and practices."

I do not hear of this approval by Polish priests who are now in the United States and who are free to speak. Quite the contrary. Religion in Poland is being harassed from many directions, with the object of making it an instrument of the state.

The Polish Embassy in the United States is a creature of the Kremlin. It is engaged in activities subversive of our unity and our security.

As an agent of a foreign power that is committed to our destruction, I say that it should not be permitted to bore from within.

Why not look at its whole propaganda output?

Analyze it. Classify it.

Then you will realize it is part of a subtle plan to color our thinking with a false picture of Poland, and make us indifferent to the sufferings of her people. All part of the strategy to separate us from our allies and friends, isolate us from the world, and make us ripe for the final harvest.

The American people, and particularly those of Polish extraction, are disturbed by the apathy of our Government in failing to curb these enemy activities within our country.

Everyone knows that Red Russia instigated the Korean war.

Everyone should know that Red Russia, again and indirectly, through its satellite embassies, is waging another war by propaganda within the United States. If the State Department cannot exercise any control over these dangerous activities it is up to the Congress to be realistic and expose this method of Communist infiltration.

FLOOD DAMAGE IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Louisiana due to its geographical location handles all the drainage of 42 percent of the area of the United States. The rainfall from 31 States in this great Nation seeks egress through streams flowing through Louisiana.

At this time in Louisiana there are 7,000 families which are homeless due to floodwaters. One of our great cities of 35,000 population is almost cut off from other parts of the State of Louisiana on account of this floodwater. One river overflowed its levees and is now spread over a width of some 20 miles and may reach a length of 80 miles. Five already are known to have lost their lives in this catastrophe.

Some members of the Louisiana delegation are being called back to their State on account of this flood.

Mr. Speaker, I am mentioning this so that when the flood-control bill reaches the floor next week you will understand, as many of us do, the necessity of making sufficient appropriations for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries flood-control project, to continue this great work which will ultimately afford us the protection to which we are justly entitled.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA SANCTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, all Americans were very glad to note the release of William Oatis from prison in Czechoslovakia due, as we note in the press, mainly to the appeal made by Mrs. Oatis. Subsequent to that I noticed in the newspapers that a spokesman for the State Department indicated that certain sanctions we had made against Czechoslovakia while Oatis was in prison might be removed by our country. Now, I do not say on my present information that the State Department has that intention, but we know that when someone who is a spokesman in the State Department indicates that that might be done, that it is seriously under consideration. The official's name in the State Department was mentioned. My thought is that we should not of our own volition remove those sanctions that we have imposed; at least, there ought to be a request from the present individuals who are in control of the Government of Czechoslovakia, because, at least, there is a trading point and a talking point. I do not see any situation, by reason of the release of Oatis, which we are all pleased to note, why we should gratuitously lift the sanctions that have been imposed. I repeat, I do not say that the State Department has that in mind, and my observations are purely made for the purpose of having the Secretary of State and those associated with him give serious consideration to not gratuitously lifting those sanctions; at least, waiting for the request, and then enter into talks and considerations that might produce other results favorable to our country.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOANS

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on the bill we concluded yesterday, on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, I noted considerable comment as to the soundness of the loans that have been granted to local cooperatives through the Rural Electrification Administration for the purpose of supplying electricity to farm homes where it was not otherwise available.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that my own county in Indiana, Henry, completed payment of their obligation to the Federal Government just recently. The information that comes to me is that this is the first of the loans that were made for the purpose of providing rural electrification to the farmers to be paid in full and from revenue derived from the sale of electricity to the farmers.

FIG FESTIVAL TIME

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, from the sunny valley of the San Joaquin, fig capital of America, the word is being spread throughout the Nation that May is fig festival time. Colorful displays not only advertise the excellence of this delicious California fruit, but they also remind the public of the many ways figs are being served today by discriminating hostesses. This annual festival is sponsored by all California fig growers, under the auspices of the California Fig Institute, to celebrate the growing American popularity of a fruit that has been one of mankind's favorites since the beginning of recorded time.

California is the sole source of dried figs in the United States, and the California fig industry, with its orchards and processing facilities, constitutes a capital investment of more than $40 million, and offers employment to thousands of persons each year. Its welfare is tightly interwoven into the economic fabric of the great and diversified agriculture of the sovereign State of California.

It is with these facts in mind that I invite the legislators of the Nation to join with me in celebrating fig festival time in the San Joaquin Valley, fig capital of the United States.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to arrange with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for division and control of the time for general debate. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island express his ideas as to the time he would like to have for general debate?

Mr. FOGARTY. As I said last evening to the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the committee, I think we should agree on 4 hours of general debate today, read the first paragraph of the bill, and then start tomorrow reading the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 4 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5246, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before explaining any of the provisions contained in the bill and the reasons for the action of the committee, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to pay my respects to each and every member of the committee on both sides.

I have had the honor and privilege of working with many committees in the House of Representatives before being assigned to the Appropriations Committee. I can truthfully and honestly and sincerely say that I have never enjoyed working with the members of any committee more than I have with the members of this committee. I particularly desire to pay tribute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who has served on the committee for 11 years, and as chairman for the past 4 years. He has been exceedingly helpful to me. I am not saying anything on the floor today that I have not said to Members individually and privately beyond the range of Mr. FOGARTY's ears. I think Mr. FOGARTY is indeed a credit to the membership of the House of Representatives. He is a gentleman at all times. He is very, very considerate of everyone's problems. I do not believe there is a single soul in the entire United States that has a greater personal interest in the various programs that come under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee on appropriations than has Mr. FOGARTY. His knowledge and experience have been invaluable to everyone on the committee, and particularly to me. He has been very generous with his knowledge and experience in assisting and counseling me during my first year as chairman. While we may differ in some instances as to how much money should be appropriated to administer individual programs, any differences between Mr. FOGARTY and me, I know, are honest disagreements. It has been a pleasure to work with him, and I hope to continue to draw on his knowledge and guidance in the future, as I have in the past.

I should also like to mention the fact that, while I know that the various subcommittees on appropriations have very fine assistants on their staffs, frankly, I do not know what I would have done this year without the most efficient and untiring assistance and cooperation of the executive secretary of the subcommittee, Mr. Robert M. Moyer. He has diligently studied this appropriation bill and every

item therein. Anytime anyone needed information, he was able to supply it immediately. I very much appreciate his valuable assistance.

In round figures, this appropriation bill contains a total of $1,965,000,000. That compares with $2,250,000,000 for the fiscal year 1953, and the original budget request of $2,100,000,000. It is $289 million below the 1953 appropriation, and is $132 million below the requested 1954 budget. It is $56,500,000 below the revised budget request.

The bill includes $1,340,000,000, two-thirds of the total amount, for grants to States for public assistance. Payments under this appropriation are required by law and are subject to no control through appropriations unless the law is changed. The committee made reductions only in instances where it honestly believed such reductions would be effective in saving Federal funds, and has therefore made no reduction in the request for this item.

Leaving out of consideration the uncontrollable item of grants for public assistance, the committee reduced the total amount requested by over 17 percent, and the amount included in the bill is 31 percent below the amount appropriated for 1953. However, the 1953 appropriations included $195 million for school construction, which was not requested in the 1954 budget.

I wish to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that each item in this bill was carefully examined by the committee. The hearings which we held on items that are included in the bill occupy 2,500 pages in four volumes. After these hearings, we sat in executive session, to arrive at our recommendations, from 9:15 in the morning until about 6 in the evening, with a short period out for a sandwich. There are no across-the-board cuts in this bill, and there are no misleading cuts in the bill. It would be very easy to reduce the amount requested for an item, like grants for public assistance, by $100 million or $200 million, but that would not be a real cut, because we know that we would be required by law to replace this in a supplemental bill. I merely mention that because I want to reemphasize it and to assure the House that there are no phony cuts in this bill.

While the committee took no action with respect to grants for public assistance, except to approve the request, I am of the opinion that the ever-increasing cost to the Federal Government of public assistance during a period as prosperous as the last 10 years is a matter that should be given most careful consideration, with a view to revising the legislation. Not only does the Federal Government now spend more than three times as much for public assistance as it did in 1945, but the share which the Federal Government bears has increased from 45.5 percent to an estimated 57.7 percent.

The committee tried to cooperate with every Member of the House, many of whom had a particular interest in one or more items. Many had an interest in vocational education; some, in vocational rehabilitation; others, in hospital construction, or the numerous other items contained in the bill.

Over 40 Members appeared before the committee not only to present their views regarding various items in which they were particularly interested, but to give the committee the advantage of their own experience and personal knowledge of the operation of the programs in their congressional districts.

There is one new item of expense in the Department of Labor that is unavoidable. The bill includes $41 million for unemployment compensation of veterans which, like public-assistance grants, is not controllable administratively. These payments must be made to the eligible veterans in accordance with mathematical formulas prescribed in the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. While the amount included in the bill shows in the report table as a reduction from the request, this is due entirely to the fact that the Department revised its estimate of the cost of this item downward after the budget was prepared. The $41 million included in the bill is the exact amount of the Department's latest estimate. This amount is $13,800,000 above the amount appropriated for 1953, principally because the law did not go into effect until after the beginning of the 1953 fiscal year.

The total amount included in the bill for the Department of Labor is less than 1 percent below the 1953 appropriations. In other words, the committee made sufficient reductions in other items in the Department to counterbalance almost exactly the increase for unemployment compensation for veterans. While this is a rather substantial reduction of over $42 million below the budget request, I firmly believe that there was not one cut made which will cripple any program.

The total amount in the bill for salaries and expenses for the Department is slightly above the 1950 appropriation. The amount for grants for unemployment compensation and employment services is also a salaries-and-expenses item, but goes to pay for State salaries and related costs. This appropriation, while a substantial cut below the request, is more than $13 million above the appropriation for 1950.

For the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the bill includes $1,700,000,000 of which $1,340,000,000 is for grants to States for public assistance, and $360 million for other activities.

Leaving out the public-assistance item, the committee has made a reduction of approximately 25 percent from the amount requested for 1954.

The budget included many requests for grants to States to carry out programs that the committee felt were primarily the responsibility of the States and communities, and that the responsibility should eventually be shifted to them. We realize that these responsibilities cannot be shifted all at once; we therefore decided as a committee to make a moderate cut this year, with the intention of making further progress in this direction during the next few years.

The committee was quite concerned about the tremendous amount of travel that was being done in these agencies and we came to the conclusion that it was excessive.

The committee has disallowed all requests for authority to purchase automobiles, either as additions to the fleet or as replacements. The committee is convinced that the Department, and especially the Public Health Service, has far more automobiles than are necessary. The Public Health Service automobiles are listed, starting on page 649 of the hearings, with pertinent information concerning each. In order that those officials who need automobiles in the conduct of their official duties may have them, the committee has included language in the bill authorizing the Secretary to transfer automobiles between appropriations.

The committee was also concerned about the continual upgrading of positions in several bureaus. Mr. Chairman, because I had always been suspicious of the way Dr. Earl McGrath, the former Commissioner of Education, was running his division, I had a special study made of the classification and upgrading in two divisions: School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, and State and Local School Systems.

Classification under the Government system consists of comparing the duties and responsibilities of a position with a set of specifications, or standards, promulgated by the Civil Service Commission for each class, or series, of positions, and each grade within a class or series. The ultimate norm of grade within a class or series is contained in the Classification Act of 1949.

We thus have a constant and a variable—the specification or standard being the constant, and the position being the variable. Our chief source of information on the variable is the position-description sheet. Because it is not feasible to desk-audit each position, the strength or weakness of the system depends to a great extent on the veracity of a position description. Such descriptions are usually signed by the incumbent and by the supervisor.

A spot check by a qualified investigator of a number of position-description sheets disclosed that, in almost every instance, they compared favorably with the standard for the grade in which the job is presently classified.

Sadly enough, this proves very little. It is not difficult to make a position description fit a standard—a standard for any grade we want to make the job. Without casting any reflections on anyone, the Civil Service Commission did call attention to a number of erroneous descriptions in their audit of the agency.

A second limitation in the classification field is that it takes little cognizance of efficient organization. It can determine that a number of individuals are doing high-powered work. It cannot determine whether it is necessary for all these people to do high-powered work.

This falls into the field of efficient management. The medical profession might well illustrate our point. The renowned specialist on the left nostril could conceivably treat the right nostril too, but if we split the work, we have two kings, each top man on his special nostril, and, of course, two bills to pay.

The survey showed that the position descriptions in these two divisions appeared to be classified correctly. Some of the descriptions were evidently somewhat erroneous. It appeared that there

are quite a number of highly graded jobs, although such a situation can well exist in an area where a number of specialists are employed. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a few comments from the investigator's report:

I have made a rather exhaustive study of promotions and other personnel actions, as reflected in the personnel cards and in many of the files. There are set out below a summary of personnel actions on all employees still listed on the rolls as of April 30, 1953, in these two divisions:

Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas

A. SECTIONS LOCATED IN WASHINGTON

Present employees upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951	36
Present employees not upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951	40
Present employees in second group hired since Jan. 1, 1952	14

B. FIELD OPERATIONS SECTION

Present employees upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951	8
Present employees not upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951	41
Present employees in second group hired since Jan. 1, 1952	16

During this period there were 10 employees reclassified upward 2 or more grades. (GS-7 to GS-9 and GS-9 to GS-11 in the professional group is not considered 2 grades.)

Attention is invited to the figures in the field-operations area of the Division, wherein upgrading was not so prevalent. It should be noted that of the 49 jobs checked, 16 are already at GS-13, which appears to be the top grade for field representative, and 10 of the jobs are at GS-12. There are 4 jobs at GS-11, but I failed to locate any in this area at GS-7 or GS-9. It then appears that they didn't have very many jobs to upgrade without opening new field offices.

In regard to promotions of more than 1 grade, I found 8 individuals, who had been in GS-3, were moved to GS-7 in periods of from 3 to 6 months. In addition, 2 of these employees had received periodic within-grade salary increases 9 months after reaching GS-7. The usual waiting period is 1 year, as prescribed by law.

Another employee, who was in GS-11 at Veterans' Administration in April 1951, was appointed here GS-12, and 6 months later was a GS-13.

A statistician, elsewhere at GS-7, was appointed here at GS-9 in December 1950, and reached GS-11 in August 1951.

1951 began cool for a GS-7 in 1 agency but warmed quickly by January 15, when she received a GS-9 appointment. Lest winter catch her unprepared, she was upgraded to GS-11 in August of 1951. Before 1952 was gone she was promoted to GS-12, which promotion has now been made permanent.

A secretary occupying a GS-4 position at the beginning of 1951 found herself in a GS-7 position during October of that year.

1951 was a good year likewise for 1 statistical clerk who was in GS-5 when Washington's Birthday was celebrated. Her Thanksgiving was a happy one, she having reached the GS-9 level by that time.

Division of State and Local School System

Present employees upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951	26
Present employees not upgraded since Jan. 1, 1951	75
Present employees in second group hired since Jan. 1, 1952	12

In connection with the above record, certain observations should be made. Of 56 employees who should be termed professional, 46 are already at GS-13, or higher. Fourteen of them are Chiefs or Associate Chiefs at GS-14 and GS-15. The 32 employees at GS-13 are specialists, in various phases of education and cannot very well be upgraded without finding some area of which they can be made Chief.

A breakdown of the professional grades follows:

Three at GS-15, 11 at GS-14, 32 at GS-13, 5 at GS-12, 3 at GS-9, 1 at GS-8, 1 at GS-7.

One point should be made in favor of the agency, and that is, that in the manner of hiring, regardless of the grade of the job, the individuals are uniformly well qualified for such appointments.

One result of the survey was quite evident: That the favored few who had recently been employed were advanced quite rapidly, while the employees who had served the Office of Education for many years faithfully and efficiently, received very little recognition and no promotions.

I think every Member of the House is particularly interested in the item of vocational education. The committee has made a reduction of a little over $2½ million in the request for this item. This is a cut of less than 10 percent in the Federal appropriation, and amounts to a reduction of less than 2 percent in the total funds provided for this program in all sources, including State and local. It is the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee that this is an excellent program. However, since this program was initiated, and undoubtedly in recognition of the fact that it is an excellent program, the contribution from the States and localities has increased practically every year to the point where State and local funds now represent about 80 percent of the total spent on the program. The Federal part of the program was established, as the name states, for the promotion and further development of this program. Obviously, that purpose has been accomplished, and it is time for the Federal Government to start withdrawing its financial support, inasmuch as the program has reached that point of maturity where it can be, and should be, a State and local responsibility. However, the committee has made a very small reduction this year, to be doubly sure that no harm is done to the program.

The bill includes $20,600,000 for vocational rehabilitation, a reduction of $2,400,000 from the request and $1,650,000 from the appropriation for 1953. The committee has long thought that this was an excellent program, but serious doubts have been cast on this assumption by the failure of States to support this activity. The committee has strongly urged greater State support and, according to the testimony of officials of the Office, they have done likewise but the States still are only contributing 34 cents of each dollar spent on the program. If a better basic law is required to correct this situation, the Department should take prompt action in making recommendations to the proper legislative committees.

The program of vocational education is one of the most worthwhile programs in the Department. Unfortunately, the administration—or lack of administration—of this program leaves much to be desired. The task force which the subcommittee had checking this program found, by spot-checking 26 cases, that Federal funds were paid for the rehabilitation of individuals that, in the investigators' opinion, were not eligible for assistance. The unfortunate part was the fact that the Office did not make a protest nor an exception in a single one of these cases. For example, vocational rehabilitation funds were spent in one State for the education of a young man who had lost three toes on his right foot, but who, despite his vocational handicap, became the eastern intercollegiate wrestling champion while being rehabilitated.

Aside from vocational education, the item in this part of the bill that has aroused the greatest amount of congressional interest is the National Institutes of Health. I am sure everyone appreciates the worthiness of the research programs of the National Institutes of Health in reference to cancer, heart, mental diseases, arthritis, neurology, and blindness; and the other institutes that have been established.

The committee is recommending a total of $61,500,000, which is about $3 million more than the Department will obligate in 1953, and more than $5 million above the revised budget request. It is $23,500,000 below the original 1954 request. However, after the Bureau of the Budget had submitted the 1954 estimates, President Truman added $15 million for construction grants. Leaving out the construction item of $15 million, the amount recommended by the committee is approximately halfway between the first and the revised budget requests for the National Institutes of Health.

The committee has allowed the amount of the revised request for operating expenses; the amount of the 1953 appropriation for the cancer, mental health, heart, dental health, and microbiology institutes; an increase of about 10 percent for arthritis and metabolic disease activities; and a very substantial increase of over 100 percent for research on neurological diseases and blindness.

The report states very explicitly that the National Institutes of Health are to concentrate their funds more on research, and less on related activities, because the committee is extremely desirous that research on these various diseases be increased. At the same time, we appreciate the limitation on expanding a program too fast. Sure, they could spend twice as much money and, frankly, I am not so sure but that they should have twice as much money for some of these activities. But this committee, like all the other subcommittees on appropriations, has to take into consideration the economic condition of the country and the balancing of the budget, and try to do everything possible to give the taxpayers of this Nation a decrease in their taxes as soon as possible.

The membership of this House is also tremendously interested in the hospital-construction program, known as the Hill-Burton program. No one in the committee is opposed in any way to a proper hospital-construction program, properly administered. We had some men go into the Department to make a survey as to how the program was being operated.

I am recommending and suggesting to the Members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

that they take a good look at this report, and have some of their staff members check into it very carefully before the Hill-Burton Act is extended, in order that they will be able to offer certain amendments which I believe will strengthen the law and correct many weaknesses and deficiencies in this program.

I do not want anything I say in regard to the gentleman I am about to mention to be construed as being personally derogatory to him in any way, shape, manner, or form. The gentleman to whom I refer is Dr. Cronin, of the Public Health Service, who is charged with the responsiblity of administering this program. As far as I know, Dr. Cronin is a very highly regarded and esteemed man in his profession. Nevertheless, I believe that, because this is a construction program, it should be administered by an engineer, or someone who has had years of experience in the construction business. If you needed an operation on your eye you would certainly go to an occulist, and not a chiropodist. I believe the program should have an engineer at the head of it.

We have found that the Department's auditors in the field, making audits on the construction of these hospitals, submit their reports to the program people, and the program people can take those reports—which they evidently have done in the past to a great extent—and throw them in the wastebasket. I think this procedure is wrong and should be corrected.

We have found in this survey that these funds, in many instances, have not been spent where there is the greatest need for hospitals. They have been spent in the areas that were able to raise money to match the Federal funds.

We had testimony before the committee that there is a tremendous shortage of doctors, nurses, and hospital attendants to staff existing hospitals. There are many deficiencies in the program that I will not take the time to discuss today.

I know the law is going to be extended and I am going to vote for extending the law, but I do hope this program will be looked at very carefully, so that some of these weaknesses can be corrected.

I do not want to leave the floor without referring to some of the publication activities of the Office of Education. The Office of Education gets out just scads and scads of publications. They have emphasized, and put out endless propaganda for, the United Nations and the UNESCO program, to the almost 100 percent exclusion of the Constitution of the United States and American history.

I am not debating today the merits or demerits of the United Nations, but in 1955 the various members of the United Nations will have to consider revision of the United Nations Charter. How are the people going to know the weaknesses of the organization—and even the strongest boosters admit there are weaknesses—if they are not given all the facts? They get only one side of the story from the Office of Education.

I have many publications, and a list of many more, issued by the Office of Education—all propaganda for the United Nations. Why, you would think the milliennium was here, from the material distributed by the Office of Education.

Just the other day, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] had a problem concerning a Communist pamphlet that was being distributed by the Hungarian Embassy to our schools throughout the United States. He wrote to Mr. Grigsby, the Acting Commissioner of Education, and asked if the Office of Education should not advise the schools concerning this publication that was propagandizing the teachers and children of our schools regarding this Communist country behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Grigsby pleaded the lack of funds, but we have scores of expensive booklets published by the Office of Education. Frankly, I doubt the need of a great many of them. Anything and everything is in them, but you cannot find mention in any bulletin of the fact that school officials should be aware of this Hungarian publication, and that it is a Communist publication. I think the new Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could well consider having someone survey the whole program.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I notice the gentleman has quite a number of the pamphlets, and apparently those are objectionable. I am sure the House would be interested in knowing the particular pamphlets, and the suggestion I wanted to make is that if you would have them listed in the RECORD, it would be of considerable help to us.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will be very glad to have them listed. There are a great many listed in the hearings, and I have many here which I did not have at the time of the hearings. I will be glad to list them at this point in the RECORD.

The titles of a portion of the pamphlets that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] requested are as follows: "How Children Learn About Human Rights"; "The U. N. Declaration of Human Rights"; "World Understanding Begins With Children"; "Teaching About the United Nations in the Schools and Colleges of the United States," published by the United States National Commission for UNESCO, Department of State; United States National Commission for UNESCO, "Teaching About the United Nations in the Schools and Colleges of the United States."

In addition, the Office of Education publishes a selected bibliography for teaching about the United Nations.

There are many others, but the above list should give anyone a pretty good idea of how they slant the propaganda in favor of the United Nations, instead of reporting objectively.

Mr. BARDEN. Some years ago, there were some most objectionable pamphlets, and our Committee on Education and Labor took some steps with reference to them. It was objectionable to the recent Commissioner, Dr. McGrath, to have this type of pamphlet going out over his signature, and it was stopped. I was just interested to know if any pamphlets had gone out over Dr. McGrath's signature, which were of the objectionable type.

Mr. BUSBEY. I might say the pamphlets were secured from the Office of Education very recently.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], by his opening remarks today before this Committee, has made it difficult for me to disagree with him on many items in this appropriation bill. But, I do want to say for the benefit of the members of the committee, I have enjoyed working on this subcommittee since the 1st of February of this year under the chairmanship of FRED BUSBEY. I do not believe any chairman could have been any fairer to any member of the minority party, nor do I believe there was a witness who appeared before our committee in the 2 months or so of hearings who can say he did not get all the time he needed to explain his case. If there was ever a time in hearings on an appropriation bill, the witnesses this year had every opportunity given to them by the chairman of this committee to explain their side of the story. They were treated like gentlemen across the table. I say that in justice to the chairman of our committee. He has been very fair to those of us on the minority, and we have no fault to find at all. As he said, we may disagree on some points, but they may be disagreements of basic philosophy or they may be disagreements of what he thinks and what I think are produced by the results of the appropriations we are making in this bill.

I can sincerely reiterate what he said about our clerk. I think Bob Moyer, our clerk, who served when I was chairman of the committee, is one of the outstanding clerks of any Subcommittee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives. As far as I am concerned, he has given me all the cooperation I could possibly expect from any clerk on a Subcommittee on Appropriations during the last 3 months under the Republican administration.

It has also been a pleasure to work with the two new members on the majority side, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE]. In all the weeks of hearings I do not believe there was any politics ever brought into the hearings and in the markup of the bill itself we were able to keep politics out of it.

We also had a new member on the minority side, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ]. I appreciate all the help that he gave me in the many hearings that have been held.

I think this is one of the most difficult appropriation bills to cut of any bill that comes before this House. Everything in this bill is directly applicable to the people of the country. The Labor Department and the new Department, Health, Education, and Welfare, each directly affects all our citizens. They affect people living today, and they affect the future welfare of our people, not only from a moral standpoint but from a physical standpoint as well. It is very difficult to cut any appropriations that we know are producing results,

which the record will show, if anyone has the time to read the hearings on this particular bill.

One thing that I am disappointed in is that this is not a unanimous report from the committee. I have disagreed with the action of the majority of the committee in several instances. I believe they have gone too deep. I believe they have cut out necessary programs; and, in my opinion, that is not economy.

When we take a look at the Department of Labor, which has received an overall 20-percent cut this year, it reminds me of the same circumstances that existed in 1947, in the 80th Congress. At that time the agency in the Government that was cut most was the Department of Labor. I remember my old friend, Frank Keefe, who was chairman of the committee at that time, saying on this floor, "We have cut the Labor Department by 25 percent"—the deepest cut made in any agency of Government in that fiscal year. In 1948, under the same leadership of the 80th Congress, they again bragged that they had cut the Labor Department an additional 20 percent. This year, leaving out grants to States for unemployment compensation, which is not a charge on the Federal Treasury, and leaving out the new item for unemployment compensation for veterans, this committee has cut the Department of Labor an average of 20 percent.

The Department is receiving under this administration exactly the same treatment it received from the 80th Congress. I doubt that that is going to be good for the Republican Party. But I do remember the campaign in 1948 that was put on in this country. It was brought out that the Labor Department had been picked out of all the agencies in Government and given the greatest cut of any agency existing at that time. I know that in the election of 1948, on the overall picture, it certainly did not help the Republican Party at that time.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I would prefer to continue with my statement, and then I will yield later.

In those days, 1947 and 1948, the Republicans had control of both the House and the Senate, but the Democrats still had control of the White House. This year, in 1953, when we are considering our estimates for 1954, we have a complete change from top to bottom. The Republicans have complete control of the executive branch and the legislative branch of our great country. I thought that, having control, they would have some confidence in the appointees of the President of the United States. I thought that when the President appointed a man like Martin Durkin as Secretary of Labor, who was confirmed by the United States Senate, when he came in and made a request for funds to operate his agency in an efficient manner, because he was one of yours, an appointee of your President, you would at least give him some consideration in the request that he was making.

In the 3 or 4 volumes of printed hearings that are before you, there is not a word of testimony that justifies one cent of reduction in the Office of the Secretary of Labor. I think that is true almost without exception throughout the bill. I do not know of a place in the hearings you have before you today that justifies a cut whether it be in the Labor Department or the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Nothing was developed in the hearings, as far as I can see, that justified the committee cuts that have been made in this bill.

We give to the Office of the Secretary of Labor $1,250,000. It is over $400,000 less than you gave the Democratic Secretary of Labor in this fiscal year. You are giving less to your own people, to your own employees, and you are giving less than your own President recommends for the running of this particular office in the Department of Labor. I could understand, if you had control of the Congress and we had a Democratic Secretary of Labor, that you might cut him some 17 or 18 percent, or $300,000 or $400,000; but I cannot for the life of me see you cutting your own man, cutting the legs out from under your own appointee, the appointee of your own President and your party, cutting him to the extent you have.

In the Office of the Solicitor you have cut over $400,000, yet in the course of a year that division, through its work, will take in more than we appropriate to carry them in any fiscal year. I do not know what brand of economy you call that.

The committee has given the Bureau of Labor Standards a very severe cut from nine hundred and some thousand dollars back to $624,000, or a cut of $374,000 below the request and $214,000 below the appropriations for 1953.

I remember a couple of years ago that in this great basic program that is run by the Bureau of Labor Standards all the Government agencies got together and decided they would take the safety and educational features out of the Army, Navy, and every other agency of Government and put them into the Bureau of Labor Standards, because that is the place they belonged. That agency has done a wonderful job; the record of industrial accidents has been going down, down, down. Here is an agency of Government that has one of the best records, dealing with industrial accidents in our country, and you are cutting them 20 or 30 percent.

Another request the agency made in this program was funds for a study of migrant farm workers in the Midwest, South, and Far West, farm hands who travel from State to State following the crops as they mature. I think it was testified that people engaged in such work, migrant farm labor, earn an average of about $500 a year. They, like everybody else, have children. These children follow their fathers and mothers from State to State.

There have been commissions appointed since Herbert Hoover's time recommending that something be done about this particular problem, but there is not a State affected by this type of labor that has done anything for the children of these workers who go from State to State. When these children arrive they are not wanted by the local churches, they are not wanted by the local schools, they are not accepted in that community. They are not second-class citizens, they are third-class citizens in all of these towns they are working in at the present time.

The first commission appointed under Herbert Hoover recommended that the Federal Government do something. There have been 7 or 8 other commissions appointed over the years. They all come out with the same recommendation, that the Federal Government should take the lead in this particular problem and do something about them, provide the leadership for the States that are affected by this particular item. I remember the President saying he did not believe in second-class citizens in this country; that all citizens should be classed as first-class citizens; yet here you are allowing this tragedy to happen. We have third-class citizens who are not wanted, whose parents are working in the particular towns in the various States and we do not allow them a dime to do anything with this particular problem.

Referring now to the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, that division is a small one. It only asked for $346,000. It has some forty-odd employees. But it is a provision that is in the Selective Service Act where every veteran who has gone to war or every reservist who has been called back to service is guaranteed his reemployment rights when discharged from the Army or when he gets out of the Reserves. Here we have a small agency of Government, the only agency in Government that guarantees the reemployment rights of the veterans, one of the smallest agencies of Government, at a time when the men are being discharged at a high rate—I have forgotten what the figure is, at the rate of a million a year—with a heavy backlog of complaints. They cannot catch up with them. These involve complaints from veterans who are having trouble getting their jobs back after getting out of the service. Yet in the face of all that, we cut this agency $46,000, the only agency that looks after veterans and their reemployment rights. That is your answer to those veterans who are returning from the service, after the Congress of the United States in the Selective Service Act guaranteed to them that they would have reemployment rights when they returned from the service.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most surprising cuts in the Department of Labor to me was in the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training. This was one agency in the Department that in 1947 and 1948 the Republicans said we should not cut. You did not cut this agency in 1947 and 1948 because everyone agreed it was one of the best run programs in the country. It was a program that was coordinated as between management and labor. Both management and labor wanted this program continued. Yet I see advertisements in my local papers today of airplane factories on the west coast trying to get labor on the east coast to go to the west coast because they still have a shortage of mechanics in that area. This was one of the agencies of the Government that was never considered in a

partisanship manner. It had the support of Republicans and Democrats alike. It had the support of labor and management in all the States and it has done a wonderful job in training apprentices during the past few years. Yet we cut that agency of Government some $700,000. That is your answer to a program that has worked well from a nonpartisan viewpoint and from the standpoint of labor and management as well.

I go now to the Bureau of Employment Security and the Bureau of Employees' Compensation. We are allowing them $187 million, which is a reduction of $30 million. Now, I think every Member of the Congress knows that this is not a drain on the Federal Treasury. This fund is set up by the three-tenths of 1 percent that the employer pays into the Federal Treasury. We allocate out of this fund the amounts that are estimated to be needed in unemployment compensation payments for the next fiscal year. There is no reason or justification for this $30 million cut at all. I have not heard a man in this country say that employment is going to be higher in 1954, but all the talk I hear around Washington today is that we are going into a recession within the next 8 or 10 or 12 or 16 months, and if we do, you are not only going to come back for a supplemental $30 million, but you might be faced in January with a supplemental of $50 million to reimburse this fund. We are taking in today on an average of $60 million a year more than we are paying out of this particular fund. It seems to me with the tightening of credit, with an increase in interest rates, with a decrease in spending in the military program, that we are headed downward, and sometimes I think it is being done purposely; that the administration in power today wants unemployment, they want a surplus labor market so that they can drag down wages and get what they want out of the employees.

There is no justification for that $30 million cut; we had no reason to cut it at all, and we know when we cut it that the agency is going to have to come back again for it in a supplemental bill. I thought we were trying to get away from supplemental bills. We already have had 2 or 3 in this session of the Congress, and will have another one by the end of June or before we get out of here this year. This action of the committee is actually suggesting to them to come back and ask us for the money next year.

Unemployment compensation for veterans: You are giving them, probably, the original Truman budget, $41 million, which is the revised Eisenhower budget. That is just an estimate. That might go to $50 million, or it might go to $35 million, no one can tell. It is just an estimate.

Salaries and expenses for the Mexican labor program: I do not know why we cut that. That only includes $1,200,000, and it is only for 6 months, from July 1 this year until December 31, 1953, because at the time the agreement between Mexico and this country had not been renewed, and we allowed the 6 months' provision. Since that time the agreement has been renewed, and we will again have to give them the additional money to continue. But they were getting little enough out of that program, and I believe that the cut that they gave was entirely too much to make a satisfactory program down on the Mexican border.

Bureau of Employees Compensation: We cut that $180,000. That is another agency in the Department of Labor that was not cut under the Republican administration in 1947 and 1948, because the Republican Members of the committee said then that Mr. McCauley, who was head of the division at that time, and still is, was one of the most conservative directors of any agency in the Government. He was always estimating on the conservative side. This cut of $180,000 means that the Federal employees are going to have to wait to receive their checks when they are injured. There is no other way out of it. They cannot keep up with the program at the present time under the cut that we have made.

Bureau of Labor Statistics: We have given them almost a $700,000 cut. That is an agency of Government that the Members of Congress use; it is the agency of Government that private industry uses; it is the agency of Government that labor unions use when they have that escalator clause in their union-management contracts. That is one agency that I think has done a splendid job, and I think that is too much of a cut.

Now we come down to the Women's Bureau. There is only one agency in government that can give help to the working women of this country. We have at the present time in this country about 20 million women who are working. This small agency in Washington is the only agency of our Government where these 20 million women workers today can get any advice, leadership, or help regarding their working conditions or the problems they are facing.

It has been almost an annual appropriation in this bill. Once in a while we might cut them $5,000 or $10,000, but we never cut them as much as $60,000, which is about a 17 percent cut. Here you are cutting one of the smallest agencies of the Government, the only agency of the Government that has anything to do with the working conditions of 20 million women in this country, and you are cutting them 17 percent.

You cut the wage-hour division $1,639,000, one of the largest cuts you have made in the Department of Labor. We cut them quite severely a couple of years ago and a year ago. I think, although I am not sure, that they are now about 50 percent below what they were 3 or 4 years ago. If you do not want the minimum wage laws lived up to in this country, if you do not want the Walsh-Healey Act enforced in this country, why not repeal the laws instead of taking money away from the agency so it cannot enforce the laws? Why go in the back door like this and cripple their enforcement procedures? Let us face it. Let us come out and say there is a change in this administration, that we are not for this law or that law. Let us either amend it or get rid of it. Let us be men about it and not come in through the back door and cut their appropriations to such an extent that they cannot enforce the provisions Congress has voted during the past 3 or 4 years. There are 600,000 or 700,000 business establishments in this country. They can visit only 35,000 out of this number at the present time with what they have to work with.

As far as the Labor Department is concerned, to me it is an exact replica of the 80th Congress in 1947, when we were before this committee, but instead of cutting it 25 percent, as you did in 1947, you cut it only 20 percent this year.

As to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have another appointee of the President of the United States in a new Secretary for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby. I never met Mrs. Hobby until she appeared before our committee. She appeared before our committee I think on three occasions, and those were the three occasions I had the pleasure of talking with her.

I remember the first time, my friend from Illinois and the other Republican members of the committee told her what a great job she was doing and what a great job they expected her to do, and how glad they were that there was a change in the old Federal Security Administration.

I said in a committee meeting that when I was chairman of this committee, whenever we got down to the office of the Secretary or the Administrator, as it was called then, when Oscar Ewing was the Administrator, there was not much I could do about it because the Republicans and the Democrats on the subcommittee for 4 years did not have much use for Oscar Ewing, and they just indiscriminately cut every year. It was an across-the-board cut. If it was a 15-percent cut, some might say 20 percent, and then, "Oh, let's make it a 25-percent cut." That is the way it went for 4 or 5 years.

His office was cut on an average of 20 percent to 25 percent because of a clash of personalities and because they did not like the way Oscar Ewing ran the office. That is why his office appropriations were cut. Then, lo and behold, a few weeks ago, we were called upon to vote to make the Federal Security Administration a Cabinet post. We made Mrs. Hobby the first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and at the same time we voted to make her a Cabinet officer. We also voted to give her additional funds under the reorganization act making it a Cabinet post. I do not know how many additional positions were given her—I have forgotten now—I think it involves in the neighborhood of $30,000 or $40,000. She appeared before our committee. I think she is a very able woman. I think she can do a good job if given the tools to work with. She came before our committee requesting additional funds which were in the request. I have forgotten the amount she requested, but when we marked up the bill, it did not make any difference whether she requested $5,000 or $50,000, the answer

was: "No. We are going to give you just what we gave Oscar Ewing in 1953." That is not the whole story. We are giving her less. You men and women who have been fighting men of the Oscar Ewing type in this country by cutting their funds did not give her what you gave Oscar Ewing under a Democratic administration. There was $30,000 or $40,000 in additional jobs that she asked for. There were the Ramspeck promotions to be put into effect. There was another item that I cannot think of at the moment, but we actually are cutting the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare more than $100,000, and are actually giving her $100,000 less in 1954 than you gave Oscar Ewing to operate in 1953. I do not know what you call that. I do not know how to express myself. I do not know what words to use. But, it seems to me if she was the appointee under a Democratic administration and I was part and parcel of that administration, I would want to give her a chance to do a job. I would want to give her the tools to work with. Then in a year or two, after we had a chance to examine the record, we could then determine whether we were right or wrong in giving her more or less than she asked for to run her particular office.

There is also in that particular office a mandate from the President of the United States that a security office be set up. If that is going to be set up in that Cabinet post, it means there will be a further cut to absorb it—and I presume there will be. They are not going to have the money to set it up unless they take it away from something else that they are now doing. Is that the way you are going to treat the appointees of your President? There was nothing in the hearings that justified such a cut as we have given her office. I thought she made a splendid presentation. I think she has ability. I think she can do a job, but you are not letting her do a job by taking the action you have taken by cutting her immediate office to that extent. It is unbelievable to me that you did not give her enough or as much as you gave Oscar Ewing when he was the target of 90 percent of the Members of Congress over the past 4 or 5 years. I cannot believe that such an action is possible. I could not believe my ears when I heard the majority of the committee say that they were going to cut out these requests of their new Cabinet officer. I am in favor of giving her the money to operate with, and let her do a good job. I think she can do it if she gets the proper help and the proper money to work with.

Now, in the Food and Drug Administration the Republican administration in the 80th Congress did not make a cut. On both sides of the aisle in those days we believed this was an agency which protects what you eat and drink, and the drugs you buy in the drugstores all over the country. It affects every living person in this country, in the work they are doing at the present time. Because of that we never cut them. Lo and behold, this year we take away from them $663,000, the biggest cut they have ever received since I have been a member of this committee. It is the one agency in Government that protects us in the food we eat, the water we drink, and the medicine we use for medicinal purposes.

How many times, day in and day out, in the course of a year do we read in the newspapers that the Food and Drug Administration has seized this particular drug off the shelves of the drugstores all over the country, because it was dangerous to people. How many times have we read in the papers of this article of food which had been seized because it was rancid or poisonous? That is what the Department is doing with this money. They are protecting you and me and every other living person in the country at the present time. Yet you are going to cut that particular agency, one of the most important in the Government, by over $600,000.

Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University: I do not know why we cut them so much. We cut Howard University over $500,000. We cut Freedmen's Hospital over $400,000. I think everyone in the country knows that Howard University has come of age, you might say, in recent years, because we have been giving them the funds with which to build buildings and to provide teachers. Their standing among the colleges of this country has risen year after year to the point where they are an outstanding college at the present time. It is practically the only college in the country where the Negro can get an education. Freedmen's Hospital is part and parcel of Howard University as a medical hospital.

In the Office of Education, you have cut vocational training $2,600,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I want to finish as soon as I can and then I will yield to everyone.

The so-called revised item in our budget originally cut this item $4 million—from $18 million down to $14 million. Then the committee came out with an in-between figure, between 14 million and 18 million, 16,048,000, and refused to allow any funds for distributive education. It seems to me that is too much of a reduction in vocational education. I say that for this reason: In the next item, further endowment of colleges of agriculture, the bill does not include any item for that at all. They reduce that by $2,500,000. In my opinion that is legislation on an appropriation bill. When we cut out entirely an amount like that, we disallow the entire amount. It affects every land-grant college in every State in the Union. In my own little State of Rhode Island, it means a cut of $27,000. The legislature has already adjourned. How can a little college like that make up that loss? I do not know what the amounts are in the other State colleges, but it affects them in almost every State in the Union.

When the new Secretary was before us she had a letter from the Bureau of the Budget where they cut this item I think 50 percent; I think the letter so stated. That letter was dated April 9. In another letter dated April 13 the budget people reversed themselves and gave the agency a little better than $2,500,000, and the reason they gave was that the program was established in 1935. In other words, in other years we have been giving this, of course, as an annual appropriation, not touching it or reducing it one dime year after year between 1935 and 1953. Further consideration should have been given before this cut was made if it was intended to turn the responsibilities back to the States, for the legislatures of 41 out of the 48 States have adjourned and will not convene for 2 years unless they are called back into emergency session. The Congress should give the States some advance notice, 2 or 3 years, but the committee said "No." They did not agree with the Bureau of the Budget and decided to cut it out entirely. That is what they have done, and that is all you have before you. You have cut out this $2,500,000 entirely, yet the legislatures in 41 of the 48 States will not meet again for 2 years unless called into special session, which is the prerogative of the Governor or the constituted authorities in each particular State.

Salary expenses for the Office of Education: You cut them $750,000, which is $460,000 below what they had this fiscal year and what we are giving them at the present time, 1953. I did not blame Dr. McGrath for resigning his office 3 or 4 weeks ago. I think if I had been in his place I would have done the same thing. I think it took a lot of guts and courage to do what he did after the treatment his Department received at the hands of the Congress in the supplemental bill that we passed only a few months ago. You remember he fought hard to restore a couple of hundred thousand dollars for the Department of Education to carry on their responsibilities under the new GI bill of rights or the Korean GI bill of rights. You remember last June or July we passed the so-called GI bill of rights after a couple of years of extensive hearing by the so-called Teague committee. I think they did a wonderful job. They made an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Education to run the program so that we would not have those fly-by-night schools that existed during World War II. We eliminated all of that and a few other things that Members of Congress were complaining about. This was done after extensive hearings. But we adjourned at the end of June or early in July without having given them any funds. When that happens they go to the Bureau of the Budget. The Budget told them to go ahead and spend up to $200,000, which they did; and it was only right that they should. They hired some forty-odd employees. They came to us in a supplemental bill, as they should have, and you voted them down a short while ago when you voted against that bill.

When you voted against that amount in the supplemental bill it meant the firing of 41 employees they had working on this program at that time. They had to fire every one of them. In addition, they had to fire about 30 more employees in the Department of Education, and on top of that, because we refused to give them the money, every employee in the Department of Education was

going to be forced to take a 2 weeks' furlough without pay before the end of June in order to make up this program. Since that time I understand a request has gone to the Senate to include the $40,000 to make sure that these employees who are left at the present time will not have to take a furlough. If you were the head of the Department of Education and got treated like that after you had lived up to the express will of Congress, how would you feel? I commend Dr. Earl McGrath for resigning as he did and refusing to appear before the Senate Committee on Appropriations with a revised budget that he knew was not sufficient to carry on the educational facilities that we had promised the educators of this country for advice and technical assistance in the elementary and higher grades of education all over the Nation. On top of that, we cut the Office of Education an additional $460,000.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: I remember the Secretary telling us in our committee that this is one agency she thought should not be cut. But we did cut it by $2,400,000.

This is one of the few agencies of Government that produces income to the Government. It has been testified that over the years for every dollar we appriate for vocational rehabilitation the Federal Treasury receives $10 back in one form or another; 25 or 30 percent of those who are rehabilitated are taken off public-assistance rolls or relief rolls of the cities, towns, and States. Here is an agency of Government that is making a return of 10 to 1 for every dollar we appropriate. Do you call it economy to cut that agency $2,400,000 when such a cut is going to result in a cost to the Government of over $3 million? Also, it is going to deny 7,000 people in this country, in the next fiscal year, the chance to get a job for themselves and the opportunity to pay their own way. That is not economy. That is just an attempt to show an overall savings in our governmental expenditure regardless of the ill effect attained. That is all it amounts to.

I know the committee expresses some doubt about certain of the programs and about some of the individuals who have been rehabilitated. I have had an opportunity to check into some of these cases, and I do not think that the charges are substantiated at all. In my opinion, they are not substantiated. Although there are three cases appearing on page 10 of the report, our committee does not know a thing about them. The only thing I know about them is that some investigator was sent down there, and I know this by reading about it. It seems to me that if we had been advised of conditions like that, we, as a committee appropriating the funds, should immediately call up to our committee the responsible people and determine for ourselves who is right and who is wrong. Is it justified or is it not justified? We should make the determination for ourselves. I do not know who this investigator was. I do not know his background. I have no idea where he got his material, nor do I know how far he went. I do not know whether he went back to the States to investigate or not. I do not believe he did.

By this cut of $2,400,000 you are actually costing the Federal Government close to a million dollars, and you are prohibiting the rehabilitation of about 7,000 people in the next fiscal year.

I come now to the Public Health Service. Outside of the National Institutes of Health, involving cancer, the heart, neurology, blindness, arthritis, rheumatism, mental health, and general health, we have made some rather severe reductions. We cut the venereal-disease item $3,325,000, allowing that branch only $5 million. A lot of people ask, What about that? You can do something about it. But there is not a doctor in this world who knows how to prevent it. The medical men in this country do not know how to prevent it, and as long as we live, unless we find a way to prevent it, we are going to have it with us; and the only way to get the cases down is to find them and have them treated with the new drugs that have been made available by research under some of these programs in past years. But we have no right to cut its funds down that much and take a chance on the disease spreading further than it is at the present time, and that is what we are doing.

The same thing is true with tuberculosis. We gave that unit a severe cut. We have no cure for tuberculosis at the present time, none whatsoever; we cannot prevent it, and the only thing we can do is to find the people that have it, that transmit it, and get them into the hospitals, and with the new drugs that have been available cure them and get them out. We can cure them if we can get them in time, but the job is to find them at the present time and not allow the disease to be transmitted or carried from person to person. Everyone knows it is highly contagious.

Communicable diseases: We gave that agency one of the most severe cuts by reducing it over $700,000. I do not know what some of the States of the Union would do if we did not have this agency. Whenever an epidemic breaks out that is beyond their control, whom do they look to? To this agency, to help them out, and they are working on this thing day in and day out.

Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: We gave them a reduction of almost a million dollars. This agency has something to do with the water that you drink, with the pollution of streams. It is the health agency of the country. It is not a State problem; it is a national problem. It is not intrastate; it is interstate, and if the Federal Government does not take the lead, the States are not going to follow through as they are now in cooperation with the Federal Government. If we hit them like this, there are States that will not be able to carry on the work that they have been doing, and the people will suffer.

Hospital-construction program: The Eisenhower budget cut this from $75 million to $60 million and the committee cut it another $10 million, which is a 33-percent reduction. This bill runs out in 1955. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has introduced a bill to extend it another 5 years, and Senator TAFT and Senator HILL, in a nonpartisan move in the Senate, have suggested the same amendment. This program was started 8 years ago, 1945, for a 5-year period. There was not a vote against it in the House of Representatives; I do not know about the Senate. It was a nonpartisan move on this side. In 1950, we not only extended the act for another 5 years but we increased the authorization from $75 million to $150 million without a dissenting vote; not a dissenting vote in the House of Representatives on either side of the aisle. It was a nonpartisan approach, because every State in the Union could get some help under this program. The statistics that we had in our hearings do not justify a cut of one dime. There is not a place in the hearings that you can put your finger on that justifies a cut of one dime in the hospital-construction program. It has been one of the best run programs of any program of the Federal Government. It is strictly a State program, you people who are talking about States' rights. The States themselves determine where these hospitals are going to be built. They have a State planning commission. The local communities are the local groups that sponsor these hospitals. They have to clear through the State planning commission, so it is almost completely a State organization and a State program only with supervision, from an architectural standpoint, from the Federal Government and the Federal Government audits the Federal payments. That is about all that we do. I feel that it is necessary to provide good, decent hospitals in some of these communities.

When we talked a few years ago about the shortage of doctors in this country, and some people wanted socialized medicine, the hue and cry was then that there are plenty of doctors but we cannot get them to go into these rural areas. This is a rural program. Since these hospitals have been built, doctors have gone into them because they have the facilities and they have a place to work.

One criticism was made in this report that we are taking nurses out of existing institutions. Maybe some are, but about 20-some percent of nurses working in these hospitals that have been built under this program have come out of retirement. They were retired and this program has got them back as nurses. In communities that never had any facility at all for a doctor to work in, there are now some 1,200 hospital projects that are working at the present time. Of these 1,200 that are operating, only 3 have received adverse comment. There was a small one in the Midwest somewhere. It was not a construction problem at all. It was for equipment, $17,000 or $18,000. The Federal Government is going to get that money back. There are two other small ones that are closed because of difficulties within the States, that we expect will be opened within the near future.

In my opinion, this reduction is one of the worst mistakes that the committee made, in cutting the appropriation from $75 million to $50 million. I am sure when the amendment is offered tomorrow that regardless of politics—and there will be no politics in it because every State in the Union wants this continued, and I am convinced as I stand

here that it is going to be continued another 5 years after 1955—this will carry because we will have support on both sides of the aisle.

As to the hospital and medical program, we reduced this figure $2,724,000 from the request and $1,188,000 from the appropriation for 1953. That means the closing of at least four hospitals, and maybe more. It means the closing of a hospital in New Mexico, it means the closing of a hospital in Cleveland, it means the closing of a hospital in Savannah, Ga., and it means the closing of a hospital in Memphis, Tenn. This cut means just that, and they may have to close one more. If the hospital at Memphis, Tenn., is closed, and the hospital at Savannah, Ga., is closed, there will not be a Marine or Public Health hospital between New Orleans and Norfolk or between New Orleans and Chicago. In the entire southeastern area of our country there will not be one Public Health or Marine hospital left if we allow this cut to stand as it is at the present time.

We have evidence that the Public Health hospitals are run more cheaply than any other hospital group in the country. They are run cheaper than those operated by private or nonprofit groups in Washington or any other place in the country. They are run much cheaper than the Veterans' hospitals. We have the most efficient program here in hospitals under the Public Health Service of the entire group, private, nonprofit, or veterans. Yet here we are forcing them to close 2 or 3 hospitals that are needed at the present time.

As to the National Institutes of Health, involving research on cancer, mental health, heart, dental, arthritis, microbiology, neurology and blindness, as the chairman said, we compromised on that. It is not as much as I would like to see in that appropriation. I think we should be appropriating more for research in cancer, mental health, heart, arthritis, neurology and blindness. If there was ever a program that the Federal Government was entitled to be in, it is this program. I think we should be appropriating much more for research in these particular programs because this research has paid off. We have listened to the testimony of all the heads of these Institutes, and on top of that at the end of the hearings we called in some of the outstanding doctors in the particular fields of heart disease, cancer, mental health, neurology and blindness. Every one of them—none connected with the Federal Government—appeared before us and urged us to appropriate more than the Truman budget. I was one of those who agreed with them that we should. We could save money in the end if we did appropriate more. I do not know how much the Veterans' Administration is paying out now for mentally ill veterans. I think it is in the neighborhood of $700 million a year. That is just for the Veterans' Administration—over $700 million a year. But through research, if we find the answer, we can save the Federal Government money in the end. Over 50 percent of the hospital beds in this country are taken up by mentally ill people. There is not a family in this country who does not have one member affected by heart disease or some phase of mental ailment or cancer or one of the forms of neurological diseases, arthritis and rheumatism, or some things that we know nothing about such as muscular dystrophy and multiple sclerosis and things like that. All the doctor can tell a person who has such diseases is how much time he can expect to live. Medical science has no idea what causes these diseases, and yet thousands of people are dying. That is a proper field for the Federal Government to be in. It is a program that we should be spending more money on than we are at the present time. It would give us ten times the return we are now getting.

The next item is the National Railroad Retirement Board. We show a reduction of $18 million there. I do not know why. We have nothing to do with it at all. It is a fund that is paid by the employer and the employee. It does not mean a thing. I do not know why we did not give it all to them because there is nothing we can do about it. We have no control over it at all.

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is the next item. There is a reduction of $500,000. I thought Mr. Cole, who, by the way, was a Republican, gave an excellent explanation of the need for these funds.

The National Labor Relations Board, which is your "baby," was cut $800,000. They have a backlog of cases at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the gentleman from Rhode Island may continue for 10 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, to have the first opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island for his wonderful presentation of the problems here involved. I agree with him that too much damage has been done to the general welfare by these proposed cuts. I am hopeful that many of the cuts may be restored. I should like to mention a subject which has been discussed by the gentleman, and that is vocational education.

This bill cuts 14 percent below the original budget figure, from $18,673,261 down to $16,048,870. There are thousands of boys and girls throughout the United States, particularly in eastern Kentucky and throughout the South, and all over the Nation, unable to go to college. In high school many of them are being taught a trade or some vocation that is profitable to them in their later years. An amendment will be offered to restore this figure to the original budget figure of $18,673,261. I, for one, intend to support that amendment, along with numerous other amendments in order that we may try to make some needed corrections in this measure when we read the bill tomorrow. Again I wish to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I likewise want to thank the gentleman for his wonderful explanation of the bill. I would like to ask one or two particular questions for information. Could the gentleman give me any idea as to how much the program for what we call future farmers of America would suffer if the proposed recommendation of the committee is carried out in this reduction for vocational education?

Mr. FOGARTY. All I can tell you is that a reduction of over $2 million would take care of the home economic group, the agricultural group. There is no provision in the bill for distributive education.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But it would cut down tremendously on that great program, what we call the future farmers of America and the future homemakers of America?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In my own district, the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, we have the University of Florida. The State legislature has recently appropriated $5 million for a great medical school. Certainly one of the great problems of this Nation is to train doctors and nurses to take care of the needs of our people. I wonder, if this recommendation prevails, if they would have trouble in getting money under the Hall-Burton Act to get the necessary matching funds which they will need to build that great medical school. On page 11 of the committee's report it gives some information about this particular point.

Mr. FOGARTY. As far as I know, if the committee action stands, you will have no chance at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just one other question, and I apologize for taking so much time, but I wanted to say that my own particular State would lose $47,640 if aid is denied these Federal land-grant colleges. I would like to say that our great Negro university in the State of Florida—I know the gentleman did not mean to suggest that Howard University was the only Negro school in the country—that great college would lose, and the president has written me protesting that particular cut.

Mr. FOGARTY. I understand an amendment will be offered to restore that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is so well informed I would like to ask him a question regarding construction, maximum security building. It is in the report on page 15:

> The bill contains none of the $195,000 requested for plans and specifications for construction of a new maximum security building. While there is some justification for such a building, the committee is not

disposed to recommend any further appropriations for buildings so long as Federal patients are a minor part of the patient load and Federal funds bear 100 percent of the cost of construction.

This is in connection with the maximum security building which was to have been erected at St. Elizabeths. It is suggested here that they will not pay anything because the Federal patient load is a minor part of the load. That is almost legislation on an appropriation bill, is it not?

Mr. FOGARTY. I would not say that, no. The committee has felt that perhaps the District of Columbia should run this hospital. The gentlewoman is talking about St. Elizabeths Hospital?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. A great percentage of the load there are District of Columbia patients. The Government should be paying more, or they should run it entirely. I am not positive myself but I think maybe that should be done eventually.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But in the meantime there is tremendous crowding at St. Elizabeths.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is a very crowded institution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And a very dangerous situation.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman. Better provision should be made for that institution. Perhaps the Senate can do something on this matter.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I wish to compliment the gentleman on what is undoubtedly the finest presentation I have heard on the floor of this House. I understand that requirements under Public Law 874 are constantly increasing, of necessity, and I would like to know how the cut in the funds for Public Law 874 will affect our children in these federally impacted areas throughout the United States in every State of the Union.

Mr. FOGARTY. It will mean exactly this: That the Congress of the United States will not be living up to its commitments under the present law. We will not be able to pay 100 percent of their entitlement; we will be able to pay under this bill only about 87 percent of their entitlement. An amendment will be offered tomorrow to correct that too.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In Oklahoma we carry on more vocational education and rehabilitation work than in nearly any State of its size. I have a letter here from J. B. Perkins, State director of vocational education, which shows the cuts which will be effected in Oklahoma, and on behalf of the entire membership of the Oklahoma delegation I would like to offer it.

I also have a letter from Mr. Skerlock, head of the rehabilitation work in Oklahoma, showing cuts there. I would like to call the committee's attention to the fact that $11,792 to promote vocational education, also $30,700,000 grants to the States are really reductions in unemployment compensation for veterans and also the items of payments to States under the office of vocational rehabilitation amounting to $2,400,000, and another one for $225,000; and, furthermore, I would like to agree with the gentleman from Rhode Island in his statements as to this great loss and also agree with him as to the great advantage of these programs.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Do I understand that the Institute for Neurological Diseases covers research in cerebral palsy?

Mr. FOGARTY. It does.

Mr. CELLER. Has there been any reduction in funds for research concerning cerebral palsy?

Mr. FOGARTY. This is a new institution that was created by Congress about 3 years ago. We are increasing funds for the work of this institute yearly but it is not as much as we would like to have it. The work of this institute affects about 20 million people in this country.

Mr. CELLER. Is the $4 million an increase over the past year?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is about a 100-percent increase.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to ask the gentleman about funds for grants to States for the administration of the unemployment-security program. Did the gentleman deal with that in his statement?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did. I said we had given it a substantial cut without anyone having come before the committee and saying we were going to have the full employment we have had. Our action is simply asking them to come back with a further request for funds in a supplemental bill next January.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to thank the gentleman. That is the information I have from our own State commission on labor in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island has consumed 1 hour and 11 minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I was not able to be present at more than a few of the committee hearings on this bill because of the fact that my Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations sat at the same time. Being chairman of that subcommittee it was impossible, of course, for me to be at both places at the same time. I did, however, participate with the full committee in the markup of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have read a considerable portion of the hearings on this bill since it was marked up by the full committee. I have the highest praise for the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] who has as big a heart, I am sure, as any Member of this House. He conducted the hearings in a very fine manner. Everyone who wanted to speak had the opportunity to be heard. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], another member of the subcommittee, is a very outstanding gentleman and one who has the welfare of suffering humanity in mind. He is sympathetic toward everything and everyone involved in this bill. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is a capable, patriotic American, a Member for whom I have the very highest regard. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ], another member of the subcommittee, was very diligent in attending the hearings and I am sure, when opportunity presents itself, he will tell this committee that he is in practically perfect agreement with the committee in marking up this bill. However, I shall let him speak for himself at the proper time.

Mr. Chairman, this is the sort of bill that one can make a most appealing speech about. Any Member of the House can stand up here and expound his feelings and philosophies with reference to the need for taking care of people who require care, the sick, the disabled; in other words all of those who might receive benefits under this bill. May I say that I yield to no Member in a desire to do everything I can, everything we can afford to do, for suffering humanity.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in everything the gentleman has said. He has cooperated to the fullest extent in the past, and he gave me in past years valuable assistance in the offering of amendments. When we came to public health he was always agreeable to public health and has always been of help to this committee as far as the public health of the Nation is concerned.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, there are many activities involved in this bill. Some cuts have been made, yes, but actually they are very minor. I feel that Mr. Durkin is a very able administrator, and I believe he can take the funds which the committee has allowed in this bill and do a much better job than has been done in years past for the Department of Labor. We have good reason to believe he can do that because the Secretary of Labor comes to us highly recommended by not only the laboring people of America, but by many of the industrialists, the employers, who have known him for many years. So, we have complete confidence that Secretary Durkin can operate under the provisions of this bill to the complete satisfaction of the labor unions and of the employers.

I think you will all agree that Mrs. Hobby is a very sincere, conscientious American, who wants to do a good job. And I am sure that she will. Mrs. Hobby recognizes the fact that we have a terrific national debt. Our national income is going down, and unless every dollar is saved in every department the day may come, and it may come sooner than many of us think, when the Congress will be forced to deny funds for many of these

worthwhile programs that we are appropriating these huge sums for today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that the Committee on Appropriations next year will put first things first, and I hope the Committee on Appropriations will bring in first the defense spending bill, so-called, and, second, the foreign WPA spending bill. Let us find out how much we are going to give to these foreign leeches before we start cutting off our own people. Let us put first things first next year.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

In line with that, I must say that so long as we are spending the billions of dollars for national defense, as well as helping people all over the world who want to be free, it is certainly necessary for us, in order to keep this Nation solvent, to spend the least that we dare spend for things here at home. All of us wish we could spend more for the needy and those old folks whose earning capacity has ended; for such things as flood control, which is a Federal responsibility that the people back home cannot handle with their own funds; for the disabled veterans who have been fighting our wars for past decades and who are now hospitalized in this country; for the widows and orphans, for those whose husbands and fathers have been maimed or diseased because of these terrible wars. Those are some things we have to think about. I hope and pray that all of us will be concerned about how we spend the taxpayers' dollars.

I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] on this bill, and I listened with a great deal of interest. I know he is sincere in everything he does and everything he says. I wonder, however, how the gentleman can justify the cuts that were made last year below the budget when he was chairman of the committee. I note that the budget estimate for 1953 was $1,983,410,861, and the gentleman and his committee reduced that figure to $1,786,086,161, a cut of $197,324,700.

This year when the budget request was $2,098,062,861 the committee allowed $1,965,581,570, a cut of $132,481,291, as against the cut the committee made last year under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] of $197,324,700.

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think we can determine anything from total figures, because there are sometimes programs of two or three hundred millions in one year and out the next, as in the bill we are facing now we had $195 million for school construction and we do not have that now.

Last year the major cut was made in grants to States for public assistance, and I will tell you why. Two years before we had cut that program $50 million, and the Senate cut an additional $100 million, which was a cut of $150 million. That year because of changes in the Social Security Act they did not need a supplemental, so last year on the basis of that record we cut that fund $150 million. But we were wrong.

Mr. JENSEN. That was a phony cut, then?

Mr. FOGARTY. It turned out to be, yes, but we were going on what happened the year before. They were able to work with $150 million less. So we put it in the same year, but we found out we were wrong, just as in the case of unemployment compensation in this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman contend there are some phony cuts in this bill this year?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not like to call they phony, but there is no justification for cutting the unemployment compensation fund $30 million. The president of the State Association for Unemployment Security appeared before our committee and said he needed every dime of it. Every one of these State agencies has said they needed this. We have had to come back with a supplemental. If you do not call it unreasonable—I do not like to call it a phony cut—maybe it is a little misjudgment or something like that. But I am sure as I stand here that we are going to be faced with a supplemental next January of at least this amount and maybe more.

Mr. JENSEN. Then, according to your statement, the cuts will actually amount, outside of the item we just mentioned, to about $100 million below the budget. Will the gentleman agree that the committee did meet all of the health items in this bill comparable to the amounts that were provided last year?

Mr. FOGARTY. I believe I said that when I made my statement.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that we even appropriated more?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right in some cases.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, as a Democrat, I would like to see this bill passed as it is presently constituted, without a single change, because I know that if it is passed in this shape it would mark the defeat of the Republican Party in the elections of next year and would see my party back in control of the House by 50 to 100 votes. But, as an American, I hope that tomorrow we cast aside partisanship and get down to the business of putting a good, solid floor under this country. My distinguished colleague said he would like to see the defense and foreign appropriation bills come before us first—he used the phrase "foreign leeches"—I do not go that far. But I do say that, outside of our moral and spiritual backbone, the first line of defense of this country is public health, and the second line of defense is public education. No amount of armament and foreign assistance can make up for a lack of those two items. We have not a friend in the world. Our only dependable ally is American youth. Today you would destroy them through this bill.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] on his magnificent analysis of this bill. I want to get down now to the business of talking about 2 or 3 items.

I would like to say that in the five terms that I have been in the Congress I have never seen such a flagrant act of discrimination as that perpetrated by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in cutting out all assistance to land-grant colleges, in cutting the budget of Howard University by 54 percent, and in cutting the budget of Freedmen's Hospital by 18 percent. This bill is discrimination at its worst. It is antidemocratic, antieducation, antipublic health, anti-Negro, anti-President Eisenhower, anti-Mrs. Hobby, and anticommon sense.

The President of the United States has just received within the last 48 hours specific recommendations from the National Manpower Council as regards what we in America must do in order to train more brain power for the future of this Nation. This subcommittee, on the other hand, has cut in half the appropriations for such brain power at one of our Nation's leading universities, Howard University, and cut out all money for land-grant colleges. I do not believe the majority of the Members of this House have full knowledge of this act. I hope that tomorrow you will restore at least the recommendations made by President Eisenhower and Mrs. Hobby.

The House recommendation is $475,000 less than the Eisenhower budget recommendation.

The House recommendation is $2,615,000 or 54 percent less than the Truman budget recommendation.

This 54 percent cut is part of a 4.96 percent cut. This means that the Howard University percentage cut is nearly 11 times as large as the average percentage cut for the whole Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and is twice as large as the next highest percentage cut in the Department. The next highest are: First, Public Health, 23.5 percent; second, Freedmen's Hospital, 18 percent; and, third, Office of Education, 16.4 percent.

The committee cuts salaries and expenses for current instruction $295,000 below the Eisenhower budget recommendation; $435,000 below the actual 1953 appropriation; and $510,000 below the Truman budget recommendation.

It cuts out entirely the preparation of plans for steam and electric utilities services to the new medical building—$25,000.

It cuts out entirely the $30,000 needed to complete the plans and specifications for the new preclinical medical building.

It denies $150,000 for a new turbogenerator for electricity, recommended by both Truman and Eisenhower Directors of the Budget and orders a change in policy from the production of power by its own plant to the purchase of power commercially, although we are expertly advised that, first, the installation of heavy switchgear for private power will cost more than the turbogenerator; and second, that commercial power will cost as much as $36,000 per annum more than privately produced power.

It withheld funds for the construction of the law building and thereby imperils the accreditment of the law school.

The university is now operating with 42 buildings. Thirteen of these are temporary wooden buildings, a fire hazard and dangerous to life. The city of Washington will not give a permit to use them longer than a 2-year period.

Fifteen others are declared by Public Buildings Service to be unfit for permanent use.

Only 14 of the present 42 buildings, therefore, are fit for safe and permanent use.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Under salaries and expenses the committee has recommended a sum of $2,240,000. This is $295,000 less than the sum recommended by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; is $435,000 less than the appropriation in 1953; and is $510,000 less than the original 1954 estimates.

The effect of this cut will be drastically destructive. In one blow it will cancel all of the money appropriated by the Congress of the United States for the improvement of instruction at Howard University over a period of 10 years, and will place the quality of instruction in a position inferior to that which prevailed in 1943. Since 1943 the congressional appropriations have been directed mainly toward the provision of, first, personnel and facilities for increased student numbers; and, second, salary increases to overcome the heavy advance of inflation. During this period less than $300,000 of all income has been applied directly to the purpose of improving the quality of instruction. The proposed cut will wipe out all this gain, at one stroke.

A careful study of the university budget shows that this cut will require a net loss of 66 persons of whom 50 will be teachers, and of these 42 must be dropped from the faculty of the college of liberal arts or 32.4 percent of this faculty. This will leave 87.5 teachers for 1978 students. The teaching ratio will then be increased from 15.3 students for each teacher, to 23 students for each teacher. This would put them back below where they stood in 1948 and would represent almost a 100-percent weakening of the student-teacher relation achieved in 1943, namely, 12.5 to 1.

The loss of teachers in the College of Liberal Arts will be only one aspect of the problem thus precipitated. If the House committee report is adopted, it will not only require, first, a 32.4 percent reduction in personnel in the College of Liberal Arts with resulting deterioration in the quality of instruction; but, second, it will also require a reduction of $215,000 in salaries, with resulting deterioration of morale throughout the university. This salary cut can be avoided only by cutting the teaching staff by an additional 38 persons, making a total cut of 88 teachers. The university cannot stand such a cut at all. It would imperil the accreditment of every school and college in the university.

In making this drastic reduction in salaries and expenses the House committee has used as its base of departure the appropriation made in 1948 for the peak enrollment of 6,268 full-time students. The years 1947 and 1948 were peak years of enrollment, due to the heavy enrollment of returned soldiers. But this peak was served during both these years at a great sacrifice in the quality of educational service. In 1947 the service rendered to the students was $236 per student, or 37 percent inferior in quality to the instruction given in 1943; and the service rendered to the students in 1948 was $91, or 14 percent inferior in quality to the instruction given in 1943. If the peak enrollment in 1948 had been served with the same efficiency as the enrollment in 1943, the university would have been obliged to expend $4,587,463 in the four categories of educational and general as compared with an actual expenditure of $3,492,944. This means that the educational service rendered the 6,268 students in 1948 fell below the teaching efficiency of 1943 by $1,048,469. The use of this low point of efficiency as a standard is, in effect, to abandon the entire qualitative purpose which the Government has been pursuing at Howard University. It has the further effect also of penalizing the university for the strenuous effort it made to serve the heavy load of returned soldiers in 1947 and 1948.

The reduction in appropriation for salaries and expenses recommended by the House committee not only injures greatly the College of Liberal Arts but causes an indefinite postponement of the purpose to establish instruction and research toward the degree of doctor of philosophy on a sound basis; moreover, it practically destroys the qualitative foundation of the present master's degree. It may effectively smother the entire program for graduate work at Howard University for a period of years.

It is further clear from the committee's report that none of the following increases within the appropriation were allowed:

1. Installation of transformer vault and wiring necessary to furnish AC current to Freedmen's Hospital	$40,000
2. Retubing of oil-fired boiler at power plant	19,000
3. Reinstallation of air preheaters	16,000
Total	75,000

Failure to include $40,000 for the transformer vaults in order for the university to furnish AC current to Freedmen's Hospital, while at the same time apparently, including funds for Freedmen's Hospital to change over to AC current, represents a fundamental change in policy. The power plant was constructed at Howard University for the purpose of furnishing heat and electric current to the University and Freedmen's Hospital. This fundamental change in policy will tend to increase the cost of electric current to both consumers.

The disallowance of item for retubing of boiler may require complete shutdown of a boiler and strain of reserve boilers. The Globe Indemnity Co. has again written to the university under date of April 6, 1953, as follows:

Mr. C. G. ELLIOTT,
Superintendent of Buildings,
Howard University,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: An accident investigation was made April 2, 1953, at the power plant of No. 3 boiler and it was found that one of waterwall tubes had ruptured. It was noted that several other tubes show signs of bulging.

The chief engineer was informed that this boiler would not be approved for operation, by the writer, until it has been completely retubed.

It is hoped that your No. 2 boiler will be used only as standby unit No. 3 is retubed and will then be retubed also. The tube metal is obviously thinned and fatigued in both of the old boilers.

Respectfully,

J. W. BURCHELL,
Supervising Engineer.

The item for reinstallation of air preheaters was requested to effect economies of as much as 5 percent in the operating costs of the powerplant. The elimination of this item for $16,000 means that the plant must continue to operate, at least another year, without the benefit of this important replacement.

The university considers the above two items to be of such mandatory importance that it will be obliged to have the work done even if it must make further cuts in personnel in order to effect it.

PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS

The committee eliminates the $30,000 required to complete plans and specifications for the premedical science building.

The committee in its comments on page 8 of the report makes this significant statement:

Including balances carried forward for prior years, a total of $274,972 is available for the 2 years 1953 and 1954, which the committee believes to be sufficient for any necessary activities of this kind.

This seems to suggest that part of this $274,842 may be used for the above premedical building plans. It has been my understanding that amounts appropriated for a specific activity can be used for another activity only when enabling legislation is enacted to give authorization. If such legislation is required, then supplemental language will be necessary unless such language can be had before bill H. R. 5246 becomes a law. A far simpler procedure would be to restore this item.

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS

The House committee has left out the recommended sum of $150,000 for an additional turbogenerator in the heat, light, and powerplant. In doing so it makes the following comment:

1. With the thought that any requirements for electrical power that cannot be filled by the present plant should be secured commercially.

The recission of this turbogenerator is almost certain to cause a breakdown in electrical production at the powerplant. The power plant is at the present time overloaded and the electrical service has failed several times during the current year, bringing about a temporary paralysis of light throughout the university—in classrooms, dormitories, libraries, and administrative offices.

The committee is clearly aware, I am sure, that this turbogenerator was recommended in accord with the policy established at the time the powerplant was erected. That power is based upon

technical information furnished by two governmental sources showing it would be substantially cheaper for Howard University to produce its own power than to purchase it commercially.

Page 98 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations exhibits in detail expert mechanical and electrical information furnished by Mr. E. W. Goodwin, chief mechanical and electrical engineer. Public buildings service, showing that Howard University can generate power from $20,828 to $36,921 cheaper per annum than it can purchase it commercially.

While throwing out the turbogenerator, the committee makes no provisions first, for the installation of the expensive equipment on the Howard University grounds which will be required to be paid for by the university before it can purchase power commercially; and second, the committee makes no provision for the increased annual cost of the power thus to be purchased.

On page 93 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN] calls attention to the fact that the installation of the high voltage switchgear required to use purchased power commercially from the Potomac Electric Power Co. is more expensive than the additional generating equipment required by the university; and on page 94 he states that the Potomac Electric Power Co. will not stand for the cost of this installation. It must therefore fall upon Howard University. The committee makes no provision for this expensive installation. It, therefore, in fact, estops Howard University from securing increased electrical power at all except by further substantial reduction of at least $186,291 and possibly more than $200,000 additional in the funds currently available for instruction in order to provide, first, the cost of the expensive switchgear—a cost greater than the turbogenerator itself; second, and the increased cost of $36,291 per annum required for the purchase of commercial power.

FORBIDS LIFTING OF FREEZE ORDER

Under "Construction of buildings," the committee would seem to be issuing an order which would prevent the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from going forward with the three construction projects which she has recommended and for which she had received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Note the following language:

> The committee was advised that no funds would be required under the Bureau of the Budget freeze order placed on construction on which a substantial start had not already been made. The committee desires that the Bureau of the Budget not lift this order unless there are compelling reasons for so doing that have not yet been called to the committee's attention.

This language would seem to require a stoppage of the entire building program, except the construction of the dentistry building, which is now under way. If so, this means that the committee is abandoning the entire program for expanding the output of physicians and dentists toward which the Congress has been working for a period of some 5 years. This is clearly a policy change of major significance.

In voting the drastic freeze order on all buildings the committee says:

> It is difficult to reason that a continuing expansion of the physical plant is necessary when the enrollment has been substantially decreasing.

The Howard University building program was never intended to accommodate 6,268 students. Its maximum objective was to accommodate 5,200 students, and this only after the medical and dental enrollments had been doubled and the graduate school had grown to be as much as 1,000 students. It must be kept in mind that all of the buildings now authorized were listed as approved objectives in 1929, when they were clearly needed already. It must be kept in mind also that the present enrollment of Howard University is not only much greater than the enrollment of 1929; it is nearly double the full-time enrollment of 1943. In order to accommodate the present enrollment the university must make use of 13 temporary wooden buildings which are a fire hazard and a danger to life, and must continue to use 15 other deteriorated buildings which the Public Buildings Service had judged unfit for continuing use. Of 42 buildings now on the grounds and actually in use, only 14 of them have the approval of the Public Buildings Service as being fit for continuing and enduring use. Every one of the buildings authorized by the Congress is a present and urgent necessity.

I am not blaming any one particular Member of this House, but somewhere back of all this is someone who is not looking at this with the eyes of a 100-percent American. We had better stop talking about Dixiecrats if this bill goes through and talk about Dixiegops. In the South today no State legislature would make a cut in education, in public health, in money for Negro education, such as you have made today in the Congress of the United States. Beginning with Florida all the way up through all the great universities of the South that are being maintained by southerners for Negro and white education, more money is being appropriated each year. You northerners better look alive. This is a prejudicial bill. You cannot give me one reason why, with an average cut of 4 percent, you pick out 1 Negro university and cut it 54 percent; you pick out 1 Negro hospital that serves not only Washington but all of greater Washington, and cut it 18 percent. Until this question is answered, some of us have opinions that we are not proud to have, but I am forced to have.

I would like to have the chairman of the subcommittee, if he is so disposed, to answer this question. Why is it that you have taken this 1 Negro university and cut its budget 54 percent; you cut it to less than President Eisenhower asked for, you have cut it to less than Mrs. Hobby asked for. The American people deserve an answer.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentleman from New York is deserving of an answer, as long as he raises the question. I am sorry to say I do not recall any testimony in the hearings for a request for a boiler. There was a request in there for a steam distribution system and powerplant. The distribution system amount was $20,000 and the powerplant was $150,000. Regardless of the testimony that was given before the committee in regard to the cheapness of generating power by their own powerplant in comparison to buying it from a public utility, the fact still remains that at St. Elizabeths Hospital they discarded the manufacture of their own power and sold the boilers, and they found out it was cheaper to buy the power from a local public utility. If that is true at St. Elizabeths, and that is borne out by the facts, we could not see why it was cheaper for Howard University to generate their own power and spend $150,000 for a new powerplant.

On the proposition of its being a 54-percent cut for Howard University, that is not quite a correct statement, because at the time this subcommittee had the hearings for Howard University there was a freeze on by the Bureau of the Budget on construction. That was the reason why we disallowed that, and that being the major portion of the appropriation that the cut was made on, and the testimony also shows that the revised budget had nothing whatever in it for new buildings.

If the gentleman just received that information that he states from Mrs. Hobby within the last 30 minutes as to the agreement between the Health, Education, and Welfare Department and the Bureau of the Budget, he has information that I do not believe any member of this committee has had to date; I am sure I have never heard of it, and if that is true they will probably present that to the Senate subcommittee and the differences will be worked out in conference.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to say to the gentleman two things: First, I have a copy of President Eisenhower's recommendation to the gentleman's committee. This is the mimeographed original. At the bottom of page 5 there is a request for a new boiler, saying that it has been requested by the Globe Indemnity Insurance Co.; that continued operation of these boilers without retubing would cause the insurance company to cancel the policy on Howard University.

Mr. BUSBEY. But they do not take into consideration transferring over to the public utility. If they transfer over to the public utility they are not going to cancel any insurance policy.

Mr. POWELL. I am talking about two things; I am talking about the heating boiler first, failure to repair which will cause canceling insurance on the university, and second, the $150,000 turbogenerator to produce electric power. It will cost more than $150,000 to switch over to private power. The Potomac Electric Power Co. will not put in the switchover equipment. It will cost more than $150,000 to put in a changeover switch to bring in private power—more than the cost of the new turbogenerator. Is this economy Mr. Chairman? If not what does it sound like?

Mr. BUSBEY. If the gentleman is talking about economics, we are looking

at it from the viewpoint of the long pull, not the initial cost of installation. I would like to have the gentleman from New York refer to the hearings and show me one word of testimony of Dr. Mordecai Johnson, the president of Howard University, where he requested a single dollar for a new boiler.

Mr. POWELL. Under the items "Salaries and expenses," "(B) for retubing of 1 steam boiler, $19,000." That is at the bottom of page 1 under the item "Salaries and expenses."

Mr. BUSBEY. Where is it in the hearings?

Mr. POWELL. I do not know about the hearings, but here is the testimony before your committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will say to the gentleman from New York that he is able to get hold of information that was never presented to the committee and has not been before the committee for consideration.

Mr. POWELL. This request was not printed in the hearings?

Mr. BUSBEY. It was never submitted to the committee.

Mr. POWELL. One last thing: The gentleman says it sounds like a lot, a 54-percent cut, but that the cut was taken out under "Construction of new buildings." All right, I grant that but, it is not the whole truth. You cut President Eisenhower's recommendation $475,000, exclusive of "new construction" which means a cut of almost 20 percent. This still means you cut the only 2 Negro items—Howard University and Freedmen's Hospital—more than any other. Why did you pick on these two Negro institutions?

Mr. BUSBEY. And if the gentleman from New York will refer to page 104, part 1 of the hearings, there is a table there showing how the enrollment of Howard University is going down year after year. The report on the top of page 8 says this: "The estimated gross enrollment for 1953 is only 62 percent of the comparable figure for 1948," and for fiscal 1954 it will be lower than that.

Mr. POWELL. Reread my speech. You took the peak year when Howard University was straining every possible nerve to take care of the GI's. They had more students per instructor than was ideal. But it was their contribution to the postwar period. Will you penalize them for being patriotic?

By your cut, they will have to fire one-third of the faculty. Salaries have gone up. To attract scholars of reputation takes more money. We are trying to create not less brain power but more brain power. What is your aim?

I still insist that our first line of defense is public health, our second line of defense is public education. We are squandering money everywhere else if we do not provide enough for those two lines of defense first.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like for the RECORD to show that since the beginning of this debate I have been attending a meeting of the District Committee and have not been in the House during the entire time. As soon as I finish making this little statement I am going back to the District Committee and will be absent for the balance of the general debate. I make this statement because I have been informed there were some statements made here attributed to me which I did not hear, and, therefore, I can neither confirm nor deny.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I may say to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] that I interpreted any remarks made regarding him as being very complimentary.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I hope they were, but I have not the slightest idea.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, no appropriations bill comes to this floor without bringing its own particular view of the devoted service of the members of this great committee. The long hours, the detailed study given to the many complex and difficult problems are made light of by the committee—but, Mr. Chairman, as an American I would appear ungrateful indeed if I did not take this opportunity to express in some measure my keen appreciation of the time and energy, the purposefulness and the devotion to duty given so continuously year after year by the members of this great committee.

It must often seem a thankless task, yet there must come moments of deep satisfaction as you strive to do all possible to oil the machinery of representative government and keep it in order.

It is probable, Mr. Chairman, that there has never been a more difficult task given any appropriations committee than that facing you this year. Keenly alive to the cold background of watchful waiting on the part of the Communist world in the hope that we shall destroy ourselves economically, your committee is given the task of bringing our national expenditures more nearly in balance with national receipts. Yet not one of you but wants to assure the continuance of such programs as are of definite benefit to the people of this great country of ours and which are legitimately within the Federal field.

Probably no subcommittee task is more difficult than that having the responsibility of appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. So many of the items in the bills deal directly with the human element, almost with the very lives of our people. May I take this opportunity to say with great sincerity that we are especially grateful to you today, Mr. BUSBEY, for what I am sure has been a heartful consideration of these important measures. That we attempt to plead the cause of some phase of one or of both bills where we feel too deep cuts have been made into the very life of an institution or a service is in line with our democratic institutions.

As a long-time Member of this body, I thank you for the time you give even while I regret that I cannot always agree with your conclusions.

Mr. Chairman, on page 9 of the bill, lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, the Congress is informed that the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor is to receive $300,000. On page 5 of the report, 2 lines inform us that this is $60,000 less than the request made by the Bureau.

I have asked for this time, Mr. Chairman, in order to give to the Members at least some picture of this Bureau and of the work it does.

The Women's Bureau was authorized by an act of Congress on June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11–16) to "promote the welfare of wage earning women, improve their working conditions, increase their efficiency, and advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

The Women's Bureau is the smallest of all Government operations. It started in 1920 and has continued a small department ever since. As was said by the distinguished Member, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] it represents 20 million working women, I believe, which is 30 percent of the women workers of the country. It is the only place where women can go for advice, for help, for information, for a sympathetic hearing and adequate understanding. The Wage and Hour Division has so much more than just the problems of women to consider. At one time there was a staff of some 80 people. In 1944 the peak of its staff was 77. By 1951 it was down to 72 and in the following 2 years, since 1951, it lost 14 more positions, so today the staff is 58. About half of them are trained, professional workers and work very efficiently in the closest cooperation with other bureaus of the Labor Department. They do this in order to widen the women's opportunities to work under suitable conditions and for fair wages.

The requested budget for 1954 was the huge sum of $360,000—thousands, Mr. Chairman, not millions. It has been cut by the committee some 17 percent reducing it to $300,000. Nearly all the reduction will have to be made in staff which would mean that about 10 of these 58 jobs would have to be vacated. For the past 2 years the Bureau has met its budgetary losses by gradually shrinking all the aspects of its work. This time the cuts must come in personnel. Now there comes a time, Mr. Chairman, when you cannot shrink any longer and continue with any kind of efficiency. In a way, you can hardly continue at all, because you cannot do a job.

Mr. Chairman, one-third of the labor force of the United States is made up of women. They are not incidental nor transient participants in the work of this country. They work in all the occupational classifications of the Census Records. Some of them work as young girls just out of school. Over one-half of those who work are married and living with their families. Over 5 million are the mothers of children under 18, who have to work. Over 2 million of these are mothers of children under 6. These again have to work. Women are the backbone of some of the essential

professional groups, like nurses and teachers. They are the bulk of the clerical workers. They do practically all of the paid housework in the country, and they are approximately one-fifth of the operatives of production industry. They are, in short, a very essential part of the economic help in this country.

At the same time they are faced with problems peculiar to them as women. They must and desire to maintain their homes and take care of their families even while they work on their jobs. In 1 family in 10 a woman is the head of a family. Women workers still face a variety of discriminations on the job. For hiring purposes they are considered "old" at 35. For training purposes they are frequently discouraged from following a natural bent, because there is not likely to be an opening for youth. In 1950 the average earnings of women from wages and salaries were overall 45 percent of the average earnings of men.

The welfare of wage-earning women means that women, their employers, men wage-earners, legislators, the press, and the public must understand their problems and deal with them on the basis of a recognition of what is involved. The program of the Women's Bureau is devised with the purpose in view of providing the tools of such understanding. It seeks to provide for these tools in terms laid out in the legislation which established the Bureau by providing information and recommending standards and policies to improve their working conditions, increase their efficiency, advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

The bill proposes a 17 percent cut.

I want to emphasize what I glossed over a moment ago, the fact that women who work are not through their work when they go home. They still have their homes to maintain. They still must put the children to bed after giving them their supper. They still must housecleen now and again. They still have a husband to feed, if they are fortunate. If they are not, maybe their mother, their sister, their aunt lives with them. Perhaps she is the one who takes care of the child while the woman goes out and earns enough to keep the family together. All these things are of great importance and they need to be understood.

The Women's Bureau serves our wonderful American women well with never-ending zeal and with rare efficiency. In addition, Mr. Chairman, our Women's Bureau is a clearinghouse for women everywhere. It is like a golden thread of hope, of friendship, of understanding across the world. Let me give you just one little taste of the far-reaching influence it has:

Recently, when Japan gave the suffrage to women, a small group of women was sent to this country. They went to the Women's Bureau. They learned there how to organize their little groups, how to learn how to vote, what it was to vote, what it meant. There was no other place for them in the whole world to go.

What has happened to them since? They have all gone back. Quite recently an American woman was up in the very northernmost part of Japan. There she found one of these women going from house to house, the little far-removed farms, where nobody goes but a Communist—and they go constantly. She found this woman eagerly waiting for mail from the Women's Bureau in Washington to answer some important questions for her. Happily she said: "The Bureau always knows how to help me."

That is not a small thing to do, Mr. Chairman, that is a very great thing to do, and it is being done in many countries of the world as women try to find their way into broader responsibilities. They need to know how to help build a world where, when they have to work, they can work without danger, at reasonable hours, where they can be adequately paid. No, Mr. Chairman, these world contacts made by the Women's Bureau are of more value than can be measured. Hope, friendship, encouragement. Is that not something very concrete, very real, very wonderful, to inject into the gathering darkness of the world? And at such little cost.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is my intention tomorrow to offer an amendment that will restore the amount to the sum requested in President Eisenhower's budget, which will make it possible for the Women's Bureau to continue doing the work it has been doing for women. Surely this is little enough to ask, Mr. Chairman, in an era when figures come mostly in millions and billions, for the work of a bureau to which women can go for help, advice, and instruction, for hope and for courage.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to take this opportunity as one who has served for 4 years on this particular subcommittee when it was the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency appropriations subcommittee, and one who has inspected over those 4 years the budget requests and the operations of the Women's Bureau, that I thoroughly agree with every single word that the gentlewoman has said here this afternoon. I shall lend my support to the amendment which will restore this unwarranted cut, a cut which cannot be explained.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. I want to say in closing that it is difficult for me to go against the action of this committee. I should like to feel that it was taken upon inadequate testimony. I shall hope that the picture as I have painted it in these short moments will have given a broader aspect of the situation which will have brought with it the conviction that the small sum should and must be restored.

It is a small sum, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, but it will mean very much to women and children—more than anyone can know.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do this in order to pay my respects to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] who has just finished speaking and making her usual eloquent plea for one of the services in which she is tremendously interested. I know of no individual in the entire United States who has given as much time, money, and talents over many years for programs for the benefit of women and children, and nursing, and many other worthwhile endeavors. I cannot entirely agree with her, however, that the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor is the only place that women can go for help and protection of their interests. I think it is a wonderful thing that they do have a special bureau known as the Women's Bureau. I am sure every member of the committee agrees with her wholeheartedly on that point. But the Wage and Hour Division administers the minimum wage laws for women, the same as for men. The Bureau of Labor Standards provides for the welfare of women, the same as it does for men, and many of the other regular agencies of Government do provide various services for women. But, nevertheless, I wholeheartedly subscribe to most of what she says. The women should have the Women's Bureau.

In regard to the cut. The so-called Truman budget was for $360,000. The so-called Eisenhower budget was for $350,000. In cutting the $50,00 from the Eisenhower budget, the committee did not intend to hinder the work of this bureau in any way. I think that the women are as patriotic as any other group in this country. They have always been in the forefront in their willingness to sacrifice for the Nation's good. I am frank to admit, as chairman of this Subcommittee of Labor—Health, Education, and Welfare, it will be very difficult for me tomorrow to oppose an amendment to restore these cuts of $50,000 or $60,000 in view of the fact that yesterday we added $50 million, above the Eisenhower budget, to the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. May I thank the gentleman. I was about to say it was a very difficult moment for all of us to accept a small cut like that when the addition has been made to the appropriation yesterday.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I wanted to question the correctness of one statement the gentleman made with regard to the gentlewoman from Ohio who just left the floor, in which he stated that she had done service in this work for so many, many years. I wondered how he arrived at that conclusion.

Mr. BUSBEY. Because ever since my first term in Congress, which was the Seventy-eighth Congress, I have heard her on this floor many, many times fight for these principles and ideals in which she believes and about which she knows so much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have a deep concern for the appropriation bill which is before us today because I am convinced that the health of the American people will be best protected and best served by vigorous research into the causes and cures of the major diseases. The Federal Government in providing funds for research in these fields is doing a service for the people of this country that is not done in any other country in the world. The efforts we are making as a nation along these lines are trail blazing and if we maintain them, will keep for us the eminence we enjoy today among the nations of the world.

The requirements in the field of mental health particularly arrested my attention as I read the hearings on the bill before us today. One of the foremost mental doctors in the country made a stirring plea for additional funds and summed up the situation very well. In his testimony he said that last year the Federal Government appropriated $10,819,000 for work in mental health, the most substantial part of which was to be devoted to basic research. He made a plea to increase that figure this year to $28 million of which $8 million was to be devoted to the construction of laboratories and research facilities. He went on to remark:

> We can confidently expect that Federal funds will provide the impetus for further basic research which in time can lead to more effective application of research to the ill patient. This impetus through adequate funds could do this by, (1) providing opportunities for more trained and skilled research workers to enter this field and for project grants; (2) through the provision of adequate facilities in the form of building and equipment.

I regret that the committee has found it necessary to strike from the request of this doctor and his colleagues all the funds for construction. It is only logical that medical men and medical machines can do a job if they are contained in a building which is adequate to house them. The problem is really as simple as that. It may be that next year we can meet this need more responsively. I certainly hope so because I am convinced that until we do, the total research effort will be seriously retarded. I am pleased though that the bill shows an appropriation for mental health for fiscal year 1954 of $10,895,000. This means that the research projects that are going on during the current fiscal year will be able to continue throughout the coming year; and 1 or 2 new ones will be inaugurated. With more than 8,000,000 people in the United States suffering from some form of mental illness, losing more than $3 billion in productivity, we can easily justify an outlay of $28 million to cure the situation. I am gratified, however, that even though the request of the medical men was not met in its entirety, we have moved a little bit forward over last year and it is my profound hope that in the years to come we will continue to accelerate the rate of this progress.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct a few remarks to the subject of rehabilitation.

It was my pleasure to be in the Congress that amended the Rehabilitation Act in 1943, which for many disabled people, and especially those suffering from blindness, could be called their bill of rights. This Congress has been called upon to appropriate funds to assist the States in training the blind and other severely disabled to fit into many types of productive employment. It is rather unique to note that both the former Democratic administration and the present Republican administration, in view of the needs of this group of less fortunate citizens, have, after due consideration, arrived at the same recommended figure of $23 million.

I am sure that all of you will agree with me that it is indeed better business to meet this request from the administration and prepare these disabled persons for satisfactory employment rather than to provide, through other programs, the financial assistance which they will call for if they are unable to receive the necessary counseling and training which will render them employable.

I would like to point out that during the last fiscal year the rehabilitation services in many States trained and placed into remunerative employment approximately 3,700 blind individuals alone.

I further believe that I am safe in saying that had not this number been trained for employment through the rehabilitation services they would certainly have applied—and rightly so—for aid to the needy blind under provisions of the Social Security Act. Now, if 50 percent of the 3,700 rehabilitated applied for aid to the blind, that would mean 1,750 persons asking for assistance. The national average is approximately $53 per month per individual. This figure alone would run well over $1 million a year, and it would not only be for 1 year. For every day a blind person is idle, it becomes harder to train that person for employment. Certainly he would have the prospect of many years of idleness with this payment increasing year by year, while with the figure recommended by the administration these blind persons could no doubt be placed into employment with a training cost of not more than $500 per person. They would then be taxpayers and we are aware of the fact that the average repayment in Federal taxes by one of these rehabilitated individuals over his working years will run well above 10 times the amount spent on his rehabilitation.

We now have more than 20,000 blind persons gainfully employed in this country. Many more are undergoing training at this time, and still others are anxiously waiting for the time to begin their training. I ask you then, are we going to economize at the expense of these less fortunate inviduals or shall we support the recommendations of the administration, and as I said before, the recommendations of the previous administration, and go along with the figures which were set by the people actually rendering this service in the field. I come from a district that is heavily populated with blind workers. I myself wish to go on record in support of every penny possible to assist in rehabilitating the blind. I do not wish to economize at the expense of a program which would train more of these blind people to become gainfully employed.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, in the bill before us today we are being asked to continue our partnership with the scientific skill and brains of this Nation in the effort to solve baffing diseases which are the principal causes of death and disability today.

This bill includes $61,586,200, in total, for the National Institutes of Health. This is a reduction of $23,413,800 from the original request, but $2,555,450 over the appropriations for 1953 and $5,246,200 over the revised budget presented to the committee by the Secretary on April 14, 1953.

The funds requested for the National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service are requested because our doctors and laboratory workers are engaged in running down leads in these fields of disease which give great promise and great hope of solution. In effect, these scientists have come to us and said: "Given the time and facilities to continue our work, we can one day do away entirely with the grievous ills that bring about prolonged suffering and untimely death." We are asked to provide a relatively small sum to enable these men to continue their work because there is no other way in which it can be continued. The Congress has recognized this fact in authorizing by law the establishment of the Institutes of Health. We are now requested to provide funds for the work of these Institutes to continue, and if we measure the accomplishments of the scientists in these Institutes, we cannot fail to realize that they must have at least the sums of money approved by the committee which heard their testimony.

It is very heartening to listen to these men of science and to realize that in a world threatened with potential atomic war, with great emphasis on the development of means of destruction and annihilation, that along with it is going the effort to extend the span of life and to eradicate the suffering that is caused by the major diseases.

The men who do this work in the scientific fields are modest men whose accomplishments for the most part are unsung. This is probably due to the fact that research is such a painstaking and slow process, and the results measured day by day are so small. It is only when the results of years of difficult and coordinated effort come to a dramatic conclusion that we arrive at a full appreciation of the achievements of the scientific workers. It is only when a discovery such as penicillin is made that we recognize the deep and far-reaching effect on the Nation's well-being which is made by these men. They have come to us and asked us for funds to continue their work. The very least we can do is to provide those funds on a scale that will enable them to continue.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], a member of the committee.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I had thought the committee was somewhat

more in agreement than has been expressed by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I am very pleased, however, to find that he and I are in complete agreement as to the relative merits and demerits of Mrs. Hobby and Mr. Ewing. Perhaps on that score we should let the report of the committee speak for itself wherein it is said, at page 17 of the report:

The committee is convinced that the new Secretary will not require an increase in funds to do a much better job than did her predecessor.

I feel that this bill, as has been stated by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is an extremely difficult bill for anyone to oppose. A great many of the amounts in the bill should be increased. With me it is only a question of what is the most important duty which I have as a Member of the Congress of the United States. When we go down through the list of items in this bill, practically every one of them relates to human sufferings which confront our people. All of us would love to see the items increased so that we could stamp out all of the sufferings with which the human race is confronted, particularly those which are physical and financial. However, I feel, as a Member of this great body, that I have a duty over and beyond that of providing, insofar as we are able, the funds to alleviate those sufferings. I feel that my greatest obligation to my country is to place it upon a fiscal policy where we can preserve for coming generations of this Nation the wonderful heritage under which we have been privileged to live, the Constitution of the United States.

I voted a few weeks back to cut appropriations for the Department of the Interior not 20 percent, as the gentleman from Rhode Island says the Department of Labor has been cut below the Truman budget, but I, coming from a western State where the Department of the Interior functions in all its programs, supported the bill which cut that Department 33⅓ percent. I supported the cuts for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments which went substantially further than the cuts here made against the Department of Labor.

Yesterday, although I come from a farming district, I voted to reduce by $55 million funds paid to the farmers. Today I appear here in support of this bill with the thought that in consistency there must be some virtue.

I dislike the cuts which have been made in this bill, probably more than any which I have previously supported, but I do feel that unless the budget is balanced and unless the taxpayers of the United States are given some relief this Nation faces collapse. In all other respects I find myself in total agreement with the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Going further in that connection I wish to agree with the remarks made by the gentleman from Iowa a few moments ago when he said that the big appropriation bills and particularly the foreign-aid bill should be presented to the Congress before these bills dealing with the needs of our own people are considered.

In case members of the committee may have overlooked it I would like to read into the RECORD an article written by the Associated Press which appeared in the Washington Star last evening under a United Nations, New York, dateline, May 20:

Ex-Secretary General Trygve Lie received $20,000 terminal pay from the United Nations in a final settlement ending his 7 years with the U. N. officials said yesterday.

Dag Hammarskold, Mr. Lie's successor, authorized the payment. Mr. Lie did not take part in the staff pension fund, but the UN Assembly decided when he was hired in 1946 that he would be granted a pension of $10,000 a year for life. This will take effect July 10.

During his time as Secretary-General Mr. Lie drew $20,000 per year salary, plus $20,000 expenses for entertainment. He also received the use of the mansion in Forest Hills complete with staff, and was furnished a car with a chauffeur.

And yet here we are talking about items that affect Americans in their very well-being, and we give a man as secretary of the United Nations $40,000 a year in tax-free money on which he pays no taxes, then give him $20,000 severance pay, and on top of that we are going to pay him $10,000 a year, tax-free, as long as he lives even though he did not contribute to the pension fund. I sincerely hope this Congress can see fit to examine completely the fiscal affairs of the United Nations and particularly the fiscal affairs as they have been conducted outside these United States. I for one pray to God—and I know all my colleagues in this body join me—that we will have the wisdom and the courage in this session of Congress to bring our fiscal affairs into such balance that we may guarantee to the future generations the marvelous advantages under which we have been privileged to live our lives in the greatest Nation in history.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I want to commend the gentleman for his stand on economy on all of the appropriation bills that have been proposed and I also want to commend him for the fine cooperation he gave so far as the National Institutes of Health appropriations are concerned.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman. I know how interested he has been in the National Institutes program since its inception. The current success of the program is in large measure due to the untiring efforts of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. Chairman, there are many items which should be increased as we go down through this bill and which could be if the peoples' substance had not been squandered elsewhere. For example, there is the National Institutes of Health item. They are seven separate institutes which are trying to find the answer as to why people suffer from these crippling, horrible infirmities which assail the human body. I join the gentleman from Rhode Island as does every Member of this body in the wish that we could in some way provide sufficient funds so that the answers may be found to these various problems. But I reiterate, we have to go one step further and be mighty, mighty sure that we do not completely destroy the basic economic structure upon which this Nation has been built.

The policy of the past 20 years has been to spend and waste here and abroad with no thought toward the ultimate and obvious result; the bankruptcy and destruction of the Republic. To that policy I cannot subscribe.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

SO THIS IS ECONOMY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am for cuts that result in economy, but I am against cuts in the bloodstream of our Nation; therefore I am happy to rise at this moment in support of the very sound views so splendidly stated on the floor here today by our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Given a citizenry healthy in mind and body, our country can withstand any and all onslaughts from within or without, whether ideological or physical.

Destroy or impair our educational and health facilities and you destroy or impair our capacity to withstand evil and to improve our civilization.

The cuts in this bill of over $65 million for health and hospital services, and over $20 million for education are unpardonable. They will wreak untold and irreparable harm. You can postpone many things but you cannot postpone treatment of the ill, rehabilitation of the maimed, or education of the young. The time lost in doing those things can never be regained. The damage can never be repaired.

A country that appropriates billions for atomic weapons of destruction will never retain the respect of a free world if it reduces by over $23 million, as proposed in this bill, the appropriations for cancer, mental health, heart, dental, arthritis, blindness, and similar research. I have many times in this session pointed out how this administration is pushing up the cost of every necessity of life of the wage earner. By this bill the Congress will now take away over $42 million that the Labor Department needs to help labor earn a livelihood.

I urge my colleagues to support the Fogarty amendments when they are offered.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks previously made by Members complimenting the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island upon his fine presentation here today. I should like to add also that the chairman of Oklahoma's congressional delegation has already placed in the RECORD copies of messages from outstanding Oklahoma leaders in the field of vocational education and vocational rehabilitation, commenting upon the unfortunate effect on these vital programs of the budget cuts proposed by this committee.

I am in wholehearted agreement with our delegation chairman in his protest against these particular cuts.

I deplore the proposal to discontinue support of land-grant colleges by endowment. This is certain to injure Oklahoma's great A. & M. College, which is so important to our State's agricultural and industrial progress, along with other great universities and colleges.

I deplore the cuts in programs vital to public health and to labor, as well as to education, and find it impossible to reconcile these cuts with the specific campaign commitments of both major parties.

I would very much prefer to see drastic cuts and economy in our programs for aid to foreign countries, before voting for these cuts in programs at home so vital to our national well-being.

It is unfortunate that we will not have the opportunity to review and vote on these foreign expenditures, before passing on budgets for programs at home.

I think a special protest is also in order, before concluding, against the proposed cut of more than 50 percent in budget estimates for Howard University. I doubt if there is another university or college in America which is being cut so drastically in its budget, in these times of rising salaries and institutional costs. Surely this cannot be justified on the sole basis of comparative enrollment in 1953 and 1948, because practically every coeducational college in our country will show enrollment decline during this period.

It is my hope that all Members will think carefully of the great importance of education, health, and vocational rehabilitation, to the enduring strength of our country, before accepting the proposed committee reductions.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has given the Committee a comprehensive statement and it would be presumptuous for me to dwell upon some of the items in which I am particularly interested. I have previously spoken of my appreciation for the significant service being rendered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Its important work is of a scientific and professional character and by reason of its nonpartisan approach has developed great prestige throughout the country. I am sure that the objective character of its studies is universally recognized. The cut in the budget request for the Bureau which the gentleman from Rhode Island mentioned will curtail and perhaps eliminate some vital services which had been anticipated during the next fiscal period. I refer to the revisions in procedures pertaining to gathering of figures on housing starts and also the resuming of certain surveys of family expenditures to keep a constant check on the Consumer Price Index.

Undoubtedly, a cut of $689,000 from the budget request will have an impact upon the current activities of the Bureau. The Bureau of Labor Statistics figures will be extremely important in case there is a turn in the business situation, and American business will suffer from lack of reliable figures, not just those constituting the Consumer Price Index but also those having to do with housing, employment, wages, and productivity.

I mention the Consumer Price Index because of its great importance to business groups. I do not intend to offer an amendment restoring the cut, but I trust before the debate is concluded the committee members can enlighten us further regarding these items.

I wish also to mention the severe cut in the apprentice training program since I happen to be somewhat familiar with this activity—incidentally, one of the oldest activities in the Department of Labor. About 19 years ago I served for a while as a member of a committee in the State of Arkansas which directed some of the operations and I became acquainted at that time with W. F. Patterson, the director, who continues in this important post. Under his able direction a splendid program has been maintained and I have never heard a word of criticism of this program upon which so many employers rely and in which leading businessmen have participated. This program was one of the highly successful programs of readjustment to civilian life of World War II veterans. It was based on the principle that employers and employees can do the training job themselves. As I understand it, there is no element of subsidy to industry in connection with this activity. I am advised that the present systems cover the employment of more than 155,000 apprentices. This is a program that cannot be handled by the States separately, for some coordination and national advisory service is imperative if requirements of American industry, particularly in a period of defense activities, are to be met. For these reasons I trust that the committee will consider restoring at least a portion if not all of the cut in the budget request.

Still another item so well presented by the gentleman from Rhode Island is that for the vocational rehabilitation service which suffered a cut of $2,400,000. Again this is a program that has proved its value. It is no longer a theoretical matter, since thousands of handicapped workers have graduated into positions requiring training. One survey which came to my attention some time ago showed that the efficiency record of a given group of these trainees exceeded those of the nonhandicapped employees.

Finally, I wish to subscribe to the statements heretofore made with reference to the elimination of the appropriations for the land grant colleges under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935. In case of the University of Arkansas this item amounts to $38,000 under a cooperative program which has nationwide support. The General Assembly of our State has adjourned and funds are not available to replace Federal funds which the university authorities had every right to anticipate.

I appreciate the opportunity of offering these comments in support of the position which the gentleman from Rhode Island has presented. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work of the subcommittee. It is only because of my conviction that the cuts in these cases will handicap the Federal service and will not achieve economy that I make these remarks with reference to the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with my other colleagues in commending the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for his fine presentation of the effects of the cuts recommended by the committee. I think it is regrettable that these cuts have been recommended, as I feel that they will seriously affect the very fundamental things that have made this the greatest country on earth, namely, the educated ability and health of our people to fully and wisely develop our natural resources. The proposed cuts strike directly at the education and health of our people. While I favor economy, we should do everything in our power to provide the necessary educational and health facilities and to encourage our people to secure the best education and have the best health possible. The recommended cuts affecting vocational education and our land-grant colleges under the Bankhead-Jones Act and such other cuts as affect the health, welfare, and education of our people are very unfortunate, and it is my intention to join with other Members in the House in attempting to restore these funds when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a telegram from the very noted educator, Mr. James J. McCain, president of Kansas State College. In this telegram he informs me that the usual biennial appropriation of $78,000 for this institution has been withheld from the appropriations. He states that this sum is urgently needed to carry on the necessary work of the college, that the Legislature of the State of Kansas has adjourned, and for this reason the sum cannot be replaced from that source.

Kansas State College is an institution of national importance with several thousand students from every part of the Nation. It seems to me that it is poor business on the part of the National Government to seek to economize at the expense of our schools. I submit the telegram from President McCain to be included in the RECORD:

MANHATTAN, KANS., *May 19, 1953.*

Representative HOWARD MILLER,
Washington, D. C.:

House Appropriations Committee in reporting appropriation bill, Department Health, Education, and Welfare recommends complete elimination grants resident teaching land-grant colleges under Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935. Full amount of cut $2,501,000. Kansas State reduction $39,000 each year of coming biennium, or total of $78,000. Kansas State and most other colleges cannot make up cuts since legislatures have adjourned. Understand bill reaches floor of

House Friday. Will appreciate your supporting restoration of full amount. Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE familiar with details.

Kindest regards.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure to listen to our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] present the matters involved in this bill; in fact, I know that this whole subcommittee, including its chairman and the other members on that committee, have worked long and untiringly to bring a fair bill to the House, and at the same time effect economies.

Mr. Chairman, however, I must agree that many of the actions taken, in my opinion, have missed the mark, and I expect to support the ranking minority Member the gentleman from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY. I find in the years I have been here that I can agree and usually do agree with him, and I know that the whole membership was pleased to hear the very fine explanation which he gave. I think that a majority are going to agree with his viewpoint. Certainly, the vocational rehabilitation program, the hospital construction program and other items which the committee has reduced are sound programs. Adequate funds for such programs should be put ahead of many things in Government. Mr. FOGARTY plans to offer amendments restoring funds to both and I shall support him. Also there are several other items in which he is interested, but which some of the rest of us have agreed to present to the House. I am glad to say that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], one of the soundest men, I think, in this body and one of the best informed men on educational matters, expects to offer an amendment restoring the reduction in the appropriation for vocational agriculture. Unless some one else should do so I expect to offer an amendment restoring the item for the land-grant college. I know we are all in favor of economy, but the question is, What is real economy? For real economy the action taken must be for real economy and if the program affected is sound and desired, we must have some reasonable plan for the continuance of the program. In my judgment the committee has no such plan either for vocational agriculture or the land-grant colleges. Practically every State in the Union participates in these programs. Practically every State depends upon these funds as a part of the school budget to handle or to take care of the faculty and the teachers and the teaching costs in those programs. Now to say that we are going to save the people tax money by cutting it out here and letting them pay it through the State does not necessarily save any money because nobody attempts to say that these programs are not good.

Now if the States can do a better job or a more economical job, well and good but the people foot the bill and just simply to let the same people support the same program by their taxes through the State instead of the Federal does not necessarily mean any saving at all.

Actually, here, while the committee says let the States handle the programs, no such arrangements have been made. Nobody attempts to say this money is not necessary to run the program. All agree they are sound, good programs. We merely say we are going to cut it out here and let the States pay it; and if all the States are participants, it is hard for me to see that you save any money there. But what do you do?

We had this same kind of approach requested by the Budget Bureau in our agricultural appropriations bill. It was recommended that we simply eliminate all quarantine on the Japanese beetles. It was recommended that we should cut all of the nurseries operated by the Soil Conservation Service, eliminate quarantines and programs on potato weevils, and on Hall scale and other diseases, and let the States do the job. But there have been no arrangements for these States to take the job over. There were no funds in the budgets of the States to take over. There had been no understanding with the States as to what was going to happen.

Further investigation showed that with regard to my State the legislature will not meet until next January, and funds could not be available for 15 months. And the legislature, so I understand, will not meet in Minnesota until the year after next, and thus it was with practically all of the States. To come in here appropriationwise and say, "Let's cut the money out and let the States pick it up," when it is apparent most of them cannot do it, is merely to abolish to a degree the program where it is apparent that actually the States cannot take over right now. It is false economy. All you are doing is upsetting the operations of a very fine work.

In the Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College in my State, which is a Negro training school, these funds constitute a large part of the support for the faculty. We are making a decided effort to strengthen Negro education in the State but this would retard the program. The same situation exists elsewhere. The same thing affects all land-grant colleges. In agricultural vocational training these funds mean much to the schools all over the United States.

If this this be a proper approach, to push everything back on the States, and I doubt that, but if that be what you are going to do, have you saved any money if they are going to have to pay for it through a program run by the States rather than by the Federal Government? If that is a saving, is it a sound approach to just cut it out here and let the States pick it up, when you know most of those legislatures will not meet for 1 year or 2 years, and they will have no chance to pick up the slack? That is what you do when you say you are going to make this reduction regardless. Let us make reductions on a sound basis and with regard to sound programs, arrange for their continuance first. If we are going to save money, let us save it in a way where we are not eliminating a very valuable and actually a necessary work.

I noted that it was stated a moment ago that yesterday we passed the agricultural appropriation bill, and I believe the statement was that we had increased it by $50 million. The truth of the matter is that the bill was $37 million below the Truman budget, and it was $24 million below this year's expenditures. Certainly that is no increase. Except for flood prevention and research there were no increases over Mr. Benson's budget in appropriations. There were increases in loan authorizations, which are dependent upon how the Department is run during the coming year. Those increases were part of programs which I think have lasting benefit; nevertheless, there was no increase in appropriations in that bill, but a reduction of $24 million from the present year.

What that has to do with the bill before us, I do not know, except that there and here we should let each program stand on its own merits, and if it is good and we wish it continued, do not cut it out until you have arranged for others to take over.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to bring to the attention of the House matters that I feel are of considerable interest. I should like to say that I intend to support the committee on this bill. I think they have done an excellent job. I recognize the very persuasive arguments the gentleman from Rhode Island has made. I also recognize the great contributions he has made to public health in the past.

I am glad that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has raised some of the questions he has as to the participation of the States, for that is one of the subjects I would like to address to the Committee today. In doing so, I may be stepping into some difficulties in my own State. I received a letter the other day which I suppose all members of the Ohio delegation received, which was sent to me by a Mrs. Arneson, Washington representative of Spokesman for Children. She sent me a copy of a letter she had received from Dr. John D. Porterfield, the director of health of the State of Ohio. I read the letter carefully because it had to do with child aid, children's health, and crippled children. I think we must take care of the children who have been afflicted. But, I was surprised when I read Dr. Porterfield's letter because, let me say to the members of the committee, the State of Ohio has no debt and has a great surplus. They are in much better position than the Federal Government. Dr. Porterfield says this, and I should like to read his letter:

STATE OF OHIO,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Columbus, Ohio, March 12, 1953.

Mrs. KATHALEEN C. ARNESON,
Washington Representative,
Spokesmen for Children,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR MRS. ARNESON: I am in receipt of your letter of February 27, which is concerned with the impending reduction in Federal grants-in-aid to the States as indicated in the President's budget.

Ohio's share of maternal and child health grant-in-aid funds is not sufficient to carry on the scope and quality of program we would like to see realized. Our State legislature has never appropriated funds to support the maternal and child-health program, and thus we rely entirely on Federal assistance.

In the main there are two broad categories which would be affected by a reduction in Federal funds, namely: (1) Less money for distribution to local health departments throughout the State, and (2) a reduction in consultative and demonstration services. This means that local health departments will have less financial assistance from the State to supplement their undernourished budgets. Of necessity such activities as well as child conferences, immunization programs, school health activities, otological diagnostic clinics, etc., would have to function on a lesser scale. From the standpoint of the State health department an expansion of the nutrition, hearing, and vision programs would not be possible and the addition of such vital persons as a pediatrician and more hospital nursing consultants to the maternal and child health staff would be out of the question. I need not dwell on what benefits would be derived from the addition of such key staff to the State as a whole.

If sufficient grant-in-aid moneys were received, this department would be in a position to not only supplement the present staff but to provide sums of money for payments to hospitals for care of premature infants of medically indigent parents and also make payments for medical and surgical care for needy children who had been examined at our State-sponsored otological diagnostic clinics.

I realize this is a rather sketchy presentation of some of the needs which could be met if additional Federal funds were available. I sincerely hope this information wil be useful to you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. PORTERFIELD, M. D.,
Director of Health.

Mr. Chairman, that comes from a State with a great surplus and no debt. They are now turning to the Federal Government and saying that we must increase these appropriations because without appropriations from the Federal Government, we will have no program in the State of Ohio for children's health, welfare, and the crippled children. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it is time to serve notice on the States that are in a position to handle these matters themselves, that they had better start to appropriate some funds. We can balance the Federal budget and reduce taxes if the State will accept their responsibilities and take care of these programs which the States can handle more efficiently and inexpensively themselves.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. That was not the attitude of you folks over in Ohio when you wanted some assistance for impacted school districts. They were over here and got hundreds of thousands of dollars to assist them.

Mr. BOW. That may be true, but I will say to the gentleman—this is my position, and I say to my State I believe it is time the States accept their responsibility. There are many on your side of the aisle, sir, as well as on mine who will agree with me and are firm believers in States' rights. I believe it is a two-way highway. If we are to have States' rights, we are to have State responsibilities, and this is one place we should accept our responsibilities.

Mr. BAILEY. At least they should be consistent.

Mr. BOW. I am sorry I do not yield further to the gentleman. We should be consistent. Let me raise a question on the point of consistency. I do not see my friend, BILLY MATTHEWS, for whom I have a great regard, but just the other day we passed the tidelands bill to give back to the States that control. Those who believe in States' rights and State control of tidelands should also believe in States' rights and responsibilities in other fields. I think there should be consistency. There has to be a two-way street. I believe that where the States can do these things, they can do them more economically and can reduce the burden of taxation because if we tax the people in Ohio and take the tax dollar from their pockets and distribute them through the bureaus here in Washington, and then back to the States, each place that that dollar stops, takes its particular part of that dollar away, and when it goes back to Ohio, you do not have the kind of dollar that has been taken out of the taxpayers' pockets. If we keep it in Ohio and run our own affairs, we will have a sound dollar in Ohio, which has not been clipped by the various bureaus as it goes on its way to the various States.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss the question of vocational training in the schools. I am a firm believer in vocational training. I have supported the program and will continue to support it. I received many telegrams urging me to vote for the increase. I regret to say I will not follow the demands that have been made upon me for that, and I will support the committee. What has happened? On the subject of vocational training, there again is something which the States can participate in. If the cut of the committee is adopted, and if my figures are right, which I have received from the committee, it will amount to a reduction of just a little bit over $1 a year for each student now in the vocational training in the schools—$1.

I am convinced that in the programs they can find some way, within a period of 1 year, to absorb $1. That is what this cut amounts to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to say, since the telegrams have started rolling into Washington, I have discussed this problem with some of the men in the various States who have the responsibility of administering this vocational education program; and in discussing it with them, while they say, "Surely, it will hurt us to some extent. We believe you are right in making the States assume their responsibility, and we will get along somehow."

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman. As I say, I believe they can find some way of taking care of that $1 for each student.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee this morning discussed briefly a question which I have raised with the Department of Education. That is the question of communistic propaganda that is being circulated in the schools of the United States. A distinguished superintendent of schools in my district called to my attention a pamphlet that is being mailed out of Washington by the Hungarian Legation, sent to the libraries of every high school in the United States. I spoke on the matter in the House on April 30, 1953, and my remarks appear on page 4263 of the RECORD, outlining the language and the type of propaganda that is being circulated into the schools. I have asked the Department of Education to list those publications that are going out to the libraries of the high schools, and to advise the faculties and superintendents of the type of propaganda it really is.

Let me read a part of one of these publications, where, after they have told the school children of the great systems of their country and how much better off they are than the children of this country, they say this, referring to their own country:

> And today the country of peace, the country building the great structure of communism, Stalin's country, is our friend, our supporter, and our ally.

That is the kind of material that is being sent to the libraries of the high schools throughout this country, telling a beautiful story and then saying, "The country of peace, the country building the great structure of communism, Stalin's country, is our friend, our supporter, and our ally."

I submit it would be much better for the Department of Education to spend some of their time in advising the schools of the type of literature that is being sent out than some of the sheets that they have been publishing and disseminating through the country.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. In connection with the remarks which Mr. McGrath, former Commissioner of the Office of Education, made, as he withdrew from that position, with rather a bitter attack upon the President of the United States and some unkind remarks about the Congress of the United States. Mr. McGrath said that the budget presented by the President was woefully insufficient, and the Department could not be operated in the manner in which it had been operating. I should like to invite the attention of Members of Congress to the hearings on this bill wherein Mr. McGrath, in answer to a question by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] stated that he was sending 40 people from his office to a convention up at Atlantic City. If that is the type of operation about which we have been speaking in considering the Truman budget, I think the American people will be very happy to have less people go to less conventions.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] condemning some of the cuts that the committee has recommended in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare; and tomorrow I will cast my vote to restore those funds that are needed to operate these various Departments efficiently. Today I wish to confine my remarks to vocational education.

The original 1954 budget recommended for vocational education under the George-Barden Act was $16,673,261, the same as the previous year. This figure was reduced approximately 25 percent, to $14,048,840, in the revised budget. The protests against this drastic reduction of educational funds were so general that the committee restored a little more than one-third of the cut, bringing the total back to $16,048,870. This is 14 percent less than the amount available for the current year.

I am for economy, but I do not intend to vote to deny high-school students the right to have an agriculture, a home economics, or any vocational training teacher. It is passing strange to me that a country which appropriates money for defense against communism at the rate of $120 million per day, refuses to appropriate as much as $50,000 per day to train its future citizens for a maximum production on the domestic front. It is generally recognized that poverty, unrest, and unemployment are the top producers of communism. The vocational education program is undoubtedly one of the best defenses against communism. It will also go far toward strengthening the home defenses by increasing production on the long-range plan. It is false economy to curtail this program at this time.

This program was first started in 1915 with the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act, and the appropriation was gradually increased until about 1925, when it reached the sum of $7,138,331, and continuously thereafter we have appropriated that amount. The cut that the committee made affected the George-Barden funds only by reducing the original budget figure of $16,673,261 down to $16,048,870—approximately 14 percent below the figure for fiscal 1953. This program deserves better treatment.

We gave away in the offshore-oil bill here just a few days ago property of sufficient value to guarantee a sound educational program in this country for the next 100 years and a sound building program in this country for the next century.

In Kentucky alone this proposed cut will amount to approximately $120,000. Unless these funds are restored, 34 departments of agriculture, 13 departments of home economics, and all the programs of distributive education will be eliminated in Kentucky. In the district that I am privileged to represent it will be necessary to withdraw Federal funds for seven departments in the Mayo State Vocational School in Paintsville, Ky. This alone would affect 125 boys in one school.

What else is taking place? A majority of the legislatures do not meet until year after next. Down in Kentucky—and it is true throughout the Nation—teacher hiring begins soon after the first of any calendar year. For several months the respective local boards of education have been hiring their teachers down in Kentucky and the State department of education has entered into contracts with local boards of education committing the $120,000 that is Kentucky's share of this proposed cut. The loss of this money, therefore, would make the repudiation of those contracts mandatory. We all know that there are many girls and boys who are unable to go to college. Why cut; why deny those boys and girls the opportunity to be taught some trade in high school that will be profitable to them and the country in later years? And that is just what we are doing here by this small cut.

I am hopeful that the Committee tomorrow will reverse the Appropriations Committee and grant the full amount as provided in the original budget.

I intend to support the Barden amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday, May 23, 1953, the Hartford Turners, Inc., will celebrate its 75th anniversary.

This organization is not only one of the oldest of its kind in the city of Hartford, but is as well one of the most respected. Over the years its members have made a substantial contribution to the community life of Hartford and the Greater Hartford area. Among its members are some of our outstanding citizens, and I take this opportunity today to congratulate this splendid organization on 75 years of worthwhile activity.

Of the various organizations which participated in the democratic movements during the nineteenth century, one of the outstanding was the Turner movement. Many members of the Turners, who were opposed to Prussian militarism, migrated to the United States to find new homes in a truly free country. This migration resulted in the establishment of many turnverein which upheld their democratic traditions and brought German culture to the United States.

Over the last 75 years the turnverein of Hartford has compiled an exceptional record toward strengthening the democratic spirit and enriching the cultural heritage of our land.

No nation has played a more vital part in the building up of western civilization than Germany. In almost all fields of human endeavor—philosophy, music, literature, medicine—German names appear at the head of the list of immortals.

Today, as we are engaged in a battle for the preservation of our civilization, a democratic Germany is in the forefront of the fight against communism. Under the leadership of Chancellor Adenauer, Western Germany is striving for a united and strong, free Germany and a united strong, free world.

For Germany must be united and free before there can be a lasting peace in Europe or in the world. Germany can and will be again a great stabilizing influence. In a little more than 8 years, Germany has come a long way on the road back to her proper place in the family of nations.

During these more than 8 years, we of the United States have been working toward that end, and we shall continue to do so until this objective is obtained.

The industrial and organizational genius of the German people, which played so important a role in the development of the United States, has brought about an amazing recovery of German economy in the last 8 years. Overall production is already 60 percent above the 1936 level. It is expected that by 1956 the steel mills of Western Germany will break an alltime production record.

The shadow that hangs over Western Germany is the knowledge that in the East their countrymen are living under a reign of Soviet terror. Kremlin agents use every means at their command to crush the German people.

Just a few days ago I again spoke on the floor of the House, calling for the exposure of these Communist acts. I appealed for the adoption by the United States Senate of the Genocide Convention, a law which makes it criminal to destroy groups by such acts as killings, mutilations, deportations, concentration and slave-labor camps, and the breaking up of families. The people of Eastern Germany look to us for help to free them from Soviet subjugation and rescue from mass murder. We cannot fail them.

We shall need all our material weapons in order to bring about the defeat of tyranny in the world. But, as the turnverein have always taught us, there is a close relationship between moral and physical strength. One can never succeed without the other.

Knowing that it shall continue to work for the further growth of our country and to fight for our democratic ideals, I wish the turnverein of Hartford every success for the future.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for his brilliant and masterful analysis of an appropriation bill such as the one now under consideration which totals almost $2 billion. The viewpoints he expressed with regard to the various items contained therein are the viewpoints of many of us here in the House.

Mr. Chairman, during my 9 years of service on the House Appropriations Committee it was my duty and pleasure at one time for a period of 4 years to serve on the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee, which has now become the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee. Out of that service grew a knowledge and familiarity with the problems of public health which

have sustained my interest in the intervening years. The program of research under the sponsorship of the National Institutes of Health has occupied my attention not only because it affects the basic health of the people in the district which I represent but because it has such a direct bearing on the health of the people of this country as a whole.

I have seen the Institutes of Health at Bethesda grow in scope and accomplishment, and I have felt a pride and admiration for the development of their activities. We in the Congress have helped this work by providing funds each year for the various institutes and by and large each year has seen some increase in the major disease areas which are under exploration. This year again it is fitting that the funds appropriated for research and collateral activities in the Institutes of Health are at least fractionally higher than last year. At that rate research now under way will be able to continue even though relatively few new projects will be undertaken. I am somewhat puzzled, however, and disappointed that the very eloquent plea for funds for the construction of laboratories and kindred facilities by the most eminent medical men in the country has gone unanswered.

In the testimony before the subcommittee there was a unanimity of conviction among the medical authorities that construction funds were necessary this year if we were to continue making progress at the rate we should. In the field of heart disease Dr. T. Ducket Jones, of New York, stated:

> There is a desperate need for further laboratory space, not elaborate, gaudy, luxurious things, but a roof and tools with which to work. One hundred and twenty-two of our leading schools and institutes in the country have indicated they desperately need construction funds and have told us the needs are in the neighborhood of $36 million.

In the field of arthritis and metabolic diseases Dr. Joseph Lee Hollander, of the University of Pennsylvania, said:

> There are few laboratories available in this country for learning the basic mechanisms involved and testing out treatments. * * * Our own laboratory has been a typical example. Our discovery of the effectiveness of compound F or hydrocortisone, when injected directly into swollen joints was only made possible by a grant from the National Institutes of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases. Had we not received this, the idea like those of many others, would have died on the vine instead of becoming a worthwhile additional aid in the management of arthritis. Well staffed and well equipped research laboratories are needed in many institutes to study the basic factors involved in these diseases and to evaluate and study new agents used in treatment.

In the field of cancer Dr. Norman Topping, speaking of the Gates Memorial Pavilion in Philadelphia, said that in the total financing of the pavilion at a cost to his university of $6,950,000, a grant of $1 million from Hill-Burton funds together with two smaller research construction grants, 1 for cancer and 1 for heart, totaling another half million, his university was able to raise about $6 million additional. He said:

> I think it is quite important for us to realize that this seed corn put down in our local community gave us the impetus, gave us the ability to show to our community itself that this building, this area in construction could be financed, that it was possible with their help; and we were successful. We would never have been able to build the Gates Pavilion without the impetus from these relatively small amounts of money.

Again, in the field of cancer, Dr. Sidney Farber, of Boston, Mass., one of the finest men in the field, described the activities of the Children's Hospital of Boston and the Children's Cancer Research Foundation. He spoke of the wonderful work being done on children with cancer and said:,

> The work began with appropriations from the program we have been talking about today. The first research began with a $10,000 grant from the National Cancer Institute. The million-and-a-half-dollar building was stimulated by a grant of a hundred thousand dollars from the National Cancer Institute for equipment. Just as Dr. Topping mentioned the case in Philadelphia, we have the stimulation of private donors on the basis of a Federal grant for a small part of the whole.

James S. Adams, a New York banker, active as a civic-minded citizen in the cancer problem, spoke of the remarkable results gained from construction funds expended in the past. Reviewing construction for fiscal years 1948, 1949, and 1950, he said during those 3 years Congress appropriated $16,303,000, a total of $25 million.

> There have been no appropriations for construction in 1951, 1952, or 1953, although we have advocated the completion of the $25 million program in each of the last 3 years. To the $16,303,000 already appropriated and very largely expended, I am glad to tell you that the expectation we had as to the availability of other funds was fully realized. For every Government dollar, six additional dollars have gone into building from private and other local sources. So, for the $16,303,000 of Federal funds, there has been nearly $100 million of additional funds, or a total of upward of $120 million, resulting. The $16,303,000 was allocated to 55 different construction projects at 49 institutes in 27 States; 46 of these projects have been completed and it is expected that the remaining 9 will be finished this year.

And in the field of mental health Mr. Charles Schlaifer, an advertising man and cochairman of the National Mental Health Committee, said:

> The physical plant in this [mental health] field is woefully inadequate for the training and research machinery to accomplish the monumental tasks set for it by the mounting hospital problem. The construction item requested in the mental health budget is $2½ million. It is a genuine first step, of course, but the figure is so small as to be only a token amount. For 3 years we have included in our citizens' proposal a request for $8 million in construction grants on the basis of requests from bona fide medical and other training schools and research centers of $13 million. At the present time there are on file requests for construction grants amounting to more than $22 million. The medical schools are bursting at the seams for lack of space to permit teachers and students to get together. Adequate clinical facilities are lacking, the laboratories and other facilities and clinical research projects are so insufficient in so many cases that some of the foremost medical and research men are unable to follow up on promising leads they uncover.

In the light of this testimony from doctors whose knowledge of medical research is unchallenged and from businessmen who understand these problems from a financial point of view, it seems to me that the need for construction is an overwhelming and compelling one. I am happy that funds for research were maintained at last year's level, but I deeply regret that some funds were not provided for construction, and I hope that this Congress will find it possible to meet this great and serious need in the public health picture.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word on behalf of the work of the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the Department of Labor. In Fort Wayne, Ind., my home town, I have observed some of the activities of this Bureau and the results of those activities. Within my knowledge, I must state that the program has been most beneficial.

First of all, it has been well ordered and operated with a view to the conservation of public funds. In this connection, there is a rather wide participation by a number of States which certainly is a good thing as it ties the Federal program to the more local activities.

The program also has a bearing upon veterans' problems. The record of the hearings shows a great many veterans are now participating in the program and, if it is continued, many more will no doubt take advantage of it.

Finally, I think it should be stressed that here is an instance in which management and labor are cooperating to produce skilled workers for the benefit of all. This is the type of cooperation that should be strengthened and encouraged, but to provide such encouragement it is necessary that the activities of the Bureau of Apprenticeship be continued. If that Bureau is limited too much by lack of funds, it cannot achieve these worthwhile goals.

I hope that the Congress will see fit to make adequate financial provision for this productive activity.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to take the opportunity to compliment my colleague from Chicago [Mr. BUSBEY], chairman of the subcommittee. He has done a very good job. He has been very diligent, and has worked long hours in a conscientious effor to do a job here; and to do the job on a bill like this calls for a lot of work plus a lot of, might we say, abuse, because it is not popular to cut expenses and it is not popular to cut the funds of departments, all of whom feel they are the ones who should be given extra funds.

I expect tomorrow to support the chairman of the committee and the committee itself on any amendments that may be offered to this bill, but I wanted this time to present some viewpoints with reference to one of the problems.

I note that this bill provides $377,000 less for the Bureau of Labor Statistics than the amount it has this year. It is my understanding that the administra-

tion recommended that this Bureau's work be continued at about its present level. I recognize that the committee feels that it must make economies wherever it is practicable in order to save money for us all, although sometimes these reductions might be made where they would mean loss of the quality of service of the Federal Government that has proved useful in the past.

I note especially in the report that the committee has specifically disallowed the requested increase for housing and public construction statistics, and I would like to comment on that item.

A number of the headquarters of important home-building organizations are in the city of Chicago, and I am familiar with the way in which they have used these statistics. As I understand it, the Bureau of Labor Statistics requested to be allowed to use some funds that it has been using in other ways this year to review and improve these statistics, which show the total number of new homes started in the United States every month. It is this set of figures on housing starts, so-called, which the Congress used in the Defense Production Act passed last summer as a basis to decide when controls on housing credit under regulation X should be suspended. It is my memory that these regulations were suspended after the number of housing starts at an annual rate had fallen below 1,200,000 for 2 or 3 successive months. The act provided that those controls could be reinstituted if the amount of home building again goes above 1,200,000 for a certain length of time.

I understand from some of the other home-building organizations in Chicago that all of the people in the industry familiar with these statistics are of the opinion that they should be improved. These figures which come partly from building permits and partly from records of houses being built in areas outside building-permit areas, are now put together on the basis of population figures from the 1940 census. All of us know how many localities grew out of all proportion to others during and after the war. The 1950 census figures are available, and these building people think, as does the Bureau of Labor Statistics, that the figures we are using in 1953 should be based on the 1950 censuses of population and housing.

A report from the United States Chamber of Commerce says the two most important series on construction are: First, the number of nonfarm houses started, compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; second, the dollar value of work put in place, prepared jointly by the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

This series on housing statistics is the first one mentioned in this report. It is not often that we have a request of this kind from the chamber of commerce, backed by a committee of people from the industry who are familiar with this kind of information.

All of us depend upon the Bureau of Labor Statistics from long standing for a lot of statistics, and we count on the Bureau to make them so that they are good and accurate. If the Bureau says that a set of statistics is not as good as it could be made and should be made, and they are confirmed in this view by the people in the industry, I think we should go along with them.

I hope the House will take into consideration that these statistics are used in the forecasting of their market by producers of building materials of all kinds, by retail lumber yards, by the suppliers of equipment, and by the big construction firms themselves. There is no other national set of statistics on the number of homes being built each month. This is such a big industry and employs so many people, both on the job and in producing materials, that I believe we should make sure we have a good, sound record of how much activity is going on every month.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I feel privileged to associate myself in support of the views so ably presented today by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I favor economy in our Federal Government; the type of economy promised during the campaign of last year by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle; an economy brought about according to their promises by increased efficiency in Government, by elimination of duplication and waste; not an economy secured through the destruction or crippling of social programs.

The new administration pledged itself to increasing rather than lessening the scope of our social programs. The cuts proposed in the bill presently under debate are in every instance aimed at specific reduction in programs most beneficial to the American people, programs designed for better utilization of our greatest resource—the human resources of this Nation.

A number of the cuts contained in this appropriation deal specifically with programs important to my State. They reduce or eliminate Federal participation to a degree which will wreak havoc with many of the cooperative activities in which my State participates.

California is not in the happy position of having huge uncommitted surpluses, of being free from bonded obligation. In my State, we have strained every resource to meet the problems brought about by the most rapid increase in population of any State in the Union. We have not been content to lay down on the job, looking to the Federal Government to bail us out. But the pressures of growth, aggravated in many instances by the defense activities of the Federal Government, have forced us to look to the Federal Government to meet a responsibility which is not solely ours.

I am particularly concerned with the impact of these reductions as they deal with the educational activities of my State. Our local school districts have planned their programs on the basis of the laws of this Nation committing it to support of specific educational programs. The budgets of these local school districts are made up. The tax rate is set. The ability on their part to underwrite a greater share of the total cost of an educational program is limited by law. They will be severely penalized if, in this appropriation bill, we repudiate the moral obligations of the Federal Government.

I will support the amendment which will be offered tomorrow to restore the funds eliminated by the committee. In supporting an increase beyond the committee recommendation, I will be acting in a manner which keeps faith with State and local government.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly impressed by the lack of substantial testimony in the report of the committee and the hearings before the committee which would tend to justify the drastic cuts which have been made. As I stated before, economy is a desired objective of any responsible legislator, but it should not be brought about without regard to the human element, without regard to the responsibilities to the public welfare which any representative government should and must assume.

The gentleman from Rhode Island has dealt extensively with each item of reduction proposed by the committee. It is not my intention to duplicate his remarks. I want to emphasize that I do subscribe to his views, that I feel he has most ably presented the case for the people in the remarks made earlier by him. I shall support his amendments. I hope the House will carefully consider the effects of the cuts proposed and recognize the wisdom of accepting a policy which continues to recognize the responsibilities of a wise and forward-looking Government.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDON].

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for the most able presentation of his viewpoint on the Labor and Health, Education and Welfare appropriation bill. Mr. FOGARTY gave one of the most lucid and moving presentations that I have heard since I have been a Member of this body. I am in complete accord with the point of view which he has expressed. I feel it particularly regrettable that the Appropriation Subcommittee saw fit to make the cuts which it made in the fields of public health and of education.

I cannot help but compare the treatment given the Department of Agriculture in its appropriation bill with that given the agencies concerned in this bill.

The Appropriations Committee, on the Agriculture appropriation bill, actually raised the request for funds made by the administration. The agencies herein concerned, however, were deeply and severely cut down. The spokesmen for agriculture throughout the Nation are articulate, and the farmers are well-organized. In addition, the farm community is in a position to wield considerable political influence. As a result, they attained more than the administration was willing to grant them.

The sick and disabled and our school children do not have the political strength or the recognized spokesmen, and as a result they are to suffer. While it is true the cost of government must

be trimmed down, I do not think it should be trimmed at the expense of proven programs which directly benefit large segments of our population. Economies that close hospitals, that cut down on medical research, that lessen the vocational rehabilitation program, that cut down the funds promised by past Congresses to our school districts, that cut back the vocational education program, are not economies demanded by the American public.

In my own district in California if the funds promised under Public Law 874 are not made available, some of our schools may not be able to complete an entire academic year. So great is the Federal impact in my district, which contains Mare Island Navy Yard, Travis Air Base, Port Chicago Naval Magazine, Camp Stoneman and Benicia Arsenal, that it is absolutely impossible for the school districts to raise from local taxes sufficient funds to offset the moneys being cut in this bill.

I feel that I must raise my voice in protest, and I hope that this body, when it considers the amendments tomorrow, will undo much of the harm that was done when the bill was presented to us in its present form.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised that in the fact of our stated intention to strengthen the Department of Labor we are, in fact, considering a rather drastic curtailment of the budget for that Department. I am sure that our committee has considered in detail the needs of the various bureaus, but I am concerned about some of the cuts that I have had time to study.

As you all know, one of the duties of the Department is to study employment and unemployment. Their data are compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of Employment Security in cooperation with the State governments. In the area I come from, Cambria, Indiana, and Armstrong Counties, we have large coal and steel industries and thousands of small businesses. It is important for me to know the trend of employment and unemployment here. The Department has these data; but if we cut the budget as drastically as proposed, it will reduce this cooperative program on employment and unemployment.

I am concerned more specifically about what we are proposing to do to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. As you know, this is the agency that has the major responsibility in our Government for compiling the official records on prices, wages, consumers' price index, employment, productivity, and construction, and other data.

We are proposing to cut the Bureau $689,000 below the budget requests and $379,000 below the current operating level. This action would cause a reduction in staff to a point well below the number of employees they had in 1948, after the 40-percent cut voted by the 80th Congress.

I have inquired into this situation, and I find that the proposed action would result in reduction of 60 to 75 people. How can we expect this Bureau to maintain accurate and reliable statistics if we cut them this much.

We specifically disallow $95,000 for overhaul of the construction housing starts series, which are widely used around the country. If we do not allow these funds for revision, we are promulgating errors which are known to exist in the figures. Statistics are similar to automobiles and other machinery, similar to our homes; they require upkeep entailing certain costs to eliminate obsolescence. We should provide adequate funds to permit the maintenance of these important economic data; otherwise, industry, labor, and the public generally will soon lose confidence in the Bureau's work.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] for permitting me to have a few minutes on the floor. Being a new Member and having no connection whatsoever with his committee, I feel I may be presuming. However, I have listened this afternoon to these discussions and I have been very much impressed with the sincerity of both sides of the House. I must recognize, however, that we are faced with a situation which, it seems to me, should prevail upon the minds of all toward bringing about some sort of recognition of the necessity somewhere along the line of reducing the expenditures of this great, big, overgrown Uncle Sam of ours who apparently has reached that point of indebtedness and obligations to the various agencies and various elements of society in this country that he is no longer able to meet the situation without continuing—continuing, I say—to borrow and spend in that manner which has become so disagreeable to most of the taxpayers of this day and age. I wonder if there is a parent among you who, recognizing that the members of his household were, without their own knowledge, perhaps without their own intent, bringing you to the point in your financial ability to bear the costs of your household, continued to impress upon you that they must have you give them today something more that they would like to have, would, in a sense of judgment, would you in your effort to maintain your sense of credit, your loyalty to your own obligation, continue to give those children of yours the things they ask for, simply because they wanted them and simply because you had permitted them through years of time to build up that sense of expectation from their parent. I say it is time we must begin to cut expenses of this Government. I notice on this side of the House that they have very willingly condemned every attempt to cut in the various phases of the budget, but have they at any time presented to the Members present or to those interested in bringing down the cost of Government, anything that would take place of proposed reductions? Do they want to continue to spend as they have been spending all these years, drawing upon the credit of the United States until it will no longer stand on its own?

These are serious things, regardless of politics. It is one of the things we must take into consideration and we must make up our minds that somewhere, somehow, some folks will have to suffer. The suffering will be trivial, and I think the American people have enough good sense to recognize the fact that if this Congress takes a step along the right direction, even though it be a very minimum one; if this Congress demonstrates to the people of the United States that we still respect our honor and our national credit, then I think the people will understand and will thoroughly approve of everything we do here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] for giving me this time. I had not planned to speak on this bill, but after listening to the very fine statement of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] with reference to the provisions of H. R. 5246, I feel I should not miss the opportunity of associating myself with the views that he has expressed.

I shall support amendments that no doubt will be offered tomorrow to raise certain sums as have been provided in the bill.

I would like to take these few minutes to talk briefly about vocational education. I am referring to the item in the bill which refers to the teaching of vocational agriculture, home economics, trades and industries, and the item for distributive education.

It so happens that I have had some personal experience with vocational education. When I was a student at the Ohio State University, in the College of Agriculture, a few years ago, it was my privilege to take the courses offered by the Ohio State University looking toward the position of teacher of vocational agriculture.

When I graduated from Ohio State University I received a certificate which would have entitled me to teach vocational agriculture in any agricultural high school in the State of Ohio. For a period of 8 years I was in school work, and during that time I was supervising departments of vocational agriculture and home economics; so I believe I know something about this type of work.

In the first place, the teachers of vocational agriculture and vocational home economics must be graduates of regularly accredited colleges or universities which carry on teacher training programs in this field. Students who take the courses in vocational agriculture and vocational home economics must carry on what are known as home projects; in other words, it is a combination of classroom study and practical work out on the farms, or in the homes, and provides what seems to me to be one of the most important types of education that we have today.

What I have said about agriculture applies with equal force to home economics; it applies with equal force to

the trades and industries, and also with reference to distributive education, it has been my privilege to visit the classes in distributive education in the Portsmouth, Ohio, high schools where I have seen the work of the young people in this field. I regret very much that that item has been taken from this bill. I believe it should be restored.

I would like to make brief reference to the fact that in 1951 $1,800,000 was appropriated for distributive education. In 1952 that was cut down to $900,000, and last year it was cut to $450,000. Those two items during the last years were restored in the Senate after they had been stricken from the House bill.

May I say again that I wish to associate myself with the efforts Mr. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, has announced he will make tomorrow to restore certain funds for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

I shall vote for the amendments which Mr. FOGARTY proposes.

I shall also vote to increase the appropriations for vocational education including vocational agriculture, vocational home economics, vocational trades and industries, and distributive education.

I wish to express my deep concern about the excessively great cuts that have been made in these four items.

The Democratic budget recommended $18,673,261 for these services. President Eisenhower's budget recommended $14,048,840, approximately 25 percent below the Truman recommendations. The Appropriations Committee has recommended in this bill H. R. 5246 only $16,048,870, which is about 14 percent below the amount that was available this year.

Maintaining the American way of life, based in large part on a rising standard of living, is a primary concern of the National Government. Such a standard of living can be assured only through continuously increasing the competency of the labor force. The principal factors which concern this problem involve:

A constantly rising degree of specialization and level of training are required to improve basic production efficiency ministering to the American standard of living.

The expenditure of Federal funds for the support of vocational education is returned in the form of increased earning power and greater national wealth.

The lack of vocational education in communities where it cannot exist without Federal financial assistance would deny many individuals the opportunity of increasing their standard of living through such training.

Vocational education is necessary to assure the country of economic independence and commercial supremacy, at home and abroad.

Since a constantly expanding body of skills among the laboring force is necessary to the national welfare, the initiation of training programs, and the maintenance of the strength of programs already in operation cannot be left to chance.

Federal aid to vocational education is necessary to guarantee the establishment of thoroughly tested, uniform standards, and to stimulate the States to maintain such standards. This means that—

(a) National preparedness, a Federal responsibility, can be guaranteed only by the provision for nationwide competence, and maintained on the basis of adequate minimum standards.

(b) Adequacy of standards can only be maintained through the Federal Government as a centralized agency working in close cooperation with all the States and Territories.

Vocational education is necessarily costly but there is nothing more costly than ignorance. Federal financial assistance provides for equalization of opportunity beyond basic educational experience.

Justification for Federal aid to the States and Territories for vocational education includes the following:

(a) To make the work of vocational training possible in States and localities already overburdened with the task of meeting the rapidly increasing requirements of general education.

(b) To help the States, with their widely varying resources, bear the additional costs of providing occupational training as a national service.

(c) To equalize among the States the task of preparing workers whose tendency to move from place to place is increasing, making their training for life work a national as well as a State or local duty and problem.

(d) To secure national assistance in solving a problem too large to be solved alone by thousands of local school districts.

(e) To give interest and prestige in the States to the work of preparing youth for useful and productive service.

This proposed cut in vocational agriculture, for example, will mean that each local department of vocational agriculture established in the rural schools of Ohio would receive a serious reduction in reimbursement. In vocational trade and industrial education, which is already established at a reimbursement level of only 26 percent, it would mean a further reduction of approximately one-third in reimbursement. In this particular case it is difficult to understand a cut at this time since the local vocational schools are frequently receiving requests for providing training services in defense production industries.

Actually in all four areas of vocational education, the proposed reduction in appropriations would mean not only the elimination of any possibility for the development of new programs in schools seriously needing vocational education, but would certainly result in the loss of some of the present programs. The truth of the present situation is that even with the present appropriation, increased operating costs have necessitated a reduction in the reimbursement rate from a previous 50 percent to the present approximately 30 percent, causing local boards of education to assume this entire additional burden.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to use any more time?

Mr. FOGARTY. Only to make an announcement for the benefit of the members of the committee. I wish to mention a few of the amendments that will be offered tomorrow. One will be to the hospital program increasing the item $500,000 to keep these hospitals from closing. An amendment will be offered to the Hill-Burton Act item increasing it from $50 million to $75 million. An amendment will be offered with regard to vocational rehabilitation raising it from $20 million to $23 million, and the item payments to school districts, I expect to offer an amendment to raise it to the Eisenhower budget of $66,500,000. I will offer an amendment to the item for the Wage and Hour Division; one for the Women's Bureau, and one dealing with the apprenticeship-training program, and one to the Food and Drug Administration; and I know an amendment will be offered dealing with land-grant colleges and vocational education by others. I would like to advise the committee what amendments will be offered that I know of, plus the other two I just mentioned.

Mr. BUSBEY. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island have any additional requests for time?

Mr. FOGARTY. My time has just about run out.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, many years ago, during debate in the Congress, one of our revered patriots, Daniel Webster, made this statement:

> Mr. President, when the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather, and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude, and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence, and, before we float farther on the waves of this debate, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are.

Mr. Chairman, we have been drifting and drifting and drifting for many years toward national bankruptcy in this country. We are approaching a national debt of $267 billion. We acknowledge that all of these programs that have been under discussion here today are worthwhile. I am sure every Member of the House wishes we could appropriate twice as much money. But we are confronted with a fact. We have to get back to a sound economy in this Nation or the United States will go down and when the United States goes down the entire world is going over to communism.

We better look twice before we start restoring these cuts, as much as we hate to cut any item in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill down to line 2, page 2.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HALLECK], having assumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for

the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGY AND BLINDNESS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the bill under consideration provides $4 million for the work of the Institute of Neurology and Blindness as against $1.9 million last year for the same Institute. I regret that it was not possible for the committee to report favorably the $7.6 million figure requested by the citizens, medical and lay, who came to Washington last month and testified in that regard.

About a week ago I presented to the Congress, for the record, a statement of the need for research in diseases that cause blindness and presented the facts relating to the six major diseases that cause so much suffering and anguish to the people who are afflicted with them. The Institute for which these $4 million are appropriated for fiscal year 1954 not only has the responsibility for research in diseases which cause blindness but also for the long list of major and minor diseases in the neurological field, including epilepsy, cerebral palsy, hemiplegia, Parkinson's disease, aphasia, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, meningitis and numerous others. It is easy to see from a mere listing of the number of diseases for which the Institute is responsible that $4 million divided among all of them will not go very far in any single one.

Unfortunately, in past years, the funds for the Institute of Neurology and Blindness were covered in with other funds of the Public Health Service and perhaps inadvertently were not given the attention that funds for the other institutes were given. This year for the first time the Institute of Neurology and Blindness is a line item in the budget and is being treated on the basis it deserves as a budget item. The funds being appropriated in this bill for the Institute will enable it to do more than it did last year. But when we consider that the concept of such an institute goes back to the days of Dr. Harvey Cushing, who more than 30 years ago recommended such a set-up, we can readily see that for many years nothing was done in a medical area which affects millions of our people. We must make up for the deficiencies of these intervening years. Starting with the additional progress represented in this bill for fiscal year 1954 we must give our most serious attention to the development of the program throughout the rest of 1953 and the first part of 1954 so that a year hence we can reevaluate the need and at that time provide more adequate funds in this field.

WHAT WE ARE DOING ABOUT BLINDNESS AND EYE DISEASES

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include some interesting facts and figures regarding blindness which I feel will more than justify any request made by the ophthalmologists of this country for Federal grants to study diseases of the eye and the causes for blindness.

I. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE SUFFERING FROM BLINDNESS AND EYE DISEASES IN THE UNITED STATES?

First. It is estimated that 600,000 people are severely visually handicapped. Of this number, the extent of our estimated blind population is 270,000, equivalent to the entire population of Miami, Fla. In addition, it is estimated that 1 million people are blind in one eye.

Second. About 22,000 persons in this country lose their sight annually.

Third. An estimated 70 million people have eye defects, and need glasses. An estimated 7,500,000 children in American schools require eye care, and a large number of these children should be wearing glasses.

Fourth. An estimated 800,000 persons have glaucoma without knowing it and may lose their sight if untreated.

II. WHAT WAS THE MILITARY MANPOWER LOSS IN WORLD WAR II FROM BLINDNESS AND EYE DISEASES?

First. Of the 4,828,000 men rejected before induction as of August 1, 1945, by the Army, 234,300, or nearly 5 percent, were rejected because of visual handicaps. This manpower loss would be sufficient to man 16 Army infantry divisions—World War II division strength, 14,477.

Second. Out of 245,358 registrants for military service examined between July 1950 and June 1951, 19,504 were rejected for eye defects, or a total of 8 percent.

III. WHAT IS BEING DONE TO DETECT BLINDNESS AND EYE DISEASES IN THE UNITED STATES?

First. According to the American Medical Association, there are only 126 non-Government hospitals and 33 Government hospitals—Army, Navy, Marine, and Veterans' Administration—with approved eye clinics. This is in contrast with the fact that there are 3,069 counties in the United States, and a large majority of counties should have some type of eye clinics.

Second. Less than $600,000 was available in 1952 for organized prevention services to enable people to keep their sight and thus reduce the number of unnecessarily blind.

IV. HOW MANY DOCTORS SPECIALIZE IN BLINDNESS AND EYE DISEASES?

First. There are only about 3,400 oculists certified for practice by the American Board of Ophthalmology as of February 1, 1953. In addition, it is estimated that there are about 4,000 doctors of medicine who treat the eyes and do some eye surgery.

V. HOW MUCH MONEY IS AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH IN BLINDNESS AND EYE DISEASES IN THE UNITED STATES?

First. Approximately $1,400,000 is being spent for research in blindness and eye diseases as follows:

(a) Government funds: Only about $345,193 is being spent in active grants as of February 1953 by the National Institute of Neurology and Blindness—United States Public Health Service—on ophthalmic research.

Second. Latest figures available—1952—list a total of $425,000 spent by other Government agencies. However, not all of this $425,000 was utilized for research dealing directly with the causes, treatment, and prevention of blindness.

(b) Non-Government funds: It is estimated that there is approximately only $750,000 being spent annually for medical research in blindness and eye diseases by voluntary agencies, medical schools, and eye institutes, and that approximately $16,000 of this amount was spent on statistical research. The American Foundation for the Blind spent $285,089 in 1951 for social research.

(c) In contrast, in 1950 we spent over $125 million in tax and private funds for the inadequate care and services to people already blind.

VI. HOW DOES THIS COMPARE WITH WHAT WE SPEND ON OTHER THINGS?

First. In contrast with the estimated maximum total of $1,400,000 which is available from public and private sources for research in blindness and eye diseases: (a) The people of the United States in 1951 spent approximately $27,530,000 for sunglasses and goggles; $23,500,000 for playing cards; $7 million for dog and pet medicaments; $4,040,000 for eye lotions and washes.

VII. HOW MUCH IS SPENT FROM PUBLIC FUNDS ALONE TO SUPPORT PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND?

First. For the fiscal year 1953, the total amount of Federal, State, and local expenditures for aid to the blind is estimated at $63,855,000, as compared with $61,740,000 for 1952 and $55,280,000 for 1951. (a) This means that the average monthly 1953 payment is estimated to be $53.75 for 99,000 monthly recipients, as compared with $49 for 105,000 recipients in 1952 and $47.20 for 97,600 recipients in 1951.

Second. This is in contrast with an estimated maximum total of $1,400,000 which is available from public and private sources for research in blindness and eye diseases.

VIII. WHAT APPROACHES ARE CURRENTLY AVAILABLE IN MEDICAL RESEARCH WHICH MIGHT BE EXPECTED TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO MAY BECOME BLIND?

First. Fundamental research: (a) These include application of recent advances made in biochemistry, physiology, heredity, nutrition, and infections including immunology and epidemiology, to determine the mechanism of the underlying disorder which is associated with diseases of the eye leading to blindness.

Second. Clinical research: (a) Direct study of the patient to determine the underlying causes of blinding diseases, the most common of which are cataract, glaucoma, uveitis, retinitis pigmentosa, and retrolental fibroplasia.

II. HAS MEDICAL RESEARCH IN EYE DISEASES PAID OFF AS YET?—YES

First. With the aid of ACTH and cortisone, we are now on the road to a successful treatment for about 25 percent of the blinding eye diseases, including practically all those which are inflammatory in nature, such as orbital cellulitis, acute and chronic allergic conditions, nonspecific conjunctivitis, interstitial keratitis, corneal ulcers, herpes zoster of the cornea, iritis, cyclitis, choroditis, optic neuritis, and retrobulbar neuritis.

Second. A new hormone, compound F, is being introduced and is proving more efficient than cortisone in the treatment of inflammatory eye diseases.

Third. There has been considerable emphasis in recent years on the production of new-type implants for use during and after removal of eyes, in order that the movement of the artificial eye will closely approximate the normal one.

Fourth. ACTH and cortisone offer a hope that a blinding eye disease known as retrolental fibroplasia—which occurs in a very high percentage of premature infants—may be prevented.

Fifth. However, a great deal of research and large sums of money are needed for both laboratory and clinical research on patients, especially those with cataracts, glaucoma, and optic atrophy, which 3 diseases alone represent 42 percent of all eye diseases.

X. WHAT ARE THE MAIN CAUSES OF BLINDNESS AND EYE DISEASES?

First. About 22 percent of blindness is caused by infectious diseases affecting all ages.

Second. Cataracts about 19 percent, mostly affecting people over 60 years of age.

Third. Optic atrophy about 16 percent.

Fourth. Glaucoma, 12 percent, striking people over 35.

Fifth. Injury about 10 percent.

Sixth. Uveitis, inflammation of the layers of the eye, 7 percent.

Seventh. General diseases, 6 percent.

Eighth. Other congenital or hereditary diseases, 6 percent.

Ninth. Myopia, malignant, about 3 percent, all ages.

Tenth. Retinal degeneration about 3 percent, all ages.

Eleventh. Structural anomalies about 3 percent, all ages.

Twelfth. Poisoning and neoplasms, 2 percent.

THE COMMUNISTIC THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time so that I may discuss with you the paramount problem that confronts us. Every other question—a balanced budget, lower taxation, social reforms, and so forth—hinge upon the ultimate outcome of our struggle with international communism.

Since World War II ended, we have spent billions of dollars in our attempt to contain communism. It is my belief that wise and prudent leadership could have saved the world this horrible nightmare. The miraculous emergence of Soviet Russia from a third-rate power to the status of a world menace is due only in part to the revolutionary zeal, the military discipline, and the fifth-column technique of the Kremlin. A major part of their success must be ascribed to the blindness of the non-Communist world in refusing to recognize the tactics and the ultimate objectives of the Soviet Union. It was our policy of appeasement and vacillation rather than Russia's astuteness and strength which enabled the Communist leaders to realize the dreams of Peter the Great. No country in history has made such rapid strides toward world conquest in such a short time and with such small cost in manpower and resources. Even the conquests of Genghis Khan are dwarfed in comparison with the acquisitions of the Soviets. Since World War II, Russia has absorbed 100 million square miles and 650 million human beings.

This unparalleled expansion has destroyed the balance of power and plunged the world into a prolonged period of peril. One man in the Kremlin can decide the fate of mankind. The initiative has long since passed from the non-Communist countries to the master of the Kremlin. He and he alone can decide the kind of world we must live in.

Because of the transcendent importance of communism and its impact upon every detail of our life, it may be appropriate to review at this time some of the important facts about communism and Russia that are not generally known. It is impossible to understand the present and prepare for the future unless we understand the past, because the past is prologue.

RUSSIA

To understand the success of communism there are certain facts about Russia which must be known and kept in mind. Throughout its long history the Russian people have never known the blessings of freedom. The Russian Tsars were absolute autocrats. They were undisputed masters of the lives and property of their subjects, like a Turkish Sultan or a Tartar Khan. There were, of course, in medieval Europe monarchs who possessed great power, but there were checks on the exercise of such power. The haughtiest monarch was sometimes brought to his knees in repentance by an independent church. The nobility was to some extent a check on the Crown, and in turn the nobility was restrained by the free cities. In Russia there was no system of check and balances. It is said that upon one occasion Ivan the Terrible wanted to demonstrate his power to a visiting merchant. He did so by ordering one of his courtiers to leap to death, and asked the merchant if the British sovereign possessed similar power. This absolutism was partly due to the influence of the Byzantine Empire upon Russia. In the 10th and 11th centuries Constantinople was the metropolis which the Russians knew best, and toward which they looked as a model. The Byzantine Emperor was an absolute ruler. The Tartar conquest of Russia in the 13th century strengthened the autocratic principle by conditioning the people to Asiatic despotism and by isolating Russia from European civilization. Geography and climate have had some influence upon the development of Russian character and institution. The vast area of Russia has few natural boundaries. There are no mountain fastnesses where rebels can take refuge, and no mountain barriers to the expansion of the Russian State. The Russian terrain facilitated the establishment of a single autocratic sovereignty. The severe climate and hard living conditions have developed a strong and tough people. As one author put it, "No one can suffer like a Russian, no one can die like a Russian."

Until the reign of Alexander II, the Russian serfs were attached to the soil in a state of semislavery. Under his reign they were emancipated under a program which was designed to invest them with land after a period of preparation, during which the lands taken from the aristocracy were held in trust by the villages. Despite the fact that there are long periods in Russian history when the people accepted tyranny quietly, it would be a mistake to conclude that the people were altogether docile and passive. There were several formidable mass peasant rebellions prior to the 19th century, but no conscious intelligent revolutionary leadership. In the 19th century, however, there was an intellectual awakening, with many individuals and small groups dedicated to the idea of overthrowing the autocracy. These groups were more or less isolated from the masses of the people and had no contact with them.

Another important influence upon Russian national character and institutions was the numerous wars which ravaged the country. Russia was a bulwark of Europe against Asia and received the hardest blows inflicted by nomadic invaders from the East. In the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries there are records of constant fighting with wandering peoples of the steppe. In the 13th century Russia was overwhelmed by the flood of Tartar conquests. For centuries Russian history was an almost continuous series of wars with oriental peoples and western neighbors. These wars produced the wretched poverty of the Russian people. As one Russian author puts it, "The state swelled, and the people grew thin." The crushing weight of taxation is illustrated by the large numbers of Russian people who preferred to become serfs in order to escape tax burdens.

Russia was invaded by the Poles, and Polish Czars sat in the Kremlin for brief periods. In 1812 Russia was invaded by Napoleon, and later by the Germans. From 1240, when the Tartar horsemen of Baty slaughtered the people of Kiev, until 1941 and 1942, when the Germans wrought the same scenes of carnage and

destruction with modern weapons, Russia has always lived under the overhanging threat of war. These wars were an important cause that made the Russian czar the most complete autocrat in Europe. They were responsible for the organization of the country on the basis of an armed camp, and they riveted the serf to the soil. In the early middle ages the Russian peasants had some freedom. They could move from one landlord's estate to another's. Because of military exigencies, the gentry were required to fight in the Czar's army, and the peasants were obliged to feed the gentry. The institutions of political autocracy and the status of serfdom for the peasant majority of the population were largely the outgrowth of Russia's hard national destiny, a destiny made up of foreign wars, invasions, and internal upheavals. The three great movements which became part of the common heritage of Western Europe and America, the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the French Revolution, were scarcely felt by Russia.

Another important fact about Russian history which must be remembered is that Russia has been an aggressive country. One hundred and ninety-six racial strains have been detected in Russia. During the 18th century Russia steadily extended her frontiers because of the weakness of her neighbors, the Poles in the west, the Tartars and Turks in the south and southwest. Under the reign of Catherine II, Russia reached its southern frontier, the Black Sea, and swallowed up the greater part of Poland. During the 19th century the Russian Empire was rounded out with new conquests in the Caucasus and central Asia. The Soviet Union is a babel tower of languages and nationalities. The three main racial strains are the Slav, Turko-Tartar, and Finnish. The great Russians are the strongest single racial group numerically and culturally, and they have gradually brought the others within the frontiers of the Russian state.

Because Russia has been a land power, it has been her historic policy to acquire a maritime outlet. She has waged exhausting wars to break out of this encirclement. At a terrific price Russia conquered the shores of the Baltic and Black Seas, but only gained access to two closed bodies of water. Because she was landlocked, Russia suffered strategic disadvantages. In time of war she could not receive supplies through shorter and more convenient routes.

The worst invasions which Russia has suffered have come from the West, and it has been her traditional desire to erect some buffer or artificial barrier between her and her western neighbors. We speak of the Iron Curtain as if it is the sole product of communism. As a matter of fact, the landlocked character of the Russian realm has isolated Russia since the beginning of her history and restricted the exchange of ideas that accompany or follow the exchange of goods with foreign countries.

THE RISE OF MODERN COMMUNISM

I have given you these facts to serve as a historical background, without which the history of communism in Russia cannot be understood. As is generally known, modern communism and socialism began with the manifesto of Karl Marx and Frederick Engel promulgated in 1848. The basic thought underlying the manifesto is that "the history of all human society, past and present, has been the history of class struggles," and that the workers of the world "cannot free themselves from the dominion of the exploiting and ruling class until they rid society of such class, which can only be achieved by the forcible overthrow of the extant social order."

The First International Association of Workers, based partially on the manifesto, was established on June 28, 1864, at St. James's Hall, London, largely through the efforts of Karl Marx. After 9 years, Marx withdrew his support because the anarchists had become too powerful.

The Second International was formed in Paris in 1889, 6 years after Marx' death, but it was based more firmly on his doctrines than the First International and became the fountainhead of international socialism.

The Second International was repudiated by the extreme radical element under Nikolai Lenin, because the Socialists put patriotism before their party doctrines during World War I.

The Third Communist International was organized by Lenin in Moscow in March 1919 to carry out the revolutionary purposes of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union.

The Communist Party had no part in the overthrow of the Tsar's government in March 1917. When Tsar Nicholas II abdicated, he did so to the representatives of the Duma. At that time Lenin was in exile in Switzerland and Trotsky was living in the Bronx, New York. Most of the other leading Communists were in exile from Russia or in the prison camps in Siberia. The United States was the first nation to recognize the provisional government of Russia, which was organized on the same democratic principles as our own. The provisional government established political and civil liberties, and Lenin himself admitted, after his return, that Russia was the freest of the belligerent countries. But the provisional government was unable to solve the problems of the war, the land question, and the chaos which prevailed in Russia. The provisional government did not have a practical and strong leader in its midst. It was composed chiefly of educated liberals and radicals who were unable to cope with the difficult role of ruling a country that was in a ferment of long-suppressed social upheaval.

Lenin, on the other hand, was an able practical revolutionary. He had under his control the Bolsheviks who were the extreme radicals. According to some authorities, they did not number more than 30,000, but others placed the figure at 300,000. On November 7, 1917, the Bolsheviks under Lenin struck. Everything had been previously planned in conspiratorial sessions of the Bolshevik Central Committee. Trotsky, as President of the Petrograd Soviet, had won over not only the majority of the workers, but also the soldiers of the garrison. Sailors from Kronstadt took an active part in the revolt. The Bolsheviks encountered very little opposition, and not more than a half-dozen persons were killed in the firing during the capture of the headquarters of the ministers of the provisional government. An all Russia Soviet congress, and a Bolshevik majority met on the same day, endorsed the revolution, and passed decrees nationalizing the land and setting up a system of workers control in industry. The vast empire of Russia fell into the hands of a small group of conspirators, experienced in the technique of revolution but wholly lacking experience in other fields. The policy-shaping leaders of the Bolshevik Party came from middleclass families. One of them had been an engineer and businessman. Another was an aristocrat.

The ease with which the Bolsheviks seized the reins of power was due to the weakness of the middle class, the terrible poverty of the great masses of the people, the great inequalities of wealth and the disunity among the few democratic and liberal leaders in Russia.

One month after the establishment of the provisional government, the German General Staff sent Nikolai Lenin and a score of his radical followers in a sealed car from Switzerland through Germany, back into Russia. They were sent to Russia for the purpose of undermining the morale of the Russian Army. It was the beginning of the fifth-column technique.

In July 1917 the Communists were unsuccessful in an uprising at St. Petersburg, and its leader, Lenin, fled to Finland. Twenty-three of the Communist leaders were captured and imprisoned, but in the first act of appeasement of communism they were freed by the provisional government. Prompt action on the part of the provisional government would have nipped the conspiracy in the bud.

HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

As I have previously said, the Third Communist International was created in Moscow in March 1919. It and its successors have completely dominated the Communist Parties throughout the world. Soon after its creation a call was issued for the organization of the Communist Parties throughout the world and their adhesion to the Communist International. A convention of extreme American radicals was called in Chicago in September 1919, made up of leftwing members of the old Socialist Party and other radicals. It was composed mostly of foreign-born workers and had but little contact or influence with the great masses of the workers in American industries. Its principal function then was that of a propaganda organization for the Communist International in support of a Communist society to be achieved by means of a proletarian revolution and dictatorship. Almost as soon as the American Communist Party was organized, it was driven under cover on account of illegality. The Government, by the use of its provisions of the wartime legislation, drove the Communist Party underground, where it remained in an illegal status until 1924, when the repeal of the war measures and the consequent halting of Government activities by the agents of the Department of Justice per-

mitted it to reappear. In the early days of the Communist Party its leadership frankly admitted that it was antireligious and intended to overthrow our Government by force and violence.

In 1932 there were approximately 20,000 members of the Communist Party, of which 70 percent were aliens. The House of Representatives on June 6, 1932, passed my bill to exclude and deport Communist aliens, which would have nipped this conspiracy in the bud. However, the bill was stymied in the Senate by the opposition and manipulations of the liberal bloc. From 1932 to 1938 the Communist Party in the United States grew from 20,000 to 165,000. In the early part of 1938 I introduced a resolution to investigate un-American activities propaganda, which passed the House and was renewed from year to year as a special committee until I quit Congress at the beginning of 1945. In 1938 we discovered that there were 165,000 card-holding members of the Communist Party and 5,000 branches in 42 States of the Union. The party and its subsidiary organizations received annually in dues and contributions, which ranged from $10 to $3,000, more than $10,000,000. Some of the contributors were rich.

In addition to the Communist Party and its subsidiary organizations, there were several hundred frontal organizations. The key positions in these organizations were held by Communists who shaped the policy and propaganda of the organizations in accordance with the Communist Party line. These frontal organizations had a total membership of about 10 million, composed partly of fellow-travelers and partly of gullible and unthinking Americans. Earl Browder estimated that there were 2 million non-card-holding fellow-travelers who went with the Party the full way. Despite the fact that the Communist control of these organizations was fully exposed by our committee in hearings, reports and speeches made by me, which were extensively publicized in the press and radio, a sizable percentage of the members of these organizations refused to resign from them or disavow them until some years later. As an illustration, the Washington branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which was composed chiefly of Government officials and employees, defied the committee and heaped abuse and insult upon it. These frontal organizations are now listed by the Attorney General, although by 1945 most of them had gone out of existence as a result of pitiless exposure. So far as I know, they are no longer in operation.

In 1938 we named 10 large industrial unions controlled by Communists and 10 others which had entrenched Communist leadership. Despite the repeated exposure of these facts from 1938 to 1945, the unions refused to clean house, and it was not until several years ago that the CIO expelled most of these unions and undertook to rid itself of the Communist elements. Of course, these Communist unions still exist in some of the important and basic industries of our land. In 1938 we named several thousand Communists on the Federal payroll and repeatedly urged the administration to expel them. Nothing was done until 1943, when 650 Federal employees and officials resigned during the loyalty program. Beginning in 1947, the FBI processed 4,644,426 loyalty forms. There were some indications of disloyalty in 25,748 cases, which necessitated full field investigation. Four hundred and forty-four were removed or their employment terminated, and 5,187 resigned before their cases could be disposed of. It is now a matter of history that Communists inside our Government delivered to agents of the Soviet Union some of the most important military and diplomatic secrets of our Government. Mr. Hoover recently estimated that there are approximately 24,783 Communists in the United States.

During the life of our committee, we investigated and exposed approximately 100 Nazi and Fascist organizations, with a total membership in excess of 100,000. Some of their leaders were sent to the penitentiary and others were deported. Within 2 years after the beginning of our investigation, we had largely destroyed by exposure these Nazi and Fascist organizations. Our success was due to public sentiment and the active cooperation of the Government insofar as Fascist and Nazi organizations and groups were concerned. With respect to Communist organizations, the situation was entirely different. The administration was hostile to the committee from the beginning and not only did not cooperate with it, but threw every obstacle in its path. Communists inside and outside the Government were coddled and protected. Furthermore, many liberal organizations joined with the Communists in a campaign of abuse and misrepresentation against the committee. The reports of the special committee from 1938 to 1945 and the numerous speeches which I made to Congress, and which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, disclose in detail the record of the Roosevelt administration in opposing the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

Several years ago Congressman VELDE inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which I made in Galveston, Tex., detailing the various acts and pronouncements of the Roosevelt administration opposing the investigation of Communists by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. Anyone interested in pursuing the matter further can refer to that speech for detailed information. Generally speaking, the administration denied to the committee repeated requests for cooperation in ferreting out and exposing Communists. It refused to enforce existing laws to deport or exclude Communist aliens. It refused to prosecute Communists for recruiting in behalf of Loyalist Spain, even though the law penalized such recruiting. It refused to require Communists to register as agents of a foreign principal under the law of registration. It refused to punish Communists for perjury. It refused to expel Communists from Government service, and it continued to hire them. Spokesmen for the administration attacked members of the Committee in the press and over the radio and set the example for friendly radio commentators and newspaper columnists to heap abuse and misrepresentation upon the committee. It ignored and refused to follow the findings and recommendations of the committee. It turned a deaf ear to the repeated warnings of the committee, that the ultimate objective of Communist Russia was world conquest. It ignored the warning which I gave in the House of Representatives in 1943, that it would be an unmitigated tragedy if Russia extended her territory as a result of the war. The plain truth is that the Government was pro-Russian to such an extent that its leadership was blind to reality and deaf to the truth.

TEHERAN, YALTA, AND POTSDAM

This was the attitude of the American representatives when they sat at the council tables with the representatives of the Soviet Union to decide the fate of future generations. Is it any wonder, therefore, that tragic errors were committed which nullified to a large extent the fruits of our victory in World War II? If our representatives had not been hypnotized by Communist propaganda, could they have sacrificed the declared objectives of the war by shameful concessions to Russia, such as the agreement for forced repatriation which condemned tens of thousands of refugees to death or slavery, and gave the Communists as their slaves the thousands of German prisoners? Under the hypnotic spell of Communist propaganda and influence, our American representatives recognized the right of Russia to seize and occupy the Baltic countries. The argument that we merely recognized a condition which had already been accomplished by force of arms does not absolve us from the terrible guilt of investing that seizure with the color of legality.

Ingenious apologists have exhausted the art of sophistry in their attempt to excuse or justify our concessions to Russia. The truth is that a terrible blunder was committed, which enabled Russia to emerge from the war with the most valuable spoils which any victor ever acquired. The truth is that we sacrificed to a large extent the fruits of our victory, and lost our golden opportunity to establish international order throughout the world. We were the most powerful nation on the face of the earth. Our armies were unbeatable. Our military might had reached the pinnacle of effectiveness and striking force. We could have solved then and there the international issues which now threaten us with another and more disastrous world war. But a decade of Communist propaganda and diplomacy had blinded our leaders and cast a hypnotic spell upon them. At this decisive moment in the history of humankind we yielded to expediency and halted on the very threshold of final victory and lasting peace.

WHAT NOW?

And now, Mr. Speaker, what are we to do to retrieve the lost ground and repair the terrible blunder? Some people advocate a return to isolationism. I confess it is a comforting idea. But it

is a delusion. If isolation comes, it will be involuntary, not voluntary. It may come through necessity if Russia conquers Europe and Asia. It will not come voluntarily, because we have made solemn commitments to aid in the defense of the non-Communist countries against Soviet aggression. If Russia conquers Europe and Asia, America will find herself cut off from raw materials, resources, and trade which are indispensable to our high standard of living. I do not say that we cannot survive, if our people are willing to pay the price and sacrifice and submit to a lowered standard of living. I do say that it would be a serious setback to our country.

Some people say that we ought to bomb Russia and get it over with. How little do these people understand the tremendous strength of Russia. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we became realistic about Russia. Russia is two and one-half times larger than the United States. It exceeds us in manpower and perhaps in resources. It can now draw upon the enormous reserve of 650 millions of ideological slaves outside of Russia. The resources of Russia are enormous. It is estimated that 55 percent of the oil reserve of the world is in Russia. It contains 28 percent of the world's power capacity, 21 percent of the iron, one-third of the forest reserves. It is second to Canada in its supply of nickel and possesses large stores of manganese, asbestos, zinc, lead, copper, and bauxite. It is the second largest gold producer in the world. It has some of the richest wheat lands in the world, and fine cattle ranges. Its people are tough and accustomed to hardship. They have a deep attachment to the fatherland, as Hitler found out when he invaded Russia.

If we waged war against Russia, there is no way such war could be brought to termination unless we invaded and possessed Russia. This would be an exhausting task. It would make it necessary for us to build up the greatest military machine the world has ever seen. The drain upon our manpower and resources would be incalculable. The flower of the French Army, under one of the greatest military geniuses of all time, Napoleon Bonaparte, found it impossible to conquer Russia. Hitler and his mighty military machine experienced the same failure. Of course, our country is much stronger than was France or Germany, and I believe that we could defeat Russia, if we were willing to pay the price, but that price might mean the loss of our own liberty. The idea that we can bring Russia to her knees by bombing her cities is not sound. Despite her recent industrial growth, the majority of the people do not live in great cities. They are scattered throughout the countryside and in small villages that dot her vast plains. Russia is far less vulnerable to attack and bombing raids than the United States. A long time ago Stalin foresaw the eventuality of another war. He moved his industries behind the Ural Mountains and built great factories under ground. While Russia does not have any natural fastnesses, her greatest ally is space. When Hitler penetrated France 200 miles, France collapsed; but when he invaded Russia a thousand miles, he was still a long way from his objective.

Russia has ceased to be a Communist country. Long ago she repudiated the precepts of Marxism. Even Lenin found after a few years that the theory of Marxism cannot be applied to practice. That theory, simply stated, was: "From every man according to his ability; to every man according to his needs." It sounded good, but it would not work, and Lenin was compelled to introduce such devices of capitalism as differentials of wages and standards of living. He licensed private traders, which was certainly a violation of Marx' teaching. Just as the French repudiated the revolution when Robespierre was beheaded and the Directory was established, and followed by the dictatorship of Napoleon, so did Stalin scrap the revolution and its ideals. Today Russia is a state corporation, and the people of Russia are the employees of that corporation. The corporation is under the complete control of the dictator. The slogans of communism are still employed to inspire the youth of Russia and to gain ideological adherents abroad. It is convenient for propaganda purposes, but communism as taught by Marx and Lenin is dead. The Communist Party of Russia, composed of not more than 5 million members, is a military organization, and it rules Russia with military discipline. The dictator is the commanding general. The members of the political bureau and the presidium are the general staff. The lower echelon are the officers. The whole nation is organized on a military basis. The major part of the production is devoted to military armaments and preparations. Russia, therefore, has the advantage of a militarized and disciplined populace and economy.

From what I have said it may be inferred that I am presenting a defeatist viewpoint. It is not my intention. I have tried to paint a realistic picture, but I am not pessimistic. I have an abiding faith in the destiny of the human race. Just as Hitler, and before him Napoleon, went down in defeat, so will the master of the Kremlin be destroyed if he attempts the conquest of the world. It is one thing to occupy other countries; it is quite another thing to conquer them. Despite some progress in recent years Russia is still a backward country. She can overrun countries because of her large armies, but she does not have the efficient organization and the know-how to consolidate her conquests. She has a long way to go to develop an economic system that can support world conquest. I am quite sure that Stalin was conscious of the limitations of Russia. I am hopeful that his long tutelage of Malenkov will impress the new master of the Kremlin with a sense of these same limitations. I was told a few years ago by a former Soviet official who knew Malenkov and grew up with him that the present dictator is an egotist, impressed with the idea that he is a second Genghis Khan. Long before Malenkov was widely known or had obtained any position of great importance in the bureaucracy of Russia this Soviet official predicted that he would someday become the dictator of Russia. The question of war or peace depends upon this man's nature and mentality and the degree of restraining influence that can be exerted upon him by his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, from what I have said it follows naturally that our proper course is to make America strong economically, spiritually, and militarily, and to do all that we can, subject to our own limitations and our self-respect, to strengthen the ties of friendship and common interest with the non-Communist world. This does not mean that we can or ought to try to buy their friendship. I think we have wasted a lot of money trying to do this. We ought to be frank and honest with our allies. We should tell them, diplomatically but frankly, that America is limited in what we can do in the common defense. We should point out to them that our taxes have reached the point of diminishing returns and that we are operating in the red. We should emphasize that we are struggling under a crushing national debt and that the interest charge on that debt is more than was required to run our Government a few years ago. We should strive to avoid accusations and violent criticism, which only serve to drive a wedge between us and our natural friends and to encourage the Kremlin to further aggression.

It must be obvious to everyone that America cannot do this job by herself. The non-Communist world cannot be saved from Soviet aggression unless it is willing to make a supreme sacrifice. We can help and ought to help to the extent of our capacity and so long as we do not jeopardize our own solvency and economic strength. But freedom is everybody's business.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a living man who knows whether the Soviet Union will continue the cold war or suddenly plunge the world into a fighting war. If the Communist leaders follow the dogma of Marx and the pattern laid down by Lenin and Stalin, they will continue the cold war indefinitely to bring about internal chaos in the non-Communist countries in preparation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They will continue to agitate through fifth columns in every other country. They will keep the world in a state of fear and uncertainty so as to require other nations to exhaust their economy in maintaining huge armies. In 1924, Lenin said in an interview which appeared in the World-Telegram in New York:

> Someday the Soviet Union will compel the United States to spend itself to destruction.

There is nothing that aids the Soviet's program more effectively than deficit spending, crushing debts, and stifling taxation. Consequently, we cannot meet the Soviet threat unless we put our house in order and restore sound fiscal policies to our Government. At the same time we cannot neglect our military defenses. We cannot foretell the hour or day when Malenkov may unloose the dogs of war upon us. We must, therefore, build and maintain an adequate nucleus which we can rapidly expand if war should come. In the meantime, we must explore every possible avenue of peace.

It is my opinion that our Government is right in wanting Russia to furnish some evidence of good intentions. At the same time we are compelled to consider the views of our allies. If they insist upon a conference to explore the possibilities of peace, we will be required to accede to their wishes, even though we are not sanguine of the outcome. Above everything else, Mr. Speaker, we must avoid any further attempts to appease the Soviet Union, and we must keep foremost in our minds the truth that you cannot compromise principle. The leaders of Russia understand only the language of strength and power. So long as we vacillate and waver we will find them arrogant and bold. They are masters in the art of bluff.

I would not be honest, Mr. Speaker, if I did not confess that it is my opinion that someday, somewhere, the free world will be forced to a showdown with international communism. The showdown may be deferred by firm and united action on the part of the non-Communist world, but history has taught that absolute autocrats who hold in subjection masses of people and maintain expensive and restless armies are propelled forward toward war. The very core of Communist ideology is world conquest. Around this central theme they have constructed their institutions. The idea has been planted in the minds of millions of their youth. To separate world conquest from the Communist philosophy would be like separating the divinity of Jesus Christ from the Christian religion. A whole generation of people have been systematically instructed in the atheistic and material philosophy of communism. Day by day the idea of conquest and hatred of God and other peoples have been drilled into their minds and hearts. Recently there appeared in one of the principal publications of Russia these ominous words:

> We hate Christianity and we hate Christians, because we regard Christianity as the chief obstacle to the world conquest of communism.

They have been taught that the end justifies the means and that it is permissible and proper for them to commit any crime in the furtherance of the Communist program. The effect of such teachings and indoctrinations must be far-reaching and destructive. The seeds of war have been sown and nurtured so carefully and painstakingly and over such a long period of time in Russia that realism and commonsense exclude the probability of permanent and lasting peace in our generation. As alert and reasonable men we must govern our decisions and our actions as if the Communists mean what they have said; we must prepare for the worst.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. REED of New York in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLARDY in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN and to include an article appearing in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) in two instances.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BUCHANAN and to include an editorial.

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. STEED and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. FISHER (at the request of Mr. WINSTEAD) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BUSBEY to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include two newspaper items.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. D'EWART (at the request of Mr. BUSBEY).

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. BUSBEY) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. ADAIR) and to include a speech by General Doolittle.

Mr. ADAIR and to include an editorial.

Mr. BUDGE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include a letter.

Mr. LOVRE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OAKMAN in two instances; to include in one an address by the Attorney General of the United States, and in the other a statement by Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. LESINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for 1 week, on account of official business in connection with flood disaster in the Seventh District, Louisiana.

Mr. UTT, for period May 23, 1953, to May 25, inclusive, on account of attending atom-bomb explosion in Nevada.

Mr. HOSMER, for the period May 23 to May 25, inclusive, and from day to day thereafter, if Nevada atomic tests scheduled May 25 are delayed, on account of official business, to view said tests.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 22, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

711. A letter from the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the advancement of certain lieutenants on the retired list of the Navy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

712. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills and resolutions passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

713. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting views and recommendations of the State of California to supplement a report transmitted on January 2, 1953, in connection with a report and findings on the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California (H. Doc. No. 147); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4505. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma; with amendment (Rept. No. 446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4823. A bill to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas; with amendment (Rept. No. 447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4677. A bill to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States, Territories, and possessions receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 5328. A bill to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5329. A bill to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street

railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., and to investigate area problems of the Greater Washington metropolitan area; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5330. A bill to establish the United States Arts Foundation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 5331. A bill to require Members of Congress to file annual financial statements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5332. A bill relating to funds established for the benefit of Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 5333. A bill to provide credit for purposes of promotion to longevity grades of certain service performed as temporary substitutes by employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 5334. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act, so as to repeal the $75 limitation upon the amount of outside income which may be received in any month by a person receiving benefits under title II of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKER (by request):

H. R. 5335. A bill to provide for the national defense and for conservation and public development and beneficial public use of the undeveloped water power of Niagara Falls and the Niagara River in the State of New York, in accordance with the provisions of the Niagara Redevelopment Treaty between the United States and Canada, ratified by the Senate of the United States on August 9, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 5336. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for flood control on the Big Sioux River at Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 5337. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. J. Res. 262. Joint resolution requesting the President to terminate an executive agreement between the United States and Canada relating to diversion of water into the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Res. 243. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 91; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give California control of its own budget in administering the Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the investigation of alleged criminal activities existing on the waterfront throughout the county of Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States restoring to the Territory of Hawaii the possession, use, and control of certain land in the city of Honolulu; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation enabling the Hawaiian Homes Commission to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for other public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, to provide irrigated pastoral areas on homes commission lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5338. A bill for the relief of Heinrich (Henry), Sali, and Gitta Aviva Schor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5339. A bill for the relief of Joseph, Brocha, and Jehoushija Genger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5340. A bill for the relief of Tibor, Szuzsa (Susanne), and Judith Sauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 5341. A bill for the relief of Chi-Hsun Pan and wife Kay Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (by request):

H. R. 5342. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5343. A bill for the relief of Charles Antoine Marie Lefeber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 5344. A bill for the relief of Bob Kan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fourere Kan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 5346. A bill for the relief of Harue Sugahara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 5347. A bill for the relief of Julianna Mamczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL (by request):

H. R. 5348. A bill for the relief of Nunzio Lo Buono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 5349. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to W. C. Palmeyer and E. M. Cole; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 5350. A bill for the relief of Miriam Sperling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 5351. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the North Charleston Lands Corp.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5352. A bill for the relief of Waltraud Hlawna and Georg Frans Kielhauser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 5353. A bill for the relief of the incorporated village of Westhampton Beach, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 5354. A bill for the relief of Liborio Guido Rutilio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 5355. A bill for the relief of Eva Gyori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

279. By the SPEAKER: Petition of T. S. Kinney and others, of Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

280. Also, petition of Frank Severa, Trenton, N. J., relative to stating a grievance that he is being unlawfully detained in the State prison at Trenton, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all majesty and mercy, by Thy grace we have awakened to the light of a new day, conscious of our high calling and responsibilities as colleagues and coworkers with one another in building a nobler civilization.

May we never become discouraged and disheartened by the magnitude of this task or allow our sense of its difficulties to exceed our sense of Thy divine power.

We pray that the spiritual ideals and principles may be given the place of paramount importance and become dynamic in the social order which we are seeking to establish.

May the minds and hearts of men be cleansed of all those attitudes and ambitions which cause discord and dissension and division among the nations of the earth.

Show us how we may help mankind cast out the selfish and supercilious spirit which engenders hatred and strife and may it be supplanted by the magnanimous spirit of love which makes for tolerance and sympathy, for fellowship and cooperation, for peace and good will.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Tibor Kálmán Jalsoviczky;

H. R. 782. An act for the relief of Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen;

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani;

H. R. 1243. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16);

H. R. 1563. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch;

H. R. 2364. An act to terminate restrictions against alienation on land owned by William Lynn Engles and Maureen Edna Engles;

H. R. 2420. An act for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk;

H. R. 2667. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom;

H. R. 2990. An act to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States;

H. R. 3042. An act for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco;

H. R. 3389. An act for the relief of Pio Valensin;

H. R. 3406. An act to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; and

H. R. 4605. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1242. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies;

H. R. 1244. An act to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and other purposes";

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl;

H. R. 1561. An act authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration (in Johnson City, Tenn.) to the State of Tennessee; and

H. R. 2366. An act for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 28. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

S. 64. An act for the relief of Teodoro Egues Munagorri;

S. 67. An act for the relief of Anastasia John Tsamisis;

S. 143. An act for the relief of Hanni Marie Matuschke;

S. 261. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River flood control compact;

S. 297. An act for the relief of Dr. Arthur Tye;

S. 313. An act for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama;

S. 315. An act for the relief of Owen Lowrey;

S. 334. An act for the relief of Gregory Leon Baranowski;

S. 340. An act for the relief of May Ling Ng;

S. 351. An act for the relief of Catherine Nina Cole;

S. 360. An act to incorporate National Service Star Legion;

S. 458. An act for the relief of Angelo Curletti Podesta;

S. 604. An act for the relief of Maria Neglia and Angelo Neglia;

S. 677. An act to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes;

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken;

S. 731. An act to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes;

S. 815. An act for the relief of Steven M. Pivnicki;

S. 816. An act for the relief of Bruno Lanier;

S. 833. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective valuation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States;

S. 971. An act to authorize films, and related material, for educational use to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books;

S. 1176. An act for the relief of Peter Hoskins;

S. 1262. An act for the relief of Stefanos A. Spilios, also known as Stephen A. Harrison;

S. 1324. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees;

S. 1387. An act for the relief of Beth Barbara (Fujiko Maezawa);

S. 1416. An act for the relief of Vito Rizzi;

S. 1516. An act for the relief of Akemi Terada;

S. 1531. An act for the relief of Richard Robert Kabisch;

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Mieko Kristine;

S. 1640. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment of bonds in connection with certain Air Force, Coast Guard, and Atomic Energy Commission contracts;

S. 1644. An act to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended, and the act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1111), to remove the limitation upon the rank of Director of Music, the leader of the Military Academy Band, and to remove the limitation upon the pay of the leader of the United States Naval Academy Band, and to authorize the appointment of Lt. Comdr. Charles Brendler, United States Navy, to the permanent grade of commander in the Navy;

S. 1679. An act to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States, Territories, and possessions receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture; and

S. 1870. An act to extend the time for filing a report by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel established by the act of July 16, 1952.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to report the bill on the Army civil functions appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5246, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee arose on yesterday, the Clerk had read the first paragraph. If there are no amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); teletype news service; any payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; $1,250,000.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make inquiry of the chairman of the committee about the moneys which were stricken from the bill concerning those funds which had been used yearly since 1935 for the purposes of instruction in the land-grant colleges of the United States.

Mr. BUSBEY. Several of the Members have discussed that subject with me and the subcommittee has under serious consideration at the present time a committee amendment to restore the amount which was deleted from the bill.

Mr. HOLMES. I am very happy to get that word from the chairman, and hope you will pardon me for bringing it up at this time because later on in the day I am going to be forced to be off the floor for a while and I was afraid the matter would be overlooked, but you are saying in so many words it is acceptable to the committee to reinstate those funds for the land-grant colleges?

Mr. BUSBEY. I have not yet taken it up with all of the committee members, but I will do so before we reach that point in the bill.

Mr. HOLMES. I thank the gentleman very much.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging apprentice training, as authorized by the act of August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), $2,700,000.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: Page 3, line 22, strike out "$2,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,400,000."

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to restore funds to the Bureau of Apprenticeship, because I feel it is necessary to maintain this agency at full strength.

My position is based on my own personal experience in the apprenticeship field, having served an apprenticeship in the sheet metal industry. I think all members of the committee will agree with me that in this House we practice the principle of apprenticeship. Last term I served my apprenticeship. We have a number of new Members serving their apprenticeship here now. We operate on the basis that after you are supposed to have learned what you are doing you are given a little authority. That is the basis of the apprenticeship program in the building industry and in the skills. Personally, I cannot see why anyone should be against this amendment, since everyone concerned seems to be for it. The President spoke for it and said he felt the apprenticeship program and the training of our skilled labor should be increased. The Secretary of Labor has stated in his recent speech:

That valuable as the work of many of the bureaus in the Department has been, not one of them exceeds the day-to-day help which is provided by the Bureau of Apprentice Training of the Department of Labor.

We find the President for it; we find the Secretary of Labor for it; we find management for it; we find all of the organized labor groups for it, as well as the individual workmen. We find the organized veterans groups for it, because at the present time there are approximately 90,000 veterans in this program.

We heard quite a fighting speech the other day given by the gentleman from North Dakota regarding the appropriations. In fact, he made the statement that there were a lot of city slickers who did not know the difference between a combine and an airplane. I would like to say to the committee this morning there are some of us from the city who do know the difference. There are many people from the country who do not know the difference between a short nipple and a long elbow. And those are plumbing terms and not physical terms. The only way you get skilled, trained workmen is to start at the bottom and work up.

You have much construction work going on in the country today, construction work as well as private homes. I have just completed an investigation, with the help of many able Members of Congress, with respect to veterans' housing. We found that at least 75 percent of the construction complaints were traceable to the fact that we do not have skilled workmen. You have men placed on the job, but they are really not mechanics.

In view of the fact that everyone seems to be for this, and the confidence I personally have in the Secretary of Labor, I see no reason why this amendment should not be agreed to.

This morning a pamphlet, The "Know-How" Cabinet, put out by the women's division of the Republican National Committee, was received by all the Members. These women do a terrific job. They have wonderful judgment, and here is what they say:

Secretary Durkin is a labor administrator of proven ability. He is both calm and judicious—qualities which will serve him in good stead during the months ahead. A man of great inner resource, he draws his basic strength from his church, which he serves as a daily communicant and as vice president of the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I wonder if the gentleman could explain to us about this increased allowance for apprenticeship training. Who pays for the apprenticeship training? The Federal Government, or industry, or the labor unions?

Mr. AYRES. It is a combined payment by management and labor and those participating in the program. The apprenticeship training program is in the Department of Labor. They have been doing a particularly good job in your city of Dayton.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training actually perform the training function?

Mr. AYRES. No.

Mr. WHEELER. What function do they perform?

Mr. AYRES. It is in an advisory and help capacity, to encourage it.

Mr. WHEELER. Is it true that their major function is simply one of recruitment?

Mr. AYRES. No; I would not say that was their major function.

Mr. WHEELER. It is my understanding that their major function is one of recruitment; then they must turn these people whom they have recruited over to some other agency for actual training.

Mr. AYRES. No; that is not the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not true that as far as these funds are concerned under this program it is the responsibility, as the gentleman from Georgia has indicated, to encourage apprenticeship training in various industries throughout the country and that this money is used primarily for administrative purposes in the development of that program?

Mr. AYRES. That is basically right. The main thing they do which is so important is to determine which skills are needed and concentrate their efforts in those fields.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think that his amendment goes a bit too far when it restores the whole amount? Are there not some phases of the program where administrators or field representatives can be cut without seriously injuring the program?

Mr. AYRES. Based on the 17 pages of testimony—and that is all that was heard on this point—I found nothing in those 17 pages that would justify the cut.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact, if the gentleman will yield——

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the amount that was recommended last year in the regular appropriation for 1953 was just the same as this bill now carries? And that the other amount is an addition that was put on in connection with the activities of the National Production Authority which has gone out of business? Are not just going along with the department absorbing the tag ends of the National Production Authority?

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to concur in what the gentleman from Ohio said with respect to the value of this program. Because this is a worthwhile program, the committee did not cut this appropriation below the 1953 level, excepting those funds previously provided under the Defense Production Act.

Concerning the statement of the gentleman that industry and labor and everybody else want this program and are cooperating with it, I read from the hearings on page 103:

Mr. BUSBEY. Has there been any trouble in getting both labor and management to cooperate in this program? Have you had any opposition from either side?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, there are some that give trouble, and it is a very real problem to get management and labor to do something about this. When we originally started 18 years ago, there was some difficulty in convincing the American Federation of Labor that it was to their advantage to work in this program. That opposition has largely faded away to the point where they are now aggressively promoting it.

By the same token, it was difficult to convince organizations like the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, and State and national trade associations, to get back of this.

I think the committee has been very fair and generous on this program. We all believe in it and want it to succeed.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], goes clear beyond the revised budget figure which was presented to the committee by Secretary Durkin.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman from Ohio knows my high regard for him and his stalwart position in the House of Representatives; however, I feel compelled at this point to make a general observation.

The gentleman from Ohio spoke of the lack of justification for this cut. I suppose we could take all of the items that might be covered in any appropriation bill and find in all of them good things—things that would lead any one of us to say that would be nice to have, so let us just carry it on. But there is one overall justification that we should keep in front of us as we go through the consideration of these appropriation bills; and that is, that the people of this country look to us to maintain the fiscal solvency of our Government. Yes; they are clamoring for a tax reduction and they should have it. We live, as the President stated, in an age of peril when we are called upon to spend tremendous sums of money for our national defense and security.

Under these circumstances, may I point out again that there is an overriding justification for supporting these cuts, if they do not go too deep and if they are not destructive of some essential governmental function. That justification is against continuing the reckless spendthrift policy that has characterized the activities of the Federal Government too long. We must stand up and be counted, else we shall never balance the budget of the Federal Government, else we shall never give the people the tax relief which they are urging.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that, in recommending an appropriation of $2,700,000, the committee has recommended as much as, or a greater amount than, has been appropriated in the regular bills for this program since its inauguration, with the exception of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952; and it is only a reduction of about 4 percent from the amount appropriated for each of those 3 years. So, I do not see how anyone can say we are crippling the program in any way. We want it carried out and we have provided sufficient funds for its operation.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the pending amendment will be voted down.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed reduction in appropriations for the Department of Labor, especially as it affects the Bureau of Apprenticeship, will have serious repercussions in the fields of business and industry.

Ever since the 1920's, when our national policy on immigration was established, it has become increasingly clear to American businessmen that we can no longer depend on the importation of foreign-trained labor. We have to depend upon our own resources to train and produce the highly skilled craftsmen that we need.

The small business owner, and the big corporation, the steel manufacturer, the repair shop, the mine manager, the railroad superintendent, the shipbuilder, and the garment maker—all of these, and many others, are today concerned about the fact that they cannot find a sufficient number of all-round trained craftsmen.

They realize, furthermore, that while the age of qualified craftsmen currently available is rapidly increasing, insufficient numbers of journeymen are being acquired through apprenticeship even for replacement purposes, to say nothing of expansion.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship has for 20 years stood in the forefront of the battle for better trained craftsmen. It has urged that more attention be given to this problem while there is yet time in which young men may receive from the older workers the skills of their trades.

Because the objectives of the Bureau have been to stimulate interest in industry of their responsibilities in training their own craftsmen, it has, heretofore, consistently received encouragement from industry as well as labor, and from both parties in Congress. Generally speaking, the opinion of those who have been assisted or advised by this agency is that the service given is impartial and technically useful.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and cooperating State apprenticeship agencies are helping industry to acquire those workers it most needs—the craftsmen of such high skill that it takes usually 3 or 4 years to learn even the beginnings of the trade.

The best evidence of the value of the services of the Bureau of Apprenticeship is the membership of joint apprenticeship committees throughout the Nation. There are today approximately 8,000 of these committees jointly established by management representatives. Participating in these joint apprenticeship committees' endeavors are more than 120,000 business establishments and nearly 100 national or international unions. Some of the biggest corporations in the United States are included in this latter group, as well as the small-business man. This furthers the idea of getting industry to acept their responsibility for training their workers. The cost to the Government is small because industry trains and not the Government doing the job for them.

If the appropriations for the Bureau of Apprenticeship are cut, the services of that agency to American industry will have to be cut in proportion, and the extension of its technical services to other industrialists and businessmen will of necessity become impossible. The staff of the Bureau is already working at full pitch in an attempt to satisfy even current demands for its services. Any reduction in its appropriation will of necessity reduce the amount of service it can give. American industry cannot afford either the immediate or the long-run loss in craftsmanship that such a reduction in this appropriation will bring about.

In conclusion, may I remind you that this agency successfully helps industry do its own training, and Government does not do the training on behalf of industry. Apprentices produce goods and earn a livelihood while they are learning.

I therefore urge that, at the very least, the appropriation for the Bureau of Apprenticeship not be reduced.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in so much disagreement with the administration and with the committee on their recommendations with respect to this bill that it is difficult for me to understand their approach to many of the items. When you make reductions in items like vocational education, apprentice training, vocational rehabilitation, and public health, you are cutting functions that are indispensable to the growth and security of our country. Measured by most appropriations which come before the House, these items are almost insignificant. Yet, the committee has approached these items as though it was considering the multi-billion-dollar bills which we will soon be considering. It is one thing to approach functions which cost billions with a pruning knife; it is quite another to start tampering with services to our people, particularly where, as in these instances, they have already in past years been cut below the point of safety.

I have had occasion during recent years to acquire some degree of familiarity with the apprentice training program. I have become convinced that the expansion of this program is indispensable to our national defense and economic growth. We are not feeding enough young men into our skilled trades to meet the future requirements of our expanding industries.

It is a program which has met with universal approval among both labor and management. It is a program based on our traditional policy of having men trained on the job by employers and employees. It is not a job that the States can do alone. Our industrial practices do not stop at State lines. The problem is nationwide in scope, and the Federal Government should augment, rather than curtail this fine service. I sincerely hope the House will restore the cuts made in the apprentice training program.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words to speak in favor of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I think my good friend from Indiana, the majority leader for the next 2 years at least, still thinks he has a Democratic President in

the White House and Democratic members of the Cabinet. It seems to me that he and other leaders of the Republican Party have been in the minority for so long it is very difficult for them to get around to the fact they are now in the majority and that they have men of their own choice as Cabinet officers and that they have their own President of the United States.

It seems to me this is a question of whether you are going to follow your President and his Cabinet or whether you are going to take the reins away from the President of the United States and run this country yourselves.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman did not vote for the administration position the other day on the $55 million for ACP payments, and I did.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know how the gentleman from Indiana voted on that particular cut, but I did, and I think the RECORD will show I voted for that $55 million cut on the rollcall.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman did, I am happy to give him my apology.

Mr. FOGARTY. I say, look at the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Those who voted for the $55 million increase were voting in the direction of returning to the amount recommended by another President of the United States, President Truman, in his budget.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Ohio said, in the hearings that we have before us, there is not one word of justification for a cut in this particular appropriation. As I said yesterday, in 1947 and 1948, when the Republicans had control of this Congress, when they were cutting the Department of Labor heavier than any other agency in Government in those 2 years, this was one agency in Government that they did not touch. The Republicans and Democrats alike in 1947 and 1948 made the claim that this was one of the best agencies in Government, that had the support of labor and management, that had the support of the Federal Government and the States themselves. It is true as the chairman of this subcommittee said, that there are instances where the division of apprenticeship training has had trouble with either a labor union or some other segment of the economy in getting their cooperation, but that is exactly the reason we have the Bureau of Apprenticeship training. I think I know something whereof I speak, because I belong to one of those unions in the building trades, and I know that for years they refused to allow but only a small percentage of their membership to become apprentices. But since we have been appropriating money for this particular division of Government, we have had more cooperation, we have had more apprentices. This program is working today better than it has ever worked before.

As the gentleman from New York stated a while ago, the National Production Board is out the window. I would say to the gentleman from New York that if we were going to cut defense spending in this country by 40, 50, or 60 percent, then maybe you could justify this cut in apprenticeship training at the present time, but the cold facts are that we are still building defense plants in this country, that we are still manufacturing planes in this country, that we are still manufacturing tanks in this country.

You will notice in the New York Times and the papers all over the east coast that every plane factory on the west coast is advertising for help on the east coast because they do not have the trained mechanics to build the tanks and planes that we need at the present time. This is the agency that can provide that help. This is the agency in Government that is the coordinating agency between the States and the Federal Government to see to it that we have an adequately trained mechanical supply in this country.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am glad the gentleman mentioned what the Republicans did for this program in the 80th Congress, and I would like to advise the committee that we have recommended almost $600,000 more in this bill than was appropriated in 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. I will say in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, my distinguished chairman, whom I have a great deal of affection for, and enjoy serving under his leadership, that in 1946 and 1947 we were not in the emergency we have at the present time. We were not spending as much on a defense plan as we are at the present time. There was no need at that time as there is at the present time because we were not appropriating funds for defense in 1946, 1947, and 1948. We had just ended the war.

Your President said in his state of the Union message in February, which you all read and listened to, I think, that—

> The administration intends to strengthen and to improve the services which the Department of Labor can render to the worker and to the whole national community.

I sincerely believe this is one place in the Department of Labor that he really meant what he said. You are going to have a chance in voting on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio to show whether you are going to support your President or whether you are going to go along with a cut that has no justification at all. Read the hearings. If you can find one place in the hearings that justifies this cut, I want you to show it to me.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. In 1947 and 1948 did we not have a GI apprentice program far greater than we have now?

Mr. FOGARTY. We did, but we are still in that, and there have been additional responsibilities put on the Bureau of Apprenticeship because of the deferment system on the apprenticeship training program we have.

Mr. YOUNGER. We were at the end of World War II at that time, and we are appropriating more money now than we did at that time for that purpose.

Mr. FOGARTY. I attempted to say that we were not in the defense spending, if the gentleman will remember, in 1947 and 1948, that we are in at the present time. Go back to the record, is all I say. The record shows it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to protest the cut which has been made in this bill in the funds provided for vocational education. Last year Congress appropriated $18,673,261 for the promotion and further development of vocational education.

On the theory that vocational education has matured to the point where its further development should gradually be turned over to the States, Federal funds have been reduced by $2,624,391. This is a severe cut. These funds should not be cut at all.

There is no more fundamental activity of Government than to provide education, including vocational education, for young folks. The great vocational educational system which we have today providing agricultural training in our schools for farm boys and girls has been made possible by Federal cooperation.

We must not reduce our support of vocational agricultural training. It is one of the best investments that can be made in the interests of more efficient agriculture. Thousands of young farm operators today are doing a much better job of farming than their fathers did because they had vocational agricultural training. The greatest differences are noticed in the poorest agricultural areas. These Federal funds help most in the poorer areas. Yes; the more wealthy States and communities can carry on their own vocational educational program, but the poorer communities may not do it without the help of Federal funds.

The cut in these funds in this bill is a step backward.

Letters and telegrams follow:

> BATON ROUGE, LA., *April 16, 1953.*
>
> Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
> *Member, House of Representatives,*
> *House Office Building:*
>
> I have been advised that proposed amendments to budget for Federal Security Agency would reduce appropriation for vocational education as provided in George-Barden Act by $4,624,391 which is 24.76 percent of

amount received this fiscal year. If such action is taken by the Congress our Louisiana programs in vocational agriculture, home economics, distributive education, and trade and industrial education will be seriously affected. It will probably be necessary for the State to reduce the number of vocational programs in proportion to the cut in Federal funds. Thousands of young people and adults would be deprived of valuable vocational training. We understand that hearing will be given before House subcommittee handling vocational appropriation on April 21. We will appreciate your giving all of the assistance possible to seeing to it that these funds are maintained at the present level for the fiscal year 1954. In fact, we need additional vocational funds to meet the needs. Your support in the House of a movement to restore any proposed cut in vocational funds to the extent that no less money will be available for vocational education for fiscal 1954 than is available for this fiscal year will be appreciated.

SHELBY M. JACKSON,
State Superintendent of Education.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May 20, 1953.*
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Louisiana has had more student participation in school-lunch program this year than at any time in history. Additional children reaching school age will increase participation during coming session. It is urgent that school-lunch appropriation remain the same as it was during past fiscal year. Any reduction will seriously handicap program operations in State. It is false economy to deprive school children of this important health and nutrition program. We are calling on you to do what you can to maintain school-lunch appropriation. Thank you for your cooperation.

SHELBY M. JACKSON,
State Superintendent of Education.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May 19, 1953.*
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
House of Representatives:

Understand Appropriations Committee cut vocational rehabilitation below present inadequate level and considerably below administration's budget figure. We urge you to do all you can to restore appropriation to at least budget figure of $23 million.

EDWARD P. DAMERON,
Commissioner of Public Welfare.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *April 29, 1953.*
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have been advised that Bureau of Budget has recommended cut of 25 percent in George-Barden funds. Louisiana Vocational Association strongly opposes any reduction in funds and respectfully requests you to use your influence in Congress to prevent any cut in funds now available. Several hundred teacher-members of our organization and thousands of Louisiana citizens will appreciate your active support of our program by preventing any reduction.

ONA SMITH,
President, Louisiana Vocational Association.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May 20, 1953.*
Congressman GEORGE S. LONG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Have been advised funds for vocational rehabilitation have been reduced below administration budget. Louisiana unable to meet demands rehabilitation cases because of insufficient funds. This program has proven to be of inestimable value to handicapped people who never had hope of opportunity to make contribution to society. Thousands have been rehabilitated; many taken off charitable rolls and made independent taxpaying citizens. Therefore, I am of opinion that such reduction is false economy. Will appreciate your having appropriation amended to its original budget figure.

SHELBY M. JACKSON,
State Superintendent of Education.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *April 25, 1953.*
Congressman GEORGE LONG,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request promotion and support of legislation including George-Barden Act providing adequate funds for vocational education.

Mrs. E. BROOME SWEENEY,
President, Practical Nurses of Louisiana, Inc.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *April 20, 1953.*
Congressman GEORGE LONG,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request promotion and support of legislation including George-Barden Act providing adequate funds for vocational education.

BATON ROUGE TRADE SCHOOL,
JEROME BOWLING, Jr., *Director.*

WINNFIELD, LA.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG.

DEAR SIR: The home-economics teachers of Winn Parish hereby urge that you oppose reduction of George-Barden funds for vocational education. Thank you for your consideration.

Mrs. NAOMI CRAWFORD,
Winnfield High School.
Mrs. DOROTHY SHELTON,
Atlanta High School.
Mrs. ELGA SIKES,
Dodson High School.
Mrs. MONA FAYE FORDHAM,
Sikes High School.
Miss RUTH WIMBER,
Calvin High School.

BATON ROUGE, LA.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
House Office Building:

Urge maintaining school-lunch appropriation as during past fiscal year. School-lunch program vital to health and nutrition of school children.

AGNES BLAZEK,
Steering Committee, Louisiana State Nutrition Committee.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 21, 1953.*
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
Care House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

For sake of the health of our children, we urge that school-lunch appropriation be kept at $83½ million.

LOUISIANA ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC HEALTH WORKERS.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baton Rouge, April 15, 1953.
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LONG: Your assistance is earnestly requested in preventing further cuts in Federal funds for vocational education. If Congress follows the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, our program in Louisiana will be seriously handicapped.

Amendments to the budget for the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency, recently transmitted to Congress by the new administration, propose a cut of $4,624,391 or 24.76 percent in the George-Barden appropriation for vocational education.

The appropriation for distributive education in the Nation was $28,852.48; in 1952 it was cut to $15,000; and this year we have only $8,655.84. The State appropriation has not been increased so many programs of training were discontinued and no new schools could be opened.

Boys and girls in Louisiana help schools enrolled in distributive education courses go to school part time and work in retail, wholesale, and service businesses part time under a cooperative training plan. Last year the 611 students earned over $350,000 in conjunction with their training and paid an amount in Federal income taxes greater than the amount of Federal dollars spent in their training.

Because of our experience with reduced funds for distributive education we are convinced that the proposed further reduction of funds for vocational education will impair our training program for youth and adults and jeopardize economic progress in Louisiana.

I earnestly request your support of vocational education and your vigorous opposition to the cut proposed by the Bureau of the Budget. The House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Labor Department and the Federal Security Agency has scheduled hearings on vocational education on April 21. If you can arrange to speak for vocational education before the committee, or with members of the committee I shall appreciate it.

Sincerely yours,
DONOVAN R. ARMSTRONG,
Supervisor, Distributive Education.

GEORGETOWN, LA., *April 17, 1953.*
Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LONG: I have been informed that there is a proposed reduction by the new administration of George-Barden funds for vocational education. As a teacher of vocational agriculture and one who sees at first hand what this type of vocational training has to offer boys and girls in rural areas and in many urban areas, I wish to state that if funds are tampered with it will endanger to a great extent the professions of farming, home-making, trades, and industry in a time when we should be trying harder than ever to maintain them all.

Therefore, after talking with many people of my respective community, I ask your help in keeping the vocational funds as they were for the fiscal year 1953.

I understand that over $4 million is proposed to be cut in the budget as it now stands. During the fiscal year of 1953, the appropriations were nearly $20 million.

Hearing on this phase of the proposed cut is scheduled for April 21, so it is requested that you do all in your power to help stem the urge to reduce worthwhile appropriations such as this.

Thanking you very much for your past considerations, I remain

Sincerely yours,
W. W. LYLES,
Vocational Agriculture Teacher.

ST. TAMMANY PARISH SCHOOL BOARD,
Covington, La., April 17, 1953.
The Ho..orable GEORGE S. LONG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LONG: I understand that the Federal Security Agency budget will be cut

about 25 percent for vocational funds. These funds would be used under the provisions of the George-Barden Act of Congress. This, of course, means that Federal funds for agriculture, home economics, distributive education, and trade and industrial education will be reduced by approximately that amount. As you know, this reduction will be passed on to the Parish School Boards if the cut is sustained by Congress.

This letter is an earnest plea to have Congress appropriate at least as much money for the fiscal year 1954 as was appropriated for this fiscal year. We need this money badly here in St. Tammany Parish. We are bonded up to the hilt for new buildings, both white and colored schools, and having no oil fields or revenue from severance taxes, we, of course, would be extremely hard put to absorb this 25 percent cut from local funds. Please do everything possible to have the committee and the Congress go along with at least the same amount of money for the coming year.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, and the thanks of all the school people for your efforts in our behalf in matters of this kind, I am

Cordially and sincerely yours,

WILLIAM PITCHER,
Superintendent.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Baton Rouge, April 18, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE LONG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LONG: I am very much alarmed at the proposal by the new administration to reduce appropriation to George-Barden funds for vocational education. If this materializes it will seriously affect all phases of vocational education being carried out by schools throughout the Nation.

I understand that there is a proposed reduction of the amount of $4,624,391 for fiscal year beginning in July 1953. It is the opinion of all concerned that there is barely enough allocation as it is at present and if there is a reduction in this it will almost stop progress in the vocational field.

If there is any assistance you can possibly be in seeing that this reduction does not materialize, we the people of Grant Parish will be certainly grateful to you.

Respectfully,

W. L. RAMBO.

GEORGETOWN, LA., *April 18, 1953.*

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
Member of Congress, Eighth District,
State of Louisiana.

DEAR MR. LONG: This is to let you know that we are concerned about the proposed reduction by the new administration of George-Barden funds for vocational education. Should this cut in funds go through, it will practically stop all phases of vocational education now being carried on in the public schools throughout the Nation.

We believe that this type of training is essential for our young people in America. Such work as vocational agriculture, home economics, industrial education, and many others will no longer be able to carry on.

It is understood that the amended budget recommends only $14,048,840 for carrying out the provisions of the George-Barden Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. This is a cut of $4,624,391 in the recommended budget passed upon in the fiscal year of 1953.

Therefore, we ask your help and consideration in this matter and hope that you will exert your energies to assist in maintaining the above funds.

Thanking you very kindly for your past cooperation, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

G. L. BARRETT, Jr.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
BATON ROUGE TRADE SCHOOL,
Baton Rouge, April 20, 1953.

Dr. GEORGE LONG,
Congressman from Louisiana,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LONG: We in the Baton Rouge Trade School appreciate very much your fine record of promotion and support for legislation for vocational education. We thank you for the excellent work you have done for us in the National Congress.

The purpose of this letter is to request that you support legislation to prevent reduction in funds provided by the George-Barden Vocational Education act. While we realize full well the need on the part of the Federal Government to effect many economies, we feel that the large and important vocational industrial education training program being carried on by this school and others like it will justify vocational education funds being maintained at their present level. The conservation of national natural resources and the efficient training of a large number of industrial workers can be effected by the continued benefits provided by funds appropriated in the George-Barden Vocational Education Act.

Yours very truly,

JEROME BOWLING, Jr.,
Director.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *April 23, 1953.*

Congressman GEORGE LONG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Urgently request promotion and support of legislation including George-Barden Act providing adequate funds for vocational education.

Yours truly,

J. BOWLING.

CLOUTIERVILLE, LA., *April 20, 1953.*

The Honorable GEORGE S. LONG,
United States Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Knowing you are interested in our farmers and their welfare, I'm calling your attention to the proposed cut in George-Barden funds which would seriously threaten the program of vocational agriculture in our parish, district, and State. I'm sure you are familiar with the work we agriculture teachers are doing in preparing young men for farming, assisting and teaching adult farmers, and young farmers. Our program is geared to the needs of the individual farmers and youngsters cause we visit with them regularly, live in "our" communities where we teach and thereby are best suited or qualified to assist them with their problems.

Should the George-Barden appropriations be cut, vocational agriculture would be seriously threatened; please vote against the proposed cut.

Sincerely,

LOUIS RYDER,
Agriculture Teacher.

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1953.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

To Vocational Education Leaders:

The new administration has just transmitted to Congress, amendments to the budget for the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency. The amended budget recommends only $14,048,840[1] for carrying out the provisions of the George-Barden Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. This recommendation proposes a cut of $4,624,391 in the amount recommended in the Truman budget and in the amount made available for vocational education for fiscal 1953. If approved by National Congress, it will result in a cut of 24.76 percent in the George-Barden appropriation.

Efforts were made by your AVA, through prominent vocational educators and lay leaders, to get the new administration to recommend an increase in vocational appropriations, or to at least recommend no decrease.

If Congress follows the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, it will mean destruction of much of America's program of vocational education and will seriously cripple the whole program. Our hope of preventing this drastic cut is through action of the National Congress. It is the responsibility of Congress to make appropriations. Congress can follow the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget or ignore them.

In times like these, Congress is likely to follow the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget because its recommendations are accepted as the views of the President. The President is now in the honeymoon period of his administration and thus, his recommendations carry unusual weight. In addition, an economy wave as to Federal spending is sweeping Congress and the Nation. It appears to be popular to cut appropriations.

It may be hard for you to believe that such a recommendation could have been made by the new administration in light of the letter written by President Eisenhower to C. M. Miller, of Kansas, copy of which is enclosed.

For your information and for comparative purposes, there is enclosed a statement regarding appropriations and budget recommendations for several programs.

It is more important than ever to get Representatives and Senators to appear before the House and Senate subcommittees on appropriations to testify in favor of vocational education and to support an all-out fight that may be waged on the floor of the House and Senate to prevent a cut in vocational funds.

You should know what to do in your State to get the support of your delegation in National Congress. We hope you will move with speed. Time is running out. Action will come soon—very soon. Lay support is needed. Officers of farm, labor, industrial, business, and other organizations should help. If we lose this battle, it may be the beginning of a gradual year-to-year reduction in Federal funds until they are completely eliminated. We hope you will be able to rally your forces and that Members of National Congress will learn from scores of people in your State that Federal funds are essential to the maintenance of a sound and adequate program of vocational education, and that they should not be cut.

Please keep us informed of the things you do. Let us know the Representatives and Senators from your State whom we can depend upon to help carry the fight in National Congress.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

M. D. MOBLEY,
Executive Secretary.

P. S.—A breakdown of allotments by States and the four types of vocational education are not yet available. We understand the recommendation is a cut across the board for all types of programs. If this is true, the recommendation proposes an increase for distributive education over the present appropriation.

M. D. M.

---

[1] At one time it was the plan to recommend an appropriation of only $5 million for carrying out provisions of the George-Barden Act. This evidently was averted through efforts of friends of vocational education.

1953 appropriations and 1954 budget recommendations

	Amount appropriated for fiscal 1953	Truman budget estimate, 1954	Eisenhower budget estimate, 1954	Percent increase (+) or decrease (−) of 1953 appropriation
I. Federal Security Agency:				
1. Vocational education	$18,673,261	$18,673,261	$14,048,840	−24.76
2. Office of Education (salaries, etc.)	2,960,000	3,250,000	2,926,000	−1.14
3. Vocational Rehabilitation	22,250,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	+3.28
4. Land-grant colleges	2,480,000	2,501,500	1,250,750	−49.56
II. Department of Labor:				
1. Bureau of Apprenticeship	3,700,000	3,400,000	3,324,000	+18.76
III. Department of Agriculture:				
1. Extension Service	27,165,908	27,169,129	27,169,129	+.01

	1951	1952
Federal funds spent for foreign aid education programs	$28,007,000	$49,807,417
Number of people enrolled or served in foreign aid education programs	13,069	16,278
Federal funds appropriated for vocational education [1]	$27,262,882	$26,408,383
Number enrolled in federally aided programs	3,363,429	[2] 3,165,995

[1] Includes Smith-Hughes and George-Barden funds.

[2] Note that as Federal funds decreased the enrollment in vocational education also decreased. Total appropriations for fiscal 1953, $25,958,383.00. This reduced appropriation will doubtless result in still further reduction in enrollment in vocational education.

THE ISAAC DELGADO,
CENTRAL TRADES SCHOOL,
New Orleans, La., April 21, 1953.

Congressman GEORGE S. LONG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: It is our understanding that the Bureau of the Budget proposes a cut of $4,624,391 in the amount recommended in the previous budget and in the amount made available for vocational education for fiscal 1953. If approved by National Congress, it will result in a cut of 24.76 percent in the George-Barden appropriation.

In view of the tremendous need for training to staff the industries in need of skilled workers there seems to be a real need to recommend no decrease. Your support of the vocational-education program will be greatly appreciated.

Kindest regards and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN E. THAMES,
Director, Delgado Trades School.

NATCHITOCHES PARISH SCHOOL BOARD,
Natchitoches, La., April 21, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: It is with much regret that I learn from information that has come to this office through the American Vocational Association, Inc., that there will be a possible reduction of 25 percent in the amount of funds appropriated by the United States Congress for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the George-Barden Act of Congress. I feel that the money that has been appropriated by Congress for the purpose of promoting the program of vocational education, as defined in the George-Barden Act, has meant a great deal to the schools of our system as well as those of the Nation. I hope you will use your good influence to see that no reduction will be made.

Very truly yours,

E. A. LEE,
Superintendent.

EVERGREEN HIGH SCHOOL,
VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT,
Evergreen, La., April 16, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
United States Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: I am a citizen, and vocational agriculture instructor of the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana, which is being represented by you. I reside and teach in the small farming community of Evergreen in Avoyelles Parish. I come from a family which have always supported the Long administration in any election they were in, because of the high standards of ideals that they possess, in presenting government on an equal basis of integrity, honesty, and general well-being of all the people as a whole, irregardless of race, degree, power, or wealth.

I have been teaching vocational agriculture at the Evergreen High School for the past 4 years, and have rendered my services to my people favorably and with appreciation, by solving many of the problems that confront them on the farm, and even assisting young prospective farmers in becoming established in farming. I am greatly liked in the community for the work I am doing. I am overjoyed of knowing that I am doing the job I am supposed to do, as shown by the people I serve, who have welcomed me to stay with them. Our little community has no industries or manufactures, so it depends solely on farming. As you can see there is a definite need for instruction and better improvements in agriculture.

The reason I am writing to you is in regards to a communication I have received from Mr. M. D. Mobley, executive secretary of the American Vocational Association, in which he states that there is a bill before Congress for a 24.76 percent decrease appropriation in vocational education as provided by the George-Barden Act. I understand that President Eisenhower is in favor of this decrease in order to balance the budget for the fiscal year. I am seeking your support in defeating this proposal of the Bureau of the Budget as this cut in Federal funds allotted to vocational agriculture would greatly cripple the Nation's agricultural industry, which it is so dependent upon.

I want you to know that I have voted for you and helped put you in the position you now hold because I trusted that you would represent your people best, and for that reason I know that you will see the dangers of this bill and fight it to its last degree.

I wish to express my desires and thanks for your worthwhile efforts, and I remain,

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND J. DUCOTE,
Teacher of Vocational Agriculture.

PRACTICAL NURSES OF LOUISIANA, INC.,
Baton Rouge, La., April 23, 1953.

Congressman GEORGE LONG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Strenously request consideration of promotion and support of legislation including George-Barden Act providing sufficient funds for vocational education.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. ANNA CAILLOUET CLOUATRE,
Secretary, Practical Nurses of Louisiana, Inc.

LENA STATION, LA., *April 24, 1953.*

Congressman Dr. LONG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LONG: I understand a bill is coming up soon in Congress to cut the appropriation for vocational agricultural schools.

These schools in Louisiana are doing a wonderful work, and I think anything you could do to prevent this cut in appropriation would be a great service to people of State.

Thanking you, I am

Sincerely,

LOUIS H. WISE.

ISTROUMA HIGH SCHOOL,
Baton Rouge, La., May 1, 1953.

Congressman GEORGE LONG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: I am urgently requesting your support of legislation including George-Barden Act which provides adequate funds for vocational education. This school has 135 boys per day in various types of vocational training in the Baton Rouge Trade School. I would not like to see this vocational program hampered on account of these boys.

Yours truly,

H. P. OVERTON, *Principal.*

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
T. H. HARRIS TRADE SCHOOL,
Opelousas, La., May 4, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LONG: The Congress is proposing to cut financial appropriations for vocational education (Smith-Hughes, George-Deen, and George-Barden accounts). Our staff, numbering 22, joins me in pleading with you to strongly oppose any cuts in appropriations for vocational education because we are convinced that such cuts are uneconomical and will result in tremendous loss of tax revenue to the Federal Government.

As an example, last February, one of our WPA war-production trainees came to our office at night to thank us for the training he received in 1942. He advised me that since receiving his vocational training he has worked continuously and has paid more than $8,000 in withholding (income) taxes. The Federal Government spent an average of $86 per student in training this group of workers, which is 1,000 percent return in 11 years.

From numerous such examples as the one cited above, we are confident that Federal expenditures for vocational education are in less than 5 years fully repaid to the United States Treasury in the form of taxes.

For the welfare of the United States of America and the well-being of our workers, we hope that you will exert your efforts toward encouraging and increasing the aid to vocational education and opposing any reduction of this aid.

Thanking you for your assistance, we beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

STAFF OF THE T. H. HARRIS TRADE SCHOOL,
By GLENN MADERE, *Director.*

LOUISIANA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Baton Rouge, La., April 29, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE LONG,
Congressman, Eighth Louisiana District, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LONG: It has come to our attention that a drastic reduction in the appro-

priation supporting the George-Barden Vocational Education Act is contemplated by the National Congress in the current attempt to balance the budget.

We are heartily in favor of curbing governmental expenditures in many of the numerous phases of operation, but we cannot see the wisdom of such rigid economy in the field of education.

I have been authorized by the executive council of the Louisiana State Federation of Labor to solicit your support of legislation providing adequate funds for vocational education purposes, and particularly in maintaining existing appropriations for the George-Barden Vocational Education Act.

I have also been authorized to solicit your support of legislation containing appropriations for public housing programs. As officers of this statewide labor organization, we are keenly aware of prospects for better living conditions offered to the common ordinary workingman through public housing, slum clearance, and defense housing programs.

We are advised that the Housing Act of 1949 authorized construction of 153,000 public housing units in this fiscal year but that under legislation presented by members of the party in control of our Government at present appropriations will be so restricted as to prohibit housing programs of any nature. It is to be regretted that this opinion apparently prevails among many of the lawmakers and we herewith urge your favorable consideration of the appeal by the American Federation of Labor to the Congress to provide funds for a public housing program comprising the minimum of 35,000 units this fiscal year as recommended by the administration in power.

We are attaching hereto a copy of a resolution submitted by the steering committee of the Southern States apprenticeship conference to the executive council of the Louisiana State Federation of Labor. The resolution, dealing with apprentice-training programs, is self-explanatory and was unanimously concurred in by the council. We trust that its contents will receive your favorable consideration.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

E. J. BOURG,
Secretary-Treasurer, Louisiana State Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTION—APPROPRIATION, BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Whereas an adequate supply of skilled mechanics in all trades is essential to our national defense and national economy; and

Whereas experience has shown that the most effective way to properly train these skilled mechanics is through an apprentice-training program sponsored and conducted by joint labor-management apprenticeship committees; and

Whereas the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor has stimulated through their efforts interest in apprentice training and has rendered valuable assistance to joint labor-management apprenticeship committees in the development of apprentice-training programs; and

Whereas it is the opinion of both labor and management that their joint efforts to develop and conduct apprentice-training programs would never have become a reality without the assistance of the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the steering committee of the Southern States Apprenticeship Conference, representing labor and management in the 10 Southern States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas at a called meeting of this committee held in Atlanta, Ga., on April 11, 1953, That the value of the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor to labor and management and their joint apprentice-training programs be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States. The steering committee of the Southern States Apprenticeship Conference is completely in sympathy with and endorses the efforts of the Congress to eliminate useless and wasteful Federal spending. However, the steering committee of the Southern States Apprenticeship Conference does not believe that the budget for essential functions of Government should be so reduced that our national defense and national economy will be jeopardized.

The steering committee of the Southern States Apprenticeship Conference, therefore, urges all Members of Congress to carefully study the budgetary needs of the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor to the end that adequate funds will be provided for this Bureau to function efficiently and properly; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Members of the Congress from the 10 Southern States composing the conference and also a copy be sent to the Director of the Budget Bureau and to the Secretary of Labor.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May 5, 1953.*

The Honorable GEORGE S. LONG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LONG: To maintain an adequate program of vocational education we need to prevent that cut of 25 percent in George-Barden appropriations.

I hope that you will always defend vocational education. Right now you can do this by voting against the cut of 25 percent recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

EULA MAE PELT,
Vernon Parish.

P. S.—The people of our State need vocational education. Think the situation over and vote for the need of a great number of our population.

E. M. P.

NORTHWESTERN STATE COLLEGE,
Natchitoches, La., May 6, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that the Budget Director is recommending a cut of $4,624,391 from the George-Barden Act as recommended by the Truman budget. I also observe there was appropriated in 1952 $49,807,417 for foreign aid education programs. That amount doubled that which was appropriated for vocational education under Smith-Hughes and George-Barden funds for 1952. The number of people served under the foreign aid program in 1952 was 16,278 while 3,165,998 were enrolled in our own vocational programs, which means we spent nearly $3,051 more per pupil educating foreigners than was spent by the Federal Government in educating American youth on a vocational level.

No doubt the appropriation for this foreign aid program will continue to remain higher than the appropriation for our own vocational programs. It is difficult for me to see why American youth should be penalized as a result of cuts in our vocational program, while at the same time we are aiding our foreign brethren. When this budget is brought out for action on the House floor for approval by your body, I am requesting that you support our vocational education program not only in the amount that was recommended by the Truman budget but in the full amount as authorized by the George-Barden Act. All of us in the field of education will be watching with extreme interest the way our congressional representatives vote on this important legislation.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. ROBINSON,
Professor, Industrial Education.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baton Rouge, May 8, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
United States Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: It is my understanding that the proposal to reduce George-Barden funds for vocational education will be brought to the floor of the House of the United States Congress sometime during the week of May 10. The purpose of this communication is to request your cooperation in voting against this proposal.

The vocational education program in this country has made outstanding progress since its inception in 1917, and it is continuing to make progress. It is a phase of education which trains in-school and out-of-school persons for gainful occupations and for leadership. I am sure that no one would want to see the day come when our people would be deprived of this kind of training in our educational system. The program of vocational education needs to be expanded. This need is evident right here in Louisiana.

The amount of Federal funds used in this program plays an important part in meeting the needs for vocational education in the States. A decrease of Federal funds for the vocational education program at this time would make it necessary to discontinue the program in a number of local schools in Louisiana. With the rapid expansion of the vocational education program during the past few years, local administrators have been "pinched" pretty severely in the administration of the program because they have had to administer a larger program with the same amount of funds. This is no time, therefore, to reduce the funds for vocational education. The real need is to increase the amount of funds. My plea to you at this time, however, is to ask that you vote against the proposal to reduce Federal funds for vocational education. The program cannot be effectively carried out with less money than received for the program last year.

Your cooperation in giving this matter your prompt consideration and doing what you can to retain the full amount of George-Barden appropriation for vocational education will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. PARENT,
State Supervisor, Vocational Agriculture Education.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 59, noes 39.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed $10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $5,100,000, of which $981,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provision of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that a single Member of this House will question my zeal for economy in Federal expenditures. My record is clear. I have supported every cut in the budget which has been presented on this floor this year, and incidentally, I have initiated some of the cuts myself. I realize that because of our critical fiscal situation drastic cutting is imperative. However, even under the extreme conditions which confront us there is such a thing as false economy.

There are four items in this bill which I would list in that category:

First, the hospital construction fund authorized by the Hill-Burton Act. This act, passed in 1949, authorized an appropriation of $150 million for the construction of public and other non-profit hospitals for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years. The Congress, after the beginning of the Korean war, properly reduced appropriations for this purpose to $75 million annually.

The Congress, having adopted a definite hospital construction program, States and localities in need of hospitals formulated plans in conformity therewith. In my district, the city of Richmond, which is the medical center for a large area of the State, was woefully in need of adequate hospital facilities. Every hospital in the city is now crowded to capacity, and has a long waiting list. It is therefore almost impossible to take care of even the emergency cases. So great is the need, that our citizens relying upon Hill-Burton funds to supplement their efforts raised by popular subscription $4 million, and actually have over three and one-half million dollars in hand. A beautiful site has been donated, plans are being drawn and upon receipt of an allocation of the funds provided in this bill, construction will begin. Without these funds, the project cannot be undertaken, because the private contributions were made with the understanding that they would be supplemented with Federal contributions. Because of other commitments in the State, the necessary funds cannot be allocated to the Richmond project unless the full amount of $75 million originally requested is appropriated in this bill.

The next item is that of vocational education. Nothing is more important to our national economy than to train our boys and girls to earn a living and to make a home. The vocational training program covers the teaching of agriculture, home economics, trade and industrial education, and distributive education in our public schools. Many of these subjects are taught at night for the benefit of those who have to earn while they learn. I believe that in the long run, the vocational education program returns to the economy by increased productivity a great deal more than it costs.

Distributive education has been eliminated entirely from the program under this bill. Our total civilian employment as of January 1953, was approximately 60 million. Of this number, 14,700,000 or 24.3 percent are engaged in distribution, comprising wholesaling, retailing, and service establishments. The distributive trade is the second largest source of employment, exceeded only by manufacturing, which employs 16,600,000 or 27.4 percent. Employment in agriculture accounts for only 5,450,000 or 9 percent. Surely, those employed in this large segment of our economy should not be denied training altogether.

The third item is that of vocational rehabilitation. This program deals with the rehabilitation of those handicapped by accident or disease. By restoring the earning power of those so unfortunately situated, we not only contribute to our national economy but, in addition, we restore self-respect and confidence to the afflicted.

The fourth item covers grants for resident teaching funds to State land-grant colleges under the Bankhead-Jones Act. This program has been in effect for many years and the agricultural and technical teaching programs of the various land-grant colleges are geared to it.

I am in thorough agreement with President Eisenhower that this entire subject of Federal grants to States should be reviewed. I shall support his recommendation for the creation of a Federal-State commission to study this and other Federal-State problems.

Until such a study has been made, however, and a future course of action determined, I urge the Congress to continue these appropriations at this year's level. If there is to be a change in Federal policy it should not be made until after thorough study and adequate notice to the States.

The programs in the various States have been predicated upon the assumption that Federal appropriations will continue at the same level. The legislatures in most of the States have recently adjourned. Practically none of them will be in session again until next year and most of them will not meet again for 2 years. The States, therefore, will be unable to make up these funds without calling special sessions which could cost more than the amounts involved.

The cuts proposed in this bill would make it necessary, therefore, to curtail the programs within the various States. Let us not attempt to balance the budget by decreasing the educational and training advantages presently made available to our young people and cripples by these funds. This, in my judgment, would be false economy indeed.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I notice that the gentleman has mentioned four items and that three of those which he believes should be modified by the House are in the educational category.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I wish to join the gentleman in his statement as to the wisdom of an overall study of the whole problem of grants-in-aid. It seems to me in view of the fact that proposed amendments would merely meet the budget recommendations of Mrs. Hobby, the House should go along with the budget estimates and approve the amendments. Then, after we have made this study, under the commission to study Federal-State relations as requested by the President, see just where we stand as to Federal requirements for a sound educational policy.

Mr. GARY. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Our educational policy is gradually being evolved. It began with President Lincoln during the Civil War in the Land Grant College legislation. In the first World War, the Smith-Hughes program was added. Later other acts aiding education have been adopted. So we would be reversing the policy of long standing, beginning with the Civil War, if we reduced the aid that the Federal Government has granted to education and to the land-grant colleges.

Mr. GARY. That would be taking action, in my judgment, without proper study, absolutely regardless of the consequences which might follow.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. In many instances in these land-grant colleges they have already made contracts with teachers. Seventeen of the land-grant colleges in the South are colored, and they will be without funds.

Mr. GARY. Those funds are being used for teaching agricultural and technical courses which are needed by our young people. It is to teach them to make better farmers, better technicians, and we need trained technicians in this scientific age.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. May I ask if it is not a fact that in this particular item the present Bureau of the Budget, after special consideration, recommended that the full amount which was granted the last few years be restored and appropriated?

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Is the Congress of the United States ever going to get to the position where it realizes its responsibility to the people to present, as far as it may be, a balanced budget?

Are we ever going to get to a point where we realize that we cannot go on with grants and grants and grants and expenditures ever and ever increasing? In this bill the committee has been very solicitous of its responsibilities and of its duties to provide the funds that might

be needed in places where they are needed.

I want to tell you a little bit about the first item the gentleman from Virginia spoke of, this item of grants for hospital construction. There the program was cut from $75 million to $50 million, and I want to tell you the manner in which that program has been administered and why it was necessary to make the cut. I will be able to give you only a few illustrations in the short time available. There was a case brought to our attention where $50,000 a bed was spent in the building of a hospital under this program; there were cases where after the hospitals had been built they had to be closed; there were no funds available in the local communities to keep them going. Unless programs of this kind are maintained on the proper basis the only recourse Congress has is to curtail the activities so that they must be maintained upon a proper basis.

On these educational items and the grants there is a little cut in vocational training, two million and a half out of something like twenty-odd million; but, here again, there were cases where it had been abused. Some of those are shown in the reports, and in the report on page 10 you can see three of them specifically: College education for a young man who had lost three toes on his right foot, but who despite his physical handicap and hardship, became the eastern intercollegiate wrestling champion while being rehabilitated. Spending $1,443 to rehabilitate a minister whose only disability was squinting and a slight nervousness. Payment for cataract operations and hospitalization for 74- and 80-year-old housewives. I do not know, but you have got to have some kind of integrity in these programs if they are going to continue to command the support of the people.

As to this matter of the agricultural college I do not know what the result will be, but here is the picture: In 1935 an act was passed which said its purpose was, and I will quote exactly: "For the further endowment of agricultural colleges." That has been put in as an emergency item and has dragged on in spite of the fact that we have gotten into a situation where the States ought to be able to take care of the agricultural colleges themselves. There has been no emergency that would prevent the States from doing that sort of thing for many years now. We should get to the point where we approach these things right side up. If we are never going to wake up to our responsibilities, if we do not care anything about keeping down expenses and we are going to lay down on our job and not be fair, I feel rather discouraged about what is going to happen to the United States of America. We can run through the mill and out the window without using our heads and without using our hearts even, just by answering telegram requests for more funds all the time, and you know the folks will ask for them.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I have been friendly now for about 13 years. I know he does not want to mislead the Congress in any statement he makes. He spoke about a hospital being built at a cost of $50,000. The record does not show that at all. I think he is referring to one in the State of Pennsylvanna. The record will show and the hearings will show, and it was gone into very thoroughly by the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] that it was not for the building but for the equipment and the revision of an existing hospital. Perhaps I should say for the modernization of an existing hospital which is the most costly thing in the world. It was not the building of the hospital that cost $50,000.

I do not think he wants to leave a false impression with the Congress. There are 1,168 hospitals throughout the country, but only 3 have been closed. The first one was not a grant for construction; it was a grant of $17,000 or $18,000 for equipment. That one has closed, but the Federal Government is going to recoup that money. Another one was closed because of the death of an elderly doctor and the remaining young doctor having moved out. They are in the process of securing two doctors to man that small facility in one of the Southern States. The third one has been closed because of a difference of opinion between two States. The hospital is situated almost on the State border. They expect that one to be opened up in a short time.

The hospitals are not being closed. Out of 1,168 only 3 have been affected. Those are the facts. I do not think the gentleman and I disagree on the facts.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It is time to call attention to the way the thing is operated and it is time to put ourselves upon guard. We have to approach this in a business-like manner. When the committee has appropriated $50 million out of $75 million that is not a serious cut and it should not impair any decent operation.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is a very serious cut. It will be remembered that only 3 years ago we not only expanded this program but we increased the authorization from $75 million to $150 million without one dissenting vote in the House of Representatives.

Mr. TABER. I think the Members of the House understand their responsibilities a little better now than they did then.

Mr. FOGARTY. Oh, no. I think that because of the record of this program they are going to extend it another 5 years on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some misgivings that I rise this morning. We have a bill before us where every human need, every human want in these United States is involved. First, I should like to take a few minutes to pay tribute to a man who I think is one of the finest living Americans, a man who has done more to preserve the fiscal policy of the United States, if we can say it has been preserved, than any other man in America. I speak of the gentleman from New York, our distinguished colleague, JOHN TABER. It is difficult for the gentleman from New York year after year and year after year to stand here and oppose the increases which you are attempting to make not only in this, but in many appropriation bills.

Consider the bill before you. Under the Department of Labor we have appropriations for these and other agencies: Bureau of Labor Standards, Veterans Employment Rights, Employment Security, Apprenticeship, Unemployment Compensation for Veterans, Mexican farm-labor program, Employees' Compensation, Labor Statistics, Women's Bureau, and the Wage and Hour Division.

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare funds for such functions as these are included: American Printing House for the Blind, Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Food and Drug Administration, Freedmen's Hospital, Howard University, Vocational Education, Endowment of Colleges of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Vocational Rehabilitation; and in the Public Health Service such functions as: Venereal diseases, tuberculosis, communicable diseases, engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene, water pollution control, hospital construction, foreign quarantine service, and leprosy hospital in Hawaii.

Also in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the National Institutes of Health, such items as: Cancer, mental health, heart institute, dental health, arthritis, and metabolic disease activities, microbiology, neurology, and blindness. Included also under the Health, Education, and Welfare are funds for St. Elizabeths Hospital, old-age and survivors insurance, grants to States for public assistance, Children's Bureau, grants to States for maternal and child welfare. The items listed affect the educational problems. We have grants for schools, for hospital construction, and various other activities—all of them excellent programs with which no one can quarrel, and toward which everyone is in complete sympathy.

Yet, a few moments ago the House adopted an amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio who said that we now have a know-how Cabinet, and yet this House voted to give the new Cabinet officer more money than his predecessor.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the people of America are crying for economy because they are scared to death that our ship of state is going on the rocks. We are facing national bankruptcy and if we are going to increase appropriations instead of decrease them, instead of taking the reductions that have been studied by this subcommittee, I think the American people will call upon us to answer. Our great problem here is maintaining the solvency of the United States, and unless we are willing to take in our own congressional districts the cuts which must be taken in order to balance the budget of the United States, I personally think the Congress

of the United States will have been derelict in its duty.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that God will save our Union, but it cannot be saved unless this Congress has the courage of its convictions, the courage to do what the people of America want done to save the United States of America from national bankruptcy. We talk about liberals. Who are the liberals? The men who would turn everything over to the Federal Government, restore us to the days when one man or one group of men could dictate to all other men? Those are not the liberals; they are the reactionaries, the men who would restore the system of government from which man fought for generations to free himself. We have had a wonderful heritage in this country. You and I have been privileged to live under it. We have a duty to pass on that heritage to future generations, but we cannot do it unless we maintain the solvency of these United States.

The appropriations listed by purpose, which are called for in this bill are as follows, and the Members will note that they total almost $2 billion.

Department of Labor

Office of the Secretary	$1,250,000
Office of the Solicitor	1,350,000
Bureau of Labor Standards	624,000
Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights	300,000
Bureau of Apprenticeship	2,700,000
Bureau of Employment Security:	
Salaries and expenses	5,100,000
Grants to States	187,300,000
Unemployment compensation for veterans	41,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm-labor program	1,250,000
Bureau of Employees' Compensation	2,000,000
Bureau of Labor Statistics	5,250,000
Womens' Bureau	300,000
Wage and Hour Division	6,000,000
Total, Department of Labor	254,424,000

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

American Printing House for Blind	$175,000
Columbia Institution for the Deaf:	
Salaries and expenses	410,000
Construction of buildings	----------
Food and Drug Administration	5,000,000
Freedmen's Hospital	2,750,000
Howard University:	
Salaries and expenses	2,240,000
Plans and specifications	----------
Construction of buildings	20,000
Office of Education:	
Vocational education	16,048,870
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts	----------
Salaries and expenses	2,500,000
Payments to school districts	60,500,000
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation:	
Payments to States	20,600,000
Salaries and expenses	500,000
Public Health Service:	
Venereal diseases	5,000,000
Tuberculosis	5,725,000
Assistance to States, general	13,350,000
Communicable diseases	5,000,000
Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene	3,000,000

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued

Public Health Service—Con.	
Grants, water pollution control	----------
Disease and sanitation investigation and control, Alaska	$1,082,000
Grants for hospital construction	50,000,000
Grants for hospital construction (liquidation of contract authority)	19,700,000
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services	750,000
Hospitals and medical care	32,500,000
Foreign quarantine service	2,900,000
National Institutes of Health:	
Operating expenses, National Institutes of Health	4,675,000
National Cancer Institute	17,887,000
National mental health activities	10,895,000
National Heart Institute	12,000,000
Dental health activities	1,650,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities	5,000,000
Microbiology activities	5,479,200
Neurology and blindness activities	4,000,000
Total, National Institutes of Health	61,586,200
Construction of research facilities (liquidation of contract authority)	2,500,000
Retired pay of commissioned officers	1,197,000
Salaries and expenses (PHS)	2,900,000
Revolving and management funds: Service and supply fund	----------
Total, Public Health Service	207,090,200
St. Elizabeths Hospital:	
Salaries and expenses	2,417,000
Major repairs	399,500
Construction, maximum security building	----------
Social Security Administration:	
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance	(62,750,000)
Construction of buildings	(1,500,000)
Grants to States for public assistance	1,340,000,000
SE, public assistance	1,600,000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau	1,500,000
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare	30,000,000
Office of the Commissioner (appropriation)	173,000
transfer from OASI trust fund	(123,500)
Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Agencies	250,000
Office of the Secretary:	
Salaries and expenses	1,075,000
OASI	(168,000)
Office of Field Services	1,835,000
OASI	(375,000)
Office of the General Counsel	350,000
OASI	(375,000)
Surplus Property Disposal	450,000
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare	1,697,883,570
National Labor Relations Board	9,000,000
National Mediation Board:	
Salaries and expenses	429,000
Arbitration and Emergency Boards	138,000

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued

National Mediation Board—Continued	
National Railroad Adjustment Board	$497,000
Railroad Retirement Board	(6,207,000)
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service:	
Salaries and expenses	3,200,000
Boards of Inquiry	10,000
Total	1,965,581,570

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word on this bill H. R. 5246 for labor, health, education, and welfare.

Mr. Chairman, we have been told that the Cabinet of the President is a million-dollar Cabinet, that every member on it has been a most successful operator. I wonder what there is about our thinking that tries to make us feel that the minute we get into the Government we have to stop being Americans, which means having the pioneer spirit, which means creating wealth, spiritual and material. I for one did not run for office with an ax in my hand. I for one did not promise I would chop every tree down on the horizon without replacing it with something else, be it a school, a home, a road, a hospital, or a playground.

It seems to me the spirit of this debate veers toward fear rather than hope for the future.

In the appropriations hearings on Post Office and Treasury, I asked the Treasury to tell us whether our fiscal program was going on the rocks. The answer was that the interest on our national debt was just a little more than 1-something percent, 1.7 percent of our gross national product in 1952—page 61, point 3, 1954 hearings. That's peanuts.

Every member of the Cabinet in ordinary business earned his salt by being able to propel his outfit ahead, and he did not do it with an ax or a tomahawk. He did it with energy and vision and hope for the future.

I do not think anybody in the American economy thinks of standing still or being sterile. As far as the people in my district are concerned, we are not taking per se, this Paris-garter word of a balanced budget, lowered taxes, and the national debt. We want employment, and earnings after employment; that comes from production and purchasing power. You are not going to dig a ditch, build a factory or home, erect a school or church, or provide for the security of this Nation with money laying on the shelf or in a vault. It has to be used. Money is energy; circulated, it creates wealth. So does an educated and gainfully employed people. I for one, and the people of the 13th District of New Jersey, are not going to listen with belief to anyone who tells them that giving the people knowledge and gainful employment and purchasing power is going to put the Government on the rocks. Full steam ahead. Let us not heed those who would drive us to sterility and ruin.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this floor to point out one or two questions involved here which I think might be worth while for all of us to think about as we consider this bill.

If the programs involved here are participated in by all the States, and most of them are, is there any evidence in the hearings or elsewhere that you would save money by letting the State take it up and do the same thing, since we have only one people financing it either way? Is there any reason to believe sending the program back to the States would help? Many times there are reasons to believe you could but how about on these programs? The statement has been made in the report of the committee that these are sound programs, which are, in most instances, acknowledged to be good by this committee, which I know is trying to do a good job. They have tried to reduce appropriations but I feel in some instances they missed the mark. They would reduce attention to vocational rehabilitation, when each person so rehabilitated and made self-supporting—which is all he or she wants—actually thereby contributes to the national income. I believe it is a mistake to reduce that program. To reduce funds for vocational agriculture and to eliminate entirely the funds for land-grant colleges with the statement they mean to let the States take them over, does not, I repeat, necessarily mean any saving if the job is to be carried on since the same American people pay for it through State governments as against through the Federal Government? Of course actually no arrangements have been made for the States to take over and that is a sound basis for my opposition to a number of actions of the committee.

I announced yesterday I would offer amendments to restore these funds. I expect to do so unless they are restored by action of the committee. Actually the legislatures in nearly all States will not meet for a year or in some cases it will be 2 years.

It is nice to say, "Let the States take it up," but most of the States cannot do it without there being a vacant interval. I have particular reference to vocational agriculture, and I have reference to the land-grant college item. Certainly with regard to hospitals we have many areas which have done their part and have had to stand by. Should this construction be delayed further? I do not think so.

Mf. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I noticed in one of the Washington papers the other day that the income-tax payments by the individual States were returned to them in the amount of 6 percent; in other words, for every $100 that was contributed by the State the Federal Government returned $6. Is that not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sure the gentleman saw it in the press, but I would not vouch for the facts, not knowing the newspaper or having any chance to check it myself. I know the gentleman to be a most conscientious, able Member of Congress. Again I say, however, programs you want continued should be turned back to the States only after working out a plan for the States to take over. Actually unless the States can run it better or more economically, there is little to be gained in turning them back.

Actually in the instances I have pointed out there has been no plan worked out for the States to take over as I understand.

The funds here eliminated for land-grant colleges have been counted on in the school budget. I understand in my State about 8 percent of the faculty costs of Alcorn A. and M. College for Negroes are paid through this program. We are making a determined effort to meet our problems but the legislature of my State does not meet until next January, and it will be about a year from this July before they have any chance to replace such funds. The same thing applies perhaps to a lesser degree to all the other land-grant colleges.

There is real need for economy but there are many things in Government that could be reduced rather than these programs. However, I repeat the point I raised a moment ago that merely turning this back to the States, if it is a sound program and should be supported, does not necessarily save any money. Secondly, do not insist that you are not actually reducing the program when it is a fact that the States cannot take over, at least not now. I ask you to keep these questions in mind as the various amendments are debated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want first of all to start with a sense of humility, and would like to state very specifically my profound appreciation for the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the members of the committee whom I know have worked long and hard to bring before this Committee a bill which would be reasonable and effective and do the job as best they know how. My background, Mr. Chairman, has been in the field of education. I want today to mention several items in this bill that cause me considerable concern. The first item is the amount of money which has been recommended for hospital construction. I may be wrong, but yesterday on the floor of the House I asked a question: If the committee's recommendations were carried out, whether that would mean that a university like the one I represent in my district, the University of Florida, would be denied certain funds by means of which they can match an appropriation which has been granted to them by the State legislature to build a great medical school and a hospital in connection therewith to do something about the problems of health that we have in this Nation of ours? The question was answered in the affirmative. In other words, it was said that if this bill were passed, as recommended, the great university I represent would be denied the necessary building funds needed for our contemplated medical school. I may be wrong, but if I am, that impression was gained yesterday in the discussion.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman's statement is absolutely correct, and that is where we were wrong in the committee in cutting these appropriations for hospital construction in that the States in a good many cases have already appropriated their part of the money and they are not going to be able to go ahead. So what happens? That money is lost, and unless additional money is appropriated either by the State or the Federal Government, it just puts the program back. The gentleman a while ago said that we were standing still. We are not standing still. By this bill we are going backward. And, may I add, I do not agree with the objective stated in the report of sloughing this program solely on the State. The Federal Government itself has a responsibility.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to thank the gentleman. May I proceed a little further and say a word about my philosophy. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], yesterday suggested that I should be consistent. There is no one in the House for whom I have higher esteem than the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. But I believe I am consistent when I point out that we have to do something about the problem of health and the other problems that face this Nation of ours. I am opposed to compulsory health insurance or any type of so-called socialized medical service, if you want to call it that. But I believe in trying to do something to solve the problems of health of the people of this Nation. The Florida State Legislature has appropriated $5 million for a medical center on the campus of the University of Florida at Gainsville, which is in my district. It has been stated that one of the great problems we have in America is to find the doctors' staff and the nursing staff to go ahead in these hospitals and man them once they have been completed. Here we have $5 million which has been appropriated by the State of Florida, and I know they are planning on some money to help them match that fund in order to get a great medical college with its associated hospital to help our students to go to a medical school to get an opportunity for a medical education. Mr. Chairman, so often we hear the word security in this great Nation of ours. I believe that word has a magic appeal, and it should, but far greater to me than the word security is the word opportunity. I want to see each boy and girl with the ability and the intelligence, the drive, and the initiative who seeks a medical education to have a chance to get that education, and by reason of that same initiative to go out and give the medical service that is so needed in this Nation of ours.

There is another aspect of this bill that concerns me, and that is the program for vocational agriculture. I may be a little biased because I come from a district where the Future Farmers of America mean so much to our people. It is my understanding that program will be cut if the bill in its present form passes. I do not doubt the good intentions of the

committee, but I do believe this great organization will be seriously harmed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MATTHEWS was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am very grateful, Mr. Chairman.

I have a deep conviction about this great youth organization. I have seen these boys and girls in the State of Florida. Their brother organization, the 4-H Club and the sister organization, the Future Homemakers of America. I have seen those groups contribute greatly to agriculture. I have seen the homes that were rude and unpainted and without gardens. During the several years that these boys and girls have had this training, they have changed the appearance of these homes. I have seen first a simple coat of whitewash and then a coat of paint, and then I have seen the gardens and the dairy cows and the progress that has come by this training that the boys and girls have received through this vocational agriculture. I most sincerely believe in it. I believe that the FFA program is giving the future citizens of this great Nation an opportunity, a word that means so much to me.

The third point in this bill that has caused me some concern is the point that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] mentioned; that is, that since 1935, every year $2,500,000, as I recall, has been appropriated to our land-grant colleges for use in their colleges of agriculture. The State Legislature of Florida has met. They passed a budget for our university and we had counted on $47,640 of that money from this $2,500,000 fund to go into our budget. That money is used to develop the great agricultural industry in the State of Florida. Without this money we will be denied $47,640 for another year. If the Congress wants to say that next year you cannot have it, I will not make any objection to that, but I do not think it is fair at this date to deny us this particular amount of money.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there is not any question in my mind about economy, but the question is, Where will the fat be cut? I have noticed in the report of the committee certain criticisms of the hospital construction program, for example. It would seem to me that those particular features that are so disadvantageous to the program could be eliminated. I think we ought to cut out all unnecessary fat. I will support any item that tends to do that, but the question is, Where will the fat be cut? I have tried to vote consistently, and I think my record will show that I have voted consistently, for bills previously that have come before the committee that would give us the possibility of real economy. As some Members have already stated in my campaign for Congress I did not talk too much about economy in the necessary domestic programs, as I did point out the fact that most of the money was spent for our great defense effort. If money is to be saved, that is where most of it is going to have to be saved. We must insist on a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar that is spent. I feel that to cut the fat out of a great domestic program is desired. But we must not kill the essential aspects of a proved program that means so much to our people.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad the gentleman paid tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I am sure that all of us share his feeling of appreciation for the efforts of the great chairman of the Appropriations Committee to achieve a balanced budget. It is not in derogation of his service that we make these points as to policy questions in the bill. The gentleman from Florida has well stated the argument that it is false economy to reduce our support of vocational education. As we educate we increase our productive capacity. In my own State the income per capita has quadrupled in the last 15 years, and it has been partly a contribution of the vocational education program in which the Federal Government has shared.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. Vocational rehabilitation goes right along with that. I did not have an opportunity to say very much about that.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I agree with the gentleman in his statements.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge reversal of the cuts made in the appropriation for the implementation of Public Law 874. We in California have a more than ordinary interest in this appropriation because we have one of the most difficult problems of financing education in the United States because of our extraordinary growth and, as a consequence, Federal impact is an aggravation of an aggravation. The extent of Federal impact is reflected in the fact that California school districts receive the largest share of moneys appropriated under Public Law 874.

In my congressional district I have 3 districts in which the Federal component of contribution exceeds 10 percent. The proposed cut means that one of these districts will lose 28.7 percent of its funds for operation, another 5.9 percent, and another 12.9 percent. By the nature of these districts and the formulas for State assistance the net result will be if this cut obtains that the pupils in these schools will receive an inferior education. In a letter addressed to the Honorable JOHN MOSS, Congressman from California, Frank Wright, associate superintendent of public instruction for the State of California, asserts:

> The majority of these districts under a reduction from net entitlement will not be able to continue to provide comparable educational opportunity for federally connected children or other children in the district.

The proposed reduction affects schools in the districts of almost every Congressman from California. It is a 42.9-percent reduction in the total requirement of a program established by this legislative body and amounts to legislation by indirection.

We in California believe in facing school problems head-on and do not approve of methods of cutting school programs to which we have given our pledge.

I am likewise opposed to almost all of the other cuts in the budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The programs of this Department directly touch on the lives of almost all of our citizens in the fields of health, education, nutrition, and protection from fraud.

The cuts in almost every instance represent a greater concern for dollars as compared with human beings. They likewise can be reasonably described as false economy. For example funds available for vocational education and vocational rehabilitation have been radically reduced. Truthfully money spent on these programs is money wisely invested dollarwise because it results in increasing the productivity of our citizens and in many instances removes a worthy citizen from public welfare roles. It is calculated that every dollar spent on vocational rehabilitation returns $10 to the Federal Government and the benefit in human happiness produced by such expenditure is incalculable.

I am hopeful that every California Member in recognition of our particular stake in appropriations for education, health and vocational training and rehabilitation will support amendments to provide tolerably adequate sums for carrying out the programs I have discussed.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49–49a), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501–503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of employment-office facilities and services in the District of Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), $187,300,000, of which $10 million shall be available only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient

administration of its unemployment compensation law and of its public-employment offices: *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of unemployment-compensation systems and employment services by States receiving grants herefrom.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 4, line 23, strike out "$187,300,000" and insert "$213,600,000."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to restore to this bill the amount requested by the administration and approved by the Bureau of the Budget, nothing else than that; and the figures in the amendment are exactly in accord with those recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I make this amendment on two bases: First, keeping faith with the needs of the States, which is not done in the amount which is set forth in this bill; and, second, following the recommendations of the administration is not done in the amount set forth in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has a moral basis, too, because this is a case in which the United States is making, in a sense, a profit; it is not spending the taxpayers' money in the sense that we normally use it here on the floor as coming out of general taxation, for the employers who are covered for unemployment insurance pay into the Federal Treasury three-tenths of 1 percent a year for the purpose of meeting exactly these expenses. In the fiscal year with which we are dealing in this bill the amount of those payments will be $282,400,000.

The appropriation contained in the bill is $187,300,000. The amendment calls for $213,600,000 and is, therefore, still far less than the amount which covered employers will pay into the Treasury. So we are dealing only with part of the excess which will go into the Federal Government on this transaction.

Why do I say we are not keeping faith with the needs of States? The States get this money in order to maintain two kinds of service: First, to administer unemployment insurance claims; and, second, to try to find employment for people who are unemployed.

I was prompted to offer this amendment by information received from the department of labor of my own State, New York. The Honorable Edward Corsi who heads that department is a devoted and outstandingly able and conservative official and administrator. His executive director of the division of placement and unemployment insurance advises me in text, that the administration of the unemployment insurance program in the State of New York will absolutely drop down to the point where he will not be able to effectively audit the claims and will not be able to do the needed job to find employment for those drawing insurance payments, if this cut which the committee proposes is put into effect. He points out that in 1948 when exactly the same thing happened we had a real scandal in New York—to cite one instance, of an individual who took advantage of the program to sun himself on the sands of Florida—because the State could not have an adequate checkup on these people who were receiving unemployment insurance because of just such shortages of funds allowed by the Federal Government for needed staff.

I think the justification for this amendment is organic even in the statement of the committee itself, and I call the attention of the Committee of the Whole to the statement of the committee in justification on page 4 of its report where the following statement appears:

The amount recommended is based on the assumption of workload continuing at the 1953 level, but with the $10 million contingency fund being available to the extent necessary for additional workload, if any, resulting from changes in State laws, increased unemployment or other factors.

You would think, therefore, that the committee ought to allow exactly what was allowed in 1953, but they did not. In 1953, $197 million will have been spent for this activity and that includes the $10 million reserve and even a deficiency appropriation. Yet the committee is giving this activity a total of only $187,300,000.

The reason for the difference between my amendment and $197 million which is being spent in 1953 is that many of the States have mandatory increases of salaries of State employees running the program. So the amount which the Federal Government recommended and the amount the Bureau of the Budget approved is to carry the same workload, except taking into account the mandatory salary increases for the people who work on the program in the various States.

I am advised that the program has got to be cut in New York in terms of the people who work on it to the tune of about 16 percent if this cut goes through. The representation by the New York Commissioner of Labor, who, as I say is a conservative administrator, and a splendid State official, is to the effect this will disable that agency from doing the effective job he has to do about these unemployment insurance funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Along the same lines the gentleman has stated about his commissioner of labor, I have here a letter from the director of employment security of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Of course, we all know that unfortunately Massachusetts now has a Republican administration. The letter is identically the same and along the line the gentleman has stated as representing the views of the commissioner of labor of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JAVITS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the other point about this whole thing is that we are really kidding ourselves because the record shows that supplementary appropriations have had to be asked for in this very situation and have had to be granted. The whole unemployment insurance system is dependent for its administration upon what the Federal Government allows out of what covered employees themselves pay in.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. This is one of those instances where improper or insufficient administration would permit more chiselers to remain on the unemployment rolls?

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly what New York's department of labor advises. We are fooling ourselves if we cut in this way. The needed amount is really not out of the Federal Government's general tax revenues, it is out of the funds the covered employees themselves pay in. We are jeopardizing security of the whole program and inviting a series of scandals which we will be the first to inveigh against, condemn, and deplore. I am calling to the attention of the Committee of the Whole today this situation which will exist if we let it stand as it is in this bill and urge therefore the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the committee's attention to the language on this item in the report:

The bill includes $187,300,000, a reduction of $30,700,000 from the request and $9,810,000 from the amount appropriated for 1953. The reduction is slightly larger than is apparent since the recommended amount contains a $10 million contingency fund whereas the latest informal estimate of the Department is that practically all of the $197,110,000 appropriated for 1953 will be expended. The amount recommended is based on the assumption of workload continuing at the 1953 level, but with the $10 million contingency fund being available to the extent necessary for additional workload, if any, resulting from changes in State laws, increased unemployment or other factors.

If I recall correctly, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] said something about a 16-percent cut. Even if you do not take into consideration the $10 million contingency fund, it will be about a 10-percent cut. If you add the $10 million that is allowed in the contingency fund, it will be approximately 5 percent.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I pointed out that practically all States had mandatory salary increases for their employees. Everybody knows, therefore, that when you have to pay people more money, and we are all doing that even in our own businesses, you are going to have less employees for the money you have.

And I read from a letter of Commissioner Corsi in which he says in New

York City it represents a 16-percent reduction and he says he just cannot do the job.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is that in New York State?

Mr. JAVITS. That is right.

Mr. BUSBEY. I misunderstood; I thought you were referring to the total. Your commissioner mentioned these people sunning themselves in Florida. It seems to me that the State of New York should check these people before they hand out their checks. They evidently hand out their checks and then check them after that?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think the gentleman heard me at all. I said in 1948 when you did just what you are doing in this bill now, that was the result. That is not the situation now in the State of New York. The situation there, I think, is the tightest of any State in the Union, but if you pass this bill as it is, you will get it again.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hope that the gentleman knows what he is talking about. The amount of the appropriation has increased every year since 1948. The amount provided in this bill is more than was appropriated in 1952, or any year prior to that. It is an increase of over 40 percent above the 1948 appropriation. We purposely provided this $10 million contingency fund so that if anything did happen to increase workloads, they would have the contingency fund to draw on. The gentleman knows as well as I do that, if this is not enough—and I think it is enough money to operate the program efficiently and economically—they will request a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to be disagreeing with my chairman again. I think the gentleman from New York has stated the facts correctly. I do not believe there is an employment security administrator in any State in the Union who will tell you today that this is enough money for them to operate on in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think that is a correct statement. All of us, if we were in that position, would argue that we did not have enough. That is the custom when they are getting funds from the Federal Government.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; that is not a true statement. These are not Federal funds, let us not forget that point. These funds are paid in by the employer, and in some cases the employee, into a trust fund in the Treasury of the United States, and the Treasury is taking in about $60,000,000 a year more than it is paying out. It is not a drain on the Federal Treasury at all; it is coming out of this fund that has been paid into by the employer, and in some cases, the employee. It is not a drain on the administration or the Federal Treasury. This is something that belongs to them. It does not belong to the Federal Government; it belongs to those people who paid into the fund, and we are taking into the Treasury an average of $60,000,000 a year more than we are paying out. Why some of these administrators are sad about this now is that it is going to upset the entire operation of their offices. It is going to bring on cases where they cannot show economy. They need the personnel, because when a man or woman comes in and makes an appeal for unemployment compensation, they have got to be investigated. You take this personnel away from them and they cannot be investigated, and the scandals that the gentleman from New York referred to will come up again, and they will not be responsible. It will be the Congress of the United States that will be responsible then if we allow this cut to stand. This is not a real cut. As the gentleman from Illinois just said, they know that they can come back with a supplemental bill. He is on the one hand against agencies coming in for supplementals and on the other hand he is suggesting to them that they can come back the first of January for a supplemental request for this agency. Let us not forget the facts. This is not an appropriation out of the Federal Treasury at all. It is money in this fund that is paid in by the employers of the country, and we are keeping $60 million more than we are paying out at the present time. Everyone knows that a cut like this is going to cripple the services in the States. It is not going to be economy in the States. There is no Federal Administrator, be he Democrat or Republican, who will agree with the action taken by this committee. I know that to be a fact, and let us not kid each other about it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. After all, irrespective of what he may say in regard to these tax payments, they are paid into the Federal Treasury, and any funds we appropriate in this bill are appropriated out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is positively right, but it is not a drain on the taxpayers of this country. That is what I am trying to say. The gentleman has to admit that is correct.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am fundamentally opposed to supplemental bills. In the opinion of the committee, this appropriation will give them ample funds. The Department not only can, but will, resort to supplemental appropriation requests if the workload increases to the extent that it cannot be handled with the contingency fund that is provided.

I wish to make it clear again that this three-tenths-of-1-percent tax is paid into the general funds of the Treasury, and this appropriation is made from the Treasury. The taxpayers of the United States will be $26,300,000 better off if this amendment is defeated.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is an additional fact that you are requesting them to come back with a supplemental request. As to the contingency fund the gentleman spoke about, $10 million, it is true we made this contingency fund available about 6 years ago in this bill to take care of unexpected increases in workloads and State salaries. Am I not correct that we go further and make a paper cut in this report, because do we not say to the States in that report—I cannot point it out directly—that we are now making the States assume the responsibiliy of any increases in salaries, which the Federal Government has always paid for before?

Mr. BUSBEY. That is a correct statement with regard to the fact that we do not allow for an increase in this appropriation, at a later date, on the basis of an increase in State salaries.

Mr. FOGARTY. So it means a further cut than shown in the actual figures, because we are telling the States now, "If you want to raise the salaries of these employees you do it yourself," even though the Federal Government is making $60 million a year profit on these funds at the present time.

A 15 percent reduction in the 1954 appropriation request for grants to the States for the administration of employment security will require that consideration be given to the elimination and curtailment of the following activities:

It would mean curtailment of fraud activities and employer tax auditing in the unemployment insurance functions. It would also necessitate a greatly reduced quality of work in other unemployment insurance activities. The system is already under heavy attack for the amount of improper payments which occur even with the best efforts to control them. This type of cut would render the States helpless in trying to improve and perfect the system.

A 15 percent cut in State grants would have its most immediate and serious effect on the placement of unemployment insurance claimants by the local offices of the State improvement services. The work test and the placement of claimants is essential to the protection of the unemployment insurance trust fund, and the reserve accounts of covered employers. A 15 percent cut in this area of activity would certainly be false economy, as the losses resulting would far exceed the apparent budgetary savings. Placement service represents 54 percent of the direct workload of the Employment Service offices throughout the country. Any overall substantial reduction would inevitably, therefore, cut sharply into this constructive service. It would be little economy to bear the fixed overhead for rents and premises, legally required work registration—for unemployment insurance claimants—and other placement-supporting activities and curtail the "end result" placement service. If levied against any of the direct placement-supporting workloads, the 15-percent cut would reduce the number of new work applications by almost 60 percent. Placement activity would be wholly stopped if this were to take place. A reduction of this size in direct workload, if applied against counseling and testing, would to all intents and purposes eliminate these placement-supporting services entirely.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we reduced this appropriation due to the fact that we felt this fund could be efficiently administered for the amount we provide in the bill.

Here is a point I think should be brought out, that when we reduce the administrative cost for this fund we save money for the people who benefit from this fund, and the action of the committee benefit the employers who pay into this fund. Certainly the department can put administrative practices into effect which will save this amount.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, I do not quite follow how the gentleman is saving money. In the first place, employees do not pay into it, it is just employers. In the second place, they pay it just the same, no matter what is appropriated in this bill. They paid $284 million into this fund. That is three-tenths of 1 percent. I do not see where they get any saving.

Mr. JENSEN. We are reducing the administrative cost.

Mr. JAVITS. You are reducing it at the expense of the administration of their own funds.

Mr. JENSEN. All right, the committee is satisfied that this fund can be properly administered with the amount we have left in the bill for administrative purposes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as the Congress can see, this comes down to the question of supporting the administration. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has faced us fairly with the question as to how this fund shall be administered saying, in their judgment, for the coming year it can be administered better. The administration has come up to Congress with a justification for the amount needed in this program for the coming year assuring that on the method that they will administer the funds, it will be done well under the Eisenhower administration. Secondly, there is real need for these funds because it has been justified by the Labor Department for this purpose. The Department has the administrative responsibility. That Department has the confidence of President Eisenhower. So I ask the Congress to give this new Cabinet officer the power to demonstrate that responsibility, and if it is wrong, let us be the first ones here later to come in and criticize.

This question depends on an overall problem of justification. When the subcommittee cuts the justification for administering unemployment compensation by $30,700,000, the subcommittee must have some specific reasons for that reduction of the request and justification of the Department. I have not heard yet any complete delineation of the various categories of the $30,700,000 that is to be reduced. That should be set out in detail, and unless the committee can supply that point by point and amount by amount, making up that $30,700,000, my position is that the cut should not be adopted by the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman who is now addressing us is out of order since he is talking about an amendment which relates to the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and we are discussing a division in the Labor Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. BUSBEY. If the gentleman had yielded to me earlier, I was going to tell him we had not reached the Department of Health, Education, and Labor.

Mr. FULTON. That is completely correct, but this has been justified to the committee by the Department of Labor. The overall policy I wanted to speak about, was whether we in this House have confidence in the Eisenhower departments that are coming up with justifications and requests for administration of these Departments during the present fiscal year. When they come up with these various justifications that they have made, how will Congress look on such requests as a general principle? Will we adopt a principle of appropriation reduction by committees of Congress before the committee has had a chance to see that the new Departments are in operation, and deny the new administration a chance to set up efficient management under its reduced budget figures? We should not adopt such a principle.

In conclusion, as to the method of approaching the cuts requested in the Labor Department and Mrs. Hobby's department, when the House approaches what they are doing, let them come here on their original appropriation bills and give full justification and then we should listen to the committee and see what are the specific details of how each should be cut. Congress should not in advance say it is going to cut down the administration requests, or that these departments have not succeeded because they have not had an adequate chance to perform. If the committee says the departments have not justified the requests properly, then require the Subcommittee on Appropriations to give the House specific details of the cut. I do not think that has been done in this instance. I believe that a vote to reduce at this time the budget of the Department of Labor will be an expression of no confidence in the justification at this particular point. I believe the Eisenhower administration is responsible and we must accept their word at this time, to give the new department heads an opportunity to set up the departments properly under the new administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this item is directly out of the Federal Treasury. It represents grants to States to administer this unemployment insurance. Frankly, the collection of that tax and the distribution of the fund by grants-in-aid is not the business way to handle the job. The collection of the tax for that purpose ought to be made by the States, in my opinion. But that is not the setup. When you administer a program like that in the States, without a sense of responsibility that goes to the State administrators and the State legislators, of the situation that is created when they have to levy a tax, you do not get that combing down of the appropriations and that control over them which you get if they have to raise the money themselves and pay it out of the funds that they have raised.

The committee was asked for $16 million more than they had available in the Labor Department for allocation to the States. The committee thought that they could get along with $187 million instead of $197 million, and there was no good justification submitted for an increase up to $213 million. Under those circumstances, why should we go over the head of the committee and increase this item by $30 million?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, as we read this bill we see operating much of what is involved in so-called grants-in-aid. I think it is about time that a lot of us realized that the phrase "grants-in-aid" is deceptive, because there is no money in the Federal Treasury to send back to the States that is not first found in 1 of the 48 States. Out in Indiana and in a lot of other States we find that by the time that money goes to Washington and is sent back the dollar shrinks.

I was amazed to hear the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] say a moment ago that if you turned such a program back to the States it would cost just as much to run as though you collected the money in Mississippi, brought it to Washington and sent it back to Mississippi. I sat in on the meeting at the White House when four governors representing the governors' conference were present and said that reliable estimates indicate that as these programs were turned back to the States for administration, the greater feeling of responsibility resulted in the work being carried on in a better fashion with at least a 25-percent saving.

I agree with the gentleman that all of these things are fine; certainly they are fine.

As far as supporting the administration is concerned, I support the administration; but I do not think it is breaking ranks with the administration if the Congress of the United States in the exercise of its responsibility with regard to appropriations feels on occasion that maybe the estimates from our own administration are still a little too high. So, as far as I am concerned, I want to say again, let us not deceive ourselves. There is a demand in the country that Federal spending be cut back; certainly, it should not be done recklessly, but I think we have got to find ways and means to get along with a little less and try to do the job with a little less. If we do not do that, then again may I say you never will get taxes down out of the stratosphere and you never will give our people the tax relief they ought to have, nor will you be able to carry on with the security of the country militarily without losing the very freedoms at home for which we fight abroad.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] is recognized.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, the comment that has been made in reference to the so-called economy program, that there is a plea for reduction of taxes, is probably very true. But a reduction proposed by the committee in this item is not going to give to the general taxpayer of this country any reduction in the tax he pays to the Federal Government. The money that goes into this fund is set by law and is paid by the employer and goes into this designated fund.

In reducing the administrative amount which is actually spent in the State agencies in the respective States what you are doing is cutting down the staff for sound administration and allowing claims to build up which in turn will create a very unhealthy situation on the part of those who are seeking their employment benefits or making application for the assistance which is set by the law of this country and the laws of the various States. It is an age-old fight. The States over the years have needed additional money for administrative purposes, and right today a great many of the States are in here supporting requests for additional money for investigative and prosecution purposes where they think there is fraud; and we find the requests of the States supported by the departmental secretaries who deal with the situation. Here we have a recommendation from the committee without any basic explanation as to why we should accept the recommendation. I think the pending amendment is worthwhile and should be supported because whenever we reduce the administrative expense without explanation, whether it be by State legislature or in the national Congress, it is my observation that the result of such action is one by which the basic law is hampered or crippled and cannot be effectively administered. In this case, a case where people do not argue against the soundness of the fundamental law in giving assistance to people over a period of unemployment, I am sure no one would want to reduce the administrative amount, thereby creating a situation where a backlog of cases is built up, claims cannot be processed, investigations cannot be made. This produces a situation whereby the law is nullified by lack of funds. To reduce the administrative expense fund as recommended here would actually bring about that result. The States and the secretaries in charge have asked for an amount that will only allow them to give proper administration.

Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment should be supported.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman correctly points out that this three-tenths of 1 percent does not come from the general tax fund. It is a set aside fund and the Federal Government is in fact trustee of the fund.

Mr. SHELLEY. That is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If this fund is paid directly to the States, then it would be a different proposition, because the States then would have adequate money to handle their own funds; but under the basic Federal law we become the trustees of this particular fund. Now to deny the States part of this fund which we act as trustee for, is, in my opinion, a violation of trust. To a certain extent we have obligated ourselves by custom to give these funds back to the States in order to administer this overall program. The fact that we are denying it to them is in effect denying to them money that is collected from individuals for that very purpose.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, there is no economy in the proposal to reduce this figure below the amount requested by the Department. This money is a trust fund to provide for the administration of this program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This is not a trust fund. It is a tax levied by the Federal Government and paid into the Treasury.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. With the express understanding it is to be used for administrative purposes in connection with carrying out that part of the organic law to which it applies.

Mr. MOSS. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The money paid into the Treasury is put there for a specific purpose. It is collected as part of the contributions to the unemployment insurance fund. These collections from the employees and employers are held in trust by the Federal Government and paid out to relieve the economic burden on persons in covered jobs when they are out of work. The fact that part of the money collected is used for administration of the unemployment aid program does not make the entire fund or any part of it any less of a trust fund.

Mr. McCORMACK. We all know it belongs to the States.

Mr. MOSS. I have always regarded it as a trust fund to provide for the payment of administrative overhead to the respective States. I know the effect on the State of California of the cuts of 1948. I know that no economy resulted from those cuts. I know that we lost many valued and experienced employees from the unemployment-insurance office staff in Sacramento because we could no longer pay them. I know that no economy resulted when we were less able to do an adequate job of investigating the applicants for unemployment insurance. I know that no economy resulted when we were unable to find jobs for unemployed people as quickly as we should have and thereby reduce the total payments from the unemployment-insurance fund.

I know that in my State of California we have long regarded this as a program of feast or famine. We have been consistently denied a sufficient appropriation to give this program the type of administration we should, whether you apply the yardstick of Government administration or the yardstick of business administration. You do not save by reducing administrative effectiveness. You are violating the promises made by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle to the American people last fall. They promised the people they would increase the administrative effectiveness at all levels of this Government.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am going to ask the gentleman if he knows that the California Legislature ordered an investigation of this fund, and whether he knows that the report resulting from that investigation stated that, during the calendar year 1952, 17 percent of all claims received were fraudulent or improper?

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentleman for bringing that point out. I was just going to. You can improve the administrative effectiveness if you give California the staff to do the job. The investigation in California showed that there were abuses. We know that most of them stem from an inadequate staff to do the job that we are charged to do by law. The only way to provide an adequate staff is to provide adequate funds.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to ask the gentleman how Secretary of Labor Durkin is going to get rid of some of these administrators that have been handling this job unless we cut some appropriations out of their administrative cost.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman knows that is at the State level, and the point he brings out was very effectively covered in the report of the investigation by the California State Legislature to which he referred. The report recommended certain administrative changes which must be handled at the State level. A drastic cut in administrative funds in the hope the cut will permit Secretary Durkin to get rid of some of his employees will not help the administration of the unemployment insurance program at the State level.

Since the gentleman from Iowa has referred to the investigation of the unemployment insurance program administration in California, it would be well to look at some of the recommendations of the California State Legislature committee which conducted the investigation. They estimated 17 percent of the 1952 payments were either fraudulent or improper and they recommended eight administrative changes to prevent future fraudulent payments.

The first recommendation was that there be an effort to "obtain additional

funds for the express purpose of combating fraudulent or improper claims payments." Of the other 7 recommended changes in administrative procedure, 4 called for changes in office procedure, and the other 3 suggested moves which would mean a more expensive administration of the program. The State investigating committee suggested a post-audit of claims payments; a program of more frequent interviews of claimants, and the employment of outside consultants to study the operation of the unemployment program in California. As the gentleman from Iowa said, the California State Legislature found a large percentage of fraudulent benefit payments, but he failed to add that the recommended remedy was to increase, not decrease, funds for administration of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 72, noes 76.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. JAVITS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 109, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under the act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), including temporary employment of persons without regard to the civil service laws, $1,250,000.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday during the general debate, I was absent from the floor because we were having a meeting of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, and the marking up of that bill. Consequently, I missed most of the debate, but of course the ranking member on this side, the gentleman from Rhode Island and a veteran on this committee, was here and he spoke my sentiments. I take this time now to say just a few words in general about the bill.

On this bill, I have gone along with the committee on a good many of the cuts which were made—cuts that hurt, because I felt there was need to cut on many of these appropriations in the effort to balance the budget. But I have not gone along with all of the cuts which were made. Particularly, I have not gone along and have protested in committee and out of committee, the cuts which were made on hospital construction, the cuts which were made on the appropriations for control of tuberculosis, vocational education, and several other items. I particularly do not go along with the committee on some of the statements that are made in this report. For example, as to this very appropriation which has just been read by the Clerk, the report says with respect to salaries and expenses for the Mexican farm labor program:

The committee had serious misgivings about this program, which guarantees to foreign agricultural workers coming into this country, many things such as medical care for sickness or injury incurred on the jobs.

I do not go along with any of those statements in this committee's report, which we of course did not see until it was printed. Then the report further says: "However in view of the recent approval of an extension of the basic legislation by a large majority of the House of Representatives, the committee is recommending a continuation of appropriations." This statement might be misleading for, contrary to inference which may be gained from this statement in the report—the committee allowed—and I am going to ask the chairman if this is not correct, the committee allowed this appropriation only for the first half of the fiscal year because this program of Mexican labor ends on December 31, and the Department asked for money only to wind up the program by December 31. The committee discussed only the funds needed up to that time, and recommended the appropriation of only enough money on the old program to last until December 31. If the program is extended by enacting into law of the bill which has already passed the House, necessarily they will have to have more appropriations. May I ask the chairman if that is not correct?

Mr. BUSBEY. I think that is a true statement which has been made by the gentleman from New Mexico when he says that we considered this for 6 months only because the program expires on December 31 of this year.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, before resuming my seat I want to congratulate and compliment the chairman of this committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the leadership of the House, for the practice which has been established this year of bringing to the floor these appropriation bills the week after they have been reported by the committee, instead of on the day following the report. I think that is an excellent practice, because it gives the membership of the House an opportunity to find out what is in these bills before they come to the floor. I think it is a very salutary practice. I hope in 1955 when the Democrats come back into power we shall continue to follow that practice. It is very salutary, as I said, and it is very considerate of the membership of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

First, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from New Mexico for conceding the 1954 election. I think, however, he is conceding it the wrong way.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time because what I have to say applies more to the succeeding sections of the bill and is general in nature.

Mr. Chairman, President Eisenhower, in the state of the Union message, February 2, 1953, discussed his plans for the Department of Labor in the following words:

The administration intends to strengthen and to improve the services which the Department of Labor can render to the worker and to the whole national community. This Department was created, just 40 years ago, to serve the entire Nation. It must aid, for example, employers and employees alike in improving training programs that will develop skilled and competent workers. It must enjoy the confidence and respect of labor and industry in order to play a significant role in the planning of America's economic future.

The President chose as Secretary of Labor one of the most respected leaders in the American labor movement—a man whose probity and ability have never been questioned. Martin Durkin took the job of carrying out in his Department the jobs entrusted to it by Congress in a wide variety of economic and social fields. Many of these jobs are in protection of the unorganized workers of this country, since Mr. Durkin's fellow union members, through collective bargaining, are quite well equipped and willing to take care of their own problems with their employers, and without Government intervention. That is the way it should be in a free country.

But the administration and enforcement of the laws which we have placed in the Department of Labor call for tools and men to handle them.

Secretary Durkin himself showed his willingness to economize by cutting back his Department's budget, under the Truman estimates, by more than $10 million. He voluntarily offered this to Congress—a cut of more than 4 percent.

But now the Appropriations Committee has gone far beyond, and is cutting through the flesh into the bone, to a point where there is grave doubt that the Department will be able to do its work.

Instead of the more than 4-percent cut by the Secretary of Labor, the committee has cut about 15 percent on the overall budget, and it has cut the administrative or payroll budget of Mr. Durkin's Department by about 18 percent.

This administrative budget amounted to only 9 percent, 9 cents out of every dollar, of the Labor Department money, the other 91 cents being used for grants to the States, for payment of compensation to workers injured in the Federal service, and for unemployment insurance for veterans.

The Department has only 5,900 employees, and is by far the smallest Cabinet agency. Yet, under the House committee cut, Secretary Durkin is being forced to issue layoff and dismissal notices to more than 600 people, over 10 percent of his force, next week. And this is being done after the Department employment had been reduced by more than 1,000 during the last 10 or 12 months.

This Department operates in a field of human relations and services rendered to people under laws passed by Congress, attempting to help people in situations where they cannot help themselves. This applies to the exploited

child worker. It also applies to businessmen who use statistics which no businessman or corporation could get for itself.

It appears on the record that the committee has gone too far, and has cut to a point where these acts of Congress cannot be efficiently carried out, where the constructive efforts of the Department to strengthen the national economy will actually be hampered.

Specifically, the heaviest cuts apply to the Department's functions for the promotion of skilled training through apprenticeship, enforcement of the wage-hour and child-labor laws, and development of job-safety training and programs.

The House committee has specifically eliminated all of the Labor Department's budget items for carrying on the defense activities which up to now have been paid for under national-defense appropriation bills. Now, this seems to me to be a very dangerous procedure. The defense emergency continues, and we are appropriating for defense operations to other agencies. The Labor Department's work in statistics, in safety programs for defense plants, and in training, has been recognized in two wars and in the current defense program, as vital to building our defenses.

Yet the committee has eliminated every cent for these defense activities. This confronts Secretary Durkin with the impossible choice of eliminating all these defense activities, or eliminating other vital, regular activities upon which business and industry, management, and labor both look to the Department to supply.

Mr. Chairman, I think this committee report falls short of President Eisenhower's recommendation in his state of the Union message of February 2, 1953, which I applauded then and applaud now, which I supported then and support now. Millions of workers who voted Republican last November are entitled to the services of a strong, efficient Department of Labor under a competent, strong, efficient Republican administration.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely regret the action of the committee in not approving the Javits amendment. There are some other elements of this labor situation that I think it would be well for my colleagues to know about. For instance, I sat through 2½ months of hearings by the Committee on Labor, and one-third of the 100 or more witnesses who appeared before that committee expressed regret at the delay on the part of the National Labor Relations Board in processing both appeals by labor and appeals by industry. There were instances in which there had been delay of as much as 3 years. It was stated particularly by the majority members of the Committee on Labor that what was needed was more and better examiners and more and better field men so as to process those cases.

Imagine my surprise when I found in this bill that the National Labor Relations Board is being reduced by approximately $800,000; that the National Mediation Board is being reduced, that the Mediation and Conciliation Service is being reduced. The members of the committee applauded the excellent job that was done by the Mediation Service under the late Cyrus Ching and said they thought a great deal of work being done by the Labor Board could very well be done by the Mediation Service. It was very generally expressed by both labor and industry that something should be done to improve the facilities and the record being made by the National Labor Relations Board, so I am surprised that some Members of the majority here do not complain about the cut in these particular items.

The Clerk read as follows:

Women's Bureau

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11–16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, $300,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 9, line 9, strike out "$300,000" and insert "$360,000."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, this matter was discussed on the floor of the House yesterday and I am sure the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] wants it made clear that this amendment was originally to have been offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON]. Unfortunately she has been temporarily called off the floor. The Clerk, therefore, had to report the amendment as having been offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I explained yesterday why I would support the amendment, and wish to say now that the committee agrees to it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to offer an amendment to this section because, believing as I do that furthering the welfare of its citizens is one of the prime reasons for Government, I am deeply concerned with the proposed cut in the Labor Department budget which deprive the Women's Bureau of roughly one-sixth of its present appropriation.

Today our country needs the best services of all its workers, men and women, to keep our defense program and our civilian economy at the high level required, and this state of affairs is likely to be with us for a long time. When one in every three workers is a woman and when over half of those working women are married women living with their families—working to help maintain the family standard of living, working also in response to pleas that trained teachers, trained nurses, trained social workers, and trained operatives in plants are serving the public interest as well as their own economic needs—it is little enough for the Government to provide $360,000 to supply all of us with information that would provide a basis of knowledge and understanding of those things which this Congress has authorized the Women's Bureau to do in the act establishing it, namely, "to promote the welfare of wage-earning women, improve their working conditions, increase their efficiency, and advance their opportunities for profitable employment." As I understand the situation, if the cut to the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor were to stand, it would mean taking away 9 or 10 jobs out of 58, and that would mean that they would have to give up essential parts of the program. I think most of you know that this is the only place in Government where any policy with regard to the economic interest of women can be formed.

I am clear in my own mind as to the value of this investment. I am morally certain that not only the women of my own constituency but women throughout the United States would share my conviction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wage and Hour Division

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35–45), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and not to exceed $3,000 for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division, $6 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 9, line 20, strike out "$6 million" and insert "$7,339,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because this is one of the agencies in the Department of Labor that has received the stiffest cut.

Let me point out that the Wage and Hour Division has, over the past several years, had its staff cut back each year. The budgeted positions of the Division have been reduced from a high of 2,417 to their request for 1954 of 1,318, a decrease of almost 50 percent.

The Fair Labor Standards Act, which the Division administers, is complex and ever changing as a result of court decisions and the development of regulations and interpretations. As new regulations are developed or interpretative questions resolved, it is necessary for the Division to give advice and counsel to employers in affected industries so that they may conform their practices to the requirements of the law.

The need for keeping employers advised as to their responsibilities under the law is obvious. An employer may violate the law either willfully or unwittingly. In either event, he is accruing liabilities in the form of back wages

legally due his employees and is subject to suit under section 16 of the act for double the amount found to be due. Then, too, there is the element of equal treatment under the law. An employer who violates the law by not paying wages properly obtains a competitive advantage over the employer who is conducting his business in full compliance with the provisions of the law.

The manner in which employers are kept advised by the Division of their responsibilities under the law are many and varied. No informational or educational media is overlooked. The most effective, however, is the direct advice and counsel that is given to individual employers and groups of employers through the Division's regional and field offices. These offices are strategically located at points throughout the country, where there are the greatest concentrations of industry, to service the public and to let employers know how the law affects them and their business. It is only through this method that there can be any assurance of reasonable compliance with the complex provisions of the law administered by the Division.

A reduction from the revised budget estimate would result in the necessity for closing a number of regional and field offices throughout the country and for reducing staff in the national office. Employers and employees throughout the country would be inconvenienced by the closing of offices necessitating travel to more distant points to seek advice and counsel on problems affecting them. The effect of the reduction would immediately weaken the effective program that has been carried out by the Division through its field organization to educate and inform the employers and employees of the country of their responsibilities and rights under the law. It is only through this approach to the administration of this law that it has been possible to obtain reasonable compliance with the inspection staff that is now provided.

A reduction in the budget will also result in decreasing the already limited number of investigations the Division can make. Any further curtailment of investigations will be detrimental to both employers and employees. Let us not cut this staff so they will be unable to help prevent employers from being sued for double damages by their employees.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, several of the cuts in the budget for the Department of Labor are, in my opinion, false economy. While some of the cuts are relatively small in the amount of dollars involved, I believe that the damage that these cuts will incur is great. A good example is the cut in the appropriation for the enforcement of the Federal wage and hour law. The Fogarty amendment proposes to restore the cut in the appropriation which the committe made in the recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget. We have on the statute books the Federal wage and hour law. Both political parties have endorsed this law. If this law is to have the effect for which it was intended, it must be enforced. The appropriation which pays for the enforcement of this law and for the education of the people, both employees and employers, as to the provisions of this law, has been cut approximately 25 percent. During this last year when the appropriation of this enforcement agency was 25 percent more than was proposed for next year, the agency was running far behind in its work. As I stated before, the work of this Bureau consists of more than just the enforcement of the law. It consists also of educating the people as to the provisions of the law. If this cut is carried through it will decrease the effectiveness of this Bureau by at least 25 percent, which will mean a reduction in the Bureau where both the employees and employers can get information regarding the law and its administration. The 85 regional offices will be cut by approximately 25 percent.

There are other cuts in the budget for the Labor Department which, I believe, will be injurious to our general economy; but I will further mention only one of these.

A striking example is a cut in the appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Standards, which has been reduced from approximately $900,000 to $624,000, a cut of $374,000 below the request of the Bureau of the Budget. I have never heard anyone criticize the job that is being done by the Bureau of Labor Standards. The efficient operation of that Bureau has saved thousands of laborers from death and injury. Yet, funds for that Bureau are being cut approximately 30 percent.

The job of curbing the killing and maiming of American workers was tremendous last year. More than 2 million workers were injured. There were three times as many people killed last year in on-the-job accidents as were killed in combat in Korea. Of those injured, 84,000 suffered permanent disability. Millions of man-days of work were lost due to these injuries.

The Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Standards promotes safe working conditions throughout industry. The National Safety Council's report shows the magnificent work that the Bureau of Labor Standards has accomplished. After careful study, this Bureau cut its budget requests as low as it could and still properly carry out the functions assigned it under the law. The Budget Bureau then investigated this budget and arrived at the figure of approximately $900,000. Yet, the Committee has cut this amount 30 percent, which can, in my opinion, only mean that the efficiency of the Bureau in preventing accidents will be correspondingly reduced.

I also want to point out that the revised budgets for these departments were worked out by each department at the request of President Eisenhower, after he was inaugurated. The Bureau of the Budget also reinvestigated these requests on the order of President Eisenhower. I am deeply interested in sound economy, but I am also aware that these departments of the Government are dependent upon these appropriations to carry out the functions assigned to them under the law. If Congress believes that these functions should be curtailed, it should curtail them by legislation, and not by strangling the Departments, such as the Labor Department, by denying the necessary funds to carry out the job delegated them by the Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed unfortunate that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to reduce the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor $1,639,000. Of course this is only one of the unreasonable cuts in the various divisions of the Department of Labor. A major reduction of this kind in the Wage and Hour Division means that Members of Congress, industrial management, labor organizations and numerous other groups throughout the country will be denied the services which this large Department renders to the people. This reduction will greatly interfere with the operations of the minimum wage laws, the Walsh-Healey Act and other services to carry out laws which Congress has enacted in former years. The reduction set out in this bill when added to reductions in the last 3 or 4 years, will mean that the funds to operate the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor have been cut about 50 percent in that length of time. This is nothing more than legislating through appropriations. It is an indirect way for the opponents of organized labor and of the Labor Department of our Government to come in the back door to cripple labor legislation which is now on the books. The money that this amendment will restore in itself is but a small part of the major reductions the administration and the leaders of the Appropriations Committee have inflicted on the Department of Labor.

The departments under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Labor have been cut almost 20 percent in the recommendations of the Appropriation Committee for this year's budget. The Bureau of Labor Standards has been cut $374,000—Veterans' Reemployment Service, $46,000 and the Bureau of Apprentice Training, $700,000. This large reduction for the apprentice training program not only cripples industry throughout the country but will greatly hamper our defense effort. During the last 12 years, millions of young boys have spent several years in the military forces of the United States. While they were thus serving, they could not prepare themselves for future livelihood through takthe advantage of the additional opportunities of apprentice training to prepare themselves to qualify as a member of the various crafts doing specialized work in our industrial economy. We can read in almost every daily paper, where defense industries are advertising for mechanics, bricklayers, plasterer, molders, glass cutters and young men who are qualified and experienced in various other lines of the skilled workmanship. Millions of our young veterans have been unable to adequately prepare themselves through apprentice training and by making a reduction of this magnitude for this division of our Labor Department, the number of graduate apprentices will be fewer than at present.

I believe that major reductions in appropriations for these departments is false economy, will hinder our defense efforts and merely postpone the day until

industry can hire the required number of skilled craftsmen.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has been cut $700,000, the Employees Compensation by $80 million. These are all services which aid industrial management and organized labor in the carrying on of our mammoth war economy. The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor has been reduced $60,000. This has been a reduction of 17 percent and will affect the working conditions of over 20 million women in our country.

The above are some of the unwise curtailments in the Labor budget and I might mention here that the Appropriations Committee was indeed mistaken when they reduced the Food and Drug Administration by $660,000. The Department looks after the health and welfare of every man, woman, and child in America and protects them from purchasing substandard drugs, bad food, and so forth.

The large reduction in the Public Health Service and the Office of Education will in the long run, prove not to be economy, but will curb the great efforts which are being expended against cancer, heart, neuralgia, rheumatism, arthritis, blindness, mental, venereal, and other diseases.

This Committee should also restore the $900,000 reduction in the appropriation for Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University. Both of these institutions are practically under the same management and are doing a great work for the Negro people not only in this locality, but throughout the country.

I firmly believe that every effort should be made to economize, but when the people of America are called upon to eliminate and curtail necessary services like the above, I am of the opinion that it will prove false economy and set the clock of progress backward.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the amount provided in the bill is more than was ever appropriated for this division, with the exception of the last 4 years. It is almost exactly equal to the appropriation made for 1950. The table on page 415 of the hearings indicates that the bulk of the work of this division is in connection with spot checking, and visiting new establishments where there are no complaints nor other indications of noncompliance with the act. The table shows that they anticipate spending less than 25 percent of their investigational activities on complaints. On questioning, it was found that during the first half of fiscal 1953 complaints had actually dropped 25 percent from 1952, instead of having increased, as the division had estimated.

My good friend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] said that if you do not believe in the 75-cent minimum wage, or if you do not believe in the Walsh-Healey Act, do not vote for this amendment. It is not quite as simple as that. Former Secretary of Labor, Mr. Maurice Tobin, just before he left office—I think it was one of his last acts—made a finding that "locality" under the Walsh-Healey Act covers the entire Nation. The cotton-textile industry has an injunction which is pending in the courts now, and it will take 18 months or 2 years for a question of this magnitude to be settled. Therefore, the work of the Wage and Hour Division should be reduced materially.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois if it is not true that the complaints are 25 percent below last year?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes. Not only that, but if you will take the time to read the 1952 annual report of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor you will find that they claimed to have investigated a lot of establishments that really were not investigated at all.

They showed a high number of investigations by going into small establishments, making quick checks, and doing a small amount of interrogation; and they called those investigations. I have personal knowledge of various instances where these investigators have gone in and harassed the employees and employers.

The funds available to the Wage-Hour Division for inspection or enforcement activity, even with the reductions recommended, are certainly sufficient to provide an adequate program. I should like to remind the Congress that the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted in 1938 and the Walsh-Healey Act in 1936. The provisions of these laws are well known to employers and employees alike—and every administrator has recognized that voluntary compliance by employers is the rule, and not the exception.

Certainly, any reduction in enforcement activity that may be necessitated by the recommended reduction in the Division's appropriation will not reduce enforcement activity below a sound or safe level.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is not this the agency of the Federal Government that supervises the operations of plants to make sure there are no violations of the child-labor law? Is not this the only agency that does that?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes; but this is a very small part of their work.

With most of the production of this country being handled by large industrial organizations, where they are highly unionized, they have for the most part, been living up to the wage and hour laws very rigidly. There are very few complaints on them. If there are violations, the unions are in a position to take care of the situation.

Mr. YATES. Are there not only approximately 16 million union members out of the whole working force in the country? Therefore, that is not a good argument in this respect. The unions cannot police the entire field of working conditions. This is the only agency that can make sure that the child-labor law is not abused.

Mr. BUSBEY. The unions watch everything in the entire plants. A plant does not have to be 100 percent unionized for the union to see that no labor laws are violated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 65, noes 95.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Food and Drug Administration

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 301–392); the Tea Importation Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41–50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C. 141–149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C. 401–411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 61–64); reporting and illustrating the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed $2,000 for payment in advance for special test and analyses by contract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement operations; $5,000,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 11, line 11, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$5,648,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this is the first amendment to be offered under the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Salaries and expenses, Food and Drug Administration:	
1953 appropriation	$5,600,000
1954 estimate (revised)	5,648,000
House committee allowance	5,000,000
Total	−648,000
Restoration requested	586,000

The $5 million for Food and Drug Administration carried in the bill reported by the House Appropriations Committee is 10.7 percent below the 1953 appropriation of $5,600,000, 11.5 percent below President Eisenhower's revised 1954 budget of $5,648,000, and 11.7 percent below the original estimate of $5,663,000.

The amount of $5,586,000 requested as an appropriation in lieu of the $5 million recommended by the House committee is $62,000 below the revised budget estimate of $5,648,000 for 1954. The request for restoration of $586,000 deletes the item of replacement of automobiles and foregoes the additional personnel requested for the increased work on the illegal sale of dangerous drugs which causes so many human tragedies.

The cut proposed by the House committee will drastically lessen the protection the public has been getting under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Enforcement cannot be curtailed against poisonous foods and dangerous drugs and cosmetics; that work is already far from adequate. Work on filthy and decomposed foods under which about 164 tons are being seized every week will have to be reduced by about 25 percent, and that on cheats, frauds, and fakes, including sale of oleomargarine as butter, will have to be curtailed even more.

In its report the committee points out that since 1947 the number of Food and Drug Administration employees in grade 14 or higher has increased from 12 to 53, and suggests that if this represents the increased productivity of these 47 employees they should be able to offset the $648,000 reduction from the budget. Actually, the increase under this appropriation was from 11 in 1947 to 52 in 1952, or 41, while the additional increase of 6 occurred in the self-supporting appropriation of certification and inspection services.

The difference between the annual salaries of these 41 positions and what they would be getting had they not been advanced beyond grade 13 is approximately $30,600 per annum. Since 1947 Congress has greatly increased both the operating and management workloads of the Food and Drug Administration by widening the scope of the law through the Miller amendment, the oleomargarine amendment, and the Durham-Humphrey amendment. During the preceding war years the Food and Drug Administration had postponed promotions to save funds for vitally needed operations. Promotions since 1947 have been in observance of the mandate of Congress in the Classification Act that equal pay be given for equal work. Each of the promotions conformed to standards in effect throughout the civil service.

On May 14, 1953, the committee reported in the Department of Agriculture bill an appropriation of $14,160,000 for the enforcement of the Meat Inspection Act. That provides for the necessary inspection of 100 percent of the meat products destined for interstate commerce.

Under its current appropriation the Food and Drug Administration can inspect only a small fraction of 1 percent of the output of other foods and of all drugs and cosmetics. The hazards to consumer health and welfare from meat products are only a small fraction of the combined hazards from other foods and from drugs and cosmetics.

Under currently restricted programs on economic cheats alone, consumers are saved more than the 3.6 cents per capita tax required to support the present appropriation; health protection is clear profit.

Average employment under the House committee cut would be reduced from 897 estimated for 1953 and 891 requested for 1954, to 790, a reduction of 107 under 1953 and 101 under 1954. The restoration requested would permit of employment 7 below that requested in the revised 1954 estimate.

The effects of the cut recommended by the House committee would be as follows:

Project, commodity, or item and House committee reduction	
Work on filthy and decomposed foods	$391,500
Development of food standards	16,900
Work on other acts enforced by Food and Drug Administration, and miscellaneous project work	21,400
Inspection of foods offered for importation	48,300
Administrative services	34,100
Enforcement of the oleomargarine amendment	74,150
Delete item requested for increased personnel for work on illegal sale of dangerous drugs without prescription	36,000
Delete item requested for replacement of 27 automobiles	25,650
Total reduction under House committee recommendation	648,000

The effects of the cut after the requested restoration would be as follows:

Increased work on illegal sale of dangerous drugs	−$36,000
Replacement of automobiles	−25,650
Round off	−350
Restoration requested	586,000
Total proposed appropriation for 1954	5,586,000

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is also cut $600,000 below last year, is that not correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Chairman, again I say in 1947 and 1948 when the Republicans had control of the Congress, this was one agency which they absolutely refused to touch because it is one of the most important agencies in our Government. This is the agency that protects the lives of people in our country. This is the agency that inspects food. This is the agency that has to do with the drugs that we use. This is the agency that you read about day after day, which takes from the shelves of drugstores all over the country some new drug which has turned out to be poisonous and may have killed people in a community. This is the agency that protects the public. It was testified only a short while ago before our committee that some store was injecting water into their turkeys around Thanksgiving time and making the turkeys weight 4 or 5 pounds more. If it had not been for the Food and Drug Administration, that case would never have been brought to light so far as we know. If you want an agency which looks after the purity of the foods that you eat, and if you want an agency that protects the water that you drink, or the medicine that you need when you are ill, this is the agency. This is the most foolish cut in my opinion that this committee has made. It is a cut that has never been made before in all the years I have been on this particular subcommittee because they have come before us year after year and told us of the advances they have made and the savings they have made for the people throughout the country in bringing to light all of the frauds which exist. This is the most severe cut that they have ever had.

Even on the item having to do with the control of filthy and decomposed foods has been cut. About 164 tons of filthy and decomposed foods are being seized every week by the Food and Drug Administration. If you want to take a chance on allowing filthy and decomposed food to be sold in the market place, and eating that kind of stuff, then you can go along with the committee, and refuse to go along with this particular amendment which I have offered. I know there are Members of Congress who have found fault with some of these decisions by the Food and Drug Administration, but I think they have always been honest decisions. They are decisions which perhaps did not affect your particular constituents, but they did in fact help to save the health and lives of men and women by refusing to allow unhealthy food or poisonous drugs to be sold, which are killing people at the present time. I hope the Congress will not say that we are going to cut an agency of Government that is responsible for the food and drugs that we use at the present time. There is no other agency in Government that gives us that protection. There is no other way we can get that protection. It seems to me that every person, when he gets an ache or pain, will take a chance on any kind of drug. They are flocking to the drugstores, trying this and that to straighten themselves out. If we do not have an agency like this, you are taking a chance and I am taking a chance, and every living person in this country is taking a chance.

I hope that this is one amendment the House will agree to today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. YATES. I object, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have some time.

Mr. BUSBEY. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is exactly correct. This is one agency of the Federal Government that must be protected because this agency protects the people of this Nation.

I urge you to take a look at the hearings. See just what this agency does, the comprehensive, essential duties it performs. It guards the American people against rotten food, harmful drugs, against mislabeling, against ruinous cosmetics, against watered

poultry, and against importations of unhealthful patent medicines.

You who come from dairy areas will be interested to know that this agency protects the public from illegal sales of oleomargarine as butter. It guards against dangerous therapeutic methods.

When the Supreme Court recently announced a decision that limited the jurisdictional scope of this agency, I received a number of letters from women in my district, as I am sure you did, urging the Congress to pass a law immediately to remedy the limitation imposed by the Supreme Court. The women know how important it is for the family's food to be safe and healthful. They know the good work this agency was performing. It would unquestionably be shortsighted economy to hamstring this agency by clinging to the committee's recommendation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course we all admit we should protect the agency, but is there any evidence that $5 million will not do the job or that $5,700,000, or whatever the figure is, will do the job?

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will look at page 46 of the hearings where the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] asked Mr. Crawford why the fines were decreasing; he replied that the loss was attributable to the fact that there was a decrease in the inspection staff. Obviously, if you have a decrease in the amount of funds necessary for the operation of this agency, you will have fewer inspectors, you will have fewer people checking up to maintain the high standards of quality in food and drugs that the American people want and deserve.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us what the decrease comes out of. Is it general administration or inspectors' salaries, or what?

Mr. FOGARTY. It will come out of both, but there will be certain provisions that they will not be able to carry on. As I said, they are now seizing 164 tons of decomposed food every week. It will cut that to about 50 percent. That is one thing they will have to cut.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. They have now 200 inspectors.

Mr. YATES. That is correct. They have 208 now, as opposed to 243 that they had before this year. If the committee's figure is approved, the Department will have to discharge more inspectors. The public is bound to suffer.

This is a good agency. I refer the chairman of the subcommittee to his own statement on page 45 of the hearings, where he stated it was a good agency:

> I might say I had occasion to make a personal investigation concerning the horsemeat scandal in Chicago last year.
>
> In connection with my investigation I went into the Chicago office of the Food and Drug Administration and the people there were very cooperative and helpful in giving me the information and data needed.
>
> Mr. BUSBEY. Their cooperation in helping to prosecute the people who were selling horsemeat for beef was excellent.

He compliments the people in the Chicago office in the job they are doing; yet he advocates cutting its funds to the point where it will not be able to continue to do its fine work.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. For the benefit of the gentleman from Minnesota I may say that this is only a $5,663,000 request for the inspection of these dangerous foods all over the country. In 1953 we appropriated almost $15 million just for meat inspection alone in the Department of Agriculture. I am for that, but here we are reducing by $600,000 an item that touches people all over the country.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It is true, of course, that the Department of Agriculture in addition to inspecting beef inspects fruits and vegetables.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will permit me to finish I would direct his attention to page 41 of the hearings where the filth and disease in foods are described, evils which should be condemned and corrected. This is one bureau of the Government that is doing a necessary and admirable job in protecting the American people and it in turn should be commended, not curtailed by appropriations cuts.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for calling attention to the fact that I paid a compliment to the Food and Drug Administration office in Chicago for its cooperation in securing the information I wanted. It would have been rather embarrassing for me to tell about my intimate knowledge of this program, as it operates out at the ground level, but if he wants to bring this out I appreciate it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I regret I cannot yield at this time.

In this bill, we allow the sum of $5 million for the Food and Drug Administration. You can do a lot of inspecting with $5 million. In addition, the departments of health of the various States and cities inspect the same things.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Not at this time; I have only a few minutes.

The bill is in excess of the amount appropriated for 1950 and all prior years. The committee has relieved the Food and Drug Administration of the expense of purchasing 27 new automobiles by providing language in the bill which will allow the Secretary to transfer necessary automobiles from other bureaus that have excess cars.

There has been wholesale upgrading of positions in the Food and Drug Administration since the end of World War II. The number of positions in the top Civil Service grades, GS–14 through 18, has increased from 12 in 1947 to 59 in 1952. During this time the total number of positions has actually decreased slightly. There have been no major changes in the law during this period which would place additional responsibilities and burdens on the employees and justify higher grades than in 1947.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I must yield to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. I feel I would not be honest with the House if I did not call attention to what they have done up in my country. There, a lot of beets are raised and canned. In order to can them they have to be cut, and they have a machine that cuts them in the form of a globe, round. The finished product is advertised and labeled as cut beets. The Food and Drug Administration, in spite of the fact that the label clearly and honestly disclosed what they were, refused to let them go on and can those beets. If they would stop doing things that are ridiculous they would have plenty of money with which to operate.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. May I say that, in my opinion, the basic work of this agency is most valuable. The members of the committee would be the last ones in the House of Representatives to cripple these activities. I think that the $5,000,000 allowed in this bill will give them ample funds to continue any and all necessary activities.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would like to say to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], that I have not been able to get that New York beet case straight in my mind yet. He spoke to us about that in subcommittee. There are other articles of food on which the labels must conform to certain standards. If there is a premium on what they call baby beets and they cut up a big beet to make it look like a baby beet, under these standards, the Food and Drug Administration has the right to make that decision.

Mr. TABER. That is ridiculous.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is the fact. Check it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 61, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Freedmen's Hospital

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital;

payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; $2,750,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That legal residents of areas outside the District of Columbia shall be given care and treatment only if arrangements are made in advance for such persons, or the Government agency having responsibility for such persons, to reimburse Freedmen's Hospital in full for the cost of such care and treatment: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks immediately after those of Mr. BUSBEY made in reference to the amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY to the wage and hour section of this bill.)

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: Page 12, line 10, after the word "university", strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$3,250,000."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read another amendment of mine on page 13, line 1, through line 6.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: Page 13, line 1, after "each quarter", strike out through line 6 to "treatment."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, do I understand the gentleman just wanted that amendment reported for the information of the Committee? He is not undertaking to join them?

Mr. POWELL. Whatever the majority leader decides.

Mr. HALLECK. I think that it would be better to consider them separately. One has to do with an amount of money and the other has to do with an entirely different matter, as to the right of people to be admitted to hospitals.

Mr. POWELL. If there is no objection I will discuss them together, and then we can vote on them separately.

Mr. HALLECK. I would rather have them treated separately.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I asked the Clerk to read the second amendment, because they have to be discussed together even if in the opinion of our majority leader they should be voted on separately.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. May we have the amendment reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: On page 12, line 10, after "university", strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$3,250,000."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this increase is roughly about the original amount asked by the President and by Mrs. Hobby. Freedmen's Hospital is the only hospital in the Nation's Capital that cares for Negro patients without any cost.

The committee at the top of page 13—and I must bring this out—has inserted brand new language for the first time in the history of any appropriation bill stating that Freedmen's Hospital shall take care of only the legal residents of the District of Columbia only if arrangements are made in advance for those outside of the District. This rule is not applied to any other hospital in our Capital. It is absolutely preposterous; it could not work. If I were hit by a car in front of the Capitol I would have to lie in the street until New York City made advance arrangements with Freedmen's Hospital before I could be admitted. This is a town of visitors; it is a town of tourists; it is a town where people come to work from outlying communities, from Maryland, from Virginia, and under this provision no one can be treated in the only hospital treating Negroes on a free basis unless they are legal residents of the District of Columbia. So, on the basis of that preposterous type of provision they have reduced the cost of running Freedmen's Hospital $500,000.

Now, you cannot have both. If you are going to wipe out this new provision and let it remain as it was, a hospital admitting all people, then you have to increase the appropriation $500,000 as asked for by Mrs. Hobby. That is elemental.

I turned over to page 15 of the committee report and I note that St. Elizabeths Hospital was only cut $10,000. The committee in its report admits that St. Elizabeths Hospital does not have many patients from the District of Columbia. I will read the exact language: "The committee is not disposed," and so forth and so on, "so long as Federal patients are a minor part of the patient load."

So St. Elizabeths Hospital has very few patients from the District of Columbia, yet the committee does not decrease its budget. It does not have this provision for any other hospital in the District of Columbia. This is flagrant discrimination; it strikes at the very heart of the Nation's Capital, the health of the visitors and strangers and workers, who happen to be Negroes, passing through here. There is no support for this. I am sure it is an oversight on the committee's part. I trust you will consider this as I have presented it.

You cannot have one hospital only for Negroes in this town and then say that only Negroes who are legal residents of the District of Columbia can go there. What will happen to the hundreds of thousands of visitors who come here and get hurt in accidents? Where are they going to go? There is no hospital anywhere to take care of them.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. What was the budget on this matter?

Mr. POWELL. The budget on this was the amount I am asking for, $500,000 more; $3,250,000.

Mr. RAYBURN. I understood the budget was $3,304,000.

Mr. POWELL. Maybe it is.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not think the gentleman is asking for that much. He is asking for $3,250,000.

Mr. POWELL. Yes; $3,250,000.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is less than the budget.

Mr. POWELL. It is less than the budget. I respect my leader's advice on this matter. I ask the committee to endorse this amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. In scanning the budget figures, and I believe I have the right figures here, the so-called Truman budget asked for $3,246,000, the so-called Eisenhower budget $3,104,000, or 3 percent below the so-called Truman Democratic budget. The committee has cut this to $2,750,000, or about 11 percent below the Eisenhower budget, according to the figures I have.

I agree with the gentleman from New York that whether this has been done knowingly or not, this certainly presents a case of clear-cut discrimination against the visiting Negro people that come to the city of Washington and who are barred from any of the other hospitals. Therefore I think the funds should be restored. This fund should be restored according to the gentleman's amendment.

I call attention to another important thing this cut does. This hospital is the teaching hospital for the Howard University Medical School as well as being a major hospital for Negroes in the Capital. The committee has cut salaries and expenses by $446,000. It is common knowledge throughout the United States that we do not have enough doctors and enough nurses. It is my knowledge that the deficiency in doctors and nurses among the Negro population, the doctors who will attend to the needs of the Negro population, is far below the deficiency among the white doctors who attend to the white people. This is one place where the Negroes can come and learn to be doctors. Certainly, if we want to do something toward stopping socialized medicine, toward stopping this cry throughout the Nation because of the inadequacy of medical attention, this is a place where we can restore some money and restore the teaching fund for young new doctors of the Negro race at this university. For this reason, as

well as the reasons brought out by the gentleman from New York, I think this is an unwise cut, and I ask that the gentleman's amendment be sustained.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. I want to take this opportunity to compliment him on his presentation and discussion of this problem yesterday on the floor of the House. I fully agree with him in every respect. I also agree with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Here again, we find a foolhardy type of economy being thrust at us by the Members on the other side of the aisle. Freedmen's Hospital consists of a general hospital with a total of 347 beds and 51 bassinets; a tuberculosis hospital consisting of 135 beds; and an out-patient department composed of 36 organized clinics and 2 emergency operating rooms. It would appear, from the testimony set forth in the hearings on this bill, that this institution is in need of everything except patients. It is understaffed; its food rations are under standard; its facilities are badly in need of repair and expansion. One point that the committee brought out in its report is that certain communities adjacent to the District of Columbia have refused to reimburse the hospital for the care of their indigent Negroes. These nearby counties, although claiming adequate facilities for such care within their own boundaries, have been found lacking in this respect. Consequently, when an emergency case arrives at the door of Freedmen's Hospital, the patient must be admitted regardless of his residence in nearby Maryland. So many factors must be considered in the administration of a hospital—factors that we, on the outside, are not entirely aware of—that I feel we can afford to accept the testimony of the hospital officials and the Bureau of the Budget in appropriating the funds carried in the budget request.

I hope every Member of the House will vote in favor of the amendment offered by our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

There is no justification for the committee's action in cutting the appropriations for Freedmen's Hospital and for Howard University—just as there was no justification for President Eisenhower's new Budget Director to reduce the figures which the administration of President Truman proposed as a minimum on which these two fine institutions could be operated in the next fiscal year.

I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] in his efforts to restore these unnecessary and uncalled-for cuts and I sincerely hope the House membership will support him this afternoon.

Howard University is the principal college in the United States for the education of Negroes. It gives graduate work and has eight professional schools. These cuts the Republican Budget Director proposes and the additional slashes by the Appropriations Committee will mean that the college will not be able to get needed additional buildings and will also mean reduction in teacher personnel.

The Truman budget called for $4,875,000 for Howard University; the Eisenhower budget goes 44 percent below the Truman figure and proposes $2,735,000. As inadequate as the Eisenhower budget is, the committee's figure is even worse, $2,260,000.

Freedmen's Hospital is the teaching hospital for Howard University Medical School and is the major hospital for Negroes in Washington. The serious cuts taken in appropriations for this institution will seriously hamper its great work.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] to restore these funds should be adopted.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is a rather grave misunderstanding of the intent of the committee with regard to the appropriation for Freedmen's Hospital. The committee certainly does not, by any stretch of the imagination, desire to cripple the program at Freedmen's Hospital in any such manner as was described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. I can appreciate his anxiety over this appropriation. The situation at Freedmen's Hospital is this: The hospital is reimbursed by the District of Columbia for care and treatment of people who go there from the District of Columbia. People are being sent there from Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, and other nearby areas, and the hospital is receiving practically no reimbursement. The committee, for several years, has been trying to get the hospital and those nearby counties and cities to work out arrangements whereby they will pay for their patients, the same as the District of Columbia reimburses for District patients. Let me read to you the language in the report last year when the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] was the chairman of the committee. The language is as follows:

> As a result of the committee's recommendations in last year's report, the hospital officials investigated the possibility of securing reimbursement for indigent patients from Virginia and Maryland on a basis similar to that for indigent patients from the District of Columbia. Their report of progress in this regard is set forth on pages 83 and 84 of the hearings. The committee is satisfied that progress has been made but notes with regret that one nearby county that has many of its indigent residents cared for at this hospital is reported to have refused the cooperation extended by all other respondents. It is hoped that this difficulty may be resolved without the necessity of resorting to a special limitation on the use of the funds provided by this appropriation. A further report on progress made in securing reimbursements where due will be expected when the 1954 request is submitted for the committee's consideration.

Unfortunately, little progress has been made. I am willing to concede the gentleman's anxiety about the language in the bill, and the committee would seek his advice, counsel, and cooperation as to how he would change the language in order to take care of the situation I have described and also to take care of the situation which he brought up regarding emergency cases of colored persons being injured in the District of Columbia. If it would be acceptable to the gentleman from New York, we could add a proviso in the bill, right after the word "treatment" on page 6, as follows: "except emergency cases arising in the District of Columbia." The committee would have no objection to that amendment. We want to do everything possible to help, and not to retard, the situation at Freedmen's Hospital. At present, the District of Columbia is paying for the care of its patients, and the surrounding cities and counties are not paying the cost of the care given their patients.

All we were trying to do was to shift that financial burden from the Federal Government to the neighboring counties, cities, and States that have their patients cared for at the hospital. This language was not put in with any intent to damage the program of Freedmen's Hospital.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. If I do accept your change in the second amendment, then you will have to increase the allotment for the hospital, because you have based your allotment now on no patients coming in except those who are legal residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BUSBEY. Most of the patients sent there at present are from the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia reimburses the hospital for their care.

Mr. POWELL. But what about those who are not legal residents of the District of Columbia?

Mr. BUSBEY. What would the genman from New York suggest?

Mr. POWELL. I suggest that the budget be increased to take care of it.

Mr. BUSBEY. That does not solve the situation confronting us.

Mr. POWELL. I will accept your change in the amendment offered at page 13 if you will accept my amendment on page 12. You cannot increase the caseload without increasing the funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BUSBEY was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BUSBEY. I may say that, if this language will stay in the bill to apply to the surrounding neighborhoods, they certainly would not need the full amount of $500,000.

Mr. POWELL. But at the same time you will have cases that are not District of Columbia cases. I want to ask this question: Are you going to have this same language apply to all of the other hospitals, health and mental institutions under this budget in the District of Columbia, or just this one hospital dedicated to Negro patients only? You have said in your report that St. Elizabeths Hospital does not have residents of the District of Columbia except a minor portion.

Mr. BUSBEY. Seventy percent of the patient load in St. Elizabeths Hospital

is from the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia reimburses the hospital for those patients. There is very serious consideration being given, I understand, to having St. Elizabeths Hospital transferred to the District of Columbia.

Mr. POWELL. Is the non-District of Columbia case load at Freedmen's Hospital more than 50 percent? It is not. It is 18 percent.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman was more fortunate than the committee. We could not get that information.

Mr. POWELL. I got it today. In fact, I went there last night. I do not think you are doing the right thing by putting in any type of prohibitory regulations on the one Negro hospital in the District of Columbia and not putting it on all of the others.

Mr. BUSBEY. I assure the gentleman there is no one on the committee who wishes to discriminate against Freedmen's Hospital.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If this sort of arrangement goes in in respect to Freedmen's Hospital, I am certain it ought to go right across the board. I would assume that there are hospitals in the surrounding areas available.

Mr. POWELL. No; there are not. That is the great problem. The surrounding area of the District of Columbia has mushroomed so rapidly in the past years that the facilities in Maryland and Virginia are not adequate to take care of either the white or the Negro caseload. The result is that the Negro patients are being cared for mostly in the District of Columbia. With this arrangement you are saying that the patients can continue to come to the District of Columbia to be cared for—and I think they should be, because this is the crossroads; this is the No. 1 tourist attraction. We have hundreds of thousands who are working here who do not live here.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me make my position clear, because I had not known of it until the gentleman called it to my attention. I can go along with that except as to the treatment of emergency cases arising in the District of Columbia; I certainly can go along with that. But I think likewise if I understand the gentleman correctly he would agree with me that while facilities in some of these outlying areas may not be as adequate as they should be for all of the people, there is a responsibility on them to make their own facilities adequate; and, certainly, to say to them that we will take care of the whole responsibility in the District of Columbia would not be quite the way that it ought to be done, because fortunately or unfortunately there are a lot of States in the Union that are not adjacent to the District of Columbia and where also their facilities are not adequate. It is up to them to make them adequate.

Mr. POWELL. I suggest that since this is a problem which transcends Negro patients and is a District problem that we abolish this provision on page 13 for this year and give to Freedmen's Hospital its budget for this year and then the committee concern itself with the overall question of how the treatment of indigents affects all the hospitals; that we deal with the problem next year after adequate opportunity for study rather than to pick on the only Negro hospital this year.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. It would appear to me that in the case of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] he is strengthened in trying to raise this budget limit if we accept the language suggested, because then Freedmen's Hospital would have a larger load and it would need more money to carry it.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is true.

Mr. RAYBURN. So it seems to me that if the language is changed then certainly we ought to provide additional funds to meet the additional load.

Mr. BUSBEY. Not entirely. If the language were revised the way I suggested, the hospital would be reimbursed by adjacent States, at least for all but emergency cases.

Mr. RAYBURN. The States do not have to reimburse.

Mr. HALLECK. If the language on page 13 were to stay in with the proviso that was suggested by the chairman, then we would have a situation under which indigent patients from surrounding areas would necessarily have to make arrangements of their own for reimbursement to Freedmen's Hospital which in addition would in some measure at least reduce the overall expense of maintenance of the hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes in order that we may clear up this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to page 348 of the hearings. He will find that there is a very small percentage of Federal patients in St. Elizabeths Hospital; that the hospital is reimbursed for the District of Columbia patients that are there. The patients for which St. Elizabeths Hospital is not reimbursed are legally the responsibility of the Federal Government. I just wanted to clear that up for the record because I think there was a little misunderstanding on that.

Now, just to try to resolve the question and find the fair way to do it, I ask the gentleman from New York if we should agree to eliminate the language on page 13—and I am just exploring this—would the gentleman agree to raise the amount not $500,000 but to the 1953 appropriation which was $2,860,700?

Mr. POWELL. If you leave it at that amount then that means there will be no repairs this year at all. I was at Freedmen's Hospital last night after we adjourned. I would not like any Member of this body to go to Freedmen's Hospital. It is a disgrace. There are rooms there, private rooms, not the wards, that have not been painted in 10 years in that hospital. The plaster has fallen down in the private rooms. I am not going to talk about the wards. There has not been a good facelifting done there. They have no funds for the extermination of insects. They have no funds allotted for that in a hospital in the Nation's Capital which receives funds from this Congress. That is what they are asking for. They want to give the hospital a facelifting which has been due for 9 years. They have asked for it before.

Mr. BUSBEY. As the gentleman knows, all legislation is compromise in the final analysis. The gentleman has an amendment pending to increase this to $3,250,000. Would the gentleman agree to an amount of $3,104,000, which is the revised budget? I think that is exceedingly fair to everybody concerned.

Mr. POWELL. I accept that.

Mr. BUSBEY. And take out the language on page 13?

Mr. POWELL. And take out the language on page 13.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from New York would be in order to ask unanimous consent to revise his pending amendment? The second one will stand as offered. Bring it in line with the figures agreed upon.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I so ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL:

On page 12, line 10, after the word "university", strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$3,104,000."

And on page 13, line 1, after "each quarter", strike out through line 6 "and treatment."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment as corrected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that this situation has adjusted itself because an awful lot of honest misunderstanding could have resulted if the language of the bill and the amount contained in the bill were continued and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] was defeated.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I want it distinctly understood that in trying to cooperate on this matter the committee does not relinquish its position in trying to make these surrounding neighborhoods pay their share toward the support of Freedmen's Hospital.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, may I call the gentleman's attention to

the fact that the situation in the District of Columbia in relation to hospitals and hospital treatment is somewhat different from other sections of the country. I became aware of that when I introduced a bill a few years ago which passed the Congress and is now law amending the Hospital Center Act.

You will remember that there are three hospitals in the District that constituted the Hospital Center. We also passed a bill authorizing $11 million contributions by the Federal Government and the District of Columbia toward the building of either 5 or 6 other private hospitals in the District of Columbia. That bill is now law.

One of them, for example, is the Children's Hospital that will receive a grant of about $450,000 toward additions to that hospital.

Another one is the new Providence Hospital. Then there are 3 or 4 other hospitals that can receive up to 50 percent contribution in the case of the construction of a new hospital. We found that the adjoining communities in Maryland and Virginia were not able to meet the hospital requirements of the people. A good number of people living in adjoining Maryland and Virginia are people who work in the District of Columbia and because of that and other unusual conditions existing in the District in relation to hospital facilities it was recognized in the field of private hospitals that the situation justified legislative action of a favorable nature. I assume that if it exists in relation to private hospitals the same situation exists in relation to St. Elizabeths and Freedmen's Hospitals. So, I am glad that this situation has been adjusted. It can be looked into in the coming year and care and caution should be taken, as I am sure it will be, that no injustice in the future is done.

While I am on my feet, I also want to talk about the amendment that will be offered in relation to Howard University. Again, it is a situation that we should view with tolerance and with understanding. We saw the other day newspaper reports of a local election in Atlanta, Ga., where an outstanding American of the colored race, as I remember, was elected to the school board. In any event, he was elected to a public office in Atlanta. It has national significance. That was one of the finest things that I have seen happen in many years. That brings about better understanding. It shows that the relationship between Americans of different racial origins and of different colors and of different creeds has made marked advancement, and for us to cut sharply, as I think has been done—and I do not accuse the committee intentionally of intending to do so—but to cut sharply as we have in the case of Howard University, is unwise. Howard University occupies an unusual situation in relation to the universities of our country. I think if we adopt the amendment that will be offered that it will not only be justified from the angle of the facts, but from the broader angle it would be justified, because failure to do so will bring about severe hardships upon Howard University, which would bring about in turn a feeling of discrimination either intentionally or unintentionally.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment that the gentleman from New York will offer will be adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Howard University

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, $2,240,000.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. CHURCH: On page 13, line 12, after the word "grounds", strike out "$2,240,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,535,000."

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, it is a strange situation, indeed, when I find myself rising to increase an item in an appropriation bill, because, like my good friends and colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the House, I am convinced that national solvency is almost the first order of the day. When, however, it comes to a cut in an appropriation for an educational institution, a cut which affects the heart and the lifeblood and the essential usefulness of that institution, I rise momentarily, at least, above the principles of stark economy. May I say to the Committee on Appropriations that there is no committee in the House, not even including the two to which I have the honor to belong, to which I pay such great and such merited tribute. I fully know of the hours that these men spend in research, of the earnestness of their study, of their disinterested appraisal; and I hope that you will let me add my conviction that their interest in human needs never ceases. I know in addition that they are reasonable—and it is to their sweet reasonableness that I would like to appeal in support of my amendment.

May I point out in turn that I have been extremely reasonable, because when I went home last night I planned to offer two amendments to this section. I now offer only one. If you will permit me, since you have been gracious enough to give me an extra 5 minutes, I am going to talk to you first about the amendment which I decided not to offer.

In the committee report on the bill you will notice that this section provides first of all a certain sum for salaries and expenses, including maintenance and repair of facilities. The Eisenhower budget approved $2,535,000 for that item. The present bill allows $2,240,000, cutting appropriations for tuition, salaries, and equipment, and so forth, on the educational side, and repairs to the plant, by $295,000.

I would say in passing that it is only to that section that my amendment refers. I am moving to remove the cut and to restore in the bill the original amount for this purpose approved in the Eisenhower budget.

In addition, the Eisenhower budget allowed $30,000 for plans and specifications, which was eliminated by the committee; and for constructon, $170,000, of which the committee wisely allowed $20,000, leaving a difference of $150,000.

When I went home last night, and before I talked with Howard University, and before I talked with the Department which Mrs. Hobby now heads, it had been my intention to offer two amendments, one to the first section, which I have done; and one to restore the amount recommended in the Eisenhower budget for the second section. I would like to tell you briefly why I did not offer the second amendment.

I found by talking with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the Department is not worried about the $30,000 for plans for a premedical science building, since it is expected, as the committee says in its report, that funds appropriated in prior years will be made available for this project.

In addition, I find that even the Department itself is inclined to agree with the committee that there is considerable controversy about the turbogenerator. They are perfectly willing, I am told, that further studies be made of this matter. Therefore I have not offered an amendment which would restore to the paragraph the amount for plans and specifications which, I repeat, will be taken care of out of prior appropriations, or the amount for the turbogenerator. In other words, my amendment, which does add $295,000 to the bill, refers only to the amount for salaries and operating expenses, and repairs as well.

I know that my colleague from Illinois has as strong an interest in the Negro people as I have. I know that he is interested also in education. However, I dare to claim perhaps a more intimate knowledge about the expense of college administration these days, because from 1940 to 1950 I did nothing else but attempt to plan fund raising, to attempt to aid budget making, and actually to go out and raise funds for one of the great colleges of this country.

I know this, Mr. Chairman: If you cut $295,000 from the Government appropriation toward the total budget for Howard University of $5,229,889, you make a cut which has to be absorbed in essential, important places and functions.

Now in such a case, what can a university do? A State college can go out and ask for more money from the State legislature. Howard University has only this Congress. Except for tuition and a few research grants, it is completely dependent on this Congress. Some colleges would, in such an emergency, feel compelled to raise tuition fees. You know, however, it is to our glory that the tuition fees of Howard University remain today only $260 per person. I am told even at that low figure, many—for financial reasons—turn away; many who need and merit education. It would

be impossible for Howard University to do what we want it to do, if it were forced materially to increase its tuition, and to lift its opportunities thoroughly out of the reach of that group which cannot pay more. Oh, you might say, "All right, keep up your educational facilities, but do away with your repairs." Well, I heard over the radio last night that the bursting of a pipe in a tunnel at Howard University had cost the lives of two old employees, one most beloved. I do not believe that Howard University can absorb this cut and yet make necessary repairs. I have checked and find that such repairs do indeed come under this particular paragraph. The only other way to absorb the proposed cut would be by a drastic and tragic cut in the faculty and educational facilities. I would say again to my good subcommittee chairman: When you cut a university or college faculty, you do not cut for one year, you cut for the unforeseeable future because you have to eliminate from the lower echelons who are building up the coming strength of a college.

Now let me tell you a little bit more. If I had any lack of faith in Howard University, I would not come before you with this plea. I wonder if you know that Howard University was founded in 1867 by a Republican Congress just 2 years after one of the most troubled periods that this country ever experienced. It was founded as a symbol of strength, as an opportunity, as a great hope. In 1952, including the summer session, it educated 4,811 people. It has approximately 450 faculty members. It maintains 10 schools and colleges plus a summer school and evening classes for adult education. Its undergraduate school gives courses in the liberal arts, pharmacy, music, engineering, and architecture. In its graduate and professional schools, degrees are given in social work, law, medicine, and dentistry, and graduate degrees also in religion. It has 39 buildings to operate and keep in repair, and 9 of them are temporary wooden buildings. It has 55 acres of land. Its roster of graduates brings forth the names of the leaders of the race throughout the years of our history. Of 16,000 graduates, 721 have won renown as religious leaders, 685 as pharmacists, 398 as engineers and architects, and 7,000 as teachers. It has 13 national honorary societies, established because of its academic standing, including Phi Beta Kappa. It is one of the few Negro colleges that has Army and Air Force ROTC courses; and prior to World War II, Howard University trained more than 50 percent of all the Negro officers in our Armed Forces.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I will yield at the end, if the gentleman will forgive me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add just this. As I thought over this problem last night, I thought in terms of three things. I thought of a great President who has made us face up to the fact that this country is spending 73 percent of our budget on forces and tools of war and on military and other forms of aid abroad. I thought in terms of the fact that this House of Representatives the other afternoon in a whiff of time voted $55 million above what the administration asked, a total of $195 million, for the conservation of soil, and we do need soil conservation. But, we also need to provide for the conservation of our youth. I thought of something else. I would wager, with reference to the money that the State Department pays to bring foreign students and others over to this country, that we spend more than this $295,000 a year. And why do we bring them? We bring them here to see democracy as it works. And how could we hold up our heads if we brought them to a National Capital where we were reducing the training staff and educational opportunities of a group of our citizens to whom we promise full opportunity and who have proved that they deserve it? I sincerly hope that the amendment passes, and, Mr. Chairman, I wish to apologize again to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, for not yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot attempt to match the magic eloquence with which this amendment has been presented, but I feel I would not be honest with the House of Representatives if I did not tell it what the situation was with which the committee was confronted when it faced this problem of providing funds for Howard University.

It was not a question of whether we should maintain Howard University as soundly and as effectively as might be done, but it was a question as to whether or not we should take into consideration the job problem that we had to face.

Let me call your attention to the facts. These are tables that were submitted to the committee, at its request, by the university, and they appear on page 104 of part 1 of the hearings on Federal Security.

Enrollment, 1948, gross 7,231; full-time equivalent, 6,268; 1949, gross 6,609; 5,557 full-time equivalent; 1950, gross 5,712; 4,821 full-time equivalent; 1951, gross 5,069; 4,236 full-time equivalent; 1952, gross 4,811; 3,870 full-time equivalent; 1953, gross 4,506; 3,428 full-time equivalent.

In other words, the budget request was not proportioned at all to the decrease in enrollment, and the work that the institution had to do.

The committee did not make a cut which was commensurate with the decrease in enrollment and the decrease in the work that it had to do. It made a very modest cut. The cut from the revised budget was from $2,535,000 to $2,240,000, or a little over 15 percent, and the estimated reduction in number of full-time enrollments is down more in proportion from the high figure for all these things than the cut.

I do wish that the House would not be guided by sentiment entirely in voting money, regardless of the need, but that they will be guided by their heads and realize that while we must provide for the proper education of the people who go to Howard University, we should not, if we expect the institution to be sound and successful and properly administered, allow it funds on the basis of many more students than the enrollment figures which they gave us show they are entitled to.

Under those circumstances it does seem to be that we should not adopt this amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. May I remind the distinguished gentleman from New York talking about decreased enrollment, it is necessary for them to maintain the same number of classes if they keep up the educational standards of the school. Back in 1948 when they had a gross enrollment of 6,000 probably the teachers were handling as many as 25 or 30 students per class. The only way you could make a reduction would be to cut out some of the classes.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid the gentleman has missed the point.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not think so.

Mr. TABER. At the peak you had anywhere from 7,200 students a year. A quarter of that would be 1,800, and that would be the average number in a class. It cannot take anywhere near as many teachers or instructors, or as much classroom requirement, or as much of anything else to operate an average of 1,125 as it would for 1,800. A reasonable approach to the problem, therefore, is a reduction in the cost, and that is the only way you can keep a faculty up on its toes and keep an institution operating effectively. When you give an institution more money than it needs on which to operate, you destroy its effectiveness and it is worse for the students than when they are a little short, because then the professors will take more interest and do a better job.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 4 to be reserved to the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for 3½ minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWELL. I have a substitute amendment at the desk. By calling for that now would my time be increased or not?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not.

(Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to yield his time to Mr. POWELL.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, speaking to the country the other night, reminded us that we live in an era of peril. I wonder how seriously the words of the President are being taken by the members of his own party in this Chamber who in the name of economy would snatch away the stoutest hopes we have of meeting the challenge of the peril.

As I have listened to the debate on the amendment to save Howard University my thoughts have been of the young man from Trinidad who drove the taxicab in which I rode one evening last week. He is a student of medicine at Howard University. On graduation he intends to return to Trinidad and pass the remainder of his life in service to his people as a physician. There are many such young men at Howard University. The expense to us of this education is small indeed compared with the dividends we shall receive in the most enduring kind of goodwill. Mr. Chairman, if we are to meet with triumph the perils of this era in a changing world we must have the abiding goodwill of the common people of other lands and of all races. The slash in the appropriation for Howard University which the committee's bill provides would do our country more damage in the loss of goodwill and of understanding than could be repurchased by ten thousand times the amount of money required for the proper maintenance of this great college of learning. I have deep respect for all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and I know it must have been only through inadvertence that the university singled out for such a drastic reduction as to be fatal chanced to be a Negro university. But how would it be received by this young man from Trinidad if his education were cut short by the action of this Congress? What would be his interpretation? What would your interpretation be if you were of a minority race and one of the great universities that had meant so much to your people had been the target? Discrimination is poison that destroys individuals and destroys nations. I am sure that no discrimination could have been intended, but that is not the way our enemies would present it in their propaganda. To earn and to hold goodwill we must remain above even the suspicion of practicing any kind of discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand the thinking behind many items in this bill before us. It may be because mine is not the philosophy of the dollar. The dollar is important, but as the servant and not the master. What you on the other side of the aisle are attempting is to put the cart ahead of the horse. You raise the interest rate on the Federal debt, thus increasing tremendously the cost of Government, and cover up with slashed appropriations for education, public welfare, and labor that strike at the very foundations of democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] for his kindness.

I would like to state on behalf of the vast majority of the membership our appreciation for the very fine remarks of the gracious gentlewoman from Illinois. I did not think anyone could rise to object, even myself, although my amendment increased the amount even more. My good friend from New York who sometimes is swayed by the dollar sign more than anything else did not have the "sweet reasonableness" the gentlewoman thought she could implant in all of us. So where there is no warm heart maybe cold logic will suffice, and I, therefore, would like to present a little cold logic and cold facts for the consideration of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York. You quote the year 1948 as the year in which the enrollment was at its peak. You are correct. But it so happens that that is the year when the GI bill of rights was operating at its peak and there was not a single educational institution anywhere in America that was not operating with crowded classrooms.

The average number of students per instructor at Howard University in 1948 was 23, incidentally a very good guess by the Congressman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. The average number of instructors in a class A university, according to the American Association of Universities and Colleges, should be 12.5. That is the aim of every single grade A university and college in America. The average at Howard University now is 15.4.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to be fair with the gentleman. I am a graduate myself of a great State university. I have been back there a few times and I know that some of those classes run up to 500.

Mr. POWELL. Surely.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman have any figures as to the student load per class per instructor in the over-all State universities?

Mr. POWELL. In the over-all State universities it runs between 14 and 18.

Mr. HALLECK. I am amazed at that figure. I do not dispute it because I do not have the information, but it seems to me from my observation it is much, much too low.

Mr. POWELL. When you attended the classes where there were 500, as I did, they were broken down into seminar groups and discussion groups. They were groups, very small, under fellows and under instructors.

Mr. HALLECK. I am quite sure as of today that is not correct because many of them are courses in economics and such subjects. At the conclusion of the year's work or the semester's work that is it.

Mr. POWELL. Then we cannot agree on this point. One thing we do agree on is that the colleges and universities of America were abnormally swollen so far as student bodies were concerned in 1948. That I am sure we all agree on because at that time the GI bill of rights was operating at its peak. The average was 23 per instructor at Howard University, now 15.

If you cut this amount, as you have, below the 15 percent, it means that Howard University will have to cut the faculty of the liberal arts college, because the college of law, the college of religion, the college of medicine, the college of dentistry, the college of engineering, the college of architecture, and the postgraduate colleges for masters and doctor of philosophy degrees are operating at peak. They are packed. There has been no decrease in enrollment in the postgraduate work at Howard University. The decrease has been only in the liberal arts. That means only in the liberal arts will the cut come. If you cut 15 percent plus of the total salaries of the total university, the reduction will come only in the liberal arts and I have been informed by the treasurer of the university this morning that that means one-third of the faculty of the liberal arts college will have to be dismissed. The average will be, as you said, 23 per instructor or 8 above what the American Association of Colleges and Universities suggests.

May I point out, whether you know it or not, Mr. Chairman, that you are trying to do, if the gentlewoman's amendment does not prevail, what not a single Southern legislative body is doing this year. There is not a single Southern legislative body that is cutting the appropriation for Negro or for white higher education.

When you talk, Mr. Majority Leader, about the fact that we must have one paramount aim before us, "fiscal solvency," may I say that fiscal solvency means nothing if we have health and educational bankruptcy.

The gentleman from Indiana calls this the age of peril. The age of peril cannot be met if the first line of defense of our country, health and education, is allowed to crumble. Just the other day our President received a report from the National Manpower Council urging specific, immediate steps to increase the brainpower of America, because we are in need of it. This is not going to increase it; this is going to decimate it.

I would like to say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that I would like to see her amendment increased, but in deference to her graciousness in offering her amendment I will withdraw mine.

I would like to point out to the Committee also that Howard University generates its own electric power. They need a new turbogenerator which costs $150,000. The committee says, "Buy your power from the Potomac Light & Power Co." All right. If they do, the Potomac Light & Power Co. informs me that Howard University will have to spend money to put the private power in, what they call the changeover switch gears, which cost $180,000. Now, if you are not going to give them the money for the generator to generate their own power, then you have to give them $180,000 to buy the changeover equipment. You cannot tell them to do something and not give them the money to do it with.

I stood here yesterday and told the Committee that they had struck out an appropriation to retube the boiler at Howard University; that the insurance company on April 6, the Globe Indemnity Co., warned Howard University that if they did not repair it they would cancel the policy. Last night the chief engineer and his assistant were scalded to death. You do not want this tragedy repeated, or do you? I do not think

I need say anything more in this connection. I ask for support of the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman spoke about the turbogenerator. Is it not true that after the $180,000 is spent for the changeover that the additional cost annually will be between twenty and thirty thousand dollars a year over the cost of the power if they generate their own power?

Mr. POWELL. The committee says they cannot understand why Howard University cannot operate under private power as cheaply at St. Elizabeths because they now have private power. St. Elizabeths method of generating their electricity was obsolete; Howard University's is not. The Public Buildings Service Committee and the Bureau of Mines testified before the committee that Howard University could make its electricity cheaper than using private power. But whether you give it to them or not, you have to give them $180,000 to buy the new equipment to put the private power in. They have not got the money and the Potomac Light & Power Co. is not going to give the money to them. What are you going to do?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution adopted by the supreme council of the order, Sons of Italy in America, in plenary session, Washington, D. C., April 11, 1953:

Whereas it is becoming increasingly evident throughout the entire Nation that the adoption of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 does not adequately solve immigration and naturalization problems, but, on the contrary, denies essential principles which have been of the utmost importance in the natural development of our beloved country, the United States of America; and

Whereas the general welfare of the people of our Nation requires that the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 be modified and amended to safeguard the inalienable rights heretofore enjoyed by all citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the problems surrounding immigration and naturalization have become serious problems not only for the people of the United States of America but also for the people of many other nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the supreme council of the order, Sons of Italy, in plenary session at the Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C., on April 13, 1953, That the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 be amended as follows:

1. The inequalities and injustices which can and do arise under existing immigration quota system based on national origin should be minimized by the suggestions herein advanced.

2. The annual immigration quota should be 250,000, which number we believe can be conveniently absorbed by this country.

3. The quotas of all nations should be reexamined every 3 years. The number of visas to be allotted to each nation should be based upon the average number used by such nations during the preceding 3 years. All unused quotas should be reallocated. Countries which have used up to 90 percent of their quota should be allowed to participate in the distribution of unused quotas on the same ratio as heretofore established.

4. Adopted children under the age of 14 should be given preference and admitted in the same category as children are generally now admitted.

5. That parents of American citizens should be admitted as nonquota immigrants.

6. Although the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, should be continued as a part of the McCarran-Walter Act in order to make possible the codification of all laws relating to immigration and naturalization, the persons actually admitted as displaced persons should be admitted in addition to established quotas.

7. The judicial powers given to administrative officers, boards, and any other governmental agencies should be eliminated. Any person or persons having powers of prosecution, should not be granted any judicial powers which deprive an individual of his rights to trial by the courts of the United States. Furthermore, the provisions of the statute of limitations heretofore existing should be reenacted.

8. Naturalized citizens should enjoy all the rights and privileges of native born citizens as heretofore established by the Constitution of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and to the chairmen of both Senate and House Committees on Immigration and Naturalization.

In witness whereof, I, the supreme venerable of the Order Sons of Italy in America, have hereunto set my hand, the date and year aforesaid.

GEORGE J. SPATUZZA,
Supreme Venerable, Chicago, Ill.

Attest:

A. A. DEMARTINIS,
Supreme Recording Secretary, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. I do not think it sufficient and I regret that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has withdrawn his substitute amendment, but due to his acceptance of the amendment of my colleague the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], I, too, support that amendment.

I think the best way to acquaint the Members of the House with the work of Howard University is to bring to their attention the statement made by its distinguished president, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, when he appeared before the committee during the hearings on this bill:

Howard University constitutes the only university organization in the States where the majority of Negroes live which offers a wide scope of undergraduate, graduate, and professional educational opportunities to Negro youth.

As a result of historical conditions beyond their control, the colored people in the United States have stood in an abnormal relationship to the tax-supported educational institutions within the States where the majority of them live.

Until very recent years they were not admitted to the State universities and professional schools which are regularly supported by State and Federal funds, and no first-rate separate university and professional school organizations were established from the public funds to serve them.

This lack of higher educational facilities among Negroes in the States where the majority of them live has resulted in a serious shortage of competent services in matters fundamental to their life, development, and security.

There is now a serious shortage among them of competent primary and high-school teachers; a serious shortage of physicians, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, architects and engineers, chemists, trained clergymen, and leaders of every kind.

Howard University exists primarily to serve the urgent needs of this disadvantaged tenth of the population.

During the 87 years of its work, the university has graduated 17,000 men and women. By far the majority of these graduates are serving as public-school teachers, building up a system of education in the States where the majority of Negroes live. Approximately 2,522 of them have become physicians and surgeons. This number approximates one-half of all Negro physicians and surgeons in the United States. Of these graduates 1,205 have become dentists. This number approximates half of all Negro dentists. Also, 1,472 have become lawyers; 735 of these graduates have become leaders in religion; 707 have become pharmacists, including a substantial number of owners of drugstores; 404 have followed engineering and architecture and other applied sciences; 359 of these graduates have entered the field of business; 201 have graduated for service in the field of social work. In every Negro population center of the United States, these graduates are rendering service to the people and they have had a substantial part in the remarkable development of the Negro race in America.

During the school year 1951–52 this institution served 4,811 students (inclusive of the summer school) in its 10 schools and colleges, namely; graduate, liberal arts, engineering and architecture, music, social work, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, law, and religion. Religion receives no support from Federal funds. All curricula are fully accredited by regional and national accrediting agencies; and I may say we have just received a vote of Phi Beta Kappa, the national honor society, to establish a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa there.

That is a very brief story of Howard University. Yet, the committee decided to reduce its appropriation $510,000 less than the amount requested in the budget. I agree with my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. POWELL] in his statement that this bill is discrimination at its worst. I plead with the entire membership of the House to restore the appropriations for Howard University.

Mr. Chairman, like others on my side of the aisle, I figure we could vote for this appropriation bill as it has been reported to us by the committee, knowing that if we did so, we would be hanging our Republican colleagues on the tree of politics. But this is not the place for political expediency. We must examine these items of expense with a conscience and vote the necessary funds to continue to the full extent those agencies of the Government that have, through the years, proven their worth and have dem-

onstrated that our faith in them has not been misplaced.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take the time of the House, but it seems to me that a very important point in human relations, in this debate, is being overlooked; if one votes for this amendment, one appears to favor segregation, if one votes against it, one appears to favor integration; yet, at heart, no such thing is true.

I will vote for this amendment to provide more funds for Howard University because a factor higher than fancy, cold-blooded, heartless logic is at stake—the need to quench the thirst of men's minds which Howard University has so brilliantly done since its inception in the 1860's, as the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] so ably stated.

If you throw the integration, segregation issue into this debate, and make logic your queen, and not life your guide, you will be forced to admit that from here on in, as integration progresses, funds for Howard University will diminish until it closes its doors or operates as an institution without regard to origin.

This amendment is not just for colored people or for anyone else, but for a social fact in America which recognizes the voluntary gathering of people of every type.

I know, for example, of some Polish people who have recently come to America from the service of General Anders and the Polish Army; they have gathered together, not in a ghetto community, as one knew ghettos in Europe, where people were forced to live, but who have assembled voluntarily because they thought they could get ahead better, that it would be better to have their children live and grow up with sympathetic people and surroundings, until they could leave the nest and fend for themselves, to their liking, as Americans.

In the North the schools are open. In the South there are those who prefer to attend their own institutions in sympathetic surroundings, and who prefer to be leaders of their own people.

Often the educated fly the coop and do not come back to aid and lift up their own. There are aristocrats in the South, both white and colored. Each has high pride. Each is dedicated to the service of his fellow man. Each is free of shame for his own kind. I, for one, would not want to do anything to discourage them. Each to his way. That is godlike.

I would not care to cast a vote and not feel that I had done the best that I could to contribute to an institution that is doing so much for its own. You will recall when you go down to Mexico and see the remains of the Mayan civilization how they built high temples to their gods, how they built buildings, and in craven fear, offered human sacrifices, virgins, to appease seemingly wrathful dieties. They had many and brave warriors. They had great areas of land. Some 8 to 12 millions of these Mayans were eventually wiped out because they just did not know anything about soil exhaustion, about soil conservation or crop rotation. They lived on corn and when the soil wore out hunger set in and they wandered and became duck soup for their enemies and they were overcome and disappeared. Just a little more knowledge about the soil and they might have survived, coming up from Guatamala to Yucatan. Ignorance. The pity of it.

I think our people would like to know that if you want to be a leader among your own, the Congress of the United States is not going to stand in the way of helping you become not only a better, but a more informed American. The amendment providing the additional funds for Howard University should pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in reading in the RECORD this morning the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] in opening his speech on this measure. He said:

> Mr. Chairman, as a Democrat I would like to see this bill passed as it is presently constituted, without a single change because I know that if it is passed in this shape it would mark the defeat of the Republican Party in the elections of next year and would see my party back in control of the House by 50 to 100 votes.

In supporting the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois, I call attention to the fact that Howard University was established by a Republican Congress. Since points of order had been raised in many subsequent Congresses by members of the now minority party, and since the then chairman of the Committee on Education, our distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. DAN REED, in the 70th Congress introduced what is now known as Public Law 634, 70th Congress, an act to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia," approved March 2, 1867, as a matter of fact, a Republican Congress was responsible for establishing this and for eliminating the points of order against this appropriation that were repeatedly made.

I feel very deeply about Mr. POWELL'S comment regarding the deplorable condition at Freedmen's Hospital.

The gentleman from New York made a very serious indictment of the former administration when he called attention to the horrible conditions existing at Freedmen's Hospital. This was the previous administration's responsibility during the 20 years and a part of the New Deal propaganda to the Negroes that they were their best friends. The Bible says, "By their fruits they shall know them." Those of us who have been here for many years as Members of Congress recognize the fact that Washington is no heaven for Negroes. Unlike my own city of Cleveland, Ohio, there is wholesale discrimination here.

President Eisenhower was inaugurated on January 20—about 4 months ago. Unlike his predecessors, he believes in works and not pleasant conversation. He is not talking for propaganda purposes or newspaper consumption. He is speaking from the heart. Every campaign speech he made last year—every pledge that he made to the American people is being and will be kept. His purpose is to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly.

Emphatically, with my friend the gentleman from New York, Representative POWELL, occupying a front seat on the floor of the House, I want the American people to hear me and to know that while this debate is in progress and since members of the minority party appear to be anxious to make mileage out of what transpires here, we want the record to show that a member of our party speaks regarding performance. Republicans have no apology to make for conditions at Freedmen's Hospital nor at Howard University. We have not been in power for 20 years. The Republican Party was born to set men free, and our greatest objective is to make men free not only here but everywhere throughout the world. Wherever the Republican Party has had an opportunity to demonstrate, we have shown that we place human rights above property rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I arrived on the floor from a meeting of my Subcommittee on Air Force Appropriations just as the gentlewoman from Illinois introduced her amendment, which is now before us.

My interest in Howard University began some years ago when I was a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations on Labor and Security. That school has done a good job in the education of the Negro youth of this Nation.

While I am and have been as ardent an advocate of economy as any Member of this House, I do not feel that supporting this amendment is contrary to my desire or activity for economy.

These funds are an investment in the future of America, and that is a good investment at any time.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, even though I dislike to go contrary to this subcommittee, which has worked on this measure so long, I am going to vote for the proposed amendment to increase the funds for Howard University.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] to close debate.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to open my concluding remarks by referring to the remark of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], and I quote, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, what he said yesterday on the floor of the House:

> I have never seen such a flagrant act of discrimination as that perpetrated by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Commitee in cutting out all assistance to land-grant colleges, in cutting the budget of Howard University by 54 percent, and in cutting the budget of Freedmen's Hospital by 18 percent.

Then he went on to say that action was anti-Negro. I wish to state my position very clearly. No one, at any time, has ever accused me of being anti-Negro. No one has ever accused me of being anti any minority group, regardless of what the so-called minority group might be. I have never been associated with any organization of any kind, even on the fringe, of which I would ever be ashamed, or for which I would ever have to apologize. Thinking very seriously over the remarks of the gentleman from New York, I do not believe he intended to imply that I am anti-Negro, because I will stack my record against any Member of the House for tolerance of all groups and all classes of people, all of the time, all through the years. So, with that fully understood, I do not see how anyone could construe the action of the committee as anti-Negro.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] had an exchange of remarks on the ratio of students to teachers. I refer you to page 103 of the hearings. At the committee's request, Howard University put into the record the ratio of students to teachers, from 1948 to 1953. In 1945, the ratio was 15.3 students per instructor; in 1949, it was 14; in 1950, it was 12.4; in 1951, it was 11.6; in 1952, it was 10.2; in 1953, it was 10. I believe the gentleman from New York admitted that the State university's ratio of students to teachers is somewhere between 14 and 18.

I would like to refer you to the committee report for just a moment:

The bill includes $2,240,000, a reduction of $510,000 from the request and $435,000 from the appropriation for 1953. The enrollment at the University has dropped every year since 1948. The estimated gross enrollment for 1953 is only 62 percent of the comparable figure for 1948. The amount provided in the bill is approximately 10 percent more than provided in 1948. Even allowing for increased salaries and other costs this is a liberal appropriation.

I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] covered very well the point that, while the appropriation has been going up every year, the enrollment has been going down every year. There is nothing discriminatory about the cut the committee has made; it is based on these plain facts.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the decrease in the enrollment at Howard University. This follows to some extent the pattern throughout the United States as shown by these figures: In 1949, total enrollment in the colleges and universities was 2,457,000. In 1950, there was a 6.5-percent decrease, the total being 2,297,000. In 1951, there was a further decrease of 7.8 percent, resulting in a total enrollment of 2,116,000. In 1952, there was a slight increase resulting from junior-college increases and the total was 2,148,000. In the same year there was a decrease of 1.7 percent in the universities proper.

Next year it is estimated that there will be a 5-percent increase and Howard University will doubtless share in this. Actually there was an increase in new students at Howard in the current year, indicating that the slump has ended.

The 5 percent estimated increase is based upon three factors, namely, the birthrate decline of 1930–35 will not be felt after this year, there is an increase in percentage of high-school students entering college, and, finally, an added number of Korean war veterans will be entering college.

Mr. Chairman, under the able leadership of Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University, the institution is enjoying added prestige and is rendering a great service. Its usefulness should not be retarded by decreased appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. CHURCH) there were—ayes 82, noes 70.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mrs. CHURCH.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 113, noes 101.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Education

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provision of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section 4 of the act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section 1 of the act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), and the act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462), $16,048,870: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed $15,873,870 for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That none of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 13, line 21, after the parenthesis, strike out "$16,048,870" and insert "$16,673,261."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore the funds for vocational training to the same amount as was provided last year.

I must confess that my normal tendencies are toward economy and saving money, and I guess my votes in the House have been about as consistent in that direction as those of any Member. I think the committee has touched one of the nerves of one of our finest and most justifiable Federal programs. The vocational training program in America today, I think, spends dollars to the best advantage of any program I know of in which the Government participates. This program is carried on throughout the United States. It is a matching proposition. The formula under which this money is distributed is a very wise and a very practical one. The Federal Government certainly is not putting anything like one-third of the amount being spent.

The only reason advanced by the committee for cutting the fund is the fact that they say the program has reached maturity. Vocational training is in its infancy in America. Vocational training is about the finest form of education from the standpoint of helping the average boy who is not able to get a college education that we can formulate, and even some of those with college educations find that they, too, must take on some form of vocational training. I have never believed that a man or a woman was educated until he or she knew how to earn a living.

This program has expanded. The more it expands the better America we will have. We try to set our sights a little too close sometimes in figuring on these money matters.

Mr. Chairman, I conducted an investigation to try to find out approximately the amount being spent by the Armed Forces in vocational training. That is, giving servicemen skilled training, the same kind of training that the vocational programs would give if it reached all of those boys. The best figure I could find indicated that approximately $135 million was spent for this service-training program and that it is not the well-organized vocational program that we have in our established school systems in America which are the most economically operated of any in the world.

Then I began trying to find out what our foreign-aid bill provided. The point 4 program, a large part of which is purely and simply vocational training for the foreign countries of this earth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARDEN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, in 1952, $472 million was spent on the point 4 program. In looking for the amount allocated or recommended for 1954 I find the sum of $453 million. It simply does not make sense to me to appropriate such tremendous sums for programs about which we know so little. And then for the young people of our own homeland, we adopt a penny-pinching policy and chop off 2 million from a small $18 million program, which covers the whole United States.

Mr. Chairman, the States are doing everything they can do but the program is expanding, it is producing, and it is building a better America. The State of North Carolina for 1952–53 appropriated for this program $2,500,000 in round figures. The State of North Carolina for 1953–54 appropriated $3,039,000, which is clear evidence to anyone that the officials of the States are catching the importance of this program and the legislatures of the States are adding to it. But, the trouble is the program is growing; they have more students, they have more schools that are carrying on more work.

I will just use the number of schools, for instance, in North Carolina. There are 1,257 vocational training schools in the State of North Carolina. Now I am going to make another very frank statement. The State of North Carolina will not fall to pieces if the measly $2 million is cut off the appropriation,

but I know in some States this cut that is advocated by the commitee will wreak havoc with the program they are trying to carry on. These are the people that we talk about so much when we are running for office that need help so badly. It is the boys and girls in the rural sections, it is the boys in the areas that know at the age of 12 or 15 they will never be able to see the inside of a college door, and yet they want to earn a living and they want to be trained in some school. Therefore, the vocational-training program is the answer to that crying need to millions of boys and girls in this country. Stop and think, with an appropriation of only $18 million, and then cut it $2 million on the theory that the program has matured. I wish that the Federal Government was spending $100 million on vocational training in the United States of America. If we did that, we would not have to spend over $125 million to give these boys training in the Armed Forces; they would be trained mechanics, they would be trained wood workers, they would be trained electricians before they ever reached the Armed Forces. So, it is the most economical place to train them. It is the finest place to train those boys and to give them the kind of training we want them to have.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I know the gentleman from North Carolina does not want to misquote the committee. He has said on 2 or 3 occasions that the committee says this program has matured. I think that is a little different than the language of the report, and I quote:

> The committee is in agreement with the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary in their belief that this program has matured to the point where its promotion and further development should gradually be turned over to the States.

We have never said it has matured, because we agree it is a wonderful program, and I agree with the gentleman that we ought to have $200 million.

Mr. BARDEN. There was no intention on my part to misquote. The statement just read is not much different from my statement. The results would be about the same. I do wish the gentleman would agree to put the appropriation back and let it go to this worthy program. If you did not have any more boys than you had 2 or 3 years ago, and if you were not going to have any more students, then you might be able to work it out as you have. But, America is growing, and the students are growing, and the schools are growing, and the need is growing, and I certainly hope the committee will not resist this $2 million to make the program a normal going proposition. No better money can be spent for the building and defense of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to see how many Members wish to speak on this amendment, and see if we can arrive at some limitation on debate. I see quite a few Members have risen, and I know they have a great interest in this program. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, and to this paragraph, be limited to 1 hour.

Mr. FOGARTY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I know there is a lot of interest in this amendment. I think for the purpose of conserving time and finishing this bill, if the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment I am sure we can save a lot of time.

Mr. BUSBEY. Nothing would please me better if we were not in such a predicament financially in this Government.

Mr. FOGARTY. Does the gentleman say "On this amendment and all amendments thereto"?

Mr. BUSBEY. On vocational education.

Mr. BAILEY. I object, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment on the desk.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on amendments to this section and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the Chairman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the latter part of the gentleman's motion is not in order. He cannot move to make 5 minutes available to himself.

Mr. BUSBEY. I accept the gentleman's point of order.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOGGS. I wonder if the Chair would make clear just exactly what section the gentleman includes in his motion.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would say to the gentleman from Louisiana I did not say the section, only this paragraph. This amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Just this paragraph.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that I have an amendment on the desk referring to the same paragraph, and I want some time to dicuss it.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is not an amendment to this amendment. I am limiting it to this amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. But it affects the same paragraph.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Let us understand what the motion is. I understood the motion was to limit debate to this paragraph and all amendments thereto, to 1 hour. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the question.

Mr. BARDEN. Where does the paragraph end?

The CHAIRMAN. Line 2, page 14.

Mr. BAILEY. I have an amendment perfecting lines 1 and 2 on page 14, which is a part of that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be in order. The gentleman or any other Member can offer an amendment to this paragraph.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be granted to the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment and sincerely hope that it will be adopted.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, those who might be disposed to accuse me of being reckless with the expenditure of Federal funds would have to be excused upon the grounds of ignorance of the record. I think there is no one on either side of this dividing aisle to whom I would have to yield on that score. But on this particular question, and let me say here that I pay very little attention to those cries from special interests and pressure groups, when those pressure groups are composed of adult Americans, but when it comes to the welfare and education of our American children, and I am faced with the knowledge that you propose to spend $16 million to educate American children during the coming fiscal year in vocational education and at the same time propose to spend $21,677,000 educating children from all over the globe—Chinese, Austrian, German, Finnish, Iranian, and from wherever you can imagine, then I can conscientiously support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina to raise the funds that we propose to spend on our own children by at least $2 million.

One of the most contradictory things I have seen this House do is its action earlier today when this committee voted to increase by $700,000 the appropriations for an agency whose sole function is to recruit trainees, their secondary function, of course, being to see to it that at least 15 reports are furnished in quintuplicate on each trainee at least 5 times a month. That program has been increased by $700,000. Here you propose to cut the agency that is charged with the responsibility of training those recruits by $2 million.

If I had time, I would like to read a statement on this floor from Candidate Eisenhower. I have no reason to believe that he has changed his position since ceasing to be Candidate Eisenhower, but on September 27, 1952, he said, in part, quoting President Eisenhower:

> One of the greatest things about the United States is the fact that it has achieved the highest level of mass education in history. This American system has many unique and variable phases, among the most important of which are the land-grant colleges, the experiment stations, the vocational-education program in high schools, the county-agent system, and the future farmers and 4–H programs.

I am just asking the Republicans to go along with their President and am asking the Democrats to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized.

(Mr. Moss and Mr. METCALF by unanimous consent yielded the time allotted to them to Mr. BAILEY.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting them at the point in the debate on the Fogarty amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from West Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to give the strongest possible support to the amendment to restore Federal support for an adequate vocational education program. The committee's proposal to cut vocational education funds and eliminate the distributive education phase of the program will make impossible the continuation of a well-rounded system of vocational education.

Adequate money should be provided to help educate those youngsters who are interested in agriculture, trades, and industry, or home economics. Education in these three fields is necessary and desirable, but it leaves a wide gap if we are to make the greatest use of our most important national resource—the human resource. Youngsters in distributive education classes are trained in merchandising, advertising, and the many other jobs that go into retail and wholesale distribution. Training is necessary in agriculture and the trades to equip students to grow or manufacture the products of everyday life. Training is necessary in home economics to assure beneficial use of the manufactured or grown products. Training is just as necessary for those students whose life work will be distributing the products of our farms and factories for use in the homes.

The effect of the proposed reduction in funds for a complete vocational education program will be a reduction in the complete utilization of the Nation's manpower. Persons who could be trained in the fields of distribution would go into those important jobs without the training which will equip them to do the best possible job. Frequently in these Chambers it has been said there should be no waste in Government. I agree wholeheartedly and add that there should be no waste in any of many activities of the people of this Nation. The proposed cut in funds for vocational education would be a waste of our most valuable treasure—the manpower of our Nation.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from North Carolina increasing funds for vocational education and the amendment by the gentleman from Arkansas to remove the prohibition on funds for distributive education.

I appeared before the subcommittee to oppose a cut in the $18,500,000 recommended in the budget submitted prior to January 20 for State grants-in-aid for vocational education under the George-Barden Act.

Curtailment of the grass roots vocational education program would be felt in this Nation's high schools, in its industries, in its business houses and on its farms.

We are appropriating, rightfully I believe, hundreds of millions of dollars to extend technical assistance abroad. I believe we can justify expenditure of this small amount to extend technical assistance to our own boys and girls.

Montana is a large State with a small population. Its principal source of income is agriculture—crops, livestock, livestock products. Its principal source of employment is distribution. A large percentage of Montana youngsters live in remote areas and do not attend college or further their education beyond high school. Our educators and taxpayers feel that this situation should be met with a well-balanced secondary education program since there are no trade schools in the State. In this balanced program, vocational education has played its rightful role. It has served the youth of Montana well. It has been geared to local needs.

Many Montana youngsters who would have reached the end of the road in achieving a formal education long before high school graduation have found that vocational education opened a new door for them. Therefore, they have stayed with their schooling, received high school diplomas and followed trades or professions with success.

Half the high schools in Montana now offer one or more of the vocational education courses. Vocational education services now functioning in Montana under competent State and local leadership are vocational agriculture, vocational home economics, distributive and business education, trade and industrial education, vocational guidance, and industrial arts.

In 60 of Montana's 176 high schools, farm youths can prepare themselves for a better life by enrolling in vocational-agriculture courses. Currently, over 2,400 Montana boys are preparing for tomorrow's efforts to increase farm production and to meet the challenge of competition offered by those long established in the field.

That these cooperative part-time work-study programs pay off is evidenced by some figures from Butte, Mont. According to a report published there, about 80 percent of the vocational-education graduates obtain full-time jobs in the kind of work for which they took training in high school.

The high school in Butte, the largest city in my district, also provides statistics showing that only about 40 percent of high-school graduates continue their education. The remaining 60 percent are absorbed into business and industry. These youngsters need the kind of training they get from vocational education.

As the Glasgow Courier put it recently in an editorial entitled "Something To Do":

> It is a recognized fact, not only among educators, but among all of us, that an excellent auto mechanic may be a more useful citizen than say, a poor lawyer. But when a boy or girl starts to seek specialized training in many of the skilled crafts or arts, the youth doesn't find much in this State. Consequently, in eastern and northern Montana, many students have gravitated to such excellent institutions as Dunwoody Institute in Minneapolis or the State School of Science in North Dakota.
>
> It is true that, at Northern Montana College a beginning has been made in such vocational instruction. Eventually, we believe, this will become one of the most widespread and beneficial forms of education in Montana. We hope to see more of it.

I am informed that the total investment—national, State, and local—in distributive education amounts to about $100 per student per year in Great Falls, Mont. I do not know how much it costs to put a boy in jail. But I know that vocational education keeps up the interest of the school youngster who is earning while he is learning; the interested youngster does not drop out of school; and there is a close relationship between juvenile crime and dropping out of school.

In Montana we have tax-supported State institutions, including a land-grant college, that teach business administration—and where we train young people to manage department stores, wholesale houses and the like. Except for the distributive education program, there is no comparable program for the boys and girls who cannot attend college and whose interests and abilities will lead them to work in the distribution field.

The only thing a youngster, interested in working in a department store, can do without distributive education, is to take his high school diploma and go get a job as a shipping clerk in competition with someone who quit school after the eighth grade, and who has since learned the special skill that qualifies him for that particular job.

Why should not our young people be able to acquire in high school, along with a knowledge of Latin and history, at least the rudiments of the work in a department store, a wholesale house or an office if he is interested in this work?

An impossible feature of this proposed cut, gentleman, is that Montana's Legislature has just completed its biennial session and will not meet again until 1955. Thus Montana cannot revamp our part of the dollar-matching formula to meet the smaller Federal funds available.

This can only result in the cancellation of programs scheduled to begin in many schools and curtailment of those already in operation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of keeping the record straight.

The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] who offered this amendment is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. He happened to be chairman of that committee in 1946, when this legislation was approved by the Congress. He did not tell you that this public law is what is known as the George-Barden Act. I take it that Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, and Congressman BARDEN are the authors of this legislation. The gentleman was too modest to even tell his colleagues in the House that he was the author of this legislation. He was the proper one to offer this amendment, because it is a well-established, well-conducted, and worthwhile program.

Just for the purpose of letting you know the kind and type of instruction that is going on under this legislation, I would like to call your attention to the program as it is carried on in the State of West Virginia, where it is one of the best-developed vocational education programs of any of the States in the United States.

I would like to say, prefacing my remarks about the program in my State, the proposed cut cannot be absorbed by the several States without materially reducing the present level of vocational activities being carried on under this program.

As proof of my statement, I would like to call attention to the program in West Virginia, where the overall cost is $1,728,164, of which the State pays $231,780. The local school districts, if you please, pay $1,082,031, and the Federal Government $414,353.

This reduction has meant a cut in the allocation to the State of West Virginia for this particular instruction of $57,000.

I was at one time State director of the budget and ex-officio secretary of the State board of school finances. I had to approve and manage the various school budgets, as well as other State and county budgets.

I know there is no place where school boards could find the money at this late date to reimburse the loss that the Federal Government would occasion by making this reduction. Let me remind you that for every Federal dollar expended here there are $3 of State money. Let me recall, too, that our State legislature has adjourned and that there is no opportunity to get additional funds. But I would like at this time to remind my colleagues of the House that the State Legislature of West Virginia, in an effort to increase and improve this program, the State legislature which adjourned some weeks ago, increased the State appropriation for this program by $100,000 in the thought that it was a worthwhile program and that the Federal Government might possibly increase the allotment. They certainly did not contemplate that the Federal Government would reduce the allocation because the State had increased its own allocation.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from West Virginia and to extend my remarks in the RECORD following his.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, may I say now briefly that in the State of West Virginia there are 268 high schools; 176 of those 268 are offering 1 or more programs which receive reimbursement from Federal and State vocational-education funds under this legislation.

Enrollments in high-school vocational classes for the year 1951–52 were: Vocational agriculture, 5,517; vocational home economics, 9,679; trade and industrial education, 3,817; and distributive education, 350; a total enrollment of 19,363.

And here is one thing in particular I would like to call to the Committee's attention.

The boys enrolled in vocational agriculture in 1951–52 conducted supervised farming programs which included crop and livestock enterprises, in addition to farm and home improvement, conservation, and farm mechanics projects. Their productive enterprises had a total value of $2,014,199. The cost of producing these enterprises was $1,005,817, leaving a return for their labor of $1,008,382.

Do you wish to impose a curtailment that would in any way handicap a project that can show profits of that kind and can show what it is doing to train young American boys to stay on the farm, if you please, and to make the farm a better place on which to live?

Let me call your attention to something else: The girls enrolled in vocational home-economics classes in 1951–52 conducted a total of 23,000 home projects under the supervision of their teachers.

The boys and girls enrolled in distributive education classes in 1951–52 earned a total of $207,000 while employed as a part of their cooperative training program.

A total of 400 high-school vocational teachers are employed in the State in 1952–53. Of these 127 are teachers of vocational agriculture, 134 are teachers of vocational home economics, 125 are teachers of trade and industrial subjects, and 13 are teachers of distributive education.

I would like to join in the plea made by the gentleman from North Carolina that a program of this type; a program that since its inception in 1936 has proved its worth and proved the wisdom of Congress in making appropriations. Let me say to you that the total amount involved here of a little better than $18 million is the same amount that you have been appropriating for the last 5 years. It is the amount that President Truman approved and it is the amount that Secretary Hobby approved.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, since 1924 the Congress has continuously recognized that the promotion and further development of vocational education in the Nation is in part a Federal responsibility. The various States have proceeded with this phase of their educational program under provisions of several laws passed by the Congress, the last of which was the act of March 18, 1950—Public Law 462, 81st Congress. The States have shown good faith by carrying on and expanding the program as much as possible as the ever-increasing load made constantly heavier demands upon them. Many of them actually went beyond their normal financial ability to support this program.

It is difficult for me to agree with the position taken by the majority party members of the committee in cutting back the appropriation for this purpose from the conservatively estimated requirement of $18,673,261 to $16,048,870, a reduction of $2,624,391, in view of the fact that the need for this type of education is greater now than ever before. This need is emphasized by the defense production effort in the country where greater skills are necessary and more people with those skills are in demand. To cut back at this time, even in the amount proposed, would be, in my opinion, directly in counterpurpose to our national defense program.

We must bear in mind, also, the fact that there are many of the men and women who have been in the Nation's Armed Forces who can avail themselves of its benefit. Even a small curtailment in the amount required could easily militate against them and I am sure that no Member of this House would condone doing that.

To my mind, this is another case of rather shortsighted attempt at so-called economy. When we consider that we are being asked to appropriate billions of our taxpayers' dollars to be sent abroad, some of which will be utilized for exactly this same purpose in foreign countries, it must be clear that the reduction we are asked to make in the funds for this valuable program is entirely unjustified. I sincerely hope, therefore, that this House will recognize the necessity for and the justice in restoring this item to the full amount estimated to be required for the proper continuation of the program. For that reason I am supporting the Barden amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that thus far in the debate we have increased the approprations recommended by the Appropriations Committee a total of $1,409,000. I will not enumerate those items. However, I submit the amendment which we are now considering is of supreme importance and I wholeheartedly support it.

I also call attention to the fact this amendment would only increase the appropriation recommended by $2,624,391.

May I also make myself clear that I intend to support the amendment which I understand the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] will offer to eliminate lines 1 and 2 on page 14 in order that the restriction on distributive education will not appear in the bill. I consider that phase of vocational education extremely vital.

Mr. Chairman, I dare say I represent the most conservative district in the

State of Virginia but if those good farmers in my district who compose the majority of the population had had the opportunity to vote between the additional $55 million for agricultural payments and this additional amount for educational requirements, I am sure they would have voted for the latter.

Mr. Chairman, let me preface what I have to say by assuring the committee that no one in the Congress is more economy-minded than I. Anyone who has, as I have, worked from his 13th birthday to put himself through school, knows the real meaning of thrift. No one more than I, and all of my private and public utterances will establish the fact, resents and resists the encroachment of socialism. However, I am persuaded that the program of Federal help for vocational education, as administered by our Government since 1917, is not calculated to socialize our educational system, and is economically and morally commendable and justifiable. I have inquired searchingly and painstakingly of my constitutents, and I am convinced that the Federal Government is making no effort to usurp or interfere with State administration and control, and is not attempting to influence policy decisions in the execution of the program. In this regard, I want it plainly understood by one and all that if the Federal Government should ever attempt to invade the educational domain of the States, I would then advocate the complete abandonment of the Federal program and the repeal of the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Barden Act.

As you gentlemen know, the George-Barden Act, which was passed in 1946, authorized the Congress to appropriate up to but not exceeding $29,300,000 for vocational education, including $10 million for agriculture, $8 million for trades and industry, $8 million for home economics, and $2,500,000 for distributive education. Since fiscal year 1951, the following funds have been made available for distribution to the States:

Fiscal year 1951

From the Smith-Hughes Act	$7,285,122.03
From the George-Barden Act	19,977,760.00
Total	27,262,882.03

Fiscal year 1952

From the Smith-Hughes Act	$7,285,122.03
From the George-Barden Act	19,123,261.00
Total	26,408,383.03

Fiscal year 1953

BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

From the Smith-Hughes Act (permanent appropriation)	$7,285,122.03
From the George-Barden Act	19,123,261.00
Total	26,408,383.03

The George-Barden Act figures quoted above include funds made available to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, District of Columbia, Alaska, and minimum amounts to States as provided by law.

Considering the economy feature involved, it seems to me that a comparison of the total Federal money spent for vocational education in America with the total Federal money spent to aid foreign students in the educational field is quite illuminating. In 1950–51, the United States paid out $28,178,000.10 to bring 13,069 persons to the United States from abroad for educational training while 3,363,684 students resident in the continental United States, Territories, and possessions obtained only $27,262,882.03 for vocational education. During fiscal 1951 the Federal Government spent $554,400 under the point 4 program to import 264 foreign vocational education students. At the same time, the State of Virginia received only $626,464 for the vocational education of 147,525 Virginia students. More then 10 times as much money as was spent for all phases of vocational education in Virginia in fiscal 1951 was spent by the Federal Government to import 3,101 students from Germany and Austria.

In fiscal 1952, which ended June 30, 1952, we brought to this country a total of 13,476 foreign students and sent to foreign countries a total of 3,252 American technicians, specialists, teachers, and so forth, all at a total cost of $49,807,417. In addition to this sum of money, we spent $171,000 for assistance to American sponsored schools in Latin America, $65,000 for American participation in the Berlin cultural festival and the Berlin industrial fair, $15,337 for the Vienna cultural festival, and $214,321 under Public Law 402 for operating costs for encouraging, facilitating, and servicing voluntary programs not connected with the expenditure of funds for United States Government grants. Compare this vast sum of money with the sum of $26,408,383.03 spent on vocational education in the United States and her Territories and possessions.

I am not here to attack the foreign student educational program, but I think that by way of comparison, these facts and figures are significant in considering the economy question involved.

To demonstrate on a comparative basis the need for supporting Federal funds for vocational education, I would like to compare the amount of Federal funds received by each geographical unit of my Sixth District of Virginia during fiscal 1952 with the total amount of money spent in that unit on all phases of the program:

Expenditures for vocational education, 1951–52

County or city (Virginia)	Federal		State	Local	Total
	George-Barden	Smith-Hughes			
County:					
Alleghany	$1,200.00	$1,000.00	$7,200.19	$17,050.31	$26,450.50
Bedford	2,650.00	2,600.00	16,057.31	24,820.18	46,127.49
Botetourt	1,500.00	4,100.00	16,251.00	11,494.41	33,345.41
Campbell	1,800.00	6,700.00	29,561.23	23,703.39	61,764.62
Craig	300.00	1,500.00	5,811.11	4,532.45	12,143.56
Floyd	900.00	4,750.00	14,138.41	9,082.23	28,870.64
Montgomery	8,049.98		24,215.65	16,461.67	48,727.30
Roanoke	3,800.00	500.00	20,399.50	22,332.80	47,032.30
City:					
Clifton Forge	602.00		3,842.27	7,528.46	11,972.73
Lynchburg	1,041.80	350.00	21,472.51	18,234.95	41,098.96
Radford		2,113.10	4,327.30	8,154.16	14,594.56
Roanoke	5,931.50	995.35	88,786.78	89,814.30	185,528.02
Total	27,775.07	24,608.45	222,063.26	253,209.31	527,656.09

Source: Mr. F. B. Cale, Director of Vocational Education, Virginia State Board of Education, Mar. 17, 1953.

With these funds, the Sixth District of Virginia has done an excellent job. Our teachers are extremely capable people and are dedicated and conscientiously devoted to the science of education. The return on the investment, in terms of individual and community improvement and economic stability, cannot possibly be measured in dollars and cents. However, infinitely more could be done with slightly larger monetary investment. Many of our schools which participate in the program are incompletely staffed and ill equipped, and many of our schools have been unable to participate at all.

If the good farmers of my district, who constitute the major portion of the population of my Sixth District, had had the opportunity to vote between the additional $55 million for soil conservation and the additional $2,624,391 for conservation of the vocational education program, I am sure they would have voted for the latter, even though the dollar benefit is smaller.

In conclusion, our view of the economy program must be taken at long range. In looking at the trees we must be careful to see the whole forest, and in looking at the whole forest we must not fail to see the individual trees. What I mean to say is that, in deciding how much we shall spend in fiscal 1954, we must not lose sight of the ultimate long-range economic benefit to be derived from raising the level of our educational base and the economic opportunities of our citizens. I trust that the committee will see fit to maintain the $450,000 allocation for distributive education and will maintain the present budgetary recommendations for all phases of vocational education.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the pending amendment.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and having the honor to represent in Congress one of America's great agriculture and coal-mining districts, I am asking that the House give serious consideration to the proposed curtailment of funds for vocational education.

I have had an opportunity to observe the excellent results of the vocational

education program in my own congressional district.

I believe all the rural people know that vocational agriculture in their rural high schools is meeting a real need of farm families—a need which in no other way could be met if it were not for this instruction program on a secondary-school basis.

Although the George-Barden Act authorized the appropriation of $29 million for the promotion and further development of vocational education, the complete authority has never been exercised and the appropriation requested for 1953 is $18,673,261. This is actually a reduction of $1,345,000 in the amount appropriated under the provisions of the George-Barden Act for fiscal year 1950–51.

Virginia received approximately $640,000 this year in Federal funds for vocational education. This is a small portion, approximately 25 percent, of the total amount expended in Virginia for vocational education.

If the amendment under consideration fails, the cuts in vocational education would come to Virginia in the second year of our biennium and, not having a session of the general assembly, we would have no way to restore these proposed curtailment of funds. Individuals and schools throughout the State would be seriously affected.

As an example:

The mine laws of the State of Virginia require that all employees occupying positions of foremen or fire bosses must obtain a certificate of competency before occupying positions of that nature. These examinations are rigorous and require knowledge of underground workings that can be obtained only through experience. In order to assist such persons, who have ambition to advance in their chosen work and improve their earning capacity, courses of instruction have been maintained throughout my congressional district since 1926, providing facilities furnished by the Virginia Trade and Industrial Education Department. This department is maintained by funds appropriated by the Federal and State governments.

The Virginia Coal Operators Association also is a token contributor, and assists the regional director in meeting travel expenses, for which no provision is otherwise made.

Attendance at these classes on the part of the employees is purely voluntary. They receive no compensation for doing so. Quarters for holding these classes are furnished by the various coal companies. The participation in these classes not only enables the men to be better qualified to pass the examinations, but it is also valuable in increasing their knowledge of proper methods of underground work.

Any reduction in the amount of funds appropriated by either the Federal or State governments would curtail to a large extent the continuation of this very important and desirable educational work. This, I feel sure, would be greatly deplored by the executives of the coal companies and by the rank-and-file miners themselves.

In addition to these courses of instruction, the Department also maintains vocational training schools at Wise and Abingdon, Va., where courses in manual training of various kinds are furnished. Participation in these courses is shared, to a great extent, by high school students who realize the values that accrue through these courses of instruction.

The Washington County Technical School in Abingdon, Va., for the past several months, has been training many hundreds of prospective employees of the Sperry-Farragut plant located near Bristol, Tenn. This important defense plant is nearing completion and will be engaged in producing guided missles for the Navy. In the next few months the fruition of this training will bloom when these employees take their place on the assembly line.

A reduction in funds for this vocational education facility would certainly curtail this valuable program which is making such a vital contribution to the national defense efforts of this Nation.

President Eisenhower recently asked Congress to authorize a commission to make a study of Federal-State fiscal relations. I highly approve such a study and I am convinced that many interesting and valuable facts will be revealed.

I believe it would be a sound policy to await such a study and give vocational education an impartial investigation along with other grants-in-aid programs, before singling them out in such a manner.

I am a strong advocate of economy, but I do not believe it is sound to effect savings at the expense of the youth of this country and the furtherance of our great productive system of free enterprise—one of the real purposes of vocational education.

I hope that the amendment prevails.

(By unanimous consent, the balance of the time allotted Mr. WAMPLER was given to Mr. ABBITT.)

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore the funds for vocational education from $16,048,870 to $18,673,261, that being the amount appropriated for this fiscal year.

The greatest assets we have are our young people. The youth of today will be the leaders of tomorrow. The future of our Nation, and the world will depend upon them. We must see that they have the best training possible to equip themselves and develop their capacities to meet this monumental task.

In 1917 Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act which provides Federal funds for the promotion of vocational education of less than college grade. In subsequent years other acts were approved by the National Congress to further stimulate and develop vocational education of less than college grade.

The last of these acts, which amended and superseded the George-Deen Act, was passed in 1946 and is known as the George-Barden Act. This act authorizes an appropriation of $29,300,000 for vocational education in the fields of agriculture, home economics, trades, and industry, and distributive education. Congress has never appropriated the full amount authorized.

The maximum amount appropriated for any one year was $19,977,760 in fiscal 1951. For fiscal years 1952 and 1953 Congress reduced the appropriation in the amount of $1,304,499. The full reduction was for distributive education. This was a reduction of approximately 7 percent.

There was no reduction in the amount of funds appropriated for vocational education in agriculture, home economics, and trades and industry.

The House Appropriations Committee has approved $16,048,870 for vocational education for fiscal 1954. This is $2,624,391, or about 14 percent less than the amount made available for fiscal 1953. This, together with the reduction since 1951, will amount to a cut of about 21 percent in George-Barden funds. Such a reduction will result in eliminating the program in many communities and seriously weakening the program throughout the Nation.

VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Appropriations are in the making to increase aid for research in agriculture. This is indeed a wise move. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that research findings are of little value until they are put to use on American farms. Vocational education in agriculture is the only program of agricultural education being operated on an in-school, organized, systematic basis for students of less than college grade. It is through this program that research findings are made known through systematic instruction to future and present farmers. This results in research being put to use on American farms for the benefit of all mankind. It does not seem logical to cut the appropriation for a program that has proved itself over a period of more than 30 years and at a time when we need to step up our efforts to teach research findings to a larger percent of our farm population.

The platform of the present majority party promised the expansion of agricultural research and education. Plans are already under way to increase the appropriation for agricultural research. It would be inconsistent and contrary to the national Republican platform to cut the appropriation for vocational education in agriculture.

There are more than 5,000 high schools in the Nation serving rural people that do not have programs of vocational education in agriculture. More than 1,500 schools need additional agricultural teachers to meet needs. At present, 400,000 youth are enrolled in vocational agriculture in the Nation. There should be 1 million enrolled in order to train a sufficient number of farmers to meet replacemeht needs. The job in agriculture is only partially done, and yet some speak of withdrawing Federal funds. Let us finish the job and stop talking about withdrawing funds. We need to put more into the program.

The future farmers of America, made up of boys studying vocational agriculture, is one of the Nation's most valuable assets. Through this organization our rural boys are being developed into real American citizens. A cut of Federal funds for vocational education is a

cut at the very heart of this program. To preserve this great organization we must see that adequate Federal funds are made available for vocational education.

DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

America's total civilian employment as of January 1953 was approximately 60 million persons. Of this number, 14,700,000, or 24.3 percent were engaged in distribution, comprising wholesaling, retailing, and service establishments. The distributive trade is the second largest source of employment, exceeded only by manufacturing, which employs 16,600,000, or 27.4 percent.

During the past 20 years, the number of workers in distributive occupations has increased much more rapidly than in agriculture and manufacturing. In the face of this increased employment, it is difficult to understand why the committee has recommended elimination of Federal support to distributive education.

Since Federal aid to distributive education was drastically reduced for the last 2 years, enrollment in distributive education programs has fallen off considerably. For example, the enrollment dropped from 341,440 in 1951 to 234,984 in 1952, a decrease of 106,456. Because of the lack of adequate Federal aid, many States have had to curtail their operations, and reduce staff personnel and the programs offered.

The great majority of distributive-education-cooperative students are individuals who either do not intend or cannot afford to go on to college. This is very important, because these young people in most cases are members of families unable to send them to college.

The distributive-education-cooperative-training program gives them the opportunity of getting practical working experience in their chosen field of endeavor while still in school. It qualifies them to obtain and hold full-time employment, to advance more rapidly on a successful business career.

It is just as important, therefore, that adequate Federal aid be extended to those interested in distribution as to those interested in other vocational areas.

HOME ECONOMICS

There are two reasons why home economics is so important. About a third of the girls who come out of high school are married within 3 years; in other words, about a third of them are married before they are 20, and they need to have had home-economics education in high school. In their early marriage years the adult homemaking programs, which are being offered increasingly throughout the country, are a great help to them. It goes beyond cooking and sewing. It goes into child care, help in the selection of equipment. Home economics helps these girls who, in increasing numbers, find themselves working even though married. It helps them to do the best kind of a 3-part job—a wife, a mother, and a job outside. That means managing their time and their household and their energy just as intelligently as possible.

For the first time in the history of our country, as you undoubtedly know, more than half of the women who work outside the home are married. Twenty million women are working outside the home and a little more than half of them are married. About a third of those have youngsters under 18, so they certainly need everything that home economists have to offer on the science and art of homemaking.

The most important values in the business of homemaking are intangibles. All the durable satisfactions of life center largely around the home. Homemaking is a basic industry and education for home and family living is essential to happiness and to progress in our society.

Crime and delinquency costs the Federal, State, and local Governments large sums of money. Not all of crime and delinquency is traceable to unhappy home life, but happy, satisfying home life does much to prevent crime and delinquency. Every individual has an interest in some kind of a home.

Vocational home economics education, as you well know, has had a healthy growth. However, of the 25,484 secondary school centers in this country only some 11,000 have vocational home economics. And nearly 7,000 secondary school centers have no home economics programs. This is evidence surely of a great unfilled need.

TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION

Vocational education was important in 1918, but never as important as it is right now. The need, particularly in trade and industrial education, is intensified by the rapidly changing pattern of our occupational employment. We are living today in the most highly developed scientific period in world history. We are at the peak of an ever-accelerating development of science and technology which is affecting every aspect of our lives and our occupations. The needs are greater, the problems are more difficult, new types of schools should be developed. It would be a tragic blow to vocational education to lose even a part of the Federal support at this crucial time. The Federal Government must continue to encourage the States by their participation in the program so that this intensified need can be met.

It is vitally important to the Federal Government that trade and industrial education be kept strong and ready for emergency training. We are now in a precarious position. We hope not, but tomorrow we could easily become involved in another worldwide war. The two American planes which were shot down in cold blood during the second week of March are reminders of current and continuing threats to our freedom.

We now have in readiness standby buildings and equipment. We also have standby stockpiles of supplies and materials. But we do not have standby supplies of skilled workers. Education in the trade and industrial field is the only agency with facilities, trained staffs, and technical know-how to train workers quickly, as was demonstrated during World War II, when the vocational schools of this country trained for employment in our war industries 7,469,506 workers. The Federal Government cannot afford to fail to keep this service strong and ready.

A very important reason for continued Federal support is that trained workers move voluntarily or are moved by the United States Employment Service from State to State for employment. An example of this is the present activity of the aircraft industry on the west coast. Skilled workers either moved voluntarily or were recruited by the Employment Service from all over the country to build a strong aircraft industry so necessary at this time. This must surely be interpreted as an obvious reason for Federal support.

The strength and well-being of America depends on the productive capacity of its people. To be efficient producers, people must be trained. America's vocational program, stimulated and financed in part with Federal funds, has played a most important role in our present position of leadership among the nations of the earth.

We should train people wherever they are so they can find work and produce goods and services wherever they may choose to live.

MORE STIMULATION NEEDED

The program has not been sufficiently stimulated. There is still much to be done. A cut in Federal funds will definitely mean a cut in the program. The cut of $900,000 in funds for 1952 resulted in a 197,422 drop in enrollment in vocational education. A cut of $2,624,391 would doubtless result in a very severe drop in enrollment in vocational education. This should not happen now or anytime. We must continue to do all we can to help our people acquire skills and knowledge that will result in increasing their productive capacity.

The security and well-being of individuals and the Nation is dependent on the skill and productive capacity of the masses of our people. Vocational education is the tool through which our people obtain training that helps them to develop skills and obtain knowledge so essential to production know-how.

We cannot afford, in this period of uncertainty, to weaken in the slightest degree our Nation's program of vocational education. Regardless of what anyone might say, a cut in Federal funds now or anytime would seriously damage the program throughout the Nation and would actually eliminate it in many communities.

COMMISSION PROPOSED

There is now pending before Congress a bill that proposes to establish a Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations. Such a Commission was recommended by the President. In his message suggesting the creation of such a Commission he stated:

> The Commission should study and investigate all the activities in which Federal aid is extended to State and local governments, whether there is justification for Federal aid in all these fields; whether there is need for such aid in other fields.

It seems only reasonable and fair that vocational education along with other State-aided programs be given an impartial investigation—a trial if you please—before summarily cutting the appropriation for the program. In addition to the damage that such a cut would do to the program it would also

tend to prejudice the Commission once it is authorized and appointed.

Vocational education is necessarily costly which makes it difficult for many communities to establish and maintain it on a sound and effective basis. But there is nothing more costly than ignorance. Vocational education is an investment in human progress.

This is the wrong time and the wrong place to make a cut. The damage that would be done to the effectiveness of the program could not be offset by the small amount saved in our efforts to balance the budget.

I think we should pause a long time before we take such a drastic step as this.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this Committee will vote to sustain the Barden amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Barden amendment. This is one program that reaches practically every State and every community in every State of this entire Nation. We are training boys and girls who may never enter college, who live in their immediate communities, and who work and earn a living for themselves. I think it is one of the greatest programs that we have in this Nation to get people off the dole and to help them help themselves.

So, I certainly hope that this appropriation will be increased to at least the amount appropriated for 1953. Let us cut $2,000,000 from some other program, or off your foreign-aid program, and add at least this $2 million to such a worthy cause.

I feel strongly that we should have adequate appropriations for distributive education, and I believe in the equalization of educational opportunities and I believe we should support our land-grant colleges at the national level, but certainly our land-grant colleges should at least have an opportunity to continue until the State legislatures meet.

An amendment will be offered to restore the funds for vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, which I consider to be one of the most important under consideration.

It has been my opportunity to observe first hand the operation of vocational rehabilitation in the States and I sincerely feel that this is the last program that should be impaired by appropriation cuts. It seems that this is one program that everyone would agree should be encouraged. The physically handicapped of this Nation are not candidates for a handout. They do not want charity. Instead they are asking only for an opportunity to work and earn a living like other people. I have personally known many physically handicapped people who would have been without hope had it not been for the program of vocational rehabilitation. I have seen despair turn to hope, and hope to assurance as these same people gained their rightful place in society.

Of course, no one can rehabilitate a crippled person. He must rehabilitate himself. But I know that the State-Federal rehabilitation programs have given many people the opportunity they never could have had otherwise. Furthermore, it is my information that the Government has received $10 in return for every $1 spent in rehabilitating physically handicapped people. It comes as somewhat of a shock to me that the committee would recommend less for vocational rehabilitation of crippled and blind adults than the President recommended in his budget.

The Government has spent great sums of money to convert from war to peace and from peace to war to help able-bodied businessmen. Provisions are made for labor, for the farmer, and we have established social security for those who can earn under the social-security program. We spend a great deal of money on rehabilitation of foreign people through our program of foreign aid, and we provide retirement for our civil-service workers. Yet, the physically handicapped are barred from civil-service employment because of not being able to meet the physical requirements. They are nevertheless expected to bear their share of the tax burden.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how any Member who understands this program can favor this reduction and I hope that we will vote to restore funds so essential to the successful operation of the program of vocational rehabilitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

FUNDS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SHOULD BE INCREASED

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment.

I want to speak in behalf of an increase in funds for vocational education. This bill provides for a decrease as compared with our current program in vocational education. Instead we should be increasing our support of this basic work.

We owe much of our progress in agriculture and rural living in recent years to the training our farm boys and girls have received in agriculture and home economics in their local high schools.

Unfortunately this great program has not yet reached all the high schools attended by all farm boys and girls. We should continue a modest increase in our Federal support of these programs each year until all of the farm boys and girls have the opportunity to take courses in agriculture and home economics.

And, we must keep this in mind, the more wealthy communities were the first ones to take advantage of Federal aid for vocational education. The communities without vocational education at the present time are our poorer communities. A few million more dollars for vocational education will do more good spent in these poorer communities than the money we are now spending for that purpose.

We should by all means increase our appropriations for vocational education by at least $2.5 million. An additional investment of this amount in the education of the youth of our land, will pay dividends amounting to millions of dollars for many generations to come.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in the legislation that is presently under consideration, and I wish to state that the entire Oklahoma delegation has gone on record urging the Appropriations Committee to appropriate sufficient funds for vocational rehabilitation to enable the State agencies of the various States to work at their greatest possible efficiency. Our State of Oklahoma has done an outstanding work under Voyle Scurlock, director of vocational rehabilitation. The Oklahoma division of vocational rehabilitation has rehabilitated 1,282 individuals, 208 of which were taken directly from relief rolls, saving the State and Federal Government $182,000 per year in relief costs. The people of Oklahoma are convinced that rehabilitation is the only effective means of making an important inroad on public assistance costs and that rehabilitation is the truly American way to deal with the problems of disability. The Oklahoma house of representatives has already voted to increase State funds for vocational rehabilitation by approximately 80 percent, for 1953–1954, and if the Oklahoma State senate has not already concurred, which I am sure that it has, the action is expected. I do not feel that the funds for vocational agriculture should be slashed. These cuts would affect activities of both the future farmers of America and future homemakers. The cuts in Federal grants, if approved by the Congress, will force local school districts and States to make up the difference or curtail their vocational agriculture and home economics courses.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Barden amendment. In the consideration of this amendment I should like to say to my friends of the majority on the committee that I do not believe that they have a mandate from the American people to cut vocational education to the tune of $2 million. I realize that the administration has recommended a cut of some $4 million, but I have a feeling that its right arm knows not what its left arm is doing. The Secretary of Agriculture, who is responsible for one of the great educational programs administered by the Federal Government, through the Extension Service, has advocated increased emphasis on education and research and less emphasis on subsidy programs which cost not millions but hundreds of millions of dollars. That is exactly in line with the proposal of the gentleman from North Carolina here. If we spend thousands for education now, we save millions in subsidies later on.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program which has developed both in industrial and agricultural areas through vocational

agriculture, vocational home economics, vocational trades and industries, and distributive education. In my State of Oklahoma we have seen the development of two of the finest organizations that I know anything about, the Future Farmers of America, and the Future Homemakers of America through classroom work and actual work in the homes and on the farm, through a program partially supported by Federal funds which the committee seeks to curtail in this instance. The development of these programs is directly in line with what the Secretary of Agriculture has been saying about expanding agricultural education and cutting down on larger grants for direct subsidies to agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no other program which has done so much for our country at such little cost as this program designed to encourage the vocational training of our young people. The funds involved in this program are insignificant compared to the total budget; and yet, the returns to the people of our country, both direct and indirect, are enormous.

They tell us we should shift the responsibility for vocational education to the States and local communities. I want to point out, however, that this program has grown up as a joint enterprise in which the Federal Government has properly manifested an interest. State laws cannot be changed overnight. Many local communities are not financially able to support a good program or any program without assistance. Unless we appropriate sufficient funds to carry on this program in the traditional manner in which it has been administered, including sufficient funds to allow for normal growth and expansion, we may here today do irreparable injury to one of the finest programs ever designed by the Congress of the United States for the benefit of our people. Most State legislative programs for the next 2 years have already been completed. Many legislatures will adjourn within the next few days and will have no opportunity to take a second look at this matter. In practically all the legislatures, the fiscal program has already been determined and there is no possible chance of having the States make up the big cuts which have been contemplated for this program. In my own State it will be absolutely impossible to carry on this program unless amendment prevails.

The Oklahoma Legislature, which is keenly alert to the needs of our people, has memorialized the Congress "to refrain from reducing the already inadequate amount of funds requested to be assigned to promotion of FFA and FHA programs throughout agricultural sections of the country." The legislature pointed out accurately that the proposal, if adopted, would result in the discontinuance of every FFA and FHA chapter of less than 25 members in the State.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. May I say to the gentleman I am very much in favor of the Barden amendment and intend to vote for it.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has always been for this program.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman and am wholeheartedly in favor of the Barden amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish I had time to go into the details of the extent to which this program has been developed in my own State and district and in the great agricultural area represented by my distinguished colleague from the First Congressional District, where many youthful members of FFA and FHA clubs have distinguished themselves in national competition. Knowing his district, I can well understand why my friend and colleague has always been a supporter of this fine program.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I just want to congratulate the gentleman on his fine presentation. The program in our State is a splendid program also. I shall support the Barden amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program which we cannot afford to curtail. In my State many new applications are pending in the office of the State director. In my district there are 116 programs of vocational education in 57 communities; 6,524 all-day students and 16,360 adults are reached by it; 134 trained teachers are employed.

It is important to note here the work of the Future Homemakers of America and the New Homemakers of America—Negro. There are now 1,991 FHA and NHA members in the third district. Their motto, "Looking Toward New Horizons," is clearly indicative of the work they are doing.

In my district there are 2,308 FFA members in 51 chapters. In 1950–51 these boys had an annual income of $715,483.29, or an average income per boy of $310.10.

Mr. Chairman, the interest in these programs is high; the need is great. The dividends in national income, national security, and national morality are immeasurable. I sincerely trust that the House will restore all recommended cuts in these fine programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Barden amendment. The vocational-education program should not be curtailed. It should be expanded. There is a great need for it in my congressional district. Permit me to read to this committee a statement made by the legislative committee, Missouri Vocational Association, which appears on pages 583 and 584 of the hearings on this bill. This statement clearly states the need for a continuation of this program. It is as follows:

NEED FOR THE FURTHER PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRACTICAL ARTS AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN MISSOURI

As taxpayers and citizens we are interested in the elimination of waste and inefficiency in government. We believe, however, that it is not sound to effect such savings at the expense of the youth of this country and our productive knowhow, which is the real purpose of vocational education.

Further, we feel it unwise to curtail our vocational programs at the time when our adversaries are expanding theirs at a rapid rate. It is rather reliably reported that many leaders in the field of vocational education are being taken from the eastern section of Germany into Russia to assist with the expansion of the practical arts and vocational education.

In the final analysis, properly conceived and well-operated programs of vocational education do not cost—they pay. Regardless of its natural resources, if a nation desires to improve its standard of living, it must provide vocational education and technical training for its people. For illustration, Denmark and Switzerland with poor natural resources and good education and technical training have a high standard of living, while on the other hand, Mexico and Brazil with their great natural resources and low education and technical training have a low standard of living, and so it is all over the world.

In Missouri the job of promoting and developing the practical arts and vocational education has been only partially completed. For example, while 18.1 percent of the labor force of Missouri is engaged in agriculture, only 7.4 percent of the high-school youth of the State are receiving training in this area. Too, while 44.5 percent of Missouri's labor force is engaged in industrial and service occupations, only 5.4 percent of the high-school youth are receiving training in this field. Only 13.3 percent of the high schools of Missouri are offering any type of industrial training. Similar circumstances exist in the fields of vocational distributive education and vocational home economics. The rapid increase in the number of enlarged school districts in our State has resulted in a great increase in requests for programs in vocational agriculture, vocational home economics, distributive, and industrial education. Six years ago the local school district was being reimbursed $1,800 for a program of vocational agriculture. Today the reimbursement for such a program is only $1,350. As more programs are approved, reimbursement to the local school for vocational education becomes less. As a consequence of this reduction in reimbursement, many local schools have failed to increase salaries in proportion to increases in the cost of living, and many vocational teachers have left the profession for higher-paying jobs in business and industry. These teachers have done better—and the children of the State have been the losers.

In the interest of national defense and economic well-being, in the interest of a balanced manpower in the different occupational areas, and in the interest of the boys and girls of Missouri, we urge that the Federal aid for vocational education be increased if at all possible, but at any rate, maintained at its present level.

Legislative Committee, Missouri Vocational Association: Joseph Castelli, Guidance; H. W. Dahlor, Industrial Education; Custer McDonald, Distributive Education; Pauline Garrett, Home Economics Education; E. E. Schmid, Agricultural Education; Tracy E. Dale, State Director of Vocational Education, Consultant; H. H. London, Committee Chairman.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to discuss briefly why I

think the proposed cuts in the appropriations for vocational education should be restored. The vocational education program has worked very well in Oklahoma and has been of immeasurable value. I have observed the program for many years and know that it is sound and has been adequately administered.

The strength of the United States among the nations of the world depends upon our ability to maintain a high level of productivity. This will be possible only through increasing the skill and efficiency of the labor force and improve efficiency on the part of business, industry, and agriculture. Naturally, I am quite concerned about the vocational education program in all its phases and especially as it pertains to agriculture, because my district is largely agricultural. No one will question the fact that America's strength among world powers lies largely in its ability to produce food and fiber. American industry is immediately dependent upon American agriculture.

For the past few years, a strong effort has been made throughout the country to keep the boys on the farm. As the business of farming becomes more complex, with all its problems of soil conservation, disease and insect control, machinery maintenance, and business management, early training will encourage young men to stay on the farms because they will be trained for the job. For farm boys who use the home farm as their laboratory and who later plan to attend agricultural colleges, this training in vocational agriculture that they receive in the high schools is an effective way to bridge the gap between the college and the farm.

I have discussed these proposed cuts with our State director of vocational education. He informed me that Oklahoma's vocational agrioulture training would be reduced in the amount of $49,000 and would result in the loss of 35 established departments of vocational agriculture, and would make idle many agriculture buildings and farm shops which have cost the local communities from $15,000 to $80,000 each. It would also disrupt the training of 2,730 of our farm people.

The proposed cut would take away $34,000 from our State's home economics program. This would result in a loss of 56 reimbursed departments, affecting 5,000 or more students.

Our State director also informed me $33,000 would be taken away from our trade and industrial education program, which would result in the loss of 50 reimbursed classes, affecting 750 trainees in 25 centers.

School statistics show that the States of this country spend many millions of dollars each year to provide college educations for just 15 to 20 percent of the Nation's youth. The other 80 or 85 percent of the young people who do not go to college must fall back on vocational education for some training for the vocation in which they will find their usefulness. At the present time in our educational setup, only vocational education is designed to meet their needs. I agree with Mr. C. H. Miller, Kansas State director for vocational education, when he said recently:

> Society will pay for the training of skilled hands, whether it pays in the orderly, efficient, and satisfying arrangement of cooperation between school and industry, or whether it pays in the more expensive and less satisfying arrangement of allowing youth to get its training in the haphazard, catch-as-catch-can plan of entering industry untrained.

Since I have been a Member of Congress I have been doing everything I could to bring economy into our Government. I think it is the desire of all good citizens that our Government operate economically, that unnecessary expenditures be discontinued, and that taxes be reduced if they can be reduced without curtailing services that are absolutely vital to the future of our country. Gentlemen of this Committee, I consider a strong vocational educational program vital to the future of our country. I ask that you give this matter your most serious consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that the committee bill calls for $2 million more for vocation education than was recommended in the revised budget. I think that item has been overlooked. We are still faced with the responsibility of following the President in his attempt to balance the budget of the United States. The Appropriations Committee, however, saw fit to increase the appropriation for this item for vocational education $2 million over the revised request. The revised request was $14,048,000. The committee recommends in this bill $16,048,000, an increase of $2 million over the budget under which the Appropriations Committee was working.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. There is a lot of talk about supporting the Eisenhower program and reference has been made to some of his speeches. Would not the gentleman conclude that probably the recommended figure was what the Eisenhower administration indicated at the moment they wanted?

Mr. BUDGE. In answer to the distinguished majority leader, I would certainly have to say that would be my impression.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, it is true that the new administration, in submitting its revised budget to the Appropriations Committee, recommended a cut of 25 percent in the amount of George-Barden funds to be available for fiscal year 1954. In the justification which was submitted by the Budget Bureau, it was pointed out that State and local government is now paying 80 percent of the cost of this program, and it was the feeling of the Budget Bureau that more of this program should be made the responsibility of State and local government. Every dollar of Federal aid we receive in Wisconsin costs the Wisconsin taxpayer $2.87.

It is my understanding that the Council of State Governments is working on the program to shift more of the responsibility for this type of an aid program to the various States in the hope that within the next 2 or 3 years, we shall be able to give up certain fields of taxation which the Federal Government has taken over almost exclusively.

I certainly am well aware of the fine work that has been, and is being done under the George-Barden program. For fiscal year 1953, the Congress appropriated $18,673,261. The so-called Eisenhower budget, which was submitted to the Appropriations Committee for fiscal year 1954, provided for a recommended appropriation of $14,048,870 as a Federal contribution for the promotion and further development of the vocational education program. The Appropriations Committee, however, recommended in the bill before us today an appropriation of $16,048,870, or an increase of $2 million for fiscal year 1954 over and above the recommendations of the present administration.

I rise in support of the Appropriations Committee report as I feel that it is a fair and just compromise. I supported the $2 million increase over the recommendations made by the Bureau of the Budget when this matter was considered by the full committee. I urge the Members of the House today to support the action of the Appropriations Committee in regard to this particular appropriation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, as you will note on page 433 of the hearings, the National Farmers Union has supported and do now support this entire appropriation. In other words, they back Mr. BARDEN's amendment. On page 461 of the hearings the American Farm Bureau Federation also declared their support of the full appropriation. The National Grange, through Mr. Saunders, on page 450 of the hearings declared their support of the full appropriation. I feel that here is one spot in the bill which it would be extremely foolish to decrease below what we have had in fiscal year 1953 and previous years.

I served 6 years on this particular subcommittee in the past and this item, together with the one the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] just mentioned—vocational rehabilitation—are two of the proposals in the bill which I do not agree should be decreased and which I think should be reinstated to the level of 1953 fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I dislike the necessity of rising to go against the distinguished chairman

of the Committee on Appropriations. If there is anybody in this House I have respect for, it certainly is that man. The only reason I do so is because of the fact I have become acquainted through past association with the program of vocational education, as it exists in my own State. I was a member of the Arizona Board of Public Welfare at one time. I know that the program of vocational education is necessary not only in that State but in all others. We have children coming out of our high schools who are not prepared to make a living, and the colleges are not expanding enough to support and take those children in to teach them other trades. It is absolutely necessary that this program not only continue at its present rate, but that it be expanded. As to vocational rehabilitation, I would like to address myself to that section for a few moments. I know of my own knowledge that the reduction in the public-welfare program in Arizona, and the reduction of the people who have been on the rolls, has been largely due to the very fine vocation rehabilitation program which has been going on in that State. It is not only a program which pays in human dividends, but it pays in dollars and cents. It removes those people from the welfare rolls, and makes responsible and productive citizens of them, and is in all ways a benefit to our American society.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, when unanimous consent was obtained by the gentleman from Illinois to limit time for debate, the Chairman was advised that I proposed to offer an amendment to the same paragraph—not an amendment to the pending amendment but an amendment involving the same paragraph. Will it be possible after this vote is taken and the matter is disposed of to offer that amendment in the same paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it will.

Mr. BAILEY. It can be offered then as a separate amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. As soon as this matter is disposed of, your amendment can be offered and acted upon.

Mr. BAILEY. My amendment, or in case some other Member desires to offer an amendment, it would be in order to do so?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUDGE. When the Chair ruled on the question raised by the gentleman from West Virginia, does that mean that the limitation of time would not apply? The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] said he had an amendment to this paragraph. There was a limitation of debate on this paragraph. Was the Chair's ruling to change the time limitation on the paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The time limitation is not changed. The question comes on the amendment, and then the gentleman may offer his amendment.

Mr. BUDGE. Within the same time limitation as now fixed?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Within the time limitation fixed.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which the gentleman from West Viriginia may offer be read at this time in order that it may be debated during the course of the time limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. That can be done. The Chair understands the gentleman from Arkansas intended to offer an amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, what I asked was a clarification, if the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] would be permitted to offer this as a separate amendment after the Barden amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Would the amendment then be subject to additional debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Only within the hour that has been fixed. It can be offered and a vote taken.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Barden amendment, and I also intend to support the amendment on the part dealing with distributive education.

In my State the vocational training program has been an excellent and successful one, and is growing, it needs to be expanded.

I am as interested in economy as anyone, and I know this Congress has a very difficult job in trying to balance the budget, but I think we should use wisdom in our efforts. To me, to try to practice economy on this program is being pennywise and pound foolish, because I do not believe there is any place in the Federal budget where the American taxpayer stands to get as much for his money as he does on this program. I do not think it is real economy to curtail a program that does as much in human and actual cash values as vocational training is doing. If we cut down on this program now when it is growing and when it is so badly needed, we are going to deny the existing generation the training it must have.

Young minds cannot wait for politicians to make up their minds. I think the time to go ahead with a program that is so well approved is now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the Barden amendment. Ever since I came to Congress I have advocated Federal aid to education. In fact, I have always felt that Congress should assume the responsibility in equalizing educational opportunities insofar as guaranteeing a minimum foundation program to all the girls and boys in this Nation.

I am glad to witness so much warm support to restore the 14-percent cut the committee made from the amount of money expended for vocational education for fiscal 1953. The original budget provided for $18,673,261, the revised, $14,048,840 and the committee recommended a little over $16 million. Unless the amount provided for in the original budget is restored, the whole program throughout the Nation will be impaired.

I am sure that the membership of this body cannot afford to throw a monkey-wrench into such an efficient program that assists the States to pay for vocational-guidance teachers to teach high-school children trades that will be useful to them in later life.

Unless these funds are restored there will be no funds for teaching distributive education, and the other three types of training—home economics, trades and industry, and agriculture—are affected. I am sure there is not a Member in this House that objects to our Government paying teachers who work with the future farmers of America. Likewise, the girls and boys who are unable to go to college should not be denied the opportunity to be taught some vocation or trade in high school.

In reality the funds for this program are entirely inadequate.

I noticed out in the reading room a few moments ago where there was a ceremony held today at the White House. President Eisenhower used several pens in signing the offshore giveaway oil bill. What type of economy is this Nation interested in?

Mr. Chairman, I have stated before in this Chamber that our schools through out the Nation could have been placed in first-class condition with the income from the offshore oil.

A vote to restore the George-Barden funds is a vote for sound economy. Like wise, a vote to restore funds to the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation is a vote for economy. Real economy is simply an intelligent and frugal allocation of available funds to essential uses.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Barden amendment and also the amendment which will be offered I understand by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE]. His amendment proposes to remove from the bill the first two lines on page 14 which now provides that none of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations. I think we should remember at this point that in the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture the Secretary requested and was granted an increase in funds for marketing research which is, really, a study in distributive education. It is my personal feeling that it would be much better to spend those funds here in distributive education than to have them spent by the Department of Agriculture in research in marketing, if we must make the choice between the two.

A report that I have from the State of Minnesota in regard to occupational and vocational teachers I think is very strong evidence in support of these full appropriations and the removal of lines 1 and 2 on page 14.

I urge the House to grant full and adequate appropriations for the support and expansion of the vocational educational program. Although the form of Federal support of vocational educational programs has changed through the decades of our national existence, the practice goes back to the very beginning. As early as 1779 the Federal Government undertook a program of instruction for those who served in the military forces of our country, and since that time the practice has been continued and extended to include instruction in practically all fields. The need for additional education in the vocational field was clearly evident after World War II and was recognized in setting up the GI educational program. The fact that so many young men and women accepted the chance to receive vocational training, following their discharge from the armed services, is, I think, evidence of the need for an expanded program. There is good reason to believe that if an adequate vocational program had been available in the secondary schools attended by most members of our armed services previous to their entrance into service, the numbers who received training under the GI bill might have been greatly reduced, and their reabsorption into the economy of the United States facilitated.

The vocational training program, in the trades and industries, in vocational agriculture, distributive education, and home economics has been widely accepted in Minnesota. The program has worked successfully in the schools of Minnesota and in my home city, St. Paul, especially, in the latter case, through the St. Paul Vocational School, a public trades school founded in 1919.

The large industry in St. Paul is highly technical and scientific, requiring skilled and trained operatives and craftsman. In addition, St. Paul is a commercial city, a center of the building trades, and of small manufacturing and assembly plants. The specialization, diversity, and technical nature of much of our employment make vocational training especially necessary. Officials in charge of the vocational education program advise me that there has been a great increase in the number of persons requesting vocational training, especially since World War II. The apprentice and journeymen training programs alone have accommodated over 25,000 students since 1945. Without Federal funds, they inform me, this program could not have been carried on. The St. Paul and Minneapolis area has been a principal source of building trades and construction workers for the defense projects of the Nation, especially for those projects intended to guard the cold, northern approaches to our country.

In Minnesota the total employed by major occupation groups increased from 928,899 persons in 1940 to 1,143,872 persons in 1950, a percentage increase of 23.1. During the same period the total population increase was only 6.8 percent. The increase in professional workers was 28.7 percent, or about the same as the percentage increase in the number of persons employed. In the same period, however, clerical and kindred workers increased by 53.4 percent, craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers by 60.5 percent and operatives and similar workers by 57.7 percent. Under such circumstances, the present program is not adequate even for the training of replacements, and it does not begin to provide for training to meet the greatly increased demand for technically trained clerical and industrial and distributive workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] is recognized.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the Barden amendment I concern myself not so much with the amount of money which the committee proposes to cut but I concern myself with the report of the committee in which it makes the statement that this program has now matured to the point where it can gradually be turned over to the States. I wonder if in not supporting this Barden amendment, I go along with what the committee had recommended we might not be embarking upon a policy of removing the very vitals out of the vocational-education program. It reminds me of a story which all of us have heard which, nevertheless, will bear repeating. A youngster down home was out fishing and pulled in a catfish. As he held the line dangling before him and reached up to grasp the wriggling fish he said: "Hold still, little fish, I'm not going to do a thing to you except cut your head off and gut you." That is about what the committee proposes when they say we should turn this vocational-education program back to the States. They are taking out the vitals of it. Of course, I do not think they are going to collapse in Georgia, but already we allocate more than 50 percent of our income to education, but we will stop the education the boys and girls in this whole Nation have a right to participate in.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his splendid statement in behalf of this amendment.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to be closely associated with vocational education for many years. Dayton, Ohio, 1 of the 3 largest cities in my congressional district, has long been known as a pioneer in vocational education, an important part of which is distributive education. Each of the other 2 large cities in the Third Ohio District, Hamilton and Middletown, also have big and important vocational-educational programs and programs of distributive education. Many of the township schools feel that their vocational-education portions of their school programs are of special importance to their students.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has long been a recognized educational truism that "we learn by doing." Every part of our educational program is important to every boy and girl in our great Nation. It is recognized, however, that all our schools have a very real obligation to these students to not only give them the necessary cultural and social background for living but that they must also be given proper opportunities to learn the practical skills and abilities to better earn their livelihood.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Barden amendment should be adopted—that the schools throughout our land should be notified that they must soon bear the entire cost of their operation through State and local taxes, and that another amendment which I am advised will be offered should also be approved. That amendment will strike from the bill any prohibition against the use of these funds for distributive education and certainly distributive education is a very important and proper part of any program of vocational education.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, this program of vocational education has long been of great interest to and dear to the hearts of the people of my State of Georgia. It is a program that from the beginning was sponsored and championed by Georgia statesmen. The original act passed in 1917 bears the names of two famous Georgians, the late Senator Hoke Smith, and the late Hon. Dudley M. Hughes. All subsequent measures bear the names of our senior Senator, the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE. Ex-Congressman Deen, of Georgia, was coauthor of one of the measures which was passed in 1936.

In addition to that, the program has been administered wonderfully in my State. Dr. M. D. Mobley, who was formerly the man who had charge of the program in Georgia, is now executive secretary of the National Vocational Association. Mr. Mobley was sent to Germany soon after the war was concluded that he might lend his experience and his knowledge of this program toward the rehabilitation of Germany's educational system. Mr. Mobley's fine work is being ably carried forward in Georgia at present by George I. Mosher.

I am glad to rise in support of this amendment. It would be folly and extreme stupidity to cut this program at this time. As a matter of fact, we ought to be adding to it instead of reducing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allotted me I shall not attempt to cover again the value of this program nor do I have time to describe the splendid work done by this program, but I would like to direct my remarks to what you would do if you go along with this

committee and should not adopt the pending amendment as I pointed out in general debate yesterday.

These funds are granted to the States for the operation of vocational work in schools scattered all over the United States where the programs are run locally. Every State, almost without exception, and there are only a very few exceptions, participates in this program. The committee says that this is the beginning of giving back to the States this job of vocational training. I do not agree with that. I believe in the equalization principle; but if it be the purpose to pass this job back to the States, it would be sending the matter back to the States before they are in a position to take it up. The State legislatures are not now in session, most of them will not be until next January at the earliest, and many of them a year after that; so if you agree with the stated objective of this committee to put this program back on the States, certainly you should not do it before they have any chance to take up the slack and to take it over. I want to say again that I differ with that objective.

For a given period, so I am advised, we had about 300,000 boys returned from Korea that had gone into the military services from the farms, of which only 75,000 returned to the farms. Fifteen percent of the American people on our farms are feeding all the rest of it. With the shortage of labor in this day and time, if there ever was a need to give specialized training to American youths and to insist and to urge them to stay on the farm, now is the time. To follow the shortsighted policy of this subcommittee, whose intentions are the best, and cut out a substantial part of this fund, to take such funds away from the local schools when they have no chance to remedy the situation, is awfully shortsighted in my opinion. I trust you will adopt this amendment. I understand the subcommittee will restore the funds for land-grant colleges.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to give my wholehearted support to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], to restore the appropriation on vocational education to the sum of $18,673,261. Having served as a member of the North Carolina General Assembly for three sessions, particularly on the committee on appropriations, I have had the opportunity of learning something about the work in the vocational educational field in North Carolina. I know of no Federal assistance which has meant more to our boys and girls than assistance in the field of vocational education. I heartily endorse the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I know of no program of education that has been more successful or provided greater opportunity for young people to provide for a livelihood than the vocational education program. It is one of the better forms of assistance that the Federal Government grants to the States. In my State it has been most successful and filled a gap which regular institutions were unable to fill. If it has been administered in other States as well as it has in the State of Utah then it is a program of which we can all be proud.

Now I share with the other Members of this body the fear that if the Federal Government continues to drain the tax dollars out of the States there will not be sufficient money left for them to carry on the functions which the States should be carrying on themselves. But until we do completely turn these functions back to the States we should continue to support them until the legislatures of the various States can appropriate the necessary funds to take them over. Let us not cripple them out of existence. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge this committee to support this amendment increasing to $18,673,000 the appropriation for vocational education. Both industry and labor are acutely aware of the necessity to provide adequate funds for vocational education in order that we may maintain and further develop the industrial strength of our country.

The attitude of both industry and labor is reflected in the correspondence which I have received from the Building Trades Employers' Association, which includes a joint resolution, as well as a letter from the director of the United Steelworkers of America, District No. 28, and I will request permission to have them inserted with my remarks:

BUILDING TRADES
EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 15, 1953.

Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FEIGHAN: Present recommended appropriations of the Bureau of the Budget have obviously singled out vocational education for a drastic cut of almost 25 percent. If this appropriation is approved, vocational education in Ohio and in other States will be dealt a blow from which it may never recover.

It seems to make little sense to recognize the soundness of the Bureau of the Budget's recommendation to increase the appropriation of the Bureau of Apprenticeship to enable further promotion of apprenticeship and to curtail the operation of vocational education, the latter which is called upon to actually give the training in the public schools.

We heartily urge you to take a determined stand against any cut in appropriations to support vocational education in the States. Ohio stands to lose 35 percent ($90,000) in support from the Federal Government of vocational education if present recommendations of the budget are approved. Your stanch support to prevent this curtailment in vocational education to youth and adults in Ohio will be greatly appreciated and recognized.

We cannot stress too strongly the importance of the continuance of the apprenticeship program to the city of Cleveland and surrounding territory.

Cordially yours,

JACK BURNS,
Executive Manager.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF DELTA CHAPTER, IOTA LAMBDA SIGMA AND NORTHEASTERN OHIO TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Whereas it is obvious that recommended appropriations of the Bureau of the Budget have partially singled out vocational education for a reduction of 24 percent thereby reducing by 35 percent—$200,000—of Federal vocational funds to Ohio; and

Whereas a recommended increase in funds for the Bureau of Apprenticeship, Department of Labor, has been made by the Bureau of the Budget despite the fact that vocational education in the public schools operates instructional programs for apprentices which are merely promoted by the Bureau of Apprenticeship; and

Whereas it is self-evident that a reduction of vocational education funds as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget will deal a crippling blow to the education and to the extension of educational opportunity of youth and adults in the public schools of the State and the Nation; and

Whereas it is recognized that the partial treatment inherent in the recommended cut in vocational education appropriations is the harbinger of gradual, year-to-year reductions approaching the elimination of Federal funds; and

Whereas a program of organized public vocational education has contributed to a major degree to the education and to the extension of educational opportunity for youth and adults in the United States since the passage of Federal legislation in 1917: It is hereby heartily

Resolved, That Ohio representatives in the United States Senate and House of Representatives be made cognizant of this impending catastrophe to the support of vocational education in the States, and that Ohio representatives wage an all-out fight on the floors of the Senate and/or the House to prevent any cut in the vocational education appropriations; and further, it is

Resolved, That all friends of vocational education in the public schools, in industry, business, agriculture, and home making support this resolution to their utmost and make personal and collective appeals and protests to their representatives in the Congress.

Adopted this first day of May 1953, at Kent, Ohio, for the two organizations.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
DISTRICT No. 28, CIO,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 20, 1953.

Hon. MICHAEL FEIGHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I just learned that the appropriation for the Bureau of Apprenticeship in the Department of Labor, has been sharply reduced by the House Appropriations Committee. Because of our organizations' deep interest in and concern with the training of skilled workers in this country, I inquired as to the effect such a cut would have on the Bureau of Apprenticeship's activity.

This Bureau is, as you know, responsible for promoting and developing programs for skilled-worker training in all industry.

My inquiries brought out some very interesting facts that I should like to pass on to you. The staff of this agency was reduced in 1952 and again in 1953 and in President Eisenhower's request of this year. The agency has not asked for increased funds, but has consolidated its organization to the point where it asked only this year, for a bare minimum of operating funds.

In President Eisenhower's state of the Union message, I remember hearing him state forecefully, his intention to improve and increase programs for the training of skilled workers necessary for a strong economy. He further stated that training of workers in industry should be promoted and stimulated by the Department of Labor; in this case, the Bureau of Apprenticeship, because it is the agency responsible for promoting this training. I learned that the reduction in budget of more than one-half million dollars out of a $3,300,000 budget, would cause a reduction in staff of about 100. Such a reduction would mean closing offices and reducing an already slim staff to the point where the services of the Bureau would be seriously affected.

I work with the Bureau of Apprenticeship people quite a lot, and I most certainly do not want to see the services they provide us reduced to even the slightest degree.

It will be deeply appreciated if you will contact any and all members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and inform them of our strongest opposition to this cut. I urge that you do so immediately, because the final vote may occur at any hour. We need the services of this agency, and we feel very strongly that important service to industry will be seriously damaged, if this reduction is permitted to stand.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. DONOVAN,
District Director.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlemen from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, but due to the parliamentary situation it cannot be presented at this time. However, at the proper time I will submit it. It is an amendment to strike out lines 1 and 2 on page 14.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Barden amendment is adopted, but whether or not it is adopted I think it is a grievous error to insert this language in the bill. We have a ludicrous situation if this language is allowed to remain. A boy in high school, for instance, wants to take up vocational agriculture; the boy right in front of him wants to take up a trade in an industrial course, but across the aisle from him there is a boy who wants to take distributive education, in the selling field, and with this language in the bill those three children in the high school will not have the same opportunity. I cannot for the life of me figure why it is in here, because it takes out at least one-fourth of the opportunities of the boys and girls.

As a cold-blooded economy matter, if you are talking about economy, we have in this distributive education in Arkansas 1,821 boys and girls.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

(Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. HALLECK.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to make a statement as to the program for the balance of this week as best I can see it, and for next week.

I had hoped very much that we might conclude this bill this evening. A number of Members are going out to Yucca Flats tomorrow, and I am glad they are going. I think it is a splendid thing that they have an opportunity to see one of these atomic explosions. My only regret is that I have not been able to get out there.

In any event, there are 14 amendments pending at the desk. I do not know how many more amendments Members might have that they would want to offer. As to those at the desk, I might say parenthetically, every one I looked at is to increase the amounts carried presently in the bill, which might indicate some little controversy about them. I know in respect to many of them there will be very much controversy. In all probability, I might say maybe it is even beyond a matter of probability, there will be a number of rollcall votes on some of these amendments. There is also the possibility that there will be a motion to recommit on which we might have a rollcall, and there might also be a rollcall on final passage.

In the light of all of that, it is quite apparent to me that we would have to work very, very late tonight in order to finish. Since we have come in at 11 o'clock this morning, and most of us have been very careful in our attendance here, it seems to me that that is not the better part of wisdom. This time will run on, and since there are about 15 minutes of debate left on this paragraph that means we will go on here to about 4:45. I do not know what the next amendment might be. We might dispose of another amendment this evening. Then it would be my suggestion that we adjourn over until Monday at 11 o'clock.

Monday is District of Columbia day. I have checked with the committee. There are several bills that are out of the committee, but I am informed there is no particular controversy about them. I wonder if any members of the District Committee on the other side would give any different indication in respect to that.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield, I might say there are a number of bills that have been reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia, but there is no controversy we know of at this time on any of the bills reported and that will be up for consideration on that day.

Mr. HALLECK. That would indicate, then, that we could go on with the consideration of this bill on Monday. Certainly we should be able to dispose of the amendments at some reasonable time Monday evening. It is my understanding that the Members who are going to Yucca Flats expect to get back in Washington Monday night. It might well be, therefore, that we could arrange to come in at say 11 o'clock on Tuesday. I recognize that in these earlier meetings we sometimes run counter to the activities of the committees. However, we are faced with a situation here that does require something maybe a little out of the ordinary, and it would be my idea that the rollcalls on amendments and on the passage of this bill could go over until Tuesday.

I understand the civil functions appropriation bill is to be reported. We expect to take it up for general debate on Tuesday after voting on the present bill is disposed of. It would be my hope that we could conclude general debate on the civil functions bill on Tuesday and read the first section. If we did that, then we would have Wednesday and Thursday to consider that bill under the 5-minute rule and bring it up for passage on Thursday evening. It is our further hope that since the following Saturday is Memorial Day, we could adjourn over from Thursday until Monday in order to give Members a chance to get home for Memorial Day or to make speeches that they may already be committed to make at that time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I realize the position that the leadership is in at this time. But I know there are two amendments to be offered which I think are important. I know there are several Members who have arranged to take this trip tomorrow to witness the atomic explosion. These Members are vitally interested in the amendment for hospital construction and vocational rehabilitation. If we continue the reading of this bill on Monday, I know they are going to be disappointed because they will not be here and will not have an opportunity to take part in the debate and have an opportunity to vote in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sorry that sort of situation prevails. Of course, their remarks could be extended, but I realize that might not be a very satisfactory way of taking care of the problem. But I might also say, for whatever it is worth, that my understanding is that the Members who are taking this trip are divided 50–50 between Democrats and Republicans alike. I do not mean to intimate by bringing that out that there would be any partisanship in their voting on any of these matters. I am sure they would probably rise above that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I hope they would rise above partisanship on this issue. I hope the Republicans will vote for it.

Mr. HALLECK. It might be worthwhile to note that many of these economy measures are pretty well supported here, and some not so well on the other side. But I do not want to get into that. If I understand the suggestion of the gentleman correctly, it is that we might put this over until Tuesday. But if we do that, in my opinion, we cannot conclude the civil functions bill by Thursday night, and that would interfere certainly with the personal convenience of a great many Members who have made their plans for Memorial Day.

Mr. FOGARTY. How about the House meeting at 10 o'clock Tuesday morning?

Mr. HALLECK. If we met at 10 o'clock on Tuesday, we would have a

quorum call the first thing in the morning, and I do not believe we could dispose of this bill, and leave any time for general debate on the Civil Functions bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Perhaps if we met early, we would have time for reading the bill under the 5-minute rule on Tuesday.

Mr. HALLECK. May I just say to the gentleman that from my observation of how this debate has progressed today, and after having seen some of the amendments at the desk, I just cannot see any reasonable manner in which to handle this situation except as I have outlined it although I do want to say I understand thoroughly what the gentleman from Rhode Island is bringing out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I hope what the distinguished majority leader has said with respect to the vote on the civil functions bill coming on Thursday does not represent any definite commitment because it had been our intention to bring that bill to the floor on Tuesday and have general debate on it. We hoped we would be able to bring that bill to a vote by Wednesday evening.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that so far as I am concerned, I shall be glad to cooperate with him in the accomplishment of that purpose of having a vote by Wednesday evening. But to undertake to determine at this time, and say that we could read the bill and dispose of all the amendments, and dispose of the bill in 1 day, I just would not want to go on that presumption at this time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Because of the previous atomic experiment being delayed, there was some delay in the Members getting back. Would it be possible to assure those of the 120 who are going on this trip tomorrow that if there should be some slight delay so that the planes returning came in here sometime Tuesday, then the civil functions bill will be taken up and the record votes then held over until the next day as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] would seem to want the civil functions bill gotten through as quickly as possible.

Mr. HALLECK. That same question was raised a week or so ago. I just do not believe I could, in good conscience, having regard to the overall convenience of the membership and the commitments made for Memorial Day, make any such agreement, because it might involve us in tremendous difficulty. I understand the last time there was a delay of 3 days. Of course, if we undertook to put this off for that length of time we would be in trouble. However, I will not foreclose that possibility. I will certainly cooperate with the minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN] and do everything I can to protect the convenience of the Members, as long as it does not run counter to the convenience of a greater number.

Mr. FOGARTY. How about meeting at 10 o'clock on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday?

Mr. HALLECK. I may say to the gentleman if he had taken some of the rather outspoken suggestions that I have had from committee chairmen, it does not strike me that that would be a feasible solution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] has an amendment which he wishes to offer after the pending amendment is disposed of.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized to close debate on the Barden amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I assure the membership that no one in this House has a higher regard for vocational education, or realizes its value more than I do. My very dear and intimate friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], whom every Member of this House holds in high esteem has much to be proud of as the father of this legislation. We all share with him the view that this legislation is good legislation, and that the vocational education program is a very worthwhile program.

However, I do want to set the record straight on one thing. Many of the Members who have spoken previously on this legislation have made a great plea not to cut below the Eisenhower budget. This item was raised above the Eisenhower budget by $2 million; so do not think the committee has cut the President's budget for this item. We have raised it $2 million.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Not at this time, I am sorry.

This moderate cut that the committee has made in vocational education means what? It means 83 cents per student. That is what the cut would amount to—83 cents per student.

It is not that we should not have money for this program. The gentleman from North Carolina said he would like to see this program have $200 million. So would I. But that money should come from the States. The reason the committee made this token cut was to see if we could not eventually get this program back to the States, where they would handle it themselves. In most cases, the States are more able to handle it than the Federal Government. As you know, the Federal Government is fast approaching bankruptcy, while some of the States do not have a single penny of bonded indebtedness, and have large surpluses in their treasuries. That is the question before the House.

Oh, sure! They say, some of the State legislatures have adjourned; that is true. But the same argument will be heard next year, and the following year, and the year following that. When are you going to get this program to the States; where it eventually belongs? The committee thought that, by making a small token cut this year and similar small reductions in future years, the program and the financing of the programs could gradually be placed entirely at the State and local level, where I believe the people really want it.

We are trying to break down this terrific centralization of government, little by little, without hurting any good program, such as the vocational education program. This token cut will not hurt the program.

I hope the amendment is not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUSBEY) there were—ayes 123, noes 61.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in considering the appropriation bill before us today, let us give some extra thought to the provision for funds to the National Institutes of Public Health in their medical research efforts.

The public health facts and figures easily accessible to all illuminate the acute need in our country today for the most astute medical minds to continue the research work which will alleviate or eradicate the many illnesses prevalent among our people. It is a fortunate home which has not been touched by cancer, heart disease, the crippling disorders of arthritis and rheumatism, mental illness, or other enemies to our Nation's health and economy.

When we are considering this request for research funds, we should remember that scientists have not only spent many dollars in securing their education and skill, but they have given up much of their personal freedom, laboring in the obscurity of the laboratory. It is imperative that we do our share also by granting the funds needed to maintain the services of these well-trained assistants. Sensitive instruments, up-to-date equipment, and modern facilities have also to be supplied as without them progress is delayed and perhaps even paralyzed.

It is unfortunate that most human beings are apt to remain apathetic until the danger strikes at home. We in Congress know that hundreds of lives might be saved if adequate funds are allotted for medical research. There are some among us, however, who seem to feel that there is no great urgency to appropriate these funds asked for today. I personally feel that the urgency is great because for many of our people their day of doom is already settled, unless science comes up with the answer.

In American industry, the word "cooperation" is an essential. As you know, every successful business organization in this country depends upon the smooth performance of each individual working effectively to make up the perfect team. If we in Congress will look upon our support of this appropriation as a business arrangement with the diligent medical men in the National Institutes of Public Health, I am convinced we will arrive at the solution to many of our national health problems.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRIMBLE: On page 14, strike out all of line 1 and line 2.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, since the adoption of the Barden amendment it is all the more imperative to adopt this amendment which I have offered which strikes this language:

Provided further, That none of this appropriation shall be available for vocational educational education in distributive occupations.

As I said a moment ago, you have a group of high school boys and girls; one takes vocational agriculture, another takes trade and industry; a girl takes home economics, and over here is a boy who wants to take education in what is known as distributive education, the selling phase of our economy, yet he is shut off. This would be discriminatory legislation as written. I do hope that the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that distributive businesses, such as wholesaling, retailing, and servicing organizations, employ approximately one-fourth of all of the employables in the United States today? It is the second largest segment of our economy, being surpassed only by that of manufacturing.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman's amendment will restore in the bill exactly what was cut out in the past 2 years by the committee and the House of Representatives on their recommendation. They did not give anything for the distributive education part of this program in the last 2 years; is that correct?

Mr. TRIMBLE. No; I do not think so.

Mr. GARY. I may say to the gentleman that absolutely is not correct. It is true that this House during the past 2 years reduced the funds for distributive education, and I think improperly, but they have never cut them out entirely. This would cut them out entirely.

Mr. BUSBEY. The record shows the House cut them out completely in the last 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment dealing with line 24, page 13. I trust the committee will accept the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABBITT: Page 13, line 24, after the parenthesis and comma strike out "$15,873,870" and insert "$18,498,261."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Just what does that amendment refer to?

Mr. ABBITT. It is line 24, page 13. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment might be corrected to show that it is line 24 after the word "exceed" and deals with the amounts to be distributed to the States.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is agreeable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the revised amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABBITT: Page 13, line 24, after the word "exceed", strike out "$15,873,870" and insert "$18,498,261."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: Page 14, after line 2, insert "Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the act of June 29, 1935, as amended, $2,501,500."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment, I should make an explanation to the committee. This is the $2,501,500 that was disallowed by the committee for land-grant colleges. Some people have stated that we cut out all of the appropriation for land-grant colleges. This is not true.

There is a permanent appropriation for $2,500,000, under a law which has been in effect since 1889. That is permanent legislation and this committee has no jurisdiction over that at all. In addition, there are 15 or more other appropriations which go, in whole or in part, to the land-grant colleges.

The $2,501,500 that was in the original request by the Bureau of the Budget was for a further endowment to the colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts. That was put in by a law passed in 1935, known as the Bankhead-Jones Act.

That was an emergency measure. I have a copy of the committee hearings, and I will insert some of the testimony of the heads of educational institutions in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. They came before the House Committee on Agriculture and made a plea for this on the basis of the emergency existing at that time. The committee thought that the emergency had long since passed. This appropriation should have been discontinued years ago. We realize the condition in which some of the land-grant colleges would be, in view of the fact that, in most cases, the State legislatures have adjourned. We are, however, giving the States notice that the committee will expect the States to assume this responsibility at the earliest possible date.

I talked to some of the school people regarding this situation, and they said, "Yes, it would cramp us a little bit this year, because we were depending on the fund, as small as it is, but nevertheless we could get by if we had to." Now the committee is being generous, to say the least, by offering this amendment to restore these funds in the hope that, within a year or two, this Federal appropriation can be eliminated altogether.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I appreciate the willingness on the part of the chairman of the committee to introduce this amendment. I think it was the proper thing to do at this time because many legislatures will not be in session until after the first of the year and, of course, they have already made or are making contracts with the teachers for next season.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to add to what the gentleman has said about the advisability of putting the schools on notice that the Federal Government expects to terminate support of this operation. I have had communications from presidents of some of the universities. Without exception they have said to me they would be perfectly willing to undertake to go to their State legislatures and determine there whether or not the program will be supported. Certainly what the Chairman of the subcommittee has said, and, I hope what I have said here, will be interpreted for just what it is, a notice that the time has come to get this particular function back to the States, as a matter of State responsibility.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hope the members of the committee will take a few moments to read the insertion I will make at this point, concerning the testimony of the heads of these institutions that came to Washington in 1935 to testify that this was an emergency measure.

Statements made by university and college officials before the House Committee on Agriculture on March 29, 1935, in support of H. R. 6123, to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges, and H. R. 6981, to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture.

STATEMENT OF DR. T. O. WALTON, PRESIDENT, TEXAS AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE, COLLEGE STATION, TEX.

The States are finding it continually more and more difficult, particularly in these times of depression, to meet these additional demands. Therefore, the representatives of the land-grant colleges and the representatives of the organized farmers of the State and Nation are coming to the Congress, believing that it is only proper that the Congress should provide additional funds for all three divisions, and that these funds should be adequate enough to enable us to meet the new demands that are being laid upon this system of educational institutions. * * *

* * * The land-grant colleges were established under an act of Congress in 1862. It was a time of national crisis. Today the Nation is again confronted with a crisis more

dangerous than the crisis growing out of the issues of the Civil War. We were fighting then to preserve the Union. We are fighting now to preserve human values. We were fighting then to destroy human slavery. We are fighting now to overcome economic slavery. * * *

* * * Due to the extraordinary demands that are now made upon the teaching divisions of the land-grant colleges to direct research and extension and to take leadership of various agricultural adjustment projects and industrial recovery programs, the colleges can no longer meet additional demands made upon them adequately without further financial support. Heretofore they have depended upon the States to meet this obligation and the States have responded in the main to the extent of their financial ability. But the States, many of them, are now unable to provide the necessary resources for the proper conduct and efficient operation of the teaching divisions of these institutions. In the main, the States have provided adequate buildings and equipment to meet the needs of the teaching, research, and extension divisions, but they are finding it increasingly difficult, particularly in these times of depression, to secure the funds necessary to provide the additional teachers to carry the increased teaching loads. Nor should the States be expected, under the general partnership arrangement that has prevailed since the establishment of these institutions, to carry these increased burdens without additional contributions to the teaching divisions from the National Government.

STATEMENT BY DR. F. B. MUMFORD, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, DEAN OF THE SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, COLUMBIA, MO.

It is true, however, that the depression has created an entirely new set of problems requiring the most careful investigation by the most competent investigators.

STATEMENT OF DR. F. O. FARRELL, PRESIDENT OF KANSAS STATE COLLEGE, MANHATTAN, KANS.

Shortly after the depression began there was a temporary decline in the resident-teaching load in the land-grant colleges. The enrollment of ordinary college students declined, and there were other reductions in the teaching load, not very great, but significant. At the same time the State support began to be reduced. Our State support in Kansas, for instance, in the last 2 years, according to the legislative action taken just a few days ago, is 28 percent lower than it was in 1930 and 1931. Because of that reduced State support we have had to reduce our teaching faculty about 15 percent, and comparable reductions have been made in the teaching faculties of most of the land-grant colleges. Those reductions were all right as long as the student enrollments were down, but in the last 2 years there has been a very marked increase in student enrollment. I do not know what it is for the country as a whole, but in our institution our enrollment is 17 percent greater than it was a year ago; that is, the general enrollment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK) having assumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H. R. 5246) under consideration today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OUTPATIENT DENTAL CARE FOR WAR VETERANS

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to correct certain abuses with respect to outpatient dental care for war veterans. May I say at the outset, I am sure there is not a single member of this body who would deny to our veterans dental care they rightly deserve. For example, I know that not one of us would offer argument in the case of a veteran who receives dental care as result of a gunshot wound through the jaw. On the other hand, however, objection can be raised to that dental care received in outpatient service rendered to veterans by Veterans' Administration clinics and offices or by participating fee-basis dentists—in other words, home-town dental practitioners who participate with the VA in furnishing dental care.

My discussion this afternoon is limited solely to this latter provision of existing legislation.

Permit me to preface my remarks with a few pertinent facts on the dental-care program. My authority is the annual report of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. As of June 30, 1952, there were 402 full-time dentists on duty in regional-office clinics. In addition, approximately 762 consultants assisted the VA dental staff. Further, some 62,000 dentists indicated their availability to participate in the fee-basis dental program.

In 1951 there were 588,378 applications for dental care. Out of this number, 367,868 were authorized for dental treatment. In 1952 there were 616,550 applicants, and 406,588 were authorized. Over and above this, 180,178 cases were still pending for determination in 1952. According to the Booze-Allen report, about 40 percent of all the outpatient treatment in the Veterans' Administration in 1951 consisted of dental care. The estimated cost of this care ran in excess of $30 million. The average annual cost has been approximately $35 million since the end of World War II. Under the present law, a veteran is entitled to dental care for life for any tooth that became defective in the service or was aggravated in service or within 1 year of discharge. The bill which I have submitted for consideration by this Congress is restricted solely to outpatient dental care. It provides that no outpatient dental services or appliances for dental disability not compensable in degree shall be furnished after the end of 2 years from the date of discharge or 6 months from the date this amendment is enacted, whichever is later.

Our veterans as taxpayers are interested in sound economy. This fact reassures me that they, too, will render their wholehearted support to this legislation. They realize, as do all our citizens, that this whole economy problem is a serious one, which can be solved only through the cooperation of every single American citizen, regardless of his status in life.

As President Eisenhower said in his message Tuesday night—

> Government cannot do this job, any more than any other job, utterly alone. You and your fellow citizens who want your Government to spend less must yourselves practice self-restraint in the demands you make upon your Government. You as citizens cannot help the common cause by merely favoring economy for every group except the one to which you belong.

I hope and trust that these words will be recalled when this bill is to be considered.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that because I was at the funeral of our former colleague, Mr. Hull, on Wednesday, I missed two votes on the agricultural appropriation bill. Had I been present, I would have voted to restore the funds.

CANCER RESEARCH

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on the first day I sat as a Member of the House of Representatives, which was the 3d day of January last, I was called upon to speak in commemoration of our late friend and colleague, the former senior Senator from the State of Connecticut, Brien McMahon. I said on that day that Brien McMahon was stricken down in the prime of his life, only in his 49th year and in the early days of his second term in the Senate of the United States. I remarked, "It is a great pity and a great tragedy that the Congress has lost him, and it is a greater pity and a greater tragedy that his State and his Nation have lost him because he had so much to give in the difficult years ahead."

As you all know, the death of Brien McMahon was due to cancer. Two other Members of the Senate were victims of cancer in the last few years, as were several of our colleagues in the House of Representatives. As a matter of fact,

there is hardly a Member of either House who in the realm of his own friendship or in his own immediate family has not felt the swift and silent hand of cancer strike with unrelenting force. That is why today, when we consider this bill which provides funds for research in cancer and also for research in the other major fields of disease which kill and incapacitate our people, we cannot think alone in terms of dollars. We must think as well in terms of human lives and of the great loss we suffer of the hearts and minds of those we cannot ever replace.

The funds which are provided in this bill are broadly speaking on a par with the funds provided in the budget enacted a year ago and in the climate in which some of our Members think and act today in the Federal Legislature, it may be that it will be difficult to provide more than this amount. I am fully aware that the subcommittee which conducted these hearings gave full attention and credence to the testimony of the brilliant medical men and fine-spirited citizens who presented the needs to the committee. Reading the record of those hearings, I was struck again and again with the simple eloquence of the somber story they told. And at the conclusion of that record I was convinced that we have done very little; that more remains to be done than has been done.

I cannot help but wonder if this great country of ours, with its vast resources and its tremendous capacity for wealth could not bring itself to provide more funds for research. It is only by research that we found the answer to the diseases which today have disappeared and which are now academic matters in the medical books of the universities. It is only by research that we will find the answer to the problems of cancer, heart disease, neurological disorders, and all the other dread diseases that rob us of our substance.

I am glad that the bill under consideration calls for a tiny increase in the funds for research. I had hoped we could meet the problem more fully. I trust we will be able to do so next year, and I know that only if we approach the problem boldly will we be meeting our full responsibility to the citizens, not of a single congressional district or of a single State, but to the citizens of the whole United States. For the problem is a national problem, the responsibility is a national responsibility, and we are the ones, in the final analysis, who must see that the job is done.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, as far as the depositors of two Chicago banks are concerned, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has failed them and has refused to live up to its obligations. For 5 weeks now the Devon Northtown State Bank and the First State Bank of Elmwood Park have been closed. People with funds in the banks have been unable to draw any part of them. Businessmen are desperately in need of their money for working capital, and people who need money for ordinary household needs, for rent, and for food are unable to use their money. They are being squeezed by inaction of the State auditor and the claimed inability of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to pay.

The people of Chicago and the people of America have believed that when a bank was closed for any reason the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation would protect them. If the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is to maintain the confidence of the people of America, it had better act quickly to relieve the people of the city of Chicago.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SHELLEY asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next for 1 hour, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to announce that I will not go on the trip to witness the atomic explosion so that I may be here on Monday to vote on the pending bill which I think is very important.

VALUE OF PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an article and a letter from the Army Times which was sent to me by Mr. Les Honeycutt describing the very remarkable prosthetic appliance demonstration by a quadruple amputee the other day. I also have in my hand a letter from the man that Mr. Honeycutt speaks of. While the letter is addressed to me personally, I am sure this young man had in mind every one who has helped to develop and further the use of prosthetic appliances for these very brave men.

Mr. Speaker, this young man is one of the finest and bravest young men it has ever been my privilege to know. He is a quadruple amputee.

Mr. Speaker, the article and letter to which I refer are as follows:

Dear Mrs. ROGERS: Enclosed you will find a tearsheet of the May 23 issue of the veterans edition of Army Times, on which appears an article I think you will enjoy.

Sincerely,

LES HONEYCUTT.

[From the Army Times of May 23, 1953]

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR VET TAKES LONG, LONG TRIP

WASHINGTON.—The few steps a young South African Air Force veteran of World War II made here this week represented the longest trip of his life—even though he had previously flown thousands of miles from his native country to be fitted for artificial limbs in the United States.

Eric Schultz, a quadrilateral amputee, walked 50 paces before the attentive eyes of House Veterans' Affairs Committee members at the conclusion of an hour-long demonstration of prosthetic appliances arranged by the advisory committee on artificial limbs of the National Academy of Sciences.

Beads of sweat clung tightly to Schultz's upper lip as he demonstrated his artificial arms and legs before committee members and 125 defense and medical observers from many nations.

He started slowly and hesitantly but had the thing whipped when he stepped up and across a platform in the middle of a caucus room in the House Office Building.

For Schultz, the demonstration marked the end of a long and successful struggle to get adequate artificial limbs since he left the South African Air Force in 1946.

Luck, not the kind that nearly killed him, made the difference between a cripple and an alert, ambitious veteran eager to get on with his fledgling career as a surface electrician at the Transvaal Chamber of Mines in South Africa.

Schultz wrote a half-dozen letters to artificial limb manufacturers in the United States 6 years ago. One of the letters arrived at the office of a termite control company in Los Angeles, the former site of an artificial limb maker long since out of business.

A secretary opened Schultz's letter by mistake and immediately became interested in his problem. She knew of the prosthetics program being carried on at the University of California at Los Angeles. She wrote Schultz details of the program and the wheels started churning.

The Rotary Club in Johannesburg, South Africa, raised funds for Schultz's trip to the United States. He arrived in Los Angeles and finally was fitted with upper extremity prosthesis at the University of California and then went to the Oakland Naval Hospital in California for his lower limbs.

Now he walks confidently and, according to an aide of Gen. F. S. Strong, executive director of the National Research Council, who now rooms with Schultz in a Washington hotel, Schultz can handle himself well.

Schultz had an attentive audience in the House caucus room this week—but none so attentive as five disabled Korean veterans brought in from the Army's Walter Reed Hospital here to witness 10 amputees demonstrate different types of prosthetic equipment.

Two of the Korean veterans were in wheelchairs, another was, himself, a quadruple amputee like Schultz. He walked in without crutches, already having acclimated himself to his new artificial legs.

One of the wheelchair patients was just back from a Chinese Communist prisoner-of-war camp. He looked small and young—but very determined. He blushed slightly when the audience applauded after House Veterans' Committee chairman, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, Massachusetts, introduced him.

A fourth Korean vet sat in the second row of the large caucus room. He leaned forward during the entire demonstration, adjusted his glasses frequently and occasionally glanced down at the bandaged-covered stump that used to be his hand.

All of them will be fitted with artificial limbs—limbs that are constantly being approved by the committee to advance rehabilitation techniques for disabled veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS said she had heard the House Appropriations Committee would continue the $1 million yearly appropriation to conduct the committee's work.

She reminded the audience that the efforts of the committee—composed of Defense Department, Veterans' Administration and other interested medical and lay authorities on the subject—help not only disabled veterans, but disabled civilians as well.

General Strong echoed her statement, and declared it an inspiring thing that Schultz could come from a friendly, free nation to get help.

New types of arms and legs were demonstrated by ex-GIs. To them and to thousands of others, they represent the difference between existing and living.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Just a few lines to try to express my gratitude for what you have done for the amputee.

I would like to thank you for being the person responsible for my visit to the United States to be fitted out with prosthesis for upper and lower extremities through the National Research Council, because if it had not been through your efforts, I would not be wearing these most wonderful appliances and would still be a cripple in South Africa today. As it is, I have learned to be quite self-reliant and independent and need ask nobody for any personal assistance.

I can imagine all the hours of labor your work entails, of the frustration and stumbling blocks you meet up with and can only say that in the long run you will meet with your just reward: The blessings of every amputee in the United States of America and also in other parts of the world. If my little demonstration before the committee was in any way an aid to the appropriation, I would be most proud.

On reading through my letter, I find it most inadequate and realize that it is quite impossible to express one's gratitude in mere words. I can only hope that one day I will be able to be of some assistance to some person in like circumstances as myself and drag him out of the depths of despair as I was when I received the invitation from the National Research Council to be fitted out with artificial limbs.

Sincerely.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter and an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON on the subject "The Theory and Practice of Our Excess-Profits Tax" and to include an editorial on the same subject.

Mr. CHATHAM and to include a resolution adopted by the Society of the Cincinnati at its triennial meeting at Philadelphia on May 8.

Mr. HART and to include a radio address.

Mr. ALBERT to include in his remarks in Committee of the Whole a telegram from the director of Oklahoma Vocational Education and other extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS and to include an editorial.

Mr. LONG with reference to the remarks he expects to make today in Committee of the Whole and to include herewith some telegrams received by him.

Mr. ARENDS and to include a letter.

Mr. JOHNSON and to include an article.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and to include an article.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona in two instances and to include an article.

Mr. BROWNSON and to include a speech delivered before the Marion County Juvenile Court Advisory Council.

Mr. GWINN (at the request of Mr. FORD) and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include an essay.

Mr. FEIGHAN to include extraneous matter in his remarks on H. R. 5246.

Mr. FISHER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY to revise and extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY to revise and extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL and to include a speech by Justice Douglas.

Mr. MAGNUSON in two instances and to include three newspaper articles.

Mr. RABAUT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. BUDGE to revise and extend remarks made today in Committee of the Whole, and to include a tabulation.

Mr. WILSON of California (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. VELDE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. NORBLAD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CASE (at the request of Mr. HESELTON), for May 22, 1953, on account of illness in family.

Mr. DODD, for an indefinite period, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 28. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 64. An act for the relief of Teodoro Egues Munagorri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 67. An act for the relief of Anastasia John Tsamisis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 143. An act for the relief of Hanni Marie Matuschke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 297. An act for the relief of Dr. Arthur Tye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 313. An act for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 315. An act for the relief of Owen Lowrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 324. An act for the relief of Gregory Leon Baranowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 349. An act for the relief of May Ling Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 351. An act for the relief of Catherine Nina Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 360. An act to incorporate National Service Star Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 458. An act for the relief of Angelo Gurisetti Podesta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 604. An act for the relief of Maria Neglia and Angelo Neglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 677. An act to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 731. An act to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 815. An act for the relief of Steven M. Pivnicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 816. An act for the relief of Bruno Lanier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 833. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective valuation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

S. 971. An act to authorize films, and related material, for educational use, to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1176. An act for the relief of Peter Hoskins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1262. An act for the relief of Stefanos A. Spilios, also known as Stephen A. Harrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1387. An act for the relief of Beth Barbara Burpee (Fujiko Maesawa); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1416. An act for the relief of Vito Rizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1516. An act for the relief of Akemi Terada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1521. An act for the relief of Richard Robert Kabisch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Mieko Kristine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1640. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment of bonds in connection with certain Air Force, Coast Guard, and Atomic Energy Commission contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1644. An act to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended, and the act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1111), to remove the limitation upon the rank of Director of Music, the leader of the Military Academy Band, and to remove the limitation upon the pay of the leader of the United States Naval Academy Band, and to authorize the appointment of Lt. Comdr. Charles Brendler, United States Navy, to the permanent grade of commander in the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1870. An act to extend the time for filing a report by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel established by the act of July 16, 1952; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 25, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

714. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the employment in a civilian position in the office of the Secretary of Defense of Lt. Gen. Graves Blanchard Erskine, upon retirement from the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

715. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946,' so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved October 25, 1951; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4540. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma; with amendment (Rept. No. 449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 5356. A bill to increase the interest rate on loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration from 2 percent to 4 percent; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 5357. A bill to prescribe certain limitations with respect to outpatient dental care for war veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 5358. A bill to protect the surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5359. A bill to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 5360. A bill to pay former prisoners of war extra compensation for periods of active duty after their imprisonment, and to promote certain former prisoners of war on active duty with the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5361. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make certain discrimination on grounds of race, religion, color, or national origin by employers and labor organizations an unfair labor practice; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 5362. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit air carriers and foreign air carriers to grant free or reduced rates of transportation to the blind, and to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 5363. A bill to amend section 14 of the act of June 25, 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 5364. A bill to promote safe driving, to eliminate the reckless and financially irresponsible driver from the highways, and to provide for the giving of security and proof of financial responsibility by persons driving or owning vehicles of a type subject to registration under the laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5365. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in or near Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5366. A bill to amend section 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1309); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 5367. A bill to terminate the prohibition against employment of Mongolian labor in the construction of reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona (by request):

H. R. 5368. A bill to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARRIGG (by request):

H. R. 5369. A bill for the relief of Jose Saavedra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5370. A bill for the relief of Elias Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 5371. A bill for the relief of Juliusz Bakalarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 5372. A bill for the relief of Oldrich Bartasek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 5373. A bill for the relief of George Anagnostopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5374. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pia Maria Del Tufo Mantini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 5375. A bill for the relief of Miss Loh Bei-Li (Mary Loh); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

281. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of Harven and Allen Post No. 8306 and Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Catawissa, Pa., calling upon the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds for the Veterans' Administration to reopen all hospital beds closed in fiscal 1953, and to keep all available Veterans' Administration hospital beds in operation throughout fiscal 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 25, 1953

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 21, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who turnest the shadows of night into morning, we pause for this dedicated moment in the freshness of this new day; we come as inquiring children seeking direction, as those too often held under the tyranny of things, seeking freedom. May Thy truth make us free. As servants of the people, help us, O Lord, to weave some precious thing into the fabric of this day; mold us to Thy purposes, fashion us to Thy hands; shape us on the anvil of these days of destiny into instruments fit for Thy use.

We lift our hearts to Thee in gratitude for our heritage in this land of rich resources, high privilege, and enlarging freedom. We pray, and would work as we pray, for sincerity and honesty in our relations with one another and with all peoples and nations that differences may be reconciled, enmities abolished, justice done, and a righteous peace achieved. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 21, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 22, 1953, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Tibor Kalman Jalsovicsky;

H. R. 762. An act for the relief of Kurt I. Hain and Arthur Karge;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerengen;

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani;

H. R. 1243. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16);

H. R. 1563. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch;

H. R. 2364. An act to terminate restrictions against alienation on land owned by William Lyon Engles and Maureen Edna Engles;

H. R. 2420. An act for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk;

H. R. 2667. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lannie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom;

H. R. 2990. An act to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States;

H. R. 3042. An act for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco;

H. R. 3389. An act for the relief of Pio Valensin;

H. R. 3406. An act to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; and

H. R. 4605. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GREEN and Mr. SMITH of North Carolina were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today, on official business.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAGNUSON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today through June 15, on official committee business.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. MONRONEY were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week, on official business.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 10 days beginning on Wednesday next.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. POTTER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the balance of this week, beginning tomorrow.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections having official business in the State of New Mexico for the next 3 days, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the next 3 days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

INCREASE IN MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is Senate Resolution No. 32. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 32) temporarily increasing the membership of the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is my intention to suggest the absence of a quorum. Before doing so, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call, Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, to introduce bills and joint resolutions, and to transact other routine business, without debate, under the 2-minute rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Barrett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Morse
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bush	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Capehart	Hunt	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Chavez	Jenner	Robertson
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Ellender	Lehman	Thye
Ferguson	Long	Tobey
Frear	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
George	Martin	Wiley
Gillette	Maybank	Williams
Gore	McCarthy	Young

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT OF BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplement to the report of that Bureau entitled "Report on Operations Under Budget Circular A-45," transmitted to the Senate in January 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, trans-

mitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator, which is the first part of the annual report of the Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE ON DISPOSAL OF EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposal of Air Force excess personal property located in areas outside the Continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the calendar year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 627

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to provide for the necessary Federal aid to maintain the central and southern Florida flood control project

"Whereas in order to protect lives, property, and the productivity of the vast agricultural area of peninsula Florida, the Federal Government, the State of Florida and the counties of south Florida have joined together in the central and southern Florida flood control project; and

"Whereas by act of the 1949 Florida Legislature, there was created the central and southern Florida flood control district, charged with the duty and invested with the power of fulfilling all the requirements of local cooperation under the overall plan developed by the United States Corps of Engineers; and

"Whereas in fulfilling its responsibility under this program, the State of Florida has contributed lands, rights-of-way and substantial funds as required under the cooperative Federal-State project. The 17 counties included in the district are contributing an annual tax levy of one mill at the present time; and

"Whereas the Florida delegation to the Congress has labored unceasingly and with every means at the members' command to obtain full Federal participation in this project. Considerable work has been planned and initiated. Yet, the development of south Florida has far outstripped the progress of the flood control program in providing protection. The situation is more precarious today than it was when the program was begun in 1948; and

"Whereas it recently appears that the Bureau of the Budget is recommending an appropriation of only $800,000 as the Federal contribution to this program for the coming year. Such an infinitesimal contribution to a projected 10-year, $208 million program would likely bring all work to a halt; and

"Whereas unless the Congress fulfills the Federal obligation implied and expressed in the 1948 Flood Control Act, and subsequent related acts, the Congress will be breaking faith with the people of Florida, and the agricultural development of peninsula Florida and the lives and property of many of its citizens will be left imperiled: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested and urged to enact appropriate legislation and appropriate sufficient sums of money to complete the central and southern Florida flood control project as speedily as possible and upon the level and within the scope anticipated; it is further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution, duly authenticated, be dispatched by the secretary of state of the State of Florida to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Legislative Resolution 10

"Whereas some of the buildings on the Fort Robinson Military Reservation have been declared by the Federal Government to be surplus property, and will be let for public bids about May 14, 1953; and

"Whereas an appointed committee of the State of Nebraska is to make a survey of possible uses of surplus buildings; and

"Whereas some of the real estate and buildings are now being used by the United States Department of Agriculture as a beef research station: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 65th session assembled:*

"1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to transfer all the buildings and land of the Fort Robinson Military Reservation to the State of Nebraska for the use of its agencies for agricultural study and experiment, for the use of public institutions, for recreational areas, or for such other purposes as the Legislature shall designate.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the Clerk of the Legislature to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, and to each member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution relative to smuggling of gold out of the United States

"Whereas the low price of gold in the United States, the lowest in the world, has been the incentive for a greatly increased amount of gold smuggling; and

"Whereas gold purchases can be made from the United States Treasury for $35 per fine ounce plus one-fourth of 1 percent; and

"Whereas it has been brought out on the floor of the United States Senate by Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, and Senator HOMER E. FERGUSON, of Michigan, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 10, page 12769, that the United States Treasury is "manipulating the price of gold so as to allow foreigners from $70 to $77 per ounce; and

"Whereas profitable smuggling and raising the price to foreigners is not only depreciating our gold reserve but also is an injustice to our taxpayers and domestic producers: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Senate of the United States is herewith urged and memorialized to create a committee to fully investigate the above conditions and to make such recommendations as will prevent further loss to the United States Treasury; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the president of the Senate, and to each Senator from California in the Senate of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 31

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to give California control of its own budget in administering the Unemployment Insurance Act

"Whereas the officials in our State government are responsible to the people of this State for the proper and efficient management of the business of the State entrusted to them; and

"Whereas the administration of the unemployment insurance laws of this State through the Department of Employment involves an annual expenditure in excess of $24 million; the employment of over 4,000 personnel; and the disbursement of some $165 million in benefits from funds collected from employers and workers in this State; and

"Whereas the imposition of Federal budgetary controls over expenditure of that portion of the administrative costs of the department which are granted to this State for administration of our unemployment insurance laws is not compatible with overall State fiscal control and policy, and is not conducive to the most efficient management of the public trust: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes Congress to enact legislation which will remove Federal budgetary control from the funds granted to the State for administration of unemployment insurance, and which will give this State control of its own budget for an administration for which it is responsible; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 33

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the number of authorized narcotic enforcement agents

"Whereas the recent reports of the pathetic and tragic cases of narcotic addiction by teen-age youngsters have shocked the citizens of this State; and

"Whereas narcotic addiction among thrill-seekers, chiefly under the age of 21, is mounting at a most unhealthy pace, resulting in an alarming increase in the number of addictions; and

"Whereas it is the belief of our own enforcement agencies that there exists a deliberate exploitation of naive boys and girls by drug traffickers, who aim to open up a rich new market by enslaving a huge new crop of addicts; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of veteran narcotic enforcement officers that by far the most dangerous offenders in this traffic are those who engage in it from the profit motive only, those who are nonusers and who, for the sake of money, cold-bloodedly and viciously ensnare our youth and our adults into narcotic addiction; and

"Whereas the drugs now composing the major law-enforcement problem in our State are heroin, marihuana, and barbiturates; and

"Whereas the supply of heroin, marihuana, and many other narcotics is primarily obtained by smuggling these drugs into this country from other countries; and

"Whereas the present staff of Federal enforcement agents is totally incapable of effecting the necessary search and border inspection to reduce substantially the illegal

importation of narcotics from other countries; and

"Whereas at present the State and local narcotic enforcement officers have no authority until the drugs have entered our country, at which time the drugs are distributed so rapidly that the problem of tracking them down is multiplied beyond description: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to increase the staff of Federal enforcement agents and the number of border inspections; and be it further

"Resolved, That during the time that it will take for the Federal Government to increase the staff of its officers at these points, it is recommended that the Congress of the United States confer authority upon State and local narcotic enforcement officers in border cities and counties to conduct searches and make inspections at border areas; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 34

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the penalties for second and subsequent narcotic offenses

"Whereas the recent reports of the pathetic and tragic cases of narcotic addiction by teen-age youngsters have shocked the citizens of this State; and

"Whereas narcotic addiction among thrill seekers, chiefly under the age of 21, is mounting at a most unhealthy pace, resulting in an alarming increase in the number of addictions; and

"Whereas it is the belief of our own enforcement agencies that there exists a deliberate exploitation of naive boys and girls by drug traffickers, who aim to open up a rich new market by enslaving a huge new crop of addicts; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of veteran narcotic enforcement officers that by far the most dangerous offenders in this traffic are those who engage in it from the profit motive only, those who are nonusers and who, for the sake of money, cold-bloodedly and viciously ensnare our youth and our adults into narcotic addiction; and

"Whereas the drugs now composing the major law-enforcement problem in our State are heroin, marihuana, and barbiturates; and

"Whereas the League of Nations, United Nations, and many enforcement agencies have recommended more severe sentences as one of the best methods to suppress the use and traffic of narcotics; and

"Whereas the penalties in the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act for second and subsequent narcotic offenders are wholly inadequate to stem the rising tide of illegal drug activity: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to amend section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to increase the penalties for second and subsequent narcotic offenders; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Joint resolution restoring to the Territory of Hawaii the possession, use, and control of certain land in the city of Honolulu

"Whereas certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, which forms a part of the public lands ceded and transferred to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation of July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), was initially reserved for naval purposes of the United States by action of the President and thereafter by a series of Executive orders and congressionally authorized interdepartmental transfers set aside to the Department of Defense as a portion of the Fort Armstrong military reservation and to the General Services Administration (Public Health Service) as a portion of its installation at the entrance of Honolulu Harbor; and

"Whereas no present or foreseeable future military need exists for the continued retention by the Department of Defense of that portion of such land under its control; that a sufficiency of substitute facilities is available on other nearby military reservations on the island of Oahu to care adequately for all current and foreseeable future military activity; and

"Whereas said portion of such land under the control of the General Services Administration (Public Health Service) is only a minor part of said Public Health Service site, contains no improvements, is not being utilized for any purpose whatsoever, and no plans for utilization exist; and

"Whereas all of said land is situate in the heart of downtown Honolulu and is greatly needed for the proper civic growth of such city; that it is in the public interest that said land be returned to the Territory of Hawaii for governmental uses and purposes and for such other uses and purposes as are consistent with the land laws of said Territory: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory certain land more particularly described in the proposed form of bill hereinafter set forth; and to that end the Congress of the United States is hereby requested and urged to adopt a bill substantially in the following form, to wit:

"'A bill to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land as Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*—

"'SECTION 1. That all of the following-described land, together with improvements located thereon, situate at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., which forms a part of the public lands ceded and transferred to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under Joint Resolution No. 55 of July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), is hereby restored to the possession, use, and control of the government of the Territory of Hawaii:

"'Beginning at a point on the harbor line, being also the west corner of parcel 7 of Honolulu harbor development of pier 2 terminal, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to government survey triangulation station "Punchbowl" being 4,667.70 feet south and 6,234.84 feet west, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"'1. 309°00' 60.00 feet along parcel 7, Honolulu harbor development of pier 2;

"'2. 219°00' 20.00 feet along parcel 7, Honolulu harbor development of pier 2;

"'3. 309°00' 153.00 feet along governor's executive order No. 1061;

"'4. 38°45' 533.18 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949, as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong.);

"'5. Thence along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949, as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong.), on a curve to the left with a radius of 110.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 353°54'10" 155.19 feet;

"'6. 309°02'20" 196.57 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949 as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong);

"'7. Thence along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949 as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong.), on a curve to the left with a radius of 100 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 281°01'10" 93.96 feet;

"'8. 253°00' 157.01 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949 as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong.);

"'9. 219°00' 59.33 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949 as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong.);

"'10. 218°57' 522.98 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949 as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong.);

"'11. 129°00'40" 107.90 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the general Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949 as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong.);

"'12. 217°08' 77.25 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949 as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong.);

"'13. 128°59'30" 113.93 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949 as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong.);

"'14. 218°48'30" 502.47 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949 as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong.), along Government restored to Territory of Hawaii by Presidential Executive Order No. 10309, dated December 3, 1951, along remainder of land transferred to the War Department by the Secretary of Labor (by letter dated December 16, 1939);

"'15. 309°00' 450.01 feet along the remaining portion of immigration station lot;

"'16. 240°25' 161.35 feet along the remaining portion of immigration station lot;

"'17. 174°25' 17.53 feet along the remaining portion of immigration station lot;

"'18. 264°25' 132.00 feet along the remaining portion of immigration station lot, along land transferred to Department of Labor by the Secretary of War (by letter dated December 20, 1939);

"'19. 354°25' 185.08 feet along the west side of Ala Moana Road to concrete monument No. 2;

"'20. 325°17' 102.75 feet along the west side of Ala Moana Road to concrete monument No. 3;

"'21. 52°23' 329.02 feet along city and county sewer pumping station to concrete monument No. 4;

"'22. 322°23' 199.75 feet along city and county sewer pumping station to concrete monument No. 5;

"'23. 52°23' 797.92 feet along the remaining portion of the land of Kaakaukukui, L. C. Aw. 7712, Apana 6 to M. Kekuanaoa for V. Kamamalu (quitclaim deed, Hawaiian government to the Bernice Pauahi Bishop estate, dated September 9, 1891, and recorded in liber 135, p. 38), to concrete monument No. 6;

"'24. 52°23' 2470.94 feet along the remaining portion of the land of Kaakaukukui, L. C. Aw. 7712, Apana 6 to M. Kekuanaoa for V. Kamamalu (quitclaim deed, Hawaiian government to the Bernice Pauahi Bishop estate, dated September 9, 1891, and recorded in liber 135, p. 38), over submerged area;

"'25. 145°00' 200.98 feet over submerged area;

"'26. 180°25' 1206.87 feet over submerged area;

"'27. 219°00' 1685.55 feet over submerged area and along the extension of the harbor line to the point of beginning and containing a total area of 73.99 acres; reserving, however, to the general services administration (U. S. Public Health Service) the use and control of Pier 1.

"'SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon its approval.'

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of Hawaii is hereby requested and directed to forward certified copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 16th day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"*Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation whereby the wooden buildings now located at Mana Airport Base, Kauai, be transferred to the county of Kauai

"*Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:*

"SEC. 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation whereby the wooden buildings erected by the United States of America at Mana Airport Base, Kauai, and not being used by said United States be transferred to the county of Kauai.

"SEC. 2. That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 21st day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"*Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 32

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to the enactment of Federal dangerous drug controls

"Whereas the recent reports of the pathetic and tragic cases of narcotic addiction by teenage youngsters have shocked the citizens of this State; and

"Whereas narcotic addiction among thrill-seekers, chiefly under the age of 21, is mounting at a most unhealthy pace, resulting in and alarming increase in the number of addictions; and

"Whereas it is the belief of our own enforcement agencies that there exists a deliberate exploitation of naive boys and girls by drug traffickers, who aim to open up a rich new market by enslaving a huge new crop of addicts; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of veteran narcotic enforcement officers that by far the most dangerous offenders in this traffic are those who engage in it from the profit motive only, those who are nonusers and who, for the sake of money, cold-bloodedly and viciously ensnare our youth and our adults into narcotic addiction; and

"Whereas the drugs now composing the major law-enforcement problem in our State are heroin, marihuana, and barbiturates; and

"Whereas at present there are no Federal controls over the ultimate distribution of barbiturates, leaving each State to enact legislation in this field, even though the control of barbiturates and central nervous stimulants such as amphetamine and its derivatives is actually a Federal problem involving interstate commerce; and

"Whereas although California's Dangerous Drug Act has received nationwide commendation as the most workable of all State laws, the fact that such controls do not exist in neighboring States allows those who wish to trade illegally in barbiturates merely to travel to other areas where they can be purchased across the counter and then bring them back into our State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the control of dangerous drugs similar to the California Dangerous Drug Act; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 28

"Whereas sugarcane requires a growth period of approximately 2 years; and

"Whereas upon the marketing of the cane, the planter realizes income, attributable to his industry over the 2-year period, but entirely taxable in the year in which realized; and

"Whereas under the heavily graduated Federal income levy such taxation places upon the sugarcane planter a larger tax burden than if the income were spread over the entire period of growth of the cane; and

"Whereas such discrimination occurs in other industries and occupations where production takes place over a period of several years, with income being lumped in a single year: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully requested to amend the Federal Internal Revenue Code to permit the averaging of incomes received over a period of 2 or more years in respect to sugar planters and other persons realizing income in a single year attributable to economic activities undertaken over several years; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint resolution requesting Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation enabling the Hawaiian Homes Commission to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for other public lands

"Whereas among lands classified as available lands under section 203, Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, there are many noncontiguous or disjointed parcels having little economic value by reason of size, difficulty of management, or potentiality for use for the purposes of said act; and

"Whereas in the interests of more effective management and to better effectuate the purposes of said act many of such areas should be consolidated; and

"Whereas no means presently exist to permit such consolidation, and enabling legislation is deemed necessary: Now, therefore,

"*Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:*

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America through the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii be, and it hereby is, requested to enact legislation permitting the Hawaiian Homes Commission to enter into exchanges involving available lands for the purposes of consolidating such holdings as above stated, and to that end the Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested and urged, through said Delegate to Congress, to adopt a bill substantially in the following form, to wit:

"'A bill to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for other public lands

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*—

"'SECTION 1. That section 204 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, be further amended by adding a new subparagraph thereto, designated subparagraph "(4)", and to read as follows:

"'"(4) The Commission may, with the approval of the Governor and the Secretary of the Interior, in order to consolidate its holdings or to better effectuate the purposes of this act, exchange the title to available lands for land, publicly owned, of an equal value. All lands so acquired by the Commission shall assume the status of available lands as though the same were originally designated as such under section 203 hereof, and all land so conveyed by the Commission shall assume the status of the land for which it was exchanged. The limitation imposed by section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act and the land laws of Hawaii as to the area and value of land that may be conveyed by way of exchange shall not apply to exchanges made pursuant hereto. No such exchange shall be made without the approval of the commissioner of public lands and of two-thirds of the members of the board of public lands."

"'SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon its approval.'

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 18th day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, to provide irrigated pastoral areas on Homes Commission lands

"Whereas in the development of the cattle industry throughout the United States, it has been found that the pasturage of cattle on irrigated pastures is both economically feasible and advisable; and

"Whereas this practice has also been found to be most advisable in the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas there are several areas of available lands under the Hawaiian Homes Commission that are most suitable to this type of agriculture: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to amend section 207 (leases to Hawaiians licenses), subsection (a) to read as follows:

"'(a) The Commission is authorized to lease to native Hawaiians the right to the use of occupancy of a tract or tracts of Hawaiian homelands within the following acreage limits per each lessee: (1) not less than 1 nor more than 40 acres of agricultural lands; (2) not less than 100 nor more than 500 acres of first-class pastoral lands; or (3) not less than 250 nor more than 1,000 acres of second-class pastoral lands; or (4) not more than 1 acre of any class of land to be used as a residence lot; (5) not less than 40 nor more than 100 acres of irrigated pastoral lands: *Provided, however,* That, in the case of any existing lease of a farm lot in the Kalanianaole Settlement on Molokai, a residence lot may exceed 1 acre but shall not exceed 4 acres in area, the location of such area to be selected by the lessee concerned: *Provided further,* That a lease granted to any lessee may include 2 detached farm lots located on the same island and within a reasonable distance of each other, 1 of which to be designated by the Commission, shall be occupied by the lessee as his home, the gross acreage of both lots not to exceed the maximum acreage of an agricultural or pastoral lot, as the case may be, as provided in this section.'

"SEC. 2. Copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 19th day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation providing for new post office buildings in the county of Kauai

"Whereas it is essential that the people of Kauai have adequate, modern post office buildings to service their postal needs; and

"Whereas the United States post offices at Waimea, and at Kapaa, county of Kauai, do not now have the necessary facilities to adequately satisfy the postal needs of the people in these respective areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation providing for the purchase and remodeling or the construction of new post office buildings at Waimea, and at Kapaa, County of Kauai, and appropriating sufficient funds therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Postmaster General, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegates to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Louisiana Municipal Association, at New Orleans, La., favoring the enactment of legislation to clarify the income-tax law provision and eliminate the present discrimination against urban dwellers where public improvements are involved; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the American Industrial Arts Association, at Detroit, Mich., favoring the restoration of appropriations for the Office of Education; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Pleasanton (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 4294) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Andrew King Post 3850, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Wailuku, Maui, Territory of Hawaii, favoring the appropriation of sufficient funds to provide adequate hospitalization for disable veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

FLUORIDATION OF COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLIES—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS STATE DENTAL ASSOCIATION, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the Kansas State Dental Association at its annual meeting in Kansas City, Mo., on May 10–13, 1953, adopted a resolution relative to the fluoridation of community water supplies. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the fluoridation of community water supplies has been demonstrated to reduce the incidence of dental decay among children by approximately two-thirds; and

Whereas the complete safety of fluoridation has been repeatedly demonstrated in extensive scientific research; and

Whereas fluoridation has been recommended and endorsed by all major national health organizations of the United States including the American Dental Association, the American Medical Association, the National Research Council, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers and many others; and

Whereas certain individuals and groups whose motives are most difficult to understand have been attempting to delay and forestall the fluoridation of community water supplies through the spread of rumors and erroneous and misleading information; Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Kansas State Dental Association in session here today hereby reaffirms its endorsement and approval of fluoridation of community water supplies and urges that fluoridation be adopted in all communities in the State of Kansas as rapidly as local conditions will permit; and be it further

Resolved, That the Kansas State Dental Association hereby go on record commending the excellent efforts of the local, State, and Federal Departments of Health for their enlightened efforts to make the benefits of fluoridation available to all children in all communities of the State of Kansas; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Edward F. Arn, Governor of the State of Kansas; to Dr. Thomas R. Hood, executive secretary of the Kansas State Board of Health; to each Senator and Representative from Kansas serving in the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Honorable Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States, and Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Sevice.

Dated at Kansas City, Mo., this 12th day of May A. D. 1953.

KANSAS STATE DENTAL ASSOCIATION,
FRED A. RICHMOND, D. D. S.,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. Res. 100. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953; adversely (Rept. No. 297).

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 621. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for the Lower San Joaquin River project; with an amendment (Rept. No. 298);

S. 1286. A bill to authorize the extension of the levee on the American River near Sacramento, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 299);

S. 1637. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma; with an amendment (Rept. No. 300);

S. 1638. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma; with an amendment (Rept. No. 301);

H. R. 2761. A bill to revive and reenact the act of December 21, 1944, authorizing the city of Clinton Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 302); and

H. R. 4035. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the prosecution of projects in the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 303).

INCREASE IN MEMBERSHIP OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, submitted a report (No. 304) on the resolution (S. Res. 32) temporarily increasing the membership of the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare, in lieu of report (No. 142), which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN (by request):

S. 1964. A bill to modify the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin authorized in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1965. A bill to prevent the payment of Civil Service or Foreign Service Retirement Annuities to persons convicted of certain crimes involving disloyalty to the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 1966. A bill to amend the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System to provide insured aged persons and their dependents, and survivors of deceased insured persons, with insurance against the cost of hospitalization, and to encourage the States to provide equivalent protection for noninsured aged persons; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1967. A bill for the relief of Paula Neumann Mahler (Paula Neumann Schibuk); and

S. 1968. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Ephraim Silber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1969. A bill for the relief of Valda Cimermanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 1970. A bill for the relief of Mioko Shiraishi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for Mr. IVES (by request)):

S. 1971. A bill to provide for the national defense and for conservation and public development and beneficial public use of the undeveloped water power of Niagara Falls and the Niagara River in the State of New York, in accordance with the provisions of the Niagara Redevelopment Treaty between the United States and Canada, ratified by the Senate of the United States on August 9, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1972. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1973. A bill providing for insurance of membership share balances in Federal credit unions by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1974. A bill to provide for a heliport in the District of Columbia, for use in helicopter service between the Friendship International Airport and the downtown area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1975. A bill for the relief of Louis F. Agnello (Luigi Flavio Agnello); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 1976. A bill to amend the Hours of Service Act, approved March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1415); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1977. A bill for the relief of Victor Rangel and his wife, Amalia L. Rangel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1978. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chang Ho Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 1979. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for forfeitures in cases of violation of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

S. 1980. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 1981. A bill to continue in effect certain provisions of section 6 of the act of February 4, 1887, as amended, relating to military traffic in time of war or threatened war, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1982. A bill to establish a special grazing district in the State of Nevada; to provide for the more efficient use, conservation, and protection of the public lands, and their use for mineral development, grazing, and agriculture, fish and wildlife, and recreation resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PREVENTION OF PAYMENT OF RETIREMENT ANNUITIES TO PERSONS CONVICTED OF CERTAIN CRIMES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the purpose of denying the benefits of retirement pay or pension to anyone who has been convicted of treason or perjury with relation to treason.

I do so because Mr. Edward B. Wilber, in testifying before the Committee on Appropriations, stated that unless legislation of this kind is passed, Alger Hiss would become eligible to retirement benefits, which would reach the amount, when he is 62, of $700 a year. The proposed legislation would deny this man, who has been convicted of treachery to his country, and who is now serving a term of imprisonment in a Federal penitentiary, the right to any retirement benefits.

The bill would provide that such a person would receive in one lump sum the amount of money he has paid into any retirement fund, together with the legal rate of interest.

I am certain that the taxpayers of the country do not want to be put in the position of paying a Federal pension to a traitor.

The proposed legislation is essential unless we want to be placed in such a position.

The bill (S. 1965) to prevent the payment of Civil Service or Foreign Service Retirement Annuities to persons convicted of certain crimes involving disloyalty to the United States, introduced by Mr. Mundt, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM RELATING TO HOSPITALIZATION COSTS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which provides a plan for hospital insurance for our senior citizens and other beneficiaries of the old-age and survivors insurance program.

In view of the request made by the acting majority leader last week that we try to expedite action on matters now on the calendar, I ask unanimous consent that my explanatory statement of the bill, together with a section-by-section summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1966) to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to provide insured aged persons and their dependents, and survivors of deceased insured persons, with insurance against the cost of hospitalization, and to encourage the States to provide equivalent protection for noninsured aged persons, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

I have just introduced a bill on behalf of Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Senator LEHMAN, of New York, and myself, which I believe should have the support of all who are interested in increasing the security and improving the health of our population, especially of the older people.

This bill would add a new benefit to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program. It would provide hospitalization benefits for aged, widowed, and orphaned beneficiaries of the insurance system. It would also provide these benefits for other aged persons who are fully insured but are still at work and their dependents. It would not call for any increase in taxes, nor would it call for any increase in social-security contributions.

For these insured persons, the new benefit would take the form of payments from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund to hospitals which furnish services to them. The payments would be made through State-administered plans and, if the States so decided, through the agency of voluntary nonprofit health-insurance plans.

This bill would also encourage the States to provide the same hospitalization benefits for aged farmers and other aged persons who are not insured under the social security system.

We now have in this country a sound and efficient national system of social insurance. The enactment of the 1950 amendments greatly strengthened this program and gave increased security to most of our population. Amendments enacted in 1952 again raised the cash benefits, so as to bring them into line with wages and costs of living.

When adopting the 1950 and 1952 amendments, the Congress recognized that it was

taking only the immediate and most urgent steps. There still remain serious gaps in protection against major economic risks. So long as these gaps remain, Congress know from their personal contacts and from their mail that lack of insurance protection against hospital costs is one of the major gaps. The amendment we are proposing is urgently needed to make our social-insurance system more adequate.

For older people and for widows and orphans, protection against hospital costs would be especially valuable. For most beneficiaries of our insurance system, the monthly cash benefits are the only source of income on which they can count with any assurance. This dependence on benefit income means that the adequacy of the insurance benefit is all important.

The 1950 and 1952 amendments provided for substantial increases in the insurance benefits. However, even with these increases, the average monthly payment today is only about $50 for all retired beneficiaries, not quite $80 for an aged couple, and just over $40 for an aged widow. Obviously, such benefit payments are scarcely sufficient to meet day-to-day expenses. They are entirely inadequate to cover the costs of serious illness, especially among the aged who as a group have higher-than-average sickness rates.

A recent survey of aged couples receiving insurance benefits showed that on the average they spend about $160 for medical care in a year. One-fourth of these couples spend between $200 and $1,600. Few of them have substantial assets to meet medical and hospital expenses of this size. Nor should those who have managed to accumulate some resources for the purpose of supplementing small retirement incomes be compelled to exhaust these assets on a catastrophic illness. Without these supplements from savings, many find themselves with insufficient income to meet the barest necessities of life. They become dependent on relatives, friends, or charitable agencies; or they are forced to ask for public assistance. This defeats one of the main purposes of the social-insurance system. It frustrates the congressional intent that contributory social insurance shall minimize Federal, State, and local expenditures for public assistance.

Our bill to provide hospitalization insurance strikes at one of the main reasons why incomes of insurance beneficiaries are inadequate. Considering the Nation as a whole, hospital expenses alone—not counting medical, surgical, and other bills—average about $125 or $150, or more, in each case. Among those 65 years of age or over the cost is nearer $225 or $250 per hospitalized case because among such persons the average hospital stay is longer than among younger people. With an average cost this high—and with many cases costing much more than the average—a hospitalized illness can mean financial disaster for people living on insurance benefits. The hospital bill alone can use up the benefit checks intended to pay for food, shelter, clothing, and all other necessities for many months.

A study made for our Subcommittee on Health a few years ago, found that about one-half of the people of the United States have some insurance against hospital costs—under Blue Cross or other nonprofit contracts and under group or individual insurance company policies. But among the aged the proportion with some insurance is only half as much; it is probably not over 25 percent, in contrast to 50 percent among people of all ages. Many insurance plans and companies do not insure older people. Others insure them, but only if they are members of employed groups. Some insurance is at average premiums, but only by excluding preexisting diseases or diseases likely to occur at the higher ages, or by sharply limiting the amount of insurance liability. These practices are not surprising, in view of the higher sickness rates in the older ages of life.

Thus, older people, with more than average need for hospital care, have less than average opportunity, as well as less than average financial resources, to buy insurance. The net result, as I have already indicated, is that they have much less private insurance protection than does the population as a whole. The widows and orphans who would be covered by our bill are in a similar predicament.

I have pointed out that our bill would provide hospitalization benefits for persons 65 years of age or over, who, though insured, are still at work. One reason for including them has already been mentioned—the lack of opportunity for older people in general to obtain private insurance. Other reasons for this important provision in the bill derive from the retirement and reemployment patterns of American workers. Most elderly workers retire only when they become disabled or are laid off by their employers. Many who retire return to work later; and some shift back and forth between the insurance rolls and paid employment.

It is to the advantage of both the older workers and the whole national economy that they should continue in productive employment as long as they can and want to do so. They should not have to leave their jobs and claim cash-retirement benefits in order to obtain hospitalization benefit. Indeed, as a practical matter of administration, eligibility for the hospitalization benefit could not be restricted to those who are actually receiving cash benefits in a particular month.

Our bill, therefore, would make the hospitalization benefit available equally to those who are at work, though insured for retirement benefits, and to those who are receiving the monthly cash benefits. Thus, insured workers would not have to retire first in order to obtain this benefit. On the contrary, the new benefit would help them to get hospital care more promptly and to return to their jobs as soon as they are recovered.

There is still another reason for making these insured persons who are still at work eligible for hospitalization benefits. They should be protected against the danger that an expensive illness will greatly reduce or even wipe out savings intended to supplement their future retirement benefits.

The bill proposes to pay for comprehensive but not unlimited hospital services. The insurance system would pay the full cost incurred for hospital care in semiprivate accommodations, with a limit of 60 days' care in a year. It would not pay for care in Federal hospitals, in tuberculosis or mental hospitals, or in institutions which furnish primarily domiciliary or nursing care, nor would it reimburse for other hospitalization provided at public expense, except when admission depends on a means test. This last provision means that the insurance system would pay for the hospital care of public-assistance recipients who are insured.

All qualified hospitals, except the kinds that are specifically excluded, would be entitled to participate in the program and to be paid for services furnished to insured persons.

The bill defines "hospital services" to cover those which are customarily furnished by a hospital to its bed patients. It does not include physician services, except those generally furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care for bed patients. Admission to the hospital would, of course, require referral by the physician, except in emergency cases. Free choice of a hospital would be preserved. Thus, the hospitalization benefits would not affect or interfere with the customary relations among patients, physicians, and hospitals.

The bill specifically prohibits any supervision or control over the details of administration or operation of any participating hospital or over the selection, tenure, or compensation of its personnel.

The bill proposes to utilize both the national administrative machinery of old-age and survivors insurance and the decentralized machinery of State agencies.

Agreements with hospitals, and payments to them, would be made by the States, and preferably by the State public health agencies. States that enter into an agreement to administer the program would act as agents of the Federal Government. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—who is charged with administering the old-age and survivors insurance system—would be authorized to perform the overall administrative functions only in States that do not affect agreements to act as agents of the national insurance system. However, I assume that such Federal administration would not be necessary because I expect that all States would participate in the program.

Each State would have the right to utilize the services of nonprofit organizations, such as Blue Cross plans, that operate voluntary insurance plans involving reimbursement agreements with hospitals. The old-age and survivors insurance trust fund would reimburse States and voluntary organizations for necessary administrative costs, as well as for payments to hospitals.

The administration of hospitalization benefits would utilize the present system of insurance wage records, the procedures for determining insurance eligibility, and similar resources. The extra administrative costs would be relatively small.

It is estimated that in 1954, about 8 million persons would be eligible for hospitalization insurance benefits. Of these, about 6.7 million will be receiving monthly benefits; and about 1.3 million will be fully insured workers who are still at work and their qualified dependents. Of the 8 million total, about 6.4 million will be persons 65 years of age or over; and about 1.6 million will be younger mothers and children.

Hospitalization in the non-Federal general hospitals of the United States averages, for all ages, about 1 day of hospital care per person a year. The cost estimates for our bill assume that the 6,400,000 eligibles age 65 and over will have on the average, from 2 to 2.5 days of reimbursable hospital care a year; the 410,000 younger adults and the 1,200,000 children under 18 will average about 1 day and about one-half day respectively. The average cost of a day of reimbursable hospital care in 1954 is estimated at $15.

At the beginning in 1954, the total cost of hospitalization benefits, including payments to hospitals and all administrative costs, would probably be at an annual rate of about $200 million.

In 1954 taxable wages and self-employment income under old age and survivors insurance, with the present $3,600 limit on the amount that is subject to social-security taxes, are expected to equal about $140 billion. Thus, the initial annual cost of the hospitalization benefits—$200 million—would be between one-tenth and two-tenths of 1 percent of taxable earnings. This cost will increase as more persons become eligible; it may rise to two-tenths or possibly three-tenths of 1 percent in future years. If hospital costs change by reason of price or wage changes, the cost of hospitalization insurance as a percent of taxable earnings will probably be unaffected because taxable earnings will probably change similarly.

The full cost of our proposed hospitalization-insurance plan would be paid out of social-security contributions in future years as well as in the initial years. No change in contribution rates beyond that now scheduled in the law is needed, and no general tax money is required. As far as anyone can tell at this time, these contributions, plus

the trust-fund assets, are more than sufficient on a self-supporting basis to meet the obligations already in the law and the proposed hospitalization benefits as well.

The beneficiaries of old-age and survivors insurance and the older workers who are insured need insurance protection against the costs of hospital care. Our contributory system of social insurance offer a ready and effective method of providing that protection. It can achieve this goal in a manner which strengthens economic security and individual dignity.

Hospitalization insurance would protect the insurance beneficiaries and insured aged persons, who are still at work, against danger of having to use up resources intended to supplement small retirement incomes. It would spare them the need to ask for private charity or public aid to meet hospital expenses.

The values of this proposal are even broader. The new benefit would give all persons who pay contributions under the insurance system a greater sense of security, knowing that they will have paid-up hospitalization insurance for life when they become eligible for retirement benefits. Workers would know that in the event of premature death, their widows and orphans would have this new protection.

Our bill would also encourage the States to provide the same protection against hospital costs to farmers and other noninsured persons who are 65 and over as to persons insured under the social security system. The States would have to work out, in their own way, the method of financing these benefits for noninsured persons. They would have the advantage, however, of the system worked out for insured persons. The administrative machinery would be available to them. Each State would have to pay only the extra costs incurred in helping these noninsured citizens to have the same protection against hospital costs that the national insurance system would give to insured persons.

Our bill has other important merits beyond these very real human values. It would help the hospitals by reducing deficits that result from the provision of free or part-pay services. It would help the insurance companies and the private nonprofit hospital-insurance plans, by taking over responsibility for groups that constitute high cost and unprofitable risks. It would help community chests and other charitable agencies and each year have to campaign for funds to pay hospital bills for people who cannot pay those bills themselves, directly or through private insurance. It also would help the public relief agencies by reducing the need for public assistance, thereby helping the general taxpayer.

I believe this bill merits the serious consideration of the Congress and of all persons who are interested in the public welfare. I hope we shall have hearings on this bill shortly and that we shall enact it promptly.

The summary presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE: SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE BILL

This bill providing for hospitalization insurance benefits is in the form of an amendment to the Social Security Act of which title II deals with the national system of old-age and survivors insurance.

Since the present law is in terms of the Federal Security Agency and the Federal Security Administrator, the new bill is written in the same terms.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 converted the Federal Security Agency into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and replaced the Administrator by the Secretary of the new Department.

Where Administrator appears in the new bill, it therefore will now mean the Secretary of the Department.

The first section of the bill contains a short title "Old-Age and Survivors Hospitalization Insurance Act."

Section 2 expresses the need for the legislation and its purpose: To provide, within the framework of the national system of old-age and survivors insurance but with appropriate utilization of State agencies and private nonprofit organizations, insurance protection against the cost of hospitalization for aged insured persons and their dependents and for the survivors of deceased insured persons; and to encourage the States to provide equivalent protection for aged farmers and other noninsured aged persons.

Section 3 (a) amends title II of the Social Security Act by adding a section 222, the provisions of which are summarized below.

Section 3 (b) contains the effective date, the 1st day of the 12th calendar month after the month in which the bill becomes law.

Section 3 (c) permits advance filing of applications for hospitalization insurance during the last 8 months prior to the effective date.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF SECTION 222 HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE

Section 222 (a). Eligibility for insurance: Paragraph (1) provides for payment from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund of the cost of hospitalization for individuals eligible for monthly cash benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act. Because eligibility for monthly benefits ends with the month preceding death, the paragraph includes a provision specifically preserving eligibility for hospitalization insurance during the month of death.

Paragraph (2) provides that, in addition to persons actually entitled to monthly benefits, other specified individuals are to be deemed eligible for monthly benefits. The effect is to safeguard the eligibility of an individual who meets all the requirements for entitlement except the requirement that he file an application for monthly benefits or—in the case of a person who would be entitled as a wife, husband or child—the requirement that an application be filed by the person on whose wage record the entitlement is based. Such individuals are deemed eligible if their application for hospitalization benefits is filed within the 6-months' period now provided for retroactive filing for monthly benefits.

Through the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2), eligibility for hospitalization insurance is defined in terms of eligibility for monthly cash benefits, whether or not such cash benefits are actually paid. Included are all fully insured individuals age 65 and over, whether retired or still at work, and their dependents: the wife, if she is 65 or over, or has his child in her care; the dependent husband 65 or over of an individual currently and fully insured; and child dependents. Persons eligible for hospitalization benefits as survivors include: the aged widows or dependent parents of individuals who died fully insured; dependent widowers of individuals who died fully and currently insured; and the children of individuals who died fully or currently insured, and their mothers.

Under the provisions of paragraph (3), applications for hospitalization benefits can be filed by relatives or other persons or by the hospital concerned.

Paragraph (4) places a limit of 60 on the total number of days of insured hospitalization for an individual in a calendar year.

Paragraph (5) specifies that existing provisions for making and reviewing determinations sec. 205 of the Social Security Act) are to be used in determining eligibility for hospitalization insurance and the number of days of insured hospitalization remaining in a calendar year for each individual.

Section 222 (b). Description of hospital services: Hospital services for which payment can be made from the trust fund are defined in terms of such services, drugs, and appliances as the hospital concerned customarily furnishes its bed patients, either through its own employees or through arrangements with other persons. Specifically excluded from the services covered is any medical (including surgical) care beyond that generally furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care for bed patients. Excluded by virtue of the type of hospital which furnishes the service is hospitalization in a tuberculosis or mental hospital or in a hospital or institution which furnishes primarily domiciliary or nursing care.

Section 222 (c). Free choice by patient: An individual may obtain the insured hospitalization in any hospital which has entered into an agreement to furnish services and which admits him. Referral by a licensed physician is required, except in emergency situations. This subsection also provides that, in accordance with regulations, payment for services rendered in emergencies can be made to a hospital which is not a party to an agreement.

Section 222 (d). Agreements with hospitals: Subsection (d) spells out the basis for the agreements between hospitals and the administering agency, providing specifically that there is to be no interference in hospital administration or operation.

Under paragraph (1), any institution (other than a tuberculosis or mental hospital or any hospital or institution which furnishes primarily domiciliary or nursing care) is eligible to enter into an agreement if it is licensed as a hospital under State law or, where the State law does not provide for such licensing, it meets qualifying standards prescribed after consultation with the Federal Hospital Council. (The Council designated to advise on these standards, and on other matters of general policy throughout the bill, is the one established under the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act—title VI of the Public Health Service Act.)

Paragraph (2) provides that all services within the scope of subsection (b) (i. e., with certain exceptions, those customarily provided by the hospital) are to be covered by the agreement and are to be listed therein. Such services are to be furnished in semiprivate accommodations, if available, unless other accommodations are required for medical reasons or are occupied at the patient's request. The agreements are to be made on such terms and conditions as are consistent with the efficient and economical administration of section 222. The duration of the agreement and the notice required for termination shall be such as are agreed upon.

Under paragraph (3), the agreement is to provide for payment of the cost of hospital services, with reimbursement limited to hospitalization which is medically necessary, as certified in writing by the referring and attending physicians. The amount of the payment to the hospital shall be determined on the basis of the reasonable cost incurred by the hospital for all its bed patients, or, when use of such a basis is impractical for the hospital or is inequitable to the hospital or the trust fund, on a reasonably equivalent basis which takes account of pertinent factors with respect to hospital services furnished to individuals included under subsection (a). Thus the bill allows for the use of a cost-accounting procedure like the standard procedure now widely used by hospitals in receiving cost reimbursement from the Veterans' Administration, the Children's Bureau, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and other agencies. At the same time, flexibility is assured in cases where the use of these standard procedures is not practical or where such use would produce inequitable results (due, for example, to the

type of accommodations the hospital is equipped to furnish). In order that the hospital will not be paid twice for the same service, payments under this section are made only for services not already paid for, except when the hospital has assured the individual of reimbursement. The hospital is precluded from requiring payments from the patient, for the cost of services insured under the agreement, after it has been advised that the patient is insured under this system; in the case of patients who request more expensive accommodations, however, the hospital may require them to pay the additional cost.

Paragraph (4) provides that payment is not to be made to Federal hospitals (or with respect to services furnished at Federal expense in other hospitals), or to any other hospital for services which it is legally required or obligated by contract with a State or locality to furnish at public expense unless a means test is used to determine eligibility for the services. The effect is to rule out, for example, reimbursement to a veterans' hospital or, with respect to hospitalization for service-connected disabilities, to a hospital having a contract with the Veterans' Administration, and to specifically include reimbursement for the hospitalization of those public assistance cases which are also eligible under the insurance program.

Paragraph (5) contains the guaranty to the hospital that it will be free from supervision or control over the details of its administration, operation, and personnel.

Under the provisions of paragraph (6), an agreement with a hospital shall be made with it, but a hospital may authorize an individual, association, or organization to act on its behalf in negotiating the agreement or in matters arising under it.

Paragraph (7) provides that payments to the hospital, other than payments which are to be made by a State agency or private nonprofit organization under arrangements pursuant to or under subsections (h) and (i), are to be made directly from the trust fund, on determinations and certifications by the Federal Security Administrator.

Section 222 (e). Nondisclosure of information: Subsection (e) provides for maintaining the confidential character of the records relating to the patient.

Section 222 (f). Hospital services under workmen's compensation: This subsection provides that, unless arrangements are made for equitable reimbursement to the trust fund, the insured hospitalization does not cover services which are received—or could on application be received—under a Federal or State workmen's compensation law. When eligibility under a compensation act is in doubt, payments under section 222 may be made, provided the individual files a compensation claim and agrees to reimburse the trust fund if entitled under the compensation law. In these cases or in other workmen's compensation cases for which payments for hospital services are made without reimbursement arrangements, the United States is to have subrogation rights (except when barred by State law), and recovered amounts are to be deposited to the credit of the trust fund.

Section 222 (g). Regulations and functions of council: The Administrator is to make all regulations specifically authorized by section 222. The Federal Hospital Council is to advise him on all matters of general policy concerning regulations and other functions.

Section 222 (h). Administration by States: The basic provisions for decentralized administration through the States are in this subsection.

Paragraph (1) declares that it is the intent of Congress that the program be administered by the States whenever a satisfactory agreement between a State and the Administrator can be made and, if the State finds it feasible, by the agency which administers the State's public-health program.

Paragraph (2) authorizes the Administrator to enter into an agreement with any State, whereby the appropriate State agency acts as the agent of the Federal Government in negotiating agreements with hospitals, in making payments to them, and in carrying out other administrative functions except for the functions of certifying eligibility, making regulations, and, to the extent it is more economical than if performed by the State, of keeping the records on the number of days of insured hospitalization remaining for each individual in a calendar year.

Paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) contain the provisions relating to reimbursements or advances from the trust fund of amounts spent by the State as payments to hospitals for insured services and of the State's necessary and proper administrative costs for the program. The amount to which each State will be entitled is to be certified to the trust fund quarterly, on an estimated basis, with adjustments where necessary for over or under payments in past quarters. The subsection also provides (par. (6)) that surety bonds for State officials may be required and paid for from the trust fund.

Section 222 (i). Services for farmers and other noninsured aged individuals: Through the provisions of this subsection, the States are encouraged to provide protection against hospital costs for farmers and other aged individuals who are outside the scope of the old-age and survivors insurance system and therefore not eligible for hospitalization insurance under subsection (a). The same facilities and personnel used in carrying out the State's functions with respect to individuals included under subsection (a) may be used in providing equivalent protection for any other category of aged persons the State may wish to cover. The trust fund will bear those costs of administration which are not reasonably attributable to the extension of protection. Costs not chargeable to the trust fund (the costs of hospital services to persons included through the extension, and the additional administrative costs reasonably attributable to the extension) are to be excluded in computing the reimbursements to which the State is entitled under subsection (h) or, if they have been included in advance payments to the State, are to be reimbursed by the State to the trust fund.

Section 222 (j). Utilization of private nonprofit organizations: Paragraph (1) directs the Administrator to utilize, in any State where he has been unable to make or continue in effect a satisfactory agreement with the State, the services of private nonprofit organizations (such as Blue Cross) which operate voluntary insurance plans involving reimbursement agreements with hospitals. These organizations are to be used to the extent the Administrator can make satisfactory agreements with them and determines that such utilization will contribute to the effective and economical administration of section 222.

Paragraph (2) authorizes the utilization of such private organizations by any State which has entered into an agreement to adminster the program.

Paragraph (3) contains the provisions relating to reimbursements or advances from the trust fund of amounts spent by the organization for payments to hospitals and for the organization's necessary and proper administrative costs in carrying out its functions under the agreement.

Paragraph (4) provides that surety bonds may be required for officers or employees of these organizations, and that the cost may be paid from the trust fund.

Section 222 (k). Certifying and disbursing officers: This subsection contains the usual provision to relieve such officials from liability with respect to payments which they certify or disburse, unless they were negligent or intended to defraud the United States.

Section 222 (l). Adjustments in cash benefits: Payments to hospitals with respect to services furnished an individual are to be considered as payments to the individual for purposes of the overpayment and underpayment provisions of section 204 of the Social Security Act.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATERPOWER OF NIAGARA FALLS AND RIVER IN STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the national defense and for conservation and public development and beneficial public use of the undeveloped waterpower of Niagara Falls and the Niagara River in the State of New York. The bill is being introduced by request of the New York State Power Authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1971) to provide for the national defense and for conservation and public development and beneficial public use of the undeveloped waterpower of Niagara Falls and the Niagara River in the State of New York, in accordance with the provisions of the Niagara Redevelopment Treaty between the United States and Canada, ratified by the Senate of the United States on August 9, 1950, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for Mr. IVES (by request)), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO ACTIVITIES OF CHANDLER INTERESTS IN LOS ANGELES, CALIF., WITH RESPECT TO MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a memorandum dealing with the so-called Chandler interests in southern California has been submitted to me. I have not verified the soundness of all the statements contained therein.

I submit for appropriate reference a resolution calling upon the Select Committee on Small Business to inquire into the allegations contained in the memorandum and to ascertain what further action and investigation may be required. I send the resolution and the memorandum to the desk, and request that both be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 114) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to inquire into the allegations contained in an article by Drew Pearson, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, May 24, 1953, describing a pattern of monopoly control by the Chandler interests in Los Angeles, Calif.

The memorandum presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON CHANDLER INTERESTS

The interests and influence of this family and its corporations, organizations, and rel-

atives are the dominant factor in the entire economy of southern California. This empire extends its control and influence over the entire southern California community in every field, including the newspaper and publishing, financial, commercial, industrial, banking, and agricultural fields. Domination in the social life of the community, through the many members of the family and through the power of the social reporters of the Los Angeles Times, is as great as the financial and commercial influence of the group upon the business interests of the area.

The dynasty was founded by Gen. Harrison Gray Otis, who started the Los Angeles Times in 1884 and was its president for many years. A short time prior to his death in 1917 he conveyed his major holdings in this and other enterprises to the various members of his family.

The empire was increased enormously by the late Harry Chandler, who married General Otis' daughter, Marian. Harry Chandler was responsible for the tremendous enlargement and diversity of the Chandler-Otis interests. It was he who was one of the original incorporators of the Douglas Aircraft Co., in which, in addition to a large stock ownership, he retained an active personal interest until his death in 1944.

The current ruler of the dynasty is Norman Chandler, the oldest of three sons of Harry and Marian Otis Chandler. Norman Chandler was born in 1899, and in 1922 married Dorothy Buffum, the daughter of A. A. Buffum, founder of the largest department store in Long Beach. Norman Chandler has again increased the holdings of the Chandler empire tremendously, and is the present ruler of this vast domain of newspapers, real-estate companies, industrial corporations, ranches, and oil fields.

The total value of this tremendous holding cannot be determined since many of the units are owned by family or personal corporations which furnish no information about themselves. A safe guess might possibly be that the aggregate value of all the business interests of the organizations headed or controlled by the Chandler family total $100 million. The income from this tremendous holding is also indeterminable. However, it is known that the annual income of the various organizations, after taxes, runs into many million dollars per year, with several of the organizations reporting incomes in excess of a million dollars a year after taxes.

In addition to this vast empire controlled through absolute ownership or heavy financial interest, the octopus of the Chandler family extends its tentacles in all directions, in all parts of our economy, through the directorships held in many organizations by Norman Chandler, his brothers, their close associates, and relatives. The complete coverage and the dominance of this octopus in every part of our community is so great as to be almost incredible. I have not, in this memorandum, attempted to trace all of the spheres of influence, nor even to list all of the directorates held by the various persons in the group. Time has not been available to make a complete investigation, and in this effort I am able only to indicate some of the better known and more prominent Chandler interests.

CHANDIS SECURITY CO., INC.

Probably the top holding company of the present generation ruling family of this dynasty is the little-known Chandis Security Co., Inc. This is a closed corporation, wholly owned by the Chandler family, and is known as a holding company and real-estate operating company. The president and treasurer is Norman Chandler. His two brothers, Harrison Chandler and Philip Chandler, are vice presidents; and his sister, Constance Chandler Crow, is the inactive secretary. Norman Chandler inherited the presidency of this corporation from his father, who was its president until his death on September 23, 1944. In 1949, the Southwest Land Co., another Chandler family company having large property holdings including a 275,000-acre ranch in New Mexico, was absorbed by this company. No information is presently available about this corporation, except that it is a large stockholder in the Los Angeles Times and, in addition, operates considerable real estate—although details of the activities of the company and the location of its properties are withheld. Its office is in the Times Building, and it is unquestionably the brain center of this octopus.

TIMES-MIRROR CO.

The Times-Mirror Co. is probably the main body or heart of the octopus. It may be the largest single holding of the Chandler family, having an admitted net worth in excess of $20 million, and owned as it is either directly by members of the family, or by organizations or which they are the sole owners or controllers. The only known exception, or outside stockholder, in the Times-Mirror Co. is probably T. B. Cosgrove, who owns a few shares and is the long-time attorney for the Chandler interests, as well as a member of the board of directors. Mr. Cosgrove is, in turn, a prominent individual in the Southland, and unquestionably it is generally recognized in his many connections that he has the power of the Los Angeles Times to back him up in his influences and directorships. Other directors of the Times-Mirror Co. include Harry J. Volk, vice president in charge of the western operations of the Prudential Insurance Company of America; and Frank L. King, president of the California Bank. The other members of the board of directors of the Times-Mirror Co. are all believed to be either members of the family or long-time employees.

The Times-Mirror Co. publishes both the Los Angeles Times, a morning paper, and the Los Angeles Mirror, an evening paper. The Los Angeles Times is the largest morning paper in southern California, and is nationally prominent and extremely profitable. The Los Angeles Mirror was started as an evening paper a few years ago and has grown very rapidly since it has the influence and prestige of the Los Angeles Times in obtaining advertising. In addition, the Times-Mirror Co. prints the Los Angeles telephone books, as well as conducting a general jobbing printing and publishing business.

The Times-Mirror Co. itself owns much real estate, including the large, modern, especially constructed newspaper building at 202 West First Street, facing the Civic Center. At 110–120 South Broadway, the company owns and occupies a building constructed in 1931 and adjacent to the main plant. At 145 South Spring Street, the company owns a 10-story building, the upper five floors of which are leased to the State of California. At 240 South Hill Street, the company owns a four-story and basement garage. In addition, the Times-Mirror Co. owns over 9 acres at 1115 South Boyle, on which is located a large new building of over 100,000 square feet in which the telephone directories are printed.

The Times-Mirror Co. has, over the years, been extremely profitable, making net earnings after taxes averaging considerably above $1 million a year for some time.

The Times-Mirror Co. has two subsidiaries. The first is a wholly owned subsidiary—KTTV, Inc., a California corporation operating a large commercial television station.

The second subsidiary is the Publishers Paper Co., of which the Times-Mirror Co. owns 51 percent, and of which, like the Times-Mirror Co., Norman Chandler is president. The Deseret News Publishing Co., of Salt Lake City, owns 24½ percent of the Publishers Paper Co., and the remainder of the stock is owned by two Oregon paper companies. The Publishers Paper Co. manufactures newsprint, as well as wrapping paper, fruit wrappings, and a number of other paper products. It also manufactures its own chemical requirements for its paper products. The newsprint is all sold by contract to the Los Angeles Times and the Deseret News Publishing Co., and its other paper products are distributed through commercial channels. This subsidiary is, in itself, extremely profitable, and is currently showing net profits after taxes, in its own operations, of over $1 million a year.

RANCHO SANTA ANITA, INC.

This corporation is a real-estate company of which Norman Chandler is president and Philip Chandler is vice president. The corporation was apparently set up by the Chandlers in 1936 to handle a small portion of their real estate activities. It acquired approximately 1,400 acres near the Santa Anita racetrack, which were formerly a part of the Baldwin Ranch. Since the property was bought during the depression and has recently been subdivided and a large portion sold, it is obvious that this company has been extremely profitable, although no financial information is available other than it owns many thousand dollars worth of real estate. It is known that the corporation owns a number of buildings in the vicinity of 1045 West Huntington Drive—all rented to others for stores, restaurants, movies, etc. In addition, it is believed that this is the corporation which owns the 8 acres at the southeast corner of Colorado Boulevard and Michillinda, which is known as a Chandler property and is improved with a restaurant, and 59-unit bungalow hotel—all of which is under lease to Eaton's Santa Anita, Inc.

EMETT & CHANDLER, INC.

This is another little-known holding of Norman Chandler. This was originally started as a partnership by Edward L. Emett and Norman Chandler as general partners and their respective wives as limited partners. The business was started by Emett and Chandler in 1929; it was incorporated in 1952. The corporation operates as general insurance brokers handling all lines of insurance. It has its clientele located all over the United States. Its head office is in Los Angeles, and it operates a branch in San Francisco. It undoubtedly attracts a large amount of insurance, to its own profit, by the extensive interests and influences of Norman Chandler. Unquestionably, his many holdings are all insured through the offices of this company. Like most Chandler interests, all financial information is concealed and no information is available as to the net worth or annual earnings of Emett & Chandler.

TEJON RANCH CO.

This well-known ranch is one of the many agricultural holdings in which the Chandler family have been joined by others. It is generally believed, however, that the Chandler family, either directly or through other organizations in which they are interested, completely control this tremendous acreage. The ranch itself is worth many million dollars and includes nearly 300,000 acres, straddling the border of Los Angeles and Kern Counties. In addition to the land owned in fee simple, the Tejon Ranch Co., of which Norman Chandler is vice president, lease approximately six large cattle ranches and graze many thousand head of cattle. The ranch also raises cotton, potatoes, wheat, barley, and other crops; and, in addition, has on its broad acres 250 producing oil wells.

CHANDLER-SHERMAN CORP.

This is the first of the corporations listed herewith in which Norman Chandler has not appeared either as president or vice president; however, he has given the corporation his name and is on the board of directors. This corporation is also worth several million dollars and is the largest single listed stockholder of the above-mentioned Tejon Ranch Co. The Chandler-Sherman Corp. is closely associated with the M. H. Sherman Co., the

Calexico Land Co., and the Colorado River Land Co., and in all of these corporations the same group of men is reputed to hold the outstanding stock. Although the other three corporations are primarily or principally ranching operations, the Chandler-Sherman Corp., in addition to its extensive ranch holdings, is a large Los Angeles property owner. It owns the Guaranty Building at 6331 Hollywood Boulevard, a large 13-story office building. It also owns the Westlake Building, which is an 8-story office building. The corporation owns a number of other real-estate properties, including one square block on Eighth Street, and in addition to its holding in the Tejon Ranch Co., the Chandler-Sherman Corp. has large ranch properties in Baja California and in Imperial Valley. In addition to these real-estate holdings, the company is reputed to hold a large, but undetermined, amount of stock and bonds. Like all of the closed corporations of the Chandler interests, this company publishes no financial information and its total holdings are unknown.

M. H. SHERMAN CO., INC.

The M. H. Sherman Co. is another company reputedly owned by the same group that owns the Chandler-Sherman Corp., and the M. H. Sherman Co. offices are in the same building as those of the Chandler-Sherman Corp. Norman Chandler is not known to be a director of the M. H. Sherman Co., although Arnold D. Haskell is president of both companies. The office, occupied by both companies, is owned by the M. H. Sherman Co., and its holdings consist of various corporations and also a large ranch near Calexico, as well as a considerable interest in the Tejon Ranch Co. The Calexico ranch alone is reputed to be worth considerably in excess of $1 million. The M. H. Sherman Co. has one wholly owned subsidiary, the Beverly-Wilshire Properties, Inc., which has large real-estate holdings in Beverly Hills.

In addition to all of the companies listed above, the Chandler influence extends in many directions at all levels of the community. Many of these closed corporations own large, but undetermined and unknown, amounts of stock in various commercial enterprises and industries. It is generally believed that these various ownership interests have been of great help to the Los Angeles Times itself, in that companies, in which the Chandler family has had influence or interest, have felt it desirable to place large amounts of advertising with the Los Angeles Times. The Chandler family has found it advantageous in their ambition to extend their influence and holdings to become members of the board of directors of various corporations either directly or through close associates.

In the banking world, Norman Chandler is a member of the board of directors of the Farmers and Merchants Bank. Frank King is president of the California Bank and is on the board of directors of the Times-Mirror Co. Both T. B. Cosgrove, the Times attorney, and Ralph J. Chandler, believed to be a cousin of Norman Chandler, and who is the vice president in charge of Los Angeles operations of the Matson Navigation Co., are members of the board of directors of the Citizens National Trust & Savings Bank.

In the financial field, Norman Chandler is a member of the board of directors of the Pacific American Investors, Inc. This is a $10 million corporation owning large stock interests in many companies. The president and treasurer of this company is Henry S. McKee, a long-time California banker and for 5 years president of Barker Bros. For the past 15 years, however, he has devoted his entire attention to this company. The secretary of Pacific American Investors, Inc. is Ward L. Bishop, who is also vice president of the Pacific Capital Corp., as well as a member of the board of directors of the City Coach Lines, the American Bus Lines, the Burlington Transportation Lines, and many other companies. Among the members of the board of directors of this corporation are C. A. Barker, of Lockheed Aircraft; John B. Lovelace, president of the Investment Co. of America; Asa V. Call, president of the Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co.; E. S. Dulin, president of Byron Jackson Co., and the ubiquitous Norman Chandler. This company and its many associates and other similar organizations with interlocking directorates are in a position to have a dominant influence in financial circles in Southern California.

Another corporation in which some of these same names appear is Barker Bros. Corp. As mentioned before, Henry S. McKee is a former president of Barker Bros., and he and J. B. Lovelace are members of its board of directors.

Among the many corporations of which Norman Chandler is a member of the board of directors and which, therefore, come within the sphere of influence of this incredibly powerful clan, are of course Buffum's Stores at Long Beach and Santa Ana. Norman Chandler's wife is the daughter of the founder of this multimillion-dollar company, and Norman Chandler is on its board of directors.

The June 30, 1951, report of the Kaiser Steel Corp. lists Norman Chandler as one of its directors.

Safeway Stores, Inc., also has Norman Chandler on its board, and the Dresser Industries, Inc., of Dallas, Tex., as well as the Santa Fe Railroad, similarly lists his name as a member of the board of directors. He is also a member of the board of directors of a number of other companies; however, in the limited time available, it has not been possible to obtain confirmation of these other listings. It is also believed that Norman Chandler's two brothers, Harrison and Philip, are on various boards of directors, and it is at least known that Harrison Chandler is a member of the board of directors of the Consolidated Rock Products Co.

It is impossible to list all of the holdings, or even all of the companies owned, controlled, or influenced by the Chandler family. It is, however, obvious that their interests make them easily the largest real-estate owners in this area, and certainly the largest individual holders of southern California organizations. With their tremendous holdings, it is very obvious that they are vitally interested in the economic climate of this area and that one of their goals is the decreasing of property taxes and the control of governmental units within the area of their holdings. It is obvious that, through these enormous holdings and extended tentacles of directorships, this family is easily the most powerful family in southern California and are able to dominate not only its economic and social life but now, because of the ever-increasing ambitions of the heads of the family, are extending their octopus-like grasp in the direction of government and are attempting to dominate the government of the city of Los Angeles.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF THE BILL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on April 25, I introduced the bill (S. 1765) to amend section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Monday, May 18, on behalf of myself and 24 other Senators, I submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes. I now take pleasure in asking that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] be added as one of the sponsors of the amendment. That means that there are now 26 sponsors of the amendment, including the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, does that mean a reprinting of the bill?

Mr. HILL. It is a very brief amendment, as the Senator will observe. It consists of but 17 lines. It is not a bill at all.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my reason for raising that question is that it has been customary to print a bill which is introduced and which carries the names of a number of sponsors. Then, when additional sponsors are added, the bill is reprinted. If additional sponsors are thereafter added, the bill is again reprinted. The reprinting of bills costs the Government money. I think it well to note that when final action is taken on a bill the names of all sponsors are included. Each time a name is added to a bill, reprinting is required—an expense that might not always be justified.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that this is not a bill at all. It is but a very brief amendment. It is what is known as the oil-for-education amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not objecting.

Mr. HILL. The 25 sponsors of the amendment are very proud to have the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] join with us in the amendment. I ask that his name be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF SAMUEL C. WAUGH, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President there was received from the White House today the nomination of Samuel C. Waugh, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of State. Notice is hereby given that the nomination will be acted upon by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired in accordance with the committee rule.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edward T. Wailes, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State; and

Walter S. DeLany, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Frederick M. Alger, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Belgium.

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

Col. Herbert D. Vogel, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, vice Brig. Gen. Don G. Shingler, relieved.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

Address entitled "Fear Psychology Unwarranted," delivered by him before the annual convention of National Livestock Exchange, Peoria, Ill., May 22, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address entitled "Defense of Freedom: A Challenge to Liberals," delivered by him at the annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action, Washington, D. C., May 23, 1953.

Editorial entitled "The Nation's Health Needs," from the April 4, 1953, issue of "America."

Editorial entitled "No, Thank You, Senator!" published in the Croton-Harmon News of May 7, 1953.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Address on the essence of due process delivered by Justice William O. Douglas before the American Law Institute, Washington, D. C., May 20, 1953.

Comments by distinguished members of the bar on proposed immunity legislation.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address entitled "Don't Talk America Into Slavery," delivered by Dr. Daniel A. Poling, chairman and editor, Christian Herald magazine, at the plenary session of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism, at Washington, D. C., on May 29, 1953.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Article entitled "The Results of Rehabilitation," published in the January–February 1953 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Article entitled "Democracy in Disorder," written by Walter Lippmann in his syndicated column, Today and Tomorrow, published in the Washington Post of May 21, 1953.

Article entitled "General Ridgway Urges Europe To Rush Arms," published in a recent issue of the Washington Post.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Article entitled "Weird Tax: No Wonder Excess Levy Is Reviled," written by William Hines and published in the Washington Sunday Star of May 24, 1953.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Addresses delivered by James App and Michael Behr in statewide public speaking contest of Future Farmers of Minnesota.

INCREASE IN MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 32.

Mr. JENNER. Madam President, Senate Resolution 32, and its corrected amenments, would create 4 additional committee places, while dispensing with 2, for a net gain of 2 committee posts in the Senate. The present number of committee posts, by rule XXV, is 209.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has no committee assignments, the number occupied is 207. The proposal of the Senator from Oregon, therefore, would raise the committee posts from 209 to 211.

In essence, the proposal of the Senator from Oregon would add himself and a Republican, each, to the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare. His proposal further would reduce the Committee on Public Works from its authorized number of 11 members to 10 members, which it now has, because one post remains unassigned, and the Committee on the District of Columbia, from its authorized total of 9 members to 8 members, which it now has, because one post remains unassigned.

An auxiliary aspect of this question is that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has submitted his resignation from the Committee on the District of Columbia. Although it has not been submitted officially to the Senate, from the Senate's precedents it would appear that no affirmative action on a resignation submitted to it is required by the Senate, although the Senate may replace the Senator from North Carolina with another minority member.

For all practical purposes, therefore, the Commitee on the District of Columbia now has a total of 7 members; and even if it were reduced from its authorized membership of 9 to 8 by the Morse resolution, it would still be a 7-member committee until such time as a minority member were appointed.

The Morse resolution, in expanding the total committee posts in the Senate by a net of two, also makes provision for expanding the triple committee assignments in the same degree. The Morse resolution, as proposed to be amended, would raise from 14 to 16 the number of Senators of the majority now serving on the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, who may serve on 3 standing committees, and no more. The Morse resolution would leave unchanged the number of 3 minority members who, being members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, may serve on 3 standing committees, and no more.

In the last Congress the rule provided that Senators of the majority party who were members of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Government Operations could serve on three standing committees, and no more. This resulted in 11 members of the majority having three standing committee assignments for the period of the 82d Congress, with none for the minority.

The Morse resolution therefore would establish a 13 to 0 ratio for the majority party in the 83d Congress, as contrasted to an 11 to 0 ratio for the majority party in the 82d Congress. The Morse proposal would extend the presently authorized membership of the Armed Services Committee from 15 to 17 Senators, and the presently authorized membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare from 13 to 15 Senators. The majority would gain two additional regular standing committee places, plus two additional triple assignments, for its membership. The Democratic minority would experience no net gain of any committee places. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would be added to two regular standing committees, for service thereon.

The Committee on Public Works, with 11 positions, which now is at an even membership of 10, would, by the Morse resolution, be left at the same number. The Committee on the District of Columbia, with 9 positions, which now is at an even membership of 8, would, by the Morse resolution, be left at the same number, although in effect, as has been pointed out, presently it has a membership of seven, because of the action of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Regarding the resignation of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] from the Committee on the District of Columbia, there has been no official notice of the same to the Senate, so far as I know. It is said that such a resignation was offered by the Senator from North Carolina in a letter to the minority leader, and it would be possible for the minority leader or the Senator from North Carolina to make a public or official announcement of it to the Senate. Other than by a few references to it on the floor of the Senate, however, the Senate has not been officially apprised of the resignation. Once the Senate were officially apprised of it, the Senate could move to replace the Senator from North Carolina with another minority member, or could simply allow the resignation to stand, without replacement.

The Morse resolution also would—

First. Disturb the presently existing balance of committee assignments in the Senate.

Second. Result in some loss to the Democratic minority in total committee assignments, as they relate to the total committee assignments of the Republican majority.

Third. Attempt now to reopen the whole field of committee preferences, which would result in many petitions being made to both the Republican and the Democratic leaders to change committee posts on both sides of the aisle.

Fourth. Another result might be an attempted expansion of other major committees, to accommodate further requests from Republican and Democratic Senators, alike, to be placed on them. If, for example, the Armed Services Committee is increased by two members, there is no reason to believe the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee should not be expanded to take care of the desires of Senators who in the past have asked for service on those committees, but who in this Congress could not be assigned to them because of their own party action.

Madam President, I now submit the report by the Committee on Rules and Administration, under the date of April 14, 1953, on Senate Resolution 32, as the report has been corrected to make it applicable to the star print of the proposed amendments of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I wish to have the report printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It conforms with the star print of the amendments of the Senator from Oregon.

There being no objection, the report (No. 304) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 32) temporarily increasing the membership of the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare, with proposed amendments, having considered the same, report it unanimously and adversely to the Senate.

This resolution, for the period of the 83d Congress, would assign to service on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare one additional member of the majority together with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

As proposed to be amended, the resolution would also reduce the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia to 8 and the Committee on Public Works to 10, and provide that 16 (rather than 14) majority Senators may have assignments to 3 standing committees and no more.

The Committee on Rules and Administration recommends the rejection of these proposals as disruptive of the presently established committee structure of the Senate.

Committee assignments arise out of party division in the Senate. As nearly as possible, they represent the percentage division between the two major parties on the floor. Customarily they also reflect a Senator's preference for committee work. Quite often, however, they do not; and, since the adoption of the Case resolution in January, the total of assignments to a committee now represents, in some measure, the Senate's recognition of the workload imposed on it.

Senate Resolution 32, as proposed to be amended, disturbs the existing equitable balance of committee assignments. Membership would be increased on 2 committees and decreased on 2.

Party representation on two committees would be evened and, in the case of each, majority control formally surrendered. To do otherwise would necessitate more than 16 members of the majority to serve on 3 committees.

On two committees majority representation would be increased without any gain for the minority. In all, the majority would have a net gain of 2 committee seats and the minority a net loss of 0. Party division would be widened in regard to triple committee assignments with the majority and minority members serving on 3 committees in a 16-to-3 ratio instead of the 14-to-3 spread now in effect.

The Committee on Rules and Administration is convinced that such changes would operate to the disadvantage of the Senate and to the majority and minority parties. The workload of the Senate has been equitably distributed within the present committee structure, and no valid purpose could be served by changing it. The majority and minority parties would sustain inequities that are objectionable and contrary to long-established custom.

There are additional reasons for failure to accommodate the junior Senator from Oregon. Other Senators, originally dissatisfied with one or both of their committee assignments, but now more or less reconciled to them, could quite properly expect the same preferment. To adopt Senate Resolution 32, as proposed to be amended, would also reopen the whole question of committee structure, now fitted to the close political division existing in the Senate. Action taken by the Senate on committees in January guaranteed to each Senator the right to two committee assignments as provided in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. To overturn that action, to reopen debate on the whole field of committee preferences, will accomplish little for the Senate, and its legislative program, at this date.

The precedents of the Senate, by which the two political parties have, for long years, harmoniously collaborated to establish committees, should be followed, and Senate Resolution 32, as proposed to be amended, should not be adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, at the outset of my brief remarks on the resolution, I now ask the Senate the courtesy of ordering a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, 4½ months ago the Senate organized its committees, and omitted the junior Senator from Oregon from his long-held places upon the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

That action, it is submitted, was in violation of the all-but-unbroken precedents of the Senate and constitutional principles.

The Senate can undo that mischief, which otherwise will stand as a precedent that threatens the future equality of representation in the United States for which the Constitution provides.

The Senate has before it not merely the case of the junior Senator from Oregon; it is faced with a decision which will be cited in future Congresses. Who can say today whether it will be the rights of a State represented by a Republican or Democrat or Independent Senator that will be in issue in years to come?

Democratic government is distinguished by its deep regard for rules of general applicability to govern all similar cases. Our traditions require that a particular decision be based upon a principle, and not upon the irritation or political convenience of the moment. That tradition is itself based upon an irreducible tenet of democratic government—equality before the law.

If political expediency and convenience had been the governing considerations in this controversy, I would have let the matter drop on January 13, when I was first excluded from the committees on which I had served for so many years. That would have been the easiest personal course. But, in my judgment, an important principle is involved; and I have never knowingly walked out on what I consider to be a matter of principle for any reason, let alone personal convenience.

As I have not always had the pleasure of my colleagues' company during discussions of this committee assignment problem, I wish to reiterate briefly the points I have made at length on several occasions since January 13.

PRECEDENTS OVERWHELMINGLY AGAINST REMOVAL

Madam President, the first point I wish to emphasize is that the precedents of the Senate are overwhelmingly against the exclusion of a Senator from committee seats already held, based upon repudiation of a party's candidate or policy. On a few occasions, a Senator has been removed from a committee chairmanship for those reasons, but only once has a Senator been removed from a committee for political reasons, and in violation of his seniority rights, based upon years of service in the Senate.

That lonely and unfortunate instance was Sumner's exclusion from both the chairmanship of, and membership on, the Foreign Relation's Committee in 1871, because of his opposition to Grant's plan for the annexation of Santo Domingo.

As I have said on the floor of the Senate so many times within recent weeks, the opposition to resolution 32 cannot cite a single precedent in the history of the United States Senate, other than the Sumner case, for the action which was taken on January 13 of this year. It is interesting that no other Senator has cited another case; nor did the Committee on Rules and Administration, in its April 14 report on my resolution, attack the precedent argument.

Let me refer briefly to some of the cases which support my position, to the many instances in the history of the Senate in which Senators have not placed party regularity above conscience, and who, for that reason, if it is a political crime, have not been removed from committees in the Senate.

Stephen Douglas, in 1859, lost the chairmanship of his committee; but his differences with his party regarding slavery did not cause him to lose his committee posts.

I might also cite the example of Norris, who attended the Bull Moose Convention and supported Teddy Roosevelt, but was not denied retention of his committees in the Senate of the United States.

We come to the more recent date, 1925, when the supporters of old Bob La Follette's presidential candidacy, in 1924, kept their committee posts, although one lost a committee chairmanship. They included Senators Ladd, Shipstead, and Wheeler, the latter having been the vice-

presidential candidate against his party in the 1924 election, on the Progressive ticket with La Follette.

In 1926 Norris campaigned against Vare, the Republican Senatorial candidate from Pennsylvania. Vare won, but was never seated. However, Norris was not denied his committee assignments in the Senate.

In 1928 Norris supported Alfred E. Smith, and Heflin crossed party lines to support Hoover. Both kept their committee assignments, and Norris remained as chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee.

In 1944 Senator Ball supported President Roosevelt; yet he remained on his committee in the Senate.

Madam President, in retrospect, it is interesting to take note of the fact that the junior Senator from Oregon, in 1944, in the midst of the campaign, when throughout the West he was speaking in support of Tom Dewey for the Presidency, took the position, in public speech after public speech, that after Senator Ball of Minnesota took the position which he took in that campaign, then as a matter of principle he should have resigned from the Republican Party. The junior Senator from Oregon has always taken the position that, as a matter of political ethics, a man has a right to take a walk during a campaign; that is, he has a right not to campaign for the candidate of his party. However, if he undertakes to campaign for the candidate of the party of the opposition, he then has the ethical obligation, in my judgment, at least, and in accordance with my standard of ethics, to resign from his party. That is exactly what I did in the 1952 campaign, in keeping faith with the position I took publicly in 1944 in regard to Ball's endorsement of Roosevelt. But I have never taken the position—because in my judgment it cannot be justified, either on the basis of the rule of the playground, the rule of fairness and sportsmanship, or upon the basis of the precedents of the Senate, that because a Senator follows his conscience, he should then be denied his seniority rights in the Senate by being removed from committees on which he has served for many years.

Let us consider what happened in 1948, Mr. President. The senior Senators from Louisiana and Mississippi supported the candidacy of Strom Thurmond. Senator Taylor was the vice-presidential candidate on the so-called Progressive Party ticket. Each kept his committee posts on the basis of his Senate seniority.

In 1952 at least two Democrats endorsed General Eisenhower, and they have suffered no committee reprisal. While I believe, Mr. President, that Senator Sumner of Massachusetts is good company, I do not believe a repetition of the Sumner exclusion would be good for the history of the Senate.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

Mr. President, a brief word now as to the constitutional issue. On March 27 I set forth at some length the history of article I, section 3, of the Constitution, which provides for equal representation of States in the Senate of the United States. I argued that it is impossible to separate that section of the Constitution from the procedures of the Senate, since, if the Senate were to follow a procedure having the effect of discriminating against the Senator of one State, then the Senate would not be according that State, under the spirit and intent of that section of the Constitution, equal representation in the Senate.

The equal-representation clause in the Constitution does not mean alone the numerical representation. That was not the basis of the great compromise which resulted from the fight in the Constitutional Convention. What those borning States were interested in, Mr. President, was equal treatment in the Senate of the United States, equal representation in the Senate.

As I have been heard to say so many times, it is impossible to separate substantive rights from procedural rights. To deny fair procedure is to deny substantive rights; and on January 13, 1953, the Senate followed a course of action, against the junior Senator from Oregon, which it is impossible to square with the equal-representation clause of the Constitution of the United States, because it cannot be squared with equal treatment or equal procedural rights for the State of Oregon in the Senate.

Mr. President, I say that historical studies show that the adoption of the equal-representation provision made possible the formulation of the Constitution of the United States and its ratification. Without it union would not have come when it did. One can only speculate on what would have taken place.

My argument on this point is that the Senate must be exceptionally careful in applying this provision, the adoption of which historians call the great compromise of the Constitutional Convention.

Equality of State representation can exist only with equality of status and treatment in the Senate in all respects. This includes the application of the same rules governing assignment of each Senator to committees. There can be no argument that the rule governing committee assignments has been that of seniority, with the single exception of Sumner, in 1871.

RULES COMMITTEE REPORT BASED ON TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR

Now, Mr. President, a brief word about the first report of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have not had an opportunity to read the report which has just been filed in the Senate, but I assume that, as the Senator from Indiana has indicated, it simply contains those modifications necessary to conform to corrections in the star print which I asked to have printed the other day.

On April 14, the Committee on Rules and Administration issued an adverse report on Senate Resolution 32. Two days later, I discussed the erroneous assumptions upon which the report was based. I discussed the report point by point to show how much of the report was based on the incorrect figure printed in the proposed amendment.

I also pointed out that the Committee simply did not come to grips with the constitutional and seniority problem—nor has anyone else.

THE PROPOSAL

Mr. President, I find it necessary to restate just what Senate Resolution 32 provides.

For the 83d Congress only, it would add one Republican and the junior Senator from Oregon to the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare. This would maintain numerical control for the majority, and would also recognize the seniority rules of the Senate.

As I said on January 13 on the floor of the Senate, as the RECORD will show, I quite agree with the majority leader that the majority party should have control on the major committees of the Senate. I believe that is contemplated and intended by the Reorganization Act, and the intention should be followed. This resolution, as I say, would maintain and recognize the seniority rules of the Senate.

The proposed amendments would eliminate the unfilled seats on the District of Columbia and Public Works Committees.

Let me make very clear that I am not discussing the action of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] in resigning from the Committee on the District of Columbia, as mentioned by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] in his comments today. That involves a question of procedure which we shall have to consider in the future, and concerning which I have not reached any final decision. I think it is perfectly clear from the Reorganization Act that the Senate has the power to assign Members to committees, and I think it is also clear from the Reorganization Act that it is presumed that a Member of the Senate will serve when he is thus assigned.

Let me say, because I think it was a choice of language rather than a matter of intent on the part of the Senator from Indiana, that I have not refused to serve on any committee in the Senate. I have not been assigned to any committee in the Senate; and the reason why I have not been assigned is that on January 13 I asked to have the assignment postponed until this resolution could be considered. At no time have I taken the position that I would not serve on any committee to which the Senate finally assigns me, because I consider it my duty to perform any assignment of the Senate, when the Senate, in keeping with its legal authority, makes an assignment. But I have tried to get the Senate to pause long enough before it makes an assignment to take into consideration what it is doing—not to me, but to the precedents of the Senate, to the principles of the Senate, and to the policies of the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I say the proposed amendments would eliminate the two unfilled seats on the District of Columbia and Public Works Committees. Elimination of the two seats would serve several purposes: It would preclude the possibility of the deciding vote being cast by me if the other members should vote on party lines; it would cancel the two posts which would be occupied by me, thereby keeping to a minimum the number of total committee posts and keeping the Democratic percentage—about which

some concern has been expressed—as close as possible to what it is now.

I point out to my Democratic friends that the Democrats would suffer a percentage loss of less than one-half of 1 percent. I point out to them also, once again, and very briefly, that what, by and large, they have refused to recognize throughout this debate is that they are not the only minority party in the Senate. I know they do not like it, but there are two minority parties in the Senate, and the moment another minority party came into being, the committee ratio of the Democratic Senators was bound to be affected. They cannot change that mathematical fact. They do not like it, but they want to fly in the face of that mathematical fact, which involves a change in ratio of less than one-half of 1 percent.

I shall go into it at greater length in a moment.

There is another fallacy the Democratic Senators have been using in their discussions of this matter, particularly in the cloakroom, and that is that it is the responsibility of the majority party to assign an independent minority party. Where did they get that idea?

In the history of the Senate the majority party has never assigned an independent, a progressive, or a liberal to a committee except upon agreement with the liberal, the progressive, or the independent. It has never done so as a matter of right of the majority party. It has always been done as a matter of agreement with the individual concerned. The Democratic minority has been arguing against a strawman on this point, because history fails to bear out their contention.

This is the first case in the history of the Senate of a man standing on his rights under the Reorganization Act of 1946. The La Follettes did not so stand. In the time of the senior La Follette, the Reorganization Act was not in existence. Later young Bob La Follette had come back into the Republican Party and would have taken his committee assignments as a Republican under the Republicans. But the junior Senator from Oregon served notice twice before January 13 that he was not going to enter into that kind of an agreement with the majority party. He did not want to be under any obligations either to the majority party or to the major minority party. He stated that he was going to ask to be assigned under the language of the Reorganization Act itself, as he had a right to do.

In some respects the situation is rather humorous. Senators talk about the Reorganization Act. But what they are actually doing is acting on the basis of the political caucus action of both parties. That is what is being done in this case. But if they want to act on the basis of party caucuses, it would be rather difficult to deny the parallelism, of an argument by the Independent Party that the Independent Party ought to have the right to assign itself, under the Reorganization Act, to the committees which it wishes to be assigned.

If it is proper for the Democratic Party to make Democratic assignments in accordance with the wishes of the Democratic Party and it is the prerogative of the majority party to do likewise, it is just as logical for the Independent Party to argue that it has the right in its caucus to make its assignments. If it did, it would assign its member to the Armed Services Committee and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

But I do not read the Reorganization Act that way, Mr. President. The Reorganization Act does not say a word about assignments based upon party caucuses. The Reorganization Act provides for electing by ballot Members of the Senate to committees. So I came before the Senate several days before January 13 and stated that I would stand on my rights as a minority party in the Senate under the Reorganization Act.

Briefly, that is it, Mr. President. But you Democrats will not face the mathematical reality, first, that there are two minority parties in the Senate, and that when the second minority party came into being it was mathematically bound to affect the committee ratio of the Democrats. But they want their cake and want to eat it, too. That is the position they have taken in this fight.

So, Mr. President, under the present organization of the Senate, the Democratic percentage of all committee posts is 46.4 percent. That is a shade better than the Republican percentage of 46.3 percent in 1950.

I should like to say to my Republican friends that one of the amusing things about these percentage statistics is that they are not doing so well as the Democrats did in 1950.

If the Morse resolution is adopted as amended, the Democratic percentage will be 45.97 percent. The percentage differences between present and proposed Democratic representation and the 1950 Republican representation will be, as we lawyers say, de minimis.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to read the remarks of the majority leader on January 13 in regard to the basic proposal of Senate Resolution 32. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said:

> I would not have objected to the motion which the distinguished Senator from Oregon says he would like to make, namely, that two additional Senators be added, one of whom may be a Republican and one of whom may be himself. But if that is going to be done, I do not think we can hold up the appointment of committees while it is done. I suggest that such a resolution be submitted and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that serious consideration be given to the problem.
>
> I have been very much interested in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I shall not be chairman of that committee, but I shall still be a member of it. So far as I am concerned, if that committee were organized with 8 Republican members, 6 Democratic members, and the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I would be delighted to have him serve on the committee. I do not raise the objection on that point.
>
> The same thing is true, I believe, of the Committee on Armed Services. But I do not see what choice we have under the present circumstances.

The distinguished majority leader also stated that the Reorganization Act of 1946 placed a limitation upon the number of Senators of the majority party who could serve on more than two committees.

The provision to which he refers is subsection 4 of rule XXV, which, before amendment on January 9, 1953, read as follows:

> Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more, except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] also said:

> We cannot put another Republican Senator on another committee * * * that is because the La Follette-Monroney Act provides there could be only 11 more majority members than minority members of the committees.

From what follows, it is fairly clear that he meant that only 11 more members of the majority party could hold more than 2 committee seats.

I should like to point out that at all times since the 1946 Reorganization Act until January of this year the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Government Operations—the latter was formerly the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which were specified by subsection 4—were 13-member committees, with 7 majority members on each. Plainly the original rule contemplated that the 14 majority-party members on those committees could serve on those committees and 2 others.

No similar provision was made for minority party members, so the difference for this purpose between the majority and minority parties was to be, not 11 to 0, as the distinguished majority leader said on January 13, but it was to be 14 to 0, which was 3 more than the majority leader mentioned on January 13, because, I repeat, those 2 committees specifically referred to in the Reorganization Act were 13-member committees; 7 to 6 was to be the division; 7 plus 7 equal 14; and the ratio, so far as serving on 3 committees is concerned, as provided for by the act itself was not 11 to 0, as the majority leader stated, but was 14 to 0, under the act of 1946.

This provision was amended on January 9 of this year, under the Case resolution, so as to permit 3 committee memberships for 14 members of the majority party and 3 for the minority party, making a difference of 11. That was when the figure 11 first arose. It did not arise under the Reorganization Act. Under the Reorganization Act it was not 11 to 0; it was 14 to 0. It was on January 9 of this year when we amended, in effect, the whole committee arrangement in the Senate by the adoption of the Case amendment, with the Democratic minority party for the first time getting 3 Senators who could serve on 3 committees.

I respectfully submit that even on the statistics the opponents of my resolution have been using, they are wrong mathematically. They have been proceeding on a false mathematical assumption.

Having made this change by the Case amendment on January 9, and having thereby enhanced the position of the minority party over that of the minority party in 1950, the majority leader states

that this difference cannot be altered because of the earlier opposition of the minority leader.

As we know, and as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, the minority leader objected on January 13 to my assignment to these committees, when the majority leader expressed willingness to go along with those assignments. That is why I have said, and it has caused Democrats to be irked, as I am well aware, but which concerns me not at all, that the responsibility for the failure on January 13 of the principle of my resolution not being put into effect lies at the door of the Democratic minority.

But the minority leader claims that he is only insisting upon the same relative standing for his party in this Congress that the Republicans had in 1950, as the party representation of each is 47 Senators. However, he completely ignores the fact that the party alinement in the United States Senate has changed since 1950.

The minority leader seeks to hide behind the false assumption that the Independent minority party should accept an assignment from the Republicans on the basis of Republican caucus action, simply because independents, liberals, free-soilers, and progressives heretofore have accepted assignment by the majority party. I repeat, that was by agreement between the majority party and the new minority party in each one of those years. No such agreement existed this year. To the contrary, the new minority party served notice that he was not entering into any agreement with either caucus, but was going to ask for his assignments under the Reorganization Act itself.

Mr. CLEMENTS rose.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to observe that the Democratic whip is finally rising to participate in a discussion of the fallacious position he and his colleagues have taken throughout this debate on the question of committee assignments, because the whip has been quoted as saying it is the responsibility of the Republican Party. But the Democratic whip has not read the history of the Senate. If he had, he would know that in every case when assignment has been made of a Progressive, a Liberal or an Independent by the majority, it was with the consent of the minority member.

I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Am I correct in understanding the Senator from Oregon to say that there had been an agreement between the majority leader and the minority leader as to the assignment of the Senator from Oregon to committees?

Mr. MORSE. No. The Senator's hearing is bad this morning if he understood me to say that. That was not what I said.

Before the Senator came to the floor, and I repeated the statement a moment ago, I pointed out that whenever, for example, the La Follettes were assigned, or whenever Norris was assigned, or whenever Ladd or any of the other Independent minority Senators were assigned, the history of the Senate will show that that was done by agreement between the majority party and the individuals concerned. That was the point I made.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad the Senator from Oregon has made that statement. It clarifies the situation very much, since there have been a good many statements made to the effect that an agreement had been made between the leader of the majority party and the leader of the minority party with reference to the assignment of the Senator from Oregon.

Very frankly, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that the Democratic whip now feels that it is the responsibility of the majority party to assign members of the Independent Party, and that has been done throughout the years.

Mr. MORSE. It has never been done without agreement. The Senator from Kentucky simply does not know his Senate history, to be brutally frank with him. Apparently, he has never read it. He would like to go along with that false assumption contained in the kind of propaganda which has been spread with regard to this question, but he is dead wrong, because that is not the history of the United States Senate.

I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that in the volume entitled "United States Congress, Organization and Procedure," by Floyd M. Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian of the Senate, at page 163, there is the following statement:

> Representatives and Senators, affiliated with third parties, receive their committee assignments through one of the two major parties, usually the minority.

But what history shows is that it has always been by way of agreement between the individual concerned and a caucus. I do not want caucus agreements. This Independent Party is not going to have to be dependent upon a Republican or a Democratic caucus. Get that one straight. This Independent Party is going to rely upon the law. The law makes perfectly clear what my rights are, and the law says that the Senate shall elect by ballot Senators to committees.

That is what I have asked for. I do not want either Republicans or Democrats to assign me to committees. I should like to have the Senate follow the law. I should like to have Senators stop giving the impression that there is some responsibility on the part of the Republicans to assign the junior Senator from Oregon to committees. There is none under the law, and there is none in the precedents of the Senate, because the only precedents in the Senate deal with those situations in which the Independent had entered into an agreement with either one caucus or the other for his assignments. Senators do not like the fact that they are faced with a novel case, the like of which has never been known in the history of the Senate, because we have had the Reorganization Act only since 1946, and I happen to be the first Senator who has stood on his rights under the act.

Two simple answers suggest themselves in justification of increasing to 16 the number of majority party Senators on minority committees who can hold two other assignments.

First. The difference between the two parties would be 13—not 14 as in 1950 and as contemplated by the unamended Reorganization Act—so that the Democratic Party is really better off than the Republicans were in 1950 even under my resolution, in that aspect.

Secondly, I should like to say most respectfully that I think the mathematical argument which is made about increasing the number to 16 instead of 14 is a de minimis argument. Increasing the number to 16 would not shake the Capitol dome. Such a course would not abuse or violate in any manner the Reorganization Act. The Senate has the power to do it. So the question becomes, Is it fair to do it? Would such a course do equity and justice to a State, forgetting about the individual who represents the State? I submit that the answer to those questions must be in the affirmative.

The original purpose of the limiting provision was to avoid the overworking of Senators, some of whom before the Reorganization Act, held six, seven, or eight committee posts. It was recognized that membership on the minor committees would be less burdensome than other committee work, and so, two additional assignments would not be in conflict with the principle of the act. Also, it was recognized that the majority party in a closely divided Senate might require such multiple assignments in order to secure numerical control of all committees.

This was explained in the report on the Reorganization Act, Report No. 1400, 79th Congress, page 18, as follows:

> It is provided—

Says the report, under the very act under which I am asking to be assigned—

> that each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more. Your committee will frankly explain the reason for this latter provision. It had been hoped that committee service of each Senator would be limited to two standing committees and in the light of generally increased jurisdiction of committees that would normally be sufficient. However, it was discovered that with a close alinement of the two major parties in the Senate that arrangement would leave many committees of the Senate in which the majority party did not have control, that is, the members would be evenly divided. The committee felt that that was not a satisfactory arrangement and hit upon the expedient of permitting Senators of the majority party who are members of the two committees named above (District of Columbia and Expenditures in the Executive Departments), whose jurisdiction was relatively light as compared with other committees, to serve on three standing committees.

That is the history of this provision for permitting a few Members to serve on three committees. The Reorganization Act made it clear that we should end the evil of having Members serve on 5, 6, or 7 committees. In one case a Member was found to be serving on 10 committees. No Senator can possibly discharge such a responsibility in a satisfactory manner. So this compromise or adjustment was hit upon. The word "adjustment" is probably a better word to use. It was provided that, as to these particular minor committees, the members

thereof could serve on 3 committees, 2 majors and a minor.

I suggest that the Case amendment was consistent with the Reorganization Act and was adopted for the convenience of the Senate. The slight modification proposed by Senate Resolution 32 with the amendments submitted would also be consistent with the act, and would not injure the Democratic representation—which would remain better than that of the Republicans in 1950.

My amendment would permit two additional majority members of the District, Public Works, and Government Operations Committees to hold triple assignments. In proposing this I am merely following the Reorganization Act and the Case amendment, in principle. Should the Senate prefer to permit majority party Members holding 2 assignments on committees not including the 3 specified, it is a matter of indifference to me.

I do not care what adjustment or selection of committees is made. I only say that it would do equity if the members of three committees were permitted triple assignments. It would do justice in this case.

Such a change would require some consultation off the floor. I would be quite amenable to deferring action on that aspect of the problem under an agreement to take up that part of the resolution—or all of it—until the matter could be resolved by the majority and minority leaders.

THE REORGANIZATION ACT CONTEMPLATES MAJORITY PARTY CONTROL OF COMMITTEES

I have heard it argued—off the floor—that it is the responsibility of the majority party to make assignments of an independent to committees.

As I have already said, there is no precedent in support of this contention so far as I have been able to discover. The proposal of members of a party by that party's caucus is based upon mutual consent of the Member and the party concerned.

Sometimes an agreement has been made between the Member and the minority party. Sometimes it has been made between the Member and the majority party. In this instance it could not be done. Why? Because the junior Senator from Oregon served notice several days before January 13 that he did not wish to be assigned by a caucus, but that he wished to be assigned under the act. He refused to enter into any agreement with either the Republicans or the Democrats on that subject. No formal agreement was ever offered. However, I am perfectly willing to say here today that individual Republicans and individual Democrats came to me and talked with me informally and inquired as to whether or not I would be interested in any arrangement worked out by their caucus concerning my committee assignments. I appreciated the courtesy. I told them so. I appreciated it, just as I appreciated the courtesy of the Republican caucus, prior to its meeting for organization purposes at the beginning of this session of Congress, in inviting me officially to attend that caucus. I thought it was decent of them, and I said so in my reply.

But I have made my decision, Mr. President, and I have no regrets over my decision. I intend to stand with my conscience in American politics. With me it is a matter of conscience. Senators may disagree, in their own valued judgments, as to whether or not I am right. That is no concern of mine. That is their business. However, with me it was a matter of conscience. I had no intention of placing myself under obligation to either caucus at the beginning of this Congress, and I said so on the floor of the Senate.

Some Republicans seized upon that circumstance, saying that I then would apparently have to follow what I have described as a "garbage-can disposal" with respect to committee assignments. Of course, that is the principle, descriptively speaking, that is being followed. I am perfectly willing to let the Republicans or the Democrats take any "out" they wish to take. However, I intend to hold them both to the language of the Reorganization Act. That is what my resolution seeks to carry out.

In the case of nonparty members, as with the Progressives in the twenties, those individuals agreed to take their committee assignments from the dominant party. In 1936 Norris was elected as an Independent and was proposed by the leader of the minority party, the then Senator from Oregon, Mr. McNary, to the committees of which he had formerly been a member.

There was no controversy about that course of action. Norris had defeated both a Republican and a Democrat in that election. It should be remembered, of course, that there was no Reorganization Act in effect at the time. In 1936 the procedure of the Senate was to assign committee memberships through caucuses. There was not a line on the statute books in 1936 which would have entitled Norris to come on the floor of the Senate and take the position that he wanted to be assigned by ballot by the full Senate. That is what the history of the Senate shows, Mr. President, and I have read every relevant scrap of paper I have been able to put my hands on in this fight. I had to do it, Mr. President, in self-defense. It was the leader of the minority party in 1936 who largely determined the Norris case. On committee assignments both groups agreed to do nothing about his position, but merely to leave him where he was. He was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary at the time he bolted to Alfred E. Smith in 1936, he did not lose his position on the committee.

Mr. President, that is the history. It would be convenient, of course, if one could change history to suit one's own convenience in a debate like this, but I may say to Senators on both sides of the aisle that cannot be done. They cannot find any sanction for what they have proposed.

Oh, they have arguments for it, out in the bailiwicks. Some Senators have sent out form letters and other letters, copies of which I have received from some of their constituents. In those letters the Senators in question have made the contention that it was the responsibility of the majority party to assign the Independent Party to committees. However, the Senators who make such a statement are without any historical fact on which to base their arguments.

Mr. President, I now go back to a further discussion of the Norris case. Let no Senators draw any false conclusion from my argument on the Norris case. I cannot begin to fill Norris' shoes in the Senate. But, as I have said, his footprints are deeply imbedded, and will be for all time, in American history. I shall try to walk in those footprints. The two cases are not parallel, in the sense that Norris followed the same course of action I have followed. He did not take the position, Mr. President, that he would endorse the candidate of the party of the opposition while at the same time keeping all the plums and benefits from the party of which he was a member.

That was not the ethics of Norris, nor of his conscience either. But Norris had a standard of ethics which caused him to say—and I think rightly so—that, having come to the opinion he had come to, in regard to both parties, by 1936 he wanted none of either. He went Independent. He was elected as an Independent. To that degree of going Independent, Mr. President, our cases are parallel, and I will leave it up to the voters of Oregon in 1956 to say whether they want to make the case completely parallel.

Norris' committee rank was based upon his former service, service performed while he was a Republican.

Another fallacious argument which has been made in the cloakrooms of the Senate and in the bailiwicks of the country is that I sat on my committees as a Republican. Mr. President, I sat in the Senate of the United States for 8 years as a Senator from a great sovereign State, unowned by either party. When I took the oath of office at the desk I was not the property of the Republican Party, because I made it clear in both of my campaigns for the Senate that I would sit in the Senate and exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of the issues in accordance with the facts as I found them. That is the attitude I have taken since I have been a member of the Senate.

Let me say that the question of party membership is secondary to a Senator's seniority rights in the Senate. A Senator's seniority rights are not based upon party membership. The seniority rights of a Member of the Senate are based upon tenure in the Senate, and the length of the tenure. That is why on January 13 I argued, as I do again today, that one must look at the question of seniority from its dual aspects; namely, a Senator's seniority in the Senate, and his party seniority within a committee. That is where party seniority comes in. However, a Senator's right to sit on a committee is dependent upon his seniority in the Senate. All the precedents of the Senate support that contention. That is why seniority rights have not been taken away from any Senator, with the exception of the unfortunate case of 1871.

Too many of my colleagues are thinking only in terms of partisanship in connection with this subject, not in terms

of the rights of a Senator on the floor of the Senate. I say to such Senators that they should read the Reorganization Act. The spirit and intent of the act is clear when it provides for election by ballot to committees. Talking in terms of partisanship or party membership, theoretically, under the language of the act, the Senate, if it had the will to do so—and, of course, if the Senate wanted to do it I would be in favor of it—could bring to an end, under the Reorganization Act, and according to its very language, the present seniority system in the Senate.

If Senators wanted to make uniform application of the theory, I would welcome it. In such a case the chairmanship of a committee in the Senate would not be dependent upon seniority, but would have a closer relationship to ability. In other words, chairmen of committees would be selected on the basis of qualifications, and the Senators best qualified would serve as chairmen.

Mr. President, I ask Senators not to fool themselves, because they are not fooling the public. They have got themselves into such a state of mind as to thinking they are selecting chairmen on such a basis at the present time.

Again going back to the Norris case, in 1936, as an independent, he remained top ranking minority member on the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Patents, and second minority member on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Rule XXIV specifies that assignment to committees shall be made by the Senate. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 for the first time made it mandatory that each individual Senator be assigned to two committees and set the limit of assignments.

As already indicated by the quotation read from the Senate report on that act, triple assignments were provided for so as to insure majority party numerical control of committees in a closely divided Senate.

I would point out to the Senate that whether we assume a party division of 49 to 47 or 48 to 47 and 1, the majority party now has more than a proportionate number of seats, just as the Democrats did in 1950. With such a close division it is probably impossible to provide proportional committee memberships and at the same time honor the more important consideration of providing for majority party control of committees which it should have for the majority party has responsibility for the program of the Senate.

My record is clear. In the 15 weeks since the action was taken I have argued many times that the majority party should have the majority on the major committees of the Senate.

However, a mathematical problem is involved in this case; and regardless of what is done in my case, in view of the present party division of the membership of the Senate, as the majority leader said on January 17, the problem cannot be worked out in such a way that the majority party will have a mathematical majority on two major committees.

Mr. President, I have already quoted from the volume entitled "United States Congress," by Floyd Riddick, the Assistant Parliamentarian of the Senate. On page 163 of that volume it is observed that third-party members receive their committee assignments through one of the two major parties, usually the minority.

That has been the record until the time of the passage of the Reorganization Act and until the case now before the Senate, which is the first of its kind in the history of the Senate.

Mr. President, a third party should be recognized for what it is—namely, a minor party; and its membership should be treated accordingly. My proposal is consistent with that thesis. The absolute number of committee assignments of the minority would not be affected. Its relative position would be affected scarcely more.

Mr. President, what we have here is a minor party, with both major parties to all intents and purposes refusing to recognize that it is a minor party. But it cannot be denied. Just as the late Senator Norris became a minor party in his day, so the junior Senator from Oregon has become one in his. Senators may think that a minor party can be ignored in the Senate, but, Mr. President, it will be heard from in the country, because in the United States there are millions of persons who are taking an increasing interest in an independent party, and they are also taking a particular interest in discovering to what extent the two major parties follow the rule of the playground in this case.

Mr. President, I am about through. I have made my case. I simply wish to say that in a controversy of this sort, the decision of a caucus should not control.

I hope the point has not been reached in the Senate when leaders will make a case such as this one a test of party loyalty. I say that because a Democratic Senator came to me a few minutes ago and told me he was disturbed because he had been placed in a position on this issue, as a test of party loyalty. In answer to that, I say that each Member of the Senate is a Senator before he is a Republican or a Democrat. Each Member of the Senate represents, as does the junior Senator from Oregon, all the people of his State—those who voted against him, as well as those who voted for him; those who oppose him, as well as those who support him. When we come to deal with the question of the rights of a minority party, Senators have no right, in my judgment, to place loyalty to their own party above the rule of fair play.

Thus, Mr. President, I say that each Member of the Senate has an obligation to determine for himself what the Constitution, the precedents of the Senate, and the Reorganization Act require in this case.

In closing, I wish to express my very sincere and deeply felt appreciation to colleagues who, over the trying weeks since the unfortunate action was taken against me on January 13, have counseled and advised with me and have expressed their deep regret that the action was taken; and in many instances—having voted against me on January 13—have been fair and decent and kind enough to say that, having thought through the matter, they will now support my resolution.

Mr. President, I also wish to thank the many organizations throughout the country that have taken an interest in this case. Oh, yes; I know what the cloakroom discussion has been, and it will now be expressed on the floor of the Senate. In the cloakroom the argument is being made, against me, that because the head of the CIO, Mr. Walter Reuther, has written to some Senators a letter in support of my resolution, therefore this is a CIO move. Mr. President, I wish to make clear that I am proud on this occasion, as I was proud in two campaigns, to have the support of the CIO, just as in those two campaigns I was proud to have the support of all the other labor organizations.

However, I wish to rebut the cloakroom argument that this resolution is a CIO measure. This is a resolution supported by the overwhelming majority of the labor organizations of America, Mr. President. They support it because labor in America—the United Mine Workers, the railroad brotherhoods, scores of American Federation of Labor unions, and the CIO—believe sincerely that it was unfair for the Senate to follow the course of action it followed on January 13.

I have before me letters from such great labor leaders as John L. Lewis and many of the leaders of the American Federation of Labor and of the railroad brotherhoods, in support of the position I have taken.

However, the support does not come only from labor, Mr. President; the support comes also from large numbers of small-business men in the United States who also desire to be fair to a representative of the Independent Party in the Senate, and who in some of their letters expressed increasing concern and a desire to have in the Senate someone who formally and officially will represent the independent voters of the United States, because most of the small-business men of the United States are independent voters, as will be discovered if the Main Streets of the United States are checked.

However, Mr. President, the support is not confined to the ones I have just mentioned. My mail during the past 16 weeks has been voluminous on the subject. I wish to say to my colleagues that in the United States there are millions of other persons who are aware of the issue at stake on the floor of the Senate—millions more than I think most of my colleagues realize.

Mr. President, having made my case, I close with one statement: The problem is now that of the conscience of each member of the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Oregon may find some comfort in the words of the old injunction, "No question is ever settled until it is settled right."

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from New Hampshire; and I wish to thank him for his courage—because it took courage—in voting on January 13th to support the rights of the junior Senator from Oregon, as the Senator from New Hampshire saw those rights. I have found him never hesitating, figuratively speaking, to walk through fire, if necessary, in support of what he thinks is right, and I appreciate the comment he has just made.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, and as part of them, some of the communications to which I have referred. I shall take just a moment to read the letter from John L. Lewis, because John L. Lewis and I do not see eye to eye on many issues. If he were a witness today, I believe he would testify that no one fought him harder than I did in 1942 in the coal cases when I wrote the dissenting opinion. I was the only member of the War Labor Board who dissented in those 1942 coal cases, and in 1950, in the Senate, at the time of the coal case then pending, I offered a bill providing for the handling of such emergency disputes, a bill which Mr. Lewis did not favor. But I will say one thing about Mr. Lewis, Mr. President. He does not hesitate to support what he thinks is right, even though it may involve someone with whom he has found himself in opposition. With that background of experience with Mr. Lewis, I am rather proud to read on the floor of the Senate today a letter which I received from him this morning:

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your fight for your seniority rights, committee privileges, and the restoration of the great State of Oregon to its proper representation in the Senate of the United States has stirred the admiration of every justice-loving American citizen.

The United Mine Workers of America and its officials join these other citizens in wishing you every success in this struggle against the selfish forces of reaction. I trust that all the rights and privileges of your high office will be restored by the action of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain other communications of the same nature, from other labor leaders, from businessmen, and from citizens generally, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 25, 1953.*

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Following telegram sent to Senators KNOWLAND, JOHNSON, and ANDERSON: "Please vote Resolution 32 to restore MORSE to original committees."

J. T. MAHR,
Oregon State Federation of Labor.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 22, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Following wire sent to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON: "We favor MORSE resolution to enlarge Senator Labor and Armed Services Committees. We urge you secure all support possible."

KENNETH R. SMITH,
President, Portland Industrial Union Council, CIO.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, *May 21, 1953.*

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of the Order of Railway Conductors, an independent labor organization and the second oldest railroad labor organization in the United States, I urge that you recommend and support the enlargement of the Armed Services Committee by two members. Your support of Senator WAYNE B. MORSE, of Oregon, as one of the two new members on the committee would meet with the wholehearted approval of the members of my organization.

R. O. HUGHES,
President, Order of Railway Conductors of America.

MAY 21, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, an independent labor organization and the second oldest railroad labor organization in the United States, I urge that you recommend and support the enlargement of the Armed Services Committee by two members. Your support of Senator WAYNE B. MORSE, of Oregon, as one of the two members on the committee would meet with the wholehearted approval of the members of my organization.

R. O. HUGHES,
President, Order of Railway Conductors of America.

MAY 21, 1953.

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, an independent labor organization and the second oldest railroad labor organization in the United States, I urge that you recommend and support the enlargement of the Armed Services Committee by two members. Your support of Senator WAYNE B. MORSE, of Oregon, as one of the two new members on the committee would meet with the wholehearted approval of the members of my organization.

R. O. HUGHES.

MAY 22, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The confidence that laboring men generally have in Senator WAYNE B. MORSE and his understanding of many of the problems in the labor-relations field makes his services as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare an important and valuable asset to that committee.

As president of the Order of Railway Conductors, an independent labor organization and the second oldest railroad labor organization in the United States, your cooperation and support in bringing about Senator MORSE's appointment to the committee, would be greatly appreciated by the members of my organization.

R. O. HUGHES.

MAY 22, 1953.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The confidence that laboring men generally have in Senator WAYNE B. MORSE and his understanding of many of the problems in the labor-relations field makes his services as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare an important and valuable asset to that committee.

As president of the Order of Railway Conductors, an independent labor organization and the second oldest railroad labor organization in the United States, your cooperation and support in bringing about Senator MORSE's appointment to the committee, would be greatly appreciated by the members of my organization.

R. O. HUGHES.

MAY 22, 1953.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The confidence that laboring men generally have in Senator WAYNE L. MORSE and his understanding of many of the problems in the labor-relations field makes his services as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare an important and valuable asset to that committee.

As president of the Order of Railway Conductors, an independent labor organization and the second oldest railroad labor organization in the United States, your cooperation and support in bringing about Senator MORSE's appointment to the committee would be greatly appreciated by the members of my organization.

R. O. HUGHES.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 22, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed herewith is copy of a telegram which I have today forwarded to Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON. It is my understanding that Senate Resolution No. 32 is scheduled for consideration on Monday, May 25.

It is my hope that a telegram from me, and similar messages from many of your other friends, will result in favorable action on the resolution.

With kind personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

W. P. KENNEDY,
President.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *May 22, 1953.*

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the more than 200,000 members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, I would respectfully request that you exert your influence in obtaining favorable consideration of Senate Resolution 32 which provides for expansion of the Armed Service and the Labor and Public Welfare Committees to include Senator WAYNE MORSE. Favorable consideration of this resolution I feel will redound to the public good in that it would make available to these two important committees the services of an outstanding American whose experience and penetrating perceptive qualities would prove invaluable to these committees.

W. P. KENNEDY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I read with extreme pleasure in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 13 your excellent statement during the Senate debate on your committee appointments. It is extremely unfortunate that the local press did not report it.

If possible, I would appreciate a copy of your statement. So far, none of the papers have indicated what happened to the resolution which went to the Rules Committee to enlarge the Armed Services Committee and the Labor Committee. I would appreciate any information on this item.

I trust you manage to get on both committees.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS S. ISSERMAN.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For several years I have closely followed your legislative activities in the Senate, and have great admiration for the manner in which you consistently abide by your convictions, disregarding your political affiliations. I was greatly disheartened to learn that my Democratic brethren had failed to support you in your quest for important committee assignments, which you so richly deserve by reason of ability and seniority. It certainly is shabby treatment of one who made the supreme political sacrifice in supporting Governor Stevenson for the presidency, and who has continually espoused their cause.

On the other hand it might all be for the best. For you enjoy the unique position of being a one-man committee for all legislation, and you will be better able to expose the nefarious activities of your colleagues. Many great men have walked alone. I hope that your Friday afternoon caucus of the Independent Party will continue. I wish you the best of luck in all your endeavors, and want you to know that here is one of many Democrats who approve what you are doing in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

CLEMENT P. YUSE.

BAY SHORE, N. Y., *April 16, 1953.*

DEAR SIR: I have written to both of my Senators, and the President, urging that better treatment than the childish discipline being displayed in the Senate, be accorded you.

To me it is entirely unjust that a man be punished for upholding the truth of his own convictions, and we must have a sorry lot of legislators to act in such a narrow manner.

There are many Americans who feel as I do about this matter, but they don't take the interest in letting the participants know about it.

I do hope you receive better consideration, and I'm rooting for you in the matter of committee participation.

Very truly yours,

ROSLYN BROMBERG,
Mrs. Fred Bromberg.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *May 3.*

DEAR SENATOR: This is the first time in my 80 years that I have felt compelled to write to a Congressman.

But this business of an outrageous and brazen steal of public property has prompted me to pen my wholehearted support of your fight against the tidelands giveaway. I hope the American public awakens before their heritage is given away for a song by the local politicians.

I would like to add that I was extremely chagrined by the failure of the Democratic Party, which, by the way, I have supported, to stand up and support you in your rightful committee posts.

Lastly, I hope the people of Oregon recognize a true representative and return you to your seat in 1956 by an overwhelming majority.

Yours truly,

CLARA and JOHN KATKO.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to the address delivered by the Senator from Oregon. It is a persuasive argument, but, unfortunately, it does not fit the facts. Ours is a two-party government. We in America believe in that system.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me get started, please. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. The Senator started with the first mistake.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Is there anything in the Constitution which says that ours is a two-party government?

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not say it was in the Constitution; so why does the Senator ask me such a question?

Mr. MORSE. Where does the Senator get the idea?

Mr. HAYDEN. I get it from the practice which has been followed for over a century, with which the Senator is familiar.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Arizona know that there have been many third-party movements, and that the Republican Party came into being as the result of a third-party movement?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is entirely true; but, for the major portion of the history of the United States, there have been two great political parties. The Senator will not deny that.

Mr. MORSE. There have been some minority parties which became the majority parties. Perhaps the Senator's concern is over the possibility that the Democratic Party may become the Independent Party. I hope it will.

Mr. HAYDEN. It may; but from the beginning of this Government there have been two major parties. They have not all lived throughout the life of the Republic, but under the great American political system, as we know it, there have been two major parties, and there has been reliance on party responsibility. If one party cannot govern to the satisfaction of the people, that party is turned out of power and the other party is placed in power. It is always fortunate for the country when the turnover is complete, so that responsibility can be placed where it properly belongs.

This concept applies to the Senate. Here there is rule by the majority. I suppose we could have a system of proportional representation, as is the custom in France. We could have so-called splinter parties, and we could have a situation like that which has existed in France since the war, where no party has sufficient votes to enable it to function.

I believe the American system is the best, that the procedure followed here is the most satisfactory. I also think that, regardless of whether candidates are elected by a majority of the people, it is better, from the standpoint of stability of the Government, to have even a plurality of the people govern the country by their votes, than to have the legislative bodies split up according to a scheme of proportional representation.

The same thoughts apply to the Senate. One party or another is in the majority and in control of the Senate, and that party assumes responsibility for the conduct of the business of the Senate.

Among the things for which the majority must assume responsibility are assignments to committees. The way that has been handled as far back as I can remember, at least, is for the majority, whether Democratic or Republican, to agree with the minority on a division of committee memberships. Then, perhaps as a matter of grace, or by reason of the fact that the majority party may be in the minority at some other time, and the method of assignment is a convenient one, the majority says to the minority, "You assign your members to the committees as you desire, and we will assign our members."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. There would be no need of rules at all, would there, if that were the method desired to be followed? There would not even be a need of the Reorganization Act, so far as committees were concerned, if that were the procedure to be followed. What does the Senator think the rule is for?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am talking about the procedure and practice of the Senate, not about the rules. I am talking about the way the matter has been handled.

Mr. MORSE. I am arguing for a government by law.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well. I will say that no law has been violated in this instance.

What happened? The two parties agreed to let each party, in proportion to the size of its membership in the Senate, determine who should serve upon the committees. That arrangement was made, and then the Committee on Committees, on each side, made arrangements as best it could, to accommodate Senators, though it could not satisfy them all. Many Senators are disappointed if they do not get the identical assignments they would like to have. But we do the best we can, and finally there is brought to the floor of the Senate a recommendation by the majority and one by the minority, indicating which Senators shall be on certain committees.

Then, under a practice which dates back as far as I can remember, to long before the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Senate elects the members of its committees. They are not selected in conference. They are elected on the floor of the Senate by vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. The majority of the Senate must ratify the action taken by the party organizations.

I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator really believe that?

Mr. HAYDEN. I can prove it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have some proof. That is not in accordance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That act contains not a word about any caucus assignments, as the Senator knows.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that.

Mr. MORSE. We have had a new day, starting with the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the old rule, there was nothing about caucuses or party government or anything of the kind.

But let me point out to the Senator what happened in 1925. Senator Watson, of Indiana, representing the unofficial committee on committees of the Republican majority party, asked unanimous consent to suspend so much of rule XXIV as provided for the appointment of standing committees by ballot. The request provoked discussion. There was a rule in the Senate, in 1925, which provided that committees were to be selected by ballot. In other words, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 repeated an existing rule.

Senator Borah, of Idaho, having in mind action of certain Senators in supporting the candidacy of Senator La Follette, Sr., for President in the November 1924 election, stated that, before consent was granted, he would like to ask what disposition the Committee on Committees had made with reference to Mr. Ladd and Mr. Frazier, both of North Dakota, and Mr. Brookhart, of Iowa, who had supported La Follette.

The following colloquies then occurred:

Mr. WATSON. The Senator from Iowa, Mr. Brookhart, is left on the same committees he was on before. The senior Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Ladd, is left on the same committees he was on before except that he is no longer chairman of a committee. The junior Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Frazier, is on the same committees he was on before with the exception of the Committee on Indian Affairs. He was transferred from the Committee on Indians Affairs to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BORAH. As I understand, the senior Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Ladd, has been demoted from his chairmanship.

(NOTE.—The Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.)

Mr. WATSON. He has.

Mr. NORRIS. Right in this connection, if I may interrupt, that is true of all the other Senators named, is it not? Have they not all been demoted?

Mr. WATSON. They have been placed at the bottom of the list.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask upon what theory the committee did that?

Mr. WATSON. Upon the theory that the first Republican conference held at this session provided that those Senators should not be invited to attend any further conference on the Republican side and that they should not be placed on any committees to fill vacancies on the Republican side.

That was the way the situation was handled at that time.

I frankly stated my position before the Committee on Rules and Administration, namely, that the mistake which the majority made in this instance was that it took the Senator from Oregon entirely off two committees. In the case of the Senators whom I have mentioned, they were deprived of their chairmanships and went to the foot of the committee. The Senator from Oregon could have been very well deprived of his seniority on the two committees of which he was a member, and placed at the foot of the committees. That would have been in accordance with the precedents. That was the mistake of the majority party. That was its responsibility. There was no rule or law or anything else that required the minority party in the Senate to assume responsibility for members of an Independent Party on any occasion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Where is the rule which requires the majority party to do it?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is custom.

Mr. MORSE. It has been violated many times in the history of the Senate, and when invoked, it has always been after consultation with the individual concerned.

Mr. HAYDEN. I agree that perhaps it was always after consultation with the individual concerned. But if a Democrat left the Democratic Party to advocate the election of a third party candidate, and he came back to the Senate, the Democratic Party has never taken away any of his committees. We did not take away Glen Taylor's committees. We did not take away Burt Wheeler's committees. He retained his membership on his committees. We were in the minority when that occurred. It depends upon what party a Senator leaves as to what is his standing. It cannot be said that a Senator can leave the Republican Party and impose on the Democrats the burden of taking care of him. That cannot be done.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that we were a minority party when Glen Taylor ran?

Mr. HAYDEN. I said, when Burt Wheeler ran.

Mr. ANDERSON. What did the Democrats do in the case of Glen Taylor?

Mr. HAYDEN. We let him remain on his committees. It depends upon what party a Senator withdraws from. He cannot make himself utterly independent of both parties and then expect one of them to give him a place on committees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. What the Senator from Arizona is trying to say is that it depends on what party a Senator withdraws from in determining his rights under the Reorganization Act. The Senator has not said one word that refutes the fact that the Reorganization Act gave the junior Senator from Oregon some specific rights as a Member of this body. It gave him the right to have the Senate elect him by ballot. But it did not give the Democrats the right to take the position that the majority party should assign him, because the Senate itself had the responsibility to assign him under the Reorganization Act. That argument the Senator will not touch with a fishing pole, because he cannot answer it. All the Senator is talking about is various caucus maneuvers. Why does he not come to grips with the Reorganization Act? Because he cannot answer that argument.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator had the right to membership on two committees. What his seniority would be, or on what committees he would serve, was absolutely and utterly dependent upon a majority vote of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. In a moment. Let me emphasize that point. Any position any Senator has on any committee can be taken away and assigned to some other Senator if a majority of the Senate so votes. There can be no question about that. If a party is in control of the majority of the Senate, it is its responsibility to resolve such situations as it may deem proper. There is no getting away from that fact, either. If we had an agreement with the Republicans at the beginning of the session that there would be a division of seats upon committees according to an agreed ratio, and then they said to us, "Very well, go ahead and make your assignments; we will vote for anyone you name upon your committees, and you will vote for anyone we place upon our committees," it was not incumbent upon the Democratic Party to see that a Senator who left the Republican Party and became an independent should get a place on any committee. He should look to the party he left, because we could not assume responsibility for him if he was absolutely and utterly independent, as the Senator from Oregon states he is.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am sure the Senator from Arizona realizes that the Senator from Oregon was placed in an embarrassing situation because he did not want any assignment from the majority party.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true, but the party should have been big-hearted enough to have given him the assignments.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. There has been much said about the Reorganization Act. Does that act limit the number of committee assignments any Member shall have? With a certain exception, does it not limit a Senator to two committee assignments? Prior to the enactment of the Reorganization Act a Senator could have had 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 committee assignments. Is not that practically all the change it makes?

Mr. HAYDEN. It did not change the procedure of election by the Senate to committee assignments. That was a requirement of the law before that time. It reformed the procedure whereby Senators had too many committee assignments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Prior to the Reorganization Act there was never any guaranty of any Senator being a member of two committees. As I brought out in my statement this morning, it certainly provided that a Senator could not serve on 7 or 8 committees as was theretofore the situation, but it also provided a guaranty of a seat on 2 major committees. It put down in black and white the right of a Senator to be elected by ballot as a member of a committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. That had been the rule of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. No; that is not the fact. The Senator a moment ago tried to argue that it had been a custom of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I read rule XXIV of the Senate which provided for election of Senators to committees by vote of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. But the Reorganization Act, for the first time, laid down in cold print as a matter of right appointment to two committees.

Mr. HAYDEN. It laid it down in a rule as a matter of right, but under that very act, the Senate, if it desired to do so, could change that rule tomorrow, because there is nothing in the act to prevent the Senate amending its rules.

Mr. MORSE. Of course the Senate could change its rules; but it has not done so.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand. What I am trying to say is that there is nothing unusual about conferring upon a Senator the right to serve on 2 committees, when most Senators had previously served upon 4, 5, or 6. Nobody ever heard of a Senator being restricted to two committees prior to the Reorganization Act. So mathematically that provision does not amount to anything at all. It provided merely for decreasing the number of committees on which Senators could serve.

Under these circumstances, I cannot see how the Senator from Oregon has any right to insist that he should be treated any differently than was Senator Norris, Senator Ladd, Senator Shipstead, Senator Brookhart, Senator Wheeler, or Senator Glen Taylor. Each of them left his party to support an independent candidate and then returned to his party.

If in the instant case the Republican Party decided—mistakenly, as I believe—to take the Senator from Oregon off his committees entirely, it was a mistake of the Republican Party, for which we on this side of the aisle have no responsibility.

A vote on the membership of the committees was taken on the floor of the Senate March 9, 1925, when the names of the chairmen and members of the committees were submitted, and it appeared that Mr. Stanfield, of Oregon, had been proposed as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, instead of the former chairman, Mr. Ladd, who had been made chairman of the committee on March 13, 1924, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Lenroot, of Wisconsin.

Mr. Norris, of Nebraska, moved to strike out the name of Mr. Stanfield and to insert that of Mr. Ladd. By unanimous consent, members of the minority, the Democrats, were permitted to refrain from voting, or to answer "present," and later that was modified by permitting any Senator desiring to do so to vote for the candidate of his choice.

On March 9, 1925, a yea-and-nay vote was had on the election of the chairman, and of the total number of votes cast, 52 in number, Mr. Stanfield received 36 votes, Mr. Ladd received 13 votes, and Mr. Jones of New Mexico received 3 votes; 26 Senators answered "present." Mr. Stanfield, having received a majority of the votes cast, was declared elected.

At that time the Democrats refused to accept a Republican responsibility. A Republican Senator, Mr. Ladd, had left his party to support La Follette. The Republicans decided they would not retain Mr. Ladd as chairman of the committee, but that Mr. Stanfield, of Oregon, should become chairman. So it was a Republican difficulty, and the Democrats abstained from voting and allowed the Republicans to settle the question, which was done by a vote on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator permit me to read what the majority leader said on January 13, 1953, as to who was responsible? I read from page 333 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the second column:

> I did my best to persuade the distinguished minority leader and the minority whip and the other minority members that they should do their best to give us 15 more members who could serve on 3 committees. But they were not open to persuasion. Perhaps they might be later. However, the action taken had to be taken by substantially majority consent, and I had to yield on that point.
>
> Consequently, under present circumstances there is no way by which we could assign the Senator from Oregon to two committees and still could avoid creating such a situation that the Senator from Oregon, together with the Democratic members of those committees, would be in control of the committees. Therefore, Mr. President, the present situation is that there are two committees which the Republicans in the Senate cannot control.

That does not sound as though the Democrats were without any responsibility in this matter. The majority leader was stating that it was the Democratic Party which, prior to January 13, had made it impossible for the Senator from Ohio, as leader of the Republicans, to do justice to the Senator from Oregon. He tried to do so, but the Democrats would not allow him to do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is very kind of the Senator from Oregon to give us that information. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the instance I have cited from 1925 is exactly parallel to the present case. In that instance, the Democrats declined to accept Republican responsibility, and in this instance we have likewise declined to accept Republican responsibility.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Had the suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon been accepted, would it not have given to the majority party, which was composed of 48 Members, more assignments than were held by the Democrats when they had 49 Members of the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know who has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not take very much time of the Senate this afternoon, because this subject was debated at considerable length on January 13, when it was last before the Senate. However, for the purpose of the record, I think there are many things which need to be made clear.

I do not believe the Senator from Oregon is correct when he claims that there has been any violation of the constitutional provision that each State shall have equality in the United States Senate. The Senator from Oregon and the State of Oregon have equality in the Senate with every other State. That provision of the Constitution does not apply to committee assignments. It is perfectly obvious that it could not do so. If it did, it would mean that each State of the Union would have to have equal representation on every committee of the Senate. There are many committees upon which my State of California has no representation whatsoever. However, it does have representation through Senators from other States; and that is true of every other State.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. To show how wrong the Senator is, is the Senator aware of the fact that at the very time the great compromise was worked out in the Constitutional Convention, each State had one representative on each regular committee of the Convention? Read the constitutional debates. One of the problems that led to the great compromise was the very fact that States could have been discriminated against on committees in the Senate. It has been interpreted by every scholar of the equal representation clause that the equal representation clause means equal procedural rights in the United States Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Oregon is entitled to his opinion, and I am entitled to mine. I say it is not the custom and is not the practice in the Senate for each State to have equal representation on each committee of the Senate. The Senator from Oregon may argue all he wishes to; the fact is that what he contends for is not the case, and has never been the case.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe the Senator wishes to have a misunderstanding of my position to stand in the Senate. I am not taking the position that equal representation means that each State shall have equal representation on committees. I merely point out that in the Constitutional Convention it was the practice to have a representative of each State on each committee.

I am not saying that each State is entitled to rights on each Senate committee; I am saying that each State is entitled to no discriminatory practices when it comes to assignment of Senators to committees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I intend to show that there has been no discrimination in that regard.

On January 13, when the pending matter was last before the Senate, the Republicans did not, in fact, have control of the Senate. The membership of the Senate then, as now, was divided into 48 Republicans, 47 Democrats, and 1 Independent. The Republicans were not the majority party on January 13, because at that time the Vice President of the United States was Mr. Barkley. Had the two minority parties gotten together, there could have been an absolute tie in the Senate, and the controling vote could have been cast by the then Democratic Vice President of the United States.

Of course, the realities of the situation were that, because the elections of last November, on January 20, 1953, a new administration was coming in, and at that point a Republican Vice President would be in the chair, and he could have cast the deciding vote. So whatever might have been done under the other theoretical possibility could have been undone on the 20th of January or shortly thereafter. So when the question was propounded to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who was then acting as majority leader, I believe that a part of his answer, at least, was based upon the fact that at that point, on January 13, the Republicans actually did not have control of the Senate, and he did not, for that reason, assume at that time that the Republicans had the responsibility for assigning the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Permit me to complete the statement.

Furthermore, not once, but on several occasions, the distinguished Senator from Oregon had publicly declared, both on and off the floor of the Senate, that he did not want to be assigned by the minority party, the Democratic Party; and that he did not want to be assigned by the majority party, the Republican Party. The Republicans were coming into office. We were assuming that after the 20th of January we would have control of the executive branch of the Government, and would at that point, at least—even if such control had been disputed on January 13—be able to organize the Senate.

We had 48 Republican Members. They were acknowledged as Republicans. They had made requests for committee assignments. In view of the fact that the Senator from Oregon had, not once, but on several occasions, said that he did not want to be assigned by the Republican conference or the Republican committee on committees, or on the basis of their recommendation, we were under no obligation to the Senator from Oregon. In my judgment, and I think it was our responsibility as a matter of equity and common sense, to get the best assignments we could for our 48 Republican Senators; and that we proceeded to do. We prepared our lists.

The Democratic minority had the same obligation, in my judgment, to take care of their 47 Members, and make the recommendations which would, to the best of their ability—of course, it is not possible to satisfy everyone with respect to committee assignments—meet the obligations which they had with respect to their 47 Members. That was done.

When the committee assignments had been made, because of the mathematics of the situation there were only two committees left to which the Independent Member of the Senate could be assigned. It is true that he was the most senior Member of the Independent Party, and at the same time the most junior Member of the Independent Party. But the only committees which were left were the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works. He would have been assigned on that particular day by action of the Senate, except that the Senator from Oregon himself, as he acknowledged today, requested that that assignment go over until the matter of the change in rules could be acted upon.

In the debate on January 13, the Senator from Oregon made it perfectly clear that he did not believe that, had the decision been otherwise, he should have maintained his seniority on the committee on the Republican side of the table. He himself very clearly stated that in any event he thought he should go to the bottom of the seniority list in the committee. I think that in itself is an admission that the seniority which he has in the Senate does not apply to the committees of the Senate, because there may be Members who are junior to me in service in the Senate, but who happen to get on a committee ahead of me. They are senior to me in service on the committee.

Let us consider for a moment what would have happened if, instead of declaring himself an Independent, the Senator from Oregon had declared himself to be a Democrat, to take a hypothetical situation. He had served on the Committee on Armed Services. Had he remained on the Committee on Armed Services he would now be standing third in line of seniority.

If the Senator from Oregon had declared that he was joining the Democratic Party, does he believe that at that point his seniority would put him ahead of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The service of the Senator from Oregon in the Senate is senior to that of all the Senators I have mentioned. Under his theory his seniority would have put him just below the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who have seniority over him in the Senate. But committee seniority is not based upon length of service in the Senate. Committee seniority is based upon length of service in the committee. So had the Senator from Oregon declared himself to be a Democrat rather than an Independent, he would have gone on the Democratic side of the table, and would have been the most junior member of the committee at that point.

What happens when the control of the Senate changes? Members are bumped off committees. I happen to have become a member of the Appropriations Committee 2 years after I entered the Senate. I was very much interested in service on that committee. But there was a change of a seat or two in the Senate, and I was bumped because I was the most junior member on the Republican side of the committee table. But years later, because of a change in control of the Senate, I returned to the Appropriations Committee. But certainly no members who are junior on the committee could complain about being bumped if the fortunes of the Senate should change in that way.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, the hypothetical which the Senator raises about my joining the Democratic Party makes interesting discussion. However, he need not worry about it. There is no danger of it. However, had I decided to join the Democratic Party, the major point I make in regard to my Senate seniority would still stand.

The point about my position which the Senator from California does not seem to recognize is that my right to remain on a committee is based upon my seniority in the Senate. As a member of the Independent Party, I would go to the bottom of the committee table, so far as seniority within the committee was concerned, in working for the chairmanship. That is what seniority in the committee amounts to. I would go to the bottom of the table as a member of the Independent Party. But that has nothing to do with my right to remain on the committee, based upon my 8 years of service in the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I quite disagree with the Senator from Oregon on that point. I think it will be obvious to the Senate why that is not so. If the Senator from Oregon has the right to claim seniority and to remain in the Senate as an Independent, then why cannot a Senator who has been in the Senate only 2 years and has 2 years' seniority, if he finds that control of the Senate is about to change, and if he is the lowest-ranking Member on the Republican side of the aisle when the control passes to the Democrats, then claim that he can change his party registration and become an Independent, Progressive, Conservative Democrat, Conservative Republican, or a member of some other independent party, and, by virtue of the change in membership alone, maintain his position on a committee upon which he would not otherwise have been able to maintain membership? Obviously, we could not permit a situation of that kind. Such a theory would give him a position superior to that of Members who actually had greater seniority than he had, or perhaps greater seniority than he would ever have on the committee.

So I do not think the Senator's argument with respect to a mere change of party giving him privileges which he otherwise would not have is sound.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Considering the very interesting hypothetical which the Senator now raises, the Senate being what it is, I can assure the Senator from California that his hypothetical Senator X would be welcomed with open arms into the party to which he said he wanted to go. On the basis of all the political caucus precedents about which my good friend from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has been discussing, a satisfactory agreement would be made with the individual Senator. What the Senator ought to talk about is the minority rights of a minority party belonging neither to the Republicans or the Democrats, when the representative of that party has 8 years' service in the Senate and he says, "I am entitled under the Reorganization Act to remain on my committees, in keeping with all the precedents of the Senate."

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was entirely correct. There is nothing in the Reorganization Act which assures any individual Senator any particular committee assignment. All the Reorganization Act says is that each Senator shall serve on two committees. The Senator from Oregon may read into it any interpretation he wishes to read into it with respect to a guaranty of seniority. The Reorganization Act contains no such language about seniority. It merely provides that each Senator shall serve on two committees.

The Senator from Oregon has argued, and apparently places great stress on it, that he does not believe the Republican conference should have assigned him to committees, and he does not feel that the Democratic conference should have assigned him, but that the Senate of the United States should have made the assignment.

Of course, as is shown by a reading of the RECORD of January 13, the Senate of the United States did make the assignments, and it did it by ballot.

The fact is that the Senate, acting in its capacity as the Senate, went through a very long and cumbersome balloting procedure, as Senators will remember, under which ballots were actually sent to the desk and the vote of each Senator was read.

At that time, by an overwhelming vote, the Senate determined that it wanted to elect to those specific committees the Senators whom it had so elected, and at that time the Senate did not wish to elect the Senator from Oregon to such committees. All the arguments were made on that day which have been made today.

Therefore if the Senator from Oregon is talking about the right of having the Senate ballot on the question, it must be pointed out that the Senate did ballot on it.

If the Senator feels he should place his judgment over and above the judgment of the Senate, as finally rendered by ballot, that is an entirely different situation. On that basis we might open up the whole committee situation, because there may be Senators on the other side of the aisle, as there may be Senators on this side of the aisle, who feel they could do a better job if assigned to other committees.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say that under all the circumstances the minority party was amply justified in taking the position it did, namely, that it did not want to change the general ratio of control. After all, they do have their rights as a minority, and we recognize their rights. I may say that some day we, too, may be in the minority.

However, as has been correctly stated, should the majority decide to do so, it could select all the majority party members of the committees, and it could select all the minority party members to be assigned to committees.

We do not do that in the Senate, because we have comity between the parties, and we must deal with the realities of the mathematics of the situation. I think that the majority party was entirely justified when it said, "We do not think it is fair for a member of the majority to be come an Independent, and then give the majority party one additional member on committees, as well as give the Independent a place on the committees, which actually changes the ratio, to the disadvantage of the minority party."

Under all the circumstances, although there may have been some Senators on this side of the aisle who felt it would have been a desirable procedure to follow, I do not think any Senator on this side of the aisle can complain about the Democratic Party attempting to protect its rights under the general precedents and customs of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks. It is now my purpose to move that the resolution——

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope that the Senator from California will not make any motion to cut off debate. I know that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] desires to speak, that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] desires to speak, and I desire to speak also.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to point out, when the discussion has been concluded, it will be my purpose to move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly in support of Senate Resolution 32, of which I have the privilege of being a cosponsor.

A number of Senators who have spoken today, notably the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], for whom I have great admiration, spoke of the importance of giving power and authority to the majority party in conducting the affairs of the Senate. I am in full agreement. I believe when the people of the country have spoken and have placed a party in the position of responsibility to conduct the affairs of the Nation, that party should be strengthened and fortified by having such authority and such power as may be necessary to effectuate its leadership.

But certainly there is nothing in Senate Resolution 32 which would in any way abridge the authority or power of the majority party. Quite the opposite is true. The majority party would be given added power and increased authority, because under the resolution the majority party, instead of having representation on the two committees in question on the ratio of 7 to 6, actually would have representation on the committees on the ratio of 8 to 6. Therefore, instead of trying to abridge the authority of the party which has been elected by the American people last November, the resolution actually would give the party additional authority and power.

I believe the illustrations presented, not only today, but on many other occasions by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon, with regard to the history of representation on various committees of the Senate, in spite of the political position assumed by a Senator against his own party, is unanswerable.

For almost 100 years, and possibly more, no Senator save one was deprived of his membership on a committee regardless of the position which he took in connection with any political struggle. There were scores who were challenged but with the exception of Senator Charles Sumner, who was excluded or removed from his position on one of the committees in 1871, when the passions caused by the Civil War were still in full tide no Senator was ever removed from his position on a committee because of his adherence to one party or another or because of his change in affiliation in party membership.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the Senator from New York is entirely correct. There is only one precedent, which is the Sumner precedent of 1871. I may say that the Senator from New York is the only Senator who so far has discussed that precedent in the debate. Everyone of the precedents cited by the Senator from New York supports my point of view, because all the cases he cited are cases in which a Senator was not removed from his committees. There just are no precedents, other than the unfortunate one of 1871 and the one of January 13, 1953.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. I was quite sure I was correct in my statement of the facts. I wish to say that the Senator from Oregon, instead of being placed in the doghouse, should be praised, because of the courage which he has shown in the situation with which he was confronted. He showed integrity and character which is frequently not shown by people who change party affiliation. He showed his courage while many Senators who are Members of this body at the present time supported candidates of other parties, but still remained members of their registered parties.

The Senator from Oregon did not do that. He felt it would be below the standards of integrity and ethics which he had set for himself, which I think are sound. He had a perfect right, of course, to change his views and his party affiliation. He had a perfect right to support any candidate whom he felt it wise to support, but he would not support a Democratic candidate while he still remained a registered member of the

Republican Party. Certainly no one can criticize him or fail to have respect and admiration for the position he has taken—a position of high integrity and high principle, for which he should be praised, in my opinion.

Yet he is now being punished for what he did in good conscience, in support of and in conformity with his high principles. He is being punished, I am sorry to say, by members of both parties.

There can be no question regarding the capabilities and the complete fitness of the Senator from Oregon to serve on the two committees, on which we hope he will again be designated. I have not been a member of the Armed Services Committee, but I know his long experience and service on that body have been of inestimable value. I know that only last summer he and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] traveled 30,000 miles to inspect many scores of military installations, and I know that the report those two Senators submitted, even after the Senator from Oregon ceased to be a member of the Armed Services Committee, is of great value to the Nation.

I have been a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with my friend, the Senator from Oregon. I have served with him for a little more than 3 years on that committee. No member of the committee served with greater devotion, greater distinction, or greater usefulness than did the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as a result of his long, wide, and comprehensive knowledge and experience in labor-management problems. I wish to say that we miss him very, very much on the committee. It would have been a source of great satisfaction to me, if the junior Senator from Oregon had permitted it, for me to resign from that committee in favor of the junior Senator from Oregon, because I know of no man whose experience, training, and knowledge would make him a more valuable member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, I do not know whether the principle of seniority rights is the best one we can follow in the Senate. Certainly persuasive arguments can be made on both sides of that question. However, it is a definite fact that the seniority principle has been followed for a great many years. I do not know just how long it has been followed, but certainly it goes back far beyond the memory of any present Member of the Senate.

If we accept the seniority principle, I do not think for a moment that political parties are justified in punishing a Senator for what seems to them an objectionable act. Oh, yes; he might not remain the ranking member of the committee; he might not be the chairman in the event that he had been a member of the majority party; but certainly he should not ever be removed from a committee to which he was assigned by the Senate—and removed for one reason only; namely, because the position he took is objectionable and offensive to political parties. That is not the way the Senate should act.

I wish to issue a warning to both political parties, but possibly more precisely to my own party, the Democratic Party. I wonder whether the political parties realize the change that has occurred in the political thinking of our people in the last two generations. I know that 30 or 40 years ago virtually everyone was "regular." Virtually everyone was either a registered Democrat or a registered Republican, and virtually everyone voted in accordance with the dictates of his party leaders or the discipline of his party. However—and I say it on the basis of some considerable experience, I believe—that that is no longer a fact. People no longer to the same extent are bound by party dicta. No longer are they willing blindly to follow the orders of political organizations or leaders. In an ever-increasing number, the independent voters of the United States are in an authoritative position to choose their own candidates and to dictate their party policies.

I wish to say here, as I have said to some of my Democratic colleagues, that we in New York elected Alfred E. Smith to be Governor four times; and we elected Franklin D. Roosevelt to be Governor of New York twice; and I have been elected in my State as Governor four times, as Lieutenant Governor twice, and as United States Senator twice. But not 1 of the 3 of us was elected by Democratic votes alone. We were elected by Independents in our State, by the votes of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—in a word, by those who had confidence that we were representing not only the Democrats in New York, but all the people of New York. So they gave us their support.

I say that party loyalty is fine, but I do not think it should be controlling. I think a Senator of the United States represents all the people of his State—not only the people of his own party, not only one small segment of the population of his State, but all the people of his State, regardless of whether they voted for him.

So I do not believe any Senator of the United States should be subjected to disabilities and the loss of privileges and responsibilities which are his by law.

That is why I shall vote—and I shall do so with much pleasure and satisfaction—in favor of the adoption of Senate Resolution 32, which again would place the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, committees on which he is entitled to membership because of his long, devoted, and distinguished service in this great deliberative body and his able representation of the people of his State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the motives which will influence the Members of this body in casting their votes one way or the other on the pending question may not be all the same. My vote will be based in some degree upon a recollection which came to me a few days ago, as I was returning from a visit to another city. I was not particularly happy about some news which had been given me there, and I was wondering what my part in the Senate would be in the next few weeks. I remember that a few days ago I had read a book by Claude G. Bowers, entitled "Beveridge and the Progressive Era." I remembered that in the book Mr. Bowers referred to the fight which involved statehood for New Mexico and Arizona, and I was curious as to whether I could recall some of the things he had said in that volume. I obtained a copy of it, because I wanted to refresh my memory on what had been said by Bowers regarding the visit which Beveridge had paid to "Matt" Quay.

Quay and Beveridge had fought a very hard fight over the admission of New Mexico and Arizona. The Congress of the United States in its wisdom was to decide that the two Territories should not then come into the Union. Quay was very vitally interested that they should. A great friend of Matt Quay's had been in New Mexico running as a Delegate to Congress, a man who had been called "Bull" Andrews. He had lived but a short time in our New Mexico, but he had seen great possibilities there, and he had attracted the support of people who were very much interested in its exploitation as a State. Quay tried to bring the then Territory into the Union. Beveridge fought him. They had a very vigorous and bitter fight; and, as Bowers points out, Quay had told Beveridge during that time that the fight was killing him, and he talked very casually of his approaching end. Then there is this paragraph, which I want to read to the Senate:

> In the closing days of his life—
>
> Quay's life—
>
> Beveridge called upon the old man, now frail and haggard. Sitting at the window looking out, Quay said, as the younger man was taking his leave: "I shall be dead in a few months, and the papers will say, 'Matt Quay, boss, is dead.' Had I lived my life differently, they would say: 'Death of Matthew S. Quay, statesman.' Take warning by me, young man." Then, taking up a copy of Peter Ibbetson, he wrote upon the flyleaf the enigmatic words, "Dream true," and gave it to Beveridge as a parting gift.

I have many times thought that one of the hardest things a man faces in this body is actually to find those occasions when he can "dream true," those occasions when he can depend upon his heart far more perhaps than he depends upon his head in the determination of problems. I cannot help but translate the difficulties in which some men find themselves back into the terms of the people themselves; and I am thinking of the great former Senator from Montana, Senator Burton K. Wheeler, who sat for many years in this body. I recognize that he did not always agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Montana; in fact, they frequently disagreed. But I remember that when Senator Burton Wheeler felt the impulse to leave the Democratic Party and join Bob La Follette in 1924 in a great campaign that he thought was for the cause of good government, he did not question where the threads of party loyalty might tie him, but decided that he would move out

into the field where his sentiments carried him, where his heart told him the welfare of the American people would be best protected. Burt Wheeler left the Democratic Party and joined with Bob La Follette in a campaign that he knew could end only in disaster. It has been my great privilege to discuss that campaign several times with former Senator Wheeler and to realize that he knew all the way through that he was heading for disaster. Nonetheless, he went ahead with the program to which he had committed himself. But the interesting thing to me is that when he came back to the Senate of the United States to take his part with the Democrats in the Senate Chamber, not one Democrat tried to bump him off his committees, and no Republican voted to push him off his committees. Both parties, Republican and Democratic alike, realized that it was the privilege of the then Senator from Montana, Mr. Wheeler, to do what he wished as an individual, and to come back to the Senate of the United States, to resume his place on the Democratic side of the aisle and on the committees as a member assigned by the Democratic Party.

I recall also that in that campaign La Follette, a former Republican was running. Senator La Follette was the candidate of the Progressive Party for the Presidency. These two men had moved out from their Senate responsibilities. But when that unsuccessful campaign was over, they came back to the Senate of the United States, and so far as I have been able to learn, no Republican ever tried to take his committee assignments away from Bob La Follette. I shall not repeat what the Senator from Oregon said about Senator Norris, but I had noticed that that was true in his life.

I remind Senators that in more recent days a Senator from Idaho, former Senator Taylor, decided that he would become a vice presidential candidate with Henry Wallace. That is sufficiently recent so it is within the memory of everyone on the Senate floor. But when he came back after the campaign was over and took his seat in the Senate Chamber, so far as I know—and I was here, I believe, during that session of the Congress—no Democrat stood up to suggest that he be bumped from his committees. And had the Republicans sought to remove him by some device, I think the Democrats would have resisted them. I may go a step further to say I believe that, had the Democrats tried to deal unjustly with him, Members on the Republican side of the aisle, would have protested.

Mr. President, we have not been too careful about seeing that Senators assigned to committees as members of the Republican or Democratic Parties are assigned only on the basis of their party regularity. If that were true, we would have made many, many changes in the committees during the past years, which we have not done. We have recognized that this is not a convention of two political parties, but that it is a place where 96 Senators of the United States have a right to act as individuals, have a right to act as they feel they should act.

I wonder what awful crime the Senator from Oregon committed. He went by successive steps from support, to indifference, to disappointment, and finally to opposition with reference to the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States. Is that a violation of the rules of the Senate? May a man not have a right to look at a ticket and say, "I believe this man will make a wonderful candidate for the Presidency," and then, a few days later, say, "I am disappointed by some of the things he is doing," and then, a few days still later, to say, "As a result of the things I have seen, I intend to take a walk"; and then, following that, as he moves ahead in his own thinking, he says, "My conscience tells me I should not only take a walk, but should stand up to campaign for the opposition ticket." Mr. President, I see nothing wrong in that. I believe as strongly in party loyalty as an individual can, but I also realize that a man has the right to follow the dictates of his own conscience, even if it means the betrayal of that which we call party loyalty.

The Senator from Oregon was, I believe, strongly for Eisenhower prior to the Chicago convention. He returned from a trip to Europe to find that while he was away statements had been made of such a nature as to shake his faith. Then followed a process when he made up his mind that he was in a campaign for a ticket that was not his ticket, but that in reality his ticket was that of the opposition party. If all the polls made by all the pollsters had shown that Stevenson would win, then one might be able to say that the Senator from Oregon was looking for a chance to land in the right camp. But he made his decision, knowing that he was moving completely against the tide of events. All across the country there were evidences that the victory of General Eisenhower would be a substantial one, a rather sweeping one; and in the face of that, the junior Senator from Oregon moved in support of the opposition candidate. I say that under those circumstances a man cannot be blamed for doing the thing he thought was right, when he certainly was not doing it with hope of reward.

Mr. President, who should assign the Senator from Oregon to committees? Has he not a right to say, "I desire to be assigned by the Senate?" Is there anything in the Constitution which provides that when a man comes to the Senate of the United States he shall accept the domination of any political party, Republican or Democratic? Having been elected, may he not decide what he wants to do in this body? It may affect the possibility that he may return, but he certainly has the right to stand up on the first day he arrives in the Senate and say, "I belong to no party," or "I belong to the Republican Party," or "I belong to the Democratic Party," or "I belong to an Independent Party."

The Senator from Oregon has that privilege, and he has exercised it.

Who, then, is to assign him? Is he to caucus with himself alone? No. The Senate must assign him, under the Reorganization Act. All I have ever desired in the matter was to see the Senate assign him, and not sacrifice the 8 years of seniority which he has in this body.

Mr. President, I have received some telegrams which happily came along after I announced the position I intended to take. I say that, because sometimes we receive telegrams and other persons then say, "Well, labor put the whip on your back," or "somebody put the whip on your back and decided for you what you were to do." I think no one in this body would fail to recognize that on the first day when the question came up last January, it was clearly understood where I stood, and it was clearly understood where the Senator from Oregon stood.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a telegram from J. T. Marr, of the Oregon State Federation of Labor, asking me to vote for Senate Resolution 32, so as to restore the Senator from Oregon to his original committees, and a similar telegram from Kenneth R. Smith, president, Portland Industrial Union Council, CIO.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 25, 1953.*

Senator ANDERSON,
Senate Office Building:

Please vote Resolution 32 to restore MORSE to original committees.

J. T. MARR,
Oregon State Federation of Labor.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 22, 1953.*

Senator CLINTON ANDERSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following wire sent to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON: We favor Morse resolution to enlarge Senate Labor and Armed Services Committees. We urge you secure all support possible.

KENNETH R. SMITH,
President, Portland Industrial Union Council, CIO.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I also have before me a rather long telegram from R. O. Hughes, president, Order of Railway Conductors of America, which reads as follows:

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, *May 21, 1953.*

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of the Order of Railway Conductors, an independent labor organization and the second oldest railroad labor organization in the United States, I urge that you recommend and support the enlargement of the Armed Services Committee by two members. Your support of Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon, as 1 of the 2 new members on the committee would meet with the wholehearted approval of the members of my organization.

R. O. HUGHES,
President, Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Mr. President, I should also like to read into the RECORD a telegram from W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, who once lived in my State. The telegram reads as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *May 22, 1953.*

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the more than 200,000 members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen I would respectfully request that you

exert your influence in obtaining favorable consideration of Senate Resolution 22 which provides for expansion of the Armed Services and the Labor and Public Welfare Committees to include Senator WAYNE MORSE. Favorable consideration of this resolution I feel will redound to the public good in that it would make available to these two important committees the services of an outstanding American whose experience and penetrating perceptive qualities would prove invaluable to these committees.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
W. P. KENNEDY, *President.*

Mr. President, I am at a loss to understand some of the comments which have been made. There are Democrats who say, "Why should we vote for the junior Senator from Oregon? He sits on the Republican side of the aisle. Why should we vote for him?"

Remember that the same thing that happens to him can happen to some of us. Some day the majority may say, "We do not like the ranking minority members on certain committees, and we intend to take some distinguished Democrat and move him down to the spot we think he should occupy."

The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is on the floor. He ranks just above me on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Can the Republican Party change that situation? Can it say that other Senators can move up the line as far as they wish to? I do not think so.

Mr. President, I am not concerned as to whether the Republicans have or have not performed their obligations. I do not know what has taken place within or without Republican caucuses, but all Members have an interest in this matter. We are now minority Members and we have a definite interest in the rights of all minority Members.

Mr. President, 2 nights ago I decided to reread a play which I had read many years ago. The play was written by Ibsen, dealing with the subject, An Enemy of the People. I remember reading it and rereading it, because Dr. Stockmann was not the wisest politician I have ever studied. He thought he ought to do something about the situation. He offended the rich and the powerful. He found his position rapidly deteriorating, yet, he stood there fighting as hard as he could for the things his conscience told him he ought to do, just as the Senator from Oregon found it necessary for him to change his support of presidential candidates in the midst of the campaign. In the last lines of the play by Ibsen, I recall very distinctly what Dr. Stockmann had discovered. He gathered his family around him in that hour of political disappointment, and said, "You must not say anything about it yet, but I have made a great discovery."

His wife said, "Another one?"

He said, "Yes." Then he said, confidentially, "Let me tell you that the strongest man in the world is he who stands most alone."

I quote that, Mr. President, to bring some comfort to the junior Senator from Oregon today. He stood pretty well alone some weeks ago when there was a vote on a similar question, and he may stand somewhat alone today. There may be only a few Senators who will vote with him. I hope there will be a great many, that there will be enough to carry his resolution. There may not be, but he will recognize that Dr. Stockmann had made a great discovery, that the man who is really strong frequently finds it necessary to stand alone.

When this battle is over, the votes of my colleagues in the Senate may make the Senator from Oregon somewhat of a political outcast. They may pin on him to a degree the label of political failure. They may plunge him into the waters of political disappointment and defeat, but I am sure that it should be said of a man of his courage and of his determination, that if ever his ship goes down, it will go with the guns booming and with the colors nailed to the mast.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long, but I do want to say that I am going to support the resolution of the Senator from Oregon. I have my reasons for supporting it. When the question was before the Senate months ago I could not support the Senator from Oregon and at the same time support one of the 47 Democratic Members of the Senate. In other words, if I voted for the Senator from Oregon I would have to vote against some other Senator. I could not bring myself to vote against a Republican Senator, and certainly I would not vote against a Democratic Senator. So my position—I am not proud of being consistent, and I do not think there is much virtue in being consistent at any time—but my position is that on this day, when the roll is called, I shall be found voting for the resolution of the Senator from Oregon.

Traditions are very important in the Senate. The Senate has existed for more than 160 years. It has rules and traditions. Of course, the rules are binding, and I think the traditions ought to be. We do not have many traditions, but those we do have are important. Unless we recognize those traditions as they affect other Senators, we cannot expect to have them recognized in our behalf.

One of the traditions, perhaps very unimportant, is that once Senators have been assigned to a suite of offices, they remain in those offices until they leave the Senate. That is understood. No Senator gets "bumped." When a new party comes in, no Senator is thrown out of his offices.

Another tradition is that Senators, once assigned to committees, remain on those committees.

A further tradition is that we regard seniority as one way of settling the question of assignments. I know there are Senators who think the seniority rule should be abandoned, and perhaps they have a great deal of logic on their side, but if we should abandon that very wise tradition, we would find that the Senate would be in constant turmoil as between little groups. This group, that group, and the other group would line up together to get the highest rating for seniority without actually having seniority. The Senate would be in constant turmoil, and I doubt that it would be able to function. As matters now stand, that question is settled. Members advance in committees according to seniority. It is a very wise tradition, one to which I believe we should hold fast.

I have one other reason for voting for the resolution of the Senator from Oregon. In my opinion, he was a very valuable member of the Committee on Armed Services. As I see these problems, I do not know of any Senator who rendered a greater contribution than did the junior Senator from Oregon when he was a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

I am one of the Members of the Senate who have feared domination of this country by the military, and I know that the Senator from Oregon would never permit such domination to come about with his sanction and approval. That is one of the reasons why I have admired the work of the Senator from Oregon on the Committee on Armed Services.

Then, too, he has made a very valuable contribution by his services on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That committee is extremely important to the American people, and the Senator from Oregon, by reason of his long experience in labor problems, had become a very valuable member of the committee. His long experience should not be lost to the country by depriving him of his membership on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I have been disappointed to learn what the Senator from Oregon has had to say about the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, especially the Democratic Party. He has lambasted the Democratic Party before audiences, and I believe he has gone far beyond what good judgment would have dictated. Nevertheless, what he said reflected his sentiments, and I shall not let his views about the Democratic minority influence me. He has called us cowards, and I suppose I could be counted as one of those cowards, because I did not vote with him when this question was before the Senate previously. However, it was not cowardice that caused me not to vote for him. It was a matter of principle; it was a matter of not wanting to vote against one of my Democratic brethren. Of course, I did not wish to vote against the majority, because, after all, I suppose the majority could take most of the assignments away from us if they desired to do so. This is one of those cases in which the majority and the minority must work together, must cooperate, and must accept the wishes and desires of the other.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly have the opportunity of performing its duty as laid down under rule XXIV, which declares that the Senate as a whole shall, by ballot, appoint the chairman of each committee and the other members necessary to complete the committee. The resolution of the Senator from Oregon is now the responsibility of the Senate as a whole, and we shall have to deal with that responsibility as individual Members of the Senate.

It is true that the initial assignments to committees are made upon the respec-

tive recommendations of the leaders of the majority and the minority. The degree to which the membership influences those decisions depends upon the appointing power and upon party caucuses or conference committees within the party itself.

I think it is true that the Republican Party was ungracious in demoting the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and relegating him from the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to two minor committees. They did not do that in the case of Senator Ball, after the election of 1944. They allowed Senator Ball to continue in his committee assignments. However, they have done so in the case of the Senator from Oregon. So I think the majority has been ungracious in this matter, and I am somewhat disappointed that my good friend from Oregon seems to heap more blame upon the Democratic Party than he does upon his former party, the Republican Party. I think that is very ungracious of the Senator from Oregon. The only explanation I have for his attitude is that, since he believes the Democratic Party to be more virtuous than the Republican Party, he therefore expects more of the Democratic Party. It is only in that respect that I think we have failed in comparison with the Republican Party.

However, since I have really no power over the majority and really should not interfere in their affairs, I should like to address myself for a few minutes to my Democratic brethren. We Democrats have been in the past, and we are also in the present, extremely indulgent of those of our members who have bolted our presidential ticket in presidential years. We were not only indulgent toward Senator Wheeler after the campaign of 1924, but I can remember the campaign of 1948, when some of our good friends not only walked out of the party but campaigned actively for the opposition. That was true not only of secessions to the left, as in the case of the former Senator from Idaho, Mr. Taylor, but also of secessions to the right in a number of the Southern States.

Nevertheless, when Congress met in 1949, it was a love feast, and apparently all was forgiven. Not only did we not bump anyone off committees but we did not change a committee chairmanship.

Now I should like to touch on an extremely important point. I do not think a Senator has a right to bolt his party and then insist that he should become a committee chairman afterward. He has no right to claim that privilege. Possibly in some cases indulgence may be granted, but certainly the party should have control of the chairmanships, because that is the means of initiating measures. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was not chairman of any committee; therefore, this statement would not apply to him. However, possibly it might apply to certain Senators on this side of the aisle.

We were extremely indulgent in 1948, and we were again indulgent after the election of 1952. Perhaps the strength of the Democratic Party is like that of an amorphous being. We can be cut into sections, yet we recombine. Perhaps it is well that we do have this loose party discipline on minor matters, which enables us to work together fairly well on matters relating to foreign relations.

I should, however, like to ask a question. Why should we be more severe toward a man who bolts his party to support our presidential candidate than we are toward members of our own party who bolt our party to support the opposition candidate for President? I am now speaking of my fellow Democrats. Why should we discipline a man who, at great personal cost to himself, supports our candidate when we will not discipline those of our own members who bolt our party openly and support the candidates of the Republican Party?

Let me make myself clear. I am not in favor of disciplining members of our party who bolted the national presidential ticket in 1952. I agree that we should not discipline them. However, it is extraordinary that we now assist the Republicans in disciplining their recalcitrant member.

The discussion of what we should do with the Senator from Oregon reminds me of the discussion now in progress in Korea as to what should be done with prisoners of war. Many of these prisoners of war deserted their army and came over to us. The Communists are insisting that we turn them back to them at the point of the bayonet. We are saying that we will not send anyone back against his will, and that the prisoners should make the choice. The Senator from Oregon is, in a sense, a prisoner of war. He deserted his party. His party is applying discipline to him, which is the right of that party, though I think it is both ungracious and ungentlemanly, and indicates bad manners. Nevertheless the party has a right to do it. But should we drive him, at the point of the bayonet, back to the Republican Party and say, "You are an Ishmael; you can find refuge nowhere"? Are we to do that? Why should we become the gestapo of the Republican Party?

Speaking now to my fellow Democrats as Democrats, I say that we would be making a great mistake if we were to drive the Senator from Oregon back at the point of a bayonet, into a party to which he does not want to belong, and to which I do not think he does belong. We should at least allow him to remain in limbo for a time as an Independent before he is finally baptized on the right side.

Having spoken as a Democrat, let me now try to speak for a minute or two in conclusion as a Member of the Senate.

The two committees on which the Senator from Oregon served were, of course, the Armed Services Committee and the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare. I have been a member of the latter committee with the Senator, but not a member of the former. As one who observed the work of the latter committee, however, it was always my impression that this committee was not in any sense a partisan committee. In essence, on the Armed Services Committee we do not have Democrats or Republicans, but Americans working for the best defense of the people of the United States. That was true, I think, under the chairmanship of former Senator Tydings, of Maryland. It was also true under the chairmanship of former Senator Gurney, of South Dakota, when the Republicans were in power; and it was true under the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I am sure it is equally true now under the chairmanship of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Whatever may be the party designations of Senators on that committee, they very largely forget whether they are Republicans or Democrats, and they work to protect the security of the United States of America. I am sure that this is what the Senator from Oregon has done as a member of that committee. He has worked for national security. He has worked for the dominance of civil authority. He has been opposed to military waste. He has had 8 years of extremely valuable experience which I do not think the country should lose. It would be a great loss to the Nation if that experience were now to be wasted, at a time when national defense is so important.

I can speak with some personal knowledge with respect to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which I served with the Senator from Oregon for 4 years.

On that committee there are many able and extremely competent men. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] probably has as fine a technical knowledge of labor law in this country as does any man in the Nation. I do not agree with the Senator from Ohio a very large percentage of the time, but no one can question his technical competence, and I have always been very quick to say that no one should question his fundamental good will and fundamental patriotism.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was technically the most competent member of the committee. There are good reasons why this was true. For many years the Senator from Oregon was the arbitrator in labor disputes on the Pacific coast dealing with longshore issues and related shipping matters. I think he first gained popular attention by reason of the excellence of this work which he did along the Pacific coast. He was in a very difficult situation, and he came out of it with the respect, admiration, and love of the employers as well as of the workers.

I next knew the Senator from Oregon when he was a member of the Railway Arbitration Board, which handed down a crucial decision with respect to the railways of this country. If it had been followed, and if he had not been bypassed, I think that decision would have brought a great degree of labor peace to the railroads.

During the war our paths separated. He became a member of the National War Labor Board, and rendered conspicuous service on that body. I was not in the country at the time, but I read the decisions of the Board and studied a number of the crucial cases. I can say that WAYNE MORSE was an independent, open-minded, absolutely fair member of that Board. He was not prolabor or proemployer. He was pro-United States.

On the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare he showed himself to be the most competent and able member of our entire group.

The Senator from Oregon is by disposition and conviction what is vaguely but popularly known as a liberal. There are many definitions of that term. Sometimes it is used as a term of derision and contempt. Personally I think it is a designation which any man should be proud to bear.

I suppose it can be said that the philosophical division in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is not a division based upon party as such, but rather one between those who are of a liberal turn of mind and those of a conservative turn of mind.

If we regard the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as one involving policy, the proposal which is now before us would not change the balance of power on that committee, because in addition to the Senator from Oregon, who would be a liberal member, the Republicans would be able to name another member, whom they would undoubtedly draw from the conservative ranks. So the relative ideological balance of power on that committee would not be disturbed. But the committee would retain its most competent member.

As I have said, the Armed Services Committee is not a political committee at all. The members of the committee are not partisans. I do not think that the political balance in the committees would be altered adversely to either side by the proposal which the Senator from Oregon is now making. I hope very much that it may be adopted.

I wish to conclude on perhaps a lower but perhaps a more practical note. I say to my colleagues, let us not become the enforcing agency of the Republican Party. Let us welcome those who, because of conscience, can no longer serve in the ranks of that party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a number of remarkably fine addresses and comments have been made on the resolution. Very little can be added to what has already been stated on the floor of the Senate, except as some of us may wish to give expression to what we hope will be the position of the Senate with reference to our colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I should like to point out, insofar as my friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is concerned, when he stated that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had deserted his party, it was not the Senator from Oregon who had deserted his party but, rather, it was the party of Abraham Lincoln that had deserted the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, that desertion has been going on for 80 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois is a long-range historian. I was thinking only of contemporary history.

This I do say, however, that there is no man in this body who is better qualified for the position on the committees to which he aspires and to which, by Senate seniority, he belongs, namely, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Armed Services, than is the Senator from Oregon.

I have been a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I served on it for 4 years. I think I can in all objectivity say that the Senator from Oregon is not a rubber stamp for anyone's ideas, in or out of the committee. I served as chairman of a subcommittee on which the Senator from Oregon also served as one of the minority members. While we agreed usually on the general basis of our reports, the Senator from Oregon saw fit, when it was within his mind and conviction to do so, to file separate views or minority reports.

I think it can be stated in all honesty and sincerity that no member of the committee had a better knowledge of labor law and that no one had a more intimate knowledge of labor legislation, or had a better philosophical background for effective labor legislation, than did the Senator from Oregon.

As we all know, that committee considers other matters, such as veterans' legislation, and it also considers matters dealing with education and health. In each of these areas the Senator from Oregon was an intelligent, informed, and conscientious participant in the deliberations of the committee. I say that his membership on the committee was for the good of the Nation and for the good of the Senate. I believe we prepared better legislation while we had in our midst one of the most informed Senators who could possibly serve on such committee. I know of no area where there is greater need for that kind of statesmanship than there is in the field of labor-management relations.

I wish to concur in what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] stated, that the resolution would not in any way change the general philosophical division within the committee. We use very loose terms when we speak about conservatives and liberals. There is always some blending and shading in each of the respective categories. However, I think it can be stated that if an additional Republican is added to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Senator from Oregon as an independent is added to the committee, insofar as the so-called balance of power in the committee is concerned, it will not be in any way offset or destroyed, unless one is unwilling to have members of the committee cast their independent judgments. I submit that the Senator from Oregon will cast his independent judgment in voting on measures before the committee, and not feel bound by any kind of rule or discipline.

On the Committee on Armed Services there is very little to be said. I recall speech after speech being made on the floor of the Senate in the past 3 years, in which our distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] reported on the work of the preparedness subcommittee, or gave us explanations of what the preparedness subcommittee was doing. They stood together time after time. I recall that the Senator from Oregon again and again praised the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] for the fine work of the subcommittee.

I mention that fact because I gather from all the information that has come to me, the Senator from Oregon was a diligent, conscientious, and effective member of the Armed Services Committee, for the public good.

I believe it should be mentioned also that the Senator from Oregon did irritate some of the officialdom in the Pentagon. I do not think there is any doubt about it. I think he irritated them primarily because he tried to protect what he believed to be the public interest. Let it be crystal clear that the Senator from Oregon has not been a false economizer on national security or national defense.

He was concerned, as I recall, on the universal military training bill, lest the generals have more influence or power than the civilians. I agreed with the judgment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] when he pointed out that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had stood as an exponent and apostle of civilian control over the Military Establishment. I wholeheartedly concurred. I submit that the Senator's presence on the Committee on Armed Services would do as much as anything I can think of in these very perilous days to assure civilian control over the Military Establishment.

One final thought, and then I shall say no more, except to express my profound admiration for the fine work which the Senator from Oregon has done. I realize that this spirit and sentiment is found in many areas of the Senate. Many Senators have spoken privately and publicly of their great respect and affection and admiration for the Senator from Oregon. Then they add that, but, regardless of their personal feeling——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the Senator spoke about the membership of the Senator from Oregon on the Committee on Armed Services. I happened to serve with him on that committee. However, as the Senator from Minnesota knows, I did not vote for the Independents in South Carolina, and I therefore cannot vote for an Independent on the floor of the Senate. I reluctantly voted for Mr. Stevenson. Since I have always endeavored to be consistent, I regret I cannot vote for the resolution of the Senator from Oregon. I know the Senator from Oregon did a fine job on the Committee on Armed Services. I will not deny it. However, I voted against the Independents in South Carolina. Therefore, I will have to vote against any Independent in the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say to the Senator from South Carolina that he is certainly consistent, and I respect his point of view. I can say that I have heard of no one who has been more generous in his comments concerning the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] than has been the Senator from South Carolina.

Let us come to this particular resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator from Minnesota feel encouraged to believe that we will now get the votes of the Senators who did vote for the Independents, and that if we do we will have a very large and substantial vote?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly if we were assured of it the Senator from Oregon would not care what happened to his individual case, because of his dedication to certain basic liberal principles.

Mr. President, let me refer to the resolution. What does the resolution do? The resolution in substance places upon two committees one additional Republican and the Independent of this body, the member of the Independent Party, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Does it do it with any degree of permanency? Some Senators feel if we change the rules now, we will have altered once and for all the permanent structural organization of the Senate. I would point out that the resolution applies only to the 83d Congress. The Senator from Oregon asks for no further extension.

Furthermore, I point out that the rules of the Senate, as applied to the organization of the Senate, seem to be sacred until someone wants to change them. When a majority wants to change a rule, it becomes practical to change it. For example, we changed the composition of certain committees during this session of Congress. We changed the rule without too much trouble. I was in favor of the change. I am glad it was done. I appreciate what the majority leader and the minority leader did in putting those changes through. However, I submit the proposed change under the resolution is no more drastic than the other changes we have made. In fact, it is much less drastic than the changes we authorized in committees which are called key committees. For the life of me, I have never been able to understand why the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is not as much of a key committee as any other committee. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare considers legislation which is of importance to the welfare of the country. What this resolution would do would be merely to add an additional Republican member, and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. How our Republican colleagues can be opposed to it is more than I can understand. It gives them additional membership. If any Senators should be opposed to it, it should be some of the Democratic Members, I suppose. But a number of us who serve on the Democratic side believe it is for the good of the Congress and for the good of the country, and also is deserved by him because of his years of service, that the Senator from Oregon be a member of the committee.

I wish to bring another point to the attention of the Senate; namely, that there is one rule in the Senate which many Senators protect almost with their lives, although it is a rule about which some of the younger Members of the Senate have not yet become fully convinced. That is the rule of seniority. I simply say that seniority is the accepted standard for promotion in the Senate. If Senators serve long enough and are reelected, they move along the line. I know of no better rule, for the moment. I have been trying to think of one; but every time I do think of one, someone points out a weakness in it.

If the rule of seniority is the "sacred cow" that apparently Senators believe it to be, then all Senators should follow it. The Senator from Oregon makes a good case when he speaks of his right to committee service on the basis of his seniority. Of course, where the Senator from Oregon serves is not nearly as important as the maintenance of his seniority.

I think the Senator from Oregon has been a little rough on some of his Democratic friends, in saying that much of the fault in connection with this matter lies with Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle. I have been trying to point out—but with little success, perhaps—that the burden lies with the Republican Senators, because they have organized the Senate at this session.

Of course, so far as seniority is concerned, let me say that—coming from the State from which I come—seniority is something for which one hopes, but of which he is never sure. I wish to say that Senators who value seniority in this body as a factor in their political lives, should not weaken the seniority principle, because if the seniority principle is not observed in the case of the Senator from Oregon, in the future it may not be observed in the case of some other Senator; in fact, there is no telling what Senator might be involved in such a circumstance. In other words, if the Senator from Oregon can be subjected to discipline by being denied his seniority privileges, similar action can be taken against another Senator. I believe this point is a very important one.

Mr. President, the argument in favor of the seniority rule is that on the basis of experience a Senator can have a more intimate knowledge of the legislative procedures and the substance of the law and can become a more useful legislator. Those points are in addition to the fact that such a Senator has been reelected, and thus the people of his State have indicated that they wish him to continue his service.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, once a Senator serves on a committee, he is not removed from the committee for disciplinary reasons; he is removed only if the ratio of membership changes. The Senator from Oregon has sufficient seniority on the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so that on the basis of the seniority rule, several other members of the committee would have had to lose their seats on those committees before he would have had to lose his. The only reason why he was removed from those committees was that apparently in the eyes of some he used bad judgment in the year 1952. I myself applaud his judgment and I applaud his courage in the exercise of that judgment. However, that matter is rather irrelevant to the issue now before us.

I do not think we should now be considering whether we like or do not like the views of the Senator from Oregon. Personally I generally join with him in the views he expresses, although sometimes he and I disagree. Of course, in such cases it is never difficult for others to know where the disagreement lies, because one or the other of us is very frank to say so.

However, Mr. President, if committee assignments are to be made on the basis of agreement in views, then indeed there will have to be many more committees than now exist in the Senate, because there are 96 individualists in this body; and if each one was to serve on a committee which would be composed only of Senators having his views, the result would be that there would have to be at least 96 committees, and then those 96 would have to be divided into subcommittees, in order to represent Senators' changes of views during the sessions.

So, Mr. President, I submit that the important principle involved in this matter is the principle of seniority.

The seniority principle is important in this matter not because of its effect upon me or upon some of the other Members of this body of whom I think so much, but because as we approach the years to come, and particularly the eventful year of 1954, I say to my Democratic colleagues, seniority will mean chairmanships and key positions on certain committees.

So I think we should retain the seniority principle, unless at this time we are ready to open up for study the entire matter of the seniority principle, in which case we could use the case of the Senator from Oregon as the means of opening up the entire system of the appointment of the chairmen of committees and the chairmen of subcommittees, in the case of all Senate committees.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator from Minnesota believe, with me, that since this case is the first one of this sort under the Reorganization Act, it will create a precedent and will open the door in the case of the next election, and that hereafter any member of the majority or the minority party will have a right to bump any committee member he sees fit to bump because of that Senator's performance in an election?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator from New Mexico is correct. In other words, if a Senator says, up to the time of an election, that he is a member of one political party, and if he shifts his position during the period of the election, and thereafter returns to the Senate, while supposedly continuing to hold the committee assignments he previously held, if that Member can, as a result, be forced to lose his previous committee assignments, regardless of what the procedural reasons may be, then every Member of this body is in jeopardy, insofar as his committee assignments are concerned.

All we ask in the resolution is that Senators take into consideration the fact—whether they like it or not—that the Senator from Oregon represents a third political force or a third political party in the Senate. Of course, I hope he will do something about it; and again I wish to say that the welcome mat is out, and we stand ready with warm hearts and warm fellowship to receive him into the ranks of democracy. But until he makes that decision, I think we must recognize that he has a right to service on an equal basis in the Senate, and that he has a right to represent an independent political party or political force.

Mr. President, I shall vote for adoption of the resolution. Again I hope there will be a great expression of confidence in both the Senator from Oregon and in the resolution itself.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very few remarks.

I am wholly and entirely sincere when I say I have made an honest effort to arrive at the conclusion stated some time ago in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. There is no question about the right of equal representation in the Senate, but that simply means that each State has a right to be represented in the Senate by two Senators. Those Senators may or may not be equal; in fact, they may be wholly dissimilar in their political philosophy, their general judgment, and everything else. However, a State has a right to equal representation in the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield to me, I should like to state for the RECORD, at this time, the constitutional provision on this point, namely, that—

> No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

In other words, it is equal suffrage, rather than equal representation.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from Florida. I was about to move to that particular point.

Mr. President, it has been said that there can never be less than equal representation in the Senate, in the sense of the constitutional provision, without a revolution; and there cannot be in this country, because no State can be deprived of its right to have two representatives in the Senate. A State itself can deprive itself of that right, or it can neglect to fill a vacancy, or what-not.

However, there is no actual or possible connection, so far as I have been able to see, between the right to a particular committee post and the right of equal representation in the Senate, because the Senate could not, even by unanimous vote, change, alter, or modify the equal-representation clause unless the State itself joined in the effort and consented to being deprived of its right of equal representation in the Senate. So I believe there is no connection between the right of equal suffrage or equal representation in the Senate and the right to hold a particular committee place or position.

Perhaps I may be pardoned for saying that I believe I am the oldest Member here in point of service. When I came to the Senate, distinguished Senators from the West, who were Democrats, too, were talking about the seniority rule. Many of them disliked it. They said, "We want to elect the best man to places on committees." There is, of course, much to be said in favor of that proposal. But a fact that is singularly overlooked today, and has been overlooked by my distinguished friend from Minnesota, for whom I have the warmest personal affection, is that the right of seniority is not merely the right to claim a particular place on a committee, but is the right to select the committee to which assignment is desired, if there is available on such committee a place to which the Senator can be assigned.

I desire to say something later about my distinguished friend, WAYNE MORSE. I am sure he knows that what I may state will be sincere, but I may say now that if he is a Democrat at this time, he is certainly the junior Democrat, and like all other Democratic Senators, under the seniority rule—which we have not always followed, but which generally we have respected—he would at least have a right to select his committee; and he would have a right, when he takes his place on that committee, to remain on it and to move gradually toward the top, if he continues in this body long enough.

Mr. President, seniority does not apply solely to the position a Senator holds on a committee. It also applies to the selection of the committee itself. There is not a word in the Constitution, nor is there a line in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which, if properly interpreted, confuses the right of representation in the Senate with the method of selecting the committees of the Senate and membership on the committees.

How are the committees to be organized? Under the law as it was before the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and as it is now, the committees are to be organized by the Senate. It is only as a matter of courtesy and sufferance and practice and usage that we let the leadership on one side and the other get together with their steering committees, or whatever political machinery may be set up to assist them, and actually make up the list and submit it to the Senate, which must approve the list.

That brings me to what I have been wholly unable to escape in this entire discussion, namely, that the Senate selects the membership of each of the Senate's standing or regular committees. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 says something about a ballot. That is merely a method of procedure. When the Senate has to do something, Mr. President, that means only one thing, namely, that a majority of the Senate controls its action. That is why a majority of the Senate, if it is to maintain any semblance of organization, must make up a committee list on which the Senate must vote.

Simply and solely because Senators on the other side of the aisle happen now to be in the majority, they have the burden of organizing and the burden of running and operating the Senate. They may not always perform that function, because they may have some on their side who do not agree with them, who may outnumber the bare majority as between the two parties. But the Senate itself, under the Constitution, under the previous law, and under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, must select the committees. It is said in the Legislative Reorganization Act, as I have already indicated, that it must be done by ballot, by the Members of the Senate voting separately. But, Mr. President, since the Senate has that responsibility, surely the majority party has the right to make up the membership of the committees. I unhesitatingly say that the majority party would have the right to determine the entire membership of the committees, except for a matter of usage and a matter of custom.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I call to the attention of the Senator in that connection the fact that during the war years from 1861 to 1865, and until 1871, the Democrats in the Senate were denied the right to name any members to committees.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is correct, but I do not want to refer to those unhappy days.

Actually, in the long run, the majority of the Senate selects the committees. Oh, it does not make any difference whether one Senator has more persuasive power than another, or whether by virtue of his long service, or some other attribute, he has "more say-so," as we sometimes say in the South, in the matter of who is to be on a committee. But since the selection is to be made by the Senate, it follows that the majority of the Senate and the majority party, if there be one in the Senate at the time and it has the power of coherence, is the party to make the committee assignments.

That, Mr. President, does not mean that every Member of the Senate would be compelled to vote for the names presented by the leadership. We follow that practice because it is convenient. We follow that practice because it is a practicable way of organizing the Senate. We have a right to vote on each separate Member of each of the several committees, if we wish to. Likewise, of course, a Democrat on this side of the aisle, who felt that he should vote for the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, should not be deprived of that privilege; indeed, he could not be deprived of it—and I would be the last man to intimate or suggest it—because, after all, if, upon a man's conscience, as a Member of this body, he believes he should vote against the majority party in its effort to organize the Senate, then he may do so; indeed, I think he should do so. But the burden is on the majority.

In my opinion, the requirement, if it be a requirement, of the Legislative Reorganization Act that each Senator should be assigned to two committees, has nothing to do with the case at all. What the Legislative Reorganization Act said in so many words—and there was a reason for it—was that no Member of this body should serve on more than two major committees; he should have membership on but two major committees

The practice had grown up of many Senators serving on 3 or 4 major committees. It was an evil. Moreover, it deprived many junior Members of the opportunity to become members of particular committees, committees of their choice, where they were best equipped to work. But even if the legislative reorganization does provide that each Member of the body shall serve on only two major committees, that does not solve the problem at all, because the majority still has the power of saying how each committee shall be organized, and if the majority hold together it is simply a majority of the Senate controlling the situation.

I grant—and this is the reason why I have had a great deal of sympathy with the distinguished Senator from Oregon—that if one becomes a Member of this body and is not given a committee assignment which will enable him to do his best work and properly to represent his State, properly to represent his section, and properly to represent his side of the great causes which come before the Senate, then, as a matter of fact, there is a limitation upon that Member, and it is to that extent a limitation upon the State he represents in connection with his effectiveness to serve his State or his section. But the right is guaranteed by the Constitution that no State, except by its consent, can be deprived of equal representation in this body.

Sometimes we get an erroneous impression that in order to be heard in this body a Senator must be a member of a committee. Mr. President, during my short period of service here I remember a distinguished Senator who resigned from every committee to which he had been assigned, but, nevertheless, he was a very effective Member of this body down to the day of his death.

A State has the right to equal representation here, but prior seniority is purely a political matter. Seniority is not spoken of in the Constitution or elsewhere. Seniority is a political rule and regulation. Loss of it may have the effect of crippling the power of the distinguished Senator from Oregon to do what he believes he should do in behalf of his State, of his people, and of the country. That I think is unfortunate; and yet seniority is essentially a matter of party determination, regulation, and control.

Mr. President, nothing I have said can be taken to reflect upon the distinguished Senator from Oregon, because I may say that from the beginning I have had the very keenest sympathy for him in this matter. I may also add that I believe if he should be a member of the two committees of which he in his resolution asks to be a member, there would be no basic or fundamental change from the philosophy held by the party on this side of the aisle on those committees in determining any of the great issues which will or may come before them. I say that in all frankness and in all candor. I also say that the distinguished Senator from Oregon has made a most magnificent record on this floor and in his committee work heretofore, but I must reach the conclusion that when anyone leaves his party he loses whatever seniority rights he had as a member of that party, with respect to whatever position he held on committees during a term of service.

Mr. President, it is not always necessary for a man to stand with the majority or to stand with the controlling influences in this body. The proud boast of the Senate is that it is a great deliberative body, with unrestricted right to debate, with full power to represent the people of the States from which the Members come, and to make themselves heard throughout the Nation. It is a fact, as the distinguished Senator from Oregon pointed out, that in the Constitutional Convention the States talked about having representatives upon every committee that might be organized in the Senate. In the Constitutional Convention that was a concept which many members had. They at least thought they were organizing a body of the several States, so to speak, and that their representatives here would be but their ambassadors sent by them to represent their States. It is also true that in the beginning of our Government there were but few committees, and it is also true that in the beginning there were but 13 States, so that each State could have a representative upon a committee.

As the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, with, I think, a great deal of force, when the equal-representation clause was agreed upon, the agitation for representation on each committee in the Senate lost much of its force and effect. But we must consider the circumstances under which that was regarded as a very important issue and question in the Constitutional Convention as of that time and under the conditions then existing.

Mr. President, I reluctantly reach the conclusion that I cannot vote for the resolution, because I think it would have the effect of saying, "Yes; the majority of the Senate and the Senate itself, through majority vote, the only way in which it can express its convictions, is charged with the responsibility of electing the members of its several committees; yet, notwithstanding the faithful and hard work of our own leaders in making up the committee list, we would disregard what the majority wishes." We would then be inviting splinter parties in the United States, and coalitions between factions of both parties, and, in a very short period of time, we would have all the ills of the coalition governments which have afflicted practically all of Europe.

That might not happen. I have lived long enough to see many things fail to come to pass that I thought certainly would come to pass, so that I am not dogmatic about it. But I know the adoption of this resolution would be a step toward a coalition movement of Senators within the two parties. It would be a step away from the two-party system which we have always regarded as somewhat important, if, indeed, not vital to the continuance of our Government in an orderly way.

So, Mr. President, with the highest confidence in the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and with the belief and conviction that he will faithfully represent his State on the floor of this free Senate, and that he will not and cannot be deprived of that right and privilege because he did not get along with his party organization in one election, I do not believe he has a right to assert here a claim of priority in committee assignments which must be made by the Senate, and under which we must work if we are to carry on the duties and responsibilities placed upon us.

With the highest personal regard for the Senator from Oregon, and with no misgivings whatsoever about the eminent qualifications of the distinguished Senator to serve upon the committees named or any other committees to which he might be assigned, I have, as I have stated before, reluctantly reached the conclusion that I could not, without doing violence to the principle which I believe to be fundamental and basic, vote for the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to answer the arguments of the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

I say advisedly that there is no Member of the Senate for whom I have greater respect than I have for the Senator from Georgia. I do not know of any Member of the Senate who has befriended me during my 8 years in the Senate more than has the Senator from Georgia, and many times, I am sure, when he did not know he was doing so. I have gone to the Senator from Georgia on many occasions and sat down with him, either on the floor of the Senate or in the cloakroom, and discussed with him problems which concerned me in the Senate, both as to issues involving legislation, and as to a great many other matters which did not involve substantive issues. I have always received from the Senator from Georgia great help, so far as assistance in solving my problems and carrying out my senatorial duties were concerned. Hence, when I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Georgia, it is not easy for me to express the disagreement because of my high regard for him. But on this occasion I find myself in disagreement with so many points the Senator has just made that, at least for the RECORD, I desire to state my rebuttal.

I shall refer first to the matter of equal representation or equal suffrage in the Senate, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. There is no question about that. If we read the constitutional debates, our constitutional fathers, when the great compromise was made, talked in terms of equal representation within the United States Senate. They did not talk merely about giving each State two votes in the Senate. The compromise was not on the basis of simply giving to each State two votes in the Senate. The whole historical background of the great compromise was the idea of protecting the States in their procedural rights in the Senate. Otherwise, equal suffrage does not mean a thing. What good are two votes for every State in the Senate if the States do not have protection from discriminatory practices against one of their representatives in regard to the procedures of the Senate?

When we come to give judicial meaning to sections of the Constitution, the

Supreme Court time and time again has gone into the historical background of the Constitutional Convention. We cannot take the equal suffrage section of the Constitution and read it apart from the constitutional debates. After there had been long discussion during 3 hectic days, when it looked as though the Convention would break up, and there would be no Constitution, the delegates finally compromised on the general philosophical principle of equal suffrage in the Senate, but counting on the Senate itself to adopt and apply rules uniformly free of discrimination against the representative of the States.

So I repeat what I have said time and time again for 16 weeks on the floor of the Senate. Senators cannot erase from this issue the fact that they are following, in my judgment, a discriminatory practice against the representative of a sovereign State.

That leads me to the next point, namely, the relationship of all this discussion to the question of seniority. Seniority in the United States Senate is not limited to party membership. There are many seniority rights within the Chamber itself resting not on party membership, but on tenure in the Senate. All the precedents which have been cited here today have involved Independents, Progressives, and Liberals who have worked out their committee assignments with the minority party. They were allowed to keep their positions on committees by way of agreements made, but there was no Reorganization Act.

I respectfully say that my good friend, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], does not answer for me when he says there is not a line of the Reorganization Act that supports my position, if the act is properly interpreted. It is nice, if one wishes to assume his interpretation to be the proper one, to say there is not a line in the Reorganization Act which sustains his opponent's position.

In 1946 Congress enacted the Reorganization Act. What did it say? It said that Senators shall be elected to committees by ballot. Let me read the exact language on this point of membership on committees, to which the Senator from Georgia referred:

> Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees, and no more.

That is mandatory; it is not permissive. In my judgment, those are our orders. As I said earlier this afternoon, this is not the time to get into a discussion as to whether or not a Senator, under the Reorganization Act, can refuse to serve. In my judgment, within the terms of this language, he morally cannot refuse. This language makes perfectly clear that the intent was that he shall serve, and that he shall serve after election by ballot of the Senate.

That brings me to the question of organization, which was referred to by the minority leader. During the hectic reconstruction days, when hysteria stalked the floor of the United States Senate, the minority party then was denied any rights except what the majority party gave to them. But the Senate ended that practice. The Senate soon came to its senses; and since reconstruction days there has never been a time when the majority party has dictated to the minority party who shall serve on committees. That is the history of the Senate, as Senators will find if they will read that history. From that time to this day, the majority caucus has picked its committee members, and the minority caucus has picked its committee members. That is the history of the Senate.

Therefore, I disagree with one of the major premises laid down in the argument of the Senator from Georgia, that the responsibility has always been the responsibility of the majority party in the Senate. That has not been the practice, and it is not the custom. The Democrats cannot have it both ways.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] argued this afternoon in terms of what the practice and custom of the Senate have been. If I understood him correctly, the distinguished Senator from Georgia argued in terms of the so-called rights of the majority party in regard to committee assignments. I say that after the Senate recovered from the hysteria of the reconstruction days, it repudiated that kind of dictation in the Senate by the majority party. Not since reconstruction days has the majority party presumed to control the minority party in committee assignments. That is history.

My third point—and I am about through—is that there is a Reorganization Act. We have two minority parties in the Senate. What is the principle of fairness which should be applied to the second minority party? It is the principle that the service of its representative based upon 8 years of seniority in the Senate, should be respected. That is the history of the Senate, too. I challenge anyone to read the discussions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the discussions of some of the other cases in the newspapers at the time, and then to deny my statement. I have checked them. What was the argument in the La Follette case, the Wheeler case, and in other cases involving so-called progressives or independents?

Time and time again the discussion was in terms of the seniority of those men in the Senate. That is why they were not kicked off committees, which is what is being done this time. Senators do not speak, in justification of their position, in terms of my seniority rights, because if they do, they cannot justify the action of the Senate.

I see a headshake. Let me pause for a moment. The reason such action cannot be justified is that we cannot change the fact that the junior Senator from Oregon has 8 years of seniority in the Senate. That is not dependent upon party membership. The relative position he takes within the committee, around the committee table, depends upon his party membership. But party membership has nothing whatever to do with his right to have his 8 years of service and seniority respected and protected on the floor of the Senate.

I now wish to reply to the last point which the Senator from Georgia made. I think it is very indicative of an attitude which I believe to be prevalent in the formation of judgments in this case. I refer to the fear that the course of action which the Senator from Oregon is taking may lead to splinter parties in American politics. That is an old argument, Mr. President. The Republican Party came into being as the result of a third-party movement. I have no fear of splinter parties because an independent party is taking form in America today. In my judgment, what will happen in the realinement will be that one or the other of the two older parties will die. I do not know how many years will be required. It may require 20 years. But I think we have moving in America today at the grassroots the same kind of political force for realinement among the people as came into being when the Whig Party went out and the Republican Party came in.

I do not believe that the scarecrow of a splinter party fear ought to be set up as a reason for voting to deny the Senator from Oregon what the precedents of the Senate show he is entitled to, namely, the protection of his seniority rights after 8 years of service, with respect to the two committees on which he served. Not a single precedent, except the unfortunate one of 1871, can be found for removing the Senator from Oregon from those two committees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Maybank
Anderson	Hayden	McCarthy
Barrett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Beall	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bush	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Chavez	Jackson	Potter
Clements	Jenner	Purtell
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smathers
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Ellender	Kuchel	Stennis
Ferguson	Lehman	Symington
Frear	Long	Thye
Fulbright	Malone	Tobey
George	Mansfield	Welker
Gillette	Martin	Williams

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to state that I had originally intended to make a motion to lay the pending resolution on the table. However, at the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who desires to have a vote on his resolution, namely, Senate Resolution 32, and since the yeas

and nays have been ordered on it, so far as I am concerned I shall not make a motion to lay the resolution on the table, but shall follow the committee recommendation and vote "nay" on the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with my resolution, there are pending before the Senate the amendments which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Committee on Rules and Administration have acted upon. I ask unanimous consent, along with the resolution, and in connection with the revised committee report, that when the Senate votes on the resolution it vote on the resolution incorporating the amendments, because the amendments are in essence perfecting amendments to the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. MORSE. So we will have one vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The resolution the Senate will vote on will be the resolution, as amended.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, incorporating the amendments intended to be proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and previously referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending resolution. I shall make my remarks very brief, but I believe the reasons for my opposing the resolution should be in the RECORD before a vote is taken on it.

In the past few weeks numerous statements have been made on the floor of the Senate with reference to the position of the minority leader, and implications and innuendoes have been made which indicated that, except for the opposition of the minority leader, the committee assignments in question would have been resolved in accordance with the desires of the Senator from Oregon.

I can understand and sympathize with the desires of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to continue as a member of the two committees on which he served for the past several years. He has devoted a number of years of service to those committees.

On the Committee on Armed Services I have served with him, and I can testify that he has rendered effective service. Unfortunately the issue before the Senate is not the ability or the integrity of the junior Senator from Oregon. In my opinion, his ability and integrity are unquestioned. The issue before the Senate is the proper procedure for the organization of the Senate.

The junior Senator from Oregon, as all of us know, is a former Republican. He has chosen his present status deliberately, as a matter of principle. In making that decision he has asserted in positive terms that he did not want the party to which he once belonged to determine his committee assignments. However, the junior Senator from Oregon has refused to cross the aisle and become a member of the Democratic Party. He has designated himself, as it is his right to do, an Independent. He has also stated specifically that he does not want the Democratic Party, in its caucus, to determine his committee assignments.

Nevertheless, the Senator from Oregon quite properly claims that he is entitled to two committee seats. His claim is based upon Senate rule XXV and on the fundamental right of his State to equal representation in the Senate. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that he is entitled to two committee seats. But, Mr. President, I do not agree with him that he has the right to determine which two committee seats he shall have. Where I part company with the junior Senator from Oregon is the method by which he is proposing to select these two committee seats.

He has presented us with a resolution. He has also presented us with amendments to his original resolution. Under the amended resolution, the junior Senator from Oregon would add 1 Republican member and 1 former Republican member to the Armed Services Committee, and he would add 1 Republican member and 1 former Republican member—now an Independent—to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. And, Mr. President, that resolution would also subtract one member, each, from the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works.

This proposal has many novel aspects. In the first place, since the majority party controls the Senate—at least, theoretically—it is difficult to see what the junior Senator from Oregon would gain as an individual. He refused to permit the majority party to determine his committee assignments, when they met in the majority conference; but apparently he is willing to have the majority party determine his committee assignments when we meet here on the floor of the Senate.

In any event, Mr. President, all of us who are realists know that the majority party, by its vote in this body, will determine not only the committee assignments of the junior Senator from Oregon, but also the committee assignments of every other Member of this body.

Over the years there has been established the custom whereby each major party determines the committee assignments for its own members. There are some precedents for instances such as the one we are voting on today. In 1849 an insurgent independent, John P. Hale, a Free Soiler and a pioneer Senate Republican, was dissatisfied with the committee asignments which were given to him. He challenged the procedure which was followed; he refused to accept the recommendations of the majority caucus; and, he refused to allow unanimous consent to suspend the balloting rule. Therefore, a ballot was required and balloting took place. The recommendations made by the majority caucus were upheld, and Senator Hale was assigned to committees as determined by the majority caucus.

Mr. President, I have done everything I could to attempt to work out a satisfactory arrangement for the junior Senator from Oregon. At the beginning of the session I met with the majority leader. He reminded me of the custom, tradition, historic policy, and precedent of the Senate, namely, that all Independents had originally been assigned by the majority party. I confirmed that statement with the Parliamentarian. The distinguished majority leader therefore asked, as he had a right to ask, for the allotment of 2 seats for each of the 48 Republican Members and 2 seats for the Independent. The minority asked for the allotment of 2 seats for each of the 47 Democratic Members.

If the junior Senator from Oregon had desired to affiliate himself with our party, I could have asked for 2 seats for 48 Members, and it may well have been that then he could have continued to serve, undisturbed, on the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But the junior Senator from Oregon did not give me that right. He refused to affiliate himself with my party, and therefore I could not ask for the allotment of committee assignments for him.

Now, Mr. President, we have distributed 2 committee assignments for each of the 47 Democratic Members.

If this resolution should prevail, the result would be that two Republican Members would be added to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Armed Services Committee; and two Independent seats would be added, one to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and one to the Armed Services Committee—or a net addition of four seats; but no seats would be added for the Democrats.

I wish to pay tribute to the fairness and the justice of the majority party. They have the votes to ram through a resolution such as this one, which would place the minority party at a distinct disadvantage. If this resolution were agreed to, we of the minority party would be faced with having the Armed Services Committee made up of 9 Republican Members and 7 Democratic Members. This body is now controlled by a majority of 1 Member, but under this resolution there would be control by a majority of 2 Republican Members. The majority control of that committee would thus be increased 100 percent; and if thereafter the Senator from Oregon voted with the Republican Members at any time, the majority party control of that committee would be increased 200 percent.

If at the next session, the majority party should gain one Senate seat, as an extreme example of what could happen, they could change the ratio of service on the Armed Services Committee to 10 to 6; and by thus having control of 1 adadditional Member of the Senate, they would have almost 2 to 1 control of the Armed Services Committee. All of us know what that would do to the ratio observed by the minority party. All of us know what that would do to the new Members who have been assigned to those committees.

Mr. President, I am willing to share the junior Senator from Oregon 50–50 with the majority party, but I am not willing to have the Senate say it will add 4 seats to 2 committees and completely disregard the 47 Members who make up the minority party.

I am glad the leadership on the other side of the aisle has not sought to take an unfair advantage. In a few months it may be that we shall be in the majority, in which case we shall try to be as decent in dealing with them as they have been in working with us.

Mr. President, I hope the resolution will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of the junior Senator from Oregon, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, is as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and it is hereby, amended—(1) by adding, "for the period of the 83d Congress, a member of the majority party be assigned to the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare and that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MORSE) be assigned to service on the same committees";

(2) by inserting, in subsection (f) (relating to the Committee on the District of Columbia), after the word "Senators": "but for the period of the 83d Congress to consist of 8 Senators)"; and

(3) by inserting in subsection (n) (relating to the Committee on Public Works), after the word "Senators": "(but for the period of the 83d Congress to consist of 10 Senators)."

SEC. 2. Section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding: "but for the period of the 83d Congress sixteen such Senators of the majority party may serve on three standing committees and no more."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent. On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] was paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

Also on this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—19

Anderson	Humphrey	Morse
Chavez	Hunt	Murray
Cordon	Jackson	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Fulbright	Kilgore	Tobey
Gillette	Lehman	
Hill	Long	

NAYS—56

Aiken	Gore	McClellan
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Pastore
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Payne
Bush	Hoey	Potter
Butler, Md.	Holland	Purtell
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Kennedy	Smathers
Daniel	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kuchel	Stennis
Dworshak	Malone	Symington
Ellender	Mansfield	Thye
Ferguson	Martin	Welker
Frear	Maybank	Williams
George	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—21

Bridges	Green	Monroney
Butler, Nebr.	Griswold	Saltonstall
Byrd	Ives	Smith, N. C.
Case	Kefauver	Taft
Eastland	Langer	Watkins
Flanders	Magnuson	Wiley
Goldwater	McCarran	Young

So the resolution (S. Res. 32) was rejected.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be assigned to the Committees on Public Works and the District of Columbia to fill the existing vacancies thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4664) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. BUSBEY, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. WHITTEN had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, while Senators are in attendance in connection with Senate Resolution 32, in response to a number of requests for information as to what the program of the Senate will be for the remainder of the week, I should like to say that the next measure which it is intended to have the Senate consider is Calendar No. 296, H. R. 4654, to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

Immediately following the consideration of that measure, it is the purpose of the acting majority leader to move to take up Calendar No. 267, Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, providing for a Consolidated General Appropriation Act.

On Wednesday, it is proposed to take up Senate Resolution 100, dealing with Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, relating to the Department of Agriculture.

Under the law 10 hours of debate is provided for in connection with a resolution rejecting a reorganization plan, unless the Senate shall determine otherwise.

I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has been consulted on that point. I did talk with some of the other Senators, and stated that if a mutually satisfactory agreement could be agreed upon between the proponents and the opponents of Senate Resolution 100, I thought such an agreement to expedite consideration of the resolution would be helpful.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe consideration of the resolution will require 10 hours. I do not know how many other Senators would like to address themselves to the resolution, but I should like to have approximately 1 hour. I should think that we could dispose of the resolution with 2½ hours of debate on each side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] had been in consultation with the ranking minority member of the committee. At that time the ranking minority member of the committee suggested the possibility that perhaps 2 hours of debate on each side

would be sufficient. However, if the Senator from Georgia feels that 2½ hours would be more satisfactory, I am sure it would be agreeable to all Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. Two hours of debate on each side would seem to me to be adequate. However, I should not like at this time to propose such a limitation because I do not know how many Senators desire to address themselves to the subject. So far as I am concerned, I would be willing to agree to 2½ hours of debate on each side, with the understanding that if we can conclude the debate within a shorter period of time the Senate will vote earlier.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I inquire whether the hearings have been printed?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that the hearings are available to Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. The hearings are available. I received a copy of them this morning.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate takes up for consideration Senate Resolution 100, relating to the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, on Wednesday of this week, the time for debate be limited to 5 hours, to be divided equally between the proponents of the resolution and the opponents of the resolution—I may add that it is a resolution of rejection which will be pending before the Senate—with the time to be controlled by the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXEMPTION FROM ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4654, which is Order No. 296 on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4654) to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That section 202 of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended by adding a subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) (1) This title shall not apply to the following officers in the executive branch of the Government: (a) persons appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone, whose rates of basic compensation exceed the maximum rate provided in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; (b) persons who receive compensation at one of the rates authorized in section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; and (c) such other officers (except postmasters, United States attorneys, and United States marshals) as may be designated by the President. No officer in the executive branch to whom this title applies shall be deemed to be entitled to the compensation attached to his office solely by virtue of his status as an officer.

"(2) The President, in his discretion, may authorize leaves of absence to persons who are exempted from this title pursuant to subsection (c) (1) (b) for use in the United States and its Territories and possessions."

SEC. 2. (a) The accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which any officer exempted from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 as a result of the enactment of this act is entitled immediately prior to the date this act becomes applicable to him shall be liquidated by a lump-sum payment at the rate of compensation which he was receiving immediately prior to such date only upon (1) the separation of such officer from the service, (2) the death of such officer, or (3) the transfer of such officer to a position under a leave system other than the leave system provided by the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

(b) In the event any such exempted officer, without any break in the continuity of his service, again becomes subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 upon the completion of his service as an exempted officer, such officer shall be recredited with the unused annual and sick leave standing to his credit at the time he was exempted from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

(c) In the event any such exempted officer is separated from the service to enter upon active service in the Armed Forces or the merchant marine of the United States, such officer shall be entitled (1) to receive compensation covering the accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which he is entitled immediately prior to the date this act becomes applicable to him, or (2) to elect to have such leave remain to his credit until his return from active service in the Armed Forces or the merchant marine.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 203 (c) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 679) is hereby amended by striking out the words "end of the last complete biweekly pay period" and substituting the words "beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period."

(b) Section 203 (d) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is hereby amended by striking out the words "end of the last complete biweekly pay period" and substituting the words "beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period."

(c) Section 208 (a) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended by striking out the words "end of the last complete biweekly pay period" and substituting the words "beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period."

SEC. 4. The foregoing provisions of this act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 5. Section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953 (Public Law 455, 82d Cong.), is hereby repealed.

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF ARID MOUNTAIN STATES RANGELANDS WITHIN THE STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the reason we have large areas of public lands, in the Western States, in addition to reserves, parks, and monuments is because Congress has not followed through with Federal legislation to enable family-sized units to be acquired; that is the units of such land that would support a band of sheep or 200 to 250 head of cattle.

INDIVIDUAL OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC LAND—A CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

Starting with the Preemption Act of 1841, followed by the Homestead Act of 1862, the Mining Claim Act of 1872, the additional Homestead Act of 1909–10, the Stockgrazing Act of 1916, the Pittman Act of 1919, and other miscellaneous acts, the obvious policy of the Congress of the United States was to hold the public lands in trust for the States until such time as Federal legislation could be passed to enable individuals to file on or take up such land in family-sized units through a procedure of proper entry and the payment of a nominal filing fee. For a homestead of 160 acres a filing fee of $16 was paid to the Federal Government. It was certainly clear that such a fee was in no way construed as payment for the land.

The 160-acre homestead accounted for the public lands from Ohio and Iowa to western Kansas. The semiarid climate and less productive land to the west then made the additional 160 acres necessary, necessitating the additional homestead act. When the Colorado plateau was reached, 320 acres was not enough to support a family unit, and then the 640-acre—1 section—stockgrazing homestead act was passed.

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY ACRES TO SUPPORT A COW AND CALF

Soon the western deserts and arid mountain areas were reached, and a total of 960 acres of land was just an aggravation, since in some areas, according to the United States Geological Survey, more than 140 acres is required in order to graze a cow unit—that is, a cow and calf—per year. That means it would require 35,000 acres, or almost 1 township of 36 sections of 36,000 acres, to graze 250 cow units.

The United States Geological Survey estimates that an average of 144 acres is required per year to run a cow unit in Eureka, Lander, Nye, and Esmeralda Counties, Nev.

GRAZING LAND PART OF LIVESTOCK UNIT

The public-land States have taxed the federally owned rangeland through the patented feed producing ranches for 50 to 75 years. This was done indirectly because cattle, sheep, and horses began to graze in the pasturelands and these grazing lands became an important part of the livestock unit.

Mr. President, if the Nevada rancher suddenly owned the publicly owned rangeland which has been utilized as one part of the livestock unit, his taxes could not be raised appreciably, since the patented lands, the home ranch which produces the feed, has been valued for tax purposes upon its value as a livestock unit, which includes the range.

For the past 60 to 90 years the ranchers have utilized the range in connection with the feed-producing "headquarters" ranches, and the feed grown on these grazing lands has been substantially utilized for more than a half century.

LONG-ESTABLISHED PUBLIC LAND LAW CHANGED

The 1934 Taylor Grazing Act, as administered by the then Secretary of Interior, changed the long-recognized public-land policy from a policy of holding these lands in trust for the States until such time as Federal land laws could be enacted to pass these arid areas into private ownership, and onto the tax rolls, to a policy of perpetual government ownership, making permanent tenants of the users of such lands.

LOCAL TAX OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR PUBLIC LAND OWNERSHIP

If the approximately 60 million acres of public lands within the State of Nevada, of a total area of 70,600,000 acres, are to be held in perpetual ownership, then the Government should pay taxes on these lands just the same as does any other landlord.

REORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL LAND LAW LONG OVERDUE

However, it is generally believed that a long-overdue reorganization of the Federal land laws is needed with a view of eventually adding public lands to the tax rolls of the States in which they are located, without interference with the forest reserves, parks, recreation areas, fish and wildlife preserves, and other areas with a beneficial public use.

Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill that will affect only three counties in the State of Nevada; they are Eureka, Lander, and Nye Counties, comprising approximately 7,367,000 acres. This proposed bill does not affect any other State in any way.

I ask unanimous consent to have the bill appear in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1982) to establish a special grazing district in the State of Nevada; to provide for the more efficient use, conservation and protection of the public lands, and their use for mineral development, grazing, and agriculture, fish and wildlife and recreation resources, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act to establish a Nevada Special Grazing District, and to provide for the conservation and protection of the public lands and their use for mineral development, grazing and agriculture, fish and wildlife and recreation purposes, and for other purposes.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a Nevada special grazing district (hereinafter referred to as the "grazing district," which shall consist of the following-described public lands situated in Eureka, Lander, and Nye Counties, Nev., exclusive of national forests, Indian reservations, the Railroad Valley Wildlife Refuge, and any other lands set aside by Federal law for any purpose other than grazing:

MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

Township 10 north, range 35 east, that part of Nye County.

Townships 9 and 10 north, range 36 east, unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Townships 8 to 12 north, range 37 east, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Townships 14 and 15 north, range 37 east, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Lander County.

Townships 7 to 19 north, range 38 east, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Townships 6 to 19 and 23 to 26 north, range 39 east, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Townships 4 to 8, 12 to 14, and 16 to 28 north, range 40 east, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Townships 3 to 8 and 12 to 30 north, range 41 east, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Townships 2 to 10 and 12 to 32 north, range 42 east, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Townships 1 to 15 and 17 to 32 north, range 43 east, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Townships 1 to 8, 10 to 17, and 19 to 32 north, range 44 east, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Townships 1 to 9 and 13 to 32 north, range 45 east, partly unsurveyed.

Townships 1 to 3, 7 to 14, and 17 to 32 north, range 46 east, partly unsurveyed.

Townships 1 to 32 north, range 47 east, partly unsurveyed.

Township 8 north, range 47½ east.

Townships 1 to 8 and 13 to 32 north, range 48 east, partly unsurveyed.

Townships 24 and 25 north, range 48½ east.

Townships 1 to 13 and 18 to 26 north, range 49 east, partly unsurveyed.

Townships 4 and 5 north, range 49½ east.

Townships 1 to 26 north, ranges 50 and 51 east, partly unsurveyed.

Townships 1 to 3 north, range 51½ east.

Townships 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 north, range 52 east, partly unsurveyed.

Townships 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 north, range 53 east, partly unsurveyed.

Townships 1 to 9 and 15 to 26 north, range 54 east, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Townships 3 to 9 and 19 to 24 north, range 55 east, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Townships 4, 5, 6, and 9 north, range 56 east.

Townships 5, 6, 7, and 9 north, range 57 east, partly unsurveyed.

Townships 6 to 9 north, range 58 east, unsurveyed.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), through the Bureau of Land Management, shall, upon the application of one or more range users within the grazing district, conduct a survey of the lands comprising the grazing district for the purpose of ascertaining and determining the boundaries of the portion or portions of such lands which heretofore have been customarily used for grazing purposes by any person. Upon such adjudication, the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall grant to each such person a permit authorizing such person hereafter to use for grazing purposes the portion or portions of such land heretofore customarily used by such person for such purpose. Each permit so issued shall specify the boundaries of the land with respect to which such permit is effective.

(b) If the person to whom any such permit is issued customarily has, prior to the effective date of this Act, enjoyed exclusive use of any such land for grazing purposes, he shall be tendered an exclusive permit which shall entitle the holder to exclusive use for grazing purposes of the lands described therein. If such person customarily has, prior to such date, used any such land for grazing purposes jointly with any other person or persons, there shall be issued a joint permit which shall entitle the holders thereof to joint use for grazing purposes of the lands described therein.

(c) The issuance of any permit pursuant to this section shall constitute a revocation of any permit previously issued by the Secretary under any other provision of law for the use for grazing purposes of the lands described in the permit issued hereunder.

(d) Any permit issued pursuant to this section may be revoked by the Secretary upon his determination, after notice and hearing, that—

(1) the holder or holders thereof have failed for a period of 2 years to make substantial use for grazing purposes of the land described therein; or

(2) the lands described therein are required for use, under any other provision of law for any use (including, but not limited to, agricultural, mining, fish and wildlife, recreation, and conservation uses) other than grazing, and that the continued use of such land for grazing purposes will substantially interfere with its employment for such other intended use.

SEC. 4. (a) As soon as application for a survey is filed under the provisions of section 3 (a) of this act, the Secretary shall give notice, by publication or otherwise, to all persons who heretofore have customarily used for grazing purposes any of the lands comprising the grazing district, concerning—

(1) the time and place at which such persons may file applications for the issuance of permits hereunder; and

(2) the time and place at which a hearing or hearings will be conducted for the purpose of ascertaining the facts upon which the adjudications required by section 3 (a) of this act will be made.

(b) Each such application shall specify (1) the location of the lands of the applicant and the number of acres contained therein, (2) the location and number of acres of the lands within the grazing district for which application is made, and (3) water rights, including domestic, stock watering, irrigation, mining or industrial permits, certificates or applications pending under the State laws, and vested rights claimed, and (4) owned or leased lands within the area applied for including commensurate feed-producing property, and (5) such other facts as may be be prescribed by the Secretary in order to enable him to make an equitable determination of all applications.

(c) In making adjudications pursuant to section 3 (a) of this act, the Secretary shall, insofar as practicable, comply with the designations of the applicants with respect to the division of lands within the grazing district, but notwithstanding the designation of specific lands by any applicant, the Secretary may issue to such applicant a permit for the use of other lands. In any case in which more than one person makes application for the use of the same lands within the grazing district, the Secretary shall determine the priority of such rights, and if determined to be equal, shall endeavor to effect an agreement among such persons with respect to the division of such lands or to the joint use thereof. In any case in which a person's application for the use of designated lands is denied, in whole or in part, such person may amend his application to include other lands, upon application to the Secretary.

(d) Any person who has filed any such application, and who is aggrieved by any adjudication made by the Secretary thereon, may within 60 days after receipt of notice of such adjudication file in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada a civil action for a determination of his rights under this act, and such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any such action, and to issue such order as shall be determined by such court to be proper. Any order so entered shall be subject to review pursuant to sections 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary may make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary governing the surrender, transfer, and assignment of permits, but no such rule or regulation shall prohibit (1) the transfer of a permit, or (2) the assignment of a permit, or the assignment of the right to use a

portion of the lands covered by such permit or, in the case of a joint permit, the assignment of a part of the lessor's right to the use of such lands, to a lessee of the lands, or portion thereof, owned by the holder of such permit.

(b) Upon the application of two or more persons holding permits for the use of the lands concerned, the Secretary may modify any permit with respect to (1) the extent of the lands covered by such permit or (2), in the case of a joint permit, the number of users of the lands covered by such permit. Before making any such modification, the Secretary shall give due consideration to the rights and privileges of any other person or persons holding a permit, and may deny the application when such rights and privileges would be adversely affected by the modification requested.

SEC. 6. (a) In case of any dispute between two or more persons holding permits under this act, the Secretary shall, at the written request of any party to such dispute, determine the rights and privileges of the respective parties under their permits. The Secretary shall hold such hearings and receive such testimony as he deems necessary for a proper determination of any such dispute. If the Secretary should find any infringement by any party to such proceeding of the permit of another person, he shall issue such orders and take such action as may be necessary to correct such infringement.

(b) Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Nevada to enjoin (1) any violation of an order of the Secretary issued under subsection (a), and (2) any infringement by a person who is not a holder of a permit issued under this act or the rights and privileges of any person under a permit issued under this act.

SEC. 7. Except as specifically required by this act, the Secretary shall not exercise any supervision over the activities of any person holding a permit, and, except as specifically required by other laws, shall not exercise any supervision over the lands comprising the grazing district with respect to the use of such lands for grazing purposes. Nothing contained in this act shall preclude the exercise by the Secretary or any other officer of the United States of his authority under any other act (other than the Taylor Grazing Act) with respect to the development or preservation of the natural resources of the public domain.

SEC. 8. (a) In order to defray the costs of administering this act, the Secretary shall assess to each person holding a permit issued under this act a reasonable annual grazing fee based upon the extent and nature of the lands covered by such permit and the extent of the privileges conferred upon such person by such permit. The total amount of all fees assessed for any fiscal year shall not exceed the costs of administering this act for the preceding fiscal year. The costs attributable to the initial determination and issuance of permits under this act shall be apportioned equally among the five fiscal years following the fiscal years in which such costs are incurred.

(b) Notice of the grazing fee for any fiscal year shall be given by the Secretary to each person who holds a permit not later than 90 days after the beginning of such year. If such fee is not paid by such person within 120 days after the commencement of such fiscal year, the Secretary may, in his discretion, revoke the permit of such person. During periods of range depletion due to drought or other natural causes, or in case of general epidemic or disease, the Secretary may, in his discretion, remit, reduce, or postpone the payment of any grazing fee required by this section.

(c) All moneys received as grazing fees under this section shall be deposited in the Treasury in a special fund to be known as the Nevada Special Grazing District Fund.

SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated, out of the Nevada Special Grazing District Fund, such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this act. In addition, for any fiscal year in which the moneys in such fund are insufficient to meet the costs of administration of this act, there are authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of a reprint of my remarks made last year included at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my present remarks.

There being no objection, the reprint was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 15, 1951, the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, established Grazing District No. 6, which would be affected by the bill I have just introduced. I ask unanimous consent that the order of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, establishing Grazing District No. 6, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

[Misc. 57324]

NEVADA

Establishing Grazing District No. 6

FEBRUARY 9, 1951.

Under and pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269, 43 U. S. C. 315 et seq.) as amended, known as the Taylor Grazing Act, and in accordance with Departmental Order No. 2583 of August 16, 1950, § 2.22 (15 F. R. 5645) Nevada Grazing District 6 is hereby established, the exterior boundaries of which shall include the following described lands exclusive of National Forests, Indian Reservations, the Railroad Valley Wildlife Refuge, and existing grazing districts:

NEVADA—MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

T. 10 N., R. 35 E., that part in Nye County.

Tps. 9 and 10 N., R. 36 E., unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Tps. 8 to 12 N., R. 37 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Tps. 14 and 15 N., R. 37 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Lander County.

Tps. 7 to 19 N., R. 38 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 6 to 19 and 23 to 26 N., R. 39 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 4 to 8, 12 to 14, and 16 to 26 N., R. 40 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 3 to 8 and 12 to 30 N., R. 41 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 2 to 10 and 12 to 32 N., R. 42 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 15 and 17 to 32 N., R. 43 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 6, 10 to 17, and 19 to 32 N., R. 44 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 9 and 13 to 32 N., R. 45 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 3, 7 to 14, 17 to 32 N., R. 46 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 32 N., R. 47 E., partly unsurveyed.

T. 8 N., R. 47½ E.

Tps. 1 to 8 and 13 to 32 N., R. 48 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 24 and 25 N., R. 48½ E.

Tps. 1 to 13 and 18 to 26 N., R. 49 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 4 and 5 N., R. 49½ E.

Tps. 1 to 26 N., Rs. 50 and 51 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 3 N., R. 51½ E.

Tps. 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 N., R. 52 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 N., R. 53 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 9 and 15 to 26 N., R. 54 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Tps. 3 to 9 and 19 to 24 N., R. 55 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Tps. 4, 5, 6, and 9 N., R. 56 E.

Tps. 5, 6, 7, and 9 N., R. 57 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 6 to 9 N., R. 58 E., unsurveyed.

The area described includes approximately 7,367,000 acres of public lands.

The Federal Range Code for Grazing Districts (43 CFR, Part 161) as amended, shall be effective as to the lands embraced herein from and after the date of publication of this order in the Federal Register, except that the lands embraced herein shall not be subject to section 161.8, paragraphs (k), (c), (d), and (e), until 1 year from the date of such publication.

MARION CLAWSON,
Director.

[F. R. Doc. 51-2216; filed, Feb. 14, 1951; 8:45 a. m.]

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of a letter written by me under date of December 20, 1950, to the Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 20, 1950.

Hon. OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In accordance with our conversation dealing with the remaining lean desert-range areas located in the three counties of Lander, Eureka, and Nye in my State of Nevada, I am attaching an outline of suggested legislation that could furnish a feasible approach to the problem.

I am advised that there are 7,367,000 acres included in the area divided between the three counties as follows:

Lander County	2,445,502
Eureka County	1,357,806
Nye County	3,563,692
Total	7,367,000

The approximately 200 acres to the cow unit annually, that your people estimate is necessary on the average—some areas will require much more and some less—just about approaches the "roller skate' requirement for the cow to cover that much area in time to get enough to eat.

The new approach for this thin production area is not proposed as a cure-all but simply as a method for your Department to bridge an impossible situation where you cannot possibly charge enough rental for the use of such lands, to return the cost of supervision to the Government.

This approach will provide a method for the Government to become entirely familiar with the actual conditions—to advise in the matter of mining development, fish and game conservation and the development of the recreation facilities, without injuring the established livestock units, which I am sure is your real objective.

If you agree with me that the new approach should be tried out and in the event

it does not merit continuation after a reasonable time, I will personally advocate the repeal of the legislation and in no event is any other area affected by the special act.

I will await your call to further discuss the details and will introduce the proper legislation when we are agreed upon procedure.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a memorandum written by the Assistant Director, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, to the Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., December 26, 1950.

Memorandum to the Secretary of the Interior.

From Assistant Director.

Subject: Nevada Grazing District No. 6.

Tabulated below is the information requested by telephone covering precipitation and average grazing capacity in Esmeralda, Eureka, Lander, and Nye Counties, Nevada:

County:	*Rain in inches per annum*
Eureka	6.26–12.17
Lander	6.17–12.22
Nye	3.07–12.29

Source: Weather Bureau.

Carying capacity: Estimated average, 12 acres per animal-unit month.

WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN, JR.,
Assistant Director.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table issued by the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, showing the arrea in acres of vacant public lands in the State of Nevada. The table is dated June 30, 1949.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management—area, in acres, of vacant public lands, by States and counties, June 30, 1949—Nevada

Counties	Outside grazing districts	Within grazing districts
Churchill		2,113,270
Clark	95,081	2,487,470
Douglas		198,994
Elko		5,985,800
Esmeralda	2,011,285	
Eureka	1,357,900	519,064
Humboldt	110,718	4,108,418
Lander	2,445,502	142,548
Lincoln	94,365	5,270,201
Lyon	280	656,438
Mineral		1,566,351
Nye	5,093,579	1,325,596
Ormsby		49,190
Pershing	137,480	2,640,929
Storey		77,417
Washoe	146,760	2,406,217
White Pine		4,347,877
Total, Nevada	11,492,856	33,596,040

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to read from page 87 of the report of the State engineer of Nevada for the period January 1, 1931, to June 30, 1932, inclusive. I may say that it is my own report, as I was State engineer from 1927 to 1935. I read as follows:

"It is not generally realized by people of the Midwest and Eastern States just how small our western development really is in comparison to the total development of the United States, or the obstacles that must be surmounted for further development.

"Nevada, for example, has a total area of 70,265,440 acres, of which less than 500,000 acres are actually under cultivation, or approximately three-quarters of 1 percent (0.75 percent). The total irrigated acreage in the 17 Western States is approximately 18,500,000 acres, which is, in itself, insignificant compared to the estimated total of 400 million cultivated acres in the United States. Approximately 1,500,000 acres of the 18,500,000 have been brought under cultivation on the Government reclamation projects."

GRAZING RIGHT DETERMINED ON CUSTOMARY USE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the proposed legislation provides that the Secretary of the Interior, through the proper agency, the Bureau of Land Management, shall adjudicate the range, determine the customary use of the range, and define the boundaries in each case, whether individual or community range. The use of such range could then be transferred, subject to the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, as to whether or not any range user, not a party to the transfer, is injured.

SIMILAR TO ADJUDICATION OF WATER

I may say at this point, Mr. President, that this adjudication of the use of the range lands would be in accordance with the laws and customs for adjudication of water which are now established in the Western States on a basis of priority of use. The water right is adjudicated by the State engineer or other proper officer of the State in accordance with the customery use or established use for beneficial purposes of that water. The individuals to whom the water is adjudicated do not own the water. What they own is the use of the water which they can lose by non-use. My bill suggests that grazing lands on the public domain be adjudicated in this same manner.

HIGHEST USE OF LAND RECOGNIZED

It is the use of the feed on the arid range lands that would be adjudicated, and the surface and subsoil would be subject to location through any Federal land law, including agriculture and mining laws and it could be set aside for parks, fish, and game refuges, recreation areas, or for any higher purpose.

The adjudication of the use of the land for grazing would not interfere with the highest use of Federal lands to be taken up under any Federal law that might be enacted by the Congress of the United States.

HARVESTED THROUGH THE LIVESTOCK

The feed values on the range lands in question can be harvested only through the livestock. The size of the feed-producing ranches depends upon the water available for irrigation. It depends on the local condition and cannot be included in a predetermined established acreage, such as the original homestead. Any Federal legislation which is enacted must meet the special conditions.

FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY ACRES PER CAPITA

Mr. President, Nevada is the sixth largest State in the Union, having approximately 70,600,000 acres, with a total population of 160,000 or approximately 450 acres per capita.

ONE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-ONE GRAZING PERMITS IN NEVADA

Mr. President, in the entire State of Nevada with about 60 million acres of public land, there are at this time, according to the information furnished by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, 1,049 grazing permits under the Taylor Grazing Act, 276 cattle permits in national forests, and 46 sheep permits in national forests, making a total of 1,371 public land grazing permits on 60 million acres.

Those figures should give the Members of the Senate an idea as to what the value of the land is in comparison with the production of the feed for grazing purposes.

NO OTHER AREA AFFECTED

Mr. President, this special proposed legislation would in no way affect any other State and would apply only to district No. 6 in the Nevada counties of Eureka, Nye, and Lander, and including only the area specifically decribed in the proposed legislation.

DECISION OF UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS CONCERNING PUNISHMENT FOR VIOLATIONS OF REGULATIONS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, recently a decision was handed down by the United States Court of Military Appeals that should be of interest to every Member of this body. It was of considerable interest to me, and I want to bring it to your attention as I feel that little notice has been given to it.

In substance, that decision ruled out the Navy's traditional penalty of bread and water, long a standby of Navy justice in meting out punishment to its personnel for violations of regulations. A traditional stalwart of Navy discipline has been the bread-and-water penalty.

When the Military Code of Justice was being written a few years ago by the Congress, general agreement was expressed by the drafters of the legislation that the unlimited penalty of bread and water was a cruel, barbaric, and outdated form of discipline. The legislative history of the new law on this matter is abundantly clear that Congress was opposed to the penalty of bread and water. Both the Army and the Air Force frowned upon it and have refused to use it. But the Navy stuck tenaciously to it even in the face of the clear intent of Congress.

So when the Manual for Courts Martial was drafted and adopted, the will of Congress was defied and regulations were set up to permit bread-and-water sentences up to 30 days. This is not the first time that the executive branch of the Government has circumvented the will of Congress and the clear intent of the law. We see that quite often. I rejoice that the United States Court of Military Appeals has not only had the wisdom but the courage as well to call the hand of the Navy in its defiance of Congress on this point. It surely gives real hope that this tribunal will not be the mere lackey of the naval and military brass. It gives real hope that justice will be guaranteed to GI's.

As Shakespeare's heroine Portia said, "The quality of mercy is not strained." The United States Court of Military Appeals, has, in effect, echoed this with its own version that the quality of mercy shall not be strained by outmoded military tradition.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the opinion rendered by the court in this matter, and I invite the reading of it by every Member of Congress.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS—UNITED STATES, APPELLEE, v. WARREN LAWRENCE WAPPLER, PRIVATE, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, APPELLANT—No. 1457

(On certification from The Judge Advocate General of the U. S. Navy)

(Decided April 15, 1953)

CDR Raymond W. Glasgow, United States Navy, for appellant.

CDR E. L. McDonald, United States Navy, for appellee.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Paul W. Brosman, judge.

On his plea of guilty, the accused, Wappler, was convicted by special court-martial[1] convened at Camp Pendleton, Calif., of absence without leave and of missing a movement of his unit through neglect—violations, respectively, of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, articles 86 and 87 (50 U. S. C., secs. 680, 681). He was sentenced to confinement at hard labor for 60 days; to solitary confinement on bread and water, with a full ration every third day, for 30 days; to forfeiture of $50 per month for 3 months; and to receive a bad-conduct discharge. The convening authority approved the sentence, but suspended the punitive discharge for the period of confinement and for 6 months thereafter—at which time it was to be remitted. This action was in turn approved by the supervisory authority. A board of review in the office of The Judge Advocate General, United States Navy, with one member dissenting, held that confinement on bread and water may not be imposed lawfully where a punitive discharge is also adjudged. Accordingly, it set aside the bad-conduct discharge, but approved the remainder of the sentence. The dissenting member felt that the court-martial in this case was—apart from the punitive-discharge aspect of the matter—without power to impose confinement on bread and water. The Judge Advocate General, United States Navy, thereupon certified to this court three questions:

"(1) May a naval court-martial legally adjudge confinement on bread and water or diminished rations where such court has also adjudged a punitive discharge?

"(2) May a naval court-martial legally adjudge confinement on bread and water or diminished rations where the accused is a person not attached to or embarked in a vessel?

"(3) May a naval court martial legally adjudge confinement on bread and water or diminished rations for a period in excess of three consecutive days?"

II

These questions require that we consider the matter of confinement on bread and water in most of its possible aspects. At the outset we must take note of articles 18, 19, and 20 of the code, supra (50 U. S. C. secs. 578, 579, 580), each of which provides that a court-martial "may, under such limitations as the President may prescribe, adjudge any punishment not forbidden by this code"—with certain exceptions spelled out for application to special and summary courts-martial. Our inquiry must, then, be whether bread and water confinement is forbidden by the code in any particular, and, if so, to what extent. First, we observe, that it is mentioned once only in the code, supra—in article 15 (a) (2) (F) (50 U. S. C. sec. 571). There its imposition is authorized as a nonjudicial punishment by commanding officers, and is limited to "a person attached to or embarked in a vessel," and to "a period not to exceed 3 consecutive days." However, paragraph 125, Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1951, after forbidding sentences to confinement on bread and water for Army or Air Force personnel—except, apparently, as nonjudicial punishment imposable under article 15 of the code, supra—goes on to provide specifically that Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard courts-martial may impose confinement on bread and water for periods not in excess of 30 days, with the restriction that "no accused shall be deprived of a full ration for a period longer than 3 consecutive days." Other limitations not here pertinent are also stated there. If this provision of the manual is not in conflict with the code, the sentence of the court-martial in this case to confinement on bread and water was not an unlawful one. If however, there is conflict with the code, the latter, of course controls and we must hold that the court below erred. *United States v. Clark* (— U. S. M. C. A. —, decided February 29, 1952).

It is significant that under articles 30 and 35, Articles for the Government of the Navy (34 U. S. C. sec. 1200), and section 447, Naval Courts and Boards, 1937, Navy summary and general courts-martial were free to impose confinement on bread and water, with a full ration every third or fifth day, for a period up to 30 days. However, as we have observed earlier, the code, except under the carefully delineated circumstances specified in article 15, makes no direct mention of confinement on bread and water as punishment of any sort. In addition, it expressly prohibits "Punishment by flogging, or by branding, marking, or tattooing on the body, or any other cruel or unusual punishment." Uniform Code (supra, art. 55, 50 U. S. C. sec. 636). For many years, confinement on bread and water has been permitted expressly by the Articles for the Government of the Navy, cited supra, but it has long been prohibited by the Army, and has not been regarded as punishment acceptable in the Air Force during the relatively short span of that service's separate existence. In its initial form, article 15 of the bill, which proposed a Uniform Code of Military Justice, provided for a nonjudicial punishment consisting of confinement on bread and water for 5 days, without distinction between personnel ashore and those at sea. (Index and Legislative History, Uniform Code of Military Justice, HH 570.) Witnesses before the appropriate House subcommittee characterized such punishment as "cruel and barbaric," and properly "in the same category as the floggings, brandings, and tattoolngs which are specifically prohibited by article 55." It was further branded as "a barbarous relic of earlier days." (Id., HH 643, 649.) In response to this opposition, yet taking account of the reasonable argument of the Navy to the effect that confinement on bread and water was one of the few effective punishments available for imposition aboard ship, the House amended the bill to permit nonjudicial punishment of this character for no more than 5 days, applicable only to persons "attached to or embarked in a vessel"—thereby excluding such punishment as to shore-based personnel. (Id., CR 3.) The House refused to raise the applicable time limit to 7 days. (Ibid.) When the bill reached the Senate, that body approved the restriction imposed by the House, which limited bread and water confinement to those "attached to or embarked in a vessel," and thereafter went on to reduce the maximum period for which such punishment might be imposed from 5 days to 3—on the ground that even the 5-day limitation was "excessive." (Id., CR 4.) At a hearing before a Senate subcommittee, confinement on bread and water received specific attention. Senator KEFAUVER is reported to have said, "I do not like this bread and water." (Id., SH 326.) Professor E. M. Morgan, Jr., chairman of the committee which drafted the bill replied, "We landlubbers said it was cruel and unusual punishment, and it ought to be taken away." To this Senator KEFAUVER responded: "Well, it is something you ought to be able to scream about." (Id., SH 327.)

Of course, in a technical sense, the preceding material relates only to nonjudicial punishment under article 15. However, the congressional concern over bread-and-water confinement was not at all directed against the source of the action, but rather was aimed at the very nature of the punishment itself. We would think it anomalous indeed if Congress, after expressing the gravest doubt in the matter, when considered in connection with article 15, were to be deemed to have given free rein to the Chief Executive to authorize Navy courts-martial to impose bread-and-water confinement within its grant of power to him to establish the maximum limits of sentence. Uniform code (supra, art. 56, 50 U. S. C., sec. 637). We cannot and do not believe that this was the congressional intent. However, the question remains whether Congress has manifested a contrary intent in the code—for that body must not be taken to legislate by inference. (See arts. 18, 19, and 20 of the code, supra.) We conceive this contrary intent to be evident in the language of article 55 of the code, prohibiting cruel and unusual punishments. Although we do not believe that the proscription against punishments of this nature contained in the Constitution's eighth amendment—if applicable—would bar the punishment adjudged here, it is to be noted that the amendment does not necessarily define the limits of "cruel and unusual," as used by Congress in article 55. Use of the phrase by Congress, therefore, raises a problem of legislative rather than constitutional construction. Certainly Congress intended to confer as much protection as that afforded by the eighth amendment. Additionally—at least to the extent of including the punishment involved here—we believe it intended to grant protection covering even wider limits. Accordingly, we think article 55 quite broad enough to bar confinement on bread and water, except to the extent permitted by article 15, and—subject to the latter qualification—outside the grant of authority of article 56.

There is—as we see it—no inherent and irreconcilable conflict between article 55, as we have interpreted it, on the one hand, and article 15, on the other. Whether certain punishments are of such a nature as to be barred by article 55 must, in many instances, become a question of degree. For example, there is nothing necessarily and basically intolerable about confinement on bread and water at sea for a single day. Yet the same punishment adjudged for execution over a period of 6 months would constitute a quite different matter. A dividing line certainly exists at some point between these two extremes. In article 15, Congress sought to draw this line at 3 days, an eminently reasonable and sensible limit. Whether, in the last analysis, logical reason exists for the distinction between land-based personnel and those at sea in this particular, we need not decide. Congress has prohibited the punishment only in the instance of the former, and it is our duty to apply the expression of its will. It cannot be gainsaid, however, that shipboard personnel problems differ sharply, and in many particulars, from those encountered ashore. Certainly a much wider variety of minor punitive action is

[1] 2-53-S-811.

available in the latter situation. We have no disposition whatever to suggest that a wholly sound and justifiable basis for the differentiation effected is not present.

In the interest of clarity, a summary of our views is perhaps required. They are simply these: (1) No court-martial—Navy or otherwise—may adjudge confinement on bread and water for personnel other than those "attached to or embarked in a vessel," but (2) a court-martial of any service may impose confinement on bread and water in cases involving personnel "attached to or embarked in a vessel," for a "period not to exceed 3 consecutive days." To the extent to which paragraphs 125 and 127c of the manual are in conflict with this construction of the Code, they are without sanction of law and must fail (*United States* v. *Clark*, supra).

III

We must turn now to the first question posed, namely, whether a Navy court-martial may impose as punishment confinement on bread and water in a case in which it has also adjudged a punitive discharge. In this respect, paragraph 127c of the manual is unequivocal. It provides that the enumerated equivalent punishments, including confinement on bread and water, may be substituted, on the basis there indicated, for the punishments listed in the Table of Maximum Punishments, "Unless dishonorable or bad conduct discharge is adjudged." This qualification in no way conflicts with the code. Hence, the only possible construction is the obvious and literal one: that where a punitive discharge is imposed, the court may not additionally sentence the accused to confinement on bread and water—even though the latter course may otherwise be open to it under the view we have taken earlier in this opinion.

IV

In accordance with the foregoing, each of the three questions certified by The Judge Advocate General, United States Navy, is answered in the negative. Because the accused in this case was not "attached to or embarked in a vessel," the sentence adjudged by the court-martial, insofar as it imposed confinement on bread and water, was illegal and void. This being so, the imposition of a bad-conduct discharge did not contravene the proscription of paragraph 127c of the manual, relating to equivalent punishments, and was not illegal. Therefore, the punitive discharge may be restored by the board of review, for it erred in setting it aside for the reason assigned. The action of the convening authority in suspending and thereafter providing for automatic remission of the discharge may, of course, remain outstanding and effective. The instant case, we should observe, is quite unlike *United States* v. *Flood*,—U. S. C. M. A.—, decided December 31, 1951. Here, the bread and water confinement aspect of the sentence was void in toto. Striking it thus leaves the punitive discharge effective in an entirely legal sentence, and certainly places the accused in no worse position than when the sentence left the court-martial.

The record is remanded to The Judge Advocate General, United States Navy, for further consideration by the board of review in light of, and consistent with, the views expressed in this opinion.

Chief Judge Quinn and Judge Latimer concur.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Maine has been speaking about bread and water furnished for the diet of naval prisoners. That is what we get in the Senate restaurant every day. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I desire to refer to a different subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

EXERCISE OF JURISDICTION BY FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION OVER SALE OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, at this time I desire to call to the attention of the Senate a judicial decision of great importance. On Friday last the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit decided that the Federal Power Commission must exercise jurisdiction over the sale of natural gas to transmission companies for the purpose of resale ultimately to consumers. This includes, of course, the fixing of the rates at which these sales are made.

While this decision will quite certainly be appealed to the Supreme Court, it nevertheless represents a significant step in the right direction—that is, back to the intention of Congress that the rights and interests of the consumer public be protected by those agencies regulating our public utilities. It is a step in the direction of righting the great wrong perpetrated by the Federal Power Commission when it ran out on its responsibility to the general public in the infamous Phillips case. And, finally, this decision represents a vindication of the judgment of an outstanding former member of the Federal Power Commission, Thomas C. Buchanan, who wrote a memorable dissent from the opinion of his colleagues in the Phillips case.

When the Natural Gas Act was passed by the 75th Congress, the clear intention was to fill in the regulatory gap which existed as a result of Supreme Court decisions which prohibited the States from acting in areas of interstate commerce even in the absence of congressional action. Congress recognized in the act the public interest nature of the transportation of natural gas. It decided that so-called wholesale sales of gas, for example, sales by producing companies to distributing companies, were far too important to be left unregulated. When the Commission refused to accept jurisdiction over this part of the process of natural-gas transportation, it abandoned the consuming public to the not-so-tender mercies of monopolistic pricing practices.

The story of natural-gas prices since World War II is an impressive demonstration of this. Prior to the war, natural gas was sold freely at 2 cents a thousand cubic feet. Today, the average price runs from 6 to 10 cents a thousand cubic feet. And during the past year or so, many contracts have been written at a rate of 15 cents, with a few in recent months at 20 cents a thousand cubic feet. I cannot believe that costs of production have risen to such a degree as to justify these radically increased prices.

Nevertheless, this is what tends to happen when public utility regulation is allowed to break down. The whole purpose of this regulation is to help the public protect itself when the protective features of a competitive pricing system are absent. Under conditions of virtual monopoly, and in an industry on which the general public depends for essential services, the Government has no alternative but to place its restraining hand on the excesses of private management. This is no radical doctrine. It is simply the time-tested wisdom behind the theory of public utility regulation.

Regardless of what happens to the Phillips case, if and when it reaches the Supreme Court, this decision of the Court of Appeals will have served a valuable purpose if it only brings about a greater consideration of the responsibilities involved in public-utility regulation. I commend to my colleagues in the Senate this decision. And I suggest to the members of the several independent agencies of the Federal Government who have ratemaking responsibilities, that an intense study of the decision, together with the dissenting opinion of Commissioner Buchanan, when the case was before the Federal Power Commission, would be fruitful of an increased awareness of the public's interest in such matters. I should think, however, that a sound understanding of the public interest involved in cases coming before these agencies should be a prerequisite for membership on them, and should be so considered by the appointive power. I need not emphasize that this has not always been so.

The issue involved here, Mr. President, is a basic one—not only to natural-gas regulation but to all public utility regulation. As Commissioner Buchanan observed in his dissenting opinion, "Apparently the majority believes no limit should be imposed on profits arising from the production and interstate sale of natural gas. Should this philosophy prevail, regulation by the Federal Power Commission of the natural gas industry would become a futile effort and should logically be abandoned."

At the same time, Commissioner Buchanan added this very pertinent excerpt from the Supreme Court's decision in the landmark decision in the Hope Natural Gas Co. case. The Court said, in respect of contentions by the State of West Virginia that reduced rates would hurt the value of producing properties situated in that State, as follows:

> We cannot find in the words of the act or in its history the slightest intimation or suggestion that the exploitation of consumers by private operators through the maintenance of high rates should be allowed to continue provided the producing States obtain indirect benefits from it (p. 612).
>
> • • • • •
>
> We do not mean to suggest that Congress was unmindful of the interests of the producing States in their natural gas supplies when it drafted the Natural Gas Act. • • • But it left the protection of those interests to measures other than the maintenance of high rates to private companies. If the Commission is to be compelled to let the stockholders of natural gas companies have a feast so that the producing States may receive crumbs from that table, the present Act must be redesigned. Such a project raises questions of policy which go beyond our province (pp. 612, 613–614).

Mr. President, I do not believe it would be sound policy for the Congress to so redesign the Natural Gas Act. We are

much more interested in doing justice both to consumers and producers of natural gas. For that reason, I hail this decision of the circuit court of appeals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this decision, together with the dissenting opinion of Judge Clark, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the decision and the dissenting opinion were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 11247: *State of Wisconsin and Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, petitioners, v. Federal Power Commission, respondent,* Phillips Petroleum Co., intervenor;[1] State of New Mexico and the Oil Conservation Commission of the State of New Mexico, intervenors;[1] Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, intervenor;[1] State of Texas, through the Railroad Commission of Texas, intervenor.[1]

No. 11241: *City of Detroit, Michigan, petitioner, v. Federal Power Commission, respondent;* Phillips Petroleum Co., et al., intervenors.

No. 11242: *City of Kansas City, Missouri, petitioner, v. Federal Power Commission, respondent;* Phillips Petroleum Co., et al., intervenors.

No. 11245: *City of Milwaukee, a municipal corporation, petitioner, v. Federal Power Commission, respondent;* Phillips Petroleum Co., et al., intervenors.

No. 11252: *County of Wayne, Michigan, petitioner, v. Federal Power Commission, respondent;* Phillips Petroleum Co. et al., intervenors.

ON PETITIONS FOR REVIEW OF ORDER OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

(Decided May 22, 1953)

Messrs. Stewart G. Honeck and William E. Torkelson for petitioners in No. 11247. Mr. Charles S. Rhyne also entered an appearance for petitioners in No. 11247.

Mr. Harry G. Slater submitted on the brief for petitioner in No. 11245. Mr. Charles S. Rhyne also entered an appearance for petitioner in No. 11245.

Mr. Jerome M. Joffee for petitioner in No. 11242. Messrs James H. Lee and Charles S. Rhyne also entered appearances for petitioner in No. 11242.

Mr. James H. Lee for petitioner in No. 11241. Mr. Charles S. Rhyne also entered an appearance for petitioner in No. 11241.

Mr. Charles S. Rhyne entered an appearance for petitioner in No. 11252.

Mr. Bradford Ross, General Counsel, Federal Power Commission, with whom Messrs. Bernard A. Foster, Jr., Assistant General Counsel, Federal Power Commission, and Pascal B. Frazier, Attorney, Federal Power Commission, were on the brief, for respondent.

Mr. Hugh B. Cox, with whom Messrs. Ernest W. Jennes, Burke Marshall, Rayburn L. Foster, Harry D. Turner and Warren M. Sparks were on the brief, for intervenor Phillips Petroleum Co.

Mr. J. Paull Marshall submitted on the brief for intervenor State of Texas and the Railroad Commission of Texas.

Mr. Peter N. Chumbris submitted on the brief for intervenor State of New Mexico and the Oil Conservation Commission of the State of New Mexico.

Mr. J. Paull Marshall submitted on the brief for intervenor Corporation Commission of Oklahoma.

Before Edgerton, Clark, and Prettyman, circuit judges.

[1] These intervenors were also intervenors in Nos. 11241, 11242, 11245, and 11252.

Edgerton, circuit judge: We have for review under sec. 19 (b) of the Natural Gas Act (52 Stat. 821, 15 U. S. C., secs. 717 et seq.), the question whether Phillips Petroleum Co. (Phillips) is a "natural-gas company" within the meaning of the act, so that the Federal Power Commission has authority under the act to fix the rates at which Phillips sells gas for interstate transportation and resale. The Commission's staff assured the Commission it had authority, but the Commission reached the opposite conclusion. Commissioner Buchanan dissented.

Phillips is a very large operator in the petroleum industry and a very large producer, gatherer, and processor of natural gas from wells in Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. Phillips owns and operates 9 gathering systems and 10 processing plants. Through progressively larger pipelines it gathers gas that it produces from its own wells, and other gas that it buys, at common points in or near its plants. At these plants it processes the gas to make it salable or to recover extractable products or both. Phillips then moves the gas here involved through short lines to points where Phillips sells it to Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co., Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co., Independent Natural Gas Co., El Paso Natural Gas Co., or Cities Service Gas Co.,[2] for interstate transportation and resale. Thus Phillips sells the gas after the time and beyond the place at which production and gathering are complete and after processing has intervened. For example, gas processed in one Phillips plant then flows about 240 feet through a Phillips pipeline to sales meters owned and operated by Phillips, where it is sold and delivered to Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. Gas that Phillips produces, gathers, processes, and sells and delivers to the interstate pipeline companies in Texas or New Mexico is resold, after continuous movement, for ultimate public consumption in many other States including Arizona, California, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, and Wisconsin, and also in the province of Ontario.

The Supreme Court decided in 1924 that the Constitution forbids States to regulate rates at which natural gas is sold, at points remote from the wells, "in wholesale quantities, not to consumers, but to distributing companies for resale to consumers in numerous cities and communities in different States." The sales in that case, like those in this case, were by a producer and gatherer. The Court said: "the sale and delivery here is an inseparable part of a transaction in interstate commerce—not local but essentially national in character. * * * The contention that, in the public interest, the business is one requiring regulation, need not be challenged. But Congress thus far has not seen fit to regulate it, and its silence, where it has the sole power to speak, is equivalent to a declaration that that particular commerce shall be free from regulation." *Missouri v. Kansas Natural Gas Co.* (265 U. S. 298, 309, 308 (1924).)[3]

Some years later Congress decided that that particular commerce should no longer be free from regulation and therefore passed the Natural Gas Act of 1938. The act begins with a declaration in section 1 (a) "that the business of transporting and selling natural gas for ultimate distribution to the public is affected with a public interest, and that Federal regulation in matters relating to the transportation of natural gas and the sale thereof in interstate and foreign commerce is necessary in the public interest."[4] The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce said in its report on the bill: "sales for resale, or so-called wholesale sales, in interstate commerce (for example, sales by producing companies to distributing companies * * * have been considered to be not local in character and, even in the absence of Congressional action, not subject to State regulation. (See *Missouri v. Kansas Gas Co.*, ((1924), 265 U. S. 298), and *Public Utilities Commission v. Attleboro Steam & Electric Co.* ((1927), 273 U. S. 83).) The basic purpose of the present legislation is to occupy the field in which the Supreme Court has held that the States may not act."[5]

In accordance with this basic purpose the Natural Gas Act provides in section 1 (b) that it "shall apply to the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, to the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale for ultimate public consumption for domestic, commercial, industrial, or any other use, and to natural-gas companies engaged in such transportation or sale, but shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution or to the production or gathering of natural gas."[6] Section 2 (6) provides that "'Natural-gas company' means a person engaged in the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, or the sale in interstate commerce of such gas for resale."[7] Section 5 (a) authorizes the Commission to regulate interstate sales rates of natural-gas companies.[8]

Accordingly the Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld the Commission's authority under the Natural Gas Act to regulate the rates at which a producer and gatherer of natural gas sells it, after producing and gathering it, to pipeline companies for resale in other States. One such case is *Colorado Interstate Gas Co. v. Federal Power Commission* (324 U. S. 581 (1945)). In that case the company called "Canadian" was a producer and gatherer. It produced from its own properties all the gas it sold. The Commission adopted a rate base, etc., that included Canadian's production and gathering properties as well as its interstate transmission system. Canadian contended "that contrary to the mandate of section 1 (b) the Commission has undertaken to regulate the production and gathering of natural gas" (324 U. S. at 597). It pointed out that Senator Wheeler, who sponsored the legislation in the Senate, said during the debate: "It does not attempt to regulate the producers of natural gas or the distributors of natural gas; only those who sell it wholesale in interstate commerce" (324 U. S. at 600). But the Supreme Court said: "A natural-gas company as defined in section 2 (6) of the act is 'a person engaged in the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, or the sale in interstate commerce of such gas for resale.' Canadian is such a company. It is plain therefore that the Commission has authority to fix its interstate wholesale rates. * * * That does not mean that the part of section 1 (b) which provides that the act shall not apply 'to the production or gathering of natural gas' is given no meaning. Certainly that provision precludes the Commission from any control over the activity of producing

[2] Slight variations with respect to sales to Cities Service Gas Co. are not material.

[3] In that case most of the gas was sold after it crossed State lines, whereas in this case it is sold before it crosses a State line, but as appears later this difference is immaterial. The electricity involved in *Public Utilities Commission v. Attleboro Steam & Electric Co.* (273 U. S. 83 (1927)), was sold at a State line. Both those cases, which denied State power to regulate, were decided before the Natural Gas Act was passed.

[4] 52 Stat. 821, 15 U. S. C., sec. 717 (a).

[5] H. Rept. 709, 75th Cong., 1st sess., April 28, 1937; quoted in *Illinois Natural Gas Co. v. Central Illinois Public Service Commission* (314 U. S. 498, 506–507, n. 1).

[6] 52 Stat. 821, 15 U. S. C. sec. 717 (b).

[7] 52 Stat. 821, 15 U. S. C. sec. 717a (6).

[8] 52 Stat. 822, 15 U. S. C. sec. 717d.

or gathering natural gas. For example, it makes plain that the Commission has no control over the drilling and spacing of wells and the like" (334 U. S. at 600–601, 602–603).

In *Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (331 U. S. 682 (1947)), the Court again upheld the Commission's regulation of the rates at which a producer and gatherer of natural gas sold it to pipeline companies for resale in other States. The Court said: "In a series of decisions announced prior to the passage of the act, this Court had held that, although Congress had not acted, the regulation of wholesale rates of gas and electrical energy moving in interstate commerce is beyond the constitutional powers of the States. * * * As was stated in the House committee report, the 'basic purpose' of Congress in passing the Natural Gas Act was 'to occupy this field in which the Supreme Court has held that the States may not act.' In denying the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction to regulate the production or gathering of natural gas, it was not the purpose of Congress to free companies such as petitioner from effective public control. The purpose of that restriction was, rather, to preserve in the States powers of regulation in areas in which the States are constitutionally competent to act. Thus the House committee report states: 'The bill takes no authority from State commissions, and is so drawn as to complement and in no manner usurp State regulatory authority.' Clearly, among the powers thus reserved to the States is the power to regulate the physical production and gathering of natural gas in the interests of conservation or of any other consideration of legitimate local concern. It was the intention of Congress to give the States full freedom in these matters" (331 U. S. at 689–690).

In the Interstate Natural Gas case the Supreme Court found the Commission's rate regulation not within the intent of the production or gathering exemption because not inconsistent with exercise by the State of its regulatory functions. This made it unnecessary for the Court to decide whether the gathering process continued to the point of sale although it observed that by the time the sales are consummated, nothing further in the gathering process remains to be done (331 U. S. at 602). But in the decision that the Supreme Court affirmed, the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, following the Colorado Interstate case supra (referred to as the Canadian River Gas case), expressly rejected Interstate's attempt to read the exception with respect to production or gathering as an exception with respect to sales (*Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (156 F. 2d 949, 951)). And as the fifth circuit said, "In *Peoples Natural Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (75 U. S. App. D. C. 235, 127 F. 2d 153), the court found that a sale in Pennsylvania to an interstate pipeline company which immediately transported it to New York was a sale of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale, and, so finding, held that the provision that the act did not apply to production or gathering did not limit the Commission's jurisdiction over such sales" (156 F. 2d at 951–952).[9]

The Commission finds that the sales involved here are sales in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale. That finding is not disputed. It follows that no State can regulate these sales. It was plain long before the Natural Gas Act was passed that "State regulatory power could not reach high-pressure trunklines and sales for resale. This was the 'gap' which Congress intended to close."[10] *Federal Power Commission* v. *East Ohio Gas Co.* (338 U. S. 464, 472–473 (1950)). As we have shown, the Supreme Court has determined that Congress closed it.[11] The Commission now holds in effect that Congress failed to close it.

The Commission finds that Phillips' transportation in interstate commerce and its sales in interstate commerce, together with its processing operations, "all constitute a part of its gathering business, or they are incidents of or activities related to such business, so that such movement, processing, and sales come within the exemption of production and gathering in section 1 (b) of the act."[12]

The premise does not support the conclusion. The Supreme Court said in the Interstate Natural Gas case: "Where sales, though technically consummated in interstate commerce, are made during the course of production and gathering and are so closely connected with the local incidents of that process as to render rate regulation by the Federal Power Commission inconsistent or a substantial interference with the exercise by the State of its regulatory functions, the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission does not attach."[13] By replacing the Supreme Court's "and" with "or" the Commission reverses the sense.

The Commission's finding expresses a belief that even if Phillips' interstate sales of gathered and processed gas are not part of its gathering business or even incidents of * * * such business, they are nevertheless within the exemption of production and gathering in section 1 (b) of the act if they are closely related to such business. If this were law neither the Interstate Natural Gas case nor the Colorado Interstate Gas case could have been decided as it was. For the sales of a producer and gatherer are necessarily and closely related to production and gathering. It does not follow that his bulk interstate sales are exempt from regulation under the Natural Gas Act. The cases we have cited, and section 1 (b) of the act itself, show that such sales are not exempt. Section 1 (b) says the act shall apply to the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, to the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale * * * and to natural-gas companies engaged in such transportation or sale. It proceeds to exempt both local distribution and production or gathering, but it exempts nothing between production or gathering and local distribution. The exemption of production or gathering does not exempt sales made after production and gathering have been completed.[14]

Phillips urges that the Commission's findings are supported by substantial evidence and should therefore be sustained. But the validity or invalidity of the Commission's conclusion that Phillips is not a "natural-gas company" does not turn upon the evaluation of testimony or upon any facts peculiar to this case. It turns upon the generic question whether the exemption of "production or gathering" in section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act covers interstate sales of gas by the cooperation that produced and gathered it. We think the act and the decisions of the Supreme Court permit only one answer. We think the Commission has applied an erroneous rule of law. Phillips' sales to the pipeline companies are not within either the statutory phrase "the production or gathering of natural gas" or the Supreme Court's paraphrase "made during the course of production and gathering." Therefore Phillips is a "natural-gas company" within the meaning of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission should fix the rates at which these sales are made.[15]

Reversed.

Clark, circuit judge, dissenting: I am able to agree neither with the reasoning of the majority nor with its conclusions. In my opinion, the Federal Power Commission had no jurisdiction over Phillips and no power to fix the rates at which Phillips sells gas to pipeline or transportation companies, and the order of the Commission therefore should be sustained. The Commission has claimed authority in so many cases in which it did not have a shadow of a claim, that it ought to be encouraged in its latest effort to stick strictly within its jurisdiction.

The answer to the question whether Phillips is a "natural gas company" within the meaning of the Natural Gas Act and as such subject to regulation thereunder depends, insofar as this controversy is concerned, solely and exclusively upon the answer to the preliminary question whether Phillips' activities are encompassed within the concepts of "production" or "gathering." If they are, then Phillips cannot be regulated

---

[9] The brief filed here for the Peoples Natural Gas Co. raised the production and gathering contention. We rejected it without mentioning it.

[10] Since Phillips' sales are made after the gas has been gathered into trunklines *Cities Service Co.* v. *Peerless Oil & Gas Co.* (340 U. S. 179 (1950)), is irrelevant. That case upholds a State's power, in aid of conservation, to fix minimum prices for natural gas sold at the wellhead for interstate movement. Such sales are obviously made during the "production and gathering" which Congress reserved to State control, and it "is now well settled that a State may regulate matters of local concern over which Federal authority has not been exercised, even though the regulation has some impact on interstate commerce" (340 U. S. at 186). Moreover the Supreme Court has said: "prior constitutional decisions, not what we have since decided or would decide today, form the measure of the gap which Congress intended to close by this act." *Federal Power Commission* v. *East Ohio Gas Co.* (338 U. S. 464, 472 (1950)).

[11] Again on April 7, 1953, the Court said: "Especially in the litigation arising under the Gas Act has this Court expressed the view that the limitations established on Commission jurisdiction therein were designed to coordinate precisely with those constitutionally imposed on the States." *United States* v. *Public Utilities Commission of California* (345 U. S. 295, 311).

[12] The quotation is from the Commission's finding (2), 1 of the 3 numbered findings at the end of its opinion. In the course of its opinion the Commission says: "Though technically consummated in interstate commerce, these sales are made 'during the course of production and gathering.' And we expressly find that they are so closely connected with the local incidents of that process as to render rate regulation by this Commission inconsistent or a substantial interference with the exercise by the affected States of their regulatory functions." As appears later, we think the description of these sales in the first of these sentences unsupportable and that this makes the finding in the second sentence immaterial. We do not imply that we think the finding supportable. On the contrary, as the Supreme Court has held, Federal protection of consumers against exorbitant rates is not inconsistent with the exercise by the producing State of its regulatory functions (*Interstate Natural Gas* case, *supra*).

[13] The Court added: "But such conflict must be clearly shown. Exceptions to the primary grant of jurisdiction in the section are to be strictly construed" (331 U. S. at 690–691).

[14] *Federal Power Commission* v. *Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.* (337 U. S. 498), on which the Commission relies, does not touch the point. It holds that transfers of leases intended for use in production are within the exemption.

[15] The Commission expressly recognizes that its decision to the contrary is subject to review.

by the Commission, for section 1 (b) plainly and unequivocally states that "this act * * * shall not apply * * * to the production or gathering of natural gas." Manifestly, then, the problem as to whether Phillips' sales are a part of the production or gathering process goes to the very crux of the issue before us and determines the outcome of this litigation. Consequently I find it impossible to go along with my brethren of the majority, who, at the very outset of their opinion, simply assume that "Phillips sells this gas after the time and beyond the place at which production and gathering are complete" and then go on to build on that assumption of the answer elaborate and imposing arguments leading quite naturally to the final conclusion that Phillips' sales are indeed without the gathering exemption of section (b). It is perhaps noteworthy that the Court's assumption flies directly in the face of a diametrically contrary administrative determination, arrived at by the Commission after it had heard testimony and read exhibits filling close to 10,000 pages of the record.

I do not disagree with the view that the extent and scope of the production or gathering exemption must be determined by reference to the statute and to familiar principles of statutory construction. In other words, the meaning of the word "gathering" is a question of law, not of fact, and therefore not dependent upon or controlled by the factual findings of the Commission, irrespective of the quantity and quality of evidence cited in support thereof. But once the scope of the exemption is established as a matter of law—and I believe the only reasonable construction of the statute and of the decisions is that sales may be included in the gathering exemption—then the Commission has the power to find and determine whether the particular operations of a particular company fit within or without the niche carved out for the exemption. Such findings should not be overturned if supported by substantial evidence;[16] they certainly may not simply be disregarded.

The natural gas business in this country consists of three main operations, separate and distinct in character and economic purpose, and usually performed by separate and distinct business units: (1) production and gathering of natural gas, carried on by independent producers and gatherers, such as Phillips; (2) transportation of gas, performed by pipe line companies; and (3) distribution of gas to the ultimate consumers, carried on by local distributing companies.[17] But this separation of functions is not and cannot be absolute. For example, some transportation is involved in both the production and the distribution phases. Similarly, all three phases culminate in sales, for the sale is expected and necessary economic reward for the service performed. It is a trite but true observation that, as Judge Waller said in his dissent in the *Interstate* case: "There can be no sustained production unless the gas can be collected and carried to market." (*Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *F. P. C.* (156 F. 2d 949, 953) (5th Cir. 1949)). Nothing could be more absurd than to say that production and gathering are exempt but that the final sale by the producer and gatherer is subject to the act.[18] That line of reasoning reduces the exemption to a hollow shell without content or meaning. In my view, the sale is as much part and parcel of the service performed as the labor or the tools which create that service, or the leases by which gas reserves may be transferred from one company to another.[19] Only the transportation phase of the natural gas business is covered by section 1 (b) and I read that to mean that the jurisdiction of the Commission extends only (1) to sales made during the transportation phase proper and (2) to sales by companies engaged in the business of transporting natural gas. On the other hand, sales made during or at the culmination of gathering and those which are a part of distribution are exempt from regulations by the negative language of section 1 (b). That interpretation of the meaning of the statute is strengthened by the additional safeguarding that the act should not apply "to any other transportation or sale of natural gas" except to what in effect is the transportation phase of the natural gas business.

The majority attempts to justify its conclusions with the argument that the legislative history shows that this statute was enacted in order to close the gap between Federal and State regulation and that the Commission order illustrates that purpose. But it is by no means clear that there was a gap where the majority thinks it was. The cases cited by the House committee in House Report No. 709, 75th Congress, 1st session, in support of the statement that the statute was designed to occupy a field in which the Supreme Court had held that the States cannot act (the famous gap), these cases dealt with sales after transportation in interstate commerce and were related to transportation and distribution, not to transportation and gathering.[20] Even more, the existence of a gap presupposes that the States have no power to regulate activities of the type in which Phillips was engaged. But not only is that field not preempted by the commerce clause,[21] for, as the Supreme Court said at page 186 in the Cities Service case:[22] "It is now well settled that a State may regulate matters of local concern over which Federal authority has not been exercised, even though the regulation has some impact in interstate commerce," and at page 187, "Nor should we lightly translate the quiescence of Federal power into an affirmation that the national interest lies in complete freedom from regulation," but by section 1 (b) the Congress specifically reaffirmed the power of the States to deal with this problem if the existence of such power had previously been in doubt. *Panhandle* v. *Public Service Comm. of Indiana* (332 U. S. 507, 517, 519, 68 S. Ct. 190 (1947)).

Since the majority opinion leans so heavily upon the *Interstate* decision,[23] it may perhaps be well to compare that case with the instant one in order to determine whether *Interstate* really is controlling here. There, the Commission found and determined, and pointed out to the courts, that the sales were made after the gathering process had been completed and after there had been some transportation in a pipeline transmission system.[24] Here, the Commission made a contrary finding. There, the State of Louisiana never opposed Federal jurisdiction;[25] here, the States involved very vigorously objected to Commission jurisdiction because, they asserted, such regulation would interfere with State regulation or State conservation policies.[26] That conflict clearly brings into play the exception contemplated in the *Interstate* opinion.[27] And finally, there, the Supreme Court based its decision not upon the reasoning supporting the opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit—which is the reasoning again relied on here—that the sales were outside of the gathering process, but it expressly declined to support its ruling on that ground when it said that it found it unnecessary to resolve the issues of whether the sales were made from the transmission or the gathering lines. Quite the contrary. The court flatly stated: "By the time the sales are consummated, nothing further in the gathering process remains to be done" (331 U. S. at p. 692). That statement can mean only that the court recognized that Interstate's sales were a part of the gathering process, which is precisely what the majority of this court flatly rejects in the instant case, even though the facts here even more strongly than there suggest sales from gathering lines.

As I see it, Phillips' sales were a part of gathering and exempt from regulation as such. I need not, therefore, discuss at length the problem whether they might be outside the regulatory coverage of the statute if they were not a part of the gathering process but merely related or incident to the production or gathering business. Suffice it to say that I cannot agree with the fine-spun reasoning of the majority which purports to find an "and" where the Commission found an "or." While the Interstate case, as the majority correctly points out, refers to sales made during the course of gathering and closely connected with the local incidents of that process, the Panhandle decision, a later

---

[16] Cf. *Cardillo* v. *Liberty Mutual* (330 U. S. 469, 67 S. Ct. 801 (1947)).

[17] Traditionally, the first and third stages are local or Statewide in character, and only the second stage is an interstate business.

[18] The Supreme Court in Interstate, note 8, infra, very pointedly refused to sustain a fifth circuit ruling which held just that; and it said in *F. P. C.* v. *Panhandle Eastern* (337 U. S. 498, 506, 69 S. Ct. 1251 (1949)), that *Colorado* v. *F. P. C.* (324 U. S. 581, 65 S. Ct. 829 (1945)), was "not a precedent for regulation of any part of production or marketing." Marketing of course includes selling.

[19] *F. P. C.* v. *Panhandle Eastern*, *supra*, note 3.

[20] See *Missouri* v. *Kansas Gas Co.* (265 U. S. 298, 44 S. Ct. 544 (1924)); *P. U. C. of Rhode Island* v. *Attleboro Steam* (273 U. S. 83, 47 S. Ct. 294 (1927)).

[21] *Cooley* v. *Board of Wardens* (12 How. 299 (1851)).

[22] *Cities Service Gas Co.* v. *Peerless Oil & Gas Co.* (340 U. S. 179, 186, 71 S. Ct. 215 (1950)).

[23] *Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *F. P. C.* (331 U. S. 682, 67 S. Ct. 1482 (1947)).

[24] Brief filed by the Commission in the Supreme Court, at pp. 29 to 33.

[25] As a matter of fact, the Interstate Gas Co. had successfully prevented State regulation with the assertion that its sales were interstate in character. (*Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *Louisiana P. U. C.* (33 F. Supp. 50 (E. D. La. 1940)); *Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *Louisiana P. U. C.* (34 F. Supp. 980 (E. D. La. 1940).)

[26] The Supreme Court has made it clear that the Natural Gas Act was not to encroach upon the jurisdiction of the States and their legitimate conservation policies. (*F. P. C.* - *Panhandle Eastern* (337 U. S. 498, 509-513, 69 S. Ct. 1251 (1949)).)

[27] The Supreme Court said, at p. 691: "There is nothing in the record to indicate that the regulation in question is in any way inconsistent with the exercise by Louisiana of the powers over production and gathering of natural gas reserved to it by Congress in sec. 1 (b) of the act. * * * The record is devoid of any suggestion that Louisiana has ever opposed the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission in this case or has ever urged that Federal regulation of the sales in question would interfere with the exercise by the State of its regulatory functions. We do not suggest that the jurisdiction of the Commission in any case is to be determined by the resistance or lack of resistance on the part of the State to Federal regulation. But * * * we regard it a matter of some significance that * * * there is no evidence of any conflict * * * in the performing of those functions by the State with the exercise of the jurisdiction of the Federal Commission." A glance at the briefs submitted by the intervenor States will reveal the obvious fact that, at least as to that point, the cases bear no resemblance.

case, at least intimated that the "or" interpretation is not so farfetched.[*] Also, any interpretation other than that suggested by the Panhandle case is unreasonable and illogical, for the act can hardly be read to require that sales, to be exempt, be not only made during gathering but be also related thereto. Only the first half of the clause is listed in section 1 (b). If that clause is to be extended by interpretation, it might more logically be extended by reading "or related to gathering" into it than by adding a brand-new requirement by an "and" clause which cannot be found anywhere in the act.

But that issue need not be decided. To me, it seems inescapable under the statute, under the decisions, and in the name of plain economic common sense, that sales by a gatherer are a part of gtahering so long as they are made before the gas enters the transmission lines proper. It is the function of the Commission to determine whether, in fact, the gas is sold before or after that point. A finding was made by the Commission in this case that the gas was sold while it was still in the gathering lines and that finding seems unassailable either in fact or under the law as I interpret it.

The petition for review should be denied.

REFINANCING PROGRAM OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, last week the Secretary of the Treasury announced a new giveaway program. He announced that about $5 billion of 1-year Treasury certificates which had previously borne an interest rate of 1⅞ percent would be exchanged for new 1-year certificates bearing an interest rate of 2⅝ percent. This is an increase of three-fourths of 1 percent.

The direct cost to the taxpayers of this new "bankers' bonus" will be about $42 million a year. The cost to private borrowers will be much greater—for the effect of this new refinancing will be to boost still higher the interest rates charged to farmers, businessmen, home buyers, and State and city governments.

COUNTRY BANKERS DO NOT BENEFIT

Mr. President, it is becoming increasingly apparent that one of the purposes of the new high-interest policy is to increase the already high profits of certain large banking institutions.

But it is too seldom realized that many small bankers, particularly the small country bankers throughout the country, strongly disagree with this policy.

This fact was brought very forcibly to my attention a few weeks ago when I received a letter from a country banker. His letter read as follows:

> We do not agree with you in issuing 3¼-percent Government bonds maturing in 30 years. Nor do we agree with your policy in withdrawing support of any Government bonds below par.
>
> We believe our 60 million taxpayers, including the country bankers, will lose faith in you when they realize it's going to cost them more money for both of these policies.
>
> Support the Government bonds at par and you will be able to borrow at 2 percent or less on an annual basis. It will also create confidence in the new administration.

I hastened to assure my correspondent that I agree wholeheartedly with his position. I asked him whether other country bankers felt the same way he did.

He responded as follows:

> I have spoken to many country bankers in Suffolk County about higher interest rates on Government bonds, and none approve same at this time. Likewise all agree that Government bonds should be supported at par for the present.

Mr. President, if so many country bankers oppose the high-interest-rate policy and support the position taken by myself and other Senators on the necessity of supporting Government bonds at par, why is it that we do not hear more about their views? Why is it that we hear only the voices of the big eastern banks who oppose the support of Government bonds at par and who are engaged in a rentless crusade for still higher interest rates?

The answer to this is also found in the letter from my correspondent, who writes:

> I am sure you understand that it is impossible to get a group or organization to go on record opposing any plans of the new Federal administration at this time.

My correspondent also gives concrete examples of the "terrific depreciation which is going on in the 14,000 country banks to their Government bond assets." Many country banks bought Government securities on the theory that they were liquid investments and safe investments. Now that the Treasury Department has forced the prices of these securities below par, these securities can now be sold only at a loss.

The big eastern banks, of course, need not sell them. Their assets are so great that to them liquidity is no problem. But the small country banker is not in such a fortunate position. In many circumstances, he cannot help but sell, and sell at a loss.

But who is waiting outside the door to buy them up?

The answer is clear: the big eastern banks who are using the present situation as a method of making a killing.

In fact, its seems to be an avowed purpose of the Treasury Department to help the big banks make a killing of this type. This fact is documented in a letter sent by W. Randolph Burgess, the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, on April 28, 1953, to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

In an inquiry dated April 18, the Senator from Minnesota asked what the effect of falling security prices would be upon commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and life-insurance companies. Mr. Burgess replied as follows:

> A reduction in prices of existing long-term Government issues provides these institutions with opportunities to invest newly accumulated funds in these issues (through market purchases) at higher rates of return.

To obtain higher rates of return on existing Government securities, the big bankers obviously must be able to buy them in the market at a price well below par.

Conveniently enough, the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System have now forced existing Government issues very far below par.

As a result, the small banks take a licking and the big banks make a killing.

Mr. President, it is profoundly shocking that country bankers have felt so intimidated that they have failed to speak out against the disastrous policies that are being forced upon the country by the big eastern bankers. It is my sincere hope that in the not too distant future they will make their voices heard and their influence felt in an effort to call a halt to the wild and reckless interest-boosting policies which are being forced upon the country by the money managers in the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letters from which I have just quoted.

There being no objection, the letters were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> SOUTHAMPTON, N. Y., *April 15, 1953.*
>
> Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR SIR: We do not agree with you in issuing 3¼-percent Government bonds maturing in 30 years. Nor do we agree with your policy in withdrawing support of any Government bonds below par.
>
> We believe our 60 million taxpayers, including the country bankers, will lose faith in you when they realize it's going to cost them more money for both of these policies.
>
> Support the Government bonds at par and you will be able to borrow at 2 percent or less on an annual basis. It will also create confidence in the new administration.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> EDWARD R. MANNING.

> APRIL 20, 1953.
>
> Mr. EDWARD R. MANNING,
> *Southampton, N. Y.*
>
> DEAR MR. MANNING: Thank you very much for your letter of April 15. I agree wholeheartedly with your opposition to the new 3¼-percent Government bonds and the policy of withdrawing support for Government bonds. My point of view is expressed in part in the enclosed statement which was issued recently by eight other Members of the Senate and myself.
>
> I was interested in your reference to the country bankers. Many people have told me in recent months that all bankers favored higher interest rates. Is it your judgment that the country bankers are exceptions to this rule?
>
> I would also be interested in your judgment as to whether the country bankers who oppose the new interest-boosting policy have been making their views known on this subject.
>
> With best wishes.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JAMES E. MURRAY.

> MAY 20, 1953.
>
> Mr. JAMES E. MURRAY,
> *United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Thank you for your letter of April 20 in reference to our opposition to the new 3¼ percent 30-year Government bonds, also to our opposition to the withdrawing of support of Government bonds as par.
>
> I have spoken to many country bankers in Suffolk County about higher interest rates on Government bonds, and none approve

---

[*] The Court said at p. 506 of 337 U. S. Reports that various sections referred to by the Commission "do not even by implication suggest to us an extension of the regulatory provisions of the act to cover incidents connected with the production or gathering of gas," and it reiterated on p. 515, "As we have held above that the transfer of undeveloped gas leases is an activity related to the production and gathering of natural gas and beyond the coverage of the act, the authority of the Commission cannot reach the sales."

same at this time. Likewise all agree that Government bonds should be supported at par for the present.

I am sure you understand that it is impossible to get a group or organization to go on record opposing any plans of the new Federal administration at this time.

Let me give you a concrete example of the terrific depreciation that is going on in the 14,000 country banks to their Government bond assets, and their municipal bond investments since March 4, 1951. A 10-point drop in approximately $200 billion direct and indirect Government securities will cause $20 billion depreciation, and 15-point drop in approximately $200 billion municipal bonds will cause $30 billion depreciation making a total of $50 billion depreciation in these two bond investments.

This is a very serious situation. I am wondering if the FDIC, the Comptroller of the Currency and the State banking supervisors are aware of this condition.

Sorry for the delay in answering your letter which was due to illness.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. MANNING.

THE AMMUNITION SHORTAGE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, yesterday's newspapers published an interim report of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which is investigating the question of ammunition shortages in Korea. The report was submitted on Saturday.

This is a very powerful, factual, calm report which pulls no punches, but which gives credit where credit is due, and gives admonition where admonition is due. I invite the attention of Senators to it.

Mr. President, we owe at least one paramount duty to our Armed Forces in Korea, who are sacrificing and dying, namely, to provide them with all the latest type of military equipment which appropriations of Congress have heretofore made possible. This report points out the evils of procrastination in supply.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "The Munition Shortage," published in the New York Times of Monday, May 25, 1953.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MUNITION SHORTAGE

A Senate Armed Services subcommittee has now brought in its report on the question of ammunition shortages in Korea. The majority of the group sustained General Van Fleet in his charges that such shortages had, in fact, existed, and stated that because of this some American lives had been needlessly lost.

The report as such is a grim and disheartening document. Any life lost in war is a sad fact, and any life lost needlessly is doubly tragic. Mistakes will always be made so long as humans are human, but mistakes in war are paid for in lives. For that reason it is incumbent on all of us to see that such mistakes are reduced to as small a minimum as we can reach.

To this end, this investigation and report should serve a useful purpose. From the technical point of view attention has been called to serious weaknesses in the method of procurement. There has been a revelation of an excessive yardage of red tape at some points, and of duplication of effort, and frequent confusion. These are mistakes, unlike some of the fallibilities of judgment, that can be corrected now and avoided for the future.

Some of the correction is already taking place and the general situation now is declared to be substantially better than it has been at different times in the past. But considerable improvement can still be made. Some of the machinery in the field of procurement and supply is badly outdated. All of it should be overhauled and some of it should be scrapped. One of the things at fault is simple departmental inertia in large operations.

Sometimes it takes a severe jolt to get out of the inertia. The subcommittee report ought to supply that jolt. There is certainly no excuse for the type of mentality that would brush off this serious matter with the pat statement that no field commander ever thinks he has enough ammunition. The subcommittee did not find that point of view correct or adequate. It found the evidence of shortage—and of a price that was paid for it.

There is no profit in rehashing a sad past merely to create issues. There is value to be had in seeing what mistakes can be corrected and what methods changed. This report, acted upon promptly and wisely, can serve that valuable purpose.

THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF NEW ENGLAND—A PROGRAM FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

IV. REDUCTION OF ECONOMIC HARDSHIPS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to turn now to a discussion of the less positive but nevertheless important part of the program which I have been presenting concerning the economic problems of New England and other areas. I wish to discuss at this time the role of the Federal Government in exercising its efforts toward a reduction of those hardships which are caused by a recession or industry dislocation. Primarily, I am speaking of the problem of unemployment and the alleviation of hardships which unemployment brings, rather than the proposals which I have discussed elsewhere in this series relating to the prevention of unemployment and the provisions of jobs for the unemployed. However, I am discussing separately from the proposals relating to the unemployment compensation program those proposals which relate to the retirement income or financial plight of our elder citizens. I do this because the younger man who loses his job remains in the labor force as unemployed; but as clearly shown by the Galenson report on unemployment in Massachusetts, the older man, exhausting his benefits and denied employment elsewhere, and finding that it is futile to remain in the labor force, retires. The problems of inadequate benefits, low living standards, and lack of purchasing power apply equally to both. I am also including in this discussion the problem of middle-income housing, because of its importance in the financial stability of these same workers and families affected by these economic hardships, and its predominance in older areas.

UNEMPLOYMENT

I have discussed previously the loss of plants to other areas, the general slump in particular industries, the lack of economic growth, and the failure to attract new industries. All of these things have meant a tremendous loss of jobs for New England as a whole and particularly in certain communities within that region. Figures from the unemployment compensation program do not show the entire story; they do not show that 30 percent of the northern cotton-rayon mills were working 4 days or less in February 1952 and that they had lost over one-third of their man-hours of production from the figure of a year previous to that date. Between January 1951 and January 1952, textile mills employment was reduced by 13.6 percent or more than 3 times as high as the reduction of employment in textiles in 6 Southern States. During that year, unemployment increased by 150 percent in Fall River, Mass., and over 100 percent in New Bedford. In Massachusetts alone the number of employees filing for unemployment compensation benefits reached shocking proportions in the towns of Lawrence, Lowell, Fall River, New Bedford, Worcester, North Adams, Milford, and Taunton. But this problem was not confined to Massachusetts, nor to New England. Despite the broad scale improvement in employment in the major metropolitan labor markets during 1952, 35 areas are presently classified in the group IV, substantial-labor-surplus category by the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this place in my remarks in the RECORD a list of all communities classified as areas of substantial labor surplus in April 1953.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROUP IV AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS

Region I: Fall River, Mass.; Lawrence, Mass.; Lowell, Mass.; Providence, R. I.

Region II: Atlantic City, N. J.; Gloversville, N. Y.; Utica-Rome, N. Y.; Mayaguez, P. R.; San Juan, P. R.; Ponce, P. R.

Region III: Altoona, Pa.; Clearfield-Dubois, Pa.; Pottsville, Pa.; Scranton, Pa.; Sunbury-Shamokin-Mt. Carmel, Pa.; Uniontown-Connellsville, Pa.; Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Pa.

Region IV: Cumberland, Md.; Asheville, N. C.; Durham, N. C.; Winston-Salem, N. C.; Beckley, W. Va.; Fairmont, W. Va.; Martinsburg, W. Va.; Morgantown, W. Va.; Parkersburg, W. Va., Point Pleasant, W. Va.; Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.

Region V: Jasper, Ala.

Region VI: Iron Mountain, Mich.; Athens-Logan-Nelsonville, Ohio.

Region VII: Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, Ill.; Terre Haute, Ind.; Vincennes, Ind.

Region VIII: Tacoma, Wash.

Mr. KENNEDY. The sight of empty buildings and from 10,000 to 14,000 unemployed workers in a single town such as Lawrence is not a pleasant one, Mr. President; and such unemployment affects more than those workers and their families. As I have pointed out before, it affects their grocers and doctors and relatives and State government and Federal Government and eventually all of us.

This Nation has devised a measure to ease the suffering of these individuals and to prevent the total decline of their purchasing power. This is, of course, our Unemployment Compensation Program. I have already discussed certain aspects of that program and the need for legislation to provide minimum standards relating to the amount and duration of benefit payments, in connection

with the importance of equalizing nonwage payroll costs among the various States. I wish to discuss at this time the inadequacies of that program as they relate to States, communities or individuals who have been particularly hard hit by an intensive period of heavy unemployment. Whenever that program is inadequate, the individual worker lacks security on the job and an adequate means of support and purchasing power when out of work. This hurts us all.

Again, although I shall concentrate upon using the New England States as my examples, I am discussing problems which are of importance to every part of the United States. Virginia, Tennessee, and North Carolina have experienced heavy unemployment in textiles. Only a year ago, the State of Michigan was leading the fight for improving the unemployment-compensation program with respect to these particular inadequacies. Since then, the unemployment problem in Detroit and other Michigan communities has substantially lessened, but I know that the Senators from that State are no less interested in preparing for a similar emergency. No Senator knows when his State may be next.

There are two approaches to making our unemployment-compensation program more adequate to meet such emergencies: The first emphasizes the sufficiency of the State fund; the second emphasizes the sufficiency of payments to the individual worker. It is my intention to discuss, and strive for the passage of, both types of legislation, unless further study by the committees of Congress show that only one of them would be necessary.

REINSURANCE OF STATE FUNDS

With respect to the sufficiency of State funds, we all realize the burden placed upon such funds by a concentration of unemployment within such State for an extended length of time. In Lawrence, Mass., alone, for example, the annual rate of unemployment-insurance payments in July of 1952 was over $11 million. It was nearly $4 million in West Frankfort, Ill., and nearly $7 million in Scranton, Pa. Similar figures can be cited for other areas of heavy unemployment. It is obvious that such drains on the State unemployment-insurance funds can, in due time, threaten the solvency of such fund.

Unfortunately, there is now no real protection against the possible bankruptcy of an individual State program. Most of our State systems are in sound financial shape and some are well above any foreseeable needs. Several States, however, have funds which are dangerously low, despite the all-time high level of employment in the Nation. For example, the State of Rhode Island on June 30, 1952, had $20.8 million in its reserve fund, but during the preceding 12 months had paid out $21 million in benefits. Thus, Rhode Island's unemployment-benefits reserve consisted of less money than had been paid out during the previous year.

The fund of the State of Massachusetts was also in a dangerous position. It had the equivalent of 4.2 percent of taxable payrolls on June 30, 1952, while benefit payments for the previous 12 months had amounted to 1.7 percent of taxable payrolls. Thus, the Massachusetts reserve fund amounted only to about 2½ times the benefit payments during the preceding year. Alaska also had a reserve fund only about 2½ times its most recent annual benefit payments, the New Hampshire fund amounted to only slightly more than 3 times its current annual benefit payments, and New York had in its reserve fund the equivalent of about 5½ times its current annual benefit payments. A heavy period of unemployment would unquestionably threaten the solvency of such funds.

I realize that in some instances the insufficiency of the State fund is due to unsound and haphazard State policies with respect to experience rating or other methods of financing; caution should be used in the provision of any Federal reinsurance funds to make good on the financial errors of a particular State. But whenever such funds are threatened because of economic conditions causing heavy unemployment, it is proper that the Federal Government take appropriate action. If our unemployment compensation program is truly insurance, then the fact that one or more States are particularly hard hit by economic catastrophe will not threaten the existence of their programs.

What action may be taken? In 1944, Congress enacted the George amendment providing for repayable Federal loans to any State whose fund fell to a dangerously low level. The mass postwar unemployment which was expected never materialized, and no State found it necessary to seek a loan. Although extended several times, the George loan fund provision expired January 1, 1952.

It should be obvious that a Federal repayable loan fund can only hope to deal with temporary crises at most; it merely postpones emergency taxation to pay back the loan until employment rises again. For a long-term problem such as the decline in textile employment in Rhode Island, a repayable loan is not a satisfactory solution.

If a State struck by such an economic catastrophe raises its rates to safeguard its fund or repay a loan, it loses more industry to other areas where the unemployment tax is lower, and thus is faced with both dwindling income from industry taxes and mounting unemployment. It is unthinkable to expect such a State to be able to repay a loan under such circumstances or after an extended period of unemployment. The loan program does not meet the entire purpose of a federally sponsored system, that of preventing one State from being at a disadvantage in comparison with another, and it may not prevent the failure of the unemployment program in the hard-hit States.

I believe a necessary solution to this problem lies in some form of nationwide reinsurance of the State unemployment funds, as recently recommended by the Report of the New England Governors' Committee on the textile industry and many others, and for which the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. GREEN] and Representative FORAND have long fought. There are several means by which this may be done other than Federal loans, and I am not insisting at this time that one means be preferred over the other. Basically, such a reinsurance program would call for State contributions to a reinsurance reserve to be used whenever the fund of a particular State fell to a dangerously low level. Such a program would not involve additional outlays by either the Federal or State Government. Funds for the reinsurance reserve could most easily come from that three-tenths of 1 percent of State receipts which are now paid to the Federal Government for the purpose of, but not directly used for; Federal administrative expenses. There is, of course, no constitutional difficulty at this time in earmarking proceeds from unemployment taxes to be used for such a reinsurance program. An alternative source would be to require each State to contribute to such fund a fixed percentage, or one based upon the probability of its drawing upon such fund, of its own unemployment tax receipts.

Such a program need not increase Federal control of the unemployment compensation system which is primarily administered on the State level. A reinsurance fund from State contributions is not really a Federal grant. Standards of solvency, sound management, and realistic taxing policy would be established upon agreement with those States participating in the reinsurance program. Such a bill should not provide for the granting of large sums from the Federal Treasury to the States to be used for such administrative purposes or benefit payments as the States may see fit. To take that unwarranted step would neither provide the necessary safeguards for a realistic reinsurance program, nor be consistent with the need to reduce the Federal deficit. It would also undermine the minimum standards needed for a real system which protects the more progressive State systems and their more liberal plans against the backward States. Nor would such a reinsurance fund have to be very large. In 1951, the State employment security agencies collected $1.5 billion in contributions at an average contribution rate of 1.6 percent. Thus, for the country as a whole, an average reinsurance rate of one-tenth of 1 percent of taxable payrolls would have yielded about $100 million for a reinsurance fund, which would have been ample to take care of any immediate needs of States like Rhode Island or Massachusetts.

The insuring of this type of excess loss would give every State a more secure position for itself and an opportunity to avoid unbearably heavy tax charges for its industry, just as the State program pools the risks of individual industries. As pointed out in the Providence Journal-Bulletin in a series of editorials last year, reinsurance is the constructive and intelligent solution to this problem.

It is generally agreed that the expiration of the George loan fund requires immediate action on the Federal level. I am convinced that a national reinsurance program for our unemployment compensation system is a necessity if we are to safeguard the solvency of our State systems in times of economic disaster beyond their control and prevent the ter-

rible consequences which would result from the downfall of those systems.

SUPPLEMENTARY BENEFITS

The second approach to the problem of long-term unemployment and the inadequacies of our present program is through direct payments to the individual. Supplementary unemployment compensation benefits from the Federal Government, again working through the State systems, of course, may be necessary when under the emergency conditions described above, employees have exhausted their claims to benefits under the normal State laws.

Such a bill, introduced a year ago by a bipartisan group of Senators from all parts of the country, recognizes the responsibility of the Federal Government to treat fairly unemployed workers laid off as the result of mobilization conversion or other emergencies, and a desire on the part of the entire Nation to preserve the standard of living and productive skills which are otherwise dissipated under such circumstances. We have already mentioned the direct aid given by the Federal Government to business in times of mobilization through the granting of tax amortization certificates, and we know of similar aid in agriculture, transportation, and other fields. It is only just that the Federal Government provide for supplementary benefits to our human resources under such circumstances.

Again, no Federal control is involved since the activation of such a provision would require the consent or request of the State government; and by making supplementary payments from the Federal Treasury which has already been enriched by the three-tenths percent tax paid by the States, such a program prevents the burden of heavy unemployment from being placed on particular States and employers. Such a law would remove neither the responsibility, the administration of the unemployment benefits program, nor the detailed determination of its nature from the shoulders of the State where it presently rests. Nor would it be desirable to provide benefits for an unlimited period of time. This is necessarily short-term insurance.

I realize the difficulty of drafting a workable bill which will fully meet these standards; and I also realize that it is important, as a corollary with the enactment of either of these methods of safeguarding the State unemployment compensation programs in times of economic catastrophe, that the previously discussed uniform minimum standards for such State systems be enacted. But despite these difficulties, and at least until the enactment of minimum standards and reinsurance, I recognize the necessity for stopgap Federal action under such circumstances to prevent the unemployed worker from going without any benefit after he has exhausted his claim.

During the 1949–50 recession in Massachusetts, there were over 161,000 unemployment recipients who had exhausted their benefit rights—or nearly 40 percent of those who received first payments under the program. In Lawrence today—and I continue to use Lawrence as my most frequent example because the conditions there are most severe and exemplify what might well happen to other areas of the United States in time of recession—over 50 percent of those unemployed workers are without unemployment benefits. The Galenson study shows that nearly three-fourths of those who exhausted their benefits during 1949–50 remained unemployed for more than 5 weeks after benefit exhaustion, and nearly 50 percent more than 20 weeks. If nothing else, this indicates that the drain on unemployment compensation funds is not caused by malingering on any large scale, for even after their payments have stopped, these men are unable to find work to restore their income. Nor are payments high enough to adversely affect the incentive to work. Too many of such able-bodied workers are thrown on the relief rolls, thus further burdening the remaining taxpaying industries in the State. The Galenson study described the plight of such workers who have exhausted their benefits—the cashing of their savings bonds and insurance policies, the selling or mortgaging of their homes, the exhaustion of their savings, the incurring of heavy debt to their banker, grocer, or landlord, and finally their reliance upon relief.

I think it imperative that legislation be enacted by this Congress to make certain that those individuals who have exhausted their unemployment claims during a period of severe unemployment do not go without benefits from the program which this country established to provide for just such situations.

OLD AGE

Secondly, we must take action to provide a more adequate program for the elder citizens of our Nation who are particularly hard hit by unemployment and recessions. The growth in number and proportion of the aged in America's population during the 20th century has been tremendous. Since 1900, the total population in the United States has doubled, but the number of persons 65 years of age and over has quadrupled. In 1900, about 1 in 25 persons was age 65 and older; but in 1950, the proportion was about 1 in 12. This increase in the number of persons age 65 and over has been far greater than that of any other age bracket.

This growth is of particular importance to all areas of the United States and to our New England States in particular. Although the West and some parts of the South had the largest increase in population 65 and over between 1940 and 1950, the highest percent of aged persons in the population may be found in certain Midwestern and New England States. In New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine, over 10 percent of the population is 65 and older, while less than 6 percent is in this age bracket in South Carolina and North Carolina. Similar comparisons may be made with respect to other States. This increase, caused by a significant decline in the birth rate, an increased life expectancy and a decline of immigration since 1925, poses serious problems for those interested in the economic security of these older citizens. Only about one-third of these older persons derive their income as earners or wives of earners. About another third derive their income from social insurance and related programs; one-fifth from old-age assistance programs; and a much smaller percent from private insurance, private pensions, and other private means. On the whole, our elder citizens are found in the very low-income groups, without either earnings or adequate retirement incomes. In June 1952, the average annual payment to a retired worker with a wife eligible for benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program was only $840. Yet, at October 1950 price levels, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that an elderly couple in Boston, Mass., needed nearly $1,900 a year to maintain a very modest budget.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Because in our modern society a combination of several social and economic factors have caused a decrease in the employment opportunities for the older worker, we have devised social-security programs for the purpose of providing insurance against the economic hazards of old age. The very large proportion of unemployed textile workers in Lawrence who are over 65 years of age now need such security. But how much security is provided by a program which pays a worker on the average of $60 a month or a retiring couple $95; which excludes from its coverage many of the self-employed, domestic servants, public employees, and farm laborers; which too frequently computes an annuity on a basis which penalizes the older worker for periods of low-wage employment or employment in jobs not covered by the program; which imposes a so-called work clause of $75 a month prohibiting beneficiaries from receiving their annuity should they earn more than that small amount; which provides no benefits for those forced to retire before age 65 for reasons of disability; and which denies benefits to widows between the ages of 60 and 65 despite the obvious need for their eligibility?

I realize that all improvements in the law which might be desirable cannot be obtained free of charge; although there is disagreement as to the extent of additional benefits which might be included without a change in the methods of financing. However, the basis for computing contributions and benefits presently pegged at $300 a month maximum should be increased to $400 or possibly $500, simply as a matter of keeping the act current with present economic trends. Such an increase would permit many, if not all, of the improvements in social security most seriously needed today.

Moreover, I hope that the Congress will in the future give consideration to the possibilities of a Federal contribution as a supplementary means of financing the old-age and survivors insurance program. Such contribution, like that given to similar programs by other nations, would be more equitably based upon ability to pay than an increase in the present obviously regressive payroll tax.

I see no reason why lawyers, dentists, public employees, and other thousands of workers should be arbitrarily denied

the protection which this act is intended to provide. I see no reason why an able-bodied man age 65 or over should be faced with a $75 limitation upon his earnings as a condition for the receipt of his annuity, in this day and age when the total of both $75 a month and a social-security benefit cannot meet the cost of living. I see no reason why those retiring before age 65 because of a total and permanent disability should be denied the protection of social insurance if they are under the social-security program, although given such protection under our railroad retirement and other publicly sponsored programs. Actually, disability is more of an economic burden than old age. It adds an extra dependent who may need special care, and it comes at a time when children may not yet be grown and the responsibility for their support is greatest.

The Committee on the New England Economy stated that "liberalization of old-age insurance and programs for retaining older people in employment would help New England because her proportion of older people is large." Studies have shown that unemployment hits older workers harder than any other age group and in disproportion to their numbers. This is particularly true in our textile industry.

But I do not recommend these improvements in the program merely as a means of aiding New England. I think it is apparent that our old age and survivors insurance program is in general need of improvement. If this Nation is to meet the test of a truly moral society, it will not fail in its responsibility to its retired citizens.

Extending and improving this basic social security program is essential if we are to give adequate protection to those most often victims of economic hardships.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

In addition to liberalizing the old age and survivors insurance program, attention must be given to our old age assistance program. It is unfortunate that too many of our elder citizens find it necessary to be given payment on the basis of need—or so-called assistance or relief—rather than on the basis of a contributory insurance program, either because they are not covered by such program, or because their social-security benefits are too low.

The administration of the old-age assistance program is primarily a State responsibility. As a result, there is wide fluctuation in the average payments ranging in December 1951 from $18.68 a month in Mississippi to $70.91 in Colorado. The Nation's average was $44.54. Since then, the Congress has provided for additional funds to the States—a contribution which was not in all instances utilized to increase the welfare payments to the individual. I urge that the Congress annually review the adequacy of the system's payments and consider providing additional grants to the States for the purpose of increasing the individual allotments when this becomes necessary.

I have talked with the older people of my State and elsewhere. I know that they prefer to receive retirement pay from an insurance fund to which they have contributed rather than public assistance from any kind of means-test program. Such a program separates those who have sufficient funds from those who do not; it sets a minimum which becomes a maximum for the individual under the program. It is little in advance of the public charities of years gone by. In order to reduce the need for such an assistance program, Congress must make social insurance more effective and its coverage more widespread.

Nevertheless, until that day when the old-age assistance program can be completely ended because all older persons will be adequately protected by old-age and survivors insurance, Congress has the responsibility to see that such program provides adequate funds for the maintenance of our less fortunate aged citizens.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I notice that the Senator from Massachusetts very modestly omitted the great assistance rendered by the State of Massachusetts. When I last looked at the figures Massachusetts was one of the States in the Union which have the highest average payments.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. Massachusetts in many of these fields has pioneered and has maintained a high standard. Of course, that has been one of the problems which we have faced in attempting to compete with areas which do not have such high social-security standards.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that Massachusetts, along with the State of Oregon and, to some degree, the State of New York, really leads the country in social legislation?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. The Senator from Illinois is one who has long been an able student of our various social-security programs. I believe he would agree that one of the basic tasks now in the areas which have gone ahead is not to turn the clock back and thus lower their standards but to attempt, through legislation and through encouragement by contributions from the Federal Government, to bring about a general raising of such standards throughout the Nation.

After all, the difference between the cost of living in Mississippi and the cost of living in Massachusetts certainly is not great enough to account for the tremendous difference in payments of this type. The latter difference obviously means that the people in these States who are given extremely little assistance are really suffering and undergoing great hardships.

It is my hope that when budgetary considerations make it possible, the Federal Government will assist the other States in raising their standards, as I know they are most anxious to do.

PRIVATE PENSIONS AND EMPLOYMENT

In addition to liberalizing our social-security programs, further action must be taken with respect to other sources of income for our aged persons. It is my intention to introduce a resolution concerning, or otherwise urge a study of, two problems in particular: First, the means of coordinating private pension plans without Federal interference; and second, the means of providing tax or other incentives to employers for the employment and retention of older workers.

Private pension plans, as I have indicated earlier, have had phenomenal growth in this country. Although only approximately 3 percent of our aged persons were receiving income from that source in December 1952, the tremendous growth in the number of such plans in the last 20 years, and in particular the last 10 years, has been astounding. This has been due to a number of reasons, including collective-bargaining trends, tax treatment, and an inadequate old-age and survivors insurance program. The number of employees covered has more than tripled during that same period. But such plans, despite the necessity of meeting certain standards for tax-deduction purposes, have developed in a completely helter-skelter fashion. Coverage is haphazard and incomplete. Frequently such plans bar employment to older workers or impose compulsory retirement on a chronological age basis. Their funding and investment provisions have raised serious problems which have yet to be answered. Perhaps of most importance to the Congress and to the problem areas I have been discussing, such private pension plans either restrict the mobility of the employees involved, or fail to provide protection for those who leave the service of the particular company after a considerable period of years. It is important that Congress take cognizance of this problem of coordinating private pension plans, and before it is too late, act to meet it effectively without Federal control.

Similarly, attention should be given to the proposals of Professor Slichter and others that tax incentives be given to employers for the employment and retention of older workers. Such a program raises a host of administrative and policy problems, particularly since most employees desire to stay on past the age of 65 until forced to retire by their disability or compulsory retirement programs. But it is just the latter element, whereby even in areas and industries of labor shortage, employees are required to cease all gainful activity because they have reached a specified chronological age, that creates a serious social and economic problem in the United States. To postpone the age of retirement or bring back to work in areas of labor shortage the many able-bodied retired employees, would provide a valuable contribution to industries now badly in need of skilled manpower, reduce the need of the support of such persons from public and private sources, provide such persons with a more adequate standard of living, and enable them to achieve the status and satisfaction which they might derive from worth-while employment.

The Galenson report on unemployment compensation in Massachusetts pointed out that—

> Anything that can be done to facilitate the placement of the older worker will relieve the fund of a substantial burden.

I am hopeful that Congress will consider legislation to encourage the active employment in labor-tight markets of our older able-bodied workers.

MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

Another most important area for Federal action is in the field of housing. Although this is a problem all over the country, New England and particularly Massachusetts because of their older and more urbanized development are especially hard hit. The solution to America's housing problems includes provisions for an adequate slum clearance and urban redevelopment program; adequate public housing for those whose income denies them and their families anything but the most substandard dwelling; and provisions for the continuation of rent controls in areas where such controls are necessary to prevent a critical housing shortage. However, I wish to stress at this particular time one facet of the housing problem on which Congress has yet failed to take adequate action, namely, the problem of middle-income housing.

Those in the truly middle-income brackets are offered nothing by the public low-rent program and nothing by the various programs of Federal loans and guaranties for higher priced dwellings. In the 81st Congress I introduced a bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of moderate-income families and to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, operating through cooperatives and other types of nonprofit organizations providing housing for rental or for sale to their members. The purpose of such a program is to provide a means whereby housing of sound standard and design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life can be produced and made available for families of moderate income who cannot afford to pay the rents or prices charged for privately financed housing currently being made available in their localities. Under such a law, a National Loan Corporation for private housing cooperatives would be set up as a constituent of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, with authority to borrow on taxable bonds and to make 100-percent mortgage loans at cost to such cooperatives. Such a program might also include provisions for guaranteeing the bonds of public agencies, such as State housing agencies or universities who wish to embark upon middle-income housing programs, and aid to limited dividend corporations. Such program involves neither Government ownership, Government subsidies, nor tax exemption. It makes no provision for direct loans to individuals, other than those now covered by the veterans' program, since a general program of that type would likely be almost impossible of administration unless severe limitations are placed upon the individual's right of resale, and would, moreover, be in more direct competition with present private sources. Neither does such a program provide for insurance of housing loans, other than the provisions of the FHA which provide a minimum amount of insured loans to housing corporatives.

Today it has been said that the middle-income groups—those with incomes between $2,500 and $4,500, depending on the cost of living in their particular area—are in the twilight zone of earning too much to qualify for admission or continued occupancy in a public housing project, and too little to purchase or rent private housing, and particularly new housing. Within this group are most of the members of organized labor and a large majority of World War II and Korean veterans. They find themselves saddled with monthly payments of interest, amortization, taxes, upkeep, and utilities beyond their means. No other high-income country in the world has been as careless of its people's housing problems as has the United States. If we have been less than adequate in our low-income housing programs, we have been almost totally neglectful of our middle-income group. Their problem continues to grow. It may yet make a mockery of our high living standards if we do not take preventative measures. An adequate, middle-income housing program is necessary to supplement other programs, both public and private. The public housing program is dependent upon the provision of satisfactory housing for families in public housing projects whose incomes exceed the limits for continued occupancy. The success of the urban redevelopment program is dependent upon the development of a sound middle-income housing program. I firmly believe that such a program is also of importance to the growth and continuance of the private building industry.

The extensive use of housing cooperatives in Europe, and their successful beginning on a small scale by such groups as the Amalgamated Clothing Workers in New York, shows what can be done. As the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, chairman of the National Conference of Catholic Charities stated:

> Cooperative housing should be regarded as a real effort on the part of the people to do things for themselves. It is a genuine expression of responsible, democratic self-organization on the neighborhood basis.

With long-term, low-interest loans and technical assistance from a quasi-independent Federal agency, such cooperatives could well provide the answer to our middle-income housing shortage. Without public ownership, cash subsidies or tax exemptions, real savings are nevertheless available through cooperatives because of no profits and coordinated maintenance costs. Such a program, self-supporting and self-liquidating at no cost to the Government or the taxpayers, will prevent the middle-income families from being priced out of the market, and will enable them to join in cooperatives charged with the management and care of their own properties and receiving the better financing terms—3 percent interest on a 50-year loan—which the Federal Government is able to provide. The goal for such a program might be a minimum of 200,000 units.

The development of a sound and workable method of meeting the housing needs of middle-income families would benefit the entire Nation, contribute to the stability of our economy and the welfare of our citizens, limit inflationary credit transactions, and economize upon the expenditures for financing, constructing, and maintaining dwelling units adequate to serve the needs of this group. To encourage home ownership through a program of financial and administrative self-reliance and decentralization, and to achieve real savings for the average housing consumer, will go a long way toward meeting a largely overlooked housing problem in this country, which is particularly troublesome in the New England and Massachusetts area.

Such legislation has particular meaning for us in Massachusetts, not only because we have a law authorizing the creation of housing cooperatives, but also because Massachusetts has attempted to solve the problem of middle-income housing first on a private, and then on a public, basis. Indeed, in 1911, Massachusetts was the first State to consider the use of public funds for the construction of housing to relieve congested areas and a shortage of housing. Massachusetts has had for many years both a rental-sale program for individual cities, which was to provide publicly sponsored housing for veterans in a higher income bracket than those covered under the normal public housing program, and a $225 million State public-housing program under which rental housing projects—in a category above Federal housing but below the FHA cost level—were provided through State guaranties of local housing-authority bonds and an occasional subsidy. Under the first program, less than 2,000 units were built in 18 communities from 1946 to 1951. Under the second, 16,000 units in 145 projects were constructed in 88 cities and towns since 1948, at average rents ranging from $34 to $48. Incomes for admission range from $3,200 to $4,000, and for continued occupancy, $4,000. The lowest rent is $22. Nevertheless, in 1952, the State housing board reported that 67 communities had on file 23,960 applications of veterans who could not be housed under rental program; and 52 communities estimated a need of 50,884 units for nonveterans. The above communities comprise 73.9 percent of our State's population. The United States Housing Census of 1950 showed in Massachusetts 82,000 married couples without own household; 288,000 units, 21.2 percent substandard; 171,000 units, 25.9 percent, of renter-occupied substandard; 1,408,787 units in State, and 1,572,000 families, or deficit of 163,203 units.

In Massachusetts, we can justifiably say that the combined efforts of the State and local government and private enterprise have failed to fulfill the needs for middle-income housing. Other States during the past 7 years have tried to give relief to this middle-income group by various costly methods: Subsidized, publicly owned housing; tax abatements; loans of low interest rates; and capital grants. These States, however, have

been in the minority, and have reached only a small proportion of their population. Aid, too, has been largely limited to veterans. These State measures were temporary stopgaps initiated under the pressures of demobilization and congressional inactivity. Connecticut will provide approximately 9,000 units of public, rental housing, at a cost of $115 million; and 6,000 units, through loans of $60 million to home purchasers. New Jersey, Illinois, and Pennsylvania, among others, have made their contributions. New York State and New York City have provided aid for some 10 or more years.

Such a Federal program for middle-income housing, which has previously been supported by many able and experienced Senators, including in particular the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], involves many more details than the broad principles which I have been able to outline in this short time. My wish is to stress the importance of having Congress enact at the earliest opportunity a program to provide an adequate supply of middle-income housing for the families of moderate means, who are the backbone of our Nation and chief producers of our national wealth, whether they live in Boston, Mass., or any other part of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield at this point for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that under such a plan as the one the Senator from Massachusetts suggests, the loan of capital to the cooperatives by the Government at cost would save probably 1 percent in the interest rate?

Mr. KENNEDY. Certainly that is true; and through the cooperatives I believe it would be possible to maintain a much longer mortgage period, and thereby reduce the monthly payments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even at a saving of 1 percent, on a house costing $10,000 for a family, that would mean a saving of $100 a year, or a little less than $10 a month; and if the amortization could be spread out to 35 years, instead of 25, there would be a further saving, would there not?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I have even suggested a 50-year amortization period, but perhaps that would be too long. At any rate, such a change would make a tremendous difference.

I know the Senator from Illinois has been concerned about this matter, and I think he will agree that there is a group that is in a sort of middle-income no-man's land. It is not helped, although it deserves help, since it comprises the backbone of the economy of the country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Is it not, furthermore, true that under the cooperatives the cooperators would maintain their properties and, hence, would lessen the expenses for upkeep?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Let me also say that I believe the concern which has been expressed by some groups, who take the position that this field is one in which the Government has no right to move, is scarcely justified. The fact is that the Government has assisted most groups of the economy with their housing problems, but this particular group has been overlooked.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator from Massachusetts observed the fact that Government assistance often is granted to those who need it least?

Mr. KENNEDY. In many instances I think that is true.

Certainly our economy depends upon the maintenance of an adequate housing program. The difficulty is that for many reasons houses have been overpriced for many persons, particularly in the middle-income group.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Illinois because I know that in the Banking and Currency Committee he has given a great deal of attention to these problems.

V. OVER-ALL OBJECTIVES

Finally, Mr. President, before concluding this series of discussions relating to proposed solutions to the economic problems of New England and elsewhere, I would like to mention very briefly certain overall legislative objectives which have a particular effect upon these problems, and upon which I am hopeful that New England and, indeed, all Senators, can unite. The accomplishment of such objectives is of considerable importance to the stabilization of our economy. These long-range objectives are: Economy in the National Government; caution in the development of international trade policies; effective enforcement of antitrust laws; safeguards against further opportunity for disaster of future inflation or serious deflation; and a national agricultural policy which harmonizes the interest of all segments of the economy. Permit me to discuss each of these briefly.

ECONOMY

First, we must strive for economy in the National Government. This is of particular importance to a region such as New England. The report on the New England economy stressed the fact that the Federal Government exerts a net drain upon the finances of New England and urged that the Federal Government be as economical and efficient as possible. Many Senators, such as the distinguished Senators from Illinois and New Hampshire [Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. BRIDGES], and other Senators from both parties, have on and off the floor of the Senate provided the leadership and wisdom which is necessary for this task.

Although I have in this series of addresses on the problems of the New England economy proposed some three dozen steps which I believe the Congress should take, it is my considered opinion that complete enactment of such a program will not depend upon larger public expenditures, further burdening our overburdened taxpayers, and might, indeed, at least in many instances, effectuate a savings in the level of Federal expenditures. For example, I have mentioned the contributions to the Federal Treasury from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the savings on Government contracts from the Small Defense Plants Administration, and the decrease in old-age assistance expenditures resulting from improved old-age and survivors and unemployment insurance programs. The elimination of tax loopholes will certainly balance any loss in total revenues resulting from additional tax amortization privileges, which in themselves will result in lower taxes for those persons able to utilize them. Recommendations concerned with labor standards, transportation costs, and the regional industrial development corporations, as well as continuing or improving Federal regulation or studies in particular fields, such as wool futures or water resources, will be at little or no additional cost in the long run, as will eventually be true of any multipurpose projects which may result from such studies. Moreover, a prosperous economy brings a higher volume of revenues from a great number of people, thus making possible a decrease in tax rates for all.

In addition, I have joined in the sponsorship of other measures designed to bring about more effective control by Congress and the executive department of the Federal budget, and to permit an intelligent and honest reduction of expenditures without harming the functions which must necessarily be performed by the Nation's Government. An efficient reorganization of Government operations; the exposure, reduction, and elimination of unnecessary subsidies; the careful and incisive reduction of civilian projects; the prevention of luxurious and duplicative personnel payments; a curbing of the unexpended balances carried over from previous years; and particularly a reduction of military waste can achieve for us a more effective, more efficient, and more economical Government. All of us have seen excessive, wasteful, and discriminatory procurement, stockpiling, and construction practices on the part of our Armed Forces. We have seen abuse of cost-plus contracts and markups and the needless inefficiency of overspecifications and supersecrecy. We know full well that the annual $600 million or larger appropriation for various river and harbor projects—which I might add have included very little for Massachusetts—has not always been necessary for the national interest. In approaching this problem of economy, we must recognize that social security, welfare, and health expenditures constitute less than 4 percent of our total budget, as compared to the nearly 60 percent devoted to military service.

Moreover, in addition to cutting waste in our Federal budget and pushing a program which will most efficiently mobilize the resources of our Nation, we may achieve real economy and greater opportunity for tax reductions by closing those tax loopholes which enable the few to escape their just share of taxes at the expense of the many. Such loopholes include the percentage depletion allowance for oil, gas, and mining; family partnerships created for tax avoidance only; special exemptions from the excess profits and corporation taxes; and other unwarranted loopholes and privileges costing in all hundreds of millions which otherwise would be used to reduce everyone's taxes.

Economy in the National Government will ease this drain on New England funds and strengthen the stability of our national economy.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Secondly, the Congress and the Federal Government must exercise caution in the development of our international trade policies. We in New England recognize that we are in a difficult position with respect to such policies. It is not our desire to demand undue protection for our manufacturing industries in a manner inconsistent with national interest, our international policies and world peace and prosperity. Nor would a generally high tariff policy benefit New England, since more than one-third of its industrial employment is dependent extensively upon the importation of raw materials. Trade barriers to the importation of long-staple cotton, raw wool, aluminum, copper, zinc, manganese, oil, and bauxite are particularly harmful to New England's industries. An adequate, low-cost supply of these materials cannot be supplied by the domestic market alone. (With respect to copper at least, Public Law 4 of this Congress has extended until 1954 the suspension of the import tax on copper; and the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL and Mr. BUSH] were active in supporting that extension.) As stated by the report of the President's Advisory Board for Mutual Security, with respect to wool, for example, "the domestic woolen manufacturer is entitled to an opportunity to compete on a fair basis with synthetic fabrics. If the consumption and production of woolen goods are not to be penalized, it is necessary to allow raw wool to be imported without a tariff or with a considerably reduced tariff." I have recently protested before committees of the House and Senate proposed restrictions on wool and oil imports which would unnecessarily damage our economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks copies of my statements before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Ways and Means Committee, regarding wool and oil imports.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, ON WOOL IMPORTS BEFORE THE SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1953

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear here this morning to express my views concerning those proposals now before you which would effectuate further restrictions upon the imports into this country of various agricultural commodities, including proposals for a parity tariff, for import fees or import quotas. In particular, I wish to discuss these proposals as they relate to the importation of raw wool.

A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO TARIFF PROBLEMS

I am very concerned about the possible legislation which may be recommended by this committee or by the present administration. I was very disappointed in the statement by Secretary of Agriculture Benson to the House Ways and Means Committee on Wednesday of this week in which he indicated that further restrictions on the importation of wool were necessary. I was particularly disappointed because, at the same time that Secretary Benson was testifying, other representatives of the administration were talking along entirely different lines before other committees of the Congress. If this Nation believes in a policy of expanded trade, and I know that this is of particular importance to your committee because the United States is the world's largest exporter of agricultural products, then we must apply that policy consistently with respect to all types of legislation, all kinds of commodities, and in all parts of the world. Today your committee is concerned about restricting the importation of wool, fats, and dairy products. Next week the House Ways and Means Committee will be concerned with restricting the importation of lead, zinc, and petroleum products. At the same time, the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees are concerned with expanding our trade with the free nations of the world. We cannot pursue a trade and tariff policy in the national interest unless the administration speaks with the same voice upon each occasion, and unless the Congress deals with the problems of various industries and regions on a comprehensive, rather than a segmentized basis.

I shall return to this method of approach as it applies to wool in just a moment; but first permit me to mention the basis for the interest in my section of the country with respect to our wool policies, and interest which must be equally considered along with the interests of the woolgrowers of the West, the consumers all over the United States, and, of course, our national and international economic objectives. No doubt the members of this committee, who come for the most part from large wool-producing States, are convinced that I have never seen a sheep in Massachusetts, much less have any information concerning the problems of the domestic wool industry. Although it may surprise you to learn that Massachusetts produces over 50,000 pounds of shorn wool annually, admittedly this is only two-hundredths of 1 percent of the national total, and Massachusetts ranks 41st in national production. But over 70 percent of the wool consumed in the United States—and we are the largest wool-consuming nation in the world—goes through Boston, the world's wool center. Over 60 percent of this Nation's woolen and worsted manufacturing industry is located in the New England area—an industry which nationally employs some 150,000 to 200,000 workers with an annual payroll approaching $500 million. I think that you will agree that the Federal Government, in determining its policies with respect to wool, must consider these interests as well as the interests of the woolgrowers.

But I am convinced that such interests are not antipathetic. I believe that this Nation's woolgrowers, wool trade, woolen and worsted manufacturers and textile workers have mutual and harmonious interests. Rather than attempt to solve the difficulties of one group without regard to that solution's effect upon the others, we must consider the problems of wool and those involved in its production and consumption in their entirety. I am convinced that only in this way will such problems be solved.

1. PRESENT TARIFFS ON WOOLEN AND WORSTED MANUFACTURES

As the first example of the need for this comprehensive approach, I ask you to look at the tariff situation of the woolen and worsted manufacturers as well as the wool producers. Since 1933, tariff rates on textiles have been reduced by 66 percent. To increase the restrictions upon the importation of raw wool into this country, without consideration of the tariff on manufactured wool, would result in great harm to our woolen manufacturers and, in turn, to the domestic wool producers who are dependent upon the manufacturers as their major outlet. Raw wool now coming to this country would instead be available in larger quantities and lower prices to foreign textile concerns, who would thus be able to import still further goods into this country at a still lower price.

Perhaps you will say that the answer is to increase substantially the tariffs on both raw wool and manufactured wool. But I am convinced that such a policy, and the innumerable other demands for protection which would follow it, would not be in the best interests of a vital and expanding woolen industry or national economy; and I think it is apparent that it would not be in the interests of our present international program. For these reasons, I cannot support any proposal effectuating a higher tariff on raw wool as a trade for higher tariffs on woolen manufactures.

2. DISTRESSED CONDITION OF THE WOOLEN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

As the second example of the need for a comprehensive approach to the problem, I ask that you consider not only the economic difficulties of wool producers, but likewise the economic difficulties of woolen manufacturers and their employees. Since January 1, 1949, 99 woolen and worsted mills, including over 640,000 spindles and over 6,000 looms, have gone out of business. Nearly 40,000 employees in these plants have lost their jobs. Many other mills are either partially or fully shut down. Recent statements indicate that further liquidations may be expected. I know that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the chairman of this committee, is concerned about the 26 woolen and worsted mills in his State. The proportion of unemployment in woolen centers is unbelievably high. In Lawrence, Mass., where approximately one-fifth of all workers have been without jobs continually since 1947, the proportion of unemployment is more than twice as great as the figure reached during the depression in 1930. In many other woolen manufacturing cities of New England and the South, unemployment has continued at high levels despite the overall national prosperity.

Thus, gentlemen, when you speak of declining prices, production and wages among the wool growers of the West, you must not forget the distressed areas of New England. To take action supposedly for the benefit of the wool growers which would result in making even more difficult the competitive position of the wool manufacturers is not the proper approach to this question. I realize, of course, that there are various problems besetting the New England economy other than its decline in textiles, and I intend to discuss these with the Senate at a subsequent date. But I do wish to remind you that economic distress is not confined to any particular area of our country.

There is, moreover, ample evidence to indicate that despite recent declines in prices, the situation of the woolgrowers includes a brighter aspect. The overall trend in the price of raw wool has been upward, and the total cash receipts of woolgrowers have fluctuated on about the same level. According to the Boston Commercial Bulletin of May 2, 1953, the demand for domestic wool remains very high, and buyers have been following the shearers, so to speak, and purchasing shorn wools as they became available. Although there is some evidence that woolgrowers are continuing to hold their product off of the market in the hope of either congressional action or some emergency, this cannot be blamed upon market difficulties. Moreover, 60 percent of our sheep already go for slaughter, and more and more sheepmen are able to turn to the production of lamb or cattle as more profitable investments, unlike the textile worker of Lawrence whose job is taken from under him.

Certainly it was to be expected that the price of wool would fall sharply after the excessive peak it reached during the first year of the Korean emergency. Moreover, the increasingly high cost and scarcity of land in the major woolgrowing States have contributed to the present decline in production. If we understand these factors, we will not so easily place all of the blame upon wool imports, nor consider the situation to be one of particular distress. But in any event, let us not forget the distressed areas and industries in other parts of the United States.

3. THE AGRICULTURAL PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

As the third example of the need for a comprehensive approach to our international trade problems, I ask that you do not consider the problems raised by our domestic agricultural price-support program apart from the long-range economic problems of the wool-producing and wool-manufacturing industries. According to the report of the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security in February of this year, a board on which the heads of the three great farm organizations serve:

"The objectives of the price-support program can be realized without restricting imports of needed commodities. There would be no serious adjustment problem for domestic wool producers if arrangements were made to give them the equivalent return that they now get from the support price. After the tariff has been reduced or eliminated, increased imports of wool would meet the greater demand for wool at the lower price, while domestic production would be unaffected."

The statistics bear out this conclusion, Secretary Benson to the contrary, there is no relationship between the price or amount of imported wool and the support price. The Secretary would have us believe that our price-support program attracts wool imports from all over the world, which, in turn, depress the price in the domestic market. However, in April 1952, when extensive Government action became necessary to support the rapidly falling domestic wool price, the cause was not heavy increases in wool imports; for according to the figures the Secretary presented to the House Ways and Means Committee, that was a time when the amount and value of apparel wool imports were dropping sharply. His statement further indicated his belief that the price-support program gave the benefit of higher prices to foreign wool producers who could import wool at a price which, including the duty, was just below the support price. The facts of the matter are, however, that statistics over a period of years demonstrate that there is no relationship between the supported or unsupported domestic wool price and the price of wool imports; and that at the present time, the prices of foreign wool are mostly higher than the support-level prices of domestic wools, particularly in the better quality wools which comprise the bulk of United States production. I realize that in theory at least the price-support program is contradictory to the principles of heavy importation of wool, but I am convinced that it would be far more helpful to the domestic wool producer to revise our present agricultural price-support program than to impose additional restrictions upon the importation of wool.

4. THE ECONOMIC NEEDS OF WOOL GROWERS AND MANUFACTURERS

Finally, getting to the heart of the problem, as a part of a comprehensive approach to these matters, the Congress must consider the economic needs and interrelationships of the wool growers and wool manufacturers. Basically, what does the wool grower need? I do not believe that the answer is higher prices. Between 1941 and 1952, the price of wool in this country increased from 35.5 cents to 53.9 cents per pound (with a particularly sharp rise and then drop during the first year of the Korean crisis. But over this same period of time, the total cash receipts of the wool growers, despite this increase in price, actually showed a decrease from $137.7 million to $123.9 million. The reason is, as pointed out by Mr. Bishop of the Boston Wool Trade Association before this committee 1 week ago, that as prices rose production dropped, from 453.3 million pounds in 1941 to 266 million pounds in 1952. Higher prices, then, will not solve the wool growers' problems, and it is useless to restrict imports for this reason.

But will a decrease in the competition from imports help the wool growers? Again, the record indicates that the answer is in the negative. After the war, the net imports of apparel wool fell sharply from actual weight of 810.2 million pounds in 1946 to 246.8 million pounds in 1949. During the same 3 years, domestic production, instead of increasing, decreased from 342.2 to 248.5 million pounds. Cash receipts of domestic wool growers fell from $116.8 million to $105.2 million. After 1949, when imports increased once again, domestic production and cash receipts also increased for the domestic wool growers. Curbing imports, then, is not the answer to their problem. The most important statistic is the fact that United States manufacture of woolens and worsteds fell during the same 3-year period from 494 million to 334 million pounds, despite an increase in the world production and consumption of wool.

I think then that it is obvious that what the American wool grower needs most of all is the American wool manufacturer. We export, of course, only an infinitesimal amount of wool; and thus unless the woolen and worsted manufacturers of New England and the South are prosperous and active, the wool growers of the West must necessarily lose their market, decrease their production, and face a decrease in their cash receipts, regardless of the wool-import situation.

Let us consider then the needs of the wool manufacturer. Obviously, because raw wool is a substantial part of the final cost of the finished woolen and worsted product, varying from 20 percent to 50 percent, depending upon the cost of wool and the type of article, the woolen manufacturer is desirous of obtaining his wool from the most inexpensive source possible. With the price of raw wool now being several times as high as in 1939, the wool manufacturer becomes increasingly concerned with his supply from imports. Domestic producers, because of limitations on land, labor, and investment, simply cannot supply enough to meet our needs, particularly at prices comparable with imports, and as a result we must obtain approximately two-thirds of our raw wool from foreign producers.

What, then, would be the result of placing additional curbs upon the importation of raw wool? The woolen manufacturer must either do without or he must pay a higher price. If he does without, that part of his production is either liquidated or devoted to competing fibers, foremost among which are the synthetics. I cannot believe that the wool growers are anxious to see the rapidly growing and highly advertised synthetic and so-called miracle blends displace still further the woolen manufacturing industry to which they must sell their product. As pointed out by the report of the Mutual Security Advisory Board, the wool tariff is "an important element in the competition between wool and synthetic fibers; the use of wool tends to be reduced below the level that would result from free choice by users at prices that would prevail in the absence of the wool tariff. The domestic consumer is entitled to buy woolen goods in preference to synthetics without being penalized for his choice. The domestic woolen manufacturer is entitled to an opportunity to compete on a fair basis with synthetic fabrics. If the consumption and production of woolen goods are not to be penalized, it is necessary to allow raw wool to be imported without a tariff or with a considerably reduced tariff."

If, on the other hand, the wool manufacturer chooses to pay a higher price for his wool, his manufactured product must sell at a higher price, the demand for his products decreases and his foreign competitors undersell him. I cannot believe that the wool growers wish to take such action which would only further injure their market. Nor is this a wise policy for the United States. As pointed out by Fortune magazine of January 1947, the tariff added $136 million to the United States wool bill in 1946 while all the wool in the United States contributed only $126 million to our national income.

What the wool growers and wool manufacturers need, Mr. Chairman, is to take the offensive away from the synthetic fibers and our foreign competitors. We must cooperate to expand our markets and lower our prices. We cannot do this by increasing the price of wool and decreasing our imports. Whatever problems the wool growers of this Nation have, they will not solve them by harming the wool manufacturers. Instead, all concerned should cooperate on the wool growers' problems of grazing lands, disease, and predatory animals; on promoting the marketing and advertising of woolen goods; fair and free competition with synthetics; on revising the price-support program into one that makes sense for all groups concerned, including the consumer; and possibly on seeking a world wool agreement, similar to the world wheat agreement, by which those problems of international trade might be better controlled without harm to the interests of any group. A most recent example of effective cooperation of this type related to the problem of importation of subsidized wool tops from Uruguay in which I was happy to join with Senators from the wool-growing States and the wool growers and wool manufacturers associations in protesting to the Secretary of the Treasury against this discrimination which hurt us all; and I was happy to see Secretary Humphrey's announcement a few days ago that countervailing duties would be imposed. It is only through such cooperation, and through a comprehensive approach by the administration and Congress to our international trade problems, that this Nation's economy, and the vitality of individual industries within it can remain strong and prosperous.

I again express my appreciation for the opportunity to present these views; and although I have not supplied detailed statistical tables in support of the statements I have made upon the assumption that such data was available to the committee, my office will be glad to supply such information upon request.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1953, ON H. R. 4294 (SIMPSON BILL) AND OTHER BILLS TO LIMIT OIL IMPORTS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear today in opposition to those provisions of the Simpson bill, H. R. 4294, and 20 some other bills which would severely limit the importation of residual fuel oil into the United States.

Before discussing this particular provision, I would like to mention briefly my position with respect to other issues under consideration by this committee. I favor an extension of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as a necessity for the prosperity of our Nation and the free world. I am opposed to quotas and other excessive limitations upon the importation of lead, zinc, and crude petroleum products, all of which—as we so well realize in the manufacturing community of New England—must be available in adequate, economical supply in all parts of the world.

In particular, however, I wish to discuss the harmful effects which would result from section 13 (a) (2) of the Simpson bill which would limit the total quantity of residual fuel oil which may be imported into the United States to 5 percent of the preceding year's domestic demand. I am convinced that the harm to our international relations, our national defense and natural resources and our manufacturing and consuming economies which would result from the imposition of such a quota would far outweigh any of the benefits claimed for our domestic oil and coal industries.

Because I have been making a special study of distressed or labor surplus areas in this country, I am fully aware of the economic problems of the coal industry. But I agree with the conclusions of the hearings on the 1952 Supplemental Trade Agreement that the decline in the coal industry is due not to residual oil imports primarily, but to problems of technology and transportation, methods of productivity, conversions of railroads to other fuels, milder weather, reduced exports, work stoppages and other problems of industrial relations, and particularly the tremendous increase in the use of natural gas as a substitute fuel. Many of these factors have also affected the domestic oil industry. The decrease of 50 million tons in the domestic consumption of coal in the United States in 1952 was accompanied by only a limited increase in the importation and use of residual oil. This has been the consistent trend since World War II, with a much larger increase in the consumption of natural gas. Although the domestic oil industry has recently suffered certain cutbacks, such cutbacks—which were not confined to the United States—followed the most productive year in that industry's history, when more wildcat and development wells and a greater total footage were drilled and more geophysical crews were employed than ever before. The industry has faced similar cutbacks in previous years following mild winters, only to rise to new heights again.

But whatever problems the oil and coal industries may have, they are not to be solved by denying to the consumer his free market and free choice. In New England, for example, our textile mills are suffering very seriously from foreign imports and other problems. Unemployment is heavy in many of our mill towns. But we do not claim that the answer to the problems of the woolen and cotton textile industry is to raise the consumers price and require him to use woolen or cotton textiles instead of synthetics. Nor are we seeking a solution which would do great harm to this Nation's international relations and defense.

The harm to our international relations: If we are to expand our trade with other nations, give them an opportunity to close the dollar gap and buy our goods and bolster the prosperity of the freed world, this Nation cannot take such action as the Simpson bill provides and arbitrarily violate our trade agreements with other nations and refuse to buy their goods. Today, with respect to residual fuel oil, this issue arises primarily in our relations with Venezuela, which provides 97 percent of our residual fuel-oil imports and 70 percent of all of our oil imports. Since 65 percent of that nation's oil product is residual fuel oil, it is estimated that the provisions of the Simpson bill would inflict a loss of $300 million a year or 23 percent of its output upon that nation, 85 percent of the revenues of its national treasury presently coming from these residual-oil exports. We would thus threaten not only the friendship of a free and peaceful friend who has never asked or received a single dollar of United States aid, but also, as pointed out by the Secretary of Commerce, threaten the availability to the United States of that vital oil supply by increasing demands for nationalization and requiring Venezuela to sell to other countries, perhaps behind the Iron Curtain.

The harm to our defense and natural resources: This relates to a second important point: The adequacy of our oil supplies in the interests of defense and conservation. At present we have an 11 to 1 advantage in oil over the Soviet Union because of our supplies and concessions abroad. But, as pointed out by the Mutual Security Public Advisory Board:

"The United States cannot expect to have access to such supplies unless it imports reasonable quantities of petroleum from these producing regions. As petroleum products constitute more than half of the total shipments to military forces, it is necessary to have assured source available in other countries in all parts of the world where they would be accessible to our forces."

For similar reasons, the President's Materials Policy Commission recommended last year:

"In view of its future needs and limited resources, this Nation should welcome crude-oil imports, not place obstacles in their way. Tariffs on crude oil imports should therefore be held down, reduced, or eliminated, within the limits imposed by national security considerations."

The harm to our exporting industries: Turning now to the effect on our domestic economy, let me first mention briefly the harm such import limitations would impose upon our farmers and manufacturers who must sell their goods to other nations in exchange for the dollars those nations receive by selling oil to us. Venezuela is this Nation's fourth largest customer. Last year, it bought more than 70 percent of its imports from the United States, one-half billion dollars worth of machinery, textiles, electrical goods, electronic devices, leather goods, paper, canned foods, chemicals, and other products which are of such great importance not only to New England but all parts of the United States. Since Venezuela gets 95 percent of its foreign exchange from the oil that it ships to the United States—which, when the shipping, insurance, and other services we provide are included, is worth roughly one-half of the goods and services it buys from us—this profitable market will be denied to us, with resulting consequences upon the incomes of our producers and their employees.

The harm to our residual fuel oil consumers: Finally, I wish to point out the disastrous effects such limitations would have upon those who presently consume residual fuel oil. I think it is apparent that such limitations would have and are frankly designed to have three direct results. First, the supply of residual fuel oil in this country would be decreased. It is generally agreed that, because American refineries concentrate on more valuable components of crude oil, there will be an increasing gap between domestic production of residual fuel oil and demand. The State Department, the Mutual Security Advisory Board, and the Paley Commission all forecast an increasing deficit over the next 25 years unless there should be a tremendous unforeseeable increase in the discovery of new wells in this country. If this deficit, which in 1951 was 117 million barrels of residual fuel oil, is not met by imports, and the yield of residual oil in United States refineries continues to drop (as it has by nearly one-third since 1945), the shortage could be a serious one. Since it is estimated that the United States, now importing over 400,000 barrels of residual oil daily, will face an 80 percent cut in its imports to approximately 80,000 barrels per day, the reduction of supplies is not a minor one. But in New England, where an analysis of tankers receipts in 11 ports shows that two-thirds of its 60 million barrels of residual fuel oil consumed per year are imported, the cut would have a most harmful effect upon the consumers of such oil.

The second result which naturally follows such a reduction in supply is an increase in the price of residual fuel oil. Some have estimated price increases of 50 percent or more would result from the enactment of this bill. Based on New England's experience with a moderate fuel shortage in the winter of 1947–48, when the price increased $1.23 a barrel from February 10, 1947, to February 4, 1948, such an increase in price would cost our region alone—and we use one-third of the residual fuel oil consumed in the United States—over $70 million annually.

The third result which naturally follows a decrease in supply and increase in price, and which is fully intended by the coal industry in its support of this measure, is a conversion by many consumers now using oil to coal. Many of these consumers have during the past several years converted at great expense from coal to oil. Others could not meet the necessary costs of the heavy equipment and installation costs, higher operating costs, and additional storage requirements which such conversion would entail. Still others—such as ships, apartment houses, hospitals, churches, public buildings, and some industries such as laundries and others—could not convert at all and would be forced to compete at higher prices for whatever oil was available. Because New England gets its oil by water and its coal by rail, the first is obtainable at a savings, while coal to large purchasers is priced about 40-percent higher than to similar buyers in the country as a whole.

I am hopeful that representatives of other parts of the country will indicate to you how these three results would harm their region and the Nation as a whole; but permit me to draw upon my experiences in New England to demonstrate how such restrictions on fuel oil would damage our economy. It is estimated that 30 percent of the New England users of residual fuel oil are public utilities. Economic studies by the Federal Power Commission and the Federal Reserve Bank have indicated that about 30 percent of the difference in the cost of steam-generated electricity to New England and to the United States is the result of differences in the cost of fuel. To further increase this cost would be to make our power costs even more discriminatory. Forty percent of New England's residual fuel oil goes to industry, for its boilers and furnaces and other industrial uses. I need not tell you that too many New England industries already are on the verge of liquidation or migration, and that our towns such as Lawrence already have unbelievably high unemployment rates. Their economic existence should not be further threatened by this measure. Since New England is the largest user of imported heavy oil in the Nation, the New England Council and other groups have expressed serious concern over the effect of curbing importations; and the New England Governors' Textile Committee and the Council of Economic Advisers' Report on the New England Economy both called for the importation of fuels without tariffs. Fifteen percent of our region's residual oil is used for purposes of heating homes, apartment buildings, offices, and factories. This is an important factor in the cost of living in the colder climate of New England; and, according to the 1950 census, over 50 percent of the heated occupied dwelling units in Massachusetts used oil, rather than coal or gas. This is no time to increase the cost of living to these families and businessmen. Finally, 15 percent is used for bunkering ships at port, railroads, military, and miscellaneous uses. Here again, price and supply are important; and it is reliably estimated that the total residual oil available under the Simpson bill would not be enough for bunkering our ships alone.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I agree with the conclusions of past congressional and Executive studies

which have recommended, not excessive import limitations, but other means of stimulating the discovery and development of our resources, the conservation of our fuels, the diversification of our industries and other means of assistance to our oil and coal industries. Let us adopt a program seeking more fuel, more energy, more production, and better living standards, with increased trade between nations, all over the world.

Mr. KENNEDY. Moreover, both the Waltham and Elgin Watch Cos., as pointed out in a recent Fortune magazine article and a recent editorial in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, have demonstrated their New England initiative, to a degree deserving public commendation in view of the severe difficulties they have faced, in meeting competition of Swiss watches through better production and diversification. The Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security in its report to the President on a trade and tariff policy in the national interest recommended that in those cases where a choice must be made between injury to the national interest and hardship to an industry, the industry be helped to make adjustments through extension of unemployment insurance, assistance in retaining workers, diversification of production, and conversion to other lines through RFC loans and tax incentives. It will be noted that all of these items are included in the program I have been discussing. We need, moreover, to develop markets abroad for our textiles, electrical machinery, metal fabricating and other manufactured products. Hundreds of thousands of Massachusetts jobs depend upon exports. An estimated 1 of 19 of manufactured goods in our Commonwealth is for export, and a proportion twice as high exists in Connecticut and Rhode Island.

Nevertheless, at least two other important industries in New England, textiles and fish as well as watches, have already been seriously damaged by heavy importations of such commodities from other countries. I have supported the requests of the fishing industry for a determination by the Tariff Commission—and I may say parenthetically that, in my opinion, it is the Tariff Commission that should decide these questions—as to whether countervailing duties or other limitations were necessary to prevent unfair competition from foreign imports. I have supported the requests of the woolen industry for a Treasury and Tariff Commission investigation of discrimination from subsidized wool-top imports which have become increasingly heavy from certain South American countries in recent years at prices from 25 to 40 cents below those combed in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania. But I further ask, as my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has long urged, that the Congress and the administration act with caution when lowering tariff barriers with respect to the fish, textile, and other industries already distressed. No one claims that either woolen textiles or fish are infant industries in need of absolute protection. On the contrary, both industries are suffering from old age rather than infancy. But a reduction in tariffs on those strong and growing industries of this country is more beneficial to the economic stability of the entire Western World than to grant further extreme concessions causing further heavy unemployment in those industries already declining and heavily concentrated in particular areas. To restrict the entry of Parmesan cheese from Italy while offering no significant barrier to Icelandic fish is not a realistic policy. There is no need to make wholesale reductions in our duties which will only lead to further deterioration of our own industries and living standards when the nations primarily benefited thereby are not in need of assistance in closing the dollar gap or other economic aid. Nor can we assume that the attainment of lower trade barriers for the United States is an isolated goal without regard to their relationship to the trade-barriers of other nations and their effect upon the domestic economy.

I realize that our trade policies must of necessity be based on the national interest, and not the interest of any particular region; but I am urging a cautious approach to this problem because of the effect which a damaged regional economy can have upon the Nation and the entire world. Much can be said in favor of the idea of specifying the quantities of these highly competitive commodities that would be permitted to enter the country in a given period of time at reduced rates of duty, particularly in relation to domestic production. This would mean that the domestic producers would know how much competition to expect under certain circumstances and would be able to make their business plans accordingly. Many of the complaints up to now against tariff reductions have been occasioned by the uncertainty of the results of lowered duties. If producers knew that quotas would increase—and at a diminishing rate—only as domestic production and consumption increase, they might be much less fearful of reductions in tariffs. Upon many occasions individual producers have made it plain that uncertainty is their greatest worry when it comes to import competition.

Such a policy of caution would be consistent with the recommendations and the Report of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry and the report of the Committee on the New England Economy. The latter report states:

> The Federal Government should reduce import duties on products of New England's declining industries with caution and whenever possible should offset any reductions by reducing barriers against imports of raw materials and foods into New England.

Such an approach is not inconsistent with our present international trade policies or the new catch phrase of "trade, not aid." A considered approach in the reduction or imposition of trade barriers affecting distressed industries is an important objective in the maintenance of national and international, as well as regional, prosperity.

ANTITRUST LAWS

Third, we must make certain that our antitrust laws are strengthened and effectively enforced. I have previously pointed out the fundamental importance of small business in the preservation of competition to our national economy and particularly to regional economies in need of economic stimulation and expansion. As I said at that time, we should neither give unfair advantage to small business nor condemn big business. But such small business and vigorous competition cannot continue if they are denied the opportunities and resources which are essential to their existence by the economic concentrations, discriminations, and other predatory actions of their giant or unlawfully combined competitors, who seek to force them out of business, capture their market or keep others out of business originally through such practices. Monopolies are not always more efficient, nor do price discriminations always save the consumers money. To weaken at this time the Robinson-Patman Act as has been proposed and thus permit monopolistic price discriminations without effective legal remedies is unthinkable to those of us who believe in the preservation of a competitive free enterprise system. The Robinson-Patman Act, the Clayton Antitrust Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act are all in need of strengthening to prevent the enemies of competition from taking advantage of loopholes in the law, uncertainties in interpretation, or weaknesses in penalties or enforcement. Such laws do not foster the inefficient or fight the competitive struggle for the weak; they merely assure for all a fair and equal opportunity to compete.

It is important that the Federal Trade Commission, dedicated by Congress to protecting the rights of businessmen from unscrupulous trade practices, should not be destroyed through weak appointments or inadequate appropriations. The same is true of the antitrust Division in our Department of Justice. For more than half a century, this Nation has believed in preventing unlawful business conspiracies.' We must continue in that tradition, and strengthen our fair competition statutes and agencies, if we are to retain the vitality of our economy.

ANTI-INFLATION AND ANTI-RECESSION POLICIES

Fourth, a healthy national economy, and particularly a regional economy such as New England which is dependent upon the rest of the country for its supply of raw materials as well as its markets, requires adequate safeguards against any future inflationary spirals. While current signs indicate that at present the peak has been reached, we are particularly interested in New England in preparing against future inflationary disaster. As pointed out by the report of the Committee on the New England Economy, New England has a larger interest than most regions in controlling inflation:

> It tends to suffer in inflationary periods both from the usual tendency of raw material and agricultural prices to rise faster than other prices and from the failure of the relatively heavy property income component in its total income to grow at as rapid a rate as other incomes. Being a large net importer of food, feed, and raw materials, it felt severely the impact of the rapid inflationary price increases in these commodities after the outbreak of the war in Korea. In fact, according to as yet unpublished analyses by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, it was a net loser by $7 million on commer-

cial and financial account during the year 1950 for the first time on record. Much of the deteriorated position in commercial and financial account in the postwar years can probably be attributed to the differential impact of inflationary developments on the New England balance of payments. New England would be well-advised to be in the vanguard of those demanding antiinflationary measures.

I thus deem it essential not only for the good of the New England economy but for the protection of the consumer and businessman and farmer and worker in all parts of the country, that the damaging consequences of the sharp inflationary increases in the cost of living which result from emergencies be controlled in advance. The President has seen fit to remove all controls; this has already increased the cost of many vital commodities, such as copper, and many essential market-basket items, such as coffee. Controls will not now be restored, I know; but it is essential that an adequate standby controls program be maintained by Congress in preparation for an emergency which would cause such an inflationary increase. It is no use ordering the fire extinguisher after the fire has broken out. An adequate standby controls program which would go into immediate effect in the case of emergency is a necessity if we are to prevent the economic hardships to both individuals and our entire economy which result from uncontrolled inflation.

In view of the present indications of deflationary trends, it is apparent that we must be equally concerned with the dangers of a severe recession. Practically every measure which I have advocated in this series would be an important step in developing our economy, the stability of our industries, the wages of our workers, and the purchasing power of our consumers, and thus ward off another severe recession. It is my belief that such measures will strengthen those many programs of the last 20 years which should prevent any recurrence of the great depression of 1929.

However, if the Federal Government is to be prepared for threatening trends of this nature, not only legislation but advance study and preparation are required. For these reasons, I am anxious that the valuable work of the President's Council of Economic Advisors and the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report be continued; and that the Congress and the executive branch take steps now to prepare for the economic changes necessary when the present mobilization period ends. Adequate preparation for deflationary economic crises is necessary for the maintenance of a strong economy and Nation and for the economic well-being of our citizens.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

Fifth, New England is concerned about our national agricultural policies and their effect upon that region. As pointed out by the Report of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry, agricultural policies which excessively and artificially increase the prices of farm products, raw materials and food are contrary to the interest of New England industries and consumers who must import a large proportion of such products from outside the region.

Since 1928, the prices of raw cotton and wool have increased five times as much as those for rayon staples, causing New England textiles to face higher prices, decreased sales, increased competition and increased need for new machinery and plants which are too often in other areas. Moreover, our tax funds are used to purchase the commodities which are stored to keep up the prices we pay. On the whole, although New England's own agricultural groups have not received support from the Federal Government comparable with other regions and other commodities, they are, nevertheless, forced to pay higher prices for their grain and other artificially supported products. The importance of such groups cannot be overlooked. Ten million acres of New England are in farmland. The dairy and poultry industries of New England each contribute nearly $200 million annually to the income of that region, with a total farm income of approximately $600 million. Many counties in New England rank among the leaders in these two lines, and in tobacco, fruits such as apples and pears, vegetables such as potatoes and onions, nurseries and greenhouse products, and other items. In 1950, 34 New England counties ranked among the leading 100 counties in the Nation 170 times for specific farm activities. Worcester and Middlesex Counties in Massachusetts, for example, have some of the best farms in the Nation. But aside from highly dubious programs for such items as potatoes, butter and others, the present price-support law has hurt the region more than it has helped. The chief support items—corn, cotton and wheat—cost New England dearly in taxes and prices. New England CCC loans on 1949 and 1950 crops were but nine one-hundredths of 1 percent of the $2.6 billion total.

We favor prosperous agriculture everywhere as a boon to all regions, but it would be better if this were not done at the cost of higher prices and unequal treatment for some regions. The Committee on the New England Economy stated that Congress should study carefully proposals which would shift our Federal agricultural policy to "supporting farm incomes directly while leaving agricultural prices to be determined in the market." Such a program must, of course, be without regimentation of the rural economy, subsidization of the inefficient farmer, or subordination of the independence of all farmers. Nor has Congress ever given adequate attention to the special problems of specialized agriculture that always characterize our older or industrialized regions. I am hopeful that the Congress and the Department of Agriculture will give active consideration to needed improvements in transportation, research, equipment, land use, labor recruitment, and education for New England's farm families as recommended by the Committee on the New England Economy. A national farm program which will promote the interests of all farmers and consumers in all regions would be an important step in bolstering our national economy.

VI. CONCLUSION

Mr. President, this concludes the presentation of my discussion of the problems facing the economic growth of New England and other parts of the country and the outline of my proposed solutions for such problems. As I have stressed throughout, although many of the recommendations I have made are of special importance to New England, nevertheless, none is contrary to the national interest, but rather would, if enacted, be of benefit to all the people wherever they may live. My discussion of these problems is intended to inspire action, not gloom. It has been impossible for me to cover adequately here all of the problem areas in our region or Nation, or to discuss all legislative steps which might have an effect thereon. I am hopeful that the present study conducted by the National Planning Association under the auspices of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report will cast further light upon these problems and their remedies. It has also been impossible to present the full details of all of the various legislative proposals which I have mentioned. But I am hopeful, Mr. President, that I have presented a basis for legislative attention and action on these problems. I realize that it may well be 2, 4, 6, or more years before such a program is enacted. I also realize that there will be many New Englanders both in the Senate and in my home State who may disagree with one or more of the proposals which I have set forth. The cooperation of all Senators from both parties from New England and other regions who realize the importance of getting started on a comprehensive program to meet these problems which threaten our economic well-being is essential; and I would welcome their study and suggestions in order to provide the most feasible legislative tools to deal with such problems.

This presentation has been organized primarily along the lines of the problems involved rather than the relationship between the various proposed solutions. Thus, the question of tax amortization is important to the stimulation of new industry, to the equitable distribution of Government incentives, and to elimination of abuses of tax privilege. An improved social-security program is essential to the equalization of labor costs and to a reduction in the hardships caused by dislocation and recession. Nor have I attempted to deal with these problems on an industry-by-industry basis. Thus, the textile and shoe industries may benefit from those proposals aimed at preventing a further decline and dislocation of business, tax incentives for modernizing equipment, regulation of trade in wool futures contracts, caution in international trade policies, a farm program which decreased market prices of wool and cotton, cheaper power, and most of the other items mentioned. The fishing industry will benefit from such caution in international trade policies, as well as from the proposal to provide additional funds for research and market development, tax amortization incentives for new equipment, and industrial diversification. All industries

will benefit from improved transportation and cheaper power, from the protection of small business, the stimulation of new business, and economy in the National Government, to name but a few.

This is basically a program for business, for its employment, its stimulation, its modernization, and its protection. It is also a program for so-called distressed areas, to bring them new industries, to prevent further industrial migrations, and to reduce the hardships caused by such migrations and heavy unemployment. The theme of the program, if it may be boiled down to a single sentence, would be the importance of the Federal Government in the preservation of fair competition in an expanding economy.

In short, I have proposed that the Federal Government act in the following specific ways:

First, toward the diversification and expansion of commercial and industrial activity—

1. By providing for regional industrial development corporations;

2. By permitting tax amortization incentives to industries expanding in labor surplus areas, and older industries seeking to replace and modernize equipment;

3. By establishing an adequate job retraining program for the acquisition of new skills for the unemployed;

4. By preserving and strengthening independent Government agencies such as the RFC and SDPA for providing loans, technical assistance, and a fair share of Government contracts to small business;

5. By providing for the fullest utilization of our natural resources and the development of an adequate supply of low-cost power;

6. Through adequate appropriations for the New York-New England survey;

7. The reservation for New England of a proper portion of the output of the St. Lawrence power project;

8. A study of the feasibility of the Passamaquoddy project;

9. Approval of the Connecticut River flood control compact;

10. By making permanent the Water Pollution Control Act; and

11. By specifically earmarking an equitable portion of import-duty funds for research, quality control, and market development in the fishing industry.

Secondly, toward the prevention of further decline and dislocation of business—

12. By more nearly equalizing the cost of labor—through increasing the minimum wage and otherwise improving the Fair Labor Standards Act;

13. Through clarifying and making more effective the Walsh-Healey Act without the restrictions of the Fulbright amendment;

14. Through modernizing and adequately enforcing such laws to prevent abuses in the provisions regulating child labor, learner permits, and the Puerto Rican exemption;

15. Through revising the Taft-Hartley law to prevent unfair restrictions on unionization in competing areas;

16. Through preventing the exploitation of minority labor with a Federal equal opportunity law and enforcement of nondiscrimination provisions in Federal contracts; and

17. Through the equalization of nonwage payroll costs by providing for a more adequate social-security program; and

18. Minimum standards in our unemployment compensation program.

By eliminating competitive abuses of tax privileges which have accentuated such business decline and industrial migration—

19. Particularly municipal securities used for commercial purposes;

20. Liquidations under the capital gains provision;

21. The abusive use of charitable trusts and other tax-free institutions,

22. Total exemptions in Puerto Rico; and

23. The misuse of tax amortization certificates.

By providing for an equitable distribution of Federal business incentives—

24. Through the allocation of defense contracts to labor surplus areas; and

25. The equal distribution of tax amortization certificates; and

26. On a long-range basis, in the location of Federal installations and grants;

27. By investigating the discrimination in the costs of New England transportation, including trucking rates, railroad freight rates, and ocean freight rates from the port of Boston; and

28. By providing for regulation of trade in wool futures contracts under the Commodity Exchange Act.

Third, toward a reduction of hardships caused by recession or dislocation—

29. By providing for a more adequate unemployment compensation program with reinsurance of State unemployment funds and/or supplementary benefits to workers who have exhausted their claims; and

30. By providing for a more adequate program for our older citizens through the liberalization and extension of our old age and survivors insurance program, improvements in the old age assistance program and a study of other problems; and

31. By providing for a more adequate middle-income housing program.

Fourth, toward the accomplishment of other overall legislative objectives affecting these problems, including specifically—

32. Economy in the National Government,

33. Caution in the development of international trade policies,

34. Effective enforcement of anti-trust laws,

35. Safeguards against the disaster of further inflation or serious recession, and

36. A national agricultural policy which harmonizes the interest of all segments of the economy.

Let us go forward to build a better New England—a better Nation and a better world—free from the economic hardships and tragedies which prevent a full life for us all.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have read the greater part of the excellent study which the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has made of the economic problems of New England. This careful analysis of the industrial ills of that great section of our country should be considered seriously by all those interested in the well being not only of New England, but of the entire Nation.

I am happy to join with the many others who have commended the junior Senator from Massachusetts for this valuable service.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from New York.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 26, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 25 (legislative day of May 21), 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Samuel C. Waugh, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Carl F. White, of California, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 27, with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif.

John J. Devaney, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard:

Frank T. Kenner
Henry C. Perkins

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 408, 82d Congress, Public Law 759, 80th Congress, Public Law 36, 80th Congress, and Public Law 625, 80th Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be lieutenant colonel

Earl S. Hallinger, Jr., MC, O373468.

To be captains

Thomas B. Dunne, MC, O468765.
James D. Harvey, MC, O965066.
William T. Leslie, MC, O536786.
Joseph E. Molloy, MC, O469109.
Ralph L. Nicholson, MC, O1918394.
Mary E. Steinheimer, MC, K994656.

To be first lieutenants

Roderick V. Brown, JAGC, O999675.
Roy E. Daniel, DC, O606191.
Ervin W. Dickson, Jr., JAGC, O538186.
John M. Hardage, JAGC, O1032350.
Carl G. Lauterbach, MSC, O988528.
Christopher L. Mengis, MC, O1536457.
Milo R. Safar, DC, O1929024.
Walter L. Shepard, DC, O1889567.
James A. Turner, DC, O2067235.

To be second lieutenants

Emma L. Broyles, WAC, L1010646.
Barbara J. Dyson, ANC, N792822.
Betty A. Patterson, WAC, L1010653.
Mildred A. Regan, WAC, L1020613.
Eleanor V. Rees, WAC, L1010635.
Alma M. Roberts, WMSC, M2918.
Martha J. Thompson, WAC, L1010651.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship and subject to physical qualification:

Howard G. Abbott, O1874979.
George W. Allen.
Dana D. Cox, O2019093.
Robert S. Cox, Jr., O954254.
Michael R. Ferrell, O1928867.
James P. Gieger, O1982485.
Alphonse C. Gomez, O1887613.
Homer H. Hanna, O2263987.
Benjamin K. Karas, O1928872.
Edward S. Konwinski, O1874981.
Arlan P. Larson, O1880054.
Robert E. McComas, O1928863.
Jack T. Orr.
Francis W. Pedrotty, Jr., O1928322.
James W. Ransone, O1892445.
James H. Ryan, O2104780.
Paul E. Siebert, O1928880.
Paul A. Thomas, Jr., O1892461.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

To be first lieutenants

Julian D. Farrar, O954117.
Otis W. Harrison, O1338341.
George J. Maranger, O2208008.
Frank E. McFadden, O959886.
Arthur Newell, O2202035.
Stephen J. Patrick, Jr., O2200301.
Rodman C. Rainville, O979222.
William D. Sheehan, O984154.

To be second lieutenants

Alfred Abbotts, O989524.
George H. Adams, O978832.
John T. Adams, Jr., O1340340.
Skinner E. Anderson, O2206975.
John L. Aultman, O2204082.
William C. Bascom, O2203134.
Robert D. Baumfalk, O955872.
William E. Beamer, O978245.
William H. Becker, O1874483.
David A. Bell, O2208066.
Ronald C. Berger, O2201474.
James A. Berry, O983576.
Edwin R. Breed, O978651.
Robert M. Broms, O975628.
Bruce F. Buck, O974012.
Ralph J. Canine, Jr., O1185998.
Edward P. Chandler, O978788.
James Clark, O2202185.
Philip L. Clark, O963399.
Carrell A. Clem, Jr., O991340.
James H. Cook, O1918918.
Omar D. Craig, O966454.
George D. Cram, Jr., O2201004.
Robert L. Davis, O1872599.
Alan DeYoung, O990917.
Irving Ellis, O2010717.
Leo J. Elmerick, O2202961.
Curtis D. Fish, O979827.
David A. Forsythe, O2102276.
Robert C. Fox, O2201884.
Clarence D. Freberg, O2206485.
Dennis V. Gentry, Jr., O992237.
Raymond Gilchrist, Jr., O986826.
David B. Goble, O2202258.
Charles S. Graves, O1334998.
Richard J. Haas, O2205198.
Donald J. Haid, O1876496.
Robert B. Hankins, O945634.
William Hart, O1186746.
Donald F. Herndon, O1328600.
Herbert S. Holland, Jr., O960126.
Charles M. Holmes, O2201464.
Raymond A. Hopkins, O2209962.
Cleo N. Howard, Jr., O2207376.
Lonnie R. Huff, O975999.
Arthur J. Jackson, O975433.
Bernard Jacobvitz, O2041806.
George R. H. Johnson, O1915279.
Maxwell V. Jonah, O1113281.
Samuel H. Jopling, Jr., O2205709.
James E. Karo, O2021089.
Edward A. Kelley, Jr., O2203631.
Gerald B. Kersey, O1879362.
Herbert E. Knight, O1873369.
Carl A. Koffler, O1341795.
Laurence H. Krause, O983596.
James R. Mason, O1919408.
Robert F. Mayor, O1335555.
Arthur D. Moreland, O2200799.
Marcus D. Moreman, O993997.
Leo M. O'Brien, Jr., O971655.
Joseph G. Oliveira, O2041819.
Y. Y. Phillips, Jr., O1339098.
John E. Philp, O2207800.
John W. Pick, Jr., O991919.
Bobbie J. Pinkerton, O2208033.
Castel L. Pittman, Jr., O1914785.
Willie G. Putnam, O989711.
Gerald C. Ray, O2041824.
Herbert H. Ray, O981274.
Howard R. Ross, O974201.
Johnnie L. Runnels, O2204181.
Warren M. Schaub, O1914554.
Harold F. Schwenk, Jr., O972628.
William J. Schworer, Jr., O2211392.
Joseph H. Slaymaker, O2200375.
Albert B. Smith, O2202611.
Gerald C. Sola, Jr., O2001800.
Joseph L. Somers, O960664.
Richard W. Stenquist, O1341054.
Lee W. Swift, Jr., O1872921.
Thomas H. Takano, O1685084.
Francis A. Thomson, O2041946.
Joe W. Uttinger, O1020224.
Robert O. Viterna, O990786.
William P. Ward, O2205447.
Gus H. Watt, O2003177.
James W. Weaver, O958115.
Lawrence H. D. Williams, O2206444.
Henry P. Zaleski, O2201730.
Robert C. Zwick, O1872449.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Officer has been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenant

AIR FORCE

Jones, Donald Bliss, 24763A.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 25, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all wisdom and power, we are again uniting our hearts in the fellowship of prayer for we know that for courage and good cheer, for faith and fidelity, for patience and endurance, in these days of strain and stress, we need the hope and help which Thou alone canst give.

We rejoice that Thou hast placed at our command and disposal those abundant moral and spiritual resources, which will enable us to turn defeat into victory, doubt into confidence, if we are only willing to appropriate them.

Lift us out of all cynical and despairing tempers of mind and may we never stand still, trembling and looking toward the future with fear, but may we walk in faith, assured that Thy sustaining grace is sufficient for our every need.

Inspire us with a passion to hasten the dawning of that better day when both friend and foe, and all the members of the human family, of whatever race, or creed, or color, shall be drawn together by the spirit of our blessed Lord, the spirit of love and friendship, of peace and good will.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 22, 1953, was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day.

IMPROVEMENT TO CERTAIN BUSINESS PROPERTIES

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3087) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to permit the erection, construction, alteration, conversion, maintenance, and use of such buildings and other improvements on (1) square 2695, lot No. 800 (east side of 16th Street, between Taylor and Upshur Streets NW.), and (2) square 1928, lot No. 5 (southeast corner of the intersection of Wisconsin and Massachusetts Avenues NW.), both situated in the District of Columbia, as the Commissioners may deem appropriate for the purpose of conducting the businesses which are being conducted on such lands on the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "Taylor and Upshur Streets" and insert "Arkansas Avenue and Upshur Street."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "5" and insert "800."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I may say that this bill and the other 10 bills that we have before us this morning were reported out of the Judiciary Subcommittee unanimously and by the entire committee unanimously to the House. I make this statement so that should any Member desire an explanation of a bill I shall be happy to give it; otherwise I shall not take up the time of the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCE FOR FUNERAL EXPENSES OUT OF DECEDENT'S ESTATE

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 4484) to amend section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of assets of a decedent's estate for funeral expenses, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the act approved June 30, 1902 (title 20, sec. 605, D. C. Code, 1951), is further amended by striking out the word "three" in line 5 and inserting in lieu thereof the word "six" and by striking out the word "three" in line 7 and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLICATION OF PARTNERSHIPS

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 4485) to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to publication of partnerships, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraphs 1507, 1508, and 1509 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1416; D. C. Code, 1951, title 41, secs. 110, 111, and 112), be, and the same hereby are, amended by striking out sections 1507, 1508, and 1509, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 1508. Effect of failure to publish: If the procedure prescribed in section 1503 be not made, the partnership shall be deemed general."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORCIBLE ENTRY AND DETAINER

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H. R. 4486) to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 20 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189, 1192), as amended (41 Stat. 555; D. C. Code, 1940, title 11, sec. 11–735), be, and the same hereby is, amended by striking out section 20, as amended, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 20. Unlawful detainer: Whenever any person shall detain possession of real property without right, or after his right to possession shall have ceased, it shall be lawful for the municipal court, on complaint under oath verified by the person aggrieved by such detention or by his agent or attorney having knowledge of the facts, to issue a summons to the party complained of to appear and show cause why judgment should not be given against him for the restitution of possession."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING DECEDENT'S BUSINESS

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 4487) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as further amended by an act of April 19, 1920—title 20, chapter 1, section 116, District of Columbia Code, 1951—relating to continuing decedent's business, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of April 19, 1920 (41 Stat. 556, ch. 153, sec. 123a), amending the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (title 20, ch. 1, sec. 116, D. C. Code, 1951), is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof, and in lieu thereof inserting the following: "The probate court may, in its discretion, authorize any fiduciary accountable to it to continue any business of the decedent for a period of 12 months after decedent's death: *Provided*, That, upon good cause shown, the probate court may, in its discretion, extend the said period."

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to amend section 20–116 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition, so that the probate court may, in its discretion, authorize any fiduciary accountable to it to continue any business of the decedent for a period of 12 months after the decedent's death, provided, that, upon good cause shown, the probate court may, in its discretion, extend the said period. The present law limits the court's power to authorize the operation of a business for 1 year only.

It is felt that the present law should be amended so as to give the court power to authorize the operation of a business for a longer period than 1 year in such cases as it may be necessary.

Mr. Speaker this bill was introduced by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] and has the approval of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Did this bill pass the House last year?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It is my recollection this is the same bill that passed the House last year.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FIX CERTAIN LICENSING AND REGISTRATION FEES

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 4939) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to fix from time to time, in accordance with section 2 of this act, the fees authorized to be charged by the following acts:

(1) The act entitled "An act to regulate steam-engineering in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1887 (ch. 272, 24 Stat. 427, as amended; title 2, ch. 15, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(2) The act entitled "An act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia," approved June 18, 1898 (ch. 467, 30 Stat. 477, as amended; title 2, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(3) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906 (ch. 2084, 34 Stat. 175, as amended; title 2, ch. 6, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(4) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907 (ch. 442, 34 Stat. 870; title 2, ch. 8, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(5) The act entitled "An act to define the term of 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," approved February 9, 1907 (ch. 913, 34 Stat. 887, as amended; title 2, ch. 4, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(6) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918 (ch. 82, 40 Stat. 560, as amended; title 2, ch. 7, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(7) The act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923 (ch. 94, 42 Stat. 1261, as

amended; title 2, ch. 9, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(8) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia," approved May 28, 1924 (ch. 202, 43 Stat. 177; title 2, ch. 5, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(9) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia," approved December 13, 1924 (ch. 9, 43 Stat. 713, as amended; title 2, ch. 10, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(10) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929 (ch. 342, 45 Stat. 1326, as amended; title 2, ch. 1, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(11) The act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937 (ch. 760, 50 Stat. 787, as amended; title 45, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(12) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and licensing of those engaging in the practice of cosmetology in the District of Columbia," approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 321, 52 Stat. 611; title 2, ch. 13, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(13) The act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 322, 52 Stat. 620, as amended; title 2, ch. 11, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(14) The act entitled "An act to amend the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof," approved July 2, 1940 (ch. 513, 54 Stat. 716; title 2, ch. 3, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(15) The act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944 (ch. 612, 58 Stat. 823, as amended; title 2, ch. 12, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(16) The act entitled "An act defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia," approved September 19, 1950 (ch. 953, 64 Stat. 854; title 2, ch. 18, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

SEC. 2. The Commissioners may increase or decrease the fees authorized to be charged by each of the acts listed in the first section of this act to such amounts as may, in the judgment of the Commissioners, be reasonably necessary to defray the approximate cost of administering each of said acts.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 1, after the word "may", insert "after public hearing."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman make a short explanation of this bill?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House last year. Some of the licensing departments and bureaus of the District are having difficulty financing themselves from the results of fees. On two occasions, I believe last year and the year before, the House passed legislation to permit certain departments or bureaus of the District to increase their fees.

This general authority would give to the District Commissioners the power of determining what fees should be charged and to raise or to lower the fees of the various licensing departments. There is a long statement here in explanation of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it may appear at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

The statement follows:

H. R. 4939

In recent years an increasing number of examining and licensing boards of the District of Columbia have found it necessary to seek increases in the fees charged under the acts administered by them. Usually these acts require that all expenses of the boards created thereby shall be paid from the income derived under the authority of such acts, but the acts make no provision for the payment of the expenses of the boards from funds other than those resulting from fees imposed by such acts.

Thus there is a definite threat to the very existence of the District's examining and licensing boards in the event their income continues for a substantial period of time to be less than their expenses. For example, at the present time the Nurses' Examining Board has a bank balance of only a few hundred dollars, hardly sufficient to meet its payroll and to procure necessary supplies, although these expenses are being held to the minimum. Should the expenses of the Nurses' Examining Board continue to exceed its income, as has been the case for the last 4 years, the Board will exhaust its funds and will no longer be able to carry on its function of registering nurses, even though an act of Congress prohibits a nurse from representing herself to be such, unless she is registered by the Nurses' Examining Board. Situations similar to that confronting the Nurses' Examining Board have in the past confronted the Board of Accountancy, the Board of Podiatry Examiners, the Board of Barber Examiners, and the District Boxing Commission; and similar situations presently confront the Board of Dental Examiners, the Board of Examiners in Veterinary Medicine, and the District of Columbia Board of Cosmetology.

In each of these cases, therefore, in the absence of general legislation, it has been, or it may be, necessary for the Commissioners to seek legislation amending the several acts administered by the various examining and licensing boards for the purpose of increasing the fees authorized by such acts. If, however, the Commissioners were authorized by general legislation to fix the fees to be charged under the various acts administered by the several examining and licensing boards, such authority would (1) allow the Commissioners to increase or decrease the fees authorized to be charged by the acts creating the various boards to an amount sufficient to meet the approximate expenses of each such board, and (2) the Congress would not need to enact separate bills relating to the fees authorized to be charged under the 16 acts mentioned in the bill.

The proposed bill would authorize the Commissioners to increase or decrease the fees authorized to be charged by 16 acts. Some of these acts—the acts creating the Board of Accountancy, the Board of Podiatry Examiners, and the Board of Barber Examiners—have recently been amended to increase the fees authorized to be charged. Nevertheless, the Commissioners should have authority to increase or decrease the fees authorized by these three acts, so that separate legislation will not be necessary, at some future date again to change such fees.

The Commissioners presently are engaged in reorganizing the government of the District of Columbia under Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952. Until such reorganization has been completed, the cost of administering the 16 acts listed in the bill will be difficult of determination. At the present time, therefore, the Commissioners, although aware that certain of the regulatory boards are in financial straits, have no way of determining what the approximate cost of administering the various acts will be after reorganization has been completed. For this reason, therefore, the Commissioners are reluctant to request separate laws amending the acts administered by certain of the 16 boards, even assuming that such separate legislation were desirable.

Accordingly, the Commissioners strongly recommend the early enactment of the proposed legislation so that they will be in a position promptly to increase or decrease the fees authorized to be charged by each of the acts listed in the bill, to the extent necessary adequately to meet the approximate cost of administering such acts, without making it necessary for them to seek separate legislation in each case.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill has previously passed the House and we feel the Commissioners should have this authority.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1324) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to fix from time to time, in accordance with section 2 of this act, the fees authorized to be charged by the following acts:

(1) The act entitled "An act to regulate steam-engineering in the District of Columbia," approved February 26, 1887 (ch. 272, 24 Stat. 427, as amended; title 2, ch. 15, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(2) The act entitled "An act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia," approved June 13, 1898 (ch. 467, 30 Stat. 477, as amended; title 2, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(3) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906 (ch. 2084, 34 Stat. 175, as amended; title 2, ch. 6, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(4) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907 (ch. 442, 34 Stat. 870; title 2, ch. 8, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(5) The act entitled "An act to define the term of 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," approved February 9, 1907 (ch. 913, 34 Stat. 887, as amended; title 2, ch. 4, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(6) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918 (ch. 82,

40 Stat. 560, as amended; title 2, ch. 7, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(7) The act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923 (ch. 94, 42 Stat. 1261, as amended; title 2, ch. 9, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(8) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia," approved May 28, 1924 (ch. 202, 43 Stat. 177; title 2, ch. 5, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(9) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia," approved December 13, 1924 (ch. 9, 43 Stat. 713, as amended; title 2, ch. 10, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(10) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929 (ch. 352, 45 Stat. 1326, as amended; title 2, ch. 1, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(11) The act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937 (ch. 760, 50 Stat. 787, as amended; title 45, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(12) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and licensing of those engaging in the practice of cosmetology in the District of Columbia," approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 321, 52 Stat. 611; title 2, ch. 13, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(13) The act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 322, 52 Stat. 620, as amended; title 2, ch. 11, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(14) The act entitled "An act to amend the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof," approved July 2, 1940 (ch. 513, 54 Stat. 716; title 2, ch. 3, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(15) The act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944 (ch. 612, 58 Stat. 823, as amended; title 2, ch. 12, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(16) The act entitled "An act defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia," approved September 19, 1950 (ch. 953, 64 Stat. 854; title 2, ch. 18, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

SEC. 2. The Commissioners may increase or decrease the fees authorized to be charged by each of the acts listed in the first section of this act to such amounts as may, in the judgment of the Commissioners, be reasonably necessary to defray the approximate cost of administering each of said acts.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to fix from time to time, in accordance with section 2 of this act, the fees authorized to be charged by the following acts:

"(1) The act entitled 'An act to regulate steam-engineering in the District of Columbia,' approved February 28, 1887 (ch. 272, 24 Stat. 427, as amended; title 2, ch. 15, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(2) The act entitled 'An act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia,' approved June 18, 1898 (ch. 467, 30 Stat. 477, as amended; title 2, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(3) The act entitled 'An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved May 7, 1906 (ch. 2084, 34 Stat. 175, as amended; title 2, ch. 6, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(4) The act entitled 'An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia,' approved February 1, 1907 (ch. 442, 34 Stat. 870; title 2, ch. 8, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(5) The act entitled 'An act to define the term of "registered nurse" and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia,' approved February 9, 1907 (ch. 913, 34 Stat. 887, as amended; title 2, ch. 4, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(6) The act entitled 'An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia,' approved May 23, 1918 (ch. 82, 40 Stat. 560, as amended; title 2, ch. 7, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(7) The act entitled 'An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved February 17, 1923 (ch. 94, 42 Stat. 1261, as amended; title 2, ch. 9, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(8) The act entitled 'An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia,' approved May 28, 1924 (ch. 202, 43 Stat. 177; title 2, ch. 5, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(9) The act entitled 'An act to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia,' approved December 13, 1924 (ch. 9, 43 Stat. 713, as amended; title 2, ch. 10, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(10) The act entitled 'An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia,' approved February 27, 1929 (ch. 342, 45 Stat. 1326, as amended; title 2, ch. 1, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(11) The act entitled 'An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes,' approved August 25, 1937 (ch. 760, 50 Stat. 787, as amended; title 45, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(12) The act entitled 'An act to provide for the examination and licensing of those engaging in the practice of cosmetology in the District of Columbia,' approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 321, 52 Stat. 611; title 2, ch. 13, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(13) The act entitled 'An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 322, 52 Stat. 620, as amended; title 2, ch. 11, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(14) The act entitled 'An act to amend the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof,' approved July 2, 1940 (ch. 513, 54 Stat. 716; title 2, ch. 3, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(15) The act entitled 'An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved December 20, 1944 (ch. 612, 58 Stat. 823, as amended; title 2, ch. 12, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(16) The act entitled 'An act defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia,' approved September 19, 1950 (ch. 953, 64 Stat. 854; title 2, ch. 18, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"SEC. 2. The Commissioners may increase or decrease the fees authorized to be charged by each of the acts listed in the first section of this act to such amounts as may, in the judgment of the Commissioners, be reasonably necessary to defray the approximate cost of administering each of said acts."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Minnesota explain the changes that have been included in the Senate bill?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the House bill on page 5, line 1, provides an amendment: "after public hearing" which the District Committee of the House would prefer. We would like that provision to remain in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

By unanimous consent, the bill (H. R. 4939) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDE FOR THE REDEMPTION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAX STAMPS

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4940) to provide for the redemption of District of Columbia tax stamps, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, where any cigarette or alcoholic-beverage tax stamps issued under District of Columbia tax laws have been spoiled, destroyed, or rendered useless or unfit for the purpose intended, or for which the owner may have no use, the amount paid for such stamps may be refunded within the limit of appropriations therefor, or allowed as a credit on the purchase of new stamps. No such refund or allowance shall be made unless the owner of such stamps shall file a written claim therefor with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent within the time prescribed in this act and unless the Commissioners or their designated agent upon receipt of satisfactory evidence of the facts, and subject to regulations prescribed by the Commissioners, certify that such refund or allowance is just and equitable.

SEC. 2. No refund or allowance shall be made in any case (1) until the stamps so spoiled or rendered useless shall have been returned to the Commissioners or their designated agent, or (2) until satisfactory proof has been made to the Commissioners or their designated agent showing the reason why the same cannot be returned, or (3), if so required by the Commissioners or their designated agent unless the person presenting the same can satisfactorily trace the history of said stamps from their issuance to the filing of his claim as aforesaid: *Provided*, That no refund shall be made in those cases where the owner may be made whole by allowing him a credit on the purchase of new stamps: *And provided further*, That no claim for a refund, or allowance for such stamps, shall be allowed unless presented within 6 months after the stamps have been spoiled, destroyed, or rendered useless or unfit for the purpose intended, or, in the

case of stamps for which the owner may have no use, within 6 months from the date of purchase thereof, except that as to stamps which have been spoiled, destroyed, or rendered useless or unfit for the purpose intended, or for which the owner may have no use, prior to the effective date of this act, a claim for a refund or allowance for credit may be filed within 6 months after the effective date of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELL CERTAIN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PROPERTY IN MARYLAND

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2969) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered, in their discretion, for the best interests of the District of Columbia, to sell and convey, in whole or in part, to the highest bidder at public or private sale, real estate now owned in fee simple by the United States of America and acquired pursuant to the act of Congress entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes," approved February 26, 1923 (42 Stat. 1358), for the government of the District of Columbia for use by the National Training School for Girls, such real estate being that property in Prince Georges County, Md., described in 2 deeds of conveyance, 1 deed from Nathan Romanov and Annie Romanov, to the United States of America, and recorded on the 7th day of November 1923, at 10:17 o'clock antemeridian, in liber 306 at folio 384, 1 of the land records of Prince Georges County, Md., and the other deed from Oliver E. Pagan and Alice J. Pagan to the United States of America, recorded on the 28th day of August 1923, in liber 306 at folio 17, 1 of the land records of Prince Georges County, Md.

SEC. 2. The said Commissioners are further authorized to pay the reasonable and necessary expenses of sale of each parcel of land sold pursuant to the provisions of this act, and shall deposit the net proceeds thereof in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Price Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls.

In 1923, pursuant to the District Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, the District of Columbia acquired a tract of land for use by the National Training School for Girls, consisting of 143.15 acres, located in Prince Georges County, Md., near Muirkirk, and lying approximately one-half mile east of the Washington-Baltimore Boulevard. At the time of acquisition the tract had on it a two-story frame building, a frame bungalow, and several outbuildings. The cost of acquisition was $32,500. Title to the land was taken in the name of the United States for the reason that it was located outside the District.

The property was used for the purpose for which it was acquired for only a few years. The location of the site proved unsatisfactory and its use was discontinued.

The Department of Agriculture at one time was interested in securing this land as an addition to the Agriculture Research Center, which is located near the tract. On December 23, 1951, the Department advised the District that it is no longer interested in acquiring the property.

The Commissioners believe that it would be in the best interests of the District to dispose of this property.

Section 9-301, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition, provides as follows:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, with the approval of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, are authorized and empowered in their discretion, for the best interests of the District of Columbia, to sell and convey, in whole or in part, to the highest bidder at public or private sale, real estate now or hereafter owned in fee simple by the District of Columbia for municipal use, in the District of Columbia, which the Commissioners and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission find to be no longer required for public purposes (August 5, 1939, 53 Stat. 1211, ch. 490, sec. 1).

Under this statute the Commissioners are given authority to sell only the real estate owned by the District in the District of Columbia. There is no authority for a Federal agency to sell property of the District.

Mr. Speaker, this matter of sale was under discussion several times when the matter was first brought up. The question was asked as to what the present market value of the property was, and that confidential information was given the committee by the District Commissioners. There was also some discussion as to whether this property could best be sold at public sale rather than private sale, but after the committee had fully considered the matter it was left to the discretion of the Commissioners as provided in the bill to sell either at a private or a public sale. The committee felt that it might be better if it could be sold at a private sale if the price was more advantageous to the District than selling at a public sale.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is it not true that this land is lying idle at the present time and the District is getting no revenue whatsoever from this land?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is correct.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POLYCULTURAL UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 4229) to change the name of the Polycultural Institution of America to Polycultural University of America, and to grant a congressional charter to such university, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the certificate of incorporation of the Polycultural Institution of America filed under subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia (31 Stat. 1280–1282; 45 Stat. 1503–1505; 48 Stat. 592; D. C. Code, 1951 edition, secs. 29–401—29–419), as herein specifically altered and modified, is hereby approved and confirmed.

SEC. 2. With the unanimous consent of the board of regents of the Polycultural Institution of America, the name of the Polycultural Institution of America is hereby changed to Polycultural University of America. Such name may be abbreviated as "PUA." Such change of name shall not affect or modify in any degree the rights, privileges, powers, and obligations of Polycultural Institution of America by other certificate of incorporation of the Polycultural Institution of America, except to the extent provided in this act.

SEC. 3. In view of the useful activities of the Polycultural Institution of America in various fields of higher learning and in view of the recognition, on a basis of full faith and credit, heretofore accorded to the Polycultural Institution of America by other colleges and universities in the United States, such recognition being attested by letters of such colleges and universities stating their acceptance on a parity basis in their own undergraduate and graduate scholastic programs of credits earned at the Polycultural Institution of America and by other actions of such colleges and universities, Polycultural University of America shall have, and is hereby granted, the power to grant, issue, and confer certificates, diplomas, and academic and honorary degrees as provided in article IV of the certificate of incorporation of the Polycultural Institution of America; and Polycultural University of America may make this act of Congress publicly known.

SEC. 4. The executive board of regents of Polycultural University of America may establish such auxiliary board of an academic, advisory, or promotional nature within or outside the United States as it deems necessary and appropriate.

SEC. 5. Polycultural University of America may enter into agreements with institutions of learning and educational and research associations and organizations within or outside the United States for the purpose of making available to students, scholars, and investigators of such institutions, associations, and organizations the educational and research facilities of Polycultural University of America and of making available to students, scholars, and investigators of Polycultural University of America the educational and research facilities of such institutions, associations, and organizations, upon such terms as may be mutually agreed upon by Polycultural University of America and such institutions, associations, and organizations, and for the promotion of polycultural education in the United States and in other countries of the world.

SEC. 6. No institution of learning hereafter incorporated in the District of Columbia or in the several States, Territories, or possessions of the United States shall use in or as its title, in whole or in part, the words "polycultural" and "Polycultural University of America."

SEC. 7. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act at any time is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 23, strike out "or in the several States, Territories, or possessions of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF DEEDS

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 4550) to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 546–D, of subchapter 3 of chapter 16 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as enacted by the act approved June 5, 1952 (66 Stat. 126, ch. 370; title 42, D. C. Code, 1951, as amended), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new language: "*Provided*, That this paragraph shall not be applicable to any bill of sale, mortgage, deed of trust, or conditional sale of railroad rolling stock filed pursuant to section 546–A or section 546–B of this subchapter."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBUS UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3796) relating to the incorporation of the Columbus University of Washington, District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the incorporation of the Columbus University of Washington, District of Columbia, under chapter 18 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, be, and the same is hereby, approved and confirmed except as herein specifically altered.

SEC. 2. The number of trustees for the management of said corporation shall not be more than 18 and not less than 12: *Provided*, That a majority of the trustees shall be members of the fraternal order known as the Knights of Columbus; that W. Francis Delaney, George R. Ellis, George E. Herring, George F. Howell, Harold Francis Jones, William E. Leahy, James F. McKeon, Walter I. Plant, Timothy J. Quirk, Michael J. Racioppi, Manning J. Wilcoxon and Thomas Gillespie Walsh shall constitute the original board of trustees under this act; that the board of trustees shall elect, from among themselves, one member to be president, one member to be vice president, one member to be treasurer, and one member to be secretary of said corporation; that at the first meeting of the board subsequent to the passage of this act the trustees shall be divided into three classes, the members of the first class to serve for a period of 1 year, the members of the second class to serve for a period of 2 years; and the members of the third class to serve for a period of 3 years; that the said trustees shall serve for the periods mentioned and/or until their successors are designated, the power of designation being in the board of trustees; that the selection of new trustees and their designation to classes shall be in the discretion of the board of trustees; that the number of professorships which may be established by said corporation shall be left to the discretion of the board of trustees, who shall have the power to establish ordinances and bylaws for the conduct of the business of the corporation, or to alter, repeal, and amend the same, and also power to frame laws and regulations to govern the faculty and students in all departments thereof and to designate such professors and lecturers as they shall deem necessary and with such salaries and duties as the said board of trustees shall deem proper: *Provided, however*, That no member of the board of trustees, except the president, shall serve in a teaching capacity in the university.

SEC. 3. That the said trustees may receive, invest, and administer endowments and gifts of money, and property absolute or subject to payments by way of annuities, during the life of the donor, for the maintenance of educational works by said university, and they shall have all the powers and authority hereby granted to or invested in the trustees of said university by chapter 18, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. The said corporation shall adopt a common seal, under and by which all deeds, diplomas, and acts of the said university or corporation shall pass and be authenticated, and the same seal at their pleasure to break and alter, or to devise a new one.

SEC. 5. That the funds, moneys, and properties of the corporation shall be held in the name of Columbus University and that the funds or the income of the corporation, or any part thereof, shall be used for no purpose or object other than to promote and advance the best interests of Columbus University.

SEC. 6. No institution of learning hereafter incorporated in the District of Columbia shall use in or as its title, in whole or in part, the words "Columbus University."

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to prevent Congress from altering, amending, or repealing same.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business of the Committee on the District of Columbia for today.

ECONOMIC STUDIES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include correspondence with the Secretary of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1953, I spoke on this floor about the significant accomplishments which had occurred in the field of newsprint as a result of the cooperative efforts of the Department of Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary. At that time I indicated the extent to which the joint activities of the Department and the committee had encouraged private enterprise to invest in new productive facilities for manufacturing newsprint from sugarcane bagasse, thus proving the effectiveness of constructive activity by the legislative and executive branches working together to open up new fields for development by private enterprise.

In March of this year I wrote to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, requesting that the Department conduct additional studies on behalf of the committee dealing with incentives to the development of industry by private capital and industrial organization in certain selected areas of the national economy. At the close of my remarks I am inserting this letter, together with Mr. Weeks' reply and my acknowledgment thereof.

Many Members of Congress and businessmen generally will be pleased to observe that the Secretary has agreed to provide these studies dealing with incentives to private industry and industrial structure.

This material will be indispensable to the committee on the performance of its legislative duties, especially where clarification of the antitrust laws is concerned. The material will also be of important benefit to private enterprise in developing new industries and new sources of raw materials. The work already conducted by the Department of Commerce at the request of the committee with respect to newsprint is a concrete example of how private investment in new facilities can be stimulated by studies of this general nature.

The Secretary is to be commended for his foresight in undertaking this program for the committee and in making available to private industry as well the important data which only his Department is in a position to provide. Credit must be given to the new administration for recognizing the serious gap which existed in available economic data and in fostering cooperative endeavors of the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1953.

Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In writing you for the first time, I want to express my great personal satisfaction that the Department of Commerce is in the able hands of a man so well acquainted with the practical problems of business. I know that the Committee on the Judiciary will be able to count upon your Department for effective cooperation in matters of mutual concern.

The Department of Commerce has made significant contributions to the work of this committee in the past. As recently as March 3, 1953, I referred on the floor of the Congress to the noteworthy achievement being made by your organization, in cooperation with the Judiciary Committee, in developing new sources to augment our national supply of newsprint, such as the use of sugarcane bagasse as a raw material. The joint efforts of the Department and this committee in the field of newsprint afford a concrete example of how a Federal agency working in conjunction with a congressional committee can open up entirely new fields for development by private enterprise, without financing by the Government.

We are looking forward with keen interest to the presentation in the near future of the Department's additional reports, requested by the committee in connection with its newsprint investigation, which I understand will relate to the development of new processes for the production of newsprint from hardwoods, the prospective use of Alaskan timber resources, and the recovery of newsprint by deinking wastepaper.

These newsprint studies were undertaken, and the initial report pertaining to bagasse was made, under the assigned supervision of Mr. H. B. McCoy, then Deputy Administrator of the National Production Authority. In late November last, I formulated a general program for the continuation during the 83d Congress of the committee's studies and investigations of antitrust matters, and I therefore requested Mr. McCoy by letter to broaden the scope of the Department's studies to embrace certain other basic industries, reports on which would be of inestimable value to this committee in the consideration and proper discharge of its responsibilities with respect to antitrust legislation. Any legislative action in a field so fundamental to the operation of our economy must necessarily be based upon a careful study of the facts concerning the major structural changes which have occurred in the location, technology, and concentration of industry as a result of defense expansion.

Now that the program of the committee has been more specifically defined, particularly with respect to the order of consideration, I should like to request that initial attention in the Department's studies be given to the following industry groups:

1. Steel.
2. Chemical.
3. Capital goods.
4. Pulp and paper.

It would be extremely useful to the committee if, as part of the Department's presentation of the above studies, it could also submit a comprehensive analysis of the financial incentives and deterrents to private industry which are incident to the development of new enterprises or the expansion of existing enterprises, with case studies showing the operation and significance of these factors in specific situations.

I was pleased to learn from Mr. McCoy in December that Mr. Jesse J. Friedman, who had been in charge of the newsprint study for your Department, was designated to supervise and direct the preparation of the additional studies requested. I may say that Mr. Friedman has made a splendid contribution to the work of the committee in the past, and I have every confidence in him and in his ability effectively to assist the committee in the future. I have designated the committee counsel, Mr. Malcolm Mecartney, to represent the committee in this matter and to cooperate with Mr. Friedman in every way possible to facilitate the progress of this project.

The studies requested will be an indispensable contribution to the committee in its consideration not only of the adequacy of present antitrust laws and the effectiveness of their administration, but also of legislative proposals for the modification of such statutes. Moreover, I am sure that the information will be of inestimable value to the business community and to the general public.

In view of the outstanding success of the Department's previous studies for the committee on the production of newsprint from bagasse, I am confident that a similar contribution will be made by the Department in completing the work outlined above and that the results of this program will further demonstrate the effective working relationship between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, in the public interest.

With assurances of highest esteem, I am

Sincerely,

CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Chairman.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1953.

The Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: Thank you for your cordial letter concerning the studies being carried on by my Department in cooperation with your committee. I am gratified by your complimentary remarks concerning our contribution to the work of the committee, and am in accord with your view that constructive collaboration between the executive and legislative branches, as exemplified by the successful relationship between the Judiciary Committee and the Department of Commerce, best serves the cause of good and efficient government.

As members of my staff have informed members of your staff, I have delayed a definite answer to your letter regarding special industry studies because of reorganization and budget problems relating to the coming fiscal year. I am very much interested in your statement regarding the program of your committee evolving legislation and policies to foster the sound development and growth of private enterprise. I agree with you about the importance of such a program, and I will provide a staff and assign to it the studies you request. I believe that considerable material has already been developed and our staff reorganization has progressed to the point where I think we can provide the material you want in the reasonably near future.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1953.

Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received your letter of May 1, 1953, and am very pleased that you have provided for the completion of the studies and reports which I have requested on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary. In my opinion, this work will be of immeasurable benefit to the legislative activities of the committee as well as to business interests generally.

Be assured that all members of the committee are looking forward with great interest to the presentation of the Department's reports.

With assurances of highest esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Chairman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum it not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 43]

Abbitt	Ford	Neal
Adair	Forrester	Nelson
Andrews	Frelinghuysen	Norblad
Angell	Friedel	Norrell
Aspinall	Fulton	O'Brien, Mich.
Ayres	Gamble	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baker	Garmatz	O'Neill
Barrett	Gary	Osmers
Becker	Goodwin	Passman
Bender	Gordon	Patman
Bishop	Granahan	Patten
Blatnik	Grant	Pfost
Bolton,	Green	Phillips
Frances P.	Gubser	Pilcher
Bolton,	Hagen, Minn.	Pillion
Oliver P.	Haley	Poulson
Bonner	Hand	Powell
Boykin	Hardy	Prouty
Brooks, La.	Hart	Rains
Buchanan	Hays, Ark.	Rhodes, Pa.
Bush	Hays, Ohio	Robsion, Ky.
Byrne, Pa.	Heller	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Hess	Roosevelt
Carlyle	Hiestand	Sadlak
Case	Hillings	Scherer
Celler	Hinshaw	Secrest
Chatham	Hoeven	Shafer
Chudoff	Holt	Shelley
Cole, N. Y.	Hope	Sikes
Cooley	Hosmer	Simpson, Pa.
Corbett	Jarman	Smith, Miss.
Coudert	Javits	Smith, Va.
Crumpacker	Johnson	Springer
Cunningham	Jones, Mo.	Stringfellow
Dague	Kearney	Sullivan
Davis, Ga.	Kelley, Pa.	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Kelly, N. Y.	Thompson, La.
Dawson, Utah	Kersten, Wis.	Thompson, Tex.
Derounian	Klein	Tuck
Dingell	Kluczynski	Utt
Dodd	Lesinski	Van Pelt
Dollinger	Lovre	Velde
Dolliver	McCormack	Vorys
Donovan	Mack, Ill.	Warburton
Dorn, N. Y.	Mailliard	Wharton
Dorn, S. C.	Martin, Iowa	Whitten
Dowdy	Meader	Wickersham
Doyle	Metcalf	Widnall
Durham	Miller, Nebr.	Willis
Eberharter	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Calif.
Edmondson	Mollohan	Wilson, Ind.
Elliott	Morgan	Winstead
Engle	Morrison	Zablocki
Fallon	Multer	
Fine	Mumma	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 253 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 244, Rept. No. 451), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5376) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of

the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House two very important matters which have escaped the attention of this body and the American people. This is understandable when we consider a possible Korean truce, a Big Three meeting, the dissolution of the French Cabinet, balancing of the budget, and so forth. What I have reference to are two bills, H. R. 4406, "To establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources," and H. R. 992, "For the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government." In my opinion and in the opinion of the majority leader, the President, Senator TAFT, and many others, these are two of the most important bills which will come before this body this session. These bills, which are closely related, lay the foundation for the proper adjustment of the numerous relationships between the Federal Government and State and local governments. They also provide for the continuation of the reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government in order that it may operate efficiently and economically and thus make minimum demands upon the sources of tax revenue which sustain the States and counties also. While a good start has been made under the Hoover Commission, it is only a start, and we must renew our efforts to make our sprawling executive branch much more efficent and economical.

Last Friday, the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, unanimously reported out both these bills for the consideration of the full committee. I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Indiana, Mrs. CECIL M. HARDEN, for her fine work on these bills. I also want to congratulate the individual members of the subcommittee, Mr. MEADER, Mr. OSMERS, Mr. HILLELSON, Mr. BROOKS of Texas, Mr. CONDON, and Mr. PILCHER, for their work on these two measures which are of such importance to our country.

It is my earnest hope that the House may soon take quick action on these bills and catch up with the Senate which has, as you know, unanimously voted on companion bills.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4664) making supplemental appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, CLEVENGER, BUSBEY, CANNON, and WHITTEN.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5246, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering nationwide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; $2,500,000: *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of Education performing advisory functions to the said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of members of the Committee, I should like them to know that after I have made this little talk, I will offer an amendment to increase the payments to school districts in federally impacted areas and an amendment to increase the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation, and then I shall offer an amendment to increase the hospital construction program from $50 million to $75 million, and then an amendment covering the hospital and medical care program.

Mr. Chairman, I had expected to offer an amendment at this point in regard to the construction of school facilities under Public Law 815. But I have been advised by the clerk of the committee that it would not be germane to this particular bill because this bill makes appropriations starting July 1, 1953. It was to be for $95 million for the construction of school facilities in these federally impacted areas. I just want to let the committee and the Congress know that when the next supplemental bill comes before the House, I will offer that amendment for the construction of school facilities in federally impacted areas of $95 million. That means that all of these schools that have met the criteria and whose applications have been accepted would be entitled to that $95 million.

In passing Public Law 815, Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States that in recognition of the impact that certain Federal activities have had on the school construction needs in the areas in which Federal activities have been or are being carried on the United States would bear the cost of constructing school facilities in such areas in the manner and to the extent provided under the terms of the act. The law provided a specific formula for determining the eligibility of school districts for assistance and the amount of Federal assistance each district was entitled to receive.

This law authorized 2 years, to June 30, 1952, in which school districts could make applications; 3 years, to June 30, 1953, in which appropriations could be made to pay the established entitlements; and 1 remaining year to complete the program. The law further provided that if a school district had spent its own funds and built school facilities for the Federally connected children in its district, it could receive a reimbursement payment not to exceed either the cost of constructing the school facilities or the amount of the entitlement. However, under the law all requests for construction had to be met before any reimbursement request could be paid.

In testifying before the House subcommittee on the status of the school construction program authorized by this act, officials of the Office of Education reported that 1,128 school districts submitted applications for assistance under section 202 of the act by June 30, 1952, the last date on which applications could be accepted. Of that number 940 school districts were eligible for assistance and 188 were found to be ineligible. These 940 eligible school districts submitted approximately 1,600 requests for construction amounting to $362 million and 184 requests for reimbursement amounting to a little over $25 million. Requirements for school facilities on Federal property under section 204 of the act were reported to be $43,380,000 and for temporary facilities under section 203 were $5 million, making a grand total

required of $435,628,608. These data are shown in a table on page 166 of the hearings before the subcommittee for appropriations for 1954 for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency.

This table also shows that the Congress has appropriated $341,500,000 to meet the total requirements of approximately $435 million. The amount appropriated is now approximately $95,500,000 short of meeting the total requirements. The remaining entitlements that cannot be paid because of insufficient appropriations are made up of $70,800,000 in construction applications and approximately $25 million in reimbursement applications.

Because the funds appropriated were insufficient to meet all of the entitlements, Office of Education officials testified that it was necessary to allot funds on the basis of the greatest relative urgency of need as required by the act. In setting up the priority formula and distributing this money the office provided funds for only minimum school facilities for 90 percent of the unhoused children in any district. In other words they required that each school district absorb 10 percent of its enrollment in order to spread these funds as far as possible to provide minimum school facilities for unhoused children.

The testimony on page 175 of the hearings shows that in my own State of Rhode Island there were 4 school districts eligible for assistance under this act and these 4 districts were entitled to and had requested $831,000 for construction of school facilities and $77,933 for reimbursement. Only 1 school district in the entire State—the Middleton School district—has received an allotment of funds under this law, and it received $322,107. This leaves an amount of $509,014 in construction and $77,933 in reimbursement, or a total of $586,947, which the law says the federally impacted school districts in Rhode Island are entitled to receive, yet a total of only $322,000, or about 35 percent of the entitlement, can be paid to these districts with the funds that have been appropriated.

Office of Education officials testified during the hearings before the subcommittee that, as a result of questionnaire returns submitted by federally affected school districts, there would be a very substantial impact of additional federally connected children migrating into these defense areas between June 30, 1952, the last date on which applications could be submitted, and June 30, 1954. This is in addition to the fact that a substantial number of school districts that were eligible for assistance under Public Law 815 have received no funds to date and that those school districts that did receive allotments were restricted to amounts sufficient to house only 90 percent of their unhoused children. Mr. Leonard O. Maine, superintendent of schools in Portsmouth, R. I., in a letter to me dated March 15, 1953, stated that his school district was entitled to $77,932 under Public Law 815. On the strength of this entitlement and in anticipation of its payment, the town borrowed money and built a school to accommodate defense-connected children and requested reimbursement of this amount. That reimbursement has not been paid for the reasons previously stated. Mr. Maine says that a trailer housing project for 300 families is now being constructed on Navy property in Melville and that this project probably will yield more than 300 additional school children. He further states that the present school facilities are crowded and that the addition of these children will make the situation in Portsmouth critical.

Office of Education officials testified that these federally impacted communities had provided from their own sources $550 million during the period beginning with World War II to build needed school facilities in their districts. These districts also provided an additional $80 million to put into projects for which they received an allotment of funds under Public Law 815. In other words in addition to a half billion dollars spent during the period of World War II, these districts paid approximately 25 percent of the total cost of projects approved under Public Law 815. Thus it appears that many of these school districts have pretty well exhausted their resources to provide additional school facilities. These data are found on page 180 of the hearings.

In view of the fact that Public Law 815 stated it to be the policy of the United States to compensate these school districts for the burden imposed on them by Federal activities and that part but not all of the school districts have received that compensation, I believe that this Congress has a moral obligation to appropriate the $95,500,000 necessary to meet the eligible requests for construction and for reimbursement that have been submitted to the Office of Education in accordance with the terms of the act. I do not see how we can pass a law that says all districts that meet certain requirements are eligible for Federal assistance and then by not appropriating sufficient funds say that only certain school districts can receive that money. This is particularly bad policy in my opinion when it generally is the school districts that have done most with their resources that now cannot receive the funds which the law says they are entitled to receive.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 15, line 1, strike out "$60,500,000" and insert "$66,500,000."

Mr. GWINN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. GWINN. The reading clerk went so rapidly on page 14 that he did not even mention a little item of $2,500,000. I want to make a point of order in regard to that language, and if the chairman please I would like the language to be read. I want to make a point of order against the language.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, may I state the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be heard on the point of order.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language on page 14 from lines 3 to 22 inclusive contains legislation on an appropriation bill. It is obvious from the language itself that it provides for expenditures for activities and programs which are not authorized by basic law, and is, therefore, in violation of clause 2 of rule 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must rule that the gentleman from Rhode Island had debated this paragraph, and the point of order comes too late.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet at the time. I asked unanimous consent that my point be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York should have raised the point of order then.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield. The gentleman from New York was on his feet and the Chairman properly, I think, recognized the gentleman from Rhode Island, a member of the committee. But the gentleman from New York was on his feet simultaneously, and I saw him on his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, according to custom, always recognizes a member of the committee before someone else. Therefore, the Chair recognized the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] could have raised the point of order.

Mr. TABER. But he raised the point of order before the amendment was read.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the paragraph on salaries and expenses starting in line 3 on page 14.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from New York is not a novice on this floor. The gentleman from New York has served here many years with distinction. He knows the procedure of the House. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] made his statement and then offered an amendment which the Clerk reported. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], at the moment when the gentleman from Rhode Island offered his amendment, had then risen, before the amendment was reported, there might have been some reason for granting this unanimous-consent request. But in view of the fact that he was here, paying attention, listening to the amendment being read, and then undertakes to go back, I feel constrained to object, and I do object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] asks unanimous consent to return to salaries and expenses.

Is there objection?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment, which is at the desk.

Mr. HALE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maine seek recognition?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has been recognized and offered his amendment, and is entitled to recognition in support of the amendment which has been reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payments to school districts: For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), $60,500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such act.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 15, line 1, strike out "$60,500,000" and insert "$66,500,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I had no desire to restrain the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] from offering an amendment, but I think the RECORD will show that the Clerk had read through lines 3 to 22, and it was not until after he had read the next paragraph, "Payments to school districts," that I asked for recognition and received it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I just want to say that hereafter on this bill every word must be read.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think that is a good idea, because it seems very strange to me that a quorum call just concluded shows that only 250 Members are present in Washington. Over 160 Members are not present in this House when we are considering an appropriation bill that calls for the expenditure of $2 billion. I hope that every word of the bill will be read, as suggested by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TABER], because I think it is that important.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. In view of the statement just made by the gentleman, I think the gentleman should also include in his statement that under a previous arrangement over 100 Members are out in Yucca Flat, at the experimental explosion of the atomic bomb.

Mr. FOGARTY. Which is, I would say, on official business.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman does not think that the consideration of this bill is official business?

Mr. FOGARTY. I certainly do, and I think the gentleman from New York will consider that I was one who wanted to finish this bill on Friday. If we had continued on until around 7:30 we could have had it finished with most of the Members here.

Mr. TABER. It was evident that we could not.

Mr. FOGARTY. Not in my opinion.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I regret very much this colloquy here about these absent Members. Surely, it is official business, and it is important that this enormous appropriation bill be considered; but it is also important for Members of Congress to know something about what the other untold billions of money that are appropriated for atomic energy is all about also; and I just think it is maybe a little bit—well, unfortunate—that this colloquy should go on and place these absent Members who are out there witnessing this revolutionary explosion—chastise them in this manner. Surely, they are both important; it is just unfortunate that the Members cannot be in both places at the same time.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not think any of my remarks will show that I was trying to chastise anyone. I did not start this colloquy in the first place; it was started on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. There is no reason whatsoever why this bill could not be put over until tomorrow. We have plenty of time this week. Instead of adjourning Thursday, let us sit Thursday and Friday; let the Committee rise; let the bill go over until tomorrow when the Members can be here and present their views.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported that we may have it in our minds as we start its consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 15, line 1, strike out "$60,500,000" and insert "$66,500,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this problem has been with Congress since 1950. Only a few weeks ago the Bureau of Education requested, for all these school districts in the federally impacted areas of the country, a sum of about $24 million. By a large vote the amendment to the supplemental bill which is similar to the one I am offering here was adopted; there were only 18 or 20 votes in the entire House at that time against it: $20,500,000. They gave this figure to meet 100 percent of the amount the schools in the federally impacted areas were entitled to.

Today we are faced with the same problem. They originally made a request for $70 million for 1954 to meet the entitlements of the school districts in these federally impacted areas. After a revision of the budget, the Eisenhower budget allowed $66,500,000 on the basis that there would be less defense spending in 1954 and that they did not think at that time they would need the $70 million. But after a thorough revision of the estimates, the Eisenhower budget came up with a total of $66,500,000. The committee has cut that budget to $60,500,000, or a $9,500,000 cut from the original budget and a $6 million cut from the Eisenhower budget. This law was passed in 1950. I do not think there were over 50 votes against it. It was in September when we were meeting in the old Ways and Means room across the street. It required at that time an appropriation of $25 million to start with. We have never had a record vote on it. You never could get more than 15 or 25 Members on this floor to oppose the amendment because we guaranteed to these school districts that they would receive this money if they met the requirements or the criteria that was spelled out in meeting these entitlements.

We not only have a moral responsibility to them now but it is a responsibility written by you men and women in 1950 that guaranteed this appropriation. One might ask, Why not let the Federal Government take care of their own? If we said to the various towns and cities: "We are not going to give you this money," then it would be the responsibility of the armed services to provide appropriations to educate these children located on the posts throughout the country as well as in various defense establishments and it would cost the Federal Government today $278.71 for each child. Under this arrangement where the local community and the State pay a certain sum it costs $144.50 to educate that particular child.

If we are not going to give them the money that they are entitled to, if we are not going to live up to our moral responsibility as Members of Congress, why do we not repeal the law rather than try to cut them now and say to these local communities, "No, the Federal Government is not going to live up to its responsibility; you provide as best you can the facilities to educate these children whose parents are working in defense establishments or whose parents are living on an Army post or in a defense establishment."

If you do that, then the communities are going to say to the Federal Government, "O. K. We entered into an agreement with the Federal Government in 1950 to provide a certain share of the funds that it would cost to operate and maintain these schools. If the Federal Government does not want to live up to its responsibility, then let the Federal Government assume all of the responsibility of educating these children."

If you do that it is going to cost you just double what it is costing you today to educate a child in that particular cate-

gory. There is no other answer to it. The answer is there, it is in the record, and it cannot be disputed.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS, PUBLIC LAW 874, 1954

In passing Public Law 874 Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance for those local educational agencies on which the United States had placed financial burdens by reason of the fact that revenues available from local sources had been reduced as a result of acquisition of real property by the United States, or such local educational agency had provided education for children residing on Federal property, or whose parents were employed on Federal property, or there had been a sudden and substantial increase in enrollment as a result of Federal activity.

This law was passed after a detailed investigation in the field by subcommittees of the House Committee on Education and Labor of the problems created for local educational agencies by activities of the Federal Government and thorough and careful study of these problems by both the House and Senate in developing the concepts that were written into the law. It coordinated the various types of Federal assistance programs for school purposes that had previously been authorized through a number of different Federal agencies in an overall program which has been administered on a uniform basis to all school districts. This is the third year the program has been in existence and it has worked well. Experience with the legislation indicates that certain minor adjustments need to be made in the basic provisions, but on the whole the legislation is sound and has proved satisfactory in meeting those serious financial burdens which Federal projects created for some local school districts.

The cost has increased each year since 1951 because expenditures for defense activities and other Federal projects have increased very substantially the number of families living on Federal property and the number of school children whose parents are employed on Federal property. In fact, expenditures for defense purposes which directly affect the requirements under this program have increased by a substantially greater percentage than the cost of this program. Because of the nature of the provisions in the act which require that the final entitlement of school districts must be determined on actual attendance of federally connected children after the end of the school year, it is very difficult for the administering agency to estimate accurately the total cost of this program for any given year until near the end of that year.

On the basis of the most recent data available at the time as to 1953 costs the Office of Education originally estimated that $72,818,000 would be required for the 1954 fiscal year. The original request to the Congress was set at $70 million. The amendment added to the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act—Public Law 11—for 1953 by the Congress would raise the estimated cost by approximately $300,000. The administration voluntarily reduced the original appropriation request for 1954 from $70 million to $66,500,000 primarily on the basis that reduced defense spending would decrease employment on Federal property under Public Law 874. This administration request is based on the assumption that entitlements of the school districts would be paid at 100 percent.

In spite of this situation, the committee has recommended that $60 million be appropriated for this program rather than the revised estimate of $66,500,000 in the Eisenhower budget, or the $70 million in the Truman budget. If this item is reduced to $60 million as recommended by the committee, which is one-half million less than the amount appropriated in 1953, a supplemental request in 1954 would be required next January or the Office of Education would be forced to prorate amounts appropriated among all eligible school districts. This proration would be at about 85 percent of the amount due each district if the entitlements reach the level of $70 million, as was originally estimated, and it would be about 90 percent if entitlements do not exceed the revised administration request of $66.5 million.

Operation of a school system requires careful planning and detailed budgeting of income and expenditures. In most communities in the Nation the tax rate for school purposes or the local revenue allocated for operation of schools must under State law be set in April, May, or June preceding the opening of schools in September. This is necessary in order that teachers may be hired, contracts for equipment and supplies completed and other necessary commitments made before the fall term begins.

Since school districts must plan their school programs and set their budgets in this manner it is essential for them to know how much of their entitlements under Public Law 874 the Federal Government plans to pay. Otherwise they are at a loss to know what to budget from this source. Since Congress has stated it to be the policy of the Federal Government to pay an amount equal to the Federal burden posed by Federal activities and since the Congress has on three successive occasions through the passage of supplemental amounts affirmed its intention to pay the full amount of these entitlements, school districts have some basis of expecting that their full entitlements under the act will be paid. If their budgets for the year are set on this basis, and the Congress later appropriates less than this amount, these districts have no way of obtaining the additional funds. The tax rate has been set for the year and in most cases cannot be changed until next year. This leaves the local school districts in a most difficult position. One source of income has been reduced and in effect the Federal Government has said we will not pay all the law says you are entitled to receive. These school districts which have large enrollments of children of defense workers and who have had substantial amounts of their taxable land taken off the tax rolls by Federal acquisition cannot finance adequate school programs without these Federal payments. If these districts are advised that appropriated funds will pay only 85 percent or 90 percent of the amount of their entitlements, they have no alternative but to reduce their school program to fit the amount they will receive from the Federal Government. The education of the children of defense workers and military personnel will have to suffer.

Another serious consequence of this action to reduce payments comes about through the encouragement this action gives to local school districts to refuse to accept responsibility for the education of children living on nontaxable Federal property. If a school district is on or borders a large Federal installation and agrees to educate children of parents living and working on that installation, it can do so only if it is assured that the Federal Government will meet its obligation under the law to pay that part of the local costs occasioned by the loss of real property tax revenues. If the Federal Government fails to accept this obligation fully, then some local school districts may turn the whole problem of educating these children over to Uncle Sam and force the Federal Government to establish schools under section 6 of Public Law 874. When the State refuses to accept responsibility for the education of children living on Federal property no State aid or local funds is paid for the cost of these educational services, and accordingly, the Federal Government is required to pay 100 percent of the cost. The data submitted to the subcommittee by the Office of Education shows that the average rate paid for children living on Federal property under section 3 (a) of the act was estimated to be $144.50 for the fiscal year 1954. On page 246 of the hearings the Office of Education stated that the actual cost per pupil for providing free public education for children living on Federal property under section 6 of the act where Federal Government paid the full cost was $278.71. Thus, if it becomes necessary to provide for these children living on Federal property under section 6 the cost to the Federal Government would be almost twice as great as it would where responsibility for their education is accepted by the State and local educational agencies.

Let me emphasize that this appropriation item is not one that can be controlled by administrative discretion. The entitlements which are based on specific formulas written into the law will amount to a certain figure regardless of how much the Congress appropriates for this program. If the Congress appropriates more than is needed to pay 100 percent entitlements, the balance cannot be spent but reverts automatically to the Treasury. If the Congress appropriates too little to pay entitlements at 100 percent, the costly process of a supplemental request must be followed or the school districts forced to either trim their services or run the risk of a deficit.

In response to a question posed by the subcommittee chairman, it was pointed out at the committee hearings on this bill that the original 1954 estimate was

designed to avoid the supplemental requests that had been necessary in each of the previous 3 years. The action now proposed by the committee will defeat this purpose unless revised by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, the committee should understand that the amount in the bill is exactly the same sum, $60,500,000, as was appropriated in the last fiscal year, 1953. There is no information we could obtain which would indicate that one dollar more for 1954 will be needed than was appropriated in 1953. I would not be surprised if they have a surplus left over should we appropriate this much money.

Mr. Chairman, we have just received a notice from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in which, under the heading of "To Review Need of Ohio A-Plant," appears the following:

It has been reported that the Pentagon has called on the National Security Council to consider abandoning or at least sharply cutting down the size of the projected billion-dollar atomic plant near Portsmouth, Ohio. The idea of taking a new look at the need for the plant is reported to have come from Secretary of Defense Charles A. Wilson, and been laid before the NSC by Deputy Secretary Kyes, during Mr. Wilson's absence in Europe.

A decision, expected in a couple of weeks, awaits a reappraisal by the Defense Department of America's stockpile needs of atomic bombs. The present numerical goal was set by the old Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the new Defense team wants to reexamine the reasoning which led to the setting of the stockpile objective.

Now, if these things come to pass, and our defense production levels off, they will not need any more money than in 1953. Furthermore, as of the first of this month, they had obligated only $24,107,224 of the $60,500,000 appropriated for 1953, which left them, as of May 1, an unobligated balance of $36,392,776.

Granting that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is correct as to meeting the Government's obligations to these school districts, I still say, in all seriousness and honesty, that I think the amount of $60,500,000, as recommended by the committee, will be sufficient. It will not surprise me if they have a surplus left over at the end of the fiscal year 1954. If they do not, they will come to Congress with a supplemental appropriation request which the House will probably grant, as it has in the past. I think the amount is ample and the Committee of the Whole should reject the additional $6 million requested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Furthermore, I think the whole program should be examined very carefully, and revalued at this time in light of the experience of the past few years. The other day on the floor of this House, we heard a lot about discrimination. This is one of the most discriminatory programs ever instituted by the Congress. With one or two exceptions large cities cannot qualify for even 10 cents of these millions of dollars of appropriations. Now, if that is not discrimination, I do not know the meaning of the word. I hope the gentleman's amendment is defeated.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I happen to be the author of the legislation under discussion, Public Laws 874 and 815.

Mr. Chairman, there is considerable disagreement and considerable difference of opinion here as to the needs of this program for the fiscal year 1954. The gentleman from Rhode Island has explained what the request was from the Department, what the Truman budget was, what the Eisenhower budget was, and what the committee did, so I will not go into that angle of it. I would like to go into the angle in a reply to the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

On the matter of discrimination and on the matter of their not needing this program, and if they did need it, that the Committee on Appropriations would be willing to give them a supplemental budget item. I cannot help but remember what happened to our supplemental bill back in January of this year when the gentleman from Illinois, without any rhyme or reason, cut the bill $24 million. He cut it out completely. If that is going to be his attitude toward a supplemental item for 1954, we better put the item in now, rather than trust the gentleman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I know the gentleman does not want to misstate me in what I said before. I did not speak for the committee, as to what the committee would do. I was speaking for the Congress, and I think if my statement was reread the gentleman would find that the Congress would put the supplemental item back in there. Now I know what the Congress has done before over the objection of the committee, but I did not appoint the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman was not speaking for himself, I assume.

Mr. BUSBEY. I was not.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I have been of the opinion that we have been attempting to get away from deficiency and supplemental bills coming before us. I have heard the statement made many, many times that they are always coming back and asking for more money. The reason is that we have not given them what we have said we would give them under the law. If this $60 million stands, it means less than they had this year, not more or as much, but less, and it means they will only be able to pay about 90 percent of the entitlement. These are the facts that have been given to me by those who are running the program at the present time.

Mr. BAILEY. May I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his comments. They are correct. May I say that in the year or 2 years the committee spent in drafting this legislation, and I happened to be chairman of the subcommittee engaged in that activity, we thought it was the most solid and most reasonable and most satisfactory legislation that has been put on the statute books in a number of years. It was solely for the purpose of discharging the Government responsibility for having impacted those school districts. We are not considering it from the standpoint of Federal aid for education. It is not a handout. It is not a gift. It does not approach the usual cry of creeping socialism. It is a matter of the Government's discharging its obligations to these school districts.

I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island. While I am on the floor, I should like to enlarge on his remarks in regard to Public Law 815, that is, the construction part of the amendment. I am sure the members of the committee present here today are interested in this appropriation because it affects 42 of the 48 States. It affects the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

Let me say now on that building program that I was glad to hear the gentleman from Rhode Island say that he would be a party to trying to handle the matter in the deficiency appropriation.

At the present time 940 districts have been granted entitlements; 300 of those 940 have received all of their allotments; 400 have received only a part of them; 240 of the 940 have not received any Federal grants at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BAILEY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement. Is action being taken to reenact Public Law 815?

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad the gentleman from Oklahoma brought that matter up. I was hopeful that the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] would be on the floor today. On account of the lengthy hearings on revision of the Taft-Hartley law we have not got around to rewriting Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, as requested by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message, but the committee has that high on its agenda and I am sure it will be done before the close of the present fiscal year.

It will be necessary to redraft Public Law 874, and we will have to have some

form of a construction bill similar to Public Law 815 unless, as the gentleman from Illinois suggested, some or all of these projects are eliminated in the present budget.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Would it be possible to extend Public Law 815 by resolution if the committee does not get around to making a complete study of the program?

Mr. BAILEY. I would say that would be one approach, but I would much prefer that the gentleman from Georgia direct that question as a parliamentary inquiry. I am sure it could be done, unless the bill is rewritten and passed before the 30th of June.

Let us be practical. The gentleman from Illinois has already agreed that the Congress will write these funds back into either a regular appropriation bill or a supplemental appropriation bill. I just made the remarks I made because I know of the attitude of the gentleman from Illinois on the supplemental item back in January of $24 million. I do not propose to be a party to leaving it to his judgment when we have an opportunity here for the Members of the committee to write this additional amount into the appropriation bill at the present time.

Why bother with the supplemental appropriation? The head of that Department, Mrs. Hobby, has indicated that she needs $66,500,000. I am certain they know more about it than the gentleman from Illinois, and members of the subcommittee, at least as to what they need.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HALE. My people are very much interested in renewal legislation of Public Law 815. The gentleman has said it will receive consideration from his committee. Does the gentleman feel fairly positive that a new bill will be on the floor, or ought to be on the floor in the next 2 weeks, if it is really to be taken care of?

Mr. BAILEY. I answer the gentleman by saying the chairman of the committee has indicated that as soon as a number of executive-session hearings of the committee are disposed of, we will take up the education bill immediately.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could come to some agreement on limiting debate on this amendment. Could we agree on 15 minutes?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. We are meeting today not because I wanted to, but with the understanding that we would have plenty of time. I can go along on this situation and be pretty decent about it, but if you are going to start closing debate by force, we are going to have several quorum calls here today.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentleman is a little in error in his anticipation, because I do not think I have ever been accused of trying any such thing as that.

Mr. FOGARTY. No, no; I did not mean you, and I am sorry if you thought I meant that because you have been very cooperative in all these hearings that we have held. I am sorry if you think that, and I did not mean to intimate that about you in any way.

Mr. BUSBEY. Can we agree on 20 minutes?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I do not think so.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to make an announcement. I do propose to object to anyone taking time on amendments in cases like this, and then yielding their time wholesale to various other Members so that they can have an advantage over someone. I do not think that is entirely fair. I think if Members ask for the time, they should be required to use the time. That is the main thing, and I think we should adhere to the rules of the House. Can we not limit debate to 30 minutes?

Mr. FOGARTY. There are at least 15 Members standing.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry but I feel constrained to move that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 30 minutes, and do so move.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY), there were—ayes 65, noes 52.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, at this point in this very important debate, the results of which will indelibly mark the destiny of millions of Americans now alive, as well as millions yet unborn, and, because I so strongly believe that as the health, education, labor, and welfare of the average American citizen is, so is the internal happiness and real prosperity of our Nation, I feel I must urge to your consideration just a few points which I believe to be determinative factors for your reasonable judgment.

In stating my premises for strongly advocating against the subcommittee's cuts, I am much aware of my own personal position for economy in all departments and agencies of our Federal Government. Also, I give credit to every other Member for not being any less economy minded than am I. During these more than 6 years that I have now had the responsibility of membership in this great legislative body, I have frequently made it clear that I urge that the national budget be balanced and kept in balance as nearly as possible, consistent with our national security and defense; and, with the general welfare of all the American people. The last administration admitted it could not balance the budget on account of commonly recognized international stresses and strains, largely emanating from aggressive and subversive communistic policies. Just a few days ago our new administration, through the considered words of President Eisenhower, advised the American people that this present administration saw no chance the next fiscal year of keeping up with is campaign-expressed language on this subject.

I commend the subcommittee for its diligent endeavor and advice to us. But frankly, Mr. Chairman, I have not during this debate heard any argument supported by ample evidence, to convince me that this Congress ought to cut below the figure asked for by President Eisenhower and his chosen advisers. It is not clear to me why our Republican-controlled committee feels it wise or necessary to cut down the Eisenhower requests by several millions of dollars. Yet, that is what is being done in the very area of daily living of American citizens where it will hurt millions of Americans most. I refer to a people's work; their health, their education, their welfare. Is there any level of activity or of daily experiences or necessities that come closer to an American family than do these? Yes, I admit actual bread and butter probably do. This being true, to reduce or remove any opportunities or protection presently enjoyed in these areas is, in my judgment exceedingly poor judgement, unwise planning, and instead of being tax-dollar economy, is in fact a tax-dollar expense. Such theoretical tax-dollar saving is in fact starting in motion an actual fast-rolling-tax-dollar liability.

Granting that Congress has a responsibility, even when President Eisenhower has sent us his carefully considered requests and desires, if the arguments on the majority side that the last election was primarily expression of confidence of the American people in President Eisenhower is well founded, then logically Congress should give our new President the money he asks for in the Department of Labor and in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which two Departments we are now discussing. In view of his promises to cut the fat out of budgets every place possible, I am unwilling to believe these two strategically important Departments can do the job assigned to them and yet absorb these committee cuts. I have heard no convincing evidence from the committee that they could.

Let us look at the cuts proposed in the Labor Department. Mr. Chairman, I believe anything which cripples an adequate apprenticeship program cripples a guaranty of adequate production in our industrial life and stability. Yet the committee cuts $700,000 below what President Eisenhower asked for.

And taking another sum of $767,000 from the President's request for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Employment certainly cannot but also lessen efficiency in this necessary bureau.

But to take $30,700,000 from the grants to the States for unemployment compensation and employment services administration, without at least first giving the States adequate notice they can try to provide these funds, is again unwise and unfair.

And then, to cut $6 million off the President's request for funds to handle unemployment compensation for veterans in the States; this again comes prematurely and unwisely.

The cut of $689,000 in the vital Bureau of Labor Statistics is again shocking in its possibilities to the whole Nation while the cut of $60,000 in the Women's Bureau is again further evidence of lack of soundest judgment. And the cut of $1,639,000 below the President's request again cannot but indicate of lack of emphasis in one of the very places which should always be amply prepared.

Mr. Chairman, while I gladly assume no member of the House would willingly cut out moneys where they should not be cut, it is not comforting for me to see the Department of Labor, an early object of such extreme and extensive cuts. Most of the American people are working people; laboring with honor and industry. So, what weakens the Department of Labor relates directly—very directly—to the welfare of most of the American people.

I oppose these cuts proposed by the Committee. President Eisenhower should have at least the money he said he needed to do a good job.

Freedmen's Hospital service in the District of Columbia is a 24-hour-a-day necessity and there is no need nor justification for cutting $446,000 from the request. It is the only hospital in the District serving our deserving Negro citizens without fee. It also is a place of experience and professional training for nurses and doctors. I have heard no justification for this treatment. I cannot find any. It is very, very poor judgment, I believe, to cut it. It needs a real face lifting and repairs.

And, to cut $510,000 from the request for Howard University, which has proven such a blessing to Negro students ever since about 2 years after the Civil War, is again a shocking proposal. No one can gainsay that the Negro boys and girls have taken advantage of the school offered. They pay almost $300 a year tuition and over 16,000 have there graduated and it offers more adequate opportunities, instead of fewer, for education is a wise investment.

And to cut $2,624,391 from the budget requested for further development of vocational education is another rash and poorly considered action. Millions of American boys and girls never have and never will sit in college classes. But, they can learn to earn adequate and honorable livelihood in this vocational education activity.

And to cut $2,400,000 from the request for vocational rehabilitation without notice to the States involved is again unfair and unwise. No doubt the States should shoulder their full share of the responsibility but we should not shirk ours.

To cut $9,500,000 from the request for payments to school districts which are commonly called impacted is clearly unfair to thousands of school districts, alone unable to absorb the population which comes to them as a result of Federal installations and activities in the school district.

In the great 23d congressional district of Los Angeles County, Calif., are more than one school district which has already used up all of their legal resources to try to give all the children who come to them a fair chance for schooling. But thousands of these children are primarily Federal responsibilities as contrasted with local responsibilities. Their coming and creating these impacted districts is not at the request of these already overburdened local school districts. Under Public Law 874, under the rules of common fairness and equity, we must not make this unwarranted act.

But my time is running out. I would speak in opposition to all these cuts which dig deep into the daily hearts and bodies and spirits and souls of everyday Americans. Yes, let us economize. Let us do it vigilantly and soundly. But, Mr. Chairman, let us not magnify the almighty dollar to such extent that we put cash above character. Mr. Speaker, it is not dollar economy to either increase illiteracy or lack of educational opportunity or to increase hazards to public health; or to make more injurious or less fair, working conditions. Yet, Mr. Chairman, these are but a few of the bad and certain results of these cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of confusion has arisen in the matter of these funds for the operation and maintenance of schools in areas impacted by the defense effort on account of certain statements which have been made that are without proper basis.

The schools are now going into their vacation period. It will not be until September, after this bill is passed, before the full entitlement of qualified schools can be computed, not until the school authorities know what their enrollment will be. They cannot go ahead with their programs to contract for teachers or expand their facilities, and so forth, for the next school year unless they know whether the money is going to be available. That is why only some $20 million of this year's appropriations have been committed. They will all be asked for within the next 60 days.

You will remember the great embarrassment that we caused the school systems last year by putting this off. We eventually had to provide money in a supplemental appropriation bill. It came late. Let us not repeat that error again.

I may say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] that my city may not be a big city in the sense of his city of Chicago, but it is a city of 65,000 and it exhausted all of its resources for school purposes before it called upon the Federal Government for aid. Unless this aid is forthcoming it cannot continue to carry the load imposed on it by the location of shipyards, a great naval air station, an Army medical supply base, and the presence of other defense establishments.

We have been through all of this before. All that it does is create confusion in the minds of the school administrators and distrust of the Federal Government. Here is one obligation that we recognize, and one obligation that the Government must accept.

I ask that the amendment be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment to increase the item "Payments to school districts" to the amount of the Eisenhower budget.

I just want to say a word in reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], who said a little while ago that the atomic-energy project in southern Ohio, known as the Portsmouth-Chillicothe project would be abandoned. It is in progress. A tremendous amount of work has already been done. Vast sums of money have been spent on it. I am sure if the gentleman from Illinois would investigate the facts he would find there is no move on foot to abandon that project. There was an article in the papers 2 or 3 days ago saying that the project was to be abandoned, but it is in the district I have the privilege to represent, and I have investigated the matter thoroughly and from the information I have the project will be carried on to completion.

May I say that the school districts in this area are in very difficult financial condition. I have the figures in my office showing that there are some 8,500 students in that area who will be unhoused. So I was glad to hear the gentleman say that he planned to offer in the next supplemental bill an item for school buildings, because they are seriously needed in the area. It is a very seriously impacted area because of this Federal project. I hope the committee will support the gentleman from Rhode Island in his effort to bring this appropriation up to the amount recommended by President Eisenhower.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK] has given the House the true situation in regard to the Portsmouth, Ohio, plant. This was a matter of concern to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. We took the matter up with the Commission and the Commission has not recommended a substantial curtailment. I do not know why this reduction was made unless the Commit-

tee on Appropriations intends to curtail this new development of atomic energy.

I see no substantial point in the gentleman from Illinois reading that so-called newspaper report.

Many of these impacted areas are outside of large cities. There happens to be one outside the city of Los Angeles, but within my congressional district. It is a little area known as the Norwalk School District. It jumped from a population of 7,500 in the last 4 years to over 54,000 people, and most of this has been a result of the tremendous defense plants expansion in that area. The imposition of these thousands of new schoolchildren on this school district is a burden impossible for the local population to meet. We must have some help. These appropriations are for the benefit of the United States. The great defense projects, wherever they may be, are Federal responsibilities; they represent burdens which the small local areas cannot bear. Most of these plants are out in outlying areas. I certainly want to commend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] in bringing this original law to the Congress; and I believe along with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] that the full entitlements will not come in for consideration until September. I therefore support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island to raise this $6 million which is in accord with the Eisenhower budget and is in accord with the request of Mrs. Hobby.

I hope the Fogarty amendment will be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if there is anything on earth that this Congress has ever considered in the 13 years in which I have served here, that was nonpolitical, it was the authorization making appropriations of this nature in order. There is not the slightest, single iota of politics in this appropriation. This is one thing that has transcended politics from its inception. The areas affected by this appropriation were overrun by the activities of the Federal Government, and you will recall, you were here during the war years, each year we had to fight the Appropriations Committee—and we did have to fight to get the funds to take care of these areas. The Congress finally got tired of going through those tactics each time the appropriations came up and the Congress sent a committee throughout the length and breadth of this country to investigate these impacted areas. It was a bipartisan group. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor served on that committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], was chairman. The committee went throughout the entire Nation and found these areas were absolutely overrun by the activities of the Federal Government and that the local and State officials were financially unable because of constitutional limitations to provide for them. We made appropriations in keeping with the two statutes which were referred to by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia. If there is any appropriation which is needed and which stops the creeping specter of socialism which we all have decried, it is this type of thing to give to communities unable to care for their overrun, impacted conditions because of these Federal installations—it is this type of bill. I do not see how anyone could possibly oppose this appropriation in keeping with the recommendation of the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we should find it unnecessary to consider very long the matter now before us. We solicited the States to cooperate with the Federal Government to the end that school children going into the different States by reason of these war installations might be educated. The Government has a contract with the States.

The most telling point in the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of this subcommittee, is that no large city is getting a portion of that money. So far as we in New Mexico are concerned we would be happy if Chicago, New York or one of the other large cties had the project which we now have in New Mexico. It is 90 miles long and 30 miles wide. The cattle growers who owned the land did not ask the Government to come in and take it over and, as a matter of fact, the Government had to go to the Supreme Court to condemn this property and put these ranchers off their land. It is now one of the most important testing grounds we have in America and is playing a vital part in our defense program. However, the number of children who came into that area because of that Federal Government activity is not small. They have filled our schools far beyond the overflowing point.

The little towns themselves could not possibly supply the schools nor the teachers which we have supplied by reason of a contract with the Federal Government. When people get in bad financial straits they settle for so much on the dollar, but I do not think Uncle Sam has reached that point yet. I was surprised when the gentleman from Rhode Island said that with the $60 million the committee wishes to give to the States you could settle for about 90 cents on the dollar. I do not believe the Congress of the United States wants to settle its word on the basis of a discount on the dollar. I am strongly in favor of the amendment because, for one reason, I believe that when the Federal Government makes an agreement with the States it should keep faith and live up to the agreement just as the States are doing. We should keep our promises.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment. It is necessary that we adopt this amendment if we are to have an orderly operation of our schools in the impacted areas of this Nation. I was a member of the committee at the time the basic legislation was studied, and supported the measure at that time. In view of the supplemental appropriations bill passed a few weeks ago, I cannot see where the amendment can be controversial if we favor the program.

Schools, like Fort Knox, Ky., on Government installations will not be affected because those schools will receive their money first as the law provides. The balance then will be distributed among the other qualified school districts. According to the amount expended for fiscal 1953, the remainder will not be adequate to pay as much as 90 percent of the entitlements. This is not taking into consideration the new development in the Portsmouth area, the atomic development that has taken place down there within the last year.

In the affected areas in Kentucky—and the same holds true throughout the country—you will find that the local boards of education have entered into contracts with teachers and incurred other maintenance and operating expenses based upon 100 percent of entitlements.

Let us take the area surrounding Fort Knox, Ky., as an illustration. Now, if we deny those areas the money, you can readily see that chaos and confusion will result. The Government is entirely responsible for the conditions existing in and around these impacted areas. It is our duty to pay our just debt to the schools in accordance with the entitlements resulting from the basic law, especially, this is true today in the affected areas.

I am glad that I have always supported the maintenance and operation program and the school-construction program for the impacted areas. This amendment is sound and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge support of the Fogarty amendment. It will be recalled that during the war Prime Minister Churchill said that he was not elected Prime Minister of England to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. I do not think that Mrs. Hobby, who has been elevated to Cabinet status, has been appointed to preside over the liquidation of her new Department. If so, we should rename it the Department of Empty Promises because the committee certainly has unreasonably cut its budget.

We, in California, have a particular stake in this appropriation. As a matter of fact, California receives the leading amount of money in this program. I served in the California State Legislature, and we meet our school problems head on. We do not legislate by indirection. If we do not feel that the schools are entitled to the money, and we do not have it, we change the formula. We are not changing the formula here. We

are legislating by indirection because, as I understand, this amounts to approximately a 42-percent cut of this program to California's affected districts. You are slashing the aid to these needy districts by 42 percent.

In my district I have a school district which is doing a good job, which derives 50 percent of its budget from this program. It could not possibly raise that money otherwise, because outside of the Federal installation, which is a military one, there is only a small community and sagebrush and jackrabbits, and when you say to that district, "We are going to cut this budget by 42 percent" you are telling them that they cannot educate their children in the way that their children are entitled to be educated.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Fogarty amendment be adopted, and I particularly urge that upon the gentlemen from California and the gentlemen from Texas because those two States participate to the largest degree in this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the views expressed by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN], in urging approval of the Fogarty amendment. California has not at any time come to this Congress and asked for special help to meet its educational needs. Instead, since the war, our people have voted over $430 million in bonds to help school districts meet the problem of housing youngsters. Our local school districts in almost every instance are at a maximum legal bonding rate and a maximum legal tax rate. The majority of the school districts of California exceeded, by special vote of the people, their legal tax and bonding rates in an attempt to meet the educational problems. Defense activities have made a tremendous impact on the schools of our State. If we are going to solve our school problems we must get the help we are entitled to receive—entitled, because we are carrying on a program of national interest in the defense activities. We must have the full measure of assistance permitted by previous actions of the Congress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The law is very specific, and the action of the committee in cutting out these moneys, or reducing them, is an effort to repeal or amend that law by indirection. The proper thing to do, if they want to amend the law, is to go to the legislature and do it there.

Mr. MOSS. I quite agree with the gentleman. It is an obligation, and if we fail to meet it, we will do irreparable damage to many young men and women in our schools today.

The Congress offered to pay for a share of the educational burden placed on the schools by the Federal defense installations which brought thousands of families all with children to be educated into the local school districts. The schools of California set up their educational programs in anticipation of this deserved and needed Federal aid. The Eisenhower budget includes the money to finance the program. Now the committee proposes cutting the amount of aid by 10 percent.

If we approved the committee's proposal we would be financing only 90 percent of a job which must be done 100 percent. We are not juggling dollars or talking about statistics here, but we are gambling with the future of our children. I cannot urge you too strongly to approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island and provide enough money to do a 100 percent job of educating the children of our defense workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit surprised that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] continues to snipe at this program when he got such a good lesson early this year that this is a bipartisan matter and is not a partisan matter at all. I am sure when the vote comes the people on his side who have these conditions existing in their districts are going to vote just as we on this side who have been making most of the speeches on this amendment. There is nothing discriminatory about this law at all. In the first place, I think it is the most carefully considered legislation that has been passed by this Congress since I have been here. I say this because of the fact that a subcommittee toured this whole country studying the school situation in Government-impacted areas. Most of the members of this committee did not have impacted areas in their districts. They came up with a piece of legislation that was carefully considered on the floor of this House and passed.

Right here I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], and the other members of this subcommittee for the fine piece of work they did on both Public Laws 874 and 815. That was constructive legislation. Now we have the attempt to hamstring it and hamper it, knowing that in the end we are going to live up to our obligation and to the promises we have made to these school people, and appropriate these funds. Eventually, why not now?

Moreover, another proof that this legislative program is not discriminatory is the fact that President Eisenhower approved it and asked for adequate appropriations to implement it. Besides, Mrs. Hobby has asked for just the amount we are pleading for.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is adopted.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore funds eliminated by the committee for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the act of September 30, 1950—Public Law 874.

Most of the defense plants in Alabama are concentrated in the 4th District, which I have the high honor to represent. At one installation, and I speak of the Anniston Ordnance Depot at Bynum, Ala., we have practically doubled the number of personnel since the outbreak of the war in Korea. Many of the families live on the installation and, therefore, have no taxable property which is subject to a school district tax. This same situation applied to Fort McClellan, Ala., and to Craig Air Force Base in Selma, Ala., where many of the defense workers and military personnel live on the reservation.

I feel that the Federal emergency is just as great as it has ever been and that to neglect the education of these children who have no choice about where they are to live will not only be unfair to my section of the country but is a shortsighted, penny-wise and pound-foolish policy which must be corrected. I do not believe that it is in keeping with the President's views as outlined in his state of the Union message and I cannot believe that such a policy can result in anything but a weakening of our national preparedness program.

I have lived near a military installation all of my life and I know from my contacts with military people and people in defense work that the morale of these people is highly important. Good relations with the local communities and school authorities can only be maintained when the proper attention is given to the health, education, and welfare of the people who, because of circumstances beyond their control, are forced to live and work in communities not always of their own selection. I believe in economy and I feel that there are many places in the Federal Government where we can do a lot of needed trimming; but to strike at the school children of America and to strike at communities which are already overburdened because of defense activities is not economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Fogarty amendment, but I take this time primarily to inquire of the gentleman from Rhode Island, author of the amendment, if we fail to appropriate as much money as the entitlements add up to, just what will happen?

Mr. FOGARTY. It means that they have 1 or 2 things to do. They can prorate this amount we give them of $60 million to all the school districts, which would mean that they would meet only between 85 and 90 percent of the entitlements that are due them; or else they could come back, as they have in other years, for a deficiency, and next January or February we could give them a deficiency amount to meet these entitlements.

Another thing. I think I should remind the gentleman that a statement was made that only twenty-some million dollars had been obligated. I think everyone who knows the bill itself knows that they cannot obligate these moneys at an advance date because they have to wait until the end of the school year. These funds are obligated on the basis of the per day child attendance at these schools. That is why the funds are not obligated. Sometimes it is August or September before these payments are made, because we have to get that information.

Mr. ALBERT. May I ask the gentleman another question? New installations are coming into operation this summer and probably have not been fully figured in the departmental estimates. Will an appropriation of $66.5 million properly take care of those school districts in communities where new defense establishments will come into operation this summer?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, it will not.

Mr. ALBERT. In other words, we may still have a deficiency even if we adopt the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I shall certainly support his amendment. We would do better, I think, to go even further and allow the Truman budget in full.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, this matter of Federal funds for local school districts where the Government, by its establishment of military camps, has caused a great influx of population is a matter we should not quibble about. In my district there are many small school districts that have no way to raise the money to carry on their schools properly if they do not get help. There have moved into these districts many people who now work in the various Army camps and for the Government. Some of the little towns have almost been blotted out. They have not been able to make the needed repairs on some of the buildings because of the fact that the money has been used to hire additional teachers to take care of those people who come in there but who do not pay one cent in taxes.

The Federal Government has been the cause of these chaotic school conditions in the local districts. It is only just and fair that we should make a contribution toward meeting this local problem by providing financial assistance both to build larger buildings and to hire more teachers.

Many of the smaller local school districts are in a desperate situation today. If we do not give them more financial assistance, there will be a complete breakdown of the local school program. Children will be unable to attend school.

We are spending millions for defense from the enemy from without. Why not spend a few million to fight the enemy of ignorance here at home?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment to restore $6 million to the budget for aid to school construction in federally impacted areas.

Where the population of school districts has been mushroomed by the business of Government, that business must contribute its fair share toward the maintenance of schools and other facilities in those districts. The tax from residential property is reaching the point of confiscation in those areas which have grown up overnight because of Government activities. The Federal Government must carry its share of this burden.

I am opposed to Federal aid to education on a general basis. The answer to this problem is to cut down on the expansion of Federal activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the unaccustomed position since the convening of this Congress of coming to the well of the House for a second time to ask for an increase in appropriations. But as I stated here last Friday, I would not be making this request if it were in the interest of some pressure group composed of adult Americans. This money is to be spent in the interest of American children. I would like to emphasize the word American. I have said in the well of the House before in discussing this same program that perhaps the shortest cut and the easiest and most effective approach for these school officials in the various impacted areas throughout the land to take in order to get funds with which to educate these transient children would be, if by some means, by some hook or crook, they could find who it is who is running the State Department and get that person or those people to designate a particular area as being foreign territory. Then they would have no difficulty whatsoever in applying to this outfit up here at Lake Failure, and getting all the money they need. It seems to me unthinkable that you will quibble over $5 million or $6 million to be spent on American children, when by your own admission, you have already admitted that you have no hope or intention of balancing the budget or reducing taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, may I justify my second appearance before the committee by saying that I was assigned to do a job as chairman of a special committee of the House Committee on Education and Labor. In the case of Public Laws 815 and 874 I have endeavored to do as good a job as it was possible to do, and we think we did an excellent job.

May I say to my colleagues of the committee that this legislation means nothing to me other than that as a former schoolman I am a person who has the welfare of the boys and girls at heart. Not a single cent of this money comes to my district in West Virginia, and in the entire State of West Virginia last year under this program, we received $24,117. So I want you to understand that all I have done in helping the program and this legislation has been done because I want to see the boys and girls of this country properly educated.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Does this appropriation of $66 million include the salaries of teachers if it should become necessary to hire additional teachers for the maintenance and operation of the schools?

Mr. BAILEY. That is exactly right. Most of these teachers have been hired and the school boards have them on their hands. If we do not give them an adequate amount of money to carry out the commitments of the Government, those teachers will have a proper claim against the board of education on their contracts. This is a matter of business, and it is no time to talk about economizing in a program of this kind. Let me say to the gentleman, and I will say it in all sincerity, I will vote against every cent of foreign commitment for economic aid if you will restore these items here that concern our boys and girls, and I will vote an open ballot on the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference what a program is or how good it is or how needful it is. The only question is what is needed, and what can honestly and intelligently be used. This year with an appropriation of $60,500,000 down through the 30th of April, the obligations only amounted to $24,107,224, leaving upward of $36 million unobligated.

The total expenditures down to that date were only $19,375,955, indicating that there is absolutely no need anywhere for more money than this committee has recommended.

Frankly, these figures were not available at the time the revised budget was prepared and the committee allowed $60,500,000 the same as last year. They only became available recently. These figures were obtained from the Department of Education this morning by our clerk. How can anybody honestly and fairly think of such a thing as voting for a dollar more than the committee has recommended. Frankly, I appeal to the House of Representatives to be honest in casting its vote here and do what they think they ought to do. We cannot hope to give them more money than they can honestly use.

I hope this amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fourteen Members are present; a quorum.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 65, noes 65.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee divided.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], when she was passing through, claimed that I had dropped 10, that instead of saying 49 I said 39.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, is there any method by which the vote can be had again when it has once been taken by tellers?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would object to that. It cannot be done except by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is a doubt on the part of the tellers about the count, it can be taken again, the Chair will rule.

Mr. RAYBURN. This is the first time I ever heard of that.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, we will pick it up on the rollcall, so let it go.

The tellers reported that there were—ayes 99, noes 87.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4), including payments, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accordance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said act for the use of blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be controlled by the State agency, $20,600,000, of which not to exceed $175,000 shall be available to the Secretary for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said act, which latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with providing such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 percent of the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Page 15, line 14, strike out "$20,600,000" and insert "$23,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, since I have been on this committee it has been testified year after year that this is one of the agencies of government that makes money for the Federal Government. It is an agency that for every dollar we appropriate in Federal dollars we get at least $10 back. That is a conservative estimate. The estimate that I have been able to get to be the more correct estimate is that it is nearer $14 or $15 for every dollar we appropriate that we get back in one form or another into the Federal Treasury of the United States. Why in the world the committee saw fit to cut this particular agency which rehabilitates people who were unfortunate enough to be born disabled or to have received an accident that prevents them from making a living at the present time, I do not know. We are today rehabilitating in the neighborhood of 60,000 people a year. This bill includes $20,600,000, or a reduction of $2,400,000.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is not the money provided for in this item used on a matching basis in many of the States?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is on some services, but not all. In some instances the Federal Government pays 100 percent for some of the services.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to back up the gentleman on what he has had to say relative to the worthwhileness of this particular program. I believe it is one of the most meritorious sections in the bill and personally I hope to see his amendment adopted.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have a telegram from the Governor of our State urging that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think every governor of every State of the Union is for this particular appropriation.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Does this appropriation contain money to buy equipment for the blind; newspapers, and so on?

Mr. FOGARTY. It certainly does.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the cold facts are that if we allow this $2,400,000 cut to stand, it means that 6,800 people who would have been rehabilitated under the regular appropriation bill will not be rehabilitated in this coming fiscal year. If you want to vote for this cut of $2,400,000 it means that we are saying to about 7,000 unfortunate people of this country that you do not want them rehabilitated.

Secondly, it means $1,750,000 Federal income taxes annually. If those nearly 7,000 people were to be rehabilitated in the fiscal year 1954, it would mean that the Federal Treasury would gain $1,750,000. It means to those 6,800 people $12 million in earnings in the fiscal year 1954. If we rehabilitate those 6,800 people by adopting this amendment I am offering today, you will be saying to those 6,800 people that "We are going to allow you to earn $12 million for yourselves in the fiscal year 1954." It means 12 million man-hours of production if these 6,800 people are rehabilitated. And, last, it means if this amendment is not adopted, that about 1,400 of these 6,800 lost rehabilitants would be on public assistance and would draw about $1 million in relief grants per year. So, all in all, it would be a loss to the Federal Treasury if we did not appropriate this additional $2,400,000.

There has been testimony year after year of the good work this Commission has been doing for these unfortunate people. It has been taking people off relief rolls on the local level and getting them to a position where they can handle a job themselves and in their own way, and at the same time pay taxes.

One of the reasons given by the committee was a report by some investigators who were sent down there to look at some auditor's reports. They gave three examples in the report, and I wish you would look at it. I have had a chance to have these three charges investigated. There is not a thing in the charges that have been made by these investigators that we have mentioned in our report that sustains anything. I do not know who the investigators were that went down there. I do know they came in with a report about 2 days before we marked up the bill. I do know that when we were marking up the bill the report of these investigators was given no consideration in our meeting at all. Much to my surprise, I read of the three cases that were picked out for some reason or other and put into the report, and I did not see it until the full committee met at 10:30 that morning. But I know there are other Members of Congress who know personally of these three cases they have mentioned. There are other cases I know which would take time to explain, but I have an answer, if an answer is not made by the Members in their own districts, to the charges that have been made by these investigators. We do not know anything about their background at all. We do not know how much time they spent. We do not know if they went into the States where the people were and asked about them back there.

If we are going to have reports by investigators of any committee of our House reprinted in a report that is before you, I think we should have all the facts. I think those investigators should not be going down there only to look at a report of an auditor but should make a decision themselves. They should go back to the source and find out for themselves from the source in the State or the city as to just what happened to this particular case or that particular case. If the investigators had done that, I am sure these three examples would not be in the report at the present time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

When I first came here 11 years ago, I was privileged to serve as a member of the Committee on Education, of which the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] was the chairman. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act was the first bill on which I worked as a new Member of Congress. Therefore, I have had a special interest in following its operations and remarkable success during these years. There is no piece of legislation that I have had anything to do with which has given me greater satisfaction. Literally thousands and thousands of persons, who were on public relief, have been restored to useful citizenship. They have jobs, are earning salaries or wages, are supporting their families, and are paying taxes back into the Federal Treasury.

May I deal with some of the objections that have been raised. It has been charged that the States apparently do not approve of this program because they are paying only 34 percent of it. If you examine the act, you find the Federal Government was to provide all the necessary administrative and guidance costs as well as——

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. In the first place, I will state I expect to support this amendment on purely economic grounds, but I should like to ask whether there is any question of humanity or Christian conduct involved in this question.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, indeed, and I am sure we are all motivated by it, but if we ignore all such considerations, this is a plain case of where we more than get our money back as well as make as great a contribution as any program in our whole country to the development of the finest kind of self-reliant and self-supporting American citizens.

Let me get back to the question of division of funds between State and Federal Governments. In the act, it was provided that the necessary administrative and guidance costs of the program would be paid out of Federal funds, plus one-half of the service costs. So that it is not possible for any State to get to the point where it provides half of the total costs. In the beginning, the Federal Government provided 72 percent of the funds. That is now down to about 65 percent because the States have increased their contributions. The legislature of my own State of Minnesota, before it adjourned in April, increased its appropriations for this program. I have a letter from the man who handles it in my home town of Minneapolis. He is one of only 16 counselors for the whole State. This is what he says:

> I have 250 names on my waiting list. Each of those names represents a man, a family, and the discouragement born of inability to work. I can help those men get back to work, but only one at a time. I could handle the job, maybe keep even, if I were triplets.

That is under the present program. Unless you adopt this amendment, it will be cut down to something still less. The letter continues:

> I am the only counselor for the vocationally handicapped adults in a city of a half million. Meanwhile those men are not working. They do not earn, but they consume public funds.

As the gentleman from Kansas just said, that is poor economy.

Last year 65,000 people were rehabilitated under this program and given vocational training so that they could get jobs. They increased their earnings by over $82 million in the first year after rehabilitation. It is estimated that by 1955 they will have paid in Federal income taxes alone the entire $21 million that the Federal Government has spent in their rehabilitation. By 1955 they will have paid back in taxes all that was put into their training, plus the contributions that they will have made to our whole economy and the well-being of their communities.

Consider this, too. Twelve thousand of these 65,000 were taken directly from relief rolls. The average cost of rehabilitation was $457 a man, and they were consuming more money than that each year in public assistance. So it is perfectly clear that the more rehabilitation we carry out, the less public assistance we have to pay, and, conversely, the less we carry out in rehabilitation, the more money we all pay for public assistance. This is just one of the reasons this is one of the soundest programs that the Congress ever adopted. It converts tax-eaters into taxpayers. I hope that the amendment will be supported.

If I have a minute or two left, I want to refer to another objection that has been raised. It has been said there has been improper administration, because training was given to certain cases unsuited for it. That is inevitable in a program of this size. For perhaps 95 percent of the cases, there is no question that the man is suitable. He is blind or has a hand or a leg missing, but is otherwise sound. Obviously he needs to be and can be rehabilitated. But there are some borderline cases, not so clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. There are bound to be a certain number of cases on the borderline, where some mistakes of judgment will be made. It is the same as in the Veterans' Administration, where the adjudicators have to decide in the case of John Jones, first, whether his disability is or is not compensable, and, second, if it is compensable, what degree or what percentage of disability exists. Those are decisions requiring individual judgment, and in a few percent of such cases there is bound to be an occasional error of judgment that does not discredit the program. I would rather err on the side of giving vocational training during a year to a few score persons who do not need it than fail to give it to some 6,800 who do need it and who will not get it unless the amendment is adopted.

There is another reason why some errors take place. When we wrote this act, in 1943, our committee was on guard against Federal control of any State rehabilitation, training, or education and other educational program. We wrote restrictions into the bill so that the Federal Government could not exercise control over the 48 States. That means that in some State here or there, there may be an official who misuses his powers and leans too far toward granting rehabilitation to people who cannot use it well. I am willing to pay that price rather than have power concentrated in Washington to dictate to the States, under the plan agreed upon when the program is started in a State. If power to make all decisions is in Washington and an official here goes wrong, it may involve the whole country. On my side of the aisle we are always talking about preventing centralization of power in Washington. This is a case where the Congress deliberately wrote into the bill provisions which make it impossible for the Federal Government to run or control the States. That means that although there may be an occasional error in a particular State, it is infinitesimal as compared to the total value of the program.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that anybody who has examined the facts in his own State will vote for this amendment to raise the appropriation to the figure that was originally estimated in both the Truman and the Eisenhower budgets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported the committee without exception on all of the amendments which have been offered to the bill. As a member of the committee, I feel the chairman and members of this committee have done a very good job, and have recommended all of the money that could justly be spent for all of the functions contained in this bill.

There has been some maladministration in this particular program of vocational rehabilitation. If the committee had taken the word for all of the criticism that came to the attention of the committee, they may have recommended much less, and possibly would have been justified; but, generally speaking, the program has been carried on in a manner which is creditable in most instances. It is a very necessary program. It has rehabilitated a great many folks and put them back to work and taken them off the relief rolls in every State of the Union.

As I said a few days ago, it is easy to make a speech which touches the heart of every American, including my own, on matters of this nature. Of course, there are many things which the Federal Government must help do, and we must take care of those very necessary things. This is one of them; but, after all, there is a limit to what can be spent.

In defense of the program in the State of Iowa, I want to say that the certified public accountants who examined the books and looked into the administration of this program in our State, Griffenhagen & Associates, consultants in public administration and finance, had this to say in their report about how the program was administered in the State of Iowa:

The standards of procedures and the techniques of administration used by this division are superior to those used generally throughout the other divisions. Extensive work has been done in the development and utilization of manuals of standard practice instructions. This excellent work is continuing and might well serve as a model for other divisions and other departments of the State government.

I am quite proud of the fact that this program in my State received this fine recognition and I congratulate the people in charge of this program for Iowa.

I read that statement so that no onus will be pointed at the administration of this program in the State of Iowa.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], this is not a very familiar role for me. This is the first time, in fact, that I have stood before this House since the 80th Congress to ask for an increase in an appropriation measure. I am compelled to do so in this instance, though, because in the first place I recognize this particular expenditure as good business for the Government. In the second place, I recognize it as much needed to carry out a very worthwhile program.

It seems odd to me that during the period of the last 5 or 6 years, we should have appropriated almost $50 billion to rehabilitate the countries of Europe—some of which several years ago were fighting us; yet refuse to spend this relatively small amount to rehabilitate unfortunate citizens of our country who happen to have suffered physical disabilities.

Several weeks ago I visited an artificial limb shop in Mississippi. I had an artificial limb I wanted to get repaired. While they were doing the repair work, I noticed that most of the fellows working there were either 1-legged or 1-armed in fact, one of them did not have any legs but was walking on artificial limbs. None of them said they had been in the service so they were not entitled to veterans' benefits. One had been in an automobile wreck and lost his leg; others had been injured in various ways. I asked them where they learned their trade of making artificial limbs. They said they had trained for this work under the vocational-rehabilitation program. Today they are producers, where yesterday they had been nonproducers.

I am sure that the money those fellows have already paid in income tax has already paid the Government for the cost of the training they received under this program. That is but a typical example, not an isolated case. Go through practically any big newspaper plant, and you will see deaf printers and typesetters, all trained under this program. There are hundreds of typical cases. It is just good business to appropriate money to teach these unfortunate people to take care of themselves and become productive citizens.

Those who are helped by this program do not expect handouts; on the contrary, they are struggling to overcome their physical handicaps to take their places in society, not as wards but rather as contributors.

I know of no money that has ever been spent by Government that went for a better cause, or that contributed more proportionately to the general welfare. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned over the effect which the sharp reduction in funds for vocational rehabilitation will have on this very vital and necessary program.

I want to read to you a letter which I have received from Hon. Lon Alsup, executive secretary-director of the Texas State commission for the blind. I had the privilege of serving with Mr. Alsup in the Texas Legislature and I know that he is providing effective leadership in the Texas program for rehabilitation for the blind. He attaches a very interesting statement to his letter which I will insert in the RECORD:

STATE COMMISSION FOR THE BLIND,
Austin, Tex., May 18, 1953.

Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THORNBERRY: I trust that the attached letter will convince you of the need for vocational rehabilitation services to be continued at the same level that it is being administered at this time. Naturally, as executive secretary-director of the State commission for the blind, I am concerned about the reduction of funds as recommended by the Committee on Labor and Education. According to press reports, the committee has submitted a report reducing current appropriations for vocational rehabilitation $2,400,000 for the States. The attached letter should convince you that rehabilitation pays off and that this reduction in funds for vocational rehabilitation is unnecessary.

I also sincerely request that you support an amendment to restore funds to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which will be offered when the bill is considered, probably on Thursday, May 21.

Thanking you for your sincere consideration of this matter and again hoping that you will support an amendment which will at least restore funds to the amount which the States are now receiving, I remain

Very truly yours,

LON ALSUP,
Executive Secretary-Director.

MAY 14, 1953.

Mr. LARNIE E. JENNINGS,
Editor, the Powder Horn,
Personnel Division, Lone Star Ordnance Plant,
Texarkana, Tex.

DEAR MR. JENNINGS: I want to express my sincere appreciation to you for allowing this letter to be placed in the Powder Horn in order that Mr. Lon Alsup, executive secretary-director, the board members, and all employees of the Texas State Commission for the Blind may express our deepest gratitude and appreciation for the excellent cooperation and good will shown to this department by Mr. Autrey, personnel manager; Mr. Cooper, assistant personnel manager; Mr. Knox, chief interviewer; Mr. J. S. Peterson, director of production; Mr. E. B. Bryant, assistant to the director of production; Mr. A. A. Rowland, assistant director of production, and all other members of the personnel department, superintendents, and supervisors of the various production lines.

It has been very gratifying to this department to see so many visually handicapped individuals, both totally blind and partially sighted, be given an opportunity for employment on jobs on which they could perform with their limited vision as well as a person with normal vision.

In most instances we are prone to evaluate an item or items from a dollar-and-cents viewpoint. When the fine work that you people of the Lone Star Ordnance Plant have done is evaluated in this manner it makes a very impressive figure. For example, 16 of the individuals who are now working in areas C, E, and R, if they were unemployed would be drawing an aid to the needy-blind grant from the State department of public welfare, which is allowed for blind people who are unemployed and who cannot secure employment. The amount of this grant would be a maximum of $55 per individual per month, or $880 per month for this group. The remaining 5 of these people would also be eligible for a $55 aid-to-the-needy blind grant, or a total of $275 per month, plus aid-for-dependent-children grants for their families; since these 5 men have a total of 11 children who, when their fathers or main source of support is unemployed, makes these children eligible for aid from the State department of public welfare. The combined aid-to-dependent-children's grants is $276 per month. The $55 per month for 1 individual is not a very impressive figure; however, when you multiply this $55 by 21 you receive a total of $1,155 per month which these people, if they were not working, would receive in the form of an aid-to-needy-blind grant. Then multiply this figure by 12 to cover a period of 1 year's time, you have a figure of $13,860. When you add to this figure of $276 per month, multiplied by 12, which is the amount being received under the aid-to-dependent-childen's grant, you have a figure of $3,312 per year. When you add the total of the amount received for aid to needy blind and the amount received for aid to dependent children by this group of people, if they were unemployed, you have the grand total of $17,172 per year. This is the amount that these people would receive in forms of grants from welfare agencies, and, of course, paid by taxpayers, so we can consider this amount saved. When we add to this figure the amount of income tax which these people will pay over a period of a year's time, this amount being $4,628 per year for the group of 21, you have a total of

$21,800. It is figures such as these that will indicate and convince one that rehabilitation is a paying business.

So far we have dealt only with the financial aspect of the picture. Add to the financial side of the picture the fact that 21 individuals have been given employment which will restore self-confidence and which will enable them to become useful citizens as well as taxpayers rather than tax consumers.

We sincerely hope that the facts and figures set out above will tell the story of what a wonderful job that the management and personnel of Lone Star Ordnance Plant have done. The State commission for the blind is very happy to have been a part of this work.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. HOLLINGER,
Placement Counselor.

In addition to this letter from Mr. Alsup I have received the following telegrams:

HOUSTON, TEX.

HOMER THORNBERRY,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building:

Our understanding that Appropriations Committee has recommended $2,500,000 cut for vocational rehabilitation which is part of Federal security appropriation. On behalf of handicapped children and young people of State, urgently request you work for restoration of funds as recommended by Bureau of Budget.

TEXAS VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
JAMES C. TAYLOR, *President.*

AUSTIN, TEX., *May 20, 1953.*

Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please restore funds cut from appropriations recommended by Budget Committee for vocational rehabilitation in labor, health, education, and welfare bill. Support increase recommended by Budget Committee. Funds desperately needed.

CARL W. MOELLER,
Vocational Rehabilitation Service.

I have also received a long-distance telephone call from Mr. M. A. Browning, the assistant commissioner of the State department of education, who has convinced me that the committee's proposed cut will seriously cripple the vocational rehabilitation program in Texas.

Because I believe in the long run more economy will be achieved in giving handicapped people an opportunity not only to earn a livelihood for themselves but to contribute to our economy, I urge adoption of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I must share responsibility for cuts that are recommended in this bill. With respect to vocational rehabilitation of crippled and blind adults, however, I fear that the committee has made a mistake. Based upon what I now know about this program, I shall vote to restore the funds to the amount recommended in the Eisenhower budget.

I do not believe any State in the Union has made greater strides in rehabilitating its handicapped citizens during the last few years than has Pennsylvania, and I do not want to see this program set back by a cut in funds at this time. In fiscal 1951, the last year for which complete figures are available, 3,700 persons were rehabilitated in Pennsylvania, including 280 blind. A most significant factor is that more than 700 of these disabled people were taken from the public assistance rolls of the State saving the State about $500,000 in relief cost the first year. In less than 5 years, these 700 handicapped persons would have drawn in public assistance more than was spent in rehabilitating them. And during the same period, they will pay in Federal income tax about $1 million more. No doubt, many more of our handicapped were prevented from getting on relief rolls at all. This seems good business to me, and as long as the program can show such results, I think it should be encouraged.

The benefits of rehabilitation that we see in Pennsylvania are likewise apparent throughout the Nation. Sixty-five thousand people were rehabilitated in 1952 and 12,000 of these were taken from public assistance rolls or from public institutions.

Feeling that the people of Pennsylvania should do even more than at present for their handicapped citizens, the legislature is now considering a recommendation of the Governor that $5 million be appropriated to build a rehabilitation center for the severely disabled, which will make it unnecessary that Pennsylvania send its disabled to other States for rehabilitation services.

With the rapid increase in our aged population and our physically and mentally handicapped people, much of it brought about by medical science's success in saving the lives of many who a few years ago would have passed away, it is now estimated that by 1980 each abled-bodied person under 65 years of age will be supporting 1 person who is either over 65 years of age or disabled. Rehabilitation is a program that can help slow up this trend and eventuallly reverse it.

Despite the very evident need for economy in government, I do not believe that we should cut funds for vocational rehabilitation of our crippled and blind citizens. After all this is money spent to help people help themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore the cut made in funds for the vocational rehabilitation program. Why anyone would refuse to appropriate every dollar that can possibly be used on this program is beyond my comprehension. I received a pertinent telegram on this subject from the director of vocational rehabilitation of my own State. Under leave heretofore obtained in the House I insert a copy of this telegram as a part of my remarks. The telegram reads as follows:

CARL ALBERT,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives:

Cut in appropriation recommended for vocational rehabilitation will deny services to 400 disabled persons and affect approximately 2,000 others in Oklahoma. Will also tend to increase cost of public assistance. Will deeply appreciate your active support of any amendment to restore the $23 million in the Eisenhower budget.

VOYLE C. SPURLOCK,
Director Vocational Rehabilitation.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that what will happen under these reductions to the program in Oklahoma is typical of what will happen throughout the United States. Are we, in the name of penny-wise economy, going to deprive thousands of unfortunate Americans of the opportunity to become productive, self-reliant citizens? Are we going to say to them that we hold out for you not even a star of hope? Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the conscience of Members on behalf of people who only ask a chance to be able to help themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this cannot even be styled an economy move. If these people are not self-sufficient they will have to be supported by Government funds. Through the fine rehabilitation program which has grown up in this country many disabled men and women are taxpaying citizens, making their way and helping to support the high cost of national defense. Is it economy to swell the relief rolls with people who could well be on the tax rolls?

Mr. Chairman, in the name of real, basic economy; in the name of plain, simple humanity, I urge the House to support this amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand here a message that came off the ticker a few minutes ago in which it is stated as follows:

WASHINGTON.—A witness today accused the House Appropriations Committee of casting discredit on the vocational-rehabilitation program without first getting the facts.

The testimony was given by H. L. Benshoof, director of vocational rehabilitation in Iowa, at a public hearing before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. The House committee had recommended a $2,400,000 cut in the $23 million rehabilitation appropriation recommended by the Eisenhower administration. The item is included in a health, education, and welfare money bill now pending in the House and on which the Senate subcommittee has started hearings.

Benshoof said the House committee made vague accusations of maladministration of the joint Federal-State rehabilitation program of training the physically handicapped to earn a living.

He asserted the criticism was based on findings of a House staff employee who "Had absolutely no training or experience in rehabilitation or related fields * * * was not a physician and made no attempt to get medical advice from the examining physicians in these cases."

He said the employee examined the complete files in none of the criticized cases and interviewed none of the disabled persons involved.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of things in this report with which I disagree violently. It is unfortunate but some of these things were not submitted to the other Members before being incorporated in the report.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say that I am in favor of the pending amendment and believe it would be false economy to cripple this program.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this opportunity pass without commenting on a statement made on page 10 of the report in which reference is made to a young man who became eastern intercollegiate wrestling champion while taking his training. I do not like a half truth and I do not think a half truth belongs in this or any other report.

That man was a policeman. After he was through with his police duties he assisted his father doing some work and stove an axe through his foot. They removed three toes. The axe and operation which followed left him with a wobbly foot.

At least three doctors, including a bone specialist, recommended the case to the Rehabilitation Service. He was accepted and went to school. He had powerful shoulders, he had powerful arms, he had a powerful back, and he did became an intercollegiate wrestling champion while he was taking this training. What is wrong with participating in athletics while going to school? I am proud to say that now he is a fine teacher of science in the public schools of the State of Pennsylvania, and I think he is located at Warren, Pa. He could not have made a living walking on his crippled foot as a policeman.

I make that statement to clarify the following statement which appears in the report at page 10:

College education for a young man who had lost 3 toes on his right foot, but who, despite his vocational handicap, became the eastern intercollegiate wrestling champion while being rehabilitated.

When I read this statement I set about to find out something about the case they were referring to. There was nothing in the hearings. But I did find the case arose in Pennsylvania. I then called the State director for the State of Pennsylvania, who looked up the records and gave me the information heretofore mentioned, and further stated that there was no just cause for criticism. That it was a good case, the man was doing fine, and had justified both the faith placed in him and the investment made.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to pay tribute to a very able person who administers vocational rehabilitation in my State. His name is Mr. H. L. Benshoof. He, himself, was rehabilitated, and he is very grateful for all the help he received in order that he might live a useful life. As director of this activity in Iowa he has performed and is performing a most worthy service.

May I give you in just a sentence or two a report on the results in my State:

About 1,000 disabled men and women are rehabilitated into self-supporting employment every year in Iowa through the services of vocational rehabilitation. Our experience has consistently been that for every 1,000 persons rehabilitated there is an increase in cash earnings of $2 million the very first year. This means more productive workers in industry, fewer disabled persons on relief rolls, and more wage earners who are paying taxes to the State government and to the Federal Government.

I testified before this subcommittee last year in behalf of vocational rehabilitation. I repeat my interest in it now. I earnestly hope that this service, which is working well and which is a vehicle for taking persons off welfare rolls and opening the door of opportunity to them to become self-supporting and taxpaying citizens, may be dealt with generously by the Congress. According to my information, the legislature of Iowa increased its appropriation for this service by 80 percent in the session recently concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I concur in everything that has been said as to the worthwhileness of this program. I know a great deal more about it myself than just what is learned through hearings with the top officials of the office, because I have worked with it in the city of Chicago. However, we are missing the main point in this debate.

I am constrained to say that the vote for restoration of the reductions the committee has made in this bill has been practically unanimous on the other side of the aisle. It was not that way 2 years ago, in 1951, when the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] was chairman of the committee. The budget request came to our committee for the same amount requested this year, $23 million. The committee, under his chairmanship, cut it the same amount as we have this year, to $20,600,000.

Now, why did the gentleman not vote to restore the cut 2 years ago, when he was chairman of the committee? But, no, it is when the Republicans are in control that you want to restore all of the cuts that are made in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one more point regarding the investigators and their report. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] made mention of the fact that he did not get the report until the committee was ready to mark up the bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I did not make any such statement. We did not get it until it was printed before the main committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman got it just as soon as any member of the committee got it. These investigators, as a result of spot checking, found about 22 cases in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in which they thought exceptions should have been taken at the Federal level here at Washington, D. C. I concurred in their opinion on those 22 cases. I think this committee should see to it that this program, which basically is very worthwhile, is carried on at the Federal level, as it should be and as the Congress wants it to be carried on. I think there is gross maladministration at the Federal level in this program, and I think this is most unfortunate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I just want to say to my distinguished chairman that I do not agree with him at all on the investigators' report. Under leave to extend the remarks I have already made, I will insert instances of the three cases mentioned in the report, not the committee, and also one or two others where the report said no exceptions were made. But exceptions were made, and the record shows they were made.

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes, exceptions were made after the staff called some of these cases to their attention. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting information in the RECORD which will show what happened to the cases mentioned in their report. I think that information should be presented to the House.

(The information referred to follows:)

State: North Carolina.
Fiscal year 1946.
Amount paid: $357.25.
Clients' names: Virginia Summers, Fred Cochrane, Ezekial Lamb, Inez Libersay.
Date audit report received in Washington: March 9, 1950.
Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: March 12, 1950.
Action taken: Cleared by region on contention of regional representative that this was not a fiscal question.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.
Type of item: Dental treatment and dentures given to four clients who did not have substantial employment handicap and whose need had not been established.
State: Idaho.
Fiscal year: 1947, 1948.
Amount paid: $139.66.
Client's name: E. T. Allen.
Date audit report received in Washington: November 10, 1949.
Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: November 17, 1949.
Action taken: Proposed exception deleted and reclassified as administrative information. The auditors had to accept the decision.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.
Type of item: Medical services to power company employee with $50 monthly life income, a car valued at $700, a tractor valued at $500, and property with a net assessed worth, after encumbrances, of $5,000, and with no debts. These figures indicate that the client was not in need. Client was

also earning $60 weekly as a turbine operator. Received new limbs from power company. After rehabilitation, returned to work as turbine operator at $60 weekly.

State: Idaho.
Fiscal year: 1948.
Amount paid: $260.33.
Client's name: Norman D. Carothers.
Date audit report received in Washington: November 10, 1949.
Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: November 17, 1949.
Action taken: Regional auditor proposed exception. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation objected. Put in administrative section.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: College tuition and books for 22-year-old student for whom occupational handicap had not been determined who had a brother in college and whose mother was a retouch artist. Client was said to have been disabled from the age of 17 but subsequent to that time (probably not on a full-time basis) earned $60 weekly as a teacher. Economic need not determined.

State: Idaho.
Fiscal year: 1948, 1949.
Amount paid: $77.64.
Client's name: James L. Welch.
Date audit report received in Washington: November 10, 1949.
Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: November 17, 1949.
Action taken: Case put in administrative section.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Training and tuition for 19-year-old boy with a loss of 3 fingers of the right hand and part of the index finger on the left hand. Client was working regularly at time of application. Got $1 per hour, was studying engineering, and also flying private plane. Client said he had $450 in cash and that his parents were able to support him but he preferred self-support. Substantial vocational handicap not indicated and need not determined.

State: Idaho.
Fiscal year: 1948 and 1949.
Amount paid: No amount given.
Client's name: Marion B. Pierstoff.
Date audit report received in Washington: November 10, 1949.
Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: November 17, 1949.
Action taken: Deleted per request of Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and put in administrative section as administrative information.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Schooling of client without disability and without demonstrating economic need. State agency contended that client would be substantially handicapped if he lost his glasses while away from home.

State: North Carolina.
Fiscal year: 1948.
Amount paid: $709.75.
Client's name: Wellington W. Daniels.
Date audit report received in Washington: Exception cleared in region. Never included in a report.
Date to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Same as above.
Action taken: Cleared in regional office on contention that it was not a fiscal exception. Auditors had to accept the decision.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Four small electric motors and other woodworking equipment purchased for amputee who was a woodworking shop worker at a salary of $160 monthly. Case folder had no evidence that client met eligibility criteria.

State: Virginia.
Fiscal year: 1948.
Amount paid: $225.
Client's name: Arlene Denicke.
Date question received in Washington: By memorandum dated July 12, 1949, for special decision.
Date question transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Draft reply to region sent to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for clearance on July 28, 1949, telling region to take exception. Eventually so released to region.
Action taken: Cleared in region on contention of regional representative of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation that needs exceeded resources. Auditor without authority to take exception.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Medical care to housewife injured in auto accident who was already under treatment when taken as client. Rehabilitation objective, housewife. Husband employed by United States Government at salary of $7,106 with unsubstantiated needs totaling $9,875, including $5,185 not detailed.

State: West Virginia.
Fiscal year 1948.
Amount paid: $1,159.65.
Client's name: Robert Moxley.
Date audit report received in Washington: Not included in an audit report. Question of allowability submitted to Washington on June 27, 1950.
Date transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Question submitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation on June 27, 1950, for their recommendation.
Action taken: No further audit action taken. The case was dropped in the region upon advice of the decision made by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation on June 20, 1951. The auditors had to accept the decision.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Training and maintenance for tipple worker with spot on lung but without tuberculosis. Rehabilitated into a minister. Sanitarium examined client for 56 days without finding TB and medical examination, including X-ray, showed no TB. Apparently no vocational handicap.

State: West Virginia.
Fiscal year: 1948.
Amount paid: $75.
Client's name: Levada Owens.
Date question received in Washington: June 27, 1949.
Date question transmited to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Draft reply sent to OVR September 8, 1949.
Action taken: We eventually had to release an instruction to delete the exception upon recommendation of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation that a substantial handicap existed. Auditors do not have enough authority to oppose the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Teeth extraction and purchase of dentures for housewife referred by the Department of Public Assistance. No other rehabilitation service furnished.

State: West Virginia.
Fiscal year: 1948.
Amount paid: $1,443.23.
Client's name: Luther Norris.
Date audit report received in Washington: August 7, 1952.
Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: August 8, 1952.
Action taken: Still waiting Office of Vocational Rehabilitation recommendation on State appeal from the exception.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Rehabilitating a minister (since 1943) into a minister. Disability consisted of squinting in both eyes and slight nervousness and examining physician recommended that client see an eye specialist. No record of eye specialist being consulted and no medical treatment was given this client.

State: District of Columbia.
Fiscal year: 1950.
Amount paid: $2,228.
Client's name: Willliam E. Spencer.
Date report received in Washington: August 21, 1950.
Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: December 28, 1950.
Action taken: The auditor commented in his administrative section on this case because of the question of whether there was a vocational handicap. No further action known of.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Schooling for 21-year-old who had been working for 2 years following 2-year commitment to St. Elizabeths. Client quit his job when accepted for rehabilitation. Doctor recommended that college training be given so that client would not have to take dual load of college study and full-time employment.

State: West Virginia.
Fiscal year: 1949.
Amount paid: $37.
Client's name: Harley L. Long.
Date question received in Washington: June 27, 1950.
Date question transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Our draft reply sent to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in July 1950.
Action taken: We eventually had to release an instruction to delete the exception upon recommendation of Office of Vocational Rehabilitation that a substantial handicap existed. Auditors do not have enough authority to oppose the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Medical care given to client referred by the Department of Public Assistance. No other rehabilitation service was rendered this client.

State: West Virginia
Fiscal year: 1949.
Amount paid: $20.
Client's name: Doris J. Ramsey.
Date audit report received in Washington: August 7, 1952.
Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: August 8, 1952.
Action taken: Action by Office of Vocational Rehabilitation still pending. No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Eyeglasses purchased for 20-year-old secretary to retain job as secretary and correct nearsightedness. Not an occupational handicap and client had monthly salary of $110.

State: California.
Fiscal year: 1950.
Amount paid: No amount given.
Client's name: Jay W. Butler.
Date report received in Washington: March 6, 1951.
Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: July 27, 1951.
Action taken: This case was referred to the regional representative for his consideration during the administrative review. It was not on list of administrative review exceptions included in 1951 audit report so apparently no further action was taken.
No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Maintenance and tuition furnished to obese (317 pounds) college student after 2 years of college. Client's vocational objective was to become a teacher of

mathematics. State suggested medical services to reduce weight, but declined. Case record indicated good possibility of school employment without anything being done to correct the so-called disability.

State: Georgia.

Fiscal year: 1950.

Amount paid: $3,735.73.

Date audit report received in Washington: February 12, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: July 2, 1952.

Action taken: This material first came in as an administrative comment. We complained to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and on April 2, 1953, they recommended that the question be sent to the region to reopen and submit to the State for concurrence or appeal of the exception.

Type of item: Travel expenses of 27 members of Georgia staff attending conference in San Antonio, most of whom were approved as a reward for assistance in a fund-raising campaign for National Rehabilitation Association. This group included 5 secretary-stenographers and 13 counselors. Director of OVR has been handling for possible fiscal exception.

State: Illinois.

Fiscal year: 1950.

Amount paid: Total expenditures approximate $8,000 per month.

Clients' names: Numerous, not identified.

Date audit report received in Washington: March 14, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: October 17, 1951.

Action taken: Handled as an administrative comment. Exception not taken because of lack of authority by audit division.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: A number of trainees sent to TB sanitaria at rates of $20 to $40 monthly to be trained in homemaking, though they were housewives.

State: Michigan (blind).

Fiscal year: 1950.

Amount paid: $1,040.62.

Clients' names: Peter Wierek, Arminda Tucker, Delia Des Armier.

Date audit report received in Washington: August 6, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: April 16, 1952.

Action taken: No fiscal action. This was an administrative comment to which the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation gave some consideration but no disallowance was made.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: $438.92, Peter Wierek, cataract operation and hospitalization for 67-year-old client residing in county infirmary. To be rehabilitated in order to be returned to former work. After rehabilitation, client did not seek employment and caseworker commented this may have been due to life of leisure in infirmary; $360, Delia Des Armier, cataract operation and hospitalization for 74-year-old housewife who received old-age assistance of $450 and had been on old-age assistance for almost 8 years prior to the operation. File indicated client kept house for a crippled son but does not indicate result of rehabilitation upon public assistance; $341.70, Arminda Tucker, cataract operation and hospitalization for 80-year-old housewife who had been on public-assistance rolls since December 1947, and during period of rehabilitation received $468 from Public Assistance. Client was said to be keeping house for invalid relatives.

State: Michigan.

Fiscal year: 1950.

Amount paid: $152.

Client's name: Leah Partridge.

Date audit report received in Washington: October 17, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: October 24, 1951.

Action taken: Commented on in administrative section.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Medical treatment of facial akin infection of housewife who was on aid-to-dependent-children rolls. Medical consultant commented that patient might pay for simple treatment of acne.

State: Pennsylvania.

Fiscal year 1950.

Amount paid: Treated as administrative comment; no amount given.

Client's name: Homer J. Barr.

Date audit report received in Washington: April 3, 1951. Not handled as an exception but as an administrative comment.

Date to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: July 3, 1951.

Action taken: No fiscal action. This was an administrative comment to which the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation gave some consideration but no disallowance was made.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: College for client without 3 toes on right foot on which 2 examining doctors disagreed to a vocational handicap. Client became eastern intercollegiate wrestling champ during rehabilitation.

State: South Dakota (blind).

Fiscal year: 1950.

Amount paid: Treated as administrative comment; no amount given.

Client's name: Mrs. Darrell McLane.

Date audit report received in Washington: July 27, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: October 12, 1951.

Action taken: Handled as an administrative comment. No action taken by auditor because of lack of authority.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Purchase of plastic eye for housewife whose husband's income was $212 with no other dependents. OVR advised regional representative not to question eligibility stating that legal obligation of husband was "probably not such rehabilitation service as a plastic eye." Husband had refused to buy new eye. OVR also stated that where husband refuses rehabilitation service for wife, or parents refuse for child, even though family income appears adequate, family funds are considered not available to client.

State: South Dakota (blind).

Fiscal year: 1950.

Amount paid: $265.45.

Client's name: William Dennett.

Date audit report received in Washington: July 27, 1951.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: October 12, 1951.

Action taken: No fiscal action because of lack of authority in Audit Division.

No exception taken by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Type of item: Eye operation for a 79-year-old recipient of old-age assistance who was not to become gainfully employed, service being given only to reduce the care at the convalescent home. After the operation, client continued to receive old-age assistance.

State: Pennsylvania (blind).

Fiscal year: 1946, 1947, 1948.

Amount paid: $1,200.

Client's name: Bruno J. Woloszyn.

Date audit report received in Washington: August 30, 1949.

Date report transmitted to Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: September 9, 1949.

Action taken: State concurred.

Exception taken and over expenditure recovered.

Type of item: In this case 3 pianos costing $1,200 were purchased for a self-employed piano tuner and repairman with an income of over $2,600 annually.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would think then the fair thing to do for you, as chairman of this committee, when you get a report like that, is to get the committee together immediately, call up the people responsible, and let us get a report and not take it from someone who does not know anything about rehabilitation.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think that suggestion is a good one, but I did not get the report in time to do that. The investigators had to work nights in order to get the report to the committee before we marked up the bill. And, I will insist on one thing more: That the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation be thoroughly investigated before we even consider appropriations for the fiscal year 1955.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 78, noes 41.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (including the objects specified in the preceding paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarer of the current fiscal year.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, just before the committee rose on Friday, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] offered an amendment restoring the land grant colleges appropriation under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, which was unanimously adopted. I think he was very wise in doing that. I want the record to distinctly show, however, that we the minority members of the committee at all times protested the elimination of this item from the appropriation bill. I am glad that the chairman of the committee reconsidered the matter and that this appropriation is now in the bill.

However, coincident with the adoption of this amendment, our genial floor leader, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] undertook to give what he said was notice to the States that this appropriation will be discontinued in the future. Now, I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Indiana. He is one of the most cogent speakers in this House, and I love to hear him speak. He is an able member of the House, and he is an able floor leader. But for the life of me, I cannot understand under what authority he assumes

to speak for the entire House and for the entire Congress. We have a law which has been on the statute books since 1935, and which as late as 1952 was given consideration by the legislative committee, and amended and extended but not repealed. If the gentleman from Indiana wants to give notice to the States of a reversal of policy by this Republican Congress, the proper thing for him to do is to go before the appropriate committee, have a bill reported out repealing that law, and submit the matter to a vote. That would be the orderly and the proper procedure.

I personally am opposed to the repeal of that law, and I am certainly opposed to its repeal by indirection in an appropriation bill. I cannot go along with my good chairman on that point, and neither can I go along with some of the declarations made in the report of this bill. For example at page 11, with respect to appropriations for the venereal diseases, it is stated:

> The committee believes that the point has been reached where the States and communities can take care of the problem with a minimum of assistance from the Federal Government.

As a member of the subcommittee, I disassociate myself entirely with any such view stated in the report.

Indeed I disassociate myself with a good many statements made in the report. I have already called attention to the statement made on page 4, with respect to the Mexican farm-labor program, where it is stated:

> The committee has serious misgivings about this program, which guarantees to foreign agricultural workers coming into this country many things such as medical care for sickness or injury incurred on the job, minimum wages, adequate living quarters, etc., which are guaranteed to our own citizens.

Those may be the views of the chairman or the majority members of the committee, but they certainly do not reflect the views of this one member of that subcommittee.

Again at page 6 of the report dealing with publications of the Office of Educations, it is stated:

> Assuming education is the science of teaching truthfully, factually, and, above everything else, objectively, one cannot help questioning the manner in which the publications regarding the United Nations have been handled.

And further down the report states:

> It is an indictment of the former Commissioner of Education that he would permit the Office to propagandise one side of a question as controversial as the United Nations, completely excluding the other side.

Mr. Chairman, these reports are prepared by the staff under the direction of the chairman, and these statements may represent the views of the chairman, but I submit that there is not one iota of evidence to justify any such severe indictment and criticism. Yes, there were statements by the chairman in which he assumed what the report says, but he did not present or point to any facts to justify his assumption, and no witness gave testimony justifying any such assumption to sustain the statement in the report.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. If the gentleman will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the other day when the gentleman from North Carolina asked me to include certain tabulations along with the hearings, he will see what I meant by that because I included it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Of course, if this report is just the opinion of the chairman, that is a different proposition. What I am complaining about is this——

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

What I am complaining about is that some of these indictments and statements of views that are put into these reports were not submitted to the other members of the subcommittee. Yet they come up here as if they were reported by the entire committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. Was the report submitted to the committee when the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] was chairman of the committee last year?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I was not a member of the committee under him, but I never saw this kind of broadside indictment in any of his reports. A committee should not be placed in the position of making unjustified indictments of this sort, without ever discussing them with the members. What is wrong with extending them that right and that courtesy? I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during general debate on this bill I brought to the attention of the Members a letter from Dr. John D. Porterfield, director of health of the State of Ohio. His letter appears on page 5345 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 21, 1953. I would like to read again Dr. Porterfield's letter:

> STATE OF OHIO,
> DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
> *Columbus, Ohio, March 12, 1953.*
>
> Mrs. KATHALEEN C. ARNESON,
> *Washington Representative, Spokesmen for Children, Arlington, Va.*
>
> DEAR MRS. ARNESON: I am in receipt of your letter of February 27, which is concerned with the impending reduction in Federal grants-in-aid to the States as indicated in the President's budget.
>
> Ohio's share of maternal and child-health grant-in-aid funds is not sufficient to carry on the scope and quality of program we would like to see realized. Our State legislature has never appropriated funds to support the maternal and child-health program, and thus we rely entirely on Federal assistance.
>
> In the main there are two broad categories which would be affected by a reduction in Federal funds, namely: (1) Less money for distribution to local health departments throughout the State; and (2) a reduction in consultative and demonstration services. This means that local health departments will have less financial assistance from the State to supplement their undernourished budgets. Of necessity such activities, as well as child conferences, immunization programs, school health, otological diagnostic clinics, etc., would have to function on a lesser scale. From the standpoint of the State health department, an expansion of the nutrition, hearing, and vision programs would not be possible and the addition of such vital persons as a pediatrician and more hospital nursing consultants to the maternal and child-health staff would be out of the question. I need not dwell on what benefits would be derived from the addition of such key staff to the State as a whole.
>
> If sufficient grant-in-aid moneys were received, this department would be in a position to not only supplement the present staff but to provide sums of money for payments to hospitals for care of premature infants of medically indigent parents and also make payments for medical and surgical care for needy children who had been examined at our State-sponsored otological diagnostic clinics.
>
> I realize this is a rather sketchy presentation of some of the needs which could be met if additional Federal funds were available. I sincerely hope this information will be useful to you.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> JOHN D. PORTERFIELD, M. D.

I was shocked and surprised by the statement that the State of Ohio—my State—which is debt-free and has a large surplus in its treasury, was failing to meet its responsibilities to the children of the State—child care, crippled children, and maternal welfare. The demand for increased Federal funds from Ohio did not, in my opinion, come with good grace. I called upon the State to meet its responsibilities, as it has the ability to do.

Dr. Porterfield, in his statement, I repeat, said:

> Ohio's share of maternal and child-health grant-in-aid funds is not sufficient to carry on the scope and quality of program we would like to see realized. Our State legislature has never appropriated funds to support the maternal and child-health program, and thus we rely entirely on Federal assistance.

Imagine my surprise—yes; my chagrin—when I found that Dr. Porterfield had not presented the true facts in his letter. I asked the Chief of the Childrens Bureau, SSA, to give me the facts—the figures—of what Ohio had appropriated and what they had paid in matching funds from Ohio. I shall read that report to you.

> CHILDREN'S BUREAU, SSA,
> *May 22, 1953.*
>
> To: Congressman FRANK T. BOW.
> From: Martha M. Eliot, M. D., Chief.
> Subject: State and local funds for matching Federal grants for maternal and child health, and crippled children's services, Ohio.
>
> In accordance with your telephone request, I am submitting below figures showing the amount of State, local, and Federal funds for Ohio's maternal and child health, and crippled children's programs during the fiscal year 1953. Title V of the Social Security Act requires that each State match a substantial part of the Federal grants for these two programs.

Maternal and child health program:	
Total State and local funds	$266,700
State	26,000
Local	240,700
Total Federal funds	449,012
To be matched	258,238
Unmatched	190,774
Crippled children's program:	
Total State and local funds	944,885
State	358,944
Local	585,941
Total Federal funds	414,636
To be matched	225,111
Unmatched	189,525
Total for both programs:	
State and local funds for matching	1,211,585
State funds	384,944
Local funds	826,641
Federal funds	863,648
To be matched	483,349
Unmatched	380,299

Ohio is, therefore, putting up a considerable amount more for the maternal and child health, and the crippled children's programs than the funds allotted to the State from Federal appropriations for these two programs.

For its total public health program, Ohio reports amounts put up by the State and local authorities for the fiscal year 1953, as follows:

State	$2,367,751
Local	7,007,497
Total	9,375,248

In accordance with your request, I am enclosing an additional copy of this memorandum for you to give to Congressman BOLTON.

MARTHA M. ELIOT, M. D.

So you see, Mr. Chairman, Governor Lausche's director of public health either is ignorant of the facts he should know or he has deliberately attempted to mislead the Congress and the people of the country.

Whichever may be the fact, Governor Lausche and Dr. Porterfield must accept full responsibility for a very confused situation which exists in Ohio today.

If the Governor had no knowledge of the act of his director of public health, he should remove him at once. As I say, he is guilty of either inexcusable ignorance, or of gross misrepresentation of material facts.

I believe it to be important to bring further facts to the attention of Members. The same Dr. Porterfield who said no funds are appropriated prepared a budget for the present legislature. His budget called for an appropriation of $2,348,000 for the first year and $2,400,000 for the second year.

Governor Lausche, through his director of finance, reduced this amount to $1,354,000 for the first year and $1,382,000 for the second year. The Governor of the great State of Ohio, Frank Lausche, has reduced the budget for health in the State $1,000,000 a year for the next two years.

This State, with no debt and a large surplus, called upon the Federal Treasury for larger contributions. No wonder we have a debt of $267,000,000,000. If we are to balance the budget; if we are to give much-needed tax relief to the American people; States must accept their rightful obligations. Can this action by the Governor of Ohio and his State health director to be an admission by them that they are not competent to handle the health problem of the State?

If the health programs of Ohio suffer during the next 2 years it will be the direct responsibility of Governor Lausche, for he, and he alone, through his director of finance, took from the State budget $2,000,000 for health programs.

I resent, and I am sure the people of Ohio will resent, the misleading statement by Governor Lausche's director of health, in the letter I referred to. He should be removed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed $3,000 for production, purchase, and distribution of educational films; $500,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 16, line 15, strike out "$500,000" and insert "$690,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes along with the previous amendment that was just adopted on the grants to States for vocational rehabilitation.

I think Dr. JUDD brought out the fact very well when he said in his closing remarks that when this budget went before the new administration, the Eisenhower administration, they did not cut grants to States by 1 dime. That was the one agency of Government that they said should not be cut. It is the one agency in Government that the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said should not be cut. It is one of the most important of all Government agencies today. But on "Salaries and expenses," the Eisenhower budget did make a reduction from $700,000 down to $690,000. All I am trying to do is to restore the committee action to the Eisenhower budget, to carry on the administration of this program. The bill includes today $500,000, which is a reduction of $225,000 from the request, and $200,000 below what you gave them in fiscal 1953. The committee report also says that none of this reduction should be applied against the approval of State plans and grants.

Let me tell you what this reduction of $190,000 below the Eisenhower budget will do. It means a cut of 37 positions out of 98.

This is a 38-percent reduction in personnel. How in the world are you going to appropriate $23 million for grants and then complain about the administration of this program. You cut their administration in half and expect them to do a half decent job?

If this action of the committee is allowed to stand it means one of two things: Either wipe out the entire regional staff—and no one in the Congress or elsewhere has even suggested this; or divide the reduction between regional and headquarters staffs. After making allowance for legal requirements incident to granting of funds, and for Federal operating expenses, this would require first the elimination of 7 of the 10 regional offices; and, second, the virtual elimination of such functions as services for the blind, hard of hearing, medical rehabilitation, statistical reporting, and public information.

This reduced staff could not even do what is now done in reviewing State programs to safeguard the spending of Federal funds invested in this program. If funds for grants to States are cut; it becomes more important than ever to insure that every Federal dollar is spent as efficiently as possible.

It is the most foolish thing in the world to come in here and complain about the administration of this program by saying that it is not being administered properly and then cut them 38 percent and take away services for the blind, the hard of hearing, and so forth.

All my amendment does, Mr. Chairman, is to restore the item to the figure recommended in the Eisenhower budget for salaries and expenses of the vocational rehabilitation program.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be defeated. The major part of this cut will be in the activity, "Development of rehabilitation services for the handicapped." This should be primarily a State function, with some coordination and advice from the Federal Government. The amount in the bill would provide about $300,000 for this purpose, even if no reduction were made in the office's other activities. If the office were run efficiently, it could operate on much less.

This cut will not hurt the program at all.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUSBEY) there were—ayes 63, noes 50.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82, noes 80.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For expenses, not otherwise pro-

vided, necessary to carry out those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of the act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466–466 (j)); $3,000,000.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How about the motion I have at the desk? Is that not a preferential motion?

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman from California suspend until the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is reported by the Clerk?

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: That the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it be referred to the Committee with instructions to increase each item in the bill by 10 percent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to be quite evident that our friends on my right are determined to prevent the adoption of this bill as written. They seem determined to add to it and to each item in it something, so I make this motion in order to save the time of the House, not that I will vote for the motion, because I will not, if it is permitted to go to a vote.

Why my colleagues should write their constituents and advocate publicly that they want to balance the budget—and this is not in the form of a lecture; it is just in sort of an inquiring mood that I happen to be in to see if I can get a little information that will help me to straighten out my course—why my colleagues should write their constituents, if they do write their constituents, that we should balance the budget and reduce taxes, and then increase every appropriation bill which renders that intense desire on their part to be impossible of accomplishment, I cannot understand.

And I will be happy, indeed, and extremely grateful if they will take me aside, because explanations here might be embarrassing—if they will take me aside in the lobby or call me to come to their offices, and give an explanation of how we can reconcile our promises and the promise of the administration with our conduct on the floor.

Now, I do not criticize; of course, I never criticize anyone. I do not question the attitude of our Democratic New Deal-Fair Deal friends. They have existed for a long, long time on this old program of Harry Hopkins to tax and spend and get the votes. And, that is all right for them, but I do not know why we, as Republicans, should go along with that program. I cannot figure it out, and, if somewhere I have missed something, I hope that they will enlighten me.

I have tried—I will not say I have prayed over it, but I have thought about it, and in the nighttime I have awakened and it has worried me and it has bothered me, so it seems to me that now, with a shortcut like this, just send it back, if that is the sense of the House, and say, "All right boys, go ahead, increase it."

With the other duties I have, I cannot understand all these questions, and when we have a Committee on Appropriations as we have, with a staff as large as it is and as competent as it is, I do not feel that I can come along and vote in opposition to their recommendations after all the study they have given to it.

I know that, for example, on this aid-to-vocational-education program, I have had a lot of wires and letters, and some folks have come in to see me personally, friends of mine, 1 or 2 of them, who contributed very generously to my primary and general election campaigns, and I would like to go along with those folks if I could; and I could, perhaps, if I just followed my own inclinations.

But the good wife every once in a while catches up with me and she says, "Now, listen. You said so and so. How come you voted that way?" I cannot keep her from reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wish I could, but I cannot do it. That is why I offered this motion. I shall vote against the motion if it is submitted.

Nevertheless, I would like an expression of the House because, if you are going to repudiate our good colleague from New York and his assistants on the committee who worked so hard and so long and who so thoroughly go into these questions, just because somebody in the district wants us to vote for this particular thing or someone makes an emotional plea, if that is the case, let us go ahead and get rid of it. Then we can do something else the rest of the week.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I certainly cannot overlook this opportunity to oppose such a motion as the one now pending before the Committee, to increase every single item in this huge appropriation bill by 10 percent. There are some items in this bill which should be increased more than 10 percent. But the pending method of approach to economy is just as senseless as it is to slash an appropriation bill by 10 percent in meat-ax fashion, and I have said this for many years.

I must say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that if his party, which is in control of the House, which is the majority party, and the Republican Senate and administration want to balance the budget, they have the votes and the prerogative to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California: On page 18, line 8, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,793,800."

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase funds for the item of engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene. I looked at the report on this item and find that it merely says that a certain amount of money has been stricken from the bill, and then the Committee feels there should be certain consolidation of activities at a laboratory that is just being opened in Cincinnati.

What is this item? This is the item by which the Public Health Service conducts its field investigations in water pollution, including industrial pollutions caused in streams, in sewage disposal, and the way to take care of sewage disposal and of chemical waste. There is not an industrial community in this country that is not concerned with chemical and industrial waste, which are the bane of our citizens. It takes care of air pollution. We remember what took place at Donora, Pa., some time ago, and what air pollution means in such a place as Los Angeles and other great industrial cities. This is the place where that work is carried on and what are you doing? You are cutting this appropriation by substantially 25 percent with no justification. It means you are going to lose a lot of trained personnel—engineers, chemists, and so forth—in a field that is extremely necessary. We are living at a high tempo. We have to find some way to take care of these wastes created by the industrialization of our country. With the populations of certain communities growing as rapidly as they are, sewage disposal presents a great problem and the neutralization of that is important. That is the type of research work that is done at this laboratory. For over the 4 or 5 years we have been in the process of building and creating a laboratory in Cincinnati. Then what do we do? We are making a meat-ax cut on the money to operate that laboratory. We are going way below the Eisenhower budget. I submit to you that in this day and age, if there is one thing we have to do, and one place we have to start, it is the study of pollution for both water and air, and the control of such diseases that comes from such pollutions. It is under this item that the work of developing a universal standardization of milk, a desirable end, will be brought about. I ask you to think this over carefully. This has no great lobby behind it and pressing for its adoption. There are a few engineers in the House of Representatives, a few Members who understand this situation, but give it some thought and see if you want this item drastically reduced and to cut off a vitally necessary field of investigation.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the States, the communities, and private industry are paying more attention to this type of research than they have in the past, and that is the way it should be. We have been talking about this great bureaucracy that has been built up in Washington over the past 20 years, with tremendous centralization of government. In nearly every one of these appropriation bills, there is an opportunity to get more authority and responsibility to the States, where it belongs. Private industry is doing a great deal in this respect and can do a lot more.

In addition, the Public Health Service has two buildings at Cincinnati where this activity is carried on. This work could be done more efficiently and with less money if it were consolidated in one building. I think the cut recommended by the committee is reasonable and moderate, and the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] should be defeated.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: On page 18, line 8, strike out the figure "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,850,000."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I speak for the substitute which I offer to the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], which increases the appropriation by $850,000 to conform to the Eisenhower budget estimate. I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my district stretches for 300 miles along the Ohio River—La Belle Riviere, or the Beautiful River, as the French called it. I have more river in my district than does any other Member of this House.

And I suspect I have more water pollution flowing past my district than does any other Member of this House. It is a doubtful distinction.

The French explorers knew what they were talking about when they called the Ohio beautiful. So did the early settlers who floated their flatboats down from Pittsburgh 170 years ago.

The wooded hills looked down on a clear river. The best of fish swam in its clean waters. In the autumn the ducks flying south happily dropped down to rest and feed on the Ohio. A settler drifting down the river could drop a bucket over the side, dip up water, and drink without fear of an immediate attack of gastroenteritis.

People seldom talk now of the beautiful Ohio. Why?

Because man has converted the Ohio into an open sewer. The river has been locked and dammed for the purpose of obtaining a 9-foot stage of water. The river consists of a series of pools which in the summertime become stagnant and foul. There is such a pool extending from Fernbank to Coney Island, a distance of about 12 miles, and into that pool goes the industrial waste of this great industrial region, and the domestic sewage of almost 1 million people; and from it comes the water supply for Cincinnati and Covington, Newport, Bellevue, Dayton, Fort Thomas and all the cities on the Kentucky side.

Only the poorest of fish linger in its waters. Ducks hardly dare light there no matter how weary. Man must spend millions of dollars in water-treatment plants before he dare drink its water. Even then, he must steel himself against the awful taste of phenol before he can swallow, and sometimes the chemists at the treatment plants tremble as they peer into their microscopes after all their treatment efforts. There is little wonder that the sale of bottled water is a flourishing industry up and down the valley of this beautiful Ohio.

The truth is that we have increased the pollution of the Ohio for every year that the white man has lived along its banks. It is, indeed, almost a monument in man's desecration of a natural resource.

This increase has continued despite the great Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 which the Ohio Valley so warmly advocated and which was based on bills proposed by Mr. Elston, Mr. Mundt, of South Dakota, and myself in the House and Senator Taft and Senator Barkley in the Senate. That act has done much. But the best it could do was to retard the rate of increase in pollution of American rivers.

One major explanation lies in the boom in the chemical industry. Up and down our river, and others throughout the country, new chemical plants are springing up everywhere. They discharge new loads of chemical waste into the rivers—often waste for which there is no known treatment.

Another reason is the boom of the cities. They are struggling manfully to master the treatment of their sewage but their populations have been growing rapidly, critical materials have been in short supply, and tax money that might have gone to this purpose has been needed for defense. The result is a slow loss of ground in our fight against filth in rivers.

We come now to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would have the House notice that I do not ask it to restore the item of $900,000 for grants to the States for research in water pollution. However, I must mention the irony of its omission from the appropriation this year.

These grants were authorized in the 1948 act just mentioned. The last appropriation was made 2 years ago. Last year a marvelous thing happened. A young scientist, working over at Johns Hopkins University under one of those grants—a grant of only $6,500 mind you—discovered what appears to be a means of preventing the formation of sulfuric acid in coal mines.

That may mean nothing to many of you. To those who come from coal or river districts, it means a great deal. It means that the greatest single industrial pollutant of American rivers may be near an end. It means that the mining industry and others who use the rivers may save each year several times the $2,900,000 that this House has voted since 1948 for these research grants.

Perfection of the mine acid process would have gotten $50,000 to add to its $6,500 if the program had been continued this year, but it was killed when the new people took over the department. I do not ask that it be restored I simply mention the irony of killing the goose who has just laid its greatest golden egg.

I do ask this House, however, to restore to the item "Engineering, sanitation and industrial hygiene." We find on page 11 of the Appropriations Committee report that the committee has recommended $3 million, a reduction of $985,000 from the amount requested by the Public Health Service for this item, or $850,000 below the revised budget.

These funds are used by the Public Health Service for its research, technical and field investigations for water pollution control and public water supplies, and for other engineering and sanitation work to keep under control the spread of communicable disease between the States. The amount recommended by the committee will drastically reduce the Public Health Service's important water-pollution-control work, including research and field investigations. It will require a reduction of 75 percent in its technical field staff.

In 1948 my State of Kentucky and seven other States in the Ohio Valley entered into a compact to take the necessary action to clean up the river. An idea of the problem facing us is revealed by a survey which 6 of the States undertook in 1950 of the foul conditions caused by human and industrial wastes. At only 3 of the 27 sampling stations along a stretch of almost a thousand miles was the bacterial quality within the range recommended by the Public Health Service as being considered acceptable for public water supply purposes. We need the Public Health Service as an ally to the States in helping us to protect the water supply that the people in my district depend upon for their very lives.

With a relatively small sum of money, the Public Health Service since 1950 has been able to carry on research on a few of the more important water pollution problems, and with the States, industries, and municipalities, has been able to get well under way the development of pollution abatement plans to be placed into effect by the States. For many decades now the problems of interstate pollution have been a major drawback to action on the part of the States. The Public Health Service has provided a means through which the States can work together to solve these interstate problems.

The reduction recommended by the Appropriations Committee is drastic, far greater than that recommended by the President and Secretary Hobby. It will curtail seriously the very excellent work that the Public Health Service is doing on the water pollution problem. Water pollution is not growing less. It is constantly rising because of our greater industrialization and increasing popula-

tion. A major reduction in the small, highly skilled professional staff which the Public Health Service will be required to make is a serious blow to the public health protection which is so essential to the people of my district and to more than half the population of our Nation who depend on our rivers and lakes for their drinking water.

In addition, there is just being completed at Cincinnati a new water pollution control research building, at a cost of $4 million. We on the Ohio River have been looking forward to this building for a long time, with the expectation that the research undertaken there would yield a great deal of the knowledge which would help us to more effectively and at less cost combat the serious problem of water pollution. The reduced funds will limit markedly the amount and kind of research that the Public Health Service can do in this fine building.

Let us think what we do. Against a problem that grows more dangerous every day, we cut back our defenses.

Never was there greater need of work on how to eliminate water pollution. New chemical wastes pour into the streams. New detergents are going into every housewife's washing machine and later into our rivers. American cities are facing a bill of between $12 billion and $15 billion for the sewage treatment plants that they must build. The thing that slows their program is the cost. But now the program which seeks a means of cutting that cost—a program that possibly might produce some great windfall like the mine-acid discovery made through the late program of grants—now the program that seeks to find a way to reduce those costs is itself to be cut back.

I sympathize with the efforts of the new administration and of the House committee to reduce appropriations, but in this case I must urge the House to make no more cut in this item than President Eisenhower did.

Our men battling the scourge of water pollution were losing ground with the program we had this year. Surely we should not withdraw their support and reduce their number at such a time. I urge the House to allow the $3,850,000 which the Budget Bureau recommended for this item.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to compliment my distinguished colleague, the dean of the Kentucky delegation, on the statement he has made here today.

Since I came to Congress a few years ago I have observed that the gentleman has always actively supported legislation to eliminate pollution of our streams, and has been a constructive leader in that field. I will support the amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. When I was working for the correction of stream pollution I was working for my own salvation, I think.

There is not a dollar in here of appropriations for the States; all this is for the Government experts who lead this fight, who coordinate the efforts, advise the States; the States must furnish the money, the States must work together to formulate a plan that will ultimately result in cleaning up this river—and it is not only for this river but there are also lots of other rivers in the Nation. The reason I speak of this river is because I see it every day. There are lots of other rivers that need it just as much as the Ohio River.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, no one can disagree with the remarks made by the gentleman from Kentucky; certainly, if we can do something this year or in succeeding years to clean up the rivers of the Nation which have been polluted, those things should—and I am satisfied will—be done. But today we are faced with a problem of defending the very Nation. The only way that we can secure funds for the defense of this country and for balancing the budget is to cut out some of the things, certainly not to increase them over the past fiscal year.

I wonder if the Members of the House realize just what we are doing on this bill. On each item as we go down through the list if the Eisenhower budget is over the 1953 appropriation, the House is increasing to the revised budget. If the budget happens to be below the 1953 appropriation, the House increases to the 1953 level. I certainly fail to see how we can, in good conscience, tell our people back home that we are down here trying to correct the financial condition in which this country finds itself when all we are doing is jumping between the two figures we are offered; and the House in each instance is accepting the higher figure. If this action continues throughout this bill, there is but one result: Substantially higher spending at the end of 1953.

If we have any confidence in the new people who have taken over this administration, certainly we must give them credit that they will be able to make token reductions down the line; and if we give them more money than they ask for, if the 1953 figures happen to be more money and then keep up all of the figures to whatever might be asked for in the revised budget, this Congress in this bill must of necessity appropriate more money for these activities than was appropriated in fiscal 1953. If that is the record the House wishes to take back to their constituents, it is one to which I cannot subscribe.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 35, noes 56.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. MILLER of California.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 49, noes 99.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the act, as amended, to remain available until expended, $50 million: *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an amount equal to the appropriation granted herein.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 18, line 24, strike out "$50 million" and insert "$75 million."

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is one of the most important amendments that we have to consider in this or any other appropriation bill. This phase of the appropriation bill affects every State in the Union. This bill is the so-called Hill-Burton hospital construction bill that was passed on a nonpartisan basis. Senator HILL and former Senator Burton of Ohio were the original cosponsors of this bill in 1945. At that time it was a 5-year program authorizing the expenditure of $75 million a year. In 1949 the bill was amended to run another 5 years, and under the law at the present time it expires in 1955. This year in the Senate, Senator TAFT of Ohio and Senator HILL of Alabama have introduced another extension of 5 years which would make the bill active until 1960. On the House side our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has introduced the same amendment as was introduced in the Senate to extend this act until 1960.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the sponsor of the act.

Mr. HARRIS. Since the gentleman referred to the two bills that have been introduced on this side and on the Senate side, I think it would be interesting to know that the present administration, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has recommended strongly an extension of 2 years of the act.

Mr. FOGARTY. When this bill was extended for this second period of 5 years 2 years ago it not only called for an authorization of $75 million but without a dissenting vote in either House, either in the Senate or the House of Representatives, we extended that act for another 5 years and authorized the expenditure of $150 million because it was on a nonpartisan basis. We appropriated $150 million that year. The next year, because of a division in the full Committee on Appropriations, it was

cut to $75 million over my objection. The next year I think we appropriated $82,500,000, and last year we appropriated $75 million. This year the Truman budget called for $75 million, because we have now been operating on a program for 8 years that has practically guaranteed to the States that there would be at least $75 million made available every year for hospital construction in every State in the Union. Now the committee comes in and cuts it by 33 percent, a law that was passed by both Houses without a dissenting vote. I wonder at times if that is not legislation on an appropriation bill. I have said this before and I will keep on saying it as long as I possibly can, that when the Congress unanimously authorizes the expenditure of a certain amount of money for various programs the Committee on Appropriations is almost obligated to appropriate that money unless we can find something in the operations performed by that agency that will justify our cutting the budget. But I wish you could take a look at the hearings, and we had lengthy hearings on the appropriation for the Hill-Burton Act. There is not one word in the hearings before you today that justifies a cut of $1 million, never mind $25 million. Read through it, if you have a chance. There was not one word of testimony that was developed by our subcommittee or the full committee that justifies a cut such as we are giving here at the present time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. What is the position of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on this amount? Has she asked for $75 million or has she asked for $50 million, or has she asked for neither?

Mr. FOGARTY. The position, I believe, of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare justified an appropriation of $60 million, which was the revised budget figure or the Eisenhower budget figure. I must say this also. I am not sure how that figure was arrived at, because I know that the Office of the Secretary went before the Bureau of the Budget, I think on three occasions. The first time they went with their budget, the Bureau of the Budget said, "No. Go back and take out some more." This they did and went back again and the Bureau of the Budget said, "No. Go back and take out some more." They went back a third time, and on what items they were giving and taking at that time I do not know. It was not disclosed in the hearings.

As far as the justification of the Bureau of the Budget in cutting the figure to $60 million is concerned, we have nothing in the hearings to justify that cut at all, nothing whatsoever in the hearings. The States, I believe, were given not only a promise but almost an obligation on our part that they would get at least $75 million. I know 3 or 4 years ago when we authorized $150 million we gave it to them one year. I know that since then there were inquiries from the States and arguments of Members coming upon the floor asking about this project or that project in their districts that could not get the amount, because we had not allowed the full authorization of $150 million.

The same thing holds true today. There is not a State in the Union this will not affect, if we permit this to hold.

The chairman of my committee made a statement the other day, as I remember, that he did not know much about Dr. Cronin. I have known Dr. Cronin since he has been in charge of this program. I do not believe there is a man in this country any more capable of carrying out his responsibilities and duties under the law as we have prescribed for him than Dr. Cronin.

My chairman said that perhaps an engineer or someone in that category should be at the head of this program. But, when this bill was discussed in 1945 and 1946, the issue was thrashed out then and there. This was not a brick and mortar problem. It was not a question of getting brick and mortar together and putting up four walls and a roof and a foundation. The principle then as advocated by the American Hospital Association and others who have endorsed this program was that it was more than a brick and mortar program, and that the programing of these hospitals should be done under some medical advice because they were the ones who knew more about it than the engineers, but at the same time he has engineers at his disposal. He has architects at his disposal. The American Institute of Architects have endorsed this procedure, and his head architect here in Washington just received the highest award that an architect can receive in our country just a few weeks ago. He was the man who was responsible for the drawing of the plans and specifications, after the advice of the American Hospital Association, because it is a hospital association which knows how big the rooms should be, and how wide the doors should be, and what type of windows there should be in a hospital of this kind. It has been that kind of working agreement under which this program has worked out.

There has been another charge made that it costs in some cases $50,000 a bed to build. Look at the hearings. The charge was made on the floor only the other day again that it cost $50,000 a bed. That was gone into very thoroughly by the chairman of our committee, and you will find it starting on page 864 of the hearings where the charge was made. If you take the time to read the next 5 or 6 pages, you will find that that charge was absolutely not true. It was not for building a hospital or the cost of hospital beds at all. There was a project nearby where a State was building a nursing home and remodeling an existing hospital at the same time. Anyone who knows a thing about construction knows that it costs more to remodel than it does to build a new building.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think, if you will look at these hearings, you will find no justification for that charge at all.

Mr. Chairman, there have been other charges made of this report about unobligated funds. This talk about unobligated funds does not mean a thing. I remember the argument was used just a short time ago when we voted to give $6 million to the school districts in the federally impacted areas where the charge was made that only some $8 million have been obligated. I think everyone knows, if they know the law at all, that these funds are not given to the school districts because they have to wait until the end of the school year in June, and then they are paid on the basis of the attendance of pupils. Sometimes the funds are not paid out until as late as September after we have passed the fiscal year that we are working in. The same thing holds true in the hospital construction program as far as unobligated funds are concerned. One of the complaints was that over $61 million of previously appropriated funds were unobligated as of February 28, 1953. But the committee, or whoever wrote the report, overlooked several factors. These funds have already been allotted to the States and were made available by the Congress for a 2-year period. That is in the law. Over $30 million of the $61 million balance had on that date been allocated to project sponsors against which they were proceeding with fund raising. In fact, as of March 31, 1953, out of the $82,500,000 appropriated for 1952, $80,267,000 was already allocated to project sponsors.

Those are the facts and they are the only facts.

Another charge was made by the committee that many of the hospitals have been built and staffed, but used only a small percent of their capacity. I have taken that up with the American Hospital Association. I do not know who else I could go to or who would know more about it in the Federal agencies downtown.

Is there an organization in this country that knows more about this problem of hospitals than they do? Is there a Member of Congress who will make the claim that he knows more about this program than the American Hospital Association? I do not think they will get up and say that they do. The American Hospital Association has just completed a survey of this program, and they endorse it 100 percent. I checked with them just the other day, and they said this charge made by the committee was meaningless, because a majority of these hospitals have been built in rural areas. That was the main purpose of the bill when it was enacted, to take care of the

rural areas, and as a result that has happened.

I remember 3 or 4 years ago, when there was some talk about socialized medicine, everyone who was against socialized medicine at that time said this was a good answer to socialized medicine. You will recall that some time ago there were complaints about a shortage of doctors in the rural areas of the country. This program has proven the point that we made then, that if we built these hospitals in the rural areas the doctors will come to them, and that has turned out 100 percent to be correct.

Another charge has been made that we are taking nurses away from some hospitals. There was something in the hearings about a certain percentage. Dr. Cronin did not know what the percentage was, but he did say that this program has brought back to active service many nurses who had retired; that 21 percent of the nurses working in these hospitals had come out of retirement, and as a result we have had much better medical care.

Another charge has been made that they are closing some of these hospitals. What does that mean? It does not amount to anything. Out of 1,150 projects that have been built so far——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has been very liberal and we have extended his time twice. There are many people who want to speak on this bill. I want a little extra time myself. I have not asked for any extra time myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to have the gentleman be a little reasonable on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in the 13 years I have been here, I have never objected to a fellow Member on a subcommittee with me, or on the full committee, having an extension of time at all.

Mr. BUSBEY. The RECORD will show that I did not object.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am strongly supporting the gentleman's amendment, and I would like to ask him this question: The amount proposed in the gentleman's amendment is only one-half of the amount authorized by law under the Hill-Burton Act?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is absolutely correct.

There have been certain charges made that certain projects in the country have been built and will be closed. I have gone to the trouble to look into this, and many of the charges made in the report are absolutely untrue. The charge is made that some of these hospitals have not been able to operate. Only 3 out of the one-thousand-one-hundred-odd were not able to operate. One of them was on account of a grant. There was a grant made of about $18,000 on equipment. The Federal Government is in the process of recouping that $18,000. The other two were small projects in the Middle West or the near South, and because of circumstances not under their control, where an elderly doctor died and a new doctor moved out, they expect to have that hospital operating again in a few weeks. When they make the charge that these hospitals are closing, there are only 3, and 2 of those 3 will be opened in the next 2 months. That is the kind of charge we have had against this bill. This is one of the best bills ever presented to this Congress. It was enacted with nonpartisan support; it affects every State in the Union, not only the States but the local communities and other groups as well, as long as they raise the funds necessary to match the Federal grants. If there ever was an important amendment offered, it is this one on this bill today.

There is not a single State in our Nation which has not derived great benefit from this program of hospital and related health facility construction. Each of us in this House has or will at some time or other require the services of a physician, nurse, or other member of a hospital or health department staff. It is enevitable. It is something we cannot and must not just toss off and forget about. I know you all feel just like I do. When I am ill or my loved ones are ill I will demand the best I can find. I have, I do, and I will. You have, you do, and you will.

As the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Labor-Federal Security Agency group I became particularly interested in the hospital survey and construction—Hill-Burton—program. I became aware of the great inadequacy of our Nation's total hospital plant to cope with needs of our people for hospital care. I realized the role of our hospitals in the training of young physicians, nurses, and other health personnel. I learned to appreciate the place of our hospitals in helping your physician and mine keep abreast of the many great advances all of us have seen in the field of medical science. Fellow Representatives, I assure you that without adequate hospital services no physician and his teammates in the medical and related fields can properly carry on his responsibilities which you, I, my constituents and yours each hour of the day require of him.

It was in appreciation of facts such as these that the Hill-Burton program was conceived. Leaders in the health field, with the support of the American Medical Association and under the auspices of the American Hospital Association established a Commission on Hospital Care to study this Nation's hospital resources and needs. As a result of this study, the 79th Congress on August 13, 1946, with bipartisan support enacted Public Law 725, more popularly known as the Hill-Burton Act. Representative PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, introduced the House version of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Senator Harold Burton, of Ohio, introduced the bill in the Senate.

Since the outset of this important and unique venture in Federal, State, and local community relationships, the program has held the interest and support of a majority of Members on both sides of the aisle in the House and the Senate. I am certain it still does today.

The program has provided an orderly survey and appraisal of existing hospital and public health center resources and has required the States to develop comprehensive programs for furnishing hospital services to all population groups. The program furnishes financial assistance, on a matching basis, for the construction of hospitals, public health centers, and related facilities.

Among Federal-assistance programs this one is unique—the degree of State and local responsibility is unusual. The States develop their own programs or State plans. They determine where the hospitals and health center projects ought to be located as well as their size and type. They establish the priority of areas and must select and approve the projects prior to approval at the Federal level. In addition, the States themselves determine the amount of Federal participation which will be available to each project and this may range from one-third to two-thirds. There is an absolute prohibition against Federal interference in the maintenance and operation of any facility assisted. The program is widely accepted throughout the Nation as an effective and orderly approach in helping to meet the needs for hospital and related health services.

The Congress has thus far authorized $542½ million which has been matched by over a billion dollars in State and local funds. This has resulted in more than 2,000 project approvals ultimately providing 100,000 hospital beds and 400 public health centers. Over 1,100 of these projects are now completed, open, and rendering community service. These are, very briefly, the figures on the program status to date.

The program, however, has not been without criticism. Some criticism was developed at the appropriation hearings. In spite of the fact that this program represents perhaps the outstanding cooperative Federal-State-and-local venture an activity of this size must inevitably result in a few mistakes of judgment either at the local, State, or Federal level. For example, the testimony disclosed that there are three small projects in trouble under the program two of which are closed and one of which is partially closed. Certainly the fact that over 1,100 others are successfully

operating would far outweigh the disadvantages. It was also shown at the hearings that there was an isolated instance of a high bed cost in which Federal participation rose to $28,374 per bed. More typical of project costs under this program, however, is a range in cost from $10,500 to $17,000 per bed. Similarly there was some apprehension over and discussion at the time of the hearings concerning what may appear to be low-occupancy figures for the hospitals assisted under the program. The facts are that the hospitals assisted under the program are faring no worse than those hospitals of comparable size built without Federal assistance. In fact many of the Hill-Burton projects are running at higher occupancy rates than non-Hill-Burton projects and are providing a wider range of services and better patient care. We cannot forget that almost universally a new hospital in a community—particularly if the community never before had a hospital—finds its occupancy at a low level during the first few years.

The members will recall that the amendments to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act made by the 81st Congress in 1949 increased the annual authorization for appropriation from $75 million to $150 million. The program, however, has been a casualty of the international situation and our intensified mobilization efforts. We were only able to appropriate $75 million for the current fiscal year. The so-called Truman budget proposed a continuation of the program at the $75 million level for next year. This recommendation was particularly important since it would have assured the States and local communities of program continuity at 50 percent of the authorized level. However, the present proposal for a $50 million appropriation is in my opinion disastrous and must not be accepted by us today.

At the outset let me emphasize that the Nation still has a hospital-bed deficit which is variously estimated at from 733,000 to 850,000 beds. While the present program has been able to add almost 100,000 beds, and certainly a very substantial amount of hospital construction has taken place without Federal aid, the needs for beds continue to increase at an alarming rate. Gratifying progress is being made in meeting general hospital-bed needs, yet progress is particularly slow in meeting our unmet needs to care for those suffering from the mental and chronic diseases. Two-thirds of the national bed deficit is accounted for by the need to provide for patients with mental and long-term illnesses. I am advised that there is a backlog of actual projects reported by the States which can utilize $110 million in Federal funds for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 in addition to $43½ million already promised out by the States in anticipation of funds for 1954 and 1955.

I also am advised that our population growth alone would require 24,000 additional hospital beds each year and that obsolescence and the literal wearing out of the hospital plant in this country, for general hospitals alone, would require an additional 6,000 beds. Thus at least 30,000 additional hospital beds a year are needed just to keep up without any attempt to reduce the deficit of many hundreds of thousands of beds we accumulated in the depression years of 1929 to 1939 when funds were not available and during the World War II years when hospital construction materials were needed in the prosecution of that struggle for preservation of our way of life. At an average cost of $16,000 per bed, $480 million would be needed from all sources; $50 million hardly seems adequate as the Federal contribution to assist our people to acquire hospital services which so many areas of this Nation require as essential.

In other words it would be well and fitting for me to request a restoration for this appropriation in the full amount of $150 million authorized by the law. I know of no program where the Federal dollar could be better spent and where the returns to our people are greater. On the other hand, I am indeed conscious of the present administration's efforts to reduce expenditures at every turn. I am equally cognizant of the fact that even the most worthwhile and the best of our programs must take their fair share of budgetary cutbacks. My plea today however, is for a restoration to the $75 million level. If we are to reduce bed deficits in the country there is a genuine need to operate the program at the full authorized level. It would be an example of "pennywise and pound-foolish" economy to cut this appropriation to $50 million and force the program to a level which would only result in a more rapid and greater bed deficit.

In addition to the compelling need for hospital and health facilities throughout the country there is another factor of which I believe the Congress should take cognizance. I refer to situations where the approval of larger projects in which the Federal share would take up too much of the State's allotment in any 1 year, or where the State desires to split the Federal financial participation among a group of projects for several successive fiscal years, the split-project technique is utilized in the program. Under this technique the Federal share is charged to the Federal allotment for a current fiscal year and one or more successive fiscal years. In other words, the State in approving the project on a split basis indicates to the project sponsor that Federal funds out of a future fiscal year allotment if appropriated will be allocated to them. In many instances this is the only way in which a large project can be undertaken; in other cases it affords the State an opportunity of spreading their allotments out to more than 1 or 2 projects. Admittedly, the procedure does not bind the Federal Government to approve additional projects in subsequent years nor is the Congress obligated to make funds available in subsequent fiscal years by any forward financing technique.

Following the cutback in the program from the $150 million level after the Korean situation, the States were all cautioned against splitting projects in excess of 50 percent of their anticipated annual allotments. Thus, the States have programmed their construction, and many of them their total anticipated allotments for next year on the basis of a $75 million appropriation. In doing so these States have made promises to communities and project sponsors throughout the Nation on the basis of an appropriation of $75 million for next year. I submit that the States and the communities on the basis of previous congressional action had good reason to assume that the Congress would appropriate at least $75 million for next year, which is only half of the authorized amount in the law.

I am advised that if the appropriation for next year is cut to $50 million, 14 States: Arkansas, Florida, George, Kentucky, Indiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, and Virginia will find themselves particularly embarrassed. Seventy-nine projects, the majority of them now under construction in these 14 States, will find that as a result of the cutback they may not get the amounts promised them by the States out of the 1954 appropriation. I can only speculate as to the manner in which these project sponsors can go about raising additional funds or whatever many of these projects may have to remain in an unfinished state until additional Federal funds are forthcoming. In addition to the 14 States that will be thus embarrassed, there are other States which will find themselves embarrassed as a result of developing long-range programs and advising their communities that they would be able to participate in the program next year. They will be unable to carry through on these projects. Many of us have already had inquiries about their future.

While there have been criticisms of the program for what may appear to be isolated instances for failing to exercise sound judgment—and I personally doubt that this has been established—the program is essentially a sound one and, I believe, very well administered. This legislation embodies the concepts of Senators TAFT and HILL. In fact, it would be difficult to devise a better program of balanced Federal and State functions under the close scrutiny of State advisory councils and a Federal Hospital Council representing the fields of hospital operation, labor, agriculture, and the public. Need I remind the Members that 19 million people, or 1 out of every 8, will be hospitalized this year, and that 95 percent of the babies born today are born in hospitals. It is significant that 85 million people are members of voluntary hospital prepayment plans. Our hospitals are, indeed, important to our Nation; the need is great.

It is for all of these reasons, therefore, that I find it compelling to request the House to restore this appropriation item to $75 million.

In addition, I should like to direct the attention of the Members to the item for

salaries and expenses. For the past several years we have been reducing the amount appropriated for these purposes to the point where the program, at the $75 million level, is utilizing $1,200,000 for salaries and expenses. The so-called Truman budget included $1,200,000 for these purposes. Secretary Hobby's budget recommendation, at the $60 million level, was $1,125,000. The present proposal of $750,000 is, I believe, much too drastic a cut. I would think that, at the $75 million level, this program requires a minimum of $1,200,000 in order to adequately protect the Government's expenditure of funds and its investment in hospital and public health center facilities. There is no other program of its kind which has accomplished so much in contributing to our Nation's security through efforts to maintain our health on so small an appropriation for salaries and expenses. Under no circumstances do I believe that the program should be permitted to continue with less than the $1,125,000 recommended by the Secretary for salaries and expenses.

What are the relative values to a community of a sick mother returned quickly in good health to her working husband and children? Who has counted the value of the speedy return of a shop foreman to his work in good health? Of a farmer to our agricultural economy? Of a businessman to his store? Of a minister to his congregation? Of a doctor to his patients? Of a legislator to his duties? Yes, of a school child to his studies? He, someday, will be our successors struggling as we are with the great issues of his day. In short, I believe our Nation's wealth is our Nation's health. We must maintain, conserve, and preserve it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested to hear the gentleman from Rhode Island refer again this time to the particular item in this bill as being a nonpartisan item. I thoroughly agree with that; I think the items in regard to the sick, those that affect our children, our education, the handicapped, the women, the Negroes, and all other groups are nonpartisan in character. But in listening to this debate and listening to this particular item I am beginning to wonder whether or not balancing the budget is a nonpartisan issue; and, indeed, it looks very clear to me that balancing the budget has certainly become a partisan issue. I have yet to see anyone among a certain group on the other side of the aisle get up and try to hold this budget in shape. I have had to listen, on the contrary, to these emotional appeals; and, incidentally, let me say in regard to these emotional appeals, that I, too, have those same emotions, the same feeling for the women and the children and the sick and the handicapped; and I am deeply concerned about it. I think we are all concerned about it, but I submit that the overreaching problem that is facing us at this particular time is inflation as it affects those people because if we continue to operate under an unbalanced budget we are going to reduce the purchasing power of the dollar even more and in effect we are not going to be giving them the funds that we say we are giving them here. Furthermore, if we continue this program of unbalancing the budget—and if you want to make a partisan issue of it I think it should be very clear that that is exactly what you are doing—we will soon have a 40-cent then a 30-cent dollar. I could get up here on this floor and make an emotional argument about many of these programs because I feel deeply about their stated objectives; but every single time you plead for more money you are asking to that extent for an unbalanced budget. And when you make these additions cumulative by advocating and voting for them all you place your vote against a balanced budget on this partisan basis.

If we are ever going to get our government back to the communities and back to private enterprise we are going to have to reduce the tax burden that the Federal Government is imposing on our people. As long as the Federal Government takes the tax money, the State and local governments cannot get the dollars; and, incidentally, the community chest and other private donations cannot help your private hospitals. Your private institutions that are really set up to handle these problems of the handicapped and the sick and the needy cannot get the money. To the extent that we continue to insist on the Federal Government taking care of these problems we take tax money away from the local communities and out of the pockets of the private citizens, bring it down here to Washington, and, incidentally, not returning dollar for dollar. For every time we collect a tax the actual amount returned to any State for these purposes is considerably less.

Somewhere along the line we are going to have to face this. The solution is very clear to me; it has been very clear throughout this entire debate: Every time we have an emotional issue the plea is to put more money in the bill. The net result is going to be just as the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] stated. We are going to have a bigger budget; we are going to spend more money this year than last year. Somewhere we have to look at the other side of the picture, and I am appealing to this Congress to use a little statesmanship and let us try to balance the budget if we can. I could not be more sympathetic with this problem of hospitals, but we have to look at the overall picture; we must be men enough to recognize that we cannot do all these things that we wish we could this particular year; we have to realize that we have a limited amount of money to spend and try to cut the garment according to the cloth.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first I wish to express my high commendation to my very able, distinguished friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], for his splendid, constructive, forward-looking contributions to the discussion of this bill.

Regarding the pending bill, I may say that I have been very much interested since the adoption of the Hill-Burton bill in adequate appropriations for community hospital projects throughout the Nation. I believe that action by Congress in providing sufficient funds to help the States carry out this vital, and in all so many instances, urgently needed work, it is a very high-priority obligation of the Congress.

Adequate medical facilities and reasonable medical costs are certainly among the great social problems now facing us. The various States, local communities, and private organizations have done much to expand both the scope and the quality of medical services in recent years so that today we can truly point with pride to the fact that American medical service, care, and treatment, is the best in the world. That does not mean that it is free of shortcomings or inadequacies. Advancement and progress still remain before us and programs to these ends must be conducted according to the American pattern rather than the pattern of the socialized police state.

This does not mean, however, that the Federal Government should not take a hand in helping the States and the local communities to provide necessary medical and nursing services and the best of care for our people. That was one of the objectives of the Hill-Burton bill and that is why I am supporting this amendment to restore current appropriations to a figure which, while it will still be insufficient, in my opinion, nevertheless will afford some reasonable approach to these problems. One of the best ways that this Congress can encourage socialized medicine and its known evils would be to deny sufficient funds for hospital construction and adequate medical care for millions of American who so desperately need these benefits. Maintaining the national health and the national well-being should be indeed a primary concern of this Congress. If we reject the appeals for sufficient funds to conduct these programs, we will, I think, put ourselves in the unfortunate position of appearing to deprive our citizens of modernized medical attention and treatment which is urgently needed to maintain the national public health and to keep our entire people strong and vigorous at a time when strength, vigor, and physical soundness are so essential to the Nation.

I am very much afraid, in fact I am convinced, that unless this amendment prevails we will suffer a definite setback to the long-range hospital construction program in many parts of the Nation. Speaking of my own State, the proposed cut to $50 million would seriously endanger work in progress on pending hospital-building projects and would also make necessary the postponement of about 14 other projects, applications for which are now under study.

To say the least, and I say it entirely without any reflection upon any members of the committee, all of whom I greatly respect, this is misguided economy. It is bound to create confusion and undue delay to hospital construction throughout the country. Those States like Massachusetts and many others which have complied with all of the requirements of the Federal Government in formulating a carefully prepared program to meet the hospital needs of its people, will be penalized because the Federal Government is not living up to a promise it has already made through the enactment of the Hill-Burton Construction Act.

It is false and misleading economy because the Congress will be called upon at a later date to appropriate the money which is being claimed as a saving here today.

I favor sound, sane, sensible, practical economy as much as anyone, as my votes in the House show, but I think this curtailment of essential health services is extremely shortsighted and certainly ill-advised and this is particularly so in the face of the grandiose, welfare programs upon which we have embarked on a global scale taking care of the peoples of remote lands while so often turning our backs on our own people. By all means let us act upon the needs of our own people and when and if cuts are made, let us make them where they properly belong, and not at the expense of the sick and the afflicted and the handicapped and the poor and the legion of earnest, hard-working men and women of the rank and file throughout the Nation.

There are few things that have ever come before this House upon which I have been called upon to vote which have touched me more deeply than this question, because cuts like this, and some of the others proposed in this bill, strike at the very heart of many meritorious programs which we have set up for the proper care and treatment of those who are unable to care for themselves, yes, and services which we have provided for the weak, the infirm, and the handicapped. I wholeheartedly and most earnestly urge my colleagues in the House to reinstate the $75 million request, an amount which is exactly one-half that originally authorized by the Congress in amendments to the Hill-Burton Act. Seventy-five million dollars is to my mind inadequate. The purpose is so wholesome, and desirable, and beneficial, that I believe it should be more, and I would so vote, but it certainly cannot be less and still permit much more than token support for this splendid program. In the interest of economy, we have already cut $75 million yearly from the hospital construction program. Let us not emasculate still further this vital program, which is doing so much to enable so many American communities to take care of chronic illness cases and all the urgent hospital, medical, and nursing needs of our people, by another cut of $25 million.

To illustrate how deficient the $50 million appropriation is, let me point out that according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the total number of approvable Hill-Burton applications now pending in the States is 338, representing a total estimated cost of about $302 million, of which the Federal share is estimated to be about $105 million or—and mind you this—just about twice as much as the current proposed appropriation. In addition, let us keep in mind that State health agencies have already made tentative commitments of Federal funds on projects already approved amounting to approximately $43 million over the next 2 years.

Let me also stress this point—that one of the most important domestic problems facing the American people today is that of sufficient and adequate hospital and medical care. We have made great progress to be sure but there is still unquestionably great need throughout the Nation for additional hospital facilities and less costly hospital, medical, and nursing care. The solution to these problems must be found, I repeat, in the American way, and not in the way of the police state.

In my opinion, to strike at such vital needs of our people at this time would be to work a great disservice upon our current health programs in practically every State in the Union and I hope that the Congress will not give further support to the claims of the advocates of socialized medicine by whittling down reasonable appropriations for health and hospital programs like the ones presented by this bill.

I will vote for this amendment and I hope that the House will pass it. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a letter from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and also a tabular study of hospital construction in Massachusetts:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1953.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: This is in reply to the request from Mr. Gaucher of your office for information relative to the Hill-Burton program.

At the present time the State agencies have 388 approvable applications pending in their files for Hill-Burton aid. These applications represent a total estimated cost of $302,026,000 and would require approximately $105,074,000 of Federal aid. In addition, State agencies have made tentative commitments of Federal funds on projects already approved amounting to approximately $43,500,000 over the next 2 years. The States of North Dakota, New Jersey, New Mexico, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming, and the Virgin Islands did not submit a report on projects pending.

We are attaching a narrative report showing the program to date in Massachusetts, and the name and location of projects requesting aid under the program in that State during the next 2 years.

I hope this material will provide the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

V. M. HOGE,
Assistant Surgeon General, Acting Chief, Bureau of Medical Services.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION IN MASSACHUSETTS

MAY 18, 1953.

Program to date:

The Public Health Service has approved 54 projects for Massachusetts, as follows: 47 general hospital projects, 1 tuberculosis unit, 3 chronic units, 2 public health centers and 1 State laboratory.

Of the 2,483 hospital beds which will be added in these facilities, 1,730 are general, 36 for tuberculosis patients, and 717 for chronic patients.

The total cost of the projects is $62,156,200, of which $12,571,000 is the Federal share.

Pending applications: Fourteen projects are currently pending which, when approved by the State agency and the United States Public Health Service, could add an additional 890 general beds for a total estimated cost of $17,463,000 of which the estimated Federal share would be $2,926,000.

A description of facilities completed or currently under construction and a list of pending projects are attached.

PROGRESS IN HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION IN MASSACHUSETTS

A summary of all the projects approved under Public Law 725 is as follows:

1. Glover Memorial Hospital, Needham. An addition of 68 beds and 16 bassinets has been completed. The existing facilities have been altered for administrative offices.

2. Athol Memorial Hospital. This facility became the first general hospital in the Athol area. A quota of 46 beds and 16 bassinets was constructed. Hospital opened in 1950.

3. Clinton Hospital. An addition of 39 beds has been completed and several old buildings demolished. Bed capacity on completion, 98. New facility opened in 1950.

4. Lawrence Memorial, Medford. An addition of 41 beds and 5 bassinets is being built, 107 beds and 34 bassinets on completion.

5. Emerson Hospital, Concord. Building an addition of 23 beds and 4 bassinets. Capacity on completion 60 beds and 18 bassinets. Construction has been completed.

6. (a) Children's Hospital, Boston. Completed an addition of 66 beds for chronic disease. (b) Service tower for connecting bridge to laboratories.

7. Milton Hospital. Constitutes a new facility in a new location and provides 56 beds and 12 bassinets. Present building to be used as a convalescent home.

8. Cape Cod Hospital, Hyannis. Added 30 beds for chronic disease. Construction completed in 1950.

9. Wing Memorial, Palmer. This is a new facility in a new location to provide 42 beds and 12 bassinets.

10. Public Health Center, Quincy. A new building, combined offices, clinics, and laboratories in one building. Construction completed, 1951.

11. Brockton Hospital. An addition of 46 beds and 15 bassinets has been completed.

12. Mariboro Hospital. There are 36 beds and 11 bassinets being added to increase the capacity of the hospital to 97 beds and 26 bassinets.

13. Bon Secours Hospital, Methuen. An equipment project has been completed at this new facility of 116 beds and 32 bassinets. New facility opened in 1950. Participations under Public Law 725 for equipment only.

14. St. Luke's Hospital, New Bedford. An addition of 68 beds and 8 bassinets to increase capacity to 341 beds and 55 bassinets.

15. Community Memorial Hospital, Ayer. Completed an addition of 16 beds and 10 bassinets to increase capacity of hospital to 39 beds and 10 bassinets.

16. Mary Lane, Ware. Project completed, 21 beds and 20 bassinets added to increase capacity to 55 beds and 20 bassinets.

17. Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Boston. Completed an addition of 22 beds,

operating rooms, and other related facilities for teaching purposes.

18. Beth Israel Hospital, Boston. Completed an addition for 165 beds and 91 bassinets to increase capacity to 363 beds and 91 bassinets. A Federal grant was made toward the purchase of equipment for the new facility.

19. Winchester Hospital. Now in the process of constructing an addition of 35 beds and 36 bassinets.

20. Boston Lying-In Hospital. Completed an addition to the out-patient department to provide additional facilities for teaching purposes.

21. Franklin County Public Hospital, Greenfield. Constructing an addition to provide 48 beds and 8 bassinets. Bed capacity on completion will be 150 beds and 41 bassinets.

22. (a) Peter Bent Brigham, Boston. Completed an addition to provide 39 beds for teaching purposes. (b) Out-patient facilities two projects.

23. New England Deaconess, Boston. Now in the process of constructing a wing to provide 76 beds for chronic disease.

24. Symmes Arlington Hospital, Arlington. Construction to increase facilities of the out-patient department and other related services. Construction completed in 1951.

25. St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Boston. Completed an addition of 153 beds to increase capacity of hospital to 400 beds. Federal grant is made toward the purchase of equipment.

26. Choate Memorial Hospital, Woburn. Constructing a wing to provide 44 beds and 6 bassinets. Construction completed in 1951. The hospital now has 88 beds and 18 bassinets.

27. Hyams Laboratory, Boston, laboratory facilities.

28. Jewish Memorial Hospital, Roxbury. Constructing a wing to provide 50 beds for chronic disease.

29. Barnstable County Sanitarium, Pocasset. Now in process of constructing an addition to provide 34 beds for chronic disease.

30. New England Sanitarium, Stoneham. Constructing a wing to provide 132 beds for chronic disease.

31. Holyoke Hospital. Construction started in July 1951, on a wing to provide 102 beds and 8 bassinets. On completion the hospital will have 183 beds and 44 bassinets.

32. St. Joseph's, Lowell. To construct an addition for 59 beds, administrative offices, kitchen, operating rooms, and other related facilities. Construction started in October 1951.

33. Lowell General Hospital, Lowell. To construct a new pediatric and maternity building to house 74 patients, a new delivery suite, central sterile supply, powerplant, and laundry alterations.

34. Leonard Morse Hospital, Natick. Now constructing a wing to provide 36 beds and 15 bassinets. On completion the hospital will have 128 beds and 32 bassinets.

35. Anna Jacques Hospital, Newburyport. Now planning to construct a wing to provide 20 beds and 18 bassinets. On completion the bed capacity will be 73 beds and 28 bassinets.

36. Winthrop Community Hospital. Completed alterations to nursery to meet requirement of the State Department of Public Health and the addition of a milk formula and suspect nursery in adjacent wing.

37. Union Hospital, Lynn. In process of constructing a new general hospital to replace existing facility. The hospital will contain 75 beds and 20 bassinets.

38. Framingham Union, Framingham. To construct an addition to provide 174 beds, kitchen, laboratories, administrative offices, and other related facilities. Alterations to present building to accommodate 49 patients. Operating rooms, and delivery rooms.

39. Holden District Hospital, Holden. To construct a new wing to provide 41 beds, and nursery wing for 11 bassinets. Alterations to existing building will provide 10 beds for pediatric. On completion the hospital will have 60 beds and 11 bassinets. Construction started in December 1951.

40. Carney Hospital, Boston. In process of constructing a new general hospital to replace existing facility. The hospital on completion will have 315 beds and no bassinets. Federal grant is made toward the purchase of equipment.

41. Brookline Health Center, Brookline. A new building to combine offices, clinics, and laboratories in one building.

42. Municipal Hospital, Springfield. In process of constructing a new chronic disease hospital to replace an existing facility. The hospital on completion will provide 237 beds for intensive medical care and 200 beds for ambulant patients.

43. Wasson Maternity Hospital, Springfield. In process of constructing a new maternity hospital to replace existing facility. The hospital on completion will provide 81 beds and 104 bassinets.

44. Malden Hospital, Malden. To construct a wing to existing general hospital to provide 56 beds for chronic disease patients.

45. (a) Norwood Hospital, Norwood. In process of constructing an addition to existing facility. The new addition will provide 50 beds and the hospital will have 143 beds on completion. (b) Operating suite and other facilities.

46. Holyoke Municipal Hospital, Holyoke. To construct a new chronic hospital to replace existing facility. The new building will provide 100 beds for intensive medical care and 50 beds for ambulatory cases.

47. Boston City Hospital, Boston. To construct an addition to existing Pediatric Building to provide a modern premature baby section with related facilities. This will total 30 bassinets.

48. Groton Community Hospital, Groton. A new general hospital to replace existing facility. The new building will provide 41 beds and 8 bassinets on completion.

49. Henry Heywood Hospital, Gardner. Alterations and additions to improve autopsy, X-ray department, laboratory, fracture room, patients toilets, administration offices, obstetric patient nursing unit, delivery equipment, surgical department, and elevator. Project mainly to improve services but will add 4 beds in process.

50. Marthas Vineyard Hospital, Oak Bluffs, Adds 11 beds.

51. New England Center, Boston. Pathology laboratory.

52. South Shore Hospital, South Weymouth. Adds 40 general beds.

53. St. Vincents, Worcester. Equipment only.

Pending applications in Massachusetts

Location	Name of facility	Beds added	Estimated total cost	Estimated Federal share
North Adams	North Adams	123	$1,826,000	$225,000
Holyoke	Providence	74	2,234,000	225,000
Amherst	Public-health center		1,281,000	200,000
Worcester	Hahnemann	50	1,347,000	142,000
Fitchburg	Burbank	120	2,200,000	250,000
Taunton	Morton	75	1,500,000	250,000
Fall River	Union	50	700,000	250,000
Fall River	St. Anne's	50	1,250,000	250,000
Boston	Memorial Teachers Clinic		1,000,000	250,000
Brockton	Goddard	50	750,000	250,000
Northampton	Cooley-Dickinson	100	1,500,000	250,000
Ipswich	Benjamin Cable	19	375,000	150,000
Webster	Webster district	40	750,000	150,000
Danvers	Danvers	40	750,000	84,000
Total, 14 projects			17,463,000	2,926,000

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when the former distinguished chairman of this committee was speaking, I think he inadvertently said that, under the school-maintenance-and-operation program, the Office of Education had to wait until the end of June to see what applications for funds would amount to. The actual cutoff date for applications is March 31.

My very good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], who has just finished speaking in the well of the House, said, "Let us make cuts where they belong." I think that is a very good slogan. In my opinion, it would not be necessary to quibble about a few million dollars for such worthy domestic programs as are contained in this bill, if we had not sent to the four corners of the globe, for what I have many times called Operation Rathole, approximately $130 billion—an amount which is almost one-half of our entire national debt. You could have everything the budget requested, and a great deal more, as far as my vote is concerned. But, we do have an obligation, we do have a responsibility that should not be forgotten because of the emotional appeal of the programs provided for in this bill. We have an obligation to keep this Government solvent so that we will not go down; because when we go down, the entire world will go down.

Now let us look at this situation for just a minute. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island is adopted, it means $15 million above the Eisenhower budget. I think my good friend, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], referred to the technique that is being used before the House today. This is a good example.

As far as the American Hospital Association is concerned, it is not infallible. And, I must disagree with the statement of the gentleman from Rhode Island that there is 100-percent approval of this program. The other day, I received the following telegram from a member of the Illinois Hospital Association and the American Hospital Association:

We hope you can completely eliminate the Hill-Burton hospital-construction program.

We do not need it. This bill is being supported by a minority group who have little conception of our hospital needs. Their interests are solely selfish.

That telegram was from a well-known doctor in Chicago.

Here is a member of the Illinois Hospital Association and also the American Hospital Association, who leaves no doubt as to his stand against this program. That is certainly not 100 percent, as far as I can see.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Is the telegram the gentleman has just read sent by a recognized official of either one of these two institutions or is it signed by an individual who belongs to the associations?

Mr. BUSBEY. He says he is a member of the Illinois Hospital Association and American Hospital Association.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Does he affix any other name to it?

Mr. BUSBEY. No, not as an official of either organization. He included his name. He is a very prominent doctor in Chicago.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that there are now many empty beds in the hospitals that have been constructed with these funds?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes. I will insert in the RECORD tables for certain States showing the occupancy of hospitals that have been built under the Hill-Burton program. You will be amazed at the low occupancy as compared to the average occupancy, or the norm, that should be maintained in order to operate a hospital efficiently.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that some of these hospitals are not even half occupied?

Mr. BUSBEY. The record will show that the average occupancy of many is not over 30 percent of capacity; and of some, it is even less than that.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. BUSBEY. This is the official record from the Public Health Service, that administers the program. They are not my figures, but the figures compiled by the people who are administering the program.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I include tables from eight States, furnished by the United States Public Health Service:

ALABAMA

Location	Name	Category	Type construction	Beds added	Beds upon completion	Date opened	Percent occupied	Source of information [1]	Architect fees	Total cost	Federal share
Ashland	Clay Co.	General	New	20	20	September 1951	52	S. P.	$13,149	$270,102	$175,034
Athens	Athens Limestone Co.	do	do	50	50	May 1951	28	R. O.	35,000	672,134	439,241
Birmingham [2]	Carraway Methodist	do	Addition		240	April 1950	64	S. P.	30,028	554,443	184,815
Do	365 Crippled Child. Cl.	do	New	100	100	July 1951	76	S. P.	86,659	1,876,969	566,018
Do	St. Vincents	do	Addition	90	213	November 1950	67	S. P.	73,298	1,559,473	483,206
Decatur	Dist. 1 TB San	TB	New	161	161	December 1951	97	S. P.	55,651	1,144,693	754,984
Fort Payne	De Kalb Co. Gen.	General	do	55	55	April 1952	31	S. P.	33,562	606,235	400,554
Hamilton	Lister Hill	do	do	37	37	December 1951	19	R. O.	24,175	451,645	286,363
Langdale	Geo. H. Lanier Mem.	do	do	87	87	August 1950	73	R. O.	106,000	2,106,398	719,009
Marion	Perry Co.	do	do	20	20	January 1951	49	R. O.	10,195	225,386	73,438
Mobile	Martin De Porres	do	do	35	35	May 1950	84	R. O.	29,652	611,425	195,475
Do	Mobile Infirmary	do	do	200	300	January 1952		N. I.	216,416	4,368,580	2,781,509
Do	Providence	do	do	200	200	August 1952		N. I.	167,274	3,551,404	2,000,000
Do	Psy. Rec. & Diag. Unit	Mental	Addition	20	320	May 1951		N. I.	8,710	138,001	45,000
Montgomery	St. Jude	General	New	152	152	June 1951	45	R. O.	67,131	1,345,067	438,663
Opelika	Lee Co. Hosp. & HC	General and public health clinic.	do	80	80	February 1952		N. I.	48,252	1,040,211	653,349
Opp	Mizell Mem.	General	do	29	29	December 1949	55	R. O.	21,707	470,908	153,668
Ozark	Dale Co.	do	do	50	50	August 1951	24	R. O.	37,529	572,672	381,029
Tuscaloosa	Bryce	Mental	Addition	125	2,058	July 1950		N. I.	12,000	346,408	230,137
Tuskegee	Macon Co.	General	do	(3)	30	do		N. I.		160,670	23,780
Union Springs	Bullock Co.	do	do	28	28	July 1951	78	R. O.	16,967	320,804	206,143
Vernon	Lamar Co.	do	do	30	30	November 1952		N. I.	22,800	455,702	298,802

CALIFORNIA

Alturas	Modoc Gen.	General	New	39	39	April 1951	49	S. P.	$55,313	$841,000	$275,000
Banning	San Gorgonia Pass Mem.	do	do	37	37	March 1951	30	S. P.	34,367	591,501	183,300
Bishop	Northern Inyo	do	do	30	30	November 1949	48	S. A.	21,266	473,230	155,327
Brawley	Pioneers Mem.	do	do	100	100	October 1950	80	S. A.	101,278	1,566,019	491,588
Corcoran	Corcoran Municipal	do	do	(3)	(3)	January 1949	44	S. A.		48,004	16,001
Dinuba	Alta	General and public health clinic.	do	50	50	February 1951	50	S. A.	50,677	812,516	266,805
Escondido	Palomar Mem.	General	do	37	37	February 1950	83	S. A.	24,900	466,328	155,442
Gridley	Biggs Gridley Mem.	do	do	(3)	(3)	June 1949	83	S. A.		370,385	16,248
Hemet	Hemet Valley	do	Addition and remodeling.	10	35	April 1949	70	S. A.	16,409	265,543	88,514
Inglewood	Gentinela Valley Comm.	do	Addition and replacement.	39	98	September 1952		N. I.	12,082	200,546	63,938
Loyalton	Sierra Valley	do	New	10	10	July 1951	40	S. A.	11,227	180,415	59,722
Mariposa	John C. Fremont	do	do	20	20	October 1951	75	S. A.		418,717	126,433
Merced	County	do	Addition	88	88	February 1952	77	S. P.	63,860	1,131,782	371,060
Modesto	Mem. Stanislaus Co.	do	New	92	92	September 1951	64	S. A.	80,057	1,211,575	400,000
Do	Stanislaus Co. Cent. Unit	do	Addition	17	177				82,406	1,465,575	323,772
Needles	Municipal	do	Addition and remodeling.	10	20	September 1952		N. I.		277,910	89,672
Paso Robles [4]	Paso Robles War Mem.	do	New	24	24	December 1949	39	S. A.	37,957	598,051	199,350
Patterson	Patterson Hosp. Dist.	do	do	25	25	August 1950	40	S. A.	28,000	445,254	145,160
Roseville [5]	Roseville Municipal	do	do	(3)	26	November 1952		N. I.		277,950	17,000
San Andreas	Mark Twain	do	do	30	30	October 1951	57	S. A.	58,391	627,507	208,169
San Rafael	Marin District	do	do	108	108	May 1952		N. I.	107,470	1,825,702	576,920
Tracy	Tracy Community Mem.	do	do	42	42	December 1948	50	S. A.	11,327	227,979	75,983
Truckee	Tahoe Forest District	do	do	21	21	April 1952		N. I.	24,917	403,238	127,747
Tulare	Tulare District	do	do	73	73	February 1951	43	S. A.	80,746	1,299,500	416,500
Ventura	Foster Mem.	do	Addition and remodeling.	30	80	March 1951	62	S. P.	27,745	415,895	138,602
Weaverville	Trinity Co.	do	New	20	20	July 1950	84	S. A.	18,198	352,215	117,405
Willows	Glenn Co.	do	do	42	42	November 1950	53	S. A.	20,014	633,824	211,275

See footnotes at end of table.

GEORGIA

Location	Name	Category	Type construction	Beds added	Beds upon completion	Date opened	Percent occupied	Source of information [1]	Architect fees	Total cost	Federal share
Adel [4]	The Memorial	General	New	25	25	August 1950	60	R. O.	$8,888	$193,800	$116,280
Arlington	Arlington City	do	do	16	16	April 1951	8	R. O.	9,436	158,000	95,340
Athens	Athens Gen	do	Addition	22	106	do	69	S. P.	29,168	522,000	184,300
Atlanta	Grady Mem. Negro	do	do	116	116	July 1952		N. I. [2]	91,632	1,735,984	1,085,590
Baxley	Baxley Appling Co	do	New	27	27	June 1951	52	R. O.	13,547	257,196	154,318
Camilla	Mitchell Co	do	do	32	32	September 1949	54	R. O.	12,310	268,139	89,380
Carrollton	Tanner Mem	do	do	40	40	November 1949	46	R. O.	24,422	528,000	176,000
Cedartown	Polk Gen	do	Addition and remodeling	10	49	July 1951	85	S. P.	3,604	69,500	41,700
Chatsworth	Murray Co. Mem	do	New	(3)	19	January 1950	47	S. P.		41,000	13,667
Clayton	Rabun Co	do	do	20	20	November 1951	29	S. P.	18,924	237,000	130,350
Columbus	St. Francis	do	do	154	154	April 1950	51	R. O.	97,823	1,909,807	636,602
Dawson	Terrell Co	do	do	27	27	April 1951	23	R. O.	12,008	255,868	153,520
Demorest	Habersham Co	do	do	44	44	July 1952		N. I. [2]	33,511	555,200	302,625
Dublin	Laurens Co	do	do	60	60	September 1952		N. I. [2]	44,400	886,068	487,337
Elberton	Elbert Co	do	do	50	50	September 1950	100	R. O.	42,500	780,276	260,092
Franklin [5]	Heard Co. Mem	do	do		18	May 1949	57	S. P.		17,217	5,739
Gainesville	Hall Co. Mem	do	do	112	112	September 1951	27	R. O.	86,935	1,666,228	536,102
Greensboro	Minnie G. Boswell Mem	do	do	28	28	August 1949	51	R. O.	23,311	401,250	133,750
Griffin	Griffin-Spalding Co	do	do	101	101	January 1951	70	S. P.	75,381	1,321,491	440,497
Hiawassee [4]	Lee M. Happ, Jr. Mem	do	do	12	12	February 1952		N. I. [2]	11,321	179,604	98,782
Lagrange	City-County	do	Addition	74	140	September 1949	65	S. P.	25,383	504,000	168,000
Macon	Macon City	do	do	24	324	August 1948	98	S. P.	3,274	57,834	19,278
Marietta [4]	Kennestone	do	New	103	103	June 1950	41	R. O.	48,290	1,208,564	402,855
McRae	Telfair Co	do	do	30	30	March 1952		N. I. [2]	17,375	360,000	198,000
Monticello	Jasper Co	do	do	25	25	January 1952		N. I. [2]	12,500	260,000	143,000
Richland	Stewart-Webster	do	do	24	24	March 1949	50	R. O.	14,525	255,536	85,179
Rome	Battey State	Tuberculosis	Remodeling	(7)		March 1952	82	S. P.	9,604	153,413	84,377
Royston	Cobb Mem	General	New	20	20	January 1950	54	R. O.	13,575	213,460	71,153
Summerville	Chattooga Co	do	do	31	31	January 1952		N. I. [2]	16,658	345,000	189,750
Swainsboro	Emanuel Co	do	do	50	50	June 1952		N. I. [2]	29,235	591,700	355,074
Sylvania	Screven Co. Gen	do	do	34	34	September 1951	34	R. O.		332,000	199,200
Sylvester	Worth Co	do	do	29	29	February 1950	56	R. O.	14,594	263,114	97,705
Thomaston	Upson Co	do	do	100	100	April 1951	33	R. O.	64,138	1,122,000	374,000
Thomson	McDuffie Co	do	do	29	29	January 1952		N. I. [2]	15,747	325,500	195,300
Toccoa	Stephens Co	do	Addition and remodeling	5	44	July 1952		N. I. [2]	22,683	424,000	254,400
Waynesboro	Waynesboro Burke Co	do	New	33	33	May 1951	30	R. O.	20,421	416,070	249,642
Windber	Barrow Co	do	do	40	40	December 1951		N. I. [2]	31,487	550,000	302,500

ILLINOIS

Aledo	Mercer Co	General	New	50	50	December 1950	51	S. A.	$50,707	$801,233	$267,078
Anna	Anna City	do	do	50	50	March 1951	58	S. A.	60,083	1,161,976	387,325
Cairo	St. Marys Nurses Home	do	Addition		95	October 1949	72	S. P.	11,824	402,754	134,251
Carlinville	Carlinville Gen	do	New	53	53	July 1952	46	S. A.	46,850	912,000	353,856
Carthage	Hancock Co	do	do	50	50	October 1950	61	S. A.	42,767	741,475	245,159
Chicago	Provident Hosp. Trg. Sch	do	Addition and remodeling	30	210	August 1951	63	S. P.	42,964	527,000	204,476
Do	Illinois Masonic	do	Addition	70	470	June 1951	61	S. P.	22,165	1,008,302	160,428
Evanston	Community	do	Replacement	50	50	October 1952		N. I. [2]	40,678	940,000	264,720
Fairfield	Fairfield Mem	do	New	100	100	July 1950	82	S. A.	89,799	1,242,983	414,328
Flora	Clay Co	do	New	50	50	March 1950	42	S. A.	44,392	966,295	302,099
Gibson	Gibson Comm	do	do	40	40	October 1952		N. I. [2]	38,250	800,000	310,400
Lawrenceville	Lawrence Co	General and public health clinic	do	50	50	July 1950	49	S. A.	46,680	971,100	323,700
Mount Carmel	Wabash Co	General	do	52	52	June 1951	60	S. A.	45,175	904,963	301,654
Mount Vernon	Good Samaritan	do	do	100	100	May 1952	62	S. A.	114,446	2,199,000	733,000
Do	State TB San	TB	do	100	100	May 1951	43	S. P.	57,237	2,117,267	446,693
Peoria [4]	St. Francis Forest Pk	General	Addition		591	August 1950	84	S. P.	2,619	1,166,524	71,401
Red Bud [4]	St. Clements	do	do	64	64	October 1949	79	S. A.	36,226	1,096,339	238,576

MINNESOTA

Anoka	Anoka State	Mental	Addition	60	832	March 1952	123	S. P.	$64,830	$1,233,312	$553,190
Appleton	Appleton Mun	General	Replacement	20	20	July 1952		N. I. [2]	20,706	429,606	185,403
Bagley	Clearwater Co. Mem	do	New	30	30	August 1950	87	S. A.	16,062	331,160	110,387
Baudette	Baudette Mun	do	do	24	24	March 1950	72	S. A.	16,436	333,279	110,225
Benson	Swift Co.—Benson	do	do	(8)	40	June 1950	89	S. A.	2,300	371,611	37,973
Blue Earth	Community Mem	do	do	32	32	September 1950	48	S. A.	25,663	454,665	151,565
Breckenridge	St. Francis and NH	do	do	123	123	September 1952		N. I. [2]	105,791	2,162,143	971,254
Buffalo	Buffalo Mem	do	do	28	28	September 1951	63	S. A.	17,393	358,696	160,513
Crookston [5]	St. Francis	do	do		140	June 1950	60	S. A.		1,865,793	79,282
Duluth [5]	St. Lukes Hosp	do	Addition and remodeling		355	December 1951	103	S. P.		2,435,000	15,750
Duluth	St. Lukes Infirmary	Chronic	New	150	473	November 1951	96	S. A.	63,362	1,161,961	387,320
Greenbush [4]	Greenbush Community	General	do	20	20	February 1950	65	S. A.	11,798	250,585	74,948
Litchfield	Meeker Co	do	do	62	62	June 1952	50	S. A.	45,500	870,200	301,630
Minneapolis	Variety Club Heart	Chronic	do	78	78	March 1951		N. I. [2]	49,780	1,400,507	381,672
Morris	Stevens Co. Mem	General	do	40	40	February 1951	50	S. A.	26,528	544,650	245,092
New Prague	Community Mem	do	do	32	32	February 1952	56	S. A.	28,011	420,472	193,282
Olivia	The Renville Co	do	do	41	41	February 1951	61	S. A.	19,327	399,920	133,306
Ortonville	Ortonville Mun	do	do	30	30	April 1952		N. I. [2]	18,823	377,335	169,801
Pelican Rapids	Pelican Valley HC	do	do	23	23	August 1951	52	S. A.	12,698	263,730	118,679
Red Lake Falls	St. Johns	do	do	20	20	October 1951	56	S. A.	19,170	416,023	186,337
Redwood Falls	Redwood Falls	do	Replacement	40	40	November 1952		N. I. [2]	26,918	537,446	241,851
Sauk Centre	St. Michaels	do	New	50	50	September 1950	73	S. A.	35,705	760,971	253,657
Slayton	Murray Co. Mem	do	do	40	40	February 1951	38	S. P.	22,729	469,347	150,745
Wells	Village of Wells Hosp	do	do	32	32	October 1950	35	S. A.	15,540	331,751	110,583
Wheaton	Wheaton Community	do	do	22	22	December 1950	44	S. A.	11,406	251,008	83,429
Worthington	Worthington Mun	do	do	80	76	May 1951	80	S. A.	34,943	682,922	227,141
Do	do	do	Addition	37	76	do		S. A.	17,102	314,004	140,972

See footnotes at end of table.

MISSISSIPPI

Location	Name	Category	Type construction	Beds added	Beds upon completion	Date opened	Percent occupied	Source of information [1]	Architect fees	Total cost	Federal share
Ripley	Tippah Co. Hosp	General	New	40	40	April 1950	62	S. A.[2]	$15,902	$448,307	$145,229
Ashland	Ashland Clinic	General Public Health clinic.	do	6	6	September 1951		N. I.[2]	3,711	122,456	80,874
Belzoni	Humphreys Co. Mem	General	do	40	40	January 1951	48	S. A.[2]	15,250	335,000	108,250
Booneville	NE Mississippi	do	do	50	50	December 1949	99	S. A.[2]	19,314	600,973	195,638
Canton	Kings Daughters	do	Remodeling	29	69	May 1952	45	S. A.	22,186	422,465	281,510
Carthage	Leake Co. Mem	do	New	50	50	September 1951	25	S. A.	24,784	528,520	166,640
Centreville	Field Mem	do	do	50	50	March 1952	61	S. A.	14,807	507,201	331,334
Clarksdale	Coahoma Co. Hosp	do	do	100	100	November 1952		N. I.[2]	61,920	1,301,094	809,870
Collins	Covington Co	do	do	25	25	July 1951	47	S. A.	7,560	220,882	144,398
Columbia	Marion Co. Gen Hosp	do	do	80	80	October 1950	45	S. A.[2]	28,097	847,974	280,751
DeKalb	Kemper Co. Hosp	do	do	25	25	September 1950	41	S. A.	7,101	228,611	74,695
Durant	Dist. 2 Comm	do	do	25	25	December 1950	49	S. A.[2]	6,687	253,924	82,878
Ellisville	Ellisville Mun. Clinic	General and Public Health Clinic.	do	8	8	August 1950	53	S. A.	2,788	81,884	26,747
Forest	SE Lackey Mem	General	do	47	47	September 1951	30	S. A.[2]	19,148	414,890	132,896
Gloster	Gloster Clinic	General and Public Health Clinic.	do	4	4			N. I.[2]	1,287	50,029	14,843
Greenwood	Greenwood Leflore	General	Replacement	135	135	April 1952	72	S. A.	88,349	1,771,340	1,157,560
Hattiesburg	Forrest Co	do	New	100	100	July 1952	50	S. A.[2]	49,306	1,303,781	859,954
Hazelhurst	Hardy Wilson Mem	do	do	50	50	September 1950	53	S. A.[2]	34,380	692,941	227,585
Laurel	Jones Co	do	do	105	105	February 1952	39	S. A.[2]	43,014	1,188,725	775,817
Leakesville	Greene Co	do	do	25	25	October 1950	13	S. A.	12,425	235,619	77,990
Lexington	Holmes Co. Comm	do	Additional	16	41	February 1952	37	S. A.	11,340	216,487	144,228
Lucedale	George Co	do	New	30	30	September 1950	38	S. A.	8,386	272,217	88,105
Macon	Noxubee Co. Comm	do	do	40	40	March 1952	43	S. A.	29,994	622,943	406,962
Meadville	Franklin Co. Mem. Hosp	do	do	30	30	February 1951	40	S. A.	7,553	269,537	87,790
Meridian	East Miss. Mental	Mental	do	260	260	March 1952	92	S. A.	88,141	1,588,152	1,058,768
Okolona	Okolona	General	do	25	25	November 1952	11	S. A.	6,349	246,540	161,927
Port Gibson	Claiborne Co	do	do	25	25	January 1952	31	S. A.[2]	11,600	245,000	160,500
Prentiss	Jefferson Davis Co	do	do	26	26	November 1950	93	S. A.[2]	7,800	223,730	72,843
Rolling Fork	Sharkey Issaquena Comm	do	do	22	22	February 1951	29	S. A.	8,505	192,111	62,130
Ruleville	No. Sunflower Co	do	do	31	31	October 1950	92	S. A.[2]	15,908	417,287	137,929
Sanatorium	TB Infirm. for Negroes	TB	Addition and remodeling.	154	619	April 1952	65	S. A.	53,532	1,753,115	584,372
Starkville	Felix Long Mem	General	New	40	40	December 1950	63	S. A.[2]	13,498	415,106	128,463
Tunica	Tunica Co	do	do	25	25	November 1950	47	S. A.[2]	6,918	228,027	73,406
Tupelo	No. Miss. Comm	do	Addition and remodeling.	48	94	January 1951	80	S. A.	1,500	297,674	197,522
Waynesboro	Wayne Co	do	New	25	25	April 1951	40	S. A.	9,694	213,618	139,506
Wiggins	Stone Co	do	do	20	20	July 1951	27	S. A.[2]	5,081	174,623	112,615

SOUTH CAROLINA

Aiken	Aiken Co	General	Additional	60	113	October 1950	60	S. P.	$15,263	$482,676	$150,628
Bamberg	Bamberg Co. Mem	do	New	32	32	September 1952		N. I.[2]	13,680	514,168	334,170
Bishopville	Lee Co. Gen	do	do	43	43	February 1952		N. I.[2]	16,274	537,424	295,583
Chester	Chester Co	do	do	74	74	July 1952		N. I.[2]	35,924	941,368	468,827
Columbia [4]	Good Samaritan Waverly	do	do	42	42	September 1952		N. I.[2]	5,815	229,649	134,302
Do	S. C. State Hosp	Mental	Remodeling	(10)					5,270	60,840	20,280
Do	do	do	Additional	(10)					3,381	72,023	24,008
Do	do	do	New	(10)	1,673	June 1952		N. I.[2]	7,634	215,870	71,975
Do	do	do	Additional	(10)					5,005	132,457	79,475
Columbia	S. C. State	do	do	50	1,709	June 1952		N. I.[2]	6,149	174,299	104,580
Fairfax	Allendale Co	General	New	(11)	27	April 1950	44	S. P.		58,984	32,441
Florence	Flor Darlington TB San	TB	do	118	118	August 1952		N. I.[2]	27,040	854,508	448,617
Georgetown	Georgetown Co. Mem	General	do	52	52	March 1950	77	R. O.	25,532	529,954	173,864
Do	Georgetown Co. Mem	do	Additional	(12)	50				2,054	60,472	33,259
Greenville	Greenville Gen	do	do	(10)	547	August 1950	87	S. P.	11,364	342,698	171,350
Greer	Allen Bennett Mem	do	New	28	28	May 1952		N. I.[2]	15,604	501,860	175,000
Hampton	Hampton Co	do	do	25	25	November 1950	63	R. O.	9,122	292,124	91,541
Loris	Loris Comm	do	do	25	25	April 1950	63	R. O.	3,000	165,496	55,165
Manning	Clarendon County	do	do	52	52	April 1951	54	R. O.	18,586	582,129	191,773
Newberry	Newberry Co	do	Addition and remodeling.	38	64	February 1951	45	S. P.	8,009	360,032	120,010
Rock Hill	York Co	do	Addition	62	141	December 1949	12	S. P.	26,435	541,103	180,368
Seneca	Oconee Mem	do	do	40	75	March 1950	64	S. P.	5,038	151,078	50,359
Spartanburg	Spartanburg	do	Addition and remodeling.	64	370	March 1951	83	S. P.	44,589	1,374,650	458,217
Do	Spartanburg Gen	do	do	(10)					2,828	124,941	62,470
State Park	S. C. Sanatorium	TB	do	(10)		March 1951			18,248	469,788	156,596
Do	S. C. State Sanatorium	do	Addition	207		June 1951			2,963	105,504	52,751
Do	do	do	Addition and remodeling.	(12)	964	do	88	S. P.	544	28,575	14,287
Do	do	do	Addition	(10)		December 1951				26,026	13,013
State Park	S. C. State Hospital	Mental	New	(10)					747	17,585	5,862
Do	do	do	Additional and remodeling.	(10)	1,621					63,080	21,027
Do	do	do	Additional	240	1,781	February 1949		N. I.[2]	25,176	487,284	162,429
Do	do	do	New	(10)	1,845				2,829	107,991	35,997
Do	do	do	Additional	(10)					4,399	130,027	78,017
Union	Union Co	General	Additional and remodeling.	60	60	October 1950	25	S. P.	18,434	733,715	244,572
Walterboro	Colleton Co	do	New	101	101	July 1952		N. I.[2]	31,336	1,077,628	660,705

See footnotes at end of table.

TENNESSEE

Location	Name	Category	Type construction	Beds added	Beds upon completion	Date opened	Percent occupied	Source of information [1]	Architect fees	Total cost	Federal share
Chattanooga	Chattanooga TB	Tuberculosis	New	120	120	October 1951	13	S. P.	$108,870	$2,098,360	$699,453
Cookeville	Cookeville	General	do	49	49	December 1950	45	R. O.	29,449	600,142	189,047
Crossville	Cumberland Med. Ctr.	do	do	50	50	March 1950	47	R. O.	30,930	707,860	235,787
Fayetteville	Lincoln Co.	do	Addition	35	77	June 1950	47	S. P.	25,678	497,409	164,750
Jackson	Jackson and Madison Co.	General and public health clinic.	New	128	128	August 1950	77	R. O.	97,901	1,839,628	589,880
Johnson City	Johnson City Mem.	General	Addition	84	152	February 1951	55	S. P.	63,335	1,245,265	408,488
Do	do	do	do	36	178				5,220	113,736	50,143
Kingsport	Holston Valley Comm.	do	do	126	240	May 1952		N. I. [9]	80,000	2,100,852	817,002
Knoxville	Eastern State	Mental	do	188	1,538	January 1951	99	S. P.	56,230	1,579,339	421,446
Do	E. Tenn. Crippled Child.	Chronic	Additional and remodeling.	40	62	June 1951	35	S. P.	24,422	523,864	267,332
Do	E. Tennessee TB	TB	Replacement	180	180	January 1951	74	S. P.	132,834	3,249,422	1,089,229
Lawrenceburg	Lawrence Co.	General and public health clinic.	New	50	50	August 1951	40	S. P.	24,402	527,548	172,349
Maryville	Blount	General	Additional and remodeling.	62	112	January 1950	83	S. P.	4,346	576,921	192,307
Memphis [4]	W. Tennessee TB	TB	New		400	May 1949	96	S. P.		285,048	95,016
Memphis	LeBonheur Child.	Chronic	do	100	100	June 1952		N. I. [9]	116,007	2,195,761	1,104,721
Murfreesboro	Rutherford	General	Additional and remodeling.	32	73	July 1952		N. I. [9]	22,750	508,439	235,600
Nashville	Central State	Mental	Additional	(5)	2,180	July 1950	94	S. P.		70,800	36,400
Pulaski	Giles Co. Hosp. and HC.	General and public health clinic.	New	41	41	November 1950	37	R. O.	22,045	414,778	131,826
Ripley	Lauderdale Co.	General	do	55	55	do	45	S. P.	20,248	531,746	172,249
Savannah	Hardin Co.	General and public health clinic.	do	50	50	December 1950		N. I. [9]	39,000	797,258	405,158
Sewanee	Emerald Hodgson	General	Remodeled	NH	46	April 1952	47	S. P.	7,323	150,446	78,332
Shelbyville	Bedford Co.	General and public health clinic.	New	58	58	April 1951		N. I. [9]	47,471	863,905	438,831
Union City	Obion Co.	General	do	60	60	October 1950	89	R. O.	41,501	760,158	251,310

[1] R. O. indicates latest information on file in regional office Mar. 11, 1953, represents figures at end of calendar year 1952.
N. I. indicates no information available.
S. P. indicates State plan dated July 1952.
S. A. indicates latest information on file with State agency Mar. 12, 1953, and usually represents 12-month period ending Dec. 31, 1952.
[2] Nurses' residence, 100 nurses' beds.
[3] Equipment only.
[4] Pick up.
[5] Pick up, equipment only, fraction.
[6] Equipment.
[7] Laboratory.
[8] Indicates latest information from State agency, Mar. 13, 1953, for month ending Jan. 31, 1953.
[9] N. I.=No information available.
[10] Service facilities.
[11] Equipment only.
[12] Nurses' Home.

Mr. BUSBEY. They talk about the shortage of hospital beds. I do not know who worked out the formula, but it is not one on which there is 100-percent agreement by a long ways. Let me read to you what John J. Bourke, M. D., executive director, New York State Joint Hospital Survey and Planning Commission, of Albany, said:

It is essential, therefore, that a competent, respected organization in the hospital field assume responsibility and leadership immediately for developing a realistic, practical method of estimating the overall hospital-bed requirements for a community, consistent with current philosophies and practices of hospital and medical care.

Here is one from the State of Washington, written by Mr. Ralph L. Nielsen, head, hospital planning and development section, hospital and nursing home program, department of health, State of Washington, of Seattle:

There are now 3.6 acute general hospital beds per 1,000 population in use in the State of Washington, and few if any people are being denied accommodations. Under these circumstances, it would seem unrealistic to build an additional 2,000 beds at this time, as would be needed to fulfill the 4.5 ratio. At present, hospitals in some parts of the State are overcrowded, but in other parts of the State, hospitals have low occupancies.

Mr. Ritz E. Heerman, superintendent, the California Hospital of Los Angeles, had the following to say:

In California, we have found that the formulas now in use are not realistic. The theoretical allotment of beds has proved, in general practice, not to be the real need. Many hospitals have been built which are now 40-percent occupied and have become questionable as to solvency. Other areas, where statistics show that additional beds should be supplied, actually do not have any shortage of beds that can be proved by the percentage of occupancy of existing institutions in the area.

These three quotations were taken from the American Hospital Association Journal.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BUSBEY was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BUSBEY. There has been some talk about this gimmick they cooked up in the Public Health Service which they call split projects. Under this arrangement, a State is permitted to allot sufficient funds to a sponsor to start a hospital, with the understanding that Federal funds will be allotted in succeeding years to complete construction if sufficient appropriations are made, thus placing Congress in the position of having to continue appropriating funds every year indefinitely or be accused of stopping construction of partially built hospitals.

It is just a gimmick that they put in the regulations and procedures in order to bring this pressure on Congress to keep paying, and paying, and paying.

It may come as a surprise to many, but they have had a hard time selling this program in some communities. They spent $21,746.19 to make a motion picture to propagandize the people in order to get them interested in this program.

Then there is another important point I would like to make. They establish hospital needs in five categories, but they do not build hospitals in the communities where the greatest need has been established. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following tables in proof of this point:

Federal share allotted, projects by priority area by fiscal year of approval

ALABAMA

	Priority in terms of hospital areas percent of need met			
	0	1–25	25–50	50 and over
1948		$1,353,147		$1,387,705
1949	$2,982,872	439,241	$4,781,509	
1950	1,145,846			664,361
1951	1,759,704		346,987	
1952		253,318	375,623	246,612
1953	500,000			597,904
Total	6,388,422	2,045,706	5,504,119	2,896,582
Grand total	16,834,829			

CALIFORNIA

1948	$491,598	$1,054,098	$233,674	$346,313
1949	1,005,177	947,980	416,248	
1950	417,937		2,839,756	1,252,420
1951		913,282	1,647,328	80,672
1952			937,481	554,236
1953	96,557	2,076,350		
Total	2,011,269	4,991,710	6,074,487	2,242,643
Grand total	15,320,109			

COLORADO

1948		$217,066	$753,981	
1949 and 1950	$108,392		435,863	$1,179,254
1951		387,764		
1952				752,240
1953				
Total	108,392	604,830	1,189,844	1,931,494
Grand total	3,834,360			

GEORGIA

	Priority in terms of hospital areas percent of need met			
	0	1–25	25–50	50 and over
1948	$507,750		$3,140,253	$473,664
1949	694,017	$116,280	1,777,730	
1950	198,000	184,318	4,398,371	90,555
1951	609,986		1,500,374	460,667
1952			2,531,624	95,401
Total	1,909,753	270,598	12,348,361	1,129,287
Grand total			15,657,999	

MONTANA

1948	$222,860			$55,414
1949	219,371			111,689
1950	208,779		$155,394	
1951	30,993			211,739
1952		$209,632	122,995	
Total	681,943	209,632	278,389	378,842
Grand total			1,609,006	

SOUTH CAROLINA

1948	$457,178	$120,010	$908,580	$180,368
1949	328,024		581,656	1,999,361
1950	1,003,875			747,214
1951				5,985,504
1952	542,913			39,754
Total	2,331,990	120,010	1,490,236	8,952,201
Grand total			12,894,437	

TENNESSEE

1948		$676,144	$1,231,054	$900,795
1949	$405,158		673,033	517,053
1950			2,522,312	1,002,028
1951				
1952			1,467,670	223,300
1953			52,000	
Total	405,158	676,144	5,945,969	2,343,086
Grand total			9,370,357	

WASHINGTON

1948	$214,175			$431,706
1949				467,166
1950	508,024		$299,242	1,050,697
1951		$92,800	634,225	678,460
1952				844,400
1953				359,000
Total	722,199	92,800	933,467	3,831,429
Grand total			5,579,895	

The testimony in our hearings shows that over twice as many beds are being built by private enterprise, without any funds from the Federal Government, as are being built under the Hill-Burton program. I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a table which shows this ratio for the last 7 years:

Hospital construction in the United States, 1947–52

[In millions of dollars]

Calendar year	Value of work placed (current prices)					
	Total	Federal	Federally aided		Nonaided	
			Public	Private	Public	Private
1947	195	30			(165 total)	
1948	349	98	1	2	124	124
1949	679	163	49	75	265	127
1950	820	146	110	118	220	226
1951	913	128	118	128	248	291
1952	866	111	106	116	261	272
1953, estimated	796	90	103	100	270	225

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Division of Hospital Facilities, May 1, 1953.

I have in my hand a Chicago paper dated April 20 which shows a picture of Mount Sinai Hospital. This is a new $3.4 million hospital built by the Jewish people of Chicago. This shows what can be done by people who not only believe in themselves, but have the will to do things on their own. They did not ask for any Federal funds. If the people want these hospitals, and they need these hospitals, they will raise the money, and take pride in raising the money themselves, instead of coming to Uncle Sam for handouts.

There was a situation a couple of years ago in the district of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], where they turned down Federal funds. The Federal Government tried to force funds on this community to build a hospital. The people said, "No, we do not want these funds. We will build our own hospital." And they did it, by everybody contributing so much of the produce from their farms and their personal services. That is the American spirit. That is the spirit that made America great, and that is the spirit that is going to keep America great.

There is a case at Morristown, N. J., where they built one of the most modern and best-equipped hospitals in the entire United States at an average cost of $9,126 a bed. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] referred to the hospital in Butler, Pa. That was a remodel job. Morristown, N. J., is in a high-cost production area. It is higher, I think, than in Butler, Pa. But after they get through remodelling the old hospital in Butler, and after deducting the $600,000 for the nurses' home, what do you think will be the result? The final cost of the additional beds in this hospital is going to be somewhere between $50,000 and $55,000 a bed. Then I would like to mention briefly Indianapolis Health Center. Here is the plush of all plush jobs. One of the most elaborate buildings with offsets, and setbacks, that you ever saw in your life. The Federal Government's participation in this project amounts to $1,500,000. A friend of mine said that, by no stretch of the imagination, should it have been over $200,000. It is so flagrant a case that at this late date, the Federal Government is trying to recoup $500,000 of the $1,500,000 that has been previously approved.

I hold in my hand a picture of the building. Here is a window overlooking the swimming pool. What do you think they did? They paid $4,000 for four drapes for this window overlooking the swimming pool. In this so-called hospital-construction program, they are appropriating money out of the Federal Treasury for many other things besides facilities which add hospital beds. I think this is a program that should be looked into very thoroughly. I am very happy to see my very dear friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on the floor, because this legislation comes under the jurisdiction of his committee. I hope he will survey it very thoroughly before the act is extended. I am sure he will find that the legislation needs some revision, as well as extension.

One of the investigators for the committee who spent a great deal of time in studying this program, as it is actually being administered, has submitted the following as his opinion regarding the program's deficiencies. With most of these contentions I agree, and I certainly think they are all worth considering in connection with further legislation or appropriations that deal with this program:

The Hill-Burton Act is deficient for the following reasons:

1. It has caused overbuilding of hospital facilities, some of which are in financial difficulties because of low occupancy.

2. It provides a nationwide formula for determining need, to which formula some State administrators have objections.

3. It allows for the building of so-called related facilities without clearly defining such facilities. Administratively, this has been interpreted as allowing for almost any facility—such as religious chapels, space for doctors' private offices, space for welfare agencies, etc.

4. It forces State agencies to locate sponsors in order to spend Federal funds. If these cannot be found in the high priority areas, the State agency continues its search and will grant funds to sponsors in areas with the lowest need.

5. It disregards local conditions and the effect these may have on bed requirements and occupancy thereof.

6. It disregards availability of essential staff, such as nurses and doctors. According to the PHS Division of Nursing Resources, over half of the existing hospitals have vacancies in graduate nurse staffs. All hospitals are said to be short 22,486 nurses, according to the 1952 study of the American Hospital Association.

7. It wastes Federal funds by allowing sponsors to claim reimbursement for lavish equipment which would not be bought if Federal funds were not available.

8. It allows State agencies to define nonacceptable beds for formula purposes. In some instances, beds over normal capacity are classed as nonacceptable, and those in facilities which have design and location limitations are also classed as nonacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, for these very compelling reasons, I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, in commenting on this bill I want to point out how accelerated medical research is absolutely essential to the solvency of our 48 State governments. Although I am heartily in support of increased research in the fields of cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and disorders of the nervous system, I want to emphasize particularly the vital importance of vastly increased research in the field of mental illness.

The care of the mentally ill today is, in many States, the most crushing single load upon the State budget. There are more than 600,000 mentally ill in our State hospitals, and the aggregate cost of caring for them is in excess of a half a billion dollars annually. More than 200,000 mentally sick persons are admitted to these State hospitals each year, and although the respective State governments have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in the past few years in mental hospital construction, there is still the need for several hundred thousand more beds.

I say to you that many State governments will go bankrupt in the next decade or two if they attempt to care for, but not treat and cure, the increased

load of the mentally ill. At present the average stay of a patient in a mental hospital is 8 years and this lengthy stay costs the State $5,600 per case. This is a back-breaking load upon the taxpayers of the State.

True economy lies in intensive treatment of the mentally ill. This can only be brought about by the training of additional personnel in this field and by a marked acceleration of research projects to find cures for this disease.

I was a Member of the 80th Congress, which appropriated the first funds under the National Mental Health Act, and I am proud of the fact that it has had a tremendous impact upon the States because of its emphasis upon accelerated research and training. Grants-in-aid to the States and to medical schools and universities have enabled hundreds upon hundreds of desperately needed psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, and social workers to obtain training. Equally important, more than 300 mental hygiene preventive clinics have received part or all of their support from this program. Finally hundreds of grants have gone to research workers in all parts of the land.

Let me tell you of the benefits of this program to my own State of Louisiana. For decades thousands of mental patients piled up each year at the East Louisiana State Hospital at Jackson and the Central Louisiana State Hospital at Pineville. There was practically no research and no training of native Louisianians to become psychiatrists. With the passage of the National Mental Health Act by the Congress, Tulane University began the development of a training program which had 27 potential psychiatrists in training last year. Your appropriations, gentlemen, were the catalytic agent in this program. Incidentally, as the training program developed and expanded at Tulane many private citizens and organizations became interested, so that at the present time Government support at Tulane constitutes only about 20 percent of the psychiatric budget.

This story had a moving climax just a month ago, when Dr. Robert Gordon Heath, professor and chairman of the department of psychiatry at Tulane, testified before the Appropriations Subcommittee of this body. Dr. Heath told how Louisiana had recently built a new State hospital at Manderville, about 50 miles outside of New Orleans. For a while the hospital was bogged down in the dilemma repeated in almost every other State—a lack of doctors. The director of the Louisiana State Hospital Board recognized that if adequate staff in sufficient numbers was to be obtained he would have to start a training program and construct a research wing on the hospital. Fortunately, the Tulane Medical School training program was just getting on its feet. A working arrangement was developed between Tulane and the new hospital. As a result, this hospital has a large staff of vigorous, young psychiatrists, more than half of whom were able to take training because of fellowships you granted under the National Mental Health Act. These doctors are treating mental illness in its early stages; they are returning people to their homes, and saving the State money.

Now, this is a fine step forward, but there must be many more of these steps if we are to lick the problem. Frankly, for the two main purposes of the National Mental Health Act—research into mental illness and the training of psychiatric personnel to combat it—Congress has never appropriated adequate moneys. I am informed that each year the National Mental Health Advisory Council to the Public Health Service must turn down hundreds of research and training applications from all over the country because of lack of funds.

I am in support of the bill under consideration, but I hope to see a much larger sum in the years to come for medical research against mental illness and its companion scourges, cancer and heart disease.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I must confess I am not too familiar with this program. All I know about it is what I have heard the gentlemen on the floor say today.

I know the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is a very conscientious legislator. I know the gentlemen in opposition are conscientious.

Perhaps it is all that you say it is, but there is another problem which to me is infinitely more important than these various programs and activities of the Federal Government.

I do not know what sort of campaign you made, but in my State of Texas I promised the people I would do everything within my power to bring about a balanced budget. People voted for me on that campaign promise. I think 2 million Texans voted for me in the general election, and I assume they intended for me to carry out my campaign promises. President Eisenhower carried the State of Texas by 175,000 votes, and he distinctly promised to restore sound fiscal policies. I am sure the people of Texas heard his speeches over the television and radio and when he appeared in the State. They knew exactly what he was promising. I feel that I have an obligation to do everything I can as an insignificant and humble Member of this body to establish a balanced budget. The only way I know that it can be done is either to reduce expenditures drastically or to increase taxes. I know that you cannot undertake to reduce expenses without running into considerable opposition. In fact, I do not know of a single activity or program of this Government which, if we undertook to curtail it, there would not be champions of that activity who would want to restore it. But the question is, How are you going to finance this Government? You cannot finance it through bonds to individuals, because there are not enough individuals who have enough money left after paying taxes to buy bonds. Furthermore, there are so many people in this country who have already lost half of the purchasing power of their money as a result of buying Government bonds that they are somewhat hesitant about buying them.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made. A while ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] looked over on the Republican side of the aisle and said, "Now you have got the votes. It is up to you to balance the budget." I thought for a little while perhaps all the Democrats over there, who once in a while used to try to help us get that job done, had all been converted to that philosophy. I am glad to see some evidence that you are not all going along with that philosophy, because, as a matter of fact, the gentleman is entirely correct in the necessity of balancing the budget. I hope as we go along we will not see a complete vote on the Democratic side to increase all amounts, and that the Republicans alone will be compelled to hold the line. We ought to have some help on the Democratic side.

Mr. DIES. As I said, you cannot finance this huge and growing deficit by the sale of bonds to individuals. Then you will be required to sell them to the banks and sell them on the open market. Already your bonds have depreciated. The moment you withdraw Government support of the bonds they begin to go down. Your interest rate will constantly increase, because people are not going to buy bonds at a lower rate of interest than they can make somewhere else. Consequently, we are faced with the tremendous problem of financing our Government debt and deficit spending. Those who are in favor of continuing projects and activities of the Government, without any reduction, ought to have the honesty and the courage to support adequate taxation to balance the budget.

You know, I have had to balance my budget all of my life. When I began to practice law in Marshall, Tex., I had to balance my budget by foregoing many necessary and useful expenditures. My wife had to economize. We lived on about $75 a month. So when you talk about curtailing expenditures, there is not any place you can curtail them without occasioning some inconvenience and, perhaps, hardship to some people. But we are engaged in a period of prolonged peril; the cold war may continue for a decade or so. No man can foresee the end of the emergency that now confronts the American people. Untold billions of dollars will have to be raised for the purpose of preparing America and safeguarding the free institutions of our country. If we permit the solvency of this Nation to be in doubt, to be in question; if we destroy the confidence of the people in the responsibility of the Congress and of the executive department, how will we be able to meet the responsibilities that we have already voluntarily entered into? I would like for some Member to discuss this question of

how we are going to finance this deficit. Can we return to the specious and unsound method of selling pegged bonds to banks and permitting the banks to deposit them in the Federal Reserve banks on a basis of 6 to 1? This is simply printing credit money; it is a form of dangerous inflation. If you print Government bonds and authorize the Federal Reserve to issue credit money on the strength of the bonds at the ratio of 6 to 1 it, of course, stimulates inflation. Who profits by inflation? Every speculator in the land, every man who has stock, every man who is wise enough to speculate in property that increases in paper value in proportion to the decrease in the purchasing power of the inflated dollar.

You say you are redistributing the wealth. Why, there are men all over this land who were only moderately wealthy before this inflation program, who had land that was worth only $20 or $15 an acre; today that same land could not be bought for $200 an acre. The men who profit by inflation are not the poor; they are not the middle class—the middle class are liquidated by it, liquidated by inflation on the one hand and crushing taxation on the other. How can my children ever achieve any independence under the tax system of this country? They would have to make a million dollars to save a hundred thousand. We freeze them into their present status for life; we make it forever impossible for men of courage and initiative to achieve any independent status in our country. They become wards of the State, for they have no other security except the security provided by our Federal program.

I submit that what I am saying is not Democratic heresy. When we took power in 1932 I remember distinctly that it was our promise, it was our commitment, that we would operate on a balanced budget.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I claim to be somewhat of an expert on economy because I believe that in the 13 years I have been here I have voted against something like $130 billion of appropriations with which I disagreed. I want to say that I am regretful that I come here as a member of the party of my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] in support of the pending amendment. I do so because I believe that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce spent more time upon this legislation than any other committee.

It came over to us from the other body. One of the things we were very concerned about and that we saw to in the consideration of that legislation was that the control of this program was largely vested within the States themselves. The States do the selecting of the priorities and the laying down of the principles as to who was to be given the first consideration in the program.

Let me say that in my own State in the course of the last 6 years there have been built 70 hospitals under this program. It is one of the finest programs we have ever had in which the Federal Government has had a part. When this program began in my own State the people familiar with it estimated that we were between 30 and 40 years behind with our hospital program. In the course of the past 6 years not only has this program developed 70 new hospitals but let me say that outside of the program and as a result, perhaps, of the initiative that had been taken, there have been many other hospitals built without any Federal or State support.

In one town in my particular district that I know of when they had voted all the funds that this little community could raise, and they had gotten aid from the State and from the Federal Government, they were still short in the furnishing and the completion of that hospital. The people went out, there was a crusade in that community and they raised by private donation the necessary funds that were needed. When I think that in many communities of my State there were people who were as far away as 50 miles from the nearest hospital, and with all of this fine program that has been built there is still much to be done in that State, as there are in many other States.

That is why I say if the gentleman from Illinois is right, if he is right in his argument, then there should be no funds allocated to this program at all. But I say to you if you are going to have this program mean what it should mean then either give it $75 million or give it nothing.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from Illinois was not talking about the basic principle of a hospital-construction program. He was talking about the deficiencies of this program, as it has been, and is being, administered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and further ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I only hope that too many Members are not going to start yielding their time to other Members and not use it. At the start of the debate I made my position very clear. I am not going to object to this request, but if there are very many more of them I am going to object to that parliamentary procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

HILL-BURTON FUNDS

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, in the 6th District of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, our people are vitally interested in the program sponsored under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, Public Law 725, 79th Congress, popularly known as the Hill-Burton program. This act, authored and sponsored by Senator HILL, of Alabama, and Senator Burton, of Ohio, was signed by the President on August 13, 1946. The program has enjoyed the approval and endorsement of the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, and many other national and local medical organizations as well as individual medical practitioners.

I recently received from the hospital authority of the city of Lynchburg, the following letter written by the Administrator, Mr. Robert Hudgens:

One of the great expectations for this administration is a lowering of the cost of Government, or at worse a more effective expenditure of public funds. One is therefore quite self-conscious in writing his representatives and requesting them to give consideration to an increase in the appropriation for any specific measure. He can do so only when his conscience and judgment have come under a satisfactory scrutiny.

It is my conviction that nothing after the preservation of our way of life is more important to the individual and Nation than health. Measured in terms of the consequences of its loss to an individual, it ranks above education, wealth, roads, or other rewards within the power of our Government to bestow. Without health the great aims of our preamble "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," are for the individual jeopardized.

It is in this belief that I ask your support of the Hill-Burton program and like measures which provide facilities for health preservation and health recovery. It appears to me that this legislation has a merit and urgency which are exceptional. It was born of a necessity which it is in the process of relieving. Unusually right in design, principle, and purpose, it has awakened people over the Nation to a renewed interest in and acceptance of responsibility for health.

Many areas have been able to obtain facilities for the first time or to replace tragically obsolete and often dangerous ones with modern units and thereby attracted better doctors, nurses, technicians, and trainees to the benefit of all.

With these things I know you are familiar, particularly in Virginia. The achievement in Leesburg, Front Royal, Woodstock, Harrisonburg, Staunton, Amherst, Lovingston, Pearisburg, Abingdon, Cumberland, Dinwiddie, Emporia, Nassawodox, Suffolk, Fredericksburg, Rocky Mount, Danville, South Boston, Farmville, Petersburg, Winchester, and a few smaller projects in Richmond and Roanoke, etc., makes an impressive list.

Because of the great expense of most of these projects they could not have been realized without grants-in-aid. The general rule has been that the local communities have raised 4 percent of the cost locally, and in doing so have often exceeded any single previous fund-raising effort.

With the limitation on public money annually available and under the priority system that as a consequence had to be followed there are numerous other places in the State, as represented by Richmond, Roanoke, Lynchburg, and Bedford, which have raised or arranged for their local share of 45 percent but whose turn has not come and which now face the prospect of not getting the matching 55 percent from grants-in-aid. Because of the number of approved projects in Virginia which have backlogged,

those now under way are assured only 33⅓ percent of their cost, as opposed to the former, standard 55 percent allowed earlier projects, and even that one-third is conditioned upon Congress continuing the present annual appropriation of $75 million for the life of the act. Should Congress reduce the appropriation, it follows that the grants-in-aid will be still less and render some of the projects impossible of accomplishment.

Frankly, I do not know the effect of extending the Hill-Burton Act beyond its termination date, but I assume that pending projects will be held up until money has accrued. This further delay after years of waiting will undermine local interest, will discourage the payment of scheduled pledges and perhaps ultimately prevent urgently needed facilities.

A recent communication informs me that Virginia still needs 5,600 more acceptable hospital beds to bring the State up to the accepted ratio of 4.5 beds per 1,000 population.

In view of the dollar shrinkage since the program started, the Federal appropriation should be increased to a minimum of a hundred million, but if this is unrealistic, surely the present appropriation of $75 million should not be cut, at least until the initial job of bringing the Nation's hospital plant up to date is completed. Once the long neglect is overcome, maintenance by normal replacement of developing obsolescence might offer some relief.

I hope you will find it possible to oppose actively any impairment of this really essential and overdue program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT HUDGENS.

According to information which I have received from the Division of Hospital Facilities, United States Public Health Service, the total estimated cost of this new facility, which is to be erected on a new site, is $3,501,000. Of the total estimated cost, the total cost applicable to the Federal participation program is $2,170,620. Of this sum the Federal share was originally 53.39 percent or $1,156,940, and the share of the applicant is 46.61 percent. This latter figure, plus the difference between the total estimated cost and the total Federal participation cost portion, is $2,307,159, which figure must be raised locally by the Hospital Authority of the City of Lynchburg. The balance of $36,900 is payable out of State funds.

I am advised by Mr. James R. Caskie, who did a most commendable job as chairman of the local solicitation drive, that the authority has already raised, by valid subscriptions, $1,500,000.

In the city of Roanoke, also within my district, we have another project estimated to cost a total of $2,887,000, of which sum the Federal Government would pay $954,038, the State government $30,428, and the local hospital $1,902,533. All of these figures have been supplied to me by the Division of Hospital Facilities, United States Public Health Service.

The current hospital bed shortage ranges between 733,000 and 850,000 beds. Our population is currently increasing at the rate of about two million per year. The Hill-Burton Act offers the only workable solution to this grave national problem yet presented. It exemplifies the ultimate in the principle of Federal, State and local partnership, and in the crucial field of national health, upon which our national security so greatly depends. This program is deserving of our wholehearted support. Naturally, we look forward to the day when our hospital facilities will be so improved and so well staffed that our States and localities will not have to look further to the Federal Government for help. Until that day arrives, this three-way partnership should be strengthened and maintained. More particularly is that true in view of the fact that our localities, in good faith, have relied upon a continuation of adequate appropriations and have, by public solicitation, already subscribed the major portion of their partnership share. Since fiscal year 1948, the annual appropriation has not been less than $75 million and in three of these years exceeded that figure. If the Congress cuts the administration's appropriation request from $75 million to $50 million, it will mean that the share of the State of Virginia will be reduced from $2,219,346 to $1,464,322, in which event, the State of Virginia may have to completely abandon one of its projects or, in any case, seriously curtail all of them. If the request for appropriations is reduced to $60 million, Virginia's share would be reduced to $1,767,363, which might enable us to consummate existing programs but would deprive us of the possibility of the addition of another much-needed project.

In view of the current world situation and the likelihood of increased need for hospital care, I deem it a false and unrealistic economy to cut the appropriation requested by the administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, before the war, in the late thirties, as a member of the National Association of Cost Accountants, meeting in New York periodically, it was, of course, a great pleasure to hear talk somewhat like the talk that one hears here today. However, I will say, in fairness to the members of the National Association of Cost Accountants, they did not fail to include talk of income or product in their talk on cost reduction; significantly, there is no talk in this House today, nor have I heard any on either side of the aisle, on the gross national product which means, generally, on our yearly wealth as a team, all hands aboard. Some hold that our economy is humming and that our production is going up and up, hence, why talk of national product? Has any corporation head worth his salt ever put out a report to stockholders in which the gross wealth of the firm was omitted? Why should we omit talk of gross national product? Let us keep an open eye on the whole picture—let us legislate according to the needs of all concerned; the pressures, created to fill these needs will spark American ingenuity in all ranks as the pioneers were sparked. When the President left office last January, he said he thought within 10 years, if we kept our economy humming, our gross national product would be up around the $500 billion mark. He left office when it was $300 billion.

On what basis are you going to balance the budget? The crying towel? Or on being bold, daring and forceful; on broadening the tax base? On spinning the fly-wheel of ingenuity? Maybe, like the National Association of Cost Accountants, we can do it by making an analysis of all needs and factors.

I am for this amendment; it is a good thing. New Jersey can use its help. More and more of the aged and more and more of the unborn will benefit from its operation, not to mention those now running life's race who might drop in their tracks any day from unforeseen maladies, needing hospitalization. I wonder what the debates in the Spanish Parliament, or whatever it was called, were in 1491, before Columbus asked Isabella for money to go to America.

Balance the budget? On what? Anticipated diminution of human needs? Anticipated lower standard of living? Years ago, 400,000 Indians in this country fought and slaughtered each other for hunting grounds; today, over 158 million Americans are getting along where 400,000 Indians could not.

Where there is a will, we are told, there is a way; let us will to solve human needs; the ingenuity needed will propel us to greater happiness. The amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I submit that most of the arguments presented here today in opposition to this amendment could more appropriately have been made in 1945 or 1950 when the original Hill-Burton Act was under consideration or the amendments to that act were under consideration. That is now the law of the land. The Federal Government has said to the States and local communities, "We will participate in this hospital construction program." The question presented here today is, what is the right amount to provide for that program? The Hill-Burton Act itself authorizes $150 million. This amendment would provide for only half that amount.

I invite attention to a letter dated May 6, 1953, received by me from Dr. R. H. Hutcheson, commissioner of public health of the State of Tennessee, from which I will quote:

I was much surprised to see in the Nashville Banner last week a statement evidently released from the regional office of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department in Atlanta, to the effect that the proposed reduction in the Hill-Burton funds would not affect Tennessee because, as the paper stated, Tennessee had not used all of its 1952–53 allocation of Federal funds. In fact, the paper went on to say that only approximately $900,000 of the $2,600,000 had been obligated. There is nothing further from the real facts in the case because Tennessee has allotted every cent of the money that is available to us from the 1952–53 appropriation except a small amount that has been held out for reserve to take care of necessary change orders and this reserve is not as large as that recommended by the Service.

Then there is this significant statement:

In Dyer County we have authorized the construction of a hospital with 83 beds at a total cost in Federal participation of

$733,720. Architects have been working on the job for over 6 months. It is not under contract and for that reason was not included in the report that the Public Health Service gave the Budget Committee. The money, however, had been allocated to Tennessee and so far as Tennessee is concerned, it is obligated and Dyer County will expect to receive that sum. None of that money appropriated in previous years will be available for allocation beginning July 1, and any reduction means that the construction program in the future will be reduced proportionately.

This amendment is fair and is based upon the essential elements of justice and equity. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the time the Hill-Burton Act became law and as one who participated in the writing of the act, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

We have heard a great deal of interesting debate on the importance of balancing the budget, reduction of taxes, and the fiscal affairs of the Nation, all with which I am in sympathy. We have heard mention of the fact that Democrats should join in some of these proposed appropriation reductions. I should like to say to the House that it is well known on many occasions I have voted to reduce appropriations. I have voted for economy. In fact, this is one of the programs in which I joined Members of the House 3 years ago and since in reducing the appropriations by one-half.

The question is where are we going to spend the money—the taxes that we are taking in? Where are you going to allocate it? That is the responsibility of the Congress. We received a budget request this year for foreign aid of more than the amount of money this Congress appropriated for that program a year ago.

Now, just a moment with reference to this program. In 1945, it became a law by bipartisan action. The Senator from Alabama, Senator HILL, and the Senator from Ohio, Senator Burton, now a member of the Supreme Court, and the gentleman from Tennessee, a member of our committee [Mr. PRIEST], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who at that time was a member of the committee, were the original sponsors and directed this program through the House of Representatives and through the Congress. It was adopted, as I recall, without a dissenting vote. It provided an authorization of $75 million.

In 1949, 2 years prior to the expiration date, the Congress saw in its wisdom and judgment the necessity of extending the program in order that the States' plans be carried out. We provided for State planning. Those plans have been made. They cannot be carried out in 2 years, 5 years, or even 7 years, but yet in 1950, after the Korean war, it became necessary to reduce expenditures to take care of the obligations. What did we do? We reduced this hospitalization construction program by one-half. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, and members of this committee, the chairman and the members of the Committee on Appropriations, what other program, what other program of the Federal Government has been reduced to the extent of this hospital construction program? I say not one, and for that reason, and because of the obligations and commitments already made, this amendment should prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I feel that the hospital construction program is one of the soundest programs carried on by our Government. I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Congress for what this program has meant to my district. My district, semirural, is composed of 12 counties. Under this hospital program three 100-bed hospitals, two 50-bed hospitals, and two health clinics have been erected.

The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the committee, indicated that he proposed to place in the RECORD the names of certain hospitals where the occupancy ratio is very low. I would like to direct this question to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Is it not true that in the smaller bed hospitals, in those hospitals with 50 beds or less, it is more difficult to keep them full than in a larger hospital because individuals suffering with serious ailments are not going to these more or less rural hospitals?

Mr. FOGARTY. It certainly is and the doctors testified before our committee to that effect, and also that when these health centers or hospitals were built in a new district, it takes time to get the people and the doctors acquainted with the hospital facilities.

Mr. DEANE. Right at that point, I direct the committee's attention to page 772 of the hearing—and I do not know whether this is the information that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] intends to place in the RECORD concerning vacancy ratio. The following States are listed: Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee. In those particular States, the occupancy ratio is perhaps lower than in some other places. I have gone to the trouble of checking with reference to the State of Alabama. Two of the hospitals were occupied in 1949, five in 1950, nine in 1951, and five in 1952. I contend, Mr. Chairman, it takes time for these hospitals to season.

We are beginning to reach the point where the shortage, which is so critical today, especially in rural areas, is going to be whipped—in view of this hospital program, and that to enlist and train technicians and nurses. But we are not going to whip this hospital personnel problem if we do not give our strong support to the rural aspect of this hospital program.

There is one other factor which has not been brought out. This is the cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and the various States and local communities. And is this not likewise true, I ask the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that various counties and political units are levying taxes to enable this program to the extent that is necessary?

Mr. FOGARTY. And issue bonds. This is a State program. The States decide where these hospitals are going to be located.

Mr. DEANE. I quote the following from Dr. Cronin, and I join with the other members in commending him for the splendid job he is doing:

I think the Hill-Burton program, at least in my experience with it, which is now approximately 4 years, is a demonstration of how the Federal Government, the local community, and the State can get together in a cooperative endeavor to accomplish something which many areas of the country are unable to accomplish for themselves by themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and to express my deep appreciation to him for offering this amendment.

As my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. HARRIS] said a few moments ago, I was chairman of a subcommittee of that committee when the original legislation was passed. The ranking Republican member of that committee was the very distinguished and able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. We worked on this bill in subcommittee for many, many days, and we reported to the entire committee. And in executive session we went over the bill word for word and phrase for phrase.

I want to emphasize this fact, although it has been mentioned heretofore, but one of the main objectives of the subcommittee and of the committee in drafting this legislation, and in presenting it to the House for adoption, was to place the responsibility for its administration at the State level. We did that, insofar as legislative language was possible. We required that a State agency, the Commissioner of Health, or some agency of State government, develop a plan for the location of the hospitals in the best possible manner to serve the needs of the people in each individual State. We emphasized that particular part of the entire program. That has been done. It is my judgment that there is no grant-in-aid program in existence today that has had finer cooperation from the local communities, from the States, and the Federal Government than this hospital construction program.

Mr. Chairman, in 3½ minutes I cannot discuss the many angles of this legislation which I would like to discuss. Most of it has been touched upon somewhat already. I want to point out one or two particularly with reference to the rural areas of our country.

My own committee 6 or 8 years ago made a study of the placement of doctors and nurses, particularly in our rural

areas, where there has been rather an acute shortage for a great many years. We found as a result of that study that most of the doctors and nurses were going to the larger centers of population because of hospital facilities there, and the people in the smaller rural communities, county seats if you will, were being denied the proper number per capita of doctors and nurses to take care of the health needs of those areas. After a few years of operation under the Hospital Construction Act, that has resulted in small health clinics of 12 beds up to larger hospitals, we found that there has been a reversal of that trend and doctors and nurses are going back to the smaller hospitals to give there a service so greatly needed by the people.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am very conscious of the urgent need for balancing our budget at the earliest possible moment, and to do so, I realize the necessity of cutting expenditures wherever it can be done safely. At the same time, I am aware that the task faced by the members of the Appropriations Committee and the members of this Congress is a most difficult one, and I would like to commend the Members on both sides of the aisle for the sincere effort that is being made to reduce expenditures. By my votes, I have made an earnest attempt to economize wherever I thought it advisable, and I shall continue to do so. Yet, there are certain recommended reductions for which I feel I cannot vote.

The reduction to $50 million of the appropriation for the hospital construction program falls within that category. I am therefore supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island, and I would like to give my reasons for doing so.

The hospital construction program was adopted in 1945 for a 5-year period by the House of Representatives on a nonpartisan basis. It is my understanding that not one single vote was cast against the original bill in the House.

In 1949 this program was not only extended for another 5 years, but the authorization was increased from $75 million to $150 million. This was again done without a dissenting vote on either side of the aisle. Certainly a program that is passed by this House without a dissenting vote must have a great deal of merit. This program will expire in 1955 unless further extended. Already the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has introduced a bill extending it another 5 years. Senators HILL and TAFT, in another nonpartisan move, have suggested the same amendment in the Senate. I understand a Senate subcommittee has already approved a 2-year extension of the program. The hospital construction has been recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike as one that has and will continue to assist in providing critically needed medical facilities for every State in the Union.

This hospital construction program first made funds available to each State to survey the State's health facilities and needs for additional facilities. State officials themselves conducted this survey. When the surveys were completed, the Federal Government began to allot assistance funds to those communities in the order of needs previously established by the surveys. The assistance given is granted on a matching basis—the Federal Government matches the local funds. The program provides that upon completion of the facility, the local community is in complete control of the hospital or health center, and responsible for its operation. No Federal funds are provided for maintenance operation. And, most important, no Federal supervision or authority exists in any way upon completion of the building. So, we can readily see that the Federal Government's role in the hospital construction program is one of assistance and not of control.

The Alabama Congressional District which I represent is predominantly a rural district. Many rural communities have found themselves not only without hospital facilities but, even worse, without a doctor. Most young doctors have been reluctant to go into communities where adequate facilities were not available for the practice of the type medicine they have studied. This is, of course, understandable. A number of communities in my district and throughout my State have built under the hospital construction program the kind of facilities that young specialized doctors require. This has assisted in attracting doctors to many of these areas. Other communities are anxious to participate in this program, and will do so if adequate funds are made available.

I would like to emphasize at this point that, of the new facilities constructed under the program, 59 percent are in communities of 5,000 or less population, and only 7 percent are located in cities which exceed 50,000. On the other hand, the program has not lost sight of the needs of larger institutions in their vital roles of training specialized hospital personnel who will eventually join the staffs of the small hospitals. Nearly $91 million of the total Federal funds made available to date are being utilized for teaching hospitals which offer internship and residency training.

Over $23 million of the funds have been allocated to 21 university medical centers in 18 States. In my own State of Alabama nearly a half million dollars has been allocated under this program to the University of Alabama Medical Center.

Although a great part of the funds are being used by rural communities, we must remember that these rural facilities could serve well as evacuation points for urban areas if war or other chaos should come to this country.

As of January 1, 1953, 1,980 hospital and medical center projects have been approved. Over half of these are already completed and are rendering great services to the communities. About 700 more are presently under construction. Plans are under way for the remaining projects.

Because of these projects, our health resources are being increased by 96,500 hospital beds and over 330 public health centers and other medical facilities. It is certainly a reassuring feeling to note that 430 communities now have hospitals for the first time. Another 150 communities have been able to do away with substandard facilities and bring their medical centers up to modern requirements.

From these statistics, we can conclude that amazing progress has been made since the hospital construction program has been in operation. Yet, according to public health reports, 850,000 more hospital beds are needed in the immediate future. The only possible way to reduce this figure under present conditions is to assume that the probable availability of Federal hospital beds to civilians, such as those of the Veterans' Administration, will decrease this need by about 117,000. This still leaves a deficiency of 733,000 hospital beds. To me, such a deficiency is alarming and, in my opinion, it would be unwise to reduce the funds for this program below the $75 million mark for fiscal year 1954. I do not feel this request is unreasonable since the hospital program law permits an annual appropriation up to $150 million. I hope the committee will see fit to support the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, my State has just recently completed a study of this program which builds a strong case for the continuation of the program and for the need of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The study, prepared by the California State Department of Public Health, explains the development of the hospital construction program in California since 1946 when the Hill-Burton Act became effective. In California, the report points out, there is extreme need for new hospital facilities because the State's population increased by more than 1 million persons between 1946 and 1952. By 1960, the report estimates, the population increase will be more than 4 million persons and the need for hospital facilities will increase proportionately.

Since the Hill-Burton Act became effective in 1946, California has constructed hospital space for 21,000 beds. There are now 85,000 hospital beds in operation or space for the beds is under construction in California. This still is only two-thirds of the State's needs. In spite of the hospital space constructed since 1946, the report states, "the shortage of hospital service is nearly as acute now as it was in 1946." This is particularly true in areas which have experienced phenomenal population growth.

The report estimates nearly 6½ million Californians still have less than three-quarters of their estimated general hospital bed needs. The need for space in mental, chronic disease, tuberculosis, and general hospitals in California by 1960 is estimated at an additional 82,857 beds. The current need for hospital space is indicated by the 118 applications

for assistance in hospital and health facility construction pending last January. To meet the health needs, projects costing an estimated $83,600,000 would have to be built and the Federal share would be some $26,900,000.

At last November's election, California voters approved a plan to bring the State construction program into line with Federal regulations. State funds now can be made available to nonprofit hospitals on the same basis as Federal funds and the State of California is doing everything possible to carry its share of the hospital construction burden. The Federal Government should do no less than its share, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will provide money necessary to help do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia, [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I join in the apparent universal plea of my colleagues in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island. My State of West Virginia, due to the hazardous occupation of mining, has probably greater need for hospital facilities than some of the other States. Let me remind my colleagues that in World War II between Pearl Harbor and V–J Day there were 125,000 miners working in the mines. One hundred and twenty-seven thousand West Virginians served in the armed services. More men were killed and injured in the mines of West Virginia than there were deaths and injuries amongst a similar number of West Virginians engaged in a world war.

So serious has the situation become in West Virginia that despite the fact that we have erected 11 hospitals under this program—so serious is the situation that the United Mine Workers are building four large hospitals out of their welfare funds in order to take up the slack—due to the fact that we do not have the facilities available in the mining sections of the State of West Virginia.

This is an excellent program; it is one in which you have local participation, one in which you have State participation, and one that is appreciated by the people because they can see the great good that is resulting from this program.

I sincerely hope that the amount asked by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be restored to this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment.

This program has been criticized on the ground that these hospitals are built where they are not needed. That certainly is not true in the State of Georgia for there the people who administer this program in the State will not approve a hospital where there are ample beds already available. The program has been administered well and strictly in accordance with its regulations and the law.

Another criticism is that this program is spending too much of the money in rural areas.

As a matter of fact, both of these complaints are the very strongest arguments in favor of the program. You refer to socialized medicine and you fight it, and I do, too. I do not approve of socialized medicine. I am unalterably opposed to it. But this program is doing more to bring the necessary medical care and treatment to the people of the rural areas than any other program could possibly do. And this all tends to lessen the demands for socialized medicine or compulsory health insurance. As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] has said, the young doctors are now attracted to the rural areas whereas formerly they did not want to practice in those areas because they did not have hospital equipment and the people were obliged to travel 25, 50, and sometimes 75 miles in order to get adequate hospital and medical treatment. This program is building hospitals in those areas where they are most needed.

It is rather amusing to have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] call upon us on this side of the aisle to again pull his chestnuts out of the fire. We have done that all through this session. If it had not been for those of us on this side of the aisle, where would your President's program be right now? You know, there are two sides to balancing the budget. Your President has said he cannot balance it this year, he admits he cannot balance it the next year and that possibly he cannot balance it even the third year. He has asked you folks over there now to extend some of the taxes that are about to expire. If you cannot balance the budget by cutting appropriations, you can help him toward a balanced budget by continuing the taxes which soon will expire. You expect us to pull your chestnuts out of the fire on your tax program, and we are going to do it, I suppose, for we seem to be just that simple. But I am going to tell you that I am not going to pull your chestnuts out of the fire and make these paltry cuts at the expense of our school children or the ill people of our country and I am not going to do it at the expense of our national security.

It looks like your man Wilson is trying to out-Johnson Louis Johnson. I was one of the first to call for the resignation of Mr. Johnson, and he was of my own party. Because he put so-called and false economy above our national security since has proven how right I was. I am not yet calling for Mr. Wilson's resignation, but it is coming pretty quickly if he goes on as he is now in his threat to cripple our air program. I am not going along with you on that; I am not going along with you to cripple our atomic energy program and I am not going to economize at the expense of our school children, the aged, the ill, and our national security.

Count on me for my support of your President in matters of true economy and a balanced budget. But not for even his suggestions on programs where he recommends false economy or economy that will cripple our Air Force or atomic energy development. These are our first and last lines of defense.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, whatever other differences may exist among us, no one will deny that the functions and services of the Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments directly affect the fundamental resources of the people of this country. Outside of moral and spiritual strength, no attributes are more vital to national security and progress than the promotion of good health, the advancement of sound education and the encouragement of peaceful labor-management relations in this Nation.

When we speak of "forcing" economies in connection with such obviously important subjects and services it is eminently wise to approach the task with the understanding mind and sympathetic heart of the skilled surgeon who knows he has life and destiny in his hands. Let me remind you that in acting upon the appropriations for these essential departments of Government we are dealing with the lives of our people and the destiny of this country in a most delicate sense.

You Members here know I have been and am now a consistent advocate of Federal expenditure reductions, and voted accordingly, whenever the absolute need of requested appropriations could not be demonstrated by the various department officials. Careful and prudent elimination of Federal waste, extravagance and nonessential spending is the objective of us all. God knows, and, without any irreverence, may I say we know our overburdened taxpayers and harassed businesses can stand that. However, let me exhort you not to let the mere cry of "economy" become a catchword instead of a patriotic watchword.

Mr. Chairman, the President has repeatedly stated that to every act of his administration he would apply the testing question, "Is this good for all America?" I do not know of a better yardstick by which to measure safe and sane economy proposals. I earnestly suggest that in our judgments on this appropriation bill we adopt the sincere, commonsense attitude of Presidential example.

Is it good for all America to practically eliminate further construction authorized under the Hill-Burton hospital program? These funds are used to help States and communities defray part of the costs to erect hospitals and public-health centers; they are granted on the basis of population and economic need. These projects are adding 96,500 hospital beds and over 330 public-health centers to the Nation's health resources. Under this program 430 communities now have hospitals for the first time. One hundred and fifty-one other communities now have hospitals where their previous facilities were substandard and unacceptable under the minimum laws of fire and life safety.

Modern and efficient hospitals constructed under the Hill-Burton Act have not only retained physicians in rural localities where there have been great shortages, but also have attracted additional doctors. The proposed cut in Hill-Burton funds means that each State

will get one-third less next year to help them build hospitals already under way or in the planning stage. In too many instances the loss of Federal contributions means the particular community will abandon the idea of a hospital entirely because they do not have enough money to complete it on their own. If there is any Federal program that has proved its worth to the American people it surely is the hospital-construction program.

Other impractical reductions set forth in this bill would disastrously impair such essential public health services as pure food and drug enforcement, control of communicable diseases, and cancer and polio research, to mention only a few. Is that good for all Americans?

In the areas of education the proposed cuts would seriously disrupt Federal assistance to the State activities and agencies carrying out vocational guidance in teaching distributive occupations, giving aid to schools in crowded defense localities, extending vocational rehabilitation to disabled veterans and the physically handicapped. The admittedly competent Federal Commissioner of Education resigned rather than attempt to fulfill the obligations of his office, which would be virtually impossible with the ridiculous budget offered him. He questioned the wisdom of saving "such small sums while we continue as a Nation to spend billions for other purposes."

In the Labor Department and the independent labor agencies the reductions advocated in this measure would paralyze the proper functioning of such important Government divisions as the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the Railroad Retirement Board; divisions which have splendid records of achievement in public service and promoting harmonious management-labor relations. Other agencies whose vital work in the public interest and welfare would be practically destroyed if these cuts stand approved are, the Women's Bureau to protect women from exploitation, the Bureau of Veterans Reemployment Rights, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Employment Security, Workmen's Compensation Bureau and the Wage and Hour Division of Labor.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies is it wise to neglect our own citizens? At a time when we are boasting to the world of our better way of life, as opposed to the Communist state, is it intelligent to dangerously retract so many public services whose contributions to national progress have been acknowledged? At a time when we are engaged in a bitter struggle for national survival is it practical to disrupt the morale of our own people? I submit it is not.

Economy in its true sense means getting your money's worth for what you can afford to spend. This is still, thank God, the greatest, strongest, and wealthiest country on the globe. We have been obtaining full value for our money from these public services in the national interest and we cannot now afford to abandon the civilized progress made under them. We have been nationally proud of our Christian social gains made under this form of government; let us sensibly maintain them. Let us not tell our people and the world, at this hour of destiny, the United States must go backward instead of forward. Let us exercise economy with the wise scalpel of the true surgeon and not the ax of the bewildered butcher. In the spirit and admonition of the President, let us continue to legislate and appropriate for the good of all America.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the necessity of the appropriations we are discussing here, for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act, has been noted in a telegram I have received from the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan.

As chief executive of the State of Michigan, Governor Williams is naturally interested in this matter, as are the other governors of the several States, I am sure. They are properly alerted to the impairment of hospital construction which will result from a substantial reduction in this appropriation.

I intend to support the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and I am inserting Governor Williams' telegram in the RECORD at this point:

MAY 25, 1953.

Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Currently planned hospital construction in Newberry, Howell, Munising, Grayling, Caro-Cass City, Hudson-Edison, Alma, Escanaba-Gladstone, Adrian and Mount Clemens and planned public-health-facility construction in Washtenaw and Oakland Counties will be impaired should the Congress reduce Hill-Burton funds by one-third. I strongly urge that this afternoon you speak and vote for Representative FOGARTY's amendment to H. R. 5246 restoring the Federal appropriation for hospital construction to $75 million.

I have personally attended the dedication of many of the recently completed Michigan community hospitals erected under Hill-Burton funds and have visited almost all of them at one time or another. I am also convinced that the people of Michigan take as much interest, pride, and satisfaction in these hospitals as any other community endeavor. Failure to go forward with a wholehearted Hill-Burton program will strike at a very vital and heartfelt interest of the people of Michigan.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor, State of Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we in South Carolina realized when we were building certain hospitals under the Hill-Burton provisions, that there would come a time when we could not staff all of these hospitals, so our leaders embarked upon a program of building a teaching hospital, comprising 245 beds, to make it possible for one of the oldest medical schools in the South, Charleston, where the South Carolina Medical College is located, to prepare people to staff these hospitals. We embarked upon a program to build a $9 million hospital. What was that hospital for? That hospital was to assist in the training of physicians, dentists, nurses, laboratory technicians, dietitians, and other hospital personnel, and offered a special priority for that teaching hospital. There was a time when we did not have all of these people in South Carolina. We went to Chicago, to that great city on Lake Michigan, and imported one of the great pathologists of the Nation. He is now dean of the medical college. To my amazement I had a letter from him the other day and he said this, "I read in the newspapers where Mrs. Hobby's request had been spurned by the Committee on Appropriations," and he was alarmed. He told me that the Medical College Hospital now of seven stories, still going up—we in South Carolina are really outbuilding—would have to be curtailed because of this shortsighted policy. Now, you know it is not wise to change horses in the middle of the stream unless the other fellow has the best horse. Never do that. We are now faced with the perplexing problem of stopping the building of a hospital after going up seven stories, after my legislature has met the fulfillments of the intendments of the statute, written by us all—HILL, BURTON, PRIEST, BROWN of Ohio, and others—because of this policy. I say to you that we have appropriated $39 billion for aid in Europe and Asia and throughout the world since World War II. When this Congress will have recessed or adjourned we will have appropriated about $45 billion for aid across the seas. Now, you know that is a powerful lot of money. Let us appropriate $75 million to take care of the sick people of this Nation. I have no misgivings about that. My dollar is hurt just as much as yours when we have inflation. We pay our bills, but we are compelled to face facts. As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] said, we cut this program from $150 million to $75 million because of this so-called police action in Korea. Let us be sensible here and do the right thing and take care of our aged and sick and fulfill the commitments of our States, and then you will be doing the right thing.

HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM IN SOUTH CAROLINA

In accordance with the provisions of the Hospital Survey and Construction—Hill-Burton—Act, the total Federal funds appropriated by the Congress each year is allotted to the States on the basis of a statutory formula. The controlling factors in this formula are the population and the per-capita income within the State. The State is required by law to prepare a State plan, to revise it and submit it annually to the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service for approval. This State plan is based on the States' survey and appraisal of the hospital service needs of the people of the State and the existing resources in hospitals and related health facilities. It also includes the construction schedule which is based on the requirements of the act that the

Federal funds allotted to the States must go first to the areas of greatest unmet bed need. The State plans recognizing the need for assigning in the training of physicians, nurses, laboratory and X-ray technicians, dieticians, and other professional health personnel, have often permitted a special priority for teaching institutions. This action is sound because it is essential to have the supply of trained health personnel consistent with the demand for their services which come from the small hospitals throughout the State. It is in the teaching center hospitals that these health personnel acquire the practical aspect of their professional training and round out their many years of academic training.

The Hill-Burton program throughout the Nation is assisting not only in getting needed hospital services to the rural areas, but has also aided in preparing health personnel in these teaching medical centers in helping to assume that this type of personnel will be constantly under training for utilization.

In South Carolina in 6 years of operation of the Hill-Burton program 110 projects have been approved at a total cost of $32,203,596. The Federal share is $16,005,406. The State has provided some State funds to help the communities match the Federal funds in these projects.

A total of 2,157 beds have been built in the following categories:

General	1,433
Tuberculosis	335
Mental	300
Chronic	29

In addition, approved projects include 8 nurses' homes, with a total of 142 beds; 19 public-health centers; and 45 auxiliary health centers.

The program in South Carolina includes facilities for the curative as well as the preventive aspects of medical care. This is a health maintenance approach and represents our basic need.

The current status as shown by the State plan of South Carolina is as follows:

A. Hospitals

Category	Existing acceptable beds	Additional beds needed	Total beds needed	Percent of need met
General	6,110	3,568	9,678	63
Tuberculosis	899	386	1,285	69
Mental	3,716	6,764	10,480	35
Chronic	195	3,997	4,192	5

B. Public-health centers

	Existing acceptable	Programed
Public-health centers	26	26
Auxiliary	65	178

In the city of Charleston which has long been an outstanding medical center of our Nation the University of South Carolina Medical School Hospital is currently under construction. The estimated total cost is $9,567,450 and of this the Hill-Burton program has provided $5,851,202. This 245 bed teaching hospital was phased out from 1951 to 1955 as far as Federal funds and construction is concerned as follows:

Fiscal year 1951	$397,143
Fiscal year 1952	1,450,078
Fiscal year 1953	1,117,500
Fiscal year 1954	[1] 1,800,000
Fiscal year 1955	[1] 1,086,481

[1] The Federal allotment for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 are provisional upon the Congress of the United States appropriating funds for those years.

The Appropriations Committee of the House has reduced the Federal funds for the Hill-Burton program to $50 million. This is $25 million below the request of the Truman administration and $10 million below the request of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

On the basis of $60 million the 1954 allotment to South Carolina will be $1,458,276, which will be $341,724 short of the $1,800,000 earmarked by the State officials of South Carolina for this university hospital.

If the $50 million request for this Hill-Burton program is accepted by the House the allotment to South Carolina will be $1,208,232 and this will be $591,768 short of the $1,800,000 earmarked. The State will be confronted with the perplexing problem of how this deficit will be met to assure the continuation of this urgently needed teaching hospital.

It will require a total appropriation in excess of $75 million for the Hill-Burton program to permit South Carolina to approve any new hospital projects in 1954.

SOUTH CAROLINA BOARD OF HEALTH,
Columbia, May 5, 1953.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RIVERS: On the 20th day of January 1953, we were notified by the United States Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency that we would have allocated, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953, the sum of $1,849,853 for hospital construction.

On the 24th day of April 1953, we received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare information that the allocation for hospital construction had been severely reduced. This was based on the revised budget estimates now pending before the Congress. They informed us that we would have a reduction of $391,577 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953 and ending June 30, 1954.

This is a serious interference with the proposal of the State to construct the teaching hospital at the Medical College of South Carolina. This actually means a loss to the college, in the year mentioned, of $341,724, as most of the funds received in this fiscal year went to the college.

We simply cannot forego construction of the medical college hospital, and we urge and request that you take the matter up with the necessary dispatch, so that the Hill-Burton hospital construction appropriation will not be reduced from $75 million to $60 million.

This has been the topic of some publicity in South Carolina being carried on in the newspapers and quoting Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of the authority.

With kindest personal regards.

Very truly yours,

BEN F. WYMAN, M. D.,
State Health Officer.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Charleston, S. C., May 4, 1953.

Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MENDEL: Referring to my telegram of May 2 to you concerning the proposal of the House Appropriations Committee to reduce the hospital construction (Hill-Burton) appropriation from $75 million to $60 million, I note in an article from Washington published in local papers that Senator TAFT has taken a strong stand for maintaining this appropriation at its present level. I am sure that you know this and will know much more of what may be done to hold this appropriation at least until hospital construction that has been started in good faith and dependence in it shall be completed.

While it is, of course, true that the allotments made to hospital construction programs were contingent upon appropriations, certainly there is a definite obligation to provide the funds where allotments were actually committed. The Medical College Hospital, now up 7 stories, still has 2 years to run in construction. The machinery for distributing Hill-Burton funds made definite allocations for the construction of this hospital and the State of South Carolina has appropriated over $2½ million and has made construction contracts involving the entire amount expected from the Federal Government. It is hardly conceivable that after all of this the anticipated Federal funds will not be forthcoming.

Trusting that our alarm may not prove justified, and with many thanks to you, I am

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH M. LYNCH, M. D.,
President.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. OAKMAN].

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it would seem that this raises the question of whether or not the Federal Government should take over the entire hospital situation in this country; whether or not it can afford to take over the hospital situation throughout the country or whether on the other hand, this is going to continue to be a cooperative program at all levels of government together with all the nongovernmental agencies continuing to work together. In the State of Michigan, when our distinguished colleague [Mr. KNOX] was speaker of the house a short time ago, the people voted to borrow $65 million and issue bonds to take care of the hospital needs. That is at the State level. In the city of Detroit, for 25 years we needed an extension of our great emergency receiving hospital. Why did we not get it? Because we did not have the money. We completed an annex this year at a cost of three and two-thirds millions, and there is not one Federal dollar in it.

As to the private hospitals, in the city of Detroit, we knew that there were many new hospitals needed and we knew that there were many expansions of existing hospitals and modernization programs needed. How was it done, or was it done? Yes; it is being done. The people of that community went down into their own pockets in the good, old American fashion, not the rich people of the town but all of the people of the town cooperating together, and they brought up $19,700,000. They are doing the job

without one dollar of Federal funds. In spite of all that, I do not think this program should be discontinued. With unexpended balances on February 28 of $172 million, and $50 million of fresh money in the 1954 budget, that is probably a great deal more than would be needed in the next fiscal period.

May I say this in conclusion: I am not unmindful of the subject of care for the sick, the indigent, and the decrepit. My father was a doctor of dental surgery, a doctor of medicine, and a Fellow of the American College of Surgeons, and he came up the hard way. In Detroit one of the finest schools for crippled children in the country is named in his honor. I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we have here an amendment increasing the appropriation $25 million. This hospital program may have some merit, but how can we afford at this time to be pouring in as much money as we did in prior years, when conditions as to the budget were not so critical and the demands upon the Federal Treasury for expenditure were not nearly so critical?

The revised budget on this item is $60 million. This proposal is $15 million above the revised budget. I have been in hopes that we would not go beyond the Eisenhower revised budget. We have a great many reasons why we could get along with less.

They say people have issued bonds, and they have to have the money to help out. The primary purpose of this bill was to provide hospital beds, but what have they been doing? They have been allocating enormous sums of money, hundreds of thousands of dollars, for nurses' homes and executive offices. That is not providing hospital beds. That is not the thing that is most urgent in connection with such a program. We should not be spending our money for that.

I have been disappointed that there have been so many cases that have been referred to here where they have low occupancy of the beds in the hospitals. We have a great lot of them in the Veterans' Administration and in the Army and Navy hospitals, and I expect we will in the Air Force hospitals. We have a great lot of it in the Public Health Service hospitals. It has gotten so bad there that they are abandoning a couple of hospitals because they have no real demand for their continuance.

I want to be reasonable about it, and I want to go along on a reasonable figure, but frankly I think the committee figure of $50 million is as much money as we should be asked to appropriate. We, at some time or other, have to balance the budget. The President of the United States has not said that he could not balance the budget. He has simply said that some of the figures did not indicate that it could be done, but that they were still trying. I hope that this amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 47, noes 57.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUSBEY and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 83, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: On page 18, line 24, strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment simply because the Eisenhower administration has recommended this sum of money.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The time was limited on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment was disposed of. This is a new amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. There was a time limit on this section of the bill. The gentleman may offer an amendment, but I do not think he is entitled to speak on the amendment under the original agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time was on the amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. And all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair stated, that has been taken care of—the Fogarty amendment and all amendments thereto. This is a new amendment.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour I do not intend to take 5 minutes. However, I do think that to those of you who felt that $75 million was in excess of the amount you wanted to support, this amendment, which carries the recommended amount by the Eisenhower administration, can well be supported.

I want to add 1 or 2 points about this program which has been under the jurisdiction of the legislative committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, over these years and has been handled on a thoroughly nonpartisan basis.

I do not know whether you have had the opportunity to examine the pertinent facts, but there have been 1,980 approved projects all over this country. There are 1,475 general hospitals. Of the nearly 2,000 projects, 1,100 are completed, 700 are under construction, and the remaining are in the planning or drawing board stage. They will add 96,500 beds and over 300 public-health centers and related facilities. Four hundred and thirty communities now have hospitals for the first time; 151 more now have good hospitals where existing ones were substandard. It is very significant that 59 percent of the new facilities are in the communities that have populations of 5,000 or less, and only 7 percent are located in cities which have in excess of 500,000 population.

This, in my judgment, is the answer to the cries for socialized medicine; it is a practical and partial answer to the maldistribution of doctors, nurses, and other personnel.

As far as I know, although there has been a suggestion of some maladministration of this program in some vague instance, there is a general approval of the way in which the program has been handled throughout the country. I think this is attributable largely to the fact that the committee originally and since that time has insisted that the new program should be handled primarily by the State and local authorities where the people themselves have had an opportunity to determine and observe not only the kind of construction but also the administration of this program.

There is now, according to reliable information, something over a 900,000 bed deficit in this country. As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] pointed out, our failure to keep pace with population growth is due largely to the drastic cutback after Korea.

I suggest that all of us who are interested in balancing the budget and in supporting this administration, should take the advice of this administration in this instance and permit at least this additional amount for the current fiscal year.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the arguments for this amendment on both sides, pro and con, are the same as on the previous amendment just voted on, I wonder if we could not agree on time for debate on this amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 82, noes 58.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY to the amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Strike out $60,000,000" and insert "$70,000,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not labor the House with the purpose of my amendment. Everyone here knows that the Fogarty amendment would have provided funds in the amount of $75 million. The Heselton amendment would provide funds to implement the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act in the

amount of $60 million. The amendment which I have now offered would provide funds in the amount of $70 million, and I trust it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I had prepared the same amendment as that offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]. I think that $60 million is a reasonable middle ground to take on this issue. There is no one here who does not approve this hospital-building program. On the whole it has worked as well as any program we have had in recent years. However, we are in a financial condition in the country where we have got to trim all kinds of good things. I voted against the $75 million appropriation because I favor this middle-ground figure. The administration to which I belong has looked over the whole matter and has come up with its recommendation of $60 million.

It seems to me that now when some 1,100 hospitals have already been built under this program the most severely acute needs have been taken care of. We are not in as urgent a situation as when this program was begun 8 years ago. I believe that in line with other cuts, we ought to reduce the original $75 million estimate to about $60 million which is the figure that those who have restudied and revised the budget have recommended.

Furthermore, I would say to my friends on this side that I think we can hold $60 million. If we lose the $70 million substitute and then the $60 million amendment and go back to $50 million, then the motion to recommit will probably include $75 million and it is likely to pass. I myself will vote for it under those conditions.

So I hope you will reject the amendment to the amendment and accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts for $60 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, when this item of $60 million came before this committee we had no justification for it at all. I do not know what the Bureau of the Budget did with it. We had no hearings on the $60 million item. The only thing we held hearings on was the $75 million figure.

It was testified, Mr. Chairman, that we still have in this country, even though this program has been in operation for 8 years, some 800,000 beds less than we need at the present time in our country. It is a question of whether or not you want to do something about getting the beds that are necessary for the people of the country and follow this program through. But I think each of us ought to be man enough to stand up and say whether we are for the program or not, when we are whittling away like this and talking the way we are this afternoon. This is the first time in my memory, in the 8 years that this bill has been law, that the Republican Party has put the Hill-Burton Act into politics. You have put it there by your talk of balancing the budget, and you apparently want to let the people of the country know that you have. Then stand up and be counted. Tell them that you are for whittling away the Hill-Burton Act. You say that you think they have enough hospital beds in the country to take care of those that need it, when you know that they have not. That is what you are saying in effect today. You are saying that the American Hospital Association does not know what it is talking about. You are telling every other organization that has surveyed this field, worked in this field, that they do not know what they are talking about. I do not know what kind of argument that is.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Do you not feel that there are other organizations in this country that are capable of building hospitals other than the Federal Government, and that that might be the way to build hospitals?

Mr. FOGARTY. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri if it had not been for the Hill-Burton Act during the past 8 years we would have 100,000 beds less than at the present time. If that is your philosophy and the philosophy of the Republican Party, take credit for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to assure the gentleman from Rhode Island, for whom I have the greatest respect and deepest regard, and under whom I had the pleasure of serving for 2 years while he was chairman of this committee, that I agree with his remarks about standing up and being counted. When we go back into the House and we ask for the rollcalls on these amendments that have increased these appropriations by millions of dollars, I hope every man on the other side of the aisle who stood up and voted for these amendments will stand up and be counted on the roll call.

On the question of a shortage of 800,000 beds, well, that is a matter of opinion. I covered that subject when I spoke on a previous amendment on this item. I am not against the basic philosophy of the Hill-Burton program. But what has happened is this: They have built hospitals without any regard as to the need in the communities or where they were going to get the doctors, nurses, and attendants to staff them.

At the present time, there is a shortage of nearly 23,000 nurses. There is also a shortage of doctors and attendants. I think it is time to stop, look, and listen, and to survey this program very carefully before we go too far and expend funds unnecessarily for hospitals that cannot be staffed and maintained, or that will not be sufficiently utilized to justify their maintenance.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. BUSBEY.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 106.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

The question was taken.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HESELTON and Mr. BUSBEY.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 43, noes 67.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the functions of the Public Health Service under the act of August 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock; and purchase of firearms and ammunition; $32,500,000, of which $1 million shall be exclusively available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service establishes or operates a health service program for any department or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment at the Clerk's desk in the name of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON]. I offer the amendment at this point.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: On page 19, line 15, after the semicolon, insert the following words: "conducting research on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing services."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment at the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON], who, because of official business is out of the city at this time. I have contacted both the minority leader as well as the majority members of the committee, and there is no objection whatsoever to this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the citation on page 19, lines 10 to 15, does not cover the language that has been omitted, and, therefore, in order to be sure these funds could be spent I would like to move insertion of the words "conducting research on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing services."

I believe also that this is the appropriate section of the bill for the language to appear.

Mr. Chairman, the expert information derived from research work done by the United States Public Health Service is urgently needed. It provides essential data for the nursing profession for determining both the nursing needs of the Nation and the educational requirements of the nurses who give the service. Very large sums of money are granted for research in the scientific fields, including medicine, but this is the only Federal money that is provided for research in nursing.

Some 30 States have made surveys with the help of the United States Public Health Service, and others are planning to make them. In the State surveys the Public Health Service furnished only the nucleus of expertness that the States do not have. These surveys determine the nursing resources and potentials in the States, including both professional and practical nurses. We can plan for what we need only when we know what we have and no one can question the need of nurses. The type of data furnished by the United States Public Health Service is the kind of material upon which the nursing organizations plan their recruitment and service programs.

The United States Public Health Service has been extremely helpful also in working up plans and procedures for making available nursing services more effective and economical. It is ready to work with nursing organizations on a national basis in initiating a nationwide plan for training of nursing aids who, though now untrained, constitute almost half of the nursing personnel in our hospitals. The Public Health Service works closely with nursing organizations in the States and Nation. Their activities are planned so that one picks up where the other leaves off.

The United States Public Health Service accumulates data from all the institutions using nurses, both public and private, and acts as a central agency for dissemination of this data. The loss of this service will be felt in all areas of the nursing profession.

The military Nursing Services, Civil Defense, and Public Health Service use the assembled data on nursing resources to aid them in their planning for effective use of available nursepower. Without this service there would exist a gap in nursing studies and research as the nursing organizations depend on the valuable guides furnished.

In conclusion may I say, the nursing problem is big enough and important enough, and affects enough other health activities to warrant a center of activity devoted solely to a solution of the many problems in this field.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the committee deleted this language from the bill because we were satisfied that it was not necessary; that the Public Health Service had authority to do these very things without this particular language. We have no objection to the language going into the bill, although I really think it is superfluous.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the amendment is accepted.

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 19, line 16, strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$34,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this is the last amendment I will offer to this bill. This has to do with the public health hospitals of our country. My amendment is $51,000 less than the so-called Eisenhower revised budget figures.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The information we have on that is that the Eisenhower budget is $33,551,000, and your figure was $34 million and something.

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will listen for just a moment, I think I can explain that, because in the language there was in the original Eisenhower budget $500,000 for the lepers in Hawaii, and the committee raised that from $500,000 to make it $1 million for the lepers in Hawaii. As a result, this amount of $34 million would leave it $51,000 less than the Eisenhower budget requested.

In the appropriation, hospitals and medical care, Public Health Service, a total of $32,500,000 is proposed for fiscal year 1954. This money is to be appropriated to the Public Health Service for the operations of its hospital and medical care program which that organization has so ably administered for so long a period of time stretching back to the beginning of our Republic. On the basis the committee report, the funds available for this program in fiscal year 1954, including anticipated reimbursements, will drop over $3½ million below fiscal year 1953, and $1,551,000 below the revised budget request for direct operations made by the Secretary of the Department. This reduction is being made in the name of economy, but in this case we are using the shibboleth of economy to penalize, if not greatly imperil, the continued operation of medical care program which has become the model among Federal hospital systems for efficiency and economy of operations.

The Public Health Service hospital system has traditionally operated its hospitals with high standards of medical care, with the lowest ratio of hospital employees to patients, the lowest per diem operating cost, and the shortest length of stay. The achievement of this hospital system has recently received recognition in a report prepared for the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs by the General Accounting Office. This is Report No. 36 of that committee submitted on April 15, 1953. In this report the General Accounting Office has made a thorough comparison of the operations of the Public Health Service hospitals with the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration and the voluntary hospitals of the Nation. In the three factors which I have mentioned above, the Public Health Service hospitals show an outstanding record. The ratio of the number of hospital employees to patients for Public Health Service hospitals shown in this report averages 1.26 in comparison with the figure of 1.60 for the Veterans' Administration hospitals and 1.83 for the private nonprofit general hospitals. Similarly, operating costs per patient day for Public Health Service hospitals during the period covered by this report averaged $14.92 in comparison with $21.32 for the Veterans' Administration hospitals and $18.47 for the private general nonprofit hospitals. Even greater credit accrues to the Public Health Service hospitals in comparison with the private nonprofit general hospitals when it is realized that data for the latter hospitals do not include the services and costs of attending physicians, which are included in calculations for Public Health Service hospitals. This record of efficiency and economy established by the Public Health Service hospitals has been achieved through careful and prudent administration of funds which the Congress has made available in the past, coupled with rigorous cutting out of unneeded and inefficient installations.

Since fiscal year 1946 the Public Health Service has closed 10 hospitals in its unceasing efforts to perform the best medical care job with the funds made available to it. At the same time, the Public Health Service medical care programs have kept pace with the tremendous strides in modern medical and hospital practice and have had to face the great demands that the rising economic spiral have made upon the limited resources available for their operation. In the past year this program suffered seriously through the action of the Congress in reducing funds available to the Veterans' Administration to reimburse the Public Health Service for care of veterans in Public Health Service hospitals. This action forced the closure of 4 Public Health Service hospitals and the reduction of staff in the remaining hospitals to a minimum which is barely sufficient to maintain safe care to patients in these hospitals. Employment in these hospitals was cut a total of 800 persons by these actions from March 1952 through February 1953. The program, struggling to recover from this serious blow, was faced with the necessity of further retrenchments under the provisions of the budget submitted by the Secretary to the current Congress. The Secretary's budget, as we were informed by Mrs. Hobby herself in Committee, would eliminate care of veteran patients in Public Health Service general and tuberculosis hospitals, and would require the closure of 2 or 3 additional hospitals and force further economies in an already overburdened activity. The Committee in reporting out the Appropriation bill has proposed that an additional $1,551,000 be cut from the resources of this program. This reduction will force the closure of 2 or 3 additional hospitals, a total of 4 to 6, and seriously hamper the Public Health Service in its responsibility to provide medical care to the beneficiaries established by law.

The Congress has directed the Public Health Service to provide medical care to the Coast Guard, to Federal employess injured at work, and to seamen on

American vessels. All of these groups are vital to the welfare and defense of the United States. A high level of medical care is essential if the Coast Guard is to carry out its manifold functions effectively, and if our shipping is to be operated efficiently. Patients of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation can be treated in Public Health Service hospitals at less cost than in outside hospitals. All of these factors argue for the maintenance of a strong, well-staffed, effective hospital system within the Public Health Service.

At the very least, a reduction of funds for this program in the amount proposed by the committee would force closure of the Public Health Service hospitals at Savannah, Ga., and at Memphis, Tenn., and would seriously cramp the work of the remaining hospitals. Savannah is the only Public Health Service hospital between Norfolk, Va., and New Orleans, La.; Memphis is the only Public Health Service general hospital between New Orleans and Chicago. Loss of these hospitals would make it very difficult for patients in Southeastern and central parts of the United States to get to a hospital when they needed care.

We can hardly expect the Public Health Service to maintain its position as the leading national health organization of the world if we continue to chip away at its very foundations. I ask that the House amend this appropriation bill to restore the operating funds for hospitals stricken from the Secretary's request, amounting to $1,551,000. I should like to emphasize that if economy is sought, if reduction in Federal expenditures is sought, if more efficient Government operation is sought, it cannot be achieved through penalizing those who have contributed so greatly to these ends in the past in operating their hospitals.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am intensely interester to see this amendment adopted. If it fails it will be necessary to close the Public Health Service Hospital at Memphis, Tenn.

This hospital was first operated as a marine hospital and was opened in 1884, or 69 years ago. This hospital is of red brick construction, on some five acres of ground overlooking the Mississippi River. The present main hospital was constructed during 1935 with a standard bed capacity of 134 patients, along modern principles of construction. The Government has an investment in this institution of slightly more than $1 million. The newer part of the hospital has been hailed as architecturally outstanding among such units in the country and is equipped with the latest and modern surgical and medical appliances.

Eligible for medical treatment are members of the Coast Guard personnel and their dependents, Federal Government employees injured in the line of duty who become Bureau of Employees' Compensation Commission beneficiaries, Coast and Geodetic Survey personnel and their dependents, Merchant Marine cadets, Public Health field service personnel, cadets of State Maritime Academies, Public Health Commission officials and their dependents, and civilian employees of the Corps of Engineers, as well as merchant seamen.

The traffic on the Mississippi River in the last two decades has increased tremendously, and the movement of grain, fuel, automobiles, steel, wire, and for that matter all classes of commodities, has increased the number of personnel who work on the boats and barges plying the river. This institution operates cheaper than any other nonprivate hospital. During this fiscal year 1953, the operating expenses of the hospital will amount to $550,000. The major portion of this money, $432,000 will go for personnel services and the remainder, $118,000 for services and supplies. In 1952, 1,265 patients were discharged from this small 134-bed institution so efficiently managed and giving the finest surgical and medical care to those admitted. In addition over 36,000 outpatients received medical care. Sixty-one percent of this total number of patients were Bureau of Employees' Compensation cases, wherein the Federal Government had a direct responsibility. These patients were United States Government employees who were injured on the job and for whom medical care had to be provided. Twenty-four percent were American seamen and Coast Guardsmen. These two categories of beneficiaries accounted for 85 percent of the hospital patients in 1952.

The hospital is staffed by 8 doctors and dentists and 20 nurses, and has a total personnel complement of 110 employees.

With all due respect to the committee, I cannot see the wisdom nor economy in closing these two general hospitals at Savannah, Ga., and Memphis, Tenn. That will mean that the average inpatient load of 99 patients per day now being handled at Memphis will have to be transferred to New Orleans, San Francisco, or Norfolk, Va. There will be no service available in the southeastern part of the country, and all qualified for admission for medical services at Memphis from the States of Arkansas, Missouri, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, North Carolina, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas will have to be transported long distances to the remaining hospitals to which I have referred.

I can see no economy in the removal of those who fall ill, or who are injured up and down that valley, and especially on the rivers where so many seamen work and where we find so many engineer employees. To me the physical risk and expense of removing them to these distant places would be far too great.

Through all its long history the Public Health Hospital in Memphis has been spared partisan political consideration. Republican and Democratic administrations alike have recognized its importance and the fine service it has given, especially to those who work on the river. In these days when all of us are interested in improving the efficiency of Federal services, in reducing waste and extravagance and the cost of those services, I do not see the wisdom in closing a 69-year-old, efficiently operated hospital for the care of the sick and injured, especially when these patients are served annually at a cost in round figures of one-half million dollars for all purposes. I urge you to vote for this amendment.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee has made a very eloquent appeal in support of his amendment and has quoted many facts and figures which I will not repeat.

The hospital in Savannah is an old institution established in 1907, 1 year prior to the year I first saw the light of day. It is a real institution in our part of the country. It has performed a wonderful service for many Federal employees who have been injured in line of duty for seamen and coastguardsmen from that southeastern area. It is in a coastal city. That is where one Public Health hospital should be. There are other areas of the country, of course, that require hospital facilities, but surely one of the greatest demands on these hospitals comes from our maritime activities.

I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that the one at Memphis is well located. The interesting thing about this problem is that the Public Health people have testified that these hospitals are economically operated. They make no complaint whatsoever about the method of operation, and their caseload has been high. It is true they are taking veterans out of these hospitals. The one at Savannah has had about 50 veterans in it. But suppose it does not run to capacity at all times, we must have available facilities. In the city of Savannah there is not a single hospital today available for the Government or the Public Health Service to contract with in order to treat Federal patients. The civilian demand upon the hospitals has been so great that patients are out in the halls of the hospitals today instead of in private rooms. Under the amendment we voted on a moment ago, a Hill-Burton hospital is scheduled for that city. It is not known whether they will get it now. I suppose we will find that out tomorrow when we take the final vote on this question.

I might point out, too, that this hospital at Savannah serves an area from Miami to Norfolk and from New Orleans to Norfolk. It is a very vital institution and deserves consideration by the Congress. If there were some mitigating circumstances that would justify its closing, that would be one thing, but in this case there are not any such circumstances.

It may be argued that these veterans coming out of the hospital will leave it below its maximum capacity.

That is true, but we never know when a disaster of some sort will occur and fill it to overcapacity. So, if it is used, 75 percent of its capacity, which I am sure it will be even with the veterans taken out, the hospital will serve a very useful need and purpose in that area. It was not the recommendation of the Public Health Service that this hospital or the one at Memphis be closed. This came as the result of committee action. The figure asked for by the Public Health Service would have prevented the closing of these two hospitals, the one in Memphis

and the one in Savannah, because they felt they could justify their existence from a priority standpoint better than they could some hospital in some other section of the country. So we appeal to you from the standpoint of fairness that this large area of the State mentioned by my distinguished colleague should not be cleared of any Federal hospital to treat Federal patients. But certainly these 2, out of the total number we have in this country, something like 18, should be retained in the southeastern part of the United States. Historically Congress has tried to operate on that basis. It has been the purpose of Congress in dealing with these programs to give area coverage and not concentrate these services in any particular section. That is why they were established that way and that is why we should maintain them today and not clear this area completely of these facilities while other sections are adequately taken care of.

Mr. Chairman, I ask support of this amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I realize that some of the Members have these hospitals in their districts, and I think they should be given time to speak on this amendment, but I wonder if we could have an agreement on time. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on amendments to this paragraph close in 10 minutes, the last 2½ minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. In Cleveland, Ohio, which is a seaport on Lake Erie, we have practically the same situation that obtains with reference to what was brought out by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]. In addition, in Cleveland, there has been a very large shortage of veteran hospital beds and this marine hospital in Cleveland has been affording 60 beds for the veterans. It seems very foolish to me to close a very modern, well equipped, up-to-date medical facility when people must obtain hospital care. There is not a sufficient number of beds available in the other voluntary public and private hospitals in that particular area. So it seems very unwise to me to close this hospital that is so fully equipped and modern when you are not saving money, because the Public Health Administration would have to make contracts with other hospitals in order to take care of that load, and the fact that there is not a sufficient number of beds available in that particular area would necessitate many of these people traveling far distances throughout the country which would add up to an unnecessary expenditure of funds, and certainly it would not be a saving.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take much of the time of the Committee. Others are to speak on this, and the time has already been fixed. I simply want to direct just a few statements to the hospitals in Memphis, Tenn., because I happen to be more familiar with that. I am sure all the others are equally meritorious.

I have been unable to find any justification from the Public Health Service or from any other source for closing down the last remaining Public Health Service hospital on the inland waters of the United States. I know also there is an extreme hospital-bed shortage in the city of Memphis, Tenn., despite the fact that today $4 million of private money is being spent in that city to expand hospital facilities. If the chairman of the subcommittee could give me one justification for closing down this hospital in Memphis, Tenn., I would like to have it, either quoting somebody or giivng his own opinion.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. May I say that the Eisenhower budget did not contain any justification for this cut. They recommended this full amount.

Mr. PRIEST. I understand the Public Health Service certainly does not recommend closing it down.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] made an important point for consideration a moment ago. This Congress itself has given the responsibility of taking care of certain categories of patients to the Public Health Service. If they cannot take care of them at Memphis, Savannah, Cleveland, and other points where those hospitals are now in operation, then they are going to have to enter into contracts to send them across the country somewhere else for their hospitalization, because Congress itself has said, "You are responsible for their hospital treatment."

Having served as chairman of the Public Health Subcommittee of my committee for a number of years and kept in close touch with this situation, frankly, the closing down of these Public Health Service hospitals to me simply does not square with good economy or sound judgment. I am willing to hear any reasonable explanation, but up to this point I have not been able to get any explanation which to me sounds reasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, permit me to say a word or two about the marine hospital at Cleveland. I shall appreciate the attention of the House.

The pending bill is a remarkable document considered from the standpoint of its effect upon the Nation's present need, is most amazing to me as it applies to the marine hospital at Cleveland. When I went to Cleveland as a young attorney to begin practice, the original marine hospital that was built on the shore of Lake Erie had served to care for the Nation's seamen for many years. It was less than 20 years ago perhaps not as long ago as that when this new marine hospital was built on the edge of Shaker Heights, where it would be pleasant for the patients because of the delightful air and pleasant outlook for the patients, as compared with the site of the original marine hospital on the shore of the lake near Ninth Street, in Cleveland.

Marine hospitals were the first means originally provided by the Federal Government for the treatment and care of seamen and others to whom it owed the duty of care. The service of the marine hospital became so popular that the marine hospital service was expanded and transformed into the Public Health Service. Marine hospitals were finally established at all important ports in the United States where it was possible to build marine hospitals. The Public Health Service as it is now known is very popular and I am reliably informed that it is the most economical hospital service in the United States today.

I have a letter here from the Secretary of the Joint Veterans' Commission. I shall not read it all, but I shall give you the names of the organizations.

This is the list: Spanish-American War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, the Polish Legion of American Veterans, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Catholic War Veterans, the Army and Navy Legion of Valor, and the Marine Corps League. They are opposed to the closing of this hospital which is in perfectly good condition, and has so well done the job for which it was originally intended that its closing is unthinkable. It has done its work in a magnificent way. The people are indignant and nonplussed at the suggestion that an institution of the high order of this one, which has only been in existence a few years, should be closed down. I urge the adoption of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, as far as the committee is concerned, it is not closing any hospitals. The application of funds to individual hospitals is left entirely to the United States Public Health Service. The four hospitals that have been mentioned today are hospitals that the Public Health Service thinks it may have to close if it does not get the full appropriation requested. As for the recommended appropriation, the amount provided in this bill is 60 percent more than the amount appropriated in 1948, and is in excess of the amount appropriated for any prior year, with the single exception of 1953. I call your attention to the hearings on page 907 dealing with the patient-load in the Public Health Service hospitals. You will see it was estimated that the number of veterans who have been in these hospitals will be reduced in 1954 by over 50 percent from the number in 1952. They were reimbursed by the Veterans' Administration for these patients. The Veterans' Administration is taking the veterans out of the Public Health Service hospitals and putting them in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. If current plans materialize, the patient-load at some hospitals will be reduced to the point where it will be uneconomical to continue their operation as Public Health Service hospitals. If these four hospitals should have to be closed, and I am not sure that all four of them will

have to be closed, they are not going to be simply junked. You have just heard a big plea here this afternoon for the Hill-Burton hospital program, and for more hospitals throughout the United States. If these hospitals are closed as Government institutions, they will be transferred to State or local agencies, or groups that can utilize them as general hospitals.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, during recent hearings on health, education, and welfare appropriations, the Public Health Service indicated it might be necessary to close the hospital at Fort Stanton, N. Mex. The reason assigned, of course, is an economy measure but I am unable to appreciate fully the logic behind the move curtailing activities at this particular hospital yet operating other hospitals in locations which are disadvantageous to rehabilitative work on tubercular patients.

This hospital was originally turned over to the Public Health Service half a century ago for tubercular patients, because it was so ideally adapted for that purpose. Everyone knows that New Mexico with its sunshine and excellent dry climate is a mecca for tuberculars. Nowhere in the country could the Government have found a better location with as good facilities and proper surroundings for that class of patients than in Fort Stanton.

Regardless of whether or not the cut made in the Public Health budget is restored or not, I am certain that upon due and careful consideration of the Public Health Service, they will conclude that this will not be 1 of the 4 hospitals which they feel must be closed. As a matter of fact we in the committee believe that with certain economies in the operation of the Public Health Service, none of these hospitals need to be closed. This is the only merchant seamen hospital in the entire southwest area, and the tubercular patients in this hospital are now living in fear that they will be transferred to some more humid climate in hospitals located around the Great Lakes, in the east coast, or in the west coast. To make sure that there will be ample funds for the Public Health Service to operate efficiently, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BUSBEY. The facts in the case are simply that the patient-load in these hospitals for 1954, according to the estimate of the Public Health Service, will be so low that it will not be economical nor efficient to operate them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be rereported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 19, line 16, strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$34,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 65, noes 77.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PRESTON and Mr. BUSBEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 73, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONG: Page 21, line 19, strike out "$1,650,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,700,000."

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, oral health problems have long been the stepchild of Congress in its efforts to assist in solving the overall health problems of our people. They should not be so. Although one does not ordinarily die of a dental disorder there is virtually no one in the entire population who is free for all of his lifetime from diseases of the oral cavity. As a matter of fact, dental caries is pandemic, affecting 95 percent of all Americans no matter where they may live. Periodontal disorders, known to the laymen as pyorrhea, probably afflict about 80 percent of the adult population. More than one-half of all persons in the country over the age of 50 wear, or should wear, a full or partial denture to replace their missing teeth. An uncounted number of individuals of the population have some malformation of the jaws which affects their ability to masticate properly and which, in many instances is a sufficiently grotesque physical characteristic as to create a social and psychological problem. The most frequent congenital defect which is found in the human race is cleft lip and palate, known better to you as harelip. Even children are not immune to dental disease and scientific studies have established that 50 percent of the children in the 2-year age group will have 1 or more decayed teeth; that by age 6, the beginning school age, each child will have at least 3 cavities and by the not-too-advanced age of 16, most adolescents, male and female, will have at least 7 teeth which are decayed, missing, or filled with at least 14 tooth surfaces involved.

I cannot parade before you the lame, the halt, and the blind, as can those who advocate funds for the more dramatic killer and crippling diseases and the dentists do not begrudge 1 cent appropriated by the Congress for the relief of humanity from the affliction of such scourges. I can only point to statistical facts about the extent of the oral health problem and hope that perhaps the memory of that forgotten toothache, the recollection of all those whom you know who wear dentures, taken together with the facts in the problem will impress upon you its universality and its seriousness.

Frankly, the dental profession of this country is becoming discouraged. For more than 100 years we have been developing our profession for the purpose of attempting to alleviate oral disorders. We have built more and more dental schools, we have trained ever-increasing numbers of dentists, but we find that we cannot keep up with the ever-accumulating backlog of dental defects which need our attention. We have spent years of our own time and vast amounts of our own money in attempting to seek means to combat the overwhelming incidence of dental disease. We have concentrated on educating the public to better mouth hygiene so that they would not have so much need for our services. Our State societies have established research foundations; our national society has established research fellowships in universities and within the very halls of government; our members have given freely of their time to study, in their spare hours, the causes and cures for dental disorders. We have done all we know how to do and as the years go by we will continue our efforts in the hope that we can do more. But outside of our own profession only a few have interested themselves in this great health problem.

For years we have supported the establishment of dental divisions in State and local health departments. For years we have supported the majority of the activities of the Dental Division of the United States Public Health Service. In 1947 we dentists were able to convince Congress of the necessity and importance of establishing a National Institute of Dental Research through which research efforts in the dental health field could be coordinated and new techniques, new methods of prevention, new cures be discovered and made known for the benefit of the public. An early result of your action in establishing that Institute was the successful coordination of years of independent research into the reaction of fluorine upon the tooth structure. Consequently, we know today that it is possible to reduce the incidence of dental caries by as much as 60 percent in the coming generation by fluoridating our community water supplies and by as much as 40 percent in areas where that method is impractical, by applying fluorine topically to the teeth of children. The Congress generously provided funds for the demonstration of that significant research result and future generations will benefit from it.

But the development of the fluorine technique is not the "be all and end all" of dental research. Innumerable problems in the periodontal diseases, in malocclusion, in the cause of caries, in the improvement of prosthetic appliances, in the use of antibiotics, and in many other dental fields await evaluation and study. The day when their solution will come

about can be speeded by adequate appropriations for the activities of the National Institute of Dental Research and the Dental Division of the Public Health Service.

The appropriations for the dental activities of the Public Health Service will not be confined in effect to the operations of that agency alone. They will directly affect the economy of the entire country, and will, in future years, affect the amount of money which it will be necessary for the Congress to appropriate for Federal treatment programs. Consider, if you will, these facts:

Today the Federal Government is spending close to $90 million a year for dental-treatment programs. Fifty million is being spent for the maintenance of such programs in the Armed Forces; more than 30 million is being expended for dental care for veterans; and the balance is spent by the Public Health Service, out of appropriations other than the one of which we speak, for treatment programs for merchant seamen, for Indians, for the United States Coast Guard, for the inmates of Federal prisons and other institutions. In addition to these sums, the public at large is spending nearly a billion dollars a year for dental treatment. Based upon a population of 150 million—and the population is now larger—that amounts to $6.66 per capita per year for dental maintenance. However, in research to reduce the problem which results in these great costs, the Federal Government for each of the past 5 years has spent on an average of only 1.1 cents per capita.

These costs can be reduced in future years by an intelligent program of research adequately financed today.

It is difficult to understand why only dental activities must bear the effect of the congressional scalpel since the committee was able to find additional millions to appropriate, over and above the revised presidential request for the cancer, mental health, heart, arthritis, and neurology institutes. Only microbiology shared with dental health in a cut from the revised request.

It is not my intention to say that the appropriations for these important activities should be reduced. I recognize their importance and applaud the Congress for its vision in providing adequate funds for them. But I do feel that there is an unjustifiable lack of proportion between the amounts annually appropriated for these more dramatic illnesses and the amount appropriated for research into the pandemic diseases of the oral cavity which also impair the efficiency, health, and comfort of human beings.

Contrast some of the differences in the scope of programs for these purposes. The proposed appropriation for dental health will permit the continuation only of the existing 36 dental research projects now supported by these funds. No additional projects can be commenced until those now under study are completed. But as against 36 dental research projects there are 111 existing projects in arthritis and metabolic diseases, 207 projects in microbiology, 140 projects in neurology and blindness, 114 projects in mental health activities, and 430 projects in cancer. Contrast the 14 dental research fellowships now in existence and to be continued without increase with the 178 fellowships for cancer, the 74 fellowships for mental health activities, the 130 fellowships for heart research, the 38 fellowships for arthritis, the 45 fellowships for microbiology, and the 36 fellowships for neurology, and determine for yourself if an adequate effort is being supported with respect to oral diseases.

I recommend that the House increase the total budget for dental health activities to the $2,700,000 originally requested. This will amount to an expenditure of 1.8 cents for each member of the population, less than the present cost of a postcard. This would permit an increase in the number of research fellowships and research dental projects; it would permit the continuation at the present level of the regional activities of the dental division of the Public Health Service which provide technical assistance to the dental health divisions in each of your States. It would permit the undertaking of studies to determine the extent of malocclusion and cleft palate and the making of grants to universities for the construction of necessary research facilities.

I ask your support of the amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. Chairman, this illustrates the point I have often made back in the District, in talking to nonpolitical organizations, such as the Kiwanis, the Lions, and the church organizations: That the House of Representatives is the greatest cross section of American life in the whole United States. Every group is represented, whether it is labor, industry, agriculture, mining, cattle raising, the medical, dental, or any other profession you may name. I can appreciate the concern of my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], but let me point out 1 or 2 things. This is the same amount that was appropriated last year, $1,650,000.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. May I make just the observation that there has never been a sufficient amount appropriated to carry on decent dental research in the United States of America.

Mr. BUSBEY. I appreciate the gentleman's interest for his profession. However, I thought that, if the committee was going to be criticized, it would be criticized for providing too much in this bill, inasmuch as we recommended no reduction below last year. This amendment would increase the appropriation from $1,650,000 to $2,700,000, which was the original estimate in the Truman budget. But do not forget that, in the Truman budget, there was $500,000 for construction, which the Department did not even request.

Further, the personnel of this institute are spending too much of their time running around the country trying to sell communities on the fluoridation of water. The institute has 102 technical dental employees, with 52 automobiles, traveling all over the Nation.

I think the committee has been exceedingly generous, and I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: Page 32, line 18, after the parenthesis strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and including in said definition employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 percent of the water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know there is no opposition to this amendment. The bill has for some time carried the language which is the proviso on page 32. There was some misunderstanding as to how that applies with regard to ditch riders who are employed by the farmers in the operation of mutually-owned and operated canals and irrigation systems. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ], who is familiar with it, and a member of the committee. If there are any questions I should be happy to attempt to answer them.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Will this help put water on the land?

Mr. BUDGE. Well, I do not know that it will do that but it brings the ditch rider, who is in a basic agricultural occupation, within the same category as all agricultural employees as far as the National Labor Relations Act is concerned.

Mr. JENSEN. They are not agricultural workers.

Mr. BUDGE. Oh, I think they are. The only thing that they do is to assist in getting water on the land. Each irrigation district employs maybe 3 or 4 men who go up and down the ditches and keep the water in them and to raise the headgates.

Mr. JENSEN. Has the Department of Agriculture ever designated this group of employees as agricultural workers?

Mr. BUDGE. I believe that they have always been understood to be agricultural workers because they do nothing except act in furtherance of agricultural pursuits.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am in full agreement with the gentleman's amendment. I think it is a very necessary amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to say that I am in full accord with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho and I would like to have him know that the

farmer from Chicago concurs in his amendment.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am happy to rise and speak on behalf of the medical research activities at the National Institutes of Health.

In reading some of the testimony of the Director of that research program, I found a statement dealing with hardening of the arteries. As all of you know, this disease—which strikes down so many men in their prime of life, including an unfortunately large number of Members of this House—is one for which there is no known cause or cure. Dr. Sebrell quoted from a summary article on this disease, placed in the Journal of the American Medical Association by an important member of our great pharmaceutical industry. The article reports in part on the work of Drs. Anfinson, Boyle, and Brown, all of the National Heart Institute, one of the National Institutes of Health. Few among us would be interested in the technical scientific description of their research. But all of us can interpret this kind of direct quote:

The work—

Of these scientists—

is a tour de force of the canniest reasoning and most arduous analytic techniques to appear in decades.

As I understand it, there are over 300 such research projects going on out there in the Public Health Service laboratories in Bethesda, Md. Many of them will pay off; some of them will not. There is no way to tell which will bring an important finding and which will lead you up a blind alley. We can only give brilliant and dedicated men both good facilities and an intellectually stimulating climate—and wait, knowing that in the future as in the past, medical research will pay rich dividends.

I would like to quote from Dr. Howard Rusk, Chairman of the Health Resources Advisory Board under both President Truman and President Eisenhower, and an eminent authority on rehabilitation. He wrote in the New York Times describing how medical research saves dollars as well as human lives:

In the period between 1937 and 1950, the death rate in the United States declined 15 percent, largely because of the sulfa drugs and antibiotics. This decline represents a saving of 1,753,347 lives, for if the 1937 death rate of 11.3 had prevailed through 1950; this many more people would have died.

This decline has resulted in the addition of an estimated $2,500,000,000 in earning to the national income. As a result of this additional income, the Federal Government has gained an additional $165 million in Federal income taxes each year, plus the revenues gained through other types of taxes.

Dr. Rusk will vouch for his statistics. But evidently, medical research yielding better health does have a major effect on the national economy. The same writer then goes on to comment on the matter now under consideration before this House:

The new administration is now engaged in a restudy of the budget for the next fiscal year, with the announced objective of making substantial cuts wherever possible. Few people will disagree with this highly desirable objective. Such cuts, however, should be selected and not aimed at programs such as medical research, which pay dividends in both lives and dollars.

The Congress of the United States has made substantial contributions to the development of medical research through its appropriations to the National Institutes of Health over the years, but particularly since World War II. During the 5-year period from 1947 to 1952, the research grant, fellowship, training, and other grant activities were increased to $34.5 millions, and the direct laboratory and field research programs were increased to $13 millions.

Any period of rapid expansion, whether industrial or governmental, creates extreme administrative problems. Caution needs to be exercised to see that administrative costs do not rise disproportionately, along with a sacrifice in quality of research.

Management experts tell us that growing organizations need to pay constant attention to the economy of their administrative structure, a premise with which I agree. Knowing that the National Institutes of Health has expanded rapidly, I have made inquiry into its administrative and indirect costs. I found to my pleasure that the program has maintained a high degree of productivity, with a steady decrease in the relative amounts of funds needed for administration.

On its direct operations, administrative costs have been reduced from 8.5 percent in 1950 to only 6.3 in the revised 1954 budget estimate.

These figures convinced me that the National Institutes of Health is running an efficient operation, comparing favorably with the best of private industries and universities engaged in research. I think that every Member of this House should be satisfied that here is a program in which the taxpayer gets value received for his dollar expenditure.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in connection with this bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in considering the Appropriations Committee's recommendations for the National Institutes of Health, the Congress knows that more than two-thirds of its funds are invested in the Nation's medical schools, universities, and research institutions in the form of grants for research and related activities. These grants constitute participation and support in areas for which adequate non-Federal funds are not available—specific research projects, increased medical and scientific manpower, improved research facilities.

It is support that means the difference between whether a very large portion of the good medical research of the country will be done or not. It is a complementary support which makes possible many, if not the majority, of the medical research advances against our greatest killers, the chronic diseases that we read of in the press. Without these funds, the work would not be done. It means, in short, the difference between progress and stagnation in research against our Nation's leading causes of death and disability.

In administering the grants program, the National Institutes of Health has developed a system which brings the best brains in medical and other sciences to bear on matters of policy and the selection on projects to be supported—and it does this without restricting scientific freedom. Twenty-five percent of all research in the Nation's medical schools last year received grant assistance from the Public Health Service. The schools and the scientists have many times attested that the grants are administered not merely in a satisfactory, but in a highly praiseworthy manner.

The Congress is always interested in the costs of administering such a program. We have heard on the floor of this House many times in the last few days debate on overhead and administration items. The cost of administering the grants program at the National Institutes of Health in 1952 was only 3.15 percent.

It is illuminating to compare these figures with those for non-Federal organizations of similar purpose—the support of research. The Ford Foundation, for example, spent 9.2 percent of its money for administration in 1952; the Commonwealth Fund, 15.5 percent; the Field Foundation, 6.8 percent; and the Rockefeller foundation, 10.3. These figures are not extremes, but represent reasonable costs of operating grant-support programs through private sources.

Low as the National Institutes of Health's figure for grant administration is, it could be still lower if we directed them to sacrifice the soundness, the truly national character of their program by restricting their scientific reviewing groups, advisory council members, and other consultants to a small eastern area. The cost of administering this program could be further reduced by leaving its direction and control in the hands of a few Federal employees, transfixed behind desks in Washington, a truly bureaucratic program.

That, ladies and gentlemen, would be a grave error. The strength of this research program and the validity of this method of research support lie in the fact that an amount of money designated by Congress is allocated solely on the basis of the merit of the projects. Determination is made entirely on the basis of advice and recommendations of prominent scientists, aided by competent and interested laymen on the advisory councils, all drawn from every part of our country.

This program, which stands as a landmark in the use of Federal grants for the ultimate good of the American people, is vital to all of us. I know that this House will not take any action to place it in jeopardy.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 10 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H. R. 5246.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN SCHOOL PROPERTIES TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS OR PUBLIC AGENCIES

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1242) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "tribe" insert ": *Provided further*, That no more than twenty acres of land shall be transferred under the terms of this act in connection with any single school property conveyed to State or local governmental agencies or to local school authorities."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOTMENT OF LANDS OF THE CROW TRIBE

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1244) to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and for other purposes," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 6, after "sold" insert ", or patents in fee may be issued therefor."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MAY 22, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before the Grand Jury of said court in reference to an investigation of possible violation of 18 U. S. C. 1001, and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicates that the Clerk may not, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very truly yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES IN RE INVESTIGATION OF POSSIBLE VIOLATION OF 18TH UNITED STATES CODE, PAGE 1001—GRAND JURY ORIGINAL

The President of the United States to Hon. Lyle Snader, Clerk of the House of Representatives, room P42, United States Capitol Building:

(And bring with you: All clerk-hire forms and other papers relating to employees of Congressman ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT and their employment, including payroll records during the period of Mr. BRAMBLETT's service as a Member of the House of Representatives.)

(Please report to Assistant United States Attorney William Hitz or Assistant United States Attorney William Becker, room 3400G, New Courthouse Building.)

You are hereby commanded to attend before the grand jury of said court on Thursday, the 28th day of May 1953, at 9:15 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the Court without leave of the Court or District Attorney.

Witness: The Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 21st day of May 1953.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL, *Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 245) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in re investigation of possible violation of 18th United States Code, page 1001, a subpena duces tecum was issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and addressed to Lyle Snader, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear before the grand jury of said court on Thursday, the 28th day of May 1953, at 9:15 a'clock antemeridian to testify and to bring with him certain forms, papers, and records in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Lyle O. Snader, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the grand jury of the court named in the subpena duces tecum beforementioned, but shall not take with him any papers, documents, or records on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers, documents, and records called for in the subpena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceedings and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any papers, documents, or records and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such papers, documents, or records in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, so as, however, the possession of said papers, documents, and records by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena duces tecum aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN RE: INVESTIGATION OF POSSIBLE VIOLATION OF 18TH UNITED STATES CODE, PAGE 1001

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays on the desk a communication which the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1953.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the United States District Court for the District of Columbia I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to appear before the Grand Jury of said court as a witness in re investigation of possible violation of 18 U. S. C. 1001 and to bring with me certain records therein described.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicate that the Sergeant at Arms may not either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum produce such records without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of the records without such consent.

The subpena in question is herewith attached and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM F. RUSSELL,
Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES—IN RE INVESTIGATION OF POSSIBLE VIOLATION OF 18TH UNITED STATES CODE, PAGE 1001—GRAND JURY ORIGINAL

The President of the United States to Hon. William E. Russell, Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol Building:

(And bring with you: All records of Government checks cashed by your office for Congressman ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT or any of his employees during the period of Mr. BRAMBLETT's service as a Member of the House of Representatives.)

(Please report to Assistant United States Attorney William Hitz or Assistant United States Attorney William Becker, room 3400G, New Courthouse Building.)

You are hereby commanded to attend before the grand jury of said court on Thursday, the 28th day of May 1953, at 9:15 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness: The Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 21st day of May 1953.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk,*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 246) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in re investigation of possible violation of 18th United States Code, page 1001, a subpena duces tecum was issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and addressed to William E. Russell, Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear before the grand jury of said court on Thursday, the 28th day of May 1953 at 9:15 o'clock antemeridian to testify and to bring with him certain records in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That William F. Russell, Sergeant at Arms of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the grand jury of the court named in the subpena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Sergeant at Arms of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers and the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of said Sergeant at Arms that the court has found to be material and relevant, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Sergeant at Arms shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Sergeant at Arms; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena duces tecum aforementioned.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCE SOCIAL SECURITY AGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ARENDS]. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the millions of American men and women between the ages of 55 and 65 who, in my opinion, are being penalized by an arbitrary decision made in 1935, when the eligibility age under old-age and survivors insurance was set at 65 years. The choice of age 65 may have been a good guess 18 years ago, when the Social Security Act was passed. However, I am convinced that, for our times, it is unrealistic, outmoded, and too frequently discriminatory. I urge your attention, therefore, to my bill, H. R. 1922, which would make old-age and survivors insurance benefits payable at age 55 for women and at age 60 for men instead of the present age of 65.

Several years ago, while a member of the New York State Senate, I became convinced that the eligibility age should be lowered. I introduced resolutions memorializing Congress to act. I talked to men and women disabled by a crippling illness at 55 or 60. I talked to other older workers who had been laid off from their jobs during the retooling period, and have found it practically impossible to get another job because of their age. I talked to widows who had been told that they must wait until they reached age 65 before they could receive the benefits to which their husband's work record entitled them.

All of these people, remember, had been paying into the retirement fund regularly and were fully entitled to benefits. All of them were in need of benefits because of an act of fate over which they had little or no control. And all of them had been told that it was too bad—but that they must wait until they reached their 65th birthday before they would be entitled to the benefits for which they had paid during their working life.

Now I know that some of the statisticians who talk about people only in terms of overall figures, are inclined to write off the kind of personal disaster I have been describing with the argument that we must see the broad picture. I have, therefore, gone into this situation myself. And I am happy to report that the people I have spoken to were right—that the facts of our time suggest the wisdom of lowering the eligibility age from 65 to 55 for women and 65 to 60 for men just as convincingly as do the stories of individual hardship which have been told to me.

Mr. Speaker: With your permission, then, I should like to discuss briefly some of these facts of our time which argue for my proposal. First of all, there is the fact that the choice of age 65 was made at a time when we had had little experience with retirement plans. It was also made before we had any idea of the tremendous productive capacity of our country which has been dramatically demonstrated during the wartime years and since. By and large it was a mathematical choice—an age picked arbitrarily, as I have said.

It is clear that a retirement system such as old-age and survivors insurance must use some such arbitrary figure. It must have such a figure both from the standpoint of its own operation, and because the American worker is entitled to know in advance the target date around which he can, if possible, make his own supplementary retirement plans. My point here, then, is that we must now reevaluate that decision made 18 years ago in the light of our experience with the system, and our development as a Nation. And I am convinced that the record of the old-age and survivors plan, the experience of the people entitled to its benefits, and the industrial development and increased productivity of our country dictate the wisdom of adopting a more realistic retirement age. My own conviction, as outlined in H. R. 1922, is that it should be lowered to age 55 for women and age 60 for men—and I believe this important improvement can and should be made in this Congress.

The second clear fact of our time which calls for this legislation grows out

of the evidence that the very genius of our productivity is shortening the work life of most Americans very decisively. We are faced with the fact that the miracles of modern American industrialism and of business expansion have made it possible for us to produce more than we had ever dreamed we could produce, at the same time that the number of man-hours required per unit of production is being sharply reduced.

How has this happened? Let me remind you of just a few reasons why we can produce more goods with relatively fewer workers. Counting all of us, young and old, the average American is 31 years old. In these last 31 years, the total electric utility capacity of the country has grown from 13½ million kilowatts of power to about 80 million kilowatts. Electricity is one of the major reasons why the slow, cumbersome, hand-tool method used in industry throughout the country's first 130 years has been replaced today by equipment which tends to be automatic, with electric motors and electronic tubes.

One somewhat dramatic example of the way machines are replacing manpower is a new paper-making machine completed last year. Each one of those machines can turn out 9 square feet of paper annually for every man, woman, and child on the earth. And only a small crew of technicians is needed to press the right buttons at the right time to start each of these giant machines.

Or take another example which is more broadly representative of what has happened just since World War II to reduce manpower requirements. The machine tools brought out since 1947 are rated 40 percent more productive per machine, on the average, than prewar models. Translated into human terms, this simply means that with the same number of new-model machines, a manufacturer can now get 40 percent more production with the same—or a smaller—number of workers.

So much for the statistical story of our progress. What does it mean in terms of people? In a period of full production such as this, most workers displaced by these new machines will be able to find other jobs in those lines of activity where new jobs are opening up. But for one group of workers—the older group—this change of jobs is especially difficult even in today's tight labor market. For if you are a woman of 55 or a man of 60 years today and lose your job, the chances are that you will have trouble finding another one.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making, of course, is that this magnificent industrial development need not be a fearsome specter striking fear into the hearts of our older workers. Instead, we must wake up to the fact that because of this industrial progress, most of us can retire earlier to make room for younger people. And remember that in this shorter working life, with the aid of machines, we have also produced more than our fathers or our grandfathers could if they worked to the end of their days. Surely this fact of our time alone calls for a re-evaluation of our retirement system. By lowering the retirement age to 55 for women and 60 for men, we will simply be bringing it up to date with modern conditions.

But, someone will say, if you lower the retirement age to 55 for women and 60 for men, everybody will retire at that age and you will simply be adding to the existing manpower shortage. For the answer to that objection, let us look at the evidence which our existing system has produced. According to the records of the old-age and survivors insurance system, most workers who have filed their claims for old-age insurance benefits did so because they lost their jobs or were no longer able to continue working. Studies of old-age insurance beneficiary retirements between 1940 and 1947 show that only about 5 percent of the men and women entitled to old-age benefits in those years left their jobs of their own accord, in good health, to enjoy a life of leisure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make that point very clear because it emphasizes the fact that what we really would be doing, in reducing the eligibility age, is to reach down 5 years for men, 10 years for women, to provide the security needed by those veterans of our labor force who, through no fault of their own, are unable to work at that age. Remember that most people who are able to work will not drop out of the labor force at the earlier ages automatically—if only because most of them would not choose to exchange today's pay check for an old-age and survivors insurance benefit which now averages only $57 per month for the primary beneficiary.

It is, then, with those men between 60 and 65, and those women between 55 and 65, who have been forced from the labor market either because they cannot get jobs, or because they have suffered a disabling illness, that my bill is chiefly concerned. As I have suggested, all evidence shows that job opportunities for older workers are decreasing simultaneously with the expansion of our economy. One way to test this out is to look at the want-ad section in any large newspaper. Take a look at the help-wanted columns and you will notice the age limitations:

Wanted: Clerk-typists under 30; salesmen, under 40; power machine operators, under 35.

Recent reports have shown that men and women lose their jobs after spending most of their work-life with one employer. According to the reports, men over 45 with the longest work record of this kind frequently have the greatest difficulty finding new jobs. They have worked so long—and therefore so satisfactorily—for one employer that they have had no experience in looking for work. Accustomed to self-sufficiency and acceptance, they find the repeated experience of being refused a job—because they are now too old—a very shattering experience.

Mr. Speaker, studies have shown that employers who may keep older workers who are already on their payrolls, put strict age limits when hiring new workers. For example, a study by the United States Bureau of Employment Security during the first 6 months of 1950 showed that most employers in all fields of work, place age restrictions at below 45 for men and at below 35 for women. And, tragically enough, at the same time about one-third of all persons applying for employment are 45 years of age and over. This evidence that older workers are the first casualties in the labor market is, in my opinion, just one more reason why they should become entitled to the retirement benefit they have earned at an earlier age, instead of having to wait until age 65 at a time of their life when they are least able to find, or to hold, another job.

As I have said, any arbitrary age for eligibility will impose some hardship. But I do maintain that the hardship will be greatly lessened if benefits are made available 5 years earlier for men, or 10 years earlier for women, for the older workers who are the casualties of modern production because of the nature of their jobs.

Equally important, in this respect, are the men and women who must quit work because of a disabling illness. All of us know that a crippling disease is no respecter of persons or age. We know, too, that these crippling diseases are more likely to occur as we grow older, and that the most indispensable worker with the best chance for staying long years in the labor market, is always subject to the hazard of being forced to retire because of heart disease, arthritis, or another chronic or disabling handicap of this sort. If we can say to these women workers who have reached age 55, or to the men workers of 60, "You are entitled right now to the benefit you have earned," we shall have gone a long way toward meeting this problem in a realistic and humane way.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you another example. Women are not entitled to benefits—as workers, as the wives of workers, or as the widows of workers—until they reach age 65 under our existing system. This is a special hardship on the aged widows and dependent mothers of wage-earners who have died. Women aged 55 and over, find it practically impossible to get a job unless they have been recently employed. You and I know that the dread angel of death has no regard for age-qualifications or for circumstances. We know women widowed at 55 who, to the tragedy of bereavement and of being alone in the world, have the added necessity of trying to support themselves.

If the bereaved widow has never had a job, or if she has long been out of the labor market because she was primarily a home-maker, her problem of sustaining herself is one of tragic proportions. Under the existing law, she will be entitled to a benefit if her husband was covered for old-age insurance—but not until she has reached age 65. If she was widowed at age 55, she must wait 10 years. If she has no children, and if she is unable to find work—either because of inexperience or ill health—she often has no recourse but public relief. My bill would move in immediately—at the time of bereavement and when the need is greatest—to protect the widows of fully or currently-insured workers if they are age 55 or over.

We know that the average age difference between husbands and wives is 2½

years. We know, too, that even if they have had work experience, women usually must retire from their jobs earlier than men. And we know that women are less likely to have learned those technical skills which make it possible for many men to remain in the employment market. One of the strongest arguments for my bill, in my opinion, is the added security it offers to women workers, and especially to the widows of workers who have died.

As our society has moved away from its agricultural past to become more productive of goods and more complex as to their distribution, the security of the individual has been threatened. Not so long ago in the history of our country there was no retirement problem, chiefly because most of the people were either self-employed or living on farms. Even today, older persons who are self-employed or on farms can usually make their own decision as to whether they will continue to work. The pace and the amount of work they can or should do make the line between being at work and in retirement much less clear cut than it is in industry.

But most of us today are not so fortunate. Census figures show the long-term decline of farming as an occupation, and the expansion of jobs, such as semi-skilled operators, clerical workers, and sales workers. In the 1950 census, farmers constituted only 7.5 percent of the population.

We are here concerned, then, not with the condition of the country in 1910—or in 1935—but with the situation today—in 1953. We are faced with the fact that the miracles of modern industrialism and of business expansion have made it possible for us to produce more than we had ever dreamed we could produce—and that by working less.

We know that, in the last analysis, the security of the individual depends upon the success of industry and agriculture in producing more and better goods and services. But we know, too, that the very success of our way of life—which in creating opportunities also increases risks—calls for greater protection against some of the economic hazards I have described.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this protection should be made available on terms which reinforce the interest of the individual in helping himself. And for this reason—if for no other reason—we must be prepared to build a social-security system which will encourage production and efficiency, make way for younger workers, and encourage a way of life which, in the democratic pattern, produces the maximum of economic progress and individual security. For the reasons which I have just outlined I believe that by the relatively simple method of lowering the eligibility age from 65 to 55 for women and from 65 to 60 for men we shall have moved a long step in that direction.

I urge your early and earnest consideration for my bill, H. R. 1922, because it would help to accomplish this great purpose.

WILBUR WRIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in this 50th anniversary year of American aviation, I wish to call attention to the fact that my native State of Indiana is paying special tribute to its son, Wilbur Wright.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that famous as the name should be and is, the Wright brothers are not so well known in the matter of their origin. Almost every schoolboy in this broad land can tell you that they flew their flimsy plane at Kitty Hawk. Many citizens, too, can account for their construction of the first plane at Dayton. Not so many are aware of their creative boyhoods—years of mechanical tinkering and experimental study, while the family in the course of the father's church work, lived first at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and later at Richmond, Ind. Only aviation's most fervent fans and the historians of our air age can recite with accuracy the place and year of the brothers' nativity.

Wilbur Wright, the third son of the Reverend and Mrs. Milton Wright, was born April 16, 1867, on a modest farm near Millville, Henry County, Ind. It is, I trust, with pardonable pride that I take these few minutes to eulogize a famous neighbor, who came into the world within 10 miles of my own lifelong home.

This year Indiana is determined to make clear its claim to Wilbur Wright. There is functioning now a Wilbur Wright Memorial Commission, authorized by the 1953 session of the Indiana General Assembly, its officers and members named by Indiana's governor. The commission, I hasten to add parenthetically, is costing the taxpayers nothing. It is without funds from the Indiana treasury, but abundantly endowed by its personnel with enthusiasm, State pride, and imagination. It proposes to establish on a neglected 5 acres, once the Wright family home, a permanent memorial worthy of a great American. In this laudable undertaking it can properly ask the support of all people who want to keep imperishable the name and renown of the Wright brothers.

A question might be raised of why Indiana has been so long in asserting its share of the glory won by a native son. On that question I cannot pose as an authority, but long association with Hoosiers and their way of doing provides me a plausible clue. Indiana, you will find, builds most of its memorials in the hearts and minds of men. It is there we largely repose a Nation's appreciation of our celebrated authors—Lew Wallace, Charles Major, Gene Stratton Porter, Eggleston, Ade, and Tarkington, to recall a few.

Our only outstanding monument to the poet Riley is a hospital where crippled children may be restored to useful living. Our monument to Lincoln—he spent 7 years of his formative youth in Indiana—is a building downstate that he himself would have sanctioned, a memorial to his mother.

Indiana, too, as frequently acknowledged, has contributed more than its share to the American saga of statecraft. Again Hoosiers rely upon the public memory to fix a place for the measure of immortality that should go to such sons as Morton, Harrison, Tom Marshall, Charles Fairbanks, and James Goodrich, to Ralston and Taggart, Beveridge, and Watson.

In the brief time at my disposal, Mr. Speaker, it would be futile to attempt to pay the recognition fully deserved by either Wilbur Wright or the noted Indiana citizens who have been enlisted to make his birth site a national shrine. Nonetheless, I should feel remiss in this privilege of addressing the House were I to omit the names of those who are foremost in furthering the work of the Indiana Wilbur Wright Commission. Moreover, I am prompted to mention an event which has so recently added impetus to the Hoosier observation of this golden anniversary of the airplane.

Yesterday at the National Airport the Indiana State Society of Washington devoted its annual breakfast-luncheon tribute meeting to the memory of Wilbur Wright, and to the pioneering aerial exploits of a living Hoosier, Robert Shank. Among the distinguished persons gathered to honor Bob Shank—he is the sole survivor among four pilots who first flew in the United States Airmail Service—were Postmaster General Summerfield; Chairman Oswald Ryan, of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Administrator Lee, of the Civil Aeronautics Commission; and United States Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART. Our master of ceremonies was our esteemed majority leader, CHARLES A. HALLECK.

Present, too, at the Wright-Shank honor brunch was a gentleman who is seated in our House gallery at this moment. He is not only my longtime friend but my successor as Henry County's representative in the Indiana Legislature. He authored the joint resolution which made it possible for Gov. George N. Craig to name and activate the Wright Memorial Commission. To this gentleman, Clem Conway, cooperating with a citizens' movement sponsored by the chamber of commerce of New Castle, Ind., and its able secretary, Charles Weaver, must go much credit for the achievement now in sight.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to place in the RECORD, under extension of remarks, the following:

Text of the Conway resolution, names of more than 30 citizens who, headed by Col. Roscoe Turner, of Indianapolis, are serving as members of the Indiana commission, and the names of those serving on the Henry County citizens' subcommittees to the State commission.

I spoke of the achievement now in sight. With the further kind indulgence of my colleagues, I should like to elaborate that point and conclude my remarks within the time allotted me.

Surely the Wright brothers came to fame as members of a typically obscure Midwest family whose beginnings left no impress upon a country's history. The records I have read show that the elder

Wrights descended from American pioneer stock—neither rich nor at all times poor, but more than casually dedicated to the cause of Christianity. Aside from books, I remember that in the latter days of life, brother Orville revealed the influence religion had played in the reflections of two men acclaimed for their engineering genius. At that time, in a rare press interview, he expressed regret for man's use of the flying machine. He said he devoutly wished the airplane had never been employed as a weapon of warfare. Later it was reported that he died with a prayer on his lips that in years to come the planes of this and all other nations might be devoted to travel, trade, commerce, and research—to all honorable pursuits of peace, but to none of the brutality and destruction of war.

The history of the Wright brothers, as coinventors of the airplane, entails several chapters which we, as Americans, can scarcely regard with pride. It is certain, for example, that long before our Nation and Government properly recognized their authenticated claim to the foremost place in aviation's hall of fame, they were accepted, assisted, and acclaimed by France and by England.

Much of the controversy that once plagued these inventors—men too shy and sensitive to press their right to eminence—has faded from memory. Under happier circumstances their plane can be viewed today by thousands at Smithsonian, and their names are honored throughout the civilized world.

It seems to me that the Indiana Wilbur Wright Memorial Commission is entitled to, and will be rewarded with, the approval of all Americans. Precisely how the Commission will strive to establish the memorial—whether by public or private subscription, or ultimately by a grant of tax moneys—I cannot pretend to know. Whatever procedure is adopted, I feel that neither my home county of Henry, my native State of Indiana, nor this the most powerful of sovereign nations can afford to neglect the memory of brothers who pioneered the miracle of aviation. If not to ourselves, we owe it to our children and theirs to perpetuate those places—be they humble or pretentious—where genius was conceived and came alive in the birth of a child.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JENKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW his remarks to be made in Committee of the Whole later today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY in five instances.

Mr. BAILEY and to include an article by Congresswoman KEE on the recent atomic blast.

Mr. ALBERT the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY in three instances and to include certain reports.

Mr. BUSBEY to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRIS and to include a resolution.

Mr. GWINN.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include an article.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include an article.

Mr. RABAUT at the point requested in Committee of the Whole and to include a telegram.

Mr. THORNBERRY, the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PRICE in five instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE in three instances and to include editorials and extraneous matter.

Mr. HARVEY and to include a resolution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DEROUNIAN, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Tibor Kalman Jalsoviczky;

H. R. 782. An act for the relief of Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen;

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani;

H. R. 1243. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16);

H. R. 1563. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee and for other purposes;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch;

H. R. 2364. An act to terminate restrictions against alienation on land owned by William Lynn Engles and Maureen Edna Engles;

H. R. 2420. An act for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk;

H. R. 2667. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom;

H. R. 2990. An act to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States;

H. R. 3042. An act for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco;

H. R. 3389. An act for the relief of Pio Valensin;

H. R. 3406. An act to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; and

H. R. 4605. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 26, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

716. A letter from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the Administrator's report which is the first part of the annual report of the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

717. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide certain construction and other authority for the military departments in time of war or national emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

718. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the annual report of the Department of the Air Force, covering the disposal of Air Force excess personal property located in areas outside the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for the calendar year 1952, pursuant to section 404 (d), title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 22, 1953, the following bill was reported on May 23, 1953:

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5376. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 25, 1953]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 244. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5376. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5275. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without

amendment (Rept. No. 452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 454. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 455. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5349. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to W. C. Pallmeyer and E. M. Cole; without amendment (Rept. No. 453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 22, 1953, the following bill was introduced on May 23, 1953:

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5376. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[Introduced and referred May 25, 1953]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5377. A bill to rescind the authorization for construction of Libby Dam project, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 5378. A bill to amend section 124 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 5379. A bill to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 5380. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 5381. A bill to provide a government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5382. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to deductions from gross income of amounts contributed to profit-sharing trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the 7th day of March of each year be known and designated in the several States as Friendship Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to leave local control and direction of the internal affairs of the Tennessee Valley Authority to the Board of Directors of the Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to renegotiation of contracts between the United States and public agencies for water supply from the Central Valley project of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the enactment of Federal dangerous drug controls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the necessary Federal aid to maintain the central and southern Florida flood-control project; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the preliminary report of the Illinois-Mississippi Canal Sinnissippi Lake Commission, and Senate joint resolution relating thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to transfer all the buildings and land of the Fort Robinson Military Reservation to the State of Nebraska for the use of its agencies for agricultural study and experiment, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to include rice and taro grown in the Territory under the Federal agricultural price-support program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands to exchange certain public lands for private lands of equal value required by the city and county of Honolulu for school purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for new post office buildings in the county of Kauai; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Internal Revenue Code to permit sugar planters to spread income attributable to their industry over a period of several years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 5383. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Merlini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5384. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Oren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 5385. A bill for the relief of Noble Jordan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 5386. A bill for the relief of Mary D. Rauch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 5387. A bill for the relief of Albert Lest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 5388. A bill for the relief of Richard Steinmetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 5389. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarita Cordero Bolin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 5390. A bill for the relief of Edward Lawrence Lynch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 5391. A bill for the relief of Carmella Bianchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5392. A bill for the relief of George Serailian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 5393. A bill providing for the extension of Patent No. 2,047,615, issued July 14, 1936, relating to balanced valves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 5394. A bill for the relief of Fritz Hans Engelmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

282. Petition by the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, American Industrial Arts Association, Oswego, N. Y., relative to a resolution adopted by the American Industrial Arts Association at Detroit, Mich., on May 2, 1953, calling for the restoration of the appropriations which are absolutely essential to make the United States Office of Education an effective agency for the discharge of its very important duties; to the Committee on Appropriations.

283. Also, petition of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., relative to endorsing the principles of Senate Joint Resolution 1, known as the Bricker resolution, which provides a treaty or executive agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

284. Also, petition of Thomas Costello and 1,278 others, Brooklyn, N. Y., requesting the enactment of H. R. 4308, providing for a special canceling stamp bearing the words "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

285. Also, petition of Mrs. Florence Lopes, Ladies Auxiliary of the Andrew King Post Veterans of Foreign Wars, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., relative to recording their vigorous protest against the reduction of the appropriations to be made by the Congress of the United States to the Veterans' Administration, so that the health and welfare of our veterans may be properly safeguarded; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1953

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 21, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. W. C. Fields, pastor, First Baptist Church, Yazoo City, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, our hearts are still and quiet for a moment before Thee—quiet in solemn acknowledgement of Thy sovereignty, quiet in full awareness of the presence of the thrice holy God.

Grant to Thy servants who wait before Thee here today a deep sense of humility and a continuing attitude of dependence upon divine leadership and power.

In the alternating currents and the changing patterns of this our time, this golden age of opportunity, give to all of us stability of mind, clarity of purpose, and courage for our convictions.

May the Divine Spirit so direct our lives this day that in the things we do and say, and by the very meditations of our hearts, we may conduct ourselves as good citizens of our country and the kingdom of God.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 25, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1324) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1242. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies; and

H. R. 1244. An act to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes."

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2969. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls;

H. R. 3087. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3796. An act relating to the incorporation of the Columbus University of Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 4229. An act to change the name of the Polycultural Institution of America to Polycultural University of America, to grant a congressional charter to such university, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4484. An act to amend section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of assets of a decedent's estate for funeral expenses;

H. R. 4485. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to publication of partnerships;

H. R. 4486. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer;

H. R. 4487. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as further amended by an act of April 19, 1920 (title 20, ch. 1, sec. 116, D. C. Code, 1951), relating to continuing decedent's business;

H. R. 4550. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property; and

H. R. 4940. An act to provide for the redemption of District of Columbia tax stamps.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1242. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies; and

H. R. 1244. An act to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes."

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and through June 23, in order that he may attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, to which he has been appointed a delegate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate after today, for the remainder of the week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to meet this afternoon and every afternoon up to and including June 15, during the sessions of the Senate. I may say that the subcommittee has a number of witnesses scheduled and is working hard to conclude its hearings by that time, but certainly we will be subject to the call of the Chair at any time important business requires our attendance in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. THYE, and by unanimous consent, the Labor and Federal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. BENNETT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXEMPTION FROM ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 4654, a bill to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. However, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, any speeches, under the rule, not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	McCarthy
Anderson	Gore	McClellan
Beall	Green	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Neely
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bush	Hill	Payne
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Purtell
Byrd	Holland	Robertson
Capehart	Humphrey	Russell
Carlson	Hunt	Saltonstall
Chavez	Jackson	Schoeppel
Clements	Jenner	Smathers
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Sparkman
Douglas	Kerr	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworshak	Knowland	Thye
Eastland	Kuchel	Tobey
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Ferguson	Long	Welker
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Young
George	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

REPORT ON ADVANCE PLANNING PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth quarterly report on the administration of the advance planning program, dated March 31, 1953, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 35

"Joint resolution relative to renegotiation of contracts between the United States and public agencies for water supply from the Central Valley project of California

"Whereas the United States has entered into numerous contracts with irrigation districts and similar agencies for a supply of water from the Central Valley project, which contracts provide for payments to be made upon construction costs of the project and, in some instances, upon construction costs of local distribution systems; and

"Whereas these contracts have been entered into pursuant to section 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of Wyoming has held provisions of the so-called '9 (e)' contracts invalid; and

"Whereas in at least two instances, superior courts of California, in considering the matter of the validity of such contracts, have held them invalid in several particulars; namely, the provisions of such contracts which deal with the matters of water rights, credit for payments made upon such contracts, and limitations as to the use of water; and

"Whereas in some instances irrigation districts have secured validation of some of such contracts by default, and are now confronted with the problem of being forced to carry out contracts which as to other districts have been declared invalid; and

"Whereas litigation concerning such contracts might extend over a long period of time, causing great uncertainty as to the rights and powers of irrigation districts and similar public agencies with respect to the Central Valley project of California; and

"Whereas the form of contracts used in connection with the Central Valley project of California should be in accord with the requirements of the laws of the State of California and the United States and should not contain features which have been held invalid: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Secretary of Interior of the United States be requested to renegotiate the existing contracts to provide a more acceptable contract and one that can be uniformly used within the Central Valley project of California and which will avoid the invalid and objectionable features of the existing contracts; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Interior of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to include rice and taro grown in the Territory under the Federal agricultural price support program

"Whereas the products of taro and rice constitute the staple diet of a majority of the people of the Territory; and

"Whereas the Territory is presently dependent upon outside sources for almost all of the rice consumed in the Territory; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory have from time to time suffered from a shortage in the supply of rice and from high prices resulting therefrom; and

"Whereas the geographical position of the Territory makes it essential to produce locially as much of such staples as possible; and

"Whereas it is the consensus of the legislature that the continued deterioration of the taro and rice industries in the Territory and the continued decrease in supply of the products of such industries is inimical to the public interest, and that in the interest of and for the welfare of the people of the Territory it is necessary to rehabilitate and to encourage the development of these basic agricultural industries; and

"Whereas the Congress has passed numerous legislative measures assisting farmers to obtain parity prices for basic agricultural commodities: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to include rice and taro grown in the Territory of Hawaii among the basic agricultural commodities which are under the provisions of price support programs administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture.

"SEC. 2. That authenticated copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Approved this 20th day of May A. D. 1953

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint resolution requesting Congress of the United States to authorize the commissioner of public lands to exchange certain public lands for private lands of equal value required by the city and county of Honolulu for school purposes

"Whereas certain privately owned lands are required by the city and county of Honolulu for school sites; and

"Whereas other lands of equal value, owned by the Territory, are available for exchanges with the owners of such privately owned lands; and

"Whereas in order to effect such exchanges the limitations imposed by section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act should be waived: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to make certain exchanges of public lands without regard to acreage and value limitations for the purpose of acquiring privately owned land needed as public-school sites; and to that end the Congress of the United States is requested and urged to adopt a bill substantially in the following form, to wit:

"'A bill to authorize the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange certain public lands for private lands of equal value required for school purposes

"'*Be it enacted, etc.:*

"'SECTION 1. Any limitations imposed by section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (31 Stat. 141), to the contrary notwithstanding, the commissioner of public lands, with the approval of the Governor and two-thirds

of the members of the board of public lands, is authorized to exchange public lands for private lands of equal value required by the city and county of Honolulu as school sites for the Kahala Elementary School, Waialae High School, and Koko Head Elementary School on the island of Oahu.

"'SEC. 2. The lands received in the exchange authorized by section 1 shall, except as otherwise provided, have the same status and be subject to the same laws as the lands given in the exchange.

"'SEC. 3. This act shall take effect upon its approval.'

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 19th day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted at a convention of district 402 of Lions International, at Hoberg's, Lake County, Calif., relating to an investigation of water conservation and transportation for the San Francisco Bay area, California; to the Committee on Public Works.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Hopi Indian Sovereign Nation, Hoteville, Ariz., signed by George Naseweseuma, and sundry other Hopi Indians, remonstrating against the drafting of Hopi Indians into the Armed Forces because of their religious beliefs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO AUTHORITY OF TREATIES—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion at Indianapolis, Ind., relating to Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment of the Constitution regarding authority of treaties.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 70

AMEND UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION REGARDING AUTHORITY OF TREATIES

Whereas subsection 1 of article VI of the Constitution provides that all treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land, binding on the judges in every State, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding; and

Whereas subsection II of article II of the Constitution provides that the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of Senators present concur; and

Whereas the Senate by a vote of one Senator, in the absence of a point of order as to lack of a quorum, might ratify a treaty; and

Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 1, by Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, and 63 of his colleagues, and Senate Joint Resolution 43, sponsored by the American Bar Association, would, if reconciled as to language and approved by the Congress, give the American people opportunity to consider fully the possible operation, effect, and implications of the treatymaking powers, and, if approved by the people as by the Constitution required, would afford protection of present and existing rights of the people and the States under the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national executive committee of the American Legion, in meeting at Indianapolis, Ind., April 30, 1953, reaffirms the principles of Resolution 426, adopted by the 1951 national convention of the American Legion, and of Resolution 1, adopted by the 1952 national convention of the American Legion, both pertaining to the subject matter of this resolution, and both incorporated in the report of the Special Committee on Covenant of Human Rights and the United Nations, heretofore approved by this national executive committee, and urges early adoption by the Senate and the House of Representatives of a joint resolution which will embody the principles of our aforesaid national convention resolutions and of said Joint Resolution 1 and Joint Resolution 43, now pending before the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CARLSON obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 5 minutes?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is proceeding with morning business by unanimous consent, speeches being limited to 2 minutes. The Chair would suggest that morning business be concluded before other business is transacted.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not wish to have the floor until the morning business is concluded, so I am happy to yield the floor, if I may be recognized later.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 1983. A bill for the relief of Joe Lee (Lee Jow); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 1984. A bill for the relief of Mabie Jernigan Bell; and

S. 1985. A bill for the relief of Ida Peggy Vernell; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1986. A bill for the relief of Lou Forrest Sitterson and Melody Yvonne Sitterson;

S. 1987. A bill for the relief of Edmond Kaiser Zahka; and

S. 1988. A bill for the relief of Linda Ann Ramsey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1989. A bill for the relief of Paul Kusmanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1990. A bill to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1991. A bill for the relief of Esperanza Jimenes Trejo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1992. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit all citizens of the United States to receive at least minimum old-age and survivors insurance benefits; and, for the purposes of computing the primary insurance amount of an individual, such individual shall be deemed to have an average monthly wage of at least $100; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPEHART (by request):

S. 1993. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, with respect to maximum interest rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 1994. A bill to authorize the care and treatment at facilities of the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by State courts and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1990) to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, introduced by Mr. YOUNG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on the bill for not more than 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will say to the Senator from North Dakota that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] had asked unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes, but under the unanimous-consent agreement which had previously been entered into morning business was first to be transacted, and speeches were to be limited to 2 minutes. The Chair therefore feels that until the morning business is concluded the request of the Senator from North Dakota to speak for 4 minutes would be out of order.

Mr. YOUNG. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I had intended to make.

There being no objection, the statement by Senator YOUNG was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG

The bill which I have today introduced has as its purpose the strengthening of investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act. This measure, if approved, would strengthen the powers contained in the Commodity Exchange Act in two important respects.

First, the bill permits the use of the subpena power for purposes of investigation, as well as for purposes of formal proceedings. Such authority is now enjoyed by a number of regulatory agencies, including the Securities and Exchange Commission. With this authority persons or firms involved in suspected manipulative activities, and persons having a knowledge of such activities could be questioned as soon as the signs of possible abuses under the act became evident.

I understand there is some uncertainty stemming from the language of the Commodity Exchange Act as to whether the subpena power shall be available for investigation, as well as other proceedings, under the act itself. The full and free use of the subpena power in connection with investigations will, in my opinion, immeasurably assist carrying out the intent of Congress as expressed in the basic act.

The second important provision of this measure is one which would permit the use of a permanent or temporary injunction to prevent violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, upon a showing that a person has engaged, or is about to engage, in a practice which is considered to be a violation. The purpose of this provision is to provide a summary-type proceeding to prevent violations before they occur. The merit of such action is obvious. It would result in considerable savings in time and expense by the Government. More important still is the fact that means is hereby afforded for expeditous and effective action by the Commodity Exchange Authority.

Presently a case is pending with respect to alleged violations of the Commodity Exchange Act by Cargill, Inc. This involves the importations of millions of bushels of Canadian oats much to the detriment of our domestic producers.

The Department of Justice has taken the view presently that criminal prosecutions "could not be maintained successfully." However, they are keeping the case open for further appraisal before a final determination is made as to whether criminal prosecutions should be instituted.

The Department of Agriculture, under the Commodity Exchange Act, has authority to institute administrative proceedings against Cargill for its alleged violative practices. Officials of the Department of Agriculture recently admitted in testimony before the agricultural subcommittee that they had reason to believe heavy importation of Canadian oats was being continued at a loss by Cargill, Inc., and possibly other grain firms. They stated, however, that under the existing law there was little or nothing that the Commodity Exchange Authority could do beyond what it had already done to halt such practices.

These continuing imports of Canadian oats have already made it virtually certain that for the third consecutive year United States farmers in 1953 will receive less than parity, and possibly even less than the Government price-support level for their oats. It is abundantly clear that the present act is not adequate to deal with a problem such as this. Therefore, I hope and feel certain that Congress will approve the measure which I have introduced today which would extend the authority of the Department to deal quickly and effectively with these serious violations.

PRINTING OF UNITED STATES WALL MAPS

Mr. JENNER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 30,051 copies of a United States wall map, size 5 by 7 feet, of which 99 copies, mounted and backed, and 7,425 copies, not mounted or backed, shall be for the use of the Senate; and 441 copies, mounted and backed, and 22,050 copies, not mounted or backed, shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. THYE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 115), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $50,000 for the purpose of discharging obligations incurred by it prior to June 30, 1954, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, Eighty-first Congress. Such sum shall be in addition to any other moneys available to the committee for such purpose, and shall be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

INQUIRY INTO INVESTIGATIONS OF POSTMASTERS BY THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MONRONEY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 116), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to consist of five members of such committee, three from the majority and two from the minority, to be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation with respect to the activities of the Bureau of the Chief Post Office Inspector of the Post Office Department for the purpose of ascertaining (1) whether unwarranted investigations of postmasters are being made by such Bureau, (2) whether improper methods are being employed in any such investigations, and (3) whether any postmasters have been wrongfully removed from office as a result of any such investigations.

SEC. 2. The subcommittee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2969. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls;

H. R. 3087. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3796. An act relating to the incorporation of the Columbus University of Washington, District of Columbia;

H. R. 4229. An act to change the name of the Polycultural Institution of America to Polycultural University of America, to grant a congressional charter to such university, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4484. An act to amend section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of assets of a decedent's estate for funeral expenses;

H. R. 4485. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to publication of partnerships;

H. R. 4486. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer;

H. R. 4487. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as further amended by an act of April 19, 1920 (title 20, ch. 1, sec. 116, D. C. Code, 1951), relating to continuing decedent's business;

H. R. 4550. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property; and

H. R. 4940. An act to provide for the redemption of District of Columbia tax stamps.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Address entitled "Young Men and Government," delivered by him before the convention of the Maryland Junior Chamber of Commerce on May 23, 1953, in Baltimore, Md.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "The Test of American Leadership," delivered by him before the American Bar Association on May 21, 1953.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Address entitled "Student Exchange Between India and the United States of America" delivered by the Ambassador from India at Syracuse University on April 11, 1953.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. HENNINGS):

Address delivered by Jerome Walsh before Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, at New York City on May 4, 1953.

Article entitled "Present Day Lesson of the Louisiana Purchase," written by Clarence K. Streit, and published in Freedom and Union for April 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Statement of 10 evidences indicating a return to the church of its Christian power, from an address by Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church of Washington, D. C., at the annual dinner of the Men's Union of the Washington (Pa.) Presbytery, at Waynesburg, Pa., last week.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Article entitled "Reds Have Master Plan for Middle America," written by Edward Tomlinson, and published in the Washington Daily News of May 25, 1953.

By Mr. HILL:

Editorial entitled "Human Values as Well as Money Saved by Sound Parole System," written by Neil O. Davis, editor of the Lee County Bulletin, of Auburn, Ala., and published in the Montgomery Examiner of May 21, 1953.

Article entitled "President's Power in Foreign Policy," written by Carroll Kilpatrick and published in the Washington Post of May 24, 1953.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Editorials from New England newspapers regarding the proposed Federal program relating to the New England economy.

By Mr. PURTELL:

Article entitled "The Story and Life of Dr. Marcus Whitman," written by Georgene Whitman Ross, of Hartford, Conn.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Article entitled "Meddling With Railroad Safety," from the Railway Age for May 4, 1953.

Article entitled "Britain's No. 1 Money Man on His Way to United States," written by Walter Trohan, and published in the Chicago Tribune, May 15, 1953.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2, 1953, RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—LETTER FROM GOVERNOR OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received this morning a letter from the Governor of Wisconsin endorsing Reorganization Plan No. 2, providing for streamlining the Department of Agriculture.

The letter points out the experiences of my State in cooperation with the USDA in successfully working out vital patterns of Federal-State relationships in the farm field.

I send to the desk Governor Kohler's letter and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

I should like also to note that I have received a message from Gavin McKnow, chairman of the Wisconsin Committee for the Hoover Commission Reforms, endorsing the reorganization plan, and opposing the resolution which would disapprove that plan.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Madison, Wis., May 22, 1953.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The proposed reorganization of the Department of Agriculture is a matter of great importance to the State of Wisconsin, and I am writing, therefore, to urge you to oppose the resolution of disapproval of Reorganization plan No. 2 of 1953, introduced by Senator RUSSELL on April 9.

The experience of our State department of agriculture indicates that the President's plan will do much to provide maximum quality of public service at minimum expense. The State is now cooperating with the USDA in working out patterns of Federal-State relationships in the field of agriculture. This pilot study is expected to provide the basis for attaining cooperation and coordination of effort, never before realized, at every level of government.

While our working relationships with the USDA have been cordial, experience has shown that a great deal of overlapping of functions, duplication of effort, and inconsistent action exists. This reorganization plan, based upon the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, will, we believe, help eliminate wasted effort and wasted tax funds, and provide a long-needed modernization of the USDA.

For these reasons, I hope you will lend your support to the plan by voting against the resolution of disapproval and by soliciting the support of your colleagues in opposition to the resolution.

With good wishes,
Sincerely yours,
WALTER J. KOHLER,
Governor.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY—PROCLAMATION OF GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a proclamation issued by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, designating Friday, May 22, 1953, as National Maritime Day.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

BY HIS EXCELLENCY, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, GOVERNOR—A PROCLAMATION, 1953

Whereas the American merchant marine is assisting immeasurably in the strengthening of our Nation and the forces of freedom by performing singularly important services in the flow of international trade and travel; and

Whereas gainful employment is now enjoyed by thousands of our skilled workers in shipyards, waterfront activities, railroad, and truck transportation, endeavors which serve our varied industries both with needed raw commodities and the furnishing of an outlet for manufactured products; and

Whereas Boston has produced under the genius of Donald McKay and others many of the famous American vessels of the past so that this tradition—"salt water is the lifeblood of our welfare, furnishing the nourishment upon which our very survival depends"—is today still carried on by the efficient shipbuilders within the Commonwealth; and

Whereas we join the Congress of the United States in honoring the American merchant marine, remembering especially the departure from Savannah, Ga., on May 22, 1819, of the *Savannah* on the first transoceanic voyage by any steamship.

Now, therefore, I, Christian A. Herter, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby designate and proclaim as National Maritime Day, Friday, May 22, 1953, in Massachusetts, and respectfully urge the people of the Commonwealth to cooperate in its observance.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston, this 12th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1953, and of the independence of the United States of America, the one hundred and seventy-seventh.

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
His Excellency the Governor.
By LEO M. HARLOW,
Deputy Secretary of the Commonwealth.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the President of the United States sent to the Senate today the nominations of Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria, and to be also United States High Commissioner for Austria, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; and Harold Shantz, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Notice is hereby given that the nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, in accordance with the committee rule.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM D. MITCHELL TO BE ADMINISTRATOR, SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 3, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William D. Mitchell, of Colorado, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK A. SOUTHARD, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (REAPPOINTMENT)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 3, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 784, TO PROHIBIT BLENDING OF IMPORTED WHEAT UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION WITH WHEAT SUITABLE FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the special subcommittee on improvements in the Federal Criminal Code, of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 10, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 784, to prohibit the blending of wheat imported unfit for human consumption with wheat suitable for human consumption. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

FIXING OF CERTAIN LICENSING AND REGISTRATION FEES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1324) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees, which was

to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to fix from time to time, in accordance with section 2 of this act, the fees authorized to be charged by the following acts:

(1) The act entitled "An act to regulate steam-engineering in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1887 (ch. 272, 24 Stat. 427, as amended; title 2, ch. 15, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(2) The act entitled "An act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia," approved June 18, 1898 (ch. 467, 30 Stat. 477, as amended; title 2, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(3) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906 (ch. 2084, 34 Stat. 175, as amended; title 2, ch. 6, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(4) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907 (ch. 442, 34 Stat. 870; title 2, ch. 8, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(5) The act entitled "An act to define the term of 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," approved February 9, 1907 (ch. 913, 34 Stat. 887, as amended; title 2, ch. 4, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(6) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918 (ch. 82, 40 Stat. 560, as amended; title 2, ch. 7, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(7) The act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923 (ch. 94, 42 Stat. 1261, as amended; title 2, ch. 9, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(8) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia," approved May 28, 1924 (ch. 202, 43 Stat. 177; title 2, ch. 5, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(9) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia," approved December 13, 1924 (ch. 9, 43 Stat. 713, as amended; title 2, ch. 10, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(10) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929 (ch 342, 45 Stat. 1326, as amended; title 2, ch. 1, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(11) The act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937 (ch. 760, 50 Stat. 787, as amended; title 45, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(12) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and licensing of those engaging in the practice of cosmetology in the District of Columbia," approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 321, 52 Stat. 611; title 2, ch. 13, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(13) The act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 322, 52 Stat. 620, as amended; title 2, ch. 11, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(14) The act entitled "An act to amend the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof," approved July 2, 1940 (ch. 513, 54 Stat. 716; title 2, ch. 3, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(15) The act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944 (ch. 612, 58 Stat. 823, as amended; title 2, ch. 12, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(16) The act entitled "An act defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia," approved September 19, 1950 (ch. 953, 64 Stat. 854; title 2, ch. 18, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

SEC. 2. The Commissioners may after public hearing increase or decrease the fees authorized to be charged by each of the acts listed in the first section of this act to such amounts as may, in the judgment of the Commissioners, be reasonably necessary to defray the approximate cost of administering each of said acts.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on May 25 the House passed Senate bill 1324 with a slight amendment which has no serious effect upon the content of the bill. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

GRAZING LANDS

Mr. BUSH obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has requested the privilege of addressing the Senate for not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Montana for 5 minutes, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that he may yield to the Senator from Montana for not more than 5 minutes, with the understanding that the Senator from Connecticut will not lose his right to the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise to protest as strongly as I can against H. R. 4023 and S. 1491.

These measures, in my opinion, constitute a raid by certain private interests on the national forests and, if successful, will lay the groundwork for further attempts to despoil the national parks, Federal wildlife refuges, and other public lands.

Anyone reading these measures can see that what they actually do would be to make a vested right of grazing privileges under the authority of the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture. Under this vested right ranchers could sell or give their grazing privileges to people of their own choosing and the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to accede to it.

Under these measures the public interest in our forests would be subordinated and the grazing privilege would be made paramount over timber production and watershed protection.

These bills will not, as they state, provide for the "improvement and development" of the public lands. These bills are deliberately designed to protect the holders of grazing permits and not the people—all the people—to whom the public domain belongs.

Under sections 6 and 7, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required, wherever he permits grazing, to grant continuing grazing privileges to present permit holders and successors of their own choosing. In other words the grazing permit holder and not the Secretary would be the one who would determine who would get all permits in the future.

Section 6 would also prevent the Secretary from making any change in present grazing allotment boundaries or the kind of livestock permitted, and section 7 would also keep him from decreasing the privilege as to the number or kind of stock, or changing allotment boundaries, for any purpose whatever, when a privilege passes to a successor.

There are other dangerous elements to these measures, but I believe I have pointed out enough of the difficulties to convince any reasonable minded person of the threat to the public welfare these proposals contain. I sincerely hope that these bills will be killed in committee, and I hope also that Secretary of Agriculture Benson will make his views known. He has been strangely silent. By his silence he has lent credence to the belief that he has adopted a "hands off" policy which, if true, augurs ill for the Forest Service which he heads. However, the only official comment up until this morning has been by a representative of the Department of the Interior. I hardly need to tell you, that was an endorsement of this questionable proposal. Much to the pleasure of the livestock industry lobbyists who have been swarming over this town during the past 2 weeks, they have it as an open secret that the Secretary of Agriculture and his Forest Service have been placed behind a curtain of some sort on this subject. As a result, no word has come from them about it, although both the House and Senate hearings on these bills will probably close soon.

I call upon Secretary Benson to stand up and be counted on this controversial measure and to let the public and the Congress know whether he is on the side of the people or the special interests.

I also call upon Secretary of the Interior McKay to make his views known to the proper committees and to the people of the country as well. This issue is so important and so far reaching in its possible consequences that it is imperative that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior come from behind the curtain and face up to this issue immediately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks I may include telegrams and letters I have received from Montana about this proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA WOOL
GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
April 30, 1953.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: I have just been browsing through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 21, and I find where you made the statement, in questioning the Senator from Washington, "May I ask the Senator from Washington if it is not his belief, that if the cattlemen's grab bill is enacted, what we shall be creating will be, in effect, a revival of the old feudalistic system, by

which leases could be handed down from father to son, and at the expense of the public, great areas of land could be removed from use for the purposes of feeding cattle and sheep, and could be turned over to individuals, for their own particular use, regardless of the number of head of stock grazed on it, and regardless of the damage done to the forage crops?

Mike, we would be very interested in knowing why you refer to this as the "cattlemen's grab bill," and from whom you got your information that it is a grab.

We would also like to know by what method you interpret it to be a revival of the old feudalistic system of handing leases down from father to son at the expense of the public.

We would also like to know what part or section of the bill would allow the removal of great areas of land at the expense of the public for the purpose of feeding cattle and sheep, and we would also like to know, what you mean relative to the damage done to forage crops.

As the Montana Wool Growers Association have been very interested in this legislation, and have had committees working on it for over 2 or 3 years in an effort to bring out a fair and just bill, we feel it is only right that you quote those sections of the bill which you think are detrimental to the public and why you interpret them in this manner.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT E. SHUEY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SOUTHEASTERN MONTANA
LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
Miles City, Mont., April 24, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed at our annual meeting held April 18, 1953, which we are very much interested in.

Yours very truly,

I. V. ZOOK, *Secretary.*

"Whereas greater uniformity and stability of administration of Federal grazing lands is needed to allow and encourage better use and greater development of these lands; and

"Whereas legislation is needed for attainment of these ends;

"Therefore, the Southeastern Montana Livestock Association urges the enactment of the Uniform Federal Grazing Land Act, H. R. 4023, and that copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen."

MONTANA STOCKGROWERS
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Helena, Mont.

"Resolution 10

"Whereas H. R. 4023 is the result of several years of study by interested stockmen's and other organizations to further the unified administration of federal grazing lands; and

"Whereas it is the policy of the Montana Stockgrowers Association to further unified practices of land management to foster conservation and protection of our national resources and continuing development of our grazing lands: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, that the Montana Stockgrowers Association wholeheartedly endorse H. R. 4023."

Attest: This is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by vote of the members of the Montana Stockgrowers Association in regular session at Missoula, Mont., May 14, 15, and 16, 1953.

E. A. PHILLIPS,
Secretary, Montana Stockgrowers Association.

DELL, MONT., *May 6, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

For domestic sheep and wool industries to survive, imperative harassing cease, proposed corrective legislation be enacted this session of Congress, and Tariff Commission must act favorably on wool case without further delay. Criticism uniform Federal grazing bill unjustified and unreasonable; defy anyone to find anything derogatory to public interest. Land-grab charge so untrue. It is contemptible. Beseech your active and vigorous support of legislation designed to effect at least partial cure of our sick industries.

WHITWORTH & SONS, INC.

WEST YELLOWSTONE, MONT., *May 20, 1953.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Montana Senator, Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please record my strongest opposition and yours to S. 1491 in the hearings now being held. This bill special legislation and would ruin our forest watershed and wildlife and would destroy the areas now used for the pleasure of all people. Please send me names of Kentucky Senators.

Regards,

MARIE B. RODMAN.

HELENA, MONT., *May 21, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:

The Montana Wildlife Federation opposes H. R. 4023 and solicits your assistance in defeating the bill.

E. A. RUDMAN,
President, Montana Wildlife Federation.

FORSYTH, MONT., *May 22, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: The members of the Rosebud Treasure County Wildlife Association, composed of 500 sportsmen from the two counties, are strictly opposed to H. R. 4023, the stockmen's land-grab bill. Such legislation is contrary to all that such clubs stand and work for. Your help in killing any and all such legislation will be appreciated.

W. E. CONN,
President.

MISSOULA, MONT., *May 16, 1953.*

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senator from Montana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: In reference to bill H. R. 4023, the Uniform Federal Grazing Land Act, I wish to state I am against it.

Reasons: It gives the big rancher too much control and crowds out the small stockman.

The committee that acts on complaints is made up of the violators themselves.

The taxpayer's money is being used for the good of a few. The taxpayer takes care of the reseeding.

On the whole there seems to be more wrong with the bill than there is good.

Yours truly,

PAT E. KISER.

HAMILTON, MONT., *May 16, 1953.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD.

DEAR SIR: I suppose that this letter is unnecessary, but I do want to assure you that my own sentiment and that of everyone to whom I have talked in Hamilton is very much against the land-grab bill, S. 1401.

Sincerely,

J. FREDERICK BELL, M. D.

RONAN, MONT., *April 9, 1953.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please send me 4 copies of H. R. 4023, introduced by Congressman D'EWART, also 4 copies of companion bill introduced by Senators BARRETT and BUTLER.

Very truly yours,

THOS. O. PEASLEY.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of April 9, 1953]

SHALL FORESTS BE PRIVATE PRESERVES?

A dangerous storm is brewing, imperiling national forests of Montana and throughout the Mountain West. It is embodied in identical bills now pending in both branches of Congress. If enacted into law these measures could turn grazing permits on our national forests into legal property rights for the benefit of a comparatively few large livestock operators. In the House this bill (H. R. 4023) has been introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana. Notation that it was introduced by request may indicate that Mr. D'EWART has some reservations regarding it but we believe his sponsorship of it, limited or otherwise, is a serious mistake. In the upper branch a companion bill is sponsored by Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming, and BUTLER of Nebraska. The bills would reverse the established policy of administering our national forests for the greatest good to the greatest number. That policy recognizes Government control as necessary to safeguard vital resources for the benefit of all the people. Timber and watersheds are given first priority. Other uses are secondary. This overall policy has proved wise and far-seeing. The Forest Service now affords the stockmen considerable protection in the exercise of grazing privileges. Having once granted a rancher a permit to graze a specific number on the national forests, he is accorded preference rights for a similar number as long as he retains his ranch holdings. But limits are established as to how many one owner may graze on the forests and these limits vary in accordance with the economy of the area which surrounds the forests.

The present legislation, could in effect, establish property rights to the grazing permits which could be bought and sold and which could lead to all of the rights eventually going to a few large operators. It would also transfer a major portion of the control and administration of forest grazing lands to advisory boards elected by the permit holders. There are bountiful assets in our public forest lands and a multiplicity of interests some of them conflicting. The grazing privilege is important to the livestock industry. It deserves both practical and fair administration but it does not deserve special advantages that would jeopardize the best long-term interests of the region and the country. We are told that the impetus of this legislation came from the Southwest. There is no conflict in Montana, but there could be in years to come, under such a law. Hence we think it is a bad piece of legislation for Montana as well as for the entire mountain area of public domain.

JORDAN, MONT., *May 7, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please send copies of H. R. 4023 and companion Senate bill.

MANUEL J. ROTH.

ROUNDUP, MONT., *May 9, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD:

We wish to let you know we are very much opposed to House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491.

We appreciate your opposing these bills as we feel they are unfair to the people except just a favored few.

Sincerely,

CHAS. C. and ETHEL E. SMITH.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, May 14, 1953.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senator from Montana,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: This is to acknowledge your note of May 8 referring to my telegram of May 7. I am not out of sympathy with an attempt to economize in Government, but I do think that judgment should be used, and that activities vital to the welfare of the people in one way or another should not be discontinued. I am prejudiced, of course, but I do feel that the establishment of the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit has placed an emphasis upon wildlife research which would have been difficult to obtain without the cooperation of the Federal Government.

I suspect that it isn't easy to serve as a member of a minority party in a time like this. I don't like some of the things going on, and I am sure you don't. In particular, I don't like the provisions of H. R. 4023 and its companion Senate bill, 1491. I understand that they are identical, although I have only seen a copy of the House bill. For your information I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have filed with the House Subcommittee on Public Lands. I think I know you well enough to know that you will oppose the provisions of this bill. At any rate, I want to register my protest to it.

With best personal regards

Sincerely,

J. W. SEVERY.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, May 14, 1953.

Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Chairman, House Subcommittee
on Public Lands,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'EWART: I have had opportunity to study H. R. 4023, a bill which proposes to revise the public-land laws, particularly as they apply to the use of the Federal lands by livestock. I must protest strongly against the passage of this bill which, it seems to me, can only lead to a relaxation of the management standards upon Federal rangelands, particularly those under the administration of the United States Forest Service.

The wording of section 5 seems to give the judgment and recommendations of an advisory board priority over the judgment and recommendations of a trained and experienced man in the field of land management—a man who is responsible to the American people for the maintenance of certain management standards upon public lands.

Sections 6 and 7 appear to tie, unnecessarily closely, the grazing privilege upon public land to so-called base property.

Section 10 seems to make administrative judgment a matter of an agency hearing if there is disagreement followed by court action if the holder of a grazing privilege is still dissatisfied. I cannot see that such delay in administration is in the best interests of the American people, who have joint ownership in these public lands.

The end result of the bill, it seems to me, would be to expose lands, already known to be poorly managed, to a still lower level of management. This is not to damn the holders of grazing permits—many of whom are high-type managers. The statement rather implies that some holders of permits are poor managers, and that this bill plays into their hands and allows poor management to continue. This can only mean the continuation of low-level management in certain areas where water values and wildlife values have little consideration at the present time.

As near as I can make out, there are about 42,000 grazing-privilege holders on Federal public lands in the 11 western-land States. H. R. 4023 seems to place the special interests of these permit holders against the interests of the several million citizens of those States, as well as the total citizenry of the United States, whose general welfare is ceratinly in part dependent upon a high quality of public-land management.

Sincerely,

J. W. SEVERY.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 12, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I sincerely request that you vote against and do all you can to defeat Senate bill 1491.

We cannot permit private interests to dictate the policy of our national forests.

Sincerely,

LEROY SCHELLY.

SQUARE BUTTE, MONT., *May 6, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Hope it isn't necessary to urge that you help defeat Senate bill 1491. Legislation of this type is shocking to say the least.

Yours truly,

RUSSELL ROBINSON.

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND
COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Glasgow, Mont., May 7, 1953.

Senator JAMES MURRAY.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD.
Representative WESLEY D'EWART.
Representative LEE METCALF.

DEAR SIRS: We strongly urge increased funds for REA electrification, the amount that the REA cooperatives anticipate they will need to borrow during the year. That includes telephone, of course.

We urge Senators to vote against crippling power projects for REA. We know that bill is to come before the Senate. It is unbelievable that our Congressmen want to cripple the REA which has done and does so much to aid the farmer in production as well as comforts.

We do not endorse H. R. 4023 or S. 1491 for the following reason: It would give big livestock men a practicaly ironclad and exclusive monopoly on use of the national forests and grazing lands for sheep and cattle.

We hope you will do all you can to defeat bill 1559 which would tax cooperatives patronage refunds. It is unnecessary to explain to you why and what it would do to the cooperatives.

Thanking you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

FARMERS UNION CHERRY CREEK LOCAL,
DANIEL J. RICE, *Secretary.*

THE FROMBERG ROD AND GUN CLUB,
Fromberg, Mont., May 9, 1959.

The Fromberg Rod and Gun Club, at a regular meeting held April 15, 1953, adopted the following resolutions and requested that copies be mailed to Montana Senators and Representatives and to the committee studying H. R. 4023 introduced (by request) by Representative D'EWART, of Montana:

"*Be it resolved*, That the Fromberg Rod and Gun Club go on record opposing the passage of H. R. 4023 for the following reasons:

"1. Although the bill is high-sounding and altruistic, its very essence is opposing American tradition and defrauding its many citizens of their heritage in order to favor a greedy minority.

"2. It is another step, and a big step, toward giving away what is left of our national domain. This diametrically is opposed to all principles of conservation.

"3. The bill makes a definite change in the basic conception of grazing on forest lands; that changes it from the status of a privilege granted the lessee by a free people to an inherent right to the Forest Service ground and grass, a right that could then be bought and sold as any chattel property.

"4. It would give the lessee virtual ownership of the land for a few paltry lease dollars and leave the taxpayer the costly job of maintaining the land, reseeding the range, building and maintaining its roads and trails, fighting its fires, etc., while at the same time depriving him more and more of any right to use the forests and forest lands.

"5. The bill tends toward building a monopoly and creating a landed aristocracy at no expense to themselves as opposed to our much-lauded system of free and competitive enterprise.

"6. The bill would lead to eventually depriving all the people of our country of all the forest lands and turning them over to the stockmen and the lumbermen and other self-seeking interests to be controlled and regulated to suit their needs and in total disregard for the public right to access.

"7. Man to be free must have reasonable and free access to the works of nature. The right to commune with your God by contemplating His handiwork is a great natural right. Let us see to it that no power ever again assaults it. Let us impress upon the minds of greedy, selfish interests that in this age of a developing city civilization the public domain shall not be restricted but rather it should be expanded for all the people.

"The gravest danger confronting our social and economic system springs from such illogical and immoral attempts to steal the national heritage and place the heel of economic expediency upon the natural rights of the American people.

"Therefore we request that this bill be killed so emphatically that the powers behind it will be unable to reintroduce it in our time.

"FROMBERG ROD AND GUN CLUB,
"F. J. RAHREK,
"*Secretary, Resolution Committee.*"

MONTANA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL
CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
Sand Coulee, Mont., May 11, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to Senate bill 1491, I would like to voice my opposition. I have been a farmer and stockman for 32 years. Having served on the Cascade County planning board for 8 years, ACP committeeman for 7 years and county committeeman for 2 years, about 11 years on the FSA and FHA committtee, and soil conservation district director for 7 years, I have a great interest in the public land in this State.

I attended the national soil conservation district convention in Cleveland, Ohio, where stockmen from all interested States discussed the subject thoroughly. Although the change in the present law was proposed by stockmen some of the large operators from California and Nevada were personally against such a change.

The deplorable condition of some of our State land, the overgrazed, overstocked condition on too much of our private range is a good indication of what could happen to our forests under Senate bill 1491. I realize the stockmen do have their problems but feel that an equitable agreement could be worked out with the present cooperative Forest Service Administration.

The welfare of our Nation depends on the Forest Service's long-range planning and the absolute control of the utilization of all foliage in our forests.

Therefore, I hope that you do not support Senate bill 1491.

Sincerely yours,

TED PETTYJOHN.

THE VALLEY SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Glasgow, Mont., May 13, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: The directors of the Valley Sportsmen's Association representing 300 members urge you to vote against Senate bill 1491, as it is a bill giving away the national forest lands to special interest groups.

This bill would reduce the present effective management of the national forest lands to a quagmire of court cases in which the special interest groups representing a minority of grazing associations would gain control of these lands. The sportsmen who number 7 million people would lose their rights to the use of these lands for the benefit of 30,000 people.

We want continued wise multiple use of our forest lands. This bill would not give us that wise use. Put the national interest above the private interests and vote against this bill.

Sincerely yours,
CARL A. OGRINC, O. D.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *May 12, 1953.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: While well aware that you need no urging to oppose House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491 (beginning to turn the resources of our national forests over to private interests), we do want to add our voice to the opposition, and good luck to you.

It would be bad enough (though possibly necessary to meet competition) to turn over to Montana all the Government land within its traditional (and actual) boundaries, but to start a wedge to turn it over to private interest is unthinkable.

Congratulations on the work you are continuing to do for us.

Yours sincerely,
HOBART MYRICK.
MABEL MYRICK.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 7, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Regarding Senate bill 1491 which provides for turning over the public grazing lands to the livestock interests, replacing Government control with stockmen's advisory boards.

This would be virtually the end to hunting and fishing by the public. We have a sample of what would happen here in this vicinity. The old Dana Ranch in the Hound Creek area west of Smith River, where it is as much as your life is worth to be caught inside the boundaries of this ranch. Nobody fishes or hunts there except maybe a special friend of the owners.

The public lands must be administered by the Federal Government for the benefit of all the people and to protect these lands from misuse.

The wildlife and fishing in this State is a big business, about a million dollars being received from hunting and fishing licenses. It seems to me that that large a business would justify some protection and promotion by the Federal Government and the State of Montana.

Public lands should be made accessible, as well as streams, for the benefit of the people.

I wish to protest this bill, Senate bill 1491, and request that this letter be made a part of the testimony of the hearings on this bill.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Very truly yours,
H. F. MCMASTER.

MAY 4, 1953.

The board of supervisors of Pondera County (Mont.) Soil Conservation District at the regular monthly meeting of said board of supervisors held on May 4, 1953, at Conrad, Mont., discussed at great length the D'Ewart bill, known as H. R. 4023, and its Senate companion measure, S. 1491.

The Pondera County Soil Conservation District has 1,051,520 acres of which 106,637 acres are in the national forest within its boundaries and during the year 1952 assisted 215 cooperators.

The board of supervisors believing that conservation of natural resources is of vital importance to the welfare of these United States and its 159 million population; and deeming that H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 are not in the best interest of the public, nor do they follow approved conservation practices. Therefore, the board has passed the following resolution and had the same spread upon the minutes of the meeting of May 4, 1953, and copies mailed to Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART, chairman, House Subcommittee on Public Lands; Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON, Secretary of Agriculture; Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD, of Montana; Representative METCALF, of Montana; respectfully requesting their disapproval of H. R. 4023 and S. 1491.

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 vitally affect 140 million acres of public domain and forest lands in 11 Western States; and

"Whereas if these bills are enacted into law then sportsmen and the public in general will find their rights of enjoyment of the national forests placed in serious jeopardy; and

"Whereas at the present time public agencies have the necessary authority to administer public lands under their jurisdiction. Under the provisions of the above bills these agencies would be stripped of such authority and the management of said lands would be placed in the hands of local advisory boards; and

"Whereas the public domain and forest lands affected by H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 are grazing lands and will be utilized by livestock operators it may be assumed that the advisory boards above referred to will be dominated by stockmen; and

"Whereas sections 6 and 7 provide that continuing grazing privileges be granted to present permit holders and successors of their choosing, thus virtually making a permit perpetual. It would be possible to hand it down from generation to generation the same as an estate or to sell the grazing privilege the same as though one were transferring owned property; and

"Whereas national forest regulations at present provide that permittees must own 'base property' in order to get grazing privileges on national forests. H. R. 4023 under section 4 would allow permit seekers to offer leased or occupied lands as base property which practice would likely lead to instability of the livestock industry; and

"Whereas the public, the owners of the public lands, will lose rights and recreational privileges due to special vested rights to be given livestock operators amounting to monopolistic control of the forests and public lands: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the board of supervisors of Pondera Soil Conservation District, are unalterably and emphatically opposed to the enactment into law of H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 and ask that this resolution be spread on the record of House Subcommittee on Public Lands at the hearing on H. R. 4023 to be held on May 20, 21, 22, in room 1324, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C."

Respectfully submitted.
WALLACE KINGSBURY,
Chairman, Board of Supervisors, Pondera County Soil Conservation District.

Attest:
CHARLES E. VOSS,
Secretary.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, April 30, 1953.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a Montana property owner, taxpayer, and resident. I also am interested in the conservation and judicious administration of our natural resources and in my field work as a geologist have the chance to observe the present administration of much of our public lands.

I believe that the present administration of our public lands (except possibly the Taylor grazing lands) is in the spirit in which these lands were set aside for the people of the United States. I am, therefore, unalterably opposed to several bills now in committee, namely H. R. 4023, and S. 1491. I urge you to strongly oppose the passage of these bills.

Sincerely,
FRED S. HONKALA, Ph. D.

UPPER YELLOWSTONE ROD AND GUN CLUB (PARK COUNTY),
Gardiner, Mont., May 12, 1953.

Honorable Senator MANSFIELD:

Over the past several years the people of Montana and the majority of the people in the Western States have become genuinely concerned about our heritage of mountains, woods, lakes, and wildlife. We feel that pending legislation such as House Resolution 4032 introduced by Congressman WESLEY A. D'EWART and Senate bill 1481 by BUTLER and BARRETT are nothing but a cleverly worded land grab in the interest of stockman interests only.

It is also the feeling of the overwhelming majority of our people that these remaining public domain heritages should remain free and intact for the use and enjoyment of all the people of the Nation instead of being controlled by a few stockmen.

This bill as proposed will directly threaten the welfare of our already hard pressed wildlife and would strip the Secretary of Agriculture of the necessary authority to administer the public lands under his jurisdiction. In fact it gives the stockman the right to sell the lands they lease from the Government, which is the public, to interests of their own choosing and to force the Secretary to accept the deal.

This is bad legislation. The public as owners of public lands should know that. We as part of the public feel the laws and policies as they stand have been fair and equitable to all concerned. Why give a few the rights to lands that belong to all of us?

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. GALB, *Secretary.*

VALIER COMMUNITY CLUB,
Valier, Mont., May 12, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: At the regular monthly meeting of the Valier Community Club, held this 11th day of May 1953, action was taken on H. R. 4023 in which the above club declared itself to be emphatically and unalterably opposed to the above-proposed bill. Furthermore, the club asks that this opposition to H. R. 4023 and its companion measures, S. 1491, be made a matter of record.

This club represents a cross section of this area in that it consists of businessmen, farmers, stockmen, Government employees, etc. With about 250 representation, this becomes of great importance to us.

Yours truly,
EARL CRAWFORD,
President.

Attested to:
DON FREEBURY, *Secretary.*

BILLINGS ROD AND GUN CLUB,
Billings, Mont., May 12, 1953.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: We wish to go on record as vigorously opposing House bill 4023 and hope you will do everything in your power to kill this bill.

This legislation is favorable to a few at the expense of many.

Yours truly,

DON ELLINGER,
Secretary.

SOUTHEASTERN MONTANA SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Billings, Mont.

Hon. MIKE J. MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: At the annual meeting of the Southeastern Montana Sportsmen's Association, held at Roundup, Mont., on May 10, the following resolution was adopted:

"*Be it resolved*, That the Southeastern Montana Sportsmen's Association go on record as opposing the passage of House bill 4023, relating to the control of grazing privileges in the national forests, and that the officers of the association be instructed to write our congressional delegation and the committees considering the bills, stating our opposition to this legislation."

The Southeastern Montana Sportsmen's Association is an association of sportsmen's clubs located within district 5 of the State Fish and Game Commission of the State of Montana. The following is a list of the clubs belonging to the association:

Columbus Rod and Gun Club, Columbus, Mont.

Fromberg Rod and Gun Club, Fromberg, Mont.

Tri-County Sportsmen's Association, Roundup, Mont.

Rosebud-Treasure Wildlife Association, Forsyth, Mont.

Big Horn County Rod and Gun Club, Hardin, Mont.

Bridger Rod and Gun Club, Bridger, Mont.

Custer County Rod and Gun Club, Miles City, Mont.

Red Lodge Rod and Gun Club, Red Lodge, Mont.

Billings Rod and Gun Club, Billings, Mont.

Tongue River Rod and Gun Club, Birney, Mont.

Absarokee Rod and Gun Club, Absarokee, Mont.

Laurel Rod and Gun Club, Laurel, Mont.

Park City Rod and Gun Club, Park City, Mont.

Yours very truly,

DON ELLINGER, *President.*

BOZEMAN, MONT., *May 13, 1953.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senator from Montana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to D'Ewart bill, H. R. 4023, and the identical Butler-Barrett bill, S. 1491.

The first three pages recite the benefits that would accrue to the public by the passage of this bill. Most, if not all, are now in effect through Forest Service policies and regulations.

"Base property" owned by the permittee as used by the Forest Service refers only to the number of cattle grazed on forest lands said owned land will support without regard to any additional number carried on the same base property. This is exceedingly liberal without additional conditions such as leased and occupied lands, water rights being added. Many stockmen in this locality are carrying more stock than their land will support.

I have seen too much private and unregulated State and private land badly misused to have any faith that a board of stockmen will do anything that is beneficial to public lands.

Sections 6-7 would give vested rights to grazing rights to stockmen. This would add thousands of dollars to the value of the permittee's property. It would preclude any new permittees the use of public lands for grazing unless they purchased some base property at at inflated price because of these sections. One person or company could buy all the grazing on any amount of public lands.

Section 8, it is my belief that if stockmen did not expect a reduction of grazing fees this clause would not have been in the bill. The grazing fee on public land is now below those charged on private lands.

If the Secretary's decisions are subject to review by the courts, important action can be put off for years. No other Government agencies are subject to such review and why should a few stockmen have this privilege?

The Gallatin National Forest in Montana is nearly all confined to three counties, Gallatin, Park, and Sweetgrass. These counties had, according to the latest USDA figures, 1,682 commercial cattle outfits and 374 commercial sheep outfits. Of these 205 cattle and 40 sheep outfits graze on the Gallatin Forest. If this ratio is anywhere near true for other public lands, one can easily see that a very few stockmen would benefit by this bill.

The above are some of the reasons why I object to this bill. Will you please give them consideration before action is taken to make this bill a law?

Very truly yours,

J. K. DWINELLE.

MAY 13.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: We are gratefully aware of your opposition to the "stockman's grazing bill" and urge that you actively fight its passage.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. M. CHESSIN.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, Mont., May 13, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: This letter is to let you know that many of us here in Montana and elsewhere in the western United States are quite concerned about the introduction of H. R. 4023, the Uniform Federal Grazing Land Act, and the contemplated introduction of similar bills in the Senate. These proposed legislative actions can hardly be interpreted save as being against the best interests for the whole country in the long run. And where is another philosophy as sound for guiding the use of our country's resources.

I do hope that you will do your best to oppose any legislation of this type which will make public lands the effective property of a few.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN A. CHAPMAN,
Instructor, Department of Zoology.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, May 1, 1953.

Mr. MANSFIELD,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let this be evidence that we are opposed to any change in administering the forest range lands as proposed in a bill before the legislative groups now, the House bill with D'EWART's name on it.

Sincerely,

IRVING BOEHELHEIDE.
PRISCILLA BOEHELHEIDE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE STATE OF MONTANA,
Helena or Saco, Mont., 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: Due to the fact that I did not have a copy of the Federal Range Code available at the time I received your letter of March 25 and the enclosure from Senator MCCARRAN, I was unable to answer it until I could get a copy of the code.

After again making a very careful check of the transfer provisions of the Federal Range Code I still feel that there is very little need for subsection (b); of section 161.7 of the code and am glad to know that Senator MCCARRAN is in agreement.

It is hard to write an amendment to the Taylor Grazing Act which would provide for the few justifiable transfers without leaving the law so that some undesirable transfers could be carried out under it. No transfer or a license or permit should be allowed from one owner to another owner unless the land on which the license or permit is based is also transferred with the license or permit. Transfers of this kind are provided for under subsection (a), of section 161.7; subsection (c) provides for the sale of land which is in excess of that necessary for the support of the licensed or permitted livestock which leaves only two classes of cases which could be justified under subsection (b). These are as follows:

1. Cases where the original base property was not entirely satisfactory and the owner has later acquired other land which would improve his position as to his livestock operation. Here a transfer of use without an actual transfer of the license or permit would very likely serve the purpose equally well and by leaving the preference attached to the original base property would eliminate the danger of commercialization of the preference as a sale of the original base property would then result in a loss of the preference. Actually under subsection (b), as now worded, A having land could buy B's land and have the license or permit transferred to his land and then immediately sell the land purchased from B which would make it possible for one or two large landowners to control most of the public land in a district.

2. Where the applicant is the holder of a leasehold without which such property would not have dependency by use or priority. This is so far as I can see the only case where transfer of a license or permit should be allowed without ownership of the base property. The need for this is very questionable.

These words in subsection (b), "*Provided*, That such transfer will not interfere with the stability of livestock operations or with proper range management and will not affect adversely the established local economy," are so broad as to have little or no limiting effect on transfers of licenses or permits. The transfers carried out in this area indicate that it not only does not limit the transfers but opens the way for much abuse of the rules.

In Montana part- or full-time water is not used as a base for livestock operations but I can see no reason why the same rules would not apply equally well in either case.

As the Federal Range Code is only a set of rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Interior under authority of the Taylor Grazing Act and the Secretary is subject to much pressure from large livestock interests, I believe the act itself should be amended in section 3, which could be accomplished either by a new bill or by an addition to Senator MCCARRAN's bill, S. 31, and the amendment should be substantially as follows:

1. That no transfer of a license or permit from owner to another be allowed without

a transfer of the base property on which the license or permit is based.

2. That no transfer of a license or permit based on ownership of land or of water be allowed to other land or water, but that the actual livestock operation could be conducted from other land or water under the same ownership.

3. That no license or permit based on control of land or of water could be transferred to other land or water except where the applicant is the holder of a leasehold without which such property would not have dependency by use or priority. (The value or need for this is questionable.)

4. Where preferences are no longer needed by the original holder or are lost because of nonuse or for failure to comply with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, they should be reallocated to other landowners who are next in line by reason of preference or need.

I hope that an amendment can be worked up which will accomplish the above suggestions either as an addition to Senator McCARRAN'S bill, S. 31, or as a new bill.

Press releases here indicate that Representative D'EWART'S bill, H. R. 4023, has a provision for transfer of preferences on forest lands similar to that in the Federal Range Code and if so would be very objectionable as it would bring about the same conditions on the forest lands as are now so objectionable on the public domain lands. Further it would create a vested interest for a few people in the forest lands which belong to all of the people. It also opens the way for a few large livestock interests to control all of the grazing privileges of these lands.

Thanking you for your continued interest, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD BARNARD.

ANACONDA SPORTSMEN'S CLUB,
Anaconda, Mont., April 30, 1953.

ALERTING ALL SPORTSMEN'S CLUBS IN MONTANA AND WYOMING

Subject: Stockmen's grazing bill, H. R. 4032, by which certain Western livestock operators proposed to secure greater control over grazing privileges in the national forests. This bill was introduced by Congressman WESLEY A. D'EWART of Montana.

Whereas over the past several years the people of Montana have become genuinely concerned about our heritages of mountains, woods, lakes, and wildlife; and

Whereas it is the feeling of the overwhelming majority of our people that these remaining public domain heritages should remain free and intact for the use and enjoyment of all people of the Nation; and

Whereas it has been called to our attention that certain Senators and Congressmen from Montana and Wyoming are aiding and abetting the large stock interests of the Rocky Mountain States in a gigantic "land grab" coalition to pass more rights and special privileges into the hands of these big stock interests, who are only a small segment of our total population, and an equally small segment of Western stock growers; and

Whereas such a bill as proposed would directly threaten the welfare of our already hard-pressed wildlife and their habitat;

Therefore, it is the purpose of this club to alert and warn all sportsmen's groups and other citizen conservation groups in the States of Montana and Wyoming to fight this class privilege legislation in whatever effective manner they choose. It is especially advised that besides contacting the Honorable A. L. MILLER (Nebraska), chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D. C., and your own Congressmen, letters and wires should go to eastern Congressmen warning them what is happening in the West to the Nation's public domain.

Don't be asleep at the switch. Get into immediate action if you wish to conserve your fish and game and recreation.

ANACONDA SPORTSMEN'S CLUB.

BELT, MONT., *April 17, 1953.*

Honorable Senator MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: We, the undersigned, are unalterably opposed to H. R. 4034.

We consider this a raid upon the public lands of the West.

Ralph P. Cook, Olaf Johnson, John E. Holmes, Jalmer, J. Maki, Rudolph Hahnes, Belt, Mont.; Tom C. Goodman, Geyser, Mont.; Kenneth Johnson, Marvin K. Cook, Bertha P. Maki, Evelyn Warilu, Belt, Mont.; Henry Heikhila, Geyser, Mont.; Dorothy Landers, Matt Makila, Elmer R. Maki, Belt, Mont.; Opal Goodman, Geyser, Mont.; John O. Carlson, Wm. Makila, Frank Urick, Mrs. Frank Urick, Richard A. Maki, Emily J. Maki, Belt, Mont.; Pauline West, Great Falls, Mont.; Olive G. Crowe, Belt, Mont.; James W. Murphy, Geyser, Mont.; Opal G. Goodman, Secretary, Willow Belt Farmers Union, No. 115, Belt, Mont.

HAMILTON, MONT., *April 28, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: I sincerely urge you to support H. R. 1972 and help defeat H. R. 4023. I believe H. R. 1972 will give us much needed improvement in our overall conservation. However, H. R. 4023 would defeat the whole purpose. I find the small stockmen here much opposed to H. R. 4023 as they feel the large interests would move in and their rights and the range also.

Montana is very fortunate in having many natural resources and outdoor recreation.

The sentiment here is along these lines, but I know very few will take the trouble to voice their wishes.

Sincerely yours,

HARVEY C. ELLIOTT.

MISSOULA, MONT., *April 28, 1953.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: I have read H. R. 4023 introduced by Mr. D'EWART and S. 1491 introduced by Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BARRETT regarding management of public lands, particularly as to grazing and lease privileges by sheep and cattle men. I am convinced the provisions of this proposed bill are a serious mistake and a step backward.

Our people out here do not want to see the management of our public lands taken from professional and competent people, who are doing a good job now, and placed in the hands of those who may exploit them for their own interests. We want to keep our hunting and fishing privileges and our precious watersheds unimpaired.

Please work against this bill in committee and vote against it should it come up for passage in the Senate.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN C. WOOD.

AUGUSTA, MONT., *April 21, 1953.*

TO: Senator MIKE MANSFIELD.
Subject: H. R. 4023.

Request that this letter be made a part of the record and be available at the hearings.

I have read this above-mentioned bill over carefully and the comments on the proposed Uniform Federal Grazing Tenancy Act, and I think it is a bad piece of legislation and not to the best interests of the general public.

Therefore I ask that adverse action be taken on this above-mentioned bill. Many of my friends with whom I have discussed this bill, also think adverse action should be taken on it.

Yours truly,

ROSCOE O. GEISE.

GERALDINE COMMUNITY
COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Geraldine, Mont., April 23, 1953.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have given consideration to H. R. 4023 and believe it to be highly undesirable. This decision was reached by unanimous vote by the Geraldine Community Commercial Club.

We kindly solicit your help in defeating H. R. 4023.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS E. HERROD, *Secretary.*

FORESTRY CLUB,
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, Mont., May 13, 1953.

The Honorable MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Reference is made to the bill H. R. 4023, introduced by Mr. D'EWART, and its twin, S. 1491, introduced by Messrs. BUTLER and BARRETT. This act, being known as the Uniform Federal Grazing Land Act, proposed by Mr. D'EWART, has been brought to the attention of our forestry club here at the university, and we have spent considerable time in interpreting the exact meaning and consequent fallacies that are to be found in this act.

We find this bill to be very cleverly written and is definitely not the boon to public interests which it proposed to be. It is in actuality the big freeze which will eventually put the whole public domain into the hands of a proportionately small, powerful, and monopolistic few. Those acquiring the bulk of this relatively "free" land will utilize it with little thought of conservation measures as they have virtually nothing to lose. They will reap the profits of the land, Uncle Sam getting practically nothing, while the taxpayer bears the full burden of depreciation. This bill would give the Secretary no more authority than he already has and would seem to require of him only that which would benefit the lessee of the land. Furthermore, any decision made by the Secretary could be appealed in the civil courts, which would attempt to abrogate the Administrative Procedure Act, which adheres to the idea that administrative decisions under statutory authority are not reviewable in courts unless capricious or illegal.

These are a few of the major points which are brought out in detail by the emergency committee on natural resources in reference to this bill. It is very poor legislation, as can be readily seen after reviewing both sides of the issue. We would very much like to see this bill defeated.

Very sincerely,

GERALD WRIGHT, *President.*

BELT, MONT., *May 6, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: In regard to D'EWART'S bill No. 4023, I wish to inform you that I'm very much concerned over the outcome of this land grab.

I'm a small permit holder in the national forest and I'm dependent on this for my summer pasture; in fact, my livelihood depends on it. My father had it before I did, a matter of some 35 years or so.

Now grass is a natural resource same as minerals, oil, and waterpower, and the only way it can be utilized is by grazing it to livestock which assures food for the Nation, a living for the small cattleman, and revenue for the Government in grazing fees and taxes.

Now, Mr. MANSFIELD, I wish you would do everything in your power to defeat this and any other bills that threaten our national forests which are our playgrounds and recreation areas. Keep up the good work in behalf of Montana.

Yours truly,

HARVEY W. TALVI.

MISSOULA, MONT., *May 14, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am writing in favor of your opposition to the D'Ewart bill, H. R. 4023, and the Butler-Barrett bill, S. 1491.

Recognising the length of time you have represented the people of this State I hope and urge that you use your accumulated knowledge to the utmost active opposition possible.

To me, the most dangerous section of the bill is section 7 in which it is made possible for a permittee to transfer his grazing privilege to successors.

Yours truly,

MRS. MILDRED SWACKHAMER.

WESTERN MONTANA FISH AND GAME ASSOCIATION,
Missoula, Mont., May 16, 1953.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Over the course of many years the Western Montana Fish and Game Association has consistently supported the cause of better management of both public and private lands. It has followed this policy in the belief that high-type land management not only will serve the best interests of the American people but that it will also provide better conditions for the production of wildlife.

Having considered the provisions of H. R. 4023, it is the judgment of the association that this bill, if passed, could only lead to poorer quality land management on much of the Federal land holdings of the West rather than lead to better quality land management. It is its judgment that the provisions of the bill would tend to degrade water and wildlife values in many areas, thus working against the best interests of the general public which has joint ownership of Federal public lands.

The Western Montana Fish and Game Association, consisting of 2,500 members, therefore, goes on record as opposed to the passage of H. R. 4023. We hereby request that this letter be made a part of the record of the hearing.

Sincerely,

ELMER J. STOWE,
Secretary.

GLASGOW, MONT., *April 16, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD: The Farmers Union, Local No. 94, goes on record as opposing H. R. 4023 because they feel this bill would be harmful to the small stockman. The local also is against H. R. 1559.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. CLARA ISAKSON,
Secretary, Farmers Union, Local No. 94.

CASCADE COUNTY TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY,
Great Falls, Mont., April 18, 1953.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: The Cascade County Trades and Labor Assembly is strongly opposed to proposal for an act, House bill 4023.

We feel that you are elected to represent the people of Montana, in Washington, D. C., and should support legislation beneficial to the residents of the State as a whole.

We note that section 5 of this bill places national forest grazing privileges under local advisory boards similar to those which now supervise administration of Taylor Grazing Act lands. Such boards are notoriously controlled by livestock interests and could not be expected to function in the best interests of all the people.

We do not believe in the principle of vested rights in the national forest grazing lands.

The assembly hopes you will defeat this proposed measure in the interest of democracy.

Very truly yours,

JOHN EVANKO, *Jr., Secretary.*

OPHEIM, MONT., *April 16, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill H. R. 4023 introduced by Representative D'EWART. Also against Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. HAZEL MILLER, *Farmer.*

FORT BENTON, MONT., *April 17, 1953.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I urge you to consider H. bill 4023 and to do everything you can to defeat this bill. It won't be necessary for me to point out the hazards and injustices in this bill for I am sure that you are aware of them. A chosen few should never obtain dominance in control of our resources. They should be kept in trust and administered for the people as a whole. The passage of this bill will give way for exploitation. I think further that the Forest Service is doing a fine job in managing our grass and timber tracts in contrast to Taylor grazing lands. Do all you can to defeat this. Will you?

I want to add now that the above is off my chest that I think you are doing an excellent job representing the people of this State and of the whole country.

Thank you.

GEORGE PUCKETT.

GREAT FALLS LODGE, NO. 1046,
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
Great Falls, Mont., April 20, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Seems funny to call you Senator but it is nice. I'm writing to you to tell you that this lodge request your help in defeating House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART, as we feel that this bill is not in the best interest of the general public. That is, of course, if the bill passes the House.

We are also opposed to turning over the tideland oil to the different States. We know that you are against this too but thought that you would like to know our viewpoint.

Thanking you in advance, I remain

Sincerely,

EDGAR R. LINN,
Recording Secretary.

STANFORD, MONT., *May 4, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Wesley D'EWART's grazing bill, I believe No. 4023, looks like a bad one to me and I have no doubt you are of the same opinion.

Hope it does not pass.

Am also definitely in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway, think it would be a great thing for the United States.

Would also like to see the farmer PMA committees continued as they are. Think we should have acreage control or marketing quotas or both to keep down burdensome surpluses.

Yours very truly,

J. H. WILSON.

GLASGOW, MONT., *April 16, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD: I wish to express my opinion on H. R. 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana. I am opposed to this bill, also the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Yours truly,

MRS. ETHEL WARD.

GLASGOW, MONT., *April 16, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I wish to express my opinion on H. R. 4033, introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana.

I am opposed to this bill, also the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Yours truly,

ALYCE BECK.

GREYBULL, WYO., *April 17, 1953.*

Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

"Resolved by the Greybull Rod and Gun Club in the regular meeting held April 6, 1953, That said legislation bill No. H. R. 4023, introduced by Congressman D'EWART, of Montana, and bill No. 1491, introduced by Senator FRANK BARRETT, of Wyoming, both bills being identical in nature, vesting the rights to a few individuals to exploit our forests and mountains at their discretion, to the determent of 90 percent of the people of Wyoming and our Nation in general. By majority vote, this club goes on record in urging the defeat of this bill; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Wyoming delegation in Congress, to the Montana delegation in Congress, to the Governors of the States of Montana and Wyoming, to the Montana Federation of Wild Life, to the Wyoming Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, and to all other clubs and groups interested in the protection of our mountains and wildlife of Wyoming and the other western States involved."

Sincerely,

GREYBULL ROD AND GUN CLUB,
By R. L. DOCKERY, *President.*

Attest:

JEANNETTE DOETER, *Secretary.*

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *April 18, 1953.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Meat Cutters and Butchers Local, No. 479, of Great Falls, Mont., at their regular meeting held April 15, 1953, took action against H. R. 4023 pertaining to leasing of forest lands to stockmen.

We believe that these forest lands should be preserved for the public, to be used as recreational centers, also for the preservation of wildlife. When these lands are leased to stockmen they usually keep the public off from these lands, thereby the public is deprived of recreational facilities. We hope you will vote against this bill when it comes up for passage.

We also took action against giving the tidelands oil to the States bordering on these tidelands. We believe that the oil on these lands should be held by the Nation as a

whole for the purpose of educating our children and building facilities to educate them.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. DUSAK,
Secretary, Butchers and Meat Cutters Local Union No. 479.

GLASGOW, MONT., *April 16, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MANSFIELD: I wish to express my opinion on H. R. 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana.

I am opposed to this bill, also the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Yours truly,

THEO. BECK.

OPHEIM, MONT., *April 16, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART; also against Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD DAVENPORT,
Stockman.

OPHEIM, MONT., *April 16, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART.

Also against the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Mrs. DELLA STEVENS.

OPHEIM, MONT.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART; also against Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. MABEL WESTLY.

OPHEIM, MONT., *April 16, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am opposed to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative W. D'EWART; also against the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Sincerely yours,

ADOLPH WESTBY.

OPHEIM, MONT., *April 16, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana; also to the Mason bill, No. 1559.

Respectfully,

L. B. TAYLOR.

OPHEIM, MONT.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART; also against the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

N. E. STEVENS, *Farmer.*

MISSOULA, MONT., *April 11, 1953.*

MIKE: I assume you are fully informed on the subject of the following editorial. If you are not and wish further information I am sure you can get it by a request to our office for someone to brief you.

Senator MURRAY is in a strategic position with his membership on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He should have the facts available to him also. Forest Cooper is a legal adviser to the southern cattlemen who sponsor this legislation. I feel sure you appreciate the significance. Hearings on the D'Ewart bill are scheduled for about May 20. AIKEN and HOPE have introduced bills to help the situation.

Regards,

PETE HANSON.

(Enclosure)

[From the Great Falls Tribune of April 9, 1953]

SHALL FORESTS BE PRIVATE PRESERVES?

A dangerous storm is brewing, imperiling national forests of Montana and throughout the mountain West. It is embodied in identical bills now pending in both branches of Congress. If enacted into law these measures could turn grazing permits on our national forests into legal property rights for the benefit of a comparatively few large livestock operators.

In the House this bill (H. R. 4023) has been introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana. Notation that it was introduced by request may indicate that Mr. D'EWART has some reservations regarding it but we believe his sponsorship of it, limited or otherwise, is a serious mistake. In the upper branch a companion bill is sponsored by Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming, and BUTLER of Nebraska.

The bills would reverse the established policy of administering our national forests for the greatest good to the greatest number. That policy recognizes Government control as necessary to safeguard vital resources for the benefit of all the people. Timber and watersheds are given first priority. Other uses are secondary. This overall policy has proved wise and farseeing.

The Forest Service now affords the stockmen considerable protection in the exercise of grazing privileges. Having once granted a rancher a permit to graze a specific number on the national forest, he is accorded preference rights for a similar number as long as he retains the ranch holdings. But limits are established as to how many one owner may graze on the forests and these limits vary in accordance with the economy of the area which surrounds the forests.

The pending legislation could, in effect, establish property rights to the grazing permits which could be bought and sold and which could lead to all of the rights eventually going to a few large operators. It would also transfer a major portion of the control and administration of forest grazing lands to advisory boards elected by the permit holders.

There are bountiful assets in our public forest lands and a multiplicity of interests—some of them conflicting. The grazing privilege is important to the livestock industry. It deserves both fair and practical administration but it does not deserve special advantages that would jeopardize the best long-term interests of the region and the country.

We are told that the impetus for this legislation came from the Southwest. There is no conflict in Montana, but there could be in years to come, under such a law. Hence we think it is a bad piece of legislation for Montana as well as for the entire mountain area of public domain.

GRASSHAVEN RANCHES,
Missoula, Mont., April 7, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: Your letter of March 10 came during my extended stay at the ranch near Billings. I am writing County Agent Thomas at Hamilton asking that he send you a copy of the ARC plan developed at the grass roots for Ravalli County. I hope you will urge Secretary Benson to give this locally developed plan his sympathetic support. I believe it is in harmony with ideas that Benson has expressed.

MIKE, I am really alarmed over the threat to our public lands and related resources that is clearly developing from various directions such as the offshore oil question. Another is H. R. 4023 by D'EWART and a similar bill in the Senate by BARRETT and others. I believe you know that it will be a sorry day for the smaller stockmen with permits on national forests and grazing districts if these bills become law. As one of them I hope you will do everything consistently possible to oppose this legislation cooked up by a little group of nonrepresentative stockmen who have worked for years for legislation that would give them an unfair advantage and open the door to the plunder of public property.

Sincerely yours,

LEON C. HURTT,
Range and Ranch Consultant.

ELKHORN HOT SPRINGS,
Polaris, Mont., May 7, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am writing in great concernment about the possibility of the passage of S. 1491, commonly called the stockmen's bill.

Senator MANSFIELD, I am unequivocally opposed to this so-called conservation bill and urge you to do your utmost in seeing and working toward its defeat.

This bill will not only aid the large cattleman and bring about the destruction of the small rancher. Not only will this bill ruin the small man it will bring about the desecration of our public lands and national forests.

Permit the rancher to have free use of the lands and forests and the lumbermen will then step up and place their foot in the door and demand their "vested rights."

We cannot permit the few to ruin our watersheds, close the playgrounds of thousands of people, stifle the propagation of our animals and fish, and impoverish the small cattleman.

Senator MANSFIELD, as a Senator from a great Western State, one in which tourists play a huge part in our income, I once again urge you to work toward the defeat of S. 1491.

Most sincerely,

CHARLES W. HAIGHT, Jr.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, May 1, 1953.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is my hope that you will help to defeat, or in any case modify, Senate bill 1491, the so-called stockman's bill.

Sincerely,

LUDVIG G. BROWMAN,
Chairman, Department of Zoology.

BELT, MONT., *May 8, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD:

We go on record against H. R. 4023. There are 106 members.

TIGER BUTTE FARMERS UNION, No. 47,
LEE ROY SMITH, *Secretary.*

DEER LODGE, MONT., *May 6, 1953.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Congressman From Montana,
Washington, D. C.:

This is a copy of a letter of protest sent to WESLEY A. D'EWART for introducing H. R. 4023:

"We, the undersigned, are just a few of the people who resent and condemn your introduction and support of H. R. 4023. Why are you trying to take from the people control of public forest and grazing land to give to the large livestock operators?"

Twenty signatures accompanied this letter.

We were pleased to note you were against the above measure and are taking this means to let you know we approve your action.

Respectfully yours,

L. D. AKERS.

HELENA, MONT., *May 5, 1953.*

Chairman WESLEY D'EWART,
Subcommittee on Public Lands, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having been born and raised in Montana, as most of my friends were, and being ardent sportsmen as well as being vitally interested in our national forests, which must be preserved unrestricted for future generations to enjoy, we are very much opposed to the passage of H. R. 4023 as well as Senate bill 1491.

We are in full accord with the letter of April 8, 1953, from Robert Yeoman, president of the Cascade County Wildlife Association, addressed to you and request that you and Representative LEE METCALF, if he is in favor of it, withdraw your personal support from this bill and that it receive an unfavorable report.

A copy of this letter is being sent to Representative LEE METCALF as well as to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, together with the request that the Senators take similar action with regard to Senate bill 1491.

Would your efforts not be better directed in securing additional funds to combat the disease that is killing millions of trees in Montana and the Pacific Northwest as, if this dread disease is not stopped, there will be no national forests or forests on private lands for anyone to enjoy.

Your earnest support is solicited.

Very truly yours,

NORMAN J. HATCH.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 4, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a citizen and sportsman of Montana, I go on record as being opposed to the passage of House bill 4023.

It is my understanding that the national forests were created for the enjoyment and use of all the people of this country. As I see it, this bill would turn over our national forests to a selected few, who could control all rights on this land for decades to come. The present policy of grazing in the national forests is adequate to serve both the stockman and other interests and yet allow the other people of this country to enjoy them.

I am certainly against any bill or provision that leads, or that could lead, to the capture of our national forests and lands by a minority group.

Yours very truly,

ANGELO PAUL MATTEUCCI.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 7, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I resent the powerful interests that are backing the bills H. R. 4023 and S. 1491.

The bills would turn grazing privileges on the public's national forests into private preserves for the benefit of the greedy few.

I will be looking to you to protect our interests so that we can continue to enjoy the beauty spots of Montana.

I request that this letter be made part of the testimony of the hearing of these bills.

Sincerely,

LILY MCKENZIE
Mrs. J. McKenzie.

LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER
SPORTSMEN'S COUNCIL,
Vancouver, Wash., May 16, 1953.

Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Congressman from Montana,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

CONGRESSMAN WESLEY A. D'EWART: It has come to my attention that you presented H. R. 4023 "by request." It is hoped that it was due to the pressure of your daily work and shortage of time to thoroughly examine this thing that you did present it. If you presented it with full knowledge of the content of the bill, and, if passed, the effect that it would have upon our public domain, I am afraid that the good people of Montana have been taken for a ride.

Having been a long-time resident of Missoula, Mont., and being very proud of the State, its history, and pioneers, I am very sorry to see such legislation as this come from a Representative of this very great and respected State.

I trust, now that you have been made aware of the full intent of H. R. 4023, that you will not do anything to further its passage, but will try to have it withdrawn. It is more honorable to admit an error of judgment than to continue with a thing like H. R. 4023.

Respectfully yours,

HOWARD E. NELSON,
President.

DEAR MIKE: Congratulations on your new place in Washington. It looks like the quality of the Senate is going up and that of the House is going down—if H. R. 4023 is any indication.

I am proud of you, MIKE, on the stand you took on the tidelands bill. I read a portion of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 4, 1953, volume 99, No. 80. Now, for the sake of some of our other land, do what you can to stop H. R. 4023. I can assume that from your stand on the tidelands bill that you would feel the same about H. R. 4023.

Elinor sends greetings and best wishes to Maureen.

Keep up the good work, MIKE. I would like to hear from you if you get a free moment.

Conservationally yours,

HOWARD NELSON.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 4, 1953.*

The Honorable Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I wish to register my opposition to House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491. You undoubtedly are more familiar with the expected workings of these than I, but as a matter of policy, not as a sportsman, but as a citizen of the United States, it seems to me that both of these bills should be killed.

I respectfully request that this letter be made a part of the testimony of the hearings on these bills before the respective committees.

Yours very truly,

FLOYD S. WEIMER.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 4, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am enclosing a clipping from the Great Falls Tribune, which is self-explanatory, and I wish to enter my protest against House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491.

I also want to mention something else—in regard to the GI loan—most of these men figure they are discriminated against and I believe if the down payment on homes for GI's was reduced to 10 percent instead of 20 percent that the loan companies demand in Montana and the payments spread over a longer period of time—it would offset a lot of the dissatisfaction among them at this time.

I am a member of the American Legion and a good listener.

Senator, I do hope this information will be of some interest to you.

With every good wish, I am,

Respectfully,

JOHN D. REARDEN.

(Enclosure)

[From the Great Falls Tribune]

EXCERPTS FROM AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN D'EWART

CASCADE COUNTY WILDLIFE ASSOCIATION,
April 8, 1953.

Chairman WESLEY D'EWART,
Subcommittee on Public Lands
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of directors of our organization, representing over 1,800 sportsmen in this area, voted unanimously to go on record as being very much opposed to the passage of H. R. 4023 for the following reasons:

Section 5 of your bill places national forest grazing privileges under local advisory boards similar to those which now supervise administration of the Taylor Grazing Act lands. We wish to go on record that we do not favor putting the national forest under local advisory boards as we do not feel that this type of supervision is in the best interests of all the people.

Administrative decisions by the Forest Service or Land Management Bureau under your bill would be made subject to court review. Under such an arrangement, Federal authority to manage and protect would be greatly weakened. Were they so inclined, powerful financial interests could prolong court action indefinitely * * * possibly for years; meanwhile, disputed range could become irretrievably ruined.

Sections 6 and 7 of your bill would give holders of established grazing privileges "first preference for continued use" and entitle them "to transfer their grazing privileges as they stand at the time, to successors." What you are proposing is a vested right in the national forest grazing lands. You would transfer to a tiny minority of western livestock men a vested right to use and sell grazing privileges in the forests which belong to the public at large.

We are not opposed to the wise multiple use of what remains of our once vast public lands. We subscribe to the theory that there must be a balance of activities and that one use cannot be to the exclusion of all others to favor any one group. Watershed, mineral, grazing, timber, recreational and wildlife must all be considered in a balanced program. Your bill, H. R. 4023, is in our opinion decidedly detrimental to the best interests of all the people and we therefore respectfully ask that—

First. H. R. 4023 receive an unfavorable report and

Second. That you withdraw your personal support from this special interest legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT YEOMAN,
President.

A VALUABLE PUBLIC ASSET IS AT STAKE

House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana, and an identical Senate bill 1491, would turn grazing privileges on the public's national forests into private preserves for the benefit of a comparatively few western stockmen. Under these bills, grazing privileges would become private property and Government control would be replaced by stockmen's advisory boards.

PROTECT YOUR INTEREST

Our forests belong to everyone. Limited grazing is essential to a well-balanced program of wise multiple use. But unless you take steps to protect your share now, you may wake up to find that the lands, within which your favorite picnic spots and fishing streams are located, are being managed primarily for the benefit of stockmen and that your favorite hunting grounds are bare of feed and game.

WE NEED YOUR HELP

Powerful interests are behind these bills. We need a storm of letters to defeat them. It's your fight, get into it. Write a letter to each Member of our Montana congressional delegation protesting these two bills. Mention the bills by number, House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491. Request that your letter be made a part of the testimony of the hearings on these bills. Below are the addresses you need.

Representative WESLEY D'EWART and Representative LEE METCALF, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

CASCADE COUNTY WILDLIFE ASSOCIATION.

BUTTE MOTOR CO.,
Butte, Mont., April 9, 1953.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: According to this morning's Great Falls Tribune, there has been a bill introduced by Representative D'EWART, H. R. 4023, which refers to grazing permits on our national forests, and according to the editorial, a companion bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming, and BUTLER of Nebraska.

According to this editorial, this is certainly legislation which we should carefully consider before allowing it to pass.

I know that you will give it your consideration but thought it advisable to write you.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE B. SCHOTTE.

MONTANA ASSOCIATION OF
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
Highwood, Mont., March 31, 1953.

Mr. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: I have recently received a copy of the bill, H. R. 4023, called the Uniform Federal Grazing Land Act. After having studied it over, I see many objectionable features which could have a very devastating effect on 20 million people living in the West.

There are approximately 2,000 communities in the Western States which are entirely dependent upon the mountain ranges for their domestic water supplies. The proper handling of these ranges directly affects the 150,000 irrigated farms in the West, and in turn the food production from these areas affects the population of the Nation. From this standpoint, therefore, no individual or group of individuals should ever have the right to direct management for selfish interests with no regard for the interests of others.

On Friday morning, March 13, 1953, our National Association of Soil Conservation District Directors met in your office with Under Secretary Coke and yourself. In your remarks I understood you to say that you desired to build grass-roots agricultural programs from the recommendations of the people from the field. Therefore, I am taking this liberty of voicing my objections to the above-mentioned bill, which I am sure is not in the interest of the majority of the people.

Some of the more objectionable features are outlined below:

The balance of power lies with the advisory boards in the administration of public grazing lands. A wildlife representative is authorized in an advisory capacity, but water, timber, recreation, and other interests are denied representation. Actually, the water alone from a given range may far outweigh the production of forage in value.

Existing permits would be frozen in the hands of those who hold them, regardless of whether they are of a temporary nature.

The sale of permits without limitation and as personal property opens the door to the creation of huge monopolies and to speculation in the purchase and sale of grazing permits.

Increased grazing capacity, although resulting from range improvements constructed from public funds, must be distributed to existing permittees regardless of other small dependent operators.

I do not believe that multiple interests can be properly safeguarded, or renewable resources properly managed subject to the Administrative Procedures Act.

In spite of the fact that this bill was introduced by a Montana man, I am sure that it is not endorsed by the majority of the people of this State. I sincerely hope that you will use your best efforts to defeat a selfish motive of this kind.

Yours very truly,

GORDON MCGOWAN,
Director, National Association of Soil Conservaiton Districts.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 22, 1953.*

Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I understand you are opposing D'EWART'S H. R. 4023. I am a small stockman running about 140 head of cattle in the national forest. I appreciate very much your opposition to this bill which is very dangerous to the well-being of all the people.

CAMP BROS.,
SIDNEY CAMP.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 22, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

I am a small stockman with over 30 years' grazing rights. If H. R. 4023 passes I feel that I will lose my rights and be wiped out. I would like the law to remain as is.

HUNT BROS.,
FRANCES HUNT.

MONARCH, MONT.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 22, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your present strong opposition to H. R. 4023 and S 1491, very dangerous legislation that will give a few stockmen a vested right in the public domain. Montana is very much interested since we have millions of acres of national forest and Department of Interior land within our boundaries. Our thousands of small family farmers and stockmen will be squeezed out of the picture entirely as lessees. They are already disadvantaged in the fact of present leasing arrangements, and H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 will make matters much worse. This legislation not only sharply limits opportunities for small stockmen but encourages bad conservation practices and opens way for unmerciful overgrazing of great Montana watersheds that feed other States. The national forests in Montana are a source of valuable timber. Provide water for human consumption, sanitation, irrigation and power, and offer recreation to all citizens regardless of station in life. This legislation allows a relatively few large stockmen to put paralyzing hands on great areas in which the general public has a vital interest. Please make our opposition to H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 emphatically clear.

RICHARD C. SHIPMAN,
Acting President, Montana Farmers Union.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 24, 1953.*

Senator MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am a small stockman. If H. R. 4023 passes I feel I will lose by grazing rights and be ruined. Would like law to remain as is. Thank you.

GUS R. OLSON.

MONARCH, MONT.

GARFIELD COUNTY SOIL
CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Jordan, Mont., May 19, 1953.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate From Montana,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Enclosed is a copy of the resolution adopted by the Garfield County Soil Conservation District, of Garfield County, Mont., concerning S. 1491 and H. R. 4023, recently introduced legislation relative to the Federal lands of the United States.

This resolution is forwarded in accordance with its terms and for the purposes therein stated.

Sincerely yours,

MANUEL J. ROTH,
Secretary.

(Enclosure)

RESOLUTION OF THE GARFIELD COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States at the 1st session of the 83d Congress a bill entitled "S. 1491," said bill having been introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, for himself and Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States at the 1st session of the 83d Congress, a bill entitled "H. R. 4023," said bill having been introduced by Mr. D'EWART, of Montana; and

Whereas both the aforementioned bills provide as follows, to wit: "To provide for the revision of the public lands laws in order to provide for orderly use, improvement, and development of the Federal lands and to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the Federal range, and for other purposes"; and

Whereas the board of supervisors of the Garfield County Soil Conservation District of Garfield County, Mont., having reviewed said bills and after due and careful consideration by said board, it has been deduced that said bills are being introduced for the benefit of a few privileged individuals and not for the benefit of all the peoples of the United States; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America does not tolerate such special legislation; and

Whereas said board feels that said bills will in effect give away the property involved therein of the people of the United States, with a complete disregard for the rights of others and amount to what might be termed a legal steal for said privileged individuals and usurping the rights of the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas such legislation would give vested rights to certain privileged individuals in the Federal lands, which vested rights would practically amount to the deeding of said lands by Congress to said individuals, to be held by them perpetually for their own selfish use and not for the benefit of all; and

Whereas the United States of America was not founded on selfishness and greed, but grew on pillars of honesty and justice for all of its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the Garfield County Soil Conservation District of Garfield County, Mont., now in special session, That it hereby goes on record against the aforementioned Senate bill 1491 and H. R. 4023, and that it desires the defeat of said legislation, for the reasons heretofore expressed in this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to Waters Davis, president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, so that he may be informed of the views and expressions of this member district, so that said views and expressions may be presented to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of both the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the following Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana: Senator JAMES MURRAY, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Representative LEE METCALF and Representative WESLEY D'EWART, so that they may be informed of said board's view and expressions, and they are hereby urged and requested to do all within their power to defeat said bills.

Dated this 15th day of May A. D. 1953.

GARFIELD COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
W. A. LARSON,
Chairman of the Board of Supervisors.

Attest:

MANUEL J. ROTH,
Secretary.

UNIVERSITY TEACHERS UNION,
LOCAL 497, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, Mont., May 19, 1953.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: At its regular meeting on May 13 the University Teachers' Union, AFT, Local 497, voted unanimously to go on record as vigorously opposed to the passage of H. R. 4023 and its companion measure in the Senate, S. 1491.

In our opinion, these bills would seriously endanger the preservation of our land and forest resources. We believe their enactment would be decidedly detrimental to the best interests of all the people, and we, therefore, respectfully request that they be given an unfavorable report and that this letter be included in the testimony offered in hearing on the bills.

Very truly yours,
C. RULON JEPPESON,
President.
LUCILE SPEER,
Resolutions Committee.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 23, 1953.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We concur most heartily in your action opposing grazing bill, H. R. 4023, as same would work a definite hardship on small-stockmen customers of ours.

GRAHAM & ROSS MERCANTILE CO.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 4, 1953.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to inform you that as residents of Montana we are very much opposed to House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491. These bills, in our opinion, are definitely detrimental to the best interest of all the people in our State. This letter may be used as testimony at the hearings on these bills.

Yours sincerely,
Thomas W. Smith, Mrs. Thomas W. Smith, Kathleen Kramer, G. H. Fontaine, Roy C. Scharr, Earl S. Hooker, Violet M. Hooker, Selmer D. Clark, Barbara J. Clark, Roy A. La Motte, Mrs. R. A. La Motte, George A. Blyth, Jeannette A. Leigland, Mrs. Earl S. La Motte, E. S. La Motte, Anthony J. Lopuch, Edward R. Teddy, Elmer V. Teddy, A. H. Strong, Ralph S. Silta, Olaf M. Olson, Eric R. Flippen, Peggy Lee Blyth, S. A. Leigland.

INTEREST RATES AND INFLATION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to speak at some length on the question of interest rates and inflation.

From across the aisle in the past few weeks has come an intermittent drumfire of criticism of one of the Eisenhower administration's steps toward establishing a sound fiscal policy for the United States. I refer to the repeated attacks which have been made against the Treasury Department's new issue of 3¼ percent 30-year bonds by some of our Democratic friends and also to the charge that it is a policy of the administration to raise interest rates. There is no such policy.

Some of this criticism may have been inspired by an honest misunderstanding of the factors which govern our monetary system. Much of it, we must conclude, has a political motive. It has become apparent that some of our opponents, with an eye on the 1954 elections, hope to use the interest-rate question as a basis for attacking the administration. It has been charged, for example, that the new Treasury bond issue is a part of what has been labeled a "takeaway" program. False slogans of that kind indicate that some of our opponents hope that if they shout black is white often enough and loud enough they can fool people into believing them.

Fortunately, the American people are rarely deceived when they have the facts, and I believe that when they know and understand the facts about this interest-rate question they will fully approve the President's program for giving the people of the United States a dollar they can count upon.

A sound dollar is one of the major goals of the Eisenhower administration, and is essential to its broad objectives of preserving our national security and strengthening our economy. The President stressed its importance in his radio report to the Nation on Wednesday, May 20, in this passage:

> For every American family today, this matter of the sound dollar is crucial. Without a sound dollar, every American family would face a renewal of inflation, an ever-increasing cost of living, the withering away of savings and life-insurance policies.

Mr. President, a return to a sound dollar will not take away anything from the American people; far from it. Instead, it will give them a sound pension dollar; a sound life-insurance dollar. It will give them a full dollar of interest on Government bonds; a full dollar of savings for a home or for the future education of their children.

It will encourage and reward thrift in all its forms. Not only will the reward of savings be greater, but economic conditions favorable to long-range planning will once more be assured.

That is the meaning of the new policy of economic stability which the present administration has announced it will follow. That the meaning of the policy which the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System have already begun to put into effect; the Treasury by keeping hands off the money market, and taking it as they find it.

To understand why such a policy is necessary, we must remember what the Eisenhower administration inherited from its predecessors. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey well described that sorry legacy when, in his address at the Associated Press luncheon on April 20, he said:

> For several years past we have been treading a dangerous path, one from which we have now turned. It is not too late to make the turn and avoid the inevitable consequences for which we were directly headed. For 20 years we have been consistently following unhealthy policies that induced inflation, depreciated our currency, and threatened to exhaust our credit. Over that period our dollar has shrunk from the hundred cents we started with to approximately 50 cents today. We have artificially manipulated our interest rates and have actually printed billions of dollars of current indebtedness which is only narrowly removed from printing money.

Mr. President, what has been the cost to the American people of these unhealthy policies of past administrations?

Ask the truly forgotten men and women who suffered because of inflation.

Ask those who had saved for a rainy day and found half their savings taken from their bank accounts by upward spiraling prices.

Ask those who had sacrificed to buy insurance for their families, only to find inflation slashing its value in half.

Ask those forced to live on fixed salaries, or upon salaries which always lagged behind the rise in prices—schoolteachers, postal employees, government employees of all kinds, Federal, State, and municipal.

Ask the pensioned war veterans and those receiving social security benefits, which they paid for, in part, with their own money.

Ask the working men and women who found the pensions upon which they had been counting made inadequate by the ever-increasing cost of living.

Ask the universities, the schools, and hospitals, whose endowment funds lost half their purchasing power, to the extent that they had fixed-income security.

Ask the teachers in any level of education.

Mr. President, much has been said about the added interest cost, totaling some 7½ million dollars a year, which is involved in increasing the Treasury's rate on long-term bonds from 2½ to 3¼ percent. That cost is negligible when measured against the toll which has been stolen from everyone's pocket by a deliberate encouragement of inflation.

We probably never will be able to reckon the total cost, but the figures for

1 year alone will give us an inkling of its magnitude. In the recent report of the Banking and Currency Committee on Senate bill 1081, we find this statement:

The cost of inflation during fiscal 1951 to the Department of Defense alone was estimated at 7 billion dollars. The consumers of this country had to pay an estimated 18 to 20 billion dollars more for the goods and services they bought because of the price increases which took place between the outbreak of hostilities in Korea and the date of the issuance of the general ceiling price regulation on January 26, 1951.

Those were the costs, in one year alone, of a deliberate policy of inflation adopted by the former administration. Those were the staggering sums taken from the pockets of American taxpayers and consumers. Measured against them, I repeat, the increased cost of the new interest rate on long-term Treasury bonds is negligible. It is a small price to pay for a return to a sound fiscal policy which, in the end, will save the taxpayers and consumers much larger amounts.

Mr. President, I have regretted that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has not, up to the present time, entered into the current discussion of interest rates. In the 82d session of the Congress he made an important contribution to the understanding of monetary questions, interest rates, and the effects of inflation.

At that time there were differences of opinion between the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board about the policy then in effect of pegging the prices of Government bonds by open-market purchases.

There were then in the Senate those who were making statements similar to some of those made recently on the other side of the aisle.

What the Senator from Illinois said then, Mr. President, was so clear and convincing that I should like to quote portions of his remarks in the Senate on February 22, 1951.

First, let us hear from the Senator from Illinois on the effects of inflation:

What do we mean by inflation? To every housewife who goes to market it is painfully apparent in the rising cost of living. To every schoolteacher, to every Government worker, to millions living on retirement funds and countless millions more who are counting on their savings, to every individual who depends for existence on a fixed income, it brings up a nightmare of fear that the dwindling purchasing power of the dollar will put them on a starvation level. To the churches, to the universities, to millions investing in insurance, it is a living threat to their security. And what about the pensions which Congress has voted for those of our Armed Forces who have been wounded on the fighting fronts? What about payments of the pensions for which labor has fought so hard; and what about the social-security payments? These pension payments are in terms of fixed money amounts; and if prices go up and the value of the dollar goes down, the security which it was intended they would give becomes a mirage.

So spoke the Senator from Illinois in February 1951.

Further on in the RECORD, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] said:

Every historian knows that inflation has been a great destroyer of the vast middle classes, and of governments. It has paved the way for dictatorships and the overthrow of democratic institutions. By wiping out the middle classes and separating society into the two classes of the propertyless, on the one hand, and the rich speculators, on the other, it paved the way for fascism and communism on the continent of Europe. It is a destroyer almost as evil as war itself. In the eyes of those who want to destroy democracy and capitalistic institutions, it is a cheap way of achieving their collapse. It costs the enemy nothing in lives or treasure. It is really a supreme folly for a nation which is arming against the threat of invasion from without to let this invader, inflation, bring ruin from within.

Mr. President, I may say it is just as true as can be that with inflation the rich become richer, and the poor become poorer. That is one of the inevitable results of inflation. I should like to debate that point with anyone at any time.

Those were strong words which the Senator from Illinois spoke, and they should be a caution to those good friends of his across the aisle who attack the Eisenhower administration bitterly for doing just what the distinguished Senator from Illinois said must be done in fairness and justice to all the people, namely, the prevention of inflation.

Now let us hear from the Senator from Illinois as he described, in 1951, the Treasury's position under the former administration when the prior interest rate controversy was in progress:

Over the shoulder of the Federal Reserve System has stood the Treasury, making threatening passes and gestures and from time to time cracking its whip.

And what have been the Treasury's demands? They have insisted that the Reserve System hold its arms wide open and buy every Government security which is offered. They have insisted, moreover, that these securities shall be purchased above par—except in the case of some short-term issue—and shall be at low rates of interest—the actual coupon rate being 2½ percent on outstanding long-term bonds.

Now, there are two assigned reasons why the Treasury insists upon this policy. The first is that they say the policy is necessary to prevent bonds from falling appreciably below par and hence bringing loss to those who hold them. The second reason is the saving to the Government in its interest payments. The total interest bill of the Government is now approximately $5,800,000,000 a year. A rise of one-half percent in the interest rate would, it is claimed, cost the Government a billion and a quarter dollars a year more in interest charges.

Listen to the Senator from Illinois as he demolishes the arguments of the men who then controlled the Treasury:

These gentlemen [Democratic Treasury Secretaries] have been misguided men. For under the guise of keeping the interest rate down, they have forced the Reserve to action which resulted in increased bank credits and hence created inflation.

The costs to the Government and to the people have been far greater than the gains which we have made from a lower interest rate. The increase in prices since Korea are probably already adding to the Federal Government costs at the approximate rate of six billion a year.

The cost of meeting the interest on the public debt is now roughly $5,800,000,000. The entire budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 1952 is approximately $71,600,000,000. This means that Government expenditures for purposes other than interest, that is, for services and materials, will be approximately $66 billion. It is a conservative estimate that there has been a general increase in prices of commodities and services of roughly 10 percent as a result of the inflation; so that this inflationary price increase then is already costing the Government at least $6 billion, and possibly more. That is in excess of the total amount which the Government now (1951) pays in interest.

Even if interest rates were doubled, which is at best a very remote possibility—

With which I agree—

the added cost of meeting the interest on the public debt would not equal the cost to the Government because of the rise in prices that has already taken place.

Furthermore, our whole society has been greatly disturbed and convulsed by the increase in the cost of living which has taken place; and no one knows what lies ahead.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois, distinguished economist that he is, displayed then an understanding of the necessity for a sound fiscal policy. I can only regret that he failed to convince some of his Democratic colleagues who are repeating now the arguments he exposed as utterly fallacious in 1951.

It has been contended that there is no longer danger of inflation; that what we now have to fear is deflation. However, all economic indicators point to the conclusion that we are still in a boom period. I have before me charts and data from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I have also before me charts from the Federal Reserve System, issued in April, containing economic indicators for May 1953. I also have the May letter on general business conditions of the National City Bank of New York. All of these documents indicate, as I have said, that we are in a boom period. Business activity is now at all-time high levels, and, generally speaking, nearly all industries are likewise enjoying great prosperity. That may not be true of all industries, but it is the showing of the general index. So, we are in a boom period.

Mr. President, we want no further inflation. We have seen too much of its damaging effects to fall into that error again. Neither do we want deflation. I read in last Sunday's newspaper about a politician who was discussing this issue. He said, "I am not for inflation, I am not for deflation. I am for 'flation.'" Mr. President, I submit that is about right.

What the Eisenhower administration wants to do—and is determined to do—is to safeguard the value of the dollar.

Mr. President, unfortunately, this is a somewhat technical subject. To understand why the new policy for a sound dollar is essential, we must understand the nature of our monetary system, and the effects upon it of Government financing. We should never forget those things, Mr. President, when we are talking about this very important and vital subject. Very simply, for a few moments, I shall try to deal with these matters. I admit the subject is very involved, and I shall therefore try not to go into it too deeply, but merely in a general way.

Since the close of the war the Government has done most of its financing by means of short-term note issues. Such securities are attractive primarily to commercial banks and to certain other

short-term investors. Their purchase by banks increases the money supply and thus puts upward pressure on prices and the cost of living. It is as simple as that.

In contrast, purchases of Government securities by long-term investors such as mutual savings banks, insurance companies, pension and trust funds, and so forth, tend to counteract the inflationary effects of Government borrowing. These institutions are the custodians of genuine savings. The funds which they put into Government securities and other types of investments can remain undisturbed for long periods of time. Indeed they are usually held to maturity.

In addition to relying almost entirely on short-term financing, the Government made it possible for investors who wished to do so to cash in their long-term holdings at any time without the risk of capital loss. Up to the time of the Treasury-Federal Reserve accord in 1951, the market was pegged. The peg was occasionally varied, but was never allowed to drop below par. At this figure, the Federal Reserve stood ready to buy all the bonds which investors might wish to sell.

The result was that long-term bonds no longer performed their unique function of contribution to economic stability. Instead they served about the same purpose as an equal amount of cash. Encouragement to inflationary spending could hardly have gone further.

It might be thought, in view of these policies, that the opportunities for long-term financing of the Government's needs during the postwar period were limited. But on the contrary, such opportunities were ample. Savings were accumulating. But they were not going into Government securities. Why? Because other borrowers were offering more attractive rates of return on obligations with a sound investment appeal.

To compete for loan funds, the Government would have had to raise interest rates—which it was unwilling to do. It would have had to meet the first test of pricing in a free market, namely, payment of the going rate. During the entire period between the close of World War II and the end of the Truman administration, the Treasury did not offer a single long-term marketable issue in either new borrowing or refunding operations. Small amounts of investment-type nonmarketable bonds were occasionally offered, and savings bond sales to individuals were promoted. But a large part of the increase in savings bonds over this period was due to the accumulation of interest. New investments of this type were not very attractive at a time when the dollar was rapidly depreciating.

It is true that the interest cost of the public debt during this period was smaller that it would have been if the Treasury had gone into the market and competed for investment funds on a price basis. Had it done so, it may be noted that the increased interest cost would have been partly recovered in taxation. Moreover, to the extent that the interest on Government bonds went to insurance companies, savings banks, pension funds, and other forms of the people's savings it would have benefited the millions of families who were being most damaged by inflation and by inadequate returns on their savings funds.

I might say, parenthetically, Mr. President, that it is time the thrifty individual, who is more responsible for the development of this country than is anyone else, came into his own again. We have been glorifying the borrower for the past 20 years, and I think we are now paying through the nose because of that policy. I believe the policy of the administration to which I referred, namely, a policy which will bring the saver back into his own and stop the hidden thief, inflation, is the policy which should be followed.

It is the intention of the present administration in conducting its financing operations to allow the forces of competition, and the price mechanism through which they work, to have the fullest scope consistent with the national well being. This is the meaning of a free market. It is an essential step in restoring the independence of the Federal Reserve System and enabling it once more to use monetary policy in the best interests of the country as a whole.

Competition for funds is strong at the present time, when the Treasury must raise new money to cover expenditures in excess of revenues. State and local borrowing this calender year will probably approach the 1952 total of more than $7½ billion. Urban home credit will probably increase by another $6 billion this year; and consumer instalment credit—especially automobile credit—is currently expanding at a very high rate.

With active bidding in the investment markets, the Treasury cannot hope to obtain any significant share of investment funds unless it offers an interest rate and other terms which are judged adequate by those who have money to lend. The fact that the new 3¼-percent bond has been selling close to par since trading on this issue began is evidence that the Treasury priced its new security about right, in view of the market, in order to get the desired amount of funds from long-term investors.

Mr. President, incidentally, there has been some criticism with reference to the way that issue was handled. I say that events have proved that the Treasury was correct. The speculators, those who oversubscribed the bonds to bring the total subscription up to approximately $5 billion, about which we have heard so much from across the aisle, were prepared to borrow 10 times as much money as they needed to buy the bonds because they thought they could make a quarter of a percent out of them, or possibly a little more than that. What they found out was that the Treasury was right and they were wrong in their guess. They unloaded rapidly, and that brought the issue down below par. But I have noticed that lately the issue is going back. The last quotation I saw was 99$^{30}/_{32}$, which is practically par. So, Mr. President, I consider that the issue was a success. There is nothing about it for which to apologize, except with reference to the behavior of the speculators, who, from time to time, think it is wise to trade against their own Government, a practice which I thoroughly disapprove and which I think should be generally condemned.

However we may look at it, the fundamental question involved in our program for a return to sound money is actually very simple. For some time the Government will be running a deficit; taxes will not be sufficient to cover all our Government expenditures because of the situation we have inherited from the Truman administration. Do we as a people want to meet these requirements out of genuine savings, paid for at competitive market rates? Or do we want to continue the process of keeping a large portion of the debt in short-term issues, with all that that implies for the encouragement of inflationary pressures?

The American people gave their answer to that, along with some other questions, last November. They voted to protect the value of their savings.

There is only one way the present administration can fulfill the monetary responsibilities which the voters gave it last year. That is courageously to take whatever steps are necessary and within their authority to maintain the present balance between inflation and deflation—to balance the budget, and to safeguard the value of the dollar.

It is worth noting that the policies now being followed by this administration with respect to money, credit, and debt management are not new policies. A flexible monetary policy, capable of meeting both inflationary and deflationary threats, was one of the purposes for which the Federal Reserve System was created 40 years ago. By whom? By Carter Glass, distinguished Democratic Senator and Secretary of the Treasury. Under whom? Woodrow Wilson, a Democratic President.

Mr. President, I want to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that those two gentlemen would roll in their graves if they heard some of the statements which have been made on this floor by members of their own party.

It is a policy which has had the overwhelming support of specialists in the field of monetary, credit, and debt management policies throughout those 40 years. A rigid interest-rate structure, supported by artificial means, is the policy which is new. It was undertaken during World War II, supposedly to meet special war circumstances. It was continued after the war, when these circumstances were no longer present—with the disastrous results with which we are all familiar, and for which we shall continue to pay for a long time to come.

The dangers inherent in artificially low interest rates, and the need for a return to free markets, were given strong expression by the committees of the Congress who have been charged with investigations of these matters in recent years.

In January 1950, for example, the Subcommittee on Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policies of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], whom I have previously quoted, made the following recommendation on monetary policy:

We recommend that an appropriate, flexible, and vigorous monetary policy, employed

in coordination with fiscal and other policies, should be one of the principal methods used to achieve the purposes of the Employment Act. Timely flexibility toward easy credit at some times and credit restrictions at other times is an essential characteristic of a monetary policy that will promote economic stability rather than instability. The vigorous use of a restrictive monetary policy as an anti-inflation measure has been inhibited since the war by considerations relating to holding down the yields and supporting the prices of United States Government securities. As a long-run matter, we favor interest rates as low as they can be without inducing inflation, for low interest rates stimulate capital investment. But we believe that the advantages of avoiding inflation are so great and that a restrictive monetary policy can contribute so much to this end that the freedom of the Federal Reserve to restrict credit and raise interest rates for general stabilization purposes should be restored even if the cost should prove to be a significant increase in service charges on the Federal debt and a greater inconvenience to the Treasury in its sale of securities for new financing and refunding purposes.

In another section of its report the committee further stressed the importance of a return to free markets as follows:

Another reason for preferring reliance on monetary, credit, and fiscal policies as the major method of general economic stabilization is that they are more consistent with the maintenance of our democratic system and with the fostering and promotion of free competitive enterprise. These instruments do not involve the Government in detailed control of the particulars of the economy; they do not require the Government to intervene in individual transactions between buyer and seller, in dealings between employer and employee, and in the determination of the prices and production of particular commodities. These millions of intricate decisions are left to the operation of the market mechanism while general monetary, credit, and fiscal policies work toward stabilization by influencing the total supply and cost of money and the total amount of money income at the disposal of the private sectors of the economy. There is every difference between the effects of general overall monetary, credit, and fiscal policies which indirectly influence the economy toward stabilization and the effects of an elaborate system of direct controls.

In June of last year, another subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report—Subcommittee on General Credit Control and Debt Management, under the chairmanship of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN—reported that it saw no reason to alter the general recommendation on money and credit policies made in January 1950 by its predecessor committee. The majority report was not particularly critical of the policies then in effect, however, and for that reason the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in a minority statement, made a strong attack on the policy whereby Government securities could be turned into cash at any time without risk of capital loss. He urged, in particular, that stability of price levels was far more important to the social and economic well-being of the country than any artificially maintained stability of the interest rate.

I have heard the criticism made lately that there is no need now for higher interest rates and tighter credit since prices are not now rising. It is said also that high rates and tighter credit will bring hardships. People who want to borrow money, it is said, will have to pay more for it, and may find it harder to get.

It is perfectly true that a flexible monetary policy operates sometimes to tighten credit—to make it harder for people to borrow—when there is danger of inflationary developments, just as it acts to ease credit when a stimulus to business activity is needed. It is also true that many prices are not rising now. But with business and trade operating at close to capacity, as at present, the simple fact is that we cannot keep prices under control if we continue to supply credit in almost unlimited amounts at artificially low interest rates. That is the real heart of the matter. A stable price structure which safeguards the value of the dollar is worth very much more to the veteran, the home buyer, the farmer, the small businessman, the consumer, than the additional price which he may have to pay for borrowed funds.

Moreover, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that the time to prevent an inflationary price rise is before it starts—not after it is under way. Because of heavy tax payment months, the Government in the present half of this calendar year is taking in more money than it has been paying out. This is helping to keep the money supply in balance with the needs of the economy. But the opposite will be true in the second half of the year. We will then be taking in considerably less than we will be paying out.

We cannot ignore this deficit. The Treasury has to borrow money to cover it. Continued rapid expansion of private credit, combined with more Government borrowing, could easily put us right back on the road to inflation again. Interest rates have an important role to play in helping to keep this from happening. Their function is lost—and monetary policy rendered ineffective—when they are kept below the level which would permit them to contribute to the stability of the economy.

No one of us needs to fear that stability cannot be maintained—or that the prosperity of the country depends on continually increasing Government spending, financed in part by inflationary borrowings. In the words of the Secretary of the Treasury, speaking before the members of the Associated Press on April 20:

Peace is what we all want. It is nothing to fear, nor is there any reason for depression. Adjustments, yes. But not depression. So long as we maintain the soundness of our money; attain that nice balance between achieving security from aggression and maintaining economic strength; eliminate waste and handle our fiscal affairs with wisdom, America can look forward to good jobs at good pay and real advances in our scale of living. We can have a stronger economy based on sounder fundamental conditions and with greater opportunity for individual and collective future security than we have known in many years.

Mr. President, I gladly subscribe to those statements by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The monetary and debt management policies now being pursued represent only a part of the broad program for getting our American economy back on a sound basis. But they are an essential element in this program, and one which every citizen can understand in terms of his own income, his own savings, and his own individual plans for the future. These policies are important to him for those reasons.

In closing, let me repeat there is no policy to increase interest rates. The policy is to have a stable dollar, a sound dollar for all the workers and savers of America. With a sound dollar interest rates may fluctuate up and down, but no one will be hurt if the value of the dollar remains stable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I very gladly yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to extend my congratulations to the Senator from Connecticut on the superb address he has just made.

Mr. BUSH. I very deeply appreciate the Senator's compliment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for his excellent presentation of the subject covered in his address, which is seemingly a controversial problem, but which should not be. I believe every American citizen is interested in the stability of the dollar. For the past 15 or 20 years there has been the threat of inflationary pressure, which has wiped out much of the earnings of our people.

I know of the Senator's long experience in the financial field. His understanding and presentation go a long way toward clarifying the issues presented by the present policy of the Treasury and of the freedom that has been given to the Federal Reserve Board to protect the value of the United States dollar.

As I understand, the opposite philosophy is that we shall meet inflation by direct Government controls, which are never effective, but are a political approach to the solution of an economic problem which ought to be solved by action of the Federal Reserve.

Does the Senator from Connecticut agree with me that this inflationary pressure began, in the first instance, with the devaluation of the dollar, when the United States went off the gold standard, and, following that, by a decrease in the rediscount rates and in the bank reserve requirements; and that the most destructive policy of all was the open market purchasing by the Federal Reserve Board at a pegged price?

Mr. BUSH. I agree with the Senator's statement that that was a very important feature of the program that began the inflationary process, especially in the monetary field. Of course, the failure to balance the budget later became a very important factor.

Mr. BRICKER. Likewise, with reference to the issuance of short-term Government notes, is it not true that for every dollar of short-term money the Government borrowed, there was pumped into the credit and currency stream of the country between $5 and $6?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is correct; there was that effect.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, that continually raised prices that the people had to pay.

Mr. BUSH. It continually increased the supply of money without enlarging the supply of goods. Increasing the supply of money but leaving the supply of goods the same obviously had an inflationary effect.

Mr. BRICKER. The increased cost of living for the people of the United States was an inevitable consequence of the fiscal policy the Government carried out.

Mr. BUSH. It could not possibly have been otherwise. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. BRICKER. The only question we face is whether we shall have a sound dollar, or shall continue to have a program of greenbackism, which has been threatening the credit of the Nation.

Mr. BUSH. There can be no question at all about that. I do not believe the people of the United States, once they understand the issue, will stand for greenbackism. I think they are solidly behind the administration in its effort to create a sound dollar, and they will support that program. Furthermore, I believe that all Members of Congress who support it will be supported by the people.

Mr. BRICKER. I am quite confident the Senator is correct. There has been no depreciation in the value of some fifty-nine or sixty billion dollars of savings bonds held by people who loaned their money in an effort to win the war. There has been no decrease in the value of those bonds.

Mr. BUSH. I will not agree with the Senator about that. I think they have had some depreciation. The value of the money that was invested in savings bonds during the early part of the war is not the same as it is now.

Mr. BRICKER. But that is the result of inflation; it is not the result of present fiscal policy.

Mr. BUSH. It is the result of inflation.

Mr. BRICKER. There is no deflation in the market price of those bonds; is there?

Mr. BUSH. No; but there was no open market in those bonds. There was one agreed price all the time. One could cash his bonds from year to year at a price fixed well in advance.

Mr. BRICKER. The only loss to holders of those bonds was by reason of inflation. Inflation has lessened the value of the return on those bonds.

Mr. BUSH. But the Senator will agree with me that it was a very important loss; will he not?

Mr. BRICKER. It was just as important as was any savings account loss to the American people in the inflationary period. Those who had insurance policies and savings accounts in banks and building and loan associations have suffered approximately 60 times the total loss to depositors and stockholders in banks and building and loan associations during the 1932 failures.

Mr. BUSH. I will accept the Senator's statement. I cannot verify it.

Mr. BRICKER. That is, measured in purchasing power of the dollar.

I again commend the Senator for his presentation. He will have much support.

Mr. BUSH. I am very grateful to the Senator from Ohio for helping to develop this subject, and for his very generous remarks.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I gladly yield to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to take this occasion to congratulate my personal friend, the great statesman sent to the Senate by the people of Connecticut, and in turn, to congratulate the people of Connecticut for sending such an able, profound statesman to this body.

It is wholesome and inspiring to listen to a Senator of his stature deliver the profound speech we have just heard. When we consider the character, integrity, and ability of the Senator from Connecticut, who has presented his thesis to us today, we need have little fear for the future of this country. I congratulate the Senator on his remarks.

Mr. BUSH. I thank my friend from Idaho very deeply and sincerely for his too generous remarks. I want him to know that I appreciate his taking the trouble to make them. I hope I may prove worthy of them.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. PURTELL. I join other Senators in complimenting my colleague from Connecticut for doing a piece of work which needed to be done. Our people have been misinformed about the whole subject of interest. On behalf of the people of Connecticut and the people of the entire country, I thank my colleague for presenting to the Senate and to the people of the Nation the truth about the subject of interest. We owe my colleague a great debt for doing the job he has done.

Mr. BUSH. I am most grateful to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut for his generous remarks. I appreciate them very much indeed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am delighted to yield to my friend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. I commend the Senator from Connecticut for the magnificent statement he has made today. I hope his statement will be widely read by the people of the United States. What they need now is the truth. Many are evading the truth. Those who are being injured by the inflation which we now have are the folks with savings accounts, the veterans who are drawing pensions, and the men and women on social security. They are the ones who are losing. Is not that true?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not also true that the businessman who wants to speculate is the man who wins by inflation?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the inflationary times through which we have passed have been wonderful for the speculators. They have done well. I suspect that that fact has been partly responsible for the reluctance of some very wealthy people and speculators to fight inflation, because they have done very well under it. At some future time I should like to develop that point, because, as I have often said, under inflation the rich become richer and the poor become poorer. Under inflation the value of the things one owns goes up, whereas the man who does not own any property does not enjoy the benefit of any increase in value. However, the cost of living goes up, and his income remains the same. Moreover, as the value of the property, securities, or real estate which the individual owns goes up, his income from such property also goes up, and he is far better off under a 5 or 10 percent inflation than is the poor fellow who owns no property, and who is lucky if he obtains a raise after the inflation. That is why the rich become richer and the poor become poorer.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I sincerely trust that at some time in the very near future, the distinguished and able Senator from Connecticut will develop the subject upon which he has just spoken. It is essential for the people of the United States to understand that we cannot remain solvent unless our dollar is sound.

If the Senator will permit me, I should like to give an illustration of what inflation means. A farmer in my own county came to me not long ago and said: "I should like to give you an illustration of what inflation has done to me. Ten years ago I bought $1,000 worth of savings bonds. The other day I cashed them and got my $1,000. They cost me $750. At the time I bought those savings bonds I could have bought a Ford car or a Chevrolet car. However, now, with my $1,000 I could not buy half a car."

Does not the Senator agree that that is a very good illustration of the situation?

Mr. BUSH. It is a very good illustration. An additional factor is that he was supposed to be getting a return on his money. However, the inflation was so great that the return withered with the capital. The Senator is absolutely correct. I am most grateful for his assistance.

Mr. President, I yield the floor unless there are some questions.

Mr. CARLSON obtained the floor.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXEMPTION FROM ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4654) to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the purpose of House bill 4654 is to settle a number of issues relating to the annual leave rights of and lump-sum payments for unused annual leave to employees in the executive branch of the Government. The bill deals not only with certain matters that have caused many of us great concern during recent weeks but, in addition, it contains provisions that will enable the heads of departments and agencies to adopt more economical and efficient practices in the scheduling of work assignments and vacation periods throughout the Federal service.

The bill accomplishes the following major objectives:

First. It removes high officials in the executive branch of the Government from the leave system applicable to Federal employees generally.

Second. It ends the granting of lump-sum payments to such exempted officials covering periods of service in the future.

Third. It settles two basic questions: First, which officers are entitled to the compensation attached to their office by virtue of their status as officers and, second, which officers are required to conform to the regular statutes and regulations governing hours of work and leaves of absence.

Fourth. It restores the annual leave accumulation provisions of the 1951 Leave Act by repealing section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953—Public Law 455, 82d Congress.

Mr. President, I desire at this time to explain in some little detail the background and importance of each of the four major objectives of this bill.

First, the removal of certain high officials from the leave system applicable to Federal employees generally.

The granting of leave of absence with pay to employees of the Government goes back to the act of March 3, 1893. From then until the act of March 14, 1936, with the exception of a temporary economy act, the statutes provided in substance that the head of a department might grant 30 days' annual leave with pay to each clerk or employee.

It was not until the act of 1936 that the right of officers, as distinguished from employees, to earn and accrue annual leave was established. The 1936 act, in pertinent part, provided that—

> All civilian officers and employees of the United States wherever stationed and of the District of Columbia, regardless of their tenure, in addition to any accrued leave, shall be entitled to 26 days' annual leave with pay each calendar year, exclusive of Sundays and holidays.

Subsequent to enactment of the 1936 act, the Comptroller General was asked for a decision as to whether the act was applicable to the Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, who had been appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Comptroller General on the basis of the language of the act and in the absence of any indication in the legislative history of the act that it was not intended to apply to Cabinet officers, agency heads, or other appointive officials held in a decision rendered on November 14, 1939, that the official in question, being a civilian official of the United States and not expressly excepted from the terms of the statute, was entitled to annual leave with pay under the terms of the 1936 act.

Although under this act civilian officers and employees were entitled to earn and accrue unused leave, upon the termination of their services the accrued leave to the credit of such officials and employees could not be liquidated in a lump sum. Consequently, such officials and employees were carried on the payroll in a leave status until the expiration of their accrued leave and then terminated.

By the act of December 21, 1944, Congress provided for the liquidation of accumulated and accrued annual leave due an officer or employee upon separation from the service in a lump sum.

The reason for the enactment of the 1944 act as set forth in reports of the committees on civil service of the Senate and House are, in part, as follows:

> The purpose of this bill is to authorize a lump-sum payment for accumulated annual or vacation leave due any officer or employee of the Government when separated from the Government (or in the event of death).
>
> At the present time there is no authority in law to pay an employee in money for such leave as may be due him upon separation from the service. In order to receive the benefits of accumulated leave prior to separation from the service, the date of separation must be fixed at the expiration of such leave. Employees who are to be separated from the service therefore, must be carried on the payroll as nominal employees until they have received salary for the period covered by the accumulated leave.

The reports of the Senate and House Committees on Civil Service in connection with the 1944 Lump-Sum Act then state:

> This bill would provide many benefits such as the problem of dual compensation; stop service credit on the last day of active duty; permit immediate recruitment of a successor to a separated employee; would make fund available to employees leaving the services after the war enabling them to return to their homes; would simplify and expedite clearance of records in closing out installations; would eliminate considerable paperwork for payroll sections, and would save expenses to the Government.

After the 1944 act became law, the Comptroller General, in response to a question raised by the Federal Communications Commission with regard to the leave rights of a Commissioner, held as follows:

> The Annual Leave Act of March 14, 1936, is applicable to all civilian officers and employees of the United States, with certain exceptions not here material. Also, the act of December 21, 1944, is applicable to any civilian officer or employee of the United States who is entitled to receive leave of absence with pay. Therefore, a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, who is a civilian officer of the United States, clearly comes within the purview of both statutes.

In 1951 the leave laws applicable to civilian officers and employees were revised by enactment of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

The provisions of the 1951 act, like the provisions of the 1936 Leave Act and the 1944 Lump-Sum Act, apply to Cabinet members, agency heads, and other officials as well as employees.

That, in brief, is the history of the leave and lump-sum rights of civilian officers and employees in the Federal service.

The disclosure recently that 215 high officials of the Government who left the service during the period November 1, 1952, to February 15, 1953, received lump-sum payments aggregating over $700,000 on account of annual leave remaining to their credit indicated the need for reconsideration of the issues involved.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is unanimous of the view that a formal leave system and the right to lump-sum payments on account of any unused leave growing out of such a system is not appropriate in the case of top-ranking officials in the Government. This conclusion is based on the premise that such officials can never divest themselves of their responsibilities even during periods of vacation or illness. In effect such officials are on duty at all times; thus, it is absurd, in the case of these officials, to pretend that attendance and leave records can be maintained and then allow them lump-sum payments for unused annual leave remaining to their credit when they leave such positions.

As indicated earlier this bill has four major objectives, the first of which is the removal of certain high officials from the leave system applicable to Federal employees generally.

Section 1 of the bill accomplishes this objective by removing from the Sick and Annual Leave Act of 1951, the following:

First. All Presidential appointees in the executive branch whose ratio of basic compensation exceeds the maximum of grade GS-18—presently $14,800.

Second. All chiefs of mission in the Foreign Service and officers of similar rank in other agencies who are paid in accordance with the provisions of section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946—$15,000 to $25,000 a year.

Third. Other officers that may be specifically designated by the President except postmasters, United States attorneys, or United States marshals.

There are approximately 225 Presidential appointees who will be exempted from the 1951 Leave Act under the first provision referred to above. There are between 70 and 80 chiefs of mission in the Foreign Service and between 15 and 25 comparable rank officers in other agencies—principally in the Mutual Security Administration—who will be exempted from the leave act under the second provision. Under the third provision

the President has the authority—except with respect to postmasters, United States attorneys, and United States marshals—to remove from the 1951 Leave Act such other officers as he may designate. It has been indicated by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission speaking on behalf of the President that a permissive provision of this kind is advisable and necessary to bring about the exclusion of officials comparable to those specifically exempted such as the Treasurer of the United States, the civilian Commissioners of the District of Columbia, etc. It is estimated that the number of officers designated by the President will number less than a hundred. Thus, in total, the bill removes the 400 to 500 top officials of the Government from the leave act.

As indicated, the second major objective of the bill is to end the entitlement of high officials to lump-sum payments covering periods of service in the future.

This objective is accomplished by exempting such officials from coverage under the 1951 Leave Act. By terminating their right to annual leave, they automatically lose any rights to lump-sum payments covering periods of future service.

The third major objective of the bill is the settlement of two basic questions: First, which officers are entitled to the compensation attached to their office by virtue of their status as officers. Second, which officers are required to conform to the regular statutes and regulations governing hours of work and leaves of absence.

Section 1 of the bill settles both of these questions. Officers who are exempted from the act would retain their present right to absent themselves from duty as they see fit but they would lose the present unwarranted added right to leave benefits and lump-sum payments. On the other hand, officers who are not exempted from the Leave Act would lose their freedom with respect to hours of work but would retain their statutory rights to annual leave and lump-sum payments for any such unused leave upon separation from the service.

The fourth and final major objective of the bill is the restoration of the leave accumulation provisions of the 1951 Leave Act. Those provisions permit a maximum accumulation of 60 days' annual leave by employees in the United States and 90 days by overseas employees with minor exceptions.

The committee firmly believes that as a general rule, agencies should restrict the accumulation of annual leave by seeing to it that employees take regularly scheduled vacations. However, a reasonable amount of flexibility in the use and accumulation of annual leave is desirable for a number of reasons:

First. The committee is convinced, on the basis of testimony by the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and others, that the restriction on accumulations of annual leave is costly and unduly burdensome to administer. It is costly because (a) under certain circumstances when employees are forced to take time off or lose certain benefits to which they are entitled their work is done by others on an overtime basis, at overtime rates of pay; (b) it is necessary for agencies to maintain dual records on each employee which increases overhead; (c) its effect is reflected in higher turnover and lower employee morale.

Second. During emergencies or rush periods it may be advantageous to the Government to restrict the use of leave on a partial or total basis within an agency or even throughout the Federal service as a whole. Under these conditions, if leave cannot be accumulated, administrative officials must either force employees to lose earned leave or must grant leave, which results in loss of production, and may require work by other employees at overtime rates of pay.

Third. Employees earn only 13 days annual leave during each of the first 3 years of their employment. During the 4th through the 15th years, they earn 20 days per year, and thereafter 26 days per year. Not all of this time is available for vacation purposes, for the reason that every absence from duty for any reason is charged to the employee's leave account. As a result many employees, particularly the newer ones, find it difficult and financially prohibitive to return to their homes for their vacations on the amount of annual leave earned and remaining to their credit during any given year.

Fourth. Federal employees, unlike most employees in private employment, are not covered by the Federal unemployment-insurance program. The only financial protection against unemployment Federal employees have is the accumulated annual leave standing to their credit.

Fifth. The June 30 deadline date in the Thomas amendment precedes the normal summer vacation period. Thus, to avoid the forfeiture of earned leave, employees are compelled to schedule vacations at a time that is disadvantageous to the agency where they are employed because it causes an excess of leave-taking during the closing weeks of the fiscal year, when the workload is often at its peak.

Sixth. Another factor, and one not without considerable significance, is the 1951 Leave Act itself This act has been in effect only a little over a year—since January 6, 1952, to be specific. Under its terms the vast majority of Federal employees received a drastic cut-back in the amount of annual and sick leave earned each year. Sick leave was cut from 15 to 13 days a year. Annual leave was reduced as follows:

(a) Employees appointed for less than 90 days, reduced from 2½ days a month to no leave at all.

(b) Employees with less than 3 years service, reduced from 26 days to 13 days a year.

(c) Employees with 3 but less than 15 years' service, reduced from 26 days to 20 days a year.

(d) Employees with over 15 years' service—no change.

These cuts as voted by the Senate in 1951, reduced the leave earnings of the 2¼ million Federal employees by 15,630,000 days, having a salary value of over $275 million. Worded in another way, Federal employees were required to work 15 million days more, under the 1951 Leave Act, than they would have worked, had that act not been enacted. That measure was passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives. I wanted the Senate and the country to know that because of that Leave Act, the employees contributed $275 million worth of work the Government would not have received if that act had not been changed by Congress.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee believes that the reduced rate of leave earnings under the 1951 Leave Act is fair both to the employees and to the Government. It does believe, however, that a further restriction, such as that provided in the Thomas amendment, is neither necessary nor advisable.

In summary, on this point, repeal of section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, and restoration of the accumulation provisions of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 would (a) enable agencies to adopt more efficient work schedules and economical practices in the granting of leaves of absence, (b) enable employees to take reasonable vacations during the normal vacation season, (c) enable employees to establish a small amount of self-provided protection in the event of sudden unemployment through no fault of their own.

In connection with the four major objectives I have covered, the bill contains the following necessary technical provisions to assure that they are carried out as intended:

Subsection (s) of section 1 enables the President to authorize leaves of absence to chiefs of mission in the foreign service and comparable officers for use in the United States, its Territories and possessions. Under the 1951 Leave Act, such officers receive, in addition to annual and sick leave, home leave at the rate of 1 week for each 4 months' service abroad. Such home leave is not in the same category as annual leave, in that it must be used for that purpose only either during one or between two assignments abroad, and when it is not used, it cannot serve as the basis for any lump-sum payment. When such officers are removed from the 1951 Leave Act, they will lose their entitlement not only to annual and sick leave, but also to home leave. It is not necessary to provide them with annual and sick leave, because as officers they have freedom to absent themselves from duty. It is necessary, however, to provide statutory leaves of absence for use in the United States, its Territories and possessions, so that their travel cost can continue to be paid in the future, as at present.

Section 2 of the bill suspends the entitlement of officers taken out from under the 1951 Leave Act, as a result of enactment of the bill, to liquidation, by lump-sum payment at the time of or during their exemption from the act, of any leave to which they are entitled immediately prior to their exemption.

Such leave will remain frozen to the credit of the officer until first, he is separated from the service, in which case it will be liquidated at the rate of compensation he was receiving at the time of his exemption from the Leave Act;

or second, he transfers to a position subject to the Leave Act, in which case it will be recredited to him.

Finally, the bill contains a perfecting change to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

The 1951 Leave Act provides that employees may not have more than specified amounts of annual leave to their credit at the end of the last pay period occurring in the year. The end of the last pay period may occur on any date from December 20—as happened last year—to the end of the month. When it occurs before Christmas, some employees are forced to forfeit leave they might otherwise use over the Christmas and New Year's holidays. This can be overcome by correcting the 1951 Leave Act to provide that employees may not have more than specified amounts of annual leave to their credit at the beginning of the first pay period occurring in the year. This management of the leave year will permit the use of unused accrued leave over the holidays, while maintaining the advantages of pay-period accounting.

The committee believes that enactment of the bill as reported is highly desirable in the interest of economy and good management.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the bill will be passed.

My colleagues will notice that various amendments are submitted to the bill, which is a House measure, and deals with only one subject. In the amendments we provide for the various changes.

So, Mr. President, I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there in the bill any provision to prohibit the so-called firing-and-rehiring racket which was recently exposed—a plan whereby employees were being separated from the service and were paid for their annual leave, and then were being immediately reemployed, without forfeiting their annual leave?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; there is. We think we have in the bill adequate provisions on that point, and we also feel that the General Accounting Office has made some very definite rulings on this particular phase of the matter. The distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the former chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, placed in the RECORD earlier this year, I believe, some correspondence he had on that subject with the General Accounting Office.

As a committee, we felt that the matter was well taken care of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield further?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No doubt the Senator from Kansas is familiar with the amendment I offered a few days ago to one of the appropriation bills. That amendment provided that in the event an employee was separated from the service and received a lump-sum payment for his annual leave, and then was reemployed before the period covered by his annual leave had expired, he would be required to pay into the Treasury an amount equal to the unexpired portion of his annual leave.

Would the chairman of the committee accept an amendment which would prohibit that practice? I do not believe it is fully corrected in the bill as it now stands. I am sure the committee agrees with me that Congress never intended to endorse this practice when we passed the original law.

Mr. CARLSON. Our committee discussed that matter at some length. Personally, I am in accord with what the Senator from Delaware desires to do. If he believes that we have not taken care of the matter in this bill—and I certainly wish to take care of it—then I would not have objection, personally, to accepting his amendment and taking it to conference, with the distinct understanding that I am not familiar with the language of the amendment, although I am familiar with the principle he is trying to apply, with which I am in accord.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let me ask the Senator from Delaware what the amendment will do? Will it change the amount of leave Federal employees have already accumulated?

Mr WILLIAMS. The amendment was prepared by the Legislative Counsel, and I think it accomplishes its purpose outlined but, if in conference it is found that a rewording of the amendment is needed, I would not object.

The purpose of the amendment is that in the event individual employees or a group of employees are separated from the service and receive lump-sum payments for their annual leave, and if, for example, they had 60 days annual leave coming to them, they are reemployed by the Government within the 60-day period, then to the extent that the 60-day period had not expired, they would pay back into the Treasury the amount represented by the unexpired portion.

This will prevent a repetition of the case which occurred in the Rent Stabilization Agency, where employees were fired wholesale on Saturday night, and were reemployed on Monday morning, but in the meantime had received lump-sum payments for their accumulated annual leave.

If my amendment is adopted, and a similar incident occurs these employees could be reemployed only after they returned to the Treasury the lump-sum payments they had received for their accumulated annual leave—which I think such employees should do.

I repeat, the amendment merely provides that employees cannot draw their annual-leave payments and keep on working for the Federal Government.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as I have stated, personally I am in accord with what the Senator from Delaware is trying to do. I have had discussions with the General Accounting Office, which, after having studied the bill, has advised me that it would be glad to write a letter to the effect that the bill does take care of the matter.

As I say, I shall be willing to take the amendment to conference, where the proposal will be worked out with the conferees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement about the matter with which the Senator from Delaware dealt a few months ago.

I was interested in it, and I wrote to the Comptroller General of the United States, asking for a modification of the former ruling. In reply, the Comptroller General advised that, having inquired into the matter further, a ruling had been made which prohibits the very thing to which the Senator from Delaware referred a few moments ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that is correct, but, according to my information, there is still this situation: A man can be reemployed in a different position, under a different annual-leave system. For example, if he is presently holding a position as a permanent employe, and is transferred into temporary status, he would be under a different leave system. Temporary employees have a different leave system than that of permanent employees. There is therefore a question in the minds of some of those in the Comptroller General's Office as to whether the modified rule corrects that situation. Again I say the amendment would merely accomplish what we are all trying to do, and what the Comptroller General says must be done. I think it would afford an additional safeguard.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think that was true until the Comptroller General made his last ruling, which, in a way, changed his former ruling. The last ruling will, I think, take care of the situation about which the Senator from Delaware has complained. I base my statement upon the letter of the Comptroller General to me and also upon the order which he enclosed therewith.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps that is true. But if we adopt this amendment we will preclude any possible chance that some future Comptroller General will reverse that interpretation and return to the old interpretation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator from Delaware about that.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from South Carolina agree that we might take this amendment to conference?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it might be well to take it to conference. If it is found in conference that there is any question of its constitutionality—a question which might be raised by the attorneys—of course, I know that the Senator from Delaware would not further insist upon it, or would modify the amendment in order to take care of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment which is in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 202 of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended by adding a subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) (1) This title shall not apply to the following officers in the executive branch of the Government: (a) persons appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone, whose rates of basic compensation exceed the maximum rate provided in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; (b) persons who receive compensation at one of the rates authorized in section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; and (c) such other officers (except postmasters, United States attorneys, and United States marshals) as may be designated by the President. No officer in the executive branch to whom this title applies shall be deemed to be entitled to the compensation attached to his office solely by virtue of his status as an officer.

"(2) The President, in his discretion, may authorize leaves of absence to persons who are exempted from this title pursuant to subsection (c) (1) (b) for use in the United States and its Territories and possessions."

SEC. 2. (a) The accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which any officer exempted from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 as a result of the enactment of this act is entitled immediately prior to the date this act becomes applicable to him shall be liquidated by a lump-sum payment at the rate of compensation which he was receiving immediately prior to such date only upon (1) the separation of such officer from the service, (2) the death of such officer, or (3) the transfer of such officer to a position under a leave system other than the leave system provided by the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

(b) In the event any such exempted officer, without any break in the continuity of his service, again becomes subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 upon the completion of his service as an exempted officer, such officer shall be recredited with the unused annual and sick leave standing to his credit at the time he was exempted form the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

(c) In the event any such exempted officer is separated from the service to enter upon active service in the Armed Forces or the merchant marine of the United States, such officer shall be entitled (1) to receive compensation covering the accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which he is entitled immediately prior to the date this act becomes applicable to him, or (2) to elect to have such leave remain to his credit until his return from active service in the Armed Forces or the merchant marine.

SEC. 3 (a) Section 203 (c) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 679) is hereby amended by striking out the words "end of the last complete biweekly pay period" and substituting the words "beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period."

(b) Section 203 (d) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is hereby amended by striking out the words "end of the last complete biweekly pay period" and substituting the words "beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period."

(c) Section 208 (a) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended by striking out the words "end of the last complete biweekly pay period" and substituting the words "beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period."

SEC. 4. The foregoing provisions of this act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 5. Section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953 (Public Law 455, 82d Cong.), is hereby repealed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, after line 18, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 4. Under no circumstances shall any sums authorized or made available by this act be used to pay any civilian officer or employee (except an officer or employee stationed outside the continental United States) for any period of terminal leave in excess of 60 days; and if such officer or employee reenters the service within a period equal to that for which he was paid terminal leave he shall be required to refund to the United States an amount covering the period of accumulated unused.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are willing to accept the amendment, and take it to conference.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have prepared an amendment somewhat along the same line, which I ask to be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CARLSON to the committee amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 5, beginning with the word "only," in line 10, strike out down through line 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in accordance with the act of December 21, 1944. However, no officer shall be considered, by reason of the enactment of this act, to have been transferred to a different leave system within the meaning of such act."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CARLSON. I will be pleased to yield to the Senator, or, if he desires the floor in his own right, I shall yield the floor.

Mr. JENNER. I desire the floor in my own right.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4654) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as an explanation of my position on the bill which has just been passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 4654

Section 1: This section would remove from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951—

(a) Presidential appointees in the executive branch of the Government whose rates of basic compensation exceed the maximum of grade GS-18 (at present $14,800).

(b) Chiefs of missions in the Foreign Service and others who receive compensation at one of the rates authorized in sections 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 ($15,000 to $25,000 a year).

(c) Such other officers as may be designated by the President. However, it is specifically provided that the President may not remove postmasters, United States attorneys, or United States marshals.

Section 2: This section suspends the entitlement of those officers who are exempted from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 as a result of the enactment of the bill, to liquidation by lump-sum payment, during the period of their exemption from such act, of the accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which they are entitled immediately prior to their exemption from such act.

The accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which any such officer is so entitled is to be liquidated, by lump-sum payment at the rate of compensation which he was receiving immediately prior to his exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, if, while he is within the class of such exempted officers, he is separated from the service, dies, or is transferred out of the exempted service to a position under a leave system other than the leave system provided by the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

Section 3: Under the present act, regular accumulation limits of from 60 to 90 days take effect at the end of the last pay period in the calendar year. This means that employees who have reached the regular accumulation limit must use or forfeit all leave earned in the year by, for example, December 21 or 22. Thus, they must lose leave which, within a few days, could be used over the Christmas and New Year's holidays. This section allows accumulation limits to take effect at the beginning of the first pay period of the calendar year, thus permitting the use of unused accrued leave over the Christmas and New Year's holidays, while maintaining the advantages of pay-period accounting.

Section 4: This section provides that the foregoing provisions shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period following enactment.

Section 5: This section repeals section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, thereby reinstating the accumulation provisions of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

A reasonable amount of flexibility in the use and accumulation of annual leave is desirable for a number of reasons:

(1) The committee is convinced, on the basis of testimony by the Civil Service Commission, Bureau of the Budget, General Accounting Office, and others that the restriction on accumulations of annual leave is costly and unduly burdensome to administer. It is costly because (a) under certain circumstances when employees are forced to take time off or lose benefits to which they are entitled their work is done by others on an overtime basis at overtime rates of pay, (b) it is necessary for agencies to maintain dual records on each employee which increases overhead, (c) its effect is reflected in higher turnover and lower employee morale.

(2) During emergencies or rush periods it may be advantageous to the Government to restrict the use of leave on a partial or total basis within an agency or even throughout

the Federal service as a whole. Under these conditions, if leave cannot be accumulated, administrative officials must either force employees to lose earned leave or grant leave which results in loss of production and may require work by other employees at overtime rates of pay.

(3) Employees earn only 13 days annual leave during each of the first 3 years of their employment. During the 4th through the 15th years, they earn 20 days per year, and thereafter 26 days per year. Not all of this time is available for vacation purposes for the reason that every absence from duty for any reason is charged to the employee's leave account.

(4) Federal employees, unlike most employees in private employment, are not covered by the Federal unemployment insurance program. The only financial protection against unemployment Federal employees have is the accumulated annual leave standing to their credit.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the following resolution:

Resolved, That pursuant to Public Law 32 of the 83d Congress, the Speaker announced the appointment of the following Members to serve as members of the Joint Committee on Observance of the 50th Anniversary Year of Controlled Powered Flight: Mr. HINSHAW of California, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota, Mr. SCHENCK of Ohio, Mr. BONNER of North Carolina, Mr. PRIEST of Tennessee, and Mr. MACK of Illinois.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF FRANCISZEK JARECKI, A POLISH FLIER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to have the attention of the Senate for a few moments. Back in the days when this country was struggling for its liberty, the names of Pulaski and Kosciusko were very familiar to the people throughout the Thirteen Original States. Those men had joined with us in our fight for liberty. Very recently, the newspapers told of an incident involving a modern hero from Poland. It was the story of a young Polish flier, a boy 19 years of age, who had been separated from his mother when he was 9; who was captured by the Russians, and indoctrinated and inoculated with communistic thought from the Kremlin. The name of that young man is Franciszek Jarecki. The Russians felt that they had made this boy subservient to the concepts of Marxism, but he so well concealed his reactions that he became one of the great lieutenants in the Russian Air Force.

A few weeks before he decided to leave Russia, there came to his attention the fact that the Russians were getting a new jet plane; so he delayed his departure. He obtained one of those planes. Then, as he was flying in company with three other men, he decided that it was time for him to join up with what he called Anders Army of the Free Poles. He forthwith flew his plane to Denmark, where he landed. He was imprisoned for 13 days. Upon his release, he found his way to England, and, finally, to America. He now wants to join the American Air Force, to fight at this time for the country for which Kosciusko and Pulaski fought more than 150 years ago.

Mr. President, it is my great privilege today to have this young man in the Senate gallery as my guest. I ask him to rise, that we may honor him with our plaudits.

[Mr. Jarecki rose from his place in the gallery, and was greeted with applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to remind the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators that I happened to be at Idlewild Airport when this young man arrived from across the seas. I believe I was the first Member of the United States Senate to have the opportunity of welcoming him to our country, and of assuring him of our appreciation of the fine work he has done. We are very happy that he is here, and I sincerely trust that we may have much benefit from his splendid services.

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 8. It is Order No. 267 on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) providing for a consolidated general appropriation act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JENNER obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, immediately preceding the request for a quorum call, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who had been acting for me at a time when I was attending a meeting of the Republican Policy Committee, moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 267, Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, providing for a consolidated general appropriation act. I now ask for action on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) providing for a consolidated general appropriation act, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

WAR IN KOREA

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, we owe a debt of gratitude to the leader of the Socialist Party of Britain.

Clement Attlee has pulled the wool from our eyes. He has shown us the proposed sell-out of our fighting men in all its ugly nakedness.

At the Pacific political conference, to be held 90 days after the cease-fire in Korea, we are to sign away our honor and give Soviet Russia and her satellites the fruits of victory.

Mr. President, have we been defeated by Red China? Is it true we must drink to the last drop the bitter brew of defeat? Are the Communists victors who must receive the rewards of victory?

We have not been defeated in the field, Mr. President.

Never in all our long history, from the days of the Indian fighting in the wilderness, have Americans fought more bravely against more cruel odds than our American youth have fought against in the Korean theater in what was in reality the battle for Asia.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that we were never meant to win the war in Korea.

The plans were laid, down to the last detail, to push our men quickly off the Peninsula at Pusan, and leave all Asia to the Red forces.

The Communists in the Soviet Union, and their obedient agents in this country, knew Korea was halfway round the world from our sources of supply.

They knew Korea had been chosen for the decisive thrust because it was the most unfavorable terrain for a nation whose advantages lay in modern industrial power.

The Communists in Russia and in Washington knew we would be hopelessly defeated.

But our fighting men and our fighting military leaders did not understand defeat. Our Navy did not know it was impossible to steam across the Pacific in time to get the Marines into battle. So they did it.

Our commander in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, did not know it was impossible to strip Japan of our garrison forces.

Our supply men did not know it was impossible to get planes and guns across the Pacific.

Our salvage men in Japan did not know it was impossible to get pieces of junk from Pacific island dump heaps and turn them into parts of planes and vehicles.

Our airmen did not know it was impossible to go up in the fog, but they did it.

The American forces were not driven back into the Pacific.

Instead, they drove the Korean Communist forces back in total defeat.

Our commanding general and his advisers turned the line at Inchon and recaptured South Korea.

The Red Chinese entered the war. We surprised them as they formed their new invasion army. Our forces had to withdraw, but turned to fight again, ready for the final test.

All this is to establish one all-important fact: the Communist forces were

defeated in the spring of 1951, more than 2 years ago.

General Van Fleet has now made even clearer what was then unmistakably clear.

He says without equivocation that on April 28, 1951, the so-called U. N. forces had stopped the last big Red offensive cold, and a counterattack at that moment would have sent them reeling back toward disaster.

I repeat, Mr. President, General Van Fleet says our Armed Forces had disastrously defeated the combined North Korean and Chinese Communist armies 2 years ago.

When the Soviet peace proposal was broached in June, 1951, the short-wave radio networks around the world were filled with statements of foreign spokesmen:

> The Americans will never accept the Soviet peace offer. They have won the war. American firepower has proven it is superior to the vast manpower pools of Asia.

Everybody knew we had won the war—everybody but us.

Faced with the fact the Reds were beaten, did the pro-Red clique in our Government hesitate? No, Mr. President. They decided to do by indirection what they had bungled by letting the military use part of their strength.

In the 2 succeeding years, someone in our Government snatched defeat from the jaws of victory, and lowered the proud standard of American military power while our officials bent the knee to the new barbarians.

First of all—and this is not a digression—the American people and their spokesmen had been persuaded in early 1951 to send American troops, as well as American materiel, to Europe, though all the fighting was in Asia.

Mr. President, let me ask you this question: If you were one of the masterminds in the Kremlin, planning to destroy America without arousing her strength, if you had to quench the patriotic fire roused by prolongation of the fighting in Korea, could you have imagined any better way to keep down the fighting forces in Asia, and to keep them short of ammunition, than to build up a fictitious crisis in Europe?

Mr. President, let us never forget that this game is played on the world chessboard, and the debate on sending troops to Europe in early spring of 1951 was in fact a debate on not sending them to Korea. Having carefully diverted attention to Europe, the appeasers could move in Asia.

On April 10, 1951, the American commander in the Far East was summarily dismissed. He first learned of his dismissal from Mrs. MacArthur who had been told by an aide who had heard it over the radio.

What evil deed of our American commander occasioned his dismissal? He had asked the Reds if they were ready for a cease-fire and warned them that, if they were not, he would step up the attack. That was good American offensive strategy, and conformed at every step with military etiquette for commanders in the field.

On May 17, President Truman said he had dismissed our commanding general because this offer of an armistice wrecked his, the President's, plan for peace. General MacArthur answered this admission in one of the most important statements he ever made.

He said that twice before he had made the same offer without any objection and that a cease-fire could only be regarded as in full support of any political move toward peace, and here I ask you, Mr. President, to listen carefully while I quote exactly:

> Unless an agreement was in contemplation on the enemy's own terms.

General MacArthur knew then, as many Senators knew then, that on March 24, 1951, an agreement was in fact in contemplation to make peace on the enemy's own terms.

Our political leaders were working then to destroy at the council table, and in the press, the hard-won victory of our men on the battlefield.

In May 1951 I said:

> For months the administration's artists in propaganda have been softening us up in preparation for a Yalta peace in the Far East, for a settlement which at first looks like a victory, but like Yalta, would in reality be a sellout.

I even stated the terms of this sellout, because the Soviet Union had formally presented them on December 9, 1950, before the U. N.

The Soviet Union had said that peace could be obtained in Korea on two conditions.

First. That all foreign troops be withdrawn immediately from Korea.

Second. That the decision on the Korean question be entrusted to the Korean people themselves.

I said then:

> All the Soviet Union wants is to get the American Armed Forces out of Asia.
>
> Then time and the fifth column will do the rest.

Mr. President, these are still the Communist aims in Korea.

We must always translate Communist statements from their Aesopian language into words which make sense to us.

The most recent Korean peace proposal, that prisoners of war be turned over to five neutral nations, is proposition one in Aesopian language.

If the Communists cannot get our forces out, they will get us to invite the troops of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and India into the Korean Peninsula.

And who, Mr. President, will direct the operations of the troops of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, and India—indeed, of all five neutrals—if they operate under a single command?

The other Communist goal was liquidation of free China and admission of Red China to the U. N., with Nationalist China's seat on the Security Council.

We can be grateful to Mr. Attlee, because he has brought out into the open what, until now, has been clothed in the softest, most ambiguous language.

Recognition of Red China is the only real barrier to a peace agreement in Korea. The prisoners of war are pawns in this cruel game of power politics. They have never been the real issue.

The Communists haggle over 48,000 prisoners so we will forget the 400 million Chinese prisoners of war we are to abandon for all time.

The pro-Communists in Britain and the pro-Communists in the United States can never give up their insistence on placing Red China on the Security Council, because that is the No. 1 objective of the U. S. S. R. in Asia.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from Indiana remember that when Mr. Acheson returned from Europe there was a joint meeting of Congress to enable Congress to hear the results of Mr. Acheson's visit?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; I recall that.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. Acheson spoke for about an hour and said only one thing which, so far as I knew, we had not heard many times before. He led up to it fast and got away from it fast, but he said that the United States would not use the veto in order to prevent the recognition of Communist China. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. JENNER. I remember that very well.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator remember any change in the State Department policy by Mr. Acheson later or by Mr. Dulles since he has taken office?

Mr. JENNER. I have noticed no change.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will further yield, he will no doubt remember that Great Britain was one of the first to recognize Communist China, followed by India and other nations. Does the distinguished Senator from Indiana remember that the junior Senator from Nevada placed in the RECORD in 1949, and again in 1950, a couple of mutual security pacts?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; between England and Russia and between France and Russia.

Mr. MALONE. There is a mutual security pact between England and Russia, one paragraph of which reads almost exactly like a paragraph in the Atlantic Pact, which we have signed with England and other nations.

Mr. JENNER. I recall that.

Mr. MALONE. It provides that the signatories shall do everything in their power to assist each other.

Does the distinguished Senator remember that France has the same kind of pact with Communist Russia, containing similar paragraphs?

Mr. JENNER. I do.

Mr. MALONE. On April 4, I believe it was, the junior Senator from Nevada placed in the RECORD a similar paragraph from the mutual security pact between Communist China and Russia. Does the distinguished Senator remember that?

Mr. JENNER. I recall.

Mr. MALONE. There is another pact, which the junior Senator from Nevada has not yet obtained, but which he believes he will obtain, between England and France. This pact was made subsequent to the two mutual security pacts,

made separately with Russia. It ties the ends together.

So we have all these mutual security pacts—England with Russia, France with Russia, Communist China with Russia, and the Atlantic Pact, between ourselves and the European countries. We have England recognizing Communist China. Does the distinguished Senator see any connection between those pacts and the continual insistence by Churchill—who, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Nevada, is one of the finest operators in the international field—on wetting down the operations in Asia at all times, so that England might keep her pact with us and keep the pact with Russia at the same time?

Mr. JENNER. I agree with the Senator.

The Soviet Union will never desist and never let its followers desist, until that aim is won.

We cannot retrace all the devious steps, Mr. President, by which we were kept in a state of confusion while the Communist sympathizers made one carefully planned move after another to push us toward the final sellout.

General Van Fleet has told us how, after the Red forces were defeated, our troops were refused permission to follow up their victory.

Our commanders could not use any body of troops larger than a patrol without approval from Washington, and that approval was never given.

We all know, Mr. President, how our armies were refused the right of hot pursuit, the right to bomb troop concentrations and airbases, where bombing would reduce casualties to our forces.

The most fantastic fact, in this fantastic dream world, is that our soldiers were ordered to limit the war to the territory of our allies.

They were expressly forbidden to make the Reds angry by attacks on their soil.

I am sure this is the first time, in all history, that a victorious government boasted it had confined the war to the territory of its friends, and had not let a shot be fired against the territory of the enemy.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does not this hark back to the time when the 17 Marshall plan countries, including our supposed Allies in the Korean war, had approximately 100 trade treaties with Russia and the Iron Curtain countries, and were selling them everything from tool steel to engines, trucks, and other articles they needed to fight a world war against us?

Mr. JENNER. That is all a part of the entire picture. As I say, I cannot trace all the devious ways, but I think I have put the pieces together so that the American people can clearly understand what is going on and what has been going on.

Mr. MALONE. Have there not been conferences in Vienna between 40 Russian representatives and businessmen from all over Europe, in an effort to make new treaties and new arrangements for further trade with the area?

Mr. JENNER. I think that is correct.

Mr. MALONE. As a matter of fact, do not these mutual-security pacts, the trade treaties, and the orders which we give our troops not to fight too hard for fear they might win, all dovetail together?

Mr. JENNER. They do.

Our demolition bombs fall on Korean railroads and power stations. Our napalm bombs set fire to Korean buildings. Our naval guns bomb Korean harbors, while the Chinese cities and roads and harbors are safe by order of an American President.

Perhaps some Americans have not thought too much about whether the war was fought in Korea or in China, but the French have noticed and the Germans have noticed, and the Southeast Asians have noticed. I am certain, Mr. President, that the Soviet leaders have noticed, because they planned it that way.

But the perfect confusion, the really effective smokescreen, was that on the diplomatic front, especially in the United Nations. I cannot take time to trace all the moves on the diplomatic chessboard, Mr. President. First, the U. N. aim was unification of all Korea. Then we were told that returning to the 38th parallel was a glorious victory. We were told stopping in mid-Korea was repelling aggression, a nice soft-spoken word in place of attack.

This is as if our police, called in to catch a burglar who was murdering a man in his bed, should say to the thief, "You must go outside the window because entering is a crime, but, if you shoot your victim from outside, we cannot touch you. We have been told to confine this police action to the interior of this house and not risk unpleasant violence by going outside to fight you."

Senators will remember the protestations that our forces must not bomb Manchurian bases because that might make the Reds angry. Russia, it was said, might come in. Is she not in, with everything she is willing to risk?

As his final legacy, Mr. Acheson left the Indian peace proposal by which we committed ourselves in advance to a Pacific political conference in which the wishes of the American people would be hopelessly out-voted. Like a retreating army, planting its boobytraps to snare the advancing foe, the pro-Communists passed the Indian proposal, after a stage-managed hesitation, and left it to plague the Eisenhower administration.

Recently, we heard of an apparent modification of the plan to sell out the Nationalists.

Instead of compelling the Formosa Government to accept the rule of Red China, we have a new plan to make the Nationalist Government sovereign over Formosa only, that is, to amputate most of its territory, and then put it under a U. N. trusteeship.

That proposal is different in form but not in substance, Mr. President.

We know that Formosa would be eaten up by Red China, as soon as public opinion had been softened up.

This plan was repudiated by President Eisenhower, but its sponsors will come up with the same idea in a new dress.

If you watch, you will notice how skillfully our spokesmen now refer to the Red Chinese as China and the legal government as Formosa.

That plants the suggestion that the Nationalists are only an island.

In the old days we used to have recognition by formal acts of governments.

Today, recognition of an invader is achieved by getting the commentators to "condition" the public to words embodying the change, as Pavlov used to condition his captive dogs to new associations.

In fact, calling the present war, the Korean war, is in itself a semantic booby trap.

It has never been a Korean war.

It has, from the beginning, been a war over Asia.

By calling it a local war our mentors conditioned us to thinking we had "limited" the war when we were fighting on the territory of our friends and protecting the territory of the attackers.

The pro-Communists have followed this one objective of getting Red China recognized and installed in the U. N. ever since the fall of China.

We have the exact words of their plan from the testimony given by Harold Stassen to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on the "briefing session" he attended at the State Department in October, 1949.

At that session the IPR inner clique, led by Owen Lattimore, were spokesmen of the party line.

They mentioned two objectives to help the Reds—the first, to put an end to the Nationalist blockade of Red China, and second, to get China's seat, in the U. N. and on the Security Council, for Communist China.

Said L. K. Rosinger: "In terms of preparing American public opinion for recognition, there is a process of disentanglement from the Chinese Nationalists," by which he meant we should end ECA aid to China, refuse to help the guerrillas, and then withdraw recognition.

Benjamin Kizer, also of IPR, said, "The American people will rather quickly adapt themselves to it." Like Pavlov's dogs again.

Let me remind you, Mr. President, of what we all know well.

Almost the first act of President Truman in June, 1950, after he sent American forces into Korea, was to order the American Fleet to protect the Red China coast against the ships of Free China.

It is impossible but true. The plans of the pro-Soviet inner circle to help Red China were put into effect by an American President as almost his first action in the Korean crisis.

No words of mine could adequately describe the shame of that order, Mr. President.

The proud American Navy was ordered to protect the Red Chinese commerce in war essentials to be used against our own flesh and blood.

No words of mine could adequately describe the honor that will justly come to President Eisenhower throughout history for his prompt lifting of that shameful, traitorous order.

For 2 years longer the inner circle worked and schemed to get the Chinese attackers accepted as a respectable nation.

They hatched the idea of having our State Department get England and India

to recognize her first so we could seem to follow the procession.

They said we must take "affirmative action to throw the Nationalist Government out of the United Nations."

I want to remind you, Mr. President, of what we all know.

Two years ago the Red Chinese were a barbarian horde.

They had some seasoned fighting men, but they had no economy to back them up.

Their war equipment moved over the Trans-Siberian Railroad at snail's pace.

The Red Chinese have used that 2 years of grace to kill off the Chinese who dared to resist them, or transfer them to the camps of Siberia, or the mines of Czechoslovakia for forced labor.

In that 2 years they have used their slaves to build railroads, airfields, submarine bases, munitions factories, while the blood of American soldiers dripped, dripped, dripped into the soil of Korea.

I want Senators to understand what defeat in this war means.

It means that the United States—not the United Nations, but the United States—has been defeated by a China which could not defeat Japan or Russia, which could not today defeat the Nationalists, if they had guns.

Do you think, Mr. President, the Japanese do not know that?

Do you think the Indians do not know it, or the people of southeast Asia or the Philippines?

There is something else we must understand to get the full measure of this proposed defeat.

If Red China has "peace" and a place in the U. N., how long will it be before the airstrips in Tibet are filled with bombers pointed at New Delhi?

How much help will the American people send to Indochina the next time?

How long will it be before Japan is drawn into the economic boobytrap already set for her?

What will the freedom of Formosa be worth then? Or Okinawa?

How far will the Communists be from Pearl Harbor?

Do you think our allies in Europe will trust us to liberate them as we "liberated" Korea?

Why should they, Mr. President?

If Red China takes her seat at the council table of the U. N., if she is given China's permanent seat on the Security Council, she will be part of the political power which commands our Armed Forces in Korea, in NATO, and our ships on the Atlantic Ocean.

Her 400 million slaves will be trained by Soviet officers and Soviet industrial managers to become one gigantic war machine for the conquest of all Asia and the United States.

Let no one try to tell us later they did not know, Mr. President. They know now.

But far more serious than all of this, what will happen to our own fighting men, Mr. President?

Americans always have fought as if they were sure of victory. A thrill of hope spread over Western Europe when American troops landed on the soil of France in 1917. A thrill of hope spread over Western Europe when the Europeans heard American troops would fight by their side after Pearl Harbor. A thrill of hope spread over the world when it was learned that American troops had at last stood up to the Communist hordes in Korea. Even here in Congress we rejoiced at the bravery of our troops in Korea, although we were deeply disturbed over the unconstitutional method of our entry.

If our troops who won a decisive military victory over Red China, must hang their heads in shame because Red China won at the council table, what will happen to the hearts of our fighting men? We shall have cut the hearts out of American fighting men.

Where are we now, Mr. President? On the military front, General Van Fleet has told us in no doubtful words:

> In terms of high strategy, the Reds have lost the war in Korea, and they know it.
>
> Only the United States Army today has the superb kind of leadership and planning which can conduct the prolonged, fluid attack, the war of motion.
>
> We have the one army in the world that can regroup as it goes along, hitting hard here, then starting a thrust somewhere else, constantly moving, maintaining the full fury of attack, never giving the enemy a chance to rest or dig in.

Mr. President, such an army could be defeated only at home.

The Red Chinese are beaten. In Korea we do not need a substitute for victory. We have the hard reality of victory, and the Red Chinese and the Russians know it. But the Soviet Union still expects to win by its skill in the psychological war, by fooling the Americans into giving the Communists what they want.

The Korean war was won in the hills of Korea. It will be lost—if it is lost—in Washington—not in London, not in Paris, not in Panmunjom, but in Washington.

If the Communists can fool us, all is lost. If they cannot fool us, all may yet be saved.

President Eisenhower has tried very hard to get us out of the morass of State Department thinking, but he is handicapped. The Communist Government of Russia still has a pro-Communist fifth column at work in the United States, as it has in Britain, trying to confuse our foreign policy, and put over Soviet peace aims under the cover of confusion.

By the Soviet fifth column, I mean members of the Soviet apparatus who work in the open party organization, members of the Soviet underground, "sleepers" who have no visible contact with the Soviet apparatus, so-called Americans who believe the Communists are going to win, and will do their bidding for a few husks of power, and fuzzy-minded Americans who can be fooled by words, who are without any ability to understand them.

We dangerously underestimate the power of the fifth column.

The 15 volumes of the IPR Report of the Internal Security Subcommittee tell us why President Eisenhower is handicapped, Mr. President. The 5 volumes of the Russell Report and the current reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee all tell the same story.

Our Federal Government and our agencies of public opinion are still honeycombed with men loyal to the Soviet Government or willing to accept orders from the Soviet agents in return for power, or, in a few cases, duped by constant repetition of the slogans the Soviet Union wants us to believe.

On March 29, 1950, Lord Vansittart told the House of Lords, in connection with the Fuchs affair, a similar story of the pentration of Communist influence into the very heart of British life—into broadcasting, education, the church, military intelligence, the diplomatic services, the armed forces, the Government services, and the great unions of Government employees. He had, himself, met people, he said, who were afraid to talk because they had been told they would be "bumped off" for their anti-Communist efforts, if war came.

Lord Milverton, in the same debate, pointed out that Communists and communism in Britain were the headwaters for communism all over the Empire, particularly in Malaya and in British West Africa, where Communists were spreading into every department of the public service.

If we want to know where we are, Mr. President, we can always look to the France of 1940. We know now why France, with the "greatest army in Europe," offered only token resistance to the Nazis. It was the Communist fifth column, in alliance with Hitler, which delivered France to the Nazi armies.

I should like to believe that this apparatus is not at work in England, but I know it is. I should like to believe it is not at work in our country, but I know it is. I should like to believe that the members of this fifth column were driven out of power by the recent election, but I know we shall have no such easy road to security at home.

I sit day after day—and for almost 3½ hours today—in meetings of the Subcommittee on Internal Security, learning of new ramifications of Communist power over our war operations and our postwar policies. But we still do not know what the Communists are doing today, except that, by every trick they have ever learned, they are throwing dust in our eyes and confusing our leaders and our people, so they will not be able to block the insidious power of suggestion of the pro-Soviet apparatus.

We have to solve the problem of foreign policy, including our Asia policy, while the fifth column is throwing dust in our eyes; while it is spreading rumors, turning Americans against each other, trying to discredit the courageous spokesmen for truly American solutions.

I say, Mr. President, that if we continue to drift, if we wait without a goal or a plan, while the trained fifth column presses forward under orders from the Soviet high command, we shall sink lower and lower until we fall into the gulf toward which we are being guided.

I repeat, Mr. President, if we go on as we are going, without a specific American strategy, Red China must win the war.

Mr. Attlee has done us a great service. He has made us look defeat in the face—to see its hideous features no longer veiled by soft words of propaganda. The

acquiescence of Mr. Churchill makes the picture perfectly clear. Either we must tell our fighting men we have sold them out and we are going to build up Red China into a great power or, with a mighty effort, we must cut ourselves off from every tentacle of this evil power, and must fight our own way back to health and life and national safety.

I say, Mr. President, that President Eisenhower can free himself now from the toils, if he choose a program which has in it not the smallest particle of appeasement, if in the whole Asian settlement he acts as vigorously as he acted to end the shameful protection, by our Navy, of the Red China coast.

Our President already has taken three major steps in the direction of American independence.

First was the order to the Seventh Fleet.

Second was the appointment of wholly new Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Third was the statement that we would never abandon our opposition to forcible repatriation of prisoners, because it was a moral issue, of central importance in the values of the free world.

The next step is an equally final statement that we will not recognize the blood-stained murderers of Red China as the legal government of China, or admit her to U. N.

To appease the Red regime in China is to imperil our own survival—

Says General Van Fleet.

When Mussolini invaded the little kingdom of Abyssinia, Haile Selassie stood before the League of Nations and begged the members, on moral grounds, to put restraints on Mussolini. The members refused. They could not bother with moral issues. The League of Nations crumbled there and then.

The admission of Red China, with her bloody hands, into the U. N. is a moral issue. If the U. N. votes to admit a cruel slave-state which invaded a peaceful, law-abiding Korea, U. N. has no moral excuse for being. All the high-sounding words are without meaning. The only choice for the United States is to withdraw.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has introduced a resolution stating the American position. I should be happy to join in sponsoring such a resolution to strengthen President Eisenhower's hand.

I know the great majority of our colleagues will never descend to the dishonor of approving Red China as a legal entity. I know they want to stand up and be counted.

Armed with a clear statement of American insistence on moral principles, the President can formulate an American program for Asia.

We do not want to cut ourselves off from our allies. We want to save ourselves from the Communist spell. If our allies wish to do the same thing, we can all go forward together.

We should tell the Chinese delegates at Panmunjom that if they do not want to sign a cease fire, we shall resume full-scale war, but that war will be carried on with no holds barred.

We should promptly carry out President Eisenhower's proposal fully to equip the armies of South Korea.

We should face the bitter facts of geography and rearm the Japanese.

Permanent demilitarization would have been ideal for Japan, if Sakhalin and the Kuriles were not occupied by Soviet Russia.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Did we not force Japan to sign a treaty which established the Russians in the islands referred to by the Senator, and within shooting distance of Japan?

Mr. JENNER. I am saying to the Senator that we must face the realities. We created the present situation.

Mr. MALONE. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I ask him whether the natural trading area of Japan is not southeast Asia.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct—southeast Asia and Red China.

Mr. MALONE. It includes Red China now. Southeast Asia is supposed to be controlled by our allies, is it not?

Mr. JENNER. It is supposed to be.

Mr. MALONE. Is the distinguished Senator from Indiana aware that Japan is not allowed to trade at all in the Malayan States or in Indochina, and is prevented therefrom through manipulation of currency, quotas, and various other devices, on the part of America and England, which devices operate against the Malayan States and against Indochina?

Mr. JENNER. We all know that Japan is in a booby trap.

Mr. MALONE. I am sure the Senator understands that we are allowing Japan to trade, practically on the basis of free trade, in the United States, with the probable result of the shutting down of plants in certain industries in our country.

Mr. JENNER. Japan is being forced into the arms of the Communists.

Mr. MALONE. I think some of us so stated when we returned from the signing of the Japanese Treaty at San Francisco. I would ask the Senator again, is it not obvious that that is the case, in view of the fact that most of those whom we still refer to as our allies have recognized Communist China, or have signified their intention of doing so?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a fact that England may appropriately be said to be the leading ally in that regard? Is it not generally taken for granted that that is the case, since England was the first to recognize Communist China?

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Most of our so-called allies have trade treaties with Russia and the Iron Curtain countries, and are shipping materials to them without stint. Is the distinguished Senator from Indiana aware of the fact that they are now threatening, aided by England and France, that if we do not give them free access to the markets of the United States for their low-cost sweatshop-labor products, they will if possible set up their trade with Russia and the Iron Curtain countries?

Mr. JENNER. Yes, not only that they will do so, but they are already setting up those trade relations, as the records will show.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Nevada does not believe it possible for them to step it up to very much more than what it is now. The Senator from Nevada stood on the floor of the Senate, several years ago and placed in the RECORD the trade treaties they had already entered into with Russia and the Iron Curtain countries. In 1950, as I recall, according to the latest figures there were 96 such treaties. I thought the country would be shocked by the statement of those facts. The country was not shocked. In fact, it shocked no one. But I would again ask the Senator, How are we to deal with allies who have received strategic materials and arms from us, and who have recognized Red China, and have done everything in the world against our best interests?

Mr. JENNER. What I am advocating today is that our best strategy is to look after America.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator from Indiana is doing a great service to our country by what he is saying on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. JENNER. I ask, which is better, for Japan to defend herself, or for American troops to garrison and defend her? The answer is obvious. We should give to Free China at least as much aid as we give to Japan.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it possible for any nation to defend another nation?

Mr. JENNER. Not unless that nation has the will and the heart to defend itself.

Mr. MARTIN. We talk much about ammunition; we talk about great guns and about the atomic bomb, but unless the will to defend itself is present a country cannot be successfully defended from the outside. Is not that a fact?

Mr. JENNER. We are worrying about sending supplies to Korea. When our boys in Korea are short of equipment, we should send it where it is needed.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not a fact that what we need to do is to give the truth to the American people? We heard on this floor an hour ago a magnificent address on the economic condition of this country, setting forth why we have inflation and what it is necessary to do in order to avoid inflation. What we need to do is to give the people the truth. The American Colonies won their independence because they had the will to win it, not because they had arms which were superior to those of England, but because they had the will to be free. Unless a nation wants to be free, no amount of money that can be appropriated will make it possible for that country to keep itself free.

Mr. JENNER. I agree with the Senator and thank him for his contribution.

Which is better—for Japan to defend herself or for American troops to act as a garrison to defend her? The answer is obvious. We should give to free China at least as much equipment and training as the U. S. S. R. gave to Red China.

Friends of the United States should not use secondhand equipment and work without technical training, while satellites of Red China forge ahead in the very fields in which we lead.

I am not a military man, and I cannot give an expert military judgment. But Senators are supposed to know how to choose experts and judge expert opinion.

From everything I have heard and read, Mr. President, I believe the people of China are only waiting for an opportunity to rise up.

I hear many experts say the Nationalists cannot recapture the mainland, but they are all experts in words, in propaganda, not military experts.

Soviet Russia is arming the oppressors of the Chinese, but in spite of big talk, we have steadfastly neglected to arm the defenders of these helpless victims of Communist inhumanity.

We have neglected the only possible protection for Indochina—the return of the Nationalists to the mainland.

I do not want war with China, Mr. President. I do not want war with the U. S. S. R. I even dread to see the Free Chinese invade their homeland and attack the Reds.

It would be intolerable, if the Communists were not killing more Chinese in their deadly "peace" than would die in a war of independence.

Far from enlarging the war, I believe arming all the free nations of Asia is the only hope of peace.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JENNER. I should like to conclude, because I must leave the floor in a few moments.

Mr. President, there are, perhaps, 20 million fighting men available in free Asia today.

Does anyone believe the U. S. S. R. would start a war, if these men were armed to defend their homelands?

No, indeed; the Soviet Union prefers to wage psychological war to tell us not to arm the Asian nations, but, if we do not swallow her bait, we can be free of fear.

To oppose communism, we must also have an idea that lifts the imaginations of men.

The American idea of liberty has always been a symbol of hope, of light in darkness.

It is a glowing idea which, set against Communist deeds, will tell its own story of our faith in human dignity.

The American principle which we can stress for the world today is the principle of national independence.

We believe in independence. We fought a war for it. We came to the help of the people of South America when their independence was threatened. We helped preserve the independence of China. We gave national independence to the Philippines.

The United States is not engaged in any duel with the Soviet Union for domination of the world.

We will not make ourselves into an imperial power system, to meet the Soviet threat. We will choose our own ground. That ground is to take up our moral leadership in the struggle of the Asian people for national independence.

Let us set against the Soviet idea of empire, President Eisenhower's principle that every nation has a right to its own government, free of compulsion by any other power.

People who loved liberty have always trusted our country because Americans have never lost their deep interest in weak or small nations which must fight great powers for their own independence.

Patrick Henry and Valley Forge are still too close to us for Americans to bear tyranny patiently.

We, in turn, can trust nations which are seeking only independence, because people who truly love their rocks and rills, their wooded and templed hills, have no wish to desecrate the homeland of others.

Nations are born out of love. Imperial power systems are born out of the will to dominate.

Let us accept the leadership of all those nations which aspire to keep their homeland free.

Let us accept the moral leadership of those people who want to fight the new slavery.

Communist China is and must remain one vast slave-labor camp.

The Soviet leaders will use their recently acquired technical arts to wring high production from unwilling workers.

They will end resistance by moving their human pawns to other parts of the Soviet chessboard, where their victims will have no friends to hear their cries.

Let us promise to any country ready to fight for its independence that we will give them arms and equipment equal to those of any country which threatens them.

Our only condition should be that they are ready to fight for their own freedom.

We do not want our Asian friends to die for us. They are dying now. We want them to live. We want them to carry a soldier's pack instead of a prisoner's chain.

Against the subtle, devious, shifting policies of the Soviet Union and her fifth column let us set a simple, firm, unyielding policy based on moral principle.

Against the lies, the smears, the rumors, the blandishments of Soviet propaganda, let us set our own strong determination to keep our minds clear, our wills firm.

I believe, Mr. President, the outcome will be peace, an American peace; but whatever the outcome, we can all meet it together, so long as it is peace with honor, or war with honor, in defense of man's inalienable right to freedom.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I have been informed by an official who is in charge of the draft in my State that they are now at the point of drafting 19-year-old men and are worried about the number which can be secured in the future without taking men who served in World War II.

The Government is $270 billion in debt. That is the heritage of 20 years of the kind of Government we have had during that period.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Indiana has given the Senate something to think about today, something it ought to consider very seriously, because we are at the end of our rope if it is true that we are now down to 19-year-olds in the draft. We have gone $270 billion into debt and are figuring on another $10 billion deficit at the end of the year. Therefore, as the Senator from Indiana has suggested, we must take stock and see what areas we can defend and what we can do with the materials and manpower we have. Does the distinguished Senator agree with me?

Mr. JENNER. I agree; and I am hoping that the new Chiefs of Staff will take a look, and take it quickly.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will further yield, I may say that it is time the new Chiefs of Staff took over. We have had the menu read backward by political generals for about 10 years. What I mean by reading the menu backward is that when the administration wanted something done the generals cooked up reasons why it ought to be done. That is the conclusion I arrived at a good many months ago.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations under the heading "New Reports."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick M. Alger, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward T. Wailes, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MUTUAL DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter S. DeLany, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Herbert D. Vogel, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) providing for a consolidated General Appropriation Act.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beall	Hendrickson	McClellan
Bennett	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Jackson	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
Green	Martin	
Hayden	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GORE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment was to strike out all after the resolving clause, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

That effective on the first day of the second regular session of the 83d Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the 'Consolidated General Appropriation Act of ' (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such contract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

"(B) estimates of the balances of appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure as of the beginning of the fiscal year, other than the obligated balances of expired appropriations;

"(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure referred to in clause (A);

"(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from the balances of appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (B);

"(E) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from revolving and management funds, other than expenditures referred to in clauses (C) and (D);

"(F) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C), (D), and (E); and

"(G) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year from the appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during the fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The information reported under paragraph (3) shall be accompanied by (i) data on revolving and management funds (including the funds of wholly owned Government corporations) which shall show the gross amounts from which the net amounts estimated to be expended are derived, and information on estimated investments, repayment of capital, payment of dividends, and other cash transactions which do not affect net expenditures; and (ii) such supplemental data as may be considered desirable by the committee making the report.

"(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

"(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(7) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall at the time the bill reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate contain in the body of the bill or in a preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem appropriate, a current estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury of the overall Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado desire recognition?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do. However, I should first like to give the proponents of the measure an opportunity to discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 is sponsored by 50 Senators. I invite attention to the fact that among the 50 sponsors are 11 members of the Committee on Appropriations. I have reason to believe that several other members of the Committee

on Appropriations will vote in favor of the resolution, which will mean that a majority of the 23 members of the committee support the resolution.

I invite attention to that fact because of the peculiar interest of the members of the Committee on Appropriations in the resolution, and to the further fact that, with one exception, all the chairmen of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations are sponsors of the resolution. The chairmen of the subcommittees are the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture; the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services; the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia; the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices; the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-Federal Security; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Judiciary; the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], chairman of the Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office.

Mr. President, I may say further that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who has served as chairman of the Appropriations Committee both at this session and in the 80th Congress, has been one of the first and one of the most active supporters and advocates of this measure, which provides for a consolidated appropriation bill and, in addition, provides for a limitation of expenditures. Senator FERGUSON has been especially active throughout the years for a consolidated bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in response to the statement by the Senator from Virginia that all or practically all chairmen of subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee favors Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, let me say that every Senator who was chairman of a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee at the time when we had a one-package appropriation bill, and who bases his present opinion upon his actual experience with the laborious work which was imposed upon him as a result of that bill, is opposed to the pending measure.

In other words, Senators who now favor the concurrent resolution have not yet been through the mill.

Mr. BYRD. In any event, for the most part the Senators who are sponsors of the concurrent resolution were Members of the Senate at that time, and many of them were then members of the Appropriations Committee. Furthermore, most Senators now favor the concurrent resolution because it is entirely different from the former measure, as I shall explain.

Such a measure was first reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration in 1947, by the then Senator Brooks, of Illinois, who was chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, the measure failed to pass the Senate at that time.

A similar measure was reported on June 2, 1949, by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and was approved by the Senate, but was not approved by the House of Representatives.

A similar measure was reported by Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, in 1951.

The concurrent resolution now before the Senate was reported by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], after hearings held by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

First, Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that the pending concurrent resolution provides for an entirely different kind of consolidated appropriation measure than that which was passed for the fiscal year 1951. That arrangement came about simply as a result of action taken by the House of Representatives, and was not in accordance with the measure passed by the Senate, which failed of passage in the House. At that time the procedure was simply to put together into one package, so to speak, the 12 appropriation bills.

The pending concurrent resolution goes further, by providing that there shall be a limitation of the net amount to be obligated during the fiscal year in the case of each appropriation which is available for obligation beyond the close of the fiscal year. That is a great improvement over what was attempted in the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not that be done under the present method of handling the appropriation bills?

Mr. BYRD. It could be done, but it never has been done.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does the Senator from Virginia know it will be done if we have a "one package" bill?

Mr. BYRD. Because it is required by the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution will have all the appropriations put into one bill, and will limit the obligations on the basis of new and old appropriations, and will require that an estimate of the expenditures be set forth in the report. That is not required at present, and such an estimate is not set forth in any of the reports of the Appropriations Committee.

In the body of the appropriation bill there will have to be a statement of the revenues, so that the total expenditures will be set forth, on the one hand; and the total available revenues, according to the Treasury's estimate, will be set forth, on the other hand. Then we shall know whether we shall be voting for a deficit or for a surplus.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it intended that the appropriations shall not exceed the revenues? Is that what this concurrent resolution proposes to accomplish?

Mr. BYRD. No. I am not speaking of the appropriations. The Senator from Louisiana well knows, for he is a member of the Appropriations Committee, that an appropriation does not necessarily mean an expenditure in the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made.

Let me state the situation as of today, under the present system. First, let me say that I have been a Member of the Senate for nearly 21 years, and I have never seen greater confusion with respect to appropriations than exists today, because under the present system we shall have $82 billion of unexpended balances, as of the 1st of July of this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Virginia know why that condition exists?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; I do.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator from Virginia know that the House of Representatives forced on us a rule which provides that before any Government department can enter into a contract, the money has to be actually appropriated, instead of having Congress provide contract authority?

Mr. BYRD. I understand that fully. I am not saying why the confusion occurred, but I am saying it has occurred under the present system, whereas the pending concurrent resolution provides that the funds may be appropriated, but the amounts to be expended each year will be limited, and thereby we shall arrive at a definite conclusion, regardless of whether there is a balanced budget.

Under the present arrangement there is no control over the expenditures until the money is actually spent by the various departments. That situation has brought about the present large unexpended balances.

I agree with the Senator from Louisiana as to how that condition occurred. For example, the House has required that if a battleship is to be built—and its construction may take 4 years—the entire amount required for construction of the battleship must be appropriated at one time, during the first year, and that means that in the following 3 years the Congress will have lost control of that expenditure, in the sense that the matter never will come before Congress again.

The plan now proposed provides for a limitation of expenditures. Thus, if a battleship, for example, is to be built, it will be possible to provide contract authority, if Congress chooses to provide it, and it will be possible for Congress to review the expenditure as the money becomes payable, in the same way that any business organization does.

With the present unexpended balances in the amount of $80 billion, what is happening in the case of the appropriations to be made at this session? Nearly one-half of them will be expended in fiscal years following the next fiscal year. The result will be that the same system will be continued into the

fiscal year 1955, and so forth, until a change is made.

Although I know that every member of the Appropriations Committee is most able and most diligent, yet I challenge any member of the Appropriations Committee to state definitely, when an appropriation bill is before the Senate, the amount of the appropriations which will be spent in the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made. Yet that is the factor which determines whether we have a deficit or a surplus.

I know very well that in the general operations of the Government the question of whether there will be a deficit or a surplus is determined by the cash income and the expenditures. I do not use the word receipts, because the Government collects money from social-security payments and other payments which constitute receipts, but do not constitute a revenue to the general Treasury, for expenditure. Instead, such funds are really trust funds.

Every once in a while we hear someone say we must balance the cash budget. That would mean taking the social-security payments and other payments and using all cash receipts of the Government to balance the cash budget, which, of course, is not a proper procedure. At the present time the arrangement is that in the Government's reports on its financial situation, the cash income, on the one hand, is set forth as opposed to the cash outgo, on the other hand, for the fiscal year. That arrangement makes no allowance for the obligations of the Government or the amounts due in the form of tax refunds, and so forth; but on June 30 of each year a balance is struck in accordance with the cash income of the Government and the cash outgo, and that is the way the Government now runs its business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the Senator from Virginia is saying that the concurrent resolution is an attempt to tie the appropriations and the expenditures closer together and to give Congress a better understanding, when it is making appropriations, of the amount of money which will be spent in the fiscal year for which the appropriations are made. Is not that the purpose of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, that is the purpose, and the Senator from Massachusetts has very correctly stated it.

Under the provisions of the concurrent resolution, we shall have a consolidated budget. When the budget is sent to us it will be consolidated, and the income of the Government will be set forth in the budget; all that information will be set forth in one document. Thus, the concurrent resolution carries out the theory, as I see it, of such a budget system.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for another question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that today the Government's books are kept on a cash basis, so that the Government itself does not know what obligations it has outstanding, until the bills come in for payment? Consequently there is not a close connection either between the revenues and the expenditures or between the expenditures and the appropriations.

By putting all the appropriations in one bill and stating how much money is to be expended under them in one year, what is sought to be done is to make it clear what the appropriation is and what the expenditure is. We can then determine how much revenue is necessary in order to balance the budget, to balance the cash expenditures and receipts. Is that not what the Senator from Virginia is seeking to do?

Mr. BYRD. That is certainly what the Senator from Virginia is trying to do, together with the other 49 sponsors of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This resolution represents one step in that direction, does it not?

Mr. BYRD. I think it a very effective step, because it will require that the amount of the expenditure in each particular fiscal year be limited in the bill. In order to understand the fiscal condition of the Government, we must separate appropriations from expenditures. Of course, we must appropriate first, as everyone knows, but there are certain appropriations which are not expended for 2, 3, or perhaps 4 years after they are made, and in that situation it is impossible to conduct the business of the Government in an orderly way.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that almost every State of the Union, and a great many municipalities, have a more advanced, modern, and up-to-date method of bookkeeping than has the Federal Government, which spends vast billions of dollars?

Mr. BYRD. I think that is correct. Of course, we must recognize today that there is no easy way to appropriate and spend $80 billion, because that is about 30 percent of the total income of all the 155 million Americans. There is no easy way to do it. I do not claim that our proposal will completely take the place of what must be done to effect true economy. Economy is the result of cutting down on expenditures. But I submit that the adoption of the resolution will give all of us a much better opportunity to understand what we are doing. The 12 appropriation bills come before the Senate at different times. Frequently they are voted upon hastily and without the Senate Chamber being filled with Senators, as I think it would be if there were the one appropriation bill. When the "one-package" appropriation bill was considered in a previous session the attendance was greater and the consideration and discussion were more complete than when the 12 bills reached the Senate at different times.

We often hear it said, when one appropriation bill comes before the Senate, "Well, I am for economy, but I am not going to have it taken out of this particular activity. I think we ought to economize all the way down the line, yet the other 11 bills are not before us." There is, therefore, the argument that we should not economize on the particular bill then under consideration; whereas if we had all the bills before us, we could compare the requests of the different departments, we could ascertain what the increases were in the different departments, and could use our judgment and decide what should be done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true also that what the Senator is seeking is to make it possible for Senators to know how much the appropriation will be for one department or subject this year, how much will be spent during the year, and how much will be obligated, so that in the next Congress, or in the next session of the same Congress, they will know the obligations with which we start before we appropriate for the ensuing year? The Senator said a few moments ago that we are going ahead, but making no improvement. If the pending resolution should be adopted by both Houses, then at least when the next session of the Congress convenes we will have a better idea of what is hanging over our heads awaiting our consideration, before we appropriate new funds, and we will know how much revenue we have with which to make expenditures. Am I correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. Under the concurrent resolution all the pertinent information is required to go into the reports, and much of it goes into the bill. For example, it is required that there be included in an appropriation bill an estimate of the revenue, the latest estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury, and then a statement of the totals of the bill can be counted up on an expenditure basis for that current year, not on an appropriation basis, but on an expenditure basis. It would be possible to ascertain in that manner, with a fair degree of accuracy, whether there would be a deficit. The pending measure does not prevent commitment of appropriations in the form of contracts. It only limits the expenditure for the particular year.

Mr. President, I now wish for a moment to refer to our present fiscal condition, which I may say looks very black to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before the Senator moves into that phase of his discussion, will he yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia is aware of the fact that under the Constitution all revenue-raising legislation must originate in the other body. The other body has construed that provision to extend to all appropriation measures. Does the Senator's concurrent resolution do anything to clarify that situation, or to give the Senate the power to originate appropriation bills?

Mr. BYRD. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not deal with that subject?

Mr. BYRD. It does not deal with it at all. It is a concurrent resolution, and, of course, must be agreed to by the House. It proposes to amend the joint rule of the two Houses.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand, but it occurs to me that one of the disadvantages of the single-package appropriation bill is the fact that it would tend to make even more unequal the respective positions of the Senate and the other legislative body with respect to appropriations. The House would have complete control over the timing of the passage of the single-package bill. If they were to pass it, let us say, in the middle of June, right on the eve of the beginning of the new fiscal year, we would only have a few days in which to consider and act upon it.

If we are to have the one-package bill, it seems to me the Senate ought to devise some way by which to originate appropriations. There is nothing in the Constitution that denies us that right, but the cold facts are that the House has always refused to consider any appropriation bill which originated in the Senate, and we are now handicapped in maintaining our position as a coequal body because of the fact that the House insists on originating appropriation bills. If all appropriations were put in one bill, and we were to adopt such a massive budget or spending program just on the eve of the beginning of the new fiscal year, it occurs to me the Senate would be still further handicapped in maintaining its position as a coequal branch of the Congress. It would give the other body great power because, if a bill comes to the Senate late in the fiscal year, there will be tremendous pressure on us to get the bill out of committee and pass it, without giving it the consideration which we would be entitled to give it, if we are to maintain our position as a coequal body in dealing with appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that the experience with the last one-package bill was that it reached the Senate earlier than was the case with the separate bills. It reached the Senate by Easter. There is no reason why there should not be simultaneous hearings. In fact, that is what is being done now. The Subcommittee on the Armed Services, under the able leadership of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], is having hearings now, and the House committee is also holding meetings, though the bill has not yet come over from the House. It is possible to have simultaneous hearings and, under the concurrent resolution, provision is made for joint hearings if desired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I observe that provision in the concurrent resolution, and, of course, we have had hearings before Senate committees time and again before the appropriation bills had ever passed the House. But the cold fact is that unless we have adequate time on the floor of the Senate in which to consider the bills, there is an infringement upon our position as a coequal body. The bills come to the Senate separately, at various times. This year some of them came to the Senate in March. I believe the single-package bill came from the House in May, did it not?

Mr. BYRD. It came to the Senate about Easter of that year, in April.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it was in May. My recollection is that it came to the Senate in May. However, I defer to the superior judgment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Many of the appropriations bills have not yet come to the Senate, though this is the last of May. The larger appropriations are still in the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator recalls, no doubt, that the single-package bill passed by the House at a previous session did not contain all the appropriations. He probably remembers that one of the largest and most controversial items in that bill, and, in fact, an item involving one of the big issues before the Congress, was the foreign-aid appropriation. If I recall correctly, foreign aid was not included in the alleged one-package bill when that system was in effect in the Congress.

I wish something could be done that would assure the Senate a fair chance to consider a one-package bill. There is provision for both simultaneous and joint hearings. But if a one-package bill is brought to the floor of the Senate only 3 or 4 days before the beginning of the new fiscal year, it will be impossible for the Senate and the individual Members of the Senate to have the opportunity to which they are entitled for the consideration of the measure on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BYRD. I should first like to answer the statement of the Senator from Georgia. Economic cooperation and foreign aid were in the appropriation bill, under title I, chapter 11.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may well be; but if I recall correctly, it was put in in the Senate. I am quite confident that a study of the RECORD will show that the foreign-aid item did not come to the Senate from the House. We added that provision in the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has a good memory, I know, but it was in the bill as enacted.

Mr. RUSSELL. My recollection is that when the bill came to the Senate we had not even passed the authorizing legislation for foreign aid. My memory is not infallible, but I do remember a great deal about the foreign-aid item. We had to hold the bill in the committee for some time in order to put the foreign-aid provision into the bill and to allow time for its passage.

Mr. BYRD. On June 25, 1950, during the consideration of the bill, there were a good many complications, but, notwithstanding that, the bill was finally signed on August 6, 1950. Since that time some other appropriation bills have not been passed until October or November, and we had to pass resolution after resolution continuing certain appropriations.

As a matter of speed, the RECORD shows that the one-package bill, imperfect as it was, made a very creditable showing, considering the fact that the Korean war broke out in the midst of the consideration of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. My recollection is that the bill did not become law until some time in September.

Mr. BYRD. That is when the President signed it. I am advised that the bill was passed on August 6.

Mr. RUSSELL. But it did not become law until some time in September.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, we could not make the President sign it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am aware of that, and I suppose the President wanted some time in which to study the bill.

That is another reason, Mr. President, why I am apprehensive about a single-package appropriation bill. It compels departments of the Government to wait until Congress has agreed on the last item before they are aware of what programs they can plan for the fiscal year. If we had completed action on appropriations for 11 departments, and there were still unacted upon the appropriations for the Department of the Interior, for example, 11 departments would have to mark time for several weeks; in fact, there have been occasions when it has been months in the new fiscal year before they were aware of the new programs they were to follow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for 5 minutes, providing he does not thereby lose the floor? I should like to try to reply to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am worried about the very points which the Senator from Georgia has raised and about the difficulties to which he has called attention, I have tried to think of a way to overcome the difficulties, and I think I have discovered a way.

First, Mr. President, I want to say that I am wholly and completely in accord with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I was a member of the Senate, though not a member of the Appropriations Committee, when the Senate had before it the single-package appropriation bill. I considered it to be a great success. I think it saved billions of dollars, and I believe the idea could be carried out further along the lines which the Senator from Virginia has advocated. It could place our fiscal policies and our fiscal state of affairs on a balanced-budget basis.

It will be recalled that there is a law which we are not observing. I refer to section 138 of the Reorganization Act, I wish to read three sentences from that section. It provides for the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to meet and to work out a ceiling for all expenditures. Why should not that be done? The law provides:

> Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved

for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees:

Then it provides:

Such report shall be made by February 15.

That is what the law says, Mr. President. It goes on to provide:

The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year.

That is what the law provides. It is an excellent law. If it were followed, we would get away from all the difficulties which the Senator from Georgia has mentioned, rather than to drag appropriations along until the end of the fiscal year and then not have an opportunity to discuss and to work out the amount of the appropriations which should be made.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an appropriation bill containing three pages, covering a list of all appropriations made in 1952. They are all there, contained on three pages. In volume it is not something which should frighten anyone. Any Member of the Congress, any member of the press, any of our citizens on the streets of our cities, reading this bill, can get a better idea of the expenditures and the fiscal policies of our country than could be obtained by reading the single-package appropriation bill containing 482 pages.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not have unlimited time, but I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. With reference to the committees meeting and working out a fiscal program and reporting before the 15th of February each year, am I in error in believing that that was tried, but it was found impossible to make a report within that time each year? Was it not also found that a committee composed of nearly 100 members could not function, and was unworkable? Is not that the reason why it was abandoned?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is a fact that it did not work out, but it is the law. I think it could be worked out, if there is a will to work it out. Of course, if there is not a will, it will not work out. We cannot accomplish these things unless there is a will to do it.

Mr. AIKEN. There were a hundred wills to deal with when we put those four committees together. It is very difficult to work them into one will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If we cannot work things out cooperatively, we cannot solve the problem.

My bill approaches the whole problem. When I explain it, I think it will be clear to every Senator.

Mr. President, some months ago our colleague, the able and experienced new chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee [Mr. BRIDGES], very properly pointed out that Congress is employing the same techniques in appropriating eighty billions that it used when appropriations were less than five billions annually. The facts are that the important function of making appropriations in these days of huge expenditures has gotten completely out of hand. The size of present-day appropriations has broken the back of our congressional fiscal machinery.

Something must be done to bring order out of this chaos. In that spirit and with that objective very much in mind, I have devised a new streamlined and very simple appropriation bill. It is a one-package appropriation bill and is so completely streamlined that it consists of but 3 pages, and yet, in my opinion, it provides more pertinent fiscal information for the people and for the 531 Members of Congress than the one-package appropriation bill of 1950, consisting of 482 pages.

As I say, my bill, which I call the percentage appropriation approach, is devised to give the Members of Congress and the man on the street a comprehensive perspective of Federal expenditure that he cannot get by reading the Federal budget, which ordinarily is 3 times as large as a Sears, Roebuck catalog, or by reading a dozen appropriation bills of 50 pages each, or even the one-package appropriation bill of 482 pages, which is being advocated by so many Senators.

The percentage approach, as Senators will see, first determines that $70 billion, or some other amount, shall be the overall total of appropriations for the following fiscal year. Every schoolboy knows that a total of anything is 100 percent. Accordingly, I split that total of 100 percent up into many items of smaller percentages, the sum of which equals 100 percent and allocate these items to the various departments and functions of Government. Dividing that 100-percent pie on the basis of the relative importance and proper support for each Federal function is the very essence of the difficult job which the Appropriations Committees of Congress are called upon to make.

From long observation, I am convinced that the average Senator and the average American citizen makes little or no distinction between thousands and millions or even billions. I have seen this Senate spend hours debating the virtue of an appropriation for $100,000 and then vote appropriations of $50 billion in a few seconds of time without batting an eye. On the other hand, percentages are a different matter because they deal with the relationship of functions rather than with unrelated amounts. Very naturally, with respect to such matters, there is much knowledge and great interest.

Before I can grasp the actual appearance of some new object, I must make mental comparisons with it and things with which I am familiar. If someone should undertake to describe an elephant to me and I had never before heard of the ponderous symbol of the Republican Party, I might ask: "Is it the size of a greyhound or a Greyhound bus?" By making comparisons with things with which I am familiar I could get a fairly accurate picture of a pachyderm.

One instantly comprehends the situation when you say the Department of Agriculture is allocated only about 1 percent of the revenues of this Government; or that the Department of the Interior, including reclamation, gets less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of those revenues, or the legislative branch receives one-tenth of 1 percent, while the military, including civil functions, receives almost 62 percent of the total revenues of the country. Relativity carries the same vital significances in appropriations which they do in Einstein's cosmic universe.

Keeping Federal appropriations in the proper adjustment with respect to public functions as a whole on a basis of value to the people is vital to the progress of this great country and its contentment. Balance is vital alike to the circus performer and to a fiscal policy.

The new administration has made a solemn pledge to the American voters to cease indulging in deficit spending. Congress cannot do less than give the new President full support in his efforts to straighten out fiscal problems by cutting spending. It is my earnest and considered opinion that the adoption by Congress of my suggestion for a streamlined appropriation bill with a fixed ceiling for the overall total appropriation and a fixed ceiling for each departmental appropriation and the opportunity for the Budget Bureau to review each department's appropriation after it is made as well as before, will be a long and constructive step toward bringing order out of chaos in Federal fiscal matters.

The figures and percentages used in my calculations have been assembled merely to illustrate the new approach to the difficult task of determining the correct size of all Federal appropriations. I do not say that any of them are correct as to amount. Doubtless, the Appropriations Committees would want to change somewhat every percentage point. I used the overall total of $70 billion because the press had reported that the distinguished majority floor leader, Mr. TAFT, and President Eisenhower have agreed upon $70 billion as a proper total for the fiscal year. My own views are that $60 billion would prove to be a far wiser fiscal target. However, that is a matter for the Appropriations Committee members to determine out of their long experience and intimate knowledge of Federal fiscal problems. But I do contend that some overall specific total must be determined and tenaciously adhered to, come what may.

The allocation of the exact percentage ceilings to each department and function of Government would then follow after exhaustive hearings and study by the Appropriations Committees. If one department or function is given more by the committees or by the Congress under my plan some other department or function must receive less. The time-honored custom has been to allocate funds to each function on a basis of the successful salesmanship of the department in convincing Congress of its requirement and then to boost the total to accommodate the increase. Under such a system it is small wonder that in this current year we have a deficit of $8 billion which, in my humble opinion, is a national disgrace. To indudge in deficit spending in the year in which we are enjoying the greatest prosperity of all time, with employment and production at an all-time high, is reckless beyond description. In such a year we are bonding our children's children to pay for our indulgence and waste. When honestly

analyzed, that is exactly what deficit spending means.

Without the active leadership, enthusiastic support, and inflexible determination of the Executive, no legislative body can effect economies in government. That is equally true of the city council, the State legislature, and the Congress of the United States.

The Founding Fathers who wrote our Federal Constitution did not recognize the importance of that fact and accordingly neglected to employ two very vital devices in handling Federal finances. They were afraid to make the Chief Executive too strong so they refused to give him the power to veto separate items in an appropriation bill without vetoing the whole measure, and they failed to make all appropriations by Congress for which no revenues have been provided null and void except in cases of insurrection or rebellion. Colorado, as do many States, has such provisions on its constitution. As a result there can be no deficit spending in such a State and the governor can keep his State's finances in balance and in orderly adjustment if he has the courage and the will to do so.

If the Federal Constitution had provided such safeguards for its Treasury the Federal debt would be merely a fraction of its present gigantic size and there would never be an undeclared war.

The percentage appropriation bill virtually gives the President the power to veto items through the Bureau of the Budget's authority and direction to scrutinize congressional appropriations after they are made and before expended by the various executive departments.

Greater use should be made of the Bureau of the Budget in dealing with the Federal fiscal problem. It is a large bureau with many trained and experienced technicians. It has 462 employees who are paid a total annual salary of $3,181,000 and an average salary of nearly $7,000 a year. In addition, there is an annual expense item of $340,200. I am not being critical of this bureau; its operation; its size; or its costs. If its costs were three times as great I would not complain because they should be the watchdogs of our Treasury, and good watchdogs cost money.

At present they compile volumes of vital data on appropriations before enacted by Congress and thereby form a basis for the President's recommendation to Congress. So far so good, but the percentage-appropriation approach contemplates that in addition to that necessary service they ride herd on every expenditure of every executive department of the Federal Government after Congress has voted a lump sum appropriation to such department. If that were done, the President of the United States could protect the Treasury in the expenditure of every penny allocated to a Federal executive department.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot yield, Mr. President, because I do not have the time.

My bill simply provides that the sum of $70 billion is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for expenditure by the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953. That is the beginning of the bill. It starts out on a percentage basis and determines on a percentage basis how much each one of the functions of Government will get on a percentage basis.

One hundred percent is seventy billion. That would be divided into percentage items, one item for each of the functions. When we were finished, we would have 100 percent, or $70 billion.

Recently an appropriation bill was before the Senate. I was seeking to have $618,440 added to a certain item. Under the proposed new system, if I made such a proposal, I would have to subtract $618,440 from some other item, because the appropriations would be in percentages. Any Senator who attempted to increase the amount of the appropriations would have to subtract from some other appropriation before he could get the increase in the appropriation he sought. That is the big advantage in the proposed method.

A newspaper in Colorado is very much sold on the idea. I sold them on it. They did not give the idea to me. They said that after the Senate finished with the appropriations this year they would reduce all the appropriations to the form of a table. I do not know whether or not they will go to all that work, but that is what they said they would do. They can then print the appropriations in a very small space in the newspaper, and the man on the street who reads the statement probably will know much more about the fiscal policy of this Nation than any of us know. I doubt whether all members of the Committee on Appropriations can possibly grasp the appropriations situation as it is now presented.

I do not wish to impose further upon the time of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], except to say that my proposal is to streamline, facilitate, and expedite the work of Congress. This is the first step. Seventy-five percent of our work is in making appropriations. I know that Senators who serve on the Committee on Appropriations devote many months to extremely hard work. They would still have to do much hard work on the kind of method now proposed. Their work would not be reduced, because, instead of appropriating in terms of dollars, they would be appropriating in terms of percentages of the total appropriation.

Mr. BYRD. It seems to me it would be necessary to have a limitation on expenditures, just as is proposed in the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true; it would be necesssary. The same point is involved. I am not arguing against the Senator's resolution.

Mr. BYRD. I understand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am trying to answer the charge that if the Senate gets such a bulky, voluminous proposal before it that we cannot handle it ourselves, the House will take advantage of us. I say it is not necessary to have a voluminous bill. It is not necessary to have an appropriation bill as big as a Sears Roebuck catalog. It can be reduced to 2, 3, or 4 pages, so that it can be considered with ease. Subcommittees would work on this kind of proposal just as they would work on the measures which now come before the Senate.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia allow me to take 1 more minute?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator may take his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The second purpose of the bill is to assist in halting deficit spending. It would have a psychological effect. I do not suppose a single Senator within hearing of my voice would have much difficulty in agreeing upon a total expenditure for the year. However, when we get down to the various items, such as how much is to be allowed for television, how much for this, and how much for that, that is when we get into difficulty, into long, drawn-out debate on the Senate floor, and into all the considerations that are necessary to be taken care of. It is simply a matter of psychology. We would first set the total amount, or a ceiling on the total amount, and then work toward percentages.

My third and last hope is that adoption of the proposal would make it easier for Congress and the people to understand what becomes of the taxpayers' dollars.

I should like to ask permission to have printed in the RECORD the text of my bill, and also two newspaper items, one an Associated Press dispatch entitled "Senator JOHNSON Proposes New Single Bill Plan for United States Appropriations," published in the Wall Street Journal of January 14, 1953; the other an article entitled "Fixed Limit on Spending is Proposed," published in the Washington Post of January 15, 1953.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 469) and newspaper articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $70 billion is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for expenditure by the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

SEC. 2. The sum appropriated by this act for expenditure by the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, is hereby apportioned among the various branches, departments, agencies, and establishments of the Government in accordance with the table contained in section 3 of this act. The sums made available by this act for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, together with any sums remaining available for expenditure from any prior fiscal years, by each branch, department, agency, or establishment shall not be increased by any other act of the Congress.

SEC. 3. The percent of the sum appropriated by this act which shall be available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, by each branch, department, agency, or establishment of the Government is as follows:

Agency:	*Percentage*
Legislative branch	0.0960
The Judiciary	.0340
Independent offices:	
Executive Office of the President	.0090
American Battle Monuments Commission	.0010
Atomic Energy Commission	5.1322

Agency—Continued	Percentage
Independent offices—Continued	
Civil Aeronautics Board	0.0047
Civil Service Commission	.4260
Commerce—Civil Aeronautics Administration	.1781
Commerce—Maritime activities	.2210
Defense Production Administration	.0030
Defense Transportation Administration	.0020
Economic Stabilization Agency	.0740
Federal Communications Commission	.0080
Federal Power Commission	.0050
Federal Trade Commission	.0060
Federal Security Agency	2.0507
Federal Civil Defense Administration	.0535
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	.0100
General Accounting Office	.0390
General Services Administration	.4910
Housing and Home Finance Agency	.1300
Indian Claims Commission	.0001
Interstate Commerce Commission	.0137
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	.00001
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	.0083
Mutual Security	7.4744
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	.0825
National Capital Housing Authority	.0001
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	.0008
National Science Foundation	.0059
National Labor Relations Board	.0012
National Mediation Board	.0014
Renegotiation Board	.0067
Revolving fund, Defense Production Act	.0019
Securities and Exchanage Commission	.0065
Selective Service	.0458
Smithsonian Institution	.0048
Subversive Activities Control Board	.0004
Tariff Commission	.0024
Small Defense Plants Administration	.0047
Tennessee Valley Authority	.4185
Tax Court of the United States	.0011
Veterans' Administration	4.8164
Independent offices, total	21.5610
Department of Agriculture	1.0438
Department of State	.2948
Department of Justice	.2296
Department of Commerce	.5858
Department of the Interior	.6793
Department of Labor	.2771
Department of Defense:	
Civil functions	3.5931
Military functions	58.0047
Department of Defense total	61.5978
Department of the Treasury	.8157
Post Office	3.4655
District of Columbia	.0137
Permanent appropriations for general and special accounts:	
Interest on the public debt	7.6589
Other	1.4616
Grand total	100.000

SEC. 4. The Bureau of the Budget is authorized to control the amounts actually expended from the sums made available by this act for expenditure by each department, agency, or establishment of the executive branch, except the following arms of Congress: the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the United States Tariff Commission.

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 14, 1953]

SENATOR JOHNSON PROPOSES NEW SINGLE-BILL PLAN FOR UNITED STATES APPROPRIATIONS

WASHINGTON.—Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado, proposed that Congress adopt this novel plan for providing the money to run the Government: Vote an overall amount and fix a percentage of it for each department and agency.

He would have Congress junk its present bulky and complex appropriations bills.

Senator JOHNSON introduced a bill to carry out his plan. He said it was designed to bring order out of chaos, halt deficit spending and make it possible for Congress and the people to have a better understanding of where the taxpayers' dollars go.

Congress now enacts a dozen or more regular money bills each year. One, for example, tells exactly how much the Treasury and Post Office Departments may spend, and for what functions.

Several years ago, Congress tried a single appropriations bill, but it was in reality just a collection of the usual bills. The difference was that it provided an immediate overall total of appropriations.

Senator JOHNSON'S proposal would go further. The single bill he has proposed would fix the total amount the Government could spend and earmark a fixed percentage for each department and agency.

The Atomic Energy Commission, for example, might be voted 5.13 percent of whatever total appropriation Congress approved, the Federal Security Agency 2.05 percent, the Defense Department 61.39 percent and so on—but in no event could these allotments add up to more than 100 percent.

One effect of this would be to make lump-sum appropriations to each department, rather than earmarking funds or various purposes. Senator JOHNSON stated the percentage allocations would be made only after exhaustive hearings by Senate and House Appropriations Committees.

[From the Washington Post of January 15, 1953]

FIXED LIMIT ON SPENDING IS PROPOSED

A Democratic Senator proposed yesterday that Congress put a top limit on Federal spending each year and then cut it up, like a pie, with slices to each agency on the basis of its importance.

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, who has been in the Senate 16 years, said the present system of lading out money piecemeal is "notoriously antiquated and sickeningly slipshod." He added the people must feel Congressmen are "a bunch of boobs" on finances.

JOHNSON said he will introduce a bill appropriating $70 billion for the 12 months beginning next July 1. He gave that figure because, he said, that is the amount President-elect Dwight D. Eisenhower and Senate Republican Leader ROBERT A. TAFT are reported to have agreed on.

Actually, the Colorado Democrat said, $60 billion would be a "far wiser target" for next year but he added the exact amount is up to congressional committees to decide.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, when I introduced my bill on January 13, I raised the question covered by the bill with the Comptroller General of the United States. I recited the law, and asked him if the appropriations we were making violated the law or were valid appropriations. In about 2 weeks I received the following letter from Mr. Frank L. Yates, Acting Comptroller General of the United States. It is short, so I shall read it.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 9, 1953.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Reference is made to your letter of January 16, 1953, requesting my views on the question as to whether the practice of the Congress in appropriating funds for the expenses of the Government without strict compliance with the provisions of section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946, 60 Stat. 812, 832, constitutes a violation of law endangering the validity of appropriations.

A report in the matter has been unavoidably delayed, but will be submitted to you in the very near future.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK L. YATES,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

That is the last I have heard from him, or that I expect to hear, on the subject. I do not wish to ask him about it again, because I do not desire to embarrass him.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it the Senator did not get a report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I did not get a report, and I feel certain that I will not get it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BYRD. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if in the bill he introduced on January 13, 1953, he had the effrontery to try to hold the Congress of the United States to a $70 billion appropriation expenditure for the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not have quite that much effrontery, but I do have quite a little effrontery, and what I am proposing in the bill is that Congress determine what the amount shall be, whether it be $70 billion, $60 billion, $80 billion, or whatever the amount may be. Appropriations would then be provided on a percentage basis, but Congress would be bound by the total amount of appropriations it fixed.

As the Senator from Nevada knows, the present method of making appropriations is to appropriate money piecemeal, so much for this item, so much for that item, and so much for something else. We do not work under a ceiling, but we keep piling up expenditures. Then when we have finished we add up the appropriations, and that is how we arrive at our ceiling. My proposal is to start with a ceiling, and then divide up the individual appropriations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he had some idea, when he introduced the bill providing for a ceiling on appropriations, of first trying to consider what the

taxpayers could pay, and then to make appropriations according to that assumption.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Nevada has been gazing into his crystal ball, because he has put his finger on exactly the purpose of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that I am, of course, in favor of the Byrd resolution, because it should shock the Senate and shock the country to see what we attempt to appropriate in one lump sum. Perhaps it might have some effect on the vote later when we come to approving the amount.

I am for the proposal of Representative REED, in the House, and I am for the one-package bill, if it will accomplish what it attempts to do, or for any other bill that attempts to determine what the taxpayers of America may be able to pay. Then we can read the menu backward and let the departments work within those amounts.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand the Senator from Colorado, he is in favor of the principle of the consolidated appropriation bill on a more simplified basis. Nevertheless, he favors the principle of the consolidated appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. With regard to the questions of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I wish to read a section of the concurrent resolution. I read from page 9, line 19:

> The Appropriations Committee of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

I cannot believe that our associates in the House would deliberately hold up an appropriation bill if the delay could be avoided.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I was not impunging the good faith of the Members of the House.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator stated that we would be at the mercy of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct; but there are many vicissitudes in the course of legislation which are not brought about by bad faith. There are often delays which come about through the ordinary parliamentary processes, and are not at all prompted by bad faith.

Mr. BYRD. I did not mean to say that. The fact is that when we had the single appropriation bill before, the bill was reported to the Senate about the last of April. This year, under the old system, the largest bills have not yet been reported to the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to refer briefly to our present fiscal status. We are to have a deficit this fiscal year of about $7 billion. There was a loss of income of about $1½ billion, according to the estimates, for the fiscal year 1954. Assuming the reduction of expenditures as represented by the President, the deficit will be approximately $5,700,000,000. That is on the assumption that there will be a reduction in expenditures of $4½ billion. I may say that up to this time not to exceed 10 percent of such reduction has been put into actual effect. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I always yield to the superior knowledge of the Senator from Virginia on fiscal matters.

Mr. BYRD. Up to this time I do not think there has been an actual saving of more than four or five hundred million dollars.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true with respect to the bills which have passed both Houses.

Mr. BYRD. It is very difficult to ascertain the savings on an expenditure basis. There will be a deficit, along the lines of the President's message, of about $5,700,000,000 for the next fiscal year, and unless there are still further reductions in the fiscal year 1955, there will be a deficit of $10 billion, because the full effect of the tax reductions will then be in operation.

As I see it, in order to balance the budget under the President's program, and with the tax reductions he has advocated, not counting those whose expiration we oppose, we must cut from the present Truman expenditure figure something like $14 billion, in order to balance the budget in 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A moment ago the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] stated that 2 or 3 years ago billions of dollars were saved, by means of the one package bill. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Virginia can tell us how that saving came about.

Mr. BYRD. I do not know the exact figure of savings. It is very difficult to determine what the savings are on an expenditure basis. Last year I think the largest single reduction that was made in an appropriation bill was $800 million. I think that is the largest single reduction that has ever been made.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was that because the appropriation bill was a single-package bill?

Mr. BYRD. The saving was the result of a reduction by 10 percent in a large number of appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] introduced an amendment to each bill to reduce it by 5 to 10 percent. A number of bills were so amended. It is very difficult to determine how much is saved, because of the manner in which the appropriations are made.

Mr. BYRD. If a reduction is made in an appropriation which is not to be spent for 2 or 3 years, there may not be any saving, because in the interim Congress may pass another appropriation for a particular purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to make some brief comment with reference to the pending measure. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the author of the concurrent resolution, that I joined with him on a previous occasion in his resolution providing for a consolidated appropriation bill. In theory I think it is a very good idea if it can be carried out in practice. If it can be put into practical effect, very profitable results can be achieved.

Senators will recall that last year we passed a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. As I recall, the bill passed the Senate by a vote of 55 to 8. It went to the House of Representatives, which did not consider it. The motion to consider the bill, or a companion bill, lacked 15 votes of the number necessary to make it the unfinished business.

Last week the Senate passed substantially the same bill, with a slight modification. The Senate passed it unanimously, and the bill is now before the House.

In my judgment, if this plan is to be workable, practicable, sound, and effective, it must be implemented by the Joint Committee on the Budget. The Joint Committee on the Budget, as we all know, is simply a joint subcommittee of the two Appropriations Committees. It must be provided with a staff to dig out the facts and the information to show us where reductions can be made.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia supported that proposal.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I know the Senator did, and I thank him.

I believe that if this measure is enacted it will become almost indispensable that the additional service to which I have referred be provided.

The concurrent resolution provides for joint meetings of the two committees, and joint hearings. I think that is indispensable to make this system work and get the maximum benefit from it.

Mr. President, with a Government as large as ours, appropriations for about $80 billion of expenditures a year, I think the time has come for members of the Appropriations Committees, if they are to do their job, to devote themselves exclusively to that task. I believe they have no time to serve on other committees. Service on the Appropriations Committees is becoming a year-round job. As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations I would dislike to give up my membership on the legislative committee on which I serve. But if we are to do the job efficiently, and hold Federal expenditures down to the minimum, we must put more time, effort, and energy into the job and concentrate on it with the best tools with which we can provide ourselves, regardless of what legislation we enact, if we are to economize and limit expenditures to objects and purposes which are absolutely necessary.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on many occasions I have spoken on the fiscal policy of the Government of the United States. Since I came to the Senate I have served on the Appropriations Committee.

I had intended to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] a question, but I know that his time was limited.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, under section 138 of the Reorganization Act of 1946 I participated in meetings of the Joint Committee on the Budget. I did not find that it was the number of members on the committee that interfered with its func-

tioning. I think there was a feeling that we did not want to know how much money we would have to spend, because it might interfere with our appropriations. I say that honestly. I think there was a feeling among the members that we—and when I say "we" I mean the Congress of the United States—wanted to have a free hand to appropriate, disregarding what the Nation's income might be. I served for many years on that joint committee with the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as well as on other committees having to do with appropriation matters. He has discussed the subject from the angle of knowledge of what the national income is to be. Knowing what the income is to be, we can look at the whole fiscal picture and determine what the appropriations should be. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] also referred to that point.

What we must have, Mr. President, is the will to do the job. The job can be done, not with separate appropriation bills, but with a consolidated bill. It can be done if we have the will to do it.

I ask the distinguished Senators who are now on the floor, how are we to tell following the passage of the first regular appropriation bill, for instance, with the many items it contains, how much money that bill should have contained in order to help balance the budget?

Aside from a few Members no one in the Senate knows what is contained in the next appropriation bill, and what we should take out of it and what we should let remain in the bill.

How can we balance the budget as between expenditures and income from taxes on any such basis?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Michigan has put his finger clearly on the difficulty. I served on the joint committee. We did not have the will to determine what the ceiling should be. If we do not have the will to do it, it will be very hard to bring it about.

However, that is the point to start from, not the point at which to end, as we do at the present time. In other words we end with the ceiling, whereas we should start with the ceiling.

Mr. FERGUSON. I remember that the Senator from Colorado served on the joint committee. I believe there was in the committee the feeling to which he referred. If we knew how much money the Government was going to receive from taxes, we would not be inclined to appropriate so freely, and we would not have so much freedom with reference to making appropriations. We did not have the will to impose a ceiling. We should have realized that Congress was destroying its control of the purse strings.

That is why, as I see it—and again I say it will take a will to do it—provision for a consolidated appropriations bill should be adopted by Congress. The House should work on such a bill as soon as the budget is sent to Congress, with the Senate dividing the work on the bill, after it comes from the House, among the various subcommittees, as it does today. The committee could then work on the various items, and when the bill came to the floor every Senator would know exactly the total amount of the appropriations contained in the bill. At the same time he would know the total amount of the anticipated receipts from taxes. Thus he would be able to determine, at that time, the answer to the question: "Do I, as a Senator of the United States, want deficit spending?"

If he wants deficit spending, he knows at that moment how much the deficit spending will amount to. If he then votes for deficit spending, he is telling the people back home in effect, "I knew we were going to have deficit spending, and I willingly accepted it. Not only did I know we would have deficit spending, but I knew how much it was going to be, and I voted for it, knowing all the facts."

I say, with appropriations coming before us in a piecemeal fashion, one at a time, as in the case of the bill passed last week, no Senator can know whether a deficit will be incurred. The amount of that bill was small; but no Senator could know to what extent the appropriations in that bill would contribute to a deficit. With a consolidated bill before him he would be in a different position.

I agree with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]—and I was cosponsor of the bill to which he referred—that there should be in Congress a joint committee of the kind provided for in his bill. We should have such a joint committee working in conjunction with a consolidated appropriation bill.

Until we know how much every bill is going to cost the taxpayers of the country we will not do very much with respect to deficit spending and deficit financing.

Why do I say that, Mr. President? My experience on the Committee on Appropriations has taught me that when a department submits a new item or asks for additional employees, and we inquire as to the reason for it, invariably the reply is: "During the last session the Congress passed such and such a bill, and because of its enactment into law we must now have additional employees or additional funds in order to implement it."

Many years ago legislation passed by Congress did not involve large bureaus and large agencies. Such large establishments were not necessary in order to execute the legislation enacted by Congress. However, considering the kind of legislation being passed today—and I say too much of it is being passed—the time has come when it can be stated that the fewer bills Congress passes the better the Congress is.

With each bill that is passed we should have before us, from the Director of the Budget, an estimate as to the cost of its operation, if the bill is passed, for the first year, and perhaps for the next 5 years. Otherwise, we will not be able to control expenditures.

On the next call of the calendar, bills will be passed with respect to which Members of the Senate and Members of the House will not have the slightest idea of the cost they entail upon the Government.

Such questions can be worked out if the pending resolution is adopted. Questions like that can be worked out even by the committees. In fact, no legislation on that point would be needed, because we could ask the Director of the Budget to furnish such information.

I return to the statement I made in the beginning. If there is a will, there can be a way. Unless all of us decide that we are going to know as much as we can about the income of the Government and about expenditures, we will never be able to balance the budget, particularly if we are to have separate appropriation bills. In that case we can have no knowledge, until we pass the last bill, whether or not we will have a balanced budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield, gladly.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, when it is submitted to us, does not the budget give an estimate of the anticipated revenue?

Mr. FERGUSON. It does.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does it not also state how much money is to be expended by each department, as well as whether the Government will be in the red or in the black?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course it has been in the red for the past 20 years, I know.

Mr. FERGUSON. For 18 years out of 20.

Mr. ELLENDER. There were 3 years during which the budget was balanced. In 2 of those years we canceled a great many contracts entered into during World War II, and we imposed additional taxes soon after the beginning of the Korean war. Aside from that there has been a deficit each year. Is it not a fact, however, that such information is furnished to the Senate and to the House by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that he has that knowledge and the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has that knowledge, because he is continuously studying the question of income and expenditures.

Mr. ELLENDER. Each Senator receives a copy of the budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think it would be casting any reflection upon a Senator to express a doubt that many Senators could read the budget and do anything else.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not necessary to read all the items. A summary is provided, which shows how much is to be spent by each department and how much the revenues will amount to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana this question: How much did the last appropriation bill contribute to deficit spending?

Mr. ELLENDER. How much?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish I knew. Does the Senator know?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Louisiana would know if we had a consolidated appropriation bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. How?

Mr. FERGUSON. Because he would know the amount of the income and the amount of the total expenditures.

Mr. ELLENDER. We know that now.

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator can find out just as easily with 10 separate appropriation bills as he can with 1 consolidated bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, he can. The amount of money to be expended by each department is set forth in the budget, and the amount of the revenue is set forth in the budget. If we add the amounts set forth for the budget of all the departments, and if we then deduct the amount of the revenues, we determine the deficit.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. But what happens is that the Appropriations Committee recommends making certain cuts in the appropriations provided by a bill, or else perhaps the Appropriations Committee recommends that the bill be passed in the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. All we have to do is compare the amount of money actually appropriated in a specific appropriation bill with the amount of appropriations recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for that agency, and in that way we can determine whether the amount of appropriations is greater or less than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. But suppose we pass an appropriation bill in the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Such action on only one appropriation bill will not make it possible for us to know whether the budget will be balanced. If in a following appropriation bill Congress appropriates less than the amount of appropriations recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, Congress still will not know whether the budget will be balanced.

On the other hand, if all appropriations are set forth in one bill, at one time, Congress will be able to determine whether the budget will be balanced or how much out of balance the budget will be.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. No Member of Congress is more interested in balancing the budget than am I, but I think the Senator from Michigan will agree with me—for he and I have been on the Appropriations Committee a long time—that one of the greatest troubles we have in connection with appropriations is not because of the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget or because of what the Senate Appropriations Committee recommends or what the House of Representatives votes, but is because of the authorization bills which are passed by Congress. When such bills are passed, we never know how much money they will finally cost.

I have voted many times to provide the appropriations required by authorizations which previously have been voted. But I ask the Senator from Michigan, if he agrees with me that the difficulties arising as a result of authorization bills are about the worst difficulties we have, because following the passage of such authorization bills, we never know how much money they will cost.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that one of the greatest troubles we have is that when we act upon authorization bills, we pay little or no attention to their ultimate cost.

Mr. MAYBANK. For instance, recently we authorized the construction of 150,000 housing units, and later the number was reduced to 35,000, and the number may yet be cut further. I know the Senator from Michigan did not vote for that number, but he knows that many cities have entered into contracts on the basis of the authorization bill passed by Congress. Is not that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is where the fault lies.

Mr. FERGUSON. How easy it is to have a committee vote to report an authorization bill, without knowing or appreciating how much the project will cost.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. That difficulty will not be corrected by a one-package appropriation bill. It must be corrected on the floor of the Senate, by defeating such authorization bills.

Mr. FERGUSON. The difficulty can be corrected by committee work, as I have said. If there is a will, there can be a way.

For instance, if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana were chairman of a committee which was considering an authorization bill, he could ask that before the committee voted to report the bill, it include as a part of its report on the bill a statement of the estimated cost of the bill for the first 5 years.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield again to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to hear the Senator from Michigan make the statement he has just made, because he knows how I feel about some of these matters.

The same difficulty exists in the case of public roads. I have supported public roads appropriations. However, the difficulty is that first the States make agreements with the Federal Government in regard to the construction of public roads, and thereafter appropriations are requested in amounts sufficient to cover the expenditures previously made under such agreements.

For instance, when, tomorrow morning, the public roads appropriation comes before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with appropriations for the Department of Commerce, the members of the subcommittee will be told, "You must vote to have the Government keep its contract with the State of Michigan or the State of South Carolina"—or with whatever State may be involved.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; we are often told, "You have allowed the expenditures to be made, under the authorization, in the respective States, and all you are being asked to do this year is to appropriate sufficient money to cover the expenditures which were made last year."

Just today, before the Appropriations Committee, a similar situation developed. Appropriations of approximately $30 million were requested for certain international organizations, and the committee had absolutely no control over that item.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield again to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I recall, those expenditures were authorized by the Foreign Relations Committee; the Appropriations Committee never knew a thing about them, but had to vote for appropriations for that purpose, in order to have the Government keep the contract which was made with the United Nations.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. As I have said, the Appropriations Committee had nothing to do with the question of whether the $30 million would be spent, for the State Department had made contracts with budgets of various branches of the United Nations, and thus determined that the United States would pay 35 percent of the total cost of those budgets. Therefore, if at this time Congress does not appropriate sufficient funds for that purpose, it will be said that the Government is in default.

Certainly a government cannot be operated properly if it is insisted that unless sufficient funds for a given purpose are appropriated, it will be considered that the Government has breached its contract—a contract which was indirectly authorized by Congress, but actually was made by another agency of the Government.

That is what I mean when I say Congress has lost control of the purse strings.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield again?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will a one-package appropriation bill cure the defect the Senator from Michigan is discussing?

Mr. FERGUSON. It will not cure all evil.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course it will not.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not declare that it will cure all evil, and the Senator from Virginia does not declare that it will cure all evil. However, it will be a good start toward placing on the shoulders of every Member of Congress the responsibility of knowing what he is doing when he votes for the appropriation bill; and in such case he will know that when he votes for the bill, he will have the responsibility of telling his con-

stituents why he voted for it. That is the purpose of the one-package appropriation bill measure.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sorry to have to disagree with some of my colleagues, but I still have a vivid recollection of the time when we tried a one-package appropriation bill. As I recall, we finally concluded the session in October of that year. Of course, the arrangement may not have worked well in that particular year.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The consolidated appropriation bill was passed on August 6, 1950, for the fiscal year 1951, and was signed by the President approximately 30 days later. That was one of the earliest times in recent years that Congress completed action on appropriations.

Mr. AIKEN. That still left us rather close to October.

Mr. BYRD. What happened was that the Korean war broke out on June 25, 1950, and then we enacted other appropriation bills, by reason of that war.

Mr. AIKEN. However, the desire for an earlier adjournment is not the principal reason why I shall not vote for the concurrent resolution. If we believe we now have trouble with pressure groups, I point out that we are actually having scarcely any trouble at all, as compared with the trouble we would have if Congress were to say, "We are going to appropriate a certain amount of money this year, and we are going to prorate that amount among the various governmental agencies, or the appropriations will be made on a percentage basis"—as was suggested a short time ago by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. If any Member of Congress thinks he has seen lobbying groups active in their attempts to have appropriations made, let me say that he has not yet seen anything of that sort, as compared to what would happen under the proposed one-package arrangement.

For example, the question would arise, "What percentage of the appropriations will go to the Department of Commerce, what percentage of the appropriations will be available for ship subsidies, how much will be available for foreign aid, and how much will be available for the construction of highways?"

A substantial number of people in the United States want better highways than the ones we have today.

Others would ask, "What part of the total appropriations will be available for airports, what part will be available for rivers and harbors, what part will be available for flood control, what part will be available for reclamation, and what part will be available for health?"

After all, many persons in the United States are vitally interested in matters pertaining to health.

Others would ask, "What part of the total appropriations will be available for public works, and what part will be available for agriculture," and so on.

Others would ask, "What part of the total appropriations will be available for the Air Force?"

Of course, that matter is under much dispute today, and every city and every area in which manufacturers of airplanes or airplane parts are located is vitally interested in that subject. So we might expect unprecedented lobbying by those who would seek the most for their own special interest.

Mr. President, I believe we ought to take up each of the functions of Government and assume the responsibility which properly belongs to the Congress of determining what is the need and how much we can spend, and how we can reduce the amount to a minimum consistent with good administration. It seems to me that we should not legislate primarily in terms of dollars, but in terms of what is best for the Nation as a whole, first determining the minimum needs of the country, and then providing the necessary money, and balancing the budget in that way. It may seem difficult for some people to do it that way, but that is the way in which the State in which I live does it. A determination is first made as to how much is required, and in my State we have an unwritten law that before the State legislature adjourns, the money must be provided to meet all appropriations.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I heard the distinguished Senator refer a moment ago to his own State of Vermont. The Senator was formerly the distinguished governor of that State. I should like to know whether the Senator from Vermont is aware of any of the 48 States which do not at this time follow the practice of making appropriations in a single-package bill.

Mr. AIKEN. The different appropriations are taken up one by one, and, at the end, are placed in a single package, which requires but a short time for its passage. But the appropriations themselves are not considered as a single package.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. But when the State legislatures get through, they have a single package, and it is possible for one to see the whole picture at a glance, and to comprehend an overall picture.

Mr. AIKEN. But I do not know of any State which, at the beginning of a session, says, "We have so much money that we are going to prorate among all the different State agencies." I do not think that method would work. I am satisfied it would not. The fact that the way is left open in the pending measure for an unrestricted number of supplemental appropriation bills indicates that perhaps the sponsors of this measure do not think it would work, either.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The single package works very well in the State of New Jersey, and I am certain it would work well in the Federal Government.

Mr. AIKEN. My view is that the other system of determining the needs of the State and then having to provide the money is a very good deterrent against wastefulness in my State, and I think it would be equally beneficial on a national scale. I think we ought to legislate to meet the needs of the country. We should then balance our budget at all times, except when there were extraordinary emergencies. There are times when a deficit is justifiable, although we all dislike the idea of a deficit.

So, Mr. President, I hope that the Congress will not undertake to abdicate its responsibility of determining the needs of each department and each function of the Government by itself. Certainly, when I am called upon to vote on appropriations for the Department of Commerce or the Department of the Interior, I do not want to have to correlate that appropriation with a thousand other appropriations at the same time. I do not think this proposal would be as workable as its proponents would lead us to think.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were, on page 6, strike out line 10; on page 8, strike out line 22; on page 17, strike out line 9; on page 20, strike out line 6; on page 32, strike out line 25; on page 39, strike out line 18; and on page 45, after line 12, insert:

A-9532298, Mathisen, Wollert.
A-1331075, Williams, George Kapa.
A-7145943, Prisciandaro, Damiano.
A-4193296, Zaganas, Leonidas alias Leo Z. Gray.
A-7019831, Begin, Joseph Real Gaeton.
A-6670579, Smith, Henry Hallam.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, which expresses congressional approval of the adjustment of status of certain cases of suspension of deportation, was agreed to by the Senate on May 6, 1953.

The House of Representatives amended Senate Concurrent Resolution 20 on May 19, 1953, by making certain technical changes chiefly with reference to the spelling of names of certain aliens embraced in the concurrent resolution.

Accordingly, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 20.

The motion was agreed to.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. Con. Res. 29) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain

aliens, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

"A-6963020, Amsel, Andor.
"A-7898535, Avilo, Rudolf.
"A-6592016, Balberiski, Miron or Bell.
"A-6756307, Baqal, Mohamad Amir or Mohamad Amir Boukal.
"A-6552873, Brotleit, Zofia Kusewicka.
"A-9825254, Bussani, Andrew.
"A-7099697, Chang, Peter Yun-Pao.
"A-6431861, Chang, Jean M. Y. (nee Young).
"A-6623722, Chang, Shau Hoa.
"A-6623721, Chang, Tsaing Wa.
"A-6625811, Chang, Yuan Lo.
"A-6851532, Chao, Tsei-Yu or T. Y. Chao or Chao Tsei Yu.
"A-7073396, Chechik, Luba (nee Luba Russak).
"A-6848439, Chen, Min.
"A-6830501, Dischka, Zauzsanna.
"A-6917990, Domb, Moses.
"A-7828138, Domb, Cyla.
"A-7828139, Domb, Fryda.
"A-7131176, Esop, Verner.
"A-6740258, Fanaberia, Calel Morika.
"A-6713644, Fanaberia, Masia (nee Rubin).
"A-6886818, Feldblum, Meyer.
"A-6536894, Fleischman, David.
"A-68414247, Fleischman, Ilona Sara (nee Eizikovitz).
"A-6769948, Frankel, Nechemie.
"A-6758622, Frankel, Chana (nee Wachs).
"A-7056845, Furer, Menashe or Menasse or Menasche or Menash Furer.
"A-7210070, Gawronski, Antonina (nee Rittigstein).
"A-6769935, Gedeon, Elie Jabra.
"A-6860145, Gedrovics, Alberts.
"A-6903711, Grunwald, Alexander.
"A-6449004, How, Julie Lien-Yng or Julie How.
"PR901282, How, Bang.
"PR901281, How, Rose May Ng or Rose Howe.
"A-6737212, Huang, Yao Sien or Eva Yai-Sien Huang.
"A-6576346, Jacobowitz, Bela (Jakobowitz).
"A-6848236, Jacobowitz, Eva.
"A-7197382, Jaszkowski, Tadeusz or Ted Jaszkowski or T. Jaszkowski.
"A-7427989, Karm, Meinhard.
"A-6772233, Khalidi, Suleiman Faud El.
"A-7491361, Kirilloff, Boris Ephim.
"A-6887572, Kopelowitz, Ester (nee Tessler).
"A-7178548, Laurik, Evald.
"A-8091096, Lee, Margaret Chia Lin (Margaret Therese Lee).
"A-6171207, Lee, Yiu Yung.
"A-6953010, Lieber, Sarolta (nee Berger).
"A-6851545, Loo, Ching Chee.
"A-7135305, Loo, Chia-Ying Chang (nee Chang).
"A-6819172, Maaliyah, Noory Heskel or Noory Heskel Musaleh.
"A-6467056, Metsalo, Valentin.
"A-6415978, Molnar, Theresia.
"A-6923766, Muller, Vera.
"A-7095882, Munteanu, George Nicholas.
"A-9107940, Nakielski, Bernard or Makielski.
"A-8091555, Novak, Joakim Ante.
"A-6801965, Pan, John Joel-Siang or John Pan.
"A-6611055, Potocka, Maria.
"A-6666080, Rand, Vladimir.
"A-6776588, Rotbart, Motel.
"A-7094824, Saltoun, Ishaq Heshel.
"A-7841095, Saltoun, Raina.
"A-7841096, Saltoun, Salum.
"A-9825231, Scrivanich, Antonio Nicolo.
"A-7048886, Shulman, Joel or Julian Shulman or Julian Szulman.
"A-6606633, Spierer, William or William or Villimos.
"A-6508114, Stern, Herman.
"A-9825170, Swidzinski, Czeslaw.
"A-7144911, Swoysik, Emery Anthony or Emerich Antonin Svojsik.
"A-7365957, Szekely, Suzanne.
"A-6862642, Tessler, Margit (nee Margit Sonnenschein).
"A-6258292, Tsai, Pe Chiu.
"A-7934047, Tulk, Johannes.
"A-7243463, Tye, Josephine Chou.
"A-6990780, Wagner, Wienczyslaw Jozef.
"A-6701080, Weiss, Rachel Ruth.
"A-6881779, Weisz, Eva.
"A-7134269, Wisniewski, Roxalia.
"A-7197533, Woo, Kok Liang.
"A-7197534, Woo, Lily Ji-Yuen.
"A-7197535, Woo, Andy Ying-Chung.
"A-7197536, Woo, Benny Fong-Chung.
"A-6291894, Zydorowicz, Zygmunt Stanislaw.
"A-6291893, Zydorowicz, Stanislawa (nee Babel) (Bombel).
"A-6615482, Cimze, Brigita.
"A-6619075, Sils, Jekabs Rudolfs.
"A-6615484, Cimze, Wilhelmina Albertine (nee Upmanis).
"A-7181298, Ambaras, Berek.
"A-7181299, Ambaras, Ruchla Leja (nee Spektor).
"A-7181301, Ambaras, Szmul or Samuel.
"A-7181300, Ambaras, Chaja.
"A-6933862, Antos, Viktor or Viktor Adler.
"A-7073948, Bajor, Laszlo.
"A-7073949, Bajor, Margaret (nee Bermann).
"A-7125348, Belohlavek, Ladislav.
"A-8015690, Boni, Donata or Bonich.
"A-7982580, Chen, Betty Shu-Hsien.
"A-7350806, Chen, Chi-Cheng.
"A-6542129, Deutsch, Emery.
"A-6542128, Deutsch, Edith.
"A-7395122, Dunn, Fung, Wen-Feng.
"A-6899359, Eisendraft, Jente Perl.
"A-7975403, Greisman, Chaim.
"A-6933870, Greisman, Dyna (nee Dyna Stern).
"A-6511086, Gulewski, Chaim Ber.
"A-6843542, Halberstam, Serena.
"A-7143248, Hauser, Moses.
"A-6896010, Kac, David or David Katz.
"A-6794615, Kahan, David.
"A-6819107, Konig, Simon.
"A-7383019, Konig, Judit.
"A-6917988, Leffel, David.
"A-7841092, Leffel, Hania Sarah Leffel.
"A-7841094, Leffel, Henry.
"A-7066379, Leicht, Alfred.
"A-6757650, Liberman, Chaja Cross.
"A-7057929, Loblovics, Jirina.
"A-7445230, Loblovics, Peter Stepan.
"A-9669698, Loser, Ladislav.
"A-6439571, Lukacs, John Adalbert.
"A-7184075, Nagy, Gustav.
"A-6953276, Ostreicher, Sally or Sara Ostreicher.
"A-9825173, Piccini, Giovanni or John Piccini.
"A-9825233, Piccinich, Antonio.
"A-9825234, Picinich, Giovanni (John).
"A-7048776, Pribramska, Milena Jaroslava.
"A-6803937, Propper, Hinda.
"A-7243272, Rofe, Clemy (nee Hassoun).
"A-7243273, Rofe, Roland.
"A-6542415, Ronikier, Adam.
"A-6275646, Rosenthal, Cecilia Lucy (nee Rochlin).
"A-6937373, Rottenberg, Laszlo.
"A-6851494, Shen, Mary.
"A-6441693, Shew, Lester Fook.
"A-6441694, Shew, Alice Lee.
"A-6450157, Shimanovsky, Alexander Eugene.
"A-6450157, Shimanovsky, Xenia Nikoaevna.
"A-6450158, Shimanovsky, Nickolai Alexander.
"A-6450159, Shimanovsky, Natalie Alexander.
"A-6905008, Strauss, Leo.
"A-7863422, Strauss, Elizabeth (nee Elizabeth Brody).
"A-7125300, Szilas, George.
"A-7125301, Szilas, Veronica Anna.
"A-6913912, Tabak, Guta.
"A-9825237, Tarabocchia, Antonio Giovanni.
"A-6805581, Teitelbaum, Dorothy.
"A-7116390, Winter, Berek Litman.
"A-7427544, Winter, Mordechai.
"A-7803010, Zaharoff, George Alexander.
"A-6659388, Zak, Irene Anna (nee Segal).
"A-6663293, Zak, Daniel.
"A-6663244, Zak, Michael.
"A-6779061, Abdul-Nabi, Sion Moshi.
"A-6907333, Abramczyk, Abram.
"A-7074032, Blumenstein, Jerta.
"A-6509235, Brecher, Samuel.
"A-6708334, Chang, Joyce Loretta.
"A-6848604, Chien, James Tai Tze.
"A-7975994, Chiu, Leung.
"A-9836671, Cymer, Alfred or Alfred Ziemer or Alfred K. Cymer or Cymer Alfred or A. Cymer.
"A-7934149, D'Antoni, Giuseppe Giovanni.
"A-6949998, Dresdner, Desider.
"A-6983006, Felkay, Miklos.
"A-6983007, Felkay, Magdalena.
"A-7445428, Felkay, Julia Agnes.
"A-6496385, Fischman, Moses.
"A-6472344, Fischman, Piri (nee Jeremias).
"A-9765956, Fook, Lum or Lam.
"A-6390069, Gerencser, Frank.
"A-6390070, Gerencser, Anne.
"A-7132030, Goldberger, Ernest.
"A-6929650, Gorodecki, Aba.
"A-6480449, Gorog, Frigyes or Frederic Gorog.
"A-7125154, Gorog, Margit.
"A-6887741, Gunsburg, Mendel.
"A-6666944, Haberfeld, Eugene.
"A-6922074, Halpert, Mendel.
"A-7491705, Ho, Hao Jo.
"A-7828496, Ho, Hsiang-Chiao Huang.
"A-7828498, Ho, Lily Li-Lien.
"A-7828495, Ho, Louise Li-Si.
"A-7828597, Ho, William Wei-Yu.
"A-7125390, Iritz, Magda.
"A-7354858, Iritz, Andras Ferenc.
"A-6438637, Jurisevic, Milo Tripe.
"A-6438638, Jurisevic, Jelena Milo.
"A-6438640, Jurisevic, Radmila Milo.
"A-6438639, Jurisevic, Svetozar Milo.
"A-6987919, Karastoyanova, Marguita Bogdanova.
"A-7056457, Karcz, Jerzy Feliks.
"A-7097876, Karcz, Irena.
"A-7134826, Karlik, Oldrich (Olda) Evse Spitihnev.
"A-7095980, Kovacs, Ilona Marie (nee Tovolgyi).
"A-7095981, Kovacs, Judith Ilona.
"A-7095982, Kovacs, Katalin Piroska.
"A-6847906, Keng, Hilda Hsi Ling.
"A-9506160, Kingsepp, Alexander.
"A-7210424, Kotas, Jindrich.
"A-7197295, Kucera, Sonia or Sonia Kucerova.
"A-7802992, Kun, Jozsef Lajos or Joseph Kun.
"A-9290474, Lian, Choo Joon.
"A-6709345, Kwong, Tin Yu.
"A-6991771, Leidermann, Susan Veronica.
"A-6985787, Leidermann, Paul.
"A-6848564, Lin, Ru-Kan or Ru Kong Lin.
"A-8001257, Ljubcic, Maria Luca.
"A-7210293, Madis Voldemar.
"A-7210288, Madis Ilona.
"A-7863133, Madis, Ilona, Jr.
"A-7863134, Madis, Voldemar, Jr.
"A-7991037, Maram, Maria.
"A-7629040, Michalski, Stefan Antoni.
"A-6555835, Milikowski, Boruch, or Milikowsky or Boruch Millikowskie or Milkowski or Bouch Milikowski or Borouch Milikowski.

"A-7483287, Moy, Don Tsit.
"A-7095886, Miculescu, Mircea.
"A-6849839, Nieh, Tseng-Lu.
"A-6852886, Ostteicher, Ester or Esther (nee Peristein).
"A-7868150, Pi, Teh Ho.
"A-9825275, Piccini, Matteo.
"A-7201404, Ripka, George Prokop.
"A-7863155, Ripka, Hubert Jean Michel or Hubert Jan Michal Ripka.
"A-6704266, Romanowska, Alicja Theresa or Alice Romanowski.
"A-6983560, Setton, Renee Albert.
"A-6746537, Shina, Isaac Saleh.
"A-9825384, Tarabochia, John.
"A-6403591, Tkachenko, Arkady.
"A-7142101, Twardon, Gerard Edward.
"A-7828393, Veres, George Stephen.
"A-7828395, Veres, Catherine Renee.
"A-7828394, Veres, Paul Stephen.
"A-7095791, Vizer, Jozsef or Joseph.
"A-7095792, Vizer, Erzsebet or Elizabeth (nee Papa).
"A-7264780, Pal, Peter or Paul Vizer.
"A-7915647, Wang, King-Ching.
"A-7354350, Wang, Shen Kuang.
"A-7379754, Wang, Chao-Chih Shih.
"A-6622376, Wang, Shih Jien.
"A-7427597, Yang, Bernard Kenneth.
"A-7248107, Yu, Fu Ching.
"A-6699842, Choye, James Hung or Tsai Hung.
"A-6933906, Feder, Solomon.
"A-7052513, Feher, Janos.
"A-7052514, Feher, Klara (nee Vajda).
"A-7052515, Feher, Agnes, Julianna.
"A-7053576, Friend, Jacob Lion.
"A-6159672, Hudec, Ladislas Edward.
"A-6159673, Hudec, Gisella Isabella.
"A-6903729, Irany, Jalal Zend.
"A-6704668, Jacob, Ellis Samuel.
"A-9778010, Kaplur, Serge Michael.
"A-9506849, Klak, Tadeusz Boleslaw.
"A-7052354, Kremnitzer, Samuel.
"A-7898806, Kremnitzer, Sala.
"A-7298969, Ku, Ta Hai.
"A-7350229, Kurzenbaum, Konstantin Paul.
"A-1604133, Lilio, Rudolf Karl.
"A-6460280, Lis, Josef Lisek Vel.
"A-6071234, Liu, James Hsi-Hwa.
"A-9825110, Maslobojew, Ryszard.
"A-7356260, Metes, Mircea Virgil P.
"A-7809812, Nacinovich, Francesco Giovanni.
"A-9831492, Paszek, Emil.
"A-7249625, Quon, Yuk Lum or Egal Kim Quon.
"A-6704260, Rymarska, Stanislawa Janina or Stella Rymaraki.
"A-7197296, Schwarzenberg, Francis (Frantisek).
"A-7197297, Schwarzenberg, Amalie (Amalia).
"A-7809033, Schwarzenberg, Ludmila.
"A-6982895, Sevcik, Jaromir.
"A-7809012, Siao, Ruby Wang.
"A-7809013, Siao, Lilly.
"A-5206882, Silla, Johannes.
"A-6992868, Sion, Caroline Eliahou (nee Caroline Eliahou Khazzam).
"A-6943745, Somogyi, John.
"A-6985795, Stransky, Frank.
"A-6985796, Stransky, Kamila.
"A-9716791, Strawinski, Adolf.
"A-9825125, Szymankiewicz, Kazimierz.
"A-6844603, Wang, Kung-Lee.
"A-6848123, Yen, Jen Hwa (Moore Yen).
"A-9766047, Abelnicks, Karlis Alexsandris.
"A-6763814, Ahmad, Abder Raouf Sayied.
"A-9621982, Baric, Slavko.
"A-9825347, Bresaz, Metodio Vittorio.
"A-7201326, Chao, Margaret Ellen.
"A-6868652, Chasan, Samuel.
"A-6843905, Chasan, Lala.
"A-6843906, Chasan, Daniel.
"A-6665493, Djordjevich, Ilija Milan or Eli M. Georgevich.
"A-6363788, Dwek, Joseph.
"A-9825078, Geba, Waclaw Stanislaw.
"A-6857645, Gedeon, William Jabra.
"A-7178712, Geiger, Leslie alias Leisie Laszlo Geiger.
"A-7197556, Geiger, Elizabeth nee Elizabeth Klein alias Elisabeth Kozmo.
"A-6870411, Gottlieb, Suzanna Gabriella.
"A-6829523, Hofer, Andras or Andre or Andrew or Andre, Fernand, Francois Hofer; Andras Nandor Ferenc Hofer.
"1100-23457, Huang, Yuan Chung or Wei Ta Huang or Walter Huang.
"A-6652842, Kenigsberg, Szaja Abram.
"A-7144083, Lederman, Abram.
"A-6923751, Lewita, Pinkas.
"A-7903765, Mikulich, Gildo (nee Erminegildo Miculich).
"A-6819103, Pick, Teresa Zeller.
"A-6555822, Rosenstein, Muzza.
"A-6987833, Sebestyen, George Stephen.
"A-7941803, Simicich, Giovanni.
"A-9825228, Tarabocchia, Antonio.
"A-6881776, Traube, Moses.
"A-6949360, Traube, Frida Pessa.
"A-6848504, Tsou, Kwan Shung or Tsou Kwan Chung.
"A-6983523, Visoianu, Florica Corneliu (nee Balteanu).
"A-8001252, Wei, Chue Sue.
"A-7118818, Winkler, Thomas.
"A-9634634, Adamson, Armant.
"A-7074001, Alimanestiano, Mihai.
"A-7052865, Alimanestiano, Ioana.
"A-7118760, Blau, Sidonia (nee Weiss).
"A-6953297, Brod, Ivan.
"A-6739686, Chao, Pei Chu.
"A-6973682, Chang, Linda Tung-Chen.
"A-7111908, Chiao, Gene Liang.
"A-7111909, Ciao, Wei Ying Lin.
"A-6522482, Chou, Kuo-P'ing alias Ch'Iao-Chin Chou (or Chow), alias Shou-Ying Chou (or Chow) alias Hsien-Chen Chou (or Chow).
"A-6921258, Deutsch, Joel.
"A-6595663, Druker, Haim Girsch.
"A-6595664, Druker, Rebecca Afraim.
"A-6595662, Druker, Leah alias Lillian Druker.
"A-6854411, Fabry, Gavriella.
"A-7135698, Fan, Kwan Chi alias Quincey Chi-Chun Fan.
"A-6897918, Faybik, Alojz Stefan alias Allen Stefan Faybik.
"A-6945554, Froemel, Robert Boris Ivanchenko.
"A-6968029, Goldstein, Margarita Martin.
"A-7395111, Hu, Helen or Yu Hsin Hu.
"A-6851699, Huang, William Yung-Nien alias William Edward Huang.
"A-7141717, Izsak, Julianna.
"A-7279652, Izsak, Robert John.
"A-6771471, Karkar, Ya'Qub (Jack) Nasif.
"A-7985654, Kask, Johannes alias Johannus Kask.
"A-7178540, Kask, Nelly (nee Jarg) alias N. Jarg or Nelli Jarg or Nellie Jarg or Millie Jarg or Nellie Jarge or Nelly Jarg Kask.
"A-7863386, King, Peter Wei Kong.
"A-6930672, Kramer, Esther or Ester.
"A-6279271, Landau, Judith.
"A-6521591, Loutchan, Ludmila Maria.
"A-7125164, Lowinger, Ida (nee Ida Klein).
"A-9914609, Pusic, Paul.
"A-9825124, Puszka, Jan.
"A-7184152, Radnai, Pal Andras alias Paul Andrew Radnai.
"A-7197543, Radnai, Eva (nee Eva Balazs).
"A-7383442, Sakin, Anna (nee Boxer).
"A-7383443, Sakin, Shulamith.
"A-7383444, Sakin, Judith.
"A-7178370, Sihv, Eduard (or E.; or Edward Sihv; or Eduard Shiv).
"A-6183233, Tamm, Igor.
"A-9580292, Toomberg, Valdemar.
"A-7057641, Treblinska, Rywka alias Rywka Treblinski or Regina Treblinski, or Hochsztein (nee Treblinska).
"A-7967275, Tung, Chen Huan.
"A-7398350, Vali, Eduard Julius.
"A-6922682, Winkler, Sandor.
"A-7046213, Winkler, Margit (nee Szerou).
"A-6790612, Wu, Chien Keng.
"A-9825045, Swideraki, Romuald.
"A-6916445, Ulm, Arvo Johannes.
"A-6779243, Schidlof-Vojnovic, Ivan, or Ivan Schidlof.
"A-7079927, Weiss, Bernat, or Bernard Weiss.
"A-6354566, Krajden, Moszko.
"A-6949467, Skarzynska, Aniela, or Irena Merenholc.
"A-5534196, Zombory, Ladislas.
"A-7941170, Chong, King Kee, or Koo Chong King or Casey King.
"A-7786119, Gorski, Boleslaw Pawel.
"A-6862321, Adamus, Stanislaw.
"A-7193792, Kulej, Hanna Teresa.
"A-7193793, Cholewicki, Victor Stefan.
"A-9677603, Aasma, August.
"A-7129220, Aurel, Mozes.
"A-6903692, Bluth, Lenke Einhorn.
"A-6861310, Chao, Hieh Chang, or Frank Chao.
"A-6852888, Feldbrand, Manci.
"A-7868117, Frank, Frieda.
"A-6887552, Ickowicz, Majer.
"A-6983574, Indig, Abraham.
"A-7841098, Indig, Irene.
"A-7052337, Levendel, Irene.
"A-6691413, Lin, Shuh Yuen, alias Shuh Yuen Liu.
"A-6794943, Malhas, Ruhi Abdul-Hamid.
"A-6612875, Maari, Mahmud Said.
"A-6887709, Meisels, Naftali.
"A-7190317, Molostvoff, Catherine Basil.
"A-7125385, Nowomiast, Mojzesz, Hirsz, alias Marvin Henry Newton.
"A-7125386, Nowomiast, Mina (nee Kaplan), alias Mina Newton.
"A-7841884, Nowomiast, Mark, alias Mark Newton.
"A-8001241, Petelka, Zofia (nee Korpowska).
"A-7427649, Rzepkowicz, Michael.
"A-7390586, Sedlak, Mirko Svatopluk, or Mirko Sedlak.
"A-4768149, Shu, E. Hah.
"A-7048743, Stern, Martin.
"A-7124129, Tan, Pai Chu.
"A-9766004, Toomepuu, Juhan.
"A-9766003, Toomepuu, Juri.
"A-6163781, Tsai, Chen Yu.
"A-7144079, Wolf, Aron Nathan.
"A-6862641, Adam, Mozes.
"A-6440636, Aizer, Salim Shaoul.
"A-5876212, Ambrus, Jan.
"A-8001260, Arro, Arnold.
"A-6952382, Beer, Adam, Eugin.
"A-7210292, Bekeffi, Laszlo, alias Leslie Bekeffi.
"A-7210291, Bekeffi, Magdalena.
"A-6967636, Chen, Paul Kuan Yao.
"A-7483958, Cheng, Ai Ming.
"A-7483959, Chen, Lilly Li.
"A-9765114, Cieslak, Alfons.
"A-6662080, Domb, Jerachmiel, alias Jerachmiel Donn.
"A-6805594, Faber, Laszlo, alias Laszlo Theodore Faber and George Leslie Faber.
"A-6567671, Friedman, Leopold.
"A-6903791, Gilbert, Suzanne, alias Suzanne Goldberger.
"A-6737204, Godkin, Michael Joseph, or Moses Joseph Godkin.
"A-7049993, Hazzan, Leon Isaac.
"A-7049994, Hazzan, Renee.
"A-6862650, Herman, Michel.
"A-6991850, Herman, Maria.
"A-6887727, Horowitz, Majer.
"A-7276014, Hwang, Lai-Yin Grace.
"A-6985811, Ionnitiu, Mircea.
"A-6903748, Kaftanski, Seymour, alias Szepsel Kaftanski.
"A-6390210, Kangro, Valdeko.
"A-7085991, Kassab, David Jacob.
"A-6627380, Kiang, Frederica Shu-Ya.
"A-9635272, Kiploks, Ludvigs, Paul or Ludvigs Kiploks.
"A-6922685, Klein, Moric.
"A-7828455, Klein, Julie.
"A-7828456, Klein, Tomas.
"A-6386367, Kogerman, Sulev Kristjan.
"56133/591, Kuljaca, Jovo Petro.
"A-6847740, Kwong, Man Hong.
"A-7087401, Lautman, Zoltan.
"A-6983796, Lee, Joseph Alexander.
"A-6694226, Li, Kuan.
"A-6625627, Li, Frances.
"A-6794979, Lieber, Leopold.

"A-6794944, Loh, Ellen (Ai Lien Loh, Ellen Lo).
"A-7757809, Loo, Ping Yok.
"A-6995548, Lowy, Gustav.
"A-6805570, Odinak, Alec (Elya Odinak).
"A-6373385, Petrova, Olga Gregorie.
"A-6904771, Pizyc, Stefa.
"A-6934637, Popoff, Sergei Vasilievich.
"A-6390227, Raid, Kaljo, alias Kaljo Raamann.
"A-7073587, Rizk, George Sliman, formerly George Sliman Rizk Abu Judom.
"A-7463362, Sabel, Bela.
"A-7463363, Sabel, Ilona (nee Adler).
"A-7903795, Sabel, Irene.
"A-6771472, Salah, Nadim John.
"A-6938007, Schwartz, Hillel Aron.
"A-7243320, Shalom, Yacoub Raphael, alias Jack Raphael Shalom.
"A-6867165, Sommerstein, Emil.
"A-6886844, Szeto, Shih-Chuan.
"A-7290210, Sztrachman, Aleksander.
"A-9734415, Tai, Ying Wah.
"A-6983820, Taub, Ladislas Basile, alias Lawrence Taub.
"A-6628885, Vaughan, Nellie Ladd.
"A-7752326, Wang, Chi-Yuan.
"A-6849833, Wang, Virginia Fu-Chuang.
"A-6904341, Wechsler, Samuel.
"A-6886824, Weiss, Josef.
"A-6844256, Wenger, Irving (Izrael Wegier).
"A-6844257, Wenger, Ida (Chaja Wegier).
"A-7130820, Berland, Felicja, alias Felicia Berland.
"A-7182346, Borowiec, Andrzej Stanislaw.
"A-9758751, Bracco, Giovanni.
"A-7139089, Bracco, Simon Guisto.
"A-8057048, Cugliani, John, or Ivan Kuljanic or Ivan Milan Kuljanic.
"A-7046293, David, Masouda M. S. S.
"A-7139010, Deblinger, Srul.
"A-6959748, Deblinger, Kate (nee Guttman).
"A-7934151, Fable, Joseph, or Joe Fable.
"A-7079925, Fulop, Jeno.
"A-7144001, Goldberger, Magdalena.
"A-6528723, Halpern, Aron.
"A-6159671, Joles, Joel Leib.
"A-6737779, Klein, Moritz.
"A-6891804, Kohn, Judith.
"A-6755538, Liang Tsich.
"A-7779160, Loo, Shou Ming.
"A-6949995, Neufeld, Josef.
"0300-299946, Paema, Ernst.
"A-7244193, Picinich, Matteo.
"A-7123477, Rawicki, Jerzy Jacob, alias Jerry Rawicki.
"A-7276711, Sang, Chang Chuan.
"A-6934990, Schnabel, Moses.
"A-7828578, Surian, Giovanni.
"A-6849828, Tai, Gertrude Loe or Hsiao Teo Loe.
"A-6620485, Tsang, John Lien-Kwei.
"A-9555577, Velder, Carl (Karl) Alfred.
"A-7118759, Weiss, Ervin, alias Erwin Weiss.
"A-7118778, Weiss, Frieda.
"A-6238175, Yang, Peter Quay, also known as Yang Quay and Yang Kwei.
"A-6210613, Litynski, Zygmunt Leopold or Zygmunt Litynski.
"A-7383205, Iliescu, Dumitru.
"A-6405961, Lin, Chi-Sun."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
WILLIAM LANGER,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
RUTH THOMPSON,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, House Concurrent Resolution 29 records congressional approval for adjustment of the immigration status of certain aliens who have established that they are displaced persons residing in the United States within the purview of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended. Included in the concurrent resolution, as agreed to by the House of Representatives, were 509 cases. The Senate committee deleted from the concurrent resolution the names of 27 aliens because upon the basis of the then available information it did not appear that there were sufficiently strong equities in the 27 cases to warrant the granting of the status of permanent residence. Upon reconsideration of the merits involved in each individual case, the conferees have agreed to reinstate 11 names which were deleted from the concurrent resolution by the Senate and to sustain the action taken by the Senate in 16 cases. In addition, three cases which were transmitted to the committees by the Attorney General have been added to the concurrent resolution.

Accordingly, Mr. President, the conferees on the part of the Senate do recommend and I hereby move that the Senate adopt the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 29.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

FARM PRICES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the subject of farm prices. I believe that the level of farm prices this year and next will have much more to do with a balanced budget next year, or the year after, than any other thing we are discussing on the floor of the Senate today. Go back as far as we want, at least 35 years, and we shall find that our national income is always approximately seven times that of our farm income. The prices of our basic raw materials are important to our national economy and have a direct relationship to it.

The many attacks on our present farm price-support program are completely unwarranted. For the most part, these attacks are based on misinformation and a complete lack of knowledge and understanding of these price-support programs. They are directed mainly against our present 90 percent price-support program for basic farm commodities. Incidentally, over the past 20 years of their operation, the price-support programs have netted the Federal Government a profit of $4 million.

Prices of practically all farm commodities continue their drastic downward trend. The average price that all commodities are selling for at the present time is less than 93 percent of parity. Many commodities, and particularly grains and feed grains, are selling at less than 85 percent of parity. While this downward trend in farm prices continues, the prices of most commodities and services that the farmers have to buy remain at their all time high, and there is every indication that the prices of some of these goods and services may increase even further. There have been important wage increases and pension benefits granted to some organized labor groups this week.

The situation we are facing today is not too unlike that which prevailed in 1929 just before the great depression. If history repeats itself, as it has many times in the past, our present greatly reduced farm income could well lead to another and even more severe depression. If we are to avert another depression, it will require bold action on the part of the United States Government to maintain at least a fair level of farm prices.

Ninety percent farm price supports, according to many of our most reputable economists, prevented the expected post World War II depression. These price-support programs, properly administered, can and will go a long way toward preventing another depression. At least part of their effectiveness has already been destroyed by unwise attacks by high officials in the present administration. These attacks, based for the most part on lack of understanding or information, have already destroyed the confidence of the American people in the future price structure.

Many of the speeches opposing the present price-support program are reminiscent of those we heard in and out of Congress during the sessions of 1949 and 1950. It will be recalled that at that time, Mr. President, many predicted that the agricultural surpluses we had then would destroy our price-support program and wreck our economy. We had some sizable carryovers of important agricultural commodities at that time—more than we have presently.

I wonder how many Members of the Senate recall that it was only a short while ago—1951, to be specific—when we were encountering not only a United States shortage of many important farm commodities but a worldwide shortage. In fact, during 1951, we saw the imposition of price ceilings on cotton and the skyrocketing of cotton prices throughout the world. Many of the textile industries, particularly in Europe, still have not completely recovered from the results of the short cotton supply and resultant high prices of that period just a short while ago. A similar situation prevailed with respect to the short supplies and resultant higher prices of many other farm commodities.

The Government of the United States, realizing the importance of maintaining sizable supplies of important raw materials in a continued tense world situation, has been stockpiling under a war emergency program important commodities such as copper, aluminum, asbestos, lead, mercury, nickel, quinine, crude rubber, tin, tungsten, diamond dyes, pepper, wool, and even castor oil. No less important than the need of stockpiling these materials has been the need to maintain sizable stocks of basic farm commodities, including cotton, corn, and wheat. These commodities, however, rather than being stockpiled under a separate program, as is the case with other strategic war materials, have been carried as surplus stockpiles under the Commodity Credit Corporation and the farm-price-support program.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has said that they had a right to stockpile, even when the prices were going down.

Mr. YOUNG. I think it was a very necessary program.

Mr. MAYBANK. But they did not stockpile, except, as the Senator has suggested, through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. There was practically no wheat or cotton stockpiled.

Mr. YOUNG. The stockpiles which were maintained meant a surplus beyond our normal carryover of these commodities, which had the effect of demoralizing prices.

Mr. MAYBANK. The surpluses were a part of the program of the Department of Agriculture. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture went from pillar to post, I may say, urging the farmer to increase his production. Is not that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. And Congress removed the controls.

Mr. YOUNG. The Department of Agriculture is asking farmers to increase their corn production at this time.

There is no attack being made upon the stockpiling of strategic war materials, except our agricultural commodities. This in spite of the fact the Government of the United States has continually year after year been asking farmers to produce more of many of these commodities. The Government of the United States is asking the corn farmers of this Nation, for example, to increase their corn production this year for the third consecutive year.

While the corn farmers are being asked to increase their corn production by the Department of Agriculture, its Secretary, Mr. Benson, at the same time has been pointing out in speech after speech the serious problem we have of corn and other surpluses. The present price support law provides among other things that our normal carryover of wheat is considered to be approximately 150 million bushels. A 150 million bushel carryover, in my opinion, and I believe most everyone else's, is an inadequate amount under our present and past unsettled world situation. Either the 150 million bushel carryover as provided under our price support legislation should be increased or wheat and other strategic farm commodities should be stockpiled under a separate program.

We read many statements by supposedly responsible people expressing alarm over our present supplies of basic farm commodities, particularly wheat, cotton, and corn. Mr. President, I have obtained what I believe to be accurate information from the United States Department of Agriculture on our present Commodity Credit Corporation holdings of farm commodities and their obligations under CCC loans which are outstanding.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire table may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, but I would like to read some of these figures into the RECORD and comment on them, as I believe they present an entirely different picture from what many persons would have us believe.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation investments in price-support operations and outstanding obligations to advance funds (including inventories, loans held by Commodity Credit Corporation, loans held by lending agencies, loans in process, purchase agreements)—Peak figures for each year

Fiscal year:	
1948, December (1947)	$565,400,000
1949, June (1949)	2,692,500,000
1950, February (1950)	4,231,100,000
1951, July (1950)	3,502,900,000
1952, October (1951)	2,041,300,000
1953, as of Mar. 31, 1953	3,267,500,000

Source: CCC, USDC.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in 1949 the total obligations under the Commodity Credit Corporation, including inventories, loans held by Commodity Credit Corporation, loans held by lending agencies, loans in process, and purchase agreements, amounted to $2,692,500,000.

In 1950 the holdings amounted to $4,231,100,000.

In 1951 they amounted to $3,502,900,000.

That is considerably higher than it is at the present time.

In 1952 the amount was $2,041,300,000.

As of March 31, 1953, it was $3,267,500,000.

That is approximately a billion dollars less than it was in 1950.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. We hear complaints about the farmers being subsidized. We are going to consider in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the appropriation of millions of dollars to subsidize maritime interests. I cannot understand why some persons who are interested in such subsidies should complain about the farmer having a right to borrow money, which he generally pays back, and at the same time Congress appropriates countless millions of dollars to keep American ships on the seas. Of course, they should be kept on the seas. But I cannot understand how such persons can complain about the farmers receiving credit.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator for his comment; all the more so since he is one of the best friends agriculture has in the Senate.

If we want to go into the question of subsidies, I think every other segment of our economy enjoys more subsidies than do our farmers.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Postmaster General made one of the best statements before the Appropriations Committee a few days ago that I have ever heard, when he said, in effect, that we were subsidizing all classes of mail except one or two classes. He admitted that we were subsidizing too much.

Mr. YOUNG. We are spending at the present time approximately $1,900,000,000 a year in research by industry. Approximately 47 percent of that amount is provided by United States Government appropriations. The total amount we spend in agricultural research is approximately $50 million to $60 million.

Mr. MAYBANK. As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the Senator knows that appropriations for agricultural research have been reduced. I have never heard any complaint about the fairness and equity of the research program carried on by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. President, it will be noted, among other things, that both our inventory of farm commodities which we hold under the CCC and the outstanding loans under the Price Support Program are considerably less than they were in 1949 and 1950.

In recent weeks we have witnessed attacks by not only other than farm people, but by some groups of our farm economy themselves against our present price-support program for grains and particularly feed grains. This despite the fact that according to the Department of Agriculture practically all feed grains were selling, as of April 15, 1953, at a national average below 85 percent of parity. The cash corn price, as of April 15, 1953, on a national average was selling at 82 percent of parity; oats at 86 percent of parity, and wheat at 85 percent of parity. Cash grain prices are even lower at the present time. Oats, for example, on Saturday, May 23, sold at Bismarck, N. Dak., for 49 cents a bushel. This is 20 cents a bushel below the support price which is 85 percent of parity. In other words, cash oats in my State are selling at not more than 70 percent of parity.

Mr. President, during the past several weeks some cattle producers and cattle feeders have made demands upon the Department of Agriculture to make available corn and other feeds at lower prices than are now obtainable on the cash markets. This is despite the fact that corn and most feed grains are selling at 83 percent of parity or less. These interests are expressing opposition to the present price-support program for grains.

Last year we had similar requests from some hog feeders who wanted cheaper corn to offset their losses resulting from the demoralized hog prices at that time. Corn prices were maintained at 90 percent of parity despite these requests. At the present time we have a very favorable hog price and normal supplies of hogs.

If corn and other feed prices had been lowered a year ago to meet the demands of hog feeders, it would have resulted in continued heavy feeding and production of hogs and a continued oversupply with demoralized hog prices. A lowering of corn prices to a year ago would have accelerated even more the cattle feeding operations with a net result of even more burdensome surpluses of cattle today. As bad as the cattle price situation is, it would have been immeasurably worse if corn prices had been lowered a year ago as requested by some of our agricultural interests. Cattle producers, as well as other farm producers, I believe are entitled to price protection. It would be

unreasonable, however, to expect grain prices to be lowered even more to meet their demands.

In substance, such demands mean that these producers expect the grain producers to subsidize their operations. The problems of our agricultural economy can best be served by all of our agricultural interests working together.

If we are to maintain a stable economy in this Nation, we are going to have to give greater protection to the prices of farm commodities and not less. To those who advocate still lower price supports for our basic farm commodities, and the resultant still lower prices that would automatically follow, are following directly in the footsteps of those who controlled the policies of the Government of the United States during the late twenties and early thirties. To follow that line of thinking under present conditions when we have a debt-ridden, topheavy economy would lead us directly and speedily toward another and disastrous depression.

Mr. President, at the present time agriculture is in a serious situation. To retain any semblance of solvency for agriculture and the Nation as a whole will require more sympathetic understanding of farm problems and some direct action. It involves not only maintaining a high level of price supports for farm commodities, but, equally important, more protection than we have on imports of more cheaply produced foreign agricultural commodities.

According to the best information I have, in the spring wheat areas the farmers have increased their wheat acreage and planting, and have reduced the number of acres of feed grains and particularly oats. The reason is simple. Oats and feed grain prices are for the most part below the cost of production. Oats prices could be at a fair level now if the past had taken action or the present administration would take the necessary action to at least curb heavy imports. I tried in vain to get the previous administration to take action to curb these imports, but with no success. The present Secretary, Mr. Benson, indicates that he desires to do something about these imports. I am patiently waiting for results.

Mr. President, let me give you just one example of why it is impossible for United States farmers to compete pricewise with Canadian farmers on feed grains. Taxes, labor, transportation, and many other costs in Canada are much lower than in the United States. The Canadian Government, because it is practically out of debt, has found it possible to eliminate certain taxes that are burdensome in America and reduce many others. Here are some startling figures on transportation costs in Canada as against the United States. The rail rate from Regina, Saskatchewan, to Fort William is 6.4 cents per bushel on oats. The rate from Crosby, N. Dak., which is directly across the line from Regina, is 15.87 cents per bushel to Duluth, Minn., which is comparable to Fort William on the Canadian side.

The freight rate from Sweet Grass, Mont.—including tax—is 45.3 cents a bushel on wheat to Duluth. The freight rate directly across the line at Coutts, Alberta, to Fort William is 16 cents per bushel for wheat.

Mr. President, this is one of the many reasons why United States farmers cannot compete pricewise with Canadian imports of grains.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. First, I wish to compliment my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from North Dakota, for the very challenging address he is giving. Then I wish to associate myself especially with the point he has just made about the necessity of maintaining adequate import tariffs on certain agricultural products, if our price-support program is to succeed. If our price-support program fails, America will be plunged into depression.

I believe it is now clearly understood among all economists in the country that when depressions originate with the farmers they eventually ramify and bring about a national depression. If we reduce by 25 or 30 percent the income of the farmers of America under our existing schedules of fixed charges we shall plunge the country into economic chaos. So when we talk about a price-support program for the farmer we are talking about a price-support program for our whole prosperity level.

May I inquire whether the Senator from North Dakota agrees with me that when we talk about a protective tariff program for American agriculture, we are not asking for anything for agriculture which is not now enjoyed by American industry?

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that the good way to bring that point to the attention of fair-minded citizens is to talk about barley. The tariff on a bushel of barley, which produces the equivalent of a barrel of beer, is 7½ cents. The farmer gets protection of 7½ cents a bushel.

I wish we had time to engage in some conjecture in the Senate as to what industry receives as its share from a bushel of barley, so that we might realize just how the farmer is being victimized by the inadequate, dishonest import tariff policy, because breweries in the United States, on every barrel of beer produced from every bushel of barley, enjoy a tariff of $3.80 per barrel. That means they receive a 50-to-1 preference over the American farmer. I know of no one who alleges that the economic success of the brewing industry is essential to the economic prosperity of the United States, whereas any student of American economics must realize that the overall economic prosperity of the farmer is essential to overall American prosperity.

I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will agree with me that no more important fiscal problem confronts the country or the Congress today than the working out of a program which will give to the farmer his fair share of the national income and the kind of tariff protection he requires, so that the price support program can work, because if the price support program breaks down, America will be headed for economic disaster, despite anything else we may do.

Mr. YOUNG. I could not more heartily agree with the Senator. I have often admired the studies the Senator from South Dakota has made of agricultural economics, especially of the prices farmers receive for their commodities and how those prices affect the entire economy. I deeply appreciate the Senator's comments.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from North Dakota has made a generous contribution to the thinking of America.

I am happy to see on the floor the very distinguished, able, and energetic chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who is listening with his usual rapt attention. Our committee is just now concluding a long series of hearings on important problems confronting agriculture. I hope those hearings may merge into legislative methods by which we can solve the problems that have been very definitely exposed.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, the prices which the producers of farm commodities and all other raw materials receive are so basic to the prosperity of the whole Nation that we simply cannot permit farm prices to slip further. If we are to maintain national prosperity and solvency, it will require a sympathetic understanding of our present administration with respect not only to the price of all farm commodities, but also to the price-support program which has been almost entirely responsible for preventing an even more serious situation.

Mr. President, I believe the 83d Congress will not adjourn next year until it has extended our present price-support program or legislate an even better program than now exists.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks a part of a letter which I have received from M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn. His is a very excellent letter bearing on the entire agricultural situation, including price supports and the effects of heavy foreign imports.

There being no objection, the portions of the letter referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., May 13, 1953.

The Honorable MILTON. R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MILT: I am very glad to have your recent letter, giving me copies of letters to you from Secretary Benson. I am particularly interested in the approach through which our Government is discussing these grain imports with the officials in Canada.

The discussions relate to oats. We have a deeper interest in barley and rye than we do in oats, particularly barley. Today, there is just no market for our barley—I mean there is no market. In order to move any substantial barley today, we would have to offer terminal elevator barley at a discount of from 5 to 10 cents per bushel under the current sluggish price for fresh country run receipts.

The maltsters simply sit in a laughing position in the situation. They have complete buying control because of the large supply

of malting barley in Canada. Naturally, the Canadians want to sell their surplus barley, and naturally, the maltsters want to buy malting barley as cheaply as they can. In the early marketing last fall, we had good malting barley prices. Just as soon as the Canadian barley crop was made and some malting barley showed up, our maltsters started importing it and tearing down our price structure. We can't even get parity for premium malting barley.

We have a deficient crop in rye. Yet, the price is way off, and again, it is the Canadian rye that does it.

I can't understand a Secretary of Agriculture, responsible for the administration of programs that seek to achieve parity for agriculture, showing the attitude that has prevailed down there last year and this year. The whole theory of support prices is to help farmers get a reasonable price on commodities that are raised in surplus. The purpose of the laws is clear. Tremendous funds from the taxpayers' money are used in supporting these programs. If we had no surpluses, we would not need price supports. But, we do have surpluses. We do need price supports. And, we use price supports.

Why then, permit the importation of surplus commodities from Canada to come in here and further aggravate our surplus accumulations? The greater the surplus in the hands of the Government, the greater the cost, the greater the publicity about it, which means a couple of black eyes to our price support program. To permit a continuation of the importation of the unneeded surpluses from Canada makes the Government look stupid, particularly the Secretary of Agriculture. It flagrantly defeats the purpose of the legislation and constitutes both an economic loss to the Federal Treasury and imposes an unjustified burden on the farmers in carrying out international trade. Further, it is a betrayal of everything promised to and expected by our grain growers.

We have import quotas on wheat for human consumption. We use quotas in the cotton program. We use quotas, subsidies, and regimentation in the sugar program. Will you tell me what economic sense it makes to use quotas on some of these commodities and deny them on feed wheat, oats, barley, and rye? Who can defend such inconsistency and lack of fairness as to one group of farmers as compared to another? Tell me anyone who can defend it. Tell me anyone who can defend imposing a tariff of $3.83 on a barrel of beer and then impose a tariff of 7½ cents on a bushel of malting barley, which is the equivalent of a barrel of beer. It looks to me as though the breweries are protected by $3.83 a barrel as against the American farmer raising malting barley with a protection of 7½ cents a bushel, which shows a prejudice for the breweries of about 50 to 1. Who can defend that?

The theory of the law of supply and demand is that shortage creates price. This past year, we raised about 60 percent of our needed supply of rye. Rye prices should boom up away above parity. But no, in comes the Canadian rye. Who can defend these things? What Member of the House, or the Senate, or the State Department, or the Department of Agriculture will take the facts to the public and attempt to defend them?

If these very important economic matters, affecting the economic welfare of our farmers, are serious to our farmers and costly to our farmers at a time when we have the highest employment we have ever had and the highest purchasing power we have ever had, what are these farmers to look forward to in a period of recession?

If there is to be a program to curtail wheat production next year, what are our farmers going to do with their cropland? If wheat restriction is approved, are we going to say to them, "Shift your wheatland into oats, barley, and rye"? I simply cannot understand how any sane man with any sense would dare openly and publicly support such economic nonsense and such flagrant prejudice against our grain farmers.

* * * * *

Our agricultural acreage is total. Followed from the South to the North, you will find areas where cotton, grain sorghums, and wheat are interchangeable in production. As you keep on moving over the country, you will find related interchangeability of crops, so that we really are always dealing with total acreage in cropland. Therefore, as you trace feed grains from Canada, it affects grain sorghum acreage or cotton acreage in the South.

Who, in view of all facts, can stand before the public and rest a case upon shifting of crops with the implication that we have surpluses of some and shortages of others:

Even though I serve as President of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, I have no contact with Secretary Benson. I wrote him one letter, which he never answered, so I am through with him. I do enjoy contact with important Members of Congress as deeply interested in this matter of protection to American farmers as I am. But, this is of no avail, unless such Members go on the floor of the House and Senate and pound away everytime there is a chance to speak, calling attention to these serious problems.

* * * * *

The land of agriculture is the last segment of free America. This great family of unorganized farmers is the last group in this country that is exposed to the jungle law of supply and demand.

Efficient agriculture carried to its ultimate conclusion will rest upon the farmlands of this country in feudal ownership, resulting finally in organized farm labor on the land, which will result in two things:

1. Organized farm labor means that consumers will be buying their food and fiber on a labor wage, portal-to-portal, time and one-half, double time, vacations, social security, resulting in prices twice as high as they are at the present time.

2. With labor organized both in the urban and rural areas, there will be the final clash between organized workers and concentrated capital.

* * * * *

Very sincerely yours,

FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION,

M. W. THATCHER, *General Manager.*

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) providing for a Consolidated General Appropriation Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is no man in the Senate for whom I hold a higher regard than the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He has spearheaded many attempts to economize in Government and to attain a balanced budget. However, I am in disagreement with him—and with the 49 cosponsors of the concurrent resolution—in his statement as to what the concurrent resolution would accomplish.

As I pointed out in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], every year the President of the United States furnishes to the Congress a budget, which he must submit early in January of each year. In that budget he states specifically the amount of money which is to be spent, or which he suggests should be spent, by each department of Government. The budget also includes an estimate of the amount of revenue which is expected to be collected during the year for which the appropriation is to be made.

In addition to the budget, which, as my colleagues are well aware, is quite voluminous, the executive department furnishes to the Congress a summary called the Federal Budget in Brief. On page 5 of the Federal Budget in Brief for the year 1954, there appears estimates of receipts for 1954 in the sum of $68.7 billion. Estimated expenditures amount to $78.6 billion. The budget summary also indicates the deficit which will occur if the amount of money suggested is appropriated, and the amount of receipts comes within the estimate made by the President.

Each year similar information is made available to all Members of Congress. I fail to see how money can be saved if we write into the appropriation bill the very thing which we are furnished by the President—that is, a statement of the receipts as against the expenditures.

I read from page 2 of the report on the concurrent resolution:

> By terms of this concurrent resolution Congress would write into each consolidated appropriation bill, as well as supplemental and deficiency bills, annual limits on all items which propose obligations for expenditure beyond a fiscal year as well as annual limitations on all obligations for expenditure carrying over from prior fiscal years.
>
> The importance of this may be seen from the fact that on next June 30, 1953, the buildup from unexpended balances from old appropriations and authorizations will probably meet $100 billion. While a large part of this total may be called obligated, the validity of the whole would be reviewed annually by adoption of this resolution.

How does the concurrent resolution seek to meet this contingency? Prior to World War II there was an understanding, or custom, between the House and the Senate, whereby authority was given to each department of Government to contract in advance for such goods, wares and merchandise as it might need. This contract authority was withdrawn during World War II, and the House insisted on the procedure requiring that before a contract could be entered into by any department of Government, Congress must first appropriate the entire amount of the contract.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to point out to the Senator that while it may be true that the unexpended balance of an appropriation may be very large, 85 percent of the items in an appropriation bill are 1-year appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, if he is referring to the number of items, rather than the amount.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am speaking about the number of items. It is proposed to

put all this information in a report, when about 85 percent of the items are 1-year appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows what is done by the Appropriations Committee with respect to some of these unexpended balances. What we do is to deduct them from the entire amount requested, and let the Department spend so much in new money, supplemented by what is carried over.

The point I wish to make is simply that, whether it be done by contract authority or by appropriating the money in advance, we cannot tell exactly how much we are to spend from year to year. We cannot hit the nail on the head, so to speak as the concurrent resolution proposes to do.

I recall very well that during 1950 we appropriated approximately $2 billion for airplanes. Those airplanes were actually ordered in 1951. They are now being delivered in 1953. However, we appropriated the money back in 1950. The money was not spent in the first year, and I doubt if it will all be spent by the end of 1953. How we shall be able to say that during a given period so much will be spent on airplanes is beyond me. It is impossible to say. When it comes to appropriating for regular departments of Government, as was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] such appropriations are appropriations from year to year. If there is any unexpended balance, either it goes back to the Treasury or it is deducted from the cash amount asked by the Department for the succeeding year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. It may be that prior to the end of the fiscal year one of the annual appropriations may be obligated; but it is obligated only for the succeeding fiscal year, and if not expended it goes back into the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] pointed out, under the terms of the concurrent resolution, if we contract to build an airplane carrier, it may require 4 years to construct it. What we would have to do would be to give contract authority to enter into a contract for the full price of the ship, and appropriate each year an amount sufficient to pay for the work as it progresses.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is not the proposal of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the concurrent resolution there would be authority to enter into contracts.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly. I do not know whether the House would ever agree to that or not.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that it would not. The House has fought against this repeatedly, and will not permit any department to enter into a contract. The House insists that the full amount of money be appropriated during the year the contract is entered into, whether or not the goods are delivered during that year, or whether they are delivered 2 or 3 years hence.

Mr. HAYDEN. What I could not quite understand in the statement of the Senator from Virginia was this: He stated that if all the money were appropriated, we could fix the amount to be expended each fiscal year. How can anyone guess how much is to be spent each year on the contract for a battleship?

Mr. ELLENDER. It cannot be done. That is just what I am trying to point out. So whether we follow the procedure of granting contract authority, or whether we appropriate the entire amount during the year the contract is made, we shall have the same result.

Mr. President, if the concurrent resolution is adopted and the House should unfortunately agree to it, I dare say it will be late in the fall before any appropriation bill is passed.

A one-package appropriation bill will not receive the same amount of study which separate bills receive. Under the present system our committee is divided into 10 subcommittees. Most of us serve on at least half of the subcommittees. For example, I serve on subcommittees which appropriate money for every one except three of the departments of the Government. I am able to attend most of the hearings which are held on appropriation bills for the Department of the Interior, the Army civil functions, and the Department of Agriculture, and I am more or less acquainted with what goes on in the other subcommittees. When the separate bills are reported to the full committee, the committee itself goes over the bills very carefully. After the bills are reported to the Senate, the Senate itself certainly has a better opportunity to study the items in separate appropriation bills for each department than if one bill for the 11 departments were to be presented at once.

There will be untold time lost also, Mr. President, in conference, where conferees will be forced to deal with and reconcile a multiplicity of items. I dare say that the committee will be doing extremely well to report a measure agreeable to both Houses by early fall.

There is no doubt in my mind that if any money is to be saved, we can more easily bring about that result under the present system of separate appropriation bills than by means of a one-package appropriation bill.

Let us not forget that in the various appropriations 87 percent of the money appropriated goes toward paying for past wars and protecting ourselves against future wars. $87 out of every $100 appropriated is for that purpose. Of the remaining 13 percent a good deal of money is spent for defense housing, aid to schools in defense areas, generation and transmission of power, atomic energy, defense plants, and other matters directly connected with our security.

No, Mr. President; the only way by which we can save money is for the Appropriation Committees of the Senate and House to make a thorough study of appropriations, and to employ sufficient help to make such a study, before the appropriation bills come before the two bodies for action.

For example, in the closing days of the 82d Congress an appropriation was requested with which to build a hospital at Fort Belvoir in Virginia. It happened that some of us knew of the conditions at Fort Belvoir. There was a request to build a 500-bed hospital, which would have cost, I believe, $15,000 a bed.

I had visited Fort Belvoir a few months before the request was made. I found there were 1,200 beds available at Fort Belvoir, and of the 1,200 beds only 250 were being used. Nevertheless, we had a request to build a 500-bed hospital.

What was the explanation given to us? There was no need for a 500-bed hospital, but those making the request were taking advantage of the emergency in order to obtain a permanent building for a hospital. Because some of us knew the true situation, there was stricken from the bill approximately $48 million requested for hospitals to be built in 10 facilities scattered throughout the country.

Mr. President, if the members of the committee had sufficient help—and we are getting it now—in order to make inspections ahead of time, we could save money, and we could save more money in that manner than by way of a one-package appropriation bill. We could cut, percentagewise, 5 or 10 percent and save the $800 million which the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] stated was saved on the one-package bill in 1950.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe I heard my colleague say that the committee is now getting help so it can examine some of the items that should be questioned. Will the Senator explain why we are getting the help now, when we were not getting it in the past?

Mr. ELLENDER. We depended too much on the military. When the military officials came before our committee we took it for granted that everything they asked of us was in order. We took their word for it. That was a grave mistake. If in the past 10 years we had had sufficient help on the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, and if we had then had some of the experts we are now employing to go forth and look behind the scenes to find out whether the things asked for were necessary, we might have saved a great deal of money, I may say to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. My colleague from Louisiana has worked in his effort to bring about economy. It is important to achieve economy and I wonder whether he agrees with me that those who are studying requests for appropriations should not be confronted with such an enormous task, without expert assistance. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and the only way economy can be brought about is by having knowledge of the facts, circumstances, and necessities? Does the Senator agree?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I agree.

Mr. ELLENDER. The example I cited a short time ago can be duplicated many times. For instance, I remember in that same bill there was contained an item

amounting to approximately $6 million for the construction of laundries in my State. I asked, "What did you do during World War II?"

I was told, "We had the laundries operated by private enterprise in the city of Lake Charles and in other towns near the camps, and with the one that was built at Camp Polk we were able to take care of the situation."

Notwithstanding the fact that the needs were well taken care of during the war years the officials had asked for an amount of money with which to build a brand-new laundry at the airport which was then being constructed at Lake Charles. Because we were familiar with the situation, we were able to examine the witnesses on the subject and elicit the facts.

By the same token, in order that we may be in a position to bring about some real savings, we must try to find out in advance what the money is to be spent for.

We should cut the appropriation in advance. The way to do it is first of all to determine the purpose for which it is to be used.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Some of us found, in studying requests for public works authorizations last year, that by sending out someone who was an expert in the construction field to examine the type of construction asked for, in many cases we could reduce the unit price by about 25 percent simply by requiring that the structures should not be so elaborate as they had been planned.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that connection, Mr. President, I may state to my colleague that I presume the method followed by the military in the case he has mentioned may be the same method followed with respect to the hospitals I mentioned a short time ago.

Instead of having plans to present to the committee as to how the hospitals were to be built, they simply said, "We will build in Louisiana a 500-bed hospital at a cost of $15,000 a bed. We are going to build a hospital at Fort Belvoir, with 500 beds; and the cost will be $15,000 a bed."

That is the way the costs were arrived at in the case of the hospitals to be built in the 10 facilities.

I have no doubt in my mind that the same process was followed in many of the cases to which my distinguished colleague is referring.

Mr. LONG. It seems that the principal thing we need is to have someone check firsthand, in the field, on many of the expenditures.

Mr. ELLENDER. And to do so before they are made.

Mr. LONG. Yes; and also to have someone who is qualified to check on those who do the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. President, I repeat that there is no chance to save the millions of dollars which some Senators say will be saved.

A while ago my good friend, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], said—and it seemed that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] did not disagree with him—that the "one package" appropriation bill which was passed in 1950 resulted in the saving of billions of dollars. I wish either of those Senators would point out to us how billions of dollars were saved in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, as amended.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question before the Senate is on agreeing to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, as amended.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, this resolution is a rehash of a great many ideas which have been popular with people who know nothing about the problem of appropriations as it exists in the Congress. To quote from a newspaper of national circulation:

> The consolidation of all appropriations into one act, whatever the theoretical arguments in favor of it, is in actual operation a wholly impractical, unwieldly cumbersome, inefficient and unbusinesslike method of handling appropriations.

There are many similar quotations, but, without quoting them, I desire to say as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as the past chairman of a subcommittee of that committee handling appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, that I have had an opportunity to compare at first hand the two methods, the old method, and the new method now proposed, which was once tried, in 1950.

The inadequacies of the so-called one-package appropriation became glaringly obvious in 1950. In that year we spent practically the whole year trying to put together into one bill the various parts, and then endeavoring in conference to obtain agreement with the House on the bill.

I know of no way by which we could make the appropriations in a one-package bill, unless there were an executive session of the Senate and House, and all their Members, sitting jointly, each Member of the Congress, hearing the testimony of each of the witnesses who appeared before them. It would mean that there would be no transaction of legislative business other than the consideration of appropriation bills.

The Appropriations Committee has a staff composed of persons who are specially trained in the work of dealing with particular phases of appropriations. They investigate the legislative proposals, search out the mistakes that may be contained in them, and endeavor to bring such mistakes to the attention of the members of the particular subcommittee with which they are working. They endeavor to reconcile the differences which may arise in the determination of where cuts can be made. The staff cannot deal with the entire governmental picture, which has become too vast. A larger staff, instead of being more helpful, would be found to be less efficient. The result would be that, being unable to provide for the necessities of the various departments, an effort would be made to balance the budget at all events, and in so doing, a particular agency, no matter how valuable it might be in the general picture, would suffer, since there would be no one present to speak for it.

From the days of the Founding Fathers, with the exception of one year, the Senate has worked on the plan of breaking down the requests for appropriations into the component parts. The most that can be said for that method is that only those Senators are kept off the floor who are engaged in the hearings, a great many of them working on appropriations only. The same is true in the House of Representatives, though not quite to the same extent, since the House has a larger membership, and therefore no Member of the House serves on more than one subcommittee. Under the procedure in the Senate the subcommittees, after having heard the witnesses, approve a budget and submit it, with their justification, to the full committee. Each subcommittee submits its justification to the full committee, after which the full committee submits a report to the Senate, together with its justifications. The Senate, on the basis of the two reports, then decides how much should be appropriated for each department, in accordance with the needs of the Nation.

That method, as we found in 1950, enables the Senate to work about 4 or 5 times as fast as under the other method, and it works with less injustice to the people as a whole. For that reason I was in 1950, and I still am, confirmed in my belief that the so-called one-package appropriation simply does not work. As in the case of many other things, the proposal embodies a fine ideal, and, assuming we had unlimited time, it might work out satisfactorily.

Mr. President, let me call attention to something else. Let us suppose that the authorizations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments were delayed until the passage of a one-package bill. Let us suppose that during that time, in working on the one-package bill, we made a 20-percent cut in the appropriation for the Post Office; and let us assume further that the one-package bill was not passed until October, as in 1950. In the meantime, July, August, September, and October would have gone by entailing the passage of continuing resolutions. The Post Office Department would have operated for 4 months on the basis of the appropriation for the preceding year. It would then suddenly face a 20-percent curtailment, to be taken care of within a period of 8 months. That would mean that, instead of its being a 20-percent curtailment, it would in effect be a 30-percent curtailment during the 8-month period, while an effort was being made to meet the budget.

Then, in order to maintain the postal service, we would have to pass numerous supplemental appropriations, that in my humble opinion would deceive the public, since we would say to them "Oh, yes, we appropriated only X billions of dollars this year," but later on we would make supplemental appropriations of Y billions of dollars.

The one-package appropriation bill would lead to that result every year, since, if it were necessary to wait for the passage of the one-package appropriation bill, numerous supplemental appropriations would be required. Even though, by curtailment of expenses, a department could get along for a while with the appropriations previously made, it would have to carry on into October, until the one-package bill could be passed. It simply would not work.

So, Mr. President, quoting from another national publication—

> The one-package approach provides a far less adequate way of determining the real needs of the departments and agencies of the Government, and makes the achievement of proper economies in governmental operations correspondingly difficult.

Mr. President, another suggestion has been made in connection with this matter. It has been suggested that the President might veto a one-package bill unless there was incorporated a provision permitting him to veto individual items.

Mr. President, that is another thing which we should consider very carefully. We must realize that that is the first step toward totalitarianism. We would be creating a superappropriations committee composed of one man. If anyone thinks that appropriations do not make government, that person is badly fooled. By striking out certain items agencies can be discriminated against; markets can be hurt; services can be curtailed. Congress would be relinquishing one of its most powerful assets if such an amendment to this concurrent resolution should be adopted. I am speaking to it, even though such an amendment may not be offered. I think it would be the most dangerous precedent we could establish. We might just as well abolish Congress and start out on a completely totalitarian basis.

I do not want anyone to infer that I am saying President Eisenhower would use the veto power wrongly, any more than I would say that Truman, Roosevelt, Hoover, or any other President in the past 20 or 30 years would have used it wrongly. But there may come a time when some President will use it wrongly, and that is what Congress must protect against. We must realize that when Congress ceases to function representative government ceases. The Members of this body know the conditions in their own States better than does any one man in the entire United States, just as a Member of the House of Representatives knows conditions in his district better than does anyone else. Therefore, Mr. President, it is entirely essential that we permit no such amendment to be adopted.

In 1950 when the one-package bill idea was followed I think we did get home in time to decorate the Christmas tree and have the grandchildren in. Unless we expect such situations as that in the future it is dangerous to follow this one-package idea of an appropriation bill.

I do not know how many members of the Appropriations Committee concur with me in this statement. Last year I was able to beat the deadline on the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill by working very hard, so that those agencies did not have any difficulty during the fiscal year in knowing how to balance their budgets to meet the appropriations and save many supplemental appropriation bills. That cannot be done with a one-package appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I hope the lessons which were painfully learned through our experience with the one-package approach will not be forgotten. Those Senators who were not Members of the Senate in that unfortunate year do not know that we battled all over the floor of the Senate. The Appropriations Committee battled for weeks. The only thing we can do is to hold up appropriations until the last one is taken care of, then bring the bill to the floor, then go into conference, which will last 5 or 6 times as long as they last on appropriation bills under our present system, and we shall finally have to shut our eyes and hope for the best in order to get any money for the departments without their having to run into the red.

Mr. President, I hope the resolution and any amendments thereto will be defeated.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if there is any plea which I should like to make to the Senate, it is that it refuse to impose upon us a bulky, unworkable, impracticable appropriation bill such as we had in 1950.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. How long has the Senator from Arizona been a member of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Too long. I have been a member of it since 1927.

In 1950 the bill passed the House on May 10. It was reported to the Senate on July 8. We had approximately 2 months to work on it in the committee, and the bill passed the Senate on the 4th of August. It was in conference for a month, and finally became law on the 6th of September 1950.

If the House of Representatives wants to control appropriations, all it has to do is to take its time about passing a one-package appropriation bill because the Senate will not have time, in the heat of the summer and late in the session, to consider and work out the details of the bill as they should be considered and perfected.

Mr. President, the 1950 appropriation bill as reported to the Senate consisted of 482 pages. It weighed more than a pound and a half. The Senate committee's report contained 303 pages. Senators simply could not digest such a voluminous report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I have the bill before me, and it consists of only 192 pages.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has the law print of the bill. He does not have before him the bill as it was reported to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. I have the bill which was signed by the President.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly; but it is in much smaller type than was the bill which the Senators considered on the floor.

Mr. President, the House Committee on Appropriations consists of 50 members. It is an exclusive committee. The members of it serve on no other committee. The subcommittees consist of five members each. Each one of the subcommittees considers appropriations for a department or a group of departments. They naturally become experts on a particular department, such as the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior. They defend the bill on the floor of the House and act as conferees when it goes to conference. They take the budget items as submitted by the President, and each one has to be completely justified by the subcommittees. So they know what is in the bill, and they handle it properly.

What about the Senate, Mr. President? We have 23 members of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Each one of us belongs to four different subcommittees. A Senator cannot be in four places at once. Many times several hearings are going on at once. The time of the Senators is not completely available for the business of the committee and its subcommittee at all times, because those who are members of that one committee are also members of at least one other committee, and some of them are members of more than one other committee.

The chairman of the committee is President pro tempore of the Senate and is also a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Four Senators are chairmen of other committees. Seven are ranking minority members of standing committees. There are 3 who have membership on 2 other committees, and 8 who are members of legislative committees of the Senate.

I do not think that situation could be better described than it was on one occasion by former Senator McKellar, when he said:

> While the wide scope of this representation of the business of the Senate is of the utmost value to the committee in its work, the time consumed by their duties on legislative committees serves to greatly shorten the time available to Members for attending hearings and considering and deciding upon individual items of appropriations. While an appropriation bill is passing through the procedure from subcommittee to full committee to floor consideration and adjusting differences in the conference committee with the House, there is constant conflict in the times and dates set for the various meetings required. In addition, since each member of the committee is a member of 4 or 5 subcommittees, Senators can never find the time necessary to spread their attendance over all of the meetings it is necessary to schedule.

There may be a valuable suggestion in the remarks made by the Senator

from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] this afternoon. Perhaps we should make the Appropriations Committee an exclusive committee, so that Senators who serve on it would have no other duties. But, as it is, we manage to get appropriation bills through in reasonable time under ordinary conditions, because the House begins to send them to the Senate early in the year, and staggers them along.

Mr. President, I have made these remarks because I am impressed with the fact that many Senators support the kind of proposal now made because their State legislatures act upon one-package appropriation bills. I made inquiry of the Senator from New York with reference to the budget of that State, and I have been advised that it is about $1,400,000,000. According to a statement which I shall read, the budget of the State of California is about a billion dollars.

I wish to quote from a very able article written by Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, who was for 12 years a member of the California Legislature and who has been for 10 years a Member of Congress, the last 7 years helping to prepare appropriation bills. He is now chairman of the subcommittee handling the independent offices appropriation bill. Mr. PHILLIPS says:

> In a private business, where projected expenditures are calculated in relatively small figures, a consolidated budget is eminently practical. In a State legislature also the plan is practical. To infer from the experience of private companies and State legislatures that the plan can automatically be taken over by the Federal Government is to overlook the tremendous difference that results when one moves from relatively small sums to sums which are so colossal that they literally defy anyone to analyze them intensively in a single operation. In my own State of California, for example, where the package budget is used, the total cost of State government is just a little over $1 billion. This is only one-sixth of the money involved in the independent offices appropriation bill alone, and a much smaller fraction of total Federal appropriations.

The independent offices appropriation bill is the one which Representative PHILLIPS' subcommitttee handles, as I have said.

> Once an omnibus bill begins to deal with sums so many times larger than a State budget, the operation necessarily becomes so bulky as to impede careful consideration.

That has been our experience in the the Senate. Mr. PHILLIPS points out another aspect of the matter which I think is very significant and is exactly in line with what happened when the Senate had before it the last package appropriation bill. A percentage cut was offered as an amendment. That is a temptation which is very hard for Senators to resist. I wish to read Mr. PHILLIPS' comment on that method of trying to reduce appropriations, a method I have protested vigorously, because I believe that thereby we surrender our judgment to the judgment of someone in a department as to where reductions in appropriations ought to be made. Mr. PHILLIPS says:

> The package budget inevitably invites amendments directing the President to cut the total amount by a given sum or percentage. In fact, one of the greatest boasts of the package-budget advocates is that the experiment on the fiscal year 1951 bill facilitated the amendment which directed the President to cut the final total by an amount approximating $550 million.

I understood the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to say that it was $800 million.

> In principle this approach represents an abdication of congressional responsibility over the power of the purse. From the viewpoint of practical politics it confers upon the President the power to penalize his political opponents by eliminating expenditures in their home districts. Any President of the United States who wanted to achieve dictatorial control over Congress could ask for little more than the restoration of the package budget and the inevitable move to amend it every year by directing him to make a cut of a given size in any manner he chooses. All he would need before him would be a list of major budget items, a list of the doubtful districts and States, a telephone at his elbow, a blue pencil in his hand, and a skilfull publicity man to explain why Senator X and Representative X were the obstacles to a new highway or dam.
>
> It is an ironic paradox that Members of Congress who shudder at the thought of a constitutional amendment allowing a President to veto individual items in a bill have supported an extra-constitutional device which in effect gives the President the same veto power but allows the Congress no opportunity to override him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Arizona think that the argument of Mr. Phillips would apply to an item veto, as has been suggested sometimes, rather than to such a bill as would come before the Senate under the concurrent resolution of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]? In most of the items, or in a large part of them, we are dealing with total figures. For instance, even in the civil functions bill, we are dealing with a total figure. The President would not be in a position to act and strike out language from the committee report. If a blanket cut were applied, it would apply to the total within the various titles of the bill.

I think the argument of the Member of the House from my State, with whom I served in the legislature some 20 years ago, would be quite applicable if we tried, which I doubt we could do constitutionally, to provide for an item veto, as some States provide in their constitutions.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator must concede that when we tell the President to reduce an appropriation bill by $550 million, he can make the reduction anywhere he pleases. To make the cut, he must take it out of items; he cannot take it out of the total.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think he could take it out of the total. I think there might be some instances which would affect only an area, but normally that is not the procedure. A certain amount is allotted for a specific purpose, but that purpose is broader than a single State or a single area of the country. So I believe that under the bill it would be difficult for the President, even if he were so inclined, to use the type of item veto which Representative PHILLIPS seems to be talking about.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think an item-veto provision would give the President much more power than does this resolution, but the point I am making is that we surrender power whenever we provide for a percentage cut. I think Mr. PHILLIPS was perfectly justified in the approach he took.

I pass on to another matter which seems to be confusing. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] mentioned it. It does not seem to be understood that the President's budget, as submitted, shows all the items the Senator from Virginia insists should be placed in a committee report. It shows the amount of money expended during the previous year. It shows the amount estimated to be needed. It shows the unexpended balances. On every subcommittee on which I have served—and I know this is equally true in the other House—every Member is keen to know what the unexpended balances are and to examine into them.

As I have pointed out today, if we were required to set forth in some kind of committee report all the things required by the terms of this resolution, a 20-column chart would be required. Furthermore, the chart would have to be revised when the House subcommittee made its report to the full committee, when the full committee made its report to the House of Representatives, and again after the House had acted. It would then have to be revised by the Senate subcommittee, next by the full committee, later revised when it came to the floor of the Senate, and finally when the bill was taken to conference.

What Senator will take the time to analyze a 20-column chart that has been revised 7 times, when all the basic information upon which action is to be taken can be found in the budget? I cannot see any advantage that could possibly accrue from a situation of that kind.

In conclusion, I point out that the Director of the Budget and his predecessor have both stated that a consolidated appropriation bill of the type proposed would not be satisfactory to them, speaking for the administration, unless it contained a provision for an item veto.

Mr. Dodge says:

> One problem which does concern me is the likelihood that omnibus appropriation bills would contain legislative riders, and in some cases would contain appropriation items which the President considered too high. Under the late schedule—

He is referring to the fact that the bill would not become a law until very late, when Congress was about ready to adjourn—

> Under the late schedule that would be apt to prevail, the veto of an omnibus appropriation bill would disrupt the operations of the Government during the intervening period until Congress passed a new bill or passed the old one over the veto of the President. I believe, therefore, that the President should be given the item veto power concurrently with the adoption of an omnibus appropriation bill.

He is eminently correct. If we are to have a one-package bill, and if we are

to allow to be incorporated into it legislation to which the President is violently opposed and which he would veto instantly if he had the opportunity, he should also have the item veto power.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Has an appropriation bill ever been vetoed?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BYRD. A total appropriation bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was never more than one omnibus appropriation bill. However, annual appropriation bills have been vetoed.

Mr. BYRD. I have been in the Senate for 21 years, and I have never known of a case.

Mr. HAYDEN. President Roosevelt vetoed one, and I am quite sure one was vetoed by President Truman.

Mr. BYRD. It might have been a special bill, but not one of the 12 regular departmental appropriation bills.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite sure that the RECORD will show that such bills have been vetoed.

Presidents during modern times have become more accustomed to using the veto. President Cleveland vetoed about 400 bills, and President Franklin Roosevelt vetoed about twice that number. Appropriation bills can be vetoed without any difficulty if the President wishes to do it. The point I am trying to make is that a President is practically helpless because if he should veto a bill of that kind, regardless of how violently he is opposed to the legislation contained in it, or how much he may be opposed to items contained in it, it would come back to the Congress and be wide open to amendment.

On the other hand, the only way Congress could stymie the President would be to pass such a bill and adjourn immediately. Even if the President possessed the item veto power, the Congress could do that. If we are to have the one-package bill, I think there is justification for the Presidential item veto power, on the basis set forth by Mr. Dodge. I am not for the one-package bill, and therefore I do not have to be for the Presidential item veto power.

If we are to try out the proposed system, as was suggested by an amendment which is pending before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, a rider can be attached to any one of the appropriation bills providing that the House and the Senate agree that individual items contained in such bill may be vetoed. I do not know how the question could ever get into court, because no one could complain. No one could show cause why the action was not legal.

It is my opinion, to get back to the beginning of what I said, that a one-package bill is a cumbersome way of handling appropriations. It would be burdensome upon members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and burdensome upon Members of the Senate when the bill reached the floor of the Senate. I believe it would be so burdensome that we would not get as good results in the way of economy as we would under the present system. That is my honest, deliberate judgment. For that reason I am opposed to the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution as amended.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That effective on the first day of the second regular session of the 83d Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the Consolidated General Appropriation Act of (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriations bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such contract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

"(B) estimates of the balances of appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure as of the beginning of the fiscal year, other than the obligated balances of expired appropriations;

"(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure referred to in clause (A);

"(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from the balances of appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (B);

"(E) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from revolving and management funds, other than expenditures referred to in clauses (C) and (D);

"(F) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C), (D), and (E); and

"(G) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year from the appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during the fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The information reported under paragraph (3) shall be accompanied by (i) data on revolving and management funds (including the funds of wholly-owned Government corporations) which shall show the gross amounts from which the net amounts estimated to be expended are derived, and information on estimated investments, repayment of capital, payment of dividends, and other cash transactions which do not affect net expenditures; and (ii) such supplemental data as may be considered desirable by the committee making the report.

"(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

"(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(7) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall at the time the bill is reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate contain in the body of the bill or in a preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem appropriate, a current estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury of the overall Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement respecting Senate Concurrent Resolution 8.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, most frequently is referred to as the single appropriation bill, or the single-package bill.

But this reference does not—it never has—accurately describe its provisions.

Actually the bill is in three principal parts:

The first part does provide for a single bill in which all general appropriations shall be considered by Congress with one cover. And this is as far as the so-called single appropriation bill of 1950 went.

The second part provides that Congress shall write into appropriation bills limitations against annual obligations against all available appropriations both current, and those previously enacted; and to my mind this provision, which has been in the bill since it was first introduced in 1947, is the most important.

The third part provides that as the bill passes through the various stages of the leg-

lative process, it shall set forth revised estimates of the revenue.

Frankly, Congress virtually has lost annual control over expenditures from the Federal Treasury, and the purpose of this bill is to recover legislative control, at least in part.

There are numerous practices which have grown up to contribute to this loss of control. They include permanent appropriations; adoption of statutory programs requiring Federal payments to meet formula fixed in the law; authorization to spend from the public debt, etc. For all practical purposes these expenditures are beyond annual review by the appropriations committees, and annual control by Congress.

But by far the most important of these practices, which deprive Congress of annual control over expenditures, is the practice of "funding" entirely—or appropriating the full amount in advance—multi-year programs and projects requiring multi-million- or multi-billion-dollar appropriations.

As the result of this practice we have piled up more than $102 billion of balances in authorizations to spend out of the Treasury. These balances are in appropriations already passed—in prior years. They include more than $80 billion in regular and special funds, and more than $20 billion in revolving and capital funds. And, it should be emphasized that all appropriations enacted by the present session of Congress will be in addition to this $100 billion to be available for expenditure next July 1.

As members of this committee know—under current appropriation legislation procedure, Congress acts only on new appropriations. Under ordinary procedure neither the Appropriations Committees nor the Congress as a whole, would act this year to review or control expenditures to be made from these huge balances. Yet, these balances are just as available for expenditure in the coming year as will be the funds provided in the appropriation bills now before us. And expenditures from these balances will result in just as much deficit as expenditures from new appropriations.

Actually under the Truman budget submitted to Congress January 9, $38 billion of next year's estimated expenditures would be out of balances in appropriations enacted in prior years over which this Congress would have no control—it would not even review them in any substantial degree.

By the same token $32 billion of new appropriations requested in the Truman budget would be for expenditure, not in the coming year, but in some future year.

From these figures it can be seen that an appropriation enacted in a year when revenue is high, may actually be expended in a year when revenue is low.

This is not responsible practice when the Federal debt is already more than a quarter of a trillion dollars—when the necessity for raising the debt ceiling is becoming more evident every day—and when the probability of a debt in excess of $300 billion can be reversed only by forthright action.

I do not concede that Federal expenditures cannot be reduced. I do not concede that deficit spending must be continued. I do not concede that more debt must be piled up.

But these conditions are virtually reality if Congress acquiesces in default. The fact is that the budget for fiscal year 1954 cannot be balanced by action on new appropriations. And I submit that the budget a year hence will be impossible of balance by reduction only in new appropriations.

This is to say that the Federal budget cannot be balanced in the foreseeable future unless control over annual expenditures is recaptured.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 is proposed by 50 members of the Senate as a constructive step toward this objective.

ANALYSIS OF BILL

Amendment to rules

Analysis of the resolution will reveal that, as in the past, the proposal is in the nature of an amendment to the joint rule of the Senate and the House of Representatives relating to the legislative budget. (If the rules of the two Houses were amended to require the proposed procedure, it could not be abandoned by more committee action. It could be repealed only by resolution approved by both Houses.)

Single package

The resolution would require the consolidation of all regular appropriations into a single general appropriation bill.

Under terms of the resolution the consolidated appropriation bill might be divided into any number of separate titles, and if desired each of these titles might correspond to one of the numerous appropriation bills enacted under present procedures.

It would permit consideration of the consolidated bill by titles, at the subcommittee stage, without interruption of the present subcommittee organization of the respective appropriations committees, if that is desired.

Deficiency and supplemental bills

There would be nothing in the resolution to preclude necessary deficiency and supplemental appropriation bills in addition to the consolidated bill, but a reduction in the number of such bills probably would result. Private act appropriation bills and appropriation recission bills also would be permissible.

Limitations

The resolution would require that Congress write into the consolidated bill limitations on the net amounts to be obligated during the ensuing year against all new multi-year appropriations. Likewise limitations would be written into the bill on the net obligations to be made during the year against appropriations enacted in prior years which were still available for obligation.

Contracts

These limitations would not prohibit Government agencies from entering into authorized contracts, but they would control the value of goods and services to be delivered and rendered during the fiscal year.

Exclusions

In the interest of administrative efficiency and precluding unnecessary bookkeeping, the provisions limiting obligations would not apply to: appropriations made specifically for payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General; to appropriations for payment of judgments; amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress; appropriations for payment of interest on the public debt; or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

Committee reports

Under the resolution both committee reports, and conference reports, accompanying each consolidated appropriation bill would show in tabular form the amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in each fiscal year under permanent appropriations; estimates of amounts to be transferred between appropriations; estimates of the net amount to be expended during the fiscal year from each appropriation, and from the balances of prior appropriations; and estimates of the amount remaining in the appropriation for expenditure in subsequent fiscal years.

Committee and conference reports accompanying deficiency and supplemental bills and appropriation recission bills would be required to include cumulative revisions of this table.

Government corporations

With respect to Government corporations and other agencies authorized to receive and expend receipts without covering them into the Treasury, committee reports on the consolidated bill would estimate expenditures out of their checking accounts (except those to retire borrowing), and estimate their receipts (except from borrowing) to be deposited in checking accounts.

Joint hearings

The House and Senate Appropriations Committees would be authorized to hold simultaneous or joint hearings on general appropriation bills in order to expedite their consideration.

Revenue estimates

And finally, to assure that expenditure authorizations are being considered at all times in the light of the latest revenue estimates, the resolution provides that the current revenue estimates by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be written into each general, deficiency, or supplemental bill as it is reported by the respective committees to the House and to the Senate.

In summary, provisions of the resolution would provide that Congress consider all appropriations in one package, instead of a dozen scattered, unrelated bills as at present, so Members and the public can see the whole picture as the spending side of the budget develops. (The so-called single appropriation bill of 1950 merely collected all of the regular appropriation bills between two covers. It did no more.)

This resolution would go further, and provide that Congress shall write into the appropriation bill, against all items involved, limitations on annual obligations for expenditure from all appropriations—those previously enacted as well as those currently under consideration. (It should be noted that it is annual expenditures, not annual appropriations, against annual revenue which result in annual deficits or surpluses, and that it is annual deficits which pile up long-term public debt.)

And, in addition, the resolution would provide that appropriation bills themselves shall establish a relationship and comparison between funds authorized for expenditure and estimated receipts.

Analysis of the resolution will indicate clearly the care with which its provisions have been worked out and drafted. For obvious reasons officials of the General Accounting Office, Treasury and Bureau of the Budget may not wish to endorse or oppose a proposal amending legislative branch rules, but they have testified that it is technically perfected, and that it is administratively practical in terms of accounting and auditing practices and fiscal and budgetary requirements.

Substantially as it is now the resolution has been introduced in the Senate in each of the past three Congresses.

It was first introduced in 1947. Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, cosponsored it with me at that time. The Senate Rules and Administration Committee of the Republican 80th Congress held exhaustive hearings and gave the resolution its approval without a dissenting vote, but it died on the calendar when the session expired before action was taken by the Senate as a whole.

The resolution was reintroduced again in 1949. This time, besides myself, it was sponsored by Senator BRIDGES, BUTLER of Nebraska, FERGUSON, GILLETTE, KNOWLAND, O'CONOR, and the late Senator WHERRY. Again, the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, of the Democratic 81st Congress held exhaustive hearings and gave the resolution its approval without dissenting vote. This time the Senate, as a whole, passed it without a

dissenting vote. But the House of Representatives failed to act before the session expired, and the resolution died again.

Once more the resolution was introduced in 1951 early in the 82d Congress. This time—as now—more than half the membership of the Senate joined in its sponsorship. Once more the Senate Rules and Administration Committee held exhaustive hearings, and this time the committee reported the bill favorably with only one dissenting vote. This was by Senator HAYDEN who expressed his opposition in Individual Views which were included in the committee report. The report was delayed until late spring last year—too late for action in the Senate.

So the bill was introduced again on February 4, this year—this time with more sponsors than ever before—51 at the last count.

Most of the opposition expressed by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman of the past session set forth in Senator HAYDEN'S "Individual Views" last year was based on what they said was their experience with the omnibus bill of the 2d session of the 81st Congress. They said it overworked the membership of the Appropriations Committee, and slowed down passage of appropriations.

There is little similarity between the omnibus bill of 1950 and the procedure proposed in this resolution. There is a vast difference between the two.

The omnibus bill as it was drafted by House Appropriations Committee in the 81st Congress merely dumped all of the regular appropriations into one bill. There was no provision for either control or limitation of annual obligations. And there was no provision for expenditure estimates. There was no authorization for relating latest revenue estimates to appropriation action.

This House Appropriations Committee version of the bill was abandoned by the committee, over the protest of its chairman, after a trial of only 1 year, and that was a year in which huge supplemental appropriations were required incident to the sudden outbreak of unexpected war. The committee action was final since the House had failed to pass this resolution which would have amended the rules.

As to overworking the membership of the committee, I can say only that nothing on earth is now more important than the fiscal condition of this Nation.

As to slowing down passage of appropriations, I can document the statement that by the record more members of both Houses of Congress participated in the debate on that omnibus bill than took part in the debates on the numerous appropriation bills passed in the years immediately before and immediately after the omnibus bill trial.

By the same record the actual working time on the floors of the two Houses was shown to have been less on the omnibus bill than it was on the numerous bills in the years immediately before and after the omnibus-bill trial.

There are legitimate criticisms of the proposal now before this committee, but they can be answered, and the sponsors believe they are both outweighed and outnumbered by the advantages.

The three major criticisms of the proposal which have been considered by both the sponsors and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration on 3 different occasions over a period of nearly 6 years are:

1. Length of time required by the Appropriations Committee and the respective Houses in consideration of a consolidated bill.

2. Necessity for the President to veto a bill containing all appropriations in the event he disapproved one or more items.

3. Tendency to increase logrolling.

With respect to the first point: Both the majority of the committee and the sponsors have taken the position that with proper cooperation between the two Houses and their respective committees, the time requirement should be met. This might well contemplate simultaneous or joint hearings, prior to passage of the bill in the House of Representatives, for detailed information purposes and justifications.

The majority of the committee, in the past, and the sponsors have taken the position that logrolling would be no greater than at present. Now Members interested in an appropriation item protest reductions in one bill because reductions are not made in others. With a consolidated bill, the tendency to logroll actually should be reduced, because the total appropriation may be calculated at one time and seen in view of estimated revenue.

Offsetting whatever legitimate criticism there may be, there are many advantages. Among them are:

1. It would bring together in one place at one time the expenditure and appropriation program of the Federal Government so that all items could be considered in their relative importance to each other. This is impossible under the present system wherein appropriation and spending legislation is considered in numerous and almost unrelated appropriation bills brought in over a period of 6 months or so.

2. It would extend legislative control over annual obligations for expenditure.

3. It would give Congress and the country a chance to see the whole spending program of the Federal Government at one time, and it would give the Appropriations Committees a chance to see and study the same thing.

4. It would give the Appropriations Committees, the revenue committees, and the country a chance to see how the spending program compares with the tax program.

The advantages of enactment of Federal appropriations under procedures proposed in this resolution were recognized by the late Harold Smith, former Director of the Budget. They have been recognized by a Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and a Republican chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They have been recognized by numerous authorities on political science and public fiscal and budgetary practices. In addition to these eminent authorities the advantages of a single appropriation bill are recognized in testimonials from governors of a majority of the 48 States which are a part of the record already made by this committee.

If the proof is in the pudding, we have the example of the omnibus bill, such as it was. That bill was reduced by a half billion dollars on one of the most carefully worked-out appropriation-reduction amendments in recent years. There was nothing meat ax about it.

CONCLUSION

I am firmly convinced that this resolution would be a long step in the direction of recovering expenditure control by Congress, where it ought to be.

It is not the substitute for all that needs to be done in the modernization of congressional procedure on fiscal legislation, but it certainly is a vitally needed reform.

In conclusion, I should like to point out, for the record, that our Federal programs, through which Federal taxes are spent, influence policies determined in world capitals around the globe; and at the same time they influence action in every county seat of the United States. They influence the destiny of nations, and the lives of individuals.

No single thing on earth is as economically important to as many people as is the fiscal situation of this Government. Yet we are financing these programs under legislative processes in which it is impossible to know whether income and outgo are in balance.

If the American Congress and public had an opportunity to analyze fiscal legislation—along with its causes and effects—during the course of its enactment, I believe the results would be wholesome, and that there would be a measurable reduction in nonessential Federal expenditures. Such an opportunity could be provided by this simple change in the system under which Federal fiscal legislation is considered.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 100, which is a resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. I do not intend that the Senate shall proceed with the consideration of the resolution tonight, but I wish to have it made the unfinished business for tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 100) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, reported adversely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, Senate Resolution 100, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 25, 1953.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and because a number of Senators have inquired as to what the program is to be for the remainder of the week, I understand that probably all of tomorrow will be occupied by the consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 2, relating to the Department of Agriculture.

It is thought possible that the doctors' draft bill may be reported from the Committee on Armed Services tomorrow. If it is, it is anticipated that it may be taken up for consideration on Thursday. If not, some other measure will be taken up on Thursday.

It is the proposal of the acting majority leader that when the Senate concludes its business on Thursday afternoon, it stand in recess until Monday next.

It is expected that the Appropriations Committee will report the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriation bill, possibly tomorrow. I am not certain that that will be the case. In any event, it will not be taken up this week, but will be ready for consideration on Monday of next week.

ADMIRAL FECHTELER, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ALLIED FORCES, SOUTHERN EUROPE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is welcome news that Admiral Fechteler will assume the duties of Commander

in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe. That post has been ably filled by Admiral Carney, who has been nominated to be Chief of Naval Operations.

The high qualities of both men are being given special effect in these new assignments. The fact that Admiral Fechteler was accepted by the 13 member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to relieve Admiral Carney is strong evidence of his qualities as a naval leader.

With so many of our citizens in the Armed Forces today, and so much of our national effort engaged all over the world, I am satisfied that the traditions of superior leadership, for which our Navy is justly famed, will be furthered by Admiral Fechteler in his new international assignment abroad.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 27, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 26 (legislative day of May 21), 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria, and to be also United States High Commissioner for Austria, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Harold Shantz, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 26 (legislative day of May 21), 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Frederick M. Alger, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Edward T. Wailes, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

MUTUAL DEFENSE

Walter S. DeLany, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, pursuant to section 406 (e) of Public Law 329 81st Congress, and as authorized by section 501 (d) of Public Law 165, 82d Congress.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Herbert D. Vogel, Corps of Engineers, to be a member, Mississippi River Commission, a position to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Burton Coffman, minister, Church of Christ, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou art He before whom the generations of men rise and fade away. From everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. From Thee comes every good and perfect gift. To Thee, we lift our hearts in thanksgiving. Of Thee, we pray forgiveness of our sins.

O God, bless the President of the United States, the Members of Congress, and the judiciary. Bless these servants of the people that they may have wisdom to know what is right, courage to do what is right, and sufficient support of their constituents to sustain them in what is right. Endow these Thy servants with grace and knowledge to the end that the wounds of our bleeding world may be healed and peace on earth prevail. May Thy name be glorified and Thy kingdom be increased throughout all nations. God bless the United States of America and this House of Representatives. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the nationwide hue and cry about the administration's proposed reduction in the budget of the Air Force is "much ado about nothing." Here are the facts:

First. As of June 30 this year there will be an unexpended balance in our military procurement funds—appropriated last year but not spent as yet—of $45.6 billion, of which $26.8 billion represent outstanding orders for aircraft not yet constructed of delivered. That means 60 percent of the unexpended military appropriations of last year is for aircraft.

Second. More than 40 percent of all military appropriations for next year will be for aircraft, even with the reduced aircraft budget.

Third. The proposed reduction in the budget for the Air Force does not mean a reduction in our airpower. More than one-half of the Navy budget is for naval airpower. In fact, about 60 percent of the entire Eisenhower budget for national defense next year will be for airpower and air defense.

In the field of military planning, at least, President Eisenhower is at home and is a topnotch authority.

H. R. 5246, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that before this appropriation bill is enacted into law a provision will be inserted granting some authority to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to transfer funds, especially those funds provided for the Secretary's office. The Appropriations Committee of the other body should call upon the Secretary and General Counsel of the Department to present their views in this matter. Should the other body so amend this measure, it ought to be accepted by the House.

It is evident that in the past the Congress has indicated mistrust of the Federal Security Agency. That agency did spend money and did engage in propaganda activities not authorized by law. The situation is now changed and in the interests of sound administration it is necessary that certain reorganization take place. To do this the Secretary must have the authority to transfer funds. I might call attention to the fact that the budget for the Department was made up before Reorganization Plan No. 1 became effective.

If the Congress wants sound economical administration of our laws, we must give honest and dependable heads of departments the authority to make the best possible use of the funds appropriated.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Fogarty amendment on page 15, line 1.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 1, strike out "$60,500,000" and insert "$66,500,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK) there were—ayes 25, noes 31.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 156, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—237

Abernethy	Donovan	Johnson
Addonizio	Dorn, N. Y.	Jonas, Ill.
Albert	Dorn, S. C.	Jones, Ala.
Andrews	Doyle	Jones, Mo.
Aspinall	Durham	Judd
Ayres	Eberharter	Karsten, Mo.
Bailey	Edmondson	Kearns
Baker	Engle	Kee
Barden	Evins	Kelley, Pa.
Barrett	Fallon	Kelly, N. Y.
Battle	Feighan	Keogh
Belcher	Fernandez	Kilday
Bennett, Fla.	Fine	King, Calif.
Berry	Fino	Kirwan
Bishop	Fogarty	Klein
Blatnik	Forand	Kluczynski
Boland	Fountain	Knox
Bolling	Frazier	Landrum
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Lane
Bramblett	Friedel	Lanham
Brown, Ga.	Fulton	Lantaff
Brown, Ohio	Garmatz	Lesinski
Broyhill	Gary	Long
Buchanan	Gathings	Lovre
Burdick	George	Lucas
Byrd	Golden	Lyle
Byrne, Pa.	Gordon	McCarthy
Camp	Granahan	McConnell
Campbell	Green	McCormack
Canfield	Gregory	McIntire
Cannon	Hagen, Calif.	McMillan
Carlyle	Hagen, Minn.	Machrowicz
Carnahan	Hale	Mack, Ill.
Celler	Hardy	Mack, Wash.
Chatham	Harris	Madden
Chelf	Harrison, Wyo.	Magnuson
Chenoweth	Hart	Mahon
Chudoff	Hays, Ark.	Mailliard
Colmer	Hays, Ohio	Marshall
Condon	Hébert	Matthews
Cooley	Heller	Merrow
Cooper	Herlong	Metcalf
Corbett	Heselton	Miller, Calif.
Crosser	Hill	Miller, Kans.
Cunningham	Holifield	Mills
Davis, Ga.	Holmes	Morgan
Davis, Tenn.	Holtzman	Moss
Dawson, Ill.	Hope	Moulder
Dawson, Utah	Horan	Multer
Deane	Howell	Murray
Dempsey	Hyde	Nelson
Dingell	Ikard	Norrell
Dollinger	Jarman	O'Brien, Ill.
Donohue	Javits	O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.	Robeson, Va.	Thomas
O'Hara, Ill.	Robsion, Ky.	Thompson, Tex.
O'Konski	Rodino	Thornberry
O'Neill	Rogers, Colo.	Tollefson
Patten	Rogers, Tex.	Trimble
Pelly	Rooney	Vinson
Perkins	Sadlak	Vorys
Pfost	Schenck	Walter
Philbin	Scott	Watts
Pilcher	Seely-Brown	Westland
Poage	Selden	Wheeler
Polk	Shelley	Whitten
Preston	Sheppard	Wickersham
Price	Shuford	Widnall
Priest	Sieminski	Wier
Rabaut	Sikes	Williams, Miss.
Radwan	Small	Willis
Rayburn	Smith, Kans.	Wilson, Calif.
Reams	Smith, Miss.	Wilson, Tex.
Rees, Kans.	Spence	Withrow
Rhodes, Pa.	Staggers	Wolcott
Richards	Steed	Wolverton
Riley	Sullivan	Yates
Rivers	Sutton	Yorty
Roberts	Teague	Zablocki

NAYS—156

Abbitt	Ellsworth	Mumma
Adair	Fenton	Neal
Alexander	Fisher	Nicholson
Allen, Calif.	Ford	Norblad
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Oakman
Andersen, H. Carl	Gentry	O'Hara, Minn.
	Goodwin	Osmers
Andresen, August H.	Graham	Ostertag
	Gross	Passman
Arends	Gubser	Patterson
Auchincloss	Gwinn	Phillips
Bates	Halleck	Poff
Beamer	Hand	Prouty
Bender	Harden	Ray
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison, Nebr.	Reece, Tenn.
Bentley	Harrison, Va.	Reed, Ill.
Bentsen	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Betts	Hess	Regan
Boggs	Hiestand	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hillelson	Riehlman
	Hinshaw	Rogers, Fla.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.
	Hoffman, Mich.	St. George
Bonin	Holt	Saylor
Bosch	Hosmer	Scherer
Bow	Hruska	Scrivner
Brownson	Hunter	Scudder
Budge	Jackson	Shafer
Burleson	James	Sheehan
Busbey	Jenkins	Short
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Simpson, Ill.
Carrigg	Jonas, N. C.	Simpson, Pa.
Cederberg	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Va.
Chiperfield	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Church	Keating	Stauffer
Ciardy	Kersten, Wis.	Taber
Clevenger	Kilburn	Talle
Cole, Mo.	King, Pa.	Thompson, Mich.
Cole, N. Y.	Krueger	
Coon	Laird	Tuck
Cotton	Latham	Van Pelt
Cretella	LeCompte	Van Zandt
Crumpacker	McCulloch	Velde
Curtis, Mass.	McDonough	Vursell
Curtis, Mo.	McGregor	Wainwright
Curtis, Nebr.	McVey	Wampler
Dague	Martin, Iowa	Warburton
Davis, Wis.	Mason	Weichel
Derounian	Meader	Wharton
Devereux	Merrill	Wigglesworth
D'Ewart	Miller, Md.	Williams, N. Y.
Dies	Miller, Nebr.	Young
Dondero	Miller, N. Y.	Younger
Dowdy	Morano	

NOT VOTING—37

Angell	Elliott	Powell
Becker	Forrester	Rains
Boykin	Gamble	Roosevelt
Bray	Grant	Secrest
Brooks, La.	Haley	Springer
Brooks, Tex.	Hillings	Stringfellow
Buckley	Hoeven	Taylor
Bush	Kearney	Thompson, La.
Case	Mollohan	Utt
Coudert	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Delaney	Patman	Winstead
Dodd	Pillion	
Dolliver	Poulson	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kearney with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Bush with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Grant.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Pillion with Mr. Elliott.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Springer with Mr. Roosevelt.
Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Case with Mr. Haley.
Mr. Bray with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.
Mr. Becker with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Secrest.
Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Dodd.
Mr. Utt with Mr. Mollohan.

Mr. VURSELL and Mr. MUMMA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BATTLE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 18, line 24, strike out "$50 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$75 million."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 203, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—197

Abernethy	Chatham	Fogarty
Adair	Chelf	Forand
Addonizio	Chenoweth	Fountain
Albert	Chudoff	Frazier
Alexander	Colmer	Friedel
Andrews	Condon	Fulton
Aspinall	Cooley	Garmatz
Auchincloss	Cooper	Gary
Bailey	Corbett	Gathings
Baker	Crosser	Gordon
Barden	Davis, Ga.	Granahan
Barrett	Davis, Tenn.	Green
Battle	Dawson, Ill.	Gregory
Bennett, Mich.	Deane	Hagen, Calif.
Blatnik	Dempsey	Hagen, Minn.
Boggs	Dingell	Hale
Boland	Dollinger	Harris
Bolling	Donohue	Harrison, Wyo.
Boykin	Dorn, N. Y.	Hart
Brooks, Tex.	Dorn, S. C.	Hays, Ark.
Brown, Ga.	Doyle	Hays, Ohio
Buchanan	Durham	Hébert
Burdick	Eberharter	Heller
Byrd	Edmondson	Herlong
Byrne, Pa.	Engle	Heselton
Camp	Evins	Hill
Canfield	Fallon	Holifield
Cannon	Feighan	Holtzman
Carlyle	Fernandez	Howell
Carnahan	Fine	Javits
Celler	Fino	Jones, Ala.

Jones, Mo.	Moss	Rogers, Colo.
Judd	Moulder	Rogers, Fla.
Karsten, Mo.	Multer	Rooney
Kee	Murray	Roosevelt
Kelley, Pa.	Norrell	Scott
Kelly, N. Y.	O'Brien, Ill.	Selden
Keogh	O'Brien, Mich.	Shelley
Kersten, Wis.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sheppard
Kilday	O'Hara, Ill.	Sieminski
King, Calif.	O'Hara, Minn.	Sikes
Kirwan	O'Konski	Smith, Miss.
Klein	O'Neill	Spence
Kluczynski	Osmers	Staggers
Landrum	Patten	Sullivan
Lane	Perkins	Sutton
Lanham	Pfost	Teague
Lesinski	Philbin	Thompson, Tex.
Long	Pilcher	Thornberry
Lyle	Poff	Trimble
McCarthy	Polk	Vinson
McCormack	Powell	Walter
McMillan	Preston	Wampler
Machrowicz	Price	Watts
Mack, Ill.	Priest	Wheeler
Madden	Prouty	Wickersham
Magnuson	Rabaut	Widnall
Marshall	Rayburn	Wier
Matthews	Rhodes, Pa.	Williams, Miss.
Merrow	Richards	Willis
Metcalf	Riley	Withrow
Miller, Calif.	Rivers	Wolverton
Miller, Kans.	Roberts	Yates
Mills	Robeson, Va.	Yorty
Mollohan	Robsion, Ky.	Zablocki
Morgan	Rodino	

NAYS—203

Abbitt	George	Nelson
Allen, Calif.	Golden	Nicholson
Allen, Ill.	Goodwin	Norblad
Andersen, H. Carl	Graham	Oakman
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Ostertag
Arends	Gubser	Passman
Ayres	Gwinn	Patterson
Bates	Halleck	Pelly
Beamer	Hand	Phillips
Belcher	Harden	Poage
Bender	Hardy	Radwan
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Nebr.	Ray
Bentley	Harrison, Va.	Reams
Bentsen	Harvey	Reece, Tenn.
Berry	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Betts	Hiestand	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Hillelson	Rees, Kans.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hinshaw	Regan
	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hoffman, Mich.	Riehlman
	Holmes	Rogers, Mass.
Bonin	Holt	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Hope	Sadlak
Bosch	Horan	St. George
Bow	Hosmer	Saylor
Bramblett	Hruska	Schenck
Bray	Hunter	Scherer
Brown, Ohio	Hyde	Scrivner
Brownson	Ikard	Scudder
Broyhill	Jackson	Seely-Brown
Budge	James	Shafer
Burleson	Jarman	Sheehan
Busbey	Jenkins	Short
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Shuford
Campbell	Johnson	Simpson, Ill.
Carrigg	Jonas, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Cederberg	Jonas, N. C.	Small
Chiperfield	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Kans.
Church	Kean	Smith, Va.
Clardy	Kearns	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Keating	Stauffer
Cole, Mo.	Kilburn	Steed
Cole, N. Y.	King, Pa.	Taber
Coon	Knox	Talle
Cotton	Krueger	Thomas
Cretella	Laird	Thompson, Mich.
Crumpacker	Lantaff	Tollefson
Cunningham	Latham	Tuck
Curtis, Mass.	LeCompte	Utt
Curtis, Mo.	Lovre	Van Pelt
Curtis, Nebr.	Lucas	Van Zandt
Dague	McConnell	Velde
Davis, Wis.	McCulloch	Vorys
Dawson, Utah	McDonough	Vursell
Derounian	McGregor	Wainwright
Devereux	McIntire	Warburton
D'Ewart	McVey	Weichel
Dies	Mack, Wash.	Westland
Dondero	Mahon	Wharton
Donovan	Mailliard	Wigglesworth
Dowdy	Martin, Iowa	Williams, N. Y.
Ellsworth	Mason	Wilson, Calif.
Fenton	Meader	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Merrill	Wilson, Tex.
Ford	Miller, Md.	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Nebr.	Young
Gavin	Miller, N. Y.	Younger
Gentry	Morano	
	Mumma	
	Neal	

NOT VOTING—30

Angell	Elliott	Pillion
Becker	Forrester	Poulson
Brooks, La.	Gamble	Rains
Buckley	Grant	Secrest
Bush	Haley	Springer
Case	Hillings	Stringfellow
Coudert	Hoeven	Taylor
Delaney	Kearney	Thompson, La.
Dodd	Morrison	Whitten
Dolliver	Patman	Winstead

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Poulson with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Pillion with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.
Mr. Becker with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.
Mr. Bush with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Case with Mr. Elliott.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Grant.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Haley.
Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Dodd.
Mr. Springer with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Secrest.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. WHEELER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 396, nays 2, answered "present" 1, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—396

Abbitt	Brown, Ga.	Dawson, Utah
Abernethy	Brown, Ohio	Deane
Adair	Brownson	Delaney
Addonizio	Broyhill	Dempsey
Albert	Buchanan	Derounian
Alexander	Budge	Devereux
Allen, Calif.	Burdick	D'Ewart
Allen, Ill.	Burleson	Dies
Andersen, H. Carl	Busbey	Dingell
	Byrd	Dollinger
Andresen, August H.	Byrne, Pa.	Dondero
	Camp	Donohue
Andrews	Campbell	Donovan
Arends	Canfield	Dorn, N. Y.
Aspinall	Cannon	Dorn, S. C.
Auchincloss	Carlyle	Dowdy
Ayres	Carnahan	Doyle
Bailey	Carrigg	Durham
Baker	Cederberg	Eberharter
Barden	Celler	Edmondson
Barrett	Chatham	Ellsworth
Bates	Chelf	Engle
Battle	Chenoweth	Evins
Beamer	Chiperfield	Fallon
Belcher	Chudoff	Feighan
Bender	Church	Fenton
Bennett, Fla.	Clardy	Fernandes
Bennett, Mich.	Clevenger	Fine
Bentley	Cole, Mo.	Fino
Bentsen	Cole, N. Y.	Fisher
Berry	Colmer	Forand
Betts	Condon	Ford
Bishop	Cooley	Fountain
Blatnik	Coon	Frazier
Boggs	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Boland	Corbett	Friedel
Bolling	Cotton	Fulton
Bolton, Frances P.	Cretella	Gamble
	Crosser	Garmatz
Bolton, Oliver P.	Crumpacker	Gary
	Cunningham	Gathings
Bonin	Curtis, Mass.	Gavin
Bonner	Curtis, Mo.	Gentry
Bosch	Curtis, Nebr.	George
Bow	Dague	Golden
Boykin	Davis, Ga.	Goodwin
Bramblett	Davis, Tenn.	Gordon
Bray	Davis, Wis.	Graham
Brooks, Tex.	Dawson, Ill.	Granahan
Green	Lyle	Robeson, Va.
Gregory	McCarthy	Robsion, Ky.
Gross	McConnell	Rodino
Gubser	McCormack	Rogers, Colo.
Gwinn	McCulloch	Rogers, Fla.
Hagen, Calif.	McDonough	Rogers, Mass.
Hagen, Minn.	McGregor	Rogers, Tex.
Hale	McIntire	Rooney
Halleck	McMillan	Roosevelt
Hand	McVey	Sadlak
Harden	Machrowicz	St. George
Hardy	Mack, Ill.	Saylor
Harris	Mack, Wash.	Schenck
Harrison, Nebr.	Madden	Scherer
Harrison, Va.	Magnuson	Scott
Harrison, Wyo.	Mahon	Scrivner
Hart	Mailliard	Scudder
Harvey	Marshall	Seely-Brown
Hays, Ark.	Martin, Iowa	Selden
Hays, Ohio	Mason	Shafer
Hébert	Matthews	Sheehan
Heller	Meader	Shelley
Herlong	Merrill	Sheppard
Heselton	Merrow	Short
Hess	Metcalf	Shuford
Hiestand	Miller, Calif.	Sieminski
Hill	Miller, Kans.	Sikes
Hillelson	Miller, Md.	Simpson, Ill.
Hinshaw	Miller, Nebr.	Simpson, Pa.
Hoffman, Ill.	Miller, N. Y.	Small
Hoffman, Mich.	Mills	Smith, Kans.
Holifield	Mollohan	Smith, Miss.
Holmes	Morano	Smith, Va.
Holt	Morgan	Spence
Holtzman	Moss	Staggers
Hope	Moulder	Stauffer
Horan	Multer	Steed
Hosmer	Mumma	Sullivan
Howell	Murray	Sutton
Hruska	Neal	Taber
Hunter	Nelson	Talle
Hyde	Nicholson	Teague
Ikard	Norblad	Thomas
Jackson	Norrell	Thompson, Mich.
James	Oakman	
Jarman	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Javits	O'Brien, Mich.	Thornberry
Jenkins	O'Brien, N. Y.	Tollefson
Jensen	O'Hara, Ill.	Trimble
Johnson	O'Hara, Minn.	Tuck
Jonas, Ill.	O'Neill	Utt
Jonas, N. C.	Osmers	Van Zandt
Jones, Ala.	Ostertag	Velde
Jones, Mo.	Passman	Vinson
Jones, N. C.	Patten	Vorys
Judd	Patterson	Vursell
Karsten, Mo.	Pelly	Wainwright
Kean	Perkins	Walter
Kearns	Pfost	Wampler
Keating	Philbin	Warburton
Kee	Phillips	Watts
Kelley, Pa.	Pilcher	Weichel
Kelly, N. Y.	Poage	Westland
Keogh	Poff	Wharton
Kersten, Wis.	Polk	Wheeler
Kilburn	Powell	Whitten
Kilday	Preston	Wickersham
King, Calif.	Price	Widnall
King, Pa.	Priest	Wier
Kirwan	Prouty	Wigglesworth
Klein	Rabaut	Williams, Miss.
Kluczynski	Radwan	Williams, N. Y.
Knox	Ray	Willis
Krueger	Rayburn	Wilson, Calif.
Laird	Reams	Wilson, Ind.
Landrum	Reed, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.
Lane	Rees, Kans.	Withrow
Lanham	Regan	Wolcott
Lantaff	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wolverton
Latham	Rhodes, Pa.	Yates
LeCompte	Richards	Yorty
Lesinski	Riehlman	Young
Long	Riley	Younger
Lovre	Rivers	Zablocki
Lucas	Roberts	

NAYS—2

Smith, Wis. Van Pelt

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Fogarty

NOT VOTING—31

Angell	Forrester	Rains
Becker	Grant	Reece, Tenn.
Brooks, La.	Haley	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Hillings	Secrest
Bush	Hoeven	Springer
Byrnes, Wis.	Kearney	Stringfellow
Case	Morrison	Taylor
Coudert	O'Konski	Thompson, La.
Dodd	Patman	Winstead
Dolliver	Pillion	
Elliott	Poulson	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Elliott.
Mr. Becker with Mr. Grant.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Haley.
Mr. Springer with Mr. Secrest.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.
Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.
Mr. Bush with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Dodd.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Patman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORK OF THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, as we know, the investigating procedures of certain committees of this Congress have occasioned comment recently on the other side of the Atlantic as well as in this country. Some of these comments have generated more heat than light. The work of the House Un-American Activities Committee was recently subjected to a searching scrutiny by a writer assigned especially to this task by the Sunday Times of London, and in this instance, I am glad to say, the resultant articles produced light.

The author of the articles, Miss Rebecca West, is an eminent figure in all English-speaking literary circles, renowned for her history of Yugoslavia, entitled "Black Lamb and Gray Falcon"; for her biography of the wartime British traitor, William Joyce—Lord Haw Haw—The Meaning of Treason; and for articles in American periodicals, including Harper's magazine which has termed her the world's greatest reporter. The articles on the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee by this eminent and disinterested author, Mr. Speaker, constitute a valuable and most interesting commentary on the committee's work. I cannot, of course, vouch for the accuracy of all of Miss West's statements and interpretations. As I have said, however, the articles did shed light. I therefore request permission for their publication in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Collectively, I believe they will take up in excess of two pages, so I shall have the first article included in today's RECORD and the second and third articles will follow in tomorrow's RECORD with permission of the Speaker.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY YEAR OF CONTROLLED POWERED FLIGHT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Public Law 32, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Observance of the 50th Anniversary Year of Controlled Powered Flight the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota, Mr. SCHENCK, Mr. BONNER, Mr. PRIEST, and Mr. MACK of Illinois.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 244 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5376) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption by this body of House Resolution 244 which would make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 5376. This bill makes appropriations for civil functions, Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

The Committee on Rules has granted an open rule waiving points of order against the bill and they have provided for 3 hours of general debate on the bill itself.

Breaking down H. R. 5376 into sections, the bill provides appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control, trust fund appropriations for the United States Soldiers' Home and appropriations for the Canal Zone government for the fiscal year of 1954.

In terms of good economical government, this bill, if passed proposes to save the American taxpayer millions of dollars. The initial budget estimates submitted to the Committee on Appropriations asked for an appropriation of $683,377,100. The revised budget estimate asked for an appropriation of $498,650,100, which represented a reduction of $184,727,000 over the original figure.

The Committee on Appropriations, however, now recommends in this bill an appropriation of $415,991,600, which is $267,385,500 below the initial estimate and $82,658,500 less than the amount recommended in the revised budget estimate. If this appropriation bill is passed, it will represent a saving of $168,075,000 over what was appropriated for the current fiscal year.

If you consider the proposed legislation in terms of percent, the results are even more revealing. The current bill calls for an appropriation that would represent a saving of 39 percent over the original estimate submitted and approximately 16 percent over the revised estimate. H. R. 5376 recommends an appropriation that is 29 percent less than the amount appropriated last year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this House Resolution 244 which would make in order the consideration of this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule on this side and I have no requests for time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5376) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5376, with Mr. HOPE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, in fulfilling my responsibility of bringing the Army civil functions appropriation bill to the floor for the consideration of the House of Representatives, I perform that act with considerable pride, if not with a great deal of pleasure. This is not the kind of legislation particularly designed to please. I bring this bill here with pride because I believe that under all of the circumstances the subcommittee has done a good job.

The major credit for the subcommittee's accomplishment should be given in two places: First of all, the executive clerk of our subcommittee, Frank Sanders, has done what I consider to be a

remarkable job in furnishing the subcommittee with the information we require in order to act with judgment upon the many requests that came before us. He spent a great deal of time in the adjournment period making on-the-spot inspections of various projects throughout the country. He has furnished us with a great deal of information as a result of those inspections. He has done a great deal of work with the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget in working out a new and more informational format for the presentation of this material. He has brought a printed record and a report here which, I think, are understandable to those who search for information on specific projects.

Secondly, I should like to give a great deal of credit to the members of the subcommittee, who worked with faithful diligence, with great harmony, and with admirable self-denial in the consideration of the various projects that came before us.

This bill has traditionally been the subject of a great deal of logrolling and back-scratching. Surely the temptation existed with the members of the subcommittee to help each other out, shall we say? For certainly every member of the subcommittee was interested and vitally interested in projects affecting their State or their part of the country. But you will not find any projects of that kind included in this bill. Two new members on the majority side, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] worked with faithfulness. They had a keen desire to get the information which was needed in order that they might exercise a fair and reasoned judgment upon these requests. On the minority side, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] are old hands at this particular bill. Most of the testimony, I suppose, was an old story to them. We were particularly pleased when our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] who had handled this appropriation in years past, was able to leave his sick room in order to join us in the mark-up of the bill and the consideration of the bill in the full committee on last Saturday. He certainly can be called an elder statesmen and an elder advisor in dealing with this particular appropriation measure. While our friend from South Carolina [JOHN RILEY] is not a newcomer to the committee, he is a newcomer to this particular subject. Just as I enjoyed working with him as subcommittee chairman in the 82d Congress, it was a pleasure to again see in action the sincerity and the integrity which has always marked his work in every subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

This bill traditionally is known in many places throughout the country as the pork barrel bill. To many people, this is simply considered a measure in which the largess of the Federal Government is distributed on the basis of political pressure to various districts and various States of the Nation. But this measure in truth provides the wherewithal for the water resources program of the country. This program cannot and ought not to be minimized, for it is a program for the development and preservation of one of our greatest natural resources.

One of the things that our committee considered at considerable length in this report was the necessity for the development of an overall water resources program on the part of the Federal Government. We felt, as our report indicates, that one of the things which will strengthen this overall program the most is a recognition on the part of the local interests involved, the local communities, that by and large the success of a national water resources program will depend upon their participation in an effective manner in that program. It is our feeling that the local community must accept a greater share of the responsibility for the development of these projects in their community.

This bill represents, as it is brought to you today, a cut of just under 40 percent from the original budget. It represents a cut of between 16 percent and 17 percent of the revised budget and the amount recommended for appropriation is about 29 percent less than the amount which was appropriated in this bill last year.

Those are large reductions, but in every case I think it is fair to say that there is an intelligent and a sense-making explanation for each of the actions taken. There was one arbitrary rule which this subcommittee followed. That was the rule that we would not include any items not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, and, as a corollary of that rule, we have not recommended more money for any specific item than had been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

This is a rule which my friend from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and I were pleased to follow when we were in the minority. It is a rule which I believe it is fair to say all of the members of the subcommittee approve at this time. It is arbitrary, and to some extent the subcommittee has been criticized by those who have been made unhappy because particular projects have not been included. They have said for us to follow that arbitrary rule is for use to relinquish the freedom of judgment that we ought to have in dealing with these projects. They have said, "You are letting the people downtown and you are letting the Members of the other body dictate, in the final analysis, the projects that shall go into that program." Perhaps there is some justification for that charge, but in the critical fiscal condition in which our Government finds itself, this freedom of choice, this right of imposing our judgment on the budget items for this particular appropriation bill, is, in a sense, a luxury that we cannot afford.

I have with me this morning a chart which I would like to call to your attention because I think it illustrates the urgency of the reductions which our subcommittee was called upon to make. Here are shown the appropriations for last year. It also sets forth the original budget for the fiscal year 1954, and it shows the revised budget upon which the subcommittee took its action. Then, getting over into these lined portions of the graph, the various colors represent the different types of project. For instance, the green is the flood-control program of the Mississippi Valley and its tributaries. The pink represents the multiple-purpose projects and the red represents new projects involving planning only this year. There are several others, but the significant line is this light blue line which you see, in fiscal year 1956, running completely off the chart. That is the cumulative line. That shows you where this program would go if we permitted the Corps of Engineers' program to proceed in the manner which has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. This is not just a program that the Corps of Engineers would like to have. This is the approved program; and unless some arbitrary action is taken by this Congress, by the fiscal year 1956 you will not have a budget of $480 million upon which to exercise your judgment, but you will have a budget of $1,165,000,000; and in the fiscal year 1957 a budget of $1,400,000,000. Where it will go from there I am not prepared to say.

So, while the members of this subcommittee have been subjected to a great deal of criticism because we took things out of the budget request, after it had been approved by the Corps of Engineers and after it had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, I submit to you that we are fulfilling a responsibility that was required, unless we are prepared to relinquish the thought of the necessary reality of bringing the spending of this Federal Government under control so that there will be some hope of balancing the Federal budget. We have tried in our subcommittee report to be specific; we tried to permit the reader of the report to go through it and know precisely what we have done and why we have done it; and I believe that the reader of the report can, by reading it, obtain the reasons for the actions which we have taken.

First of all, with respect to the program of survey and examinations, I think the chart is the best evidence that can be presented with respect to that. The program of the Corps of Engineers must be made more concise; the number of projects available for appropriations must be reduced unless we are to embark upon a program of public works far beyond anything that would seem reasonable in the foreseeable future.

Our subcommittee for many years has not earmarked the projects upon which survey and examination money is to be spent. That is true because the survey determines whether or not the project is sufficiently worthwhile to proceed with planning and construction money at a later date. We have felt consistently that the survey money should be made available, that the general scope of the work should be set by the level of general appropriations of Congress, but that the Corps of Engineers, the experts in this field, should be the ones to make the decision as to the priority for the expenditure of those funds.

When you get to the next step, however, and that is planning money, there we felt that on the basis of the surveys which had been completed, on the basis of information which the Corps of Engineers could then present to us, we

were in a position to exercise judgment as to the priority with which that money should be spent; in this bill, therefore, we have before us planning requests for some 30 to 35 projects. Because we felt that to permit them to proceed would aggravate the problem that is portrayed by this chart, we picked out the 10 we considered to be of greatest urgency and of greatest economic benefit to the Nation and earmarked, on page 6 of the report, the 10 projects for which planning money is to be spent.

In the field of construction there are three projects for which funds were denied completely, and that does not reflect necessarily upon those projects; it simply means that in those 3 cases there were 2 that represented resumptions where funds had not been appropriated in recent years, and another where we felt that local interests should exercise a great deal more activity with respect to it. There were others, a group of about 12, that were started last year as a result of appropriations late in the fiscal year. They were presented to Congress in a supplemental budget after the House had acted on the appropriation bill last year. With one exception, the Oklahoma City Floodway, where local interests did cooperate fully and there was prompt action in getting construction under way, we have denied funds in this bill this year. That will not prevent those projects from proceeding in an economical manner. Because of their late start last year they just did not get under way. A great share of the money is still unexpended. They can go ahead with the money appropriated last year and expend it during this fiscal year.

With the remainder of the projects, those that were well along, we did not attempt to make any drastic reductions. Once they are well along toward completion, the economical thing to do is to provide the funds to permit the Corps of Engineers to wind up the projects. In some cases that means putting the projects in the hands of local interests for maintenance; in other cases it means the completion of projects so that the revenue they will produce can be returned to the Federal Government.

In the field of operation and maintenance we made a very nominal cut in a very local and specific place, and that was with respect to the fish program in the Columbia River Basin. In no other place did we make any reduction in the operation and maintenance funds because of our feeling that this program has been starved for funds in the last few years, and that it does not represent good economy to deprive these functioning projects of the necessary maintenance in order to permit that backlog to pile up and to create the definite danger that we will be faced not with maintenance but with new construction to replace the facilities that we have permitted to deteriorate.

One new item that you will find in the report this year is that of general expenses. That has been handled as a part of the construction fund in the past. This is the first time it has been set out so that we know just what portion of it is used for the general administrative expenses of the corps.

There are a number of items of language which are explained quite fully in the report. For the most part they represent long hours of work among people of the General Accounting Office, people in the Corps of Engineers and in the Bureau of the Budget, and on the part of our executive clerk, Frank Sanders, in working out a new format so that we can improve the administration, improve the budget, and improve the fiscal control that the Congress exercises over the Corps of Engineers.

As I said, I do not expect you to greet the presentation of this report with great pleasure. This is not the kind of an appropriation bill that evokes great pleasure but it does represent the unanimous best judgment of seven men who devoted themselves diligently to the task set for them by the Members of this House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I notice the following language used in the report on page 6:

> Allocation of planning funds are not to be taken as an indication that these projects are to be constructed.

I wonder what other interpretation we could have that you are making funds available for planning and do not expect to prosecute those plans because our great loss in funds has been in the planning area rather than in the construction part. So it has been hoped by a great many of us that the planning stage would be removed and that funds would be made available for construction, and planning would then become a part of construction.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think perhaps it would clarify it in the gentleman's mind if we had said: "Constructed immediately upon completion of the plans." Our objective is to permit planning on these projects to be completed so that they will represent a reasonable backlog of projects to be constructed when our economic situation is less critical than it is today.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It would seem to me if you are going to have an orderly working of these civil projects, it would be better to get them in the planning stage, not abandoning completely those projects, because we have already spent approximately $40 million in planning on projects that have never been completed. So if we are going to look at the purse strings, the most fruitful field to save money is to eliminate those plannings, unless actually there is some work going to take place following this planning work.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would not want to give the impression that the committee frowns upon the construction of these projects. What we are saying is, we want to serve notice, in a sense, to the people interested in these projects that the completion of the planning does not necessarily mean that this subcommittee is then committed to the appropriation of construction funds immediately. That has been one of the difficulties that puts us in the position illustrated on this chart.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It seems to me that the subcommittee is not taking a very practical position on the matter if they say, "Now we are going to give the Corps of Engineers sufficient money to make detailed plans and to go into further actual studies of conditions surrounding these various projects," and then say, "We may mean that this will be shelved." The pursuit of these projects within season is the place to save money on planning, so if we continue to make these appropriations without following up with construction, then the Federal Government is losing money by investing in that type of planning.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not consider it as losing money. I know that the most economical thing to do as far as individual projects are concerned would be to proceed with construction immediately upon completion of the planning.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Is it the intention of the appropriations subcommittee to try and take a reasonable amount of work and pursue it to its conclusion or is it going to be one of these types of projects that we are going to say, "Well, we have $600 million for 1 year" or "$300 million the next year," and so on, because unless we get some orderly planning, then these works cannot be prosecuted?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It is the opinion of the subcommittee that there certainly is a place in a program of this kind for a backlog of planned projects that can be pursued when the economic situation of the country so requires.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I understand.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. But at the same time we want to make it clear that the application of this planning money is not a commitment on the part of this subcommittee for the appropriation of construction funds for each of these projects next year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am not trying to get the chairman of the subcommittee to say he is committed to these projects. I am talking about the planning as a part of the program. So I come back to this situation that we have now enough projects on hand that would require about $12 billion worth of appropriations to complete at present-day costs. We have spent some $40 million, I remind the gentleman from Wisconsin, on the very thing he is talking about. So why should we continue to insist that planning should be divorced from a scheduled program of construction?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Certainly the gentleman is not suggesting, is he, that we should not proceed with the planning of projects which are urgent and which have a high benefit to cost ratio until we have cleared up the backlog on all of the projects that have been planned in the past.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, I do not think the appropriations subcommittee will undertake to set up a system of priorities as to the dates that they were authorized and the first instances in which money was appropriated for planning, because we have enough projects that there must be some system of priorities reestablished to prosecute those works that are most meritorious

and neglect those that do not have proper merit.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. One other thing should be mentioned, that a great many of these previously authorized projects that have been stagnant and that are not meritorious should be deauthorized, so that they do not remain part of that backlog.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I certainly hope we can do that.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would like to ask the chairman a question which I think he can answer very readily. The other day I discussed with the gentleman the floodwater project on the Rio Grande at Albuquerque. Does the gentleman recall that?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I understood the chairman to tell me that the committee was not reducing that project below the amount recommended by the Director of the Budget.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not believe I made that statement.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thought the gentleman did. Then will the gentleman tell me this: The Congress of the United States has authorized what is known as the floodway project at Albuquerque. The reason I assumed the Congress had for authorizing it is that the channel is about 4 feet higher than the main street of the city. Last year we had a flood costing about a $1½ million to a lot of people. They have small homes and do not have very much finance, but they did have that much destruction, for which they were not compensated at all. This had been going on year by year. The gentleman's subcommittee took every dollar out of that appropriation, so far as that project was concerned, which the budget recommended.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is consistent with what I mentioned. That was one of the 11 local flood-control projects that was presented to the Senate committee in a supplemental budget request late in the last session. Money was appropriated. The work is not well along at this stage. There is money in last year's appropriation to permit the continuance of work during this fiscal year.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is it the disposition of the chairman to be consistent and not to cure something where damage is being done to property?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Surely, the gentleman from New Mexico is not going to try to put me in that kind of position just because he did not get the amount of money he thought he ought to have for a particular project.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I did not ask you to give the money there that you should have, I asked you to leave the money in there that the Eisenhower Budget Director recommended. It was insufficient, but it would have helped.

Let me say this to the gentleman: The Rio Grande rises in Colorado.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yielded for a question. There are a great many Members waiting for time in this general debate.

Mr. DEMPSEY. This is a very important bill. You have gone over it for weeks. When I approached the gentleman the other day I thought I might come before his committee. I want him to know at this time that, because of the existing situation that I am telling him about, the State of Texas is suing the State of New Mexico because Texas claims New Mexico is not giving Texas the amount of water due to Texas that comes into the river. The reason that we cannot deliver that water is that we have no channel through there to carry the water properly and without waste and destruction. It floods into cellars and basements and what not, but we cannot get it down the river because there is no channel. This thing has been going on and on. The 80th Congress recognized the need and voted money for this project.

Certainly New Mexico does not own the river. Old Mexico gets a certain amount of the water by treaty which we must get down there. What we are trying to do is get the channel open. I have a great deal of respect for the ability of the chairman of the subcommittee, but I think you have made a mistake. You made the mistake a year ago and admitted it, and you changed it on the same proposition. All we want to do is this: We are not trying to get a big project through, we are trying to get the channel opened up so the water can get through where it belongs, to old Mexico, to southern New Mexico farmers, and to Texas. That is our obligation. It was not too many months ago that everybody who came out to my State—

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Will not the gentleman please cooperate with all of the people who have time assigned in general debate and permit them to use that time? I have tried to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But you have not answered it at all. The gentleman from New Mexico is willing to cooperate to the extent of voting for every dollar that you voted. I regret to say that you took out every dollar from this project which is as worthy as any of those that you have in this bill. You took out every dollar for New Mexico.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have tried to explain that it was not the intention to stop this project in its progress, but because of a late start last year, and the late appropriations of funds, there has not been a substantial start, and it was the feeling of the subcommittee that they could proceed with the construction during the fiscal year, as they already have.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. On the chart to which the gentleman has referred, am I correct in reading the last figure there for projects which have been authorized and have been planned would cost $6,780,000,000 to complete?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the balance to complete the projects after the fiscal year 1954; that is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. May I say to the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, I feel he might recommend to the Committee on Public Works that they do what the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is doing for the Reclamation Bureau in calling upon them to review all of their presently authorized projects to see whether some of those projects, which have heretofore gone so far as to be authorized, are now feasible. I want to congratulate the gentleman and his committee for the excellent work they have done.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the committee place an item here for an emergency fund for the use of the Army engineers?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. There is money available for the emergency fund.

Mr. DONDERO. Is that $10 million?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; there is money in the emergency fund. They have a considerable unexpended and unobligated balance, which is more than the amount that they have used or have asked for in previous appropriations. They did not request additional funds this year.

Mr. DONDERO. Among 10 projects for which planning money has been granted, I find Libby Reservoir. I presume that means Libby Dam?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I wonder if the committee knows that a bill is pending both in the other body as well as in the House to deauthorize that project completely.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The reason for the planning money in this project is not for the prosecution of that project as is now contemplated, but to permit the continuance of the study now under way by the corps to determine the feasibility of relocating and redesigning that particular project, because we feel there is an urgency for some project in that particular location.

Mr. DONDERO. There seems to be great controversy existing as to that project, and while an estimate has been made that it will cost $318 million, information has come to me that it will cost closer to $500 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They have a very serious relocation problem, and a problem with the Canadian Government and a number of other matters as well, if they proceed with the project as now contemplated.

Mr. DONDERO. That raises the question as to whether or not it was wise to place more money in a fund for planning on a project that might or might not be authorized—and which might be deauthorized, which would be more correct to say.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Because we felt there was a need for working out a project in this area, and not because we wanted to encourage the engineers to proceed with the program they have now contemplated is the reason why the money is in the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. During the 1951–52 floods there were 13 communities in my district which were flooded, 10 communities on the Minnesota River and 3 communities on the Mississippi River. I think in the State of Minnesota we had that many more communities which were flooded at other points. We obtained through action on the part of the other body last year, funds for preliminary surveys. I attended one or two of the hearings which the engineers had. Can the gentleman tell me what happened to the engineer's report on the preliminary surveys because there is not one cent in this bill for the entire State of Minnesota. What is the reason for that?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have tried to explain that we did not allocate these projects on the basis of their geographical location.

We do not try to earmark survey funds. However, if there is nothing mentioned here I would assume that the reason is that the results of the preliminary examinations did not reach the Bureau of the Budget in time for the Bureau of the Budget to submit a request for authorization to Congress.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I have not had an opportunity to contact the Bureau of the Budget, but I know the district engineer has completed his preliminary surveys, to be submitted about the 1st of January of this year. I presume the Bureau of the Budget's recommendations came after that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The revised budget estimate came after that, but as of this moment I cannot tell you the status of those examination reports of the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman should not feel too badly about his State being left out. I do not see a 5-cent piece here for the State of Michigan.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman is in good company.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I rise to question the gentleman about the project at Havre, Mont. Last year your committee appropriated $348,000 for the construction of this project. According to the report, $300,003 will be left over after the end of the fiscal year. Is it your intention that this fund will be available after July 1 for the continuation of the construction work on this project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes. That project at Havre is in the same status as the project mentioned by the gentleman from New Mexico. The funds were made available and released for purposes of construction late in the current fiscal year. They will remain available.

Mr. D'EWART. So that the project can proceed in what we believe to be an orderly manner?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. D'EWART. These funds were frozen about January 1 and only recently have been released. That is why such a small amount has been used.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes. I think the gentleman can assure the people of that community that they can anticipate proceeding with that project in an orderly fashion.

Mr. D'EWART. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. HOLMES. Does the committee have any policy in relation to going ahead with these projects when the planning has been completed?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We stated that we did not wish to be committed with respect to construction funds, even though the planning might be completed on these particular projects. We have got to reserve the right to choke them off somewhere, if we are not going to let this get completely out of bounds.

Mr. HOLMES. Does the committee review the projects after the planning is completed in any priority system?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They usually come before the committee if approved by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. They come before us with their projects and then the committee exercises its judgment as to the priority with which they should be initiated. For the last 3 years—at least, this is the third year now since the outbreak of the war in Korea—it has been the consistent policy of our subcommittee to permit no new projects to be started.

Mr. HOLMES. In the policy that the committee pursues in permitting no new projects to be started, do they investigate first the necessity and the speed of amortization of the project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We have not done that in the last 3 years because of the previous decision that had been made that we would simply not appropriate money for any new starts.

Mr. HOLMES. Could you give any estimate as to how long the committee will take that attitude?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would hope that the committee would continue to take that attitude as long as the war in Korea continues, with the shortages of critical materials, and so long as so much of the key personnel of the Corps of Engineers is required for military construction, and so long as the Federal Government budget continues to be unbalanced.

Mr. HOLMES. Then the committee would not give consideration to the fact that a project might in itself be necessary to help prosecute that war?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Oh, we have had this policy from downtown of certifying certain projects for defense, as defense necessities. I might say that in the 3 years I have been sitting in the hearings of this subcommittee we have never been too much impressed with the certification that we have received on that score.

Mr. HOLMES. You have not been impressed with the certifications?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Not particularly.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. On the point that was brought up a moment ago about new projects, does the committee have any policy as to what is a new project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This year we regarded a new project this: If the entire project was new, if it represented substantially a new portion of an overall project, or if it represented a resumption of a project after a lapse of more than 1 year.

Mr. HARRIS. I have in mind a particular project, a dual-purpose project in my district in Arkansas, which was authorized and on which $13 million or more has been appropriated, the reservoir and dam constructed. As I say, it was a dual-purpose project, flood control and power. The power portion of it, the dam, is all completed. The flood control part of it below the power dam is being interpreted by someone—I cannot find out just who—as a new project, when it will take only about $400,000 more to complete it and get the flood control benefit that is so badly needed. As it is now, we do not get flood control benefit although it started as a dual purpose project, power and flood control. But the flood control part of the project is constantly being held as a new project. Both projects were authorized at the same time. I have made an effort now for several years to try to find out just why the balance of the project is not considered to be part of the over-all project instead of being a new project. I just wondered from the answers the gentleman has given here interpreting what is meant by a new project what would be the situation in regard to the project I have in mind.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would take from what the gentleman has said that it did not come before our subcommittee, that it was not approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HARRIS. I appeared before the subcommittee. A member of the gentleman's committee was there. I brought it to the attention of the committee. The gentleman was busy with the other committee in the other room. The matter was brought to the attention of the gentleman's committee. It did have approval of the budget when it was originally started, but about the time the rule on new projects was again invoked it was again held to be a new project and therefore it was cut out.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We did not exercise our subcommittee judgment on projects of that nature if the Bureau of the Budget did not submit the projects to us.

Mr. HARRIS. One other question with reference to planning as included in your report under general investigation, what is the full interpretation of the language that this is a new appropriation item which provides primarily for survey and studies prior to authorization? Does that mean that this item goes only for those projects under study before they are originally submitted to Congress for authorization?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Those are what we generally refer to as examination and surveys, which authorized by law or by resolution of the Public Works Committee. They are prior to authorization of the projects for construction.

Mr. HARRIS. And prior to the actual authorization of the project by the Congress making it, of course, available for appropriations when the committee could approve funds for it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They are authorized for survey purposes, by resolution of the Public Works Committee and not by the Congress as a whole.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I realize the tremendous problem the gentleman and his associates are faced with as members of this committee. The gentleman will no doubt recall that in 1951 our State suffered possibly a greater loss than any combination of States has ever suffered in the United States in the tremendous flood of that year. In looking through this bill I see that we are no nearer solving our problem than we were in 1951. Under the program of no new starts which has been in force, I believe the gentleman stated, for 3 years, one river and one watershed district that was under consideration has been stopped from getting appropriations from the Bureau of the Budget.

Does the gentleman have any idea when those new starts will take place? It seems to me that a State that has suffered a billion dollars of flood loss should possibly have some consideration or perhaps special consideration.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not in a position to state when that policy is to be changed other than to reiterate the comments that I made in response to a previous question along the same line. That is, when the world situation and our fiscal situation are different from what they are.

Mr. GEORGE. I doubt if either one will improve until we have another flood at least as big as the last one we had and as long as our condition exists as it does now we have nothing to do but to dump our water on Missouri and Oklahoma.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. I want to commend my colleague from Wisconsin for his very fine presentation. There is one thing I would like to have clarified in my own mind. I would like to know when a project enters the planning stage? I have in mind, as the gentleman knows, two projects in Wisconsin, the Pecatonica flood-control project and the Kickapoo flood-control project. Preliminary surveys have been completed on those two projects. Now, is the next survey to be made a planning survey?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The result of the preliminary survey would be reviewed by the Corps of Engineers and if their preliminary survey appears to be favorable, then, the next step would be authorization for construction of the project. After that planning funds would be requested specifically for that project before our subcommittee.

Mr. WITHROW. I understand, I think. Those planning funds, the gentleman states, his subcommittee will not earmark?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We do earmark planning funds. We do not earmark survey and examination funds.

Mr. WITHROW. Then if a survey is to be completed, the Corps of Engineers must give it a priority?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. WITHROW. And the money is appropriated and given to the Corps of Engineers, they to designate the surveys they feel should be completed?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct. I think it is fair to say that the Corps has a large backlog of requested surveys for which they have not had the money to proceed as rapidly as they would like.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The gentleman is well aware of my interest in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific because of my correspondence with him and from testimony before the committee that I gave. That prompts me to ask upon what basis the committee reduced the amount for maintenance and operation of cemeteries by $197,000, page 2 of the report, and just how that will affect the cemeteries where additional maintenance is very seriously needed?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We tried to explain that in the second paragraph on page 2 where we have attempted to limit their administrative personnel and have suggested to them that we feel they could make better use of mechanized equipment instead of as much manpower as they are now using.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I assume the gentleman takes into account the peculiar conditions which apply in that particular cemetery?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I visited the cemetery that the gentleman has in mind and I think it is adaptable to the use of mechanized equipment.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I do not want to belabor the gentleman's point of view, but I am afraid that unless additional maintenance is provided, the condition of that cemetery will continue to deteriorate to the shame of the Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not think you will find the subcommittee intended to reduce ordinary maintenance operations. It is on some of their planning and development sections and administrative personnel that this cut is to be applied.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman has listed in the report, on page 6, 10 projects for which planning money is recommended. I note the gentleman has stated that the certification of defense needs and that sort of thing has not made much of an impression on the committee, but I would like to ask how many of these 10 projects have been certified as being in the interest of national defense.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would assume that there would be a national defense need on all of the 30 or 35 that were submitted in the budget request for planning. The remark that I made earlier was with respect to construction funds, many times that were dragged in at the last minute, and those were the projects on which I questioned the real sincerity of the defense certification.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. We appreciate the committee must exercise its discretion, but I am anxious to know 1 or 2 other things. Of these 10 projects, how many, if any, have had assertions or assurances of local contributions? I note the committee has mentioned the need for more local contributions on projects.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I believe it is fair to say that assurances satisfactory to the Corps of Engineers will be given in all of those cases where it is required.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is, that there will be local contribution?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In the cases that it would ordinarily be required in; yes. In multiple-purpose dams, for instance, there is no local contribution.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I understand that. But with respect to flood-control projects, you do have assurances that there will be local contribution?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Well, we certainly are not going to provide construction funds unless we have very definite assurances by the time the matter reaches the appropriation stage.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman has been most generous with his time, but I would like to ask one more question. In connection with these 10 some projects, or in connection with any of the projects we have had under consideration, the gentleman mentioned some 30, have any of them been in the budget heretofore? Has the budget recommended planning money, has planning begun, and then has the committee now refused to recommend further planning money? I have reference to one particular project where some $200,000 of planning money has been expended, the budget has recommended another $100,000 for the next fiscal year, and yet the committee, for good reasons, I assume, has not placed it in this bill. Can the gentleman explain that situation?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am sure that is true with respect to quite a number of those that have not been allotted planning funds in this report, but we tried to pick out those that in our judgment represented items of greatest economic benefit.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I am sure of that. I just wanted to make sure that the particular project I have reference to was not treated any differently than other projects which came before the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I assure the gentleman that these appropriations were made on the basis of a preconceived plan and that we did not pick and choose on the basis of any consideration other than that.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. In other words, there are other projects where planning work has been done but now will be halted because of the action taken by the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not certain that is true, because there remains a large amount of unobligated planning fund available to the Corps, which the committee has not earmarked.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I have reference to Eagle Gorge Dam in the State of Washington, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I note the report says that—

> Generally speaking, the reduction made by the committee has been achieved by application of unexpended and unobligated balances on the individual projects so as to provide funds which can be economically expended during fiscal year 1954.

Can the gentleman tell me approximately what that amount was, the unexpended and unobligated balances that you took over in an attempt to reduce the overall appropriation?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Where there were unobligated and unexpended balances on these specific projects the funds were applied to those specific projects. The budget recommends that $10 million of surplus funds be applied to the construction program. We were confident there was more such money available, so we have taken $15 million of funds held in suspension and have allocated them as a part of the appropriations in this bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Who determines whether or not they shall take those funds?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We determine what they should take, and in the other cases the Corps of Engineers informs us as to projects which had been completed and they had some money left over, bless their hearts, or in other places where it was not feasible or advisable to continue with the construction, the money was taken out of that place of suspension and made available as a part of the $15 million.

Mr. GAVIN. Those who may be interested in the different projects that remain uncompleted and for which appropriations have been made may differ with the Engineers as to taking that money away from a particular overall flood-control project. We have no recourse, then, except to accept the determination of the Engineers that they are going to take that money away, even thought it has been appropriated and established for a particular project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. My understanding is that this money was not taken from those projects, that it was taken from projects which had been completed at less than the estimated cost, or projects for which it was not found feasible to use the money for some reason or other so that proceeding with the construction was not economically feasible at this time.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished former chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], such time as he may require.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] has well said—and no one within my recollection has discharged the duties of that position better than the gentleman from Wisconsin—this bill has come to be widely known as the pork-barrel bill.

There could be no greater misnomer. While it is true that in this bill as in any other general appropriation bill, and I might say in every other general appropriation bill, there have been vast sums of money appropriated which were unwarranted and in many respects wasted, the Government has received from money carried in this bill from year to year, as great a benefit as it has received from money appropriated for any other civilian purpose. Generally speaking, no money appropriated in any bill has been better invested. It is also the vehicle through which the Federal Government provides money to remedy injustices and to right losses which have been occasioned by the Government itself under its all-embracing power of eminent domain in the improvement of the waterways of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I did not write this bill. If I had written it, it would have been considerably different. I believe I can also say, Mr. Chairman, that would be true in the case of any other Member of the House of Representatives. If every Member of the House had been given carte blanche to write this bill, as he personally thought it ought to be written, and as he would endeavor honestly and fairly to write it, we would have 435 separate bills, no two of which would be identical. This bill, therefore, does not conform entirely to the views of any member of the committee. It is not as a whole acceptable to any Member of the House and for that reason we can safely support it as a general composite of the views of the House and of the needs and purposes of the agencies it supplies.

Mr. Chairman, one of the turning points in the economic history of the United States was the adoption in 1913 of the 16th constitutional amendment. Up until that time, the Federal Government had been closely restricted in revenues with which to carry out essential Federal purposes. Finally in desperation, because of the growing need for money which could not be brought in under current constitutional provisions, we passed the 16th amendment giving the Federal Government the right to levy income taxes.

The result was astounding. Instantly there poured into the coffers of the Federal Treasury such a golden stream as never had been anticipated. None of those who had so carefully studied the proposal for many years before it was finally adopted foresaw the vast amount of money that could be and would be provided for the use of the Government under its right to impose income taxes.

Money flowed in at an unprecedented rate. Naturally, we began to spend it in the same way. Millions were spent for purposes for which it had previously been impossible to appropriate thousands. And that was especially true of purposes carried by this bill. As a result there developed a psychology of spending which swept through all branches of the Government. It is interesting and informative to compare the general appropriation bills before the adoption of the amendment with those following the adoption of the amendment. And the world wars accelerated the process. We expanded appropriations to meet war emergencies expecting to return to former rates of expenditure only to find that the close of the wars brought no retrenchment and peacetime expenditures exceeded war expenditures. Everybody seemed to have the idea that the Federal Treasury was bottomless and increasing the Federal income was merely a matter of increasing Federal appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And to make sure they got the money, they put on the withholding tax, did they not?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is an authority on that subject and is doubtless taking steps to do something about it.

The golden stream continued to flow in, swollen by expanding war incomes.

And along with the idea of boundless national revenues there developed the idea that every State and every congressional district was entitled to its share, and States and districts vied with each other in submitting million dollar projects. Government engineers, ambitious statesmen, canny contractors, and obliging budget bureaus cooperated to bring in fantastic millenniums. And before we knew it we had piled up a backlog of surveys, planning projects, and construction programs, which, as the chairman of the committee has so graphically demonstrated by this chart here before us, as will when completely under way require not millions but billions. As demonstrated conclusively by the chart before us, expenditures at the rate proposed, and approved will in a few years exceed national revenues for all purposes.

To complicate this situation, many projects as they near completion produced situations more serious than those they proposed to remedy. For example, in my own State we conceived an ambitious program of deepening the Missouri River and providing a permanent channel which would open our river cities to inland waterway commerce and make them in effect ports of entry. Vast sums of money were spent annually by the Federal Government in dikes, dams, retards, revetments, and levees only to find that the project was impracticable and the only effect was to so obstruct the channel that the water was thrown out over the banks and lands never before subject to overflow were inundated, denuded of crops, and covered with sand.

It has now become apparent that the plan is visionary and the larger part of the money spent on it has been worse than wasted, and with that in view the last Congress included in the conference report on this bill, the civil functions appropriation bill, the following paragraph:

> The conferees are in unanimous agreement that the funds approved for the Missouri River from Kansas City to Sioux City, and

Kansas City to the mouth, ought to be used only for bank stabilization work.

This language repudiates any further idea of establishing a 9-foot channel in the Missouri River, and directs that all future funds provided for this section of the river shall be used exclusively for bank stabilization.

The subcommittee has found in its hearings this year no occasion to change its views or wishes in this respect; and if no further action is taken on the subject by either House, this provision will govern the expenditure of all funds provided in this bill for that portion of the Missouri River—that none of it shall be spent on a 9-foot channel, and that all of it shall be used exclusively for bank stabilization.

The appropriation for the Missouri River is inadequate. I have urged a larger sum for this purpose on the grounds that the loss and destruction in this section is due directly to the action of the Government in obstructing the natural flow of the water in its futile and fruitless effort to deepen the river and improve navigation. But the committee insists that appropriations must be curtailed. So we must make the most of what we have. At least we can be certain that the flow of the river will not be further hampered and such funds as are expended will be used to protect the land.

Just a word on the effect of providing money for surveys and planning. Surveys cost only a few thousand dollars. In the past almost any request for a survey was granted. But there are those who take the view that because small amounts have been provided for surveys and plans, the committee and the Congress is thereby committed to the construction of projects costing millions of dollars.

The purpose of surveys and plans is to determine the practicability and merit of a project and the ratio of the advantages to be derived from the completed project to its cost. Repeatedly the committee underwrites surveys and plans and then pigeonholes them on the findings. As in the last Congress, for example, the committee after studying the plans submitted by the Board of Engineers on the Tombigbee River found that the costs outran the benefits and although several years and large sums of money had been spent in the study, directed that the project be permanently abandoned.

It would be absurd to contend that because a project is among the many surveyed and planned, the committee is under obligations to construct it regardless of the findings on the merits of the proposition. Certainly it would be in contravention of the practice of the committee and the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have had a little experience in dealing with harbor projects and flood control projects, some of which have been completed. I would like to ask the gentleman, who is very experienced in this, to answer this question: When the Board of Army Engineers, and finally the Chief of Engineers, look into a project and approve it, do they take anything into consideration, for instance, the national economy and the capacity for taxation, or do they simply take that isolated case and decide that it is feasible to be built? In other words, do they disassociate themselves from the whole national picture instead of trying to fit that into some kind of a national pattern by which the American taxpayers and the American Government can stand?

Mr. CANNON. That is a very pertinent question, and is directly in point at this time.

The Board of Engineers, as the gentleman has indicated, merely reports on the feasibility of the project. The Board makes no attempt to in any way evaluate the effect of the project or the expenditure involved on the economy and the financial integrity of the Government.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Did I understand the gentleman to state that planning was for the purpose of determining the economic ratio of cost to benefit?

Mr. CANNON. One of the objects of it is to determine how economically advantageous it would be and what is the ratio of cost to advantage?

But there is more to be taken into consideration than the feasibility of a proposed project and its cost ratio.

When I first became a member of the Committee on Appropriations and had opportunity to observe the processing of a project, the question before the committee was whether the project was needed and whether the money appropriated for it would be well invested. If so, the appropriation was usually made.

But for years now we have been expending more than we take in. Practically all these appropriations are deficit expenditures. There is no money in the Treasury to pay them and they have to be added to the ever-growing national debt.

So the question has changed. The question now is whether we can get along without them. And if so, the appropriation should not be made.

Mr. Chairman, along with the other members of the committee I vote to reject the request of colleagues for appropriations with the greatest reluctance. The great proportion of them are desperately needed. The money asked for them would be well spent and in many instances would result in increased taxes and revenues more than compensating the Government for the cost of construction.

But I hope they will be patient with us and understand that as soon as we can balance the budget and begin to pay our way, we can take them up and give them real consideration.

We are confronted today by the most dangerous, the most expensive, and the most deadly military situation in our history. Heretofore in all its wars the United States had before it only the question of victory or defeat. Today we are confronted with a war of extermination. If we lose, we lose the majority of our people, all our great cities, and we lose forever our form of government.

The war is being fought on many fronts, on the economic front as well as on the military front. We can lose the war without firing a gun. We can lose it by economic bankruptcy. We can lose it by voting here on this floor to appropriate money we do not have, for something we can get along without.

Mr. Chairman, at midnight tonight, at some disputed barrier, in some flaming town, on the scarred slope of some battered hill, young men—hardly more than boys—will give everything they have—for time and all eternity.

We voted to send them there.

Can we not also vote here on this floor this afternoon to back them up by denying expenditures, however needed, in order to win the war on the economic front while they are winning it on the Korean front?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in support of the committee's recommendation of $29,250,000 to be appropriated in the 1954 budget to continue construction of the Dalles lock and dam project.

I am naturally especially interested in this project because it is located in the district I represent in Oregon. But I think the important thing to consider this afternoon is the importance of this project from the point of view of all the people and the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Continued construction of the Dalles project is needed as a national defense measure. The defense effort at this time urgently needs the productive capacity that the power from the Dalles Dam would give.

Continued construction of this project is also needed as an economy measure. In the long run, the quick completion of this project will cost the people less than delaying it, and the present administration is certainly committed to a policy of saving money.

It is my understanding that $21 million has already been spent in starting this dam. Any businessman knows that a job worth starting is a job worth finishing. You don't make a business go by buying inventory and then letting it lay in a warehouse. You do not make a farm profitable by buying a tractor and then letting it stand out in the rain. The taxpayers have spent $21 million in starting this job, and they are not going to get any return on either principal or interest until the job is finished.

The Dalles project will provide an initial installation of 1,092,000 kilowatts of power generating capacity, and I am told the first two units of 78,000 kilowatts each will go on the line in November 1957. This power is greatly needed in the defense effort. Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay stated in a letter of April 29, 1953, that any delay in the construction of the Dalles Dam will have an adverse effect upon production for defense in the Northwest.

The power from this project will make it possible to save money on national defense. It is well known that the cost of the Pacific Northwest hydroelectric power is reasonable, so the materials produced by this power will give the taxpayers of this country more defense for less money.

The effects of the shortage of power upon national defense were made clear last winter when the water flowing in the Columbia River was at a low level. This shortage of water produced a shortage of power that forced important defense industries in the area to cut their output. This meant, for example, that three electric furnaces in a Portland steel mill were standing cold 22 hours a week, and losses in aluminum production in the Pacific Northwest were amounting to about 1,000,000 pounds daily.

I understand that present power prospects are that without the Dalles project coming into service as scheduled in 1957, there would be a bad shortage situation that year. The installation at this project on the present plan will go far toward meeting estimated future load requirements. Because this project is so close to major load centers, particularly Portland, Oreg., and Seattle, Wash., the transmission costs and losses will be low.

Because the Dalles Dam is already under construction, generation there can be started sooner than at any other site offering as much power.

Finally, I think it is very important to point out that the money spent on this dam is not an expense, it is an investment—a reimbursable investment—and that $327 million out of a total of $348 million that the project will cost will come back to the people with interest. And if the record on Bonneville Dam is any indication, the money will come back into the Treasury a lot quicker than present plans call for. The army engineers told me this morning that payments on principal, interest, and operating charges on Bonneville Dam come to about $3 million a year, while they are clearing about $6 million a year on the sale of power. So on that dam they are taking in about twice what they need to keep up their payments.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, the Dalles Dam is a job that has been started and should be finished. It is needed for defense, and can provide defense tools that are needed at reasonable cost. It will help to alleviate a critical and costly power shortage. And it is not an expense. It is an investment, and a good one.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, there is no need of going over or even attempting to emphasize the excellent statement made by my friend from Wisconsin, the chairman of this subcommittee. He has in some detail given to the Members of the Committee of the Whole the approach the subcommittee felt it had to make in connection with these sensitive appropriations, not the approach that we would like to make under other circumstances; not the approach, indeed, that we might be able to make next year or the year after, but the approach that we had to make this year in view of the unbalanced budget and the crushing burden of taxation and the emergency situation which confronts us. So that I am not going to go into that again nor need I repeat what he said about the harmony and the hard work which I think was done by every member of this subcommittee, and the excellent work done by Frank Sanders, our executive clerk.

When I went to law school, a member of the faculty defined, not very well, but defined a good lawyer as a good index to a good legal library. That is not an accurate definition, but it serves to illustrate what I mean about Frank Sanders. He is a good index and a fast index to all the vast amount of information which has been accumulated over the years by the Committee on Appropriations.

What I want to do, even though it may in some respects be considered out of harmony with the present approach of the committee with which I am in accord, is to indicate very briefly what I think of as guide posts for our future consideration on a bill of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, the bill now before you is a result of a great many weeks of hearings, and during those weeks your subcommittee averaged better than 6 hours a day in the continuous examination of both Government witnesses, Members of the Senate and of the House, and local interests.

With respect to the local interests alone, the subcommittee heard 650 witnesses, and the total hearings comprise 1,893 pages.

The legislation primarily involves scores of projects within the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, some involving only a few thousand dollars and others involving in excess of $300 million.

The legislation contemplates appropriations for continuation of planning and surveys, for the continued construction of navigation projects on many of our great rivers, for flood control projects both local and regional, and for the huge multiple purpose projects which involve in one design, flood control, improvements to navigation, the production of hydroelectric power, and to some extent the irrigation and reclamation of agricultural lands.

In addition to the familiar civil functions section of the bill, it also includes the proposed appropriation for the Panama Canal, both the Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government, and other Government activities, including the National Cemetery program, and the Soldiers' Home here in Washington.

The money involved, as large as it is, is almost trifling when compared to some other appropriation bills which we have been or soon will be considering; but the scope of the bill is so varied and so detailed, that it would be quite impossible to discuss it in any generalized remarks and within any reasonable limits of time.

I shall, therefore, confine my own remarks to two phases which I think are fundamental to the understanding of the problem, one dealing with the approach used by your committee for the immediate problem, which is provisions for the fiscal year 1954, the other the philosophy, if I may use that expression, which it seems to me the committee and the Congress should consider for the next and future fiscal years.

Now, with respect to the general rules which guided the committee in its present considerations. We sought to follow, perhaps even a little too closely, the plans of the present administration as indicated by the Bureau of the Budget. For Members who are interested in details in this connection, I refer to part I of the hearings, pages 204 through 208, which include correspondence between the Director of the Budget, the Secretary of the Army, and the Chief of Engineers, commencing on February 3, 1953, and establishing certain general principles.

For example, the letter of Director Dodge dated February 3, 1953, says in part:

> With respect to construction: It is the policy to proceed only with those projects which are deemed clearly essential in terms of the objectives of this administration and on such projects to employ the strictest standards of economy. Each department and agency head is therefore directed to:
>
> (a) Review all proposed or authorized construction projects on which work has not yet begun, and to propose initiation of construction during the remainder of the fiscal year 1953 and the fiscal year 1954 only on those projects which he determines meet the above criteria.
>
> (b) Review all going construction projects in the light of the above criteria and take such action as he may deem appropriate, including action to stop the work.
>
> With respect to all programs: It is the policy to operate at a minimum level of cost and expenditures. This policy requires that the necessity for all work be questioned and that action be taken to eliminate unnecessary programs and to hold the remainder to minimum levels.

A following letter from Earl D. Johnson, the Under Secretary of the Army, says:

> 1. You will eliminate all new starts and resumption of projects and all new separate units of projects which have been previously started.
>
> 2. You will delay construction up to 1 year on larger projects where this can be done consistent with economical prosecution of the work by slowing down earnings on contracts already awarded and slowing up the award of additional contracts. The above should not be applied, however, to projects which are so near to completion that the delays in achieving anticipated benefits do not warrant the budgetary results which can be obtained.

As I indicated before, these were general guides laid down by the administration, which were not only followed perhaps too rigorously by the committee, but within such limitations the committee very substantially reduced the amounts allocated by the Bureau of the Budget, even under those restricted criteria.

I need hardly interpolate that the work of the committee is difficult in the extreme, and in some degrees highly unpleasant. We were dealing time and time again with projects of undoubted merit, projects very close to the hearts of the people in the affected communities and, indeed, very close to our friends

and colleagues in the House. It is not agreeable to eliminate or reduce such projects, but if we are sincere in our frequently stated position that the expenditures of the Federal Government must be reduced, and that tax relief must take place, and that the budget must be balanced, we cannot frustrate these broad and important objectives of national policy by making exceptions in this or any other bill. It may and probably will be argued that we have very recently violated this principle of reduction of expenditures, and my only answer to that is that such violation was not the work of or responsibility of this subcommittee.

There are items in this bill of which I do not approve, and there are items omitted in this bill which I should like to see in it, but it seems to me that we have got to have a little bit of breathing space during the first year of this administration to see how far we can achieve the objectives of reducing expenditures, reducing taxes, balancing the budget, and a sound economy, and the attempt of this committee has, therefore, been along these lines. I ask your temporary indulgence because it is quite possible that when we can see daylight some of the things which the committee would like to do, and which the House would like to do, can be done.

GUIDEPOSTS FOR THE FUTURE

I do want to respectfully suggest for your consideration some of the guideposts which I think should mark our deliberations on this subject after we have had that breathing space. I do not suggest these as a blueprint for future action, but as almost random thoughts which are entitled to our study in planning the future of this whole program:

First. Planning and surveys: On February 14, 1953, Secretary Johnson prepared a memorandum for the Chief of Engineers in which, among other things, he said:

> Recommendations presented in survey reports must be carefully screened against existing Federal policy and favorable action indicated only when the economics of the project are sound and consistent with the policy statements contained in the February 3 Bureau of the Budget directive; advance planning under way and proposed for fiscal year 1954 must be carefully analyzed and bear a reasonable relationship to the number of projects proposed for inclusion in yearly programs. This is one area in which it would be preferred to err on the safe side since expenditures for adequate planning may save greater amounts for actual construction.

I must confess I have a great deal of sympathy with this position. Planning and survey moneys in reasonably adequate amounts are very necessary, first, to permit us to evaluate any given project; second, on the assumption that careful planning ought to prevent waste and save money in construction; and third, because I believe we should have a reservoir of carefully screened and planned projects ready for the time when we will be in a position to give more heed to our domestic economy and our domestic welfare. Such a reservoir of properly planned projects might also be vital in the event of any serious recession in our present high rate of general business activities.

In this connection, however, I want to call to the attention of the Members that the present survey program bears no relationship to common sense or to available moneys. There is no use whatever in deluding ourselves that, because we might obtain an action by the Public Works Committee to have a survey made, the survey ever will be made. There is an 8-year backlog of uncompleted surveys now, and the situation is not improving. If the members will refer to part I of the hearings, at page 214, and following pages, they will see listed by Chairman DAVIS a table of examinations and surveys which clearly proves this point. I invite your attention to my examination of General Chorpening on the question of navigation studies, on page 219, as follows:

NUMBER OF NAVIGATION STUDIES TO BE MADE IN 1954

Mr. HAND. You have in this budget requested $300,000 for replenishment of that fund for navigation studies; is that correct?

General CHORPENING. That is $900,000, of which $300,000 we propose to apply to navigation; yes, sir.

Mr. HAND. On navigation studies alone you have outstanding requests for 378 surveys. Do I understand that to be the situation?

General CHORPENING. 378; yes, sir.

Mr. HAND. You have 378 reports officially requested by the Congress for navigation studies only?

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAND. You contemplate in the coming fiscal year working on only 11 studies; is that right?

General CHORPENING. Working on 11 of those; yes, sir.

Mr. HAND. So that the program has bogged down completely, has it not? I mean what is the use of the Public Works Committee, or what is the use of Congress asking for further surveys if you are only going to do 11 out of 378? This is not critical of you. I am just trying to determine the situation. If you get the money you are requesting and do your 11 surveys, there will be the three hundred and sixty-odd still left at the end of the year; is that right?

General CHORPENING. It is obviously rather slow progress on the program.

Mr. HAND. I think that is an understatement, General. You have 378 reports officially requested by Congress, but this year you ask for only $900,000 in the revised budget, which includes both flood control and navigation, and in navigation projects you will only take up about 11?

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAND. So, the resolutions really begin and end with the committee.

General CHORPENING. That is correct.

Mr. HAND. Moreover, if you do get reports back, there is still a backlog before the Public Works Committees of 80 on which they have not acted; is that correct?

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir, more than 80 favorable ones.

Mr. HAND. In effect, we are doing quite a little shadow boxing with this program, are we not?

General CHORPENING. It is not a live program on the basis that we are proceeding.

Mr. HAND. When one of the Members of the House goes to the Public Works Committee and asks them for a resolution directing some survey of a project in his district, he is kidding himself under the present circumstances.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. Do any of these 10 projects listed on page 6 of the report, which have received an allocation for planning money, have a cost-benefit ratio equal to or less than 1.4?

Mr. HAND. My recollection is very certain that they do. That is, they are all in excess of that benefit ratio and many of them are substantially in excess of it. May I add I have a project in my district which has a benefit-cost ratio of 16 to 1 and it is not being processed.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAND. Resuming my statement, I want to call to the attention of the Members the present survey program which it might be worth while for the Members to hear. The present survey program bears no relationship to common sense or to available money. There is no use whatever in deluding ourselves that because we might obtain action from the Committee on Public Works to have a survey made that that survey ever will be made or will be made within a reasonable time. There is an 8-year backlog of surveys now and the engineers are not able to catch up on that backlog. They are still as far behind as they were a couple of years ago. I will not have time to go into detail about that, but there are 337 surveys pending which will not be done in any reasonable time in the future. The Members may want to look at the colloquy between the committee and General Chorpening on that subject, which is on page 218 of the hearings. Suffice to say that the survey program in which almost all of us are interested to some extent is not a live program in the words of General Chorpening.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Why does the gentleman say it is not a live program. The House could furnish the money to order a survey at any time, could it not?

Mr. HAND. The House could furnish the money, but it could not afford the money to take care of the surveys. I am coming to that question shortly.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We could insist upon the surveys if we wanted them.

Mr. HAND. We could, indeed. We could do one of two things to facilitate this program. One is to appropriate about ten times as much money for planning and surveys, but by far the more sensible approach, at least now, is to reduce the number of plans and surveys which are now authorized.

Mr. LECOMPTE. You mean deauthorize some of them?

Mr. HAND. I mean that many of them should be deauthorized if they are no longer current, or no longer of great benefit.

That brings me to a point which I hope to refer to later, and that is in all projects, either local or regional, if we would require by law that local interests contribute a substantial part of the funds required for planning, we would not only cut Federal expenses materially, but we would assure ourselves that the locality involved is really interested and the project has real merit which they are willing to back with their own money. We would eliminate a lot of planning

which is without merit and done largely for political purposes. On those, of course, it is a legislative problem, and I take the liberty of suggesting that the Public Works Committee continue its scrutiny of the whole program, eliminating projects which no longer have merit, or are no longer current; carefully screen new ones, and insist upon a degree of local cooperation and expense sharing.

Secondly, I suggest that we cannot forever relate all of our planning and construction of civil projects to the so-called defense effort. With all of you, I sincerely pray for an early termination of the hostilities in Korea and the restoration of stable and peaceful relationships in the world, but even if we are frustrated in that desire in the immediate or near future, we cannot forever neglect important domestic planning here at home. In this same connection, I suggest that while for the most part I approve of our efforts to eliminate new starts for this coming fiscal year, I at the same time suggest that this is not always a valid criteria. Some projects, regarded as new starts, may well be immensely more important than the continuation of projects fortunate enough to have been started heretofore.

Thirdly, I would say I am afraid in our preoccupation with the enormous and costly multiple projects involved, principally flood control and hydroelectric power, that we are neglecting the primary and historic function of the Corps of Engineers to maintain and improve the tremendously important navigation facilities of our rivers, lakes, and inland waterways. I should not burden you with figures, but if you care to study the problem, you will find that the transportation tonnage now carried by our inland waterways is nothing less than astonishing, and habitually exceeds every estimate that the engineers make.

Fourth. And I hesitate to say this because I shall certainly be accused of provincialism, I feel that in all fairness we are bound to pay a little bit more attention to that section of our great land which lies east of the Mississippi River. I should hate to calculate the percentage of the money involved in this bill which is spent in or on the Atlantic coast. It is infinitesimal, and yet the Atlantic Coast States pay a very large part of the Federal tax bill. Do not misunderstand me, I am not suggesting that projects be located in the East just because they ought to get their share of Federal spending, that is merely a pork-barrel approach. I realize, of course, that the East does not have, generally speaking, the problems nor the geography which would warrant some of the construction we are now engaged in, as on the Mississippi, Ohio, or the Pacific Northwest, but I am seriously suggesting that in order to support the millions which we are spending in other sections, we are being very niggardly with the important navigation facilities near the Atlantic coast and are, among other things, doing nothing whatever about the beach-erosion problems of our great coastal cities and towns notwithstanding the legislative authority for such protection passed by the 79th Congress. My people insist that salt water is just as wet as fresh water, and if it is necessary to protect the town of A in Minnesota from the occasional floods of a river, it is equally important to protect the town of B on the coast of New Jersey from occasional floods by the ocean, especially when the town of B often has far more valuable ratables to protect.

Fifth. Speaking of beach-erosion legislation reminds me of what I think is the most important subject of all, and that is that if we are to continue this meritorious but extremely expensive Federal program we must establish a formula that is not discriminatory and is equitable, and which would require in most cases a far greater degree of local contribution than presently exists. I have had many witnesses tell me that the national economy can afford such and such an improvement. I think the national economy can; the question is whether the Federal Treasury can or ought.

There is no rhyme or reason for the present formula for local contribution. Region A will hugely benefit from a $300 million multiple-purpose project built at the entire cost of the Federal Government; region B will make some contribution by way of lands and easements; region C will make a substantial cash contribution. There is no equitable formula which applies to them all alike. Moreover, while the national economy is certainly benefited to a degree by the construction that we are undertaking in this bill, it is also true that the local flood-control district, levee districts, and regional areas seeking benefits including a cheap and plentiful electricity, are benefited far more. Is there any reason why they should not contribute accordingly? I think not. It may well be that the Congress, in a far less generous mood when it passed the beach-erosion acts, had established a standard which we might use for a guide. You will recall in that legislation the community to be affected is not only required in the first instance to put up 50 percent of the cost of the survey, but thereafter is required to contribute two-thirds of the cost of construction and all of the subsequent maintenance. Maybe this is not the formula, but it is perhaps a guide for our consideration of some formula which is fair to the local community and less costly to the Federal Government.

Now, just a few more scattered comments, and I am done. In many of our huge dam projects we, in the construction of the dam, flood almost as much value as we seek to protect.

I am bound to say that I am dissatisfied with the value set on the acquisition of land by the Corps of Engineers. I have hardly seen an instance where we are not paying top value, and I suspect in many cases far more than the going market value.

We are involved in relocations of bridges, highways, and railroads, which sometimes amount to as much as the new project. Presumably, this is mostly unavoidable, but when I see a highway relocated at an approximate cost of $1 million a mile, I must wonder whether some saving might not be effected.

We are negotiating claims of Indian tribes, because we violate their fishing rights and other inherent rights, all presumably resulting from treaties that, in one instance that I know of, are suggesting payments of $16 million for a comparatively small group. This may be simple justice, or it may be unjust enrichment. All I know is that one payment to one Indian tribe would take care of all the Federal money that I ever hope to see spent in New Jersey by the Federal Government for many years to come.

They are building, as you know, the most elaborate contrivances to help the salmon leap up the Columbia River, in spite of evidence that the salmon crop has not materially declined even after years of huge dam construction. I like salmon, and I certainly am not unfriendly to the salmon industry, but I am tempted to think it might be cheaper to buy all the packing plants and liquidate them, and do without this delicious fish, rather than to build ladders and other contrivances for the convenience of their homecoming.

You know that when we condemn land for building a dam, we again lease the same land for agricultural purposes, even though it is subject to the occasional flooding. That may sound like good business on the surface, but did you also know that we promptly give 75 percent of the proceeds of these leases back to the States involved for the use of local schools and other purposes. Thus we have Federal aid to education in a big way.

In Panama we pay 25 percent additional compensation to employees in the zone, apparently still on the 1900 theory that it is an undesirable place to live. In addition to that, we have been renting Government-owned houses costing $25,000 to $30,000 for a fraction of what rents would be in the States. In addition, we charge the minimum or nothing for hospital services, so that one small hospital suffers $500,000 loss annually. In addition to that, for a population of approximately 50,000 and within a maximum of 1 hour's travel distance, we have four different hospitals, one of which is about one-half filled, or less.

So I could go on, but you have my assurance that the committee is energetically working on all of these problems, and with the completion of this bill, I hope that our work will be just beginning, because the important thing is to plan an overall program which is constructive, fair, and economical.

I hope the time will come, and soon, when the drastic revision of our foreign policy and a great reduction in expenditures made in connection with it, will permit us to spend more money, not less, on works which are vital to our domestic economy. But when that day does come, we ought to be ready with a formula which will require far greater local and regional cooperation than now is required, and which will eliminate extravagant expenditures which have inevitably crept into this far-flung program.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the distin-

guished ranking minority Member and former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, have so well explained this bill that it is not necessary for me to go into too much detail.

However, I want to express my appreciation to the subcommittee chairman, my colleagues and the staff, for the courtesy and consideration which they have evidenced in the hearings; for the sincere, impartial, and objective views that they have taken in regard to the requests made; for the long hours that they have met and worked in order to meet the time schedule which was set up to bring this bill on the floor of the House.

These colleagues of mine have resolved a very difficult job.

It is hard to defer the requests of your colleagues, people with whom you have to work every day; but this committee has been deeply concerned with the high tax rate under which our citizens are laboring today and the high cost of government which made that high tax rate necessary. In presenting this bill to you, Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has kept in mind your concern about the tremendous and burdensome government costs of the day. Many worthy projects were presented to the committee, projects that are vitally needed, projects that would help commerce, projects that would affect the floodwaters that are so destructive, projects that would save beach erosion, projects that would bring power into being by harnessing that wasting power which runs down our great rivers, dredging the harbors so our ships could come in and go out, and numerous other projects in regard to the waterways. But all of them involve costs, and this committee at your request, and we believe with the backing and approval of the taxpayers of this Nation, deferred all of these projects that they conscientiously could defer without involving additional heavy costs in connection with the deferment.

I was very much surprised in making the study—this is my first year on this particular subcommittee—to find that more than 20 percent of all the bulk freight of this country moves along the inland waterways and inland rivers of this Nation—gasoline, coal, and iron ore, among other products—and because of the cheap rate involved in moving over these waterways great benefit is derived by having cheap gasoline and reasonably priced steel and coal.

You who are disappointed because you did not get the project that you were interested in, I feel sure, must agree with your subcommittee that the first concern of this great body is to defend this Nation from those lustful foreign leaders who would attempt to take over our Nation and use it for their own greedy desires, who would destroy our form of government, who would destroy the great wealth we have built up, the great progress we have made. It is because of that we ask you to cooperate with us in deferring everything that can possibly be deferred, things that we know are needed, things that would prove to be good investments but things that can be deferred in view of this major problem which is before us.

My colleagues have touched on the overall problem of developing our natural resources particularly as regards the waterways. I want to concur with them in the suggestions they have made in regard to this. The program is divided and uncoordinated; at least four of the administrative divisions of the Government have a hand in forming a program and a policy for our waterways: The Army engineers, the Interior Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission. This program needs to be coordinated; we need an overall program so that this Congress and the taxpayers of the Nation can know what this program is costing, and just what the program is, and just what will be accomplished when the program is completed. More definite planning, more detailed planning, so the proper committees of the Congress can reasonably evaluate the benefits that will be derived from these particular projects in line with the demand of the public for drastic economy until our defense expenses can be reduced. Again I plead with you to go along with the committee and defer everything that can be deferred until our international problems can be resolved and we can once again take up these worthy projects and make proper provision for the development of our natural resources. But first of all, I believe you will agree we must defend our right and our privilege and our opportunity to take care of these resources by properly taking care of our defense.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I had intended to propound a question of the gentleman from New Jersey before he finished his remarks. If I may, I will ask him a question now. Can the gentleman tell me with regard to the pay limitation for Panama Canal workers whether the investigation of the 15-percent reduction has been fully determined, and fully heard, or whether he thinks there might be some necessity for a further hearing, particularly before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which the gentleman was formerly a member.

Mr. HAND. I would say to my friend from California that so far as our subcommittee is concerned, we feel that we gave the problem a great deal of careful attention. I may say further that, of course, we recognize it is a legislative problem. I am not aware of any other general hearings that have been held on the overall subject, either with respect to Panama or other foreign services and, speaking for myself, I would be delighted to see the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries give further consideration to the problem. I am satisfied there ought to be a reduction, but it certainly would not hurt to give the whole problem further legislative study in addition to the attention that we gave it. Does that answer your question?

Mr. ALLEN of California. It does.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of this House, I want to say that it has been a real pleasure for me to serve on this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. I was very delighted to realize that here is a place where there is very little partisanship. These projects have been looked at from a nonpartisan point of view and have been weighed solely on their merits and without any political considerations.

I have also found that being a member of this particular subcommittee is a great opportunity to make no friends and influence no people. I have no illusions I will do so this afternoon because all of us have these particular pet projects and the great majority of them are very, very worthy projects.

We listened to the testimony of the Corps of Engineers and we had people who were interested in their particular projects from all over the United States take up their time and pay their own money to come here and tell us of the particular problems in their own areas. As I say, we have had projects brought before us which are worthy and which have a great deal of merit.

However, there is a limitation as far as the United States Government is concerned as to how far it can go in this particular field or, as far as that is concerned, in any other field. I may say that in these particular hearings we have heard various people throughout the United States and I have never heard a group that has been more interested in economy, but it has always been false economy to touch their particular project. I came to this Congress as an advocate of economy, but I am no longer for economy; I am for false economy. I think we are going to have to be that way or we will not remain solvent. As a matter of fact, I do not believe we are solvent at the present time.

I believe before this bill is passed that we are going to hear a great many arguments for particular projects on the point of view that we are spending a great many billions of dollars in foreign aid; we are spending money here for projects throughout the whole world, so why can we not spend a little bit of it at home. I believe there is a good deal of merit in that argument, and I think we ought to do something about the foreign-aid proposition to a degree, because as far as I am concerned, two wrongs will never make a right.

In the hearings before the committee the matter of local participation was brought out. That is something that ought to be explored, because on many of these projects, when it comes right down to it, the question of whether or not the individual in the area is concerned in putting up his own money or a portion of his own money is the true test as to the worthiness of a particular project. In many areas where that test is made the requirement of money is not forthcoming, and therefore the merits of the project as determined by the people who will benefit by it are sometimes questionable. We have also the

question or problem about harbors throughout the United States, as well as the depth of harbors, and certainly we have many worthy projects along those lines, many of which have been brought before this particular committee. But, you know our shipping interests are building larger boats and they are building boats which will carry much greater tonnage and therefore draw more water, and I think something in the years to come is going to have to be done along those lines so that there can be adequate coordination, because we realize that this vital industry is involved in this particular field.

Then, of course, we have the projects of these great dams in the West and in the Northwest many of which are built primarily for power and secondary for flood control. I think this is an area in which there can be a great deal of study made because as far as I am concerned personally I am not much of a public power man. I believe that there probably are areas where the Federal Government can be involved in the production of power but the distribution of power, and some of the other areas involved ought to be studied with a great deal of consideration. I think this is the time when a great number of the Members of the House are going to have to stand up and be counted in these matters of economy. As I say, you certainly cannot blame the Members of the House for doing what they can for the particular districts from which they come in regard to their projects, but there is going to have to be a tightening of the belt, and we will have to tighten it all the way around so far as I can see. Maybe I should not be too happy about this, but nevertheless we, in the State of Michigan, are great contributors to the Federal Treasury, yet I dare you to find one cent, other than for maintenance and operation of particular projects in Michigan, for our State. There is not one cent in this bill for our particular State, and we have needs there as well as there are needs anywhere else. But, so far as I am concerned we are able to take our cut and I hope you gentlemen will go along with us on this bill because it is a good bill. I could not hope to match the eloquence of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in his plea to the House today as far as giving prime consideration to the fiscal condition of our great country, because if we lose our own particular way of life by going bankrupt, and we can, then all of these projects will mean very little. So, let us give consideration to these things and do what we can for this particular bill. I know that in many instances it is going to be a little hard because we have particular projects involved. I want to say again it has been a pleasure for me to be a member of this committee and to have a part in this particular bill.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members this afternoon a project for which an appropriation is not included in the bill now under consideration. This project is the proposed Warrior lock and dam which, when built, will be an important link in the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway, and will be located in the Sixth District of Alabama which I have the privilege of representing.

In the original budget estimates for the fiscal year 1954, funds amounting to $1,900,000 were included for construction on the Warrior lock and dam. However, this sum was eliminated in the revised budget estimates and was not restored by the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

According to the information I have been given by the Corps of Engineers, any appreciable delay in the construction of this dam to replace the now dilapidated locks 8 and 9 could result in a complete stoppage of navigation along the Warrior River for a period of months. If such a stoppage should occur, it would not only cause a serious setback in trade and commerce on this waterway, but the present movement of critical materials along the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway to and from the great steel producing center of Birmingham could be seriously impeded.

The building of the Warrior lock and dam would further eliminate multiple lockages now required by this waterway, and would thereby reduce considerably the time of travel. This would, of course, speed up all water movements, including that of critical defense materials. At the same time, it would bring about a significant saving in transportation costs.

The construction of this proposed Warrior lock and dam would save annually an estimated $157,363 in operating costs alone by the elimination of antiquated locks 8 and 9. I received a report on the 28th of April of this year from the Corps of Engineers, stating the present condition of locks 8 and 9. In this report they state:

The present condition of lock 9 is considered very critical. The lock was unwatered during the low-water season of 1951 for emergency repairs to the lock flood to cut down on leakage. To accompliah this unwatering, it was necessary to pump a hydraulic fill completely around the river wall and across the upper and lower ends of the lock. Even with this hydraulic fill in place, unwatering was difficult. It was found that the entire river wall and the lock floor had been undermined to a depth of 3 to 4 feet, leaving the river wall supported only on the original timber piling. The wood sheet piling surrounding the river wall is in poor condition and in some locations missing entirely. While the river wall has not settled appreciably, it moves excessively when rubbed or struck by tows entering or leaving the lock.

The timber crib dam at lock 9 settled from 0.2 to 0.5 feet over a 75-foot section during the high-water season of 1949–50 after being rubbed by a tow attempting to navigate over the dam. Inspection during the next low-water season revealed that the crest timbers have moved downstream and the original crib section of the dam is crushed. In general, the wood cribbing of this dam is from 33 to 50 percent wasted away due to deterioration.

Due to the above-described very poor condition of the entire structure at lock 9, it is not believed practicable to repair it sufficiently to insure a 10-year additional useful life. Any attempt to rehabilitate the lock would at least require replacement of the river wall and would require closure of the river to traffic for a period of about 1 year.

At lock 8 the structure is similar to lock 9, but apparently in somewhat better condition. The dam is in fair condition and has been recently faced with steel sheets on the upstream side. Subsequently, a leak has developed in a 50-foot section which would need facing with steel sheet piling. Except for the upstream sheathing, no part of the original crib dam was replaced. The lock being the same age and similar in construction as at lock 9, it is believed that the same undermining exists but not as critical as at lock 9. The river wall of the lock does not move excessively when rubbed or struck by tows. There is at least 1 known hole under the land wall near the lower valves which is about 6 feet deep. In general, the leakage at this lock is such that for unwatering a hydraulic fill has to be pumped around the lower end of the river wall from the dam downstream and across the lower end of the lock.

It is believed that this structure could be made reasonably safe for 10 years by repairing the leaking 50-foot section of the dam and repairing and reinforcing the lock by coffering it off, breaking out the lock floor and placing steel sheet piling around the entire river wall, placing an additional row of piling along the inside of the river wall, and pumping concrete back under the wall and pouring a new toe to the wall to rest on the additional row of piling. Steel sheet piling would also be placed along the inside edge of the land wall as determined to be necessary from inspection. It is estimated that this repair would necessitate closing the lock to traffic for a period of 4 months.

In summary, it is believed that to maintain navigation for 10 years over the Warrior River from the Demopolis pool to Tuscaloosa lock and dam, it will be necessary to either build the Warrior lock and dam or to replace lock and dam 9 with a new structure and rehabilitation lock and dam 8 as described above with a 4-month closure of the waterway.

The approximate cost of rebuilding lock No. 9 to present dimensions is an estimated $5,900,000. Although the Engineers report that lock 8 could be repaired the cost of repair is an estimated $750,000. In order to make the necessary repairs on lock 8, traffic interruption for 4 months during the repairing of this lock is estimated to have a worth of $348,000. Therefore, in order to replace lock 9 and repair lock 8, it will be necessary to spend $6½ million in the near future if the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers are followed. Under such a plan, the major benefits attributable to modernization and reduction of lockages would not be realized.

The cost of building the Warrior lock and dam, a modern structure 110 feet by 600 feet with a maximum lift of 22 feet, is estimated at $19 million. From a long range point of view, it is my opinion that it would be much better to begin construction on the proposed Warrior lock and dam than to incur the tremendous expense of repairing and rebuilding the old locks and dams. At the same time, in constructing the Warrior lock and dam, we will be continuing the program of development already approved by the Congress for the development of the Warrior-Tombigbee River systems.

I presented most of this information to the Civil Functions Subcommittee on May 13, 1953. I feel sure the members of the subcommittee considered my report

carefully, and, if so, must realize not only the merit of this project but the urgency of beginning construction at the earliest possible date.

I understand the necessity of postponing many worthwhile projects while this country is attempting to arm the free world and at the same time stabilize our dollar. I have been assured by several members of the subcommittee that no appropriation has been made in the bill under consideration for new construction and that the Warrior lock and dam has been eliminated on that basis. Under the circumstances, I cannot at this time expect special consideration for this particular project if others are receiving the same treatment. Yet, I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to point out the reasons for the urgency of constructing the Warrior lock and dam. I sincerely hope the condition of our budget may soon be such that both the committee and the House can favorably reconsider this project and that no serious emergency arises on this waterway in the meantime.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss with the Members a project which is not in this bill and which ought to be in this bill. I base my argument that it ought to be in this bill not on the contention that my district should have consideration because of projects in some other district, not on the contention that we ought to appropriate funds for domestic activities because we are spending money all over the world. I base my argument to support this project on good, sound, common sense from a fiscal standpoint because it will save money for all the taxpayers of this Nation. It is a project that involves the expenditure of $7,772,000. It is a project for which we need this year $4,500,000. It is a project that will take from 18 months to 2 years to complete. It is a project that has been under study and planning for approximately 10 years. It was authorized I think, in the 79th Congress before I was elected. The Craney Island Disposal Basin would serve directly the constituents of three Virginia Congressional Districts. It will serve directly or indirectly every citizen of the Nation because of its essentiality to the Navy.

This is a project to provide a disposal area for material dredged from the Hampton Roads Harbor and its tributaries. Last year I offered an amendment to the bill pending then, because at that time it was estimated that the situation would become critical in about 18 months to 2 years from then. I was unsuccessful at that time. I think we made a mistake in not approving it then. We should have provided the funds last year, but it is urgent that we provide them now.

I would like to describe to the Members just exactly what has occurred and what the situation is now that confronts us. Heretofore we had some deep holes in the Hampton Roads Harbor. We had some holes as deep as 90 feet, and the materials dredged in the maintenance of our channels and piers and in the elimination of shoals in the harbor, was dumped into these deep holes. It was thought at that time that the natural currents might carry that material out to sea. But you know, the currents on the bottom of the ocean and the bottom of the harbor are pretty hard to predict. Those holes are now filled up.

Last year when I appeared before the committee the District Engineer had estimated that those holes would be filled up in 18 months to 2 years. In February of this year orders were issued that no additional permits would be granted for the dumping of material in these holes in our harbor. Already the elevation of the mud which has been put in the harbor has reached a point where there can be no further material dumped there.

We are running into another situation in connection with that. In certain areas where there has been an accumulation of the silt that has been dumped the currents are taking that back into the harbor and depositing it again around our piers. It is causing some shoaling, and we are handling some of the same material over and over again.

We have reached a critical condition now where we must provide a basin to dump this material in. The alternative is to haul this material out to sea some 40 miles beyond the capes. You can appreciate the cost which this entails.

Let us take a look at what the cost situation is. I believe the Army engineers estimated the cost of this project at $7,772,000. They have provided me some figures on the amount of material that has to be removed annually to maintain our harbor, our channels, and our naval facilities there. It is estimated that 3,820,000 cubic yards of material will have to be dredged annually for the Government alone. There is another 480,000 cubic yards that will have to be dredged for the maintenance of private installations. The cost of handling 3 million yards of material removed, if this facility is built, will be at the rate of 13 cents a cubic yard. The cost of carrying the materials to sea is about 60 cents a cubic yard or a difference of 47 cents a cubic yard. For the remaining 500,000 cubic yards that have to be removed by scows annually, the difference is some 76 cents a cubic yard between the cost of pumping it into the basin and the cost of hauling it to sea. Applying simple arithmetic, the amount of money we will have to appropriate annually for the removal of only that amount which must be removed to maintain the Government activity will be an additional appropriation of $2,020,000.

Private interests would use this facility also. They would be charged a toll of 35 cents a cubic yard to amortize the facility in addition to the 13 cents of estimated operating cost. That would give another $168,000. So unless we build this facility at a cost of $7,772,000, we are going to spend annually for maintenance work an additional $2 million of taxpayers money.

Most of the projects included in this bill are justified on the basis of the benefits which would accrue to the local community. The Craney Island disposal basin was originally justified on a similar basis, but now I can point out to you that it would be self-liquidating in savings of appropriated funds in less than 4 years. This project during its useful life will save the taxpayers many times its cost of construction. This is a type of project which, in the interest of good fiscal policy, should be built as quickly as possible, and it ought to have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget before now.

I have talked to the committee about this, and at the time the Under Secretary of the Army, Mr. Johnson, appeared before the subcommittee he mentioned this project and indicated his expectation that Budget Bureau approval would be forthcoming. His testimony is found on page 202 of the hearings.

It is understandable that this project was not included in the budget recommendations submitted by President Truman, or in the revised budget recommendations submitted originally by President Eisenhower. At the time these budgets were drawn material dredged in the Hampton Roads area was still being dumped in the holes in the harbor. But as I have pointed out, the situation became critical in February when the district engineer found it necessary to discontinue dumping permits. It was then that I sought to have a supplemental budget request submitted in time for consideration of the project by the Appropriations Committee.

I believe that generally speaking the policy of the present administration to deny approval for starting a new project which is not urgently needed in the interest of national defense is a sound policy. Prior to last February the Craney Island disposal basin was not urgently needed in the interest of national defense, because we still had a place to dump the dredged material. But now that is all changed. In the latter part of February, Rear Adm. I. N. Kiland, commandant of the Fifth Naval District, recommended to the Navy Department that this facility be constructed immediately in the interest of national defense. In a letter dated February 26, addressed to Mr. H. M. Thompson, executive vice president, Hampton Roads Maritime Association, Admiral Kiland had this to say: "The construction of a disposal area for dredged material north of Craney Island in Hampton Roads is primarily a project to be sponsored by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army. The dredging of the navigational channels in the harbor and the maintenance of both Federally owned and private waterfront areas is a perpetual requirement which annually involves large expenditures of funds. The present disposal area in the vicinity of Forth Wool and elsewhere nearby in the Hampton Roads Harbor will soon reach capacity for filling and it will be necessary to haul future dredged material out to sea at considerable additional expense. The proposed disposal area north of Craney Island is considered to be a sound and economical project, which can, in my opinion, be justified as an urgent defense requirement. I am accordingly recommending to the Navy Department that it strongly support such action as the Chief of Engineers may take to secure the necessary funds for undertaking this work."

I subsequently learned that the Chief of Naval Operations had strongly recommended the construction of this facility to the Secretary of the Army, and that likewise the Secretary of the Army had submitted the project to the Bureau of the Budget.

In view of all of this, and in view of Under Secretary Johnson's statement to the Appropriations Committee, I had thought that this proposal was in line for favorable action by the Bureau of the Budget, and that it would conform to its criteria. Last week I learned that the Bureau proposed to disapprove of this item, so I requested an appointment with Mr. Dodge. I am grateful to him for giving me an opportunity to present to Mr. Hughes certain aspects of the matter which I believe have not previously been properly presented. We had a very frank and comprehensive discussion of the matter with Mr. Hughes. Mr. Hughes agreed to take it under advisement, and I hope that approval will eventually be forthcoming. But funds ought to be included in this bill. To defer action will entail the additional annual expense of about $2,000,000, and may also involve additional costs in construction and in the necessary land acquisition.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out a few other aspects in connection with this matter. I am particularly interested in it from a standpoint of national defense. If war should come it would be particularly difficult to maintain the harbor and channel depths necessary.

We cannot continue to carry this material to sea because then we could not afford to send our dredges outside of the submarine nets which are run across the Capes. Therefore, in the event of war we will find ourselves in a position of dredging this material and dumping it somewhere else inside the harbor area hoping to goodness it is not quickly washed back into the channel.

Adequate harbor, anchorage, and channel depth must be maintained. Let us not forget the tremendous Naval activities concentrated at Hampton Roads where we have the Fifth Naval District Headquarters, the great Norfolk Naval Base, the naval shipyard, the air station, the amphibious training station, the supply center, the hospital, the Marine Corps forwarding depot, and a number of other naval, marine, Army, and Air Force installations. Remember also that here is located the Hampton Roads port of embarkation and in time of war tremendous convoys of troops and supplies, as well as combatant vessels would be continuously using Hampton Roads. We cannot gamble with the facilities necessary for the satisfactory operation of so vital a part of our total defense establishment. A $4½ million appropriation at this time is a cheap insurance. These funds ought to be provided now, and I personally feel that we ought not to defer another month steps to bring this project to the quickest possible realization.

Mr. Chairman, I have not dwelt upon the commercial value of this project because I have felt that these other factors of national defense and of fiscal savings are paramount at this time. I could have told you about the tremendous volume of shipping that is handled in the Port of Hampton Roads and referred to some recent statistics for emphasis. Suffice it to remind you that in 1 recent year, I believe it was 1951, more than 55 million tons of waterborne commerce was handled through this port, and during the same year nearly 7,000 ocean-going vessels arrived and sailed to and from Hampton Roads.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot overemphasize the need for action on this matter now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, there are a great many Members here interested in this bill who would like to have some time to discuss it, but since the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is my next-door neighbor and I understand what he is going to say, I will not make objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. I know the interest he has in the matter I am going to discuss. I recognize the importance of the bill under discussion this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, the entire Nation is deeply concerned over drastic cuts in appropriations for national defense—to the extent that it is about time this Congress begins to concern itself and to ponder the question whether we can attain greater military strength, through weakness, as some administration officials would have us believe.

Are we approaching the defense budget for fiscal year 1954 with a dollar limit in mind, or are we thinking primarily of a safe, adequate program to provide for our national defense? Are we giving any thought to what the enemy can do to us? In my opinion Secretary of Defense Wilson has yet to give real assurance to the American people that defense was the primary objective in the slashing of the budget for the Military Establishment.

There is serious doubt existing as to the manner in which our budgeting for national defense for fiscal year 1954 has been established—whether it is coming from civilian level alone or whether our military leaders are being consulted.

At the conclusion of my remarks I will include a letter from the Director of the Budget to the Secretary of Defense, which is worthy of attention of the House. It gives rise to the question whether the advice of our Joint Chiefs of Staff has been followed. As far as I know the Joint Chiefs have not changed their strategic estimates, and if they have not then the proposed cuts in naval aviation and in the Air Force are not safe. They represent a dangerously high price to pay for so-called economy. They represent an invitation for an enemy to attack.

The letter gives rise to another question: Is Secretary Wilson, himself, in full accord with the proposed cuts? What were Secretary Wilson's recommendations to the Director of the Budget? Were his suggested cuts as drastic as the figures forced upon the Defense Establishment by the Bureau of the Budget?

Congress and the people should know the answers to these questions.

Budget Director Dodge's letter is arbitrary. It applies the discredited meat-ax technique to the defense of the Nation.

In view of this letter, I believe it is not out of place to ask: Who is Secretary of Defense?

Is it to be the Director of the Budget?

Are we to plan our defense and defense of future generations on the recommendations of accountants, adding machines and comptometers rather than on the recommendations of men who have spent their entire adult careers in the study of military problems?

Are we willing to trust our defense to a battery of accounting machines rather than to an adequate Air Force?

President Eisenhower himself has said many times that Russia recognizes only strength. Yet his administration leaders cut our defense budget even in the light of the President's own remarks in his first fireside chat with the people of the Nation in which he said:

> There has been, to this moment, no reason to believe that Soviet policy has changed its frequently announced hope and purpose—the destruction of freedom everywhere. There is, therefore, no reason for the free nations to alter their course: to hope and work for the best, to arm and be ready for the worst.

Have we suddenly found out from some mysterious source that Russia can be cowered by penny-pinching so-called efficiency better than it can be by an Air Force which is equipped to deliver the atomic bomb at any designated target in the world?

England found out that a balanced budget would not protect it from Hitler's Luftwaffe when it was fighting the Battle of Britain.

Today the people of the United States in cooperation with the people of the other free nations are engaged in a life and death struggle against communism. The most obvious battlefront in this struggle is Korea. We must not forget, however, that the Communists look on Korea as only one part of the larger war which they are waging by political and economic as well as military means. We would do well to remember Lenin's words when he talked of peaceful agreements:

> The concessions which we grant * * * are the continuation of war in another form. * * * This agreement is equivalent to war.

Today I want to talk about only one part of that war—the military part. Without in any way minimizing the importance of the Korean battlefront, I want to talk about the larger problem today of creating adequate military power—military power which will make the Soviets less likely to start a total military war—military power which will defeat them if they do.

The issue of adequate national security is the most crucial one facing us

today. All of us should take heed of the statesman who warned: "War is too important to be left to the generals." I think that war is also too important a matter to be left to the businessmen.

The business of national security is a matter which concerns all of us. In a democratic country such as ours it is a matter which must be decided by the people. Before World War II, perhaps it was all right for us to sit back and leave problems of military security to the military and political planners. Even during World War II, our homes and factories were never threatened by the enemy.

But let us look at the facts today. Today the Soviets themselves are reported to have an army of more than 3 million men organized into over 175 divisions. Added to this are the armies of the Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe and Asia. Altogether the Communist military forces probably number between 8 and 11 million men in uniform.

We have always thought of the Communists as having tremendous manpower resources. Now, the Soviet Union has become an important naval as well as military power. Undoubtedly, the most important feature of her naval strength is her submarine force. Authoritative sources indicate that she has at least 350, and probably has more than 370, submarines. This is a larger, much more modern submarine force than the German force of World War II, which attacked our shipping with such deadly effectiveness. Some sources indicate that this force will be increased to 750 by 1955.

Even more important, however, in terms of the safety of our own homes and factories, is the fact that the Soviet Union has the most powerful air force in the world today. The Red Air Force has more than 20,000 aircraft assigned to combat-type units. This represents twice the number of our Air Force, our naval air arm, and Marine air combined. Furthermore, the Soviets have an additional 20,000 aircraft in reserve. During World War II, the Red Air Force put most emphasis on air support of ground units, and it had virtually no strategic air. Today, however, the Soviets have about 1,000 long-range bombers capable of hitting most of the vital areas of the United States.

Most important, the Soviets have had the atomic bomb since the fall of 1949. The explosion of the Soviet A-bomb in 1949, nearly 3 years ahead of our previous estimates, together with the increasing size of their strategic bombing force, obviously called for a new look at our basic military strategy. It takes time to develop plans just as it takes time to build the weapons to put those plans into effect. Thus, there is a planning lead time as well as a production lead time.

In the spring of 1951, a new basic military strategy was approved which took into account the new military capabilities of the Soviet Union. In late 1951, more than a year after the Soviet A-bomb explosion, new force levels were approved.

The levels approved by the President called for an Army of 21 divisions, a Navy of 408 combat ships, and an Air Force of 143 wings. These goals were to be reached by June 30, 1955.

Today we have an Army of 20 divisions, a Navy of 408 combat ships and an Air Force of only 106 wings. It is important to note that the Air Force is much farther from its goal, because it started to build up from a much lower level than the other two services.

This, then, brings us up to date, except for one point. The administration has just presented the Congress with a defense budget which drastically cuts down the military forces originally planned.

The new budget does recommend an increase in Army appropriations of $1.6 billion over the previous budget for fiscal year 1954. However, the new budget provides for the advance financing of combat consumption of supplies and equipment in Korea, which was not included in the old budget. Thus, since it is reasonable to assume that the hostilities in Korea will cost the Army more than $1.6 billion, the new budget represents an actual cut from the previous recommendation. Furthermore, the Army is to be limited to its present strength of 20 divisions instead of being allowed to activate and equip 1 additional division originally planned for. The budget further provides that the Army's present strength will be reduced by about 80,000 men by June 30 next year.

The new budget for the Navy requires a reduction of $1.7 billion from the previously recommended appropriation of $11.4 billion. Almost half of this cut will be felt in the construction of aircraft and related procurement. By June 30, 1954, the Navy personnel will be cut about 55,000 from its present strength of about 800,000. The budget calls for a cut in the Marine Corps of about 15,000. For both the Army and the Navy the budget calls for further reductions in civilian personnel in addition to those which have already taken place in the last few months.

As I have stated, more than half of the Navy budget cut comes in aircraft and related procurement. This cut amounts to $834,134,000. In talking later about the cut in Air Force procurement, I want the Congress to bear in mind that this figure adds almost a billion dollars to curtailment in aircraft production for our Armed Forces. Taken along with the slash in the Air Force budget, it adds to the seriousness of the threat to United States air supremacy. And, add to this another $85 million for aircraft and facilities in the Navy program, so that there is a total cut of $919,134,000 in naval aviation.

I am also alarmed over the reduction in appropriations in research and development. The program in the Department of the Army will take a reduction of $105 million, in the Navy of $6,352,000, and in the Air Force of $62 million, a total reduction of $173,352,000 in this very important field.

In talking of these reductions, we must also consider that they are the suggestions and recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and that they are subject to review by appropriations committees in Congress. I am sincerely hopeful that these congressional committees will not make further reductions on expenditures for our national security.

Serious as these reductions are for the Army and Navy, it is the Air Force which will be the hardest hit. Air Force appropriations are to be cut over $5 billion. The bulk of this decrease is to be felt in two categories, aircraft and related procurement and maintenance and operation appropriations. In addition to cutting down on the new money to be appropriated, the budget limits the amount of money which the Air Force can spend during the next year out of money previously appropriated.

It has been pointed out that the Air Force has a lot of money on hand, which it has not yet spent. Apparently, this is supposed to mean that the Air Force does not need more money until it spends what it already has. Two points refute this appealing but false logic.

First, the limit on spending for next year means that the Air Force will not be permitted to spend all this money even if it wanted to. In effect, the budget says: Since the Air Force has not spent $28 billion of that which it now has, we will only provide $12 billion more. Thus, it will have $40 billion to spend next year, which is more money than it had a year ago. Then comes the joker. The budget turns right around and says although the Air Force has $40 billion, it can only spend $15 billion next year.

Second, is the fact that almost all of the unspent money has already been earmarked. The Air Force has already made contracts for most of the money obligating the Government to make payments when the contracts are filled. Since it still takes anywhere from 16 to 27 months to build an airplane, depending on the type, it is obvious that the Air Force will always have money at the end of the year. But this represents money to pay for aircraft which have been ordered but not yet delivered. Thus the limit on spending means that aircraft which have been ordered for delivery next year will have to be delivered at a later date, or the orders canceled.

On the one hand, it will obviously cost the Government money to change or cancel these contracts. On the other hand, it means that the Air Force will receive fewer aircraft next year than planned. I fail to see, therefore, that such an action can be described as businesslike or as the strengthening of our planned Air Force.

The reduction in appropriations, together with the limit on spending, means the complete abandonment of the 143-wing strength. Instead, the Air Force's goal has now been reduced to only 120 wings, and this strength is not to be reached until 1956, instead of 1955.

It is, of course, difficult for anyone, even a military man, to know just what the proper strength is to meet the threats posed by our enemies. It is particularly difficult when we talk in terms of ships or divisions or wings to know just what those units mean in terms of strength. We know, of course, that a wing is the smallest effective combat unit which contains within its own organization the means to support it directly in combat. And we know that the number of

aircraft in a wing varies from 75 for a fighter wing to 30 for a bomb wing. But it is impossible for the average man to know whether we need 140 wings or 143 wings or 155 wings.

In talking about Air Force strengths, however, it is important to remember how they were arrived at. Thus, the 143-wing strength which was approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff was based on the best military estimate of the capabilitites of the Soviet Union and her satellites. Every wing in that force was justified on the basis of specific tasks which would have to be performed immediately in the event of all-out war.

Thus, 57 strategic wings were authorized in order to be able to destroy the Soviet atomic capabilities, her war-sustaining resources, and to support Western Europe in the event of war with the Soviet Union. Twenty-nine air defense wings were authorized as a defense against the Soviet's offensive air capabilities. Forty combat tactical wings were authorized to support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Far East, and the necessary bases in the United States for rotation and training. Seventeen troop carrier wings were authorized to support the Army.

The requirement for the strategic wings was based on the quantity and quality of the Soviet air defense which would have to be penetrated in order to direct a successful atomic attack against the Soviet Union in case of war. The requirement for air defense wings was based on providing the means to defend our vital areas. The Air Force recognized that this force was submarginal in strength. The requirement for tactical wings was based on specific national commitments to NATO, and on a minimum force for the defense of Japan and Okinawa.

The Air Force supported the total goal of 143 wings last year as the absolute minimum which would be required to attain a reasonable degree of security in view of Soviet capabilities.

This strength was in itself less than the Air Force thought was desired. Now we find that this force which was established as the minimum force needed by 1954 is not to be reached even by 1956.

In the presentation of this budget to the Congress, it was pointed out that the administration plans to take a new look at the entire defense picture. I would certainly be the first to agree that we should take a new look at the defense picture. We should see if there have been changes in the strategic situation which would require basic changes in our national military policy. It seems strange, however, to make arbitrary cuts before we have taken the new look.

Apparently, we are supposed to be reassured by the statement that "Once the program is well underway and a reasonable level of production is underway, there is a somewhat lesser requirement for advance financing to provide for lead times."

Lead time counts the time from the release of funds by the Secretary of Defense to the Air Force for a reorder contract until the delivery of the first plane under the contract. Unquestionably, the lead times for the production of our older aircraft which have been in production for some time has been reduced. I understand, however, that the lead time for the newer models of the F–86 is still from 16 to 20 months and that the lead time for the newest fighter, the F–102, is estimated at 25 months. The lead time for our new intercontinental jet bomber, the B–52, is estimated at 27 months. In each case an additional 12 months must be added to count the time until the last plane is delivered under a reorder contract.

On the one hand, the budget presentation points out that there is no indication that the threat and danger to the free world has appreciably lessened. Then we hear that the budget is to be cut, although the danger is still the same. Finally, we are told not to worry about it too much because the whole matter will be reviewed next summer and fall. I think it is time to call a halt to such goings on and put first things first.

In considering the problems of military security, we must not lose sight of the importance of the time element. Plans for an effective strength tomorrow do no good if we are called upon to use that strength today. We must not lose sight of the lead time that is required for planning. It took us more than a year between the time that the Soviet A-bomb exploded and the time that force levels necessary to meet this new threat were decided upon. Thus, if the Joint Chiefs of Staff take a new look at the strategic situation this summer and fall, it will probably be late this year, if not the middle of next year, before a new strategy can be formulated. This means that if the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree that the military threat has not lessened, and that a 143-wing strength is necessary, its achievement will be delayed by at least 6 months, if not by more than a year.

We have been assured, however, that the new budget will give us a bigger and better Air Force next year than would have been possible under the old budget. We are told that the 110 wings which we will have next year will be better than the 133 wings which we would have had next year. If such a miracle were possible, I would be all for it; but I cannot see how it can be done. First of all, the limitation on expenditures means that equipment which has already been contracted for will have to be delayed or canceled. I understand that the limitations are such that reductions in equipping standards will be necessary, even in the reduced force.

It is true that the new appropriations for next year will provide for equipment which will be delivered primarily 2 years from now. However, the reduction in funds for buying aircraft will affect deliveries next year and the year after, as well as in fiscal year 1956. To offset the drastic impact which this cut would have on the industry, the Air Force must reprogram aircraft already planned for deliveries next year and the year after until 2 years from now. If the aircraft were not reprogramed over the 3-year term, there would be a great danger that much of the aircraft industry would be cut to the point that they would not be able to fill later aircraft orders.

The Air Force will also be hard hit by the limitations on their manpower. Originally, Air Force planners figured that they would need 1,700,000 men to man an Air Force of 143 wings. By using stringent manpower controls and by cutting down on the provision for reserve crews to take care of combat attrition, the Air Force was able to reduce this strength by almost half a million men. On this reduced basis, the Air Force indicated that it would be able to achieve its present strength of 106 wings with 1,016,800 men. At the present time, however, the actual strength of the Air Force is some 30,000 less than that level. Now we find that the Air Force is to be cut down an additional 20,000 men at the same time its strength is to be increased by 4 wings. The following year the Air Force is expected to stay at this reduced strength and add an additional 5 wings. While it may be possible for the Air Force to reach and maintain a strength of 115 wings with only 960,000 men, it will be impossible to reach the new goal of 120 wings without more men.

To cut down from 143 to 120 wings it has been reported that the Air Force will cut out 5 strategic wings and 18 wings planned for Army support. On the one hand, the cut in strategic wings would appear to lower the effectiveness of our Strategic Air Command as a deterrent to war. On the other, the decrease of about a third in the planned air support for the Army would seem to mean that the Army cannot hope to count on the air superiority it has always enjoyed in the past.

Now I certainly do not think that we should cut the strength of our small Army any further, but it does not seem logical to reduce the Army's divisions by 5 percent at the same time the air support of the Army is to be cut some 30 percent. The only logical step is to insist that the Air Force be given enough money so that it can adequately support the Army as well as carry out its strategic and defensive missions.

The forced decrease in our tactical air support strength seems especially strange in light of General Ridgway's recent testimony. General Ridgway, who replaced General Eisenhower in Europe, was testifying before Congress on the mutual security program. He stated:

> Today, as a year ago, airpower is still the weakest link in our defense. Despite the substantial gains in numbers of aircraft and trained pilots deriving from the United States mutual defense assistance program, our air forces today are still inadequate to carry out their assigned tasks.

Apparently we are expected to ignore the General's remarks.

Apparently we are expected to accept at face value the statement that the new budget "plan calls for achieving as much airpower as possible within the limits of available resources." I for one, however, cannot believe that our American aircraft industry is incapable of producing for an Air Force of 133 or 143 wings. If this statement really means that we will get as much airpower as possible out of the money to be appropriated, it is of course quite understandable. I am sure that the armed services can be further improved by the further application of business methods to their operations. If, however, the statement

is supposed to mean that the people of the United States are unwilling to make available an additional $5 billion next year toward the creation of an Air Force to meet the minimum needs of national security, then the statement cannot be accepted.

I would like to point out an article published by four professors of the Harvard Business School in the Harvard Business Review in 1951. At that time they stated that the resources of the United States could support an Armed Force of 6 million men and yearly expenditures of $84 billion for as long a time as necessary without serious impairment of the civilian economy. Yet today we are told that after 2 years the people of the United States cannot make sufficient resources available for a sum less than half that amount.

It seems to me that the new budget underestimates the intelligence and the willingness of the American people to make sacrifices if those sacrifices are necessary. Three recent polls give an indication of how the American people feel about a 143-wing Air Force, and military security.

A recent Gallup poll showed that 74 percent of the American people would be opposed to any reduction in our Armed Forces, even if there is a truce in the Korean fighting.

My friend and Democratic colleague, Hon. E. C. GATHINGS, recently conducted a poll in the First Congressional District of Arkansas. He found that 85.5 percent were opposed to a reduction in defense spending which would delay the planned 143-wing Air Force, as well as the development of the atomic-energy program.

On the other side of the aisle, my distinguished Republican colleague, Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, conducted a poll in the First Congressional District of Iowa. He found that over 57 percent were opposed to cutting down the budget for defense and military spending. He found that 83 percent were opposed to a reduction in defense spending which might delay realization of the planned 143-wing Air Force.

In matters of such grave concern as national security, the people have a right to know certain basic facts. They are not interested in the technical military details, whose release would help the enemy military leaders. They do have a right to the basic truth without distortion. If the facts are presented instead of specious arguments used to justify arbitrary cuts in the interests of false economy, the American people will make the right choice. Our leaders have been chosen by a free people in free elections. Our leaders must not now put false economy ahead of freedom.

The letter from Budget Director Dodge and his revision of defense funds which I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C. May 7, 1953.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The report on your review of the 1954 budget estimates for your agency has been received and carefully considered in relation to the administration's stated policies and budget objectives.

To meet these objectives the revisions in appropriations set forth in summary below and in detail in the enclosures will be necessary. You are expected to adjust your recommendations accordingly and present these revisions to the Appropriations Committees.

Summary of revisions for fiscal year 1954

	Amount in 1954 budget	Revised amount	Difference (+) or (−)
Office of the Secretary of Defense and departmentwide	$1,030,975,000	$1,029,625,000	−$1,350,000
Department of the Army	12,109,391,000	13,671,000,000	+1,561,409,000
Department of the Navy	11,367,882,000	9,650,695,000	−1,717,187,000
Department of the Air Force	16,778,000,000	11,688,000,000	−5,090,000,000
Total new obligational authority	41,286,448,000	36,039,320,000	−5,247,128,000
Cash to liquidate prior-year contract authority	131,968,000	131,968,000	0
Total appropriation	41,418,416,000	36,171,288,000	−5,247,128,000

The accomplishment of these budget objectives will require that you reexamine your programs, their components, and the priorities related to them, and reschedule your operations so that budget expenditures for the military functions of your agency will be held to a level of about $43.2 billion in fiscal year 1954.

Your attention is particularly called to the fact that these determinations relate to appropriation and expenditure levels that do not take effect until July 1, 1953, about 2 months in the future; also that the expenditure level applies to the 12 months following July 1, 1953. Thus, there is a period of almost 14 months in which to accomplish an adjustment to the given level of expenditure. To avoid a need to reach the average by moving from a point above it to one below it at the end of the period, action should be taken as promptly as possible before July 1, 1953, to approach the expenditure level established for the ensuing year.

Also, you are reminded that action on the fiscal year 1954 level of expenditures should be related to the budget objectives for fiscal year 1955.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. DODGE, *Director.*

Revisions in appropriations, fiscal year 1954

Appropriation title	Amount in 1954 budget	Revised amount	Difference, increase (+) or decrease (−)
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENTWIDE			
Salaries and expenses	$13,900,000	$12,800,000	−$1,100,000
Claims	6,000,000	6,000,000	0
Retired pay	375,000,000	375,000,000	0
Contingencies	75,000,000	75,000,000	0
Emergency fund	60,000,000	60,000,000	0
Salaries and expenses, Office of Public Information	750,000	500,000	−250,000
Salaries and expenses, Court of Military Appeals	325,000	325,000	0
Reserve tools and facilities	500,000,000	500,000,000	0
Total	1,030,975,000	1,029,625,000	−1,350,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY			
Military personnel	4,729,437,000	4,776,173,000	+46,736,000
Maintenance and operations	3,999,504,000	4,720,000,000	+720,496,000
Procurement and production	2,471,779,000	3,395,266,000	+923,487,000
Military construction, Army civilian components	15,000,000	9,094,000	−5,906,000
Reserve personnel requirements	116,636,000	102,909,000	−13,727,000
Army National Guard	215,355,000	211,273,000	−4,082,000
Research and development	475,000,000	370,000,000	−105,000,000
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice	100,000	100,000	0
Operation and maintenance, Alaska communication system	11,780,000	11,185,000	−595,000
Civilian relief in Korea	75,000,000	75,000,000	0
Total	12,109,391,000	13,671,000,000	+1,561,409,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY			
Military personnel, Navy	2,643,341,000	2,569,000,000	−74,341,000
Military personnel, Naval Reserve	61,970,000	63,300,000	+1,330,000
Navy personnel, general expense	92,100,000	84,000,000	−8,100,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps	776,884,000	751,695,000	−25,189,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps Reserve	16,490,000	13,800,000	−2,690,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—CON.			
Marine Corps troops and facilities	$668,215,000	$452,000,000	−$216,215,000
Aircraft and facilities	1,055,000,000	970,000,000	−85,000,000
Aircraft and related procurement	2,234,134,000	1,400,000,000	−834,134,000
Ships and facilities	1,069,165,000	938,000,000	−131,165,000
Construction of ships	56,739,000	56,700,000	−39,000
Shipbuilding and conversion	996,120,000	741,500,000	−254,620,000
Ordnance and facilities	816,619,000	818,000,000	+1,381,000
Medical care	91,000,000	84,900,000	−6,100,000
Civil engineering	140,117,000	117,700,000	−22,417,000
Military construction, Navy civilian components	32,400,000	31,200,000	−1,200,000
Research	74,952,000	68,600,000	−6,352,000
Servicewide supply and finance	419,947,000	385,000,000	−34,947,000
Servicewide operations	109,539,000	105,300,000	−4,239,000
Naval petroleum reserves	13,150,000	0	−13,150,000
Total	11,367,882,000	9,650,695,000	−1,717,187,000
LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1954			
Construction of ships	76,968,000	76,968,000	0
Ordnance for new construction	55,000,000	55,000,000	0
Total	131,968,000	131,968,000	0
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE			
Aircraft and related procurement	6,664,000,000	3,495,000,000	−3,169,000,000
Major procurement other than aircraft	900,000,000	625,000,000	−275,000,000
Acquisition and construction of real property	700,000,000	400,000,000	−300,000,000
Maintenance and operation	4,235,000,000	3,200,000,000	−1,035,000,000
Military personnel requirements	3,560,000,000	3,300,000,000	−260,000,000
Research and development	537,000,000	475,000,000	−62,000,000
Reserve personnel requirements	23,000,000	14,900,000	−8,100,000
Air National Guard	128,000,000	147,100,000	+19,100,000
Contingencies	31,000,000	31,000,000	
Total	16,778,000,000	11,688,000,000	−5,090,000,000

I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his kindness in yielding me this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the subcommittee on doing an excellent job on this bill. I know how difficult the problems have been. I know the disappointments that many of us have felt with the report, but I am in full accord with the philosophy behind the reductions made.

There was one little item, however, in the budget on which I feel the committee made an unintentional error. I believe that if the committee had known the facts the item of $245,000 which I am speaking about now would have been included in the bill. I refer to a project on a little creek which runs directly through a city in my district, Amazon creek in Oregon. There has been a small flood control project to control that creek under construction for several years. $245,000 would have completed the project this next fiscal year, and the annual benefits are $206,000. Economically, it seems to me that this job should be completed this coming year.

In the hearing on this project, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], chairman of the subcommittee, made this comment:

> The requested appropriation for fiscal year 1954 is $245,000 to bring the project to 59 percent of completion.

As a matter of fact, that is not true. The purpose of this appropriation was to complete the project. $245,000 brings to 59 percent the amount of the total cost which the Government will put into the project. The citizens of the city of Eugene, Oreg., have already raised and are ready to spend or have spent the amount of $414,000. The Federal Government has to date spent $379,000, and $245,000 will complete the job with resulting annual benefits of $206,000. No benefits can come from the money spent until the last link in the drainage canal is completed.

I am sure if the subcommittee had even considered these few facts they probably would have allowed this item. But the reason stated in the report for leaving out the item is this: that the project is one which had been suspended, and it was the policy not to resume suspended projects.

With that policy statement of the committee I do not have the slightest disagreement. The only difficulty is that this project did not qualify under that particular statement.

This project was frozen by the President late in 1950, but upon a showing of need and of actual defense value the frozen funds were released. In the flooded area which floods almost every year there is a total overall lumber production of 150 million board feet annually. Not only is this important production in the Douglas-fir region, but there were many other things which caused the President and the Bureau of the Budget to unfreeze the funds which were impounded so that the project did continue under construction until late in October of last year. So the work is almost completed but there must be this final appropriation to complete the job so that the city of Eugene can get the benefits that it needs from the money it has spent. Unless it is completed Eugene will be flooded probably at least once a year.

Another question was raised by the committee—and I submit these questions to your consideration and ask if you gentlemen had realized these things whether the subcommittee would have left this item out—the question was raised by the committee why should the Federal Government protect 50 city blocks in a small city not only in Oregon but anywhere? That is a fair question but that question is not applicable in this case. The city is upstream from about 11,500 acres of farm land. The city of Eugene can and did raise ample money which it could have used selfishly to run the water through the town and turn it loose on the farm lands. But a few miles beyond the city is a reservoir to which a ditch is now being built to take off this water. Had the city of Eugene done its own job, as it could have—and it already has spent money enough to have done it—the city would not now be flooded but the farm lands would have received the flood waters from the city. Instead it cooperated in building the long canal. There now remains a very short link to complete the canal to take the water off the city of Eugene and put it in the reservoir.

I submit to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that had they known these facts, had they given consideration to them this item would be in the bill; it should be.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, last year by resolution of the Public Works Committee a special committee was established for the study of water resources. As the committee pointed out in its report that study is now pending before the committee, and it is hopeful that we will get consideration of its recommendations within the next few weeks.

I did not realize the complexity of the problems of water resources until we undertook that sudy. It is not complete by any means and it is a problem that needs continuous study. Certainly there has not been a subject matter in which there is such universal interest as there is in water, for water means the very life of our civilization.

Year before last the Appropriations Committee brought out some glaring defects in our program of water resources. The Public Works Committee took note of those problems, and there has been a manifestation of complete harmony and cooperation between the two committees to resolve these problems. We are grateful, indeed, Mr. Chairman, to the experts on your subcommittee for recognizing some of the findings that were made in that report. However, on page 3 of this committee report accompanying the bill, we find that you comment upon a request for local participation for survey money. The sentence I refer to is on page 3 under "Local contribution" and reads:

> The committee is particularly concerned with the lack of local participation in survey projects prior to authorization.

That poses more difficulties, Mr. Chairman, than it resolves. In the first place, the great problems arise when the water starts its flow and increase as the size of the stream increases.

We have long recognized that there is a Federal responsibility for the development of flood control and navigation and we know it has a significance upon the national economy. This was recognized back in the first session of the First Congress when the Internal Improvement Act was passed which recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government to develop navigation and to open up the waterways for the future economic development of this country for trade and for commerce.

The report reflects a feeling that there must be local responsibility. Where does local responsibility start and where does Federal responsibility commence? The very complexity of that problem I submit, Mr. Chairman, cannot be resolved by requiring local participation in surveys, for if it embraces more than just flood control, or navigation and flood control, there must be a separation of that function before a survey program can be carried forward.

The very nature of the survey is to determine if local responsibility should be forthcoming in the development of a project and the amount of local contribution based upon the direct benefits to that community.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will not press for this point because there is no legal authority by which any agency charged with the responsibility of carrying out this work can assume payment from local authorities for surveys.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] for yielding me the balance of his time so that I might discuss the matter of an appropriation for the improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, Brooklyn, port of New York.

Gowanus Creek is a tidal waterway on the east side of upper New York Bay, in the Borough of Brooklyn, about 4 miles by water southeast of the Battery, New York City. It extends 1.8 miles northeasterly from the north end of Bay Ridge Channel in Gowanus Bay and includes the 1-mile upper portion known as Gowanus Canal, which local interests have improved to depths ranging from 12 feet at the lower end to 7 feet at the head. The lower part of Gowanus Creek has been improved by the United States under a project known as Gowanus

Creek Channel. The locally dredged Henry Street Basin enters Gowanus Creek Channel from the north, 750 feet upstream from the lower end of the Federal project. This basin, about 2,000 feet long and 200 feet wide, has depths decreasing from 21 feet in a strip 100 feet wide in the lower 1,000 feet of the basin to 5 feet at the head.

Local interests have expended approximately $17 million in developing waterfront terminals and berthing facilities in the section of Gowanus Creek under consideration. Insufficient depth in the 26-foot section of the waterway precludes efficient operation of the larger deep-draft vessels and, during high tide, congestion is aggravated with the concentration of deep-draft vessels taking advantage of the additional depth of water. Depths in the Henry Street Basin are insufficient to accommodate the cargo ships and tankers that use, or expect to use, the basin.

The authorized plan of improvement, which local interests claim would produce annual benefits estimated at $525,000, provides for deepening the existing 26-foot project of Gowanus Creek Channel to 30 feet at mean low water, including extension of the deepened channel about 500 feet into the 18-foot project, and widening of the channel at the junction with the existing 40-foot project of Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels, and for a branch channel 30 feet deep and 150 feet wide in the lower 1,000 feet of Henry Street Basin.

The authorization for the improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel was contained in H. R. 7855, which was reported to the House on last June 16 and became Public Law 551 of the 82d Congress last July 16.

The requested appropriation was not included in the budget sent up to the subcommittee on appropriations.

I have here before you a map which shows the channel system within the port of New York. You will note that the channel which extends around Staten Island and up the North or Hudson River, and up the East River to Long Island Sound and out into New York Bay and the Atlantic Ocean is, according to this color, 30 feet in depth. In the channel system of the port of New York there is at this space which I indicate on the map and which looks like a pip on a radar screen, what is called Gowanus Creek Channel, which is only 26 feet in depth. Now, in that small pip on the map there is carried more cargo than is carried in the whole ports of Boston, Mass., or Houston, Tex. As the result of the channel being only 26 feet in depth it becomes necessary to move all the deep draft ships—and there have been over 400 of them using this Gowanus Creek Channel in a year—at high tide. The space in the channel is most congested and everyone wants to use it at the same time. It becomes quite hazardous. As a matter of fact, there are only 4 hours generally out of the 24 hours in the day in which the channel can be used to berth and unberth these ships.

If you will look at pages 6 and 7 of the committee report on this bill, you will find that the bulk of the money contained in this bill goes to States other than New York. There is not a dime of the $251,496,000 contained in this bill for the construction projects for the State of New York. The amount involved for Gowanus Creek Channel is only the sum of $400,000. I might point out in passing that there is on this channel a grain elevator which is the only grain elevator equipped to service seagoing ships in the entire port of New York, and which has a capacity of 1,800,000 bushels.

At the time of the hearings on the authorization representatives of the Corps of Engineers testified that the improvement would relieve congestion on the waterway by spreading the traffic of deep-draft vessels throughout the day instead of only during the hours of high tide and would eliminate the hazards of grounding. The recommended project has an indicated benefit-cost ratio of 2.65 for Gowanus Creek Channel, 1.22 for the channel in Henry Street Basin, and 2.28 for the total improvement. Improvement of the project, as recommended by the Corps of Engineers, is justified further since two large shipyards on the Gowanus Creek 26-foot channel are engaged in the repair of all types of vessels from many ports, including the latest type of oceangoing tankers and cargo vessels, and the project thus contributes materially to national-defense requirements.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that is entirely nonpolitical and nonpartisan. There are 8 Members in this body from the Borough of Brooklyn and all 8 Members are in agreement with regard to this request. They are the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], the gentlemen from New York [Mr. CELLER, Mr. KEOGH, Mr. MULTER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. DORN, and Mr. RAY]. We appeared before the committee, I believe on the 15th of May, and I shall seek permission to insert with these remarks the testimony before the subcommittee on appropriations on that date. We were accorded a very, very fine and courteous hearing. It is regrettable, indeed, that the subcommittee did not see fit to include in the bill this very worthwhile and necessary project, a project which should be completed immediately.

I should like to read to you an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of May 3, 1953, entitled "Deepening the Gowanus Creek Channel Vital to Brooklyn and the Whole Port":

A barrier of mud less than a mile long, 4 feet thick, and 200 feet wide bars the improvement of a substantial part of Brooklyn's multi-billion-dollar waterfront. This murky curtain lies at the bottom of a waterway known as Gowanus Creek Channel, sometimes confused with Gowanus Canal, into which it runs at Percival Street, just south of Hamilton Avenue. Gowanus Creek Channel is now 26 feet deep, the depth established in 1904, when it was first dredged. It should be 30 feet deep to accommdate the larger cargo-carrying vessels developed in half a century of shipping progress.

BILL PASSED LAST YEAR

Last year both Houses of Congress passed and President Truman signed a bill authorizing the deepening of Gowanus Creek Channel. It was left to the succeeding Congress, through its Appropriations Committee, to provide a relatively modest sum so that the work could actually begin.

Less than $500,000 for a substantial improvement on Brooklyn's waterfront should not cause much concern, even at a time when economy is and should be the watchword in Washington. Some things must be done, and this is one of them.

Gowanus Creek Channel, even in its preaent archaic state, carries as much cargo as entire ports the size of Boston or Houston. The goods coming through it are vital to Brooklyn industry and commerce. During national emergency it is of tremendous military importance. Chromium ore and other metals and chemicals necessary in the manufacture of steel for national defense come in over Gowanus Creek Channel. It furnishes raw materials and takes away finished goods necessary to the entire metropolitan area, all of Long Island, and to an area extending all the way to the Mississippi River.

It does all this despite the fact it is only 26 feet deep. Ships drawing more must wait until the tides add 4 feet to its depth and then scrape bottom in order to get to their piers. There have been groundings and long delays at anchor waiting for tides. Because daylight navigation is necessary only 4 hours in the 24 are practicable. A condition such as this is not far removed from the primitive conditions when cargo ships stayed downstream and were unloaded by lighters. They are not characteristic of the greatest, most modern port in the world.

Recently the Bull Lines spent about $17 million installing a modern waterfront terminal on the shore served by Gowanus Creek Channel. The great New York Port Authority Grain Terminal is dependent upon it. Numerous shipping and ship-repair companies line both sides of it. Every conceivable type of cargo from fuel oil to cocoa beans and sugar and coffee come into it. The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce estimates that at least $10 million in further improvements would soon be undertaken if there was reasonable assurance the channel would be deepened.

The matter will come before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives Monday, May 11. At that time various Brooklyn agencies interested in this matter are to be heard. But the disturbing fact is that there now is considerable doubt as to its chances of being passed. The reason for this is that the present administration is for economy.

Representative JOHN TABER, Republican, of New York, Appropriations Committee chairman, has not ruled the proposal out. As a matter of fact, it has been given a prominent place on the agenda of the coming meeting. All eight members of the Brooklyn congressional delegation are for it, regardless of party. The chamber of commerce has for several years prepared and presented facts and figures to legislators and committees explaining the need for it.

SHOULD VOTE APPROPRIATION

It is to be hoped that the Members of Congress serving on the Appropriations Committee can be made to understand that the small sum of money involved in this particular improvement is vitally necessary to the world's largest port and of particular importance to that part of the port which carries cargo the value of which exceeds half of all that is carried by the rest, the Brooklyn waterfront. While Brooklyn's interests would be and should be served by this, it is of great importance to a much wider area and of vital necessity in every national emergency.

FRIDAY, MAY 15, 1953.

GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL

(Witnesses: Hon. John J. Rooney, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York; Hon. Emanuel Celler, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York; Hon. Eugene J. Keogh, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York; Hon. Edna P. Kelly, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York; Hon. Francis E. Dorn, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York; Hon. John H. Ray, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York; Hon. Louis B. Heller, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York; Hon. John Cashmore, president, Borough of Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Frank D. Schroth, publisher of the Brooklyn Eagle, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Col. A. C. Welsh, foreign-trade secretary and transportation secretary, chamber of commerce, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Donald L. O'Toole, former Member of Congress, New York; Howard A. Swain, executive secretary, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce)

Mr. DAVIS. The subcommittee will resume this afternoon with the consideration of Gowanus Creek Channel project in the State of New York. The chairman is somewhat overwhelmed to see this delegation of the Members of Congress from the State of New York and I am very pleased to turn the conduct of the discussion of this matter over to one of the very distinguished and hard-working members of the House Appropriations Committee, the Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY.

Mr. ROONEY, I will ask you to introduce these others who are with you and proceed with the discussion in your own way.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to you and shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. Chairman, we are seeking the funds necessary to implement Public Law 551 of the 82d Congress, of which I was the author and which provided for the deepening of Gowanus Creek Channel in the port of New York, in Brooklyn.

This channel, which is less than a mile in length, is the only part of the channel in the entire port of New York which is not 30 feet in depth. If you will please look at this map which shows all the authorized channel projects in the New York district—in this color [indicating] throughout the port the channels are 30 feet in depth.

The point with which we are concerned today is the channel leading out of Gowanus Bay—the strip that goes through there [indicating]. In this small strip of water cargo is carried to the extent of 4 million tons a year. This equals the amount of cargo handled in the whole area of the ports of Boston or Houston, Tex. Along this channel and since 1948 there have been provided private improvements to the extent of over $17 million; almost half a million dollars have been spent to deepen slips. This channel has been 26 feet in depth since 1904. Before I forget it, I should point out that along this channel there is a grain elevator with a capacity of 1,800,000 bushels of grain.

I am highly honored to have the opportunity of presenting to you many distinguished gentlemen from the Borough of Brooklyn who fully realize and will tell you of the importance of this project. I shall first introduce each of them and then ask them to briefly address the chair with regard to this project.

First, I shall introduce my distinguished colleagues who are present. You very well know the dean of the New York State Democratic delegation who has seen more than 30 years of distinguished service here in the House and the author of the book, You Never Leave Brooklyn, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER.

Then, on his left Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH; Congresswoman EDNA F. KELLY; Congressman FRANCIS E. DORN; and Congressman JOHN H. RAY. It has been impossible for Congressman LOUIS B. HELLER to be here this afternoon, but I would like to have appended at the end of the testimony his statement of his views in regard to this matter.

I have been asked to express to you the views of Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER, who is presently out of the State and district on official business. He is in full accord on the matter with which we are concerned today, and his views are the same as those I express.

We have with us here today the very able, capable, and highly respected president of the Borough of Brooklyn. Mr. John Cashmore for 12 years has been, in effect, mayor of a city of over 3 million people. Such is the significance of the office of president of the Borough of Brooklyn.

And the publisher of the Brooklyn Eagle, one of the well-known papers of this country, Mr. Frank D. Schroth; the executive secretary of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Howard A. Swain; Col. A. C. Welsh, the foreign-trade secretary and transportation secretary of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce; as well as Mr. Robert P. Schulze, general manager of marine terminal operations, New York Port Authority.

Now, I would like to have you listen to our borough president the Honorable John Cashmore.

Mr. CASHMORE. First, I want to thank you for giving us this opportunity to be heard. I fully realize the importance of your committee's work. In the matter of appropriations, your jurisdiction and your responsibilities are enormous. They apply not only to the whole United States, but to every part of the world where Federal expenditures are involved. I appreciate the value of your time and want, therefore, to be as brief as possible.

The matter in which we are vitally interested is the proposed appropriation to deepen one of the important tidal waterways in the Borough of Brooklyn and city of New York. This is the Gowanus Creek Channel on the easterly side of upper New York Bay.

Although this channel is actually less than a mile long and decreases gradually in width from 300 feet to 200 feet, I believe I am correct in saying that it is certainly one of the busiest and most important waterways in the entire United States.

As we proceed in this hearing, it will be shown how directly this is related to our national defense and the civilian requirements essential to the international conditions we are facing today.

But before this is done, I hope your committee will allow me to speak very briefly about the community of which this channel is such an important part.

The capacity in which I appear before your committee is that of president of the Borough of Brooklyn. I have the honor to represent 3 million people who live there and help to make it the great and famous community it is. I was born in Brooklyn and have lived there all my life. Frankly, I love Brooklyn and am proud to be a Brooklynite. And if anyone tries to get me to move to Wisconsin, I will have to say "No."

All over this country and throughout the world, people hear much about Brooklyn. They hear about the Dodgers and Ebbets Field. They see pictures of the famous Brooklyn Bridge. They know about Coney Island and its ocean-front bathing beaches.

During World War II Brooklyn became known in every corner of the globe where our troops were stationed. This was because so many of the young men and women of Brooklyn joined the Armed Forces and served wherever they were needed. The record shows that 326,000 young men and women of our borough—a number larger than any other city of the Untied States—fought in the war, and that 7,000 gave their lives for our country.

But while Brooklyn is known far and wide, it is probably also true that comparatively few people realize Brooklyn's importance as a great and commercial manufacturing center.

I doubt, for example, whether it is generally remembered that during the war Brooklyn was the headquarters of the largest port of embarkation in the world.

From the time of Pearl Harbor until V-E Day, this port of embarkation moved more than 3 million troops and their equipment overseas. It directed the shipping of more than 63 million tons of supplies and cleared half of this tonnage through the port of New York. The port of embarkation could handle nearly 100,000 troops a day and move supplies that would fill a freight train extending from New York to North Carolina.

Nor is it generally remembered that the Brooklyn Navy Yard built the largest and mightiest battleships and aircraft carriers in the world—the *Missouri*, the *Iowa*, and the *Franklin D. Roosevelt*. Today the Brooklyn Navy Yard has again been called upon to help strengthen our national defense by building the super-aircraft-carrier *Saratoga*.

In Brooklyn today we have more than 7,000 manufacturing plants. While most of these are in the so-called small-business category, the fact is that their output, when combined with the output of the larger establishments, is valued at more than $1 billion a year.

Brooklyn continues to be our country's principal foreign-trade center. In a representative month, 52 shipping companies send out 179 ships to 238 ports in all parts of the world and many return with raw materials important to our national security.

All these activities are concentrated in an area of just 80 square miles, the area of the Borough of Brooklyn. This is an industrial miracle and the reason for it is not hard to find. It is due largely, of course, to Brooklyn's location on the great New York Harbor, to our waterways and the waterfront properties that have been developed during past generations, and to our productive capacity and the tremendous manpower skills of which we are very proud.

I could and would like to say more about this wonderful community. But there is a time limitation today and I want to go directly to the matter before us.

In the calendar year 1952 the dollar value of imports of the entire port of New York was nearly $4 billion. Although the customshouse at New York keeps no separate figures on Brooklyn imports, it is conservatively estimated their dollar value totaled about $1,316 million and that the revenue or duty the Government collected on these Brooklyn imports was nearly $100 million.

According to the latest figures I have been able to obtain, the Gowanus Creek Channel area handled in the year 1951 about 4,538,000 tons of cargo—an increase of 555,000 tons over the previous year. This vast amount of tonnage was carried in 846 steamers, 604 motorships, and 8,451 barges.

While most of this cargo consisted of ordinary commodities, I have been reliably informed that much of it related to our present national state of emergency. Some of this information may be classified, but I believe enough facts will be brought to your attention to justify your committee's approval of the appropriation that is being requested for the deepening of this channel.

The Army engineers have studied and reviewed this proposed improvement several times. It has been recommended by the Army district engineer, the division engineer, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and by the Chief of Engineers.

The report of the Board of Engineers shows how petroleum products are generally received at the Gowanus Creek Channel from Texas, Louisiana, and from Venezuela. Coal arrives from Virginia and Pennsylvania mines. Grain and grain products are

shipped from the Middle West by way of the Great Lakes, the Erie and Oswego Canals, and the Hudson River, direct by water or water-rail combination to the Port of New York Authority grain terminal, and are then shipped to all parts of the world.

This is clearly in the national interest. By no means can this be regarded as a so-called local matter.

This area is served by a great highway system and is only a short distance from the Brooklyn-Battery tunnel. We started to build this tunnel before World War II, but were compelled to halt work when the war came. In 1950 we completed this tunnel at a cost of $80 million and since that time traffic through the tunnel has been increasing at an enormous rate.

From May 1, 1952, to April 30, 1953, the total number of vehicles using the tunnel increased to nearly 17 million.

As a further example of how this Gowanus Channel area serves the national interest, all one has to do is to watch the trucks and trailers coming through the tunnel and crossing our bridges in the morning. They arrive from many States along the Atlantic seaboard. They bring in manufactured goods and where are they headed? For the Brooklyn waterfront, of course, and many go directly to this Gowanus Creek Channel area.

Because of the tremendously increased shipping activity there, the borough president's office, with the approval of the New York City Board of Estimate, has provided $528,000 in improvements for this section in the past few years. Every few years the city dredges the Gowanus Canal, which lies beyond the Gowanus Creek Channel.

It has been stated that just one of the shipping lines has spent $17 million in recent years to construct a modern marine terminal on the channel. The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce has estimated that $10 million in further improvements are planned, if there is a reasonable assurance that the channel will be deepened.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I believe you are fully justified in approving this proposed appropriation. Let us bear in mind the present 26-foot channel has existed since the year 1904. The cost, including maintenance during all these years, was about $140,000 to June 30, 1949.

The Army engineers have stated the major problem for navigation in the channel is the lack of sufficient depth which prevents efficient operation of the larger and more economical deep-draft vessels now in use. They have stated that on many occasions more than 50 barges and other vessels have moored in the vicinity of the junction of the channel and what is known as the Henry Street Basin, thereby obstructing berthing operations.

The Army engineers have further reported that grounding accidents, due to insufficient depth, have taken place. In 10 years, 8 vessels, consisting of tugs and barges, have been sunk.

When you consider these conditions, I believe you will agree the channel must be deepened to 30 feet. In the 82d Congress you passed a bill, which the President signed, authorizing this improvement. For this we extend our particular thanks to our distinguished fellow Brooklynite, Congressman ROONEY, of your committee.

Like each of you, we, too, recognize the need for economy. But there is a point beyond which economy is hard to justify and sound judgment is needed. My hope, therefore, is that you will see the need for this improvement as we see it, and that your committee will recommend this necessary appropriation.

I am grateful to your committee for giving us this time. I sit on the board of estimate of the city of New York. Our budget is not as large as yours. My budget is only $1,528,000,000. I have sat there for 13 years. Everyone says, "Go, put your house in order; but don't cut us down on the budget."

I am putting up this plea for my country and my city. We bought more war bonds in Brooklyn than in 39 States of the Union. We won more Army and Navy E awards. We are an energetic little city. And we are asking for only $400,000.

Mr. SCHROTH. Mr. Chairman, it is embarrassing for me to be here. It is embarrassing for the editor of a newspaper who is constantly yapping and criticizing expenditures to come before a committee of Congress to ask for an appropriation of $400,000.

The facts and statistics will be presented, not only by the borough president and experts but I address myself to what I call public opinion. This is the first time I have any conception of where I can see not only that the Democrats are for it but the Republicans, too. The capitalists are for it and labor is for it. Members of Congress of both political parties are for it. I know of no other interest in my rather long newspaper career where it can possibly be said that in this great community, there is not a single, solitary voice in opposition.

A newspaperman has a number of functions, the printing of the news, the facts of the day, and some critical comment thereon. You have good or you have bad. The one other purpose is the betterment of the community in which he lives as related to the whole country. And I know of no improvement past, present, or future, that has so much of an effect upon the welfare of the country as a whole as this award for Gowanus Creek Channel.

There have been a great many fine things done for Brooklyn, the Brooklyn Battery tunnel, the bridges and everything else, but there is nothing—especially in the state of flux in which our national economy is in at the moment regarding international affairs—there is nothing so important as making this channel sufficiently navigable to take care of present and future needs.

I say that I am embarrassed because it is the first time I have done such a thing as this. I think newspapers should speak on their editorial pages and not be supplicants individually and personally. But however, this is of such importance, not only to the community which is interested enough, but to the country as a whole, that I am not sorry to say to you today that this is a good thing.

Mr. DAVIS. I am sure you need make no apology for appearing before the subcommittee on an occasion of this sort.

Mr. SCHROTH. Thank you.

Mr. CELLER. This is rather an unusual experience to have the solid delegation from Brooklyn, both Democrats and Republicans with the president of our borough and a distinguished editor and publisher of a traditionally known Brooklyn paper and one of the best papers in the country—all consulting here in the interests of getting 4 feet greater depth to this Gowanus Creek Channel.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. CELLER. On the record.

Brooklyn has asked very little from this Congress all the years that I have been here. We have never said much—hardly anything—and Brooklyn Members have always supported that which we deem was right and proper, like the TVA, the Farm Bureau, and REA. We now come as supplicants to ask you to aid our local commerce, but in doing so, you will enhance the national commerce and the national interests.

The Bureau of Engineers a few years ago said the total cost would be less than $400,000. Probably it is higher now but not much; $289,000 a few years ago. What the exact amount will be, I cannot say.

You have heard a very masterful presentation of this matter by our borough president for whom we all have an affectionate regard and the supplementary statement by Mr. Schroth; and I will state that no one can challenge anything these two distinguished gentlemen have said.

I might add that something like 4,537,000 tons of petroleum products go through that creek every year. That is a vast amount of petroleum and petroleum products. In addition, there are vast tons of coal, grain, cereals, wheat, and chromium which is very strategic and very essential in the manufacture of steel; many strategic chemicals go through. There are great quantities of nonferrous ore and there is not a State in the Union that is not affected by commerce that goes through that creek and most of that product is carried by deep-draft cargo.

These ships have a great deal of trouble in berthing because they must wait in New York Harbor in Gowanus Bay before they can go alongside their piers.

The industry is very anxious to expend some money on piers and bulkheads. They have spent about $6 million and have built 27 piers there. There are more piers there than you find in many cities. There are 28 bulkhead tunnels whose assessed value with the channels together with facilities are worth $19 billion. These figures are almost astronomical when you figure that what we are asking for is half a million.

Very important lines have spent money there. The Bull Line has spent $17 million on its terminal and intends to spend as much in the future. Bethlehem Steel and other companies have reported an average of 917 vessels a year. The Patchogue Oil Terminal handles 2,950,000 tons of petroleum a year through these facilities and if you will spend $500,000 on this improvement they intend to spend $600,000 to build a 600,000-ton storage there.

I am reading briefly from a statement contained in the New York Times this morning:

"During the high-tide rush period the engineers found as many as 50 small craft and barges will block the canal on Gowanus Creek and Henry Basin creating dangerous conditions. For this reason navigation of the creek is carried on only in daylight hours."

Doing business there needs to be one continuous operation, not only in the daytime but in the nighttime as well.

You are told that time and tide wait for no man. But we must wait for time and tide and that time waste is money lost. Lots of money is lost in taxes—a deliberate loss to the Federal Government. You can make money and not lose money by increasing the expenditure for this improvement. May I have inserted into the record later a letter which includes a list of imports and exports in and out of the Gowanus Creek Channel?

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. CELLER. We will be happy to accept your letter with enclosures for the record.

(The matter referred to follows:)

MAY 15, 1953.

Mr. FRANK SANDERS,
Subcommittee on Civil Functions,
House Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SANDERS: Please insert the following after my testimony today, Friday, in support of the Gowanus Creek Channel appropriations as follows:

I have asked the Department of Commerce, Office of International Trade, to prepare for me a list of imports and exports in and out of the Gowanus Creek Channel as well as the steamship liners which berth in this channel and the countries which they serve.

You will see how widespread the nature of this commerce is and the great number of countries affected, as indicated in the attached memorandum from the Department of Commerce.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1953.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: In accordance with your request of even date, we are pleased to attach information on the Gowanus Channel.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT ASHTON,
Director, Transportation, Communications, and Utilities Division.

"THE GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL

"Port of New York includes the section from Twenty-eighth Street, Brooklyn, to Hamilton Avenue Bridge. This area is heavily industrialized, being the site of docks of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., the Texas Co., and the Sullivan Drydock Co., as well as of a Delaware, Lackawanna & Western terminal.

"The 1951 import tonnage was 599,000 tons, carried in 351 vessels, while 505,000 tons were exported in 405 vessels. The major commodities moving in international trade in this area are:

"Imports

"Fish and meat products, raw hides and skins, animal feeds, fruits and nuts, coffee, cocoa beans, spices, sugar,[1] rubber, castor beans, vegetable oils and fats, inedible, vegetable dyeing and tanning extracts, tobacco, textile fibers, lumber,[1] petroleum, crude,[1] residual fuel oil,[1] iron and steel products,[1] other metals,[1] industrial chemicals, and fertilizer.

"Exports

"Fish and meat products, corn, wheat and wheat flour, animal feeds, vegetable oils, lumber, lubricating oil and grease,[1] iron and steel products,[1] metal manufactures,[1] machinery,[1] and chemical specialties.[1]

"Steamship lines which berth in this channel and countries which they serve are as follows:

"Crossocean Shipping Co. (Yugoslavia Lines), Yugoslavia, Mediterranean ports; Bull-Insular Lines, Puerto Rico, Caribbean ports; Isthmian Line, India, Persian Gulf, Far East, Hawaii; Black Diamond Line, Rotterdam, Antwerp, Hamburg; United States Navigation Co., Rotterdam, Antwerp, Hamburg; Barber Line, Philippines, South Africa, Scandinavia; Furness-Withy (tankers), Venezuela, Aruba."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, Congresswoman KELLY would like to be heard.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee in an endeavor to urge the appropriation of funds to deepen the Gowanus Creek Channel in the Borough of Brooklyn.

I agree with the previous speakers, including Hon. John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn; Hon. Frank Schroth, owner and editor of the Brooklyn Eagle; and my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

I desire to emphasize one point which I believe should bear considerable weight. The Borough of Brooklyn, 1 of the 5 boroughs of the Greater City of New York, contributes $1,040,000,000 annually in internal revenue to the Federal Treasury. Only 16 States in these United States contribute more than that amount.

I agree we are all economy minded, but I think you have a good guaranty that this small investment on the part of the Federal Government will bring increased revenue into the Treasury.

I urge that you take favorable action on this project.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. ROONEY. Congressman DORN.

Mr. DORN of New York. I do appreciate the opportunity to speak before this committee today, and particularly because it gives me the opportunity to emphasize the bipartisan character of the people who are advocating this tremendous improvement for the Borough of Brooklyn. I am the first Republican elected from the Borough of Brooklyn for over 80 years and Republicans and Democrats and everyone else in the borough are behind this appropriation and are urging it.

I want to emphasize the effect of comparisons. Enormous sums are spent on the harbors of Houston and Boston and Norfolk by the Federal Government. Here a comparatively small amount of $400,000 will do twice as much in improvements as is spent on these other harbors. Houston has less cargo. Boston has just about an equal amount, and Norfolk in 1951—I do not know the precise figure—has about an equal amount in cargo tonnage as this small Gowanus Creek.

You may never have heard the name before, but it means just as much to the commerce of the country as Houston, Boston, and Norfolk, and this improvement will practically double the tonnage that will come into this small creek channel.

It seems to me that the importance of defense this particular little creek has to the country emphasizes the fact that $400,000 is not much to spend on it.

And again, Mr. Chairman, let me stress the bipartisan nature of the people you have before you today.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Mr. DORN. Mr. RAY.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to complete the roster of Brooklyn's Congressmen—all of us support the Gowanus Creek Channel deepening. I can endorse all the statements of fact and concur in the recommendations which have been presented to you here today. I have no new comments to add, but I wish to give such emphasis as I can to the statement made here by Mr. Schroth. It is true economy to spend the amount required to deepen the Gowanus Creek Channel because that small expenditure will cause large additional private investments, increase the flow of commerce, and increase employment, and it should substantially increase Federal and State tax revenues. I shall not take more of your time, but I do ask your considerate attention for this Gowanus Creek project.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. RAY.

Mr. ROONEY. Colonel Welsh, of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.

Colonel WELSH. Gentlemen, in discussing the port, we must understand it is part of a tightly woven structure that handles the overall commerce of the country and while it may be of minimum importance to a locality it is in a broader sense a part of the national structure.

Going on from there, my name is A. C. Welsh and I represent the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce. We appear here in favor of affirmative action by your committee in connection with the appropriation of funds for the improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel in the port of New York.

Gowanus Creek Channel at the present time has a depth of 26 feet for a width of 200 feet for most of its course. The total improvement would be about eight-tenths of a mile. The present project was completed in 1904 and at that time was quite adequate to accommodate commerce using the waterway. In 1904 the 5,000-ton freighter was the standard type and the 26-foot channel was adequate to permit the efficient operation of this type of vessel. Also, as late as 1947 there were only 56 ships a year that used that channel. Today, the situation is entirely changed. The common type of vessel today is the so-called C-2 with a tonnage capacity of 12,500 tons. This type of vessel cannot be operated in a channel with less water than 30 feet. This restricts operation of ships in the channel to the limited time of high tide.

In addition to this the number of vessels using the channel has entirely changed since 1947 and in 1951 414 ships were using the waterway. The port of New York needs wharfage space badly and it is essential that this important channel be improved so as to permit operation of the highest efficiency for the longest possible period of time.

A further disadvantage of the inadequacy of the developments is the necessity for dredging slips to provide adequate water for ships in dock at extreme low tide. If a fully loaded ship were docked it would lie on the bottom and a serious strain might result. Because of this it is necessary to dredge the slips below the channel flow for a depth of from 30 to 35 feet. This results in almost impossible maintenance since the channel mud is being washed into the slip by every passing vessel. Since steamship operations are restricted to the period of high tide, congestion is bound to result because of the effort of so many vessels to reach berth in such a limited period of time. This heightens the problem of handling the four-million-odd tons now using the channel. If any large portion of this commerce were driven to other sections of the port, serious congestion might result.

Among the 4 million tons moving over this waterway much is vital to our own economy and some is vital to our defense and to that of the free world. However, much of this tonnage is indistinguishable. For example, a large shipment of X-ray insulating material moved to a contractor in Puerto Rico had nothing to distinguish it from ordinary commercial traffic. However, upon investigation we found that the material was to be used in the construction of a military hospital.

Some commodities are earmarked and can be readily recognized, as in the case of the large and regular movement of trucks, rockets, and artillery moving to the Yugoslav Army, which moves in large quantities, or the movement of special machinery from Germany consigned to the Air Force. We have abstracted from the tonnage records of the steamship lines the commodities associated with the production of defense material. Among the inbound freight are antimony, bismuth, lead ingots, copper cathodes (used in the manufacture of shells), aluminum ore, tinplate and ingot (Government controlled), ferromanganese, chrome ore (bagged and in bulk), mercury, special steels, brass tubing and rods. In addition to this 18,645,196 bushels of grain moved to European ports in the past 3 years while 386 million board-feet of lumber moved into this port.

In this statement I have endeavored to be as brief as possible and at the same time emphasize the commercial importance of this gateway. It will be recalled that in my statement I included a great number of import commodities which are entirely for United States Government use, and almost the entire volume of grain that I reported was shipped on Government programs.

It is our feeling that the Gowanus Creek Channel's importance to the United States Government as a harbor facility should not be overlooked because of the existing international difficulties in Korea and elsewhere.

I thank you for this opportunity, and if there are any questions I shall be very glad to answer them.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Colonel Welsh.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Swain.

Mr. SWAIN. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I want to thank you on behalf of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce and industry for giving this matter your attention. I hope that you are able to find favorably for it. I hope particularly that you find the time to give particular attention to the defense aspects that have been underlined by Colonel Welsh and if any members of the committee wish further information and more specific information on it we are always ready to supply them through the borough delegation to Congress.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Swain.

[1] Major commodities.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity extended to me by your committee to express my views in support of the proposed appropriation to improve the Gowanus Creek Channel in the New York Harbor.

This channel, which is now 26 feet deep, was first dredged back in 1904 when ships were small. During the past half century shipping has made notable progress, and it is imperative that a great harbor such as New York should keep up with this progress, if it wants to maintain its position as one of the world's largest ports of entry and exit through which is funneled much of the commodities used and produced by the eastern half of the United States. It requires a sum of less than $500,000 to dredge this channel to a depth of 30 feet in order to accommodate larger cargo-carrying vessels.

If this improvement is undertaken in the very near future, I understand that at least $10 million will be spent by shipping and ship-repair companies in building modern waterfront terminals and making other necessary improvements, which should prove to be a great boon to the economy of New York. The goods coming and going through the Gowanus Creek Channel are especially vital to commerce and industry in the Borough of Brooklyn, which has a population of some 3 million. Any deterioration in the economy of this huge community would immediately be felt throughout New York and would unquestionably have its effects on a much wider area.

The improvement so urgently needed in this channel has long been delayed—too long, to be sure—so that there is a good deal of uneasiness and anxiety in our borough, particularly among commercial and industrial interests, concerning the future. If Congress, which last year authorized the deepening of this channel, should now fail to appropriate the relatively small sum required to fulfill this project, I can assure this committee that there will be a tremendous disappointment felt by all the people of Brooklyn, business interests will feel a great letdown, and the first signs of economic deterioration in the area may soon appear.

It would be extremely shortsighted and a great disservice to a huge community such as Brooklyn, whose commercial and industrial activities are so dependent on the flow of goods through this harbor area, to economize on this relatively modest sum so urgently needed to improve shipping facilities. When a whole area involving the welfare of millions of people and many more millions of dollars in investment in business enterprises is so dependent for its livelihood on its port facilities, it would be false economy on the part of Congress to try to save a sum of $500,000 at the detriment of a whole community. There are certain expenditures which must be made in order to maintain our economic position, and I cannot think of a more urgent and more deserving project than the improvement of this channel.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the members of this committee to take into consideration the problem and the needs involved in this situation, to realize that the small sum required for this improvement is of vital necessity to a large segment of our population, and to recommend to Congress that this expenditure be appropriated as soon as possible so that work on the project can be undertaken at an early date. You will be performing a creditable service to this entire area, and one of which you will be proud and blessed for many years to come.

Mr. CASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question; or if I should not ask it, will you tell me to withdraw it? About what date can you tell me what is going on and what is going out?

Mr. DAVIS. We expect to make that within the next week.

Mr. CASHMORE. While Brooklyn is the strongest Democratic county in the United States and I, as president of the borough, said Brooklyn was Democratic, yet when General Eisenhower came to Brooklyn I turned over the steps of borough hall to him. I built a stand and put 48 chairs there.

Mr. DAVIS. You want to remember that the Republicans are going to have something to say about that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. O'Toole is a former Member of Congress for New York, Mr. Chairman, and has a few remarks to offer.

Mr. DAVIS. You may proceed, Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I live 3 blocks from this canal and channel and every day I have the opportunity of observing the way commerce is held up by its narrowness and depth. As the editor of the Brooklyn Eagle and my colleagues have brought out, this is a national waterway. It is not a local proposition. Every part of our country receives assistance from the Federal Government recognizing its obligation to the people.

But during all these years we have never received any assistance and the assistance we ask today is not for ourselves nor our community, but as has been pointed out, for the entire Nation and national and international trade.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Mr. O'Toole. Before concluding this hearing, I should like to say that my attention has been called by Mr. Schulze to the fact that the grain elevator on this channel which, as I said before, has a capacity of 1.8 million bushels is the only grain elevator in the port of New York which can service seagoing vessels.

Mr. Chairman, I will leave this map with you. May I express the thanks of each and every one of us who came here today from Brooklyn. We truly appreciate your patience and your courtesy. We do hope you see fit to include funds for the improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel in the bill you report.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, one member of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, referred this afternoon to the approach of the time when we will not be able to defer all projects that are new starts. He had in mind that true economy requires that some new projects get under way. The deepening of Gowanus Creek Channel is that kind of project. It will facilitate and increase the flow of commerce, and already the channel carries as much tonnage as the port of Boston or the port of Norfolk. It will increase investment and employment in a very important industrial section of Brooklyn and it will increase Federal and State tax revenues.

Mr. Chairman, I have every sympathy with the committee. It has done a difficult job and done it well. In this case, I submit it has done it too well as it ran beyond the line of economy and reached into the field of false economy.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, Gowanus Creek is a small tidal waterway in Brooklyn extending northeasterly about 1½ miles from the north end of Bay Ridge Channel, as is seen by the map. The project authorized by the River and Harbor Acts of 1881 and 1896 provided for a channel 26 feet deep at mean low water from Bay Ridge Channel at 28th Street to the foot of Percival Street, with width decreasing from 300 feet at 28th Street to 200 feet at Percival Street; thence 18 feet deep at mean low water to Hamilton Avenue Bridge, gradually reducing in width to 100 feet at the bridge, all as limited by harbor lines. Length of section included in project is three-fourths mile. In 1952, Congress authorized modification of the existing project so as to provide for deepening the existing 26-foot channel to 30 feet and for a branch channel 30 feet deep and 150 feet wide in the lower 1,000 feet of Henry Street Basin at an estimated cost of $287,000. Work authorized by the River and Harbor Acts of 1881 and 1896 was completed in 1904 at a cost of $70,000; however, no work has been done on the modification. The average annual commerce transported over this waterway during the period of 1941 to 1950 amounted to 4,441,600 tons, including 240,300 car ferry tons. Commerce during calendar year 1951 amounted to 4,696,400 tons, including 158,900 car ferry tons.

The terminal properties located on the Gowanus Creek Channel are among the most easily accessible waterfront properties in the Port of New York since the opening of the Brooklyn-Battery Tunnel.

Because of the wide streets and parking facilities available in the immediate vicinity trucks delivering cargo to the piers do not cause undue congestion or obstructions to traffic.

The amount of general cargo exported and imported by ships berthing at piers located on the Gowanus Creek Channel exceeds the tonnage of many large United States ports. With few exceptions, all the slips at which freight vessels berth have been dredged to 30 feet or over in anticipation of the channel also being dredged to 30 feet at mean low water as recommended by the Army engineers as far back as 1946. This dredging could be done now at a fraction of the cost of performing this operation in time of an emergency.

The officials of the city of New York, recognizing the increasing importance of this waterway, have made improvements and changes in the streets and approaches to the terminals. In the case of our terminals 2 streets were widened to 100 feet and a third, which heretofore had been closed, was opened and paved.

Tidal currents in the Gowanus Creek Channel are at a minimum, thereby greatly aiding in the handling of barges and lighters and reducing the damage done to piers and ships in spite of the fact that the Gowanus Creek Channel is a narrow body of water.

The channel is continuously filling in, which in turn means some of this fill, through ship propeller action, finds its way into the slips dredged at considerable expense by private interests.

Vessels are arriving and leaving with deeper draft, therefore the difficulties navigating the channel are increasing.

Due to the fact that deep-draft vessels can only leave during daylight, at certain stages of high tide, the congestion in the waterway at those times increases, operations become difficult, delays are prevalent.

Business interests engaged in shipping and marine facilities have expended over $17 million since 1948 in new construction and improvements. Over $500,000 for dredging the slips, so deep-laden ships can be accommodated; all in anticipation of the Government improving the channel leading to same.

All Brooklyn is behind this improvement. It is nonpartisan and joined in by all of the Democratic Members of Congress, as well as all of the Republican Members of Congress from Brooklyn.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, there are two projects that were contained in the revised budget estimate in my home district of Kentucky that this great Appropriations Committee saw fit to delete and strike out. I am very grateful to the committee for giving me time, when I know they are under great pressure and that many Members of this House will not be afforded that opportunity.

I feel that if they can get a grasp of the true facts that exist on the Cumberland River in southeast Kentucky at Barbourville, Ky., and Pineville, Ky., they will realize that these two projects measure up in every particular, any way you look at it, to be included in this bill.

Last year we were in the budget and we received an appropriation at Pineville of $274,000. At Barbourville we received an appropriation of $75,000 to complete the planning. We have expended a portion of that fund. We got it, as was stated on some of the other projects, near the end of the session of Congress last year. We immediately went to work. The citizens of Pineville, Ky., have voted bond issues and sold bonds to the tune of $590,000. Although the entire project and the expenditures of the Federal Government are only $1,500,000, we are paying a third of the cost. We have our money in the bank. It is drawing interest. At Barbourville also bonds have been voted and money raised by local citizens to meet their share of expenses.

When they started the work there this spring on this first appropriation we were notified by the Federal Government to buy rights-of-way over the first segment of this flood wall. We took $50,000 of our money and bought those rights-of-way. As soon as we were placed in the budget for this year on the revised estimate of the Army engineers, we began to expend, at the request of the Army engineers, further money for more rights-of-way, and we made a contribution of $50,000 over and above what we were obligated to do in order that there may be no obstacle to speeding up this work.

We were frozen, as all other projects were frozen, along in January, but as soon as that freeze order was off we went to work again.

We furnish to this great Nation a large amount of bituminous coal. Pineville, Ky., that will be protected by this flood wall, has a railroad yard in it where the great trains of bituminous coal that go into the war factories of this Nation are assembled. We produce on the CV division of the L. & N. Railroad Co. from 15 to 20 million tons of coal a year. You cannot produce steel in America unless you have bituminous coal.

In addition, just below Pineville, Ky., and between Barbourville and Pineville, Ky., and these two towns are under like and similar circumstances, there is a great electric generating plant owned by the Kentucky Utilities. As soon as the Korean war broke out the United States Government, and the people in charge of the bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., requested this electric company, with headquarters in Pineville, to double the capacity of electricity. Every day of the year this electric plant near Pineville is sending to the Oak Ridge plant electricity with which to make bombs. This flood wall will protect those essential war industries, if you will put us back in this bill.

The bituminous coal burned in this electric plant goes through the streets of Pineville, Ky., and some through Barbourville, Ky., and when these flood walls are built, these streets and haulways will be protected.

I understand that the Army engineers do not have a sufficient sum left out of last year's appropriations to keep this Pineville project going this fiscal year and work will stop if $590,000 is not put back in this bill.

Floods sweep through Pineville, Ky., most every year, water gets more than 6 feet deep all over town, in business buildings, schools, churches, the courthouse and post office, and the homes of our people. The same thing happens at Barbourville. When floods strike, tremendous damage is inflicted on our people.

At the expense of the people of Kentucky, through the highway department, we have built at our own expense a high bridge and street, or highway, over the Cumberland River at Pineville which is above flood stage, and this ties in with our flood wall. This was done at our own expense of over $100,000—local money of Kentucky.

The electric power furnished Oak Ridge bomb plant from our coal and plant below Pineville is so important to our Government, they have a helicopter airplane to patrol this line from Pineville to Oak Ridge every day.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, now, no pancake is ever so flat that it does not have two sides. We are here not arguing or dictating, but to plead with you to consider with an open mind, without any bias or prejudice whatever, the merits of our case.

To me it is rather regrettable that we should take your time and take our own in having to come before this committee again.

For the 20 years that I have been in Congress I have been working for Table Rock Dam.

It took some time for me to be sold on its merits, I might say, but every governmental agency that has dealt with this project has approved it, not only the district engineers, the division engineers, and the Chief of Engineers of the Army, but the Federal Power Commission, the Flood Control Committees, the legislative committees of both the Senate and the House, the Bureau of the Budget under President Roosevelt and President Truman, the Natural Resources and Planning Board; and Congress itself, both the House and Senate authorized Table Rock Dam with Bull Shoals in 1941.

So, it has been pretty firmly established, I think, by all these governmental agencies, both in the executive and legislative branches of the Government, that Table Rock is a project that, from an engineering and economic standpoint is feasible and justifiable.

Now, over a period of the past 15 years there have been survey studies made and test borings and drillings taken. We have spent more than $800,000 in exploratory work.

Last year Congress gave us $3 million for the beginning of construction.

Both Table Rock and Bull Shoals were authorized in 1941, but because of the war and the shortage of critical materials and manpower, construction was delayed, but in 1946, a year after V-J Day, funds were voted for the beginning of the construction of Bull Shoals and that is now nearing completion. The reservoir is filling, power is being developed, and people are receiving benefits from that great project.

It was not until last year that we got funds for the beginning of the construction of Table Rock.

I wish that your committee would bear in mind that Table Rock and Bull Shoals are tied together as a unit.

It would be rather foolish, from the standpoint of the engineers' and the economists' testimony, to build one of these dams without the other.

The construction of Table Rock will not only develop power at that site, but it will increase the output of power of the Ozark Beach Power Dam at Forsyth, Mo., a private utility which was constructed 41 years ago, and it will enormously increase the output of power of Bull Shoals which is about 100 water-miles, and 50 air-miles down the White River from Table Rock dam site.

Now, I want to impress upon you as one who was born there and has lived there all of his life, and these other witnesses will also tell you, that we have had recurring disastrous floods in that valley, I suppose, from time immemorial, but we have felt them most in recent years.

Between 1927 and 1938 there were seven disastrous floods, and we have had several since then. In fact, it is estimated that there is $2 million of flood damage each year in that valley.

So, from the standpoint of flood control alone the construction of Table Rock, I think, would be justified, but when you connect with it the generation of power and the increased power which it will give to both Ozark Beach Dam and Bull Shoals Dam, I do not

see how anyone could intelligently and logically oppose it.

I might say that the White River rises in the Boston Mountains in northwest Arkansas, and it flows through three counties in my district, Taney, Barry, and Stone and it cuts back across northeastern Arkansas and spills into the Mississippi. It is a clear, beautiful river as it storms out of those steep, rugged hillsides. I do not want to stress them unduly, but I think I should mention the great incidental benefits from a recreational standpoint.

We have there the Ozark Playgrounds Association. This is quite a watering place. We get tourists from St. Louis, Kansas City, Wichita, Tulsa, Little Rock, and that whole region who come there.

While some of our bottom farmlands in the White River Valley will be taken out of production and out of taxation, I think I am conservative and would be perfectly safe in predicting that within 2 or 3 years after the construction of that dam the revenues in my own county will be doubled or trebled. That is the experience we have had at Norfork and are having at Bull Shoals.

I want to point out, too, to this subcommittee that all of the power being generated at Bull Shoals is already contracted for by the huge aluminum plant being built in north Arkansas.

We have some precious and strategic minerals there, such as bauxite, titanium, lead, zinc, and fluoride, and if we had the power, and if we could adopt the electrolytic process, I am sure that many of these marginal mines which are having a hard time, and that many people out of employment would find gainful work and that the prosperity of the whole region would be enormously increased.

Most of the lake or the reservoir that this dam will create will be in my home county, Stone County, and Barry County to the west is in my district.

There is a little opposition to this project which has been quite vocal and vociferous. I should have enjoyed listening to them if I had had the time, but I can tell you as these other witnesses will tell you, Democrats, Republicans, Old Dealers, New Dealers, all of them, regardless of their politics or religion, that I think at least 95 percent of all of the people in my district and in JIM TRIMBLE'S district in that region are for the construction of Table Rock Dam.

If I did not think it was a worthy project I certainly would not have spent all of the time and energy that I have on it for 20 years. You gentlemen know me.

I served on the Flood Control Committee, on the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and on the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee, of the House of Representatives, and I served for 6 years as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, a lot of hard work, little honor, and no pay.

Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, is now president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress; I am chairman of the board.

I have been tremendously interested in flood control and aware of the importance of navigation, the development of hydroelectric power, and the conservation of our water and land resources all over this Nation. I have visited the dams and projects in the Ohio, the Mississippi, and the Missouri Valleys, and I have gone into Arkansas and up and down the Atchafalaya and Boeuf in Louisiana, all of them from the Columbia out in the West to the Connecticut in New England.

I have voted as a Member of Congress for certain projects, and I have voted against others.

I want you to know now that I do not want to turn my district into a lake.

The Engineers have a lot of projects in reserve on the shelf which I could never support. They even want to build a dam above my little home town of Galena. We do not want that one built. It would cover up Crane, Hurley, and Nixa, because the land up there is more of an open and level nature, but down at Table Rock on the White River above Bull Shoals and above the Ozark Beach Dam the valleys are deeper, or the hills are higher, put it either way you like, the canyons are narrower, and the construction of that dam will not cover up railroads or utilities or industries, and it will not interfere too much with highways and bridges. There will be a minimum of dislocation.

There will be some relocations of highways, and maybe 2 or 3 bridges to be built and a road, but it will create this reservoir there to protect a million acres of fertile farmlands below, chiefly in Arkansas.

They are going to benefit from it, but it will also generate power to give all of the people in that vast region where we have considerable unemployment an opportunity for employment. Bear in mind that has been declared a distress or hardship area.

That alone, I think, would almost justify the construction of this dam that will bring in new industries to develop our resources. Industries follow power.

My district is dotted with canning factories. We can tomatoes, peas, and beans, and it is great dairy country, and also poultry country, and great strawberry country. It is fast becoming one of the leading poultry and dairy districts in the United States.

My district, Mr. DAVIS, would compare very favorably with any district in the State of Wisconsin today in the production of milk, butter, and other dairy products; we have Kraft cheese, Carnation and Pet milk plants, and brooder houses scattered all through my district.

It is a great poultry and dairy country. We have these sawmills and industries there and we need this power because all of the power that is being generated at Bull Shoals is already committed for that aluminum plant.

It would be the greatest possible boon to that whole region, and this project is self-liquidating. It will pay off every dollar. There was $10,800,000 in the Truman budget.

I know and you know that Republicans were elected, and this administration put in power, because one of the main reasons was promised economy. We wanted to cut expenditures, and wanted to reduce taxes. We still do.

You know my voting record when it comes to economy and trying to restore the value of the dollar. I want to trim off all the fat that we can, but I do not want to cut into the muscle and I do not want to cut the nerve.

I think it would be false economy after all of the time and energy and money that has been spent on it, and the tremendous interest of the people in that vast region around Table Rock Dam to eliminate the whole $10,800,000 from the budget. It would be wanton waste.

These people would continue indefinitely in distress if you did that. The farmers in this region have not built homes, they have not painted their houses, they have not repaired their fences or barns, and they have not increased the fertility of their soil because they have been living with the sword of Damocles hanging over their heads, expecting to be covered up.

We have a lot of the local people here today to testify who will give you a clearer picture of their situation than I could.

When you think of the value that will be added to the whole region, not only in flood control, but from the development of hydroelectric power, and the bringing in of new industry, in giving employment to people there who need work, and who are eager for it, and all of the recreational advantages that the Ozark playland will afford I do not see how any man with an open mind, or with a sound brain, if he will just take time enough to get the true facts, how he could oppose such a worthy proposition.

I have never gotten a dime for such projects in my district until last year. I have never gotten a dime for flood control or for the development of dams, and some of the dams the engineers want built in my district we do not want built. We want to build Table Rock Dam because it is tied in, intertwined, interrelated with Bull Shoals. They are to function as a unit as the Army engineers will tell you. Table Rock is a sound economic investment that will pay dividends in the years ahead.

I do not think I could add anything more to what I have said unless you gentlemen want to ask some questions.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I have not risen to put any new project in this bill. The fact is I want to take one of the projects out. I live at Williston, which is in close proximity to Garrison Dam on which they have already spent $335 million. The irrigation system they expect to establish will cost about $335 million more. Before they get through with it and ready to operate it, the people of the United States will have a billion dollars in it. When the plant was authorized, they provided for a pool of 17 million acre-feet. Everybody agreed on that. That would not have flooded out our town. The Army engineers discovered in a few months they had found 6 million acre-feet more water

capacity. So now they want 23 million acre-feet. That takes away from us 90,000 acres of additional land in that rich valley. It inundates the railroad, the only railroad in our vicinity, the Great Northern. You have on record here this statement from the President that they will not maintain their line behind dikes. Here is the city of Williston with a population of 16,000 people, which is coming up fast since the discovery of oil. This rise of water floods that town out. They expect us to live behind dikes for the rest of our lives. The Congress never discussed dikes at all.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Does the gentleman intend to offer an amendment to take out this appropriation?

Mr. BURDICK. I do.

Mr. GAVIN. I will be glad to help you in the matter, and I will be glad to support the amendment.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I have no criticism against the committee at all. I think they did as well as anybody could do. But there is an item there for $4 million which can be stricken out. That $4 million is to provide protection to that area. It just says protection, but it does not say dikes. But I know what that means. They are going to protect us all right. The Congress does not know at this moment whether you can build a dike on quicksand which will keep the water out, and keep it from seeping onto agricultural land. It cannot be done because we have tried it. Furthermore, this reservoir will not be filled for the next 10 years or 15 years. Why is it necessary to run in here now, 10 or 12 years ahead of time and appropriate $4 million to buy land upon which to build these dikes. Now you can save some money this time if you want to. There are many bills coming up here on which I am going to vote with you to save money, but I am not going to vote with you to take away educational advantages. You found that out yesterday. But on matters of this kind, I am with you 100 percent. You would naturally think, when I come from Williston, that I am here to get something. But that is not true. I want you to take some of it back, and I am going to offer an amendment, when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule, to strike out this $4 million. Then we could have school lunches and we can have educational advantages and a lot of other things, but we do not need this appropriation at this time. According to the report that has come in this is exactly what the Army engineers will do with that $4 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers for unmarked graves; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; maintenance of that portion of the Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title, Confederate burial places under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, the Surrender Tree Site in Cuba, and graves used by the Army in commercial cemeteries; $4,870,000: *Provided*, That hereafter no railroad shall be permitted upon any right-of-way acquired by the United States leading to a national cemetery, or to encroach on any roads or walks thereon maintained by the United States: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be used to repair more than a single approach road to any national cemetery: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be obligated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family quarters at a cost per unit in excess of $14,000, but such limitation may be increased by such additional amounts as may be required to provide office space, public comfort rooms, or space for the storage of Government property within the same structure: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds in this or any other act shall be used for the payment for services rendered by any retired officer detailed on active duty at Arlington National Cemetery as provided by the War Department Appropriation Act, 1933 (Public Law 286, 72d Cong.).

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention to take the floor today. However, I think a very significant point has been brought to our attention by my very good and able friend the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], who is asking that $4 million be taken out of the $27 million that has been established for the Garrison Dam in North Dakota.

Therefore I am at a loss to understand just how the engineers arrive at what projects shall be included and what projects shall not be included in their recommendation as it is evident from what my good friend from North Dakota has stated the people of North Dakota are not concerned about the project.

I am interested in a little project up in my district at Johnsonburg, Pa., that was authorized in 1944. It was a four-phase project. The first phase was to construct a dam to impound the water, which has now been completed. The second and third phases were the widening, channeling, and dredging of the river at three small towns below the dam.

Last year we had an appropriation of $850,000 for this project for completion of the dam and there was an overage of $400,000 on the project. I assumed, in view of the fact that the law provided and I quote, "It is hereby modified to include construction of flood control work for the protection of Ridgway, Johnsonburg, St. Marys, Brockway, and vicinity in the State of Pennsylvania," that the engineers would immediately start on the second phase of the project, which was for widening, channeling, and dredging at this town of Johnsonburg, Pa., below the dam, but they, along with the Bureau of the Budget, decreed otherwise, that when this money was available it could not be applied to this project until it was authorized at the direction of the Congress. While the law specifically states "flood protection for the town of Johnsonburg" and the money was appropriated for this project, it was applied elsewhere; now what right they had to reallocate this money to some other project I cannot understand.

The Members of Congress certainly ought to be entitled to some consideration in these various projects which concern the economic and industrial life of their districts, and when appropriations are made to a project and they are to be diverted elsewhere that consideration should be given Members of Congress before action is taken. I did not bypass the Civil Functions Subcommittee; I went before them; I explained the whole situation as the hearings indicate. This money was appropriated for this particular project; still I get no satisfaction; the money is reallocated somewhere else. I do not know whom I can appeal to other than in regular manner go to the Civil Functions Subcommittee, present my case, and ask them to consider it. I do not know what consideration was given other than the $30,000 included for planning and in the report it states on page 6 that although money has been allocated for planning, yet the allocation of funds is not to be taken as an indication that the project will be considered. I am at a loss as to whom we can appeal. The Bureau of the Budget says to go to the engineers; the engineers say to go to the Bureau of the Budget; and from the Bureau of the Budget they tell you it is up to the Civil Functions Subcommittee.

And here is the irony of it, after I have been working on this project for 10 years and every spring and fall the town is threatened with devastating floods—the other day, Friday, the day the bill was presumably marked up, Johnsonburg was again badly hit by a cloudburst and in the west end area the town homes were under 5 to 6 feet of water. Here we have a desperate situation existing where people are being flooded out each year and can secure no relief.

I have many telegrams and pictures here from that area. Let me read some and place the rest in the RECORD:

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:

Dredging of Clarion River at and below Johnsonburg absolutely necessary immediately. Eighth disastrous flood occurred Friday night. Estimated personal damage, $2,000.

G. E. MCALEE.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:

Please get some dredging for west bend of Clarion River. We had a disastrous flood Friday night; personal loss, approximately $4,000.

MERLE CROSS.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Disastrous flood Friday night; lost all the first-floor furnishings. Please do something; need help badly.
Mr. and Mrs. LAVERN BREAKEY.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Dredging of Clarion River at Johnsonburg absolutely necessary immediately. Eighth disastrous flood occurred Friday night; estimated personal damage, $20,000.
McMANIGLE MOTORS,
REED MCMANIGLE.

RIDGWAY, PA., *May 26, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Floodwaters of Clarion River and Silver Creek rising at over 1 foot per hour at Johnsonburg, Pa. Emergency whistle blown at 11 a. m. this date warning residents to abandon homes. West Johnsonburg and Rolfe flooded for second time in 3 days. Aroused citizens cannot understand lack of governmental action when necessity for flood-control project this area has been proven and accepted for so long a period. Clarion River and Elk Creek about to overflow banks in Ridgway Borough. You have seen the millions of dollars destruction and loss of life this area as result of repeated floods. Suggest your colleagues also come to site and view damage. Immediate action necessary.
PAUL B. GREINER,
Republican County Chairman.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 26, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Vote yes on flood control for Johnsonburg. Hit twice in 3 days.
Eddie Hazer, William McGonigal, Richard Dubler, Mrs. C. E. McAlee, Mr. G. E. McAlee, Miss Ann McAlee, Mr. Regis Wilhelm, Henry Wilhelm.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 26, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Junior Women's Club representing 70 women of Johnsonburg urgently request continuation of your efforts for Johnsonburg flood control.
MARY ZELENOSKI,
Corresponding Secretary.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
My home flooded. Still raining. Please vote favorable H. R. 4485, amended May 20, 1944.
Mr. and Mrs. B. F. GARRY.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Again deluged by 4 feet of muddy floodwaters from the west branch of the Clarion River. When are you going to get us some relief?
Mrs. E. A. HEWETT.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Flooded again Friday night. What are you going to do about it? Lost first-floor furnishings.
Mr. and Mrs. LOUIS JORDAN.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Just narrowly averted another 1942 flood. Imperative flood control be finished by the small additional outlay necessary if we are to have full benefit of East Branch Dam.
D. S. DICKINSON,
General Manager, Russell Snow Plow Co.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
We respectfully request your continued leadership and support for flood-control project in Johnsonburg.
AMERICAN LEGION POST, 50,
L. E. ANDERSON, *Adjutant,*
Johnsonburg, Pa.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Please appropriate funds for flood control, West Johnsonburg.
E. J. MCDONALD, Jr.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
May 23 flash flood proves present control inadequate. Johnsonburg Order of Eastern Star, 160 members, urges prompt consideration of flood control of west branch Clarion River.
WELFARE COMMITTEE OF JOHNSONBURG CHAPTER NO. 36, OES,
KATHERYN WOLBERT, *Secretary.*

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Your help in getting appropriation for flood relief in West Johnsonburg needed urgently.
ORA MCALEE.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Earnestly urge your continued support of flood control in Johnsonburg.
Mrs. L. E. ANDERSON.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Disastrous flood again Friday night; lost first floor furnishings. Please get west branch Clarion River dredged.
RICHARD KOSMISKI.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Disastrous flood Friday night. Please have west branch of Clarion river dredged. Property and furniture ruined.
Mrs. PHILIP CROTZER.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Disastrous flood Friday night. Please have west branch of Clarion River dredged. Property and furniture ruined.
R. J. PRESHAK.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Urgent help needed by dredging west branch of Clarion River. Lost entire beauty shop in flood Saturday. My only means of support.
C. BERTILLA MALLOY.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building:
Please pass flood-control bill.
ROMAN KOSMISKI.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Crescent Study Club, representing 120 women of Johnsonburg, urgently request continuation of your efforts for Johnsonburg flood control.
MARY GORDON,
Corresponding Secretary, Crescent Study Club.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We request approval of second step flood relief at once.
Arthur L. Hughes; Christie Storrar; Norman Miller; Peter W. McAlee; John R. Preshak; John Cander; George A. Long, Jr.; John Marrone; Dick A. Ross; Paul S. Black; S. C. Dragone; R. A. Kosmiski; Jack Keneske; Larry Zuraski; T. P. Gray; Mr. and Mrs. George Forrest; Mr. I. C. Williams; Mr. and Mrs. Arthur O'Neil; R. C. Myers; Mr. and Mrs. Laverne Breakey; Mrs. George Freyer; Mr. and Mrs. James Primearano; Harold Kirkpatrick; S. A. Vavala; Thomas Starror; Bernard R. Pavlock; Joseph F. Kriegish; James R. Shuey; Paul Launer; Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Evans; Mr. and Mrs. Emmett J. McDonald, Sr.; Mr. and Mrs. Harold Mortimer; Mr. and Mrs. Heitzenrater; Mr. and Mrs. Cleto Duchi; Mr. and Mrs. Gerald F. Russell; Mr. and Mrs. Edward Dubler; Mr. and Mrs. Jack McGonigal; Mr. and Mrs. Ross P. Young; Mr. and Mrs. John R. Clark; Mr. and Mrs. Miles Wheeler; Mr. and Mrs. James Eggler; Mrs. C. E. McAlee; Beatrice McAlee; Mrs. James Flanagan; Mrs. William McKnight.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Flood conditions over weekend point up need for continuing effort to obtain funds for flood control.
RUTH BRADLEY.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Increase efforts for appropriation for flood relief in West Johnsonburg.
BEATRICE MCALEE.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*
Hon. LEON GAVIN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urgently request aid from repeated flood damage.
Mrs. Thomas Zeleckoski, Mr. Thomas Zeleckoski, Joseph Parana, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Parana, Edwin Muroski, Mr. and Mrs. Malcolm Stump, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Stump, Guy Allegretti, Arthur R. Airgood, Lawrence John Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Kroah, Mrs. Anthony Ferragine, Mrs. Antoinetta Ferragine, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Wickett, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Vinilla, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Pusl, Mr. and Mrs. James Brown, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Stahli, Claude R. Willor, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Beaver, Mr. John Connors, Mr. Fred Hoffman, Merle E. Cross, Hannah M. Hewett, Mr. James Heitzenrater, Mrs. James Heitzenrater, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Wilhelm, Mr. and Mrs. Alois Dietz, Mr. and Mrs. Norman Parks, Mr. Sam Parks, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Smith.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*

LEON H. GAVIN,

New House Office Building:

We have had the eighth disastrous flood, destroying all furnishings, floors, and decorating on first floor. We want immediate relief by dredging west branch of Clarion.

Mr. and Mrs. MILES WHEELER.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,

New House Office Building:

Disastrous flood occurred again Friday night. Please have something done about dredging of west branch Clarion River. Lost first-floor furnishings and car Friday night in flood.

VINCENT LUPOLE.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,

New House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Rush legislation to dredge west branch Clarion River.

Mrs. Glenn McAlee, Robert Abplanalp, W. M. Stahli, Central Hose Co. No. 1, Carl Miller, Mrs. Donald Dickey, Mr. and Mrs. John Cunningham, Lloyd Wachob, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Mann, Mr. and Mrs. W. V. Terry, Mr. and Mrs. Glenn C. Willow, Mr. and Mrs. Regis Wilhelm, Mr. and Mrs. John Gorske, James Wilhour, John H. Steudler, James M. Hennessy, Stephen Gapinski, B. Garry Marlin King, Mr. and Mrs. John Wachob, Jasper Torchia, Mr. and Mrs. Allen L. O'Connor, Mr. and Mrs. John Dubler, Robert C. Jacobs, Jr., Laura Belle Jacobs, Fiore Allegretto, Mary Allegretto, Mr. and Mrs. Chas. Resch, Mr. and Mrs. P. Punair, Mr. and Mrs. Wm. McGonigal, Mr. and Mrs. Geo. Steudler, Mr. and Mrs. John Sekelsky, Helen Sekelsky.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 26, 1953.*

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,

New House Office Building:

The Catholic Daughters of America representing over 200 women of Johnsonburg urgently request your continued efforts for Johnsonburg flood control.

Miss JENIE MALFARA,

Secretary, Catholic Daughters of America.

ST. MARYS, PA., *May 26, 1953.*

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,

House of Representatives:

In behalf of 2,000 members of local 502, IUE–CIO, who reside in Johnsonburg, Ridgway, St. Marys and Elk County area we request that you do everything within your power to have money appropriated for flood control project in this area to supplement the East Dam Branch project just completed so that further discomfort and hardship to residents in this area will be eliminated. Request you inform me on this matter at your earliest convenience.

JOHN P. MCCLUSKEY, *President.*

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 26, 1953.*

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,

New House Office Building:

Fifty thousand dollars damage in West Johnsonburg. Please rush relief.

Harvey Lehman, Mr. and Mrs. Howard McAnick, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Dudler, Henry Wilhelm, Richard Kosmiski, Mrs. Philip Crotzer, Philip Crotzer, R. J. Preshak, Mrs. Forrest Crotzer, Mr. Forrest Crotzer, Mrs. Ross Young, Mr. Charles Sweeney, Mrs. Anna Sweeney, Mrs. Rose Seneno, Mr. Frank Serena, Franj Kreigger, Mr. and Mrs. W. R. Myers, Mrs. Joseph Czekal, Joseph Wolfe, H. Korep, Neva Breakey, Mrs. E. J. Bliskey, Mrs. Fred Eggler, Mrs. Mary Nelson, D. D. Nelson, Mildred Nelson, Mr. and Mrs. Irvin Henry, Mrs. Gertrude Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Claude Gordon.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,

New House Office Building

Seventeen floods since 1936. Where is relief for flood control?

Mr. and Mrs. Dan O'Connell, Mr. and Mrs. Victor Wolfe, Pearl Wolfe, Lawrence Polaski, Josephine Polaski, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Boulis, Mr. and Mrs. William Bullers, Fannie Howe, Andy Gullickson, Mr. and Mrs. Pat Condon, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Himes, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Fiscuss, D. M. Fulton, R. O. Fulton, Mr. and Mrs. Terry Merle Wolfe, Mr. and Mrs. William Girts, Mr. and Mrs. B. Piurkoski, Mrs. Sarah Nortum, Paul Wingate, Mr. and Mrs. Mike Paladino, Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Rosenhoover, Mr. and Mrs. Angelo Metro, Mr. and Mrs. S. E. Mortimer, C. H. Leroy, C. W. Kifer, Mr. and Mrs. John Mann, Edward D. Schott.

JOHNSONBURG, PA., *May 25, 1953.*

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,

New House Office Building:

How much longer must we wait for flood relief?

Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Mowrey, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Bedfore, Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Aunkst, Mrs. Ruth Klase, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Himes, Mrs. Shirley Halpin, Mrs. Ben Himes, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Harry Anderson, Mr. and Mrs. Bell Olosiwioski, Amanda Kosmiski, Clair Clark, Mr. and Mrs. Ed Clark, Charles Zuroski, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Gabor, Miss Gladys Mecca, Mr. and Mrs. Orville Dickey, Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Parks, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Ross, Mr. and Mrs. Ray Blashak, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Kasmurski, Mr. and Mrs. Ray Liscinski, Julia M. Steele, Edward Sosmiski, Mrs. E. Allegretto, Adam Sopok, Joseph Zedkoci, Mrs. Clara Weirich, Mrs. Leon Muroski, Mrs. Chester Willow.

But here today, a gentleman, a distinguished gentleman from North Dakota whom I greatly admire, takes the floor and states that they neither want nor do they need the money that has been allocated to the Garrison Dam project in North Dakota and that he is going to offer an amendment to cut it by $4 million, and yet we come to committee and present our case representing the people back home who are begging for relief from these devastating, recurring floods that are periodically visited upon their community; they are asking for help, and we can secure no help while millions are allocated on projects that are not wanted. These folks have no opportunity to take part in the discussion here today or present their case. They depend upon their representatives for help.

Why are not these matters carefully considered, as to where this money should be allocated? And why is it not wisely and equitably allocated where it would be most effective and do the most good for the people?

Why do we see small projects denied? Why do Members have to come up here and plead their case vigorously to afford relief to suffering people? Why are not cases like that presented by our friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], taken care of? Here we find him appealing for help in a desperate situation that has developed in New York harbor where a small appropriation would be most helpful. And there are many other places where small amounts of money would be effective to relieve existing conditions that need attention and should be taken care of.

But when it comes to the question of a gigantic monumental dam we can spend ten, twenty, thirty, or forty millions; but the folks back home who are getting flooded out every spring and fall every year, who come here and ask for help, cannot get any consideration. So I have reached the point where I am concerned as to how my State, a great State whose industrial and economic life is threatened in this highly competitive situation over the United States, can get the help it needs particularly on flood control.

In this town I talk about we have 1 industry in which 1,800 or 2,000 people are employed. When the rains and cloudburst hit it last Friday, May 22, it again meant trouble, homes flooded out, 5 or 6 feet of water in the streets and the individual losses are great. Those people are affected, and it affects the economic life of that whole community. I was in that town in 1942 when the plant was closed down for weeks, when I saw whole rows of houses that had been bowled over, 8 or 10 houses laying on top of one another and in that flood people were marooned on tops of houses and freight cars. Certainly those are the sort of projects we should consider? I listened to my very good and able friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], who turned in a remarkable performance in his conscientious way as chairman of this subcommittee, but I just want to point out that it is about time we get away from these recommendations of the engineers on these 20-, 30-, and 40-million-dollar projects and let us get to thinking about the folks back home.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I may say that we have been in more or less the same predicament as has the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It seems to us that year after year it is virtually impossible to get any consideration in this particular bill for what we consider very meritorious projects, and by "meritorious" I have in mind four different areas in my particular congressional district in Minnesota where the floods in recent years have so silted in the normal drainage outlets that the entire drainage system which had operated well for the last 40 years has now collapsed, and in some instances we have as much as 70,000 acres of good farm land in the lower Red River Valley inundated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GAVIN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, last year alone we had in my congressional district a loss of $1 million to the people simply because of the lack

of consideration in years gone by to these problems directly affecting the people. As the gentleman has well said, it is time for this Congress to do a little serious thinking and to try to force the Army engineers or whoever it might be to get in and take a look at these projects which mean so much to the people involved and try to save those people.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman for expressing his opinion. These losses are by individuals, and they cannot understand why relief is not afforded them. When I go back to my district and say, "You do not understand the situation. What difficulties we encounter to get an appropriation through Congress" they say, "We want relief. We are taxpayers. You say it is being considered. It has been considered for years they say. Why do we not get action?" Then the flood breaks and again they have individual losses running into thousands of dollars, their homes are washed out, they have to clean up the debris. They cannot continue to take this beating. That is why I went before the committee and asked that some consideration be given to this matter. The money had been appropriated. It was not going to increase the appropriation, it had been allocated, yet they took it away and reallocated it to other places.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I commend the gentleman for his statement regarding the situation in Pennsylvania. I want to call your attention to your neighboring State of Ohio. Four million dollars was recommended in the Truman budget for Cleveland Harbor and $3 million was recommended by the Eisenhower budget. This committee eliminated it entirely. As I see it, those of us coming from the Great Lakes States and those who are Representatives from New England are remiss if we fail to point out the fact that the committee is killing the goose that lays the golden egg.

Industries are moving elsewhere because Congress provides vast appropriations for undeveloped areas. I am not being narrow and provincial, but I submit that since these Great Lakes States provide so much of the tax money, and inasmuch as Cleveland Harbor supplies the entire country with steel and products we manufacture we deserve every consideration. This harbor cannot serve boats larger than 475 feet—and they are now building boats approximately 600 feet long—you can appreciate why we are concerned.

The Cleveland Harbor project has been approved in House Document No. 629, 79th Congress, 2d session, and also has the approval of the Defense Production Administration and the Munitions Board as being necessary in connection with the current national-defense program.

This project should be completed at the earliest date possible in order that the three steel companies, American Steel & Wire Co., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., and Republic Steel Corp., might receive iron ore and limestone without delays inasmuch as the capacity of the three steel companies has increased from 1,767,000 tons in 1938 to in excess of 4 million tons annually.

Railroad companies owning bridges replaced under the Truman-Hobbs Act will not let contracts unless sufficient funds have been made available to pay the Government's share of the costs. Therefore, if appropriations are not made to carry the work forward, construction will be delayed at least 12 months.

It takes 6 months to get delivery on steel piling and from 9 to 12 months on heavy steel for bridge construction.

This project has moved along in a very orderly way in the past because funds have been made available so that the Corps of Engineers could arrange with the railroads to let contracts, and the $5,085,000 now available is under contract and is to be spent as follows:

Bridge No. 25	$15,000
Bridge No. 8	40,000
Bridge No. 9	2,677,000
Bridge No. 1	2,334,600
Plans and specifications for bridge No. 15	13,000
Plans and specifications for bridge No. 3	5,400
Total	5,085,000

The working plans and specifications for a new bridge No. 15, owned by the New York-Chicago & St. Louis Railroad, and bridge No. 3, owned by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, will be completed by August and contracts could be let by September 1 providing that the $3 million recommended in the Eisenhower budget is approved by Congress. This money would be spent as follows:

Bridge No. 15 (cost) $5,168,000	$1,730,000
Bridge No. 3 (cost) $3,311,000	1,269,000

The Cleveland steel companies have spent in excess of $160,000,000 in enlarging their steel-making facilities at Cleveland, and they can only move ore carriers up the Cuyahoga River which are not less than 35 years old and many are 55 years old. There are so few of these small boats that there aren't enough water transportation facilities available to meet the needs of Cleveland steel mills; therefore, part of their shipments have to move by rail at tremendous expense.

It is hoped that the Congress will recommend $3,000,000 for the fiscal year 1954 so that this important project which is in the interest of national defense might move forward without delaying it at least 1 year.

Mr. GAVIN. I agree with the gentleman, and I, too, am not selfish. I like to see the exploration and exploitation of all parts of our country, the development of our natural resources, the conservation and development of our forest areas, but at the same time I think we ought to give a little consideration to the man on the street and folks back home. He has no one to speak for him other than his Representative, and when he has difficulties and he and his family are flooded out and all of his personal effects are lost, and his home is ruined, I think he should be given some assistance. I feel that instead of building some of these gigantic dams, like the one my good friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], talked about, for which they are allocating $27 million, and from what my very distinguished friend tells us the people out there do not want, and I think he represents the people and represents them well—but still the engineers are going ahead and they are putting in $27 million—it would be more advisable to take part of that and allocate it among all of these projects that are emergency projects. They need help, they are begging us for help, as these wires indicate to me, pleading with me, to see what I can do with the Congress to get some help from these devastating floods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has brought up the problem facing the people of his district. Both he and I have attempted over the years to secure some consideration, but seemingly there has been no solution. I have four large separate areas of good farmland in my district that are slowly deteriorating into slough bottom land because of the closing up through silting of the normal outlets. The floods of 1951 and 1952 have so closed up these outlets that the normal drainage facilities have become practically useless. Consequently, thousands of acres of the best farmland in the Midwest is becoming waterlogged and we are forced to turn to the Army engineers for help in saving these farms from destruction.

The Army engineers in St. Paul have been very cooperative and helpful, but with their very limited funds they are unable to do the necessary investigative and survey work. Yet right in this bill the subcommittee has seen fit to cut down the amount for necessary investigations and surveys having to do with the entire United States. I repeat, these gentlemen have seen fit to cut down this very necessary work to two-thirds of what has been requested by the budget. By this action they close the door on permitting the engineers to look into what we consider an emergency.

It is rather discouraging for these farmers who have been writing me recently to the effect that formerly, 10 years ago, where they farmed a good quarter section of land, or 160 acres, now they have 57 or 60 acres of that land available for farming and the balance is under water. What would you personally think if about two-thirds of your property were taken away from you through something not within your ability to cope with? You would probably ask Uncle Sam to help, as it is within the Federal responsibility to keep open the natural drainage outlets by cleaning out these streams and rivers of the sediment they have filled up with. The whole thing is getting worse from year to year. It has gradually gotten to the point where we have to do something about it because, not only is the property of thousands of farmers involved, but because the health of fine communities is threatened. These drainage waters cannot get out by the normal outlet and consequently last spring in five communities in my district the sewage facilities were blocked. Surely when

the health of people is involved, we here in Congress can at least put up the needed funds to permit the Army engineers to do something about it.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is my intention tomorrow to endeavor to replace in the budget, not just for my State, but for the overall nationwide work having to do with the investigations by the Army engineers, the sum of $750,000, to bring back part way to the level of this fiscal year the moneys they have had available for this work. We need help and I am sure the Army engineers can do what our communities cannot accomplish by themselves. A little help now will restore over 50,000 acres of good farmland to production. Most essential of all is the protection of the health of hundreds of children. My district has never asked directly any assistance since I have been in Congress. Now we would appreciate very much some consideration in the solution of what is, to us, a very serious problem.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARRINGTON: On page 2, line 12, strike out "$4,870,000" and substitute "$5,067,900."

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase the total appropriation for cemetery expenses by the amount of $197,000, which is the amount by which the budget estimate figures for maintenance and operations were reduced. During the course of general debate, I asked the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, just how that economy was to be achieved. He said the answer was to be found in a sentence in the third paragraph of the report, which says:

The committee believes these reductions can be achieved by increased use of mechanized equipment in the cemeteries and by restriction of the activities of the technical planning and development section of the cemetery branch to those clearly essential to the operation of the program.

I am prompted to offer this amendment by the very great concern I have about the condition of the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific. This is one of the three great cemeteries created as a result of World War II. It is located in the Punch Bowl Crater in Honolulu. At the present time some 14,000 of World War II dead are located there. I presented to the committee in the hearings a letter from the leading landscape architects of Honolulu pointing out that at the present time there were a total of only eight men available for the maintenance of the cemetery, an area of 40 acres, in which more than 14,000 graves are situated. I think the gentleman who wrote that letter, Mr. Robert D. Thompson, knows whereof he speaks, and I think he made a particularly important point when he said that the estimate of expenditures necessary there was based upon experience in the States, rather than upon the special requirements of Hawaii. In this part of the country and throughout the States, you do not have to maintain your grass and your plants for much more than 6 months of the year. But when you get down into the tropics, you have to maintain them for 12 months of the year, and, in fact, the growth during the winter months is very great because of the heavy rainfall. I also presented to the committee a letter from Mr. Harland Bartholomew, one of the most distinguished city planners and landscape architects of this country. Mr. Bartholomew said he had recently been at the cemetery and was disappointed in its present appearance. He added that possibly one of the difficulties encountered in the maintenance of the Punch Bowl is that costs may have been judged by precedents in other cemeteries by a standard cost of maintenance per acre or per grave that did not apply in Hawaii.

The Punch Bowl Cemetery cannot be maintained on the standards that apply in the temperate zone because it is situated in a semitropical area where conditions are very different.

There is need in the Hawaii cemetery for much more water due to the irregularity of the rainfall. There is also a need for special planning and special care of types of plants native to Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the answer to the inadequate personnel at the Punchbowl cemetery may be found in the testimony of General Marshall. He told the committee that the standard for determining the personnel required for maintenance was 1 man for every 3,000 graves or 5 acres. By using what he described as the mathematical approach to this problem, it is evident that someone arrived at the conclusion that only 8 laborers were needed in Hawaii because there are 40 acres being used or available for graves.

I should like the committee to inform me, if it can, whether the special conditions prevailing in Hawaii have been taken into account in arriving at the need for maintenance funds. The maintenance of the cemetery in good condition is important to the morale of our Armed Forces. Honolulu is the gateway to the Far East. Practically all of the troops called into service pass through Honolulu. Many of them visit the memorial cemetery. Certainly it will not improve their morale to find that the cemetery is not maintained in proper condition.

I trust the chairman will be willing to offer answers to the questions I have raised.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know how much the gentleman has done toward the development of the cemetery there and having the markers at least put back in a temporary way. Certainly the least we can do is to honor our dead.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that has been offered. I do so with a great deal of respect for the sincerity in which the amendment was offered; but I do so first because, in accordance with the explanation which we have placed in our report, we believe that certain economies can be effected in the overall operation and maintenance program. It should be made clear that we do not earmark the specific funds for the specific cemeteries. We are not in a position to judge whether or not they need 1 or 2 additional men for maintenance in this particular cemetery that might be transferred from some other place, but we are in a very good position to judge the overall picture. It is true that the figure before us this afternoon does represent a reduction in the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget, but it is just as true that the amount provided in this bill is the most that has ever been provided for the operation and maintenance of the cemeteries. Last year there was appropriated $2,285,000. This year the amount recommended by the committee was $2,330,000. So when you consider that there can reasonably be expected reductions in overall costs for this maintenance program, and when you consider that the amount this year represents an increase over what we had last year and what we had the year before and the year before that, I think it is reasonable to expect that the proper maintenance of this cemetery and all of the other cemeteries in this program can be adequately cared for by the amount provided in this bill.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have every sympathy with the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii, but I agree with my chairman of the subcommittee that the figure this year is larger than any appropriation made for this purpose since World War II. I hope that this committee will see fit to defeat the amendment and leave the figure that we have provided, which I believe is ample for the purpose.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman, and, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Was it not the understanding that we were not going to vote on any amendments this afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman knows of no such understanding.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Well, I think we should have a quorum before deciding any of these items in this important bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman withdraw that?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will withdraw it for the moment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It is the understanding with the members of the subcommittee on the other side that we would attempt to finish just this paragraph on cemetery expenses this afternoon and then withhold any discussion of the Corps of Engineers program and other items until we meet tomorrow. I believe we can reasonably dispose of this paragraph without hardship or unfairness to anyone, and then it is my intention to move that the Committee rise as soon as we have finished this paragraph.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Might I further discuss the point of order? Is

the gentleman from Hawaii in agreement with that?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I am perfectly agreeable to following that procedure, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That procedure is all right with me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for withdrawing his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota withdraw his point of order?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Temporarily, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Hawaii.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REAMS: On page 2, line 12, after the figures "$4,870,000", strike the colon, add comma, and insert the following: "$850,000 of which may be used to pay to next of kin not exceeding $25 in lieu of headstone or marker for the grave of any deceased person for which the Secretary of Defense is authorized to furnish a marker or headstone: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense receive from the administrator or executor of the estate, or next of kin, proper proof that there has been purchased and placed upon the grave of the veteran a suitable marker or headstone of a value not less than $25."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the generosity of the chairman of the subcommittee in reserving the point of order and thereby permitting me to present this amendment to the committee. My amendment does have the refreshing quality of not asking that the appropriation be increased.

This amendment would permit the Government to furnish to the next of kin $25 in cash in lieu of the headstone which is given to the next of kin of each veteran who applies for it. During the year 1952, $1,403,947 was spent for these headstones. The cost was said to be $19.60 apiece. I am quite sure that was a wholesale cost at the plant, because the appropriation would indicate that there was a total cost in excess of $25 spent for each stone.

The markers which are offered to the next of kin to mark graves of veterans are very small, plain slabs. They are not appropriate to all purposes for which they are intended. There is no choice, except a very limited degree.

I am advised that these headstones that are furnished to the families of deceased veterans are so cheap and so unsatisfactory that a great many of the families never place them in the cemeteries. Often they do not match the other monuments and the other markers in the family cemetery lot. Often they are so out of keeping with the feeling of love and respect that the family has for the veteran that they are abandoned and not used. I have seen a great many of these thrown aside and used as stepping stones instead of for memorial, the purpose for which they were intended.

The purpose of this amendment is to carry out the desire of the Congress and the Government properly to mark the graves of its veterans. It will do five things in this respect. In the first place it will permit the family to take this $25 in lieu of the marker and apply it to the kind of stone they want to erect on their loved ones grave. If they want to put up a $100 marker they will not take the one which cost the taxpayer $25 and discard it when they find it is not suitable. They will have $25 which can be applied toward a better marker. If they cannot afford to pay more than $25, they will have the choice of either getting the ready made, hand-me-down marker, such as is being given now, or purchase one from their own monument builder for $25. They will at least have the choice of the color of the stone and the inscription thereon.

Second. It will insure that if the Government spends this $25 the marker will be used and that the grave will be marked. Many of these veterans' graves are not marked now because the markers are so unsuitable they would rather have none than to put that on. This amendment would require that a certificate be made to the Army before they issued the $25 certifying that a suitable marker has been purchased and has been placed on the grave.

Third. It will give to those who decide to spend more money for the marker a contribution toward a monument which will meet the desire and ability to pay of the family of the veteran.

Fourth. It will carry out the principle of private enterprise which we talk so much about here but with which principle we often inconsistently appropriate the taxpayers' money. If there ever was a case of inconsistency with private enterprise, it is here in the purchase of these monuments wholesale from 1 or 2 big companies and completely bypassing the local monument builder.

And, lastly, Mr. Chairman, it will assure the Government that the wasteful practice of having these monuments ordered by the families of veterans and veterans' organizations whether they expect to use them or not will no longer exist if this amendment is adopted.

I do hope the chairman of the subcommittee will waive the point of order and let this amendment be adopted by the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order on the ground this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes a point of order that this amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard?

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair thinks that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5376) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FINANCIAL AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES WITH FOREIGN EXCHANGE SHOULD BE REEXAMINED

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Congress is being called upon to provide additional funds for foreign aid and military assistance to the NATO countries. In view of the amount of the expenditure, and considering some unanswered questions, I am going to insist on a few explanations of what has happened to our money in this and similar instances, before I shall expect to vote for the additional funds requested.

I think the Members of the House will be interested in some facts that have come to my attention in connection with the establishment of our huge defense bases in Morocco. The United States is required to make all exchange of American dollars for Moroccan francs through the State Bank of Morocco. Payroll and materials purchases in Morocco are paid in Moroccan francs.

The serious situation, to my mind, is that this exclusive authority is in the hands of what is now primarily a private bank. That is, the bank is owned either by private individuals or other banking institutions. It is not owned by the Moroccan Government. During the period that this exchange has taken place, the American Government and its contractors have been given an exchange rate of approximately 350 francs to the dollar while the international rate existing in Tangiers, a short distance away, is approximately 400 francs to the dollar. It would appear that someone or some group has had the advantage of taking the difference. Oddly enough, the headquarters of the State Bank of Morocco is in Tangiers where this free money market exists. For some time this bank also was making a charge, in addition to the lower exchange rate, for the changing of American dollars for Moroccan francs.

Originally the State Bank of Morocco was established as one of the results of the International Conference of Algeciras. It was intended to be an international bank, and 14 shares were distributed, 1 each among 14 countries. Since that time a majority of the shares have become the property of private banks. The largest holdings are held by the oldest and largest French investment bank, which holds 6 of the 14 shares, Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas. The chairman of its board is a former governor of the Bank of France.

It is significant to note in the earnings and assets record of this bank that there has been a tremendous jump in assets and profits during the time our forces have been in Morocco. From 1945 to 1950 the assets of this bank have increased at a rate of approximately two to three billion francs a year. From 1950 to 1951 the assets of this bank increased 17 billion francs, or an increase of approximately 5 times the previous average annual increase in assets. The earnings of the bank in 1950 and 1951 show a similar increase. The figures for 1952, I understand, show still further spectacular increases for both assets and profits.

This is just one of many instances wherein in the past our State Department agreements have been to the disadvantage of our country economically. I hope that the new State Department will proceed to correct this inequitable situation. Since these profits of the Bank of Morocco go primarily into private hands, it is significant that we have had to pay in just money exchange alone from 12 to 15 percent markup. We do not have exact figures, but from information I have been able to obtain it is my opinion these private banking institutions have made profits during 1950, 1951, and 1952 of more than $40 million. The committees of Congress charged with the supervision of the State Department should insist upon an examination of all similar provisions in our treaties which are to the detriment of our economy or trade. It also seems to me that we should divest ourselves of the idea that all our international agreements must be entered into by our so-called striped-pants corps of the State Department. We need a few more experienced businessmen to sit at the conference tables and guard against these disadvantageous economic provisions in treaties which cost the taxpayers of this country millions of dollars.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 249, Rept. No. 471), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 250, Rept. No. 472), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5069) to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SURPLUS LABOR AREAS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, while this legislative body awaits the decision of the House Ways and Means Committee on the proposal to impose a quota limitation on residual oil imports, I call attention to the recent announcement of the Secretary of Labor in relation to his attempts—in cooperation with the Office of Defense Mobilization—to encourage new industry to enter surplus labor areas.

Two of the current 35 surplus labor areas, as defined by the Bureau of Economic Security, are in the congressional district which I represent, and you may be sure that we are intensely interested in any plan that would bring relief to our depressed economy. Meanwhile, however, a very distinct measure of assistance can be granted by Congress merely by enacting the bill to limit residual oil imports and protect other industries suffering from the unfair competition of cheap foreign products.

Of the 35 surplus labor areas, 16 are coal-producing areas. The coal industry and its employees first began to feel the adverse effects of foreign residual oil when America's fuel markets became the dumping ground for this alien product shortly after the end of World War II. The problem was accentuated with the gradual increase in shipments during succeeding years, and each month the high water mark of economic distress has been reaching a new high level.

We in the northern part of the State have been particularly hard hit by foreign oil because a good percentage of our coal markets are on the eastern seaboard where oil importers are enticing away our customers with dump prices for their alien-produced product.

The currently quarterly report issued by the West Virginia State Department of Mines shows that in Monongalia County alone there has been a loss of 668 jobs in the first quarter of 1953. But our coal miners and their families are not the only group affected by these conditions. As a Bluefield newspaper editor stated in this month's issue of the West Virginia State Magazine:

Anything that means trouble for coal means trouble for West Virginia.

Layoffs on coal-carrying railroads must necessarily accompany declines in freight traffic. Our timber people and other suppliers are idle. Whole communities are suffering. The coal industry has always been the chief source of income in West Virginia. We have in my congressional district one of the world's outstanding mining schools—at the University of West Virginia—and we encourage our boys to study courses in mining engineering because we are confident that the coal industry can provide a good living for our people through the years if it is not placed at a disadvantage through unfair competitive practices.

The policy of admitting unrestricted quantities of foreign residual oil into coal's markets constitutes a serious breach of the basic principles of free competition. It abets depression and contributes to the establishment of labor surplus areas in the United States.

We welcome all efforts that may bring new industry into our district, but we know that recovery can be expedited if Congress will place a curb on residual oil imports.

SALE OF AUSTRIAN WINTER PEAS BY THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, some of the Members of the House may have read an article in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, May 21. The article

dealt at some length with a sale by the Commodity Credit Corporation of 80,000 tons of dried winter peas, a feed crop, to a select group of buyers at a price well below the sale price then current. To begin the story on this transaction, which is the subject of my remarks this afternoon, I will introduce into the RECORD at this point the full text of the Daily News article:

PRIVATE DEAL LOPS $1,000,000 OFF PRICE—FAVORITISM CHARGED IN GOP SURPLUS SALE

There's a political storm brewing over, of all things, 80,000 tons of dried winter peas.

The new Republican leadership at the Agriculture Department is in the middle of it.

Democrats are talking quietly about favoritism and the Republican mess, and their voices may get louder. Agriculture spokesmen have so far declined to give a full explanation from their point of view.

The peas are, officially, Austrian winter peas—a cover crop. Agriculture bought some seed from Northwest growers in 1951 to keep the price up, and it has been trying to sell the surplus peas ever since.

This April 1, in its regular monthly list of surplus commodities for sale, the Agriculture Department offered 100,000 tons of dried peas for use as cattle feed, at $50 a ton. Normally, the Department guarantees that any listed price will hold through the month.

But on May 1, without any further notice, the Department disclosed that it had sold 80,000 tons of the dried peas at $30 a ton—or 40 percent below list price.

The 80,000 tons, the entire stock on the west coast, were sold in secret negotiations to a syndicate of 3 Northwest grain firms. The total purchase cost them $2,400,000, or $1,600,000 less than the listed price.

That started the fuss.

On May 2, a constituent of Representative JOHN F. SHELLEY, Democrat, of California, wired him:

"Our firm has been purchasing this material regularly * * * at announced resale prices. We received no notice of intention to sell on bid * * * we believe as members of feed industry we should be allowed opportunity to purchase on the same basis as these favored buyers."

Other protests went directly to the Agriculture Department. They sounded the same theme: Why weren't we given a chance to bid at a cut rate?

Representative SHELLEY wrote Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, asking for an explanation. The letter was dated a week ago and has not yet been answered.

From other sources the News has been able to piece together a picture of what happened.

The Agriculture Department offices which ordinarily handle sales of dried peas—offices here and in Portland, Oreg.—knew nothing about the cut-rate sale. They were still selling peas for $50 a ton while the $30 a ton purchase was being negotiated.

The man who handled the deal for Agriculture was Elwood L. Chase, a high-ranking Republican appointee in the Department's Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC).

Mr. Chase negotiated the sale with at least these two officials of the three syndicate companies:

Carl C. Farrington, vice president of the CCC from 1940 to 1947 and now a member of Secretary Benson's 14-member Agricultural Advisory Committee, headed by Dean William I. Myers, of Cornell.

C. G. Burlingham, an Oregon grain dealer with whom Interior Secretary Douglas McKay is acquainted and who visited Mr. McKay in his office here recently.

Mr. Chase told the News the deal was desirable from the Government's point of view because the dried peas were deteriorating and storage charges mounting up at a rate of about $40,000 a month.

Under the negotiated sale, the owners took possession May 1 and assumed all storage charges at once, he said, "a definite saving for the Government."

Other sources called the idea of the peas deteriorating "a laugh."

And John E. Tripp, an official of the division which ordinarily handles grain at Agriculture, said: "So far as I know, the peas were sound."

Mr. Chase also said it was not unusual for Agriculture to negotiate sales of surplus commodities without prior announcement.

But others in a position to know insisted that the Department in the past, when it was planning to negotiate sales below list price, always let the trade know.

The regular procedure in this case, these sources said, would have been to wait until May 1 and then announce that the Department was open for offers on the winter peas. That way no one in the trade could complain of favoritism.

Mr. Chase declined to say why other dealers were not informed in this case. He would only hint that dealers who complained about the sale probably were not big enough to handle it themselves.

He also refused to say whether he or the purchasing companies had started the negotiations that led to the sale.

"I'm not going into all the details of the Department of Agriculture's business," Mr. Chase said.

Before the story appeared in the press I had been looking into the transaction at the request of San Francisco constituents—a firm engaged in selling grain and feeds. I had not intended to make a public issue of the matter until my investigation was completed, but when the press stumbled on to the situation and queried me about it I gave them the facts as I knew them. In fairness to my fellow Members of the House I also asked for this time so that they would be fully informed on the case. These are the facts developed up to this point:

On May 2 I received from my San Francisco constituents a telegram alerting me on the matter. I shall now read this telegram, omitting the name of the sender at this time at his request and in order not to prejudice his future dealings with the Commodity Credit Corporation or with the group who purchased the dried peas:

This week the CCC sold all Government surplus stocks of dried peas to 3 buyers on secret negotiated basis at 40 percent less than announced resale price. Our firm has been purchasing this material regularly from CCC at announced resale prices. We received no notice of intention to sell on bid this stock. We believe as members of the feed industry we should be allowed opportunity to purchase on same basis as these favored buyers. We need immediate action and will phone your office at 11 a. m. Monday next to determine what steps should be taken to protect our interest and customers.

On Monday, May 4, I received a phone call from the sender of the telegram and at that time I asked him to send me, airmail, full details on the transaction, as far as he knew them. His letter, which I shall now read into the RECORD was received on May 6. This letter gives a picture of the details of the transaction, its implications, and possible effects on the feed trade and the farmer growing feed crops. I again leave out the name of the individual and the firm.

MAY 4, 1953.

Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY.

DEAR SIR: In line with our telephone conversation of this morning, we give you the following facts and information pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation's recent sale of the surplus stocks of dried Austrian winter peas. We would like to caution you that the information we have here, even though appearing reliable and from responsible sources, still needs verification at your end. This situation is still pretty new for all the facts to be clarified, and at this stage there is as much gossip in the situation as there are facts.

These peas were taken over by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of their support program in previous years, I believe the year 1950. They were originally reoffered for sale on the basis of seed but in view of the tremendous quantity there was no particular interest in this merchandise and finally they agreed to sell it for feed purposes provided the buyer specified that this was it's ultimate use and it would not be used for seed. They have been offering this merchandise on a declining price schedule and their lowest offering was on the basis of $2.50 per hundred during the month of April just passed. In informal discussions with members of the Commodity Credit Corporation's Portland office, they were getting some movement of these peas at this price. I know our firm has been buying small quantities of it regularly for use in this area as pigeon feed. Our information was that about April 27 or 28, the Government concluded a sales arrangement with a group of three buyers acting as a unit for their total supplies stored on the west coast of approximately 80,000 tons. This negotiated price, according to trade sources, was on the basis of $30 per ton with a guaranty and understanding from the Government that their other stocks and inventories of this merchandise stored at other points outside of the Pacific Coast States would not be offered for sale into this area. How this was to be enforced, I do not know. Our advice also, further, was that they were allowed a period of 6 months free storage from the date of their purchase. This point appears to be contradicted from other sources but I believe worth investigating and verifying. The third report we have which is related to the matter of free storage was that the purchasers were allowed the prerogative of paying for this when it's shipped which, in effect, gives them a period of 6 months to pay for it. This point may not be true, however, if, as I have been told, they were to accept storage charges beginning the first of May. Generally the Government accepts shipment as technically the date title passes.

As I mentioned to you on the phone and in my wire, we have been purchasing this material regularly, and I might add on the basis of a certified check immediately following or accompanying our notice of intention to purchase, and in each instance when purchases were completed, we were allowed free storage until the end of the current month. It is obvious that our name, as an interested user for this merchandise would be on file in, at least, the Portland office. In this connection, I am also apprised that the Portland office, who was handling disposition of this material, had no advice or inkling that this whole transaction was taking place. The first notice came on May 1, from Washington, D. C., wherein they received a telegram stating that this merchandise was no longer available for sale. The details then followed a few hours later stating that it had been sold and was off the market.

As I explained to you on the phone, our objection to this whole situation is the fact that we were not given the opportunity of protecting our normal trade requirements and entering a bid for the merchandise. The

situation now is that we have to buy these things through second hands from our competitors at prices equivalent to the April offering figure of the Commodity Credit Corporation to approximately $10 per ton less. These reoffering prices by the owners of the merchandise have not yet been officially established so this point is not definite by any means.

I would like to also bring to your attention the significance and the effect of this sale at this level. Eighty thousand tons of feed is a sizable quantity and this merchandise is going to be a strong competitor with other supported crops and crops that are now in the process of being harvested. This is particularly true in the case of barley. These Austrian peas, for certain purposes, have a great deal more feed value than barley, and the indicated resale prices will place this merchandise about $2 to $5 a ton under new crop barley figures. In other words, not only is the Government showing favoritism in their sales procedure but they are also setting up another competitor for other supported items and working to the detriment of the farmer who, for all the advices he receives from Washington, must prepare in the future to market and harvest his crop with a minimum of Government support and protection. We know from our own experience in the trade that there is also going to be an effort on the part of the owners of this merchandise to sell this to the cattle feeding industry as a substitute for grain and other concentrates. It is too early to say how successful they will be and how this merchandise will be accepted by this group of users.

I hope the above has given you some information on the situation and reflected our attitude on the matter. In view of the fact that we do not wish to appear publicly as troublemakers, we request, as we discussed on the phone, that this letter be kept confidential and our name not enter into the matter at any level or discussion or publication.

We very much appreciate your cooperation and willingness to look into the matter. The only regrettable feature of this situation is, however, that investigations and publicity on the transaction will not satisfy or protect our immediate needs or position.

Very truly yours.

Before receiving the letter I have just read I called the Department of Agriculture and spoke with officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation and of the Production and Marketing Administration, which handled the actual sale. Aside from confirmation of the fact that such a sale had taken place, I obtained little information, particularly as regards those features of the terms of the sale and the method of negotiation which the letter indicates are unusual.

With the letter in my possession I began to look further into the matter, since I believed that an investigation was warranted. My investigation disclosed the following information:

First. The normal practice on the sale of Austrian dried winter peas was to set a price at the beginning of each month and make the peas available to all buyers at this price. This price was normally guaranteed to hold throughout at least a 30-day period.

Second. Sales of the commodity were normally conducted by officials of the Grain Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration.

Third. On April 1, 1953, the price of Austrian dried winter peas in possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the Pacific Northwest had been set at $50 per ton, or an equivalent price of $2.50 per 100-pound bag.

Fourth. On May 1, 1953, the Production and Marketing Administration announced that the entire 80,000 tons of the commodity held on the west coast had been sold to a combine of purchasers at a price of $30 per ton, or an equivalent price of $1.50 per 100-pound bag. At a reduction of $1 per bag from the price held steady to the trade through April the total discount amounted to $1,600,000.

Fifth. Officials of the Grain Branch of PMA, normally responsible for such sales were not consulted and had no knowledge that the transaction was under negotiation.

Sixth. Regular purchasers in the trade, or other prospective purchasers, were given no notice of the proposed sale, nor were they invited to submit bids on any basis.

Seventh. The combine to whom the peas were sold consisted of three buyers. One of the purchasing firms was the Archer, Daniels, Midland Feed Company, doing business in Minnesota and the Dakotas and headed by a Mr. Carl Farrington.

Eighth. Negotiations on behalf of the Commodity Credit Corporation and PMA were conducted by Mr. Elwood Chase, recently appointed Assistant Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration. As stated before, these negotiations were on a secret basis, unknown either to the Grain Branch of PMA or to the trade in general.

Ninth. Normal practice was to sell Austrian dried winter peas subject to the purchaser taking possession within 30 days.

Tenth. It was reported that the combine of purchasers was allowed 6 months within which to take delivery. It is noted in the newspaper article that Mr. Chase states that storage charges are assumed by the buyers as of May 1, the announced date of the sale.

On the basis of this preliminary confirmation of the information from San Francisco, on May 14 I wrote and mailed to Secretary of Agriculture Benson a letter requesting full information on the transaction. I now read into the RECORD the full text of my letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1953.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Certain of my constituents in San Francisco, enagaged in grain and feed marketing operations, have called to my attention a recent transaction by the Commodity Credit Corporation which has worked a hardship to them in their businesses. Although I have discussed the matter by telephone with officials of the CCC, I am somewhat puzzled by some aspects of the transaction and will, therefore, appreciate your investigating the circumstances of the case and supplying me with a complete report. The request is made in the interest of those businessmen in my district who report that the transaction has caused them financial distress.

On May 1, 1953, the Commodity Credit Corporation announced the sale of surplus stocks of dried Austrian winter peas amounting to 80,000 tons in 1,600,000 bags. These stocks had formerly been on sale to the trade through the Portland, Oreg., office of the CCC and, I am told, constituted the entire stock of this particular type pea in storage by the Corporation on the West Coast. My constituents report that this sale to a combine of purchasers, without the general trade having opportunity to purchase on an equal basis, has deprived them of their customary source of supply and forces them to obtain needed peas from the bulk purchasers at increased prices.

Although it should contain all available information on the transaction, I will appreciate your including the following specific points in your report:

1. The names of the purchasers of the peas.
2. The dates of the period during which negotiations were under way.
3. The quantity of peas involved in the sale.
4. The unit price at which they were sold.
5. The unit price at which they were on sale to the trade generally during the period in which negotiations were under way.
6. The terms of the sale; i. e. contractual provisions governing amounts and times of payment for the peas.
7. Provisions concerning dates on which the purchasers are required to accept delivery; and provisions concerning storage of the peas during the interim, including information as to how the expense of this storage will be borne.
8. Whether any provisions limiting resale of the peas were included in the contract.
9. Whether buyers for resale in the export trade have been deprived of a source of supply by the sale.
10. Any agreement which may exist to hold other CCC stocks of dried Austrian winter peas out of any marketing area.
11. Whether the personnel negotiating this sale for CCC were the personnel normally conducting such negotiations heretofore.

In any instance, particularly in instances involving the points outlined above, where the practice followed in the subject sale deviated from the methods or policy previously established for sales of this commodity, I should like an explanation of the reasons for the deviation. I should also like your comments on how this sale at a price lower than the peas were on offer to the trade at the time conforms with previous policy in maintaining and changing price quotations. One other factor in which I am interested is the effect releasing this 80,000 tons of peas will have on the markets for competing Government supported crops.

Please be sure that I will appreciate your cooperation in making this information available to me, together with any comments you may wish to make.

Sincerely and cordially,
JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is now almost 2 weeks since I asked the Secretary to supply me with this information. I have not yet received an acknowledgment or an explanation of any kind.

It is not my purpose in taking the floor this afternoon to make charges of any kind. But it strikes me that there is something about the transaction not in line with good business practice, with fairness to the trade, nor with the idea of morality in government towards which we are all working.

I make no charge that favoritism has been shown in concluding this sale, but there are some elements in the matter which make me conclude that this may be something more than a straight business "deal." It may, for instance, be pure coincidence that Mr. Carl Farrington, of the Midland Archer Feed Co., is a member of Secretary Benson's recent-

ly named Agriculture Advisory Committee. It may also be coincidental that Mr. Farrington is a cousin to Mr. R. L. Farrington, who was promoted not long ago by the Secretary to the position of Director of Agricultural Credit Services in the Department of Agriculture. However, since there is no apparent reason why the Department should have deviated from its usual course in disposing of this commodity, and since the trade in general is now suffering from loss of a cheap source of supply while a preferred group is benefiting from a "corner" on the market of dried peas on the west coast, it would appear that an investigation is in order.

In connection with this corner on the market, I have not mentioned previously that the reports I have received indicate that the sale agreement included a commitment by the Department of Agriculture that present surplus stocks of dried peas now stored in the Midwest, particularly Denver, will not be sold to the trade west of the Rockies. If this is so, the buyers have not only been shown a decided preference in the price they paid for these peas, but they have, in effect, been guaranteed a close market. My constituents in San Francisco have discussed with Department of Agriculture officials here the possibility of purchasing some of the Midwest stored peas for shipment to the coast. They have been told by these officials that there is "a sort of a commitment" not to sell them west of Denver. This would seem to confirm that the combine of buyers had been granted a monopoly on the western market. In any event, that phase of the transaction should be looked into.

There are some other aspects of this sale of peas which invite attention, as pointed out in my letter to Secretary Benson. Specifically, and most serious because of the probable effect on the Government price-support program as a whole, the dumping of 80,000 tons of feed on the market at a drastic price reduction cannot help but affect the wholesale feed-grain market as a whole. The price of other competing Government price-supported feed crops will tend to drop. Thus we have the spectacle of the Department of Agriculture undercutting the very markets for which the American taxpayers foot so heavy a bill in price-support funds. Not only can the taxpayer suffer, but I am sure that the farmer growing feed crops will not appreciate a drop in the price of his grain. Certainly a careful study of the economic effects of unloading the entire available stock of this commodity to a preferred group of purchasers is warranted.

Another point which deserves comment is the fact that before the regular purchasers of these peas were "frozen out" by the bulk sale to the combine, a number of them had been purchasing the feed for resale in the export market. One of the greatest problems connected with the whole Government price support program has been to find an outlet for Government stocks of commodities off the normal domestic market. To the extent that these peas had formerly been sold for export, the pressure on the domestic market had been relieved. This transaction puts the pressure back on. Thus we have another conflict with basic policy of the price support program which certainly merits attention by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up any more of my colleague's time by dwelling on other issues raised by this transaction, except to add the footnote that the combine is now selling the peas in the California market at about $53 per ton, delivered. Compare this with their purchase price of $30 per ton. Allowing for transportation charges, a tidy profit remains I am sure.

A review of the material I have placed in the RECORD during the course of these remarks will make the issues I have not mentioned obvious to any one familiar with the Department of Agriculture's normal policy in its price support operations. I urge that the Members of the House study that record carefully.

Finally, and again, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear that at this point I make no charges of misfeasance or malfeasance on the part of anyone in the administration who has had anything to do with this matter. However, I do feel that the facts I have related speak for themselves and that these facts are so strange that they warrant a complete investigation by the proper committee of the Congress. I now formally request that such an investigation be made by the House Committee on Agriculture. I shall be happy to make the material in my possession available to the committee for that purpose.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I shall be very glad to yield to the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HOPE. I will say to the gentleman that I know nothing about the matter to which he has made reference and knew nothing about it until today, and until this afternoon I did not know that the gentleman intended to discuss it this afternoon. I have not had time to make any personal investigation of the matter, but I can assure the gentleman that the Committee on Agriculture will be glad to have any information which he can furnish it, and we will be pleased to look into it.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the very distinguished gentleman, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the former majority floor leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me there is a case made out here that the chairman of the committee ought definitely to promise that the committee will investigate it.

Mr. HOPE. If I did not make myself clear on that, I will say to the gentleman that I did not hear all of the remarks of the gentleman from California; I just heard perhaps the last 10 minutes of what he said; and I do not have all the information which he has just given the House. But I am assuming that he has submitted some information which would warrant an investigation, and that is what I intended to say we would do; that is what we do intend to do.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the capable former chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to say he wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture more than 2 weeks ago about this important matter and has not yet had a reply to his communication?

Mr. SHELLEY. That is true, I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Have you been able to ascertain what the terms of the sale were? In other words, you did indicate that they would give him 6 months to move the beans. How much time was given him to pay for the beans?

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Elwood Case, who handled the sale, says that they did not give them 6 months. Others have advised me that they were given 6 months.

Mr. COOLEY. Have you been able to ascertain whether or not it was a cash transaction or time transaction?

Mr. SHELLEY. I have not.

Mr. COOLEY. If I understand it, the sale was made in such manner that the ordinary dealers were not advised and were given no opportunity to participate, and that the transaction was so large that a small dealer could not participate even if he had known about it; is that right?

Mr. SHELLEY. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, 80,000 tons of beans passed from the Government in this one transaction.

Mr. SHELLEY. Passed from the Government in this one transaction to a special joint-venture combine of three individuals or companies who now have complete control of that 80,000 tons on a protected market on the Pacific coast.

Mr. COOLEY. And you do understand after all as part of the transaction the officials of the Government agreed that they would not sell other beans in the west coast area?

Mr. SHELLEY. That is what I have been advised by people from the Pacific coast; and in telephone checks with the Department of Agriculture the only reply you can get is: "Well, there seems to be a commitment not to sell them there."

Mr. COOLEY. And these beans ordinarily would have sold for $50 a ton?

Mr. SHELLEY. They would have sold for $50 a ton; yes.

Mr. COOLEY. The combine purchased the beans at $30 a ton.

Mr. SHELLEY. Yes; that is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Then they sell them on the protected market at $53 a ton?

Mr. SHELLEY. At $53 a ton. People seeking to purchase them can go to nobody else but the combine that purchased them at $30 a ton.

Mr. COOLEY. Because the Government officials have agreed not to compete with them in the west coast market?

Mr. SHELLEY. That is what the information that comes to me would indicate.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to say as a member of the Committee on Agriculture——

Mr. SHELLEY. May I interrupt again? That is what the reports that

come to me, and the checking I have done, would indicate. I make no charges, but I think that the situation as I have revealed it is such that the House Committee on Agriculture should investigate. I am very happy to hear the chairman say an investigation will be undertaken.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me that we have an excellent chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, a man in whom all of us have great confidence and for whom all of us have great respect. I am delighted that he is present and has heard the gentleman's statement, and I express the hope he will give this matter immediate attention to the end that the public and the Congress might know what the facts really are.

Mr. SHELLEY. I agree with the comments of the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman from California stated that these peas were listed by the Commodity Credit Corporation for a period of time?

Mr. SHELLEY. The Austrian dried peas had been listed for some time, the last listing with a quoted price being on April 1 at $50 per ton.

Mr. HUNTER. Have there been any purchases of the peas at $50?

Mr. SHELLEY. There were.

Mr. HUNTER. What were the amounts of the purchases?

Mr. SHELLEY. I have not been able to get that information from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman know anything about the condition of these peas or the age of them? I know that one of the great problems of the Commodity Credit Corporation is the disposition of commodities that have been held for a long time and that have deteriorated or that are approaching a condition of deterioration. I am just wondering if the gentleman has looked into that phase of the matter in the course of his study of it.

Mr. SHELLEY. My reply to the very able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is that I have not been able to look into that personally, but those who have consistently over the years been buying these peas, and have bought them up to just before this sale to the combine took place, scoff at the idea that they were deteriorated. One gentleman in the Department told me in a telephone conversation that there was some element of deterioration. Others say there has never been any reported deterioration. With the conflicting statements from both sides, and in keeping with the way in which I have tried to present it, I think this is a matter the committee ought to go into.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has made the statement that he is not making any charges. I assume that if he wishes the committee to investigate he will submit some information which I assume in effect would constitute the making of charges upon which the committee can base its investigation. I am a little at loss to know what the gentleman means.

Mr. SHELLEY. May I reply to the gentleman by saying that I have never tried to make charges against a person without having all the facts personally. It has been pretty difficult to get the facts in this case. I have tried to be fair. Two weeks ago I wrote a letter of inquiry as to certain facts and still I have had no acknowledgment of that letter or no reply. I will make this charge that the information I have acquired is so strange that it possibly can be more strange and an investigation should be made.

Mr. COOLEY. I was going to suggest that apparently you have made out a prima facie case, if your information is accurate; that is, the peas were offered for $50, they were suddenly withdrawn and sold secretly for $30, then put back on the market for $53. That seems to me to indicate there is something rotten in Denmark or somewhere else, and the Portland office did not know about the transaction. I think that in itself warrants an inquiry without preferring charges. You do not have to prefer charges to warrant an inquiry by the appropriate committees of Congress. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this information to our attention, for otherwise we might not have heard about it.

Mr. RAYBURN. If the gentleman had not all the facts, he would not be asking for an investigation.

Mr. SHELLEY. That is true.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman said that he had addressed a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture asking certain questions. Has there been any communication from the Department of Agriculture which would indicate that they refused to answer those questions or merely that they are preparing an answer at the present time which will be forthcoming within a reasonable period of time?

Mr. SHELLEY. I will say to the gentleman I surely would not impugn the intelligence of the Secretary of Agriculture that they would even indicate that they did not intend to answer. I have not heard whether they are preparing an answer. All I know is I have been in telephone communication almost daily for about a week. The letter is there. They know it is there. They know I sent it. We mentioned it in telephone conversations, but still I have no reply.

Mr. HUNTER. How long has the Commodity Credit Corporation had this 80,000 tons of Austrian peas in storage?

Mr. SHELLEY. I think that question could better be answered by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. HUNTER. One other question. What is it costing the Commodity Credit Corporation each month to store these peas?

Mr. SHELLEY. I think that is another question that could best be answered by the Commodity Credit Corporation as well as how much they originally paid for these peas.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I was just going to call attention to the fact that the newspaper article which the gentleman referred to mentions the name of Mr. Chase as having been the person in the Department. Now, Mr. Chase is one of the persons who negotiated the sale with at least three officials of the syndicate companies. The newspaper says of him, "I will not go into all the details of the Department of Agriculture business." Now is Mr. Chase an employee of the Government?

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chase is an employee of the Government.

Mr. COOLEY. And he is the one that participated in these negotiations?

Mr. SHELLEY. That is my information.

Mr. COOLEY. Apparently he is the official who, according to this press report, is unwilling to discuss the details of this important transaction.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, were the remarks of Mr. Chase addressed to some member of the press?

Mr. COOLEY. I assume so.

Mr. SHELLEY. Yes; they were.

Mr. HUNTER. What obligation is there on the part of Mr. Chase to discuss Department of Agriculture matters with the press?

Mr. COOLEY. He may not be obligated to do so, but if it was a perfectly fair and honest transaction I do not see any reason why the press should not know about it, and apparently there is no excuse for an official of the Government refusing to answer a letter or declining to answer a letter for 2 weeks.

Mr. HUNTER. My understanding is that my distinguished colleague from California has addressed a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture asking a number of questions in connection with this matter, and perhaps the case is this, that Mr. Chase is deferring his answer until the Secretary officially speaking for the Department answers all the questions involved.

Mr. COOLEY. I suppose the only reason the gentleman from California is now taking the floor of the House is that he has not obtained the information that he wants to obtain; is that not correct?

Mr. SHELLEY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. All of this conversation, I think, adds up to the fact that what is really needed is an investigation of the situation.

Mr. SHELLEY. I think the gentleman has summed it up very briefly and very succinctly.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Has the gentleman from California been assured that he will receive an answer to his communication?

Mr. SHELLEY. I have no such assurance but I now feel sure since the House Committee on Agriculture will

look into the matter that an answer will be forthcoming either to myself or the committee.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge in this House that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN] was prosecuted and indicted in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for purportedly having violated the statute prohibiting Members of Congress from entering into, executing, holding, and enjoying a contract with the United States or an agency thereof.

The House is equally well informed that the case some weeks ago was heard by His Honor, Judge T. Blake Kennedy, of the United States District Court of the State of Wyoming, who was, by assignment, hearing cases in Washington.

Most Members of the House are further acquainted with the fact that a verdict of acquittal was ordered by Judge Kennedy and reached Washington on May 16. It happened that on that day I and a number of other Members of the House were in the State of Nevada, witnessing one of the atomic-bomb tests at Yucca Flat, from which we did not return for several days. The gentleman from South Carolina, Congressman McMILLAN, the defendant in the case, was also absent at the time from Washington for several days, attending to business in his congressional district in South Carolina. Had I been present and had the gentleman from South Carolina, JOHN McMILLAN, been here, I would have arisen on the floor at that time to felicitate and congratulate my friend and colleague upon his vindication by the court.

In fact, long before this issue came to trial it had been my inclination, and the inclination of other friends here who were familiar with the facts involved, to express here, as we have elsewhere, our confidence in the integrity and honesty of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] and his innocence of the charges brought against him. However, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] himself suggested that it would have been improper for us to make this floor a sounding board of the issues involved while the case was still before the court. Now that the case has been settled once and for all, and our colleague cleared of any criminal wrong, I have the urge and the pleasure, as senior Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina, to say that the verdict was no more than I expected and that we rejoice with our colleague who has served with us for 15 years and has built up a reputation for honesty, integrity, and devotion to duty.

I have not the time here today to read the eminently fair decree by that great jurist, Judge Kennedy, but perhaps it would be well to cite a few of the basic facts of the case, as well as a few excerpts from the judge's memorandum.

Judge Kennedy says in his memorandum:

Through some friend the defendant learned of land that was susceptible to application for leasing owned by the United States in the District of Utah and thereupon decided to file an application for certain selected areas through lease under the Federal Leasing Act of 1920, as amended. Accordingly an application for lease was made through the managing agent of the Utah Land Office with the payment of the required fees under the provisions of the leasing act. No effort was made apparently on the part of the defendant to conceal his identity or his position as his address was given at the House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

I might add that the evidence also showed that the application for the lease and the signed lease itself with the fee of $740, were addressed to the Department of the Interior in a brown envelope with Congressman McMILLAN's name and title on it, plus the usual stamps for private correspondence. In other words, the whole thing was free, open, and above board, and there was no kick from anyone, including the Department itself, until some other fellow who had placed a bid on this land raised objection. The manager of the Utah office of the Department thereupon canceled the lease. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] then sought sound legal advice and, based upon that advice, determined that he was eligible to be a party to this lease even though a Member of Congress. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] objected to the decision of the lower office and carried his protest to the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who affirmed the decision of the Utah official, subject to the right of appeal to the Secretary of the Interior. Upon appeal to that official, the decision of the Utah manager and the Assistant Secretary were affirmed, whereupon the defendant decided to protest no further but requested the Utah official to refund to him the rental deposited.

And now comes a very interesting observation by the learned judge in his memorandum. I quote Judge Kennedy:

It would seem in the natural course of events that this would have been the end of the matter inasmuch as the Interior Department has established for the purposes of the case its contention that the defendant was an ineligible applicant for a lease of this character. However, regardless of the fact that the defendant had been deprived of any and all benefits of the lease and had elected not to pursue his contention further in the courts, evidently the Department of Justice felt that the facts would justify criminal proceedings against the defendant and accordingly an indictment was found, as cited above, under which the defendant was brought to trial.

Judge Kennedy further says:

Doubt arises as to whether or not the Leasing Act itself is of such a nature that Members of Congress were prohibited from taking the benefits tendered. It is specific in regard to who might become applicants, noncompetitive in its character, and apparently open to anyone who is a citizen of the United States and pays the fees required.

Further, Judge Kennedy says:

In the case at bar the opportunity offered to the defendant was one of a general nature, open to anyone defined as eligible, noncompetitive in its character and not entirely dissimilar to the offering of Government bonds and other securities, including bills of exchange, clearly exempting Members of Congress from its provisions.

I still quote Judge Kennedy:

Only by the strictest technical legal construction can it be found that there was a criminal intent on the part of the defendant in this case to violate the law. He earnestly believed in his right to apply for and hold the lease under the provisions of the statute. He was and is a man of the highest type of character and occupies a position of honor and trust in the legislative department of the Government. * * * I am definitely inclined to the belief that under all these circumstances the defendant would never have been convicted by a jury of his peers and thereby branded as a criminal by a verdict of guilty.

Many of us have wondered, along with the eminent judge who heard JOHN McMILLAN's case, why a distinguished Member of Congress of unimpeachable character should be indicted for violation of an old and ambiguous statute with not a scintilla of evidence showing criminal intent, or effort to conceal, or to seek any advantage for himself not open to all other citizens of this country. It would seem that those at the head of the departments of our Government who thought up this indictment should have sought first clarification of the statute through the halls of Congress rather than possible destruction of a man's good name, reputation and political standing through criminal proceedings.

In any event, may I say that JOHN McMILLAN's friends here and in his native State, and they are legion, rejoice in his vindication. It was no more than we expected.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to my distinguished leader and former Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. It has been distressing to me for many years that in many parts of the country there is the attitude that every day is a field day on officeholders, and especially on Members of the Congress. I can conceive of no place in this country where that attitude is more prevalent than in the District of Columbia, and I measure my words when I say that. I knew JOHN McMILLAN at a time when he was a secretary here. I have known him more than 20 years. He was a good secretary and then he became a Member of the Congress. I want to say I have never served in the House of Representatives with a man who, I think, has a higher sense of honor and integrity and love for his country and a desire to serve his country.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank my distinguished leader for that very heartening statement.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished former Speaker has just made a very true observation. It seems that throughout the Nation, as a whole, it is always an open season on Members of Congress by newspapers and commentators alike here in the District of Columbia. There is a ceaseless, endless, and relentless campaign by certain types of so-called commentators and so-called

journalists to defame, attack, and embarrass the names and reputations of many Members of Congress. The institution of Congress itself has received an interminable barrage by leftwingers and Communist sympathizers. Certainly, throughout my 13 years in Congress, I venture the opinion that any Member of either branch of the Congress, charged with any crime at all, regardless of how ridiculous, would stand more than a 50–50 chance of being convicted in the District of Columbia, as a result of the bad name that our institution constantly receives at the hands of these traitors to constitutional government.

I sat, along with the distinguished dean of our delegation, the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, through the entire proceedings of the McMillan trial. Despite the fact that I have been a member of the bar for over 20 years, I could never discern any rhyme or reason for this case to be in criminal court in the first place. There was not the slightest earmark of criminal proceedings throughout the length and breadth of the trial, so much so that both sides waived a jury trial, and both sides were content to leave the obviously ambiguous question up to the discretion of the eminent Judge Kennedy. At the closing of the trial, neither the Justice Department, nor counsel for Congressman MCMILLAN delivered any closing arguments. These were submitted weeks after, in writing. This is a procedure unheard of in a criminal case.

I want to say here and now that I am firmly of the opinion that Mr. MCMILLAN's indictment and trial was conceived in a conspiracy between the Department of the Interior, and the then Secretary Oscar Chapman, and the Department of Justice, to defame, embarrass, humiliate, and attempt to politically destroy this outstanding public servant. Instead of the Department of the Interior terminating the case in its own Department, without rhyme or reason, it transferred the case to the Department of Justice. This was without notice to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], and what is even more alarming and interesting, the then Attorney General James McGranery, a former Member of this body, and one who should certainly know of the vicissitudes of a Member of Congress, urged the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] to plead guilty. This was so ridiculous the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] did not even take the suggestion seriously. McGranery then promised to discuss the matter with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] before anything was done, but in order to take care of his end of the conspiracy to hurt the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], and during the last 2 or 3 days McGranery was in office at the end of the Truman administration, he rushed this case over to the grand jury, and an indictment forthwith was returned, despite overwhelming evidence that no criminal intent could possibly be present.

I want to commend Judge Kennedy for his splendid decision on this matter. It is the only existing decision on this subject. It is clear, concise, and it vindicates the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] beyond the peradventure of a doubt. The eminent jurist in this case made this statement:

> Regardless of the rule that all defendants of whatever class and strata of life should be amenable to the law, only by the strictest technical legal construction can it be found that there was a criminal intent on the part of the defendant in this case to violate the law.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina, Congressman MCMILLAN, is free of any stigma of a criminal act. His reputation is as spotless today as it was before this uncalled for trial and unquestioned conspiracy against him.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. I wish to commend and thank my distinguished colleague, the dean of our delegation from South Carolina, and my colleague who has just spoken [Mr. RIVERS] and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN] for bringing this matter to the floor of the House and letting the world know the high esteem in which my friend and colleague, JOHN MCMILLAN, is held. He is a man of the highest integrity. He is a capable, conscientious legislator, a man with whom it is an honor to serve in this great body.

I am glad that a judge from far away Wyoming could hear this case and without prejudice clear JOHNNY MCMILLAN of all the charges against him and restore his good name which some had attempted to libel. It gives me a great deal of satisfaction, and it is a great privilege for me to be able to agree with my distinguished dean in his appraisal of my colleague.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, my colleague [Mr. RILEY] also the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] for their very fine statements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I am happy for this opportunity of joining my colleagues in extending congratulations to the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable JOHN L. MCMILLAN, on the occasion of his having been completely vindicated of any wrongdoing or wrongdoing intent in connection with his application for the purchase of certain Government lands.

I should also like to extend my congratulations to the honorable judge, T. Blake Kennedy, of the United States district court of the State of Wyoming, for an immensely fair decree. The ability to be able to grasp the real issue in a case at bar and to be able to distinguish thereby prosecution from persecution is a quality which marks a truly great jurist. Judge Kennedy displayed this mark of greatness.

It has been my privilege for the past few years to serve on the same committee as the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN]. I have a high regard for all of my colleagues. I know of no one in whom I have more confidence in his honesty and integrity than the gentleman from South Carolina. JOHN MCMILLAN just would not do anything wrong intentionally.

The facts in this case made it obvious that he had nothing to conceal. The way he handled himself throughout this entire ordeal has added to his stature in the eyes of his colleagues and in the eyes of the people everywhere who know him and love him. The action of the court in this case strengthens our faith in the American system. It is good to know that in spite of an effort to persecute, justice will triumph, as it has in this case.

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of doubt, uncertainty, and turmoil caused by wars, rumors of wars, and other threats of danger now so prevalent throughout the world, it is easy for us to wonder just where we may be drifting. So it is highly important that we, as individuals, and as a nation, carefully evaluate all good signs that appear, and there are many, and also think of these when we may become despondent and discouraged as to our plight. Ours is a government divided into three branches, each with separate responsibilities and duties: the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. We know that acts of the legislative and executive branches of our Government are subject to review by the judicial and may, under the wording of our Constitution, be set aside. In fact, there are no branches, divisions, departments, or agencies of our Government whose acts, directives, laws or edicts are not subject to review and close scrutiny, modification or reversal by our Supreme Court, and its interpretation and decision are controlling and final throughout our land.

Therefore, it is highly important for us to observe constantly the manner in which our Federal courts perform their duties because we know that all personal liberty and property rights of our citizens are by our organic law placed in the care and keeping of our Federal judges. Therefore, it is reaffirming, reassuring, and highly wholesome when we examine the past record of our Federal judges and find that in practically every instance our judges have performed their official duties with fidelity and a high sense of public responsibility. And so long as this remains true, we may rest assured that personal liberty and property rights will be, in every respect, safeguarded and fully protected under our laws. Our Government cannot decay so long as we have judges who remain faithful in the discharge of their duties and keep their eyes focused solely upon the justice of each case. The record of our judiciary is good.

So many important instances could be cited to justify fully this statement, but at this time I am primarily thinking of the recent case wherein Congressman JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of the Sixth District of South Carolina, was charged with a

minor infraction of the law. The prominence of this able public official caused this to be an important case. He was charged with entering into a contract with an agency of the Government in violation of statute. It appears clearly from the record that all material facts relating to the contract were well known to both contracting parties at the inception of the contract, and that no effort was at any time made to conceal or withhold any fact. The contract was entered into after full and free discussion and it is not suggested that deception of any nature was practiced, unfair advantage gained, or anything of value obtained. In such instance, it would to me appear unconscionable to expect a Government prosecution, instituted against a citizen to be successful, when the sole charge was that the citizen entered into a contract with the Government, and the record fully disclosing that all facts were well known to both contracting parties before the consummation of the contract. If one party to that contract has transgressed, I am constrained to feel that both parties have willingly entered into the same transgression. In such instances, it is extremely difficult for one party to successfully accuse the other. If a contract is illegal and both parties thereto are possessed of all facts at the inception of the contract, we may seriously doubt if one party is more responsible than the other.

It is my privilege to represent the Seventh Congressional District of North Carolina, and this district immediately adjoins the Sixth South Carolina District so ably represented by Congressman McMILLAN. The two districts have many common problems and naturally we have had constant contact with each other. This experience has caused me to place high value upon the splendid qualities of efficiency and resourcefulness of Congressman McMILLAN, and I have found him to be, at all times, diligent, able, and forthright in the discharge of his many duties. His experience and training, together with his innate honesty, have endeared him to the Members of Congress, and he has been constantly elevated to positions and committees of great importance and trust. Hard work and faithfulness have caused him to be a tower of strength in Congress and certainly, I am fortunate to know that he is my friend. I know that it was not within him to intentionally trangress the law, and for this reason I followed the case very closely and with intense interest.

Congressman McMILLAN went into court with clean hands and with the strong feeling of security that he had done no wrong. He did not request a jury trial but, with a confident plea of not guilty, placed his cause entirely in the sound discretion and judgment of a Federal district judge who, by years of careful training, would be thoroughly capable of rendering a righteous judgment based upon a proper interpretation of the law applicable to the case. Of course, it is well known that Congressman McMILLAN was not only acquitted but completely exonerated of any wrongful or questionable act, and the case as it relates to him is of little moment. But the efficiency with which our Federal court performed its duty in this case is of great importance to every citizen of this country.

Therefore, this case served a very useful purpose. It completely exonerated, vindicated, and cleared any suggestion of blemish against the character and name of a good and useful citizen and public servant. It also gave to the people of this country the opportunity to observe again our Federal court in action, dispensing justice without regard to person, station, or class: high and low, strong and weak, all under our system receiving the same measure of justice.

Let it be remembered that the Honorable T. Blake Kennedy, able and distinguished judge of the United States district court for the State of Wyoming, who was duly assigned to conduct a term of court in Washington, D. C., was presiding when this case was called for trial by the district attorney. The decorum in his court clearly suggests the presence of a highly experienced, scholarly, and just judge. His verdict and judgment in the McMillan case have added new luster to our Federal judiciary. May the tenure of this distinguished jurist, and those possessed of like qualities, be long upon the Federal bench.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have been somewhat disturbed; in fact, I have been greatly disturbed by the constant attacks throughout the United States of America on Members of Congress of this country. I came to the House of Representatives as a Member of the 80th Congress, and I personally have never known a finer or more patriotic group of men than those who serve in this body on both sides of the aisle. If these attacks on the Congress of this country continue they will destroy the confidence of the people of this country in this, their representative body. If that happens, then this great country, now engaged in a great war with ruthless dictatorships throughout the world, will be placed in a decidedly precarious position.

I think people in all responsible walks of life, whether they be members of the press or radio commentators, jurists, members of grand juries in Washington, or in some other field should try to preserve and protect the honor, dignity, and respect of their Congress. The faith of the American people in democratic representation must be preserved. I must add that it is also our duty to so conduct ourselves as to hold every confidence and trust of the American people. I do not know a group that has more consistently tried to live the kind of life which would warrant the respect of the people of the United States than the membership of this great body. And I do thank my distinguished colleague, Mr. RICHARDS, as the dean of our delegation for bringing this matter to the attention of this House today.

I have never in all my life seen a more flagrant example of an attempt to smear the good character of a man who has served so honorably in this House for many years as this attempt to discredit the Honorable JOHN McMILLAN. Mr. McMILLAN is a member of a distinguished South Carolina family. His brother is chief highway commissioner of South Carolina, and the highway department of that State is a credit to any State or country in the world. JOHNNY McMILLAN does not know how to do anything shady or dishonest; he has never entertained the thought. It looks like an attempt on the part of some bureaucrat with leftwing tendencies—and I do not mind saying that here—to destroy this great, conservative, middle-of-the-road American, a man who believes in democracy, who believes in justice.

I think JOHN McMILLAN has been vindicated by this great judge from the West, impartial, who sat in judgment on the facts as he saw them and then rendered this decision as only a great jurist and a great American could.

I am glad to stand here today, and pay tribute to a patriotic American who needs no defense. It has been a great pleasure for me to serve with a man of such honor and integrity and who has the welfare of the people of the whole United States at heart. I hope such men as JOHN McMILLAN will continue to be sent here to represent the people of this great Nation.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am delighted that our distinguished friend, JOHNNY McMILLAN, has been completely vindicated and exonerated, and came through the recent unfortunate experience entirely untarnished. To be charitable, we might say that it was a most unfortunate instance, but actually we know that the prosecution was ridiculous and wholly unfounded, and altogether ill advised.

I have known JOHNNY McMILLAN for many years and during the most of the time that he has served as a Member of Congress I have worked and labored with him on the House Committee on Agriculture. I have known him intimately and well, and I know and appreciate his true worth. He is an honest and upright citizen, and in my opinion he is incorruptible. He is a devoted public servant and is at all times tireless in his efforts to honestly and faithfully represent his people. From what I have been able to learn about the case, and I think I am familiar with all of the facts and circumstances involved, I am convinced that no element of moral turpitude was in the slightest way involved in the entire transaction. Having practiced law for more than 30 years and knowing something about our courts and juries, I do not believe that any jury in any jurisdiction, even including the District of Columbia, would have convicted him or would have stayed in the jury room 2 minutes before returning a verdict of not guilty. Just as JOHNNY McMILLAN had nothing to conceal in the transaction—he likewise did not seek to escape the unpleasant experience of appearing in a criminal court to face a

criminal charge because he knew in his own heart that he was innocent and free from wrongdoing. It is not a pleasant thing for an upright and honorable man to be indicted and haled into criminal court charged with a violation of criminal law, but JOHNNY MCMILLAN faced it like a man. When it was suggested that some impropriety might be involved, his every word and act was that of a gentleman and indicated that his conscience was perfectly clear.

JOHNNY MCMILLAN has not only served the people of his district and State with great ability and devotion, but he has likewise served well and faithfully the the people of the District of Columbia. For many years he was Chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, and frequently was referred to as mayor of Washington. Not only in the State of South Carolina, but right here in the District of Columbia he has thousands of friends who are delighted with the outcome. Even the judge complimented him and took judicial notice of his splendid qualities and sterling character. JOHNNY MCMILLAN is a great and a good man, and I shall always cherish his friendship.

Mr. RICHARDS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my fellow colleagues in bearing testimony of my high regard for our esteemed friend from South Carolina, JOHN MCMILLAN. Our districts join, mine being on the southern border of North Carolina and John's on the northern border of South Carolina. I have known him for many years. I sincerely trust that the press that has carried such glowing stories about his indictment will pick up the theme here this afternoon and carry it to his home folks as to how we feel toward him, and that he stands before the 435 Members of the House of Representatives, I am sure, completely vindicated. Not only do we think of JOHN MCMILLAN today, but I am reminded of our colleague's family and those near and dear to him who have been crushed by the unwarranted publicity. We rejoice in this complete vindication which is shared not only by John's family but his many thousands of friends here in the Congress and throughout his district.

I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] for taking this time to give some of us an opportunity to pay these respects to our beloved friend.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to review the events of this trial. I think justice has been done. As a matter of fact, it was an injustice to have ever dragged JOHN MCMILLAN into court on this matter, but since that was done it is fitting that the judgment that the gentleman just read should have been rendered.

I want particularly to use this opportunity to say to JOHN MCMILLAN'S friends and to his constituents that the Members of this House who have known him and who have worked with him for many years all know that he was unfairly accused of wrong, that he was properly acquitted of any wrongdoing, and that those who have worked with him, and it has been my privilege to serve with him on the Agricultural Committee for 10 or 12 years, know that he is the high-class, upright, honest, able Representative that those people of his district have indicated they believed him to be all of these years. We in this House know JOHN MCMILLAN is every year becoming a more valuable Representative of that district. We know that rather than having lost any of his influence in this House he stands in the recognition of all Members of the House today on a higher place than he has ever occupied before.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am grateful for the gentleman's observation.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I also want to add my faith in, and admiration for, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN]. I met him when I first came to Congress 11 years ago and I do not know of a more honorable and modest Member of the House than Mr. MCMILLAN. His conduct in the trial of his case showed that he went to get the best legal advice he could before he made a purchase of this land. This clearly shows that he wanted to comply with the law and that he could not have had any intent to obtain the land be bought in defiance of the law. I will say further that the judge who decided this case showed a very broad attitude, the kind of attitude that we expect from our Federal judges. His analysis of the facts of the case and his conclusion that Mr. MCMILLAN had no criminal intent in what he did was masterful. Mr. MCMILLAN'S acquittal was very pleasant news to me and justly deserved. The gentleman who now has the floor knows that I have a little interest in South Carolina because my daughter is his constituent.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to say that the gentleman has a very fine daughter, and she lives in my hometown, and we are glad to have her there.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the distinguished minority whip, formerly majority leader of the House, and may I say this: Long before this case was tried, the gentleman from Massachusetts on this floor expressed his confidence in the integrity of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCCORMACK. There is not much for me to say. What I will say I stated a few weeks ago on the floor of the House. I want to express my deep pleasure in the acquittal of JOHN MCMILLAN. I wrote him a letter of congratulations after reading of Judge Kennedy's verdict. I want to add that as the result of the remarks I made on the floor a few weeks ago I received a number of letters from the good people who live in JOHN MCMILLAN'S district conveying to me their thanks, but particularly conveying to me the very high regard that they have for JOHN MCMILLAN. Each and every one of us knows that he is honorable and trustworthy in every respect. But, I think now that the verdict has been rendered, we should pay a justifiable tribute to Judge Kennedy. First, by his fair conduct of the trial, by his consideration of the evidence, and by his verdict, he has shown that he is living up to the highest traditions of the Federal judiciary. It seems to me to be a complete justification for the independence of our judiciary. An independent judiciary is vital and necessary for the protection of our civil liberties and of our rights under the Constitution. I have always taken that position. The first office I ran for in 1917 was as a member of the constitutional convention in a district which only the preceding fall had voted 15 to 1 in favor of the election of judges. I opposed the election of judges, which was one of the great questions passed upon in the Constitutional Convention in 1917. I recognized the argument behind it. But I feel that it is important that we have an independent judiciary, and in order to have an independent judiciary we must have men appointed under conditions which can assure independence of thought and action on their part. The verdict of Judge Kennedy was commendable. We are greatly pleased with it, naturally. We congratulate him not only for the verdict, but for living up to, in the highest degree, the great traditions of our independent Federal judiciary.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN NEWSBOYS OF LOWELL, MASS.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this morning 58 newsboys, each 12 years old, came to Washington from my district to see the sights. They had breakfast with me in the Speaker's dining room at the Nation's Capitol. The trip was sponsored by the Lowell Sun, of Lowell, Mass., because these boys secured many new subscriptions to the paper. One secured 450.

The boys had the great privilege and delight of meeting our Speaker, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN. He told them that he started his career as a newsboy. He told them to hitch their ambition to a star. Certainly our Speaker is a star and sets a splendid example of integrity and ability. These boys were thrilled to have him talk to them and to point the way for ambition, for happiness, and for service.

The boys were just as fine and courteous as they could be. I was grateful and deeply touched because they presented me with a very beautiful orchid. I wish every one of those boys could have had the pleasure of meeting all the Members of Congress, and I know the Members of Congress would have joined me in appreciation and praise of them. They are wonderful young Americans; I am glad because I know the future of America marches on the feet of youth. I am extremely proud to be their Member of Congress—they are a great inspiration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON on the subject of the Indian Springs experiment.

Mr. JAVITS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a supplemental study on the subject Permit Communist-Conspirators To Be Teachers? by Hamilton A. Long.

Mr. REED of New York in four instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. HOPE in two instances and to include a table in one.

Mr. PERKINS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and include a letter from the Director of the Budget and other extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO and to include an editorial.

Mr. BRAY.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. HORAN and to include an article.

Mr. GROSS and to include an editorial.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARDY the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and to include quotations from certain letters.

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER and to include a report of the International Rubber Study Conference.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include an editorial.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER in four instances.

Mr. DONOVAN and to include an address delivered by James A. Farley.

Mr. WOLVERTON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON and to include an editorial.

Mr. GAVIN (at the request of Mr. WAMPLER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1242. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies; and

H. R. 1244. An act to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and other purposes."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Tibor Kalman Jalsoviczky;

H. R. 782. An act for the relief of Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen;

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani;

H. R. 1243. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16);

H. R. 1563. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Petsch;

H. R. 2364. An act to terminate restrictions against alienation on land owned by William Lynn Engles and Maureen Edna Engles;

H. R. 2420. An act for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk;

H. R. 2667. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom;

H. R. 2990. An act to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States;

H. R. 3042. An act for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco;

H. R. 3389. An act for the relief of Pio Valensin;

H. R. 3406. An act to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; and

H. R. 4605. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of official business.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of official business.

Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 2 days, on account of official business.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. BOLAND), for the balance of the week, on account of death in family.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah, for the remainder of this week, on account of the death of mother.

Mr. SCHERER, for May 27 and 28, 1953, on account of hearing of subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities in New York City.

Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 3 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 27, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

719. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the 14th quarterly report on the administration of the advance planning program, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 352, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 153); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

720. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report required by section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended, for the period ended March 31, 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5363. A bill to amend section 14 of the act of June 25, 1948, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 249. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1026, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 250. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5069, a bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 472). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 484. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United

States; without amendment (Rept. No. 456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 712. An act for the relief of William R. Jackson; without amendment (Rept. No. 457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1334. An act for the relief of the Reverend A. E. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 660. A bill for the relief of Frank B. Pindle; without amendment (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 812. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. India Taylor Palmi Stevenson; with amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1167. A bill for the relief of W. A. Sampsel; with amendment (Rept. No. 461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2021. A bill for the relief of Clarence R. Geller and other employees of The Alaska Railroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2387. A bill for the relief of William M. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3623. A bill for the relief of Willard Chester Cauley; with amendment (Rept. No. 464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4097. A bill for the relief of Terry L. Hatchett; without amendment (Rept. No. 465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4329. A bill for the relief of Huntington, McLaren & Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4799. A bill for the relief of Otho P. Hipkins; with amendment (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5236. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Jarecki; with amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 25. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 5395. A bill to correct tax equities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 5396. A bill to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 5397. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a 3-year carryover for medical and dental expenses in excess of the maximum deduction allowable under section 23 (x); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow, as a deduction from gross income, certain amounts paid as life-insurance premiums, and to provide more liberal income-tax treatment for amounts paid for hospitalization insurance and amounts paid under voluntary medical care plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 5400. A bill to amend section 1802 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to change the basis for taxing transfers of stock with no par value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 5401. A bill to amend section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 5402. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $125 a month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5403. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the work clause shall not apply to work performed by individuals who have attained the age of 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 5404. A bill authorizing the Civil Service Commission to confer a competitive classified civil-service status upon certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5405. A bill to create a Federal Civilian Retirement Administration and to transfer thereto the functions of the Civil Service Commission pertaining to civil-service retirement activities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 5406. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire title to real property and to provide for the construction of certain public buildings for housing of Federal agencies or departments, including post offices, by executing purchase contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 5407. A bill to amend section 2879 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY:

H. Res. 247. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to Sarah Waldron, mother of Mary Waldron, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. Res. 248. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to the estate of Charles R. Torbert, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress in opposition to a reduction of the appropriation for the national school-lunch program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of the House of Representatives in the General Court of Massachusetts, congratulating members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, resolutions of the Massachusetts State Senate memorializing the Congress of the United States to reconsider any proposed curtailment of employment or work at the Boston Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, resolutions of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge that any steps aimed at curtailment of employment or curtailment of work at the Boston Naval Shipyard be reconsidered in view of the value of this facility to our State and national defense and our State national economic security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress in opposition to a reduction of the appropriation for the national school-lunch program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives in the General Court of Massachusetts extending to the members of the armed services its congratulations for their excellent work, and assuring them of the continued cooperation of the peoples of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to compel the Department of Defense to maintain the present standard of employment and work at the Boston Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge that any steps aimed at curtailment of employment or curtailment of work, at the Boston Naval Shipyard, be reconsidered in view of the value of this facility to our State and national defense and our State and national economic security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in opposition to a reduction of the appropriation for the national school-lunch program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reconsider any proposed curtailment of employment or work at the Boston Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the curtailment of employment or curtailment of work at the Boston Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to congratulating members of the armed services for their excellent work and to assure them of the continued cooperation of the peoples of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation whereby the wooden

buildings now located at Mana Airport Base, Kauai, be transferred to the county of Kauai; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5408. A bill for the relief of Marie Martha Schramm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 5409. A bill for the relief of Shamail Shamilzadeh, Shoushan Shamilzadeh, David Shamilzadeh and Bila Shamilzadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 5410. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rosanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 5411. A bill for the relief of Jules Maurice Lotode, Mary Tsong Lotode, and Jeanne Marie Lotode; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5412. A bill for the relief of Novak Zuber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5413. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Galina Nicolaevna Warner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5414. A bill for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5415. A bill for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 5416. A bill to authorize the advancement of certain lieutenants on the retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5417. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Efraim Silber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

286. By Mr. BENTLEY: Petition of Herbert Springs, Harry Burges, and Robert Rigoulet joined by the Shiawassee County Road Commission employees, to amend the Social Security Act so that employees of State and local government may have old age and survivors insurance, even though they have had a retirement system at the time the State and Federal agreement was consummated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

287. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Racine Unit No. 76 of the American Legion Auxiliary, for favorable action to maintain the rights of the United States relative to the St. Lawrence Waterway development and not relinquish our rightful share to another country; to the Committee on Public Works.

288. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Dickson County Chamber of Commerce, Dickson, Tenn., relative to being placed on record as strongly opposing any decrease or cuts in appropriations to the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Appropriations.

289. Also, petition of California-Nevada Association of Lions International, Santa Barbara, Calif., recommending that an impartial, qualified, and unbiased engineering study be undertaken concerning water conservation and transportation for San Francisco Bay area; to the Committee on Public Works.

290. Also, petition of Lee Nichols and others, of Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447 social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1953

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 21, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of God, descend upon our hearts and grant that in this temple of a people's hope Thy servants in the ministry of public affairs may serve Thee in the beauty of holiness.

For every spiritual insight which sees beyond the faulty and superficial and finds sermons in stones and good in everything; for every heavenly treasure which satisfies the heart, so that for its sake we gladly surrender the cheap and sordid; for all strengthening burdens, weights which turn into wings as they increase strength and gladden the spirit; for all doors of opportunity to render service, to extend kindness, to reach out the helping hand of understanding friendship; and for the radiant hope that sends its ray far down the future's broadening way: We praise Thy name, as in the heat and burden of this new day we lift lame hands of prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 26, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DIRKSEN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate from today through June 15, on official business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I inquire what is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business is Senate Resolution 100, a resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, on which, under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, there is a limitation of 5 hours of debate, the time to be controlled equally by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following a quorum call Senators may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, make insertions in the RECORD, and transact other routine business, under the usual time limitation of 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarthy
Beall	Griswold	McClellan
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Byrd	Holland	Payne
Carlson	Humphrey	Purtell
Chavez	Hunt	Robertson
Clements	Jackson	Russell
Cooper	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Kilgore	Sparkman
Ellender	Knowland	Stennis
Ferguson	Kuchel	Symington
Flanders	Lehman	Tobey
Frear	Long	Watkins
Fulbright	Malone	Welker
George	Mansfield	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Gore	Maybank	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to

attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a quarterly report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended March 31, 1953, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress in opposition to a reduction of the appropriation for the national school-lunch program

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress a bill to substantially reduce Federal aid under the national school-lunch program; and

"Whereas such reduction would result in the loss by the school pupils of this Commonwealth of 3 million free bottles of milk and approximately 1 million free lunches: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts hereby expresses its opposition to the passage of legislation which would reduce Federal aid under said national school-lunch program; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Three resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions congratulating members of the Armed Forces

"Whereas the week of May 10 was designated as Armed Forces Week; and

"Whereas during said week the various members of the armed services, including the Army, Navy, Air Corps, Marines, and hospital units displayed to the public their new and latest equipment; and

"Whereas through this fine display the public became much better informed as to means being taken to defend our Nation and protect the lives of the men in our armed services; and

"Whereas an important part of this display was the part taken by the recruiting services; and

"Whereas this Commonwealth stands well in front of other States in the activities of this most important adjunct of our armed services; and

"Whereas demonstrations such as this help build and keep up the morale of the peoples of this great Nation of ours: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives in the General Court of Massachusetts extends to the members of the armed services its congratulations for their excellent work and to assure them of the continued cooperation of the peoples of this Commonwealth; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the members of Congress from Massachusetts and to the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces."

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to reconsider any proposed curtailment of employment or work at the Boston Naval Shipyard

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has already been declared a critical unemployment area; and

"Whereas any further cutback in work at the Boston Naval Shipyard would increase unemployment in this area to an untenable degree; and

"Whereas currently the Boston Naval Shipyard is responsible for an income of approximately $64 million annually to the workers of the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the Boston Naval Shipyard draws its employees from every part of the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas each community therein is in part affected by the financial stability of these employees: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to compel the Department of Defense to maintain the present standard of employment and work at the Boston Naval Shipyard; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of Labor."

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge that any steps aimed at curtailment of employment or curtailment of work, at the Boston Naval Shipyard, be reconsidered in view of the value of this facility to our State and national defense and our State and national economic security

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has already been declared a critical unemployment area; and

"Whereas any further cutback in work at the Boston Naval Shipyard would increase this unemployment to an untenable degree; and

"Whereas this activity now introduces an approximate income of $63,972,000 annually to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

"Whereas this income is dependent upon the continuance of this activity in its present size and scope; and

"Whereas the Boston Naval Shipyard draws its employees from every part of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

"Whereas each community is in part affected by the financial stability of these employees: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts recommend that the Congress of the United States use its influence to urge the Department of Defense to take such action in relation to the employment level and this work schedule of the Boston Naval Shipyard as will insure the continuance of this activity in its present healthy condition; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of State send copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A statement in the nature of a petition, issued at the manifestation of Americans of Ukrainian descent from Syracuse, Auburn, and Utica, N. Y., commemorating the memory of those who died in the famine of 1932–33 in Ukraine (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the delegates of 52 societies and 7 circuits of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, at Holyoke, Mass., relating to Poland's fight against communism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the leaders, members, and representatives of the 46 identifiable bands of Mission Indians of California, Valley Center, Calif., relating to the rights of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Blue Star Mothers of America, Department of California, relating to the shortage of beds available in California for California veterans, provided by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS OF DAKEM-WELLS FARMERS UNION LOCAL, EMMONS COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three resolutions adopted by the Dakem-Wells Farmers Union Local, of Emmons County, N. Dak., relating to the efforts of private-utility companies to gain control of cooperative generating plants, 100-percent parity for farm products, and appropriations for rural telephone associations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and referred as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas the farmers and members of the Dakem-Wells Farmers Union Local have been advised that there are now moves and steps being taken by private utilities company to grasp and gain control of cooperative generating plants set up by funds provided for by the Government; and

"Whereas the farmers feel that such generating plants should remain in control of Federal Government and cooperative organizations: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Dakem-Wells Farmers Union Local*, That it go on record opposing any move or arrangement whereby the private utilities gain control and management of Federal Government electric-generating

plants throughout the United States, and that said control and management remain with the Federal Government or such cooperative organizations as may be provided for by law; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to honorable United States Senators, WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG, and Congressmen USHER L. BURDICK and OTTO KRUEGER by the secretary of the local.

"Motion for the adoption of the above resolution was made, seconded, and duly carried on the 14th day of May 1953.

"DAKEM-WELLS FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
"ROY B. VETTER, *President*.
"ANDREW WERNER, *Vice President*.
"ADAM BAUMSTARKS, *Secretary*.
"JOSEPH VETTER, *Legislative Director*."

"Whereas information has come to the members of the Dakem-Wells Farm Union Local that Secretary of Agriculture, Benson, is drifting from the farm-price-support program set up by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas we are advised and informed that Secretary of Agriculture, Benson, favors the old rule of supply and demand without price support: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Dakem-Wells Farmers Union Local in regular meeting on this 14th day of May 1953*, That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States provide farmers with 100-percent parity and that farm commodities be protected by the Federal Government by at least 90 percent of parity; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the local to the Honorable Senators, WILLIAM LANGER, MILTON R. YOUNG, and Congressmen, USHER L. BURDICK, and OTTO KRUEGER.

"Motion for the adoption of the above resolution was made, seconded, and duly carried on the 14th day of May 1953.

"DAKEM-WELLS FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
"ROY B. VETTER, *President*.
"ANDREW WERNER, *Vice President*.
"ADAM BAUMTARCK, *Secretary*.
"JOSEPH VETTER, *Legislative Director*."

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"Whereas the Dakem-Wells Farmers Union Local, of Emmons County, N. Dak., in regular meeting on May 14, 1953, is advised and informed that the Congress of the United States has rejected and defeated an appropriation bill which would have provided adequate funds for rural telephone associations; and

"Whereas a rural telephone association has been properly formed and incorporated including parts of Emmons, Burleigh, and Kidder Counties of the State of North Dakota; and

"Whereas said co-op will now be without sufficient funds to go forward with its program because of Congress failing to furnish adequate finances: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Dakem-Wells Farmers Union Local meeting on the 14th day of May 1953*, That we urge and request that the Congress of the United States immediately take steps to reconsider their action on the legislation providing sufficient funds for the finances of RTA Co-ops that have their engineering designs completed on or before June 30, 1953; it is further

"*Resolved*, That copies of said resolution be sent to the Honorable United States Senators, WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG, and that copies be forwarded to Congressmen, USHER L. BURDICK and OTTO KRUEGER by the secretary of the local.

"Motion for the adoption of the above resolution was made, seconded, and duly carried on the 14th day of May 1953.

"DAKEM-WELLS FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
"ROY B. VETTER, *President*.
"ANDREW WERNER, *Vice President*.
"ADAM BAUMTARCK, *Secretary*.
"JOSEPH VETTER, *Legislative Director*."

COMMEMORATION OF POLISH CONSTITUTION—PETITION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a petition sent to us by the Polish Constitution Day Committee, Lowell, Mass., under date of May 10, 1953, relating to the commemoration of the Polish constitution.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY COMMITTEE,
Lowell, Mass., May 10, 1953.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: We, the undersigned Polish-American citizens of Lowell, Mass., and vicinity, gathered in the Polish National Home, 10 Coburn Street, Lowell, Mass., on the 10th of May 1953, to witness a solemn academia commemorating the promulgation of the Polish constitution on the 3d of May 1791, do hereby pass the following resolutions:

In view of the fact that the Polish nation, in the cause of liberty and democracy, has fought on practically every front in the world, both on the side of the Allies and alone on the very soil of Poland under the united direction of the Polish Government, which in its time was recognized by all nations and declared by former President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, to be "the inspiration of all nations"; in view of the fact that the Polish nation, which went to battle under the motto, "For your freedom and ours," never recognized the superiority of force over righteousness, and today, without any fault of its own, is suffering under the yoke of communistic slavery, we (the undersigned) demand—

1. Recognition of the one only legal and constitutional government of Poland, presently exiled in London, as the true and legal representative of the Polish nation.

2. Denunciation of all Yalta and Teheran agreements dealing with Poland since the Polish Government was neither a participating member nor did it authorize any agreements.

3. The return of freedom to the Polish nation within such boundaries as were established and recognized in 1939 on the east and from the Oder to the Nissa Rivers on the west.

4. Presentation on an international level of the deeds and particularly of the massacres at Katyn to the forum of the United Nations for the purpose of accusing and sentencing the greatest criminals of mankind.

5. The undertaking of steps necessary to free 12 of the 16 leaders of the Polish underground who are presently herded, unlawfully and unrighteously, in the dungeons of Soviet prisons.

6. The introduction of changes in the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and the putting into practice the motion of the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, to allow 120,000 immigrants to enter the United States annually, first preference being given to escapees and immigrants from behind the Iron Curtain.

Long live the United States of America.
Long live Poland as a free and independent nation.

John Markiewicz, John Bardzik, John Slowik, Henry Golec, Dr. J. Dziura, Rev. Thaddeus J. Kozieja, Jan Wiki, Helen A. Wozinak, Frank Slowik, Sophie Jankowski, Stanislaw Szymcrak, Tadeusz M. Karasirakes, Tadeus Rursak.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4495. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 305).

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 285. A bill to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification; with amendments (Rept. No. 306);

S. 1981. A bill to continue in effect certain provisions of section 6 of the act of February 4, 1887, as amended, relating to military traffic in time of war or threatened war, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter; without amendment (Rept. No. 307); and

H. R. 2347. A bill to permit continued exercise, until 6 months after termination of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, of certain powers, relating to preferences or priorities in the transportation of traffic, under sections 1 (15) and 420 of the Interstate Commerce Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 308).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1995. A bill to provide certain construction and other authority for the military departments in time of war or national emergency;

S. 1996. A bill to authorize the furnishing of information and civilian education for personnel in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

S. 1997. A bill to authorize the employment in a civilian position in the Office of the Secretary of Defense of Lt. Gen. Graves Blanchard Erskine, upon retirement from the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1998. A bill to repeal section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952;

S. 1999. A bill to provide for the recovery, care, and disposition of the remains of members of the uniformed services and certain other personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 2000. A bill to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years' active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years' service, and for other purposes; and

S. 2001. A bill to defer from induction by Selective Service members of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States selected for attendance at officer candidate schools on courses of instruction leading to an aeronautical rating; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2002. A bill for the relief of Reza Razmara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 2003. A bill to provide for the election of the Governor and Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii by the people of the Territory; for the appointment by the Governor of the justices and judges of the courts of

the Territory; and for the formation of a constitutional government by the people of the Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2004. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Postmaster General in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2005. A bill to permit the sale or exchange of livestock threatened with destruction by disease to be treated as an involuntary conversion; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 2006. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shoreline of the State of Connecticut from the Hammonasset River to the East River; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2007. A bill for the relief of Warren C. Baggett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 2008. A bill relating to the venue of actions for violations of the act entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2009. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edward E. Jex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President of the United States to officially proclaim the week of June 7–14, 1953, as "Aid to Korea Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the establishment of a bi-State park by the States of Kentucky and Virginia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED ARMED SERVICES LEGISLATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a series of seven bills relating to the Armed Forces. Six of the bills are recommended by the Department of Defense and are accompanied by letters of transmittal from the Department explaining the purpose of the bill in each case. Introduction of the seventh bill was requested by the National Guard Association.

I ask that the accompanying letters in each case be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following the listing of bills introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bills introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 1995. A bill to provide certain construction and other authority for the military departments in time of war or national emergency.

The letter to accompany Senate bill 1995 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to provide certain construction and other authority for the military departments in time of war or national emergency.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, and the Bureau of the Budget states that there is no objection to its transmittal to the Congress for consideration by it. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would provide continuing statutory authority during the present national emergency for the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to expand productive capacity in both Government-owned and privately owned plants, with ownership remaining in the Government for those facilities placed in privately owned plants. Subsections 1 (a) and (b) of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 712, ch. 508), as amended and extended by sections 13 and 16 of the act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314, ch. 340), and subsection 1 (a) (4) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 330, ch. 570), provide, among other things, authority for the construction and expansion of defense plants and facilities in order to expedite the building up of the national defense. In addition, the act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1053), as amended and extended by section 1 (a) (1) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act, authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to provide for the necessary construction and maintenance of facilities used in the procurement of items authorized in connection with the prosecution of war and the maintenance of the national defense. Those 2 statutory authorities, however, will expire on July 1, 1953, unless further extended. This proposal is submitted in lieu of a request for a further extension of those acts which contain other authorities not within the scope of this proposal.

Under normal peacetime conditions the construction, conversion, or expansion of facilities for the procurement of military items is reduced to a minimum and limited to specific items which may be required during such peacetime periods. Peacetime authority of the military departments is not sufficiently broad to provide facilities that will be needed when an emergency occurs. Nor is there any peacetime authority available to the departments for assisting the expansion of privately owned productive capacity for an emergency. Expansions of both Government-owned and privately owned plants became immediately necessary in the emergencies that occurred prior to World War II and with the advent of the Korean conflict.

In the case of construction at military installations, it has been the practice periodically to obtain specific authorizing legislation for known needs. This procedure is clearly not feasible in the case of construction or expansion of plants needed to alleviate unforseen shortages in defense production. It is not possible to foresee and predict accurately the need for specific authorizing legislation. During World War II, authority similar to that contained in this proposal proved to be of inestimable value for the rapid expansion of productive capacity by the construction of Government-owned and expansion of privately owned plants.

In the present national emergency, the expansion of industrial capacity for the production of procured military items, and the rehabilitation of Government-owned plants which had been retained and maintained on a minimum basis, was started with an initial appropriation to the Army alone for fiscal year 1951 of expediting production funds of $125 million. During the remainder of that fiscal year, an additional $975 million was made available to the Army by supplemental appropriations. In fiscal year 1952 $1 billion was made available to the Army for the same purposes (Public Law 179, 82d Congress). These funds have been and are being utilized for the rehabilitation, expansion, and conversion of plants retained under Government control during the peace years, the construction of certain additional specialized plants for the production of items not normally produced by civilian industry, and the conversion of existing privately owned plants to the production of military items.

Under the existing international situation, the present emergency may become acute at any time without warning. In such an eventuality, time would be a large and very significant factor in the expansion of urgently needed productive capacity. It is believed that statutory authority for a rapid expansion of productive capactiy is important to the timely satisfaction of the need of the military departments for vital supplies.

The authority that would be contained in this proposal would extend not only to facilities for current defense production but also to facilities intended for mobilization reserve purposes. The reserve capacity to be provided will be for specialized military items requiring a long-lead production time. In the event of full mobilization, a lack of adequate productive capacity for such items would create a serious bottleneck. The Department of Defense budget for fiscal year 1954 contains $500 million for this purpose.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. ADAMS,
General Counsel, Acting.

S. 1996. A bill to authorize the furnishing of information and civilian education for personnel in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1996 is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1953.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To authorize the furnishing of information and civilian education for personnel in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes," and a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposal is designed to provide permanent legislation, applicable to all three military departments, in relation to information and educational activities for military personnel. The act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314; 50 U. S. C. App. 761, 776) authorizes the Secretary of War, until 6 months after World War II, to provide for entertainment and instruction in connection with the welfare of enlisted personnel. This wartime authorization was extended, subject to revocation by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, until April 1, 1953, by subsection (a) (5) of the first section of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82d Cong.), and constitutes the only enabling legislation, other than the annual appropriation acts, for Army and Air Force

information and educational activities. The only authorization which the Navy and the Marine Corps has, in this respect, is carried in annual appropriation acts. It is recommended that these temporary authorizations be enacted into permanent law.

Information and educational programs in the Military Establishment are an important factor in relation to military preparedness and morale of members of the Armed Forces. It is believed that this proposal will provide personnel in the Armed Forces with informational and adult civilian educational opportunities commensurate with similar opportunities available to persons in civil life. It is the desire of the Department of Defense to provide for its military personnel, opportunities to increase individual ability by appropriate training and education and to provide information on citizenship, American ideals, and current events so as to foster within each individual a realization of his personal responsibility in relation to the general welfare of the Nation.

In connection with the enactment of the Selective Service Act and the Universal Military Training and Service Act amendments of 1951, and the increased emphasis on citizenship training and educational activities within the Military Establishment itself, greatly increased emphasis is currently being put on the informational and educational requirements of military personnel. It is believed that this proposal would provide the necessary authority to enable the Department of Defense to implement those programs.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that the cost of this proposal, if enacted, would be as follows:

Fiscal year 1953:	*In millions*
Air Force	$2.7
Army	13.631
Navy	.1
Marine Corps	.5
Total	16.931

Cost for typical future year assuming end strength at June 30, 1953, level:	
Air Force	2.7
Army	12.6
Navy	.2
Marine Corps	.5
Total	16.0

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel.

S. 1997. A bill to authorize the employment in a civilian position in the Office of the Secretary of Defense of Lt. Gen. Graves Blanchard Erskine, upon retirement from the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The letter to accompany Senate bill 1997 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To authorize the employment in a civilian position in the Office of the Secretary of Defense of Lt. Gen. Graves Blanchard Erskine, upon retirement from the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953 and it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation is designed to authorize retired pay for Lt. Gen. Graves Blanchard Erskine upon his voluntary retirement from the Marine Corps, and his subsequent employment in a civilian position in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Due to General Erskine's outstanding qualifications the Secretary of Defense desires to appoint him, in a civilian capacity, as head of the Office of Psychological Policy in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. However, this appointment, which is in the best interests of the Government, is precluded by two provisions of law.

A proviso under the heading "Retired Pay" in Title II of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act 1953, provides that no part of funds appropriated for retired or retirement pay shall be used to pay the retired or retirement pay of any commissioned member of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who is voluntarily retired after the date of enactment of that act, unless retired (1) for physical disability incurred in line of duty, (2) for age, or (3) whose application is approved by the Secretary of Defense as in the best interests of the service or for hardship.

Lieutenant General Erskine has served on active duty in the Marine Corps since July 1917 and is eligible for voluntary retirement in grade of general except that the above referenced proviso in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1953 precludes the payment of retired pay to him since he does not fall within the exceptions thereto.

The second provision of law which is a bar to the appointment of Lieutenant General Erskine to this important position is the act of July 31, 1894, which, with certain exceptions, requires a special authorization for a retired officer of the Armed Forces, with retired pay of $2,500 or more per annum, to hold a civilian office. The proposed legislation would exempt Lieutenant General Erskine from this limitation and provide that, while serving in the civilian position, he shall receive the pay of the civilian position in lieu of retired pay, without prejudice to his status as a retired officer.

The Office of Psychological Policy has been established in the Office of the Secretary of Defense to provide a centralized mechanism for the development of policy guidance and for the integration of Department of Defense participation in the national cold war effort. The activities with which the office is concerned include the highest order of national intelligence, psychological operations, and unconventional warfare activities. The integration of these activities and the effective development of Department of Defense capabilities in this area are of critical importance to the national interest. The greatly increased significance of these activities is noted in the President's address on the state of the Union of February 2, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 75, 83d Cong.).

The nature of Department of Defense participation in these activities is of such a nature as to require the utilization of personnel of the highest skill to provide for prompt, increased, and effective utilization of the Department of Defense potential.

Lieutenant General Erskine is particularly qualified in this area, both as an officer with extensive military experience and as an individual with keen imagination, administrative skill, and experience in interdepartmental and international negotiation at the highest level. His duties in the past, including an assignment with the Mutual Security Agency in South Asia, his demonstrated skill in the type of activity in which the Office of Psychological Policy participates with other agencies of Government, and the very high esteem in which he is held by these departments make his appointment to this position particularly desirable.

There is also inclosed a short statement on the career of Lieutenant General Erskine.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Office of the Secretary of Defense is the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. ADAMS,
General Counsel, Acting.

SUMMARY OF SERVICE RECORD AND QUALIFICATIONS IN CASE OF LT. GEN. GRAVES B. ERSKINE, USMC

General Erskine is 55 years old, having been born June 28, 1897, in Columbia, La. He graduated from Louisiana State University in June 1917, and the following month reported for duty as a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps. He presently holds the permanent rank of major general and the temporary rank of lieutenant general while in his current assignment as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic.

His long and distinguished record covers practically every type of service known to the Marine Corps, and his performance of many varied and important duties has been consistently outstanding. In France during World War I he was twice wounded in action and was decorated for gallantry, and his service during and since World War II has been particularly notable. From the latter part of 1942 to the latter part of 1944 he was chief of staff of the Amphibious Corps (later the V Amphibious Corps), Pacific Fleet. During this period he played an important part in the planning and training for the ATTU and KISKA amphibious operations in 1943, for which he was awarded the Legion of Merit; and in 1944 received a Gold Star in lieu of a second award of the Legion of Merit for distinguished service and forceful leadership in the assault and capture of the islands of Saipan and Tinian. In 1945 he commanded the Third Marine Division in the assault and capture of Iwo Jima, and was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for brilliant, skillful and inspiring leadership and personal courage.

By act of Congress approved February 8, 1946, General Erskine was appointed by the President to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator in the Department of Labor, at the same time retaining his full status as an officer of the Marine Corps. This was an emergency organization, established to coordinate the efforts of the Federal Government, the several States, and the local communities in assisting returned veterans to resume civilian life. In this difficult and important task, General Erskine displayed marked ability and his successful efforts were highly commended by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and others.

In 1950, General Erskine was designated as Representative of the Secretary of Defense and as Chief of the Military Group of the Joint State-Defense Mutual Defense Assistance Survey Mission to Southeast Asia. In a letter from the chairman of the mission, his services were most warmly praised, and mention was particularly made of his ability, in an area new to him, to master the details and complexities of the political and economic picture with extraordinary rapidity and rare understanding, and to divorce himself from a strictly military viewpoint.

He has demonstrated outstanding qualifications not only as a professional marine officer, but as an executive and administrator as well.

S. 1998. A bill to repeal section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

The letter to accompany Senate bill 1998 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: By letter dated January 5, 1953, the Department of Defense submitted to the President of the Senate two

legislative proposals; (1) a bill, "To repeal section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952" and (2) a proposed joint resolution, "To postpone the effective date of section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 relating to the maximum strength of the Ready Reserve." These submittals were referred to the Armed Services Committee and in your letter of February 7, 1953, you requested advice as to whether on re-examination by the present administration these proposals were still supported by the Department of Defense.

These proposals have been reexamined and I am authorized to advise you that the Department of Defense reaffirms its support of the first of these proposals, that is, the bill, "To repeal section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952."

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. ADAMS,
General Counsel, Acting.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1953.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To repeal section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952" and a draft of a proposed joint resolution "To postpone the effective date of section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 relating to the maximum strength of the Ready Reserve."

These proposals are a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to their presentation for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that they be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to repeal subsection 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 which provides that the "authorized aggregate personnel strength of the Ready Reserve shall not exceed a total of 1,500,000." This limitation defeats the basic purpose of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 and the Universal Military Training and Service Act of achieving equity in liability for service in the Armed Forces and permitting reduction of the degree of such liability only by satisfactory participation in active service or reserve training programs. This concept was carefully developed to meet the need of the individual reservist and industry for a method of bringing a practicable degree of predictability into the program.

The establishment of the Ready Reserve and the Standby Reserve as the bases of liability for service rather than as organizations was designed to accomplish those objectives. The Ready Reserve is to consist of those reservists whose active duty service is insufficient to render them eligible for transfer to the Standby Reserve under the criteria established pursuant to section 208 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act and thus reduce their liability for active service.

The Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, requires a total of 8 years active and reserve service for all individuals who enter the Armed Forces after June 19, 1951. The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 provides for a Ready Reserve and a Standby Reserve status for members of the Reserves. In general, the obligated time in the Ready Reserve requires a minimum of 5 years of a combination of active duty and participating Ready Reserve service. The input into the Ready Reserve will vary with the numbers of individuals whose enlistment or induction service terminate each year, as well as the varying numbers who desire to voluntarily remain in the Ready Reserve after they are eligible for transfer to the Standby Reserve. All members of the National Guard and Air National Guard are, by law, members of the Ready Reserve.

Section 208 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act is so written that the Secretaries of the military departments may, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, reduce the period of Ready Reserve service at any time. By this means individuals with the most active service and reserve training may be permitted to transfer to the Standby Reserve.

Since the Ready Reserve is a status of liability for further involuntary active duty and not an organization, it is not possible to set a definite strength limit without destroying the concept of degree of vulnerability. While the future strength of the Ready Reserve can be reduced administratively under the provisions of section 208, it is considered most unwise to reduce the period of obligation under this provision until the international situation permits a revaluation of our military objectives.

As the ceiling specified in section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 will become effective on January 1, 1953, there is also enclosed a proposed joint resolution to postpone the effective date of that subsection until April 1, 1953, in order to suspend the ceiling while the Congress is considering this proposed legislation.

BUDGET DATA

The estimated strengths of the paid Ready Reserves not serving on active duty contained in the Department of Defense budget request for fiscal year 1954 are within the ceiling of 1,500,000 established by the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952. However, the inclusion under the ceiling of the Reserves on active duty and the Ready Reserves in a nonpaid status would result in the ceiling being exceeded in fiscal year 1954. It is not practicable to assume that the Reserves on active duty would be released in order to come within the ceiling. The same is true of the majority of those reservists who will be in a pay status. The only remaining group is that composed of individuals discharged from active duty who are required to serve in the Ready Reserve pursuant to law. On the assumption that a necessary reduction in strength would be made if the ceiling is not removed and that the reduction would be taken from this group, i. e., those Ready Reserves in a nonpaid status, there are no budget implications in the proposed legislation insofar as fiscal year 1954 is concerned.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Office of the Secretary of Defense is the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT.

S. 1999. A bill to provide for the recovery, care and disposition of the remains of members of the uniformed services and certain other personnel, and for other purposes.

The letter to accompany Senate bill 1999 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To provide for the recovery, care, and disposition of the remains of members of the uniformed services and certain other personnel, and for other purposes," and sectional analysis thereof.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation would provide a uniform law applicable equally to the uniformed services with respect to the care and disposition of remains of members of the uniformed services. In addition, it would grant limited authorization for the care and disposition of remains of dependents of members of the uniformed services and civilian personnel of the United States.

In general, the authorization provided for in the proposed legislation follows existing statutory authority on the subject. The legislation does, however, provide additional authorization for the transportation of remains of dependents of personnel of the uniformed services and civilian personnel of the United States who die while abroad or while in a travel status to or from overseas destinations.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. ADAMS,
General Counsel, Acting.

S. 2000. A bill to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years service, and for other purposes.

The letter to accompany Senate bill 2000 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1953.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years' active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years' service, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposal is to amend section 202 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1064) by deleting from said section the words "or more than 30."

The cited section 202 amended section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 507), as amended (10 U. S. C. 943a), by providing for the voluntary retirement of Regular and Reserve officers of the Army and Air Force upon completion of not less than 20 or more than 30 years' active Federal service, at least 10 years of which must be active commissioned service. The act of July 31, 1935, provided for the retirement of Regular Army officers after 15 years' service and was adopted primarily as a means of reducing the officer strength of the Army, when necessary, and for alleviating the concentration of officers of the same seniority and length of service which was created as a result of integration during World War I. In its present form, it is the authority for the retirement of Regular Army officers only in the relatively few instances where retirement with less than 30 years' service is granted for extremely compassionate reasons or in connection with the elimination action under title I of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.

Section 202 places a penalty upon the Reserve officer with more than 30 years' service by denying to him retirement under its pro-

visions. It is believed that deletion of the words "or more than thirty" would remedy this condition and would permit the retirement of non-Regular officers at any time after the completion of 20 years' active Federal service, at least ten of which are active commissioned service. Such retirement, as is the case of officers in the Regular Army, would continue to be within and subject to the discretion of the Secretary of the Army or of the Air Force.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

S. 2346, 82d Congress, was substantially the same as this proposal.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that the additional cost resulting from enactment of this proposal will be, for the Departments indicated, as follows:

Army: There are approximately 300 Reserve officers presently on active duty who have more than 30 years of active service. If this proposal is enacted so as to be in effect for the last quarter of the fiscal year 1953, it is estimated that 150 of these officers would retire with a resulting cost of approximately $155,000 to the retired pay appropriation. However, as a partial offset to this amount would be savings to the retired pay appropriation that would accrue if any officers who, under the present law would retire with 29 years' service, elect to remain on active duty until they have completed 30 or more years of service. In future years, it is estimated that the proposed legislation would result in a maximum additional cost of approximately $740,000 to the retired pay appropriation annually and will continue until all Reserve officers who have accumulated over 30 years' service prior to enactment have been retired and then decrease until officers affected have attained age 60.

Air Force: There are only 4 known instances of Reserve officers on active duty with this Department with over 30 years' service. Accordingly, the additional cost to the retired pay appropriation would be negligible. In view of the number of officers who, under the present law would retire after 29 years' service, but under the proposed law continue on active duty, it is probable that the enactment of this legislation would result in a savings to the appropriation indicated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel.

S. 2001. A bill to defer from induction by Selective Service members of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States selected for attendance at officer candidate schools on courses of instruction leading to an aeronautical rating.

AUTONOMOUS GOVERNMENT FOR HAWAII—ELECTION OF OWN GOVERNOR AND SECRETARY—ADOPTION OF OWN CONSTITUTION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill which would grant the people of the Territory of Hawaii the right to elect their Governor and to elect a Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii, who in effect would also be the Lieutenant Governor.

GOVERNOR APPOINT SUPREME COURT JUDGES

The bill also provides for the appointment of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory by the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii.

WRITE THEIR OWN CONSTITUTION

The bill also provides that the people of the Territory of Hawaii may organize a government pursuant to a constitution of their own adoption.

The qualified voters of the Territory will have the privilege of accepting or rejecting the right to organize a government under such a constitution. If a majority of the qualified voters cast their votes in favor of accepting this provision for organizing a government, the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii shall call a convention to draft a constitution for the Territory.

A REPUBLICAN REPRESENTATIVE FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, the bill specifically states that such constitution shall provide a republican representative form of government and shall include a bill of rights, subject to approval by the Congress of the United States.

I believe that is a proper step in government for all the Territories of the United States which are of sufficient size and importance as to merit such self-government.

OFFSHORE AREAS—HAWAII, PUERTO RICO, ALASKA, GUAM

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has been granted the power to form a government based on complete home rule. The people of Puerto Rico have adopted a constitution which has been approved by the Congress of the United States. This type of government is working very well for Puerto Rico, and should be the type of government for noncontiguous areas such as Hawaii, Alaska, Guam, or any other offshore Territory.

Before Newfoundland became a Province of Canada it made overtures to the United States to be brought within our Government as a State.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

I introduce for reference a bill providing for self-government for the Territory of Hawaii and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2003) to provide for the election of the Governor and Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii by the people of the Territory, for the appointment by the Governor of the justices and judges of the courts of the Territory, and for the formation of a constitutional government by the people of the Territory was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 66 of the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 531), is amended to read as follows:

"THE EXECUTIVE POWER

"SEC. 66. (a) The executive power of the government of the Territory of Hawaii shall be vested in a governor, who, except as hereinafter provided, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and shall hold office for 4 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, unless sooner removed by the President. At the general election in 1954 and at each quadrennial general election thereafter, the Governor of Hawaii shall be elected by the qualified voters of Hawaii and shall hold office for a term of 4 years commencing on the 2d day of January following the date of the election and until his successor is elected and qualified. No person shall be eligible for the office of governor unless at the time of his taking office he is at least 35 years of age, is a citizen of the Territory of Hawaii, and has resided therein for at least 3 years next preceding the date of his taking office. The election of the governor shall be held in the same manner provided by law for the election of the Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii to the House of Representatives of the United States.

"(b) The governor shall be commander in chief of the militia of the Territory. He shall have the power to grant pardons or reprieves for offenses against the laws of the Territory, and reprieves for offenses against the laws of the United States until the decision of the President is made known thereon.

"(c) The governor (other than a governor appointed by the President) shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. The house of representatives of the Territory of Hawaii shall have the sole power of impeachment. Impeachment shall require the concurrence of two-thirds of all of the members of the house of representatives. The senate of Hawaii shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, the members of the senate shall be on oath or affirmation and the chief justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Hawaii shall preside. No person shall be convicted without the concurrence of three-fourths of all the members of the senate. Judgment in the cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the government of the Territory. Any person convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to law."

SEC. 2. Section 69 of such act of April 30, 1900 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 534), is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There shall be a secretary of the Territory who, except as hereinafter provided, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and who shall be a citizen of the Territory of Hawaii and hold his office for 4 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, unless sooner removed by the President. At the general election in 1954, and at each quadrennial general election thereafter, the secretary of the Territory of Hawaii shall be elected by the qualified voters of Hawaii and shall hold office for a term of 4 years commencing on the 2d day of January following the date of election and until his succesor is elected and qualified. No person shall be eligible for the office of secretary unless at the time of his taking office he is a citizen of the Territory of Hawaii and has resided therein for at least 3 years next preceding the date of his taking office. The election of the secretary shall be held in the same manner provided by law for the election of the Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii to the House of Representatives of the United States. The secretary (other than a secretary appointed by the President) shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes or misdemeanors, in the manner provided in section 66 (c) of this act."

SEC. 3. Section 70 of such act of April 30, 1900 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 535), is amended to read as follows:

"ACTING GOVERNOR IN CERTAIN CONTINGENCIES

"SEC. 70. In the case of a vacancy in the office of the governor, the person holding the

position of secretary of the Territory of Hawaii at the time the vacancy occurs shall succeed to the office of governor and to all the duties and emoluments for the remainder of the term. If for any reason the governor is temporarily absent from Hawaii, or unable to perform his duties, the secretary shall act as governor, with all the powers and duties of the office during such temporary absence or disability. In the event the secretary is unable to assume the office of governor or unable to act as governor, or in the event that the office of secretary is also vacant, such other person as may be provided by the laws of the Territory shall succeed to the office of governor, or shall act as governor, as the case may be. In the event that a newly elected governor is unable to take office, a temporary successor shall be elected by a majority vote of all members of the legislature of the Territory meeting in joint session at the next succeeding term thereof, who shall hold office until a successor is elected and qualified at a special election to be held within 120 days from the date of adjournment of such session."

SEC. 4. (a) The first sentence of the first paragraph of section 80 of such act of April 30, 1900 (U. S. C., title 48, secs. 546 and 633), is amended by striking out "That the President shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint the chief justice and justices of the supreme court, the judges of the circuit courts, who shall hold their respective offices for the term of 4 years, unless sooner removed by the President; and the governor shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, appoint" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The governor shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, appoint the chief justice and justices of the supreme court, the judges of the circuit courts,".

(b) The third paragraph of such section is amended to read as follows:

"The salaries of all officers, other than those officers whose salaries are prescribed in this act, shall be as provided by the legislature, but those of the chief justice and the justices of the supreme court and judges of the circuit courts shall not be diminished during their term of office."

(c) The portion of section 82 of such act of April 30, 1900 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 632), as precedes the proviso therein is amended to read as follows: "The supreme court shall consist of a chief justice and two associate justices:".

SEC. 5. (a) Fully recognizing the principle of government by consent, this section is enacted in the nature of a compact so that the people of the Territory of Hawaii may organize a government pursuant to a constitution of their own adoption. This section shall be submited to the qualified voters of the Territory for acceptance or rejection in a referendum to be held for such purpose under the laws of the Territory. If this section is approved by a majority of the votes cast in such referendum, the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii shall call a convention to draft a constitution for the Territory. Such constitution shall provide a republican form of government and shall include a bill of rights.

(b) Upon adoption of the constitution by the people of the Territory, the President of the United States shall, if he finds that such constitution conforms with the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this section, transmit such constitution to the Congress of the United States. Upon approval by the Congress, the constitution shall become effective in accordance with its terms, subject to the conditions and limitations of the act of Congress approving it.

STATEHOOD RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am familiar with the 1952 Republican platform insofar as statehood for Hawaii and Alaska is concerned. I am also aware that the party favors statehood for both under equitable conditions, and eventual statehood for Puerto Rico.

Since first elected to the United States Senate, I have consistently voted against Hawaiian, Alaskan, and Puerto Rican statehood, mainly because this Nation never has granted statehood to any noncontiguous territory; and it is not conceivable at this time that we could ever have a homogeneous people through the acceptance of areas widely separated from the mainland—Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and other like offshore territories—and areas.

If, however, the claims of Hawaii and Alaska for statehood are to be considered at this time, I believe it is only fair to consider both of them, in view of the fact that Alaska is just as eager for statehood as her sister Territory, Hawaii. Alaska has been in territorial status for a long time; the population there is increasing faster than in any other area under the flag, and the general development, noted on my visit there, is amazing. Alaska, at least, is on the North American Continuent and is connected by land with the United States.

VIEWS OF THE COMMITTEE AND CONGRESS WILL PREVAIL

The views of the committee and the Congress will prevail on the question of statehood for the two Territories, or self-government under a constitution of their own adoption. But in fairness to both, I can see no reason why one should have priority over the other.

COMMITTEE VISITED PUERTO RICO—1947

I was one of 5 Senators who visited Puerto Rico in 1947. The question of statehood for that area was just as hot then as is the Hawaiian and Alaskan question now. At that time we recommended against statehood, and suggested that Puerto Rico be given their own constitution, the right to elect their own governor, supreme court justices, and complete autonomy, subject, of course, to provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Reese River Reveille of May 23, 1953. The editor of this paper—the oldest newspaper in our State—is Jack Taylor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALONE'S STAND ON HAWAII WELL TAKEN

Everything considered, and regardless of whether or not we individual citizens see eye to eye with him, there is a great deal of merit in Senator GEORGE W. MALONE'S reasons for opposing immediate admission of Hawaii to full statehood.

As Senator MALONE points out, no area has ever been admitted to statehood that was not contiguous to the United States. Noncontiguous areas, the great bulk of whose people have no direct and personal knowledge of life and conditions in the United States, necessarily have ways of life different from ours. In consequence they are likely to be far more easily infiltrated by the exponents of theories antagonistic to the American way of living.

So far as Hawaii is concerned, Senator MALONE unquestionably is right when he says that Harry Bridges' communistic International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union is all-powerful. "The union could control the political life of the islands and Moscow conceivably could have great influence in the United States Senate."

Admitted to statehood, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, or any others of our possessions who will sooner or later be clamoring for statehood, would each have two Senators. Representing ways of life not actually ours, a group of such Senators could easily control the balance of power.

It does not necessarily follow that, denied statehood, they must be kept subject colonies. They can be given a vast amount of freedom of self-government without at the same time being put in a position where their representatives in the Senate can perhaps endanger the welfare of the American way of life which neither those Senators nor the people they represent are able to fully understand.

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA—S. 224

Mr. MALONE. On January 7, 1953, the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the committee to which such legislation is referred, introduced Senate bill 224, providing that the Territory of Alaska elect their own Governor and secretary. Mr. President, I believe that method to be the proper procedure to be followed.

BEACH EROSION CONTROL OF CONNECTICUT SHORELINE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, at the request of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to assist certain beach erosion and control activities along the shoreline of the State of Connecticut from the Hammonasset River to the East River.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2006) to authorize certain beach-erosion control of the shoreline of the State of Connecticut from the Hammonasset River to the East River, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for Mr. PURTELL and himself), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1106 AND S. 1444, RELATING TO RENDITION OF MUSICAL COMPOSITIONS ON COIN-OPERATED MACHINES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trade-marks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, June 5, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 1106 and S. 1444, relating

to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address delivered by him at commencement exercises at Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C., on May 23, 1953.

By Mr. PURTELL:

Speech prepared by him for delivery at 35th anniversary celebration of Armenian independence, at New Britain, Conn., on May 24, 1953.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

Address entitled "We Shall Not Bury the Talents," delivered by Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, before the 18th annual meeting of the Delta Council, at Cleveland, Miss., on May 21, 1953.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address entitled "The Faith of Free Men," delivered by Robert L. Johnson, Administrator, United States International Information Administration, before the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, at Washington, Saturday, May 23, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Freedom of the Press Is Not a Blank Check for Disloyal Editors," published in the Dillon (Mont.) Examiner of May 13, 1953.

By Mr. PAYNE:

Article regarding Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, published in Time Magazine for May 25, 1953.

By Mr. BUSH:

Article entitled "Economists and the Free Enterprise System," by Lloyd G. Reynolds, Sterling professor of economics, at Yale University, published in the current issue of the Yale Alumni Magazine.

Editorial entitled "How Childish Can We Get?", published in the New York Times.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorial comment in regard to attendance by legislators at the Bermuda conference.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statement of principles regarding immigration policy, as adopted by the program board of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County, N. Y.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Editorial entitled "No Land Rush Into the Tidelands," published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 26, 1953.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Comments received by him from Philip B. Perlman and Jacob M. Lashly, regarding Senate bill 16, proposing immunity legislation.

Editorial in reference to President Eisenhower's tax program and campaign promises, published in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of May 21, 1953.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Editorial entitled "Mr. KENNEDY and New England," published in the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of recent date.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Cattle market report written by the editor of the Taylor (Tex.) Times, and published in that newspaper on May 21, 1953.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Address delivered by Owen W. Hurd, before the Northwest Public Power Association on May 7, 1953.

Editorial from the Walla Walla (Wash.) Union Bulletin with reference to Northwest power development.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Editorial entitled "More Juice for TVA," published in the Washington Post of May 27, 1953.

Article entitled "Democracy Undid Treasury in Selling Long-Term Bonds," written by J. A. Livington, and published in the Washington Post of May 27, 1953.

Article entitled "Hugh Grant Declares United States Should Pull Out of Korea," published in the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle of May 21, 1953.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Editorial from the May 20, 1953, issue of the Daily Herald, of Provo, Utah, with reference to budget balancing and tax reduction.

THE NEED FOR LETTERS FROM AMERICANS PRIOR TO THE APPROACHING ELECTION IN ITALY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to address the Senate for a period not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post appears an article, written by Drew Pearson, which I think is very timely and significant. The article is entitled "Luce Warns of Reds in Italy." The article is rather short, and for that reason I shall read it in toto at this time:

LUCE WARNS OF REDS IN ITALY

Ambassador Clare Boothe Luce has cabled the State Department from Rome that the Italian Communists are making tremendous inroads and may win an important election victory June 7.

Many Italians, Mrs. Luce reports, are fooled by the phony Russian peace drive, with the result that Premier Alcide de Gasperi's pro-American government is in real danger.

That's why every American citizen of Italian descent should write his friends and relatives in Italy, giving them the facts regarding the United States and the danger of communism. Letters from friends are a lot more persuasive than Government propaganda, and 4 years ago, it was the tide of letters from Italo-Americans which helped swing the election against communism. Next month will see the first national election in Italy since then.

In an attempt to counter communism, Andrew N. Farnese, deputy attorney general of Pennsylvania, with a committee of seven is flying to Italy today to start construction of a Boys' Town in Sicily.

Money for this Boys' Town was raised in the United States, and the cornerstone will be laid just a few days before the Italian elections. The American committee will stay in Italy until election day and should be a healthy factor in helping to make Italian democracy live.

Mr. President, I recall that when it was my privilege to serve as Governor of Rhode Island in 1948, I was asked to take part in the letter-writing program. I am in no position to say now how decisive that program was in maintaining the spirit of democracy in the great country of Italy, but I have heard time and time again that it was a very effective campaign, in that in all probability it constituted the margin of force and persuasion which was necessary in keeping Italy in the family of democratic nations.

Mr. President, over the years we have been investing, in the form of foreign aid, millions of dollars in Italy. Today Italy is a very active and very vigorous and very enthusiastic partner in the North Atlantic Treaty. All this may be lost to America and to the rest of the free world if on June 7 the elections in Italy go communistic.

Therefore, I feel that this program, which was initiated in 1948, should be resumed.

We do not propose to tell the people of another country how they should vote, for if they told us how we should vote, we would resent it. But it is not wrong, and is entirely fitting, for anyone who has any friends or relatives in Italy to write to them, to tell them of the virtues of democracy and of the evils of communism, and to remind them that our chances for world peace would be greatly damaged if the wrong party won in Italy on June 7. More than that, Mr. President, all that we have been trying to invest in money and in propaganda during recent years in keeping Italy within the family of democratic nations might be lost to the entire world.

I therefore urge as strongly as I can that every American, regardless of racial extraction, who has any friends or relatives in Italy, write to them immediately, telling them of the perils of communism and reminding them of the virtues of democracy and freedom.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2, 1953—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 100), which had been reported adversely by the Committee on Government Operations, and which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 25, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, providing for reorganizations in the Department of Agriculture, was submitted to the Congress under date of March 25, 1953, under authority of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The President, in his message which accompanied the plan, stated that its purpose was to simplify and improve the internal organization of the Department of Agriculture, to make effective the operations of the Department, to place the administration of farm programs close to State and local levels, and to adapt the administration of the programs of the Department to regional, State and local conditions. He also stated that the plan was substantially in accord with recommendations made by the Hoover Commission in its reports filed with the Congress in 1949.

With certain exceptions, plan No. 2 transfers to the Secretary of Agriculture the functions now vested by law in other

officers, and in the agencies and employees, of the Department, and would authorize the Secretary to delegate such functions to any other officer, agency, or employee of the Department as he may determine to be necessary in order to fully utilize the delegated authority in attaining the objectives set forth in the plan. The plan also provides for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries and an Administrative Assistant Secretary, which the Congress has already authorized for every other departmental head, in order to provide administrative assistance to the Secretary to carry out the responsibilities which will be vested in him under the plan. The new positions are essential to efficient departmental operation, due to the complexities of the innumerable activities carried on by the Department, and meet a need which has long been recognized by the Congress.

There are presently in the Department of Agriculture some 20 agencies which report directly to the Secretary, 4 of which are excepted from the plan—the Commodity Credit Corporation, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Office of Hearing Examiners, and Farm Credit Administration. The plan, therefore, affects only six statutory components, whose functions would be placed under the authority of the Secretary for reorganization, transfer, consolidation, or redistribution. These important components of the Department are the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, and Office of the Solicitor. The functions of the other 10 are vested in the Secretary. Under their present status these agencies have certain autonomous, statutory status, independent of the Secretary. The plan would bring them under the administrative control of the Secretary so that their activities may be properly coordinated with other departmental functions.

Senate Resolution 100 was introduced in the Senate on April 9, 1953, by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], expressing disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953; it was referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The Subcomittee on Reorganization held extended hearings on the plan and the resolution of disapproval on May 12, 13 and 18, 1953. A total of 19 witnesses appeared at the hearings—5 in favor of the resolution of disapproval, and 14 in opposition. Testimony was received on behalf of Senate Resolution 100 from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and from representatives of the National Farmers Union and the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association.

Of the 14 witnesses who appeared in opposition to the resolution of disapproval, and in support of the plan, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, as representatives of the Congress, provided the subcommittee with essential information relative to the conformity of the plan with legislative objectives. Other witnesses supporting the plan included representatives of leading farm organizations, which included the National Grange, the National Milk Producers Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the Virginia Department of Agriculture. Spokesmen for the Hoover Commission, which included Dr. James K. Pollock, a former member of the Hoover Commission; Dean Henry Rusk, chairman of the Commission's Task Force on Agriculture; and two representatives of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, also appeared in opposition to the resolution and in support of the plan.

The subcommittee provided the Secretary of Agriculture, supported by a representative of the Bureau of the Budget, full opportunity to present the views of the administration in support of the President's plan. The Secretary was specifically requested to supply the committee with complete information and supporting data relating to the various points raised by opposition witnesses. His testimony was comprehensive, covered in detail the need for additional administrative controls, and clearly illustrated the need for continuing reorganization, as proposed by the plan, if the operations of the Department are to be improved to meet present-day and future problems in the agricultural field.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 is one of numerous proposals that have been submitted to the Congress with a view to providing much-needed reorganizations in the Department of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the Department consists of many interrelated offices, bureaus, administrations, services, and corporations established over a period of nearly a century by statutes applying specifically to its various important components, the hearings developed conclusively the fact that everyone who is familiar with the operations of the Department recognizes the essential need for reorganizations within the Department. The evidence clearly indicated the unanimous view of every witness that the Department of Agriculture is one of the most important departments of the Government, and that its activities must be better integrated in the interest of the farmers, and the consumers. The only problem involved is for the Congress to determine what is the best procedure to be followed in carrying out its obligations in providing the necessary authority to modernize the Department. The many efforts made by the Congress, both before and after the submission of the Hoover reports in 1949, to centralize the functions and to promote adequate administrative controls within the Department of Agriculture, have failed. It is therefore incumbent upon the Congress to act without further delay, and the pending plan is the culmination of years of study and effort to accomplish this objective.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 is so drawn as to meet various points raised in opposition to previous proposals to reorganize the Department, particularly to the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950, which was rejected by the Senate. In an effort to conform to the expressed views of the Senate in its rejection of the previous plan, the pending proposal has included five additional safeguards in addition to the provisions of Plan No. 4 of 1950, as follows: (a) Functions of the Farm Credit Administration are not transferred to the Secretary; (b) the Secretary is required to give public notice of major changes in the departmental structure, with opportunity afforded to interested persons and groups for presentation of their views; (c) in any redistribution of functions, the Secretary is specifically required to simplify and make efficient any operations affected thereby; (d) the Secretary is required to seek to place the administration of the farm programs close to the State and local levels, and to adapt the administration of programs to regional, State, and local conditions; and (e) a limitation is established on the transfer of any unexpended balances of appropriations to insure that they shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriations were originally made.

The Subcommittee on Reorganization recommended, at a meeting of the full Committee on Government Operations on May 21, 1953, by a vote of 5 to 1, that the resolution of disapproval now pending before the Senate be reported adversely, and that the plan be permitted to become effective on the expiration of the period specified in the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. The full committee supported these recommendations by a vote of 9 to 3, and submitted a report to the Senate to accord with this action on May 25, 1953 (S. Rept. No. 297).

As set forth in the committee's report, the hearings developed four major areas on which emphasis was placed by various witnesses appearing before the Subcommittee on Reorganization, as follows:

One. Whether the safeguards included in this plan are adequate to overcome major objections to Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950;

Two. Whether the language requiring the Secretary of Agriculture, to the extent he deems practicable, to give appropriate advance public notice of the delegation of functions proposed to be made by him and afford interested groups an opportunity to place before the Department their views with respect to such proposed delegations before they were effectuated, is adequate to insure that this would be done;

Three. What effect the vesting of authority in the Secretary over the functions of the six agencies of the Department of Agriculture not now vested in him would have on the operations or programs of those agencies;

Four. That any such plan should provide for a specified blueprint for reorganization of the Department; that the Congress should be advised in advance of action and permitted to approve or reject detailed reorganizations.

The report contains extracts from statements submitted on behalf of the resolution of disapproval, and in support

of the plan, on the part of various witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, which apply to these specified issues. The Secretary, in his testimony before the committee, stated that he had no intention of drastically reorganizing or realining the functions of the six major components directly affected by the plan, and repeatedly assured the committee that he would conform with the letter and the spirit of the provision of the plan which would require him to give appropriate advance public notice of the delegations of those functions to the Committees on Agriculture of the Congress, and to farm and other interested groups, in order to afford them a full opportunity to present their views before any proposed reorganizations are carried out. The Secretary concluded his comments on this provision of the plan by stating:

It will ever be my purpose and the purpose of my staff not to interfere with the prerogatives of the Congress but to defend them and to see that the purposes and objectives of the Congress in any legislations pertaining to agriculture are fully carried out.

After carefully considering the testimony submitted, a majority of the Committee on Government Operations held that Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 does meet and overcome the basic objections to the previous plan. The pending plan does not give the Secretary of Agriculture any new or enlarged authority with regard to functions that must be performed pursuant to the laws of the Congress, or to abolish any such functions. The plan is designed merely to give the Secretary additional authority required by him properly to administer the Department in the interest of the farmers of the Nation, for which he is held accountable to the Congress.

The Congress has already taken action to vest in the heads of all other major departments and agencies of the Federal Government authority sufficient to hold the secretaries and administrators of such agencies fully responsible for the activities of those agencies. The sole remaining department on which such action has not been taken is the Department of Agriculture. It is the view of a majority of the committee that, if the Secretary is to be held accountable for the operations of the Department, he must be vested with full control over its functions, and that he should be authorized to properly supervise its activities and reorganize and realine its component agencies in order to improve the administration of the Department better to perform its duties of carrying out policies established by the Congress.

It is the view of a majority of the committee that the plan will not only accomplish these objectives but will promote greater efficiency and economy in the operations of the Department of Agriculture. The plan is in conformity with recommendations made by the Hoover Commission, and it is the duty and responsibility of the Senate to fully appraise its provisions with a view to taking constructive action upon this proposal submitted to the Congress by the President in the interest of good Government.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, and under authority of the Committee on Government Operations, I therefore urge that the Senate reject Senate Resolution 100, and thereby permit the plan to become effective on June 4, 1953.

Mr. President, since the closing of the hearings, I have received, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, a letter from Mr. William Rhea Blake, executive vice president of the National Cotton Council of America, who opposed Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950, but is now supporting plan No. 2 of 1953. I desire to include Mr. Blake's letter in the RECORD, since it was not received in time to be included in the record of the hearings.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Memphis, Tenn., May 25, 1953.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization, Committee on Government Operations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: The National Cotton Council strongly favors a reorganization of the Department of Agriculture along the general functional lines recommended by the Hoover Commission. As a member of the agricultural task force of the Commission that spent 10 months on this problem, I personally learned firsthand both of the great need for a thorough reorganization of the Department and of the major improvements and economies in agricultural programs that could be realized from it.

Nevertheless, when Reorganization Plan No. 4 for Agriculture was submitted in the spring of 1950, the Cotton Council, along with most of the other agricultural organizations, opposed it. This year the Council, along with most of the other agricultural organizations, is supporting Reorganization Plan No. 2. We are anxious that you know why. There are major differences in the situation confronting us now as compared with that of 3 years ago.

Both plan 4 of 1950 and plan 2 of 1953 are broad grants of authority to the Secretary to reorganize the Department. The plan of this year, however, carries three very important limitations on the Secretary's authority that were not in the plan of 1950. The first makes certain that unexpended funds, which are transferred as functions are transferred, may be used only for the purposes for which such funds were originally appropriated. The second prescribes these basic policies to be followed in effecting any reorganization: (a) any change must have as its purpose the simplification and increased efficiency of Department operations; (b) administration of farm programs must be placed close to State and local levels; and (c) the administration of such programs must be adapted to meet local needs. The third limitation requires advance public notice and hearings on any proposal for major organizational changes.

These three limitations go a long way toward assuring that both the spirit and the letter of the Hoover Commission recommendations will be followed in reorganizing the Department under plan 2 of 1953, whereas there were no such assurances given in plan 4 of 1950. However, there is an even more important difference that lies outside the plans themselves.

Before plan 4 of 1950 had even been submitted, the then Secretary of Agriculture had already publicly expressed his disagreement with most of the agricultural reorganization recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Since plan 4 gave him complete, blank-check authority to do as he pleased, it was perfectly evident that we would never get the Commission's recommendations carried out under plan 4. In fact, if the Congress had permitted plan 4 to become effective in face of Secretary Brannan's then publicly expressed attitude, it would have been tantamount to specifically authorizing him to ignore the Hoover report. We, therefore, urged in May 1950 that plan 4 be rejected and that the Congress proceed with legislation to accomplish the desired reorganization.

Three years have passed, however, and the Congress has not acted. We are now about persuaded that if we are ever to attain the necessary reorganization, it will have to be done by the executive branch under authority of the Reorganization Act of 1949. Furthermore, we are encouraged to believe that this goal may now be possible of attainment for two important reasons. One is the assurances, already referred to, that are specifically provided in plan 2 of 1953. The other is the attitude of the present Secretary of Agriculture as expressed in his statement before your committee on May 18. The few preliminary moves which Secretary Benson has made thus far with respect to the Department's reorganization certainly have been in the direction of the Hoover Commission's recommendation. Also, his openminded attitude in the consideration of further reorganization steps encourages us in the hope that most of these recommendations will be adopted.

A final point that should be considered is the continuing authority of the Secretary to effect further reorganizations in the future. This feature is common to plan 4 of 1950 and plan 2 of 1953 and, in fact, to all of the other reorganization plans that have heretofore been submitted under the act of 1949. We understand that this is the principal objection that has been voiced to plan 2 in the hearings held by your Committee on Resolutions of disapproval. We, too, share the concern expressed on this point and so testified in the hearings held on plan 4 in 1950.

It is, of course, essential that any executive have authority commensurate with his responsibility in controlling his organization, but we know of no executive of even a moderate-sized organization in private business that would not have to check with his board of directors before effecting any major change in his organization structure. It would seem that the observance of this principle is even more important in the case of Government, and that, after the initial reorganization contemplated under the act of 1949 is effected, any major changes in organization that may be proposed subsequently should be checked in some appropriate manner with the Congress.

The observance of this principle, however, is not and should not be tied to the now pending plan 2 for the Department of Agriculture. If the principle is sound, it must be applicable equally to all other departments of government and must be dealt with by an amendment to the basic Reorganization Act of 1949. We certainly would support such an amendment, but would strongly oppose the singling out of the Department of Agriculture for special action along this line or deferring further the badly needed reorganization of the Department until such an amendment to the basic act can be passed.

We earnestly hope, therefore, that all resolutions of disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 2 for the Department of Agriculture will be defeated and that this plan will be permitted to become effective.

Sincerely,

WM. RHEA BLAKE,
Executive Vice President.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Blake sets forth in detail the position of the National Cotton Council of America, and

the reasons why the council's opposition to plan No. 4 of 1950 has been overcome by the safeguards in plan No. 2 of 1953. I want specifically to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that, in his view, the Secretary of Agriculture in 1950 had expressed public disagreement with most of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission as they related to the Department of Agriculture, whereas the present Secretary of Agriculture, in his statement before our committee, clearly indicated his desire to conform to these recommendations in effecting reorganizations within the Department. The council also expressed commendation for the open-minded attitude of Secretary Benson in connection with his consideration of reorganization steps that may be proposed within the Department.

Mr. Blake stresses the essential need for vesting authority in the Secretary if he is to properly control the operations of the Department of Agriculture, as has been done in relation to practically every other department of the Federal Government.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for an observation?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, because of the fact that I have another committee meeting this afternoon which has been heretofore scheduled, I should like to say that, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and as a Senator representing an agricultural State, I wish to commend and to support the position taken on the pending measure by my distinguished friend and colleague, the able senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. At the same time, Mr. President, I should also like to support the remarks which will be made later this afternoon in advocacy of the measure by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. President, this is not a dictatorial proposal at all, or one which would give the Secretary of Agriculture a dangerous control over the farm economy of the Nation. Far from it; it is an effort, and a sound one, to promote real economy and efficiency in a key Federal agency. That it would save considerable cost and administrative expense I am certain. That it would bring order out of what has been chaos in the Department of Agriculture, I am also certain. I believe the reorganization proposed has the support of the American farmer. It is a sensible move to provide the cohesion and efficiency which have been all too absent in the past. The plan should become law.

I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], for their support of this reorganization plan.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho for his observation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on March 13, 1950, the then President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, transmitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 4, providing for reorganization in the Department of Agriculture. Subsection (a) of section 1 of the reorganization plan contained the crux of the order. I shall read this subsection:

(a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions of all other officers of the Department of Agriculture and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the entire order may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, most of the present Members of the Senate were Members in 1950. They will remember the reception accorded the proposed grant of power to the Secretary of Agriculture. It was vigorously condemned as a proposal to surrender to an appointive official legislative control over the Department of Agriculture. It was assailed as an abdication of the constitutional power of the Congress and as conferring unbridled and unlimited power to an appointive official. Republicans and Democrats alike condemned the plan, and a nonpartisan resolution rejecting the plan was offered by two Republican and two Democratic Senators.

Both the Farm Bureau and the Grange were unsparing in their criticism of the proposed delegation of power to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The so-called Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Government resisted the plan before the committee in the person of its agricultural task force. Seven of the eight members of the Hoover Commission task force for the Department of Agriculture denounced the so-called Reorganization Plan No. 4 as being wholly contrary to the findings of the Hoover Commission, and demanded that the plan be rejected.

Mr. John H. Davis, at that time executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, appeared as a witness before the committee in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 4. I quote one sentence from his testimony:

We oppose plan No. 4 because it turns the whole job of reorganizing and determining the emphasis within the Department to the Secretary.

Hon. R. E. Short, vice president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, appeared before the committee as the representative of that organization. He was accompanied by a number of members of the executive committee and State presidents of the Bureau, and the record of the hearings discloses that Reorganization Plan No. 4 was strongly opposed by practically every State component of the Farm Bureau. I quote brief excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Short speaking for the American Farm Bureau:

Reorganization Plan No. 4 submitted by the President on March 13 constitutes a general grant of authority to the Secretary of Agriculture, without direction or guidance to him to carry out any phase of reorganization recommended either by the Hoover Commission or its task force on agriculture. Since it is without guide or direction, we regard the plan as an unwise grant of general authority and power.

* * * * * *

Reorganization Plan No. 4 is really not a plan. A plan should have recommendations, framework and structure. Plan 4 does not have these. It is therefore not a plan.

* * * * * *

Therefore, we want to again say that by reason of the fact that plan No. 4 is really not a plan—just a grant of authority without congressional check—we feel it should be rejected.

After the hearing the committee filed its report with the Senate. I wish to quote two brief paragraphs from the majority report of the committee:

In the final analysis, the Congress, if it approves Reorganization Plan No. 4, will be completely surrendering its prerogatives as to the basic policies of the Government in the field of agriculture, and would place the farmers under the complete jurisdiction of the administration in power for whatever political manipulations the present or any future Secretary of Agriculture may be disposed to utilize.

The plan contains no compulsion or mandate to the Secretary that he shall reorganize the Department, nor is there any provision in the plan which would place any limitation on his authority to disrupt one service with which he is not in full accord in favor of another which he might favor. It places in the Secretary a blank check to use or not in any manner he may desire now and hereafter without advance indications to the Congress as to what action he will take to effect reorganizations either in accord with or opposed to Hoover Commission recommendations.

Mr. President, the plan of 1950 had short shrift in the Senate. After very brief debate, including a fine presentation by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and a statement of opposition by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]—and I believe the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] also spoke against the plan—the resolution disapproving the plan was adopted by a voice vote. It was not even accorded the dignity of a yea-and-nay vote, as the Senate, with practically a unanimous voice, denounced Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950, providing for reorganizations in the Department of Agriculture, as too great a surrender of congressional power to an appointive official, which the Senate was not willing to make.

Time marched on. An election was held in 1952, and the American people, under the Constitution of the United States, chose a new leader. He appointed a new Secretary of Agriculture. On March 25, 1953, President Eisenhower sent to Congress a message transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, providing for reorganizations in the Department of Agriculture. As in 1950, the heart of the reorganization plan was embodied in subsection (a) of section 1 of the plan. I quote that subsection of the plan of 1953, and suggest that it be compared with subsection (a) of the plan of 1950 to discover what, if any, dissimilarities there are between the two:

(a) Subject to the exceptions specified in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture

all functions not now vested in him of all other officers, and of all agencies and employees, of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask that Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 in its entirety be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. RUSSELL. The power conferred in subsection A of section 1 in 1953 is practically identical with the powers conferred in subsection A of section 1 of the plan of 1950. What happened in 1953? Mr. President, we have witnessed a most remarkable exhibition of the effect of the shift of political power in 1953 on what were proclaimed as the weightiest principles of government when they were before the Senate in 1950.

The two gentlemen from whom I quoted now occupy positions of great power in the Department of Agriculture. They are expected to be appointed to the two new Assistant Secretaryships in the Department of Agriculture which this order would create.

The farm organizations which fought order No. 4 in 1950 as an unconscionable grant of power to a Secretary of Agriculture are now demanding that the same powers be granted to a Secretary of Agriculture in 1953.

In 1950, so far as I am advised, Mr. Herbert Hoover, who was chairman of the Commission to recommend plans for reorganizing the Government, did not go on record as approving Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950. Mr. Hoover did not remain silent in 1953. He sent to the committee his statement demanding that the plan be approved.

Moreover, the agricultural task force of the Hoover Commission, which denounced the 1950 plan as being utterly inconsistent with the findings of that Commission, have made a most remarkable discovery in 1953. They have discovered that practically the same language now implements the findings of that Commission, whereas in 1950 they contended that such findings would be practically destroyed by the reorganization order.

The principal witness let the cat out of the bag. I refer to Dr. H. P. Rusk, who was chairman of the agricultural task force of the Hoover Commission, and who appeared in opposition to Plan No. 4 of 1950. When he appeared in support of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 he made this very significant statement:

> Of much more significance than differences in the precise wording of the two plans is the difference in the attitude that currently prevails in administrative circles of the United States Department of Agriculture and the policy atmosphere of the Department administration in 1950.

In other words, boiling that statement down to its bald essence, "because we have got rid of Charles Brannan as Secretary of Agriculture and now have Ezra Benson as Secretary of Agriculture, we have reversed the position we took in 1950." It cannot mean anything else. The situation shows the dangers which constantly tempt the Congress to legislate on the basis of men rather than principle. Secretary Benson is here today, and he may be gone tomorrow. His successor may occupy the office for 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years. But, Mr. President, the agencies created to serve the farmers of the Nation are the creatures of Congress. They perform their functions under laws enacted in the manner prescribed by the Constitution. I have resisted, and shall continue to resist, the effort which is becoming so popular, to legislate purely on the basis of like or dislike for some individual, some human being who is an appointive official of the Government.

The majority of the committee who stood so firmly for the prerogatives of the Congress in 1950 now file a report approving the same plan, in its essence, that we had before us in 1950; and they seek to justify the complete reversal of the action which was taken 3 short years ago. I submit that the differences between the plan of 1950 and the plan of 1953 are inconsequential. The differences are mere window dressing. They are put in, of course, in the attempt to give those who would change their position a place to stand, but they are really inconsequential.

I opposed Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950 for the reason that it did not propose to reorganize the Department of Agriculture. It was purely a sweeping grant of power to a nonelected official, the Secretary of Agriculture, to reorganize the Department of Agriculture. It undertook to use the machinery of the Reorganization Act, under which the Congress provided that the President should submit specific reorganization plans, to delegate to the head of one of the executive departments of Government a power greater than that the Congress had been willing to delegate to the duly elected President of the United States in the basic reorganization law.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the distinguished Senator from Georgia oppose giving to Secretaries of other departments and Administrators of other agencies similar power to reorganize their agencies or departments?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Georgia does not remember at the moment how he voted on any of the other reorganization plans. The Senator from Georgia takes the position that the Department of Agriculture occupies a unique position among the departments of Government. It makes comparatively little difference whether or not the head of some other department in Washington juggles and shifts around various agencies within his department. But when we are dealing with functions created by the Congress which are vital to the well-being of the 6 million farm families of the Nation, it makes a great difference.

I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. Did the Senator from Vermont vote to grant similar powers to the heads of other departments?

Mr. AIKEN. I voted to grant certain powers, I believe. I think I voted against one or two such plans.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator voted against Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950.

Mr. AIKEN. I was wondering whether the Secretary of Labor or the Secretary of the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would not also have opportunities to abuse the power conferred on them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. When President Eisenhower submitted the plan creating the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare he specifically stated that no function that was vested in any official by law could be changed by the newly created Secretary. I read from section 7 of President Eisenhower's plan No. 1 of 1953:

> *Provided*, That no professional or substantive function vested by law in any officer shall be removed from the jurisdiction of such officer under this section.

In creating the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the President specifically protected the laws which the Congress had enacted; but in the case of the Department of Agriculture he proposes to vest full power in the Secretary over all the functions of the Department.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator recall whether similar reservations were made in other reorganization plans relating, for example, to the Department of Commerce or the Department of Labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not recall. When I appeared before the Committee on Government Operations the issue was raised by Senators who claimed to have knowledge of the facts, that similar powers had been vested in other Secretaries. It may well be that that was the case, but I have endeavored to keep in close contact with the functioning of the Department of Agriculture, which I regard, next to the Department of Defense, as perhaps the most vital of all the executive agencies of Government. I did not vote in 1950 to delegate these powers to the Secretary. I stood with the Senator from Vermont then. I am opposed to such action today, and I regret that the distinguished Senator from Vermont is no longer on the high ground he occupied in 1950.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for one more question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Georgia takes the position, then, that the Department of Agriculture should be placed in one category, and all the other departments of Government in another category. Is that his position?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. That is what I understood the Senator from Georgia to say.

Mr. RUSSELL. I say that I would place the Department of Agriculture in a more important position because of its intimate relationship to the welfare of those who till the soil.

I may have been wrong in previous votes on these questions. I have made a number of mistakes in the many votes I have been compelled to cast on the many questions which have come before Congress since I have been a Member of the Senate. However, if I made a mistake in the past it is all the more reason why I should not compound the error now by giving any such powers to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I cannot too strongly state my hearty agreement with the position taken by the Senator from Georgia, specifically with regard to the way in which the Department of Agriculture interlocks its activities with those of the States and counties, and of special districts and special areas of all types, created on the local and State level, to handle agricultural problems.

I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Georgia can find in the functions of the Department of Commerce, for example, similar cooperation between the Federal Government and the States to that which occurs, in the maintenance of the experiment station service, or functions in the Department of Commerce which are similar to those that obtain in the field of agriculture in the agricultural extension service, in which the Federal Government, States, and counties cooperate financially and otherwise; or if he can find in the Department of Commerce anything comparable to the activities in the PMA field, where there are not only selected State officials who serve on the State basis, but also officials who serve on the county level and even on the community level which officials are selected by the farmers themselves?

The Senator will, of course, carry the comparison further. For example, in the field of REA associations, and in the field of local organizations for carrying on soil conservation work.

Does the Senator know of anything comparable in the Department of Commerce, to the various activities which I have mentioned—and there are others that can be mentioned—in which the activities of the Department of Agriculture do have a very direct and cooperative relationship with State and local governments, and with the citizens themselves, so that they relate intimately to the life of our rural people and affect their prosperity and their lives and living conditions in the most intimate way possible?

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Florida for stating the issue in such cogent terms. The activities of the Department of Agriculture place it in a separate sphere from all the other activities of the Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for another question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the Senator from Georgia answered fully the question of the Senator from Florida. Does not the present Department of Health, Education, and Welfare work down through the State and local levels, affecting perhaps the activities of 80 percent of the people?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does; and I assume that is why President Eisenhower said in his reorganization order that none of the present functions should be taken from any officer in the reorganization of the Department. The same reservation as to the functions of the officials of the Department that was made by President Eisenhower was not made by President Truman in the order which was rejected by Congress. When the President protected the functions created by Congress, Congress overwhelmingly approved the order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for one more question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Georgia point out any provision in Reorganization Plan No. 2 whereby the Secretary of Agriculture is given authority to abolish any of the functions which Congress has provided shall be carried on within the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the intent of Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is the identical situation presented by the Reorganization Plan of 1950. The powers are the same, and the Senator from Georgia is in the same position. The Senator from Vermont, as I remember, made a very able speech in 1950, in which he pointed out the many vices in the plan.

Mr. President, I am not here to split hairs as to whether the Secretary of Agriculture can abolish functions. The President of the United States can abolish functions. He must send a message to Congress, and place his plan abolishing functions before Congress. This proposal bypasses Congress. It departs from the general terms of the Reorganization Act under which the President submits reorganization plans to Congress. The Secretary of Agriculture may do with the functions as he pleases, without let or hindrance from any source, and without having to report to Congress. That is the difference between this proposal and the substantive law. The Secretary of Agriculture would have that power and could use it as he pleased.

I am not talking about Mr. Benson. I do not believe in legislating on the basis of individuals. I do not know how long Mr. Benson will be Secretary of Agriculture. I do not know whether in the near future the swing of the political pendulum may not put into office another Democrat, and perhaps even Mr. Brannan may again become Secretary of Agriculture. In that case he would have the very powers which the Senator from Vermont resisted giving him in 1950. I say under this order the Secretary of Agriculture would then have the power to so submerge the functions as to have the practical effect of extinguishing them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not want to argue the point with reference to the difference between the pending plan and the plan submitted in 1950. I would say there is a vast difference, and I shall try to point it out later.

Is the Senator from Georgia aware of the fact that only last year the REA Administration, which was not fully under the control of Secretary Brannan, entered into an agreement with the Bureau of the Budget to curtail activities and loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration regardless of what Congress indicated should be done in that matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was not aware of it.

Mr. AIKEN. I point it out because if the Secretary of Agriculture decides to controvert the intent of Congress he does not need a reorganization plan under which to do it. If the Senator from Georgia will read the testimony before the Committee on Appropriations on May 19, he will find that Mr. Clyde Ellis pointed out that the Administrator of REA entered into an agreement with the Bureau of the Budget to limit the amount of the loans made by the REA regardless of what Congress did or had intended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was not aware of it.

Mr. AIKEN. I point that fact out to show that it is the will of the Administrator that counts. In other words, if he has the will to pervert the intent of Congress, he does not need a reorganization plan to enable him to do it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was not aware that any such agreement had been entered into. I certainly would not approve of any such agreement. I am not challenging the Senator's statement, but——

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Georgia will find the testimony in the records of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not challenging the Senator's statement. I am merely stating that I was not aware of that fact. I would say that Mr. Benson was much more forthright in his attack on REA. He came before the committee and said that the Congress should cut the Department's appropriation by thirty or forty million dollars. He did not enter into any agreement. I do not agree with his frontal attack on REA, but certainly he was much more forthright in his attack than the course of action followed in the situation related by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish merely to correct the Senator's statement, and then I shall reserve the remainder of my argument for presentation during my own time. Secretary Benson did not ask for a cut of $40 million in REA appropriations. He asked for a cut of so many millions and permission for REA to spend the unexpended balance, with the total coming to about the same amount as before.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The unexpended balances were to be used in both instances. Under the Truman budget there would have been thirty or forty million dollars more available.

Mr. AIKEN. It does not matter whether the Senator's version is right or whether my version is right insofar as the present reorganization plan is concerned, because what we have been discussing does not have anything to do with Reorganization Plan No. 2.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it does have something to do with it.

I am glad to commend Secretary Benson for his forthrightness, and I disapprove of any agreement entered into by anyone in the executive branch of the

Government to thwart the will of Congress as expressed in legislation. I do not propose to encourage any such movement by voting for the kind of unbridled grant of powers contained in the pending reorganization plan.

As I stated, this is greater power than we have been willing to give to the President of the United States, because we require the President to report to Congress as to what he does with the different agencies and departments. When he sends a plan to Congress, we can disapprove of it. The pending plan would place powers in the Secretary of Agriculture in perpetuity, without ever having to report his actions to Congress. It would divorce Congress from its control over the Department of Agriculture, and from its right to direct the functions of that Department, which are the creatures of Congress.

Of course, we know that every President will support whatever his Secretary of Agriculture does, and in the last analysis Congress would be required to summon a two-thirds vote in order to override a veto to reestablish control over such functions.

We put a time limit on the President of the United States. We say to him, "You can reorganize these departments up to April 1, 1955, and submit your plans to Congress."

This delegation of powers to the Secretary of Agriculture, if it is approved by Congress, is utterly unlimited as to time. It is from here on out. There is absolutely no limitation of time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understand it is the position of the Senator from Georgia that this reorganization plan is another example of an invasion of the separation of powers doctrine of the Constitution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it will represent a surrender by the Congress of its power contrary to the separation of powers doctrine. This plan is an invitation to invade that doctrine. I do not propose to accept the invitation by voting to surrender the powers of Congress in the legislative field.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Georgia ever known of a time when I have not stood on the floor of the Senate and fought an attempted invasion of the separation of powers doctrine of the Constitution?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President. The Senator from Oregon is one of the keenest students and bravest defenders of the separation of powers doctrine of the Constitution I have ever known.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the Senator from Georgia object to the failure to include a limitation of time provision in the reorganization plans approved for other departments and agencies of the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not believe I did. However, in this case it is a little unusual for the Senator from Vermont to insist on the jewel of consistency on the part of the Senator from Georgia, inasmuch as the Senator from Vermont has changed his position entirely since the earlier reorganization plan.

I believe it was Emerson who said:

A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds.

I have always opposed any attempt to encroach upon the powers of the legislature, by any proposal affecting the essence of the legislative activity and the reason for the existence of a legislature.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Georgia believe a limitation of time should be placed upon the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with this reorganization plan, but none on other Secretaries, in the case of other reorganizations?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, indeed. I have discussed that matter with the Senator from Vermont in private conversations.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Vermont knows my views on that question. He knows that I believe a limitation of time should be imposed in the case of all heads of departments and agencies who would have power to juggle the functions of their departments or agencies.

Mr. AIKEN. I concur in the statement the Senator from Georgia has made relative to the conversation I had with him.

I simply wished to state for the record that I did not believe the Senator from Georgia would think of voting to apply a time limitation upon a Secretary of Agriculture, when the Senator from Georgia would not vote to apply such a limitation upon other department heads and Secretaries.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; if we have been unwise in delegating powers to the head of any department, I wish to recapture those powers or to place a time limitation upon their exercise, regardless of what department in the executive branch of the Government it may be.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does it not seem to the Senator from Georgia that it is a rather unusual situation to find an administration which, in spite of unwillingness now to make its position known as to what reorganization it contemplates—let us say because of its apparent timidity at the present time to disclose what it has in mind—is yet bold enough and audacious enough to assume responsibility for writing general legislation under which from now on it must accept the responsibility, so long as its program is general law, for every change in our agricultural organization that may be made by any Secretary of Agriculture throughout the years?

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree completely with the inference of the Senator's question.

Mr. President, when a plan similar to this was before us in 1950, I opposed it because in my opinion it was a complete surrender of legislative power over the Department of Agriculture for all time to come. It gave the Secretary of Agriculture the power to shift and juggle the functions of the Department of Agriculture according to the whim or fancy of the individual who happens to occupy the office of Secretary of Agriculture.

Every objection which prompted me to vote against plan No. 4 of 1950 is valid as against the blank-check authority of the plan of 1953. Let me say, Mr. President, that my position in this matter is in nowise dictated by the personalities of those who may have occupied the office of the Secretary of Agriculture. I opposed the plan in 1950 when there was a Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, and I am opposed to granting any such blank-check authority to a Republican Secretary of Agriculture in 1953. If in the future the vicissitudes of politics bring the Democratic Party back into control of the Government and if I happen to be in the Congress at that time, I will continue to oppose any such abdication of congressional power over congressionally created functions in the Department of Agriculture as this plan provides.

My position is dictated by my beliefs in the principles of government involved, and not by partisan considerations. I submit that the principles which the Senate stated so forcefully when it was practically unanimous in rejecting plan No. 4 in 1950 should be reiterated with equal force today in rejecting plan No. 2.

Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not opposed to a proper reorganization of the functions of the Department of Agriculture. There are unquestionably areas of that Department in which reorganization would produce greater efficiency in administering our farm programs.

I stand ready and willing to support any reasonable, specific reorganization plan submitted by the President in accordance with the letter and spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

During my tenure here I have supported all the legislation providing for the reorganization of our national Government in the quest for efficiency and economy. I shall continue to support that basic principle.

Mr. President, I would be less than frank if I did not say that the results of some of the plans adopted have been somewhat disappointing, but I still approve of the basic policy of the Reorganization Act.

Reference has been made to reorganization plans which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and other Senators contend conveyed vast powers to various departments of the Government. Most of those plans were approved in 1949 and 1950. Let us have a report on the great economies that flowed from the approval of those plans, before we are beguiled into approving this plan on the basis of any such argument as that. I would not condemn the Hoover Commission, but I have noted that this city

has been full to overflowing with Assistant Secretaries of this, that, and the other department of Government ever since the report of the Hoover Commission was adopted. Every one of the plans recommended by the Hoover Commision resulted in the creation of additional Assistant Secretaries, and the plan now before the Senate would go one step beyond the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, for it proposes to create two more Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, whereas the Hoover Commission recommended only one.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Does not the Senator from Georgia believe in economy and efficiency in government?

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope I do. I have never seen anyone who would admit that he was opposed to economy and efficiency in government. No one who has ever aspired to preference at the hands of the electorate has ever proclaimed from the stump his opposition to efficiency and economy in government, and I do not propose to take such a position.

Mr. FREAR. I realize the position of the Senator from Georgia, of course——

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the opportunity the Senator from Delaware has afforded me to declare my undying advocacy of economy and efficiency in government.

Mr. FREAR. This plan is proposed on the basis that it will result in economy and efficiency.

Mr. RUSSELL. But no one has shown how it will result in saving even a thin dime.

The Secretary of Agriculture says that by the creation of three additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, each to have a salary of $15,000, he will be able to save money. I propose to wait and see how that is to be done.

Mr. FREAR. Does it not propose as one of its aims that there will be only one committee in each State for advisory work, leaving the administrative work to the departmental or State employees?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think that is included within this specific order, but that is one of the policies the Secretary of Agriculture is applying at the present time.

Mr. AIKEN rose.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, if I may continue for another question or two regarding the policy of the present Secretary of Agriculture, Has he laid down a specific plan of approach for what he desires to have done?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, he has not; and I intend to deal with that shortly in my statement. The Secretary moved into office on January 20, and I believe that by the 22d, he proposed a reorganization plan under the powers he possessed. But, now, though he has been in office for 4 months, he has not told the committee anything specific about the plan he has had in mind, but I believe that at the time of his appearance before the committee, he stated that he did not know just what he would do with the powers proposed to be conferred upon him by Reorganization Plan No. 2.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will defer to the Senator from Arkansas, who is a member of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad to advise the Senator from Delaware that we made every effort in committee—I know I did, in the limited time I had—to question the Secretary, and to get him to name one thing that he would do if the powers now sought were granted to him. The only promise we have is that he will study. He is going to study, and for that reason I was prompted to suggest at the time that if he had no plan, if he did not then know one thing he was going to do when he got this power, the submission of the plan itself was premature.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a pig-in-the-poke aspect to this proposal, which I deplore very strongly, because we are simply being asked to buy a bill of goods without having any idea of what we will get. The Secretary knew within 2 days what he wanted to do with the powers he had, but now he has been in office more than 4 months, and still would not tell the committee what he proposed to do with the authority he is seeking under this unbridled and unlimited grant of power and delegation of legislative reponsibilities.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. FREAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield further to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Did not the previous Secretary of Agriculture make the same promise?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not altogether aware of what the previous Secretary of Agriculture testified when the reorganization plan was before the Senate in 1950. I really do not recall. The Senator from Arkansas may recall. I am not a member of the committee. I think the then Secretary of Agriculture took pretty much the same position in regard to what he was going to do after he got the powers: He was going to do that which in his judgment was best for the Department, the farmers, and the country.

Mr. President, that is what is claimed by every man when he is reaching for power. We see that claim made here today. It will be said, "If I get the powers, I will exercise them wisely and beneficently in the interest of all the people." I doubt not that Mr. Brannan made the same statement in 1950. At that time, all the cohorts who are for the presently pending plan were opposing what was then proposed. They now say, "Our man is now Secretary of Agriculture; give him these powers; he will use them wisely in the public interest."

Mr. President, we should never legislate on the basis of an individual. Ours is a government of laws, not of men. We should have a law, and the individual, whoever he may be, should carry out the instructions of the Congress in this field, instead of the Congress being required to buy a pig in a poke, and to wait to see what happens later on.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know whether the Senator from Delaware has concluded.

Mr. FREAR. I shall have some further questions later on.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. AIKEN. First, if the Senator from Georgia will permit, I may say to the Senator from Delaware that the particular matter to which he referred is not covered by the reorganization plan now under consideration, and that whatever economies have been effected in that respect have been accomplished under authority already possessed by the Secretary of Agriculture. What I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia is with respect to the reference which has been made to the possible extravagance of providing two additional Assistant Secretaries.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, Mr. President, I do not become excited about the two Assistant Secretaries. If the Secretary of Agriculture needs two additional Assistant Secretaries, I am willing to have them made available to him, but not in the fashion here proposed.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator agrees that that was not a material factor in the rejection of the 1950 plan, does he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; it was not.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say I repeatedly advised Secretary Brannan that if he would send to the Congress a request for two additional Assistant Secretaries, I would be very glad to vote for it, and would anticipate no difficulty in obtaining approval of the request.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely conceded the correctness of his position regarding the two Assistant Secretaries, because that was one of the principal vehicles to promote efficiency of the Hoover Commission in all of its plans, which the commission said would result in substantial economy. We find the departments running over with Assistant Secretaries.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I notice that the reorganization plan for the Department of Defense gives Secretary Wilson six Assistant Secretaries.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. That, so to speak, "takes the cake." The request for two Assistant Secretaries for the Department of Agriculture is by comparison a modest request.

Mr. AIKEN. It is far more important to be an Assistant Secretary than be assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suppose so, but I do not think that comparison applies, so far as the number of Assistant Secretaries is concerned, though I would not quibble on two Assistant Secretaries for the Department of Agriculture, in view of the fact that we have made provision for Assistant Secretaries in all the other departments. I should like to see an

indication that they have brought about some of the efficiency and economy the creation of additional Assistant Secretaries was supposed to bring about, because I am genuinely interested in the subject of efficiency and economy. Congress has provided for Assistant Secretaries world without end—and we might say "amen"—including six for the Department of Defense, but I have not yet seen evidence that they have brought about any great efficiency and economy. I think some of those positions were created 3 or 4 years ago, some even in 1941.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely desired to point out to the Senator a case in which this specification of the reorganization plan is not at all an impossible task. The example to which I have particular reference, and to which reference was made in the committee, is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. As to that agency the plan itself set forth in detail exactly what would be done under it. There was no grant of authority in the sense of giving power to do anything other than what the plan itself provided for. That is what is within the spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act itself. I think that is a good example of what could be done, and be acceptable.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is a good example of what was intended as the policy of the Congress when it passed the Reorganization Act of 1949. What reason can possibly be given to justify the failure of the Department of Agriculture to come before the Congress with a specific plan for its reorganization?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. In one moment I will yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Studies have been made, world without end, by the Department of Agriculture and by various commissions all through the years. Under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture has until April 1, 1955, to submit to Congress specific plans of reorganization. If he does not now know what he wants, as he testified before the committee, when he decides what he does want, after he has studied the problems further, he can draw up a reorganization plan and send it to the Congress and let Congress pass upon it. If and when that is done, we, as reasonable men, seeking to serve the public welfare and the national interest, will approve any specific, reasonable plan which may be proposed to improve the operations of the Department. He can prepare for the President's transmission to the Congress as many plans as he can devise between now and April 1, 1955; and that is the orderly procedure, rather than for Congress to make this unlimited grant of power.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator, one of his principal objections to this particular reorganization plan is that it does not set forth what it is expected to do under the plan. We have had other plans sent to us, for example, the plan regarding the Internal Revenue Bureau. When that plan came to the Senate, it will be recalled that a chart was submitted, setting forth what was expected to be done in the event of adoption of the plan.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The present plan sets forth nothing that is expected to be done under it. That being true—and I know the Senator from Georgia is a good lawyer—when in the plan that certain things are specified cannot be done by the Department, then anything else can be done by the Department which it wants to do. Is not that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a blank check. It is an unlimited grant of congressional power to an appointed official. I submit the Congress is entitled to have a specific statement from the Department of Agriculture as to what form the Department is to take after the reorganization. It is entitled to an opportunity to know the specific plans. If we are to accept a proposal of this nature, if we are expected to buy a pig in a poke, without having the slightest idea of what is to be done, no Member of Congress can know the effect of the plan, because the Secretary of Agriculture himself said he did not know what he proposed to do with these powers, or what agricultural legislation we may hereafter be asked for.

I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I invite attention to subsection (c) of section 4 of the plan which is relied upon by the Secretary and by those advocating the plan as sufficient justification for them to support it, because there is a declaration of intent contained to accomplish three specific results, namely:

> In carrying out subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall—

These are the three things he is directed to seek to establish—

> the Secretary shall seek to simplify and make efficient the operation of the Department of Agriculture—

That is basic.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is inherent in the basic act of 1949. That was the purpose of the law. Those words here are mere surplusage and window dressing.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Certainly.

I read further:

> to place the administration of farm programs close to the State and local levels—

There are many ways in which to do that, but I suggest that if Congress is to be informed and to vote intelligently, the Secretary of Agriculture should be able to come forward with a declaration of policy to lay before us as to how he intends to accomplish the desired result.

I read further:

> and to adapt the administration of the programs of the Department to regional, State, and local conditions.

I dare say the present Secretary and his immediate predecessor would definitely disagree upon how to accomplish that result. So, without any indication as to how it will be accomplished, we are simply releasing control, abdicating responsibility, without the slightest indication of what the result may be.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator, and I agree with his statement.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I asked the Secretary specifically to tell us how he expected to accomplish those results. He could not give us an answer. He said he had no plans as yet.

Mr. RUSSELL. The pig is still in the poke. It is simply a question of whether we wish to buy it without any knowledge as to its size, breed, or lineage.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Following the remarks made by the Senator from Arkansas, I ask the Senator from Georgia is there any difference between what the Secretary of Agriculture could do under the Reorganization Plan of 1950 and the Reorganization Plan of 1953, regarding local level jurisdiction?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not the slightest.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to ask the Senator if the extension service is established by legislative authority, or is it within the prerogative of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the functions of the extension service are now in the Secretary of Agriculture. I will not be positive of that, but that is my recollection.

Mr. FREAR. Is the same thing true of soil conservation and PMA?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not true of the Soil Conservation Service; neither is it true of REA.

Mr. FREAR. Then the Reorganization Plan of 1953 would not alter that situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; it would give the Secretary complete power to take over those functions, if the plan is approved.

Mr. FREAR. If the plan is approved, the Secretary of Agriculture will have jurisdiction over legislative intent and authority, which is supposed to remain in the hands of the legislature rather than in a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my position. All I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture to do is to submit a specific plan, telling us which function he intends to magnify, which one of the functions he intends to stifle or to play down, and what function is to be merged with other functions. I hope we are intelligent and reasonable men, and I know we have the interests of the Agricultural Department at heart. Why should not the Congress, which created those functions, be permitted to know what is to be done with them before they are juggled by the Secretary?

Mr. FREAR. If those who are interested in the agricultural program want to change it, then the source of such change should be an act of the Congress and not powers granted to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not insisting that the Secretary should not be permitted a great deal of leeway in reorganizing his department. What I am demanding is that he do it in accord with the spirit and the intent of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I am insisting that he apprise the Congress fully what reorganization plans he has in mind, that he submit specific plans to the Congress, and give us an opportunity to approve or disapprove them.

This is not a plan; it is a blank check which is filled out to the Secretary of Agriculture, giving him unlimited power over agencies within the Department, without making any report or without any limitation as to time. I do not propose to sign a blank grant of legislative authority of that nature. The basic act went a long way in granting power to the executive branch of the Government, but we did retain to ourselves the right to approve or disapprove a specific plan of reorganization. That right would be stricken down by this program, because once the plan is approved, from then henceforth whoever shall happen to be Secretary will have complete power to juggle the agencies as he shall see fit, to stifle a function of which he may disapprove, and to enlarge some other function that he may like. Congress would be practically powerless to do anything about it unless it could override the President's veto.

Mr. FREAR. During the time of the debate on Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950, there was a good deal of discussion as to the then Secretary of Agriculture. If this plan should be approved and should the destiny of this country be placed back into Democratic hands someday—God hasten that day—would not the plan be applicable to the then Secretary of Agriculture, and he could continue operating under the plan if this power is given to the present Secretary?

Mr. RUSSELL. It might well be that the gallows prepared for Mordecai might be used to hang Haman. It would not be the first time in our history that such a thing has occurred. But I am not standing on whether we have a Democratic or a Republican administration. I would not derive any great satisfaction from seeing the Haman of Republicanism dangling from the gallows designed for Mordecai, a Democrat, come 1957, if it is to destroy the congressionally created functions of the Department of Agriculture or handling them in such a way as to place them beyond the powers of the Congress to deal with or supervise.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining? I have promised some of my colleagues that I would allow them some time in which to discuss this question, and I have not yet concluded my own statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 92 minutes left.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of the fact that the former Secretary of Agriculture came forward with no plan other than the Brannan plan, does not the Senator from Georgia think it is a little bit unreasonable to expect Secretary Benson to come forward with a detailed blueprint after such a short time in office?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not think it is unreasonable. He has been in office for 4 months. I heartily disapproved of the Brannan plan, but Mr. Brannan at least had a plan and he gave Congress something to discuss, something to debate, some basis for legislation. We did not take the Brannan plan, but, in lieu of it, we adopted our present farm laws.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator think we should give Secretary Benson a chance to get himself established in office, thoroughly familiar with his work, and time to make a review of past programs, and to formulate recommendations for the future, before criticizing him too severely?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not be critical of the Secretary. As a matter of fact, I have, for some 2 or 3 months, said, "Let us give the man a chance to devise his plan." But I am frank to say that the day is approaching when the Secretary should give the American farmers the plan he has in mind. It seems to me, after 4 months in office, with all the facilities he has, with the advice of the distinguished Senator from Vermont who has been dealing with these programs and handling them on the Senate floor for years, with the advice of Mr. Davis, Mr. Short, and all the other experts in agriculture, with the advice of former Secretary of Agriculture ANDERSON, who I am sure is always available, it seems to me the time has about arrived when the Secretary ought to be able to present a plan. It is like a mother making excuses for her son. She had made excuses for him for 15 years. She says, "Remember, Joe is young. We will have to excuse his frailties." When Joe gets to be about 21 or 22 years old, nobody is disposed to excuse him except his mother.

I think we are approaching the time when even the Senator from Vermont should think that the Secretary of Agriculture ought to come forward with some kind of farm plan.

Mr AIKEN. There is no relationship between the farm plan and the mother-and-son story of the Senator from Georgia, because Secretary Benson has not been in office for 15 years; he has been in office only a little over 4 months.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Vermont and I did not agree with Mr. Brannan's plan. I thought the former Secretary of Agriculture was a little precipitate. The Senator and I agreed with each other in opposition to the Brannan plan. But Mr. Brannan at least had a plan, and he did not wait 15 years to submit it. He submitted his plan after he had been in office a relatively short time, and Congress turned him down. Congress provided other farm legislation.

I do not object to Mr. Benson's bringing out a bad plan; I would forgive him for bringing out a bad plan; but I object to having the legislative wheels stalled while we wait on Mr. Benson to give birth to some kind of farm plan.

Many of us have ideas about a proper agricultural program. We cannot move forward until we get the basis in the form of a recommendation from Mr. Benson. I think the time has about arrived when Mr. Benson should take Congress into his confidence with respect to farm plans.

Mr. AIKEN. I am certain the Senator from Georgia wishes to be as fair as anyone can be.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope so.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator knows that Secretary Brannan had been in office about 11 months when he came forward with the Brannan plan. I know he was not ready with it when he submitted it to Congress; he wanted more time to work out a farm program.

I am breaching no confidence in saying that I think it would be better to give Mr. Benson a little more time to be sure about what he submits to Congress than to force him to submit a plan too peremptorily.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe the time has arrived when the Secretary of Agriculture should come forward with a plan. I recognize that he has a very difficult problem on his hands, particularly in view of that fact that, according to statements made during the campaign, he had in mind formulating a plan to provide 100-percent of parity. I have never been able to evolve to my satisfaction a plan which would guarantee farmers 100-percent of parity. So the Secretary of Agriculture has a great burden, and I do not wish to be too impatient, but I should like to have him produce a plan.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator from Georgia will yield briefly to me, I should like to ask him two questions. Do I understand correctly that under the plan proposed there is to be no time limit on the exercise of the powers granted?

Mr. RUSSELL. The life of the powers would extend henceforth and forevermore.

Mr. STENNIS. Suppose Secretary Benson should exercise these powers, and someone else became Secretary in the future, and, exercising the same powers now proposed to be granted, further reorganized the Department of Agriculture, or organized it on a different basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the basis of my objection to the grant of power for unlimited time. We do not legislate on the basis of a person. I would deplore legislating on such a basis. I do not object to Senators vigorously supporting Mr. Benson, as they are apparently doing, but Congress should not legislate on the basis of Charles W. Brannan or Ezra Taft Benson. It should legislate on the basis of the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, because individuals are here today and gone tomorrow.

There may well be other Secretaries of Agriculture before the expiration of 4 years. Perhaps Mr. Benson may decide to retire from his arduous duties, and resign. A number of things could happen.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will further yield, as I understand, there would be no limitation of time, but once the power was exercised, it could be re-

exercised, even on a different basis, at a later date.

Mr. RUSSELL. Whoever happened to be Secretary of Agriculture could juggle the functions of the Department to his heart's content, without let or hindrance, without direction or control, without reporting to Congress for approval or disapproval under the powers granted by this plan.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his answers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am very much interested in the argument that we should not criticize Mr. Benson because he has not been in office very long. I think it is unfortunate that someone was not appointed Secretary of Agriculture who had sufficient knowledge of agricultural problems throughout the country so that even within a space of 4 long months he could have sent the Senate specific recommendations or a blueprint of a plan for reorganization he desired to have adopted.

Does the Senator from Georgia agree that if the Secretary of Agriculture is so inexperienced that he has not been able in 4 long months to make up his mind specifically as to a blueprint with respect to what ought to be done, we should not sit here in the Senate today and delegate to him the unlimited authority and the arbitrary discretion he is asking for? I think we ought to say, "Mr. Benson, you had better wait a while longer, until you have had a little more experience and can come before us with specific recommendations as to what you want to do, because we have no intention of violating the separation of powers doctrine by making the executive department of the Government a superlegislature," which apparently is what this administration wants. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the position of the Senator from Oregon that Secretary Benson should submit specific plans for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. I am opposed to an unlimited grant of power. If this proposal is approved, it will place the destiny of the American farmer, insofar as his life is affected by the legislatively created functions of government, in the hands of whatever individual happens to be the head of the Department of Agriculture, beginning with the day this plan is approved. That is all the more reason why the Secretary of Agriculture should not have this authority, because he has stated plainly to the committee within the past 10 days that he did not know what he would do with these powers if emergencies should arise. Then why should we delegate this power and abdicate our responsibility when the Secertary has said he does not know he will do with the power?

We should reject the blank-check proposal and require the Secretary to come before us with specific plans as to what he proposes to do. Then we can consider them and ask, Is this plan good or bad? I can assure the Secretary of my sympathetic consideration. I shall do all in my power to help make his administration of the Department of Agriculture a success, because the way agricultural matters are now going, that Department is a little more in need of help than is any other department of the Government.

These functions were created by Congress. Congress ought to know what is going to be done with them in advance of any action that may be taken. We cannot avoid our responsibility. We may seek to delegate authority. We may say, "Let all this go to the Secretary of Agriculture." But if failures occur in the future as a result of reorganization—and I refer not to Mr. Benson or to anyone else who may succeed him in the course of time—those failures will properly be laid at our door.

If we approve this plan, we shall be abandoning our power and responsibility as legislators. We cannot absolve ourselves of our accountability.

Mr. President, it has been contended, Mr. Benson has not yet had time to submit his views on the reorganization of the Agriculture Department. It is a little remarkable to me that he could use all the power he had to reorganize the Department within 2 days after he took office, but now, after 4 months he still does not know what to do with the powers proposed to be conferred upon him by this reorganization plan. This may be much more important in many respects than the question of where this function or that function is to be. The adoption of this proposal would give the Secretary vast powers over the most important functions of the Department. It could well have a vast influence on the type of legislation which will be adopted by the Congress if we ever have an opportunity to vote on a new farm program.

The Department of Agriculture has many ramifications. There have already been changes in the position of some of those who are supposed to be primarily interested in the farmer.

Our present price-support program will expire in 1954. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I tried vigorously to have that program extended. We were able to have it extended only until 1954. We have introduced legislation to extend it further.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator believe that we shall have any other agricultural bills or programs before us besides this one?

Mr. RUSSELL. I greatly fear that we shall not. Some of the leaders in the field of agriculture seem to think that we shall have other agricultural legislation before us. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said that the Congress will have ample opportunity to enact a farm law. What I apprehend is about to happen is that in 1954 the present price-support program will be permitted to die, which will return us to the act of 1949, containing the so-called sliding scale. The scale will immediately slide 15 points down in farm prices, when we already have a declining farm market.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is no farm legislation before the Congress now.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any.

Mr. MAYBANK. Except legislation which has been introduced in the House to increase the rates on REA from 2 to 4 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not familiar with any statement coming from the Department of Agriculture as to a long-range farm program. I hope it will come. I should welcome such a statement. However, I am very apprehensive that we shall not have before us specific legislation. I am very apprehensive that we shall revert to the agricultural law of 1949, which, in my judgment, would be absolutely disastrous to the American farmer.

I am unalterably opposed to the so-called sliding scale. I have never been able to see how it could possibly benefit the farmer, because it fails him at the very time he needs help. The greater the surplus and the more prices are depressed, the farther down his support is pushed. If that is a farm program for the benefit of the American farmer, I have never been able to see it. It fails him at the critical moment, at the time when he is in dire need of assistance, as he reaches out for something by way of income to support himself and his family. He finds that as the surplus increases and prices are reduced, the scale of supports slides down. In my judgment, if such a sliding scale is ever applied in this country we shall find that it does not meet the wholehearted approval of the American farmer.

Mr. Davis is to be one of the Assistant Secretaries created by the present proposal. When he was before the committee in 1950 he took the position that the reorganization was premature, and that it ought to be geared to a permanent farm plan to be adopted by the Congress. I quote from his testimony:

> At the present time our basic agricultural policy is in more or less of a state of flux. The farm plan that will be the basic structure for the next several years is not definitely crystallized. There are various plans that are up for discussion, and it seems to us that it is very difficult and unwise to try to reorganize the Department until we know what kind of farm plan the Department is to carry out.
>
> I think we will know much more about the shape of our farm policy within a few months, and the reorganization should be geared to the evolving farm policy. So we do not think now is a good time for a reorganization to take place.

Can any man conceive of any situation to which that advice would apply that fits it better than the situation we find today? Everyone is discussing farm plans and waiting upon the Secretary of Agriculture to arrive at a specific program. Rumors are floating around as to what kind of plan we are to have in 1955. If Mr. Davis was right in 1950, we should defer this reorganization until we know the kind of farm law under which the farmer must operate after 1954.

In my judgment, the American farmer is deeply concerned over the present unsettled state of affairs as it relates to a basic agricultural policy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. With the broad powers given under this reorganization plan, is it not true that

the Secretary of Agriculture could make changes today, and then tomorrow, next week, or next month, make further changes, or change back to the old system? Perhaps 3 months from now he would return to the same plan under which the Department is now operated. Is not that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course. The decision is left absolutely to the whim or fancy of whoever may be the Secretary of Agriculture for all time to come.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As the Senator from Georgia stated a few moments ago, we all want economy. However, at the same time, we do not want to frighten everyone who is working in the Department of Agriculture. We do not want to keep them frightened all the time, for fear that a change will put them out, for fear that, in effect, they may be legislated out of a job by the Secretary of Agriculture. Under the terms of the pending proposal, could not that be done at any time the Secretary wished to do it? Is it not true that the present proposal does not take into consideration the question of good relationships with the employees? Would not the proposed plan keep the employees frightened all the time?

Mr. RUSSELL. It could. However, I must say that I have great sympathy with the theory that anyone in a policy-making job ought to be named by the man in power who is charged with responsibility.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think that principle necessarily applies all through the ranks. I have not shared the great fears expressed by some of my colleagues over the impending change in policy-making positions. I think the party in power is entitled to considerable leeway on the policymaking level.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. However, any man who has rendered good and faithful service is entitled to some consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. He is entitled to all the protection he has under our present civil-service laws.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For the information of the country it might be news for some people to learn that today the Department of Agriculture, from the standpoint of the number of personnel, is approximately 38.2 percent smaller than in 1939. This is a fact which I fear is not recognized by very many persons. The number of employees on a full-time basis on March 31, 1953, was only 55,294, the lowest number since the early 1930's. I think the public ought to know that, in order to realize what we are dealing with at the present time in the great field of agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. COOPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have not been privileged to hear all the remarks of the Senator from Georgia, but I should like to ask a question or two and seek his advice and counsel. I should like to have the benefit of his observations.

Undoubtedly the Senator from Georgia has read the testimony before the Committee on Government Operations, and particularly the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. I read that. I did not read all the testimony, but I did read Secretary Benson's testimony, because I was very anxious to ascertain what he had in mind, and was disappointed that he did not give any inkling whatever as to what he proposed to do with these vast powers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall that the junior Senator from Minnesota asked certain questions of the Secretary?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] were both very diligent in examining the Secretary on that score.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does the Senator recall that in the hearings, when we asked the Secretary of Agriculture over how many of the units or divisions, or whatever one wishes to call them, within the Department he presently had reorganizational authority under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture stated that there were about 20 units.

Mr. RUSSELL. Four would be exempted under this plan and over six he would have power by virtue of this order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Four are exempted in the reorganization plan?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall further that the Secretary of Agriculture indicated he had no present plan or no contemplated plan to do anything about Rural Electrification, Soil Conservation, or the Farmers' Home Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Secretary of Agriculture, from the position he took before the committee, undertook to allay any fears that any Senator may have had with respect to any function in which the particular Senator was interested. I am not so much concerned about what Secretary Benson would do. I am concerned about the grant of powers and the unwarranted delegation of powers to the office of Secretary. Secretary Benson is here today, and he may be gone tomorrow. Regardless of who the Secretary is, the delegation of powers will still be in existence if this plan is approved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator will recall that by the time the Secretary of Agriculture had gone through all the units in the Department, there were only three units which would come under his reorganization plans, namely, the counselor's office, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the Forest Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Secretary left the inference that he had something in mind affecting those bureaus, but, if I understood his testimony—and I will say that I did not hear the testimony, but only read it—he said he had nothing specifically in mind now as to the Rural Electrification Administration and had nothing specifically in mind as to the Soil Conservation Service. However, I do not believe he absolutely closed the door—and he wanted to be fair, I believe—by stating that, if he wanted to do so later, he would not affect those functions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my understanding of the Secretary's testimony. The Senator will recall, I am sure, that the reorganization plan of 1950 affecting the Department of Agriculture was rejected by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was rejected with perhaps the greatest show of unanimity I have ever seen displayed in this body. The Senator from Minnesota, as I remember, had filed his minority views. The Senator from Minnesota was on the floor and heard the speeches by the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Vermont, and other Senators who deplored this vast delegation of legislative authority, and the Senator from Minnesota indicated that they had almost persuaded him. I am relying on my memory. He stated that they had almost persuaded him that it was too great a grant of power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota said so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I heard his statement, but it has been some years since he made it. I remember I stated to the Senator from Minnesota that I was glad he had seen the light on this question, and that he was not in favor of giving to the executive practically all the powers of Congress. I hope the light has continued to spread its refulgent rays and that the Senator will again vote to reject this proposed complete delegation of power and will not support the sale to us of a pig in a poke.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I examined the record of the debates on the 1950 reorganization plan, and found that there was considerable debate on the floor of the Senate. Several distinguished Senators who were members of the Committee on Agriculture spoke on the subject. They stated in no uncertain terms what they thought of a blank-check authority, or a broad delegation of power, under the terms of the Truman or Brannan reorganization plan.

The Senator from Minnesota said nothing in that debate until the last minute, before the Senate voted. As he now recalls the Senator from Minnesota pointed out that the delegation of powers, as they were explained in the debate, was beyond what he dreamed was contained within the Reorganization Act, and he pointed out further that it seemed to him the Department of Agriculture ought to come before Congress with specific, detailed proposals, such as we ask for from the Bureau of Internal Revenue when we call upon them for their outlines, charts, and proposals.

(At this point Mr. RUSSELL yielded to Mr. HUMPHREY for the purpose of inserting in the RECORD a statement of his views on Reorganization Plan No. 2, which by unanimous consent, was ordered to be printed at the conclusion of Mr. RUSSELL's speech.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question or observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to be generous, but my time is almost exhausted. I have been asked by 2 or 3 other Members of the Senate to yield some time to them. I shall yield briefly to the Senator from Minnesota, but I must ask my colleagues to be brief with their questions, until I have finished with my statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator from Georgia is aware of the fact that there is a great fear in many agricultural areas as to what might happen to some of the REA programs and soil conservation programs and to the Farmers' Home Administration. Of course, he is aware of the fact that the Farmers' Home Administration is the credit agency, so to speak, for the small farmer who needs a break in life, as a beginning.

I submit that thus far, in terms of philosophy of Government, we have seen in the Department of Agriculture, as well as in other departments, what seems to me to be not too much concern over REA, over the Farmers' Home Administration, over the soil-conservation program, or over the many people engaged in agricultural pursuits throughout the Nation who need help. I say that has been a very controlling factor in my view and in my judgment upon this reorganization plan.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky, then I shall yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, first I should like to say that I do not want to take up too much of the Senator's time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am always glad to yield, but we are operating under a limitation of time.

Mr. COOPER. I always have great respect for the views of the distinguished Senator from Georgia on farm problems. Usually I am in accord with his views. I should like to say that while I am very much interested in efficiency and economy in the administration of the Department of Agriculture, I am chiefly concerned now with the effect of the proposed grant of power upon the farm programs, which I support. I know that interest is also the interest of the Senator from Georgia.

I agree that power should not be granted merely because we believe in the good intentions of the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, or any other Secretary of Agriculture. The question goes deeper. It is whether the delegation of power is unwise and capable of doing harm to the farmer.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia to indicate the specific ways in which he believes the proposed grant of power would adversely affect farm programs or the individual farmer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like very much to yield to my colleagues. I should very much like to yield to the Senator from Kentucky, but I must ask that he make his statement in his own time. I have only 8 minutes remaining, and I do not believe that I can conclude my statement within that time.

Mr. COOPER. I will ask only a few questions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. COOPER. Is there anything in the proposed grant of power which would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to interfere in any way with appropriations which are made by Congress to REA, FHA, the Soil Conservation Service, PMA, or any farm agency?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; he cannot interfere with the appropriations for the current year. It is specifically stated in the order that he cannot do so for the current year. However, that does not apply to the recurring appropriations. If he stifles or whittles down a function, necessarily it will not be important whether an appropriation can be transferred. So far as the current year is concerned, however, he cannot touch the appropriations under this grant of power.

Mr. COOPER. Can he abolish any function of any agency?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a debatable question. I have not the time to go into that question now. I doubt that he could abolish a function, but he could stifle it, or limit it to the point where it would really not be operative, by merging it with other functions.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator thinks, does he not, that by transferring a function the Secretary of Agriculture could minimize the importance of the function?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is it exactly. That is what I am apprehensive about with respect to several agencies, in particular with respect to the REA and the Farmers' Home Administration.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true, however, that the Secretary has the same power now with respect to at least 10 sections of the Department of Agriculture, among them the PMA.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and the Senator from Vermont earlier in the day undertook to show he had power even over functions that have not been transferred to the Secretary. Undoubtedly the Secretary of Agriculture does have some influence, but they can be reasserted by Congress if he infringes on our powers without the necessity of a two-thirds vote.

Mr. COOPER. I know the Senator from Georgia has been very generous with his time in yielding to me. I should like to ask him whether there is any difference in the grant of power which is now proposed to be given to the Secretary of Agriculture and the broad grant of power which has been given to other agencies.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that was discussed for some 10 or 15 minutes of my time earlier in the day, and I shall have to ask the Senator to excuse me.

I say the Department of Agriculture stands in a peculiar position, for it handles programs which vitally affect 6 million farm families of the United States, and I do not propose to measure that program by the standards by which I would measure the program of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, was it not the position of Secretary Benson, when he appeared before the committee, that he did not know what his program would be, as it would be affected by this plan?

Mr. RUSSELL. He stated specifically that at that time he did not know the program he would adopt; but he wanted these powers, although he did not know exactly how they would be applied.

Mr. YOUNG. That was his position when he appeared before the committee, at the time when the question of confirmation of his nomination as Secretary of Agriculture was before the committee. At that time he stated he had no fixed views on agricultural policies and did not know what he would do as Secretary of Agriculture.

But from the day when his nomination was confirmed, up to this very day, he has been attacking the 90 percent support program which was made possible by the Russell-Young-Cooley Act. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there can be no doubt that he looks with disfavor upon the existing law. That is one of my apprehensions in connection with this matter.

Mr. President, it is estimated that the farm income of the United States will decrease by more than $1,500,000,000 in 1953, as compared with farm income in 1952. On the other hand, the estimates show that the income of the nonfarm population of the United States will increase more than $13 billion in 1953. So the farm income is going down at the same time that the cost of everything the farmer must buy is constantly rising. That is why I say Congress cannot for 1 second relax its hold on the Department of Agriculture.

I am apprehensive. I hear references around Washington to "a free market for the American farmer." Just what does that mean? It should be spelled out. If it means a free market for every segment of our economy and if it means the abolition of every artificial prop or subsidy for every segment of American business and industry, the farmer will welcome that kind of free market.

The farmer produces the basic necessities. Everyone must have clothing to wear and food to eat. Certainly the farmer will get along in a free market, but I apprehend that the free market we hear talked about means that farm prices alone are to be permitted to seek their level in an economy in which almost every other segment of American economic life has some artificial support or benefit that is conferred by national law. If "free market" means that the farmer alone is to have a free market, that means he will be thrown to the wolves and that he is headed for disaster.

Mr. President, we cannot have a prosperous economy in our Nation if the farmer is to be pushed back into a position of low income, with mortgage foreclosures and heartaches and actual privation in the farm homes of this land.

Only yesterday I secured some statistics from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. They show that the farmers' share of the total national income for 1953 is estimated to be lower than it has ever been in any other year of our

history except the disaster year of 1932. We should bear that in mind, and we should consider what is in store for the farmer. We must not forget that the farmer's share of the total national income is to sink lower in 1953 than it has ever been in all our history, except in the year 1932, and some of us are old enough to recall the terrible distress which existed in the farm homes of the Nation in that year.

Mr. President, I ask that the table of figures to which I have referred, entitled "Income to Persons on Farms as a Percentage of National Income" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Income to persons on farms as a percentage of national income, 1910–53

Year	Net income to persons on farms from farming as a percentage of national income [1]	Total net income to persons on farms as a percentage of national income [1 2]
	Percent	*Percent*
1910	12.7	
1911	11.4	
1912	12.7	
1913	10.9	
1914	12.4	
1915	12.1	
1916	10.9	
1917	16.5	
1918	16.4	
1919	15.0	
1920	11.8	
1921	6.8	
1922	8.0	
1923	8.1	
1924	7.8	
1925	9.6	
1926	8.3	
1927	8.2	
1928	8.3	
1929	8.0	
1930	6.6	
1931	6.3	
1932	5.5	
1933	4.9	
1934	6.0	9.9
1935	9.8	13.4
1936	7.1	10.6
1937	8.8	12.3
1938	7.6	11.1
1939	7.0	10.6
1940	6.8	10.2
1941	7.8	11.0
1942	9.1	12.2
1943	8.5	11.2
1944	8.0	10.7
1945	8.2	10.8
1946	9.4	12.0
1947	9.0	11.6
1948	9.1	11.6
1949	7.3	9.8
1950	7.0	9.4
1951	7.1	9.3
1952 [3]	6.4	8.7
1953 [3]	8.5	7.8

[1] Includes Government payments to farmers 1933–53.
[2] Net income from all sources, including both farm and nonfarm earnings, to persons on farms.
[3] Preliminary.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. While the farmers' income has gone down, at the same time the price of everything the farmer has to buy has risen, and interest rates have also risen, have they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is true. All the elements which enter into the cost of production on the farm are constantly rising, but the income of the farmer continues to go down. So there is reason for the farmer to be concerned over the prospects that are before him for the next few years, and he is entitled to more information as to what he may expect.

Mr. President, a moment ago I was referring to the free market. I have stated that I would welcome a truly free market in the United States. However, I see no indications that we are going to have one.

If I ever hear Secretary Humphrey tell Congress that he wishes to have all the tariffs which have been imposed by Congress repealed; if I ever hear Secretary Durkin tell Congress that he favors wiping out the minimum-wage law and doing away with the 40-hour week and doing away with time and a half pay for overtime, and that he favors the repeal of laws which give the benefit of collective bargaining; and if I ever hear Secretary Weeks tell Congress that he favors a repeal of the subsidies which are paid to various transportation facilities, including the airlines, shipping at sea, and the railroads—if I ever hear such policies advocated and put into effect, then I shall see the day of the free economy dawning.

But until that time comes, I propose to stand up and fight for the American farmer as an American citizen who is entitled to all the rights that accrue to any of those who live and earn their livelihood in any other segment of our economy.

The farmers are American citizens, too. Some of them are Democrats and some of them are Republicans. However, we should not deal with these matters on a partisan basis.

Every American citizen has a great stake in the question of legislation affecting the farmers, for the effect of such legislation is not altogether confined to the farmers. There are many reasons why Congress should be unusually careful in dealing with farm problems.

All of us are dependent for what we eat and what we wear on the products of the farms. It is important to our national existence as a people to keep the American farmer in business and not let him be driven into bankruptcy, in the midst of unparalleled prosperity and higher wages than we have ever known before, which are enjoyed by all our people who are not farmers.

The farmers of the United States have never been on strike; but if the American farmer ever went on strike for as long as 1 week, the chaos which would ensue in this Nation would be absolutely unbelievable.

Mr. President, in connection with earning his livelihood, the American farmer has problems which are different from those confronting any other segment of our national life.

In the first place, the farmer is the only one who is compelled to gamble on the weather and on insects. Storm or drought can, overnight, wipe out all the farmer's investment. Occasionally tornadoes will have a serious effect on some segment or branch of industry, but they seldom affect the livelihood or any other element of the life of those engaged in industry in the way that weather and insects affect the farmer.

The farmer is the only producer—although he produces the basic necessities of our life—who cannot control his production when threatened with loss. Once he plants his crop and thus makes his investment, he is absolutely a slave to that investment. There is nothing he can do about it from that time on. Any other producer in the United States can protect himself; he can reduce his production or can adopt a 3-day week or can take advantage of any number of other methods if he is confronted with a surplus.

But although the farmer produces the essentials of life, he is absolutely subject to his investment, once he makes it. It is a very evident truism that all wealth originally comes from the ground. In its raw state, all wealth comes from the fields or the mines or from some form of mineral deposits.

I am quite sure that statistics will show that the farmer, who produces the basic wealth necessary to our existence, receives the least return for his toil, of all the thousands who handle that which he produces before it reaches the ultimate consumer.

The producers of other wealth in the raw state, other than the farmer, have a means of protecting themselves. If a man strikes oil, and if there is a surplus of oil, he can cap his oil well and can leave the well, and years later can return and open it, and oil will still flow from the well.

If a man is mining a vein of coal or a vein of some other mineral, and a surplus of that mineral threatens, with the result that the price of the mineral is forced down, that man is not involved in great loss if he shuts down his mining operation and awaits a more propitious time to market the product of his mine.

Once the farmer has planted his crop, he must carry it through to conclusion. Mr. President, let us consider how many millions of people in this country earn their livelihoods by processing, fabricating, handling, shipping, or selling farm products, or, as economists say, that which the farmer produces.

Thousands of people own textile mills, and many more thousands work in them, spinning cotton and wool and other fabrics into cloth. Thousands of others earn their livelihood by changing that cloth into finished clothing. Thousands are engaged in packing it, in handling it, and in shipping it, all down through the chain of the wholesale houses to the retail outlets, where the consumer finally is able to acquire it. So far as income is concerned, on the average, most of them fare better than the farmers.

The same argument applies to flour mills. There are thousands who own flour mills and other thousands who work in them; there are thousands who handle the flour as it is packed, as it is shipped, as it reaches the wholesaler, and as it goes to the bakery, to be baked into bread, and delivered in that form. One could carry this line of thought on at much greater length than would be possible in the time I have available and at my disposal, to show how many people

take the raw product the farmer produces and use it as a means of earning a livelihood. All of them have some protection.

The owner of a plant may shut down for 3 days a week without any loss. If he shuts down for a longer time, the workers in the plant have unemployment insurance which will protect them, for a time at least. The farmer alone, in our economy, has no means of protecting himself.

What would happen to a dairy farmer who tried to operate on a 3-day-a-week basis because of a surplus of milk? His herd would perish in 4 or 5 days. How about a beef cattle farmer presuming to operate on the basis of 3 days a week, because of a surplus of beef? We all know that it would simply plunge him directly into bankruptcy. So I say, Mr. President, in view of the vicissitudes which beset agricultural life, in view of the absolute necessity of having farmers who can raise the food products the people must have, the Congress would do well to recognize that the farmer is entitled to be treated as are other American citizens, and to have some protection.

Mr. President, I have always advocated and defended the 90-percent support plan as applied to the basic agricultural commodities. I regret that I did not know on yesterday that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was to address himself to this subject. As my custom is, I read the RECORD this morning, and I saw the report of the able statement the Senator made yesterday.

I agree with him that there has been more misrepresentation, ignorance, and confusion regarding the subject of 90-percent support with reference to the basic commodities than with reference to any other law the Congress has ever passed. There have been those who editorialized on the subject with the premise that the law permitted any farmer to produce all he wanted to produce, and that the Government had to buy at 90 percent of parity all the wheat, corn, and cotton the farmers of the Nation could produce.

I have never known of a supporter of the 90 percent of parity for basic commodities who has ever advocated coupling it with unlimited production. The law provides machinery which, if properly used, will protect the Government of the United States from any loss in affording protection to the farmers in the way of support prices for the basic commodities. It provides machinery for establishing acreage allotments and marketing quotas. There is argument as to whether the farmers approve of the present farm laws. There is a very simple way to ascertain their reaction. The law provides that a referendum may be called, and two-thirds of those producing each commodity who vote must support the plan, and assert their willingness to regulate their production in accordance with the estimates, or they get but a 50-percent price support; which, of course, means no support at all.

There has been a great deal of misrepresentation about that law; but I repeat, if the law is properly administered and properly applied, there will be no loss to the American taxpayer, so far as the basic commodities are concerned. If I recall correctly, the Senator from North Dakota said yesterday that a profit of $4 million had been made over the years on the basic commodities.

Mr. YOUNG. That was the testimony of the Department of Agriculture before the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Committee only 2 weeks ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was my recollection of the Senator's statement, and I know how careful he is in dealing with such matters.

Mr. President, these questions have been submitted to the farmers before, by way of a referendum, and there has never been a rejection in the case of one of the major crops. There were 1 or 2 rejections in the case of tobacco. I think that in Maryland a year ago the program was rejected, but I would wager that the farmers would not reject it today. I see the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] on the floor.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I may say to the Senator that there was an effort at this very session to have the bill repassed so the farmers could make their choice; but the bill failed of passage in the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was also the case in respect to flue-cured tobacco, or Burley, one year. The producers rejected the program, and immediately asked for another opportunity to pass upon it. They did not get it for another year, and they almost went broke. But as soon as they had another opportunity, they seized upon it. There have been no losses since that time, and the program has worked out to the benefit of the public, the farmer, and to the benefit of the national economy.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Since that time, in every referendum which has been held in the Burley district, the vote has been approximately 98 percent in favor of the program.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the program has worked well; it has involved no cost to the National Government, and yet it has afforded some measure of protection to those who till the soil, and has to some extent put them on an equal basis with other segments of our economy.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has probably been in closer touch with legislation affecting the farmer and over a longer period of years than any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLEMENTS. In the Senator's judgment, is there any basic difference between the reorganization plan dealing with the Department of Agriculture, as presently submitted, and the reorganization plan which was submitted in 1950?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is merely some window dressing in the new proposal. It is provided in the plan that the Secretary, if he deems it practical, shall have hearings; but there was nothing in the other plan which prevented hearings.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Georgia that there is no basic difference between the two plans?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no essential difference, except that the Farm Credit Administration is excepted in the 1953 plan, but was included in the 1950 plan.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that a preponderant number of Senators on each side of the aisle rejected the plan submitted in 1950?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have just stated that the Senate acted with greater unanimity in rejecting the plan in 1950 than in respect to almost any other matter I have seen brought before the Senate during my service here. Republicans and Democrats alike denounced it as an unwarranted abdication of congressional responsibility.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture has not yet made up his mind, as stated by the Senator from Vermont, as to what he wishes to propose to the Congress by way of a farm plan. I do not wish to prod him or to be critical of him. I content myself by expressing the hope that he will soon make up his mind, because it is a very important matter. If we go into the next crop year of 1954 with the present uncertainty and confusion as to what is to ensue in 1955, it will result in a severe break in farm prices, and in greater losses to farmers, who are already hard hit by the reduction of their prices. I hope the Congress will have an opportunity to vote upon an appropriate plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator, by his own request, is informed that he has 1 minute of his 40 minutes remaining.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Presiding Office, and I shall be through in a moment.

I wish to conclude, Mr. President, by referring to statements which have been made and which indicate that we should reach a balance in our farm program by squeezing out of business those whom some officials are pleased to designate the least efficient farmers.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who advocate subsidies to the inefficient farmers. There are inefficient persons in all walks of life in this Nation. But I am unalterably opposed to a program which is deliberately designed to squeeze the inefficient. I think that is the effect of the sliding-scale method. Why should we apply this principle only to the farmers? That is not done in the case of tariffs to protect business and industry. They protect the efficient and inefficient producer alike. In dealing with airlines we make an exception in the case of those who are less efficient and give them even greater subsidies than are given to those who are more efficient and who are operating at a profit. Yet it is proposed to say to the farmer, "If you cannot make a profit on 75 percent of parity under the sliding scale, we will slide you right into bankruptcy."

I think any such system is unfair and discriminatory as between American citizens. I do not propose by my vote to single out the farmer as the only one of our citizens who will be driven into bankruptcy because he cannot successfully compete with great concentrations of wealth in large corporate farms and with those who have unlimited credit facilities.

Mr. President, the powers which this reorganization order would confer can be used to foster and promote such a program. I do not refer to the present incumbent in the office of Secretary of Agriculture. These powers are unlimited as to time. They will diminish for all time the power, authority, and control of the Congress of the United States in formulating a proper farm program. This reorganization order should be rejected. The Congress can then consider on its merits any plans which may occur to the Secretary between now and April 1, 1955, which are submitted in specific terms which enable us to understand what is proposed.

The Secretary, in my opinion, should announce the overall farm program for American agriculture that he recommends Congress enact into law. Let it be debated and discussed thoroughly. The farm program and the reorganization can then go hand-in-hand in an orderly way to produce the greatest benefits to the American farmer at the lowest measure of cost to the American taxpayer.

As it stands now, we have only a negative policy. The Secretary states that he does not know just what changes he will make in the structure of our Agricultural Department, though he has been in office for more than 4 months and had ample opportunity to not only examine the workings of the Department but to inform himself on the various studies which have been made.

It would seem to me that he has had ample time to come to a conclusion as to a proper action program to apply for the benefit of the American farmer and the American consumer. I submit that it is time for us to be presented with a clearly defined legislative program for American agriculture. I respectfully suggest to the Secretary of Agriculture that he make up his mind and take us and the farmer into his confidence. I can assure him that I shall receive sympathetically any plan which he may submit.

Thus far, Mr. President, we have had only a negative policy from the Department. There has been no statement as to what is to be done by way of reorganization, no statement of a farm program. I hope the time will soon come when we may have an affirmative program and a specific reorganization plan consistent with the act of 1949.

In the utmost good faith I have made the statement that it is my intention to cooperate with this administration in the national interest, not as a partisan, but as an American. But, Mr. President, I am apprehensive over the negative policies, the wait-and-see attitude, which can result only in still further handicapping the American farmer in his effort to share with his fellow Americans in the blessings of our great civilization, and pushing him down even farther in the disparity which he suffers as compared with other elements of our population.

EXHIBIT A

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1950

[Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, March 13, 1950, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions of all other officers of the Department of Agriculture and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department.

(b) This section shall not apply to the functions vested by the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) in hearing examiners employed by the Department of Agriculture nor to the functions of the corporations of the Department of Agriculture, of the boards of directors and officers of such corporations, or of the Advisory Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

SEC. 2. Performance of functions of Secretary: The Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of Agriculture of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan.

SEC. 3. Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture: There shall be in the Department of Agriculture two additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall perform such duties as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, and who each shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments.

SEC. 4. Administrative Assistant Secretary: There shall be in the Department of Agriculture an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary of Agriculture under the classified civil service, who shall perform such duties as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 per annum.

SEC. 5. Incidental transfers: The Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time effect such transfers within the Department of Agriculture of any of the records, property, personnel, and unexpended balances (available or to made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of such Department as he may deem necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this reorganization plan.

EXHIBIT B

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

[Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, March 25, 1953, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949, as amended]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Subject to the exceptions specified in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions not now vested in him of all other officers, and of all agencies and employees, of the Department of Agriculture.

(b) This section shall not apply to the functions vested by the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1001 et seq.) in hearing examiners employed by the Department of Agriculture nor to the functions of (1) the corporations of the Department of Agriculture, (2) the boards of directors and officers of such corporations, (3) the Advisory Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation, or (4) the Farm Credit Administration or any agency, officer, or entity of, under, or subject to the supervision of the said Administration.

SEC. 2. Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture: Two additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each such Assistant Secretary shall perform such functions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall, from time to time, prescribe and each shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments.

SEC. 3. Administrative Assistant Secretary: An Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary of Agriculture under the classified civil service, and shall perform such functions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall, from time to time, prescribe. The provisions of the item numbered (1) of the third proviso under the heading "General Provisions" appearing in chapter XI of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, approved June 5, 1952 (66 Stat. 121), are hereby made applicable to the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. Delegation of functions: (a) The Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency of employee, of the Department of Agriculture of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan.

(b) To the extent that the carrying out of subsection (a) of this section involves the assignment of major functions or major groups of functions to major constituent organizational units of the Department of Agriculture, now or hereafter existing, or to the heads or other officers thereof, and to the extent deemed practicable by the Secretary, he shall give appropriate advance public notice of delegations of functions proposed to be made by him and shall afford appropriate opportunity for interested persons and groups to place before the Department of Agriculture their views with respect to such proposed delegations.

(c) In carrying out subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall seek to simplify and make efficient the operation of the Department of Agriculture, to place the administration of farm programs close to the State and local levels, and to adapt the administration of the programs of the Department to regional, State, and local conditions.

SEC. 5. Incidental transfers: The Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time effect such transfers within the Department of Agriculture of any of the records, property, and personnel affected by this reorganization plan and such transfers of unexpended balances (available or to be made available for use in connection with any affected function or agency) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of such Department, as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this reorganization plan; but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made.

During the delivery of Mr. RUSSELL'S speech,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me, without his losing his right to the floor,

to file a statement which I have prepared, in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 2?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so, provided it will be printed at the conclusion of my speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I wish to record myself in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 2 and in support of the resolution presented by Senator RUSSELL. As a result of the hearings before the Committee on Government Operations and the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, it is clear that the Secretary has authority under present law to reorganize the majority of the Bureaus, Divisions and Units of the Department of Agriculture. Reorganization Plan No. 2 excludes any reorganization authority insofar as it would apply to the following groups:

1. The Advisory Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation.
2. The Farm Credit Administration.
3. Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
4. Office of Hearing Examiners.

The remaining six agencies in the Department of Agriculture not presently covered by reorganizational authority are:

1. The counselor's office.
2. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics.
3. The Soil Conservation Service.
4. The Farmers' Home Administration.
5. The Rural Electrification Administration.
6. The Forest Service.

The Secretary in his testimony indicated that he has no plans for the reorganization of these agencies. In fact, he made it quite clear that, while he requested the reorganization authority, he did not have any specific program of reorganization that he could offer to the Congress.

Insofar as administrative supervision of these agencies is concerned, it is now clear that with the forced resignation of Mr. Claude Wickard, the former Administrator of REA, the Secretary does exercise authority over what was believed to be an independent or autonomous agency within the Department. The Secretary has the power of appointment of the counsel for the Department. The Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, like the Administrator of REA, is a Presidential appointment, but again, in view of the evidence before us concerning the REA, subject to the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Also, the Secretary, Mr. Benson, testified that he had no intention of altering the Farmers' Home Administration, the REA, or the Soil Conservation Service. It appears, therefore, that the only three units or agencies which would come under contemplated reorganization plans are the Counselor's Office, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the Forest Service.

I believe in reorganization authority, but I also believe that the Department head should present at least an outline of the proposed reorganization before such authority is granted. I recognize the merit of the arguments made by the National Rural Electrification Association and the Soil Conservation Service Association. These two groups, in particular, are deeply concerned lest the services of the REA and the Soil Conservation Service be sharply curtailed or altered in such manner as to make them ineffective.

It appears to me that the reorganization authority requested by the Secretary is a blank check. The Secretary did not make a case before the committee, in my view, for his request—at least he had no specific proposals that he could outline, nor did he have any evidence as to the urgent need of reorganization in those divisions or agencies which were not presently covered by law that gives the Secretary reorganizational power.

Therefore, I cannot support Reorganization Plan No. 2.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose Senate Resolution 100 and to support the reorganization plan which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Government Operations. The field has been very well covered by the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations [Mrs. SMITH of Maine].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose Senate Resolution 100 and to support Reorganization Plan No. 2. This subject has been ably covered by the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. However, I should like to discuss a few points before the time comes to vote on this very important matter.

This plan is one of almost twoscore reorganization plans that have been submitted to Congress over the past 3 or 4 years. I should like to take up briefly the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, with relation to its organization at present. The Department is now constituted primarily of 20 different agencies. Some of these agencies of the Department were created by statute; some were established by departmental order; some of them are fully under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; some are largely under the direction of the Secretary; others are partly under his jurisdiction; and 3 are hardly under the jurisdiction of the Secretary at all, but are being dealt with directly by Congress.

The purpose of Reorganization Plan No. 2 is to give to the Secretary of Agriculture complete jurisdiction over all the agencies within the Department for which he has to assume responsibility, whether or not he has jurisdiction over their functions. In brief, this plan will give to the Secretary control over the personnel of the agencies for which he is responsible. It will give him supervisory powers over their expenditures, to see that the money is spent efficiently and in accord with the intent of Congress.

Mr. President, this plan will give the Secretary authority to see that all agencies within the Department of Agriculture carry out the intent of Congress. The Secretary will be held responsible, if this plan is adopted, for the work which those agencies do.

The whole purpose of the plan is to enable the United States Department of Agriculture better to serve the American farmer. It will help him in many ways.

It has been inferred by persons not too well informed, at this place or that and from time to time, that the present Secretary of Agriculture is not sympathetic with farm programs which would maintain a prosperous agriculture. Nothing could be further from the truth. I wish to say here that the American farmer has no better friend on earth than he has in Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

In considering very briefly the various agencies within the Department of Agriculture, I call attention to the fact that of the 20 major agencies, Secretary Benson has full control over the functions of 10 of them.

The first is the Agricultural Research Administration. Next is the Production and Marketing Administration. Questions have been raised as to what the reorganization plan would do to the PMA. It will not do anything to PMA, because the Secretary already has full authority over the functions of that agency. In fact, that agency was established by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], when he was serving as one of the really great Secretaries of Agriculture which the United States has had.

Other agencies over which the Secretary has full control at present are:

Commodity Exchange Authority.

Next, the Federal Extension Service, which was established, not by act of Congress, but by departmental order. I am certain that some persons will be surprised to learn that.

Then, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Office of Budget and Finance, Office of Information, Office of Personnel, Office of Plant Operations, and the Library.

So only 10 agencies are now fully under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Under Reorganization Plan No. 2, four agencies within the Department are exempt. They are the Commodity Credit Corporation, which was established by act of Congress in June 1948; the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, which was, I believe, reestablished in the same year; the Office of Hearing Examiners, a quasi judicial organization; and the Farm Credit Administration. The Farm Credit Administration was not exempt from the reorganization plan of 1950, which was defeated. It is exempt this year, because legislation is now being considered by the Agriculture Committees of the Senate and the House looking toward reorganization of the Farm Credit Administration.

That leaves only 6 major agencies within the Department of Agriculture which will be in any way affected by the proposed plan. They are the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, an agency within the department upon which the

Secretary has to depend for the vital information necessary to formulate his programs, plan and carry out the work placed before him by Congress, and to perform other vital functions. Is it unreasonable for the Secretary of Agriculture to have control over such a vital organization within his department as the Bureau of Agricultural Economics?

The second organization over which he now has control in the main, but not complete control, is the Forest Service.

The third is the Soil Conservation Service—that is, the Federal part of it—over which he now has main control, but not complete control.

The fourth agency is the Farmers' Home Administration, which also is mainly under the control of the Secretary at this time, but not completely so.

The fifth agency which would be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary is the Rural Electrification Administration.

The sixth is the Office of the Solicitor. In view of the tremendous amount of legal work which a department necessarily incurs, is it unreasonable to say that he should have control over the lawyers who work for him?

So there are only three agencies affected by this reorganization plan which would be affected to any extent by the change. They are the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Office of the Solicitor. When this plan is approved by both Houses of Congress, as I am sure it will be, the Secretary of Agriculture will then be in a far better position than he is at the present time to administer the law efficiently and economically, and to carry out the full intent of the Congress.

Plan No. 2, which we are considering, would permit the establishment of clear lines of authority and responsibility. This was an objective upon which the Hoover Commission placed great stress. In other words, the Secretary may delegate his authority to those in charge of departments and divisions below him, and the authority will be passed on, so that the Secretary will have the full line of authority from his own office down to the lower levels of employment, and he, in turn, will be responsible to the White House.

Some have asked what great changes may be expected if this reorganization plan is made effective, and what savings can be effected. We need not expect any spectacular results from the approval of this plan. I think there may be some savings. There is no agency of Government so administered today that it could not be administered better. I am sure of that. There is no agency administered in such a way that we could not get the same services for a little less cost. I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture can also effect savings within his own department.

In fact, he is already making some changes and readjustments in the PMA offices under the authority which he already has by law, as well as a realinement of functions in the Soil Conservation Service, which changes are claimed to save probably 233 man-years and permit more money to be spent on the land and less in the offices. It is claimed that some savings have been made through adjustments in the county and community committee systems of the PMA. The Secretary has already transferred an independent office set up within the Department to the Soil Conservation Service; and in other ways he has effected what are expected to be savings, but none of them will be spectacular. I should say that all the savings effected by the Secretary of Agriculture in the administrative field since he took office would not amount to more than a few million dollars.

So neither I nor anyone else can say just what savings will be effected. We do know, however, that when the head of an organization has full authority over those within his establishment he can do better work than he can if some outside group deals directly with the subordinates within his Department.

It has been said that the Secretary might destroy some of the programs if he had this power. That is not true. He could not, under this reorganization plan, abolish any of the functions of agencies which are laid down by the Congress. In some cases they could be transferred, but they could not be abolished. Congress will still determine the policy relating to the work now performed by all agencies within the Department of Agriculture. Congress will still control all the appropriations. The Secretary will have nothing to do with appropriations. He will have nothing to do with formulating congressional policy, except as Members of Congress and committees may seek his advice.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. While in the House of Representatives I supported all the Hoover Commission proposals. I believe that we ought to try to approach these problems on an objective basis. However, I have been concerned over 2 or 3 features of this reorganization proposal as it relates to the resources program. By the resources program, of course, I refer to the United States Forest Service, the REA, and the Soil Conservation Service. I should like some assurance that the policies involved in those programs will not be directly affected.

I feel that every possible economy should be made without affecting the basic law. In view of what has happened in the Department of the Interior in connection with the power program, I have some doubt in my mind as to what will happen to the REA and to the Forest Service. I may say that I was one who, as a member of the committee, voted to support this plan so that it could be brought to the floor of the Senate. However, I do have some serious misgivings. I certainly think it would be very helpful if some reassurance could be given to the people of the country with reference to the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the REA.

Mr. AIKEN. In regard to the Forest Service, first let me say that the functions of the Forest Service are, in the main, vested in the Secretary of Agriculture at the present time. It has been my observation that the Forest Service is likely to be strengthened under the present administration. I think it is in very friendly hands at this time. Certainly the Secretary of Agriculture cannot dispose of forest property without an act of Congress. He must conduct the Forest Service work in accordance with the intent of Congress.

Mr. JACKSON. I quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont, but there is always danger that administrative programs may be put into effect which will encourage monopolistic situations and result in the kind of administration of the conservation program which might not be in the best interest of the program.

As I recall, the man who founded the Forest Service, and the first United States Forester, was Gifford Pinchot, who served under President Theodore Roosevelt. I go along with President Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot in their approach to these problems. I merely wish to make sure that we shall not depart from those principles. We have already departed from Theodore Roosevelt in respect to our power policy. That is what disturbs me. I say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Vermont that I voted for Secretary Benson's proposal, but I do not wish to find myself in a situation where, after we approve the plan, there is to be a change in the substance of the important programs which relate to our natural resources.

Mr. AIKEN. I go along with the Senator from Washington in supporting the policies of Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt. I agree that it is always possible to have programs administered in such a way as to not be in the public interest. That however is not usually a matter of law. It is usually a matter of administration of Government. I do not know of anything in the reorganization plan which would give the Secretary of Agriculture any greater authority to administer any of the laws in such a way as not to be in the public interest than he already has.

Furthermore, we know that the present Secretary of Agriculture is a friend of the forests, and I would be very much surprised if he ever did anything harmful to the forests.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it the Senator's understanding that there is any proposal in the offing which would affect the basic philosophy and policy involved in the REA, as we have known it up to now, or the basic conservation programs involved in the Forest Service?

Mr. AIKEN. No. Secretary Benson has repeatedly stated his strong support of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. JACKSON. I agree that every effort should be made in that direction. That is why I, at least, voted for the plan in committee, on the assumption that economies could be effected. I do not want to have the Secretary of Agriculture use the economy device to change the basic policy and philosophy which have prevailed for many years in build-

ing up a fine REA and a fine Forest Service.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Washington that we must not do anything which would depreciate the work of the REA or the Forest Service. I know that all officials of Government are constantly under pressure to hand out resources which probably belong to all the people, and to administer programs in such a way as to benefit this one or that one.

I do know of Secretary Benson's strong advocacy of REA, and I also do know that it is not necessary to have a reorganization plan in order to have an official of the Government subvert the intent of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Vermont. Is that sufficient time?

Mr. AIKEN. It will depend on how many questions I am asked.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. How much time does the Senator from Vermont desire?

Mr. AIKEN. It will not take long for my own statement. I have not answered the question of the Senator from Washington. I was going to say to the Senator from Washington that I was amazed at a hearing of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations, to listen to testimony given by Mr. Clyde Ellis, secretary of the National Rural Cooperative Association. He testified on May 19, only a week ago. He said:

Here is another thing—

I am reading from the transcript of the testimony—

Here is another thing we want to call your attention to. We learned this year to our amazement and to our disappointment sometime along about in January that the REA Administrator had agreed with the Bureau of the Budget or with the Budget Director last year not to lend more than $165 million in this fiscal year, irrespective of the amount appropriated by the Congress.

Lest I not be misunderstood, I want to repeat that, if I can. We understand it was almost a directive on the part of the Bureau of the Budget, but it was agreed to by the REA Administrator—and I imagine he was somewhat helpless in the situation—that the REA would not lend for rural electrification purposes more than $165 million this year, no matter how much money was available.

We did not know that until January. We did not know it until the REA began to tell our systems in certain areas we did not have money enough for them.

I am reading the testimony merely to point out that it is not always the law that is involved, or the reorganization plan, or the authority now vested in the Secretary of Agriculture, or in the REA Administrator. If the will to subvert the intent of Congress is present, it will be done anyway, regardless of whether a reorganization plan is put into effect.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. My reason for asking the questions, of course, is to make it clear that the power granted to the President—in this case to the Secretary of Agriculture—to reorganize should be used only for the purpose of making the Department more efficient and to bring about a saving of money. I think it would be regrettable indeed if through the reorganization device we would permit a department to change the basic law.

That is why I have raised these questions on the floor of the Senate.

I believe millions of farmers, and citizens generally, are eager to know exactly what will happen under the various reorganization proposals. As I have stated to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, in the past I have supported every Hoover Commission reorganization proposal. I want to support all such proposals which will result in saving money. However, I believe we must be very careful to have the assurance at all times that the reorganization programs are used for purposes only of efficiency and economy.

If I vote against the pending resolution it will be on the stipulation and with the understanding that there will be no change made in the basic programs in the Forest Service, the REA, Soil Conservation, and Farmers' Home Administration.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Washington is on perfectly sound ground in insisting on assurance in that respect. I am satisfied that there is absolutely nothing in the pending reorganization plan which would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to change the intent of Congress, or to abolish any of the functions authorized by Congress, or to do anything other than to carry out the intent of Congress in the most efficient and economical manner possible.

Mr. JACKSON. Does not the Senator from Vermont believe that the Secretary of Agriculture should use this plan solely for the purpose of improving the efficiency of his organization and to save money, not to attempt in any way to change basic law?

Mr. AIKEN. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the reorganization plan will be used for that purpose.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. We have Mr. Benson's assurance that so long as he is Secretary he will never permit it to be used for anything except to carry out the express intent of Congress.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, some of the questions which I had intended to ask of the Senator from Vermont have been asked by the distinguished Senator from Washington. However I should like to address two or three questions to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

First, I want to say I value the Senator's views because of his chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and also because I know of his deep concern with agricultural problems.

I have supported agricultural programs, and I would not want to vote for the reorganization plan we are now considering, if it meant there was any danger that our agricultural programs would be abolished or crippled.

I have received many inquiries from farmers in my State who are concerned about this proposal.

I would say further, if the proposed grant of power is too great, I would not want to vote for it.

The question which I asked the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] a few minutes ago went to the extent of the grant of power to the Secretary of Agriculture which is in the proposed plan.

I should like to address the same questions to the Senator from Vermont.

In the first place I know that a similar grant of power to reorganize their departments has been made to Departments of the Treasury, Justice, Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

Is the grant of power which is proposed by this resolution any more extensive or any larger than the powers which already have been granted to the secretaries of the departments I have enumerated?

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that it is not, and that only one reorganization plan submitted to Congress contained any reservation at all on the grant of power; and that one—as was pointed out earlier this afternoon by the Senator from Georgia—related to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. COOPER. The distinguished Senator from Georgia stated that in his view a specific program or plan should be presented to Congress in the reorganization resolution, before it should be accepted or approved by Congress.

I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont whether the reorganization plans which were adopted and approved by Congress for the Departments of the Treasury, Justice, Commerce, Interior, and Labor, contained specific plans.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope some of my colleagues will correct me if I am wrong about this, but I recall no instance where the department or agency had submitted a specific program for reorganization before the reorganization plan was approved by Congress. I do not think that could possibly be done; I do not think they could tell how they were going to shift the personnel or offices a few months ahead. I am sure that we Members of Congress cannot make our plans months ahead, and I do not believe the department heads could, either; and I would not expect them to, except in a general way.

Mr. COOPER. In the committee report it is stated that 10 sections or agencies of the Department of Agriculture are already subject to the same power which this plan would simply delegate to the Secretary for 6 additional agencies in his Department. Would the power proposed to be granted with respect to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers' Home Administration, or the Rural Electrification Administration be greater than the power the Secretary of Agriculture now has with respect to the Production and Marketing Administration, the Extension Service, and 8 other agencies of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. AIKEN. It is not proposed by this plan to give the Secretary of Agriculture any greater power over the 6 agencies which are not now completely under his jurisdiction than the power he now has over the Production and Marketing Administration, the Extension Service, and the other agencies over which he now has full jurisdiction.

Mr. COOPER. I have received letters, as I am sure the Senator from Vermont has——

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I have.

Mr. COOPER. I have received letters from people interested in the Soil Conservation Service, Production and Marketing Administration Committees, from the Farmers' Home Administration, and from persons interested in other agencies, stating their fear that if this plan is adopted, the Secretary of Agriculture will have power to abolish those agencies.

I know the plan does not give the Secretary of Agriculture such power; but I should like to have the Senator from Vermont, as one who is most familiar with the Department of Agriculture and with agricultural problems, state his views regarding this matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Since assuming office, the Secretary of Agriculture has transferred additional work to the Soil Conservation Service. I am sure he would not have done that in the case of an agency that he contemplated abolishing, even if he had the power to abolish it.

On the other hand, the Secretary of Agriculture cannot abolish the Federal part of the soil-conservation work; and we know that most of the work is done by soil-conservation districts which are set up under State law, anyway.

Let me say that in the Reorganization Act of 1949 there were set forth many categories of action which could be included in a reorganization plan for any department, as submitted by the President. One of those categories was the abolition of all or of any part of the functions of any agency. That is a rather far-reaching power.

However, the reorganization plan for the Department of Agriculture, as submitted by President Eisenhower, contains no such authority whatsoever. It contains only authority to transfer the whole or any part of any agency or the whole or any part of the functions thereof to the jurisdiction or control of any other agency; or, second, authority to consolidate or coordinate the whole or any part of any agency or the whole or any part of the functions thereof with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; and, third, authority for any officer to delegate his functions.

One purpose of the reorganization plan, as I understand it, is that when there are several agricultural agencies—some established by acts of Congress and some established by order of the secretary of one of the departments—which work along the same line, and duplicate the work of one another, this plan will, I believe, give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to consolidate that work in one agency, and not have three or four agencies undertake to do the same work at the same time.

Question was raised as to what could be done to the Rural Electrification Administration. Nothing could be done to the Rural Electrification Administration; it will continue, as Congress has planned.

But I note that the Rural Electrification Administration is now contributing toward the hiring of approximately 20 or 30 Extension workers, who operate under the jurisdiction of the Extension Service; and I assume that is because the Extension Service, having had a ceiling in its appropriations, could not afford to hire them. I think the Extension workers who now are provided by the Rural Electrification Administration could be hired by the Extension Service if that Service received sufficient funds for that purpose.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I have another question to ask, if I may do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator from New York to let me complete answering the questions of the Senator from Kentucky first.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. With respect to the Soil Conservation Service, it is a fact, as the Senator from Vermont knows, that the Soil Conservation Service is organized under acts of the legislatures of States and the Congress cannot abolish this Service.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I note that in the testimony of Secretary Benson, before the subcommittee, he was asked about the Farmers' Home Administration. I read now from the hearings; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was asking a question:

> Is it your intention to dismantle the Farmers' Home Administration? Do you intend to keep it intact, sir, or what are your intentions with reference to it?
>
> Secretary BENSON. I certainly have no intention of dismantling it, Senator. I do have an intention of studying it very carefully. I do feel that the Farm Credit and Farmers' Home operate in different fields.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Senator HUMPHREY. Now, Mr. Secretary, you have indicated that you have no intention of abolishing the farmer-elected committees; is that correct?
>
> Secretary BENSON. Yes; I think that is generally true. I think my statement which I made before the Agricultural Appropriations Committee sets forth that rather clearly. I would like just to restate that if I may.
>
> Senator HUMPHREY. Surely, please.
>
> Secretary BENSON. I said:
>
> "You may be assured that I am aware of the splendid contribution PMA county and community committees have made to agriculture, and that we intend to make the best possible use of these farmer-elected committees in administering farm programs. I have recently revised the regulation," which I have mentioned earlier here today, and then told why.
>
> So I have been very much in favor of the committee system as a service to agriculture and as a service to the Department in making our operations more effective.

I also note the following question asked by the Senator from Minnesota as to the intentions of the Secretary of Agriculture regarding the Rural Electrification Administration:

> Now, the fear is—I hope it is an unfounded fear—that the reorganization proposal may result in the dismantling of the Rural Electrification Administration, in other words, taking certain functions of the Rural Electrification Administration and dispersing them through several units in the Department, the credit functions, for example, of the REA. Then, of course, there are the technical aspects of REA.
>
> What is your thinking on that, Mr. Secretary?
>
> Secretary BENSON. I certainly have not reached any conclusion that any of the important functions of REA would be distributed to other agencies. I have been intensely interested in the work of REA.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for his answers to my questions. It is his view, is it not, that under this plan there is no power either to abolish any farm agency which has been established or to abolish its functions.

Mr. AIKEN. It is required in the plan itself that whenever any major change is contemplated, the Members of Congress and all other interested parties shall be notified and given full hearing. I might sum up my answers to the Senator from Kentucky by saying that if I felt for a minute that this reorganization plan would result in a weakening of any of the beneficial farm programs now in effect, I would not be here advocating it.

Mr. COOPER. I would not vote for it either.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. The report recites that Secretary Benson has given assurance that he would make no major changes in organization without consultation with the appropriate committees or without consultation with the farm organizations and other leaders of agriculture. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee what form those assurances took? Were they given in open hearing before the committee?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I am sure they were.

Mr. LEHMAN. Are they a matter of record in the hearings?

Mr. AIKEN. Secretary Benson has given those assurances, I am sure, several times. They are in the hearings. He has assured us that he would not expect, he would not contemplate, any major changes without giving adequate notice to the interested parties. He interpreted the interested parties, I believe, to be the farm people of the country, the farm organizations, and the committees of the Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New York for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the chairman feel that the assurances given by the present Secretary of Agriculture would be binding upon succeeding Secretaries of Agriculture?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think we can bind future officials very well, and, as I have pointed out, it is unnecessary to have a reorganization plan to subvert the intent of the Congreses with regard to programs that are good for the people, if those in charge of administering them are minded to do so. I may say I have more than ordinary confidence in Secretary Benson. I may as well say that here. And I want to say, too, that he has already been practicing what he preaches. He has consulted very frequently with Members of Congress. We have had group discussions of butter, of cottonseed and its problems, of the livestock industry, and of other industries. I think when the Secretary says he wants the advice of the Congress he really means that he wants it. He has not been partisan about this. For instance, when we were discussing the price of butter, there were four or five of us from the dairy States on the Committee of Agriculture who met with him. When we discussed the cottonseed problems, as I recall it, practically every person except myself was from a Democratic State. The Secretary is cooperating. He seems to feel that it helps him; and apparently he does not have any preconceived ideas or intentions before consulting with Members of Congress; I believe that, more than once, he has changed his own personal opinion following such consultation.

Mr. LEHMAN. The reason I raise the question about this rule being binding on succeeding Secretaries is because of the wording of one part of the report, on page 12, which reads:

> In view of this statement, as well as other discussions of this point in the hearings, the committee believes that it is clearly indicated that the Secretary of Agriculture will consult with the appropriate committees of the Congress before making major organizational changes, and that this rule will apply to succeeding Secretaries.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not a constitutional or legislative lawyer, but I would say that that made it clear that it is intended to apply to succeeding Secretaries; as I recall Secretary Benson so stated in the hearings; but a great deal would depend upon the disposition of the succeeding Secretaries. It is impossible to legislate good intentions into a man; he must have them to begin with.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the distinguished chairman of the committee knows of my high admiration for him.

Mr. AIKEN. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. LEHMAN. We have worked together for a good many years, both during the period in which we were Governors of our respective States, and since.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I recall that on one occasion we went to the White House together. That was at a time when we were not too popular.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I remember that very well. What the chairman of the committee says has very great weight. I take it for granted from what he has said that if there were any breach of the assurance which has been given to the effect that no major organizational changes would be made without consultation with appropriate committees of the Congress and with agricultural organizations and leaders, the distinguished chairman would consider that to be a breach of good faith on the part of the Secretary, and would do what he could to correct it.

Mr. AIKEN. I would consider that to be a time for action by the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. McCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the Senator from Arkansas. I want to save 10 minutes if the chairman has it, in which to complete my statement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be brief. I make this observation because it has been stated that the Secretary has given assurances. Other Secretaries have given assurances in the past. My position is that no important changes should be made that have not first been submitted to the Congress for approval. Let the Congress pass upon any proposed change following the submission of an appropriate plan of reorganization.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator will recall that the reorganization plan which was submitted in 1950 was defeated. The Senator recalls how far we got with it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The reorganization plan of 1950 was the same as the present one, was it not?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The only exception is that this one contains specific language.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall endeavor to point out to the Senator several exceptions. I may point out that, in my opinion, neither the Congress nor the Secretary of Agriculture can predict with certainty the pattern of organization within the Department that may be desired even a year from now. We have found it necessary to change our minds very much from year to year. It is simply impossible to blueprint the future in detail.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In view of the fact that we have no plan with respect to the details of reorganization to be followed, is it not true that the Secretary of Agriculture would be expected to prepare plans, and to present them in the future to the committees? He would be expected to consult with us. Is that what the Senator means?

Mr. AIKEN. I think that, before making any major changes, he would consult with the committees of the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Why does not the Secretary of Agriculture formulate his plan now and submit it to us for our approval?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the Secretary is ready to do that. I think we may judge what the Secretary will do in the future by what he has done in the past, with the authority that he has already had. He may find out that certain of the changes he had made in the PMA will not work. If so, I have confidence that he will change them, and he would have the right to do so. He has, in fact, changed them so that they now comply with the program which has been in effect in the Senator's own State of South Carolina and in my own State of Vermont, during the past few years.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that, when he comes back to the committees of the Senate and House with his plans, he will be, so to speak, the prosecuting attorney? Will he not also, in a manner of speaking, be the jury and the judge at that time?

Mr. AIKEN. If a public official has the will and intention of usurping authority and of subverting the intention of the Congress, he most assuredly will find a way to do it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. He can do that. The only thing we could do then would be to pass another act of Congress. Is not that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. We have tried that method repeatedly.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That has been found to be impossible, and the thought is that we have given the Secretary absolute authority and cannot undo it. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. No. The Secretary would have no more authority over any of the agencies covered by the present reorganization plan than he has over 10 major agencies at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But it is true, is it not, that he can reorganize almost any department except those that he excludes in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. AIKEN. That is the purpose of the reorganization plan, to make the departments more efficient.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Secretary were to do something the Congress did not like, it would then be necessary for the Congress to pass another act in order to carry out our wishes. Is not that correct? We would have to pass an act by a majority of the House and by a majority of the Senate, after which it would go to the President for signature. When it goes to the President, in case the Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to it, it will be vetoed. Is not that the usual procedure in regard to all legislation affecting agriculture? It would then be necessary for the bill to be passed by the Congress by the requisite two-thirds vote in the House and Senate, in order to override the veto of the President. Is not that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, if all those things came to pass, that would probably be true; but, as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico told the committee the other day—and "CLINT" ANDERSON was one of the best Secretaries of Agriculture that this country ever had—he simply could not conceive of the possibility that a Secretary of Agriculture would do things that the Congress did not intend to have him do, particularly in view of

the fact that the Congress would be holding the purse strings.

I do not want to yield any further at this time, because I am reminded that time is fleeting, and I have two more comments to make on this subject.

I have already pointed out that this reorganization plan does not give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to abolish any functions which have been set up by the Congress. Congress will still determine the agricultural policies of this country, and the Secretary will administer them. He has agreed to do so according to the desires of the Congress. Congress will still provide the necessary money. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] stated that he could not imagine the Secretary going outside the policies established by the Congress. As I pointed out in connection with the REA, certain things can be done with or without a reorganization plan.

I should like to point out briefly who are supporting the plan:

J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel, the National Grange; Gavin W. McKerrow, National Milk Producers Federation; Homer L. Brinkley, executive vice president, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; Allan B. Kline, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; J. H. Meek, director, division of markets, Virginia Department of Agriculture and Immigration; Senator George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Representative Clifford R. Hope, of Kansas; Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; William F. Finan, Assistant Director for Management and Organization, Bureau of the Budget; Dr. James K. Pollock, former member, Hoover Commission; Dean Henry P. Rusk, chairman, Task Force on Agriculture, Hoover Commission; Ward Quaal, committee on agriculture, Citizens Committee for Hoover Report; Ed Molter, committee on agriculture, Citizens Committee for Hoover Report; Rhea Blake, of the Cotton Council.

Mr. President, it has been said that this plan is almost identical with Reorganization Plan No. 4, which was submitted in 1950 and which was defeated. That is not the case, Mr. President. This plan is substantially different from the plan submitted in 1950, and it has been changed in such way as to overcome the objections of those who opposed Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950.

The first change is that the functions of the Farm Credit Administration are not transferred to the Secretary. That includes the functions of the Federal land banks and other agencies of that nature. It must be readily agreed that the transfer of those functions would give the Secretary of Agriculture considerably more power than he would have under a plan which does not include such transfer.

The Secretary is required, under the plan, to give notice of major changes in departmental structure, with opportunity for interested persons and groups to present their views.

That provision was not in the plan of 1950.

Under this plan it is required that in any redistribution of functions the Secretary is specifically required to simplify and make efficient any operations affected thereby.

That was not included in the reorganization plan of 1950.

Under this plan the Secretary is required to seek to place the administration of farm programs close to the State and local levels and to adopt the administration of programs to regional, State, and local conditions.

That was not in the reorganization plan of 1950.

In this plan a limitation is established on the transfer of any unexpended balances of appropriations to insure that they shall be used only for the purpose for which such appropriations were originally made. I think that is clear.

Under the 1950 plan there was no specific restriction against the Secretary using for another purpose funds appropriated for a certain purpose. That prohibition is specific in Reorganization Plan No. 2.

There has been comment that those who opposed the plan in 1950 are supporting the present plan, and, therefore, they are not consistent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know how much time the Senator has remaining, but if he has time to do so, I wish he would discuss briefly one point which he raised with reference to farm financial agencies not being transferred. Does the Senator have time to discuss that subject briefly?

Mr. AIKEN. I think so. I will say that the farm credit agencies are not transferred to the Secretary, for the reason that there is now pending proposed legislation in the Senate and House Agricultural Committees looking to a reorganization of the farm credit agencies and to the final transfer of those agencies to the farmers themselves, who will operate them and get the Government out of the banking business as soon as may be feasible.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will bear with me for just one more brief question——

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Suppose the pending proposed legislation should not be enacted, under the broad powers provided in this plan could the Secretary of Agriculture attend to the matter himself and not depend upon Congress to transfer those agencies to him?

Mr. AIKEN. No. If the pending farm credit measure should not be passed, the Secretary would have no more authority over those agencies than he has today.

I think a potent reason why those who opposed the program 3 years ago are now supporting this reorganization plan is summed up in a paragraph in a letter from Mr. William Rhea Blake, executive vice president of the National Cotton Council of America, to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], which reads as follows:

Before plan 4 of 1950 had even been submitted, the then Secretary of Agriculture had already publicly expressed his disagreement with most of the agricultural reorganization recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Since plan 4 gave him complete, blank-check authority to do as he pleased, it was perfectly evident that we would never get the Commission's recommendations carried out under plan 4. In fact, if the Congress had permitted plan 4 to become effective in face of Secretary Brannan's then publicly expressed attitude, it would have been tantamount to specifically authorizing him to ignore the Hoover report. We, therefore, urged in May 1950, that plan 4 be rejected and that the Congress proceed with legislation to accomplish the desired reorganization.

Congress did proceed to introduce such a measure, but it never became law. I think that largely explains why those who opposed the reorganization plan in 1950 support the reorganization plan in 1953.

Mr. President, I should like to read the names of some of those who appeared before the committee in opposition to the plan:

Senator Richard B. Russell; Senator James E. Murray (statement); Senator Olin D. Johnston; Paul Opsahl, president, South Dakota Farmers Union, Huron, S. Dak. (also representing National Farmers Union); Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Senator Lester C. Hunt, Senator A. Willis Robertson, Senator Robert S. Kerr, filed statements.

There were very substantial persons who appeared in opposition to the plan, but I maintain that the bulk of the evidence is in favor of approving this reorganization plan.

The Secretary of Agriculture has repeatedly expressed his intention of using it in a way to perform greater service and benefit to American agriculture. I think his record is such that we can safely depend upon him to do that.

It has been mentioned that he should have a limitation of time within which he can reorganize his Department, but I maintain that it would be distinctly unfair to single out the Department of Agriculture and place it under a time limitation when no other agency of Government is included in such limitation. Should there be proposed legislation introduced to place a time limit on all agencies of Government for reorganization purposes, I would personally give it serious consideration, but I could not agree to single out the Department of Agriculture, any more than I would single out the Department of Agriculture as the only agency in Government where the Secretary or the administrative head is not permitted to reorganize his Department in the best interest of efficiency and economy.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I was asked by my colleague, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], to read the statement which he would have liked to make on the floor of the Senate during this debate. It was necessary for him to be out of town to fulfill a long-standing prior engagement, and since I had heard his testimony before the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations he asked me to present his views. The

statement of the Senator from New Mexico is as follows:

I testified before the Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Reorganization, on Monday, May 18, 1953, in behalf of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. I felt it my duty as a former Secretary of Agriculture to point out how essential it was for the Secretary of Agriculture to have authority that would enable him to discharge his responsibilities and carry out the intentions of the Congress.

During the time I was Secretary of Agriculture, starting in June 1945 and ending in May 1948, I had the necessary authority to reorganize the Department under the War Powers Act. The need for the sort of authority provided in Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953—authority to simplify, clarify, and adjust the internal organization of the Department of Agriculture to meet changing needs—has been recognized for a long time by different individuals and groups. Former Secretaries of Agriculture have recognized this, leading farm organizations have recognized it, Members of Congress have recognized it, students of efficient Government like the Hoover Commission for Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government have recognized it, and have recommended the basic authority now proposed.

There have been differences of opinion as to methods. There have been fears, sometimes justified, that adequate safeguards were not provided in certain past proposals. But there has been little difference of opinion as to the need to provide adequate flexibility in the authority granted the Secretary of Agriculture, to make it possible for him to do a commonsense job of administration. This means the authority to regroup and adjust units and services to meet the currently most urgent problems, as well as the activities directed at long-range objectives.

When I testified I drew on my own personal experiences to illustrate why a Secretary of Agriculture needs flexible authority. I do not intend to review testimony which is printed and available, but I point out again that during one year I had been concerned with the problems of price control and decontrol, the next year with the work of a famine-emergency committee, the next year with foot-and-mouth disease, and so it went. The tasks of the Department change rapidly and the needs of the individual agencies, both in manpower and money, shift suddenly.

I also pointed out that there is no question but that the great collection of agencies which serve the farmers of the United States can be simplified to the benefit of everyone. Once this preliminary work is done, there will still be need for constant adjustment and revision to meet the needs of changing conditions. The Secretary must have the necessary authority to carry out these assignments. In fact, we should insist that he be given and accept such authority so that he can be held fairly accountable for needed action.

Because of that I made it abundantly clear that I was not worried by the fact that there is no termination date to the plan.

The committee has been kind enough to include beginning at page 117 of its hearings a talk which I made before the National Reorganization Conference of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report held in Washington on December 13, 1949. I stated my convictions then as strongly as I could, and I am pleased that the Committee on Government Operations allowed that statement to go into its records.

The question was asked during my appearance, How drastic is this proposal to enlarge the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture? As a matter of fact, at present the authority now exists in the Secretary of Agriculture to reorganize the Production and Marketing Administration, that is the largest of the groups. He has authority to reorganize the Foreign Agricultural Service, and the Agricultural Research Administration, and that is a very important division or group within the Department. Likewise, he has authority to reorganize the Commodity Exchange Authority and the Federal Extension Service. The Secretary ought to have authority to reorganize the other functions of the Department such as the staff agencies, like the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Solicitor's Office, as well as such parts of the line agencies as he desires, including REA, SCS, the Forest Service, and the Farmers' Home Administration. The fact of the matter is, I personally would not even exempt the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. There is certainly some reorganizing that could be done there profitably. Certainly a reorganization plan cannot be drastic which merely adds authority to the Secretary to do the same things with respect to 6 agencies that he already has authority to do with 10 other agencies in the Department.

In closing I would like to make it clear that I do not believe that the Congress is in any way abdicating its responsibility to establish policies for farm programs. It is not granting authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to create, change, or abolish any functions established by the Congress, and finally funds must be used for the purpose for which they are appropriated.

On the basis of the provision for a hearing by interested persons on any major organizational changes, farm organizations and other interested parties will have the necessary opportunity to bring their views to bear in a timely manner. I urge that this not be treated as a partisan issue but rather as a long stride forward in the interest of better government.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, acting on behalf of the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Maine for allowing me 5 minutes in order to explain my position on the pending resolution.

I realize that much has already been said concerning the issues involved; nevertheless I should like, by way of emphasis to summarize briefly the reasons why I believe this plan should be approved. As was just pointed out in the statement by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], this reorganization plan would not in any manner abolish any of the functions or duties which the Secretary of Agriculture is charged to perform in carrying out the will of Congress with respect to the administration of the various laws under his jurisdiction. As I understand the proposal, all the reorganization plan would do is simply give the Secretary of Agriculture power to transfer in part to other agencies in his Department the administration of certain acts of Congress. Secretary Benson has stated that in this manner, and utilizing the authority requested by the President, greater economy and more efficiency may be obtained and much duplication can be eliminated.

I have supported all except two, as I recall, of the reorganization plans submitted to Congress since the passage of the original Reorganization Act of 1949.

In those two, the President, in his message to the Congress, abolished certain functions. As Senators well know, under section 3 of the Reorganization Act the President, in order to be in a position to abolish any functions of any statute, must among other things, specify in his message accompanying the plan, which functions are to be done away with.

The act provides as follows:

> The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan, the statutory authority for the exercise of such function, and shall specify the reduction of expenditures (itemized so far as practicable) which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the plan.

In the matter at hand neither the message of the President nor the reorganization plan itself seeks to abolish any of the functions of any of the 20 bureaus now under the Secretary of Agriculture. As a matter of fact, of the 20 bureaus which are now under the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary can exercise the same powers sought to be given to him under the Reorganization Act with respect to 10 of those bureaus. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture already has the same authority over 10 of the 20 United States Department of Agriculture bureaus that this proposal would give him over 6 of the remaining bureaus. Of the remaining 10, four of them are excluded from the reorganization plan. Only with respect to six of them—namely, the Bureau of Agricultural Econmics, the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers' Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Office of the Solicitor—would the Secretary of Agriculture be given the power, not to abolish, but simply to transfer authority within his department for purposes of administration in the hope of saving funds, of providing more efficiency and preventing duplication. That is all the reorganization plan does, as I understand it.

In the past I have been very much concerned over the reorganization plans which were submitted to the Congress with respect to the Department of Agriculture. I was very much afraid that an attempt might be made by the Secretary of Agriculture to consolidate the Extension Service with other larger bureaus within the Department of Agriculture and thus cripple the Extension Service by submerging its authority. However, I have since learned that under the proposed reorganization plan, the Secretary of Agriculture would not have the power to curtail any of the functions of the Extension Service. The Extension Service is purely educational. It is administered on a cooperative basis with the States, parishes and counties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes additional to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from California. I will need about 3 minutes more.

I have been informed that it is not the intention of the Secretary of Agriculture to in any way change or alter the functions of the Extension Service. As a matter of fact, he cannot exercise such power without the specific permission of the Congress—something he has not requested.

In order to bolster my position concerning this issue, I asked for an opinion from the counsel of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. Harker T. Stanton. I wish to place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a memorandum giving his views as to what the reorganization plan does with reference to the abolition of any of the existing United States Department of Agriculture functions, and also what the Reorganization Act provides with respect to the rights of the President to abolish functions.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 27, 1953.

This responds to your inquiry concerning Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. No authority for the abolition of any function is contained in the plan; and no function which the Department is required to perform will be subject to abolition without further act of Congress or submission of a further reorganization plan.

Section 3 (2) of the Reorganization Act of 1949 authorizes inclusion in plans of provisions to abolish functions; but requires the President to specify in his message transmitting the plans the statutory authority for the exercise of each function to be abolished. Reorganization Plan No. 2 authorizes the transfer or delegation, but not the abolition, of functions; and the President's message contains no suggestion that any functions would be authorized to be abolished. Furthermore, the Secretary of Agriculture, in testifying before the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate on the reorganization plan and on S. Res. 100 disapproving the plan (p. 151), stated categorically that the plan contained no provision for the abolition of any function.

Mr. ELLENDER. In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to again emphasize that the pending proposal in no way provides the Secretary of Agriculture with the power to abolish any function of the Department of Agriculture. All the plan does is vest the Secretary with the authority to transfer functions among the various agencies under his supervision. I should like for Senators to understand clearly that difference; namely, the difference between the abolition of functions and the transfer of functions.

Senators will note that on page 152 of the hearings held by the Senate Committee on Government Operations concerning the proposed reorganization, Secretary Benson stated:

No present function of the Department can be abolished in whole or in part pursuant to any authority contained in this plan.

I support this plan because I have been assured that neither the Soil Conservation Service nor the Extension Service will be modified with respect to functional authority; nor will they be affected in such a way as to frustrate the intent of Congress in creating them. This proposal, Mr. President, merely vests in the Secretary of Agriculture that authority necessary to increase the efficiency of the Department of Agriculture, and to eliminate any overlapping or duplication which may now exist.

I thank the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for yielding me additional time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is not present in the Chamber. Several speakers have been heard in opposition to the resolution. I understand that there are some speakers in favor of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is true that there may be some other Senators who are in favor of Senate Resolution 100, in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. I am in favor of the resolution, and I wish so to express myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Let me say in the beginning that I took the same position in 1950 that I am taking at the present time. At that time President Truman submitted a reorganization plan dealing with the Department of Agriculture. Senate Resolution 263, providing for disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 4, was submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and myself. It was a bipartisan resolution. I hope the Senate will vote today in a bipartisan manner with respect to the present resolution.

The Agriculture Department is of much greater importance than any other department, insofar as it affects the people. It affects all areas, all counties, all communities, of the country. It affects the South and South Carolina, vitally, for we depend to a great extent on agriculture.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I think there should be some reorganization in the Department of Agriculture. The committee of which I was formerly chairman, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, made an extensive study of personnel management in the Department. The committee made a recommendation, at that time, which fits in very well with a part of this plan. It recommended one additional Assistant Secretary and one Administrative Assistant Secretary in the Department of Agriculture. We felt that these additional top level assistants would be beneficial to the Department of Agriculture, and would be of great assistance to the Secretary in performing his duties.

The present reorganization plan includes such recommendations if it included as well other recommendations which outlined exactly what it was intended to accomplish, what the plan would cover, and what it would not cover, I would be in favor of the plan. I think there should be some reorganization. But I am not in favor of turning over to the Secretary of Agriculture the absolute right, not merely for this year, but for next year, the year after, and all future years into eternity, the authority to make reorganizations at various and sundry times. That is what this reorganization plan provides for, as it is submitted to us. It excludes certain bureaus or agencies in the Department of Agriculture. It says, "We will not touch these." But aside from them, it provides for a blanket reorganization power without a time limitation.

Secretary Benson does not presently know what he is going to do. I wrote a letter to him asking for certain assurances about the reorganization. I have just received his reply. It has not been before the committee and it has not been before the Senate. Without taking up too much time of the Senate, let me say that the Secretary told me in reply that he has not decided, up to this minute, upon any major changes in any field of activity under the reorganization plan.

The Secretary made that statement. He stated that he would come before congressional committees prior to taking any action under Reorganization Plan No. 2. Of course, we understood that he would do so. But, as I have stated on the floor of the Senate and before the committee, when the Secretary comes before us with his reorganization plan, or submits it to farm organizations, he will be acting in the roles of the plaintiff, the jury, and the judge. The viewpoints expressed in opposition to his plan will make little difference for the Secretary will undoubtedly go ahead and do what he wants to do, and what he intended to do, in the first instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in order to be completely fair with the Secretary of Agriculture, and to bring before the Senate his current views, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a copy of the letter which I sent to the Secretary of Agriculture under date of May 15, 1953, and his reply to me under date of May 26, 1953.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 15, 1953.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: As you may know, I appeared on Wednesday, May 13, 1953, before the Subcommittee on Reorganization, Government Operations Committee, in support of Senate Resolution 100.

This resolution, of course, would have the Senate disapprove the proposals embodied in Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. I was against an almost identical plan when it was presented in 1950, on the grounds that it vested the Secretary of Agriculture with too much general authority and deprived the Congress of its right to appraise and approve departmental organizations.

I am anxious, however, to see reorganization take place within the Department wherever it is needed in the interest of economy and efficiency. Nevertheless, I do not feel that I can support Reorganization Plan No.

2 without assurance along specific lines. With this in mind, I should greatly appreciate your views as to reorganization in the following areas:

First, I think it would be helpful to know whether the farmer-committee system of the Production and Marketing Administration will continue to exist and, if so, on what basis.

Second, I wonder whether agricultural conservation payments will be made through county agents of the Extension Service, through the Soil Conservation Service, through the PMA committee system, or through other channels.

Third, it is vital to know, also, whether the locally organized soil-conservation districts would be subordinated; for example, to the land-grant colleges, the PMA committees, or the county agents.

Fourth, I should like to know whether you anticipate that the Soil Conservation Service will be placed under the Extension Service and, if so, will SCS technicians be made assistant county agents?

Fifth, in the event the PMA committee system were altered or abandoned, how would crop insurance be sold to farmers?

Sixth, would you place the county agents of the Cooperative Extension Service into the operations of action programs or would they be left in educational and demonstration work?

These are questions which, it seems to me, form the crux of the agricultural reorganization issue that is now before the Senate. I earnestly believe that your candid advice in clarifying this issue will do much to speed some type of authority for reorganizing the Department, whether that authority be the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, or some other enactment.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 26, 1953.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: As a preliminary answer to all of the questions which you propound in your letter of May 15, I wish to state that we have not at present determined upon the advocacy of any major change in any of the fields of activity contemplated in the reorganization plan. On the other hand, it can be agreed, I think, that there is no field of activity of the Department now done so well that it cannot be improved upon. What the plan contemplates is a grant of the necessary authority to make it worthwhile to undertake the careful and detailed studies necessary to disclose the areas in which improvement may be made. The time and expense of such studies would scarcely be justifiable unless there is authority to carry out improvements indicated and to vary and change them with experience. The entire purpose of the plan is to enable the Department to more effectively, efficiently, and economically carry out the will of Congress as expressed in substantive legislation.

As you know, the plan provides that before any major organizational changes are made, public notice shall be given to interested persons and groups so that they may have an opportunity to present their views. This provision was discussed at length on May 18, and I stated that I felt that it would obligate any Secretary of Agriculture to consult with the appropriate committees of the Congress, as well as with farm organization leaders and others.

I regard the provision for consultation as an extremely important one, and I intend to follow it. I believe that through this process we will develop better and sounder answers to our organizational problems than we would without such consultation.

We cannot tell at this time, of course, what conclusions will grow out of this consultative process. Until then we should keep an open mind. On a number of matters I sincerely feel that new answers need to be developed, out of the best thinking of the Congress, the Department, and the farm organizations.

The foregoing statement should be considered in connection with the following numbered answers to the numbered questions contained in your letter:

1. As I said at the hearing on May 18, I am very much in favor of the farmer committee system. Plan No. 2 directs the Secretary in making any delegation of functions to place the administration of farm programs close to the State and local levels. I think we will always need these farmer committees. I have some question, however, whether we are yet making the best use of these committees that is possible. We have recently provided that the committees will work on a part-time, rather than a full-time basis. The committees will retain full responsibility for administration of program operations in their respective areas as they have in the past, but day-to-day operations will be carried on by full-time administrative officers responsible to the committees. This plan has been in effect in a majority of the States and counties, so that what we are doing is to put all committees on a uniform basis. We believe the change will strengthen the committee system.

2. We do not have in mind at present anything that would change the channel through which the agricultural conservation program payments are made. We do get complaints from farmers that there are too many people visiting their farms and telling them what to do. Careful study, investigation, and consultation in this field may be indicated.

3. The soil conservation districts to which you refer as being locally organized are established by the laws of the States. The reorganization plan does not give the Secretary any authority to transfer or change State functions. We do not have in mind at present any substantial change in the Soil Conservation Service, but there does seem to be opportunity for better coordination of the work of the Soil Conservation Service, the Extension Service and the PMA Committees.

4. In my testimony in support of the plan I said that I regard the Extension Service as an educational agency and the Soil Conservation Service as an action agency. In general, I believe that the educational and action agencies should be kept separate.

5. As stated in answer to question 1, I believe the farmer committee system should be continued. We have had some difficulty with the sale of crop insurance and I believe there may be opportunity for improvement in this field.

6. As stated, it is my view the Extension Services should be primarily education agencies and should not administer action programs.

I am glad to have this opportunity to give you my views. I do not believe that there are any important differences between the Congress and myself in these matters. There are some problems that need to be worked out, and I sincerely believe that the judgment of the Congress will be of very great help in arriving at sound answers.

With every good wish.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON, *Secretary.*

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, prior to my leaving the Chamber I had left at the desk of the clerk a disposition of the time that remained to the proponents of the resolution. I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who is in charge of the allocation of the time of the opponents of the resolution, had temporarily to leave the floor, and the Senator from California was assigned the responsibility of assigning time in opposition to the resolution.

We have had several speakers on this side of the aisle in opposition to the resolution, and the acting majority leader inquired as to whether there would be any speeches to be made in favor of the resolution of rejection. I had no knowledge who the speakers would be. The Senator from South Carolina rose, and he was asked how much time he was allocating to himself. Naturally I assumed that the Senator from Georgia had left the Senator from South Carolina in charge of the time, when the Senator from South Carolina allowed himself 10 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret very much——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the colloquy be not charged to either side, so we may straighten out the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I inquired of the official of the Senate who is keeping the time as to how much time remained to me. I was advised that 36 minutes remained. I regret I did not know the Senator from South Carolina desired to address himself to the subject. He had made no statement to me about it. Several other Senators had asked me for some time, and I had allocated the remaining 36 minutes, leaving a list of the allocation on the desk of the official of the Senate who was keeping the time. I had already advised various Senators of the length of time they had available. I regret any question has arisen. I do not wish to be unreasonable. If I had any time of my own remaining I would gladly yield it. However, I have already allocated time to other Senators.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I will be very pleased to divide my time with the Senator from Georgia if that will help him.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Maine is gracious, as usual, and I thank her from the bottom of my heart for extricating me from the dilemma in which I unwittingly find myself.

I therefore allocate to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] the time he has taken out of the time so graciously given to me by the distinguished and able Senator from Maine, and I again thank her for her courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So the record will be clear, at the time referred to by the acting majority leader, neither of the Senators in charge of the time or any of the Senators named on the list were on the floor. Therefore when the

Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] rose the Chair assumed it was with the understanding of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I rise to oppose Reorganization Plan No. 2. Under the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, the President has limited authority to submit plans for reorganization to Congress, which in turn has the power either to accept or reject. Reorganization Plan No. 2 is an unlimited grant of authority to an appointive official, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make changes without submitting them either to the President or to Congress for approval or rejection.

I have listened carefully to Senators who have told us today what the Secretary of Agriculture will or will not do if Reorganization Plan No. 2 becomes effective. I must remind them, however, that the Secretary himself has declined to tell Congress what he would do. I should like to ask them, Mr. President, if they speak with the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture so that he is bound by their statements?

It appears strange to me that Senators are in a position to tell this body what the Secretary of Agriculture would do, when he himself has repeatedly said that he did not know what he would do. I am surprised that Members of this body today are supporting a reorganization plan which is very similar, even identical, in substance, with one which they so strenuously opposed but 3 short years ago.

They opposed the plan then when there was in office a Secretary of Agriculture who, in my judgment, was seeking to do all he could for the American farmer. They support the plan today when there is in office a Secretary of Agriculture who in my judgment, will do all he can to the American farmer. They support the plan today to give the Secretary of Agriculture great powers to diminish or impair a program which he himself does not favor and which, in my judgment, will be a club in the hand of the Secretary of Agriculture to destroy our great agricultural program.

Mr. President, it has required 20 years to build the farm program. It is a program of laws, carefully worked out and laboriously developed. It is a program which has been developed by the Congress of the United States after deliberation, after debate, after discussion, and after the very greatest effort possible to build the best program that could be devised.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am so limited in time that I must say I cannot yield, much as I should like to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, if Reorganization Plan No. 2 is approved today we will have in 5 hours given to 1 man authority to impair, even destroy, the usefulness of a program which Congress itself has over the years so laboriously struggled to build up.

If Congress wants to abandon the farm program it should have the courage to do so legislatively, instead of placing the ax in the hand of an executive appointee who, in my judgment will do what I do not believe Members of this body would have the courage to do legislatively. If we do not wish to abandon this great farm program, then why should we surrender the power to a Secretary of Agriculture whose purpose, in my judgment, is to scuttle and destroy that program?

Mr. President, if we wish to have that program killed, we should do it ourselves, by direct legislative action, and should not permit it to be done indirectly by a grant of authority to one who, in my judgment, would do so if he could.

I do not believe this is the Benson plan. The Secretary of Agriculture has stated publicly that there will be no Benson farm program.

Mr. President, this plan is not the Hoover Commission plan, because when a very similar plan was before the Congress, as I recall, 7 out of 8 members of the task force of the Hoover Commission assigned to agricultural matters appeared before the committee in opposition to the plan.

Mr. President, I believe this plan is the Hoover plan. In the record of the hearings, I notice a letter from the Waldorf Astoria Towers, in New York City, addressed to the committee, supporting this reorganization plan. That letter of endorsement does not bear the signature of the Hoover Commission; it does not bear the signature of the members of the task force of the Hoover Commission. That letter of endorsement of this reorganization plan, which comes from the Waldorf Astoria Towers, bears the signature of Herbert Hoover; and I think the Members of this body should know and should recognize that when they endorse and approve this reorganization plan, they are implementing, not the Benson plan, not the Eisenhower plan, not the Hoover Commission plan, but the Hoover plan.

Mr. President, I think Mr. Benson is a good man but I wish to say that the farmers of Oklahoma do not trust him. They do trust the President of the United States—that is, many of them do—they do trust this Congress—that is, most of them do. But I wish to say that this plan does not authorize the President to do something to their farm program. This plan does not authorize the Congress to do something to their farm program. This plan authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, whom they do not trust, to take charge of, and do something to, their program.

Mr. President, I say it is a black and dark day indeed, and a bleak outlook, when American farmers are placed in such a position that they can look only to Ezra Taft Benson for the preservation and operation of the farm plan which means so much to them.

Members of this body have said they do not know what Mr. Benson's program is; and I do not know what he would do under this plan, except that I must believe that what he would do would be consistent with the public utterances he has made; and he has said two things which, in my judgment, give us all the knowledge we need to enable us to act intelligently on this reorganization plan.

Mr. Benson has said to a committee of the Congress that, in his judgment, the Department of Agriculture must support all farm products or no farm products; and there is not a Member of this body who does not know that Mr. Benson is unalterably opposed to the support of all farm products, and therefore we must conclude that he is opposed to the support of any farm products.

He made another statement which gives us enlightenment on his attitude with reference to the farm program. He said the only program of cooperation or assistance he would endorse would be one of insuring American farmers against undue disaster. I should like to say that he did not even tell us when disaster would stop and when undue disaster would begin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes allotted to the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] who spoke earlier this afternoon. I think he covered most of the points very thoroughly, and I am in complete agreement with his attitude toward this measure.

I also wish to say, by way of preliminary statement, that the presentation of this plan in the form in which it has been submitted only fortifies my belief that I was correct in voting for the McClellan amendment affecting reorganization plans which was voted on earlier. That amendment, as will be recalled, provided that reorganization plans could be disapproved by a simple majority of the Senators present. When I see the so-called plan now before us, I am all the surer that that was a correct procedure, and I regret that the Senate did not adopt that particular change, as proposed.

Mr. President, this issue is an extremely important one in my State. Judging by my mail and other communications from my constituents, there have been few issues in recent years of as much concern to the farmers of Arkansas. I regret very much that they are so divided in their opinions on this matter. After the debate on this issue and the statements which have been made today, I think a great deal of that division will evaporate.

This was not the case in 1950, when Reorganization Plan No. 4 was presented. I opposed that plan; and in doing so, I believe I had the overwhelming support of the farmers of Arkansas. As a matter of fact, the opposition to that plan was virtually unanimous in the Senate, where the plan was defeated. The opposition was so overwhelming that, notwithstanding the requirement that 49 Senators must vote against a plan, in order to defeat it, there was not even a yea-and-nay vote on the resolution of disapproval. The Presiding Officer simply announced, "A majority of the authorized membership of the Senate having voted in the affirmative, the resolution (of disapproval) is agreed to."

What were the reasons for disapproving the plan in 1950, and how do they apply to the present plan?

The plan was disapproved by the committee in 1950 by a vote of 10 to 3. The majority report of the committee clearly spells out the reasons for its opposition to the 1950 plan, as follows:

This is not a reorganization plan. It is simply a proposal to have Congress delegate all of its legislative authority to the Secretary of Agriculture. It would take away from Congress any authority to pass on organizations within the Department of Agriculture, and might pave the way for the potential disruption of the entire farm program conceived by the Congress after nearly a century of constant study and development. The risk involved under such a proposal dwarfs any possible improvements that might result from the plan's adoption.

The hearings also clearly disclose the reasons for the defeat of the plan in 1950. Merely as examples, let me quote from the testimony of two witnesses who testified, in behalf of their organizations, in opposition to the plan.

First, I shall quote from the testimony of Mr. Romeo E. Short, then vice president of the National Farm Bureau Federation, and a highly respected farm leader from my State. I particularly wish to quote him because I have known him for many years and I have the highest respect for him; and, in most cases, on important questions I have been entirely in agreement with him, especially as regards our foreign policy and the way it affects agriculture. I think he has been one of the most enlightened leaders in agriculture on that question.

So now I wish to quote what he said, as his statement appears on pages 50 and 51 of the hearings on plan No. 4 of 1950:

Reorganization Plan No. 4 is really not a plan. A plan should have recommendations, framework, and structure. Plan 4 does not have these. It is therefore not a plan. Section 1 (a) reads:

"Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions of all other officers of the Department of Agriculture, and all functions of all agencies, employees of such Department."

These words clearly transfer a general and broad grant of authority for reorganization to be effected without compliance with the Reorganization Act of 1949; that is, without reference back to Congress for approval or rejection. * * *

We would like to call attention to the fact that the legislative history of the Reorganization Act indicates that the reorganization plans submitted to Congress would be in some detail, so that the Congress would know, and everyone else would know something about the direction the reorganization was taking.

In his statement, Mr. Short further says:

Reorganization plans are supposed to go into considerable detail, thus enabling the Congress to have some check on authority granted in the Reorganization Act.

The section which Mr. Short quoted may be compared to the following section of the plan now before us:

SECTION 1. (a) Subject to the exceptions specified in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions not now vested in him of all other officers, and of all agencies and employees, of the Department of Agriculture.

As pointed out by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] the two sections are almost identical.

Another witness, Mr. William Rhea Blake, an old friend of mine, executive vice president of the National Cotton Council, testified as follows, quoting from page 41 of the hearings:

Under plan 4, if the Congress permits it to go into effect, as we see it, the Secretary could do exactly what the Hoover Commission recommended. He could also do exactly opposite from what the Hoover Commission recommended, or he could do nothing, or he could do anything in between. We do not think that is in keeping with either the spirit or the letter of the Hoover Commission report.

I want to make this clear. What I am saying about the Secretary is not directed at the present Secretary; it is directed at whoever may be Secretary of Agriculture, because under this plan the authority to reorganize now and then next year reorganize again, and keep on reorganizing in the future is vested in whoever may be the Secretary of Agriculture.

We do not feel that that broad grant of authority to any Secretary of Agriculture, as I say, is either in keeping with the spirit or the letter of the Hoover Commission recommendations.

It is very clear that the primary and overriding reason for the opposition to and the defeat of Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950 was the fact that it granted to the Secretary of Agriculture, in perpetuity, regardless of who happened to hold the office at any particular time, the right and power to organize the Department as he sees fit.

A great effort has been made in some of the testimony on this plan and in the report which the Senate Committee on Government Operations has issued, to distinguish it from Plan No. 4 of 1950.

None of these distinctions in my opinion has any relation whatsoever to the basic identity of the two plans, which is that they simply relinquish to the Secretary of Agriculture, whoever he may be in the future, the authority to organize the Department as he sees fit. Nor do these distinctions have any relation to the basic objection that neither of these plans is in fact a plan, that they do not disclose to the Congress nor to the public what the organization of the Department will be at any time in the future.

Many of my constitutents have written to me suggesting that they are in favor of the plan because they believe it to be a method of arriving at a particular form of organization, National, State, or local, which they favor. I am utterly unable to tell them whether or not this plan, if adopted, will lead to the form of organization which they favor, for the simple reason that there is no indication in the plan as to what this or any future Secretary of Agriculture will do. However, I am sure that if I approve this plan, I shall be held acountable by my constituents for what results from it. My farmer constituents have looked to the Congress as having some jurisdiction and control over agricultural matters, and quite properly so. How I could explain and justify to them that I have surrendered my personal responsibility in this field to any future Secretary of Agriculture I do not know.

As I have said, an attempt has been made to distinguish this plan from Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950. The distinctions are not sufficient to constitute a difference in my opinion. However, I should like to mention one or two of them.

It has been said that this plan prohibits the use of transferred unexpended balances for any purpose other than that for which the appropriation was originally made. In my opinion this was equally true of Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950. That this is also the opinion of Secretary Benson is evident from his testimony before the committee, at page 151 of the hearings, as follows:

Section 4 (4) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, contains a similar requirement and this limitation upon expenditures of appropriations is doubtless applicable to any plan transmitted pursuant to the act.

This, therefore, is not a difference.

The point is also made that the plan would place the administration of farm programs close to State and local levels. This provision apparently appeals to many people in my State who have cited it as a reason for their approval of the plan. The exact provision of the plan is found in section 4 (c) which reads as follows:

In carrying out subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall seek to simplify and make efficient the operation of the Department of Agriculture, to place the administration of farm programs close to the State and local levels, and to adapt the administration of the programs of the Department to regional, State, and local conditions.

Obviously, this provision is merely a general one admonishing the Secretary to do what everyone would like to have done. There is, of course, a great difference of opinion as to what organizational steps would accomplish these generally desirable goals. This provision has the defect of the so-called plan itself in that it is not specific as to the method which is to be followed and it in no way diminishes the complete power of the Secretary, or any future Secretary, under section 4 of the plan to "from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate," with respect to the powers given him under the plan.

Mr. President, I did not oppose Reorganization Plan No. 4 in 1950 merely because Mr. Brannan happened to be Secretary of Agriculture. Rather I was persuaded by my own powers of reason, and by persons in whom I had confidence, that the plan was as it was described in the testimony I have quoted. By the same token I am not opposed to this plan, so-called, because Mr. Benson happens to be Secretary of Agriculture. I oppose it because, notwithstanding the small improvements and the window dressing, it is essentially the same plan with precisely the same defects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has had assigned to him 15 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may I inquire whether that is all the time remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 16 minutes more, 15 of which have been allocated to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield 3 minutes of my time to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it seems clear to me that the fact this plan has advanced as far as it has is quite a tribute to the honor and integrity and confidence of the Congress in the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. He is a man of great honor and character, and he brings to his office fine, high ideals for true public service. If that were the only question involved here, I am sure this plan would be approved perhaps by a unanimous vote. But Congress finds itself confronted with a situation in which there is no time limit placed upon the application of this plan. We find that it is, in effect, general legislation carrying vast powers, that can be exercised not once but many times.

So it is not solely a question of what the present Secretary of Agriculture will do; it is also a question of what his successors may do—not one but perhaps several.

Therefore, it is placed in the lap of the Congress to decide what it shall do with reference to this unlimited grant of perpetual power to an office rather than to an officer. This primary responsibility rests on the Congress. I voted against the reorganization plan 3 years ago, and I am compelled to oppose this one for the reasons already stated. To my mind, it is clearly far beyond the concept of the original reorganization act providing for reorganization plans.

I think there is no doubt that, so far as Mr. Benson's efforts are concerned, he would do the best job he could. Someone else could come along, though as a successor to Mr. Benson, and set up an entirely different plan. Moreover, as I read the plan itself, it refers not only to powers now existing in various agricultural acts but also to powers which may hereafter be placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture by bills to be passed later by the Congress.

In order to keep future power from passing under the provisions of this plan, it would be necessary to write a provision in bills that may be passed hereafter, providing that the power shall not be transferred under this reorganization plan.

If another plan should be submitted with a reasonable time limitation on it, and at least a bare outline of the highlights of what is contemplated by the present Secretary of Agriculture, I think I would be glad to support it. Under the present circumstances, I do not think we can abandon the responsibility that is primarily that of the Congress. Especially there should be a time limitation, and we should know something about the highlight of the plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired. The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has 12 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have been interested in reorganization of the executive branch of the Government ever since and even before I served on the Hoover Commission. I have been interested, however, in getting reorganization with congressional approval, not reorganization by the delegation of uncontrolled and unrestricted powers to members of the Cabinet and heads of the different agencies of the Government.

Knowing that Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950 had been rejected by the Senate, when I learned that this plan was being submitted by the President I had hopes that it would take cognizance of what had before transpired and that it would be a reorganization plan in the proper sense of that term.

When it was first submitted, Mr. President, I glanced at it and could not see any great difference between it and plan No. 4 of 1950, which the Senate had rejected. But I did not then announce my position in opposition to it. I confidently hoped that the Secretary of Agriculture would come before the appropriate committees of the Congress, particularly the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and lay before that committee and the Senate a definite plan and program spelled out that would justify us in approving the plan and permitting it to go into effect. Therefore, Mr. President, I waited in that hope and in that expectation until such time as the Secretary testified. I was not a member of the subcommittee on reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, but I attended the hearings and was extended the courtesy by the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Maine, of interrogating the Secretary. After hearing him testify and after having heard the answers he gave to questions propounded to him by members of the subcommittee, I was greatly disappointed. I was gratified by one thing, however, and that was the complete frankness and honesty of the Secretary in acknowledging and admitting that he had no plan whatsoever.

Mr. President, it is well to be factual and realistic about this matter. This purported and so-called Reorganization Plan No. 2 is no plan at all. It is simply a request for a delegation of power by the Congress, a delegation of power to the Secretary of Agriculture unaccompanied by a plan to implement that delegation of power. It may be argued from now until Congress adjourns that there is a difference between this plan and that of 1950. There is one additional agency excepted in this plan, but aside from that, Mr. President, there is no basic difference whatsoever, because subsection (c) of section 4 of the plan No. 2 which is before us is nothing in the world but an expression by Congress of a pious hope that the powers delegated will be exercised in a certain direction, and there is no binding requirement that will compel the Secretary to move in that direction once this plan is enacted. Even if he undertook conscientiously to carry out the provisions of subsection (c), Mr. President, the Senate might completely disagree with him as to whether his methods and his approach would produce the desired results.

Let those who expect to vote for this plan quit kidding themselves. If this is the proper way to legislate, let us simplify it. All we have to do is to enact one amendment to the original Reorganization Act and say the President has authority under the law, whenever he wants a department reorganized, to transfer all the functions of every agency in that department to the Secretary, and the Secretary then may then redistribute them and reorganize the department in any way he may desire and as often or as frequently as he may choose.

That is all this plan provides. There is no limitation or restriction other than as to the four agencies specifically exempted. Why go at it piecemeal? We can save our time and quit making ourselves ridiculous. We are doing by piecemeal what we would not dare to do by an amendment to the original Reorganization Act, and we know it.

I have no quarrel with Secretary Benson, Mr. President. I have much confidence in him in many respects. I would not give some Secretaries we have had in the past as much power as I would be willing to delegate to Secretary Benson. I do not know who his successor will be. I do not know whether I would give his successor the same powers, but of the past four Secretaries of Agriculture, including the present one, there were two to whom I would not have given such powers, and neither would any other Senator now serving in this body.

We are asked to delegate broad and sweeping powers that will be in perpetuity. If a serious difference arises, Mr. President, in the future between the Secretary of Agriculture and the President on the one hand, and the Congress of the United States on the other, we shall have delegated the executive branch the power to legislate, and if a program with which we do not agree is put into operation, it becomes permanent unless Congress should or can by law repeal it. We then place ourselves in the position of having to pass a law over a Presidential veto by a two-thirds majority of both Houses. Now let us take a look. Here comes the Secretary before us and says, "I have a plan to reorganize the department. Here it is." When we read it we find it is nothing but a delegation of power.

Following the interrogation of the Secretary by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, I asked him specifically as to four of the six agencies over which he says he does not now have authority to reorganize. I asked him specifically as to the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farm and Home Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Forestry Service. I said, "Mr. Secretary, what do you propose to do with them if you are given this power? What is your plan? They are four of the six agencies this plan would effect."

He did not have a plan. He could not tell us one thing he would do with all, any or either of them.

Mr. President, I have just been handed a letter which has been delivered to

the junior Senator from South Carolina in the course of the debate this afternoon, in which the Secretary of Agriculture, in reply to an inquiry from the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, said:

As of this moment—as a preliminary answer to all the questions which you propounded in your letter of May 15, I wish to state that we have not at present—

More than 4 months after he took office—

We have not at present determined upon the advocacy of any major change in any of the fields of activity contemplated in the reorganization plan.

Not a major change in his mind at the moment, not a major plan, not even an abbreviated detail of a plan of any kind.

We are asked to give him this power whenever he makes up his mind. He used the word "advocacy." He does not have to advocate anything, Mr. President. By a stroke of the pen he can put the order into effect once we give him the authority he is now seeking.

Mr. President, I had hoped—and I say this to my Republican friends in all kindness—I had hoped a change in administration meant some change in the attitude of the executive department of this Government toward a reorganization of government.

These plans were before Congress in the past administration, and Congress turned them down. In the last administration we turned down a plan similar to this, and we turned down many other plans. Therefore I am unwilling to give to the present administration and the present Secretary of Agriculture what I refused to give to the last administration, notwithstanding the making of allowance for the difference in confidence some of us may have in different personalities.

I heard the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] interrogate the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] about the continuation of power. I do not know whether in 2 months, 3 months, or 6 months the present Secretary of Agriculture may not have encountered such difficulties, one way or another, that he will have resigned his position. He may be out of office for other reasons. I do not know who his successor may be. Secretaries, like Senators, come and go. But when the nomination of his successor comes before the Senate for confirmation, do Senators think the nominee will be interrogated about these powers? No. The Senate will inquire only into his character and general qualifications. We are now about to delegate these powers in perpetuity to the present Secretary of Agriculture and all his successors.

This type or form of legislation, this approach by way of a reorganization plan, is bringing about a deterioration of the legislative responsibility of the Congress of the United States. Whenever plans of this character have come before Congress, not only in this administration, but in the past administration, they have been plans for the delegation of power, and nothing else. If Congress grants such power, it is then a party to tearing down and abdicating the responsibility that should be guarded, cherished, and preserved.

Mr. President, this is not the first time I have used the words "grab of power." I used them in connection with one of President Truman's plans. A day or two later I was called to the White House and taken to task for doing so. But there is no head of a party, and there is no party, to whom or to which I am willing to abdicate the powers and responsibilities that are reposed by the Constitution in the Congress. We have the final responsibility. We may delegate the powers that we are entrusted with to others, but Mr. President, we cannot shirk or evade the final responsibility and accountability.

This plan should be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If I have any time remaining, I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the senior Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If there is any time left on the other side, which I might utilize, I should be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that 1 minute still remains of the time of the Senator from Georgia, to be allocated to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], who is not now on the floor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement on the question before the Senate be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLEMENTS

Before submitting my objections to the proposed reorganization plan for the Department of Agriculture, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, I would like to review the criteria that the Congress set up to govern the submission of such plans.

The Reorganization Act of 1949 provides that the President "shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a)" of the act.

Section 2 (a) states that the President shall examine the reorganization of the various Government agencies and determine the changes required to accomplish the following purposes:

1. To promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

2. To reduce expenditure and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

3. To increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

4. To group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

5. To reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

6. To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

At the outset, let me say that I am in favor of a reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. It has been my experience, both in State governmental administration and since coming to the Senate, that changing times and conditions require shifts in the operations of the various governmental establishments. This is particularly true in the field of agriculture, which has progressed at an astonishing rate since the turn of the century. There is no doubt that there should be a change of emphasis on programs in the Department and I am thinking principally at this time of our export trade. I am glad to see that the Foreign Agricultural Service has been given additional responsibilities by the Secretary and it is my hope that he will go even further in his efforts to promote a steadily increasing market abroad for the tremendous production output reached by our farmers.

If I may interpolate at this point, I would like to see early action by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on a bill introduced last March by my good friend, Senator MUNDT, S. 1369, and of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, to set up a Foreign Trading Division in the Commodity Credit Corporation. I am convinced that the objective of this bill is sound, and I am also convinced that from this start we could capitalize on the trading ability of the American exporter to increase substantially the export of United States agricultural commodities.

Now, in analyzing Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, it becomes quite obvious that it is not an actual reorganization plan by the widest stretch of the imagination. Instead, it is merely a request for approval to delegate to the Secretary of Agriculture the broad authorities of the President, without stating the scope or intent of the administration with respect to anticipated changes. The plan is almost identical to the reorganization plan for the Department of Agriculture submitted to the Congress by President Truman in 1950. This plan, it may be recalled, was disapproved by a majority of the Senate in May 1950, because it did not comply with the basic requirements of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

In view of the marked resemblance of this plan to the 1950 plan, I ask your indulgence to reflect upon the wisdom emanating from the witnesses appearing before the 1950 hearings in opposition to that plan. It is my thought that these witnesses had excellent arguments in their favor, although—I must confess—it does seem that they have been subjected to the new "brainwashing" process since January of 1953. I would first refer to the remarks made by Mr. Romeo E. Short, then vice president, American Farm Bureau Federation, now the director of the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Short, a likely prospect for nomination for one of the new assistant secretaryships called for under this plan, stated and I quote him:

"Reorganization Plan No. 4 is really not a plan. A plan should have recommendations, framework, and structure. Plan No. 4 does not have these. It is, therefore, not a plan. • • • Reorganization plans are supposed to go into considerable detail, thus enabling the Congress to have some check on authority granted in the Reorganization Act. Therefore, we want to say that by reason of the fact that plan No. 4 is really not a plan—just a grant of authority without congressional check—we feel it should be rejected."

And then there is the statement presented by Mr. John H. Davis, of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. Mr. Davis is now the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and, I understand, destined also for one of the new positions established under the plan. Mr. Davis stated:

"There are various plans that are up for discussion, and it seems to us that it is very difficult and unwise to try to reorganize the Department until we know what kind of farm plan the Department is to carry out."

Mr. Davis goes on to say:

"We feel that Congress should assume the responsibility for laying out of the general outline of organization at the time Congress lays out the general outline of basic farm policy."

Having the statement of Mr. Davis fresh in our minds, let us move forward to the 25th of March 1953, and the appearance of Secretary Benson before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In speaking of the 1953 plan, Secretary Benson said:

"We look upon reorganization in the Department as a continuing effort, with changes to be made as they appear appropriate and desirable. * * * No conclusions have as yet been reached with respect to any specific changes, and it would be unwise to make any attempt to anticipate what the final conclusions will be."

The above remarks were directed to the committee on the same day, March 25, that Reorganization Plan No. 2 was transmitted to the Congress by the President, and have been reiterated time and again by Secretary Benson since its introduction.

The tacit approval by these gentlemen today, and I refer to Mr. Short and Mr. Davis, of the 1953 plan is most interesting, and I hope at some later time to discover the secret of their pronounced agility in fence-hopping.

More interesting to the Senate perhaps than the statements attributed to the foregoing gentlemen, is the calm serenity of those in the Congress that just a short while ago were adamant for the inclusions of details in the 1950 plan. Among these stalwart opponents was our esteemed chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Senator AIKEN, who stated, in part, during debate on the floor of the Senate on May 18, 1950:

"So, Mr. President, I should dislike very much to give this power to the Secretary of Agriculture at this time, and have the Congress recess later this summer without any action having been taken by the Congress, only to find that as soon as Congress recessed certain changes which would be objectionable to the Congress, such as dismemberment of the Extension Service, would be put into effect, at a time when Congress would be unable to make any correction or to do anything about it."

Our esteemed chairman was seconded by our distinguished colleague from Kansas, Senator SCHOEPPEL, who said, in part, and I quote him:

"This plan, Mr. President, gives the Secretary a blank check authorising him to reorganize the Department in any manner without a guide or restraint as to when or how it is to be done. I am opposed to granting this directionless discretion. I submit that this resolution (to disapprove) should be adopted and that the President should then submit a plan based on the report of the (Hoover) Commission."

With confidence in the sincerity of President Eisenhower, it has been the aim and effort of the minority to aid and assist him in the initiation of his programs. This has not been the easiest of tasks as we have been subjected to much pulling and tugging by the various blocs within his administration. Despite this we have endeavored to assist him, I repeat, and any modest assistance given has been done gladly, and with the interest of our country paramount in our hearts.

I am convinced, however, that the principle of unbridled authority, apparent in this plan, is not in the interest of agriculture or of our Nation and should not be adopted. This is not a partisan objection from my standpoint. I would like to emphasize that although I was not a Member of the Senate in 1950, it a matter of public record that I was opposed to the 1950 plan, and for the same reason stated today. And I might say, the conclusion I reached becomes sounder to me with each public utterance from officials of the Department, in commenting on the plan. For instance, during the week of April 20, before a group of farm editors, the Assistant Secretary, Mr. J. Earl Coke, was asked what changes could be expected in the soil conservation programs under the reorganization. Mr. Coke replied that no specific plans had been written for such changes. An editor then asked Mr. Coke the following question: "With all due respect, do you mean to say that if the proposal passes Congress nobody here (in the Department) knows what will happen?" Mr. Coke replied: "I suspect you are right." The tragic part about this interchange is that I am convinced that Mr. Coke was completely sincere, and undoubtedly correct in his answer to this question. I cannot believe that the Congress should be expected to turn over the authority implied in this plan to such a group of confused officials, as represented by the foregoing statement, and other statements released by Department officials. There are many questions that should be answered before action on this plan is taken by the Congress. And these answers should be in the plan, not just off-the-cuff opinions obtained during hearings. For instance, what is the future role of the Soil Conservation Service? The rural electrification program? The Extension Service? PMA and the farmer-committeeman system?

So, in conclusion, I say let the administration come forward with a real plan, a plan complete with details. Let us have a plan with substance and a sound course charted within its framework. Given such a plan I am convinced that it would receive the overwhelming support of the Congress.

In the absence of such a plan before us today, however, it is my conviction that the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia should be adopted.

Mr. DWORSHAK rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] for an amount of time to be determined when the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] shall have returned to the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Idaho has been allotted 20 minutes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks which have been made by the opponents of this reorganization plan. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I was able to attend the hearings and to listen to testimony presented by both sides on this issue. I listened with much interest particularly to the remarks of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], because I recall that in the past 2 years, he and I, as members of the Committee on Government Operations, have opposed some reorganization plans. There was a personality involved in some plans, and especially, when we remember what happened in 1950 to Reorganization Plan No. 4, involving the Department of Agriculture.

It is my understanding that during the past few years, since the enactment of the reorganization law granting authority for such plans, all major departments have been reorganized with the sole exception of the Department of Agriculture, which remains as the only agency of that status which has been denied the authority granted to all other Federal departments. Why should there be discrimination against this Department?

I am certain that even the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas will admit that this plan contains the essence of authority to be granted to a man in whom absolute confidence has been placed by the American people—yes, by the leaders of the agricultural movement.

A few minutes ago I heard the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma endeavor to inject a political overtone into this debate. I feel certain he did not intend to disparage this reorganization plan primarily because he alleged it reflected the views and the thinking of former President Herbert Hoover. So far as I am concerned, I do not hesitate to stand in the Senate and to support most of the views presented by that distinguished patriot who, in the twilight of his political career, is recognized as an outstanding American, who has no other concern except the welfare of the American people, and certainly that includes the American farmer.

The rank and file of farmers will have their ears attuned to any proposals which may stem from the granting of this authority. Consequently, I feel that there is ample safeguard, as well as assurance, that Secretary Benson will not attempt to do anything which may abuse the power and authority granted to him under this reorganization plan.

The approval of this plan will permit the establishment of clear lines of responsibility and authority from the President through the Secretary of Agriculture down to the lowest level of operations. The problem of placing responsibility in officials of the Government and authorizing them to redelegate part of their responsibility to subordinates is one which has received considerable discussion in the Halls of Congress, and has been under study by students and experts in public administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I prefer not to yield until I have concluded. Then I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho declines to yield to the Senator from Illinois until he has concluded his speech.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The senior Senator from Oklahoma charged that the Secretary of Agriculture might attempt to scuttle and destroy the farm program. I am certain that the Senator from Oklahoma does not contend that the Secretary of Agriculture would deliberately and arbitrarily seek to destroy or undermine our farm program. The question may be asked, "What is that farm program?" Such questions have been asked over a period of many years. However, we know that if this reorganization plan is approved by the Senate today, and if it is not rejected by the House of Representatives, the Repub-

lican Party, currently in control of the legislative and executive branches of the Government, must take the consequences for any inept or unwise or indiscreet policies which may result under the authority granted by this reorganization plan.

Some persons may contend that we are taking too great a chance; that we are gambling on the possibility that the Secretary of Agriculture may make a misstep which would have serious implications, so far as the prestige and standing of the Republican Party are concerned. I think our good friends on the other side of the aisle who are opposed to this plan should take cognizance of that aspect of the reorganization plan, because we who are supporting the plan, on the basis that there is an essential need for greater efficiency and economy within the Department of Agriculture, are placing our faith and confidence in the integrity and ability of the Secretary of Agriculture to do a job which will be so effective that it will be satisfactory to farm leaders and to Congress.

The Hoover Commission recognized this problem and established what I believe is a sound approach to a solution of it by stating that "essentials of effective organization," are not only necessary but without it all other steps to improve organization and management are doomed to fail. In this connection the Commission stated:

> The President, and under him his chief lieutenants, the department heads, must be held responsible and accountable to the people and the Congress for the conduct of the executive branch.
>
> Responsibility and accountability are impossible without authority—the power to direct. The exercise of authority is impossible without a clear line of command from the top to the bottom, and a return line of responsibility and accountability from the bottom to the top.
>
> Definite authority at the top, a clear line of authority from top to bottom, and adequate staff aids to the exercise of authority do not exist. Authority is diffused, lines of authority are confused, staff services are insufficient. Consequently, responsibility and accountability are impaired.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 is similar in some respects to Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950, except that in the plan which is presently pending before the Congress, certain changes have been made in order to strengthen the plan, and to help clarify some of the specific authorizations which are not permitted to be transferred, or which may be changed when conditions justify such reorganization. In Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 the functions of the Farm Credit Administration, or any agency, officer, or entity of such Administration, are not transferred to the Secretary.

The plan further provides that before the Secretary of Agriculture transfers any major functions or major groups of functions to other constituent units of the Department, he shall give appropriate advance public notice of such proposed transfers and afford interested persons and groups an opportunity to express their views.

In this connection, Mr. President, when the Secretary testified before the committee, he said that:

> The Secretary, under this plan, is under definite obligation to consult with farmers, leaders of farm organizations, Members of the Congress, and other interested groups, and to serve notice of any plan he intends to put into operation before he takes such action, and get their views and recommendations.

The Secretary is also required in reorganizing the Department to simplify and make more efficient the operations of the Department and place the administration of farm programs close to State and local levels and adapt the administration of the programs to regional, State, and local conditions. In my opinion, these safeguards were placed in the reorganization plan to assure everyone concerned that when the Secretary of Agriculture regroups or reorganizes some of the bureaus, offices, and agencies within the Department he will do everything possible to obtain the advice, counsel, and guidance of those who are interested in the programs under consideration, and try to make the programs operate in such a manner as to implement the local programs. This objective will help to allay the fears that have been created during the past that the Secretary of Agriculture was attempting to establish an organization whereby he would maintain push-button controls. In other words, instead of all the direction, advice, and information flowing out of Washington, such information will be flowing into Washington from the grass roots and it will be used in the Department for the purpose of improving the administration, rather than promoting programs which the farmers and people throughout the country do not want, or are not prepared on the local level to accept.

Another safeguard that was placed in this plan was the requirement in section 5 that when funds are transferred from one organizational unit to another within the Department for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the reorganization plan, such funds shall be expended only for the purpose for which such appropriations were originally made. I believe that this is a marked improvement over Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950, because it definitely requires the Secretary to use the funds at his command in accordance with the way they were justified to Congress, and for the purpose and object for which such funds were appropriated. This restriction should allay any fear or doubt in the minds of those who suspect that funds may be transferred from one organizational unit to another in order to promote one program at the expense of another. We have seen in numerous instances in the past that when the Congress of the United States gave certain individuals in the executive branch authority to carry out certain activities or programs, the interpretation of such authority, and exercise of the authority which Congress thought was being granted, turned out to be entirely different from what was intended; and as a result funds were transferred and used for certain programs and activities which was not intended.

Mr. President, it appears to me that this plan is a big improvement over the one that was rejected by the Senate in 1950. The safeguards which I have enumerated and which other Members of the Senate have explained should overcome any apprehension or doubt regarding the exercise of the authority contained in this plan. I realize that a complete detailed plan or a blueprint of the reorganizations proposed under this plan, has not been submitted to the Congress. However, I believe that it is a bit premature, and that we are possibly asking the Secretary of Agriculture, who has been in office a little more than 100 days, to present to the Congress a complete outline of all of the transfers of functions and activities, which would freeze the organizational structure and preclude adoption of changes in programs which he may feel necessary to make during the next year or two. The Department of Agriculture is one of the largest and most important executive departments of the Government; and because of its size and complexity will require continuous study, research, and consideration in order to reorganize it in such a way as to improve administration and to obtain the greatest amount of service with the least possible cost to the taxpayer.

The question was raised several times during the hearings on this plan as to whether or not the Congress was delegating too much responsibility and authority to an appointive official of the Government; and it is noted that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who was Secretary of Agriculture during the period 1945 to 1948, appeared and testified before the committee urging that this plan be approved. It appears to me that the junior Senator from New Mexico, with his vast experience in the department, really knows the problems involved in this department, and that he made a great contribution to the Senate and to this country when he testified as follows:

> It is my personal opinion that the Secretary of Agriculture would do well to tell the Congress at this hearing what he now has in mind on the subject of reorganization, but if he is unwilling, or not ready to do so, I would still give him the clear power to reorganize his department.

This is the most persuasive statement that I have been able to obtain in the hearings, reports, and studies which have been made available on the entire subject of Government reorganization, and for this reason, together with the other reasons given above, I hope that the Senate will approve Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

During the hearings much emphasis was placed on the fact that there were many groups which are now supporting Plan No. 2 of 1953 which opposed Plan No. 4 of 1950, on the premise that they were closely related. In answer to a specific inquiry on this point addressed to Dr. Henry P. Rusk, who was chairman of the Agriculture Task Force of the Hoover Commission, he pointed out some of the reasons why there was opposition to reorganizing the Department of Agriculture in 1950. At that time, Dr. Rusk stated that there was considerable evidence of an effort on the part of those in

charge of agricultural programs to centralize control over all of our agricultural industries. He specifically stated that efforts were then under way to place PMA in a dominating position over the farmer and over farm cooperatives, banks, and other agencies which serve the farmer, and concluded that this dictational approach greatly influenced the seven members of the Agriculture Task Force of the Hoover Commission to oppose approval of Plan No. 4 of 1950 under these conditions. He concluded that the steps already taken by the present administration of the Department of Agriculture to decentralize, rather than centralize, administrative functions indicate a marked change in attitude and one which he believed is much more acceptable to the rank and file of farmers and to the Congress.

The testimony of Dr. Rusk in the hearings, in reflecting what he thought to be the views of the agriculture task force of the Hoover Commission, indicated that he had absolute confidence in the reorganization plan.

Mr. President, I should like to quote one paragraph from his statement:

> I believe that needed improvements in the obsolete organization of the United States Department of Agriculture have been too long delayed. The public interest will be served most effectively by prompt action to dispel the uncertainty and lack of authoritative direction that are hampering some areas of work in the Department.
>
> This plan is directed toward changes that are in substantial accord with the Hoover Commission recommendations. The initial steps already taken by the Secretary are in harmony with the intent of those recommendations.

Another statement made by Dr. Rusk before the committee indicated that the farm leaders with whom he talked have such confidence in Secretary Benson that they feel justified in supporting the plan, notwithstanding the fact that they were opposed to the plan of 1950.

Much has been said by Senators who are in opposition to the plan about our asserting our legislative authority, and that Congress alone has the power to legislate and to safeguard the interests of agriculture.

It is significant, Mr. President, that at the hearings held recently by the Committee on Government Operations spokesmen for the National Grange, with a membership of more than 1 million members; spokesmen for the American Farm Bureau Federation, with a membership in excess of one-half million; and spokesmen for the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, indicated that they favor the plan primarily because they have confidence in the Secretary of Agriculture, with whom they have worked over a great many years.

Mr. J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel of the National Grange, in supporting the plan, stated that his organization felt that—

> There are some basic differences in this plan which guarantee an opportunity for those on the outside that are interested in sound administration of the Department of Agriculture and its programs to have something to say when major reorganizations are proposed. * * * We think that the reorganization of the Department is a continuing process which the Administrator should have the right, within certain limit, set down by the Congress, to perform.

Mr. Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in expressing the same general support of the plan as evidenced by the two above-named witnesses, stated that it was the view of his organization that—

> The initial step in good administration is to delegate to the principal officer of the Department of Agriculture clearly defined authority to act, equal to the responsibility the farmers and the public are led to believe he possesses. It is a complete anomaly to vest superior authority in heads of agencies who are presumably subordinate to the Department head. This indefensible position for most Departments of Government was corrected by the Congress when it approved reorganization plans for the Departments of Justice, Treasury, Labor, Commerce, and Interior in 1950, vesting in the Secretaries of those Departments complete authority over all agencies and functions within such Departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield me 1 additional minute?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I believe the support which has been forthcoming to the plan from these representatives of national farm organizations justifies the confidence of the Members of this body in the plan. Certainly none of us would stand on the floor of the Senate and defy the rank and file members of agricultural groups or those who earn their living in agriculture, or do something that might be inimicable to their best welfare. Therefore, I appeal for support of this plan, so the Secretary of Agriculture may do an effective job in cleaning up the Department and in safeguarding the interests of agriculture at this crucial hour in the history of our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, during the debate in 1950 on Reorganization Plan No. 4 I stated I was opposed to that plan. As I gather from the debate with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, it is the same plan as the plan of 1950. Therefore I am forced to oppose Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

I have listened attentively to the Senators on the other side of the aisle, and I have great faith and confidence in what they have said. But the present Secretary of Agriculture, in his testimony before the Committee on Agriculture, did not state a policy or principle or program. Therefore I shall stick to what I said in 1950, namely, that I do not want to delegate the authority of Congress to any man, be he Cabinet member or other official of the Government, especially one who is not elected by the people.

Mr. President, the people of Delaware are very much interested in agriculture, as are the people represented by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. We want to see the farm program brought back into the hands of the farmer, and we want to see it decentralized.

If the Secretary of Agriculture had come before the committee with a plan which would decentralize the agency and put the plan back on the farm, I could have listened to his plea and gone along with him. However, I must oppose the proposed reorganization plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, in closing the debate on the resolution, I should like to make certain observations for the purpose of clarifying the issues raised.

Some objection has been voiced on the ground that a detailed blueprint has not been submitted in the plan.

In all fairness, Mr. President, I do not think we should expect of Secretary Benson, in a period of only 4 months, to produce a detailed blueprint, when his predecessor could not produce one in 4½ years.

It has been stated that some Senators who were opposed to plan No. 4 in 1950 have reversed themselves, and that there is no material difference in the two plans.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 differs from Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950 in the following respects:

First. Functions of the Farm Credit Administration are not transferred to the Secretary.

Second. The Secretary is required to give public notice of major changes in the departmental structure, with opportunity afforded to interested persons and groups for presentation of their views.

Third. In any redistribution of functions, the Secretary is specifically required to simplify and make efficient any operations affected thereby.

Fourth. The Secretary is required to seek to place the administration of the farm programs close to the State and local levels, and to adapt the administration of programs to regional, State, and local conditions.

Fifth. A limitation is established on the transfer of any unexpended balances of appropriations to insure that they shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriations were originally made.

There has been considerable uncertainty as to the Secretary's right to abolish functions.

The Reorganization Act of 1949 specifically states:

> The President in his message transmitting a reorganization plan shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

The President did not include any reference to the abolition of functions.

It is the view of a majority of the committee that Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 does not give the Secretary of Agriculture any new enlarged discretion with respect to what functions must be performed pursuant to the laws of Congress. All that is given the Secretary is some additional discretion in choosing tools by which the functions prescribed by Congress will be performed. No present function of the Department can be abolished in whole or in part by virtue of any authority contained in the plan.

During the course of the hearings before the committee, certain witnesses raised a question as to whether or not Plan No. 2 of 1953 was in accord with the purpose and intent of the Reorganization Act of 1949. Following the close of the hearings, the Secretary of Agriculture requested the Solicitor of the Department to prepare for him a memorandum setting forth the relation of this plan to other reorganization plans of similar import that had been submitted under the Reorganization Act.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to the Secretary from Mr. Carl D. Loos, Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, in which he sets forth in detail applicable sections of the Reorganization Act of 1949, and the various actions taken by the Congress which involved reorganization plans of a similar import.

It should be pointed out in this connection that none of these plans contain restrictions incorporated in Plan No. 2 of 1953, relating to the submission of reorganizations to interested persons, requiring the administration of programs at local levels or limitations on the transfer of unexpended balances of appropriations to insure that they shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriations were originally made.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1953.

Opinion for the Secretary.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 is a reorganization plan within the meaning of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 203, approved June 20, 1949, 5 U. S. C. 133z).

As more completely detailed below, it is our opinion that Plan No. 2 of 1953 is clearly within the authorizations of the Reorganization Act of 1949 as being a transfer or consolidation of functions within the Department, and an authorization to the head of the Department to delegate his functions. Numerous plans of identical legal import have been adopted under this law, as well as under substantially identical provisions in the Reorganization Act of 1945 (5 U. S. C. sec. 133y). These plans now affect the bulk of Government agencies and have been recognized as controlling by constituted authority.

Section 8 of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, provides:

"For the purposes of this act the term 'reorganization' means any transfer, consolidation, coordination, authorization, or abolition, referred to in section 3."

Section 3 lists six classes or categories of actions, as follows:

"1. The transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

"2. The abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

"3. The consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

"4. The consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

"5. The authorization of any officer to delegate any of his functions; or

"6. The abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan will not have any functions."

The section provides that whenever one of the forgoing actions is found by the President to be necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes listed in section 2 (a) of the act, "he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan."

Section 7 of the act defines the term "agency" as meaning, among other things, "any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government." Thus, the Department of Agriculture as a whole is an agency as defined by the act. So, also, is the Secretary of Agriculture or any division or office within the Department of Agriculture.

Section 4 of the act authorizes the inclusion in any reorganization plan of changes in names or titles and provision for the appointment and compensation of new officers, such as the Assistant Secretaries.

Plan No. 2 of 1953 utilizes 3 of the 6 categories listed in section 3 of the act, namely:

"1. The transfer of the whole or any part of * * * the functions * * * [of any agency], to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency.

* * * * *

"4. The consolidation or coordination of any part of * * * the functions [of any agency] with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof.

"5. The authorization of any officer to delegate any of his functions."

* * * * *

Section 1 of the plan transfers to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions not now vested in him of all other officers and of all agencies and employees of the Department of Agriculture. This action is taken pursuant to item (1) of section 3 of the act, namely, the transfer of any part of the functions of the Department to the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary. This action may also be considered as taken pursuant to item (4) of section 3 of the act as the consolidation of any part of the functions of any agency (the functions of the Department not now vested in the Secretary), with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof (namely, the functions already vested in the Secretary). In other words, section 1 of the plan may be regarded as a transfer to the Secretary of functions presently vested in various units and officers of the Department; and it may likewise be regarded as a consolidation, under item (4) of the functions not now vested in the Secretary with the functions presently vested in him.

Section 4 of the plan authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture from time to time to make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of Agriculture of any functions of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this plan. This action is taken pursuant to item (5) of section 3 of the act, the authorization of any officer (the Secretary) to delegate any of his functions.

Sections 2 and 3 of the plan provide for Assistant Secretaries and an Administrative Assistant Secretary and are included pursuant to section 4 (2) of the act which provides that any reorganization plan may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of one or more other officers of any agency (the Department).

The remaining provision of the plan, section 5, provides for incidental transfers, pursuant to the authority of section 4 (3) and (4) of the act which requires that any reorganization plan shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any reorganization and for the transfer of unexpended balances of appropriations and other funds available for use in connection with any function affected by a reorganization.

Thus, all provisions of the plan are in conformity with the specific authorizations and requirements of the statute and as a whole they constitute a plan of reorganization as contemplated by the act.

Plan No. 2 of 1953 is also similar to and in conformity with many other plans of reorganization which have become effective under the Reorganization Act of 1949. Some 28 plans have become effective pursuant to that act prior to 1953.

Six of these twenty-eight plans relate to the reorganization of other executive departments in a manner similar to the proposed reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. These six plans are:

Post Office Department (Plan No. 3 of 1949).

Department of Justice (Plan No. 2 of 1950).

Interior Department (Plan No. 3 of 1950).

Department of Commerce (Plan No. 5 of 1950).

Department of Labor (Plan No. 6 of 1950).

Treasury Department (Plan No. 26 of 1950).

Each of these reorganization plans includes a provision for transfer of functions to the head of the department and a provision for continuing authority to the head of the department to delegate his functions.

Each of these plans contained a provision (1) for transfer of functions to the head of the department, (2) for continuing authority to the head of the department to delegate his functions or provide for their performance by any other officer or by any agency or employee of the respective departments, and (3) for incidental transfers. Each of these plans also provided for additional officers, such as Assistant Secretaries or an Administrative Assistant Secretary. None of these plans contained any other reorganization provisions. None of them set forth any detailed description of the redistribution of functions contemplated. The Comptroller General has had occasion to consider the applicability of Plan No. 3 concerning the Interior Department and Plan No. 5 concerning the Commerce Department. In each case the Comptroller General found the provisions of the plans controlling law. (See 29 Comp. Gen. 519; 30 Comp. Gen. 366.)

The provisions of sections 1 (a) and 4 (a) of Plan No. 2 of 1953 providing for transfer of functions to the Secretary and a continuing authority to the Secretary to delegate his functions are set forth below and are compared with corresponding provisions in each of the six other reorganization plans providing for reorganization of an executive department.

PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

"SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Subject to the exceptions specified in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions not now vested in him of all other officers, and of all agencies and employees, of the Department of Agriculture.

* * * * *

"SEC. 4. Delegation of functions: (a) The Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of Agriculture of

any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan."

PLAN NO. 3 OF 1949—POST OFFICE

"SECTION 1. Functions of the Postmaster General: (a) There are hereby transferred to the Postmaster General the functions of all subordinate officers and agencies of the Post Office Department, including the functions of each Assistant Postmaster General, the purchasing agent for the Post Office Department, the Comptroller and the Bureau of Accounts. (b) The Postmaster General is hereby authorized to delegate to any officer, employee, or agency of the Post Office Department designated by him such of his functions as he deems appropriate."

PLAN NO. 2 OF 1950—JUSTICE

"SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Attorney General: (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Attorney General all functions of all other officers of the Department of Justice and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department.

* * * * *

"SEC. 2. Performance of functions of the Attorney General.—The Attorney General may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of Justice of any function of the Attorney General, including any function transferred to the Attorney General by the provisions of this reorganization plan."

PLAN NO. 3 OF 1950—INTERIOR

"SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior all functions of all other officers of the Department of the Interior and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department.

* * * * *

"SEC. 2. Performance of functions of Secretary: The Secretary of the Interior may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of the Interior of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan."

PLAN NO. 5 OF 1950—COMMERCE

"SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Commerce all functions of all other officers of the Department of Commerce and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department.

* * * * *

"SEC. 2. Performance of functions of Secretary: The Secretary of Commerce may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of Commerce of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan."

PLAN NO. 6 OF 1950—LABOR

"SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Labor all functions of all other officers of the Department of Labor and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department.

* * * * *

"SEC. 2. Performance of functions of Secretary: The Secretary of Labor may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employees, of the Department of Labor of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan."

PLAN NO. 26 OF 1950—TREASURY

"SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, and subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury all functions of all other officers of the Department of the Treasury and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department."

* * * * *

(NOTE.—Section 1 (c) contains a limitation applicable to the Coast Guard.)

"SEC. 2. Performance of functions of Secretary: The Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of the Treasury of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan."

Nine of the reorganization plans which have become effective under the Reorganization Act of 1949 provided for the reorganization of boards or commissions, as follows:

Plan No. 5 of 1949, Civil Service Commission.

Plan No. 6 of 1949, United States Maritime Commission.

Plan No. 8 of 1950, Federal Trade Commission.

Plan No. 9 of 1950, Federal Power Commission.

Plan No. 10 of 1950, Securities Exchange Commission.

Plan No. 13 of 1950, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Plan No. 21 of 1950, Federal Maritime Board.

Plan No. 25 of 1950, National Security Resources Board.

Plan No. 1 of 1951, Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Each of these plans contained general provisions for the transfer of functions to the head of the board or commission and provisions authorizing such head to redistribute or delegate such functions from time to time without any limitation upon or expiration of such authority. None of them contained any detailed description of the manner in which it was contemplated the functions would be redistributed.

For example, plan No. 8 of 1950 relating to the Federal Trade Commission, contained the following provisions:

"SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Chairman: (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred from the Federal Trade Commission, hereafter referred to as the Commission, to the Chairman of the Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Chairman, the executive and administrative functions of the Commission including functions of the Commission with respect to (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the Commission, (2) the distribution of business among such personnel and among administrative units of the Commission, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds.

* * * * *

"SEC. 2. Performance of transferred functions: The Chairman may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any officer, employee, or administrative unit under his jurisdiction of any function transferred to the Chairman by the provisions of this reorganization plan."

Plan No. 1 of 1951 relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation contained the following provisions:

"SEC. 5. Functions transferred to Administrator: All functions of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, including those of the members and Chairman of the Board and including those with respect to the management of the Corporation, are hereby transferred to the Administrator, except as the said functions are otherwise vested by the provisions of sections 6 and 7 of this reorganization plan.

* * * * *

"SEC. 8. Delegation of functions: The Administrator may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate with respect to the performance by any officer, employee, or administrative unit under his jurisdiction of any function of the Administrator under the provisions of this reorganization plan."

The reorganization plans relating to other commissions or boards in this group contained similar provisions for transfer of functions to the head and continuing authority in him to redistribute and delegate such functions.

Another group of reorganization plans which have become effective under the act of 1949 related to transfers of certain functions or agencies from one department or from an independent status to another agency. There were 11 such plans, including plans Nos. 2, 4, and 7, of 1949, and 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, and 23, of 1950. While most of these plans related to a limited number of functions, each plan contained provision for the transfer of such functions to the head of the department or agency to which the transfer was made and granted continuing authority to such head to delegate or redistribute such functions in a manner similar to the authority provided by section 4 of plan No. 2 of 1953.

Only 2 of the 28 plans referred to which have become effective under the act contained provisions which could be said to be specific and limited. One of these was plan No. 14 of 1950 entitled "Labor Standards Enforcement" which established authority in the Secretary of Labor to prescribe appropriate standards, regulations, and procedures to be observed by other agencies with respect to compliance with and enforcement of labor standards. This plan was confined to this one specific purpose and did not contain any provisions of general transfer or authorization.

The other was plan No 1 of 1952, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This plan abolished certain existing offices and established new offices which were specified. The plan, however, did provide for the transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury of "the functions, if any, that have been vested by statute in officers, agencies, or employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the Department of the Treasury since the effective date of Reorganization Plan No. 26, of 1950." The plan referred to (No. 26, of 1950) has already been mentioned as one of the departmental reorganization plans which contained general, continuing authority in the head of the department to redistribute and delegate any functions vested in him. Therefore, the Bureau of Internal Revenue reorganization plan contemplates that all functions affected by that plan are subject to the continuing right of the Secretary of the Treasury to redistribute and delegate them.

The foregoing review of reorganization plans which have become effective under the current Act demonstrates that the provisions for transfer of functions to the Secretary and continuing authority in him to redistribute and delegate his functions are in conformity with the normal pattern that has been followed in the preparation and submission of

reorganization plans pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Under the procedure followed in the submission of reorganization plans under the Act, each plan is reviewed and approved by the Attorney General. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 was so reviewed and approved.

This pattern of including in reorganization plans general provisions for the transfer of functions to the head of a department and granting him continuing authority to redistribute and delegate functions became established even before the enactment of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The Reorganization Act of 1945 (in sec. 3, 5 U. S. C. 133y–1), is virtually identical with the provisions of section 3 of the 1949 act, in stating the President's functions under the act. The only substantial difference is that the 1949 act has added subsection (5) expressly providing for authorization to any official to delegate his functions (5 U. S. C. 133z–1). The Budget Bureau in discussions concerning departmental proposals under the 1945 act, recommended that transfers and consolidations within the Department be in the nature of transfers of functions to the Department head, with authority to provide for the exercise of such functions by designated officers and employees within the agency.

Plans Nos. 1, 2, and 3 of 1946 contained provisions of this type. (See 5 U. S. C. y–16 note.) Plan No. 1 of 1946, among other things, would have provided for the transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture of the functions of the several research bureaus of the Department. The plan also provided, for example, for the similar transfer of certain functions to the Secretary of State. This plan was rejected; however, the issue here involved was not raised. Plans Nos. 2 and 3 of 1946, which went into effect, included similar provisions vesting functions in the Department heads with reference to the Department of Labor, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Agriculture. This Department was involved in part V of Plan No. 3 of 1946, which transferred to the Secretary various functions which had been consolidated during wartime in the War Food Administration. In 1947 Plan No. 1 (see 5 U. S. C. y–16 note) was adopted transferring to the Secretary of Agriculture the research agency functions which had been contained in the rejected Plan No. 1 of 1946.

The interested committees of Congress have recognized the force and effect of these various reorganization plans in several reports. See, for example, report of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, dated September 13, 1950, Organization of Federal Executive Departments and Agencies, Committee Report No. 10, 81st Congress 2d session. On page 2 of that report it is stated:

"Major accomplishments in the reorganization field include the complete realinement of the Departments of Defense and State, and the creation of a General Services Administration consolidating the functions of the Federal Works Agency, the War Assets Administration, the National Archives Establishment, and the Bureau of Federal Supply. In addition, the functions of all except one of the executive departments and many of the independent establishments have been vested in the heads of the respective agencies. Authority was granted under such legislative actions which permits the chief official of such agencies to effect necessary reorganizations therein by administrative action, as recommended by the Hoover Commission."

We find nothing of record to indicate that the validity of any of these reorganization plans now in effect has been challenged on the ground that they did not constitute reorganization plans or that they did not otherwise conform to statutory requirements.

Sincerely yours,

KARL D. LOOS,
Solicitor.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, much has been said about the agencies affected. The Secretary of Agriculture explained the situation in detail, and his statement is included in the committee report. I ask unanimous consent that the detail be included in my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO THE SECRETARY

Section 1 of the plan transfers to the Secretary of Agriculture, with certain exceptions to be noted, all functions not now vested in him of all other officers and of all agencies and employees of the Department of Agriculture.

There are presently in the Department some 20 agencies. Of these, one-half have been created in such manner that their functions are vested in the Secretary and he has the present power to redistribute or delegate them.

These agencies are: Agricultural Research Administration, Production and Marketing Administration, Commodity Exchange Authority, Extension Service, Foreign Agricultural Service, Office of Budget and Finance, Office of Information, Office of Personnel, Office of Plant and Operations, Library.

With respect to the other agencies covered by this plan, many functions are vested, by statute or by prior reorganization plans under earlier statutes, in the agency itself or in the head of some other officer of the agency.

With respect to such functions the Secretary does not now have adequate authority of transfer, consolidation, or distribution.

Such agencies include: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Farmers' Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Office of the Solicitor.

The remaining four agencies, Commodity Credit Corporation, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Office of Hearing Examiners, and Farm Credit Administration, are excepted from the plan.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I urge the rejection of Senate Resolution 100.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarthy
Beall	Griswold	McClellan
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Byrd	Holland	Payne
Carlson	Hunt	Purtell
Chavez	Jackson	Robertson
Clements	Jenner	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Knowland	Sparkman
Ellender	Kuchel	Stennis
Ferguson	Langer	Symington
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Long	Welker
Fulbright	Malone	Wiley
George	Mansfield	Williams
Gillette	Martin	
Gore	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that the vote is to be taken on Senate Resolution 100, which calls for rejection of the reorganization plan, so that a vote in favor of the resolution would be a vote against the reorganization plan, and a vote in support of the plan would be a vote "nay" on the resolution; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 100. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

If present and voting the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] would each vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 29, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—29

Chavez	Hoey	McClellan
Clements	Holland	Morse
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Frear	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Fulbright	Kerr	Smathers
George	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	Langer	Sparkman
Gore	Long	Stennis
Hayden	Mansfield	Symington
Hill	Maybank	

NAYS—46

Aiken	Ferguson	Millikin
Beall	Flanders	Mundt
Bennett	Green	Pastore
Bricker	Griswold	Payne
Bridges	Hendrickson	Purtell
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Saltonstall
Byrd	Jackson	Schoeppel
Carlson	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Watkins
Douglas	Kuchel	Welker
Duff	Lehman	Wiley
Dworshak	Malone	Williams
Eastland	Martin	
Ellender	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Hennings	Monroney
Barrett	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Potter
Capehart	Kefauver	Taft
Case	Kennedy	Thye
Dirksen	Magnuson	Tobey
Goldwater	McCarran	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not having received the affirmative votes of a majority of the authorized membership of the Senate, the resolution (S. Res. 100) is rejected.

REPAIR AND REHABILITATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AIRPORTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 35) to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, notwithstanding section 17 (c) of the Federal Airport Act or any other provision of existing law, all appropriations heretofore made to the Department of Commerce pursuant to certifications made by that Department to the Congress under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, for reimbursement of public agencies for the cost of rehabilitating or repairing public airports damaged by Federal agencies, shall remain available until expended," and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to extend the authority to expend certain funds for the reimbursement of public agencies for the cost of rehabilitating or repairing public airports damaged by Federal agencies."

Mr. BRICKER. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House; ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRICKER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. GRISWOLD, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. PASTORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Frank T. Kenner for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the Coast Guard; and

Dorland H. Konichek, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Albert Pierson, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Col. Harvey R. Fraser for appointment as professor of mechanics, United States Military Academy;

Midshipman John Bellows Sturges, Jr., United States Naval Academy, class of 1953, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant;

Midshipman Philip G. Charest, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Navy and Marine Corps; and

Benjamin P. Field, Jr., and sundry other officers, for permanent appointment in the Navy.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Arthur Gardner, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Cuba;

R. Douglas Stuart, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Canada;

William T. Pheiffer, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Dominican Republic; and

Michael J. McDermott, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador.

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Edmund F. Mansure, of Illinois, to be Defense Materials Procurement Administrator.

SHORTAGE OF AMMUNITION IN KOREA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I served as a member of the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee investigating the shortage of ammunition in Korea and other matters incident thereto.

The chairman of this subcommittee, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], I desire to say, served with great capacity, courage and firmness. Senator SMITH conducted all the hearings, including testimony from the highest military officials of the Government, and evidenced a capacity to dig out the facts, which, in my judgment, contributed in a very effective manner to the development of the true conditions.

Senator SMITH was impartial but firm, and, as a member of the subcommittee, I want to pay my tribute to her for the remarkably fine service she rendered.

The conditions of inefficiency and waste, as developed by the committee, were shocking in the extreme. The inefficiency of the armed services procurement organization resulted not only in a shortage of ammunition in Korea but in the depletion of the national stockpile of ammunition, which, had a war emergency arisen or occurred soon, would have placed us in a desperate situation. All of this was notwithstanding the fact that Congress promptly made the appropriations requested by the armed services at the very beginning of the Korean war.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD the conclusions and recommendations of the subcommittee.

The Smith committee will shortly make other recommendations as to a reorganization of the ordnance and procurement divisions of the armed services.

There being no objection, the conclusions and recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

As a result of the investigation conducted by this subcommittee, evidence has been collected which establishes the fact that there has been a continuing shortage of ammunition during the entire period of the Korean war. It is absolutely clear that at some time or other the following important items were in short supply: The 4.2-inch mortar, the 81-millimeter mortar, the 105-millimeter howitzer, the 155-millimeter howitzer, and the hand grenade. On the basis of the evidence, the subcommittee concludes that—

(1) There were vast stocks of most all types of ammunition on hand at the outbreak of the Korean war. For 2 years, however, the bulk of the ammunition furnished to our troops in the field was supplied out of World War II stocks, seriously depleting these stocks.

(2) It is evident that it was the firm policy of the United States to run the Korean war without disrupting the civilian economy.

(3) From the beginning of the Korean war, the policy was established which forced the planners to assume that the war would be over on different specific dates stated in the assumptions. Beginning with September 27, 1950, the procurement agencies were directed to proceed on the assumption that the war would be ended by July 1, 1951.

From then on, even after the Chinese Communists entered the war, the same policy of fixing specific dates for the termination of the war continued for more than 2 years.

(4) In attempting to trace the accounting and budgetary procedures for the procurement of ammunition, it becomes apparent that the budgetary structure of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army is in an intolerable state. It is evident that the accounting and budgetary procedures are not functioning in the manner intended under title IV of the Unification Act. This was shockingly disclosed in many areas but particularly in the conflict between the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, Mr. McNeil, and the Comptroller of the Department of the Army, General Decker.

(5) The procurement system under the ordnance department of the armed services indicated unconscionable inefficiency, waste, and unbelievable red tape. The testimony of Mr. McNeil, comptroller of the armed services, showed that some papers for procurement traveled over 10,000 miles to some 34 units and over 154 desks before a contract was let. The testimony showed this result: That after an appropriation had been signed by the President, a month elapsed before the fund was allocated, an average of 5 months before a contract was let, and another 18 months before the first deliveries were made, making 24 months in all as the average period between the passage of an appropriation and the deliveries of ammunition.

(6) It is incontrovertible that as a result of shortages, ammunition of many types had to be rationed to the troops on the battlefield.

(7) As a result of the ammunition shortage: (a) The mission of the United Nations' forces in Korea was circumscribed; (b) there was a definite and adverse effect on United States military operations; (c) there was a needless loss of American lives.

(8) The shortage of ammunition is not in any way traceable to a lack of funds. The record reflects that the Congress was fully responsive to all budgetary requests for ammunition, and that the Army consistently failed to spend the money which was available.

(9) It is difficult to pinpoint the responsibility for the situation. The President, the State Department, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the National Security Council, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff miscalculated the aggressive designs of international communism. They did not provide the necessary guidance for the military planners. Neither did they take effective action to correct the situation when it became obvious to all parties involved. Neither G-4 of the Army, nor the Ordnance Department, whose duty it was to secure necessary production, discharged its responsibilities in a creditable fashion. Then, when the procurement of items was turned over to the Ordnance Department, the same incomprehensible inefficiency occurred in effecting reasonably prompt deliveries. The tragic situation resulting came from a combination of errors and ineffective administration which involved practically everyone in whom official responsibility has been vested.

(10) The committee concludes that there was a lack of coordination between the civilian chiefs of the armed services and the military leaders including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Former Secretary of Defense Lovett testified that he first heard of the shortage of ammunition by rumor, the former Secretary of the Army Pace testified along similar lines, while there was an admission on the part of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that no direct reports were made to the Secretary of Defense as to the reports of ammunition shortages which came to the Joint Chiefs. As the administrative control of the armed services is under the Secretary of Defense, the committee regards such actions as in conflict with the fundamental principle that the administration of the armed services should rest in the hands of civilians, as provided by law, and in the persons of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, of Navy, and Air Force.

(11) A calm and objective analysis of the testimony which has been presented before this subcommittee can lead only to the conclusion that this is a tragic episode which has been extremely costly to the American people. A repetition of this type of miscalculation and inability to plan for the defense and security of the United States could result in catastrophe for this Nation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In submitting this interim report of its findings, the subcommittee desires to continue to study the cause and effect of the problem of ammunition shortage, and to look further into our worldwide ammunition position before submitting final and constructive recommendations. In the interim the subcommittee will—

(1) Transmit the entire record of this investigation and the report of same to the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army with a request that they particularize a program or programs designed to correct the conditions described herein and designed to prevent a recurrence of such conditions. The report is also being forwarded to Mr. Bernard Baruch, World War II mobilization adviser; Gen. Brehon Somervell, wartime Chief of the Service of Supply, and Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, former Chairman of the Army and Navy Munitions Board and Chairman of the War Production Board, and others who have had broad experience in this field, for constructive recommendations.

(2) Request a monthly report from the Secretary of Defense as to the adequacy of available ammunition supplies until such time as this committee decides that the problem has been resolved, and every 6 months thereafter.

(3) Urge the Senate Armed Services Committee to conduct a specific study of the budgetary and procurement procedures of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to ascertain the reasons why the provisions of title IV of the National Security Act are not functioning as intended.

(4) Request the Department of Defense to inventory all plants, determine their productive capacity in event of war, and the time required for war conversion and report their findings to this committee.

(5) Utilize these and other reports secured by this committee in making a final report and recommendations.

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Chairman.
Senator ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation of the very generous words of the distinguished Senator from Virginia, and to add that it was only because of the very able assistance of the members of the committee who were associated with me, and that of the counsel of the committee, that I was able to do the work to which the Senator from Virginia has referred.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I am about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4495, to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes. That bill will be the order of business tomorrow. I understand the committee report will be available to Senators the first thing tomorrow morning.

When we complete consideration of that bill, it is the intention of the acting majority leader to move that the Senate recess until Monday.

I understand from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that the appropriation bill for the State Department, the Commerce Department, and the Justice Department has been completed this afternoon and will be reported to the Senate, and it will be our purpose to take it up for consideration the first of next week.

On Monday I shall be prepared to announce the program for the remainder of next week, but it will somewhat depend upon the progress made with measures under consideration.

Mr. President, I desire to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

REGISTRATION, CLASSIFICATION, AND INDUCTION OF CERTAIN MEDICAL AND DENTAL CATEGORIES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4495. I will say again, for the information of the Senate, that it is not our intention to debate that bill this afternoon, and there will be no further votes this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments.

FLOOD DISASTER IN LOUISIANA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, torrential rains, followed by record-breaking floods, have subjected the people of my State to tremendous suffering and loss of life during the past several weeks. Property damage has been conservatively estimated at $100 million in the stricken areas, which include over half the parishes of the State of Louisiana.

For the past 10 days I have been attempting to expedite Federal aid and relief to these suffering people. I am pleased to report that I have been for the most part successful; however, my State still awaits the certification by President Eisenhower of Louisiana as a

disaster area, thus opening the Presidential emergency fund for the relief of our people.

Mr. President, I do not need to remind Senators of the huge toll of damages left in the wake of floods in our Nation's history. Only 2 years ago the entire Missouri Valley felt the effect of a virtual wall of water which took lives, destroyed crops, and washed away precious acres of fertile land.

My own State has experienced similar damage, though on a smaller scale. While destruction has been as intense, it has, fortunately, been spread over a smaller area, and I am grateful that the loss of life from high water has been held to less than 10. Nevertheless, Mr. President, there are nearly 9,000 Louisiana families homeless at this time. Crop damage alone has been estimated at nearly $46 million. Our lands have been ravaged and our roads and bridges and public buildings have sustained severe damage.

In an effort to expedite the recovery of these areas, which include immensely valuable cotton and rice lands, the port of Lake Charles, and the basins of the Calcasieu, Red, and Mermentau Rivers, I have contacted President Eisenhower, urging speedy certification of my State as a disaster area; I have arranged necessary certification by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in order to make loans available to property owners; the Farmers' Home Administration is cooperating with farm housing, crop and seed loans; and the Corps of Engineers has assured me that their officials will take steps to survey the damage and recommend ways and means of protecting our people from a future inundation.

I should also like to extend the gratitude of the people of Louisiana and myself as their Senator and fellow citizen for the aid the Red Cross has so speedily rendered. But for the Red Cross and other emergency organizations, the loss of life might well have been much greater.

In order that Senators may be made aware of the full extent of crop damages to my State, I should like to ask unanimous consent that a telegram I have received from the Honorable Dave Pearce, commissioner of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Louisiana, be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to your telephone request for information concerning flood damage to Louisiana crops and commodities, following are our estimates: These do not include any damage to homes, places of business, highways, machinery and equipment, nor soil erosion.

The estimates cover all Louisiana parishes except Orleans, St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, and part of St. James. Floodwaters caused the actual evacuation of approximately 8,900 families in Louisiana.

	Estimated total loss	Amount needed in outside loans or grants to replant and/or replace
Cotton	$22,000,000	$7,000,000
Rice	6,463,000	500,000
Hay and pasture	5,724,000	1,000,000
Corn	6,625,000	1,250,000
Livestock	2,000,000	2,000,000
Sweet potatoes	1,881,000	75,000
Truck crops (strawberries, beans, cucumbers, Irish potatoes, tomatoes, watermelons, etc.)	1,816,000	250,000
Small grains	350,000	100,000
Total	45,859,000	13,171,300

If this department can be of any further service to you, please advise us.

DAVE L. PEARCE, *Commissioner.*

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President before yielding the floor I should like to urge all Senators to study these figures well and to realize that they reflect only a portion of the total physical damage the State of Louisiana has sustained. In addition, I should like for Senators to attempt to gain some realization of the suffering and privation the people of my State have suffered during the past 2 weeks—their homes flooded their furniture gone, their loved ones lost, and in many instances their businesses ruined.

I should like to emphasize in closing that while the actual physical damage wrought by this flood is limited to the State of Louisiana, its effect is nationwide and, if you please, worldwide. For the lands under water include our Nation's rice bowl and some of the most fertile cotton-producing areas in the South.

Mr. President, these are the fruits of high water; these are the rewards of untamed rivers and unleveed streams. The example of Louisiana, drenched by torrential rains, scarred by rampaging waters, and beset by the specter of suffering will, I pray, offer a concrete indication that there is no such thing as a purely local disaster. When disaster strikes one, it strikes all.

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT PARTY—NATURAL RESOURCES — HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is not Friday, but I have been advised that in all probability the Senate will not be in session on Friday.

I may say to my colleagues that I sent to the press gallery earlier today a rather long speech on a very important subject. The speech is in opposition to the giveaway program and philosophy of the Eisenhower administration in the field of natural resources. Having sent the speech to the press gallery, I feel a moral obligation to deliver it in the Senate tonight. So I say to my colleagues that they can, at this late hour, proceed to what I hope will be delicious dinners. Senators who are interested can read my speech tomorrow. I may say that I am speaking more to the constituents of my colleagues than to my colleagues themselves. I have given up hope with respect to most of my colleagues, but I have not given up hope with respect to their constituents, because, believe me, when the American people come to realize fully the great threat of the Eisenhower administration to the protection of their heritage in the natural resources, then, I am certain, my colleagues in the Senate will take more interest in what I have been saying on this subject in the United States Senate for the past several weeks, and shall continue to say for the next several years.

Mr. President, I think this is the time to announce that my weekly reports as a member of the Independent Party in the Senate will continue to be made to the American people. The demand for them from the people is too great at this time to resist. Of course, the United States Senate has done nothing to protect the right of the people of my State, under the equal representation clause or suffrage clause of the Constitution, to have equal representation in the Senate. But that battle is behind us for this term.

However, I shall continue as a representative of the people of the State of Oregon, and as a member of the Independent Party, once a week, to use the floor of the Senate as a member of the Committee of the Whole, in order to give a report of the Independent Party to the people. It is necessary for me to do so, because, based upon my experience to date, I cannot expect to get any fair treatment from the American press as a whole. I know whereof I speak when I say that there is no indication, at least on the part of the press as a whole, to present the facts concerning the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon on any issue in the Senate.

I say to the people of my State that for some 5 months they have not read in the Oregon newspapers, outside of the Medford Mail-Tribune, an accurate story of any controversy in which the junior Senator from Oregon has participated. If anyone wishes to question that statement, let him take any story or any editorial from the reactionary press of the State of Oregon and compare what the editors have said with what the junior Senator from Oregon has said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

To the people of my State, I say this afternoon, "If you see the initials 'AP' on any newspaper story, then be sure you are getting a distorted story, because I am satisfied that the Associated Press is simply incapable, apparently by design, of sending into the State of Oregon an accurate story about the junior Senator from Oregon."

What most of the people of my State do not realize is that the Associated Press is but a cooperative owned by the publishers of the United States. It is not a free news-reporting service. It is a slanted news-reporting service, feeding to the readers of the publishers of the news service what the Associated Press wants to feed them.

Of course, the AP has a group of clever writers, skilled in the use of snide, reputation-assassinating adjectives. For instance, there is a story today that amuses me very much, because I see through it all. I have a sense of humor.

But I am certain my colleagues will be interested in knowing that following the committee battle on the Senate floor on Monday, in which the Senate turned down, by an overwhelming vote, what I believed to be the constitutional rights of the State of Oregon to equal representation in the Senate, there appeared an Associated Press dispatch in which it was said, "The Senator from Oregon left the floor fighting mad over the treatment he received on the floor of the Senate." That is a lie, Mr. President. I am using a strong word, but it is necessary to use it in connection with the Associated Press if one wishes to speak the truth. The Associated Press lied in that story, as it does so frequently, and as some of my colleagues know, because the junior Senator from Oregon left the floor quite amused. I sat here and enjoyed the debate. Of course, I did not agree with the result. I said, "The fight has just started." I said it good naturedly, so far as the principle I defended on the floor of the Senate was concerned. There was no anger about my statement. I fight hard, but I fight professionally.

I know that the publishers who own the Associated Press are, by and large, reactionary businessmen, who recognize that if there is in American politics a representative of the Independent Party who is not afraid to speak out and tell the American people what he believes the facts to be on any issue, he is the kind of man the big press of the country does not like.

As I have said to a good many of my liberal friends in the Senate, I have no doubt at all, that liberals must expect, during the deep reactionary trough through which the American people are now passing in United States politics, to be smeared and misrepresented. I say to the people of the State of Oregon that I think one of the outstanding sources of the smear is to be found in the snide articles of the Associated Press. So, I put my people on warning. I say to them, "Do not conclude that, because you see the initials 'AP' at the head of a news story in any Oregon newspaper, you are reading the truth."

HELLS CANYON DAM—THE NEW GIVEAWAY PROGRAM: "STOP THE DAM"

Mr. President, there are a great many other committee items which I might take up. However, I wish to devote the remainder of my committee report today to a speech on Hells Canyon Dam.

On May 5 the Eisenhower administration dealt the public and the 50-year-old conservation and natural resource policies of this Nation a one-two punch.

On that day, the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 13 to give away the multi-billion-dollar submerged oil lands, which the Supreme Court of the United States had three times held to be under the paramount jurisdiction of the United States, to three or four coastal States.

As if that were not enough damage in one day to the natural wealth held by the United States in trust for all the people, the Department of the Interior announced withdrawal of opposition to the Idaho Power Co.'s application for permission to build a small dam which would preempt the site of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Oregon-Idaho border. The announcement came at a meeting called by the new Secretary of Interior McKay for the declared purpose of stating his views on an important matter of policy. He opened the press conference and the statement itself was read by Solicitor Davis. Clearly this was a declaration of the new Secretary's policy and decision, prepared under his direction. I therefore will refer to it as the Secretary's statement.

The action was formally a withdrawal of opposition. In effect, and judging from the public statement of Secretary McKay, it was a withdrawal of support of the Department's own earlier plan for a magnificent and necessary multipurpose Federal dam and was an endorsement of the inadequate and short-sighted plan submitted by the Idaho Power Co.

When I was informed of Secretary McKay's statement, I termed it "A shocking betrayal of the public interest."

Today, I propose to examine his announcement in detail to demonstrate how the people of this country are being short-changed by the new administration. It has been reported, and not denied, that the action of the Interior Department was cleared with the President and the Cabinet.

This action is conclusive proof—if any were needed after the tidelands gift—that this administration is the representative not of the people, but of monopoly.

The issue posed is not a choice between private enterprise and nationalization. It is a choice between Federal construction and operation of an indispensable multipurpose dam in the interest of farmers, small and medium-sized business, rural, and domestic consumers on the one hand, and monopoly private utility exploitation on the other.

As the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] pointed out on May 15, the Idaho Power Co. states in its Federal Power Commission application that it is not in competition with any public or private utility in the area it serves.

The streams of America belong to the Nation and should be used for the benefit of the greatest number and with all possible regard for the welfare of future generations. They cannot be suffered to be placed in the selfish hands of a monopoly utility company for half-hearted, incomplete development for only the immediate profit of a few.

THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT'S STATEMENT DOES NOT STAND UP UNDER SCRUTINY

I will discuss the McKay statement point by point. It does not stand up under close scrutiny.

SECRETARY'S BASIC ASSUMPTION INCORRECT

The basic reasoning and assumption of Secretary McKay's statement is wrong. The Secretary states:

> The Department of Interior would be playing the reprehensible part of a dog in the manger if it insisted on opposing a badly needed development that private capital is ready and willing to undertake if the plan proposed by the Idaho Power Co. is reasonably comparable as to results, while the Department itself has no assurance that it can carry out its plan without extended delay.

He then turns to a comparison of the Hells Canyon Dam, as originally planned by the Department's Bureau of Reclamation and as proposed by S. 1664, which I introduced for 13 other Senators and myself on April 16 with the Idaho Power Co.'s plan A for three dams—Oxbow, and possibly Brownlee and a small Hells Canyon Dam. Of these three, the Oxbow is the smallest and promises the least power.

The plain and simple fact is that, as of May 5, when the Secretary made his statement, the Idaho Power Co. application for permission to build was only for the Oxbow Dam.

The company's original application was filed on December 9, 1950. It asked for the Federal Power Commission to approve construction of the Oxbow Dam only. In exhibit Q attached to the petition it stated that it plans the proposed Oxbow project as the first installation in a series of low-head developments. The total number was then five.

The Federal Power Commission has informed me that on November 10, 1952, the company filed an amended exhibit Q. This exhibit set forth two alternative plans for the Snake River. Plan A was new and called for three dams—those upon which Secretary McKay's May 5 statement was based. Plan B was the first five-dam plan.

The amended exhibit does not constitute a request for permission to build. It does nothing more than purport to set forth what the company may do. Federal Power Commission approval of the Oxbow application would not place the company under any obligation to complete the so-called plan. Indeed, no definite drawings for the Brownlee and the small Hells Canyon Dams had been submitted. As of May 8, 3 days after the Secretary's abandonment of the reclamation project, I was informed that the company still did not know whether the Brownlee site would support a dam of the height contemplated by plan A. It has all but abandoned plan B—and yet no one knew whether plan A would be possible. If the company did not know, and it is supposedly doing the preparatory work, the Secretary of the Interior could not know and did not. No independent field investigation of the feasibility of constructing the large Brownlee Dam has been made by his Department.

The Federal Power Commission further informed me on April 27, 1953:

> The exhibit also states that the development of the remaining projects according to either of the proposed alternative plans will be undertaken in orderly stages as power requirements demand.

According to the Secretary, the need is immediate. I agree that the Northwest needs additional inexpensive power as soon as it can be provided on a feasible basis.

Apparently, the company is nonchalant about power requirements. As Lincoln said of his early Union generals, the company has a case of the "slows."

Yet, the Secretary claims to be abandoning a Federal multipurpose dam at Hells Canyon because the Idaho Power

Co. is ready and willing to undertake a plan which is reasonably comparable as to results, while the Department itself has no assurance that it can carry out its plan without extended delay.

Where is the evidence that the company's plan is ready? I asked the Secretary. The regrettable truth is that the Idaho Power Co. plan is not a plan, it is not even a promise, it is a bare statement—that has been changed several times during the past 2 years according to the company's published releases.

IDAHO POWER CO. PLAN NOT COMPARABLE TO FEDERAL PROJECT

And what is the evidence that the company plan is reasonably comparable?

It claims—and the Secretary and the Federal Power Commission have had nothing but the company's allegation—that plan A will have 783,400 kilowatts of installed capacity. This is the plan as filed with the Commission.

Mr. President, think of it. We have a Secretary of the Interior who has the audacity to tell the American people, based upon no facts from the Department of the Interior's own engineers, but based entirely upon the allegation of the party in interest in the fight, the Idaho Power Co., that their plan will develop 783,400 kilowatt-hours. The Idaho Power Co. has been so unreliable in its representations in the past that, for its benefit, I want to say, as a lawyer, I would not think of making a representation to a court that something was a fact until I had ascertained from my own investigation whether it was a fact.

The Secretary of the Interior, sitting downtown, with well-paid Government engineers at his disposal, makes a representation based, not upon the representations of the Government's engineers but on the representations of the power company's engineers.

I am not surprised. I am not surprised that a spokesman for the private utilities of America, sitting in the seat of the Secretary of the Interior, would follow such a course. I know the significance of that statement, Mr. President, and I mean it.

In my judgment we might as well have the president of a national private utility association sit in the seat of the Secretary of the Interior as to have sitting in the seat the man who is there now, because his philosophy, his attitude, and his record support my statement that he is a stooge of the private utility monopolies of America, and he has paid off as the Secretary of the Interior, in withdrawing from the hearing on the Hells Canyon Dam issue.

The American people have the right to expect the Secretary of the Interior to intervene and make the Department of the Interior a party to what will prove to be a historic case in the whole field of protecting the natural resources of the United States, which are the great heritage of the American people.

The argument has been made that all he has done amounts to is that the Secretary of the Interior will not be a special pleader in this case. I ask the question: Who is going to plead the people's case if the department of Government which has the jurisdiction and responsibility and obligation to protect the people's interest in the Nation's natural resources does not do so?

Mr. President, do not swallow the alibi of the Secretary of the Interior. Do not fall for its sophistry. It must be recognized that when there is an important contest between the Federal Power Commission and private utilities with respect to the disposition of the potential kilowatt power of any great river in America, it is the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to act in the people's interest as an intervenor, to see to it that the public interest is protected.

Yet he has the brazen nerve to take the position that he is not participating because if he did participate, the Department of the Interior would be a special pleader in the case.

Let me serve notice on the Secretary of the Interior today that, although it may take a few weeks or months for the people of the Pacific Northwest to see through his sophistry, sooner or later they will see through it, and when they do, the Eisenhower administration will discover how it has been let down by its Secretary of the Interior.

The people of the great Northwest recognize that there is a fight to the finish on the great issue of preserving for them their right to cheap power developed from the streams of the Pacific Northwest, and their right to be protected from any program of a stooge of the private utilities, sitting in the seat of the Secretary of the Interior, which seeks to require the people of the Pacific Northwest to pay tribute to a private utility monopoly such as the Idaho Power Co., or any other private utility monopoly.

That will be the issue, Mr. President. I welcome it. I welcome it on two grounds. I welcome it because of my deep conviction that it is the duty and the obligation of the Government to protect a free people in their heritage in America's natural resources. I welcome it on the second ground that it is an issue made to order to demonstrate to the people of the Pacific Northwest what I told them throughout the campaign, when I campaigned against Eisenhower, that this is the kind of result they should expect if they put the Government in the control of big business. "That," I said, "is what will happen if you elect this Republican candidate to the presidency."

That is what has happened. We are now a government of big business. It is very poor business for the people of the United States, but it is a very profitable business for the plunderers and looters and exploiters, and they are plundering and looting and exploiting, not to the tune of millions of dollars, but of billions of dollars.

Mr. President, I shall continue to raise my voice on the floor of the Senate, week after week, in forewarning the American people as to what is going to happen unless, beginning in 1954, they put into practice the very sound political maxim: "Turn the rascals out."

Mr. President, let us take a look at a few statistical facts with regard to plan A of the Idaho Power Co. It covers Brownlee, Oxbow, and the small Hells Canyon Dam. There is not even a promise of power development, except in connection with Oxbow, which is the subject of a petition before the Commission. There is not even a promise of such development so far as Brownlee and the small Hells Canyon Dam are concerned, but merely a statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table which shows the allegations of the company as to the installed capacity, the estimated cost, the cost per kilowatt hour, and the length of the reservoir, inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Plan (A)

Project	Installed capacity	Estimated cost	Cost per kilowatt	Length of reservoir
	Kilowatts			*Miles*
Brownlee	360,400	$61,800,000	$171.50	53
Oxbow	151,000	23,400,000	155.00	13
Hells Canyon	272,000	44,850,000	164.90	21
Total	783,400	130,050,000	[1] 166.00	

[1] Average.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, almost half of this alleged capacity—360,000 kilowatts—supposedly will be provided by the Brownlee Dam. Yet, as of May 5 the Federal Government had nothing before it to give assurance that the dam could be built, let alone that it would be.

It should be noted that under "plan B"—the original one filed in 1950—the Brownlee site was proposed to have a 90,000-kilowatt capacity, slightly less than one-quarter of the amount of the lately proposed Brownlee Dam.

The claim is made by the Department of Interior that the "first unit" of the Idaho Power Co. plan would be in operation 8 years ahead of Hells Canyon Dam.

Let me digress to say this about the argument of the Secretary of the Interior and his rationalization and alibi about the time element: It will take a long time—apparently he thinks it will take too long—to protect the economic interest of the people in their full heritage in the Snake River by building the great multiple-purpose dam which will develop the maximum potential of the Snake River; but if we had some leadership in this administration, if we had an administration that put the interest of the people first, instead of putting the private monopolies' interest first, it would be carrying this issue to the people, and the people would carry the issue to Congress. Once the people came to understand their interest in the maximum development of the electric-power potential of the Snake River, there would be speedy action by Congress.

I am not impressed with the alibi, excuse, and lame rationalization of the Secretary of the Interior to the effect that it is thought it would take a long time to get a Hells Canyon Dam bill through Congress. Have they tried to get such a bill through Congress? Has the President of the United States made

the enactment of such a bill an issue? Has he exercised any leadership on that subject? No, Mr. President. He has a Secretary of the Interior who has done just the opposite in that he has encouraged discouragement in connection with Hells Canyon Dam.

So I am not impressed with that argument. Congress could pass such a bill very quickly, and construction of the dam could proceed rapidly, if the administration were not in favor of killing the project.

I know I am making a blunt statement; but I am convinced that the American people will have to be talked to very bluntly if we are to get their heads out of the sand, so that they may be able to see how important it is that they cease to indulge in wishful thinking, recognize that a "father" image will not save them, but that their interests will be saved only if they use their own heads and exercise their citizenship responsibilities, and realize that, after all, they—the people—will have to run the Government for themselves and will have to take it away from the control of big business.

It would not take too long to build Hells Canyon Dam if there were a will to proceed to build it. The economic advantages which would flow from the development of the maximum resources of the Snake River in the long run would be much more beneficial to the welfare of our country. We had better be thinking of our country in terms of the long run rather than to speed up now the building of one little dam at Oxbow, which will for all time do irreparable damage to the development of the maximum potential of the Snake River. I say the benefits in the long run from Hells Canyon Dam would be so much greater than the immediate benefits to a small group of consumers from the project of the Idaho Power & Light Co. and the immediate benefits to the stockholders of that company, who for the most part live in the East, that I do not think there is any comparison in terms of what should be done as between the two plans. In the national interest we should take whatever additional time is required—and it will not be nearly so much time as the Secretary of the Interior implies—to build the great multiple-purpose dam which will preserve for future generations of Americans the maximum potential of the Snake River, not only in respect to the generation of electricity but also in respect to irrigation and flood control.

With accelerated construction, it will be possible to build Hells Canyon Dam in 5 years. That is what the engineers say, and I am a good enough lawyer, I think, to rely on the experts on questions of fact when they are experts who represent the public interest. That is what Secretary of the Interior McKay would learn if he would talk to his own engineers, as well as to the Army engineers, instead of feeding the American people the propaganda of the private engineers of a private monopoly. Yet he has the nerve—following their advice—also to talk in terms of "special pleading." I am aghast; I wonder if he really thinks the Idaho Power Co. is not a special pleader. If it is—and I will take judicial notice of it, just as you, Mr. President, will have to do, too—then, as Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay should present to the American people the data and evidence that he can find in his own files in the Department of the Interior, from his own engineers—which he has not done to date, because, if he did, that data and evidence would be so inconsistent with the misrepresentations he has been making that even he might choke in presenting the correct information.

The power company claims it will take 1½ to 2 years to complete the first plant of its 3-dam plan. In the official hearings held before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, engineers declared:

> Construction will begin April 1 of the first fiscal year and will be completed by the end of the seventh fiscal year.

Thus the greatest difference in time that could exist would be 5 years, and it could be as little as 3 years.

The statement apparently assumes instant construction of the three dams. It completely ignores the fact that even before completion of Hells Canyon Dam, the waters impounded by it would be available to take up the slack at downstream plants, and would increase their output of power at a very early date.

The mathematics of the Secretary's assertion that it would take 25 years for Hells Canyon Dam to make up the loss of power of the company plan is highly questionable, and requires fuller explanation on his part. I do not think it can be explained.

Let me illustrate. While the capacity of Oxbow Dam would be 151,000 kilowatts its actual prime power output, according to engineers, would be 106,000 kilowatts. Assuming a full 5-year difference between the completion of Oxbow Dam and the completion of Hells Canyon Dam, Oxbow Dam would produce 530,000 kilowatts, considerably less than 1 year's power output by Hells Canyon Dam by itself.

I submit there is no substance to the Secretary's allegation that serious consideration be given the company plan as it is ready and willing to provide comparable results while the Reclamation project for Hells Canyon may be delayed for a considerable time.

Quite the opposite is true. I pause at that point, Mr. President, because it is not pleasant to stand on the floor of the Senate and feel compelled by the facts to say that the opposite of what a representative of this administration has said is the truth. But the big-lie technique has so permeated this administration, as it was so rampant throughout the campaign, that we must stand upon the floor of the Senate and call the lie when the administration does not speak the truth; and I propose to do that. I care not what the political consequences may be. I think the big-lie technique which has now come into American politics is so serious from the standpoint of the welfare of the whole Government that I am not going to hesitate to speak the truth, even when the truth means that I have to say, as I have just said, that a statement put out by an administrative spokesman is the opposite of the truth.

EISENHOWER AND M'KAY FAIL TO PROVIDE LEADERSHIP

Indeed, the responsibility for delay in accomplishing the Bureau of Reclamation's plan for Hells Canyon Dam is squarely upon the Eisenhower administration.

Secretary McKay lamely observes that appropriations necessary to start and complete the work may not be available for a considerable period of time.

Why not?

Because the administration, as I have said, has failed to supply leadership—leadership which will demonstrate to the people and the Congress the necessity of Hells Canyon for power to feed defense, manufacturing, farms, and homes; for irrigation to help create a food supply equal to the needs of our expanding Nation; for flood control to spare millions of dollars of private property, representing private savings and work, from destruction; and for the other benefits in which this project will result. The President and his Cabinet officers have an obligation to lead—not to follow—the private monopolies of America, but an obligation to lead the people; an obligation not to become the vehicles of exploitation and tribute collecting by American big business.

The argument that Hells Canyon would not be inexpensive is not sound. The project would be completely self-reimbursing. It is true that the pay-out period would be extended. But 90 percent would come back to the Treasury—with interest in the first 50 years of project operation. Fifty years is not long in the history of a nation. Thereafter, the project would return millions of dollars annually to the Treasury.

And as we approach what seems to be a deflationary phase of the national economy, we should be gearing up for public-works projects such as this to provide income to private companies and payrolls for our working citizens, which mean income in turn for many thousands more. Does the Republican administration plan to ignore all of the economic danger signals of high inventories, shaky farm prices, lower employment, and the other indications that the economy is approaching a crisis?

The business administration would do well to worry more about general business conditions and plan ahead to meet them. Individual monopolies like Idaho Power Co. should not come ahead of sound national economic planning.

HELLS CANYON FOR GREATER POWER

The Department of the Interior, through its new spokesman, concedes that the Bureau of Reclamation plan—which is the basis of my bill, S. 1664—for Hells Canyon will result in more power for the Northwest.

When completed, Hells Canyon Dam alone will produce 688,000 kilowatts of firm year-round power. That is only part of the story.

The dams now in operation on the Columbia into which the Snake River

feeds have been handicapped in low-water seasons and years. With the giant recervoir proposed for Hells Canyon the enormous runoffs of spring water would be impounded and held back for release later when the water is too low downstream to permit maximum utilization of the hydroelectric plants there.

The additional power gained in this fashion would amount to—now, listen, Mr. President, just listen to these figures of additional firm power—would amount to 436,000 kilowatts of additional firm power—and I emphasize "firm"—to bring the grand total of power gained by the construction of Hells Canyon Dam to 1,124,000 kilowatts.

Mr. President, do not forget that figure. I do not intend ever to let the Eisenhower administration forget it. We are going to talk about that figure, in the months and years immediately ahead, at the crossroads of the Pacific Northwest, so that the people may come to understand that figure, and so that they will have a more complete realization of what is happening to them through an administration that is seeking to give away, in one way or other, their great heritage in the natural resources of the Nation.

The figure of 1,124,000 kilowatt-hours would be achieved through the greater efficiency of downstream dams now in operation, under construction, or currently authorized. Their integration is not included in the Idaho Power Co. program, because they do not have reservoirs with sufficient storage capacity to supply the downstream dams with the water they need in the low-water season, in order to obtain the maximum use of the hydroelectric producing power of those plants.

Let us compare these power output figures with the electric power which is claimed for the Idaho Power Co. plan. One may say, "Well, what about it, MORSE? Are you not making a claim, too?" Yes, I am. What do I base it on? Not on the statements of special pleaders. I base it upon the statements of the engineering representatives of the people in the Army Engineer Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation. How many times, on the floor of the Senate, when appropriation bills have been before us, the first thing Senators have wanted to know has been, "What do the Army engineers and the Government engineers have to say? Do they support the claim?"

Mr. President, let there be no doubt about it. I am using the figures of those engineers. The private monopolies have never been able to attack them successfully. The Government engineers have stood like great intellectual Rocks of Gibraltar in defense not only of their figures but also, by their figures, in defense of the people.

The Oxbow Dam would have a paltry 151,000 kilowatts of installed capacity, of which only some 106,000 kilowatts would be firm year-around power. Under plan B, Oxbow would have a smaller installed capacity and less firm power. The Idaho Power Co. Hells Canyon Dam—that is the low-head dam—do not become confused by the terms. This is not the big Hells Canyon Dam about which I am talking, but the low-head dam, a little tribute-collecting dam—the Idaho Power Co. Hells Canyon Dam would contribute 272,000 kilowatts the company claims—slightly more than one-third of the Federal Hells Canyon Dam. The biggest purported power producer would be Brownlee, with 360,000 kilowatts of installed capacity, and considerably less output. I reiterate the fact that, as of the Interior Department's announcement on May 5, it was not known whether the site of that dam would support a dam of sufficient height for that purpose. Under Plan B—the five low-head dam company plan—it is scheduled for a mere 90,000 kilowatts.

Under plan B, the total claimed power capacity would be 714,000 kilowatts. Under plan A, the installed capacity would be 783,000 kilowatts, and its firm power from 600,000 kilowatts to 650,000 kilowatts.

That is a far cry, Mr. President, from 1,124,000 kilowatt-hours which will be developed as a result of building the proposed Federal multipurpose dams.

It is interesting to note that the Secretary's statement describes the Idaho Power Co. dams only in terms of installed capacity, which is substantially more than actual firm output.

We are dealing with such a technical subject, Mr. President, that I am not surprised that people are confused about it. The average citizen does not recognize that there is a great difference between installed capacity and firm output. The only thing that counts is the firm output, so far as the consumer is concerned. It does not do you any good, Mr. President, as a businessman seeking to get a supply of power in a locality where there is a hydroelectric dam, to be told that you cannot get it because they have already contracted away all the power they have available. You may say, "There must be some mistake about it, because the installed capacity of that dam is 1 million, and I understand that you are using only 750,000 kilowatt-hours, so that 250,000 kilowatt-hours are being wasted."

The reply is made, "You do not understand the difference between installed capacity and firm output. You can get out of it only 750,000 kilowatts of firm power. Therefore, we cannot give you the contract because we do not have the firm power to deliver to you the year around."

It is a subject which many persons do not understand. It is very interesting that the Secretary of the Interior talked in terms of installed capacity. It is easier to mislead the people in that way. The people of the Northwest are entitled to know from the Secretary how much firm power they will get out of the Idaho power plan A or plan B.

It should be made absolutely clear that the Oxbow Dam would be of such slight dimensions that it would have no reservoir value. Hence, it could not impound water for release in low-water periods for the use of downstream dams. So it would add not 1 kilowatt of production to other dams.

Did McKay say that? In his announcement at the press conference or in his Boston speech did he let you in on that secret, Mr. President? Read his press release and read his Boston statement. One would think he was talking about the same possibilities under the Idaho Power Co.'s proposal that are existent under the Hells Canyon Dam proposal. The only difference is that in the former case less power would be produced, less time would be required to construct the project, and it would be done by private enterprise. Of course, Mr. President, the Secretary means private monopoly. It is not private enterprise at all. It is recognized as a private monopoly by our regulatory laws, which are designed to regulate monopolies.

There are various ways of lying to the American people, Mr. President. One of the most vicious ways adopted by some politicians is in the form of what they do not tell the people. I respectfully submit that when a person is talking about two plans for the development of the resources of a river, he ought to make very clear in his statement to the people that he is discussing them on parallel terms. He ought to make clear to the people that when he is supporting a private monopoly program at Oxbow it will not produce 1 kilowatt-hour of power for the dams already built below that site.

Mr. President, it is a tough position in which I find myself, for I am dealing with a highly technical subject, and with scientific matters which have to be stated in the abstract, when it comes to engineering problems, and thus lacking the dramatic color that one likes to present to the people. When we are in that kind of a situation, Mr. President, it is easy for those in power to confuse the people. The people want to believe the best. Thank God, they do. Thank God, that is one of our great traits as a people. We want to believe the best. It is, of course, one of the conditioning results of our being a humane people, a kindly people, and a charitable people.

So, since the beginning of our history when liberals in the Senate have had to stand up against selfish, exploiting economic forces that the liberals know are raiding the public interest, it takes a long time for the people to wake up. It takes a long time for the people to come to recognize that the liberals are, in fact, fighting for the public interest.

Look at the record of the Senate in connection with conservation; consider the years it has taken to win every major conservation battle. The people finally came to see they were wrong in thinking the best in respect to the program of the reactionary administration for the time being in control of their Government.

The La Follettes had that experience many times on the floor of the Senate. It was nothing new to Burton Wheeler when he fought some of the great battles he made against the railroad monopoly. It certainly was the experience of the great George W. Norris in the years he fought to protect the people's interest in Muscle Shoals which became the great TVA project.

I say on the floor of the Senate today that, in my judgment, we are starting another great battle in the field of natural resources. I do not expect it to be won in a day, a month, or a year. But we are going to fight. I now serve notice, after talking to my colleagues who are cosponsors of the Hells Canyon Dam bill, that we are going to fight. So long as we are in the Senate, we are going to fight to protect the public interest wherever it is being exploited by big business interests that want to place private monopoly above true private enterprise.

In my judgment, the greatest protectors in the Senate of private enterprise are those who are fighting to protect business interests that would be able to carry on private enterprise in the economic environment of a great dam, such as a multiple-purpose dam like Hells Canyon Dam, which would give them the cheap power that is necessary to build up the private enterprise that is needed for expanding the economy of the Nation.

It will take time to get that point of view across, but I have complete faith in the final victory of right over wrong. However, I do not delude myself about it. Certainly I would not, in a seminar in philosophy, ever advocate the premise which every teacher of philosophy always raises for discussion sometime during the course, namely, the premise that right always prevails over wrong in the long run. Mr. President, one gets into a very interesting discussion of various values in the search for a definition of right. The investigation into what is meant by right, leads to a very interesting discussion of what is meant by the time factor and what is meant by the prevailing of right over wrong in terms of time.

We know how intellectually stimulating such discussions are. But I would not think of trying to sustain the burden of argument on the premise that right always prevails. However, I would argue with great enjoyment in any philosophy seminar that if there is a group of men and women dedicated to the right side of an issue, perfectly willing to make whatever sacrifice is necessary to present it for as long as it may take, then, more often than not—that is as far as I would go; more often than not—in such situations the right will prevail over the wrong.

So I am very much encouraged about this particular situation, because there is a litle band of Senators dedicated to the right side of this issue, willing to make the sacrifices, and determined to see the fight through, if for no other reason than to keep faith with the great men who have established the principle of a sound conservation program, men such as Teddy Roosevelt, Pinchot, and George Norris. We have no intention of letting them down, because we are convinced that once the American people see the issue, they, too, will not let them down.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator from Oregon has concluded his remarks, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], that the unanimous-consent request having been granted, and the hour already being late, and the speech still a long one, I can give them my word of honor that if they would like to go to dinner, no business will be transacted in the Senate in their absence; and that when I have finished my speech, I will simply go home. Of course, I should be happy to have their presence, but they can read the speech in the RECORD more quickly that I can utter it, and the speech is going to be made. Having given my word on this matter, it is now up to the Senators to decide whether they wish to tarry with me or take care of the needs of the inner man.

To resume the tenor of my remarks, it is interesting to note that the Secretary's statement describes the Idaho Power Co. dams only in terms of installed capacity, which is substantially more than actual firm output.

It should be made absolutely clear that the Oxbow Dam would be of such slight dimensions that it would have no reservoir value. Hence, it could not impound water for release in low-water periods for the use of downstream dams. So it would not add one kilowatt of power to other dams. I am informed that the same is true for the somewhat larger company Hells Canyon Dam, assuming that it will come into being.

If Brownlee is feasible as a storage dam, if the company ever receives approval to build the dam, and if it is built, the dam would have a storage capacity of 1 million acre-feet. This compares to 3,800,000 acre-feet for the Reclamation dam at Hells Canyon. Plan B of the Idaho Power Co. has no reservoir dams and hence would be of no benefit to downstream dams.

It is very interesting to see how the company has shifted its position in regard to the storage matter, because that is only of recent date. They have sought to make no provision at all for storage, but they were hearing from the farmers, and they are now providing, as a rough estimate, about a third—yes, less than a third, but we will say a third, by way of overstatement—of the storage capacity that would result from Hells Canyon Dam itself.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say that, however you slice it, Hells Canyon would provide substantially more power than either plan A or B of the Idaho Power Co.

It is interesting to note that the Idaho Power Co. did not file applications for Brownlee and a low Hells Canyon Dam until May 15—10 days after the Secretary's announcement.

I am advised that the company's board of directors adopted the resolution to file the applications at its regular quarterly meeting on April 9. No public announcement was made so far as I am aware. As of May 8—3 days after the McKay announcement withdrawing support for Hells Canyon—the Federal Power Commission was not advised of the action of the board of directors and had no indication of the company's intent.

The new applications are interesting indeed. As I have already described, the company's 1950 application set forth "plans" for five run-of-the-river dams in exhibit Q. That exhibit was amended in November 1952, to set forth plan A—the three-dam plan.

When the May 15 applications for Brownlee and a low Hells Canyon dam were filed, they were requested in separate and new applications and not submitted as amendments to the original application.

It has not been made clear publicly how the Idaho Power Co. Brownlee Dam would be utilized to coordinate its reservoir with the needs of Federal dams downstream. Yet it is asserted by the Secretary that if the full Columbia Basin project were realized the total difference between Hells Canyon and plan A would be only 170,000 kilowatts a year. Taking the projects now in operation and under construction and authorized, the really comparable figures are 1,124,000 kilowatts of firm power for Hells Canyon and some 600,000 kilowatts to 650,000 kilowatts for plan A—a difference of some 500,000 to 450,000 kilowatts. The Department of the Interior claims the difference would be 260,000 kilowatts a year. That, too, however, is considerable, but it is far less than the facts. I know the significance of that statement, too, Mr. President. I repeat it. The estimate of the Department of the Interior is far less than the facts, with respect to the difference between the maximum potential of Hells Canyon and the maximum potential of the Idaho Power Co. plan.

Let us examine the figures and reasoning used by the Secretary in comparing the power potentials of the Hells Canyon and Idaho Power Company plan A. It is noteworthy that the even less promising plan B—to which the company may have to revert—is not discussed by the Secretary.

The Secretary states:

> If cost and economics and time of completion are discounted, the Hells Canyon project will probably produce more total prime power than the 3-dam plan though even this point can be contested. However, our general studies do not indicate that the advantage is large.

Behind this conclusion lies the assumption that all authorized and recommended Federal dams below Lewiston would be in operation. It should be understood that plan C–2 would take some 50 years to achieve and the Bureau of Reclamation has based its estimates on that plan. It includes only constructed and authorized projects plus Hells Canyon.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this time a table showing the C–2 plan.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C–2 phase system of Federal power projects on Columbia River and its major tributaries, which are constructed, under construction and authorized (Excluding Willamette and other small Federal plants)

Project	Status	Active reservoir capacity [1]	Installed capacity
		Acre-feet	*Kilowatts*
1. Hungry Horse	(2)	2,980,000	285,000
2. Albeni Falls	(2)	1,000,000	43,000
3. Libby	(3)	4,250,000	588,000
4. Grand Coulee	(4)	5,120,000	1,944,000
5. Chief Joseph	(2)	0	1,182,000
6. Priest Rapids	(3)	0	954,000
7. McNary	(3)	0	980,000
8. John Day	(3)	0	1,105,000
9. The Dalles	(3)	0	1,050,000
10. Bonneville	(4)	0	518,000
11. Ice Harbor	(3)	0	260,000
12. Little Goose	(3)	0	260,000
13. Lower Monumental	(3)	0	240,000
14. Lower Granite	(3)	0	230,000
Total		13,350,000	9,599,000
15. Hells Canyon		2,880,000	800,000

[1] Usable for power production.
[2] Under construction.
[3] Authorized.
[4] Constructed.

NOTE.—System prime capability is 7,800,000. This could serve a 10-million-kilowatt load with 75 percent load factor. The system now only comes to about ¾ of this amount.

Mr. MORSE. The Secretary's statement is predicated not upon the 50-year C–2 plan but a plan for full development which would take many years longer.

After the accomplishment of C–2 and as new dams are added, the contribution of Hells Canyon to the whole system would be somewhat less and the difference between Hells Canyon and plan A would grow smaller.

But that would take well over 50 years—and the difference would be quite substantial.

The Secretary states that Hells Canyon would add 170,000 kilowatts of prime power to the fully completed system over that provided by plan A.

That is a great difference. In reaching it, however, the Secretary took the absolutely dimmest view of future conditions on the Snake and assumed depletions of waterflow which are the most pessimistic. Based upon reports made by Geological Survey, it is quite apparent that the Secretary assumed depletion factors without also assuming any offsetting conditions. He did not assume average river conditions.

This also explains the comparatively low figures given for differences between the two plans assuming various stages of development downstream.

Even if the Secretary's unjustifiably low figures are used, the loss of power under plan A would be substantial. The Northwest and the Nation cannot afford that loss.

To sum up, the Federal dam at Hells Canyon would surpass the power production of plan A each year as follows:

First. Integration with all currently operating units and completion of dams under construction and authorized, 500,000 to 260,000 kilowatts.

Second. Integration with all currently operating units and completion of all projects under construction, at least 210,000 kilowatts.

HELLS CANYON FOR IRRIGATION

The Idaho Power Co. plans would make a tremendous contribution to conservation—of sagebrush. The Idaho Power Co. plan is a great sage-brush plan; but there is no conservation of irrigated lands in it. The sad and simple fact is that no irrigation would be provided by the company plan. Think of it. Go into the Idaho-Oregon area. Drive over the sage-brush areas. All they need is water to make them bloom like the Garden of Eden. Who is there in the Senate who wishes to stand up and make the assertion that, in the light of what the situation will be 100, 150, or 200 years from now, population increases being what they are, and with our population experts all saying that the increases will be constant, with world problems what they are in connection with world food supply, we have any moral right in our day in the Senate to surrender to a private monopoly the great irigation-producing potential of the Snake River in connection with the controversy of Hells Canyon against a nonirrigation-producing program of a private power monopoly? The sad thing is that anyone should have to stand up on the floor of the Senate and argue the point. I think the issue is so clear from the standpoint of public interest that it is a sad reflection upon American politics that we find ourselves in a position where we have to stand up and argue on the floor of the Senate to protect the irrigation potential of the Snake River. But we do, because Eisenhower and McKay are about to give it away—not give it away, but destroy it—by surrendering control of the Snake River at the Oxbow site to the Idaho Power Co. The people will see through it, Mr. President. Wait and see. And when they do, there will be a great many crosses on pallets that will mark political graves.

The historic pattern for reclamation dams has been ample provision for irrigation, which otherwise cannot be financed by the farmers now on the soil and others who could bring enormous areas under cultivation if water were available.

Multipurpose dams have been approved again and again by Congress with provisions for irrigation features which are paid for in large part by power revenues.

The Department of the Interior statement treats this problem as follows:

The responsibility for resolving the second question, which has to do with reclamation subsidy, is not a direct concern of the Federal Power Commission but rather a matter for the Department of the Interior and the Congress to consider. Hells Canyon project is not an integral part of the Payette unit or any other reclamation project and so there is no reason why it need be considered the only project that can be used to create this subsidy. For this purpose, and if Congress agrees, there appears to be no reason why other projects in the basin could not be used with the same logic as that proposed for Hells Canyon. Of these other projects there is Mountain Sheep or Nez Perce on the Snake River, several dams on the Salmon and more on the Clearwater River.

When S. 1664 was introduced on April 16, I answered that argument in advance as follows:

Mr. President, I suspected it. Oh, it is easy to predict. One does not have to be smart to be way ahead of them. Their lines are a pattern. They can follow only one pattern. It has been repeated over and over again in the history of our country, when a group of exploiters get into power and want to loot. I was ready for the argument. So I rebutted it when, on April 16, even before they uttered it, I said:

Few of the potential irrigation developments in the central and upper Snake River Basin have substantial power developments associated with them; hence inadequate or no assistance can be expected from project power revenues.

It is only through a provision such as contained in section 4 of this bill that the benefit of Snake River power revenues can be made available for assistance in the return of costs incurred in bringing water to the land.

I went on in that speech to argue:

A special provision covering this desirable aspect of resource development in the Snake River Basin is necessary because the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 limits the use of power revenues to assist in repayment of irrigation costs to features of the project of which the power development is a part. Thus, it is necessary to state by legislation that additional works may be treated for payout purposes as part of the Snake River project, of which the principal division is the Hells Canyon division.

I continued with the argument as follows:

Without question, if Oregon and neighboring Idaho are to expand and prosper increasingly, we need large-scale irrigation and for irrigation we must have financial aid from power revenues. It is sheer nonsense to suggest that we reverse national policy of half a century's standing and ask Congress to write off those costs which are in excess of the amount farmers may be expected to repay. Such objective cannot be attained and I, for one, would fight vigorously against changing the self-sustaining reclamation program into a "Let's tap the taxpayer" handout.

The State of Idaho would gain enormously from the financial aid provision of the new bill. It has lying at the doorstep of the city of Boise the Mountain Home project. Apparently everyone is in favor of transforming this vast area of sagebrush, some 192,000 acres, into a community of fertile, irrigated farms—in favor of creating another Boise Valley, so to speak. The cost of bringing water to the land, which involves the diversion of water from one river basin to another, is high. The small powerplants associated with the project would not produce adequate power revenues to aid farmers in complete repayment of the project. Under this legislation, Mountain Home project, when authorized, would be made feasible through use of Hells Canyon power revenues.

Let me add to the discussion today.

The Secretary's statement does not hold water—if you will pardon the pun.

It concedes that power revenues are necessary to defray irrigation costs, although it twice refers to such assistance as a "subsidy."

Is it a subsidy for the Government of the United States to dedicate power revenues to irigation to build a food supply

adequate for generations of Americans to come? Or is it just plain commonsense? Our population is growing by tens of millions each decade—war and careless motorists notwithstanding. We must plan for the food of American boys and girls—not in the next election—but for 100 and 200 years in the future. We cannot squander the few remaining natural resources we have today and leave future generations to shift for themselves.

The Interior Department's statement ignores the fact that the Hells Canyon Dam is a necessary part of the two best plans recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of the Snake and Columbia Rivers—see committee print, House Interior Committee, 1952, selected information on proposed Snake River reclamation project including Hells Canyon Dam Committee Report submitted by the Department of the Interior, pages 4–9. The Army engineers, as the result of independent investigation, also recommended it as necessary for the proper control of the Snake.

Certainly, the Department of the Interior knows that projects on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers entail great difficulties because of interference with fish runs. The statement also suggests that Nez Perce might provide the power revenue needed to defray the irrigation costs of Mountain Home.

When I read the statement of the Secretary of the Interior about developing some of the other sites, I chuckled. I chuckled because he apparently thought he might fool someone with that statement. He is not going to fool anyone who knows the facts. The Secretary of the Interior knows that the so-called alternative sites he is talking about have been fought and opposed by the fish industry and by the sportsmen, who know that there is no question about the fact that they create a serious impairment to the spawning grounds.

What about Hells Canyon, Mr. President? We are advised by the Engineers that it is the one great natural site for a great multiple-purpose dam which will not detrimentally affect the fishing industry.

The Secretary of the Interior knows it too. Yet he creates what I would call diversionary tactics, confusing tactics, when he points out that maybe at some time in the future we can get around the difficulties and the opposition which are presently involved in the Mountain Sheep site or the Nez Perce site. Is that not the same argument for rationalizing a failure to do what we ought to do now, when we have those sites available so as to provide the maximum potential to which there is not the organized opposition which the Secretary of the Interior knows exists with respect to the other sites?

In the selected information already cited, the Department of Interior in 1952 stated:

> Since Nez Perce would effectively block off the salmon run from the Lower Snake River to the Salmon River, Nez Perce should not be built at this time, or until a solution to the salmon situation is found. The Hells Canyon Dam portion of this plan can proceed, however. Hells Canyon is an essential part of this best plan. Also Hells Canyon avoids the Salmon River fish problem.

That is the report of the engineers of the Secretary's own Department. In years gone by his own engineers have recommended the Hells Canyon Dam project because, for one reason, it does not involve any interference with the fish industry.

Secretary McKay apparently believes that Hells Canyon Dam is too expensive to procure congressional support. In the quote from his statement, he recommends Mountain Sheep Dam as an alternative to Hells Canyon Dam as support for Mountain Home Dam irrigation.

But let us see what the Department said in 1952, about high Mountain Sheep Dam—page 8, "Selected information," supra:

> Further, it would cost the United States an initial outlay of approximately $150 million more than Hells Canyon, and would require an expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars by the private power company.
>
> If the high Mountain Sheep Dam is built, neither the Nez Perce nor the Hells Canyon Dams could be built or justified, and the loss of storage capacity in the Hells Canyon site would be a permanent loss, and nothing could ever be done to recover it.
>
> Incidentally, it is noteworthy that the high Mountain Sheep Dam, with a hydraulic height of 739 feet, would be a dam of completely unprecedented height. By way of comparison, Hoover (Boulder) Dam has a hydraulic height of 576 feet. It would take years to make the detailed plans for such a structure, and many more years to build it.

Yet despite the negative recommendation of his own engineers, the present Secretary of the Interior makes a statement which flies directly in the face of the scientific findings of his own Department.

Does the Department claim to have resolved the difficulties pointed out in the 1952 report? Has it recommended construction of those projects? The plain answer is "No."

The Department merely takes a Micawber-like attitude that "something will turn up." I submit that the something will continue to be sagebrush if the program of the new administration and the new team in the Interior Department is followed.

LOW-COST POWER FOR IRRIGATION PUMPING

In addition to the direct irrigation benefits, the new block of low-cost electric power provided by Hells Canyon Dam would lower the cost of pumping for irrigation.

As I observed when introducing Senate bill 1664:

> Compared with rates charged farmers in Oregon and Washington, Idaho rates are exceedingly high. The farmer's monthly electric bill in Idaho is much higher than that of his neighbor in the two coastal States.
>
> What does this mean to the farmer who would like to irrigate new land by pump? The added cost frequently determines whether or not it's possible for the farmer to irrigate * * * to bring new land into production. It's a gross handicap to the State of Idaho which needs new agricultural land for its sons and daughters.
>
> A comparison of power rates will illustrate the point. For instance, a typical pumping operation, involving irrigation of 100 acres with an average of 3½ acre-feet of water, lifted 100 feet, would cost $709.40 in areas served by the Umatilla Electric Co-op in Oregon, and the Big Bend Electric Co-op, the Benton County REA, the Columbia County REA, and the Okanogan Electric Co-op, all in the State of Washington. They all purchase low-cost power from the Columbia River system.
>
> In contrast to this cost of $709.40, the Idaho Power Co. bill for the same operation would be $867.10, or $155.70 more—money which the farmer could be putting in the bank or spending with local businessmen. When the lift is greater, an even larger difference in pumping costs is involved.
>
> That Idaho farmers are concerned about high power costs for underground pumping was clearly demonstrated recently. Sixty-one central and southeastern Idaho irrigationists appeared to protest the increased power rate the Idaho Power Co. is seeking at the hearing before the Idaho Public Utilities Commission. Verne Ames, representing American Falls underground water users through the Farm Bureau Federation, said, "Any rate increase would certainly hinder the development of Idaho's thousands of unwatered acres."
>
> With low-cost Hells Canyon made available to them through the Idaho Power Co., REA's, municipalities and other organizations, farmers need not be concerned with high costs for pumping.

FLOOD CONTROL

This is what the Secretary of the Interior says about flood control:

> Insofar as flood control is concerned, there is little to choose between the two plans. Either the Hells Canyon Dam with its larger storage capacity and the Brownlee Dam with its lesser storage capacity would, if they had been operated perfectly, have had the effect of reducing the crest of a flood equal to that of 1948 by about 0.7 feet at Portland. For larger floods on the Snake River, which occur infrequently, the Brownlee Dam would be somewhat less effective than the Hells Canyon Dam.

First, it should be made clear that the Brownlee Dam referred to is the larger one projected for plan A. I reiterate that as of May 5, it was not known whether that larger Brownlee Dam could be built to store 1,000,000 acre-feet of water. Plan B, which the Secretary does not discuss, would provide no flood-control benefits.

But, Mr. President, I am shocked at the calm with which the new head of the Interior Department brushes off the relative ineffectiveness of the Idaho Power plan if a flood larger than that of 1948 should occur. He says such floods are infrequent.

But, Mr. President, if one is living on the banks of a river which is subject to floods, and if one of the floods occurs, there is no rescue value in a statement by the Secretary of the Interior that such floods are infrequent. At the critical moment the flood is very real to those who live on the banks of the river.

One of the things that concerns me is the shocking lack of political morality that characterizes the Eisenhower administration. "Anything for profits, but little for the people" seems to be their motto.

To have a Secretary of the Interior try to rationalize and alibi and justify, on the ground that the large floods are infrequent, a failure to support a plan that

will give the maximum development of flood-control potential, shows a bankruptcy of idealism on the part of the Eisenhower administration, and a capitulation to political immorality.

It happens to be the obligation of a government of a free people, in my judgment, to do the things necessary to protect the lives, property, and welfare of the people. I, for one, am going to protest vigorously the attempt of the Eisenhower administration, speaking through its Secretary of the Interior, to escape its moral responsibility to do the things necessary to be done to save the people who live in flooded areas from suffering from floods, I care not how infrequent the floods may be. After all, a baby drowned is a baby drowned. The fact that people may be drowned infrequently does not bring to life those who are drowned.

The truth of the matter is that if the people of the United States are willing to make some economic sacrifice for a time, by investing capital in self-sustaining and self-liquidating multiple-purpose dams, we can prevent the loss of life by floods.

I intend to force the issue with this administration, on the question of its lack of political morality. As a people, we are simply not going to accept the alibi that such great floods are infrequent. When we have a chance to make a choice as between two projects, one of which will do a much better job in building up a reservoir for flood-control purposes than the other will do, we will not agree to the construction of the one proposed by the private monopoly, which will not give our people the protection they deserve in the field of flood control.

On this question the attitude on the part of the Eisenhower administration is shocking. I want the American people to understand what it means. I want to translate the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior into human values. So as to show the American people how inhumane the proposals of the Eisenhower administration are in the field of flood control.

The worst Snake River flood occurred in 1894. If it were to be repeated now the loss in property and damage would come to some $350,000,000.

The Corps of Engineers advises me that Hells Canyon would save some $10 million to $12 million in private property from a flood of the 1948 dimensions. That is my answer to Brother McKay as to the property-loss feature. I accept the Army engineers as my expert witnesses. I try my case before the bar of public opinion, on this issue, with the testimony of the Army engineers, and I say to the Army engineers, "If you had had Hells Canyon Dam in 1948, you would have saved from $10 million to $12 million in property loss." The new administration, I thought, was supposedly interested in private property, supposedly concerned about private property. But I ask this afternoon whose private property?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Oregon have an estimate of the flood damage which might have been prevented during the 1894 flood in the area he mentioned?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I shall cover that. I am concerned about the private property on the Snake and on the Columbia down to Portland. Those property owners do not appreciate that they are expected to cope with "infrequent" floods. A flood when it comes can wash up a farmer or factory owner for life. Once the flood is too high, it is too much, and we should plan for it.

And we should plan for the long future pull. The flood of 1894 or 1948 can occur at any time in the next 100 years, the engineers tell me. We should build for the next 200.

Multimillion-dollar flood losses in private property mean lost investment, lost savings, lost plans, lost farms, lost jobs. And disasters of that sort weaken the whole surrounding countryside and region.

The Bureau plan for Hells Canyon is an integral part of the main control flood plan for the Northwest. Should there be a reoccurrence of the 1894 flood, disastrous as that flood was, the losses now, because of the increased population, the greater concentration of population and the building up of congested areas along the Columbia River, would be many times greater than they were in 1894, when the area was more sparsely populated. I repeat, the Bureau plan for Hells Canyon is an integral part of the main control flood plan for the Northwest, aimed at trying to prevent or greatly to reduce the damages of such great floods as those of 1894 and 1948. The Corps of Engineers, charged with the responsibility of analyzing flood problems and planning for their control, has categorically stated that Hells Canyon will provide complete control of the Snake River at that point in the river (see letter from Col. F. C. Itschner, Corps of Engineers, dated April 18, 1952, hearings on H. R. 5743, pages 618 to 620).

Quite obviously Brownlee, if feasible, would fall 2,800,000 acre-feet short of complete control.

It is pennywise to pretend to cut expenditures that will result in tens of millions of dollars of loss to American citizens. I say "pretend" to cut expenditures because 90 percent of the money spent for Hells Canyon will come back to the Treasury with interest.

That is investment. And we need such prudent investment for flood control also; I emphasize that statement, Mr. President, and it needs to be repeated many times as we discuss the problem of appropriations in the Congress of the United States. Of course, it is obvious to me that what the Secretary of the Interior does not realize—although I am surprised that he does not, since he has kept business books—is the difference between capital investment and operating cost; and the fact that in the Government's bookkeeping the two are mixed up. We simply do not have a sound system of bookkeeping in the Federal Government. Capital investments ought to be entered in one place and not carried as part of the operating costs. If that were done, people could not use economy as an alibi in connection with the question of whether to build Hells Canyon Dam. Hells Canyon Dam is not going to be built at the expense of the taxpayer. It is going to pay for itself and, over the years, of course, it will create in terms of the value of an expanding economy, in the tax dollars that will flow from that expanding economy, many times its original cost.

I ask again, how are we to impart that information to the American people so they will clearly understand? I do not know how to do that except by repeating and repeating and repeating, by illustrating and illustrating and illustrating. They must see that when McKay talks about economy in connection with this issue he is fooling them. There is no economy in failing to build Hells Canyon Dam. In fact, it is wasteful not to build it. It is a false economy not to develop the maximum resources of the Snake River at Hells Canyon, including power, flood control, and irrigation. I say, Mr. President, we should invest in Hells Canyon, because we also need such prudent investment for flood control.

NAVIGATION

Mr. President, what about navigation? The Secretary concedes that Hells Canyon would be "somewhat more effective in improving navigation but this benefit is small in any event."

I suggest that this is a myopic view. Today, the navigability of the Snake is not a matter of tremendous concern. But it will be of increasing importance as new farms come under production, as new factories tool up along the Snake River and need inexpensive freight facilities and this area supports many new thousands of our citizens (see Itschner letter previously cited).

RECREATION AND TOURIST TRADE

What about recreation and tourist trade?

The 722-foot-high Hells Canyon Dam would be one of the highest dams in the world and the third largest. The canyon is deeper than Grand Canyon.

The magnificent lake behind the dam would be a garden spot for recreation, camping, boating, and fishing. As a tourist attraction, it would match Hoover Dam and Grand Coulee.

The people of the Northwest deserve such a resort for their enjoyment, and the hundreds of thousands of expected visitors would stimulate new trade.

In comparison, the Oxbow Dam and small Hells Canyon Dam would have all the attraction of an irrigation ditch on a neighboring farm.

When I think, Mr. President, of what it is proposed to substitute for the great recreational advantages of Hells Canyon Dam, when I think of the sacrifice the Secretary of the Interior is proposing of the benefits to the Pacific Northwest which would accrue from the Hells Canyon Dam project, I am at a loss to understand how a man could ever get himself

into such a position that he would be willing to substitute the interests of a private monopoly for those of a public project. I do not understand such a mentality. Yet, Mr. President, that is what he is proposing.

I repeat, the people will see through it.

What about the scare argument? Let me say that although the Secretary of the Interior tried to get the people to think that all he was doing was withdrawing as a special pleader in the case, he went on in his statement and again in his Boston speech, which I shall discuss some other week as a part of my committee report of the Independent Party to the Nation, because it is too late to go into it tonight; the interesting thing is that all the arguments he advanced were in support of the Idaho Power Co. He made a statement that was a special-pleader statement for the Idaho Power Co., and then said he was taking the Department of the Interior out of the class of being a special pleader.

That is just so much baloney, Mr. President. The American people are going to see it. He will not support building the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River, but let me tell you what he is going to do, and is doing. He is going to sell the American people down that river. That is the kind of a Secretary of the Interior we have.

Let us take up the argument about private enterprise. We need multiple-purpose Federal dams for the protection and the stimulation of private enterprise. Private enterprise will be developed to a much greater extent under the economic environment of a great multiple-purpose Federal dam than it will by paying tribute to a low-head private monopoly dam.

The Idaho Power Co. plan does not represent American private enterprise. Private enterprise provides new products and cheaper products for an expanding economy. That is the kind of private ownership that has done so much to develop this richly endowed land.

But, the mainspring of private enterprice is competition.

There is no competition to stimulate production, service to new areas, and ever lower rates in the power field without Federal dams and marketing by co-ops, public utility districts, and municipal systems. I tried to tell that story on the floor of the Senate on April 2. Public power is the people's yardstick.

Low-cost power is good for business and industry. In the Northwest it is indispensable. Every new kilowatt-hour of power has several potential customers. And new industry means new products, cheaper products, more jobs, more payrolls, more purchases, and more business.

That is the kind of private enterprise for which the backers of Hells Canyon are battling.

Mr. President, without taking the time to read it, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter signed by Herbert H. Scott, 2444 Grove Street, Baker, Oreg., which, in my judgment, is a good example of an argument from the grassroots concerning and in support of the desirability of public-power projects.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAKER, OREG., *May 1, 1953.*

DEAR SIR: Having been born less than a quarter of a mile from the bank of the Snake River and living on it and its tributaries for over 60 years, I know the river valley from one end to the other and am well acquainted with the canyon.

I have watched the river valley and its tributaries grow from a few farms along the river bottoms—the rest sagebrush, coyotes, jack rabbits, and horned toads—to one of the richest agricultural valleys in the Northwest. This was not done by private power or private dams but by Government-built dams that private companies could not or would not build because they could not wait 90 years for their money back.

I daresay that if the Government would figure the extra income from taxes alone, without the water charge, they would find that most of the projects had paid for themselves already.

For an example: I own a piece of property that 20 years ago I paid the State and county $80 taxes. No income taxes then. This year I paid the State and county $501.78 and the United States income tax $1,890.69. My renter, I am retired, paid the United States income tax of $2,656.52, making the Government income tax from this property $4,547.21, besides paying the water costs. These are the results of the Government coming in and taking over what private companies had already tried to do and had broke every farmer under the project.

Now if the Hells Canyon is left to the Idaho Power we will be just where we are now. But, if the Government builds the high dam, not only will Idaho, Oregon, and the West benefit by the high dam but our whole Nation will benefit from the revenue from the extra power that we need for industry.

As a heavy taxpayer in Malheur County, Baker County, Oreg., and Payette County, Idaho; I am, therefore, asking you not to let the Idaho Power have the Ox Bow site to spoil the wonderful Hells Canyon site. We have many minerals here such as lime, gypsum, and phosphate just waiting for the power to develop them.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. SCOTT.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would have the leaders of the Eisenhower administration in the executive branch of the Government and in the Congress read Herbert Scott's letter. We are going to hear from more Herbert Scotts in the next few years, because the Herbert Scotts are wise to what the Eisenhower administration is up to. The Herbert Scotts in America are wise to the fact that the Eisenhower administration has turned the Government over to the selfish profiteering interests of American monopoly not only with respect to the development of power resources, but with respect to natural resources generally.

To my Republican colleagues in the Senate, let me say today that one of the issues in 1954 and in 1956 will be that of natural resources, and the position of the junior Senator from Oregon is that those persons running for office who seek to exploit the natural resources of the people must be defeated in 1954 and in 1956, I care not who they may be, because the issue is more important than is the man. That is the position of the Independent Party. That is a very nonpartisan position, too, Mr. President, because it applies to Democrats as well as to Republicans. If they are out to exploit the natural resources belonging to the people, the Independent Party says to the American voters, "Defeat them at the polls. Turn the rascals out."

I say, Mr. President, that Hells Canyon Dam means a more secure, a more prosperous America for generations to come by the creation of inexpensive and plentiful power, ample irrigation, adequate flood control, improved navigation, and new recreational facilities.

I wish to point out for the RECORD that the people of Oregon have voted Oxbow down.

In various public statements, including his speech in Boston last Thursday before the American Power Association, the Secretary has said that he believes that there should be greater participation in the formulation of power policy at the local level.

A week ago last Friday, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] described at some length—and quite effectively—the nonlocal character of the Idaho Power Co.

The Secretary knows very well that the people of Oregon rejected the Oxbow Dam in a referendum.

One of the great political strengths of my State is that the people have reserved unto themselves a check on the politicians. In my State we have the great Oregon system of initiative, referendum, and recall. In my State we have a pure primary law, in which the people do the nominating. A man running for high office does not have to get the approval of a corrupt political machine or a group of political bosses before he can be nominated for office. The people do it, and they do it directly. In my State the people have protected themselves under the Oregon system of initiative and referendum.

In 1948 the Oregon Legislature passed, over the Governor's veto, a bill amending the State law governing hydroelectric projects. The matter was forced to a referendum.

The Oregon Voter, a private periodical which vigorously endorsed the amendments, had this to say, before the referendum, in its issue of September 4, 1948:

Quite unfortunately, Senate bill 99 originated out of a move by Idaho Power Co. to place an important power dam at what is known as Oxbow site, on the Snake River in Baker County. This circumstance easily led to the conclusion that Idaho Power has promoted the measure and promotes it chiefly out of selfish motives. It has been this narrowed view which influenced Mr. Snell—likewise former Gov. Charles Sprague—to oppose Senate bill 99.

The development which precipitated the proposal embodied in Senate bill 99 has been the wish of the Idaho Power Co. to obtain a license and build a $15 million to $28 million powerplant at Oxbow, Baker County, beside a wing dam on the Oregon side of the Snake River. This power company's representatives lobbied at Salem for the bill. The unfortunate feature of this circumstance is that it particularly affords opportunity for public ownership crusaders to assail the measure as a power site "grab." They are enabled to assert that little else than the selfish motives of the Idaho Co. would be served.

BROAD INTERESTS AT STAKE

During the campaign much will be heard of a selfish purpose of this particular company to "stop forever the Federal Government from building Hells Canyon Dam—a project bigger than Boulder Dam." It is asserted in this Grange argument that at least $314 million would be spent by the Government on that Snake project as against a possible $26 million (their figure) investment at Oxbow.

Implication that the Idaho Co.'s project would in any manner keep the Government from building Hells Canyon Dam—which would flood out Oxbow—is exaggeration in the extreme. It is untrue. One of those same objectors will tell you in the next breath that the Idaho Co. hopes to reap unholy gain by exacting a high price for its works when the Government builds the canyon project. Oxbow cannot prevent the Hells Canyon development and at the same time yield a profit as a result of its construction.

The building of Hells Canyon Dam, another monolithic river barrier like Grand Coulee, cannot be advocated as wholly wise and in any event belongs in the remote future. Hydro works at Oxbow could be of great usefulness over a considerable period of time before hundreds of millions of dollars are dumped into Hells Canyon, if ever.

If the voter prefers to look at SB 99 in the narrow view, as some cliques do, then he may perhaps in good conscience but unwisely vote "No" on the measure in November. It is to be hoped that a majority of electors will take the broader view of Oregon's possible development which was taken by 70 of the State's 90 legislators and will vote to remove the out-of-date hampering restrictions which preclude licensing and useful development of new hydro projects.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the major portion of the Oregon Voter's discussion of the referendum which demonstrates beyond a doubt that the undesirability of the Oxbow Dam was the basis on which opponents of the amendments campaigned. Its proponents urged adoption of the proposition by arguing to the contrary and urging the benefits of the Idaho Power Co.'s plan for Oxbow.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Quite unfortunately, Senate bill 99 originated out of a move by Idaho Power Co. to place an important power dam at what is known as Oxbow site, on the Snake River, in Baker County. This circumstance easily led to the conclusion that Idaho Power has promoted the measure and promotes it chiefly out of selfish motives. It has been this narrowed view which influenced Mr. Snell—likewise former Gov. Charles Sprague—to oppose Senate bill 99.

The development which precipitated the proposal embodied in Senate bill 99 has been the wish of the Idaho Power Co. to obtain a license and build a $15 million to $28 million powerplant at Oxbow, Baker County, beside a wing dam on the Oregon side of the Snake River. This power company's representatives lobbied at Salem for the bill. The unfortunate feature of this circumstance is that it particularly affords opportunity for public ownership crusaders to assail the measure as a power site grab. They are enabled to assert that little else than the selfish motives the Idaho Co. would be served.

BROAD INTERESTS AT STAKE

During the campaign much will be heard of a selfish purpose of this particular company to "stop forever the Federal Government from building Hells Canyon Dam—a project bigger than Boulder Dam." It is asserted in this Grange argument that at least $314 million would be spent by the Government on that Snake project as against a possible $26 million (their figure) investment at Oxbow.

Implication that the Idaho company's project would in any manner keep the Government from building Hells Canyon Dam—which would flood out Oxbow—is exaggeration in the extreme. It is untrue. One of those same objectors will tell you in the next breath that the Idaho company hopes to reap unholy gain by exacting a high price for its works when the Government builds the Canyon project. Oxbow cannot prevent the Hells Canyon development and at the same time yield a profit as result of its construction.

The building of Hells Canyon Dam, another monolithic river barrier like Grand Coulee, cannot be advocated as wholly wise and in any event belongs in the remote future. Hydro works at Oxbow could be of great usefulness over a considerable period of time before hundreds of millions of dollars are dumped into Hells Canyon, if ever.

If the voter prefers to look at Senate bill 99 in the narrow view as some cliques do, then he may perhaps in good conscience but unwisely vote "no" on the measure in November. It is to be hoped that a majority of electors will take the broader view of Oregon's possible development which was taken by 70 of the State's 90 legislators and will vote to remove the out-of-date hampering restrictions which preclude licensing and useful development of new hydro projects.

LEADERS SAY "YES"—IMPORTANT EASTERN OREGON GROUPS FAVOR ACT CHANGES

Many groups in eastern Oregon have gone on record for or against the changes in the hydroelectric law voted by the 1947 legislature in Senate bill 99.

Two sets of arguments—one opposing, one favoring the amendment—are to be carried in the official Voter's Pamphlet on behalf of eastern Oregon groups. (Two other arguments will be carried.)

The page argument from eastern Oregon opposing Senate bill 99 is signed by, and presumably has been paid for by, a group calling itself Eastern Oregon Citizenship Council. This is officially described as "a voluntary organization composed of farmers, laborers, businessmen, and other citizens of Baker, Union, Malheur, Wallowa, and other eastern Oregon counties." Signing as secretary was Clarence Carter, who transmitted the arguments to the secretary of state, accompanied by the $300 payment. Carter was, until late in August, a director of Union County Public Utilities Administration, and at the same time Democratic candidate for State representative. Due to this candidacy he resigned as public utilities administration director.

The eastern Oregon groups which sponsor the amendment and a "300 X Yes" vote are much more official in nature. That is today, they represent permanent organizations—city councils, chambers of commerce, civic clubs. Some little weight should be given this point of difference between the favoring and opposing groups—that the one is composed of elected and appointed executives whereas the other is no more than a name for a temporary, loosely aggregated bunch of residents, the large majority of whom favor public ownership of power utilities.

OPPONENTS GIVE STATEMENTS

Mr. Carter's group sets forth 3 reasons why its members "oppose the construction of Oxbow Dam." First, we quote, then follow with only the briefest of comment since fuller rebuttal is given elsewhere. The 3 opposition "because's":

"1. The Oxbow development, as well as others planned by the Idaho Power Co. on the Snake River, will prevent the establishment of new irrigation projects and will jeopardize existing irrigation projects and water rights in Oregon.

"2. The Oxbow development is too small to provide the abundant and low-cost power which is needed for the development of new industries in eastern Oregon.

"3. The Oxbow Dam will not provide any flood control and will block the building of Hells Canyon Dam—a dam which is needed if we are to prevent another Vanport."

There is added a further jab at the Idaho Power Co., in part saying: "The Idaho Power Co. has owned and operated a 600-kilowatt dam at Oxbow for more than 30 years. It did not see fit to develop this dam until the Government proposed to construct the million-kilowatt Hells Canyon Dam, a large multipurpose dam just below the Oxbow."

REASONING NOT SOUND

There is amazingly little merit in the foregoing arguments, on which the Eastern Oregon Citizenship Council so substantially rests its case. What merit there is would seem to be mostly embodied in the No. 1 argument. As to that, the Voter does not believe the construction of the Oxbow Dam would prevent further irrigation projects, or jeopardize existing irrigation projects or water rights. It is our understanding that such further irrigation projects as are feasible would harm the power dams, including Hells Canyon, rather than be prevented or harmed by the dams. Wouldn't it be the duty of the Federal Power Commission to reject the company application if building of the dam threatened in any appreciable manner to preclude desirable proposed irrigation works?

Argument that the Oxbow development would be too small to do much good is a superficial argument. It is proposed that the Oxbow plant shall have ultimate capacity of 130,000 kilowatts. That is more than one-eighth of Grand Coulee's present capacity. Furthermore, Idaho Power already is acceptably taking care of the industries in its eastern Oregon territory. The addition of even 50,000 kilowatts of capacity would mean that a large new demand from industries could be satisfied.

The pretense that Oxbow should be vetoed because it would not afford flood control is silly. The implication that even a mammoth dam such as Coulee or Bonneville would help "prevent another Vanport" yields no credit to the council, for power dams, whether large or small, do not prevent floods. TVA has more than 20 completed dams and still has serious floods, as 1948 pictures reposing on the writer's desk attest.

ARGUMENTS BY PROPONENTS

The eastern Oregon proponents of a "yes" vote favoring Senate bill 99 urge the favorable vote by all who want—

"1. More electric power plants built to benefit the people of Oregon.

"2. More property added to the tax-rolls for relief of taxpayers and the support of State and local government.

"3. Full protection to the rights of the State in the development of its natural resources."

Those are not direct arguments. The ensuing thread of argument declares that "After long and careful study, we in eastern Oregon are convinced that the proposed law is a good thing—good for the people of the entire State. It will make possible an orderly expansion of the electric industry and help provide needed electric power for our future growth and development without jeopardizing the rights of the State."

Noting that there has been no hydroelectric development in Oregon by private industry in the 17 years the hydroelectric law has been in effect, the argument proceeds: "It is evident that certain sections of the Oregon Hydroelectric Act have been too restrictive. Natural resources belong to the people and rightfully so, but they become

useful only when developed. In this period of industrial growth, the State faces a power shortage, and must make possible the building of powerplants by private business as well as by public agencies."

SITE LEASE ONLY—NOT LOSS OF RIGHTS

Affirming that the State would not surrender any right of value, the collective proponent group says:

"The law (as changed) still provides that at the end of the license period the property may be taken over by the State of Oregon upon giving notice and payment of remaining net investment as stated in the act. The State would not surrender its rivers—merely lease their use. Furthermore, nothing in the bill restricts the right of the State or any municipality to take over the project at any time by condemnation.

"It appears to us that those who oppose the enactment of this proposed law are doing so merely because they oppose any and all expansion of private enterprise. In opposing such expansion, they are recklessly disregarding the welfare of the people.

"There is an acknowledged shortage of electric power in many sections of Oregon, principally in areas where the Federal Government has assumed the responsibility for its supply. Yet those who favor further extension of Government ownership are not content—they would withhold all development unless it conforms to their own ideology, and therefore seek to prevent investments by private enterprise. In this period of State growth, sound development of Oregon's natural resources should be encouraged by all its citizens."

Now note the importance and wide range of bodies and organizations associated in urging a "yes" vote, their arguments sketchily, only in part summarized here: City of Baker, Baker County Taxpayers Leagues, Ontario Chamber of Commerce, Baker County Chamber of Commerce, Kiwanis Club of Baker, Vale Chamber of Commerce, Baker Junior Chamber of Commerce, Nyssa Chamber of Commerce, and Baker Lions Club.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what about the results of the election? The results speak for themselves. The proposition was defeated in 35 of 36 counties, and the vote was:

For the Oxbow proposition, 173,004.

Against the Oxbow proposition, 242,100.

Mr. President, that is one reason why I am a little amused when people ask the questions: Does MORSE really represent public opinion in his State? Do the people of Oregon really feel about these issues the way MORSE seems to feel?

We will let the record speak for itself. I know what the people of my State think about Oxbow. They have told me at the polls. I know what my people think about Hells Canyon Dam, because it has been an issue in my campaign.

Mr. President, when I stood here for 22 hours and 26 minutes to dramatize the giveaway program of the Eisenhower administration with respect to tidelands, I knew what my people thought, because tidelands was an issue in my campaign in 1950.

I have no doubt what my people think about the public power issue. I know the grassroots sentiment of Oregon is with me. To my Republican friends, all at dinner except my good friend, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is now presiding, let me say that I shall prove it to them in 1956. My people know that their interests will be protected best by following the principles of conservation of the great Norris, of Pinchot, and of Teddy Roosevelt.

So, I thought my colleagues would be interested in having in the RECORD, at least, what the people of my State said at the polls after a hot referendum campaign on the Oxbow issue.

Mr. President, in Oregon we take the referendum seriously, and the voters are very discriminating. Eleven propositions were before the electorate in the 1948 election. Six were accepted, and five were rejected, including the amendment for which the Idaho Power Co. lobbied to facilitate its Oxbow Dam.

Let me remind the Secretary of the Interior that that is local participation in the formulation of power policy.

What about more local sentiment? As an indication of sentiment at the local level, backers of Hells Canyon have had printed three post cards, two of which are being sent to the Federal Power Commission and Secretary McKay, urging construction of the indispensable Federal dam. A third, addressed to Mrs. PROST and me, are sent to me, as an indication of the volume. This campaign has been under way only about 2 weeks.

As of yesterday afternoon 1,782 cards had come into my office from Oregon, Idaho, and Washington.

That, Mr. McKay, is an expression of local sentiment.

I intend in my weekly reports to keep the Senate informed from time to time as to the official tabulation in connection with the drive in the State of Oregon to have some local expression of sentiment. I say to the people of Oregon today, "Let me hear from you. I will welcome your communications, and I will keep the Senate informed as to the count showing where you stand on Hells Canyon Dam. Let us have a poll voluntarily springing from the grassroots of Oregon on the issue of whether or not you support your Senator in the fight he is making in the Senate in opposition to the attempt of a private monopoly to gain, through the Eisenhower administration, control of the Snake River, which belongs to all the people of the country."

WHO IS THE DOG IN THE MANGER?

The Secretary of the Interior says:

The Department of Interior would be playing the reprehensible part of a dog in the manger if it insisted on opposing a badly needed development that private capital is ready and willing to undertake if the plan sponsored by the Idaho Power Co. is reasonably comparable as to results, while the Department itself has no assurance that it can carry out its plan without extended delay.

But who is playing the dog in the manger?

The Oxbow site is not indispensable to the Idaho Power Co.'s needs, but its construction would foreclose erection of Hells Canyon Dam for the simple reason that Oxbow is in the area to be covered by Hells Canyon reservoir. This is recognized by the Federal Power Commission in a letter from its secretary to me dated April 27, 1953 which recites:

The proposed Oxbow development conflicts with the proposed Hells Canyon project recommended for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Let me quote from a front page story in the Argus-Observer of Ontario, Oreg., dated April 23, 1953:

The Idaho Power Co. plans to begin building a $15 to $20 million dam within the next few months, A. C. Inman, attorney for the company, told the Ontario City Council Monday night.

Robert Ball, assistant to the president of the company, verified the statement to the Argus-Observer Wednesday.

Ball said that the demand for power was so great that the company would soon need to build another dam. He said that the company hoped the Federal Government would approve the Oxbow site but, if it did not, the company had other sites nearer the head waters of the river.

I think that was a bad slip of the tongue. It was letting the cat out of the bag, giving us a pretty clear indication as to the identity of the dog in the manger. He is covered with a great many little fleas, too. Senators know what I mean by that. The dog in the manger about which the Secretary of the Interior was speaking has a great many fleas on him, in the form of the stooges, the hirelings of a private monopoly which is seeking to use men holding a public trust in a manner calculated to defeat the public interest.

The position of the assistant to the president of the Idaho Power Co. is borne out by the fact that the Idaho Power Co. has filed requests for other dams with the State of Idaho at three other upriver sites: Eagle Rock, near American Falls Dam; Guffey, near Murphy, Idaho; and Upper Bliss, near the company's present Bliss power site. The company states that these sites would produce 142,000 kilowatts, about the same as the Oxbow plant.

What is the urgent necessity for Oxbow, a dam which would destroy the incomparable Hells Canyon site and, as I will show in a moment, imperil the future development of the Snake and lower Columbia?

Who, indeed, is the dog in the manger?

HELLS CANYON: KEYSTONE OF THE SNAKE AND LOWER COLUMBIA SYSTEM

In endorsing the Secretary's decision on Hells Canyon last Thursday, President Eisenhower is reported to have said, in essence, that each public-power project would be judged on its individual merits.

If this was an effort to imply that future development of the Snake and lower Columbia had not been scrapped and that abandonment of Hells Canyon is not a deathblow to the carefully investigated and planned blueprint for full development of the Columbia Basin, the attempt at reassurance was either disingenuous or based upon lack of knowledge. Certainly the Interior Department knows better.

For as Hells Canyon goes, so goes the Snake and lower Columbia. The Hells Canyon Dam is the keystone of the system. Inasmuch as the Secretary has resolved all issues against the Hells Canyon project, he can hardly be expected to view other projects which would be integrated with Hells Canyon with greater sympathy.

Let us examine the projects which would be more efficient and whose power

would be augmented by the release of Hells Canyon water during periods of low water downstream.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a table showing integration benefits which appears at page 377 of the 1952 House hearings on H. R. 5743.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nominal price capability, kilowatts

Plant	With Hells Canyon	Without Hells Canyon	Added by Hells Canyon
Hells Canyon	688,000		688,000
Lower Granite	170,000	116,000	54,000
Little Goose	209,000	141,000	68,000
Lower Monumental	194,000	132,000	62,000
Ice Harbor	204,000	139,000	65,000
McNary	617,000	569,000	48,000
John Day	715,000	659,000	56,000
The Dalles	687,000	637,000	50,000
Bonneville	476,000	452,000	24,000
Other plants	3,894,000	3,885,000	9,000
Total	7,854,000	6,730,000	1,124,000

Mr. MORSE. The table shows the augmentation of power output at eight major downstream dams and a few other minor installations attributable to Hells Canyon. The eight are either in operation, under construction, or authorized.

Let us examine the authorized but unfinanced projects. Significantly no funds were requested by the Interior Department for beginning construction.

As the table shows, Lower Granite, which is only authorized, has a potential of 170,000 kilowatts, 54,000 of which would result from integration with Hells Canyon—that is approximately one-third of the total. We have the same situation in regard to Little Goose—68,000 kilowatts—again approximately one-third dependent upon Hells Canyon. Lower Monumental and Ice Harbor are in the same category. John Day is similar. Of its full potential of 715,000 kilowatts, 56,000 would result from Hells Canyon.

The remaining dams which are in place or under construction would each have integration benefits smaller in kilowatts and percentage than any of the dams which are only authorized.

Can we not see the Secretary testifying at hearings next year or the year after, that in the interests of economy, construction of these dams would not be warranted, because the original potential which might have warranted the cost could not be realized. But he will not go on to tell us why. What is the reason? It is because Hells Canyon would not be available to boost their output by one-half of their unintegrated prime kilowatt capability.

Mr. President, he will not go on to state that the position he took in 1953 as Secretary of the Interior, if his view is allowed to prevail, made it possible for the Idaho Power Co. to destroy for all time this great potential, and this was the real cause for his being able to make the argument that the downstream dams should not be built. I refuse to believe that the Senate will be so shortsighted as not to see through that statement.

We have seen exactly that type of reasoning, which I have criticized on the part of the Secretary of the Interior, in the Secretary's statement on Hells Canyon. He states:

> Furthermore, the value of the storage for the generation of power in either plan (Hells Canyon and the Idaho Power Co.'s plan) is dependent to a very large extent on the number of downstream power plants through which the stored water can flow.

I predict that the argument, that the "value of the storage for the generation of power in either plan is dependent to a very large extent on the number of downstream powerplants through which the stored water can flow," will be used in reverse when the Secretary argues against the desirability of downstream plants.

If we now destroy the possibility of building Hells Canyon Dam we will find ourselves listening to the argument, "with that potential gone, there is no longer any great need for the development of the downstream dams."

It becomes regrettably clear that the Secretary has not merely turned thumbs down on Hells Canyon, he has endangered, if not foreclosed, the vital plans for full development of the Snake and lower Columbia.

And the rationalization is that there is immediate need for 106,000 kilowatts from Oxbow.

The people of the Northwest know this for the sophistry that it is. What they and the Nation need is the full potential of 7,854,000 kilowatts which all of the dams in place, under construction, and authorized, plus Hells Canyon, will provide.

With the loss of Hells Canyon's 688,000 kilowatts and storage, the probability is that the one and a half million kilowatts of the authorized but unfinanced dams will be gone forever. To that must be added the 131,000 kilowatts which Hells Canyon would add to Bonneville and the dams under construction. Assuming that those under construction will be completed, the results of junking Hells Canyon will come to 2,311,000 kilowatts a year.

With the keystone gone, the bridge may very well not be built.

Mr. President, in closing I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks the Orchard Heights Farmers' Union resolution on Hells Canyon.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON HELLS CANYON DAM ADOPTED BY ORCHARD HEIGHTS LOCAL, OREGON FARMERS UNION

Whereas the Idaho Power Co. is trying to block construction of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River; and

Whereas this dam is needed to insure maximum development of Columbia River power; and

Whereas cheap power is required for the manufacture of phosphate fertilizer from the phosphate beds in eastern Idaho: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Orchard Heights local of the Oregon Farmers' Union urge Secretary Douglas McKay and members of the Oregon delegation in Congress to oppose the application of the Idaho Power Co. now before the Federal Power Commission to build Oxbow Dam, and further urge that authorization of Hells Canyon Dam and a start on construction be made at an early date.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a resolution of the Mount Pisgah local of the Oregon Farmers' Union.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DALLAS, OREG., *May 4, 1953.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In action taken at the Mount Pisgah local of the Oregon Farmers' Union, at the meeting of May 1, it was voted unanimously to urge you to use all possible influence to save Hells Canyon damsite for all of the people of the Northwest instead of turning it over to the Idaho Power Co.

Very truly yours,

KATHERINE ALSIP,
Secretary, Mount Pisgah Local of Farmers' Union.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Hood River County Pomona Grange.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas there is a hearing proposed on the construction of Hells Canyon Dam; and

Whereas we feel that the construction of this dam would greatly benefit the Northwest by increasing the power developed, regulating the flow of the stream, benefit for irrigation, and increase recreational area; and

Whereas the Hells Canyon Dam would bring cheap power for the development of fertilizer and phosphate beds, and other benefits of cheap electricity; and

Whereas the smaller dams as proposed by the private power companies would fail to fully develop the area: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Hood River County Pomona Grange favor the construction of Hells Canyon Dam and do hereby endorse the bill introduced by Senator MORSE, Senator JACKSON, and Representative PROST.

HOOD RIVER COUNTY POMONA GRANGE,
CLARENCE MCCOY, *Secretary*,
GEORGE E. MORELL, *Pomona Master*.
HOOD RIVER, OREG., *May 5, 1953.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point Secretary McKay's statement, so that the RECORD will be complete and show the sophistry I have been answering in my speech this afternoon. It is sophistry. It is a statement which denies to the people of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest their interest in a public heritage.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY MCKAY'S MAY 5, 1953, STATEMENT ON HELLS CANYON PROJECT

The Hells Canyon project has been planned to produce a large block of power at the dam site, increase the power output at several existing and proposed dams downstream, improve navigation and flood control and produce recreation benefits. In addition, it is intended to provide a subsidy that will permit the reclamation of a large acreage of irrigable farmland in the vicinity of Mountain Home, Idaho.

The cost of the Hells Canyon project is not small and bears examination in the light of present efforts to balance the national budget. The estimated cost of the facilities

directly related to Hells Canyon and necessary to produce and distribute the power which is credited to this project is $559,791,000, divided as follows:

Hells Canyon Dam, including powerplant	$356,810,000
Transmission lines	144,274,000
Additional turbines and generators required at down stream dams	58,707,000
Total direct cost of produce and distribute power credit to Hells Canyon	559,791,000

The estimated cost of the Payette unit of the Mount Home irrigation system is $282,800,000. This will irrigate 193,000 acres of land and provide 90,000 kilowatts of installed generating capacity.

The total estimated costs of the Hells Canyon project and the Payette unit is $842,691,000. The cost of power is $337 per kilowatt of installed capacity and the cost of irrigation is $1,200 per acre.

It is also necessary to appreciate that before the full estimated power benefits of Hells Canyon can be realized, all of the proposed and authorized dams on the Snake and Columbia Rivers below Lewiston must be completed. Of these, Bonneville Dam is now completed, McNary Dam is nearing completion, and the Dalles Dam is being built. No appropriations have been made for the John Day Dam or any of the 4 dams on the lower Snake River. The estimated cost of these 5 new dams, not including transmission lines, is $881 million. For this investment separate power, navigation, and flood control benefits will be realized to support the cost but nonetheless the money must be spent before Hells Canyon Dam is fully effective.

The Hells Canyon project has been before Congress twice. On one occasion legislation was indefinitely postponed and on the other it was defeated. New legislation is now before both Houses, but in view of efforts to balance the budget it appears doubtful that appropriations for the work could be justified now even if the project is authorized.

We, therefore, find ourselves with a plan to do some very desirable things for the Northwest and we do believe the Hells Canyon project is generally feasible from an engineering viewpoint. However, we cannot be unmindful of the probability that the large appropriations necessary to start and complete the work may not be available for a considerable period of time. This would be of less significant consequence if the Northwest were not now critically short of power so necessary for its own economic well-being and also for the defense effort. For these reasons at least we must, therefore, give serious consideration to the proposal of the Idaho Power Co. plan to build dams on the Snake River at Hells Canyon, Oxbow, and Brownlee.

The Department of the Interior would be playing the reprehensible part of "a dog in the manger" if it insisted on opposing a badly needed development that private capital is ready and willing to undertake if the plan proposed by the Idaho Power Co. is reasonably comparable as to results, while the Department itself has no assurance that it can carry out its plan without extended delay.

The matter then reduces itself to two basic questions which are:

1. Will the plan to build the Hells Canyon, Oxbow and Brownlee Dams permit reasonably comparable development of the natural resources involved and avoid serious wastage?

2. Will it be possible to find other reasonably comparable means of providing a subsidy for the reclamation features of this project?

While the responsibility for resolving the first question is by law a matter for the Federal Power Commission to determine, we do recognize that the matter can be argued either way. If cost and economics and time of completion are discounted, the Hells Canyon project will probably produce more total prime power than the three-dam plan though even this point can be contested. However, our general studies do not indicate that the advantage is large.

Both the Hells Canyon Dam and the 3-dam plan would provide a maximum head for generation of power of 602 feet. The Hells Canyon Dam would have an ultimate installed capacity of 900,000 kilowatts and the 3 dams would have 783,000 kilowatts. The essential difference in the 2 plans lies in the greater storage capacity of 3,880,000 acre-feet for Hells Canyon and 1 million acre-feet by Idaho power Co. The 1 million acre-feet is approximately sufficient to store all of the surplus water that flows through Hells Canyon in a low-water year. The greater storage in the Hells Canyon Dam becomes valuable over a period of several low-water years. Furthermore, the value of the storage for the generation of power in either plan is dependent to a very large extent on the number of downstream powerplants through which the stored water can flow.

If all the presently completed and under-construction projects below Hells Canyon are considered, the Hells Canyon Dam is creditable with approximately 210,000 kilowatts of prime power more than the 3 dams. If all of the authorized, but not financed, projects are completed the advantage to Hells Canyon becomes about 260,000 kilowatts. If all of the projects proposed for the Columbia River System are built, the advantage to Hells Canyon is reduced to approximately 170,000 kilowatts of prime power. There are other possible combinations of proposed projects that will give either greater or less difference but the above figures are believed to be a reasonable measure of the maximum difference that should be anticipated.

It should be noted that, considering the time necessary for design and construction before initial production of power and the need for balancing the national budget, it is reasonable to assume that the first unit of the 3-dam project can be on the line 7 or 8 years before the Hells Canyon Dam can be in production. During this period there would, in effect be, a substantial loss of power and based upon reasonable estimates, the Hells Canyon project would have to operate more than 25 years before it could possibly make up for the loss. It could never replace the loss at the present time when it is very critical.

Insofar as flood control is concerned, there is little to choose between the two plans. Either the Hells Canyon Dam with its larger storage capacity and the Brownlee Dam with its lesser storage capacity would, if they had been operated perfectly, have had the effect of reducing the crest of a flood equal to that of 1948 by about 0.7 foot at Portland. For larger floods on the Snake River, which occur infrequently, the Brownlee Dam would be somewhat less effective than the Hells Canyon Dam.

The Hells Canyon Dam would be somewhat more effective in improving navigation but this benefit is small in any event.

The responsibility for resolving the second question, which has to do with reclamation subsidy, is not a direct concern of the Federal Power Commission but rather a matter for the Department of the Interior and the Congress to consider. The Hells Canyon project is not an integral part of the Payette unit or any other reclamation project and so there is no reason why it need be considered the only project that can be used to create this subsidy. For this purpose, and if Congress agrees, there appears to be no reason why other projects in the basin could not be used with the same logic as that proposed for Hells Canyon. Of these other projects there is Mountain Sheep or Nez Percé on the Snake River, several dams on the Salmon and more on the Clearwater Rivers.

In view of these circumstances and since by law the Federal Power Commission is clearly charged with considering the matter of full and reasonable development of the resources involved, the Department of the Interior will follow the usual and normal process of furnishing the Federal Power Commission with all information, plans, and other data available to the Department in the matter and will abide by the findings of the Commission. Accordingly, the Department will withdraw the petition for intervention filed on June 27, 1952.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article written by Lowell Mellett entitled "Another Name for 83d Congress," published in the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER NAME FOR 83D CONGRESS—IN LIGHT OF OLD POWER POLICY, READOPTED BY HOUSE, IT COULD BE CALLED THE COME-AND-GET-IT CONGRESS

(By Lowell Mellett)

There seems to be considerable resentment among statesmen of the majority party because some people are calling this the give-away Congress. The phrase came into rather general use during the prolonged debate over the offshore oil land bill. Already you can hear it resounding up and down the land in the congressional campaign of next year when the Democrats hope to regain control of the lawmaking body. As said, the Republicans don't like it, but that isn't likely to lessen its use. The Democrats remember the effectiveness of President Truman's unrelenting denunciation of the do-nothing 80th Congress. So, in their language, the 83d is going to be the give-away, unless they happen to hit on something they regard as even more descriptive—such, for example, as the come-and-get-it Congress.

As illustrating the Government's generosity toward the private power interests the latter description may be even more pat. Because of its sinister name and the immensity of the gift, the abandonment of the Hells Canyon project in favor of the Idaho Power Co. has attracted chief attention, but the same treatment is being accorded a large number of smaller projects designed to serve the people of many States. In cutting the Interior Department's budget by one-third, the House Interior Committee hit intended power projects hardest of all, granting only one-half of what was asked. Farmers expecting to obtain light and power through their REA cooperatives, were told in effect to buy the same from the private power companies at the companies' prices. All new facilities for direct service to the co-ops were killed. Going beyond the administration's 40-percent slash in funds for the Southwestern Power Administration, the House made it impossible to continue delivering wholesale power to co-ops serving 250,000 farmers in Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas.

In addition to killing transmission lines to the co-ops, the House killed the American Falls Dam project in Idaho, the site for which was bought from the Idaho Power Co. several years ago at a cost of $1 million. Three similar projects in Utah and one in Washington likwise were killed.

Coming up is the Army civil functions bill. From this the administration has eliminated funds for continuing work on dams in Arkansas, Oregon, and South Dakota and for a new project in Washington. Appropriations were severely slashed for dams under way in Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Oregon, and Washington. That in the last named State is Chief Joseph Dam,

recently in the news because the Government rejected a $1.5-million lower bid by a British firm and told Westinghouse to come and get the contract.

How the Senate will react to all of these assaults on public power cannot yet be determined. Rural cooperatives and the beneficiaries of reclamation and irrigation, all directly interested in the power projects, have been considered potent politically. It is possible, however, that the Senate will accept the new philosophy spelled out by the House committee in its report. This cited the Hoover Dam project of the 1920's as the pattern for the future, explaining, "The surplus power over and above the direct project needs (for operating gates, etc.) was leased to private utility companies and municipalities which financed and built the transmission facilities." In other words, the Government would build the dams and the power plants and tell the companies to come and get the power.

It becomes clear that the private power companies have not maintained a $400,000-a-year lobby in Washington in vain.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Riverview Farmers' Union, a resolution adopted by the Wallowa County Pomona Grange, No. 22, and a resolution from the Keating Grange, No. 823, of Baker County, Oreg.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIO, OREG., *May 9, 1953.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following is a resolution adopted by the Riverview Farmers Union at its last meeting.

"Whereas the rapid development of the great natural resources of the West are necessary to meet the requirements of the fast increasing population and whereas the present great government projects now completed or nearly so are proving to fall far short of supplying the necessary power required, it is essential for the good of all the people that a bill be passed to authorize the Federal Government to construct the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River in Idaho to develop new irrigation projects that would put thousands of acres of desert lands under production: that would furnish power to develop the great phosphate beds in eastern Idaho so badly needed now by western farmers: that would give the private power companies competition thereby assuring the people lower power rates and adding many millions of dollars in wealth to the people of our country: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Riverview Farmers Union, Loc No. 113, in regular session May 2, 1953, go on record as favoring the Federal construction of the Hells Canyon Dam in Idaho; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be placed on the permanent records of the local union, a copy be sent to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to the Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE, and to the Honorable Senator GUY CORDON.

"RALPH MCDONALD,
"Chairman of Resolutions Committee."

Very truly yours,

JOSEPHINE SOMMER,
Secretary, Riverview Farmers Union.

RESOLUTION OF WALLOWA COUNTY (OREG.) POMONA GRANGE, NO 22, PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY

Whereas we have formally resolved in favor of the construction of the Federal Dam at Hells Canyon as an essential element in the comprehensive plan of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers for maximum development of the Snake and Columbia Rivers; and

Whereas we are convinced on the basis of engineering facts that Hells Canyon Dam will provide the greatest possible use of the water of the Snake, and that its economic benefits will provide tremendous impetus to the region's economy; and

Whereas engineering facts incontestably demonstrate that the plans by the Idaho Power Company to develop the mid-Snake are inadequate and furthermore will prevent the construction of Hells Canyon Dam: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Douglas McKay, be urged to protect the public interest by continuing his Department as intervenor against the Oxbow project No. 1971 during the forthcoming technical hearings to be held before the Federal Power Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, be further urged to continue the historical role of his Department in the development of our land and water resources and do all in his power to obtain the earliest possible authorization of Hells Canyon Dam.

BARNEY JEWELL,
Master.
ETHEL PUDERBAUGH,
Secretary.

KEATING, OREG., *May 8, 1953.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Keating Grange No. 823, of Baker County, Oreg., favors the construction of Hells Canyon Dam and fully appreciates your support of the project.

Sincerely,

MRS. BARBARA COLVARD,
Secretary.
LUCY COOK, *Master.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Still as Clear as Mud." The article was published in the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of May 11, 1953. It was written by Edward J. Milne. Of course it refers to the public power policy of the Eisenhower administration. I believe mud is transparent in comparison with the density of the Eisenhower program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL AS CLEAR AS MUD

(By Edward J. Milne)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration attempted the other day to make clear its public power policy.

If it did become clear after a sort of is-you-is-or-is-you-ain't quizzing of Interior Secretary McKay, one could have been left only with this impression:

The policy is in the middle of the road, headed in both directions at once, with a blind alley at one end of the road and cul-de-sac at the other.

McKay, who used to be governor of Oregon, announced the policy, or said he was going to announce it, at a press conference to which the 11 Western governors, in town for the White House briefing on world affairs, were invited. All but Utah's Lee, who had to go home, showed up. All are Republicans.

WITHDRAWS DAM OPPOSITION

The main subject of the conference turned out to be an announcement by McKay that he was withdrawing the Department's opposition, instituted by Democratic Secretary Chapman, to the Idaho Power Co.'s request to the Federal Power Commission for permission to build a dam on the Snake River. This private project, Chapman had held, would mean the end of Federal plans (or at least Chapman's plans, for Congress has never approved them) to build the Hells Canyon Dam, which would become one of the Nation's greatest multiple-purpose (power, reclamation, navigation, conservation, flood control, etc.) river-harnessing projects.

SAYS GOVERNORS CONCUR

A reporter with western obligations asked McKay if his decision had been concurred in by the western governors.

"Yes, sir," the Secretary said.

"Fully, would you say?"

"Is there any governor that does not concur?" McKay asked.

There was no immediate response.

"They concur in the policy," McKay elaborated. "They weren't absolutely sure. Governor Warren, of California, raised the question that we wanted to be sure we were not shutting out possible projects in California or anywhere else."

"Or Colorado," spoke up Governor Thornton, of that State.

"Colorado raised the same point," said McKay. "They don't want to shut out projects. In other words, the United States Government is not going to get out of the business of generating power, or reclamation."

The colloquy took a new twist at this point, but a few minutes later McKay, a slip of paper in his hand, said:

"Here is a question that has been handed to me. I should clarify my position. It might be well to state that the governors' presence does not indicate their approval. They are here to get information, as guests. I don't want to put the governors on the spot. Someone asked me if they approved. They never heard of it until a little while ago. Let's not put the boys on the spot with your questions."

McKay repeated the Hells Canyon decision did not mean the end of Federal initiation of of multiple-purpose projects. Then:

"In the event the Federal Power Commission should deny the Idaho Power Co.'s application, do you have any idea what the Department itself would do?"

"First of all, it is up to Congress because Hells Canyon has not been authorized."

"You would request again an authorization of Hells Canyon?"

"We haven't requested it. It is Congress' request."

Here an assistant secretary chipped in:

"We would restudy it."

"We will restudy the thing," McKay said. "That is a good word."

NO PERSONAL PREFERENCE

Later:

"Mr. Secretary, which do you favor, the Hells Canyon project or the Idaho Power project?"

"I don't think that is important. I am not a lawyer. That is for the Federal Power Commission."

"Do you have any opinion?"

"My opinion? That is irrelevant to the discussion."

"The Department of the Interior did make a recommendation to Congress as to whether Hells Canyon should be built or not?"

"Yes."

"And thus did participate in policy matters?"

"That is right."

"Are you making such a recommendation?"

"I haven't been asked yet. If they should ask me for a recommendation, I would say 'No'."

"If you were asked for a recommendation on pending legislation authorizing Hells Canyon, what would you say about that?"

"I wouldn't oppose it."

McKay's letter to the Federal Power Commission withdrawing from the Idaho Power

Co. application case said "the Department destroys its own value as a repository of information when it becomes a partisan contestant."

ASKS AIDE TO CLARIFY

Reporters asked if that meant the Department no longer intended to intervene in any private application case. McKay said it didn't, then called on Clarence W. Davis, Department solicitor, to cover the point.

Davis said the Department's function is to supply FPC with information. "When this Department undertakes to override the judgment of the power commission it is placing itself in the position of a contestant before a body" with superior responsibility, he said, and "the general rule" would be for Interior to keep quiet.

Later in the press conference a reporter returned to that issue.

"I would like to ask an old question another way. I am confused. Does this mean where private enterprise steps in and applies for a license to build a dam on a western river the Department will not intervene?"

McKay: "No. Where did you get that idea?"

"Will you or won't you intervene if you feel that private enterprise would interfere with wildlife and natural resources?"

"Not intervene—I would appear before the Federal Power Commission with all of the information as to what it would do."

"Would you be a party as a contestant?"

"No."

"Don't your duties call for that safeguarding?"

"The letter (to FPC on Hells Canyon) says that today it is not the duty of this office, so stated by the attorneys, who are smarter than I am."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the United States Chamber of Commerce's Washington Report of May 15, 1953, entitled "First Major Victory Won by Private Power," reporting the statement of Secretary McKay and speeches before the chamber of commerce by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Aandahl and Representative COUDERT of New York.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST MAJOR VICTORY WON BY PRIVATE POWER

Faced with its first major decision in the public versus private power controversy, the Eisenhower administration last week gave the nod to private power.

Secretary of Interior McKay told newsmen he would oppose the Federal multipurpose hydroelectric dam at Hells Canyon, Idaho, should Congress ask his opinion. The dam was proposed by Interior's Bureau of Reclamation under Democratic administration.

On the other hand, McKay said, his Department will not oppose an application by the Idaho Power Co., a private utility, to build dams on the Snake River at Hells Canyon, Ox Bow and Brownlee, Ida. The application must be approved by the Federal Power Commission.

"We believe," McKay explained, "that private enterprise, wherever possible, should be allowed to develop water power projects, provided it does not interfere with the orderly development of our natural resources."

His statement tied in closely with an address by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Fred G. Aandahl before a natural resources committee luncheon at the National Chamber's 41st annual meeting. Aandahl disclosed sharp differences between the old administration and the new in the matter of Federal electric power sales.

"When I took office," Aandahl said, "I found we had inherited a Federal power structure aimed at a completely federalized electrical generating system that was fully monopolistic as far as the Federal Government was concerned."

BEYOND BOUNDS OF PROPRIETY

As a result, he said, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Southeastern and Southwestern Power Administrations "have reached out beyond the bounds of propriety as we measure it in the present administration."

He said one example was the improper use of the so-called preference clauses in laws governing the sale of Federal power which place certain groups of power users, notably cooperatives and municipalities, in a priority classification.

Aandahl described these preference clauses as "generally sound." But he said there is "sizable indication" that in the administration of Federal power sales, the clauses had been used "as an implement practically to force local communities to establish public power systems to take advantage of low-cost hydropower."

"I feel," he continued, "that Federal power should be dropped into the communities and distributed by whatever retail system prevails there at the time the power is available. If preference customers are there, they should be so recognized and sold power in long-term contracts. The remaining power should be made available by equally long-term contracts to the other customers in the area."

RECOGNIZE LIMITS

Aandahl disagreed with suggestions that Federal power projects should be turned over to big business, predicting an adverse public reaction.

"The public," he said, "would be just as critical of big business that is trying to gobble up this phase of Government activity as it would be critical of a government that is willing to turn it over to business.

"I feel that our policy should recognize the legitimate limits of Federal power."

Thus power generated by multipurpose dams should be supplied communities in such a way as to cause the least possible disturbance, Aandahl said. The power should be sold first to preference customers and then to other customers distributing power in the area.

"There is ample room," Aandahl concluded, "for the justifiable use of Federal power as indicated and for private enterprise. We must find a way of making those forces work together."

Representative FREDERIC COUDERT, Republican, New York, a second speaker, took a more positive position. "If I had my way," he said, "the Interior Department would be turned largely into a liquidating agency."

GET OUT, STAY OUT

"Whenever government moves into fields where free enterprise is able and willing to perform, then the answer must be 'get out'.

"Whenever government threatens to move into fields where private enterprise is in fact performing, then the answer is 'stay out.'"

COUDERT said his answer to the problem of government encroachment upon private enterprise was his resolution calling for a congressional investigation of the whole field of government in business. He called for an "honest, objective investigation" of all Government activities of a proprietary nature with a view of getting these activities back into private hands "so far as is consistent with the public interest."

He said the administration's proposals to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and to sell the synthetic rubber plants and Federal barge lines to private business "are steps in the right direction."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have one more little comment to make on the subject. We have a Governor in our State by the name of Patterson. I have before me a photostatic copy of an article which appeared in the Portland Oregonian. The headline reads: "Patterson Insists Oregon Must Receive Oxbow Power Regardless of Builder."

I shall ask unanimous consent to have the whole article printed in the RECORD at this point, but first I wish to read a paragraph or two from the article. It reads:

STATE HOUSE, SALEM, May 7.—The State of Oregon must receive its full share of power developed on the Snake River, whether the dams are constructed by the Federal Government or private interests, Gov. Paul Patterson said Thursday.

The Governor returned late Wednesday from Washington, D. C., where he attended the conference of State governors sponsored by President Eisenhower.

"It is not my intention to tell the Federal Power Commission who should be licensed to construct powerplants on the Snake River, but I will insist that Oregon get a fair proportion of any power developed," Patterson said.

That is stated several times in the story.

I ask unanimous consent that the whole article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, so I may comment on it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATTERSON INSISTS OREGON MUST RECEIVE OXBOW POWER REGARDLESS OF BUILDER

(By Wayne A. Pettit)

STATE HOUSE, SALEM, May 7.—The State of Oregon must receive its full share of power developed on the Snake River, whether the dams are constructed by the Federal Government or private interests, Gov. Paul Patterson said Thursday.

The Governor returned late Wednesday from Washington, D. C., where he attended a conference of State governors sponsored by President Eisenhower.

"It is not my intention to tell the Federal Power Commission who should be licensed to construct power plants on the Snake River, but I will insist that Oregon get a fair proportion of any power developed," Patterson said.

Public Utilities Commissioner Charles H. Heltzel will be asked to conduct a study to determine what Oregon's share would be.

HELTZEL IN ACCORD

Heltzel said that while he had not been called into conference by the Governor, he would undertake a study of the Snake River situation at any time.

Governor Patterson said Oregon's interest in power development should be written into licenses issued for power development projects.

Asked if the Snake River power wouldn't be fed into the Northwest power pool, Governor Patterson said:

"I still insist that Oregon receive its share of the power."

POOL STILL UNCERTAIN

"The Northwest power pool could be dissolved at any time as it is purely a voluntary arrangement."

The Governor said the 3-dam project of the Idaho Power Co. probably could be completed within 2 or 3 years while it might require 8 years to complete the Hells Canyon Dam. The Idaho Power Co. project would produce 783,000 kilowatts of power and the Hells Canyon project 950,000 kilowatts.

"I was much impressed with the type of men in the present administration," Governor Patterson continued, "and feel if they

can't pull us out of the present mess no one can."

The Governor made it plain that the Hells Canyon project is up to the Federal Power Commission.

PRIVATE CAPITAL FAVORED

Under its new policy, according to Patterson, the Interior Department will not oppose development of hydroelectric power by private capital provided private capital is able to avoid damage to natural resources.

"There is a strong chance," the Governor added, "that Congress will insist on the Government paying its full share of surcharges assessed by power companies during low-water periods." He referred to the 30 percent surcharge imposed by three Oregon power companies because of added expense in operating steam generating plants during the low water period last fall and early winter.

In a statement in Washington earlier this week, Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay said his Department would not oppose the Idaho Power Co.'s application for a dam on the Snake River.

Mr. MORSE. Is that not some statement? He wants to be sure that Oregon gets its fair share of whatever power is developed at Oxbow by the Idaho Power Co., at the tribute prices that the people of his State and my State will have to pay to that private utility.

That is the interest of the Governor of Oregon. But why does not the Governor of Oregon stand up and be counted on the issue of Hells Canyon Dam? I will tell you why, Mr. President. It is because he plays the same game that McKay plays, the private utility game.

If the Governor of Oregon was thinking of the interest of the people of his State, he would not be making the statement he made about the Hells Canyon Dam, namely, that he does not know what the interest of the State is in the dam. Let him take a trip to Baker, Oreg., or to other places in eastern Oregon, talk to the people there, and educate and inform himself as to the interest of the people of Oregon in Hells Canyon Dam.

Mr. President, today from the floor of the Senate, I say to the people of Oregon, "Get wise to your Governor, because he is a voice of the private utilities, so far as developing the natural resources of the State of Oregon is concerned."

They are getting wise to him. Labor got wise to him the other day, when he signed one of the most vicious antilabor acts ever passed by the legislature of my State. To Oregon labor, to the small-business men of Oregon, and to the people of Oregon generally I say today, "You will find me continuing to fight against such antilabor acts, because they are not in the interest of the businessmen of the State."

The act the Governor of Oregon signed the other day is one which is not in the interest of the small-business men of Oregon, but is an act which is bound to develop resentment and labor strife in the State.

Mr. President, I am proud, here on the floor of the Senate today, to pledge to the labor of Oregon, to the small-business men of Oregon, and to the people of Oregon generally that I will continue to stand on a record that cannot be reconciled with the kind of record the Governor of Oregon is making in the field of public power and in the field of labor legislation.

Mr. President, with that, I close my report of the Independent Party for the week.

Come next week, at an appropriate time on Friday, I hope to give my next report.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Pursuant to the previous order, the Senate now stands adjourned until noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), the adjournment being under the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 28, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 27 (legislative day of May 21), 1953:

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization.

IN THE ARMY

Gen. Joseph Lawton Collins, O5247, United States Army (major general, U. S. Army), for temporary appointment as general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be general

Gen. John Reed Hodge, O7285, Chief, Army Field Forces (major general, U. S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Doyle Overlton Hickey, O10123, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we daily invoke Thy blessing and endeavor to find the right solution to our many difficult problems, may we have a greater faith in the primacy and potency of those moral and spiritual values which Thou hast ordained.

Grant that in seeking to minister to a turbulent and troubled world, in which many of the old securities are being severely shaken, may our own minds and hearts be tempered with that calm and steadfast spirit which has found its refuge and strength in Thee.

Show us how we may make the ideals and principles of democracy a more vital force in our own land and in all the places of the earth where men and nations are struggling for freedom and peace.

We pray that we may be inspired with a longing to give the blessings of democracy that larger geographical and numerical expansion which is inherent in the very truth which it proclaims.

To Thy name, through Christ Jesus our Lord, we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4654. An act to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution providing for a consolidated general appropriation act.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1324. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees; and

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. Con. Res. 29) entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS TO TERMINATE DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE RED REGIMES

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the heroic act of V. C. Georgescu, against whom a cruel attempt was made by the Red Rumanian legation,

exposes the common practice of Communist Embassies and consular offices in the United States of conducting espionage by blackmail and by other criminal methods.

A Government agency has reliably informed me that the chief activity of these offices is espionage against the United States and that, except for outward forms, they do not in any true sense engage in legitimate diplomatic practices.

I have today reintroduced into the House a series of resolutions introduced by me in the 82d Congress, expressing as the sense of Congress that the United States should forthwith withdraw recognition of the Communist regimes, including that of the Soviet Union, on the grounds that they do not represent the peoples of their countries and are used primarily as one of the important links to increase the Communist war potential.

There are today at least 272 Communist nationals in the United States on duty in the diplomatic and U. N. offices, all of whom are under strict discipline to spy in the United States for the fulfillment of the Communist dream of ultimate conquest of our country.

Every one of these Communist diplomats, and not only Christache Zambeti, of the Red Rumanian legation, is, as long as he is loyal to the Communists, a dangerous enemy of America.

To keep the average Red diplomat in line, a close member of his family is kept in the Soviet Union as a hostage. A number of these Red diplomats have recently secretly discussed with American agents the possibility of making a break for freedom. If they have the heroic courage of Georgescu, many would break away from the Communists. In the Red Embassies and consulates everyone lives in fear and no one knows who is the NKVD agent set to watch upon the others. It might be the Embassy chauffeur or any other inconspicuous person who is capable, however, of enforcing the police-state terror upon the other members of the Embassy.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was granted permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the regular business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Angell	Dawson, Utah	Grant
Brooks, La.	Dingell	Haley
Bush	Dodd	Hays, Ohio
Canfield	Dolliver	Hillings
Carrigg	Elliott	Hoeven
Celler	Gamble	Kean
Kearney	Mason	Rains
Kee	Miller, Calif.	Reed, Ill.
King, Calif.	Moulder	Shelley
Knox	O'Konski	Stringfellow
Lesinski	Patman	Taylor
McConnell	Poulson	Winstead

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and ninety-four Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

BEHIND THE WITCH HUNTS

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was granted leave to extend my remarks by inserting the first in a series of articles authored by Mrs. Rebecca West. As stated in my prefacing remarks yesterday, I am including in today's RECORD the second and third articles of this series entitled "The Surprising Mr. Kaplan" and "The Terrified Teacher."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADLAK asked and was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes on June 3, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, the annual congressional baseball game will be played on the night of June 5 at Griffith Stadium. Members of the Senate and the House will participate, Democrats versus Republicans.

Tickets are on sale at the Secretaries' Club and at the Evening Star, and everyone will be given an opportunity to purchase tickets, reserved seats if you get your orders in early.

The Congressional Secretaries' Club has taken over the promotion of the sale of the tickets for this game. Anyone wishing to purchase tickets can do so by calling extension 1459 or extension 1908 here in the Capitol, or drop by Congressman LANDRUM's office, room 318. Ticket booths are also set up in the Capitol.

The funds from the sale of these tickets will go toward the 2 weeks' vacation for underprivileged children of the District sponsored by the Washington Evening Star.

This year President Eisenhower has accepted the invitation to throw out the first ball. More than 100 champions have been invited for luncheon at the White House at 1 p. m. on June 5 and they will also be invited to attend the game that evening and will be introduced. That is only part of the program offered to you. There will be a massing of the State flags; two or three bands will entertain us during the evening, and there will be other features.

May I say for the information of the House that coaches MARTIN, HALLECK, and ARENDS have assured us they will be there on deck to see that we bring home the bacon as we did last November. But as you know in the last five tries—I will answer this before I am asked—the Republicans won the first game I had the privilege of managing and then lost the next five.

I would like to yield to the distinguished gentleman now who manages the Democrats, SID HERLONG, of Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. In this connection I should like to make just one brief observation: We on the Democratic side have from time to time during the 83d Congress felt sorry for you Republicans and have bailed you out of some difficulties you found yourselves in, but on June 5 we are not going to bail you out. Since President Eisenhower is going to invite the champions for luncheon, he ought to invite the whole Democratic team, because we are the champions, and we intend to remain the champions.

May I say also that I understand the President has taken a stand on this issue for a Republican victory. I am happy to see that he has taken this stand, but even though he has we are not going to bail him out this time; we are going to get in there and cut you down just like you have been cutting us down lately.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I know the team is very greatly improved since the days when I played shortstop on the Republican team, but I want to call the gentleman's attention to one record which the papers reported that I made: I made 5 errors out of 4 chances.

Mr. BISHOP. Thanks. We hope that everyone will participate, for it is a great cause, and those players who do participate may rest assured of taking a lot of aches and pains to make possible the game on June 5. Thanks for your attention.

MESSENGERS FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 118 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 4, 1953, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to Messenger Hughlon Greene and Messenger Walter B. Little, Committee on Ways and Means, at the basic rate of $380 and $500 per annum, respectively.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "January 4, 1953" and insert: "June 1, 1953."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 243 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 91, 83d Congress, incurred by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000, including expenditures for the employment beginning on May 25, 1953, of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is authorized by a previous resolution, House Resolution 91, which was adopted by the House on or about February 18, and authorized the Ways and Means Committee to investigate all subjects that come within the jurisdiction of that committee.

I may say for the benefit of the Members that the proposal at this time contemplates a thorough investigation of the problem of social security and all of the related problems that are associated with the great subject of social security. There is something like $18 billion in the enormous social-security fund. This fund is represented by bonds or I O U's of the Federal Government. The investigation of this subject appeals to me more than any of the investigations that have heretofore been authorized by this Congress and funds provided for the same.

If there are any questions about this resolution I am sure that members of the Ways and Means Committee present will be glad to answer such questions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in agreement with the resolution, but I do not want the record to go unchallenged when the statement is made about Government bonds being I O U's because they are not. Only the other night on Meet the Press, Secretary Humphrey said there was no better way to invest the money in the fund than by putting it in Government bonds and that he would do that, so that they are not I O U's. The gentleman may have his own opinion, but I want the RECORD to show that Government bonds are not I O U's and that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, on Sunday night last said it was the best way to invest the money.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that funds in the amount of $18,500,000,000 have been paid into the Treasury. The Federal Government has used those funds and owes the social-security fund about that amount of money. That is correct, I think, if I understand the situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, but the money would have to be invested some place.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is right. I am not criticizing the manner in which it is done for I believe it is too much money to undertake to hold as currency in the Treasury. The Federal Government owes the social-security fund this enormous sum, if I am correctly advised, money paid into the social-security fund by payroll taxes, employers' contributions, self-employed persons, and so forth.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5376) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5376, with Mr. HOPE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 4, page 3, of the bill. If there are no further amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, preliminary examinations, surveys and studies (including cooperative beach erosion studies as authorized in Public Law No. 520, 71st Cong., approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented), of projects prior to authorization for construction, to remain available until expended, $2,275,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 3, line 20, strike out $2,275,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I personally recognize the difficulties under which this subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] must necessarily operate. I believe this subcommittee is probably faced with more pressure than any similar subcommittee in the Congress of the United States.

However, I do feel that the subcommittee has made a mistake in squeezing too tightly on what we term the funds for general investigations for the collection and study of basic information by the Army engineers in connection with proposed projects. I say that because the sum brought in by the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Wisconsin is $1,125,000 below the Eisenhower budget. It is $1 million below the present fiscal year appropriation. It is less than half what the original Truman budget requested.

I want to make very plain, Mr. Chairman, that I do not recall that during the past 14 years at any time have I stood on the floor of the House and asked specifically for anything for the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota which I am not willing to give to all parts of our Nation. I do want to give to the people of my district, and yours, an opportunity to request of the Army engineers that they look into very serious problems which may arise relative to flood and drainage problems. The district engineer in St. Paul has been very courteous and helpful to us in the problems we have presented to him. Detailed surveys and study is impossible without considerable work in his office. He has been very much handicapped by lack of funds and yet here in this bill there is only two-thirds of the amount appropriated for 1953. It is absolutely necessary that we give them sufficient funds so that they will have the personnel and the engineers available to go out and see whether the problems we put up to them are worthwhile and feasible. Is that unreasonable? I do not think it is.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. Would the various projects that were in the Eisenhower budget for planning be eligible to participate in the additional fund for which the gentleman's amendment calls?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This sum is left to the discretion of the Army engineers for allocation within certain general classifications. May I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if it is not correct that in this item there is only money for investigations and surveys of projects prior to authorization for construction, and that there is no planning money here?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. There is no planning money in this item.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. DONOVAN) Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman from New York. If this was not such an important thing affecting not only the property but also the health of thousands of people in my congressional district, I would not be here pleading with you today. They do need and are entitled to help in the serious water problems arising from the severe floods of the past few years.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman is making the point that the survey is the foundation which is so necessary before these people who have been flooded out will have an opportunity to present a program, and it can be made only by the engineers.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. This is our only avenue of approach. The Army engineers must help to provide drainage outlets in our rivers, otherwise large drainage systems affecting thousands of acres will fail.

In 1951 and 1952 at least $1 million of actual cash loss was suffered by the people in my congressional district alone. Besides this, countless acres of formerly good farmland is becoming waterlogged because of there being no outlet available. The old outlets have silted in, our rivers are encumbered with tree growth and snags, and the normal flow of water has been retarded to such an extent as to create floods at the point of outlet of the large drainage systems.

Mr. Chairman, in the past 10 years the situation has become steadily worse. The outlets to our great drainage systems have been slowly silting in and clogging up, until the entire drainage areas embracing thousands of acres of the best farm land in Minnesota is slowly disintegrating. Good farms of years standing are now fast on the way to becoming worthless unless we can secure consideration by and help from the Army engineers to decide the proper plan for cleaning out the creeks, straightening and widening the outlets, which are the heart of any drainage system. The problem is beyond the capabilities of the local communities. The farmers have had their money invested for 30 or 40 years in the drainage tile and the various lateral ditches and the judicial ditches with which all of you gentlemen from that region are familiar. But unless you do have ample outlet into the streams, and that is where the Army Engineers come in, we are simply stymied. We go to see the district engineer in St. Paul, and he is absolutely truthful with us when he says that he is unable to do much for us because of lack of funds. The present district engineer, Colonel Bagnulo, wants to help us and is interested in helping to work out the proper solution to our problems.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. I agree with everything that the gentleman says about the necessity of surveys in the section of the country from which he comes. But there is in this bill at this point in this sum of $2,275,000 an item of $600,000 for a survey in New York and New England. I have made quite a minute and extensive investigation to find out what that $600,000 is for. I find that it does not belong in the bill. If you wipe it out, abolish it, and eliminate it, I will go along to transfer it for an investigation for your part of the country. At this point I would like the gentleman to yield so that the chairman of the subcommittee will tell us what that $600,000 for a survey of New York and New England is for. I would not like a mealymouthed answer like that which was given by the Army engineers at the hearings. I would like to know specifically what that $600,000 is for.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. First, may I say to the gentleman I am not asking specifically for special allocation to my district. This amount of survey money, as you know, has to do with the entire United States and is spread very thinly through the various districts of the Army engineers. The sum you refer to is a special allotment from the total survey fund.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin to answer the question of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would explain that by saying that the figure of $600,000 which is referred to is for the continuation of a survey of the water resources of the New York and New England area. It is a survey that has been going on for a couple of years. It was originally intended to be completed in 2 years, but it has now been spread over a longer period. This is to permit them to proceed with the survey, which we hope will be completed in the fiscal year 1955.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee please point out to the House the page in the record where the Army Engineers said that this $600,000 was for a water survey or water power survey?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not know whether that particular term was used in this particular hearing.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman read the record and was present when the record was made. I say to the gentleman, it just is not there, and I defy any Member of this House to point out where the Army engineers said it was for a survey of waterpower resources.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman misquoted me. I did not say waterpower resources. I said water resources.

Mr. DONOVAN. The fact of the matter is, it was a survey directed by the last administration to discover the cause of the flight of industry from New York and New England to other parts of the country. It was conducted in conjunction with the Department of Commerce, the Federal Power Commission and other agencies of the Government. In other words, a national boondoggle that is still going on.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I get back to the point that I had under discussion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it not correct to say that if the Army engineers had made a preliminary survey many local communities, counties, and States could have taken action, but the engineers say, "We do not know what effect it will have on navigation and other uses of this waterway, so we cannot permit you to go ahead until we have made surveys in these cases and determined the particular effects."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. As the gentleman knows, the responsibility of the Army engineers commences at a certain point. The Soil Conservation Service has been very good in certain of these particular investigations, but they cannot proceed beyond their line of authority. They leave off where the engineers commence. There is no other avenue of approach for us in that area except go to the Army engineers. We cannot afford to lose hundreds of thousands of dollars annually in my one small district in property and crop damage. In the spring of 1952 one county in my district had a loss of at least $400,000. Sewage systems have failed because of flood conditions and high-water levels. There is a real threat to health in several communities. Two of my small cities have suffered considerable loss. In one city of 5,000 people there was $263,000 damage in one year, and additional damage the following year. Is it good commonsense to permit a thing like that to recur year after year? I say it is not. I am stating the viewpoint of my congressional district. All I am asking for in this increase is not even as much as President Eisenhower requested. He requested $3,400,000 in comparison to the $5,400,000 requested by the Truman administration. I am asking that $3 million be put in here so that some of us can get consideration of these vital, serious problems with which we are faced. I do not think that is being unreasonable.

I submit the subcommittee has been too tight with this particular item. Of course, the subcommittee chairman will probably say, as he did in the full Committee on Appropriations, that there are certain unobligated funds, certain unexpended funds in this 1953 fiscal year in this particular category. Yet the Army engineers have written me time after time, "We regret that because of lack of funds we cannot take care of your situation. We regret very much, Mr. ANDERSEN."

All of these regrets do not help when I try to explain to my farmers in my district why our Government does not help them in keeping their farms from being flooded. Farms that were formerly 160 acres of good land in size have now been cut down to half or less, because of drainage systems becoming clogged and water backing up miles away over thousands of acres of land.

Is that good business, to let those great farming districts deteriorate? I think it is absolutely essential to raise this appropriation item to the point where at least we can hope to get a little consideration. I say that in respect to every major problem of like nature which may be prevalent anywhere throughout the United States and which affects the economy of the people.

With that I close, and I thank you very much for your consideration and attention.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

May I remind my colleagues that in my district and in the district of my neighbor, Congressman WILL NEAL, of the Fourth West Virginia District, we have an area comprising some 7 or 8 counties in which flash floods during the last 10 years have drowned a total of 81 people. In one city alone in that area the damage amounted to $1,750,000 in a flood in 1950. Only in the last year or two have the Army Engineers moved in to try to do some channel improvement work, and the first thing they tell me is that they do not have the necessary funds to make the necessary surveys to determine the type of project that is best suited to solve this situation.

I think there is considerable merit in the proposal of the gentleman from Minnesota. I believe we should have this money for making these surveys and these researches to solve such serious problems as we face in that particular section, and I know similar situations must exist in other sections of the country. I trust that the Committee will use its best judgment in restoring to the appropriations at least a part of what was asked for in the Eisenhower budget.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I rise in support of this amendment and compliment the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from West Virginia in the presentation of this matter and to say it seems strange indeed that we do not have funds to conduct these very much needed surveys. This item is not sectional. The use of these funds will be widely distributed over the whole country. There are many local essential projects unnecessarily being delayed for want of ample funds in this item. I plead for support of this amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as during the course of my service in Congress I have inflicted my Maine accent on this House but little, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not in this instance, but if these demands for extra time continue I shall object to future requests.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I should like the Members of the House to take out their microscopes and consider with me for a few minutes the identity of a small drop of water in a flood of Federal appropriations, and I am talking about an appropriation which is sought of $2,500 for a survey of Lermonds Cove in Rockland Harbor, Maine. You know, in my State and district which has not become accustomed to the appropriation of millions of dollars, $2,500 can be disturbing. But it is not the $2,500 that disturbs me in this particular instance; I am completely disturbed by the policy which this House is following.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Functions has set a policy that it will not recommend any appropriation for anything that has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. This means that to that extent we have completely delegated to the Bureau of the Budget our legislative function. We have delegated to them our constitutional right to appropriate money for the peoples in our various districts. In the Reorganization Act we provided for a legislative budget, and the authors of that act conceived that that act would protect our powers to appropriate money, and would retain in Congress controlled appropriations and expenditures. Unfortunately, that provision died an early death from complete neglect. I think it is a sorry state of affairs, Mr. Chairman, when a Member of Congress has to go to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Corps of Engineers as a supplicant in order to get approval for a project in his district. Yet that is exactly what has happened and what has been done for lo, these many years. If the logic of the committee is correct and we should accept the conclusions of the Bureau of the Budget, and if the premise of their argument is right that the Bureau of the Budget must be inevitably correct in what it excludes, then with logic it must be inevitably correct in what it includes and the committee itself has committed sacrilege in cutting things included in the budget by the Bureau of the Budget. I and citizens of Rockland had a full and courteous hearing before the subcommittee. It proved an empty gesture. We should have gone to the bureaucrats in the Bureau of the Budget. If the committee's logic is sound we in this House might as well rubber-stamp the Budget report, surrender our rights and powers, and go home early.

This is one of the things that disturbs me about this policy. Perhaps you will say that the Bureau of the Budget is better equipped than the Congress to decide on these various projects. They have the time, they have the staff, and they are in there, under present enunciated policies, for life. They have plenty of time to determine what is good and what is bad for you. In addition to that, they have the advantage that they never have to respond to the will of the people. They are appointed, not elected. That is the first thing that disturbs me greatly about this policy, not the $2,500.

The second point I want to make is that we are forgetting the historical and traditional role of the Corps of Engineers, a role which promoted navigation, which cleaned out our harbors, which kept our rivers navigable. We have become obsessed with multipurpose projects, a lot of them built in the name of flood control with the development of power, of course, as a very important but little-mentioned incident of that development.

There is such a thing as false economy as there is such a thing as too much spending. I think I have voted for about every economy measure that has been offered in this House. But when we economize at the expense of our rivers and harbors to build multi-million dollar power projects, we are letting the harbors fill up with silt, we are letting the rivers fill up with silt, and before you know it the cost of the projects will be doubled. Is there anyone here who does not realize that the emergency will be with us for years to come? The cost of those projects, therefore, will be twice or three times as much as they would be today.

The third point I want to make is that this policy absolutely discourages local initiative and I want to make that point on the basis of the project involving $2,500 which I have cited to you. The city of Rockland, Maine, badly in need of dredging in Lermonds Cove, has asked for $2,500 just for a survey. Three years ago the State of Maine appropriated $50,000 for a project to build a wharf and the city of Rockland incorporated a port district with a capital of $100,000. For 3 years they have been waiting around just to get $2,500 to have a survey of their harbor made.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. No part of this continuing survey that has been going on since 1950, for which $600,000 is provided in this bill, ostensibly for New York or New England, was diverted to take care of any of those surveys in the State of Maine, is that correct?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct, and I may say to the gentleman that if my memory is correct the $600,000 which we are asking to be appropriated today is the first time the Congress has appropriated anything for that survey because 3 years ago the Congress refused to appropriate money for the survey and President Truman took the money from other agencies in order to make the survey.

Mr. DONOVAN. I have a little suspicion that the gentleman is not correct when he says this is the first time the Congress has appropriated any money for New York and New England. The fact of the matter is that the record shows that this is a continuing survey for which many hundreds of thousands of dollars have been appropriated in the past. Will the gentleman ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether or not I am correct in that respect?

Mr. NELSON. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin answer that?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I did not get the question.

Mr. DONOVAN. Is it not true that this item of $600,000, about which I have been talking, is part of a continuing proposition, a continuing survey, for which many hundreds of thousands of dollars have already been appropriated in the past?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. NELSON. I will say as my third point, Mr. Chairman, that the policy we are now following completely discourages rather than encourages local initiative in connection with these projects.

Here is the city of Rockland, Maine, that for 3 years has been waiting for just $2,500 for a survey; a survey not for power development, but a survey for what is an essential Federal function, the maintenance of rivers and harbors, and they have failed to get it. This has consequently tied up $150,000 which they cannot use until the survey is made and the harbor developed. So I say to you, though it may be flying in the face of the Bureau of the Budget and the policy adopted by the Committee on Appropriations, that it would be passing good for us all if we adopt this amendment and reassert a power which we once had and have long since lost.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I have been very much impressed with the statement made by the gentleman, and if he will pay me the compliment of reading the statement I made yesterday in general debate on this bill, he will find a very considerable amount of agreement. I agree fully that we must not let the Bureau of the Budget dictate to us. I agree that we have neglected navigation projects for other types of programs, but will the gentleman not agree with me, so far as this year is concerned, in order to give this administration a breathing spell to see if we cannot balance the budget—the $2,500 will not upset it—and reduce taxes, that the policy is justified at least at this time until we can get the breathing spell I have referred to.

Mr. NELSON. I will say that I paid the gentleman the compliment of listening to him while he made his speech.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NELSON. And I would also say that the city of Rockland has waited 3 years during a spaced breathing spell in order to get this project, a project which meets both civilian and defense requirements, in my estimation, and I anticipate if the present policy is continued, they will wait for years more.

Mr. HAND. I personally have the honor of being a member of the subcommittee. There are projects in my district that have been waiting since 1945, and they are not in this bill.

Mr. NELSON. The gentleman from Maine realizes that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. DONOVAN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the very splendid argument we have just heard from the gentleman from Maine. I think the Members of Congress are making a tremendous mistake if we undertake to paralyze and stop the progress of this great country by denying planning and survey money for the domestic flood control and rivers and harbors program of this great Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDEN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This paragraph does not deal with planning money. That will be found in the following paragraph. This refers only to surveys and examinations.

Mr. GOLDEN. I understand that, but I think it is essentially a false policy for us to go on record here that we are not going to allow in these appropriation bills sufficient money to take care of the initial surveys for some of the new problems that confront our people every year.

I also think it is a serious mistake on the part of this committee to tie down all of the planning money allowed in this present bill to the 10 projects set forth in the committee's report. I feel that there are several projects, including one in my home district, Barbourville, Ky., on the Cumberland River, where the planning is about half completed, the Budget Director recommended $75,000 to complete that plan, they apportioned the amount of money that was necessary for the flood-control project for the local citizens to raise, and we have raised $800,000. It is there in the bank waiting for this plan to be completed in connection with certain sewer improvements and also this flood-control plan. The policy of this committee in stopping all planning and stopping all surveys except on the 10 preferred projects is in my opinion a mistake. I hope this Congress rectifies the mistake that is made by this honorable subcommittee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Heretofore money has been appropriated to the extent of some $275,000 for a flood wall in the gentleman's home town, and the committee has denied funds for completion.

Mr. GOLDEN. That is true in the case of Pineville, Ky. I am speaking now of survey money and planning money for Barbourville, Ky., another town on the same river, only 18 miles from Pineville.

I thank the gentleman for his comment.

The project at Barbourville has been authorized. Terrible damage is inflicted by floods. Delay in completing the plans is very hurtful to all the citizens of this city. This community has floods most every year—losses are great. These people contribute to the national defense, this section is a large producer of bituminous coal and hardwood timber and this amendment ought to be adopted and plans should be completed at Barbourville and at other projects that are thoroughly justified.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the committee for including the Calumet-Sag Waterway among the 10 projects for which it has allocated funds for advance engineering and design. Despite the fact that the committee has seen fit to reduce the total appropriation for such purpose by $2,023,000, leaving the total appropriation at $977,000, it has allocated $100,000 to Calumet-Sag. This is a recognition by this Congress of the great worth of this project and may be accepted as an assurance that this most important development will not be abandoned by the Federal Government until its completion. The committee's report on page 6 describes the 10 projects, of which Calumet-Sag is one, as "of high economic justification as well as those upon which the Corps can effectively expend funds during the next fiscal year."

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken on several occasions in this Congress on the urgent necessity of the prompt construction of the Calumet-Sag channel. At this late date it would serve no useful purpose to repeat what was said when the matter was still before the committee. It is reassuring to know that the committee agreed to the extent of including Calumet-Sag among the bare 10 projects that were spared from the economy ax.

In the 81st Congress, championing this project, as had my illustrious predecessors, the Honorable Raymond D. McKeough and the Honorable William A. Rowan, I appeared before the committee and later offered an amendment to provide for the immediate digging of the channel. My amendment was defeated on a point of order. In the 82d Congress, the Honorable Richard B. Vail, then representing the Second District of Illinois, continued the effort for the construction of this waterway. On this issue there is no division of opinion along political lines. We in the Great Lakes district know the vital importance to our region and to the Nation of this development. I had planned to offer at this time an amendment for the start of

actual construction, but am withholding such amendment because of the promise held out by the action of the committee and because I also realize the futility of such an effort at this time.

The national defense, as well as the industrial welfare of the Great Lakes region, demand the completion of the Calumet-Sag Channel at the earliest possible moment. As the representative from the Second District of Illinois I shall continue at the proper time to press for the necessary construction appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I am extending my remarks to include the testimony of Col. W. D. Milne, Deputy Chief of Civil Works for Rivers and Harbors, at the public hearings of the subcommittee, as follows:

ILLINOIS WATERWAY, CALUMET-SAG CHANNEL

Mr. DAVIS. The second project under navigation for advance engineering and design is the Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag Channel. Can you tell us the reasons for the request for an additional amount of planning money in the fiscal year for this project?

Colonel MILNE. Mr. Chairman, our budget request for additional planning money in the amount of $100,000 is to continue planning on the Calumet-Sag project.

I might say that the Cal-Sag project to the city of Chicago and the Nation has assumed a greater and greater importance as the development of Chicago is moving to the south. There is no good waterway that taps the large industrial area of South Chicago.

The present Cal-Sag is inadequate. It is 60 feet wide and 9 feet deep, but in spite of being extremely inadequate, it is carrying about 4 million tons of commerce a year. The Congress authorized improvement of this waterway to a more modern canal, 225 by 9 feet in 1945 and 1946. The money that we are requesting now will permit us to have our planning in such a state that we can initiate construction.

Mr. DAVIS. Have you spent $1,219,000 on planning previously?

Colonel MILNE. Mr. Chairman, that is not all on planning. There was one item for actual construction of a bridge, around $350,000 or $400,000. The rest is planning.

Mr. DAVIS. You did not do anything there last year?

Colonel MILNE. No, sir.

BASIS FOR RESUMPTION OF PROJECT

Mr. DAVIS. What is the basis upon which this resumption is now sought?

Colonel MILNE. For the past several years it was quite apparent that the capacity of the steel industry was so taxed that there was a question of getting the steel. There is a lot of steel required in the Cal-Sag project because of the number of bridges that have to be replaced. It did not seem that there was much likelihood of construction in the near future. As I understand it, the question of steel is not now as tight as it once was. The need for Cal-Sag is even greater than it was. Those two factors, we feel, make it important to finish this planning to the point that construction can be started.

Mr. DAVIS. What length is involved?

Colonel MILNE. The total project is about 40 miles, but actually the part that really is the most difficult runs about 16 miles.

Mr. DAVIS. What are the waterways that are joined?

Colonel MILNE. It will join the Illinois Waterway, and of course the Great Lakes. It will tap the Great Lakes at one end and the Illinois Waterway at the other.

Mr. HAND. Does this complete your planning?

Colonel MILNE. That will put planning in a status where we can go into construction.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat with reluctance that I appear in opposition to the proposal made by my good friend from Minnesota. I call the attention of my friend to the fact that this bill is the one that is spotlighted all over the Nation, as to whether or not Congress has made up its mind that it is determined to have good management and economy in Government. Rightly or wrongly, this is the bill that is spotlighted as to whether or not we intend to be thrifty and whether or not we have determined to cut expenses.

As I said yesterday, there are many, many worthy projects that have been proposed by the various Members of this Congress. They are investments. They would pay handsome dividends. The question is, can we afford them at this time, or are there other things that are more important. So I bring to the attention of this Congress these thought-provoking questions.

I went along with the gentleman from Minnesota when he proposed to increase the appropriation for soil conservation. I went along with him when he proposed to increase the appropriation for the upstream water retention program. Those things are all part of this overall program. As we said to this committee yesterday, they should be coordinated so that you can look at the overall picture, you can look at the amount that is being expended by the Interior Department, you can look at the amount that is being expended by the Agriculture Department, and you can look at the amount that is being expended by the United States Engineers and the Federal Power Commission. All of these things should be in one whole picture so you can properly evaluate them and know just what you are spending and what you are getting for your money.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. As the ranking Member from this side of the aisle on this subcommittee on appropriations, can the gentleman tell the Members of the House what the $600,000 included in the $2,275,000 item now under debate, characterized as being for a survey in New York and New England—can the gentleman tell the House specifically what kind of survey that is? Will the gentleman at least give us the history of it for the last 2 years? What have they been doing for the last 2 years? I cannot find out from the chairman of the subcommittee, I cannot find out from the Clerk, and I cannot find out from the RECORD. I would like to know if the gentleman could clear the atmosphere a little bit.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, did the gentleman from New York try the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. DONOVAN. I know something about the New York subways, but I do not know anything about that labyrinth.

Mr. RILEY. I will say to the gentleman from New York it is my understanding that the $600,000 is for a continuation of an overall survey of the water resources of New York and New England; to inquire into the possibility of a development there which would be economically feasible and would be an investment for the people of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I inform the gentleman from New York that briefly the history of it is this. Some of the Members of Congress in both branches, and in both parties, started this 4 or 5 years ago. I do not want to take the gentleman's time, but later in debate I will be glad to give the gentleman from New York the history of it and the reason for it—I might say the justifiable reasons for its continuation.

Mr. DONOVAN. I am glad I finally have gotten under the crust of reluctance.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman referred to the economic necessity of anything that we spend, and certainly it must be justified. Let us consider one of these four projects, which I am asking the Army engineers to investigate, and for which they tell me they do not have the necessary funds to make a proper study. Last year alone $400,000 was lost in that immediate area covering 55,000 acres of good farm land which was flooded unnecessarily just because of the lack of a proper outlet. Is that good economics and good business to permit a recurrence of such loss?

Mr. RILEY. I am in thorough sympathy with the gentleman's problems. There are thousands of acres of land under water just now in the lower Mississippi valley as well as thousands of acres under water in other areas of the country. I would like to do something about all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Might I further ask the gentleman what are we who have such problems which have arisen in the last 3 or 4 years to do, and what recourse do we have, unless we can go to the Army engineers and ask them to study our problem? Shall we continue to allow these thousands of farmers in my area alone to lose crops year after year just because of a very poorly set-up policy by the Congress in refusing to give the Army engineers sufficient money to even get out and look the proposition over? Is that not poor business?

Mr. RILEY. Again I say to the gentleman from Minnesota I am in thorough sympathy with the purposes of his amendment, but I do not believe this is the time to increase this appropriation. The Army engineers at the present time are involved in a great construction pro-

gram for the defense of this country. Some of the best engineers we have, have been employed in the civilian functions program under this appropriation. We need those engineers in military construction to get that program behind us. So in a time of great emergency in my opinion, it is absolutely necessary that this program be curtailed until the overall defense of the country has been provided for, and until the military establishments have been completed and until we are safe from the threat of aggression from the outside. I know this limited appropriation is a deprivation to many of us. It is a deprivation to many of the people in my section of the country to defer these projects. We are not asking you to give them up but to defer them until such time as we can provide for them without weakening the economy of the country. Every nickel that you spend today is feeding the fires of inflation, as we have been told time and time again. Unless it is absolutely necessary, we should restrict the expenditures of this Government until we can balance the budget. The question of carrying these heavy taxes is a great burden on the people of your section and mine. I venture to say that when most of you go back home one of the chief topics of conversation will be, "When are you going to reduce taxes?" I ask you, how are you going to reduce taxes unless you curtail some of the things that we consider essential. I am not speaking of nonessentials. We are surely going to cut those out, but we are going to have to cut down on the essential things also.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further? He has been very courteous as usual.

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that there is no possible way in which to put a dollar figure upon public health. The gentleman has said nothing whatsoever about my argument about my five communities where sewage systems do not operate at times because of being flooded out. This is one place where we cannot measure projects in dollars and cents. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me on that point.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would say to my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] that in Michigan we have had pollution of the streams for the last 10 or 15 years. The Kalamazoo River runs through there and it actually stinks. Fifteen or twenty years ago you could drink the water. Now you cannot bathe in it. But do I get any sympathy from these boys? They tell us to lump it and like it. That is all they say to us.

Mr. RILEY. I say to my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] that in this appropriation which we have made a very generous allocation will be made to his State as much in proportion as to any other State. In addition, I call attention to the fact that in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture appropriation bills there will be other appropriations to take care of flood control and the water resources of the Nation.

I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, because I believe cuts in the planning and survey program may well be more harmful to our future development than reductions in the actual construction program.

This 83d Congress has been called an economy-minded Congress. The spending programs which the House Appropriations Committee has so far presented to the House of Representatives, prove, I am sure, that the congressional majority has economy as its goal. I do not agree that true economy can be accomplished by drastic cuts in funds budgeted for construction of reclamation and flood-control projects, and I am certain no form of economy will be accomplished by a drastic reduction of the program of planning for future projects.

It is said the Government policy should be to devote the resources of the Nation to the ending of hostilities and the building of our national defenses. This is desirable and necessary. Equally as important is the recognition that the time will come when a backlog of carefully planned and surveyed projects will contribute to the economy of the Nation. It is good business to provide money now to prepare plans for feasible projects of the future.

The refusal to provide money to complete planning for Black Butte Dam in California is an example of the questionable nature of the economy which is being proposed. There has been $100,000 already spent in planning for the project, and an additional $100,000 was requested to complete the plans. Without the funds to complete the plans, the first appropriation will be wasted, and the project will not be ready for construction in the future when I am sure it will have to be built.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions and Military Construction, say that of the funds available each State will be given its rightful share in connection with these examinations and surveys. My interpretation from the reading of the report on pages 4 and 5 is that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] is correct.

At this time the Army engineers have initiated and are making very important studies involving surveys on the upper Yadkin River in my congressional district of North Carolina. This survey, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, is of extreme importance to not only my district but to the entire Yadkin-Pee Dee Valley. Frankly, the ultimate salvation of one of the great land areas in North Carolina is involved.

I commend the United States Corps of Engineers for their recommendation and urge this agency to proceed in making a final determination on ways and means of the right course of action to control the ravaging floodwaters of the Yadkin River.

Again I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] for his kind interpretation of the use of this particular fund for general investigations.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes, and that that 5 minutes be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I do not think there is anything I can add to improve upon the fine statement made by our colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY]. But perhaps there are a few facts that might be added to it.

This committee recommendation of $1,910,000 for the examinations and surveys when coupled with unobligated balances presently available—I am speaking not about unexpended balances, but about unobligated balances—will make $2,704,600, which is $304,600 above the amount requested in the revised budget for this item.

In addition to that, just a few weeks ago, this committee approved the transfer from general expenses of $200,000 in order to expedite the survey program during this current year.

With respect to the answer some Members of Congress received from the Corps of Engineers, that they did not have the money available, that, of course, is the easy answer for them to give, and they would give the same answer, I venture to say, if they had 10 times as much as has been included in this bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Not at this particular point.

Mr. Chairman, we have a backlog of new authorized projects approaching $11 billion without adding any projects that might be put in that backlog as a result of the surveys and examinations that might be conducted with additional money.

There are presently before the Congress 80 favorable reports on which no action has been taken. There are 27 such reports before the Bureau of the Budget and 15 with State and Federal agencies. Action on all of them has been completed by the Corps of Engineers.

Yesterday in general debate I attempted to point out, on page 5587 of the RECORD for yesterday, the considerations which made it necessary for us to limit these survey and examination funds in the years ahead, the considerations which made it necessary for us to relinquish the luxury of adding projects to this appropriation bill which had been previously approved by the Bureau of the Budget and those of you who have not had an opportunity to see that chart which was on the floor here yesterday and which has been in the Speaker's lobby since yesterday, will, I hope, look at it; I hope you will recognize the fact that if we are to proceed with the projects which we already have before us we we will be talking in terms of more than a billion dollars a year by fiscal 1956, and in terms of one and a quarter billion in 1957.

A reasonable amount of money is provided, more money than the revised budget calls for, when the appropriated amount here is added to the unobligated balances. As the gentleman from South Carolina put it, we cannot think exactly in normal terms when we are dealing with appropriations these days; we must always keep in mind the stringent conditions at home and abroad in which our country is now operating. I hope the members of the committee will take the advice of the gentleman from South Carolina and will reject this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 38, noes 95.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONOVAN: Page 3, line 20, after the word "expended", strike out "$2,275,000" and insert "$1,675,000."

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the extensive debate that has already taken place on this minute matter of $600,000, I do not think it is necessary for me to take up much of the time of the committee in discussing my amendment.

In glancing through the report of the committee yesterday afternoon I noticed on page 5 at the top of the page, "Special studies: New York-New England, $600,000." So I telephoned to a distinguished but unidentified member of the Committee on Appropriations from the State of New York and asked him if he could find out for me what that $600,000 was for. Promptly, diligently, and reliably, as is his wont, he called me at my office in 5 minutes and said: "That is for an industrial survey; that is, a survey to determine the cause of the flight of industry from New York and New England to the South and other far reaches of the continent."

I asked him, "Why are the Army engineers in on that?" And his answer was, "Honestly and candidly, I do not know."

I then talked to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. He got the record of the hearings for me and when he looked it over shook his head. I do not think that is breaking any confidences. I came in here this morning and I asked the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee what it was all about and he told me that candidly he did not know. In the course of debate when I inquired, if I recall correctly, and I do not want to misquote him, he came up with the answer that it was for a study of water resources.

Now, if anyone in this House can tell us and satisfy the membership what this $600,000 is for, I am ready to withdraw my amendment. Since the distinguished former leader of the Democratic majority, now the Democratic whip of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, so kindly volunteered to go into the details of it and explain the interest that he and several other Members of Congress, present and former alike, have in it, I yield the balance of my time to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is very generous of the gentleman, but I will take my own time.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the New England-New York survey is of vital importance to that area of the country. It is not in connection with the field of industry moving from New England that the gentleman from New York said he received information from some other Member about. It is along the same line as the Arkansas-White-Red River basin survey which is found on page 226 of the hearings. My friend picked out New England and New York. There is the same kind of a survey going on in the Arkansas-White-Red River basin area.

Now this was brought about as the result of the interest on the part of the Members of both parties from New England and from New York. I was very deeply interested in it as was Senator Green of Rhode Island. We conferred with Republican Members from the area, and it is one of those surveys like the Arkansas-White-Red River basin survey where it is very carefully worked out in conjunction with the governors of the States. The governors of the States appoint representatives in connection with it. The spearheading is the Corps of Engineers to do the consulting and the cooperating. This has been going on, as the evidence and the hearings show, since 1950. It was expected to be finished by now, but due to budgetary conditions in the past it was extended for 2 years. The purpose is to find out what the natural resources of New England are and to have a complete report, the same as the survey being made in connection with the Arkansas-Red-White River basin. I repeat, it is a matter of vital importance to New England. In fact, this is the only money that is included in the bill which relates to either New England or New York. There is no other money in the bill in relation to that great area; not that I am arguing that money should be put in because of area considerations, but this money is requested to carry out a survey already under way and a survey which is of vital importance to the New England States and to New York. I hope that that information satisfies the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. It would not be a first cousin to any of those surveys that were made by the WPA in the boondoggling days, would it?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I can assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. DONOVAN. I assure the gentleman from Massachusetts that nothing he has said convinces me to the contrary.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be defeated. This is not a boondoggling project.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman says this is for the purpose of coordinating and cooperating, similar to the Arkansas-White-Red River basin project. Now just what does it do? Does it have any bearing on the subject of the migration of industry?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; absolutely not. It is looking into the Passamaquoddy, for instance; the natural resources of New England, the necessity for flood control, the opportunities for development of public power or by private companies, and a survey of the New England area in connection with its future development, along the same line as the Arkansas-White-Red River basin survey. One of the important things is flood control, water pollution, and various aspects of that kind.

Mr. BARDEN. That gets into pretty general terms when the gentleman says "various aspects." Is it flood control, with the possibility of power development?

Mr. McCORMACK. General Chorpening said:

This is a survey with a view to developing comprehensive and integrated plans for navigation and flood control and related land and water uses.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what I am going to say is not spoken out of any unkindliness to New England, but a great deal has been said about the industrial development of the South. Sometimes reference is made to the fact that industries from other parts of the country are locating in the South. There is industrial development going on in the South, but it is a perfectly logical development; it is a perfectly logical thing that there should be industrial development in the South.

The South originally was an agricultural area. It was largely a one-crop area. There were new developments in the South. Diversified crops came in.

It was then recognized that the South had certain characteristics that are wholesome for industrial development.

It has a fine climate. It has a native-born, highly productive and a religious people. It has natural resources. It has great potential water power development. It has coal, which gives potentialities to other types of power. It has a wide variety of raw materials. It has a fine system of transportation. It has a great highway system. It is close to the great markets of the country; if you take a spot in East Tennessee, and you are within a 900-mile radius of three-fourths of the population of the United States. Therefore, a plant located in that area has a wide market radius. There is every reason why new industry should look with favor upon the South, an area that is a desirable location.

There has been no campaign in the South to attract industry from other parts of the country. It is inevitable that industry come to the South and that there be industrial development in the South, unless the South is expected to remain primarily in an agricultural state; and no one expects the South to so remain.

I think it is unfortunate that there is a campaign being waged over the country about the South's undertaking to induce industry from other parts of the country to come South. You may be sure the New Englander, may I say to my good friend from Massachusetts, is shrewd, is a shrewd trader, is conservative in relation to his interests and the interests of the enterprises wih which he is associated. You need not be uneasy about his coming down South unless it is to his interest to locate in the South.

We are not isolationists in the South, and I am speaking now from a national standpoint. We embrace the people from all parts of the country when they come down there, whether New England, or the North, or the West. You will be welcome when you come, and you will become happily and thoroughly southernized.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

For purposes of clarification, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee several questions. The total item is $2,275,000 and the amendment offered concerns just one of the items mentioned in the total; is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that every project we have, even those in the lower Mississippi tributaries, had some survey and investigation before being finally authorized by the committee and an appropriation made by the Congress?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is always a preliminary before the authorization.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I ask the chairman this question concerning this particular project? How much money has been appropriated heretofore to carry on this work?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. One million five hundred thousand dollars was previously appropriated. Just a few weeks ago, another $200,000 was transferred from general expenses.

Mr. PASSMAN. Then you do have $1,700,000 invested in this particular project which the amendment proposes to strike out?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. And this project was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, was it not?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It was, and it is a continuation of the survey which has been going on for the last 2 years.

Mr. PASSMAN. To me it appears to be false economy to strike out a project involving surveys which have been going on for the past 2 years and on which $1,700,000 has already been invested. This is especially true since surveys are preliminary to establishing the merit of a particular project and are usually required before an authorization and appropriation are made.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee—I see he is here—telling about the glories of the Tennessee Valley. I think your chambers of commerce and other enterprising organizations do a pretty fair job in Tennessee trying to attract the industries from the north down into the Tennessee Valley so I do not quite agree with some of the things that the gentleman said. The gentleman also pointed out that the New England States, New York, and Pennsylvania are somewhat apprehensive of what is happening to their industrial life. They should be because there isn't any question about the fact that industries are moving down into the Tennessee Valley. Also I think the gentleman from Tennessee should feel quite pleased about this bill because there are $16 million more in this program for Tennessee. There is no $16 million in it for Pennsylvania. So I can readily see the gentleman's enthusiasm for the work in the Tennessee Valley. He is right. We are concerned—I do not mind telling you that. It is about time we in Pennsylvania and New York State and in the New England States became aroused as to what is happening in this industrial and economic situation throughout the Nation. To me the question is whether my State can continue to maintain its industrial preeminence and the position it has occupied in the life of the Nation in this present situation. We have 10 million people in Pennsylvania who are dependent on Pennsylvania for their future and welfare. We are very much concerned in the State of Pennsylvania. Let us take a look at the TVA we hear so much about. Now one of the basic industries of my State is coal.

We have gone down the line year after year in coal production, until whole communities in the eastern part of Pennsylvania are shutting down, as there is no demand for coal because of cheap power elsewhere. Why do these things happen? You take the TVA. The Federal Government has put about eight hundred or nine hundred million dollars into the TVA. We in Pennsylvania pay 8 to 10 percent of the taxes so we put in about eighty or ninety million dollars to make the TVA possible. New York State pays about 15 or 20 percent. So they put in a considerable sum, about one hundred and sixty million or more, and the New England States pay their share. So we develop the TVA—fine, but the benefits that accrue do not come to the State of Pennsylvania, New York State, or New England, who help pay the cost of TVA. So when an industry such as you are talking about wants to locate an industrial plant you do not think they are going to locate up in the New England States, do you, or in Pennsylvania or New York State? Why certainly not. They are going down into the Tennessee Valley, where you produced cheap hydroelectric power, tax-exempt, which was financed by the Government. TVA started as a flood-control project. Then you got into hydroelectric power. Then you did not have enough power to operate efficiently because of low periods of water in the summertime; so you moved in with steam powerplants which are financed by the Government to give you a year-round operation. That is all right with me if you pay for it and finance it yourself. But do not ask the States of Pennsylvania and New York and the New England States to put up the money to subsidize a project that is crucifying the industrial life of my State and throwing out of work thousands of people who are rooted to the soil, who lived and worked all their lives in Pennsylvania and want to stay there. They do not want to go down to Tennessee; they want to stay in Pennsylvania. So let us be fair about this matter. If the Government spent eight hundred or nine hundred million in our State we certainly would have no difficulties and would be speaking glowingly of Pennsylvania industrially and of its future prospects.

Now when you talk about cheap hydroelectric power, which is tax exempt, let me say, if the utilities in my district were tax exempt they certainly could reduce their rates, which would make it attractive for industry to come to my State. With preferred freight rates and with unorganized labor and cheap power tax exempt, certainly they want to go down to the Tennessee Valley.

It is about these New Englanders you are talking about and concerned. In other words, as I have said before on this floor, the only thing we do in the northeast section of the Nation is to furnish the money to sharpen the razor that cuts our economic and industrial throats. So do not sing too loud about Tennessee and its attractions because we have been hearing about it for years and years, and I am going to start talking about it because we in Pennsylvania, New York, and the New England States have consistently over the years been paying the taxes to make possible the things and opportunities you enjoy. It is about time you start to operate on your own.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. If this $600,000 boondoggling is knocked out, would the gentleman be glad to accept any part of it by way of transfer, for that flood control project he is interested in, in Pennsylvania?

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman for his generous thought, however, I feel quite certain such consideration would not be given.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, 3 or 4 days ago I read an article in a local newspaper about the last surviving soldier of the North talking over long distance to the last 2 or 3 surviving soldiers of the South—the Blue and the Gray. I thought that was a good thing. Tears came into my eyes when I read that. These were the surviving soldiers of the War Between the States. Their gracious greetings to each was, "God bless you." This is the way the survivors of the Blue and Gray feel.

I am the grandson of a southern soldier that fought in the War Between the States. I thought we had an armistice in that war, way back in the days gone by. Yes. I thought we made peace. I thought we had come to the time when there was no longer a North and a South, an East and a West; that this was 1 country under 1 flag. Are we fighting it over today? My State has not tried to take any industries from the North, the South, the East, or the West. If they want to come down there they can come and we will be glad to have them. But none has transferred. Let us not fight that war all over. It is over and it is past. We are brothers. Our daughters have married eastern and northern men, and your men have married southern daughters, and it is time to quit fighting the War Between the States.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can reach an agreement to close debate with respect to this particular amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

Mr. DONDERO. Reserving the right to object, there are at least five Members on their feet. That means about 2 minutes for each Member. I would suggest the Chairman make it 20 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If the gentleman would agree to that, I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] would be happy with 3 minutes and I would take 3 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we have 5 minutes for each Member who is standing. Otherwise, I shall have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from Wisconsin is that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Is there objection?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the glowing tribute which our colleague from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] paid to the southern area. This is neither a sectional nor a partisan question. I have no quarrel with that, but I do want to call attention to the fact that there are other areas in this country that need developing besides the South; New England is one, and I hope before the session ends this House will have an opportunity of casting at least two votes: one on the question of developing the power on Niagara River; and the other on adopting the St. Lawrence seaway navigation and power project. The northeast section of our country needs that power, and the entire Middle West including the Great Lakes States, needs the navigation. The St. Lawrence seaway will affect 17 States of this Union in which reside about 55 million of our people. Even national security is involved. We in the State of Michigan and the other Great Lakes States cannot get any of the power developed on the St. Lawrence, we are beyond economical transmission distance; it will benefit New England and New York. We are content, however, that they will benefit from it. We do need the navigation. I realize that New York and New England are not interested in the navigation part of the project; we of the Middle West and the Great Lakes States are. It is no longer a question of whether you are for or against the St. Lawrence seaway; the question now is whether or not you want the United States Government to participate with Canada in constructing it, because they have given notice—and they are not bluffing—that if we do not want to participate with them they are ready within an hour to proceed with the construction of the canals for navigation and the power features. Already the license has been granted by the Federal Power Commission to the New York State Power Authority to join Canada in building the power; it is simply a question now of the navigation. I am therefore going to vote to retain this $600,000 in the bill for the benefit of New England and the entire northeastern part of the United States.

I say again the development of our country should never be sectional nor partisan.

In the 80th Congress we Republicans voted more money for the Mississippi Valley than they had ever had before in any one year. We were not stingy, we were generous with you of the South. We are willing to develop the Mississippi Valley and the South. Now you have the opportunity to show that we are also entitled to the same consideration in New England and the Middle West.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, it would seem that this debate carries a little touch of anxiety from the industrial States of the North as to the increasing establishment of industry in the South. Now, I am willing to go along with my distinguished colleagues from New York and the New England area in supporting their request for the appropriation for a special survey in connection with rivers, harbors, and flood control in the New York-New England area, but I want at this point to call their attention to the fact that in my district we also have the problem of river and flood control which also needs surveys, and I hope when we ask for assistance in connection with surveys for our industrial area, that we will have the support from you gentlemen from New York and the New England area.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have just returned from the stricken areas of my district and have viewed the horrible destruction and devastation caused by floodwaters to the homes and farms of that area. I limit my remarks at this time to my district; however, I must mention that many other sections of Louisiana were so affected. I saw over 3,000 homes inundated, where automobiles, furniture, and other belongings were completely lost, or damaged so severely that they will require replacement. I saw hundreds of farms of small farmers inundated to the extent that our cotton crop has been 80 percent lost, and many other crops so severely damaged as to require replanting in nearly every instance. Damage from this flood may well be in excess of $100 million.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we survey the causes of this destruction with the view in mind of protecting our citizens as much as possible and to institute at least a system of warnings, when such volumes of water begin to descend that will endanger their properties, in order that they may at least take precautionary steps. In some cases much of the danger along the Calcasieu River could have been averted had proper warnings of stream gaging and precipitation been made available to the people along the lower reaches. On the floor of the House, I have previously made a statement relative to flood control in Louisiana and I again submit to the Members of this body that proper allocation of funds should be made for research, planning, and development in control of water in the lower reaches of the Mississippi and other rivers which flow through Louisiana. Water is a natural resource which, if not controlled and utilized, reverts into a threat to human life and wealth of our people, and I feel that it is urgent that the fine work that has been done by the Corps of Engineers in all phases of water-resources development be continued.

A plea for Louisiana along the lines of flood control is not a selfish plea for relief from a burden caused by purely State conditions. The Mississippi River which empties into the Gulf of Mexico at a point below New Orleans, carries the burden of flow of some 30 rivers,

extending from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. The Red River, of course, is one of the tributaries of the Mississippi and carries floodwaters from the west through Louisiana and into the Mississippi at a point near where the Atchafalaya River begins. The problem of floodwater in Louisiana, therefore, is brought about by streams far beyond the control of any local activity.

The proper planning of diversion of some of our streams can well aid our national economy and safety, as well as giving relief from the dread salt-water intrusion which is plaguing rice farmers throughout the southern planting area of Louisiana. Losses to the rice farmers by salt-water intrusion each year have been tremendous. Any cut in funds to be used toward the control of water will be a step backward insofar as increased production in Louisiana is concerned and would be actually false economy, especially in view of the great concern that within the next 20 years the problem of producing enough foodstuff to feed the people of our Nation will gain serious proportions unless the production of agricultural products can be stepped up to a point far beyond what we are able to produce today. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the other Members of this body join with me in making available funds for further development along these lines which will redound to the benefit of all.

Mr. Chairman, the people of my district are a strong people. They bear their burdens of taxation and assume their full share of responsibility for our Nation's welfare. They in turn expect our National Government to assume responsibilities which rightly are encompassed in its designated scope.

The recent flood disaster in Louisiana is something beyond the control of the citizens of Louisiana and in my opinion, they have a right to expect the National Government to give them protection from such disaster caused by these floodwaters, and I say again, the cutting of funds to be used for the control of water in the lower reaches of the Mississippi and other rivers which flow through Louisiana would be false economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we ought to consider the appropriations that are suggested in this measure from a sectional viewpoint or a political viewpoint. I have always supported the appropriations as recommended for the TVA projects and other projects for the general benefit of the country. At the same time, I want to say that I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] when he calls attention to the fact that Pennsylvania in this measure has recommended appropriations for only $1,770,000; and that other projects requested for the benefit of Pennsylvanians were absolutely denied.

The State of New York, the State of Ohio, the State of Illinois and the State of Pennsylvania combined, Mr. Chairman, have in this bill approximately $4,500,000 although those four States pay about one-third of the income of the entire United States Government. Ohio has not a single dollar in this bill, New York has not a single dollar in this bill, Pennsylvania gets $1,770,000 and Illinois $2,790,000. Thus four States, paying approximately one-third of the taxes of the country, receive less than 2 percent of the appropriations called for in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the Corps of Engineers has gotten into the habit of turning down any requests for worthwhile projects from States in the East, and giving everything to States in the South and West. It recalls to me some of the area over which I traveled within the past week. It is arid, and few people want to live there; and so we take the taxpayers' money from the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois to make those Western States livable in. Of course, the States in the East have in the past relied on their own initiative and their own ability to bring life to the earth, and to manufacture and produce, while the West is depending on the East to put up for them the money to help them prosper. They seem not to have the initiative or ability to provide for themselves.

I might add that it seems as though the chambers of commerce in the East do not put on sufficient pressure. Why do they not learn a lesson from some of the States of the West and South, that know how to put pressure on the Army Engineers, so that we also can get the worthwhile projects to which we are rightfully entitled?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak first on the pending amendment. Every area of our country which has had any kind of development of its water resources has first had to have a survey. That is the economical, businesslike way of doing it. I know my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN] does not know much about this problem of water resources. His district is a Manhattan district, while mine is across the island on the west side of Manhattan. I have a little more water resources on my side of the island. I have the Hudson River; he has the East River; so, I suppose I know more about it than he does.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in the problem of water resources in every part of this country for many years. That is one of the great natural resources of our Nation. For New York and New England to ask simply to continue a survey that has been going on for 3 years is logical. If you want to kick that $1,700,000 that has already been spent down the drain follow the advice of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN]. If you want to give us a chance to analyze our own resources so that we may know how we can best develop our part of the country, you will follow the leadership of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. You will realize that this is not a partisan issue and you will include this money in the bill.

One further point relative to this. At the proper time I am going to recommend that the Committee of the Whole reinstate either the $989,000 requested by Mr. Truman or the $100,000 requested by Mr. Eisenhower to continue engineering surveys and studies of the Niagara River, both for the power project and for the remedial works to continue the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls. I understand that this was knocked out of the bill on the assumption of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], that since this was going to be given away, this great natural resource, to the private utilities, that therefore the engineers had no more responsibility for it. I am going to point out at the proper time that the gentleman from New York is wrong. Governor Dewey is opposed to this giveaway; Mr. Burton, of the New York State Power Authority, is opposed to this giveaway; the Democrats in this House are opposed to this giveaway, and most of the upstate Republicans who have long been in favor of public power. Every Republican Governor of New York State since my uncle, Teddy Roosevelt, has been in favor of developing this power resource for the consumer's benefit, and I hope you will go along with me on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York, I know, is both sincere and courageous in offering the amendment that he has. He is a very able and conscientious Representative, and if we fail to convince him that this $600,000 should stay in this bill, then I feel it is the fault of the committee. This is a bipartisan, nonpartisan proposition. It was started in one administration and continued by another, the present one. One million and seven hundred thousand dollars has been appropriated and most of that money has been expended. This $600,000 is to complete this needed survey of the New England States to see whether or not they have water resources that can be utilized advantageously for the benefit of their whole area; to see whether or not it will pay dividends to the residents of that very important section of the country, and I hope that we will not curtail or eliminate this $600,000 which will complete this survey, according to the testimony of the engineers, by July 1, 1954. This is the last appropriation over several years of appropriations for this purpose. Let us not stop this survey now. Let us complete it and see just what we have, so that we can evaluate the report properly and reach a proper decision when the report is rendered to this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I regret that some of the discussion with respect to this amendment has taken on a sectional nature, and there is

no reason for that. This survey is preliminary to possible authorization and possible planning for the development of the resources of this area of our country. The part that we are dealing with here today deals with the water resources, but it is a part of a comprehensive survey, some of which is being done by the States involved. Some of it is being done by the Department of Commerce, and there have been appropriations for that; some of it by the Department of the Interior, and this House has made appropriations for that; some of it by the Federal Power Commission, some by the Department of Agriculture. This fits into the pattern. Over $1 million has already been appropriated.

If this House was determined to stop this survey it should have been done last year or the year before.

Now, if we are going to gain the benefits of the money which has been spent, if we are to have the benefit of the information for which we have been spending this money in the several agencies of the Government, and among several of the States in this area, we need this money. I think it would be a mistake to throw that away and deny to this Congress the information for which we have spent this money.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONOVAN) there were—ayes 35, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NELSON: Page 3, line 20, strike out the period at the end of the sentence, insert a colon, and add "*Provided*, That any State or municipality in which there is located a project a survey of which has been duly authorized by law but for which no appropriation has been made may pay into the Department of the Army the funds authorized for such survey and the Department of the Army shall thereupon undertake such survey."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but reserve the point of order at this time.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It merely provides that if the Bureau of the Budget does not approve the amount necessary for a survey and if the Appropriations Committee of the House does not approve it, and if the Corps of Engineers does not allocate money for the survey, then the municipality or State in which the project is located may itself appropriate the money, pay it in to the Corps of Engineers, and the Corps of Engineers shall then undertake the survey.

I recommend the amendment to you as being one which would definitely encourage local initiative, which would enable the municipality or the State, if Congress refused to appropriate the money, to raise the money itself and give it to the Corps of Engineers, and go ahead and have the survey of the project made.

I full well realize this amendment is subject to a point of order. I hope the Committee will not insist upon the point of order, as I think this amendment would be a very valuable addition to the law in encouraging local initiative in having surveys made, consequently saving the Government a lot of money. You will note in the amendment that I have not even asked that the money they may appropriate be refunded.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am not in disagreement with the purpose the gentleman from Maine, my good friend, seeks to attain, but I must insist on my point of order on the ground that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maine desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, that would be like spitting in the face of a Maine northeaster.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine apparently concedes the point of order. The amendment is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); and not to exceed $1,250,000 for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for conservation of fish and wildlife as authorized by law; to remain available until expended, $253,723,000: *Provided*, That on part of this appropriation shall be used for projects in the Columbia River Basin which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 4, line 5, strike out "$253,723,000" and insert "$258,723,000."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that my duties on the military appropriations committee have prevented my discussing Tuttle Creek Dam in general debate, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide funds for the continued construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Blue River in Kansas. Tuttle Creek is not a new project; $5 million was made available last year, and work has already commenced. The earthen dam work is under way. To halt construction now would not be an economy. It would be a waste because unless the work is continued, what has been done will be washed down the stream. Furthermore, it is economy to save lives and property not to mention loss to the Federal Treasury. I assume that all of you have read the hearings relating to this civil functions appropriation bill. I would call your attention to pages 156 to 234 of part II of the hearings and there you will find all of the facts and figures and logic in support of the continued construction of Tuttle Creek Dam, as well as the statements of the opposition who, although they have opposed Tuttle Creek, offer us no satisfactory alternative. Certainly, they mention watershed development, but a watershed will not stop the floods, even by the words of their own engineers upon whose opinion they depend to stop the work on Tuttle Creek. Those engineers admit that. For the opinions of the Army engineers relating to Tuttle Creek, you can look on pages 603, 656, and 685 of part I of the hearings.

Shortly after the 1951 flood the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments visited this flood area. Upon their return, they made a report dated August 1, 1951, in which they recommended construction of Tuttle Creek—and other dams previously authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here as an individual. Although my home town of Kansas City, Kans., has been terrifically hard hit in all of the major floods on the Kansas River and particularly the flood of 1951, I am here as a representative of the people in that area pleading for these funds on behalf of thousands of flood victims in the Kansas and Missouri Valleys. I do not have to refresh your recollection of the terrific flood that hit this valley on Friday, July 13, 1951. That day is now known as Black Friday. Thousands and thousands of these people were ruined financially. These people are working people, manning our factories. Their homes were swept away. Businesses of all kinds were ruined. They are having a terrific struggle trying to come back, but they are beating back, they are rebuilding homes and industries. When they found that the Bureau of the Budget had not retained the funds for Tuttle Creek, they were hurt. They were disappointed to learn that the Committee on Appropriations did not include $5 million for the continued construction. But, notwithstanding this, they pin their hopes upon the Congress of the United States to provide assurance that devastation will not again visit them. These people have seen billions of American dollars going overseas, part of which they have furnished. They have seen ECA supplies sold by European nations, thereby providing those countries with hundreds of millions of dollars to build dams in Europe. They feel some tax money should remain at home to build dams here. They feel, and I agree, that if we can spend billions overseas we can invest a few million at home. They are certain that the Congress will recognize their position, which in many instances was even worse than conditions brought about by the ravages of war. They have heard about how great is their courage and fortitude, but they are wondering if you are going to reward that courage and fortitude in their hour of need. Mr. Chairman, Tuttle Creek Dam was authorized in 1938. Its effectiveness in controlling floods on the Kansas River has never been successfully contro-

verted. Had it been built and in operation prior to 1951, it would not have prevented that flood—I would not, in all fairness, say that it would, but it would have substantially reduced the damage, because it would have reduced the crest of that flood by 2½ or 3 feet, and it was the last 2½ or 3 feet that made all the damage possible.

The cost of this flood to the Government has been tremendous. The loss in that 1951 flood on the Kansas and Missouri basin amounted to over $1 billion. The Federal income tax loss alone, as a result of the loss in that area due to this flood, is better than a quarter of a billion dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the civil functions subcommittee does not, in fact cannot, deny or disprove the need and value of this dam. The Bureau of the Budget does not and cannot deny the value and need of this dam.

There will be references made, undoubtedly, to the fact that the Missouri River Basin Commission brought in a report which said that Tuttle Creek Dam was not a necessary installation, disavowed it, but I would point out to you that the chairman of the Missouri River Basin Commission, the Senator, Mr. HENNINGS, from the State of Missouri, is one of the most ardent advocates of the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam in the entire House or Senate. Certainly, after he had taken part in that study, he knows and realizes the value of this project.

After all, Tuttle Creek Dam will protect the Kansas Valley in all major floods—not merely the ones of great catastrophic dimensions but all of our annual recurrent floods that we have throughout that part of the country. Not only does this valley of the Kaw have in it thousands of acres of fertile fields but there are defense plants, airfields, the world's greatest rail center, flour mills, steel plants, refineries, and the major packing plants—all vital to our national defense; and, of course, there are homes, yes; and there are people, people who live and work on the farms and in the factories—families, families that can look only to you for the relief they need and, indeed, must have—the continued construction of Tuttle Creek Dam.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and point out pages of the hearings where literally hundreds of resolutions, representing the views of thousands of people, favoring this construction have been introduced before the subcommittee. I could show you scores of favorable newspaper editorials—all of which offset claims made by opponents that there is not a majority desire in Kansas for Tuttle Creek Dam to be constructed. Oh, there was opposition. Never discount that. There is well-organized and well-financed and highly vocal opposition. There has been much confusion about Tuttle Creek because of lack of information. I am surprised, when I approach one of the members of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, how they can keep their courteous mien and discuss with me this much-discussed subject. They have been courteous, and I appreciate that courtesy. However, I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that if this House will reflect upon all of the facts disclosed to the Civil Functions Subcommittee, if you will read the hearings, if you will depend upon facts and not emotions, you will agree with me that this amendment should be adopted, and that there should be $5 million added to be used for the continued construction of this dam which is already under way.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the proponent of the restoration of these funds had an extra 5 minutes allocated to him, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 5 minutes may be made available to the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the remarks of my good friend from the adjoining district in Kansas, and I can well recall the old saying: "The watchdog never barks when he hears his master's voice." I was very much surprised by the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas that there is a well-organized and well-financed opposition to the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam. I witnessed only a few days ago the hearings held in connection with this dam, and I found coming from Kansas City, Kans., and more still from Kansas City, Mo., a whole room filled with—it looked like 75 or more—well-dressed, well-financed businessmen, bankers, industrialists, and lawyers representing a lot of high finance. On the other hand I witnessed in that same room a handful of farmers and farmers' wives coming from out in the west end of my district, from the agricultural community from that Blue Valley that he would have us inundate. That handful of farmers was the well-organized and well-financed opposition. I have been in some of the meetings of the Blue Valley Study Club, a club which was instituted out there where the damsite is and before it was begun, instituted by prayers to the Almighty, led by their pastor, that Congress might see fit not to permit the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam. They took up a collection, and from time to time they have added to it, a dollar here and a dollar there, some of the more successful cattlemen giving $100 or more, until they finally had about $1,600 in the treasury that helped finance this Blue Valley delegation that was up here 2 weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a statement that if I have time I would like to read to you.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of good reasons why this dam should not be constructed, any one of which should be sufficient to defeat this amendment.

First. It is impractical. It is impractical because it would not do the job for which it is designed.

Second. Because even if it did, it is impractical. There is a better, less expensive method of doing the same thing.

Third. It is impractical because it does not take sufficiently into consideration soil and water conservation practices. So much for the reason that it is impractical.

Now, there is another good and sufficient reason why this amendment should not carry. It is this: The people of the congressional district in which this proposed dam is located are decisively against it. They proved it at the polls. The people of the State are against it. Their representatives in both houses of the State legislature memorialized this Congress not to construct it. Let me ask each one of you, my colleagues, whether you would expect Congress to come into your district and force a controversial undertaking of this magnitude upon your people. You would resent it; your people would resent it. That is not the way we do things in this democratic America.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there is another and higher ground upon which to base your decision in this matter, the ground of common justice and morality. Let me give you the overall picture of this Kaw River Valley. The Kaw River is formed by the union of four major tributaries—the Solomon, the Smokey Hill, the Republican, and the Blue. Of these, the Republican drains the greatest area, the Blue the smallest. Now, some people build a city where the Kaw and the Missouri unite, and they called it Kansas City. It is built on a beautiful, rolling terrain. For many years no one built on the river bank. For a time they seemed to remember the story in the scripture of the man who built his house upon the sand. But in later years some became bold and built upon the water's edge. Others followed. They erected great structures in the very path that the water must take. For some years they seemed to be safe. Then came the flood of July 1951. While these people were building on the river banks of Kansas City other people were pushing westward up the Kaw Valley, and they came to the beautiful valley of the Blue. Did these people build on the water's edge? Did they even build out in the middle of the valley? No; they were wise. They could see, as anyone can see, that that valley was the emergency path of the river; and they knew, as the people of Kansas City should have known, that sooner or later Old Man River would need that passageway. What did they do? Go out there and see. Their houses and barns are located on the high ground adjacent the river bluffs. They were wise. They did not build upon the sand, and when the rain descended and the flood came and the wind blew and beat upon those houses they fell not, for they were not built upon the river bank. And let me tell you, my colleagues, this Congress is not hearing any weeping and wailing about flood damage nor any prayers that people from other parts of the United States shall bail them out.

I ask you, is it fair, is it good morals to punish the people who were wise enough to protect themselves in order to bail out the people who were foolish

enough to build in the historical pathway of a flood? It is not just and it does not make sense. Right here I should like to read to you the testimony of William P. Lambertson, who served as Congressman from my district for 16 years, who was born and raised there and who has seen this condition come about:

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

My name is W. P. Lambertson, from Fairview, Kans. I served on the Appropriations Committee of the House for 12 years, and was third man on our side when I left. There is one thing which has not been emphasized this morning, and that is that Cole was defeated by about 4,000 votes. If it had not been for the Republicans pleading for him in spite of his attitude on the dam in order to guarantee a Republican House, he would have been beaten by at least 10,000 more.

I actually do not know of anybody who is in favor of the dam out of the Kaw Valley. I live 50 miles east of the Blue Valley. They may be there, but you do not find them. I do not know who they are, honestly.

We are unanimous on this, as expressed by the legislature almost unanimously as to how Kansas feels about this Blue Valley proposition.

There is a bottleneck at Kansas City that is manmade. We have the Kaw and the Missouri meeting. A dike on the Missouri has been thrown up which retards the emptying of the Kaw which helps to flood Armourdale; as a result down there it has cut off the natural flow of the Kaw into the Missouri.

What divine or human rights do those people have which are superior to the rights of the people of the Blue Valley? Thank you, gentlemen.

A testimony such as that needs no comment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

(Mr. MILLER of Kansas (at the request of Mr. WIER) was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, let us not be deceived. This is not a question of an appropriation of $5 million. It is not a question of $87 million. It is a question of billions of dollars.

This is not a question of construction of Tuttle Creek Dam, it is a question of construction of scores of Tuttle Creek Dams. Just as the argument is put forth to spend $80 million to save the $5 million, so will the argument be put forth to construct scores of other dams to make Tuttle Creek effective.

This amendment does not only propose making a swamp out of 57,000 acres of good bottom land, if it passes and the Corps of Engineers carry out their plans as already made, the same program will be advanced for the valleys of the Republican, the Smoky Hill and the Solomon.

Then, indeed, will there be desolation. Instead of those beautiful valleys with their grainfields, their pastures, their cattle and swine; there will be fetid swamps, with their cattails, their sour grass, their swamp thorn. Instead of the beautiful farms with their men in the hayfield, the housewives in the kitchens, their children in the swings, there will be heard the doleful sound of the bullfrog, there will be seen the turtle waiting for his prey, the slimy moccasin gliding into a slimy pool.

My fellow Congressmen, this is a picture of horror, but it is in no sense exaggerated. It is a picture of what must happen if we pass this amendment and carry the program, of which it is the key, to its logical conclusion. It is a picture of what has already happened where this program has been effected. This amendment must not carry.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I am appearing before you in a most unusual role. I am appearing to protest against a measure enacted in past sessions of Congress whereby more than $80 million is being authorized piecemeal to be spent in my district and more than one thousand millions in the State of Kansas.

I am opposing this expenditure not only because I believe it to be unwise, but I believe it to be positively dangerous to the future welfare of the United States.

I shall try to be brief in laying the matter before you.

The First District of Kansas is on the borderline of the humid and the more or less dry belt of the great Missouri Basin.

This basin, comprising one-sixth of the area of the United States, is more subject to the ravages of flood than any other section of the country. It is over this area that the moisture-laden air from the Gulf of Mexico, moving northeastward, comes in contact with the colder air coming south from the Frigid Zone. Their meeting causes intensive precipitation over that area. It is not uncommon to have several inches of rainfall within a few hours. This is bound to cause floods and it was in this way that the great river valleys of that area were formed.

When the white man settled this area, unwisely as it now seems, he built cities in these valleys and sometimes dangerously close to the river banks.

The story is told that an old Indian chieftain, looking down from the river bluffs on the beginning of what is now Kansas City, gave utterance to this expression: "Ugh. White man heap big fool."

It was to prevent the damage done to farm land by excessive rainfall and further flood damage to the cities situated on the banks of the rivers that the Soil Conservation Act of 1936 and the Flood Prevention Act of 1938 were passed.

It was in furtherance of this program that the Corps of Engineers advised the construction of what is known as Tuttle Creek Dam.

This is but 1 of a number of dams recommended to be built on the 4 large tributaries which unite to form the Kaw or Kansas River.

Along with these are recommended a number of smaller dams bringing the number up to more than a hundred, and the cost to more than a billion dollars.

The Corps of Engineers told the committee investigating this project that this Tuttle Creek Dam is the key to their entire flood-control program. I agree with them, and I agree with the Missouri Basin Survey Commission and the Kansas Industrial Development Commission that the entire program needs a thorough going over. This project was developed before the invention of modern machinery, which makes a better program possible. We must not permit that $87 million key to unlock a billion-dollar program which will do more damage than benefit. Is it wise to spend billions in a questionable program of flood control and have nothing left for flood prevention and soil conservation? All the time during the years that the Army engineers will be building these hundreds of dams, that same water that they permit to run loose over the farms and down the gullies and creeks will have done more damage than could possibly be done to the cities they claim to protect. Why, my fellow Congressmen, that good black soil out there on the plains of the Middle West is worth more, not only than the houses and factories, it is worth more than all the fine residences and all the skyscrapers in those cities. It built them there in the first place, and if, by any catastrophe of flood or fire, they should be destroyed, that good soil, if we but keep it, will build them back. What made possible Chicago, Cleveland, Cincinnati; yes, and Kansas City, if you please? What built all those fine towns scattered over the Middle West? Yes; I'll go further than that—I'll ask you what is it that makes it possible for tens of millions of people to live and find jobs in New England and the middle States? What would happen to the economy of this country if the Middle West were to fail to produce the food and to buy the products of the East? You Congressmen from New York and Philadelphia know what would happen.

There would be such an economic disaster as this Nation never dreamed of. Then, indeed, would the grass grow upon the streets of our cities. Mr. Speaker, I tell you that this plan proposed by the Corps of Engineers, if we permit them to build Tuttle Creek Dam to implement their program, will not only bankrupt this Nation, it will destroy the very foundation of its prosperity. That may sound like an extravagant statement, but let me ask you, are we Members of this Congress prepared to lay out billions of dollars to try to control floodwater, and, after that has failed, to go back and begin all over again a program that we should have adopted in the first place?

No; we are not prepared to adopt such a program. We cannot carry on such a program. Why not begin the solution of this problem where the problem arises?

What is the Committee on Agriculture doing toward underwriting such a program? They have made an appropriation of $5 million to develop a few pilot subwatersheds.

Do not misunderstand me. That is more than any other Subcommittee on Agriculture ever brought to the consideration of this body for that purpose. Why do they not bring before us an appropriation to begin an adequate program commensurate with the importance of the undertaking?

I will tell you why. The Corps of Engineers has been given all the money. With their great wisdom and with a blank check on the Federal Treasury they have spent hundreds of millions of dollars up and down the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, and their tributaries; narrowing the channel here, deepening

it there, diverting the current toward the Missouri side then back to the Kansas side. I can take my good friends, the Congressmen from Kansas City and St. Louis, to the banks of those rivers and show you.

Their favorite pastime is to bring down thousands upon thousands of cypress, cedar, and fir logs. They are stripping our forests of our best saw logs and finest timber. They pile them up on the river bank at St. Joseph or Kansas City. You do not need to take my word for it. You can go to St. Joseph or Kansas City and see them there at this time. They then measure them and sort them for species, for length, for diameter. They bark them, they sharpen them, bevel the butt end, and have metal bands fitted to them so that they won't split under the impact of the pile driver. Then they load them on barges and are ready to start out to control old man river which, like the wagon wheel, just keeps rolling along. No, fellow Congressmen, the Engineers don't do any of these things.

They just sit back at a fine walnut desk in an upholstered chair with their blueprints for controlling floods that should not have been permitted to happen, and take bids from contractors to do the things I have enumerated.

It is the biggest, rawest smelling, pork barrel that has ever emanated from the halls of Congress.

I have lived within 60 miles of the scene of operation at St. Joseph, Mo., all my life. I have witnessed the inefficiency, but it is only in the last 5 months that I have been in a position to even raise a protest.

Why, every time I take a truck load of hogs or cattle to market I pass five sawmills right by the Missouri River that depend entirely upon the piling they can salvage from the Missouri River, piling that the Engineers had driven in at some point to protect a river bank or divert the current. Only a part is salvaged. A great part goes on down the river and floats out into the Gulf of Mexico; and when the flood controllers have done their best, spent the people's good money, along comes Old Man River and floats their piling out.

It is a mighty fine business, their taming of the Missouri. It is a well-paying job, and, best of all for the job holder, it is a never-ending job. By the time the piles have been driven in on this side and on that side and the rubble stone dug out of the hills, loaded on barges, and dumped here and there, from Omaha to St. Joe, and from St. Joe to Kansas City, it is time to begin all over again.

Now I repeat, I am not finding too much fault with the Corps of Engineers. I am just telling facts as I see them. We, the Congress, gave them the money to spend and they are spending it. But we did not expect them to be like the Bourbon kings of whom it was said: "They learn nothing and forget nothing." All we want is to bring them up to date. These big dams on the main stem of a river system for flood control purposes are antiquated and outmoded. They never did the job and they never will. Mankind never did control floods—for the reason that the very definition of flood is water out of control.

We must prevent floods, not control them, and we have learned how to do it.

We have learned how to do it because we have invented machinery that makes it possible.

The water converging from the creeks and tributaries toward the river channel is much like the streams of cars converging toward this Capitol Building. What the traffic directors do is to halt the traffic at intersections, regulate its passage so as to prevent congestion. The Corps of Engineers' plan, applied to city traffic, would be to let her go pell mell down First Street, down Second Street, down every street and try to control it on Pennsylvania and Massachusetts Avenues. That would be just as sensible as to permit the water unimpeded to rush toward the Kaw, the Missouri, and the Mississippi Rivers, and there try to control it.

Mr. Chairman, to me the demonstration of my position is as plain and as conclusive as the theorem that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts. It is as plain as the truism that if each resident will sweep his own doorstep, the city will be clean.

If we prevent flooding in the tributaries we have thereby prevented flooding on the river plain. I am confident that this Congress will not continue the foolish program of permitting the development of floods and then try to control them. If we refuse to finance dams out of place we can better afford to finance dams where they are needed. In the interest of every segment of society, in the interest of the very people who advocate the construction of this dam, Tuttle Creek Dam should not be built. Any amendment proposing additional funds for construction of this dam should be defeated.

Now, my fellow Congressmen on this side of the aisle, you may wonder why I have come to your lectern. No, it is not that I have become a Republican, it is because of those good Republicans in the first district who never elected a Democrat in the more than 90 years that Kansas has been a State until the fall of 1952; it is because they need your help. Let me tell you of one incident in that campaign, and you will know how those people feel about this dam business. Up until the last week of the campaign I hadn't set foot in Clay County. You see, I am a farmer. I didn't have time for campaigning. The odds were against me 2 to 1. The political atmosphere was bad. Ike was on the ticket and even the children were saying "I like Ike." That wasn't doing my cause any good. Then I had 110 cattle in the feed lot that were losing money on every bushel of corn. That wasn't paying campaign expenses.

Well, at last I drove a hundred miles in my 1948 Chevrolet to Clay Center. I went into stores and garages and filling stations. I told all the people the same story that I had been telling in Topeka, in Atchison, in Leavenworth, and all over the district. I said, "I am a candidate for Congress in opposition to construction of Tuttle Creek Dam. Opposition—do you get that?" I had but one story. After having visited the people in Blue Valley, seeing all that I saw and hearing all that I heard, there was for me but one issue in the campaign. After all this I had gone to the dam site. Now you can take that expression in two ways and I'm not sure but that either way would be appropriate, but I want it understood that I am not using profanity here in the Halls of Congress. I say I went to the dam site and saw and heard what was going on there. They were laying the foundation for the most stupendous blunder that any body of really smart men had committed in the history of the world. From where I stood I could see the famous Dave Casement Ranch from which is sold more than $100,000 worth of farm products every year. That famous ranch is to be flooded. I could see scores of farms, smaller but just as fertile, and I thought to myself, "In a short 5 years this will be a lake, a swamp, an inland sea. Even this highway will be frequently under 40 feet of water." That beautiful picture before me was to be obliterated. There would be no cattle in those feed lots, no hogs in those pastures. There would not be any feed lots, there would not be any pastures. There would be no farmers plowing in those fields. No smoke arising from those chimneys, no housewives busy in those kitchens, no children playing in the dooryards. No, there would not be any fields, any houses, there would not be any farmers and farmers' wives, there would not be any children. All would be desolation.

Fellow Congressmen, this is the picture I carried with me to Clay Center on that fateful day.

It was a fateful day because it was on that day, in the town of Clay Center, that the tide was turned against construction of Tuttle Creek Dam.

I will make the story short. Those people wanted to know what that Brown County farmer stood for.

An evening meeting was arranged. It was presided over by the chairman of the Democratic County Committee. I was informed that nearly all of the business and professional men in the town were there. I told them that I was out in opposition to the Tuttle Creek Dam, and spent 15 minutes telling them why.

I sat down. There was a fair applause. The chairman arose and said, "I want to ask the speaker one question. Do you think, Mr. MILLER, that, if elected, you can prevent completion of Tuttle Creek Dam?" I arose and replied, "No, I cannot prevent construction of Tuttle Creek Dam." There was a hush, then I said, "But if you people of Clay Center will stay back of me, if the people of Clay County and the First District will support me, together we can defeat its construction. No Congress—Democratic or Republican—will vote money to build a dam in a district where the people, by their votes, show that the people do not want it."

The result was like an electric shock. That audience arose as one man and cheered. The next issue of the Clay Center paper carried a full-page ad subscribed to by 40 business and professional men and women in the city and

county. It said, "Vote for MILLER for Congress."

I have heard that all but three of those who signed were Republicans.

That is why my good Republican friends who are just as patriotic as we Democratic Members on the other side of the aisle—and sometimes I think quite as smart—that is why I have come to your lectern to ask you to support the cause of your own people in the First District of Kansas.

Would you be interested to learn the result of that one day I spent in Clay County? The election returns show Eisenhower 5,059; Stevenson, 631; Cole, 1,699; Miller, 3,816.

That one day in Clay County swung the election. Why? Because the people were against Tuttle Creek Dam.

And now I am back home to my own party and my own minority group. I know I need make no special plea to the members of the party that justly holds itself out to be the party of the common people. I make no plea to you. To do so were to challenge your honor. I only bring to you the facts upon which to base your conviction. In absolute confidence, I leave you to make the decision.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Scrivner amendment. Tuttle Creek Dam is a must if we are to accomplish flood control along the Missouri River below Kansas City. Here are the facts.

The Tuttle Creek Dam is located above Manhattan, Kans., on the Big Blue River. This tributary of the Kansas River must be controlled if the lower Kansas Valley is to have any assurance of flood protection.

The Blue River is the largest single threat to the lower Kaw Valley because it is very close to the critical flood areas. It is about at the dividing line between the semiarid regions to the west and the more humid regions to the east. Its annual rainfall of 35 to 40 inches contrasts with less than 25 inches over much of the Republican and Smoky Hill Basins. It has produced flood discharges of over 100,000 cubic feet per second. Thus, this single tributary in a major flood can produce about 25 percent of the flow just below Manhattan and, in the case of smaller floods, a far greater percentage.

During the 50-year period 1903–52, records show that the Kansas River at Manhattan exceeded flood stage about 20 times. The Big Blue River contributed to every one of these floods, and a substantial part of the flow below Manhattan originated from the Blue River during 10 occurrences. The flood of June 1941 with a stage of 25.8 feet at Topeka was caused by flood flows from the Big Blue River. The Big Blue River contributed over 40 percent of flood flows at Topeka in May 1903, June 1908, June 1941, and June 1943, June 1947, June 23, 1951, and June 30, 1951. The Big Blue contributed over 40 percent of flood flows at Topeka in July 1951. The Big Blue contributed substantially to floods at Manhattan in May 1903, June 1908, June 1935, June 1941, and June 1943.

During the June floods of 1941 and 1951, flooding at Manhattan was caused by flood flows of the Big Blue River, the Kansas River not exceeding bankfull stage above Manhattan. About 21 percent of the peak flow during June 1951 was derived from the Big Blue. Just below Manhattan about 90 percent of the peak flow in 1941 was derived from the Big Blue River, and in July 1951 about 21 percent of the total flow was from the Big Blue.

Flood damages have been experienced throughout the entire Kansas River Basin, extending into the western portion of Kansas and the southern part of Nebraska. However, by reason of population, land use, and industrial development, the heaviest losses in major floods are sustained from Manhattan eastward to the mouth of the Kansas River, a distance of about 125 miles. Within this stretch of river are located 145,000 acres of extremely fertile bottom lands in addition to the cities of Manhattan, Topeka, Lawrence, Kansas City, and numerous smaller towns. Full protection of the municipalities is possible only if Tuttle Creek and the smaller reservoirs are operating to reduce flood crests to a point where local levees can handle the flow.

Tuttle Creek is the key reservoir in the entire Kansas River system, due to its strategic location and the large amount of runoff which it will control. In the great flood of 1951, it alone would have reduced the crest flow just below Manhattan by about 21 percent. This major reduction would not have prevented all of the damage which occurred, but it would have reduced depths and duration of flooding on 150,000 acres of bottom farmland in Kansas and, to a lesser degree, on down the Missouri River in my district. In addition, it is entirely probable that such a reduction would have saved the large industrial area of Fairfax, located in Kansas City. The actual damage in this industrial area has been estimated at over $90 million, or more than the cost of Tuttle Creek Dam.

The 1951 flood on the Kansas River was the largest of record. The effective storage capacity of Tuttle Creek Reservoir—2,095,000 acre-feet—would have been required to obtain optimum protection on the lower Kansas River. Thus it has already been demonstrated that Tuttle Creek is required for the sole purpose of flood control. Reduction of the 2,095,000 acre-feet of flood-control storage is not contemplated for any purpose. Without this flood storage on the Blue River, the main Kansas River Valley will forever be vulnerable to a repetition of the 1951 disaster which cost over half a billion dollars in this area alone. All of the floodwaters from the Kansas River Valley flow into the Missouri River at Kansas City. Therefore without Tuttle Creek Dam, thousands of fertile acres of Missouri farmland below Kansas City will continue to suffer loss of valuable crops due to floods. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect and sympathy for the distinguished gentleman from Kansas who spoke against this amendment. He represents a relatively small number of people who would be adversely affected by the construction of this particular project. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] and I, on the other hand, represent many of the hundreds of thousands of people in Kansas and Missouri who would be aided by this project.

Now I regret that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] attempted to leave in your minds the impression that on the one side of this issue were great industrialists, men of wealth, and, on the other, little people.

I saw the area, much of it in Kansas City, Kans., which was so adversely affected by the great flood of 1951, and "The Great Flood" is the right name. To my knowledge there has never been in the history of this country a flood disaster of the size of the Kansas-Missouri flood of 1951, which wrecked the lives of so many tens of thousands of people.

I rather mildly, mildly only because I know his intentions are good, resent the implication by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] that those of us who support this amendment are not just as interested as he is in little people. I saw in Kansas City, Kans., thousands of small, modest homes, the homes of workingmen, destroyed by this flood; in truth, these houses were then a fit habitation only for the bullfrogs and the moccasins, after the raging waters of the Kansas River wiped away not only houses but homesites. Not just the house but often the land itself was moved away.

The key fact in this situation is that there is presented to this Congress and to the people of this area absolutely no reasonably effective alternative to the construction of this dam. We do not believe, nor does any objective student of the problem, that those very valuable and important efforts toward soil conservation alone will do the job. We do not believe the time has come when anybody can demonstrate to us that that great industrial area of Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo., can be protected by the measures advocated by the opponents of this dam. We think those measures will be required, but we think the big dams will be required also.

There is no hopeful alternative confronting the people of this area. We have not from the present administration or from anybody in Congress received a concrete program that will give us hope of protection from a repetition of the kind of disasters we have suffered periodically. I have the greatest sympathy for those people who would be injured by the construction of the dam, but I think this Congress should now, as in the past and in the future, guide itself in its decisions by acting in the interest of doing the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Five million dollars has been expended, $5 million of the taxpayers' money, to make a start on the construction of this dam. I submit it is wasteful to stop the construction. I submit we should go forward now.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is it not a fact that this is what is known as a dry

dam? In other words, 75 percent of the land inundated can be farmed during certain seasons?

Mr. BOLLING. That is my understanding.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Only 25 percent of the soil the dam affects will be covered by water during the entire year.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I am wondering why they are wanting to buy up this land that is going to be dry. There is no other reason for this dam except to flood that land, and if you flood it you are going to have a swamp at least a part of the time.

Mr. BOLLING. I believe that if the gentleman will study some of those projects that have gone forward so successfully in the State of Ohio he will find that in a number of cases they have bought the land and been in position to lease it back virtually every year. The reason for the dry-dam approach is so that that kind of thing may be done, the land may continue to be utilized.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just left the floor suggested that there is no practical alternative to the construction of this large dam. I recognize that neither the proposed large dam nor any alternative can stop all floods, but I do submit there is a practical alternative, and that it has been suggested. It consists of upstream flood prevention. If we would give more consideration to this upstream approach I believe we can get more flood control for less money than we can hope to get under this large dam program.

I do not have the exact figure on Tuttle Creek Dam with me at the moment. I know roughly what the figures are. I know that a number of these dams are being built in the Kansas area and that the average cost is running about $28,000 per square mile of land above the reservoirs. I think it is fair to assume that the cost of Tuttle Creek will run about like the average. Some of these Kansas flood control dams are going to cost almost $40,000 for each section of land above the dam. Some will not cost that much. Now, before you say, "What difference does that make what it costs above the reservoir, it is the land below the reservoir that is to be protected" let me point out that all of the flood-control advantages of any dam are achieved if an amount of water equal to the storage capacity of the dam is caused to sink into the ground. When properly treated the soil itself is a great blotter. By the application of conservation practices and by applying ordinary practices to make the water go into the ground, and holding it where it falls, you can hold far more water in the soil of a watershed than you can hold by building one large dam at the lower end of that watershed. And you can do it a whole lot cheaper. Once you have caused the water to go into the ground, you have removed it as a menace. Consider that very carefully when you are spending $30,000 per section, or $20,000 or even $10,000 per section. And you are spending that or more on Tuttle Creek. When you are spending even $20,000 per section, do you realize how much you are investing per acre? Twenty thousand dollars per section is more than $30 per acre for every acre of land above the dam. Think of how much conservation work you could do with that? Think of spending $20,000 on one flat section in Kansas. Why you could put up terraces, and you could plant strip crops, you could build gully plugs, you could construct small ponds, and plant legumes all over the place. You could fix that land so that very little water would run off in any flood. You can make more water go into the ground by spending $20,000 per section than you could ever put in in a reservoir, no matter how much you spend on it.

The fallacy about this thing is that the people who feel they must rely on the big dams alone fail to recognize that the Lord gave us the greatest reservoir for water in all the world in the earth itself. The earth itself is the greatest reservoir. Man can never build a reservoir equal to that which nature has provided in the way of the soil, if we simply provide the proper kind of coverage and the proper kind of land treatment on the surface of the soil to make that water go into it, the soil will serve as a great sponge. When excess water goes into the soil, your menace of floods is gone, and your menace of erosion is gone. Then there will be no possibility of flooding people out of their homes either in the valley of the Blue or in Kansas City. If you mean to try to protect all the people, why do we not start this flood control where it will protect everybody—from the top of the watershed right down to the mouth of the river. Why do we begin at the lower end of the stream to try to protect simply a few—a favorite few down below the dam? With only a big dam, you cannot protect anybody except those who are below it. With the proper kind of soil treatment and with the proper kind of upstream works and practices, you can protect everybody from the point where the water falls to the point where that water goes into the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Is it not a fact that there has been passed in recent days in this House a beginning of that very kind of program in the Hope bill providing $5 million for pilot plants?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is on the right track. He does not say that you do not need something else, but he does say to start where the water falls.

Mr. SCRIVNER. How does the gentleman account for the terrific floods that we have had in our section of the country before an acre of sod was ever broken by the plow?

Mr. POAGE. You will get some floods whether you have a Tuttle Creek Dam or not. You will undoubtedly get some floods whether you have a soil-conservation program or not. But you will get far fewer and much smaller floods. Nobody can contend that either the dam you propose to build on Tuttle Creek or the soil treatment which I suggest will give 100-percent protection from all floods. We had floods before an acre of land went into cultivation. I believe we can so treat our watersheds that the soil will hold more water than it did before the white men came. Surely we know that with a far smaller expenditure we can make the soil of the Blue Valley hold lots more floodwater than we can store in the proposed Tuttle Creek Reservoir. What I ask is that we try to prevent floods by keeping them from developing. What the Tuttle Creek Dam proposes is to try to control floods after they have developed. I do not claim perfection for the flood prevention approach. On the other hand not even the Engineers will claim that the large flood-control dam will give perfect protection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been demonstrated by the comparatively brief discussion we have had on this floor that this indeed is a very controversial issue. It is controversial not only here on the floor of the House of Representatives, but it is a very controversial issue in the State of Kansas as well. I think the uncertainty and the controversy that rages over this project at this time is the best reason I can advance as to why this Congress should not take the bit in the teeth and attempt to resolve that controversy by denying appropriation of additional funds at this time.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. Is it not true that the Governor of Kansas himself appointed a commission to resolve this problem and that they came up tentatively with an adverse report?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is true. At least the report recommended that they not proceed with the project at this time. It was an independent board of engineers, and they published what is known as the Veatch report. The Missouri River Basin Survey Commission has suggested that this project ought not to proceed at this time. I believe that the better part of judgment would dictate that we not provide these funds in this appropriation bill.

I take this position with a heavy heart because the sponsor of this amendment has been a gentlemen in every respect, in his sincere advocacy of this project. He is one of the veritable, hardworking members of the Committee on Appropriations. Certainly I want to make it clear that this is only on the basis of the uncertainty with respect to this project, and the controversy which rages in the State of Kansas with respect to it

that I believe this House should deny the funds for the Tuttle Creek Dam.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 4, line 5, strike out "$253,723,000" and insert "$254,123,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in introducing this amendment is to add to the funds for "Construction, general," at page 4 of the bill, the sum of $400,000 to further deepen from 26 feet to 30 feet a portion of Gowanus Creek channel in Brooklyn in the port of New York and to improve the same, as was contemplated in House Report No. 2172, 82d Congress, 2d session. This item was not included in the budget which was sent up to the subcommittee by the Bureau of the Budget for the reason that the authorization therefor, which was contained in H. R. 7855 of the 82d Congress, was reported to the House on the 16th of June of last year and became Public Law 551 of the 82d Congress as late as the 16th of July 1952.

I should like to point out to you on this map before you the portion of the channel system of the port of New York involved in this amendment. The channels of the port of New York, which are at least 30 feet in depth, are shown on this map in brown, and, as you will note, they run up the Hudson or North River, on up the East River into Long Island Sound, and are at least 30 feet in depth. They run around Staten Island, out into New York Bay, and out to the Atlantic Ocean.

The part of this great port with which we are now concerned—and I referred to it on this map yesterday as being about as large as a pip on a radar screen—which I now indicate with this pointer, is less than a mile in length; but in that channel of less than a mile in length there is carried annually more cargo than is carried by the entire port of Boston in a year, or in the port of Houston, Tex. The situation which has come about and which we seek to rectify has been occasioned in recent years by the use of ships called C-2's, which have a capacity of 12,500 tons, as compared with 5,000-ton freighters of some years back, when this channel was of adequate depth. For over a number of years over 400 ships a year of deep draft which need at least a 30-foot channel have been using this waterway. They can use it only during approximately 4 hours out of the 24; they have to await the tides. The creek itself is so narrow that movement of these 12,500-ton ships cannot be made at night, but must be made in the daylight hours. The result is that everyone vies to use the waterway in the 4 hours in which the channel can be used to get ships in and out.

The amount involved is merely the sum of $400,000 for the improvements referred to and to have the engineers dredge this channel to a depth of 30 feet.

The improvements in the immediate vicinity and along this waterway, improvements made by private industry in the last few years, have amounted to over $17 million, and over $5 million additional in private improvements are expected to be made in the course of the next year or so.

Let me point out also that along this waterway are two large ship repair yards which repair all types of vessels from many ports, including tankers and cargo ships, of the latest oceangoing models, which are of vital importance to us in our shipment of arms and goods to our troops overseas. Along this waterway are loaded and unloaded many strategic materials, including material and munitions of war which are sent to our allies abroad and to our troops in Germany and Austria.

I do not wish to criticize the committee and have not done so since first discussing this matter with them. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] will agree. I agreed that at the hearing on May 15 last we were given the most courteous and kindly treatment ever accorded supplicants appearing before an Appropriations Committee. I can appreciate the position they take: they say this is not in the budget and therefore should be denied. But it is the prerogative of this House to see that this vitally needed project gets started and gets started right away, and not be deferred for a year, when it will surely be done. Why should it not be started right away? After all, this is not a question of sectionalism. This is your port, the greatest seaport in the world, the famous port of New York, your seaport as well as mine; and I am sure that you do not want to continue the situation I describe in a small area of the port, a distance along the channel of less than 1 mile, where 4 million tons of cargo are carried each year, and to turn down a modest request such as this. I am content to leave this to the good judgment of you Members of the House.

I should refer in passing to an editorial which appeared in this morning's New York Times and read to you a portion of it:

It may be folly to dredge Mud Creek so that seven owners of pleasure launches can get into Driftwood Lake to fish, or to create a harbor so that the world can have the benefit of easy access to the limitless quantities of sand available in Chilblain Cove, Maine. But the dredgers of rivers and the builders of harbors do some good things, too. For example, the $400,000 asked and refused for deepening four-fifths of a mile of the Gowanus Creek channel in Brooklyn might have been well spent. Where a great many projects, large and small, have to be considered by a single committee or subcommittee the rule of not appropriating for any new project is simple, but it cannot always be wise.

We need economy in Government. We also need farsighted planning to get the most out of our harbors, waterways, and natural resources. The meat-ax method * * * does reduce appropriations, but it isn't really businesslike. Somewhere between the old-style pork barrel and the new-style empty pantry there must be a possible compromise.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the good reasoning of the Committee of the Whole on this small item of $400,000 for the greatest seaport in the world. I should point out before I conclude that this is not a partisan matter and that there is not the slightest bit of politics involved. Every single Member of the congressional delegation from Brooklyn, 2 of whom sit on that side of the aisle, and 6 on this side, is in accord. May I say also that I have had great assistance and help from the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], who are on that side of the aisle. My collegues on this side have likewise been of great assistance and help ever since a year ago when I introduced the original legislation.

I appeal to you to give due consideration to this very worthy project.

In conclusion, may I say that I have never in my 9 years as a member of the Appropriations Committee appeared here in the well of the House in behalf of a project in this bill, but have supported over those years many, many projects for the development of other parts of the country, particularly the Northwest.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 20 minutes, the final 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, Gowanus Creek is not a new project. Gowanus Creek has been in existence and dredged since 1881 when the original bill passed this Congress. Last year it became necessary to dredge this creek deeper. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. ROONEY], who represents the district adjacent to mine in Brooklyn, sponsored a bill providing that this creek be dredged an additional 4 feet. This bill passed last year. What we are now seeking is an appropriation to dredge this creek 4 feet deeper. When the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] said that this was a nonpartisan problem, he was absolutely right. All of the Members from Brooklyn are behind the move because we realize it is important, first, to the economy of Brooklyn and, second, to the economy of New York City, and I can assure you what affects the harbor of New York City affects the whole United States. I am speaking for the two Republican Members of the Brooklyn delegation, Congressman RAY and I. All we are asking, in very simple words, is for the United States to be a good neighbor. The people who own the adjacent property to Gowanus Creek have spent over $17 million on the theory that this creek was going to be dredged. The city of New York has spent over $500,000 improving the approaches, widening the arteries and insuring that

trucking facilities and railroad facilities would be adequate for this particular improvement. The adjacent slip owners have their slips dredged to 30 feet. The mud and silt coming from the undredged creek keeps refilling these dredged slips. Under the law only the United States can dredge the creek. How can the United States, as a good neighbor, refuse to give this appropriation for the purpose of dredging Gowanus Creek to a depth of 30 feet?

Mr. Chairman, it is important that the Federal Government in this instance be the good neighbor. They own the waterway. If this money could be provided or if this work could be done through some other source, there is no question but what it would be done. However, it is up to the United States as the owner to do the work. Brooklyn depends on its shipping industry. I am the first Republican Member to be elected from Brooklyn in over 30 years. My community depends on the shipping industry. We are asking for only $400,000. We are asking it for the preservation of this $17 million investment by adjacent property owners, for the preservation of the $500,000 invested by the city of New York.

Be a good neighbor, Members of the House, and give us this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and I want to commend Mr. ROONEY for his very fine presentation of the need for this Gowanus Creek Channel project. I also agree completely with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN].

Mr. Chairman, there is one point that I want to bring out at this time and that is that the Borough of Brooklyn, which is only one of the boroughs of the greater city of New York, contributes 1.04-plus billion dollars to the revenue of these United States. This amount is greater than the individual contribution of any one of 36 States of our Union. I believe I can fairly state that if this appropriation is approved, the revenue from the Borough of Brooklyn to our Federal Government will be greatly increased. Therefore I do not consider that the refusal to include this appropriation is an economy move. I think it is a necessity. It is a necessity as far as the port of New York is concerned in order to increase the amount of imports and exports brought in through this Gowanus Channel. Therefore I urge all of you to grant to Brooklyn this appropriation which is needed for the beginning of a greater expansion so far as the Gowanus Creek Channel is concerned in the city of New York. Your support of this amendment will permit increased expansion by private industry in this area which will reap greater profit in Federal revenue. I beg of you to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I can recall, and I am sure it is the first time since I have been a Member of this House, that anyone from New York City, anyone from our county of Kings, which is coterminus with the Borough of Brooklyn, has come before this House and asked for an appropriation which was to be used entirely within the city or within the Borough of Brooklyn within the city.

I think those of you who know how we in New York always reacted on matters of this kind that have come before the House can now return the compliment and give us, too, a little support in exchange for the support we have always given to every other part of the country when the matter concerned not merely a local problem but also the overall national interest, and that is what this little channel concerns.

This $400,000 is to help keep this channel in use as a necessary and important part of the great port of New York. Those of you who listened to what our distinguished colleague, [Mr. ROONEY], has stated on the subject know that he has told you the facts exactly as they exist. He has presented them to you precisely, accurately, and fairly. Our distinguished colleague from Brooklyn [Mr. DORN] has told you, as Mr. ROONEY has also told you, that there is no political partisanship in this at all. The fact of the matter is that the distinguished county chairmen of both the Republican and Democratic parties have indicated their full support of this item. It is something that is in the public interest. The local chamber of commerce and the State chamber of commerce urge that this work be done.

The amount of money that is being sought is indeed small, but it is necessary. The only excuse that can be offered against it is that it is not in the administration budget. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has already pointed out, it is not there because the law authorizing it was not enacted until July of last year. But the Congress authorized it, and by doing that, you put your stamp of approval on it. Now, let us go forward with this work by adopting this amendment and give us this little bit of money that Brooklyn needs for this important project, which is important to the entire country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the continuation of various projects in the Red River of the North. This overall program which provides for flood control, water drainage, and water conservation in the rich lands of the Red River of the North watershed area in both Minnesota and North Dakota will be about 32 percent completed, with the expenditure of funds which are asked for and requested by the Budget Bureau this year. Without those funds, of course, the project will probably be somewhere between 25 to 30 percent complete. The Congress many times has indicated it is anxious to complete the program to prevent the recurring annual flood losses of millions and millions of dollars in some of the richest land area in the world.

The longer these projects are delayed from year to year, the larger the amount of loss that occurs to the Federal Government in less income taxes, because when these farmers get flood protection on these rich lands they pay anywhere from $500 to $5,000 per year in income taxes. They have already previously expressed a desire to, and will in the future contribute their full share of the local participation in these projects. So it is an economic loss and it is a waste if these projects are not continued and advanced from year to year until the entire program is fully completed in the Red River Valley of the North.

May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if it is his opinion, since the Congress has authorized all the various projects and units in the overall program whether or not the Engineers can allocate or use some of these funds that have not been allocated up to this time. I understand it will be about $376,600 as of July 1 of this year, and they still have unexpended $526,000 at this time.

The question is: Can they use any of these funds, assuming that there will be no additional appropriation when the bill is finally passed by the Congress? Can they use any of those funds remaining and not immediately used, for one or more additional and other projects in the overall river-valley program, because of the fact that other projects, now in process of completion or are to be started and for which there are funds available, may be delayed for a time. It is true that they can have some discretion, is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman has correctly stated the situation. Money would be available from unobligated or unexpended balances which have not been previously used by the Corps of Engineers in certain local communities with which the gentleman is familiar because of a lack of proper local interest at that particular point.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Then it is true, if the Sand Hill River project is ready to go, and the local sponsors are ready, willing, and anxious to commit their local share and contribution, it is the opinion of the chairman, that it is possible to go ahead with at least a portion of the initial stage of the project, if the funds should be available that are left over from the amount which is now unobligated and unexpended.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out that this project was authorized in a bill last year which means that action was taken in time to permit this authorized project to be brought to the attention of the Bureau of the

Budget. It was screened prior to the time of the presentation of this bill to the Congress.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I would like to say very briefly I think we all have sympathy with the merits of this project. There are many items in the bill which have been left out which have merit. But in view of the financial stringency that has to be one of the projects which are omitted. But it is possible, Mr. Chairman, to exaggerate the need. I think the gentleman from New York, when he was indicating that the tonnage carried through the Gowanus Channel was greater than the tonnage carried through the harbors of Houston and Boston together was much mistaken.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield—I did not say that.

Mr. HAND. It was with reference to either one separately. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ROONEY. That is exactly so—4 million tons a year. My figures were furnished to me in April 1952 by the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. HAND. Four million tons in 1951. That is correct; 3,983,000 tons in 1950; 2,935,000 tons in 1949. The figures for Houston are 43 million tons for 1951, 40 million tons for 1950, 36 million and some odd tons for 1949. Boston, 19 million tons, 19,446,000 tons, and 15 million tons. We were surprised at the gentleman's statement which was made in the course of debate. These figures were obtained, and are presumably accurate, from the Army engineers just this morning.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for giving us the correct information.

Mr. Chairman, I would like in conclusion to read a statement obtained from General Chorpening, of the Corps of Engineers, within the last few days. The statement is as follows:

> I am unable to state that there are defense implications connected with this project which would set it apart from numerous other navigational projects, construction of which would be economical and beneficial to local and regional communities.

Mr. Chairman, there are many meritorious projects which have been authorized, about $11 million worth, as a matter of fact, which we have not been able to include any funds for in this bill. The fact that no funds are included does not reflect upon the merit of some time or other of proceeding with this particular project.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken; and (the Chair being in doubt) on a division, there were—ayes 82, noes 64.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 107, noes 94.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: Page 4, line 5, after the words "until expended", strike out "$253,723,000" and insert "$255,723,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The figure has been changed by the Rooney amendment and, therefore, the proposed amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas contends that this is in order unless the approval of the Rooney amendment makes it now out of order. This, Mr. Chairman, if included would carry out an authorization that was made several years ago regarding bank stabilization on the Arkansas River. It is thoroughly authorized; it is absolutely in order unless the adoption of the Rooney amendment would bar the adoption of this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] would amend a figure which is no longer in the bill and it is not in order, under the rules of the House, to offer an amendment to any amount which has been agreed to by the committee. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent that this amendment which carries $2 million be added to the total amount of this item after we include the amendment that was adopted, namely, the Rooney amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is attempting to amend the Rooney amendment?

Mr. NORRELL. I am attempting to amend the amount that is carried in here for construction of rivers and harbors which includes the amount of money that the Rooney amendment added to this amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that the gentleman send his amendment to the Clerk's desk so that we may have it before us.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the point of order raised against the amendment as originally presented has been sustained?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. There is nothing presently before the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. That is true.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: On page 4, line 10, after the word "appropriated", add the following language: "*Provided, further*, That an additional $675,000 is hereby appropriated for planning and construction in the Middle Rio Grande flood-control project in New Mexico as authorized by the 1948 and 1950 Flood Control Acts."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, this includes two phases of the Middle Rio Grande project, one the planning of the Chamita-Abiquiu Dam, and one for construction work which has already started on the floodway at Albuquerque.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] said yesterday with respect to the floodway project, the money was appropriated for this year late last year upon a supplemental request, in the amount of $350,000. That money contemplated only construction work during the last few months of this fiscal year. The gentleman from Wisconsin also stated that this is one of 13 projects similarly situated and which had been treated alike by the committee. I do not know what the situation is with respect to the other 12, but if the circumstances are exactly the same as in our case, then the committee's error of judgment has been compounded thirteenfold.

Since this money was appropriated only for the last few months of this fiscal year and since we only have left out of the $350,000 as of April 30, $241,629, when the committee says to us now: You have this money and carry on for the next year, it means that that construction will start for the same number of months at the beginning of the next fiscal year. Then what happens? The project would have to close because there will not be enough money to construct for the full 12 months' period.

President Truman's budget recognized the situation that we only had money for a few months. You cannot stop a project after 2 or 3 months. It would not be economical or advisable, so they recommended in that budget an additional $890,000. The Eisenhower budget likewise recognizing the same circumstances still recommended a somewhat reduced additional amount of $500,000.

The committee now says that we still have $241,629 and we can continue construction during fiscal 1954 without the additional appropriation. Well, when they use up that money in about 3 or 4 months, at the beginning of the fiscal year, the project will have to stop. That, Mr. Chairman, is not orderly planning, it is not good business, it is not economical businesslike procedure. This I feel is a serious error of judgment of the part of our committee.

Now with respect to the Charvita control dam, that phase of the project is now ready for planning. And, let me tell you that the committee out of the 30 projects ready for planning—and this is one of them—picked out only 10 and proceeded to approve those for planning money. I think it would have been wiser had they picked out more of them, if not all. We are going to be faced with severe unemployment one of these days. This war is going to end, God grant, in the next few months, and then

thousands and thousands of soldiers will be coming back, defense plant construction will be reduced, and there will be unemployment in this land. We are already beginning to see depression in the price of farm commodities. That is always the first danger signal. We should be ready to see to it that this unemployment is picked up by these projects. So, it is only wise that we provide planning for these projects, which must eventually be built. The planning part takes a year or 2 before actual construction can begin. In my State we only have this one project in the planning stage, and if we have unemployment we ought to have it at least in the stage where construction can begin. All these projects where surveys have been completed, should be ready with the planning accomplished, so that when unemployment begins to creep on us we can control it from the beginning. That is only sensible. This administration is going to have to be charged with that responsibility of planning and being ready. All of them should be carefully reviewed and restored either by this House or by the Senate before this bill passes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to know just what it takes to get an appropriation for a project that has been authorized by the Congress of the United States, the money, in large part, being provided for a survey, two different Presidents having recommended appropriations for it, and still the committee says "No." In Albuquerque, N. Mex., we have a river the bed of which is now 4 feet higher than the main street of the greatest city in our State. As the result, when we get rain out there—which we get infrequently—we not only have damage caused by it but we are not able to impound it and conserve it for useful purposes when we like to. In addition to that, the Rio Grande in New Mexico is not owned or controlled by the State of New Mexico. Fifty years ago a great President, Theodore Roosevelt, allocated of those waters 60,000 acre-feet a year to Mexico to settle a claim that the great country of Mexico had against the United States. Texas is entitled to certain of the waters of that river, and today the State of Texas is suing the State of New Mexico in the Supreme Court of the United States because we cannot deliver the amount of water to which that State claims to be entitled. The reason we cannot do it is that there is no channel to carry it.

I have gone along pretty much with the findings of the budget when the Director of the Budget and his staff cut the so-called Eisenhower budget item for this program from $890,000 to $500,000. I can see where they might want to make a certain reduction. I talked to the very able chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. I may have misunderstood the chairman, but I understood him to tell me that not any of the money recommended for this project by the recent Director of the Budget was taken out by the committee. I am not sure now whether he feels he told me that or not.

Last summer when we had some flash floods in the mountains in and about Albuquerque some people who had constructed homes there were taken out in the middle of the night because of 6 to 8 to 10 feet of water in their homes. Furniture was destroyed. The total destruction in the residential area was about a million and a half dollars. The Army engineer there says we may expect the same thing this year unless something is done, unless we get this money for which we have asked.

I do not know how long the Congress of the United States will say, "Well, we need economy." I agree with that, but is it economy to destroy property? Is it economy to destroy lives? We are destroying a great many in Korea, and we are much upset about it, and we are destroying them at home.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. The gentleman is not now talking about a river flood in Albuquerque?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am talking about the floods because the channel cannot carry the water away.

Mr. HAND. But there has been no river flood in Albuquerque, so far as the testimony shows, since 1930. Is that correct?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is not correct.

Mr. HAND. That is what your witnesses testified to.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Last summer there was a million and a half dollars damage.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In late years we had a whole town destroyed. San Antonio was completely destroyed by floods. It is just below Albuquerque.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Ball, an engineer, appearing with the gentleman from New Mexico at the hearing, said this:

> Since 1930 we have not had a flood in Albuquerque from the river.

That is an exact quotation from his testimony.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Now I see what the gentleman means. It cannot get from the river because the river will not take the water there. The riverbed is 4 feet higher than the city of Albuquerque, so there is no channel to carry away flood waters.

Mr. HAND. Would the gentleman mind saying how deep the river is at this time at a point just north of Albuquerque? Is it about 2½ feet?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would not say it was.

Mr. HAND. That is what the testimony shows.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is 2½ feet higher than the main street of Albuquerque.

The Army engineers stated, in a paper I got this morning from New Mexico, that we can expect another flood at Albuquerque unless something is done immediately to prevent it.

The Rio Grande project was approved in the 80th Congress. The survey has been going on since 1940. Now the time has come to do something to the channel. Unless we do, we are going to have a recurrence, and the water will not go to southern New Mexico or to Texas because we will not be able to get it through.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If the gentleman will yield further, when that supplemental came down it was because, after careful investigation, the former administration concluded that it was a matter of emergency. When the new administration went into it and considered it, they likewise considered it an emergency and approved the $500,000 additional.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is correct. The Army engineers considered it an emergency. Everybody considers it an emergency except you gentlemen on the subcommittee. I think it is only because you have not been out there to see it. I would trust any man in this Congress to go and see it, and I would be governed by his decision. But just to cut out all the money for this project, notwithstanding the Army engineers and the two Directors of the Budget, I do not know what anyone can expect.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment carries.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to reiterate what I told the gentleman from New Mexico who just preceded me on the floor. Certainly I made no commitments at any time as to what would be in this bill. I do recall talking to him about whether or not there was money in the budget, and I pointed out there was $500,000 in the budget. Certainly, it would be presumptuous for me or any other subcommittee chairman to make statements to anyone as to what the subcommittee was going to do before the markup of the bill. There are seven members on this subcommittee.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In addition to the $500,000, of course, there is some $175,000 for the other phase of it in the Chamita project. They are both in the budget, is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is a planning project. It is not in this construction phase. It was pointed out that this floodway is another one of those projects which came in late last year. There was some money appropriated last year, but little work has been done on this project, except planning. The funds remaining on the project in the form of unobligated and unexpended balances will be sufficient, as in the case of these other projects which were brought in late last year, to permit the program to carry on during the fiscal year 1954. On April 30, the close of last month, there was $236,000 unobligated, and almost $250,000 unexpended. What they have done so far has been to spend for planning and not for construction. I want to say with regard to the Chamita

project that the other gentleman from New Mexico mentioned that the testimony we had by the corps was that that was of questionable economic and engineering value as originally authorized. It was one of a number that we deleted from this bill because we picked out for planning only those projects that have a high economic value on the basis of the benefit-to-cost ratio. To permit this amendment to stand would be to do an injustice to the other projects which are in a similar situation, and would repudiate what this subcommittee has unanimously felt to be a reasonable method of permitting these projects to proceed in an economic manner during the course of the 1954 fiscal year.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Referring to the discussion I had with the gentleman yesterday when you talked to me later, you said you were mistaken and that you thought you were talking about an Arizona project.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is another matter. When I told the gentleman about a project, I had the Jemez Canyon and the Tucson, Ariz., project in mind when the gentleman mentioned a previous appropriation, but that is not relevant to what we were discussing here yesterday.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The Army engineers told me this morning that the money is insufficient to carry on this year, and that very little can be done with the money now available. They insist upon that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I dare say that if any individual Member of the Congress were to call on the Corps of Engineers and to ask them if they could not use money for a particular project, each and every Member would get an affirmative answer.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Permit me to say to the gentleman that I did not ask that. I just asked what the result would be. They told me the result would be very bad unless this money is restored.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That would be expected.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am sure when the Director of the Budget recommended it he must have believed it was necessary.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DEMPSEY) there were—ayes 58, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 4, line 5, after the sum named, insert "and an additional $2 million for bank stabilization on the Arkansas River."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment should be adopted, it would add $2 million to the construction fund in the rivers and harbors part of the bill. This $2 million is for bank stabilization on the Arkansas River. The amendment should be known as, and it is sponsored jointly by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], and myself as it is through our districts that the Arkansas River flows, in the State of Arkansas.

This $2 million has been approved by the Army Engineer Corps, from the lowest jurisdictional officer to the Chief of the Army engineers. This $2 million has also been approved by the last administration. It is in the so-called Truman budget estimates. This $2 million was investigated by the Eisenhower administration, and it is recommended and included in the so-called Eisenhower Bureau of the Budget estimates. We not only, therefore, have the Truman Bureau of the Budget but we have the Eisenhower Bureau of the Budget.

You know we have a staff in our Committee on Appropriations. I think, I have strong suspicions that the staff of the committee approved this $2 million. I have tried to find out, but I have been unable to do so.

Then what is wrong with the $2 million. We have two budget estimates. We have the staff approving it, I think. I do not know and I cannot find out. It is authorized. It is a flood-control project.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. NORRELL. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. The staff recommended $2,800,000, and that is the figure that was included.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Now, this is a flood-control bill. If this item of $2 million is not placed in here, it may be a terrible thing for Kansas City, St. Louis, and other areas in these regions. If this amendment is adopted, it will be for stabilizing the banks of the Arkansas, where a large number of gaslines cross the Arkansas River transporting natural gas to Kansas City, St. Louis, and the sections up there. Everybody using natural gas in those areas gets it through gaslines which cross the Arkansas River near Pine Bluff, Ark. One item is to stabilize the banks of the Arkansas River where these lines cross so that the banks of the river will not cave in and these gaslines will not be destroyed. It also protects a railroad bridge. It protects the finest soil you can find anywhere in the world, land that sells for $500, $600, and $1,000 an acre. It also protects the levees. In case the banks continue to cave and destroy the land that is adjacent thereto, eventually the levees are washed away, and the Government must then buy additional land and construct a setback levee and pay for that. Therefore, our Government is guilty of destroying this fine land and the buying of additional land, reconstructing the levees, and this always costs several times more money than it would take to stabilize the banks.

I am saying to you that we have a budget estimate, we have the recommendation of the engineers, we have the estimates from the Eisenhower and the Truman administrations; there is no objection to this whatever so far as I know. I like the members of this committee. Far be it from me to say anything detrimental about them. They felt according to their report that since this money was not earmarked for specific projects that they ought not to allow the engineers an amount to use wherever they might want to.

If you have the hearings before you and will turn to page 326 you will find that the good chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. DAVIS], asked General Chorpening where he would spend the money if it was allowed. Listen to the question and the General's answer:

Mr. DAVIS. As of this date, can you tell us where you anticipate spending the $2 million of unearmarked funds for emergency purposes?

General CHORPENING. There are a number of locations on the river that we know of and which, of course, we included in the overall estimate previously discussed of $18-million-plus. That data is worked out and will be placed in the record.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

"Present indications are that conditions at the following locations may become critical at any time and require allocations from unearmarked funds that may be included in the fiscal year 1954 appropriations for the Arkansas River. It cannot be accurately predicted where critical areas will develop and locations other than those listed below may require allocation of funds from the unearmarked amount. Available funds will be allocated for work at critical locations when and as the need develops.

"*Major stabilization reach emergency location*

	Present estimated cost
"Vache Grasse Bend to Bluff contact: Trustee Bend cutoff miles 340.0–337.0	$200,000
Okane Bend to Patterson Bend: McLean Bottoms, pile dikes, 298.9RB; McLean Bottoms, revetment, 297.7RB	500,000
Rock Island RR. bridge to White Bluff:	
Browns Bend, revetment and pile dikes, miles 152.2–151.1	600,000
Estes Place, revetment and pile dikes, miles 150.0–148.8	400,000
Warings Bend, revetment and pile dikes, miles 148.1–146.6	500,000
Rob Roy Bridge to Arkansas Post Canal:	
New Gascony miles 86.0–80.5:	
South bank above Madding, pile dikes	230,000
North bank, revetment, and pile dikes	575,000
Brunsons Crossing, revetment and pile dikes	455,000"

Thus, if all the objection the subcommittee has is that it has not been earmarked, why can we not appropriate the money and say that here is where the money should be spent?

We actually need over $18 million to prevent various sections of the banks of the Arkansas River from caving in and being washed away. I think a request was made to the Bureau of the Budget by the engineers for this sum. The so-called Truman Bureau of the Budget only allowed a total of $4,800,000, the sum of $2,800,000 being earmarked for specific projects and the bal-

ance of $2 million was allowed in a way that it could be spent anywhere on the river in Arkansas where the emergency was the greatest. This, so the Bureau of the Budget thought, would be more economical than allowing the total of $18 million requested. Now we find the subcommittee taking it away from us. I hope this amendment will be adopted. I thank you.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is little I can add to the remarks of my colleague from Arkansas, but I appeal to the House to give us relief. I know that if the Members could see the Arkansas River Valley and the devastations that have been caused there in the last few years they would give us this additional sum of money. Actually, $11 million could be justified for the fiscal year.

In 1946 the Congress approved a comprehensive plan enlarged in 1949 for which sums have been appropriated every year. This year in the face of the showing we made the Bureau of the Budget of the present administration recommended that $4,800,000 be appropriated.

The additional $2 million proposed by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] is to bring the appropriation up to the budget figure. In 1936 the Congress authorized a program of flood control. It was based on levee protection. The levees have not lasted. The theory of the 1946 and 1949 acts is bank stabilization. If we can have bank stabilization instead of levees, the rich valley lands can be protected.

The Arkansas River is our national responsibility, not just the responsibility of the three districts through which the river runs. Let me emphasize that, Mr. Chairman. The Arkansas River at this point carries the floodwaters of 6 States. We have no power in the State of Arkansas to halt those descending floodwaters at Fort Smith and tell them they have no license to enter our State. It is a national responsibility, and General Feringa, formerly Assistant Chief of Engineers, said of the Arkansas River that it is the most treacherous, unpredictable large stream in the United States.

All of the best lands of our districts are in the Arkansas Valley, and this river through the years has been eating that land away. It is, therefore, false economy not to follow the engineers' recommendation to stabilize the banks and protect the lands which produce food and fiber not only for our Nation but also for the friendly nations who are identified with us in the world conflict. For that reason we are appealing to the committee to help us. May I reiterate that we are asking only that the budget recommendation be followed. Without this help I fear for the future. Again let me say if the Members of this House could only see the destruction that is visited upon us year by year they would come to our assistance.

Beginning in 1927 there was a flood that washed a large acreage away, in 1945 there was a flood in which one-tenth of all the cultivated acreage between Fort Smith and Little Rock was irreparably destroyed following the 1943 flood of devastating proportions.

We must look to the Federal Government. I submit on the basis of the testimony mentioned by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], that the $4,800,000 is a modest amount to give the Arkansas River the protection it needs.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because I want to say to you that I believe if the members of this committee could see the Arkansas River and the condition of its banks, there would be no dissenting votes. During the redistricting of Arkansas last year there was added to the district which I have had the great honor to represent six new counties. In those counties is encompassed a great section of the Arkansas River. I have lived up in the mountains, but I must confess that before I became more intimately interested as a Member of Congress, I could not realize just what the situation was on the Arkansas. Last fall I stood on the banks of that great river and on the levee that protects the McLean Bottoms in Johnson County in the district which I represent—and this is typical of many up and down the river—and saw that the banks had caved in until the river is within 100 feet of that great levee in which the Government of the United States and the people of that vicinity have invested more than one and one-half million dollars in protecting the surrounding area.

The engineers have stated, as I remember, that with $150,000 they can start revetments there which will protect that great levee and 20,000 acres of among the finest land in this great country.

I say if this amendment is not adopted and the engineers are prevented from protecting that levee, 1 year from today, and mark it on your calendar, it will cost a million dollars to repair the damage that $150,000 will prevent now and in the meantime you will have devastated untold millions of dollars of property in the McLean Bottoms. That is a single instance.

We have been trying to get in this appropriation bill a so-called emergency fund so that the Corps of Engineers can go to places like McLean Bottoms or the Crawford County Levee District in Crawford County, in my district where the same conditions as these exist in McLean Bottoms, and on down the river. It is real economy to adopt this amendment and I certainly hope that the committee will do so.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes, the time to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The chief objection which the members of our subcommittee have to this amendment is that it provides an unearmarked fund to be spent at the discretion of the Corps of Engineers. I think that the past record of the manner in which the total authorization for this project has grown and the manner in which the cost of the emergency reaches have been pyramided, indicates the danger of permitting what we might call a slush fund to be created by the addition of this money. Now, to state that the Corps of Engineers has approved this is a correct statement, but not entirely a complete one, because in their revised estimate submitted by the Corps of Engineers they listed $2,800,000. This is the exact amount provided by the subcommittee for the earmarked projects where they knew the Corps would profitably spend these funds.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. Is it not true that the committee provided all of the funds that the engineers specifically pointed out for a specific purpose and we only curtailed funds to be used without any definite project in view?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct. We invited the Corps of Engineers, I might say, to tell us where the $2 million would be spent, and they submitted a list not for $2 million but for almost $3,500,000. I do not think that this Congress wants to put itself in the position of appropriating money for indefinite and unearmarked phases of projects of this kind. It was on that basis that the funds were denied and I believe it is on that basis that the funds should be denied and the subcommittee should be sustained.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Then will the gentleman explain to me why, when you asked the gentleman as indicated on page 326, "As of this year, can you tell where you anticipate spending $2 million of unearmarked funds for emergency purposes?" you listed these four items?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. He listed them, which amounted to almost $3,500,000, and that is where they could spend it; no doubt they could.

Mr. NORRELL. He indicated that is where they could spend it, and is it not true that there are two budget estimates for it?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct; there are two budget estimates, but neither one of them tell exactly where the $2 million was going to be spent.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NORRELL) there were—ayes 50, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHORT: On page 4, line 5, after the sum named insert "and in addition, $6,000,000 for construction of Table Rock Dam, White River, Mo."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, for 20 long years in and out of Congress I have been pleading and working for the construction of Table Rock Dam on the White River in southern Missouri. This particular project should be continued to its completion for the following reasons:

First, every Government agency that has studied, surveyed, and considered this project has given it its stamp of approval. Not only the district engineers at Little Rock, the division engineers at Dallas, and the Chief of Engineers' Office in Washington, D. C., but the Federal Power Commission, the National Resources and Planning Board, the Roosevelt and Truman administrations and the Directors of the Budget in each, the flood-control committees of the House and the Senate, the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate, and the conferences they have held, and both Houses of Congress, the Senate and the House, have approved Table Rock Dam.

Twelve years ago, in 1941, Table Rock and Bull Shoals were authorized by the Congress of the United States. Because of the priorities and the shortage of materials and manpower in wartime the construction of those two projects was delayed until after the war. In 1946 funds were voted for the construction of Bull Shoals, and it is being completed. Table Rock, that had been authorized at the same time, 12 years ago, was held up until last year, but the Congress not only has authorized it but the Congress last year voted $3 million for the beginning of construction of Table Rock, which is an integral part of a single project unit so interlocked, intertwined, and connected with Bull Shoals that it would be foolish to construct one dam without building the other.

So this is not a new project. This is to build the project that was started years ago. It is to complete the unit. Not only will the construction of Table Rock Dam help the farmers who live in the White River Valley; from the standpoint of flood control alone it could be justified. The annual flood damage in the valley is approximately $2 million. I have seen the angry waters undermine highways and railroads, uproot farmhouses, destroy livestock, and even take human lives.

Table Rock will save a million fertile acres, mostly in the State of Arkansas, but not only from the standpoint of flood control have the Engineers decided this dam is justified. It would almost be justified from the single point of view of the development of hydroelectric power. It is self-liquidating; a sound investment that will pay dividends in the future. Its ultimate maximum production will be 531 million kilowatt-hours of energy every year. It will increase by 50 percent the output of power at Ozark Beach Dam, a privately owned utility constructed 41 years ago. It will increase the output of power at Bull Shoals 30 percent. So when you combine the interest of flood control, the protection it will give the farmers and the urban centers in the White River Valley, along with the development of hydroelectric power, I cannot see how any intelligent man could logically oppose such a worthy project. Not only from the standpoint of flood control and power is it justified, but from the standpoint of national defense. All of the power that will be produced at Bull Shoals, Ark., 50 air miles and 100 water miles below Table Rock, has already been contracted for by the huge Reynolds Aluminum plant in north Arkansas. Those people in Arkansas and Missouri have not kicked, howled, or criticized too much, but out of patriotism they have agreed to give all the power generated at Bull Shoals to our national-defense effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, because I sat through all of the debate yesterday and all day today, I more than appreciate your generosity in granting me 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, not only from the standpoint of flood control and the development and generation of hydroelectric power which will bring new industry into that country—incidentally we have been declared a distress area. Many of our people are out of work and need and want employment. It is one of the few places in the United States today where people are now on relief and receiving Government assistance. We will improve the situation there if we can develop power to turn the wheels in our canning factories, our sawmills, and our garment plants, and in the marginal mines in that tri-State area. Let me point out to the Members of the House that we have many precious and strategic metals in south Missouri and north Arkansas. For instance, lead, zinc, bauxite, fluoride, titanium, and manganese, metals and minerals that are essential for our national defense.

Particularly because all of the power at Bull Shoals has been contracted for by the aluminum plant of the Reynolds Co., it is imperative that we go ahead and finish the construction of Table Rock that has not only been authorized but for which we have appropriated money. This is not in the study or survey stage. It is not in the planning stage. Why, the Federal Government in the past 15 years has spent over $850,000 in making the studies, surveys and drill soundings at Table Rock Dam site. We are far past that stage. Why practice this false economy of stopping the wheels now after the Federal Government voted $3 million last year, and after many of the little towns in both Missouri and Arkansas have voted school bonds during the past year and voted bonds for sewage systems and bonds for roads and highway improvements counting upon the Government to keep its faith and its word? There is a solemn moral obligation, if not a legal contract, between the Government and the people who live in that region.

I simply say to you after having served on the old Flood Control Committee, the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee in the House of Representatives, president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in the 22 years I have been privileged to sit in your midst, and after visiting flood-control projects and projects for the development of hydroelectric power and irrigation and reclamation and other projects which will utilize and conserve our vast water and land resources not only in the Connecticut Valley in New England, not only up and down the Susquehanna, Monongahela, Ohio, Mississippi, the Missouri and the Arkansas and the Red Rivers, but out on the west coast in your Central Valley and in the Columbia and the Colorado River Basins, nowhere in this Nation can I think of a more natural project for flood control and for the generation of hydroelectric power than Table Rock.

I am not in favor of all the dams that are recommended by the Army engineers. I voted for some and I have voted against others. I think every individual project should stand or fall upon its own merits. I am not so much for building high dams in the upper reaches of any river where the land is flat and where you will inundate thousands upon thousands of fertile acres. But down in the Ozarks where our hills perhaps are not so much higher than your hills in Kansas and North Dakota, but where our hollows are a lot deeper, I believe in them. Let me tell you the canyons are narrower down where I live. You will not disrupt anything and you will not cover up industries, railways, and highways because they simply do not exist there. You will have a minimum of dislocation at the dam site that will hold back the floodwaters and then gradually let the waters out in order to fill this Ozark Beach Reservoir and Bull Shoals Reservoir and so regulate or equate the flow as to increase the output of power in all those reservoirs.

I hope and trust that the Members of this House who already have gone on record authorizing this project, and having voted money for its construction, will not be shortsighted and will not practice false economy and discontinue the completion of this project. It will retard the development of that entire area. The fact that they have delayed it this long has kept people in a state of uncertainty, and it has kept the farmers from building new barns, new homes, and building up the fertility of their soil because they live in constant fear of being covered up.

I hope you can go along with this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my experience in Congress, and during my service on the Committee on Public Works, I have never observed a project where so many people can be benefited, and where it is opposed by so few, as the Table Rock project, which has been spoken about by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. He has told you about our mountains. I wish it were possible for this committee right now to be transported down to that beautiful scene, the projection of Table Rock down over the clear blue waters of the White River. All of us interested in it would like you to be there. We would like to show you those purple mountains. We would like to show you those low piled hills. We would like for you to listen to the laughter of the silver rills. Then you could understand why the Farm Bureau has endorsed this project; why the National Grange has endorsed this project; why the Missouri FFA has endorsed this project; why the REA co-ops in a group of six States have endorsed this project. You would understand also why the Chamber of Commerce of Springfield, the metropolis of that area, and the chambers of commerce of all the other towns in the valley affected have endorsed this project.

As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has already indicated, when the Congress last year authorized $3 million to begin construction of this project, the people in that valley were electrified—at last their fight of 20 years was over—the towns in the surrounding area planned ahead. In my home town of Berryville, Ark., with a population of 1,800, we floated $300,000 worth of bonds. We have sold those bonds. The contract has been let and construction is under way, making additions to the water and sewer systems of that town. The same thing at Green Forest in my home county, and Harrison, and Eureka Springs, and the small towns in my colleague's district in Missouri.

Now, there is a moral contract with all these people that the Government of the United States complete this project. It is an investment in the future. It is not an expenditure. It is an investment in national defense.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I think it would be well to remind Members of the House on both sides that the President of the United States, in his state of the Union message on February 2 in this Chamber, told us that soundly planned projects already initiated should be carried out; and Table Rock is soundly planned and it is already initiated and it should be carried out.

The gentleman from Missouri is just as correct as he can possibly be. Work is in progress and the contracts are let, and it will be false economy for this project to be stopped now.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to my colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], and to urge upon this committee the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to join my distinguished friend from Arkansas and my friend from Missouri and associate myself with the remarks of the speaker. I have had mail from northeastern Oklahoma, an area which faces the same economic conditions, strongly in support of Table Rock Dam. It will benefit three States and will be of great benefit to the people. I certainly hope the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am greatly impressed with the facts presented to this committee by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri and the distinguished gentlemen from Arkansas. No more able and sincere and conscientious Members of this Congress are in this Hall. They are alert to the interests of their people and loyal to the interests of their constituents, and if I were in their position I would do just as they are doing to try to get this project continued.

But according to the information which was furnished to the subcommittee, this project has been expanded, has been increased without additional authorization. The prospective cost has been more than doubled. Not more than one-third of the moneys appropriated have been expended thus far, the $3 million the gentleman spoke of. With these facts facing us the committee felt justified in not making additional appropriations but agreed to let them use the money they have, let them get additional authorizations for the expanded program before we go ahead.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. In just a minute.

Now, as to power revenue from the project which is to be used to amortize the cost, it was originally estimated at $2,702,000. The present estimate is $1,878,000, so that with an increased cost you have a reduced income. I think, therefore, the committee is justified in deferring this project at least for further study. Now I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I appreciate my friend's yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the project has not been expanded so much as there has been an actual normal increase in cost from the time the project was authorized in 1941, 12 years ago. That is the reason we made the mistake of not building the dam sooner. You cannot build a dam like Table Rock overnight; it takes about 5 years; and, goodness knows, if we become embroiled in a global war we will have use for all the power we can generate in that region, and more.

Mr. RILEY. According to the information that is furnished us, there is ample power to take care of the situation over there for the next several years, and this project could logically be deferred at least for further study.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would like to agree with what my colleague from South Carolina has said. There is no urgency about this project from a power standpoint or from any other standpoint that I can perceive. No continuing contracts have been let. Thus we would not be losing previously expended funds by failure to proceed rapidly with this project at this time.

I think in order to complete the picture it should be said that the same President who recommended that planned projects should be proceeded with, as quoted by the gentleman from Missouri, the same President is the one who recommended against the appropriation of all funds for this project in this fiscal year.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I think I know why he recommended against it. He did not do it voluntarily.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The power situation in that section of Arkansas is misunderstood by the able gentleman from South Carolina, because there is a power shortage. The people are clamoring for it all the time. My mail is full of requests for it. The people want more power for more industry. There has been no new authorization but costs have gone up.

Mr. RILEY. According to the estimate furnished us by the Federal Power Commission there will be power reserves in this area through 1958. Of course, that is the source of our information.

Mr. TRIMBLE. That is exactly the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RILEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. TRIMBLE. If you do not complete this dam and get this 653 million kilowatt-hours in 1958 you will have a desperate shortage. This dam is scheduled to be completed in 1958 if construction is allowed to proceed.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, as much as I am in sympathy with the project as explained to the committee by the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Arkansas, in view of the emergency in which we find ourselves today and the fact a great many projects now under construction will be finished this year, which might make available funds for appropriation for other projects next year, I trust that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago, and there has been reference to it in other cases, that reports have come to the gentleman's committee which would indicate that the cost of construction of these projects has increased to the point that made it doubtful as to whether the benefits justify the cost. I am very much concerned about that attitude that has been expressed on behalf of the committee.

Does the committee adopt the viewpoint that the cost of construction of these plants has gone up, has increased in this inflationary era we have been going through, and contend that the benefits to be derived therefrom remain at the same cost level as was determined at the time the justification was made?

Mr. RILEY. The time for amortization of these multipurpose projects, as presented to the committee by the corps, is 50 years. The estimates which were furnished to us indicated that it would take 70 years to amortize the power features of this project.

Mr. HARRIS. That is not the question I asked the gentleman and the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do this not for the purpose of delaying the Committee but this is an important matter. I have read reports and I have seen reports, as many of you have. This committee has tried to do an excellent job. I know the members have worked hard and they have labored long, but there have been some pretty important pronouncements made by the Committee on Appropriations. What has been very forceful to me is the fact that obviously the position must be taken that projects that were justified 3 or 4 years ago or more were justified on the basis of benefits according to cost.

Now, we have those same projects today on which reports come in, not only on this one but on many more, and I understand they have been given to this committee. I am trying to raise a point that I think is important to all of these projects and that is, since these projects were justified the cost in these years that have intervened has gone up, and they take the position that since the cost has increased that there is some question about the justification. The question that I raise is, Does the committee take the position that the cost of these projects has gone up but that the benefits derived therefrom have not also increased during this natural adjustment of our economy? I would like to have an expression from some member of the committee on this point because I think it means a great deal in the consideration of these projects in the future. If the gentleman from South Carolina or the gentleman from Wisconsin could give me and other Members of this House information as to its attitude on this important question, it would be appreciated.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. I will say to the gentleman that I think those things ought to be taken into consideration. The committee thinks that this project should be deferred to get an up-to-date cost estimate and see whether or not it would pay dividends and whether or not it could be amortized within the length of time that these other projects are amortized. It might have been a profitable venture to build something 10 years ago that would not be profitable or economical at the present time, whether it be a dam or building or railroad or something else. Conditions change.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman take the position or does his committee take the position that the cost in this inflationary period has gone up, but yet the benefit derived therefrom stays at the same level, price level, as it was when the project was justified?

Mr. RILEY. The income to amortize this project would certainly be less if the cost was more than double. I think the gentleman will agree with me on that.

Mr. HARRIS. Yet the benefit remains as it was when cost was much less than today?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have not heard up until now that there has been any fixed term of years where a dam would amortize itself. If it is a project that can be justified, it would appear to me that the number of years it would take to amortize it would be insignificant. The question is whether or not you want to preserve the fertile acres of this country and whether or not you want the people to have sufficient power. Now let me say this about this proposition because I have been here a long time and I have had some terrific fights about it since 1935, when the Utility Holding Company Act was passed, and all that: If we were to dam every river in America for flood control and soil conservation, with incidence of power, every one that would generate power in America, in my deliberate opinion, in 20 years, unless there were hundreds of steam plants built, we would have a power shortage in the United States.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I want to say I appreciate the gentleman and his committee for the efforts they have made. You have worked hard on this program, and I want to express to your committee my very sincere appreciation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I just wanted to make two comments, first of all, with reference to the comment made by the distinguished minority leader. It has been the policy of the Corps of Engineers since these multipurpose dams have been constructed by the Federal Government that a 50-year amortization period should be the basis for the benefit-to-cost ratio.

Of course, we do try to get the latest available figures both with respect to cost and with respect to benefits, so that we do have the latest computations available on which to get an up-to-date benefit-to-cost ratio. The up-to-date figures simply are not available to the committee with respect to Table Rock Dam.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand, and I agree with my distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. I have not had a reply to my question. Certainly you cannot seriously contend the benefits from these projects have not increased as a result of the inflationary trend the last few years as has the cost of construction. The ratio of costs to benefits must be the same now as it was a few years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 74, noes 102.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SHORT and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 83, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all amendments which may be offered henceforth on this paragraph of the bill be limited to 10 minutes on each amendment, with 5 minutes for the proponents and 5 minutes for the opponents.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on all amendments on this portion of the bill, this paragraph, be limited to 10 minutes for each amendment, with 5 minutes for the proponents and 5 minutes for the opponents on each amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: On page 4, line 5, after the sum named insert "of which $400,000 shall be expendable for flood protective work at Johnsonburg, Pa."

Mr. GAVIN. This is a project at Johnsonburg in Elk County, Pa. When we first considered flood control legislation, it was purely flood control, to protect the people from these devastating, reoccurring floods that are periodically visited upon our communities, causing great destruction and loss. I think the picture was ably presented today by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

I want to say that up in our district they have great difficulty with flood waters, particularly in this one spot at Johnsonburg; however, it has gotten so now that we do not stay with flood con-

trol appropriations. It is hydroelectric projects, steam projects, multiple-purpose dams, and you are into all kinds of projects—not just flood control.

This project of which I speak is actually a flood control project to protect the people from devastating floods. The project started in 1944, and it went along satisfactorily and last year we had an appropriation of $850,000. On this last appropriation, when they completed the dam they had $400,000 left over. I presumed we would start the second phase of it, which was the widening, channeling, dredging, of the river below the dam to let the water get away. But the Corps of Engineers thought otherwise and evidently the Bureau of the Budget agreed. I am not asking for anything that was not appropriated. The Corps of Engineers allocated this remaining $400,000 some place else. I do not know where. I have tried to find out. All I am asking you is that the $400,000 that was overage on the project be restored to this Johnsonburg project.

This is what the Chief of Engineers said in a letter under date of March 2, 1953:

> In the case of the East Branch Clarion River Reservoir, I am pleased to inform you that through the receipt of favorable bids and careful economy, the Corps of Engineers has been able to complete the project for approximately $400,000 less than was estimated when the last appropriation for the work was made by the Congress.

However, these funds cannot be used to start the Johnsonburg project for reasons set forth in the following paragraph.

He then goes on with his explanation to which I did not agree. So I immediately became concerned as to why the reallocation of these funds. I had the matter up with Engineers, Bureau of the Budget, Civil Functions Subcommittee, and others but I got nowhere.

It was only last Friday up in this little town of Johnsonburg where we have been trying to get this project completed for the past several years that they were hit again with rain and flood waters. Here are the newspaper headlines: "Johnsonburg badly hit by cloudburst—5 or 6 feet water in streets—Deluge damage heavy on hilltop."

For about $400,000 or $500,000 channeling, dredging and widening of this river would give these people relief from these floods.

I have received bunches of telegrams. They appeal to me. Why don't you get action. They do not understand why they cannot get help. When they are flooded out and their homes destroyed and their belongings are lost, they cannot understand why the Government should not be sympathetic and help them. It is not a 20- or 30-, or 40-, or 50-million-dollar project. It is a $400,000 project. Therefore, I am asking you to give consideration to this amendment to include $400,000 in the bill to get the work done.

Here is a telegram I received:

> Flood waters of Clarion River and Silver Creek rising at over 1 foot per hour at Johnsonburg, Pa. Emergency whistle blown at 11 a. m. this date warning residents to abandon homes. West Johnsonburg and Rolfe flooded for second time in 3 days. Aroused citizens cannot understand lack of governmental action when necessity for flood control project this area has been proven and accepted for so long a period. Clarion River and Elk Creek about to overflow banks in Ridgway Borough. You have seen the millions of dollars destruction and loss of life this area as result of repeated floods. Suggest your colleague also come to site and view damage. Immediate action necessary.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to have to oppose the project which is so close to the heart of my good friend from Pennsylvania, but there are one or two things that I think we must observe in connection with it. In the first place, although the gentleman has indicated that this is an old project on which funds are already available, the truth is that this is not. According to the opinion of the Army engineers and of this committee, it is a new start and the planning has not even been completed with respect to this new start.

I would like to say also with regard to planning that this committee has allocated the sum of $30,000 for planning the Johnsonburg project in which the gentleman is interested.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. Not at this time; I am sorry.

I do not know whether the gentleman is familiar with this or not, but additional studies are under way at this time which would give some additional flood protection.

This project now is costing—and it has been reviewed and restudied—at least 220 percent more than it did since its authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to come to the rescue of my good friend who yesterday in the course of general debate felt, I gather the impression, that he had to apologize to the people of his district for not being able to get quite as much for flood control as he wanted.

Mr. GAVIN. Oh, no; the gentleman is wrong. I do not have to apologize. The people of my district know me and that I will make the effort for anything that benefits my State.

Mr. HAND. In fiscal year 1947 for the Clarion River Reservoir, which is in the same general area, we appropriated $500,000; in fiscal year 1948, $1,000,000; in fiscal year 1949, $2,000,000; 1950, $2,500,000; 1951, $1,800,000; 1952, $2,000,000; and in 1953, $850,000. That is the gentleman's testimony and with respect to that project I think the committee was reasonably generous.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. Not at the moment. I am very sorry.

This is a new start; it needs further planning; money has been allocated by the committee for further planning; and much as I hate to oppose my good friend from Pennsylvania, this is only one of dozens of projects which the committee has been obliged to deny in the interest of proper economy and proper procedure.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I am glad to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. That is why I want to present to the House the proposition that this is not a new project. The gentleman has just read off the yearly appropriations that were made up to and including the present year to continue the job. This $400,000 I have been talking about should have been applied to continuation of work at Johnsonburg.

Mr. HAND. The gentleman is speaking of a separate project in the same area.

Mr. GAVIN. And of the last appropriation there was $400,000 left over to start the second phase of the work.

Mr. HAND. The $400,000 will have to be reallocated.

Mr. GAVIN. Not with my consent, believe me.

Mr. HAND. I now yield, Mr. Chairman, to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would just like to ask why Massachusetts, with 17 projects in my district, has not had any consideration at all? I would like to have the gentleman tell me why.

Mr. HAND. I may say to the gentleman that Massachusetts has had the friendliest kind of consideration.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, friendly consideration. But that does not prevent floods.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN) there were—ayes 47, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. McDONOUGH: Page 4, line 10, after "appropriated", insert "*Provided*, That additional funds of $1,900,000 for Los Angeles Drainage District, $1,200,000 for Whittier Narrows and $500,000 for San Antonio Reservoir are hereby provided as previously authorized by the Congress."

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, on account of the limitation of time placed by the chairman of the subcommittee on amendments to this section, many Members of the California delegation are unable to present their side of the case.

The Los Angeles Flood Control Drainage District covers some 4,500 square miles and is occupied by about four and a half million people, having an assessed value of more than $4 billion. It has over the past 10 to 15 years invested more than $100 million of its own money. Last year it voted a bond issue of $179 million to prosecute and to construct additional flood-control projects of its own.

Since 1936 the Congress has recognized the flood-control problem in Los Angeles County and has contributed considerably to the needs of the number of people who are there and to the protection of a large amount of property and has recovered to

the county and to the wealth of the Nation millions of dollars of otherwise inundated land.

The Los Angeles Drainage District in this budget is provided with only $6 million, which actually means that for the next 20 years we will be working on trying to recover from some of the flood damage that will result if we do not have more money. I am asking not for an amount above the Eisenhower budget but for $975,000 less than the Eisenhower budget.

I am asking for another million dollars which will make the total 7 million instead of 6 million as now stated in the bill.

The Whittier Narrows is a project that protects a lot of defense plants in the Long Beach area. Without it the homes of at least a half million people are endangered.

The underground water supply of the county and surrounding area, and water is important to us, is consequently limited. I am not asking for more than the Eisenhower budget for that particular project.

The San Antonio Reservoir is a project that is on the east side of the county adjoining San Bernardino County. In that narrow area the traffic coming into Los Angeles County comes both by rail and by highway. There is danger, and the floods have on many occasions washed out the highways and the railroads, and we are only asking for half a million dollars more on that particular project, which is $1,500,000 less than the Eisenhower budget. In other words, we are spending $3 of our own money for every dollar that the Federal Government is putting into our projects, and we think we have an exemplary situation in Los Angeles County in providing for our own needs as compared to any other part of the country, and because of the increase in population, which is increasing greater there than any other part of the United States, we are entitled to this consideration.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and state that as concerns the situation, due to tremendous quantities of water that accumulate in our flood-control areas and such, the work that has been already completed in many instances may be destroyed or set back seriously for a long time to come unless this additional amount of money is authorized.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Is it not true that with 4½ million people affected by your amendment it affects 1 out of every 34 people in these United States of America?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is correct.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLT. Is it not a fact that it is necessary to complete the Federal projects so that the water carried by the county and city storm drains may be carried off into the ocean?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Of course. I am not speaking without some knowledge in this situation because before coming to Congress I served as a member of the Los Angeles County flood control district and I also served as a member of the board of supervisors of the County of Los Angeles for 11 years. I have faced the situation many times and I know the damage that results from heavy floods in this area.

Let me read a wire from H. E. Hedger, Los Angeles County flood control chief engineer:

Los Angeles, Calif., May 26, 1953.

Hon. Gordon L. McDonough,
Congressman, 15th District, California,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reduction in President's flood-control budget as recommended by the House Appropriations Committee is of great concern to this area.

Elimination of San Antonio project will seriously affect prosperity of Los Angeles County.

Principal easterly transportation outlet from Los Angeles area is through gap between mountains east of Pomona. San Antonio Wash bisects this gap.

Four transcontinental rail lines moving 4,000 freight cars and 435 passenger cars daily funnel through gap handling 80 percent easterly transcontinental traffic and 50 percent all rail traffic, Los Angeles County, including coastal and local.

Four United States highways, handling 50,000 vehicles per day, cross gap. In addition, 33 other highways and roads.

In 1914 and 1938 all rail lines and all highways simultaneously severed by overflow of San Antonio Wash completely closing this outlet to east.

This flood-control project was a new start in 1950 which required certification by the President as necessary for national defense.

Benefit cost ratio does not reflect population increase of 40 percent in Claremont since 1950 due principally to new defense plants.

Reduction in funds for Whittier Narrows project and Los Angeles drainage area project will seriously retard improvement of lower Los Angeles River, Rio Hondo, and Whittier Narrows Dam which is so vitally needed to protect Long Beach Harbor in view of very appreciable subsidence in this area.

Reductions in local projects very inequitable. Los Angeles drainage area, 24.8 percent reduction; Whittier Narrows, 19.4 percent; San Antonio, 88 percent, an average of 30.5 percent reduction for local projects as compared with 16.9 percent national average. We feel sure that you will do everything possible to restore these reductions on the floor of the House when the bill is introduced.

Los Angeles County Flood Control District,
H. E. Hedger, *Chief Engineer.*

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a favorable vote on the amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDonough] to restore $2,700,000 to the appropriation for the Los Angeles Drainage District, the Whittier Narrows Dam and the San Antonio Reservoir.

Due to a limitation on debate time I cannot give the many reasons why this cut in the Eisenhower budget allowance should be restored.

Over 1 million people are endangered by flood control hazards in Los Angeles County. Our county has bonded itself for three dollars to every one advanced by the Federal Government. During the last year we passed a special bond assessment for $179 million for flood control.

The great aircraft manufacturing plants of North America, Lockheed and Douglas lie in this area. They are busily engaged in producing war planes for use in Korea—a flash flood of unusual size in the mountains might endanger these vital defense plants. In addition thousands of lives might be endangered and billions in property values.

I urge the committee to restore this cut in the Eisenhower budget by supporting the McDonough amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, the new and great 23d Congressional District of my native State of California is directly affected by lack of adequate flood-control provision in the northeast portion of Los Angeles County for which the amendment by Mr. McDonough asks protection. In the absence of prompt completion of the Whittier Narrows project, the eastern portion of the 23d District is in real danger for it abuts the Whittier Narrows neighborhood and territory directly.

The lack of flood-control protection in the southern portion of Los Angeles County, as refers to the flood-control channel running through Long Beach into the Pacific Ocean, could well mean that the flood waters would gather and remain in a southern portion of the 23d District instead of running off into the flood-control channel.

The following telegram from the Los Angeles flood-control district was received by me just a few hours ago. I read it for your information and your guidance:

Los Angeles, Calif., May 26, 1953.

Hon. Clyde Doyle,
Congressman, 23d District, California,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reduction in President's flood-control budget, as recommended by the House Appropriations Committee, is of great concern to this area.

Elimination of San Antonio project will seriously affect prosperity of Los Angeles County.

Principal easterly transportation outlet from Los Angeles area is through gap between mountains east of Pomona. San Antonio Wash bisects this gap.

Four transcontinental rail lines, moving 4,000 freight cars and 435 passenger cars

daily, funnel through gap, handling 80 percent easterly transcontinental traffic and 50 percent all-rail traffic Los Angeles County, including coastal and local.

Four United States highways, handling 50,000 vehicles per day, cross gap. In addition, 33 other highways and roads.

In 1914 and 1938 all rail lines and all highways simultaneously severed by overflow of San Antonio Wash, completely closing this outlet to east.

This flood-control project was a new start in 1950 which required certification by the President as necessary for national defense.

Benefit-cost ratio does not reflect population increase of 40 percent in Claremont since 1950, due principally to new defense plants.

Reduction in funds for Whittier Narrows project and Los Angeles drainage area project will seriously retard improvement of lower Los Angeles River, Rio Hondo, and Whittier Narrows Dam, which is so vitally needed to protect Long Beach Harbor, in view of very appreciable subsidence in this area.

Reductions in local projects very inequitable. Los Angeles drainage area, 24.8-percent reduction; Whittier Narrows, 19.4 percent; San Antonio, 88 percent; an average of 30.5-percent reduction for local projects as compared with 16.9 percent national average.

We feel sure that you will do everything possible to restore these reductions on the floor of the House when the bill is introduced.

H. E. HEDGES,
Chief Engineer, Los Angeles County Flood Control District.

You will notice that this important telegram recites that the committee reduction in the projects for the Los Angeles County area amount to a 30.5-percent reduction, while the average percent reduction in such projects nationwide in the committee report is only 16.9 percent. Why is this? I ask the subcommittee this question.

Certainly the undisputed record speaks clearly that the county flood-control district has done its share of voting millions of dollars for its own help and that it has been well spent.

All these 6 years I have been in this House, I have kept well informed on these Los Angeles County flood-control problems and have personally made it my business as a Representative to observe much of the flood controls or lack of them in my section of Los Angeles County.

In reading the committee report on this bill and also the hearings, I find no testimony of lack of need or worthiness as relates to this county flood-control plan.

I gladly join with Congressman McDONOUGH'S remarks and make them as and for my own. I know he is well informed.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of this amendment, not as a Representative only of the people of my congressional district, roughly one out of every 435 Americans, but as a spokesman for one out of every 34 citizens of the United States of America. The 4½ million people whose lives and safety are affected by the flood control work in the Los Angeles River Basin are vitally interested in our action here today. When winter rains and flash floods come to southern California, our action today may determine whether many of those Americans will suffer the loss of their lives, with the loss of all their properties, or both.

One million and one hundred forty thousands people are dependent for their safety on Whittier-Narrows Dam alone. For flood control in the Los Angeles area, $554 million has been committed locally by the people there as against $375 million by the Federal Government. These figures are for the total flood control work to be carried on to its conclusion. Up to the present time, the Federal Government has actually appropriated $113½ million toward completion of the work, while local sources have furnished $303 million. In other words, the local people are so concerned that they are willing to spend three times the amount the Federal Government is willing to appropriate for this necessary flood-control construction.

I can most easily emphasize the seriousness with which 4½ million people of the Los Angeles flood-control basin regard their situation by pointing out that only last November these people voted by a wide margin to subject themselves to pay $179 million bond levy to carry on this work. That amounts to $40 per person or $160 for every family of four persons.

The amount by which the McDonough amendment would raise the Federal appropriation for this vitally important work amounts to less than 50 cents for each of these persons so vitally affected. A small price indeed to pay to insure their lives and safety.

I ask you, my colleagues, to restore to this budget, for work in the Los Angeles River Basin to control raging flood waters, only the amount that was approved and recommended in the Eisenhower budget.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an acute problem that the folks I represent face when we have rains of flood proportion. Our community is a part of the Los Angeles County drainage area, and consists roughly of the San Fernando Valley and Hollywood area of Los Angeles County. Many defense projects are located in our community. Los Angeles is a key area in our country's overall defense program.

I thoroughly believe in solving all problems possible on a local level, and I want you all to know that we have contributed 75 percent of the money ourselves to finish our flood-control projects. In other words, the city and county governments are spending all of the money possible to solve our own flood-control problem. We have just recently voted 4 to 1 for a bond issue which will raise $179 million. We have an outstanding record of local contribution and self-protection.

In my district, however, it is particularly necessary that the Federal project be completed to receive and carry away the floodwater which pours into it from the city and county projects when a flood occurs. This project, by name, is the Los Angeles River drainage project. The section that must be completed immediately is the area from Sepulveda Boulevard to Reseda Boulevard. It is then highly important that the river drainage system be extended on out farther into the West Valley until completed. The local city and county drainage projects will soon be completed and will empty into the Los Angeles River at various points.

Unbelievable hardships have been forced upon the residents of my community during several minor floods. If a major flood occurred, there could be very serious losses. At the present rate of appropriations, it will require 40 years or more to complete this project.

As I have pointed out, a grave flood hazard is found in Los Angeles County. This hazard affects over 1 million residents and billions in property values. Only acceleration of construction of this whole flood-control system to completion will remove this hazard.

The Los Angeles County drainage area project was first authorized by Congress in 1936. The project report recommended annual appropriations of $20 million so it could be completed within 10 years or less. By 1942 Congress had appropriated $73,541,000, representing 33.2 percent of the total estimated cost. By 1946, due to decreased appropriations and increased construction costs attributable to World War II, appropriations totaled $79,203,000, or 26.3 percent of the total estimated cost. Today, primarily due to insufficient annual appropriations since 1946, Federal appropriations total $113,656,000, or 34.8 percent of the estimated project cost. Thus for the last 8 years progress on this project has been at a rate of 1 percent per year.

If no further increase in construction costs occur, appropriations at the average rate of the past 8 years will require 40 years or more to complete the project. I was happy to note that 1954 budget recommendations recognize the necessity for increased appropriations, but if continued it will still require 27 years for completion.

Here, then, is one of the great projects of the Nation, one of the most vitally needed, which has marked time while most other flood-control works throughout the country have advanced toward completion in less than 10 years.

Why does Los Angeles County need so much flood-control work?

First. Cloudburst-type rainfall.

Second. Precipitous terrain.

Third. Debris flows.

Fourth. Vast population—4½ million now, with over 1 million in flood zones.

Is Los Angeles asking for too much help?

First. Federal commitments for flood control total about $370 million, including Los Angeles County drainage area,

$326 million; Whittier Narrows, $36 million; San Antonio, $8 million.

Second. Commitments for flood control and supplemental systems total about $554 million.

Federal appropriations to date total about $113½ million. District appropriations to date total about $303 million, of which $179 million is financed by bond issue voted in November 1952. Federal appropriations since 1946 have averaged $5,118,000 per year. District appropriations since 1946 have averaged $9,215,000 per year.

I submit that we have an outstanding record of self-help. Still the problem is so large that Federal help is needed. I extend a cordial invitation to the Members on behalf of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County. This will enable these distinguished gentlemen to see for themselves the problems we face when rains of flood proportions fall.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH], whose presentation of our problem has been quite complete. There are only a few other points that need stressing.

The project of the San Antonio Dam can conceivably be of very vital importance because of the transcontinental railway lines, transcontinental highways which can and have been interrupted seriously and at critical times. These lines take 80 percent of all the railway traffic east from Lost Angeles. In recent years they have been twice wrecked by sudden storms. It is for this reason the President had certified this project as one for national defense.

To those of you who have traveled our country and have seen these wide river beds completely dry, it is difficult to depict the quick change of scene when in rainy season a virtual wall of water sweeps great boulders ahead of it with immense loss of property and even lives.

The Los Angeles County flood-control project, which was reduced by the committee $1,975,000, includes several very important control points in my particular district: The Santa Anita Wash, the Arcadia Wash, and the Eaton Wash in the foothill area. In addition to this the great San Fernando Valley, which was severely damaged a year ago, has been recently flooded by overflow from the Pacoima and Wilbur Canyons, the Bull Creek Canyon and from the Lopez Basin. Tremendous work has been accomplished already but needs connecting up with the Los Angeles River for flowoff.

In addition to this the city of Burbank needs vitally a $900,000 appropriation to protect its important defense industries. This was not even included in the present bill but must absolutely be included in the next bill.

May we reiterate that it is difficult to imagine, for anyone not present during the great 1938 storms and several lessor ones since, the destruction from the mountains suddenly poured on a thickly populated and highly productive plain. We must recognize also the Los Angeles County appropriation was reduced by the committee nearly 25 percent, far more than the national average reduction. We must consider that Los Angeles County has provided $3 for every $1 of Federal funds and that this is not for the commercial benefit of the community but for protection, not only of the community but for the defense industries so important in our present crisis. I highly recommend to you the passage of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to oppose this amendment as I have those which have previously been offered. First of all, I think this Congress should know that the people of the Los Angeles community have done a remarkable job of coordinating the efforts of their local community in cooperating with the State and with the Federal Government before the prosecution of this work for flood control in their area. We recognize and all the members of the subcommittee recognize that the work has been proceeding at too slow a pace; that they ought to be stepping up if real and substantial progress is to be made in controlling the rather unusual flood-control problems which they do have in this area. I think the record will demonstrate that this failure of proper progress to no little extent is due, not to the failure of the Congress to provide adequate funds for this program nearly so much as it has been due to the failure to expend funds which the Congress has appropriated.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think in addition to that we should consider the fact that we had a couple of war years in which materials were short, and that insofar as local interests are concerned, when we have voted not on one occasion but on several occasions and issued several million dollars of bonds, that we are evidencing our willingness to speed up the work as fast as we possibly could.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think there is no question about that, but I think there has been a great deal of forbearance on the part of the people of Los Angeles during the emergency period when materials were not available and the personnel was not available.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate that remark. May I say that the subcommitten on both sides of the aisle have been very patient and very considerate. You gave a good hearing to our flood control engineer and to our other interested parties when they came before you. We hope you will be just as generous in your support of my amendment as you were in the time you gave us during that period.

Mr. RILEY. If the gentleman will yield, may I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if it is not true that on the Whittier Narrow Reservoir project practically the whole amount of last year's appropriation is unexpended?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I believe that is substantially correct, about $6,000,000.

Mr. RILEY. On the Los Angeles drainage area approximately one-third is unexpended, so that the committee felt justified in reducing appropriations for this year, which in the aggregate would give more than was appropriated last year, to carry on these projects.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think that when there has been a demonstrated ability to proceed at a more reasonable rate the committee will be happy to give consideration to appropriations in order to carry on this work in a more economical manner.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLT. May I thank the gentleman and his subcommittee for the courtesy and consideration they have shown us. May I also extend an invitation to the subcommittee to visit our Los Angeles area to see the problem we have out there.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McDONOUGH) there were—ayes 34, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRIEST: On page 4, line 5, after the figure "$253,723,000," add the following: "$1,835,000 shall be used for the Cheatham Lock Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee."

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, in presenting this amendment I want to express my personal appreciation to this subcommittee for a demonstration of courtesy and consideration in a difficult situation in the performance of their task in this writing and handling of this bill. I come not to make any criticism whatsoever of the subcommittee or of the Appropriations Committee.

I hope you will not believe I am trying to be facetious when I say that I am presenting this amendment as an economy amendment. It does increase the total of the appropriation, or would if adopted by $1,835,000, bringing the appropriation insofar as the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River is concerned up to the Eisenhower budget recommendation.

The new or revised budget recommended an appropriation of $4,835,000 to continue work on this dam. The Appropriations Committee recommended to the House an appropriation of $3 million, which is $1,835,000 less than the Bureau of the Budget recommended.

Mr. Chairman, this navigation lock on the Cumberland River, that is to replace three older and worn-out navigation dams, is now about 98 percent complete. There will be installed at this project one generating unit of 25,000-kilowatt capacity. The appropriation of only $3 million for the coming fiscal year will delay the completion of this rather small dam by approximately 1 year. On the basis of that delay I believe I can logically present this request to bring it up to the budget estimate as an economy move. Even at the budget figure it will be delayed at least 6 months beyond the original target date for the completion of the dam. Colonel Paules from the Army engineers in his testimony before this subcommittee, in response to a question asked by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] said:

The schedule for operation of the project already would be 6 months behind schedule.

And when asked the reason for that delay by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], he replied:

The reduction in funds, sir. With the amount of funds included in the new budget, we will be unable to finish in the time that was originally proposed, this being a lesser amount than we anticipated requesting.

I have made some effort since yesterday to get another estimate from the Army engineers as to what effect an additional cut below the budget estimate would have insofar as the completion date is concerned. It seems it will run perhaps to a delay of 1 year. That delay is costly from two viewpoints, I think. In the first place, no multipurpose dam can begin to pay for itself and can begin to return revenue to the Treasury of the United States until that time comes when the generators are started and the power generated at the dam is sold. That is the only way I know of whereby a return can be made to the Federal Government. This delay of 1 year not only means a delay in the time the revenue will begin to return to the Federal Government, but this 25,000 kilowatts of power had been considered in a large allotment of power scheduled to go for operating the new atomic-energy plant at Paducah, Ky., and the wind tunnel installation at Tullahoma, Tenn., when both of those are in operation. If it is delayed 1 year, the power for these Federal projects will have to come from some other source. Where, I do not know, perhaps some supplementary steam-generating plants. I feel that it is in the interest of economy not to delay this project for at least 1 year when by adopting the budget recommended by President Eisenhower, we can save at least 6 months and perhaps more in the completion of the project. A slowed-down construction project almost invariably costs more in the end. I do not care to take the time of the committee at this late hour for any further discussion, Mr. Chairman. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Briefly, in explanation of what the subcommittee has done—may I say there are really two parts to this project. One is for the completion of locks and that will be virtually completed with the funds that are available. The second part is the power project. That was authorized here last year so that the start on that, the progress on that, has been very small. There was an unobligated balance available at the beginning of the calendar year of about $1.9 million. There was an unexpended balance of $4.7 million at that time. The power is scheduled to go on the line in 1956, but the figures that we have been able to obtain indicate there will be no shortage in that area at that time. Since we are in effect starting a new phase of the project through a new authorization while we felt it was completely proper we do proceed with the power facility, we are not unreasonably delaying the completion of the project, but are providing an orderly method of transition from the lock construction to the power facility construction with the $3 million provided in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I would like to direct the attention of the committee, and particularly the attention of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. DAVIS], to the Cuyahoga River-Cleveland Harbor project, and the report thereon by the committee.

I will not go into the fact that this is a project so necessary and essential for our national defense program. What I want to bring out is this: According to my analysis of this entire project, the appropriations for this Cleveland Harbor project have been granted under the same principle as the Truman-Hobbs Act; that is, that when the Secretary of the Army approved any project, he would so advise the Secretary of the Treasury, who would then be required to set aside a certain amount of money, provided, of course, that the Congress would appropriate it.

You state there is $5,067,000 that will be unexpended as of June 30 of this year, but that is for four bridges. Those are under construction by different railroads. Under the principles of the Truman-Hobbs Act, money has been appropriated for those four particular projects, and it would seem unfair to me to ask that the city of Cleveland or the railroads allocate some of the moneys that we have already appropriated for those four bridges to two other bridges, when different railroads are in the process of constructing those two other bridges. I really feel that there is no disagreement as to the essentiality of these projects, and the fact that the Congress will eventually grant this appropriation, but I think in all fairness the committee should approve the $3 million which was in the Eisenhower budget, and enable the railroad company to enter into its contract for construction of those two bridges. After all, the Government will not expend the money until the construction has begun.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In response to the query of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], let me say that the subcommittee had a very definite objective in mind in denying funds for this purpose at this particular time. These bridges should not be replaced and relocated under the Truman-Hobbs Act, but should be handled as a straight appropriation, as part of the authorized improvement of the facilities in Cleveland Harbor.

Mr. FEIGHAN. They are being constructed under the same principles that obtain under the Truman-Hobbs bill. The only fact is that inasmuch as this is a project of 15 different bridges, instead of taking each one of them separately they have joined them all together under one authorization of Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think it is fair to say it is being done under the same principle; but referring to page 9 of our report, our objective at this time is to remedy what we consider to be an unfair situation in tying up funds appropriated by the Congress in this area, without any progress being made in the completion of the project for which we are appropriating the funds. In past years we have been appropriating money, and now we find it is tied up and sitting there because of what we consider an arbitrary attitude on the part of the railroad companies involved. What we are doing in this report is to attempt to break that backlog so that this project can go ahead in what we consider a reasonable manner and on a more reasonable basis than has been the procedure in the past.

Mr. FEIGHAN. But I think it seems unfair to try to take money from one railroad which is already constructing a bridge and allocate it to another railroad which is just in the process of beginning to construct a bridge.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We not only have an unexpended balance but what was an unobligated balance at the end of last year of $2.6 million.

This indicates that the money has not all been committed and that they can proceed and the backlog can be broken with the money they already have.

Mr. FEIGHAN. It was my understanding that the amount of money appropriated has been committed. We should not confuse obligations with allocations. The Truman-Hobbs Act specifically provides that when the Secretary of the Army orders the removal or modification of a railroad bridge and the railroad company prepares plans suitable to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Army approves, then the Secretary of the Treasury must reserve from whatever funds are available to this type of work the amount necessary to complete the work. While it is my understanding that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], is correct in his statement that all the funds are not obligated on this project,

they are specifically allocated to the project as provided for by the Truman-Hobbs Act. Therefore there are no funds available unless an appropriation is made to accomplish the work on bridges 3 and 15 as the committee, in its report, recommended should be done.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOLDEN: Page 4, line 5, after the colon insert "An additional sum of $590,000 to be expended on the Pineville, Ky., flood-control project on the Cumberland River as previously authorized by Congress."

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore to the bill the exact figure that was contained in the Eisenhower budget as referred to the subcommittee on appropriations by the Budget Director of the United States. This would protect a small town in my district in Kentucky where I live and where about 4,000 people reside.

We have devastating floods, the like of which you have never seen unless you have been somewhere in the Missouri Valley or in some of these other great flood districts where the waters rip through the streets and get 10 or 15 feet deep.

We had an appropriation during the last term of the Congress, and part of that money has been expended. Our community on a flood-control project that called for the expenditure on the part of the Federal Government of $1,500,000 was asked to raise $590,000. This small town has already raised that money; we floated the bonds, sold the bonds, and have the money in the bank.

Last year we were allowed $270,000 to start this project. The project has been started and part of the money has been expended. The people of Pineville have put up $50,000 of their money to buy rights-of-way for the first segment of this flood-control project; and, recently, in the last few days they have put up additional sums to buy more rights-of-way so that the project could proceed and give our people protection.

In the flood of 1946 the damage to this town was greater than the entire cost of this flood-control project.

It is said in the report that the reason we were cut out was because it was felt that there would be sufficient money left from last year's appropriation to carry on this work in an orderly manner. I think the committee made a mistake about that. There is only $180,000 left in this fund according to the best information I have.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDEN. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to go on record as supporting the gentleman's amendment. It certainly would be false economy to spend $275,000 and start a flood wall in a city where floods recur almost annually and then stop construction. Considerable damage is done to one of the most beautiful cities in the whole country every time a flood takes place. In view of the explanation that the gentleman has given here today I feel that the membership of this committee will restore the fund needed to carry on the construction of this flood wall.

Mr. GOLDEN. I certainly thank the gentleman.

In order that the Members of Congress may fully appreciate the importance of this amendment to give Pineville, Ky., protection from these floods not only from the standpoint of the citizens who live there and who are almost destroyed by these recurring floods but also from the standpoint of national defense and the large contribution that this section and city makes to the security and welfare of the entire United States, permit me to state the following facts:

Pineville, Ky., is in the heart of the bituminous coal section of southeast Kentucky. It is located on the C. V. division of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad. The flood wall which is to be built in this project surrounds and protects the railroad yards where very large coal trains are brought in from other sections of Bell and Harlan Counties and assembled so as to start on their trips to the defense and war factories of this Nation.

This section produces from fifteen to twenty million tons of bituminous coal each year. Besides much of this coal going to help manufacture essential war materials, a very large part of it goes directly to the steel mills to help make steel. You cannot make steel unless you have bituminous coal for fuel.

One of the largest mines in the world is at Lynch, Ky., in Harlan County, and this mine is owned by United States Steel Co., and the coal from this mine is brought to Pineville, Ky., and then sent on, and all of it used in the steel mills to make steel. This flood wall will protect the homes of the railroad workers and other people who are engaged not only in the coal business but in the railroad business as well.

In addition to all of this, when the Korean war broke out the United States Government and the authorities in charge of the huge atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., requested the Kentucky Utilities Co., with headquarters at Pineville, Ky., to increase the capacity of their generating plant approximately 50 percent so as to furnish electricity to the Federal Government and to the atomic plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

This Kentucky Utilities Co. is a privately owned corporation, located on the Cumberland River just below Pineville, and it burns bituminous coal, by which electricity is created. This company enlarged its plant and increased its capacity at an expenditure of several million dollars and built a direct line of high-tension wires from its plant to the Oak Ridge atomic plant across the State line into Tennessee. The bomb plant at Oak Ridge is some 70 to 90 air miles from Pineville.

The coal that is burned in this electric-generating plant is transported mainly in trucks through the city of Pineville and some through the city of Barbourville, Ky., to this electric-generating plant, and every day large amounts of electric energy is being created and sent to Oak Ridge, Tenn., from this plant. The flood wall would protect the streets and highways of Pineville and enable this coal to pass along to the electric-generating plant.

The Government felt that the continuation of this flow of electric current was so important to the Oak Ridge bomb plant across the line in Tennessee that they have placed a helicopter into service, manned by expert electrical and mechanical engineers who patrol this line from the Kentucky utilities plant to the Oak Ridge plant each day so as to repair immediately any interference with the flow of this current.

We feel that we are making a large contribution to the defense of this country and that this essential project should not be held up for another year, as is done in the present bill. This community has done everything it possibly can and has met all of the requirements demanded of it by the Federal Government, and we feel that the Government should keep faith with the citizens of this community.

Besides raising their full share of the local contribution, namely, floating and selling bonds for $590,000 of their own money, recently the State of Kentucky, through the highway department, has constructed a high bridge across the Cumberland River at Pineville and has constructed a highway and street from the bridge into and through the city connecting with the flood wall and project so as to enable traffic to go through the city and be protected by the flood wall.

This was done at an expense of more than a million dollars, and the Congress was not called upon to make any contribution to this expenditure at all. If time would permit, I could give many additional reasons for adopting this amendment and allowing this Pineville flood-control project to proceed rapidly to completion, and I most sincerely hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. Chairman, this project is in the same situation as those I have mentioned several times. This is one of those that was brought in last year. The major portion of this project is actually in the planning stage. There is no major construction that has been started and there is an unexpended balance that will permit them to proceed during the fiscal year.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I think it is true that all the rights-of-way have been acquired and actual construction work has already commenced on this particular project.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. Just for the record I wish to state that the project has been started and some of the money has been expended on this site, besides raising $590,000 to build a million-dollar bridge out of Kentucky's money and a highway to connect with this floodwall. We have

done as much in Kentucky to do our part to meet this emergency as any other community in the United States. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 4, line 5, after the colon and following the figure in line 5 insert "An additional $989,000 is hereby appropriated to carry out the provisions of Public Law 516, 81st Congress, 1st session, authorizing flood control for Cape Girardeau, Mo.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I bring before you a project that is noncontroversial. In listening to this debate for the last 5 or 6 hours I have followed the committee in its objections to all amendments offered. I can truthfully say this project meets every objection that has been advanced so far by the committee. This is a project in which no one will be injured by any construction. We are coming before you on the principle of equity.

Cape Girardeau is a town of more than 25,000 population, the largest town on the west side of the Mississippi River between St. Louis and New Orleans. It is the largest town in the 10th Congressional District, although it is much smaller than some of the towns that have been asking for help. The town is now subjected to floods brought about by construction by the United States Government of levees on the upper part of the river and of levees on the other side of the river which have flooded the city of Cape Girardeau and its principal business section 7 times during 10 years.

I call your attention to the fact that this old town, which has been incorporated as a town since 1804, nearly 150 years ago, had only 3 floods in 100 years until these levees were built. The United States Government is responsible for the floods and the damage that is caused there annually.

This project is ready to go. It has been approved by the Engineers and it has been approved by the 81st Congress. I may say to you that we have been knocked out on a technicality two different times. The first time we came here for money they said: "Well, you have not provided a certain paper that the Engineers should have" and which in the past the Engineers had not asked for until construction was ready. I know you are going to say today that this is not recommended in the budget.

It has been recommended in two budgets, but I say that that is no reason for this Congress not approving this project. I have noticed the effectiveness of this committee, and I want to compliment the committee for its honesty, for its hard work, and for its effectiveness in cutting down the amount of money you are appropriating. They have done a swell job in cutting down the money. But I say they have not approached this realistically; they are not being fair with the people who are entitled to the protection by reason of a condition which was caused by the Government.

I want to say also, and I say this kindly, that I want to compliment the leadership on the Republican side here today. Their whip has worked very effectively. They have kept their Members on the floor, they have kept them in line. When my dear friend, the gentleman from Missouri, DEWEY SHORT, had the Table Rock amendment up here, as popular as he is and as meritorious as the project is, there were only 12 votes on that side of the aisle for his meritorious amendment. I am not expecting to get many votes on that side but I am saying to you that if you are going to be fair with the people, if you are going to recompense Cape Girardeau for the damage the Congress of the United States has previously caused, if you are going to correct the damage which has been done by the United States Government, you are going to approve the money for this project which the engineers said was feasible, which has been justified, which has been approved by two budgets. All we are asking for here now is this small amount of money. This city in on the main line of the Frisco Railroad between St. Louis and Memphis, Tenn. Twenty-one days out of the year that main line is covered with water to the extent that the trains cannot travel in that flooded area. The electric-generating plant there in Cape Girardeau has to be sandbagged every time these floods come. The depot in that town is covered with water. The water comes to a point over my head, approximately 6 feet. One of the main business sections of that town is flooded, business stops in that part of the principal town in the 10th Congressional District, a town of 25,000 population, and a shoe factory employing 1,500 people has to be shut down. One of the two banks of the town can do no business, as well as department stores and chain stores in this section of Cape Girardeau when the floods come. Now, this is all we are asking for. We ask you to be fair. Are you going to approach this on a basis of equity or on a basis of politics? I am ready for a vote.

Since, because of the time limitation, I have been unable to go into detail outlining the facts upon which I am basing my request for the inclusion of the funds as approved in two budget requests, I am including herewith a copy of a letter signed by the presidents of the two levee improvement districts of Cape Girardeau, addressed to the Senate and House subcommittees in the hope that Members of Congress will read enough to become convinced of the merit in this proposal, which previously has been approved in the other body.

As an indication that this project has the full support of the people of Cape Girardeau who have cooperated in every way, and complied with every request that has been made in connection with this project, I also include herewith a letter from the chamber of commerce of that city, signed by the president and chairman of the flood-control committee of that organization:

MAIN STREET LEVEE
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT,
NORTH MAIN STREET LEVEE
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT,
Cape Girardeau, Mo., May 4, 1953.

Re Cape Girardeau, Mo., flood control, House Document 204, 81st Congress, 1st session, Public Law 516, 81st Congress, 1st session.

To the Senate and House Subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee for Civil Functions, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We would respectfully call your attention to the following facts with respect to Mississippi River flood conditions at Cape Girardeau, Mo.:

1. The 1953–54 budget, submitted by the previous administration, included an item of $989,000 for beginning the construction of flood protection works at Cape Girardeau, Mo. The 1952–53 budget contained an item of $1 million for the same purpose. No appropriation was made at the last session because final construction plans had not been completed. They are now.

2. Flood protection for Cape Girardeau was authorized by the 81st Congress, 1st session, Public Law No. 516 based upon House Document No. 204, 81st Congress, 1st session. Final plans for the construction of reaches 1 and 2 have now been completed and were inincluded, so we understand, in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers for construction in the current fiscal year. We also understand it is the purpose of the Corps of Engineers to first provide protection to reaches 1 and 2 as soon as funds are made available.

3. Cape Girardeau has been disastrously flooded in 7 years out of the last 10. We have absolutely no flood protection. Our floods have been increasing both in frequency and depth due to upstream levees. The same volume of discharge creates a higher flood stage. Previous to their construction, we were practically immune to disastrous floods.

4. The flood stage at Cape Girardeau is 32 feet. The record of river gage readings shows that prior to 1943 it equalled or exceeded 38 feet only 3 times since 1844, more than 100 years. Since 1943, the last 10 years, it has exceeded 38 feet 7 times. (One of the years, 1948, the gage was 37.8 feet—we call it 38 feet.)

5. Cape Girardeau has been an established town with a continuous city government since 1804. The community was established as a trading post a number of years prior to that date. It is the largest city on the west bank of the Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and New Orleans, La., and has a population of 25,000. Like old established river towns, the main business section was established and now remains adjacent to the river front. Steamboats were then the carriers; now the Frisco Railroad is next to the river with its tracks at street level. Practically all of the retail business section between the river bank and the east line of Spanish Street, 2 full blocks in width, although previously not subject to Mississippi River overflow, is now flooded—some of it 2 feet to 5 feet over the street, with all building basement filled to the top.

6. The cause for this increase in flood frequency is primarily due to rainfall and the construction of a continuous line of levees on the Illinois side of the river from above St. Louis to below Cape Girardeau which necessarily raises the height of the flood plane. The confined flood between the bluffs on the Missouri side and the levees on the Illinois side has no escape as in former years before the levees were built.

7. We especially direct your attention to the practical completion of a continuous levee on the Illinois side of the river. Their agricultural lands needed them but neither their districts nor any other party has the

moral right to destroy Cape Girardeau. These levees have caused an increase in the projected flood stage of more than 7 feet at Cape Girardeau. The map I shall file with the committee was prepared by and procured from the United States district engineer's office at St. Louis and shows the location of these levees and the status of their completion together with the total estimated cost of the various projects and the amount made available up to the beginning of the present Congress. This map demonstrates why our flood frequency has been so greatly increased in the past 10 years. It is self-evident. You ask why so important a town has not been afforded flood protection? The answer is, we did not need it until the flood plane was raised, but we sorely need it now.

8. Within reaches 1 and 2 of the flooded area at Cape Girardeau, as designated by the engineers' plans, are the First National Bank, the chief retail stores, including 8 or 9 so-called chain stores, the Frisco railroad with its passenger depot, the Missouri Utilities electric generating plant which supplies electric energy not only to Cape Girardeau but also to the surrounding area to the south and west extending about 75 miles, St. Vincent's Catholic Church, which is the oldest church organization in the city and which is over 100 years old, a Jewish synagog, wholesale grocery houses, oil distributing plants, International Shoe Factory with a payroll of approximately 1,500 people, retail automobile agencies, filling stations, hardware stores and office buildings.

9. Reaches 3 and 4 are south of the highway traffic bridge over the Mississippi and include the industrial section in the south part of town. Within that area are located woodworking plants, packing houses, regional oil distribution tanks, the Missouri Pacific railroad and Marquette cement plant. A large part of that area is given up to workmen's homes, some retail stores and markets.

10. The General Assembly of the State of Missouri, recognizing the public need for flood protection at Cape Girardeau, enacted an enabling act in 1947 (Laws of Missouri 1947, vol. II, p. 226 et seq.) authorizing the creation of Special Assessment Levee Districts in municipalities, similar in principle to the procedure followed in the organization of levee districts in rural areas. The undersigned districts were organized under that law.

11. Two regularly authorized special improvement districts—political subdivisions of the State—called Main Street Levee Improvement District and North Main Street Levee Improvement District, were organized in 1945 and have executed the required assurances with respect to providing right-of-way, maintenance of work when constructed and absolving the Government from claims for damages because of the construction of the improvements.

12. The city of Cape Girardeau, by duly enacted ordinances, has made available to the United States of America such portions of its streets, alleys and public places as may be required for construction of the flood protection works.

13. The Missouri State Highway Department, recognizing the blocking and complete disruption of both local and interstate traffic because of the increased depth and frequency of floods at Cape Girardeau, has already completed the raising of the grade of the highways adjacent to the city of Cape Girardeau in the flooded area south of town at a cost of over $2,025,000.

14. I would especially call attention to the previous appropriations totaling $43,025,200 (estimated cost $79,772,300) made for building the levees in Illinois and the Perry County levees in Missouri. The river bluffs on the Missouri side begin at the water's edge and rise almost perpendicularly, except for a small area in Ste. Genevieve and Perry Counties, which now have levee protection and are budgeted for more at this time, all of which adds to Cape Girardeau's flood depth. The entire valley in both Illinois and Missouri from St. Louis south has flood protection except the city of Cape Girardeau. This is not as it should be.

15. Lest some confusion may arise, we would call attention to the item shown on the tabulation on the map (which I will file) of $140,000 made available for the Cape Girardeau project. The cost of final engineering plans was paid out of this fund. No part of this has been or can be used for construction. No contracts have been let.

16. The Cape Girardeau project was 1 of 5 or 6 other projects especially recommended by the previous administration in the 1953–54 budget for construction during the present fiscal year. That budget allocated $989,000—too small to complete even two reaches but would put encouragement in the hearts and souls of the community.

17. The Public Works Committee of the Senate saw the 1951 flood both at Cape Girardeau and in the Missouri Valley. Percentagewise Cape Girardeau was damaged as much as Kansas City. Many of the senatorial committee marveled at the flood fight that Cape Girardeau was singlehandedly putting up. However, we cannot control the Mississippi River when it is on a rampage. Cape Girardeau has done nothing or failed to do anything which has brought about our flooded condition. Only the Congress and the Corps of Engineers have been able to control it and, if given the requested appropriation, they will save Cape Girardeau from these increasing floods.

18. The increasing frequency and higher river stages carries the threat as of a ghost silently swishing at flood stage with damage and destruction at Cape Girardeau's most important section. We have gone down and have heard 7 annual counts out of the last 10 years but are still up and on our feet, but we are groggy. Are you going to force us to await three more annual counts and then declare Old Man River the winner?

It will not do to say to Cape Girardeau "Be good. Keep quiet. We'll take care of you later." The largest and most important city on the west bank of the Mississippi from St. Louis south cannot continue to exist if its transportation, its mail, and its economy are completely disrupted by floods similar to others which have been inflicted upon us in 7 of the last 10 years.

We call your attention to the extent and duration of the flood at Cape Girardeau, as shown by Weather Bureau reports. Remember the flood stage is 32 feet.

Year	Gage reading	Number of days above flood stage
1943	42.40	40
1944	40.80	35
1945	38.70	86
1947	41.90	40
1948	37.80	16
1951	41.80	36

During much of that time the railroads were not operating. "They were shut off an average of 26 days in each of the past 10 years." The mail was greatly delayed, the highways were impassable, the condition of the town was deplorable.

19. We hope your committee will appropriate such a sum as will provide this city with equal protection to that afforded similarly situated areas with no discrimination between locations. The plans are ready, the assurances have been given, the Budget Bureau has included it in two separate budgets, the Corps of Engineers has prepared the plans, they are ready to let the contracts and the need is great.

20. We are not unmindful of the expressed desire and determination of the present administration to reduce appropriations. We are, however, assuming that no cut in budget recommendations—even in the Truman budget—would be made without full study, familiarity and knowledge of the facts; that funds which have been previously recommended by qualified men will not be eliminated simply because other men, who in the very nature of things and because of the time factor, could not have become as familiar with the facts and the needs as those who made the prior recommendations. There should be no blind adherence to the principle of reducing costs of Government to such an extent as would bring about discrimination in preserving the lives and property of our people irrespective of whether they are upstream, downstream, across the river, abroad, or at home.

Respectfully submitted.

MAIN STREET LEVEE IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT,
By C. A. (ANDY) JUDEN, *President.*
NORTH MAIN STREET LEVEE IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT,
By LINDER DEIMUND, *President.*

CAPE GIRARDEAU CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Cape Girardeau, Mo., May 9, 1953.

Re Cape Girardeau, Mo., flood control, House Document No. 204, 81st Congress, 1st session; Public Law 516, 81st Congress, 1st session.

To the Senate and House Subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee for Civil Functions.

GENTLEMEN: The raised hopes of the city of Cape Girardeau and its citizens for flood protection have again been dashed by the removal from the 1954–55 budget of the $989,000 allocated for flood protection for this city. The Cape Girardeau Chamber of Commerce is solidly in favor of flood protection for this city. Cape Girardeau is the largest and most important city on the west bank of the Mississippi River between St. Louis and New Orleans. It is the only city on this west bank without flood protection. Our Cape Girardeau section is the only unprotected part of the river south of St. Louis to the Ohio River. Cape Girardeau has not asked for flood protection until recent years when we have had almost annual disastrous floods. These floods have been caused by the work of the Government in protecting the shores of Illinois above us and across from us and the shores of Missouri above us. This has resulted in turning the natural asset of the Mississippi into an uncertain liability.

Having been founded upon the river, Cape Girardeau has naturally built from the river and practically all of our industries, much of our retail section, and several hundred dwellings are subject to these almost annual floods.

Without flood protection, the health and safety of our city is continually threatened. Our utilities plant has been saved through several of these floods only by superhuman effort, and if the utilities flooded out our power would cease, our water supply would be threatened, and eventually completely depleted. We would find it difficult to combat the hazards of fires as well as having a health hazard. Naturally, all our commerce, industry, and business would come to a standstill if a flood should close our utilities plant. There is no question that the failure to properly safeguard this city from the ravages of the Mississippi floods threatens the health, safety, and jobs of the 25,000 people living in Cape Girardeau as well as the jobs of many who depend upon Cape Girardeau for work.

Cape Girardeau has always regarded the Mississippi River as an asset. We are proud to see increasing commerce upon the river and we are making improvements upon our waterfront to take care of river traffic. When

a flood hits us, no water traffic can stop in Cape Girardeau. As a matter of fact, there is no traffic to Cape Girardeau—commerce stops. The Frisco Railroad which follows the Mississippi from St. Louis to Memphis, Tenn.; and the Missouri Pacific Railroad cannot bring their trains into Cape Girardeau. Mail, express, and freight schedules are disrupted. Furthermore, if it had not been for the fact that the Missouri State Highway Department has only recently raised the grade of its highway south of this city; truck and automobile traffic into Cape Girardeau from the south and west would be impossible when the river is up beyond the 38-foot stage. The Mississippi in flood forces circuitous routes to Cape Girardeau.

While the Cape Girardeau Chamber of Commerce realizes that this first appropriation of $989,000 will not complete flood protection for Cape Girardeau, it does think that a start should be made. The Cape Girardeau Chamber of Commerce believes in all fairness that this city and its citizens should not be forced to bear the punishment of Mississippi floods which would not have occurred without the levee protection already afforded property and citizens along the Mississippi across the river and above us.

We respectfully urge that your committee reinstate this item in the budget and hope that you will continue to appropriate sums in the future to provide our city and citizens with the same protection afforded other areas and cities along the Mississippi. We cannot believe that the United States Government and its Congress will discriminate against Cape Girardeau.

Respectfully,

ARNOLD ROTH, *President,*
Cape Girardeau, Chamber of Commerce.
E. J. BAUERLE, *Chairman,*
Flood Committee, Cape Girardeau, Chamber of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from Missouri that this was not approached in any political or partisan manner. This project is in the same condition as a number of other projects throughout the country. It is a local flood protection project. The results of the final plans are not available to the committee. It would appear that there is nothing to differentiate this from a great number of other projects, all with merit, throughout the country, but which we have had to, with a great deal of reluctance, deny appropriations for in the bill this year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman did not mean to say he did not have a report on this.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. A definite project report.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What does the gentleman mean? Did not the engineers give you a report? What more do you want?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; we do not have a definite project report for this project which is something that for the last 2 years now we have told the Corps of Engineers we must have before we consider appropriations for construction.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All I can say then is that the Corps of Engineers—I would not say lied, but that their man misrepresented the facts, because they told us that they have done everything, that the project is in order, and I will raise plenty of Cain with the district engineer down there for telling us things like that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 47, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: On page 4, line 5, strike out "$253,723,000" and insert "$247,723,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it attempts to change a figure in the bill which has already been changed.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Dakota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, it is a limitation of the amount of money provided for that particular purpose. I think it is clearly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The way the amendment is framed at this time it attempts to change a figure which has already been stricken from the bill; in other words, it is an amendment to an amendment which has been adopted by the committee. Under the ruling the Chair has already made on another occasion this afternoon the gentleman's amendment is out of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAVIN. Can the gentleman be permitted to modify his amendment right now so that it will be parliamentarily correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is entirely up to the gentleman. The Chair does not know whether or not the gentleman wishes to modify the amendment or reoffer it.

Mr. BURDICK. All I am concerned about is to give back $4 million we do not want. Of course there will be some parliamentary tactics that will prevent us from giving the money back.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair suggest to the gentleman from North Dakota that he correct the amendment, if he cares to offer it in another form, and the Chair will recognize him a little later.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCUDDER: On page 4, line 5, after the sum named, insert "and in addition $500,000 for improvement of Humboldt Harbor, Calif."

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, it is very unfair, I believe, for us who have been trying to get the floor all day to present our problem to be limited to 5 minutes, when I have several Members who desire to speak in favor of my project.

Last year this project, the improvement of Humboldt Harbor, was put through both Houses of the Congress and signed by President Truman as a necessary, urgent measure that should be taken care of. I conferred several times with the Bureau of the Budget, and not once did they raise any objection. They felt that this project was a highly worthy project. They made their rule on the basis that no new projects would be started. This harbor was developed in 1881. It has been in operation all these years except for the past 10 years the harbor depth has been too shallow to permit modern ships to operate from that harbor. Last year when I had this matter up for authorization, I received a letter from the head of the Army procurement division, signed by Major General F. A. Heileman, stating that the Federal Government alone was losing $32,000 a year on their own ships which were operating in that harbor. This year I contacted the Division of Forestry, and I have a letter which I would like very much to be able to read to you in its entirety. But I will only have time to read it in part. It is as follows:

In 1951 Humboldt County accounted for 25 percent of the total lumber production in California. Eight hundred and ten million feet of Douglas-fir were cut in Humboldt County that year, but as recently as 1947 the total cut of Douglas fir in all California was only 769 million.

For the timber on the Six Rivers National Forest tributary to Humboldt Bay the current rate of cutting is approximately 25 million board feet compared to a sustained yield cutting capacity of about 90 million feet. The national forest timber is much less accessible than the private timber. The 65 million feet of undercut on the Six Rivers National Forest result in the loss of about $650,000 of gross revenue annually to the United States. Since generally losses from decay and other natural factors balance growth in virgin timber areas, this undercut is lost each year rather than being stored up for future use.

A somewhat similar situation prevails in the portion of the Siskiyou National Forest in Oregon tributary to Crescent City where there is a sustained yield cutting capacity of approximately 20 million board feet annually and only minor amounts are currently being cut. Until such time as the Crescent City harbor facilities can be developed for oceangoing vessels, the timber tributary to Crescent City is also dependent for intercoastal marketing opportunities on the harbor facilities at Humboldt Bay.

For the above reasons the deepening of Humboldt Bay harbor to permit larger ships to take on full cargoes would advance opportunities to market the full sustained yield cut from the Six Rivers and Siskiyou National Forests.

Furthermore, in the 2 southern counties of Oregon, there is a $200,000 loss by undercutting timber in that area.

This lumber after it is harvested, must be marketed and there is no way in the world to market the lumber except over a one-track railroad which runs from Eureka to San Francisco. The expense of harvesting and marketing the lumber under those conditions is so great that we cannot meet the competition that we

must meet. At the present time there are 35 foreign ships hauling lumber from British Columbia to our Atlantic coast. Foreign lumber is coming in here while we are not permitted to load a ship and move lumber from the west coast to the east coast.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I believe my colleague, the gentleman from California, has a very worthy project. It is economical in the sense that it will provide for the shipment of a large quantity of virgin lumber from the northern part of California, which now cannot be marketed because of the lack of facilities in Humboldt Harbor.

Mr. SCUDDER. That is right. There is 1 lumber company from New York that invested $3½ million and they are shipping lumber from there to the east coast. But they cannot fully load in that harbor and get it out because it costs an extra $5,000 to $8,000 per ship to move it.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. Do I understand as a result of this amendment by which you propose to spend $500,000, the Federal Government will get back half again that much in a year's time in revenue?

Mr. SCUDDER. That is right.

Mr. HOSMER. This certainly seems like a good deal, and an economical and a sensible project.

Mr. SCUDDER. Eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars of lumber a year can be purchased in that area from the Federal Government, and the whole project calls for only $500,000. I believe—I know that the Federal Government will make money on this project. You are simply allowing our natural resources to go to waste.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is another meritorious project, but it is a new start, and therefore I do not believe it proper to appropriate funds for it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: On page 4, line 5, after the figure "$254,123,000", insert "of which not more than $250,123,000 shall be obligated during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959."

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, the reason why the first amendment did not apply is that you boosted the amount during the debate. Now I have reduced the amount to which you boosted it by $4 million.

If some of you gentlemen who wanted to get a project in your district had let me talk a little while before, you would have had some money to use. But you were determined to do all the talking. Now go and get the money.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I always yield to the gentleman from Cape Cod.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I might ask the gentleman from North Dakota just one question. I have tried to the best of my ability, which is not too much, I guess.

Mr. BURDICK. To which I agree.

Mr. NICHOLSON. To get something for my district here in the Congress. So far I have not been able to do it. If the gentleman from North Dakota will show me how, I certainly should use that method.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, if you will sit down I will try to show you.

When this project was authorized it provided for approximately 1,830 feet level of water. Everything was planned accordingly. I was in the Congress when that was done, and I wanted to make sure that our irrigation projects would be protected. So we wrote into that bill, as it passed this House, that the building of this reservoir should never at any time interfere with our operating the irrigation plants or the city of Williston. I thought that settled it. But now the Army engineers, of their own volition, have come along and they want 20 feet higher water. That means that the irrigation plants in the areas will be drowned out, and a city of 16,000 people will be drowned out, and the water system and the only railroad drowned out. Then they in turn say, "We will protect you. Don't worry about us. We are for you." Just like this committee is for you fellows. We are for you. Now they propose dikes. They propose to build dikes, and this very moment they are out buying land in my section of the country for the purpose of building dikes. A 1,830-foot flood will not fill up that reservoir until 12 or 15 years. So you are spending $4 million this afternoon to buy land for dikes that this Congress knows nothing about. Now, if that is good business, go ahead and do it. I suppose you noticed this afternoon that I became very conservative. I voted against the attempt to raise this amount of money, and I voted with the Committee. Now I want the Committee to vote with me. I am cutting it down.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. How do they propose to get the water that seeps through the dike back into the river?

Mr. BURDICK. Of course they will never do it. This Congress knows nothing about dikes built on the quicksands of the Missouri River. I have lived up there all my life and I know all about it. You cannot build a dike on that formation that will not seep water, and you cannot protect those irrigation plants, because that water will seep through and destroy all of the agricultural land. There will not be a basement in Williston that will not be full of water. Of course, the center of business activity is not going to the south at all. It is going to Williston. I think this is just a conspiracy to try to drown out our town ahead of time. What is the use of putting all that money out 12 years before you need it?

If you strike this out—this has been a burning political question in North Dakota; there are a lot of people for it and an awful lot of them against it, and I know in congressional battles those who have been for a high dam are still up there.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is not this the same issue that Mr. Lemke fought, bled, and died for on the floor of this House for a long time?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; and I did everything that he did except die.

When Congress gets a chance to hold hearings on this question of a larger pool and a higher water level, and the possibility of dike protection to our irrigation projects, the city of Williston and the Great Northern Railroad I am sure Congress will not authorize any such fantastic enterprise, and in the meantime this reduction in the appropriation will keep the Army engineers from going any further, without authority, to seize land around the Williston area and drive the owners off, when this river bed will not be raised to an 1830 level for the next 12 to 15 years. We have time enough to have Congress understand what the Army engineers are trying to do, and time enough to investigate the feasibility and the necessity of their proposed dike projects.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KRUEGER].

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. It is undoubtedly apparent that the senior member of the congressional delegation from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], is the larger half, but I am speaking frankly when I say I represent the greater portion of the population of North Dakota.

The sum which my colleague would take out of the bill he says is the sum necessary to acquire land that might possibly be flooded when the Garrison Dam is filled to its full height of 1,850 feet level.

Personally, I do not blame my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], a great deal because he has a personal interest in the matter. May I point out that he is in error in the matter of representation. He says he represents a whole lot of North Dakota people although there are some who are against it. I assure you that the great majority of the people of North Dakota are for the higher dam level and the Congress has approved it several years ago.

The Army engineers thoroughly investigated the design of the dam and reservoir; those matters were approved long ago. The proposed appropriation for Garrison Dam has already been twice reduced. The so-called Truman budget approved $29 million; the revised budget reduced the amount to $31 million; and the committee in its effort to curtail expenses and exercise economy reduced it further to $27 million. Now the gen-

tleman from North Dakota, my friend Mr. BURDICK, comes along and wants to reduce it by an additional $4 million. The $27 million is necessary at this time to proceed in the construction of the Garrison Dam in an orderly manner.

Much of the dam is already completed. The closure ceremony is scheduled within a few days. Many of you Members have been invited, and I have replies saying that you will attend the closing ceremony at Garrison Dam. I think you who go there will see and hear for yourselves that the higher level of the dam, which has long been approved, is no longer an issue. This matter of prohibiting the acquisition of land which may be inundated by the higher level is a back-door entrance to prevent the construction of the dam at Garrison to the higher level. I am opposing the amendment and I hope it is defeated.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this project is over 70 percent completed. Other Congresses have passed on this matter of the height of the dam. The Corps of Engineers has given us assurances with respect to their ability to handle the construction of the dikes in this area.

This is not a saving of money, because every dollar this would save now would deprive the Federal Government of $7.50 in revenue that would be obtainable annually as a result of the increased elevation of the pool. I think it would be unwise to adopt the amendment.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Is the gentleman prepared to tell this committee that the building of those dikes is a practical and a safe proposition for the people and for the agricultural land as well as the city of Williston?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the assurance we have had in testimony by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. BURDICK. Is that the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not an expert on it.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman has not had a hearing on it?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BURDICK. Who was there besides the Engineers?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The Corps of Engineers testified on this particular project and there was a statement filed with the committee at a subsequent date on the very point.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 126, noes 67.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON: On page 4, line 5, after the sum insert "an additional sum, $14,079,000, to be allocated as follows:

"Chief Joseph Dam, $2,000,000;
"Albeni Falls Dam, $1,200,000;
"McNary Lock and Dam, $2,700,000;
"The Dalles Dam, $8,179,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, the Pacific Northwest resource-development and flood-control program will suffer severely unless the Congress acts to provide sufficient funds for continuing orderly planning and construction of several important projects under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

I have been deeply disappointed by the drastic slashes made by the Appropriations Committee in funds for a number of the key projects in the Pacific Northwest. It will be noted that no planning or construction funds are provided for the important Eagle Gorge Dam and Reservoir, on the Green River, near Seattle, a stream that periodically floods, to cause tremendous damage and to threaten defense production and transportation in the area.

Another important project for which no funds are provided by the committee is the Ice Harbor Lock and Dam, on the Snake River, not far from the great Hanford Atomic Works. The power and the navigation aid which would be provided by the Ice Harbor Dam would be of tremendous value to this area.

Deep cuts were made by the committee in funds needed for the completion of projects which are now under way. I believe that most of us will agree that the sooner we can place new generators in production the sooner we can pay off, through earnings on the sale of power, the cost of installing those generators. The heavy cut in the appropriation for The Dalles Dam means that completion of this great project, on which more than $24 million already has been spent, will be delayed another year, or quite likely 2 years. The longer we delay, the longer the Pacific Northwest will suffer from its great power shortage, and the longer will be the time before we can start returning to the Treasury the earnings from the sale of The Dalles power.

I feel that it is false economy to delay completion of this project. I feel it is also false economy to cut the amounts needed for construction of Albeni Falls Dam, Chief Joseph Dam, and McNary Lock and Dam.

The minimum that Congress should approve is the amount requested for these projects in the budget submitted by the White House. Personally, I feel that some of these budget items were unnecessarily low, but, in any event, they are the minimum needed to see that the generators start producing power for the energy-hungry Pacific Northwest.

My amendment would increase this construction item in the bill by $14,079,000, which would raise to the level of the so-called Eisenhower budget amounts appropriated for continuing work on four Pacific Northwest multipurpose dams which are under construction.

The four dams under construction to which this $14,079,000 would be allocated, under my amendment, are: Chief Joseph Dam would be increased from $23 million to $25 million.

McNary lock and dam would be increased from $25 million to $27,700,000.

The Dalles Dam would be increased from $29,250,000 to $37,429,000.

Albeni Falls Dam in Idaho would be boosted from $6 million to $7,200,000.

The budget cuts made by the committee—and let me say that I share the committee's commendable desire to economize—would delay completion of these projects, to which we are irrevocably committed, and delay arrival of the day when the benefits and earnings of these dams will begin to be realized.

I urge approval of my amendment, which would restore the funds requested in the budget, and which are the smallest amounts that we economically should provide.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I wonder if the gentleman thinks he might not unwittingly be doing the people in his area a disservice by asking for $14 million additional at this time and whether he does not agree with me that the committee and the Congress over a period of time have been extremely generous to the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the gentleman that the Congress has been generous, and I think that its generosity will pay off. From an economic standpoint, I mean. I do not believe projects such as these are or should be settled on the basis of generosity or friendship. They must be economically sound, and I assure you that the public power program of the Pacific Northwest qualifies for that characterization.

I want to emphasize that these items that I would like to have restored to the bill were approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and I hope that this Committee of the Whole House will approve my amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington because I am familiar with the power shortage in the Columbia Basin. The Columbia River which rises in Canada and flows through my own district in Montana is the last large untapped reservoir of power in the United States. It is important that this vast power potential be fully utilized in order for the entire Nation to have the benefit of the aluminum, the fertilizers, the minerals and the timber of the region. The tremendously important defense plants along the Columbia devour increased power faster than we are able to supply it. These big projects in the Northwest should not be slowed down, rather they should be accelerated in order to prepare to meet the power load that is increasing year by year.

When Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee Dam were first started it was

charged that they were the biggest boondoggle since the Pyramids. Opponents to those projects shouted that we would have power running out of our ears. Contrast that with the statement made this afternoon by the distinguished minority leader, who has been working on this question for more years than any man in Congress. If we dam every river in the Nation, produce all the power that we can develop by hydro plants we will still need thousands of steams plants to meet the demand.

But we will never catch up with the demand if we constantly curtail appropriations and slow up the development of the last great natural dam sites.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] pointed out the need of additional power for national defense, a need that is nationwide. In order to demonstrate the gravity of this need as it is applicable to the proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I will read excerpts from a letter to me from the Defense Electric Power Administration. In a letter dated April 7, 1953, this department said:

> In the Pacific Northwest power supply is seriously short and not until 1953 can all of the prospective power loads be carried even with median water conditions. In 1955 and 1956, while loads could be carried under median water conditions with adverse water conditions serious curtailment would be necessary for more than 6 months out of the 12. From the defense aspect the impact of a power shortage is equally as serious on the interruptible industrial loads as on the so-called firm loads, since these interruptible loads are almost wholly in defense-supporting types of production, principally aluminum.

On March 5, 1953, Mr. W. D. Wilder, Director of the Power Supply Division of the Defense Electric Power Administration, analyzed the projects for which increased appropriations are being sought.

This is what he had to say about each of these four projects:

> The Dalles: It is highly important that appropriations be continued at a level that will insure initial delivery of power in 1957 from this Columbia River project.
>
> McNary: Essential that there be no delay as to generating units scheduled for operation 1953-56.
>
> Chief Joseph: Essential that there be no delay in the service dates of at least the first 12 units scheduled 1955-57.
>
> Albeni Falls: Important that power plant proceed as rapidly as construction conditions permit, initial unit now scheduled 1954.

It is good business, good for the defense of the Nation and good for the continued supply of power in the Northwest to push the projects forward as rapidly as possible. The amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, to accept this amendment would be to toss out the window the work which our subcommittee has done with respect to these projects. There is already $83 million in the bill for them and there are quite large, in some cases, very large unobligated and unexpended balances which have not been used with respect to them. I am sure that those who have given careful study to the work of the subcommittee and the subcommittee report will agree that they have been generous with these projects, that we have given them careful consideration, and that they can proceed in an orderly and economic fashion with the money already provided in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: On page 4, line 5, strike out "$254,123,000" and insert "$254,623,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but will reserve the point of order, if I may do so.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard on the point of order, the sum included in my amendment is the amount in the bill as amended.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. May I suggest to the chairman that that amended figure is not amendable at this stage, as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Maine that he is offering an amendment to an amendment that has already been agreed to. His amendment is therefore out of order at this time, and the Chair sustains the point of order. The Chair will recognize the gentleman later if he desires to offer a further amendment.

Mr. HALE. I withdraw the amendment, Mr. Chairman, and will perfect it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GEORGE: On page 4, line 5, after the sum named insert "and an additional $1,900,000 which shall be expended for construction of the Toronto Dam on the Verdigris River in Kansas."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, realizing the temper of the House, had we not been able to make a saving a short time ago occasioned by the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota I would not have offered this amendment at this time; but I am sure that out of the kindness and the generosity of the Members of this House, when they take into consideration that the State of Kansas suffered a $1 billion loss in 1951, and when they take into consideration that not 1 cent of flood control is contained in this bill, they will look favorably on this amendment. It is true that we have two items in here for flood diversion. They are ditches that divert flood waters around the city of Hutchinson and around the city of Wichita.

The district I represent and the section of the State which is the drainage area going through from the west to the east into the southeast part of Kansas is part of the Arkansas River watershed. Our projects have never been in controversy; in fact, after the 1951 flood a supplemental appropriation was offered to this committee with an authorization for $1,900,000 for construction of this dam. The plans are complete. We are ready to build. Ex-President Truman also submitted this in his proposed budget. The Eisenhower revised budget did not carry this item. The criterion of no new starts is working a definite hardship on our State and our drainage area. I am asking this committee, as the Committee of the Whole, to correct that situation.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. May I ask the gentleman how the people in his own district feel about this proposed dam?

Mr. GEORGE. They are about 1,000 to 1 for it.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. That is not different from the situation in my own district.

Mr. GEORGE. I admitted there was controversy in our State, but there was not on these projects.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment covers a project on which, as I understand, there has been no construction whatever on the particular phase of the project to date. This is part of a general system in which the whole benefit-to-cost ratio as last presented to the committee as 1.06 to 1, which is lower than on any project we have authorized for construction in this bill.

In addition, and I think this is the most important thing of all for the Committee now to consider, the realization of the benefits which might flow from this particular project is conditioned upon the construction of four projects. The total estimated cost of those 4 projects, including Toronto Dam, is $87 million. So that without spending $87 million, we cannot realize the full benefits from the project proposed by the gentleman's amendment. The major portion of all flood control in this situation will not be realized until the completion of another reservoir, and there are no plans at present for the construction of that reservoir. Finally, as has been indicated, there is a very great deal of uncertainty and a great deal of local opposition within the State itself as to the construction of the project. So that I think that under all the circumstances, there ought to be a great deal more study given to the Toronto Dam before we authorize the commencement of construction.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. One dam out of the four has been completed in this river setup. The Fall River Dam is built and was in operation in 1951 and worked satisfactorily.

Mr. HAND. There have been two completed, as I understand it, is that not correct?

Mr. GEORGE. One has been completed.

Mr. HAND. And four dams have not been completed.

Mr. GEORGE. One is completed, and this one is ready for planning. Two are not completed. I am not talking about the Neosho Reservoir.

Mr. HAND. Is not the gentleman obliged to agree with me? We will never get to realize the benefits of this project until we complete the remainder of the system at a cost of $87 million.

Mr. GEORGE. I will say that this one would give us a great deal of benefit because the Fall River Dam cut down 2 feet of the flood in this last 1951 flood and saved the water works in two cities. We have lost the Sinclair Oil Refinery, which moved out because we did not correct this situation.

Mr. HAND. May I say to the gentleman that I heard the gentleman's presentation, and the presentation by his witnesses. I am sure there is merit in this project, but a day or two later I heard as many people opposing the project.

Mr. GEORGE. You heard two gentlemen testify against it. One has a business of pond and terracing, and is presently engaged in building small dams of that type. He was speaking for his business.

Mr. HAND. There is no point in presently spending money on which we cannot get any benefit without contemplating the expenditure of additional millions.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment, and ask that it be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: On page 4, line 10, after the word "appropriated", insert "and an additional amount of $500,000 to be expended in dredging and anchorage in Portland Harbor, Maine, in accordance with the plan of the Army engineers."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to address the committee on this amendment this afternoon, but when the sonic barrier was penetrated by my friend, the gentleman from Brooklyn, decided that I could not keep silent because this project is precisely on all fours with their project. It has every bit of merit that their project has. The only distinction between their project and mine, purely a practical distinction, is that there are more Members of the House from the State of New York than there are from the State of Maine. I hope that the House will not give too much weight to this point. The anchorage which this amendment seeks was authorized by legislation passed in 1945. It is the completion of a program inaugurated long before that, and the work authorized by the legislation of 1945 has been done except for this anchorage basin. Other channels have been dredged and this appropriation is necessary to give effect and fruition to the moneys that have already been expended. Portland is the southern terminus of the Portland-Montreal pipeline on which eastern Canada largely relies for its gasoline supply. Over 7 million tons of shipping enters Portland Harbor every year. That tonnage consists, in enormous preponderance, of tankers, and the tankers are mostly of large size. They draw a lot of water. They take a lot of room when they swing to an anchor. I need hardly remind this committee that tankers have very sensitive cargoes. If you have a serious grounding or a serious collision in Portland Harbor, it will produce a calamity similar to that which took place in Texarkana a number of years ago.

The relation to the national defense of this harbor improvement is obvious; because if you have a conflagration that puts the port out of business, it will certainly affect the operation of the Canadian pipeline. This would do inestimable damage to the defense structure of the United States, because the defense of Canada and the defense of eastern United States are interdependent.

I do plead with this committee, even at this late hour, to make possible by voting in support of this amendment the completion of the necessary work. This appropriation was in the Truman budget. It was left out of the Eisenhower budget. I think even the gentlemen on the subcommittee will agree that it is a meritorious project for the completion of work already done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is another project which is not in the budget. That does not necessarily reflect upon its merits. It is something we will have to do sometime, but under the circumstances I could not recommend to this House that the funds be appropriated for the furtherance of the project this year.

I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAINWRIGHT: On page 4, line 5, strike the colon and insert a comma and "in addition $228,000 shall be available for the project known as Fire Island Inlet."

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the applause of this Congress was for the patience of the House as a whole or for my persistence as a freshman in trying to get the floor, but I thank you for your kindness.

The project that I ask this committee to consider has been before this House at least twice. It has been before the Senate the same number of times. The Senate has put it in each time and the House has turned it down. The project itself originated in 1937. The project is 72 percent completed. I point this out to refute the idea that this is a new project.

This project is for $228,000. It is for the dredging of the Fire Island Inlet on Long Island in Suffolk County. Fire Island Inlet is located some 50 miles from the Battery in New York City. Fire Island Inlet is the only opening to that great natural inland waterway known as the Great South Bay.

What happened was that after the hurricane of 1938 this particular inlet shoaled up. Money was appropriated and the inlet was supposedly opened. A large jetty was built, and approximately $600,000 was spent, but the amount that was to be used for the dredging was not appropriated. This is identical to building a hospital and not putting a roof on that hospital. This inlet has been opened up, but no boats can go through. How can you call that economy?

I also want to point out that one-third of the people of New York live on Long Island and that we would be in grave danger of being isolated from the mainland should there be an atomic attack on New York. Two hundred and twenty-eight thousand dollars would give us access to the sea to the south.

I also want to call to the attention of the House that at least 3 military projects are being built in the district; that if the money, this $228,000, had been appropriated by the Congress several years ago each one of those 3 projects would have saved at least $228,000. Do you call that economy or not economy?

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Yes; I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. DELANEY. Is it not true that the partial stabilization program as done so far by the Army engineers has aggravated the situation? That we have sand shoals where sand shoals never formed before?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. That is correct. This $228,000 would eliminate that.

Mr. DELANEY. And those shoals prevent the fishing fleet from going out to sea and bringing in fish which they used to do to the extent of millions of pounds each year.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. DELANEY. And is it not further true that our clamming industry has been destroyed and that there used to be some 3,000 men who made their living digging clams in that bay?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Also I would point out that the oyster industry in the last 2 years has disappeared, and not one single oyster is being taken from the bay. These industries have been badly hurt because these funds are unavailable.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Was it the fault of the Army Engineers that caused this trouble?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. No; it was not the fault of the Army engineers that caused this trouble, it was the fault of this Congress in not appropriating these funds.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I understood the gentleman to say a while ago that the Army Engineers had caused these conditions to develop.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I did not say that; my colleague from New York said it.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. LATHAM. I have consistently supported the Appropriations Committee and the Bureau of the Budget in their efforts to economize but I think they have grievously erred in this case and made a mistake which we can readily correct here. As I examine the merits of this proposal I say to myself that I cannot in good conscience fail to vote for this amendment when I know that I am going to be called upon to vote for reciprocal trade acts which will help the economy of other countries, that I will be asked to vote military aid for other countries, yet this small appropriation to complete this project which would so materially help the people of Long Island is denied.

I hope this amendment carries.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I thank my colleague from New York.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for me to clean up a point?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DELANEY. I said the partial completion of this stabilization program and not full completion has aggravated the situation.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. That is quite correct, and the partial completion is due to the fact that funds have not been appropriated.

Let me point out that this is a nonpartisan project. My predecessor presented this very same project to this Congress, and I have a great deal of support for it on both sides of the aisle. I am well aware that the President is opposed to anything new in the budget, but I feel that this project would save much more than the amount involved. I also want to tell the Congress that many fine citizens have given much of their time to a nonpartisan committee to push this project. They are leaders in the Long Island community and they are in a better position than any of us here today to know if this is a worthwhile project. There is not a dissenting vote in the community.

I am going over the head of the Budget Director and the Appropriations Committee in calling on you here today as a court of last resort to give the people of Long Island what they deserve.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that at this hour in the afternoon our opposition to all these projects has caused the Members to feel that the members of the subcommittee have grown observable horns, but it is my duty to oppose this project as well as the others.

This project is not in the recommended budget. It was not in the original budget; it is not in the revised budget. The report that this committee has always required is not available to the subcommittee. For those reasons—and I am not reflecting on the merit of the project or upon the necessity for proceeding with it at some time—I must recommend and urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is it not true that the reason this project was not in the budget is because a dredging project, even though the project already exists and is 72 percent complete, is considered a new project, and, therefore, it was not put in the budget?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not know why it was not in the budget, but I do know that it was not in either the original or the revised budget.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Would it not be true that it was excluded from the budget because it was considered new?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If it were considered new, it would be excluded.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I believe I pointed out to the membership that the project is not new.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are not all of these projects nonpartisan?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. So far as I know, they are.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WAINWRIGHT) there were—ayes 73, noes 101.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JARMAN: On page 4, line 5, after the appropriation figure add the following: "and an additional $800,000 for the Oklahoma City Floodway."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Oklahoma City Floodway project was started during this fiscal year. The Truman budget called for something over $3 million for the next fiscal year, the Eisenhower revised budget called for $1,800,000 and the subcommittee has reduced this figure to an even $1 million. The amendment I have offered would restore the figure to the Eisenhower budget of $1,800,000.

It must be remembered that the amount the subcommittee has set for the continuation of this project, a project which was hoped and planned to complete in 3 years, is a figure less than one-third of the original amount set for it in the Truman budget. The money during the next fiscal year it was hoped would complete the present contract that is under way, would relocate two railroad bridges, and would begin construction of the next unit of the floodway channel. This work cannot be done on the amount authorized by this subcommittee.

I would mention to the Committee that the average loss in the Oklahoma City area has been something over $400,000 a year from flood damage and in 1 year in particular as much as $6 million. It has been estimated that $75 million of publicly and privately owned facilities in the Oklahoma City area are in the danger zone of floods that this project would control. It has been estimated that $5½ million in new construction has been made, its builders relying on the scheduled protection from this project and a target goal of 3 years' completion.

Sometimes criticism has been leveled at communities because the communities have not locally cooperated with the Federal Government in raising their share of the money and doing their part on the project at hand. I would point out to this committee that in the hearing on this matter General Chorpening complimented Oklahoma City on what it has done, on the bond issue it has raised, and on the fact that Oklahoma City generally has done her part. The local participation in the overall project would be about $6,500,000, the Federal figure around $10,500,000.

It has been estimated that 90 percent of the facilities within the flood plain area are essential to the national defense program. I would remind you again that this project is now under construction and needs orderly procedure to achieve the best results.

Certainly we all recognize economy is essential, Mr. Chairman, but I would emphasize that economy can still be achieved in voting for this amendment because it is a compromise figure. It is the Eisenhower budget figure of $1,800,000, and it will make it possible to proceed in an orderly manner toward the completion of a project that is needed in Oklahoma City and in our section of the Southwest.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for favorable consideration of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the only one of the belatedly submitted flood-control projects that came to the Congress last year for which this committee has allotted any funds in this bill, and we did so because the project is moving along in what we consider to be a very satisfactory manner. Now at the end of the calendar year there was $829,628 unobligated. Plus the million in this bill that means there is about $1,829,628 available for construction during the 18-month period. In the opinion of the subcommittee that is the proper amount, that is the amount which we believe the Corps of Engineers can properly handle in proceeding with that project in the proper manner.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment and I hope it will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN.].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONIN: Page 4, line 5, after the sum named, insert "and in addition $975,000 for Swoyersville-Forty Fort, Pennsylvania."

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Chairman, I submit this amendment for the purpose of reinstating the sum of $975,000 eliminated by the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I appreciate the difficulties with which the committee is confronted and I wish to compliment them for their diligence in their task.

However, I do believe that the committee has erred in eliminating the money for fiscal year 1954. This is not a new project. It is a continuation of work previously completed on the west bank of the Susquehanna River known as the Kingston-Edwardsville-Swoyersville-Forty Fort area. These communities are in the heart of the anthracite industry and contain highly productive coal mines. The Wilkes-Barre-Wyoming Valley Airport lies within the area to be protected and will receive protection if this work is continued. Incidentally, I might say that the control of this water will help materially to reduce the cost of mining in this particular area. The mines are constantly being filled by the seepage from the overflow of the Susquehanna River.

This, as you probably know, is a highly distressed area. I was informed just yesterday that two more mines in my district were closed, putting out of work 900 additional men. At the present time there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 28,000 people unemployed, good, hard-working men, who desire to remain in that area. Yet, the subcommittee comes along, on something that will help to provide work for these people, and deprives them of the opportunity to continue this work.

I might also say that this is a soundly planned project. The President of the United States stated in this House on February 4 of this year that all sound projects should be carried to completion. If the funds provided for this project were to go into fiscal 1954, they would make this project almost 50 percent complete, and thereby help to save thousands and thousands of dollars for the Federal Government in the ensuing years in taxes alone. We are all fully aware of the fact that any person who sustains loss or damage as a result of flood may deduct it from his income tax. We have industries in that area that are producing income that is paid to the Federal Government.

Not only for that reason is it necessary to continue this project. The people of that area are particularly disturbed as was stated here, and I believe that the statements that have been made are true, that economy has its worth, and I believe in economy, but I do not believe in carrying economy to such an extent that it is materially going to hurt a particular area or a particular State.

I wish to compliment my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] for the worthwhile statement he made from this floor with reference to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has been hard hit. I see no reason why this subcommittee should deprive it of any additional benefits to which it is properly entitled.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In doing this, Mr. Chairman, may I say to my friend from Pennsylvania that it is a pleasure to be able to say that this committee is in accord with the notion that this is a worthwhile project. This is a project which was brought in last year at a very late period. The first moneys were available late in the year. The result is that the engineers have not been able effectively to spend any considerable amount of money, and the project, still, just getting started.

As of the end of the calendar year 1952 there was an unexpended and unobligated balance for this purpose of $847,050. The estimate for the end of the current fiscal year was an unexpended balance of $743,000. In the opinion of the subcommittee this project, as worthwhile as it may be, has ample funds already provided for it to allow the engineers to proceed in an orderly and economical manner. No additional funds are required during this fiscal year.

With that comparatively brief statement, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote, and ask that the gentleman's amendment be defeated because sufficient moneys are already available.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BONIN. Is it not a fact that this is actually a continuation of the work that was done on the east bank of the Susquehanna River?

Mr. HAND. I think it might be said to be so, but on this project we think there are sufficient funds available as the result of the very large unexpended balances caused because the work was started so late last year the engineers simply did not have time to spend the money they have allotted for it.

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BONIN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 4, line 10, after the word "appropriated" insert "no part of these funds shall be used for the purchase of land in Cheatham County, Tenn."

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the committee for not being able to speak louder as I have a bad case of laryngitis, but I think after talking with the committee chairman, they are in a mood to agree to this. In fact, I hope they will agree to it. The purpose of this, Mr. Chairman, is as follows:

Cheatham County is in the district I have the honor to represent. It is in Cheatham County that the dam is being built. The people who own the land there, and from whom the Government is going to get the land, are wholeheartedly in favor of letting the Government have the land. The Corps of Engineers have promised the people that they would let them decide whether the Government should have a flowage easement or whether the people should sell their land to the Corps of Engineers in fee simple. At a meeting which they had, to which I flew from Washington to attend in Ashland, 118 people, by record vote, voted for flowage easements. Ten property owners wanted to sell to the Corps of Engineers and three had no preference whatsoever. So it was decided that the Corps of Engineers would take a flowage easement. Thus all the land could have been taken at half the price involved as compared to the Government getting the land in fee simple. The sportsmen then got on the Corps of Engineers and through pressure, they decided that they would buy this land. The farmers agreed to let the Corps of Engineers have the land, but they want to have the privilege and the right to the water rights and also to have the land in times when the water is not at a high level stage.

So for that reason, Mr. Chairman, we are asking on behalf of these people that no part of these funds shall be expended for the purchase of land in Cheatham County, Tenn. They can get the land through this flowage easement at about half the price that they could if the Government bought the land in fee simple. Some of the land which the Government has already tried to buy is now in the Federal courts in Nashville, Tenn., because they have to condemn practically all of it, which is an expense to the Federal Government. They have also taken away land from the farmers down there. I hope the committee will accept this. This is not asking for an additional appropriation, but it is actually cutting the appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Can the gentleman assure the subcommittee that the suggestion he has offered is what the vast majority of the people in that community want?

Mr. SUTTON. The vote was 118 for flowage easement and 10 for selling in fee simple and 3 with no preference. That was the rollcall vote which the Corps of Engineers took themselves at the courthouse in Ashland City, Tenn., with the colonel of the Nashville division calling the roll himself, personally. I was present at the meeting. In other words, I wish the gentleman would accept the amendment and then let them take it out in the Senate if it does not prove satisfactory.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. On that basis the subcommittee offers no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the cities of Covington and Maysville are in the district I represent. A flood wall has been almost completed in the city of Covington. Covington is a fine industrial city, where

there are a great many defense plants located. It is a city of 65,000 people. Maysville is an industrial city that is of importance. Both of those cities have been devastated by floods of the Ohio River. There have been 45 major floods in the Ohio Valley in the last 90 years. The Ohio River is a treacherous and unpredictable river.

Those cities have made a contract with the Government to build these protective works. The cities have furnished the lands, the easements, and the rights-of-way at great cost to them after the issuance of bonds for which the citizens voted.

I have not offered any amendment to the appropriation for the construction of these protective works. The Eisenhower budget estimated $1,300,000 for this year for Maysville. Their estimate for Covington was $1,475,000 for this fiscal year. The committee has appropriated $1 million each for these two cities.

All I am anxious about is that these protective works be completed as soon as possible, because the people are always subject to these disastrous floods, which many times have caused great damage to the cities, more damage than the cost of the completion of these protective works.

What I want to know is whether the appropriation of $1 million for each city will retard the expeditious construction of these protective works. I would like to know what the unexpended balances are. I understand that the engineers will make an intensive study and investigation in the field and they will submit their information to the Senate. I hope, if this fund is not sufficient, that in conference you may make it sufficient to insure the expeditious construction of these works.

Can the gentleman tell me what the unexpended balances are?

Mr. TABER. Eight hundred and sixty-one thousand dollars, so that you have got $1,861,000 to operate on the rest of this year, and that is more than they are spending this year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the correct figure for Covington.

Mr. SPENCE. And what for Maysville?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The unexpended balance at the end of this fiscal year will be $506,700, so that they will have over $1,500,000 to operate with during the present fiscal year.

Mr. SPENCE. It is the opinion of the committee that that will be sufficient to expeditiously do all the work the engineers can do in this fiscal year?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That was the basis on which the allocation was made, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the leadership of the House if we finish this bill tonight what business we will have tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. There is a matter that involves a resolution out of the Judiciary Committee that we expect to have up for consideration on tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then adjourn until Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMALL: On page 4 after line 10, insert the following new paragraph:

"ANACOSTIA RIVER BASIN FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

"For the prosecution of the Anacostia River Basin flood control project; to remain available until expended, $1,000,000."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this is one project that I think every Member of this House is familiar with. It is known as the Peace Cross, Bladensburg, project. This area was flooded 29 times last year and it has been flooded 18 times already this year. Any Member of the House who comes into Washington by way of Baltimore or Route 50 has to come through Bladensburg. I am sure that most all of you are familiar with the situation that exists out there. I believe the chairman of the subcommittee himself will vote for this amendment. He is familiar with the situation.

You are going to have the routine explanation that this is not in the budget, which is true, it is not in the budget, but I do not think the Director of the Bureau of the Budget or the Budget Bureau itself should have the final word on what this House should, could, and can appropriate.

I am asking for $1 million. The State of Maryland is putting up $4,250,000 of its own money, but it is contingent on some money being appropriated by the Federal Government.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. This is known as the Defense Highway; is it not?

Mr. SMALL. That is correct.

Mr. DEVEREUX. It is one of the principal exits of the city of Washington, the Nation's Capital; is that true?

Mr. SMALL. It would be the only one if these bridges to Virginia were blown up.

Mr. DEVEREUX. If we should, and we all hope we will not have a great disaster here in the city of Washington, but, if we should and tried to evacuate the people from the city of Washington, the closing or blocking of that roadway would be a detriment to the people of the city of Washington?

Mr. SMALL. They would be trapped in this city like rats in a trap. They could not get out.

Mr. DEVEREUX. This project is principally for the benefit of Washington and not for the State of Maryland?

Mr. SMALL. It is for the benefit of the whole United States of America. It is on the Defense Highway which goes to the Naval Academy, which goes to Fort Meade, and is part of Route 1, the first United States route that was ever established in the United States. That is correct, it affects the whole of the United States.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I think the gentleman's project is exceedingly worthy.

Mr. SMALL. There is no question about that, and we are putting up $4,250,000 of our own money but we cannot spend it unless we get some Federal funds.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Following what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX] has said, is it not also a fact that every time there is even a modest rainfall the road is blocked to automobile traffic?

Mr. SMALL. That is entirely correct. All we are asking this House for is to give us a little Federal money in order that we may spend our own money. Do not stop us from spending our own money. All we want is just a little money from the Federal Government and let us spend four and a quarter million dollars.

This project was declared critical under the last administration when they cut out all public-works projects except the critical ones that had to do with defense. It is more critical now than it was then. Now, it is going to be said it is not in the budget, and it is not, but maybe the chairman of the committee will vote for this bill and help me a little bit.

Members of the committee, this is a worthy project, and please do not stop us from spending our own money. I could stand here and talk all day long, but if it should start to rain those of you who are going that way will not be able to get home. So, I will sit down and ask you to support this amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SMALL], to provide $1 million for the flood control at Peace Cross, Bladensburg, Md. The time is long past due when the Federal Government should do its share toward the relief of flood conditions at this point which it must do before the State of Maryland can go forward with its part of the work. Flood conditions at Peace Cross have reached the point where it almost amounts to criminal negligence to delay it further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of the subcommittee to oppose this amendment. As we understand it, the State of Maryland proposes to do a considerable amount of work in this area which would effect about 50 percent of the direct benefits to be derived from the Federal project. Now this construction program casts considerable doubt on the economic wisdom of embarking upon the Federal proj-

ect. The present project as designed is to cover a flood more than twice as great as any that they have had of record in this area. These costs cannot be considered as firm especially as we do not have a definite project report on it. We also understand that the Corps of Engineers are considering enlarging the scope of the project.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman says there is considerable doubt as to the plan. These plans were drawn by the Army engineers, and I do not think they contemplate changing the plans. I have a statement I received from them this morning saying, "If we get construction funds we will be in shape to start at once." So, they do not contemplate changing the plan. The only contemplation of any change was that if we do not get this project going, the State of Maryland may have to spend some money that would be lost, because in the overall plan, when it does come—and it will some day, when enough Congressmen and Senators get stuck in that flood, which I hope you will not, but you will if you come to Washington—then we are going to get some money to fix it. It should have been done 10 years ago, as a matter of fact.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It is on the overall project that we do not have a report, and this makes it quite indefinite as to the final cost.

Mr. SMALL. It does not, sir. It is definite; it is not indefinite.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, is this near Hagerstown?

Mr. SMALL. No; it is not near Hagerstown. It is right outside of Washington.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. SMALL. You will get your money back anyhow, so what are you kicking about?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SMALL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 4, line 5, after the sum insert the following: "of which $1 million shall be expended for bank erosion control and channel stabilization between Omaha, Nebr., and the Decatur-Onawa Bridge, and $1,500,000 to be expended for bank erosion control and channel stabilization between the Decatur-Onawa Bridge and Sioux City, Iowa."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does not increase the amount, it simply provides that out of the amount recommended in the bill $2,500,000 be expended for channel stabilization and bank-erosion control from Omaha to Sioux City. The Missouri River from Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa, was ordered to be made navigable by Federal law in the middle thirties. Since 1949, virtually no money has been spent for channel stabilization on the Missouri River from Omaha to Sioux City because of the fact that the Army engineers did not want to spread their appropriated funds too thinly, so they have spent their funds downstream from Omaha. Therefore, I ask that an amount be earmarked for channel maintenance and bank-erosion control from Sioux City to Omaha, where the banks are eroding no end and where fine farm land is being taken acre by acre, day after day.

The Bureau of the Budget approved this project and recommended $2,500,000 for this purpose. There has been some controversy about where this money was to be used. There was some testimony given by an Army engineer who said he wanted to use this money to put water under a bridge. It was never the intention of any Congressman or Senator nor the many interested people who testified before the committee from that area, that all this money should all be used for that purpose. My amendment takes care of that matter.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. As I understand, the amendment offered by the gentleman would not increase the appropriation?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. COLMER. It would merely earmark the amount?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. This amendment does not increase the appropriation. It simply earmarks out of the money herein appropriated, this $2,500,000 for a very necessary purpose.

I have just received a letter from General Chorpening, Assistant Chief of Engineers, which I believe, will satisfy the objections to my amendment.

I shall read his letter now:

In accordance with your oral request, I am pleased to furnish the following information.

The President's budget includes $2,500,000 for resumption of stabilization work in the Omaha to Sioux City reach. No work has been done in this reach since 1949, and an average of $5 million worth of work previously installed has been lost annually since that time.

That is the installation the Army engineers put in. That does not take in the terrific loss to the farms and the property.

Resumption of work to reduce losses and provide protection to the agricultural lands now being eroded and to public works is proposed to start in the 16-mile stretch from Omaha Mission Bend to upper Decatur Bend where serious erosion has caused the loss of considerable farmland and structures.

In accordance with the authorized plan for the Missouri River, the Corps of Engineers proposes in future years, as funds may be made available by the Congress, to stabilize the entire reach of the Missouri River between Omaha, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa. This work, in addition to the stretch above Decatur Bridge, should start from the upstream end of the presently improved river near Omaha, Nebr., and proceed upstream, including the Blair Bridge area.

The early completion of Fort Randall and Gavins Point Dam, and the necessity of having a stable river after regular discharges are scheduled, makes necessary an early start on resumption of stabilization activity.

I am sorry my time is limited to 5 minutes to explain the great and most urgent need for these funds.

A year ago last April we had the most destructive floods that ever occurred on the Missouri in that area. Thousands of homes were flooded and thousands upon thousands of acres of wonderful productive land was flooded and sanded over. I am pleading with you to approve my amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, we who live in the upper part of the Missouri Valley Basin are somewhat disappointed because the committee did not earmark $2½ million for channel stabilization work between Omaha and Sioux City. The committee still asserts that all stabilization work should be confined to that portion of the river between Omaha and Kansas City before placing any major effort on the portion of the river north of Omaha to Sioux City. I cannot subscribe to such a program and believe it economically unsound and unfair to devote the major effort to the stabilization program south from Omaha while again completely neglecting that section of the river north of Omaha to Sioux City.

The amount of money actually allocated for work north of Omaha is quite negligible. In my judgment, it will be a long time before the river between Omaha and Sioux City is stabilized unless funds are specifically earmarked for that purpose. That is the recommendation made by me and others when we appeared before the Subcommittee on Civil Functions only a few days ago. I am, however, pleased that the general purposes of river development in the Missouri River Basin are being carried out. I refer specifically to the appropriation carried in the bill for Oahe Dam, Fort Randall Dam, and Gavins Point. Although these projects are not in my congressional district, the people in northwest Iowa are vitally interested in the completion of these projects. They believe that our investment in such projects should be protected and the same should be completed as soon as possible. We will benefit through the new electrical power which will be generated and channeled through the REA cooperatives in my section of the State. I hope that the appropriations carried in the bill for these projects may remain intact.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition on the amendment, and yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much. I know the time is getting short, however, I am in the same area as the gentleman from Iowa, and I feel about this the same as he does. First I want to congratulate the committee on the fine job they have done. The fact that

they have left us out of the picture does not discourage us too much. They have a rule by which they are operating and under which a project must be a new project in order to get some of the money. We feel that we have had our nose under the tent for some 15 or 20 years, and therefore are entitled to some of the money because this project of river stabilization has been going on for a long time.

The Members of Congress for the past number of weeks have been very articulate in the well of the House on the matter of soil conservation. If there ever was a project which is a very worthy project, from the point of view of soil conservation, it is this particular project.

It has been said that a stitch in time saves nine; however, this philosophy has not been applied in this instance, and as a result the stabilization which was built into this section of the river, at a cost of $31 million, has been ruined, for the reason that Congress failed to provide the moneys necessary for small repairs.

As much as we believe in the economy effort that is being put into operation in this administration, we fail to see the economy in such operation.

In addition to the thousands of acres that are laid waste in this most fertile farming area of the United States, the community and Nation are being denied the use of a $2 million bridge which, after 15 or 20 years of effort on the part of the civic-minded citizens, were successful in having constructed.

The construction was completed at the location which was laid out and recommended by the Army engineers, who were agents of the Government. It occurs to me that the Federal Government has a moral obligation to these citizens who have invested their money in a project which has a national interest and need and, too, in the interest of food production the Federal Government has an obligation to save the fertile acres by stabilizing the river and putting it in its proper channel.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

TEKAMAH, NEBR., *May 26, 1953.*

R. D. HARRISON,
House of Representatives:

Please put your support behind the appropriation bill of $2½ million for river work between Omaha, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa.

TOM TOBIN.

TEKAMAH, NEBR., *May 26, 1953.*

R. D. HARRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

At the regular meeting of the Burt County Board of Supervisors May 26, the Burt County board respectfully requests your support for the appropriation of $2½ million for bank stabilization of the Missouri River between Omaha, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa.

JOHN SKINNER,
Chairman, Burt County Board of Supervisors.

TEKAMAH, NEBR., *May 26, 1953.*

R. D. HARRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request your support for the appropriation of $2½ million for river control between Omaha, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa.

CHARLES A. ROGERS,
Republican Chairman, Burt County, Nebr.

OMAHA, IOWA, *May 26, 1953.*

R. D. HARRISON,
Member of Congress:

Regret action of Appropriation Committee on river stabilization between Omaha and Sioux City, would appear committee deemed the amount requested was for placing the river under the Decatur Bridge which is not a fact. The river at Decatur is out of control, doing great damage to farmland in this vicinity and bank stabilization is urgently needed and if authorized and river controlled here the channel will be established where designed and problem of the bridge solved. The budget estimate is not a request to earmark funds for the Decatur Bridge, but for 118 miles of river from Omaha to Sioux City at such vital points as may be determined by Army Corps of Engineers. Request you assist to have the $2½ million replaced in river and harbor bill when this appropriation comes up for consideration in House for this is vital to farm interests and will save vast acres of fine farmland.

W. W. SMALL,
Chairman, Burt County Bridge Commission.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In the first place, historically and for a period of years, the Corps of Engineers has advised this subcommittee and the full committee that before work is undertaken to any extent above the point that the gentleman is referring to, it should be completed from Omaha to Kansas City. That, in their opinion, is the more important part of the project to be undertaken. They say very specifically that work should not be started from Omaha to Sioux City until such time as funds are made available in excess of those required in the region from Kansas City to Omaha; that, of course, has not been done. There is not much point in doing one part without doing the other, and it will ultimately cost $86,433,000 to complete this project. Certainly, while this amendment does not add money to this bill, nevertheless it earmarks $2,500,000, and other gentlemen who have projects in this bill had better be careful that their $2,500,000 are not taken as a result of the amendment.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. It is also true that several dams on the main stream have been completed which would greatly reduce the possibility of floods in that area.

Mr. HAND. I would say so. If the gentleman has anything further to add, I wish he would.

Mr. RILEY. The gentleman from South Carolina concurs fully with what the gentleman from New Jersey has said in regard to the position he has taken.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. Very briefly, sir, I must yield to the gentleman, but very briefly.

Mr. JENSEN. You do not mean to say that this stretch from Omaha to Sioux City is going to cost $86 million, do you?

Mr. HAND. The present estimate of the work between Omaha and Sioux City is in excess of $86 million.

Mr. JENSEN. There is not a penny here as it stands now which is earmarked for the stretch from Omaha to Sioux City, a stretch of 120 miles where they have had the most terrific floods.

Mr. HAND. I think it is more on the order of 150 miles, as a matter of fact.

Mr. JENSEN. At this very minute, farmers are losing their land acre after acre. It is eroding into the river by the acres. Certainly we have to have a little money to stop that erosion and destruction which is going on.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask for a vote on the amendment, and ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; removal of obstructions to navigation; rescue work, and repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood; and not to exceed $600,000 for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for conservation of fish and wildlife as authorized by law; to remain available until expended, $80,730,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD at this point, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the Beach Erosion Board, and the California Debris Commission; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; commercial statistics; and miscellaneous investigations; $9,616,000.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES CONSTRUCTION

For construction of flood-control works or parts thereof and for other related activities in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved May 15, 1928, as amended (33 U. S. C. 702a); to remain available until expended, $37,940,000.

MAINTENANCE

For expenses necessary for maintenance of flood-control work or parts thereof, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood-control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, and other related activities in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved May 15, 1928, as amended (33 U. S. C. 702a); to remain available until expended, $14,600,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The foregoing appropriations shall be available for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase

(not to exceed 250 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; *Provided further*, That the number of passenger motor vehicles held by the Corps of Engineers on December 31, 1952, shall be reduced by 100: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balances on June 30, 1953, of sums heretofore appropriated for the Corps of Engineers for river and harbor and flood control activities which were made available until expended shall be classified under the corresponding heads, herein established, shall be transferred to and merged with the amounts appropriated under those heads, and shall be available for the purpose therein specified.

REVOLVING FUND

For establishment of a revolving fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of the plant and equipment of the Corps of Engineers used in civil works functions, including acquisition of plant and equipment, maintenance, repair, and purchase, operation, and maintenance of not to exceed four aircraft at any one time, temporary financing of services finally chargeable to appropriations for civil works functions, and the furnishing of facilities and services for military functions of the Department of the Army and other Government agencies and private persons, as authorized by law, $100; and in addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide capital for the fund by capitalizing the present inventories, plant and equipment of the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers. The fund shall be credited with reimbursements or advances for the cost of equipment, facilities, and services furnished, at rates which shall include charges for overhead and related expenses, depreciation of plant and equipment, and accrued leave: *Provided*, That on July 1, 1953, (1) the fund shall assume the assets, liabilities, and obligations of the Plant accounts, as carried on the records of the Corps of Engineers as of June 30, 1953, under the appropriations for "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works", "Flood control, general", and "Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries", and (2) there shall be transferred from said appropriations to the fund amounts equivalent to the unexpended cash balances of the Plant accounts on June 30, 1953: *Provided further*, That the total capital of said fund shall not exceed $140 million.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

For maintenance and operation of the United States Soldiers' Home, to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund, $4,655,000, of which $570,000 shall remain available until expended for the construction of buildings and facilities, and $525,000 shall remain available until expended for renovation and expansion of existing boiler plant: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the payment of hospitalization of members of the Home in United States Army hospitals at rates in excess of those prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, upon the recommendation of the Board of Commissioners of the Home and the Surgeon General of the Army.

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

Operating expenses: For operating expenses necessary for the Canal Zone Government, including operation of the Postal Service of the Canal Zone; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles (including not to exceed one for replacement only); expenses incident to conducting hearings and examining estimates for appropriations on the Isthmus; expenses of attendance at meetings, when authorized by the Governor of the Canal Zone, of organizations concerned with activities pertaining to the Canal Zone Government; expenses of special training of employees of the Canal Zone Government as authorized by law (63 Stat. 602); contingencies of the Governor; medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable; and payments of not to exceed $50 in any one case to persons within the Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions; $12,237,500: *Provided*, That hereafter all revenues from operation of the Canal Zone postal service shall be paid into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That the number of passenger motor vehicles held by the Canal Zone Government on December 31, 1952, shall be reduced by four.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

The following corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1954 for such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

Not to exceed $3,300,000 of the funds available to the Panama Canal Company shall be available during the current fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of the Company, which shall be computed on accrual basis: *Provided*, That as used herein, the term "general and administrative expenses" shall not be construed to include expenses otherwise classified in the preceding fiscal year: *Provided further*, That funds available for operating expenses shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles (for replacement only): *Provided further*, That the number of passenger motor vehicles held by the Panama Canal Company on December 31, 1952, shall be reduced by six.

REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

The appropriation granted under the head, "Cemeterial Expenses, No Year," in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1949, is reduced by $5,158,763, and said amount shall be carried to the surplus of the Treasury.

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

The appropriation granted under this head in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953, is reduced by $850,017, and said amount shall be carried to the surplus of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the amount made available in said appropriation for construction and major equipment is decreased from "$4,900,000" to "$4,049,983."

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. No part of any appropriation contained in this act or of the funds made available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used directly or indirectly, except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the Republic of Panama: *Provided, however*, (1) That, notwithstanding the provision in the act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409), limiting employment in the above-mentioned positions to citizens of the United States from and after the date of approval of said act, citizens of Panama may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the United States so employed, if United States citizens are available in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3) that nothing in this act shall prohibit the continued employment of any person who shall have rendered 15 or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled, technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this act (a) shall normally be employed not more than 40 hours per week, (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in continental United States plus 10 percent; (6) this entire section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory positions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch of the United States Government or by any corporation or company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the United States Government: *Provided further*, That the President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part compliance with this section if he should deem such course to be in the public interest.

SEC. 104. The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), in an amount not exceeding $15,000: *Provided*, That the rates for individuals shall not exceed $100 per diem.

SEC. 105. Amounts expended by the Panama Canal Company in maintaining defense facilities in standby conditions for the Department of Defense, and in providing school and hospital services for agencies of the United States other than the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government hereafter shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be fully reimbursable to the Panama Canal Company by such agencies.

SEC. 106. No part of the funds of the Canal Zone Government or the Panama Canal Company shall be used hereafter for providing free medical and hospital care to employees

of the Panama Canal Company or the Canal Zone Government.

SEC. 107. Funds available to the Canal Zone Government or the Panama Canal Company for the payment of salaries and compensation to persons employed outside the continental United States shall be available hereafter for the payment of such salaries and compensation only at rates of pay equal to those paid for the same or similar services of persons employed by the Government in continental United States, plus such amount, not to exceed 10 percent, as may be fixed in regulations prescribed in accordance with law.

SEC. 108. No part of the funds of the Panama Canal Company or the Canal Zone Government shall be available hereafter for payment of military personnel assigned to the Panama Canal Company or the Canal Zone Government in excess of their military pay: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to those officers serving as Governor of the Canal Zone and President, Panama Canal Company and as Lieutenant Governor of the Canal Zone.

SEC. 109. This act may be cited as the "Civil Functions Appropriations Act, 1954."

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS: On page 5, line 12, under "Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, Construction," strike out "$37,940,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$38,530,000, of which sum $590,000 shall be expended for the Lake Pontchartrain, La., project."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand the gentleman has offered his amendment and there is another amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. I wonder if we could not have a unanimous-consent agreement that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the gentleman having his 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I make one correction. I have two amendments on page 6, both referring to the same subject; and then I have one amendment to go at the end of the bill, which might very well be called out of order.

Mr. HALLECK. Would not the gentleman from New York in 5 minutes explain his various amendments, and then of course the voting on them would have nothing to do with the time limitation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would accept 5 minutes for the amendments on page 6, but I would like at least 2 or 3 minutes for the last page of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am in somewhat the same position as the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] insofar as this amendment is concerned. As far as I know, I may say to the gentleman from Indiana, I am the only speaker on this amendment. I would appreciate not being limited, if possible. I think the limitation is going to apply anyway.

Mr. HALLECK. I will withdraw my request at this time. Then I will renew the request for a 15-minute limitation, which I hope will be adopted because the hour is late. A great many Members would be greatly convenienced if we could conclude quickly.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the members of the committee for taking any time at this hour of the day. I assure you that had it been in order earlier, I would have tried to get time then.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think the gentleman or any other Member need apologize for taking time. This is public business and I think the Members should be given an opportunity to discuss the amendments in which they are interested.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman very much, but I recognize the fact that the Members have been here all day and they are tired. I dislike being in the position of imposing upon them. I assure you I am not. I am only here because I am compelled to be here out of public consideration of the people that I have the honor to represent.

In coming here I feel like the broken record. I felt that years ago this project that I am talking about had been settled by the Congress of the United States. I have no criticism of the members of the subcommittee, because I think the subcommittee, in failing to provide funds for this project, were operating on the basis of misinformation from the Bureau of the Budget.

Let me try to explain what is involved here. If you can see this map, over here is the lower Mississippi River, from a point a few miles above the city of New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico. You see a small area marked, which is the Bonne Carre Spillway. Here is Lake Pontchartrain, La. I might say that although it does not involve the Mississippi River, today in the State of Louisiana something like 1,200 square miles of land are under water and something like 25,000 people are homeless. But when the Mississippi River reaches flood stage, it goes this way as well as this way into the Gulf of Mexico.

In 1941—and these dates are important—I introduced the first authorization bill for the Lake Pontchartrain project, tying it in with the Mississippi River project. The first authorization after World War II was passed in 1946, and in that first opportunity the Congress included the Lake Pontchartrain project and authorized the expenditure of $3 million for the project.

In the meantime, as the work got under way, we experienced the calamitous situation of the river's being high and a hurricane coming in from the Gulf of Mexico at the same time; so the Corps of Engineers came in and reviewed the project on the basis of the new data provided by this disaster which, incidentally, cost the lives of 28 people, flooded 2,000 homes, and caused millions of dollars of damage.

This area involves one of the most heavily populated areas of the city of New Orleans.

On the basis of that study a modified project was adopted by the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget said later this year—not under the original budget but under a new budget—that this was a new start. The Army engineers did not say it was a new start. Certainly it is something that has been going on now since 1940. Three million dollars has been spent by the Federal Government; $2 million has been spent by local interests, and the local interests are prepared to spend another $2 million. The Federal Government is asked to put up $590,000.

In my judgment this project would never have been eliminated had it not been for the Bureau of the Budget failing to say that this was a modification rather than a new project.

From the point of view of economy, here is a project that on the testimony of the president of the Mississippi River Commission, General Farrington, will be lost completely and entirely if the work does not go ahead, because the money that has been expended must be secured by protecting this levee against wave wash.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. I hope I shall not take the 2 additional minutes.

I have here a picture. I know you cannot see it but I wish you could. There is a levee in being. There is Lake Pontchartrain, La. There it exists. That represents $3 million of Federal funds and local funds. Here comes the Mississippi River, plus the waters of that lake. Now, if this levee is not tied in, if it is not riprapped, all of it is going to be lost; and the net effect of it is going to be that we will have spent $3 million and gained nothing. In the meantime here is an area next to the largest concentration of population in the South, where about 70,000 people are living. This is not a rivers and harbors project or a planning project, or even a dam or something that we envisage in the future; this is something that involves the property and the lives of 70,000 people. For us to fail to provide these funds on the basis of misinformation, in my judgment is the height of shortsightedness and the worst type of false economy.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is again my duty to oppose the pending amendment. We had a large group of witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee representing the lower Mississippi River Valley. They came here and almost without exception went down the line for the revised budget which was before the committee. The amount which is in the bill today is the amount which was in the revised budget.

The committee was under no misapprehension about this matter. We

looked into it carefully. In view of the budget that was before us and the support which that budget was given by those who are gravely concerned with a great problem which they have in that part of the country, the subcommittee was responsive to its responsibility in approving the amount that the Bureau of the Budget submitted to us.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Boggs) there were—ayes 78, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boggs: Page 5, line 12, after the figures "$37,940,000" add a colon and insert "*Provided*, That as much of these funds as will not seriously impair the continuation of projects provided for up to a maximum of $590,000, shall be expended on the Lake Pontchartrain, La., project."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman's point of order is probably valid. I withdraw the amendment and offer another one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boggs: Page 5, line 12, after the sum named and before the period insert a comma and the following: "and of which $590,000 shall be available for expenditure on the Lake Pontchartrain, La., project."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I get a clarification of how that 15 minutes will be disposed of, because if the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], has 5 minutes, and the committee has 5 minutes on this amendment I would be left with 5 minutes to split up with the committee on three amendments? I do not think that is a fair allocation of time.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman from Louisiana would be satisfied with 3 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana. I do not think I will require more than 3 minutes; maybe not that much.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If it is the understanding then that I will have at least 2 minutes on each of my amendments, I think that is the minimum I can ask for.

Mr. HALLECK. I think that is reasonable enough.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take but a minute. I appreciate the support I had in the committee for the amendment I offered a moment ago.

This amendment seeks to accomplish the same thing, but it seeks to accomplish it by not increasing the amount made available in the bill namely, $37,940,000 for the Mississippi River and its tributaries. I would not urge this method if I were not so completely convinced of the necessity for continuing this work. The gentleman from Wisconsin made some point about the representatives of various levee boys and other groups up and down the Mississippi River coming in and speaking for this sum of $37,940,000, but the gentleman failed to mention the fact that all of the interests in southern Louisiana, representatives of the Governor of the State of Louisiana, the department of public works of the State of Louisiana, the Pontchartrain levee boys, the parish of Jefferson, and the city of New Orleans—and I might point out to the gentleman, the Republican organization in Louisiana, all came in and specifically pointed out the prime importance of this project, because this is a project which, unlike so many flood-control projects involves a built-up residential section of a vast, growing city.

Now, I am the last person in the world to complain about protecting floodlands or grazing lands or reclaimed lands, but I think it follows rather logically that when you have street upon street built up to capacity, lots 50 and 175 feet, with the whole area populated, where your local interests are putting up more than half of the money involved, where they are ready to put it up now, where if you do not carry on with the project you will lose $3 million, we are operating under a misapprehension in the first place that it is unsound, that it is unwise to reject this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope, not involving any money, not another nickel of expenditure, that some of my good friends over here to my left can see fit to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, to permit this amendment to stand would be to revoke the judgment that has previously been had by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, those who have testified before our subcommittee, and the committee. The only way that money can be used for this project is to take it away from other portions of this overall project which have been considered more urgent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Boggs) there were—ayes 84, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Roosevelt: On page 6, line 17, add the following:

"NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT REMEDIAL WORKS INVESTIGATION

"For engineering and economic investigations and surveys, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization of the waters of the Niagara River, $989,000."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, with the simple statement to the Members that I want the record to show that this figure of $989,000 is the recommendation of the Truman budget, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Roosevelt: On page 6, line 17, add the following:

"NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT REMEDIAL WORKS INVESTIGATION

"For engineering and economic investigations and surveys, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization of the waters of the Niagara River, $100,000."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I am sure no Members of this House have ever seen a Roosevelt drop $889,000 so fast. However, I am offering this amendment because this is the recommendation of the Eisenhower revised budget. I understand that the committee in its hearings eliminated this $100,000 on the theory that since the Niagara power project was to go through, probably by giving it away to the private utility combine of New York State, therefore the Corps of Engineers and the United States Government have no further responsibility.

I want to correct that misunderstanding on the part of the committee because, under the treaty with Canada agreed to in 1950, whether we like it or not the United States Government has an obligation to build its half, with Canada building the other half of the remedial works for the preservation of the scenic beauty and the slowing down of the erosion of Niagara Falls.

This calls for only $100,000. It is true that part of these engineering surveys in connection with the remedial works is also connected with surveys for the ultimate power project. However, this appropriation does not in any way commit the Congress—I want this made clear as it was made clear in the testimony in the hearings—on the proposition of whether the power project shall be built by the private utilities, the New York State Power Authority, or the Federal Government. This calls only for continuing our obligation under the 1950 treaty to continue to study and to work with the Canadian Government on the remedial works and the ultimate power project.

In addition, may I say that the Republican administration of the State of New York, headed by Governor Dewey, takes

the same position I do, and the chairman of the New York State Power Authority does also.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I would like the other 2 minutes on these amendments to apply at this point, for further consideration of this amendment.

As I pointed out, both Governor Dewey and the chairman of the New York State Power Authority have taken a position against the giveaway to the private utilities. Their position is in favor of State construction. There is possibly some difference between Senator LEHMAN and me on the one hand, and Governor Dewey and the New York State Power Authority on the other as to the preference clause. Senator LEHMAN and I take the position that the users, the consumers in this case of the power, should get the preference for its use just as under all Federal statutes since 1906 that has been carried out. The New York State statute is not clear on that. However, this question is not before the House at this time. I only mention it to clarify the issue. I want to say one other thing. Nothing to do with the St. Lawrence seaway or power project was included in this amendment. Niagara is completely separate from the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. This only deals with the Niagara.

I might add a third point. That I hope in the very near future, Senator Lehman and Governor Dewey and Mr. Burton, of the power authority, and I will meet on the question of the ultimate disposal of Niagara power. But do not preclude a decision on that issue by what you do here today. Do not tell the Canadians that we are not going to live up to our 1950 treaty under which we commit ourselves to undertake 60 percent of the remedial works to preserve the scenic beauty and I might add many of you have constituents who travel to Niagara Falls on probably the most interesting week or two of their lives, on their honeymoons, therefore, you all are very interested in what is done with Niagara Falls, especially so far as the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls is concerned. That is what we are primarily interested in in this amendment. Mr. Chairman, I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment. It provides only $100,000 in accordance with the Eisenhower recommendation and the Bureau of the Budget. It is not a new project, it is a continuing project, and I hope the committee will accept it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this money, whether it be $989,000 or $100,000 in a very real sense in the opinion of the subcommittee is superfluous money. Plans for the institution of construction are now complete. They can go ahead with the construction without any new funds for this planning just as soon as this Government makes up its mind as to the means by which that construction work is to be done.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLER of New York. I confirm the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee. I represent the Niagara district in New York. I represent the district in which this money would be spent. I say to you unequivocally we want no part of it. It is the most ridiculous proposition I have ever heard of. Thirty years ago the private utilities developing power now in the Niagara River completed all the plans, including the remedial works. They completed the plans for the development of the Niagara River. If they are not allowed to develop this additional power, they will give the plans to the Federal Government or to the Army engineers or to the State of New York. Hearings have been held by the Senate and the House Public Works Committee on the redevelopment of the Niagara River. They have been completed. If the State of New York is authorized to develop this project under a license, which they will get from the Federal Power Commission, they will have to spend all of the money for remedial works pursuant to the license. What is the use of us providing money today when if private enterprise is authorized, private enterprise pursuant to the terms of the license, will have to spend the money for the remedial works? There is no violation of any treaty with Canada. The treaty provides that all scenic beauties shall be preserved pursuant to the regulations in effect and the license issued by the Federal Power Commission. As a matter of fact, General Chorpening, who has been referred to here several times today, testified just yesterday before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on Civil Functions in regard to the Niagara project. Here is what he said yesterday:

> Since the budget was originally made up and later revised, action has been taken by the administration as indicated by the Bureau of the Budget that the construction of Niagara is favored by private development. That being true, we have adequate funds to do what the Government must do in connection with the remedial works working in with the private company, if that is the final answer.

Senator ELLENDER asked the question:

> General, do you have any funds on hand now unexpended?
>
> General CHORPENING. Yes. $70,000, which is enough to take care of it under the present administration's policy. Therefore, these funds, referring to the $100,000, have not been allowed by the House committee, and I am not requesting these funds here in the Senate because we do not need them.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to make one correction of that $70,000 figure, because the testimony which the general gave the House was $35,000. Is it not true that his proposition has been opposed by Mr. Burton of the New York State Power Authority; and, furthermore, every Republican governor since the day of my Uncle Teddy Roosevelt has opposed giving away to the private utilities?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I am not talking about that. That question is not before the House today, as to whether or not it shall be developed by public money or by private enterprise. This is an appropriation for remedial works, which will be provided for whatever agency is authorized, whoever it may be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT: Section 109 at page 13, line 11, is hereby redesignated "Section 110"; after line 10, page 15, add the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 109. For all intents and purposes, each section or item of appropriation of this bill shall be deemed to be a separate bill, and shall be subject to approval or disapproval by the President as though contained in a separate bill."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that this is legislation on an appropriation bill which gives to a public official authority which he does not now have.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This amendment is similar to the separability clause we have put in many other substantive pieces of legislation passed by this House. If ever an appropriation bill should have this item providing for veto power in it, it is this one. This is a bill, which is nothing more nor less than a one-package bill of a whole series of separate appropriations on separate projects. All I am asking and suggesting is that the separability concept do apply to this bill, as perhaps it does not apply to other appropriation bills which deal with a major sum of money to be expended by a single agency in pursuit of a broad policy. These are separate projects and separate sums of money are recommended in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOPE). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair believes that the provision is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore sustains the point of order.

At the time the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, the Chair was informed the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] was on his feet. Unless there is objection, the Chair will recognize the gentleman for 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the subcommittee, one question. Since time immemorial this annual appropriation bill has carried an item in the first paragraph under "Cemeterial expense" to provide for the maintenance of the grave of Pushmataha, an Indian chief. I was surprised to see that this item had been eliminated. I want to make sure if such is the case that it is not the idea of the committee that that maintenance of this grave, which has been an honored obligation of the Federal Government for more than a hundred years, is going to be stopped.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to assure the gentleman from Mississippi that the chief's grave will be properly maintained. The specific item is not necessary in view of the more general language now carried in the bill.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and I who represent the minority on this subcommittee wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the subcommittee, for the able and courteous manner in which he has handled a difficult assignment. We congratulate him on a job well done.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. With the Chair's indulgence, and before I make a few remarks of my own, I am going to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and that I may do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have read with particular interest the report of the Committee on Appropriations concerning the Panama Canal Company. The special attention of the committee is invited to those portions of the report found on pages 12 and 13.

During the 81st Congress, I headed a special subcommittee appointed by the late chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, the Honorable Schuyler Otis Bland. Our mission was to make a study of the toll structure of the canal and to make various recommendations as to the business aspects of the canal operation. It seemed like a simple job but the subcommittee ran into an incredible mass of complications. Finally the reorganization, under Public Law 841, resulted. This was the law which set up the Panama Canal Company as a Government corporation. Within this corporation there should be all of the necessary business implements to carry on this vast public utility.

It is noted that the Appropriations Committee, at least by indirection, suggests that the tolls should be sharply increased to provide for repairs and improvements and for obsolescence. The committee further suggests that there has been what they call dalliance on the part of the Panama Canal Company in not providing for these items in the past. I doubt very much if this suggestion is justified, but if it is, there is no reason why those who are in authority should not be held responsible.

Let me invite to the attention of the committee some questions which perplexed my subcommittee in the 81st Congress and which now are giving concern to the canal management, to the Bureau of the Budget, and I hope to the present administration. You might well start with the curious historic control of the entire Panama Canal by the President and you should realize that it was by Executive order that he designated the Secretary of the Army, or Secretary of War, as he was then called, to act for him. This was an individual designation and in no way did it place the War Department, or the Department of the Army, in charge of the canal.

Now, if the committee begins a study of this complicated subject of amortization, let me suggest that you first determine exactly what the Panama Canal is: Is it a part of the National Defense Establishment? If so, by what right, moral or otherwise, should any particular group of citizens be required to amortize it? If it is not part of the National Defense Establishment, then is it a navigation project? If so, will the committee please point out what other navigation project is required to pay tolls, interest, or amortization? Posing now another realistic question: Suppose it is part national defense and part navigation project. What is a fair proportion to allocate to each?

During the many months when my special subcommittee was studying such questions as these, we discussed at length with the Bureau of the Budget what to do about depreciation. We concluded that only the expendable parts could justifiably be covered by normal depreciation. The present toll rate includes all the costs of operating and maintaining the canal for the transit of ships, a depreciation charge to cover the renewal of all expendable parts, and a fair share as agreed with the Bureau of the Budget for the cost of all civil government functions on the Canal Zone. We could find in our studies no single Government project of this character which provided for both interest and amortization, except the public power plants which were in competition with private enterprise. In these, the Government accounting was made to conform with private practice.

I am convinced that the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company has fixed a toll rate which is fair and which provides for all businesslike and reasonable expenses incident to the transiting of ships. This is according to the law, and if it is the intention of the Appropriations Committee to order the Board to take steps which are not according to law, it might be well for them to suggest to the Committee on Merchant Marine that the Law be amended and not ignored.

For some years there has been an effort made to set up a commission to study the long-range problems of the Panama or other Isthmian canals. There is such a bill now before the Congress, introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], who is a very keen student of Panama Canal affairs. At an appropriate time, I myself expect to introduce a companion measure. It will provide for an entirely neutral group of competent experts to study the engineering problems, the problems of the location of any new or diverted sections of the present canal; it would study the diplomatic problems involved which incidentally are tremendous and of most far-reaching importance; it would decide whether it is feasible and suitable to proceed with the sea-level canal which was recommended some years ago by one group of Army engineers, and which was not favorably considered by the Congress. It would have cost then some five and one-half billions and now would perhaps cost twice that much. Whether this is the ultimate solution is still a sharply controversial question among engineers.

The Martin bill would take the problem out of the hands of either proponents or opponents of any known plan and would leave the recommendation in the hands of neutral experts. Until a group studies and reaches a solution of this overall problem, there can be no intelligent estimate of future costs and consequently none concerning amortization, reserves for obsolescence, depreciation, replacement, and so forth.

I hope that before issuing further peremptory instructions to the Panama Canal management, the committee will make a careful study of the problems which are involved. This has been done by the legislative committees concerned and presumably it is being done by the management.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us contains a provision to limit the payment of salaries to employees in the Canal Zone to the amount paid in the States plus 10 percent in lieu of plus 25 percent as heretofore allowed. The committee has done well to call attention to the fact that a review should be made of the salaries of Canal Zone employees. I doubt however, that the committee has given the subject sufficient investigation and believe that the provisions which they have recommended will produce some inequitable results which the committee did not intend.

There are Panamanian citizens already employed by our Government on the Canal Zone and they are subject to the United States Civil Service regulations, and also the Classification Act of 1949, which sets rates of pay. Such Panamanian citizens do not pay income tax on moneys received from the United States Government, while all United States citizens employed on the Canal Zone are required to do so. This will result, in case the differential is reduced from 25 percent to 10 percent in Panamanian citizens receiving larger incomes than American citizens doing identical work.

Here is one of many examples which might be quoted: Mrs. Miller, a United States citizen, is a GS-4 (b). Her salary will be $3,255, plus the 10 percent or $3,580.50.

Mrs. Oller, a Panamanian citizen, working along side Mrs. Miller, doing the same work, is also a GS-4 (b). Her salary is $3,255. Panamanian citizens paid at the United States rate do not receive any differential.

Mrs. Miller pays income tax of $596 which reduces her income to $2,984.50, while Miss Oller, a Panamanian citizen, will receive the full $3,255 or $270.50 more than a United States citizen for the same work.

This is also true regarding all craft positions and all other positions.

It seems to me that we should recognize the fact that it is desirable to have a substantial group of citizens of the United States engaged in the operation of the Panama Canal and that it will be difficult to maintain such a force

unless the salary schedule is more equitably determined than may result under the provisions of the bill as they now read.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at this late hour that this has in every sense been a subcommittee bill. It has been a subcommittee effort to do what we considered necessary to do for a very important program and in the light of the very stringent economic circumstances that now face our Federal Government.

I want to express my appreciation for the very consistent support, the very willing support, and the very helpful support that has come to this subcommittee from the other side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5376) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 244, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to incorporate their remarks on this bill and to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AUGUST SCHEDULE IN DISTRICT

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have always attempted to keep in close contact with the people of the 17th Ohio District, whom I represent.

While a Congressman is expected to have a broad grasp of national and international matters, and to give information on many troublesome subjects, I deem it most advisable to keep in touch with the people of our district so that I might have their views and endeavor to be of service to them in their personal problems.

Having been assured by the leadership that the Congress will not be in session, I will again, this year, follow the procedure of holding meetings in the courthouses of the seven counties in my district.

I have established the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, August 17 and 18, Ashland, Ashland County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 19 and 20, Mansfield, Richland County.

Friday and Saturday, August 21 and 22, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday and Tuesday, August 24 and 25, Delaware, Delaware County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 26 and 27, Newark, Licking County.

Friday and Saturday, August 28 and 29, Millersburg, Holmes County.

Monday and Tuesday, August 31 and September 1, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

Weekdays 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Saturday conferences will last only until noon, when the courthouse closes.

It is surprising how much can be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down and talk over national and personal problems.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences and I urge any or all of my constituents to meet with me on the date most convenient to them.

With the knowledge thus obtained, I know I will be better able to truly represent them in the Congress of the United States.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time because a great many Members have been inquiring about the program for next week. As I said earlier, a bill to provide political asylum for a Polish flier will be up for consideration tomorrow. Then we propose to adjourn until next Monday.

On Monday we propose to call bills on the Consent Calendar and on Tuesday bills on the Private Calendar, then take up the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

For the balance of the week we have the bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act, and H. R. 5069, to prohibit the shipment of extremely flammable clothing in interstate commerce. Both of those bills come from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

If a rule is granted, we will take up the bill H. R. 5141, which has to do with small business.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to whether or not the gentleman from Indiana has any information as to what action might be taken by the Government Operations Committee with regard to plan No. 2 for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. HALLECK. I understand there is a disapproving resolution, but what may transpire I do not know. I might make this further observation as to a possible matter next week which I do not believe will be controversial or extremely so. There are two bills that have been reported by subcommittees out of the Government Operations Committee, one having to do with the creation of a commission on intergovernmental relations, that is relations between the States and local governments and the Federal Government, and another bill having to do with the carrying on of the work of a commission similar to the Hoover Commission.

Mr. COOLEY. From my information the action, if it is to be taken at all, must be taken on Reorganization Plan No. 2 not later than Wednesday of next week.

Mr. HALLECK. I see the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the committee, present. It would be up to the Member who files the resolution to call it up if he elected to do that.

Mr. COOLEY. I understand the rules are to the effect that, first, a motion to discharge the committee might be necessary. After that it becomes a motion of highest privilege to call it up for consideration.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. My only purpose in making inquiry now is that the membership of the House might know what action is contemplated and the leadership might indicate to the membership as to about when it would be called up or when it would be convenient or most appropriate for the author to ask for its consideration.

Mr. HALLECK. The author has said nothing to me about any intention of calling it up. I may say I had hoped it would not be called up.

Mr. COOLEY. If the author does not call it up, then I understand any other Member who opposes plan No. 2 and favors the resolution will be recognized to call it up. For the benefit of the Members of the House I would like to say that if the author does not see fit to call it up I myself propose to ask for recognition for the purpose of calling up the resolution to the end that it might be considered in the House. I would suggest, if it meets with the leadership's approval, that we say that will be done either by the author or by myself.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman has that right. All of the membership will have to be alerted to that effect.

Mr. COOLEY. I wish to say that now for the benefit of the membership of the House. If the author does not call it up I will ask for recognition on Wednesday for the purpose of calling it up for consideration.

Mr. HALLECK. That adds to the declaration I made as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that the announcement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] to call this up is the first I heard of it. We

intended to have further discussion. I think I can safely say there will be further discussion and that the gentleman from Indiana will be kept advised of the situation.

Mr. HALLECK. It was a complete surprise to me also. I had no information at all except I had understood there was a very strong likelihood it would not be called up.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from North Carolina was cooperative in letting us know about his intention to call it up. That is the first information I had. However, there will be conferences and the gentleman from Indiana will be advised so that the membership can be alerted. Might I suggest to my friend, the bill coming up tomorrow having very unusual significance, that he ask unanimous consent now that it be in order to be considered under the 5-minute rule for those who want to talk. I think it would be very fine.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I had not assumed that there would be any difficulty about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; there is no difficulty about it, but I thought it would be very nice.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that he would be constrained to object unless the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] who has charge of the bill, is here.

Mr. HALLECK. Might I say to the gentleman I am quite sure that it would be better to get that unanimous consent tomorrow.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence be granted me next week, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent to address the House for the possible use of 1 hour on Monday next after the regular order of business, and I would like to make the announcement that I intend at that time to speak on the subject of civilian power by atomic energy. This subject has been the subject of numerous newspaper articles and national magazine articles now for several weeks. I think it is about time that someone on the Atomic Energy Committee asked for time on the floor of the House to bring before the Congress of the United States and the American people some very important information on this particular subject. Therefore I make this unanimous consent request for time on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore granted.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House, H. R. 4304, a bill which I have introduced, providing for an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development and also for Assistant Secretaries for Research and Development for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

For the past 3 years I have been deeply interested in the problem of proper organization of our military-research programs, upon which we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars.

Two years ago I initiated and was responsible for a thorough study of the subject. Partly as a result of a report I made to President Truman at that time, the President established an organization known as the Science Advisory Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization, composed of leading scientists of the country, which is today under the chairmanship of Dr. Lee Dubridge, president of the California Institute of Technology.

I can heartily endorse the recommendation of President Eisenhower calling for the establishment of an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research as the necessary first step, but I submit that the President, now having opened up the whole broad subject of reform in military research, steps should be taken to place a proper administrative foundation under military research and that such steps should be taken now. The most necessary step in this accomplishment I believe would be for Congress to provide for similar Assistant Secretaries for Research for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

During World War II our military research was conducted largely through the operations of the Office of Scientific Research and Development of which Dr. Vannevar Bush was Chairman. Following the war, the unfinished projects were turned over to the particular services involved, and since that time, these services have been carrying on their individual programs guided to some extent by the Defense Research and Development Board with which most Members are familiar, and which under the President's recommendations is to be abolished.

I wish to point out that the responsibilities for carrying through research programs even down to the operation of individual laboratories are in the hands of military officers and there are no qualified scientific administrators charged with sufficient authority either to administer these programs or operate these laboratories and bring them through to success.

If the Congress approves the Department of Defense reorganization plan, which includes the recommendation of President Eisenhower for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research, a small start will be made but I am convinced that under the present operating methods no Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research can accomplish anything of importance until the whole operating procedure is changed, modified, and amended.

I submit that the prime qualifications vital to the success of any reorganization is that these Assistant Secretaries for Research be qualified administrators with scientific standing and experience, and therefore, I ask you to seriously weigh H. R. 4304, which writes into the law that such Assistant Secretaries shall be so qualified.

As illustrations of the unsound system of conducting our military research programs, we have the following:

First. There are insufficient provisions at the defense level for coordinating the work of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in this field.

Second. There are no qualified scientific administrators at the Assistant Secretaries level of the Army, Navy, and Air Force with sufficient responsibility and authority to operate and control scientific research projects.

Third. Military research activities within the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the civilian scientists who either direct the work or are engaged actively in research, are subject to the laws, regulations, and controls established by Congress and the Departments to control troops, operate a base or fleet, or purchase supplies and materials.

There is conclusive evidence that these laws, rules, regulations, and limitations seriously hamper the freedom of action that civilian scientists must have to be successful in their activities.

Fourth. Civilian military scientists employed by the Army, Navy, and Air Force are subject to civil-service regulations. There is no way whereby these services can offer special inducements to obtain badly needed experts and there is no way the Departments can reward a scientist for outstanding accomplishment or provide a strong incentive to accomplish a given end.

It is very difficult to obtain qualified scientists to engage in military research in our service laboratories because of the difficulties they encounter working under the present system and the red tape.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force get around these difficulties by placing many research contracts with universities, private companies, or individual experts but it is most important that our service laboratories be maintained and strengthened, if for no other purposes

than to control and supervise the work and coordinate the programs.

The problem of closely knitting together experienced military men and qualified civilian scientists into a harmonious team is a most difficult task. It presents what is possibly the greatest challenge to management skill we have seen in our times. Its solution is vital to the protection of our country.

This bill does not reflect criticism on either the military leaders or civilian scientists. This bill does, however, spell out who should be the keymen and what their qualifications should be.

We must have the greatest efficiency in the administration of our large research programs or we never can achieve superiority in every form of military weapons, equipment, and supplies.

Of what value is our outstanding industrial capacity for defense if the military products they make are inferior or obsolete? Our scientists and military leaders, working together have had some brilliant successes, but not enough.

The surest way of keeping out of war is to be so superior to our enemies in military research, that they will not dare to go to war against us.

We have it within our power to achieve this superiority and the best chance of achieving it is by placing qualified scientific administrators in charge of the programs, removing the unnecessary inapplicable rules and regulations under which they now operate and establishing a new and acceptable doctrine of joint military research which will bring closely together the scientific knowledge of our scientists and the experience of our military leaders, into a "happy marriage."

Most military leaders do not qualify to pass on scientific matters because they do not know what is "discoverable"—on the other hand, most military scientists do not qualify to pass on the effectiveness of a particular weapon or device in the field where they must be used.

The problem of reorganizing military research administratively and operationally, has had the attention of almost every military leader, every military civilian scientist, every Secretary of Defense, the Army, Navy and Air Force since the conclusion of World War II. They were all disturbed about it. All were agreed that something should be done but up to now, no solution has been found.

The appointment of an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research is an attempt to grapple with this situation but if you place the responsibility on such an Assistant Secretary to improve the success and results from research, without correcting the faults that lie in the system of operation and administering, he will accomplish very little and we will have given him an almost hopeless task.

If there is established responsible heads for military research in the Army, Navy and Air Force, as provided in H. R. 4304, the work of reorganizing the present system can proceed at once. If an Assistant Secretary for Research is good for the Department of Defense, it is even more important that Assistant Secretaries for Research be established for the Army, Navy and Air Force, because it is in these three departments that the work is actually done. With 4 qualified men working on the programs instead of 1, we can expect more immediate reform with no loss of time.

May I point out in closing that in the field of military research, time is of the essence, the most important element in the race for superiority. We cannot afford to waste any time or lose any opportunity in this most important field.

TRADE POLICIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, how long must we follow State Department policies based on a philosophy of frustration and failure? For the past several years we have stood by as our military advantages over the common enemy have been dissipated through a series of strange diplomatic and political blunders, and now the same type of unsound strategy is being thrust upon our industrial and economic estates. We are now being asked to sacrifice America's industrial might so that the other nations of the world may be strengthened. The current plan is to stampede the country into accepting all the goods that foreign sources care to ship us, without regard to their effects upon our economy or our security. It is another of the State Department's erratic contrivances, and its appraisal by the legislative branch of the Government is obviously of no consequence to the backers of this outrageous scheme.

Members of Congress have explained the dire consequences of present trade policies. From these elected representatives of the people, who are in close touch with their constituencies, have come tragic stories of unemployment and poverty directly attributable to loss of markets through unfair competition with cheap foreign products. I have reported conditions in my district that exist at this very period when there should be ample work for every employable adult in our land. I have pointed out that coal mines are closing because of the loss of markets to residual oil imports and that there is danger that those mines will not be available in a national emergency. But the State Department presumes to take issue with the findings of Members of Congress. The State Department sends its emissaries right into the Halls of Congress to lobby against our own recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, Congress was not established to sit back and accede to the demands of pusillanimous planners who have taken the pocketbooks of the poor people of Pennsylvania and—whether inadvertently or by deliberate design—are leading America down the highway to disaster. We are beyond the crossroads. We are proceeding in the wrong direction and going at an excessive rate of speed. We are moving along a labyrinth of dangerous passages that can lead only to further confusion and insecurity. It is past time to turn back and assume a course designated to strengthen the national defense and promote the national welfare.

For years there has been in the State Department a coterie of so-called liberal intellectuals who have persistently subordinated the interests of our beloved country in order to carry out a set of ridiculous schemes that have brought progressive retrogression not only to the United States but to the world in general. Some individuals among the group responsible for this condition have been exposed as actual followers of socialism and communism; others have been shown to be moral derelicts. The clean-up which got under way with the change of administrations is in the process of driving out the traitors and degenerates, but still lingering is that horde of complete confusionists who—however innocent of evil intent—have nevertheless contributed to the state of disorder and remain as obstructionists in the program that would give precedence to the cause of America. It is not possible to neutralize completely in 4 months a condition that has been in the process of fermentation for two decades.

Only a few short years ago we were the mightiest Nation in the history of the world. We were in a position to give leadership and guidance to our brethren in other lands so that never again would they be subjected to the terroristic treatment which through the centuries had prevailed time and again in the Eastern Hemisphere. But by stupid and/or conspiratorial effort we not only wasted away our ability to guarantee protection for other peoples; we also relinquished much of the power by which we could defy threats to our own security.

In the past few weeks this Congress has been informed of failure after failure in diplomatic and politically dictated military policies. We have learned that Europe—despite all the manpower and money that we have shipped into the British Isles and the Continent in the past 7 years—could not successfully repel an invasion of the Soviet Army at this time. We have been told that the United States itself is not necessarily immune to an attack by the Red air force. To those military leaders who have been so brutally frank during congressional studies, we are deeply indebted, for at long last we are in a position to go forward in our defense program.

But while our military begins to extricate itself from the bonds of diplomatic and political restraint, it is also incumbent upon our leadership to undertake a program that will enable our industrial forces to maintain world preeminence. Such a program cannot be carried out under prevailing trade policies.

It is my privilege to represent the typical congressional district. My constituency is made up of men and women of every race and creed, of multitudinous skills and professions. The variety of economic interests is due primarily to nature's generous bounty and to the aptitude and ingenuity of my people. We have rich farmland, undulate mountain terrain, and all the topographical advantages necessary for diverse industrial activity and commerce. Through farsighted planning, willingness to invest in the future of our country and

our district, and hard work, the counties of Armstrong, Cambria, and Indiana have for many years been one of the Nation's outstanding agricultural, mining, and manufacturing districts.

The men and boys from my district served in the Nation's Armed Forces in every conflict from the Revolution through Korea. You will find that my boys are well represented in the hills above Seoul, in the air along MIG alley, and on the warships that are blasting Wonsan Harbor. I spoke to a high school graduating class in my district last Friday night, and many of these young men are planning to enter the Armed Forces in the days immediately ahead. It would seem to me that our people, who have given so willingly in the defense of their country, have every right to ask for equitable treatment by this Government, and that their pleas deserve at least as much attention as the bleating of planners safely ensconced behind carved desks at the State Department.

Thousands of miners in my district, and their neighbors, are out of work because foreign residual oil is depriving their product of a market. State Department allegations to the contrary are falsehoods. In the first month of this year the public utilities market along the east coast from Delaware to Massachusetts took 73 percent more oil than it consumed a year ago. This is a normal coal market, and much of that coal would come from the mines in my district.

Some of our mines which are closing as a result of this unfair competition are being dismantled. Equipment is removed, tipples are torn down, and the mines are being flooded. If, as President Eisenhower has warned, we are living in an age of peril, where will we get the necessary fuel for our war machine if the enemy should strike? Not from foreign sources. Ocean shipping lanes are easily closed in a period of snorkel submarines and jet aircraft. The enemy knows this fact. Surely it is also realized by policymakers in the State Department. What I want to know is whether this consideration is being ignored because of a blind faith that there is no danger ahead, or is the present policy just a leftover of the destructionists' program that has already been so costly to America? Whichever the case, Congress must not permit a continuance of this policy. We must protect our industries and our workers by curtailing residual oil imports.

Self-styled advocates of free trade are attempting to give the impression that those of us who wish to protect home industry and labor are selfish in serving American interests. But they do not explain what free trade really is or that the United States is already one of the lowest tariff countries in the world. Canada, Italy, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, Mexico, and India are among the larger nations having higher tariffs and more severe import quotas.

Since World War II we have been giving away money and materials to build the economy of our allies. Our people have been taxed higher and higher to build industries in foreign lands. We have provided the plants, the equipment for their operation, and even power supply stations. Now that the plants are in operation, we are also expected to buy their products in preference to goods made by our own people. This is not free trade, regardless of what the freeloaders try to tell us, and if the policy of the State Department and other advocates of this type of program is continued, not only will it bring more unemployment and dislocations to this country but it will lend encouragement for a continuance of the sweatshop practices in foreign lands where these cheap products originate.

We are beyond the point where we can cater to alleged diplomats who, even if their hearts are in America, have failed to keep their minds on the proper page of the world atlas in which they have become so absorbed. It is time for the showdown. Congress can permit the Government agency which has been consistently wrong to continue a policy that brings only destitution and danger to the United States, or it can once again regain its inherent prerogative of acting to promote the national welfare and defense. My vote is for the latter alternative, and I plead with you to join in this crusade in behalf of this land and its people.

POST OFFICE, LOUISVILLE, KY.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I requested this time in order that I may call the membership's attention to a situation existing in the Post Office Department today. I made a statement on the floor of the House on Wednesday, May 20, page 5279 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, relative to the situation of the Louisville, Ky., postmaster. The Louisville Courier-Journal on the same day had an editorial under an excellent cartoon which throws more light on the methods used to make the postmasterships political plums.

I also invite the attention of the House to that editorial which I inserted in the RECORD on May 22, page A2858, taken from the Louisville Courier-Journal entitled "It's No Way to Run a Post Office." Also, an editorial, on the same subject taken from the Louisville Times of May 19, entitled "Hungry Patronage Hounds Bay for the Post Office," appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, page A2917.

I further call the Members' attention to a story I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 20, page A2776, taken from the Louisville Courier-Journal, entitled "Louisville Postmaster and Three Aides Facing Charges by Inspectors—All Accused Registered as Democrats."

The postmaster and three of his top assistants are facing charges described by the press as "operational irregularities." The Courier-Journal editorial reports that—

> The most recent regular inspection gave the Louisville Post Office an efficiency rating of 99. This was March 19.

A special inspection 1 month later, then charges. Their guilt or innocence on these charges will be decided by Assistant Postmaster General N. R. Abrams, described by the press as a "New Jersey Republican of old organization ties."

The Louisville Times, editorially speaking on May 19, made this statement:

> Here is a postmaster with 6 years of unquestioned service suddenly called on the carpet, along with career men whose experience in the Department ranges from 16 to 37 years, only 2 months after the Louisville office had been given a 99-percent efficiency rating. What sort of operational procedures could upset such a rating so soon?
>
> We have Mr. Scholtz' word for it that the charges involve no violation of postal or civil-service laws, that they're "not serious and certainly can be answered satisfactorily." Satisfactorily to whom? If this is a move to get his scalp on technical or picayunish grounds, then no answer the Democratic postmaster might give is likely to be satisfactory to job-hungry Republican politicians.
>
> This newspaper, though a firm believer in civil service, did not complain when the Eisenhower administration last month canceled the results of postmaster examinations conducted late in the Truman administration. Here was a patronage grab involving no fewer than 1,400 jobs. We did not fall for the flimsy official explanation that this was done to establish higher standards of eligibility. We simply took it all with a shrug, bearing in mind that the Democrats hadn't been above playing politics with postmasterships.
>
> We did not anticipate, however, that anybody in authority in Washington might go further and uproot men who had acquired years of experience in what should be career positions in the fullest meaning of the term, as Congress intended when in 1937 it enacted the present law giving postmasters lifetime tenure. When such experience is wastefully sacrificed to serve the cause of political patronage, taxpayers are among the victims.
>
> It is true, of course, that Mr. Scholtz came to his present post after considerable activity in Democratic politics, including a term as mayor. Naturally this didn't hurt him in getting the appointment, although as it happened he made the highest score of 14 applicants examined for the job. Under the law a President can appoint any one of the three top applicants. Had Mr. Scholtz been outscored by two Republicans, we do not doubt Mr. Truman would have given him the job.
>
> All this, however, is beside the point. What is important now is that Mr. Scholtz has enhanced his worth to taxpayers with 6 years of good service on the job. Is this valuable experience, along with that of men who've been in the service even longer, now to be sacrificed on the altar of patronage politics?

The Hoover Commission made five recommendations designed to aid the Post Office Department in eliminating the annual $500 million deficit incurred in their operations. The recommendations Nos. 1 and 5 to make the Postmaster General a nonpartisan career man and eliminate Senate confirmation of first-class postmasters is being ignored in this case.

I cannot stand idly by and see the civil-service system sabotaged and policies established which will simply increase the annual deficit of the Post Office Department. We should face the situation and either make these positions strictly political plums or support our own acts and preserve the civil-service system by retaining experienced and

efficient career men in all post office positions.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN.

Mr. MORGAN. This hatchet work that is going on in the Post Office Department is not limited to Louisville or even to the State of Kentucky. I have 2 first-class post offices in my district. Postal inspectors from upstate have appeared and the postmasters in each one of the first-class post offices who were long career men with 20 years of service or more are under fire. Both had received high ratings only 1 month before. One had been rated 98 and the other had been rated 90. At a recent inspection, they were both rated 67. The irregularities charged are trivial things. One of the irregularities of which one postmaster was accused is that he objected to the wearing apparel of one of his clerks.

Mr. PERKINS. Why did he object to the wearing apparel, would you mind telling the House?

Mr. MORGAN. One of the clerks appeared in the window with a sweatshirt on with a picture of a bathing beauty, and when, of course, the inspector came around, the hatchetman, to get the postmaster, he interviewed the employees. That was one of the complaints, and that is the reason this postmaster lost 1 point on the inspection.

Mr. PERKINS. Where is the location of that post office?

Mr. MORGAN. Cannonsburg, Pa. The other first-class post office is in Uniontown, Pa. The postmaster is under fire there because he is an attorney for the United Mine Workers of America. He was an attorney long before he was appointed postmaster. He is an attorney on an annual-fee basis. He does not try any cases. He has an assistant. But they went into the compensation courts of the State and got the dates of the hearing and then accused this postmaster of appearing at the hearings when his assistant, as a matter of fact, appeared. He filed an affidavit to support his claim that he was not at the hearing, but still he received a rating of 67½ percent. This is purely a political method of removing postmasters.

Mr. PERKINS. Getting back to the Cannonsburg post office, what was the reason if you know why the postmaster called the attention of his clerk to his wearing apparel?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman gets to the post office in Pennsylvania, would he yield to me with reference to the matter of the post office in Louisville?

Mr. PERKINS. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania has concluded, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky. I will have time to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. This is an instance concerning the wearing apparel which happened in 1951, and he is charged with that in 1953.

Mr. PERKINS. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This is the third time that my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, has discussed the Louisville post office situation on the floor of the House. I want to ask you the question: Have you as yet seen the charges that were brought against these men?

Mr. PERKINS. May I say to the gentleman from Louisville that he has been quoted as saying that he was displeased with the idea that the Louisville postmaster might be the guinea pig for an experiment in getting rid of Democratic postmasters by filing such charges as these against efficient postmasters.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to have an answer to my question, if the gentleman pleases. Have you seen the charges that have been brought?

Mr. PERKINS. I have talked to the postmaster of the Louisville, Ky., post office about these charges.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Have you seen the charges?

Mr. PERKINS. Yesterday one of our colleagues in the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] appeared on a program before the National Association of Postmasters in Reading, Pa., with Mr. Abrams, and he referred to the Louisville post-office situation.

When Mr. Abrams responded in his speech, he said that he had not made up his mind about the Louisville Post Office. Now I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from Kentucky if he is interested in, or has been instrumental in preferring these charges against Mr. Scholtz.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to know if you have seen or have knowledge of what the charges are. You can answer that question.

Mr. PERKINS. I have some knowledge, yes. But, if you are going to defend this type of work, I would like to have my colleague tell this House what is wrong with my efforts in exposing corruption, or what is wrong with my efforts in exposing an act that is wrong because you fail to do something in the American way. If you do not believe in civil service, why not come in here and introduce a bill to repeal the civil service laws? Why not do it in the American way instead of trying to accomplish the means by subterfuge. Does that answer the gentleman from Louisville?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have not seen the charges. I do not know what the charges are. I did not make the complaint and you have not seen the charges either and you do not know what the charges are.

Mr. PERKINS. How does the gentleman know so much about what I know about this case?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. You tell us if you have seen the charges.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe the gentleman has been quoted as saying that he would like to see this man out down there. Is that right?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like you to answer my question. Have you seen the charges or do you know what the charges are?

Mr. PERKINS. I will say this to the gentleman, since he knows so much about the situation in Louisville. It is general talk in the district that I represent that Democratic postmasters must go and Republican politicians have even sent word to some postmasters asking them to resign by a certain date. I just do not believe in this underhanded way of doing a job. If you believe in civil service, why not support it; and if you do not believe in civil service, let us have the guts to come in here with legislation and do something about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have in my hand a copy of the resolution adopted by Branch No. 1 of the National Association of Postal Supervisors of Louisville, Ky. The charges in this resolution were amazing to me:

> On May 20, in a special meeting of Branch No. 1, National Association of Postal Supervisors, the following resolution was unanimously adopted.

Then I come to the meat of it, as far as I am concerned. One of the "whereases" is:

> Whereas in the opinion of the members of Branch No. 1, National Association of Postal Supervisors, this investigation was conducted in a prejudicial and un-American manner involving attempted intimidation of employees; and
>
> Whereas the religious affiliations of Louisville, Ky., post office supervisors was made a matter of question by inspectors—

I will refrain from mentioning their names now, but the names are contained in the resolution. It is signed by one of the officers of Branch No. 1 of the National Association of Postal Supervisors located at Louisville, Ky. I know that neither Democrats nor Republicans would subscribe to that, inquiring about the religious affiliation of any person or any employee. The religious affiliation of any person is a matter of their own private conscience. This charge is here. I do not know whether it is correct or not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I object.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, with consent of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION], who has the next special order, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute to place an important request in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. COOLEY. I wish to express the hope, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], chair-

man of the Committee on Government Reorganization, will have the records and transcripts of the hearings before the committee printed and available to Members of the House; and to express the further hope that the gentleman from Michigan will assemble his committee and take such action as the committee may decide to take on the plan for reorganization of the Department of Agriculture known and designated as plan No. 2.

I would like to point out in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that unless the committee does act, debate on the motion to discharge the committee will be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to the opposition and 30 minutes to the proponents. If the committee does take action whether it reports favorably or unfavorably the House will have not to exceed 10 hours for debate. I hope, therefore, the committee will take action.

THE LOUISVILLE POSTMASTERSHIP

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that it becomes necessary to take up the time of the House at this hour of the evening to discuss a matter which has no business on the floor of this House at this time; but the gentleman from Kentucky, my colleague, has for the third time discussed the Louisville post office matter on the floor of this House, an office that is 200 miles from his home and a matter about which he knows absolutely nothing. He has not seen the charges; he has not discussed the charges with anyone who is familiar with the charges, and there is no possible reason for bringing this up at this time.

Now, to start off with, when charges are brought against postal officials——

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. No; I will not at this time.

When charges are brought against postal officials very properly they are held confidential. Charges have been brought against three or four prominent officials here, and they are confidential. The Post Office Department would not let me see them. I do not know a Member of this House, including the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] who has seen them; and in my opinion this is no place to try the case of these postal officials until after it has been handled by the Post Office Department itself.

I want to point out to the gentleman from Kentucky, that I have certain papers that I am not guessing about as you are.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Just for a statement. I do not have 15 minutes as the gentleman did.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is a lawyer. You are insinuating here that you are in a position to get facts and I am not in a position to get facts. I will readily agree that you are in a better position to get the facts; in fact, you know all about this condition existing down there today. But I know as a lawyer that when charges are brought against any individual, that person has the opportunity to respond to those charges.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further in the limited time at my disposal; I am sorry.

I do want to point out some facts in particular. My friend talks about being a great defender of the civil service; in the Louisville post office there are 90 supervisors. Twelve are Republican. Is that civil service?

Furthermore, there are 1,400 employees under civil service in the Louisville post office, one-quarter of whom are colored. On the other hand, there is not one single colored supervisor in the office at Louisville, although the postmaster, who has the authority to appoint supervisors, at the same time is chairman of the board of directors of the Louisville Urban League, a community agency doing social work among the Negroes. Yet he has not appointed one single one of the 400 among his supervisors.

I may say this is not the time or the place to handle the Louisville postal situation. Once the charges are answered, once the matter is brought out into the open as it will be in due course, then the gentleman and I, if the House wants to listen to us, can discuss the civil service problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

(On request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky was given 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to state to my colleague from the great city of Louisville that there are postmasters serving today in the district that I am privileged to represent, who were appointed back some 25 or 30 years ago during a Republican administration. I know that there is something wrong in besmirching a gentleman like Joseph Scholtz, whose office received a grade of 99 percent one month, and then a month or so later other inspectors came in and preferred charges.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I refuse to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I will say that I did not bring the charges, the Senator did not bring the charges, Congressman GOLDEN did not bring the charges. In my opinion, no Republican leader in Kentucky was instrumental in bringing these charges. Where the charges came from and what they are, I do not know. The gentleman is a great believer in civil service. Let the civil service handle this in due course. When it has finished, then we will know which way to go in the matter. Until then the gentleman is guessing as I am guessing, which is not the way to handle the matter.

FEDERAL TAX INCENTIVES FOR LABOR SURPLUS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the New England textile "bust" in the middle of a national boom has been the subject of much diagnosis. The economic doctors have jotted down all the symptoms and then have examined the patient all over again.

But no one bothers to put the medicine to work or use blood plasma.

In the mill valleys of New England, many factories are empty. They have either closed permanently or have moved their operations down South.

How is this vacuum to be filled—to provide jobs for the jobless?

Plainly, the textile industry is on the way out of this area. Other industries must take their place, and not by taking over ancient plants that would add to the cost of production.

We must attract new industries and by offering inducements for them to locate where so much skilled labor is waiting to assist them.

The Federal Government has promised to help, but so far it has done nothing.

It can help, as it has helped other regions. The precedent has been established. For years, money has been taken out of New England by the Federal Government to build up so-called backward areas that are now ahead of New England. They have taken too much blood out of the donor, who needs some of that blood back if he is to survive.

I propose, therefore, that the Assistant Director for Production, Office of Defense Mobilization, be directed by Congress to issue certificates of necessity to corporations who will build new plants in labor-surplus areas.

We have done and are doing this for manufacturers who are engaged in producing for defense, or, in other words, military hardware.

But how about our internal security—the problem of providing jobs for displaced workers and helping certain communities to make the transition from declining industries to growth industries for the purpose of saving them from economic disaster?

As I said before, this method is being employed to stimulate production of war goods. It must be extended to fill the void left by vanishing textiles, by encouraging manufacturers to locate there and set up plants for the production of civilian goods. A new form of economic pioneering is required to provide jobs for the displaced workers of the mills that have given up the ghost.

Certificates of necessity can be of immediate and practical help by offering real incentives for growth industries to come here.

They will permit private companies to recover part or all of their new investment in such facilities within 5 years instead of the routine period of 20 years.

They will help us to overcome an emergency of a different nature than that of preparedness against a foreign threat, but one of no less importance to

our people. Men can be killed off by the slow death of chronic unemployment, as surely as if they were the target of enemy weapons. The suffering lasts longer.

Our national security will not be guaranteed by planes and guns and men in uniform and ammunition if we neglect our homefront—the jobs, the earning power, and the morale of our citizens. This, too, requires defense.

President Eisenhower signed Executive Order No. 10433 on Februray 4, 1953, and issued it on February 6, 1953. This recognized and reaffirmed the practice of issuing certificates of necessity to meet emergency conditions.

I believe that it should be extended to meet the needs of labor-surplus areas, for we, too, have an emergency on our hands.

As the Federal Government has failed to take action authorizing this new interpretation and new application, I am introducing legislation for that purpose.

My bill would amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and section 124A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1950 to make industries planning to locate, modernize, or expand in distressed areas eligible for certificates of necessity on the basis of a domestic emergency in such localities. This would apply irrespective of the type of goods they manufacture, whether for military or civilian needs.

So that the potential benefit for such companies may become a real one, to reward them in some measure for the risk they are being asked to assume, I suggest that they be given some discretion in selecting the particular 5 years during which the accelerated amortization will take place.

At the beginning of their venture, profits may be so slow as to make certification meaningless. Our immediate problem is to get them started in labor-surplus areas and then permit them in such instances to use the tax-benefit consistent with their rate of development. This refers to companies that may not be crowded with orders for military goods.

The first move must come from the Congress, through the medium of constructive, enterprising legislation.

Federal tax incentives are imperative to help the economies of transitional areas like New England to resume their progress on firm footing and on a new road.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ARENDS and to include a statement.

Mr. YOUNGER.

Mr. HESS and to include a radio broadcast by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] on Tuesday, May 26.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. CEDERBERG and to include excerpts from certain Michigan newspapers.

Mr. VAN PELT and to include an essay.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in four instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. CRETELLA and to include an editorial.

Mr. GRANAHAN and to include an address he made before the American Legion in Philadelphia.

Mr. DOLLINGER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. BOLAND).

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an editorial.

Mr. VELDE and to include two articles.

Mr. SADLAK in connection with a presentation made at the White House today.

Mr. HESELTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NORBLAD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in three instances and to include a speech by the Senator from Vermont, newspaper items, and resolutions from the Nebraska State Legislature.

Mr. WOLVERTON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include an address by Gen. Samuel Sturgis, Chief Engineer, notwithstanding the fact that the estimated cost will be $231.

Mr. WIDNALL and to include an article.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANTAFF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LUCAS and to include a statement he made with regard to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. BAILEY in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES and to include a resolution.

Mr. HOLTZMAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include an editorial.

Mr. JONES of Missouri to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain letters.

Mr. FARRINGTON and to include an article notwithstanding the fact it exceeds 2 pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $294.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUNTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. D'EWART in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAMPLER and to include a magazine article.

Mr. WICKERSHAM and to include a letter.

Mr. PRICE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. ROONEY and to include an article appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle May 26.

Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. KNOX (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1242. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies; and

H. R. 1244. An act to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and other purposes."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 28, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

721. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 23, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Great Lakes connecting channels, with a view to determining if it is advisable to provide an alternative ship canal connecting Lake Superior and waters of the lower Great Lakes, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 5, 1949, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 118. Resolution providing for additional compensation for two messengers for the House Committee on Ways and Means; with amendment (Rept. No. 473). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 243. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 91; without amendment (Rept. No. 474). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2564. A bill to make the provisions of section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to injury to or interference with communications systems operated or controlled by the United States, applicable to and within the Canal Zone; without amendment (Rept. No. 489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4126. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits, until July 1, 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4506. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law prohibiting the use of funds of or available for expenditure by any Government corporation or agency for certain payments of annual leave accumulated by a civilian officer or employee thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 674. A bill for the relief of Irene F. M. Boyle; with amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 786. A bill for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar; with amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 819. A bill for the relief of Monika Klein; without amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1106. A bill for the relief of Hannelore Mayerl Fulbright; with amendment (Rept. No. 478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Kates and Ronald Kates; with amendment (Rept. No. 479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1754. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manousos A. Petrohelos; with amendment (Rept. No. 480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 820. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pia Bondi; with amendment (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 892. A bill for the relief of Betty and Irene Robertson; with amendment (Rept. No. 482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2604. A bill for the relief of Lauri Allan Torni; with amendment (Rept. No. 483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3831. A bill for the relief of Panagiotes G. Karras; without amendment (Rept. No. 484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4424. A bill for the relief of Eleonore Friedrich McAnelly; without amendment (Rept. No. 485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4833. A bill for the relief of Hormoz Mahmoud; with amendment (Rept. No. 486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2413. A bill for the relief of Matsue Hashimoto; with amendment (Rept. No. 487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2187. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Miki Tomono; with amendment (Rept. No. 488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 5418. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate trusts and real-estate associations with transferable shares or beneficial interests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 5419. A bill to extend the duration of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 5420. A bill to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, relating to the patenting of plants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5421. A bill to amend section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from taxation the interest received from loans guaranteed under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5422. A bill to authorize the care and treatment at facilities of the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by State courts, and the United States district court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5423. A bill to amend section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from taxation the interest received from loans guaranteed under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 5424. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948, so as to provide that disability and death benefits based on military service shall be excluded from net income in establishing rents for certain low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 5425. A bill to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned synthetic rubber facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 5426. A bill to prohibit the transmittal of communistic propaganda matter in the United States mails or in interstate commerce for circulation or use in public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 5427. A bill to establish two additional offices of Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture and office of an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 5428. A bill to amend section 47c of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 5429. A bill to provide increased annuities for certain civilian officials and employees who performed services in the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 5430. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 5431. A bill to prohibit the discharge of industrial wastes into the waters of Lake Erie and the Niagara River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5432. A bill to prohibit the discharge of industrial wastes into the waters of Lake Erie and the Niagara River, except where the Surgeon General has issued a permit authorizing such discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 264. Joint resolution providing for the taking effect of Reorganization Plan No. 6; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 265. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. J. Res. 266. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week of June 7–14, 1953, as Aid to Korea Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. J. Res. 267. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the establishment of a bi-State park and/or recreational area by the States of Kentucky and Virginia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the establishment of a bi-State park and/or recreational area by the States of Kentucky and Viriginia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should withdraw its recognition of the present Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should withdraw its recognition of the present Communist government of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should withdraw its recognition of the present Communist government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should withdraw its recognition of the present Communist government of Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the

United States should withdraw its recognition of the present Communist government of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should withdraw its recognition of the present Communist government of Bulgaria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should withdraw its recognition of the present Communist government of Albania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. Res. 251. Resolution providing for the publication of the article, How Our Laws Are Made, as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 252. Resolution to provide for the publication of the Constitution, as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. Res. 253. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Fay Little Boykin, daughter of Joseph H. Little; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Res. 254. Resolution providing for compensation for the services of an assistant file clerk; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress in opposition to a reduction of the appropriation for the national school-lunch program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to the Congress of the United States to urge that any steps aimed at curtailment of employment or curtailment of work, at the Boston Naval Shipyard, be reconsidered in view of the value of this facility to our State and national defense and our State and national economic security; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress of the United States to reconsider any proposed curtailment of employment or work at the Boston Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature congratulating members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 5433. A bill for the relief of Perry Perkins and Norah Meredith Perkins, parents of Opal Perkins, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5434. A bill for the relief of Ardent Ross, Nell Ross Taylor, Gertrude Ross Fox, Mildred Ross Hicks, Peggy June Ross, and Patsey Gail Ross, brothers and sisters of Kenneth Ross, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 5435. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edwin G. Griffith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 5436. A bill for the relief of David Hanan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 5437. A bill for the relief of Mr. Zafirios Rapessis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 5438. A bill for the relief of Ely Schapiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 5439. A bill for the relief of Catherine Virginia Flynn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 5440. A bill for the relief of Frank T. Adler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 5441. A bill for the relief of Elena Spacapan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5442. A bill for the relief of Mr. On Saik Chiang and Mrs. Nena Tabongbanua Yee Chiang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 5443. A bill for the relief of Eva Lowinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5444. A bill for the relief of David Dembitzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5445. A bill for the relief of Nickolaos Theochorous Grammatikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 5446. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Chmura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. Res. 255. Resolution for the purpose of sending H. R. 1114, together with all accompanying papers, to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 256. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 4661) for the relief of the Av-Equip Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

291. By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Madison, Wis., Common Council urging congressional passage of legislation to permit integration of the Wisconsin State retirement system with Federal social security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

292. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert E. Edmondson, of Bend, Oreg., relative to transmitting the text of the unconditional dismissal decision of the Washington mass case as handed down on November 22, 1946, by Chief Justice Laws and upheld by the United States Court of Appeals, effective July 31, 1947, ending the prosecution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

293. Also, petition of Jose Alvarez Micheltorena, Gastronomic Workers of Cuba, Habana, Cuba, relative to the investment of their funds and the opening of a new working center where they can obtain work in regard to the building of a new hotel in Habana to be operated by the International Hilton Corp.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.